

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

9-1-1946

The Authenticity of Ephesians

Carl William Schrader

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_schraderc@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schrader, Carl William, "The Authenticity of Ephesians" (1946). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 190.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/190>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF EPHESIANS

**A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Theology**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity**

**by
Carl William Schrader
September 1946**

Approved by:

W. C. Rindt
Serge P. Fick

THE AUTHENTICITY OF EPHESIANS

Controlling Purpose: To determine whether or not the Epistle to the Ephesians was written by the Apostle Paul or by an imposter.

Introduction: Historical background to Ephesus and the Ephesian congregation.

Body of thesis:

I. Authenticity Denied

- A. The letter is of a later date than Paul.
- B. The doctrinal character is inconsistent with typical Pauline literature.
- C. The letter is too cold to be Pauline.
- D. The language, style and grammar are not Pauline.
- E. The Epistle is dependent upon Colossians, therefore written by a forger.

II. Authenticity Affirmed

- A. The Epistle has been accepted from antiquity.
- B. Examination of internal evidence corroborates Paul's authorship.
- C. Modern exegetes and theologians accept Paul as writer of Ephesians.

Appendix.

Bibliography.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF EPHESIANS

The city of Ephesus in Asia Minor, to which our epistle was addressed, was one of the important cities of its day. The inhabitants were for the most part Greek and Oriental. Within this city was to be found one of the Seven Wonders of the World, the Temple of Diana. Considering the day in which it was erected, it was truly a marvel. Containing a temple of this magnitude dedicated to a heathen goddess, Ephesus consequently became the center of heathen worship. Thousands migrated to Asia Minor to behold this structure of which the world spoke, and which was one of the reasons why Ephesus became the city that it was. For many years the city ranked with Antioch and Alexandria as one of the three great emporia of the trade of the Eastern Mediterranean, and formed the commercial capitol for the wide and varied territory west of the Cilician gates.¹

Ephesus, however, did not always remain a great city. Time and the elements worked against it. The river bed over which traffic entered the city to bring it commercial trade from all over the world eventually became impassable for the larger ships. Although repeated efforts were made to deepen the channel, in time this effort was suspended. Ephesus became a deserted city, and the Temple of Diana, the Theatre and other notable structures, victims of the ravages of nature.

1. Deissmann, Prof. A., "The Excavations in Ephesus", in the Biblical Review, Vol. XV, July 1930, No. 3.

This heathen city was destined of God to become the home of a great Christian congregation among which the great Apostle to the Gentiles worked feverishly for over two years. His labors were not without fruit. The germ of the Gospel, planted in fertile soil and nourished by the Spirit of God, brought forth much fruit, not only within the confines of the city, but also throughout the provinces of Asia Minor.

There appears to be no accurate history of the beginnings of the Ephesian congregation. However, the book of Acts relates that upon the first Pentecost festival men from Asia were present to hear Peter's soul stirring sermon. Possibly some of these in due time reached Ephesus and planted there the Word of God. There is, however, no record of this. Then Acts also relates that Paul on his second missionary journey was forbidden to preach the Word in Asia, but that at the close of that journey, when he was on his way from Greece to Syria, he visited Ephesus and reasoned with the Jews in the synagogues.

That the apostle met with some success is evident from the fact that he was requested to remain for some time. This he could not do at that time, since he wished to be in Jerusalem for the keeping of the feasts. For this reason he left Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus, and himself promised to return later. (Acts 18, 19-21). These three then, it is believed, laid the foundation for the church in Ephesus --- Paul, Aquila and Priscilla. Then Apollos came to Ephesus, knowing only of the baptism of John. Aquila and Priscilla made known

to him the things pertaining to the mysteries of God, so that he became an apt teacher himself. As a result of his thorough indoctrination, he "mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ. (Acts 18,28). Apollos continued on to Corinth, after which Paul himself returned from Jerusalem and Antioch and worked in Ephesus for more than two years. Consequently, many turned from the practice of the magical arts, so common in this heathen city, to Jesus Christ. Thus the news soon spread, and was taken by travelers and merchants back to their homes in the Asian provinces. Missionaries and church workers assisted in the dissemination of the Good News to the outer regions. But the Gospel always has opposition wherever it is introduced. So also in Ephesus, where the silversmith Demetrius was the leader of the opposition to Paul and his message. Paul was forced to flee, bade farewell to Ephesus, and journeyed to Greece. Though he for the first did not again set foot in Ephesus, yet he was concerned about the young and tender congregation, and himself gathered with the elders of the congregation at Miletus on his last voyage to Syria (Acts 20, 17-38).

Some years later, after the Ephesian congregation was flourishing, and after the decease of the Apostle who was so instrumental in the rapid growth of the church, there appear in early Christian literature references to a letter which claims to have been addressed by him to this same congregation. This was not an uncommon occurrence in that day, for numerous similar letters were

E. Nestle, Edgar J., "Introduction to the New Testament".

addressed both to individuals and to congregations. The general purpose of such letters was to admonish if it was found necessary, to exhort to a greater service of God, and to condemn sins which were interfering with the growth of either congregation or individual. Not only were such letters written as have been recorded for us in the Holy Scriptures, but numerous others have been preserved from antiquity, indicating that such custom was common place. Nevertheless, it has occurred again and again that the authenticity of the one or the other has never satisfactorily been established, as far as some critics are concerned. Such is the case with the letter to the Ephesians.

The question has been raised as to who is the true author of this letter which Coleridge calls "the divinest composition of man", and which Harless has similarly called "a most beautiful letter"? There are those who argue against the Pauline authorship, while a large number of critics feel that it could not have been written by anyone but Paul. Goodspeed in one place mentions that of fifty-five modern writers on Ephesians, twenty-two accept it as a genuine letter of Paul's and thirty-three do not.² This will not browbeat us into a rejection of the epistle ascribed by the church to the Apostle Paul. The issue can be settled only by a fair examination of the arguments propounded by both sides, weighing with equity all the points advanced, and drawing an honest conclusion on this basis. Following the outline, we shall begin with the arguments advanced

2. Goodspeed, Edgar J., "Introduction to the New Testament".

by those who deny the authenticity of the letter to the Ephesians.

I. Authenticity Denied

The first real opponent to acceptance of the Pauline authorship of Ephesians was Schleiermacher (1768-1834). He was followed by such men as De Wette, the Tuebingen School under Baur, together with Schwegler, Zeller, Schmiedel and others, Ritschl, Moffatt, and Edgar J. Goodspeed. There are other and lesser critics who neither deny nor affirm the authenticity of the epistle, and thus leave the issue undecided. Among the arguments offered by these men, one of the most effective is that the letter evidently is of a later date than Paul.

Chief proponents of the later date theory are the Tuebingen School, Edgar J. Goodspeed and James Moffatt. Baur calls the epistle "a second century epistle, originating in the Valentinian Gnosticism". Going into greater detail, he gives these two reasons for his statement: 1. "The epistle contains a Gnostic effusion because of its exalted views of the person and reign of Christ; its allusions to various ranks in the heavenly hierarchy, and its repeated use of the term 'pleromena'". 2. "The epithet ^{εἰς} ἀγγεῖος applied to apostles and prophets betrays a late origin." In other words the letter was written by a man who would exalt himself.

