

# Reasons for Ephesians

THORSTEN MORITZ

It is commonly argued that Ephesians was addressed to a Gentile audience,<sup>1</sup> whereas Colossians betrays signs of Judaistic tendencies among the recipients.<sup>2</sup> More specifically it is often suggested that Ephesians aims to counterbalance any sense of Gentile superiority over, or lack of appreciation of, the Jewish roots of their faith. This, it is maintained, led to an acute lack of unity between Gentile and Jewish Christians. Käsemann was influential in the formulation of this view.<sup>3</sup> Turning to Colossians, the debate over its origin and intention has largely centred on whether or not the letter was occasioned by the so-called 'Colossian heresy'. Although most commentators still interpret Colossians in the light of what is thought to lie at the heart of the 'Colossian error',<sup>4</sup> it is well known that Hooker took issue with the suggestion that Colossians was written in response to false teaching.<sup>5</sup> One of her major arguments consisted of the observation of 'the extraordinary calm with which Paul confronts it [ie the alleged false teaching].'<sup>6</sup> Here Colossians contrasts with Galatians, for instance. She also suspects that the near consensus of scholars is not so much a sign of the strength of their argument, but evidence of scholarly desires to mirror-read Paul's epistles and to reconstruct pre-Christian hymns in order to relate them to an alleged *Sitz im Leben*. Circularity in argument appears to be an accepted ingredient of such exercises. A more plausible scenario, Hooker argues, is that Colossians appears to have been written into a situation not so much of false teaching, but where 'young Christians are under pressure to conform to the beliefs and practices of their pagan and Jewish neighbours'.<sup>7</sup>

If we compare this with Lincoln's more recent estimate of the situation behind Ephesians, ie that the implied readers 'are in danger of accommodating to the values of the surrounding world',<sup>8</sup> it emerges that scholars are still less than clear about the distinctiveness of these two letters or indeed their interrelationship. This impression is compounded by the fact that Lincoln thinks it possible and indeed likely that the intended

readers of Ephesians also lived in the Lycus valley, more specifically in Laodicea or possibly in Hierapolis, that is only some ten to fifteen miles from Colossae.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, just as Hooker fails to find evidence of false teaching or a crisis behind Colossians, so Lincoln maintains that Ephesians neither reads like a polemic nor like an extended apologetic, as indeed he detects no sense of crisis nor specific problems among the implied audience.<sup>10</sup> The question this raises is as straightforward as it is difficult to answer: if both epistles had such similar audiences, *why was there a need for two letters as closely related as these?* To shed light on these matters, the present study intends to isolate some of the main features of scholarly debate which perhaps have prevented further progress and to outline a way forward to answer the question just posed.

## ***1. A Common Historical Assumption About the Intended Readership of Colossians***

Ever since Lightfoot's discussion of the significant Jewish presence in parts of Asia Minor (a view based largely on Josephus' reference [Ant 12.147–53] to the relocation of 2,000 Jewish families to Lydia and Phrygia by Antiochus III in the late third or early second century B.C.), commentators have continued to imply that the Colossae of Paul's time must have been inhabited by a not insignificant number of Jews.<sup>11</sup> Consequently attempts to elucidate the nature of the Colossian false teaching centred largely around various Jewish, Jewish Christian or Jewish syncretistic concepts.<sup>12</sup> These attempts may or may not be along the right lines, but I wish to suggest that the underlying assumption of a Jewish presence in the city of Colossae at the time of writing is not nearly as secure as is usually implied.

