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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 conflations 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.
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INTRODUCTION: THE NATURE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EPH AND COL.

SUMMARY OF LINCOLN'S VIEW AND OUTLINE 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. xl-viii-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 παντεσθέντες 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 σωμα and οἱ κομματία (Lincoln, pp. lll-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), Aristeas - 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 Aristeas 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 Aristeas 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 Aristeas 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 Aristeas 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 charac-
teristic 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 verba-
tim 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).
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").

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.

---

(ἐμοὶ δ' οὖς ἀναγκαῖον ἔδοξεν εἰναι τὰ ὅνοματα τῶν ἐβδομηκοντα πρεσβυτέρων, οί τῶν νόμων ἐκόμιζον ὑπὸ Ἑλεαζάρων πεμφθέντες, δηλοῦν) but refers to the end of the letter (Ἡν 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 γνώναι τῶν ἐν τῷ συμπόσιῳ ζητηθέντων εἶναι μαθεῖν ἀναγνωρίζον τῷ Ἀρισταῖον βιβλίον. δ' συνέγραψε διὰ ταῦτα (Jew. Ant., § 100). 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. Part of this implementation of a unity of composition is also the unification of style.

1.2 JOSEPHUS' PURSUIT OF HIS OWN PARTICULAR POINTS OF EMPHASIS IN REDACTING HIS SOURCE

1.2.1 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 (1.2.1-2.4).

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: τούτο γὰρ ποιήσειν ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπηγγειλάμην).  

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 κἀκεῖνῷ δὲ πρέπειν ἐνόμισα τὸ μὲν τὸν ἀρχιερέας μιμήσασθαι μεγαλώσασθαι, τὸ βασιλεῖ δὲ πολλοὺς ὀμοίως ὑπολαβέτιν). 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 vivante 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 *Ἰουδαϊκή Ἀρχαιολογία (Jewish Antiquities)* as a counterpart to Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Ῥωμαϊκή Ἀρχαιολογία (Roman Antiquities).*

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". 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.

---


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) έξαιρέτως ἐφιλοτιμήθη τὸν ἱμέτερον νόμον (...) εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φοινήν μεταβαλείν: il a mis à faire traduire notre Loi en grec tout son point d'honneur (Ant. I, 10). Discrete leçon pour les nouveaux maîtres!"

The second and last time Pelletier refers to this 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 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, §§ 11-118 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.

I.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). 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.


\(^{12}\) 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).

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 διαράσσομαι, καθὼς ἔθος σύντοις ἐστίν, εἰ τις διασκεδάζει προστιθεὶς ἢ μεταφέρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιοῦ μενος ἄφορεσιν", 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, εἰ τις ἡ περισσὸν τι προσγραμμένον ὁρᾷ τῷ νόμῳ ἡ λείπων, πάλιν ἐπισκοποῦντα τοῦτο καὶ ποιοῦσαν φανερὸν 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, revêtû 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."  

1.3 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 vocabulary, but also in his grammar and style. 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".

1.4 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 ἀπ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἔξ ἀπ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς, ἔξ ("six from each tribe") and of ἀπὸτούς το κατὰ τὴν ἐρµινείαν ὀρίσθηκεn ("obtained an accurate translation"; Arist., § 32) is changed into ἔξ ἀπ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς and into το κατὰ τὴν ἐρµινείαν ὀρίσθηκεn ἀπὸτούς (Jew. Ant., § 39). This phenomenon also occurs in Eph's rewriting of Col, namely in Eph 4.15 which changes τὰ πάντα εἰς σῶτον (Col 1.20) into εἰς σῶτον τὰ πάντα, in Eph 5.16 where τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγωγοῦμενοι (Col 4.5) is changed into ἐξαγωγοῦμενοι τὸν καιρὸν, and in Eph 6.9 where ὅπου ἐστὶν προσωποληψιά (Col 3.25) is turned into προσωποληψιά ὅπου ἐστὶν. 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 ηὗξατο

---

16 See Pelletier, pp. 203-204.
18 See Pelletier, pp. 254-259.
19 See Pelletier, pp. 259-260.
20 See Pelletier, p. 261.
21 See Pelletier, pp. 260-261.
pán to plēthos, ἵνα σοι γένηται καθὼς προσαιρη διὰ παντὸς, καὶ διασώζῃ σοι τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνη 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 ἐποιήσατο γενέσθαι σοι τὰ κατὰ νοῦν καὶ φυλαχθῆναι σοι 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 (Ἐνδυσάσθησε σοί ὅπως [...] ταπεινοφοροῦντι, πραύτητα, μακροθυμιάν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων) is modified by inserting καὶ and μετὰ: μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφοροῦντος 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 πλοκῆ, θαυμασίως ἔχουσα, ῥοµβωπθὴν ἀποστελεύσα τὴν ἀνά 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 ῥοµβωπθὴ (made in the shape of a rhombus') is replaced by the noun ῥοµβος in Jew. Ant., § 72: μετὰ δὲ τὸν μαιανδρον πλέγμα τι σχοινοειδές περιήκτο, ῥοµβόν τὴν κατὰ μέσον ὄψιν ἐμφερέσ ("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 (Νεκρωσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ὅτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία) are changed into adjectives: πάς πόρνον ἡ ἀκαθαρσία ἡ πλεονέκτης, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομιάν 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 Aristeas* 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 conflations 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 Autorship, Origin and Purpose*, Oxford: OUP, 1951; Appendix I, pp. 279-315) are unsatisfactory and for the detection and the examination of conflations 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 conflations 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 ἄγιος καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

Cf. Eph 1.4 καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἄγιος καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἁγίατη, with Col 1.22 διὰ ἀποκατηλλαξαί ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, παραστήσας ἡμᾶς ἄγιος καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

Since the phrase ἄγιος 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 ἄγιος 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 ἠγαπημένῳ, ἐν ὧν ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν γίνεται τὸν 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 Epheserbrief, 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


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. 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 ἢς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγάπημένῳ, ἐν οἶχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων (Eph 1.6-7) is compounded from

(a) τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, ἐν οἶχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (Col 1.13-14), a direct parallel in the opposite column; the noun υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (Col) is replaced by the perfect passive participle ἡγάπημένος: 'the one loved by God' instead of the 'son of God's love'. The clause ἐν οἶχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (Col), which qualified the υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, is literally copied. A minor change, however, is that the phrase ἀφεσιν 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.
(b) subsequently the author of Eph relies on Col 1.20 καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξας 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 ἀφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, found in Col 1.14, which language can also be found in Col 1.20 καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξας 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 ἀπολύτρωσις 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 ἀφεσις 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 1.6b-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 ἢς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγασμένῳ, ἐν ὧν ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων, κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἢς ἐπερίσσεσθεν 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'.

18
Lincoln, pp. Lll 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 φιλομέν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν ... τὴν ἀφεσιν, 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 Ἰδία τούτῳ κατά, ἐκκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἄγιονς, ὁ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μειᾶν ποιοῦμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ἵνα ὁ θεός τοῦ κυρίου ἢμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (...) δῶῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλυπτεῖ σὲ ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ (Eph 1.15-17) is compounded from

(a) Ἰδία τούτῳ κατά ἡμείς, ἀφ' ἡς ἡμέρας ἐκκούσας, ὁ 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 Ἰδία τούτῳ κατά ἡμείς (...) ὁ παύομαι 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 ἡμείς into the singular: Ἰδία τούτῳ κατά ἡμείς, ἀφ' ἡς ἡμέρας ἐκκούσας, ὁ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι (Col) is converted into Ἰδία τούτῳ κατά, ἐκκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἄγιονς, ὁ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μειᾶν ποιοῦμενος (Eph). Secondly, the phrase ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα is (Col) is changed into μειᾶν ποιοῦμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ἵνα (Eph): the verb προσευχόμενοι is now 'spelled out' as μειᾶν 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). 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 θεός (...) δῶῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλυπτεῖ σὲ ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ (Eph) ...
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' ἓς ἡμέρας ἱκούσαμεν in Col 1.9 (Διὰ τούτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἓς ἡμέρας ἱκούσαμεν, ού πανομεθα έτης) is replaced by another since the author draws upon the clause ἄκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἦν ἔχετε εἰς τὸν πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους in Col 1.4-5 Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, ἄκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἦν ἔχετε εἰς τὸν 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 Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς (πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) is changed into ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς (πίστις ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ) and finally the phrase τὴν ἀγάπην ἦν ἔχετε εἰς τὸν πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (Col) is shortened to τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς τὸν 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 ἄκούσας 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. 49), 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 intercessions introduced by the final clause with ἵνα in 1:17 takes up elements of the intercessions in Col 1:9, also introduced by ἵνα" (Lincoln, p. 49).

Cf. Mitton, p. 65 (point b): "It seems likely that the word ἄκοψω in Col. i.9 made a mental link, in the mind of the writer of Ephesians, with ἄκοψαντες 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' ἓς ἡμέρας ἱκούσαμεν (...) eine Rückbeziehung auf die (...) Notiz von [Kol 1,4]: ἄκοψαντες .... κτλ sind. Der Vf [the author of Eph] mußte daher jetzt, wo er den Gedanken des ἄκοψειν 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 1.15-19a (Ochel, pp. 32-37). The passage Eph 1.15-19a can be divided between the introduction to the intercessory prayer (Eph 1.15-16 Διὰ τούτῳ κατά ἡμᾶς, ἑκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς τὸν πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, οὐ πανομεθα έκχαριστών ύπὲρ ὑμῶν μενειαν ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου) and the intercessory prayer itself (Eph 1.17-19a ἵνα ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, δόθη ὑμῖν πνεῦμα
the intercessory prayer in Eph 1.17-19\textsuperscript{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-Fürbitten 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 θεός [...]) δὴν ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπίγνωσει αὐτοῦ) not even as reminiscences of the same terms in Col 1.9 (ἵνα πληρωθῇ τῇ 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\textsuperscript{a}: "Jedoch sind (...) auch die Gemeinsamkeiten mit der koloss. Fürbitten (...) Gemeinsam haben beide Fürbitten nur die Begriffe ἐπίγνωσις und σοφία. Da diesen beiden der Eph- und Kol-Fürbitten 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\textsuperscript{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 κάγω (... ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν μειᾶς μοι ὑμῖν ἡμεῖς καὶ προσευχήματα μοι ἵνα (Eph 1.15-17) is derived from διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς (... ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν προσευχήματα καὶ ἀμοιβάς 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 ἐπίγνωσι σατοῦ] 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\textsuperscript{a} has not been composed independently from Col is also clear from the fact, that the fragment εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τις ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τις ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρο-
The sentence εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἀγίοις (Eph 1.18) is primarily compounded from

(a) τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἡθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτον ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν, ὁ ἐστιν 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 ἡθέλησεν 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 sentence; the neutral τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης is changed into the masculine τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης while the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν (τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτον ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν) 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 ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπίς etc. (Eph) is part of a sentence which extends over Eph 1.15-19:

115 Διὰ τοῦτο κάγω, ἀκούσας τὴν καθ’ ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἄγαπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, τοὺς προσενέχων μου, ἡθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, διὰ ὑμᾶς πνεύμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύφθην, ἐπιγνώσθην αὐτοῦ, 116 περιφρονημένοι τοὺς ὁφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας (ὑμῶν) εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, 117 καὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἀγιότος 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, ἄγαπη εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους and ἐλπίς occurs (see point 2b). The first two terms, πίστις and ἄγαπη, 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 Ιησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἢ ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τούς ἁγίους διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς ἀποκειμένης 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 το πλούτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὥστε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἢ 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 conflations 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 πλούτος 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 τῆς ὁ πλούτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (Eph 1.18) is an example of this 'borrowing' since it reflects εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρί τῷ ἐκκαθάρισαν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μετά τοῦ κληρονομοῦ τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ (Col 1.12) 27, a verse which was probably already used at the start of Eph 1.18 περισσοτε- 

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 ἑορτά.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 conflations 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 (...) τὸ παντόμηθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ συνάνθρωποι ἵνα ...

with Eph 1.15ff. Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγώ (...) τὸ παντόμηθα ἐν χείριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνείαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχόμενον 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 ἄγιοσ διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν εἰς τοὺς οἰκονόμους

with Eph 1.15 ἀκούσας τὴν κἀγὼ πίστιν εἰς τὸ κύριον Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἄγιοσ.

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 πνευματικῆ) and continues with an infinitive-construction περιπατῆσαι ἄξιος τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πάσαν 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 ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπίγνωσι ἀοτροῦ, and subsequently mentions an extra object, namely περιπατισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν (in reliance on Col 1.12-13 εὐχαριστοῦντας τὸ πατρὶ τὸ ἰκανὸν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλῆρον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ ἑορτά ὡς ἔρροφον ὑμᾶς ἑκ 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, ἁγάπη 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 ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ (see conflation 3b).

That the mentioning of the terms πίστις (Eph 1.15), ἁγάπη (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, ἁγάπη and ἐλπίς occur in the same sequence in both letters:

---

28 Cf. Lincoln, p. 58 on the phrase περιπατισμένους 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 ἦν ἐχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους διὰ (3) τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς ὁμανοίς, ἤν προπροκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας

with Eph 1.15-18 Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγώ, ἀκούσας (1) τὴν καθ’ ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ (2) τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (...) εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστιν (3) ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλῆσεως αὐτοῦ.

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

Cf. Eph 1.18 εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλῆσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις

with Col 1.26-27 τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἡθέλσαν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐθεσείν, ὃ ἐστιν 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 γνωρίσας τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐθεσείν (Col 1.27) is implemented thrice in Eph: εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς (1) τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλῆσεως αὐτοῦ, (2) τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, καὶ (3) τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς 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 τὸ πατρὶ τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φασί.

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 κατά 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 τοῦτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐθεσείν, ὃ ἐστιν 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 extend 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 ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐννόηγησαν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρων αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξίῳ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (Eph 1.19-20) is compounded from
(a) ἐν πάσῃ δύναμει δυναμοῦμενοι 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 ἰσχίος αὐτοῦ: ἐνδυνάμωσθε ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχίου 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 κράτος (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 τοῦ κράτους:

(b) ἀγανιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἐμοί ἐν δύναμει (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 ἐνήργησαν ἐν in the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχίος αὐτοῦ ἣν ἐνήργησαν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (Eph) since it is similar to the relative clause τὴν ἐνεργομένην ἐν in κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἐμοί 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 δύναμεως 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 [ἀγανιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἐμοί ἐν δύναμει]. 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 ἰσχίος αὐτοῦ ἣν ἐνήργησαν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν]." Although Lincoln refers to the relation between Eph 1.19 and Col 1.29 he nevertheless nowhere notices the unique combination of ἐνεργεῖα and ἐνεργεῖν which occurs only in Col 1.29 and Eph 1.19-20;

and by (c) συνηγέρθησε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν (Col 2.12). It is obvious that the combination of the term ἐνεργεία with the phrase ἐγείρας αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν in Eph is dependent upon Col 2.12³⁰, especially since the combination of the term ἐνεργεία 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 δύναμει δυναμοῦμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ".

³⁰ Cf. Lincoln, p. 61: "Col 2:12 (...) also employs the term ἐνεργεία 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 κατά τὸ χράτος in Col 1.11 (see point a above). Having copied this phrase he subsequently blends it with the phrase κατά 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 κατά τὸ χράτος with. The phrase κατά τὴν ἐνέργειαν in Col 1.29 is the first instance of 'power language' like δύναμις, χράτος and ἐνέργεια after Col 1.11 and therefore the author of Eph immediately made use of it changing the phrase κατά τὸ χράτος (Col 1.11) into κατά τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ χράτους. That Col 1.29 has been consulted is beyond any doubt since the combination of the noun ἐνέργεια and the verb ἐνέργειν 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 ἐγέρσειν 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 δόν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἅνω ζητεῖτε, οὔ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθίμενος. The only changes are, firstly, that the verb καθίσασθαι is changed into καθίσειν, while, secondly, the term τὰ ἅνω 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 (τίνα ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ὁ Ἰσραήλ Χριστός [...] δόθη ἡμῖν [...] περιττιμώμενος τοὺς ὀρθολογίας τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ἡμᾶς [...] τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστευόντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ χράτους τῆς ἱσχοῦς αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις κτλ), while in the sentence Col 3.1 God ahs 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 ὃ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνέργειας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐνεργοντος αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν), the text just drawn on, but lastly also in Col 3.1 - Εἰ δόν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἅνω ζητεῖτε, οὔ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθίμενος. 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 1.19b-2.10 which he considers to be a separate unit. Since the confluences 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 confluences five to seven form together the uninterrupted text of Eph 1.22-2.5. The sentence καὶ αὐτὸν ἐδοξασεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἤτοι ἢ ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (Eph 1.22-23) is compounded from

(a) καὶ αὐτὸς ἢ ἐστὶν 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 ἢ 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) ἀντανακληρῶ τὰ ύποτέρℏιματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκι μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὁ ἢ ἐστιν 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, ὁ ἢ ἐστιν 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 ὁ ἢ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία which qualifies the term σῶμα (τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὁ ἢ ἐστιν 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, ἤτοι ἢ 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 ἢ 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 ἐδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν πληρομένου (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 ἐκτίσται), 1.17 (καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν) and 1.20 (καὶ δι᾿ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλέλεται τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν);

(b) ὃς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων (Col 1.18), in which the phrase ἐν πᾶσιν can be found (cf. Col 3.11 [τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστὸς]). 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 κατοικήσαι (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 πληρομένου (Eph 1.23).33

(7) The passage 21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τoῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τoῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν αἷς ποτὲ περιπατήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας, ἐν ὅις καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημεν <ποτε> ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν <διανοιαν>, καὶ ἡμεῖς τέκνα φύσει ὡρικὴς ὡς καὶ οἱ λουποὶ (…), 25 καὶ ὃντας ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς τoῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτι ἐστε σεσωμένοι - καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Θεσοῦ (Eph 2.1-3 and 2.5-6) is compounded from several 'Colossian' passages.