Following are a few of the Gnostic references in Ephesians suggested by Baur: (See Stoeckhardt's Epheserbrief, p. 4)

- Ch. 2, 7 ἀϊῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι
 Ch. 2, 2 ἀἰῶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου
 Ch. 3, 21 ἀϊῶνες
 Ch. 1, 10 πλῆρωμα
 Ch. 6, 12 ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐφουβία

These are the Montanistic references given by Baur:

Ch. 1, 13 πνεύματι
 Ch. 2, 20 προφητῶν
 Ch. 3, 5 πνεύματι - προφηταῖς
 Ch. 3, 5 πνεύματι
 Ch. 4, 11 προφητῶν
 Ch. 4, 30 πνεύματι

Let it be said here and now that Baur has few, very few critics who would agree with him on the Gnostic and Montanistic references in the epistle to the Ephesians. Stoeckhardt in his Einleitung has this to say in reply to Baur, that these references have nothing to do with the Gnostics and Montanists, and that this argument is very vague and far fetched.³ Why should the above references be employed to evidence traces of a later schism? The words alluded to are not employed in an unpauline sense. They are used in the usual manner of the apostle. Because certain terms in the Gnostic controversy which were the subject of much debate are found in an epistle does not establish the fact that it is a product of the days of controversy. Furthermore, there are too many arguments available to prove that the letter is of an earlier date (cf. following pages).

Among modern day critics who hold that Ephesians is of a later date than the Pauline era is James Edgar Goodspeed.⁴ He

-
3. Stoeckhardts Einleitung, p. 4: "Die Auslegung wird zeigen, dass die angeführten dicta mit den wuesten Spekulationen der Gnostiker, wie der Montanisten nichts zu schaffen haben, wie dies z. B. sonderlich Hofmann in seinem Kommentar zu dem vorliegenden Einwurf bemerkt: 'Wenn Baur meint, dass die Art, wie der Verfasser besonders von Epheser gnostische Ideen und Ausdruecke anwende, bei paulinischer Autorschaft nichts anderes bedeute, als dass der Apostle den von ihm bekaempften Gnostikern selbst in die Haende gearbeitet haette, so beruht das auf einer seltsamen Verschiebung der Sachlage.'"
4. Goodspeed, Edgar J. "The Meaning of Ephesians", Chicago, 1933, pp. 82-165.

offers a number of points to prove that Ephesians was probably written about 90 A. D. This is the sequence of the New Testament writings, according to Goodspeed: The personal letters of Paul, then the Gospels and Gospel histories -- Mark, Matthew, Luke-Acts, then the Pauline letters were assembled and published. In other words, Ephesians is placed after Luke-Acts, which would make the date of its composition about 90 A. D. He further argues that after Acts had been completed, the Pauline corpus was collected and published, and that Ephesians serves as an introduction to the corpus. He offers the internal evidence of the letter to prove his contention. His points are listed in order. (1) The liturgical character of the work binds it inseparably to the age of Luke-Acts, the Revelation, Hebrews, and I Clement. (2) The encyclical interest of the letter reflected in "every family" of chapter 3, verse 15, with "all God's people", verse 18, and "the church" universal, verse 21, recall to the address of 1, 1, and the times when an encyclical address to Christians everywhere could be thought of. (3) The "pleroma" or fulness is coming to have an ethical rather than a cosmic sense; as also in chapter 4, 13, and the eschatology "every family in heaven" is taking on Greek forms in place of Jewish. At every point both the manner and the matter of the section exhibit the atmosphere of the tenth decade.⁵ (4) Ephesians 4, 1-16, belongs to the end of the century. (5) Ephesians 2, 11, refers to the church as being made up of Gentiles, which makes the date of the letter clearer, and taken in connection with the encyclical address of 1, 1, leaves no room for Christians of Jewish blood.

5. op. cit. pp. 50-51.



All are of heathen stock. This cannot have been the case before 90 A. D. (6) The emphasis upon the unity of the church against the sects is unmistakably the atmosphere of the closing years of the century. The term "enotes" is used shortly before in the Acts, but was little used prior to the years 60-80 A. D.

Other critics have submitted different dates, e. g. 55-58 A. D. (McGiffert); 60-61 A. D. (Meyer); 62 A. D. (Zahn); 61-63 A. D. (Lightfoot); 75-80 A. D. (Ewald); about 80 A. D. (Scholten); about 100 A. D. (Holtzmann, Mangold); 130-140 A. D. (Baur, Davidson). But as Expositor's Greek New Testament correctly states, the date will depend largely on the question of the place of writing. The epistle itself makes it clear from chapters 3,1; 4, 1; and 6, 20, that Paul was a prisoner when he wrote it. There are also some references in the letter which indicate a relationship with other churches. The reference to Tychicus as the bearer links it with the Epistles to Philemon and the Colossians especially. Hence it is reasonable to assume that these three letters must have been written about the same time, at least during the same period. We know that the Apostle was imprisoned at least twice, once in Caesarea and the second time in Rome (Acts 23,35; and 24, 27). Which of these two imprisonments shall we believe produced this letter? Each has its supporters. Reuss and Meyer hold to the Caesarean captivity. Meyer places great stress on these arguments. (1). That it is more probable that Onesimus should have sought safety in Caesarea than that he should have risked the long journey by sea to Rome, and the possibilities of capture there. (2). That

if Ephesians and Colossians had been sent from Rome, Tychicus and Onesimus would have arrived at Ephesus first and afterwards at Colossae; in which case it would be reasonable to suppose that Paul would have mentioned Onesimus to the Ephesians as he does in the epistle to the Colossians. (3) That the in Ephesians 6, 21, implies that when Tychicus reached Ephesus he "would already have fulfilled the aim here expressed in the case of others", and these others are the Colossians (Col. 4, 8-9). That in Phil. 22, Paul asks a lodging to be prepared for his speedy use -- a statement implying that his place of imprisonment was not so distant from Colossae as Rome was.⁶

All these suggestions of Meyer's are not very convincing. A runaway slave such as Onesimus was not apt to flee to the lesser metropolis when there was much more opportunity for seclusion in a large city such as Rome. We are not informed of the circumstance of the flight of Onesimus.

The circumstances of Paul's captivity are not of a decisive nature. From the book of Acts, chapter 24,23, it is shown that at Caesarea Paul was handed over to a centurion, that he had some liberty, and that none of his friends was hindered to minister to him or to come to him. When, after a long journey, he reached Rome, the remaining prisoners were delivered into the hands of the guard. Paul was excepted, he was privileged to dwell by himself, having only a guard about him. Paul was not

6. The Expositor's Greek New Testament, p. 234.

so well known in Rome as he was in Caesarea. In the latter place and in the neighboring provinces the name of Paul was well known and the opposition was incensed. Considering everything, we incline to the view that the letter was written during the captivity in Rome, and not the one in Caesarea. This would set the time of the writing of the epistle about 60-65 A. D.