Although it is true that the ruins of Colossae have not yet been excavated and that the city is likely to have been the victim of a major earthquake in 60/61

A.D.,<sup>13</sup> it is significant that we have neither literary nor archaeological evidence pointing to Jewish inhabitants in this city. Trebilco, in his major study of Jewish communities in Asia Minor does not even mention Colossae in his index.<sup>14</sup> This picture is confirmed by Schürer's otherwise extensive survey.<sup>15</sup> Probably the closest one gets is Philo's claim that 'Jews inhabited every town in Asia and Syria in great numbers',<sup>16</sup> but this is hardly meant to be taken as literal evidence. By the same token it does not suffice to defend the assumption of a significant number of Jews in first century Colossae by perpetually reiterating Lightfoot's influential introduction.<sup>17</sup> As Lightfoot himself remarked, Jewish (re-)settlements seem to have concentrated on thriving cities, an attribute which, by the first century A.D., was no longer applicable to Colossae. This is evident not only from the relative lack of literary references to this city in the first century, but also from Strabo's omission of Colossae in his list of *πολιςματα*<sup>18</sup> and from the fact that in contrast to Laodicea, Colossae did not recover, ie was not rebuilt, following its destruction by earthquake. It is to be hoped that the city will be archaeologically examined in the not too distant future.

## 2 To What Extent does Colossians Incorporate Jewish(Christian) Motives?

The main argument for a Jewish element among the intended readers has always been the presence of Jewish motifs in this epistle. These include references to circumcision (2.11; 3.11), meat/drink, festivals, new moons and Sabbaths (2.16, 21<sup>19</sup>) and possibly angel worship (2.18), although evidence for the last in first-century Judaism is at best sketchy. Occasionally scholars have attempted to link the phrase *ἀποκαταλλαξαι* (1.20) with the Jewish Atonement Day.<sup>20</sup> Burney regarded Col 1.15-20 as a midrash on Gen 1.1 and was rightly criticised for this by Gabathuler.<sup>21</sup> One might point to the phrase *ἐν δεξια του Θεου* and relate it to Ps 110.1, but this hardly amounts to much. Lindars goes as far as seeing in Col 2.22 a 'quotation' from Isa 29,<sup>22</sup> but again this is more likely to be an innocent piece of OT rhetoric on the part of the author. It is best to restrict the discussion to the references in ch 2.11-21 cited above.

There are two issues arising from this. (1) To what extent are these elements Jewish? (2) What does this reveal regarding the implied readership of this epistle? In answer to the first question one has to acknowledge the evidently Jewish nature of these features. At the same time it is vital to recognise these elements as what has come to be termed Jewish 'identity markers'.<sup>23</sup> This immediately moves us some way towards answering the second question: whereas Col 2.11-20 probably proves that the author expected his audience to be

familiar with three of Judaism's most prominent features, it does not imply that the intended readership necessarily included Jews. Put differently, virtually anyone in first-century Asia Minor would sooner or later have come across these Jewish 'identity markers'. Given the syncretistic nature of the recipients, it is hardly surprising that the Colossians should have incorporated some Jewish elements into their religious or Christian framework. It is instructive for the interpreter to find these particular markers (and only these!) in such close proximity in this letter. The lack of other explicitly Jewish references brings us to the next point.

## 3. The Use of Traditions in Colossians and Ephesians

Ephesians, as M. Barth put it, is a hunting ground for traditions.<sup>24</sup> As far as Colossians is concerned, Cannon would argue that essentially the same verdict applies.<sup>25</sup> However, it is striking, first, how few scholars have noticed the extent of OT traditions (direct or mediated) in Ephesians (1.20-3; 2.13-7; 4.8-10; 4.25-5.2; 5.14; 5.31; 6.2; 6.14-7) and secondly, as we saw above, the virtual lack of the same in Colossians. If we compare these passages synoptically, we find repeatedly that the Ephesian parallels are marked out by some sort of OT component which is unparalleled in Colossians. This is illustrated by the following table in which verses which contain an OT element are listed in bold type:

Colossians		Ephesians	
(text)	(OT material)	(text)	(OT material)
1.13	-	1.15-23	<b>1.20, 22</b>
1.3-27; 2.9-14	<b>1.17</b>	2.11-8	<b>2.13, 17</b>
2.15	-	4.8-10	<b>4.8</b>
3.5-12	<b>3.10</b>	4.25-5.2	<b>4.25, 26a, 26b, 30; 5.2</b>
-	-	-	<b>5.14b</b>
3.16	-	5.17-20	<b>5.18</b>
3.18f	-	5.21-33	<b>5.31</b>
3.20f	-	6.1-4	<b>6.2</b>
-	-	-	<b>6.10, 14, 15, 17</b>

