

GEORGE H. VAN KOOTEN

Cosmic Christology  
in Paul and the  
Pauline School

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

171

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber/Editor

Jörg Frey

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Friedrich Avemarie · Judith Gundry-Volf

Martin Hengel · Otfried Hofius · Hans-Josef Klauck

171







George H. van Kooten

# Cosmic Christology in Paul and the Pauline School

Colossians and Ephesians  
in the Context of Graeco-Roman Cosmology,  
with a New Synopsis of the Greek Texts

Mohr Siebeck

GEORGE H. VAN KOOTEN, born 1969; 1995 M.A. Theology (Leiden); 1995 M.A. Theology (Durham); 1996 M.St. Oriental Studies (Oxford); 2001 Ph.D. (Leiden); since 2002 lecturer in New Testament and Early Christian Studies at the University of Groningen.

ISBN3-16-148007-4

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe)

eISBN 978-3-16-157190-9 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

© 2003 J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen.

This work is licensed since 11/2022 under the license “Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International” (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). A complete version of the license text can be found at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

The book was printed by Druckpartner Rübemann GmbH in Hemsbach on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Schaumann in Darmstadt.

Printed in Germany.

## Preface

This book is the revised form of a Ph.D. thesis submitted at the University of Leiden (2001). I am grateful to the Council for the Humanities, part of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), for my appointment as a junior researcher during the years 1996—2000.

Preparatory research already started during my postgraduate studies at the University of Durham (1994—1995). When I came to Durham to study Pauline theology with Prof. James Dunn, Prof. Dunn was about to finish his commentary on the *Letter to the Colossians* (Dunn 1996). He suggested I should draw up a new synopsis of the Greek texts of the letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians as a precursor to further studies into the theologies of these letters. His deep insight into Pauline issues, his rapidity of mind, and warm interest were and remain a great stimulus.

This book also owes much to Prof. Martin Goodman, with whom I studied at the Oriental Institute of the University of Oxford (1995—1996). More than anyone else he helped me to overcome the Judaism/Hellenism divide, and urged me to give as much thought as possible to sources from the pre-500 AD period to avoid anachronistic pitfalls.

I wish to thank Prof. Henk-Jan de Jonge, my supervisor at the University of Leiden, for his unfaltering guidance and support during my studies, both at the undergraduate and postgraduate level, and for his continuous urge for unambiguous comprehensibility. I am grateful to him and the other members of staff, Dr Johannes Tromp and Dr Harm Hollander, for many energetic and valuable debates on the issues of this book.

Furthermore, I wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Michael Frede (Oxford) for his willingness to discuss various aspects of the ancient philosophical side of this book and for many important suggestions which opened up new perspectives. His view that ‘Christianity (...) [is] a thoroughly ancient phenomenon, one without which antiquity would not be fully understood, and one which would not be fully understood, at least historically, without understanding its origins in antiquity’ (Frede 1999a, p. 45) is a challenge for more interdisciplinary cooperation in this field.

Dr Maria Sherwood-Smith (Leiden), fellow-member of The House, was so kind as to check the English of this book. Naturally, all flaws and errors remain mine.

Last but not least, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr h.c. Georg Siebeck, publisher, Prof. Jörg Frey, series editor, and Dr Henning Ziebritzki, editor, for accepting this study in their WUNT series, seeing it through to publication, and making it available for scholarly discussion.

Groningen, May 2003

George H. van Kooten

University of Groningen  
Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies  
Oude Boteringestraat 38  
9712 GK Groningen  
The Netherlands

Email: [g.h.van.kooten@theol.rug.nl](mailto:g.h.van.kooten@theol.rug.nl)

# Table of Contents

Preface.....	V
Table of Contents.....	VII
Introduction.....	1
<b>Chapter 1: The Body of the Cosmos and its Coherence according to the <i>Letter to the Colossians</i>: Early Christian Thought in the Context of Contemporary Stoic and Middle Platonist Physics.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Introduction.....	9
1.1 The centrality of the concept of body (σῶμα) in the warnings against the rival philosophy: A general analysis of <i>Col</i> 2.8—3.4.....	11
Introduction.....	11
1.1.1 The first warning ( <i>Col</i> 2.8—15).....	13
1.1.2 The second warning ( <i>Col</i> 2.16—17).....	15
1.1.3 The third warning ( <i>Col</i> 2.18—19).....	15
1.2 The concept of body (σῶμα) against the background of Stoic and Middle Platonist physics.....	17
1.2.1 An introduction to Stoic physics and the stability of the cosmic body.....	17
1.2.2 The stability of the cosmic body according to the author of <i>Col</i> .....	21
1.2.3 The location of the cosmos in Christ ( <i>Col</i> 1.17b).....	23
1.2.4 The cosmic body and head ( <i>Col</i> 2.9—10).....	23
1.2.5 The cosmological meaning of body (σῶμα) in <i>Col</i> 2.17.....	27
1.2.6 The bonds holding together the cosmic body ( <i>Col</i> 2.19).....	30
(a) Alexander of Aphrodisias (fl. c. 200 AD) on Stoic physics	31
(b) The Old and Middle Stoa.....	32
(c) Stoicism of the later period: Cornutus, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, and the account of Stoic physics in Cicero’s <i>De natura deorum</i> .....	34
(d) Cicero and the <i>Timaeus</i> of Plato.....	39
(e) Plato and Middle Platonism: Timaeus of Locri, Philo, Plutarch, Alcinoüs, Apuleius, Numenius, and the account of Plato’s physics in Diogenes Laertius.....	42
(f) Numismatic evidence.....	52
1.2.7 Review of previous research and conclusions.....	53

Chapter 2: Physics and Cosmic Christology in Paul's Authentic Writings.....	59
Introduction.....	59
2.1 Physics and cosmic Christology in Paul's <i>Letter to the Galatians</i> : Christ's descent to lift man's bondage to the cosmic elements ( <i>Gal</i> 4.3—10).....	59
Introduction.....	59
2.1.1 The realm of the cosmic elements.....	60
2.1.2 The elements of the cosmos and (Jewish) law.....	70
2.2 Physics and cosmic Christology in Paul's <i>First Letter to the         Corinthians</i> : Christ's subjugation of the cosmic principles, powers and forces ( <i>1 Cor</i> 15.23—28).....	79
Introduction.....	79
2.2.1 Christ's gradual subjugation of the cosmic powers: A general analysis of <i>1 Cor</i> 15.23—28.....	80
2.2.2 The Jewish tradition of the heavenly eschatological agent.....	88
Introduction.....	88
(a) The tradition of the heavenly eschatological agent.....	89
(b) The heavenly eschatological agent in <i>Daniel</i> 7 LXX.....	93
2.2.3 Paul's understanding of 'powers' in <i>Daniel</i> 7.27 LXX as cosmological principles and forces.....	95
(a) Powers, principles, and forces in Jewish literature.....	95
The powers (ἐξουσίαι).....	95
The principles (ἀρχαί).....	96
The forces (δυνάμεις).....	97
(b) The principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) in relation to the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου).....	100
2.2.4 The gradual disappearance of the present cosmos and God's new reality.....	103
(a) The gradual disappearance of the present cosmos.....	103
(b) God's new reality: The Anaxagorean phrase 'all in everything'.....	104
2.2.5 Paul and the author of <i>Col</i> .....	108
Chapter 3: Paul and the <i>Letter to the Colossians</i> Reconsidered: The Further Hellenization of Paul's Cosmology and Cosmic Christology.....	110
Introduction.....	110
3.1 The principles and powers according to the introductory prayer ( <i>Col</i> 1.9—23).....	111

Introduction.....	111
3.1.1 The structure of the introductory prayer: Creation and reconstitution of the cosmos.....	112
(a) The introductory prayer of <i>Col</i> 1.9—23.....	112
(b) Earlier attempts at the reconstruction of a hymn in <i>Col</i> 1.15—20.....	115
3.1.2 Philosophical background of the introductory prayer.....	121
Introduction: Thrones, dominions, principles and powers.....	121
(a) Prepositional metaphysics.....	122
(b) Christ's role in creating the cosmos.....	125
(c) The notion of filling the cosmos.....	126
(d) The notions of cosmic reconciliation and peace.....	127
3.2 The principles, powers and elements in the central part on the Colossian philosophy ( <i>Col</i> 2.8—3.4).....	129
3.2.1 Christ and the reconstitution of the cosmos.....	129
3.2.2 Harmonising the primordial antagonism of the cosmic principles: Aphrodite and Eros.....	130
3.2.3 Resolving present cosmic discord: Osiris.....	131
Conclusion.....	134
3.3 The identity of the Colossian philosophy.....	135
Introduction.....	135
3.3.1 The general tenor of the author's criticism.....	135
3.3.2 The Colossian philosophy as it emerges from the first warning	137
3.3.3 The Colossian philosophy as it emerges from the second warning.....	138
3.3.4 The Colossian philosophy as it emerges from the third warning	139
3.3.5 The philosophies of the author of <i>Col</i> and his opponents: Two conflicting instances of Middle Platonism.....	144
 Chapter 4: The Reasons for the <i>Letter to the Ephesians</i> : The Pauline Debate on God, Christ, and the Cosmos Continued.....	 147
Introduction.....	147
4.1 Part A—Sender, addressees, and greetings ( <i>Eph</i> 1.1—2).....	149
4.2 Part B—The author's thanksgiving to God ( <i>Eph</i> 1.3—14) and the letter's subject matter: The cosmos will be recapitulated and summarized in Christ.....	150
4.3 Part C—The author's introductory prayer for his readers ( <i>Eph</i> 1.15—2.10): The extension of Christ's influence over the cosmos	152
Introduction.....	152
4.3.1 Description of the introductory prayer in part C of <i>Col</i> .....	152



4.3.2 The adaptation of the introductory prayer in part C of <i>Eph</i> — first section ( <i>Eph</i> 1.15—23): Christ and the cosmos.....	154
(a) General outline.....	154
(b) The relation between Christ and the cosmos.....	156
4.3.3 The notion of filling the cosmos ( <i>Eph</i> 1.23).....	159
4.3.4 The adaptation of the introductory prayer in part C of <i>Eph</i> — second and last section ( <i>Eph</i> 2.1—10): The remaining evil cosmic powers.....	166
4.4 Part NEW 1—The first ecclesiological passage ( <i>Eph</i> 2.11—22): Fellow-citizens of the household of God.....	168
4.5 Part D—Paul’s ministry and the mystery revealed to him ( <i>Eph</i> 3.1—21): The church’s mission to the cosmos.....	171
Introduction.....	171
4.5.1 Part D in <i>Col</i> .....	171
4.5.2 The adaptation of part D in <i>Eph</i> : The global church and its mission to the cosmos.....	172
4.5.3 The Stoic notion of the cosmic city.....	175
4.5.4 The notion of cosmic dimensions.....	179
4.6 Part NEW 2—The second ecclesiological passage ( <i>Eph</i> 4.1—16): The ascending Christ, the filling of the cosmos, and the church’s active involvement.....	183
4.6.1 General outline.....	183
4.6.2 Christ’s ascension and the instruction of the church in its cosmic task.....	185
4.6.3 Critique of the notion of Christ’s cosmic body.....	187
4.7 Part NEW 3—The fight against the cosmic rulers ( <i>Eph</i> 6.10—17).....	191
4.8 Part I—Ending: Personal matters, a note on the messenger, and greetings ( <i>Eph</i> 6.21—24).....	193
4.8.1 General outline.....	193
4.8.2 <i>Eph</i> as the <i>Letter to the Laodiceans</i> .....	195
(a) The chronological order of <i>Col</i> and the <i>Letter to the</i> <i>Laodiceans</i> .....	195
(b) The original addressees of <i>Eph</i> : Laodicea.....	197
4.8.3 The reasons for <i>Eph</i> .....	202
Chapter 5: Summary and Conclusions.....	204
5.1 Cosmic Christology in Paul and the Pauline School.....	204
5.2 Leading themes in the <i>Letter to the Colossians</i> : Christ’s cosmic body and its coherence.....	204
5.3 The cosmic principles, powers and elements according to Paul.....	205

5.4 The cosmic principles, powers and elements according to the <i>Letter to the Colossians</i> .....	207
5.5 The cosmic principles and powers according to the <i>Letter to the Ephesians</i> .....	209

## Appendixes

<b>Appendix I: Towards a Genetic Interpretation of the <i>Letter to the Ephesians</i>: Brief Review of Previous Synopses &amp; the Present Synopsis.....</b>	<b>215</b>
Introduction.....	215
1 E.J. Goodspeed's synopsis (1933).....	216
2 C.L. Mitton's synopsis (1951).....	217
3 R. Reuter's synopsis (1997).....	218
4 M.-A. Wagenführer's synopsis (1941).....	220
5 The present synopsis.....	223
5.1 Analyses of the structures of <i>Eph</i> and <i>Col</i> .....	223
5.2 Relation between <i>Eph</i> , <i>Col</i> , Paul and the Septuagint.....	224
Introduction.....	224
(a) The relationship between <i>Eph</i> and <i>Col</i> .....	227
(b) The relationship between <i>Eph</i> and Paul.....	229
(c) The relationship between <i>Eph</i> and the Septuagint.....	232
5.3 Definition of parallelism.....	234
5.4 Synopsis layout.....	235
5.5 The synopsis and the reasons for <i>Eph</i> .....	236
5.6 Introduction and key to the synopsis.....	236
 <b>Appendix II: Synopsis of the Greek Texts of the <i>Letter to the Ephesians</i>, the <i>Letter to the Colossians</i>, Paul's Authentic Letters and the Septuagint.....</b>	 <b>239</b>

## Bibliography

1 Bibliographical abbreviations.....	291
2 Sources.....	294
2.1 Individual authors or separate anonymous and pseudepigraphic writings.....	294
2.2 Other literary sources (collections of texts).....	302
2.3 Epigraphic and papyrological material.....	302

2.4 Numismatic material.....	303
2.5 Tools.....	303
3 Literature.....	304

### Indexes

1 Index of Passages from Ancient Authors.....	317
1.1 Biblical references.....	317
1.1.1 Old Testament: MT, LXX, and Vulgata.....	317
1.1.2 New Testament.....	319
1.2 Classical, pseudepigraphic, apocryphal, Qumran, and patristic references.....	323
1.3 Epigraphic, numismatic, and papyrological references.....	333
1.4 References to collections of philosophical texts: Diels, Diels- Kranz, KRS, LS, and <i>SVF</i> .....	333
2 Index of Modern Authors.....	334
3 Index of Subjects and Selected Ancient Names.....	337

*Aber auch wenn wir von der johanneischen Frage absehen, so sind doch in der älteren Zeit Elemente genug vorhanden, deren Beachtung zu demselben Ergebnisse führt wie (...) das Paar der Briefe an die Ephesier und Kolosser. Aber auch Paulus selbst kommt hier in Betracht, dessen Christologie doch jedenfalls mit der kosmischen Stellung, welche sie der Person Christi gibt, eine Linie eröffnet, auf deren gerader Fortsetzung die Logospekulation liegt. Mit anderen Worten, die Einführung der Philosophie in das Christentum erscheint nicht als die Neuerung der Apologeten, welche nur an der Gnosis ihren Vorläufer hat; sie ist schon in einer viel früheren Zeit angebahnt.*

C. Weizsäcker, Review of A. Harnack's *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg 1886, vol. 1), in: *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, October 15th, 1886, no. 21, pp. 821—831; quotation from p. 829.

*... christological thinking between 50 and 100 CE was much more unified in its basic structure than New Testament research, in part at least, has maintained. (...) more happened in the first twenty years than in the entire later, centuries-long development of dogma.*

Martin Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology*, Edinburgh 1995, p. 383.

*Fundamental is the eschatological claim that with Christ's death a whole epoch has passed and a new age begun. Moreover, this new age is characterized by the steady reclaiming of individuals for an ever closer conformity to the risen Christ. In some sense the event of Christ's passion and resurrection has to be reenacted in believers until the renewal of the new age is complete. Not only so, but the process cannot, almost by definition, be something merely individual or individualistic. Rather, by its very nature it is a shared experience which involves creation as well. The 'with Christ' cannot be fully enacted except as a 'with others' and 'with creation.' (...) the language cannot be reduced simply to a description of baptism or of membership in the believing community. Paul's language indicates rather a quite profound sense of participation with others in a great and cosmic movement of God centred on Christ and effected through his Spirit.*

James D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, Edinburgh 1998, pp. 403—404.



## Introduction

This study is concerned with Pauline views on the interrelationship between God, Christ, and the cosmos. It relates these views to contemporary Graeco-Roman theology and cosmology. The interrelationship between God, Christ, and the cosmos may also be termed cosmic Christology as Christ is accorded a cosmic role in God's dealings with the cosmos. Sometimes, the cosmology and cosmological concerns which come to expression in this cosmic Christology may also justify calling it christological cosmology rather than just cosmic Christology. No matter how one looks at it, God, Christ, and the cosmos seem to be closely intertwined in Pauline thought.

This way of thinking comes to the fore not only in some of Paul's authentic letters, but particularly in the Pseudo-Pauline letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians. I consider these letters as constituents of a Pauline debate on God, Christ, and the cosmos because, as I will aim to demonstrate in this book, the author of the *Letter to the Colossians* (*Col*) deliberately took issue with certain aspects of Paul's cosmic Christology (chaps 2.2.5 and 3). The author of the *Letter to the Ephesians* (*Eph*), in turn, continued this debate by drawing on *Col* and commenting on some features of its Christology and cosmology (chap. 4). It seems that both authors pursued this debate from theological and cosmological positions which they shared, to some extent, with Graeco-Roman contemporaries. Paul had opened up the possibility of such a debate in terms of Graeco-Roman cosmology, as he held the widespread opinion that the cosmos is composed of elements (chap. 2.1). Paul had also played a pivotal role in opening up an important aspect of Jewish eschatology to the Graeco-Roman mind by conceiving of the figure of the heavenly eschatological agent as a being which is engaged in the subjugation of chaotic and obstinate cosmic principles and forces (chap. 2.2).

In this introduction, I shall first briefly introduce the letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians with regard to their addressees and date before commenting on their relationship. This relationship is somewhat obscure as a result of the complex manner in which the author of *Eph* is dependent on *Col*. The *Letter to the Colossians* is purportedly addressed to the Christian congregation at Colossae in the Roman province of Asia. Colossae is close to the region of Caria in southwest Asia Minor and is situated in the southwestern part of the ill-defined region of Phrygia.<sup>1</sup> Colossae was eas-

---

<sup>1</sup> On Phrygia, see Mitchell 1996.

ily accessible from Ephesus, the economic and administrative centre of provincial Asia, as it was situated on the Eastern Highway which led from Ephesus to the East, just over one hundred miles (i.e. 160 kilometres) to the east of Ephesus.<sup>2</sup> As I shall argue in due course, the *Letter to the Colossians* was probably written in the 80s AD at the earliest (chap. 2.2.5).

The *Letter to the Ephesians*, however, does not seem ever to have been addressed to the Christian congregation at Ephesus. The reading of Ephesus in the letter's address is probably corrupt. In this study, I shall suggest that the letter was addressed, although only purportedly, to Laodicea-Lycus (chap. 4.8). This city was on the same direct line of the Eastern Highway as Colossae, only approximately ten miles (16 kilometres) further west of Colossae in the direction of Ephesus.<sup>3</sup> The favourable location of Laodicea and Colossae on the Eastern Highway made both cities very attractive geographical points of reference for someone producing pseudepigraphic literature.

Although the present *Letter to the Ephesians* was, in my view, originally addressed to the Laodiceans, I will continue to call it by its common name. The *Letter to the Ephesians*, is—as I shall recall in the introduction to chap. 1—generally, and rightly, regarded to be dependent on the *Letter to the Colossians* and must therefore have been composed after *Col* in the 80s AD or later. As it is doubtful whether the so-called apostolic fathers like Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch were acquainted with *Eph*, the first firm evidence for the existence of *Eph* seems to derive from Marcion (fl. c. AD 140), who knew *Eph* as the *Letter to the Laodiceans* (see chap. 4.8), Tertullian (c. AD 160—240; see chap. 4.8), and Basilides (fl. AD 130—140).<sup>4</sup> For that reason, the date of *Eph* ranges somewhere between the 80s and AD 140. A date in the first two decades following the

---

<sup>2</sup> On the geographical position of Colossae and the Eastern Highway, see Ramsay 1895, vol. 1, chap. 6.1, pp. 208—211 and chap. 6.6, pp. 217—219. For a classical map of Asia Minor, which makes it possible to measure the distance between Ephesus and Colossae, see Calder and Bean 1958 and Talbert 2000 (see bibliography, section 2.5). For the situation of Colossae near modern Honaz, see Bean 1971, pp. 257—259, with a map on p. 233.

<sup>3</sup> On the geographical situation of Laodicea, see Ramsay 1895, vol. 1, chap. 2.2, pp. 35—37. Cf. also Bean 1971, pp. 247—257, with a plan of Laodicea on p. 252, showing the Eastern Highway which enters Laodicea by the 'Ephesian Gate' (A) and issues forth by the 'Syrian Gate' (C) in the direction of Colossae (see also Ramsay's description in Ramsay 1895, vol. 1, p. 35, with a map between pp. 34 and 35). See also Bean 1976. For the distance between Laodicea and Colossae, see again Calder and Bean 1958 and Talbert 2000 (bibliography, section 2.5).

<sup>4</sup> See Lincoln 1990, pp. LXXII—LXXIII and Lindemann 1979, pp. 199—221, esp. pp. 204—205, 215 and 220. For Basilides' acquaintance with *Eph*, see the reports in Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* (see index locorum in ed. Marcovich, p. 424). I owe this reference to Basilides to Prof. A.P. Bos, Amsterdam.

composition of *Col* in the 80s AD is to be preferred, since the unpolemical way in which *Eph* exhibits a positive view on God and creation seems to antedate the beginnings of Gnosticism after AD 100.<sup>5</sup>

The obscure nature of the relationship between *Eph* and *Col* and, in connection with that, the reasons why *Eph* was written constituted the starting point of my research. As recently as 1987, in his overview of the modern scholarly discussion on *Eph*, Merkel reiterated earlier observations of others that the literary and historical problems to which *Eph* exposes its interpreters have not been overcome.<sup>6</sup> Though it is generally accepted that the author of *Eph* is dependent on *Col*, neither the exact nature of this dependency nor the reasons why the author of *Eph* chose to make use of *Col* have been satisfactorily determined so far. The synopses of the Greek texts of both letters, compiled by Goodspeed (1933), Wagenführer (1941), Mitton (1951), Reuter (1997) and Vleugels (1997), have proved far from sufficient for clarifying the genetic development of *Eph* out of *Col*. For that reason, my whole study is based on a new, extensive synopsis which I have drawn up and which is included in appendix II, together with a review of all previous synopses and a description of the characteristics of the present synopsis in appendix I. This synopsis contains the Greek texts of *Eph* and *Col*, as well as those Greek passages in Paul and the Septuagint on which the author of *Eph* also draws.

This literary-critical approach to the relationship between *Eph* and *Col* is complemented with a historical enquiry into the context of contemporary Graeco-Roman cosmology which I believe to shed considerable light on several important issues in *Eph* and *Col*. In this I continue the line of research set out by scholars like Eduard Schweizer, DeMaris, Dupont and, recently, Schwindt. Unlike these scholars, however, I intend to integrate research into *Col* and *Eph*: in many studies Schweizer focused solely on *Col* and left *Eph* out,<sup>7</sup> DeMaris' critical update of Schweizer's view on *Col* is likewise only concerned with *Col*,<sup>8</sup> whereas Dupont's *Gnosis* contains valuable sections on important motifs in *Eph* but lacks a comparative treatment of *Eph* and *Col*.<sup>9</sup> Schwindt offers a convincing interpretation of *Eph* in terms of Graeco-Roman cosmology, yet does not show how this material has a bearing upon *Col* and on the interrelationship between *Eph* and *Col*.<sup>10</sup> Unlike Schweizer and DeMaris, I shall not only characterise the

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Schwindt 2002, chap. 4.5.3, esp. pp. 503—505 and 508.

<sup>6</sup> Merkel 1987, p. 3157.

<sup>7</sup> Schweizer 1970, 1975, 1988, 1989*a* and 1989*b*.

<sup>8</sup> DeMaris 1994.

<sup>9</sup> Dupont 1949.

<sup>10</sup> Schwindt 2002, esp. chaps 3 (ancient cosmology) and 4 (*Eph*).



philosophy which is criticised in *Col* as Middle Platonist, as they do,<sup>11</sup> but also detect many Middle Platonist motifs and overtones in the theology and cosmology of the author of *Col* himself, alongside notions which are more particularly Stoic.

As a whole, this book aims to do justice to the importance of the cosmological side of early Christian theology and Christology. Cosmological interest is not only noticeable in the Pseudo-Pauline letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians, but—as I shall show in chap. 2—already in Paul. In these letters, whether authentically Pauline or pseudepigraphic, Graeco-Roman cosmology is closely intertwined with the soteriological question of man's salvation. In this, I disagree with scholars like MacMullen and Carr. In his *Christianizing the Roman Empire*, MacMullen says that the most conspicuous difference between Christianity and Graeco-Roman culture was Paul's Jewish stress on the 'antagonism of God toward all other supernatural powers' whereas classical culture—and here MacMullen quotes Carr with much approval—'lacked any sense of mighty, hostile forces that stood over against man as he struggled for survival.'<sup>12</sup>

Carr's opinion is recorded at length in his *Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase *hai Archai kai hai Exousiai**,<sup>13</sup> which—as far as its object of research is concerned—provides the closest analogy to the research which I undertake in the present book. Carr's view on the identity of Paul's forces and the supposed absence of such forces in contemporary Graeco-Roman thought seems untenable, however. In my view, the powers Christ is thought to be confronted with in Pauline and Pseudo-Pauline letters are in fact *similar* to those antagonistic cosmological powers which—according to Plutarch—are subjugated by Eros, Aphrodite and Osiris (chap. 3.2). As soon as Paul reckoned with the reality of the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) in his *Letter to the Galatians*, he took over the whole Graeco-Roman view of the sublunary cosmos as the realm in which the passive elements are subject to a destructive cosmic force (chaps 2.1 and 3.2). As far as cosmological concepts and terminology are concerned, there are many similarities between Pauline Christianity and Graeco-Roman cosmological philosophy. The importance of cosmic Christology

---

<sup>11</sup> Schweizer himself used the term 'Pythagorean' (see, e.g., Schweizer 1989a, pp. 103—104), but after DeMaris had demonstrated that 'Middle Platonist' is a more appropriate characterisation (DeMaris 1994, pp. 88—97 and chap. 4, pp. 98—133), Schweizer showed himself more or less convinced (Schweizer 1995): 'Richtig ist, daß ich "Pythagoreer" (...) immer in Führungszeichen hätte schreiben sollen, da mir (...) mittelplatonischer Einfluß natürlich deutlich war' (Schweizer 1995, col. 240). See also Sterling 1998.

<sup>12</sup> MacMullen 1984, pp. 18—19 and 130 note 8; Carr 1981, p. 174.

<sup>13</sup> Carr 1981.

and cosmology in Paul and in the Pseudo-Pauline letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians is reflected in the genuine efforts made by the authors of *Col* and *Eph* to adapt Paul's view on God, Christ, and the cosmos to their own temporal and intellectual circumstances.

The interest of early Christians in cosmology did not wane, but rather increased. Physics continued to concern Christians throughout the second and third centuries AD and after. Physics even occasioned the Marcionite or Gnostic crisis in the middle of the second century, far ahead of all more specifically christological and Trinitarian issues which were decided at the great councils of the fourth and fifth centuries. The Gnostic movement, as is now increasingly acknowledged, is closely related to the history of Graeco-Roman philosophy.<sup>14</sup> This movement is, as Dillon puts it, part of the 'Platonic underworld,' in which category he includes, among others, the Gnostic writings which he considers to reflect a particular type of Platonism.<sup>15</sup> The emergence of Gnosticism becomes more understandable, as Mansfeld has shown, if it is understood as involving the radicalisation of a concept that had never really been adopted in Graeco-Roman philosophy but had largely remained only a logical possibility: the concept of a bad or ignorant Demiurge (Creator).<sup>16</sup> Inasmuch as Gnosticism is a particular, though radical variation on Graeco-Roman philosophy, one can detect many similarities between Gnosticism and the letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians. Yet, these similarities are only due to their common background in Graeco-Roman philosophy. The dissimilarities between Gnostic views on the cosmos on the one hand, and those of *Col* and *Eph* on the other spring easily to mind if one looks at the interpretation of these letters by Gnostics, who have embraced the notion of a bad or ignorant Demiurge.<sup>17</sup> This notion is certainly absent from *Col* and *Eph*. For that reason, the scholarly interpretation of *Col* and *Eph* in terms of Gnosticism has to be abandoned,<sup>18</sup> and due attention should be paid to general Graeco-Roman cosmology as the immediate contemporary context of *Col* and *Eph*.

In this study, I shall proceed as follows. In the first chapter, I will start off by introducing *Col*, the first of the two Pseudo-Pauline letters at issue. Attention will first be drawn to the fact that in its warnings against a particular philosophy, the concept of body (σῶμα) plays a pivotal role (chap. 1.1). On closer inspection, the term 'body' (σῶμα) appears to stand for the

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., Roukema 1999, esp. chaps 7 and 9.

<sup>15</sup> Dillon 1996a, chap. 8A, pp. 384—396. See also Dillon 1996b.

<sup>16</sup> Mansfeld 1981, esp. pp. 312—314.

<sup>17</sup> See the evidence of the Gnostic interpretation of Paul collected in Pagels 1975.

<sup>18</sup> For an overview of this Gnostic interpretation, see Merkel 1987, chap. 2.1, pp. 3176—3195.

body of the cosmos, and a discussion of contemporary Stoic and Middle Platonist views on the cosmic body and its coherence becomes indispensable (chap. 1.2).

Having introduced *Col* and highlighted its interest in cosmic coherence, I shall try to account for the distinctiveness of the cosmology of *Col* by comparing it with the cosmology of Paul's authentic writings. In the second chapter, the way is paved for such a comparison. To this end, some important cosmological terms are discussed which occur in both cosmological systems. These terms are 'elements of the cosmos' (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου), 'principles' (ἀρχαί) and 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι) which occur not only in *Col*, but also already in Paul's letters to the Galatians and the Corinthians. In chap. 2.1, I focus on the idea that Christ came down to lift man's bondage to the 'elements of the cosmos' (*Gal* 4.3—10). In chap. 2.2, the notion is discussed that between his resurrection and the end of time, Christ is engaged in subjugating the cosmic 'principles' and 'powers' (*1 Cor* 15.23—28). It seems that already Paul's Christology is highly cosmological in nature and has much in common with contemporary Graeco-Roman thought. On the other hand, however, Paul's expectation of a gradual and imminent disappearance of the cosmos and its powers as a result of Christ's activities appears to be in marked contrast with the stability and coherence which the author of *Col* attributes to the *present* cosmos (chap. 2.2.5).

The third chapter develops this comparison between Paul and the author of *Colossians* further, and in it I comment in detail on the latter's view on the principles, powers and elements of the cosmos. This view is expressed in the introductory prayer at the beginning of *Col* and in the central part of the letter in which the so-called Colossian philosophy is refuted. First the introductory prayer will be dealt with (chap. 3.1), and this will be followed by a treatment of the letter's central part (chap 3.2). Finally, I shall address the issue of the identity of the Colossian philosophy to which the author of *Col* is opposed (chap. 3.3).

Once a clear picture has emerged of the cosmic Christologies of Paul and of the author of *Col*, it will prove possible to understand the characteristics of the cosmic Christology of *Eph* as well. In the fourth chapter, I will demonstrate that the author of *Eph* is literarily dependent on *Col*, adopted almost its entire structure, but modified its cosmological tenets. My arguments in this chapter are largely based on the new synopsis of the Greek texts of *Eph* and *Col* which is contained in the second appendix, together with a critique of all previous synopses and a full explanation of the present synopsis in the first appendix. These appendixes are meant to promote a genetic interpretation of *Eph*, i.e. an interpretation in terms of its development out of *Col*.

At the end of this introduction, a few disclaimers apply with respect to the following chapters. First, if I use the term 'church' (ἐκκλησία) in this book, most frequently in chap. 4, I do so only reluctantly because at the beginning of Christianity the word did not yet have the specifically Christian ring to it which it acquired later. As is apparent from a footnote at the end of chap. 1.2.4, Plutarch, a contemporary of the author of *Eph*, used the word ἐκκλησία, like all Greeks, in the sense of an 'assembly of people' (*De defectu oraculorum* 426A). It is in that general sense that the term 'church' should be understood.

Secondly, for ease of reference I use the term 'Septuagint' in a broad sense as an equivalent of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek, even if the texts quoted or alluded to in Paul, *Col* or *Eph* were not yet part of the integrated body of writings which is now designated as the Septuagint.

Thirdly, the labels which I attach to some philosophical notions, such as 'Stoic' or 'Middle Platonist,' have to be taken with some caution because, as Frede has recently pointed out in his epilogue to *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, clear contours are absent in the philosophy pursued in the period between 125 BC and 250 AD.<sup>19</sup>

Fourthly, for the sake of historical transparency I usually add the biographical dates of classical authors in brackets behind their name. These dates have on the whole been derived from the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (*OCD*<sup>3</sup>), though the need to be brief sometimes coerces me to simplify its nuances.

Finally, in calling *Col* and *Eph* Pseudo-Pauline letters, rather than Deutero-Pauline letters, I follow the practice, current among classicists, of prefacing the names of pseudepigraphic authors with the prefix 'Pseudo.'

---

<sup>19</sup> Frede 1999b, pp. 790—793.



## Chapter 1

# The Body of the Cosmos and its Coherence according to the *Letter to the Colossians*: Early Christian Thought in the Context of Contemporary Stoic and Middle Platonist Physics

## Introduction

It is the assumption of this study, which will be ascertained in due course, that Paul's *Letter to the Colossians* and *Letter to the Ephesians* are in fact examples of the phenomenon of pseudepigraphic literature, which was widespread in classical antiquity.<sup>1</sup> A striking feature of these letters is that they seem to have been written by two distinct adherents of Pauline theology, both of whom credited their writings to Paul, while at the same time one of them was dependent on the other. Generally, *Eph* is thought to be secondary and to share many of its tenets with *Col*, the writing it was modelled on. The two pseudepigraphic writings resemble one another in many respects, but the secondary one also diverges to some extent from its model, and the question of how to account for both similarity and divergence remains puzzling till the present day.

There seems, however, to be a way out of this problem. In previous research into these letters, the relationship between the contents of these letters and the cosmological debate conducted within the religious philosophy of the Graeco-Roman period has not received the attention it deserves. Recently, James D.G. Dunn drew attention to the concept of body (σῶμα) in *Col* and showed the large semantic variety of this concept here, including the meaning of σῶμα as the body of the cosmos.<sup>2</sup> In this chapter, I aim to demonstrate that such a cosmological use of σῶμα ('body') characterizes a passage in *Col* which is devoted entirely to an analysis and refutation of a rival doctrine about the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, the elements of the cosmos (*Col* 2.8—3.4). The cosmological use of σῶμα ('body'),

---

<sup>1</sup> On pseudepigraphic literature in classical antiquity, see Rose and Parsons 1996.

<sup>2</sup> Dunn 1994, esp. 3rd section, pp. 173—177 on the cosmic body.

however, seems to disappear, as I wish to argue later, in the parallel passages in *Eph*. This disappearance might shed light on the interrelation between *Col* and *Eph*, and on the purpose of the latter.

This approach to the interrelation of these letters was already suggested by Martin Dibelius in the 1927 edition of his commentary on *Col* but seems to remain either neglected or unjustifiably criticized. According to Dibelius, the term 'body' (σῶμα) in *Col* 2.19 should be understood as referring to the body of the cosmos. Interpreting this concept as a reference to the body of the church, as the parallel but secondary passage in *Eph* does (*Eph* 4.16), amounts to imposing the meaning of *Eph* 4.16 on *Col* 2.19.<sup>3</sup> In this chapter, I intend to provide fresh evidence for the cosmological meaning of σῶμα ('body') in *Col* and to supplement the appropriate religio-historical background of this concept which Dibelius' interpretation was still lacking.<sup>4</sup> Knowledge of contemporary cosmology can contribute significantly towards the clarification of the enigmatic relationship between *Eph* and *Col*.

This argument will be developed over several stages. First, it will be argued that the term σῶμα ('body') is *central* to the section which deals with the disputed doctrine about the elements of the cosmos in *Col* 2.8—3.4 (chap. 1.1). Secondly, attention will be given to the cosmological *meaning* of the term σῶμα ('body') in this passage. This meaning clearly arises against the interpretative background of contemporary physics as developed in Stoicism and Middle Platonism (chap. 1.2). On the basis of this detailed discussion of the concept of σῶμα ('body') in the central section in *Col*, in one of the subsequent chapters a comparison can be drawn with *Eph*, where this terminology reappears but loses its cosmological meaning (see chap. 4.6.3).

---

<sup>3</sup> Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, pp. 36—37 on σῶμα in *Col* 2.19: 'Bei der Zurückdrängung der kosmischen Gedanken in der Kirche ist es beinahe selbstverständlich, daß Ausleger wie Theodoret [=Theodoret of Cyrrhus, c. 393—466 AD] die Stelle einfach nach *Eph* 4,16 deuten' (p. 36; =Dibelius 1927<sup>2</sup>, p.27; not yet in Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>). On the secondary nature of *Eph*, see Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, pp. 83—85 (cf. Dibelius 1927<sup>2</sup>, pp. 63—65 and Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>, pp. 113—114).

<sup>4</sup> Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, pp. 29—30: 'Aber sichere Belege für die religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge fehlen; wir können nur den kosmischen Gebrauch von κεφαλή und σῶμα (2,19) konstatieren' (p. 30; =Dibelius 1927<sup>2</sup>, p. 22; not yet in Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>).

## 1.1 The centrality of the concept of body (σῶμα) in the warnings against the rival philosophy: A general analysis of Col 2.8—3.4

### Introduction

*Col* as a whole seems to center around the passage 2.8—3.4 where a doctrine about the cosmic elements (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) is criticized. The author of *Col* tries to meet this cosmological theory, which is designated as philosophy (φιλοσοφία) at the outset of this passage (2.8), with an alternative perception of wisdom (σοφία). The whole letter is permeated by a plea for this wisdom. Before the rival understanding of wisdom is criticized in detail in the central section now under consideration (2.8—3.4), the conception of wisdom (σοφία) has already come to the fore in some preceding passages.

In one of these, the author entreats God that his readers may receive full insight into his will, all wisdom (σοφία) and spiritual understanding (1.9—10).<sup>5</sup> The importance of the conception of wisdom (σοφία) to the letter's train of thought is shown subsequently in the lines immediately preceding the central section on the contested philosophy. In these lines all the 'cognitive' terms used in 1.9—10 (σοφία and its near-synonyms ἐπίγνωσις and σύνεσις, supplemented with the term γνῶσις) reoccur together. The author is concerned to teach everyone and instruct everyone in all the ways of wisdom (1.28: ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ). He aims to bring the readers to the full wealth of conviction which understanding brings, and to the comprehension of God's secret, which is Christ himself, in whom lie hidden all the treasures of wisdom (σοφία) and knowledge (2.2—3).<sup>6</sup> The specific contents of the author's Christ-centred understanding of wisdom (σοφία) had already been hinted at implicitly in an extended christological passage (1.13—22). They are now outlined more explicitly in the central section which deals with the combatted understanding of wisdom.

This passage is introduced by an admonition not to be led captive by an empty, deceiving pursuit of wisdom: Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης (2.8). The words διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης ('by an empty, deceiving pursuit of wisdom') are best taken as a hendiadys: an empty, pretentious and deceiv-

<sup>5</sup> Col 1.9—10: οὐ παυόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ.

<sup>6</sup> Col 2.2—3: ἀγῶνα ἔχω (...) ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, συμβιβασθέντες (...) εἰς πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ. Χριστοῦ, ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνῶσεως ἀπόκρυφοι.



ing pursuit of wisdom. The vanity of this pursuit stands in contrast with the fulfilment (2.10a) achieved by those who have received the correct Christian tradition (2.6—7). The pretentious nature of the search for wrong wisdom is emphasized when the adherent of that wisdom is described as puffed up without grounds: εικῆ φυσιοῦμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ (2.18). Naturally, the author of *Col* does not speak disparagingly of the pursuit of wisdom (φιλοσοφία) as such. He himself speaks favourably about σοφία ('wisdom') several times. His criticism is rather levelled at an investigation into knowledge of a deceptive kind. Near the end of the whole section the achievements of this pursuit are deemed to have only an outward, deceptive appearance of wisdom: ἄτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας (2.23).

The entire passage warning against the pursuit of misconceived wisdom shows a tripartite structure, each part starting with a particular admonition. The sole purpose of the present discussion is to show that the concept of body is central to this passage. A full, detailed interpretation of all warnings against the 'Colossian philosophy' will be presented in chap. 3.3. These warnings run as follows.

(1) Let nobody lead you captive by means of the empty and deceiving pursuit of wisdom which, in accordance with human tradition, deals with the elements the cosmos consists of: Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (2.8). That is, let nobody lead you astray by means of the empty and deceiving pursuit of wisdom concerning the constituent elements of the cosmos, a doctrine transmitted by human tradition.

(2) Let nobody judge you either in view of regulations of eating and drinking or in view of festivals (regulated by the calendar), celebrations of the new moon and the Sabbath: Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων (2.16).

(3) Let nobody rule over you in matters of the humble worshipping of angelic beings, nor as regards the visual perception of (celestial) phenomena: Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἃ ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεῶν (2.18).

Each part of the structure starts with a warning against specific aspects of the rival philosophy. Subsequently, the author of *Col* substantiates this warning by developing his own view on the issue. The demarcation line between admonition and subsequent motivation of this criticism is somewhat fluid. At this stage I would like to argue that the core of each warning seems to lie in the concept of body (σῶμα) as understood by the author of *Col*. The centrality of the concept of body in the three parts of the section on the rival philosophy (2.8—3.4) will be discussed here in detail.

After the importance of 'body' (σῶμα) in the successive parts has been established, I will suggest in the next section (chap. 1.2) that the meaning of body in the substantiation of these warnings is cosmological.

### 1.1.1 The first warning (Col 2.8—15)

In the first part, which runs from *Col* 2.8 to 2.15, the demarcation line between the warning and the subsequent substantiation of this warning is clearly indicated by a causal particle (ὅτι): Let nobody lead you captive by means of the empty and deceiving pursuit of wisdom which deals with the cosmic elements and not with Christ, for (ὅτι) in Christ all the fullness of the divine nature dwells corporeally (σωματικῶς: as a body), and you have been fulfilled in him, who is the head of all principles and powers (2.9—10).<sup>7</sup>

The key concepts in these lines seem to be Christ's body (σῶμα), which is totally pervaded by the divinity, and his headship (κεφαλή) over cosmic entities. These concepts, represented by the terms 'body' and 'head,' are put forward to oppose the understanding of the cosmic elements in the alternative view and to underpin the warning against it. Although the entire substantiation of the first warning continues for many more lines, the core of this substantiation seems to lie in the author's use of the terminology of σῶμα ('body') and κεφαλή ('head') (2.9—10). Apart from an excursus on Christ's death and resurrection (2.11—13), the remainder of this argumentation consists solely of a further clarification of Christ's headship (2.14—15). The structure of the whole passage seems to be as follows.

(a) Warning against the wrong understanding of the elements of the cosmos: Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (2.8).

(b) Substantiation of this warning by referring to Christ's body and his headship over the principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι): ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας (2.9—10).

(c) Section (c) will be discussed presently.

(d) Further explication of the concept of Christ's headship over the principles and powers by reference to the disarmament of these principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι) on the cross: ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν (sc. Christ) ἐκ τοῦ μέσου προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ· ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς

<sup>7</sup> *Col* 2.9—10: Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν· ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας.

ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ (2.14—15).

The passage (c) between sections (b) and (d) is an excursus on Christ's death and resurrection (2.11—13). This excursus is linked with the preceding substantiation of the warning against the rival philosophy by means of the relative clause ἐν ᾧ ('in whom'): (b) ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὃς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, (c) 2.11 ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετιμήθητε (...), 2.12 συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε (...). 2.13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας (...), συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ. The function of the excursus on Christ's death and resurrection becomes clear after the third and last warning when the conclusions of the whole passage against the criticized philosophy are looked at from the angle of the believers' participation in both Christ's death and resurrection:

(1) If with Christ you died to the elements of the cosmos, why do you submit to ordinances as if you still live in the former cosmos? (2.20—23: Εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε, κτλ.);

(2) If you have been raised with Christ, seek the things that are above (3.1—4: Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, κτλ.).

Both the excursus (2.11—13) and the final conclusions (2.20—23 and 3.1—4) are intended to make the readers aware of their connection with Christ and of the salutary effects of this union. In these passages in *Col* the preposition σὺν ('with') is used repeatedly to denote the fact that the readers share in Christ's baptism, death, and resurrection.<sup>8</sup> When this excursus is put in parenthesis, the train of thought developed in (b) on Christ's headship over the cosmic principles and powers appears to be continued in (d) without interruption:

(b) ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὃς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας. (...) (d) ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ· ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. Christ is (b) the head of the cosmic principles and powers since (d) he has disarmed them by removing a particular 'handwriting' (χειρόγραφον). The core of the substantiation of this warning against the rival doctrine concerning the cosmic elements, thus, lies in Christ's headship (κεφαλὴ) of the body (σῶμα).

<sup>8</sup> See the six occurrences of σὺν in 2.12—13, 2.20, and 3.1.

### 1.1.2 The second warning (Col 2.16—17)

The second warning summons the readers not to let themselves be judged in view of dietary regulations or in view of festivals, celebrations of the new moon and the Sabbath. It is not totally clear where the description of the contested doctrine is terminated, and where the author of *Col* continues with his subsequent motivation for warning against this doctrine. The whole section reads as follows: Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει εορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων, ἃ ἔστιν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2.16—17).

The relative pronoun ἃ ('things which ...') in the phrase ἃ ἔστιν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων ('things which are a reflection of everything that happens') refers back to the celebrations of periodical events such as particular festivals, the new moon and the Sabbath. These events are part of the calendar which, according to contemporary understanding, is regulated by the heavenly bodies. As we shall see later, the calendrical events are the reflection (σκιά) of the influence of the heavenly bodies which extends over the whole cosmos and determines everything that happens (τὰ μέλλοντα).<sup>9</sup> Consequently, the phrase ἃ ἔστιν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων ('things which are a reflection of everything that happens') can be regarded as belonging to the warning against the rival doctrine rather than to the subsequent substantiation. The warning runs as follows: Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει εορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων, ἃ ἔστιν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων. That is, let nobody judge you either in view of dietary regulations or in view of festivals, the new moon and the Sabbath, phenomena which are the reflection of things destined, destined, that is, by the heavenly bodies.

In that case, the substantiation of the second warning consists in the phrase τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ: the heavenly body on which the festivals and calendrical cycles depend is in fact nothing other than Christ. For the cosmological meaning of body (σῶμα), the evidence will be provided in the next section of this chapter (chap. 1.2.5). Again, the conception of σῶμα constitutes the core of the warning against the rival philosophy.

### 1.1.3 The third warning (Col 2.18—19)

The third and last warning touches on the humble worshipping of angelic beings and the visual perception of certain phenomena which are not specified but, given the general interest of the letter in cosmological matters, may be assumed to be of a cosmic nature. The warning runs: Μηδεὶς

---

<sup>9</sup> Properly, the term τὰ μέλλοντα does not mean 'future things' but 'things destined.' See LSJ 1099 s.v. μέλλω I: 'to be destined.' They happen in the future, *because* they have been destined.

ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἃ ἐόρακεν ἐμβατεύων. That is, let nobody who takes delight in the humble service of angelic beings and pretends to be initiated into things he has seen, rule over you. In other words: let nobody force you to render humble service to angelic beings,<sup>10</sup> under the pretext that he has gained a deep insight into the visible celestial phenomena.

The following line, εἰκῆ φουσιούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ ('puffed up without grounds by the mind of his fleshly nature'), is not so much a clarification of the warning just expressed, but rather a derogatory comment on the idleness of the kind of philosophy the author wants to defeat. The admonition not to be deceived with respect to angelic beings and celestial phenomena, however, is substantiated in the following line (2.19). In it, the author points out that whoever follows the doctrine opposed here, fails to take notice of the head from which the divine growth of the body, sustained by various bonds which keep it together, originates. Such an opponent is οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὖξει τὴν αὖξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ (2.19).

As in the preceding cases, the nucleus of the argumentation which substantiates the warning against the contested views is formed by certain speculations about head (κεφαλῆ) and body (σῶμα).

In summary, the first warning against the disputed understanding of the elements of the cosmos is motivated by the consideration that in Christ all the fullness of the divine nature dwells corporeally (σωματικῶς); Christ, who is the head of all principles and powers (ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας) (2.9—10). In support of the second warning, the one concerning the regulation of the calendar by the movements of the heavenly bodies, the author of *Col* adduces the fact that the entirety of the celestial bodies is the body of Christ: τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2.17). The last warning, directed against the worship of angelic beings and celestial phenomena, is secured with reference to the head (κεφαλῆ) from which the divine growth of the body (σῶμα) originates (2.19). The conception of body (σῶμα), thus, is at the heart of each of the three warnings against the contested philosophy.

---

<sup>10</sup> The phrase ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων is understood here as a hendiadys with the angels as object: 'in the matter of humble service directed towards angelic beings.'

## 1.2 The concept of body (σῶμα) against the background of Stoic and Middle Platonist physics

### 1.2.1 An introduction to Stoic physics and the stability of the cosmic body

The meaning of the term ‘body’ (σῶμα) in the warnings against the rival philosophy becomes clear in the light of contemporary physics. According to a definition of Stoic physics in Diogenes Laertius, the study of physics can be divided into five topics. These topics are (1) bodies (σώματα), (2) principles (ἀρχαί), (3) elements (στοιχεῖα), and (4) gods (θεοί). The bodies, principles, elements and gods are all of a bodily nature and constitutive for reality.<sup>11</sup> The fifth and last topic of Stoic physics, however, consists of (5) non-bodies which are typified as limits, place, and void (Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 7.132).<sup>12</sup>

It is noteworthy that the components of this division of Stoic physics can be discerned verbally in *Col* as well. (1) The cosmos itself is perceived as a σῶμα (‘body’) (2.9, 2.17, and 2.19). (2) The ἀρχαί, the principles, are mentioned as cosmic entities which have been brought into being in Christ (1.16), are controlled by him (2.10) and taken charge of (2.15). (3) The στοιχεῖα, the elements, are the constituents of the cosmos (2.8, 2.20). (4) Physics and theology (the ‘gods’) are also interrelated in *Col*. According to Stoic physics, the world is the substance of God, and God the nature which sustains the world and makes things grow.<sup>13</sup> Physics is in the end interchangeable with theology. Theology and physics are connected in a similar way by the author of *Col*. His opinion is that the divine nature has not remained secluded in the invisible God (1.15) but has in Christ assumed the existence of a cosmic body: ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς (2.9). The growth of this body is therefore characterized as divine: πᾶν τὸ σῶμα (...) αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ θεοῦ (2.19). This demonstrates that physics and theology (reflected in such terms as θεότης and θεός) are also interrelated in *Col*. (5) Much attention is also paid in *Col* to non-bodies such as limits and place (though not to void) as the repetitive use of the prepositional location ‘in him’ makes clear

<sup>11</sup> On the Stoic notions of principles (ἀρχαί) and elements (στοιχεῖα), see Lapidge 1973.

<sup>12</sup> Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 7.132 (LS 43B): Τὸν δὲ φυσικὸν λόγον διαιροῦσιν εἰς τε τὸν περὶ (1) σωμάτων τόπον καὶ περὶ (2) ἀρχῶν καὶ (3) στοιχείων καὶ (4) θεῶν καὶ (5) περάτων καὶ τόπου καὶ κενοῦ.

<sup>13</sup> Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 7.148 (SVF 2.1022 and 2.1132; LS 43A): Οὐσίαν δὲ θεοῦ Ζήνων μὲν φησι τὸν ὅλον κόσμον καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Χρῦσιππος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ θεῶν καὶ Ποσειδώνιος ἐν πρώτῳ Περὶ θεῶν. (...) φύσιν δὲ ποτὲ μὲν ἀποφαίνονται τὴν συνέχουσαν τὸν κόσμον, ποτὲ δὲ τὴν φύουσαν τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς.

(1.16—17; 1.19; 2.9; see chap. 3.1.2 [a]). The author of *Col* and contemporary Stoic physics, thus, share their interest in bodies, principles, and elements, both tend to identify theology with physics, and pay attention to the cosmos' spatial location.

Most topics treated by Stoic physics, therefore, are equally characteristic of the theology which emerges in *Col*. In the present chapter (chap. 1.2), I intend to explore the tenets of Stoic physical theology in more detail and to offer a more comprehensive analysis of those passages in *Col* where 'body' (σῶμα) takes on cosmological meaning. My final aim is to prove that the author of *Col* and contemporary physics had a similar concern with the internal coherence of the cosmic body.

According to Stoic understanding, in the final analysis physics is identical with theology since the world is God's body: God is mixed with matter, pervading all of it and so shaping it, structuring it, and making it into the world.<sup>14</sup> In this process the world, once it has left the state of cosmic conflagration, turns into water and earth and bodily nature (τὸ σωματοειδές): it has in a way changed into body (σῶμα) and soul so as to be compounded out of these.<sup>15</sup> This universal body is the substance and prime matter out of which all other bodies are formed.<sup>16</sup> The regulation of the body of the cosmos is entrusted to a commanding faculty (ἡγεμονικόν) which is variously specified as the element of heat, containing within itself a vital power which pervades the whole world,<sup>17</sup> the heaven, the sun, the aether or the purest part of aether. This commanding faculty passes perceptibly as it were through the things in the air and through all animals and plants, and through the earth itself by way of 'tenor.'<sup>18</sup> As regards human beings, the orthodox view among the Stoics

<sup>14</sup> Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De mixtione* 225.1—2 (*SVF* 2.310; *LS* 45H): μεμῖχθαι τῆ ὕλῃ λέγειν τὸν θεόν, διὰ πάσης αὐτῆς διήκοντα καὶ σχηματίζοντα αὐτήν, καὶ μορφοῦντα καὶ κοσμοποιοῦντα. On the bodily nature of God, see also Origen, *Contra Celsum* 4.14 (*SVF* 2.1052; *LS* 46H): Ἄλλα καὶ ὁ τῶν Στωϊκῶν θεός, ἅτε σῶμα τυγχάνων, ὅτε μὲν ἡγεμονικὸν ἔχει τὴν ὅλην οὐσίαν, ὅταν ἡ ἐκπύρωσις ᾗ· ὅτε δὲ ἐπὶ μέρους γίνεται αὐτῆς, ὅταν ᾗ διακόσμησις.

<sup>15</sup> Plutarch, *De Stoicorum repugnantiis* 1053B (*SVF* 2.605; *LS* 46F): τρόπον τινὰ εἰς σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν μετέβαλεν ὥστε συνεστάναι ἐκ τούτων.

<sup>16</sup> Calcidius, *Timaeus* 293 (*LS* 44E): ergo corpus universum iuxta Stoicos determinatum est et unum et totum et essentia. Totum quidem, quia nihil ei partium deest; unum autem, quia inseparabiles eius partes sunt et invicem sibi cohaerent; essentia vero, quia princeps silva est omnium corporum per quam ire dicunt rationem solidam atque universam. For a detailed interpretation of this passage, see Van Winden 1959, pp. 99—101.

<sup>17</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.24 (*LS* 47C).

<sup>18</sup> Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 7.139 (*SVF* 2.634; *LS* 47O): οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸν ὅλον κόσμον ζῶον ὄντα καὶ ἐμψυχον καὶ λογικόν, ἔχειν ἡγεμονικόν μὲν τὸν αἰθέρα, καθὰ φησιν Ἀντίπατρος ὁ Τύριος ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ Περὶ κόσμου. Χρῦσιππος δ' ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ προνοίας καὶ Ποσειδώνιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ θεῶν τὸν οὐρανόν φασὶ τὸ

seems to be that the commanding faculty is located in the region of the heart,<sup>19</sup> though according to some unnamed Stoics the head is the site of the ἡγεμονικόν.<sup>20</sup> These Stoics adjusted themselves to the Platonic view that the head is the most divine part of the human body and reigns over all its parts (Plato, *Timaeus* 44D—45B; 69C—E; 73C—D; and 89E—90B). Against this background it is highly likely that the author of *Col* situated the ἡγεμονικόν of the body of the cosmos in Christ's head which thus became the metaphor for the governing part of the universe (*Col* 2.9—10, 2.19).<sup>21</sup>

The Stoics advanced their views on the regulation of the cosmic body basically because they felt the coherence of the world-order stood in need of explanation. They held that the world had been composed out of four elements: earth, water, air, and fire. According to a passage in Stobaeus, among these elements the element of fire has pride of place because it gives rise to the generation of the other elements and these elements will finally dissolve into it, when the whole cosmological process is reversed and earth is dissolved into water, water into air, and air into fire.<sup>22</sup> The technical terms which are used to denote this cyclical process of composition and eschatological dissolution are συνίστασθαι ('to be composed') and διαλύεσθαι ('to dissolve') respectively.

Most Stoics assumed this process of dissolution and restoration to be infinitely recurrent. They believed that the present world-order was due to recede into the fiery void surrounding the world and to be restored after that. Nevertheless, Stoic physics devoted a great deal of effort to explain-

ἡγεμονικόν τοῦ κόσμου, Κλεάνθης δὲ τὸν ἥλιον. ὁ μὲντοι Χρῦσιππος διαφορώτερον πάλιν τὸ καθαρώτατον τοῦ αἰθέρος ἐν ταύτῳ, ὃ καὶ πρῶτον θεὸν λέγουσιν αἰσθητικῶς ὥσπερ κεχωρηκέναι διὰ τῶν ἐν ἀέρι καὶ διὰ τῶν ζώων ἀπάντων καὶ φυτῶν· διὰ δὲ τῆς γῆς αὐτῆς καθ' ἑξίν. The term 'tenor' is a translation of ἑξις, the verbal noun of ἔχειν, which denotes the constitutive force operative in (classes of) things. For a detailed explanation of this term, see Long and Sedley 1987, vol. 1, p. 289.

<sup>19</sup> See Galen, *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* 2.5.13: καὶ ἡ διάνοια ἄρα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς κατωτέρω τόποις, μάλιστα πῶς περὶ τὴν καρδίαν (*SVF* 3: Diogenes 29; LS 53U); Galen is quoting here Diogenes of Babylon. See also Galen, *op. cit.* 3.1.25 (*SVF* 2.886; LS 65H), referring to Chrysippus.

<sup>20</sup> Aetius, *Placita* 4.21.4 (*SVF* 2.836; LS 53H): αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ ἡγεμονικόν ὥσπερ ἐν κόσμῳ <ἥλιος> κατοικεῖ ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ σφαιροειδεῖ κεφαλῇ.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, pp. 29—30 whose stipulation of the background of the cosmic meaning of σῶμα and κεφαλή is still tentative: 'Aber sichere Belege für die religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge fehlen; wir können nur den kosmischen Gebrauch von κεφαλή und σῶμα (2,19) konstatieren' (p. 30; =Dibelius 1927<sup>2</sup>, p. 22; not yet in Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>22</sup> Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 1.129.7—10 (*SVF* 2.413; LS 47A): τὸ δὲ κατ' ἐξοχὴν στοιχεῖον λέγεσθαι (sc. τὸ πῦρ) διὰ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πρῶτου τὰ λοιπὰ συνίστασθαι κατὰ μεταβολὴν καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἔσχατον πάντα χεόμενα διαλύεσθαι.



ing how the stability and coherence of the present cosmic body is guaranteed until the next conflagration. Some Stoics like Boethus of Sidon (2nd cent. BC), Panaetius (c. 185—109 BC), Diogenes of Babylon (c. 240—152 BC) and Zeno of Tarsus (head of the Stoa in 204 BC) even had doubts about or rejected the periodical conversion into fire and apparently took more interest in the enduring coherence of the cosmos.<sup>23</sup>

Zeno (not Zeno of Tarsus, but Zeno of Citium, founder of the Stoic school) demonstrated the stable position of the world in the infinite void around it in the following way. In his view, according to another passage in Stobaeus, all the parts of the world have a tendency towards the centre of the universe. This centripetal movement is not only typical of the elements which have weight (water and earth) but of air and fire as well, since they are blended with the heavy elements. Due to their naturally weightless and centrifugal nature which is nonetheless altered by their intermingling with the other elements, air and fire create the coherence (σύστασις) between the centre of the world and its periphery.<sup>24</sup> In this way the Stoics could participate in the contemporary debate on the stability of the world and reply to the Aristotelian critique that if void existed outside the world, substance would have flowed through it and been infinitely scattered and dissipated.<sup>25</sup> This criticism, thus, was met by reference to the sustaining influence exerted by the elements air and fire, which could be equally designated as 'breath' (πνεῦμα) which consists of a mixture of these elements.<sup>26</sup> The internal coherence (σύστασις) between the centre

<sup>23</sup> On Boethus of Sidon, Panaetius, and Diogenes of Babylon, see Philo, *De aeternitate mundi* 76—77 (LS 46P). For the testimonium on Zeno's doubts as to the cosmic conflagration, see *SVF* 3: Zeno Tarsensis 5.

<sup>24</sup> Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 1.166.6—19 (*SVF* 1.99; LS 49J): διόπερ ὀρθῶς λέγεσθαι πάντα τὰ μέρη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον τοῦ κόσμου τὴν φορὰν ἔχειν, μάλιστα δὲ τὰ βάρους ἔχοντα (...). (...) ἄβαρῆ εἶναι ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ· τείνεσθαι δὲ καὶ ταῦτα πῶς ἐπὶ τὸ τῆς ὄλης σφαίρας τοῦ κόσμου μέσον, τὴν δὲ σύστασιν πρὸς τὴν περιφέρειαν αὐτοῦ ποιεῖσθαι· φύσει γὰρ ἀνάφοιτα ταῦτ' εἶναι διὰ τὸ μηδενὸς μετέχειν βάρους. Παραπλησίως δὲ τοῦτοις οὐδ' αὐτόν φασιν τὸν κόσμον βάρους ἔχειν διὰ τὸ τὴν ὄλην αὐτοῦ σύστασιν ἔκ τε τῶν βάρους ἐχόντων στοιχείων εἶναι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀβαρῶν. Notice also the repeated occurrence of the term σύστασις which denotes the coherence of the cosmos. For a detailed interpretation, cf. Hahm 1977, pp. 107—122.

<sup>25</sup> Cleomedes, *De motu circulari corporum caelestium* 10.24—26 (*SVF* 2.540; LS 49H): Λέγεται κάκεινο ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ὡς εἰ ἦν ἔξω τοῦ κόσμου κενόν, χρομένη δι' αὐτοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἐπ' ἀπειρον διεσκεδάσθη ἂν καὶ διεσκορπίσθη. These objections derive from Aristotle, *Physica* 4.8 (see Long & Sedley 1987, vol. 1, pp. 296—297). Cf. also Hahm 1977, pp. 103—104.

<sup>26</sup> Galen, *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* 5.3.8 (*SVF* 2.841; LS 47H), reporting on Chrysippus' views: τοῦτ' οὖν τὸ πνεῦμα δύο μὲν κέκτηται μόρια τε καὶ στοιχεῖα καὶ καταστάσεις, δι' ὄλων ἀλλήλοις κεκραμένα, τὸ ψυχρόν καὶ θερμόν, εἴπερ δ' ἐτέροις ὀνόμασι καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν οὐσιῶν ἐθέλοι τις αὐτὰ προσαγορεύειν, ἀέρα τε καὶ πῦρ. The conception of πνεῦμα is further clarified in Long & Sedley 1987, vol. 1, pp. 287—288.

and periphery of the cosmos is ascribed to the specific properties of certain elements (στοιχεῖα).

The issue of the composition and stability of the cosmos, then, appeared to be at the heart of the two passages from Stobaeus just referred to, and is designated by terms like συνίστασθαι ('to be composed') and σύστασις ('coherence'). In these passages, it is clearly stated that the element of fire is the element *par excellence* because the other elements and hence the whole cosmos are composed out of it (τὸ δὲ κατ' ἐξοχὴν στοιχεῖον λέγεσθαι [sc. τὸ πῦρ] διὰ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πρώτου τὰ λοιπὰ συνίστασθαι κατὰ μεταβολήν) and are eventually dissolved into it (καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἔσχατον πάντα χεόμενα διαλύεσθαι).<sup>27</sup> Once the cosmos is established its breakdown is prohibited by the coherence which is due to the binding characteristics of the elements air and fire (τείνεσθαι δὲ καὶ ταῦτα πῶς ἐπὶ τὸ τῆς ὄλης σφαίρας τοῦ κόσμου μέσον, τὴν δὲ σύστασιν πρὸς τὴν περιφέρειαν αὐτοῦ ποιεῖσθαι).<sup>28</sup> This issue of the cohesion of the cosmic body seems equally to have occupied the attention of the author of *Col*, as I intend to demonstrate now.

### 1.2.2 The stability of the cosmic body according to the author of *Col*

According to the author of *Col*, all things in the cosmos have been created through and for Christ.<sup>29</sup> In him, the cosmos is considered to find its present coherence: ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (...) τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτίσται, (...) καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν (*Col* 1.16—17). These lines display a remarkable similarity with the Stoic thoughts preserved in Stobaeus and just discussed above. According to the Stoa, the element fire is all-comprehensive by operating both as the beginning (ἐξ αὐτοῦ) and the end (εἰς αὐτό) of the whole cosmological process: τὸ δὲ κατ' ἐξοχὴν στοιχεῖον λέγεσθαι [sc. τὸ πῦρ] διὰ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πρώτου τὰ λοιπὰ συνίστασθαι κατὰ μεταβολήν καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἔσχατον πάντα χεόμενα διαλύεσθαι. In the same way, *Col* presents Christ as the origin and completion of the cosmos: τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτίσται. The author of *Col*, thus, appears to assign functions to Christ which in contemporary Stoic physics were attributed to a particular element (στοιχεῖον), and he does so in similar terminology.

---

For other aspects of the Aristotelian-Stoic debate on the stability of the cosmos, see, e.g., the Aristotelian philosopher Alexander of Aphrodisias (fl. AD 200) who questioned the Stoic conception that the universe is unified and sustained by a breath (πνεῦμα) which pervades the whole of it (Alexander, *De mixtione* 223.25—27; *SVF* 2.441; LS 47L). Cf. Todd's study on Alexander of Aphrodisias' attitude towards Stoic physics (Todd 1976).

<sup>27</sup> Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 1.129.7—10 (*SVF* 2.413; LS 47A).

<sup>28</sup> Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 1.166.13—15 (*SVF* 1.99; LS 49J).

<sup>29</sup> See also the full treatment of propositional metaphysics in section 3.1.2. (a) below.

This suggests that the author intends to argue that Christ should be assigned the important position which in contemporary physics was attributed to one of the cosmic elements. That is the reason why he characterizes the rival cosmology as a philosophy *κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν*, a philosophy concerning the elements of the cosmos, but not in relation to Christ (*Col* 2.8). Like the Stoa, the author of *Col* is interested in the *σύστασις*, the coherence of the cosmos: *τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν* (*Col* 1.17). But unlike the Stoa, his cosmology is christological.

According to the author of *Col*, probably the present cosmic order has only recently been re-established since the principles (*ἀρχαί*) and powers (*ἐξουσίαι*), which were originally brought into being in Christ (*Col* 1.16: *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, [...] εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι*), nevertheless arrived at a position where Christ had to subdue them: *ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ* (*Col* 2.15). It is likely, therefore, that the present stability of the cosmos as indicated in *Col* 1.17 (*τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν*) is the result of a restitution of the original order of the cosmos. This idea of an original constitution of the world, its decay, and its subsequent return to the same condition as before, is also current in contemporary Stoic physics. According to Nemesius, the Stoics say that when the planets return to the same celestial sign, in length and breadth, where each originally was when the world was first formed (*ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον ὁ κόσμος συνέστη*), at set periods of time they cause conflagration and destruction of existing things. Each time the world returns anew to the same condition as before.<sup>30</sup> Along these lines, the author of *Col* could regard the present cosmological order (1.17) as the outcome of a restoration (*ἀποκατάστασις*) which brought the cosmic principles and powers back into Christ (2.15) in whom they were originally created (1.16), and in whom they regained their original stable and coherent constitution (*σύστασις*): *τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν*.

In *Col*, the idea that the cosmos possesses stability and coherence is essential. This idea is expressed in several ways. In the first place, the cosmos is said to reside *ἐν αὐτῷ*, that is, in Christ (*Col* 1.17b), which means that the cosmos owes its cohesion to him (chap. 1.2.3). Secondly, according to *Col* 2.9–10, the cosmic principles and powers constitute Christ's body and are commanded by him as their commanding faculty

<sup>30</sup> Nemesius, *De natura hominis* 111.14–18 (chap. 38, pp. 309–310 ed. Matthaei 1802; *SVF* 2.625; *LS* 52C): *οἱ δὲ Στωϊκοὶ φασιν ἀποκαθισταμένους τοὺς πλανήτας εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ σημεῖον κατὰ τε μήκος καὶ πλάτος ἐνθα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἕκαστος ἦν ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον ὁ κόσμος συνέστη, ἐν ῥηταῖς χρόνων περιόδοις ἐκπύρωσιν καὶ φθορὰν τῶν ὄντων ἀπεργάζεσθαι, καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ τὸν κόσμον ἀποκαθίστασθαι.*

(chap. 1.2.4). Thirdly, the cosmic body of Christ is also the entirety of the heavenly bodies which determine the calendar and everything that happens (*Col* 2.17; chap. 1.2.5). This cosmic body, lastly, is also said to have bonds which lend it coherence and keep it together: *πάν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβασζόμενον αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ* (*Col* 2.19; chap. 1.2.6). These different ways of speaking about the body (σῶμα) of the cosmos betray the author's view that the body at issue is a stable, coherent unity. They will now be commented on in more detail.

### 1.2.3 The location of the cosmos in Christ (*Col* 1.17b)

According to *Col* 1.16, the cosmos was brought into being in Christ: *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. The result of the creation is further specified as things visible and invisible, and, subsequently, as cosmic entities like thrones, dominions, principles, and powers: *τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι*. The idea that the cosmic entities derive their order and mutual coherence from their being in Christ is stressed in *Col* 1.17b: *τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν*. The coherence of the cosmos, thus, is ensured by its continuous preservation 'in him' (*ἐν αὐτῷ*). In the next section (chap. 1.2.4) I will expand on the spatial meaning of the phrase *ἐν αὐτῷ* ('in him'), although the full meaning of this and similar prepositional phrases will only be discussed in chap. 3.1.2 (a), when I deal with prepositional metaphysics. In due course, it will also become clear that it is but one step from the notion of all things being held together in Christ to the author's plain assertion that the cosmos is Christ's body.<sup>31</sup>

### 1.2.4 The cosmic body and head (*Col* 2.9–10)

The spatial meaning of the phrase *ἐν αὐτῷ* ('in him'), which denotes that the cosmos is held together in Christ (1.16–17), gains relief in 2.9–10 where it is stated that 'in Christ' the divine nature dwells in a corporeal way: *ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς* (2.9). Located in Christ, thus, are not only the cosmos and cosmic entities like the principles (*ἀρχαὶ*) and powers (*ἐξουσίαι*; 1.16–17) but also the divine nature. The adverb *σωματικῶς* ('as a body') seems to indicate how the divine nature is present in Christ: in a corporeal way. The adverb seems to

<sup>31</sup> See, implicitly, Hofius 2001, pp. 187–188, esp. p. 188: 'Die Erklärung, daß Christus die κεφαλή des Alls als seines σώμα ist, würde in der Sache nur noch einmal wiederholen, was bereits die Worte καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν V. 17 zum Ausdruck gebracht haben.' Cf. also Käsemann 1960, p. 36 (referred to by Hofius): 'Indirekt ist damit der Gedanke des Christusleibes schon vorweggenommen'.

point at Christ as the space which is filled with the cosmic body (σῶμα), a body which comprises the principles (ἀρχαί), powers (ἐξουσίαι), and other celestial forces. The cosmos is viewed as coextensive with Christ. The divine nature which was originally secluded in the invisible God (1.15), expresses itself in Christ, who as the πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, the firstborn of all creation, represents the first phase of creation (1.15). In him the divine nature assumes corporeal existence, the existence of a cosmic body (σῶμα). The interpretation according to which the cosmic principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι) constitute Christ's cosmic body is supported by the remark in *Col* 2.10 that Christ is the head, the commanding faculty, of the cosmic principles and powers (κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας). To a considerable extent, the cosmological theory of the author of *Col* is paralleled by the Stoic doctrine of the world as reviewed in Cicero's account of Stoic physics. Cicero states that, according to Stoic conviction, God is the world itself, and the universal pervasiveness of its mind; that he is the world's own commanding faculty, since he is located in intellect and reason; that he is the common nature of things, universal and all-embracing.<sup>32</sup> Similarly, the coherence of the cosmos in *Col* is guaranteed because the cosmos is a body which is commanded by Christ, its head.

The cosmological interpretation of σωματικῶς ('corporeally'), however, is not the *communis opinio* and has gained only little support though this, from Lohmeyer, was noteworthy.<sup>33</sup> A more common view is the one taken by Schweizer, who regards the adverb σωματικῶς ('corporeally') as a reference to the body of the resurrected and exalted Christ. In Schweizer's opinion the passage ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς (2.9: 'in him the fullness of the divine nature dwells in a corporeal way') is a reiteration of *Col* 1.18—19 where Christ is disig-

<sup>32</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 1.39 (*SVF* 2.1077; *LS* 54B): ipsumque mundum deum dicit esse et eius animi fusionem universam, tum eius ipsius principatum qui in mente et ratione versetur, communemque rerum naturam universam atque omnia continentem.

<sup>33</sup> Lohmeyer 1964, pp. 106—107: 'Dann kann auch diese Fülle nur darum in ihm "leiblich" wohnen, weil er das Haupt eines "Leibes", d.h. Herr des versöhnten Alls geworden ist' (p. 106; =Lohmeyer 1930, p. 106). Even Dibelius is among Lohmeyer's critics. Although Dibelius advocates a cosmological interpretation of the term σῶμα in *Col* 2.19, he disagrees with Lohmeyer as regards the term σωματικῶς in *Col* 2.9: 'Lohmeyer: Die Fülle der Gottheit wohnt σωματικῶς in Christus, weil er das Haupt eines σῶμα, d.h. Herr des versöhnten Alls geworden ist (...). Aber dann sollte man eine sehr viel engere Verbindung von σωματικῶς mit V. 10<sup>b</sup> [ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας] erwarten; und V. 11 erscheint σῶμα in völlig anderem Sinn [2.11: σῶμα τῆς σάρκος]. Aber σωματικῶς kann (...) eine allgemeinere Bedeutung haben: Das Pleroma ist "wirklich" in ihm erschienen' (Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, p. 29; not yet in Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>—1927<sup>2</sup>; Dibelius criticizes the 1930 edition of Lohmeyer's commentary on *Col*).

nated as the first to return from the dead, to become in all things supreme, because in him all the fullness chose to dwell: πρωτότοκος εκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι (1.18—19). Both in *Col* 1.19 and 2.9, the dwelling of the divine nature in Christ is taken by Schweizer as a characterization of the πρωτότοκος εκ τῶν νεκρῶν, the resurrected Christ. In this view, the term σωματικῶς ('corporeally') alludes to the body of Christ's resurrection.<sup>34</sup>

Such a limitation of the meaning of σῶμα ('body') to the body of the resurrected Christ, however, does not seem to do justice either to the cosmological interest of the immediate context in 2.8—10, which is concerned with the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) and the cosmic principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι), or to the train of thought developed in 1.18—19. It is clear that in 2.9 the same conception and the same terminology of the fullness of the divine nature dwelling in Christ are used (ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς) as in 1.18—19 where Christ occurs as the first to return from the dead, to become in all things supreme, because in him all the fullness chose to dwell (ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι).

It would, nevertheless, be an unwarranted simplification to conclude that also in 1.18—19 the divine nature is thought to dwell in the resurrected Christ exclusively. In fact, the causal clause 'because in him all the fullness chose to dwell' (1.19: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι) does not comment directly on Christ's resurrection from the dead (1.18c: πρωτότοκος εκ τῶν νεκρῶν) but aims primarily to offer an explanation of the immediately preceding consideration that Christ ought to become first in all things (1.18d: ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων). The primacy of Christ lies not only in his role as firstborn from the dead (1.18c: πρωτότοκος εκ τῶν νεκρῶν), but also in his status of firstborn of all creation (1.15b: πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως): Christ is the first both in creation and in the reconstitution of the cosmos. The divine nature, therefore, does not dwell in Christ only after his resurrection. It resided already in the one in whom the cosmic principles and powers were created and in whom the whole cosmos finds its present coherence (1.16—17).

Even merely the order of 1.19—20, which speaks first of the indwelling of the fullness in Christ (1.19) and subsequently of his death (1.20), makes it unlikely that this 'indwelling' should be understood as referring forward to the coming resurrection. It does not appear to be Christ's resurrection which is in view here. Nor can God's indwelling point at Christ's incarna-

<sup>34</sup> Schweizer 1989a, pp. 107—108 on *Col* 2.9.

tion, because then the wording of 2.9 would not have been in the present tense: (...) ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς. Had this been a reference to his incarnation, then we would probably have had a different tense here, as John's prologue makes clear: Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (1.14).

There is no reason, thus, to relate the conception of the divine nature dwelling in Christ, as mentioned in *Col* 2.9, solely to the body of the incarnate and/or resurrected Christ. Given the interest which the author of *Col* takes in the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) and in Christ as the head of the cosmic principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι) in the immediate context (2.8—10), it seems likely that the adverb σωματικῶς ('corporeally') in 2.9 refers to the cosmic body which is constituted by the principles, powers, and other cosmic forces.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, it makes less sense to talk of the indwelling of God in the physiological body of the heavenly, resurrected Christ than to talk of the indwelling of God in the cosmic Christ. This is particularly true since a cosmological understanding of the prepositional phrase 'in him' (ἐν αὐτῷ) in 2.9 is fully in line with the meaning of this phrase in 1.16a (ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) and 1.17b (τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν; see further chaps 3.1.2 [a] en 3.1.1 [a]).

The cosmological interpretation of σωματικῶς ('corporeally') in 2.9 becomes even more probable if one bears in mind that the term 'body' (σῶμα) as used in *Col* is equivocal and takes on a variety of meanings.<sup>36</sup> With regard to Christ's body, the author of *Col* seems to distinguish between three different senses of body (σῶμα), which can be specified as (1) ecclesiological, (2) physiological, and (3) cosmological. (1) The ecclesiological meaning of Christ's body is clearly attested in *Col* 1.18 where Christ is presented as the head of the body of the church (κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας),<sup>37</sup> and in 1.24 where Paul's sufferings are said to

<sup>35</sup> Cf. also Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, p. 36 on the terminology of κεφαλή and σῶμα in *Col* 2.19: 'κεφαλή ist, da es sich um den Gegensatz zu den στοιχεῖα-Verehrern handelt, im Sinne von 2,10 zu deuten. Dann ist σῶμα = πᾶσα ἀρχή καὶ ἐξουσία, meint also den durch die στοιχεῖα repräsentierten Kosmos' (=Dibelius 1927<sup>2</sup>, p. 27 and, almost verbatim, Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>, p. 83). See also Lohmeyer 1964, p. 107 on *Col* 2.10: 'Denn es heißt nicht mehr "Haupt des Leibes der Gemeinde", sondern "Haupt aller Mächte und Gewalten". Diese Mächte bilden also den Leib, der Christus zugehört; und es ist also in diesen ihren Repräsentanten die Welt als ganze mit ihm verbunden wie der Leib mit dem Haupt' (=Lohmeyer 1930, p. 107).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Dunn 1994.

<sup>37</sup> Plutarch, too, regards an ἐκκλησία, an assembly of people, as a single body (σῶμα), which consists of separate bodies. See Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum* 426A: οὐ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα μὲν ἐν συνίσταται σῶμα πολλακίς ἐκ διεστώτων σωμάτων, οἷον ἐκκλησία (...);

be accomplished for the sake of Christ's body, which is the church (ὕπερ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία). (2) Besides the ecclesiological sense, the author of *Col* speaks of Christ's body in a physiological sense, namely when Christ's death (1.21) and circumcision (2.11) are in view. In these instances, Christ's body is qualified as a body of flesh, a *σῶμα τῆς σάρκος*.

In addition to the ecclesiological and physiological meanings, (3) the word *σῶμα* ('body') used for Christ's body seems to have a cosmological meaning in other passages (2.9, 2.17, and 2.19). In these passages, the term 'body' (*σῶμα*) is neither qualified by 'church' (*ἐκκλησία*) nor by 'flesh' (*σάρξ*). The cosmological context of these occurrences of *σῶμα* ('body') makes it likely that Christ's cosmic body is meant here. In each case, the context determines what kind of body the author has in mind, just as, for example, the context in Aristotle's *De anima* suggests whether Aristotle is focusing on the human or on the cosmic psyche. In *Col* 2.9, thus, the term *σωματικῶς* ('corporeally') is used with regard to the cosmic body which is made up of the principles (*ἀρχαί*), powers (*ἐξουσίαι*), and other cosmic forces which have Christ as their commanding faculty. In this way the cosmos remains coherent.

### 1.2.5 The cosmological meaning of 'body' (*σῶμα*) in *Col* 2.17

According to the author of *Col*, Christ's cosmic body comprises the whole of the celestial bodies. On these, the festivals and calendrical cycles depend (see also chap. 1.1.2 above). Therefore, the periodical events which are regulated by the heavenly bodies, such as particular festivals, the new moon and the Sabbath, can be called the *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων* (*Col* 2.16—17): the calendrical events are the reflection (*σκιὰ*) of things destined (*τὰ μέλλοντα*), destined, that is, by the movements of the heavenly bodies<sup>38</sup> whose influence extends over the whole cosmos and determines everything that happens (*τὰ μέλλοντα*). It seems preferable to take *τῶν μελλόντων*, 'everything that happens,' as a genitive of apposition, which defines how one should understand the preceding noun *σκιὰ* ('reflection'). The calendrical events are a reflection, which consists of things destined; they are an important example of all things which are determined by the heavenly bodies. These heavenly bodies together are part of Christ's cosmic body: *τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (*Col* 2.17). For this reason, the *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*, the reflection of things destined, is in fact the reflection,

<sup>38</sup> See again LSJ 1099 s.v. *μέλλω* I: 'to be destined,' indicating that, properly speaking, the term *τὰ μέλλοντα* does not mean 'future things' but 'things destined.' They happen in the future, because they have been destined. This predestination is the effect of the influence exerted by the heavenly bodies.



the shadow cast by Christ's cosmic body, as we shall see at the end of this section.

The idea that the course of earthly events is influenced or even determined by the heavenly bodies and their movements is attested in Jewish as well as in other traditions in the Graeco-Roman world. Philo, for instance, mentions the predictive value of astronomy: the purpose of the sun, the moon, and the stars, apart from their function for measuring time (*De aeternitate* 19; *De opificio* 59—60) and giving light (*De opificio* 56—57), is to give σημεῖα μελλόντων, signs of coming events (τὰ μέλλοντα), by means of their risings, settings, eclipses and by other kinds of alterations in their appearance and movements, which provide a basis for conjecture about how things will turn out (*De opificio* 58—59). In Philo's view, many things on earth, such as storms, good or bad crops, fertility or sterility of animals, are announced by the signs of heaven (*De specialibus legibus* 1.92): 'heaven is inscribed with the signs of all things that happen upon earth.'

Between the celestial bodies and things on earth there is sympathetic affinity, notwithstanding the fact that they are separated in space (*De migratione* 178—181). The movements of the planets exhibit the force of the hebdomad, from which all earthly things gain their strength (*De opificio* 101). The planets display the greatest sympathy with air and earth (*De opificio* 113; *Quaestiones in Genesin* 3.3) and cause all things on earth, living creatures and fruit-yielding plants, to grow and to bring their fruit to perfection by enabling the natural power in each of them to run its entire course (*De opificio* 113). By their movement and revolution through the zodiacal signs, the planets are 'the causes for sublunary beings, of all those things which are wont to take place in the embrace of concord, in the air, in the water, on the earth and in all mixtures from animals to plants' (*Quaestiones in Exodum* 2.78; transl. R. Marcus). In the elements of air, earth and water, and in animals and plants, each of the signs of the zodiac produces its own particular colouring (*De vita Mosis* 2.126) and therefore Philo credits the zodiac cycle with the improvement of things here below (*De praemiis* 65). Philo, thus, appears to share the widespread contemporary view on the sympathy between celestial bodies and things on earth.<sup>39</sup>

Other Jewish writings take a keen interest in the relationship between the movements of the celestial bodies and the celebration of religious festivals. The author of the *Book of Astronomical Writings*, which is part of *I Enoch*, is interested primarily in advocating the right calendar. In order to

---

<sup>39</sup> Even the art of genethliology (the casting of horoscopes) was practised within Judaism, as some documents among the Dead Sea Scrolls clearly attest (e.g., 4Q186, 4Q534). For an introduction, translation, and bibliography, see Vermes 1997 (ed. Dead Sea Scrolls), pp. 357—358 and 521—522.

distinguish between aberrant movements in heaven and a properly functioning cosmos, the readers need Enoch's instructions as revealed by the angel Uriel (*1 Enoch* 80.1). Uriel's exact computations are revealed in view of the religious festivals (82.7). Astronomy and the computing of time were at the heart of a calendrical controversy within Judaism which comes to the fore in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>40</sup>

The belief that there is a link between celestial and terrestrial events was also common among non-Jews. Most people in the Graeco-Roman world believed that there was a universal sympathy connecting all parts of the cosmos in a harmoniously functioning whole. Accordingly, Stoicism legitimized divination.<sup>41</sup> Many intellectuals accepted and justified astrology, though there were sceptics and critics.<sup>42</sup>

In viewing the cosmos as a harmoniously functioning whole, the author of *Col* shares the worldview of many of his contemporaries. He, too, is convinced that there is a link between celestial and terrestrial events, owing to the sympathy which connects the parts of the cosmos. Calendrical events are the reflection (σκιὰ) of the things which are destined (τὰ μέλλοντα) by the heavenly bodies. They are in fact the shadow (σκιὰ) which is cast by the cosmic body (σῶμα) of Christ. The multiple heavenly bodies together are part of Christ's single cosmic body: τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

The idea that a reflection, a shadow (σκιὰ), is cast by a body (σῶμα) is ubiquitous in literature of the period. According to Plutarch, the distance of light from bodies (σώματα) produces shadows (σκιαί) which are many times larger than the bodies that cast them (*De facie in orbe lunae* 936A).<sup>43</sup> According to Philo, in the sunshine the shadow (σκιὰ) follows the body (σῶμα).<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> As regards the Dead Sea Scrolls, see the concern about time reckoning in, e.g., *IQpHab* XI.6—8 and *IQH* IV.11—12. On this issue, see Talmon 1988 and VanderKam 1998. See Hayward 1996 for a clarification of this concern in terms of the parallelism between heaven and earth. On the historiographical aspects of the Jewish controversy over the calendar in the Graeco-Roman period, see Van Kooten 1999.

<sup>41</sup> For Stoic divination, see, e.g., Cicero, *De fato* 12—15 (LS 38E); *De divinatione* 1.82—83 (*SVF* 2.1192; LS 42D); and *De divinatione* 1.127 (*SVF* 2.944; LS 55O).

<sup>42</sup> For astrology in the Graeco-Roman world, cf. Gundel & Gundel 1966 and Beck 1996. On the lack of terminological distinction between 'astrology' and 'astronomy' in classical antiquity, see Hübner 1990. For criticism of astrology, cf. Long 1982.

<sup>43</sup> Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae* 936A: διὰ τίν' αἰτίαν; ὅτι πολλαπλασίους αἱ τοῦ φωτός ἀπο στάσεις τῶν σωμάτων τὰς σκιάς ποιοῦσι. δεῦρο δὴ θεῶ καὶ τῆς σελήνης, ὅτε πάμμηνός ἐστι καὶ μάλιστα τὴν ιδέαν ἐναρθρον τοῦ προσώπου βαθύτητι τῆς σκιάς ἀπο δίδωσι, τὸ μέγιστον ἀπέχοντα διάστημα τὸν ἥλιον· ἡ γὰρ ἀπόστασις τοῦ φωτός αὕτη τὴν σκιάν μεγάλην, οὐ τὰ μεγέθη τῶν ὑπὲρ τὴν σελήνην ἀνωμαλιῶν πεποίηκε.

<sup>44</sup> Philo, *De virtutibus* 181: ἔπεται δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον ὡς περ σκιά σῶματι καὶ <ταύτη> τῆς ἐχθρας διάλυσις. Cf. also Philo, *De decalogo* 83: ὄνομα γὰρ αἰεὶ δεύτερον

In the final analysis, however, the shadow, the reflection, i.e. the things destined, the calendrical events, are not produced by the heavenly bodies, but by Christ's cosmic body. This notion, that the entirety of the heavenly bodies belongs to Christ's cosmic body is paralleled in contemporary cosmology which regards the heavenly bodies as parts of a god. According to Augustine, probably depending on Varro (116—27 BC), Roman philosophers believe that the heavenly bodies are parts of Jupiter, and—alternatively—that Janus is the cosmos and all stars are located in him.<sup>45</sup> Along these lines, the author of *Col* can regard the multiple heavenly bodies as parts of Christ's single cosmic body; the things destined, including all calendrical events, are the reflection caused, the shadow cast, by Christ's cosmic body (2.16—17),<sup>46</sup> and all things, including the planetary 'thrones' and 'dominions' (see chap. 3.1.2 below), are located in him (1.16—17). The world as a harmoniously functioning and stable body is at the same time the body of Christ.

#### 1.2.6 The bonds holding together the cosmic body (Col 2.19)

The conception of the stability of the cosmos is finally also expressed by means of the description of the cosmos as kept together by bonds. According to *Col* 2.19, the cosmic body is provided with bonds (ἀφάι and

---

ὑποκειμένου ράγματος, σκιᾷ παραπλήσιον, ἢ παρέπεται σώματι; and *De virtutibus* 118. For that reason, the shadow (σκιᾷ) is secondary to the body (σώμα). See Philo, *De migratione Abrahami* 12: ἄποπον γὰρ ἢ σκιάν σωμάτων ἢ μίμημα ἀρχετύπων φέρεσθαι πλέον· σκιᾷ μὲν δὴ καὶ μιμήματι ἔοικεν ἐρμηνεῖα, σώμασι δὲ καὶ ἀρχετύποις αἱ τῶν διερμηνευομένων φύσεις πραγμάτων; *De confusione linguarum* 190; and *Quis rerum divinarum heres* 72.

<sup>45</sup> Augustine, *De civitate dei* 4.11: 'Nam ut alia omittam, quae sunt innumerabilia, cum dicunt omnia sidera partes Iovis esse (...). (...) Si autem stellas omnes ideo colunt, quia in Iove sunt quem colunt, isto compendio possent in illo uno omnibus supplicare' (cf. Varro, *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, fragments 24 and 27); and 7.15: 'Quare autem Ianus non accepit aliquam stellam? Si <propterea>, quia mundus est et omnes in illo sunt: et Iovis mundus est et habet tamen' (cf. Varro, *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, fragments 230, 233 and 234. See also Cardauns' commentary on these fragments in Cardauns 1976, vol. 2. On Augustine and Varro, see Hagendahl 1967, vol. 2, chap. 6, esp. chap. 6.3.

<sup>46</sup> The combination of σκιᾷ and σώμα in *Col* 2.17 is unique among the New Testament writings and fully explained by Graeco-Roman parallels. There is no reason, therefore, to draw on *Hebrews* 10.1 (Σκιάν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις ἄς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι), a passage only remotely parallel and with an eschatological twist. In this, I disagree with, among others, Sterling 1998, pp. 355—358. The thrust of *Hebrews* is clearly eschatological (1.1—2a: Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ), whereas *Col* is concerned with the cosmos. Σκιᾷ and σώμα are therefore best taken in their ontological-cosmological sense.

σύνδεσμοι) by which it is held together: πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὐξεῖ τὴν ἀξίησιν τοῦ θεοῦ.

(a) *Alexander of Aphrodisias (fl. c. 200 AD) on Stoic physics*

This notion of bonds which lend coherence to the cosmos by knitting it together is current in Stoic physics. According to Alexander of Aphrodisias (fl. c. 200 AD), the Stoics claim that the cosmos is held together by a *pneuma*, a breath (πνεῦμα) which unifies and pervades the whole of substance and renders the cosmos stable and in sympathy with itself.<sup>47</sup> The verb ‘held together’ (συνέχεται) refers to the coherence (συνέχεια) which holds the cosmos together and from which stability (συμμονή) and sympathy between the parts of the cosmos (σμπάθεια) result.<sup>48</sup>

This unity the Stoics attribute to certain bonds (δεσμοί) and material causes, and a *pneuma* which pervades the whole of substance.<sup>49</sup> One of these bonds is subsequently specified as the bond brought about by the *pneuma* (ὁ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος δεσμός).<sup>50</sup> The force which is exerted by the *pneuma* and holds the universe together is described as the tension of the *pneuma* through which bodies are bound together and have internal continuity with their own parts, and are connected with juxtaposed parts (of the cosmic body as a whole).<sup>51</sup>

Thus, according to the Stoics criticised by Alexander, the *pneuma* holds the whole cosmic body together. For describing the coherence prevalent in the cosmos, Alexander uses the verbs συνδεῖν (‘to bind together’) and συνάπτειν (‘to join together’). For the same purpose *Col* 2.19 uses the related nouns σύνδεσμοι and ἀφαί, bonds and bands which hold the cos-

<sup>47</sup> Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De mixtione* 223.7—9: ἠνώσθαι τὴν σύμπασαν οὐσίαν πνεύματος τινος διὰ πάσης αὐτῆς διήκοντος, ὅφ’ οὗ συνέχεται τε καὶ συμμένει τὸ πᾶν καὶ συμπαθές ἐστιν αὐτῷ.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Todd 1976, pp. 36 and 188. Cf. also the identical wording in *De mixtione* 216.14—17 (=SVF 2.473) with attribution to Chrysippus. The term τὸ πᾶν stands for the cosmos: see Todd 1976, p. 56 note 142 and p. 188.

<sup>49</sup> Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De mixtione* 223.16—17: δεσμοῖς τισι καὶ ὕλικαῖς αἰτίαις καὶ τινι πνεύματι διὰ πάσης τῆς οὐσίας διήκοντι ἀνατιθέασιν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἔνωσιν.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibidem*, 223.34.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibidem*, 223.34—36: ὁ τόνος τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅφ’ οὗ συνδούμενα τὴν τε συνέχειαν ἔχει τὴν πρὸς τὰ οἰκεῖα μέρη καὶ συνήπται τοῖς παρακειμένοις. According to Todd, the expression ‘the tension of the *pneuma*’ does not refer to *pneuma*’s own internal principle of coherency, but to ‘the tension transmitted to bodies internally (πρὸς τὰ οἰκεῖα μέρη) and in their relation to other bodies, i.e. in their universal sympathy’ (Todd 1976, p. 217).

mos together. This terminology is used in Stoicism to elucidate the organic unity of the cosmos.<sup>52</sup>

Though Alexander was a teacher of Aristotelian philosophy, one can rule out the possibility that the terms συνδῆν ('to bind together') and δεσμός ('bond') in Alexander's account of Stoic physics reflect Aristotelian rather than Stoic terminology. In fact, these terms do not occur in Aristotle's writings in this sort of physical or cosmological sense. The nearest one comes to this concept are several occurrences of the verb ἐνδῆν ('to bind in, on or to') in Aristotle's *De caelo* and one in his *Meteorologica*. In these writings, the verb ἐνδῆν ('to bind in, on or to') is used with regard to the sun (*De caelo* 289a), the stars which move with the circles to which they are bound (289b: τὰ δὲ ἄστρα ἡρεμεῖν καὶ ἐνδεδεμένα τοῖς κύκλοις φέρεσθαι), the circles which are bound to one and the same centre (289b), the planets bound in revolutions (292a), and the last sphere which moves with many others to which it is bound (293a: ἐν πολλαῖς γὰρ σφαῖραις ἢ τελευταία σφαῖρα ἐνδεδεμένη φέρεται). The fixed stars as opposed to the planets are designated as τὰ ἐνδεδεμένα ἄστρα (*De caelo* 290a, 296b; *Meteorologica* 346a).

In Alexander's account of Stoic physics, the cohesion of the cosmos is described by means of the terms συνδῆν ('to bind together') and δεσμός ('bond'). This idea of the cosmos' coherence as well as the terminology of 'binding together' and 'bonds,' is Stoic and not Aristotelian.

### (b) *The Old and Middle Stoa*

These reports on Stoic physics reflect Stoic physics as perceived by Alexander of Aphrodisias around 200 AD. But despite the fact that—in the passages quoted above—Alexander seems to comment on contemporary Stoic thought of the second century AD and hardly refers to the early Stoics, Von Arnim collected these passages under the name of Chrysippus (c. 280—207 BC) and regarded them as 'general Stoic teaching.'<sup>53</sup> It seems highly questionable, however, that the cosmological concept of bonds and binding phrased with the terms συνδῆν ('to bind together') and δεσμός ('bond') was already used by Chrysippus or elsewhere in the Old Stoa.

<sup>52</sup> The terminology at issue is also used by Stoics in their doctrine of causality operating within the cosmos. See Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De fato* 192.2—6: καὶ τοῦτω τῷ τρόπῳ συνδεομένων ἀλλήλοις ἀπάντων, καὶ μήτε οὕτως τινός ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένου, ὡς μὴ πάντως ἐπακολουθεῖν αὐτῷ καὶ συνῆφθαι ὡς αἰτίῳ ἕτερόν τι, μήτ' αὐ τῶν ἐπιγινόμενων τινός ἀπολελύσθαι δυναμένου τῶν προγεγονότων, ὡς μὴ τινι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖν ὡσπερ συνδεόμενον. For a detailed interpretation of *De fato* 191.26—193.2 (= *De fato* XXII), see Sharples 1983 (ed. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De fato*), pp. 152—154.

<sup>53</sup> See *SVF*, vol. 2, p. 13: 'Chrysippi placita cum generali Stoicorum doctrina composita.' For these passages from Alexander of Aphrodisias, see *SVF* 2.441 and 2.945.

This concept does not occur in such terms either in the fragments which can be attributed with certainty to Chrysippus, or in the fragments of the other representatives of the Old Stoa, Zeno and his pupils Aristo, Apollonphanes, Herillus, Dionysius of Heraclea, Persaeus of Citium, Cleanthes of Assos, Sphaerus of Borysthenes and others.<sup>54</sup>

It is possible, however, that an example of the use of δεσμός ('bond') in a physical sense among the Old Stoics occurs in Philo, *De aeternitate mundi* 117—149. In this passage, Philo draws extensively on Theophrastus (c. 371—287 BC), associate and successor of Aristotle and contemporary of Zeno (335—263 BC). Theophrastus is quoted for his outline and criticism of Stoic considerations concerning the destructibility of the cosmos.<sup>55</sup> One of these considerations is that the world is perishable since each part of the world, earth, water, air and fire, is liable to destruction.<sup>56</sup> The perishable nature of earth is demonstrated by the fact that even the strongest stones become damp and disintegrate through the decline in their cohesiveness. This cohesiveness is brought about by the all-pervasive πνεῦμα ('breath'). It is a bond (δεσμός) which is not unbreakable but merely hard to dissolve (*De aeternitate* 125).<sup>57</sup> In the passage quoted, the term δεσμός ('bond') clearly denotes a principle of physical coherence. The term might well derive not from Philo or Theophrastus, but from some early Stoic. If this is the case, however, it seems to be rather a one-off occurrence.

It is more likely that the term δεσμός ('bond') is due neither to a Stoic contemporary of Theophrastus nor to Theophrastus himself, who never uses this term in a cosmological sense.<sup>58</sup> Rather, it seems to have been employed by Philo in the process of drawing on matter from Theophrastus and paraphrasing it. This seems probable in light of Philo's repetitive use of the term 'bond' throughout his writings. Philo's frequent cosmological use of δεσμός (bond) will be discussed below. Moreover, as we shall see in due course, in *De aeternitate mundi* Philo had already introduced the concept of a cosmic bond (δεσμός) by quoting Plato's *Timaeus* (41A—B)

<sup>54</sup> For testimonia, see *SVF*, vol. 2, nos. 1—332 (Zeno) and nos. 333—631 (Zeno's pupils, most notably Cleanthes, nos. 463—619).

<sup>55</sup> Philo, *De aeternitate mundi* 117—149. Other text editions in Diels, *Doxographi graeci*, pp. 486—491, no. 12 as part of Theophrastus' physical doxography (pp. 473—495) or in Fortenbaugh, Huby, Sharples & Gutas 1992, vol. 1, pp. 342—355, no. 184. On Theophrastus' views on the cosmos, see Van Raalte 1988.

<sup>56</sup> Philo, *De aeternitate mundi* 124—129.

<sup>57</sup> Philo, *De aeternitate mundi* 125: λίθων οἱ κραταιότατοι ἄρ' οὐ μυδῶσι καὶ σήπονται <καὶ> κατὰ τὴν ἔξεωσ ἀσθένειαν-ἢ δ' ἐστὶ πνευματικὸς τόνος, δεσμός οὐκ ἄρρηκτος ἀλλὰ μόνον δυσδιάλυτος-.

<sup>58</sup> The only two occurrences of δεσμός in Theophrastus' material outside the passage preserved in Philo are non-cosmological (*Historia plantarum* 7.11.3 and *De causis plantarum* 2.18.2). Cf., however, Van Raalte 1988, pp. 192 and 210 n. 15.

as support for the view that the cosmos is indestructible (*De aeternitate* 13). In this quotation the term 'bond' is used with regard to the coherence and indestructibility of the world. It continues to bear this cosmological meaning in various places in Philo's treatise<sup>59</sup> before it is used in the same sense in the material Philo drew from Theophrastus (*De aeternitate* 125).<sup>60</sup> For these reasons, the use of the term δεσμός ('bond') in Theophrastus' account of Stoic cosmology as preserved by Philo is rather to be credited to the latter than to Theophrastus or some early Stoic.

In any case, the concept under consideration is certainly absent from the early Stoics already mentioned (Zeno, Zeno's pupils, and Chrysippus), and from the fragments which survive from Chrysippus' pupils and successors as well. The latter include Zeno of Tarsus, Diogenes of Babylon, Antipater of Tarsus, Apollodorus of Seleuceia, Archedemus of Tarsus, Boethus of Sidon, Basilides, Eudromus, and Crinis.<sup>61</sup> The so-called 'Middle Stoa,' represented by Panaetius (c. 185—109 BC) and his pupils Posidonius and Hecaton, does not show any acquaintance with the cosmological use of (σύν)δέϊν ('to bind together') and (σύν)δεσμός ('bond') either.

(c) *Stoicism of the later period: Cornutus, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, and the account of Stoic physics in Cicero's De natura deorum*

#### *Introduction. Cornutus*

It is, in fact, only from the first century BC onwards that there is evidence for the occurrence of the terms (σύν)δεσμός ('bond') and (σύν)δέϊν ('to bind together') in Stoic physics. In this section, I shall argue that these terms do not only occur in Greek writings of later Stoics such as Cornutus (1st cent. AD), Epictetus (mid-1st to 2nd cent. AD) and Marcus Aurelius (emperor AD 161—180); there is also evidence in Cicero (106—43 BC) that this terminology was used to describe Stoic physics as early as the first century BC.

That is not to say that the *notion* of cosmic binding was absent from the Old and Middle Stoa. As Lapidge has demonstrated, Chrysippus (c. 280—207 BC) was the first Stoic who applied the concept of an all-pervasive breath (πνεῦμα) in a cosmic sense and developed a theory of cosmic sym-

<sup>59</sup> See Philo, *De aeternitate* 30, 36, and 75.

<sup>60</sup> The term δεσμός is also used in a cosmological sense in *De aeternitate* 137 within the material derived from Theophrastus (*De aeternitate* 117—149). Here, however, it is not applied to describe the Stoic position, but figures instead in the criticism of the Stoic expectation of a future destruction of the cosmos. Again, it is hard to decide whether the term is due to Theophrastus or Philo, though the fact that Theophrastus does not use it in a cosmological meaning elsewhere suggests that Philo is responsible.

<sup>61</sup> Testimonia in *SVF*, vol. 3, pp. 209—269.

pathy according to which all parts of the cosmos are interconnected.<sup>62</sup> I doubt, however, whether Chrysippus also devised the metaphor of cosmic binding in terms of (σύν)δεσμός ('bond') and (συν)δεῖν ('to bind together'). The passages which Lapidge adduces in favour of this are derived from Alexander of Aphrodisias (fl. c. 200 AD) and Philo (first half of the first cent. AD) who do not attribute this terminology to Chrysippus. Rather they reflect general contemporary Stoicism.<sup>63</sup>

The terms at issue do not seem to have been applied in Stoic physics before the first centuries BC and AD. According to the Stoic philosopher Cornutus (1st cent. AD), Zeus binds the cosmos together (ἐπιδέειν), just as Aphrodite has the power to bind it together (συνδέειν) by her embroidered girdle (Homer, *Iliad* 14.214: κεστός ἱμάς).<sup>64</sup>

### *Epictetus*

A similar view of the universe as something bound together was held sometime between the mid-first and second century AD by the Stoic philosopher Epictetus. He came from Hierapolis in Phrygia. In *Col* 4.13, one of Paul's co-workers is said to have been very concerned about the Christians of Hierapolis, along with those of Colossae and Laodicea-Lycus.

In a discourse on divine providence and the physical unity of the cosmos, Epictetus argues that all things are united in one (*Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae* 1.14.1). What is on earth feels the influence of that which is in heaven (1.14.2). The plants run their regular seasonal cycle (1.14.3) and the things on earth undergo alteration and change concomitantly with the change of the heavenly bodies (1.14.4). According to Epictetus, the plants and the human bodies are bound up (ἐνδεῖν) with the universe and experience its influence (1.14.5),<sup>65</sup> while the souls are bound up

<sup>62</sup> Lapidge 1989, pp. 1383—1384; and Lapidge 1980, p. 818.

<sup>63</sup> Lapidge 1980, p. 818 note 10: *SVF* 2.441 (=Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De mixtione* 223.34 and 223.34—36; see texts in the section on Alexander of Aphrodisias above); *SVF* 2.458 (=Philo, *Quod deus immutabilis sit* 35) and *SVF* 2.719 (=Philo, *De fuga* 112; see texts in the section on Philo below). Cf. Lapidge 1989, p. 1384: *SVF* 2.719 and *SVF* 2.441.

<sup>64</sup> Cornutus, *Theologiae graecae compendium* 7, p. 8.3—6: ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου φύσις ἐπισχύσασα, ἦν δὴ Δία ἐλέγομεν καλεῖσθαι, τὸ λίαν φερόμενον τῆς μεταβολῆς ἐπέσχε καὶ ἐπέδησε μακροτέραν διεξαγωγὴν δοὺς αὐτῷ τῷ κόσμῳ; and *Theologiae graecae compendium* 24, p. 46.2—6: ὁ δὲ Κεστός ἱμάς [ὡς] οἶον κεκασμένος ἐστὶν ἢ διακεκεντημένος καὶ ποικίλος, δύναμιν ἔχων τοῦ συνδεῖν καὶ συσφίγγειν. καλεῖται δ' οὐρανία τε καὶ πάνδημος καὶ ποντία διὰ τὸ καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν γῆ καὶ ἐν θαλάττῃ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῆς θεωρεῖσθαι.

<sup>65</sup> Epictetus, *Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae* 1.14.5: ἄλλα τὰ φυτὰ μὲν καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα (...) ἐνδέδεται τοῖς ὀλοῖς καὶ συμπέπονθεν.



(ἐνδεῖν) and joined together with God as portions and particles of his being (1.14.6).<sup>66</sup>

Thus, according to Epictetus, earthly things such as plants and human bodies, are 'bound up' with the universe. He views the universe as something of which the parts are connected or 'linked up.'

### *Marcus Aurelius*

Epictetus' writings are known to have had an impact on the emperor Marcus Aurelius. In his meditations, Marcus Aurelius urges his readers to reflect on the concatenation (ἐπισύνδεσις) of all things in the universe and the relation between them. He opines that, in a way, all things are interwoven. They are placed in order by the all-pervasive energy resulting from the tension produced by breath (6.38).<sup>67</sup> The chain by which the universe is bound together is denoted here by the term ἐπισύνδεσις ('concatenation').<sup>68</sup> This concatenation is considered a holy bond (7.9: σύνδεσις ἱερά). Nothing within the cosmic chain is alien to any other part since all things are arranged harmoniously and contribute together to the arrangement of the cosmos (7.9).<sup>69</sup>

### *The account of Stoic physics in Cicero's De natura deorum*

The writings of the later Stoic philosophers like Cornutus, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius exhibit a clear interest in the physical terminology of ἐπιδεῖν, συνδεῖν, ἐνδεῖν ('to bind'), and of σύνδεσις and ἐπισύνδεσις

<sup>66</sup> Epictetus, *Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae* 1.14.6: ἀλλ' αἱ ψυχαὶ μὲν οὕτως εἰσὶν ἐνδεδεμέναι καὶ συναφεῖς τῷ θεῷ ἅτε αὐτοῦ μόρια οὔσαι καὶ ἀποσπάσματα.

<sup>67</sup> Marcus Aurelius, *Ad se ipsum* 6.38: Πολλάκις ἐνθυμοῦ τὴν ἐπισύνδεσιν πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ σχέσιν πρὸς ἀλλήλα. τρόπον γάρ τινα πάντα ἀλλήλοις ἐπιπέλεκται καὶ πάντα κατὰ τοῦτο φίλα ἀλλήλοις ἐστί· καὶ γὰρ ἄλλω <ἄλλο> ἐξῆς ἐστί ταῦτα διὰ τὴν τονικὴν κίνησιν καὶ σύμπνοιαν καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν τῆς οὐσίας. For a more detailed commentary on this passage, cf. Farquharson 1944 (ed. Aurelius, Marcus, *Ad se ipsum*), vol. 2, pp. 704—706.

<sup>68</sup> The term ἐπισύνδεσις is also used in Stoic views on causality, as Aetius' *Placita* (probably written at the end of the first century AD) attests. According to Aetius, fate is regarded by the Stoics as a train of causes, that is to say as an unalterable ordering and concatenation: οἱ Στωϊκοὶ εἰρμόν αἰτιῶν, τουτέστι τάξιν καὶ ἐπισύνδεσιν ἀπαράβατον (sc. τὴν εἰμαρμένην). See Aetius, *Placita* 1.28.4 (*SVF* 2.917; *LS* 55J). Cf. also Nemesius (fl. c. AD 400), *De natura hominis* 108.15—17 (chap. 37, p. 301 ed. Matthaëi 1802; *SVF* 2.918): ἡ δὲ εἰμαρμένη εἰρμός τις οὔσα αἰτιῶν [ἀπαράβατος] (οὕτω γὰρ αὐτὴν οἱ Στωϊκοὶ ὀρίζονται, τουτέστι τάξιν καὶ ἐπισύνδεσιν ἀπαράβατον).

<sup>69</sup> Marcus Aurelius, *Ad se ipsum* 7.9: Πάντα ἀλλήλοις ἐπιπέλεκται καὶ ἡ σύνδεσις ἱερά, καὶ σχεδόν τι οὐδὲν ἀλλότριον ἄλλο ἄλλω· συγκατατέτακται γὰρ καὶ συγκοσμεῖ τὸν αὐτὸν κόσμον. Detailed commentary in Farquharson 1944 (Aurelius, Marcus, *Ad se ipsum*), vol. 2, pp. 722—723.

(‘bond,’ ‘concatenation’).<sup>70</sup> It is true that some prominent representatives of later Stoicism like Musonius Rufus, Epictetus’ teacher, and Hierocles do not show any acquaintance with this terminology, at least as far as we can tell from their extant works. Yet, Cornutus, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius show that later Stoics used the terms at issue and that this terminology does not only occur in the description of Stoic physics by opponents like Alexander of Aphrodisias. How the Stoics of the later period came to use this terminology may be explained on the basis of Cicero. In the second book of his *De natura deorum*, Cicero reports on the Stoic position.

In Stoic opinion as presented by Cicero, the nature of the world is joined together in uninterrupted succession by means of the reciprocal influence which the four elements aether, air, water, and earth exert on each other. The union (‘coniunctio’) by which the various parts of the world are kept together results from the continuous interchange between these four elements of which all things are composed (*De natura deorum* 2.84).<sup>71</sup> In disagreement with certain contemporary views, the Stoics assert that this coherence of the parts of the universe is due to divine providence.<sup>72</sup>

The physical concept of binding comes into view even more clearly when Balbus, the representative of the Stoic school in Cicero’s *De natura deorum*, speaks about the stability and coherence of the world. He argues

---

<sup>70</sup> In the first century AD, there is also evidence of a cosmological interpretation of the Homeric phrase δεσμὸς χρύσεος (‘golden bond’) among Stoic philosophers like Heraclitus. Heraclitus allegorizes the description of how Hera was punished by Zeus by being suspended on a golden chain (δεσμὸς χρύσεος) from on high (Homer, *Iliad* 15.18—21), explaining it in terms of cosmological theory (Heraclitus, *Quaestiones homericae* 40, pp. 59.4—61.5). On the cosmological interpretation of this passage in Homer, see Buffière 1956, pp. 115—117; Pépin 1958, pp. 160—162; and Lévêque 1959, pp. 27—28. This interpretation is comparable to the cosmological exegesis of the golden rope (σειρῆ χρυσεῖη) by which, according to Homer, the totality of earth, sea and gods could be pulled up by Zeus (*Iliad* 8.17—27). On the cosmological interpretation of this passage, see Lévêque 1959, chap. 1, pp. 13—30. In the *Orphic Poems*, for instance, the golden cord (σειρῆ χρυσεῖη), which is also called a bond (δεσμὸς), is thought to unify the contents of the cosmos (*Orphic Poems* 166; for commentary, see Lévêque 1959, pp. 13—15 and West 1983, pp. 237—239; date: 1st cent. BC, according to West 1983, pp. 246—251).

<sup>71</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.84: ‘Sic naturis his ex quibus omnia constant suorsus deorsus ultro citro commeantibus mundi partium coniunctio continetur.’

<sup>72</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.87: ‘Quodsi omnes mundi partes ita constitutae sunt ut neque ad usum meliores potuerint esse neque ad speciem pulciores, videamus utrum ea fortuitane sint an eo statu quo cohaerere nullo modo potuerint nisi sensu moderante divinae providentia.’ Cf., e.g., the Academic criticism of this view in 3.28: ‘illud non probabam, quod negabas id accidere potuisse nisi ea uno divino spiritu contineretur. Illa vero cohaeret et permanet naturae viribus, non deorum.’

that bodies remain unified most permanently when they are encompassed by some bond ('vinculum') which draws them together (*De natura deorum* 2.115). This function of binding is performed by that substance which extends itself pervasively throughout the whole world and, bringing all things about in a rational and intelligent manner, draws and turns the outermost parts of the universe towards the centre (2.115).<sup>73</sup> Apart from the interchange between the elements, and the binding activity of the all-pervasive substance, lastly the revolutions of the heavenly bodies are also said to contribute to the coherence of the world (2.155).<sup>74</sup>

In Cicero's report on Stoic physics, the term 'vinculum' ('bond') is of particular interest as it is the Latin rendering of δεσμός ('bond'). No reference to authorities of the Old and Middle Stoa is made, however. This seems to suggest that the physical concept of binding in terms of a 'bond' (δεσμός/'vinculum') is only applied in the exposition of Stoic doctrine from the first century BC onwards.

