





in a manner worthy of that calling, reflecting God's work. There is complete unity and oneness in the Godhead in engineering the work--there should, therefore, be a like oneness in the work itself.

A. The Ephesians' lives were to be conducted in view of their calling (vs. 1)

The verse opens, *ἡμεῖς ὡς οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγαπῇ* (I, therefore the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you . . . *κατακαταλήσω* (a declarative indicative, Dana-Mantey, p. 168) at the beginning for emphasis (not *ἐν τῷ*, I). Paul is here strongly appealing, urging or exhorting the readers to their duty (BAG, p. 617), hence our translation "beseech." He describes himself as the prisoner of the Lord, *ὁ δεσμώτης ἐν κυρίῳ*, "Lord" being anarthrous. This is no problem, the need for a second phrase was clear enough (Blass-Debrunner, Sec. 272; Robertson, p. 783).

The exhortation is for the readers to walk worthily of their calling, *ἀξιῶς περιπατήσατε τῆς καλέσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε*. This is the main point of the whole section (vss. 1-6), verses 2-16 substantiating and validating this main imploration. *ἀξιῶς*, "worthily", or, "in a manner corresponding, or suiting" (BAG, p. 78) the calling of which they had been called. ( *ἧς* attracted for *τῆ* the cognate accusative--Abbott, p. 105). God's calling is worthy of a behavior commensurate with His perfection.

B. The key to walking worthily is recognition of one's own true position within the Body (vss. 2, 3).

With verses 2 and 3, Paul tells his readers how they are to walk worthily--the methodology of a unified church life. "With all [there can never be too much truth?] humility and gentleness, *μετὰ πικρίας ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πρανότητος*. The qualities given are similar (complementary) and yet distinct: *ταπεινοφροσύνης* engenders humility, modesty, an unassuming nature (BAG, p. 804), or lowliness of mind (Stott, p. 148). *πρανήτης* relates an accompanying gentleness, more of actions or in endeavors (see Appendix II). These are accompanied *μετὰ ἀκροθυσίας*, with longsuffering, a resultant quality of response to aggravations (such as God in Christ showing us, Rom. 2:4; I Tim. 1:16). It is the opposite of irritability or shortness of temper (Eadie, p. 269). Further description of this character is given by *ἀνεγκλιαντα ἀλλήλων ἐν φόβῳ*, restraining yourselves in love.

*Paul's key to walking worthily*

Robertson (p. 807) interestingly notes this as the very rare direct middle voice and translates it "holding yourselves back from one another, in love."

Now, Paul continues the characterization that Christians should be occupied with the activity of "endeavoring to keep", or "maintaining the unity produced by the Spirit" (Genitive of production, Wallace, p.37). He is saying that "humility is essential to unity--pride lurks behind all discord" (Stott, p. 148) and that careful attention to the above qualities will contribute to the maintenance of the Spirit's work in the church, *τῆν ἐνοτητα, τὴν ἑνότητα* is not lexically (it means "unity") crucial (though used commonly in Ignatius, I Eph. 4:2; 14:1; 5:1; I Phil. 2:2, etc., etc., BAG, p. 267). But its significance is borne out by its being related as what the Spirit is doing in the Church. There will be diversity (no cloning mentality), but unity, oneness and a sounding together in unison. This maintenance is to be carried on "in the bond of peace" *ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης* --this being according to Eadie (p. 271) and Abbott (p. 107) a genitive of opposition, that bond which is peace. "Peace is that tranquility which ought to reign in the church, and by maintenance of which its essential spiritual unity is developed and 'bodied forth'" (Eadie, p. 272). Now, lest the charge be laid that the controlling interest in the Church be peace alone (an ecumenical kind), we return to the thesis of this paper, that in these verses Paul is exhorting his readers to plug into the peace which the Spirit is working out. Doctrinal purity is not accordingly commanded--it is clearly assumed! The plan of redemption which God is doing (Chs. 1-3) is what the Ephesians have been included and grafted into--they have no prerogative to tamper with the theology--they are to recognize the given revelation, and act in a manner which adorns it (*λαλεῖτε ἀπεφύγετε τῆν ἀδικίαν ἀλλὰ ἀναμύνητε ἑαυτοὺς ὡς οὐκ ἐστέ*), "speak the things which become, befit, owe to [BAG, MM] healthy teaching" Titus 2:1). Actively included into the Body of Christ, they were to maintain the natural Christian unity, bound together in peace. Pre-Christian life must know little but turmoil (*τῆς κωνοφρονίας*, 2:3c)--the Christian life should know little but peace. What marvelous intent the Holy Spirit has for the Church!