The relative predominance of OT material in Ephesians is evident. Needless to say, the verses containing OT material listed for Ephesians cover a range of qualitatively different appropriations. These range from quotations (5.31; 6.2), amalgamations (5.14b) and allusions (1.20-2; 2.13-7) to polemic re-appropriations of competing interpretations (4.8)<sup>26</sup>, a deliberate collection of OT motifs (6.10,14-7) and an 'OT flavoured' exhortation (4.25-5.2). Eph 5.18a might be regarded as innocent everyday language, but the comparison with the Colossian parallel shows a similar pattern to that evident elsewhere: the Ephesian parallel uses OT language (cf Prov 23.31) where Colossians does not.

Despite these varying degrees of OT flavour each of

these verses can be linked with a specific OT verse.<sup>27</sup> For the present argument it is irrelevant whether the OT material was obtained directly from the Jewish Scriptures or whether it was mediated via Jewish ethical instruction, although the verbal agreement perhaps makes the former more likely. The main observation is that Ephesians time and again supplies OT precedents or OT language where Colossians fails to do so. This does not square easily with the common assumption that Colossians addresses a mixed Jewish-Gentile audience, whereas Ephesians was intended for predominantly Gentile recipients. To obtain a clearer picture in this matter we need to find out the specific purpose and the significance of these individual OT echoes.

It is striking to note that most of the verses listed occur at strategically important places within the letter. Ch 1.20–3 summarises and concludes the majestic opening eulogy and thanksgiving. A similar function is performed by ch 5.14,18, this time in relation to the extended hortatory section starting with ch 4.17. Ch 2.13–7 forms the theological and literary centre piece of the epistle's major discussion of Jewish-Gentile relationships. Ch 4.8–10 (text and interpretation) poignantly, though implicitly, contrasts the Christian charismata (vv7–16) with the contemporary Jewish re-appropriation of Ps 68.18 as a celebration of the giving of the Torah to Moses, a re-appropriation with which Paul does not agree.<sup>28</sup> The inclusion and positioning of chs 5.31 and 6.2f is perhaps the clearest case of all. Both epistles have a threefold household code, but the decisive difference is that the Ephesian version is significantly extended. Given the rather formal arrangement of household codes (three pairs covering three sets of relationships) these extensions are somewhat surprising. It is significant that the two quotations from the Pentateuch play a major part in these extensions. This leaves the famous weaponry passage in ch 6.10,14–7 which, of course, sums up the entire epistle.

It would be quite feasible to extend this discussion by examining the possible OT background of a variety of motifs—rather than verbal links—employed in Ephesians,<sup>29</sup> but the verses mentioned above provide the strongest evidence for the thesis that in Ephesians Paul was at pains to employ OT language and thinking wherever appropriate. I suggest that any discussion of the reasons for Ephesians must come to terms with this phenomenon.

#### 4. *The Intended Audience of Ephesians in General*

One of the intriguing questions surrounding the use of OT traditions in Ephesians is the seeming tension

between the deliberate presence of such material on the one hand and the fact on the other hand that ch 2.14–7 leaves no doubt that the Jewish Law had been removed 'when he came'.<sup>30</sup> Why then, the reader may well ask, does Paul carry on alluding to and quoting from the OT such as, for instance, in ch 6.2f? Given that most of the passages which incorporate such material are either ecclesiological (1.20–2; 2.13–7; 4.8) or ethical (4.25–5.2; 5.14b, 18, 31; 6.2f) key passages, the suggestion seem plausible, first, that the use of these traditions is indicative of Paul's audience assumptions and secondly, that he was at pains to demonstrate the fundamental compatibility between the ethics operational in his churches and those of Judaism. Perhaps he saw a need to demonstrate this in the light of Jewish criticisms of the Pauline churches as being unacceptably libertine or ethically lax. In any case, the argument that Ephesians may well have been addressed to mixed audiences consisting of Jewish and Gentile Christians has the main advantage of combining the two assumptions into one explanation. Admittedly this preliminary conclusion contrasts with majority opinion and needs to be underpinned further.