One particular passage, though, seems to contradict this conclusion. *De natura deorum* 2.63—74 is part of a discussion of the divine nature (2.45—72). Here, Cicero delineates the Stoic conviction that the gods of popular worship are in reality personified forces of nature. This conviction, which is meant to be a kind of scientific theory, is attributed to Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus. According to Cicero, they believed that the forces of nature had been taken to be gods, and these gods, in human shape, had been made the protagonists of fables.<sup>75</sup> An example of these fables is the legend that Saturn was thrown into bondage by his son Jupiter.<sup>76</sup> According to Stoic interpretation, Saturn stands for that being who holds together the course and periodical return of the seasons and spaces of time.<sup>77</sup> Saturn was bound by Jupiter in order to prevent time from running immeasurable courses. To prevent this, Saturn was restrained by the

---

<sup>73</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.115 (*SVF* 2.549): 'Maxime autem corpora inter se iuncta permanent cum quasi quodam vinculo circumdato colligantur; quod facit ea natura quae per omnem mundum omnia mente et ratione conficiens funditur et ad medium rapit et convertit extrema.'

<sup>74</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.155: 'Iam vero circumitus solis et lunae reliquorumque siderum (...) ad mundi cohaerentiam pertinent.'

<sup>75</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.63: 'Alia quoque ex ratione et quidem physica magna fluxit multitudo deorum qui induti specie humana fabulas poetis suppeditaverunt, hominum autem vitam superstitione omni refererunt. Atque hic locus a Zenone tractatus post a Cleanthe et Chrysippo pluribus verbis explicatus est.'

<sup>76</sup> *Ibidem*, 2.63—64: 'Nam cum vetus haec opinio Graeciam oplevisset, exsectum caelum a filio Saturno, vinctum autem Saturnum ipsum a filio Iove, physica ratio non inelegans inclusa est in impiis fabulas.'

<sup>77</sup> *Ibidem*, 2.64: 'Saturnum autem eum esse voluerunt qui cursum et conversionem spatiorum ac temporum contineret.'

bonds of the stars (2.64).<sup>78</sup> But in this passage the terminology of bonds ('vinculum'), though attributed explicitly to the Old Stoa, does not reflect Stoic vocabulary. The terminology was already given in the contents of the popular legend according to which Saturn is thrown into bondage. Therefore, it does not indicate the currency of the physical concept of bonds in the Old Stoa.

This concept seems to emerge only gradually in Stoic doctrine from the first century BC onwards. Cicero's *De natura deorum*, composed in 45 BC, bears witness to this development. At the same time, his book might reveal the actual historical provenance of the physical terminology of cosmic bonds which hold the body of the universe together, as we will see presently.

(d) *Cicero and the Timaeus of Plato*

Balbus' view in *De natura deorum* that bodies remain unified most permanently when they are encompassed by a bond which binds them together<sup>79</sup> is likely to derive from Plato's *Timaeus*. In this dialogue, Plato develops the notion that the body of the cosmos (*Timaeus* 31B—32C) as well as the bodies of the stars (*Timaeus* 38E—39A) have been securely bound together by bonds. Cicero was very well acquainted with the contents of this work, the only Platonic writing exclusively devoted to physics, since he translated it in the period immediately preceding the composition of his *De natura deorum* in 45 BC.<sup>80</sup> Cicero's translation of the *Timaeus* formed part of an unfinished dialogue on physics. The (fictitious) dramatic setting of this dialogue is Ephesus in 51 BC, when Cicero travelled to Cilicia to take up his post of proconsul. Cicero claims to have met

---

<sup>78</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.64: 'vinctus autem a Iove ne [aetas] inmoderatos cursus haberet atque ut eum siderum vinculis alligaret.'

<sup>79</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.115: 'Maxime autem corpora inter se iuncta permanent cum quasi quodam vinculo circumdato colligantur.'

<sup>80</sup> For various aspects of Cicero's paraphrase of the *Timaeus*, see Giomini 1975 (ed. Cicero, *Timaeus*), pp. X—XVII (dating); Baltes 1976, vol. 1, pp. 28—30 (debate about the eternity of the cosmos); Puelma 1980 (Cicero's *Timaeus* as dialogue, esp. pp. 151—154, and Cicero's translation technique); and Powell 1995 (Cicero's translations from Greek, esp. pp. 279, 280—281, 287—288 and 291 on the *Timaeus*). Cf. also MacKendrick 1989, p. 339 note 8 (general introduction). On Cicero's relation to Plato, see: Dörrie 1987, nos. 25—31: 'Ciceros Verhältnis zu Platon,' pp. 212—258 (texts and translations) and 483—543 (commentary); and Long 1995, esp. 2nd section, pp. 43—50 on Cicero's Plato. On *Timaeus* commentaries in antiquity, see: Dörrie & Baltes 1993, no. 81: 'Die Kommentare zum Timaios,' pp. 48—55 (texts and translations) and pp. 162—171 and 209—226 (commentary). For the understanding of Plato's physics in antiquity, see: Dörrie & Baltes 1996—1998.

on that occasion the participants in the dialogue, the Neopythagorean P. Nigidius Figulus and the Peripatetic Cratippus.<sup>81</sup>

According to Plato, fire and earth were the elements God started with to construct the body (σῶμα) of the universe (*Timaeus* 31B). But since it is impossible for two things alone to be combined thoroughly, these elements required some intermediary bond (δεσμός) to connect them, a bond (δεσμός) which would unite into one both itself and the things it had to bind together (τὰ συνδούμενα; 31B—C).<sup>82</sup> In Cicero's translation the term δεσμός ('bond') is rendered by 'vinculum'.<sup>83</sup> One medium, however, does not suffice to bind together (συνδέϊν) both itself and the two elements because the body of the universe does not come into being as a two-dimensional, plane surface but needs depth as well (32A—B).<sup>84</sup> That being the case, God set two mediums, water and air, in the midst between fire and earth, and having conferred upon these four elements a like ratio in their relationship towards each other he bound together (συνδέϊν) and erected a visible and tangible universe (32B).<sup>85</sup> For these reasons the body of the cosmos was brought into existence out of the materials mentioned, so disposed towards each other and, being four in number, co-ordinated by mathematical proportion, that the cosmos enjoyed harmony and, being fused into one, became indissoluble except to God who had bound this body together (συνδέϊν; 32B—C).<sup>86</sup>

<sup>81</sup> Cicero, *Timaeus* 1.1—2 (ed. Giomini, pp. 177.1—178.2).

<sup>82</sup> Plato, *Timaeus* 31B—C: δύο δὲ μόνω καλῶς συνίστασθαι τρίτου χωρὶς οὐ δυνατόν· δεσμόν γάρ ἐν μέσῳ δεῖ τινα ἀμφοῖν συναγωγὸν γίγνεσθαι. δεσμῶν δὲ κάλλιστος ὅς ἂν αὐτόν καὶ τὰ συνδούμενα ὅτι μάλιστα ἐν ποιῇ.

<sup>83</sup> Cicero, *Timaeus* 4.13 (ed. Giomini, p. 186.21—25): 'omnia autem duo ad cohaerendum tertium aliquid acquirunt et quasi nodum *vinculumque* desiderant. sed *vinculorum* id est aptissimum atque pulcherrimum, quod ex se atque de iis quae stringit, quam maxime unum efficit.'

<sup>84</sup> Plato, *Timaeus* 32A—B: εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐπίπεδον μὲν, βάθος δὲ μὴδὲν ἔχον ἔδει γίγνεσθαι τὸ τοῦ παντός σῶμα (=universi corpus), μία μεσότης ἂν ἐξήρκει τὰ τε μεθ' αὐτῆς συνδέϊν (=colligere) καὶ ἑαυτήν. Cf. Cicero, *Timaeus* 5.14 (ed. Giomini, p. 188.9—12): 'quod si universi *corpus* planum et aequabile explicaretur, nihil in eo quicquam <crassitudinis> esset requisitum; unum enim interiectum medium et se ipsum et ea, quibus esset interpositum, *conligaret*.'

<sup>85</sup> Plato, *Timaeus* 32B: οὕτω δὴ πυρός τε καὶ γῆς ὕδωρ ἀέρα τε ὁ θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ θεῖς, καὶ πρὸς ἄλληλα καθ' ὅσον ἦν δυνατόν ἀνά τὸν αὐτόν λόγον ἀπεργασάμενος (...), συνέδησεν καὶ συνεστήσατο οὐρανὸν ὄρατόν καὶ ἀπτόν (=qua ex *coniunctione* caelum ita aptum est, ut sub aspectum et tactum cadat); Cicero, *Timaeus* 5.15 (ed. Giomini, p. 190.1—3).

<sup>86</sup> Plato, *Timaeus* 32B—C: καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐκ τε δὴ τούτων τοιούτων καὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τεττάρων τὸ τοῦ κόσμου σῶμα (= mundi corpus) ἐγεννήθη δι' ἀναλογίας ὁμολογήσαν, φιλίαν τε ἔσχεν ἐκ τούτων, ὥστε εἰς ταῦτόν αὐτῷ συνελθὼν ἄλυτον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄλλου πλήν ὑπὸ τοῦ συνδήσαντος γενέσθαι (=nisi ab eodem, a quo est *conligatus*). Cf. Cicero, *Timaeus* 5.15 (ed. Giomini, p. 190.3—8): 'itaque et ob eam causam et ex iis rebus numero

Not only the body of the cosmos is thought of as being bound together with bonds; the cohesiveness of the bodies of the sun, moon and planets is expressed in the same way. These bodies, which are needed to help in producing time, have been generated as living creatures, their bodies bound with living bonds (δεσμοῖς τε ἐμψύχοις σώματα δεθέντα). Having come into their proper orbits and learned the order given to them, they remain revolving within the circuit of the planets (the 'circuit of the Other'), which is transverse and passes through the circuit of the fixed stars with their regular movements (the 'circuit of the Same') and is dominated by it (38E—39A).<sup>87</sup> The phrase δεσμοῖς τε ἐμψύχοις σώματα δεθέντα ('bodies bound with living bonds') is rendered into Latin as 'conligatisque corporibus vinculis animalibus'.<sup>88</sup>

It is clear from these passages that Cicero's notion of bodies which maintain their union most permanently when they have some enclosing bond ('vinculum') to bind them together,<sup>89</sup> a notion he uses to illustrate the Stoic doctrine of the stability and coherence of the cosmos (*De natura deorum* 2.115), can be traced to his translation of Plato's *Timaeus*.

Cicero's use of Plato's notion of cohesion in the cosmos is an instance of the rapprochement between Stoa and Platonism which took place from the end of the second century BC onwards. From then on, various doctrines from Plato's *Timaeus* were incorporated into the systems of later

---

quattuor mundi est *corpus* effectum, ea constrictum comparatione, qua dixi; ex quo ipse se concordia quadam amicitia et caritate complectitur atque ita apte cohaeret, ut dissolvi nullo modo queat nisi ab eodem, a quo est *conligatus*.'

<sup>87</sup> Plato, *Timaeus* 38E—39A: ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὖν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῷ πρόπουσαν ἕκαστον ἀφίκετο φορὰν τῶν ὅσα ἔδει συναπεργάζεσθαι χρόνον, δεσμοῖς τε ἐμψύχοις σώματα δεθέντα ζῶα ἐγεννήθη τό τε προσταχθέν ἐμαθεν, κατὰ δὴ τὴν θατέρου φορὰν πλαγίαν οὖσαν, διὰ τῆς ταύτου φορᾶς ἰούσης τε καὶ κρατουμένης. The binding of the bodies of the stars with bonds is later also referred to in *Timaeus* 41A—B (τό μὲν οὖν δὴ δεθὲν πᾶν λυτόν, τό γε μὴν καλῶς ἄρμωσθὲν καὶ ἔχον εὖ λυεῖν ἐθέλειν κακοῦ δι' ἃ καὶ ἐπεὶ περ γεγέννησθε, ἀθάνατοι μὲν οὐκ ἐστὲ οὐδ' ἄλυτοι τὸ πάμπαν, οὐτι μὲν δὴ λυθήσεσθε γε οὐδὲ τεύξεσθε θανάτου μοίρας, τῆς ἐμῆς βουλήσεως μείζονος ἔτι δεσμοῦ καὶ κυριωτέρου λαχόντες ἐκείνων οἷς ὅτ' ἐγένεσθε συνεδείσθε) and 43A (οὐ τοῖς ἄλυτοις οἷς αὐτοὶ συνεῖχοντο δεσμοῖς, ἀλλὰ διὰ σμικρότητα ἀοράτοις πυκνοῖς γόμοις συντήκοντες).

<sup>88</sup> Cicero, *Timaeus* 9.30 (ed. Giomini, pp. 204.13—206.2): 'Quando igitur sibi quidque eorum siderum cursum decorum est adeptum, ex quibus erat motus temporis consignandus, *conligatisque corporibus vinculis animalibus* cum animantia orta sunt eaque imperio parere didicerunt, tunc ex alterius naturae motione transversa in eiusdem naturae motum incurrentia in eaque haerentia atque impedita.'

<sup>89</sup> Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.115: 'Maxime autem corpora inter se iuncta permanent eum quasi quodum vinculo circumdato colligantur.'

Stoics such as Panaetius and Cicero's teacher Posidonius.<sup>90</sup> Cicero's *De natura deorum*, thus, contains the oldest datable importation of Plato's physical concept of a bond (δεσμός) into an exposition of Stoic doctrine.<sup>91</sup> The passages from Cornutus, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, and Alexander of Aphrodisias discussed above demonstrate that this Platonic concept continued to be applied in Stoic physical thought throughout the first and second century AD.

(e) *Plato and Middle Platonism: Timaeus of Locri, Philo, Plutarch, Alcinoous, Apuleius, Numenius, and the account of Plato's physics in Diogenes Laertius*

### Plato's Timaeus

The concept of bonds which hold the cosmos together appears, ultimately, to go back to Plato's *Timaeus*, which is thus the origin of the tradition behind the imagery of bonds in *Col* 2.19.<sup>92</sup> Plato regards the elements of the

<sup>90</sup> On the use made of Plato's *Timaeus* in the later Stoa, see Runia 1986, pp. 45—49 and 480—481. On Panaetius' and Posidonius' positive attitude towards Plato, see Frede 1999b, pp. 777—778, 782—785 and 787.

<sup>91</sup> Lapidge's insistence that it 'is important at the outset to distinguish between the sort of cosmic binding described in Stoic sources and that described by Plato, *Timaeus* 31b—32c' (Lapidge 1980, pp. 818—819 note 11) should not have led him to deny the Platonic provenance of the terms (σύν)δεσμός ('bond') and (συν)δεῖν ('to bind together') in Stoic physics.

<sup>92</sup> In Pre-Socratic philosophy, there is only some limited evidence of a cosmological use of δεσμός and δεῖν. In the first half of the 5th cent. BC, Parmenides argues that it is impossible for 'what is' (τὸ εἶν) to come into being or to be destroyed, so that 'what is' remains immovable within the limits of great bonds (δεσμοί): αὐτὰρ ἀκίνητον μεγάλων ἐν πείρασι δεσμῶν | ἔστιν ἀναρχον ἄπαστον (Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria*, p. 145.27—28; =Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, p. 237: Parmenides, no. B 28, fragm. 8.26—27; =KRS, no. 298.26—27). A mighty necessity holds 'what is' within the bonds (δεσμοί) of a limit which encloses it round about: κρατερὴ γὰρ Ἀνάγκη | πείρατος ἐν δεσμοῖσιν ἔχει, τὸ μιν ἀμφὶς ἐέργει (Simplicius, p. 146.3—4; =Diels-Kranz, vol. 1, p. 237: fragm. 8.30—31; =KRS, no. 298.30—31). According to Parmenides, there neither is nor will be anything else besides 'what is' since fate bound it up (ἐπιδεῖν) to be whole and unalterable: οὐδὲν γὰρ <ἦ> ἔστιν ἢ ἔσται | ἄλλο πάρεξ τοῦ εἶντος, ἐπεὶ τὸ γε Μοῖρ' ἐπέδησεν | οὐλον ἀκίνητόν τ' ἔμειναι (Simplicius, p. 146.9—11; =Diels-Kranz, vol. 1, p. 238: fragm. 8.36—38; =KRS, no. 299.36—38). In the same century, as Plutarch reports, Archelaus, a pupil of Anaxagoras and teacher of Socrates, thinks that coldness is a bond (δεσμός) which renders the earth unalterable and unchangeable, since nothing can loosen it and make it soft, seeing that this would happen if the earth were subject to heating and warming: ἡ ψυχρότης δεσμός ἐστιν, ὡς Ἀρχέλαος ὁ φυσικός εἶπεν, οὐδενὸς χαλῶντος αὐτὴν οὐδὲ μαλάττοντος, ἅτε θερομένην καὶ ἀλεινομένην † οὐσαν (Plutarch, *De primo frigido* 954F; =Diels-Kranz, vol. 2, p. 48: Archelaos, no. B 60, p. 48.19—21). Lastly, according to Aetius, Empedocles (c. 492—432 BC) says that the fixed stars have been bound together (συνδεῖν) by ice

body of the universe as being bound together with bonds (*Timaeus* 31B—32C) and the bodies of the planets also as bound with bonds (38E—39A).

This physical concept of binding extends even further since the circuit of the Other, around which the planets revolve, and the circuit of the Same, through which the former circuit passes (38E—39A), are considered to have been bound together as well. According to Plato, these two circuits emerged during the construction of the soul of the cosmos preceding the composition of its body (34B—36D). This construction of the soul took place over three distinct phases. In the first phase, the soul was compounded as a blend of the Same and the Other (35A). Subsequently, this mixture was cut into portions which were re-arranged in successions of mathematical intervals which function as bonds (δεσμοί) lending the structure cohesion (35B—36B).<sup>93</sup> Lastly, this whole structure was split into two parts lengthwise, laid down like a cross while each of these parts was bent into a circle and bound fast, both to itself and to the other (36B—C).<sup>94</sup> These two circles were made into the outer circuit of the Same and the inner circuit of the Other. The latter was split into seven circles which would accommodate the bodies of the planets (36C—D), and is held together by συνδέσεις ('binding links;' 43D).<sup>95</sup> In this way, prior to the fabrication of the body of the cosmos within it (36D—E), the soul of the cosmos came about as a mixture of the natures of the Same and the Other and Being, which were then proportionately divided and bound together (συνδεῖν; 37A).<sup>96</sup>

Not only the elements of the body of the universe and the bodies of the planets, thus, are said to be bound together with bonds; everything corporeal belonging to the universe appears to have been fabricated within, and united with, the two circuits of the soul of the cosmos. These circuits are

---

whereas the planets are unfastened: 'Ἐμπεδοκλῆς τοὺς μὲν ἀπλανεῖς ἀστέρας συνδεδέσθαι τῷ κρυστάλλῳ, τοὺς δὲ πλανήτας ἀνεῖσθαι (Diels-Kranz, vol. 1: *Empedokles*, no. A 54, p. 293.26—27; =Aetius, *Placita* 2.13.11, ed. Diels, *Doxographi graeci*, p. 342). Though not absent, the use of the terminology of bond (δεσμός) and binding (δεῖν) in a cosmological sense is rather sparse in Pre-Socratic philosophy.

<sup>93</sup> For the term δεσμός, see *Timaeus* 36A—B: ἡμιολίων δὲ διαστάσεων καὶ ἐπιτρίτων καὶ ἐπογδῶν γενομένων ἐκ τούτων τῶν δεσμών ἐν ταῖς πρόσθεν διαστάσεσιν, τῷ τοῦ ἐπογδῶου διαστήματι τὰ ἐπίτριτα πάντα συνεπληροῦτο.

<sup>94</sup> Plato, *Timaeus* 36B—C: ταύτην οὖν τὴν σύστασιν πᾶσαν διπλὴν κατὰ μῆκος σχίσας, μέσην πρὸς μέσην ἑκατέραν ἀλλήλαις οἷον χεῖ προσβαλὼν κατέκαμψεν εἰς ἓν κύκλῳ, συνάψας αὐταῖς τε καὶ ἀλλήλαις ἐν τῷ καταντικρῷ τῆς προσβολῆς.

<sup>95</sup> See *Timaeus* 43D: τὴν δ' αὖ θατέρου διέσεισαν, ὥστε τὰς τοῦ διπλασίου καὶ τριπλασίου τρεῖς ἑκατέρας ἀποστάσεις καὶ τὰς τῶν ἡμιολίων καὶ ἐπιτρίτων καὶ ἐπογδῶν μεσότητος καὶ συνδέσεις, ἐπειδὴ παντελῶς λυταὶ οὐκ ἦσαν πλὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ συνδήσαντος, πάσας μὲν στρέψαι στροφάς.

<sup>96</sup> Plato, *Timaeus* 37A: ἐκ τῆς ταυτοῦ καὶ τῆς θατέρου φύσεως ἐκ τε οὐσίας τριῶν τούτων συγκεραθεῖσα μοιρῶν, καὶ ἀνά λόγον μερισθεῖσα καὶ συνθεθεῖσα.



bound fast, each within itself and also with the other. The comprehensive physical concept of binding is characteristic of Plato's *Timaeus*. The concept does not occur elsewhere in Plato's writings apart from a passage in the last book of the *Respublica*. There reference is made to the bonds (δεσμοί) of a light which stretch from heaven. This light is the bond (συνδεσμος) of the heavens. Like the ropes used to strengthen the hull of a trireme, it holds together the entire revolving vault (*Respublica* 616C).<sup>97</sup>

### *The Middle Platonists*

The so-called 'Middle Platonists' from the first century BC onwards remained familiar with the physical-cosmological concept of binding of the *Timaeus*. This is clear from their works. It is either via the Platonizing Stoic tradition dealt with above, or directly via the Platonic tradition that the author of *Col* became acquainted with the imagery of bonds holding together the cosmos. I will now discuss the latter tradition. It can be traced in the works of Timaeus of Locri, Philo, Plutarch, Alcinoüs, Apuleius, Numenius, and Diogenes Laertius.

### *Timaeus of Locri*

Probably in the late first century BC or the first century AD, a cosmological treatise entitled *De natura mundi et animae* appeared under the name of Timaeus of Locri, the main locutor in Plato's *Timaeus*, and purporting to be the original on which Plato's *Timaeus* depends.<sup>98</sup> In fact, however, it is a paraphrase of the *Timaeus*. The argument presented in *Timaeus* 31B—32C that the elements earth and fire are bound together with air and water by means of the powerful bond of proportion is recapitulated in this paraphrase (Timaeus of Locri, 39—41 [217.5—14]).<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> Plato, *Respublica* 616C: καὶ ἰδεῖν αὐτόθι κατὰ μέσον τὸ φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰ ἄκρα αὐτοῦ τῶν δεσμών τεταμένα-εἶναι γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ φῶς σύνδεσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οἷον τὰ ὑποζώματα τῶν τριήρων, οὕτω πᾶσαν συνέχον τὴν περιφορὰν. In the reproach in Plato's *Phaedo* levelled at those who do not have the good in mind, which must bind and hold together all things: καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ δεόν συνδεῖν καὶ συνέχειν οὐδὲν οἴονται (*Phaedo* 99C), the notion of binding might also be physical. But the case is debatable. The notion of one bond naturally uniting diagrams, systems of number, combinations of harmony and the revolution of the stars is certainly a physical concept in Pseudo-Plato's *Epinomis*: δεσμός γὰρ πεφυκῶς πάντων τούτων εἰς ἀναφανήσεται διανοουμένοις (*Epinomis* 991E—992A).

<sup>98</sup> For a commentary on the text, see Baltes 1972.

<sup>99</sup> Timaeus of Locri, *De natura mundi et animae* 39—41 (p. 217.5—14): δι' ἀέρος δὲ καὶ ὕδατος συνεδέσαστο δεσμῶ κρατίστω, ἀναλογία, ἃ καὶ αὐτὰν καὶ τὰ δι' αὐτὰς κρατεώμενα συνέχεν δύναται. εἰ μὲν ὦν ἐπίπεδον εἴη τὸ συνδεόμενον, μία μεσόταξ ἱκανὰ ἔστιν· εἰ δὲ κα στερεόν, δύο χρήσει. (...) εἰς μὲν ὦν ὅδε ὁ κόσμος δαιμονίῳ δεσμῶ τῷ ἀνὰ λόγον ἔστιν. Cf. the commentary in Baltes 1972, pp. 126—129.

*Philo of Alexandria*

Close acquaintance with Plato's *Timaeus* is attested in the works of Philo of Alexandria (first half of the first cent. AD). He is reckoned among the Middle Platonists.<sup>100</sup> In Philo's view, it is important to examine the various parts of the cosmos which, although they are separated from each other in the positions which they occupy, are nevertheless made one by the powers which govern them. The parts are unified by the invisible bond (δεσμός) of harmony and unity (*De migratione* 220).<sup>101</sup> This bond is operative in the smallest parts of the universe. It is even effective as a bond of cohesion in some of the lifeless components of the universe, such as stones and wood. These remain intact because they are held together by the bond of cohesion.<sup>102</sup>

The bond (δεσμός) of all things is God. He holds all things together indissolubly and binds them fast, whereas in themselves they are dissoluble (*Quis rer. div. heres* 23).<sup>103</sup> God is ubiquitous, for he extended his powers over earth and water, air, and heaven. He left no part of the universe destitute of himself. Thus, bringing all together with all, God tied everything fast with invisible bonds (δεσμοί), so that the cosmos would never be loosened (*De confusione* 136).<sup>104</sup>

The function of binding Philo also accords more specifically to God's word (λόγος). God constituted his word as an unbreakable bond (δεσμός) which stations itself as a boundary between the elements earth, water, fire, and air. These threaten to destroy one another. The word positions itself between them like a vowel between consonants. As a result, the universe produces a harmonious sound just as a skillful piece of literature does (*De plantatione* 10).<sup>105</sup>

<sup>100</sup> Dillon 1996a, pp. 139—183 and 438—441.

<sup>101</sup> Philo, *De migratione* 220: και διάσκεπαι τὰ μέρη, ὡς τόποις μὲν διέξευκται, δυνάμει δὲ ἦνωται, και τίς ὁ ἀόρατος οὗτος τῆς ἁρμονίας και ἐνώσεως πᾶσι δεσμός.

<sup>102</sup> See Philo, *Quis rerum divinarum heres* 137, and *Quod deus immutabilis sit* 35 (=SVF 2.458). Cf. also the binding force of sweet water (as distinguished from salt water) by which the earth is bound and held together (*De opificio mundi* 131).

<sup>103</sup> Philo, *Quis rer. div. heres* 23: τῶν ὄλων δεσμός ἐστι συνέχων αὐτὰ ἅλυτα και σφίγγων διαλυτὰ ὄντα ἐξ ἑαυτῶν.

<sup>104</sup> Philo, *De confusione* 136: πανταχοῦ δέ, ὅτι τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ δια γῆς και ὕδατος ἀέρος τε και οὐρανοῦ τείνας μέρος οὐδὲν ἐρημον ἀπολέλοιπε τοῦ κόσμου, πάντα δὲ συναγαγὼν δια πάντων ἀοράτοις ἐσφιγξε δεσμοίς, ἵνα μή ποτε λυθείη.

<sup>105</sup> Philo, *De plantatione* 10: δεσμόν γάρ αὐτὸν ἀρρηκτον τοῦ παντός ὁ γεννήσας ἐποίησε πατήρ. εἰκότως οὖν οὐδὲ γῆ πᾶσα διαλυθήσεται πρὸς παντός ὕδατος, ὅπερ αὐτῆς οἱ κόλποι κεχωρήκασιν, οὐδ' ὑπὸ ἀέρος σβεσθήσεται πῦρ, οὐδ' ἔμπαλιν ὑπὸ πυρός ἀήρ ἀναφλεχθήσεται, τοῦ θείου λόγου μεθόριον τάττοντος αὐτὸν καθάπερ φωνήεντα στοιχείων ἀφώνων, ἵνα τὸ ὄλον ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐγγραμμάτου φωνῆς συνηχησῆ.

The function of binding is accorded to God's λόγος ('word') in several other passages in Philo's works. The divine word, which clothes itself in the world by being enwrapped by the elements and all that is constituted from these (*De fuga* 110), is the bond (δεσμός) of all things and holds and ties all their parts together, preventing them from dissolution and separation (*De fuga* 112).<sup>106</sup> Things which in themselves are without coherence are bound fast by the divine λόγος ('word'), which is a glue and bond (δεσμός), filling up all things with its being (*Quis rer. div. heres* 188).<sup>107</sup> The elements earth and water in the midst of air and fire are not firmly fixed by anything at all but have been bound together by the λόγος (*Quaestiones in Exodum* 2.90; *SVF* 2.548). It is the strongest and most stable bond of all things, binding and weaving together the various parts of the universe and their opposites (*Quaestiones in Exodum* 2.118).<sup>108</sup>

In *Timaeus* 41A Plato states that whoever wishes to dissolve what was well bound must be wicked, and that God wished the cosmological bonds to be indissoluble. These ideas are alluded to in several of Philo's writings (*De confusione* 166; *Quis rer. div. heres* 246), once with mention of the *Timaeus* and extensive quotation of the passage in question (*De aeternitate* 13).<sup>109</sup> In *De migratione Abrahami* the Platonic view at issue is even credited to Moses, who teaches that this universe is held together by invisible powers. These the creator extended from the ends of the earth to the boundaries of heaven, taking care that what was well bound (τὰ δεθέντα) should not be dissolved. The powers of the universe are bonds (δεσμοί) that cannot be broken (*De migratione* 181).<sup>110</sup>

### Plutarch

The works of Plutarch (c. 50—120 AD) are no less saturated with the contents of the *Timaeus* than are those of Philo. The various aspects of the

<sup>106</sup> Philo, *De fuga* 112 (*SVF* 2.719): ὁ τε γὰρ τοῦ ὄντος λόγος δεσμός ὦν τῶν ἀπάντων (...) καὶ συνέχει τὰ μέρη πάντα καὶ σφίγγει κωλύων αὐτὰ διαλύεσθαι καὶ διαρτᾶσθαι.

<sup>107</sup> Philo, *Quis rer. div. heres* 188: κόλλα γὰρ καὶ δεσμός οὗτος πάντα τῆς οὐσίας ἐκπεπληρωκώς.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. also *Quaestiones in Exodum* 2.74 and 2.89.

<sup>109</sup> In *De aeternitate mundi* Philo uses the term δεσμός also to delineate Aristotelian and Stoic views on cosmic cohesion. See resp. *De aeternitate* 36, 75 and 137 (Aristotelian view), and 125 (Stoic view; *SVF* 1.106). On Philo's *De aeternitate mundi*, see Runia 1981.

<sup>110</sup> Philo, *De migratione* 181: ἀλλὰ συνέχεσθαι μὲν τόδε τὸ πᾶν ἀοράτοις δυνάμεσιν, ἄς ἀπὸ γῆς ἐσχάτων ἄχρις οὐρανοῦ περάτων ὁ δημιουργὸς ἀπέτεινε, τοῦ μὴ ἀνεθῆναι τὰ δεθέντα καλῶς προμηθεύμενος· δεσμοὶ γὰρ αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ παντός ἀρρηκτοί. On the concept of binding in Philo's writings, cf. Runia 1986, pp. 238—241.

physical concept of binding distinguished in Plato are discussed again by Plutarch.

Firstly, the elements of the body of the universe are described as bound together with bonds as in *Timaeus* 31B—32C. According to Plutarch, it took not one proportion but two to bind together the universe. Therefore, water and air were put between fire and earth. Thus composed, the cosmos became indissoluble except to God who had bound it together (*De animae procreatione* 1016F—1017A). God gave form to the matter of the body of the cosmos after that matter had presented itself to him, and fitted it together by binding (δεῖν) and bounding the unlimited with proper limits and forms (*Platonicae quaestiones* 1001B).<sup>111</sup>

Secondly, in *De animae procreatione in Timaeo* Plutarch pays attention to the binding together of the circuits of the cosmic soul: the circuit of the Same, around which later the fixed stars would revolve, and the circuit of the Other, which would accommodate the planets. This topic is treated in *Timaeus* 34B—36D on which Plutarch's work is meant to be a commentary.<sup>112</sup> According to Plutarch, it is first in the soul of the cosmos that sameness and difference have been joined, bound together by numbers and ratios and harmonious proportions (*De animae procreatione* 1024D—E).<sup>113</sup>

Thirdly, Plato's view that the stars have their bodies bound with living bonds (*Timaeus* 38E) is echoed in *De facie in orbe lunae* 943F. In Plutarch's view, each of the stars was constructed of earth and fire. These are bound together in proportion by means of the two intermediate natures water and air (*De facie in orbe lunae* 943F).<sup>114</sup> Plato's belief that, though their bonds are not indissoluble in themselves, the stars have nevertheless obtained a greater and more sovereign bond in God's will (*Timaeus* 41B), is reflected in another passage in Plutarch's *De facie in orbe lunae*. There, the moon is said to have been situated on high, embraced by the bond (δεσμός) of reason which is firmer than the bond of nature (*De facie in*

---

<sup>111</sup> Plutarch, *Platonicae quaestiones* 1001B: τῆς ὅλης παρασχομένης, ἐμόρφωσε καὶ συνήρμοσε, πέρασιν οἰκείοις καὶ σχήμασι δῆσας καὶ ὀρίσας τὸ ἀπειρον. Cf. Plato, *Philebus* 27D for the notion of generating something by a mixture of the infinite and the finite (limit); the terminology of binding (δεῖν), however, is not used there.

<sup>112</sup> For an extensive quotation of *Timaeus* 35B—36B, also containing the term δεσμός, see *De animae procreatione* 1027B—C. Cf. *Compendium libri de animae procreatione* 1020A—B.

<sup>113</sup> Plutarch, *De animae procreatione* 1024D—E (= *Compendium* 1032C): καὶ μέμικται πρῶτον ἐνταῦθα περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀριθμοῖς καὶ λόγοις συνδεθέντα καὶ μεσότησιν ἐναρμονίως.

<sup>114</sup> Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae* 943F: ὁ καὶ τῶν ἀστέρων ἕκαστον ἐκ γῆς καὶ πυρός συνηρμόσθαι διὰ τῶν <δυσῶν> μεταξὺ φύσεων ἀναλογίᾳ δεθεισῶν.

*orbe lunae* 927C).<sup>115</sup> The passages in Plutarch mentioned so far show that in adapting Plato's *Timaeus* Plutarch did not fail to make use of Plato's cosmological concept of binding. Plutarch uses it for the cohesion of the elements of the body of the universe, the circuits of its soul, and the bodies of the planets.

In addition to the roles binding plays in Plato's cosmology, Plutarch makes the concept of binding cover the construction of the basic elements of the universe themselves. The construction of the bodies of fire, earth, water, and air is dealt with in *Timaeus* 53C—57D but Plato did not describe the composition of these bodies with the aid of the terminology of (συν)δεῖν ('to bind together') and δεσμός ('bond'). Plutarch, however, does use this terminology in his account of the primary bodies of the cosmic elements. According to Plutarch, when numbers and ratios have been generated, matter is bound (δεῖν), as it were, and embraced by lines and by the figures generated by lines, that is solid figures. Thus, matter supplies the primary kinds and distinct forms of bodies which are the foundations, so to speak, for the generation of air, earth, water, and fire (*Quaestiones convivales* 719D).<sup>116</sup>

Moreover, the Platonic concept of binding is used by Plutarch also with regard to the mutual cohesion of the various levels into which the universe is divided. According to Plutarch, if the air between the earth and the moon were to be removed and withdrawn, the unity and connection of the universe would be broken up since there would be an empty and unbound (ἄσυνδετος) space in the middle (*De defectu oraculorum* 416E).<sup>117</sup> Similarly, there are said to be four principles of all things, the principles of life, motion, generation, and decay which are bound together at the various levels of the cosmos. The monad at the invisible (the outer rim of the celestial sphere) binds (συνδεῖν) the first principle together with the second, the second in turn is bound together with the third by the demiurgic mind at the sun, while the third is bound together with the fourth by nature at the moon. These bonds (σύνδεσμοι) are taken charge of by Atropos, Clotho, and Lachesis respectively, the goddesses of fate and daughters of

<sup>115</sup> Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae* 927C: ἄνω δὲ σελήνην ἰδρῦσθαι, βεβαιοτέρω τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν τῷ κατὰ λόγον δεσμῷ περιληφθεῖσαν.

<sup>116</sup> Plutarch, *Quaestiones convivales* 719D: ἀριθμῶν δὲ καὶ λόγων ἐγγενομένων, οἶον δεθεῖσα καὶ περιληφθεῖσα γραμμαῖς ἐκ δὲ τῶν γραμμῶν ἐπιπέδοις καὶ βάθεσιν, εἶδη τὰ πρῶτα καὶ διαφορὰς σωμάτων ὡσπερ θεμελίων παρέσχευεν πρὸς γένεσιν ἀέρος καὶ γῆς ὕδατος τε καὶ πυρός. Cf. also *De facie in orbe lunae* 926F—927A; *De animae procreatione* 1023C; and *Compendium libri de animae procreatione* 1031A.

<sup>117</sup> Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum* 416E: εἰ τὸν ἀέρα τις ἀνέλοι καὶ ὑποσπάσειε τὸν μεταξὺ γῆς καὶ σελήνης, τὴν ἐνότητα διαλύσει καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ παντός ἐν μέσῳ κενῆς καὶ ἄσυνδέτου χώρας γενομένης.

necessity (*De genio Socratis* 591B).<sup>118</sup> The various divisions of the universe and principles of all things, thus, have been bound together with bonds.<sup>119</sup> Along these lines, it can also be said that God, so far as he is in some way or other present in the cosmos, by his presence binds together (συνδεῖν) its substance. He exerts control over its bodily weakness which tends towards dissolution (*De E apud Delphos* 393F).<sup>120</sup>

### Alcinous

The physical concept of binding comes also to the fore in Alcinous' *Didaskalikos*. This is a summary of Plato's doctrine, probably written in the second century AD.<sup>121</sup> Alcinous, in agreement with *Timaeus* 31B—32C, asserts that some bond (δεσμός) was needed to bring the elements earth and fire together. The divine bond (δεσμός) is that of proportion which naturally unites both itself and what it binds together (τὰ συνδούμενα). Since the cosmos was not a plane, two-dimensional figure but spherical, one intermediary did not suffice; two (the elements air and water) were required to bring it into harmony (*Didaskalikos* 167.32—37).<sup>122</sup>

The binding of the circuits of the soul of the cosmos, treated in *Timaeus* 34B—36D, is described differently from the way it is in Plato: the soul of the cosmos is now more explicitly said to bind together the body of the world. The soul extends from the centre of the cosmic body to its extremities, and consequently encompasses and covers the body of the cosmos all around, so that the soul is coextensive with the whole cosmos and, in this way, binds (συνδεῖν) and keeps it together. This coextension notwithstanding, the exterior parts of the cosmic soul (the outer circuit of the fixed stars) nevertheless have dominance over the interior ones (the inner

<sup>118</sup> Plutarch, *De genio Socratis* 591B: τέσσαρες δ' εἰσὶν ἀρχαὶ πάντων, ζωῆς μὲν ἡ πρώτη κινήσεως δ' ἡ δευτέρα γενέσεως δ' ἡ τρίτη φθορᾶς δ' ἡ τελευταία· συνδεῖ δὲ τῆ μὲν δευτέρα τὴν πρώτην Μονὰς κατὰ τὸ ἀόρατον, τὴν δὲ δευτέρα τῆ τρίτῃ Νοῦς καθ' ἥλιον, τὴν δὲ τρίτην πρὸς τετάρτην Φύσις κατὰ σελήνην. τῶν δὲ συνδέσμων ἐκάστου Μοῖρα κλειδοῦχος Ἀνάγκης θυγάτηρ κάθηται, τοῦ μὲν πρώτου Ἄτροπος τοῦ δὲ δευτέρου Κλωθῶ, τοῦ δὲ πρὸς σελήνην Λάχεσις, περὶ ἣν ἡ καμπὴ τῆς γενέσεως.

<sup>119</sup> On this passage, see Dillon 1996a, pp. 214—216. Cf. at a lower level also the binding of solids by moisture (*Quaestiones convivales* 687A) and the binding of earth by coldness (*De primo frigido* 954F).

<sup>120</sup> Plutarch, *De E apud Delphos* 393F: τοῦναντίον γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀμωσγέπως ἐγγέγονε τῷ κόσμῳ, τοῦτο συνδεῖ τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ κρατεῖ τῆς περὶ τὸ σωματικὸν ἀσθενείας ἐπὶ φθορὰν φερομένης.

<sup>121</sup> For commentaries, see Whittaker 1990 (ed. Alcinous, *Didaskalikos*) and Dillon 1993 (ed. Alcinous, *Didaskalikos*).

<sup>122</sup> Alcinous, *Didaskalikos* 167.32—37: Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ δεσμὸν ἔδει τινὰ συναγωγῶν ἀμφοτέρων ἐν μέσῳ γενέσθαι, θεῖος δὲ δεσμός ὁ τῆς ἀναλογίας, ὃς εαυτὸν τε καὶ τὰ συνδούμενα πέφυκεν ἐν ποιεῖν, ἐπιπεδός τε οὐκ ἦν ὁ κόσμος (ἀπέχρη γὰρ ἂν αὐτῷ μία μεσότης) σφαιροειδῆς δέ, δυοῖν ἐδέησεν αὐτῷ μεσοτήτων εἰς συναρμογήν.

circuit of the planets) (*Didaskalikos* 170.4—9).<sup>123</sup> In this passage, some stress is placed on the fact that the cosmos is bound together in such a way that the coextension of the cosmic soul with the cosmos pertains to the *entire* cosmos (ὥστε ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ αὐτὴν παρεκτείναι). The full extent to which the cosmic body is bound also comes to the fore in *Col*, where the *entire* body of the cosmos is said to have been furnished with bonds which knit it together: πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβάζόμενον αὕξει τὴν αὕξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ (*Col* 2.19).

### Apuleius

The works of Apuleius of Madaurus (c. 125—170 AD) include a survey of Platonic philosophy entitled *De Platone et eius dogmate* and a rather free paraphrase of the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *De mundo*. These works show that Plato's physical concept of binding remained in use.<sup>124</sup> Apuleius was educated in Carthage, Athens, and Rome.<sup>125</sup> He travelled widely visiting, and went to Asia Minor, for instance, where he reports that he visited a site near Hierapolis in Phrygia (*De mundo* 327). This is the Hierapolis which, along with neighbouring Colossae and Laodicea, is mentioned in *Col* 4.13.<sup>126</sup>

In *De Platone* 197, Apuleius summarizes the argument of *Timaeus* 31B—32C that the body of the cosmos was composed by binding the elements together. According to Apuleius, the elements are bound together with one another and interconnected. For that reason water and air are located between fire and earth. Just like fire is bound together with air by means of a natural connection, a similar connection joins moisture with earth. Thus, one undivided world comes into being in which all things are

<sup>123</sup> Alcinoüs, *Didaskalikos* 170.4—9: Τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς ταθείσης ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἐπὶ τὰ πέρατα, συνέβη αὐτὴν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κόσμου κύκλῳ διὰ παντός περιέχειν καὶ περικαλύπτειν, ὥστε ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ αὐτὴν παρεκτείναι καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον αὐτὸν συνδέειν τε καὶ συνέχειν, κρατεῖν μὲντοι τὰ ἐκτός αὐτῆς τῶν ἐντός.

<sup>124</sup> On Apuleius' place in the Middle-Platonist tradition, see Dillon 1996a, pp. 306—338 and 447. On Apuleius as a Platonic philosopher, see also Hijmans 1987. For vindication of the authenticity of *De Platone* and *De mundo*, see Beaujeu 1973 (ed. Apuleius, *De mundo* and *De Platone*), pp. IX—XXIX and Dillon 1996a, pp. 309—310. Dillon makes use of Redfors 1960, who regards the question of authenticity insoluble (see Redfors 1960, pp. 114—117). A thorough analysis of *De mundo* and *De Platone* is offered by Harrison 2000, chap. 5, pp. 174—209. Harrison considers both writings as authentic (see Harrison 2000, chap. 5.1, pp. 174—180).

<sup>125</sup> Apuleius, *Florida* 18, p. 35.10—16 (ed. Vallette 1924: 18.14—15): Carthage, Athens; 18, p. 38.8—13 (18.36): Carthage; 18, p. 39.4—8 (18.42): Athens; 20, pp. 40.23—41.5 (20.3—4): Athens; and 17, p. 31.8—13 (17.4): Rome.

<sup>126</sup> See Beaujeu 1973 (ed. Apuleius, *De mundo* and *De Platone*), p. 326 for a commentary on this passage in *De mundo* 327 (note 3).

contained (*De Platone* 197).<sup>127</sup> This view also occurs in *De mundo*. Here, the elements are said to have been attached to one another by firm connections (*De mundo* 297).<sup>128</sup> Apuleius is probably also acquainted with the Platonic notion of the circuits of the cosmic soul which have been bound together (*Timaeus* 34B—36D), for he describes the heavenly spheres, of which the outer one is the unerring circuit of the Same, as being bound together with one another in order of succession (*De Platone* 203).<sup>129</sup> He seems to have the Platonic idea that the planets are bound together (*Timaeus* 38E—39A) in view when he reports that the planets were bound fast with mutual cohesion, held together and encircled by the outer unerring circuit (*De mundo* 292).<sup>130</sup>

### Numenius

Occasionally, the Middle Platonists make mention of the divine concern for the inherent weakness of the cosmos. According to Plutarch, by his presence in the world God binds together (συνδέειν) its substance and exerts control over its bodily weakness which tends towards dissolution (*De E apud Delphos* 393F).<sup>131</sup> A similar concern is expressed by the Middle Platonist Numenius of Apamea in Syria, who lived in the second century AD and had considerable influence on Plotinus, Porphyry, and other Neoplatonists. In Numenius' view, the Demiurge bound (συνδέειν) the matter of the cosmos together by harmony lest it might break away and become separated. For that reason the Demiurge settled himself on matter (fragm.

<sup>127</sup> Apuleius, *De Platone* 197: 'Haec autem invicem ex se intra se apta et conexas esse; idcircoque in igne atque terra aquae et aeri est situs, et, sicut ignis aeri cognatione coniungitur, ita humor adfinitati terrena iugatur. Hinc unum esse mundum in eoque omnia.'

<sup>128</sup> Apuleius, *De mundo* 297: 'Elementorum inter se mutui nexus artis adfinitatibus implicantur.' The Platonizing tendency of Apuleius' translation is evident when compared with the Greek original: Πέντε δὴ στοιχεῖα ταῦτα ἐν πέντε χώραις σφαιρικῶς ἐγκείμενα, περιεχομένης αἰετῆς ἐλάττονος τῆ μείζονι (Pseudo-Aristotle, *De mundo* 392b35—393a2). The Latin reads: 'Elementorum inter se mutui nexus artis adfinitatibus implicantur, et quinque coniuges copulae his ordinatae vicibus adtinentur, ut adhaereant et gravioribus leviora' (Apuleius, *De mundo* 297). The phrase 'elementorum inter se mutui nexus artis adfinitatibus implicantur' lacks any counterpart in the original.

<sup>129</sup> Apuleius, *De Platone* 203: 'Globorum vero caelestium, nexorum inter se per vices mutuas, omnium supremum esse eum qui inerrabili meatu censetur.'

<sup>130</sup> Apuleius, *De mundo* 292: 'ac vicissim mutuis adhaesionibus nexae complexu illius orbis, qui inerrabilis dicitur, continentur.' Cf. the Greek text where this aspect is not worked out in detail: τοὺς τε ἐπτά ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἐμπεριέχεσθαι, πάντας γε μὴν ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀπλανῶν σφαιρας περιειλήφθαι (Pseudo-Aristotle, *De mundo* 392a21—23).

<sup>131</sup> Plutarch, *De E apud Delphos* 393F: ὁ θεὸς ἀμωσγέπως ἐγγέγονε τῷ κόσμῳ, τοῦτο συνδέει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ κρατεῖ τῆς περὶ τὸ σωματικὸν ἀσθενείας ἐπὶ φθορὰν φερομένης.



18).<sup>132</sup> In the same vein, *Col* 2.19 suggests that preservation of the cosmic body is a function exerted by Christ.

*The account of Plato's physics in Diogenes Laertius*

Although not a Platonist himself, Diogenes Laertius too offers evidence for the Platonic character of the physical concept of binding designated by the term δέιν ('to bind'). His compendium of the lives and doctrines of the ancient philosophers, probably compiled in the early third century AD, includes an account of Plato's views on the cosmos (*Vitae philosophorum* 3.68—77). In accordance with the *Timaeus*, Plato is said to have considered the universe an animate being since it is bound fast (δέιν) in animate movement (3.74).<sup>133</sup> This is the only instance in Diogenes' survey of ancient philosophy, stretching from the Presocratic philosophers to Epicurus in the third century BC, in which the term δέιν ('to bind') takes on a physical meaning. This seems to confirm that this terminology is Platonic. Thus if one examines the history of the tradition of the physical terminology of δέιν ('to bind') and δεσμός ('bond'), it can be traced to the *Timaeus* along Platonizing-Stoic and Middle Platonist lines. The influence of these traditions on popular philosophy and world views in the Graeco-Roman period should not be underestimated.

(f) *Numismatic evidence*

In addition to the Stoic and Middle Platonist evidence contemporary with *Col*, it is significant that the imagery of bonds holding together the cosmos also appears on Roman coins of the period.<sup>134</sup> The most relevant numismatic data can be found on coins issued by mintmaster T. Carisius (49—44 BC) at the time of Caesar's dictatorship,<sup>135</sup> and of various coinages issued at Rome by the mintmasters M. Mettius (c. 44 BC),<sup>136</sup> L. Aemilius

<sup>132</sup> Numenius, fragm. 18: ὁ δημιουργὸς τὴν ὅλην, τοῦ μήτε διακροῦσαι μήτε ἀποπλαγχθῆναι αὐτήν, ἀρμονία συνδεσάμενος αὐτος μὲν ὑπὲρ ταύτης ἰδρυταί. On Numenius, see Dillon 1996a, pp. 361—379 and 448—449, and Frede 1987. On Fragment 18 in particular, cf. Dillon 1996a, p. 370 and Frede 1987, pp. 1066—1067 and 1068.

<sup>133</sup> Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 3.74: ἐμψυχον δὲ πάντως διὰ τὸ ἐμψύχῳ φερῶν δεδέσθαι. See *Timaeus* 34B—36D on the circuits of the cosmic soul, and *Timaeus* 38E—39A on the binding of the bodies of the planets with living bonds.

<sup>134</sup> See Gundel 1992, pp. 60—63 and the catalogue on pp. 292—299 (nos. in Gundel 1992 given below refer to this catalogue). The bibliographical details for the current section on numismatic evidence are given in the bibliography, section 2.4.

<sup>135</sup> Grueber 1910 (*BMC*), nos. 4064—4069 (vol. 1; with illustrations in vol. 3, plate LII, nos. 4—6); Seaby 1952 (*RSC*), vol. 1.1, p. 24: Carisia 4 (with illustration); Gundel 1992, no. 302 (no illustration).

<sup>136</sup> Sydenham and others 1952 (*CRR*), no. 1056 (no illustration); Alföldi 1974, vol. 2, p. 2: Sydenham no. 1056, with illustrations on plates X—XXIII, type III; Gundel 1992, no. 303 (no illustration).

Buca (c. 44 BC),<sup>137</sup> and L. Mussidius Longus (c. 42 BC)<sup>138</sup> after Caesar's death, in the period between c. 44 and 37 BC. Coins issued c. 30 BC by Octavian and recording the naval victory of Actium in 31 BC also display the imagery of a cosmic globe held together with bonds.<sup>139</sup> Other examples are coinages minted during the Flavian dynasty by Vespasian (79 AD),<sup>140</sup> Titus (80—81 AD),<sup>141</sup> Domitian (83 AD),<sup>142</sup> and Italian provincial coins issued by Antoninus Pius (140—143 AD).<sup>143</sup> This shows how widespread, iconographically speaking, this imagery was in the late Republic and early Empire, when *Col* was written. This fact as such, however, does not suffice to explain the imagery used in *Col* 2.19 since the terminology of δεσμός ('bond') is left unaccounted for. This terminology can only be clarified with literary evidence, which is found in contemporary Platonizing-Stoic and Middle Platonist traditions deriving from Plato's *Timaeus*.

### 1.2.7 Review of previous research and conclusions

The concept of a cosmic body (σῶμα) held together with bonds (δεσμοί) in *Col* 2.19 appears to fit into contemporary Stoic and Middle Platonist physics. This background, however, seems to have remained unnoticed so far in scholarly literature. Exegetes of *Col* 2.19 normally accept J.B. Lightfoot's medical, physiological understanding of the terms σῶμα ('body') and δεσμός ('bond') and take these terms as metaphors which describe the unity and cohesion of the body of the church.<sup>144</sup> Lightfoot's

<sup>137</sup> Sydenham and others 1952 (*CRR*), no. 1063, with an illustration on plate 28, no. 1063; Alföldi 1974, vol. 2, p. 3; Sydenham no. 1063, with illustrations on plates XCII—CLV, type XIII; Gundel 1992, no. 304 (no illustration).

<sup>138</sup> Sydenham and others 1952 (*CRR*), no. 1095 (no illustration); Gundel 1992, no. 305 (no illustration).

<sup>139</sup> Grueber 1910 (*BMC*), no. 4341 (vol. 2; with an illustration in vol. 3, plate LIX, no. 14; cf. also *BMC*, nos. 4338—4340, vol. 2, with illustrations in vol. 3, plate LIX, nos. 10—12); Seaby 1952 (*RSC*), vol. 1.2, p. 119, no. 60 (with illustration); Gundel 1992, no. 306 (with commentary and an illustration on p. 61). For commentary and an illustration, see also Kreitzer 1996, pp. 31—32 (figure 1f).

<sup>140</sup> Mattingly 1930 (*CREBM*), vol. 2, p. 45, no. 251, with an illustration on plate 7, no. 16; Gundel 1992, no. 312 (no illustration).

<sup>141</sup> Mattingly 1930 (*CREBM*), vol. 2, pp. 245—246, nos. 128—134, with illustrations on plate 47, nos. 7—9; Gundel 1992, no. 313 (no illustration).

<sup>142</sup> Kent, Overbeck & Stylow 1973, plate 62, no. 243; Gundel 1992, no. 314, with an illustration on p. 293.

<sup>143</sup> Mattingly 1940 (*CREBM*), vol. 4, pp. 264—265, nos. 1641—1646, with an illustration on plate 39, no. 11; Gundel 1992, no. 316. For other examples, see Gundel 1992, no. 301 (with commentary on p. 60), and nos. 317—318. See also Grueber 1910 (*BMC*), vol. 3, Index 3, p. 107 s.v. 'Globe' (references listed there are to volume and page no.).

<sup>144</sup> Lightfoot 1879, pp. 198—201, with reference to the physiology of Aristotle and Galen in particular. Cf. already Wettstein 1752, vol. 2, p. 289, referring to the term σύνδεσμος in Galen.

exegesis of *Col* 2.19 is given a positive reception in the commentaries of Abbott, Moule, Lohse, O'Brien, Wolter, Barth and Dunn.<sup>145</sup> Though Dibelius and Lohmeyer take the term σώμα ('body') in *Col* 2.19 in a cosmological sense,<sup>146</sup> they refer nevertheless with agreement to Lightfoot's physiological understanding of the terms ἀφή ('ligament,' 'band') and σύνδεσμος ('ligament,' 'bond').<sup>147</sup> Commentaries betraying awareness of the (originally) cosmological meaning of the term σύνδεσμος ('bond') in *Col* 2.19 are those by Gnilka and Pokorný. Both refer to some passages in Philo but then continue to interpret *Col* 2.19 in an ecclesiological sense.<sup>148</sup>

Dibelius did argue in favour of a cosmological interpretation of σώμα ('body') in *Col* 2.19. But his intuition still lacked the appropriate contemporary substantiation in terms of the history of religion, as he himself admitted.<sup>149</sup> Dibelius' cosmological interpretation of *Col* 2.19 is supported by scholars like Lietzmann,<sup>150</sup> Ochel,<sup>151</sup> Wagenführer,<sup>152</sup> Lohse (in a pub-

<sup>145</sup> See Abbott 1909, pp. 271—272; Moule 1957, pp. 106—107, Lohse 1968, pp. 178—179 (with note 1 on p. 179); O'Brien 1982, p. 147; Wolter 1993, p. 150; Barth 1994, pp. 351—352 (cf. Barth's commentary on *Eph*: Barth 1974, vol. 1, pp. 187—188 with note 211); and Dunn 1996, p. 186.

<sup>146</sup> Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, pp. 36, 29—30 (Dibelius 1927<sup>2</sup>, pp. 27, 21—22; Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>, p. 83); Lohmeyer 1964, p. 126 (Lohmeyer 1930, p. 126).

<sup>147</sup> Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, p. 37 (Dibelius 1927<sup>2</sup>, p. 27; Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>, p. 84); Lohmeyer 1964, p. 125 note 4 (Lohmeyer 1930, p. 125 note 4).

<sup>148</sup> Gnilka 1980, p. 152 (=Gnilka 1991<sup>2</sup>): 'Ohne Zweifel sind die Vorstellungen vom Zusammenhalt des Leibes durch Bänder (...) von Haus aus kosmologischer Natur.' See also Pokorný 1987, p. 127. Cf. also Fitzer's article on σύνδεσμος in *ThWNT*: Fitzer 1964, pp. 854.29—855.17 on Plato (ET: vol. 7, p. 857, first para.) and p. 856.14—22 on Philo (ET: vol. 7, p. 858 sub B3) in particular, though the cosmological meaning of σύνδεσμος is discarded for the interpretation of *Col* 2.19 (see p. 856.28—30; ET: vol. 7, p. 858 sub C).

<sup>149</sup> Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, pp. 36—37, and pp. 29—30 on *Col* 2.10. Dibelius had to confess: 'Aber sichere Belege für die religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge fehlen; wir können nur den kosmischen Gebrauch von κεφαλή und σώμα (2,19) konstatieren' (Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, p. 30; =Dibelius 1927<sup>2</sup>, p. 22; not yet in Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>150</sup> See Lietzmann 1932, pp. 226—227 (ET, edition 1961: pp. 214—215; ET, edition 1993, vol. 1, pp. 198—199): 'Während Paulus selbst in seinem Schreiben nach Kolossae (...) Gedanken entwickelt, die nur (...) im Sinne einer kosmischen Mystik begriffen werden können, haben wir im Epheserbrief dieselben Worte ohne jene Beziehungen (...) verwendet (...). Der dort unvermittelt erscheinende Ausdruck Pleroma ("die Fülle" der Gottheit [*Col* 2.9]) wird auch hier mehrfach gebraucht, aber nicht zur Kennzeichnung der kosmischen Bedeutung Christi, sondern auf die Gemeinde bezogen, die vom Geiste Christi erfüllt ist. Auch Paulus nennt öfter die Gemeinde den "Leib Christi" und hat im Kolosserbrief dies Bild zu der die ganze obere und untere Welt umspannenden Summe der Christus dienenden Geisterwesen ausgeweitet, deren Haupt Christus ist: aber im Epheserbrief wird dieselbe Stelle ihrer höheren Bedeutung entkleidet und zur Bezeichnung der Kirche verwendet.'

lication prior to his commentary on *Col*),<sup>153</sup> and Mitton. Mitton rightly states: 'In Ephesians the "Body" of which Christ is the "Head" is the church. In *Col. ii*, however, it is not the church which is under consideration but the "cosmic forces" (cf. *Col. ii.10*).'<sup>154</sup>

Unconvincing criticism was launched against Dibelius' cosmological interpretation by scholars like Percy, Schweizer, Schmauch, O'Brien, Bruce, Gnilk, Barth, and Hübner.<sup>155</sup> In the wake of this criticism, *Col*

<sup>151</sup> See Ochel 1934, p. 3: 'Eine ähnliche Beobachtung ist für das auf Christus angewandte Bild vom Haupt zu machen (*Kol* 2,19 und *Eph* 4,16). Man trifft in beiden Briefen das gleiche Bild mit weitgehender, wörtlicher Übereinstimmung gezeichnet (...). *Kol* 2,19 heißt Christus jedoch das Haupt der kosmischen Kräfte, so daß *σῶμα* dort den Kosmos bezeichnet. *Eph* 4,16 ist aber das Bild vom Haupt von Christus und der Gemeinde gebraucht, so daß hier die gleichen Aussagen, welche in *Kol* vom kosmischen *σῶμα* gemacht sind, in *Eph* dem *σῶμα* der Gemeinde zufallen.'

<sup>152</sup> See Wagenführer 1941, p. 28 on the meaning of *κεφαλή* in *Col* 2.19: 'Für den *Kol* legt sich kein anderer Sinn nahe als der von 2,10, nämlich daß Christus das Haupt des Kosmos (=σῶμα) ist; aus dem *Eph*-Kontext wird aber ersichtlich, daß *σῶμα* hier nur die Gemeinde sein kann, deren Haupt Christus ist. Was über dieses *σῶμα* ausgesagt wird, ist in die gleichen Worte gekleidet, und doch ist in beiden Fällen etwas anderes gemeint. Man wird also niemals den *Kol* nach dem *Eph* auslegen dürfen. Beide Bilder sind in dem Zusammenhang, in dem sie stehen, verständlich; der *Kol* stellt die kosmische Bedeutung Christi dar, der *Eph* die Bedeutung Christi für die Gemeinde und deren Wachstum.' See further Wagenführer, pp. 61—62 on *Col* 2.19: 'Hier wird die organische Beziehung des Christus zum Kosmos, seinem Leib, durch Entfaltung des aus der Natur gewählten Bildes deutlich: von Christus, dem Haupt, aus wird der Kosmos versorgt und zusammengehalten—die *ἄφατ* und *σύνδεσμοι* bringen den physiologischen Zusammenhang zum Ausdruck—, und er wächst so in göttlicher Weise. Die Herrschaft des Christus über den Kosmos ist demnach die höchste Erfüllung, die der Kosmos überhaupt findet, ist seine segensreichste Bestimmung. Die den Kosmos regierenden Kräfte werden gleichsam zu göttlichen Organen, indem sie Christus als ihr Haupt anerkennen. (...) Wenn ein organischer Zusammenhang zwischen Christus und dem Universum besteht, wenn der Kosmos und damit auch Welt und Natur in Christus ihre letzte Erfüllung finden, so ist damit jede negative Kosmoschau als einseitig abgewiesen. Die paulinische Theologie wird falsch beurteilt, wenn man die Kosmologie des *Kol* nicht in ihrem vollen Umfang berücksichtigt, und dazu gehört auch eine Aussage wie die *Kol* 2,19: der Kosmos ist das *σῶμα* Χριστοῦ, der Leib Christi.'

<sup>153</sup> See Lohse 1964/65, p. 206 with note 1 (cf., however, Lohse 1968, pp. 178—180). Cf. also, implicitly, Hofius on the phrase *τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν* in *Col* 1.17: 'Die Erklärung, daß Christus die *κεφαλή* des Alls als seines *σῶμα* ist, würde in der Sache nur noch einmal wiederholen, was bereits die Worte *καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν* V. 17 zum Ausdruck gebracht haben' (Hofius 2001, p. 188) and Käsemann 1960, p. 36 (referred to by Hofius): 'Indirekt ist damit der Gedanke des Christusleibes schon vorweggenommen'.

<sup>154</sup> Mitton 1951, p. 84.

<sup>155</sup> See Percy 1946, p. 127 with note 99, and pp. 382—384; Schweizer 1964, p. 1074 note 486 (ET: vol. 7, p. 1076 note 486); Schmauch 1964, pp. 72—73, Schweizer 1976, p. 125 with note 414 (=Schweizer 1989a<sup>3</sup>); O'Brien 1982, pp. 146—147; Bruce 1984, p.

2.19 is interpreted fully in accordance with *Eph* 4.15—16, with the building of the church's body in view.<sup>156</sup> This is stated most explicitly by Bruce in his interpretation of *Col* 2.19: 'In spite of Dibelius's argument, developed in agreement with his exposition of *Col*. 1:18 and 2:10, that the body here is the cosmos, it is preferable by far to take the present passage in the same sense as *Eph*. 4:16, the body being the church.'<sup>157</sup> This ecclesiological understanding of *Col* 2.19 was phrased most clearly by Schweizer and Gnllka. According to Schweizer, 'Christ is thus Head over the world, but only the church is His body, and the whole power of growth flows from Him to it.'<sup>158</sup> Gnllka assumes in an equally over-schematic way that Christ possesses two headships (one over the church, the other over the world) but only one body, that of the church: 'A distinction is made (in *Col* that is) between Christ's two positions as Head. He is the Head of every power and authority (2.10), controlling and ruling them. They are not his body. He is the Head of the church which is his body.'<sup>159</sup> Such a strained interpretation fails to do justice to *Col*'s independence from *Eph*, its background in contemporary Stoic and Middle Platonist physics, and its distinction between various sorts of bodies.

The ecclesiological interpretation of *Col* 2.19 takes the terms σῶμα ('body'), δεσμός ('ligament,' 'bond'), and ἀφή ('ligament,' 'band') in a medical, physiological sense. It must be deemed highly unlikely given the strong cosmological interest of the author of *Col*, an interest which pervades the letter as a whole and the section against the rival philosophy (*Col* 2.8—3.4) in particular.

The physical meaning of σῶμα ('body') is also suggested by the immediate context of *Col* 2.19. In this verse the adherents of the rival philosophy are reproached for failing to take notice of the head from which the

123 with notes 140—141; Gnllka 1980, p. 152 (=Gnllka 1991<sup>2</sup>) and Barth 1994, p. 351 with notes 56—57 (cf. also pp. 76—79 with note 121, and Barth 1974, vol. 1, pp. 185—186 with note 200). Hübner 1997, p. 89: 'πάν τὸ σῶμα ist eben nicht, wie Dibelius/Greeven K 36 [=Dibelius 1953<sup>3</sup>, p. 36] annahmen, der Kosmos, sondern die Kirche (so fast alle neueren Kommentatoren).'

<sup>156</sup> *Eph* 4.15—16: ἀξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὃς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους τὴν ἀξῆσιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται εἰς οἰκοδομὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

<sup>157</sup> Bruce 1984, p. 123.

<sup>158</sup> Schweizer 1964, p. 1074.22—23: 'Christus ist also Haupt über die Welt, aber nur die Kirche ist sein Leib, dem alle Kraft des Wachstums von ihm zuströmt' (ET, quoted above: vol. 7, p. 1077). See also Schweizer 1976, p. 125 (=Schweizer 1989a<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>159</sup> Gnllka 1980, p. 152 (=Gnllka 1991<sup>2</sup>): 'Dabei wird eine doppelte Hauptstellung Christi unterschieden. Er ist Haupt jeder Macht und Gewalt (2,10), indem er sie beherrscht. Sie sind nicht sein Leib. Er ist Haupt der Kirche, die sein Leib ist' (English translation my own).

divine growth of the body, sustained by various bonds which keep it together, originates. Such an opponent is depicted as οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ θεοῦ (*Col* 2.19). The term κεφαλὴ ('head') is not further qualified but can be taken to be identical with the κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας (the 'head of all principles and powers') just mentioned (*Col* 2.10). In *Col* 2.10, the readers are exhorted to be fulfilled in him, who is the head of all cosmological principles and powers: καὶ ἔστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας (*Col* 2.10). Both the adherents of the rival philosophy (2.19) and the readers of this Pseudo-Pauline letter (2.10) are characterised in their relation to Christ's head. Taking into account the cosmological meaning of Christ's headship in 2.10, it is only natural to interpret the term κεφαλὴ ('head') accordingly in 2.19.

A physical, cosmological understanding of the terms σῶμα ('body'), δεσμός ('bond') and ἀφή ('band') in *Col* 2.19, therefore, is to be preferred to a medical, physiological one. This physical understanding is in accordance with contemporary Platonizing-Stoic and, especially, Middle Platonist views on the cosmos and its coherence. This probably holds also true for the term ἀφή ('band') since Plato and Alexander of Aphrodisias used the cognate verb ἄπτεσθαι repeatedly as an alternative to the verb δεῖν ('to bind').<sup>160</sup> This shows the unfoundedness of Percy's objection against a physical-cosmological interpretation of *Col* 2.19: 'Moreover, what do the ἀφαί and σύνδεσμοι mean if the body is the κόσμος?'<sup>161</sup>

As in the previous instances of σῶμα ('body') in *Col* 2.9—10 and 2.17, the term σῶμα in 2.19 stands for the body of the cosmos. In the criticism of the rival philosophy in *Col* 2.8—3.4 the term σῶμα ('body') is central and consistently has a physical-cosmological meaning. For the present

<sup>160</sup> Plato, *Timaeus* 36B—C on the construction of the two circuits of the cosmic soul: ταύτην οὖν τὴν σύστασιν πᾶσαν διπλὴν κατὰ μήκος σχίσας, μέσην πρὸς μέσην ἑκατέραν ἀλλήλαις ὅσον χειρὸς προσβαλῶν κατέκαμψεν εἰς ἓν κύκλω, *συνάψας* αὐταῖς τε καὶ ἀλλήλαις ἐν τῷ καταντικρῷ τῆς προσβολῆς. See also Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De mixtione* 223.34—36: ὁ τόνος τοῦ πνεύματος, ὑφ' οὗ *συνδούμενα* τὴν τε συνέχειαν ἔχει τὴν πρὸς τὰ οἰκεία μέρη καὶ *συνήπται* τοῖς παρακειμένοις. See also his *De fato* 192.2—6: καὶ τοῦτω τῷ τρόπῳ *συνδεόμενων* ἀλλήλοις ἀπάντων, καὶ μήτε οὕτως τινὸς ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένου, ὡς μὴ πάντως ἐπακολουθεῖν αὐτῷ καὶ *συνήφθαι* ὡς αἰτίῳ ἕτερόν τι, μήτ' αὐτῶν ἐπιγινόμενων τινὸς ἀπολελυθῆαι δυναμένου τῶν προγεγονότων, ὡς μὴ τι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖν ὡς περ *συνδεόμενον*. These passages have already been mentioned above. See also the notion of the συναφή of the cosmos as a whole in Theophrastus (Van Raalte 1988, esp. pp. 192—194, 206, and 211 n. 23), as well as the cosmological meaning of συναφή as 'junction of branches of the Milky Way' (LSJ 1700 s.v. συναφή).

<sup>161</sup> Percy 1946, p. 384: 'Und was würden die ἀφαί und σύνδεσμοι bedeuten, wenn der Leib der κόσμος wäre?' (English translation my own).

purpose, it is not necessary to inquire into the precise nature of this rival philosophy (on this issue, see chap. 3.3 below). The physical-cosmological meaning of σῶμα ('body') in *Col* 2.8—3.4 and its background in contemporary Stoicism and Middle Platonism can now be considered plausible. This result seems to be a good basis for a comparison of the distinctive cosmology of *Col*, with the physical aspects of the authentic Pauline writings, first, and, secondly, with the criticism of the cosmology of *Col* by the author of *Eph*.

## Chapter 2

# Physics and Cosmic Christology in Paul's Authentic Writings

## Introduction

In order to show how distinctive *Col*'s Stoic and Middle Platonist cosmology is, in the next chapter a comparison will be drawn between the cosmology of *Col* and the cosmology of Paul's authentic writings (chap. 3). This comparison will concern the use of some important terms which occur in both cosmological systems. These terms are 'elements of the cosmos' (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου), 'principles' (ἀρχαί), and 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι). Not only do they occur in *Col* (see *Col* 1.16, 2.8—10, 2.15, and 2.20) as essential components of its cosmology, but they are found already in Paul's authentic writings. First I wish to look at the discussion of the elements of the cosmos in *Galatians* 4.3—10 (chap. 2.1). The cosmic principles and powers are the subject of *1 Corinthians* 15.23—28 where their eschatological submission to Christ is at issue. This question will be addressed in the second part of the present chapter (chap. 2.2).

### 2.1 Physics and cosmic Christology in Paul's *Letter to the Galatians*: Christ's descent to lift man's bondage to the cosmic elements (*Gal* 4.3—10)

#### *Introduction*

In his *Letter to the Galatians*, Paul wrote that the time prior to Christ's birth had been an age when all human beings, Jew and Greek alike, were under the control of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, the elements of the cosmos: καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι (*Gal* 4.3). This situation of subservience to the cosmic elements changed when, in the fullness of time, God sent his Son, who was brought forth by a woman, and was submitted to the law, in order that he would redeem those



under the law: ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ (*Gal* 4.4—5a).

First, I intend to examine in what sense Jews, like Paul, and Greeks, like the gentile Galatians, were thought to be subject to the cosmic elements (chap. 2.1.1). After that, I will address the questions of what, in Paul's view, the law has to do with man's bondage to the cosmic elements, and how Christ is thought to lift this domination (chap. 2.1.2).

### *2.1.1 The realm of the cosmic elements*

In Paul's view, until recently Jews and Greeks had been subject to the elements of the cosmos.

According to contemporary philosophy as reflected, for example, in Plutarch, the elements of the cosmos (also designated as its 'parts,' μέρη) constitute the realm in which the destructive cosmic force operates. The destructive force (ἡ φθαρτικὴ δύναμις) is weak and feeble in this material world but mingles and combines with the passive and changeable elements (*De Iside* 373D).<sup>1</sup> Due to this mingling of the destructive force with the various parts of the cosmos, all kinds of changes happen under the moon. Under the sphere of the moon is where the part of the cosmos exists which experiences generation and destruction. In this part of the cosmos all things are moved and changed owing to the very fact that they consist of the four elements (στοιχεῖα), fire, earth, water and air (*De Iside* 376D).<sup>2</sup> The continuous changes and movements of the elements are designated as birth (γένεσις) and death (τελευτή; *De Iside* 376E).<sup>3</sup>

Plutarch's view of the elements, as the constituents of the realm in which the destructive cosmic force operates and the entities through which all things are subject to motion and change, is shared by Philo. According to Philo, the robe of the Jewish high priest, as regards colour, length, and decoration, is reminiscent of the three elements (στοιχεῖα) air, water, and earth. The high-priestly robe that reaches to the feet is a symbol of the three elements air, water, and earth, from which and in which are all mortal and destructible species. For just as this robe is one, the three said elements are also all of one kind because all things lower than the moon suf-

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *De Iside* 373D: ἐκείνη μὲν ἀσθενής καὶ ἀδρανής ἐνταῦθα, φυρομένη καὶ προσπλεκομένη τοῖς παθητικοῖς καὶ μεταβολικοῖς μέρεσι.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, *De Iside* 376D: καὶ γὰρ ἡ γεννωμένη καὶ φθειρομένη μοῖρα τοῦ κόσμου περιέχεται μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς σεληνιακῆς σφαίρας, κινεῖται δ' ἐν αὐτῇ πάντα καὶ μεταβάλλεται διὰ τῶν τεττάρων στοιχείων, πυρός καὶ γῆς καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἀέρος.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, *De Iside* 376E: αὗται γὰρ εἰσι τῶν στοιχείων μεταβολαὶ καὶ κινήσεις.

fer change and transition (*De vita Mosis* 2.121).<sup>4</sup> The elements (στοιχεῖα) are regarded as entities from which originate, and in which exist, all destructible and mortal species. These species are liable to change and transition through their being composed out of the cosmic elements.

Philosophy contemporaneous with Paul, then, regarded the elements as the realm in which generation and destruction, birth and death came to pass. I will now show in detail that in popular philosophical tradition man was viewed as made up of these elements. Not only Plutarch, but also Jews like Philo and the author of *2 Maccabees* reckon man among those destructible and mortal beings which originate from, and live in, the cosmic elements. This will shed light on Paul's assertion that until Christ's birth Jews and Greeks had been enslaved under the elements of the cosmos. Some recent authors have questioned whether Paul saw Jews and Greeks as subject to the same cosmic elements.<sup>5</sup> Analogies from Plutarch, Philo, and other writers will show that their scepticism was unfounded.

Plutarch, to start with, believes the entire universe (including man) to have been composed out of the four elements (στοιχεῖα).<sup>6</sup> He refers to Empedocles who clearly says that men, beasts, plants, and birds are produced by the mixing of the elements (*Adversus Colotem* 1113B).

In *2 Maccabees*, written between 124 BC and the 60s BC,<sup>7</sup> the author has the mother of seven sons who are martyred by Antiochus IV Epiphanes encourage her sons in the following way. 'I do not know,' the mother says, 'how you came into being in my womb. Neither did I give you breath and life, nor did I arrange in order the composition of the elements (στοιχειώσις) of each of you. For that very reason, the creator of the cosmos, who moulded the generation of man and discovered the origin of all things, will with compassion restore to you breath and life again, inasmuch as you now take no notice of yourselves for the sake of his laws' (*2 Macc* 7.22—23).<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Philo, *De vita Mosis* 2.121: τριῶν μὲν δὴ στοιχείων, ἐξ ὧν τε καὶ ἐν οἷς τὰ θνητὰ καὶ φθαρτὰ γένη πάντα, ἀέρος, ὕδατος, γῆς, ὁ ποδῆρης (...) σύμβολον εδείχθη προσηκόντως: ὡς γὰρ ὁ χιτῶν εἷς, καὶ τὰ λεχθέντα τρία στοιχεῖα μιᾶς ἰδέας ἐστίν, ἐπειδὴ τὰ κατωτέρω σελήνης ἅπαντα τροπᾶς ἔχει καὶ μεταβολάς.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Mußner 1974, p. 268.

<sup>6</sup> See Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum* 430C—D, and *Aquane an ignis sit utilior* 957B.

<sup>7</sup> Schürer, Vermes, Millar & Goodman 1986, vol. 3.1, pp. 531—532.

<sup>8</sup> *2 Macc* 7.22—23: Οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἐφάνητε κοιλίαν, οὐδὲ ἐγὼ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῖν ἐχαρισάμην, καὶ τὴν ἐκάστου στοιχειώσιν οὐκ ἐγὼ διεπρῶθμισα: τοιγαροῦν ὁ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστης ὁ πλάσας ἀνθρώπου γένεσιν καὶ πάντων ἐξευρῶν γένεσιν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῖν πάλιν ἀποδίδωσιν μετ' ἐλέους, ὡς νῦν ὑπερορᾶτε ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ νόμους.

The author of *4 Maccabees*, who wrote around 100 AD or slightly later, relates the same martyrdom but talks about the elements of the cosmos at another point in the story.<sup>9</sup> In his version the seventh and youngest son addresses Antiochus IV, and asks him disparagingly if he is not ashamed as a human being to cut out the tongue of those who have like feelings and came into being out of the same elements (στοιχεῖα; *4 Macc* 12.13).<sup>10</sup> Both Jewish authors regard man, regardless whether he be Jew or Greek, as composed out of the same elements and to experience like feelings.

This also holds true for Philo. Apart from his conviction that the whole cosmos (man not excluded) consists of the four elements,<sup>11</sup> Philo more explicitly says, as I observed above, that all destructible and mortal species originate from the elements (στοιχεῖα) and exist in them (*De vita Moysis* 2.121). Elsewhere these species are specified as animals and plants; Philo speaks about the four elements and the animals and plants which were put together out of the material of these elements (*Quis rer. div. heres* 140).<sup>12</sup> As a consequence, the animals and plants exist in the elements earth, water, air and fire, which Philo portrays as a flock herded by God, their shepherd and king (*De agricultura* 51).<sup>13</sup> Destructible and mortal species, namely animals and plants, thus, are said to exist *in* the elements.

Not only animals and plants, but man himself is explicitly said to belong among the destructible and mortal species which originate from, and exist in, the elements. According to Philo, in the constitution of his body, each man is associated with the entire cosmos. This is due to the fact that man is mixed out of the same things—earth, water, air and fire—as the cosmos. Each of the elements supplied the portion which needed to be contributed in order to fill up the optimum amount of material, which the creator required for fabricating this visible image, man (*De opificio mundi* 146).<sup>14</sup> Indeed, in Philo's view, the universe comprises four constituents of

<sup>9</sup> On matters of dating and the author's dependency on *2 Macc*, see Van Henten 1986, and Van Henten 1997, chap. 3, esp. chaps 3.4 (dependency) and 3.5 (date).

<sup>10</sup> *4 Macc* 12.13: οὐκ ἠδέσθης ἄνθρωπος ὄν, θηριωδέστατε, τοὺς ὁμοιοπαθεῖς καὶ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν γεγονότας στοιχείων γλωττοτομήσαι.

<sup>11</sup> Philo, *De opificio mundi* 52, 131; *De cherubim* 127; *Quod deterius* 8; *De plantatione* 120; *Quis rer. div. heres* 197, 281; *De somniis* 1.15—16, 1.39; and *De providentia* 2.45.

<sup>12</sup> Philo, *Quis rer. div. heres* 140: τὰ (...) τέτταρα τοῦ κόσμου στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰ διὰ τούτων παγέντα ζῷα τε αἶ καὶ φυτά.

<sup>13</sup> Philo, *De agricultura* 51: καθάπερ γὰρ τινα ποιμνὴν γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὅσα ἐν τούτοις φυτά τε αἶ καὶ ζῷα (...) ὁ ποιμὴν καὶ βασιλεὺς θεὸς ἄγει.

<sup>14</sup> Philo, *De opificio mundi* 146: πᾶς ἄνθρωπος (...) κατὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ σώματος κατασκευὴν [ῥακεῖται] ἅπαντι τῷ κόσμῳ· συγκέκρται γὰρ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν, γῆς καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἀέρος καὶ πυρός, ἐκάστου τῶν στοιχείων εἰσενεγκόντος τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος

which the visible cosmos consists; these are the same constituents from which man has been shaped and modelled into a human form (*De somniis* 1.15).<sup>15</sup> The universe and man are viewed as composed of the same elements.

For that reason, from an ethical perspective, Philo says that one has to consider what it is fitting to do to other human beings, who are by nature akin to oneself since they are engendered as they are from the same elements (στοιχεῖα; *De specialibus legibus* 1.294).<sup>16</sup> This argument is based on the homogeneity of all men in view of their being composed of the same elements, regardless of whether if they are Jew or Greek. This ethical reasoning is similar to that already encountered in *4 Maccabees* (*4 Macc* 12.13).

Philo regularly expresses the notion that man is composed of the four cosmic elements using imagery of 'borrowing' (δανείζεσθαι) elements from the cosmos. This imagery derives from Plato's *Timaeus* where Plato says that the gods (the stars, that is) were appointed by the creator to generate both the mortal parts of the human soul and the human body (*Timaeus* 41A—D). To this end, the gods borrowed (δανειζόμενοι) portions of fire, earth, water and air from the cosmos. They borrowed these portions as something that would be given back. The portions thus taken were glued together by the stellar gods (*Timaeus* 42E—43A).<sup>17</sup>

According to Philo, too, man was composed by borrowing (δανεισάμενοι) small portions from the four elements which in their entirety make up the universe, namely earth, water, air and fire (*De aeternitate* 29).<sup>18</sup> At the end of one's life, however, these portions need to be returned. Each person, formed by the combination of the four constituents and borrowing (δανεισάμενος) small portions from the substance of each, pays off this loan when the fixed periods of time have come to an end. This loan is given back by returning what is dry in one's constitution to earth, what is wet to water, what is cold to air, and what is hot to fire (*Quis rer. div.*

πρός εκπλήρωσιν αὐταρκεστάτης ὕλης, ἣν ἔδει λαβεῖν τὸν δημιουργόν, ἵνα τεχνιτεύσῃ τὴν ὀρατὴν ταύτην εἰκόνα.

<sup>15</sup> Philo, *De somniis* 1.15: τῷ παντὶ τεττάρων ὄντων, ἐξ ὧν συνέστηκεν ὁδε ὁ κόσμος, καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἰσαρίθμων, ἐξ ὧν διαπλασθέντες εἰς ἀνθρωπόμορφον εἶδος ἐτυπώθημεν.

<sup>16</sup> Philo, *De specialibus legibus* 1.294: σὲ τί ποιεῖν ἀρμόττει πρὸς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς φύσει συγγενεῖς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν στοιχείων σπαρέντας.

<sup>17</sup> Plato, *Timaeus* 42E—43A: πυρὸς καὶ γῆς ὕδατος τε καὶ ἀέρος ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου δανειζόμενοι μόρια ὡς ἀποδοθησόμενα πάλιν, εἰς ταῦτόν τὰ λαμβανόμενα συνεκόλλων.

<sup>18</sup> Philo, *De aeternitate* 29: ἀνθρώποι γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν τεττάρων στοιχείων, ἃ δὴ ὅλα τοῦ παντός ἐστιν οὐρανοῦ, γῆς, <ὕδατος>, ἀέρος τε καὶ πυρός, βραχέα τὰ μέρη δανεισάμενοι συνεκράθημεν. See also *De decalogo* 31.

heres 282).<sup>19</sup> In this passage, Philo's dependency on Plato's *Timaeus* 42E—43A is obvious.<sup>20</sup> As Philo says elsewhere, the parts of those who have ended life are resolved into the elements (ἀναστοιχειούμεναι). They are separated and brought back to the forces of the universe out of which they were put together. The loan which was lent out (δανεισθείς) to each man is returned, after unequally fixed times, to nature which is his creditor, when it wishes to recover the debts it is due (*De posteritate* 5).<sup>21</sup>

That being the case, it appears that, according to Philo, the vault of the sky has tightly bound together all those things which experience generation; it surrounds them and holds them fast within itself (*De posteritate* 5).<sup>22</sup> For that reason, it is indeed impossible for man to slip out through the material principles of the universe, since in getting away from one particular element one necessarily passes to another element (*Quod deterius* 153—155).<sup>23</sup> It is impossible for a man to hide himself from the parts of the cosmos, or from the cosmos itself (*Legum allegoriae* 3.5—6).<sup>24</sup>

Material contemporaneous with Paul, thus, provides the interpretative background to Paul's statement that, until Christ's coming, both Jews and Greeks were subject to the elements of the cosmos: καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι (*Gal* 4.3). According to Greeks like Plutarch, and to Jews like Philo and the authors of *2 Maccabees* and *4 Maccabees*, man was composed of, and enclosed by the elements of the cosmos. Admittedly, it cannot necessarily be concluded from the philosophical traditions mentioned so far that by 'elements' Paul meant water,

<sup>19</sup> Philo, *Quis rer. div. heres* 282: ἕκαστος ἡμῶν συγκριθεὶς ἐκ τῶν τεττάρων καὶ δανεισάμενος ἀφ' ἑκάστης οὐσίας μικρὰ μόρια, καθ' ὄρισμένας περιόδους καιρῶν ἐκτίνει τὸ δάνειον, εἰ μὲν τι ξηρὸν εἴη, ἀποδιδοῦς γῆν, εἰ δὲ τι ὑγρὸν, ὕδατι, εἰ δὲ ψυχρὸν, ἀέρι, εἰ δ' ἐνθερμον, πυρὶ.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. also the Platonist Alcinous (probably second century AD) on the gods who borrowed (δανεισάμενοι) some portions from the primary matter for fixed periods, as material that would be given back. In this way, the gods created the mortal animals (the winged, those living in water, and those on land as distinguished from the human race): Αὐτοὶ δὲ δανεισάμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ὕλης μόρια ἅτα πρὸς ὄρισμένους χρόνους, ὡς εἰς αὐτὸ πάλιν ἀποδοθησόμενα, ἐδημιούργουν τὰ θνητὰ ζῶα (*Didaskalikos*, chap. 16, 171.38—172.3; quotation from 171.42—172.3).

<sup>21</sup> Philo, *De posteritate* 5: καὶ γὰρ αἱ τῶν τετελευτηκότων ἀναστοιχειούμεναι μοῖραι πάλιν εἰς τὰς τοῦ παντός δυνάμεις ἐξ ὧν συνέστησαν ἀποκρίνονται, τοῦ δανεισθέντος ἐκάστῳ δανείσματος κατὰ προθεσμίας ἀνίσους ἀποδιδομένου τῇ συμβαλοῦσῃ φύσει, ὅποτε βουληθεῖ τὰ ἐαυτῆς χρέα κομίζεσθαι.

<sup>22</sup> Philo, *De posteritate* 5: πάντα γὰρ ὧν γένεσις ἐστὶν οὐρανοῦ κύκλος περισφίγξας ἐντὸς ἑαυτοῦ κατέχει.

<sup>23</sup> Philo, *Quod deterius* 153—155: οὐδὲ τὰς ὑλικὰς ἀρχὰς ἐνεστι διεκδῦναι, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη τῷ μίαν διαφυγόντι εἰς ἑτέραν μεταβῆναι.

<sup>24</sup> Philo, *Legum allegoriae* 3.5—6: <μη> τὰ μέρη τοῦ κόσμου μηδὲ τὸν κόσμον αὐτὸν δυνάμενος τις ἀποκρῦπτεσθαι.

earth, fire and air. He may also have been thinking of other physical elements like the sun, the moon, and other celestial bodies. The material discussed does, though, give a good analogy for Paul's idea of man's being subject to the elements.

Paul also describes this pre-incarnation condition of being under the control of the elements as slavery in the service of 'those who by nature are no gods:' τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς (*Gal* 4.8). It seems highly likely that 'those who are by nature no gods' (οἱ φύσει μὴ ὄντες θεοί) are identical here with the elements (στοιχεῖα). Indeed, according to the testimony of Theodoret of Cyrrhus (c. AD 393—466), Plato, Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch taught that the Egyptians, the Phoenicians and, of course, the Greeks too believed that the first gods were sun and moon, heaven and earth, and the other elements (στοιχεῖα; Plutarch, fragm. 213).<sup>25</sup> In the classical Greek and Graeco-Roman periods the cosmic elements (στοιχεῖα) were held by many to be divine.

This deification of the cosmic elements is also discussed by Philo. According to Philo, some have made the four principles, earth, water, air, and fire into gods. They call the earth Kore, Demeter or Pluto, the sea Poseidon, the air Hera, and the fire Hephaestus (*De decalogo* 53—54).<sup>26</sup> In the *De vita contemplativa* these people who have deified the cosmic elements again come to the fore when Philo discusses the Jewish sect of the so-called Therapeutae ('worshippers') and Therapeutrides. Philo asks rhetorically with whom this Jewish sect can be compared as regards their reverence towards the gods. Philo ponders if one could draw a comparison with those who revere the elements (στοιχεῖα), earth, water, air and fire. Various people have given these elements different names, calling the fire Hephaestus, the air Hera, the water Poseidon, and the earth Demeter (*De*

<sup>25</sup> Plutarch, fragm. 213 (Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio* 3.23, pp. 74.23—75.3): πρώτους θεοὺς ἐνόμισαν καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ Φοῖνικες καὶ μέντοι καὶ Ἕλληνες ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν καὶ ἄλλα στοιχεῖα· τοῦτο γὰρ δὴ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων καὶ ὁ Σικελιώτης Διόδωρος καὶ ὁ Χαίρωνεὺς ἐδίδαξε Πλούταρχος. Cf. Plato, *Cratylus* 397C: "Ἀρ' οὖν οὐ δίκαιον ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀρχεσθαι, σκοποῦ μένους πῆ ποτε ἀπὸ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα οἱ "θεοὶ" ὀρθῶς ἐκλήθησαν; Εἰκόσ γε. Τοῖόνδε τοῖνυν ἐγωγε ὑποπεύω· φαίνονται μοι οἱ πρώτοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τοῦτους μόνους [τοὺς θεοὺς] ἡγεῖσθαι οὐσπερ νῦν πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων, ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ γῆν καὶ ἄστρα καὶ οὐρανόν.

<sup>26</sup> Philo, *De decalogo* 53—54: ἐκτεθειώκασιν γὰρ οἱ μὲν τὰς τέσσαρας ἀρχάς, γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ (...). καλοῦσιν (...) οἱ μὲν τὴν γῆν Κόρην, Δήμητραν, Πλούτωνα, τὴν δὲ θάλατταν Ποσειδῶνα (...), Ἦραν δὲ τὸν ἀέρα καὶ τὸ πῦρ Ἥφαιστον.

*vita contemplativa* 3).<sup>27</sup> In Philo's view, those who revere the cosmic elements cannot possibly challenge the piety of the Jewish Therapeutae. The reason for this is that the divine names attributed to the elements are merely the invention of sophists. In reality, the elements (στοιχεῖα) are but lifeless matter which is motionless of itself, but has been laid as a substratum by God, the artificer, for all kinds of forms and qualities (*De vita contemplativa* 4).<sup>28</sup>

Philo's criticism of the deification of the cosmic elements bears considerable resemblance to the way Paul evaluates the elements in *Galatians*. Philo points out that the elements are not divine but just lifeless matter which is incapable of moving of itself. Similarly, Paul regards them as entities which, by nature, are not gods: οἱ φύσει μὴ ὄντες θεοί (*Gal* 4.8). Philo contrasts the lifeless and impotent elements with God. Likewise, Paul opposes the elements which are by nature not gods to God whom the Galatians have now come to know. For that reason, Paul deems it incomprehensible that, knowing God, the Galatians would return to their prior reverence for the weak and small elements: τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ ὄσιν θεοῖς· νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν (...), πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε; (*Gal* 4.8—9).

I shall now briefly summarize the outcome of the search for the meaning of 'elements' (στοιχεῖα) in literature contemporary with Paul. These results help to understand in what sense Paul believed that Jews and non-Jews had been subject to the elements of the cosmos before the incarnation (*Gal* 4.3—5).

(1) Among Greeks the belief that the elements of the cosmos enjoyed divine status was widespread. The elements earth, water, air and fire were identified with gods like Demeter, Poseidon, Hera and Hephaestus respectively. This belief is criticized by Philo.

(2) According to both Plutarch and Philo, the elements are entities from which originate, and in which exist, all destructible and mortal species.

<sup>27</sup> Philo, *De vita contemplativa* 3: ἀρά γε τοὺς τὰ στοιχεῖα τιμῶντας, γῆν, ὕδωρ, ἀέρα, πῦρ; οἷς καὶ ἐπωνυμίας ἔθεντο ἐτέρας ἕτεροι, τὸ μὲν πῦρ Ἡφαιστον (...) καλοῦντες, Ἡραν δὲ τὸν ἀέρα (...), τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ Ποσειδῶνα (...), τὴν δὲ γῆν Δήμητραν;

<sup>28</sup> Philo, *De vita contemplativa* 4: ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ὀνόματα σοφιστῶν ἐστὶν εὐρήματα, τὰ δὲ στοιχεῖα ἀψυχὸς ὕλη καὶ ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἀκίνητος, ὑποβεβλημένη τῷ τεχνίτῃ πρὸς ἀπάσας σχημάτων καὶ ποιότητων ιδέας. Elsewhere, however, Philo suggests that the worship of the elements of the universe (τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ παντός), earth, water, air and fire, is a less severe form of idolatry than the worship of things of wood and stone made by human sculptors: see *De specialibus legibus* 2.255 (cf. also *De decalogo* 66 and *De aeternitate* 10). On the topic of Jewish polemics against image-worship in the Graeco-Roman period, see Tromp 1995a.

Because they are composed out of the elements all things experience change, including generation and destruction.

(3) Greeks, but also Jews like Philo and the authors of *2 Maccabees* and *4 Maccabees*, considered man, regardless whether Jew or Greek, to be comprised of the four cosmic elements earth, water, air, and fire. Men are composed by borrowing small portions from the four elements of the cosmos. This loan is repaid at death when man is resolved into the elements. Man is not only comprised of, but also enclosed by the elements so that it is altogether impossible to slip out through the cosmic elements. This shows what Paul must have had in mind when he said that Jew and Greek alike were subject to the elements of the cosmos: καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι (*Gal* 4.3).

In order to get a clearer view of the whole issue of man's bondage to the elements, I will now discuss one notable interpretation of *Gal* 4.3—10, that by Mußner.<sup>29</sup> Mußner holds that, according to Paul, the elements to which Jews and Greeks were formerly subject (*Gal* 4.3), were not the same for Jews and Greeks. The elements should rather be divided into 'Jewish' and 'pagan' elements of the cosmos.<sup>30</sup> What both kinds of elements have in common, according to Mußner, is that they enslave those within their sphere of influence. The stress is to be placed on 'being enslaved' (δεδουλωμένοι) as the common denominator between Jews and Greeks in their pre-eschatological period prior to Christ's birth: καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι.<sup>31</sup>

Mußner propounds his view on the enslavement to the cosmic elements when he deals with *Gal* 4.9—10. In *Gal* 4.9 Paul states that by adopting Jewish regulations, the non-Jewish Galatians return (ἐπιστρέφειν πάλιν) to the weak and small elements which they are again (πάλιν) and anew (ἄνωθεν) willing to become subject to: πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἄσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦν θέλετε; According to Mußner, the repeated use of the term πάλιν ('again'), the second time reinforced with ἄνωθεν ('anew'), makes clear that, when the Galatians turned to the Jewish lifestyle, *for them* it meant that they turned back

<sup>29</sup> Mußner 1974, pp. 268—304.

<sup>30</sup> Mußner 1974, p. 268: 'Aber schon hier kann gesagt werden, daß als die versklavenden "Weltelemente" für Juden und Heiden nicht dieselben "Elemente" gemeint sind; es muß jedoch in den Augen des Apostels ein tertium comparationis zwischen "jüdischen" und "heidnischen" Weltelementen geben, das den alten Äon in gleicher Weise gekennzeichnet hat.'

<sup>31</sup> Mußner 1974, p. 268: 'Dieses Gemeinsame besteht für den Apostel darin, daß wir in der Zeit der Unmündigkeit versklavt waren—den Ton trägt in V 3 das an den Schluß gestellte, rhythmisch retardierende δεδουλωμένοι.'



to the elements they formerly adhered to.<sup>32</sup> Mußner is apparently of the opinion that the Jewish lifestyle and the 'pagan' elements of the cosmos do not correspond in reality. They do so only in the eyes of the Galatians. Mußner seems to suggest, as we will see presently, that the Galatians were attracted by the Judaizing brand of Christianity because within that type of religion they believed they could resume their old religious interest in the cosmic elements. In Mußner's view, this belief was a misinterpretation of the Judaizing religiosity in question. Mußner does acknowledge that this religiosity had to do with calendars, but refuses to see this Jewish religiosity as slavery to the elements of the cosmos.

The Jewish lifestyle the Galatians adopted is, as Mußner rightly remarks, characterised by Paul as carefully observing certain fixed days, months, seasons, and years: *ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροῦς καὶ ἑνιαυτοῦς* (*Gal* 4.10). Since Jewish law consisted to a considerable extent in observance of the calendar, which was fixed by the revolutions of heavenly bodies, in Mußner's view the Galatians, from their non-Jewish perspective, took the calendar-based piety of the Jews as a kind of reverence for the cosmic elements.<sup>33</sup> According to Mußner, Paul criticized the Jewish calendar-based piety because it was misunderstood by the Galatians. Due to their pagan past, the Galatians, unlike the Jews and Jewish Christians, were easily tempted to revere as gods the heavenly bodies which determine the calendar.<sup>34</sup> Mußner is careful to maintain his initial differentiation between 'Jewish' and 'pagan' elements of the cosmos and tries to rationalize how the Galatians could misinterpret the Jewish regulations as if they were applied to the 'pagan' elements of the cosmos. Due to this misinterpretation, according to Mußner, the Galatians passed from their old state of enslavement into a new one.

---

<sup>32</sup> Mußner 1974, p. 298: 'Das zweimalige *πάλιν*, das zweite Mal verstärkt noch durch ein *ἔνωθεν*, läßt erkennen, daß die Hinwendung der Galater zum gesetzlichen Leben für sie eine erneute Zuwendung zu den "Elementen" ist.'

<sup>33</sup> Mußner 1974, p. 302: 'Damit konnte aber gerade das gesetzliche Leben, weil es mit der "Kalenderfrömmigkeit" verbunden war, die Galater dazu verführen, dasselbe als eine Art von "Elementenverehrung" zu verstehen.'

<sup>34</sup> Mußner 1974, p. 302: 'Warum lehnt sie [= die "Kalenderfrömmigkeit," the Jewish calendar-based piety] aber Paulus so radikal ab? Sehr wahrscheinlich deshalb, weil mit der religiös begründeten "Beobachtung" von Tagen, Monaten, Zeiten und Jahren bestimmte Gefahren verbunden waren: nämlich abergläubischer Gestirnskult—da die Gestirne den Kalender bestimmen und diese dann nur allzuleicht mit "Göttern" verwechselt werden konnten. (...) Der Weg (...) von den den Kalender regelnden Gestirnen zu den "Göttern, die in Wirklichkeit keine sind", war für die Galater nicht weit. Diese Gefahr war für Juden und Judenchristen aufgrund ihres strengen Monotheismus nicht oder kaum gegeben, wohl aber für Heidenchristen, zumal für solche, die noch vor nicht allzu langer Zeit Heiden waren, für die "Elemente" und "Götter" vielfach identisch sind, d.h. aber auch: Elementendienst und Götzendienst.'

Mußner's analysis is unlikely to be correct. Material contemporary with Paul clearly shows that Jews themselves take man, Greek and Jew alike, to consist of physical elements. Not only from the distorted perspective of the Galatians, as Mußner thinks, but also according to a view shared by numerous Jews, all men, non-Jews as well as Jews, were subject to the same cosmic constituents. True, as Philo's criticism of the deification of the elements indicates, Jews probably did not accord these elements divine status. But cosmologically and physiologically speaking, both Jew and Greek were held to be subservient to the very same elements. The elements are entities from which all destructible and mortal beings originate. These beings do not merely originate from the elements, they also continue to exist *in* them. This view is not only expressed in the Jewish testimonies referred to above to the effect that man is made up of the cosmic elements. Paul himself, too, as Mußner tends to neglect, states that Jews before Christ's coming were under the control of the elements: καὶ ἡμεῖς ... ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι (*Gal* 4.3). Moreover, Paul plainly depicts the *conversion* of non-Jewish Galatians to Jewish law as a *return* (ἐπιστρέφειν πάλιν) to the weak and insignificant elements. To these elements the Galatians are willing to become subject again and anew: πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἀνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε; (*Gal* 4.9). By adopting Jewish law, they move again into the realm of the cosmic elements.

Paul alludes to the link between Jewish law and the elements already in *Gal* 4.3—5. In this passage, Paul explains that man's subjection to the elements of the cosmos (ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) ended when, in the fullness of time, God sent his Son. The latter was born of a woman and came under the law (ὑπὸ νόμον) in order to redeem those under the law (ὑπὸ νόμον): καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ (*Gal* 4.3—5a). The parallelism between the phrases 'under the elements of the cosmos' (ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) and 'under the law' (ὑπὸ νόμον) seems to be indicative of the fact that those under the elements of the cosmos, Greek and Jew that is, are viewed as identical with those under the law. But in what sense could the non-Jewish Galatians be regarded as being under the law?

At the moment when Paul wrote his letter, the non-Jewish Galatians had come or were about to come under *Jewish* law by adopting Jewish prescriptions. Paul directed his entire letter against this Judaizing tendency among the Galatians. Paul himself had been confronted with Judaizing Christians before. Titus, one of Paul's non-Jewish co-workers, had first not been forced to be circumcised but this changed through the pressure of

some fellow-Christians (ψευδαδέλφοι). They tried in vain to put Paul and Titus under the authority of the Jewish law (*Gal* 2.3—5). Similarly, Paul had witnessed how such Jewish fellow-Christians, who continued to believe in the validity of Jewish law, succeeded in putting Cephas, a Jewish Christian himself, under pressure in Antioch. They criticized Cephas for his custom of eating together with non-Jewish Christians (2.11—12). These Judaizers are identified as people connected with James (2.12), Jesus' brother (1.19) and one of the pillars of the Jewish-Christian community at Jerusalem (2.9). They were even successful in convincing Paul's Jewish co-worker Barnabas of their views (2.13; cf. 2.1, 9).

The Judaizers now also appear to be at work within the churches of Galatia to whom the letter is addressed (1.2). As in the case of Titus, the Judaizing Christians try to force the non-Jewish Galatians to be circumcised (6.12—13), and to oblige them to keep the entire Jewish law (5.2—3). Paul is quite astonished that the non-Jewish Galatians, who had become Christians, should change their opinion so quickly by turning away from his teaching and adopting the views of Judaizing Christians (1.6—7). The Galatians are willing to place themselves under the authority of Jewish law: οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι (4.21). In this sense the non-Jewish Galatians have come, or are about to come, under *Jewish* law and are reckoned among 'those under the (Jewish) law:' οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον (4.5).

For that reason, Paul can speak of 'we,' Jew and Greek that is, who were formerly enslaved under the elements of the cosmos (4.3: ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) in parallel with those who are under the law (4.5: ὑπὸ νόμον). The latter comprise both Jews by birth and non-Jews like the Galatians who place themselves under the authority of the Jewish law.

But there seems to be more to it. The conversion of the non-Jewish Galatians to Jewish law is depicted by Paul as a return to the weak and small *elements*. They are willing to become subject to these elements *again* and *anew* by carefully observing the Jewish religious calendar of certain fixed days, months, seasons, and years: πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἀνωθεν δουλεῦειν θέλετε; ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς (4.9—10). Paul apparently assumes there is a link between Jewish law and the elements of the cosmos since, in his view, adopting Jewish law amounts to returning to the cosmic elements. In the next section I wish to show in what way the Jewish law and the elements were thought to be related.

### *2.1.2 The elements of the cosmos and (Jewish) law*

Paul regarded the adoption of Jewish law by non-Jewish Galatians as a return to their former servitude to the elements of the cosmos. The reason he did so, was that some parts of Jewish law were regarded as specifically

concerned with the elements. In this section, I will try to show that such a view on the relation between religious legislation and the cosmic elements was widely held among Jews and Greeks of the Graeco-Roman period.

According to Philo, when the third and last season has begun in the seventh month at the autumnal equinox, Israel celebrates the sacred-month-day (τερομηνία). It is called σάλπιγγες, 'the Trumpets' (*De specialibus legibus* 1.186). According to *Leviticus* 23.23—24, this festival was instituted when God commanded Moses to tell Israel that in the seventh month, on the first day of the month, they should observe a day of rest, commemorated with trumpet-calls (μνημόσυνον σαλπίγγων). At the beginning of the sacred month, Philo says, it is a custom to sound the trumpet at the same time when the sacrifices are offered in the temple. For that reason the festival is naturally called 'the Trumpets' (*De specialibus legibus* 2.188).

One of the reasons for which this festival is celebrated, in Philo's view, is that it is a thank-offering to God for the peace he gives in nature. The trumpet, as an instrument of war, is used in view of the war conducted by nature. This war takes place when nature experiences a state of discord in itself, when its various parts (μέρη) attack one another and its observance of the laws of cosmic equality is overcome by the greed for individual gain. As a result, the things on earth suffer destruction from the forces of nature which operate through droughts, heavy rains, the capricious violence of southerly winds, the burning heat of the sun and the chill of snow. The harmony of the annual seasons is turned to discord (*De specialibus legibus* 2.190—191). For that reason, according to Philo, the law (ὁ νόμος) proclaimed the festival of Trumpets to be a token of gratitude to God, the peace-maker and the guardian of peace, who puts an end to the factions in the various parts of the cosmos (μέρη τοῦ παντός). Instead of discord, God produces prosperity, good seasons, and other kinds of good things in abundance. God does not permit any smouldering coal of the actions of destruction to be rekindled (*De specialibus legibus* 2.192).<sup>35</sup>

From the interpretation Philo gives of the Trumpets festival, it becomes clear that, in Philo's view, some of the regulations of Jewish law had been given with an eye to the behaviour of the various parts of the cosmos (μέρη τοῦ παντός). The conviction that some laws are connected with cosmic phenomena seems also to underly Paul's view on Jewish calendrical events, such as particular feastdays, months, and seasons (*Gal* 4.10:

---

<sup>35</sup> Philo, *De specialibus legibus* 2.192: διὰ τοῦτο καθάπερ ἐπώνυμον ἑορτὴν ὄργανου πολεμικοῦ σάλπιγγος ἀπέφηνεν ὁ νόμος, ἐπ' εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ εἰρηνοποιοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰρηνοφύλακος, ὃς (...) τὰς ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τοῦ παντός στάσεις ἀνελῶν εὐθηνίας καὶ εὐετηρίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγαθῶν ἀφθονίαν ἀπειργάσατο, μηδὲν ἐμπύρευμα καρπῶν φθορᾶς ἐσάσας ζωπορηθῆναι.

ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιρούς). This is evident from the fact that Paul relates these events, one way or another, to the elements of the cosmos (*Gal* 4.3, 9: στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου).

To a certain extent, then, Paul and Philo agree in assuming a link between certain Jewish laws and cosmology. The assumption of such a link is also exemplified by the way Philo interprets the Jewish rite of purification by means of ashes and water (*Numbers* 19.17—19). When people are sprinkled, the elements (στοιχεῖα) themselves, earth and water, make sounds and say, almost loudly enough to be heard: 'We are the substance of which your body is composed. Nature, after mixing us, moulded us by rules of divine art into a human form. Because you were put together from us when you came into being, you will again be dissolved into us when you have to die' (*De specialibus legibus* 1.266).<sup>36</sup> As Philo says elsewhere when commenting on similar purification rites, Moses deemed it right that those who were about to sacrifice should sprinkle themselves with the substances mentioned, ashes and water. Moses held nobody worth of offering sacrifices who had not first come to know himself and had comprehended human nothingness, conjecturing from the elements (στοιχεῖα) of which he was formed that he is worth nothing (*De somniis* 1.212).<sup>37</sup> In Philo's view, some purification rites which are prescribed in Jewish law relate to the elements (στοιχεῖα) man is composed of.

Such a rationalization of rites in terms of the cosmic elements (στοιχεῖα) seems to have been widespread in the Graeco-Roman period. Plutarch, for instance, adopts a similar approach when he tries to explain marriage rites current among the Romans. As an answer to the question of why the Romans exhort the bride to touch fire and water, Plutarch suggests the possibility that of these two, which are reckoned among the elements (στοιχεῖα) or first principles, fire ('ignis' in Latin) is masculine and water ('aqua') feminine. Fire provides the beginnings of motion, water supplies a material substratum (Plutarch, *Quaestiones romanae* 263D—E).<sup>38</sup> On this interpretation, the marriage rite is concerned with the ele-

<sup>36</sup> Philo, *De specialibus legibus* 1.266: ἐν οὖν τῷ περιρραίνεσθαι (...) μόνον οὐκ ἄντικρυς αὐτὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα, γῆ καὶ ὕδωρ, φωνὴν ἀφιέντα φησὶν· ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν ἡ τοῦ σώματος ὑμῶν οὐσία, ἡμᾶς ἡ φύσις κερασαμένη θεῖα τέχνη διέπλασεν εἰς ἀνθρωπόμορφον ἰδέαν, ἐξ ἡμῶν παγέντες, ὅτε ἐγένεσθε, πάλιν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀναλυθήσεσθε, ὅταν δὲ θῆσκειν.

<sup>37</sup> Philo, *De somniis* 1.212: καὶ τοὺς μέλλοντας ἱερουργεῖν περιρραίνεσθαι τοῖς λεχθεῖσιν ἐδικαίωσεν, οὐδένα θυσιῶν ἀξίον νομίσας, ὅς μὴ πρότερον ἑαυτὸν ἐγνωκε καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην οὐδένειαν κατείληφεν, ἐξ ὧν συνεκρίθη στοιχείων τὸ μηδενὸς ἀξίος εἶναι τεκμηράμενος.

<sup>38</sup> Plutarch, *Quaestiones romanae* 263D—E: "Διὰ τί τὴν γαμουμένην ἄπτεσθαι πυρός καὶ ὕδατος κελεύουσι;" πότερον τούτων ὡς ἐν στοιχείοις καὶ ἀρχαῖς τὸ μὲν ἄρρεν ἐστὶ τὸ δὲ θῆλυ, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀρχὰς κινήσεως ἐνίησι τὸ δ' ὑποκειμένου καὶ ὕλης δύναμιν. For

ments (στοιχῆια) fire and water, which are essential components in procreation. Plutarch, Philo, and Paul seem to agree that some religious rituals, either marriage rites, purification rites or rites of a different kind, are connected with the elements of the cosmos.

This cosmological rationalization of religious rituals is reflected upon by Plutarch. In his *De Iside*, Plutarch comments on the rituals of Egyptian priests. He objects to the view of those who believe that all that is irrational, legendary, and superstitious has been implanted as a principle in the sacred rites performed by the Egyptian priests. Quite the opposite is the case, Plutarch argues, since their rituals are actually based on things which have moral or practical causes, or on things which are not without historical or physical elegance (κομψότης φυσική; *De Iside* 353E).<sup>39</sup> That is to say, Plutarch holds that religious rituals (insofar as they are not irrational, mythical or the expression of superstitious fears) derive from ethical, historical, or physical considerations.

Plutarch continues by giving an example of a ritual based on physical considerations. The case is of importance to us as it illustrates the fact that some rituals were thought to be cosmologically motivated. According to Plutarch, the Egyptian priests hold the onion in abomination. They are disgusted at it and are guarded against it. The reason for this, is that the onion is the only plant which is disposed by nature to thrive and flourish in the moon's wane (*De Iside* 353F). In like manner the Egyptian priests believe the wild boar to be an unholy animal since it is reputed to copulate almost always in the waning of the moon (*ibidem*). The religious customs of abstaining from onions and the meat of wild boar are accounted for in astronomical terms: the waning of the moon. Plutarch uses these examples in order to demonstrate that some rituals are based on 'physical elegance' (κομψότης φυσική), that is on the subtleties of cosmology.

It appears that in philosophy contemporaneous to Paul, as evidenced in the works of Plutarch and Philo, there was a pervasive awareness that certain religious rituals and laws had come into existence for ethical and historical reasons, but others for physical reasons. Some of these rituals motivated by physical reasons are concerned with the microcosmos and focus on the cosmic elements (στοιχῆια) man is composed of. In the rites of purification as described by Philo, ashes and water remind those who partake in those rituals of the elements (στοιχῆια) from which they are put together and into which they will again be dissolved. These rites help them

---

a commentary on Plutarch's interpretation of Roman marriage ceremonies, see Rose 1924, pp. 101—109 and, esp., 169.

<sup>39</sup> Plutarch, *De Iside* 353E: Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλογον οὐδὲ μυθῶδες οὐδ' ὑπὸ δεισιδαιμονίας, ὡσπερ ἔνιοι νομίζουσιν, ἐγκατεστοιχειοῦτο <ταῖς> ἱερουργίαις, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἠθικὰς ἔχοντα καὶ χρειώδεις αἰτίας, τὰ δ' οὐκ ἄμοιρα κομψότητος ἱστορικῆς ἢ φυσικῆς ἔστιν.

to gain more self-knowledge and to become aware that, as men, they are futile beings. Similarly, in the Roman marriage rites, according to Plutarch's interpretation, the fire and water the bride is expected to touch, represent the elements (στοιχεῖα) which play an important role in human procreation. Fire provides the beginnings of motion; water supplies the substratum or matter needed for generation. The purification and marriage rituals mentioned are connected with the microcosmos. Other rituals are involved rather with the macrocosmos. This applies, for instance, to the rules concerning abstention from onions and the meat of wild boar, as recorded by Plutarch. Onions and wild boar are thought to be subject to astronomical influences. Philo explains the institution of the celebration of Trumpets festival in macrocosmic terms. He takes the festival to be an expression of gratitude towards God for his putting an end to the cosmic strife between the various parts of nature.

Paul takes the Jewish legislation to be linked with the cosmic elements. Such a cosmological understanding of religious rules, rituals, and customs was widespread in his time. It should be borne in mind that the link between Jewish law and the cosmic elements was a reason for Paul to denounce the Galatians' Judaizing inclinations.