C. The unity of the Body reflects the unity of God and of His plan (vss. 4-6).

The next three verses serve to illustrate the preceding argument, as if to say, "are you looking for more rea-



son to walk worthily, humbly and unified?" Here it is: *ἐν σώμα καὶ ἐν πνεύματι*, literally, "one body and one spirit." Here we have a deliberately implied structural marker. With Eadie (p. 272), the verse abruptly introduces an assertatory illustration, and in the style of Paul omitting a connecting particle. We supply "there is," *ἐστίν* in our thinking, it being the simplest supplement. In reality, there is only one body and one Spirit--this is not mere theory, it is the reality shown to Paul. It transcends all natural differences in men, and is a radical concept in an exclusivistic world.

They were called in a single (*ἑνὸς*) hope, (he reminds them of the single-minded fixation on Christ which they all shared at salvation), and thus are now reminded (*ἀκλόβως*) of the reality of there being one Body and one superintendant Spirit. The implications against factions, divisions and disunity are clear.

Paul continues the formula of theological unity, which has its evidence in the plan of redemption: *εἰς κύριος, ἓν πνεῦμα*, *ἐν βραβείῳ* (vs. 5). The indirect emphasis now seems to show the participation of Christ in the program--he is called Lord, He is the single object of faith and it is His death into which sinners are baptized. Again, the theology (Christology, here) is implicit, not necessarily explicit. The formula is illustrative and used by Paul to describe and validate the unity or oneness needed in the Church--there is unity in God, there was unity in what Christ did, there should therefore be unity in the Ephesians' corporate experience. *ἓν βραβείον* comes into frequent discussion. Tertullian (in Eadie, p. 275) argues from this against the repetition of baptism. But the attempt to see this reference as sacramental is inconsistent with the context (note the absence of the Lord's supper). The mention of "one baptism" refers to spiritual baptism into Christ commensurate with "one faith" and an initial recognition of true Christian theism (*εἰς κύριος*).

Verse 6 gives us the general and overall reason for there being a Divinely designed unity of the Spirit in the church: *εἰς θεός καὶ πατήρ πνεύματων...*, "one God and Father of all. Unsaved sinner, saved sinner, angel, and all else have one God and only one God. Polytheism knows no expression at all in Pauline (or any other Apostolic) theology. There is no part of the universe which is not under Him. But here is specified by the context one God for the Church--Jews and Gentiles now worship the same God.

*Did you check directly if?*  
*check*

*He*  
ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ ἐκ πάντων καὶ ἐν πάντων, "He (is) over all and through all and in all." That He is sovereign is clear in the first phrase, but exactly what "through all" means is debated. Eadie surveys the options well: (1) God as the Son being through all (Aquinas, Jerome); (2) God as the Spirit through all (Calvin, Meyer); (3) God providing for all (Chrysostom, Beza, Zanchius, et al); (4) God acting through all (Bengel, Winer); (5) God working by providence, His influence being felt everywhere (Eadie). The last of these seems most consistent with Pauline theology proper--He is not remote (though transcendent) or indifferent (though sovereign). And lastly, He is ἐν πάντων. A few texts add *πάντων*, more adding *πάντων* on the end of the phrase. Appendix I sufficiently resolves the matter for this paper, the choice being exclusion of the word. So *ἐν πάντων* means that God is omnipresent in and with all saints, and also near to all the world (Acts 17:27). Finally, interestingly, Robertson notes that Paul is fond of the idiom of varying the preposition to condense his thought, each preposition adding a new idea (p. 567; cf. also Rom. 11:36; Gal. 1:1).

