

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1927

Criticism of the Theories Regarding the Epistle to the Ephesians

Herbert Hellbusch

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

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hellbusch, Herbert, "Criticism of the Theories Regarding the Epistle to the Ephesians" (1927). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 713.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/713>

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.

CONTENTS.

PART

PAGE

CRITICISM OF THE THEORIES REGARDING
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

a. Denial of Authenticity 11 - 211
b. Defense of Authenticity 211 - 217

presented to the faculty of

a. Concordia Seminary, 217 - 218
b. St. Louis, Mo. 218 - 219

c. by 219 - 221

Herbert Hellbusch

in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree
of

Baccalaureus Divinitatis.

Bibliography 221

CRITICISM OF THE THEORY REGARDING
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

CONTENTS.

PART	PAGE
Introduction	I
I. The Authorship of the Epistle ...	II
a. Denial of Authenticity	II - XII
b. Defense of Authenticity ...	XII - XIV
II. The Place of Writing	XIV
a. Ephesus	XIV - XVII
b. Caesarea	XVIII - XIX
c. Rome	XIX - XX
III. To Whom addressed	XX
a. Laodicea	XX - XXII
b. An Encyclical Letter	XX - XXIII
c. Written to Ephesus	XX - XXIX
Conclusion	XXIX
Bibliography	XXX

only the tenth, or the twentieth, or hundredth reading that lets us into the secrets of its power. (1) Luther calls this epistle one of the noblest of the New Testament books. Nevertheless, there have been various and conflicting theories concerning this Epistle, principally concerning its authorship, place of writing, and destiny. The following is an investigation of these theories presented in the following order:

- I. The authorship of the epistle.
- II. The place of writing.
- III. To whom it was written.

(1) Expositor's Greek New Testament, p. 205.

(2) Hayes, Paul and His Epistles, p. 205.

(3) Strong, Popular Lectures, p. 205.

CRITICISM OF THE THEORIES REGARDING
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

In reading the Epistle to the Ephesians one is impressed by its peculiar loftiness and its grandeur in style. Scholars quite generally have accepted it as one of the sublimest and most profound of all the New Testament writings. Dr Salmond says: "In the judgment of many who are well entitled to deliver an opinion, it is the grandest of all the Pauline letters" (1). And Hayes remarks: "This epistle is a work of art. Its sublimity of thought is matched by its beauty of expression" (2). Strong calls this Epistle "the greatest production of inspiration" and adds, "the apostle in the greatness of his thoughts, struggles with earthly language. Language staggers so to speak, under the weight of meaning he would lay upon it. It is an epistle which we can read for the first time and be deeply impressed by it; and yet it is only the tenth, or the twentieth, or hundreth reading that lets us into the secrets of its power" (3). Luther calls this epistle one of the noblest of the New Testament books. Nevertheless, there have been various and conflicting theories concerning this epistle, principally concerning its authorship, place of writing, and destiny. The following is an investigation of these theories presented in the following order:

I. The authorship of the epistle.

II. The place of writing.

III. To whom it was written.

(1) Expositor's Greek New Testament, Pg. 208.
(2) Hayes, Paul and His Epistles, Pg. 389.
(3) Strong, Popular Lectures, Pg. 222.

I. THE AUTHORSHIP.

The authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians was first attacked by Schleiermacher and Usteri. Since that time there has always been a minority of scholars rejecting the Pauline authorship of Ephesians. Thus De Wette considers it only a "verbose amplification" of the Epistle to the Colossians (4), and the work not of Paul but of an imitator, a pupil of the apostles. Baur finds that the letter is full of Gnostic and Montanist thoughts and terminology (5), and therefore places the epistle into the second century when Gnostic speculation had taken shape and become known. Baur finds Gnostic thought expressed in such phrases as: *κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* (2,2); *ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῖς ἔπρχο μέγοις* (2,7); *ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων* (3,9); *τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων* (3,21); *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάντι πληρουμένου* (1,23); *τοῦ πληρώματος* (1,10); *πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς πρὸς τὰς ἐφουσίας* (6,12); *πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ* (3,10); and words like *μυστήριον*, *σοφία*, *γῶσις* (1,8.9; 3,3.9). These are some of the passages most insisted upon by Baur. An investigation shows that when fairly interpreted, these passages are not inconsistent with Paul's usual phraseology and form of doctrine. Thus the phrase *κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, "according to the time of this world", that is, the present time, speaks of the time from the Fall to the coming (6) of the Lord. The accent is on *τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*.

(4) International Critical Commentary.

(5) Baur, Paulus II, 25 (from Zahn, Einleitung, Pg. 357).

(6) Stoeckhardt, Epheserbrief, Pg. 116.