Critics who deny the authenticity of Ephesians on the basis of the date on which it was written will have difficulty in convincing others that the letter was written after the time of Paul. There is too much evidence against them. A careful weighing of their arguments can only bring one to the conclusion that it was written long before the date the Tuebingen school and Goodspeed and others claim for it. It is true that the latter bases most of his arguments on the content of the letter, and that as yet we have not discussed his arguments. These will be dealt with later in the thesis. Suffice it to say at this time that the evidence presented by these critics does not convince us that the letter to the Ephesians was written at a later date than the time of Paul.

The second big point advanced by critics of the Pauline authorship theory is that the doctrinal character of the letter is inconsistent with Pauline authorship. In attempting to establish or deny the authenticity of the letter to the Ephesians it is of course essential to enter into the doctrinal content. If a number of instances of a type of doctrine which is not Pauline

are found, then the correct inference would be that it was not written by the Apostle Paul. Let us examine the doctrine of this letter. Expositor's New Testament says, page 221; "Baur, Schwegler, and other adherents of the Tuebingen School dilate chiefly on its doctrinal character as inconsistent with the Pauline authorship. They find it full of Gnostic and Montanist thought and terminology. They lay stress on such terms as 'pleroma', on the peculiarities of the Christology, etc., and judge it to be the product of the second century, when Gnostic speculations had taken shape and had become familiar. But this view of the Epistle is no longer asserted with the former confidence or in the pronounced form in which it was elaborated by Baur himself. It is acknowledged more generally now that the phenomena in the Epistle on which the old Tuebingen School fastened may be accounted for by the operation of ideas which were in affinity with those known as Gnostic, but which came short of the developed Gnosticism of the middle of the second century; and further that the passages most insisted on by Baur, when fairly interpreted, are quite consistent with the form of doctrine found in the primary Pauline epistles."

Baur is not satisfied with the teaching on the Christian church as found in Ephesians. He says it is definitely not Pauline in its implications. And Soden says, "Der Zweck des Briefes laesst sich also dahin formulieren: es gilt zuerst aufzuzeigen, dass durch dass, was Christus den Menschen gebracht hat, der Unterschied, der die Welt spaltete, zwischen Juden und Heiden aufgehoben, also jede Trennung zwischen

geborenen Juden und Heiden grundlos ist; sodann gilt es, beide Teile zu voller Einheit in Liebe und Frieden zu verschmelzen und damit in Form einer eng in sich geschlossenen, alle umfassenden ekklesia die Menschheit, soweit sie sich fuer die Wahrheit gewinnen laesst, zu einem einheitlichen Organismus zu vereinen."⁷ And this thought is considered as being foreign to Paul, who generally, it is stated, has in mind the individual congregation under the term "ekklesia"; but the author of this letter has placed the idea of the una sancta in the middle of the epistle. Likewise then, it is assumed that the Christology of the letter differs from that in the accepted letters. Now Stoeckhardt says in his comment,⁸

"An diesen Aufstellungen ist so viel richtig; die Einheit der Kirche, die una sancta, ist das Hauptthema unsers Briefes, und dieses Thema ist in keinem der frueheren den Namen Pauli tragenden Briefe so allseitig durchgefuehrt und ausgefuehrt, als in diesem Briefe. Doch das ist wahrlich kein Beweis gegen die paulinische Abfassung desselben. Kann nicht ein und derselbe Autor, der durch die mannigfachsten Motive zum Schreiben veranlasst wird, in verschiedenen Schriften verschiedene Materien behandeln? Die obige Zeitcharakteristik, die Anschauung, als habe man erst im nachapostolischen Zeitalter auf die Einheit der Kirche hingearbeitet, also haetten zu Pauli Zeit die beiden Parteien, Juden und Heidenchristen,

7. Stoeckhardt, Einleitung, p. 5.

8. Same.

noch getrennt einander gegenuebergestanden, ist ein offenkundiges historisches FALSUM." Thus he states that it is a falsity that not before post-apostolic days the *una sancta* was stressed. The first half of the 15th chapter of Romans substantiates this contention, and Romans was not a post-apostolic composition.

Paul frequently dwells upon the subject of the "church" in his epistles. It is admitted that in some he speaks of the church in one manner, while in others he views the church from a different angle. Here are a few references from the Ephesian letter which seem to indicate that Paul refers chiefly to the una sancta when he speaks of the church:

- Chap. 3, 21: "unto Him be glory in the church by Christ.."
- 5, 23: "even as Christ is the head of the church..."
- 5, 24: "as the church is subject unto Christ...."
- 5, 25: "even as Christ also loved the church...."
- 5, 27: "a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle.."
- 5, 32: "I speak concerning Christ and the church...."

On the other hand, Colossians, which is accepted by practically all critics, also has similar references to the *una sancta*, e.g.:

- Chap. 1, 18: "he is the head of the body, the church...."
- 1, 24: "for his body's sake, which is the church.."

Other references and passages from Pauline letters likewise reveal that the Apostle employed the term "ekklesia" not only in the sense of the local church or congregation, but also to mean the church universal. The fact that he employs the one meaning more often in this epistle is hardly a basis for rejecting the entire epistle as the work of Paul. Circumstances alter cases, and the Apostle had reason for stressing the "church universal". Zahn says: "Nicht die Einzelgemeinde von Rom, sondern die

Christenheit auf Erden nennt er Rom. 12, 5, Christi Leib; denn er begreift sich selbst mit darunter.....Dass er dies sonst selten, dagegen im Epheserbrief neunmal tut, wuerde fuer die Kritik nur dann von einigen Belang sein, wenn die sonstigen, dem Paulos gelaefigen Bezeichnungen der gesamten Christenheit im Epheser fehlten, was wie gezeigt, nicht der Fall ist."⁹ As he continues

a discussion of this problem in his introduction, Zahn adds:

"Dass aber diese Idee gerade in Eph. besonders stark hervortritt, erkluert sich daraus, dass Paulos nur in diesem Brief sich an eine Vielheit von Gemeinden wendet, welche nicht wie diejenigen Galatiens durch seine eigene Arbeit entstanden waren, deren mannigfaltige Verhaeltnisse er abgesehen von dem, was er durch Epaphras und Onesimus ueber Kol. wusste, im einzelnen nicht kannte, und deren Gesamtheit ihm nur als ein betraechtlicher Teil der ihm befohlenen Heidenkirche am Herzen lag."¹⁰

Though these suggestions of Zahn may not be the perfect explanation, nevertheless they must be considered as plausible, and serve as a worthwhile reply to critics.

It is further contended that the view of the Law in this epistle is unusual to Paul. It is claimed that the Law is shown as possessing simply a "typical significance", and "as the cause of enmity and separation between Jew and Gentile". In addition, critics claim that the Law is ridiculed, e.g. circumcision. This after and in spite of the fact that Paul by speaking of the una sancta indicates the oneness of both

9. Zahn, T. "Einleitung in das Neue Testament," Erster Band, p. 358.

10. Same, p. 368, par. 29, point 9.

Jew and Gentile within the one great church of Jesus Christ. Now he points his finger to those things which separate them, and even holds them in ridicule. Surely this cannot be the opinion and the words of the great Paul.