It is not surprising that Paul criticized the observance of Jewish law by non-Jewish Galatians as a return to the elements. In fact, he, like many others, interpreted regulations contained in Jewish law as enslaving those who observed them to the cosmic elements. For that reason, by adopting Jewish law the Galatians would return to the position of being subject to the same elements as before: πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἄσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἀνωθεν δουλεῦειν θέλετε; (*Gal* 4.9). By becoming more and more attracted to Jewish regulations, the Galatians do not merely pass from their old, non-Jewish state of enslavement into a new one. They become enslaved to the very same cosmic elements as before. These elements give rise to similar religious legislation, though this time legislation of a Jewish type. In this way the law and the elements of the cosmos are tied up.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Cf., however, Martyn 1995 for a different assessment of the relation between the elements of the cosmos and the law in *Gal*. Martyn concedes that, on lexicographical grounds, in texts of Paul's time the elements (στοιχεῖα) should be identified as the *physical* elements of the cosmos (pp. 16—20), as the Galatians (pp. 20—22) and Paul's Jewish contemporaries (pp. 22—26) would be likely to do. Nevertheless, Martyn develops an implausible hypothesis concerning Paul's understanding of the elements (pp. 26—32), to the extent that, 'when he speaks in 4:3 and 9 of the elements of that cosmos, Paul himself has in mind not earth, air, fire, and water, but rather the elemental pairs of opposites listed in 3:28, and emphatically the first pair, Jew and Gentile, and thus the Law and the not-Law' (p. 31 [repeated almost verbatim in Martyn 1997a, p. 404 and in Martyn 1997b, p. 138]; quoted with approval by Stanton 1996, p. 114). Consequently, Mar-

For that reason, Paul could equate those 'under the elements of the cosmos' (*Gal* 4.3: ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα) with those 'under the law' (*Gal* 4.5: ὑπὸ νόμον), whom Christ set out to redeem. In the fullness of time, Christ was sent by God, was born from a woman, and came under the law in order to redeem those under the law: καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ (*Gal* 4.3—5a). Before, I surmised from the Judaizing pressure exerted by the Christian Judaizers at work in Galatia, that the phrase 'those under the law' (*Gal* 4.5a: οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον) refers equally to Jews by birth and non-Jews like the Galatians who have come, or are about to come, under the influence of the Jewish law. In this case, 'those under the law' simply means 'those under the Jewish law.' The Jewish law, however, is probably not the sole referent of the term νόμος ('law') in *Gal* 4.5a. It was shown above that in the Graeco-Roman period religious legislation was understood to be partly based on cosmological considerations. Furthermore, the adoption of Jewish laws by non-Jewish Galatians is viewed by Paul as a return to a religion concerned with the elements of the cosmos. For these reasons, it is likely that the term νόμος ('law') in the phrase 'those under the law' (*Gal* 4.5a) points not only to the Jewish law as such, but refers rather to the Jewish law as a specimen of laws in general based on a national ethic. Another example of these laws is the religious rules of the Egyptian priests as described in Plutarch's *De Iside*.

The term νόμος ('law') in Paul's letters does not necessarily refer exclusively to the Jewish law but is rather equivocal so that its meaning needs to be construed in each particular case from the context in which it occurs. This has recently been argued by Hollander.<sup>41</sup> In *1 Cor* 9.4—10,

---

tyn regards the law as one of the cosmic elements till it is turned by Christ into the 'law of Christ' (*Gal* 6.2) (pp. 32—39). Martyn's hypothesis is based on the dubious assumption that the pairs of opposites mentioned in *Gal* 3.28 (Jew-Greek, slave-free, male-female) can be compared with the pairs of opposites consisting of the *physical* elementary qualities wet, dry, cold, and hot which, in contemporary philosophy, are each attributed to one of the elements of the cosmos. According to Martyn, Paul uses the expression 'elements of the cosmos' to refer to the oppositional elements of *religious* polarity listed in *Gal* 3.28 (pp. 29—31). Such a transformation of a literal meaning of στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου into a figurative one would be unlikely to have been clear to the Galatians and is, above all, unnecessary. See also Martyn's commentary on *Gal*: Martyn 1997a, esp. pp. 393—406: 'Comment 41: Christ and the Elements of the Cosmos.'

<sup>41</sup> Hollander 1998. Cf. also Hollander & Holleman 1993. For a similar approach, see Winger 1992. As regards the term νόμος in *Gal* 4.5a, however, Winger reaches a different conclusion than I do: 'ὑπὸ νόμον in 4:5 follows immediately on ὑπὸ νόμον in 4:4, which—because it is describing Christ—plainly refers to Jewish law; so, presumably, does 4:5' (Winger 1992, p. 78). Winger nevertheless concedes another interpretation is



for instance, Paul argues that, legally speaking, the apostles have the right to be financially supported by the Christian communities, and are not obliged to earn a living for themselves. Paul first takes three examples from human society where it is customary that soldiers are not expected to pay their own salary, and farmers and shepherds normally make use of the products of their vineyard and cattle for their own sustenance (*1 Cor* 9.7). But Paul not only argues 'on a human level' (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον) but refers also to 'the law' (ὁ νόμος) in support of the apostolic right to be sustained. Paul continues by quoting a passage from 'the law of Moses' (ὁ Μωϋσέως νόμος) to the effect that an ox which is treading out the grain should not be muzzled (*Deuteronomy* 25.4): Μὴ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ, ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει; ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται, Οὐ κημῶσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα (*1 Cor* 9.8—9).

As Hollander has shown convincingly, Paul first argues 'on a human level' (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον) by pointing at three examples which are drawn from everyday life and are based on what is customary in human society. These customs are corroborated by written legal codes (ὁ νόμος), of which the Jewish law of Moses (ὁ Μωϋσέως νόμος) is a specimen.<sup>42</sup> Hollander is right in concluding that 'Paul, as a Hellenistic Jew and Christian living in the Graeco-Roman culture, could refer first to "the law" in general, and next to "the law of Moses" as a specimen of a larger class of national laws, given by a God-inspired man, Moses, to the people of Israel (or the Jews). This means that in *1 Cor.* 9:7—10 Paul wants to make clear to his readers that it was not only in keeping with human standards or (unwritten) manners that people might expect to be sustained by their labours, but that on a higher, a divine level, "the (written) law" in general and "the law of Moses" in particular ordained the same thing.'<sup>43</sup> In this passage, thus, 'the law of Moses' appears to be a specimen of national laws in general.

In a similar way, 'those under the law' in *Gal* 4.5 (οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον) are in the first place 'those under the Jewish law.' These people had come under the authority of the Jewish law either by birth or by adopting it, as the non-Jewish Galatians had done or were about to do. The Jewish law, however, is certainly not the sole referent of the term νόμος ('law') here, because the phrase 'under the law' (*Gal* 4.5: ὑπὸ νόμον) constitutes a clear

---

possible. After having argued that in 4.4 'the reference (...) is necessarily to Jewish νόμος' (p. 74), in a footnote he adds: 'It is natural to infer that the same νόμος is referred to by ὑπὸ νόμον in 4:5 also; but while I think this is probable I do not think it is inevitable' (p. 74 note 41).

<sup>42</sup> Hollander 1998, pp. 119—123 on *1 Cor* 9.8—9. For Graeco-Roman parallels for the use of ὁ νόμος as referring to 'the law' or 'the laws' in general, and for the phrase ὁ νόμος λέγει ..., see Hollander 1998, pp. 122—123, nn. 24 and 25 respectively.

<sup>43</sup> Hollander 1998, p. 123.

parallel with the preceding phrase 'under the elements of the cosmos' (*Gal* 4.3: ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου). According to Paul, 'we'—Jews like Paul and non-Jews like the Galatians—were enslaved under the elements of the cosmos (ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου). But when the fullness of time came, God sent his Son, born from a woman, arriving under the law (ὑπὸ νόμον), in order that he would redeem those under the law (ὑπὸ νόμον): καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ (*Gal* 4.3—5a). Given the fact that Jews and non-Jews are described here as enslaved 'under the elements of the cosmos' (ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου), one would expect that Paul would continue by relating that Christ came under the power of these elements in order to redeem 'those under the elements of the cosmos.' Instead, Christ is portrayed as he who came 'under the law' in order to redeem 'those under the law:' γενόμενος ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ. The phrases 'under the elements of the cosmos' (ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) and 'under the law' (ὑπὸ νόμον) correspond with one another. If the term νόμος ('law') referred exclusively to the Jewish law, Christ would be considered as redeeming only those who find themselves under the Jewish law. In that case, however, the non-Jews, who are enslaved under the elements of the cosmos, but have not or not yet taken the Jewish law as their own would be excluded from salvation.

Paul's argumentation becomes transparent, though, once the term νόμος ('law') is taken as referring to the Jewish law as a specimen of a larger class of national laws. These national laws in general constitute the second referent of the term νόμος ('law'). The parallelism between the phrases 'under the law' and 'under the elements of the cosmos' betrays that Paul is particularly concerned here with national laws insofar as their religious legislation is based on cosmological considerations. If this is taken into account, the thrust of the argument in *Gal* 4.3—5 is clear. Those who were under the influence of the elements of the cosmos (ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου), Jews and non-Jews alike, were liberated when in the fullness of time God sent his Son. By being born from a Jewish woman, Christ came under the Jewish law (ὑπὸ νόμον). The Jewish law, however, is only a representative of a larger class of cosmologically-motivated laws. Consequently, Christ was able to redeem those who found themselves under any particular law (οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον), either Jewish or non-Jewish.

In other words, for the purpose of delivering Jews and Greeks from their bondage to the cosmic elements, Christ needed to be born. To be born is, physiologically or cosmologically speaking, to be born from a

woman (*Gal* 4.4c: γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικός). By being born from a woman, Christ is composed out of the elements of the cosmos. That in contemporary Jewish and non-Jewish sources man is regarded to consist of the four elements was demonstrated in chap. 2.1.1 above. By being born from a woman, Christ entered the realm of the elements of the cosmos. To be born is also, religiously speaking, to come under a law (*Gal* 4.4d: γενόμενος ὑπὸ νόμον), under a law, that is, which includes prescriptions concerning the cosmic elements. In the present section (chap. 2.1.2), certain religious laws were shown to be linked with the elements, both according to Jews and Greeks. Through his activity as saviour, Christ lifted man's bondage to the elements, and thereby rendered the religious legislation concerning the cosmos superfluous and without foundation. For that reason, the non-Jewish Galatians are warned not to return to the elements (*Gal* 4.9: πῶς επιστρέφετε ἄλλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς ἄλλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦν θέλετε;) by adopting Jewish legislation (4.10).

Christ lifted man's bondage to the elements through his activity as saviour. This activity is again in view at the very end of the *Letter to the Galatians* where it is linked particularly to the cross. In *Gal* 6.14—15, Paul says that he wishes not to boast of anything but of the cross of Christ through which the cosmos is crucified to him (Paul), and he to the cosmos: ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καγὼ κόσμῳ. As a result, it no longer means anything to be Jewish or non-Jewish, but what matters is a new creation: οὔτε γὰρ περιτομὴ τί ἐστίν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις. On the cross Christ liberated Jew and Greek alike from the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) by crucifying and destroying the cosmos (κόσμος) and replacing it with a new creation.

The old relation between the cosmic elements and the Jewish and Greek religious legislations concerned with these elements has been surpassed. The new cosmic reality is now dominated by Christ. For that reason, the new religious order acknowledges this new cosmic constellation of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ('cosmic elements') by στοιχεῖν (6.16; cf. 5.25), by being in line with the basic, elementary insight that, due to the all-encompassing reality of the new creation, previous ethnic differences are no longer valid: ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καγὼ κόσμῳ. οὔτε γὰρ περιτομὴ τί ἐστίν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις. καὶ ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν, εἰρήνην ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ (6.14—16). Paul apparently makes a clever use of the words στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ('elements of the cosmos;' 4.3, 9), which has a cosmological meaning, and στοιχεῖν (LSJ 1647—48: 'to be in line with, walk by, agree with;' 5.25, 6.16), which has a different meaning.

Making use of these cognate words with more than one meaning, he is punning and playing with language in order to bring home his point that the cosmic reality and religious legislation are interlaced. The new constellation of the στοιχῆα τοῦ κόσμου, the elements of the cosmos, gives rise to a new religious agreement which is dominated by Christ's Spirit (4.6; 5.25: εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν) and overcomes all ethnic divisions (6.16).

Such a process of subjecting the cosmic elements and supplanting the cosmos with a new reality also comes into view in *1 Corinthians* 15.23—28. In this passage it is said that till the end of time Christ is engaged in the subjection of cosmic principles, powers and forces. Since this vocabulary referring to the cosmic powers partly returns in *Col*, I will now give a detailed interpretation of *1 Cor* 15.23—28.

## 2.2 Physics and cosmic Christology in Paul's *First Letter to the Corinthians*: Christ's subjugation of the cosmic principles, powers and forces (*1 Cor* 15.23—28)

### *Introduction*

The investigation of Paul's physics in his authentic letters will now be complemented with an inquiry into the meaning of the terms 'principles' (ἀρχαί) and 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι) in *1 Cor*. This will enable us in the next chapter (chap. 3) to draw a comparison between the cosmology of *Col* and that of Paul's authentic letters.

In Paul, the terms 'principles' and 'powers' appear in the fifteenth chapter of *1 Corinthians*. Within a discussion of the resurrection of the dead at the end of time (*1 Cor* 15.12—57), Paul reflects on what will happen after the deceased believers have been made alive at Christ's reappearance in the world. After Christ's arrival, the actual end will be reached when Christ subdues all cosmic principles (ἀρχαί), powers (ἐξουσίαι), and forces, and returns the dominion to God so that God will be all in everything (*1 Cor* 15.23—28).

First, I will provide a general analysis of *1 Cor* 15.23—28 in order to obtain a clear idea of what kind of Christology is involved here. The Christology of this passage seems to centre around the thought that Christ is authorized by God to subdue the cosmological powers gradually in the time between his resurrection and the end of time (chap. 2.2.1).

In the second section, the history of the tradition underlying the concept of Christ subjecting the cosmic powers will be reconstructed. As I will argue, this concept belongs to the Jewish tradition of the heavenly eschato-

logical agent. It derives ultimately from *Daniel* 7.27 LXX where the powers (ἐξουσίαι) are said to submit to the 'son of man' (chap. 2.2.2).

In the third section, I will argue that, whereas in *Dan* 7.27 LXX the powers (ἐξουσίαι) are terrestrial kingdoms, Paul takes them to be cosmic entities. He equates them with cosmological principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις). Paul's concept of Christ subduing the cosmological powers in *1 Cor* 15.23—28 will prove similar to the notion in *Gal* 4.3—10 that Christ lifts man's bondage to the elements of the cosmos as described in chap. 2.1 above. It emerges that the principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις), with which Paul puts the Danielic powers (ἐξουσίαι) on a par, are identical with the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) or with the forces by which these elements are dominated (chap. 2.2.3).

Finally, it will be shown that, according to Paul, the process of Christ's subjection of the cosmic powers results in the disintegration of the present cosmos and its replacement with a new reality. This reality is characterized as a state in which God is everything in everything (chap. 2.2.4).

### *2.2.1 Christ's gradual subjugation of the cosmic powers: A general analysis of 1 Cor 15.23—28*

The passage *1 Cor* 15.23—28 is a clearly distinguishable section on Christ's eschatological reign. In it, Paul states that the resurrection of Christ will be followed by that of those who belong to Christ (15.23). Subsequently, the definitive end will arrive when Christ returns the dominion to God, when he (Christ) will have annihilated all principles, powers and forces: εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν (15.24). Although eschatology is the subject matter of the whole chapter, this is the first and only time Paul uses the term τέλος ('end') for the final consummation.

This end appears to comprise two separate stages: first the principles, powers and forces will be abolished, subsequently the παράδοσις, the transmission of Christ's temporary rule to God, will be effectuated. The two phrases, i.e. the phrase ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί ('when Christ returns the dominion to God') on the one hand, and the phrase ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν ('when he [Christ] will have annihilated all principles, powers and forces') on the other, do not qualify the 'end' in the same way. They are not two equal subordinate clauses on the same level. It seems very likely that the last clause ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν ('when he [Christ] will have annihilated all principles, powers and forces') is subordinate to the preceding clause. The end will appear when the dominion is returned to God, when, prior to that, all

kinds of cosmic powers will have been subjugated. In the context, the statement that Christ would transmit his dominion to God before the subjection of the cosmic powers had been realised, would not make sense. The differentiation between Christ's rendering the dominion to God and Christ's dominance over the cosmic powers prior to this return seems to be important to Paul's argument here. The differentiation reappears in the last verse of the present passage (15.23—28) so as to link back to the first verse, as will be shown below.

In the next three verses (15.25—27), the thought that at the end the dominion will be returned to God when the powers have been overcome is supported by references to two passages from the *Psalms*.

In the first place, it is said that Christ needs to exert his dominion until he has placed all enemies under his feet: δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὗ θῆ ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (15.25). This verse is a remoulded quotation from *Psalms* 109.1 LXX. It seems to stress the temporary nature of Christ's reign, which is spoken of in the preceding verse: εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ (15.24a: 'and then comes the end, when he returns the dominion to God the Father'). It can be shown that the psalm quotation is meant to back up this statement, since the term 'dominion' (βασιλεία: ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν) affects the subsequent quotation from the *Psalms*. In the Greek of the LXX, the text of *Psalms* 109.1 reads Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου ('Take your seat on my right, until I make your enemies a footstool of your feet'). Other early Christian quotations of *Psalms* 109.1 LXX retain the phrase κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, 'take your seat on my right' (*Mark* 12.36 parr, *Acts* 2.34—35 and *Hebr* 1.13). Paul, however, renders this phrase differently by replacing it with δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ('For he must exert his dominion'). The reason why Paul replaced 'take your seat on my right' (κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου) by 'he must exert his dominion' (δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν) is apparently that he wanted the quotation of *Psalms* 109.1 LXX to support the idea of the transmission of Christ's temporary dominion (βασιλεία) to God. This dominion needs to be returned since, according to Paul's application of *Psalms* 109.1 LXX, it is only assigned to Christ until he, the ruler who has been endowed with such authority, has placed the enemies under his feet: ἄχρι οὗ θῆ ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (*1 Cor* 15.25). The return of Christ's dominion to God, thus, is based on the temporary nature of Christ's authority. He has received this authority only in order to subdue the cosmic principles, powers and forces. After that, Christ's control has to be surrendered.

Paul can use *Psalms* 109.1 LXX as he does since, as scholars have often noticed, he changes the original ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου (*Psalms*

109.1 LXX: 'until I make your enemies a footstool of your feet') into ἄχρι οὐ θῆ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (*I Cor* 15.25: 'until he [Christ] has placed all the enemies under his feet'). The change of the noun ὑποπόδιον ('footstool') + genitive (in the phrase ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου: 'a footstool of your feet') into ὑπὸ ('under') + accusative (ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ: 'under his feet') is unimportant. It may be merely a simplification, possibly under the influence of *Psalms* 46.4 (ὑπέταξεν [sc. κύριος] ... ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν) or of 17.10 (ἐκκλινεν ... ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ). The switch from the possessive pronoun σου ('your') in the same phrase ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου ('a footstool of your feet') to αὐτοῦ ('his'; ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ: 'under his feet') is also insignificant in itself. It is merely due to the change from the direct speech in the LXX psalm into the indirect speech employed in the application of this psalm in *I Cor* 15. For the same reason, the possessive pronoun σου ('your') in the phrase ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου ('until I make your enemies') is omitted by Paul so that the unqualified noun remains, though supplemented now with the adjective 'all' (ἄχρι οὐ θῆ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς: 'until he has placed all the enemies').

There are, however, two noteworthy alterations. The most important one is the transformation of the verb θῶ (1 sg.: 'I make'), of which the subject in the LXX psalm is God, into the verb θῆ (3 sg.: 'he has placed'). In the immediate context Christ is the one who at the end will return the dominion to God having subdued the cosmic powers (*I Cor* 15.23—24). Consequently, it is Christ too who will reign until he has placed all enemies under his feet (15.25). The subject of the verb θῆ ('he has placed') in the psalm quotation in *I Cor* 15.25, is, again contrary to the other early Christian quotations of this psalm which retain the original θῶ ('I make'), not God but Christ. There is no indication in the immediate context that the subject would change from Christ, who exerts his dominion, to God, who would place the enemies under Christ's feet. A change of subject has to be assumed only later, i.e., in the next psalm quotation.

A less important but still notable alteration, lastly, is the change from the relative adverb ἕως ἂν ('until'; ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου) into the preposition ἄχρι to a relative pronoun ('until'): ἄχρι οὐ θῆ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ('until he has placed all the enemies under his feet'). This is in contrast to the other early Christian quotations of *Psalms* 109.1 LXX which retain the reading ἕως ἂν ('until'; see *Mark* 12.36 parr; *Acts* 2.35; and *Hebr* 1.13). In general, the relative particle ἕως ἂν ('until') with subjunctive, which occurs in the LXX psalm, expresses the point of time up to which an action lasts, with reference to the end of the action at an *uncertain* time in the future.<sup>44</sup> In *Psalms* 109.1 LXX, thus, the particle ἕως ἂν ('until') in the phrase κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου ('Take your seat on my right, until I make your enemies a footstool of your feet') indicates the moment up to which the action of being seated on God's right hand will last, that is until the *uncertain* time somewhere in the future when the king's enemies will be subdued. In the context of *I Cor* 15, however, this particle which refers to an uncertain time in the future is better replaced with the preposition ἄχρι with relative pronoun ('until') since, in Paul's understanding, the decisive submission of all the enemies does not take place at an *indeterminate* point in the future but at the end itself: εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ (...). δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὐ θῆ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (15.24—25). Here the quotation is put by Paul into an eschatological framework which is absent from the LXX psalm. Subsequently, the text of the psalm has been adapted accordingly.

<sup>44</sup> See LSJ s.v. ἕως I.2.

All these modifications of *Psalms* 109.1 LXX (the replacement of κάθου εκ δεξιῶν μου with δεῖ γάρ αὐτὸν βασιλεῦειν, the change of the verb θῶ into θῆ and the concomitant conversion of the subject 'God' into 'Christ', and the change of ἕως ἄν into ἄχρι οὗ) are meant to make the psalm serve as the basis for the notions of Christ's βασιλεία ('dominion'), its temporary nature and transmission to God and its purpose, all of which are expressed in the preceding verse. Christ's dominion will be returned to God at the end (*I Cor* 15.24) since it has to last only until all the enemies are placed under his feet (15.25).

Before Paul adduces a second quotation from the *Psalms*, he adds a small remark on the quotation discussed: ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος (15.26). In this verse, Paul identifies death as the final enemy which will be brought under Christ's dominion and subdued. The whole passage 15.23—28 is now clearly placed within the broader context of the fifteenth chapter which deals with the resurrection of the dead, and the end of death.<sup>45</sup>

Subsequently, then, Paul adduces another psalm quotation to underpin his idea that Christ will subdue the cosmic powers. Among these, death will be the last. This second reference to the *Psalms* is taken from *Psalms* 8.7 LXX. The quotation says that 'he' has placed all things under his feet: πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (*I Cor* 15.27).<sup>46</sup> In all likelihood, the subject of the verb ὑπέταξεν ('he has placed') in the line πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ('for he has placed all things under his feet') is not Christ but God. God has placed all things under his, that is under Christ's feet.

God's role emerges clearly from Paul's commentary immediately following the psalm quotation. In the commentary Paul paraphrases the contents of the quotation from *Psalms* 8.7. He remarks that, when Scripture says that all things are subdued, he (God) who has placed all things under Christ is evidently exempted from this subjection: ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ ὅτι πάντα ὑποτέτακται, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα (*I Cor* 15.27b). This designation of God as ὁ ὑποτάξας αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ('he who

---

<sup>45</sup> See *I Cor* 15.21 and 15.54—57 on the origin and disappearance of death respectively. That in Paul's view death is a cosmic power is probably also apparent from *I Cor* 3.21—23: πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν, εἴτε Παῦλος εἴτε Ἀπολλῶς εἴτε Κηφᾶς, εἴτε κόσμος εἴτε ζωὴ εἴτε θάνατος, εἴτε ἐνεστῶτα εἴτε μέλλοντα· πάντα ὑμῶν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς δὲ θεοῦ.

<sup>46</sup> The text of the quotation does not differ from that of the LXX psalm except for two details. The direct speech in which God is addressed in the psalm (πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ: 'You have placed all things under his feet') is now changed into indirect speech and phrased in the third person singular (πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ: 'for he has placed all things under his feet'). In addition, the preposition ὑποκάτω ('under') + genitive is replaced with ὑπὸ ('under') + accusative. These differences are insignificant.



has placed all things') shows that it is He who has placed all things under Christ. For this reason, God is most naturally taken as the subject of the verb in the psalm quotation at the beginning of verse 27 too: God has placed all things under Christ's feet. This time the context urges one to suppose there is a change of subject from Christ (who is the auctor in 15.24—25, succeeded by death as the subject of 15.26) to God.

The quotation from *Psalm* 8.7 LXX, thus, has the same function as that from *Psalm* 109 LXX. With both quotations Paul tries to clarify why Christ is able to abolish all antagonistic principles, powers and forces, and among them death, which will be the last one (15.26). The quotation from *Psalm* 8 says that Christ has the potential to achieve this since God has placed all things under Christ's authority: πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοῦς πόδας αὐτοῦ (15.27a). In Paul's understanding, this position of authority was only accorded to Christ from his resurrection onwards. The same idea occurs in *Romans* 8.34 where Paul says, this time in an allusion to *Psalm* 109.1 LXX, that Christ is the one who died and, more importantly, the resurrected one who is at the right hand of God.<sup>47</sup> The position of authority at God's right hand is taken by the resurrected one. Along similar lines Paul states at the beginning of the *Letter to the Romans* that Jesus Christ was proclaimed to be the 'Son of God' when by an act of power he was raised from the dead (*Romans* 1.4).<sup>48</sup> According to Paul, at Christ's resurrection he was not only appointed 'Son of God' but also installed as ruler (κύριος). The notion of Christ's resurrection and that of his being invested with power are also connected in *Romans* 10.9. Here the confessions that Jesus is ruler and that God has resurrected him from the dead occur to-

<sup>47</sup> *Romans* 8.34: Χριστός Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀποθανών, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθείς, ὅς καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ. For the phrase ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, see *Psalm* 109.1 LXX: Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. This allusion to *Psalm* 109.1 LXX in connection with the resurrected Christ is also made in *Mark* 14.62 parr and *Hebr* 1.3, 10.12 and 12.2. Christ's resurrection and *Psalm* 109 LXX are clearly linked in *Acts* 2.32—36.

<sup>48</sup> *Romans* 1.4: (...) Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (...) τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει (...) ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. A similar link between Jesus' resurrection and the title υἱός is made in *Acts* 13.32—33, with the aid of *Psalm* 2.7, where it is said that God raised Ἰησοῦν ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε (*Acts* 13.33). The quotation from *Psalm* 2.7 is also used with regard to Jesus' resurrection in *Hebrews* 1.3—5. On Jesus' divine sonship in *Romans* 1.3—4 and *Acts* 13.33, cf. Dunn 1989, pp. 33—36: 'On the basis of Rom. 1.3f. and Acts 13.33 we may conclude therefore that the first Christians thought of Jesus' divine sonship principally as a role and status he had entered upon, been appointed to at his resurrection' (p. 36).

gether and are judged to be essential to the Christian faith (*Romans* 10.9).<sup>49</sup>

According to Paul, the idea of Jesus' resurrection and that of his elevation to power are closely related. Probably the relationship between these concepts also underlies the quotation from *Psalms* 8.7 in *1 Cor* 15.27a. In the latter passage, Paul points to Christ's enthronement at his resurrection when Christ was authorized by God to subdue the cosmic powers.<sup>50</sup> Paul refers to this capacity of subduing the cosmic powers in *Philippians* 3.20—21. There he mentions the way Christ will act at his reappearance in the world. Christ will act in accordance with the force which empowers him to subjugate all things (*Philipp* 3.21).<sup>51</sup> In Paul's view, this will undo the subjection of creation under the purposelessness which was brought about by Adam, who placed creation under this vanity (*Romans* 8.20).<sup>52</sup> Christ's enthronement at his resurrection, thus, qualifies him to restore creation from its bondage under purposelessness and to exert his dominion over all things. This enthronement is depicted in *1 Cor* 15.27a in words derived from *Psalms* 8.7. The idea of Christ's enthronement explains why he is able to terminate the enmity of the cosmic powers and to abolish death: at his resurrection God placed all things under his authority. After quoting *Psalms* 8.7, Paul has to restrict its possible meaning. Indeed, all things have been placed under Christ's authority but obviously not God himself: ὅταν δὲ εἶπη ὅτι πάντα ὑποτέτακται, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτός τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα (*1 Cor* 15.27b).<sup>53</sup>

<sup>49</sup> *Romans* 10.9: ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ. See also *Romans* 14.9 (εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἐξήσεν ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ), and *Philipp* 2.9—11: διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν (...), ἵνα (...) πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς. The affirmation that Jesus is κύριος also comes into view in Paul's writings in *1 Cor* 12.3 and *2 Cor* 4.5 (cf. *Col* 2.6), though here with no mention of Jesus' resurrection.

<sup>50</sup> *Psalms* 8.7 is also used as a reference to Christ's resurrection in *Hebr* 2.5—9. Cf. the use of *Psalms* 8.7 in *1 Peter* 3.21—22 and *Eph* 1.20—22 as well, though these passages are probably dependent upon Paul. The relationship between *Eph* 1.20—22 and *1 Cor* 15 will be treated in chap. 4.3.2 below.

<sup>51</sup> *Philipp* 3.21: κατὰ τὴν ἐνεργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.

<sup>52</sup> *Romans* 8.20: τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἣ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἐκούσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα. On the basis of *Romans* 5.12, 18 and *1 Cor* 15.21, where Adam is regarded as responsible for the introduction of sin and death into the world, I think the ὑποτάξας in *Romans* 8.20 has to be identified with Adam and not with God.

<sup>53</sup> The quotation of *Psalms* 8.7 in *Hebr* 2.5—9 is also followed by a short but different commentary. Having quoted *Psalms* 8.7, the author of *Hebr* stresses the fact that nothing escapes subjection, even though this total subjection can not yet be seen: πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. ἐν τῷ γὰρ ὑποτάξαι [αὐτῷ] τὰ πάντα οὐδὲν

The thought that Christ will return his dominion to God at the end when he will have subdued the cosmic powers (*1 Cor* 15.24), has now been strengthened by two psalm quotations. The first quotation seems to highlight the temporary nature and the purpose of Christ's dominion (βασιλεία). This reign is to be returned to God (15.24a) since it finishes when all cosmic powers have been overthrown (15.24b): δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὗ θῆ ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (15.25). The second psalm quotation seems to answer the question why Christ is able to annihilate the cosmic powers (15.24b) with all their enmity (15.25), and death in particular (15.26). Christ is able to do this since he has been empowered to start the process of the destruction of all these powers. He received this power at his resurrection, when God placed all opposition under his authority: πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (15.27a). The two psalm quotations, therefore, are meant to shed light both on the transfer of Christ's dominion to God, and on Christ's combat against the cosmic powers.

In the last verse of 15.23—28, Paul returns to the differentiation he made at the outset between the two stages of the end (15.24): the completion of Christ's subduing of all powers, and the transfer of Christ's authority to God. Paul now mentions the two stages in reverse order. According to Paul, when all things have been subjected to Christ, at that moment the Son will subject himself to God as well: ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῆ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε [καὶ] αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα (15.28). The first part of 15.28 focuses on the penultimate stage of the end when all things are placed under Christ: ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῆ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα. This (15.28a) corresponds to 15.24b, where Christ is said to annihilate all principles, powers and forces. The subsequent transmission of Christ's dominion to God which represents the final stage of the end and is spoken of in 15.24a, is reiterated in the second part of 15.28. When all things have been made subject to Christ, then Christ will also subject himself to God: τότε [καὶ] αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα (15.28b).

The passage *1 Cor* 15.24—28 as a whole is consequently framed as an inclusion or, to use a more appropriate expression, it shows a concentric symmetry of elements arranged in the order A-B-B'-A'. In 15.24a the final stage of the end is in view when Christ returns his dominion to God (A). This stage also comes to the fore at the close of the entire passage in 15.28b when Christ is viewed as subjecting himself to God (A'). The penultimate stage of the end, when Christ completes the subjection of the cosmic powers, is described in 15.24b (B) and again in 15.28a (B'). In

---

ἀφήκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον. νῦν δὲ οὐπω ὀρώμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα (*Hebr* 2.8).

between, two psalm quotations (15.25—27: C and C') support the thought expressed in A and B that at the end Christ will return his temporary dominion to God when all cosmic powers have been subdued.

Each time the psalm quotation is followed by a line which elaborates its contents and comments upon it (D and D'). The first quotation (C) stresses the temporary nature and purpose of Christ's reign. Its commentary (D) specifies death as the last cosmic power which is to be defeated. The second quotation (C') links up immediately with the preceding commentary on the first psalm quotation and introduces the idea of God's authorization of Christ at his resurrection to explain why Christ is able to abolish all antagonistic cosmic powers including death. Despite this universal process of subjection, God himself, the commentary (D') supplements, remains superior to Christ. The following pattern arrises: A-B-C-D-C'-D'-B'-A'.

This structure is finally concluded in 15.28c with the phrase ἵνα ᾧ ὁ θεός [τά] πάντα ἐν πάσιν (E). This phrase reveals the purpose of the entire process in which the cosmic powers and eventually Christ himself are subjected to God: eventually God will be all in everything. The whole structure A-B-C-D-C'-D'-B'-A'-E reads as follows:

Structure of *1 Cor* 15.24—28

- A 15.24 εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ,  
Then comes the end, when he (Christ) returns the dominion to God the Father,
- B ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν.  
when he (Christ) will have abolished all principles, powers and forces.
- C 15.25 δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεῦειν ἄχρι οὗ θῆ ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (*Psalm* 109.1 LXX).  
For he (Christ) needs to exert his dominion until he has placed all enemies under his feet.
- D 15.26 ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος·  
The last enemy to be abolished is death;
- C' 15.27 πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (*Psalm* 8.7 LXX).  
for he (God) has placed all things under his (Christ's) feet.
- D' ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ ὅτι πάντα ὑποτάσσεται, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.  
When Scripture says that all things are subdued, he (God) who has placed all things under Christ is evidently exempted from this subjection.
- B' 15.28 ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῆ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα,  
When all things have been subjected to Christ,
- A' τότε [καὶ] αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα,  
at that moment the Son will subject himself to God as well,
- E ἵνα ᾧ ὁ θεός [τά] πάντα ἐν πάσιν.  
in order that God will be all in everything.

### 2.2.2 The Jewish tradition of the heavenly eschatological agent

#### Introduction

Now that the general tendency and structure of the passage 15.23—28 has been established, the meaning and provenance of the notion of Christ's eschatological destruction of the cosmic principles, powers and forces (15.24) will be commented on in more detail.

In early Christian literature of the first century, the terms ἀρχαί ('principles'), ἐξουσίαι ('powers') and δυνάμεις ('forces') taken in a cosmological sense occur only in Paul, and in literature dependent upon him. Only once does such a term occur independently from the Pauline literature, namely in a passage of *Mark* and its synoptic parallels, as will be shown shortly.

The combination of all three terms ἀρχαί ('principles'), ἐξουσίαι ('powers') and δυνάμεις ('forces') appears on only two occasions: in *1 Cor* 15 and once again in the Pseudo-Pauline *Letter to the Ephesians* (see *Eph* 1.21), in a passage which—as I shall argue in chap. 4 on the cosmological powers in *Eph*—is clearly influenced by *1 Cor* 15.23—28 (see chap. 4.3.2 below). In the immediate context of *Eph* 1.21, one of these cosmic powers is specified as the 'power of the air' (*Eph* 2.2: ἐξουσία τοῦ ἀέρος).

Furthermore, all possible pairings of the individual terms ἀρχαί ('principles'), ἐξουσίαι ('powers') and δυνάμεις ('forces') occur. The terms ἀρχαί ('principles') and ἐξουσίαι ('powers') frequently occur together in *Col* and *Eph*.<sup>54</sup> The terms ἐξουσίαι ('powers') and δυνάμεις ('forces') are combined in *1 Peter* 3.22, that is, in a writing which is considered to have been exposed to Pauline influence.<sup>55</sup> The terms ἀρχαί ('principles') and δυνάμεις ('forces'), lastly, are paired in *Romans* 8.38.

All these letters are either authentically Pauline (*1 Cor*, *Romans*), or Pseudo-Pauline (*Col*, *Eph*), or written under the influence of the Pauline literary corpus (*1 Peter*). All occurrences of the terms ἀρχαί ('principles'), ἐξουσίαι ('powers') and δυνάμεις ('forces') in these letters, consequently, belong to one and the same tradition which is headed by *1 Cor* 15.

Apart from these occurrences of the terms ἀρχαί ('principles'), ἐξουσίαι ('powers') and δυνάμεις ('forces'), the term δύναμις ('force') is the only one which is applied in a cosmological sense in the earliest Christian literature outside the Pauline sphere of influence. In *Mark* 13.25 and its synoptic parallels (*Matthew* 24.29, *Luke* 21.26) it is said that in the last days, after particular oppression and immediately prior to the reappearance

<sup>54</sup> See *Col* 1.16, 2.10, 2.16, and *Eph* 3.10, 6.12.

<sup>55</sup> See, e.g., Lindemann 1979, pp. 252—261.

of Christ into the world, the stars will fall down from heaven and the heavenly forces (δυνάμεις) will be shaken (*Mark* 13.24—26 parr).<sup>56</sup> These lines on falling stars and wavering forces in heaven (13.25) seem to reflect either Jewish, Christian, or Stoic apocalyptic views current in the Graeco-Roman period.<sup>57</sup> In *Mark*, however, the idea of powers being subjected to either Christ or God, which is essential to Paul's argument in *1 Cor* 15.23—28, is entirely lacking. Consequently, the mention of cosmic δυνάμεις ('forces') in *Mark* 13.25 (parr) does not shed much light on the cosmic ἀρχαί ('principles'), ἐξουσίαι ('powers') and δυνάμεις ('forces') which, according to *1 Cor* 15.24, are eventually subjected by Christ.

In this section I wish to reconstruct the traditions underlying Paul's view of the cosmological powers and their submission to God. It seems that the concept of Christ subjecting the cosmic powers is part of the Jewish tradition of the heavenly eschatological agent. On closer inspection, the concept as applied by Paul appears to be particularly influenced by *Daniel* 7 LXX, the oldest testimony to this tradition.

(a) *The tradition of the heavenly eschatological agent*

In order to assess the precise meaning of *1 Cor* 15.24, it is important to examine the history of the tradition according to which Christ will finally subdue all cosmological principles, powers and forces. As Holleman has recently argued, the expectation of Christ's reappearance in the world at the end of time as expressed in *1 Cor* 15 belongs to the Jewish tradition of the coming of the heavenly eschatological agent, who exerts his dominion over the world, passes judgement, and releases the righteous ones.<sup>58</sup> The

<sup>56</sup> *Mark* 13.24—26: 'Ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην (...) οἱ ἀστέρες ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται. καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.

<sup>57</sup> The reference to *Isaiah* 34.4 LXX in the margin of Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> is somewhat dubious, at least for *Mark* 13.25b. It is more plausible that *Mark* 13.25b (parr) influenced *Isaiah* 34.4 LXX BL than the other way around. It might well be, as Adams 1997 argues, that the link between cosmic crisis and the destruction of Jerusalem in *Mark* 13 is paralleled in the *Civil War* of Marcus Annaeus Lucanus (39—65 AD). In this work on the war between Caesar and Pompey in 49—48 BC, Lucan repeatedly associates the destruction of Rome with the collapse of the cosmos (see Lucan, *De bello civili* 1.67—80, 1.639—672, 2.289—292, and 7.134—138; references taken from Adams 1997, pp. 337—341). See esp. 1.72—76 about fiery stars falling into the sea, 1.663—664 about stellar constellations abandoning their courses and moving obscurely through the cosmos, 2.289—292 about the stars and the cosmos sinking down, and, lastly, 7.134—137 about the ether falling down on the earth. On Lucan's Stoicism, see Adams 1997, pp. 336—337. On the topic of cosmic eschatology in Jewish, Christian and pagan sources in the Graeco-Roman period, see further Van der Horst 1994 and Downing 1995.

<sup>58</sup> Holleman 1996, pp. 103—114 (chap. VI b).

evidence for such a tradition is contained in *Daniel*, the *Sibylline Oracles* (book 5), the *Fourth Book of Ezra*, the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* (*2 Baruch*), and in the *Similitudes of Enoch* in the *Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (*1 Enoch* 37—71).<sup>59</sup> It seems well worth examining this tradition with a view to the question of whether it also refers to cosmological principles (ἀρχαί), powers (ἐξουσίαι), and forces (δύναμεις) as the object of this agent's eschatological activities.

To answer this question, I will start with a discussion of the *Sibylline Oracles* (book 5), *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* which are all dated between 70 and 130 AD.<sup>60</sup> I will then discuss the *Similitudes of Enoch* (*1 Enoch* 37—71) which a growing consensus dates to the end of the first century AD though a definite *terminus ante quem* cannot be set.<sup>61</sup> Finally, I will turn to the oldest extant representative of the Jewish tradition concerning the coming heavenly eschatological agent, the seventh chapter of *Daniel*. This chapter may well date back to the period between 219 and 200 BC when Antiochus III the Great gradually loosened Ptolemaic control over Syria and Palestine, and placed these areas under Seleucid rule.<sup>62</sup> It will be argued that the thought that Christ will eventually subdue all cosmological powers (*1 Cor* 15.24) can be partially illuminated with reference to the tradition of the coming heavenly eschatological agent which surfaces in the *Sibylline Oracles* (book 5), *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, the *Similitudes of Enoch*, and in *Daniel* 7. In the majority of passages which attest this tradition, however, the activities of the heavenly eschatological agent are directed against earthly political powers, and not against cosmological forces. The clearest parallels to *1 Cor* 15.24 seem to be provided in *Daniel* 7 and, to some extent, in the *Similitudes of Enoch*.

In the *Sibylline Oracles* (book 5), *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* the activities of the heavenly eschatological agent are, without exception, of a social, ethical, political or military nature, or concerned with issues like idolatry. The fifth book of the *Sibylline Oracles* reflects a strong expectation of the eschatological return of Nero. On his return, he will be confronted with a heavenly eschatological figure. When Nero comes, 'wishing to destroy

<sup>59</sup> Holleman 1996, p. 104: *Sib. Or.* 5.108—110, 158—161, 414—427 (428—433); *4 Ezra* 13.1—13, 25—26, 33—38, 51—52 (7.28—29, 11.37—12.3, 12.31—34); *1 Enoch* 37—71, *passim*; *2 Baruch* 39.7—40.4 (29.3—30.1, 72.2—73.1). On the absence of the notion of future heavenly eschatological agents in the *Dead Sea Scrolls*, see Holleman 1996, p. 107 note 3.

<sup>60</sup> See Schürer, Vermes, Millar & Goodman 1986, vol. 3.1, pp. 643—645 (*Sib. Or.* 5: 70—130 AD, probably before the end of the first century AD); pp. 299—300 (*4 Ezra*: towards the end of Domitian's reign in 81—96 AD); pp. 752—753 (*2 Baruch*: 70—130 AD).

<sup>61</sup> Schürer, Vermes, Millar & Goodman 1986, vol. 3.1, pp. 256—259.

<sup>62</sup> Lebram 1981, p. 335.14—54.

utterly the city of the blessed ones, then a certain king sent from God against him will destroy all the great kings and chiefs' (*Sib. Or.* 5.107—109). In another passage mention is made of a heavenly eschatological agent in the form of a great star which 'will come from heaven to the awful sea and will burn up the deep sea and Babylon itself [Rome] and the land of Italy' (5.158—160). The 'sea' in this passage stands for 'Poseidon of the sea' to whom the whole earth gave honor, as the preceding lines indicate (5.155—157). The political and anti-idolatrous activities of the heavenly eschatological agent gain further relief in 5.414—427. Here the advent of a saviour figure leads to the restitution of wealth to the good (5.416—417), the destruction of cities and nations of wrongdoers (5.418—419), and the cessation of things like adultery, paedophilia, murder, and unrest (5.429—431).

4 *Ezra* has a similar concept of the role of the heavenly agent. In the sixth vision of *Ezra*, the author reports on the final hostile encounter on the top of Mount Zion between the ungodly nations and the eschatological agent (4 *Ezra* 13). The assembled nations are destroyed on account of their ungodliness and evil thoughts (13.37—38). The ten Jewish tribes which had been led into captivity are peacefully gathered by the heavenly agent (13.39—47). Earlier, in the third vision of *Ezra*, the dawn of the temporary messianic kingdom is mentioned, but only so briefly that no opponents are referred to (7.28—29). In the fifth vision, however, the heavenly eschatological agent, here depicted as a lion, turns against the eagle (4 *Ezra* 11—12), the last one of the four animals which reign the world, and which is explicitly identified with the fourth kingdom in the seventh chapter of *Daniel* (4 *Ezra* 12.11). This last animal is blamed for all kinds of terror, deceit, and oppression of the meek and peaceable, and for the unwarranted destruction of farms and cities (11.40—46).

A similar, though less explicit, allusion to the fourth kingdom in *Daniel* 7 occurs in 2 *Baruch*. Again, the heavenly agent is said to oppose the last ruler and to destroy his entire host (2 *Baruch* 39.7—40.4). The rule which the heavenly eschatological agent is thought to implement can partly be characterized as of a social nature. At his appearance, the hungry are fed with the sea monsters Behemoth and Leviathan, with the fruits of the earth, and with wine and manna (29.3—30.1). Partly, this eschatological rule is also of a political and military nature, since those nations which have ruled over Israel will be exterminated (72.2—6). After everything which is in the world has been brought down, the heavenly agent will sit in eternal peace (73.1).

The same picture of socio-political and ethical measures taken by the eschatological agent arises in the *Similitudes of Enoch* (1 *Enoch* 37—71), at least in the first and second parables (1 *En* 38—44, 45—57). The socio-



political features of the eschatological agent's actions come to the fore when it is said that he will judge those who possess the earth and the mighty kings (*1 En* 38; 38.4—5). Whereas God, the Lord of Spirits, will transform heaven and the dry ground (45; 45.4—5), the heavenly agent will rouse the kings, the powerful, and the strong, and he will cast them down on account of their iniquitous deeds and their wealth (46; 46.4—7). These oppressors, against whom the heavenly agent rises up, are identified as the kings of the earth and the landowners, the 'strong who possess the dry ground' (48; 48.8) and the powerful of this earth (53; 53.5). Nothing is hidden from the judgement of the heavenly agent, not even the things that are secret (49.4). This judgement extends to the fallen angels as well (55.4). The eschatological action of the heavenly intermediary also concerns the removal and destruction from the mountains of all kinds of metal, so that 'there will be neither iron for war, nor material for a breast-plate' (52; 52.8—9).

In the third parable (*1 En* 58—69), the eschatological intermediary has a similar socio-political programme. Important for the present purpose are chapters 61—64. These form a coherent unity. The immediately preceding and following chapters, chapters 60 and 65—69.25, are extracts from a *Book of Noah* and do not relate history from Enoch's perspective but from that of Noah, who allegedly received and transmitted Enoch's antediluvian wisdom. These extracts have been incorporated into *1 Enoch* at various places.<sup>63</sup> The intermediate chapters, chapters 61—64, do not belong to the excerpts from Noachic literature but constitute a single, coherent passage.

The main theme in these chapters (*1 En* 61—64) is, again, the condemnation of the ruling class of all the kings and the mighty and the exalted, and those who possess the earth (62—63). At the appearance of the heavenly eschatological agent, on the day of judgement, the members of the ruling class will be terrified (62.3—9). They will be delivered to the angels for punishment (62.10—11), despite their pleas for mercy (63.1—11). This theme is consistent with the socio-political programme which underlies the eschatological actions of the heavenly agent in the earlier parts of the *Similitudes of Enoch* and in the passages of the *Sibylline Oracles*, *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* treated before.

In the Jewish tradition concerning the advent of the heavenly eschatological agent, there seems to be no parallel for the concept contained in *1 Cor* 15, according to which, on his appearance, the cosmological powers will be destructed. In the Jewish literature reviewed so far, the actions of the heavenly agent are primarily motivated by ethical, social or political considerations.

---

<sup>63</sup> Schürer, Vermes, Millar & Goodman 1986, vol. 3.1, p. 260 on the Noachic passages in *1 Enoch*, and p. 332 on the *Book of Noah*.

*1 Enoch* 61, however, does refer to cosmic powers in heaven and on earth as the object of the eschatological agent's activities. Prior to the condemnation of the tyrannical ruling class (*1 En* 62—63), there seems to be a kind of judgement of cosmic powers. The heavenly eschatological agent is installed by God on a throne and judges 'all the works of the holy ones in heaven above' (61.8—9). Subsequently, 'he,' God that is, 'will call all the host of the heavens, and all the holy ones above, and the host of the Lord, the Cherubim, and the Seraphim and the Ophanim, and all the angels of power, and all the angels of the principalities, and the Chosen One [=the heavenly eschatological agent], and the other host which (is) upon the dry ground *and* over the water' (61.10). All these forces and heavenly, angelic beings are summoned to glorify God (61.11—12).

*1 Enoch* 61.10—12 is certainly the closest Jewish parallel to the idea expressed in *1 Cor* 15.24 that the heavenly eschatological agent will eventually subdue all cosmological principles, powers and forces. It is not explicitly said in *1 Enoch* 61, however, that the cosmological powers are subjected and destroyed as is the case in *1 Cor* 15. The heavenly agent judges all the works, the secret ways, and the paths of the 'holy ones in heaven above' (61.8—9). Such a judgement of heavenly beings is not the same thing as the subjection and annihilation of cosmological powers in *1 Cor* 15. This subjection does not come into view in *1 Enoch* either when it is said that 'all the host of the heavens' and 'all the angels of the principalities,' and 'the other host which (is) upon the dry ground *and* over the water' together with heavenly, angelic beings like 'all the holy ones above, and the host of the Lord, the Cherubim, and the Seraphim and the Ophanim, and all the angels of power' are summoned to glorify God (61.10—12).

It may be concluded that the idea of a destruction of all cosmological powers in an eschatological encounter with a heavenly intermediary is not inherent in the Jewish tradition of the heavenly eschatological agent as attested in the *Sibylline Oracles* (book 5), *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch* or the *Similitudes of Enoch*. The Jewish authors of these post-70 AD writings and Paul share their acquaintance with the Jewish tradition concerning the advent of the heavenly eschatological judge and saviour. But the distinct shape this notion takes in *1 Cor* 15, including the extinction of the cosmic powers, still needs to be accounted for.

(b) *The heavenly eschatological agent in Daniel 7 LXX*

Paul is clearly familiar with the Jewish tradition concerning the coming of an eschatological intermediary from heaven. Besides this, he seems to draw directly upon the oldest testimony of this tradition contained in the seventh chapter of *Daniel*. This chapter consists of a vision granted to

Daniel concerning the successive appearances of four mythical animals (7.2—8), the following judgement passed by God, the consummation of the last animal by fire (7.9—12) and, finally, the arrival of someone like a human being, designated in Aramaic and Greek as someone like a 'son of man,' who becomes the recipient of an eternal dominion (7.13—14). In search of the meaning of this vision (7.15—16), Daniel first receives a general explanation of the four animals. They appear to be four successive terrestrial kingdoms. Then the 'son of man' is identified as the 'holy ones of the Most High;' their kingdom is perpetual (7.17—18).

At Daniel's request (7.19—22), the angelic interpreter expounds the description regarding the fourth, exceedingly terrifying animal. One of the rulers of the kingdom this animal represents is said to blaspheme against the Most High, oppressing the holy ones of the Most High and undertaking to change the calendar and the law (7.23—25). His oppressive dominion over the holy ones, however, is utterly destroyed by God's judgement (7.26). The holy people of the Most High on the other hand, the interpretation concludes, will receive an everlasting kingdom, and all powers will submit to them and obey them: καὶ πᾶσαι <αἱ> ἐξουσίαι αὐτῷ ὑποταγήσονται καὶ πειθαρχήσουσιν αὐτῷ (7.27—28).<sup>64</sup>

It is clear that in *1 Cor* 15 Paul regards the eschatological intermediary from heaven as one individual, namely Christ, not as the plurality of God's holy ones on earth. In this, Paul agrees with an exegetical tradition connected with *Daniel 7* in Jewish and early Christian circles and surfacing in *4 Ezra*, *1 Enoch*, and *Mark* and *Q*.<sup>65</sup> Furthermore, in *1 Cor* 15 the eschatological agent of God, Christ that is, is taken to participate actively in the subjection of the forces resistant to God's authority whereas in *Daniel* the 'son of man' is inactive. There he receives the eternal kingdom (*Dan* 7.13—14, 22, 27) rather passively, after God has already totally destroyed the fourth kingdom (*Dan* 7.9—11, 26). Paul's concept of the eschatological intermediary as an individual who is actively engaged in the subjugation of antagonistic powers derives from Christian tradition, not directly from *Daniel 7*. But the apostle's view that cosmic ἐξουσίαι (powers) will be subjected is certainly directly dependent on *Dan* 7.27 LXX.<sup>66</sup> Such a view proved to be alien to the way the coming of the heavenly eschato-

<sup>64</sup> The Theodotion translation reads καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἀρχαὶ αὐτῷ δουλεύουσιν καὶ ὑπακούουσιν (*Dan* 7.27 Theod).

<sup>65</sup> On the post-Danielic changes in the interpretation of the Jewish concept of the son of man, cf. Holleman 1996, pp. 110—111.

<sup>66</sup> See also Berger 1976, pp. 404—405 note 563; Black 1982, pp. 74—76; Kreitzer 1987, p. 151; and De Jonge 1999, p. 495 note 6. Cf., however, Schade 1984, p. 35, with note 110 on p. 227 against Berger 1976, p. 404. Schade's criticism is too insubstantial to be persuasive.

logical agent is portrayed in the *Sibylline Oracles* (book 5), *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, and in the *Similitudes of Enoch*. In these writings, the activities of the heavenly eschatological agent were shown to be of a social, ethical or political-military nature and were not directed against cosmological powers.

It must be admitted that cosmological powers are not in view in *Dan* 7.27 LXX either. There it is simply said that all powers will submit to the holy people of the Most High and obey them: καὶ πᾶσαι <αἱ> ἐξουσίαι αὐτῷ ὑποταγήσονται καὶ πειθαρχήσουσιν αὐτῷ (7.27). At the level of *Daniel* 7, the ἐξουσίαι ('powers') probably stand for the earthly, political kingdoms (βασιλείαι) whose power will be taken away (*Dan* 7.17, 27). But contrary to the post-Danielic writings which emphatically describe the political tenor of the heavenly agent's actions at the end of time, this passage in *Daniel* allows for the cosmological interpretation Paul gives it in *1 Corinthians*. Prior to the transmission of Christ's temporary dominion to God at the end of time, Christ is said to subdue all principles, powers and forces: εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν (*1 Cor* 15.24). Since the *Sibylline Oracles* (book 5), *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch* and the *Similitudes of Enoch* do not mention an eschatological subjection of cosmological powers, Paul's concept of such a subjection must go back to *Dan* 7.27 LXX. But taking into account that the ἐξουσίαι (powers) at the level of *Daniel* 7 denote terrestrial political powers, one needs to add that the entire concept of a subjection of cosmological powers as described in *1 Cor* 15.24 is, after all, new and due to Paul's innovative understanding of *Dan* 7.27 LXX. The non-political, cosmological meaning of ἐξουσίαι ('powers') and its equivalence with principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) will form the subject of my next section.

### *2.2.3 Paul's understanding of 'powers' in Daniel 7.27 LXX as cosmological principles and forces*

#### *(a) Powers, principles, and forces in Jewish literature*

##### *The powers (ἐξουσίαι)*

Paul was not the first Jew to use the Greek term ἐξουσία ('power') in a non-political, cosmic sense. In *2 Maccabees*, for instance, a work composed in Greek between 124 BC and the 60s BC,<sup>67</sup> God is named the 'sovereign of spirits and of all powers:' ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης (3.24). Here ἐξουσία ('power') stands for non-political, angelic

<sup>67</sup> Schürer, Vermes, Millar & Goodman 1986, vol. 3.1, pp. 531—532.

or cosmic entities. This meaning is also attested in later writings, both Jewish and early Christian. These locate the 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι) together with 'thrones' (θρόνοι) in one of the heavens (*Testament Levi* 3.8). They are thought to be controlled by angels (3 *Baruch* 12.3: ἄγγελοι ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξουσιῶν). They are mentioned together with other principles (ἄρχαι καὶ ἐξουσίαι), along with angels, archangels and thrones (*Testament of Abraham* [Short Recension] 13.10). Although the term ἐξουσία ('power') appears to function in a non-political, angelological or quasi-cosmological sense, the term nevertheless remains rather vague. It does not seem to have been current in Graeco-Roman cosmology contemporaneous with Paul. Neither in Philo nor in Plutarch does the term ἐξουσία ('power') occur in a cosmological sense.<sup>68</sup>

### *The principles (ἄρχαι)*

In *1 Cor* 15.24, Paul supplements the term ἐξουσίαι ('powers'), borrowed from *Dan* 7.27 LXX, with the terms ἀρχαί ('principles') and δυνάμεις ('forces'). He does so probably because ἐξουσία ('powers') was not a current, unambiguous, cosmological term. This lack of semantic clarity was remedied by Paul through the addition of two more common, less equivocal cosmological terms. Paul uses both terms together elsewhere (*Romans* 8.38—39) in an enumeration of angelic and physical entities comprising, among others, angels (ἄγγελοι), principles (ἄρχαι), forces (δυνάμεις), and height (ὕψωμα) and depth (βάθος). The latter two terms have an astrological meaning (see chap. 4.5 below).

The terms ἀρχαί ('principles') and δυνάμεις ('forces') are also abundantly attested in Jewish writings of the Graeco-Roman period unconnected with Paul. In the Greek fragments of *1 Enoch* some of the fallen angels are called ἀρχαί ('principles'; *1 Enoch* 6.8). In Esther's prayers God is addressed as the king of the gods who rules over all principles: βασιλεὺ τῶν θεῶν καὶ πάσης ἀρχῆς ἐπικρατῶν (*Esther* 4.17r LXX). Likewise David's eulogy in *1 Chronicles* 29 praises God as the ruler of all principles (ὁ ἀρχῶν πάσης ἀρχῆς; *1 Chron* 29.12 LXX).<sup>69</sup>

In later Jewish writings the ἀρχαί ('principles') are ranked together with angels, archangels, powers (ἐξουσίαι), and thrones (*Testament of Abraham* [Short Recension] 13.10). According to the *Testament of Job*, these ἀρχαί ('principles') speak a dialect, the διάλεκτος τῶν ἀρχῶν, which Kasia, one of Job's daughters, adopts when she no longer regards worldly things but praises God for the creation of the heights (49.2). Her

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Nelis 1975, pp. 101—102 on 2 *Macc* 3.24.

<sup>69</sup> *1 Chron* 29.12 LXX: σὺ πάντων ἀρχῆς, κύριε ὁ ἀρχῶν πάσης ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐν χειρὶ σου ἰσχύς καὶ δυναστεία, καὶ ἐν χειρὶ σου, παντοκράτωρ, μεγαλύναι καὶ κατισχύσαι τὰ πάντα.

sisters speak in the angelic dialect (48.3) or in the dialect of the cherubim (50.1, 2).

The term ἀρχαί ('principles'), thus, appears to stand for angelic beings, either fallen (*1 Enoch*) or not (*Test. of Abraham*, *Test. of Job*), or to point to more abstract, cosmic principles (*Esther*, *1 Chron*).

### *The forces (δυνάμεις)*

In Jewish sources of the Graeco-Roman period the term δύναμις ('force') refers more frequently to cosmic forces and less often, if at all, to angels. In the Greek fragments of *1 Enoch* for instance, the δυνάμεις ('forces') are specified as the heavenly forces (δυνάμεις τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), an expression which occurs several times in the LXX and its expansions.<sup>70</sup> In *1 Enoch* these heavenly forces are mentioned together with those stars which have been imprisoned for not coming out at their proper times (*1 En* 18.14—15). Other heavenly forces (δυνάμεις) have been entrusted to the supervision of angels, the ἄγγελοι τῶν δυνάμεων (*1 En* 20.1). This class of angels also comes to the fore in *3 Baruch*, a work which—in its present form—is a Christian composition.<sup>71</sup> Here the ἄγγελος τῶν δυνάμεων (1.8, 2.6), the angel of the forces, is said to have taken Baruch to the firmament of heaven and disclosed to him the mysteries of God in the first heaven (1.8—2.7). In the *Testament of Abraham* (Long Recension), a writing which contains Christian interpolations,<sup>72</sup> a commander-in-chief of the forces above (9.3, 14.12: ἀρχιστράτηγος τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων) is mentioned.

Not only angels are perceived as holding the cosmic forces in check. Nearly thirty passages in the Septuagint place these forces under the control of God himself, as the phrases 'lord of the forces' (κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων)<sup>73</sup> and 'God of the forces' (θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων)<sup>74</sup> testify.<sup>75</sup> The

<sup>70</sup> See *4 Kings* 17.16, 21.3, 21.5, 23.4—5 LXX, *2 Chronicles* 18.18 LXX, *Isaiah* 34.4 LXX (codices BL; =*Mark* 13.25 par). Cf. also *Oratio Manassis* 15 LXX: σὲ ἕμει πάσα ἡ δύναμις τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (ed. A. Rahfls 1935, vol. 2, p. 181).

<sup>71</sup> Schürer, Vermes, Millar & Goodman 1987, vol. 3.2, pp. 789—793.

<sup>72</sup> Schürer, Vermes, Millar & Goodman 1987, vol. 3.2, pp. 761—767.

<sup>73</sup> See *2 Kings* (*2 Sam* MT) 6.2, 6.18, *3 Kings* (*1 Kings* MT) 18.15, *4 Kings* (*2 Kings* MT) 3.14, 19.31, *Psalms* 23.10 (=24.10 MT), 45 (46).8, 45 (46).12, 47 (48).9, 68 (69).7, 83 (84).2, 83 (84).4, 83 (84).13, *Zeph* 2.9, *Zech* 7.4, and *Jer* 40.12 (=33.12 MT). Also in some codices in *1 Kings* (*1 Sam* MT) 4.4 and *Zech* 1.3. According to Zobel 1989, however, the LXX rendering of יהוה צבאות as κύριος (ὁ θεός) τῶν δυνάμεων is not original but secondary since it was probably derived from Theodotion (c. 2nd cent. AD) via Origenes' *Hexapla* (3rd cent. AD) and inserted in the LXX (see Zobel 1989, col. 878 with reference to Eißfeldt 1966, p. 105 note 1 [=Eißfeldt 1950, p. 130 note 1]). But Van der Woude 1984, though mentioning the possibility that the translation κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων derives from Theodotion via Origenes' *Hexapla*, at least excludes *4 Kings* (*2 Kings* MT)

corresponding Hebrew expressions can easily be retrieved in the Hebrew bible. The phrases κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων ('lord of the forces') and θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ('God of the forces') are the renderings, with a few unimportant exceptions, of the Hebrew epithet יהוה צבאות (Yahweh Sebaoth) and, sometimes, of the epithet יהוה אלהים צבאות (Yahweh God of hosts) or אלהים צבאות (God of hosts). Statistically, however, the Greek renderings of the three Hebrew expressions mentioned by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων ('lord of the forces') and θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ('God of the forces') are only secondary in importance. The more frequent rendering of the Hebrew phrases is παντοκράτωρ ('the Almighty'). As Zobel observed, the phrase יהוה צבאות (Yahweh Sebaoth) is rendered in the LXX as παντοκράτωρ ('the Almighty') approximately 120 times.<sup>76</sup>

Just like the epithet παντοκράτωρ ('the Almighty'), the phrases 'lord of the forces' (κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων) and 'God of the forces' (θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων) express the idea that the heavenly, cosmic forces (δυνάμεις τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) are held in check by God. This observation does not contradict the fact that the Hebrew phrase יהוה צבאות (Yahweh Sebaoth) already points to Yahweh's extensive power. As Zobel notices, the scholarly consensus is that the name יהוה צבאות (Yahweh Sebaoth) originated in Yahweh's temple at Shiloh (*1 Sam* 1.3, 1.11, and 4.4). Significantly, the name Yahweh Sebaoth was sometimes linked with the divine epithet 'the one who is enthroned above the cherubim' (יהוה צבאות ישב הכרובים; *1 Sam* 4.4, *2 Sam* 6.2). This shows that 'Yahweh Sebaoth' was meant to signify the enlargement of Yahweh's kingly power.

Whatever the original, still disputed meaning of צבאות (Sebaoth), it seems beyond doubt that the new epithet יהוה צבאות (Yahweh Sebaoth) served to denote the extension of Yahweh's power.<sup>77</sup> This power was supposed also to comprise a cosmic dimension. This dimension was the starting point for the translation of the Hebrew phrase יהוה צבאות (Yahweh Sebaoth) into such Greek expressions as παντοκράτωρ ('the Almighty')

---

and *Psalms* from the passages Zobel regards as being dependent on Theodotion (Van der Woude 1984, col. 507, with reference to Wambacq 1947, p. 60).

<sup>74</sup> See *3 Kings* (*1 Kings* MT) 17.1, *4 Kings* (*2 Kings* MT) 19.20, *Psalms* 58.6 (=59.6 MT), 79 (80).5, 79 (80).8, 79 (80).15, 79 (80).20, 83 (84).9, 88 (89).9, and *Is* 42.13; *Psalms* 79 (80).15 reads ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων whereas all other passages read κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων.

<sup>75</sup> A similar designation for God appears in *3 Maccabees*, composed in Greek around the beginning of the Christian era. Here, God is called the πάσης δεσπόζων δυνάμειος θεὸς ὑψίστος, the most high God who is master of all power (7.9). For the date of *3 Macc*, see Tromp 1995b, pp. 325—326.

<sup>76</sup> Zobel 1989, col. 878.

<sup>77</sup> On the earliest background of the term צבאות (Sebaoth) and its meaning, see Zobel 1989, cols 882—885 (II.3—III.1).

and κύριος/θεός τῶν δυνάμεων ('lord/God of the forces'). These Greek expressions highlight the cosmic character of God's power more distinctly than the Hebrew phrase. The frequent use of παντοκράτωρ ('the Almighty') and κύριος/θεός τῶν δυνάμεων ('lord/God of the forces') by Jewish writers typifies a widespread awareness of God's authority over the cosmos and its forces (δυνάμεις).

When in *1 Cor* 15.24 Paul says that God's dominion will finally extend over all principles (ἀρχαί), powers (ἐξουσίαι), and forces (δυνάμεις), he articulates a belief of which several components are already ensconced in Jewish tradition of the Graeco-Roman period. In this tradition, as has just been shown, God's dominion over the principles (ἀρχαί) is denoted in phrases like πάσης ἀρχῆς ἐπικρατῶν (*Esther* 4.17r LXX: 'he who rules over all principles') and ἄρχων πάσης ἀρχῆς (*1 Chron* 29.12 LXX: 'the ruler of all principles'). God's rule over the powers (ἐξουσίαι) is expressed in the phrase τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης (*2 Macc* 3.24: 'the sovereign of spirits and of all powers'). And finally, God's rule over the forces (δυνάμεις) is articulated in the epithet κύριος or θεός τῶν δυνάμεων (LXX *passim*: 'lord/God of the forces').

Although these phrases expressing God's dominion over the principles, powers, and forces are widespread in Graeco-Roman Judaism, the entire substructure of Paul's belief that these powers will be subjugated by Christ derives from elsewhere. This substructure appeared to stem from the expectation in *Daniel* 7.27 LXX concerning the eschatological submission of all powers (ἐξουσίαι). These powers will give way to the everlasting kingdom of the son of man, the holy people of the Most High. It is beyond reasonable doubt that Paul's conception of a heavenly eschatological agent engaged in the overthrow of antagonistic forces derives ultimately from *Daniel*. On the level of *Daniel* 7, the powers (ἐξουσίαι) do not yet refer to cosmological powers but are identical with terrestrial political powers. Paul, however, seems to interpret the subjection of the powers (ἐξουσίαι) under the son of man in *Daniel* 7 as a subjection of cosmic forces by equating them with principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις).

In what follows, I hope to show that within the context of Paul's thought something more can be said about the identity of the forces mentioned in *1 Cor* 15.24. I will demonstrate that the terms 'principles' (ἀρχαί) and 'forces' (δυνάμεις), with which Paul supplemented the Danielic term 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι), bear a specific cosmological meaning. These terms designate the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) and the powers by which these elements are affected.



(b) *The principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) in relation to the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου)*

It is unlikely that in *1 Cor* 15.24 the terms 'principles' (ἀρχαί), 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι), and 'forces' (δυνάμεις) primarily denote angelic beings, as these terms sometimes do in the Jewish (and early Christian) writings mentioned above. They stand rather for powers of a cosmological nature. Admittedly, it would be wrong to construe too much of a difference in Paul's thought between angelic powers and the cosmos. In *Romans* 8.38—39, for instance, angels (ἄγγελοι) are mentioned along with principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις). But definite cosmological (or rather astrological) terms like height (ὕψωμα) and depth (βάθος) occur here as well (see chap. 4.5 below), so that it is not at all imperative to identify the principles and forces with angels. It is true that Paul regards the agents of Satan as angels (*2 Cor* 12.7, 11.14) and thinks angels will duly receive judgement (*1 Cor* 6.2—3). In that limited sense, the notion of the subjection of angels does indeed play a role in Paul's thought. It is nevertheless not plausible that primarily these angels are in view when principles, powers, and forces are finally said to be subjected to God's authority (*1 Cor* 15.24).

An important reason to assume that in *1 Cor* 15.23—28 Christ is engaged in subjecting powers of a cosmological nature, and not of an angelic nature, is the congruence with Paul's Christology as described in *Gal* 4.3—10. As was shown in chap. 2.1 above, according to *Gal* 4.3—5 Christ freed mankind from its bondage to the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου). Here, the opponents Christ directs himself against are indisputably cosmological. The same holds true, I would suggest, for the principles (ἀρχαί), powers (ἐξουσίαι), and forces (δυνάμεις) in *1 Cor* 15.24. This seems indeed to be the case, since in contemporary philosophy the terms ἀρχαί ('principles) and δυνάμεις ('forces'), with which Paul supplemented the Danielic term ἐξουσίαι ('powers'), are frequently put on a par with the term στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ('elements of the cosmos'). The synonymy of principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) with the cosmic elements (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) can be demonstrated in the writings of Philo and Plutarch.

The synonymy between principles, forces, and elements is apparent, for instance, from Philo's commentary on the passage 'but you will depart to your fathers full of peace in good old age' (*Genesis* 15.15). According to Philo, the term 'fathers' in this passage is interpreted by some as referring to the four principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) out of which the cosmos has been put together: earth, water, air, and fire (*Quis rer. div. heres*

281).<sup>78</sup> The terms ἀρχαί ('principles') and δυνάμεις ('forces') together clearly refer to the elements earth, water, air, and fire of which the cosmos is composed.

The cosmic elements can also be designated with the term ἀρχαί ('principles') alone. Philo remarks that some have deified the four principles (ἀρχαί), earth, water, air, and fire (*De decalogo* 53).<sup>79</sup> Plutarch similarly reports that fire and water are reckoned as στοιχεῖα ('elements') or ἀρχαί ('principles;' *Quaestiones romanae* 263D—E). According to Plutarch, most people regard the four primary bodies in the universe as being the elements (στοιχεῖα) and principles (ἀρχαί) of everything else, fire, water, air, and earth (*De primo frigido* 947E).<sup>80</sup> In these passages in Philo and Plutarch, the term ἀρχαί ('principles') stands for the elements of the cosmos.

Additionally, the term δυνάμεις ('forces') can also refer to the four cosmic elements. In his *De aeternitate mundi*, Philo argues against the supremacy accorded by the Stoics to the element of fire as the sole element into which the cosmos will be resolved at the conflagration. According to Philo, this supremacy is contradicted by the equality of the elements that manifests itself in their mutual interchanges. In his view, there exists an extensive system of 'retribution' between the four forces (δυνάμεις). That which these forces give in exchange is measured with the standard of equality and within the bounds of justice. Although the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) seem to die in their mutual interchanges, contrary to all expectation, they are made immortal by eternally following the same long course upwards and downwards in a continuous process of exchange (*De aeternitate* 108—109).<sup>81</sup>

In this passage, the four forces (δυνάμεις) are clearly identified as the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου), earth, water, air and fire.<sup>82</sup>

<sup>78</sup> Philo, *Quis rer. div. heres* 281: τινὲς δὲ πατέρας ὑπετόπασαν εἰρῆσθαι τὰς τέτταρας ἀρχὰς τε καὶ δυνάμεις, ἐξ ὧν συνέστηκεν ὁ κόσμος, γῆν ὕδωρ ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ.

<sup>79</sup> Philo, *De decalogo* 53: ἐκτεθειώκασιν γὰρ οἱ μὲν τὰς τέσσαρας ἀρχὰς, γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ. Cf. also Philo, *Quod deterius* 154 on the four principles (ἀρχαί) the creator entirely used to constitute the world: πρὸς τῷ μηδὲ ἐκτός ὑπολειφθῆναι τι τὸν δημιουργὸν ὅλας δι' ὧν τὰς τέτταρας ἀρχὰς εἰς τὴν τοῦ κόσμου σύστασιν ἀναλώσαντα.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. also Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae* 926E—927A (αἱ τῶν ὧν ἀρχαί).

<sup>81</sup> Philo, *De aeternitate* 108—109: ὑπεβάλλουσα γὰρ τις τῶν τεττάρων ἀντέκτισιν δυνάμεων ἰσότητος κανόσιν καὶ δικαιοσύνης ὄροις σταθωμένων τὰς ἀμοιβὰς. (...) τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ταῖς εἰς ἄλληλα μεταβολαῖς, τὸ παραδοξότατον, θνήσκουσιν δοκοῦντα ἀθανατίζεται δολιχεύοντα ἀεὶ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἀνω καὶ κάτω συνεχῶς ἀμειβόντα.

<sup>82</sup> For the identity of the powers (δυνάμεις) and the four cosmic elements, cf. also Philo, *De posteritate Caini* 5 on the particles of the dead which resolve again into their original elements (ἀναστοιχειώω). In this process, the particles are brought back to the

In some passages in Philo, the term δυνάμεις ('forces') has a narrower sense: here it is used to denote the *qualities* of the four elements, i.e. the forces (δυνάμεις) dry, wet, cold, and hot. Each of these qualities is thought to be characteristic of one particular element.<sup>83</sup>

The material from Philo and Plutarch discussed above shows that the words ἀρχαί ('principles') and δυνάμεις ('forces') are current in contemporary cosmological language and that, as cosmological terms, they denote the elements of the cosmos. By applying these terms in *1 Cor* 15.24, Paul indicates that he understands the imprecise and less familiar term ἐξουσίαι ('powers') taken from *Dan* 7.27 LXX in a cosmological sense. According to *1 Cor* 15.24, since Christ's resurrection, God's dominion is established over principles, powers and forces of a cosmological nature.

The context in which the principles (ἀρχαί), powers (ἐξουσίαι), and forces (δυνάμεις) occur in *1 Cor* 15.23—28 indicates, however, that they include not only the elements of the cosmos, but also the forces by which these elements are dominated. According to Paul, the principles, powers, and forces are Christ's enemies, the last of which is identified as θάνατος, death (*1 Cor* 15.24—26). Death is one of the principles active in the cosmos and often designated in contemporary literature as φθορά (dissolution), the principle of passing out of existence, as opposed to that of generation (γένεσις).<sup>84</sup> Comparable with Paul's assertion that death will be abolished (*1 Cor* 15.26) is his expectation in *Romans* 8.21 to the effect that creation will be released from its bondage to dissolution (φθορά).<sup>85</sup> In Paul's understanding, death (θάνατος) and dissolution (φθορά) are related. The principles and forces Christ is currently defeating do not only comprise the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) but apparently also principles like death and dissolution.

---

powers of the universe (αἱ τοῦ παντός δυνάμεις) out of which the dead had been constituted: καὶ γὰρ αἱ τῶν τετελευτηκότων ἀναστοιχειοῦμεναι μοῖραι πάλιν εἰς τὰς τοῦ παντός δυνάμεις ἐξ ὧν συνέστησαν ἀποκρίνονται. Cf. further Philo, *Quaestiones in Genesis* 4.8 on the sublunary things which are wrought out of the four powers (δυνάμεις): ἐδημιουργήθη τὰ ὑπὸ σελήνην ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων δυνάμεων. Marcus' surprise about the use of δυνάμεις ('forces') instead of στοιχεῖα ('elements') in the latter text is unwarranted since the synonymy of these terms is attested in Philo; see Marcus 1953 (ed. Philo of Alexandria, *Opera quae supersunt*), vol. 1, p. 280 note h.

<sup>83</sup> See Philo, *Quis rer. div. heres* 152—153; *De sacrificiis* 108; and *De aeternitate* 21.

<sup>84</sup> The terms θάνατος ('death') and φθορά ('dissolution') appear to be closely related in, e.g., Philo, *Quis rer. div. heres* 277; Plutarch, *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 109E; *De Iside* 382F; and *Non posse suaviter vivi* 1104C. Paul uses the term φθορά ('dissolution') twice by the end of *1 Cor* 15 in the verses 42 and 50.

<sup>85</sup> *Romans* 8.21: καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς.

By reckoning death and dissolution among the cosmic principles, Paul is again in tune with contemporary philosophy. According to Plutarch, for instance, there are four principles (ἀρχαί) of all things, life, motion, generation and dissolution (φθορά; *De genio Socratis* 591B).<sup>86</sup> Likewise, Plutarch speaks of the destructive force (ἡ φθαρτικὴ δύναμις) as a force operative in the cosmos. It is one of the principles (ἀρχαί) or forces (δυνάμεις) dominating the sublunar cosmos (*De Iside* 369B—D). This destructive force operates by mingling with the passive and changeable elements (μέρη) and attaching itself to them (*De Iside* 373D).<sup>87</sup>

Thus, in contemporary philosophy the terms principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) not only refer to the cosmic elements, but also to powers like the destructive force and the principle of dissolution by which these elements are affected. According to Paul, it is the totality of these cosmological principles, powers and forces which are gradually subdued during Christ's reign. This reign starts with Christ's resurrection and lasts till the end.

#### *2.2.4 The gradual disappearance of the present cosmos and God's new reality*

##### *(a) The gradual disappearance of the present cosmos*

Christ's gradual subjection of the present cosmos is thought to continue till the end of time. According to Paul this end is imminent and will actually come about within a life-span. This is apparent from the assurance he gives to the Christian community of Rome at the end of his letter to them. He announces that the God of peace will soon crush Satan under their feet (*Romans* 16.20).<sup>88</sup> On the same supposition that the end is pending, Paul writes to the Corinthians that not all of them will live to see the end of time. He himself, however, expects to be among those who will not die before the end (*I Cor* 15.51—52). But upon all of them the end of the ages has come (*I Cor* 10.11). In Paul's view, many or at least some of the members of the Christian communities at Rome and Corinth will experience the imminent end of time at some moment in the next few decades while still alive.

<sup>86</sup> Plutarch, *De genio Socratis* 591B: τέσσαρες δ' εἰσὶν ἀρχαὶ πάντων, ζωῆς μὲν ἡ πρώτη κινήσεως δ' ἡ δευτέρα γενέσεως δ' ἡ τρίτη φθορᾶς δ' ἡ τελευταία.

<sup>87</sup> Plutarch, *De Iside* 373D: ὁ λόγος (...) τὴν φθαρτικὴν οὐκ ἀπόλεσεν ἀλλ' ἀνεπήρωσε δύναμιν. ὅθεν ἐκεῖνη μὲν ἀσθενῆς καὶ ἀδρανῆς ἐνταῦθα, φυρομένη καὶ προσπλεκομένη τοῖς παθητικοῖς καὶ μεταβολικοῖς μέρεσι.

<sup>88</sup> *Romans* 16.20: ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει.

In the meantime, the cosmos is being gradually dismantled. The time, Paul writes to the Corinthians, is now limited. As far as the remaining time is concerned, those who use the world should act as though they made not full use of it since the form of the present world (τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) is passing away (*1 Cor* 7.29—31).<sup>89</sup>

Within the context of *1 Corinthians* it does not seem too far-fetched to regard the passing away of the form of the present cosmos (τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) as the result of Christ's gradual and ongoing subjection of the cosmic principles, powers, and forces (*1 Cor* 15.23—28). As a consequence of this subjection, the form of the present cosmos is passing away. The principles and forces of the cosmos are involved in a process which will soon lead up to a new situation where God will be all in everything: ἵνα ἦ ὁ θεὸς [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν (15.28). I will now comment on this phrase.

*(b) God's new reality: The Anaxagorean phrase 'all in everything'*

In the general analysis of *1 Cor* 15.23—28 at the beginning of chap. 2.2, it was shown that the phrase ἵνα ἦ ὁ θεὸς [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ('that God will be all in everything') is the final element in the structure A-B-C-D-C'-D'-B'-A'-E (see chap. 2.2.1 above). In this passage the thought is conveyed that, eventually, Christ will return the dominion to God (A and A') when all cosmological principles, powers, and forces have been subdued (B and B'). The last element E discloses the ultimate aim of the current process during which the powers of the cosmos and eventually Christ himself are subjected to God. The final aim is God's being all in everything.

Paul's formulation of the thought that God will ultimately be all in everything seems to have a base in cosmological tradition. All instances of the expression 'all in everything' (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν) prior to Paul seem to be connected with the Presocratic philosopher Anaxagoras (c. 500—428 BC). In every instance Anaxagoras is mentioned by name. This is even the case whenever πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ('all in everything'), originally a cosmological phrase, appears outside cosmology in the fields of ethics and rhetoric.

I will now pass over the instances in which Anaxagoras' phrase figures outside cosmology, and concentrate on those passages where it is used in a cosmological sense.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>89</sup> *1 Cor* 7.29—31: τοῦτο δέ φημι, ἀδελφοί, ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος ἐστίν· τὸ λοιπὸν ἵνα (...) καὶ οἱ χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι [ῥῶσιν]· παράγει γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. On the cosmological meaning of this passage, see Adams 2000, chap. 5.3.8, pp. 130—136.

<sup>90</sup> Anaxagoras' phrase πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν is used in ethics by the third-century BC Stoic philosopher Chrysippus in a passage preserved in Olympiodorus (c. 380—425 AD). See Olympiodorus, *In Platonis Alcibiadem commentarii*, p. 134: 214.10—18 (or see Chry-

(a) Simplicius (6th cent. AD) is the author of a commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*. In it he gives an account of the physics of Anaxagoras. According to this account, Anaxagoras held the view that all things which have like parts, such as water or fire or gold, are without origin and incorruptible. These things have no origin and are incorruptible even though they seem to come into being and to cease to exist. In reality, however, they only experience combination and separation since everything is in everything (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ἐνόντα), and each single object is characterized by that which is predominantly present in it. Gold, for instance, is manifestly that in which there is much gold, yet everything else is also present in it (Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria* 1.2, p. 27.5—9).<sup>91</sup>

(b) The notion of all things having like parts or, in other words, having a similar composition (πάντα τὰ ὁμοιομερῆ) is a consequence of the view that everything is in everything (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ἐνόντα). This view is frequently attested in Anaxagoras' fragments. He repeatedly says that in everything there is a portion of everything: ἐν παντὶ παντός μοῖρα ἐνεστίν (fragments 11.1 and 12.5—6) or πάντα παντός μοῖραν μετέχει (fragm. 6.3—4; cf. 12.1) and, briefly, ἐν παντὶ πάντα (fragm. 6.2—3).

In accordance with the assumption that all things are in everything, Anaxagoras argues that these things do not come into being or perish. The Greeks, according to Anaxagoras, do not use the words 'coming into being' and 'ceasing to exist' correctly because a thing neither comes into being nor ceases to exist. In fact, everything is formed by a combination of existing things and eventually dissolves into these elemental parts. For that reason, Anaxagoras argues, it would be more correct to call coming

---

sippus in *SVF* 3.302): Ἀναξαγόρας ἔλεγεν πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, ἐν δὲ πλεονάζειν (214.14—15). In a similar ethical sense, Paul employs the phrase in *1 Cor* 12.4—11 when offering some guidelines for the internal ethics of the community at Corinth: καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτός θεός, ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν (12.6). Anaxagoras' saying is also used in rhetoric by the Greek critic and historian Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who lived at Rome in Augustus' time. See his *Ars rhetorica* 9.11, p. 346.1—3: Ἀναξαγόρου δὲ λόγος ἐστίν, ὅτι "πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν: εἴτα ὕστερον διεκρίθη" (346.2—3). Cf. *Ars rhetorica* 8.10, p. 309.3—4.

<sup>91</sup> Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria* 1.2, p. 27.5—9: πάντα γὰρ τὰ ὁμοιομερῆ, οἷον ὕδωρ ἢ πῦρ ἢ χρυσόν, ἀγένητα μὲν εἶναι καὶ ἀφθαρτα, φαίνεσθαι δὲ γινόμενα καὶ ἀπολλύμενα συγκρίσει καὶ διακρίσει μόνον, πάντων μὲν ἐν πᾶσιν ἐνόντων, ἐκάστου δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐπικρατοῦν ἐν αὐτῷ χαρακτηριζομένου. χρυσός γὰρ φαίνεται ἐκεῖνο, ἐν ᾧ πολὺ χρυσοῖον ἐνὶ καίτοι πάντων ἐνόντων (ed. Diels 1882; other editions in Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 2, p. 15: Anaxagoras, no. A 41 [quotation from p. 15.17—21] and in Diels, *Doxographi graeci*, pp. 478—480: Theophrastus, fragm. 4 [quotation from pp. 478.21—479.1]). Cf. the comments on this passage in Sider 1981, pp. 21—23, with reference to Anaxagoras' fragments.

into being 'combining,' and ceasing to be 'dissolving' (fragm. 17).<sup>92</sup> Unlike the Mind, which regulates and controls all things, and which is entirely alike in itself, no other thing is like anything else. Nothing is identical with anything else because each particular object is characterized by those things which are predominantly present in it (fragm. 12.27—30).<sup>93</sup>

Anaxagoras' basic doctrine, thus, consists of the assertion that in everything there is a portion of everything (ἐν παντί παντός μοῖρα ἔνεστι). Or differently phrased, everything is mixed in everything (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν μεμίχθαι),<sup>94</sup> or everything is present in everything: πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν εἶναι.<sup>95</sup>

(c) The cosmological meaning of the axiom πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ('all in everything'), comes to the fore again in the phrase ἵνα ᾗ ὁ θεός [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν in *1 Cor* 15.23—28.<sup>96</sup> As was shown above, this phrase is the concluding element in the structure A-B-C-D-C'-D'-B'-A'-E. In this section, Paul expresses the thought that at the end of time Christ will return the dominion to God (A and A') when all cosmological principles, powers and forces have been subdued (B and B'). The phrase ἵνα ᾗ ὁ θεός [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ('that God will be all in everything') indicates that the whole process in which the constituents of the present cosmos are subdued leads up to another coherent cosmic reality. Paul is convinced that God will ensure a new coherent reality by being all in everything (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν).

In the first century AD, though, the axiom 'all in everything' (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν) was unlikely to have been taken in its proper pre-Socratic,

<sup>92</sup> Anaxagoras, fragm. 17: τὸ δὲ γίνεσθαι καὶ ἀπόλλυσθαι οὐκ ὀρθῶς νομίζουσιν οἱ Ἕλληνες· οὐδὲν γὰρ χρῆμα γίνεται οὐδὲ ἀπόλλυται, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ ἐόντων χρημάτων συμμίσγεται τε καὶ διακρίνεται. καὶ οὕτως ἂν ὀρθῶς καλοῖεν τὸ τε γίνεσθαι συμμίσγεσθαι καὶ τὸ ἀπόλλυσθαι διακρίνεσθαι.

<sup>93</sup> Anaxagoras, fragm. 12.27—30: νοῦς δὲ πᾶς ὁμοίος ἐστι (...). ἕτερον δὲ οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ὁμοῖον οὐδενί, ἀλλ' ὅταν πλεῖστα ἐνι, ταῦτα ἐνδηλότατα ἐν ἕκαστόν ἐστι καὶ ἦν.

<sup>94</sup> Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria* 3.4, p. 460.19 (=Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 2, p. 18: Anaxagoras, no. A 45 [quotation from p. 18.18]).

<sup>95</sup> Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria* 1.2, p. 27.7 (=Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 2, p. 15: Anaxagoras, no. A 41 [quotation from p. 15.19]; or Diels, *Doxographi graeci*, pp. 478—480: Theophrastus, fragm. 4 [quotation from p. 478.23]).

<sup>96</sup> The axiom in question continues to have a cosmological meaning in later philosophical tradition. See, e.g., the discussion of Anaxagoras' axiom πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν by Alexander of Aphrodisias (teacher of Peripatetic philosophy at Athens between 198 and 209 AD). This discussion is conducted in his *De mixtione* 228.16—17 and *In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria* 291.15—19. Cf. also *In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria* 310.36 ff. and 311.14 ff., and *In Aristotelis Topicorum libros octo commentaria* 66.24 ff. These passages, however, contain merely general references to the doctrine of everything in everything, and do not mention Anaxagoras by name.

Anaxagorean meaning. It is far more likely that this axiom was understood as a brief outline of Stoic physics, in particular because 'all in everything' is identified with God. In Stoic physics, it is believed that God is absolutely identical with the 'all' when, after the conflagration of the cosmos, the entire substance of the cosmic body is absorbed by God and becomes one with his commanding faculty. During the subsequent phase in which the cosmos is again orderly arranged, however, God is only present in part of its substance.<sup>97</sup> Despite the background of the axiom 'all in everything' in Anaxagorean physics, the phrase that God is all in everything will have caused many of Paul's contemporaries to think of the Stoic concept of the conflagration and subsequent reconstitution of the cosmos.

From the following discussion in *1 Cor* 15 about the qualities of human bodies after the eschatological resurrection of the dead (15.35—49), it might be inferred in rather more detail what the future cosmic reality will be like. According to Paul, the reality in which God is all things in everything will still be corporeal even though this corporeality is no longer 'psychic' (ψυχικός) and earthly, but 'pneumatic' (πνευματικός) and heavenly instead (15.44—49). The distinction Paul makes here between 'psychic' and 'pneumatic' seems to be typical of him. In Greek literature these terms are not used in such contradistinction but are each often applied as the opposite of 'corporeal' (σωματικός). Paul, however, uses these terms to designate two qualitatively different modes of corporeality, a 'psychic body' (σῶμα ψυχικόν) and a 'pneumatic body' (σῶμα πνευματικόν).<sup>98</sup> But whatever the precise meaning of the opposites 'psychic' and 'pneumatic,' it is clear that after the accomplishment of the end the nature of both those who are resurrected and those who are transformed will be still corporeal. The same applies in all likelihood to the whole cosmic fabric. The future cosmic reality is corporeal and all its diverse elements are solidly integrated (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν) so that its coherence is guaranteed.

The coherence of the *present* cosmos, however, is denied by Paul. He argues that the form of the present cosmos is being dismantled and its constitutive principles, powers and forces are being subjugated. He claims, however, that the future cosmos will be coherent. The present world will disintegrate within the next few decades.

---

<sup>97</sup> See Origen's description of Stoic physics in *Contra Celsum* 4.14 (SVF 2.1052; LS 46H): 'Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ τῶν Στωϊκῶν θεός, ἅτε σῶμα τυγχάνων, ὅτε μὲν ἡγεμονικὸν ἔχει τὴν ὄλην οὐσίαν, ὅταν ἡ ἐκπύρωσις ᾗ· ὅτε δὲ ἐπὶ μέρους γίνεται αὐτῆς, ὅταν ᾗ διακόσμησις.

<sup>98</sup> Paul equally applies the terms ψυχικός ('psychic' or 'natural') and πνευματικός ('pneumatic' or 'spiritual') to designate present believers (πνευματικοί) and unbelievers (ψυχικοί) in *1 Cor* 2.13—15.



### 2.2.5 Paul and the author of Col

The cohesion versus the incoherence of the present cosmos is precisely the issue on which the cosmology of the author of *Col* sharply diverges from that of Paul. This will be demonstrated in the next chapter (chap. 3) when their views on the cosmos are compared. According to the author of *Col*, the eschatological disintegration of the present cosmos is not imminent and its form is not being demolished. On the contrary, all things are currently being held together in Christ: τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν (*Col* 1.17b). The entire body of the cosmos is supplied with various bonds by which it is put together: πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβάζόμενον (*Col* 2.19). It seems unlikely that Paul would have developed a viewpoint so different from his ideas in *1 Cor* 15 as the author of *Col* did.

It is true that Paul himself gradually abandoned the belief of being still alive at the end of time, a belief still unchallenged in *1 Thess* 4.15—17 and *1 Cor* 15.51—52. From some point onwards, Paul started to reckon with at least the possibility of a death preceding the end of time (*2 Cor* 4.16—5.8, *Philipp* 1.19—25, 2.17, and 3.10—11). But there are definitely no traces of a change in his understanding of the impending end of the cosmos. Apart from personal circumstances which led Paul to contemplate his own death (see, e.g., *2 Cor* 1.8—9), no sufficient impetus existed which urged him to reconsider his expectation that the end of time was imminent. Paradoxically, the more Paul reckoned with his own death before the end of time, the less the expectation of the imminence of the end of the cosmos could be proven false by Paul himself. Indeed, Paul does not seem to have lived for the full period of those few decades which he assumed as an interval between the mid-50s and the end, and was consequently not urged to question his view on this issue.

The *Letter to the Colossians* was probably written from the perspective of someone who, sometime in the 80s at the earliest, saw Paul's claim concerning the imminence of the end and the concomitant disintegration of this cosmos refuted. In order to overcome this problem of the invalidation of Paul's imminent eschatology, the author of *Col* could have chosen the model of eschatological retardation which the author of *2 Thessalonians* applied to account for the failure of Paul's expectation of an imminent end of time. According to the author of *2 Thess*, the end cannot come before the final rebellion against God takes place and the 'man of lawlessness' is revealed (*2 Thess* 2.3—4). This man of lawlessness, however, is currently still withheld by the restraining power which ensures that he will not be revealed prematurely (2.5—8).<sup>99</sup>

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Lietaert Peerbolte 1996, chap. 3 A—C on *2 Thess* 2.1—12, pp. 63—89.

The author of *Col*, however, did not resort to such a model of eschatological retardation. Neither did he persist in asserting the gradual and continual disappearance of this cosmos as Paul had done. Instead, he stressed its ongoing coherence now that the end turned out to be distant and not imminent. This author urgently needed to interpret differently what he regarded as the core of Paul's theology, Christ's subjugation of the cosmological principles, lest this core might otherwise be radically forfeited. According to the author of *Col*, all cosmic principles, powers, and elements have already been subdued and integrated into Christ's cosmic body. Instead of a gradual disintegration of the present cosmos and its replacement with a new cosmic reality, the author of *Col* holds the present cosmos to be coherent in Christ. The full consequences of this view will be spelled out in the next chapter.

## Chapter 3

# Paul and the *Letter to the Colossians* Reconsidered: The Further Hellenization of Paul's Cosmology and Cosmic Christology

## Introduction

The prime purpose of this chapter is a comparison of the cosmological vocabulary which Paul and *Col* have in common. This vocabulary consists of the terms 'principles' (ἀρχαί), 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι) and 'elements' (στοιχεῖα) which, as far as Paul is concerned, have just been studied in the previous chapter (chap. 2). Although Paul's use of this terminology was examined in chap. 2, a comparison with *Col* is only possible after the vocabulary in question has been analysed in *Col* as well. Such an analysis had not yet been undertaken in chap. 1 as this chapter solely served the aim of demonstrating that in *Col* the word 'body' (σῶμα) is central to the author's refutation of a rival philosophy, that this word stands for the body of the cosmos and, finally, that the author of *Col* explains that this cosmic body is coherent as a result of bonds (σύνδεσμοι) which hold it together. In the present chapter, however, I will focus on the cosmological terminology which Paul and the author of *Col* share with one another.

In *Col*, the words 'principles' (ἀρχαί), 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι) and elements (στοιχεῖα) occur in two sections of the letter. As we will see in full detail in chap. 4, the structure of *Col* is made up of nine sections: the opening part which contains references to the sender and the addressees as well as greetings (part A), the author's thanksgiving to God (part B), his introductory prayer for his readers (part C), a section on his ministry and the mystery which has been revealed to him (part D), his refutation of the rival cosmological philosophy (part E), ethical exhortations (part F), instructions for managing a Christian household (part G), a final request for intercessory prayers for the dissemination of his mystery (part H), and the letter's ending (part I). The cosmological terminology now under consideration occurs in two sections: in the introductory prayer of part C, and the central section on the Colossian philosophy in part E. These parts will be

treated in chap. 3.1 and 3.2 respectively. The principles, powers and elements have of course already been mentioned in chap. 1 alongside the body of the cosmos, but in the present chapter they are the focus of attention. The various classical notions associated with the principles, powers and elements will be spelled out in more detail. In chap. 3.3, finally, conclusions will be drawn with regard to the identity of the Colossian philosophy against which *Col* is addressed, and with regard to the differences and similarities between Paul and *Col*.

By comparing the respective cosmological systems of Paul and *Col* on the basis of their common terminology, I aim to account better for the interest which the author of *Col* expresses in the present coherence of the body of the cosmos, on which we focused in chap. 1, and especially for the divergence between *Eph* and *Col* in this respect, which will be discussed in chap. 4. The main observation which emerges from the comparison between Paul and *Col*, as we will see in the present chapter, is that *Col* represents a further Hellenization of Paul's cosmology. On the one hand, this Hellenization is certainly already present in Paul insofar that his Christology is highly cosmological and deals with Christ in relation to the elements, principles and powers of the cosmos. In the interpretation of the Jewish notion of the struggle between the 'son of man' and the powers, Paul seems to have been the first to take this struggle in a cosmological sense (see chap. 2.2 above). On the other hand, however, once this transition from Jewish eschatology to Graeco-Roman cosmology is made, Pauline Christology is in principle susceptible to further development.

### 3.1 The principles and powers according to the introductory prayer (*Col* 1.9—23)

#### *Introduction*

First, I shall deal with the words 'principles' (ἀρχαί) and 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι) in the introductory prayer in *Col* 1.9—23. In this, it is necessary to begin with an analysis of the structure and function of this prayer (chap. 3.1.1). Contrary to common opinion, it will be argued that the entire passage has been conceived by the author of *Col* himself, reflects his cosmological views and does not entail a critical modification of an already existing hymn. After that, I shall deal with four notions of mixed origin which constitute the philosophical background to the introductory prayer (chap. 3.1.2). Close inspection reveals that, both with regard to structure and contents, the passage can be understood in its own right, does not show the kind of parallelism which would justify the distinction of the

alleged hymn into stanzas, and fully complies with the cosmological views of the central part of the letter.

### 3.1.1 *The structure of the introductory prayer: Creation and reconstitution of the cosmos*

#### (a) *The introductory prayer of Col 1.9—23*

In his introductory prayer in *Col* 1.9—23, the author of *Col* tells his readers that he has never ceased to address God in prayer on their behalf, asking him to fill them with knowledge of his will, all wisdom and spiritual understanding so that they may live a life worthy of their Lord in a way that is truly pleasing to him (1.9—10a). The characteristics of such a way of life are fourfold. If his readers attain to the ideal lifestyle, they bear fruit by performing all kinds of good deeds, increase in their knowledge of God himself, are strong enough, as a result of God's magnificent strength by which they have been empowered, to stand firm and persevere, and, finally, they joyfully return their thanks to God their Father (1.10b—12a).

The reason why they should be thankful to God their Father is that he has made them fit to share in the inheritance which the saints receive by being positioned in the light; this happened when he drew them out of the power of darkness and ignorance into the kingdom of his beloved Son, in whom they receive deliverance, the remission of their sins (1.12—14). According to the author of *Col*, within the dominion of God's Son the readers are set free from the power of darkness, because he is the visible representation of the invisible God (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀοράτου), the firstborn of the entire creation (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως). Christ is called the firstborn of creation because in him all things (τὰ πάντα) in heaven and on earth were created, the visible as well as the invisible (τὰ ὀρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα), whether thrones (θρόνοι), dominions (κυριότητες), principles (ἀρχαί) or powers (ἐξουσίαι; 1.15—16c). Not only have all things been created in him, but also through him and for him: he is prior to all things and all things have been put together in him (1.16d—17: τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτίσται, καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν).

In the author's view, the readers have been delivered from the power of darkness as Christ's rule extends over the entire fabric of the cosmos, from its very beginning onwards. He continues by stating that Christ, to whose kingdom (βασιλεία) they have been transferred (1.13), is head of the body of his assembly (ἐκκλησία), the church: he is the church's origin (ἀρχή), because he is the πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, the firstborn from the dead (1.18a—c). In *Col*, the church is seen as originating from Christ's resurrection as people enter the church by baptism, through which they are

believed to participate not only in Christ's death but also already in his resurrection (2.12—13; 2.20; 3.1—3).

So far, in his introductory prayer the author of *Col* has designated Christ as firstborn of all creation (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως) and firstborn of the dead (πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν). Christ is also firstborn of the dead, the author of *Col* continues, in order that he might become first in everything: ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων (1.18d). The following structural pattern, which will be visualised in Table 1 below, now begins to emerge clearly. The author first mentions the fourth characteristic of the Christians' way of life, namely their returning thanks to God the Father for their transference from the power of darkness into Christ's kingdom (1.11b—14). Subsequently, the author of *Col* explains this deliverance as coming about through Christ who is (A) the πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, the firstborn of all creation (1.15—17). In this capacity he is superior to any part of the entire cosmos. Christ is also (B) the πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, the firstborn from the dead, and as such he is the origin of his church which is closely linked, if not identical with his kingdom to which the readers have been transferred (1.18a—c). He is both, in order that he might become (C) the first in everything, i.e. in creation and re-creation: ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων (1.18d).<sup>1</sup> That Christ being first means that he is indeed first in creation and re-creation is shown beyond doubt as the author explicitly states the reasons on which Christ's priority is based. Christ is first in everything because the entire fullness was pleased to dwell in him (A') and, by making peace, to reconcile through him all things to him (B')—all things, whether on earth or in heaven.

The first reason (A') of the fullness being pleased to dwell in him does not refer to the incarnation, but to Christ's role in creation. This is clear from the reiteration and expansion of this clause in the central part on the Colossian philosophy. In that context, the entire fullness appears to be the fullness of the divine nature which takes on in Christ the shape of the visible body of the cosmos (2.9—10; see also chap. 1.2.4 above). Both rea-

---

<sup>1</sup> See also Stettler 2000, p. 247: 'V. 18c [ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων] fasst alle diese Aussagen zusammen. πρωτεύων muß deshalb hier ausnahmsweise auch eine zeitliche Sinnkomponente enthalten: Jesus wird durch seine Auferstehung der erste Aufgestandene und somit in *allem* der Erste, in Bezug auf die Schöpfung der Welt (1. Strophe) wie in Bezug auf die Neuschöpfung, die mit der Auferstehung beginnt (...). Wie in Phil 4,12; 1 Tim 3,11 meint auch hier ἐν πᾶσιν nicht nur das All, sondern bedeutet „in allen Stücken“—Jesus ist also nicht nur in der Schöpfung, sondern auch in der Verwirklichung des verheißenen Heils der Erste.' Cf. Stettler 2000, p. 346: 'Auch V. 18c ist sowohl formal wie inhaltlich sinnvoll: (...) die Zeile fasst die Nominalprädikationen von V. 15 und 18ab zusammen, ist also auch richtig platziert.'

sons, thus, refer back respectively to Christ's creation and recreation mentioned earlier: Christ is (A) the firstborn of creation and (B) the firstborn from the dead, so that (C) he may become the first in everything, in creation and re-creation that is, as (A') the entire fullness of the invisible God was pleased to dwell in Christ as a visible cosmic body and (B') to reconcile the entire cosmos through and to him. The realisation of God's purpose to dwell in Christ and to assume in him (ἐν αὐτῷ) a cosmic body (1.19) demands that the cosmos, which has been created in Christ (ἐν αὐτῷ), through him (δι' αὐτοῦ) and for him (εἰς αὐτόν; 1.16), is now also reconciled through (δι' αὐτοῦ) and to him (εἰς αὐτόν; 1.20). In the interest of clarity and as an alternative to the reconstructions which I will deal with below, the structure of *Col* 1.11b—20 can be visualised in the following manner (see Table 1).

Table 1. The structure of the introductory prayer in *Col* 1.9—20

1.9	Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι
	ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπιγνώσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ,
	1.10 περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν,
	ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες
	καὶ ἀξανάμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ,
	1.11 ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δοξῆς αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν,
The Father	μετὰ χαρᾶς 1.12 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ
	τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί·
Christ	1.13 ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ,
(A) Creation: the firstborn of creation	1.14 ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν· 1.15 ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως,
	1.16 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι. Τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν ἐκτίσται, 1.17 καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν.
(B) Re-creation: the firstborn from the dead	(B) 1.18 Καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὃς ἐστὶν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν,
(C) The first in everything: i.e. (A') in creation	(C) ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτός πρωτεύων,
	1.19 ὅτι (A') ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι
and (B') re-creation	1.20 καὶ (B') δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν,
	εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, [δι' αὐτοῦ] εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

In his introductory prayer, the author of *Col* appears to be concerned with the redemption of man as well as with the creation and reconciliation of the cosmic principles and powers. As this cosmology is basically identical with the cosmological views which are set forth as orthodox in the central part on the Colossian philosophy, as we shall see in chap. 3.2, there is no reason to attempt to reconstruct an original hymn which has supposedly been modified critically by the author of *Col*.

(b) *Earlier attempts at the reconstruction of a hymn in Col 1.15—20*

The reconstruction of such a hymn has a distinguished history, which has been well recorded,<sup>2</sup> and the conviction that it should be undertaken is nothing less than common opinion. As an example I will present Schweizer's reconstruction and discuss it in brief.<sup>3</sup> The text of *Col* 1.15—20 is first of all divided into two stanzas on account of their parallelism. For the sake of clarity, I will enumerate the parallels in question and visualise Schweizer's reconstruction in Table 2 below. Both stanzas start with a relative clause (1) ὅς ἐστιν ('who is ...') and comprises, apart from this relative clause, also the following parallels: (2) the term πρωτότοκος ('firstborn'), either 'the firstborn of all creation' or 'the firstborn from the dead,' (3) the causal particle ὅτι ('because'), which is immediately followed by (4) the prepositional phrase 'in him' (ἐν αὐτῷ), (5) the phrase 'all things in earth and in heaven' (τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), (6) the words 'all things' (τὰ πάντα) and the prepositional phrases (7) 'through him' (δι' αὐτοῦ) and (8) 'for him' (εἰς αὐτόν). According to Schweizer, these parallels occur in the first and second stanza as the following table shows (see Table 2).

In the first stanza, the phrase 'the things visible and invisible, whether thrones, dominions, principles or powers' (τὰ ὀρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι) in 1.16b—c is considered to stand in apposition to 'all things in heaven and on earth' (τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) in 1.16a and not to have been part of the original hymn. By excluding 1.16b—c (see [1 ...]) from the first stanza and 1.18d (see [3 ...]) together with 1.20b—c (see [4–5 ...]) from the second, Schweizer is able to create two similar stanzas, both in length and in terminology.

<sup>2</sup> Gabathuler 1965 and Benoit 1975; particularly noteworthy among the earliest reconstructions is Norden 1913, pp. 250—254.

<sup>3</sup> Schweizer 1961, cols 241—245 (=Schweizer 1963, pp. 293—299).



Table 2. Schweizer's reconstruction of the original hymn in *Col* 1.15—20

## First stanza

- 1.15 (1) ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, (2) πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως,  
(1) who is the representation of the invisible God, (2) the firstborn of all  
creation,  
1.16a (3) ὅτι (4) ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη (5) τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,  
(3) because (4) in him (5) all things in heaven and on earth have been  
created,  
1.16b—c [[<sup>1</sup> τὰ ὄρατά καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε  
ἐξουσίαι·  
the visible things and the invisible, whether thrones, dominions, principles  
and powers;]]  
1.16d (6) τὰ πάντα (7) δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ (8) εἰς αὐτόν ἐκτίσται,  
(6) all things have been created (7) through him and (8) for him.

## Intermediary stanza

- 1.17a καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων  
And he is prior to all things  
1.17b καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν.  
and all things have been put together in him.  
1.18a καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος [[<sup>2</sup> τῆς ἐκκλησίας]]·  
and he is the head of the body [[<sup>2</sup> of the church]];

## Second stanza

- 1.18b—c (1') ὃς ἐστὶν ἀρχή, (2') πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν,  
(1') who is the origin, (2') the firstborn from the dead,  
1.18d [[<sup>3</sup> ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτός πρωτεύων,  
in order that he might become the first in everything]],  
1.19 (3') ὅτι (4') ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι  
(3') because (4') in him the entire fullness was pleased to dwell  
1.20a καὶ (7') δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι (6') τὰ πάντα (8') εἰς αὐτόν,  
and to reconcile (7') through him (6') all things (8') to him,  
1.20b [[<sup>4</sup> εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ,  
making peace through the blood of his cross,]]  
1.20c [[<sup>5</sup> [δι' αὐτοῦ] εἴτε (5') τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,  
[through him]—(5') all things, whether on earth or in heaven.]]

The section in between the two stanzas, which does not show the same parallelism and which is too short to constitute a stanza of the same quality as the others, is, for that reason, called an intermediary stanza ('Zwischenstrophe'). This intermediary stanza is taken, in its entirety, as a further explication of the creation spoken of in the first stanza. The genitive 'of the church' (τῆς ἐκκλησίας) in 1.18a (see [[<sup>2</sup> ...]]) is therefore taken as a gloss by which the author of *Col* turned the original notion of a cos-

mic body, of which Christ was head, into the idea of an ecclesiastical body.<sup>4</sup>

From the second stanza, the clause ‘in order that he might become the first in everything’ (ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτός πρωτεύων) in 1.18d (see [³ ...]) is left out, as well as its end in 1.20b—c (see [⁴–⁵ ...]). According to Schweizer, this end had been added by the author of *Col* in order to connect the second stanza with Christ’s crucifixion (1.20b), so that its scope is no longer restricted to his resurrection alone, whereas 1.20c is merely a repetition of the similar phrase in 1.16a.

This reconstruction seems questionable for three reasons.

(1) In the first place, the corresponding lines of the first and second stanza do not seem to be of equal length; nor is the order in which parallels re-occur in the second stanza entirely consistent with the order in the first stanza. These problems have been tackled in a reconstruction proposed by Burger, who leaves out the intermediary stanza and limits the parallels so radically to Schweizer’s first four instances of parallelism that their sequence in both stanzas is perfectly the same. In Burger’s view, the original hymn reads as follows.<sup>5</sup>

Table 3. Burger’s reconstruction of the original hymn underlying *Col* 1.15—20

1.15a	(1) ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν (1) <u>who is</u> the representation of the invisible God
1.15b	(2) πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (2) <u>the firstborn</u> of all creation
1.16a	(3) ὅτι (4) ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (3) <u>because</u> (4) <u>in him</u> all things have been created
1.16b	τὰ ὄρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα the visible things and the invisible.

<sup>4</sup> Note, however, Hofius’ convincing criticism of this widespread view: ‘Die These, das σώμα V. 18a [καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας] im ursprünglichen Text kosmologisch gemeint war (=τὰ πάντα) und daß erst der Verfasser des Kolosserbriefes die Worte τῆς ἐκκλησίας als ekklesiologisches Interpretament hinzugefügt hat, setzt die Zugehörigkeit des V. 18a zu den vorangehenden Aussagen über Christus als den Schöpfungsmittler voraus. Dann aber ergibt sich eine erhebliche Redundanz der Aussagen: Die Erklärung, daß Christus die κεφαλὴ des Alls als seines σώμα ist, würde in der Sache nur noch einmal wiederholen, was bereits die Worte καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν V. 17 zum Ausdruck gebracht haben.’ See Hofius 2001, pp. 187—188.

<sup>5</sup> Burger 1975, pp. 3—38, esp. p. 26.

- 1.18b (1') ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή  
(1') who is the origin
- 1.18c (2') πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν  
(2') the firstborn from the dead
- 1.19 (3') ὅτι (4') ἐν αὐτῷ κατέκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα  
(3') because (4') in him the entire fullness dwelled
- 1.20c εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς  
whether those on earth or those in heaven.

This rigorous reconstruction which reduces the hymn to an absolute minimum only highlights the arbitrariness of such undertakings, whereas it seems perfectly possible to understand the text as it stands as a product of the author of *Col* himself.

(2) In the second place, although it is true that the first and second stanzas in Schweizer's reconstruction start with the relative clause ὅς ἐστιν ('who is ...'), it is important to notice that relative clauses occur more often in the introductory prayer (see ὅς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκοτίου in 1.13: 'who has drawn us out of the power of darkness' and ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν in 1.14: 'in whom we receive deliverance'). They are a characteristic of the author's style employed in his introductory prayer so that the repetition of the relative clause ὅς ἐστιν ('who is ...') does not necessarily mark the beginning of a second stanza.

Moreover, the notion of stanzas seems to be problematic in the case of *Col* 1.15—20. Brucker has recently made clear that, according to classical rhetoric, a text is only poetic when it is written in metres.<sup>6</sup> For that reason, *Col* 1.15—20 is not a *poetic* hymn. More importantly, Brucker argues that in classical and early Christian writings parallelism and changes towards a more elevated style are not, by definition, indicative of hymnic poetry but also occur in what he calls epideictic rhetoric, which is concerned with eulogy expressed in prose.<sup>7</sup> As part of this genre of epideictic rhetoric, Brucker also counts hymns in prose like those written by Aelius Aristides

<sup>6</sup> Brucker 1997, chap. 1, pp. 23—30.

<sup>7</sup> Brucker 1997; for the term 'epideictic rhetoric' see Brucker 1997, chap. 2.2, pp. 110—173, esp. p. 111 note 4 with reference to Aristotle, *Ars rhetorica* 1358a36—1358b8. At the end of his study, Brucker disqualifies *Philipp* 2.6—11 from being a poetic hymn (see Brucker 1997, chap. 5, pp. 280—346) and suggests that the same conclusion may be reached for *Col* 1.15—20 (Brucker 1997, pp. 351—352).

(AD 117—181).<sup>8</sup> According to Aristides, in contrast to poetic hymns, prose hymns do not consist of stanzas (στροφαί) (*Oratio* 45.3).<sup>9</sup>

This brief glance at classical rhetoric shows clearly that *Col* 1.15—20 is certainly not a *poetic* hymn as it is not written in metres. It appears to be a prose hymn and, as such, is perhaps better seen as an instance of epideictic rhetoric. That means, however, that it is no longer possible to divide up the text into two stanzas and an intermediary stanza because stanzas only occur in poetic hymns. Consequently, it is impossible to reconstruct an original hymn which underlies *Col* 1.15—20: the text as it stands is an epideictic passage of which the author of *Col* can most plausibly be taken to be the author.

(3) In the third place, if the epideictic nature of these verses is not taken into account, one fails to see that they are an integral part of the introductory prayer and its train of thought, displaying a different structure which reflects the author's real interest. As has been demonstrated above, this structure consists of the pattern A-B-C-A'-B': (A) Christ is the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) of all creation as well as (B) the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) from the dead, (C) in order that he might become the first in everything (ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων), i.e. in the creation as well as in the reconstitution of the cosmos, because the fullness of the divine nature of the invisible God was pleased (A') in him to take on the shape of a cosmic body and (B') through him to reconcile the cosmos to himself.

The first part of this pattern is linked with the preceding introductory prayer by means of the relative clause ὃς ἐστίν ('who is ...'). After the author has said that he prays God that his readers may conduct their lives in an appropriate way, which consists partly in showing themselves thankful to God for having been transferred to the kingdom of Christ, in whom they receive deliverance, the author of *Col* immediately adds the relative clause under consideration. The thought of God saving them from the power of darkness, thus, is substantiated by portraying Christ's cosmic magnitude in creation as its firstborn (1.15—17).