II. The Ephesians Are Also Seen As Individually Included in God's Redemptive Plan (vss. 7, 8).

It is a wonderful thing to be given the "big picture" of the work of God on earth--to be given the perspective of a macroscopic view of Christ building His Church. It should serve to humble us to realize that we are included in such a universal and comprehensive calling. But lest identity be feared lost, Paul turns to a more microscopic view now, and reminds of individual inclusion as well.

A. The Body of Christ is made up of individual people, each given the proportionate measure of Christ's grace (vs. 7).

The thought of the passage now progresses. Verse 7 begins *ἐν ἑκάστῳ ἡμέτερον*, "But to each one of you..." Turning from the supporting theology of the exhortation to walk worthily, Paul recounts the Ephesians' individual experience. The structural marker *ἕκαστος* is used when some contrast between clauses is desired, (BAG, p. 171)--and can mean "but" or even given an untranslated pausal function. The contrast is clear, though, and Paul here returns the address directly to them. The grace (*χάρις*) which they received was allotted on an individual basis--none may enter without it, none (of the Church) need fear losing it--each one (*ἕκαστος*, commonly used with the genitive, [see also Luke 13:15],



Robertson, p. 746) has it. And here it is a continuing grace, as it is "according to the measure of the gift of Christ," *κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The grace received worked out differently for each member (unity is not uniformity here, Eadie, p. 279)--each Christian is not an exact replica of the other, God is not creating monotony. But the grace received is all from the same sovereign source, Christ--He is the distributor.

B. Christ's ministry was in leading a host of captives vic- toriously and in diversely giving gifts to men (vs. 8).

It is the same Christ who was resurrected and ascended, therefore (he) says . . . Robertson notes (p. 392) that God here is the unexpressed but well-known subject of this perfective present *ἔδωκεν* --the emphasis of a past action with present results (Wallace, p. 175). The quote is from Psalm 68:18, but a problem arises for there it seems to say "receiving gifts among men" not as here, "gave gifts to men," *ἔδωκεν δωρεὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*. Stott offers what seems to be a satisfactory solution (p. 157). He points out that after every conquest in the ancient world, there was both a receiving of tribute and a distribution of booty to the conqueror's own people. He feels the Hebrew text may imply this, one Ara- maic and one Syric version even rendering the word "gave." So, the problem is not irreconcilable. Christ has ascended, leading His captives, and powers, and evidently defeated principalities and powers, and acquiring total victory which He by grace freely makes those of His Church partakers of. Paul has surveyed the whole of cosmic history here and conclusively shown Christ indeed to be Lord of His Church.

**CONCLUSION**

The passage stands as both encouragement to us and testimony against us. The progress made in the Church to date stands as supernaturally wrought evidence that what the Bible here says is true. And yet we know so little of what God wants for us in the Church today. We seem to glory in the diversity rather than use the diversity to magnify the unity. If we walk worthily of the calling of which we have been called, if we practice (chs. 4-6) the revealed theology (chs. 1-3) which we by grace own, we would better know the glory of God in Christ, intent in the Church.

**AN APPLICATION**

It seems too often in the American church today that prac- tical unity is sacrificed for dogma or true doctrine sacrificed for an empty unity. It should be every local church's strategy (elders need to catch this vision) to be propagating a long-term program of balanced ministry, teaching the pure "milk of the word" and simultaneously allowing it to change lives and to have Bible doctrine evidence itself clearly in Christians' lives.