The traditional hypothesis of an intended Gentile audience is largely based on the clear references to Gentiles in Eph 2.11 and 3.1. Yet this only proves a predominantly Gentile audience, not a solely Gentile one. Otherwise the question would have to be raised why Paul had to emphasize the Jewish-Gentile relationship at all. The fairly extended discussion of the reconciliation between the 'circumcision' and the 'uncircumcision' (2.11–22) with its strongly worded announcement of the removal of the Torah and its concluding reminder of the new christocentric temple of God almost certainly presupposes that this relationship was very much a live issue. Further support for the assumption of a mixed audience might be adduced from ch 1.1 where the separation of *saints* and *believers* has perplexed commentators. In view of Rom 15.26, 1 Cor 16.1 and 2 Cor 9.1 it is at least possible to regard the term *saints* as a reference to Jewish believers (cf Eph 2.19; LXX Exod 19.6).<sup>31</sup> Finally, and as I hinted above and argued in detail elsewhere, there is a good case for suggesting that ch 4.8–10 presupposes a readership who were aware of contemporary Jewish re-appropriations of Ps 68.18 for the purpose of Jewish Pentecostal Torah celebrations, but also of Christian counterclaims that this OT verse might more profitably be applied to Christ's incarnation and ascension followed by the giving of gifts to the church than to Moses' ascent on the mountain to receive and pass on the Torah.<sup>32</sup>

If, then, the proposal is made that Ephesians rather than Colossians had a mixed audience in view, the next step is to relate this to the textual evidence of Eph 1.1 and to the above discussion of some common historical

assumption regarding these letters. The former has of course received an enormous amount of scholarly attention.<sup>33</sup> For our purpose, however, it suffices to pick up Marcion's famous suggestion which has been modified somewhat in the relatively recent commentary by Lincoln.<sup>34</sup>

### 5. *The Laodicea Hypothesis in Particular*

Marcion identified Ephesians with the Letter to the Laodiceans mentioned in Col 4.16. In Colossians Paul asks the recipients to pass on greetings to the Laodiceans. This is seemingly inconsistent with the fact that by his own admission he sent a letter to the Laodiceans. If that epistle was in fact our Letter to the Ephesians, its impersonal tone, which is probably due to its circular nature, might explain why he wanted the Colossians to pass on personal greetings. There is no space here to discuss the merits of the Laodicean hypothesis,<sup>35</sup> suffice to say that it would go some way towards explaining the following. First, whereas first-century Colossae cannot be demonstrated to have had any significant Jewish presence, such a presence in Laodicea is beyond doubt.<sup>36</sup> Secondly, while Laodicea and Colossae were ethnologically different enough to warrant separate letters, they were geographically close enough to explain similar letters by the same author. We saw above how the assumption of a mixed audience for Ephesians helps to explain the letter's distinct but subtle OT flavour which is perhaps more likely to have been understood by Jewish readers or hearers than by Gentile believers or ex-Godfearers. It is admittedly impossible to deduce a significant Jewish contingent purely from the author's use of traditions, but the distinct difference in the use (Ephesians) or neglect (Colossians) of OT traditions in two otherwise very similar letters is most profitably explained this way.

On the assumption just outlined it would seem promising to describe in more detail the audience presupposed by Ephesians. The obvious danger in that is the temptation to squeeze too much out of the available evidence, but in view of the seemingly general character of Ephesians and the less than adventurous attempts by scholars to describe its audience,<sup>37</sup> there may be some merit in attempting to obtain a more detailed picture. For now I shall point out just one possible line of enquiry which results from the present study.