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

(a) Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτὲ ὄντας ἀπελλοτριωμένους (Col 2.11) in the directly opposite column and

(b) καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας ἐν τoῖς 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 2.11 as his starting point (Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτὲ 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 ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν (except for the change of the accusative ὑμᾶς into ὑμᾶς). The remainder of Eph 2.5 reads καὶ ὄντας ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεξαποιήθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτι ἐστε σεσωσμένοι - and can be traced back to Col 2.13 as well.34

The author of Eph copies not only the accusative clause καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἁκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, συνεξαποιήθησαν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρίσματος ὑμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα, with Eph 2.5 καὶ ὄντας ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεξαποιήθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτι 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 ἁκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν since the term ἁκροβυστία is part of an argument in the passage Col 2.11-13 about πεντηκοσίη, ἁκροβυστία and βαπτισμός 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 ἁκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν by the dative καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, whereas during the second application of Col 2.13 in Eph 2.5 he leaves the phrase καὶ τῇ ἁκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν even out)36, 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 ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς] and in all three references the word order is slightly different. Eph 2:5, συνεξαποιήθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, (...) is dependent on Col 2:13, συνεξαποιήθησαν 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 ἀπολλοφριαμένους as well.

35 In Eph 2.11, however, the author of Eph picks up Col's antithesis between ἁκροβυστία and πεντηκοσίη; 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 Kol 2,13 a, nur daß die im Eph-Zusammenhang nicht passende ἁκροβυστία τῆς σαρκὸς einmal (2,1) durch ἁμαρτία 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 ἁκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν (Col 2.13) into τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν (Eph 2.1): "On avait là [Col2.13] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἁκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν. Le deuxième élément de cette paire précisait le passé pêcheur des Colossiens par leur condition piaine: ils étaient des incirconcis. 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 Ephésiens, ayant laissé de côté ce thème polémique de circoncision-baptême, n'avait plus à évoquer le passé <<incirconcis>> de ses lecteurs (...). Elle substitue donc à τῇ ἁκροβυστίᾳ καὶ, une expression plus générale, pratiquement synonyme de la précédente" (p. 14).
συνεζωοποίησεν, which has the accusative clause ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας as its object, while the phrase συνεζωοποίησεν (...) σὺν αὐτῷ (Col) is specified as συνεζωοποίησεν 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 ὦ κατὰ Χριστὸν ὄτι 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 ἦμιν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα (Col) is also transferred to Eph 2.5: ἁρπαί ἐστε σεσωμένοι (Eph), which phrase is repeated again in Eph 2.8 τῇ γὰρ ἁρπαί ἐστε σεσωμένοι 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 only here in Eph 2.6.

See Col 2.12-13 ἐν ὦ καὶ συνηγέρθησα διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὶς ὄντας κτλ.

and Col 3.1-3 Εἰ σὺν συνηγέρθησε τῷ Χριστῷ, τά ἄνω ἐξετάζει, οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος (...) ἀπεθάνετε γάρ, καὶ ἦ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέρκυσται 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, 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 ἀκροβοταίia in Eph 2.11 and that the antithesis between περιτομή and ἀκροβοταίia 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 ἀκροβοταίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν but does not comment on this replacement: "ἀμαρτία (... 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 (...) συνεζωοποίησεν" (p. 12).

38 Cf. Benoit, pp. 12-13: "son horizon céleste (en tois 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 (συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ ... καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν εν τοις ἐπουρανιοῖς εν 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 συνηγέρθησε, (...) 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).
καθήσονται (Col 3.1 ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος) is changed into συνκεκάθισεν (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 Χριστὸς ἔστιν 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 ἦν ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ).

(d) The lines ἐν οἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε etc. (Eph 2.2-3) are compounded from Col 3.5-7 Νεκρῶσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (...) ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν (...), δι’ ἐρχεται ἡ ὁργή τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς νιότοις τῆς ἁπειθείας; ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατε 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 ἄμαρτίας mentioned in Eph 2.1.

Cf. Lincoln, pp. 90, 93 and 98: "Eph 2:2, ἐν οἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε, (...) takes up the language of Col 3:7, ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατε 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 νιότοις τῆς ἁπειθείας; ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατε ποτε.40 The prepositional clause ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατε

39 Cf. Lincoln, p. 105 on Eph 2.6 (καὶ συννήσεις καὶ συνεκαθισέως 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 νιότοις τῆς ἁπειθείας are omitted in a part of the tradition (א^6, ב^4, כ^5, ב and ס) 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 (א, ב, ג, ד, ה, י, ק, ל, מ, נ, ט, י, ו, ב, מ, נ, ט, י, ו, ב) (p. 15-17) in favour of the reading ἐπὶ τοὺς νιότοις τῆς ἁπειθείας are firstly, that without the words ἐπὶ
That means that the words \( \text{EJII Tife djiEieelaq in 3.6} \) are almost probably authentic -oloix; \( \text{Col} \) and \( \text{5.6 5i6t Ta^Ta f) opyn TOV Geov eirl} \) \( \text{EpxeToi} \) and \( \text{xov} \) \( \text{Col} \) eeoT)); interestingly, in both derivations from \( \text{f}) \) \( \text{xavxa yhp 'ipxexai} \) \( \text{5.6 8ia} \) \( \text{Eph} \) \( \text{3.6 8i' a ip^ETai f}) \) \( \text{xov} \) \( \text{Qzov} \) \( \text{TCOTE} \) but also in \( \text{Col} \) \( \text{jtAvTeq inieic}, 3.7 \) \( \text{2.2-3} \) are derived from \( \text{Eph} \) \( \text{avEOTpdcprmEv \oid} \) \( \text{TOlOTE} \) \( \text{EV} \) \( \text{Kod} \) \( \text{nEpiETiaTr|gaTE} \) \( \text{ale, noxe nepienax-t\]caxz} \) \( \text{2.2-3} \) \( \text{where it is employed since the phrases} \) \( \text{EV} \) \( \text{and ev} \) \( \text{Kal} \) \( ? \) \( \text{(p.15): vient ajouter I'incise TOVTOI OTE E^TITE ev} \) would cause a pleonastic repetition: "on ne voit vraiment pas, dans cette construction, ce que\( \text{EjriGDfiiav KaKTiv, Kal TITK; EOTIV Ei8coX.oX} \) \( \text{7cX.E0ve^iav, aTpia}, \) \( \text{^-^} \) \( \text{0} \) \( \text{TTIV} \)\n
En 1 Th 2,16; Rom 1,18, on attend ici un complement" (p. 15); an object of the wrath of God: "Normalement la Colore de Dieu «vient sur» quelqu'un: comme those who are disobedient, amongst whom the believers previously lived (\( \text{EJII Tife djiEieelaq the phrase} \) \( \text{5i' a EpxETai fi opyfi} \) \( \text{in} \) \( \text{Col} \) \( \text{TO'vx; •uioix; djiapTian; by its synonym} \) \( \text{Tiepienaxfiaaxe (a \text{ddvxei; and the replacement of} \text{dveoxpd} \) \( \text{reflects firstly the} \text{©v (prmev (Eph)} \) \( \text{xfiq \text{noxe e7ti9v dneiGeiaq}) and the following clause which specifies this term show again dependence \text{Col, parallel in} \text{xfjq} \text{one particular term in the second \text{katá-phrase (namely the term \text{vioi tīs \text{άπειθειας}})}} \) \( \text{is now presented in the form that the believers were by} \text{tois \text{vioi\v d\text{νιας \text{άπειθειας}}} the phrase} \text{dί' \text{έχρεται \text{ή όργη τού θεού}}} \text{in \text{Col 3.6 would be left without an object of the wrath of God: "Normalement la Colère de Dieu <vient sur> quelqu'un: comme en 1 Th 2,16; Rom 1,18, on attend ici un complément" (p. 15);} \text{secondly, if the words \text{ἐπί τοὺς \text{vioi\v \text{d\text{νιας \text{άπειθειας}}}}} \text{are omitted both \text{ἐν οἷς} and \text{ἐν τοῖς \text{/io\v το\v \text{περιεπατήσατέ}}} \text{and \text{secondly the term \text{ἐπιθυμίας which already occurs in \text{Col 3.5-7 \text{Νεκρώσατε \όν \text{τά \text{μέλη τά \text{ἐπί \text{τής \text{γῆς}}} \text{(... \text{ἐπιθυμίαν θακήν} (...}} \text{. The last part of \text{Eph 2.3 (καὶ \text{ἡμεθα τέκνα φύσει όργής ός καὶ οἱ λοιποί}})} \text{also shows that the author of \text{Eph draws upon the passage \text{Col 3.5-7 since the thought that the wrath of God (the \text{ὁργή τοῦ θεοῦ}}} \text{is coming over those who are disobedient, amongst whom the believers previously lived (δι' \text{έχρεται \text{ή όργη τοῦ θεοῦ \text{ἐπί τοὺς \text{vioi\v \text{d\text{νιας \text{άπειθειας}}} \text{ἐν οἷς καὶ ύμεις \text{περιεπατήσατε} \text{ποτε}}}), is now presented in the form that the believers were by}}\)
nature children of wrath (τέκνα φόνει ὁργῆς) like the rest (καὶ ἡμεθα τέκνα φόνει ὁργῆς ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ).

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 πονηροὶ and διάνοια occur already in Col 1.21. Kai ὡς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριμένους καὶ ἐχθροῖς 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 χάριτι ἔστε 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 Kai ὡς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοὺς παραπτώμασιν
and Eph 2.5-6 καὶ ὄντας ὡς νεκροὺς τοὺς παραπτώμασιν συνεξωσποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτι ἔστε σεσωσμένοι - καὶ συνῆγερεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦς

with Col 2.12-13 ἐν ὧς καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὡς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὡμῶν, συνεξωσποίησεν ὡς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρίσαμένος 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 χάριτι ἔστε σεσωσμένοι) which passage is - as explained before - relying on Col 2.12-13. See Eph 2.5-6 and 2.8

καὶ ὄντας ὡς νεκροὺς τοὺς παραπτώμασιν συνεξωσποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτι ἔστε σεσωσμένοι - καὶ συνῆγερεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦς (...).

The immediate indication, however, that διὰ πίστεως was derived from Col 2.12 might be that πίστεωσ 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 χάριτι ἐστε σεσωμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τούτο ὅπως εἴς ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δόμον· οὕτω εἴς ἔργον) - the only place in Eph where this contradistinction occurs - can terminologically also be found in Col 1.21-23 (καὶ υἱὸς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένος καὶ ἐξερχόμεν τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πνεύμοις), νυν δὲ ἀποκατήλθασέν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς ἀυτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, παραστήσας υἱόν ἰδίου καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, εἰ 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) εἰ 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 1.19b-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 1.17-19a (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 1.19b-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 1.19b-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 ἐνεργείαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ
derived from Col 2.12 συνταφείς αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ὧν καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ

1.20 ἦν ἐνηγγεσαν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ
[1] relative clause to link two parts of Col 2.12 together

ἐγείρας αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν,
derived from Col 2.12 διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἑγείραντος αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν
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^ e i c η μᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ. Ochel's argument is that the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν belongs together with πιστεύοντας and functions as the qualification of e i c η μᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας, and that the combination of πίστεως and ἐνέργεια also occurs in Col 2.12 ἐν ὧ καὶ συνηγέρθη ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνέργειας τοῦ θεοῦ. The author of Eph derives this combination from Col 2.12 only changing the noun πίστεως into the verb πιστεύειν: e i c η μᾶς 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 ἐνέργειας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν), the author of Eph has according to Ochel to introduce the relative clause ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ
Xριστῶ 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 ἥν 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 ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ ἥν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν

with Col 2.12 ἐν ὧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνέργειας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνέργειας 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 conflations 2 and 3) the primary constituents of Eph 1.15-18 are Col 1.9 (the framework of Eph 1.15-17 ἄλλα τῶν τάξεων [...] οὐ παρόμοια εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν μνεῖαν ποιομένος 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 conflations 2b and 3 showed). It is, therefore, first necessary to see if the phrase εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἱσχύος 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 ἱσχύος 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 (...) ἥν 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 ἥν 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 τους 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 τους 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 ὧν καὶ πιστεύοντες ἑσφραγίσθητε 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 ἐγείροντος αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν as the fragment ἐγείροντος αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν (Eph 1.20 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἢν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείροντος αὐτῶν 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 ἢν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείροντος αὐτῶν 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 τῷ κράτος (Col 1.11) into κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους (...) ἢν ἐνήργησεν ἐν with the aid of Col 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἑνεργουμένην 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 ἐγείροντος αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν so that the complete 'Ephesian' sentence became κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἢν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείροντος αὐτῶν 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 ἢν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείροντος αὐτῶν 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 τῷ κράτος (Col 1.11) as its starting point.
(2) The other part of Ochel's interpretation, which entails that the passage *Eph* 1.20c-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 ἐδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἢτις 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 ἐδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἢτις 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 πάσιν πληρομένου (*Eph* 1.20-23) 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* 1.20c-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 [...] χάριτι ἐστε σαφειμένοι 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* 1.19b-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 ἐννιμουνέστε ὅτι ποτὲ ὑμεῖς τα ἐθνη ἐν σαρκί, οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς εἰ σαρκὶ χειροποίητου (*Eph* 2.11) is compounded from

(a) ἐν ὧ καὶ περιτεμόθηκε περιτομὴ ἀκροβυστίτι τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκὸς, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Col* 2.11) from which the terms περιτομή, χειροποίητος (in *Col* negatively phrased as ἀχειροποίητος) and σάρξ are derived;

and (b) καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς 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 τῆς ἄκροβυστίας 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 τῆς ἄκροβυστίας τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν (Col 2.13) but replaced the last part καὶ τῆς ἄκροβυστίας τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν with καὶ τοῖς ὀμαρτίαις 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 ἄκροβυστία 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 περιτομὴ ἄχειροποιητός in Col 2.11 as parallel. In fact the author of Eph draws also upon Col 2.13 since he extracts the contradi stinctive terms περιτομὴ (Col 2.11) and ἄκροβυστία (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 ἄκροβυστία 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 so); 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 ὤτε τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, ἀπῆλλοτριμένου τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἐν τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἀθεοί ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. 2.13 νυνὶ δὲ ... (Eph 2.12-13) is compounded from

(a) Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε [ποτε = τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ] ὄντας ἀπῆλλοτριμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς [καὶ ἐχθροὺς = καὶ ἐν τοῖς διανοιαῖς 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 (...).
The pre-Christian time is described in Col by the participle ἀπελλοτριωμένοι and the noun ἐξήρωσι τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ποιημαίοις (Col 1.21). This description of the pre-Christian state reappears in Eph: ἀπελλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ καὶ ξένων τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. The only changes are that firstly the noun ἐξήρωσι is replaced by ξένων, secondly the participle ἀπελλοτριωμένοι is further qualified by a genitive (ἀπελλοτριω-μένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ) and thirdly the dative τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ποιημαίοις which qualified the noun ἐξήρωσι (καὶ ἐξήρωσι τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ποιημαίοις) is replaced by the genitive τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (καὶ ξένων τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας).

Cf. Benoit, p. 18: "Eph 2,11-12 paraît bien s'inspirer de Col 1,21. Non seulement le ποτὲ ύμείς rappelle le καὶ ύμας ποτε ὄντας de Col (...), mais encore le rare ἀπελλοτριωμένοι est repris"; "son associé de Col ἐξήρωσι est remplacé au v. 12 par ξένων (cf. encore le v. 19)". The only difference is that Benoit does not recognize that the ύμας (...), ὄντας scheme found in Col 1.21-22 is copied in Eph 2.12-13 and changed into τῷ καρφери ἐκεῖνῳ (...), νυνὶ δὲ; therefore he points at the alleged similarity of Col 1.21 Καὶ ύμας ποτε ὄντας ἀπελλοτριωμένοι with Eph 2.11 Διὸ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ποτὲ ύμείς τά θέην ἐν σαρκί although to me the real similarity is found in the τῷ καρφери ἐκεῖνῳ (...), 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 ἐλλίπει μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἂθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: ἦτε τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, ἀπελλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ καὶ ξένων τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλλίποδο μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἂθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. The contradistinction between κόσμος and Χριστός seems to be derived from Col 3.8 κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ὅταν κατὰ Χριστὸν ἤρθαν οἱ συναδελφοί μας ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ἀρα ζόντες 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 ποτὲ (...), νυνὶ δὲ scheme from Col 1.21-22 has been copied although changed into τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ (...), νυνὶ δὲ. The ποτὲ (...), νυνὶ δὲ scheme occurs further in Col also in Col 3.6-7 (the only other place in Col besides Col 1.21-22 where the term ποτὲ occurs): ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἁπαθείας: ἐν οἷς καὶ ύμεῖς περιπατήσατε ποτὲ, ὅτε ἔζησεν ἐν τούτοις. νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόκεισθαι καὶ ύμεῖς τὰ πάντα; this structure seems to have already been copied in Eph 2.2-4 ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπεθανός ἐν οἷς καὶ ημεῖς πάντας ἀνεστράφημεν ποτὲ (. . .) δὲ δέεις πλουτίας ὅπως ἐν ἐλέει ἡμᾶς. The ποτὲ (...), νυνὶ δὲ scheme derived from Col 1.21-22 is a very suitable way to expand on the pre-Christian past of the ἁρμονία 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 ὡμείς οἱ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθησε ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ σῶματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. \(^{2,14}\) Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ὀμφότερα ἐν (Eph 2.13-14) is compounded from

(a) καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξατο τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ σῶματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ (Col 1.20). Here we find the notion of εἰρήνη together with the term σῶμα 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 βραβευότω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθη ἐν ἐνί σῶματι, 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 2.14-16; 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 ἐχθραν, ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ. \(^{2,15}\) τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίση ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον ποιῶν εἰρήνην. \(^{2,16}\) καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἁμοφατέρους ἐν ἐνι σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἐχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ (Eph 2.14-16) is one conglomerate of different confluations that have joint-together. There are two major components.

(a) The first component is ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοὺς δόγμασιν ὃ ἔνεπαντίν ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἤρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἁρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, ἤσιμοι ἀληθεύσας αὐτούς ἐν αὐτῷ (Col 2.14-15). This component embraces the whole Eph-passage running from καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας τὸ ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἐχθραν 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 τοὺς δόγμασιν δὴ ἔνεπαντίν
has been cancelled and taken away (Col 2.14 ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ’ ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοὺς δόγμασιν οὐ ἔχει ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἤρκεν 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 ἤρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου (Col) and the term μεσότοιχον in καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας (Eph). Interestingly the cross also figures not only in Col (Col 2.14 προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τὸ σταυρὸ) but in Eph as well (Eph 2.16 καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφότερος 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 αὐτοῦ 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 δόγμα. 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 conflations 10a and 11a demonstrated.