**APPENDICES**

**I. TEXTUAL CRITICISM: EPHESIANS 4:6**

**A. External Evidence**

1. List of Variants:
  - a. *καὶ ἐν τρισίῃ μὲν*
  - b. *καὶ ἐν τρισίῃ*

**2. Classification of the evidence (Nestle26 Apparatus):**

VARIANT	BYZANTINE	ALEXANDRIAN	WESTERN	OTHERS
a. Byz → 150-200 (7 wit- nesses)		ψ --xiii-ix	D-vi, F-ix, G-ix, Lat Sy (Syriac)--iv	
b. (16 wit- nesses)	Epiphanius	P46--200, N--iv, A--v, B--iv, C--v, P--ix, 6--xiii, 33--ix, 081--1044, 082--vi, 104--1087	Augustine	1881, 2464 Coptic Jerome

**3. Evaluation of the Evidence:**

- a. Date and Character of the Witnesses:
  - For the first reading, agreement between the Byzantine and Western witnesses push the reading back very early, perhaps to 150 A.D. The mss. represented in the first reading are of a moder- ate character, none being exceptional. The second reading includes both agreement between A and C, and N and B, the two agreements coupled,

*differentia*

*MS S?*

*offer differentia?*

*Byz = 100's of mss*



pushing the reading back perhaps also to 150 (or 200 at least). The second reading is supported by the highest individual character in mss., including the pauline portion of the Chester-Beatty papyrus, P46 (c. 200 A.D.).

b. Geographical distribution: Generally, the first reading is present in the Byzantine and Western regions (and by  $\Psi$  in the Alexandrian), with the second predominant in the Alexandrian region.

c. Genealogical solidarity: The first reading captures all of the Western witnesses and the Byzantine mss. (with the insignificant exclusions of the fathers, Epiphanius and Augustine--due to their respective levels of textual noteworthiness). The second reading captures all of the Alexandrian witnesses except the somewhat noteworthy  $\Psi$ .

4. Conclusion Based on External Evidence. Since the first reading (including the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$ ) holds agreement between the Byzantine and Western families, it is the choice based on external evidence alone. But the choice is not decisive since the quality of mss. in the second reading is so good.

B. Internal Evidence

1. Transcriptional Evidence:

1st  $\Delta\text{I}\alpha\text{T}\alpha\text{N}\tau\omega\text{N}\kappa\alpha\text{I}\text{E}\text{N}\tau\alpha\text{C}\text{I}\text{N}\eta\text{M}\text{I}\text{N}\text{E}\text{N}\text{I}\alpha\text{E}\text{E}\kappa\alpha\text{C}\text{T}\omega\text{H}\eta\text{M}\omega\omega\text{N}$

2nd  $\Delta\text{I}\alpha\text{T}\alpha\text{N}\tau\omega\text{N}\kappa\alpha\text{I}\text{E}\text{N}\tau\alpha\text{C}\text{I}\text{N}\eta\text{M}\text{I}\text{N}\text{E}\text{N}\text{I}\alpha\text{E}\text{E}\kappa\alpha\text{C}\text{T}\omega\text{H}\eta\text{M}\omega\omega\text{N}$

- a. Unintentional changes:  
1. Errors of sight:  
a. Wrong word division--not a problem here.  
b. Confusion of letters--possible, but not likely since we are dealing with exclusion of four letters.  
c. Dittography is possible, since  $\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$  of vs. 7 could have been inadvertently supplied into vs. 6  $\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$ . This is questionable, though, since  $\omega$  and  $\text{I}$  (unicap forms) are dissimilar, and seemingly discernible.  
d. Metathesis--not likely here, since the number of letters is different.  
2. Errors of Hearing: Not likely, as it would involve exclusion of one whole word in a probable highly attended (abrupt language structure) section.

3. Errors of Memory: A possibility, since to some scribes, the mere pronoun might slip remembrance. However, this would have to supercede the word's definite exclusion from the previous two prepositional phrases. Therefore, if the error of memory occurred, it would support exclusion, not inclusion.  
4. Errors of judgment: Later scribal exclusion is possible, since the word does not occur in the previous two prepositional phrases. This is unlikely, however.

b. Intentional Changes--possibilities:

1. Harmonistic changes: not likely, since the notion of God being simply "in all of us" is not in the New Testament.  
2. Conflations: This would be the case if the second reading is original.  
3. Elimination of supposed discrepancies: This would be the case if the scribe thought addition was inconsistent with the whole verse.

c. Summary of Transcriptional Evidence: The most likely occurrences would be either errors of dittography or of memory.