It should be no surprise, if the author subsequently returns to the notion of Christ's kingdom, to which the readers have been transferred, and adds that as the firstborn from the dead, Christ is the origin of the Christian assembly, the church, of which he is head (1.18a—c). The rest of the intro-

---

<sup>8</sup> Brucker 1997, pp. 165—173; on the genre of prose hymns, see esp. pp. 165 (notes 59—60 in particular), 170—171 and 173.

<sup>9</sup> According to West, a stanza (or strophe) is 'a structure longer than a single verse, made up of one or more periods, and recurring in the same form, whether immediately or after intervening matter;' a period is 'the fundamental self-contained unit in metrical composition,' which differs from a verse or line inasmuch as it extends over many lines (West 1982, pp. 4—5).

ductory prayer only elaborates on this twofold priority of Christ (1.18d) in creation (1.19) and re-creation (1.20—23). This re-creation encompasses cosmos (1.20) as well as man (1.21—23). Cosmology and soteriology are never far apart in *Col*.

The pattern A-B-C-A'-B' proves to be an integral part of his introductory prayer. This analysis of the introductory prayer has an additional advantage over and against attempts at a reconstruction of the original hymn inasmuch as these attempts lead in fact to the assumption of a third position, that of the original author of the hymn, alongside the positions taken by the author of *Col* and the adherents of the Colossian philosophy.<sup>10</sup> It is hard to see why the author of *Col*, in a letter in which he deals with the Colossian philosophy, would take up a particular hymn which was suitable for inclusion in the introductory prayer to this letter but was, at the same time, in need of critical modification.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, introducing a third factor in the already unclear interrelationship between the author of *Col* and the Colossian philosophy dims the distinctiveness of each position separately still further, especially in respect to their cosmology.

In the present chapter it has become plausible, however, that the author of *Col* himself is to be credited with the entire introductory prayer in *Col* 1.9—23. His opinion is that the principles and powers of the cosmos have been created, put together and reconciled in, through and to Christ (1.16—17; 1.20).

In the next section, chap. 3.1.2, I shall comment briefly on four classical notions which seem to be employed in the cosmology of the introductory prayer. In chap. 3.2 it will be shown that in the central section on the Colossian philosophy the cosmology of this prayer is supplemented with a clarification of how the reconciliation of the cosmos was actually brought about and what its current effects are. Once the distinctness of *Col* from

---

<sup>10</sup> So explicitly Schweizer 1975, 5th section, pp. 499—501; =Schweizer 1982, 5th section, pp. 176—178: 'Die drei Antworten im Kolosserbrief.' See also Schweizer 1989a, pp. 102—104.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Stettler 2000, pp. 99—100: 'Es ist ohnehin nur schwer denkbar, dass der Kol-Verfasser an zentraler Stelle als „Helfer“ für seine Argumentation einen Text gebrauchte, der an mehreren Stellen zu undeutlich war oder seiner Theologie gar nicht entsprach, so dass er ihn erst noch durch Zusätze zurechtrücken musste. (...) Aus formalen Überlegungen ist es also unwahrscheinlich, dass der Kol-Verfasser in den Text des ursprünglichen „Psalms“ interpretierende Zusätze eingefügt hat.' According to Stettler, no changes have been made in the original text of the hymn (Stettler 2000, pp. 345—346). Stettler also reckons with the possibility that the author of *Col* himself is its author. See Stettler 2000, pp. 101—102 and 346—347: 'Es ist auch möglich, dass der Verfasser des Kolosserbriefs den Psalm selbst gedichtet hat, zu einer früheren Gelegenheit oder—weniger wahrscheinlich, aber nicht völlig auszuschließen—*ad hoc* für den Kolosserbrief' (p. 347).

Paul has become clearer, some conclusions will also be drawn in chap. 3.3 regarding the identity of the philosophy which is criticised in *Col*. Finally, I shall conclude that the author of *Col* expresses views which go well beyond the cosmological ideas entertained by Paul. These views are best understood as a further Hellenization of Paul's cosmology.

### 3.1.2 Philosophical background of the introductory prayer

#### *Introduction: Thrones, dominions, principles and powers*

In the previous section (chap. 3.1.1), the cosmology of the introductory prayer was attributed to none other than the author of *Col* himself. In his view, all things in heaven and on earth were created in Christ, the visible and the invisible (1.16a—b). These things are subsequently specified as thrones (θρόνοι), dominions (κυριότητες), principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι; 1.16c). This list indicates what he thinks the cosmos (τὰ πάντα) is composed of and which powers he considers to play a role in its functioning.

The last two terms mentioned, 'principles' (ἀρχαί) and 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι), seem to refer to the tangible side of the cosmos as they stand for the elements of the cosmos. The combination of principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι) has been adopted from Paul who uses these terms, as we saw above, in *1 Cor* 15.23—28 (chap. 2.2). In this passage, as I argued, Paul seems to draw on *Daniel* 7 LXX and to apply its notion of the subjection of the powers (ἐξουσίαι) under the 'son of man' (see chap. 2.2.2 above). But, whereas at the level of *Daniel* these powers still refer to earthly, political kingdoms, in Paul's interpretation the powers (ἐξουσίαι), which seem to lack a clear cosmological meaning in literature contemporaneous with Paul, are flanked by principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) which do have such a meaning. In contemporary cosmology, these principles and forces are often identical with the elements (στοιχεῖα) of which the cosmos is composed (see chap. 2.2.3 above).

Interestingly, in *Col* Paul's triad of principles (ἀρχαί), powers (ἐξουσίαι), and forces (δυνάμεις) is reduced to the first two, principles and powers. In the introductory prayer they are mentioned together with thrones and dominions (1.16), but elsewhere in the letter, in its central part, they occur as a pair (2.10; 2.15). Whereas Paul needed to supplement the Danielic, non-cosmological term ἐξουσίαι ('powers') emphatically with the cosmological terminology of principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) in order to make his readers understand that the submission of the powers under the 'son of man' is an action which concerns the physical cosmos, in *Col* the cosmological meaning of the combination of principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι) is taken for granted. In *Col*, this

combination functions as a contracted formula which stands for the components of the cosmos. Their cosmological meaning in *Col* is clear from the fact that they are subsumed within τὰ πάντα, the cosmos (1.16—17; 1.20), and are implicitly identified with the elements of the cosmos (2.8—10; 2.15 and 2.20).

Whereas the principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι) mentioned in the introductory prayer of *Col* may well represent the visible things (τὰ ὄρατά; see *Col* 1.16b) of the cosmos, inasmuch as these principles and powers are identified with the cosmic elements, the other terms ‘thrones’ (θρόνοι) and ‘dominions’ (κυριότητες) belong to a different category. These terms seem to stand for the powers which are exerted by the planets. It might well be that thrones and dominions represent the invisible things (τὰ ἀόρατα; see *Col* 1.16b) which operate within this cosmos. In contemporary astronomy, the term ‘throne’ (θρόνος) is a metaphor for the force which planets exhibit when they are in a particular position and are exalted in power. When planets attain exaltation, they exert their influence to the maximum.<sup>12</sup> Upon their thrones, the planets have ‘royal power.’<sup>13</sup> It is important to note that planets are not absolutely identical with thrones but, metaphorically speaking, occupy them as their seat.

Although, to my knowledge, no astronomical meaning has been attested for the next term κυριότης (‘dominion’), it should probably also be taken as a reference to powers which are exerted by heavenly bodies and cause particular parts of the cosmos to be controlled by their dominion.<sup>14</sup> Invisible things like thrones and dominions, and visible things like principles and powers have been created in Christ.

I shall now briefly comment on four notions in the introductory prayer, which are of mixed origin but are employed by the author of *Col* to express his conviction that the principles and powers are closely linked with Christ.

#### (a) Prepositional metaphysics

The first, most conspicuous notion is what in a recent article Sterling has called ‘prepositional metaphysics.’<sup>15</sup> According to the author of *Col*, all things have been created in Christ (ἐν αὐτῷ), through him (δι’ αὐτοῦ) and

<sup>12</sup> Cf. my comments in chap. 4.5 below on the terms ‘height’ and ‘depth’ in *Eph* 3.18—19 and *Romans* 8.38—39.

<sup>13</sup> See *Michigan Papyrus* no. 1, fragm. 3, col. A, lines 22—34 (ed. Robbins 1927, pp. 22—23 [text], 43—44 [commentary] and 1 [date: 2nd cent. AD]). Cf. Ptolemy (fl. between AD 146 and 170), *Tetrabiblos* 1.23. See also LSJ 807 s.v. θρόνος I.6a—b.

<sup>14</sup> See the very frequent occurrence of the noun κύριος (‘lord,’ ‘master’) in an astronomical sense in Vettius Valens, *Anthologiae* (see index ed. Pingree, pp. 523—524).

<sup>15</sup> Sterling 1997.

for him (εἰς αὐτόν; 1.16); all things have their existence in him (ἐν αὐτῷ; 1.17); the fullness of the divine nature has settled in him (ἐν αὐτῷ; 1.19; cf. 2.9), and all things have been reconciled through (δι' αὐτοῦ) and to him (εἰς αὐτόν; 1.20). In chap. 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 above, I already suggested that the stress which the author of *Col* places on Christ as the origin and fulfilment of the cosmos can be taken as a polemic against Stoic views on the pre-eminence of the element fire which was understood to operate as that out of which (ἐξ αὐτοῦ) the entire cosmos is composed and into which (εἰς αὐτό) it will eventually dissolve. In his polemic the author of *Col* wants to redress the balance between Christ and the elements of the cosmos (*Col* 2.8—10). I will now focus in some more detail on these instances of prepositional metaphysics.

In his essay, Sterling listed several Stoic and Middle Platonist texts of which the following are of immediate relevance for *Col*.<sup>16</sup> According to a Stoic argument preserved in the Pyrrhonist Sceptic Sextus Empiricus (end of the 2nd cent. AD), there is not only 'that out of which something becomes' and 'that by which something becomes' and 'that for which,' but also 'that in which (τὸ ἐν ᾧ) something becomes.' That 'out of which something becomes' is matter, the 'by which' is the cause, the 'for which' the purpose, and the 'in which (τὸ ἐν ᾧ) something becomes' is the place (*Adversus dogmaticos* 4.10 [= *Adversus mathematicos* 10.10]).<sup>17</sup> Similarly, Marcus Aurelius (emperor AD 161—180) exclaims when he addresses God in his manifestation in cosmos and creation: 'All things (πάντα) come from you, all things are in you (ἐν σοὶ πάντα), and all things are for you (εἰς σέ πάντα; *Ad se ipsum* 4.23).'<sup>18</sup>

In Middle Platonist thought, these prepositional phrases are attested in Philo and a report given by Seneca. In Philo's view, for the coming into being of anything many things need to go together, the 'by which,' the 'from which,' the 'through which' (τὸ δι' οὗ), and the 'for which.' The first of these is the cause, the second the material, the third (the 'through which') is the instrument (δι' οὗ δὲ τὸ ἐργαλεῖον), and the fourth that for the sake of which it is generated, the motive or object. In the construction

<sup>16</sup> See the useful tables in Sterling 1997, pp. 224 ('Prepositional metaphysics in the late Stoa') and 229 ('Prepositional metaphysics in Middle Platonic thought').

<sup>17</sup> Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus dogmaticos* 4.10 (= *Adversus mathematicos* 10.10): ὡσπερ τε εἰ τὸ ἐξ οὗ τι γίνεταί ἐστι, καὶ τὸ ὑφ' οὗ τι γίνεταί καὶ τὸ δι' ὃ, οὕτως ὑπάρχοι ἂν καὶ τὸ ἐν ᾧ τι γίνεταί. ἐστι δὲ τὸ ἐξ οὗ τι γίνεταί, οἶον ἡ ὕλη, καὶ τὸ ὑφ' οὗ, οἶον τὸ αἰτίον, καὶ τὸ δι' ὃ, καθάπερ τὸ τέλος· ἐστιν ἄρα καὶ τὸ ἐν ᾧ τι γίνεταί, τουτέστιν ὁ τόπος (*SVF* 2.501, p. 162 lines 19—23).

<sup>18</sup> Marcus Aurelius, *Ad se ipsum* 4.23: Πᾶν μοι συναρμόζει δ σοὶ εὐάρμοστόν ἐστιν, ὃ κόσμος: οὐδέν μοι πρόωρον οὐδὲ ὀψιμον δ σοὶ εὐκαιρον. πᾶν μοι καρπὸς δ φέρουσιν αἱ σοὶ ὄραι, ὃ φύσις: ἐκ σοῦ πάντα, ἐν σοὶ πάντα, εἰς σέ πάντα.



of the cosmos, the cause of its generation is God by whom it has come into being, its material the four elements from which it was compounded, its instrument the word of God through which it was constructed (ὄργανον δὲ λόγον θεοῦ δι' οὗ κατασκευάσθη), and the motive for its construction the goodness of its creator (*De cherubim* 124—127).<sup>19</sup>

Platonic prepositional metaphysics has also been described in one of Seneca's letters to Lucilius. In his letter on the first cause (*Epistle* 65), Plato is said to distinguish five causes, the 'from which,' the 'by which,' the 'in which' (id in quo), the 'after which' and the 'for which' (*Epistle* 65.8).<sup>20</sup> In the imagery of the fabrication of a bronze statue, the 'from which' is the bronze, the 'by which' is the artist, the 'in which' is the form which is adapted to the bronze material (id in quo forma est, quae aptatur illi), the 'after which' is the model which is imitated by the agent, the 'for which' is the agent's purpose, and the result of all these is the statue itself (65.8).<sup>21</sup> These causes also collaborate in the creation of the cosmos: the agent is God; the 'from which' is matter; the form is the shape and arrangement of the visible cosmos (formam, haec est habitus et ordo mundi, quem videmus); the model is the totality of ideas within the mind of God which constitute the patterns of all things,<sup>22</sup> the model after which God has made this great and most beautiful creation; the purpose is that for which he made it, goodness (65.9—10).<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> See esp. Philo, *De cherubim* 125: πρὸς γὰρ τὴν τινος γένεσιν πολλὰ δεῖ συνελθεῖν, | τὸ ὑφ' οὗ, τὸ ἐξ οὗ, τὸ δι' οὗ, τὸ δι' ὃ· καὶ ἔστι τὸ μὲν ὑφ' οὗ τὸ αἴτιον, ἐξ οὗ δὲ ἡ ὕλη, δι' οὗ δὲ τὸ ἐργαλεῖον, δι' ὃ δὲ ἡ αἰτία; and *De cherubim* 127: ἐβήσεις γὰρ αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν θεὸν ὑφ' οὗ γέγονεν, ὕλην δὲ τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα ἐξ ὧν συνεκράθη, ὄργανον δὲ λόγον θεοῦ δι' οὗ κατασκευάσθη, τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς αἰτίαν τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ.

<sup>20</sup> Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae morales* 65.8: Quinque ergo causae sunt, ut Plato dicit: id ex quo, id a quo, id in quo, id ad quod, id propter quod.

<sup>21</sup> Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae morales* 65.8: Tamquam in statua (...), id ex quo aes est, id a quo artifex est, id in quo forma est, quae aptatur illi, id ad quod exemplar est, quod imitatur is, qui facit, id propter quod facientis propositum est, id quod ex istis est, ipsa statua est.

<sup>22</sup> Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae morales* 65.7: His quintam Plato adicit exemplar, quam ipse ideam vocat; hoc est enim, ad quod respiciens artifex id, quod destinabat, effecit. Nihil autem ad rem pertinet, utrum foris habeat exemplar, ad quod referat oculos, an intus, quod ibi ipse concepit et posuit. Haec exemplaria rerum omnium deus intra se habet numerosque universorum, quae agenda sunt, et modos mente complexus est; plenus his figuris est, quas Plato ideas appellat, immortales, immutabiles, infatigabiles. On the concept of the ideas as the thoughts of God, see, e.g., Jones 1981 and Rich 1981. This concept is standard Middle Platonist doctrine.

<sup>23</sup> Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae morales* 65.9—10: Haec omnia mundus quoque, ut ait Plato, habet: facientem: hic deus est. Ex quo fit: haec materia est. Formam: haec est habitus et ordo mundi, quem videmus. Exemplar, scilicet, ad quod deus hanc magnitudi-

These Stoic and Middle Platonist texts are of direct relevance for the propositional metaphysics in the introductory prayer of *Col*.<sup>24</sup> Its views that all things have been created in Christ (ἐν αὐτῷ; *Col* 1.16) and that the entire fullness of the divine nature of the invisible God has taken on in him (ἐν αὐτῷ) the shape of the visible cosmos (1.19; cf. 2.9) are closely paralleled by the Stoic argument for the ‘in which’ (τὸ ἐν ᾧ) something becomes<sup>25</sup> and ‘in which,’ or rather ‘in whom,’ all things are.<sup>26</sup> All things are currently being held together in Christ (*Col* 1.17). One can easily see that it is but one step from the spatial notion of the cosmos being held together in Christ to the idea that the cosmos constitutes his body.

These views on the ‘in which’ also bear close resemblance to the Platonic ‘in which’ (id in quo), the form which is adapted to matter, the shape and arrangement of the visible cosmos.<sup>27</sup> Likewise, the idea that all things have been created for Christ (εἰς αὐτόν; *Col* 1.16) and have been reconciled to him (εἰς αὐτόν; 1.20) accords with Marcus Aurelius’ Stoic exclamation that all things are from Nature, in Nature, and for Nature: εἰς σὲ πάντα (*Ad se ipsum* 4.23). Finally, the notion that all things have been created and reconciled through Christ (δι’ αὐτοῦ; *Col* 1.16 and 1.20) mirrors Platonic interest in the instrument through which the cosmos was constructed (Philo, *De cherubim* 124—127).

### (b) Christ’s role in creating the cosmos

The second cosmological notion which seems to be employed in the introductory prayer of *Col* is closely related to the one just mentioned. It is highly remarkable that in *Col* propositional metaphysics serves to highlight Christ’s role in the creation of the cosmos. Paul himself has merely a passing interest in Christ’s cosmological function and speaks only once of Christ through whom (δι’ οὗ) all things were created (*1 Cor* 8.6b).<sup>28</sup> Otherwise it is God from whom (ἐξ οὗ), through whom (δι’ οὗ) and for whom

nem operis pulcherrimi fecit. Propositum, propter quod fecit. Quæris, quod sit propositum deo? Bonitas.

<sup>24</sup> Sterling’s conclusion is important: ‘what we find in the New Testament is a reflection of the variety of understandings current in the philosophical schools. (...) A failure to recognize the different traditions has often led interpreters to reject the technical meanings’ (Sterling 1997, p. 232).

<sup>25</sup> Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus dogmaticos* 4.10 (= *Adversus mathematicos* 10.10).

<sup>26</sup> Marcus Aurelius, *Ad se ipsum* 4.23.

<sup>27</sup> Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae morales* 65.8—9.

<sup>28</sup> See *1 Cor* 8.4—6: Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὗν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς, καὶ γὰρ εἶπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, ὥσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, ἀλλ’ ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ.

(εἰς αὐτόν) all things are said to have their being (1 Cor 8.6a; Romans 11.36: ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα). The special emphasis which the author of *Col* places on Christ's role in creating the cosmos is scarcely prefigured in the authentic Paul. Nor for that matter is it paralleled in other early Christian writings (*Hebrews* 1.2; *John* 1.3 and 1.10; *Rev* 3.14) or by comments in the Jewish Septuagint on hypostases like the personified wisdom.<sup>29</sup> Of course, these writings do speak of Christ through whom (δι' οὗ) the cosmos was generated and of wisdom which was present when God created the cosmos and assisted him in setting it in order (*Proverbs* 8.22—31 LXX). A fuller parallel is offered in the *Wisdom of Solomon* in which wisdom is explicitly depicted as the artificer (τεχνίτις) of the cosmos (*Wisdom of Solomon* 7.21 LXX). But the full elaboration which the author of *Col* gives of the pre-eminence of Christ in the generation of the cosmos seems only fully understandable in the context of contemporary Middle Platonist thought.

In Middle Platonism the Demiurge of the cosmos is no longer the highest God, as was still the case in Plato's *Timaeus*; rather the function of Creator seems increasingly to be fulfilled by a second god. According to Dillon, '(initially), the Demiurge seems to have been taken as the supreme principle, active in the world, but when under Neopythagorean influence the One, as a totally transcendent first principle, was placed above the active principle, the Demiurge came to be seen as a second god, Intellect (*nous*), the agent or *logos* of the supreme God.'<sup>30</sup> This development in contemporary Platonism seems to account for the very high degree to which Christ is involved in the creation of the cosmos in *Col*.

### (c) *The notion of filling the cosmos*

The third cosmological notion which the author of *Col* makes use of in his introductory prayer is the idea that the fullness is pleased to dwell in Christ: ἐν αὐτῷ ἐβδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι (*Col* 1.19). The expansion of this idea in the central part on the Colossian philosophy

<sup>29</sup> Cf., however, the stress placed on the background of this notion in Hellenistic Judaism in Hegermann 1961 and Weiß 1966, pp. 305—317.

<sup>30</sup> Dillon 1996a, p. 7. On this issue, see also Frede 1999a, pp. 54—56. See further the general index in Dillon 1996a s.v. 'Demiurge,' but esp. pp. 45—46 (God, Demiurge and World Soul in Middle Platonist physics); 215 (Plutarch [AD 50—120]); 363 and 366—375 (Numenius of Apamea [2nd cent. AD]); and 393—394 (the *Chaldean Oracles* [3rd cent. AD]); cf. pp. 387—388 for a negative, Gnostic view on the Demiurge in Valentinianism. On Numenius' views on the Demiurge, see also Frede 1987, esp. chap. 4.2, pp. 1054—1070: 'Die Theologie des Numenius.' On the Platonic Demiurge, see also Halfwassen 2000.

shows that it is the entire fullness of the divine nature (2.9: πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος) which is in view here.

There are two reasons to assume that by dwelling in Christ the invisible God (1.15) takes on the visible shape of the cosmic body. Firstly, this fullness dwells in him (1.19: ἐν αὐτῷ), in whom all things are said to have been created and exist: ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (...) καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν (1.16—17). Secondly, in the central part of *Col* the author explicitly states that the fullness of the divine nature dwells in him as a body (σωματικῶς). In the context of the central part of the letter, as I argued in chap. 1.2 above, this body refers to the body of the cosmos.

It seems that the idea that the fullness (πλήρωμα) of the invisible God assumes in Christ the outward, visible shape of a cosmic body is paralleled in contemporary physics inasmuch as God is believed to have filled the cosmos. According to Aelius Aristides (117—181 AD), for instance, Zeus has passed through everything and has filled the cosmos: διὰ πάντων ἦκει καὶ τὸ πᾶν πεπλήρωκε (*Oratio* 45.21). A full inquiry into the notion of God filling the cosmos (πληρῶω τὰ πάντα) will be made in chap. 4.3.3 below, when I will discuss its origins in classical philosophy and will comment on its remarkable usage by the author of *Eph*, which diverges sharply from the standard way in which it is employed in *Col* and contemporary philosophy.

*(d) The notions of cosmic reconciliation and peace*

The last concepts which seem important in the cosmology of the introductory prayer of *Col* are the notions of cosmic reconciliation and peace. According to the author, the fullness of the divine nature was not only pleased to take on in Christ the physique of a cosmic body but also again to reconcile the cosmos through him and to him: καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν (1.20). It may be the case that the author of *Col* has in mind Paul's assertion that God, in Christ, was reconciling the world to himself: θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ (2 *Cor* 5.19), though the immediate context of this passage shows that not the physical cosmos but the inhabited world, men in general, is in view. It is important to note that also outside *Col* the terminology of reconciliation could be applied, in a metaphorical sense, to the cosmos.

The Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (c. 280—207 BC), for instance, argues that the cosmos alone is said to be self-supporting because it alone comprises in itself all things it needs, and it is nourished from itself and grows because its different parts are reconciled to one another (τῶν

[ἄλλων] μορίων εἰς ἄλληλα καταλλαττομένων).<sup>31</sup> Similarly, Dio Chrysostom (c. AD 40/50—110) traces back the origins of civic concord to the cosmos, in which it embraces friendship, reconciliation (καταλλαγή) and relatedness. In the cosmos, this concord unites the elements (*Oratio* 38.11).<sup>32</sup>

In a similar passage, Dio relates this concord of the elements to the peace (εἰρήνη) which reigns in the physical cosmos (*Oratio* 40.35—37; esp. 40.37). In the same way, the author of *Col* describes the reconstitution of the cosmos as making peace. By reconciling the cosmos to himself through Christ, God has made peace (εἰρηνοποιήσας) through the blood of his cross with all things, whether on earth or in heaven (*Col* 1.20). The metaphorical use of ‘peace’ in a cosmological context occurs often in Greek thought. Not only Dio Chrysostom is evidence for this. According to Philo, God is praised for being the peace-maker and guardian of peace (ὁ εἰρηνοποιῶν θεός καὶ εἰρηνοφύλαξ), who destroys the factions in the various parts of the physical cosmos (*De specialibus legibus* 2.190—192; esp. 2.192; cf. also *De opificio mundi* 33). At least as early as Heraclitus the antithesis between war and peace in the cosmos was an issue in Greek cosmology.<sup>33</sup> These texts show that it was not unusual to apply the terminology of reconciliation and peace in a cosmological sense.

This survey of cosmological notions in the introductory prayer of *Col* helps to understand how the principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι) of the cosmos are viewed. Employing classical prepositional metaphysics, the concepts of Christ’s involvement in creating the cosmos and of the cosmos

<sup>31</sup> Plutarch, *De Stoicorum repugnantibus* 1052C—D (*SVF* 2.604): αὐτάρκης δ’ εἶναι λέγεται ὁ κόσμος διὰ τὸ μόνος ἐν αὐτῷ πάντ’ ἔχειν ὧν δεῖται, καὶ τρέφεται ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐξεται, τῶν [ἄλλων] μορίων εἰς ἄλληλα καταλλαττομένων.

<sup>32</sup> Dio Chrysostom, *Oratio* 38.11: εἶτε γὰρ ὑπὲρ γενέσεως αὐτῆς πολυπραγμονεῖν ἐθέλοι τις, ἀνάγκη τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτῆς ἐπανάγειν ἐπὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν θεῶν πραγμάτων. ἡ γὰρ αὐτὴ καὶ φιλία ἐστὶ καὶ καταλλαγή καὶ συγγένεια, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα περιείληφεν. καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα δὲ τί ἄλλο ἢ ὁμόνοια ἐνοῖ; καὶ δι’ οὗ σφύζεται πάντα τὰ μέγιστα, τοῦτό ἐστι, καὶ δι’ οὗ πάντα ἀπόλλυται, τοῦναντίον.

<sup>33</sup> Heraclitus, fragm. 109(67) (=Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, no. 22 B 67, p. 165.8—11; =KRS, no. 204): ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμῶν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός· ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ>, ὅπταν συμμιγῆθι θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ’ ἡδονὴν ἐκάστου. Cf. also Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.8 (=Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, no. 22 A 1, p. 141.17—25): Καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ μέρος δὲ αὐτῷ ὧδε ἔχει τῶν δογμάτων· πῦρ εἶναι στοιχεῖον καὶ πυρὸς ἀμοιβὴν τὰ πάντα, ἀραιώσει καὶ πυκνώσει γινόμενα. σαφῶς δ’ οὐδὲν ἐκτίθεται. γίνεσθαι τε πάντα κατ’ ἐναντιότητα καὶ βεῖν τὰ ὅλα ποταμοῦ δίκην, πεπεράνθαι τε τὸ πᾶν καὶ ἓνα εἶναι κόσμον· γεννᾶσθαι τε αὐτὸν ἐκ πυρὸς καὶ πάλιν ἐκπυροῦσθαι κατὰ τινος περιόδου ἐναλλάξ τὸν σύμπαντα αἰῶνα· τοῦτο δὲ γίνεσθαι καθ’ εἰμαρμένην. τῶν δὲ ἐναντίων τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν γένεσιν ἄγον καλεῖσθαι πόλεμον καὶ ἔριν, τὸ δ’ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκπύρωσιν ὁμολογῆναι καὶ εἰρήνην, καὶ τὴν μεταβολὴν ὁδὸν ἄνω κάτω, τὸν τε κόσμον γίνεσθαι κατ’ αὐτὴν.

as filled with God, as well as the notions of cosmic reconciliation and peace, the author of *Col* expresses his conviction that the principles and powers, together with the rest of the cosmos, have been created and reconstituted in Christ. His view on the reconstitution of the cosmos diverges from Paul who, as I have shown in chap. 2.2 above, suggests they will be subjugated and destroyed rather than reconstituted. How this reconstitution is achieved is an issue which the author of *Col* discusses in more detail in the central part of his letter.

### 3.2 The principles, powers and elements in the central part on the Colossian philosophy (*Col* 2.8—3.4)

#### 3.2.1 Christ and the reconstitution of the cosmos

In the central part of his letter, on the subject of the Colossian philosophy, the author of *Col* explains that Christ has again become actual head over the cosmic principles and powers (*Col* 2.9—10). Christ has achieved this position because by putting off his human body (2.11: ἀπέκδυσις τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός),<sup>34</sup> he has also put off the cosmic principles and powers (2.15: ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας). In this way he has exposed them openly and triumphed over them in himself (2.15). This action is also described as dying to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, the elements of the cosmos (2.20).

This is very similar to Paul's view in *Gal* 4.3—10, a passage discussed in chap. 2.1 above. In this view Christ entered the realm of the cosmic elements in order to lift man's bondage to the elements of the cosmos. The principal difference, however, is that according to Paul Christ liberated Jew and Greek from the elements of the cosmos by crucifying the cosmos and *replacing* it with a new creation (*Gal* 6.14—15). In *Col*, on the contrary, the principles, powers and elements of the present cosmos are not replaced but are brought back under Christ as head (*Col* 2.10). They have been restored to their original status and, as I have argued in chap. 1.2, really make up his cosmic body again (2.9; 2.17; 2.19).

---

<sup>34</sup> In *Col* 2.11, the human body (σῶμα τῆς σαρκός) is, admittedly, not the human body of Christ, although he does indeed possess such a body (see *Col* 1.22), but that of the believers. At their baptism (*Col* 2.12a), however, they re-enact Christ's action of putting off his human body in his death on the cross. See also Dunn 1994, section 2.2, pp. 169—170.

### 3.2.2 Harmonising the primordial antagonism of the cosmic principles: Aphrodite and Eros

The notion of the reconstitution of cosmic principles, after a period of chaos and insurrection, seems to be paralleled in contemporary Middle Platonist physics. In his treatise *De facie in orbe lunae*, Plutarch has Lamprias direct himself to the state of the principles (ἀρχαί) of all things before the cosmos had been constituted. These primordial conditions are characterised as disorder and disharmony brought about by the so-called ‘Strife of Empedocles,’ the force which Empedocles (c. 492—432 BC) deems to exert a destructive influence on the elements (*De facie in orbe lunae* 926E).<sup>35</sup>

In this state, the principles of all things (αἱ τῶν ὄλων ἀρχαί), the four cosmic elements water, earth, fire, and air, as is clear from the context, were unmixed and without mutual attraction. They were monads which do not allow blending or communion with one another but, seeking to avoid each other by turning to flight and by moving with their characteristic and arbitrary motion, they were similar to anything God is absent from, as Plato says in his *Timaeus* (*Timaeus* 53B). They were like corporeal substances short of mind and soul (*De facie in orbe lunae* 926F).

It is in the continuation of Plutarch’s description, when he narrates how the cosmic principles (ἀρχαί) are brought into harmony, that the parallel with the concept of Christ triumphing over the cosmic principles (ἀρχαί) becomes apparent. In Plutarch’s account, the corporeal substances of the cosmic principles remain chaotic until Desire extends providentially over nature and Love arises or Aphrodite or Eros (as Empedocles, Parmenides and Hesiod say), in order that—by exchanging positions and receiving powers from one another, some being forcibly bound to motion while others to rest, and by being subdued by force to give in and change their nature into something better—these corporeal substances bring forth a harmony and communion which span the cosmos (926F—927A).<sup>36</sup>

<sup>35</sup> See Empedocles, fragments 8(17).6—8; 8(17).16—20; 16(26).5—7; and 25(22).6—9.

<sup>36</sup> Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae* 926F—927A: ἀλλ’ ἄκρατοι καὶ ἄστοργοι καὶ μονάδες αἱ τῶν ὄλων ἀρχαί, μὴ προσιέμεναι σύγκρισιν ἑτέρου πρὸς ἕτερον μηδὲ κοινωνίαν, ἀλλὰ φεύγουσαι καὶ ἀποστρεφόμεναι καὶ φερόμεναι φορὰς ἰδίας καὶ ἀθάδεις οὕτως εἶχον ὡς ἔχει πᾶν οὐ θεὸς ἀπεσι κατὰ Πλάτωνα, τουτέστιν, ὡς ἔχει τὰ σώματα νοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς ἀπολιπούσης, ἄχρις οὐ τὸ ἰμερτὸν ἦκεν ἐπὶ τὴν φύσιν ἐκ προνοίας, Φιλότητος ἐγγενομένης καὶ Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Ἐρωτος, ἢ ὡς Ἐμπεδοκλῆς λέγει καὶ Παρμενίδης καὶ Ἡσίοδος, ἵνα καὶ τόπους ἀμείψαντα καὶ δυνάμεις ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων μεταλαμβάντα καὶ τὰ μὲν κινήσεως τὰ δὲ μονῆς ἀνάγκαις ἐνδεθέντα καὶ καταβιασθέντα πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον, ἐξ οὐ πέφυκεν, ἐνδοῦναι καὶ μεταστῆναι ... ἀρμονίαν καὶ κοινωνίαν ἀπεργάσθαι τοῦ παντός.

By referring back as far as Hesiod (c. 700 BC), one of the earliest Greek poets, and to other Presocratic philosophers like Parmenides (c. 450 BC) and Empedocles (c. 492—432 BC), Plutarch elucidates his view of how the principles (ἀρχαί) of all things were deprived of their antagonistic nature and turned into constituents of a harmonious universe. The 'Strife of Empedocles' which exerted such a destructive influence on the four elements (ἀρχαί; see 926E—F) is now contrasted with 'Love,' the force which unites the discordant elements.<sup>37</sup> This force is able to subdue the antagonistic nature of the corporeal substances and is identified as Aphrodite or Eros.<sup>38</sup>

The model after which the author of *Col* perceived Christ's action as an activity by which the cosmic principles and powers are not annihilated but harmonised is, thus, clearly attested in contemporary philosophy. The idea that Aphrodite and Eros gain control of the insubordinate cosmic principles constitutes a close analogy to the notion of Christ's triumph over cosmological principles. This constitutes an important difference between *Col* and Paul, as in his interpretation of the subjugation of the powers under the Danielic 'son of man,' Paul assumed these powers to be annihilated.

### 3.2.3 Resolving present cosmic discord: Osiris

Plutarch also reflects on the harmony of the cosmos in an extensive passage in his *De Iside et Osiride*. This passage is particularly relevant because it shows that Plutarch is not only concerned with the harmonisation of the principles of the cosmos in the primordial age, when they were arranged for the first time, but also in the present. In the passage in question it is the god Osiris who is portrayed as victorious over cosmic discord.

According to Plutarch, the present cosmos is mixed as the result of two opposite principles (ἀρχαί) or two antagonistic forces (δυνάμεις). If this is not true of the entire cosmos, at least this terrestrial cosmos, along with the moon, is irregular, unstable, and susceptible of all sorts of changes (*De Iside* 369C—D).

Strictly speaking, the principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (δυνάμεις) here are not exactly identical with the four elements of the cosmos as the principles of all things (αἱ τῶν ὄλων ἀρχαί) in the previous passage in Plutarch's *De facie in orbe lunae* proved to be (*De facie in orbe lunae* 926F). Rather, the opposing principles and powers of the *De Iside* are equivalent to the two

<sup>37</sup> See Empedocles, fragments 8(17).6—8; 8(17).16—24; 14(21).7—8; 16(26).5—7; and 47(35).

<sup>38</sup> 'Love' is identified with Aphrodite in Empedocles, fragment 8(17).16—24; on Aphrodite's activity, see also fragments 25(22).4—5; 60(71); and 86(87). On the cosmic role of Aphrodite and Eros, see also Rudhardt and Vernant 1986.



principles underlying the elements as the cosmic elements in *De facie* are acted upon and regulated by the Empedoclean opposites Strife and Love.

That is indeed how Plutarch interprets them subsequently in *De Iside* when he provides an elaborate historical sketch in support of his view of the cosmos (*De Iside* 369E—371A). In this overview, he again draws attention to Empedocles' doctrine of the antagonistic principles Strife and Love (370E).

That being the case, it is clear that in *De Iside* the antagonistic principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (δυνάμεις) are not exactly identical with the four cosmic elements but point indeed to the forces underlying these elements. These forces are typified as the Empedoclean opposites Strife and Love. Just as in *De facie in orbe lunae* 'Love'—the force which subdues the discordant elements of the cosmos—is identified with Aphrodite or Eros, Plutarch similarly connects the beneficent principle with a god in *De Iside*. This time the identification is with the god Osiris, as will be shown shortly.

Before commenting on the identity of the beneficent cosmic principle with Osiris in some more detail, I will dwell a little on the support Plutarch also draws from Plato in his historical survey of the doctrine of the two antagonistic powers. This passage in Plutarch is particularly significant because it makes clear why in philosophy contemporaneous with *Col* the terminology of cosmic elements and powers was almost inextricably linked with the notion of cosmic disorder. According to Plutarch, in his *Leges* Plato testifies to the doctrine of the two antagonistic principles which range in the lower cosmos, since he argues that the cosmos is not put into motion by one soul but perhaps by a greater number, at any rate no less than two. One of these souls is beneficent, while the other is opposed to it and the author of all opposite things (*De Iside* 370F).<sup>39</sup>

The passage Plutarch has in mind is *Leges* 896E. He thinks this passage shows that Plato assumed the existence of an evil soul alongside the good World Soul which is constructed, as is shown in Plato's *Timaeus* (34B—37C), by the Demiurge. Although in his *Timaeus* Plato does not speak of an evil soul, this notion does resemble Plato's remarks on the disorderly condition of matter before it was arranged by the Demiurge: this primordial matter was not in a state of rest but moved in a discordant and disorderly manner (*Timaeus* 30A). All things were in a state devoid of reason or measure, a state in which the elements fire, water, earth and air were as badly disposed as anything is likely to be whenever God is absent from it (*Timaeus* 53A—B).

---

<sup>39</sup> On the disorderly soul of Plato's *Leges*, see also Plutarch, *De animae procreatione in Timaeo* 1014D—E and 1015D—E.

These passages in Plato's *Leges* and *Timaeus* are evidence of a small yet undeniable measure of dualistic thinking in Plato to account for the reality of disorder in pre-cosmic times and for its potentiality ever since. As Mansfeld has clearly shown, this dualism should not be styled 'Gnostic' as Plato, unlike the Gnostics, considers the Demiurge to be good.<sup>40</sup> In Middle Platonist philosophy, this view on the antagonistic nature of the cosmic elements and principles, however limited this antagonism actually was, was taken seriously by, among others, Plutarch and Numenius.<sup>41</sup> In fact, this view was so inseparably bound up with the notions of cosmic elements and matter that it also accounts for the negative evaluation of the elements of the cosmos by Paul (see chap. 2.1 above on *Gal* 4.3 and 4.9) and the author of *Col*, and explains why they considered Christ's intervention necessary.<sup>42</sup>

After the historical sketch in *De Iside* in which he draws on the authority of philosophers such as Plato and Empedocles, Plutarch concludes his extensive section on the antagonistic cosmic powers with an explicit identification of the creating and conserving power, which opposes the disorderly one, with Osiris. In Plutarch's view, the generation and structure of this cosmos is complex because it results from opposing powers (δυνάμεις) which are, however, not equal in force since the real strength lies with the better one, which is the god Osiris, the sovereign and lord of all good things (371A). Osiris opposes the disorderly power which mingles with the passive and changeable elements and attaches itself to them (373D).

In his *De Iside*, Plutarch discloses that the elements of the cosmos (ἀτῶν ὄλων ἀρχαί) were not only subdued when the universe was generated and Love or Aphrodite or Eros suppressed Strife which had exerted such a disintegrating influence on these elements—as he had explained in his *De facie in orbe lunae*—but were also subdued at present in Osiris' victory over disorder.

---

<sup>40</sup> See Mansfeld 1981, esp. pp. 293—299 on Plato, and the general conclusion on pp. 312—314. For the Gnostic notion of a bad or ignorant Demiurge in the Gnostic interpretation of the Pauline letters, see Pagels 1975, e.g., pp. 116, 118—125, 127, 130 (Gnostic exegesis of *Eph*) and 137 (Gnostic exegesis of *Col*).

<sup>41</sup> On Numenius' view on matter, see Frede 1987, chap. 4.1, pp. 1050—1054. See esp. Numenius, fragm. 52.87—92 on Plato's view on matter and 52.64—70 on the two souls. On Plutarch's dualism, despite disclaimers misleadingly called 'Gnosticizing' or 'Gnostic,' see Betz 1990 and Dörrie 1981*b*.

<sup>42</sup> This seems to be all the more the case as the doctrine of the creation out of nothing had not yet been formulated and matter was therefore not yet explicitly said to be subordinate to God. See May 1994.

### Conclusion

The consideration of these parallels from Plutarch shows that when the author of *Col* speaks of Christ's triumph over the cosmological principles, powers and elements, he actually models this view on the notion of the subjugation of such cosmological forces and elements current in contemporary philosophy. In Plutarch, this subjugation is either conceived of as a primordial action of Love or Aphrodite or Eros against Strife in order to break its rule over the cosmic elements, or as a present clash between Osiris and the opposite disorderly principle which mingles with the susceptible elements. In *Col*, the role of Aphrodite, Eros and Osiris is fulfilled by Christ.<sup>43</sup>

As in Plutarch, the elements of the cosmos are not replaced with a new creation (as happens according to Paul in *Gal*); nor are they, the cosmological principles, rendered powerless (as happens in *1 Cor*), but instead these principles and elements are brought into harmony.

---

<sup>43</sup> For this reason, I disagree strongly with Carr who reaches the following conclusions at the end of his book on the Pauline phrase αἱ ἀρχαὶ καὶ αἱ ἐξουσίαι, which he translates as 'angels and principalities' (Carr 1981). According to Carr, 'the pagan world to which Paul (whom Carr considers to be also the author of *Col*; Carr 1981, p. 47) went lacked any sense of mighty, hostile forces that stood over against man as he struggled for survival (Carr 1981, p. 174; quoted with much approval by MacMullen 1984, p. 130 note 8). In Carr's view, 'there was at the time of Paul on the one hand no demand from the world for release from powers or for a doctrine of a cosmic battle in which Christ rescued men from the domination of such forces. On the other hand, there was no material to hand in the Jewish background of Christianity from which such a myth could be constructed at that time' (Carr 1981, p. 175). Carr does not notice Paul's use and cosmological interpretation of *Daniel* 7.27 LXX in *1 Cor* 15.23—28 since he does not comment on the subjugation of the ἐξουσίαι (powers) under the 'son of man' in *Daniel* 7 LXX (despite Carr 1981, pp. 7, 37 and 39; Carr wrongly reads ἀρχαὶ instead of ἐξουσίαι in *Daniel* 7.27 LXX; ἀρχαὶ is the reading of the Theodotion translation). Nor does he take the terms ἀρχαὶ (principles), ἐξουσίαι (powers) and δυνάμεις (forces) in *1 Cor* 15.24 in a cosmological sense. Instead, he argues that '(the) list of those being brought to nought is a conventional one for power and authority of whatever sort. (...) The reference is to human authority of whatever sort and wherever located' (Carr 1981, pp. 90—92; quotation from p. 91). Even with regard to the notion of Christ putting off the principles and powers in *Col* 2.15, Carr maintains that not cosmological powers are in view, but angels: 'the concept of exaltation and of triumph, of which celebration is a key-note, does not necessarily require the concomitant notions of battle and victory in order to be meaningful. (...) in *Col*. 2:15 Paul does not speak of a war but of a celebration. The powers do not need to be defeated, since they are the angels of God. Just as in Jewish thought these enhance the glory of Jahweh, so in Paul's thought they exalt the Lord Christ' (Carr 1981, p. 175; cf. chap. 3.1, pp. 47—85). Similarly, Carr denies that the term 'elements (of the cosmos)' in *Col* (2.8; 2.20) and *Gal* (4.3; 4.9) stands for the physical elements as it is taken to refer to 'elementary teachings' (Carr 1981, pp. 72—76, esp. pp. 75—76).

This explains how, according to the author of *Col*, the reconstitution of the cosmos was achieved. As the terminology of reconciliation and peace in his introductory prayer already suggested (see chap. 3.1.2 above), this reconstitution did not come about through dissolution but through the harmonious integration of the cosmic elements into Christ's cosmic body (*Col* 2.9—10; 2.17), which is firmly held together by means of cosmic bonds (2.19). Indeed, the notion current in Middle Platonist physics that cosmological principles, forces and elements are or have been subdued by gods like Aphrodite, Eros and Osiris chimes in with the equally Middle Platonist concept of a Demiurge who has settled himself on matter and has bound it together by harmony in order to prevent it from breaking away and becoming separated (Numenius, fragm. 18; see chap. 1.2.6 above).

Now that the distinctiveness of the cosmology of *Col* vis-à-vis Paul's cosmological views has become clearer, in the next section (chap. 3.3) I will comment briefly on the identity of the Colossian philosophy against which *Col* is addressed. After that, the relation between the cosmologies of *Col* and *Eph* will be studied (chap. 4).

### 3.3 The identity of the Colossian philosophy

#### *Introduction*

Considering the many cosmological notions which the author of *Col* has in common with Graeco-Roman philosophy, of which the Colossian philosophy at issue in *Col* gives every indication of being a particular variant, it seems as if, in the final analysis, the cosmologies of *Col* itself and of the rival Colossian philosophy are not very different from one another. As I will argue in this chapter, this is indeed the case. To demonstrate this, I will comment on each of the three warnings which, as has already been shown in chap. 1.1 above, the author of *Col* issues against the Colossian philosophy. First, however, I will draw attention to the very general mode of expression which characterises the author's refutation of the rival philosophy.

#### *3.3.1 The general tenor of the author's criticism*

Each one of the warnings against the Colossian philosophy is given with a rather general reference to a *τις* (anyone), used in an indefinite way as 'they,' or a *μηδείς* (not even one, nobody). The readers need to be on their guard lest anyone lead them captive (*βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν*) by means of the empty and deceiving pursuit of wisdom which, in accordance with human tradition, deals with the cosmic ele-

ments and not with Christ (*Col* 2.8). They are warned not to allow anyone to judge them (μη οὐδὲν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω) in view of regulations of eating and drinking nor in view of calendrical events such as festivals and celebrations of the new moon and the Sabbaths (2.16—17a). Nobody should rule over them (μηδεις ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω) in matters of the humble worshipping of angelic beings, nor with regard to the visual perception of (celestial) phenomena (2.18).

Taking into account the vague reference to an indefinite ‘anyone’ or ‘nobody’ it becomes questionable whether the author has one particular local philosophical movement in mind. It is noteworthy that nowhere else in *Col* outside the central part on the ‘Colossian philosophy’ (*Col* 2.8—3.4) is reference made to opponents. The encouragement to persevere in the faith as it was announced to them (1.23), the warning that nobody should mislead them by persuasive though fallacious reasoning (2.4), the exhortation to stand firm on the basis of the faith which they were taught (2.6—7), the ethical exhortations (3.5—17) as well as the instructions for managing a Christian household (3.18—4.1) and the final exhortation to be wise in their dealings with non-Christians—all these encouragements, warnings, exhortations and instructions are devoid of any spirit of hostile antagonism. Apart from some remarks on the futility of his opponents’ claim to possess wisdom (*Col* 2.4; 2.8; 2.18; 2.23), fierce polemics and controversy are sought for in vain, and even within the central part the three warnings, as we have just seen, are quite general. Colossae seems to be merely a specimen of the entire inhabited world in which the author deems the message of the true gospel to bear fruit and to increase (*Col* 1.5—6). The churches at Colossae and neighbouring Laodicea and Hierapolis are examples of the effect of Paul’s world-wide mission (2.1—3 in conjunction with 1.26b—29 and 1.23b) in which co-workers assist and represent him (4.12—13).<sup>44</sup>

The very general way in which the rival philosophy is criticised in *Col* fits in with the fact, ascertained in chap. 2.2.4 and 3.2 above, that *Col* is

---

<sup>44</sup> The case that in *Col* no particular local philosophy is criticised has previously been argued by Hooker 1973. In view of the general character of the warnings, Hooker questions ‘the theory that they (the Colossians) are under attack by a specific group of teachers who are advocating a particular doctrine which can properly be termed “the Colossian error”’ (Hooker 1973, p. 326; =Hooker 1990, p. 132). Similarly, she argues that there is no evidence for a hymn underlying *Col* 1.15—20: ‘If our interpretation is correct, then this has certain consequences for our understanding of the christological passage in *Col*. 1. If no Colossian “error” existed, then Paul’s christological statement here was not, as has been suggested, developed or formulated in any attempt to combat false teaching’ (Hooker 1973, p. 329; cf. pp. 316—317 and 321—324; =Hooker 1990, pp. 135, 122—123 and 127—130).

not authentically Pauline but a pseudepigraphic letter written in Paul's name. If this letter was pseudepigraphic, it is unlikely that it was ever meant to arrive at Colossae. This destination seems rather to have been chosen because Colossae was known to have been destroyed in an earthquake under Nero (emperor AD 54—68) in the early sixties AD, together with neighbouring Laodicea and Hierapolis.<sup>45</sup> This earthquake presented an ideal opportunity to disguise the letter's pseudepigraphic origins. The names of its inhabitants mentioned at the end of *Col*—Onesimus (*Col* 4.9), Epaphras (4.12; cf. 1.7—8) and Archippus (4.17)—are taken from Paul's authentic *Letter to Philemon* (see *Phm* 10, 23 and 2 resp.) in which there is no indication of where they live. Their names are copied, together with the names of Paul's co-workers Aristarchus, Mark, Luke and Demas (*Phm* 24; see *Col* 4.10 and 4.14). The author of *Col* clearly takes advantage of Paul's negligence in locating the addressees of *Phm*.<sup>46</sup>

The finding that *Col* is pseudepigraphic and was not meant to be delivered at Colossae reinforces the observation that the criticism of the rival philosophy under consideration in *Col* is not addressed against a particular local movement but is a rather more general critique. In order to shed some light on its identity, I shall now return to the warnings against this philosophy in the central part of the letter.

### 3.3.2 The Colossian philosophy as it emerges from the first warning

In the first specific warning, after the more general exhortation that his readers should not be misled by fallacious reasoning (*Col* 2.4), the author of *Col* cautions them lest anyone lead them captive through an empty and deceiving pursuit of wisdom which, in accordance with human tradition,

---

<sup>45</sup> On the destruction of Laodicea, see Tacitus (c. AD 56—118), *Annales* 14.27.1: 'Eodem anno, ex inlustribus Asiae urbibus, Laodicea, tremore terrae prolapsa, nullo a nobis remedio, propriis opibus revalvit.' According to Syme and Koestermann, this earthquake occurred in AD 60 as the histories reported in *Annales* 14.26 relate to events of the years 59—60 AD (Syme 1958, vol. 1, p. 392 note 2; Koestermann 1968 [commentary on Tacitus' *Annales*], vol. 4, p. 76). The destruction of Laodicea, Hierapolis and Colossae together is reported in Eusebius of Caesarea (c. AD 260—339), *Hieronymi Chronicon*, p. 183.21—22: 'In Asia tres urbes terrae motu conciderunt, Laodicea Hierapolis Colossae.' According to Eusebius' report, the earthquake occurred in the 210th Olympiad, the 10th year of Nero, the 20th year of Iulius Agrippa II, i.e. in AD 64 (see Eusebius, *Hieronymi Chronicon*, p. 183.18; cf. the Armenian translation in Karst 1911, p. 215); and Orosius (early 5th cent. AD), *Historia adversus paganos* 7.7.12: 'In Asia tres urbes, hoc est Laudicia, Hierapolis, Colossae, terrae motu conciderunt.' The references to Tacitus, Eusebius and Orosius are taken from Lähnemann 1971, p. 83 note 125.

<sup>46</sup> On the literary dependence of the author of *Col* on *Phm*, see also Standhartinger 1999, chap. 3.2, pp. 81—85. Standhartinger denies *Col* to be literarily dependent on other authentically Pauline letters; see Standhartinger 1999, chap. 3, pp. 61—89.

grapples with the elements of the cosmos but leaves Christ out of it (2.8). As we have seen so far throughout chapters one, two and three, the cosmological philosophy at issue here can be firmly identified as Graeco-Roman, both as regards terminology and content.

### 3.3.3 *The Colossian philosophy as it emerges from the second warning*

This identification is not undermined by the second warning. According to this warning, the Colossians should not allow anyone to judge them in view of dietary regulations or in view of festivals and celebrations of the new moon and the Sabbaths, periodical events which are the reflection of things destined, destined, that is, by the movements of the heavenly bodies whose influence extends over the whole cosmos and determines everything that happens (2.16—17a; see chap. 1.1.2 and 1.2.5 above). I disagree with Martin, who argues that, as all three categories of festival (ἑορτή), new moon (νεομηνία) and Sabbaths (σάββατα) occur together at various places in the Septuagint, these categories are ‘unquestionably’ and ‘exclusively’ Jewish.<sup>47</sup> The combination of the three categories as such does not necessarily and exclusively point to a Jewish background of the philosophy at issue in *Col*. The first two categories of festival (ἑορτή) and new moon (νεομηνία or νοομηνία) are equally current terminology in Graeco-Roman calendars.<sup>48</sup> The last category of Sabbaths (σάββατα), of course, does unambiguously refer to the celebration of the Jewish Sabbath but even in this case it would be wrong to stress its *exclusive* Jewishness as if in the Graeco-Roman period it was only held in reverence and celebrated by Jews. As a matter of fact, there is much contemporary evidence of pagan reverence for and observance of the Sabbath.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Martin 1996, esp. pp. 106—111 and 119. Martin refers to *1 Chron* 23.31 LXX (σάββατα, νεομηνίαι and ἑορταί); *2 Chron* 2.3 LXX (σάββατα, νοομηνίαι and ἑορταί) and 31.3 LXX (σάββατα, νοομηνίαι and ἑορταί); and *Hosea* 2.13 LXX (ἑορταί, νοομηνίαι and σάββατα, flanked by εὐφοροῦναι, festivities, and πανηγύρεις, festal assemblies); see Martin 1996, p. 106. For a consistent interpretation of the Colossian philosophy in distinctively Jewish terms, see Dunn 1995 and Dunn 1996, esp. pp. 29—35 and 144—198.

<sup>48</sup> See, e.g., Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum* 417C and *De Iside* 361B: ἑορταί; *De Iside* 368A and 368C: νοομηνία; cf. *De E apud Delphos* 391D: τῆ ἕκτη τοῦ νέου μηνός, ‘on the sixth day of the new month,’ a description of the day when the Pythia of the Delphic oracle is conducted down to the *prytaneion*, the symbolic centre of Delphi.

<sup>49</sup> See Schürer 1986, vol. 3.1, pp. 161—162 note 50 and 625—626, note 183 in particular. Epigraphic evidence is provided by Hicks 1891, pp. 233—236, nos. 16—17 (inscription from western Cilicia, not much later than the Augustan age); also in *OGIS*, vol. 2, pp. 262—264, no. 573. See also *CPJ* III, pp. 43—56, nos. 1 (Tanais on the north-eastern corner of the Sea of Azov; third cent. AD); 3 (Phrygia; 151 AD); 4 (Thyateira in Lydia; Hadrian’s reign); 5 (Cilicia; Augustus’ reign [= *OGIS*, vol. 2, no. 573]); and 6

One should not infer from this reference to the Jewish Sabbath that the cosmological philosophy under consideration can only be Jewish. Festivals, new moons and regulations for eating and drinking are general elements of Graeco-Roman calendars.<sup>50</sup> Among these, the author of *Col* now includes the Jewish Sabbaths. In his view, periodical events such as particular festivals and the new moons, celebrated according to both Greek and Jewish calendars, as well as Jewish Sabbaths are all calendrical phenomena which are regulated by the movements of the heavenly bodies. In that sense, there is no basic difference between Jewish and non-Jewish calendars so that their specific temporal categories can be listed together indiscriminately. Again, the rival philosophy is pictured in a very general way. It has distinctively calendrical sides to it and, inasmuch as calendars are determined by the heavenly bodies, this picture of the rival philosophy is totally consistent with its delineation as a cosmological philosophy in the first warning.

### 3.3.4 The Colossian philosophy as it emerges from the third warning

This general description is continued in the third warning. According to the author of *Col*, the Colossians should not allow anyone who takes delight in the humble service of angels and pretends to be initiated into things he has seen, rule over them (2.18; see chap. 1.1.3 above). The belief in the existence of angels (ἄγγελοι) which is presupposed in this warning is an integral part of contemporary cosmology and is not restricted to Judaism.<sup>51</sup> According to Philo, Moses gave the name 'angels' (ἄγγελοι; 'messengers') to those whom other (Graeco-Roman) philosophers call demons (δαίμονες), invisible spirits (ψυχαί), that is, which fly in the air (*De gigantibus* 6—9; see also *De somniis* 1.140—142; cf. *De plantatione*

---

(Lydia; undated); cf. the commentary on pp. 47—56. See further Horace (65—8 BC), *Satires* 1.9.67—72 on pagan scruples about having a long conversation on the Sabbath lest the Jews be affronted; and Juvenal, *Satires* (written during the 2nd and 3rd decades of the 2nd cent. AD) 14.96—106 about a pagan father who reveres the Sabbath. For commentary on these passages in Horace and Juvenal, cf. Goldenberg 1979, pp. 430 and 436—438. Cf. also Josephus' claim that the custom of abstaining from work on the seventh day has been widely adopted by non-Jews; Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, 2.281—282: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ πλήθεισιν ἤδη πολὺς ζῆλος γέγονεν ἐκ μακροῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβείας, οὐδ' ἔστιν οὐ πόλις Ἑλληνῶν οὐδὲ τισοῦν οὐδὲ βάρβαρον οὐδὲ ἐν ἔθνος, ἐνθα μὴ τὸ τῆς ἐβδομάδος, ἦν ἀργοῦμεν ἡμεῖς (reference taken from Martin 1996, p. 111).

<sup>50</sup> On fasting, purification and asceticism in the Graeco-Roman world, see resp. Henrichs 1996, Parker 1996 and Rousseau 1996. On Greek calendars and the new moon, see Mikalson 1996.

<sup>51</sup> For the cosmological role of angels in Judaism of the Graeco-Roman period, see Mach 1992, pp. 173—184 and chap. 5.3, pp. 262—264; and Davidson 1992, chap. 4.4, pp. 91—95; chap. 10.8, pp. 206—208; and chap. 14.8, pp. 314—315.



14). Spirits, demons and angels are merely different names for the same beings which can, however, be divided into good demons and evil demons, into angels who are worthy of invocation (πρόσρησις) and those who are not (*De gigantibus* 16—17).<sup>52</sup>

Philo's identification of angels and demons is not merely due to his Greek interpretation of Jewish angelology; indeed, as Mitchell has recently shown in depth, the term ἄγγελοι (angels) features abundantly in Greek epigraphic evidence concerning the cult of Theos Hypsistos.<sup>53</sup> Although most of the inscriptions belong to the second and third centuries AD, other inscriptions reveal that Theos Hypsistos was worshipped in the first century AD. In Mitchell's view, 'the cults of angels and of Theos Hypsistos (...) were not a development of the second and third centuries, but occurred at least sporadically during the late Hellenistic or early imperial periods.'<sup>54</sup> According to Mitchell, angels 'appear as a common feature of pagan, Jewish, and Christian worship in Asia Minor.'<sup>55</sup> This accords very well with the fact that demons were also thought to fulfil an angelic role by coming down and reporting (ἐξαγγέλειν) prophecies (Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae* 941F—942A; cf. *De defectu oraculorum* 420A) and taking charge of the oracles (*De facie in orbe lunae* 944C—D). Dillon has given a clear idea of the importance of demons in Middle Platonist cosmology.<sup>56</sup>

Let us now see if the various warnings in *Col* against the rival philosophy are interrelated and are addressed against one more or less coherent system of belief. It is my aim to suggest, by means of a reasonable historical hypothesis, a context in which the ideas, beliefs and practices to which the author of *Col* is opposed fit together. A few examples from Plutarch may help to clarify that the notion of angels employed in the third warning against the rival philosophy is also consistent with the dietary regulations

---

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Sheppard 1980—81, p. 84 note 35 who argues convincingly that τῆς προσρήσεως ἄξιος should be translated 'worthy of invocation' rather than 'worthy of the name "angel."' The latter translation would also run counter to Philo's argumentation in *De gigantibus* 6—9 and 16—17 that spirits, demons and angels are actually synonymous.

<sup>53</sup> Mitchell 1999, pp. 86, 91, 102—104 and 115 on angels and pp. 107—108, 109, 123 and 126 specifically on angels and cult. See already Mitchell 1993, vol. 2, pp. 45—46 and Sheppard 1980—81.

<sup>54</sup> On the dating of the material, see Mitchell 1999, 4th section, pp. 108—110; quotation from p. 109.

<sup>55</sup> Mitchell 1999, p. 103.

<sup>56</sup> See the subsections on demons in the sections on the physics of some Middle Platonist philosophers in Dillon 1996a: pp. 31—32 (Xenocrates); 90—91 (Antiochus of Ascalon); 171—174 (Philo of Alexandria); 216—224 (Plutarch); 287—288 (Alcinous); 317—320 (Apuleius); and 378 (Numenius). On demonology in the early Imperial period, see also Brenk 1986 and, in relation to *Col*, DeMaris 1994, pp. 104—108.

in combination with specific calendrical events which were mentioned in the previous warning. Plutarch records the opinion of Xenocrates (head of the Platonic Academy from 339 to 314 BC), that bad demons exist who take pleasure in and are appeased by the beating of breasts, lamentations, fasts (νηστεῖαι), words of ill omen and foul language which accompany the unlucky days and the festivals (ἑορταί) associated with them (*De Iside* 361B).

In Plutarch's view, in the space between gods and men there exist certain natures whom it is right, in accordance with the customs of the fathers (κατὰ νόμον πατέρων), to regard as demons and to worship as such (σέβεσθαι; *De defectu oraculorum* 416C).<sup>57</sup> These demons are present at the oracles, at the mystic rites practised at the initiations into the mysteries, and at the celebrating of the mysteries (*De defectu oraculorum* 417A). As is also pointed out in *De Iside* (see above), some of them, the evil demons, attend festivals (ἑορταί), such as unlucky and gloomy days. These festivals are marked by, among other things, fasts (νηστεῖαι), lamentations and foul language at the holy places, performed as propitiatory and assuaging rites to avert evil demons (*De defectu oraculorum* 417B—C).

Many features of Graeco-Roman demonology are also characteristic of the rival philosophy in *Col*, especially fasts and dietary regulations, the observance of particular days of the calendar and the worship of angels. There can be little doubt that the ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων ('the humble worshipping of angels') is worship directed to angels and not worship performed by angels.<sup>58</sup> The contrast in the third warning is between worshipping angels and holding fast to Christ as head of the cosmic body (2.18—19) so that the author's critique is, in all likelihood, concerned with the worship which is extended to angels.

Another element of Graeco-Roman demonology and calendar observance which returns in the author's description of the rival philosophy in *Col* is that such views and rites are κατὰ νόμον πατέρων, in accordance with the customs of the fathers (Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum* 416C). In his first warning, the author of *Col* reveals that the rival philosophy is κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, in accordance with that which is handed down by human (*Col* 2.8), i.e. ancestral, tradition. In the final conclusions (2.20—23; 3.1—4) after his three warnings, he stresses that the

---

<sup>57</sup> Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum* 416C: φύσεις τινές εἰσιν ὡσπερ ἐν μεθορίῳ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων (...), οὓς δαίμονας ὀρθῶς ἔχει κατὰ νόμον πατέρων ἡγουμένους καὶ ὀνομάζοντας σέβεσθαι.

<sup>58</sup> Against Francis 1962; Carr 1981, pp. 66—72; Hurtado 1988, pp. 32—33. On the issue of angel veneration in Graeco-Roman Judaism, see Mach 1992, chap. 4.4, pp. 291—300; Hurtado 1988, esp. pp. 23—35; and, in particular, Stuckenbruck 1995, esp. part two, pp. 45—204, and pp. 269—271.

regulations of fasting and abstinence (2.20—21) are κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, in accordance with the ordinances and teachings of humans (2.22).

The author's revolutionary injunction is that these ancestral traditions, ordinances and teachings, valid as they may have been, have nevertheless been abrogated by Christ. Christ put an end to these ordinances (2.14: δόγματα). By subjugating the principles and powers of the cosmos and triumphing over them (2.15), Christ died to the elements of the cosmos, so that it is no longer necessary to submit to ordinances (δογματίζεσθαι) as if one lives in a cosmos which has not yet been affected by Christ's death and resurrection (2.20).

In everyday life, religious ordinances (δόγματα) played an important role and were set down as inscriptions on stones. Collections of Greek epigraphy in Asia Minor show that inscriptions such as dedications, temple laws, oracles, prayers, regulations concerning religious festivals and contests, confession inscriptions and even, occasionally, philosophical catechisms abound in the agoras, sanctuaries and cemeteries of the cities of Asia Minor.<sup>59</sup>

Strikingly, the argumentation of the author of *Col* resembles Paul's views on the enslavement of mankind to the elements of the cosmos outlined in chap. 2.1 above. Prior to Christ's incarnation and his death on the cross, the bondage to the cosmic elements was still effective and prompted man, whether Jewish or Greek, to observe religious rules in view of the elements. The link between such legislation and the elements of the cosmos was only severed by Christ who in his death on the cross substituted the beginnings of a new creation for the cosmos (see chap. 2.1 above). The main difference between Paul and the author of *Col*, however, consists in the fact that according to the latter the present cosmos has not been replaced but has become entirely reconciled.

The background of the worship of angels in contemporary demonology also clarifies a final aspect of the rival philosophy as described in the third warning: the claim to have gained insight into celestial phenomena by one's initiation into a mystery cult (*Col* 2.18b; cf. chap. 1.1.3 above). We have seen that, according to Plutarch, demons are present at the τελεταί, the mystic rites performed at the initiations into the mysteries (*De defectu*

---

<sup>59</sup> On Greek epigraphy, see Pleket 1996, esp. pp. 541—542. Collections of Greek epigraphy in Asia Minor are offered in *Tituli Asiae Minoris*, *MAMA* and *Inscripfen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*.

*oraculorum* 417A).<sup>60</sup> According to the author of *Col*, the average adherent of the rival philosophy not only takes delight in the humble worshipping of angels, but also pretends to be initiated into things he has seen: ἃ ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεῶν (*Col* 2.18b).<sup>61</sup> The things he has seen at his initiation are probably celestial phenomena, as descriptions of initiations in Apuleius and Dio Chrysostom make clear. According to Apuleius (c. AD 125—170), the initiate is swept through all the elements and sees the sun and the celestial gods (*Metamorphoses* 11.23).<sup>62</sup> The purpose of the initiation is spelled out more clearly in Dio Chrysostom (c. AD 40/50—110), who describes the initiation as an experience of mystic views, alternation between darkness and light, and of innumerable other things which convey the impression that insight is offered into the plan of the cosmos (*Oratio* 12.33).<sup>63</sup>

In the final analysis, the rival philosophy at issue in *Col* appears to be some form of contemporary Graeco-Roman philosophy which is concerned with the elements of the cosmos (*Col* 2.8), dietary regulations and calendars (2.16—17a), the worshipping of angels and demons as well as with the cosmological experiences in the initiations into the mysteries (2.18). Inasmuch as the greatest common denominator for the material adduced above is Middle Platonist, the Colossian philosophy may be defined more precisely as a form of Middle Platonism. In his portrayal of contemporary cosmology the author of *Col* also included a reference to the Jewish Sabbath. This is possible because, from his perspective at least, the calendrical concerns of Jews and Greeks amount to the same.

---

<sup>60</sup> Cf. the mysteries (τὰ μυστικά) in *De defectu oraculorum* 417B—C; see also LSJ 1771 s.v. τελετή I.1. On the relation between the mystery cults and (Platonic) philosophy, see Dörrie 1981a and Burkert 1987, chap. 3, pp. 66—88, esp. 84—88.

<sup>61</sup> LSJ 539 s.v. ἐμβατεῶν IV.

<sup>62</sup> Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 11.23: Accessi confinium mortis et calcato Proserpinae limine per omnia vectus elementa remeavi; nocte media vidi solem candido coruscantem lumine; deos inferos et deos superos accessi coram et adoravi de proximo.

<sup>63</sup> Dio Chrysostom, *Oratio* 12.33: σχεδόν οὖν ὁμοιον ὥσπερ εἰ τις ἄνδρα Ἑλληνα ἢ βάρβαρον μνοῖη παραδοῦς εἰς μυστικόν τινα οἶκον ὑπερφυῖ κάλλει καὶ μεγέθει, πολλὰ μὲν ὁρῶντα μυστικά θεάματα, πολλῶν δὲ ἀκούοντα τοιοῦτων φωνῶν, σκότους τε καὶ φωτός ἐναλλάξ αὐτῷ φαινομένων, ἄλλων τε μυρίων γιγνομένων, ἐτι δὲ [εἰ] καθάπερ εἰώθασιν ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ θρονισμῷ καθίσαντες τοὺς μουσμένους οἱ τελοῦντες κύκλω περιχορεύειν· ἀρὰ γε τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον μηδὲν παθεῖν εἰκὸς τῇ νυχτὶ μὴ ὑπονοῆσαι τὰ γιγνώμενα, ὡς μετὰ γνώμης καὶ παρασκευῆς πράττεται σοφώτερας, εἰ καὶ πάνυ τις εἴη τῶν μακρόθεν καὶ ἀνωνύμων βαρβάρων, μηδενὸς ἐξηγητοῦ μηδὲ ἐρμηνέως παρόντος, ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν ἔχων; See also the continuation of this passage in *Oratio* 12.34. Reference taken from Burkert 1987, pp. 89—90.

### 3.3.5 *The philosophies of the author of Col and his opponents: Two conflicting instances of Middle Platonism*

The reconstruction of the Colossian philosophy as an instance of Middle Platonism basically confirms the conclusions reached in several groundbreaking studies by Schweizer and in DeMaris' recent revision and furtherance of Schweizer's hypothesis.<sup>64</sup> I disagree with Schweizer and DeMaris, however, insofar as my discussion of the cosmology of the author of *Col* throughout chapters one and three has shown that his cosmology also consists predominantly of Middle Platonist conceptions besides some Stoic notions. *Col* is almost a modification of Middle Platonist doctrine from within.

In fact, the author of *Col* does not deny that the cosmos has been composed of elements. On the contrary, in the clarification of his first warning against a deceiving pursuit of wisdom which grapples with the elements of the cosmos but neglects Christ (*Col* 2.8), the author of *Col* claims that Christ has triumphed over the cosmic elements, principles and powers and has reconstituted them in such a way that they make up his cosmic body once again (*Col* 2.9—10 and 2.14—15; see chap. 3.2 above).

Nor does he reject the idea that calendars and calendrical events are determined by the heavenly bodies (*Col* 2.16—17a; see this section, chap. 3.3). Already in the introductory prayer he has expressed his conviction that planets exert some kind of influence (*Col* 1.16c; see chap. 3.1.2 above). In his view, it is nevertheless wrong to judge one another with regard to calendrical issues and dietary regulations, since the totality of the heavenly bodies on which the festivals and calendrical cycles depend is Christ himself: the heavenly bodies together are part of Christ's cosmic body (*Col* 2.17b; see chap. 1.1.2 and 1.2.5 above). The reconstitution of the elements, principles and powers of the cosmos and their integration in Christ's cosmic body render the rites associated with calendrical events obsolete.

For this reason, the author of *Col* criticises dietary regulations which restrict the use of things which are destroyed by consumption (*Col* 2.22a). Instead of condoning an unsparing treatment of the body (ἀφειδία σώματος), he believes it is right for the human body (σάρξ; cf. σῶμα τῆς σαρκός in *Col* 1.22 and 2.11) to be pleasantly full of food and drink (πλησμονή τῆς σαρκός; *Col* 2.23). Dietary regulations which accompany particular calendrical events are no longer needed because these events are

---

<sup>64</sup> Schweizer 1970, Schweizer 1988 and Schweizer 1989b on the elements of the cosmos; Schweizer 1989a (commentary on *Col*, 3rd ed.), esp. pp. 100—104 on the Colossian philosophy; cf. also Schweizer 1975. See also DeMaris 1994 and, for Schweizer's reaction to DeMaris' criticism, Schweizer 1995. Cf. also Sterling 1998.

determined by the heavenly bodies which, when it comes down to it, are part of the cosmic body of Christ. This view on the obsolescence of calendrical rites demonstrates a strong belief in the hegemony of Christ.

This belief also motivates the author's warning against the worshipping of angels and demons (*Col* 2.18a; see this section, chap. 3.3). He does not dispute the existence of such beings, as they are part and parcel of contemporary cosmology, but reminds his readers that ultimately the coherence of the cosmic body depends on its head, Christ (*Col* 2.19). Even though, as Frede has recently shown, in Platonism the worship of lesser beings does not constitute a violation of the monotheism to which Platonists adhere,<sup>65</sup> the author of *Col* nevertheless radically forbids his readers to revere such beings since, in his view, such reverence fails to do justice to the supremacy of Christ within the cosmic hierarchy.<sup>66</sup>

This concern, finally, is also reflected in the author's critique of claims to have gained insight into the plan of the cosmos by one's initiation into a mystery (*Col* 2.18b; see this section, chap. 3.3). Again, his criticism is not directed against mystery cults as such, but against their erroneous cosmology in which Christ's being head of the cosmic body is ignored (*Col* 2.19). This criticism resembles his first warning against an erroneous philosophy which is concerned with the elements of the cosmos but leaves Christ out of it (*Col* 2.8).

In fact, the author tries to argue that contemporary Middle Platonist philosophy is essentially 'Christian:' the elements of the cosmos cannot be properly conceived of without Christ (*Col* 2.8—10), Christ fulfils the role of Aphrodite, Eros and Osiris in harmonising the cosmos (*Col* 2.15), and, like Numenius' Demiurge, Christ has bound together the body of the cos-

---

<sup>65</sup> See Frede 1999a, pp. 61 and esp. 64—66: 'one crucial text is Plato, *Timaeus* 37C, according to which the world, itself divine, is itself an image (*agalma*) of the everlasting gods. We certainly do not expect Plato or any Platonists to worship the world. What we do expect is that they treat the world with respect, given that it is an image of higher things. It is clear, at least in the case of Platonists, that divine beings form a hierarchy in which the lower beings are images or reflections of the higher beings, and in which each being, however modest its position in this hierarchy, represents the divinely ordained order of things and is a reflection of God. It is clear even from what Origen quotes from Celsus [Origen, *Contra Celsum* 8.67; see Frede 1999a, pp. 61—62] that Celsus argues that we should pay respect to or even worship demons because in doing so we show respect for God and the divine order. This suggests a line of thought which justifies the worship of lesser gods, as long as they are understood to be mere images, pale reflections of the God' (pp. 64—65).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. also Sterling 1998, p. 370: 'The Deutero-Paulinist's critique of the worship of evil daemons anticipates the criticisms later Christian authors would level against Platonists,' with reference to Augustine, *De civitate dei* 8.13—22. See also *De civitate dei* 10.3.

mos by means of bonds (*Col* 2.19; Numenius, fragm. 18). But in comparison with contemporary Middle Platonism, the author of *Col* is more radical in his stress on the exclusive worship of Christ.

The definition of Christ's relation to the other entities and beings in the cosmos becomes acute for the author of *Col* since, unlike Paul, he integrates the entire present cosmos into one, renewed hierarchy. Whereas according to Paul the cosmic elements have been superseded, as a result of Christ's action, by the beginnings of a new creation (chap. 2.1 above) and the principles, powers and forces of the present cosmos are in the process of being made of no effect in the period between Christ's resurrection and the end (chap. 2.2 above), in the view of the author of *Col* the present physical cosmos has already been entirely reconstituted by Christ in a role comparable to that of Aphrodite, Eros and Osiris in Middle Platonism. According to the author of *Col*, the cosmos has already become Christ's cosmic body again.

This view is a further Hellenization of Paul's cosmology and was prompted, as I argued at the end of chap. 2 (see chaps 2.2.4 and 2.2.5), by the need to overcome the invalidation of Paul's imminent eschatology and to save what the author of *Col* regarded as the core of Paul's theology: Christ's submission of the cosmological principles, powers and elements. Once he has integrated the entire cosmos into a renewed hierarchy with Christ on top, he secures the absolute hegemony of Christ by criticising the observance of particular rites—in favour of the crucial rite of baptism (*Col* 2.12—13)—and the worshipping of lesser beings. As I shall show in the next chapter (chap. 4), despite these restrictions his identification of the body of the cosmos with Christ did not remain undisputed.

## Chapter 4

# The Reasons for the *Letter to the Ephesians*: The Pauline Debate on God, Christ, and the Cosmos Continued

### Introduction

After dealing with the cosmologies of the *Letter to the Colossians* (chaps 1 and 3) and Paul's authentic writings (chap. 2), as well as with the difference between them, in this chapter I wish to discuss the reasons for the Pseudo-Pauline letter commonly known as the *Letter to the Ephesians*. Since there exists a (literary)<sup>1</sup> relationship between *Eph* and the earlier Pseudo-Pauline *Letter to the Colossians*, the reasons for *Eph* can be inferred when the adaptation of *Col* by the author of *Eph* is taken into consideration: why did the author of *Eph* choose *Col* as his model? Was it the only Pauline letter which the author of *Eph* possessed (Wagenführer)?<sup>2</sup> Is it likely that he 'believed Colossians to be Pauline in the sense of being the product of another follower of Paul (...) and therefore treated Colossians as the model of the sort of writing that could be done in the apostle's name' (Lincoln/Merklein)?<sup>3</sup> Did he need to rely on *Col* to authorize his own views (Schwindt)?<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On the literary nature of this relationship, see my discussion in appendix I, section 5.2 below.

<sup>2</sup> Wagenführer 1941, pp. 141—142.

<sup>3</sup> Lincoln 1990, p. LXVIII with reference to Merklein 1973, p. 41.

<sup>4</sup> Schwindt 2002, pp. 46—55, esp. p. 54: 'Der enge Anschluß an die kol Terminologie läßt vermuten, daß der Kol im Umfeld des Eph ein größeres Ansehen besaß. Dies könnte Kol wegen seines vermeintlich paulinischen Charakters zugekommen sein. Möglicherweise hat sich Eph an Kol orientiert, um seinen Gedanken und Lehren Verbindlichkeit und Autorität zu sichern.' According to Schwindt, the reasons for *Eph* have to do with the period's increasing dualism (Schwindt 2002, pp. 360—361), demonology and astrology (p. 370), and the author's 'Bemühen, die Theologie des Paulus, die ohnehin bereits pneumatisch-gnoseologische und kosmologische Kategorien verarbeitet, für seine vorwiegend heidenchristliche Leserschaft vor dem Spiegel des ihnen vertrauten gutteils magisch-astrologischen Weltbildes weiter zu plausibilisieren' (p. 521). Yet, Schwindt is



In my view, the questions of the relationship between *Eph* and *Col* and the reasons for *Eph* should be addressed on the base of a synopsis. However, the synopses of the Greek text of *Eph* and *Col*, compiled by Goodspeed (1933), Wagenführer (1941), Mitton (1951), Reuter (1997) and Vleugels (1997), prove far from sufficient for clarifying the genetic development of *Eph* out of *Col*, as I will argue in detail in appendix I below. For that reason, my study is based on a new synoptic overview which I have drawn up and which is presented in appendix II below. The synopses drawn up by Goodspeed and Mitton do not include a continuous text of *Col* and consequently offer no structural analyses of *Eph* and *Col*. Reuter's synopsis entails an implicit attempt at such an analysis, though also fails to include a continuous text of *Col*. As a matter of fact, the only synopsis to date which prints the continuous Greek text of both *Eph* and *Col* while analysing their respective structures is that of Wagenführer.

In their analysis of the structure of *Eph* and *Col* Wagenführer and Reuter fail to recognise how the author of *Eph* adapted the structure of *Col*. As will be demonstrated in the present chapter, the structure of *Col* consists of nine parts, which we shall designate as parts A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H and I. As the synopsis of the Greek texts of *Eph* and *Col* shows (see appendix II below), the author of *Eph* adapted this nine-part structure of *Col*, first, by leaving out part E on the Colossian philosophy and, secondly, by interpolating new parts (NEW 1, NEW 2 and NEW 3) at various stages in the structure which he took over from *Col*. This can be visualised as follows:

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E	---	F	G	---	H	I
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---	NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I

In the present chapter, I shall deduce the reasons for *Eph* from the reinterpretation which the author of *Eph* gave of the various parts of *Col* and from his insertion of new passages into the structure which he copied from *Col*.<sup>5</sup> I will argue that *Eph* was presented as the twin letter of *Col* and is in

---

unable to account for the reason why the author of *Eph* chose *Col* as his letter's model (Schwindt 2002, p. 54). I agree with Wagenführer that the issues of the relationship between *Eph* and *Col*, and the theological idiosyncrasy of each letter can only be comprehensively treated on the base of a synopsis (Wagenführer 1941, pp. 1–2).

<sup>5</sup> Throughout this chapter, I will make extensive use of the synopsis of the Greek texts of *Eph*, *Col*, Paul's authentic letters and the Septuagint which is included in appendix II below. Readers who wish to check my view of the genesis and development of *Eph*

fact a commentary on *Col* with, as its main purpose, a critical modification of its cosmology and cosmic Christology.<sup>6</sup> The Pauline debate on God, Christ, and the cosmos, as pursued by the author of *Col*, appears to be continued in *Eph*. The interrelationships between the cosmologies of *Eph*, *Col* and Paul seem best explained within the framework of contemporary Graeco-Roman cosmology. I will demonstrate this by showing how the author of *Eph* reworked each part of the structure of *Col*.

#### 4.1 Part A—Sender, addressees, and greetings (*Eph* 1.1—2)

The opening part of *Col*, part A (*Col* 1.1—2), mentions the alleged senders of the letter, Paul and Timothy, the addressees in Colossae and the greetings sent to them.

This opening is reproduced in the corresponding part A in *Eph*, except that the authorship is now claimed for Paul alone and, of course, the addressees are now located elsewhere. Textual difficulties, however, do not allow hasty conclusions about whether these addressees were inhabitants of Ephesus, a limited group of Christian communities in various cities who received a circular letter, early Christianity at large, or—as I shall eventually propose—inhabitants of Laodicea, though—given the pseudepigraphic nature of the letter—only nominally. A discussion of this issue is best postponed till a detailed assessment of the letter's contents has been made (see chap. 4.8 below). For all practical purposes, however, I will continue to speak of the *Letter to the Ephesians*.

In part A, the author of *Eph* not only makes use of part A of *Col*, but, as the synopsis clearly shows, in the extra material he inserts at this point he is clearly dependent on the opening of *2 Cor* (see *2 Cor* 1.1—2). Interestingly, already the author of *Col* drew upon the opening of *2 Cor* but part A in *Eph* hinges on it to an even higher degree. Moreover, this dependency of the author of *Eph* on the beginning of *2 Cor* continues directly in the opening words of the author's thanksgiving in part B of *Eph*, which are derived from Paul's thanksgiving at the beginning of *2 Cor* (see *2 Cor* 1.3—4a). This shows that the author of *Eph* not only made use of *Col* but,

---

against this synopsis may find it helpful to note the short introduction and key to the synopsis in appendix I, section 5.6.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Gese 1997, who argues that the author of *Eph* wanted to modify and comment on the contents of *Col*, although for different reasons. Gese is of the opinion that the author of *Eph* appreciated *Col*'s universal tendency, yet deemed it to lack a historical perspective. See Gese 1997, esp. pp. 52—53 and 266—271. As Gese himself admits, this does not sufficiently account for the excessive degree to which the author of *Eph* is dependent on *Col* (Gese 1997, p. 271).

though to a considerably lesser extent, also of other Pauline letters. Of these he seems definitely to have known and used *1 Cor*, *2 Cor* and *1 Thess*, probably also *Romans*, and possibly *Philipp* as well; there is no evidence of his acquaintance with *Gal* and *Phm* (see appendix I, section 5.2 [b] below). In the present chapter, we will encounter some notable instances of the author's acquaintance with *2 Cor*, *1 Cor*, *Romans* and *1 Thess*.

#### 4.2 Part B—The author's thanksgiving to God (*Eph* 1.3—14) and the letter's subject matter: The cosmos will be recapitulated and summarized in Christ

Part B in *Col* (*Col* 1.3—8) consists of the author's thanksgiving to God for what he has heard of the Colossians' faith, love and hope. This hope is characterized as the hope which is laid up in store for them in heaven and of which they heard beforehand (προακούω) when the gospel reached them and, on Epaphras' instruction, they learned of God's grace.

This part, like all parts of *Col* except part E on the Colossian philosophy, is taken up in its entirety in the corresponding part in *Eph* (part B) though reworked and, as all parts apart from the concluding parts H and I,<sup>7</sup> expanded. As I have just mentioned, in the opening line of part B in *Eph*, the author—though running parallel with the beginning of part B in *Col*—quotes verbatim from Paul's eulogy of God at the start of *2 Cor*. Immediately thereafter, the author of *Eph* draws on various passages from part B in *Col*. The notion of the hope which is kept in reserve in heaven and of which the Colossian readers have heard beforehand (προακούω), when the message of the truth of the gospel arrived at Colossae, is taken up near the end of part B where the author of *Eph* speaks of those who hoped for Christ before (προελπίζω) and heard the message of the truth, the gospel.

It seems that the prefix προ- ('before') gives rise in part B of *Eph* to an entire protology of divine election, predestination and predetermination, both in relation to the readers as well as with regard to Christ. God's predestination and election of the readers is spoken of at the beginning and end of part B.<sup>8</sup> Especially at the end of part B, these issues are linked up with other, related Pauline ideas, notably the theme of being sealed up with the holy Spirit, which is a guarantee of the readers' future deliverance, a theme derived from *2 Cor* 1.21—22.

<sup>7</sup> On the contraction of parts H and I in *Eph*, see the last footnote in chap. 4.7 below.

<sup>8</sup> See the notions of divine election (εκλέγομαι) before the foundation of the cosmos (πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου) and divine predestination (προορίζω) in *Eph* 1.4—5 and 1.11.

In the middle of the thanksgiving of part B, however, the author of *Eph* focuses on God's predetermination of the plan which he fixed beforehand in Christ.<sup>9</sup> This passage is preceded by, and actually part of, the reflections of the author of *Eph* on a passage in part B in *Col* on God's grace (χάρις), of which the Colossians learned through Epaphras. This term 'grace' is taken up by the author of *Eph* and twice elaborated. First, this grace is bestowed upon the readers by God through Christ (*Eph* 1.6—7b). Secondly, this grace is so abundantly granted to the readers that they obtain knowledge of God's mystery (*Eph* 1.7c—9a). God's predetermination with regard to Christ comes into view when the author of *Eph* says that the mystery which God makes known complies with the plan which he determined beforehand in Christ (*Eph* 1.9).

In comparison with part B in *Col*, the author of *Eph* develops a comprehensive protology which embraces not only God's predetermination of man, but also his stipulation of a particular mystery in accordance with a fixed plan. In *Col*, as we shall see in due course, such a mystery is not spoken of until part D on Paul's ministry and the mystery revealed to him (see chap. 4.5.1 below). Though the author of *Eph* will appear to reproduce the concept of mystery in the corresponding part D in *Eph* (see chap. 4.5.2 below), he mentions it already here in the thanksgiving of part B. According to him, this mystery is that, according to God's predetermined plan, in the fullness of time Christ will eventually become head again throughout the cosmos (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα),<sup>10</sup> in heaven as well as on earth (*Eph* 1.10).

This is the most remarkable feature of the protology developed by the author of *Eph*. It is lacking in the thanksgiving in part B of *Col*. It seems that the mystery according to which the cosmos will be summarized in Christ is actually made the subject matter of the whole letter. At important

<sup>9</sup> For the notion of the plan which God determined beforehand (προϋθημι) in Christ, see *Eph* 1.9.

<sup>10</sup> For this translation of ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, which is the technical term for summing up an argument in rhetoric (LSJ 108), see the notion of repetition and improvement which the preposition ἀνά can acquire in composition (LSJ 97—98: ἀνά F.3). I disagree with the de-historizing interpretation which Lindemann gives of Christ summing up the cosmos as if this has already been fully accomplished so that nothing remains of the future eschatology behind *Eph* 1.10 and time has been dissolved (Lindemann 1975, pp. 94—99): 'Er hat das All in Christus zusammengefaßt, das πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν, die Aufhebung der Zeit, ist jetzt Gegenwart' (Lindemann 1975, p. 98). According to Lindemann, 'die Herrschaft Christi ist nicht unter futurisch-eschatologischem, sondern unter "aoristisch-eschatologischem" Aspekt gesehen' (Lindemann 1975, p. 99). Cf. Merkel 1987, pp. 3193—3195, esp. p. 3194, for a critique of Lindemann's view on the eschatology of *Eph*. My critique will be reiterated at the end of chap. 4.3.3. below. For Irenaeus' interpretation of the notion of recapitulation in *Eph* 1.10, see Osborn 2001, part III; Osborn 1993, appendix II; and Noormann 1994.

stages in the letter's train of thought, i.e. in the introductory prayer in the next part (part C; see chap. 4.3.2 below) and in the second ecclesiological passage (part NEW 2; see chap. 4.6.2 below), this theme is worked out explicitly.

### 4.3 Part C—The author's introductory prayer for his readers (*Eph* 1.15—2.10): The extension of Christ's influence over the cosmos

#### *Introduction*

As we have just seen, in his thanksgiving to God in part B the author of *Eph* diverges from part B in *Col* by incorporating as the central theme of his letter the idea that eventually Christ will become head again throughout the cosmos. This issue subsequently receives its first explanation in the introductory prayer for his readers in part C as the author spells out in what sense Christ has become head of the cosmos. In addition to this initial clarification of the letter's subject matter, the author's reworking of the introductory prayer in part C of *Col* is also characterised by another feature.

Whereas the introductory prayer in *Col* reflects a confident cosmology which describes the present physical cosmos as brought to peace, reconciled and put together in Christ (chap. 4.3.1), the author of *Eph* is convinced that the extension of Christ's influence over the cosmos is still in progress (chap. 4.3.2). To express this conviction, the author of *Eph* draws on Paul's portrayal of Christ subjugating the cosmic powers at the end of *1 Cor* (see *1 Cor* 15.23—28). This modification of the cosmology of *Col* is, however, also brought about by adapting another motif, the concept of filling the cosmos, which originated in Graeco-Roman philosophy (chap. 4.3.3). The difference between the cosmologies of *Eph* and *Col* appears to bear on their respective understanding of sin (chap. 4.3.4).

#### *4.3.1 Description of the introductory prayer in part C of Col*

In the introductory prayer in part C of *Col* (*Col* 1.9—23), the author assures his readers that he has incessantly prayed to God that they may be filled with knowledge (ἐπιγνώσις), wisdom (σοφία) and spiritual understanding (σύνεσις πνευματική), in order to live a worthy life which is pleasing to the Lord. This is characterised as a way of life in which they, first, bear fruit, in an ethical sense, and grow in their knowledge of God; secondly, are strengthened by God to persevere patiently; and, finally, ren-

der thanks to God for having removed them from the darkness into the realm of Christ.

As I have argued above (chap. 3.1.1), the description which is subsequently given of Christ should be ascribed to the author of *Col* in its entirety instead of being traced to a hymn which he, for some reason, picked up and adapted to his own purposes. Rather, the cosmological views which he expresses here in connection with Christ are integral to his line of reasoning and many aspects of this cosmology will be brought to bear on the problem of the Colossian philosophy in part E. For the sake of a detailed comparison with *Eph* I will now summarise some of the things I said on the cosmology of the introductory prayer in *Col* (see chap. 3.1.1),

In the introductory prayer of part C (*Col* 1.9—23), the author's views are presented in the structure A-B-C-A'-B'. According to the author of *Col*, Christ is (A) the firstborn of the entire creation (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως), the visual image or representation of the invisible God (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου)<sup>11</sup> since in him, through him and for him the whole cosmos with all its powers was created; in him, who was prior to the cosmos, the cosmos was put together (1.15—17).

Christ, however, is also head of the realm into which the Colossian believers have been transferred (1.18 a—c). This realm had already been identified as the kingdom (1.13: βασιλεία) but is now designated as the church (ἐκκλησία). From the perspective of recreation, Christ is seen as (B) the firstborn from the dead (πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν). Christ, in the author's view, is the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) both of creation and from the dead in order that (C) he should become first in everything (*Col* 1.18d: ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων), that is in creation and recreation.

The author of *Col* views Christ as being the first both as regards his actions of creation and recreation. This is apparent from the fact that, after he has said that Christ will become first in everything, he follows this statement by a causal particle (ὅτι) which again brings up these respective activities which had already been denoted by the titles 'firstborn of the entire creation' and 'firstborn from the dead.' Christ, according to the author of *Col*, becomes first in everything since the entire fullness was willing (A') to settle in him and (B'), through him, to reconcile the cosmos to himself again by making peace (1.19—20). These notions of creation and reconstitution of the cosmos are fundamental to the letter's train of thought.

This becomes clear from two further passages in *Col*. First, the present permanent state in which the entire fullness of the divine nature has be-

<sup>11</sup> There is a most intriguing parallel with the conclusion of Plato's *Timaeus* (92C) where the cosmos (κόσμος) is called an εἰκὼν τοῦ νοητοῦ θεοῦ αἰσθητός, a perceptible God, who is the image of the intelligible.

come situated in Christ and has taken on in him the shape of the body of the cosmos is spoken of more extensively in part E in the author's first warning against the Colossian philosophy (*Col* 2.8—10). Secondly, the theme of the cosmos' reconstitution again plays a significant role in part E at the very end of the first warning, when the author explains that Christ has again become head of the cosmic powers after his triumph over them (*Col* 2.15; see chap. 3.2 above).

In the introductory prayer of part C, this reconstitution had been articulated in terms of reconciling the physical cosmos and making peace. The terminology of reconciling the cosmos is, as I have shown above (chap. 3.1.2), exactly identical with the terminology used by philosophers like Chrysippus (c. 280—207 BC) and Dio Chrysostom (c. 40/50—110 AD) when they speak about the reconciliation of the physical cosmos. The wording of making peace in the physical cosmos has likewise been derived from Graeco-Roman philosophy, and seems to have been a theme in ancient philosophy since Heraclitus (c. 500 BC).

The notion of reconciliation in the introductory prayer is not limited, however, to the cosmic level. This was scarcely to be expected since the author of *Col* had already exhorted his readers to render thanks to God for their transference to Christ's kingdom (*Col* 1.12—13), their redemption (1.14) and their membership of Christ's assembly on earth, the church (1.18). Having said that through Christ the cosmos has been reconciled (1.20), he concludes his introductory prayer by stating that the readers, too, have been reconciled and will finally be presented holy in the sight of God (1.21—22), on condition, though, that they do not depart from the gospel which was proclaimed to them (1.23).

#### *4.3.2 The adaptation of the introductory prayer in part C of Eph—first section (Eph 1.15—23): Christ and the cosmos*

##### *(a) General outline*

In his adaptation of the introductory prayer of *Col* in the parallel part C, the author of *Eph* likewise asserts that he has never ceased to pray for his readers.<sup>12</sup> He does not pray that they may be filled with knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις), wisdom (σοφία) and spiritual understanding (σύνεσις πνευματική), as *Col* has it, but, instead, that God may give them the spiritual

---

<sup>12</sup> Strikingly, in the opening line of his introductory prayer the author of *Eph* makes extensive use of material from the beginning of the thanksgiving in part B of *Col*. This data he had left aside when composing his thanksgiving, the start of which was derived verbatim from the beginning of *2 Cor*, as was the extra material in the letter's address in the preceding part A (see *2 Cor* 1.1—3). Now the first three verses of part B are drawn upon at the beginning of his adaptation of part C.

gift of wisdom (πνεῦμα σοφίας) and knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις). These qualities do not enable them, as their equivalents in *Col* are supposed to do, to live a worthy life which is pleasing to the Lord, but allow them to know some aspects of God.

These aspects include the excessive greatness of God's power (δύναμις) which believers come to know. According to the author of *Eph*, this power is after the fashion<sup>13</sup> of the 'action of the strength of his might,' which God performed in Christ when he raised him from the dead and placed him at his right hand in heaven. This passage on God's power clearly goes beyond what the author of *Eph* found in the introductory prayer in *Col* although he makes use of its characterisation of the Christians' life as being strengthened by God with all power in accordance with the strength of his splendour (*Col* 1.11). When the author of *Eph* amplifies this sketch of God's power in the introductory prayer of *Col*, he does so by concatenating all that the author of *Col* has said in subsequent parts of his letter about the notions of God's power (δύναμις), strength (κράτος) and action (ἐνέργεια).<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> See LSJ 882—993 s.v. κατά B.IV.3 for the preposition κατά in comparisons.

<sup>14</sup> This concatenation or conflation which is visible in *Eph* 1.19—20 progresses in four stages. First, the phrase τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ (...) κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ('the excessive greatness of his power') in *Eph* 1.19 is essentially derived from the introductory prayer in part C of *Col* where Christians are said (*Col* 1.11) to be ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ('strengthened with all power in accordance with the strength of his splendour'). Secondly, the phrase κατὰ τὸ κράτος (...) αὐτοῦ ('in accordance with his strength'), which the author of *Eph* derives from *Col* 1.11, is amplified by means of the similar phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοί ('in accordance with his action which he performs in me') which he finds in part D on Paul's ministry (see *Col* 1.29) but now applies to Christ: κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ('in accordance with the action of the strength of his might which he performed in Christ'). Thirdly, the author of *Eph* expands on the notion of God's action (ἐνέργεια) by adding that God performed this action in Christ when he raised him from the dead: ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. This expansion is achieved by drawing upon a segment of part E in *Col* where the readers are pictured as having been raised together with Christ through their trust in the action (ἐνέργεια) of God who raised him from the dead: ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (*Col* 2.12). Finally, the author of *Eph* again makes use of part E of *Col* when he concludes his statement about Christ's resurrection with a note on Christ's installation at God's right hand in heaven (καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις), a notion expressed at the end of part E of *Col* in connection with Christ's resurrection (*Col* 3.1; cf. *Psalms* 109.1b LXX). In this way, the author of *Eph* has progressively and systematically conflated all occurrences of power (δύναμις), strength (κράτος), action (ἐνέργεια) and resurrection (ἐγείρω/συνεγείρω) into a single passage. This reworking is indisputable evidence for the posteriority of *Eph*, as phrases which in *Col* belonged to the author's train of thought are taken out of their original context and conflated into one new passage. This reworking is so sophisticated that it clearly points



After the author of *Eph* has disclosed that the purpose of his prayers is that his readers may come to know and experience the magnitude of God's power, which is only comparable with the action which God performed in resurrecting Christ and installing him in heaven (*Eph* 1.15—20), he proceeds to define the relation between the exalted Christ and the cosmic powers below him (1.21—23). It appears that he does not agree outright with the cosmological views which the author of *Col* expressed in his introductory prayer. He does not reiterate the latter's belief that the present cosmos is held together in Christ and has already been reconciled, but rather modifies this view by introducing the notion of an ongoing process during which the cosmos becomes increasingly dominated by Christ. This idea he found at the end of Paul's *1 Cor* (see *1 Cor* 15.23—28). It is likely that he drew upon that passage of *1 Cor* and tried to interpret the cosmological statements of the introductory prayer in *Col* in that light.<sup>15</sup>

(b) *The relation between Christ and the cosmos*

The author of *Eph* defines the relation between the heavenly Christ and the cosmic powers as follows. Christ has been installed in heaven above all cosmic powers. These powers are specified as principles (ἀρχαί), powers (ἐξουσίαι) and forces (δυνάμεις), in the same sequence in which they occur in *1 Cor* 15.24, though supplemented with the dominions (κυριότητες) which are unique to the introductory prayer in *Col*. He again draws on *1 Cor* by quoting *Psalm* 8.7b LXX: and all things were subdued under his feet (*1 Cor* 15.27). From this the author of *Eph* concludes, now leaning on the phraseology of the introductory prayer of *Col*, that Christ has been given to the church as supreme head over the cosmos (καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ).

---

to literary dependence and not just dependence through recollection only (see also appendix 1, section 5.2. [a] below).

<sup>15</sup> The evidence for the acquaintance of the author of *Eph* with *1 Cor* 15.23—28 lies in the combination of (1) the terms ἀρχαί ('principles'), ἐξουσίαι ('powers') and δυνάμεις ('forces'); (2) the quotation of *Psalm* 8.7b LXX; and (3) the phrase τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ('all in everything'). This combination is unique to the introductory prayer of part C in *Eph* and *1 Cor* 15.23—28. It should not be supplemented with the allusion to *Psalm* 109.1b LXX (Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου) at the end of *Eph* 1.20 (καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ) and the paraphrase of this clause at the beginning of *1 Cor* 15.25 (δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεῦειν), which is followed by a quotation of *Psalm* 109.1c LXX. As I argued in the previous footnote, the allusion to *Psalm* 109.1b LXX in *Eph* 1.20 is not caused by the author's familiarity with *1 Cor* 15.23—28 but is due to *Col* 3.1 (which itself, of course, is a direct allusion to *Psalm* 109.1b LXX) and represents the final stage in the formation of the extensive concatenation in *Eph* 1.19—20. For this reason, one can not increase the evidence for the acquaintance of the author of *Eph* with *1 Cor* 15 by arguing that the combination of *Psalm* 8 LXX and 109 LXX in itself is unique to *Eph* and *1 Cor*.

This is the first clarification he offers of the subject matter which he had announced in the thanksgiving of part B, i.e. that, in the fullness of time, Christ will eventually become head again throughout the cosmos (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα; see chap. 4.2 above). Christ's cosmic rule, as the author of *Eph* makes plain, does not yet extend over the entire physical cosmos. It began to be implemented, precisely as Paul presupposes in *1 Cor* 15.25, when Christ was resurrected and installed in heaven (*Eph* 1.20). The benefit of this rule, however, is still limited to the church because Christ has only been given as cosmic head to the church. This idea is closely paralleled by what Apuleius of Madaurus (c. 125—170 AD) writes about the cosmic rule of Isis. Although Isis is the natural mother of all things ('rerum naturae parens') and the mistress of all the elements ('elementorum omnium domina'),<sup>16</sup> only for those who have been initiated into her mystery cult does she, through whom the elements function, restrain the harmful course of the stars.<sup>17</sup>

The fact that the author of *Eph* thinks the benefit of Christ's rule is still restricted to the church emerges clearly from the explication which he gives of the church. The church, in his definition, is the fullness of him who fills all in everything: τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου (*Eph* 1.23). In the introductory prayer in part C of *Col*, this fullness was the fullness of the invisible divine nature which, in Christ as its visual representation, took on the shape of the cosmic body (*Col* 1.15—17; cf. *Col* 2.9—10). In *Eph*, however, the fullness is identified as the church. Yet, we should be careful not to take this as a clear-cut and exhaustive identification. More seems to be at issue than that the author of *Eph* simply disapproved of the understanding of the 'fullness' (πλήρωμα) as the invisible divine nature taking shape in Christ as cosmos, and made the concept stand for the church. On the contrary, even though the fullness is now seen as the church it does not entirely lose its cosmological meaning since the church is defined as 'the fullness of him who fills all in everything' (τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου).

First, the notion of filling all things (πληρῶν τὰ πάντα) is a cosmological concept which derives from Graeco-Roman philosophy. This will be demonstrated at some length in the next section (see chap. 4.3.3 below).

Secondly, as I argued above in chap. 2.2.4, the phrase τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ('all in everything') which the author of *Eph* derives from *1 Cor* 15.28, also originated in Greek cosmology in the philosophy of Anaxagoras (c. 500—428 BC) who held the view that in everything there is a portion of everything. In *1 Cor* 15.23—28, Paul applied this idea to ex-

<sup>16</sup> Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 11.5.

<sup>17</sup> Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 11.25: 'stellarum noxios meatus cohibes.' On the effects of initiation, see also Schwandt 2002, pp. 464—467 and 517—518.

press his conviction that, after all principles, powers and forces of the present cosmos have been subdued by Christ, God will ensure a new coherent cosmic reality by being all in everything. It is unlikely, of course, that in the first century AD this axiom 'all in everything' would have been understood in its original pre-Socratic, Anaxagorean meaning. Rather, especially as God was identified with 'all in everything,' this phrase was understood as a résumé of Stoic physics. The Stoics taught that God is absolutely identical with the 'all' when, after the conflagration of the cosmos, he has the whole substance of the cosmic body as his commanding faculty because it has been absorbed by him. During the subsequent phase of the new orderly arrangement of the cosmos, however, he is only partly its substance.<sup>18</sup> For that reason, the phrase that God is all in everything will have reminded many of Paul's contemporaries of the Stoic concept of conflagration and subsequent reconstitution of the cosmos.

If this cosmological notion of 'all in everything' (τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν) is taken into account, in combination with the concept of filling all things (πληρῶ τὰ πάντα), it is clear that the definition of the church as the fullness of him who fills all in everything is not devoid of cosmological meaning. Rather, the church is the locus where Christ's rule over the cosmos has already been fully implemented. The church has already been filled, it is already a fullness (πλήρωμα), whereas the cosmos itself is still in the process of being filled.<sup>19</sup> It is to the background of this notion that we now turn.

---

<sup>18</sup> See Origen's description of Stoic physics in *Contra Celsum* 4.14 (*SVF* 2.1052; LS 46H): Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ τῶν Στωϊκῶν θεός, ἅτε σῶμα τυγχάνων, ὅτε μὲν ἡγεμονικὸν ἔχει τὴν ὄλην οὐσίαν, ὅταν ἡ ἐκπύρωσις ᾖ· ὅτε δὲ ἐπὶ μέρος γίνεται αὐτῆς, ὅταν ᾖ διακόσμησις.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Colpe 1960, pp. 176—178. Colpe is right about the cosmological meaning which he attaches to 'fullness' (πλήρωμα) and 'filling the cosmos' (πληρῶ τὰ πάντα). Colpe duly criticised Mußner for tampering with the evidence from Philo (Colpe 1960, pp. 176—178 discussing Mußner 1955, pp. 45—64). This evidence will be adduced in chap. 4.3.3 below and points at the unambiguously cosmological meaning of the notion of filling the cosmos (πληρῶ τὰ πάντα). Although Mußner knew the evidence from Philo (Mußner 1955, pp. 47—50), he wrongly insisted that in Philo the notion of God filling the cosmos meant nothing but God having dominion over the cosmos in a spiritual, non-physical way (Mußner 1955, pp. 49—50, 58—59, 63—64). Mußner objected in particular to Schlier's and Dupont's cosmological interpretation of this notion in *Eph* (Mußner 1955, pp. 63—64 against Schlier 1949 and pp. 59, 64 against Dupont 1949). Mußner was correct in criticising Schlier's assumption that the origins of this notion were Gnostic (Mußner 1955, pp. 50—53, 61—64; cf. Schlier 1949, p. 110 note 15 [=Schlier 1956, p. 170 note 15]). Mußner's critique of Dupont's study is ill-founded, however. Whereas Schlier could still confess that the history of the notions of fullness and filling the cosmos had not yet been written (Schlier 1949, p. 110 note 15 [=Schlier 1956, p. 170 note 15]), in that same year that history was presented by Dupont. The following section (chap. 4.3.3) fully corroborates Dupont's conclusion that the origins of

#### 4.3.3 The notion of filling the cosmos (Eph 1.23)

As I said earlier, the notion of filling all things or the cosmos (πληρώω τὰ πάντα) originated in Graeco-Roman philosophy. The author of *Eph* did not derive it from the Septuagint, despite some seeming analogies. In the Septuagint, it is said that the earth (γῆ) or God's work (ἔργον) is full of (πλήρης) or filled with God's mercy, glory and praise.<sup>20</sup> But here the exact terminology is lacking since the term τὰ πάντα ('all things'/'the cosmos') does not occur. Moreover, not God himself but only his attributes are said to fill the earth.

A closer parallel is found in *Jeremiah* 23.24 LXX where God is reported to ask: 'If a man hides himself in some hidden place, shall I not see him, since I fill heaven and earth?'<sup>21</sup> Although God himself is the subject of filling heaven and earth, again the exact terminology for the cosmos (τὰ πάντα) is missing. The notion of filling heaven and earth is actually due to the theme of humans hiding themselves from God.

The closest parallel in the Septuagint to the idea of God filling the cosmos is certainly found in the *Wisdom of Solomon*. According to *Wisdom of Solomon* 1.7a, God's spirit—which is paralleled in 1.7b with that which holds together the cosmos (τὸ συνέχον τὰ πάντα)—has filled the whole world: πνεῦμα κυρίου πεπλήρωκεν τὴν οἰκουμένην. This verse as a whole is indeed testimony to the notion of filling the physical cosmos,<sup>22</sup>

---

the notion of filling the cosmos are neither Gnostic (Dupont 1949, pp. 454—461) nor Jewish (pp. 468—471) but lie in Greek philosophy (pp. 461—468). Yet, the history of this notion can be more fully drawn as, apart from the Philonic evidence, Dupont mentions only two Greek texts (Aelius Aristides, *Oratio* 45.21; Aristotle, *De anima* 1.5.411a), and places perhaps too much stress on the Stoic nature of this notion. Dupont also appears to minimize the role played by a saying of Thales of Miletus in its formation and to ignore the overlap with the Platonic notion of cosmic plenitude. That does not alter the fact that his achievement is remarkable.

<sup>20</sup> See *Psalm* 32 (33).5b LXX, 118 (119).64a LXX: God's mercy (ἔλεος); *Psalm* 71 (72).19 LXX, *Ecclesiasticus* 42.16b LXX and *Isaiah* 6.3c LXX: God's glory (δόξα); and *Habakkuk* 3.3e LXX: God's praise (αἴνεσις). Cf. possibly also the statement in *Psalm* 103 (104).24c LXX that the earth (γῆ) is filled with God's possessions (κτησίς) or creation (κτίσις). Phrases like ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς (*Psalm* 23 [24].1 LXX; *Jeremiah* 8.16 LXX, 29 [47].2 LXX; *Ezekiel* 12.19 LXX, 19.7 LXX, 30.12 LXX), ἡ οἰκουμένη καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς (*Psalm* 49 [50].12 LXX, 88 [89].11 LXX), and ἡ θάλασσα καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς (*1 Chronicles* 16.32 LXX; *Psalm* 95 [96].11 LXX, 97 [98].7 LXX) are not, however, analogous at all.

<sup>21</sup> *Jeremiah* 23.24 LXX: εἰ κρυβήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐν κρυφαῖοις, καὶ ἐγὼ οὐκ ὄψομαι αὐτόν; μὴ οὐχὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐγὼ πληρῶ;

<sup>22</sup> Interestingly, Origen also interpreted *Jeremiah* 23.24 LXX in this sense as he quoted this passage in combination with *Wisdom of Solomon* 1.7 LXX. See Origen, *Contra Celsum* 4.5.

though the Hellenistic date of the *Wisdom of Solomon* encourages us to look for this notion in Greek literature as well.

In Greek literature, the idea of filling the cosmos (πληρώω τὰ πάντα), or the cosmos (τὰ πάντα) being full (πλήρη), appears to be a widespread notion attributed to Thales of Miletus (6th cent. BC). As Aristotle reports, Thales is of the opinion that all things are full of gods: καὶ Θαλής φήθη πάντα πλήρη θεῶν εἶναι (*De anima* 1.5.411a, 7—8).<sup>23</sup> In this way, Thales expresses his view that the cosmos is somehow alive and animated.<sup>24</sup> Through the ages, his statement that the cosmos is full of gods was repeated literally, either with or without explicit attribution to him, by authors like Plato, the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (c. 280—207 BC), the Neoplatonic Syrian philosopher Iamblichus (c. 245—325 AD), the philosopher Themistius (c. 317—388 AD) and Julian, emperor in 361—363 AD.<sup>25</sup> These philosophers quoted Thales' statement verbatim but, in addition to this, its contents were widely known and used.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, no. 11 A 22, p. 79.26—27.

<sup>24</sup> For an interpretation of this aspect of Thales' cosmology, see KRS, pp. 95—98; text on p. 95, no. 91.

<sup>25</sup> Plato, *Leges* 899B, without attribution to Thales; Chrysippus, *Fragmenta logica et physica*, SVF 2.1046 with attribution; Iamblichus, *De mysteriis* 1.9 (30.1—3) without attribution; Themistius, *In libros Aristotelis De anima paraphrasis*, 35.28—29 with attribution; and Julian, *Eiς τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν* 18 (178b), without attribution: πάντα γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ πάντα περὶ αὐτοῦς ὑφέστηκε καὶ >>πάντα τῶν θεῶν ἐστὶ πλήρη<<. Cf. a differently phrased view, also attributed to Thales, that the cosmos (κόσμος or τὸ πᾶν) is animated (ἐμψυχος/ον) and full of divine powers (δαίμονες). See Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 1.27 (=Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, no. 11 A 1, p. 68.28—29); Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, no. 11 A 3, p. 73.9; and Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 1.1.29b, vol. 1, p. 34.8—9 (Aetius, *Placita* 1.7.11; =Diels, *Doxographi graeci*, p. 301.21—23; =Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, no. 11 A 23, p. 79.33—34). A comparable saying: 'All things (πάντα) are full of spirits (ψυχαὶ) and divine powers (δαίμονες)' is ascribed to Heraclitus of Ephesus (fl. c. 500 BC); see Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.7 (=Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, no. 22 A 1, p. 141.11). Dupont is too negative about the possibility of tracing the phrase 'all things are full of gods' back to Thales (Dupont 1949, p. 465 note 1).