(III)

The phrase *ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπέρχομένοις* "in the coming times", designates the coming eternity after the end of the world. So also *ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων* "from ancient time", means from the beginning of the world, as in Luke 1,70: "By the mouth of his prophets since the world began". In this way also the *πληρώματος* in 1,10 is explained as meaning "the fullness or completion of a particular time". The *πλήρωμα* in 1,23 denotes the contents, that which fills the contents, not the filled object (*id, quod rem implet, quo aliquid impletur, and not id, quod impletur* (7)) and is not to be taken absolutely as the Gnostics do, who refer it to the intellectual world. Also the phrase *πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας* (6,12) makes no reference to Gnostic speculation - notions of intermediaries between God and the world. The whole passage is translated, "We wrestle against principalities, and authorities, and against the world-rulers of the darkness of this world". Our battle therefore, is against the demons and spirits that belong to the super-sensual, transcendental world. The air and atmosphere which we breathe is not the real province of these demons (8). Finally, the words *μυστήριον, σοφία, and γνῶσις*, do not necessarily contain Gnostic thoughts. *Μυστήριον* usually refers to God's plan of providing salvation for men through Christ, which was once hidden, but now is revealed;

(7) Stoeckhardt, Epheserbrief, Pg. 109.

(8) Stoeckhardt, Epheserbrief, Pg. 254.

σοφία is a knowledge of the divine plan, previously hidden, of providing salvation for men by an expiatory death of Christ. It is "the knowledge of the divine plan of salvation long hidden and now revealed" (9). The word *γῶσις* signifies intelligence, knowledge, as in 3,19: Christ's love to us surpasses our knowledge of it". We find "wisdom and knowledge" stressed also in the Letter to the Corinthian Church, where there was certainly no Gnosticism. Even the more liberal critics now acknowledge that there is no developed Gnosticism in this Epistle, and it is generally accepted, that it is more probable that the Gnostics borrowed some of the terms of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and used them to suit their own purpose.

Other scholars rejecting the Pauline authorship are: Weizsäcker, Ewald, Holtzmann, Renan, Schwegler, Davidson, Cone, Moffat, Dobschütz, Pfleiderer, Clemen, Scott, and von Soden (10). The following arguments are advanced against the Pauline authorship of the epistle: a). The vocabulary argument, especially the use of too many Hapaxlegomena; b). That certain words and terms are used different from those usually employed by Paul; c). That the epistle contains an anti-Pauline type of thought and an entirely different language from other epistles; d). That it contains compounds, comparatives, and superlatives; e). That special doctrine are stressed, which Paul usually passes over lightly;

(9) Intro. to Eph. Expositor's Greek New Testament.

(10) Hayes, Paul and His Epistles, Pg.397.

f). That the epistle sets forth the Church as an outward organization and that it was therefore written later; g). That the similarity between Ephesians and Colossians indicates that Ephesians is a later interpolation of Colossians; h). That the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* in the text definitely concludes the arguments against the Pauline authorship, for, because of internal reasons, Paul could not have written the epistle to the Ephesians. That looks like a very formidable array of arguments against the Pauline authorship. We shall take these arguments up singly and see upon what kind of a foundation they rest.

One of the arguments advanced against the epistle is the vocabulary argument. This happens, however, to be one of the weakest arguments that can be advanced against the authorship of any book. To support their argument, critics advance forty-two Hapaxlegomena, and thirty-nine words which occur elsewhere in canonical writings, but not in writings recognized as Pauline. The Epistle to the Colossians as well as the Pastoral Letters are not taken into account in this computation. Dr. Salmund says to this: "At the most the number of these Hapaxlegomena is not proportionately greater than in some of the acknowledged Pauline Epistles (11). In Galatians there are thirty-three words that are used only there and nowhere else in the New Testament; in Philippians there are forty-one; in Second Corinthians there are ninety-five; and in Romans there are no ^{fewer} less than

(11) Salmund, Intro. To Eph. Expos. Gr. New Test.

one hundred, and in First Corinthians one hundred and eighty". Some of the Hapaxlegomena occur in related forms in other epistles. There is hardly no reason why Paul, an educated man, should not use a different vocabulary when writing to different people under varied conditions.

It is also objected that Paul used certain words and terms in a new sense, or that ideas are expressed by terms different from the ones usually employed by Paul. Such phrases as ἄγαπᾷ τὸν Κύριον, ἄγαπᾷ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, and others are mentioned. But who would expect a man like Paul coming in touch with the culture of the Jewish, Greek, and Roman world of his day, and having a good schooling from his youth to use the same stereotype expressions in every one of his letters. Dr. Salmond asks: "Is he to be debarred from using the word ἄγαπᾷ with reference to Christ or to the Church in this epistle, merely because in other epistles he uses it with regard to God? And is it impossible for him to address his hearers as τέκνα ἀγαπητά, when the imitation of God is in view, because elsewhere he may use that designation with regard to their relationship to himself?" (12).

Over against the objection that the epistle contains an anti-Pauline type of thought, a different language from the other epistles, long involved sentences, full of synonyms, as in 1, 3-14, we have the fact that the epistle is also full of Pauline thought and phraseology (13).

(12) Salmond, Introduction to Ephesians (Expositor).

(13) International Critical Commentary.