It might be suggested in reply that Paul in his other epistles speaks of the Law in various manners, depending upon the circumstances, e.g. Romans 7, 9, where the Law is holy and again in Romans 8, 3, as weak and failing; in Galatians 3, 25, as a schoolmaster; in Galatians 3, 10, as a curse bearer. Expositors, p. 224, says on this subject: "...it was matter of course that he should speak particularly of the dividing effect of the Law as it was witnessed in the pre-Christian times". Now, however, in the church universal there is nothing that divides, and both Jew and Christian are equal, have the same rights and privileges, having been redeemed by the same Christ.

The times when Paul occasionally refers to the Law in an unusual and even derogatory manner appear to be a psychological move on his part. The victory has been gained, the two parties, Jew and Gentile, have been unified. He would have his readers now consider their former folly in permitting the Law to stand in the way of perfecting the una sancta. (cf. Eph. 2, 13-15) Through Christ the barrier has been removed, and where formerly two factions existed, now a perfect unit obtains.

Another contention is that this epistle is not Pauline in its teaching about the death of Christ. In other letters, such as Romans, the Apostle dwells upon the death of Christ

from the angle of its propitiary value. In the Ephesian letter this is ignored and little in general is stated about it. This is not like Paul. However, just as Paul treats the Law from varied viewpoints, so he also treats the death of Christ. Hence the difference must again be attributed to the state of those addressed. Even here, in Chapter 2, 16, a reference to the cross as a means of reconciliation occurs: "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby". Concluding this point, we may add that in this epistle we have many statements about the blood of Christ, redemption through his blood, and the forgiveness of sins as a consequence of His suffering on the cross. Surely that is typically Pauline doctrine.

Higher criticism levels another attack against the authenticity of the epistle by referring to the strange Christology it contains in comparison with other accepted letters of Paul. In Ephesians Christ is emphasized as the Head of the Church, while in I Cor. 12, 12, the body is said to be Christ. To understand this usage of the apostle we must recall that he in Ephesians is speaking of the relation between Christ and the Church, while in the other epistles he primarily refers to the relation between the members of the Church themselves.

Summarizing the attacks upon Ephesians with respect to the "unpauline doctrine", S. D. F. Salmond, writing in the Expositor's Greek New Testament, p. 227, says: "In none of these particulars in which this Epistle is asserted to stand apart is there any essential difference between it and the acknowledged

Pauline Epistles. There are differences, but they are differences which admit in each case of a natural explanation, and which in no case amount to anything that is incompatible with the recognized Pauline doctrine. On the other hand, as scholars like Juelicher, who gives Ephesians a "non liquet" status, frankly admit, we find in this Epistle many distinctive Pauline ideas, turns of expression and qualities of style...." This letter is full of doctrine which is so similar to that found in other accepted letters that it would be difficult on the basis of the evidence offered by critics to conclude that Ephesians is not a genuine epistle.

We proceed now to the third charge raised by critics against the authenticity of Ephesians, and that is that the letter is too cold to be Pauline. Juelicher writes: "Ist Epheser als ein von Paulo nach Ephesus gerichteter Brief, und dann: Ist er ueberhaupt als ein Paulusbrief zu halten? Die erste Frage ist unbedingt zu verneinen. An seine Ephesinische Gemeinde der er mehrere Jahre seiner besten Kraft geschenkt -- konnte er nicht in dem kuehlen Ton von Ephesus schreiben, niemanden laesst er besonders gruessen, von niemandem bestellt er einen Gruss..."¹¹ Goodspeed and Moffatt agree, find within the letter a lack of that warmth which manifests itself throughout the other Pauline letters.

Let us examine the epistle carefully to note whether there are indications of lack of warmth on the part of the writer to those addressed. It is true that in many of the Pauline letters,

11. Juelicher, "Einleitung", Vol. 2, pp. 120-128.

he includes personal greetings to individuals in the congregation. This is especially true of Romans 16, which is devoted almost exclusively to greetings. I Corinthians 16, 20, contains a general greeting. Philippians contains a similar greeting. Other epistles of Paul make mention of individuals within the congregation. But in Ephesians we do not find this peculiarity. Why should Paul, if he did write the letter, fail to recognize at least one or two of his staunch supporters within the congregation at Ephesus? Had he not spent over two years in Ephesus, working to enlarge the Kingdom of Christ?

One answer may be that Paul knew so many Christians in this congregation, having worked among them for so long, that their number prevented him from mentioning any of them or even recording any personal references to them, lest he hurt the feelings of others. In churches where Paul knew only a few prominent individuals, they are greeted, as in Philippi, Colossae, Rome and Corinth. In Ephesus he knew many. Though none is mentioned by name, yet the Apostle displayed a boundless affection for every individual, as his terminology reveals. There is an unusual closeness between the shepherd and his sheep. Note these allusions to intimacy in the epistle to the Ephesians. He refers to them as persons as "sealed with that holy Spirit". He recalls their condition prior to their acceptance of the Gospel, and their subsequent conversion, the certainty of their salvation since they were believers in the Lord Jesus Christ. In Chapter 3, 1, he writes: "For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles". Paul records his own name in the epistle and adds that he was

a prisoner of Christ for them, manifesting his love and deep affection for them. Paul is anxious for them to walk worthy of their calling; he desires that they flee from false teachings so that ultimately they may be among the saved (Eph. 4, 14). He promises to send a personal representative to them in the form of Tychicus, who was to "make known to you all things" (Eph. 6, 21). The writer acknowledges the Ephesians as exhibiting the possession of faith and love; the Gentile portion of them as one with him; as having been so well acquainted with them that they were prone to faint at his sufferings; as taking such a deep interest in his personal affairs, that they would be comforted by the appearance of a personal emissary.

It should be mentioned here that Ephesians is looked upon by many theologians today as having been intended as a general epistle, addressed not only to the Ephesian Christians, but to all the congregations in the adjacent provinces as well. This is a likely explanation for the lack of personal references, and would also refute the charge that this is a "cold epistle".

This letter is one of the most beautiful in the New Testament. It contains all the apostolic teachings couched in plain and simple language so that all readers and hearers may grasp what the writer meant. The charge of its opponents, that it lacks personal greetings and a general warmth of tone, appears to be without foundation.

Critics are perturbed by the language employed by the

author of Ephesians. They maintain that it is so different from that of the Pauline letters that it must on this basis be discarded as his product. This is their fourth big argument. Edgar J. Goodspeed, in his "Introduction to the New Testament", says, "While so much of the language is Paul's own, it is used in other senses than Paul's. The secret of Col.1, 27, is Christ in the believer; in Ephesians the secret is the enfranchisement of the heathen as of equal rights with the Jews in the Christian salvation (Eph. 3, 6). The "principalities and dominions" that the Colossians were tempted to worship have in Ephesians become the spiritual enemies with whom the Christian soldier has to grapple (Eph. 6, 12).....The style is reverberating and liturgical, not at all the direct, rapid, Pauline give and take. For example, the Spirit, or the Spirit of God, or the holy Spirit, becomes the "holy spirit of God" (Eph. 4, 30).....The novel element in the vocabulary, that is, the words used in Ephesians but not found in the nine genuine letters, is mostly akin to works like Luke-Acts, 1 Clement, 1 Peter and Hebrews, written toward the close of the century".