A synthetic look at the OT material used in Ephesians shows that a number of these revolve around the Torah. There is, first, ch 2.13–7 which appears in a rather Torah-sceptical co-text: with the removal of the Law 'when he came' the major separator between the 'circumcision' and the 'uncir-

cumcision' had disappeared.<sup>38</sup> Secondly, ch 4.8–10 is best interpreted as a quotation from an early Christian polemical adaptation of Ps 68.18 which emulates, but radically redirects a similar Jewish adaptation of the same verse for use as part of the Jewish Pentecostal Torah commemorations. Thirdly, there are the two quotations from the Pentateuch in chs 5.31 and 6.2f. which may well serve the purpose of reassuring critics of the Pauline churches, particularly in the area of morality. Given this preoccupation with Torah matters, the proposal seems plausible that Paul's intended audience needed teaching on the relationship of Jewish Torah and Christian faith. This observation can be combined with another: there are numerous indications throughout the letter, but primarily in ch 1,<sup>39</sup> that the recipients were well-versed in mystical-visionary language. Paul repeatedly used and glossed such language for his own purposes.<sup>40</sup> Since a variety of primary sources from the first and second centuries indicate to us the use of the Jewish Torah for mystical purposes in a variety of religious circles,<sup>41</sup> it is not far-fetched to consider the possibility of Paul combating a type of Torah mysticism.<sup>42</sup>

What, according to this proposal, was the distinctive difference in audience intention between Colossians and Ephesians? A plausible answer would seem that both letters were addressed into situations where believers may have had knowledge and possibly experience of mystical experiences, the difference being that Ephesians was more specifically addressed to those who used the Jewish Torah to this end. Both implied audiences needed to be given essentially the same warning—the difference lay in the contextualising of this warning depending on the religious and ethnic backgrounds of the respective audiences. The Colossians had to be told that to have Christ means not to have to rely on mystical-visionary experiences (Col 2.18). The Ephesians needed to be told that to be in Christ is fully sufficient; there is no need for a Torah-centred mysticism (4.8–10). At the same time, not needing Jewish Torah (2.13–7) is not the same as not having a moral framework. In fact, Paul appears to argue that Christian faith and practice are perfectly compatible with Jewish piety (6.2f). The new covenant even adds the distinctly new (Christ-) dimension to that which had already formed part of Jewish moral thinking (5.31f).

The last two paragraphs are largely conjecture. However, such conjectures are needed to advance what has for some time been a relatively stagnant Ephesian scholarship. What matters most for the present study—regardless of the value of these conjectures—is the observation that Ephesians may have to be interpreted not so much as an isolated general letter, but as a re-contextualisation of the message of Colossians by the same author for a different audience which faced similar problems.

## 6. Conclusion: Reasons for Ephesians

About a quarter of the vocabulary of Ephesians and a third of its content is paralleled in Colossians. There are few reasons to question the scholarly consensus that there was some sort of literary relationship<sup>43</sup> between these two epistles and that Colossians was very probably written first. Time and again it is much easier to explain Ephesian parallels as developments of the Colossian *Vorlage* than to argue the other way around. Nevertheless it is not really good enough to be able to determine the sequence of writing. Was Ephesians written just shortly after Colossians? If so, why was it written at all? Is Ephesians the result of a post-Pauline redactor who interpolated major passages into the much shorter letter to the Colossians? Is the whole of Ephesians post-Pauline? It is hardly surprising that the question of the precise literary relationship of these letters has played the most significant part in the argument of those who deny Pauline authorship.<sup>44</sup> Anyone wishing to uphold Pauline authorship quite simply has to offer reasons for Ephesians.