We might consider such phrases as 2,5.8: Saved by grace, through faith; the stress placed upon the Love of Christ, 3,19; 5,12.25; the sealing by the Holy Spirit, 1,13; 4,16; access unto the Father through Christ, 2,18; 3,12; comparing the Church with the body, 1,23; 4,16; comparing the Church with a temple 2,21. (14).

No arguments can be adduced for the anti-Pauline authorship from such crude compounds as *συγκληρόνομα καὶ σύσταμα καὶ συμμετόχα*. These, and the comparative-superlative form in *ἐλαχιστοτέρως* fit better into Paul's character, very anxious to express his thought, regardless of grammar or rhetoric, than into the writings of some later calm interpolator.

The denial of the Pauline authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians is also based on the special characteristics of doctrine. In the Ephesian Epistle the writer does not particularly develop the doctrines on Justification, the Law, Faith, and the Flesh, although he also touches upon these. In this epistle the supreme place is allotted to Christ, the author and center of creation, the point towards which everything converges, and the source of all grace. But the circumstances under which Paul must have written the Epistle to the Ephesians account for the doctrine and style (15). Paul is a prisoner and in his solitary position ^{had} he has opportunity to meditate and to set forth the dignity of Christ.

(14) Barth, *Einleitung* S.73.

(15) *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

(VIII)

He dwells upon the blood of Christ, redemption through His blood and the forgiveness of sins as related to His blood, all of which is distinctly Pauline. Meditating upon these themes ideas crowd upon him and he rises into unprecedented eloquence. "His rapt soul expresses itself in lyric beauty, in reverent, rhythmic reasoning which rises to the level of an epic" (16).

It is further affirmed that this epistle differs from Pauline writing in its view of the Church. Separated from the faithful he seems in one sweeping glance to embrace all the Christians scattered throughout the world (17).

The writer never speaks of local churches but of the "Church". But this conception of the one Church is not a new one (cf. 1 Cor. 12, 28 *ἔθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους* ; Phil. 3, 6: *διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*; and Acts 20, 28: *τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν περιποίησάτο*).

The Church is, however, not represented as the unity of an organization made up of a multitude of separated churches, but a union of individuals, the Faithful. This is therefore no argument in favor of a later writing.

Again, Ephesians is rejected because of its great similarity to the Epistle to the Colossians. The fact of the close affinity of the two letters is indisputable. There is a close resemblance in structure, contents, and leading thoughts. Both have the "Relation of Christ to the

(16) Hayes, Paul and His Epistles, Pg. 390.

(17) Catholic Encyclopedia.

(IX)

universe and to the Church" as dominant theme. Abbott in the International Critical Commentary gives the list of closely related passages as follows: (18)

	<u>Ephesians</u>	<u>Colossians</u>	<u>Ephesians</u>	<u>Colossians</u>
Chapter	1,7	1,14	4,22f	3,8ff
"	1,10	1,20	4,25f	3,8f
"	1,15-17 ..	1,3.4	4,29	3,8;4.6
"	1,18	1,27	4,31	3,8
"	1,21	1,16	4,32	3,12f
"	1,22	1,18	5,3	3,5
"	2,1.12 ...	1,21	5,4	3,8
"	2,5	2,13	5,5	3,5
"	2,15	2,14	5,6	3,6
"	2,16	2,20	5,15	4,5
"	3,1	1,24	5,19f	3,16f
"	3,2	1,25	5,21	3,18
"	3,3	1,26	5,25	3,19
"	3,7	1,23.25	6,1	3,20
"	3,8f	1,27	6,4	3,21
"	4,1	1,10	6,5f	3,22ff
"	4,2	3,12f	6,9	6,1
"	4,3f	3,14f	6,18f	6,2f
"	4,15f	2,19	6,21f	6,7f
"	4,19	3,1.5		

Gregory has a similar list (19). Davidson says: "Out of one hundred and fifty-five verses contained in the Epistle to the Ephesians, seventy-eight expressions are nearly identical with those of the Colossian Letter" (20). That seems to be a close similarity indeed! Now these related passages have been used in an attempt to show that Ephesians is dependant upon Colossians and therefore a later work. Scholars differ, however, as to which epistle is dependant upon the other. H. J. Holtzmann inferred that parts of Ephesians showed priority to Colossians, parts of Colossians again to Ephesians. He concluded that the Epistle to the

International Critical Commentary (Abbott) §18).

(19). Gregory, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, S.714.

(20). Davidson, Introduction II, Pg.200.

Colossians was originally much shorter and on this shorter work the Ephesians Epistle was based. The Colossians Epistle ^{to the} was afterwards enlarged by its author, who was someone different from Paul. But why all this complicated guess-work! The terms supposed to have been taken from Colossians, can only point to a close sequence of the two epistles, for the passages come in very naturally and in a different context in Ephesians. They are, moreover, the least characteristic parts of the Epistle to the Colossians. Since there are whole paragraphs in Ephesians which have nothing in common with Colossians, it is hard to see why so original a writer, capable of producing the Ephesians Epistle would have thought of using the less important parts of another epistle. Regarding these similar passages Gregory says: "Even though there is such a close similarity in thought and expression, the passages show such freedom and natural swing that the thought of imitation is excluded"(21). The similarity is accounted for by Dr. Salmond in this way: "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 tenor of address which will be to a considerable extent the same

(21) Gregory, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, S.174.