Juelicher writes regarding the many strange expressions and words found in Ephesians, that Holzman and von Soden find seventy-six new words, thirty-five of which never are found elsewhere in the New Testament. They also find syntax peculiarities, such as the frequent employment of the genitive construction, the preference for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$; the frequent use of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$.¹²

12. Juelicher, "Introduction to New Testament", page 121.

No one will deny that in Ephesians there are numerous new words not employed in other epistles, nor in any other section of the New Testament. Yet this is hardly a basis for denial of the Pauline authorship, and for these reasons: Zahn finds in Galatians, an epistle accepted as truly Pauline, twenty-nine words not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and thirty-five which are not found in any other letter of Paul's. Thus in both Ephesians and Galatians there are thirty-five words which Paul uses for the first time in these respective letters, yet in one case this is advanced as an argument against the authorship of the apostle. Ewald has made a thorough study of the new words in the accepted Pauline letters, and has compared his statistics with the new words in epistles denied, and finds that the percentage is almost identical. For this reason, the argument seems to carry little weight. As for the employment of ἐν in this letter, it might be added that in the Epistle to the Romans this preposition is used twenty-five times in chapter 1 alone, while in chapter 6 it is found only five times. The usage of πρὸς in chapter 1 is almost excessive; yet it fails to draw the harsh criticism accorded to Ephesians.

Yes, there is an abundance of new words in Ephesians. But let us remember that the apostle was a very versatile writer and did not have to confine himself to a limited vocabulary, as perhaps other writers would. Ewald, after comparing the language of Ephesians with that of the accepted letters, Galatians, Philippians, Romans, Corinthians, says: "Man mag Lexikon oder vielmehr Konkordanz waelzen, wie man will, es zeigen sich mit

fast kritischer Praezision immer fast genau die gleicher Prozentzahlen betreffs die angefochtenen wie betreffs die anerkannten Briefe".¹³ If the writer does seem to employ the genitive construction to the point of excess, synonyms with $\kappa\alpha\iota$ between, manifold use of $\pi\alpha\varsigma$, let us again attribute this to Paul's versatility, rather than to the eccentricity of an unknown. The language, the style, the syntax, the new words, are still typical of Paul. In English literature one finds, for example, that Shakespeare uses words in Hamlet which are not found in King Lear, and in The Merchant of Venice words and constructions not found in either Hamlet or King Lear. In fact, all men who write professionally make it a point to avoid undue repetition of form and language with the avowed intent of making their writing more interesting to their readers. Why should not Paul do likewise?

We now come to the fifth point against the authenticity of this epistle, as it is advanced by critics. No two epistles of the New Testament writings are so closely related as Colossians and Ephesians. There are many points of similarity. Apparently they were written about the same time. Higher criticism, however, would induce us to believe that the author of Ephesians had Colossians before him when he sat down to write, and on its basis wrote Ephesians. The conclusion is that the author of Ephesians is a forger. De Wette is one of the outstanding proponents of the theory that Ephesians is dependent upon Colossians. This "Abhaengigkeit", he says, "is without example except

13. Stoeckhardt, "Einleitung in das Neue Testament", p. 5.

in the case of 1 Timothy, which he also considers spurious. He continues: "This epistle is only a mere verbose expansion (wortreiche Erweiterung) of that to the Colossians.....of an unpauline color and complexion, both in diction and doctrine".¹⁴ In his arguments De Wette shows a similarity between the following passages in Colossians and Ephesians:

Ephesians 1, 4	Colossians 1, 22
" 1, 7	" 1, 14
" 1, 10	" 1, 20
" 1, 21	" 1, 16-18

Upon close examination of these verses we find that in Ephesians 1, 4, perfection is presented as the end or ideal of the eternal choice, while in Col. 1, 22, it is held out as the result of Christ's death. Forgiveness of sins is introduced differently in Ephesians 1, 7, than in Col. 1, 14. In Ephesians 1, 21, Paul pictures Christ's official exaltation over all the heavenly hosts, but in Colossians 1, 16-18, he represents Christ as Creator and therefore Head or Governor. In both epistles, Christ is κεφαλη and the church is εκκλησια, but the accompanying illustration is different. Westcott comments on the criticism of De Wette as follows: "The resemblance is not so strong as to warrant imitation; the thought and connections are different in both epistles."¹⁵

De Wette and others have listed seventy-eight out of one hundred and fifty-five verses in which there is a similarity of phraseology in the two epistles. We have referred to but a few

14. Eadie, "Ephesians", p. 32.

15. Westcott, "Ephesians", p. 39.

of them. Dr. Salmond in the Expositor's Greek New Testament, page 216, comments on this point by writing: "It does not follow, from this, however, that the one is dependent on the other. There are, indeed, important differences between the two kindred writings which make it difficult to regard the one as made up out of the other. The style is different, that of Ephesians being round, full and rhythmical, where that of Colossians is more pointed, logical and concise. The Epistle to the Ephesians has much more of an Old Testament colouring than that to the Colossians.....There are phrases which are distinctive of the Ephesians but which do not reappear in that to the Colossians.....and besides all this, there are whole paragraphs in Ephesians which have nothing like them in Colossians.." Concluding his remarks on this point he makes this significant statement on page 217: "A writer addressing himself in two different communications, prepared much about the same time, to churches in the same part of the world, not widely separated from each other, with much in common, but with something of difference also in their circumstances, their dangers and their needs, naturally falls into a style and a tenor of address which will be to a considerable extent the same in both writings, and yet have differences rising naturally out of the different positions". This appears to us to be an adequate reply, to which we heartily agree. For this reason we cannot agree that this letter is dependent upon the letter to the Colossian Christians.

These then in summary are the chief arguments advanced by critics against the authenticity of Ephesians:

1. The letter is of a later date than the time in which Paul lived.
2. The doctrinal character of the letter is inconsistent with typical Pauline letters.
3. The letter is too cold to be Pauline.
4. The language, style and grammar are not Pauline.
5. The epistle is dependent on Colossians, hence written by another than Paul.

Upon review this evidence offered by opponents of the authenticity of Ephesians seems weak. Some of the men who formerly argued that Paul was not the writer of this letter have come to the same conclusion. Still others admit that there is much in Ephesians which is typically Pauline. Let us now proceed to the arguments favoring the genuineness of Ephesians.

II. Authenticity Affirmed

From the beginning of the early history of the Christian church the letter to the Ephesians was accepted as Pauline. Its authenticity remained unchallenged for fifteen centuries. The epistle opens with the words: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ". From the time of Irenaeus until now, many have believed that this proves Paul to be the author. We have good reason to say that at the end of the second century the work was generally regarded as that of Paul. And there is evidence that at the close of the first century or the beginning of the second the letter was in circulation. Again we quote from Salmond in the Expositor's Greek New Testament, page 218: "In short, in oldest antiquity there is nothing to show that the claim which it bore upon its face was questioned or that it was assigned to any other writer than Paul".