(b) The second major component is καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ (Col 1.20) and Καὶ τῆς ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας (...) ἔχθρος (...) 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 εἰς τὸν μέσον ἤρκεν 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. L1 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 δόγμα 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 P 46 which omits ἐν δόγμασιν" (p. 142).
σαρκός 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 ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἁμοφόρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ. Besides the verb ἀποκαταλλάσσειν the other elements which reappear are εἰρήνοποιεῖν (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 σῶματος 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 ἔχθρος (occurring in Col only in Col 1.21 καί ὑμᾶς ποτε ἄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἔχθροις [...], νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκαταλλάξεν καὶ not in Eph) is reproduced and modified into ἔχθρα (not occurring in Col but twice in Eph 2.14-16 καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φαγημοῦ λόγου, τὴν ἔχθραν, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ [...], ἵνα [...]. ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἁμοφόρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ). Lastly, the phrase ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ (Eph 2.14) is derived from νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκαταλλάξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου (Col 2.12).

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 conflations 10a and 11a to which 12b can now be added); here in Eph 2.14-16 this application of Col 1.20-22 totally coincides and intermingles with the simultaneous 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 ἐνταλλοῦν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας) and the phrase ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ in Col 1.22 (νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκαταλλάξεν 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 καί ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας de Col (...), mais encore le rare ἀπηλλοτριωμένου est repris, et si son associé de Col ἔξθροι est remplacé au v. 12 par ἔξθροι (cf. encore le v. 19), il se retrouve néanmoins dans l’ἔξθρον 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 ἑνὶ σώματι ... διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, plus ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ au v. 14)". 
σταυροῦ in Eph 2.16 (καὶ ἀποκαταλλαξῆς τοὺς ἁμαρτείνοντας ἐν ἑνὶ 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 conflations, namely by

(c) the ἵνα-clause ἵνα τοὺς δῶν κτίσις ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἑνὰ καὶ ὁμοίως ἀνθρώπων (Eph 2.15) derived from ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (Col 1.16) and ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιόν ἀνθρώπων σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινώμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν καὶ 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 κτίσειν and then moves on to the only other place in Col where the verb κτίσειν is to be found (Col 3.9-10);

and (d) the phrase ποιῶν εἰρήνην, καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἁμαρτείνοντας ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ (Eph 2.15-16) derived from καὶ ἠ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύσετα ἐν τοῖς κορδήσις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἑν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἑνὶ 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 ἁμαρτείνοντας), 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 ἠ εἰρήνη.

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 σαρκὶ 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 δῶν κτίση ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἑνὰ καὶ ὁμοίως ἀνθρώπων 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)."
The term εἰρήνη occurs further only in Col 1.2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀμώμιος παρόν ἡμῶν and Col 1.20 is the only instance of εἰρήνονοικών. 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 ἕν ἐνι 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 ἀκροβυσσία 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 (...) νῦν δὲ structure in Col 1.21-22 (see conflation 10a) in order to elaborate respectively on the past and the present of the ἀκροβυσσία 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 ἀκροβυσσία (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 ἀκροβυσσία 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 σύνεσιν μου ἐν τῷ μυστήριῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 35 ὕπ’ ἐτέρως γενεάς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἄνθρωπον ὡς γὰρ ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἄγιοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι, 36 εἶναι τὰ ἔθιμα συγκληρονόμα (Eph 3.4-6) is compounded from

(a) πληρώσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἄποκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεάων - γὰρ δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἄγιοις αὐτοῦ, αἰς ἡθήλησαν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστήριον τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθεσιν (Col 1.26-27); these verses appear directly in the opposite column;

(b) εἰς πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστήριου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ (Col 2.2), the different elements being rearranged into the phrase σύνεσις ἐν τῷ μυστήριῳ 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) λαλήσαι 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 apparently 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 σύνεσιν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ 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. 37 οὐ ἐγεννήθην 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 <οῦ ήκούσατε>, <τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανόν>, οὐ 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 εἰναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκλητονόμαι καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου). The context, therefore, is totally different but the structure τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὐ ἐγεννήθην 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 οὐ ήκούσατε καὶ τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανόν but continues with the next relative clause οὐ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος modifying ἐγενόμην into ἐγεννήθην and omitting ἐγὼ Παῦλος; subsequently the author of Eph supplements his sentence διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὐ ἐγεννήθην διάκονος by adding two κατὰ-contructions:

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

(b) The first κατὰ-construction κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι is copied from the passage ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἡς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσαν 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 ἐγένεμήν ἐγώ (... διάκονος:

Cf. Col 1.23 τοῦ ἐναγγέλιου (...), οὗ ἐγένεμήν ἐγώ Παύλος διάκονος
with Col 1.24-25 τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ἐκκλησία, ἐς ἐγένεμήν ἐγώ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν ὀικονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληροῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ. The noun is respectively ἐναγγέλιον and ἐκκλησία and followed by οὗ or ἵς ἐγένεμήν ἐγώ (... διάκονος. The author of Eph conflates these two passages: having copied the first clause τοῦ ἐναγγέλιου (...), ἵς ἐγένεμήν ἐγώ Παύλος διάκονος from Col 1.23 and changed it into τοῦ ἐναγγέλιου, ἵς ἐγένεμήν διάκονος his eye moves to the end of Col 1.24 where the same construction is found (ἵνα ἐκκλησία, ἵς ἐγένεμήν ἐγώ διάκονος) and then he continues the copying with the phrase κατὰ τὴν ὀικονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς (Col 1.25) which follows immediately after this construction (ἵνα ἐκκλησία, ἵς ἐγένεμήν ἐγώ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν ὀικονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσαν 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 ὀικονομία 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 ὀικονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς).

Actually, this is the second time that the author of Eph draws upon the phrase κατὰ τὴν ὀικονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσαν 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 ὀικονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς with Eph 3.2 εἰ γε ἦκοσμετε τὴν ὀικονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς.

and Eph 3.7 σῦ ἐγένεμῆν 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 ὀικονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Col) is enlarged by the genitive-construction τῆς χάριτος: τὴν ὀικονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ (Eph 3.2); subsequently the accusative case of the relative clause τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι (Col) is changed into the genitive case since this clause is now made dependent on τῆς χάριτος which has just been added: τὴν ὀικονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι (Eph 3.2).51

Secondly, this version is adapted further in Eph 3.7: the noun ὀικονομία (Col), which was modified into ὀικονομία τῆς χάριτος (3.2), is now totally omitted in Eph 3.7 since ὀικονομία τῆς χάριτος is modified even further into δωρεὰ τῆς χάριτος by maintaining τῆς χάριτος but by replacing ὀικονομία with δωρεὰ. This is a very gradual adaptation and modification: from ὀικονομία τοῦ θεοῦ το ὀικονομία 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. 114 and 174: "Eph 3:2, in taking up Col 1:25, adds τῆς χάριτος after τὴν ὀικονομίαν, making the description 'given to me for you' now qualify 'the grace', rather than immediately qualify 'the stewardship" (p. 114).

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 ὀικονομίαν."
Ochel, p. 54, does not show full awareness of this gradual modification since he only notices "daß der Ausdruck κατά τήν οίκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος [Eph 3.2] durch ein κατά τήν δορεάν τῆς χάριτος [Eph 3.7] ersetzt ist"; this observation is not totally correct either, insofar Eph 3.2 reads the accusative τήν οίκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος without the preceding preposition κατά (Eph 3.2 εἰ γε ἥκούσατε τήν οίκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος κτλ.).

(c) The second κατά-construction κατά τήν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, which links immediately with the first, is copied from the passage κατά τήν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τήν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει (Col 1.29).

Cf. Eph 3.7 κατά τήν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ with Col 1.29 κατά τήν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τήν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.

The author of Eph obviously draws upon Col 1.29 since the phrase κατά τήν 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 κατά τήν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τήν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει - and inserts it between τήν ἐνέργειαν and αὐτοῦ (κατά τήν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ) while the relative clause τήν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἐμοὶ 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 τήν οίκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι (Eph 3.2) as τήν δορεάν 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 τήν οίκονομίαν 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, κατά τήν 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 \(^{39}\) καὶ φωτίσαι [πάντας] τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀπο-
κεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι, \(^{310}\) ἦν γυνοσθῆ

νῦν ταῖς ἁρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἔξοσιαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ

πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ (Eph 3.9-10) is compounded from

(a) the phrase τὸ μυστηρίον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων derived

from πληρώσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, \(^{1.26}\) τὸ μυστηρίον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν

αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεάν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ (Col 1.25-

26).\(^{54}\) The application of this phrase occurs by two modifications which reveal further

conflations:

(b) the past participle ἀποκεκρυμμένον in the phrase τὸ μυστηρίον 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 πλη-

ρώσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστηρίον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεάν -

νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις 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 ὃ εἴσαν 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 μυστηρίου (which probably functioned as a 'pivotal' term

leading the author of Eph from Col 1.26 τὸ μυστηρίον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων to Col 2.2

eἰς 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 μυστηρίον

tὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων is that the noun μυστηρίου 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.\(^{1.25}\) ἦν ἐγενόμην

ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσαν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρώσαι

tὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, \(^{1.26}\) τὸ μυστηρίον 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 γυνορίζειν: ἤνα γυνορίσθη νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ (Eph 3.10).56 The term γυνορίζειν occurs thrice in the passage Eph 3.3-10:

(i) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνορίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον (Eph 3.3),

(ii) τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ ἐτέρας γενεάς οὐκ ἐγνορίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι (Eph 3.4-5) and

(iii) ἤνα γυνορίσθη 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 γυνορίζειν can all together be traced back to Col 1.27 νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἦθελσαν ὁ θεὸς γυνορίσαι τι τὸ πλούτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτοῦ ἐν τοῖς θεόντευν. The author of Eph not only used twice the phrase κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείαν 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 γυνορίζειν, as can be visualised in the following way (the clause κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν κτλ and its usage in Eph has single underlining, the verb γυνορίζειν double):

Col 1.24-28

Νῦν χαίρεν ἐν τοῖς παθήσασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀντανακληρώ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων του Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἦσαν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἢς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείαν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς

πληρώσας τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἦθελσαν ὁ θεὸς γυνορίσαι τι τὸ πλούτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτοῦ ἐν τοῖς θεόντευν, ὃ ἦσαν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἢ ἡ χάρις τῆς δόξης: ὃν ἤμεισα καταγγέλλωμεν νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἀνθρώπων ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ.

Eph 3.1-10

Τοῦτον χαίρεν ἐγὼ Παύλος ὁ δεσμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἦσαν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν - εἰ γε ήκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείαν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς,

ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνορίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ἄλγη, πρὸς δὲ δύνασθε ἀναγνώσκοντες νοεῖν τὴν σύνεσιν μοι ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ ἦτερας γενεάς οὐκ ἐγνορίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι, εἶναι τὰ ἐδόμενα συγκλητονία καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετοχὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὐ ἐγενήθη διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δοθείαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείας μοι κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. ἐμοὶ τῷ

56 Cf. Lincoln, p. 184: "its use of γυνορίζειν for the positive side of the contrast [Eph 3.10] reflects its use in the elaboration on the Colossian schema in Col 1.27."
The reason that the single use of γνωριζεῖν 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 τοὺς ἁγίους αὐτοῦ), the author of Eph mentions as the receivers of this revelation respectively the apostle himself (Eph 3.3 μου), the wider circle of the apostles and prophets (Eph 3.5 τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις) and eventually - after having mentioned the ἐνθή in Eph 3.8 (τοῖς ἐθνεσιν εὐαγγελισθεὶς 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 γνωριζεῖν (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 γνωριζεῖν in Eph 3.10 (ἵνα γνωριζηθῇ 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 μυστήριῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὥς ἐτέρας γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἄνθρωπων ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις. This combination of γνωριζεῖν and μυστήριον is due to the 'Colossian' model which reads τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἤθελσεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τῷ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστήριου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν (Col 1.26-27). The subject of γνωριζεῖν in Eph 3.10, however, is not μυστήριον but the term σοφία: ἵνα γνωριζηθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ
Although the verb γυροῖειν 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 γυροῖειν, 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 δὲ εἰσὶν 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 γυροῖειν, 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 γυροῖειν τὶ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς θενεσίν (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 δὲ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι. Besides this, it seems if the adjective πολυποίκιλος (BDG, 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 τῶ τά 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 αὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ όρατά καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυρίοτητες 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 ἐξουσίαι.
oviai 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 ἀρχαι and ἐξουσία 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 ἀρχαι and ἐξουσία) also made subsequently use of ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (Col 1.16; the combination of τὰ πάντα and κτίσειν 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 αἰῶνων 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 αἰῶνων (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 θέλησεν 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] τις 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 δῷ ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ δυνάμει κραταυωθήναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἐσώ ἀνθρωπον (Eph 3.16) is compounded from

(a) τοῖς ὁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς θέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν (Col 1.26-27). The phrase τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης was already used in Eph 1.18 (εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι υμᾶς τις ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τις ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὁγίοις) 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).
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 Χριστός φανερωθῇ, ἥ ἡμῶν, τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερώθησατε 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 δυναμοῦμαι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ

with Eph 3.16 κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ δυνάμει κραταίωθηναι.

Firstly, the genitive τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτοῦ found in Col 1.27 (τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν) 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 κραταίωθηναι, while thirdly the phrase ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει is changed into δυνάμει and belongs now together with the verb κραταίωθηναι 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 κραταίωθηναι as the phrase κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ qualified δύνασθαι in Col 1.11.

(17) The sentence κατοικήσαθι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν ὅγιατη ἐρρίζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι (Eph 3.17) is compounded from

(a) ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατατυπήσαι (Col 1.19) and ἐν αὐτῷ κατατυπεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς (Col 2.9); ⁵⁹

(b) καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύεται 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 κατοικήσαθι with Christ as subject, or by βραβεύεται with the εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ figuring as subject) exclusively occur in Col 3.15 and Eph 3.17. It seems as if the verb βραβεύεται + ἐν (Col 3.15) is replaced in the conflation by κατοικήσαθι + 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 κατατύπει πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος ... καὶ ἐστέ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι (...) is picked up in two ways, in Eph 3.17, κατατυπήσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ (...) and in Eph 3.19, ἰδα πεπληρωθῇ εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ"; and p. 206: "Here [Eph 3.17] transfers this notion [the notion of 'dwelling in'] to Christ, using κατατύπειν, which may well have been taken up from the passage in Colossians, 1:29-2:10, on which this section [Eph 3:14-21] ist 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 ἐρριζωμένοι and τεθεμελιωμένοι, which are derived from the following texts:

(c) ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐπουκοδομοῦμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ (Col 2.6-7) and

(d) εἰ 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 καρδιαῖς ὑμῶν (Eph).

(e) It might be that even the phrase ἐν ἀγάπῃ, which is now linked with ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι (ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζωμένοι 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 καρδιάς ὑμῶν, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι.61 Both the participles συμβιβασθέντες καὶ ἐρριζωμένοι 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 φίλον καὶ συνηγέρθη τῇ πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτῶν 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 conflations 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 καρδιάς 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 ὑπερεκπερισσῶ ἃν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν κατ' τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργοῦμεν ἐν ἡμῖν, αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα (Eph 3.19-20) is compounded from

(a) οὐ πανόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (Col 1.9). The verb αἰτεῖναι 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 αἰτεῖναι + 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 αἰτεῖναι + 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. 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' πνε-ρο ὅν-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: πληρῶσαι 3) and with completing the ministry someone has received (Col 4.17 καὶ εἴπατε Ἀρχίππῳ, Βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληρῶσῃ). Remarkably the two 'Colossian' passages about the believers' fulfilment seem to have merged with one another since the combinations πλη-ροῦν + 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 ὑπερεκπερισσῶ ἃν 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, κατοικεῖ τοῖς Χριστῶν (...) 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 πάν τὸ πλῆρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ παραπομένου) and 1.9 (οὗ πανομέθεα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἴτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ) respectively.

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

Cf. Col 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργούμενην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν
dυνάμει

with Eph 3.20 κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργούμενην 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 ἐνεργούμενην 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 ἐνεργούμενην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν
dυνάμει

with Eph 1.19-20 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐν


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 ὀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξησομεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὡς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, 4.16 εἰς ὅ πᾶν τὸ σώμα συναρμολογοῦμεν καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης ἀρχῆς τῆς ἐπιστορήσεις <κατ’ ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους> τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται <εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἐκατοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ> (Eph 4.15-16) is compounded from

(a) the phrase εἰς αὐτόν 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 αὐτὸν ἐκτίσται). 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 αὐξεῖν 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 ἐνεργούμενην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν
dυνάμει (...) is echoed in the wording of Eph 3:20, κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργούμενην ἐν ἡμῖν" (p. 199).
(b) Subsequently the immediately preceding passage *Col* 1.18 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας is used and changed into the relative clause οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ in order to qualify the preceding αὐτόν: εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα, οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ, 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 -οιον 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, οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός.

(c) Then the author of *Eph* continues this sentence by 'information' about the term κεφαλὴ which he distracts from *Col* 2.19. The term κεφαλὴ 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 ἐστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, οὗ ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἔξουσίας, ἐν οὗ καὶ περιεπεμβητε ζτλ) 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, εἰς οὗ πάν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενοι καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὐξαν ἔτην συνέστων τοῦ θεοῦ

with *Eph* 4.15-16 εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, οὗ ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, εἰς οὗ πάν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενοι καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης ἀρχῆς τῆς ἐπιχορήγης καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἔνος ἑκάστου μέρους τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ἄνθρωποι.