<sup>26</sup> Thales' notion that the cosmos is full of gods should be distinguished, though not radically (Dupont 1949, pp. 461—462), from the much discussed issue of the relation between fullness (τὸ πλήρες), empty space (τὸ κενόν) and all things (τὰ πάντα) in philosophers like Democritus (b. 460—457 BC; see Aristotle, *Physica* 1.5.188a, 19—23 [=Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 2, no. 68 A 45, p. 95.23—24] and Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, vol. 2, no. 68 A 44, p. 95.20—22); Aristotle (*De caelo* 312b); Chrysippus (c. 280—207 BC; see *Fragmenta logica et physica*, SVF 2.433, 2.469 and 2.545); and Alexander of Aphrodisias (public teacher of Aristotelian philosophy between 198 and 209 AD; see *In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria* 303.29—304.7). It has probably also to be set apart, though again not completely segregated, from what Lovejoy—in his classic lectures on the great chain of being (Lovejoy 1936)—called the 'principle of plenitude.' This is the doctrine, expressed in the final conclusion of Plato's *Timaeus*,

Philo, for instance, often made use of the notion of God filling the cosmos. In his view, God has filled the cosmos and has completely penetrated it: πάντα (...) πεπλήρωκεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ διὰ πάντων διελήλυθεν (*Legum allegoriae* 3.4). His omnipresence is repeatedly accounted for on the basis that he has filled all things.<sup>27</sup> He has left nothing empty or void of himself but has entirely filled the cosmos: θεοῦ μηδὲν κενὸν μηδὲ ἔρημον ἑαυτοῦ καταλελοιπότης, ἀλλὰ πάντα διὰ πάντων ἐκπεπληρωκότος (*De posteritate* 6). That God is thought to have filled the cosmos *with himself* is indisputably inherent in the notion of God or gods filling the cosmos but is also more overtly suggested in the last passage as it says that God has left nothing destitute *of himself* but has entirely filled the cosmos. It is made explicit in Iamblichus who, as we have already seen above, quoted Thales' saying at the beginning of his *De mysteriis* (1.9 [30.1—3]). Later on, Iamblichus says that God is all things, is equivalent to all things, and has

---

according to which this cosmos, by receiving all living beings both mortal and immortal, has become completely filled, a visible living being which encompasses the visible creatures, a perceptible God, who is the (visible) representation of the intelligible: θνητὰ γὰρ καὶ ἀθάνατα ζῶα λαβὼν καὶ ἔμπληρωθεις ἴδεν ὁ κόσμος οὕτω, ζῶον ὁρατὸν τὰ ὁρατὰ περιέχον, εἰκὼν τοῦ νοητοῦ θεοῦ αισθητός (*Timaeus* 92C). See Lovejoy 1936, pp. 45—55 on Plato's 'theorem of the "fullness" of the realisation of conceptual possibility in actuality' (p. 52), and pp. 61—66 on its full elaboration in Neoplatonism. Cf. Aelius Aristides (117—181 AD), *Oratio* 43 (Εἰς Δία: 'Regarding Zeus'): 'After he had separated matter and had prepared the Universe, he filled it with different kinds of life, creating them all in turn with a view to their harmony and with the care that there be no omission to prevent everything from being perfect and suited to each other' (*Oratio* 43.15: ὡς δὲ διέκρινε τὴν ὕλην καὶ κατεσκευάσατο τὸν κόσμον, ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα ἐξῆς ποιῶν σὺν ἀρμονίᾳ καὶ προνοίᾳ τοῦ μηδὲν παραλειφθῆναι τὸ μὴ οὐ πάντα πρέποντα καὶ τέλεια ἀλλήλοις; transl. Behr 1981). Whereas *Oratio* 43.15 is a clear example of the notion of cosmic plenitude, in *Oratio* 45 (Εἰς Σάραπιν: 'Regarding Sarapis') Aristides applies the notion of God having filled the cosmos as he states that Zeus has passed through everything and has filled the cosmos: διὰ πάντων ἦκει καὶ τὸ πᾶν πεπλήρωκε (*Oratio* 45.21). Cf. also Plutarch, who in his *De Iside et Osiride* says that the material of the cosmos is full (374B: πλήρης γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ ὕλη τοῦ κόσμου) and relates this cosmos to Plato's myth about the birth of Love out of Poverty and Plenty (*Symposium* 203B—204C). According to Plutarch, the material of the cosmos, which he identifies with what Plato called Poverty, was of herself utterly lacking in the Good but was filled (πληρουμένη) by him: Πενίαν δὲ τὴν ὕλην προσεῖπεν ἐνδεᾶ μὲν οὖσαν αὐτὴν καθ' ἑαυτὴν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, πληρουμένην δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (*De Iside* 374D). These passages suggest, as is probably already implicit in the conclusion of Plato's *Timaeus* (92C), that the notion of cosmic plenitude (*De Iside* 374B) and the idea of the cosmos having been filled with God/the Good at its creation (*De Iside* 374D) conceptually overlap to some extent. Dupont's lack of awareness of this overlap (Dupont 1949, pp. 461—468) may have led him to emphasize too much the Stoic character of the notion of filling the cosmos.

<sup>27</sup> See Philo, *De sacrificiis* 67; *De gigantibus* 47; *De somniis* 2.221; and *Quod deus immutabilis sit* 57.

filled all things *with himself*: θεός μὲν πάντα ἐστὶ καὶ πάντα δύνатаι καὶ πάντα πεπλήρωκεν ἑαυτοῦ (*De mysteriis* 3.19 [146.8—9]).

That this notion of God filling the cosmos was considered to derive from the pre-Socratic saying that all things are full of gods is apparent, for instance, from the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *De mundo*. In his discussion on the cause that holds the cosmos together, its author refers to what he calls an ancient theory, which all men inherited, that all things are from God and have been put together for us by God, and that no creature is of itself self-supporting if it is left without God's preserving influence (*De mundo* 397b13—16). On this account, Pseudo-Aristotle continues, some of the ancients were caused to say that all the things of this cosmos are full of gods: πάντα ταῦτά ἐστι θεῶν πλέα (397b16—18). This is a clear reference to Thales' saying.<sup>28</sup> According to Pseudo-Aristotle, however, the ancients used expressions which, although they fit God's divine power, do not fit his essence (397b19—20). In his view, God is he who preserves all things and begets all things in the cosmos, in whatever way they are brought about. But he does so, not by submitting to the trouble of someone who, patient of toil, works with his own hand, but by using an untiring power (δύναμις) through which he prevails over things which seem far off (397b20—24).<sup>29</sup>

This passage in Pseudo-Aristotle's *De mundo* makes it particularly clear that, first, the issue of God filling the cosmos was connected with the 'ancient theory' that all things are full of gods and, secondly, sometimes, though only rarely, this thought was critically modified inasmuch as not God's essence itself but only his indefatigable power was thought to fill the cosmos. In *De mundo*, as Merlan puts it, 'it is conceded (to the Stoa) that God is present in the cosmos, but only by his powers, which means that its pantheism of substance is replaced by dynamic pantheism: *panta theōn pleā* is true when it refers to *theia dynamis*, false if it refers to *theia ousia*.'<sup>30</sup> Taking the latter point into mind, it is rather surprising that

<sup>28</sup> Interestingly, in his Latin reworking of *De Mundo*, Apuleius of Madaurus (c. 125—170 AD)—as Beaujeu observed (Beaujeu 1973, p. 329)—rendered the Greek text πάντα ταῦτά ἐστι θεῶν πλέα (Pseudo-Aristotle, *De mundo* 397b17—18) as 'omnia Iove plena esse' (Apuleius, *De mundo* 343), thus adapting this Greek notion to his Roman public (cf. Virgil [70—19 BC], *Bucolica* 3.60: 'Iovis omnia plena,' and Aratus [c. 315—240 BC], *Phaenomena* 2—4: μεστὰ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἄγριαί, πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα καὶ λιμένες, translated into Latin by, among others, Terentius [b. 82 BC] and Cicero [106—43 BC]; on Latin translations of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, see Courtney 1996).

<sup>29</sup> Philo likewise says that God has altogether filled the cosmos with his beneficent power (δύναμις; see *De vita Mosis* 2.238). As we have seen, Philo nevertheless does not deny that God fills the cosmos with himself.

<sup>30</sup> Merlan 1967, pp. 131—132.

Christians did not normally modify the notion of God filling the cosmos in the way Pseudo-Aristotle did.

The first Christian who employed this notion, as far as we can tell from the surviving evidence, is the author of *Col*, as I already pointed out briefly in chap. 3.1.2 above. In the introductory prayer in part C of *Col*, he wrote that, at the beginning of creation, the entire fullness was pleased to dwell in Christ: ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι (*Col* 1.19). In part E on the Colossian philosophy, the author of *Col* elaborates on this idea by explaining that it is the fullness (πλήρωμα) of the divine nature (θεότης) which now dwells in Christ and has taken on in him the shape of the cosmic body: ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς (*Col* 2.9). Admittedly, the author of *Col* stops short of saying that the cosmos has been filled by God. It seems reasonable, however, to take his idea that in Christ the fullness of the divinity has taken on the form of the cosmic body as an abstract version of the Greek notion that the cosmos has been filled by God.<sup>31</sup> If it is true that this notion is already used in the introductory prayer in *Col*, then the author of *Eph* appears to reinterpret it in a most interesting and distinctive way in his own introductory prayer, as we shall see presently.

Apart from the authors of *Col* and *Eph*, many other early Christian authors took up Thales' notion. Clement of Alexandria (c. 150—211/216 AD) resembles Pseudo-Aristotle as he avoids saying that God fills the cosmos with himself. Rather, he holds that God fills the cosmos with his holy powers. According to Clement, Christians—in contrast to Athens, the rest of Hellas, and Ionia—see him as their teacher who fills the cosmos full of his holy powers in creation (δημιουργία).<sup>32</sup> But in his *Legatio*—a work defending Christianity and cast in the form of a letter to Marcus Aurelius (emperor 161—180 AD) and his son Commodus (co-ruler 177—180 AD)—the Athenian Christian apologist Athenagoras says, without restriction, that all things have been filled by him and are held fast by him: πάντα γὰρ ὑπὸ τούτου πεπλήρωται (...) πάντα γὰρ ὑπὸ τούτου κατέχεται

<sup>31</sup> See also Dunn 1994, p. 175. I am not convinced by Mußner's criticism of Dupont 1949: 'Für das Verbum πληροῦν bestehen "Parallelen", besonders in Verbindung mit der kosmischen τὰ πάντα-Formel, für πλήρωμα im Sinne unserer Briefe jedoch nicht (...). Aus den πληροῦν-Stellen einfach einen bestimmten (den kosmischen) Sinn von πλήρωμα abzuleiten (...) ist methodisch nicht gerechtfertigt' (Mußner 1955, p. 64 with reference to Dupont 1949, pp. 461—468 and 473—476).

<sup>32</sup> Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* 11.112: Διό μοι δοκεῖ, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἦκεν ὡς ἡμᾶς οὐρανῶθεν ὁ λόγος, ἡμᾶς ἐπ' ἀνθρωπίνην ἰέναι μὴ χρῆναι διδασκαλίαν ἐτι, Ἀθήνας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα, πρὸς δὲ καὶ Ἰωνίαν πολυπραγμονούντας. Εἰ γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ διδάσκαλος ὁ πληρώσας τὰ πάντα δυνάμεσιν ἁγίαις, δημιουργία σωτηρία εὐεργεσία, νομοθεσία προφητεία διδασκαλία, πάντα νῦν ὁ διδάσκαλος κατηχεῖ, καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἤδη Ἀθῆναι καὶ Ἑλλάς γέγονεν τῷ λόγῳ.



(*Legatio* 8.6). The author of the *Acta Ioannis*, a writing from the first half of the third century AD,<sup>33</sup> describes Christ as him who encompasses the cosmos and fills it: τὰ πάντα περιέχων καὶ πληρῶν τὰ πάντα (*Acta Ioannis* 108.9).

It is significant that all Christian, Jewish and Greek philosophical authors mentioned so far, with the sole exception of the author of *Eph*, use the notion of filling the cosmos to describe a factual and persistent status of the cosmos which has been achieved and maintained since its creation: the cosmos is full of gods or, alternatively, God has filled the cosmos with himself. The author of *Eph*, in marked contrast, is the only one who applies the notion of God filling the cosmos to signify a process during which the cosmos is increasingly filled with God or Christ.

This view that the cosmos is in the process of being filled with God or Christ is remarkable, not only because it runs counter to the common understanding of Thales' assertion that the cosmos is full of gods, but also because, in the first century AD, such a theology of process in which God is engaged in the filling of all things was, in Greek literature, not a matter of course. This is due to the fact that this theology presupposes a kind of identification of God with the vicissitudes of the cosmos which was commonly associated with Stoic cosmology.<sup>34</sup> As far as the conflagration theory was concerned, this cosmology was heavily criticised by its opponents. Plutarch (c. 50—120 AD), for instance, criticises the changes (μεταβολαί) which the deity experiences in the periodic cycles of conflagration (ἐκπύρωσις), when the fire sends forth the deity's own self with it, and the new order (διακόσμησις) which the deity re-establishes thereafter when he turns again into cosmos. According to Plutarch, such views are blasphemous since changes or vicissitudes never affect God (*De E apud Delphos* 388C—389D and 393E—394A).<sup>35</sup>

Against this background, it becomes clear that the author of *Eph* adapted Thales' saying in a most extraordinary way to express his own conviction that the cosmos is still in the process of being filled with God. This conviction, as we saw in the previous paragraph (see chap. 4.3.2 above), led him to modify the optimistic cosmology of the introductory prayer in *Col* with the aid of what Paul had written at the end of *1 Cor*. Instead of regarding the physical cosmos as put together in Christ (*Col* 1.17), filled with God (1.19) and entirely reconciled (1.20), as the author

<sup>33</sup> Schneemelcher 1989, vol. 2, p. 155.

<sup>34</sup> On the identification of God with the changes of the cosmos, see, e.g., Origen, *Contra Celsum* 4.14 (*SVF* 2.1052; *LS* 46H): 'Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ τῶν Στωϊκῶν θεός, ἅτε σῶμα τυγχάνων, ὅτε μὲν ἡγεμονικὸν ἔχει τὴν ὄλην οὐσίαν, ὅταν ἡ ἐκπύρωσις ᾗ· ὅτε δὲ ἐπὶ μέρους γίνεται αὐτῆς, ὅταν ᾗ διακόσμησις.

<sup>35</sup> For commentary on these passages, see Babut 1969, pp. 148—154.

of *Col* does, the author of *Eph* stresses the ongoing process of Christ's activity in filling the cosmos. This activity bears close resemblance to the process in which, according to Paul, Christ gradually subdues the principles and powers of the cosmos, a process which eventually ends with God being all in everything (*1 Cor* 15.23—28).

As a matter of fact, the author of *Eph* derives the notion of God having filled the cosmos from the introductory prayer in the structurally parallel part of *Col* (*Col* 1.19; see chap. 4.3.1 above) and supplements it with the phrase 'all in everything' (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν) which he had read in *1 Cor* 15. In *1 Cor* 15.28, the identification of God with all in everything signified that, as a result of the transformation of the cosmos, God is absolutely identical with the cosmos, which is absorbed by him, whereas during the phase of world order he is present in a part of the cosmos. According to Paul, this equation of God with all in everything is the eschatological outcome of a process during which the principles and powers of the present world order are subdued by Christ (*1 Cor* 15.23—28). By equating God first with all things and then pointing at his presence in all things, Paul seems to refer to the transformation of the cosmos and the new cosmic order beyond.

The author of *Eph* appears to follow him as he understands God *being* all in everything (Paul) as God *filling* all in everything. The eschatologies of Paul and the author of *Eph* are both future and not realised yet as they both reckon with an ongoing process during which the cosmos is brought under Christ's control.<sup>36</sup> In this respect, the author of *Eph* exhibits re-

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf., however, Lindemann 1975 who stresses *Eph*'s de-historizing eschatology to the extent that time is seen as dissolved. Luz 1974, with reference to Lindemann's then unpublished doctoral thesis (=Lindemann 1975), considers future eschatology to have lost its importance in *Eph* (Luz 1974, pp. 99—101, esp. p. 99). For a positive appreciation of Lindemann 1975, see also Walter 1997, pp. 263—265. Lona 1984 offers a critique of Lindemann's thesis and pays due attention to *Eph*'s future eschatology (esp. in chap. 3.1.2, pp. 312—354 and chap. 3.1.4, pp. 418—428). Yet, the distinction between temporal and spatial categories which Lona takes over from Lindemann does not seem particularly useful as it leads to the following confusing conclusions with respect to the eschatology of *Eph*: (1) a growing preponderance of spatial categories (chap. 3.1.3, pp. 355—418); (2) a fusion of temporal and spatial categories (chap. 3.1.2, pp. 312—354); and (3) an increased importance of the future temporal perspective (chap. 3.1.4, pp. 418—428). It is not the relation between temporal and spatial categories which seems decisive for the development of the eschatologies of Paul, *Col* and *Eph* but rather the attitude towards the cosmic powers. Although Schwindt 2002 grants that there is some future eschatology in *Eph* (Schwindt 2002, pp. 506—507), I disagree with his predominant view that the eschatology of the author of *Eph*, despite his use of *1 Cor* 15.23—28, is generally realised and differs from Paul's eschatological views: 'Während Paulus indes Christi Sieg als noch ausstehendes Endzeitszenarium malt, ist es für den Deuteropaulinen bereits Wirklichkeit' (Schwindt 2002, p. 431). Cf. Schwindt 2002, p. 366: 'Im

Paulinizing tendencies as his eschatology resembles Paul's. Their eschatologies are only dissimilar inasmuch as the future eschatology of *Eph* is not imminent whereas in Paul's eschatology the end was expected to take place within a few decades (cf. chap. 2.2.4 above). As a matter of fact, *Eph* holds a middle position between Paul and *Col*.<sup>37</sup>

In the process which the author of *Eph* perceives ahead, the church is allocated an important role as we will see later, particularly in parts NEW 1 and D. The church is the πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου; the church is fullness, in the sense that it is the locus where Christ's cosmic rule has already been realised. His influence on the cosmos is also progressively extending outside the church inasmuch as Christ—since his ascension to heaven, as we will learn in part NEW 2—is filling the entire cosmos. In the rest of *Eph* after the introductory prayer, it will become apparent that the church is to be actively engaged in this process. But first, in the remainder of the introductory prayer, the author of *Eph* concerns himself with the direct consequences for his readers of the evil which still remains in the cosmos.

#### *4.3.4 The adaptation of the introductory prayer in part C of Eph—second and last section (Eph 2.1—10): The remaining evil cosmic powers*

In the introductory prayer in *Col*, as we have already seen (chap. 4.3.1), the author says that the fullness of the divinity was determined, at creation, to take on in Christ the shape of a cosmic body and, later, to reconcile the cosmos through him (καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα) by making peace on the cross (*Col* 1.19—20). Subsequently, the author of *Col* adds that Christ has not only brought reconciliation to the cosmos but also to the Colossian readers, who were first alienated from God: Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους (...), νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν (*Col* 1.21—22).

---

Rahmen der eph Eschatologie, welche „die Fülle der Zeiten“ (1,10) als in Christus bereits verwirklicht sieht, wirkt d[as] frühjüdische Zwei-Äonen-Schema [*Eph* 1.21b: οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι] (...) befremdlich.' See further Schwindt 2002, pp. 359, 432, 450—453, 462—463 and 520. Cf., however, Schwindt 2002, pp. 360: 'das Streben nach einer immer größeren Verwirklichung des Seins ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ;' 468—469: 'Die Welteinung zu vollziehen, ist erst der Kirche aufgetragen;' and 506—507: 'In Eph tritt zwar wie bei Philo die apokalyptische Zukunftserwartung gegenüber einer topologisch-statischen Sichtweise zurück, doch ist die zeitliche Dimension, insbesondere der eschatologische Vorbehalt, keineswegs aufgegeben.'

<sup>37</sup> This observation has also been made by Dahl 2000, p. 458: 'In many respects it is Ephesians that holds a middle position between the undisputed letters and Colossians.' I disagree, however, with his suggestion that 'no line of development leads from the undisputed letter of Paul over Colossians to Ephesians.'

In the adaptation of the introductory prayer of *Col* in *Eph*, the author of *Eph* elaborates greatly on the period before his readers' conversion to Christianity. At that time, they lived in accordance with the present cosmos (κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου), by the favour of the ruler who—like the demons in contemporary thought (see chap. 3.2.2 above)—controls the air,<sup>38</sup> the spiritual being which still operates in those who are disobedient to God: κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας (*Eph* 2.2). Again, the author of *Eph* seems to modify the cosmology of *Col* by drawing on *1 Cor* where there is talk of the ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, the rulers of this passing age (*1 Cor* 2.6 and 2.8), and the πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου, the spirit of the cosmos (*1 Cor* 2.12).

According to *Col*, after the reconstitution of the cosmos in Christ on the cross, there are no evil cosmic powers left. The ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους, the power of darkness out of whose sphere of influence the Colossian readers were drawn when they were placed in God's light (*Col* 1.12—13), was active until Christ's death. On the cross, Christ was victorious over all cosmic principles and powers (*Col* 2.15). That is not to deny that sin has continued to be committed ever since. But, in the view of the author of *Col*, sin is a direct result of focussing one's thoughts on the things on earth instead of aspiring to the realm above (*Col* 3.1—2; 3.5). It occurs when human beings fail to differentiate, so to speak, between creation (κτίσις) and Christ as the firstborn of the entire creation (*Col* 1.15: πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως).

This failure manifests itself in the development of a cosmological philosophy which deals merely with the elements of the cosmos, but not with Christ (*Col* 2.8: ἡ φιλοσοφία [...] κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν), despite the fact that he is the body of the cosmos, and the head of all cosmic principles and powers (2.9—10). The individual adherent of such a philosophy fails to hold fast the head from which the entire body of the cosmos derives its growth: οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα [...] ἀξίζει τὴν ἀξίησιν τοῦ θεοῦ (2.19). The inevitable consequence of making the cosmos absolute and severing it from Christ, by fixing one's thoughts on the things on earth but not on those on high (3.1—2) is, according to the author, ethical misconduct (3.5). Christians will only be proven holy at their eschatological judgement if they persist in the faith as they were taught it (1.22—23 and 2.6—7). Only then will they partake in the eschatological glory (3.3—4). Thus, sin in *Col* is not instigated by evil powers but is effectively defined as the denial of Christ's hegemony within the cosmic hierarchy.

<sup>38</sup> On the Graeco-Roman background of this notion, see Schwindt 2002, pp. 383—384 and 370.

This is in marked contrast with *Eph*. Sin, as the author of *Eph* makes plain in the final section of his introductory prayer, is the direct result of evil cosmic instigators such as the demonic ruler who controls the air. These evil cosmic powers are still in operation since, until now, the cosmos outside the church is still only in the process of being filled with God. Although the author of *Eph* seems to make a bold statement when he asserts that his readers have been raised with Christ and seated with him in the heavenly realms (*Eph* 2.6), on closer inspection these realms are not necessarily a safe place as they are also home to the evil cosmic powers (3.10 and 6.12). It is clear from his introductory prayer, that—unlike *Col*—the author of *Eph* believes that Christ as yet has no absolute control over the powers of the cosmos though he has been given to the church as head of the cosmos. The church is the locus which has already been totally filled with Christ's cosmic rule, whereas the cosmos outside the church is in the process of being filled with Christ. In the remainder of his letter, the author of *Eph* wants to argue that an important role in this process is assigned to the church. To this end, in the following part he first introduces the church as such, irrespective of its role in the cosmic process.

#### 4.4 Part NEW 1—The first ecclesiological passage (*Eph* 2.11—22): Fellow-citizens of the household of God

After the introductory prayer in part C, which corresponds to part C in *Col*, the author of *Eph* does not immediately proceed to rework the subsequent part D of *Col*. First he inserts a new part in the structure which he copied from *Col*. This part is accordingly called part NEW 1. As was stated in the introduction to chap. 4, the author of *Eph* copies the entire structure of *Col* with the sole exception of part E on the Colossian philosophy which is left out, whereas three new parts are inserted at various stages. However, the first two of these parts, parts NEW 1 and NEW 2, contain large segments from part E which is nevertheless absent as a constitutive part of the entire structure. As stated above, the adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph* can be visualised as follows:

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E	---	F	G	---	H	I
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---	NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I

As I mentioned briefly at the end of the last section (chap. 4.3.4), in part NEW 1 the author of *Eph* introduces the church irrespective of its role in the process of filling the cosmos. This role of the church was hinted at in the introductory prayer and will be worked out in parts D and NEW 2 in particular. In part NEW 1, however, the author focuses on how the church originated from Christ's unification (2.14a—b) of pagans (2.11—13), like his readers, and Jews (2.14c—15a) into one peaceful ecclesiastical body (2.15b—16). In this way, Christ—in Isaiah's own words (*Isaiah* 57.18—20 LXX)—brought peace to those who were far off, the pagans, and those who were near, the Jews (2.17—18). No longer are the pagan readers alien foreigners (ξένοι καὶ πάροιχοι), who do not share the πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, the community and rights of Jewish citizens (2.12), but in the church they live together with the Jews as fellow-citizens (συμπολῖται) of one ecclesiastical community. They belong to the same household as they are all part of the household of God (οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ) and are built upon the foundation-stone of the apostles and prophets (2.19—20).

It has been said that the reasons for *Eph* are implicit in this passage and have to do with a deficient sense of identity among non-Jewish Christians in the post-apostolic period. They are ignorant of the church's origins and need, therefore, to reassess their relationship to Israel.<sup>39</sup> Alternatively, the passage has been understood as an apologetic historiography which answered the criticism that the Christian church was a new phenomenon and lacked ancient roots, by highlighting its Jewish antecedents.<sup>40</sup> It has also been perceived as a polemic against imperial propaganda of the pax romana: not the Roman state but the Christian church guarantees lasting peace between the nations.<sup>41</sup>

Although historiographic and polemical considerations, which cause the author to reinforce the communal identity of the Pauline churches, may have played a role in the writing of part NEW 1, it seems more likely that it is a statement about the origins of the church which serves as an introduction to the author's description of its function within the cosmic process. This function of the church was already alluded to in the introductory prayer (1.22—23) and is worked out in detail in parts D and NEW 2 which follow immediately after the present description of the church's origins. As we shall see in chap. 4.5.3 below, the way the author of *Eph* portrays the church in part NEW 1 as a community which grants citizenship (πολιτεία), and the members of which are fellow-citizens (συμπολῖται) who belong to the household of God (οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ), is perfectly compatible with his interest in the cosmos. The reason is that cosmos and citi-

<sup>39</sup> See Lincoln 1990, pp. LXXIII—LXXXVII, XCII—XCIII, 133, and 164—165.

<sup>40</sup> So Chadwick 1960, pp. 147—149.

<sup>41</sup> See Faust 1993, esp. pp. 117—121 and chaps 3—5, pp. 221—483.

zanship are also closely linked in the contemporary Stoic notion of the cosmic city on which he seems to draw. Part NEW 1 presents the church before its involvement in the cosmic process is commented upon in parts D and NEW 2.

Technically, part NEW 1 was developed in the following manner. As already said, it has no corresponding part in *Col* but is inserted within the structure which the author of *Eph* copied from *Col*. As in part NEW 2, the author nevertheless makes abundant use of a segment from part E of *Col* on the Colossian philosophy, which is the only part of *Col* which he leaves out as a structural whole. The author of *Eph* draws on this segment for his designation of the pagan and Jewish constituents of the church as, respectively, the uncircumcised (ἄκροβυστία) and the circumcised (περιτομή). Despite the fact that in part E of *Col* this pair of opposites is not used in an ethnic sense, because the term περιτομή (circumcision) is taken metaphorically, in *Eph* the same pair is now applied to signify the former ethnic differences between the pagan and Jewish members of the church (2.11). In *Eph*, the pagan past and conversion of the uncircumcised (2.11—13) are subsequently described in some detail by means of supplementary material from the end of the introductory prayer of part C in *Col*, on which the author of *Eph* had just drawn in his own introductory prayer. The segment from part E and the end of the introductory prayer of part C are again made use of when the author describes how pagans and Jews are peaceably unified in the church. Now Christ has ended the mutual ethnic hostility which was caused by the ordinances (δόγματα) of Jewish law, the two groups are reconciled with each other in him.

By drawing on the aforementioned passages in *Col*, the author of *Eph* again dismantles the notion found in these passages that the cosmos has already been entirely reconstituted in Christ. It is no longer the cosmos which is said to have been reconciled and made peaceful (*Col* 1.22) but the formerly conflicting ethnic groups (*Eph* 2.14—16). Nor has Christ triumphed in himself over the cosmological principles and powers (*Col* 2.15) and put an end to the validity of cosmologically-motivated doctrines (*Col* 2.14 and 2.20), but he has in himself ended ethnic hatred (*Eph* 2.16) and abolished the ordinances of Jewish law (*Eph* 2.15). This time, the author of *Eph* does not modify the cosmological views of *Col* by developing an alternative cosmology as he did in the introductory prayer in part C, but by neutralising them and applying the terminology in which they had been cast to describe the origins of the church.

These tactics of neutralisation do not reflect the author's lack of interest in cosmology in general. On the contrary, part NEW 1 introduces the church as such as a prelude before drawing attention, in the immediately succeeding parts D and NEW 2, to its function in the course of action

which Christ takes to become head again throughout the cosmos by filling it with himself.

#### 4.5 Part D—Paul’s ministry and the mystery revealed to him (*Eph* 3.1—21): The church’s mission to the cosmos

##### *Introduction*

In *Eph*, as we shall see shortly, part D is important in the author’s line of reasoning as it is in this part that he declares for the first time in what sense the church contributes to the restoration of the physical cosmos. The corresponding part in *Col*, however, on which it is modelled, is less essential for the train of thought which is developed in *Col*.

##### 4.5.1 Part D in *Col*

In *Col*, there is considerable continuity between part D (*Col* 1.24—2.7) on Paul’s ministry and the introductory prayer of part C which, in *Col*, immediately precedes part D. At the end of the introductory prayer, the author of *Col* has expressed his ardent wish that his readers may persevere in faith and not depart from the gospel as it was proclaimed to them, and to the spread of which throughout the world Paul had rendered his service (*Col* 1.23). Only then, if they persevere, will they finally be placed before God, holy, perfect and blameless (*Col* 1.22). In the following part D, the author substantiates his concern for his readers by explaining what service Paul rendered to the gospel during his ministry for the church (*Col* 1.25). He describes at length his efforts that they may appear perfect at the eschatological judgement (1.28; 1.22), the suffering and misfortune he experienced (1.24), and his increasing weariness of exerting himself in struggle for the Colossians, the inhabitants of neighbouring Laodicea and all others who have not encountered him personally (1.29—2.1).

In this way, the author of *Col* motivates his readers to persevere in faith. His struggle consists in fulfilling the task which God has assigned to him, that he should preach the mystery which God now wishes to reveal to those devoted to him (1.26—27a). In part D, the contents of this mystery are only mentioned briefly since, in this part, the author of *Col* only intends to prompt his readers to appreciate the uniqueness of God’s revelation as made known in the Pauline mission, and to induce them to show determination in their faith. The mystery itself is twice defined in a few words, the first time as ‘Christ among the nations, the hope of glory’ (*Col* 1.26—27: Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης) and the second time as ‘Christ in whom all treasure of wisdom and knowledge lie hidden’ (2.2—



3: Χριστός, ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοί). What this entails is made clear in the subsequent part E on the Colossian philosophy. In his refutation of the alleged wisdom (*Col* 2.23) of this philosophy, the author of *Col* develops his cosmic Christology along lines which he had already set out to draw in the introductory prayer of part C.

#### *4.5.2 The adaptation of part D in Eph: The global church and its mission to the cosmos*

The function of part D in *Eph* is very different. The main differences between *Eph* and *Col*, as regards part D on Paul's ministry and the mystery revealed to him, are threefold.

First, in part D in *Eph* no concern of Paul for his readers' perseverance is expressed. The interest which, in *Col*, Paul is said to take in the concrete Christian communities of Colossae and Laodicea (*Col* 2.1) is not repeated after the general account on the church's origins which the author of *Eph* has just given in part NEW 1.

Secondly, whereas in *Col* Paul has to make known the mystery, Christ, to all nations (*Col* 1.25—26), in part D of *Eph* the mystery is to be revealed in ever-widening circles which include the apostles and prophets, the nations and the cosmos. As in *Col*, there is a twofold definition of the mystery. In the first definition, the mystery consists of the incorporation of pagans and Jews into one ecclesiastical body (*Eph* 3.6: εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετόχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). This definition clearly evolves from the first definition of the mystery in *Col*, according to which the mystery is 'Christ among the nations,' although it is now cast in the terminology of part NEW 1 of *Eph*: in Christ, the Jews and the other nations have been integrated into one body (*Eph* 2.16). This integration, though, is not an end in itself but leads to something else. The mystery is progressively revealed to the apostles and prophets (3.3—4), among whom Paul belongs (3.3 and 3.7), and by him to the nations (3.8—9) which, as soon as they have been incorporated in the church, start to reveal the much-variegated wisdom (ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία) of God to the cosmic principles and powers themselves. In the second instance, thus, the mystery appears to consist of the divine wisdom.

The revelation of the mystery finds its final goal in the church disclosing God's wisdom to the powers of the physical cosmos. Eventually, also in *Eph*, the mystery proves to be of a cosmological nature. This is in line with the initial definition of the mystery in the thanksgiving in part B of *Eph*. There the mystery had been defined as the reconstitution of the entire cosmos in Christ (*Eph* 1.9—10: ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν αὐτῷ). This reconsti-

tution now appears to be enhanced by the church which reveals God's wisdom (σοφία) to the physical cosmos. Already in his thanksgiving in part B, the author of *Eph* had related wisdom (σοφία) to the disclosure of the mystery that eventually Christ would become head again throughout the cosmos (*Eph* 1.7c—10). In the introductory prayer in part C, he added that wisdom (σοφία) is necessary to understand God's action by which Christ was raised from the dead, installed above the cosmic powers and given as head over the cosmos to the church (*Eph* 1.17—22).

In fact, the wisdom which is said in part D to be disclosed by the church to the cosmic principles and powers (*Eph* 3.10) is the exact counterpart of the wisdom which, according to the second definition of the mystery in part D of *Col*, is hidden in Christ and, as is apparent from the following part E in *Col*, is also of a cosmological nature. An important difference, however, is that in *Col* this cosmological wisdom involves a cosmos which is held together in Christ and is his body, whereas the author of *Eph* modifies this idea by stating that this cosmological wisdom still needs to be revealed by the church to the cosmic powers in order to bring them around to accepting Christ's rule. In that sense, in *Eph* the contents of the mystery are perceived in a different manner than in *Col*.

It could well be that this changed understanding of the contents and final goal of the revelation of the mystery is hinted at and authorised at the beginning of part D in *Eph*. There, the author of *Eph* says that he has already written quickly about the revelation of the mystery to him; in reading this, they must be aware of his ("Paul's") insight into the mystery: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Eph* 3.3—4). It seems unlikely that he is referring here to the earlier mention of the mystery of Christ's recapitulation of the cosmos in the thanksgiving of part B (see *Eph* 1.9—10). If that were the case, it would be superfluous to state that they can notice Paul's intelligence when they read the passage referred to (ἀναγινώσκοντες), since they are currently reading the letter in question. Moreover, the author's initial stipulation of the mystery in part B as the recapitulation of the cosmos in Christ (*Eph* 1.10) is far too short and preliminary for him to claim that it is clear evidence of his insight into the matter.

I agree with Meade that the author directs attention to an earlier writing, rather than to the thanksgiving of *Eph*, and that the most likely candidate is *Col* where the mystery is first spoken of in the parallel part D (*Col* 1.26—27 and 2.2).<sup>42</sup> If that is true, the author of *Eph*, by explaining with

<sup>42</sup> Meade 1986, pp. 149—150. Like Meade, I consider it possible that the author of *Eph* refers to a different passage outside *Eph* (Meade 1986, p. 150). I consider especially *Romans* 16.25—27 to be a serious possibility. The idea that a mystery is made known by

more care and in greater detail in *Eph* what he himself had purportedly written briefly<sup>43</sup> or quickly<sup>44</sup> before in *Col*, authorises his own interpretation of *Col*. This makes even more sense if, as we shall see in chap. 4.8.2 below, the author of *Eph* conveys the impression that his letter is in fact the *Letter to the Laodiceans* mentioned in *Col* 4.15—16 which the Colossians were encouraged to exchange for *Col*.

In *Eph*, thus, the mystery is said to be made known in widening circles to the apostles and prophets, the nations and the cosmic principles and powers. It is the church which is engaged in the reconstitution of the cosmos by convincing its powers of the divine wisdom. In accordance with some strands of Graeco-Roman Judaism, wisdom (σοφία) is understood as a force which was present at the creation of the cosmos and helped in putting it together (*Proverbs* 8.22—31 LXX) and acted as artificer of all things (*Wisdom of Solomon* 7.21 LXX).<sup>45</sup> By making known this wisdom to the principles and powers of the cosmos, the church will make them aware that the divine wisdom is capable of permeating the entire cosmos again (*Eph* 3.10). This is the most important aspect of the reworking of part D in *Eph* and shows again that the author of *Eph*, despite his modification of *Col*'s cosmology, has not lost interest in the cosmos. On the contrary, it seems that his ecclesiology centres around the relation between church and cosmos, an issue which is raised again in part NEW 2.

---

means of revelation (*Eph* 3.3), the role played by prophets or prophetic writings in this respect (*Eph* 3.5), as well as the structure and contents of the doxology at the end of part D (*Eph* 3.20—21) are elements which part D of *Eph* shares with *Romans* 16.25—27, as the synopsis indicates. Yet, I am convinced that the parallelism between the structurally corresponding parts D in *Eph* and *Col* is of greater weight, so that the reference in *Eph* 3.3—4 is to part D in *Col*.

<sup>43</sup> LSJ 1215 s.v. ὀλίγος IV.3: ἐν ὀλίγῳ (χώρῳ): 'in a small place.'

<sup>44</sup> LSJ 1215 s.v. ὀλίγος IV.3: ἐν ὀλίγῳ (χρόνῳ): 'in a short time, quickly.' I prefer the rendering of ἐν ὀλίγῳ (*Eph* 3.3) as 'quickly,' since the actual descriptions of the mystery in part D of *Col* (1.27: Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης; and 2.2: Χριστός, ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοί) are hardly shorter than those in *Eph* (3.6: εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετοχὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; and 3.10: ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ). For that reason, ἐν ὀλίγῳ should not be understood as 'briefly' but rather as 'quickly,' with the connotation of 'less exactly' and 'being in need of clarification.' Such modifications of *Col* seem to constitute the reasons for *Eph*.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Lang 1999, esp. pp. 901 and 903 with reference to Kloppenborg 1982 on Isis as the model for Sophia in the *Wisdom of Solomon*. On the relation between wisdom and the cosmos in Graeco-Roman Jewish thought, see also Collins 1998, chap. 11, pp. 196—221. The cosmological meaning of πολυποίκιλος (*Eph* 3.10) is commented on in Schwindt 2002, pp. 368 and 464.

#### 4.5.3 The Stoic notion of the cosmic city

Thirdly, part D in *Eph* differs from its parallel part in *Col* inasmuch as the author of *Eph* adds a supplication to God (*Eph* 3.14—21) which does not occur in *Col*. In this prayer for his readers, he expresses two other cosmological views.

The first cosmological view is articulated in the address of the author's prayer to the Father (πατήρ) after whom all descendants (πατρία) in heaven and on earth are named. In this appellation of God as the Father of all descendants in heaven and on earth, the author of *Eph* makes explicit what he already presupposed previously in part D when he said that God's wisdom is to be announced by the church to the cosmic principles and powers (*Eph* 3.10). This presupposes that the cosmos is alive.

This presupposition that the cosmos contains living entities like cosmic principles, powers and forces is of course an idea which the author of *Eph*—as is particularly shown in his introductory prayer in part C (see *Eph* 1.20)—shares with the author of *Col* and Paul. The notion of the cosmos as a living entity is equally found in Greek philosophy. It lies behind Thales' view that the cosmos is full of gods, an idea taken up and adapted in *Eph*, as we have seen. It is also set forth, for instance, at the end of the *Timaeus* where Plato calls the cosmos a visible living being, a ζῶον ὄρατόν (*Timaeus* 92C). In the supplication which the author of *Eph* is now seen to add to part D, he makes this notion more explicit: those who make up the church are able to confront the cosmic principles and powers with God's cosmic wisdom (*Eph* 3.10), precisely because human beings and the principles and powers of the cosmos belong to the same lineage (πατριά) which goes back to God, their Father (πατήρ). This designation of God rationalises why, in the final analysis, the church can direct its preaching to the principles and powers of the cosmos themselves.

It might seem quite odd, though, that the church which in part NEW 1 has just been described in political terms as a common-wealth (πολιτεία) whose members are fellow-citizens (συμπολιται), not strangers (πάροικοι), but kinsmen who all belong to the household of God (οἰκέλοι τοῦ θεοῦ), is now, in part D, closely linked up with the cosmic principles and powers in heaven. According to the introductory prayer in part C, Christ's fullness which has already filled the church is now penetrating the cosmos with the aim of filling it, too (*Eph* 1.22b—23: καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου).

In this way, one might say, the community of the church is stretching out so as to include the cosmos. This notion of an ecclesiastical community which enjoys fellowship with the cosmos seems so unusual that an analogy with contemporary thought can add much to its clarity. In con-

temporary philosophy, a similar connection between citizenship (πολιτεία) and cosmos is made in Stoic theories about the so-called cosmic city.<sup>46</sup> This idea of the cosmic city is well expressed in a report which the Stoic philosopher Dio Chrysostom (c. AD 40/50—110), also called Dio Cocceianus or Dio of Prusa, gave to his fellow-townsmen of Prusa in Bithynia (Asia Minor) of a speech which he had delivered to citizens of Borysthene in Pontus.

In his Borysthentic discourse (*Oratio* 36), Dio addresses the issue of the divine city or government (ἡ θεία εἴτε πόλις εἴτε διακόσμησις), which he distinguishes from the notion of the mortal city (ἡ θνητὴ πόλις).<sup>47</sup> According to Dio, the cosmos is not only a living being (ζῶον) but, albeit in a non-literal sense, also a city (πόλις).<sup>48</sup> The present orderly arrangement of the cosmos is compared by the Stoics with a city because of the order and efficiency of its internal administration (διοίκησις) under which a great number of creatures come into being and pass away (36.30). Dio stresses, however, that citizenship (πολιτεία) of this cosmic city does not extend to all living beings without distinction, but only to those who have a share in reason and wise judgement: only they partake in the κοινωνία δαιμόνων καὶ ἀνθρώπων, the fellowship between gods and men (36.38). This fellowship is based solely on reason, which the human race (τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος) has in common with the divine (36.31).

This fellowship embraces, firstly, the first and greatest God (36.35: ὁ πρῶτος καὶ μέγιστος θεός; cf. 36.54), who is the wisest and eldest ruler and lawgiver (36.32), the leader of the entire heaven (36.32: ὁ τοῦ ξύμπαντος ἡγεμῶν οὐρανοῦ) and lord of being (36.32). He is the Father of gods and men (36.32: πατὴρ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων), the Father of the entire rational race (36.35: πατὴρ ἅπαντος τοῦ λογικοῦ γένους) or, alternatively, the Father of all who live in the 'house of Zeus' (οἶκος τοῦ Διός), his city (πόλις), the cosmos (36.36).

Secondly, this fellowship consists of the δαίμονες or θεοί, the gods (36.38), who—in contrast with the first and greatest God—are created (36.60) and are identified with the blessed gods in heaven (θεοὶ μακάριοι κατ' οὐρανόν), the stars that is, the fixed stars as well as the planets (36.22).<sup>49</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Cf. LS, vol. 2, p. 274, note on LS 46G: 'The conception of the world as a commonwealth or city is standard doctrine,' with reference to several passages in *SVF*.

<sup>47</sup> Dio Chrysostom, *Oratio* 36.27. The actual treatment of the cosmic city is found in *Oratio* 36.29—38. For literature on the Stoic idea of the cosmic city, see Schofield 1991, chap. 3, pp. 57—92 and Schofield 1999, chap. 22.7, pp. 760—768, esp. 767—768.

<sup>48</sup> Dio Chrysostom, *Oratio* 36.29—30.

<sup>49</sup> On the identity of the gods, cf. Schofield 1991, p. 76 note 23.

Thirdly, the fellowship of the cosmic city is shared by rational human beings (36.30—31; 36.38), though in fact only by those among them who are of sound mind, wise, and truly live in accordance with right reason (36.20—23; 36.38).<sup>50</sup>

This idea of the cosmic city, Dio concludes, introduces a far better and fairer legislation than that of a city like Sparta, according to which it was impossible for the helots, the Spartan serfs, to acquire Spartan citizenship, for which reason they continued to contrive against Sparta (36.38). Dio's clear inference is that the Stoic notion of the cosmic city precludes ethnic-social tensions between different populations as they are all offered citizenship of the cosmic city if they live in full compliance with its rational law. As Schofield observes, the idea of a cosmic city does not advocate a political system but points at a universal community, which is 'universal not in that it includes all mankind, but because it is made up of gods and sages wherever they may be: not a wider community, but a wholly different sort of "community". (...) In short, political vocabulary is depoliticized.'<sup>51</sup>

The similarities between the Stoic notion of the cosmic city and the views which the author of *Eph* expresses on God, the cosmos and the ecclesiastical community are immediately apparent. Of course, the most conspicuous dissimilarity is that whereas, according to the Stoics, there is fellowship in the cosmic city between the first and greatest God, the astral gods in heaven and the wise among the rational human beings, according to the author of *Eph* the cosmic principles and powers in heaven are not yet fully part of this cosmic community as they still need to gain more knowledge of God's wisdom (*Eph* 3.10). The distinction which the Stoics make between those human beings who are wise and are members of the cosmic city and those who are not is also applied, in *Eph*, to the principles and powers of the cosmos outside the church. The cosmic principles and powers have only been partially reconstituted, as Christ is still in the process of filling the cosmos. In this process the human members of the church are actively engaged insofar as they make those principles and powers aware of the multi-faceted cosmic wisdom of God.

---

<sup>50</sup> On the restriction of the membership of the cosmic city to the wise, see Schofield 1991, chap. 3.5, pp. 74—84, with reference to a fragment from Philodemus, *De pietate* on the third book of Chrysippus' *On nature*: ἐν δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ τὸν κ[όσ]μον ἓνα τῶν φρονιμ[ω]ν, συναπλειτευ[ό]μενον θεοῖς καὶ ἀνθρώποις (ed. of Philodemus' fragm. [*PHerc.* 1428] in Henrichs 1974; see p. 18, col. 7.21—26). The relevant passage Schofield renders as follows: 'the universe of the *wise* is one, citizenship of it being held by gods and men together' (Schofield 1991, p. 74; italics mine). See also Schofield 1999, p. 768.

<sup>51</sup> Schofield 1999, p. 768.

Despite this dissimilarity, it is clear that the whole logic depends on the Stoic idea of the cosmic community. The human members of the community seem to be able to address the cosmic principles and powers in heaven (*Eph* 3.10) because God is the Father (πατήρ) after whom all descendants (πατρία) in heaven and on earth are named (*Eph* 3.14—15): he is the Father (πατήρ) of gods and men (Dio, *Oratio* 36.32), the Father of the entire rational family (36.35), of all those who live in the cosmos (36.36), astral gods as well as men. In the Christian cosmic community, the non-Jewish nations no longer live separately from the Jews, unable to receive the grants of Jewish citizenship (*Eph* 2.12: πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ), just as the helots had no access to Spartan citizenship (Dio, *Oratio* 36.38). Now the Jews and Greeks are fellow-citizens (συμπολίται) as they are both οἰκέτοι τοῦ θεοῦ, of the same household of God (*Eph* 2.19), analogous to the helots and Spartans for whom citizenship of the cosmic city is available so that they can both enjoy their fellowship with the gods (Dio, *Oratio* 36.38).

Just as the cosmic city, in Stoic thought, is not absolutely identical with the cosmos but comprises God, the astral gods in heaven and those rational human beings who are wise, likewise the church in *Eph* does not exactly coincide with the cosmos: it represents the fellowship between God, the Christians, who want to live not as unwise (ἄσοφοι) but as wise men (σοφοί; *Eph* 5.15) who make the wisdom (σοφία) of God known to the cosmos (*Eph* 3.10), and, finally, a growing number of cosmic principles and powers which are increasingly filled with Christ.<sup>52</sup>

On this account, the church, even if it is introduced in part NEW 1 in political terms, is certainly not conceived of as a merely political entity. Schofield's conclusion that, in the case of the Stoic idea of the cosmic city, 'political vocabulary is depoliticized,'<sup>53</sup> also holds true for *Eph*'s ecclesiology. The church is not a political community, but—to paraphrase Schofield—a universal community; universal not in that it includes all mankind, but because it is made up of God, Christ, an increasing number of cosmic principles and powers, and Christian sages wherever they may be: they do not constitute a wider community, but a wholly different sort of community.<sup>54</sup>

For this reason, it is wrong to summarise the difference between *Eph* and *Col*, as is commonly done, by saying that *Col* is more concerned with

---

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Schwindt 2002, pp. 512—513, who speaks of the 'epouranisch[e] Sozietät,' although he refers to a different background in Jewish Enochic literature (pp. 367—369 and 512), which is supplemented (p. 464) with Graeco-Roman demonology (pp. 463—475 and 513—515).

<sup>53</sup> Schofield 1999, p. 768.

<sup>54</sup> Schofield 1999, p. 768.

cosmology whereas *Eph* focuses on ecclesiology. In fact, the ecclesiology of *Eph* is merely a function of its cosmic Christology.<sup>55</sup> The way in which the specific relation between the members of the church and the cosmic principles and powers in heaven is thought of in the author's supplication at the end of part D appears to have its analogy in the Stoic notion of the cosmic city in which the wise, the astral gods and God enjoy mutual fellowship.<sup>56</sup>

#### 4.5.4 The notion of cosmic dimensions

Apart from the appellation of God as the Father of the whole cosmic family (*Eph* 3.14—15) at the beginning of his supplication in part D, this supplication may contain a second cosmological view. This view is set forth as part of the author's actual request. The author says he prays God that his readers may be able to grasp with their mind the concepts of breadth (πλάτος), length (μῆκος), height (ὕψος) and depth (βάθος), as well as to perceive Christ's love (*Eph* 3.18—19).

I am inclined to follow Dupont's suggestion that the dimensions mentioned in the author's request are the dimensions of the cosmos.<sup>57</sup> Admittedly, the dimensions are not explicitly qualified as cosmic, but it would be too hasty to conclude that the breadth and length and height and depth of Christ's love are in view here. The author of *Eph* does not speak of the dimensions of Christ's love, but wishes that his readers may comprehend the various dimensions as well as that they may perceive the love of

<sup>55</sup> Cf. also Schwindt 2002, chap. 4. See, e.g., p. 399 on 'eine ekklesiologisch konnotierte, aber kosmologisch formulierte Christologie,' and pp. 468—469: 'Die von Gott zur Ökonomie beschlossene Heilwerdung der Welt (...) ist nach dem Verständnis des Eph durch Christi Auferweckung und Erhöhung (1,20) nur ermöglicht. Die Welt-einung zu vollziehen, ist erst der Kirche aufgetragen.'

<sup>56</sup> Cf. the Christianization of the notion of the cosmic city in Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 4.26: ἐγὼ δὲ ἂν ἐξαιήμην τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ περῶσαι με εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ τὴν ἐμὴν· λέγουσι γάρ καὶ οἱ Στωϊκοὶ τὸν μὲν οὐρανὸν κυρίως πόλιν, τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ γῆς ἐνταῦθα οὐκέτι πόλεις· λέγεσθαι μὲν γάρ, οὐκ εἶναι δέ· σπουδαῖον γάρ ἡ πόλις καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἀστεῖόν τι σύστημα καὶ πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ νόμου διοικούμενον, καθάπερ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑπὸ λόγου, ἀπολιόρητος ἀτυράννητος πόλις ἐπὶ γῆς, θέλημα θεῖον ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ: 'But I shall pray the Spirit of Christ to wing me to my Jerusalem. For the Stoics say that heaven is properly a city, but places here on earth are not cities; for they are called so, but are not. For a city is an important thing, and the people a decorous body, and a multitude of men regulated by law as the church by the word—a city on earth impregnable—free from tyranny; a product of the divine will on earth as in heaven' (transl. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson). Like in *Eph*, the heavenly, cosmic city of the Stoics is equated with the church.

<sup>57</sup> Dupont 1949, pp. 476—489. A similar interpretation of *Eph* 3.18 in terms of cosmic dimensions is offered by Dahl 2000, chap. 12, and Schwindt 2002, pp. 393, 444—447 and 466.



Christ. In the next part of *Eph*, one of these dimensions, the dimension of height (ὕψος), occurs again when the author quotes *Psalms* 67.19 LXX about an ascension to the heights (ὕψος) of heaven and interprets this ascent as the ascension of Christ who went up far above all the heavens (*Eph* 4.8—10).

For this reason, it is tempting to adopt Dupont's cosmological interpretation, though it is difficult to prove definitively that his exegesis is correct. Dupont bases his interpretation on three observations.

(1) Firstly, he points out that the terminology of breadth, length, height and depth can be used to indicate the movements of the heavenly bodies.<sup>58</sup> This is apparent from a passage in Plutarch (c. 50—120 AD), who uses this terminology to describe the apparent variations of the moon's motion in height and depth (τὰ φαινόμενα τῆς κινήσεως ὕψη καὶ βάθη), the deviations in latitude (αἱ κατὰ πλάτος παραλλάξεις) and the revolutions of the moon in longitude (αἱ κατὰ μῆκος αὐτῆς περιόδοι; *De facie in orbe lunae* 939A—B). As will become clear in due course, height (ὕψος) and depth (βάθος) appear to denote the same dimension. In an earlier passage in his treatise, Plutarch had used only the words βάθος (depth), μῆκος (length/longitude) and πλάτος (breadth/latitude) to give an account of the moon's motion. According to Plutarch, the moon does not move with a single motion but is called the Τριοδίτις, the goddess of the three ways, since she is born on the Zodiac in a contrary direction to the signs in longitude (μῆκος), latitude (πλάτος) and depth (βάθος; *De facie in orbe lunae* 937F).<sup>59</sup>

Dupont adds that this astral terminology is also found, in a slightly different sense, in *Romans* 8.38—39. In this passage, Paul expresses his strong conviction that no part of creation, including principles (ἀρχαί),

<sup>58</sup> Dupont 1949, pp. 479—480.

<sup>59</sup> Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae* 937F: καίτοι μίαν οὐ κινεῖται κίνησιν, ἀλλ', ὡς που καὶ λέγεται, Τριοδίτις ἐστίν, ἅμα μῆκος ἐπὶ τοῦ ζῳδιακοῦ καὶ πλάτος φερομένη καὶ βάθος. The terminology of height, depth, length and breadth can also be applied to the size of the cosmos itself, as is clear from an explicit identification of these dimensions with the cosmos in an anti-Christian treatise which partially survives in Macarius of Magnesia's *Apocriticus* (*Monogenes*) 2.15: τί δὲ καὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χώρῳ, πόσον ἢ ποῖον ὕψος ἢ βάθος ἢ μῆκος ἢ πλάτος; εἰ γὰρ ταῦτ' ἐν αὐτῷ, κόσμος ἐστὶ ταῦτ' ἔχων (ed. Harnack 1916, fragm. 72, esp. 72.16—17). Cf. Crafer's transl.: 'And what is there peculiar in that place in the way of quantity and quality, height and depth, length or breadth? For if it is possessed of these things, then it follows that it is a world.' This treatise might depend on Porphyry's *Against the Christians*. On the authorship of this treatise see, besides Harnack 1916, also Harnack 1911, esp. chap. 6, pp. 137—144 (Porphyry) and Barnes 1973, pp. 428—430 (not Porphyry but someone who may have relied on Porphyry, though only indirectly).

forces (δυνάμεις), height (ὑψωμα) and depth (βάθος), will be able to separate him and his fellow-Christians from the love (ἀγάπη) of God which is in Christ (*Romans* 8.38—39). As in the supplication made by the author of *Eph*, cosmic entities and the love of Christ are set side by side. Partly, the cosmic entities mentioned are the same, as both Paul and the author of *Eph* make mention of height (ὑψωμα or ὕψος) and depth (βάθος). It seems that Paul, who speaks of ὑψωμα, uses this word in its astrological meaning signifying the position in which planets are exalted in power and exert their influence fully.<sup>60</sup> The other term βάθος, consequently, functions as the equivalent of ταπεινωμα and takes on the meaning of the position in which planets decrease in power.<sup>61</sup> Paul seems to say that planetary influence will cause Christians no harm as it is powerless to separate them from God's love in Christ.

(2) Secondly, Dupont draws attention to a philosophical topic which he calls the theme of 'moving in heaven' (οὐρανοβατεῖν).<sup>62</sup> This theme he found in philosophers like Cicero (106—43 BC) and Seneca (4 BC/AD 1—AD 65), according to whom by contemplating the cosmos, its size and its dimensions man comes to know God, the mind of the cosmos, the totality of what is seen and unseen, the greatness greater than which nothing can be imagined.<sup>63</sup> In the same way, according to Dupont, the author of *Eph* believes his readers come to know the love of Christ by comprehending the breadth, length, height and depth of the cosmos. I shall return to this argument in a moment after I have mentioned and discussed Dupont's last observation with regard to the dimensions which occur in *Eph* 3.18—19.

(3) Thirdly and lastly, Dupont thinks it possible that the enumeration of various cosmic dimensions in the passages of Cicero and Seneca mentioned above has been influenced by technical formulas which are used for

<sup>60</sup> Cf. my comments in chap. 3.1.2 above on the term 'throne' in *Col* 1.16.

<sup>61</sup> For the planets' exaltation (ὑψωμα) and depression (ταπεινωμα) in power, see, e.g., Ptolemy (fl. between AD 146 and 170), *Tetrabiblos* 1.19. See further Bouché-Leclercq 1899, chap. 7.1.2, pp. 192—199 on exaltation and depression, esp. p. 194: 'une planète en "altitude" au premier sens du mot, c'est-à-dire plus rapprochée de la verticale, doit darder plus énergiquement ses effluves, "exalter" son influence. En "altitude" au second sens du mot, c'est-à-dire à l'apogée, elle est plus loin de la Terre, sans doute, mais on peut supposer qu'elle "monte" parce que sa vigueur propre est accrue, et que cette élévation ajoute à sa dignité, la réjouit, bref, la dispose à agir plus et mieux. Υψωμα signifie alors exaltation, accroissement d'énergie. C'est le sens astrologique du mot.' See also LSJ 1910 s.v. ὑψωμα 2; LSJ 301 s.v. βάθος 1b with reference to ταπεινωμα; and LSJ 1757 s.v. ταπεινωμα.

<sup>62</sup> Dupont 1949, pp. 483—487.

<sup>63</sup> Seneca, *Naturales quaestiones* 1, Praefatio 7; 1, Praefatio 12—13; and 1, Praefatio 16—17. See also Cicero, *Disputationes Tusculanae* 5.69—70; *De natura deorum* 2.153 and the opposite, Epicurean view in *De natura deorum* 1.54.

the description of particular objects.<sup>64</sup> Dupont mentions only formulas which comprise the three terms 'breadth' (πλάτος), 'depth' (βάθος) and 'length' (μῆκος).

It is important to note, however, that in mathematical studies contemporaneous with *Eph*, all four terms occur together, including the term 'height' (ὑψος). According to the mathematician and inventor Heron of Alexandria (fl. AD 62) and the Platonist Theon of Smyrna (fl. c. 115—140), these words together represent the three dimensions (διαστάσεις) of a cube. According to Heron, a cube is a solid figure that is made up of three dimensions, length (μῆκος), breadth (πλάτος) and height (ὑψος), which is the equivalent of depth (βάθος).<sup>65</sup> The formula τὸ μῆκος καὶ τὸ πλάτος καὶ τὸ βάθος ἢ τὸ ὑψος (length, breadth, depth or height) appears more than once in Heron's *Stereometrica*.<sup>66</sup> Often, formulas like τὸ δὲ ὑψος ἢ τὸ βάθος (height or depth) indicate that, in a three-dimensional mathematical model, depth (βάθος) and height (ὑψος) are equivalent.<sup>67</sup>

In general, then, the term βάθος stands ambiguously for either depth or height, depending on whether this dimension is measured upwards or downwards. But since ὑψος means straightforward 'height,' it naturally causes βάθος to indicate depth if both words occur together.<sup>68</sup>

I tend to think Dupont is right in concluding that the dimensions which are enumerated in *Eph* 3.18—19 are best understood within the context of contemporary philosophy in which knowledge of the cosmos is thought to contribute to man's knowledge of God.<sup>69</sup> More attention should be paid, however, to the specific way in which this general theme is adapted by the author of *Eph* to fit his purposes. In his supplication at the end of part D, the author of *Eph* prays God that his readers may be able to grasp the dimensions of the entire physical cosmos in order to come to know the scope of Christ's love which otherwise defies understanding (*Eph* 3.18—19). It is necessary for his readers to contemplate the cosmic dimensions as well as Christ's love since, as has been made clear earlier in part D, the readers

<sup>64</sup> Dupont 1949, pp. 487—488.

<sup>65</sup> Heron of Alexandria, *Stereometrica* 1.22: Κύβον μετρήσαι, τούτέστι σχῆμα στερεόν περιεχόμενον ὑπὸ τριῶν διαστάσεων, μήκους, πλάτους, ὑψους ἀκολουθῶς ἢ βάθους. Cf. Theon of Smyrna, *De utilitate mathematicae* 113.2—8: τούτων δὲ τὰ μὲν πάντη ἰσόπλευρα, τούτέστιν ἴσον ἔχοντα τὸ μῆκος καὶ πλάτος καὶ βάθος, ὑπὸ τετραγώνων ἴσων πάντων περιεχόμενα, κύβοι· τὰ δὲ τὸ μὲν μῆκος καὶ πλάτος ἴσον ἔχοντα, τούτέστι τὰς βάσεις τετραγώνους, τὸ δὲ ὑψος ἔλαττον, πλινθίδες· τὰ δὲ τὸ μὲν μῆκος καὶ πλάτος ἴσον, τὸ δὲ ὑψος μείζον, δοκίδες· τὰ δὲ πάντη ἀνισόπλευρα σκαληνά.

<sup>66</sup> Heron, *Stereometrica* 1.47 and 2.3.

<sup>67</sup> Heron, *Stereometrica* 1.47; 1.48; 1.49; 2.3; and 2.4.

<sup>68</sup> See LSJ 301 s.v. βάθος 1a and LSJ 1910 s.v. ὑψος.

<sup>69</sup> Dupont 1949, pp. 488—489.

have to address the principles and powers of the cosmos and to reveal the wisdom of God to them (*Eph* 3.10). The author's supplication to God for the benefit of his readers may be seen as a prayer which should enable the readers to accomplish such a gigantic task.

This supplication to God for the readers (*Eph* 3.14—21), which was not yet present in part D in *Col* but has been added by the author of *Eph* to his reworking of part D, appears to be congruent with his cosmology as we have come to know it. First, it corresponds with the core of part D (*Eph* 3.1—13), his idea—still absent from *Col*—that God's cosmic wisdom is announced by the church to the principles and powers of the cosmos (*Eph* 3.10). In his subsequent supplication, the author of *Eph* suggests that is possible to confront the cosmic principles and powers with this wisdom because Christians and cosmic powers are, ultimately, one cosmic family which descends from God, their Father (*Eph* 3.14—15). In order to convince the cosmic powers of God's cosmic wisdom, the church itself needs to be aware of Christ's love which is being extended to the entire physical cosmos (*Eph* 3.18—19). This is the process already alluded to in the introductory prayer in part C, the process in which the church, as the fullness of Christ, is actively engaged in Christ's operation to fill the cosmos with himself. By this process, the community of the church is extended to include the cosmos as well (*Eph* 1.22—23). In the next part, NEW 2, this process of filling the cosmos, in which the church participates, is focused on again.

#### 4.6 Part NEW 2—The second ecclesiological passage (*Eph* 4.1—16): The ascending Christ, the filling of the cosmos, and the church's active involvement

##### 4.6.1 General outline

Part NEW 2 is the second new part which the author of *Eph* adds to the structure of *Col* which he copied almost in its entirety, omitting only part E on the Colossian philosophy (*Col* 2.8—3.4). Since part E is omitted, part NEW 2 comes immediately after part D, as the following figure shows.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E	---	F	G	---	H	I
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---	NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I

As was the case in part NEW 1, in part NEW 2 the author of *Eph* again makes use of a large segment from part E in *Col*. Since after the adaptation of part D on Paul's ministry part E is replaced with part NEW 2, containing a large segment from part E, one could argue that part NEW 2 in *Eph* is the counterpart of part E in *Col*. That would mean that part E is not edited out of the structure of *Eph* but retains its place and is only reduced to a segment. This would be misleading, however, as the reduction is so severe that it is scarcely possible to claim that part E of *Col* is retained.

The most cogent reason, though, for saying that part E on the Colossian philosophy has indeed been eradicated, consists in the fact that part NEW 2 starts off as if it were part F. Part F of *Col* is concerned with ethical exhortations of the readers and consists of a specification of vices, from the practice of which the readers should desist (*Col* 3.5—11), and virtues which are endorsed by the author (*Col* 3.12—17). At the beginning of part NEW 2, the author of *Eph* is heavily dependent on a large segment from this endorsement in part F of *Col*, thus showing that having left out part E, he continues, naturally, with part F. He does not, however, deal initially with the vices which occur first in the ethical exhortations of part F in *Col*, but instead turns immediately to the later half of part F on the virtues. The author of *Eph* starts by duplicating the exhortation that the readers should practise humility, mildness and forbearance, and be patient with each other and recognise the importance of love (*Eph* 4.1—2; cf. *Col* 3.12—14). As soon as he reaches the admonishment that the peace of Christ, to which they have been summoned in one ecclesiastical body (σῶμα), may govern them (*Col* 3.15), the author of *Eph* begins to elaborate on that body and turns what started off as a reworking of part F into a new part, part NEW 2, the second ecclesiological passage.

Thus it appears that part NEW 2 is not the equivalent of part E of *Col*, but is a new part which the author of *Eph* developed after he had left out part E on the Colossian philosophy. Though part NEW 2 seems to originate as a reworking of the ethical exhortations of part F—not unexpectedly because after part E had been omitted part F was the next part which should be revised—the author of *Eph* changed it into part NEW 2. After part NEW 2, as we will see in due course, he turns straight away to part F in *Col* again and, this time, edits the whole of it in the corresponding part F. It seems that in part NEW 2, the author of *Eph* consciously drew on the enumeration of virtues in part F because they offered an opening for another passage on the church, especially as this list of virtues also contained a reference to the one body of the church.

After the author of *Eph* has taken over the endorsement of virtues which he finds in part F in *Col* (see *Eph* 4.1—2), he expands on the church and mentions all that unifies its members: not only do they constitute one

body, but they should also endeavour to maintain the unity of the Spirit as they are united by one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism and one God (*Eph* 4.3—6). Many of these confessional assertions are also made by Paul, especially in *1 Cor*, and are now reiterated here. Despite this stress on unity, at the same time the author of *Eph* makes an attempt to differentiate between the various members of the church by stating that to each of them God's grace is allotted in a certain measure (*Eph* 4.7). This statement, which again is part of Paul's ecclesiology as he declares that Christians receive gifts of God's grace which are different (*Romans* 12.6), is now substantiated by a quotation from the *Psalms* (*Eph* 4.8).

According to the author of *Eph*, God's grace is apportioned to each of the church's members in a certain measure, because 'by ascending to the height of heaven he captured a body of captives but gave gifts to men' (*Psalms* 67.19 LXX). In fact, formally, the rest of part NEW 2 is but an explanation of this passage which the author of *Eph* adduced to differentiate between the gifts of God's grace received within the Christian community.

#### 4.6.2 *Christ's ascension and the instruction of the church in its cosmic task*

Firstly, the author of *Eph* explains that he who ascended to the height of heaven is Christ, who, after he had previously come down to the lowest regions of the cosmos, the earth,<sup>70</sup> ascended far above all heavens so that he might fill the entire cosmos (*Eph* 4.9—10). Here we again encounter the notion of filling the cosmos (πληρώω τὰ πάντα) which was spoken of in the introductory prayer in part C (*Eph* 1.22—23) and proved to play a pivotal role in *Eph*'s cosmology (see chap. 4.3.2—4.3.3 above). It seems that the ascension mentioned in *Psalms* 67 LXX is so rich in imagery that it was almost natural that the author of *Eph* should employ this imagery to

---

<sup>70</sup> In my view, the contrast is between the earth (ἡ γῆ) in *Eph* 4.9 and the heavens (οἱ οὐρανοί) in 4.10. This contrast is all the author of *Eph* needs in order to argue that, when Christ ascended from earth to his place above all heavens, he set out to fill the entire cosmos (*Eph* 4.10). For this reason, I translate the phrase τὰ κατώτερα [μέρη] τῆς γῆς in *Eph* 4.9 not as 'the lowest regions of the earth' but as 'the lowest regions, i.e. the earth,' thus taking 'the earth' as a genitive of apposition. Despite its attractiveness, I do not share Kreitzer's view that 'the lowermost parts of the earth'—as he translates the phrase τὰ κατώτερα [μέρη] τῆς γῆς—are reminiscent of the Plutonium of Hierapolis (Kreitzer 1998). One can easily imagine, however, how the author of *1 Peter*, who was dependent upon *Eph* (see, e.g., Mitton 1951, chap. 17, pp. 176—197) could interpret the notion of Christ's descent in *Eph* 4.9—10 as his descent into Hades (*1 Peter* 3.18—22). The descent which the author of *Eph* has in mind is, in all likelihood, the descent of the pre-existent (*Eph* 1.3—4) Christ in his incarnation. His descent to the earth, prior to his ascent far above all heavens, is stressed in *Eph* 4.9—10 to highlight the cosmic scope of his activity.

illustrate, in a figurative sense, what he meant by Christ filling the cosmos. He did not mean, as the introductory prayer makes plain, that the cosmos was filled as soon as the ascending Christ reached the upper height of the heavenly realms. But Christ's resurrection and ascension are the start of the process during which, with the active involvement of the church as Christ's fullness, the cosmos outside the church is increasingly filled with Christ.

Secondly, the author of *Eph* makes clear that the gifts which the ascending Christ shares out are various forms of ministry, the ministries of apostles, prophets, preachers of the gospel, and, finally, shepherds and teachers (*Eph* 4.11). Apostles, prophets and teachers had already been distinguished in Paul's ecclesiology (*1 Cor* 12.28—29). This interpretation of *Psalms* 67 LXX serves to justify differentiations in the otherwise unimpaired unity of the church.

Thirdly, although Christ's gifts consist in the institution of a number of ministries, these gifts are given not to a few but to men in general. Consequently, the author of *Eph* argues that the sole aim of installing ministries in the church is the restoration, training and discipline (καταρτισμός) of all Christians (*Eph* 4.12). They need to be restored to a right mind. The need which the author of *Eph* feels for such a training is not surprising if it is the church, as he has just made clear in part D, which ought to make known God's multi-faceted cosmic wisdom to the principles and powers of the cosmos (*Eph* 3.10). The teachers (διδάσκαλοι) of the church (*Eph* 4.11) have to ensure that its members are no longer thrown into confusion and bewildered by different teachings (διδασκαλία) and illusions, but, as a result of their training, grow up to adulthood and indeed arrive at unity of belief (*Eph* 4.13—14; 4.5).

Only then, when they have been correctly instructed, and cease to be subject to other teachings and illusions but instead speak the truth, will they be able to cause the cosmos (τὰ πάντα) to grow up to him who is the head (κεφαλή), Christ (*Eph* 4.15).<sup>71</sup> This is the author's full explanation of

---

<sup>71</sup> There can be little doubt about the transitive meaning of the verb αὐξω (to increase; to increase in power; to strengthen; to cause to grow) here. Firstly, its object is τὰ πάντα (all things) which, throughout *Eph*, signifies the cosmos and should not be taken as an adverbial accusative ('in every way'). The last time the phrase occurred was just before in *Eph* 4.10, when the author of *Eph* spoke of Christ's ascent far above all heavens to fill the cosmos (τὰ πάντα). Secondly, as the synopsis shows, the phrase εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα (*Eph* 4.15) echoes the phrase τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν from the introductory prayer in *Col* (*Col* 1.16; 1.20) where the cosmos (τὰ πάντα) is said to have been created through Christ for him (εἰς αὐτόν), and God to have reconciled the cosmos (τὰ πάντα) through Christ to him (εἰς αὐτόν). Thirdly, τὰ πάντα is the object of αὐξω, and not an adverbial accusative, because in the corresponding passage in part E of *Col*, as the synopsis again indicates, αὐξω is also transitive (*Col* 2.19: αὐξει τὴν ἀδξησην). Fourthly, the

his conviction, which he has expressed as the letter's subject matter in the thanksgiving of part B, that eventually Christ will again become head throughout the cosmos (*Eph* 1.10: ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα; see chap. 4.2 above).

This subject matter first comes into view in the introductory prayer in part C where Christ is said to have been given by God to the church as head (κεφαλή) over the cosmos (τὰ πάντα; see chap. 4.3.2 above). This idea is disclosed in connection with the suggestion that the church, as the locus where Christ's cosmic rule has already been implemented, is to play a role in the process in which Christ fills the entire cosmos (*Eph* 1.22—23). After he has commented on the church's origins (part NEW 1), on its task of making known God's multi-faceted cosmic wisdom to the cosmos (part D), and on the institution of a number of ministries in the church which ensure that the church is properly trained and prepared for such a task (part NEW 2), at the end of part NEW 2 the author of *Eph* comes to a final explanation of the subject matter of his letter by saying that the church causes the cosmos to grow up to Christ. This the church probably does by exposing the principles and powers of the cosmos to God's cosmic wisdom (*Eph* 3.10 in part D).

#### 4.6.3 Critique of the notion of Christ's cosmic body

Whereas according to the author of *Col*, as he makes plain in his introductory prayer in part C, God has already reconciled the physical cosmos (τὰ πάντα) through Christ to himself (εἰς αὐτόν; see *Col* 1.19—20), in *Eph* the church is still engaged in causing the cosmos (τὰ πάντα) to grow up to him (εἰς αὐτόν), who is the cosmos' head (κεφαλή). Notwithstanding this ongoing process during which Christ becomes more and more the actual head of the cosmos, the author of *Eph* nevertheless refuses to regard the

---

observation that ἀξω must be intransitive because the author of *Eph* contrasts the growth of his readers with their childish state before (4.14—15: ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι, κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης, ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀβήσωμεν εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα) is not convincing. The contrast he makes is rather between their childish state on the one hand and the maturity and the measure of the full stature of Christ on the other (4.13—14: μέχρι καταστήσωμεν οἱ πάντες [...] εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι), and between deceit and speaking truth (4.14—15: κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης, ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ). Finally, Lincoln's objection that '(nowhere) else in Ephesians is there talk of the church's active influence on the cosmos, and nowhere else is the cosmos said to grow up to Christ' (Lincoln 1990, p. 260; cf. Merklein 1973, p. 111) ignores the fact that, according to the immediately preceding part D in *Eph*, the church makes known the cosmic wisdom of God to the cosmic principles and powers in heaven (*Eph* 3.10; see chap. 4.5 above).



cosmos as his body. This may be the most essential difference between *Eph* and *Col*. According to the author of *Eph*, the entire ecclesiastical body takes its growth from Christ. This body, which is joined and knitted together by every constituent ligament, builds itself up thanks to the performance of each separate part (*Eph* 4.15—16). In this passage—as the synopsis indicates—the author of *Eph* depends heavily on a large segment from part E in *Col*, although the divergence of the author of *Eph* is significant.

In *Col*, the author argues that the adherents of the Colossian philosophy do not hold fast to Christ as head of the cosmos, despite the fact that the entire body of the cosmos, which is supplied with bindings (ἀφαι) and bonds (σύνδεσμοι) which hold it together, derives its divine growth from him (*Col* 2.19). In his view, as he has already made clear in his introductory prayer in part C and repeated at the beginning of his refutation of the Colossian philosophy in part E, in Christ the invisible God took on the shape of the perceptible body of the cosmos; after some sort of temporary instability of the cosmos, the entire cosmos has become reconciled, is held together in Christ and is (again) considered to be his body (*Col* 1.15—17; 1.19—20; 2.9—10). At present, the cosmos is entirely coherent, not only because it has been put together in Christ (*Col* 1.17b), but also because its body is held together by bonds (σύνδεσμοι; see *Col* 2.19). As I have shown in chap. 1.2.6 above, the notion of bonds which hold together the body of the cosmos is a tradition which can be traced back, via contemporary Middle Platonism and Platonizing Stoicism, to Plato's *Timaeus* (*Timaeus* 31B—32C). Since the author of *Col* is convinced that the cosmos is the body of Christ in which the invisible God has become perceptible, he also regards the growth of this body as divine growth, an ἀξίησις τοῦ θεοῦ (*Col* 2.19).

In *Eph*, the entire idea that the cosmos is the body of Christ, is held together by bonds, and grows as an essentially divine organism, is dropped. As such, the notion of cosmic coherence as a result of bonds which hold the cosmos together is not incompatible with the interest which the author of *Eph* takes in the concept of filling the cosmos. In Greek literature, the latter concept is often applied alongside other notions which are used to assert that the cosmos is coherent. In the first century AD, Philo of Alexandria says that all things have been filled by God, who encompasses (περιέχων) but is not encompassed (*De confusione* 136), who holds the elements together (συνέχων) and has completely filled the cosmos (*De vita Mosis* 2.238). According to Philo, if things which are porous and spongy of themselves nevertheless become dense, this is due to the fact that they are tightened up by the divine Word, which is a glue and bond (δεσμός), filling all things with his being (πάντα τῆς οὐσίας ἐκπε-

πληρωκώς; see *Quis rer. div. heres* 188).<sup>72</sup> This last passage is a perfect example of the compatibility of the notion of cosmic bonds, which is employed by the author of *Col* in his description of the coherence of the cosmic body (*Col* 2.19), and that of filling the cosmos, which is used in *Eph* (*Eph* 1.23; 4.10). Despite the different backgrounds of these concepts, they do not contradict each other and are actually interchangeable.

What makes them incompatible in the case of *Eph*, is that the author uses the concept of filling the cosmos to signify a process instead of a factual status. In his view, only the church is Christ's body. The cosmos is not yet the body of Christ since it is still being brought under Christ's cosmic rule. Whereas the concept of filling the cosmos can be used in a gradual sense to indicate a process during which all things are increasingly filled with God, the idea that the cosmos is Christ's body and the notion of bonds which bind this cosmic body together can not. It would be impossible to say that God is, at present, tying up the cosmos by fastening bonds around it; the cosmos either is Christ's body or is not. For that reason, in part NEW 2 in *Eph* the term 'body' (σῶμα) no longer stands for the cosmos but is interpreted as the body of the church. The notion of cosmic bonds (σύνδεσμοι), by which the body of the cosmos is held together, is left out completely.

Owing to the fact that the cosmos is not yet Christ's body, the author of *Eph* also drops the idea that the growth of this cosmic body is divine. This has nothing to do with a supposed critique of the pantheistic cosmology of *Col*, since the cosmology of both *Eph* and *Col* is best characterised as pantheism, even though this term was only coined in the nineteenth century. Their views are pantheistic because, while maintaining that the cosmos is dependant on God and God is transcendent, they nevertheless think that in Christ the invisible God took on the shape of the visible cosmic body (*Col*) and that Christ is currently filling the cosmos with himself

---

<sup>72</sup> Philo, *Quis rerum divinarum heres*, 188: χάρις γὰρ τὰ τε ἄλλα ἐξ ἑαυτῶν, εἰ δὲ πού καὶ πυκνωθεῖη, λόγῳ σφίγγεται θεῶ. κόλλα γὰρ καὶ δεσμός οὗτος πάντα τῆς οὐσίας ἐκπεπληρωκώς. For another example of a passage in which the concept of filling the cosmos occurs in combination with other expressions of cosmic coherence, see, e.g., Iamblichus, *De mysteriis* 1.9 (31.13—32.7): Τὸ δ' ἔστιν ἐν καὶ αὐτὸ πανταχοῦ ὅλως, ἀμερίστως τε πάρεσι πᾶσι τοῖς δυναμένοις αὐτοῦ μετέχειν, παντελεῖ τε δυνάμει πεπλήρωκε πάντα, καὶ ἀπειρῶ δὴ τινη τῇ κατὰ αἰτίαν ὑπεροχῇ συμπεραίνει τὰ ὅλα ἐν αὐτῷ, συνήνωται τε πανταχοῦ πρὸς ἑαυτὸ καὶ τὰ τέλη ταῖς ἀρχαῖς συνάπτει· ὅπερ δὴ καὶ ὁ σύμπας μιμούμενος οὐρανός καὶ κόσμος τὴν ἐγκύκλιον περιφορὰν περιπολεῖ, συνήνωται τε πρὸς ἑαυτόν, καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα κατὰ κύκλον περιδινούμενα ποδηγεῖ, πάντα τε ἐν ἀλλήλοις ὄντα καὶ πρὸς ἄλληλα φερόμενα συνέχει, μέτροις τε τοῖς ἰσοῖς ἀφορίζει καὶ τὰ πορρωτάτω διωκισμένα, καὶ τὰς τελευταῖς ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ὡς γῆν οὐρανῷ συγκεῖσθαι ποιεῖ, μίαν τε συνέχειαν καὶ ὁμολογίαν τῶν ὅλων πρὸς ὅλα ἀπεργάζεται.

(*Eph*; see chap. 4.3.3 above).<sup>73</sup> The reason for the author of *Eph*'s discarding the concept of a divine growth of the cosmos is the fact that, in his view, despite the influence which Christ exerts on the cosmos, it still falls short of being his body.

Under the present circumstances, Christ's only body is the church, in which Christ's rule over the cosmos has already been implemented; the church is full, whereas the cosmos is still being filled with Christ (part C). In this process of filling the cosmos, the church—which came into being when Christ incorporated pagans and Jews into one body (part NEW 1)—participates by heralding God's cosmic wisdom, God's agent in creation, to the principles and powers of the cosmos (part D). Only when the church has been properly instructed, is it competent to cause the cosmos to grow up to Christ, thus connecting it with its cosmic head so that, eventually, the cosmos will become Christ's body as well (part NEW 2). At that moment, Christ will truly have become head throughout the cosmos (part B).

Now that the letter's subject matter, which was given with the announcement that eventually Christ will sum up the entire cosmos as head (part B), has been worked out to its fullest extent, its line of thought seems to have reached its end. This, however, is not the case.

After finishing part NEW 2, the author of *Eph* continues with his reworking of the ethical exhortations of part F (*Col* 3.5—17) and the instructions for managing a Christian household in part G (*Col* 3.18—4.1).<sup>74</sup> But after his elaborate adaptation of parts F (*Eph* 4.17—5.20) and G (*Eph* 5.21—6.9), he deems it necessary to remind his readers of the letter's cen-

<sup>73</sup> See the definition of panentheism in Dierse and Schröder 1989.

<sup>74</sup> In *Eph*, the ethical exhortations of part F are preceded by a new introduction (*Eph* 4.17—18) which is designed to move from the positive description of the church in the immediately preceding part NEW 2 to the vices which the author of *Col* mentions at the beginning of part F (*Col* 3.5—9). Such an introduction is not needed in *Col* since these vices illustrate the ethical consequences of the wrong cosmology spoken of in part E. In his introduction, the author of *Eph* contrasts the cognitive failure of the pagans—who are characterised by the folly of their mind (ματαιότης τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν), unclear thought (ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ) and ignorance (ἄγνοια)—with the correct instruction of the church, which enables people to speak the truth (see *Eph* 4.12—15 in part NEW 2). The order of vices (*Col* 3.5—11) and virtues (*Col* 3.12—15) in part F of *Col* is developed into a treatment of vices (*Eph* 4.19—31), virtues (*Eph* 4.32—5.2) and vices again (*Eph* 5.3—18); this tripartite passage is now interspersed with material from Paul's authentic letters and some books of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek. Both parts end with an exhortation to Christian hymn singing (*Col* 3.16—17; *Eph* 5.19—20). In his second treatment of vices (*Eph* 5.3—18), the author of *Eph* draws extensively on Paul's distinction between light and darkness (2 *Cor* 6.14; 1 *Thess* 5.4—7), which now seems to pave the way for his description of 'the cosmic rulers of this darkness' (οἱ κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου) in part NEW 3 (see *Eph* 6.12). His ecclesiological interest resurfaces in his reworking of the household instructions in part G (see *Eph* 5.23—24; 5.25—30).

tral theme in the last new part which he inserts into the structure copied from *Col*, part NEW 3. This is shown in the following figure.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E	---	F	G	---	H	I
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---	NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I

#### 4.7 Part NEW 3—The fight against the cosmic rulers (*Eph* 6.10—17)

In part NEW 3, the author of *Eph* returns to the relationship between church and cosmos. So far, the church has been seen as engaged in announcing God's cosmic wisdom to the cosmic principles and powers (part D) and causing the cosmos to grow up to its cosmic head (part NEW 2).

This time, in a part which the author of *Eph* adds to the structure of his model, the Christians are urged to put on God's full armour (*πανοπλία*), i.e. breastplate, shield, helmet and sword, which symbolise, respectively, righteousness, faith, deliverance and God's spoken word.

The notion of putting on such spiritual items like armour is a well-known theme which occurs in Paul (*1 Thess* 5.8) and the *Wisdom of Solomon* (*Wisdom of Solomon* 5.17—18a LXX) and seems to derive from *Isaiah* (*Isaiah* 59.17 and 21 LXX). In these writings, the armour is worn by God or the Christian believers in order to intervene on earth to end injustice and oppression, to fight enemies or to live a Christian life. It is never used to combat the powers of the cosmos. Paul, of course, says that the weapons of his war are not 'fleshly' (*2 Cor* 10.4), just as the author of *Eph* believes that the fight of the Christians is not against flesh and blood (*Eph* 6.12), but Paul undertakes his campaign to demolish the strongholds of reason and thought and to bring them in line with the knowledge of God (*2 Cor* 10.4—5).

In part NEW 3, however, the strife is against the principles (*ἀρχαί*) and powers (*ἐξουσίαι*) of the cosmos, against the rulers of the cosmos (*κοσμοκράτορες*) and the wicked spiritual beings in the heavenly realms. These beings even threaten the readers who, on their conversion, have been resurrected and placed (in a figurative yet powerful sense) with Christ in the heavenly realms (*Eph* 2.6). The spiritual beings are explicitly identified as *κοσμοκράτορες*, as rulers of the cosmos. In Greek literature,

such rulers are sometimes conceived of as the planets.<sup>75</sup> According to Iamblichus (c. 245—325 AD), in the hierarchy of demons (δαίμονες), angels (ἄγγελοι), gods (θεοί), archangels (ἀρχάγγελοι), and rulers (ἄρχοντες), the rulers are οἱ κοσμοκράτορες οἱ ὑπὸ σελήνην στοιχεῖα διοικούντες, the rulers of the cosmos who control the elements under the moon (*De mysteriis* 2.3 [70.18—71.6]).

The idea that the fight against the cosmic principles and powers and the rulers of the cosmos is still in progress is in marked contrast with the view expressed by the author of *Col* in his refutation of the Colossian philosophy in part E, which was, significantly, omitted out from *Eph*. According to him, Christ has already led the principles (ἀρχαί), powers (ἐξουσίαι) and elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) in triumph (θριαμβεύσας) and fully integrated them again into his cosmic body (*Col* 2.8—10 and 2.15).

In the view of the author of *Eph*, though, the decisive triumph over the physical cosmos has not yet come about because the confrontation with the cosmic powers, in which the church is actively engaged, still continues. At first glance, some discrepancy might be felt between the show of belligerence in part NEW 3 on the one hand, and the more tranquil notions of announcing God's wisdom to the principles and powers of the cosmos (part D) and causing the cosmos to grow up to its head (part NEW 2) on the other.

Yet this disparity is not significant since the armour which the church puts on is not meant to destroy the opponents, though the fight is heavy. The armour consists of spiritual entities such as truth (ἀλήθεια), peace (εἰρήνη) and the spoken word of God (ῥῆμα θεοῦ). Such things are indispensable for the confrontation of the principles and powers of the cosmos with God's wisdom. This wisdom, which is made known (*Eph* 3.10) to the cosmos by speaking the truth (*Eph* 4.15: ἀληθεύοντες), will eventually transfer the physical cosmos into a harmonious and peaceful whole.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>75</sup> See, e.g., Vettius Valens, *Anthologiae* 7.6 (p. 265.26—27); 8.7 (p. 301.10—11: the sun); and 9.16 (p. 345.10—14: the sun and moon; written between 152 and 162 AD).

<sup>76</sup> This optimism is emphasized by Schwindt 2002 and contrasted with incipient Gnosticism. See, e.g., Schwindt 2002, pp. 360: 'Daß Eph nicht zur Weltflucht aufruft, sondern zur Auseinandersetzung mit ihr, besonders ihrem σκότος, setzt ihn deutlich ab von dem gnostischen Weltverständnis, das die Welt als an die bösen Mächte unwiederbringlich verloren betrachtet. Die Schöpfungstheologie des Eph, die die Welt trotz ihrer Fragilität in all ihren Teilen als Gottes Werk bejahen kann, vermag einer Weltverachtung gnostischer Prägung noch zu wehren;' and 368: 'Ob (...) Eph die Weisheitsoffenbarung der Ekklesia an die bösen Engel als Unheilsverkündigung versteht, ist allerdings fraglich. Da das ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι des Alls in Christus (1,10) als Vollendung und Heilung der Schöpfung gedacht ist, dürfte es auch die himmlischen Mächte prinzipiell miteinschließen;' chap. 4.5, esp. p. 508: 'Die (...) Kosmologisierung des christlichen Kerygmas

After his adaptation of the extensive ethical instructions of part F and G, in part NEW 3 the author of *Eph* wanted to bring the letter's subject matter home to his readers and to remind them, for the last time, of the church's active role in filling the cosmos. After he has taken over the short part H (*Col* 4.2—6), almost without adaptation, and reiterated its request for intercessory prayers for the dissemination of the mystery (*Eph* 6.18—20), the author of *Eph* comes to the conclusion of his letter.<sup>77</sup>

#### 4.8 Part I—Ending: Personal matters, a note on the messenger, and greetings (*Eph* 6.21—24)

##### 4.8.1 General outline

The conclusion of *Eph* is significant because it contains an extensive note on the alleged bearer of the letter, Tychicus, the beloved brother and trustworthy servant in the Lord, who will tell the addressees in detail all things which concern Paul. Paul has sent him to them on purpose, so that they may hear how Paul is, and so that Tychicus may encourage them. This note on the messenger is taken from the corresponding part in *Col* (*Col* 4.7—18) and was only lightly edited, as one can see from the synopsis below. It is the most extensive literary parallel between *Eph* and *Col* and this seems to have been intended (See Table 1).

Whereas the author of *Col* says that all Paul's personal matters will be made known to his readers by Tychicus, the beloved brother and trustwor-

---

will Antwort geben auf die sich im Bereich des Judentums und weit darüberhinaus abzeichnende Welt- und Gottesentfremdung, die den All-Got in eine weltferne und tatenlose Transzendenz entrückt sieht. Die Weltbejahung des Deuteropaulinen, die Himmlisches und Irdisches als von dem erhöhten Christus-Logos zusammengeführt und pazifiziert weiß, ist für spätere „Paulinen“ jedoch nicht mehr leichthin nachvollziehbar;’ and p. 520: ‘Der vom Deuteropaulinen (...) hergestellte positive Bezug der Christologie zur Schöpfung ist keineswegs selbstverständlich. (...) D[ie] pessimistische Weltsicht, die das Heil für die Schöpfung erst nach deren völliger Vernichtung für möglich hält, ist Eph fremd. Die auf den Christus-Logos hin wachsende Kirche bezieht den Kosmos mit ein in die alle Gegensätze aufhebende Einheit am Ort des Logos.’

<sup>77</sup> Parts H and I of *Eph* are the only parts in the structure of *Eph* which are shorter than their corresponding parts in *Col*. In part H, this is due to the fact that the author of *Eph*, in his reworking and restructuring of *Col*, regards the two ethical exhortations at the end of part H (*Col* 4.5 and 4.6) as out of place in this part, which is a request for intercessory prayers for the dissemination of the mystery (*Col* 4.2—4). He transfers these exhortations to where he considers them to belong, among the ethical exhortations of part F (see *Eph* 5.15—16 and 4.29 respectively). This is again an example of the posteriority of *Eph* as well as of the deliberateness which characterises the reworking of *Col* by the author of *Eph*.

thy helper and fellow-servant in the Lord, whom Paul sent to them for the express purpose that they may come to know his particulars and that Tychicus may encourage them (*Col* 4.7—8), the author of *Eph* adds something at the beginning. According to him, Paul sends Tychicus in order that they, too, may know (ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε) his personal matters and what he experiences (τί πράσσω). As we shall see in due course, this change—though unimportant in itself—might accord with the fact that the author of *Eph* viewed his letter as secondary to *Col*: not only the Colossians, but also the readers of *Eph* (καὶ ὑμεῖς), are to be informed of Paul's vicissitudes. The sole difference in the rest of the note on Tychicus is that he is no longer characterised as a fellow-servant (σύνδουλος).

Table 1. The notes on the messenger in *Eph* and *Col*

<i>Eph</i> 6.21—22	<i>Col</i> 4.7—9
6.21 ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, τί πράσσω, πάντα γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικός ὁ ἀγαπητός ἀδελφός καὶ πιστός διάκονος ἐν κυρίῳ, 6.22 ὃν ἐπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ παρακαλέση τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν.	4.7 Τὰ κατ' ἐμέ πάντα γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικός ὁ ἀγαπητός ἀδελφός καὶ πιστός διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος ἐν κυρίῳ, 4.8 ὃν ἐπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ παρακαλέση τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν.

After this note on the letter's messenger, the author of *Eph* not only leaves out a list of six fellow-Christians who send their greetings to the community in Colossae (*Col* 4.10—14), but also omits Paul's requests to the Colossian congregation. Paul asks them to pass his greetings to the Christians at neighbouring Laodicea, to Nympha and the congregation that meets at her house (*Col* 4.15) and to take care that, once the letter to the Colossians has been read in Colossae, it is also read in the Laodicean congregation and exchanged for the letter received by the Laodiceans, so that the Colossians may come to know the letter to the Laodiceans as well (*Col* 4.16): Ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐν Λαοδικεῖα ἀδελφοὺς καὶ Νύμφαν καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν. καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῆ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ (=the *Letter to the Colossians*), ποιήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῆ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας (=the *Letter to the Laodiceans*) ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε (*Col* 4.15—16).

#### 4.8.2 *Eph as the Letter to the Laodiceans*

Although it is understandable that the author of *Eph* could not copy greetings and other data which exclusively pertain to the specific setting of *Col*, it is nevertheless significant that he also edited out the reference to the letter to the Laodiceans. In combination with the remarkably extensive note on the messenger, derived from *Col*, this might suggest that the author of *Eph* deliberately wanted to give the impression that his letter was dispatched at the same time and delivered by the same messenger as *Col*. If this is true, it is likely that he was trying to present his letter as the letter to the Laodiceans referred to in *Col* 4.16.

There are, however, still two obstacles which hinder such a straightforward identification of *Eph* as the *Letter to the Laodiceans* mentioned in part I of *Col*. The first obstacle is the contradiction between *Eph* and *Col* with regard to the question of whether the *Letter to the Laodiceans* is prior to *Col* or posterior. In my view, the letter to the Laodiceans mentioned in *Col* 4.16 has allegedly already been written prior to *Col*, whereas the author of *Eph* (if *Eph* indeed purports to be the *Letter to the Laodiceans*) suggests that his letter, the *Letter to the Laodiceans*, is posterior to *Col*. It is important here to interpret *Col* in its own right and not to glance at *Eph* beforehand. The second obstacle is formed by those readings of the address of *Eph* (*Eph* 1.1—2) which indicate that the letter was addressed to Ephesus. It seems, though, that both obstacles are in fact insubstantial and can be easily removed.

##### (a) *The chronological order of Col and the Letter to the Laodiceans*

First, in *Col* it is probably presupposed that the *Letter to the Laodiceans* is an earlier, already existing letter. At the very end of *Col*, in part I, the author of *Col* suggests to the Colossians that, once they have read *Col*, they should exchange it for his letter to the Christians of neighbouring Laodicea. It is, in all likelihood, taken for granted that this letter to the Laodiceans has already been written and is prior to *Col*.

The author of *Col* probably mentions this exchange of letters for no other reason than to account for the circulation of his own letter beyond its alleged destination. The need to explain how *Col* had come into broader circulation was pressing since, as we have seen in chap. 3.3.1 above, the author of *Col* had chosen Colossae as the fictional address of his letter on account of its destruction in an earthquake in the early sixties AD. By exhorting the Colossian readers to see that *Col* is also read at Laodicea (*Col* 4.16a—b), he gives an explanation for the fact that *Col* has remained extant after the earthquake. He underscores this exhortation by prompting them to exchange *Col* for a completely fictitious, non-existent letter which he had allegedly written to the Laodiceans (*Col* 4.16c). His recommenda-



tion that they should obtain a copy of this letter to the Laodiceans (*Col* 4.16c) is merely an extra, superfluous mirror image of his instruction to convey *Col* to the Christian community at Laodicea (*Col* 4.16a—b).<sup>78</sup> Even though neighbouring Laodicea was hit by the same earthquake as Colossae (see chap. 3.3.1 above), the author's instruction to pass *Col* on to the Laodiceans sufficiently explains its wider circulation.

It seems that the identification of *Eph* with the *Letter to the Laodiceans* is impossible on the grounds that, in my analysis, *Eph* appears to be a conscious reworking of the structure and (cosmological) contents of *Col* and cannot, therefore, be prior to *Col*. For that reason, *Eph* and the *Letter to the Laodiceans* can hardly be identical.

The fact that not only in my analysis, but also in the view of the author of *Eph* himself *Col* is prior to *Eph* seems to be reflected in part D of *Eph*, as we have already seen in chap. 4.5.2 above. In part D, the author of *Eph* refers to what he has written quickly before (προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ) in another letter which, in all probability, is supposed to be *Col* (*Eph* 3.3—4). So here, the author of *Eph* seems to refer to *Col* as an earlier writing and to modify the meaning of the mystery. Though for both authors the mystery appears to concern Christ's subjection of the cosmos, the author of *Eph* differs in viewing this subjection as an ongoing process in which the church has an important role to play. This modification is crucial to the author of *Eph* and he authorises his own understanding of the mystery by claiming in part D of his letter that he has written about it quickly before in part D of *Col*. In this way, the author of *Eph* implies that what he really means is now written down with more precision in his present letter (see chap. 4.5.2 above). The author of *Eph* thus needs *Col* to be prior to his own letter which entails a further clarification of the mystery earlier spoken of quickly in *Col*.

The priority of *Col* seems to be implied, again, in his reworking of the note on the messenger in part I of *Col*. Whereas in *Col* Paul's personal matters are said to be made known by Tychicus to the readers, the Colossians, the author of *Eph* adds, as we have already seen above, that Paul sends Tychicus in order that they, too (καὶ ὑμεῖς), may know his personal

---

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Reuter 2003, p. 256: 'Mit ziemlicher Sicherheit ist der Kolosserbrief bewusst als Teil einer Sammlung paulinischer Briefe abgefasst worden. Dafür sprechen sowohl die Philemonbrief-Rezeption als auch die Erwähnung des—fiktiven—„Laodicener“-Briefs. Während der übernommene Situationsrahmen des Philemonbriefes die Situation, in der der Kolosserbrief angeblich verfasst ist, erklären soll, dient die Behauptung der Existenz eines Laodicenerbriefs der Selbstlegitimation des Kolosserbriefs. Dieser Hinweis darauf, dass weitere unbekannte Paulusbrieve existieren, soll das plötzliche Auftauchen eines neuen—alten—Paulusbrieves erklären.'

matters. This addition suggests that, after the Colossians, the readers of *Eph*, too, are informed of Paul's circumstances.

As *Eph* itself confirms the result of literary analysis that *Col* is prior to *Eph*, this seems to preclude an identification of *Eph* with the *Letter to the Laodiceans* since, according to *Col*, the *Letter to the Laodiceans* had already been written at an indeterminate time before *Col*. This contradiction, though, is solved in *Eph* in an ingenious way by qualifying the indeterminate period which, in *Col*, exists between *Col* and the earlier *Letter to the Laodiceans*. Let us, for a moment, assume that *Eph* and the *Letter to the Laodiceans* are one and the same, and—for the sake of clarity—call this letter *Laod/Eph*. In part I of his letter, the author of *Laod/Eph* qualifies the indeterminate period which, according to *Col*, separates *Col* from the earlier *Letter to the Laodiceans*. The author of *Laod/Eph* qualifies this period by drawing extensively, to an unprecedented degree, upon *Col* and copying its note on the letter's messenger. By doing so, the author of *Laod/Eph* strongly suggests that both *Col* and *Laod/Eph* were dispatched at the same time and delivered by the same messenger, Tychicus. This seems to be the only function of the otherwise inexplicable degree of literary dependency in *Eph* 6.21–22. As a result, *Col* and *Laod/Eph* are supposedly written, not at an indeterminate interval, but at about the same time.

More importantly, in this way the author of *Laod/Eph* could even reverse the priority of *Col* and *Laod/Eph* as, given his view of the posteriority of *Laod/Eph* and the temporal closeness of *Laod/Eph* to *Col*, the reference in part I of *Col* to the *Letter to the Laodiceans* no longer has to be read as an allusion to a previous letter. It can be understood, though only on the assumptions of the author of *Laod/Eph*, as a reference to a letter to the Laodiceans which had not been written yet but which Paul, when writing to the Colossians, had already planned to write and intended to send with the same messenger who was to depart for Colossae. Since he knew, allegedly, what he was going to write to the congregation at Laodicea, he could already recommend that the Colossians should get hold of his letter to the Laodiceans. In this scenario, *Col* is prior to *Laod/Eph*. This means that, at the level of *Laod/Eph*, the contradiction as regards priority is solved and nothing impedes the identification of *Eph* with the *Letter to the Laodiceans*.

(b) *The original addressees of Eph: Laodicea*

Secondly, there is further reason to believe that the author of *Eph* indeed presented his letter as the *Letter to the Laodiceans* and never intended it for the Ephesians. This conjecture might be substantiated by the following reconstruction of the letter's address in part A, an issue I alluded to above (see chap. 4.1). It is probable that the correct reading of the address is:

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus, by the will of God, to the saints who live at Laodicea and are faithful in Christ Jesus). The phrase which concerns us here is:

τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ  
(to the saints who live at Laodicea and are faithful in Christ Jesus).

This reading is probable, on account of reports in Tertullian (c. 160—240 AD) and Eriphanius (c. 315—403 AD) on Marcion's reading of the letter's heading (ΠΡΟΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΑΣ: 'To the Laodiceans') and address.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>79</sup> Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5.11.12: 'Praetereo hic et de alia epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios praescriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodiceanos;' and 5.17.1: 'DE EPISTULA AD LAODICENOS. Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodiceanos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolos scripserit dum ad quosdam' (cf. also Harnack 1910, pp. 700—703; the word 'titulus' in 5.17.1 refers to both the heading and address of the letter as Harnack 1910, pp. 701—703 and Schmid 1995, p. 111 point out on the base of an analogous passage in 5.5.1). See also Eriphanius, *Panarion (Adversus haereses; AD 374—376)* 42.9.4 (p. 105.9—14): αἱ δὲ ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ παρ' αὐτῷ (sc. Marcion) λεγόμεναι εἰσι: πρώτη μὲν πρὸς Γαλάτας, δευτέρα δὲ πρὸς Κορινθίους, τρίτη πρὸς Κορινθίους δευτέρα, τετάρτη πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, πέμπτη πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς, ἕκτη πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς δευτέρα, ἑβδόμη πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, ὀγδόη πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς, ἐνάτη πρὸς Φιλήμονα, δεκάτη πρὸς Φιλιππησίους: ἔχει (sc. Marcion) δὲ καὶ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικέας λεγομένης μέρη; 42.11.8 (p. 120.3—5): <Τῆς> πρὸς Λαοδικεῖς <παρ' αὐτῷ (sc. Marcion)> ἰᾶ. ᾧ <μ>. >>Εἰς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἕν βάπτισμα, εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πάνσιν<< (=Eph 4.5—6); 42.11.9—10 (pp. 123.18—124.1): Αὕτη ἡ νενοθευμένη τοῦ Μαρκίωνος συνταξίς, ἕχουσα μὲν χαρακτῆρα καὶ τύπον τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίου, καὶ Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου οὐχ ὅλον, οὐ πασῶν τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολῶν, ἀλλὰ μόνον τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἐφεσίους καὶ <τῆς> πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς καὶ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικεῖς καὶ [ἀπὸ] τῆς πρὸς Γαλάτας καὶ τῆς πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας καὶ τῆς πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας καὶ τῆς πρὸς Φιλήμονα καὶ <τῆς> πρὸς Φιλιππησίους; 42.12.3 (p. 182.11—20): προσέθετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀποστολικῷ καλουμένῳ καὶ τῆς καλουμένης πρὸς Λαοδικέας ᾧ καὶ μὴ σχόλιον. >>Εἰς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἕν βάπτισμα, εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πάνσιν<< (=Eph 4.5—6). ᾧ καὶ μὴ ἑλεγχος. Συναδόντως μὲν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, ὃ Μαρκίων, καὶ ταύτας τὰς κατὰ σοῦ μαρτυρίας ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης πρὸς Λαοδικέας συνήγαγες, ἵνα ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τοῦ συντάγματος μάθομεν ἀναγνόντες τὰ παρὰ σοὶ καὶ γνόντες τὰ κατὰ σὲ καταγνώμεν τῶν διὰ σοῦ ἀλλοτριῶς ἐπινενοημένων τριῶν ἀνάρχων ἀρχῶν διαφορὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἐχουσῶν; and 42.13.4 (p. 183.11—14): οὐ γὰρ ἔδοξε τῷ ἐλεεινοτάτῳ Μαρκίῳ ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ταύτην τὴν μαρτυρίαν λέγειν, ἀλλὰ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικέας, τῆς μὴ οὔσης ἐν τῷ ἀποστόλῳ (all passages of Marcion and most passages of Eriphanius are also referred to in Schmid's reconstruction of Marcion's text of Eph; see Schmid 1995, pp. 337—341: 'Der Text des Epheserbriefs;' here p. 337 note 1). Finally, see also Theodoret of Cyrhus (c. AD 393—466), *Interpretatio XIV epistolarum sancti Pauli apostoli* 82.625C: Τινὲς ὑπέλαβον καὶ πρὸς Λαοδικέας αὐτὸν γεγραφέναι.

From this reading the location ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ (at Laodicea) is dropped, probably in an attempt to render the address more general. This phenomenon is known from the address of *Romans* 1.7 (πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις) and 1.15 where a few manuscripts leave out the location ἐν Ῥώμῃ (at Rome). On this account, the address of *Eph* is changed and now reads:

τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ  
(to the saints, who are also faithful in Christ Jesus).

This reading is attested in the original readings of the Sinaiticus (Σ<sup>\*</sup>; 4th cent.) and the Vaticanus (B<sup>\*</sup>; 4th cent.) and manuscripts 6 (13th cent.) and 1739 (10th cent.).<sup>80</sup> Another witness of this reading is papyrus 46 (P<sup>46</sup>; about 200 AD) which, probably by accident, drops the second τοῖς. In the next phase, in many manuscripts and early versions the phrase τοῖς οὖσιν ('... who are') is again supplemented with a location.<sup>81</sup> They supplement the phrase τοῖς οὖσιν ('... who are') with the location ἐν Ἐφέσῳ (at Ephesus):

τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ  
(to the saints who live at Ephesus and are also faithful in Christ Jesus).

The addition of Ephesus is probably made on the basis of the *Second Letter to Timothy*, according to which Paul has sent Tychicus—the messenger of *Col* and *Eph* (see *Col* 4.7; *Eph* 6.21)—all the way from Rome, where Paul had been imprisoned (*2 Tim* 1.8; 1.16—17; 2.9), to Ephesus (*2 Tim* 4.12) where Timothy lives (*2 Tim* 1.15—18; 4.11—21a). This sketch can easily be applied to Paul's situation according to *Eph* where he is also said to have been imprisoned (*Eph* 3.1; 4.1; 6.20) and to have sent Tychicus to the city of the letter's recipients (*Eph* 6.21—22). Once the original location Laodicea was lost, Ephesus certainly was a reasonable alternative

---

There is also a short Latin *Epistle to the Laodiceans*, written between the 2nd and the 4th century and mainly based on Paul's *Philipp*. On this writing, see Schneemelcher 1989, vol. 2, chap. 14.2, pp. 41—44.

<sup>80</sup> All readings in my treatment of the text of *Eph* 1.1 are derived from Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th edition (1993).

<sup>81</sup> See the second group of correctors of the Sinaiticus (Σ<sup>2</sup>; c. 7th cent.), the Alexandrinus (A; 5th cent.), the second group of correctors of the Vaticanus (B<sup>2</sup>; 6/7th cent.), the Claromontanus (D; 6th cent.), manuscripts F and G (9th cent.), manuscript Ψ (9/10th cent.), manuscripts 0278 (9th cent.), 33 (9th cent.) and 1881 (14th cent.), the Majority text, including the Byzantine Koine text (M), and, of the early versions, the entire Latin tradition, all the Syriac versions, and all the Coptic versions. A few of them (of the manuscripts: Σ<sup>2</sup> and A) also read πᾶσιν τοῖς instead of the second τοῖς; τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

which proved more powerful than the clue to the letter's identity in *Col* 4.15—16.

If this reconstruction of the original reading of the address of *Eph* is correct, *Eph* is addressed:

τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.  
(to the saints who live at Laodicea and are faithful in Christ Jesus).<sup>82</sup>

This reading also has the advantage that it can, interestingly, be understood in terms of the genesis and development of *Eph*. As the synopsis shows, the address in part A of *Eph* closely follows the address in the corresponding part of *Col*, which reads:

τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ  
(to the holy and faithful brothers in Christ at Colossae).

This formulation is taken over by the author of *Eph*, though, as we have come to expect of him, not without modification. As we have already seen above in our discussion of parts A and B of *Eph*, in the opening part A and at the beginning of his thanksgiving in part B the author of *Eph* also draws on the opening of *2 Cor*, including its address (see *Eph* 1.1—3 and *2 Cor* 1.1—3 in the synopsis). The address of *2 Cor* 1.1 reads as follows:

τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὖσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ,  
σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ  
(to the church of God that is at Corinth,  
together with all the saints who live throughout Achaia).

From part A of *Col*, the author of *Eph* copies its address τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ (to the holy and faithful brothers in Christ at Colossae). He modifies this address by leaving out the location 'at Colosse' (ἐν Κολοσσαῖς) as well as the noun 'brothers' (ἀδελφοί), thus turning the adjectives 'holy' (ἅγιοι) and 'faithful' (πισ-

<sup>82</sup> This reading is supported by Harnack 1910 (see esp. p. 703), although I do not share Harnack's line of reasoning which presupposes the authenticity of *Eph* (Harnack 1910, pp. 696—698; though cf. p. 704) nor his view that the location Laodicea was deliberately erased on account of its negative evaluation in *Revelation of John* 3.14—22 (Harnack 1910, pp. 704—709). In recent literature, the reading is adopted by, among others, Goulder 1991, p. 16 note 1; and Güting 1997, p. 403. Cf. also Lincoln 1990, pp. 1—4 (following Van Roon 1974, pp. 72—85), though Lincoln's and Van Roon's reconstruction also entails a reference to Hierapolis. Their reading is: τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει καὶ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ, πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Best 1987, on the other hand, argued that *Eph* originally lacked any geographical designation (Best 1987, esp. pp. 3278—3279; cf. also Best 1979 and Best 1982).

τοί) into nouns instead, and by adding the name ‘Jesus’ to the phrase ‘in Christ’ (ἐν Χριστῷ): ‘to the saints (...) and the faithful in Christ Jesus’ (τοῖς ἁγίοις [...] καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). The saints to whom the letter is addressed are qualified by drawing on the address of 2 *Cor* 1.1 in which the saints are identified by means of the phrase ‘who are at ...’: τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν κτλ. (‘to all the saints who are at ...’). This phrase is now taken up in the address of *Eph* in order to identify the letter’s addressees as the saints ‘who are at Laodicea’ (τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ). These modifications lead to the following result:

τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ  
(to the saints who live at Laodicea and are faithful in Christ Jesus).<sup>83</sup>

Now that this reading of the address of *Eph* is secured, it appears that the author of *Laod/Eph* intended his letter to appear to be the letter to the Laodiceans mentioned in part I of *Col*. The reference at the end of *Col* to a non-existent letter to the Laodiceans, which the author of *Col* mentioned in order to account for the circulation of *Col* outside Colossae (see this section, chap. 4.8, above), is now employed by the author of *Laod/Eph* as an excellent opportunity for providing his letter with a most convincing pseudepigraphic setting.<sup>84</sup> After the elaborate repetition of the note on the letter’s messenger in part I (*Eph* 6.21—22), the readers could not fail to recognise in *Laod/Eph* the letter to the Laodiceans mentioned in part I of *Col* (*Col* 4.16). This letter now turns out to have been dispatched at the same time as *Col* by their alleged author, Paul, and to have been subsequently delivered by the same messenger, Tychicus.

As a matter of fact, *Eph* throughout simulates being the *Letter to the Laodiceans*: in part A it is addressed to the congregation at Laodicea, in part D it is contrasted with the imprecise description of the mystery which has been quickly given before in part D of *Col*, and, finally, in part I it appears to be nothing less than the parallel letter to *Col*, the exchange of which, it is suggested, was recommended in part I of *Col*.

---

<sup>83</sup> The conjunction καὶ (‘and’) in this address is fully comprehensible if the address of *Col* is taken into account and does not need to be supplemented with a second location ‘Hierapolis’ as Lincoln proposes: τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει καὶ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ, πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Lincoln 1990, pp. 3—4).

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Reuter 2003, p. 256 n. 236 on the reference to the fictitious letter to the Laodiceans in *Col* 4.15—16: ‘Zumindest ein weiterer neutestamentlicher Schriftsteller hat hier bewußt angeknüpft. So benutzt der Verfasser des Epheserbriefs die Notiz Kol 4,16 sehr wahrscheinlich, um sein eigenes Schreiben zu lancieren. Die intensive Benutzung des Kolosserbriefs, und hier insbesondere die wörtliche Übereinstimmung in den Schlussspassagen legen die Vermutung nahe, daß der Epheserbrief eben dieser „Laodicener“-Brief zu sein beansprucht.’

#### 4.8.3 *The reasons for Eph*

The reason why the author of *Laod/Eph* depicts his letter as the twin letter of *Col* is that he can make use of the recommendation at the end of *Col* to exchange *Col* for *Laod* and to read the latter as well. Because he disagrees with the cosmology of *Col* inasmuch as he has considerable doubts about whether the body of the cosmos is already Christ's body (see chap. 4.6.3 above), he causes *Laod/Eph* to run almost completely parallel to *Col*. This gives him the opportunity to write his letter as a full-scale critical commentary on *Col*, in particular on its cosmology and cosmic Christology. As I showed in chap. 1.2.7 above, the author of *Eph* has been particularly successful, even among modern interpreters, in conveying the impression that in the third warning against the Colossian philosophy the author of *Col* speaks of Christ's ecclesiastical body (*Col* 2.19), as he himself does in part NEW 2 of *Eph* (*Eph* 4.15—16), and not of Christ's cosmic body. By composing a fully parallel letter, the author of *Laod/Eph* was able to affect the interpretation of *Col*.

The only question that remains to be discussed now is why the author of *Eph* could be confident that the letter to the Laodiceans mentioned in *Col* 4.16 had not yet been written. Either he considered *Col* to be an authentic letter written by Paul or he suspected it to be a product of pseudepigraphy. If, in his view, *Col* was authentic, then he must have been aware that no letter to the Laodiceans by Paul was extant. If, however, he recognised, or perhaps knew, *Col* to be inauthentic (which I consider more plausible as the possibility of a rediscovery of an authentically Pauline letter to the Laodiceans would have jeopardised his entire enterprise), he will have realised that its reference to a letter to the Laodiceans was part and parcel of its pseudepigraphy and, consequently, false. For this reason, he was able to turn this reference into a recommendation of his own letter. In this case, he—a pseudepigraphic author himself—does not criticise the pseudepigraphic nature of *Col* but puts this letter to his own use.

This implicit recognition of pseudepigraphy is not at all unlikely, as in antiquity pseudepigraphy was not necessarily evaluated as a negative phenomenon. Pupils of philosophers credited their works to the alleged founder of their philosophy, as is clear, for instance, from the many Pythagorean texts of the Hellenistic period which were ascribed by their authors to Pythagoras or to early Pythagoreans like Timaeus of Locri.<sup>85</sup> The opposite phenomenon, that of plagiarism, sometimes proved equally acceptable. Cicero, for instance, presented his translation and reworking of Plato's *Timaeus* as his own dialogue (see esp. Cicero, *Timaeus* 1.1—2 [ed. Giomi-

---

<sup>85</sup> See Speyer 1971, pp. 34—35: 'Überlieferungen der Philosophen- und Ärzteschulen;' Thesleff 1961 and 1965; and Rose and Parsons 1996.

ni, pp. 177.1—178.2]), although all bilingual readers will easily have recognised its real provenance. In a period when formal commentaries on Paul's letters were not yet written, pseudepigraphy was an important tool in furthering the Pauline debate on God, Christ, and the cosmos.