Among ancient patristics the letter seems to have been

known and to have been regarded as the work of St. Paul. E. g. in Clement Romanus c. 64 ἐλεγάμενος τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν προούσιον compared with Eph. 1, 4-5: καὶ ὡς ἐξεδέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ---Προορίσθημεν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ; c. 46: καὶ οὐχὶ ἓνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν καὶ ἓνα Χριστὸν καὶ ἐν πνεύματι τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκχυσθῆναι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ μίαν κλήσιν ἐν Χριστῷ with Eph. 4, 4-6. Similarly, Ignatius ad Ephesios c. 6: ὡς παῦλος ὑμῶν ἐγραφεν ἐν βῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεύματι with Eph. 4, 4-6.

It is furthermore maintained by some scholars that Ignatius speaks definitely of Paul as writer of the Ephesian letter. This statement is found in Epistle ad Eph. c. 12: παύλου συμμύσται (εἴτε) τοῦ ἡγιασμένου--- ὅς ἐν πέτρῃ ἐπιτολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ And Ignatius in other writings employs expressions which appear to be taken from the letter to the Ephesians, such as: πληρώμα ἐκ δέξιν θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς δι' οὗ ναοῦ πατρὸς μνηστῆ ὄντες τοῦ Θεοῦ (Chap. 1; cf. Eph. 1, 1).

The admonition to the servants and masters in the Didache IV, 10.11 discloses a familiarity with Eph. 6, verses 5 and 9. The expression πᾶσα ἀδικία ἐκ τοῦ στόματος σου ἐκπορεύεσθαι in Hermas shows familiarity with Eph. 4, verses 25 and 29. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, also shows acquaintance with Ephesians when he writes in his Epistle ad Philipp. Chap. 1: χάριτι εἴτε βεβωβημένοι οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων (cf. Eph. 2, verses 5, 8 and 9), and in the Latin form "ut his scripturis dictum est, irascimini et nolite peccare et sol non occidat super

ircundiam vestram" (Ch. 12; cf. Eph. 4, 26).

The testimony of Irenaeus that Paul was the author of our epistle and that he quotes Ephesians in his Adv. Haer., 1, 8, 5, is further evidence of Pauline authorship. Writes Irenaeus: *καθὼς ὁ μακάριος παῦλος φησὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίου ἐπιστολῇ ὅτι μετὰ ἑβένου τοῦ βωμῆτος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς βάρκας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ὀβελῶν αὐτοῦ* (cf. Eph. V, 30). The Muratorian Canon mentions the Ephesians as one of the churches to which Paul wrote epistles. Clement of Alexandria cites 2 Cor. 11, 2, as an injunction of the Apostle, and then introduces Ephesians 4, 13-15. In the same manner he quotes 1 Cor. 11, 3, and Galatians 5, 16, following, as words of Paul, and then proceeds in the Greek along lines similar to those found in Ephesians 5, 21-25.

Marcion was of course considered the "heretic", yet he to testifies to the Pauline authorship, although he gave the epistle the title "ad Laodiceanos". Tertullian, his opponent, mentions Ephesus as being one of the churches which had the original apostolic epistles.

Thus we have here a number of examples of quotations from the Ephesian letter found in the writings of the early church fathers. Although we cannot prove in every instance that these are direct quotations, yet there is ample reliable proof that the fathers during the early centuries of the Christian church knew of the letter to the Ephesians, and that they employed it in their own personal studies, and were well enough acquainted with it to copy certain sections from

it, which for them possessed a certain amount of appeal. This can bring us to only one conclusion, and that is that from antiquity the letter to the Ephesians existed, and that it was ascribed to the apostle Paul.

Proponents as well as opponents of the authenticity of Ephesians cite the internal evidence of the letter to prove their contention. It is listed here as the second link in the chain of evidence which establishes the apostle Paul's authorship.

In order to ascertain whether or not a certain author has written a book we examine the book, study its language, the style of writing, the grammar, the depth of thought, etc. In this instance, we shall look into the content of the epistle to the Ephesians, and in so doing we should be able to come to some conclusion as to who its author may be.

Chrysostom, who accepted Paul as author of Ephesians, had this to say about this letter: "The epistle overflows with lofty thoughts and doctrine.....things which he (Paul) scarcely anywhere else utters he here expounds". Erasmus follows with this statement: "Idem in hac epistola Pauli fervor, eadem profunditas, idem omnino spiritus ac pectus".

Hodge advances a number of arguments on the basis of internal evidence for the Pauline authenticity of the letter. He says: (1) "The epistle announces itself as written by Paul". Chapter 1, 1, says: 'Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God'. This first verse is the first sentence in the entire letter, and the first statement the

the writer has to offer his readers is concerning his identification. He would have them to know that he is not a stranger to them, that he was not an apostle by his own choice, but by the will of God, and that his name is Paul. All the Christians of the congregation at Ephesus were, if not personally acquainted with the apostle, at least familiar with his name and his accomplishments. After all, Paul had worked in Ephesus several years, and had left many friends, memories and impressions. The name "Paul" was well known. On the basis of this first verse we accept him as writer. In Chapter 3, 1, the writer says: 'For this cause, I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles.....' Here he again gives his name, and to refresh their memories regarding him he adds the statement of his imprisonment, with which the Ephesians were acquainted. Therefore both the Ephesians and we today have evidence that Paul wrote this letter."

Hodge continues: (2) "There is nothing in the contents of the letter inconsistent with the assumption of his being its author". Paul was a very consistent writer. That is, he did not deviate greatly in his messages to the various churches. It is true, of course, that where he felt there was need he would place a greater emphasis upon one doctrine than on another. And if conditions among his Christians warranted it, he very strenuously admonished, and employed the law in all its severity and forcefulness. This is to be expected. But in general there is nothing in the letter to the Ephesians which would denote that its content is inconsistent with Pauline teaching. In fact the very opposite is true,

here we find Paul at his best, writing as he never has written before, in language which only one who was inspired by the Spirit of God could have written.

Hodge lists another point. (3) "All incidental references which it (the letter) contains to the office, character and circumstances of the writer, agree with what is known to be true concerning Paul". The letter refers to Paul as an apostle in chapter 1, 1, which was generally known throughout the Christian church, and is stated again and again in accepted books of Paul. This letter designates him as an apostle to the Gentiles, which was a well known fact among his followers. It refers to him as a prisoner, Chapters 3, 1, and 4, 1; 6, 20. Finally, the letter refers to Tychicus as a good friend and companion, and a fellow-laborer who was to be sent to them with further information regarding Paul, and to convey special instructions. This same person is referred to in the letter to the Colossians.

Hodge: (4) "The style, doctrines, sentiments, the spirit, the character revealed in this letter are those of Paul". There are in fact many terms and expressions found in this letter which are also found in other recognized Pauline epistles, as we have previously observed; the line of thought is often the same as that in one or the other letters, there are grammatical constructions also found in Romans, Colossians, etc. All these together would be an indication that Paul is also the writer of this epistle. Regarding the style, Hodge expressly states: "...same fervor and force of expression, the same length and complication in his sentences, clause linked with

clause, till he is forced to stop and begin his sentence anew".