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

Another point, already partly discussed under point b above, is that in *Eph* the name Χριστός has been added to κεφαλὴ (*Eph* 4.15 εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, οὗ ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, 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, εἰς οὗ πάν τὸ σῶμα (...) αὔξαν τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ is grammatically incorrect because the female gender of the term κεφαλὴ requires εἴς τῇ κεφαλῆν, εἴς ἅτις instead of εἴς οὗ (τὴν κεφαλὴν, εἴς οὗ). Although it is understandable that the author of *Col* uses εἴς οὗ since the whole passage *Col* 1.14-20 is totally concerned
with Christ, the οίκος τῆς ἁγάπης αὐτοῦ (Col 1.13), so that the author thoughtlessly continued with ἐξ οὖν after τὴν κεφαλὴν (τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὖν), the author of Eph considered it nevertheless appropriate to correct this grammatical error by putting the name Χριστός between κεφαλὴ and ἐξ οὖν, thereby straightening the grammatical structure: εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὡς ἑστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός, ἐξ οὖν πάν τὸ σῶμα (... τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται. ⁶⁴

The description of the term σῶμα in Col, which reads διὰ τῶν ἀρών 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 ἀρών καὶ συνδέσμων (Col) which expressed how the body is nourished and held together is now changed into διὰ πάσης ἀρής τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας (Eph) replacing the plural τῶν ἀρών (διὰ τῶν ἀρών) by the singular πάσης ἀρής (διὰ πάσης ἀρής), omitting καὶ συνδέσμων (διὰ τῶν ἀρών καὶ συνδέσμων) and adding the genitive τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας - the omitted participle ἐπιχορηγούμενον (Col 2.19 διὰ τῶν ἀρών καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον) reappearing here as a noun - to διὰ πάσης ἀρής 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 κατά τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοί ἐν δυνάμει in Eph; the other instances are Eph 1.19, 3.7 and 3.20 (see resp. conflations 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 Ἐνί 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 ἐκατοῦ, 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 ἐκατοῦ, 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 οἷς ἑστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός, ἐξ οὖν ..., Kol 2,19 aber οὗ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλήν, ἐξ οὖν ..., so daß in Kol eine constructio ad sensum vorliegt, die der Vf v Eph in seinem Text behoben hat."

⁶⁵ Cf. 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).

⁶⁶ Cf. for a similar analysis Lincoln, pp. LIII, 230-231, 260-263 and 265; see esp. pp. 230-231.
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 \( \text{δε οὐχ οὕτως ἐμᾶθετε τὸν Χριστὸν} \), \( \text{εἰ γε αὐτὸν ἥκουσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, καθὼς ἐστὶν ἁλήθεια} \) en τῷ Ἰσσωύ,

\( \text{αὐτὸν ἠποθέσατο ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἁναστροφὴν τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης,} \)

\( \text{καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἀνθρώπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνη καὶ ὀσιότητι τῆς ἁλήθειας (Eph 4.20-24) is compounded from several conflating parts. The second and following parts of the sentence (ἀποθέσατο ὑμᾶς etc.) is mainly dependent on Col 3.8-10. The first part of the sentence is compounded as follows:} \)

(a) \( \text{Cf. Col 1.5-7 ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἁλήθειας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς (...) ἀφ' ἣς ἡμέρας ἥκουσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἁλήθεια καθὼς ἐμᾶθετε ἀπὸ Ἐπαφᾶ} \)

with Eph 4.20-21 \( \text{δε οὐχ οὕτως ἐμᾶθετε τὸν Χριστὸν, εἰ γε αὐτόν ἥκουσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, καθὼς ἐστὶν ἁλήθεια} \) en τῷ Ἰσσωύ.

It is clear that the positive assertion καθὼς ἐμᾶθετε (Col) has been changed and reversed into ὑμεῖς δε οὐχ οὕτως ἐμᾶθετε; the use of Col 1.5-7 is also suggested by the words ἥκουσατε and ἁλήθεια. 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 εἰ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένη (...) καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗ ἥκουσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν

and Col 2.6-7 Ὁς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰσσωύν τὸν κύριον, εν 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: "μαθάσαντες is used for learning the gospel tradition - in Col 1:6,7 in connection with ἀκούσαν (...) and ἁλήθεια (...) - ... 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: "ἁλήθεια occurred earlier in connection with ἀκούσαν 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 οὖν οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν (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 εἰ γε αὐτὸν ἦκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε (Eph 4.21). This phrasing recalls Col 1.23 εἰ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι (...) καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗ ἦκούσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν; the verb ἦκούσατε is of course also found in Col 1.5-7 ὥς ἡμέρας ἦκούσατε καὶ ἔπεγνατε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.68

(c) The later part of Eph 4.21 εἰ γε αὐτὸν ἦκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε is dependent on Col 2.6-7 ὅς οὖν παρέλαβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, (...) βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε; probably the fragment παρέλαβετε 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 ἀποθέσατε, ἀνανεώσατε and ἐνδύσασθαι:

καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, (...),

(i) ἀποθέσατε ὑμᾶς <κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν> τὸν παλαιὸν ἐνθρωπὸν <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 ἐδιδάχθη (...) is employed in [Col] 2:7 (cf. Eph 4:21); and p. 279: "The (...) formulation of the reminder [Eph 4.20 ὑμεῖς δὲ οὖν 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 παρέλαβετε 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) ἀνανεώσθητε δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν.
(iii) καὶ ἐνδυσάσθει τὸν καινὸν ἀνθρώπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα <ἐν
dικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὀσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας> (Eph 4.21-24). This passage is derived from
Col 3.8-10 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς <τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν, ἑλπίζοντες εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον <σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτῶν>, καὶ ἐνδυσάσθει τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον <εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν> κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτισαντος αὐτῶν. The contents of these verses are now rewritten in a sentence structure which consists of three infinitives 72:

(i) ἀπόθεσθε is changed into the infinitive ἀποθέσθαι. The objects of ἀπόθεσθαι in Col 3.8, namely τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν, ἑλπίζοντες εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἑλπίζοντες εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον which, however, is derived from Col 3.9 although it functioned there as the object of the participle ἀπεκδυσάμενοι (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον) which does not reappear in Eph. 72 Actually the author of Eph leaves out the whole passage <τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν, ἑλπίζοντες εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἑλπίζοντες εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι> (see the brackets in the quotation of Col 3.8-10 above) and links ἀπόθεσθε immediately to τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον while replacing the phrase <σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτῶν>, which qualifies the 'old person', by <κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφήν> (according to your former [i.e., pre-Christian] way of life, BCD, 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 conflations since the term ἐπιθυμία occurs in the directly parallel column in Col 3.5 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πᾶθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακίαν, 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 μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλλαγωγὸς διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενής 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. 263-264: "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 ἀποθέσθαι from Col 3:8 for ἀπεκδυσάμενα in 3:9"; and p. 284: "Ephesians (...) has replaced the ἀπεκδυσάμενα of 3:9 with the ἀποθέσθαι 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 ἐνθυσάμενοι τὸν νέον [ἐνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον (Col 3.10) is made into the infinitive ἀνανεοῦσθαι, now accompanied by the phrase τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοοῦ ὑμῶν; except for the change of a participle into an infinitive there is simultaneously an interchange of the terms νεός / καινός and ἀνακαινοῦσθαι / ἀνανεοῦσθαι and : ἐνθυσάμενοι τὸν νέον [ἐνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον (Col 3.10) becomes ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοοῦ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐνθυσάμενοι τὸν καινόν ἑνθρωπον (Eph 4.23-24)75;

(iii) the participle ἐνθυσάμενοι in ἐνθυσάμενοι τὸν νέον [ἐνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτὸν (Col 3.10) is changed into the infinitive ἐνθυσάμενοι καὶ ἐνθυσάμενοι τὸν καινόν ἑνθρωπον τὸν κατά θεόν κτισθέντα, while τὸν νέον [ἐνθρωπον] is altered into τὸν καινόν ἑνθρωπον. Lastly, the verb κτιζεῖν in the accusative τὸν νέον [ἐνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον <εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν> <κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτὸν> (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 καινόν ἑνθρωπον τὸν κατά θεόν κτισθέντα <ἐν δικαιοσύνη καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἁληθείας>.76 This rewriting is more complex than it seems:

(a) the phrase κατά θεόν (Eph) can be regarded as an 'abbreviation' of κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτὸν (Col).

Cf. Ochel, p. 61: "Die (...) Abweichung in 4,24 (τὸν κατά θεόν κτισθέντα Kol 3,10 τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτῶν) 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 κτιζεῖν which occurred in the phrase κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτῶν (Col) now reappears in the relative clause τὸν κατά θεόν κτισθέντα which qualifies the καινός ἑνθρωπος. While the phrase κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτῶν (Col) modified the renewal of the new man (τὸν νέον [ἐνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτῶν), the phrase κατά θεόν

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 κατά θεόν (...) replacing κατ’ εἰκόνα (...) from Col 3:10" (p. 274).
(Eph), however, is a modification of the creation of the new man (τὸν καίνὸν ἀνθρωπὸν τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα);

(c) the phrase εἰς ἔπειγωσιν (Col), which qualifies the participle ἀνακαίνωμεν (τὸν νέον [ἀνθρωπὸν] τὸν ἀνακαίνωμεν εἰς ἔπειγωσιν), seems to be replaced in Eph by the comparable phrase ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὀσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας by which the participle κτισθέντα is qualified (τὸν καίνὸν ἀνθρωπὸν τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὀσιότητι 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 πᾶσα πικρία καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ κραυγὴ καὶ βλασφημία ἀρθήτω ἀφ᾽ ὦμων σὺν πάσῃ κακίᾳ. 4.32 γίνεσθε [δὲ] εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοὶ, εὐσπλαγγνοι, χαριζόμενοι ἐσόντος καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (Eph 4.31-32) is compounded from

(a) 3.8 γνω δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς <τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν>. 3.9 μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδύσαμεν.adv. τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρωπὸν (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, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν> had been left out in Eph 4.22 (see the brackets) and that ἀπόθεσθε was immediately linked with τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρωπὸν as its object: ἀποθέσθαι ὑμῖς (... τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρωπὸν (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᾽ ὦμων + 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 αὐτὰς.77 Interestingly the last part καὶ μὴ πικραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτὰς is omitted when the author of Eph rewrites Col 3.19 in Eph 5.25 (ἀγαπάτε τὰς γυναῖκας, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός 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, εὐσπλαγχνοι, χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐγκαίριατο ὑμῖν with Col 3.12-13 Ενδύσασθε οὖν (...) σπλάγχνα οἰκτριμοῦ, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφορόσύνην, πραΰτητα, μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς ἐὰν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχῃ μομφὴν καθώς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐγκαίριατο ὑμῖν οὕτως καὶ ψυμεῖς.

The clause Ενδύσασθε οὖν (...) σπλάγχνα οἰκτριμοῦ, χρηστότητα (Col) is changed into γίνεσθε [δὲ] εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί, εὐσπλαγχνοι reading the adjectives χρηστός and εὐσπλαγχνος instead of the nouns χρηστότης and σπλάγχνον (rendering the meaning of σπλάγχνα οἰκτριμοῦ [BGD, p. 561: οἰκτριμοῦ: ἐνδύσασθαι σπλάγχνα οἰκτριμοῦ (gen. of quality) put on heartfelt compassion Col 3.12] now into one word: εὐσπλαγχνος) and replacing the imperative Ενδύσασθε 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, ἀπεκδυσόμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον; 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, εὐσπλαγχνοι).

77 Cf. Lincoln, p. 308 on Eph 4.31: "The cognate verb πικραινεῖν 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 οἰκτίρμον and χρηστότητα, changed them into adjectives and combined them with the phrase εἰς ἀλλήλων which is derived from Col 3.12-13 as well, the author of Eph now makes use of the phrase χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς read in Col 3.12-13: Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν (...) σπλάγχνα οἰκτίρμον, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραύτητα, μακροθυμίαν, ἄνευ ἤμοιον ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς (Col 3.12-13). Interestingly the 'leap' in Eph's application of Col 3.12-13 from σπλάγχνα οἰκτίρμον, χρηστότητα to χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς neglecting the intermediate words ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραύτητα, μακροθυμίαν, ἄνευ ἤμοιον ἀλλήλων can be perfectly explained since these words were already taken up by the author of Eph in Eph 4.1-2: ἄξιος περιπατήσας τής κλήσεως ἡς ἐκλήθη, 42 μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραύτητος, μετὰ μακροθυμίας, ἄνευ ἤμοιον 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 ἄνευ ἤμοιον ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ. 43 σπουδάζοντες τρεῖς τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης. 44 ἐν σώμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα, καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθη ἐν μία ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν

with Col 3.14-15 3.14 ἐτῷ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην, ὁ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειώτητος. 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβευτέω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθη ἐν ἐνι σώματι.

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 Verwantschaft 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 erinner, 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 κλητος with the cognate verb: ἀφίησεν περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἃς ἐκλήθησε (Eph 4.1) and καὶ ἐκλήθησε ἐν μιᾷ ἀληθίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν (Eph 4.4). The vocabulary of 'calling' and 'choosing' occurs in Col only in Col 3.12 (the adjective καλεόμενος) and in Col 3.15 (the verb καλεῖν), thus only in the passage Col 3.12-15. Eph 3.12 ἐνδύσασθε όν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἰδίοι καὶ ἰδιαπεμείνοι, (...) ταπεινοφοροῦντι, πραΰτητα, μακροθυμίαν κτλ. 3.15 ὁ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετο ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθη ἐν ἑνὶ 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 κλησίας in Eph 4.1 and 4.4 as well, the only exception being ἐκλέγεσθαι outside Eph 4.1-4 in Eph 1.4 καθὼς ἐκλέξατο ἡμῖν 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 ταπεινοφοροῦντι, πραΰτητα, 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 ἑκατοντάς (although leaving out the immediately following clause ἐὰν τις πρὸς τινα ἐξη μορφὴν in Col 3.13 χαριζόμενοι ἑκατοντάς ἐὰν τις πρὸς τινα ἐξη μορφὴν) the author of Eph now concludes this reliance by copying also the clause καθώς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (Col) while firstly leaving out its continuation οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς and secondly changing the copied phrase καθώς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (Col) into καθώς καὶ ὁ θεός 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 ταπεινοφοροῦντι, πραΰτητα, 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 ἑκατοντάς (although leaving out the immediately following clause ἐὰν τις πρὸς τινα ἐξη μορφὴν in Col 3.13 χαριζόμενοι ἑκατοντάς ἐὰν τις πρὸς τινα ἐξη μορφὴν) the author of Eph now concludes this reliance by copying also the clause καθώς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (Col) while firstly leaving out its continuation οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς and secondly changing the copied phrase καθώς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (Col) into καθώς καὶ ὁ θεός 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 ταπεινοφοροῦντι, πραΰτητα, 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 ἑκατοντάς (although leaving out the immediately following clause ἐὰν τις πρὸς τινα ἐξη μορφὴν in Col 3.13 χαριζόμενοι ἑκατοντάς ἐὰν τις πρὸς τινα ἐξη μορφὴν) the author of Eph now concludes this reliance by copying also the clause καθώς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (Col) while firstly leaving out its continuation οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς and secondly changing the copied phrase καθώς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (Col) into καθώς καὶ ὁ θεός 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.

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-
The three sentences \(^{53}\) πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκαθαρσία πάσα ἢ πλεονεξία μηδὲ οἰνομαξέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἰγίοις, \(^{54}\) καὶ αἰσχρότης καὶ μιρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία, ὥστε ἀνήκεν, ἀλλὰ μάλλον εὐχαριστία.

\(^{55}\) τούτῳ γὰρ ἵστε γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὃ ἐστίν εἰδωλολατρίας, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομιᾶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις, διὰ ταύτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργή τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς νίκους τῆς ἀπειθείας. \(^{57}\) μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν. \(^{58}\) ἢτε 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, πορνεῖαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακῆν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἦτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία, δι' αὐτῆς ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργή τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς νίκους 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 μηδε οἰνομαξέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν (Eph).\(^{79}\)

(b) Besides the three terms mentioned before, the terms αἰσχρότης and μιρολογία occur in Eph: καὶ αἰσχρότης καὶ μιρολογία; these terms seem to display the use of *Col* 3.8 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, 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, αἰσχρότης and μιρολογία (supplemented with the term εὐτραπελία which can not be traced back to the 'Colossian' model) are commented upon by the relative clause ὥστε ἀνήκεν and contrasted with εὐχαριστία: (...) καὶ αἰσχρότης καὶ μιρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία, ὥστε ἀνήκεν, ἀλλὰ μάλλον εὐχαριστία.

Then the second sentence after a newly made introduction τούτῳ γὰρ ἵστε 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, πορνεῖαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακῆν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἦτις 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 πιστιά (...) and κραυγή (...). 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 [χαρίζομεν αἰτίοις. The other nouns and participle from *Col* 3:12,13 have already been employed in Eph 4:2."

with Eph 5.5 πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκόαστος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὁ ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομιάν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

The same three terms πορνεία, ἀκοαστία and πλεονεξία are drawn upon as in Eph 5.3-4 but this time even the relative clause ἡτίς ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρία which qualified πλεονεξία is employed although changed into an adjective and into the first case of the male gender: πλεονέκτης, ὁ ἐστιν 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 ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ· δὲ ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς (...) καὶ μετέστησαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ

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

In Col 1.12-13 the language of inheritance (μερίς τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ = '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 ἀπολήμψεθε 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 ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ· δὲ ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ) and applied in Eph 5.8 ὁτε γὰρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ. The clause ἐν κυρίῳ (Eph 5.8 ὁτε 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 μετεστησαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ).

(d) The term βασιλείαν θεοῦ is apparently derived from Col 4.10-11 Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἀρίσταρχος (...) καὶ Μάρκος (...) καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας, 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 ύμας ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις (Eph 5.6) and is compounded by referring to

Col 2.4 Τοῦτο λέγω ἵνα μηδεις ύμας παραλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ

and Col 2.8 βλέπετε μή τις ύμας ἔσται ὁ συλλαγωγὸν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 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 ύμας but continues subsequently the sentence in a different way: instead of παραλογίζηται (μηδεις ύμας παραλογίζηται) he makes use of the phrase συλλαγωγῶν 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 ύμας ἀπατάτω (Eph 5.6). Then this verb ἀπατάτω is supplemented by the following dative κενοῖς λόγοις (Μηδεις ύμας ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις) to denote the manner of seduction. The noun λόγος (Μηδεις ύμας ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις) has been distracted from Col 2.4 where its root λόγ- can be found twice in the verb παραλογίζεσθαι and in the noun πιθανολογία as well (μηδεις ύμας παραλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ), 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 συλλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης (Col 2.8) is the basis for Μηδεις ύμας 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' ἐρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας, changing only δι' ἐρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱους 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 μὴ κατ' ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν ὡς ἀνθρωπάρσεσκοι ἀλλ' ὡς δούλοι Χριστοῦ ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς (Eph 6.6) is compounded from

(a) μὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλίᾳ ὡς ἀνθρωπάρσεσκοι, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας

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 ὀφθαλμοδουλίας) 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 ποιούντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ πνεύματι and supplemented to μὴ κατ’ ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν ὡς ἀνθρωπόφαρσκοι ἀλλ’ by means of the particle ὡς which contrasts ὡς δούλοι τῷ ἡμῖν ἀνθρωπόφαρσκοι;

(c) the phrase ποιούντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ πνεύματι which qualifies the δούλοι Χριστοῦ (Eph 6.6 ἀλλ’ ὡς δούλοι Χριστοῦ ποιούντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ πνεύματι) is partly derived from Col 3.23 δέ ἐὰν ποιήσητε, ἐκ πνεύματι ἀγάπησθε, but inventing here τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ as the object of the participle ποιούντες.