(XI)

in both writings and yet have differences rising naturally out of the different positions"(22). It seems, then, that this is rather an argument in favor of the Pauline authorship, for it is more credible that Paul wrote both, ^{then} as that an imitator should express himself in such a free and fervid style.

Finally Moffatt especially advances the argument, that if the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* remain in the text (1,1), the epistle cannot have been written by Paul (23), because the writer poses as one not acquainted with the people to whom he is writing, while Paul was well-acquainted at Ephesus, having worked there for three years. Moffatt argues, that there is no internal evidence to prove that Ephesus was the church addressed and much to the contrary.

Whether *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* belongs to the text or not will be taken up later. There is, however, not necessarily an inconsistency with Pauline-authorship even if the words remain. That Paul should write to the Ephesians as to people with whom he is not acquainted, is explained by the fact that he had been absent from Ephesus for a number of years, during which time the congregation undoubtedly grew very much in number. In those epistles in which Paul writes to congregations with which he is not personally acquainted he makes special mention of this fact, as in Col. 2,1 and Rom. 1,13. No mention is made of it in this Epistle.

(22) Introduction to Ephesians, Expositor.

(23) Moffatt, Introduction to the Lit. of the N. Test. Pg. 391.

The words in chapter 1, 15.16 "after I heard of your faith", do not necessarily show that Paul had not previously had any connections with them, but can just as well refer to their constancy in faith since Paul's departure. That the personal references and greeting should be omitted is almost natural, if it is remembered that Paul had a trustworthy messenger in Tychicus, whose duty it was to "make Paul's present state known to the Ephesians" (6, 21.22). Certainly Tychicus could also bring Paul's personal greetings to the Ephesians almost as well as Paul could do it in writing. Besides, the very great number of personal friends may have hindered him from giving the greetings in writing since the list would have been rather long. It is noteworthy that it is just in those letters sent to unknown congregations that Paul sends the most personal greetings, probably to recommend officials to these new congregations, or as a recommendation for himself. So much in regard to the anti-Pauline arguments.

For the fact that Paul wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians we have the title *Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, Paul's usual way of beginning his epistles. The work is therefore not anonymous. Also the ancient Church unanimously assigned the epistle to Paul. Already at the close of the first century the letter was in circulation and by the end of the second century it was universally recognized.

ship as against it, that there are

Clement of Rome (+92), and the Shepherd of Hermas have phrases "which seem like echoes of this epistle". Others having reference to the epistle are Ignatius, Polycarp, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. The Muratorian Canon includes Ephesus among the churches to which Paul wrote epistles. The Canon of Marcion was drawn up before the middle of the second century and the epistle must have been very generally received long before that. From the time of Marcion on up to modern times the epistle was universally accepted as Pauline. Of modern times Dr. Salmond says: "With few exceptions scholars of all the different schools who have studied and interpreted this epistle have been at one in regarding it as one of the sublimest and most profound of all the New Testament writings, and the grandest of all Pauline letters!" (24) An interpolated epistle would not have found such favor. Among the scholars accepting the Pauline authorship are: Weiss, Zahn, Harnack, Shaw, Knowling, Luenemann, Lock, Robertson, Bacon, Schenkel, Salmon, Godet, Hort, Howson, Salmond, and others. Practically all the English commentators maintain its genuineness (25). It is evident that this historical testimony outweighs by far any internal consideration, that might be held against the Pauline authorship, and it is also evident that the internal testimony is just as strongly in favor of the Pauline authorship as against it, that there are in fact no conclusive

(24) Introduction to Ephesians, Expositor.

(25) Hayes, Paul and His Epistles, Pg. 398.

(XIV)

arguments against the Pauline authorship. The only just conclusion possible, therefore, is that of Dr. Howson, the biographer of Paul, namely, that no one else but Paul could have written this epistle (26).

II. PLACE OF WRITING.

It seems that Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon were written during the same imprisonment, for Paul's condition was the same during the writing of each of these. He is a prisoner as seen from Eph. 3,1; 4,1; 4,20; Phil. 1,7.16; Col. 4,18; Philem. 9.13. In all four letters Paul mentions his freedom to preach the gospel (cf. Eph. 6,18-20) (Phil. 1,12-20; Col. 4,3.11; Philem. 10). At least three of these letters were sent to their destination through Tychicus (cf. Eph. 6,21; Philem. 13; Col. 4,7). Most of the above mentioned passages will be more closely examined as we take up the three cities that are usually advanced as possible places of composition. The three cities referred to are Rome, Caesarea, and Ephesus. Beginning with the last mentioned, the first thought to enter one's mind is this: We do not know that Paul ever was a prisoner in Ephesus. The Epistles to the Corinthians, however, seem to indicate such a possibility (1 Cor. 15,30ff; 2 Cor. 1,8ff) and with this Appel, Deissmann, and Albertz, the main advocates for this theory, begin their arguments in favor of Ephesus as the place of composition.