It was the intention of this essay to point out the general plausibility of the suggestion that Ephesians was addressed to an ethnologically different audience than Colossians. This is hardly a new insight; what is new is the proposal that it is not Colossians but Ephesians which was intended for (an) audience(s) with a not insignificant Jewish contingent. Given the duplication of much of the content of Colossians in Ephesians and also the significant addition of OT material, I suggest that we see Ephesians as a deliberate rewriting of Colossians for a similar but more Jewish-oriented audience. It is well known that Colossians speaks into a situation of religious syncretism. This will have included knowledge of the major Jewish 'identity markers' (ie Sabbath observance, food laws and circumcision) even by non-Jews as well as visionary mystical experiences. Undoubtedly these were among the main features of the teaching and practice Paul was so concerned about. Having written Colossians to warn the predominantly Gentile church of Colossae of the dangers inherent in these practices, Paul may have decided within days or weeks to address the same warnings to mixed Jewish-Gentile congregations in Asia Minor, quite possibly including Laodicea. He asks the two churches to exchange letters because, although they overlap significantly, they represent different contextualisations of the same theological truths. Colossians serves more directly as an anti-syncretistic warning letter, while Ephesians represents a more subtle and possible prophylactic follow-up version addressed to mixed Jewish-Gentile Christian congregations in the area of the Lycus valley (Laodicea) and perhaps even as far afield as Western Asia Minor (eg Ephesus).

In many ways this essay is not much more than a ground-clearing exercise. The task that has to follow is to examine the two letters 'synoptically' with a view to underpinning the above hypothesis. For now it remains to conclude that it is by no means inconceivable that one and the same author might have written Colossians and Ephesians within a short space of time, but addressed to ethnologically different, though religiously similar audiences. I suggest this goes some way towards explaining the striking OT flavour of Ephesians when compared with its Colossian *Vorlage*. Hooker's proposal that Colossians was not a polemic directed against a 'heresy' has met with little favour, but her insistence that it addresses a situation where Christians face the pressures of their pagan environment<sup>45</sup> is entirely plausible. I do disagree, however, that the intended recipients of this letter were under pressure from Jews and Jewish Christians—that theory seems rather more applicable to Ephesians, and it is here that we need to look for the reasons for Ephesians.

## Footnotes

1. M. Barth, *Ephesians* (Doubleday 1960) 1–3, 3f.
2. For the view that Colossians reflects a 'gnosticized Judaism' which has been 'peculiarly' united with elements of Christianity see G. Bornkamm, 'The Heresy of Colossians' in (ed. F. Francis and W. Meeks) *Conflict at Colossae* (Scholars Press, 1975) 135.
3. Käsemann, 'Ephesians and Acts' in (ed. L. Keck and J. Martyn) *Studies in Luke-Acts* (SPCK 1968) 291; cf. K. Fischer, *Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1973) 79–94 who takes this further by detecting not just a sense of disunity, but more specifically disagreements among the intended readership over matters of church organization.
4. An example of the confidence displayed by some scholars who attempt to reconstruct the situation behind Colossians is J. Lähnemann, *Der Kolosserbrief* (Gerd Mohn 1971) 27f: 'Diese Untersuchung ist deshalb möglich, weil man die Gemeindesituation in Kolossae recht gut erhellen kann. Der Briefschreiber widmet sich intensiv den Lehren der Häretiker in Kolossae'. One of the more recent full length treatments of this matter is that by T. Sappington, *Revelation and Redemption at Colossae* (Sheffield Academic Press 1991) 225 who concludes that the Colossian heresy is closely related to 'a type of Jewish/Gentile Christianity that was strongly oriented towards the ascetic-mystical piety of Jewish apocalypticism'. A survey of the astonishing variety of opinion regarding the teaching of Paul's opponents in Colossae is offered by J. Gunther, *St Paul's Opponents and their Background* (Brill 1973) 3f.

5. M. Hooker, 'Were there false teachers in Colossae?' in (ed. B. Lindars and S. Smalley) *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (Cambridge University Press 1973) 315–31.

6. *Ibid.*, 316.

7. *Ibid.*, 329.