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 ὀφθαλμοδουλίας ὡς ἀνθρωπόφαρσκοι, ἀλλὰ] 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.
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, p. 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, conflations and embellishment made in view of the author's own particular points? But what is the exact relation between paraphrasing, literary dependence, omissions, conflations and all the other phenomena 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 Arist. 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 'reaction attisante' 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. 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 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 ἔδωξεν εἶναι τὰ ὀνόματα

---

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 ο Φαληρεύς in 12; Συριαν και Φωνίκην 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; τοὺς βασιλεῖς τουτοὺς in 34; ὡς ἄν οὕσαιν in 37; ἀρ' ἔκαστῃς φυλῆς in 39; τῆς σὺς προαρέσεσθε in 39; βασιλεῖς Πολεμίας Ἀρεαζάρφω in 45; τοῖς σοὶς πολίταις in 46; τῶν νόμων ὑμῶν in 48; καλῶς ὕσιν ποιήσαις in 49; ἀρ' ἔκαστῃς φυλῆς in 49; εἰς τὸ ἑρων in 50; καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς in 55; ἔχοντας τὸν νόμον in 56; πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας in 61; τῇ τορείᾳ βασιλεύσεως in 64; στεφάνης τὸ μὲν in 65; διὰ τριμιᾶς κατελημμένου in 66; ὧπο δὲ τὴν in 68; τοὺς δὲ λίθους in 68; τῶν προειρημένων καρπῶν in 68; περὶ δὴ τὴν in 68; καθ' ὅλου τοῦ in 70; κατὰ τὴν στεφάνην in 70; τῆς τραπέζης μιανδρὸν in 71; ὧπο τὴν τράπεζαν in 73; τὸ πᾶν ἐλάσσιμα in 74; Τῶν δὲ κρατήρων in 78; ἀνθεμίστι καὶ βρυχόν in 78; ἑώρα τὸ βασιλεῖ in 85; καὶ τῶν συμπαρόντων in 91; τὸν τῆς ζωῆς in 92; ὧπο τὸ βασιλεῖ in 94; καὶ περὶ τούτων in 95; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας in 97; παρηθέματα, τῶν δὲ in 97; καὶ διελθὼν τὸ in 103; ἐν ἡμέραις ἐβδομήκοντα in 107; συναγαγὼν ὁ Δημήτριος in 107; εἰς τὸν τόπον in 107; παρόντων καὶ τῶν in 107; καὶ τὸν Δημήτριον in 108; τοῖς ἡγουμένοις αὐτῶν in 108; εἰς κοινοῦς ἀνθρώπους in 112; παρὰ τοῦ Δημήτριο in 114; ποιεῖσθαι τῶν βιβλίων in 114; περὶ πολλοῦ ποιομένου in 118.

**Four Consecutive Words**

- τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην in 12; ἐν τῇ σῇ βασιλείᾳ in 20; δὲ καὶ τῶν παρόντων in 25; ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς τραπέζης in 28; τὴν τῶν διαφόρων δόσιν in 32; τοῖς υπύρταις τῶν προαγάλων in 32; καὶ τὸ τῆς εἰσιδοθεού in 35; παρὰ σοὶ διπεριβομένα in 37; καὶ ἀκέραιον τὴν νομοθεσίαν in 37; φησιν Ἔκαστος ὁ Ἀδρίπτης in 38; γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἐκ τῶν in 48; καὶ τὰς φάλας ἄς in 53; καὶ τῶν τέκνων καὶ τῶν βασιλείας ἐν εἰρήνη in 55; τὰ περὶ τῆς τραπέζης ἐν 60; ἐκ τῶν τριῶν μερῶν in 64; πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας ὑποδοχὰς in 96; μέχρι μὲν ὅρας ἐνάτης in 104; τῇ θαλάσσῃ τῆς χειράς in 106; καὶ πρὸς τὸν Δημήτριον in 110; τῶν τραγωδιῶν ποιητοῦ in 113; καὶ κυλίκιον ταλάντων τριάκοντα in 117; φιάλας καὶ τρύβλια καὶ in 117.

**Five Consecutive Words**

- καὶ παρὰ τὴν τῶν πατρὸς in 29; περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων βιβλίων in 34; τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ἀκριβούς in 39; χρυσοῦ μὲν διὰ τῶν τάλαντα πεντήκοντα in 40; καὶ νομίσματος εἰς θύσιας καὶ in 41; ἂν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν θεόν in 52; χρυσοῦς ἐκκοσ καὶ ἀργυρᾶς τριάκοντα in 53; ὃν ἂν δέησαι τὸ ἑρων in 53; ἀπὸ τῆς βάσεως μὲρι τοῦ in 78; γὰρ ἡμέρας ἐκέλευσεν ἀνὰ χείρα in 96; τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς μετὰ τῆς in 96; τῆς θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν νήσου in 103; ἐπὶ τὰ βόρεια μέρη συνεδρίου in 103; καὶ τῶν ἐρμηνευομένων πρὸς τοὺς in 108.

**Six Consecutive Words**

- βασιλεῖς μεγάλων παρὰ Δημήτριον, προστάξαντός σου in 36; κρατήρας πέντε καὶ τράπεζανε εἰς ἄναθεσαν in 53; κυμάτων θέσιν καὶ τὴν τῆς στεφάνης in 69; τάλαντα δύο καὶ κυλίκιον ταλάντων καὶ in 116.
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, πρός δὲ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοήσαι 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-Aland. 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**

άγιοις καὶ άμώμους in 1.4; διὰ τοῦ αἵματος in 1.7; τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν in 1.7; τοὺς οὕρανοὺς 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: αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν in 1.20; ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι in 2.16; μοι εἰς ὃμᾶς 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; πάν τὸ πλήρωμα in 3.19; τὴν ἐνεργούμενην ἐν in 3.20; τῶν παλαιῶν ἀνθρώπων in 4.22; οἱ πατέρες, μη in 6.4; τά τέκνα ὃμᾶς in 6.4; Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε in 6.5; ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι ἀλλ᾽ in 6.6; εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ in 6.9; τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ in 6.19; τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ 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 ἁρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας in 1.21; τῆς ἀπειθείας; ἐν ὃς καὶ in 2.2-3; τὸ πλούτος τῆς δόξης in 3.16; ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὃμῶν in 4.29; τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις in 6.5; ὡς δὲ με λαλήσατι in 6.20.

FIVE CONSECUTIVE WORDS
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἡσυχ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 1.3; ἐν ὃ ἐχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν in 1.7;
ἐξ οὗ πάν τὸ σῶμα in 4.16; Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπάτε τὰς γυναῖκας in 5.25; Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῖσιν in 6.1.

SEVEN CONSECUTIVE WORDS
Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἡσυχ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ in 1.1.

EIGHT CONSECUTIVE WORDS
χάρις ὃμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν in 1.2; ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπους, εἰδότες ὅτι in 6.7-8.

TEN CONSECUTIVE WORDS
ἐρχεται ἡ ὄργη τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας in 5.6; πάντα γνωρίσετι ὃμῖν Τυχικὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διδακόνος in 6.21.

NINETEEN CONSECUTIVE WORDS
ἐν κυρίῳ, ὃν ἑπιμνημι πρὸς ὃμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἵνα γνώτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ παρακαλέση τὰς καρδίας ὃμῶν 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 conflations 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 conflations 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 ἐγκολστία 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 ἐγκολστέω 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 κολοσσαλείς


1.3 Ἔχειν αριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [E 1.3] πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, 1.4 ἄκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἥν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοῖς ἁγίοις [E 1.15] 1.5 διὰ "<τὴν <ἐλπίδα [E 1.18]> τὴν (ἀποκείμενην) ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἦν {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 υἱῶν, ἀρ' ἡ ἡμέρας ἡκούσατε καὶ ἔπεννυτε τὴν κάριν τοῦ θεοῦ [E 1.6, 1.8] εἰς ἀληθείαν. 1.7 καθὼς ἔμαθετε [E 4.20-21]>> ἀπὸ τὸ ἔπαφα τοῦ ἁγαπητοῦ (συνδούλου) ἡμῶν, οὐ ἐστὶν πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προς Εφεσιούς

11 "Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὐσίν [ἐν {Ἐφέσῳ}] καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 1.2 ἀριστε ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρός ἡμῶν [C 1.2-22] καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

1.3 <Ἐνυλογήται> ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [C 1.3] ὁ {εὐλογήται} ὑμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ {εὐλογίᾳ} πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς {ἐπουρανίοις} ἐν Χριστῷ, 1.4 καθὼς <ἐξελέξατο> 1.5 ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ {καταβολῆς} κόσμου εἶναι ὑμᾶς ἄγιον καὶ ἁμώμονος κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, 1.5 {προοίμιος} ὑμᾶς εἰς {υιοθεσίαν} διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν, κατὰ τὴν <ἐνυλογίαν> τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, 1.6 εἰς {ἐπαίνον} δόξης <τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ [C 1.6]> ἢς (ἐχαρίτωσεν) ὑμᾶς ἐν <<τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ. 1.7 ἐν ὑμῖν ἐχαρίτωσεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν <διὰ τοῦ ἁμάτος αὐτοῦ> 4. τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων>, 5 κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος <τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ [C 1.6]> 1.8 ἢς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς εἰς

1 Col 3.12 ως ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁγίοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι.
2 Col 1.22 παραστίσατε ὑμᾶς ἁγίοις καὶ ἁμώμοις καὶ ἀνεγκλήτως κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.
3 Cf. εὐδοκεία in Eph 1.5 and 1.9 to εὐδοκέω in Col 1.19-20: δι' ὑμᾶς ὑμῖν καὶ εὐδοκέων
4 Col 1.20 εἰρηνοποιοῦσα διὰ τοῦ ἁμάτος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ.
5 Col 1.13-14 τοῦ ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγάπης αὐτοῦ, ἐν ὑμῖν ἐχαρίτωσεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.
διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1,8 ὁ καὶ ἡ δηλώ-
σας] ἦμεν τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύ-
ματι.

ἡμᾶς, ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ [φρο-
νήσει] 6, 1,9 ἡ γνώρισας ἦμιν τὸ
μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ7, κατὰ τὴν
(εὐδοκίαν) αὐτοῦ ἢν
[προέθετο] ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς οἰκονομίαν
τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν καιρῶν8,
(ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) <τὰ πάντα ἐν
τῷ Χριστῷ, αὕτη ἐπί τοῖς ὑπαραγωγῶν καὶ
tὰ ἐπὶ τῆς τῆς> 10 ἐν αὐτῷ.

1,11 Ἔν ὅ καὶ (ἐκληροθε-
μεν) κατὰ (προ-
θεσιν) τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος
κατὰ τὴν (βουλὴν) τοῦ θελήματος
αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς
(ἐπαινοῦν) δόξης αὐτοῦ <τοὺς
{προπληκτικάς} ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ.

1,13 Ἔν ὅ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες
τὸν λόγον τῆς ἁλπθείας, τὸ
ἐυαγγέλιον, 12 τῆς (σωτηρίας) υμῶν,
ἐν ὅ καὶ {πιστεύσαντες}<[ἐφαργίσ-
θητε] τῷ πνεύματι τῆς (ἐπαγγελίας)

6 Col 1.9 ἰνα πληρωθήτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει

7 Col 1.26-27 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεφαλαίωσας 69 απὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἔφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἤθελεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τὸ πλούς 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 εὐδοκία in Col 1.19-20: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι καὶ διὰ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλάβαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν.

9 Cf. Gal 4.4-5 ὅτε δὲ ἤθελεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ ἁρώνου, ἐξαιτοῦ ὁ θεὸς τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ (...), ἴνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν σωτηρίαν ἀπολύσομεν [cf. ae. σωτηρία in Eph 1.5].

10 Col 1.16 ὅτι αὐτῷ ἐκτίθη πᾶν σάμα ἐν τοῖς ὑπαραγωγῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τῆς καὶ and 1.20 τὰ πάντα (...). eiteit τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς eiteit τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑπαραγωγῶν.

11 Col 1.12 ἔχαριστον ἔρωτι τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλάμα τῶν ἁγίων ἐν

12 Col 1.5 διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκεφαλήν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς ὑπαραγωγῶν, ἢν προσκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς

αλλαγής τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς.

1.15 <<Διὰ τούτου καί γώρ <<ἀκούσας [C 1.9]> τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πιστίν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους>>, 1.16 οὕτω παυόμεθα <ἐυχαριστῶν [C 1.12]> ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (μνείαν) ποιούμενος ἐπί τῶν προσευχῶν μου, 1.17 ἵνα [C 1.9]>>, 1.18 οὐκ οὖσας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ (πατὴρ τῆς δόξης), δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεύμα <σοφίας [C 1.9]> καὶ <ἀποκαλύψεως> ἐν <ἐπιγνώσει [C 1.9, 1.10]> αὐτοῦ, 1.19 οὐκ [περιπατήσαι μένους] τοὺς (ὀφθαλμοὺς) τῆς καρδίας [ὑμῶν] εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τις ἐστιν ἢ <<ἐλπίς> 1.17 τῆς (κλήσεως) αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλεῦτος τῆς <δόξης [C 1.11]> τῆς <κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν

13 Cf. 2 Cor 1.22 ὁ καὶ σφαγιασμένος ἡμᾶς καὶ δούς τὸν ἀρραβώνα τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τοῦτο καρδίας ἡμῶν [cf. ἐπαγγελία θεοῦ in 1 Cor 1.20] and 2 Cor 5.5 ὁ δὲ κατεργασμένος ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θεοῦ, ὁ δούς ἡμῖν τὸν ἀρραβώνα τοῦ πνεύματος (ἀρραβών 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 ἀγίους διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα (see for ἐλπίς Eph 1.18) τὴν ἄποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.

15 Col 1.9 ἄν ἐν τούτῳ καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἢς ἡμέρας ἡκούσαμεν, οὕτω παυόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἴτιομενοὶ, ἵνα.

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

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 ἀγίους διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἄποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.


1.14 ἐν ὧν ἐξερεύνησε τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν [E 1.7]>>


1.20 ἢν ἐνήργησεν ἐν> 19 τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν>> 20 καὶ [(καθίσας] ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ> 21 ἐν τοῖς [ἐπουρανίοις]

1.21 <<[ὑπεράνω] πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος [C 1.16]>> 22 καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος [ὄνομαξιμένου], οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ [αἰωνὶ τούτῳ] ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ <μέλλοντι> 23. 1.22 καὶ <κάτα [C 1.16 twice, 1.17 twice, 1.20]> ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοῖς [πόδας] αὐτοῦ καὶ <αὐτὸν ἐδοκεῖν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. 1.23 ἢτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ [C 1.18]>> 24, τὸ

18 Col 1.26-27 τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσισι τῷ πλοῦτι τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσίν, δ ἔστιν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλλισ τῆς δόξης.
19 Col 1.11 ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμικούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ and 1.29 ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειμαν ἐν ἔμοι ἐν δυνάμει.
20 Col 2.12 συνυπηρέτησε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.
21 Col 3.1 τὰ ἄνω ζητείτε, οὕτως οὗ ὁ Χριστὸς ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθημένος.
22 Col 1.16 ὦ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ ἑκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐφράνοις καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ἀοράτα καὶ τὰ ἀοράτα, εἰτε θρόνοι εἰτε κυριότερες εἰτε ἀρχαὶ εἰτε ἐξουσίας : Col 2.10 δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας and Col 2.15 ἀπεκδικομένος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύων αὐτοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ.
23 Col 2.17 ὦ ἔστιν εἰκὼν τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. probably not only for μέλλον but even for σῶμα Eph 1.21-23 οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξαν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτῶν ἐδοκεῖν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἢτις ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ.
24 Col. 1.18 καὶ αὐτός ἔστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας and 1.24 ἀναναπληρῶ τὰ υπερήφανα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. 5 ἔστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία.
<κυρίοττες εἴτε ἄρχαι εἴτε ἐξου-
σιαὶ [E 1.21] (E 3.9-10)>> <<τὰ
<πάντα [E 1.22, 1.23] δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς
αὐτὸν [E 4.15]>> ἐκτίσται 1.17 καὶ
αὐτὸς ἐστὶν πρὸ <πάντων [E 1.22, 1.23]>
καὶ τὰ <πάντα [E 1.22, 1.23] ἐν αὐτῷ
(-svgésthekev), 1.18 <καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν
ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σῶματος τῆς ἐκ-
κλησίας [E 1.22-23, 4.15-16, 5.23]> [E 3.21]
>><>< δς ἐστὶν ἀρχή, (πρωτότοκος) ἐκ
τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται <ἐν πᾶσιν
[E 1.23, 4.6] αὐτῶς {πρωτεύων}, 1.19 ὅτι
<<ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν [εὐθόκησεν] [E 1.5, 1.9]>
<<πᾶν τὸ <πλήρωμα [E 1.23]> [E 3.19]>>
κατοικῆσαι [E 3.17]>> 1.20 <<<<καὶ δι’
αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξας <<< <<τὰ
<πάντα [E 1.22, 1.23] εἰς αὐτὸν [E
4.15]>>, <<[εἰρηνοποιήσας] διὰ τοῦ
αἴματος 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 ὡμᾶς <ποτὲ [E 2.2,
2.3]> ὄντας [E 2.1]>> <<< <<ἀπηλλο-
τριομένους καὶ <<[ἐξήρων] [E 2.14,
2.16]> τί <διανοία [E 2.3]> [E 4.18]>> ἐν
toῖς <ἐργοῖς [E 2.9, 2.10] τοῖς πονηροῖς,
1.22 νυνί δὲ [E 2.12-13]>>> <<<άποκατ-
ήλλαξέν <ἐν τῷ [σῶματι τῆς σαρ-
κὸς] αὐτοῦ [E 2.14] διὰ τοῦ [θανά-
tου] [E 2.16]>>> <<παραστήσαται ὡμᾶς
2.1  <<Καὶ ὡμᾶς ὄντας
[C 1.21] νεκροῖς τοῖς παραπτώ-
μασιν>>26 καὶ <<ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις
哙ῖμῶν, 2.2 ἐν αἷς <ποτὲ [C 1.21] περι-
ἐπαθήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμο-
mου τούτου, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς
ἐξουσίας τοῦ (ἀέρος), τοῦ πνεύματος
toῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς
tῆς ἡπείριας. 2.3 ἐν οἷς καὶ ἤμεις

25 See the frequent occurrence of τὰ πάντα in Col 1.16-17 and 20, and see ἐν πᾶσιν in Col 1.18 ἵνα
gένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων. See further Col 3.11 [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστὸς.
26 Col 1.21 Καὶ ὡμᾶς ποτὲ ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριομένους and 2.13 καὶ ὡμᾶς νεκροῖς ὄντας (ἐν) τοῖς
παραπτώμασιν.