And in conclusion, Hodge says: (5) "Finally and mainly, the epistle reveals itself as the work of the Holy Ghost". This is no mere man speaking, but rather man writing by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This man writes with an holy awe and reverence for the Almighty, repeatedly giving God the credit for his revelations to him. And typically Pauline humility is evident throughout the epistle. The apostle never takes advantage of his position and office, but always remains one with his people, seeking the same goal they seek, worshipping the same Christ, and awaiting the same hope of eternal glory. For these reasons the epistle has been adjudged by many as one of the sublimest and most profound in the entire New Testament, and as the grandest of all the epistles.

In addition to the points by Hodge, listed above, Dr. Salmond adds others in the Expositor's Greek New Testament, page 208, based on internal evidence: (1) "The remarkable cohesion in the composition, part fitting in with part naturally and without effort. In its structure the epistle is an unmistakable unit. The whole argument moves round a few great ideas. The plan is simple, the epistle opening and closing in the usual Pauline manner, and divides itself naturally into two great sections, the one doctrinal and the other practical or hortatory. There is the usual greeting in 1, 1, followed by a thanksgiving which takes the form of a solemn ascription of praise to God for the spiritual blessings enjoyed by the writer and his readers. Then come the various doctrines which are stressed in the epistle. After

these the hortatory chapters come in order. They treat practical matters, e. g. the necessity to walk in harmony with the Divine call; the commendation of humility, meekness, forbearance, concord, peace, and all good brotherly relations; the duty of growing in likeness to Christ; watchfulness against falling back into pagan evil; regard in which marriage is to be held; admonitions to husbands, wives, parents, master and slaves. In the last few chapters the apostle reminds his readers of their Christian warfare and the sufficiency of the Christian armor. The letter closes by some personal references bearing on the writers requirements and commission, Eph, 6, 19-20; a brief notice of the mission of Tychicus in 6,21-22, and a final salutation or benediction which is given in terms of grace and peace, 6, 23-24. Thus the letter follows the typical pattern of Paul from beginning to end."

(2) "The vocabulary of the epistle also is singular and full of interest. The letter contains a number of words and phrases which are peculiar to itself and the sister epistle to the Colossians, so far as the New Testament writings are concerned, such as: *ἀνθρωποπαρέεβκος ἀφ᾽ ἡ ἀποκατα-
λλάσσειν ἰούσει* and its nouns *αὐφ᾽ ἡβις ῥιψοῦν, ἐκ ψυχῆς συ-
βιβάζειν*. It has others which are confined to itself and certain others of the Pauline epistles: *ἀγαθωσύνη, ἀνηλεύειν
εὐνοία, εὐωδία, ὀλίπειν* etc." Here then we note a previous point brought out in this writing, namely that a writer of many letters will naturally employ many similar words and expressions common to all the letters written by the same pen.

A special point is found in the fact that so many of the identical words and expressions found in Colossians are also found in this letter. The former is accepted as the work of Paul. Goodspeed maintains that the writer of Ephesians knew Colossians best and used its materials. In one of his books he devotes 82 pages to the similarity of language between the two. His object is to show that the writer of Ephesians is not Paul, but some other person who used the letter to the Colossians as a model and a source. But does it not so much the more indicate that the same man wrote both letters?

As to the literary style of this letter, Lord Bishop of Durham in "The Later Pauline Epistles" writes: "We may accept this Epistle as genuine on purely literary grounds without the slightest misgivings. The early evidence of allusions and quotations is ample and absolutely unanimous. Irenaeus often quotes the epistle. In the writings of the fathers at large, no book of the New Testament is more frequently quoted....."

Findlay argues in behalf of the Pauline authority for this letter. He shows that Pauline qualities are stamped on the face of this document for these reasons: "(1) The apostle's intellectual note, what has been well called his 'passion for the absolute'. (2) The historical note of original Paulinism in his attitude towards Judaism...We utterly disbelieve that any later Christian writer could or would have personated the apostle and mimicked his tone and sentiments in regard to his vocation. (3) His specific theological note in his doctrine of the Cross. Paul glories in it, which was the scandal of Saul the Pharisee. (4) The specific spiritual note in the

mysticism that pervades the epistle and forms in fact its substance. 'I live no longer: Christ lives in me.' 'He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit.' In other words: the sense of personal union through the Spirit with Christ Jesus. (5) The ethical note of true Paulinism is the conception of the new man in Christ Jesus, whose sins were slain by His death and who shares His risen life unto God."¹⁷

Paley defends the authenticity of Ephesians in his *Horae Paulinae* as follows: "Whoever writes two letters or two discourses nearly upon the same subject and at no great distance of time but without any express recollection of what he had written before, will find himself repeating some sentences in the very order of the words in which he had already used them; but he will more frequently find himself employing some principal terms with the order inadvertently changed, or with the order disturbed by the intermixture of other words and phrases expressive of ideas rising up at the time; or in many instances repeating, not single words, nor yet whole sentences, but parts and fragments of sentences".¹⁸ Another mark of genuineness, says Paley, is the use of *πρόωτος*, used metaphorically as an augmentative of the idea to which it happens to be subjoineda figurative use familiar to St. Paul, but occurring in no other writing in the New Testament, except once in James 2, 5, "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith?" where it is manifestly suggested by the antithesis. And a third

17. Findlay, "Ephesians-Philippians" -- edited by W. R. Nicoll, 1903, p. 4.

18. The International Critical Commentary -- T. K. Abbott, 1905.

mark of genuineness according to Paley, is "a species of digression which may properly.....be denominated 'going off at a word'. It is turning aside from the subject upon the occurrence of some particular word, forsaking the train of thought then in hand, and entering upon a parenthetical sentence in which that word is the prevailing term. E. G. 2 Cor. 2, 14, at the word *ὁμοίως*, 2 Cor. 3, 1, at *ἐπιτολῶν*, and 2 Cor. 3, 13, at the word *καὶ οὕτως*. In Ephesians we have two similar instances, viz. Eph. 4, 8-11, at the word *ἀνεβή*, and again Eph. 5, 13-15, at *φῶς*.

The Popular and Critical Bible Commentary states that among the defenders of the authenticity of Ephesians the following are numbered: B. Weiss, Salmon, Godet, Zahn, and on page 600 makes this statement: "The external testimony is certainly exceedingly strong. In fact, apart from the theoretical and a priori grounds the argument for authenticity is more than sufficient to overcome all the objections alleged against it."

Still others testify to the origin of this letter, among these an eminent theologian of the Lutheran Church, Dr. G. Stoeckhardt. In his "Kommentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Epheser" on page 10, he writes: "Nein, nicht ein spaeterer Pseudo-Paulus, sondern der echte Paulus ist es, welcher nach dem Zeugnis des Briefes selbst, nach der einhelligen kirchlichen Tradition und auch nach dem fast einstimmigen Urteil der neueren Exegeten auch im Epheserbrief zu uns redet. Die charakteristischen Ideen desselben fuegen sich gar wohl in den Rahmen der paulinischen Theologie, ueberhaupt der apostolischen Lehre ein.....Und wer geistliches Verstaendnis hat

so fuegen wir hinzu, spuert es auch, dass der Geist Gottes auch im vorliegenden Sendschreiben, nach Inhalt und Form, durch Paulus geredet und die Indola Pauline in seinen Dienst genommen hat."