2. Intrinsic Evidence: The masculine and neuter dative plural  $\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$  occurs rarely in Paul. It appears (in MG, 771ff.) to never occur with  $\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$ . While fond of  $\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$  in general, its dative coupling with  $\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$  would be unusual. Therefore, intrinsically, the evidence seems to favor exclusion. If inclusion were original, the phrase would have a limited application to the readers, or the elect, etc.

3. Conclusion of Internal Evidence: The evidences are weak, but the compilation of the possibilities of dittography, memory error, and/or intrinsic inconsistency seem to favor exclusion of  $\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$ , the 2nd reading.

C. Conclusion of the Textual Problem.

The 2nd reading (exclusion) is chosen, though marginally, the decision based on some internal evidence and the high quality of mss. which support it (though they are mostly all Alexandrian).

*Best text!*  
*Variant preferred*



II. WORD STUDY--

A. πραύτης, πραοτης

1. Classical Usage: The word is abundant in classical literature, observed with its root, πραος. πραοτης (later πραυτης) consistently means meekness or gentleness (Aristotle, EN 1125b 26, iv B.C.; Lydian Orator, v B.C.; Plato, R 558a, v B.C.; Thucydides Historicus, 4.108, v B.C.). The adjective form πραος has some interesting uses: (a) OF THINGS AND PERSONS: mild, meek or gentle persons (Pindacus Lyricus, P. r.136; e.71, v B.C.); a soft or gentle sound (Xenophon Historicus, Smp. 1.10, iv-v B.C.), a gentle horse (Cyr. 2.1.29); (b) OF ACTIONS AND FEELINGS: caresses (Xenophon, Eq. 9.10), to speak lightly (An. 1.5.14); to be mild after having been angry, (Herodotus Historicus, [Comp.] 2.181, v B.C.); (c) PHYSICALLY: gently (Plato, Grg. 489d; Phd. 94d).

In summary, the word seems to have a wide distribution, not necessarily entailing weakness (due to its use of domestic animals), and not overly used as a statement of virtue--more as a general observational term.

2. LXX Usage: There are three usages of πραυτης in the Old Testament portion of the Septuagint, ημυ and the Pual of ημυ, with two general meanings: (a) ps. 45:4, "...ride forth in behalf of truth, humility and righteousness," (b) Ps. 132:1, "Remember David and all his hardships" (cf. also ps. 90:10). There are six uses in Sirach also, with the same general meaning of meekness. Sirach 1:26, "faith and meekness are his delight."

Though limited, Septuagint usage seems to continue the earlier general meaning of gentleness and meekness, adding the possible accompaniment of trouble or hardship.

3. KOINE Usage: Moulton-Milligan (p. 534) gives two Koine uses: "with mutual forbearance and kindness," P.Lond. 1912101, A.D. 41; and in an inscription dated c. A.D. 350, "you behold, friend, the tomb of the meek Aquilinus (in Kara Dagh, Ramsay, p. 518). The term πραυτης holds the meaning, meekness, with restraint."

Extra-NT sum.

4. New Testament Usage: The word πραυτης is used eight times by Paul, twice by James and once by Peter. There are three categories, all very similar: (a) gentleness: "the fruit of the Spirit is . . . gentleness . . . , "restore him gently" (Gal. 5:23; 6:1; cf. also I Cor. 4:21; Col. 3:12; II Tim. 2:25; I Peter 3:16). (b) humility: "Remind the people . . . to show true humility to all men (Titus 3:2, cf. also James 1:21; 3:13). (c) meekness: "by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, I appeal to you." (II Cor. 10:1, cf. also Eph. 4:2 here).

The word is used most widely in a relational sense, "gentleness," pertaining to Christians' relationships among themselves and to the world.