27 Col 3.5-7 ἐπιθυμίαιν κακῆν (...), δι' ὅ προτετήτη τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπεθανοῦσαν]. ἐν αἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς πεπιστήσατε ποτε.
29 Cf. Col 3.1 Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε [cf. συνήγειρεν in Eph 2.6] τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ δὲ ζητεῖτε, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν διεξ ὑμῶν καθήμενος καὶ especially Col 3.3 ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέρδυλται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ.
30 Cf. εἰς ἐκθεσιν in Eph 2.7 to δειτερατίζεω in Col 2.15 ἀπεκδοσάμενος τάς ἀρχὰς καὶ τᾶς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρασιο, βραβεύσας αὐτούς ἐν αὐτῷ.
31 Cf. Col 2.12 ἐν ὃ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ on which also Eph 2.5-6 is dependent.
32 Col 1.16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὅρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἰσὶ θρόνοι εἰσὶ κυρίωτες εἰσὶ ἀρχαὶ εἰσὶ ἐξουσίαι.

33 Eph 2.10 ἐπὶ ἐργοὺς ἄγαθοὺς οἰς προποιμαζεῖν ὁ θεὸς. ἴνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν is contrasted to Eph 2.1-2 τοῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν αἷς ποτὲ περιπατήσατε (περιπατέω 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 περιπατήσατε ποτὲ, where ἐν οἷς refers back either to πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν καθὼς καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἡταί ἂν εἰσὶν εἰδωλολατρία (Col 3.5) or to τοὺς νοῦς τῆς ἀπειθείας (Col 3.6). Cf. Eph 2.10 also to Col 1.10 περιπατήσαι άξιός τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πάσαν ἄρεσκείαν, ἐν παντὶ ἐργῷ ἄγαθῳ καρποφοροῦντες.

34 The θῆνη 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 ἠθέλησαν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς θῆνεσιν, on which especially Eph 3.4-6 is dependent.

35 Col 2.11 Ἐν ὅ καὶ περιεπέμψε ἐργατικῆς ἀρετοποιήσει ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδόσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιποίησι τοῦ Χριστοῦ and 2.13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκρῶς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπλάσμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυσσίᾳ τῆς σαρκός ὑμῶν and eventually 3.11 ὅποιον ὅποι ἐν (...) περιποίησι καὶ ἀκροβυσσία.

36 Cf. Col 2.8 κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου [cf. ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ] καὶ ὅποι κατὰ Χριστὸν [cf. χωρίς Χριστοῦ].

όμείς οἱ ποτὲ δόντες [μακράν] ἐγενήθησα τὸ αἰώνιον εἰς τὸν Χριστόν.  
2.14 ΄Αυτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας ἔν τὰ [ἀμφότερα] καὶ ἔν τῷ [ἀμφότεροι] τοῦ [φραγμοῦ] [ἀψίδας], τὴν <Εὖ-θᾶν> ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ>41.  
2.15 τὸν [νόμον] τῶν ἐντόλων ἐν δόγματι (καταργήσας), ἵνα τοὺς (δύο) <κτίσσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς τάς [καὶ νόμον] ἀνθρώπων>42 <ποιῶν εἰρήνην>43.  
2.16 καὶ ἑν ἀποκαταλάβῃ τοὺς [ἀμφότερος] ἐν ἐνι σώματος44 ὅ τι ὅλου ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν  

38 Col 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλάβει τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἰώνιος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ.  
39 Col 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Ἑρώτου βραβεύεται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἐν καὶ ἐκλήθης ἐν ἐνι σώματι [cf. besides ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν in Eph 2.14 also the identical phrase ἐν ἐνι σώματι in Eph 2.16 καὶ ἀποκαταλάβη τοὺς ἀμφότερους ἐν ἐνι σώματι]. The term εἰρήνη occurs three times in the current passage in Eph, namely in Eph 2.14, 15 and 17.  
40 The term ἐξάρα in Eph 2.14 and 16 is - as its context in Eph 2.16 makes clear - dependent on the term ἐξάρας in Col 1.21 Καὶ ὡς ποτὲ δόνται ἀπελθοτριμένους καὶ ἐξάρας τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἐργοῖς τοῖς πονηροῖς.  
41 Col 1.22 νῦν δὲ ἀποκατάλαβεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ ἑν καὶ περιεμένης περιτομῆς ἀνεμοποιών ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδοσεί τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκὸς, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Ἑρώτου.  
42 Col 1.16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα καὶ 3.9-10 ἀπεκδοσάμενου τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπου σὺν ταῖς πράξεις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνδύσαμεν τῶν νέον [cf. τὸν καβοῦν in Eph 2.15] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ᾽ εἰκόνα τοῦ Κτίσαντος αὐτῶν.  
43 Col 1.20 εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἰώνιος τοῦ σταυροῦ [cf. διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ in Eph 2.16] αὐτοῦ, (δι' αὐτοῦ) εἶτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὕμνοις.  
44 Col 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη [cf. the term εἰρήνη in Eph 2.14, 15 and 17] τοῦ Ἑρώτου βραβεύεται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἐν καὶ ἐκλήθης ἐν ἐνι σώματι.
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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 (...) ἐχθροῦς [cf. the term ἐχθρα in Eph 2.14 and 16] (...) νυνὶ δὲ ἄποκαταλλάξει ἐν τῷ σώματι [cf. ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι in Eph 2.16] τῆς σωρκος αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου.

46 Col 2.14-15 ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ’ ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασι [see τὸ νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι in Eph 2.15] ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἑμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἤρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου [see τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ in Eph 2.14] προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τὸ σταυρὸ [see διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ in Eph 2.16] ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἑδειγμάτισεν ἐν παραθύρῳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ [see ἀποκτείνας τὴν εὐθραν ἐν αὐτῷ in Eph 2.16].

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

48 Col 1.10 περιπατήσας ἄζιος τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πάσαν ἄρεσκείαν, ἐν παντὶ ἐργεῖ ἁγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξάνομενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ.

49 Col 4.18 μηνιμονευτεῖ μου τὸν δεσμὸν.

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 τι τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτον ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

3.3 οὗτι κατὰ (ἀπόκαλυψιν) <ἐγνω-ρίσθη> μοι τὸ μυστήριον [C 1.27]>; 51, καθὼς (προέγραψα) ἐν {ολίγῳ}, 3.4 πρὸς δὲ {δύνασθε} <ἀναγνώσ- κοντες> 52 νοήσαι τήν <σύνεσιν> μου ἐν <<τῷ μυστήριῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ>> 53; 3.5 ἐν τῆς γενεαῖς ὡς ἐγνώρισθη τοῖς (ὑφίτος τῶν) ἁλφώπαιν] ὡς νῦν {ἀπεκαλύφθη} τοῖς ἁγίοις ἁπαστόλους αὐτοῦ καὶ [προφήταις] ἐν <πνεύματι> 54, 3.6 ἐτέρας γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνώρισθη τοῖς (ὑφίτος τῶν ἁλφώπαιν] ὡς νῦν {ἐπαγγελίας} ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ <τῷ > 55 εὐαγγελίου, 3.7 οὗ ἐγεύθην διάκονος κατὰ τήν {δωρεάν} τῆς ἕα-

51 Col 1.26-27 τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἐθέσειν. The verb γνωρίσαι 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 ὁταν ἀναγνώσθη παρ’ ἑαυτῷ ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε Ἰνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνώσθη, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας Ἰνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνώστε.

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

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

55 For the term ἐθέσιν 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 ἐθέσειν.

56 Col 1.26-27 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτῶν, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἐθέσειν.
3.8]>>. 1.28 οὖν ἡμεῖς [καταγγέλλομεν] [νοεθετούντες] πάντα ἀνθρώπων καὶ
dιδάσκοντες πάντα ἀνθρώπων ἐν πάσῃ
σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἀν-
θρώπων <τέλειον [E 4.13]> ἐν Χριστῷ:
1.29 εἰς δὲ καὶ κοπίῳ [ἀγωνιζόμενος]
<κατά τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν
ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει
[E 1.19-20, 3.7, 3.20; cf. 4.16]>.

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

3.8 Ἐμοὶ τῷ {ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ}
pάντων ἄγιον ἔδοξη ἡ χάρις αὐτῆς,
τοῖς <ἐθνεσιν>59 [ἐναγγελίσασθαι]
<τῷ {ἀνεξιγνώστου} πλοῦτος τοῦ
Χριστοῦ [C 1.27]>60 3.9 καὶ {φωτίσαι}
[πάντας] τις ἡ οἰκονομία <τοῦ μυσ-
τρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ὑπὸ
tῶν αἰώνων [C 1.28]>61 ἐν <κτεῖς> τοῦ
τά πάντα κτίσαντι, 3.10 <τίνα
<γνωρισθῇ>62 νῦν τοῖς ἀργαῖς καὶ
tοῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς {ἐπουρα-
γίαις}>>63 διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ
πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ)>64.

57 Col 1.24-25 ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἣς ἐγένετο ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοξαίην
μοι καὶ Col 1.23 τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (...) ὡς ἐγένετο ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος.
58 Col 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.
59 For the term ἐθνή see also Eph 2.11, 3.1 and 3.6; they (and especially Eph 3.6) are dependent on Col
1.27 αἷς ἠδύνασεν ὁ θεὸς γνορίσαι τι τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν.
60 Col 1.27 τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν [cf. τοῖς ἐθνεσιν
ἐναγγελίσασθαι in Eph 3.8], ὃ εστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν.
61 Col 1.25-26 πληρώσαι τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ὑπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ
ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἄγιοις αὐτοῦ.
62 The verb γνωρίζεω 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 ἄγιοις
αὐτοῦ, ὃς ἠδύνασεν ὁ θεὸς γνορίσαι τι τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς
ἐθνεσιν.
63 Col 1.16 ἐν αὐτοῦ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς ὑπαρχοὺς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἄρατα,
ete θρόνοι εἰτε κυριότετες εἰτε ὄραται εἰτε ἐξουσίαι.
64 Col 2.15 ἀπεκδημάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησία [cf. ἐν ὃ ἔχουμεν
τὴν παρρησίαν in Eph 3.12], ὑπακοέως αὐτούς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ Col 2.2-3 εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν [cf. γνωρισθῇ
in Eph 3.10] τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, ἐν ὃ εἰσίν πάντες οἱ θραυσοὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ
21 [Θέλω] γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι
[ἦλίκον] [ἀγώνα] ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ
tῶν ἐν {Δικαστικίας} καὶ ὅσοι ὑμῖν
[ἐόρακαν] τὸ [πρόσωπών] μου ἐν
σαρκί, 22 ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν <<αἰ
καρδιάς αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντες <ἐν
ἀγάπῃ [Ε.4.16]> [Ε.3.17]>> καὶ εἰς πᾶν
πλοῦτος τῆς {πληροφορίας} τῆς
<<συνέσεως, εἰς εἰπήγωσιν τοῦ
μνηστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ. Χριστοῦ
[Ε.3.4]>>. 23 ἐν ὧν εἰσίν πάντες οἱ {θη-
sαυροί} τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως
[ἀπόκρυφοι] [Ε.3.10]. 24 <Τούτῳ λέγω
[Ε.4.17]>, <ἵνα μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς [παραλο-
χίζῃ] ἐν [πιθανολογία] [Ε.5.6]>. 25 εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ {ἀπειμι}, ἀλλὰ
tῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι, {χαίρων}
καὶ βλέπων ὑμῶν τὴν [τάξιν] καὶ τὸ
{στερέωμα} τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως
ὑμῶν.

65 Cf. τοῦ μνηστήριου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων in Eph 3.9, which verse is dependent on Col 1.26 τοῦ μνηστήριου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν.
66 Cf. Col. 2.15 ἀπεκδοσάμενος τὰς ἁρχὰς καὶ τὰς εξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ.
67 θριαμβεύσει ἄυτον ἐν αὐτῷ.
68 Col 2.12 ἐν ὧν καὶ συνηγέρθησε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ
ἐγείραντος αὐτόν ἐκ νεκρῶν.
69 Col 1.24 Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑπερήματα τῶν
θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὁ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία.

2.8 Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ [συλαγωγὸν] διὰ τῆς [φιλοσοφίας] καὶ [ἐκεῖνης ἡ ἄμαχος [Ε4.22] [Ε5.6]] κατὰ τὴν [παράδοσιν] τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ [στοιχεῖα] τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστὸν [Ε2.12]· ὁτι [ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ [Ε3.17]] ἐπὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς [θεότητος] [σωματικῶς], καὶ ἐστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι [Ε3.19], ὡς ἐστίν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἁγίης καὶ εἴσοδος [Ε1.2]].


2.15 << ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς έξουσίας [Ε 1.21,3.10]>


2.16 Μὴ οὖν τις υμᾶς <{κρινέτω} ἐν (βρῶσει) καὶ ἐν (πόσει) [Ε 5.29] ἤ ἐν μέρει (ἐορτής) ἢ (νεομηνίας) ἢ (σαββάτων). 2.17 << ἡ ἑστίν (σκιά) τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ <σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Ε 4.12]> [Ε 1.21-23]>>. 2.18 μηδεῖς υμᾶς (καταβραβευέτω) (θέλων) ἐν ταπεινοφορσύνῃ καὶ (θρησκείας) τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἢ (ἐόρακεν) (ἐμβατεύων), << (εἰκῆ) (φυσιούμενος) ὑπὸ τοῦ (νοὸς τῆς σαρκός) αὐτοῦ [Ε 4.17]> , 2.19 καὶ οὐ (κρατών) <τὴν κεφαλὴν, εἰς οὗ πάν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφών καὶ συν- δέσμων (ἐπιχορηγούμενον) καὶ συμ- βιβαζόμενον αὔξει τὴν αὐξησίν τοῦ θεοῦ [Ε 4.15-16]>.

2.20 Εἰ (ἀπεθάνετε) σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν (στοιχείων) τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς (ξάντες) ἐν κόσμῳ (δογματί- ζεσθε); 2.21 <μὴ (ἀψί) μηδὲ (γεύση) μηδὲ (θίγης) [Ε 5.29]> , 2.22 ἡ ἑστίν πάντα εἰς (φθοράν) τῇ (ἀποχρήσει), κατά τὰ (ἐντάλματα) καὶ <διδασκα- λίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων [Ε 4.14]> ,

2.23 ἀτινά ἑστίν λόγων μὲν ἐχοντα σο- φίας ἐν (ἠθελοθησίας) καὶ ταπεινο- φορσύνη (καὶ) << (ἀφειδία) σῶματος [Ε 5.29]> , οὐκ ἐν (τιμῇ) τίνι πρὸς (πλησι- μονήν) τῆς σαρκός.
3.1 «Ει οὖν (συνηγέρθησε)
τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ (ἀνω) (ζητεῖτε), οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν <ἐν δεξίοι> τοῦ θεοῦ
(καθήμενος) [Ε 1.20] [Ε 2.6].> 3.2 τὰ (ἀνω) (φρονεῖτε), μή τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
3.3 (ἀπεθάνετε) γὰρ καὶ (ἡ ζωὴ υμῶν (κέρκυρα) σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ
[Ε 2.6].) 3.4 (ὅταν) ὁ Χριστὸς φανερώθη, ἡ ζωὴ υμῶν, τότε καὶ υἱεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ
φανερώθησατε ἐν δόξῃ.

3.14 Τούτου (χάριν) (κάμπτω) τὰ (γόνατά) μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,
3.15 εὖ οὖ <πᾶσα (πατριὰ) ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς> 69 (δομαζέται),
3.16 ἵνα δῷ υμῖν <<κατὰ <τὸ πλοῦτος
tῆς δόξης> 70 αὐτοῦ δυνάμει (κρα-
tαιωθήναι)>> 71 διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος
αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν (ἐσω) ἀνθρώπον,
3.17 «<<κατοικήσαι τὸν Χριστὸν
dιὰ τῆς πίστεως>> 72 ἐν <<κατά
cαρδιάς υμῶν>> 73, ἐν ἀγάπῃ>> 74
<ἐρρίζωμένοι> 75 καὶ <τεθεμελιω-
μένοι> 76, 3.18 ἵνα (ἐξίσχυσθη) (κατα-
λαβέσθαι) σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις τῇ

69 Col 1.16 τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and 1.20 τὰ πάντα (...) (...) εἰτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς
gῆς εἰτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
70 Col 1.26-27 τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, αἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεός γνωρίσαι τί τῷ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ
μυστηρίου τοῦτον ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν.
71 Col 1.11 ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμοῦμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.
72 Col 2.12 ἐν ὦ καὶ συνηγέρθησε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτῶν ἐκ
νεκρῶν.
73 Col 1.19 ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδοκήσας κἀν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικήσαι and 2.9 ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ pἀν τὸ
πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σοματικῶς and 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετο ἐν τοῖς καρδιάς
υμῶν.
74 Col 2.2 ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ.
75 Col 2.6-7 ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, ἐρρίζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικισθημένοι ἐν αὐτῷ.
76 Col 1.23 εἰ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένου.
και (μήκος) και (υψός) και (βάθος), 3.19 γνώναι τε τήν (υπερβάλ- 
λουσαν) τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ 
Χριστοῦ, << θεόν το πλήρωμα τού 
θεοῦ.>>77.