In his "The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Philippians", page 341, R. C. Lenski, prominent theologian of the Lutheran church, adds his affirmative vote to the question of Paul's authorship. He writes: "The hypothesis that some brilliant pupil of the apostle, impersonating his great teacher, wrote this epistle, really attempts to invent a second St. Paul, one who stooped to falsification and who succeeded in deceiving the entire church -- now at last a few still keener minds have exposed this base impersonation. Impossibilities require no refutation....."

Dr. L. Fuerbringer, eminent theologian and student of the Bible, of the Lutheran church, Missouri Synod, holds that Paul is the true author of this epistle. (See Fuerbringer, Einleitung in Das Neue Testament, page 47). And on page 68 of the same book he adds: "Die Echtheit des Briefes wird verteidigt von Meyer, Harless, Bleek, Zahn, Harnack, Hort, P. Ewald, Barth, Feine, Stoeckhardt".

In reviewing the writings of prominent Biblical critics, we find there are very few prominent ones who deny the authenticity of Ephesians, while by far the greater number affirm it. The arguments advanced by the opponents must be judged extremely

19. See also "Lutheran Commentary (Ephesians-Thessalonians) No.9, pages 4-7, and H. A. W. Meyer, "Kommentar ueber das Neue Testament", paragraph 3, pages 19-24.

weak. Those that are offered can readily be explained away. All students of the Bible will agree that here we have a letter that is different, one that does not make specific references to individuals in the congregation, one that contains a somewhat different tone than other letters ascribed to Paul. Nevertheless, a diligent study of the text, the contents, the original Greek, in the light of other letters by the same author, will persuade one that here too we have a genuine letter of Paul. It is widely agreed that in this instance he is addressing a letter not only to one congregation, but one that is intended also for other Christian congregations in the provinces adjacent to Ephesus. The latter, being the first city of the coastal area and the more prominent, would naturally be the recipient of the letter. The voice of the critics is weak, lacks clarity, and fails in conviction.

Here then we have one of the most beautiful of New Testament epistles, beautiful in tone, in language and in style. It is a typically Pauline masterpiece. Having carefully weighed the evidence offered by those who deny the genuineness of the letter, we reach the conclusion that Paul and only Paul could have been its author. To this conviction we shall adhere until we can be shown from the epistle itself that another penned its chapters.

The evidence offered in the above statements is impressive. To the above mentioned arguments we might well add that Paul habitually names the destination of his epistles, e. g. 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians.

APPENDIX

The Ἐν Ἐφεσῶν Argument.

An argument of considerable magnitude revolves about the words Ἐν Ἐφεσῶν in the opening verse of the letter to the Ephesians. Some hold that these two words were omitted in the original manuscripts, while others maintain they were contained in the first copies but were deleted for some reason at a later date. Some critics contend that if these words are original then this could not have been the product of the pen of Paul. "...if the words Ἐν Ἐφεσῶν in Eph. 1, 1, are to be held to be original we have here no composition of Paul the prisoner, writing in 63 A. D., but the work of a later hand who has artificially adapted himself to the part of an apostle." -- Encyclopedia Biblica, pages 866-867.

Here are some of the arguments advanced in behalf of the retention of Ἐν Ἐφεσῶν in the original manuscripts, as listed in the Expositor's Greek New Testament, pages 227-228:

1. All MSS both uncial and cursive with the exception of three have the words Ἐν Ἐφεσῶν in the opening verse.
2. All MSS so far known to us, without any exception, have had at one time or another this note of destination.
3. The intended readers described as the saints is found in all the ancient manuscripts.
4. Everywhere the TITLE of the Epistle bears that it is addressed to the Ephesians.
5. Meyer, a great student of the Scriptures, stated that the ancient church (with the exception of Marcion) from the Muratorian Canon, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, held the Epistle to be addressed to the Ephesians.²⁰

The evidence offered in the above statements is impressive,

20. To the above mentioned arguments we might well add that Paul habitually names the destination of his epistles, e. g. 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians.

but we cannot accept it as conclusive. Here are a number of arguments to the contrary, which imply that the Greek reading was absent in the original manuscript. Again we turn to the Expositor's Greek New Testament. These points are:

1. The words $\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$ are omitted in our two best manuscripts, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. (These two sources are the best we have today as well as two of the oldest in existence, at least among those discovered thus far.)
2. The words $\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$ are also struck out of the cursive number 67.
3. Marcion, although considered a heretic, nevertheless regarded it as a letter addressed to the Laodiceans. From this it may be deduced that the words of designation were missing in the manuscript which he employed.
4. Origen in his commentary says that $\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$ was lacking in his epistles.
5. There is a strong likelihood that Tertullian did not have it.
6. Basil speaks of it as having been absent.
7. There is no evidence that $\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$ formed part of the Greek text of the first three centuries.

To this may be added that the oldest manuscript we have, Papyrus 46, dating from about 200, does not have the phrase.

For these reasons it seems that the evidence offered against $\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$ as having been found in the original manuscripts is the weightier. Consequently we hold that this expression did NOT appear in the letter of Paul for the reason that the apostle desired that this letter should be a general epistle, to be read not only in the congregation situated in Ephesus, but also in other congregations of Asia Minor. This will in turn explain the so-called "coldness" of the letter. In all likelihood the Apostle to the Gentiles had good reason for intending this letter as a general one, in contrast to the others addressed to particular congregations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAYNE, PAUL, Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians.
- DAVIES, L., Introduction to Ephesians.
- DAVIS, JOHN D., Dictionary of the Bible, 1924.
- DEISSMANN, ADOLPH, "Ephesus Excavations", Biblical Review, Vol. XV, July 1930, No. 3.
- FINDLAY, Ephesians-Philippians, W. R. Nicoll, 1903.
- FUERBRINGER, L., Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
- GOODSPEED, EDGAR J., "Church History of Eusebius", Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 1.
The Meaning of Ephesians, Chicago, 1935.
New Chapters in New Testament Study, McMillan, 1937.
"The Place of Ephesians in the First Pauline Collection", Anglican Theological Review, Vol. 12, 1930, No. 3.
- HARRISON, NORMAN B., His Very Own, The Bible Institute-Colportage Ass'n.
- HAUPT, ERICH, Meyer Commentary on Ephesians.
- HODGE, Ephesians.
- HOLTZMANN, Kritik Der Epheser und Kolosserbriefe.
- JUELICHER, ADOLPH D., Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
- LENSKI, R. C., The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Philippians.
- LIGHTFOOT, J. B., The Epistles of St. Paul, 1875.
- MOFFATT, JAMES B., An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.
- MOULE, H. G. C., Ephesian Studies.
- SALMOND, S. D. F., "The Epistle to the Ephesians", Chapter III, Vol. III, The Expositor's Greek New Testament, Erdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- STOECKHARDT, D. G., Der Epheserbrief.
Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
- WEISS, JOHANNES, Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
- WESTCOTT, Ephesians.

Bibliography, continued

ZAHN, THEODOR, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Erster Band,
Leipzig, 1924.

Commentaries Used:

Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament,
H. A. Meyer.

Encyclopedia Biblica.

International Critical Commentary.

Lange-Schaff Commentary.

Lutheran Commentary.

Matthew Henry Commentary.

Popular and Critical Bible Commentary, Samuel Fallows.