The literary analysis of the entire structure of *Eph* has shown that *Eph* is a reworking of *Col*. Research into the history and traditions of the religious and philosophical contents of *Eph* has shed light on the general direction taken by this reworking. In his letter, the author of *Eph* in fact offers a sort of commentary on *Col* in order to modify its cosmology and cosmic Christology. In *Eph*, Christ's body is no longer understood as the body of the cosmos which, as in Plato's *Timaeus*, is stable and held together by bonds. Nor is the cosmos considered already to have been fully filled with Christ. The cosmos is not yet the body of Christ since it is still in the process of being filled with him. This the author of *Eph* makes clear by, in an unprecedented way, interpreting the classical notion of filling the cosmos as an ongoing process. In this process, the members of the church participate by announcing God's wisdom to the principles and powers of the cosmos, thus causing the cosmos to grow up to Christ.

That *Eph* is a reworking of *Col* is also confirmed more specifically by an analysis of parts A and I, the opening and concluding part of *Eph* respectively. Textual criticism of the letter's address in part A revealed that this letter was originally addressed to the congregation of Laodicea. This accords very well with the result yielded by a literary analysis of part I, that *Eph* is portrayed as the twin letter to the Laodiceans. The literary dependence of the author of *Eph* on *Col* appears to serve the aim of enabling the author of *Eph* to write his letter as an exhaustive commentary on the cosmological and cosmic christological tenets of *Col*.



## Chapter 5

# Summary and Conclusions

### 5.1 Cosmic Christology in Paul and the Pauline School

The Pauline debate on God, Christ, and the cosmos as pursued by the authors of *Col* and *Eph* effectively centres around the question of whether or not the body of the cosmos is Christ's body. The two authors treat this question for different reasons and answer it in diverse ways. In Pauline literature, the notion of a cosmic body (σῶμα) first comes up in *Col*. It is still absent from Paul's authentic letters. The author of *Eph* was aware of its occurrence in *Col*, because he is dependent on that letter, but he was unwilling to identify the cosmic body with the body of Christ, and consequently dropped this notion altogether.

In view of the peculiarity of the notion of a cosmic body in *Col*, it was necessary to discuss it straightaway in the first chapter of this book. This was all the more imperative as this notion was not merely omitted in *Eph* but was also partially replaced with another concept, that of the body of the church. This replacement has proven so successful that the somewhat obscure and difficult contents of *Col* have often been interpreted in accordance with *Eph*, which is, in general, more lucidly written and more explicit. As a consequence, the cosmological meaning of the term 'body' as it appears in *Col* has become no longer discernible for those who read *Col* with their mind saturated with the views of *Eph*. For that reason, it was important to start this study with a renewed and independent inquiry into the notion of body in *Col*.

### 5.2 Leading themes in the *Letter to the Colossians*: Christ's cosmic body and its coherence

In *Col*, the concept of the body is central to the author's refutation of a rival philosophy. In each warning against a particular aspect of the so-called Colossian philosophy in the central part of the letter, the term

‘body’ (σῶμα) plays a pivotal role. It appears to stand for the body of the physical cosmos. The author adduces the notion of a cosmic body in order to substantiate his warnings and claims that the whole of physical reality is in fact the body of Christ (chap. 1.1).

The physical concept of the body gains much relief if set in its proper and contemporary context of Stoic and Middle Platonist physics (chap. 1.2). Like Stoic physics, for instance, the author of *Col* expresses himself in terms of bodies (σώματα), principles (ἀρχαί), elements (στοιχεῖα), God/gods (θεός/θεοί) and spatial location. As is the case in Stoicism, and probably in all contemporary physics with the clear exception of Epicurean cosmology, physics and theology are closely related. As regards the cosmos, the author of *Col* has a similar concern about its coherence as can be discerned in the contemporary philosophical debate on the stability of the world (chap. 1.2.1). He expresses the idea that the cosmos possesses stability and coherence in several ways (chaps 1.2.2—1.2.5). The most remarkable metaphor which the author of *Col* applies is the metaphor of bonds (σύνδεσμοί) which hold the entire cosmic body (σῶμα) together. This notion is current in contemporary Stoic and Middle Platonist physics and derives, ultimately, from Plato’s *Timaeus* (chap. 1.2.6).

### 5.3 The cosmic principles, powers and elements according to Paul

The distinctiveness of the Stoic and Middle Platonist physics of *Col* becomes apparent from a comparison between its cosmology and the cosmology implicit in Paul’s authentic letters. Due to the fact that the notion of a cosmic body is lacking in Paul, this comparison is based on other terminology which occurs in both cosmological systems. This terminology consists of ‘elements of the cosmos’ (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου), ‘principles’ (ἀρχαί) and ‘powers’ (ἐξουσίαι).

In his *Letter to the Galatians*, Paul appears to share the conviction, current in the Graeco-Roman period, that the cosmos is composed of elements (στοιχεῖα; chap. 2.1). According to this conviction, not only is the universe composed of elements but the elements are the entities from which originate, and in which exist, all destructible and mortal species too, including human beings. Inasmuch as they are composed by the intermingling of small portions from the four elements of the cosmos, it is impossible for human beings to slip out through the elements and leave the realm in which the passive and changeable elements are haunted by a destructive cosmic force. By adopting the common theory that the cosmos

is made up of elements, Paul took over its negative view on the elements and man's bondage to them (chap. 2.1.1).

In Graeco-Roman philosophy, these elements were considered to have given rise to religious legislation. People were convinced that some laws which prescribe particular religious festivals, purification rites and other rituals and rules are connected with cosmic phenomena. These laws derive from physical considerations, just as other religious laws—insofar as they are not irrational, mythic or superstitious—have been determined for ethical and historical reasons. In a similar way, Paul takes the Jewish legislation to be linked with the cosmic elements. In his view, Christ lifted man's bondage to the elements by coming under the elements and under the law (*Gal* 4.3—10). On the cross, Christ crucified the present cosmos and caused it to be superseded by the beginnings of a new creation, thereby rendering the religious legislation concerning the present cosmos superfluous (chap. 2.1.2).

The subjugation of the cosmos comes also into view in Paul's *First Letter to the Corinthians* (chap. 2.2). This time the terminology is not that of elements but consists of 'principles' (ἀρχαί), 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι) and 'forces' (δυνάμεις). According to Paul, between his resurrection and the end of time Christ is engaged in the gradual submission of the cosmic principles, powers and forces (*1 Cor* 15.23—28; chap. 2.2.1). This idea belongs to the Jewish tradition of the heavenly eschatological agent and derives, ultimately, from *Daniel* 7.27 LXX where the powers (ἐξουσίαι) are said to submit to the figure of the 'son of man' (chap. 2.2.2). But whereas in *Daniel* these powers (ἐξουσίαι) are terrestrial kingdoms, just as in the entire Jewish tradition of the heavenly eschatological agent this agent's opponents are conceived of as earthly political powers, Paul, on the other hand, understands the Danielic powers (ἐξουσίαι) as cosmic entities.

Considering the fact that the Danielic word 'powers' (ἐξουσίαι) is not in use in Graeco-Roman cosmology, it seems likely that Paul, when he drew upon *Daniel* 7.27 LXX, deliberately equated these powers (ἐξουσίαι) with principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) which do have a clear cosmological meaning in contemporary philosophy. In Paul's time, the principles (ἀρχαί) and forces (δυνάμεις) are identical with the cosmic elements (στοιχεῖα) or with the forces by which these elements are dominated (chap. 2.2.3). Paul's concept of Christ subduing the cosmological powers and forces proves similar to his conviction that, as a result of Christ's action, the elements (στοιχεῖα) are supplanted by a new creation (*Gal* 4.3—10).

In Paul's view, the process of Christ's gradual subjugation of the cosmic principles and forces results in their reduction to powerlessness and in

the replacement of the present cosmos with a new reality. The characterisation of this reality as a state in which God is ‘all in everything’ (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν) will have been understood by many of Paul’s contemporaries as reminiscent of the Stoic concept of the conflagration and subsequent reconstitution of the cosmos. Paul himself, however, does not speak of a conflagration, but seems to refer to the transformation of the cosmos and the new cosmic order beyond (chap. 2.2.4).

#### 5.4 The cosmic principles, powers and elements according to the *Letter to the Colossians*

In the *Letter to the Colossians*, the whole idea of an ongoing reduction of the present cosmos to powerlessness and its being gradually superseded by a new creation, which is characteristic of Paul’s cosmology, is absent. Such an idea would have been incompatible with the emphasis which the author of *Col* places on the stability of the cosmic body which is held together by bonds.

This view of cosmic coherence is easily recognised in what he says of the cosmic principles, powers and elements in his introductory prayer and in the central part of the letter. According to the introductory prayer—which is to be credited, in its entirety, to the author of *Col* himself—the principles (ἀρχαί) and powers (ἐξουσίαι) of the cosmos have been created, assembled and reconciled in, through and for Christ (chap. 3.1.1). This view is expressed in terms of Stoic and Middle Platonist propositional metaphysics. The importance of Christ’s role in creating the cosmos seems to be paralleled in a contemporary development in Platonism, according to which the function of Creator is increasingly fulfilled by a second god. The idea that the fullness of the invisible God takes on in Christ the visible shape of the cosmic body corresponds with the assumption in contemporary physics that God has filled the cosmos. Similarly, the notions of cosmic reconciliation and peace are matched in Graeco-Roman philosophy (chap. 3.1.2). All these notions assist the author of *Col* in setting forth, not only that the cosmic principles and powers were created in Christ, but also that they have already been reconstituted in him.

In the central part on the Colossian philosophy, the author of *Col* explains how the reconstitution of the principles, powers and elements was brought about and what its lasting effects are (chap. 3.2). By putting off his human body, Christ is considered also to have put off the cosmic principles and powers and to have triumphed over them in himself. This is very similar to Paul’s view in *Gal* 4.3–10, according to which Christ entered the realm of the elements for the purpose of lifting man’s bondage to

the elements of the cosmos. But whereas, in Paul's view, the cosmos was crucified and supplanted by the beginnings of a new creation, according to *Col* the principles, powers and elements of the present cosmos are not replaced entirely but restored to their original status (chap. 3.2.1). The notion of the reconstitution of the cosmos, after a period of chaos, is paralleled in Middle Platonist views on the role of Aphrodite, Eros and Osiris in harmonising the cosmos. In *Col*, this role is fulfilled by Christ. The reconstitution of the cosmos is achieved by integrating the elements harmoniously into Christ's cosmic body, which is firmly bound together by cosmic bonds (chaps 3.2.2—3.2.3).

Although the author of *Col* appears to make use of Graeco-Roman philosophical notions of mixed origin, some Stoic and some Middle Platonist, and of philosophical notions of a more general nature, it seems on the whole to be Middle Platonism which exerted the greatest influence on his attitude towards the cosmos. The primarily Platonic notion of the binding of the cosmic body by bonds, the Middle Platonist view that the second god is involved in creating the cosmos, as well as the attribution to Christ of the role performed in Middle Platonist physics by Aphrodite, Eros and Osiris are evidence for the predominance of his Middle Platonist inclinations.

Interestingly, the Colossian philosophy to which he is opposed in his letter is also best described as an instance of Middle Platonism (chaps 3.3.1—3.3.4). The most conspicuous difference between both instances of Middle Platonism, however, is the radical stress which the author of *Col* places on Christ's headship over all cosmic principles and powers and on the absolute worship of Christ, to the exclusion of angels and demons. The need to define Christ's relation to the rest of the cosmos was more urgent for the author of *Col* than it had been for Paul, insofar as the author of *Col* aimed to integrate the entire present cosmos into one, renewed hierarchy. In Paul's view, the elements of the cosmos were only reduced to impotence, and replaced by the beginnings of a new creation. In the interval between Christ's resurrection and the end of time the cosmic principles, powers and forces are still in the process of being rendered powerless. According to the author of *Col*, however, the various disorderly parts of the present cosmos have already been entirely consolidated, united in one renewed hierarchy and reconstituted as the cosmic body of Christ.

This view is evidence of a further Hellenization of Paul's cosmology which helped the author of *Col* to overcome the invalidation of Paul's expectation that the completion of Christ's gradual subjugation of the subordinate cosmic principles and the end of time were imminent and would come to pass in the decades following the 50s AD. Sometime in the 80s AD at the earliest, the author of *Col* felt the need to interpret differently

the matter he regarded as fundamental to Paul's theology, Christ's subjugation of the cosmological principles, for fear that Paul's theology might otherwise collapse. In his view, Christ has already fully reconstituted the physical cosmos and made its various constituents into his single, coherent cosmic body.

Two important conclusions can be drawn from this comparison between the cosmologies of Paul and *Col*. First, Paul had made it possible for his cosmology to be further Hellenized inasmuch as he held the opinion that the cosmos is composed of elements. At the same time, Paul had put an important aspect of Jewish eschatology into a cosmological perspective by interpreting the figure of the heavenly eschatological agent as a being who is engaged in the subjugation of insubordinate cosmic principles and forces.

Second, the future eschatology which was inherent in the Jewish notion of the heavenly eschatological agent and had become an ineradicable characteristic of Paul's views on the cosmos was seriously challenged when Paul's imminent eschatology had been proven wrong by the sheer progress of time. Although the author of *Col* retained the notion of a future judgement, as he did not question that man had to leave this world, the cosmos itself he believed to have already been fully renewed. For that reason, he did not hesitate to call it Christ's cosmic body. In his mind, eschatology and cosmology had become disentangled and segregated, eschatology being solely a matter of each individual's death and afterlife.

### 5.5 The cosmic principles and powers according to the *Letter to the Ephesians*

The author of *Eph*, as he probably acknowledged himself, profited much from the fact that the invalidity of Paul's imminent eschatology had now been overcome in *Col*. Yet, the consequence that the present cosmos is already the cosmic body of Christ did not appeal to him. Even though he did not resort to Paul's original imminent eschatology, he was certainly keen to reintegrate a certain amount of future eschatology into his cosmology. In so doing, however, he, too, pushed the Hellenization of Pauline cosmology further by also drawing on other Graeco-Roman philosophical notions than those introduced by Paul and the author of *Col* (chap. 4). The reintegration of eschatology and cosmology which he intended was expressed in the form of a letter.

Due to some unfortunate editorial interventions in the address of *Eph*, *Eph* has become known as a letter addressed to the Ephesians whereas, in fact, it had been addressed—although only purportedly—to the Christians

at Laodicea (chaps 4.1 and 4.8.2). The reasons why *Eph* was written can be inferred from the remarkable way in which almost the entire structure of *Col* was taken over in *Eph*. The structure of *Col* consists of nine parts, which can be designated as parts A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H and I. The author of *Eph* adapted this structure of *Col* by omitting part E on the Colossian philosophy and adding three new parts (NEW 1, NEW 2 and NEW 3) at various stages in the structure. The structure of *Col* is rearranged as follows.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E	---	F	G	---	H	I
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---	NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I

Textual criticism of the address in part A and literary analysis of the letter as a whole warrant the conclusion that the letter purported to be addressed to the Christian congregation at Laodicea, a city in the neighbourhood of Colossae and mentioned at the end of *Col* (chaps 4.1 and 4.8.2).

In the author's thanksgiving to God in part B of *Eph*, the author speaks of God's predetermination of a particular mystery according to which, in the fullness of time, Christ will eventually become head again throughout the cosmos. This notion is introduced as the subject matter of *Eph* and is worked out explicitly at important stages in the letter's train of thought (chap. 4.2).

The first clarification of the letter's subject matter is offered in the author's introductory prayer for his readers in part C (chap. 4.3). In contrast to the introductory prayer in part C of *Col*, in which the present cosmos is considered already to have been brought to peace, reconciled and assembled in Christ, the author of *Eph*, on the other hand, believes that Christ is still in the process of extending his influence over the cosmos. This conviction he expresses in two ways.

First, he draws on Paul's description of Christ's eschatological triumph over the cosmic principles and powers in *1 Cor* 15.23—28. This triumph is the outcome of an ongoing process during which the cosmos becomes increasingly dominated by Christ.

Second, this modification of the cosmology of *Col* is also achieved by means of the philosophical notion of the filling the cosmos. According to the author of *Eph*, at his resurrection Christ was given to the church as supreme head over the cosmos. The church is the fullness of him who fills all in everything and is, as such, the locus where Christ's cosmic rule has already been fully implemented. The cosmos itself, however, is still in the process of being filled (chap. 4.3.2). Although the notion of filling the

cosmos had already been used by the author of *Col*, the author of *Eph* uses it to a greater extent. The notion of filling all things or the cosmos (πληρῶ τὰ πάντα) originated in Graeco-Roman philosophy. The author of *Col* employed it, in full accordance with its general meaning, to describe a factual and persistent status of the cosmos: God has filled the cosmos with himself. The author of *Eph*, however, applies this notion to signify a process by which God or Christ increasingly fills all in everything.

In this, the author of *Eph* resembles Paul inasmuch as their eschatologies are both future: both reckon with an ongoing process in which the cosmos is brought under Christ's control. He differs, however, from Paul insofar as the future eschatology of *Eph* is not imminent and involves the active participation of the church. In the process which the author of *Eph* perceives ahead, the church, which is Christ's body and is characterised as his fullness, appears to play a pivotal role in the way in which Christ is progressively filling the cosmos and establishing himself as its head (chap. 4.3.3).

The next part, part NEW 1, is the first addition by the author of *Eph* to the structure of *Col* and contains the letter's first extensive ecclesiological passage. In part NEW 1, the author of *Eph* introduces the church irrespective of its role in the process of filling the cosmos. This function is worked out in parts D and NEW 2 which—as the table above clearly visualises—follow immediately after the introductory comments on the church's origins in part NEW 1 (chap. 4.4).

In part D, which is concerned with Paul's ministry and the mystery revealed to him, the author of *Eph* makes known for the first time in what sense the church is involved in the restoration of the cosmos (chap. 4.5). According to the author of *Eph*, the global church is entrusted the task of revealing God's wisdom to the powers of the physical cosmos. By disclosing this wisdom—which was understood to have been instrumental in the creation of the cosmos—to the cosmic principles and powers, the church makes them aware that the divine wisdom is capable of permeating the entire cosmos again. In this way, Christ's fullness, which has already filled the church, starts to penetrate the cosmos with the aim of filling it too (chap. 4.5.2).

As a result, the community of the church is progressively expanding and will eventually include the cosmos. This notion of a community which enjoys fellowship with the cosmos has its analogy in the Stoic notion of the cosmic city. According to Stoic theories about the cosmic city, fellowship of this city is held by God, the celestial powers and those human beings who are wise. Similarly, the entire church is in fact made up of God, Christ, an increasing number of cosmic principles and powers, and Chris-



tians who want to live as wise men. The ecclesiology of *Eph* is, in the last analysis, but a function of its cosmology (chap. 4.5.3).

In combination with this notion, the author of *Eph* possibly also employs the philosophical view that by contemplating the cosmos, its size and its dimensions, man comes to know God. Within the context of *Eph*, however, this view is adapted to shape the author's prayer that his readers may be able to seize with their mind the cosmic dimensions in order to come to know the scope of Christ's love which is being extended to the entire physical cosmos (chap. 4.5.4).

In the next part, part NEW 2, which holds the letter's second extensive ecclesiological passage, the church's cosmic task comes again into view (chap. 4.6). The author of *Eph* uses the imagery of Christ's ascension to indicate the start of the process by which the cosmos is increasingly filled with Christ. At his ascension, Christ installed various forms of ministry which should ensure that the members of the church are properly trained in view of the church's cosmic task. Only if they have been rightly instructed, will the Christians be able to cause the cosmos to grow up to its head, Christ. This is the final explanation of the letter's subject matter: the expectation that eventually Christ will become head again throughout the cosmos (chap. 4.6.2).

However, considering the gradual and still ongoing implementation of Christ's rule in the cosmos outside the church, the author of *Eph* deems it inappropriate to call the present cosmos Christ's cosmic body. This is the most essential difference between the cosmologies and cosmic Christologies of *Eph* and *Col*. In *Eph*, the idea disappears that the cosmos is the body of Christ, is firmly bound together by cosmic bonds, and grows as a divine organism. This idea is suitable for indicating a factual status but cannot be applied to designate an ongoing process; the cosmos either is Christ's cosmic body or is not. For that reason, the author of *Eph* favours the concept of filling the cosmos. As long as the present cosmos has not been completely filled with Christ, his only body and fullness is the church (chap. 4.6.3).

After his adaptation of the ethical exhortations of part F and of the instructions for managing Christian households in part G, in part NEW 3 the author of *Eph* once more reminds his readers of the letter's central theme. For the last time, he speaks about the church's active role in filling the cosmos by urging them to put on God's full armour. The strife in which the church is engaged is directed against the principles, powers and rulers of the cosmos, and aims at rendering these obstinate constituents of the cosmos into a harmonious and peaceful whole. Despite the fact that the present cosmos is considered to be still subject to the dominion of the planetary 'rulers of the cosmos' which control its elements, the cosmology

of *Eph* is nevertheless essentially optimistic inasmuch as the cosmos is thought to be increasingly filled with Christ (chap. 4.7).

Subsequent to his adaptation of a final request for intercessory prayers in part H, the author of *Eph* concludes his letter in part I by giving the clear impression that his letter was dispatched simultaneously with *Col* and delivered by the same messenger. At the same time, however, he consciously edited out *Col*'s reference to a letter to the Laodiceans. In doing this, he tried to present his own letter as the letter to the Laodiceans, the reading of which was recommended at the end of *Col*. Moreover, a reconstruction of his letter's address in part A suggests that *Eph* was indeed addressed to Laodicea (chaps 4.8.1—4.8.2). The reason why the author of *Eph* presented his letter as the *Letter to the Laodiceans* and as the twin letter of *Col* was that, by doing this, he could make use of the recommendation contained in *Col* that people should read both letters.

This leads to a final conclusion. In his Pseudo-Pauline *Letter to the Laodiceans*, the author of *Eph* offered a full-scale critical commentary on *Col* since he caused his letter to run almost completely parallel. In his commentary, the author of *Eph* gave expression to his view that the cosmos does not yet constitute Christ's cosmic body, because the cosmos is still being filled with Christ. In this process the church participates insofar as it announces God's wisdom to the cosmos. The boundaries of its community are widened to include the cosmic principles and powers as well. In his cosmology and cosmic Christology, the author of *Eph* develops Paul's notion of Christ's gradual subjugation of the cosmos by interpreting the classical notion of filling the cosmos, in an extraordinary way, as an ongoing process in which the church plays an important role. The relationship between church and cosmos has its analogy in the fellowship between man and cosmos in the Stoic notion of the cosmic city. The entire interrelationship between the cosmologies/cosmic Christologies of *Eph*, *Col* and Paul's authentic letters is best explained within the context of contemporary Graeco-Roman cosmology.



## Appendix I

# Towards a Genetic Interpretation of the *Letter to the Ephesians*: Brief Review of Previous Synopses & the Present Synopsis

## Introduction

As in the case of the so-called synoptic gospels *Mark*, *Matthew* and *Luke*, the need for a synoptic arrangement is equally pressing for the *Letter to the Ephesians* and the *Letter to the Colossians*. To date, four synopses of the Greek text of *Eph* and *Col* have been drawn up and published.<sup>1</sup>

The first synoptic overview which included the entire continuous text of *Eph* was published in 1933 by E.J. Goodspeed, who was to be followed by M.-A. Wagenführer (1941), C.L. Mitton (1951) and, recently, by R. Reuter (1997). However, none of the synopses mentioned serves the prime function of a synopsis—the reconstruction of the genetic development of one document vis-à-vis another document—particularly well. As the onus of proof rests with me to show that these synopses are inadequate for study into the genesis and development of *Eph*, I shall treat the previous synopses, focussing on the relation between *Eph*, *Col* and Paul as perceived in each of them.<sup>2</sup> I start off with commenting on the synopses of Goodspeed (1933), Mitton (1951) and Reuter (1997) in the first three sections. The synoptic overview presented by Wagenführer (1941) is dealt with after that in section four. Wagenführer's synopsis differs from the others in that his is the only one which makes an effort to present not only fragments

---

<sup>1</sup> In this review, only those synopses are included which have been published and cover the entire Greek text. I will also briefly comment on an unpublished Greek synopsis by G.A.M. Vleugels (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Potchefstroom, South Africa, 1997). The English synopses of Goodspeed 1956 and Francis and Sampley 1975, however, have been left out. This also holds true for the synoptic work mentioned and listed by Reuter: lists of Pauline references, discussion of individual passages, and individual synopses for particular text segments (Reuter 1997, pp. 228—229).

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed discussion, see Van Kooten 2001, chap. 5, and Reuter 2003.

from *Col* but its entire continuous text. Finally, I will outline my new synopsis in section five.

### 1 E.J. Goodspeed's synopsis (1933)

Goodspeed's synopsis is the first Greek synopsis with a complete continuous text of *Eph*.<sup>3</sup> As Goodspeed himself acknowledges, his synopsis is not meant to be 'an *exhaustive* showing of the use made in Ephesians of [what he regards] the nine genuine letters of Paul; the task may be still more thoroughly done.'<sup>4</sup> Goodspeed's aim is only 'to carry it to the point of demonstration.'<sup>5</sup> The merits of Goodspeed's synoptic exhibit are clearly that it is the first Greek synopsis of *Eph* and *Col* with a complete continuous text of *Eph*.

His synopsis leads Goodspeed to calculate percentages of parallelism between *Eph* and Paul's letters including *Col*. According to Goodspeed, 'in *Eph* fully 88 per cent is convincingly paralleled in the other letters.'<sup>6</sup> Although this practice has some justification in the extraordinary relation of *Eph* vis-à-vis *Col* and Paul's authentic letters, a relation which—as Goodspeed rightly remarks—does not exist between, e.g., the *Letter to the Philippians* and the other letters,<sup>7</sup> such a precise calculation of the percentage of parallelism is somewhat odd.

The interest in calculating the *exact* degree to which the author of *Eph* is dependent on *Col* and Paul is related to the way Goodspeed perceives the entire relation between *Eph*, *Col* and Paul's authentic letters. According to Goodspeed, '(hardly) a line of Ephesians is unaffected' by *Col* and Paul's letters, 'in idea if not in language, and *every one of those letters* has made some contribution to Ephesians.'<sup>8</sup> The reason for this is that 'the writer of Ephesians has found and assembled the Pauline letters, and (...) has undertaken to introduce them to the Christian world, prefacing them with a letter cast in Pauline forms.'<sup>9</sup> As a result, Goodspeed regards *all* authentic Pauline letters, among which he includes both *Col* and *2 Thessalonians*, as being convincingly reflected in *Eph*.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Goodspeed 1933, pp. 77—165.

<sup>4</sup> Goodspeed 1933, p. 80; italics mine.

<sup>5</sup> Goodspeed 1933, pp. 80—81.

<sup>6</sup> Goodspeed 1933, p. 79.

<sup>7</sup> Goodspeed 1933, p. 79.

<sup>8</sup> Goodspeed 1933, p. 79; italics mine.

<sup>9</sup> Goodspeed 1933, p. 80. This theory had already been advanced by Jülicher 1906, p. 127 and Weiß 1917, pp. 533—534; see Merkel 1987, pp. 3172—3173 and 3213.

<sup>10</sup> Goodspeed 1933, p. 80.

I find this perception of the relation between *Eph*, *Col* and Paul difficult in two respects. Firstly, Goodspeed's calculation of the exact percentage as regards the dependency of *Eph* on the other letters may fail to do justice to the individual intentions and independence of the author of *Eph*. Secondly, the main intention which Goodspeed does ascribe to the author of *Eph*, that is his aim to write *Eph* as an introduction to his collection of Pauline letters, seems to ignore the special literary relationship which exists between *Eph* and *Col*. Goodspeed argues that each one of the Pauline letters is reflected in *Eph*, and does not single out the extraordinary use the author of *Eph* makes of *Col* in particular. This point of criticism was raised by Mitton in 1951.

## 2 C.L. Mitton's synopsis (1951)

Mitton, whose synopsis appeared in 1951<sup>11</sup>, appraises Goodspeed's almost twenty-year old synopsis as the most careful one so far.<sup>12</sup> Yet, Mitton criticises Goodspeed for overdoing the relationship between *Eph* and the other Pauline epistles besides *Col*.<sup>13</sup> This criticism is not primarily levelled against Goodspeed's synoptic overview as such, but rather against the conclusions Goodspeed draws from it in terms of gross percentages and numbers indicating the extent to which *Eph* is dependent on *Col* and on the other Pauline letters.

Mitton's criticism implies that, if passages in *Eph* are paralleled in both *Col* and Paul's authentic letters, the author of *Eph* is most likely to be dependent on *Col* given the overall dependence of *Eph* on *Col*. In these cases, dependency on Paul's authentic letters in addition to *Col* should not be assumed.<sup>14</sup> Underlying Mitton's criticism of Goodspeed's synopsis is his clear intention to present Goodspeed's case more convincingly to those who are still sceptical about the non-Pauline origin of *Eph*.<sup>15</sup>

Though Mitton rightly criticises Goodspeed's synopsis for regarding passages in *Eph* which have parallels both in *Col* and also in Paul's authentic letters, as not primarily dependent on *Col* but on Paul as well,<sup>16</sup> Mitton fails to stick to his own principle and continues, as Goodspeed did

---

<sup>11</sup> Mitton 1951, pp. 279—315.

<sup>12</sup> Mitton 1951, p. 100.

<sup>13</sup> Goodspeed's synopsis is commented on in a chapter on the extent of the interdependence between *Eph* and the Pauline letters other than *Col* (Mitton 1951, chap. 10, pp. 98—106).

<sup>14</sup> Mitton 1951, pp. 101—102.

<sup>15</sup> Mitton 1951, pp. 101—104.

<sup>16</sup> Mitton 1951, pp. 101—102.

before him, to offer authentically Pauline parallels even if a passage in *Eph* is sufficiently and convincingly explained from *Col*. In my synopsis, however, I strictly adhere to the rule that, if a passage in *Eph* is sufficiently explained from *Col*, there is no need to adduce Pauline parallels in addition. Consequently, I omit such Pauline passages to enable a better genetic explanation of *Eph* out of *Col*. Reference is only made to the authentically Pauline material where this is strictly necessary.

The fault of offering too many authentic Pauline parallels to *Eph* is probably the most frequent methodological error in the synopses of Goodspeed, Mitton and Reuter. Unfortunately this means that their synopses, in failing to provide sufficient insight into the genesis of the text, do not make full use of the potential of the genre, becoming instead mere concordances.

### 3 R. Reuter's synopsis (1997)

In his synopsis from 1997, Reuter mentions the previous synopses of Goodspeed and Mitton<sup>17</sup> but judges them incomplete through lack of detail since 'minor correspondences were not documented as a rule.'<sup>18</sup> They are also deemed to lack clarity as a result of the fact that both the parallels between *Eph* and *Col*, and those between *Eph* and Paul are given in one synoptic chart.<sup>19</sup> Unlike the authors of synopses before him, Reuter divides his synopsis into a synopsis covering the parallels between *Eph* and Paul, and another which covers the parallels between *Eph* and *Col*.<sup>20</sup>

In the first place, it is surprising that Reuter offers the synopsis of the parallels between *Eph* and Paul first (chap. 2) and, only then, the other synopsis with the parallels between *Eph* and *Col* (chap. 3). This sequence is contrary to the genesis of *Eph*, which is primarily dependent on *Col*.

In the second place, more seriously, it is a draw-back that Reuter decided to split his synopsis into two disconnected synopses at all. The advantage of one synopsis is that one can see how, besides his primary dependence on *Col*, the author of *Eph* simultaneously makes use of Paul's authentic letters. The main reason why Reuter seems to favour this separa-

<sup>17</sup> Reuter 1997, pp. 23—24, 228 and 534.

<sup>18</sup> Reuter 1997, p. 534.

<sup>19</sup> Reuter 1997, p. 534.

<sup>20</sup> The synopsis of *Eph* and Paul's authentic letters, and that of *Eph* and *Col* are published in the first volume of Reuter's five-volume series entitled *Synopse zu den Briefen des Neuen Testaments/Synopsis of the New Testament Letters* (Reuter 1997). The synopsis of *Eph* and Paul's authentic letters is given first in chap. 2 (pp. 227—531) and the synopsis of *Eph* and *Col* follows after that in chap. 3 (pp. 533—619).

tion is that, according to him, the 'synopses provided by E.J. Goodspeed and C.L. Mitton are not particularly well laid out due to the material they contain that goes beyond the Col parallels.'<sup>21</sup> It is no improvement, however, to separate the synopsis into two distinct parts and to treat the relationship between *Eph* and Paul as totally separate from that between *Eph* and *Col*. That is what Reuter consistently does, to the extent that in his first synopsis, that of *Eph* and Paul's authentic letters, all possible parallels are given between *Eph* and Paul's letters even if a passage in *Eph* is better explained from parallels taken from *Col*, which he presents in his second synopsis. Reuter's synopsis of *Eph* and Paul's letters is more than three times as long as his synopsis of *Eph* and *Col*, neglecting the fact that only those similarities between *Eph* and Paul's authentic letters need be given which can not be sufficiently explained from the particularly close relation which exists between *Eph* and *Col*. Reuter's most persistent error seems to be his neglect of the special relation between *Eph* and *Col*. Even in the case of the most extensive literary parallel between *Eph* and *Col* (*Eph* 6.21—22//*Col* 4.7—8), Reuter still suggests more unlikely parallels between *Eph* and Paul's authentic letters.<sup>22</sup>

In practice, Reuter's sympathy seems to lie with Goodspeed, who also disregarded the special relationship between *Eph* and *Col*. In his introduction to his synopsis of *Eph* and Paul's authentic letters, Reuter quotes the following momentous statement by Goodspeed with great approval: 'Ephesians is a mosaic of Pauline materials; it is almost a Pauline anthology; it is altogether built of Pauline elements, even though the writer goes well beyond Paul in the use he makes of them.'<sup>23</sup> According to Reuter, '(this) observation by E.J. Goodspeed from 1933 (...) can still be used adequately to describe the relationship between *Eph* and the Pauline Epistles, even if one does not share Goodspeed's thesis that *Eph* is intended as an introduction to a collection of Pauline Epistles.'<sup>24</sup>

In theory, however, Reuter is not unaware of the extraordinary literary relationship between *Eph* and *Col*. As Reuter says, '*Eph* should be regarded as trito-pauline because it assumes *Col* as a literary model and this in turn is based on parts of the pauline corpus.'<sup>25</sup> His synopsis project, however, is undertaken 'not with the aim of providing redaction critical models for a solution, but rather in order to document the verbatim corre-

---

<sup>21</sup> Reuter 1997, p. 534.

<sup>22</sup> The reverse is sometimes also the case: passages in *Eph* which are better explained from Paul's authentic letters are unjustly paralleled by unlikely passages from *Col*.

<sup>23</sup> Reuter 1997, p. 228; quoted from Goodspeed 1933, p. 8.

<sup>24</sup> Reuter 1997, p. 228.

<sup>25</sup> Reuter 1997, p. 25 note 1; cf. also p. 534.



spondences as completely as possible in order to facilitate *subsequent* evaluation.<sup>26</sup>

In this respect I totally disagree with Reuter, since the task of any synopsis should be to note only the relevant parallels. If there is a consensus, from the perspective of analysis of the redaction, that the author of *Eph* makes use primarily of *Col*, and of other letters only in addition to it, one should not mention all possible parallels with the aim to 'facilitate subsequent evaluation' but devise one single synopsis which rules out those parallels which are unlikely to have contributed to the genesis and development of *Eph*. Reuter's complaint that the material is inconveniently arranged and lacks clarity when the parallels between *Eph* and Paul are exhibited together with those between *Eph* and *Col*<sup>27</sup> should be overcome differently by means of clear and unambiguous references from the text of *Eph* to the other columns.

In practice, Reuter thus entirely neglects the special relation between *Eph* and *Col* and offers superabundant explanations for the text of *Eph* by giving too many unconvincing and superfluous parallels from Paul's authentic letters in a distinct synopsis. By recording more parallels than necessary, Reuter can not easily deny the verdict of having blurred the difference between a synopsis and a concordance. Consequently, the actual relation between *Eph*, *Col* and Paul has been seriously obscured and the genesis and development of *Eph* disguised beyond recognition.

#### 4 M.-A. Wagenführer's synopsis (1941)

I shall now discuss Wagenführer's synopsis which appeared in 1941.<sup>28</sup> The reason I did not treat it in its chronological place between Goodspeed's synopsis of 1933 and Mitton's of 1951 is its layout. Wagenführer's synoptic display is the only one so far which comprises not only the continuous text of *Eph* but also the entire continuous text of *Col*.

When his synopsis was published in 1941, the only earlier complete synopsis of *Eph* and *Col* available to Wagenführer was that of Goodspeed (1933). Wagenführer levels severe criticism against Goodspeed's synoptic overview since for Wagenführer it is questionable whether the author of *Eph* was familiar with authentically Pauline writings besides *Col*. Wagen-

<sup>26</sup> Reuter 1997, p. 25; italics mine.

<sup>27</sup> Reuter 1997, p. 534.

<sup>28</sup> Wagenführer 1941. Wagenführer's synopsis is published as a fold-up enclosure, added separately at the back of his Jena doctoral thesis. In the table of contents, the enclosure is simply called 'Synopsis of the Letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians,' whereas no title is given on the enclosure itself, which consists of ten numbered tables.

fürer strongly disagrees with Goodspeed, because the latter is of the opinion that *Eph* is equally dependent on all Paul's authentic letters.<sup>29</sup> The parallels which Goodspeed lists between *Eph* and Paul's letters are, according to Wagenführer, similarities between isolated words which Goodspeed wrenched out of their context. Moreover, these parallels between *Eph* and Paul disguise the indisputable literary relationship between *Eph* and *Col*.<sup>30</sup>

Wagenführer's criticism of Goodspeed's synopsis is similar to the criticism which Mitton, independently of Wagenführer, addressed against Goodspeed a decade later. Despite the fact that he fell prey to the same methodological errors as Goodspeed, Mitton criticized Goodspeed for obscuring the self-evident overall dependence of *Eph* on *Col* by adducing a plethora of less likely parallels between *Eph* and Paul's authentic letters. I also levelled similar criticism at Reuter's synopsis because Reuter effectively negates the special relation between *Eph* and *Col* by drawing up a separate synopsis of *Eph* and Paul which does not take into account the relationship between *Eph* and *Col*. The pendulum of Wagenführer's criticism, though, swings to the other extreme when in his objections against Goodspeed's synopsis he not only emphasises that *Eph* is heavily dependent on *Col* but also denies that the author of *Eph* knew any other Pauline letter besides *Col*.<sup>31</sup>

I agree with Wagenführer that the way Goodspeed treats the relationship between *Eph*, *Col* and Paul's authentic writings fails to do justice to the *special* relationship between *Eph* and *Col*.<sup>32</sup> Yet, I would not conclude—as Wagenführer does—that *Col* was the only writing the author of *Eph* happened to know. According to Wagenführer, the author of *Eph* was either a secretary of Paul or a pseudepigraphic author who wrote in Paul's name. On either account, whether the author of *Eph* is Paul's secretary or a pseudepigraphic author, Wagenführer concludes that there is no literary relationship between *Eph* and Pauline letters besides *Col*<sup>33</sup> and therefore his synopsis does not cover parallels between *Eph* and Paul's authentic letters. Of course, Wagenführer is right in criticising Goodspeed's opinion that the author of *Eph* is equally dependent on all Paul's authentic letters including *Col* since this view does not do justice to the extraordinary relation between *Eph* and *Col*. It seems unlikely, however, that *Col* was the only letter the author of *Eph* happened to know, as Wagenführer suggests,<sup>34</sup> and is literarily dependent on.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Wagenführer 1941, p. 142 note 43.

<sup>30</sup> Wagenführer 1941, p. 142 note 43.

<sup>31</sup> Wagenführer 1941, p. 142.

<sup>32</sup> Wagenführer 1941, p. 142 note 43.

<sup>33</sup> Wagenführer 1941, p. 142 note 43.

<sup>34</sup> Wagenführer 1941, p. 142.

Before starting to comment on my new synopsis, I wish to discuss very briefly a synopsis which G.A.M. Vleugels drew up in his unpublished doctoral thesis (1997) at the University of Potchefstroom, South Africa. This synopsis is equally unsuitable for a genetic interpretation of *Eph*, or at least for an interpretation which presupposes the absolute priority of *Col*. According to Vleugels, the author of *Eph* and *Col*, Paul, interrupted the final redaction of his letter to the Ephesians when he received an urgent call to address the Colossian heresy. Paul allegedly made use of his still unfinished script of *Eph* and, after his completion of *Col*, although Vleugels fails to state this, the latter necessarily affected the final redaction of the former when Paul sat down to finish the letter he had begun to write to the Ephesians.<sup>36</sup>

Although Vleugels drew up two distinct synopses, one based on *Eph* and the other on *Col*, he did not do so in order to visualise a process of reciprocal influence.<sup>37</sup> The first synopsis is arranged on the basis of *Eph* and displays the continuous text of *Eph* in the first column and the fragmentary parallels from *Col* in the other columns.<sup>38</sup> The second synopsis is based on the continuous text of *Col* and paralleled with the corresponding passages of *Eph*.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Wagenführer 1941, p. 142 note 43.

<sup>36</sup> Vleugels 1997, chap. 5.5, p. 242; cf. p. 270.

<sup>37</sup> Vleugels 1997, pp. 9 and 263.

<sup>38</sup> Vleugels 1997, chap. 2.1, pp. 23—47.

<sup>39</sup> Vleugels 1997, chap. 2.2, pp. 48—69.

## 5 The present synopsis

### 5.1 Analyses of the structures of *Eph* and *Col*

With the sole exception of Wagenführer's synopsis, all previous synopses, those of Goodspeed, Mitton, Reuter and Vleugels, lack a continuous text of *Col* and only list parallels from *Col* in a fragmentary form. Consequently, Goodspeed, Mitton, Reuter and Vleugels have no analyses of the structures of *Eph* and *Col* either. Reuter, admittedly, makes an implicit attempt at a structural analysis by distinguishing between parallels which have a similar position in the overall outline of *Eph* and *Col*, and supplementary parallels which are derived from other locations in *Col*. Yet, his proposal does not seem totally convincing.<sup>40</sup> Even Wagenführer's explicit undertaking proves inadequate.<sup>41</sup>

In chap. 4 on the reasons for *Eph*, however, I showed that *Col* has a nine-part structure: part A mentions the letter's sender, its addressees and the sender's greetings (*Col* 1.1—2). Part B contains the author's thanking to God (*Col* 1.3—8), and part C his introductory prayer for his readers (*Col* 1.9—23). Part D is concerned with Paul's ministry and the mystery revealed to him (*Col* 1.24—2.7). In part E, the author of *Col* addresses the issues raised by the Colossian philosophy (*Col* 2.8—3.4). Part F consists of ethical exhortations (*Col* 3.5—17) and part G of instructions for the management of a Christian household (*Col* 3.18—4.1). After the author's request in part H for intercessory prayers so that the mystery may be further disseminated (*Col* 4.2—6), part I constitutes the ending of the letter with some remarks on the author's personal matters, a note on the messenger, and greetings (*Col* 4.7—18).

This nine-part structure of *Col* is, as the structural analysis of *Eph* in the new synopsis shows (see appendix II), taken over in *Eph* in its entirety. Not only do the respective parts of this structure retain the same themes as their counterparts in *Col* but, as the synopsis shows, the author of *Eph* expresses himself in almost the same vocabulary. The only changes which the author of *Eph* makes in his adaptation of the structure of *Col* are his omission of part E on the Colossian philosophy and his addition of three new parts at various stages in the structure which he copies from *Col*. The first new part, part NEW 1, the letter's first ecclesiological passage (*Eph* 2.11—22), is positioned directly after the introductory prayer of part C. Part NEW 2, the second ecclesiological passage (*Eph* 4.1—16), is added immediately after the omission of part E on the Colossian philosophy. Part

<sup>40</sup> Reuter 1997, pp. 27—28. For a detailed discussion, see Van Kooten 2001, pp. 209—218.

<sup>41</sup> See Van Kooten 2001, pp. 225—244.

NEW 3, finally, is about the fight of the Church's members against the cosmic rulers (*Eph* 6.10—17) and is inserted at the end of *Eph* between parts G and H. For this reason, the structure of *Eph* consists of eleven parts and relates to the structure of *Col* as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*

<i>The Letter to the Ephesians</i>	<i>The Letter to the Colossians</i>
1. Part A: Sender, addressees, and greetings	1. Part A: Sender, addressees, and greetings
2. Part B: Thanksgiving	2. Part B: Thanksgiving
3. Part C: Introductory prayer	3. Part C: Introductory prayer
4. Part NEW 1: The first ecclesiological passage	XXX
5. Part D: Paul's ministry and the mystery revealed to him	4. Part D: Paul's ministry and the mystery revealed to him
XXX	5. Part E: The Colossian philosophy
6. Part NEW 2: The second ecclesiological passage	XXX
7. Part F: Ethical exhortations	6. Part F: Ethical exhortations
8. Part G: Rules for the management of a Christian household	7. Part G: Rules for the management of a Christian household
9. Part NEW 3: The fight against the cosmic rulers	XXX
10. Part H: Request for intercessory prayers for the dissemination of the mystery	8. Part H: Request for intercessory prayers for the dissemination of the mystery
11. Part I: Ending: Personal matters, a note on the messenger, and greetings	9. Part I: Ending: Personal matters, a note on the messenger, and greetings

## *5.2 Relation between Eph, Col, Paul and the Septuagint*

### *Introduction*

In the previous section, I argued that in the eleven-part structure of *Eph* all parts—except for parts NEW 1, NEW 2 and NEW 3 which are added and part E which is missing—are the counterparts of the respective parts in the nine-part structure of *Col*. This is true both with regard to their place in

the overall make-up of the documents as well as with respect to their vocabulary and general content.

The parts in *Col* to which parts A—C, D, F—G and H—I of *Eph* correspond structurally are the primary text on which the author of *Eph* draws. But also in the case of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2, which the author of *Eph* adds to the overall structure copied from *Col*, he appears to draw on a particular text segment of *Col*. Both in part NEW 1 and part NEW 2, the author of *Eph* makes abundant use of large segments of part E in *Col*. This makes sense because we have seen that part E on the Colossian philosophy was the only part of *Col* to have been omitted as a whole from the structure which the author of *Eph* took over from *Col*. Two different, roughly successive segments of this part are now revealed to function as the primary text for parts NEW 1 and NEW 2 in *Eph* which lack counterparts in the structure of *Col*. Part NEW 3 on the strife against the cosmic rulers is the only part in the structure of *Eph* which is not only without structural counterpart in *Col* but does not relate to any primary text in *Col* at all.

There is more to the relation between *Eph* and *Col* than this, however. Besides what I call 'primary parallels' which are detected between a particular part in *Eph* and the corresponding part of *Col*, there are also passages which the author of *Eph* derives from non-corresponding parts in *Col*. These parallels between *Eph* and *Col* I call 'supplementary parallels' because they do not stem from the structurally parallel parts in *Col* but from other parts in *Col*. As the synopsis shows, part B of *Eph*, for instance, is structurally parallel with part B in *Col* and correspondences between these parts are primary parallels because part B of *Col* is the primary text the author of *Eph* makes use of. But in addition to these structural or primary parallels, as the third column of the synopsis (see appendix II; cf. section 5.4 below) shows, in part B of *Eph* the author of *Eph* also employs supplementary passages from parts C and D. Such supplementary passages are also detectable in parts NEW 1 and NEW 2 in *Eph* where they are added to passages derived from segments of part E in *Col* which function as his primary texts for parts NEW 1 and NEW 2.

Thus between *Eph* and *Col* there exist both primary parallels and supplementary parallels. Primary passages on which the author of *Eph* draws are either derived from the structurally parallel parts in *Col* or, but only in the case of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2, from text segments of part E in *Col* which function as primary texts. Supplementary passages from *Col* come in addition to passages which the author of *Eph* has taken over from the primary texts in *Col*.

For the sake of an economical and meaningful synopsis, which does not degenerate into a kind of hybrid between a synopsis and a concordance, it is important to distinguish primary parallels carefully from supplementary

ones. Given the fact that the author of *Eph* copied and adapted the overall structure of *Col* consciously, in the identification of parallels preference should be given to primary parallels which exist between the same parts in the respective structures of *Eph* and *Col* and—in the case of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2 of *Eph*—to primary parallels which are present between parts NEW 1—2 and the primary text segments of part E in *Col*. Passages in *Eph* should be explained first by tracing them back to the primary text of *Col*; only if that does not yield a convincing result should they be illuminated by supplementary passages from *Col*. If the primary text of *Col* accounts sufficiently for a passage in a particular part of *Eph*, one need not resort to supplementary passages as well.

Unfortunately, the synopses of Goodspeed, Mitton and Reuter lack such methodological considerations. They are too uncritical and list too many parallels between *Eph* and *Col*. A definition of what constitutes a parallel is urgently needed. The impression which the abundance of parallels listed in earlier synopses makes on the reader is not that the dependence of the author of *Eph* on *Col* is literary and systematic but that, throughout *Eph*, the latter epistle is a constant mixture of passages which stem from all parts of *Col*. On this account, the similarity between *Eph* and *Col* is regarded as merely partial, based on associative thoughts and best explained as due to the author's recollection of and familiarity with *Col*.

This, however, obscures the fact that each part of *Eph* is dependent first and foremost on its structural counterpart in *Col* or, in the case of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2, on segments from part E in *Col* which function as their primary text. Certainly, there are also passages in each part of *Eph* which derive from other parts in *Col* but these passages are supplementary. Strict methodology, however, can bring the ratio of primary and supplementary parallels between *Eph* and *Col* back into proportion.

This holds true also for the relation between *Eph* and Paul's authentic letters. Goodspeed, Mitton and Reuter have too easily included references to Paul's authentic letters in their synopses. This criticism applies all the more to Reuter, who splits his synopsis up into two distinct synopses, one dealing with *Eph* in relation to *Col* and the other with *Eph* in relation to Paul's authentic letters. In the latter synopsis, however, Reuter lists all possible parallels between *Eph* and Paul, irrespective of whether passages in *Eph* are better explained on the base of *Col*. Again, it is necessary to define what should be regarded as a parallel between *Eph* and Paul's letters (see section 5.3 below). Moreover, such a parallel should only be mentioned if a passage in *Eph* cannot sufficiently be explained on the base of primary and supplementary passages from *Col*.

The respective parts of *Eph* are best explained in their genetic development by taking into account, in order of succession: first, their direct

counterparts in the structure of *Col* or, but only in the case of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2, the segments of part E of *Col* which function as the primary text of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2; second, supplementary passages from other parts of *Col* which the author of *Eph* uses in addition to the primary parallels; third, passages from Paul's authentic letters or the Septuagint. In a genetic interpretation of a passage of *Eph*, one is only justified in resorting to a wider interpretative context in *Col* or even outside *Col* if this particular passage in *Eph* would otherwise be insufficiently explained.

Now that the general outline of my view on the relation between *Eph*, *Col*, Paul and the Septuagint has been made clear, I wish to deal with the nature of the relationship between *Eph* and its sources in more detail.

(a) *The relationship between Eph and Col*

Although the majority of modern scholars hold the author of *Eph* to be dependent on *Col*,<sup>42</sup> those, like Ochel and Benoit,<sup>43</sup> who depict this dependence as literary have nevertheless been criticised.<sup>44</sup> According to Merkel, Ochel exaggerates the dependency of *Eph* on *Col* since—in Merkel's view—this relationship is better explained from the recollections which the author of *Eph* had of *Col* than from literary dependence. Merkel agrees with Mitton that although the author of *Eph* is undoubtedly dependent on *Col*, this dependency is 'recollective' and not mechanistic. For this reason, Merkel likewise criticises Benoit for wrongly suggesting that the author of *Eph* was confined to such mechanistic borrowing of lines and individual words from *Col*. In Merkel's view, the dependence is not mechanistic but due to 'recollective reproduction.' Benoit, however, in turn levelled his criticism against scholars like Mitton and believed that the subtle way in which the author of *Eph* made use of *Col* points at literary dependence.<sup>45</sup>

I wholeheartedly agree with Benoit that the use which the author of *Eph* made of *Col* is too sophisticated<sup>46</sup> to be accounted for in terms only of memorisation.<sup>47</sup> The relationship is best characterised as literary depend-

<sup>42</sup> Merkel 1987, pp. 3212—3220.

<sup>43</sup> Ochel 1934 and Benoit 1963.

<sup>44</sup> Merkel 1987, pp. 3214 (criticism of Ochel), 3216 (agreement with Mitton; Merkel refers to Mitton 1951, pp. 55—67), 3217 (criticism of Benoit) and 3219.

<sup>45</sup> Benoit 1963, p. 20 note 33, with reference to Mitton 1951, pp. 57, 63—64, 75, 78—79 and 243—244. Benoit's analysis was still limited to three passages in *Eph* (*Eph* 2.1—6; 2.11—12; and 4.17—24).

<sup>46</sup> For a clear example of this sophistication, see the present study, chap. 4.3.2 above on *Eph* 1.19—20.

<sup>47</sup> Despite the fact that I assent to Ochel's and Benoit's view that there is an extended literary dependence between *Eph* and *Col*, at a more detailed level I disagree with many of their arguments since I have the advantage of a (better) synopsis.



ence. More specifically, the best arguments in favour of literary dependence are the sophisticated nature of the way in which *Col* has been adapted by the author of *Eph* and the repetitive conflation of structurally parallel and supplementary passages of *Col* into a single passage in *Eph*. Although Mitton had already noticed the phenomenon of what he called 'conflation,' a combination of originally separate passages in *Col* into a single new passage in *Eph*,<sup>48</sup> he still believed it was caused by the fact that the mind of the author of *Eph* was saturated with the contents of *Col* and not by a literary reference to a copy of *Col* in front of him. The fact, however, that the author of *Eph* can be shown to have deliberately adapted the entire structure of *Col* and to be primarily dependent on the corresponding passages in *Col*, to which supplementary passages are added, points at literary dependence.<sup>49</sup>

Apart from literary dependence, dependence through familiarity with *Col* has of course also played a role in the genesis and development of *Eph*. Literary dependence and dependence through familiarity together answers the objections of those who regard the dependence of the author of *Eph* on *Col* as merely recollective, while not ruling out a sliding scale of dependence ranging from direct literary dependence to conscious recollection and virtually unconscious familiarity.

The nature of the dependence is not only literary, it also seems without parallel despite Lincoln's efforts to draw an analogy between the way the author of *Eph* reworked *Col* and the way the *Letter of Aristeas* was edited in Josephus' *Antiquities*.<sup>50</sup> If the synopsis of the *Letter of Aristeas* and *Jewish Antiquities* 12.12—118, compiled by Pelletier,<sup>51</sup> is studied in detail, it appears that Lincoln's statement that 'Ephesians' redaction of Colossians is similar to that which can be shown to have taken place in the

---

<sup>48</sup> Mitton 1951, pp. 63—67. Except for his synopsis, Mitton's study contains surprisingly little critical examination of the relation between *Eph* and *Col* (chap. 6, pp. 55—57). Mitton lists eight segments of *Eph* where conflation occurs though comments only briefly upon three instances (pp. 65—66).

<sup>49</sup> For this reason, I question the views of those who consider *Eph* to be an authentically Pauline letter which either was (Goguel 1935) or was not reworked and supplemented with interpolations or not (Percy 1946; Van Roon 1974). Recent literature which exhibits such views includes Barth and Blanke 1994, who wrongly suggest that the same author wrote both letters (Barth and Blanke 1994, pp. 72—114), Porter and Clarke 1997, who incorrectly assume Paul to be the author of *Eph* and *Col* (Porter and Clarke 1997, pp. 77—83), and Best 1997, who unconvincingly argues that both letters were written independently by 'distinct authors who were members of the same Pauline school and had discussed together the Pauline theology they had inherited' (Best 1997, p. 96). However, as the new synopsis shows, it is beyond reasonable doubt that there exists a literary dependence between *Eph* and *Col*.

<sup>50</sup> Lincoln 1990, pp. LV and LVIII.

<sup>51</sup> Pelletier 1961, pp. 307—327.

case of Josephus' use of the *Letter of Aristeas* in his *Jewish Antiquities*<sup>52</sup> is ill-founded. Most importantly, the author of *Eph* and Josephus differ in that, in his reworking, Josephus makes no use of the literary technique of conflation by which originally distinct phrases and passages in the source text are moulded into a single passage in a new document.<sup>53</sup> The author of *Eph*, on the other hand, uses this technique as his most important device in reworking his source. The use of this technique is so sophisticated, as I agree with Benoit,<sup>54</sup> that (despite claims of Mitton and Merkel to the contrary) the nature of the dependence can only be literary and, as I conclude against Lincoln, without analogy.

*(b) The relationship between Eph and Paul*

The passages from Paul and the Septuagint, together with what I call 'stylistic hallmarks' of the author of *Eph* (distinctive phrases which occur more than once and seem to be characteristic of his style), are listed in the fourth column of the synopsis (see appendix II; cf. section 5.4 below). Here the question of whether the relation between the author of *Eph* and his sources can be characterised as literary dependence comes to the fore again. As regards the relation between the author of *Eph* and *Col*, I concluded above that there is literary dependence on *Col* as well as dependence through general familiarity with *Col*. In the case of the dependence of the author of *Eph* on Paul and the Septuagint, however, it is difficult to ascertain the nature of this dependence since the author's literary acquaintance with Paul's writings and the Septuagint needs to be proven and can not be taken for granted.

Where I refer to passages from Paul's authentic letters in the fourth column of my synopsis, nearly all references concern merely specific isolated notions and distinctive combinations of two or more terms which occur not only in *Eph* but in Paul's writings as well. Sometimes, these notions and combinations can be shown to be evidence of literary dependence. In most instances, however, the author of *Eph* reflects a general acquaintance with Paul's letters. This acquaintance might be mainly based on recollections of letters he had read in the past or on oral transmission of Paul's theological thought. Such similarities show that the author of *Eph* lived within the literary, oral and educational sphere of influence of Paul and the Pauline school of thought, whatever form the latter may have taken. The actual interplay of literary dependence, dependence on recollec-

---

<sup>52</sup> Lincoln 1990, p. LV.

<sup>53</sup> See Van Kooten 1995, chap. 1. Cf. Best 1997, pp. 76—77: 'while Josephus made many modifications (...), it does not appear that he conflated passages from different parts of *Aristeas*.'

<sup>54</sup> Benoit 1963, p. 20 note 33.

tion and dependence on oral traditions is difficult to assess and, given the fact that these various factors are involved, one necessarily has to reckon with sliding scales of dependence. Some of the references to Paul's literary corpus which I make may be out of place because, on closer inspection, some notions and combinations of terms may not necessarily be distinctively Pauline but at home in other early Christian circles as well. But since the author of *Eph* belonged to Pauline Christianity I did not want to leave these references out.

It seems plausible, however, that *Eph* is literarily dependent on some of Paul's writings. There seems to be a literary dependence at least on the Corinthian correspondence. In part A and in the opening line of part B, the author of *Eph* draws extensively on the beginning of *2 Cor* (see *Eph* 1.1—3; *2 Cor* 1.1—3). In part B of *Eph*, the notion of having been sealed and given the pledge of the Spirit, which Paul employs in *2 Cor* 1.21—22, is applied (*Eph* 1.13—14; cf. *Eph* 4.30 in part F). In parts D and F, the author of *Eph* depends on what Paul writes in *2 Cor* 4.16—17 about the destruction of the outer man and the concomitant renewal of the inner man (see *Eph* 3.13; 3.16; 4.22—23). In part F, he also makes use of Paul's ethical reminder in *2 Cor* 6.14 that righteousness has no share in lawless conduct, nor does light have anything in common with darkness (see *Eph* 5.7—11). And in part NEW 3, finally, he draws on Paul's assertion in *2 Cor* 10.4—5 that the weapons of his campaign are not fleshly (see *Eph* 6.12). These similarities seem to point to direct acquaintance with *2 Cor*.

This acquaintance seems to extend to *1 Cor* as well. The best indication for this is the introductory prayer of part C in *Eph* where the author of *Eph* makes extensive use of Paul's description of Christ's subjection of the principles and powers of the cosmos in *1 Cor* 15.23—28 (see *Eph* 1.21—23). Other traces of *1 Cor* are detectable in parts NEW 2 and F. In part NEW 2, they include the close interrelation between the Spirit, the ecclesiastical body and baptism (see *Eph* 4.4—5; *1 Cor* 12.13) and the enumeration of apostles, prophets and teachers (see *Eph* 4.11; *1 Cor* 12.28—29). In part F, such traces can be discerned in the notion of getting tired as a result of labouring with one's own hands (*Eph* 4.28; *1 Cor* 4.11—12) and the warning that those who commit particular offences will not inherit the kingdom of God (*Eph* 5.5; *1 Cor* 5.11, 6.9—10). It is clear, therefore, that the author of *Eph* was familiar with Paul's Corinthian correspondence.

It seems probable that he had read *1 Thess* as well. In part C, the author of *Eph* employs the notion of being thankful to God for his readers when he mentions them in his prayers (*Eph* 1.16), a notion which is also found in *1 Thess* 1.2. Again, in part C and the following part NEW 1, there are literal reminiscences of the distinction Paul makes in *1 Thess* 4.13 between the Christians and the rest of mankind (*Eph* 2.3), who have no hope

(*Eph* 2.12). In part F, in his elaboration of the antithesis between light and darkness (*Eph* 5.8; 5.14; 5.18), the author of *Eph* seems to draw on *1 Thess* 5.4—7. The clearest instance of his dependence on *1 Thess*, however, is the imagery of the spiritual armour in part NEW 3 (see *Eph* 6.13—17). Although some elements of this imagery also point to *Isaiah* (59.17; 59.21 LXX) and the *Wisdom of Solomon* (5.17—18 LXX), it is probable that the author of *Eph* made use of *1 Thess* 5.8 as well.

His acquaintance with other letters of Paul is less certain, however. Part D on Paul's ministry and the mystery which was revealed to him might betray some familiarity with the doxology at the end of *Romans* (see *Romans* 16.25—27). The idea that a mystery is made known by means of revelation (*Eph* 3.3), the involvement of prophets or prophetic writings in this revelation (*Eph* 3.5) and the entire structure and contents of the concluding doxology (*Eph* 3.20—21) are features shared by part D in *Eph* and *Romans* 16.25—27. In part D, there might also be an allusion to the conviction which Paul expresses in *Romans* 8.38—39 that neither height nor depth nor any other part of creation will be able to separate him and his readers from the love of God which is in Christ (cf. *Eph* 3.18—19). Remarks in *Romans* 12.3 on a particular measure (of faith or of grace) which is apportioned to each member of the Christian congregation, finally, may have been taken up in the second ecclesiological passage of part NEW 2 (see *Eph* 4.7; 4.16).

Although the accumulation of such verbal similarities renders the familiarity of the author of *Eph* with *Romans* possible, such cumulative evidence seems absent for *Philipp*, *Gal* and *Phm*. There is a remote similarity between the opening line of the author's supplication at the end of part D in *Eph* (see *Eph* 3.14) and *Philipp* 2.9—10, as both passages talk about bending the knee in an act of submission to God or Christ, who is superior to all kinds of celestial and terrestrial entities. Distinctive similarities between *Eph* and *Gal* appear to be limited to the formula that Christ loved mankind and gave himself up for them, a formula which, in this extensive form, occurs only in parts F and G of *Eph* (see *Eph* 5.2; 5.25) and in *Gal* 2.20. A partial parallel to the warning in part F in *Eph* to the effect that those who perform particular sins do not inherit God's kingdom (*Eph* 5.5) may be offered by *Gal* 5.19—21, though the passage is on the whole better explained from *1 Cor* 5.11 and 6.9—10. Meaningful parallels between *Eph* and *Phm*, finally, must be deemed lacking, all the more since the application of the notion of the author's thankfulness to God for his readers when he mentions them in his prayers is already explained on the basis of *1 Thess* (see *Eph* 1.16; *1 Thess* 1.2; *Phm* 4).

In short, there are descending degrees to which the author of *Eph* can be shown to be acquainted with Paul's authentic writings. He is undoubtedly

familiar with *1 Cor* and *2 Cor*, probably with *1 Thess*, and there is a good chance that he was aware of the contents of *Romans*.<sup>55</sup> As in the case of *Col*, the relationship between the author of *Eph* and *1 Cor*, *2 Cor*, *1 Thess* and *Romans* is one of literary dependence in addition to dependence through general familiarity. Some passages in *Eph*, like the opening of the letter, the discussion of Christ's subjection of the cosmic powers in part C and the passage on the spiritual armour in part NEW 3 reflect a very close reading of the Corinthian correspondence and *1 Thess*. Most passages discussed above, however, result from thorough familiarity with letters which the author of *Eph* had probably read or heard several times.

Such familiarity also accounts for less specific notions and combinations of only two words which occur in *1 Cor*, *2 Cor*, *1 Thess* and *Romans* and are also listed in the fourth column of the synopsis. Although there is no evidence for the author's acquaintance with *Philipp*, *Gal* and *Phm*, these writings are nevertheless referred to in the fourth column on the assumption that particular notions and combinations of words may have been part of oral traditions which functioned within the Pauline school and ultimately derive from, or are also reflected in writings like *Philipp*, *Gal* and *Phm*. All things being equal, references to Paul's letters are given in this order: *1 Cor*, *2 Cor*, *1 Thess*, *Romans*, *Philipp*, *Gal* and *Phm*.

(c) *The relationship between Eph and the Septuagint*

Apart from *Col* and Paul's authentic letters, the author of *Eph* made also abundant use of the Septuagint.<sup>56</sup> In part NEW 1, he alludes to a passage in *Isaiah* 57.18—20 on peace for those who are far off and those who are near, whereas the wicked will be excessively tossed about (see *Eph* 2.13; 2.17). This allusion is intermingled with a terminological combination of the noun 'peace' (εἰρήνη) and the verb 'to proclaim as glad tidings' (εὐαγγελίζομαι) which is found elsewhere in *Isaiah* (see *Isaiah* 52.7 LXX; cf. *Nahum* 2.1 LXX). Another combination which also occurs in *Isaiah*, that of the terms 'used for the corner foundation' (ἀκρογωνιά) and 'foundation' (θεμέλιον), is equally used in part NEW 1, probably to expand on the imagery of foundation and building which the author of *Eph* derives from Paul (*1 Cor* 3.10—13: θεμέλιον; *1 Cor* 3.9: οἰκοδομή) and uses in *Eph* 2.20—21.

In part NEW 2, *Psalms* 67.19 LXX is quoted and subsequently commented on in detail. Of all the quotations of and allusions to the Septua-

<sup>55</sup> Cf. for an inclusive view on this issue (acquaintance with all Paul's authentic letters, including *Col* and *2 Thess*) Goodspeed 1933, pp. 79—80. Cf. also Gese 1997, pp. 54—85: all Paul's authentic letters, with the exception of *Philipp*. An exclusive view (acquaintance with *1 Cor* only) is held by Lindemann 1979, pp. 122—130.

<sup>56</sup> On this issue, see also Moritz 1996 and Lincoln 1982.

gint, this is the only one which is introduced by a formula which characterises the succeeding words as an explicit quotation. In his comments on *Psalms* 67.19, a final distinctive part of *Isaiah* 57.18—20 to which the author of *Eph* alluded in part NEW 1 is taken up (*Eph* 4.14): in contrast to those who are far off and those who are near, who both receive peace, the wicked (or, on the level of part NEW 2, those not yet full-grown in spiritual understanding) are tossed about (κλυδωνιζόμενοι).

In parts F and G, the author of *Eph* widens his ethical exhortations and instructions for managing a Christian household to include quotations from the prophets (*Zechariah* 8.16 in *Eph* 4.25), the *Psalms* (*Psalms* 4.5 in *Eph* 4.26) and the *Pentateuch* (*Gen* 2.24 in *Eph* 5.31; *Exodus* 20.12 and/or *Deuteronomy* 5.16 in *Eph* 6.2—3).

In part NEW 3, finally, the author of *Eph* expands on Paul's imagery of spiritual armour, which he found in *1 Thess* 5.8, by drawing on various passages in *Isaiah*. The first passage deals with the metaphor of spiritual armour in a slightly more extensive way than Paul (see *Isaiah* 59.17 and 59.21 in *Eph* 6.14—17). Paul himself had probably been dependent on this passage in *1 Thess* 5.8. The second passage contains similar imagery of girding up one's loins for battle (*Isaiah* 11.5 in *Eph* 6.14). The third passage holds a comparable picture of the feet of him who proclaims the glad tidings of peace (*Isaiah* 52.7 in *Eph* 6.15).

The way the Greek Old Testament (conveniently called the Septuagint) is used in *Eph* is noteworthy in two respects. First, its application appears to be restricted to parts NEW 1, NEW 2, NEW 3 and parts F and G, i.e. to those parts which either supplement the structure which the author of *Eph* derives from *Col* (parts NEW 1—3) or parts which contain many separate ethical exhortations and household instructions to which Septuagint quotations and allusions can easily be added (parts F and G). The concentration of Septuagint quotations and allusions in parts NEW 1, NEW 2 and NEW 3 of *Eph* seems to confirm that these parts are additions to the structure of *Col*, especially as the Septuagint is not used in *Col*. The Septuagint provided the author of *Eph* with material for the two ecclesiological passages NEW 1 and NEW 2 as well as for that on the fight against the cosmic rulers in part NEW 3. These passages were inserted at various stages in the structure which he derived from *Col*. The expansion of the ethical exhortations in part F and the instructions for managing a Christian household in part G was also achieved by drawing on Septuagint material. Secondly, it is notable that among the books of the Septuagint the author of *Eph* is particularly well acquainted with *Isaiah*.

In conclusion, the relation between *Eph*, *Col*, Paul and the Septuagint is best accounted for as follows. The author of *Eph* appears to be principally dependent on the primary text of *Col*. This primary text consists of the

respective counterparts in the structure of *Col* or, but only in the case of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2, of segments of part E of *Col*. In addition to the primary passages, the author of *Eph* also draws on supplementary passages in *Col* which belong to parts other than the primary sections. Apart from that, Paul's authentic letters are employed, particularly the Corinthian correspondence, *1 Thess* and *Romans*. Finally, he also makes use of the Septuagint but exclusively in parts NEW 1, NEW 2 and NEW 3, and in his expansions of parts F and G.

### 5.3 Definition of parallelism

What actually constitutes a parallel between *Eph* on the one hand and *Col*, Paul and the Septuagint on the other needs to be discussed. As regards the relation between *Eph* and *Col*, the author of *Eph* appears to be dependent first and foremost on the text of the corresponding parts of *Col*. It is natural, therefore, to list all verbal similarities between a particular part of *Eph* and its structural counterpart in *Col*. This also holds true for the analogies between parts NEW 1 and NEW 2 in *Eph* and the segments of part E in *Col* which function as their primary texts. Similarities in idea rather than in language should not be noted, however, since the assumption of such correspondences seems arbitrary. Parallels between a particular part of *Eph* and its primary text in *Col*, thus, include all verbal similarities.

A different norm applies for the parallels between *Eph* on the one hand and the supplementary passages from *Col*, Paul and the Septuagint on the other. These parallels should, as a rule, be based on a combination of at least two words or cognate words. The interval between these terms should not normally exceed fifteen words. Reuter, whose synopsis is the only one to date which includes serious methodological considerations of what is a parallel, defines the minimum requirement of a parallel as 'a word-for-word coincidence of two lexemes within a verse.'<sup>57</sup> However, it is anachronistic to use verse distinctions in this definition since the division into verses only dates back to 1551, when Robert Estienne (Stephanus) first divided the text into numbered verses in his fourth edition of the Greek New Testament (Geneva, 1551).<sup>58</sup> If a parallel concerns a combination of words which happen to be at either side of a verse distinction, such a parallel is not recorded by Reuter, since such a combination fails to meet his requirement of two lexemes coinciding *within a verse*.

To prevent this happening, it makes more sense to stipulate as a minimal norm for parallelism the distinctive combination of two words (or cognate words) not within a verse, but within an interval of fifteen words. Parallels based on isolated words are consequently only acceptable when

<sup>57</sup> Reuter 1997, p. 27.

<sup>58</sup> See Metzger 1964, pp. 103—104. Cf., however, Reuter 2003, p. 190.

they occur in the structurally corresponding parts in *Eph* and *Col* or, in the case of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2, in segments of part E of *Col*. Supplementary parallels between *Eph* and *Col*, *Eph* and Paul, and *Eph* and the Septuagint need to be based on a combination of at least two distinctive terms or cognate terms. In all cases, parallels should normally be verbal: non-verbal similarities might jeopardise the accuracy of a synopsis.

5.4 Synopsis layout

Investigation into the respective structures of *Eph* and *Col* (see section 5.1 above) and into the relation between *Eph*, *Col*, Paul and the Septuagint (see section 5.2 above) led to the conclusion that it is possible to understand *Eph* entirely in its genetic development. The successive stages of this development are represented in four columns (see Table 2).

Table 2. Layout of the present synopsis

The adaptation of the structure of <i>Colossians</i> in <i>Ephesians</i> :				Adaptation ( <i>continued</i> ):						
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C ---	D	E	---	F G ---	H	I	<i>Col</i>
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C NEW 1	D	---	NEW 2	F G NEW 3	H	I	<i>Eph</i>
								Parallel Passages from Paul and the LXX, and Stylistic Hallmarks of <i>Eph</i>		
The Continuous Text of <i>Ephesians</i>	The Continuous Text of <i>Colossians</i> —Primary Text			Supplementary Passages from <i>Col</i>						
Part A, etc.	Part A, etc.			[<Part ...] ...			[<Part ...] ...			

The first column contains the respective parts of the continuous text of *Eph*. The second column presents the structurally parallel parts in *Col* or, in the case of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2 of *Eph*, the corresponding text segments of part E in *Col*. Part A of *Eph* is paralleled by part A of *Col*, and so on. The entire structure of *Eph* proves to be copied from *Col* with the exception of part E on the Colossian philosophy, which is omitted as a whole from *Eph*, and parts NEW 1, NEW 2 and NEW 3 which have been added. Nevertheless, parts NEW 1 and NEW 2 make use of large segments of part E of *Col* which are presented in the second column as their primary texts. The third column holds the supplementary passages from *Col* which are used in addition to the primary passages of the second column. Finally, the fourth column accommodates supplementary passages from Paul and the Septuagint, as well as stylistic hallmarks of *Eph*.



The order of these four columns is dictated by the idea that a wider context for the interpretation of *Eph* should only be sought if the material listed in the previous column lacks sufficient explanatory force. This idea is of course based on the recognition that the author of *Eph* copied the entire structure of *Col*, omitted part E on the Colossian philosophy and added parts NEW 1, NEW 2 and NEW 3. The way the author of *Eph* adapted the structure of *Col* is represented in the diagram which appears at the top of each opening of the synopsis, as a constant reminder of how the author of *Eph* proceeded.

### 5.5 The synopsis and the reasons for Eph

Even the mere way in which the author of *Eph* adapted the structure of *Col* suggests that he was in fact writing a commentary on the latter. He copied the entire structure of *Col* with the exception of part E on the Colossian philosophy, though large segments of part E were drawn upon in parts NEW 1 and NEW 2 which, together with part NEW 3, were added to the structure. Though primarily dependent on the structurally parallel parts in *Col* and, in the case of parts NEW 1 and NEW 2, on segments of part E, he made also use of supplementary passages from other parts of *Col*. Finally, he also drew on Paul and the Septuagint.

Although the synopsis itself suffices to show that *Eph* can be understood as a comprehensive and systematic commentary on *Col* and not just as a patchwork made by sewing together small pieces of material from *Col*, Paul and the Septuagint, this is argued at length in the fourth chapter above on the reasons for *Eph*.

### 5.6 Introduction and key to the synopsis

The Greek text and punctuation of *Eph*, *Col* and Paul's authentic letters are according to the Fourth Revised Edition of *The Greek New Testament* (1993). The Greek text and punctuation of the Septuagint are according to the edition by A. Rahlfs (1935).

The starting point for the use of this synopsis is the first column which offers the continuous text of *Eph*. Symbols structured as  $x^y$  refer to the other columns,  $x$  standing for the column number (either 2, 3 or 4) and  $y$  for the reference number within that particular column.

Example: *Eph* 1.3 ( $4^{1/2^1}$ ) Εὐλογητός ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλόγησας ἡμᾶς ( $3^1$ ) ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ ( $3^3$ ) πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ. The symbols ( $4^{1/2^1}$ ) refer respectively to the fourth column, first reference and the second column, first reference; ( $3^1$ ) refers to the third column, first reference, and ( $3^3$ ) to the third column, third reference. Underlinings show which words and phrases are considered parallel.

On some occasions, in the first column a reference number is followed by an apostrophe and is structured as  $x^y'$ . Such a symbol always occurs together with the same symbol  $x^y$  without the apostrophe and indicates that, whereas  $y$  refers to the proper equivalent,  $y'$  refers either to a less precise or less extensive equivalent (often with less context) or to its repetition. In column two, three or four, an apostrophe merely signifies another occurrence or repetition of a particular word or phrase. The apostrophe should always warn readers of the synopsis to look for the same symbol without apostrophe.

References to a combination of two or more words in the fourth column are made by means of as few symbols as possible; normally only one element of a combination will be marked. If the presentation of material from Paul's authentic letters is of equal weight, the following non-canonical order is maintained: *1 Cor*, *2 Cor* and *1 Thess* first, then *Romans*, and lastly *Philipp*, *Gal* and *Phm* (see section 5.2 above for an explanation of this order). The stylistic hallmarks of the author of *Eph*, which are indicated in the fourth column, are distinctive phrases which occur more than once and seem to be characteristic of his style.

The diagram at the top of each opening of the synopsis shows how the entire structure of *Col* has been adapted by the author of *Eph*. A vertical arrow indicates which part of the structure of *Eph* is being dealt with on that particular opening.



Appendix II

Synopsis of the Greek Texts of  
the *Letter to the Ephesians*, the *Letter to the Colossians*,  
Paul's Authentic Letters and the Septuagint

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

↓

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part A

2: *Col* — primary text: Part A

### A. Sender, Addressees, and Greetings (1.1—2)

### A. Sender, Addressees, and Greetings (1.1—2)

**1.1** (2<sup>1</sup>) Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χρισ-  
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ δια θελήματος θεοῦ  
(2<sup>2</sup>/4<sup>1</sup>) τοῖς (2<sup>4</sup>/4<sup>2</sup>) ἁγίοις (4<sup>3</sup>) τοῖς  
οὔσιν (2<sup>3</sup>/4<sup>4</sup>) [ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ] (2<sup>5</sup>) καὶ  
πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,  
**1.2** (2<sup>6</sup>/4<sup>5</sup>) χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη  
ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (4<sup>6</sup>) καὶ  
κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**1.1** (1) Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χρισ-  
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ δια θελήματος θεοῦ  
καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός  
**1.2** (2) τοῖς (3) ἐν Κολοσσαῖς  
(4) ἁγίοις (5) καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελ-  
φοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, (6) χάρις ὑμῖν  
καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

None.

(1—4) Cf. the following forms of address: ... (1) τοῖς (2) ἀγίοις πᾶσιν (3) τοῖς οὖσιν (4) ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ in *2 Cor* 1.1 (cf. *2 Cor* 1.2—3 in *Eph* 1.2—3), and ... πᾶσιν (1) τοῖς (2) ἀγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (3) τοῖς οὖσιν (4) ἐν Φιλίπποις in *Philipp* 1.1.

(5—6) See the opening greetings (5) χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (6) καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in *2 Cor* 1.2 (cf. *2 Cor* 1.1 in *Eph* 1.1, and *2 Cor* 1.3 in *Eph* 1.3), *1 Cor* 1.3, *Rom* 1.7, *Philipp* 1.2, *Gal* 1.3 and *Phm* 3 (cf. also *Eph* 6.23).

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

		↓					
	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>	
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E	
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW I	D	---	
				<i>The Church (1)</i>			

1: *Eph* : Part B

2: *Col* — primary text: Part B

## B. Thanksgiving (1.3—14)

## B. Thanksgiving (1.3—8)

1.3 (4<sup>1/2</sup><sup>1</sup>) Εὐλογητός ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (4<sup>2</sup>) ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς (3<sup>1</sup>) ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ (3<sup>3</sup>) πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ, 1.4 καθὼς (4<sup>3</sup>) ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ (2<sup>3/4</sup><sup>5</sup>) πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἶναι ἡμᾶς (3<sup>4</sup>) ἀγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, 1.5 (2<sup>3/4</sup><sup>4</sup>) προ-ορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἰοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν, (4<sup>7</sup>) κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, 1.6 (4<sup>8</sup>) εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης (2<sup>5</sup>) τῆς χάριτος (4<sup>9</sup>) αὐτοῦ ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν (3<sup>5</sup>) τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ. 1.7 ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν (3<sup>8</sup>) διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, (3<sup>6</sup>) τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων, κατὰ (4<sup>10</sup>) τὸ πλοῦτος (4<sup>11/2</sup><sup>5</sup>) τῆς χάριτος (4<sup>12</sup>) αὐτοῦ 1.8 ἧς (4<sup>13</sup>) ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, (3<sup>1</sup>) ἐν πάσῃ (3<sup>2</sup>) σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονή-σει, 1.9 (3<sup>11</sup>) γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, (4<sup>7</sup>) κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ ἦν (2<sup>3</sup>) προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ 1.10 εἰς οἰκονομίαν (4<sup>14</sup>) τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, (3<sup>7</sup>) ἀνακεφαλαιώ-σασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, (3<sup>10</sup>) τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ (3<sup>9</sup>) τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν αὐτῷ.

1.3 (1) Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν προσ-ευχόμενοι, 1.4 ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους 1.5 διὰ (2) τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν (3) προ-(4) ηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου 1.6 τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς, καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν καρποφο-ρούμενον καὶ ἀξιοζώνον καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκού-σατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε (5) τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ· 1.7 καθὼς ἐμάθετε ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπη-τοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν, ὅς ἐστιν πιστός ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1.8 ὁ καὶ δηλώσας ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I Col
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I Eph
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: Col — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(1—3) [**<PART C>**] 1.9 (...) ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (1) ἐν πάσῃ (2) σοφία καὶ συνέσει (3) πνευματικῇ.

(4) [**<PART C>**] 1.22 νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς (4) ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

(5—6) [**<PART C>**] 1.13 (...) καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν (5) τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, 1.14 ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, (6) τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.

(7—10) [**<PART C>**] 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ (7) ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας (8) διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, [δι' αὐτοῦ] εἶτε (9) τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἶτε (10) τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

(11) [**<PART D>**] 1.26 (...) νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, 1.27 οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς (11) γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

(1—2) 2 Cor 1.3—4 (1) Ἐὐλογητός ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (...), (2) ὁ παρακαλῶν ἡμᾶς (cf. 2 Cor 1.1—2 in Eph 1.1—2; cf. also 2 Cor 1.3 in Eph 1.17).

(3) Notion of divine election (ἐκλέγομαι) also in 1 Cor 1.27—28.

(4—6) Notion of (4) divine pre-determination (προορίζω) in 1 Cor 2.7, combined with the similar phrase (5) πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, and with the phrase (6) κατὰ πρόθεσιν in Rom 8.28—30.

(7) Hallmark: κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν (...) αὐτοῦ in Eph 1.5 and 1.9.

(8—9) Hallmark: (8) εἰς ἔπαινον (τῆς) δόξης (...) (9) αὐτοῦ in Eph 1.6, 1.12 and 1.14. Cf. the phrase εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ in Philipp 1.11.

(10—12) Hallmark: (10) τὸ (...) πλοῦτος (11) τῆς χάριτος (12) αὐτοῦ in Eph 1.7 and 2.7.

(13) Combination of χάρις and περισσεύω/περισευεία also in 2 Cor 9.8 and Rom 5.15, 5.17 and 5.20.

(14) Notion of the fullness of time (τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου) in Gal 4.4: ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. Cf. the phrase τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων in 1 Cor 10.11.



The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

↓

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW I	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part B

2: *Col* — primary text: Part B

1.11 ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν  
(2<sup>3</sup>/4<sup>4</sup>) προ-ορισθέντες (4<sup>6</sup>) κατὰ  
πρόθεσιν (4<sup>15</sup>) τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργούντος κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ 1.12 εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς (4<sup>8</sup>) εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης (4<sup>9</sup>) αὐτοῦ τοὺς (2<sup>3</sup>) προ-(2<sup>2</sup>) ηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. 1.13 ἐν ᾧ καὶ (2<sup>4</sup>) ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (4<sup>16</sup>) τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες (4<sup>17</sup>) ἐσφραγίσθητε (4<sup>19</sup>) τῷ πνεύματι (4<sup>20</sup>) τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ, 1.14 ὃ ἐστίν (4<sup>18</sup>) ἄρραβῶν (3<sup>12</sup>/4<sup>21</sup>) τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν, εἰς (3<sup>13</sup>/4<sup>22</sup>) ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως, (4<sup>23</sup>) εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

None.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I Col
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I Eph
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: Col — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(12—13) [**<PART C**] 1.11 (...) μετὰ χαρᾶς 1.12 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανωσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα (12) τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί· 1.13 ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, 1.14 ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν (13) τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.

(15) 1 Cor 12.6 (...) ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. Cf. also *Philipp* 3.21: (...) κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξει αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.

(16) Relation between deliverance (σωτηρία) and gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) also in *Rom* 1.16.

(17—19) 2 Cor 1.21—22 ὁ δὲ (...) θεός, 1.22 ὁ καὶ (17) σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς (18) τὸν ἄρραβῶνα (19) τοῦ πνεύματος (cf. *Eph* 4.30). For the clause ὁ ἄρραβῶν τοῦ πνεύματος see also 2 Cor 5.5.

(20) Relation between promise (ἐπαγγελία) and the Spirit (πνεῦμα) also in *Gal* 3.14.

(21) Relation between heir (κληρονόμος) and Spirit (πνεῦμα) also in *Rom* 8.16—17.

(22) Relation between redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) and the Spirit (πνεῦμα) also in *Rom* 8.23.

(23) Hallmark: εἰς ἔπαινον (τῆς) δόξης (...) αὐτοῦ in *Eph* 1.14, 1.12 and 1.6. Possibly derived from the phrase εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ in *Philipp* 1.11.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

			↓			
	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW I	D	---
				<i>The Church (1)</i>		

1: *Eph* : Part C

2: *Col* — primary text: Part C

### C. Introductory Prayer (1.15—2.10)

### C. Introductory Prayer (1.9—23)

**1.15** (2<sup>1</sup>) Διὰ τοῦτο καγὼ (2<sup>2/3</sup>6) ἀ-  
κούσας (3<sup>7</sup>) τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν  
ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγά-  
πην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους  
**1.16** (2<sup>3</sup>) οὐ παύομαι (3<sup>1/4</sup>1) εὐχα-  
ριστῶν (2<sup>4</sup>) ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (4<sup>2</sup>) μνεῖαν  
ποιούμενος (2<sup>5/3</sup>5/4<sup>3</sup>) ἐπὶ τῶν  
προσευχῶν μου, **1.17** (2<sup>6</sup>) ἵνα  
(3<sup>2/4</sup>4) ὁ θεὸς (3<sup>4/4</sup>6) τοῦ κυρίου  
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (3<sup>3/4</sup>5) ὁ  
πατὴρ (2<sup>13</sup>) τῆς δόξης, δώῃ ὑμῖν  
(2<sup>9</sup>) πνεῦμα (2<sup>8</sup>) σοφίας καὶ ἀπο-  
καλύψεως ἐν (2<sup>7</sup>) ἐπιγνώσει αὐ-  
τοῦ, **1.18** (2<sup>16</sup>) πεφωτισμένους τοὺς  
ὀφθαλμοὺς (4<sup>7</sup>) τῆς καρδίας  
[ὑμῶν] εἰς τὸ εἰδέναί ὑμᾶς τίς  
ἐστιν (3<sup>8/3</sup>13) ἡ ἐλπίς (4<sup>8</sup>) τῆς  
κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, (3<sup>10</sup>) τίς ὁ πλοῦ-  
τος (3<sup>11/2</sup>13) τῆς δόξης (2<sup>14</sup>) τῆς  
κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ (3<sup>12</sup>) ἐν  
(2<sup>15/3</sup>9) τοῖς ἁγίοις,  
**1.19** καὶ τί (4<sup>9</sup>) τὸ ὑπερβάλλον  
μέγεθος (2<sup>10/3</sup>17) τῆς δυνάμεως  
αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας  
(2<sup>11/3</sup>14) κατὰ (3<sup>15/3</sup>18) τὴν ἐνέρ-  
γειαν (2<sup>12/4</sup>10) τοῦ κράτους  
(4<sup>11</sup>) τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.  
**1.20** (3<sup>16</sup>) ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ  
Χριστῷ (3<sup>19/3</sup>21) ἐγείρας  
(3<sup>20</sup>) αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ  
(3<sup>23</sup>) καθίσας (3<sup>22</sup>) ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ

**1.9** (1) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἧς  
ἡμέρας (2) ἠκούσαμεν, (3) οὐ παυ-  
όμεθα (4) ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (5) προσευχό-  
μενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι, (6) ἵνα πλη-  
ρωθῆτε (7) τὴν ἐπιγνώσιν τοῦ θε-  
λήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ (8) σοφία  
καὶ (9) συνέσει πνευματικῆ, 1.10  
περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς  
πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ  
ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ ἀδξα-  
νόμενοι (7') τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ  
θεοῦ, 1.11 ἐν πάσῃ (10) δυνάμει  
δυναμούμενοι (11) κατὰ (12) τὸ  
κράτος (13) τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς  
πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυ-  
μίαν. μετὰ χαρᾶς 1.12 εὐχαρισ-  
τοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι  
ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα (14) τοῦ κλη-  
ρου (15) τῶν ἁγίων ἐν (16) τῷ  
φωτί. 1.13 ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ  
τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετ-  
έστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ  
υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, 1.14 ἐν ᾧ  
ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν  
ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. 1.15 ὃς  
ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου,  
πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως,

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>		<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H	I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>		

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(1—8) [**<PART B>**] 1.3 (1) Εὐχαριστοῦμεν (2) τῷ θεῷ (3) πατρὶ (4) τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν (5) προσευχόμενοι, 1.4 (6) ἀκούσαντες (7) τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους 1.5 (8) διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα.

(1—3) The verb (1) εὐχαριστέω in combination with the phrase (2) μνειαν (...) ποιοῦμαι + (3) ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν also in *1 Thess* 1.2 and in *Phm* 4; without εὐχαριστέω also in *Rom* 1.9—10.

(9—17) [**<PART D>**] 1.26 (...) νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη (9) τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, 1.27 οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι (10) τί τὸ πλοῦτος (11) τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου (12) ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, (13) ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης· 1.28 ὃν ἡμεῖς καταγγέλλομεν (...)· 1.29 εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος (14) κατὰ (15) τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ (16) τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν (17) δυνάμει.

(4—6) For the title (4) ὁ θεὸς καὶ (5) πατήρ (6) τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, see *2 Cor* 1.3 (cf. *2 Cor* 1.3 in *Eph* 1.3) and *Rom* 15.6.

(7) Cf. illumination (φωτισμός) and the heart (καρδία) in *2 Cor* 4.6.

(8) Hallmark: ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως in *Eph* 1.18 and 4.4.

(18—20) [**<PART E>**] 2.12 συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως (18) τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ (19) τοῦ ἐγείραντος (20) αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

(9) Combination of exceeding/ excess (ὑπερβάλλων/ὑπερβολή) and power (δύναμις) also in *2 Cor* 4.7.

(10—11) Hallmark: (10) τὸ κράτος (11) τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ in *Eph* 1.19 and 6.10.

(21—23) [**<PART E>**] 3.1 Εἰ οὖν συν- (21) ηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὗ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶν (22) ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ (23) καθήμενος.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

		↓				
	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---
				<i>The Church (1)</i>		

1: *Eph* : Part C

2: *Col* — primary text: Part C

(2<sup>19</sup>) ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανόις  
**1.21** ὑπεράνω (2<sup>21</sup>/4<sup>12</sup>) πάσης  
ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας (4<sup>13</sup>) καὶ  
δυνάμεως (2<sup>20</sup>) καὶ κυριότητος  
καὶ (4<sup>18</sup>) παντός ὀνόματος ὀνομα-  
ζομένου, οὐ μόνον ἐν (4<sup>19</sup>) τῷ  
αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ  
μέλλοντι· 1.22 καὶ (4<sup>14</sup>) πάντα  
(4<sup>15</sup>) ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας  
αὐτοῦ (2<sup>22</sup>) καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν  
(2<sup>23</sup>) κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ (2<sup>18</sup>/4<sup>14</sup>) πάντα  
(2<sup>25</sup>/3<sup>26</sup>) τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ,  
**1.23** (3<sup>25</sup>) ἣτις ἐστὶν (2<sup>24</sup>/3<sup>24</sup>) τὸ  
σῶμα αὐτοῦ, (2<sup>27</sup>) τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ  
(4<sup>16</sup>) τὰ πάντα (4<sup>17</sup>/2<sup>26</sup>) ἐν πᾶσιν  
πληρουμένου.

**2.1** (2<sup>28</sup>/3<sup>30</sup>) Καὶ (2<sup>29</sup>/3<sup>31</sup>) ὑμᾶς  
(2<sup>31</sup>/3<sup>33</sup>) ὄντας (3<sup>32</sup>) νεκροὺς  
(3<sup>34</sup>) τοῖς παραπτώμασιν (3<sup>35</sup>) καὶ  
(4<sup>20</sup>) ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις (3<sup>36</sup>) ὑμῶν,  
**2.2** ἐν αἷς (2<sup>30</sup>/3<sup>43</sup>) ποτε (3<sup>42</sup>) περι-  
επατήσατε (4<sup>21</sup>) κατὰ (4<sup>22</sup>) τὸν  
αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου,  
(4<sup>21</sup>) κατὰ (4<sup>23</sup>) τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς  
ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, (4<sup>24</sup>) τοῦ  
πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν  
(3<sup>41</sup>) τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας·  
**2.3** ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες

1.16 ὅτι (17) ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη  
(18) τὰ πάντα (19) ἐν τοῖς οὐρα-  
νοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὀρατὰ καὶ  
τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε  
(20) κυριότητες εἴτε (21) ἀρχαὶ  
εἴτε ἐξουσίαι· (18') τὰ πάντα δι'  
αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτισται·  
 1.17 **(22')** καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ  
(18') πάντων καὶ (18') τὰ πάντα  
ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν, 1.18 (22) καὶ  
αὐτός ἐστιν (23) ἡ κεφαλὴ  
(24) τοῦ σώματος (25) τῆς ἐκκλη-  
σίας· ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος  
ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται  
(26) ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτός πρωτεύων,  
 1.19 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν  
**(27) τὸ πλήρωμα** κατοικήσαι 1.20  
 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι  
**(18')** τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνο-  
 ποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυ-  
 ροῦ αὐτοῦ, [δι' αὐτοῦ] εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ  
 τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

1.21 **(28) Καὶ (29) ὑμᾶς**  
**(30) ποτε (31) ὄντας** ἀπηλλοτριω-  
 μένους

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>		<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H	I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>		

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

## 4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(24—26) [**<PART D**] 1.24 Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ (24) τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, (25) ὃ ἐστίν (26) ἡ ἐκκλησία.

(27—38) [**<PART E**] 2.12 συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ (27) συνηγέρθητε (28) διὰ (29) τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν· 2.13 (30) καὶ (31) ὑμᾶς (32) νεκροὺς (33) ὄντας [ἐν] (34) τοῖς παραπτώμασιν (35) καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκός (36) ὑμῶν, (37) συνεζωποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, (38) χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα.

(39—44) [**<PART F**] 3.5 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος (39) ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία, 3.6 δι' ἧς ἔρχεται (40) ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπὶ (41) τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας]. 3.7 ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς (42) περιπατήσατέ (43) ποτε, ὅτε ἐζήτε (44) ἐν τούτοις.

(12—17) *1 Cor* 15.24—28 (...), ὅταν καταργήσῃ (12) πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν (13) καὶ δύναμιν. (...) (14) πάντα γὰρ (15) ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. ὅταν δὲ εἶπῃ ὅτι (14') πάντα ὑποτέτακται, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτός τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ (14') τὰ πάντα. ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ (14') τὰ πάντα, τότε [καὶ] αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ (14') τὰ πάντα, ἵνα ἢ ὁ θεὸς (16) [τὰ] πάντα (17) ἐν πᾶσιν.

(18) Πᾶν ὄνομα in *Philipp* 2.9.

(19) For ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, see also *1 Cor* 1.20, 2.6, 2.8, 3.18; *2 Cor* 4.4; *Rom* 12.2.

(20) Trespass (παράπτωμα) and sin (ἁμαρτία) in *Rom* 5.20.

(21) Walking (περιπατέω) in accordance with (κατά) in *1 Cor* 3.3 (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον), *2 Cor* 10.2 (κατὰ σάρκα), *Rom* 8.4 (μὴ κατὰ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα) and 14.15.

(22) Combination of ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος and world (κόσμος) in *1 Cor* 1.20 and 3.18—19. For ὁ κόσμος οὗτος, see *1 Cor* 3.19, 5.10 and 7.31, and for ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος *1 Cor* 2.6, 2.8, *2 Cor* 4.4 and *Rom* 12.2.

(23) Cf. the ἀρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου in *1 Cor* 2.6 and 2.8.

(24) Πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου in *1 Cor* 2.12.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

			↓			
	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW I	D	---
				<i>The Church (1)</i>		

1: *Eph* : Part C

2: *Col* — primary text: Part C

ἀνεστράφημέν (3<sup>43</sup>) ποτε (3<sup>44</sup>) ἐν (3<sup>39</sup>) ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις (4<sup>25</sup>) τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ποιῶντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ (2<sup>32</sup>) τῶν διανοιῶν, καὶ ἤμεθα τέκνα φύσει (3<sup>40</sup>) ὀργῆς (4<sup>26</sup>) ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποί· 2.4 ὁ (2<sup>34</sup>) δὲ θεὸς πλούσιος ὢν ἐν (4<sup>27</sup>) ἐλέει, διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ ἦν ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, 2.5 (3<sup>30</sup>) καὶ (3<sup>33</sup>) ὄντας ἡμᾶς (3<sup>32</sup>) νεκροὺς (3<sup>34</sup>) τοῖς παραπτώμασιν (3<sup>37</sup>) συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ, - (3<sup>38</sup>) χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι - 2.6 καὶ (3<sup>27/345</sup>) συνήγειρεν καὶ (3<sup>46</sup>) συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 2.7 ἵνα ἐνδείξηται ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις (4<sup>28</sup>) τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοῦτος (4<sup>29/338</sup>) τῆς χάριτος (4<sup>30</sup>) αὐτοῦ ἐν (4<sup>31</sup>) χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. 2.8 (3<sup>38</sup>) τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι (3<sup>28</sup>) διὰ (3<sup>29/235</sup>) πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ (4<sup>32</sup>) τὸ δῶρον· 2.9 οὐκ ἐξ (2<sup>33/433</sup>) ἔργων, ἵνα μὴ τις (4<sup>34</sup>) καυχῆσθῃται. 2.10 αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν ποίημα, (2<sup>17</sup>) κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ (2<sup>33</sup>) ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν.

καὶ ἐχθροὺς (32) τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν (33) τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς, 1.22 νυνὶ (34) δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἀγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ,

1.23 εἰ γε ἐπιμένετε (35) τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἐδραῖοι καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐ ἠκούσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, οὐ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(25) Desire (ἐπιθυμία) and flesh (σάρξ) in *Rom* 13.14, *Gal* 5.16 and 5.24.

(26) See also *1 Thess* 4.13: καθώς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ (cf. *1 Thess* 4.13 in *Eph* 2.12).

(27) Cf. God's mercy (ἐλεος) and anger (ὀργή) in *Rom* 9.22—23.

(28—30) Hallmark: (28) τὸ (...) πλοῦτος (29) τῆς χάριτος (30) αὐτοῦ in *Eph* 2.7 and, before, in 1.7.

(31) Kindness (χρηστότης) and wealth (πλοῦτος) also in *Rom* 2.4.

(45—46) [**PART E**] 3.1 Εἰ οὖν (45) συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὐ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ (46) καθήμενος.

(32) Cf. δωρεά (gift) and χάρις (grace) in *Rom* 3.24, 5.15 and 5.17 (cf. also *Eph* 3.7).

(33) Contrast between works (ἔργα) and faith (πίστις) also in *Rom* 3.27—28, 4.4—6, 9.32; *Gal* 2.16, 3.2, 3.5, 3.9—10. Contrast between works (ἔργα) and grace (χάρις) also in *Rom* 11.6.

(34) Deeds (ἔργα) and boasting (καυχάομαι) in *Rom* 3.27 and 4.2.



The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	Address	Thanksgiving	Prayer	↓	Ministry	Philosophy
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---
				<i>The Church (1)</i>		

1: *Eph* : Part NEW 1

2: *Col* — primary text: ---

### NEW 1: The First Ecclesiological Passage (2.11—22)

**2.11** Διο μνημονεύετε ὅτι (3<sup>7</sup>) ποτε ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη (2<sup>5</sup>) ἐν σαρκί, οἱ λεγόμενοι (2<sup>4</sup>) ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ (2<sup>1</sup>) τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς (2<sup>3</sup>) ἐν σαρκί (2<sup>2</sup>) χειροποιήτου. **2.12** ὅτι ἦτε (3<sup>7</sup>) τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, (3<sup>8</sup>) ἀπηλωτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ξένοι (4<sup>1</sup>) τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, (4<sup>2</sup>) ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ (4<sup>3</sup>) ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. **2.13** (3<sup>10</sup>) νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς (4<sup>6</sup>) οἳ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε (4<sup>8</sup>) ἐγγύς ἐν (3<sup>5</sup>) τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**2.14** Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἔστιν (3<sup>2</sup>) ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὃ (3<sup>3</sup>) ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφοτέρα ἐν καὶ (2<sup>7</sup>) τῷ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, (3<sup>9</sup>) τὴν ἐχθραν (3<sup>11</sup>) ἐν τῇ σαρκί αὐτοῦ. **2.15** (4<sup>3</sup>) τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν (2<sup>6</sup>) ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, ἵνα τοὺς δύο (3<sup>14</sup>/3<sup>17</sup>) κτίση (3<sup>13</sup>) ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα (3<sup>16</sup>) καινόν (3<sup>15</sup>) ἄνθρωπον (3<sup>3</sup>) ποιῶν (3<sup>2</sup>/3<sup>18</sup>) εἰρήνην. **2.16** καὶ (3<sup>1</sup>) ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους (3<sup>19</sup>) ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ (3<sup>4</sup>) διὰ (3<sup>6</sup>/2<sup>8</sup>) τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας (3<sup>9</sup>) τὴν ἐχθραν (2<sup>9</sup>) ἐν αὐτῷ.

[<PART E: The Colossian Philosophy] 2.11 ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε (1) περιτομῇ (2) ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος (3) τῆς σαρκός, ἐν (1') τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2.12 συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. 2.13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ (4) τῇ ἀκροβυστία (5) τῆς σαρκός ὑμῶν, συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα. 2.14 ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον (6) τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἤρκεν ἐκ (7) τοῦ μέσου προσηλώσας αὐτὸ (8) τῷ σταυρῷ. 2.15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς (9) ἐν αὐτῷ.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(1—12) [**<PART C**] 1.20 και δι' αὐτοῦ (1) ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, (2) εἰρηνο- (3) ποιήσας (4) διὰ (5) τοῦ αἵματος (6) τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, [δι' αὐτοῦ] εἶτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἶτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 1.21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς (7) ποτε ὄντας (8) ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ (9) ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς, 1.22 (10) νυνὶ δὲ (1') ἀποκατήλλαξεν (11) ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, 1.23 εἰ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει (12) τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἑδραῖοι καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐ ἠκούσατε.

(13—14) [**<PART C**] 1.16 (...) (13) ἐν αὐτῷ (14) ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

(15—17) [**<PART F**] 3.9 (...) ἀπεκδυσάμενοι (15) τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ 3.10 καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι (16) τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα (17) τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν.

(18—19) [**<PART F**] 3.15 καὶ (18) ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε (19) ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι.

(1) Relation between covenant (διαθήκη) and promise (ἐπαγγελία) also in *Rom* 9.4 and *Gal* 3.17.

(2) The phrase ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες also in *1 Thess* 4.13: Οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων, ἵνα μὴ λυπήσθε καθὼς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα (cf. *1 Thess* 4.13 in *Eph* 2.3).

(3) Cf. the notion of not knowing God in *1 Thess* 4.5 and *Gal* 4.8.

(4—8) *Isaiah* 57.18—20 LXX (...) καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῷ παράκλησιν ἀληθινήν, 57.19 (4) εἰρήνην (5) ἐπ' εἰρήνην (6) τοῖς μακρὰν (7) καὶ (8) τοῖς ἐγγύς οὖσιν (...). 57.20 οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι οὕτως [see *Eph* 4.14:] κλυδωνισθήσονται.

(9) Relation between law (νόμος) and commandment (ἐντολή) also in *Rom* 7.7—14 and 13.8—10.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

		↓				
	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---
				<i>The Church (1)</i>		

1: *Eph* : Part NEW 1

2: *Col* — primary text: ---

**2.17** καὶ ἐλθὼν (4<sup>10</sup>) ἐβηγγελίσατο  
(4<sup>4</sup>) εἰρήνην ὑμῖν (4<sup>6</sup>) τοῖς μακρὰν  
(4<sup>7</sup>) καὶ (4<sup>5</sup>) εἰρήνην (4<sup>8</sup>) τοῖς  
ἐγγύς· 2.18 ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν  
(4<sup>11</sup>) τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότε-  
ροι (4<sup>12</sup>) ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν  
πατέρα.

None.

**2.19** ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι  
καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλὰ ἐστὲ συμπολι-  
ται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ  
θεοῦ, **2.20** (3<sup>20</sup>) ἐποικοδομηθέντες  
ἐπὶ (3<sup>12/4</sup>13) τῷ θεμελίῳ (4<sup>14</sup>) τῶν  
ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν,  
ὄντος (4<sup>15</sup>) ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ  
Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, **2.21** ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα  
(4<sup>16</sup>) οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη  
(4<sup>17</sup>) αὔξει εἰς (4<sup>18</sup>) ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν  
κυρίῳ, **2.22** ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς  
(4<sup>20</sup>) συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικη-  
τήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν (4<sup>19</sup>) πνεύ-  
ματι.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I Col
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I Eph
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: Col — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

**(20) [←PART D]** 2.6 ὦς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, 2.7 ἔρριζωμένοι καὶ **(20)** ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε, περισσεύοντες ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ.

**(10)** Combination of proclaiming as glad tidings (εὐαγγελίζομαι) and peace (εἰρήνη) in *Isaiah* 52.7 LXX (cf. also *Nahum* 2.1 LXX).

**(11)** Notion of access (προσαγωγή) through Christ also in *Rom* 5.2.

**(12)** The notion of one Spirit (ἐν πνεύμα) also in *1 Cor* 12.9, 12.11 and 12.13 (cf. *Philipp* 1.27).

**(13)** Foundation (θεμέλιον): *1 Cor* 3.10—13 (cf. *Rom* 15.20).

**(14)** Apostles and prophets: *1 Cor* 12.28—29 (cf. *Rom* 1.1—2).

**(15)** The term ‘used for the corner foundation’ (ἄκρογωνιαίος) in combination with θεμέλιον also in *Isaiah* 28.16 LXX.

**(16—17)** Building/edifice (οἰκοδομή): *1 Cor* 3.9 (cf. *1 Cor* 14.5 and 14.12). Combined with **(17)** the notion of growing (ἀξάνω) in *1 Cor* 3.6—7.

**(18—19)** Temple (ναός): *1 Cor* 3.16—17 and *2 Cor* 6.16. Combined with **(19)** the Spirit (πνεῦμα) in *1 Cor* 3.16: ναός θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.

**(20)** To build (οἰκοδομέω): *1 Cor* 14.4.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>			<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---		D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1		D	---
				<i>The Church (1)</i>			

1: *Eph* : Part D

2: *Col* — primary text: Part D

D. Paul's Ministry and the  
Mystery Revealed to him  
(3.1—21)

D. Paul's Ministry and the  
Mystery Revealed to him  
(1.24—2.7)

*The Mystery (3.1—13)*

3.1 Τούτου χάριν (3<sup>5</sup>) ἐγὼ Παῦλος (3<sup>8</sup>/3<sup>11</sup>/4<sup>1</sup>) ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [ ' Ἰησοῦ] (2<sup>2</sup>) ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (2<sup>23</sup>) τῶν ἐθνῶν - 3.2 (3<sup>1</sup>) εἰ γε (3<sup>3</sup>) ἤκουσατε (2<sup>7</sup>) τὴν οἰκονομίαν (4<sup>2</sup>) τῆς χάριτος (2<sup>8</sup>/4<sup>3</sup>) τοῦ θεοῦ (2<sup>9</sup>/4<sup>4</sup>) τῆς δοθείσης μοι (2<sup>10</sup>) εἰς ὑμᾶς, 3.3 [ἴτι] (4<sup>5</sup>) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν (2<sup>19</sup>) ἐγνωρίσθη μοι (2<sup>11</sup>) τὸ μυστήριον, καθὼς (4<sup>6</sup>) προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, 3.4 πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε (3<sup>7</sup>) ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι (2<sup>32</sup>) τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν (2<sup>33</sup>/2<sup>22</sup>/3<sup>9</sup>) τῷ μυστηρίῳ (2<sup>34</sup>/2<sup>24</sup>/3<sup>10</sup>) τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 3.5 ὁ ἑτέρας (2<sup>15</sup>) γενεαῖς οὐκ (2<sup>19</sup>) ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς (2<sup>16</sup>) νῦν (4<sup>7</sup>) ἀπεκαλύφθη (2<sup>17</sup>) τοῖς ἀγίοις (4<sup>9</sup>) ἀποστόλοις (2<sup>18</sup>) αὐτοῦ (4<sup>10</sup>) καὶ προφήταις (4<sup>8</sup>) ἐν πνεύματι, 3.6 εἶναι (2<sup>23</sup>) τὰ ἔθνη (4<sup>11</sup>) συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ (3<sup>2</sup>) τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 3.7 οὐ (3<sup>4</sup>/2<sup>4</sup>) ἐγενήθη (3<sup>6</sup>/2<sup>5</sup>) διάκονος (2<sup>6</sup>) κατὰ (4<sup>12</sup>) τὴν δωρεάν (4<sup>2</sup>) τῆς χάριτος (2<sup>8</sup>/4<sup>3</sup>) τοῦ θεοῦ (2<sup>9</sup>/4<sup>4</sup>) τῆς δοθείσης μοι

1.24 Νῦν χαίρω (1) ἐν τοῖς παθημασιν (2) ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα (3) τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστίν ἡ ἐκκλησία, 1.25 ἦς (4) ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ (5) διάκονος (6) κατὰ (7) τὴν οἰκονομίαν (8) τοῦ θεοῦ (9) τὴν δοθείσαν μοι (10) εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, 1.26 (11) τὸ μυστήριον (12) τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον (13) ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ (15) τῶν γενεῶν - (16) νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη (17) τοῖς ἀγίοις (18) αὐτοῦ, 1.27 οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεός (19) γνωρίσαι τί (20) τὸ πλοῦτος (21) τῆς δόξης (22) τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν (23) τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, (24) ὃ ἐστίν Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης: 1.28 ὃν ἡμεῖς καταγγέλλομεν νοουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ: 1.29 εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I Col
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I Eph
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: Col — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(1—6) [**PART C**] 1.23 (1) εἰ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἑδραῖοι καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος (2) τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗ (3) ἠκούσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, οὗ (4) ἐγενόμην (5) ἐγὼ Παῦλος (6) διάκονος.

(7—8) [**PART I**] 4.15 'Ἀσπάσαθε τοὺς ἐν Λαοδικεῖα ἀδελφοὺς καὶ Νύμφαν καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν. 4.16 καὶ ὅταν (7) ἀναγνώσθῃ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνώσθῃ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε. (...) 4.18 'Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου. μνημονεύετέ (8) μου τῶν δεσμῶν. ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν.

(9—11) [**PART H**] 4.2 Τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε (...), 4.3 προσευχόμενοι ἅμα καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ὁ θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν θύραν τοῦ λόγου λαλήσαι (9) τὸ μυστήριον (10) τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' ὃ καὶ (11) δέδεμαι.

(1) Notion of Paul as a captive (δέσμιος) of Christ in *Phm* 1 and 9.

(2—4) Cf. (2) ἡ χάρις (3) τοῦ θεοῦ (4) ἡ δοθεῖσα μοι in *1 Cor* 3.10 and, without τοῦ θεοῦ, in *Rom* 12.3, 15.15 and *Gal* 2.9.

(5) Combination of ἀποκάλυψις and the mystery being made known also in *Rom* 16.25—27 (cf. *Rom* 16.25—27 in *Eph* 3.20—21).

(6) See *1 Cor* 5.9—11 for a reference to a previous letter by the same author: Ἐγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ (...). 5.11 νῦν δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν κτλ. Cf. also *Rom* 15.3b—4: ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται, (...) [in the LXX]. 15.4 ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη.

(7—8) Notion of things (7) being revealed (ἀποκαλυφθῆναι) through (8) the Spirit (πνεῦμα) also in *1 Cor* 2.10.

(9—10) (9) 'Ἀπόστολοι and (10) προφήται in *1 Cor* 12.28—29 (cf. *Rom* 1.1—2). See *Rom* 16.25b—26 about the mystery now revealed through prophetic writings (διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν).

(11) Κληρονόμος/κληρονομία and promise (ἐπαγγελία) also in *Rom* 4.13—14, *Gal* 3.18 and 3.29.

(12) Cf. gift (δωρεά) and grace (χάρις) in *Rom* 3.24, 5.15 and 5.17.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

					↓		
	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>			<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---		D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1		D	---
				<i>The Church (1)</i>			

1: *Eph* : Part D

2: *Col* — primary text: Part D

(2<sup>25</sup>) κατὰ (2<sup>26</sup>) τὴν ἐνέργειαν  
 (2<sup>29</sup>) τῆς δυνάμεως (2<sup>27</sup>) αὐτοῦ.  
 3.8 ἐμοὶ (4<sup>13</sup>) τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ  
πάντων ἀγίων (4<sup>14</sup>) ἔδόθη ἡ χάρις  
αὐτῆ, (2<sup>23</sup>) τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (4<sup>15</sup>) εὐαγ-  
γελίσασθαι (4<sup>16</sup>) τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον  
 (2<sup>20</sup>) πλοῦτος (2<sup>24</sup>) τοῦ Χριστοῦ  
 3.9 καὶ φωτίσαι [πάντας] τίς  
 (2<sup>7</sup>) ἡ οἰκονομία (2<sup>11</sup>) τοῦ μυστη-  
ρίου (2<sup>12</sup>/3<sup>12</sup>) τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου  
 (2<sup>13</sup>) ἀπὸ (2<sup>14</sup>) τῶν αἰώνων (3<sup>13</sup>) ἐν  
τῷ θεῷ (3<sup>14</sup>) τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαν-  
τι, 3.10 ἵνα (2<sup>19</sup>) γνωρισθῆ νῦν  
 (3<sup>15</sup>) ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ (3<sup>16</sup>) ταῖς  
ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ  
 τῆς ἐκκλησίας (2<sup>35</sup>) ἡ πολυποίκι-  
 λος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ, 3.11 (4<sup>17</sup>) κα-  
τὰ πρόθεσιν (2<sup>14</sup>) τῶν αἰώνων ἦν  
 ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ  
 κυρίῳ ἡμῶν,  
 3.12 ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν (4<sup>18</sup>) τὴν παρ-  
ρησίαν καὶ προσαγωγὴν ἐν πεποι-  
θήσει (3<sup>17</sup>) διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ.  
 3.13 διὸ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ (4<sup>19</sup>) ἐγκα-  
κεῖν (2<sup>1</sup>) ἐν (2<sup>3</sup>/4<sup>22</sup>) ταῖς θλίψεσίν  
μου (2<sup>2</sup>/2<sup>30</sup>) ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν  
 (4<sup>23</sup>) δόξα ὑμῶν.