3.20 Τῷ δὲ (δυναμένῳ) ὑπὲρ 
πάντα ποιῆσαι (ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ) ἀν 
αἰτούμεθα>78 ἢ (νουῦμεν) <κατὰ 
τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν 
ἡμῖν>79, 3.21 <αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν 
τῇ ἐκ-
κλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ>80 <εἰς 
pάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ [αἰώνος τῶν 
αἰῶνων]>81, (ἁμὴν).

4.1 Παρακαλῶ σὺν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ 
<< (δέσμιος) >82 ἐν κυρίῳ <δέσμιος 
περιπατῆσαι>83 τῆς (κλήσεως) ἢς 
ἐκκλήθητε, 4.2 <μετὰ πάσης ταπεινο-
φροσύνης καὶ προφήτης, μετὰ 
μακροθυμίας, ἀνέχομενοι ἀλλή-
λῶν ἐν ἀγάπῃ. ἢς (σπουδάζοντες) 
(τρείριν) τὴν (ἐνότητα) τοῦ πνεύματος 
ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης> 4.4 "Ἐν 
σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα, καθὼς καὶ 

77 Col 2.9-10 ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ 
πεπληρωμένοι. Cf. πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα in Col 1.19 ἐν αὐτῷ ευδοκήσαν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικήσαι.
78 Col 1.9 οὐ πανόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι, ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν 
tοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ.
79 Col 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἑμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.
80 Cf. Col 1.12-13, 15 and 18 εἰςαριστούντες τὸ πατρὶ (...) [cf. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν 
τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν 
Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in Eph 3.21], δὲ (...) μετέτηθησαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ μιᾶς 
tῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (...) [cf. 
αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν 
Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in Eph 3.21], δὲ (...) ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ 
sῶματος 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 μην ἐμονεῦτε μου τῶν δεσμῶν.
83 Col 1.10 περιπατῆσαι δέσμιος τοῦ κυρίου.


84 Col 3.12-15 'Ενδύσασθε οὖν (...) ταπεινοφροσύνην προκύπτων μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεξάμενοι ἄλλαχιν (...)· ἐπὶ πάσιν δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἄγαπην, δὲ ἐστίν συνέδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβευόταν ἐν τοῖς καρδίασις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθη ἐν ἐνί σῶματι.

85 Col 2.12 συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ὦ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἑγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

86 Col 1.18 δὲ ἐστιν ἀρχή, προτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς προσεύχων 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 θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργείων τά πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. 12.11 πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα and 12.13 ἐν ἐν ἐνεργεία ἡμείς πάντες εἰς ἐν σώμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἰτε ἱονισθοῦν εἰτε Ἐλληνες εἰτε δουλοὶ εἰτε ἐλεύθεροι.

87 Col 4.17 καὶ εἴπατε Ἀρχίσατε βλέπεν τὴν διακονίαν ἢν παρέλαβες ἐν κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληρώσῃ.

88 Col 1.24 ἀντανακληρόν τὰ υπερήματα τῶν θηλευσάν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ του σώματος αὐτοῦ, δὲ ἐστίν ἡ ἐκκλησία and 2.17 καὶ ἐστίν σκία τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.
4.13 {μέχρι} {καταντήσωμεν} οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν {ἐνότητα} τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ ισότοι τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα <τέλειον>89, εἰς {μέ-τρον} {ἡλικίας} τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 4.14 ἵνα {μηκέτι} ὁμεν {νή-μισι}, {κλυδωνιζόμενοι} καὶ {περι-φερόμενοι} παντὶ {ἄνέμω} τῆς <δι-δασκαλίας> ἐν τῇ {κυβείᾳ} τῶν ἀνθρώπων>90, ἐν {πανουργία} πρὸς τὴν {μεθοδείαν} τῆς {πλάνης}.

4.15 {αληθεύοντες} δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ <<σι-ξήσωμεν> <εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα>91, ὡς ἔστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, 4.16 ἧν ὅπως πάν τὸ σῶμα {συναρμολογο-μενον} καὶ {συμβιβαζόμενον} διὰ πάσης ἀρχῆς τῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως <κατ' ἐνέργειαν>92 ἐν {μέτρῳ} ἕνος ἐκάστο-του μέρους τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος.

---

89 Col 1.28 ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἀνθρώπων τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ and 4.12 ἵνα σταθητε τέλειοι καὶ πεπληρωμενοι 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 αὐτόν ἐκτισται and especially 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλαξαὶ τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν.

92 This phrase recalls the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν in Eph 1.19 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἱεραίας αὐτοῦ. Ἦν ἐνέργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἑγείρας αὐτόν ἐκ νεκρῶν (which in dependent on Col 2.12 διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνέργειας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἑγείραντος αὐτόν 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 ἐνεργομενὴν 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. <<<πορνεῖαν <ἄκαθαρσίαν [E 4.19]〉〈πάθος〉 <<<ἐπιθυμίαν [E 4.22]〉〈κακῆν〉, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν [E 4.19], ἥτις ἐστὶν (εἰσιδωλολατρία),

3.6 δι' ᾧ ἔργεται ἡ ὕποπτη τοῦ θεοῦ
[ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας] [E 5.3, 5.5-6]>>>. 3.7 <ἐν ὅις καὶ ὑμεῖς περι-επατήσατε ποτε [E 2.1-2, 2.10]> [E 2.1-3]>>>, ὅτε (ἐξήτε) ἐν τούτοις.

3.8 νυνὶ δὲ <<<ἀπόθεσε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὑπήρχεν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν [E 4.31]>, <<<[αἰσχρολογίαν] [E 5.4, 5.12]> ἐκ τοῦ στόματος υμῶν [E 4.29]>·

3.9 <μὴ ψεύδεσθε> εἰς ἀλλῆλους

93 Col 2.19 καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλήν. ἐξ ὅϋ πάν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἄρων καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπισχημονοῦμεν καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὐξεῖ τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ and Col 1.18 καὶ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἔκκλησιας, so it seems if Eph 4.15-16 makes use of two of the three κεφαλή- passages in Col (Col 1.18, 2.10 and 2.19), that is using the two only explicit σώμα- and κεφαλή-passages in Col, namely Col 1.18 and 2.19. Eph 4.15-16 draws for the phrase τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτῶν 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 ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπισχημίας 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. ὅταν μὴ ἔχωμεν παραλογίζω τὴν πιθανολογίαν.

96 Col 2.18 εἰκῆ φουσιούμενος ὅπλο τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.

97 Col 1.21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτὲ ὄντος ἀπολλωτρισμένοις καὶ ἐχθροῦς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἐργαῖς τοῖς πονηροῖς.
καθώς ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὸς οὖν παρελθῆτε τῶν Χριστῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, (…) βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἔδιδαχθησθε, 1.5-7 ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀλήθειας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς (…), ἀφ’ ἂς ἡμέρας ἦκουσατε καὶ ἔπεγνω τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀλήθειας καθὼς ἐμᾶθητε ἀπὸ Ἐσαήλ, and possibly also 1.23 εἰ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένηι (…) καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ὑπὸ ἦκουσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν.

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


5.3 <<<[Πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκα-θαρσία πάσα ἡ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ὁνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς [πρέπει] ἄγιος, 5.4 καὶ <<<[αἰσχρότης] καὶ [μωρολογία] [Ε 3.8]>>>107 ἦ [ἐντρα-

102 Col 3.8 ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς (...) αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν.
103 Col 3.19 Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἄγαπάτε τὰς γυναίκας καὶ μὴ πικραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτὰς.
104 Col 3.8 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμῶν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν.
105 Col 3.12 ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι, σπλάγχνα οἰκτιμοῦ χρηστότητα.
106 Col 3.12 ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι.
107 Col 3.8 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμῶν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν.
pelía), ο όπις ἀνήκεν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία (C 3.15, 3.17). 4.5 τούτο γὰρ ἵστε γεννάσκοντες, ὑπὲρ τοῦ τότε πάσης (πόρους) ἢ (ἀκάθαρτος) ἢ (πλεονέκτης), ὦ ἐστίν εἰδωλολάτρης (C 3.5). 108. οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομιαν ἐν εἰσ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ 109. 5.6 (ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς (ἀπατῶν) κενοὶς λόγοις) διὰ ταῦτα γάρ ἔρχεται ἢ ὅργῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς νίκους τῆς ἀπειθείας (C 3.5, 4). 110. μή οὖν γίνεσθε (συμμέτοχοι) αὐτῶν. 5.8 (ἡτίς γὰρ ποτὲ σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ) 112. ως τέκνα φωτός <περιπατεῖτε> 5.9 - ὦ γὰρ (καρπὸς) τοῦ φωτός ἐν πάσῃ (ἀγαθοσύνη) 113 καὶ (δικαιοσύνη) καὶ ἀληθεία -

108 Col 3.5 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἦτις ἐστίν εἰδωλολατρία. Το έντεκτον τοῦ εφεσίου 5.5 εἶναι πλάγια κατά τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ 2.4 ἔντεκτον λέγει, ὡσπερ ἤταν ἡμᾶς καθορισμένα εἰς πιθανολογία. 110 Col 2.8 Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἀπέταται ὁ συλαγωγὸς διὰ τῆς πιθανολογίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 111 Col 3.5-6 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἦτις ἐστίν εἰδωλολατρία, ἢτις ἐστίν εἰσ βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (ἐπὶ τοὺς νίκους τῆς ἀπειθείας).

109 Col 1.13 καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ νικοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (cf. τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ εφεσίου 5.5) καὶ 4.11 συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

110 Col 2.8 Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἀπέταται ὁ συλαγωγὸς διὰ τῆς πιθανολογίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ 2.4 Τοῦτο λέγει, ἃ ἤταν ἡμᾶς καθορισμένα εἰς πιθανολογία. 111 Col 3.5-6 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἦτις ἐστίν εἰδωλολατρία, δεῖ ἐρχεθαι τῇ ὁργῇ τοῦ θεοῦ (ἐπὶ τοὺς νίκους τῆς ἀπειθείας).

112 Col 1.12, 13 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ γεγονότι· ὡς ἐρρῖσθαι ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ νικοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ.

113 Col 1.10 περιπατήσεις ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πάσαν ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν πάντι ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφόροντες.
5.10 [δοκιμάζοντες] <τι ἐστιν εὐ- άρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ>114, 5.11 καὶ μὴ [συγκοινωνείτε] τοὺς ἐργοὺς τοῖς
<[ἀκάρποις]>115 τοῦ σκότους, μᾶλλον
dὲ καὶ [ἐλέγχετε]. 5.12 τὰ γὰρ [κρυφῇ]
γινόμενα ὑπ’ αὐτῶν <[αἰσχρῶν] ἐστιν
cαὶ λέγειν [C.3.8]>116, 5.13 τὰ δὲ πάντα
[ἐλεγχόμενα] ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανε-
ροῦται, 5.14 πάν γὰρ τὸ φανερόμενον
φῶς ἐστιν. [διὸ] λέγειν ἑγεῖρε, ὁ [κα-
θεύδων], καὶ [ἀνάστα] ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ
[ἐπιφάνει] οἱ ὁ Χριστῶς.

5.15 Βλέπετε οὖν (ἀκριβῶς) πῶς
<περιπατεῖτε μὴ ὃς (ἄσσοφοι) ἀλλ’ ὃς
[σοφοὶ], 5.16 ἐξαγωγοῦμενοι τὸν
καρπόν>117, ὃτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραί
ἐισιν. 5.17 διὰ τοῦτο μὴ γίνεσθε [ἀφρο-
νεῖς], ἀλλὰ [συνιεί] τῷ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ
cυρίου. 5.18 καὶ μὴ [μεθυσκεσθε]
[ὀίνῳ], ἐν ὃ ἐστιν (ἀσωτία), ἀλλὰ
πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι, 5.19 <καλοῦν-
tες ἑαυτοῖς [ἐν] ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὄνομις
καὶ ωδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ἀδοντες
καὶ [ψάλλοντες] τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ
cυρίῳ. 5.20 εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε
ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐν ὑνόματι τοῦ κυρίου
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ θεῷ καὶ
πατρί [C.3.16-17]>.

3.16 Ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (ἐνοι-
κεῖτο) ἐν ὑμῖν (πλουσίως), ἐν πάσῃ
σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες <<καὶ [νουθε-
tοῦντες] ἑαυτοὺς, ψαλμοῖς ὄνομις
ωδαῖς πνευματικαῖς ἐν [τῇ] χάριτι
ἀδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν
tῷ θεῷ. 3.17 καὶ πάν ὃ τι ἐὰν ποιήτε ἐν
λόγῳ ή ἐν ἑργῳ, πάντα ἐν ὑνόματι
cυρίου Ἰησοῦ, <εὐχαριστοῦντες [E
5.4]> τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ δι’ αὐτὸν [E 5.19-
20]>>.

114 Col 3.20 τὸ ὅπου ἐναρεστὸν ἐστιν ἐν κυρίῳ.
115 The phrase τοῖς ἐργοῖς τοῖς ἁκρόποις τοῦ σκότους refers back to and is contrasted with the καρπός
τοῦ φωτὸς in Eph 5.9, which passage is dependent on Col 1.10 ἐν παντὶ ἑργῇ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες.
116 Col 3.8 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόκενεσθαι ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὁργήν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχυρολογίαν
ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν.
117 Col 4.5 Ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω τῶν καιρῶν ἐξαγωγοῦμενοι.
3.18 <Αἱ γυναῖκες, ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὡς ἀνήκεν ἐν κυρίῳ [Ε.5.21-22].


5.29 <Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν ἄλλα [ἐκτρέψει] καὶ [θάλπει] αὐτὴν> 121.

118 Col 1.18 καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας.
119 Col 3.12 ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄγιοι καὶ ἠπατημένοι.
120 Col 1.22 παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἄγιοις καὶ ἀμωμοσς καὶ ἀνεγκλήτων κατενώπιοι αὐτοῦ.
121 The author of Eph's general statement (Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν ἄλλα ἐκτρέψει καὶ θάλπει αὐτὴν) contradicts a phenomenon which is described in Col 2.16 (Μὴ οὖν τὰς ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν δικαίωσιν καὶ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἐρωτήθη ἡ νεογνησία ἢ σαββάτων), 2.21 (μὴ ὡς μηδὲ γεύση μηδὲ διψήμι τὴν γίγνεις ) and 2.23 (ὑπερείδια σώματος [= severe (lit. unsparing) treatment of the body, asceticism, BGD 124]).
καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, 5.30 ὁτι μέλη ἐσμέν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ.
5.31 [ἀντὶ] τοῦτο [καταλείψει] ἀνθρώπους [τὸν] πατέρα καὶ [τὴν] [μητέρα] καὶ [προσ-
κολληθησται] πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔστωνται οἱ [δύο] εἰς σάρκα μίαν. 5.32 τὸ 
μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστὶν ἔγω δὲ 
λέγω εἰς Χριστόν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλη-
σίαν. 5.33 [πλήν] καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἑνα, 
ἐκαστὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως 
ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἰνα 
φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα.

6.1 <<Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε 
τοῖς γονέσιν κατὰ πάντα, <τοῦτο 
γὰρ εὐάρεστον ἐστὶν ἔν κυρίῳ 
[E 5.10]> [E 6.1]>>.

3.21 <<Οἱ πατέρες, μὴ ἑρεθίζετε 
τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν [E 6.4], ἵνα μὴ 
[ἀθυμῶσιν].

3.22 <<Οἱ δούλοι, ὑπακούετε 
κατὰ πάντα τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυ-
ρίοις [E 6.5]>, <μὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμο-
δουλία ὡς ἄνθρωπόρεσκοι, ἀλλ' 
[E 6.6]>, <ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας [E 6.5]>, 
<φοβοῦμενοι τὸν κύριον [E 6.5]>, 3.23 <ὅ 
ἐὰν ποιήτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε [E 
6.6]>, <ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἄν-
θρώποις. 3.24 εἰδότες ὅτι [E 6.7-8]>, 
<ἀπὸ κυρίου [E 6.8]> ἀπολύμανθος τὴν 
ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας. <τῷ 
κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε [E 6.6]>.

122 Col 3.24 τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε and 3.23 ὃ ἐὰν ποιήτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε.
3.25 ὁ γὰρ ἀδικῶν <κομίσεται [E 6.8]>

δ [ἡδικησεν] [E 6.5-8]>>, <καὶ οὐκ

ἐστὶν προσωπολημνία [E 6.9]>. 4.1 <Οἱ κύριοι, τὸ δίκαιον καὶ

τὴν [ισότητα] τοῖς διώλοις [παρέχεσθε], εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔχετε κύριον ἐν ὑπανύ] [E 6.9]>.


6.9 <Καὶ οἱ κύριοι, τὰ αὐτὰ

ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς. [ἀνινέτες] τὴν [ἀπειλήν], εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν ὁ κύριος ἐστίν ἐν ώρα-

νοίς [C 4.1]> <καὶ προσωπολημνία

οὐκ ἐστὶν παρ' αὐτῷ [C 3.25]>.

6.10 Τοῦ {λοιπὸν}, <[ἐνδύνα-

μοθεὶ] ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει
tῆς [ἰσχύος] αὐτοῦ>124, 6.11 ἐνδύσασθε
tὴν [πανοπλίαν] τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸ

dύνασθαι] ὑμᾶς στήνῃ πρὸς τὰς

μεθοδείας τὸυ [διαβόλου]. 6.12 ὅτι

οὐκ ἐστίν ἡμῖν <ἡ [πάλη] πρὸς αἴμα

καὶ σάρκα ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς,

πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας>125, πρὸς τοὺς

<(κοσμοκράτορας) τοῦ σκότους τοῦτον>126, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς

[πονηρίας] ἐν τοῖς [ἐπουρανίοις].

6.13 διὰ τοῦτο ἄναλάβετε τὴν [παν-

οπλίαν] τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα [δυνηθῆτε]

[ἀντιστῆναι] ἐν τῇ [ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ]

καὶ ἀπαντᾶ (κατεργασάμενοι) στήνῃ.

6.14 στήτε ὅθην [περιζωσάμενοι] τὴν

[ὁσφῖν] ὑμῶν ἐν ἀλληθεία, καὶ ἐνδυ-

σάμενοι τὸν [θώρακα] τῆς [δικαιο-

σύνης] 6.15 καὶ [ὑποδησάμενοι] τοὺς

[πόδας] ἐν [ἐτοιμασία] τοῦ ἐναγγε-

123 Col 3.11 ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι (... δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος.

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

125 Col 2.15 ἀπεκδύσαμεν τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισαν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύοντες

αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ.