(26) Life and Epistles of Paul, Conybeare and Howson.

That Paul suffered very much in Ephesus is plainly stated in Corinthians. These statements seem to agree remarkably well with words like *λύπη* and *θλίψις* in the captivity letters. An examination reveals a close similarity between the Captivity Epistles and the Epistle to the Corinthians and Romans. This would indicate that they were written about the same time. But Paul was a prisoner in Rome nearly ten years after First Corinthians had been written. If the Captivity Letters were written in Rome, it is likely that Paul's style should be considerably changed from that of Corinthians, and Appel, Deissmann and Albertz, therefore accept an earlier time of writing and Ephesus as the place(27).

Appel, Deissmann, and Albertz point out, that Caesarea as well as Rome cannot come into consideration as the place of authorship, because of the plans Paul had for his journey. They say, that it is improbable that Paul would have released Timothy, who was his only companion in his so grievous days in Rome, in order to send him to Philippi (Phil. 2,19) from Rome, and himself await his return from there with a report of that congregation, when such a journey would require months. Also the "shortly" in Phil. 2,24, would not have the usual meaning, since Paul was not certain of a speedy release, and besides if he were released he would have to travel for months. Even before he could go

(27) Deissmann, Licht vom Osten, S. 201.

on that journey he would have to await the return of Timothy. Since Philippi is closer to Ephesus, a sending of Timothy from Ephesus would be more easily understood.

Concerning Epaphras, for whom Paul sends greetings to the Colossians (Col.4,12), Appel says (28), that he would have been unable to leave his station for so long a time, that he could make a journey either to Caesarea or to Rome. According to Philem.23, he is even a prisoner with Paul, and as Appel points out, seemingly voluntarily, in order to obtain counsel against false teachers from Paul. To make the long journey to Rome and remain there for a considerably period would take too much time for one as badly needed as Epaphras. A place of composition nearer to the congregations in question is therefore insisted upon.

Passages in Romans also seem to point to Ephesus. During one imprisonment Priscilla and Aquila (Rom.16,3.4) laid down their necks for Paul's life. Now Aquila and Priscilla once resided in Ephesus. With Ephesus, according to Appel, Deissmann, and Albertz, everything mentioned in the Captivity Letters agrees remarkably well. The places spoken about in these epistles, they insist, also point to Ephesus. They say that *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* is best explained that way, namely, that it was written there, circulated among the other congregations and returned to Ephesus. Also they say, that Onesimus would be more likely to flee to Ephesus

(XVII)

than to Rome. An inscription given in Wood's Discoveries at Ephesus says, that there was a Praetoriani in Ephesus, and Phil. 1,13, according to Albertz again points to Ephesus, since the Praetoriani in Rome consisted of many thousand men, and it is unlikely that Paul should have conferred with so many. The Praetoriani in Ephesus would likely consist of only a few men. Albertz further states that *Τὸ Πραιτερίσιον* might be taken in a local sense to designate an imperial residence outside of Rome, perhaps the residence of the Governor of Asia in Ephesus. The same would hold of the household of Caesar (Phil.4,22), which Albertz connects with an imperial burial society, and thus explains the existence of a pile in Ephesus called *Σεβαστήν*.

These arguments in favor of Ephesus seem weightier than they are usually taken to be, especially also since there are some objections to Caesarea and Rome as the place of authorship. The fact, however, remains that we have nowhere a direct statement that Paul was a prisoner in Ephesus. To such a fiery character as Paul's, any hindrance in his work would be "tribulation" and "sorrow" and "affliction", and these words do not necessarily point to Ephesus. The arguments concerning Epaphras, Timothy, Aquila and Priscilla are not conclusive, and Onesimus, although he would possibly flee to Ephesus as the Capital of Asia Minor, could have fled to Rome as well in order to be more sure of not being recaptured.

The view that this epistle was written in the Caesarean Captivity is advocated by D. Schultz, Beza, Thiersch, Schott, Boettger, Wiggers, Meyer, Laureant, Schenkel, Sabatier, Reuss, Weiss, and Haupt (29). Here again it is argued that the various allusions to individuals, such as Tychicus, Timothy, Onesimus, and Demetrius are best harmonized with a Caesarean Captivity. Meyer advances four arguments in favor of Caesarea: That it is more probable that Onesimus should have sought safety in Colossae than that he should have risked the long journey by sea to Rome, and the possibilities of capture in Rome; 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 had mentioned Onesimus to the Ephesians as he does in the Epistle to the Colossians; that the *Ἰὼ δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν κατ' ἐμὲ* in Eph. 6, 21 implies that when Tychicus reached Ephesus he would have fulfilled the aim here expressed in the case of others, namely, that others already had been informed, and these others are the Colossians (Col. 4, 8.9); and that in Philem. 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 (30).