8. A. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (Word 1990) lxxvii.

9. *Ibid.*, lxxxii.

10. *Ibid.*, lxxx.

11. P. O'Brien, *Colossians* (Word 1982) xxvii; F. Bruce, *Colossians* (Eerdmans 1984) 8–13.19. E. Schweizer, *The Letter to the Colossians* (SPCK 1982) 13f even goes as far as stating that a Jewish community had been established by Antiochus III in Colossae. This ignores that Josephus does not in fact mention Colossae. Similarly over confident are A. Wedderburn, 'The theology of Colossians' in (ed. J. Dunn) *The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters* (Cambridge University Press 1993) and D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (Intervarsity Press 1970) 549. Much more cautious is P. Pokorny, *Colossians—A Commentary* (Hendrickson 1991) 20.

12. Cf Sappington, *Revelation*, 15–9.

13. Orosius, *Adversus Paganos*, 7.7 (cf Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.27.1).

14. P. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (Cambridge University Press 1991).

15. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (T&T Clark 1986) III.1, 17ff.

16. Philo, *Legatio*, 33.245.

17. J. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (MacMillan 1879) 19–22.

18. Strabo, *Geography*, 12.576.

19. The triad 'festivals, new moons and Sabbaths' is also found in LXX versions of Hos 2.13; Ezek 45.17; 1 Chr 23.31 and 2 Chr. 2.3 and 31.3 where it refers to Jewish rites. But the use of OT language says more about the author's familiarity with OT language than about the recipients' ethnic background.

20. E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1930) 43–7.

21. C. Burney, 'Christ as the APXH of Creation' in *JTS* 27 (1926) 160–77; H. Gabathuler, *Jesus Christus: Haupt der Kirche—Haupt der Welt* (Zwingli 1965) 28ff.

22. B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (SCM 1961) 165 and 249.

23. Cf J. Dunn, *Romans* (Word 1988) lxxi; W. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians—The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (Yale University 1983) 36f and E. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (SCM 1983) 102.

24. M. Barth, 'Traditions in Ephesians' in *NTS* 30 (1984) 3–25.

25. G. Cannon, *The Use of Traditional Materials in Colossians* (Mercer University Press 1983).

26. For a detailed discussion and a fresh interpretation of the relevant data cf T. Moritz, *The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians* (forthcoming; Brill 1996).

27. For Eph 1.20–3 cf Pss 110 and 8; Eph 2.13, 17 cf Isa 11.4f; 52.1 and 57.19; Eph 4.8 cf Ps 68.18; Eph 4.25–30 cf Zech 8.16; Ps 4.5; Deut 24.15; Lev 19.11; Isa 63.10; Eph 5.14 cf Isa 26.19 and 60.1f; Eph 5.18 cf Prov 23.31; Eph 5.31 cf Gen 2.24; Eph 6.2f cf Exod 20.12; Eph 6.10, 14–7 cf Isa 11.4f; 40.26; 52.7 and 59.17.

28. Here Paul appears to assume that his intended audience know about the Jewish interpretative history of Ps 68.18, an assumption which is by no means unrealistic given the prominent place of this Psalm in Jewish Pentecost festivals—cf G. Caird, 'The Descent of Christ in Ephesians 4:7–11' in *Studia Evangelica* 2 (Berliner Akademie 1964) 535–45.

29. These include primarily the *mystery* motif in Eph 1.9, 3.3, 4 and 6.19 which is likely to be linked with Daniel's similar motif—cf C. Caragounis, *The Ephesian Mysterion—Meaning and Content* (Clerup 1977) 23; also the Temple and corner stone imagery (2.20–2—cf Ps 117.22[LXX] and Isa 28.4[LXX]). Whether the election motif in the opening eulogy (1.3ff) might come into this category falls beyond the scope of this study.