(25) κατὰ (26) τὴν ἐνέργειαν  
 (27) αὐτοῦ (28) τὴν ἐνεργουμένην  
ἐν ἐμοὶ (29) ἐν δυνάμει.  
 2.1 Θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἶδέναι  
 ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω (30) ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν  
 καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ καὶ ὅσοι  
 οὐχ ἔδρακαν τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν  
 σαρκί, 2.2 ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν  
 (31) αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασ-  
 θέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ εἰς πᾶν πλοῦ-  
 τος τῆς πληροφορίας (32) τῆς  
συνέσεως, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν (33) τοῦ  
μυστηρίου (34) τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ,  
 2.3 ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν (35) πάντες οἱ θη-  
 σαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως  
 ἀπόκρυφοι.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I Col
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I Eph
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: Col — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(12—13) [**<PART E>**] 3:3 ἀπεθά-  
νετε γάρ και ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν (12) κέ-  
κρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ (13) ἐν τῷ  
θεῷ.

(14—16) [**<PART C>**] 1.16 (...) ἐν  
αὐτῷ (14) ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν  
τοῖς οὐρανοῖς και ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ  
ὄρατὰ και τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι  
εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε (15) ἀρχαὶ  
εἴτε (16) ἐξουσίαι. (14') τὰ πάντα  
δι' αὐτοῦ και εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτισται.

(17) [**<PART E>**] 2.12 συνταφέντες  
αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ και  
συνηγέρθητε (17) διὰ τῆς πίστεως  
τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγεί-  
ραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

(13) Notion of Paul as the least (ὁ  
ελάχιστος) also in *1 Cor* 15.9.

(14) Grace (χάρις) given to Paul  
in view of his mission to the na-  
tions (ἔθνη), see *Rom* 15.15—16  
and *Gal* 2.9.

(15) Proclaiming glad tidings  
(εὐαγγελίζομαι) to the nations  
(ἔθνη) also in *Gal* 1.16.

(16) Unsearchable (ἀνεξιχνίασ-  
τος) and riches (πλοῦτος) also in  
*Rom* 11.33.

(17) *Rom* 8.28: κατὰ πρόθεσιν.

(18) *Phm* 8: having freedom of  
speech/action (παρρησία) in Christ.  
*Rom* 5.1—2: having access (προσ-  
αγωγή) through Christ (cf. *Eph*  
2.18). See *2 Cor* 3.4 for having  
trust (πεποιθήσις) through Christ.

(19—23) *2 Cor* 4.16—17 Διὸ  
οὐκ (19) ἐγκακοῦμεν, ἀλλ' εἰ και  
ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν (20) ἄνθρωπος δια-  
φθείρεται, ἀλλ' (21) ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν  
ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρα και ἡμέρα.  
4.17 τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ελαφρὸν  
(22) τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερ-  
βολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βά-  
ρος (23) δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν  
(cf. *2 Cor* 4.16 in *Eph* 4.22—23).  
Notion of the inner man (ὁ ἔσω  
ἄνθρωπος) besides *2 Cor* 4.16 also  
in *Rom* 7.22.



The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

					↓		
	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>			<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---		D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1		D	---
				<i>The Church (1)</i>			

1: *Eph* : Part D

2: *Col* — primary text: Part D

*Paul's Supplication to God for his Readers (3.14—21)*

**3.14** Τούτου χάριν (4<sup>26</sup>) κάμπτω (4<sup>25</sup>) τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, **3.15** ἐξ οὗ (4<sup>27</sup>) πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς (4<sup>24</sup>) ὀνομάζεται, **3.16** ἵνα δῶ ὑμῖν (3<sup>19</sup>) κατὰ (2<sup>20</sup>) τὸ πλοῦτος (2<sup>21</sup>/3<sup>21</sup>) τῆς δόξης (3<sup>22</sup>) αὐτοῦ (3<sup>18</sup>) δυνάμει (3<sup>20</sup>) κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς (4<sup>21</sup>) τὸν ἔσω (4<sup>20</sup>) ἄνθρωπον, **3.17** (3<sup>24</sup>) κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν (3<sup>17</sup>) διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν (3<sup>31</sup>) ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν ἀγάπῃ (2<sup>36</sup>) ἑρριζωμένοι καὶ (3<sup>23</sup>) τεθεμελιωμένοι, **3.18** ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πάνσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ (4<sup>28</sup>) ὑψος καὶ (4<sup>29</sup>) βάθος, **3.19** γινῶναί τε (4<sup>30</sup>) τὴν (4<sup>32</sup>) ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως (4<sup>31</sup>) ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα (3<sup>26</sup>) πληρωθῆτε εἰς (3<sup>25</sup>) πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ. **3.20** (4<sup>33</sup>) Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα (4<sup>34</sup>) ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν (4<sup>35</sup>/2<sup>25</sup>) κατὰ (2<sup>29</sup>) τὴν δύναμιν (2<sup>28</sup>) τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν, **3.21** (4<sup>36</sup>) αὐτῷ (4<sup>37</sup>) ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (4<sup>38</sup>) εἰς πάσας (2<sup>15</sup>) τὰς γενεὰς (4<sup>39</sup>) τοῦ αἰῶνος (4<sup>40</sup>/2<sup>14</sup>) τῶν αἰώνων, (4<sup>41</sup>) ἀμήν.

2.4 Τούτο λέγω, ἵνα μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς παραλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ. 2.5 εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι, χαίρων καὶ βλέπων ὑμῶν τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ὑμῶν. 2.6 Ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, 2.7 **(36)** ἑρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε, περισσεύοντες ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

## 4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(18—22) [**<PART C>**] 1.10 (...) ἐν παντί ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ ἀξαναόμοιοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ, 1.11 (18) ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι (19) κατὰ (20) τὸ κράτος (21) τῆς δόξης (22) αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν.

(23) [**<PART C>**] 1.23 εἰ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει (23) τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἑδραῖοι καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐ ἠκούσατε.

(24—26) [**<PART E>**] 2.9 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ (24) κατοικεῖ (25) πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, 2.10 καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ (26) πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας.

\*) (*Continued*) Similar doxologies in *Rom* 11.36: (36) αὐτῷ (37) ἡ δόξα (38) εἰς (39) τοὺς αἰῶνας, (41) ἀμήν; *Philipp* 4.20: (36) τῷ δὲ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἡμῶν (37) ἡ δόξα (38) εἰς (39) τοὺς αἰῶνας (40) τῶν αἰώνων, (41) ἀμήν; and *Gal* 1.4—5: (...) κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, 1.5 (36) ῶ (37) ἡ δόξα (38) εἰς (39) τοὺς αἰῶνας (40) τῶν αἰώνων, (41) ἀμήν.

(24—27) ‘Bending the knee’ and celestial and terrestrial entities also in *Philipp* 2.9—10: διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς (...) ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ (24) τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα, 2.10 ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ (25) πάν γόνυ (26) κάμψῃ (27) ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων.

(28—31) *Rom* 8.38—39: πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι (...) οὔτε ἀρχαὶ (...) οὔτε δυνάμεις 8.39 οὔτε (28) ὑψωμα οὔτε (29) βάθος οὔτε τις κτίσις ἕτερα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρῖσαι ἀπὸ (30) τῆς (31) ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. Cf. the depths (βάθη) of God in *1 Cor* 2.10, and the depth (βάθος) of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God in *Rom* 11.33.

(32) Antithesis between γνώσις and ἀγάπη also in *1 Cor* 8.1—3 and 12.31b—13.13 (note also the clause καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ὁδός in 12.31b: Καὶ ἔτι καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι).

(33—41) Similar structure in *Rom* 16.25—27: (33) τῷ δὲ δυνάμενῳ + (34) infinitive + (35) κατὰ with acc. + doxology. This doxology reads: (36) μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [ῶ] (37) ἡ δόξα (38) εἰς (39) τοὺς αἰῶνας, (41) ἀμήν (cf. *Rom* 16.25—27 in *Eph* 3.3).\*)

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>			<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---		D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1		D	---
				<i>The Church (1)</i>			

1: *Eph* : ---

2: *Col* — Part E

### E. The Colossian Philosophy (2.8—3.4)

In *Ephesians*, part E of *Colossians* has been omitted, though it is used and reworked in parts NEW 1 and NEW 2 in particular.

[First warning against the Colossian philosophy] 2.8 βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν· [Reason for the first warning] 2.9 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, 2.10 καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας.

[Excursus locating the readers within the drama of Christ and cosmos: their death and resurrection with Christ] 2.11 ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2.12 συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτόν ἐκ νεκρῶν· 2.13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκός ὑμῶν, συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα 2.14 ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I Col
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I Eph
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: Col — Part E (*continued*)

ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ·

[Return to the actual reason for the first warning ...] 2.15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ.

[Second warning against the Colossian philosophy] 2.16 Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων· 2.17 ἃ ἐστὶν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, [Reason for the second warning] τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[Third warning against the Colossian philosophy] 2.18 μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφορσίᾳ καὶ θρησκευίᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἃ εἶδεν ἐμβατεύων, [Reason for the third warning] εἰ κἢ φυσιοῦμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοσὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, 2.19 καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ θεοῦ.

[Conclusions] [1: The readers' death with Christ] 2.20 Εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε; 2.21 Μὴ ἄψη μηδὲ γεύση μηδὲ θίγης, 2.22 ἃ

4: Col — Part E (*continued*)

ἐστὶν πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει, κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 2.23 ἃτινὰ ἐστὶν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν θελοθρησκίᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφορσίᾳ [καὶ] ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος, οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινὶ πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός.

[2: The readers' resurrection with Christ] 3.1 Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος· 3.2 τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 3.3 ἀπεθάνετε γάρ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ· 3.4 ὅταν ὁ Χριστός φανερωθῇ, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν, τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	Address	Thanksgiving	Prayer		Ministry	Philosophy
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part NEW 2

2: *Col* — primary text: ---

### NEW 2: The Second Ecclesiological Passage (4.1—16)

4.1 (4<sup>1</sup>) Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ (3<sup>1</sup>/4<sup>5</sup>) ὁ δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ (4<sup>3</sup>/3<sup>3</sup>) ἁξίως (4<sup>2</sup>/3<sup>2</sup>) περιπατήσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς (2<sup>5</sup>/4<sup>4</sup>) ἐκλήθητε. 4.2 μετὰ πάσης (2<sup>1</sup>) ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραυτήτος, μετὰ μακροθυμίας, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν (2<sup>2</sup>/3<sup>5</sup>) ἀγάπῃ, 4.3 σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν (4<sup>7</sup>) τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν (2<sup>3</sup>) τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης. 4.4 (2<sup>7</sup>/4<sup>6</sup>) ἐν σώμα καὶ (4<sup>7</sup>) ἐν πνεύμα, καθὼς (2<sup>4</sup>) καὶ (2<sup>5</sup>) ἐκλήθητε (2<sup>6</sup>) ἐν (3<sup>6</sup>) μῇ ἐλπίδι (4<sup>8</sup>) τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν. 4.5 (4<sup>9</sup>) εἰς κύριος, (3<sup>4</sup>/3<sup>8</sup>) μία πίστις, (3<sup>7</sup>/4<sup>10</sup>) ἐν βάπτισμα, 4.6 (4<sup>11</sup>) εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πάσιν. 4.7 (4<sup>12</sup>) Ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν (4<sup>14</sup>) ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ (4<sup>13</sup>) τὸ μέτρον (4<sup>15</sup>) τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 4.8 διὸ λέγει, [Quotation] (4<sup>16</sup>) [A] Ἐναβάς εἰς ὕψος ἠχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, [B] ἔδωκεν δόματα [C] τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. [Interpretation] [A': Ἐναβάς εἰς ὕψος] 4.9 τὸ δὲ Ἐνέβη τί ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα [μέρη] τῆς γῆς; 4.10 ὁ καταβάς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς

[<PART F: Ethical Exhortations] 3.12 Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι, σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ χρηστότητα (1) ταπεινοφροσύνην πραυτητα μακροθυμίαν, 3.13 ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς ἐάν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχη μομφήν· καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἔχαρισατο ὑμῖν, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς. 3.14 ἐπὶ πάσιν δὲ τοῦτοις (2) τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅ ἐστιν (3) σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος. 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβευέτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν (4) καὶ (5) ἐκλήθητε (6) ἐν (7) ἐνὶ σώματι· καὶ εὐχάριστοι γίνεσθε.

## Adaptation (continued):

	↓					
		<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>	
---		F	G	---	H	I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2		F	G	NEW 3	H	I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>				<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>		

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(1) [**<PART I>**] 4.18 (...) μνημο-νευέτέ μου τῶν δεσμῶν.

(2—3) [**<PART C>**] 1.9 (...) ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (...), 1.10 (2) περιπατήσαι (3) ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν.

(4—6) For the triad ἐλπίς (*Eph* 4.4), ἀγάπη (*Eph* 4.2) and πίστις (*Eph* 4.5), see *Col* 1.3—5 [**<PART B>**]: Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, 1.4 ἀκούσαντες (4) τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ (5) τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους 1.5 διὰ (6) τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. In Paul's authentic writings, the triad occurs in *1 Cor* 13.13, *1 Thess* 1.3, 5.8 and *Gal* 5.5—6.

(7—8) [**<PART E>**] 2.12 συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν (7) τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ (8) τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγειράντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

(1—4) Same beginning in *1 Cor* 4.16 and *Rom* 12.1: παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ... Παρακαλέω + walking worthy of God in *1 Thess* 2.12: παρακαλοῦντες ὑμᾶς (...) εἰς (2) τὸ περιπατεῖν ὑμᾶς (3) ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ (4) τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς.

(5) *Phm* 1, 9: Δέσμιος of Christ.

(6) One body: *1 Cor* 10.17, 12.12—13, 20; *Rom* 12.4—5.

(7) One Spirit: *1 Cor* 12.9, 12.11 and 12.13 (cf. *Philipp* 1.27).

(8) Hallmark: ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως in *Eph* 4.4 and 1.18.

(9) One lord: *1 Cor* 8.6.

(10) One Spirit, one body, and baptism in *1 Cor* 12.13: ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἐν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν (...) καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

(11) One God (εἰς θεός): *1 Cor* 8.6. Cf. *Rom* 9.5: God as ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, and *1 Cor* 12.6: God as ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν.

(12—13) See *Rom* 12.3: (12) ἐκαστῷ ὡς ὁ θεός ἐμέρισεν (13) μέτρον πίστεως (cf. *2 Cor* 10.13).

(14) Grace (χάρις) given to the church's members in *Rom* 12.6.

(15) Gift (δωρεά) and grace (χάρις) in *Rom* 3.24, 5.15 and 5.17.

(16) *Psalms* 67.19 LXX ἀνέβης εἰς ὕψος, ἠχημαλώτευσας αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	Address	Thanksgiving	Prayer		Ministry	Philosophy
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part NEW 2

2: *Col* — primary text: ---

ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν,  
ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα.

[B': ἔδωκεν δόματα] 4.11 καὶ αὐτός ἔδωκεν (4<sup>17</sup>) τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους,

[C': τοῖς ἀνθρώποις] 4.12 πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, (4<sup>18</sup>) εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 4.13 μέχρι καταστήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς (4<sup>19</sup>) ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 4.14 ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι, (4<sup>20</sup>) κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ (2<sup>16</sup>) τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδεῖαν τῆς πλάνης, 4.15 ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ (2<sup>14</sup>) ἀυξήσωμεν (3<sup>13</sup>) εἰς αὐτόν (3<sup>12</sup>) τὰ πάντα, (3<sup>9</sup>) ὅς ἐστιν (2<sup>8/3</sup> 10) ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, 4.16 (2<sup>9</sup>) ἐξ οὗ πᾶν (2<sup>10/3</sup> 11) τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον (2<sup>13</sup>) καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον (2<sup>11</sup>) διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς (2<sup>12</sup>) τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας κατ' ἐνέργειαν (4<sup>21</sup>) ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνός ἐκάστου μέρους (2<sup>15</sup>) τὴν αὐξῆσιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται (4<sup>22</sup>) εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

[<PART E: The Colossian Philosophy] 2.18 Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύτω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἃ ἐόρακεν ἐμβατεῦων, εἰκῆ φυσιοῦμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοδὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, 2.19 καὶ οὐ κρατῶν (8) τὴν κεφαλὴν, (9) ἐξ οὗ πᾶν (10) τὸ σῶμα (11) διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων (12) ἐπιχορηγούμενον (13) καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον (14) αὐξεί (15) τὴν αὐξῆσιν τοῦ θεοῦ.

2.20 Εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε; 2.21 Μὴ ἄψη μηδὲ γεύση μηδὲ θίγης, 2.22 ἃ ἐστιν πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει, κατὰ (16) τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Adaptation (*continued*):

↓						
---	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	---	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>	
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I	<i>Col</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>	F	G	<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	H	I	<i>Eph</i>

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(9—13) [**PART C**] 1.16 (...)(12') τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ(13') εἰς αὐτόν ἔκτισται· 1.17 καὶ

αὐτός ἐστιν πρό πάντων καὶ τὰ

πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν, 1.18

καὶ (9) αὐτός ἐστιν (10) ἡ κεφαλὴ(11) τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας·

ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ

τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν

αὐτός πρωτεύων, 1.19 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ

εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι

1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκατα-

λλάξαι (12) τὰ πάντα (13) εἰςαὐτόν, (...) [δι' αὐτοῦ] εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ

τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

(17) Apostles (ἀπόστολοι), prophets (προφῆται) and teachers (διδάσκαλοι): *1 Cor* 12.28—29 (for the two former, cf. *Rom* 1.1—2).

(18) Building (edifice)/act of building (οἰκοδομή) the church: *1 Cor* 3.9, 14.5 and 14.12.

(19) Contrast between adult (ἄνθρωπος) and child (νήπιος) in *1 Cor* 13.11. For the imagery of νήπιοι (children)/νηπιάζω (being childish) see also *1 Cor* 3.1 and 14.20.

(20) *Isaiah* 57.18—20 LXX (...) καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῷ παράκλησιν ἀληθινήν, 57.19 [see *Eph* 2.13 and 2.17:] εἰρήνην ἐπ' εἰρήνην τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς οὐσιν (...). 57.20 οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι οὕτως (20) κλυδωνισθήσονται.

(21) Measure (τὸ μέτρον) and portion/assigning a part (μέρος/μερίζω) to each in *Rom* 12.3: ἐκάστω ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως (cf. *2 Cor* 10.13).

(22) Building (edifice)/act of building (οἰκοδομή) the church: *1 Cor* 3.9, 14.5 and 14.12. Relation between love (ἀγάπη) and building (οἰκοδομή/οἰκοδομέω) also in *1 Cor* 8.1.



The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW I	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part F

2: *Col* — primary text: Part F

F. Ethical Exhortations  
(4.17—5.20)

F. Ethical Exhortations  
(3.5—17)

**4.17** (3<sup>1</sup>) Τούτο οὖν λέγω καὶ  
(4<sup>1</sup>) μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ, (3<sup>2</sup>) μη-  
κέτι ὑμᾶς (2<sup>8</sup>) περιπατεῖν, καθὼς  
καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν (4<sup>2</sup>) μα-  
ταιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν,

**4.18** ἐσκοτωμένοι (3<sup>7</sup>) τῇ διανοίᾳ  
ὄντες, (3<sup>6</sup>) ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς  
ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν ἀγνοίαν  
τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὴν πώ-  
ρωσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, 4.19 οἵ-  
τινες ἀπηληγότες ἑαυτοὺς παρ-  
έδωκαν (4<sup>3</sup>) τῇ ἀσελείᾳ εἰς  
ἐργασίαν (2<sup>2</sup>) ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης  
ἐν (2<sup>4</sup>) πλεονεξίᾳ.

**4.20** (3<sup>10</sup>) ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως  
ἐμάθετε (3<sup>3</sup>) τὸν Χριστόν, 4.21 εἴ  
γε αὐτὸν (3<sup>9</sup>) ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐν  
αὐτῷ (3<sup>5</sup>) ἐδιδάχθητε, (3<sup>4</sup>) καθὼς  
ἐστιν (3<sup>8</sup>) ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ,  
**4.22** (2<sup>11</sup>) ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ  
(4<sup>4</sup>) τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν  
(2<sup>21</sup>/4<sup>5</sup>) τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον  
(4<sup>6</sup>) τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ  
(2<sup>3</sup>) τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης,  
**4.23** (2<sup>24</sup>/4<sup>7</sup>) ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ  
(4<sup>8</sup>) τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν  
**4.24** (2<sup>22</sup>) καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι (2<sup>23</sup>) τὸν  
καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (2<sup>25</sup>) τὸν κατὰ  
θεὸν κτισθέντα (4<sup>9</sup>) ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ  
καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.

3.5 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπι  
τῆς γῆς, (1) πορνείαν (2) ἀκαθαρ-  
σίαν πάθος (3) ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν,  
καὶ (4) τὴν πλεονεξίαν, (5) ἥτις  
ἐστὶν (6) εἰδωλολατρία, 3.6 (7) δι'  
ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ [ ἐπι  
τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας]. 3.7 ἐν  
οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς (8) περιεπατήσατέ  
(9) ποτε, ὅτε ἐζήτε ἐν τοῦτοις: 3.8  
(10) νυνὶ δὲ (11) ἀπόθεσθε καὶ  
ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, (12) ὀργὴν,  
(13) θυμὸν, (14) κακίαν, (15) βλασ-  
φημίαν, (16) αἰσχρο- (17) λογίαν  
(18) ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν: 3.9 μὴ  
(19) ψεύδεσθε (20) εἰς ἀλλήλους,  
ἀπεκδυσάμενοι (21) τὸν παλαιὸν  
ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐ-  
τοῦ 3.10 (22) καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι  
(23) τὸν νέον (24) τὸν ἀνακαι-  
νούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν (25) κατ'  
εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, 3.11  
ὅπου οὐκ ἐνὶ Ἑλλήν καὶ Ἰουδαί-  
ος, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρ-  
βαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος,  
ἀλλὰ [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πάσιν  
Χριστός.

Adaptation (*continued*):

↓	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

## 4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(1—5) [**<PART D**] 2.4 (1) Τοῦτο λέγω, ἵνα (2) μηδεις ὑμᾶς παραλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ. (...) 2.6 Ως οὖν παρελάβετε (3) τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, 2.7 ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει (4) καθὼς (5) ἐδιδάχθητε, περισσεύοντες ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ.

(6—7) [**<PART C**] 1.21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας (6) ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς (7) τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς, 1.22 νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν.

(8—10) [**<PART B**] 1.5 (...) ἐν τῷ λόγῳ (8) τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου 1.6 τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς, καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας (9) ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ· 1.7 καθὼς (10) ἐμάθετε ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν.

(1) A similar combination of λέγω and μαρτυρέω in *1 Thess* 4.6 and *Rom* 9.1.

(2) Vanity/being foolish (ματαιότης/ματαιώ) and being in darkness (σκοτώ) also in *Rom* 1.21: (...) ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδιά.

(3) Licentiousness (ἀσέλγεια) and impurity (ἀκαθαρσία) also in *2 Cor* 12.21 and *Gal* 5.19.

(4) Similar clause in *Gal* 1.13: ἡ (...) ἀναστροφή ποτε.

(5—7) *2 Cor* 4.16 Διό οὐκ ἐγκακούμεν, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ (5) ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος (6) διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν (7) ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ (cf. *2 Cor* 4.16—17 in *Eph* 3.13 and 3.16).

(8) Spirit (πνεῦμα) and mind (νοῦς) in *1 Cor* 14.14—15. The renewal (ἀνακαινώσις) of the mind (νοῦς) in *Rom* 12.2.

(9) Righteousness/righteous (δικαιοσύνη/δικαίως) and piety/pious (δσιότης/δσίως) in *1 Thess* 2.10.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW I	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part F

2: *Col* — primary text: Part F

**4.25** Διό (2<sup>11</sup>) ἀποθέμενοι  
(2<sup>19</sup>) τὸ ψεῦδος (4<sup>10</sup>) λαλεῖτε ἀλή-  
θειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον  
αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐσμέν (2<sup>20</sup>) ἀλλήλων  
(4<sup>11</sup>) μέλη.

**4.26** (4<sup>12</sup>) ὀργίξεσθε καὶ μὴ  
ἀμαρτάνετε· ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω  
ἐπὶ [τῷ] παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν,

**4.27** μηδὲ δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβό-  
λῳ.

**4.28** ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέ-  
τω, μᾶλλον δὲ (4<sup>13</sup>) κοπιᾶτω ἐργα-  
ζόμενος ταῖς [ιδίαις] χερσὶν  
(4<sup>15</sup>) τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἵνα ἔχη μεταδιδό-  
ναι (4<sup>14</sup>) τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι.

**4.29** (2<sup>17</sup>/3<sup>11</sup>) πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς  
(2<sup>18</sup>) ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκ-  
πορευέσθω, ἀλλὰ εἴ (4<sup>16</sup>) τις ἀγα-  
θὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας,  
ἵνα δῶ (3<sup>12</sup>) χάριν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.

**4.30** καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε (4<sup>18</sup>) τὸ  
πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν ᾧ  
(4<sup>17</sup>) ἐσφραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν  
(4<sup>19</sup>) ἀπολυτρώσεως.

**4.31** (3<sup>13</sup>) πᾶσα πικρία καὶ  
(2<sup>13</sup>) θυμὸς καὶ (2<sup>12</sup>) ὀργὴ καὶ  
κραυγὴ καὶ (2<sup>15</sup>) βλασφημία ἀρ-  
θῆτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν σὺν πάσῃ (2<sup>14</sup>) κα-  
κίᾳ.

**4.32** γίνεσθε [δὲ] (2<sup>30</sup>) εἰς ἀλλή-  
λους (2<sup>29</sup>) χρηστοί, (2<sup>28</sup>) εὐσπλαγ-  
χνοί, (2<sup>31</sup>) χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς,  
(2<sup>32</sup>) καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ  
(2<sup>33</sup>) ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν.

3.12 (26) Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς  
ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ  
(27) ἠγαπημένοι, (28) σπλάγγνα  
οἰκτιρμοῦ (29) χρηστότητα ταπει-  
νοφροσύνην πραῢτητα μακροθυ-  
μίαν, 3.13 ἀνεχόμενοι (30) ἀλλή-  
λων καὶ (31) χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς  
ἐάν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχη μομφήν·  
(32) καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος (33) ἐχα-  
ρίσατο ὑμῖν, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς·

Adaptation (*continued*):

	↓					
	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>		
---	F	G	---	H	I	<i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I	<i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>			

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(10) *Zechariah* 8.16 LXX λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ καὶ κρίμα εἰρηρικὸν κρίνατε ἐν ταῖς πύλαις ὑμῶν.

(11) Notion of being members of one another (ἀλλήλων μέλη) also in *Rom* 12.5 (cf. *1 Cor* 12.25).

(12) *Psalms* 4.5<sup>a</sup> LXX ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε.

(13—14) *1 Cor* 4.12 καὶ (13) κοπιῶμεν ἐργαζόμενοι ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσίν. Cf. *1 Thess* 4.11—12 in combination with (14) *χρεῖαν ἔχειν* (to be in want), though without *κοπιῶν*.

(15) *Rom* 2.10 and *Gal* 6.10: *ἐργάζομαι* + τὸ ἀγαθόν as its object.

(16) Combination of ἀγαθός with πρὸς οἰκοδομήν in *Rom* 15.2.

(17—18) *2 Cor* 1.21—22 ὁ δὲ (...) θεός, 1.22 ὁ καὶ (17) σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δούς τὸν ἄρραβῶνα (18) τοῦ πνεύματος (cf. *2 Cor* 1.21—22 in *Eph* 1.13—14).

(19) Redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) and the Spirit also in *Rom* 8.23.

(11—12) [**PART H**] 4.6 (11) ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν (12) χάριτι.

(13) [**PART G**] 3.19 Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπάτε τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ μὴ πικραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part F

2: *Col* — primary text: Part F

5.1 (2<sup>26</sup>) γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς (4<sup>20</sup>) τέκνα (4<sup>21</sup>/2<sup>27</sup>) ἀγαπητά 5.2 καὶ περιπατεῖτε (2<sup>34</sup>) ἐν ἀγάπῃ, (2<sup>32</sup>) καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς (2<sup>27</sup>/4<sup>22</sup>) ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς (4<sup>23</sup>) καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (4<sup>24</sup>) προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας.

5.3 (2<sup>1</sup>) πορνεία δὲ καὶ (2<sup>2</sup>) ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα ἢ (2<sup>4</sup>) πλεονεξία μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἀγίοις, 5.4 καὶ (2<sup>16</sup>) αἰσχροτύχη καὶ (2<sup>17</sup>) μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπέλεια, ἃ οὐκ ἀνήκεν, ἀλλὰ μάλλον (2<sup>35</sup>) εὐχαριστία.

5.5 τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες, ὅτι (2<sup>1</sup>/4<sup>25</sup>) πᾶς πόρνος (4<sup>26</sup>) ἢ (2<sup>2</sup>/4<sup>33</sup>) ἀκάθαρτος (4<sup>28</sup>) ἢ (2<sup>4</sup>/4<sup>27</sup>) πλεονέκτης, (2<sup>5</sup>) ὃ ἐστὶν (2<sup>6</sup>/4<sup>29</sup>) εἰδωλολάτρης, (4<sup>32</sup>) οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν (4<sup>31</sup>) τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ (4<sup>30</sup>) θεοῦ.

5.6 (3<sup>14</sup>) Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς (3<sup>19</sup>) ἀπατάτω (3<sup>18</sup>) κενοῖς (3<sup>15</sup>) λόγοις· (2<sup>7</sup>) διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας. 5.7 (4<sup>34</sup>) μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε (4<sup>35</sup>) συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν· 5.8 ἦτε γὰρ (2<sup>9</sup>) ποτε (3<sup>23</sup>/4<sup>39</sup>/4<sup>46</sup>) σκότος, (2<sup>10</sup>) νῦν δὲ (3<sup>22</sup>/4<sup>38</sup>) φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ· ὡς (4<sup>47</sup>) τέκνα φωτός (4<sup>40</sup>) περιπατεῖτε 5.9 - (3<sup>21</sup>) ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός (3<sup>20</sup>/4<sup>41</sup>) ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθῶσύνῃ καὶ (4<sup>36</sup>/4<sup>42</sup>) δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ

3.14 ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις (34) τὴν ἀγάπην, ὃ ἐστὶν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος.

3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβευέτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι· καὶ (35) εὐχάριστοι γίνεσθε.

## Adaptation (continued):

↓	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G	---	H I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

\*) (Continued) See *1 Esdras* 5.51, *Psalms* 39.7, *Odae* 7.38, *Daniel* 3.38 and 4.37. The term ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας (fragrant odour) occurs about 50 times in the LXX, sometimes together with προσφορά (*Jesus Sirach* 50.13—15) but often together with θυσία (e.g., *Exod* 29.41; *Lev* 1.9). In Paul, the latter combination of θυσία and ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας is found in *Philipp* 4.18.

(14—19) [<PART D/E] 2.4 Τοῦτο λέγω, ἵνα (14) μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς (15) παραλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ. (...) 2.8 (16) βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ (17) τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ (18) κενῆς (19) ἀπάτης.

(20—23) [<PART C] 1.10 (20) ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῶ (21) καρποφοροῦντες (...), 1.11 (...). μετὰ χαρᾶς 1.12 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν (22) τῷ φωτί. 1.13 ὃς ἐρρῶσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας (23) τοῦ σκότους.

(20—21) The phrase (20) τέκνα (21) ἀγαπητά also in *1 Cor* 4.14.

(22—23) Combination of (22) ἀγαπάω and (23) παραδίδωμι + object + ὑπέρ also in *Gal* 2.20: (...) τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (cf. *Eph* 5.25). Cf. *Rom* 8.32: παραδίδωμι + object + ὑπέρ.

(24) Combination of offering (προσφορά) and sacrifice (θυσία) frequently in the LXX.\*

(25—33) *1 Cor* 5.11 μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος ἢ (25) πόρνος (26) ἢ (27) πλεονέκτης (28) ἢ (29) εἰδωλολάτρης, and 6.9—10 ἄδικοι (30) θεοῦ (31) βασιλείαν (32) οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν etc. Cf. *Gal* 5.19—21 τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ἅτινά ἐστιν (25) πορνεία, (33) ἀκαθαρσία, (...), (29) εἰδωλολατρία (...)· οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες (31) βασιλείαν (30) θεοῦ (32) οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν.

(34—39) *2 Cor* 6.14 (34) Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις· τίς γὰρ (35) μετοχή (36) δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία ἢ τίς (37) κοινωνία (38) φωτὶ πρὸς (39) σκότος;

(40) Φῶς and περιπατέω in *Rom* 13.12—13.

(41—42) Καρπὸς and (41) ἀγαθωσύνη: *Gal* 5.22. Καρπὸς and (42) δικαιοσύνη: *Philipp* 1.11.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part F

2: *Col* — primary text: Part F

ἀληθεία - **5.10** (4<sup>43</sup>) δοκιμάζοντες  
 τί (3<sup>25</sup>) ἐστὶν (3<sup>24</sup>) εὐάρεστον  
 (3<sup>26</sup>) τῷ κυρίῳ, **5.11** καὶ μὴ  
 (4<sup>37</sup>) συγκοινωνεῖτε (4<sup>44</sup>) τοῖς ἔρ-  
γοῖς τοῖς ἀκάρποις (4<sup>39</sup>) τοῦ σκό-  
τους, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε.

**5.12** τὰ γὰρ κρυφῆ γινόμενα ὑπ'  
 αὐτῶν (2<sup>16</sup>) αἰσχρόν ἐστὶν καὶ  
 (2<sup>17</sup>) λέγειν, **5.13** τὰ δὲ πάντα  
 ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ (4<sup>45</sup>) τοῦ φωτός  
φανερῶνται, **5.14** πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φα-  
 νερούμενον φῶς ἐστὶν. διὸ λέγει,  
 Ἔγειρε, (4<sup>48</sup>) ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ  
 ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπι-  
 φαύσει σοὶ ὁ Χριστός.

**5.15** (3<sup>16</sup>) Βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς  
 πῶς (3<sup>28</sup>) περιπατεῖτε (3<sup>17</sup>/3<sup>27</sup>) μὴ  
 ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί,

**5.16** (3<sup>30</sup>) ἐξαγοραζόμενοι  
 (3<sup>29</sup>) τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι  
 πονηραὶ εἰσιν. **5.17** διὰ τοῦτο μὴ  
 γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνίετε τί  
 τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου. **5.18** καὶ μὴ  
 (4<sup>49</sup>) μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν  
 ἄσωτία, ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύ-  
 ματι, **5.19** λαλοῦντες (2<sup>36</sup>) ἐαυτοῖς  
[ἐν] ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ  
ὠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ᾄδοντες καὶ  
ψάλλοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ κυ-  
ρίῳ, **5.20** (2<sup>39</sup>) εὐχαριστοῦντες  
 (2<sup>37</sup>) πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων (2<sup>38</sup>) ἐν  
ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ  
Χριστοῦ (2<sup>40</sup>) τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ.

3.16 ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικεί-  
 τω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως, ἐν πάσῃ σο-  
 φίᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ νοθετοῦντες  
 (36) ἐαυτοῦς, ψαλμοῖς ὕμνοις  
ὠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς ἐν [τῇ] χάριτι  
ᾄδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν τῷ  
θεῷ. 3.17 καὶ (37) πᾶν ὅ τι ἐὰν  
ποιῆτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, πάντα  
(38) ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ἰησοῦ,  
(39) εὐχαριστοῦντες (40) τῷ θεῷ  
πατρὶ δι' αὐτοῦ.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	↓					
	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>		
---	F	G	---	H	1	<i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	1	<i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>			

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(24—26) [**PART G**] 3.20 Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν κατὰ πάντα, τοῦτο γὰρ (24) εὐάρεστόν (25) ἐστίν (26) ἐν κυρίῳ.

(43) Testing (δοκιμάζω) what is εὐάρεστον in *Rom* 12.2.

(44) Deeds (ἔργα) and darkness (σκότος) in *Rom* 13.12.

(45) Φῶς/φωτίζω and making visible (φανερῶω) in *1 Cor* 4.5.

(46—49) Combination of the terms ‘lying asleep’ (καθεύδω), ‘darkness’ (σκότος), ‘children/sons of light’ (τέκνα/υἱοὶ φωτός), and ‘getting drunk’ (μεθύσκομαι) also in *1 Thess* 5.4—7: ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐστὲ (46) ἐν σκότει, ἵνα ἡ ἡμέρα ὑμᾶς ὡς κλέπτῃ καταλάβῃ· 5.5 πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς (47) υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας· οὐκ ἐσμὲν νυκτός οὐδὲ (46') σκότους· 5.6 ἄρα οὖν μὴ (48) καθεύδωμεν ὡς οἱ λοιποὶ ἀλλὰ γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν· 5.7 οἱ γὰρ καθεύδοντες νυκτός καθεύδουσιν καὶ (49) οἱ μεθύσκομενοι νυκτός μεθύουσιν (cf. *1 Thess* 5.8 in *Eph* 6.14—17).

(27—30) [**PART H**] 4.5 (27) Ἐν σοφίᾳ (28) περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω (29) τόν καιρόν (30) ἐξαγοραζόμενοι.



The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part G

2: *Col* — primary text: Part G

### G. Management of a Christian Household (5.21—6.9)

**5.21** (2<sup>2</sup>) Ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλή-  
λοις (2<sup>14</sup>) ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ,

**5.22** (2<sup>1</sup>) αἱ γυναῖκες (2<sup>3</sup>) τοῖς ἰδί-  
οις ἀνδράσιν ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ,

**5.23** ὅτι (4<sup>1</sup>) ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ  
τῆς γυναικὸς ὡς (3<sup>1</sup>) καὶ ὁ Χρισ-  
τὸς κεφαλὴ (3<sup>3</sup>) τῆς ἐκκλησίας,

αὐτὸς (4<sup>2</sup>) σωτὴρ (3<sup>2</sup>) τοῦ σώμα-  
τος· **5.24** ἀλλὰ ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία  
(2<sup>2</sup>) ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕ-  
τως καὶ (2<sup>1</sup>) αἱ γυναῖκες (2<sup>3</sup>) τοῖς  
ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί.

**5.25** (2<sup>4</sup>) Οἱ ἄνδρες, (2<sup>5</sup>) ἀγα-  
πάτε (2<sup>6</sup>) τὰς γυναῖκας, καθὼς καὶ  
ὁ Χριστὸς (4<sup>3</sup>) ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκ-  
κλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν  
ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, **5.26** ἵνα (4<sup>4</sup>) αὐτὴν  
ἀγιάσῃ καθαρίσας (4<sup>5</sup>) τῷ λουτρῷ  
τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι, **5.27** ἵνα  
(3<sup>4</sup>/4<sup>6</sup>) παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ  
ἐνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχου-  
σαν σπίλον ἢ ρυτίδα ἢ τι τῶν  
τοιούτων, ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ (3<sup>5</sup>) ἀγία καὶ  
ἄμωμος. **5.28** οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν  
[καὶ] (2<sup>4</sup>) οἱ ἄνδρες (2<sup>5</sup>) ἀγαπᾶν  
(2<sup>6</sup>) τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας ὡς τὰ  
ἑαυτῶν σώματα. (2<sup>5</sup>) ὁ ἀγαπῶν  
(2<sup>6</sup>) τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἑαυτὸν  
ἀγαπᾷ. **5.29** οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν  
ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν ἀλλὰ ἐκ-  
τρέφει καὶ θάλπει αὐτήν, καθὼς

### G. Management of a Christian Household (3.18—4.1)

**3.18** (1) Αἱ γυναῖκες, (2) ὑποτάσ-  
σεσθε (3) τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὡς ἀν-  
ῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ.

**3.19** (4) Οἱ ἄνδρες, (5) ἀγαπάτε  
(6) τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ μὴ πικραί-  
νεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	↓		
---	Exhortations F	Household Management G	Request Ending --- H I Col
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3 H I Eph
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(1—3) [**<PART C**] Notion of Christ as head of the Church also in *Col* 1.18: (1) καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή (2) τοῦ σώματος (3) τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

(4—5) [**<PART C**] 1.22 νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου (4) παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς (5) ἀγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

(1) Notion of the husband as the head of the wife also in *1 Cor* 11.3: (...) κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ.

(2) Notion of Christ as the saviour (σωτήρ) of the body (σῶμα) also in *Philipp* 3.20—21.

(3) Combination of ἀγαπάω and παραδίδωμι + object + ὑπὲρ also in *Gal* 2.20: (...) ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (cf. *Eph* 5.2). For παραδίδωμι + object + ὑπὲρ see also *Rom* 8.32.

(4) Notion of Christ rendering the Church (ἐκκλησία) sacred (ἀγιάζω) also in *1 Cor* 1.2.

(5) Combination of ἀπολούω/λουτρὸν (to wash off/bath) and ἀγιάζω (to make sacred) also in *1 Cor* 6.11.

(6) Cf. also the notion of betrothing and presenting (παραστήσαι) the Corinthian believers as a chaste virgin to Christ, her true and only husband, in *2 Cor* 11.2

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part G

2: *Col* — primary text: Part G

καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν,  
**5.30** ὅτι (4<sup>7</sup>) μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ  
σώματος αὐτοῦ. **5.31** (4<sup>8</sup>) ἀντὶ  
τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος  
[τὸν] πατέρα καὶ [τὴν] μητέρα καὶ  
προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυ-  
ναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο  
εἰς σάρκα μίαν. **5.32** τὸ μυστήριον  
 τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν· ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς  
 Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.  
**5.33** πλὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἓνα,  
 ἕκαστος (2<sup>6</sup>) τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα  
 οὕτως (2<sup>5</sup>) ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν, ἡ  
 δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα (2<sup>14</sup>) φοβῆται τὸν  
 ἄνδρα.

**6.1** (2<sup>7</sup>) Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε  
τοῖς γονεῦσιν ὑμῶν (2<sup>9</sup>) [ἐν κυ-  
ρίῳ]· (2<sup>8</sup>) τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστίν (2<sup>25</sup>) δί-  
καιον. **6.2** (4<sup>9</sup>) τίμα τὸν πατέρα  
σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐν-  
 τολή πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ, **6.3** ἵνα  
εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἔση μακροχρό-  
νιος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

**6.4** Καὶ (2<sup>10</sup>) οἱ πατέρες, μὴ  
παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀλλὰ  
 ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ  
 νοουθεσίᾳ κυρίου.

**3.20** (7) Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε  
τοῖς γονεῦσιν κατὰ πάντα, **(8)** τοῦ-  
το γὰρ εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν **(9)** ἐν κυ-  
ρίῳ.

**3.21** **(10)** Οἱ πατέρες, μὴ ἐρεθί-  
ζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ἵνα μὴ ἀθυμώ-  
 σιν.

Adaptation (*continued*):

		↓			
	<i>Exhortations</i>		<i>Household Management</i>		<i>Request Ending</i>
---	F		G	---	H I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F		G	NEW 3	H I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>				<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

None.

(7) Notion of the Christians being limbs (μέλη) of the body (σῶμα) of Christ also in *1 Cor* 6.15, 12.12—27 and *Rom* 12.4—5.

(8) *Genesis* 2.24 LXX ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

(9) *Exod* 20.12 LXX τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς, ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι and/or *Deuteronomy* 5.16 LXX τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, ὃν τρόπον ἐνετείλατό σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	Address	Thanksgiving	Prayer		Ministry	Philosophy
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part G

6.5 (2<sup>11</sup>) Οἱ δούλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις (2<sup>14</sup>) μετὰ φόβου (4<sup>10</sup>) καὶ τρόμου (2<sup>13</sup>) ἐν ἀπλότῃ τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ, 6.6 (2<sup>12</sup>) μὴ κατ' ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι ἀλλ' (2<sup>19</sup>) ὡς δούλοι (2<sup>18</sup>) Χριστοῦ (2<sup>15</sup>) ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς, 6.7 μετ' εὐνοίας (2<sup>19</sup>) δουλεύοντες (2<sup>16</sup>) ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις, 6.8 εἰδότες ὅτι ἕκαστος ἐάν τι ποιήσῃ ἀγαθόν, τοῦτο (2<sup>20</sup>) κομίζεται (2<sup>17</sup>) παρὰ κυρίου (3<sup>6</sup>) εἴτε δούλος εἴτε ἐλεύθερος.

6.9 Καὶ (2<sup>24</sup>) οἱ κύριοι, τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ἀνιέντες τὴν ἀπειλήν, (2<sup>26</sup>) εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν ὁ κύριός ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς (2<sup>21</sup>) καὶ (2<sup>23</sup>) προσωπολημψία (2<sup>22</sup>) οὐκ ἐστιν παρ' αὐτῷ.

2: *Col* — primary text: Part G

3.22 (11) Οἱ δούλοι, ὑπακούετε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, (12) μὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλίᾳ ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ' (13) ἐν ἀπλότῃ καρδίας (14) φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον. 3.23 (15) ὃ ἐὰν ποιήτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε (16) ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις, 3.24 εἰδότες ὅτι (17) ἀπὸ κυρίου ἀπολήμψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας. (18) τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ (19) δουλεύετε· 3.25 ὁ γὰρ ἀδικῶν (20) κομίζεται ὃ ἠδίκησεν, (21) καὶ (22) οὐκ ἐστιν (23) προσωπολημψία.

4.1 (24) Οἱ κύριοι, (25) τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε, (26) εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔχετε κύριον ἐν οὐρανῷ.

Adaptation (*continued*):

		↓			
	<i>Exhortations</i>		<i>Household Management</i>		<i>Request Ending</i>
---	F		G	---	H I Col
NEW 2	F		G	NEW 3	H I Eph
<i>The Church (2)</i>				<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	

3: Col — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(10) The clause μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου also in 2 Cor 7.15 and Philipp 2.12.

(6) [**<PART F**] 3.10 καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, 3.11 ὅπου οὐκ ἐνὶ Ἑλλήν καὶ Ἰουδαίος, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος, ἀλλὰ [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW 1	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part NEW 3

2: *Eph* — Part NEW 3 (*continued*)

### NEW 3: The Fight against the Cosmic Rulers (6.10—17)

**6.10** (4<sup>1</sup>) Τοῦ λοιποῦ, (3<sup>1</sup>) ἐνδυνα-  
μοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν (3<sup>2</sup>) τῷ  
κράτει (4<sup>2</sup>) τῆς ἰσχύος (3<sup>3</sup>) αὐτοῦ.  
**6.11** ἐνδύσασθε (4<sup>3/4/17</sup>) τὴν πανοπ-  
λίαν τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι  
ὑμᾶς στήναι πρὸς τὰς μεθοδείας  
τοῦ διαβόλου. **6.12** ὅτι (4<sup>5</sup>) οὐκ  
ἔστιν ἡμῖν (4<sup>4</sup>) ἡ πάλη (4<sup>7</sup>) πρὸς  
(4<sup>8</sup>) αἷμα καὶ (4<sup>6</sup>) σάρκα, ἀλλὰ  
(4<sup>7</sup>) πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, (4<sup>7</sup>) πρὸς  
(3<sup>4</sup>) τὰς ἐξουσίας, (4<sup>7</sup>) πρὸς τοὺς  
κοσμοκράτορας (3<sup>5</sup>) τοῦ σκότους  
τούτου, (4<sup>7</sup>) πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ  
τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.  
**6.13** διὰ τοῦτο ἀναλάβετε (4<sup>17</sup>) τὴν  
πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δυνηθῆτε  
ἀντιστῆναι ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονη-  
ρᾷ καὶ ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι  
στήναι. **6.14** στήτε οὖν (4<sup>9</sup>) περι-  
ζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν ἐν  
ἀληθείᾳ (4<sup>14</sup>) καὶ (4<sup>10</sup>) ἐνδυσά-  
μενοι (4<sup>11</sup>) τὸν θώρακα (4<sup>15</sup>) τῆς  
δικαιοσύνης **6.15** καὶ ὑποδησά-  
μενοι (4<sup>18</sup>) τοὺς πόδας ἐν ἐτοιμα-  
σίᾳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης.  
**6.16** ἐν πᾶσιν ἀναλαβόντες τὸν  
θυρεὸν (4<sup>12</sup>) τῆς πίστεως, ἐν ᾧ  
δυνήσεσθε πάντα τὰ βέλη τοῦ  
πονηροῦ [τὰ] πεπυρωμένα σβέσαι·

**6.17** (4<sup>13</sup>) καὶ τὴν περικεφαλαίαν  
τοῦ σωτηρίου δέξασθε καὶ τὴν  
μάχαιραν (4<sup>16</sup>) τοῦ πνεύματος, ὃ  
ἔστιν ῥῆμα θεοῦ.

Adaptation (*continued*):

			↓			
---	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>		---	<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
NEW 2	F	G		NEW 3	H	I <i>Col</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>	F	G		<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>	H	I <i>Eph</i>

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(1—5) [**PART C**] 1.11 ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει (1) δυναμούμενοι (2) κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης (3) αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν. μετὰ χαρᾶς 1.12 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ικανώσαντι ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί· 1.13 ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ (4) τῆς ἐξουσίας (5) τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ.

But also a continuation of the interest in the contrast between σκότος and φῶς already shown in *Eph* 5.8—14 in part F.

\*) (*Continued*) See also *Isaiah* 59.17, 21 LXX: (14) καὶ (10) ἐνεδύσατο (15) δικαιοσύνην ὡς (11) θώρακα (13) καὶ περιέθετο περικεφαλαίαν σωτηρίου ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς (...). 59.21 καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, εἶπεν κύριος· (16) τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐμόν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ σοί, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα, ἃ ἔδωκα εἰς τὸ στόμα σου, οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπη ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου. Cf. *Wisdom of Solomon* 5.17—18a LXX λήμψεται (17) πανοπλίαν τὸν ζῆλον αὐτοῦ (...). 5.18 (10) ἐνδύσεται (11) θώρακα (15) δικαιοσύνην.

(1) Same beginning in *Gal* 6.17: Τοῦ λοιποῦ ... .

(2) Hallmark: τὸ κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ in *Eph* 6.10 and, before, in 1.19.

(3) The imagery of weapons (ὄπλα) also in 2 *Cor* 6.7, 10.4, *Rom* 6.13 and 13.12. In *Rom* 13.12 also combined with ἐνδύομαι.

(4—7) 2 *Cor* 10.4—5 (4) τὰ γὰρ ὄπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν (5) οὐ (6) σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ (7) πρὸς καθαίρεισιν ὀχυρωμάτων, λογισμοὺς καθαίροντες 10.5 καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα.

(8) Blood (αἷμα) and flesh (σὰρξ) also in 1 *Cor* 15.50 and *Gal* 1.16.

(9) *Isaiah* 11.5 LXX καὶ ἔσται δικαιοσύνη ἐξωσμένος τὴν ὄσφον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀληθεία εἰλημένος τὰς πλευράς.

(10—17) 1 *Thess* 5.8 ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέρας ὄντες νήφωμεν (10) ἐνδυσάμενοι (11) θώρακα (12) πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης (13) καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας (cf. 1 *Thess* 5.4—7 in *Eph* 5.8, 5.14 and 5.18).\*)

(18) *Isaiah* 52.7 LXX ὡς ὄρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης.



The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	Address	Thanksgiving	Prayer		Ministry	Philosophy
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW I	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part H

2: *Col* — primary text: Part H

H. Request for Intercessory Prayers for the Dissemination of the Mystery (6.18—20)

H. Request for Intercessory Prayers for the Dissemination of the Mystery (4.2—6)

6.18 (2<sup>1</sup>) Διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς (4<sup>1</sup>) καὶ δεήσεως (2<sup>3</sup>) προσευχόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ (4<sup>2</sup>) ἐν πνεύματι, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγρυπνοῦντες ἐν πάσῃ (2<sup>2</sup>) προσκαρτερήσει καὶ δεήσει (2<sup>5</sup>) περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων 6.19 (2<sup>4</sup>) καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, (2<sup>6</sup>) ἵνα μοι δοθῇ (2<sup>8</sup>) λόγος (2<sup>7</sup>) ἐν ἀνοιξίῃ τοῦ στόματός μου, ἐν παρησίᾳ γνωρίσαι (2<sup>9</sup>) τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 6.20 ὑπὲρ οὗ (4<sup>3</sup>) πρεσβεύω ἐν ἀλύσει, (2<sup>10</sup>) ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ (4<sup>4</sup>) παρρησιάσωμαι (2<sup>11</sup>) ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι.

4.2 (1) Τῇ προσευχῇ (2) προσκαρτερεῖτε, γρηγοροῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, 4.3 (3) προσευχόμενοι ἅμα (4) καὶ (5) περὶ ἡμῶν, (6) ἵνα ὁ θεὸς (7) ἀνοιξῇ ἡμῖν θύραν (8) τοῦ λόγου λαλῆσαι (9) τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' ὃ καὶ δέδεμαι, 4.4 (10) ἵνα φανερώσω αὐτὸ (11) ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι.

4.5 Ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἕξω τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι. 4.6 ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος, εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι.

Adaptation (*continued*):

			↓		
	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>		<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>
---	F	G		H	I <i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I <i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>		

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

None.

(1) Combination of prayer (προσευχή) and entreaty (δέησις) also in *Philipp* 4.6.

(2) Notion of praying (προσεύχομαι) in the Spirit (πνεῦμα)/ with the assistance of the Spirit also in *Rom* 8.26.

(3) Cf. Paul's reference to himself as a ambassador/old man (πρεσβύτης) and a captive (δέσμιος) in *Phm* 9.

(4) Combination of speaking freely (παρρησιάζομαι) and talking (λαλέω) of the gospel also in *1 Thess* 2.2.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW I	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part I

2: *Col* — primary text: Part I

I. Ending: Personal Matters, a Note on the Messenger, and Greetings (6.21—24)

6.21 Ἴνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς (2<sup>1</sup>) τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, τί πράσσω, πάντα γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικός ὁ ἀγαπητός ἀδελφός καὶ πιστός διάκονος ἐν κυρίῳ. 6.22 ὃν ἐπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν.

I. Ending: Personal Matters, a Note on the Messenger, and Greetings (4.7—18)

4.7 (1) Τὰ κατ' ἐμέ πάντα γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικός ὁ ἀγαπητός ἀδελφός καὶ πιστός διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος ἐν κυρίῳ, 4.8 ὃν ἐπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, 4.9 σὺν Ὀνησίμῳ τῷ πιστῷ καὶ ἀγαπητῷ ἀδελφῷ, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν· πάντα ὑμῖν γνωρίσουσιν τὰ ὄδε.

4.10 Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἀρίσταρχος ὁ συναιχμάλωτός μου καὶ Μάρκος ὁ ἀνεψιός Βαρναβᾶ (περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε ἐντολάς, εἰάν ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δέξασθε αὐτόν) 4.11 καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούστος, οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς, οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, οἵτινες ἐγενήθησάν μοι παρηγορία. 4.12 ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἐπαφρᾶς ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν, δούλος Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ], πάντοτε ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, ἵνα σταθῆτε τέλειοι καὶ πληροφορημένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ. 4.13 μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔχει πολὺν πόνον ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει. 4.14 ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρός ὁ ἀγαπητός

Adaptation (*continued*):

					↓	
	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>		<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>	
---	F	G	---	H	I	<i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I	<i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>			

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

None.

None.

The adaptation of the structure of *Col* by the author of *Eph*:

	<i>Address</i>	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Ministry</i>	<i>Philosophy</i>
<i>Col</i>	A	B	C	---	D	E
<i>Eph</i>	A	B	C	NEW I	D	---

*The Church (1)*

1: *Eph* : Part I

2: *Col* — primary text: Part I

καὶ Δημᾶς.

4.15 Ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐν Λαοδικεῖα ἀδελφοὺς καὶ Νύμφαν καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν.  
4.16 καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῆ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῆ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνώτε.

4.17 καὶ εἶπατε Ἀρχίππῳ, Βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς.

4.18 Ὁ ἀσπασμός τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ Παύλου. μνημονεῦτέ μου τῶν δεσμῶν.

6.23 (3<sup>1</sup>/4<sup>3</sup>) Εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (4<sup>2</sup>) καὶ (4<sup>1</sup>) ἀγάπη μετὰ (4<sup>4</sup>) πίστεως (3<sup>2</sup>/4<sup>5</sup>) ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς (4<sup>6</sup>) καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

6.24 (2<sup>2</sup>) ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ.

(2) ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν.

Adaptation (*continued*):

	<i>Exhortations</i>	<i>Household Management</i>		<i>Request</i>	<i>Ending</i>	
---	F	G	---	H	I	<i>Col</i>
NEW 2	F	G	NEW 3	H	I	<i>Eph</i>
<i>The Church (2)</i>			<i>The Cosmic Rulers</i>			

3: *Col* — supplementary passages

4: Paul, LXX, and hallmarks

(1—2) [**PART A**] 1.2 (...) χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ (1) εἰρήνη (2) ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.

(1—6) Combination of peace (εἰρήνη) and love (ἀγάπη) in a letter ending also in 2 *Cor* 13.11: (...) καὶ ὁ θεὸς (1) τῆς ἀγάπης (2) καὶ (3) εἰρήνης ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν.

The three terms εἰρήνη, ἀγάπη, and πίστις occur together in *Gal* 5.22—23 as well: Ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν (1) ἀγάπη χαρὰ (3) εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία χρηστότης ἀγαθωσύνη, (4) πίστις 5.23 πραΰτης ἐγκράτεια.

Cf. also the opening greeting χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ (3) εἰρήνη (5) ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (6) καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 2 *Cor* 1.2, 1 *Cor* 1.3, *Rom* 1.7, *Philipp* 1.2, *Gal* 1.3 and *Phm* 3 (see also *Eph* 1.2).



# Bibliography

## 1 Bibliographical abbreviations

### 2 Sources

2.1 Individual authors or separate anonymous and pseudepigraphic writings

2.2 Other literary sources (collections of texts)

2.3 Epigraphic and papyrological material

2.4 Numismatic material

2.5 Tools

### 3 Literature

## 1 Bibliographical abbreviations

Anchor Bible <i>ANRW</i>	The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday W. Haase and H. Temporini (eds), <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972 ff.
ARGU	Arbeiten zur Religion und Geschichte des Urchristentums. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
<i>BMC</i>	H.A. Grueber, <i>Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum</i> , 3 vols. London: The British Museum, 1910
Budé	Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres
<i>CPJ III</i>	V.A. Tcherikover, A. Fuks, M. Stern and D.M. Lewis (eds), <i>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum</i> , vol. 3. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1964
Comm. in Arist. graeca <i>CREBM</i>	Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Berlin: G. Reimer H. Mattingly, <i>Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum</i> , vol. 2: <i>Vespasian to Domitian</i> ; vol. 4: <i>Antoninus Pius to Commodus</i> . London: The British Museum, 1930—1940
<i>CRR</i>	E.A. Sydenham, G.C. Haines, L. Forrer, and C.A. Hersh, <i>The Coinage of the Roman Republic</i> . London: Spink & Son, 1952
CUP	Cambridge University Press
Diels, <i>Doxographi graeci</i>	H. Diels (intro. and ed.), <i>Doxographi graeci</i> . Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965 <sup>4</sup> (reprint of the 1st edition, 1879)
Diels-Kranz, <i>Vorsokratiker</i>	H. Diels and W. Kranz (ed. and transl.), <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und deutsch</i> , 3 vols. Zürich/Berlin: Weidmann, 1964 <sup>11</sup>
EPRO	Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain. Leiden: E.J. Brill
ET	English Translation



- GCS Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
- Greek New Testament B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini and B.M. Metzger (eds), *The Greek New Testament: Fourth Revised Edition*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft & United Bible Societies, 1983.
- HNT Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)
- HThK Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder
- Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften; Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, vols 1—57, 1972—2000
- JSJS Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill
- JSNTS Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press
- KEK Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
- KRS G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven, and M. Schofield (ed., transl., and comm.), *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*. Cambridge: CUP, 1983<sup>2</sup> (1957)
- LCL The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann
- LS A.A. Long and D.N. Sedley (ed., transl., and comm.), *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, vol. 1: *Translations of the Principal Sources, with Philosophical Commentary*; vol. 2: *Greek and Latin Texts with Notes and Bibliography*. Cambridge: CUP, 1987
- LSJ H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H.S. Jones, and R. McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), 1940<sup>9</sup> (With a Supplement, 1968)
- LXX *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graecae iuxta LXX interpretes* (A. Rahlfs, ed.), vol. 1: *Prolegomena, Leges et historiae*; vol. 2: *Libri poetici et prophetici*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935
- MAMA *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*. Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor. Manchester: Manchester University Press, vols 1—8, 1928—1962. Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies. Journal of Roman Studies Monographs; 4 and 7. London: The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, vols 9—10, 1988—1993
- MT The Masoretic Text, see: *Biblia hebraica Stuttgartensia* (R. Kittel, K. Elliger, and W. Rudolph, eds). Second revised edition by W. Rudolph and H.P. Rüger. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984 (1967, 1977)
- Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> *Novum Testamentum graecae* (Nestle-Aland; E. & E. Nestle, B. & K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini, and B.M.

- NIC Metzger, eds), Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993<sup>27</sup>  
The New International Commentary on the New Testament.  
Grand Rapids (Michigan): W.B. Eerdmans
- NovT *Novum Testamentum: An International Quarterly for New Testament and Related Studies*
- NovTSup Supplements to Novum Testamentum. Leiden/New York/  
Köln: E.J. Brill
- OCD<sup>3</sup> S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford/New York: OUP, 1996<sup>3</sup>
- OCT Oxford Classical Texts. Scriptorum classicorum bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP)
- OECT Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP)
- OGIS W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, 2 vols. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1903—1905
- OUP Oxford University Press
- PhAnt Philosophia antiqua. Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill
- PVTG Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece. Leiden: E.J. Brill
- RSC H.A. Seaby, *Roman Silver Coins*, vol. 1.1: *The Republic*; vol. 1.2: *Julius Caesar to Augustus and Their Families*. London: B.A. Seaby, 1952
- SBL Society of Biblical Literature
- SC Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf
- StNT Studien zum Neuen Testament. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn
- SNTW Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark
- SVF H. von Arnim (ed.), *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, vol. 1: *Zeno et Zenonis discipuli*; vol. 2: *Chrysippi fragmenta logica et physica*; vol. 3: *Chrysippi fragmenta moralia. Fragmenta successorum Chrysippi*; vol. 4: *Indices* (M. Adler). Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1968—1978 (stereotypical edition of the 1st edition, 4 vols, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1903—1905, 1924)
- TAM *Tituli Asiae Minoris collecti et editi auspiciis Academiae Litterarum Austriacae*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, vols 1—5.2, 1901—1989.
- TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds), G.W. Bromiley (transl. and ed.), and R.E. Pitkin (indices), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols. Grand Rapids (Michigan): W.B. Eerdmans, 1964—1976 (=ET of *ThWNT*)
- Teubner Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig/ Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner
- THAT E. Jenni and C. Westermann (eds), *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, 2 vols. München: Chr. Kaiser/Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984
- ThWAT G.J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry (eds), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz: W. Kohlhammer, 1970 ff.

ThWNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds), and O. Rühle (indices), <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> , 11 vols. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz: W. Kohlhammer, 1933—1979
TRE	G. Krause and G. Müller (eds), <i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> . Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977 ff.
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)

## 2 Sources

### 2.1 Individual authors or separate anonymous and pseudepigraphic writings

- Acta Ioannis*, see: E. Junod and J.-D. Kaestli (ed., intro., transl., and comm.), *Acta Iohannis*, 2 vols. Corpus Christianorum; Series Apocryphorum; 1—2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1983.
- Aelius Aristides, *Orationes*, see: (1) B. Keil (ed.), *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia*, vol. 2: *Orationes 17—53*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1898; (2) C.A. Behr (transl.), *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works*, vol. 2: *Orations 17—53*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981.
- Aetius, *Placita*, see: (1) H. Diels (intro. and ed.), *Doxographi graeci*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965<sup>4</sup> (reprint of the 1st edition, 1879), pp. 267—444: *ΑΕΤΙΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΑΡΕΣΚΟΝΤΩΝ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ*; (2) J. Mansfeld and D.T. Runia, *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. 1: *The Sources*. PhAnt; 73, 1997.
- Alcinous, *Didaskalikos*, see: (1) J. Whittaker (intro., ed., and comm.) and P. Louis (transl.), *Alcinoos: Enseignement des doctrines de Platon*. Budé, 1990; (2) J. Dillon, *Alcinous: The Handbook of Platonism: Translated with an Introduction and Commentary*. Clarendon Later Ancient Philosophers. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), 1993.
- Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria*, see: M. Hayduck (ed.), *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria*. Comm. in Arist. graeca; 1, 1891.
- , *In Aristotelis Topicorum libros octo commentaria*, see: M. Wallies (ed.), *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis In Aristotelis Topicorum libros octo commentaria*. Comm. in Arist. graeca; 2.2, 1891.
- , *De fato*, see: (1) R.W. Sharples, *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Fate: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. London: Duckworth, 1983 (Greek text: pp. 179—212; photographic reprint of the text in I. Bruns, ed., *Supplementum Aristotelicum*, vol. 2.2: *Alexandri Scripta minora reliqua*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1892, pp. 164—212); (2) P. Thillet (ed. and transl.), *Alexandre d'Aphrodise: Traité du destin*. Budé, 1984.

- , *De mixtione*, see: R.B. Todd, *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Stoic Physics: A Study of the De Mixtione with Preliminary Essays, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. PhAnt; 28, 1976.
- Anaxagoras, *Fragments*, see: D. Sider, *The Fragments of Anaxagoras: Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie; 118. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1981.
- Annaeus Lucanus, Marcus, *De bello civili*, see: (1) D.R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili libri X*. Teubner, 1988; (2) S.H. Braund, *Lucan: Civil War. Translated with Introduction and Notes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), 1992.
- Apuleius, *Florida*, see: (1) R. Helm (ed.), *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Opera quae supersunt*, vol. 2.2: *Florida*. Teubner, 1959 (stereotypical edition of the 1st edition, 1910, with additions); (2) P. Vallette (ed. and transl.), *Apulée: Apologie, Florides*. Budé, 1924.
- , *De mundo* and *De Platone et eius dogmate*, see: (1) C. Moreschini (ed.), *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Opera quae supersunt*, vol. 3: *De philosophia libri*. Teubner, 1991; (2) J. Beaujeu (ed., transl., and comm.), *Apulée: Opusculs philosophiques (Du Dieu de Socrate, Platon et sa doctrine, Du monde) et fragments*. Budé, 1973.
- , *Metamorphoses*, book 11, see: J.G. Griffiths (ed., intro., transl., and comm.), *Apuleius of Madauros: The Isis-Book (Metamorphoses, Book XI)*. EPRO; 39, 1975.
- Aratus, *Phaenomena*, see: D. Kidd (ed., intro., transl., and comm.), *Aratus: Phaenomena*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries; 34. Cambridge: CUP, 1997.
- Aristotle, *De anima*, see: W.D. Ross (ed.), *Aristotelis De anima*. OCT, 1956.
- , *De caelo*, see: P. Moraux (ed. and transl.), *Aristote: Du ciel*. Budé, 1965.
- , *Meteorologica*, see: P. Louis (ed. and transl.), *Aristote: Météorologiques*, 2 vols. Budé, 1982.
- , *Physica*, see: W.D. Ross (ed.), *Aristotelis Physica*. OCT, 1950.
- , *Rhetorica*, see: W.D. Ross (ed.), *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica*. OCT, 1959.
- Pseudo-Aristotle, *De mundo*, see: W.L. Lorimer (ed.), *Aristotelis qui fertur libellus De mundo*. Nouvelle Collection de Textes et Documents publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1933.
- Athenagoras, *Legatio*, see: W.R. Schoedel (ed. and transl.), *Athenagoras: 'Legatio' and 'De resurrectione'*. OECT, 1972.
- Augustine, *De civitate dei*, see: (1) B. Dombart (ed.), *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De civitate Dei*, 2 vols. Aurelii Augustini Opera; 14.1—2; Corpus Christianorum; Series Latina; 47—48. Turnhout: Brepols, 1955; (2) R.W. Dyson (transl.), *Augustine: The City of God Against the Pagans*. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
- Aurelius, Marcus, *Ad se ipsum*, see: (1) J. Dalfen (ed.), *Marci Aurelii Antonini Ad se ipsum libri XII*. Teubner, 1987<sup>2</sup> (1979<sup>1</sup>); (2) A.S.L. Farquharson (ed., transl., and comm.), *ΜΑΡΚΟΥ ΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΟΣ ΤΑ ΕΙΣ ΕΑΥΤΟΝ: The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus*, vol. 1: *Text and Translation*; vol. 2: *Greek Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), 1944.
- 2 *Baruch* (=The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch), see: (1) S. Dederich (ed.), *Apocalypse of Baruch*. The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version; 4.3: *Apocalypse of Baruch; 4 Esdras*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973; (2) for an English translation, see: A.F.J. Klijn, '2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch,' in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1. New York: Doubleday, 1983, pp. 615—652.

- 3 *Baruch* (=The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch), see: J.-C. Picard (ed.), *Apocalypsis Baruchi graece*. PVTG; 2, 1967, pp. 61—96.
- Caldius, *Timaeus*, see: J.H. Waszink (ed.; with the collaboration of P.J. Jensen), *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus*. Corpus Platonicum medii aevi. Plato latinus; 4. London/Leiden: The Warburg Institute & E.J. Brill, 1962.
- Cicero, *De divinatione*, *De fato*, and *Timaeus*, see: R. Giomini (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 46: *De divinatione, De fato, Timaeus*. Teubner, 1975.
- , *De natura deorum*, see: O. Plasberg and W. Ax (eds), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 45: *De natura deorum*. Teubner, 1968 (stereotypical edition of the 2nd edition, 1933).
- , *Disputationes Tusculanae*, see: M. Pohlenz and O. Heine (ed. and comm.), *Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum libri V*, 2 vols. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1957.
- Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, see: O. Stählin (ed.), *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 1: *Protrepticus und Paedagogus* (third, revised edition by U. Treu). GCS. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972.
- , *Stromata*, see: (1) O. Stählin and L. Früchtel (eds), *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 2: *Stromata, Buch I-VI*. GCS; 52 (15). Berlin : Akademie-Verlag, 1960<sup>3</sup>; and O. Stählin, L. Früchtel and U. Treu (eds), *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 3: *Stromata, Buch VII und VIII. Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae prophetae, Quis dives salvetur, Fragmente*. GCS; 17. Berlin : Akademie-Verlag, 1970<sup>2</sup>; (2) A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (transl.), *Clement of Alexandria: The Stromata, or Miscellanies*, in: A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, vol. 2. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark and Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1994 (American Reprint of the Edinburgh Edition), pp. 299—568.
- Cleomedes, *De motu circulari corporum caelestium*, see: H. Ziegler (ed. and transl.), *ΚΛΕΟΜΗΔΟΥΣ ΚΥΚΛΙΚΗΣ ΘΕΩΡΙΑΣ ΜΕΤΕΩΡΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΑ ΔΥΟ: Cleomedis De motu circulari corporum caelestium libri duo*. Teubner, 1891.
- Cornutus, *Theologiae graecae compendium*, see: C. Lang (ed.), *Cornuti Theologiae graecae compendium*. Teubner, 1881.
- Dead Sea Scrolls: 4Q186, see: J.M. Allegro (ed. and transl., with the collaboration of A.A. Anderson), *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan*, vol. 5: *Qumrân Cave 4*, vol. 1: 4Q158—4Q186. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), 1968, pp. 88—91.
- , 4Q534, see: J. Starcky (ed., transl., and comm.), 'Un texte messianique araméen de la grotte 4 de Qumrân,' in: *Mémorial du cinquantenaire 1914—1964: École des Langues Orientales Anciennes de l'Institut Catholique de Paris*. Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris; 10. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1964, pp. 51—66.
- , 1QH (=The Thanksgiving Hymns), see: E.L. Sukenik (intro. and ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955, pp. 37—39 (introduction) and plates 35—58 (transcription).
- , 1QP<sup>a</sup>Hab (=Commentary on Habakkuk), see: M. Burrows (intro. and ed., with the assistance of J.C. Trever and W.H. Brownlee), *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. 1: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*. New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950, pp. xix—xxi (introduction) and plates LV—LXI (plates and transcription).
- , see: *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (G. Vermes, intro. and transl.). Harmondsworth: Allen Lane. The Penguin Press, 1997<sup>5</sup>.

- Dio Chrysostom, *Oratio* 12 (Olympicus) and 36 (Borystheniticus), see: D.A. Russell (ed., intro., and comm.), *Dio Chrysostom: Orations VII, XII and XXXVI*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics Imperial Library. Cambridge: CUP, 1992.
- Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, see: H.S. Long (ed.), *Diogenis Laertii Vitae philosophorum*, 2 vols. OCT, 1964.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ars rhetorica*, see: H. Usener and L. Radermacher (eds), *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant*, vol. 6: *Opusculorum volumen secundum*. Teubner, 1985 (stereotypical edition of the 1st edition, 1904—1929), pp. 253—387.
- Empedocles, *Fragments*, see: M.R. Wright (ed., intro., comm., concordance and new bibliography), *Empedocles: The Extant Fragments*. Bristol Classical Press. London: Gerald Duckworth and Indianapolis/Cambridge (USA): Hackett, 1995 (first published by Yale University Press, New Haven/London 1981).
- 1 *Enoch*, see: (1) M.A. Knibb (in consultation with E. Ullendorff), *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, vol. 1: *Text and Apparatus*; vol. 2: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), 1978; (2) M. Black (ed.), *Apocalypsis Henochi graece*. PVTG; 3, 1970, pp. 1—44.
- Epictetus, *Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*, see: (1) J. Souilhé (ed. and transl.; with the collaboration of A. Jagu: vols 3—4), *Épictète: Entretiens*, 4 vols. Budé, 1943—1965 (vol. 1, 1975<sup>2</sup>; vol. 2, 1969<sup>2</sup>); (2) H. Schenkl (ed.), *Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*. Teubner, 1916.
- Epiphanius, *Panarion (Adversus haereses)*, see: K. Holl (ed.), *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*, 3 vols (vols 2—3: second, revised edition by J. Dummer). GCS. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1915 (vol. 1), 1980<sup>2</sup> (vol. 2) and 1985<sup>2</sup> (vol. 3).
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hieronymi Chronicon*, see: (1) R. Helm (ed.), *Eusebius Werke*, vol. 7: *Die Chronik des Hieronymus: Hieronymi Chronicon*. GCS; 47 (24 and 34). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956<sup>2</sup>; (2) J. Karst (ed.), *Eusebius Werke*, vol. 5: *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*. GCS; 20. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1911.
- 4 *Ezra*, see: A.F.J. Klijn (ed.), *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra*. TU; 131. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983.
- Galen, *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*, see: P. de Lacy, *Galen: On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato: Edition, Translation, and Commentary*, 3 vols. Corpus medicorum graecorum; 5.4.1.2: *Galenus De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1978—1984.
- Hecaton, *Fragments*, see: H. Gomoll, *Der stoische Philosoph Hekaton: Seine Begriffswelt und Nachwirkung unter Beigabe seiner Fragmente*. Inaugural-Dissertation, Bonn. Borsdorf-Leipzig: Wilhelm Hoppe, 1933, pp. 87—114: 'Fragmentensammlung.'
- Heraclitus, *Fragments*, see: M. Conche (ed., transl., and comm.), *Héraclite: Fragments. Épiméthée; Essais philosophiques*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1986.
- Heraclitus, *Quaestiones homericae*, see: F. Oelmann (ed.), *Heracliti Quaestiones homericae*. Teubner, 1910.
- Heron of Alexandria, *Stereometrica*, see: J. L. Heiberg (ed. and transl.), *Heronis quae feruntur Stereometrica et De mensuris*. Heronis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt omnia; 5. Teubner, 1914.
- Hierocles, *ἩΘΙΚΗ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΣΙΣ*, see: H. von Arnim (ed., with the collaboration of W. Schubart), *Hierokles: Ethische Elementarlehre (Papyrus 9780) nebst den bei Stobäus erhaltenen ethischen Exzerpten aus Hierokles*. Berliner Klassikertexte; 4. Berlin: Weidmann, 1906.

- Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, see: M. Marcovich (ed.), *Hippolytus: Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Patristische Texte und Studien; 25. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.
- Horace, *Satires*, see: F. Villeneuve (ed., transl., and notes), *Horace: Satires*. Budé, 1932.
- Iamblichus, *De mysteriis*, see: É. des Places (ed. and transl.), *Jamblique: Les mystères d'Égypte*. Budé, 1996.
- Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, see: B. Niese (ed.), *Flavii Iosephi Opera*, vol. 5: *De Iudaeorum vetustate sive Contra Apionem libri II*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1889.
- Julian, *Εἰς τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν*, see: G. Rochefort (ed. and transl.), *L'empereur Julien: Œuvres complètes*, vol. 2.1: Discours de Julien Empereur. Budé, 1963, pp. 92—131.
- Juvenal, *Satires*, see: J. Willis (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae sedecim*. Teubner, 1997.
- Lucan, see Annaeus Lucanus, Marcus.
- Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, see: C. Bailey (ed., intro., transl., and comm.), *Titi Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex*, 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), 1947.
- 2 *Maccabees*, see: LXX (ed. A. Rahlfs 1935), vol. 1, pp. 1099—1139.
- 3 *Maccabees*, see: LXX (ed. A. Rahlfs 1935), vol. 1, pp. 1139—1156.
- 4 *Maccabees*, see: LXX (ed. A. Rahlfs 1935), vol. 1, pp. 1157—1184.
- Macarius of Magnesia, *Apocriticus (Monogenes)* 2.15, see: (1) A. von Harnack (ed.), *Porphyrus: 'Gegen die Christen,' 15 Bücher. Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate*. Einzelausgabe aus den Abhandlungen der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1916; philosophisch-historische Klasse; 1. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1916, fragm. 72, p. 90 (Greek text); (2) A. Harnack, *Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts: Die im Apocriticus des Macarius Magnes enthaltene Streitschrift*. TU; series 3; 7 (37.4). Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1911, pp. 26—29 (Greek text and German transl.); (3) T.W. Crafer (transl.), *The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes*. Translations of Christian Literature; series 1: Greek texts. London: SPCK/ New York: Macmillan, 1919, pp. 46—47.
- Musonius Rufus, *Reliquiae*, see: (1) O. Hense (ed.), *C. Musonii Rufi Reliquiae*. Teubner, 1905; (2) C.E. Lutz, *Musonius Rufus: 'The Roman Socrates.'* New Haven: Yale University Press/London: Geoffrey Cumberlege & OUP, 1947, pp. 31—147 (Greek text adapted from O. Hense 1905, with translation).
- , *Musonii Epistola*, see: R. Hercher (ed.), *ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΙ: Epistolographi graeci*. Paris: A.F. Didot, 1873, pp. 401—404: *ΜΟΥΣΩΝΙΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ. Musonii Epistola*.
- Nemesius of Emesa, *De natura hominis*, see: (1) M. Morani (ed.), *Nemesii Emeseni De natura hominis*. Teubner, 1987; (2) C.F. Matthaei (ed.), *Nemesius Emesenus: De natura hominis. Graece et latine*. Halle: J.J. Gebauer, 1802 (reprographic reprint, Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1967).
- Numenius, *Fragments*, see: É. des Places (ed. and transl.), *Numénius: Fragments*. Budé, 1973.
- Olympiodorus, *In Platonis Alcibiadem commentarii*, see: L.G. Westerink (ed.), *Olympiodorus: Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1956.
- Oratio Manassis*, see: LXX (ed. A. Rahlfs 1935), vol. 2, pp. 180—181.
- Origen, *Contra Celsum*, see: (1) M. Borret, *Origène: Contre Celse. Introduction, Texte critique, Traduction et Notes*, 5 vols. SC; 132, 136, 147, 150, and 227, 1967—1976; (2) H. Chadwick (transl., intro., and notes), *Origen: 'Contra Celsum.'* Cambridge: CUP, 1953.
- Orosius, *Historia adversus paganos*, see: M.-P. Arnaud-Lindet (ed., transl., and notes), *Orose: Histories (Contre les Païens)*, 3 vols. Budé, 1990—1991.

- Orphic Poems*, see: O. Kern (ed.), *Orphicorum fragmenta*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1922.
- Panaetius, *Fragments*, see: M. van Straaten (ed.), *Panaetii Rhodii Fragmenta*. PhAnt; 5, 1962<sup>3</sup> (1946<sup>1</sup>; 1952<sup>2</sup>).
- Philo of Alexandria, *Opera quae supersunt*, see: (1) L. Cohn, P. Wendland, S. Reiter (eds), and J. Leisegang (indices), *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, 7 vols. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1896—1930; (2) R. Marcus, *Philo: Supplement*, vol. 1: *Questions and Answers on Genesis: Translated from the Ancient Armenian Version of the Original Greek*; vol. 2: *Questions and Answers on Exodus: Translated from the Ancient Armenian Version of the Original Greek* (Appendix A, pp. 177—263: 'Greek Fragments of the Quaestiones'). LCL, 1953; (3) F.H. Colson, G.H. Whitaker (ed., transl., and notes), and J.W. Earp (indices), *Philo*. LCL, 10 vols, 1927—1962.
- Philodemus, *De pietate*, see: (1) Diels, *Doxographi graeci*, pp. 529—550: 'Ciceronis ex libro I De deorum natura et Philodemi ex libro I De pietate philosophorum de deis opiniones comparatae;' (2) A. Henrichs, 'Die Kritik der stoischen Theologie im *PHerc.* 1428,' in: *Cronache Ercolanesi* 4 (1974), pp. 5—32; ed. and transl. of *PHerc.* 1428 on pp. 12—26.
- Plato, *Cratylus*, see: W.S.M. Nicoll and E.A. Duke, in: E.A. Duke, W.F. Hicken, W.S.M. Nicoll, D.B. Robinson, and J.C.G. Strachan (eds), *Platonis Opera*, vol. 1. OCT, 1995, pp. 187—275.
- , *Leges*, see: J. Burnet (ed.), *Platonis Opera*, vol. 5.1—5.2. OCT, [1913].
- , *Phaedo*, see: J.C.G. Strachan, in: E.A. Duke, W.F. Hicken, W.S.M. Nicoll, D.B. Robinson, and J.C.G. Strachan (eds), *Platonis Opera*, vol. 1. OCT, 1995, pp. 85—186.
- , *Philebus*, see: J. Burnet (ed.), *Platonis Opera*, vol. 2. OCT, [1910].
- , *Respublica*, see: J. Burnet (ed.), *Platonis Opera*, vol. 4. OCT, [1905].
- , *Symposium*, see: J. Burnet (ed.), *Platonis Opera*, vol. 2. OCT, [1910].
- , *Timaeus*, see: J. Burnet (ed.), *Platonis Opera*, vol. 4. OCT, [1905].
- Pseudo-Plato, *Epinomis*, see: J. Burnet (ed.), *Platonis Opera*, vol. 5.2. OCT, [1913].
- Plutarch of Chaeronea, *Moralia*, see: (1) F.C. Babbitt, W.C. Helmbold, P.H. de Lacy, B. Einarson, P.A. Clement, H.B. Hoffleit, E.L. Minar, Jr., F.H. Sandbach, H.N. Fowler, L. Pearson, and H. Cherniss (ed., transl., and notes), *Plutarch's Moralia*. LCL, 16 vols, 1927—1976; (2) the following editions of various writings from his *Moralia*.
- , *Consolatio ad Apollonium (Moralia 101E—122A)*, see: (1) W.R. Paton, in: W.R. Paton, J. Wegehaupt, M. Pohlenz, and H. Gärtner (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 1, pp. 208—252. Teubner, 1974<sup>2</sup> (1925<sup>1</sup>); (2) J. Hani, in: J. Defradas, J. Hani, and R. Klaerr (ed. and transl.), *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales*, vol. 2, pp. 1—89. Budé, 1985.
- , *Quaestiones romanae (Moralia 263D—291C)*, see: J.B. Titchener, in: W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, and J.B. Titchener (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 2.1, pp. 273—336: *Aetia romana*. Teubner, 1935.
- , *De Iside et Osiride (Moralia 351C—384C)*, see: (1) W. Sieveking, in: W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, and J.B. Titchener (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 2.3, pp. 1—80. Teubner, 1935; (2) C. Froidefond (ed. and transl.), *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales*, vol. 5.2: *Isis et Osiris*. Budé, 1988; (3) J. Gwyn Griffiths (ed., intro., transl., and comm.), *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride. Sine loco*: University of Wales Press, 1970.
- , *De E apud Delphos (Moralia 384C—394C)*, see: (1) W. Sieveking, in: W.R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, and W. Sieveking (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 3, pp. 1—24. Teubner, 1929; (2) R. Flacelière (ed. and transl.), *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales*, vol. 6: *Dialogues pythiques*, pp. 1—36: *De E Delphico*. Budé, 1974.



- , *De defectu oraculorum* (*Moralia* 409E—438D), see: (1) W. Sieveking, in: W.R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, and W. Sieveking (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 3, pp. 59—122. Teubner, 1929; (2) R. Flacelière (ed. and transl.), *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales*, vol. 6: *Dialogues pythiques*, pp. 83—165. Budé, 1974.
- , *De genio Socratis* (*Moralia* 575A—598F), see: (1) W. Sieveking, in: W.R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, and W. Sieveking (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 3, pp. 460—511. Teubner, 1929; (2) J. Hani (ed. and transl.), *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales*, vol. 8, pp. 37—129. Budé, 1980.
- , *Quaestiones convivales* (*Moralia* 612C—748D), see: (1) C. Hubert (ed.), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 4, pp. 1—335. Teubner, 1938; (2) F. Fuhrmann, F. Frazier, and J. Sirinelli (ed. and transl.), *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales*, vol. 9: *Propos de table*, 3 vols. Budé, 1972—1996; (3) S.-T. Teodorsson (ed. and comm.), *A Commentary on Plutarch's Table Talks*, 3 vols. *Studia graeca et latina Gothoburgensia*; 51, 53, and 62. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1989—1996.
- , *De facie quae in orbe lunae apparet* (*Moralia* 920A—945E), see: M. Pohlenz, in: C. Hubert and M. Pohlenz (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 5.3, pp. 31—89. Teubner, 1955.
- , *De primo frigido* (*Moralia* 945E—955C), see: C. Hubert, in: C. Hubert and M. Pohlenz (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 5.3, pp. 90—114. Teubner, 1955.
- , *Aquane an ignis sit utilior* (*Moralia* 955D—958E), see: C. Hubert, in: C. Hubert and H. Drexler (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 6.1, pp. 1—10. Teubner, 1959.
- , *Platonicae quaestiones* (*Moralia* 999C—1011E), see: C. Hubert, in: C. Hubert and H. Drexler (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 6.1, pp. 113—142. Teubner, 1959.
- , *De animae procreatione in Timaeo* (*Moralia* 1012A—1030C), see: C. Hubert, in: C. Hubert and H. Drexler (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 6.1, pp. 143—188. Teubner, 1959.
- , *Compendium libri de animae procreatione in Timaeo* (*Moralia* 1030D—1032F), see: C. Hubert, in: C. Hubert and H. Drexler (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 6.1, pp. 189—194. Teubner, 1959.
- , *De Stoicorum repugnantibus* (*Moralia* 1033A—1057C), see: M. Pohlenz and R. Westman (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 6.2, pp. 1—58. Teubner, 1959.
- , *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* (*Moralia* 1086A—1107C), see: M. Pohlenz and R. Westman (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 6.2, pp. 123—172. Teubner, 1959.
- , *Adversus Colotem* (*Moralia* 1107D—1127E), see: M. Pohlenz and R. Westman (eds), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 6.2, pp. 173—215. Teubner, 1959;
- , *Fragments*, see: F.H. Sandbach (ed.), *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 7. Teubner, 1967.
- Posidonius, *Fragments*, see: L. Edelstein and I.G. Kidd (eds), *Posidonius*, vol. 1: *The Fragments*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries; 13. Cambridge: CUP, 1989<sup>2</sup> (1972<sup>1</sup>).
- Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos*, see: (1) W. Hübner (ed.), *ΑΠΟΤΕΛΕΣΜΑΤΙΚΑ*. Claudii Ptolemaei Opera quae exstant omnia; 3.1. Teubner, 1998; (2) F.E. Robbins (ed., transl., and notes), *Ptolemy: Tetrabiblos*. LCL, 1940.
- Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae morales*, see: L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *L. Annaei Senecae Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*, 2 vols. OCT, 1965.
- , *Naturales quaestiones*, see: H.M. Hine (ed.), *L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium quaestionum libri*. Teubner, 1996.
- Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus dogmaticos* (= *Adversus mathematicos* 7—11), see: H. Mutschmann (ed.), *Sexti Empirici Opera*, vol. 2: *Adversus Dogmaticos libros quinque* (*Adv. mathem. VII—XI*). Teubner, 1914.

- Sibylline Oracles*, see: J. Geffcken (ed.), *Die Oracula Sibyllina*. GCS. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902.
- Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria*, see: H. Diels (ed.), *Simplicii In Aristotelis Physicorum libros quattuor priores commentaria*. Comm. in Arist. graeca; 9, 1882.
- Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, see: C. Wachsmuth and O. Hense (eds), *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium*, 5 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1884—1912.
- Tacitus, *Annales*, see: (1) K. Wellesley (ed.), *Cornelii Taciti Libri qui supersunt*, vol. 1.2: *Ab excessu divi Augusti libri XI—XVI*. Teubner, 1986; (2) E. Koestermann (intro. and comm.), *Cornelius Tacitus: Annalen*, vol. 4: *Buch 14—16*. Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1968.
- Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, see: E. Evans (ed. and transl.), *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*, 2 vols. OECT, 1972.
- Testament of Abraham*, see: F. Schmidt, *Le Testament grec d'Abraham: Introduction, édition critique des deux recensions grecques, traduction*. TSAJ; 11, 1986.
- Testament of Job*, see: S.P. Brock (ed.), *Testamentum Iobi*. PVTG; 2, 1967, pp. 1—59.
- Testament Levi*, in: *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, see: M. de Jonge (in cooperation with H.W. Hollander, H.J. de Jonge, and Th. Korteweg), *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. PVTG; 1.2, 1978.
- Themistius, *In libros Aristotelis De anima paraphrasis*, see: R. Heinze (ed.), *Themistii In libros Aristotelis De anima paraphrasis*. Comm. in Arist. graeca; 5.3, 1899.
- Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, see: (1) J. Raeder (ed.), *Theodoretii Graecarum affectionum curatio*. Teubner, 1904; (2) P. Canivet (intro., ed., transl., and notes), *Théodore de Cyr: Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*, 2 vols. SC; 57, 1958 (Greek text adapted from J. Raeder 1904).
- , *Interpretatio XIV epistolarum sancti Pauli apostoli*, see: J.L. Schulze (ed.), 'Theodoretii Commentarius in omnes Pauli epistolas,' in: J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia graeca*, vol. 82. Paris, 1864, cols 31—878.
- Theodotion; for the Daniel translation of Theodotion, see: LXX (ed. A. Rahlfs 1935), vol. 2, pp. 870—936.
- Theon of Smyrna, *De utilitate mathematicae*, see: E. Hiller (ed.), *Theonis Smyrnaei philosophi Platonici Expositio rerum mathematicarum ad legendum Platonem utilium*. Teubner, 1878.
- Theophrastus, *De causis plantarum*, see: B. Einarson and G.K.K. Link (ed., transl., and notes), *Theophrastus: De causis plantarum*. LCL, 3 vols, 1976—1990.
- , *Historia plantarum*, see: A. Hort (ed., transl., and notes), *Theophrastus: Enquiry into Plants*. LCL, 2 vols, 1916.
- , *Placita*, see: (1) H. Diels (intro. and ed.), *Doxographi graeci*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965<sup>4</sup> (reprint of the 1st edition, 1879), pp. 473—495: *ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΥ ΦΥΣΙΚΩΝ ΔΟΞΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΩΝ ΙΗ. ΑΠΟΣΠΑΣΜΑΤΙΑ*; (2) W.W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby, R.W. Sharples, D. Gutas, and others (ed. and transl.), *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought, and Influence*, vol. 1: *Life, Writings, Various Reports, Logic, Physics, Metaphysics, Theology, Mathematics*; vol. 2: *Psychology, Human Physiology, Living Creatures, Botany, Ethics, Religion, Politics, Rhetoric and Poetics, Music, Miscellanea*. PhAnt; 54.1—54.2, 1992.
- Timaeus of Locri, *De natura mundi et animae*, see: (1) W. Marg, *Timaeus Locrus: De natura mundi et animae. Überlieferung, Testimonia, Text und Übersetzung*. PhAnt; 24, 1972; (2) Th.H. Tobin, *Timaios of Locri: On the Nature of the World and the Soul. Text, Translation, and Notes*. SBL; Texts and Translations; 26. Graeco-Roman

- Religion Series; 8. Chico (California): Scholars Press, 1985 (Greek text adapted from W. Marg 1972).
- Varro, *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, see: B. Cardauns, *M. Terentius Varro: Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum*, vol. 1: *Die Fragmente*; vol. 2: *Kommentar*. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse; Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1976.
- Vettius Valens, *Anthologiae*, see: D. Pingree (ed.), *Vettii Valentis Antiocheni Anthologiarum libri novem*. Teubner, 1986.
- Virgil, *Bucolica*, see: R.A.B. Mynors (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. OCT, 1969, pp. 1—28.

## 2.2 Other literary sources (collections of texts)

- Biblia hebraica Stuttgartensia* (R. Kittel, K. Elliger, and W. Rudolph, eds). Second revised edition by W. Rudolph and H.P. Rüger. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984 (1967, 1977).
- Doxographi graeci* (H. Diels, intro. and ed.). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965<sup>4</sup> (reprint of the 1st edition, 1879).
- Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und deutsch* (H. Diels and W. Kranz, ed. and transl.), 3 vols. Zürich/Berlin: Weidmann, 1964<sup>11</sup>.
- The Greek New Testament: Fourth Revised Edition* (B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini and B.M. Metzger, eds). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft & United Bible Societies, 1983.
- The Hellenistic Philosophers* (A.A. Long and D.N. Sedley, ed., transl., and comm.), vol. 1: *Translations of the Principal Sources, with Philosophical Commentary*; vol. 2: *Greek and Latin Texts with Notes and Bibliography*. Cambridge: CUP, 1987.
- Novum Testamentum graece* (Nestle-Aland; E. & E. Nestle, B. & K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini, and B.M. Metzger, eds), Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993<sup>27</sup>.
- The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts* (G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven, and M. Schofield, ed., transl., and comm.). Cambridge: CUP, 1983<sup>2</sup> (1957<sup>1</sup>).
- Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (A. Rahlfs, ed.), vol. 1: *Prolegomena, Leges et historiae*; vol. 2: *Libri poetici et prophetici*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.
- Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* (H. von Arnim, ed.), vol. 1: *Zeno et Zenonis discipuli*; vol. 2: *Chrysippi fragmenta logica et physica*; vol. 3: *Chrysippi fragmenta moralia. Fragmenta successorum Chrysippi*; vol. 4: *Indices* (M. Adler). Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1968—1978 (stereotypical edition of the 1st edition, 4 vols, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1903—1905, 1924).

## 2.3 Epigraphic and papyrological material

- Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, vol. 3 (V.A. Tcherikover, A. Fuks, M. Stern and D.M. Lewis, eds). Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Hicks, E.L. 1891. 'Inscriptions from Western Cilicia,' in: *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 12, pp. 225—273.
- Inscripfen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften; Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, vols 1—57, 1972—2000.

- Mitchell, S. 1999. 'The Cult of Theos Hypsistos between Pagans, Jews, and Christians,' in: P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede (eds), *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), chap. 4, pp. 81—148.
- Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*. Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor. Manchester: Manchester University Press, vols 1—8, 1928—1962. Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies. *Journal of Roman Studies Monographs*; 4 and 7. London: The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, vols 9—10, 1988—1993.
- Oriens Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (W. Dittenberger, ed.), 2 vols. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1903—1905.
- Robbins, F.E. 1927. 'A New Astrological Treatise: Michigan Papyrus No. 1,' in: *Classical Philology* 22, pp. 1—45.
- Sheppard, A.R.R. 1980—81. 'Pagan Cults of Angels in Roman Asia Minor,' in: *Talanta: Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 12—13, pp. 77—101.
- Tituli Asiae Minoris collecti et editi auspiciis Academiae Litterarum Austriacae*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, vols 1—5.2, 1901—1989.

#### 2.4 Numismatic material

- Alföldi, A. 1974. *Caesar in 44 v. Chr.*, vol. 2: *Das Zeugnis der Münzen*. Antiquitas; series 3: Abhandlungen zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte, zur klassischen und provinzialrömischen Archäologie und zur Geschichte des Altertums; 17. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt.
- Grueber, H.A. 1910. *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum (=BMC)*, 3 vols. London: The British Museum.
- Gundel, H.G. 1992. *Zodiakos: Tierkreisbilder im Altertum. Kosmische Bezüge und Jenseitsvorstellungen im antiken Alltagsleben*. Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt; 54. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, chap. 6, pp. 199—349: 'Katalog' (catalogue including several coins).
- Kent, J.P.C., B. Overbeck, A.U. Stylow (photographs by M. Hirmer and A. Hirmer). 1973. *Die römische Münze*. München: Hirmer.
- Kreitzer, L.J. 1996. *Striking New Images: Roman Imperial Coinage and the New Testament World*. JSNTS; 134.
- Mattingly, H. 1930. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum (=CREBM)*, vol. 2: *Vespasian to Domitian*. London: The British Museum.
- . 1940. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum (=CREBM)*, vol. 4: *Antoninus Pius to Commodus*. London: The British Museum.
- Seaby, H.A. 1952. *Roman Silver Coins (=RSC)*, vol. 1.1: *The Republic*; vol. 1.2: *Julius Caesar to Augustus and Their Families*. London: B.A. Seaby.
- Sydenham, E.A., G.C. Haines, L. Forrer, and C.A. Hersh. 1952. *The Coinage of the Roman Republic (=CRR)*. London: Spink & Son.

#### 2.5 Tools

- Berkowitz, L., and K.A. Squitier (with technical assistance from W.A. Johnson), *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works*. New York/Oxford: OUP, 1990<sup>2</sup>.
- Calder, W.M. and G.E. Bean, *A Classical Map of Asia Minor: Being a Partial Revision by Permission of Messrs John Murray of J.G.C. Anderson's Map of Asia Minor*. London: The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1958.

- Denis, A.-M., (with the collaboration of Y. Janssens), *Concordance grecque des Pseud-épigraphes d'Ancien Testament*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain; Institut Orientaliste, 1987.
- Hatch, E., and H.A. Redpath (assisted by other scholars), *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)*, 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), 1897—1906 (reprinted in 2 vols by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids [Michigan] 1991<sup>5</sup> [1987<sup>1</sup>]).
- Liddell, H.G., R. Scott, H.S. Jones, and R. McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), 1940<sup>9</sup> (With a Supplement, 1968).
- Talbert, R.J.A. (ed.), *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae CD ROM#D. Packard Humanities Institute. University of California. Compilation © 1992.

### 3 Literature

- Abbott, T.K. 1909. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Adams, E. 1997. 'Historical Crisis and Cosmic Crisis in Mark 13 and Lucan's *Civil War*,' in: *Tyndale Bulletin* 48, pp. 329—344.
- . 2000. *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language*. SNTW.
- Babut, D. 1969. *Plutarque et le Stoïcisme*. Paris: Université de Paris (Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines).
- Baltes, M. 1972. *Timaios Lokros: Über die Natur des Kosmos und der Seele*. PhAnt; 21.
- . 1976—1978. *Die Weltentstehung des platonischen Timaios nach den antiken Interpretationen*, vol. 1; vol. 2: *Proklos*. PhAnt; 30 and 35.
- Barnes, T.D. 1973. 'Porphyry Against the Christians: Date and the Attribution of Fragments,' in: *Journal of Theological Studies* 24, pp. 424—442.
- Barth, M. 1974. *Ephesians*, vol. 1: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 1—3*; vol. 2: *Translation and Commentary on Chapters 4—6*. Anchor Bible; 34—34A.
- and H. Blanke (translated by A.B. Beck). 1994. *Colossians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible; 34B.
- Bean, G.E. 1971. *Turkey Beyond the Maeander: An Archeological Guide*. London: Ernest Benn/Totowa (New Jersey): Rowman and Littlefield.
- . 1976. 'Laodicea ad Lycum,' in: R. Stillwell, W.L. MacDonald and M.H. McAllister (eds), *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton (New Jersey): Princeton University Press, pp. 481—482.
- Beck, R.L. 1996. 'astrology,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, p. 195.
- Benoit, P. 1963. 'Rapports littéraires entre les épîtres aux Colossiens et aux Éphésiens,' in: J. Blinzler, O. Kuss and F. Mußner (eds), *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*. FS J. Schmid. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, pp. 11—22.
- . 1975. 'L'hymne christologique de Col 1,15—20: Jugement critique sur l'état des recherches,' in: J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, vol. 1: *New Testament*. FS M. Smith. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity;

- 12.1. Leiden: E.J. Brill, pp. 226—263 (republished in: P. Benoit, *Exégèse et théologie*, vol. 4. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1982, pp. 159—203).
- Berger, K. 1976. *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Deutung des Geschickes Jesu in frühchristlichen Texten*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments; 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Best, E. 1979. 'Ephesians i.1,' in: E. Best and R.McL. Wilson (eds), *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black*. Cambridge: CUP, pp. 29—41 (republished in: E. Best, *Essays on Ephesians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997, chap. 1, pp. 1—16).
- . 1982. 'Ephesians 1.1 Again,' in: M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson (eds), *Paul and Paulinism*. FS C.K. Barrett. London: SPCK, chap. 22, pp. 273—279 (republished in: E. Best, *Essays on Ephesians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997, chap. 2, pp. 17—24).
- . 1987. 'Recipients and Title of the Letter to the Ephesians: Why and When the Designation "Ephesians"?' in: *ANRW* 2.25.4, pp. 3247—3279.
- . 1997. 'Who Used Whom? The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians,' in: *New Testament Studies* 43, pp. 72—96.
- Betz, H.D. 1977. 'Observations on Some Gnosticizing Passages in Plutarch,' in: G. Widengren (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism: Stockholm, August 20—25, 1973*. Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar; Filologisk-filosofiska serien; 17. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell/Leiden: E.J. Brill, pp. 169—178 (republished in: H.D. Betz, *Hellenismus und Urchristentum: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, vol. 1. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], chap. 9, pp. 135—146, with a new afterword).
- Black, M. 1982. 'Πᾶσαι ἐξουσίαι αὐτῷ ὑποταγῆσονται,' in: M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson (eds), *Paul and Paulinism*. FS C.K. Barrett. London: SPCK, chap. 8, pp. 74—82.
- Bouché-Leclercq, A. 1899. *L'astrologie grecque*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Brenk, F.E. 1986. 'In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period,' in: *ANRW* 2.16.3, pp. 2068—2145; index in: *ANRW* 2.36.2 (1987), pp. 1283—1299.
- Bruce, F.F. 1984. *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. NIC.
- Brucker, R. 1997. 'Christushymnen' oder 'epideiktische Passagen'? *Studien zum Stilwechsel im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments; 176. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Buffière, F. 1956. *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque*. Université de Paris; Faculté des Lettres. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Burger, C. 1975. *Schöpfung und Versöhnung: Studien zum liturgischen Gut im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament; 46. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Burkert, W. 1987. *Ancient Mystery Cults: Carl Newell Jackson Lectures*. Cambridge (Massachusetts)/ London: Harvard University Press.
- Cardauns, B. 1976. *M. Terentius Varro: Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum*, vol. 1: *Die Fragmente*; vol. 2: *Kommentar*. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse; Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Carr, W. 1981. *Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning, and Development of the Pauline Phrase hai Archai kai hai Exousiai*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series; 42. Cambridge: CUP.
- Chadwick, H. 1960. 'Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes,' in: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51, pp. 145—153.

- Collins, J.J. 1998. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Colpe, C. 1960. 'Zur Leib-Christi-Vorstellung im Epheserbrief,' in: W. Eltester (ed.), *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche*. FS J. Jeremias. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche; 26. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, pp. 172—187.
- Courtney, E. 1996. 'Aratea,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, p. 136.
- Dahl, N.A. 2000. *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes* (D. Hellholm, V. Blomkvist, and T. Fornberg, eds). WUNT; 131.
- Davidson, M.J. 1992. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1—36, 72—108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series; 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- De Jonge, H.J. 1999. 'Les origines historiques de l'attente du retour de Jésus,' in: *Études théologiques et religieuses* 74, pp. 491—503.
- DeMaris, R.E. 1994. *The Colossian Controversy: Wisdom in Dispute at Colossae*. JSNTS; 96.
- Dibelius, M. 1909. *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1912<sup>1</sup>. *An die Kolosser, Epheser. An Philemon*. Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus; 2.2. HNT; 3.
- . 1913. *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus*, vol. 2: *Die neun kleinen Briefe*. HNT; 3, pp. 65—94: *An die Kolosser* (=Dibelius 1912<sup>1</sup>).
- . 1927<sup>2</sup>. *An die Kolosser, Epheser. An Philemon*. HNT; 12.
- (reworked by H. Greeven). 1953<sup>3</sup>. *An die Kolosser, Epheser. An Philemon*. HNT; 12.
- Dierse, U. and W. Schröder. 1989. 'Pantheismus,' in: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, vol. 7, col. 48.
- Dillon, J.M. 1996a<sup>2</sup>. *The Middle Platonists: A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220. Revised Edition with a New Afterword*. London: Duckworth (1977<sup>1</sup>).
- . 1996b. 'Gnosticism,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, p. 641.
- Dörrie, H. 1981a. 'Mysterien (in Kult und Religion) und Philosophie,' in: M.J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Die orientalischen Religionen im Römerreich*. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain; 93. Leiden: E.J. Brill, chap. 13, pp. 341—362.
- . 1981b. 'Gnostische Spuren bei Plutarch,' in: R. van den Broek and M.J. Vermaseren (eds), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions*. FS G. Quispel. EPRO; 91, pp. 92—116.
- (edited by A. Dörrie). 1987. *Der Platonismus in der Antike: Grundlagen, System, Entwicklung*, vol. 1: *Die geschichtlichen Wurzeln des Platonismus*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1987.
- Dörrie, H. and M. Baltes. 1993. *Der Platonismus in der Antike: Grundlagen, System, Entwicklung*, vol. 3: *Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- . 1996—1998. *Der Platonismus in der Antike: Grundlagen, System, Entwicklung*, vol. 4: *Die philosophische Lehre des Platonismus: Einige grundlegende Axiome; Platonische Physik (im antiken Verständnis) I*; vol. 5: *Die philosophische Lehre des Platonismus: Platonische Physik (im antiken Verständnis) II*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Downing, F.G. 1995. 'Cosmic Eschatology in the First Century: "Pagan," Jewish and Christian,' in: *L'Antiquité Classique* 64, pp. 99—109.

- Dunn, J.D.G. 1989<sup>2</sup>. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SCM Press (1980<sup>1</sup>).
- . 1994. 'The "Body" in Colossians,' in: Th.E. Schmidt and M. Silva (eds), *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology*. FS R.H. Gundry. JSNTS; 100, pp. 163—181.
- . 1995. 'The Colossian Philosophy: A Confident Jewish Apologia,' in: *Biblica* 76, pp. 153—181.
- . 1996. *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids (Michigan): W.B. Eerdmans/Carlisle: The Paternoster Press.
- Dupont, J. 1949. *Gnosis: La connaissance religieuse dans les épîtres de saint Paul*. Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis. Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica consequendum conscriptae; 2.40. Bruges/Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Eißfeldt, O. 1966. 'Jahwe Zebaoth,' in: idem, *Kleine Schriften* (R. Sellheim and F. Maass, eds), vol. 3. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), pp. 103—123. (Previously published in: *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia*, vol. 2.2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1950, pp. 128—150.)
- Faust, E. 1993. *Pax Christi et Pax Caesaris: Religionsgeschichtliche, traditions-geschichtliche und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zum Epheserbrief*. Novum testamentum et orbis antiquus; 24. Freiburg (Switzerland): Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Fitzter, G. 1964. 'σύνθεσμος,' in: *ThWNT* 7, pp. 854—857. ET: 'σύνθεσμος,' in: *TDNT* 7 (1971), pp. 856—859.
- Francis, F.O. 1962. 'Humility and Angelic Worship in Col 2:18,' in: *Studia Theologica* 16, pp. 109—134 (reprinted in: F.O. Francis and W.A. Meeks [eds], *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity Illustrated by Selected Modern Studies*. SBL; Sources for Biblical Study; 4. Missoula (Montana): Scholars Press, 1975 [revised edition], pp. 163—195).
- and J.P. Sampley. 1975. *Pauline Parallels*. SBL; Sources for Biblical Study; 9. Philadelphia (Pennsylvania): Fortress Press/Missoula (Montana): Scholars Press.
- Frede, M. 1987. 'Numenius,' in: *ANRW* 2.36.2, pp. 1034—1075.
- . 1999a. 'Monotheism and Pagan Philosophy in Later Antiquity,' in: P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede (eds), *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), chap. 2, pp. 41—67.
- . 1999b. 'Epilogue,' in: K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld and M. Schofield (eds), *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Cambridge: CUP, pp. 771—797.
- Gabathuler, H.J. 1965. *Jesus Christus, Haupt der Kirche—Haupt der Welt: Der Christushymnus Colosser 1,15—20 in der theologischen Forschung der letzten 130 Jahre*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments; 45. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli-Verlag.
- Gese, M. 1997. *Das Vermächtnis des Apostels: Die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie im Epheserbrief*. WUNT; 2nd series; 99.
- Gnilka, J. 1991<sup>2</sup>. *Der Kolosserbrief*. HThK; 10.1 (1980<sup>1</sup>).
- Goguel, M. 1935. 'Esquisse d'une solution nouvelle du problème de l'épître aux Éphésiens,' in: *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 111, pp. 254—284 and 112, pp. 73—99.
- Goldenberg, R. 1979. 'The Jewish Sabbath in the Roman World up to the Time of Constantine the Great,' in: *ANRW* 2.19.1, pp. 414—447.
- Goodspeed, E.J. 1933. *The Meaning of Ephesians*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.



- . 1956. *The Key to Ephesians*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goulder, M.D. 1991. 'The Visionaries of Laodicea,' in: *JSNT* 43, pp. 15—39.
- Gundel, H.G. 1992. *Zodiakos: Tierkreisbilder im Altertum. Kosmische Bezüge und Jenseitsvorstellungen im antiken Alltagsleben*. Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt; 54. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Gundel, W. and H.G. Gundel. 1966. *Astrologumena: Die astrologische Literatur in der Antike und ihre Geschichte*. Sudhoffs Archiv; 6. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Güting, E. 1997. Review of U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos* (Berlin/New York, 1995), in: *NovT* 39 (1997), pp. 396—405.
- Hagendahl, H. 1967. *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, vol. 1: *Testimonia, with a Contribution On Varro by B. Cardauns*; vol. 2: *Augustine's Attitude*. *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia*; 20. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Hahm, D.E. 1977. *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press.
- Halfwassen, J. 2000. 'Der Demiurg: seine Stellung in der Philosophie Platons und seine Deutung im antiken Platonismus,' in: A. Neschke-Hentschke (ed.), *Le 'Timée' de Platon: Contributions à l'histoire de sa réception—Platos 'Timaios': Beiträge zu seiner Rezeptionsgeschichte*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Éditions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie/Louvain, Paris: Peeters, pp. 39—62.
- Harnack, A. 1910. 'Die Adresse des Epheserbriefs des Paulus,' in: *Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*; 1910, no. 2. Berlin: Georg Reimer, pp. 696—709.
- . 1911. *Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts: Die im Apocriticus des Macarius Magnes enthaltene Streitschrift*. TU; series 3; 7 (37.4). Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- Harrison, S.J. 2000. *Apuleius: A Latin Sophist*. OUP.
- Hayward, R. 1996. 'Heaven and Earth in Parallel: The Key Role of Angels in Ancient Judaism,' in: D. Brown and A. Loades (eds), *Christ: The Sacramental Word*. London: SPCK, pp. 57—74.
- Hegermann, H. 1961. *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum*. TU; 82. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Henrichs, A. 1996. 'Fasting,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 588—589.
- Hicks, E.L. 1891. 'Inscriptions from Western Cilicia,' in: *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 12, pp. 225—273.
- Hijmans, Jr., B.L. 1987. 'Apuleius, Philosophus Platonicus,' in: *ANRW* 2.36.1, pp. 395—475.
- Hofius, O. 2001. "'Erstgeborener vor aller Schöpfung"—"Erstgeborener aus den Toten": Erwägungen zu Struktur und Aussage des Christushymnus Kol 1,15—20,' in: F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger (eds), *Auferstehung—Resurrection*. The Fourth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium; Resurrection, Transfiguration and Exaltation in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Tübingen, September, 1999). WUNT; 135, pp. 185—203.
- Hollander, H.W. and J. Holleman. 1993. 'The Relationship of Death, Sin, and Law in 1 Cor 15:56,' in: *NovT* 35, pp. 270—291.
- Hollander, H.W. 1998. 'The Meaning of the Term 'Law' (Νόμος) in 1 Corinthians,' in: *NovT* 40, pp. 117—135.
- Holleman, J. 1996. *Resurrection and Parousia: A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15*. *NovTSup*; 84.
- Hooker, M.D. 1973. 'Were There False Teachers in Colossae?,' in: B. Lindars, S.S. Smalley (eds), *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*. FS C.F.D. Moule. Cambridge:

- CUP, chap. 21, pp. 315—331 (reprinted in: M.D. Hooker, *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul*. Cambridge: CUP, 1990, chap. 11, pp. 121—136).
- Hübner, H. 1997. *An Philemon, An die Kolosser, An die Epheser*. HNT; 12.
- Hübner, W. 1990. Die Begriffe 'Astrologie' und 'Astronomie' in der Antike: Wortgeschichte und Wissenschaftssystematik mit einer Hypothese zum Terminus 'Quadrivium.' Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse; 1989, no. 7. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur/Stuttgart and Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Hurtado, L.W. 1988. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. London: SCM Press.
- Jones, R.M. 1981. 'Die Ideen als die Gedanken Gottes,' in: C. Zintzen (ed.), *Der Mittelplatonismus*. Wege der Forschung; 70. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, pp. 187—199 (originally published in English in: *Classical Philology* 21 [1926], pp. 317—326).
- Jülicher, A. 1906<sup>5-6</sup>. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften; 3.1. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Käsemann, E. 1960. 'Eine urchristliche Tauf liturgie,' in: idem, *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 34—51.
- Kloppenborg, J.S. 1982. 'Isis and Sophia in the Book of Wisdom,' in: *Harvard Theological Review* 75, pp. 57—84.
- Kreitzer, L.J. 1987. *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology*. JSNTS; 19.
- . 1998. 'The Plutonium of Hierapolis and the Descent of Christ into the "Lowermost Parts of the Earth" (Ephesians 4,9),' in: *Biblica* 79, pp. 381—393.
- Lähnemann, J. 1971. *Der Kolosserbrief: Komposition, Situation und Argumentation*. StNT; 3.
- Lang, B. 1999<sup>2</sup>. 'Wisdom,' in: K. van der Toorn, B. Becking and P.W. van der Horst (eds), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible (DDD)*. Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids (Michigan): Eerdmans, pp. 900—905.
- Lapidge, M. 1973. 'ἄρχαι and στοιχεῖα: A Problem in Stoic Cosmology,' in: *Phronesis: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* 18, pp. 240—278.
- . 1980. 'A Stoic Metaphor in Late Latin Poetry: the Binding of the Cosmos,' in: *Latomus. Revue d'études latines* 39, pp. 817—837.
- . 1989. 'Stoic Cosmology and Roman Literature, First to Third Centuries A.D.,' in: *ANRW* 2.36.3, pp. 1379—1429.
- Lebram, J.C.H. 1981. 'Daniel/Danielbuch und Zusätze,' in: *TRE* 8, pp. 325—349.
- Lévêque, P. 1959. *Aurea catena Homeri: Une étude sur l'allégorie grecque*. Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon; 27. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Lietaert Peerbolte, L.J. 1996. *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents*. JSJS; 49.
- Lietzmann, H. 1932. *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, vol. 1: *Die Anfänge* (4 vols, 1932—1944). Berlin/ Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter. ET, edition 1961: *A History of the Early Church* (B.L. Woolf, transl.). London: Lutterworth, 1961. ET, edition 1993: *A History of the Early Church* (B.L. Woolf, transl.; with Foreword and Bibliography by W.H.C. Frend), 2 vols. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1993.
- Lightfoot, J.B. 1879. *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, and Dissertations*. The Epistles of St Paul; 3.2—3.3. London: MacMillan (New edition; 1875<sup>1</sup>).
- Lincoln, A.T. 1982. 'The Use of the OT in Ephesians,' in: *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 14, pp. 16—57.
- . 1990. *Ephesians*. WBC; 42. Dallas (Texas): Word Books.