It is evident, however, that Onesimus would be more likely to avoid such a small city as Caesarea and flee to a city like Rome or Ephesus. Neither is there any certainty connected with the statement that Paul would have

(29) Moffatt, Intro. to the Lit. of the New Test. Pg. 158.

(30) Meyer, Kommentar zum Epheserbrief

mentioned Onesimus to the Ephesians even if Onesimus and Tychicus had first stopped at Ephesus. The *Ἰνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμῆ*, "but that ye also may know my affairs" does not of necessity imply that there had been earlier stops for Tychicus and Onesimus, or that Paul's affairs had previously been made known at Colossae. The *καὶ* indicates simply that there were others who possessed an interest in Paul's affairs, but the epistle does not indicate who these others were. Asking for a lodging to be prepared for him is merely an accidental mention of the fact the Paul intended soon to make another missionary journey to Asia Minor and Greece (Phil.2,24).

It is also said, that if Rome is the place of authorship it is peculiar that "Many of the brethren" (Phil.1,14) should have been afraid to preach the gospel during the early part of Paul's imprisonment, when Paul continued to preach even in captivity. But that passage does not indicate that the others actually stopped in their mission-work. It shows only that they were encouraged to more enthusiastic action by the favorable light in which his imprisonment was beginning to be regarded when seen in its true character.

The arguments usually advanced against Caesarea for Rome are these: 1. Paul was not permitted by the Jews to enjoy the liberties indicated in the epistles at Caesarea. 2. The mention of Caesar's household does not agree

with Caesarea. 3. In Caesarea Paul did not have the hope of a speedy release, which he has in this epistle, because from Caesarea he first appealed to Caesar and had to await the outcome (Acts 25,12). And finally Zahn says:

"The simultaneous mission-work of Paul and his co-workers Timothy, Luke, Aristarchus, Epaphras, Demas, and probably Tychicus, who were with him presupposes a large city" (31), and Caesarea was not so large.

Indeed the circumstances of the captivity suit Rome much better than Caesarea. The majority of scholars have always taken the epistle to have been written from Rome, and Caesarea seem to be out of the question. If the epistle was written from Rome, the date of writing is between 60-62.

III. TO WHOM ADDRESSED.

Again there are several theories that must be considered. The three most important are these: 1. That it was originally addressed to the Laodiceans. 2. That it was an encyclical letter addressed to a group of churches in Asia Minor. 3. That it was addressed directly to the Ephesian Church.

There are several scholars who have held that this epistle was originally addressed to the Church at Laodicea. This idea originated with Marcion in the second century. Grotius, Bleek, Harnack, and Baur followed his lead. Marcion gave the letter the caption "To the Laodiceans",

(31) Zahn, Einleitung in Das Neue Testament, S.315.

but was rebuked for doing so by Tertullian. Marcion's reason for doing this was the fact that Paul mentions an epistle coming from Laodicea in Col.4,16. Besides Tertullian, also Origen and Clement of Alexandria objected to this.

Another reason usually given to establish Laodicea as the destiny of the epistle is found in the fact that some of the older manuscripts do not contain the words $\epsilon\gamma\ \bar{\epsilon}\psi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$. The three manuscripts mentioned by Dr. Stoeckhardt as not having these words are \mathcal{A}^o , B, and cod. 67. Dr. Stoeckhardt however, also says, that \mathcal{A}^o has the words added by a later hand (32), that B has the words added in the margin, and that cod.67 originally had the words but that they were struck. Even if the words were not originally in the text, that does not give anyone the authority to put "Laodicea" into the text, since none of the older manuscripts have the greeting "To the saints which are in Laodicea". Moreover, that Paul should send greetings to the Laodiceans through the Colossians (4,15) is quite incompatible with the idea that Paul wrote an epistle to the Laodiceans at the same time. Zahn and others therefore argue that Paul is speaking of a circular letter Col.4,16, which was not directly addressed to the Laodiceans, so that Paul could not very well send greetings in it, although it was also to be read at

(32) Stoeckhardt, Epheserbrief, S.12.

Laodicea. This circular letter they identify with Ephesians and explain the situation in this way that they say: Paul and Tychicus entrusted Onesimus with the Colossian Epistle while Tychicus went to other churches with the encyclical letter.

The following are the arguments used to defend the encyclical idea: 1. The words $\epsilon\gamma\ \epsilon\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$ are not found in certain manuscripts. 2. The apostle says, that since the time that he has heard of their faith and their love, they have been an object of thanksgiving and prayer for him, which indicates that Paul himself had not previously been working at the churches addressed. This cannot be said of Ephesus. 3. In Chapter 3,2 Paul speaks to the Ephesians as though they knew nothing of his ministry. 4. Only through the reading of this epistle, according to 3,3, could the readers get a proper conception of what Paul understood under Christianity. 5. The Epistle has such an impersonal character that the Ephesians, among whom Paul worked for three years, could not have been the receivers of the epistle. 6. By accepting this theory it is explained why Paul did not mention the personal missionary to the Ephesians as he does in the case of the Colossians, for there were different missionaries at every place where the epistle was read. 7. Paul addressed his readers as Gentile Christians, and there certainly were Jews at Ephesus.