5. Conclusions:

- a. In pre-New Testament times, the word was more general, taking on no overwhelming ethical/moral usages. It is versatilely used and can be interpreted as accompanying hardship.
- b. With the New Testament usage, however, it is given a wholly ethical meaning, describing the virtue of gentle humility by personal choice. It is often listed as desirable along with other Christian virtues, most notably love, restraint, peacefulness, etc.

relate to you

passage:

crucial is this?

How

How







EXEGETICAL LECTURE AND PAPER CRITIQUE  
GREEK 904

*(B) (+) on commentary; Appendix hist. (you.)*

Student's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Box # Neil Damgaard

Course Section No. 904 A2B

*Good job, Neil. Work on appendix & stating/defending views & you'll be a fine exegete.*

I. LECTURE PRESENTATION

	Superior	Good	Acceptable	Mini- mal	Poor
A. Introduction to the passage	✓				
B. Statement of exegetical idea	✓				
C. Statement of main points of the exegetical outline		✓			
D. Development of the exegetical idea from the passage (overall treatment)		✓			
1. Selectivity of material		✓			
2. Support given from the text		✓			
E. Use of transitions		✓			
F. Concluding synthesis		✓			
G. Overall oral delivery		✓			
H. Time limit: Time began <u>7:40</u> : ___ Time ended ___ : ___	✓				

II. EXEGETICAL PAPER

A. Translation of the passage with verse notations			✓+		
B. Exegetical idea statement(s)			✓+		
1. Statement of subject			✓+		
2. Statement of complement			✓+		
C. Exegetical outline with verse notations		✓-			
1. Full sentence ideas		✓-			
2. Coordination and subordination of thought		✓-			
D. The commentary					
1. Introduction		✓-			
a. Contextual orientation		✓-			
b. Introduction to subject of the passage		✓-			

2. Exegesis

- a. Treatment of Greek grammar showing its significance
- b. Statement of exegetical problems with alternatives given
- c. Support given for interpretations adopted in problem areas
- d. Transitions showing logical relationships between main points
- e. Synthesis of thought following technical discussions
- f. Treatment of key words in the passage
- g. Incorporation of conclusions on word study and textual problem
- h. Use of commentaries
- i. Use of other resource tools
- j. Evidence of theological thinking
- k. Tracing author's thought through the passage
- l. Explanation of ambiguities in the text

*work on this, the heart of exegesis.*

_____	V+	_____	_____	_____
_____	<del>V-</del>	<del>V+</del>	_____	_____
_____	_____	V+	_____	_____
✓-	_____	_____	_____	_____
✓-	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	V+	_____	_____
✓-	_____	_____	_____	_____
✓-	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	V+	_____	_____
✓	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	V+	_____	_____

3. Conclusion

- a. Concise review of main points
- b. Restatement of idea

_____	_____	✓	_____	_____
_____	_____	✓	_____	_____

4. Overall treatment in commentary

_____	_____	V+	_____	_____
-------	-------	----	-------	-------

E. An application germane to the passage

✓	_____	_____	_____	_____
---	-------	-------	-------	-------

F. Items in the Appendices

1. Textual problem (overall treatment)

- a. Classification of data
- b. Evaluation of external evidence
- c. Evaluation of internal evidence
- d. Support for conclusion

_____	_____	_____	V+	_____
_____	_____	✓-	✓	_____
_____	_____	_____	V+	_____
_____	_____	_____	✓	_____

2. Word study (overall treatment)

- a. Historical study (field of meaning)
- b. Contextual study (meaning of term in context)

_____	_____	<del>V-</del>	<del>V+</del>	_____
✓	_____	_____	_____	✓

3. Structural layout (overall treatment)

- a. Identification of independent clauses
- b. Identification of subordinate clauses
- c. Modifier placement

✓	_____	_____	_____	_____
✓	_____	_____	_____	_____
✓	_____	_____	_____	_____

G. Format of the paper

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

H. English Composition (overall)

- 1. Use of English grammar
- 2. Spelling and/or proofreading
- 3. Clarity of expression

*2 nice style!*

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
✓	_____	_____	_____	_____
✓	_____	_____	_____	_____
V+	_____	V+	_____	_____