30. In view of the above discussion it is unsurprising that a comparison with Col 2.14 shows that Eph 2.14f puts rather more emphasis on the fact that the 'writing' that was removed on the cross was actually the Jewish Law. M. Barth's attempts to diffuse the statements of Eph 2.14f by interpreting them as directed against *misusing* the Law or against *oral* laws (*Ephesians*, 287–91) can only be explained against the background of his well known ecclesiology, not on the basis of the textual evidence.

31. The third person plural references to *the nations* in ch 3.6, 8 and 4.17 can probably not be used as an argument as the term appears to refer to non-Jews who need the gospel rather than to letter's addressees.

32. Of course, the Jewish re-appropriation became only possible by radically changing the wording of the original Psalm (*to take* becomes *to give*). Quite possibly, therefore, Paul quotes an early Christian polemical imitation of this alteration which was then employed as part of *Christian* Pentecostal celebrations. This background makes the quotation in Eph 4.8 eminently suitable as an introduction to the discussion of Christian gifts in vv11ff.

33. An excellent overview is found in E. Best, 'Ephesians i.1' in (ed. E. Best and R. Wilson) *Text und Interpretation* (Cambridge University Press 1979) 29–41.

34. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 3f suggests that the redun-

dant καὶ in Eph 1.1 originally connected two place names which were subsequently omitted to 'catholize' the letter. In the light of the similar endings of Ephesians and Colossians he speculates that the autograph referred to Hierapolis and Laodicea. The argument that no manuscripts which mention a specific location have been found is not very strong. If Tychicus took the letter with him on his trips (6.21; Col 4.7) such specifications were unnecessary.

35. Apart from Lincoln, *Ephesians* cf M. Goulder, 'The Visionaries of Laodicea' in *JSNT* 43 (1991) 15–39; Bruce, *Colossians*, 184 n68 and H. Kümmel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Quelle & Myer 1983) 311.

36. Trebilco, *Communities*, 17.

37. Cf Lincoln, *Ephesians* who is not at all convinced that we can say anything specific about the letter's intended audience. Those who do venture to be more specific range from Fischer, *Tendenz* who interprets Ephesians as a post-Pauline attempt to return to the 'liberal gospel' of the apostle to H. Merklein, *Das kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbrief* (Kösel 1973) who finds himself at the opposite end of the spectrum when he detects in this letter a progressing institutionalization of the church. The most fruitful recent approach is that by C. Arnold, *Ephesians: Powers and Magic* (Cambridge University Press 1989) who does much to illuminate the epistle in the light of the first century Western Asia Minor 'powers' terminology and background.

38. When F. Zeilinger, *Der Erstgeborene der Schöpfung: Untersuchungen zur Formalstruktur und*

*Theologie des Kolosserbriefes* (Herder 1974) 92 and 106f. comments on the *dogmata* referred to in Col 2.14 (cf 2.20) that they are Jewish commandments and that here and elsewhere in Colossians the author seeks to outdo claims made for the Law and to replace them with Christ, these comments really should be made about Ephesians, not Colossians.

39. Details in T. Moritz, 'Summing up all things' in (ed. A. Clarke and B. Winter) *One God One Lord* (Tyndale House 1991) 88–111.

40. Goulder, 'Visionaries', 15–39.

41. For an extensive discussion see W. Meeks, *The Prophet-King—Moses Traditions* (Brill 1967) mainly pp122–56, 205–36 and 294–9.

42. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 243 once uses the term 'Moses mysticism', without, however, pursuing this matter fully.

43. Note the verbatim agreement between Col 4.7ff and Eph 6.21ff which is extremely difficult to explain on the basis of the assumption of a post-Pauline imitator. Why would any imitator copy this particular part of Colossians?

44. A full discussion of the matter is found in W. Ochel, *Die Annahme einer Bearbeitung des Kolosserbriefes im Epheserbrief* (Konrad Tritsch 1934).

45. Hooker, 'Teachers', 316–28. For a useful discussion of this pagan environment see Wedderburn, 'Theology', 3–22.

*Thorsten Moritz is the New Testament lecturer at Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education, Cheltenham.*