126 Cf. Col 1.13 ὡς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους.
Τὴ <<< <προσευχὴ (Ε 6.18)> (προσκαρτερεῖτε), (γρηγοροῦντες) ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, 4.3 <προσευχό-

μεναι (Ε 6.18)> [άμα] καὶ <περὶ ἡμῶν

Ε [Ε 6.18-19]>, <<ἳνα ὁ θεός [ἀνοίξῃ]

ἡμῖν [θόραν] τοῦ λόγου λαλῆσαι

<τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ε 3.4)]

Ε [Ε 6.19]>>, <δι’ ὁ καὶ [δεδεμαι], 4.4 ἵνα

φονερόσω αὐτῷ ὡς δεὶ με λαλῆσαι

Ε [Ε 6.20] (Ε 6.18-20)>>.

4.5 <Ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς
tοὺς (ἕξο) τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγωγῶ-

μεναι (Ε 5.15-16)>. 4.6 ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν

πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, [ἅλατι] [ἡρτυ-

μένος], εἰδέναι πῶς δεὶ ὑμᾶς ἐνι

ἐκάστῳ [ἀποκρίνεσθαι].

4.7 <Τὰ κατ’ ἐμὲ πάντα γνω-

ρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικὸς ὁ ἀγαπήτως

ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος καὶ

[σύνδουλος] ἐν κυρίῳ. 4.8 ἐν ἐπεμ-

ῳ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο. ἤνα

λίου τῆς εἰρήνης, 6.16 ἐν πάσιν ἀνα-

λαβόντες τὸν [θυρεόν] τῆς πίστεως,

ἐν ὑ [δυνήσεσθε] πάντα τὰ [βέλη]

τοῦ πονηροῦ [τὰ] [πεπυρωμένα]

[σβέσαι]. 6.17 καὶ τὴν [περικεφα-

λαίαν] τοῦ [σωτηρίου] δέξασθε καὶ
tὴν [μάχαιραν] τοῦ πνεύματος, ὁ

ἐστιν [ῥήμα] θεοῦ.

6.18 Διὰ πάσης <<< <προσευχῆς

[C 4.2)] καὶ [δεήσεως] <προσευχόμε-

νοι [C 4.3]> ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεῦ-

ματι, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ [ἀγρυπνοῦντες] ἐν

πάσῃ (προσκαρτερήσει) καὶ [δεήσει]

<περὶ> πάντων τῶν ἀγίων 6.19 καὶ ὑπὲρ

ἐμοῦ [C 4.3]>, <<ἳνα μοι δοθῇ λόγος ἐν

[ἀνοίξῃ] τοῦ στόματός μου, ἐν παρ-

ρησίᾳ γνωρίσαί τοῦ μυστήριον τοῦ

eὐαγγελίου [C 4.3]. 6.20 <<ὑπὲρ οὗ

[προσβευό] ἐν [ἀλόσει], ἥνα ἐν αὐτῷ

[παρρησιάσωμαι] ὡς δεὶ με λαλῆ-


6.21 ἤνα δὲ εἰδήτε καὶ ὑμεῖς

<τὰ κατ’ ἐμὲ, τί [πράσσω], πάντα

gνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικὸς ὁ ἀγαπη-

τῶς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος

ἐν κυρίῳ. 6.22 ἐν ἐπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς

127 Col 4.3-4 δι’ ὃ [cf. ὑπὲρ οὗ in Eph 6.20] καὶ δεδεμαι [cf. προσβευό ἐν ἀλόσει in Eph 6.20], ἤνα

φονερόσω αὐτῷ [cf. ἤνα ἐν αὐτῷ παρρησιάσωμαι in Eph 6.20] ὡς δεὶ με λαλῆσαι (= ὡς δεὶ με

λαλῆσαι in Eph 6.20).
γνώτε τα περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ παρακάλεσθε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. \[^{[E 6.21-22]}\]

4.9 σὺν ('Ονησίμῳ) τὸ πίστιν καὶ ἀγαπητὸν ἀδελφόν, ὡς ἔστιν εὖ ὑμῶν· πάντα ὑμῖν γνωρίσουσιν τὰ (ὡδε).

4.10 ("Ασπάζεται") ὑμᾶς ("Αριστοτέρη") ὁ (συναίχμαλωτός) μου καὶ (Μάρκος) ὁ (Ἀναγνώστης) (Παραμυθία) (περὶ τοῦ ἑλάβετε) ἐντολάς, ἐὰν ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς δέξασθε αὐτὸν. \[^{[E 5.5]}\]

4.11 καὶ (Ὑσοῦς) ὁ λεγόμενος (Ὑσοῦς), οἰ ὄντες ἐκ περιπομῆς, οὗτοι μόνοι (συνεργοί) εἰς <τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ> \[^{[E 6.13]}\]

4.12 (Ἀσπάζεται) ὑμᾶς (Ἐπαφρᾶς) ὁ εὖ ὑμῶν, δοῦλος Χριστοῦ (Ὑσοῦ), πάντοτε ἀγαπητῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς προσευχαῖς, ἵνα σταθῆτε <τέλειοι> \[^{[E 4.12]}\]

4.13 (μακρυφώ) γὰρ αὕτῳ ὅτι ἔχει πολὺν (πόνον) ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν (Λαοδικείᾳ) καὶ τῶν ἐν (Ἰεραπόλει).

4.14 (Ἀσπάζεται) ὑμᾶς (Λουκᾶς) ὁ (ἰατρός) ὁ ἀγαπητός καὶ (Δημᾶς).

4.15 ("Ἀσπάσασθε") τοὺς ἐν (Λαοδικείᾳ) ἀδελφοὺς καὶ (Νῦμφαν) καὶ τὴν κατ’ (οἴκον) αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν. \[^{[E 3.4]}\]

4.16 καὶ (ὅταν) ἀναγινώσθη, οἱ ἐπιστολῆς, ποιήσατε ἢν καὶ ἐν τῇ (Λαοδικέας) ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγινώσθη, καὶ τὴν ἐκ (Λαοδικείας) ἢν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγινώστε \[^{[E 4.12]}\]

4.17 καὶ (ἐἴπατε) ("Ἀρχίππῳ") βλέπει τὴν ἡμέραν \[^{[E 4.12]}\]
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4.18 ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, μνημονεύετε μου τῶν <(δεσμῶν) (E 3.1, 4.1)> δὴ ἡ ἔριξ μεθ’ (E 6.24) ὑμῶν.

6.22 Εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 6.24 ἡ ἔριξ μετὰ (C 4.18) πάντων τῶν ἅγιον πάντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ.

* 1 Cor 16.21 ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου and 2 Thess 3.17 ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, δ ἐστιν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ οὕτως γράφει. 128 Col 1.2 τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἅγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, χάρις ἡμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. Cf. Eph 1.2 χάρις ἡμῖν 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 συζησσωμεν εις αυτων τα παντα: THE CHURCH'S ACTIVE INFLUENCE ON THE COSMOS

According to the 'majority of scholars' (so H. Merklein, München 1973, p. 112) the words τα παντα in Eph 4.15-16 ⁴.¹⁵ ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ συζησσωμεν εις αυτων τα παντα, ὡς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστὸς, ⁴.¹⁶ ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σώμα (...) τὴν συζησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἐκατοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ are to be considered as an adverbial accusative ('in every way') while the verb συζησσωμεν 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 τα παντα as the object of a transitively taken verb συζησσωμεν so that τα παντα 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 Epheserbrief (München 1973, pp. 110-112 on the phrase ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ συζησσωμεν εις αυτων τα παντα).
(1) The first argument for the understanding of the clause τὰ πάντα as 'cosmos' is that Eph 4.15 αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα is derived from the verses Col 1.16 τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτίσται and especially Col 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλάβαξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν (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 αὐτὸν (the clause εἰς αὐτὸν itself occurring in Eph outside Eph 4.15 only in Eph 1.5 προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτὸν, 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 δὲ ἐστίν ἡ κεφαλή which follows in Eph 4.15 immediately after εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα (αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, δὲ ἐστίν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός) has been derived from the same passage Col 1.16-20, namely from Col 1.18 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστίν 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 σώμα occur together, namely the passage Col 2.19 καὶ οὖ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὖ πάν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἥρων καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμμβιβαζόμενον αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. conflation 19c), which are thus earlier already found in Col 1.18 (καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστίν 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 σώμα-passages in Col, Col 1.18 and Col 2.19 (the other κεφαλὴ-passage in Col, Col 2.10, does not read the term σώμα: καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, δὲ ἐστίν 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 αὐτὸν 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 αὐξήσωμεν (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 σώμα in its immediate context (αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, δὲ ἐστίν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πάν 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 γνώρισας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (...) ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (where the clause τὰ πάντα is found together with a cognate term of κεφαλή) while the second fragment, Eph 1.22-23, reads καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἦτες ἐστίν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν
ndoiv TiXtipovnevov (where the terms keφαλή, σώμα 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 keφαλή and its cognate term ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι occur except for Eph 5.22-23 which reads Ἄι γνωστές τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀνδράσιν ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι ἄνηρ ἐστιν keφαλή τῆς γυναικος ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς keφαλή 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 keφαλή. The fact that the terms τὰ πάντα and keφαλή 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):\(^{13}\) Εὐλογητός ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ του κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλογητος ἡμᾶς (...),\(^{14}\) καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς (...),\(^{15}\) προορίσας ἡμᾶς (...)\(^{16}\) εἰς ἐπανο ν δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἢς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγασμένῳ,\(^{17}\) ἐν ὃ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν (...) κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ,\(^{18}\) ἡς ἐπερισσευσαν εἰς ἡμᾶς (...)\(^{19}\) γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (...)\(^{10}\) ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπαρνοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

The theme of ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι 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 τοῦς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἡτὶς ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν 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: αὐξησάμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὡς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστὸς, ἐξ ὑμῶν πάν τὸ σῶμα (...) τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται.

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 σώμα 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 [...] ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἀμφότερον ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λόσας, [...] τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, ἵνα [...] ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφότερους ἐν ἐνι σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ in an attempt to reinterpret Col 2.14-15 [see conflation 12 above] but also Eph 2.20 ἐπικοινωνημένες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμέλιῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὅντος ἀκρογονιαίου 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 ἑυθεγετιστάς, 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 ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς 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 κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἦτης ἐστίν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν πληρωμένου) 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 κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἦτης ἐστίν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν πληρωμένου) is picked up again in Eph 4.10 (ὁ καταβὰς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβὰς 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 οὐξήσωμεν, 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 γνωρισθῇ 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 μυστήριῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δὲ ἐπέρας γενεσίς οὗκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς νῦν ἀπεκάλυφθη τοῖς ἄγιοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτῶν καὶ προφήταις), to the Gentiles (Eph 3.8-9 τοῖς ἑθεσιν εὐαγγελισθαι τὸ ἀνεξιχνιαστὸν πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ φωτίσαι [πάντας] τις ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστήριον 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 γνωρισθῇ 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 γνωρισθῇ 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 αὐτῶν [object=Christ] ἐδοκεῖν [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 ἀπεκδοσάμενος 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 ἡ πόλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας [!] τοῦ σκότους τοῦτοῦ, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, διὰ τούτο ἀναλάβετε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δυνηθῆτε ἀντιστήναι 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 εἰσὶν; interestingly the clause ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν is copied from Col 4.5 but the clarifying reason ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ εἰσὶν 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 πολυποικίλος σωφρία τοῦ θεοῦ and Eph 6.12 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ πόλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦτοῦ, 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 θεός καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλογητὸς ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ), the realm where Christ is seated (Eph 1.20 ἤν ἐνίρισθην 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 ἄντα ἡμᾶς νεκροὶ τοῖς παραπτάμασιν συνεξωκοπηκαίντων τῷ Χριστῷ [...] καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκαθισεν 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 δεὶ πάντως ἀτέλες εἶναι, χρόνον δὲ προϊόντος αὔξεσθαι μέχρι παντελοῦς τελείωσεος: ὡστε, εἰ γέγονεν ὁ κόσμος, ἦν μὲν ποθ', ἣν κἀγὼ χρήσομαι τοῖς ἡλικίοις ὀνόμασι, κομιδὴ νήπιος, ἐπιβαίνων δ' αὖθις ἐνιαυτῶν περίοδοι καὶ μήκεσι χρόνου ὤψ καὶ μόλις ἐτελειώθη [...] οὐ μόνον σώματος αὔξησισται, λήγεται δὲ καὶ οὐς ἐπίδοσιν, ἐπί καὶ οἱ φθεῖροντες. Interestingly, besides the theme of the 'growth of the cosmos', firstly the language of perfection (αὔξεσθαι μέχρι παντελοῦς τελείωσεος καὶ εἰ γέγονεν ὁ κόσμος, ἦν μὲν ποθ' [...] κομιδὴ νήπιος, [...] καὶ [...] ἐτελειώθη) and infancy (εἰ γέγονεν ὁ κόσμος, ἦν μὲν ποθ′ [...] κομιδὴ νήπιος, age (εἰ γέγονεν ὁ κόσμος, ἦν μὲν ποθ', ἣν κἀγὼ χρήσομαι τοῖς ἡλικίοις ὀνόμασι, κομιδὴ νήπιος) and body (οὐ μόνον σώματος τὸ σώματος αὔξησισται) 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 καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες (...) εἰς ἄνδρα τελειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρωματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 4.14 ἦν μηκετί ὡμέν νήπιοι (...) 4.15 ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὔξησομεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, δὲ ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστοῦ, 4.16 εκ οὐ πᾶν τὸ σώμα (...) τὴν αὔξησιν 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 αὔξησιν; 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."

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, ζῷα τε αὐτά καὶ φυτά καρποὺς γεννώντα, αὔξουσι καὶ τελεσφοροῦσι [subject=οἱ πλανήτες]). 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" (ταρσοὶ τε οἱ σπορτῶν καὶ δενδρῶν αὔξονται καὶ τελεσφοροῦται σελήνης περιόδους). 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 αὔξειν + object + εἰς (Eph 4.15) in *De Migracione Abrahami*, 55 although the topic is different: τί γὰρ ὁφελοὶ πολλὰ μὲν θεωρῆματα παραλαμβάνειν, ἔκαστον δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ἀρμόττον μέγεθος μὴ συγκυαζόσι: (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 "(αὔξαν έν) 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 αὔξησωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, οὐς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή Χριστός, εξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα [...] τὴν αὔξησιν 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 αὔξησωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, οὐς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός, εξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα [1] συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης ἀφις τῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως (...) τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος [2] ποιεῖται would stand for the Church while the second σῶμα would
designate the cosmos; "es [ist] gewaltsam, das zweimalige σώμα 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 αὐξάνων is found only twice in Eph, namely outside Eph 4.15 only in Eph 2.21.

Secondly, although the verb αὐξάνων in Eph 2.21 is intransitive (Eph 3.21 ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ συναρμολογοῦμένη αὐξάνων νοῦν ἀγίου ἐν κυρίῳ), this is not a valid argument against a transitive understanding of αὐξάνων in Eph 4.15, since for instance in 2 Cor the verb αὐξάνων occurs only twice as well but each time clearly differently because in 2 Cor 9.10 αὐξάνων is transitive (2 Cor 9.10 καὶ αὐξάνων τὰ γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ύμῶν) but in 2 Cor 10.15, a few verses later, it is to be understood intransitively (2 Cor 10.15 ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχοντες αὐξάνωμένες τῆς πίστεως ύμῶν).

Thirdly, if the clause τὰ πάντα in Eph 4.15 is stressed due to its place in the context (αὐξάνωσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστὸς) 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 αὐξάνωσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα (Eph 4.15) points at the growth of the cosmos towards its head it does not mean that the αὐξήσεως τοῦ σώματος (Eph 4.16 Χριστός, εἷς ὁ πᾶς τὸ σῶμα [...] τὴν αὐξήσεως 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, εἷς ὁ πᾶς τὸ σῶμα [...] τὴν αὐξήσεως 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 ὄμεν 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 ὄμεν νήπιοι) and spiritual growth and maturity (ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξήσωμεν). This view is, however, not convincing since a contrast between πλάνη and ἀληθεία 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 αὐξήσομεν). The contrast is then certainly between the two clauses κλαυδωνίζομεν 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 ὄλγῳ, πρὸς δὲ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοήσαι τὴν σύνεσιν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: THE LETTER TO THE EPHESIANS AS THE LETTER TO THE LAODICEANS

As D.G. Meade has argued the phrase καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὄλγῳ in Eph 3.3-4 (καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὄλγῳ, πρὸς δὲ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοήσαι τὴν σύνεσιν 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 μυστηρίον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ [...] ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι 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 (ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι 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 δὲ in accordance with; BGD, p. 710: πρὸς III,5,δ or "according to", "with reference to"; Meade, p. 150) δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοήσαι τὴν σύνεσιν 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

---

66 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 ἀναγνώσκοντες (Eph 3.3-4 καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγνώσκοντες νοήσαι τὴν σύνεσιν 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 ἀναγνώσθη παρ' ὑμῖν ἣ ἐπιστολή [=the Letter to the Col], ποιήσατε ἱνα [subject=the Letter to the Col] καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλησία ἀναγνώσθη, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείᾳ [=the Letter to the Laodiceans=Eph] ἱνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνώστε.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 Ἰσραήλει 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 μυστηρίου 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 μυστηρίου 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 ἀπόκαλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγνώσκοντες νοήσαι τὴν σύνεσιν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ [...] εἶναι τῷ ἔθει τῷ μισθίῳ καὶ σύνησιμῳ καὶ συμμέτοχῳ τῆς ἐπανεγεργείᾳ 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 ἀναγνώσθη παρ' ὑμῖν ἢ ἐπιστολὴ (Goodspeed, p. 110; Mitton, p. 293) while the actual derivation seems to be from the following part ποιήσατε ἱνα [subject=the Letter to the Col] καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλησία ἀναγνώσθη.
πρὸς δ᾿ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοήσαι τὴν σύνεσιν 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 ἀναγνώσθη παρ᾿ ὑμῖν [= the Colossians] ἡ ἐπιστολὴ [=the Letter to the Col], ποιήσατε ἵνα [subject=the Letter to the Col] καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέου εἰκλησίᾳ ἀναγνώσθη. 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 προέγραψε ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς δ᾿ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοήσαι τὴν σύνεσιν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ)89 but subsequently he changes the contents of the mystery in Eph 3.6: ἐὰν τὰ ἐθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ γύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα 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: 126 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενέων - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, 127 οἷς ἡθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τι τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, δ᾿ ἐστιν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἢ ἔλπις 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 αὐτοῦ 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).
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