- Lindemann, A. 1975. *Die Aufhebung der Zeit: Geschichtsverständnis und Eschatologie im Epheserbrief*. StNT; 12.
- . 1979. *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie; 58. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Lohmeyer, E. 1930. *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon*. KEK; section 9; 8th edition.
- . 1964. *Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon: Nach dem Handexemplar des Verfassers durchgesehene Ausgabe* (W. Schmauch, ed.). KEK; section 9 (2); 13th edition.
- Lohse, E. 1964/65. 'Christusherrschaft und Kirche im Kolosserbrief,' in: *New Testament Studies* 11, pp. 203—216.
- . 1968<sup>1</sup>. *Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon*. KEK; section 9; vol. 2; 14th edition.
- . 1977<sup>2</sup>. *Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon*. KEK; vol. 9.2; 15th edition.
- Lona, H.E. 1984. *Die Eschatologie im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief*. Forschung zur Bibel; 48. Würzburg: Echter.
- Long, A.A. 1982. 'Astrology: Arguments Pro and Contra,' in: J. Barnes, J. Brunschwig, M. Burnyeat, and M. Schofield (eds), *Science and Speculation: Studies in Hellenistic Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: CUP/Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, pp. 165—192.
- . 1995. 'Cicero's Plato and Aristotle,' in: J.G.F. Powell (ed. and intro.), *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), chap. 1, pp. 37—61.
- and D.N. Sedley (ed., transl., and comm.). 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, vol. 1: *Translations of the Principal Sources, with Philosophical Commentary*; vol. 2: *Greek and Latin Texts with Notes and Bibliography*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lovejoy, A.O. 1936. *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University, 1933*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press (1948<sup>3</sup>).
- Luz, U. 1974. 'Erwägungen zur Entstehung des "Frühkatholizismus". Eine Skizze,' in: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 65, pp. 88—111.
- Mach, M. 1992. *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*. TSAJ; 34.
- MacKendrick, P. (with the collaboration of K.L. Singh). 1989. *The Philosophical Books of Cicero*. London: Duckworth.
- MacMullen, R. 1984. *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100—400)*. New Haven /London: Yale University Press.
- Mansfeld, J. 1981. 'Bad World and Demiurge: A "Gnostic" Motif from Parmenides and Empedocles to Lucretius and Philo,' in: R. van den Broek and M.J. Vermaseren (eds), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions*. FS G. Quispel. EPRO; 91, pp. 261—314.
- Martin, T. 1996. 'Pagan and Judeo-Christian Time-Keeping Schemes in Gal 4.10 and Col 2.16,' in: *New Testament Studies*, 42, pp. 105—119.
- Martyn, J.L. 1995. 'Christ, the Elements of the Cosmos, and the Law in Galatians,' in: L.M. White and O.L. Yarbrough (eds), *The Social World of the First Christians*. FS W.A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, pp. 16—39.

- . 1997a. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible; 33A.
- . 1997b. 'Christ and the Elements of the Cosmos,' in: idem, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*. SNTW, chap. 8, pp. 125—140.
- May, G. 1994. *Creatio ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of 'Creation out of Nothing' in Early Christian Thought* (transl. by A.S. Worrall; with a Preface to the English Edition). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark (authorised English translation of *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts: Die Entstehung der Lehre von der Creatio ex Nihilo*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte; 48. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978).
- Meade, D.G. 1986. *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*. WUNT; 39.
- Menge, H. 1936<sup>9</sup>. *Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments* (1923<sup>1</sup>). Stuttgart: Württembergischer Bibelanstalt.
- Merkel, H. 1987. 'Der Epheserbrief in der neueren exegetischen Diskussion,' in: *ANRW* 2.25.4, pp. 3156—3246.
- Merklein, H. 1973. *Das kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbrief*. Studien zum alten und neuen Testament; 33. München: Kösel-Verlag.
- Merlan, P. 1967. 'Greek Philosophy from Plato to Plotinus,' in: A.H. Armstrong (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*. Cambridge: CUP, part I, pp. 11—132.
- Metzger, B.M. 1964. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP).
- Mikalson, J.D. 1996. 'Calendar, Greek,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 273—274.
- Mitchell, S. 1993. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, vol. 1: *The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman Rule*; vol. 2: *The Rise of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP).
- . 1996. 'Phrygia,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 1176—1177.
- . 1999. 'The Cult of Theos Hysistos between Pagans, Jews, and Christians,' in: P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede (eds), *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), chap. 4, pp. 81—148.
- Mitton, C.L. 1951. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin, and Purpose*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP).
- Moritz, T. 1996. *A Profound Mystery: The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians*. NovTSup; 85.
- Moule, C.F.D. 1957. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon: An Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mußner, F. 1955. *Christus, das All und die Kirche: Studien zur Theologie des Epheserbriefes*. Trierer theologische Studien; 5. Trier: Paulinus.
- . 1974. *Der Galaterbrief*. HThK; 9.
- Nelis, J.Th. 1975. *II Makkabeeën uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd* (doctoral thesis, Catholic University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands). Romen: Paul Brand/ Bussum: Unieboek.
- Noormann, R. 1994. *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret: zur Rezeption und Wirkung der paulinischen und deuteropaulinischen Briefe im Werk des Irenäus von Lyon*. WUNT; 2nd series; 66.
- Norden, E. 1913. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig/Berlin: B.G. Teubner.
- O'Brien, P.T. 1982. *Colossians, Philemon*. WBC; 44. Waco (Texas): Word Books.

- Ochel, W. 1934. *Die Annahme einer Bearbeitung des Kolosser-Briefes im Epheser-Brief in einer Analyse des Epheser-Briefes untersucht* (doctoral thesis, University of Marburg). Marburg: Konrad Triltsch.
- Osborn, E. 1993. *The Emergence of Christian Theology*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 2001. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Pagels, E. 1975. *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International.
- Parker, R.C.T. 1996. 'Purification, Greek,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, p. 1280.
- Pelletier, A. 1962. *Flavius Josèphe: Adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristée. Une réaction atticisante contre la koinè*. Études et commentaires; 45. Paris: C. Klincksieck.
- Pépin, J. 1958. *Mythe et allégorie: Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*. Philosophie de l'Esprit. Aubier: Éditions Mouton.
- Percy, E. 1946. *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*. Skrifter Utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund/Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis 39. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup (photomechanical reprint København: Villadsen og Christensen, 1964).
- Pleket, H.W. 1996. 'Epigraphy, Greek,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 539—543.
- Pokorny, P. 1987. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament; 10.1. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Porter, S.E. and K.D. Clarke. 1997. 'Canonical-Critical Perspective and the Relationship of Colossians and Ephesians,' in: *Biblica* 78, pp. 57—86.
- Powell, J.G.F. 1995. 'Cicero's Translations from Greek,' in: J.G.F. Powell (ed. and intro.), *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP), chap. 10, pp. 273—300.
- Puelma, M. 1980. 'Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer,' in: *Museum Helveticum* 37, pp. 137—178.
- Ramsay, W.M. 1895. *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia: Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest*. vol. 1: *The Lycos Valley and South-Western Phrygia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP; reprinted by the Arno Press, New York 1975).
- Redfors, J. 1960. *Echtheitskritische Untersuchung der apuleischen Schriften De Platone und De Mundo*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.
- Reuter, R. 1997. *Synopse zu den Briefen des Neuen Testaments—Synopsis of the New Testament Letters*, vol. 1: *Kolosser-, Epheser-, II. Thessalonicherbrief/Colossians, Ephesians, II. Thessalonians*. ARGU; 5.
- . 2003. *Textvergleichende und synoptische Arbeit an den Briefen des Neuen Testaments: Geschichte, Methodik, Praxis. Textvergleich Kolosser- und Philemonbrief*. ARGU; 13.
- Rich, A.N.M. 1981. 'Die platonischen Ideen als die Gedanken Gottes,' in: C. Zintzen (ed.), *Der Mittelplatonismus. Wege der Forschung*; 70. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, pp. 200—211 (originally published in English in: *Mnemosyne* 4.7 [1954], pp. 123—133).
- Rose, H.J. 1924. *The Roman Questions of Plutarch: A New Translation with Introductory Essays and a Running Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP).
- and P.J. Parsons. 1996. 'Pseudepigraphic literature,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, p. 1270.
- Roukema, R. 1999. *Gnosis and Faith in Early Christianity: An Introduction to Gnosticism*. London: SCM Press.
- Rousseau, P. 1996. 'Asceticism,' in: *OCD*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 186—187.

- Rudhardt, J. and J.-P. Vernant. 1986. *Le rôle d'Éros et d'Aphrodite dans les Cosmogonies grecques*. Essais et conférences du Collège de France. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Runia, D.T. 1981. 'Philo's De Aeternitate Mundi: The Problem of its Interpretation,' in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 35, pp. 105—151 (reprinted in: D.T. Runia, *Exegesis and Philosophy. Studies on Philo of Alexandria*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1990, chap. 8).
- . 1986. *Philo of Alexandria and the 'Timaeus' of Plato*. PhAnt; 44.
- Schade, H.-H. 1984<sup>2</sup>. *Apokalyptische Christologie bei Paulus: Studien zum Zusammenhang von Christologie und Eschatologie in den Paulusbriefen*. Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten; 18. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (1981<sup>1</sup>).
- Schlier, H. 1949. 'Die Kirche nach dem Brief an die Epheser,' in: H. Schlier and P.V. Warnach, *Die Kirche im Epheserbrief*. Beiträge zur Kontroverstheologie (Beiheft zur *Catholica*); 1. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, pp. 82—114 (reprinted in: H. Schlier, *Die Zeit der Kirche: Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge*. Freiburg: Herder, 1956, chap. 12, pp. 159—186).
- . 1959<sup>2</sup>. *Mächte und Gewalten im Neuen Testament*. *Quaestiones disputatae*; 3. Freiburg: Herder (1958<sup>1</sup>).
- Schmauch, W. 1964. *Beiheft*, in: E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon: Beiheft von Werner Schmauch*. KEK; section 9 (separate issue, 98 pp.).
- Schmid, U. 1995. *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der Marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung; 25. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schneemelcher, W. 1989<sup>5</sup>. *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, vol. 2: *Apostolisches, Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Schofield, M. 1991. *The Stoic Idea of the City*. Cambridge: CUP (reprinted, with a new foreword by M.C. Nussbaum, by The University of Chicago Press, Chicago/London 1999).
- . 1999. 'Social and political thought,' in: K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld and M. Schofield (eds), *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Cambridge: CUP, chap. 22, pp. 739—770.
- Schürer, E., G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman. 1986—1987. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.—A.D. 135)*, vols 3.1—3.2. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Schweizer, E. 1961. 'Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den paulinischen Antilegomena,' in: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 86, cols 241—256 (republished in: E. Schweizer, *Neotestamentica: Deutsche und englische Aufsätze 1951—1963*. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963, pp. 293—316).
- . 1964. 'σῶμα κτλ.,' in: *ThWNT* 7, pp. 1024—1091 (except for section B1—2, pp. 1042—1043, written by F. Baumgärtel). ET: 'σῶμα κτλ.,' in: *TDNT* 7 (1971), pp. 1024—1094 (except for section B1—2, pp. 1044—1045, written by F. Baumgärtel).
- . 1970. 'Die "Elemente der Welt" Gal 4,3.9; Kol 2,8.20,' in: O. Böcher and K. Haacker (eds), *Verborum Veritas*. FS G. Stählin. Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, pp. 245—259.
- . 1975. 'Versöhnung des Alls. Kol 1,20,' in: G. Strecker (ed.), *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie*. FS H. Conzelmann. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), pp. 487—501 (reprinted in: E. Schweizer, *Neues Testament und Christologie im Werden: Aufsätze*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982, pp. 164—178).

- . 1988. 'Slaves of the Elements and Worshipers of Angels: Gal 4:3,9 and Col 2:8, 18, 20,' in: *JBL* 107, pp. 455—468.
- . 1989<sup>3</sup>a. *Der Brief an die Kolosser*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament; 12. Zürich: Benziger Verlag/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag (1976<sup>1</sup>).
- . 1989<sup>3</sup>b. 'Altes und Neues zu den "Elementen der Welt" in Kol 2,20; Gal 4,3,9,' in: K. Aland and S. Meurer (eds), *Wissenschaft und Kirche*. FS E. Lohse. Texte und Arbeiten zur Bibel; 4. Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, pp. 111—118.
- . 1995. Review of R.E. DeMaris, *The Colossian Controversy: Wisdom in Dispute at Colossae*, Sheffield 1994, in: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 120, cols 240—242.
- Schwindt, R. 2002. *Das Weltbild des Epheserbriefes: Eine religionsgeschichtlich-exegetische Studie*. WUNT; 148.
- Sheppard, A.R.R. 1980—81. 'Pagan Cults of Angels in Roman Asia Minor,' in: *Talanta: Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 12—13, pp. 77—101.
- Speyer, W. 1971. *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft; 1.2. München: C.H. Beck.
- Standhartinger, A. 1999. *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte und Intention des Kolosserbriefs*. NovTSup; 94.
- Stanton, G. 1996. 'The Law of Moses and the Law of Christ. Galatians 3:1—6:2,' in: J.D.G. Dunn (ed.), *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. The Third Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism (Durham, September, 1994). WUNT; 89, pp. 99—116.
- Sterling, G.E. 1997. 'Prepositional Metaphysics in Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Early Christian Liturgical Texts,' in: D.T. Runia and G.E. Sterling (eds), *Wisdom and Logos: Studies in Jewish Thought*. FS D. Winston. The Studia Philonica Annual; Studies in Hellenistic Judaism; 9. Atlanta (Georgia): Scholars Press, pp. 219—238.
- . 1998. 'A Philosophy According to the Elements of the Cosmos: Colossian Christianity and Philo of Alexandria,' in: C. Lévy (ed.; with the collaboration of B. Besnier), *Philon d'Alexandrie et le langage de la philosophie*. Monothéismes et Philosophie. Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 349—373.
- Stettler, Chr. 2000. *Der Kolosserhymnus: Untersuchungen zu Form, traditionsgeschichtlichem Hintergrund und Aussage von Kol 1,15—20*. WUNT; 2nd series; 131.
- Stuckenbruck, L.T. 1995. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. WUNT; 2nd series; 70.
- Syme, R. 1958. *Tacitus*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP).
- Talmon, S. 1988. 'Kalender und Kalenderstreit in der Gemeinde von Qumran,' in: idem, *Gesellschaft und Literatur in der Hebräischen Bibel*. Gesammelte Aufsätze; vol. 1. Information Judentum; 8. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, pp. 152—189.
- Thesleff, H. 1961. *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis; Humaniora; 24.3. Åbo: Åbo Akademi.
- . 1965. *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis; Humaniora; 30.1. Åbo: Åbo Akademi.
- Todd, R.B. 1976. *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Stoic Physics: A Study of the De Mixtione with Preliminary Essays, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. PhAnt; 28.
- Tromp, J. 1995a. 'The Critique of Idolatry in the Context of Jewish Monotheism,' in: P.W. van der Horst (ed.), *Aspects of Religious Contact and Conflict in the Ancient World*. Utrechtse Theologische Reeks; 31. Utrecht: Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid, Universiteit Utrecht, pp. 105—120.

- . 1995b. 'The Formation of the Third Book of Maccabees,' in: *Henoch* 17, pp. 311—328.
- Van der Horst, P.W. 1994. "'The Elements Will Be Dissolved With Fire:" The Idea of Cosmic Conflagration in Hellenism, Ancient Judaism, and Early Christianity,' in: idem, *Hellenism, Judaism, Christianity: Essays on Their Interaction*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, pp. 227—251.
- VanderKam, J.C. 1998. *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London/ New York: Routledge.
- Van der Woude, A.S. 1984. 'צבא,' in: *THAT* 2, cols 498—507.
- Van Henten, J.W. 1986. 'Datierung und Herkunft des vierten Makkabäerbuches,' in: J.W. van Henten, H.J. de Jonge, P.T. van Rooden, and J.W. Wesselijs (eds), *Tradition and Re-interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. FS J.C.H. Lebram. *Studia Post-Biblica*; 36. Leiden: E.J. Brill, pp. 136—149.
- . 1997. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. JSJS; 57.
- Van Kooten, G.H. 1995. *The Literary Phenomenon of 'Conflation' in the Reworking of Paul's 'Letter to the Colossians' by the Author of the 'Letter to the Ephesians': Including a New Synopsis of the Greek Text of Both Letters* (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Durham, UK).
- . 1999. 'Enoch, the "Watchers", Seth's Descendants and Abraham as Astronomers: Jewish Applications of the Greek Motif of the First Inventor (300 BCE—CE 100),' in: A. Brenner and J.W. van Henten (eds), *Recycling Biblical Figures: Papers Read at a NOSTER Colloquium in Amsterdam, 12—13 May 1997*. *Studies in Theology and Religion*; 1. Leiden: Deo Publishing, pp. 292—316.
- . 2001. *The Pauline Debate on the Cosmos: Graeco-Roman Cosmology and Jewish Eschatology in Paul and in the Pseudo-Pauline Letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Leiden).
- Van Raalte, M. 1988. 'The Idea of the Cosmos as an Organic Whole in Theophrastus' *Metaphysics*,' in: W.W. Fortenbaugh and R.W. Sharples (eds), *Theophrastean Studies on Natural Science, Physics and Metaphysics, Ethics, Religion, and Rhetoric*. Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities; 3. New Brunswick (USA) and Oxford (UK): Transaction Books, pp. 189—215.
- Van Roon, A. 1974. *The Authenticity of Ephesians*. NovTSup; 39.
- Van Winden, J.C.M. 1959. *Calcidius on Matter: His Doctrine and Sources. A Chapter in the History of Platonism*. PhAnt; 9.
- Vleugels, G.A.M. 1997. *De brieven aan de Kolossenzen en aan de Efeziërs in synopsis: Een studie van hun literaire verwantschap* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Potchefstroom, South Africa).
- Wagenführer, M.-A. 1941. *Die Bedeutung Christi für Welt und Kirche: Studien zum Kolosser- und Epheserbrief*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben. Leipzig: Georg Wigand.
- Walter, N. 1997. "'Hellenistische Eschatologie" im Neuen Testament,' in: N. Walter (W. Kraus and F. Wilk, eds), *Praeparatio Evangelica: Studien zur Umwelt, Exegese und Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*. WUNT; 98, pp. 252—272 (originally published in: E. Gräßer and O. Merk [eds], *Glaube und Eschatologie*. FS W.G. Kümmel. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1985, pp. 335—356).
- Wambacq, B.N. 1947. *L'épithète divine Jahvé S<sup>e</sup>ba'ot: Étude philologique, historique et exégétique*. *Sine loco*: Desclée, De Brouwer.
- Weiß, H.-F. 1966. *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinischen Judentums*. TU; 97. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.



- Weiß, J. 1917. *Das Urchristentum, nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben und am Schlusse ergänzt von R. Knopf*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- West, M.L. 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP).
- . 1983. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (OUP).
- Wettstein, J.J. 1751—1752. *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ: Novum Testamentum graecum editionis receptae cum lectionibus variantibus (...) nec non commentario pleniore ex scriptoribus veteribus hebraeis, graecis et latinis historiam et vim verborum illustrante*, 2 vols. Amsterdam: Dommer.
- Winger, M. 1992. *By What Law? The Meaning of Νόμος in the Letters of Paul*. SBL; Dissertation Series; 128. Atlanta (Georgia): Scholars Press.
- Wolter, M. 1993. *Der Brief an die Kolosser: Der Brief an Philemon*. Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament; 12. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn/Würzburg: Echter Verlag.
- Zobel, H.-J. 1989. 'צבאות,' in: *ThWAT* 6, cols 876—892.

# Indexes

- 1 Index of Passages from Ancient Authors
- 2 Index of Modern Authors
- 3 Index of Subjects and Selected Ancient Names

## 1 Index of Passages from Ancient Authors

Some short passages of *Col* and *Eph* are included under a larger unit if this is dealt with specifically and extensively in a separate chapter section, which is then mentioned between brackets. For example, *Eph* 3.10 is listed separately, but some references are included under *Eph* 3.1—21, which is treated extensively in a separate chapter section, chap. 4.5.

All sections of the index, including the section with biblical references, are arranged in alphabetical order.

### 1.1 Biblical references

- 1.1.1 Old Testament: MT, LXX, and Vulgata
- 1.1.2 New Testament
- 1.2 Classical, pseudepigraphic, apocryphal, Qumran, and patristic references
- 1.3 Epigraphic, numismatic, and papyrological references
- 1.4 References to collections of philosophical texts: Diels, Diels-Kranz, KRS, LS, and *SVF*

## 1.1 Biblical references

### 1.1.1 Old Testament: MT, LXX, and Vulgata

<i>Chronicles, The First Book of</i> (1 <i>Chron</i> )	18.18 LXX	97 n. 70
16.32 LXX	31.3 LXX	138 n. 47
23.31 LXX		
29.12 LXX		
	<i>Daniel, The Book of (Dan)</i>	
	7.2—28 LXX	93—95
	7.27 LXX	80; 94—96; 99;
		102; 121;
<i>Chronicles, The Second Book of</i> (2 <i>Chron</i> )		134 n. 43
2.3 LXX	7.27 Theod(otion)	94 n. 64; 134 n. 43

- Deuteronomy*  
25.4 LXX 76  
40 (33).12 LXX 97 n. 73
- Ecclesiasticus*  
(*The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach*)  
42.16b LXX 159 n. 20
- Esther*  
4.17r LXX 96; 99
- Ezekiel, The Book of the Prophet*  
12.19 LXX 159 n. 20  
19.7 LXX 159 n. 20  
30.12 LXX 159 n. 20
- Ezra, The Fourth Book of*  
(*4 Ezra—Vulgata*)  
7.28—29 90 n. 59; 91  
11.37—12.3 90 n. 59  
11.40—46 91  
12.11 91  
12.31—34 90 n. 59  
13.1—13 90 n. 59  
13.25—26 90 n. 59  
13.33—38 90 n. 59  
13.37—38 91  
13.39—47 91  
13.51—52 90 n. 59
- Genesis*  
15.15 LXX 100
- Habakkuk*  
3.3e LXX 159 n. 20
- Hosea*  
2.13 LXX 138 n. 47
- Isaiah, The Book of the Prophet*  
6.3c LXX 159 n. 20  
34.4 LXX 89 n. 57; 97 n. 70  
42.13 LXX 98 n. 74  
57.18—20 LXX 169  
59.17 LXX 191  
59.21 LXX 191
- Jeremiah, The Book of the Prophet*  
8.16 LXX 159 n. 20  
23.24 LXX 159  
29 (47).2 LXX 159 n. 20
- Kings, The First Book of*  
(*1 Kings MT; =3 Kings LXX*)  
17.1 LXX 98 n. 74  
18.15 LXX 97 n. 73
- Kings, The Second Book of*  
(*2 Kings MT; =4 Kings LXX*)  
3.14 LXX 97 n. 73  
17.16 LXX 97 n. 70  
19.20 LXX 98 n. 74  
19.31 LXX 97 n. 73  
21.3 LXX 97 n. 70  
21.5 LXX 97 n. 70  
23.4—5 LXX 97 n. 70
- Leviticus*  
23.23—24 LXX 71
- 2 Maccabees (2 Macc—LXX)*  
3.24 95; 96 n. 68; 99  
7.22—23 61
- 3 Maccabees (3 Macc—LXX)*  
7.9 98 n. 75
- 4 Maccabees (4 Macc—LXX)*  
12.13 62; 63
- Numbers*  
19.17—19 LXX 72
- Oratio Manassis (LXX)*  
15 97 n. 70
- Proverbs*  
8.22—31 LXX 126; 174
- Psalms*  
2.7 LXX 84 n. 48  
8.7 LXX 83—85; 87; 156  
17 (18).10 LXX 82  
23 (24).1 LXX 159 n. 20  
23 (24).10 LXX 97 n. 73  
32 (33).5 LXX 159 n. 20  
45 (46).8 LXX 97 n. 73  
45 (46).12 LXX 97 n. 73  
46 (47).4 LXX 82  
47 (48).9 LXX 97 n. 73

*Psalms (cont'd.)*

49 (50).12 LXX	159 n. 20
58 (59).6 LXX	98 n. 74
67 (68).19 LXX	180; 185; 186
68 (69).7 LXX	97 n. 73
71 (72).19 LXX	159 n. 20
79 (80).5 LXX	98 n. 74
79 (80).8 LXX	98 n. 74
79 (80).15 LXX	98 n. 74
79 (80).20 LXX	98 n. 74
83 (84).2 LXX	97 n. 73
83 (84).4 LXX	97 n. 73
83 (84).9 LXX	98 n. 74
83 (84).13 LXX	97 n. 73
88 (89).9 LXX	98 n. 74
88 (89).11 LXX	159 n. 20
95 (96).11 LXX	159 n. 20
97 (98).7 LXX	159 n. 20
103 (104).24 LXX	159 n. 20
109 (110).1 LXX	81—84; 87; 155 n. 14; 156 n. 15
118 (119).64 LXX	159 n. 20

*Samuel, The First Book of*  
(1 Sam MT; =1 Kings LXX)

1.3 MT	98
1.11 MT	98
4.4 MT	97 n. 73; 98
4.4 LXX	97 n. 73

*Samuel, The Second Book of*  
(2 Sam MT; 2 Kings LXX)

6.2 MT	97 n. 73; 98
6.2 LXX	97 n. 73
6.18 LXX	97 n. 73

*Wisdom of Solomon (LXX)*

1.7	159—160
5.17—18	191
7.21	126; 174

*Zechariah (Zech)*

1.3 LXX	97 n. 73
7.4 LXX	97 n. 73

*Zephaniah (Zeph)*

2.9 LXX	97 n. 73
---------	----------

*1.1.2 New Testament**Acts of the Apostles (Acts)*

2.32—36	84 n. 47
2.34—35	81; 82
13.32—33	84 n. 48

*Colossians, The Letter to the (Col)*

1.1—2	149—150 (chap. 4.1)
1.3—8	150—152 (chap. 4.2)
1.5—6	136
1.7—8	137
1.9—23	112—115 (chap. 3.1.1 [a]); 120; 152—154 (chap. 4.3.1)
1.9—10	11
1.11	155
1.12—13	167
1.13—22	11
1.13	118
1.14	118

1.15—20	115—121 (chap. 3.1.1. [b]); 136 n. 44
1.15—17	157; 188
1.15	17; 24; 25; 127; 167
1.16—17	18; 21—26; 30; 122; 127
1.16	17; 22; 23; 26; 59; 88 n. 54; 121—122; 123; 125; 144; 181 n. 60; 186 n. 71
1.17	22; 23; 26; 108; 123; 125; 164; 188
1.18—19	24; 25
1.18	25; 26; 56
1.19—20	25; 166; 187; 188
1.19	18; 25; 123; 125; 126—127; 163; 164; 165
1.20—23	120

<i>Colossians, The Letter to the (cont'd.)</i>		
1.20	25; 122; 123; 125; 127; 128; 164; 186 n. 71	2.12 2.14—15 2.14 2.15
1.21—23	120	129 n. 34; 155 n. 14
1.21—22	166	13—14; 144 142; 170
1.21	27	17; 22; 59; 121; 122; 129; 134 n. 43; 142; 145; 154; 167; 170
1.22—23	167	2.16—17 2.16 2.17
1.22	129 n. 34; 144; 170; 171	15; 27; 30; 136; 138; 143; 144
1.23	136; 171	12; 88 n. 54
1.24—2.7	171—172 (chap. 4.5.1)	16; 17; 23; 27; 27—30; 30 n. 46; 57; 129; 135; 144
1.24	26	2.18—19 2.18
1.25—26	172	15—16; 141
1.26—29	136	12; 136; 139; 142—143; 145
1.26—27	173	2.19
1.27	174 n. 44	10; 16—19; 23; 24 n. 33; 27; 30—31; 42; 50; 52; 53—58; 108; 129; 135; 145; 146; 167; 186 n. 71; 188; 189; 202
1.28	11	2.20—23 2.20—21 2.20
1.29	155 n. 14	14 n. 8; 17; 59; 113; 122; 129; 134 n. 43; 142; 170
2.1—3	136	2.22 2.23
2.1	172	3.1—4 3.1—3 3.1—2 3.1
2.2—3	11	14; 141 113 167 14 n. 8; 155 n. 14; 156 n. 15
2.2	173; 174 n. 44	3.3—4 3.5—17 3.5—11 3.5—9 3.5
2.4	136; 137	3.12—17 3.12—15 3.12—14 3.15
2.6—7	12; 136; 167	3.16—17 3.18—4.1 4.2—6 4.2—4
2.6	85 n. 49	136; 190 184; 190 n. 74 190 n. 74 167 184 190 n. 74 136; 190 193 193 n. 77
2.8—3.4	9; 10; 12; 56; 57; 58; 129; 136; 183	
2.8—15	13	
2.8—10	25; 26; 59; 122; 123; 145; 154; 192	
2.8	11—13; 17; 22; 134 n. 43; 136; 141; 143; 144; 145; 167	
2.9—10	13; 16; 19; 22; 23; 57; 113; 129; 135; 144; 157; 167; 188	
2.9	17; 18; 23—27; 54 n. 150; 123; 125; 127; 129; 163	
2.10	12; 17; 23; 26 n. 35; 54 n. 149; 55—57; 88 n. 54; 121; 129	
2.11—13	13—14	
2.11	24 n. 33; 27; 129; 144	
2.12—13	14 n. 8; 113; 146	

*Colossians, The Letter to the (cont'd.)*

4.5	193 n. 77
4.6	193 n. 77
4.7—18	193—203 (chap. 4.8)
4.9	137
4.10	137
4.12—13	136
4.12	137
4.13	35; 50
4.14	137
4.15—16	174
4.17	137

*Corinthians, The First Letter to the (1 Cor)*

2.6	167
2.8	167
2.12	167
2.13—15	107 n. 98
3.21—23	83 n. 45
6.2—3	100
7.29—31	104
8.4—6	125 n. 28
8.6	125—126
9.4—10	75—76
10.11	103
12.3	85 n. 49
12.4—11	104—105 n. 90
12.6	104—105 n. 90
12.28—29	186
15.12—57	79
15.21	83 n. 45; 85 n. 52
15.23—28	6; 59; 79—87; 88; 89; 100; 102; 104; 106; 121; 134 n. 43; 152; 156; 157; 165
15.24—26	102
15.24	88—90; 93; 95; 96; 99—100; 102; 134 n. 43; 156
15.25	156 n. 15; 157
15.26	83; 102
15.27	156
15.28	104; 157; 165
15.35—49	107
15.42	102 n. 84
15.44—49	107
15.50	102 n. 84

15.51—52	103; 108
15.54—57	83 n. 45

*Corinthians, The Second Letter to the (2 Cor)*

1.1—3	154 n. 12; 200
1.1—2	149
1.1	200; 201
1.3—4	149
1.8—9	108
1.21—22	150
4.5	85 n. 49
4.16—5.8	108
5.19	127
6.14	190 n. 74
10.4—5	191
11.14	100
12.7	100

*Ephesians, The Letter to the (Eph)*

1.1—3	200
1.1—2	149—150 (chap. 4.1); 195— 201 (chap. 4.8.2)
1.3—14	150—152 (chap. 4.2)
1.3—4	185 n. 70
1.7—10	173
1.9—10	172; 173
1.10	165—166 n. 36; 173; 187
1.15—2.10	152
1.15—23	154—158 (chap. 4.3.2)
1.17—22	173
1.20—22	85 n. 50
1.20	175
1.21	88; 165—166 n. 36
1.22—23	169; 175; 183; 185; 187
1.23	159—166 (chap. 4.3.3); 189
2.1—10	166—168 (chap. 4.3.4)
2.2	88
2.6	191
2.11—22	168—171 (chap. 4.4)
2.12	178

*Ephesians, The Letter to the (cont'd.)*

2.16	172
2.19	178
3.1—21	171—183 (chap. 4.5)
3.1	199
3.3—4	196
3.10	88 n. 54; 168; 186; 187; 192
3.18—19	122 n. 12
4.1—16	183—191 (chap. 4.6)
4.1	199
4.5—6	198 n. 79
4.8—10	180
4.15—16	56; 202
4.15	192
4.16	10; 55 n. 151; 56
4.17—5.20	190
4.17—18	190 n. 74
4.19—31	190 n. 74
4.29	193 n. 77
4.32—5.2	190 n. 74
5.3—18	190 n. 74
5.15—16	193 n. 77
5.15	178
5.19—20	190 n. 74
5.21—6.9	190
5.23—24	190 n. 74
5.25—30	190 n. 74
6.10—17	191—193 (chap. 4.7)
6.12	88 n. 54; 168; 190 n. 74
6.18—20	193
6.20	199
6.21—24	193—203 (chap. 4.8)

*Galatians, The Letter to the (Gal)*

1.2	70
1.6—7	70
1.19	70
2.1	70
2.3—5	70
2.9	70
2.11—12	70
2.13	70
3.28	74—75 n. 40
4.3—10	6; 59; 67; 80; 100;

4.3—5	66; 69; 75; 77; 100
4.3	59; 64; 67; 69— 70; 72; 74 n. 40; 75; 77—78; 133; 134 n. 43
4.4—5	60
4.4	75—76 n. 41; 78
4.5	70; 75; 76
4.6	79
4.8—9	66
4.8	65; 66
4.9—10	67; 70
4.9	67; 69; 72; 74; 78; 133; 134 n. 43
4.10	68; 71—72; 78
4.21	70
5.2—3	70
5.25	78; 79
6.2	74—75 n. 40
6.12—13	70
6.14—15	78; 129
6.14—16	78
6.16	78; 79

*Hebrews, A Letter to (Hebr)*

1.1—2a	30 n. 46
1.2	126
1.3—5	84 n. 48
1.3	84 n. 47
1.13	81; 82
2.5—9	85 nn. 50 and 53
2.8	85—86 n. 53
10.1	30 n. 46
10.12	84 n. 47
12.2	84 n. 47

*John, The Gospel according to*

1.3	126
1.10	126
1.14	26

*Mark, The Gospel according to*

12.36 parr	81
13.24—26 parr	89
13.25	88; 97 n. 70
14.62 parr	84 n. 47

<i>Peter, The First Letter of (1 Peter)</i>	8.34	84
3.18—22	185 n. 70	8.38—39
3.21—22	85 n. 50	
3.22	88	180—181
		8.38
		10.9
<i>Philemon, The Letter to (Phm)</i>	11.36	84—85
2	137	12.6
10	137	14.9
23	137	16.20
24	137	16.25—27
		173—174 n. 42
<i>Philippians, The Letter to the (Philipp)</i>		
1.19—25	108	<i>Thessalonians, The First Letter to the (1 Thess)</i>
2.6—11	118 n. 7	4.15—17
2.9—11	85 n. 49	5.4—7
2.17	108	5.8
3.10—11	108	190 n. 74
3.20—21	85	191
		<i>Thessalonians, The Second Letter to the (2 Thess)</i>
<i>Revelation of John, The (Rev)</i>		2.1—12
3.14—22	200 n. 82	2.3—4
3.14	126	2.5—8
		108 n. 99
		108
		108
<i>Romans, The Letter to the (Rom)</i>		<i>Timothy, The Second Letter to (2 Tim)</i>
1.3—4	84 n. 48	1.8
1.4	84	1.15—18
1.7	199	1.16—17
1.15	199	2.9
5.12	85 n. 52	4.11—21
5.18	85 n. 52	4.12
8.20	85	199
8.21	102 n. 85	

## 1.2 Classical, pseudepigraphic, apocryphal, Qumran, and patristic references

<i>Acta Ioannis</i>		Aetius	
108.9	164	<i>Placita</i>	
		1.7.11	160 n. 25
<i>Aelius Aristides</i>		1.28.4	36 n. 68
<i>Orationes</i>		2.13.11	42—43 n. 92
43.15	160—161 n. 26	4.21.4	19 n. 20
45.3	119		
45.21	127;	<i>Alcinous</i>	
	158—159 n. 19;	<i>Didaskalikos</i>	
	160—161 n. 26	167.32—37	49
		170.4—9	50



- |                                                                 |                                  |                                       |               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| 171.38—172.3                                                    | 64 n. 20                         | Apuleius                              |               |
| Alexander of Aphrodisias                                        |                                  | (a) <i>De mundo</i>                   |               |
| (a) <i>De fato</i>                                              |                                  | 292                                   | 51            |
| 191.26—193.2                                                    | 32 n. 52                         | 297                                   | 51            |
| 192.2—6                                                         | 32 n. 52; 57 n. 160              | 327                                   | 50            |
|                                                                 |                                  | 343                                   | 162 n. 28     |
| (b) <i>De mixtione</i>                                          |                                  | (b) <i>De Platone et eius dogmate</i> |               |
| 216.14—17                                                       | 31 n. 48                         | 197                                   | 50—51         |
| 223.7—9                                                         | 31 n. 47                         | 203                                   | 51            |
| 223.16—17                                                       | 31 n. 49                         | (c) <i>Florida</i>                    |               |
| 223.25—27                                                       | 20—21 n. 26                      | Ed. Helm                              |               |
| 223.34—36                                                       | 31 n. 51; 35 n. 63;<br>57 n. 160 | 17, p. 31.8—13                        | 50 n. 125     |
| 223.34                                                          | 31 n. 50; 35 n. 63               | 18, p. 35.10—16                       | 50 n. 125     |
| 225.1—2                                                         | 18 n. 14                         | 18, p. 38.8—13                        | 50 n. 125     |
| 228.16—17                                                       | 106 n. 96                        | 18, p. 39.4—8                         | 50 n. 125     |
| (c) <i>In Aristotelis Metaphysica<br/>commentaria</i>           |                                  | 20, pp. 40.23—<br>41.5                | 50 n. 125     |
| 291.15—19                                                       | 106 n. 96                        | Ed. Vallette                          |               |
| 303.29—304.7                                                    | 160 n. 26                        | 17.4                                  | 50 n. 125     |
| 310.36 ff.                                                      | 106 n. 96                        | 18.14—15                              | 50 n. 125     |
| 311.14 ff.                                                      | 106 n. 96                        | 18.36                                 | 50 n. 125     |
| (d) <i>In Aristotelis Topicorum libros octo<br/>commentaria</i> |                                  | 18.42                                 | 50 n. 125     |
| 66.24 ff.                                                       | 106 n. 96                        | 20.3—4                                | 50 n. 125     |
| Anaxagoras                                                      |                                  | (d) <i>Metamorphoses</i>              |               |
| <i>Fragments</i>                                                |                                  | 11.5                                  | 157 n. 16     |
| 6.2—3                                                           | 105                              | 11.23                                 | 143           |
| 6.3—4                                                           | 105                              | 11.25                                 | 157 n. 17     |
| 11.1                                                            | 105                              | Aratus                                |               |
| 12.1                                                            | 105                              | <i>Phaenomena</i>                     |               |
| 12.5—6                                                          | 105                              | 2—4                                   | 162 n. 28     |
| 12.27—30                                                        | 106                              | Aristotle                             |               |
| 17                                                              | 106                              | (a) <i>Ars rhetorica</i>              |               |
| Annaeus Lucanus, Marcus                                         |                                  | 1358a36—1358b8                        | 118 n. 7      |
| <i>De bello civili</i>                                          |                                  | (b) <i>De anima</i>                   |               |
| 1.67—80                                                         | 89 n. 57                         | 1.5.411a                              | 158—159 n. 19 |
| 1.72—76                                                         | 89 n. 57                         | 1.5.411a, 7—8                         | 160           |
| 1.639—672                                                       | 89 n. 57                         | (c) <i>De caelo</i>                   |               |
| 1.663—664                                                       | 89 n. 57                         | 289a                                  | 32            |
| 2.289—292                                                       | 89 n. 57                         | 289b                                  | 32            |
| 7.134—138                                                       | 89 n. 57                         | 290a                                  | 32            |
| 7.134—137                                                       | 89 n. 57                         | 292a                                  | 32            |
|                                                                 |                                  | 293a                                  | 32            |

296b	32	2.6	97
312b	160 n. 26	12.3	96
(d) <i>Meteorologica</i>		Calcidius	
346a	32	<i>Timaeus</i>	
		293	18 n. 16
(e) <i>Physica</i>		Cicero	
1.5.188a, 19—23	160 n. 26	(a) <i>De divinatione</i>	
4.8	20 n. 25	1.82—83	29 n. 41
		1.127	29 n. 41
Pseudo-Aristotle		(b) <i>De fato</i>	
<i>De mundo</i>		12—15	29 n. 41
392a21—23	51 n. 130	(c) <i>De natura deorum</i>	
392b35—393a2	51 n. 128	1.39	24 n. 32
397b13—16	162	1.54	181 n. 63
397b16—18	162	2.24	18 n. 17
397b17—18	162 n. 28	2.45—72	38
397b19—20	162	2.63—74	38
397b20—24	162	2.63—64	38 n. 76
Athenagoras		2.63	38 n. 75
<i>Legatio</i>		2.64	38—39
8.6	163—164	2.84	37
Augustine		2.87	37 n. 72
<i>De civitate dei</i>		2.115	38; 39 n. 79; 41
4.11	30 n. 45	2.153	181 n. 63
7.15	30 n. 45	2.155	38
8.13—22	145 n. 66	3.28	37 n. 72
10.3	145 n. 66	(d) <i>Disputationes Tusculanae</i>	
Aurelius, Marcus		5.69—70	181 n. 63
<i>Ad se ipsum</i>		(e) <i>Timaeus</i>	
4.23	123; 125	1.1—2 (pp. 177.1	40 n. 81;
6.38	36	—178.2)	202—203
7.9	36	4.13 (pp. 186.21—	40 n. 83
2 <i>Baruch</i>		25)	
(= <i>The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch</i> )		5.14 (pp. 188.9—	40 n. 84
29.3—30.1	90 n. 59; 91	12)	
39.7—40.4	90 n. 59; 91	5.15 (pp. 190.1—	40 n. 85
72.2—73.1	90 n. 59	3)	
72.2—6	91	5.15 (pp. 190.3—	40 n. 86
73.1	91	8)	
3 <i>Baruch</i>		9.30 (pp. 204.13—	41 n. 88
(= <i>The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch</i> )		206.2)	
1.8—2.7	97		
1.8	97		



- 61.8—12 93  
 62.3—11 92  
 63.1—11 92  
 80.1 29  
 82.7 29
- Epictetus  
*Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*  
 1.14.1—1.14.6 35—36
- Epiphanius  
 42.9.4 (p. 105.9—14) 198 n. 79  
 42.11.8 (p. 120.3—5) 198 n. 79  
 42.11.9—10 (pp. 123.18—124.1) 198 n. 79  
 42.12.3 (p. 182.11—20) 198 n. 79  
 42.13.4 (p. 183.11—14) 198 n. 79
- Eusebius of Caesarea  
*Hieronymi Chronicon*  
 p. 183.18 137 n. 45  
 p. 183.21—22 137 n. 45
- Galen  
*De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*  
 2.5.13 19 n. 19  
 3.1.25 19 n. 19  
 5.3.8 20 n. 26
- Heraclitus of Ephesus  
*Fragments*  
 109 (67) 128 n. 33
- Heraclitus  
*Quaestiones homericae*  
 40, pp. 59.4—61.5 37 n. 70
- Heron of Alexandria  
 1.22 182 n. 65  
 1.47 182 nn. 66—67  
 1.48 182 n. 67  
 1.49 182 n. 67  
 2.3 182 nn. 66—67  
 2.4 182 n. 67
- Homer  
 8.17—27 37 n. 70  
 14.214 35  
 15.18—21 37 n. 70
- Horace  
 1.9.67—72 138—139 n. 49
- Iamblichus  
 1.9 (30.1—3) 160 n. 25; 161  
 1.9 (31.13—32.7) 189 n. 72  
 2.3 (70.18—71.6) 192  
 3.19 (146.8—9) 162
- Josephus  
*Contra Apionem*  
 2.281—282 138—139 n. 49
- Julian  
*Εἰς τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν*  
 18 (178b) 160 n. 25
- Juvenal  
*Satires*  
 14.96—106 138—139 n. 49
- Lucan, see Annaeus Lucanus, Marcus
- Macarius of Magnesia  
*Apocriticus (Monogenes)*  
 2.15 180 n. 59
- Nemesius of Emesa  
*De natura hominis*  
 Ed. Morani  
 108.15—17 36 n. 68  
 111.14—18 22 n. 30  
 Ed. Matthaei  
 37, p. 301 36 n. 68  
 38, pp. 309—310 22 n. 30
- Numenius  
*Fragments*  
 18 52; 135; 146  
 52.64—70 133 n. 41  
 52.87—92 133 n. 41

Olympiodorus		166	46
<i>In Platonis Alcibiadem commentarii</i>		190	29—30 n. 44
p. 134: 214.10—	104 n. 90		
18		(e) <i>De decalogo</i>	
p. 134: 214.14—	104—105 n. 90	31	63 n. 18
15		53—54	65
Origen		53	101
<i>Contra Celsum</i>		66	66 n. 28
4.5	159 n. 22	83	29 n. 44
4.14	18 n. 14;	(f) <i>De fuga et inventione</i>	
	107 n. 97;	110	46
	158 n. 18;	112	35 n. 63; 46
	164 n. 34	(g) <i>De gigantibus</i>	
8.67	145 n. 65	6—9	139; 140 n. 52
Orosius		16—17	140
<i>Historia adversus paganos</i>		47	161 n. 27
7.7.12	137 n. 45	(h) <i>De migratione Abrahami</i>	
<i>Orphic Poems</i>		12	29—30 n. 44
166	37 n. 70	178—181	28
Philo of Alexandria		181	46
(a) <i>De aeternitate mundi</i>		220	45
10	66 n. 28	(i) <i>De opificio mundi</i>	
13	34; 46	33	128
19	28	52	62 n. 11
21	102 n. 83	56—57	28
29	63	58—59	28
30	34 n. 59	59—60	28
36	34 n. 59; 46 n. 109	101	28
75	34 n. 59; 46 n. 109	113	28
76—77	20 n. 23	131	45 n. 102; 62 n. 11
108—109	101	146	62
117—149	33; 34 n. 60	(j) <i>De plantatione</i>	
124—129	33 n. 56	10	45
125	33; 34; 46 n. 109	14	139—140
137	34 n. 60; 46 n. 109	120	62 n. 11
(b) <i>De agricultura</i>		(k) <i>De posteritate Caini</i>	
51	62	5	64; 101 n. 82
(c) <i>De cherubim</i>		6	161
124—127	124; 125	(l) <i>De praemiis et poenis</i>	
125	124 n. 19	65	28
127	62 n. 11; 124 n. 19	(m) <i>De providentia</i>	
(d) <i>De confusione linguarum</i>		2.45	62 n. 11
136	45; 188		

(n) <i>De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini</i>		2.90	46
67	161 n. 27	2.118	46
108	102 n. 83		
(o) <i>De somniis</i>		(w) <i>Quis rerum divinarum heres</i>	
1.15—16	62 n. 11	23	45
1.15	63	72	29—30 n. 44
1.39	62 n. 11	137	45 n. 102
1.140—142	139	140	62
1.212	72	152—153	102 n. 83
1.221	161 n. 27	188	46; 188—189
		197	62 n. 11
		246	46
(p) <i>De specialibus legibus</i>		277	102 n. 84
1.92	28	281	62 n. 11;
1.186	71		100—101
1.266	72	282	63—64
1.294	63		
2.188	71	(x) <i>Quod deterius potiori insidiari solet</i>	
2.190—192	128	8	62 n. 11
2.190—191	71	153—155	64
2.192	71; 128	154	101 n. 79
2.255	66 n. 28		
(q) <i>De virtutibus</i>		(y) <i>Quod deus immutabilis sit</i>	
118	29—30 n. 44	35	35 n. 63;
181	29—30 n. 44	57	45 n. 102
			161 n. 27
(r) <i>De vita contemplativa</i>		Plato	
3	65—66	(a) <i>Cratylus</i>	
4	66	397C	65 n. 25
(s) <i>De vita Mosis</i>		(b) <i>Leges</i>	
2.121	61; 62	896E	132
2.126	28	899B	160 n. 25
2.238	162 n. 29; 188		
(t) <i>Legum allegoriae</i>		(c) <i>Phaedo</i>	
3.4	161	99C	44 n. 97
3.5—6	64		
(u) <i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin</i>		(d) <i>Philebus</i>	
3.3	28	27D	47 n. 111
4.8	101—102 n. 82	(e) <i>Respublica</i>	
		616C	44
(v) <i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum</i>		(f) <i>Symposium</i>	
2.74	46 n. 108	203B—204C	160—161 n. 26
2.78	28	(g) <i>Timaeus</i>	
2.89	46 n. 108	30A	132

- |                                        |                                          |                                                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 31B—32C                                | 39; 42 n. 91; 43;<br>44; 47; 49; 50; 188 | (c) <i>Compendium libri de animae<br/>procreatione in Timaeo</i><br>( <i>Moralia</i> 1030D—1032F) |
| 31B—C                                  | 40                                       | 1020A—B 47 n. 112                                                                                 |
| 32A—B                                  | 40                                       | 1031A 48 n. 116                                                                                   |
| 32B—C                                  | 40                                       | 1032C 47 n. 113                                                                                   |
| 34B—37C                                | 132                                      |                                                                                                   |
| 34B—36D                                | 43; 47; 49; 51;<br>52 n. 133             | (d) <i>Consolatio ad Apollonium</i><br>( <i>Moralia</i> 101E—122A)                                |
| 35A                                    | 43                                       | 109E 102 n. 84                                                                                    |
| 35B—36B                                | 43; 47 n. 112                            |                                                                                                   |
| 36A—B                                  | 43 n. 93                                 | (e) <i>De animae procreatione in Timaeo</i><br>( <i>Moralia</i> 1012A—1030C)                      |
| 36B—C                                  | 43; 57 n. 160                            | 1014D—E 132 n. 39                                                                                 |
| 36C—D                                  | 43                                       | 1015D—E 132 n. 39                                                                                 |
| 36D—E                                  | 43                                       | 1016F—1017A 47                                                                                    |
| 37A                                    | 43                                       | 1023C 48 n. 116                                                                                   |
| 37C                                    | 145 n. 65                                | 1024D—E 47                                                                                        |
| 38E—39A                                | 39; 41; 43; 51;<br>152 n. 133            | 1027B—C 47 n. 112                                                                                 |
| 38E                                    | 47                                       |                                                                                                   |
| 41A—D                                  | 63                                       | (f) <i>De defectu oraculorum</i><br>( <i>Moralia</i> 409E—438D)                                   |
| 41A—B                                  | 33; 41 n. 87                             | 416C 141                                                                                          |
| 41A                                    | 46                                       | 416E 48                                                                                           |
| 41B                                    | 47                                       | 417A 141; 142—143                                                                                 |
| 42E—43A                                | 63; 64                                   | 417B—C 141; 143 n. 60                                                                             |
| 43A                                    | 41 n. 87                                 | 417C 138 n. 48                                                                                    |
| 43D                                    | 43                                       | 420A 140                                                                                          |
| 44D—45B                                | 19                                       | 426A 7; 26 n. 37                                                                                  |
| 53A—B                                  | 132                                      | 430C—D 61 n. 6                                                                                    |
| 53B                                    | 130                                      |                                                                                                   |
| 53C—57D                                | 48                                       | (g) <i>De E apud Delphos</i><br>( <i>Moralia</i> 384C—394C)                                       |
| 69C—E                                  | 19                                       | 388C—389D 164                                                                                     |
| 73C—D                                  | 19                                       | 391D 138 n. 88                                                                                    |
| 89E—90B                                | 19                                       | 393E—394A 164                                                                                     |
| 92C                                    | 153 n. 11;<br>160—161 n. 26;<br>175      | 393F 49; 51                                                                                       |
| Pseudo-Plato                           |                                          | (h) <i>De facie quae in orbe lunae apparet</i><br>( <i>Moralia</i> 920A—945E)                     |
| <i>Epinomis</i>                        |                                          | 926E—927A 101 n. 80                                                                               |
| 991E—992A                              | 44 n. 97                                 | 926E—F 131                                                                                        |
| Plutarch of Chaeronea                  |                                          | 926E 130                                                                                          |
| (a) <i>Adversus Colotem</i>            |                                          | 926F—927A 48 n. 116; 130                                                                          |
| ( <i>Moralia</i> 1107D—1127E)          |                                          | 926F 130; 131                                                                                     |
| 1113B                                  | 61                                       | 927C 48                                                                                           |
| (b) <i>Aquane an ignis sit utilior</i> |                                          | 936A 29                                                                                           |
| ( <i>Moralia</i> 955D—958E)            |                                          | 937F 180                                                                                          |
| 957B                                   | 61 n. 6                                  | 939A—B 180                                                                                        |
|                                        |                                          | 941F—942A 140                                                                                     |

- 943F 47  
944C—D 140
- (i) *De genio Socratis*  
(*Moralia* 575A—598F)  
591B 49; 103
- (j) *De Iside et Osiride*  
(*Moralia* 351C—384C)  
353E 73  
353F 73  
361B 138 n. 48; 141  
368A 138 n. 48  
368C 138 n. 48  
369B—D 103  
369C—D 131  
369E—371A 132  
370E 132  
370F 132  
371A 133  
373D 60; 103; 133  
374B 160—161 n. 26  
374D 160—161 n. 26  
376D 60  
376E 60  
382F 102 n. 84
- (k) *De primo frigido*  
(*Moralia* 945E—955C)  
947E 101  
954F 42 n. 92; 49 n. 119
- (l) *De Stoicorum repugnantiis*  
(*Moralia* 1033A—1057C)  
1052C—D 128 n. 31  
1053B 18 n. 15
- (m) *Fragments*  
213 65
- (n) *Non posse suaviter vivi  
secundum Epicurum*  
(*Moralia* 1086A—1107C)  
1104C 102 n. 84
- (o) *Platonicae quaestiones*  
(*Moralia* 999C—1011E)  
1001B 47
- (p) *Quaestiones convivales*  
(*Moralia* 612C—748D)  
687A 49 n. 119  
719D 48
- (q) *Quaestiones romanae*  
(*Moralia* 263D—291C)  
263D—E 72; 101
- Ptolemy  
*Tetrabiblos*  
1.19 181 n. 61  
1.23 122 n. 13
- Qumran, see Dead Sea Scrolls
- Seneca  
(a) *Ad Lucilium Epistulae morales*  
65.7 124 n. 22  
65.8—9 125 n. 27  
65.8 124  
65.9—10 124
- (b) *Naturales quaestiones*  
1, praefatio 7 181 n. 63  
1, praefatio 12— 181 n. 63  
13  
1, praefatio 16— 181 n. 63  
17
- Sextus Empiricus  
*Adversus dogmaticos*  
(=*Adversus mathematicos* 7—11)  
4.10 (10.10) 123; 125 n. 25
- Sibylline Oracles*  
5.107—109 91  
5.108—110 90 n. 59  
5.155—157 91  
5.158—161 90 n. 59  
5.158—160 91  
5.414—427 90 n. 59; 91  
5.416—417 91  
5.418—419 91  
5.428—433 90 n. 59  
5.429—431 91



## Simplicius

*In Aristotelis Physicorum libros  
commentaria*

1.2, p. 27.5—9	105
1.2, p. 27.7	106 n. 95
1.3, p. 145.27—28	42 n. 92
1.3, p. 146.3—4	42 n. 92
1.3, p. 146.9—11	42 n. 92
3.4, p. 460.19	106 n. 94

## Stobaeus

*Anthologium*

1.1.29b	160 n. 25
1.129.7—10	19 n. 22; 21 n. 27
1.166.6—19	20 n. 24
1.166.13—15	21 n. 28

## Tacitus

*Annales*

14.26	137 n. 45
14.27.1	137 n. 45

## Tertullian

*Adversus Marcionem*

5.11.12	198 n. 79
5.17.1	198 n. 79

*Testament of Abraham*

## Long recension

9.3	97
14.12	97

## Short recension

13.10	96
-------	----

*Testament of Job*

48.3	97
49.2	96
50.1	97
50.2	97

*Testament Levi (in: The Testaments of  
the Twelve Patriarchs)*

3.8	96
-----	----

## Themistius

*In libros Aristotelis De anima paraphrasis*

35.28—29	160 n. 25
----------	-----------

## Theodoret of Cyrthus

3.23, pp. 74.23— 75.3	65 n. 25
82.625C	198 n. 79

## Theon of Smyrna

*De utilitate mathematicae*

113.2—8	182 n. 65
---------	-----------

## Theophrastus

(a) *De causis plantarum*

2.18.2	33 n. 58
--------	----------

(b) *Historia plantarum*

7.11.3	33 n. 58
--------	----------

## Timaeus of Locri

*De natura mundi et animae*

39—41 (217.5— 14)	44
----------------------	----

## Varro

*Antiquitates rerum divinarum*

Fragment 24	30 n. 45
Fragment 27	30 n. 45
Fragment 230	30 n. 45
Fragment 233	30 n. 45
Fragment 234	30 n. 45

## Vettius Valens

*Anthologiae*

7.6 (p. 265.26— 27)	192 n. 75
8.7 (p. 301.10— 11)	192 n. 75
9.16 (p. 345.10— 14)	192 n. 75

## Virgil

*Bucolica*

3.60	162 n. 28
------	-----------

## 1.3 Epigraphic, numismatic, and papyrological references

<i>BMC</i>		no. 1095	53 n. 138
nos. 4064—4069	52 n. 135		
nos. 4338—4340	53 n. 139	Hicks 1891	
no. 4341	53 n. 139	pp. 233—236: nos. 16—17	138 n. 49
<i>CPJ</i> III			
pp. 43—56: nos. 1; 3; 4; 5; 6	138—139 n. 49	<i>Michigan papyrus</i>	
		No. 1, fragm. 3	122 n. 13
<i>CREBM</i>		<i>OGIS</i>	
vol. 2, p. 45: no. 251	53 n. 140	vol. 2, pp. 262—264: no. 573	138 n. 49
vol. 2, pp. 245—246: nos. 128—134	53 n. 141	<i>PHerc. (Herculaneum papyri)</i>	
vol. 4, pp. 264—265: nos. 1641—1646	53 n. 143	No. 1428	177 n. 50
<i>CRR</i>		<i>RSC</i>	
no. 1056	52 n. 136	vol. 1.1, p. 24: Carisia 4	52 n. 135
no. 1063	53 n. 137	vol. 1.2, p. 119: no. 60	53 n. 139

## 1.4 References to collections of philosophical texts: Diels, Diels-Kranz, KRS, LS, and SVF

Diels, <i>Doxographi graeci</i>		No. B 28, fragm. 8.30—31, p. 237	42 n. 92
p. 301.21—23	160 n. 25	No. B. 28, fragm. 8.36—38, p. 238	42 n. 92
p. 342	42—43 n. 92	No. A 54, p. 293.26—27	42—43 n. 92
pp. 478—480: fragm. 4	105 n. 91; 106 n. 95	Vol. 2	
pp. 486—491: no. 12	33 n. 55	No. A 41, p. 15	105 n. 91; 106 n. 95
Diels-Kranz, <i>Vorsokratiker</i>		No. A 45, p. 18	106 n. 94
Vol. 1		No. B 60, p. 48.19—21	42 n. 92
No. 11 A 1, p. 68.28—29	160 n. 25	No. 68 A 44, p. 95.20—22	160 n. 26
No. 11 A 3, p. 73.9	160 n. 25	No. 68 A 45, p. 95.23—24	160 n. 26
No. 11 A 22, p. 79.26—27	160 n. 23		
No. 11 A 23, p. 79.33—34	160 n. 25	<i>KRS</i>	
No. 22 A 1, p. 141.11	160 n. 25	No. 91	160 n. 24
No. 22 A 1, p. 141.17—25	128 n. 33	No. 204	128 n. 33
No. 22 B 67, p. 165.8—11	128 n. 33		
No. B 28, fragm. 8.26—27, p. 237	42 n. 92		

No. 298.26—27	42 n. 92	2.413	19 n. 22; 21 n. 27
No. 298.30—31	42 n. 92	2.433	160 n. 26
No. 299.36—38	42 n. 92	2.441	20—21 n. 26; 32 n. 53; 35 n. 63 35 n. 63; 45 n. 102
LS		2.458	
38E	29 n. 41	2.463—619	33 n. 54
42D	29 n. 41	2.469	160 n. 26
43A	17 n. 13	2.473	31 n. 48
43B	17 n. 12	2.501	123 n. 17
44E	18 n. 16	2.540	20 n. 25
45H	18 n. 14	2.545	160 n. 26
46F	18 n. 15	2.548	46
46G	176 n. 46	2.549	38 n. 73
46H	18 n. 14; 107 n. 97; 158 n. 18; 164 n. 34	2.604 2.605 2.625 2.634	128 n. 31 18 n. 15 22 n. 30 18 n. 18
46P	20 n. 23	2.719	35 n. 63; 46 n. 106
47A	19 n. 22; 21 n. 27	2.836	19 n. 20
47C	18 n. 17	2.841	20 n. 26
47H	20 n. 26	2.886	19 n. 19
47L	20—21 n. 26	2.917	36 n. 68
47O	18 n. 18	2.918	36 n. 68
49H	20 n. 25	2.944	29 n. 41
49J	20 n. 24; 21 n. 28	2.945	32 n. 53
52C	22 n. 30	2.1022	17 n. 13
53H	19 n. 20	2.1046	160 n. 25
53U	19 n. 19	2.1052	18 n. 14; 107 n. 97; 158 n. 18; 164 n. 34
54B	24 n. 32		24 n. 32
55J	36 n. 68		17 n. 13
55O	29 n. 41		29 n. 41
65H	19 n. 19	2.1077	104—105 n. 90
<i>SVF</i>		2.1132	
1.99	20 n. 24; 21 n. 28	2.1192	19 n. 19
1.106	46 n. 109	3.302	3: Diogenes 29
2.1—332	33 n. 54		3: Zeno Tarsensis
2.310	18 n. 14		5
2.333—631	33 n. 54		

## 2 Index of Modern Authors

Abbott, T.K. 54	Barnes, T.D. 180 n. 59
Adams, E. 89 n. 57; 104 n. 89	Barth, M. 54; 55; 228 n. 49
Alföldi, A. 52 n. 136; 53 n. 137	Bean, G.E. 2 n. 2; 2 n. 3
	Beaujeu, J. 50 nn. 124 and 126; 162 n. 28
Babut, D. 164 n. 35	Beck, R.L. 29 n. 42
Baltes, M. 39 n. 80; 44 nn. 98—99	

- Benoit, P. 115 n. 2; 227; 229  
 Berger, K. 94 n. 66  
 Best, E. 200 n. 82; 228 n. 49; 229 n. 53  
 Betz, H.D. 133 n. 41  
 Black, M. 94 n. 66  
 Blanke, H. 228 n. 49  
 Bouché-Leclercq, A. 181 n. 61  
 Brenk, F.E. 140 n. 56  
 Bruce, F.F. 55; 56  
 Brucker, R. 118—119  
 Buffière, F. 37 n. 70  
 Burger, C. 117—118  
 Burkert, W. 143 nn. 60 and 63  
  
 Calder, W.M. 2 n. 2; 2 n. 3  
 Cardauns, B. 30 n. 45  
 Carr, W. 4; 134 n. 43; 141 n. 58  
 Chadwick, H. 169 n. 40  
 Clarke, K.D. 228 n. 49  
 Collins, J.J. 174 n. 45  
 Colpe, C. 158 n. 19  
 Courtney, E. 162 n. 28  
  
 Dahl, N.A. 166 n. 37; 179 n. 57  
 Davidson, M.J. 139 n. 51  
 De Jonge, H.J. 94 n. 66  
 DeMaris, R.E. 3—4; 140 n. 56; 144  
 Dibelius, M. 10; 19 n. 21; 24 n. 33;  
     26 n. 35; 54; 55—56 n. 155; 56  
 Dierse, U. 190 n. 73  
 Dillon, J. 5; 45 n. 100; 49 nn. 119 and  
     121; 50 n. 124; 52 n. 132; 126; 140  
 Dörrie, H. 39 n. 80; 133 n. 41;  
     143 n. 60  
 Downing, F.G. 89 n. 57  
 Dunn, J.D.G. 9; 26 n. 36; 54; 84 n. 48;  
     129 n. 34; 138 n. 47; 163 n. 31  
 Dupont, J. 3; 158—159 n. 19;  
     160 n. 25; 160—161 n. 26;  
     163 n. 31; 179—182  
  
 Eißfeldt, O. 97 n. 73  
  
 Farquharson, A.S.L. 36 nn. 67 and 69  
 Faust, E. 169 n. 41  
 Fitzer, G. 54 n. 148  
 Francis, F.O. 141 n. 58; 215 n. 1  
 Frede, M. 7; 42 n. 90; 52 n. 132;  
     126 n. 30, 133 n. 41; 145  
  
 Gabathuler, H.J. 115 n. 2  
 Gese, M. 149 n. 6; 232 n. 55  
 Giomini, R. 39 n. 80  
 Gnilka, J. 54; 55; 56  
 Goguel, M. 228 n. 49  
 Goldenberg, R. 138—139 n. 49  
 Goodman, M. 61 n. 7; 90 nn. 60—61;  
     92 n. 63; 95 n. 67; 97 nn. 71—72  
 Goodspeed, E.J. 3; 148; 215—221;  
     223; 226; 232 n. 55  
 Goulder, M.D. 200 n. 82  
 Gundel, H.G. 29 n. 42;  
     52—53 nn. 134—143  
 Gundel, W. 29 n. 42  
 Gütting, E. 200 n. 82  
  
 Hagendahl, H. 30 n. 45  
 Hahm, D.E. 20 nn. 24—25  
 Halfwassen, J. 126 n. 30  
 Harnack, A. 180 n. 59; 198 n. 79;  
     200 n. 82  
 Harrison, S.J. 50 n. 124  
 Hayward, R. 29 n. 40  
 Hegermann, H. 126 n. 29  
 Henrichs, A. 139 n. 50; 177 n. 50  
 Hicks, E.L. 138 n. 49  
 Hijmans, Jr., B.L. 50 n. 124  
 Hofius, O. 23 n. 31; 55 n. 153; 117 n. 4  
 Hollander, H.W. 75—76  
 Holleman, J. 75 n. 41; 89; 90 n. 59;  
     94 n. 65  
 Hooker, M.D. 136 n. 44  
 Hübner, H. 55  
 Hübner, W. 29 n. 42  
 Hurtado, L.W. 141 n. 58  
  
 Jones, R.M. 124 n. 22  
 Jülicher, A. 216 n. 9  
  
 Käsemann, E. 23 n. 31; 55 n. 153  
 Kent, J.P.C. 53 n. 142  
 Kloppenborg, J.S. 174 n. 45  
 Koestermann, E. 137 n. 45  
 Kreitzer, L.J. 53 n. 139; 94 n. 66;  
     185 n. 70  
  
 Lähnemann, J. 137 n. 45  
 Lang, B. 174 n. 45  
 Lapidge, M. 17 n. 11; 34—35; 42 n. 91  
 Lebram, J.C.H. 90 n. 62

- Lévêque, P. 37 n. 70  
 Lietaert Peerbolte, L.J. 108 n. 99  
 Lietzmann, H. 54  
 Lightfoot, J.B. 53  
 Lincoln, A.T. 2 n. 4; 147; 169 n. 39;  
   186—187 n. 71; 200 n. 82;  
   201 n. 83; 228—229; 232 n. 56  
 Lindemann, A. 2 n. 4; 88 n. 55;  
   151 n. 10; 165 n. 36; 232 n. 55  
 Lohmeyer, E. 24; 26 n. 35; 54  
 Lohse, E. 54  
 Lona, H.E. 165 n. 36  
 Long, A.A. 18—19 n. 18; 20 nn. 25 and  
   26; 29 n. 42; 39 n. 80  
 Lovejoy, A.O. 160—161 n. 26  
 Luz, U. 165 n. 36
- Mach, M. 139 n. 51; 141 n. 58  
 MacKendrick, P. 39 n. 80  
 MacMullen, R. 4; 134 n. 43  
 Mansfeld, J. 5; 133  
 Marcus, R. 101—102 n. 82  
 Martin, T. 138  
 Martyn, J.L. 74—75 n. 40  
 May, G. 133 n. 42  
 Meade, D.G. 173 n. 42  
 Merkel, H. 3; 5 n. 18; 151 n. 10;  
   216 n. 9; 227; 229  
 Merklein, H. 147; 186—187 n. 71  
 Merlan, P. 162  
 Metzger, B.M. 234 n. 58  
 Mikalson, J.D. 139 n. 50  
 Millar, F. 61 n. 7; 90 nn. 60—61;  
   92 n. 63; 95 n. 67; 97 nn. 71—72  
 Mitchell, S. 1 n. 1; 140  
 Mitton, C.L. 3; 55; 148; 185 n. 70; 215;  
   217—221; 223; 226; 227—229  
 Moritz, T. 232 n. 56  
 Moule, C.F.D. 54  
 Mußner, F. 61 n. 5; 67—69; 158 n. 19;  
   163 n. 31
- Nelis, J.Th. 96 n. 68  
 Noormann, R. 151 n. 10  
 Norden, E. 115 n. 2
- O'Brien, P.T. 54; 55  
 Ochel, W. 54; 227  
 Osborn, E. 151 n. 10  
 Overbeck, B. 53 n. 142
- Pagels, E. 5 n. 17; 133 n. 40  
 Parker, R.C.T. 139 n. 50  
 Parsons, P.J. 9 n. 1; 202 n. 85  
 Pelletier, A. 228  
 Pépin, J. 37 n. 70  
 Percy, E. 55; 57; 228 n. 49  
 Pleket, H.W. 142 n. 59  
 Pokorný, P. 54  
 Porter, S.E. 228 n. 49  
 Powell, J.G.F. 39 n. 80  
 Puelma, M. 39 n. 80
- Ramsay, W.M. 2 n. 2; 2 n. 3  
 Redfors, J. 50 n. 124  
 Reuter, R. 3; 148; 196 n. 78; 201 n. 84;  
   215; 218—221; 223; 226; 234  
 Rich, A.N.M. 124 n. 22  
 Robbins, F.E. 122 n. 13  
 Rose, H.J. 9 n. 1; 72—73 n. 38;  
   202 n. 85  
 Roukema, R. 5 n. 14  
 Rousseau, P. 139 n. 50  
 Rudhardt, J. 131 n. 38  
 Runia, D.T. 42 n. 90; 46 nn. 109—110
- Sampley, J.P. 215 n. 1  
 Schade, H.-H. 94 n. 66  
 Schlier, H. 158 n. 19  
 Schmauch, W. 55  
 Schmid, U. 198 n. 79  
 Schneemelcher, W. 164 n. 33;  
   198—199 n. 79  
 Schofield, M. 176 nn. 47 and 49;  
   177—178  
 Schröder, W. 190 n. 73  
 Schürer, E. 61 n. 7; 90 nn. 60—61;  
   92 n. 63; 95 n. 67; 97 nn. 71—72;  
   138 n. 49  
 Schweizer, E. 3—4; 24—25; 55; 56;  
   115—118; 120 n. 10; 144  
 Schwindt, R. 3 n. 5; 3; 147; 157 n. 17;  
   165 n. 36; 167 n. 38; 174 n. 45;  
   178 n. 52; 179 nn. 55 and 57;  
   192—193 n. 76  
 Sedley, D.N. 18—19 n. 18; 20 nn. 25—  
   26  
 Sharples, R.W. 32 n. 52  
 Sheppard, A.R.R. 140 nn. 52—53  
 Sider, D. 105 n. 91  
 Speyer, W. 202 n. 85

- Standhartinger, A. 137 n. 46  
 Stanton, G. 74 n. 40  
 Sterling, G.E. 4 n. 11; 30 n. 46; 122—  
 123; 125 n. 24; 144 n. 64; 145 n. 66  
 Stettler, Chr. 113 n. 1; 120 n. 11  
 Stuckenbruck, L.T. 141 n. 58  
 Stylow, A.U. 53 n. 142  
 Syme, R. 137 n. 45
- Talbert, R.J.A. 2 n. 2; 2 n. 3  
 Talmon, S. 29 n. 40  
 Thesleff, H. 202 n. 85  
 Todd, R.B. 20—21 n. 26;  
 31 nn. 48 and 51  
 Tromp, J. 66 n. 28; 98 n. 75
- Van der Horst, P.W. 89 n. 57  
 VanderKam, J.C. 29 n. 40  
 Van der Woude, A.S. 97 n. 73  
 Van Henten, J.W. 62 n. 9  
 Van Kooten, G.H. 29 n. 40; 215 n. 2;  
 223 nn. 40—41; 229 n. 53  
 Van Raalte, M. 33 nn. 55 and 58;
- 57 n. 160  
 Van Roon, A. 200 n. 82; 228 n. 49  
 Van Winden, J.C.M. 18 n. 16  
 Vermes, G. 28 n. 39; 61 n. 7;  
 90 nn. 60—61; 92 n. 63; 95 n. 67;  
 97 nn. 71—72  
 Vernant, J.-P. 131 n. 38  
 Vleugels, G.A.M. 3; 148; 215 n. 1; 222;  
 223
- Wagenführer, M.-A. 3; 54; 147—148;  
 215; 220—222; 223  
 Walter, N. 165 n. 36  
 Wambacq, B.N. 97—98 n. 73  
 Weiß, H.-F. 126 n. 29  
 Weiß, J. 216 n. 9  
 West, M.L. 37 n. 70; 119 n. 9  
 Wettstein, J.J. 53 n. 144  
 Whittaker, J. 49 n. 121  
 Winger, M. 75—76 n. 41  
 Wolter, M. 54
- Zobel, H.-J. 97 n. 73; 98

### 3 Index of Subjects and Selected Ancient Names

- Adam 85  
 —stars/heavenly bodies 15—16;  
 27—30; 35; 38; 39; 41; 47; 49—50;  
 63; 97; 119—146; 157; 176—177;  
 180  
 —thrones 23; 121—122
- Anaxagoras  
 —‘all in everything’ 104—107;  
 157—158
- Angels and/or demons 95—97; 100;  
 134 n. 43; 139—146; 167—168;  
 176; 191—192  
 —worship of angels/demons 15—16;  
 136; 139—146; 208
- Aristeas  
 —*Letter of Aristeas and Josephus’*  
*Antiquities* 228—229
- Astronomy/astrology 27—30; 73—74  
 —depth 96; 100; 180—182  
 —dominions 23; 121—122  
 —height 96; 100; 180—182  
 —planets 28—30; 41—43; 47—51;  
 122; 144; 176—177; 181; 191—192
- Baptism 14; 112; 146
- Body  
 —centrality of the concept in *Col* 13—  
 16; 57; 204—205  
 —see: Cosmos, body of the cosmos  
 —see: Church, body of the church
- Calendar 15; 27—30; 68; 71—72; 136;  
 138—146
- Christ  
 —ascension 166; 180; 185—186; 212  
 —body, see: ‘Church’ or ‘Cosmos’  
 —Christ as Demiurge 125—126;  
 207—208

- Christ and/as the heavenly eschatological agent or the son of man 89—95; 99; 111; 131; 206; 209
- death 13—14; 78; 113; 142; 167
- descent into Hades 185 n. 70
- eschatological reign 79—109
- firstborn of all creation 25; 112—113; 119; 153; 167
- firstborn from the dead 24—25; 112; 119; 153
- headship over cosmic entities 13—16; 19; 56—57; 129; 145; 150—152; 152; 157; 167—168; 186—187; 187—190
- incarnation 25—26; 59; 64—65; 69; 77—78; 142; 185 n. 70
- resurrection 13; 24—26; 80; 84—87; 112; 157; 186; 206
- Spirit 79
- Christology
  - cosmic Christology 1; 4—5; 111; 149; 172; 179; 202—203; 212; 213
- Church
  - body of the church 10; 26—27; 53—56; 112; 116—117; 119; 168; 184; 187—190; 204
  - church and cosmos 156—158; 166; 168; 171; 172—174; 175—179; 183; 185—190; 191—193; 203; 211—213
  - household of God 168—170
  - terminology 7; 26 n. 37
- Colossae 1—2; 136—137; 195—196
- Colossians, Letter to the*
  - date 2; 108; 208—209
  - dependence on *Philemon* 137
  - relationship with *Eph* 1; 9
  - structure 110; 223
- Cosmology
  - christological cosmology 1
  - cosmology and theology 17; 205
  - Graeco-Roman cosmology 3; 5; 213
  - optimistic cosmology 164—165; 192; 212—213
  - Platonic/Middle Platonist cosmology 3—4; 39—58; 123—125; 125—126; 130—135; 143; 144—146; 207—208
  - prepositional metaphysics: in, through, for 17—18; 21—22; 23; 26; 112; 122—125; 207
  - Pre-Socratic cosmology 42—43 n. 92
  - Stoic cosmology 4; 17—42; 53—58; 107; 123—125; 158; 169—179
- Cosmos
  - as an animate being 52; 160; 175; 176
  - body of the cosmos 9—10; 15; 17—58; 110—111; 113—114; 119; 125; 126—127; 129; 135; 144—146; 153—154; 163; 167; 187—190; 202—203; 204—205; 205; 207—209; 209; 212
  - bonds holding together the cosmos 30—58; 188—189; 208
  - coherence and stability 18—24; 27; 30—31; 35—36; 41; 44; 48—49; 51—52; 106—109; 111; 145; 158; 188; 205; 207
  - commanding faculty 18—19; 22; 24; 27; 107; 158
  - conflagration 19—20; 22; 101; 107; 158; 164
  - cosmic city 169—170; 175—179; 211; 213
  - cosmic dimensions 179—183
  - cosmic plenitude 160—161 n. 26
  - cosmic rulers 190 n. 74; 191—192
  - cosmic wisdom 11—12; 22; 126; 135—136; 137—138; 171—175; 183; 186; 190; 192
  - cosmos and religious laws 69; 70—78; 141—142; 206
  - cosmos and sin 166—168
  - deification of the cosmos 65—66, 68
  - Demiurge 5; 51—52; 125—126; 132—133; 207—208
  - dissolution and death 60—61; 83; 85; 102—103
  - elements of the cosmos 1; 17; 19—22; 25; 37—38; 40; 44; 47; 48; 49; 50—51; 59—70; 70—79; 100—103;

129—130; 131—132; 143; 145—146; 157; 167; 192; 205—206  
 —end of the cosmos 19—20; 88—89; 103—104; 107—108  
 —ethics 62—63; 167—168  
 —evil cosmic powers 166—168  
 —filling the cosmos 126—127; 157; 159—166; 177; 185—186; 188—190; 203; 210—211  
 —Logos 45—46; 124; 126  
 —matter 47; 48; 51—52; 66; 122—125; 132—133  
 —microcosmos and macrocosmos 62—65; 73—74; 129  
 —principles, powers, forces *passim*, but esp. 88—89; 95—99; 100—103  
 —recapitulation 150—152; 172; 186—187; 210  
 —reconstitution 22; 107; 113—114; 119—120; 127—128; 129—135; 158  
 —strife (and peace) 74; 127—128; 129—134  
 —soul of the cosmos 18; 43—44; 47; 48; 49—50; 132—133  
 —theology of process 152; 156; 164—165; 189—190; 203; 210—211

Demons, see: angels

Dietary regulations 15; 136; 138—146

Empedocles 130—132

*Ephesians, Letter to the*

—authorising its interpretation of *Col* 173—174; 196  
 —conflation (literary technique) 155—156 n. 14; 227—228  
 —date 2—3  
 —dependence (including literary dependence) on *Col* 1—3; 9—10; 147—149; 155—156 n. 14; 193 n. 77; 203; 216—222; 224—229  
 —dependence on Paul's authentic letters 149—150; 216—221; 226; 229—232  
 —dependence on *I Cor* 156—158; 164—165; 185; 210; 230

—dependence on the Septuagint 232—234  
 —divergence from *Col* 187—190; 202—203; 212  
 —imposing the meaning of *Eph* on *Col* 10; 55—56  
 —as the *Letter to the Laodiceans* 195—203; 213  
 —posteriority of *Eph* 155—156 n. 14; 193 n. 77; 194  
 —reasons for *Eph* 3; 9—10; 147—149; 169; 202—203; 236  
 —re-Paulinizing tendencies 165—166; 209—210  
 —structure 148; 210; 223—224

Ephesus 2; 149

Eschatology 19—20; 30 n. 46; 79—109

—Paul's imminent eschatology 103—108; 146; 165—166; 208—209; 211  
 —*Col*'s eschatology of individual death and afterlife 154; 167; 209  
 —*Eph*'s future eschatology 151 n. 10; 152; 165—166; 209—211

Gnosticism 5; 132—133; 192—193

God

—Demiurge (Creator) *passim*, but esp. 5; 51—52; 125—126; 132—133; 207—208  
 —God being all in everything 107; 158  
 —God's dominion over the cosmos 95—99  
 —ideas as the thoughts of God 124  
 —identification with the vicissitudes of the cosmos 164  
 —knowing God by contemplating the cosmos 181—182  
 —monotheism 145  
 —panentheism 189—190  
 —pantheism 162

Gods 65

—Aphrodite 4; 35; 130—131; 133—135; 145; 208  
 —Atropos 48—49  
 —Clotho 48—49  
 —Demeter 65



- Eros 4; 130—131; 133—135; 145; 208
- Hephaestus 65
- Hera 65
- Isis 157
- Jupiter 38
- Kore 65
- Lachesis 48—49
- Osiris 4; 131—135; 145; 208
- Pluto 65
- Poseidon 65
- Saturn 38—39
- worship of gods 65—66
- Zeus 35
  
- Hierapolis 35; 50; 137; 185 n. 70
  
- Hymns and epideictic rhetoric 118—119
  
- Initiations 141—145; 157
  
- Laodicea 2; 137; 149; 171; 195
  - the *Letter to the Laodiceans* 194; 195—203; 213
  
- Moses 46; 76
  
- Politics
  - political activities of the heavenly eschatological agent, but depoliticized in Paul's understanding 89—95; 99—103; 206
  - political vocabulary depoliticized and applied to the cosmos in the Stoa 177—178
  - removal of ethnic divisions 78; 169—170; 172; 177; 178
  
- Pseudepigraphy 7; 9; 136—137; 201; 202—203
  
- Sabbath 15; 27; 136; 138—139
  
- Soteriology 4; 14; 77—78; 113—114; 119—120; 154
  
- Synopses 3; 147—148; 215—237
  - layout, introduction, and key 235—237
  - parallelism (definition) 234—235
  - primary and supplementary parallels 224—226
  
- Thales of Miletus
  - 'all things are full of gods' 160—162; 164; 175
  
- Tychicus 193—194; 196—197; 199—201

# Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

## Alphabetical Index of the First and Second Series

- Ådna, Jostein:** Jesu Stellung zum Tempel. 2000. *Volume II/119.*
- Ådna, Jostein and Kvalbein, Hans (Ed.):** The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles. 2000. *Volume 127.*
- Alkier, Stefan:** Wunder und Wirklichkeit in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus. 2001. *Volume 134.*
- Anderson, Paul N.:** The Christology of the Fourth Gospel. 1996. *Volume II/78.*
- Appold, Mark L.:** The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel. 1976. *Volume II/1.*
- Arnold, Clinton E.:** The Colossian Syncretism. 1995. *Volume II/77.*
- Ascough, Richard S.:** Paul's Macedonian Associations. 2003. *Volume II/161.*
- Asiedu-Peprah, Martin:** Johannine Sabbath Conflicts As Juridical Controversy. 2001. *Volume II/132.*
- Avemarie, Friedrich:** Die Taufferzählungen der Apostelgeschichte. 2002. *Volume 139.*
- Avemarie, Friedrich and Hermann Lichtenberger (Ed.):** Auferstehung – Resurrection. 2001. *Volume 135.*
- Avemarie, Friedrich and Hermann Lichtenberger (Ed.):** Bund und Tora. 1996. *Volume 92.*
- Bachmann, Michael:** Sünder oder Übertreter. 1992. *Volume 59.*
- Back, Frances:** Verwandlung durch Offenbarung bei Paulus. 2002. *Volume II/153.*
- Baker, William R.:** Personal Speech-Ethics in the Epistle of James. 1995. *Volume II/68.*
- Bakke, Odd Magne:** 'Concord and Peace'. 2001. *Volume II/143.*
- Balla, Peter:** Challenges to New Testament Theology. 1997. *Volume II/95.*
- *The Child-Parent Relationship in the New Testament and its Environment.* 2003. *Volume 155.*
- Bammel, Ernst:** Judaica. Volume I 1986. *Volume 37.*
- Volume II 1997. *Volume 91.*
- Bash, Anthony:** Ambassadors for Christ. 1997. *Volume II/92.*
- Bauernfeind, Otto:** Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte. 1980. *Volume 22.*
- Baum, Armin Daniel:** Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum. 2001. *Volume II/138.*
- Bayer, Hans Friedrich:** Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection. 1986. *Volume II/20.*
- Becker, Michael:** Wunder und Wundertäter im früh-rabbinischen Judentum. 2002. *Volume II/144.*
- Bell, Richard H.:** Provoked to Jealousy. 1994. *Volume II/63.*
- No One Seeks for God. 1998. *Volume 106.*
- Bennema, Cornelis:** The Power of Saving Wisdom. 2002. *Volume II/148.*
- Bergman, Jan:** see *Kieffer, René*
- Bergmeier, Roland:** Das Gesetz im Römerbrief und andere Studien zum Neuen Testament. 2000. *Volume 121.*
- Betz, Otto:** Jesus, der Messias Israels. 1987. *Volume 42.*
- Jesus, der Herr der Kirche. 1990. *Volume 52.*
- Beyschlag, Karlmann:** Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis. 1974. *Volume 16.*
- Bittner, Wolfgang J.:** Jesu Zeichen im Johannes-evangelium. 1987. *Volume II/26.*
- Bjerkelund, Carl J.:** Tauta Egeneto. 1987. *Volume 40.*
- Blackburn, Barry Lee:** Theios Anēr and the Markan Miracle Traditions. 1991. *Volume II/40.*
- Bock, Darrell L.:** Blasphemy and Exaltation in Judaism and the Final Examination of Jesus. 1998. *Volume II/106.*
- Bockmuehl, Markus N.A.:** Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity. 1990. *Volume II/36.*
- Bøe, Sverre:** Gog and Magog. 2001. *Volume II/135.*
- Böhlig, Alexander:** Gnosis und Synkretismus. Teil I 1989. *Volume 47* – Teil 2 1989. *Volume 48.*
- Böhm, Martina:** Samaritanen und die Samaritaner bei Lukas. 1999. *Volume II/111.*
- Böttrich, Christfried:** Weltweisheit – Menschheitsethik – Urkult. 1992. *Volume II/50.*
- Bolyki, János:** Jesu Tischgemeinschaften. 1997. *Volume II/96.*

- Bosman, Philip*: Conscience in Philo and Paul. 2003. *Volume II/166*.
- Brocke, Christoph vom*: Thessaloniker – Stadt des Kassander und Gemeinde des Paulus. 2001. *Volume II/125*.
- Brunson, Andrew*: Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John. 2003. *Volume II/158*.
- Büchli, Jörg*: Der Poimandres – ein paganisiertes Evangelium. 1987. *Volume II/27*.
- Bühner, Jan A.*: Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium. 1977. *Volume II/2*.
- Burchard, Christoph*: Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth. 1965. *Volume 8*.
- Studien zur Theologie, Sprache und Umwelt des Neuen Testaments. Ed. von D. Sänger. 1998. *Volume 107*.
- Burnett, Richard*: Karl Barth's Theological Exegesis. 2001. *Volume II/145*.
- Byron, John*: Slavery Metaphors in Early Judaism and Pauline Christianity. 2003. *Volume II/162*.
- Byrskog, Samuel*: Story as History – History as Story. 2000. *Volume 123*.
- Cancik, Hubert* (Ed.): Markus-Philologie. 1984. *Volume 33*.
- Capes, David B.*: Old Testament Yaweh Texts in Paul's Christology. 1992. *Volume II/47*.
- Caragounis, Chrys C.*: The Son of Man. 1986. *Volume 38*.
- see *Fridrichsen, Anton*.
- Carleton Paget, James*: The Epistle of Barnabas. 1994. *Volume II/64*.
- Carson, D.A., O'Brien, Peter T. and Mark Seifrid* (Ed.): Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism. Volume 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism. *Volume II/140*.
- Ciampa, Roy E.*: The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2. 1998. *Volume II/102*.
- Classen, Carl Joachim*: Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament. 2000. *Volume 128*.
- Colpe, Carsten*: Iranier – Aramäer – Hebräer – Hellenen. 2003. *Volume 154*.
- Crump, David*: Jesus the Intercessor. 1992. *Volume II/49*.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup*: Studies in Ephesians. 2000. *Volume 131*.
- Deines, Roland*: Jüdische Steingefäße und pharisäische Frömmigkeit. 1993. *Volume II/52*.
- Die Pharisäer. 1997. *Volume 101*.
- Dettwiler, Andreas and Jean Zumstein* (Ed.): Kreuzestheologie im Neuen Testament. 2002. *Volume 151*.
- Dickson, John P.*: Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and in the Pauline Communities. 2003. *Volume II/159*.
- Dietzfelbinger, Christian*: Der Abschied des Kommenden. 1997. *Volume 95*.
- Dobbeler, Axel von*: Glaube als Teilhabe. 1987. *Volume II/22*.
- Du Toit, David S.*: Theios Anthropos. 1997. *Volume II/91*.
- Dunn, James D.G.* (Ed.): Jews and Christians. 1992. *Volume 66*.
- Paul and the Mosaic Law. 1996. *Volume 89*.
- Dunn, James D.G., Hans Klein, Ulrich Luz and Vasilé Mihoc* (Ed.): Auslegung der Bibel in orthodoxer und westlicher Perspektive. 2000. *Volume 130*.
- Ebertz, Michael N.*: Das Charisma des Gekreuzigten. 1987. *Volume 45*.
- Eckstein, Hans-Joachim*: Der Begriff Syneidesis bei Paulus. 1983. *Volume II/10*.
- Verheißung und Gesetz. 1996. *Volume 86*.
- Ego, Beate*: Im Himmel wie auf Erden. 1989. *Volume II/34*.
- Ego, Beate and Lange, Armin with Pilhofer, Peter* (Ed.): Gemeinde ohne Tempel – Community without Temple. 1999. *Volume 118*.
- Eisen, Ute E.*: see *Paulsen, Henning*.
- Ellis, E. Earle*: Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity. 1978. *Volume 18*.
- The Old Testament in Early Christianity. 1991. *Volume 54*.
- Endo, Masanobu*: Creation and Christology. 2002. *Volume 149*.
- Ennulat, Andreas*: Die 'Minor Agreements'. 1994. *Volume II/62*.
- Ensor, Peter W.*: Jesus and His 'Works'. 1996. *Volume II/85*.
- Eskola, Timo*: Messiah and the Throne. 2001. *Volume II/142*.
- Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology. 1998. *Volume II/100*.
- Fatehi, Mehrdad*: The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul. 2000. *Volume II/128*.
- Feldmeier, Reinhard*: Die Krisis des Gottessohnes. 1987. *Volume II/21*.
- Die Christen als Fremde. 1992. *Volume 64*.
- Feldmeier, Reinhard and Ulrich Heckel* (Ed.): Die Heiden. 1994. *Volume 70*.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T.*: Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology. 1997. *Volume II/94*.
- Förster, Niclas*: Marcus Magus. 1999. *Volume 114*.
- Forbes, Christopher Brian*: Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment. 1995. *Volume II/75*.

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

- Fornberg, Tor*: see *Fridrichsen, Anton*.
- Fossum, Jarl E.*: The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. 1985. *Volume 36*.
- Fotopoulos, John*: Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth. 2003. *Volume II/151*.
- Frenschkowski, Marco*: Offenbarung und Epiphanie. Volume 1 1995. *Volume II/79* – Volume 2 1997. *Volume II/80*.
- Frey, Jörg*: Eugen Drewermann und die biblische Exegese. 1995. *Volume II/71*.
- Die johanneische Eschatologie. Volume I. 1997. *Volume 96*. – Volume II. 1998. *Volume 110*.
- Volume III. 2000. *Volume 117*.
- Freyne, Sean*: Galilee and Gospel. 2000. *Volume 125*.
- Fridrichsen, Anton*: Exegetical Writings. Edited by C.C. Caragounis and T. Fornberg. 1994. *Volume 76*.
- Garlington, Don B.*: 'The Obedience of Faith'. 1991. *Volume II/38*.
- Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance. 1994. *Volume 79*.
- Garnet, Paul*: Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls. 1977. *Volume II/3*.
- Gese, Michael*: Das Vermächtnis des Apostels. 1997. *Volume II/99*.
- Gheorghita, Radu*: The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews. 2003. *Volume II/160*.
- Gräbe, Petrus J.*: The Power of God in Paul's Letters. 2000. *Volume II/123*.
- Gräber, Erich*: Der Alte Bund im Neuen. 1985. *Volume 35*.
- Forschungen zur Apostelgeschichte. 2001. *Volume 137*.
- Green, Joel B.*: The Death of Jesus. 1988. *Volume II/33*.
- Gregory, Anthony*: The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus. 2003. *Volume II/169*.
- Gundry Volf, Judith M.*: Paul and Perseverance. 1990. *Volume II/37*.
- Hafemann, Scott J.*: Suffering and the Spirit. 1986. *Volume II/19*.
- Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel. 1995. *Volume 81*.
- Hahn, Johannes (Ed.)*: Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels. 2002. *Volume 147*.
- Hannah, Darrel D.*: Michael and Christ. 1999. *Volume II/109*.
- Hamid-Khani, Saeed*: Revelation and Concealment of Christ. 2000. *Volume II/120*.
- Hartman, Lars*: Text-Centered New Testament Studies. Ed. von D. Hellholm. 1997. *Volume 102*.
- Hartog, Paul*: Polycarp and the New Testament. 2001. *Volume II/134*.
- Heckel, Theo K.*: Der Innere Mensch. 1993. *Volume II/53*.
- Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium. 1999. *Volume 120*.
- Heckel, Ulrich*: Kraft in Schwachheit. 1993. *Volume II/56*.
- Der Segen im Neuen Testament. 2002. *Volume 150*.
- see *Feldmeier, Reinhard*.
- see *Hengel, Martin*.
- Heiligenthal, Roman*: Werke als Zeichen. 1983. *Volume II/9*.
- Hellholm, D.*: see *Hartman, Lars*.
- Hemer, Colin J.*: The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History. 1989. *Volume 49*.
- Hengel, Martin*: Judentum und Hellenismus. 1969, <sup>3</sup>1988. *Volume 10*.
- Die johanneische Frage. 1993. *Volume 67*.
- Judaica et Hellenistica.
- Kleine Schriften I. 1996. *Volume 90*.
- Judaica, Hellenistica et Christiana.
- Kleine Schriften II. 1999. *Volume 109*.
- Paulus und Jakobus.
- Kleine Schriften III. 2002. *Volume 141*.
- Hengel, Martin and Ulrich Heckel (Ed.)*: Paulus und das antike Judentum. 1991. *Volume 58*.
- Hengel, Martin and Hermut Löhr (Ed.)*: Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum. 1994. *Volume 73*.
- Hengel, Martin and Anna Maria Schwemer*: Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien. 1998. *Volume 108*.
- Der messianische Anspruch Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie. 2001. *Volume 138*.
- Hengel, Martin and Anna Maria Schwemer (Ed.)*: Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult. 1991. *Volume 55*.
- Die Septuaginta. 1994. *Volume 72*.
- Hengel, Martin; Siegfried Mittmann and Anna Maria Schwemer (Ed.)*: La Cité de Dieu / Die Stadt Gottes. 2000. *Volume 129*.
- Herrenbrück, Fritz*: Jesus und die Zöllner. 1990. *Volume II/41*.
- Herzer, Jens*: Paulus oder Petrus? 1998. *Volume 103*.
- Hoegen-Rohls, Christina*: Der nachösterliche Johannes. 1996. *Volume II/84*.
- Hofius, Otfried*: Katapausis. 1970. *Volume 11*.
- Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes. 1972. *Volume 14*.
- Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6-11. 1976, <sup>2</sup>1991. *Volume 17*.
- Paulusstudien. 1989, <sup>2</sup>1994. *Volume 51*.
- Neutestamentliche Studien. 2000. *Volume 132*.

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*

- Paulusstudien II. 2002. *Volume 143*.
- Hofius, Otfried* and *Hans-Christian Kammler*: Johannesstudien. 1996. *Volume 88*.
- Holtz, Traugott*: Geschichte und Theologie des Urchristentums. 1991. *Volume 57*.
- Hommel, Hildebrecht*: Sebasmata. *Volume 1* 1983. *Volume 31* – *Volume 2* 1984. *Volume 32*.
- Hvalvik, Reidar*: The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant. 1996. *Volume II/82*.
- Joubert, Stephan*: Paul as Benefactor. 2000. *Volume II/124*.
- Jungbauer, Harry*: „Ehre Vater und Mutter“. 2002. *Volume II/146*.
- Kähler, Christoph*: Jesu Gleichnisse als Poesie und Therapie. 1995. *Volume 78*.
- Kamleh, Ehrhard*: Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament. 1964. *Volume 7*.
- Kammler, Hans-Christian*: Christologie und Eschatologie. 2000. *Volume 126*.
- Kreuz und Weisheit. 2003. *Volume 159*.
- see *Hofius, Otfried*.
- Kelhoffer, James A.*: Miracle and Mission. 1999. *Volume II/112*.
- Kieffer, René* and *Jan Bergman (Ed.)*: La Main de Dieu / Die Hand Gottes. 1997. *Volume 94*.
- Kim, Seyoon*: The Origin of Paul's Gospel. 1981, <sup>2</sup>1984. *Volume II/4*.
- “The ‘Son of Man’” as the Son of God. 1983. *Volume 30*.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef*: Religion und Gesellschaft im frühen Christentum. 2003. *Volume 152*.
- Klein, Hans*: see *Dunn, James D.G.*
- Kleinknecht, Karl Th.*: Der leidende Gerechtfertigte. 1984, <sup>2</sup>1988. *Volume II/13*.
- Klinghardt, Matthias*: Gesetz und Volk Gottes. 1988. *Volume II/32*.
- Köhler, Wolf-Dietrich*: Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus. 1987. *Volume II/24*.
- Kooten, George H. van*: Cosmic Christology in Paul and the Pauline School. 2003. *Volume II/171*.
- Korn, Manfred*: Die Geschichte Jesu in veränderter Zeit. 1993. *Volume II/51*.
- Koskenniemi, Erkki*: Apollonios von Tyana in der neutestamentlichen Exegese. 1994. *Volume II/61*.
- Kraus, Thomas J.*: Sprache, Stil und historischer Ort des zweiten Petrusbriefes. 2001. *Volume II/136*.
- Kraus, Wolfgang*: Das Volk Gottes. 1996. *Volume 85*.
- see *Walter, Nikolaus*.
- Kreplin, Matthias*: Das Selbstverständnis Jesu. 2001. *Volume II/141*.
- Kuhn, Karl G.*: Achtzehngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim. 1950. *Volume 1*.
- Kvalbein, Hans*: see *Ådna, Jostein*.
- Laansma, Jon*: I Will Give You Rest. 1997. *Volume II/98*.
- Labahn, Michael*: Offenbarung in Zeichen und Wort. 2000. *Volume II/117*.
- Lambers-Petry, Doris*: see *Tomson, Peter J.*
- Lange, Armin*: see *Ego, Beate*.
- Lampe, Peter*: Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten. 1987, <sup>2</sup>1989. *Volume II/18*.
- Landmesser, Christof*: Wahrheit als Grundbegriff neutestamentlicher Wissenschaft. 1999. *Volume 113*.
- Jüngerberufung und Zuwendung zu Gott. 2000. *Volume 133*.
- Lau, Andrew*: Manifest in Flesh. 1996. *Volume II/86*.
- Lawrence, Louise*: An Ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew. 2003. *Volume II/165*.
- Lee, Pilchan*: The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation. 2000. *Volume II/129*.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann*: see *Avemarie, Friedrich*.
- Lieu, Samuel N. C.*: Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China. <sup>2</sup>1992. *Volume 63*.
- Loader, William R.G.*: Jesus' Attitude Towards the Law. 1997. *Volume II/97*.
- Löhr, Gebhard*: Verherrlichung Gottes durch Philosophie. 1997. *Volume 97*.
- Löhr, Hermut*: Studien zum frühchristlichen und frühjüdischen Gebet. 2003. *Volume 160*.
- : see *Hengel, Martin*.
- Löhr, Winrich Alfried*: Basilides und seine Schule. 1995. *Volume 83*.
- Luomanen, Petri*: Entering the Kingdom of Heaven. 1998. *Volume II/101*.
- Luz, Ulrich*: see *Dunn, James D.G.*
- Maier, Gerhard*: Mensch und freier Wille. 1971. *Volume 12*.
- Die Johannesoffenbarung und die Kirche. 1981. *Volume 25*.
- Markschies, Christoph*: Valentinus Gnosticus? 1992. *Volume 65*.
- Marshall, Peter*: Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians. 1987. *Volume II/23*.
- Mayer, Annemarie*: Sprache der Einheit im Epheserbrief und in der Ökumene. 2002. *Volume II/150*.
- McDonough, Sean M.*: YHWH at Patmos: Rev. 1:4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting. 1999. *Volume II/107*.

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

- McGlynn, Moyna: Divine Judgement and Divine Benevolence in the Book of Wisdom. 2001. *Volume II/139*.
- Meade, David G.: Pseudonymity and Canon. 1986. *Volume 39*.
- Meadors, Edward P.: Jesus the Messianic Herald of Salvation. 1995. *Volume II/72*.
- Meißner, Stefan: Die Heimholung des Ketzers. 1996. *Volume II/87*.
- Mell, Ulrich: Die „anderen“ Winzer. 1994. *Volume 77*.
- Mengel, Berthold: Studien zum Philipperbrief. 1982. *Volume II/8*.
- Merkel, Helmut: Die Widersprüche zwischen den Evangelien. 1971. *Volume 13*.
- Merklein, Helmut: Studien zu Jesus und Paulus. Volume 1 1987. *Volume 43*. – Volume 2 1998. *Volume 105*.
- Metzdorf, Christina: Die Tempelaktion Jesu. 2003. *Volume II/168*.
- Metzler, Karin: Der griechische Begriff des Verzeihens. 1991. *Volume II/44*.
- Metzner, Rainer: Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums im 1. Petrusbrief. 1995. *Volume II/74*.
- Das Verständnis der Sünde im Johannesevangelium. 2000. *Volume 122*.
- Mihoc, Vasile: see Dunn, James D.G..
- Mineshige, Kiyoshi: Besitzverzicht und Almosen bei Lukas. 2003. *Volume II/163*.
- Mittmann, Siegfried: see Hengel, Martin.
- Mittmann-Richert, Ulrike: Magnifikat und Benediktus. 1996. *Volume II/90*.
- Mußner, Franz: Jesus von Nazareth im Umfeld Israels und der Urkirche. Ed. von M. Theobald. 1998. *Volume 111*.
- Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm: Gesetz und Paränese. 1987. *Volume II/28*.
- Heidenapostel aus Israel. 1992. *Volume 62*.
- Nielsen, Anders E.: “Until it is Fullfilled”. 2000. *Volume II/126*.
- Nissen, Andreas: Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum. 1974. *Volume 15*.
- Noack, Christian: Gottesbewußtsein. 2000. *Volume II/116*.
- Noormann, Rolf: Irenäus als Paulusinterpret. 1994. *Volume II/66*.
- Novakovic, Lidija: Messiah, the Healer of the Sick. 2003. *Volume II/170*.
- Obermann, Andreas: Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium. 1996. *Volume II/83*.
- Öhler, Markus: Barnabas. 2003. *Volume 156*.
- Okure, Teresa: The Johannine Approach to Mission. 1988. *Volume II/31*.
- Oropeza, B. J.: Paul and Apostasy. 2000. *Volume II/115*.
- Ostmeyer, Karl-Heinrich: Taufe und Typos. 2000. *Volume II/118*.
- Paulsen, Henning: Studien zur Literatur und Geschichte des frühen Christentums. Ed. von Ute E. Eisen. 1997. *Volume 99*.
- Pao, David W.: Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus. 2000. *Volume II/130*.
- Park, Eung Chun: The Mission Discourse in Matthew’s Interpretation. 1995. *Volume II/81*.
- Park, Joseph S.: Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions. 2000. *Volume II/121*.
- Pate, C. Marvin: The Reverse of the Curse. 2000. *Volume II/114*.
- Peres, Imre: Griechische Grabinschriften und neutestamentliche Eschatologie. 2003. *Volume 157*.
- Philonenko, Marc (Ed.): Le Trône de Dieu. 1993. *Volume 69*.
- Pilhofer, Peter: Presbyteron Kreiton. 1990. *Volume II/39*.
- Philippi. Volume 1 1995. *Volume 87*. – Volume 2 2000. *Volume 119*.
- Die frühen Christen und ihre Welt. 2002. *Volume 145*.
- see Ego, Beate.
- Pöhlmann, Wolfgang: Der Verlorene Sohn und das Haus. 1993. *Volume 68*.
- Pokorný, Petr and Josef B. Souček: Bibelauslegung als Theologie. 1997. *Volume 100*.
- Pokorný, Petr and Jan Roskovec (Ed.): Philosophical Hermeneutics and Biblical Exegesis. 2002. *Volume 153*.
- Porter, Stanley E.: The Paul of Acts. 1999. *Volume 115*.
- Prieur, Alexander: Die Verkündigung der Gottesherrschaft. 1996. *Volume II/89*.
- Probst, Hermann: Paulus und der Brief. 1991. *Volume II/45*.
- Räsänen, Heikki: Paul and the Law. 1983, <sup>2</sup>1987. *Volume 29*.
- Rehkopf, Friedrich: Die lukanische Sonderquelle. 1959. *Volume 5*.
- Rein, Matthias: Die Heilung des Blindgeborenen (Joh 9). 1995. *Volume II/73*.
- Reinmuth, Eckart: Pseudo-Philo und Lukas. 1994. *Volume 74*.
- Reiser, Marius: Syntax und Stil des Markusevangeliums. 1984. *Volume II/11*.
- Richards, E. Randolph: The Secretary in the Letters of Paul. 1991. *Volume II/42*.
- Riesner, Rainer: Jesus als Lehrer. 1981, <sup>3</sup>1988. *Volume II/7*.

- Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus. 1994. *Volume 71*.
- Rissi, Mathias: Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs. 1987. *Volume 41*.
- Roskovec, Jan: see Pokorný, Petr.
- Röhser, Günter: Metaphorik und Personifikation der Sünde. 1987. *Volume II/25*.
- Rose, Christian: Die Wolke der Zeugen. 1994. *Volume II/60*.
- Rüegger, Hans-Ulrich: Verstehen, was Markus erzählt. 2002. *Volume II/155*.
- Rüger, Hans Peter: Die Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza. 1991. *Volume 53*.
- Sänger, Dieter: Antikes Judentum und die Mysterien. 1980. *Volume III/5*.
- Die Verkündigung des Gekreuzigten und Israel. 1994. *Volume 75*.
- see Burchard, Christoph
- Salzmann, Jorg Christian: Lehren und Ermahnen. 1994. *Volume II/59*.
- Sandnes, Karl Olav: Paul – One of the Prophets? 1991. *Volume II/43*.
- Sato, Migaku: Q und Prophetie. 1988. *Volume II/29*.
- Schaper, Joachim: Eschatology in the Greek Psalter. 1995. *Volume II/76*.
- Schimanowski, Gottfried: Die himmlische Liturgie in der Apokalypse des Johannes. 2002. *Volume II/154*.
- Weisheit und Messias. 1985. *Volume II/17*.
- Schlichting, Günter: Ein jüdisches Leben Jesu. 1982. *Volume 24*.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J.: Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul. 1985. *Volume II/16*.
- Shutter, William L.: Hermeneutic and Composition in I Peter. 1989. *Volume II/30*.
- Schwartz, Daniel R.: Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity. 1992. *Volume 60*.
- Schwemer, Anna Maria: see Hengel, Martin
- Scott, James M.: Adoption as Sons of God. 1992. *Volume II/48*.
- Paul and the Nations. 1995. *Volume 84*.
- Shum, Shiu-Lun: Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans. 2002. *Volume II/156*.
- Siegert, Folker: Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten. Teil I 1980. *Volume 20* – Teil II 1992. *Volume 61*.
- Nag-Hammadi-Register. 1982. *Volume 26*.
- Argumentation bei Paulus. 1985. *Volume 34*.
- Philon von Alexandrien. 1988. *Volume 46*.
- Simon, Marcel: Le christianisme antique et son contexte religieux I/II. 1981. *Volume 23*.
- Snodgrass, Klyne: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants. 1983. *Volume 27*.
- Söding, Thomas: Das Wort vom Kreuz. 1997. *Volume 93*.
- see Thüsing, Wilhelm.
- Sommer, Urs: Die Passionsgeschichte des Markusevangeliums. 1993. *Volume II/58*.
- Souček, Josef B.: see Pokorný, Petr.
- Spangenberg, Volker: Herrlichkeit des Neuen Bundes. 1993. *Volume II/55*.
- Spanje, T.E. van: Inconsistency in Paul? 1999. *Volume II/110*.
- Speyer, Wolfgang: Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld. Volume I: 1989. *Volume 50*.
- Volume II: 1999. *Volume 116*.
- Stadelmann, Helge: Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter. 1980. *Volume II/6*.
- Stenschke, Christoph W.: Luke's Portrait of Gentiles Prior to Their Coming to Faith. *Volume II/108*.
- Stettler, Christian: Der Kolosserhymnus. 2000. *Volume II/131*.
- Stettler, Hanna: Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe. 1998. *Volume II/105*.
- Strobel, August: Die Stunde der Wahrheit. 1980. *Volume 21*.
- Stroumsa, Guy G.: Barbarian Philosophy. 1999. *Volume 112*.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T.: Angel Veneration and Christology. 1995. *Volume II/70*.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter (Ed.): Das Evangelium und die Evangelien. 1983. *Volume 28*.
- Biblische Theologie und Evangelium. 2002. *Volume 146*.
- Sung, Chong-Hyon: Vergebung der Sünden. 1993. *Volume II/57*.
- Tajra, Harry W.: The Trial of St. Paul. 1989. *Volume II/35*.
- The Martyrdom of St. Paul. 1994. *Volume II/67*.
- Theißen, Gerd: Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums. 1979, <sup>3</sup>1989. *Volume 19*.
- Theobald, Michael: Studien zum Römerbrief. 2001. *Volume 136*.
- Theobald, Michael: see Mußner, Franz.
- Thornton, Claus-Jürgen: Der Zeuge des Zeugen. 1991. *Volume 56*.
- Thüsing, Wilhelm: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie. Ed. von Thomas Söding. 1995. *Volume 82*.
- Thurén, Lauri: Derhetorizing Paul. 2000. *Volume 124*.
- Tomson, Peter J. and Doris Lambers-Petry (Ed.): The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature. 2003. *Volume 158*.

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*

- Treloar, Geoffrey R.*: Lightfoot the Historian. 1998. *Volume II/103*.
- Tsujii, Manabu*: Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung. 1997. *Volume II/93*
- Twelftree, Graham H.*: Jesus the Exorcist. 1993. *Volume II/54*.
- Urban, Christina*: Das Menschenbild nach dem Johannesevangelium. 2001. *Volume II/137*.
- Visotzky, Burton L.*: Fathers of the World. 1995. *Volume 80*.
- Vollenweider, Samuel*: Horizonte neutestamentlicher Christologie. 2002. *Volume 144*.
- Vos, Johan S.*: Die Kunst der Argumentation bei Paulus. 2002. *Volume 149*.
- Wagener, Ulrike*: Die Ordnung des „Hauses Gottes“. 1994. *Volume II/65*.
- Walker, Donald D.*: Paul's Offer of Leniency (2 Cor 10:1). 2002. *Volume II/152*.
- Walter, Nikolaus*: Praeparatio Evangelica. Ed. von Wolfgang Kraus und Florian Wilk. 1997. *Volume 98*.
- Wander, Bernd*: Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten. 1998. *Volume 104*.
- Watts, Rikki*: Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark. 1997. *Volume II/88*.
- Wedderburn, A.J.M.*: Baptism and Resurrection. 1987. *Volume 44*.
- Wegner, Uwe*: Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum. 1985. *Volume II/14*.
- Weissenrieder, Annette*: Images of Illness in the Gospel of Luke. 2003. *Volume II/164*.
- Welck, Christian*: Erzählte ‚Zeichen‘. 1994. *Volume II/69*.
- Wiarda, Timothy*: Peter in the Gospels. 2000. *Volume II/127*.
- Wilk, Florian*: see *Walter, Nikolaus*.
- Williams, Catrin H.*: I am He. 2000. *Volume II/113*.
- Wilson, Walter T.*: Love without Pretense. 1991. *Volume II/46*.
- Wisdom, Jeffrey*: Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law. 2001. *Volume II/133*.
- Wucherpfennig, Ansgar*: Heracleon Philologus. 2002. *Volume 142*.
- Yeung, Maureen*: Faith in Jesus and Paul. 2002. *Volume II/147*.
- Zimmermann, Alfred E.*: Die urchristlichen Lehrer. 1984, <sup>2</sup>1988. *Volume II/12*.
- Zimmermann, Johannes*: Messianische Texte aus Qumran. 1998. *Volume II/104*.
- Zimmermann, Ruben*: Geschlechtermetaphorik und Gottesverhältnis. 2001. *Volume II/122*.
- Zumstein, Jean*: see *Dettwiler, Andreas*

*For a complete catalogue please write to the publisher  
Mohr Siebeck • P.O. Box 2030 • D-72010 Tübingen/Germany  
Up-to-date information on the internet at [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)*