(33) Zahn, Einleitung S. 345.

(34) Salmond, Intro. to Eph. Expos. Pg. 232.

(35) Zahn, Einleitung S. 345.

That again seem to be quite an array of arguments against Ephesus as the congregation to which this epistle was addressed. But let us consider the arguments one at a time.

The words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are not found in certain manuscripts mentioned before. Zahn says: "According to his explanation of Eph. 1, 1 Origines did not read the words there, although he did not doubt that the epistle was addressed to the Ephesians" (33). According to Dr. Salmond, Basil, when saying that the words are absent "speaks not only of the ancient copies themselves, but also of the tradition of the men who were before him" (34), and describes the clause as being in both cases simply τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Zahn also says: "If the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ belonged to the text, Paul would have placed τοῖς οὖσι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ differently, either before ἁγίοις as in Rom. 1, 7; Col. 1.2 or after Χριστῷ as in Phil. 1, 1". (35).

In answer to the omission of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ we note that all the manuscripts (A, B, and cod. 67 excepted) have the words, and so also the translations. The whole ancient church accepted it as addressed to the Ephesians (Kanon des Muratori, Irenaeus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Ignatius). And Zahn, who argues very strongly for the encyclical character, himself agrees, that the epistle was universally accepted into the collection of Pauline letters under the

(33) Zahn, Einleitung S. 345.

(34) Salmond, Intro. to Eph. Expos. Pg. 230.

(35) Zahn, Einleitung S. 345.

title *Πρὸς Ἐφεσίους* in the second century. Zahn likewise admits that Origenes did not doubt that the epistle was addressed to the Ephesians. At any rate Origenes is concerned with the words *τοῖς οὖσι* in his explanation, and does not show that the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* were not there. Although Basil seems to have known of manuscripts in which the words were not found, he himself, according to Dr. Stoeckhardt, accepted the letter as addressed to the Ephesians (36). The historical evidence therefore is strongly in favor of Ephesus. The corrections in the manuscripts A^o, B also speak in favor of this. The other argument, that the words ought to have a different position, does not seem to be a strong point, and the following parallels show that *οὖσι* is always followed by the name of the place to which the letter is addressed: Rom. 1, 7: *πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσι ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ κλητοῖς ἁγίοις*; 1 Cor. 1, 2: *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆ οὖσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ ἡγιασμένοις* . . . ; 2 Cor. 1, 1: *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆ οὖσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ*; Gal. 1, 2: *ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας*; Phil. 1, 1: *πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τοῖς οὖσι ἐν Φιλιππίοις*; Col. 1, 2: *τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ*; 1 Thess. 1, 1: *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων*. These introductions show that *οὖσι* without the name of the place would be unique. The omission also brings on all manner

(36) Stoeckhardt, Epheserbrief, S. 30.

of exegetical difficulties. Exegetes have tried to translate it thus: "To the holy ones, which are also believers", or "the holy ones, which are also faithful", or "the holy ones, which are in reality so", or "the holy ones, which are found there" (37). But these explanations fail to give any meaning to the text. Although this difficulty is put aside by accepting a blank space in back of $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\gamma$, which was later to be filled in, yet that notion is also untenable. It is not likely that Paul would do such a thing. At any rate he would have mentioned the fact, if this were to be an encyclical letter, as he does in Galatians 1,2 and 2 Corinthians 1,1.

Another argument advanced in favor of the encyclical idea is this, that, as in the case of the Colossians (Col.1,3-9) the apostle says, that since the time he has heard of their faith and their love, they have been the object of thanksgiving and prayer for him (1,15f). This argument is easily met and has little weight, for, as previously said, these words may just as well refer to constancy in faith, since the time that the apostle had last seen them. In Philem.5, Paul uses the same words "Hearing of thy love and faith, which thou hast towards the Lord Jesus, and toward all the saints", and Philemon had been converted by Paul himself. If he can use that expression in the case of Philemon, why shouldn't he use it also in the case of

(37) Stoeckhardt, Epheserbrief S.18.

Ephesians? Besides it must be remembered that years had passed since Paul had left Ephesus.

Those in favor of the theory that Ephesians is an Encyclical letter say, that in chapter 3,2:"If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward", Paul speaks to the Ephesians as though they knew nothing of the fact that he had received charge over them also from God, but that they had only recently received it from hearsay. This was not the case in Ephesus. However, these words do not exclude the possibility that they had heard concerning it from Paul himself. He seems to be referring to his work in general during the last few years among the Gentiles.

It is further said that the words in Ephesians 3,3: "Ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ", show that only through the reading of this letter the readers could get the proper conception of what Paul understood under Christianity. These words, however, show only that through this letter the Ephesians were to receive understanding of the mystery that the Gentiles had accepted Christ, and had become fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God.

Probably the strongest argument against Ephesus as the destiny is the impersonal character of the epistle. He does not make mention of his own work among them, although in Acts 20,31 he describes himself as "ceasing not to warn

every one day and night with tears" during the space of three years. Here he seemingly has forgotten all about those years and about his own affectionate farewell from the elders of Ephesus at Miletus. On the contrary, as critics say, Paul even speaks of their conversion to Christianity as of something with which he has had no connection (1,13;4,20), just as he does in the case of the Colossians (Col.1,5f.23;2,6). In the passages usually referred to, however, Paul speaks of the hearing of the Word of God, and he again nowhere excludes the possibility of ^{their} having heard it from Paul himself. It does seem strange that Paul would under those conditions lay such little stress upon his personal work among them and that he would close the epistle in such a general way. But there are those also, who affirm that the epistle is not so impersonal after all. Alford, for example, says: "The epistle is clearly addressed to one set of persons throughout, coexisting in one place, and as one body, and under the same circumstances" (38). The letter might be taken as being more general, because it was not written at white heat against some special error, but has a wider range of thought and places greater emphasis upon the supremacy of Christ. But even if we accept the statement that the epistle is very impersonal for a congregation like Ephesus, that does not go far in offsetting the weight of evidence both external and internal, which points towards Ephesus.

(38) Quoted from Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary (Eph.).

Several other arguments for the encyclical theory remain to be answered. It is said, that by accepting this theory, it is explained why Paul did not mention the personal missionary to the Ephesians, as he does in the case of the Colossians (Col.1,7), namely, because the missionaries were different in each place where the letter was read. But the fact that Epaphras was with Paul and had informed him concerning the conditions at Colossae explains the mention of the missionary in that case. An argument a little harder to meet is the fact that Paul addresses his readers as Gentile Christians. This, according to critics, seems to be the only distinction between these readers and others (2,1f.11f; 3,1-13; 2,17-24). In several places Paul indeed addresses his readers as Gentile Christians, but there is no reason to assume that he does not address those as well, who were brought over to Christianity from Judaism. Outside of Palastine the Jews were in the minority, as a rule, and so undoubtedly also at Ephesus. The passages in question apply to the Jews as well, for they too are reminded of their former condition, when they were uncircumcised in heart in spite of their circumcission of the flesh.

The arguments for the encyclical theory were first advanced by Archbishop Usher and this theory is not quite generally held by modern scholars. Among those holding

the theory are Beza, Bengel, Reuss, Hofmann, Zahn, Noesgen, Haupt, Ewald, Barth, Feine, Neander, Harless, Olshausen, Ellicott, Hort, Gédet, Salmond, Sabatier, Findlay, Hayes, and others. According to their arguments Paul must have sent an encyclical letter to the churches of Asia Minor to the exclusion of Ephesus, for they include only those congregations of the Province of Asia, which Paul had not previously visited. They fail to tell us, however, how *Ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* got into the text, if that were the case.

Other, as for example Hayes, include Ephesus. Hayes explains the situation this way: "Tychicus would land at Ephesus, and the church there would read the epistle first. Then Tychicus would carry the letter to Laodicea and leave it there while he hastened to Colossae. The Colossians were (39) asked in their Epistle to send to Laodicea for it". This might be the most natural explanation if the encyclical theory were accepted, however the arguments in favor of this as seen from the above are not very weighty. Over against this we have the testimony of the ancient manuscripts, the universal testimony of the church (Marcion excepted), and the testimony of the epistle itself, that Paul addressed this epistle to the congregation at Ephesus.

To sum up: The most natural conclusion still is, that Paul himself wrote this epistle during his captivity in Rome and addressed it directly to the congregation at Ephesus, from where it was added to the Canon as the property of the Universal Church.

(39) Hayes, Paul and His Epistles, Pg. 400.

(39) Hayes, Paul and His Epistles, Pg. 400.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Zahn, Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
2. Weiss, Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
3. Barth, Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
4. Gregory, Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
5. Moffatt, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.
6. Jülicher, Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
7. Fried. Bleek, Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
8. H. E. F. Guericke, Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
9. P. Feine, Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
10. Milligan, The New Testament Documents.
11. Salmon, Introduction to the New Testament.
12. Davidson, Introduction II.
13. Appel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
14. Deissmann, Licht vom Osten.
15. Hayes, Paul and His Epistles.
16. Westcott, The Epistle to the Ephesians.
17. Life and Epistles of Paul (Conybeare and Howson).
18. The Epistles of Captivity (Maurice Jones), Expositor X.
19. Expositor's Greek New Testament (Vol. III, Ephesians).
20. Stoeckhardt, Epheserbrief.
21. International Critical Commentary (Abbott).
22. Catholic Encyclopedia.
23. Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown Commentary.
24. H. A. W. Meyer, Handbuch über den Brief an die Epheser.