

Introduction

OVERVIEW OF PAUL'S LETTER TO THE EPHESIANS

Perhaps no letter in the Pauline corpus takes the reader to such mountain heights of adoration and to such level fields of practicality as the six short chapters of Ephesians do. One might call it a feast for the Christian imagination, for it lays out the gospel with great depth and intellectual texture. Paul¹ reflects on the magnificence, even lavishness, of God's redemptive work established in Christ and continued in the Spirit. Chrysostom remarks how Paul grasped the eternal plan of God, connecting Paul's thought with Christ's own words in Matt 25:34 to the faithful that he will welcome them into the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world.² Paul explores the intricacies of what this kingdom looks like for the church now and in the future, as he fills out the picture of the Triune God who from the beginning has orchestrated this grand movement of salvation. Jerome, likely following Origen, acknowledged the complexity of Paul's thought in describing God's free gift of salvation. Recall, Jerome remarks, that Ephesus in Paul's day had at its center the great temple of Artemis/Diana and the widely practiced magical arts commanding allegiance and attention of all its dwellers and visitors. Paul's letter taught deep theological realities about the powers and principalities against which believers do battle, for the Ephesians were in the thick of the fight.³ Martin Luther, in his theological disagreement with the Roman Catholic Church, argued that Ephesians (4:5) expressed Paul's vision of the church as the one true body of believers united by one heart even though separated physically by thousands of miles.⁴ Luther's

1. Pauline authorship of Ephesians is debated, and a detailed discussion of the matter is found later in this chapter.

2. John Chrysostom *Hom. Eph.* 1.

3. Jerome *Comm. Eph.*, preface, bk. 1.

4. Martin Luther, *Papacy* (1520).

Introduction

comments reflect the general Christian debate about the nature of the church, which has continued through the centuries and relies in large part on Paul's understanding of the church expressed in Ephesians. As these three examples show, Ephesians covers key foundational aspects of the gospel, including Christology, pneumatology, soteriology, eschatology, and ecclesiology. To these we might add the modern questions of authorship and the social roles described in chapter 5. In Ephesians we find much to reflect upon as God's plan of redemption, and our own part in the story, is laid before us. The first chapter of Ephesians presents with rhetorical flourish and fanfare the praise rightly due to the one true God, Father, Son, and Spirit. The stage lights are first focused on God the Father, who chose to redeem the world for his good purposes, including creating a people unto himself in Christ. In chapter 2 the spotlight grows to include more fully the role of Christ Jesus in the plan of salvation, and with chapter 3 the stage is flooded with light, revealing the activities of the Holy Spirit in accomplishing the goals of salvation within the church. The final three chapters direct attention to the church, this new creation based on the work of Christ and empowered by the Spirit for God's glory. Why start with the Trinity? Whatever Paul's reason, it has the effect of reinforcing the amazingly simple, but profound truth that God is the center of the universe. Not my salvation, not my social justice concerns, not my doctrines on ecclesiology or eschatology; God is the center, the beginning and the end. The tremendous idea—Paul trips over his words to make sense of it—is that the majestic God has determined in our time to make known his salvation plan in Christ. Through the Spirit, he set in motion the salvation plan for a new creation and the full realization of the kingdom of God. If we start with Ephesians in our quest to understand the gospel as Paul outlines it (instead of starting with Romans, for example, although the two letters share quite a bit in common), we might register aspects of Paul's message that have been muffled or ignored. For example, Ephesians stresses God's grace in the forgiveness of sins for the purpose of building a new community, a holy temple dedicated to God's glory. God acted in Christ through the Spirit to make a new creation, which includes personal forgiveness of sins *so that* a people (Jew and Gentile, slave and free, male and female) might be made into a new household of God for his glory.

Though difficult to reduce such a complex argument as we find in Ephesians into a single sentence, a possible statement might be that

through Christ, God the Father has redeemed humanity from sin and has created a new people empowered by the Spirit. The following outline highlights Paul's major thought units:

I. Introduction

A. 1:1–2: Paul's Greetings

II. Redemption in Christ makes the Two One

A. 1:3–14: God's Work of Salvation

B. 1:15–23: Christ's Rule over All Things

C. 2:1–10: Saved by Grace Alone

D. 2:11–22: Christ Our Peace Builds His Church

III. Mystery of Salvation Seen in Paul's Imprisonment

A. 3:1–13: God's Salvation Plan Revealed

B. 3:14–21: Paul's Prayer for Believers' Wisdom and Fullness

IV. Exhortation to Walk Worthy of Our Calling

A. 4:1–16: One Spirit, One Lord, One God and Father, One Body

B. 4:17–24: Put on the New Person

C. 4:25–32: Speak Truth in Love

D. 5:1–14: Imitate God, Walk in Love

E. 5:15–21: Be Filled with the Spirit

F. 5:22—6:9: Spirit-Filled Relationships in Christ

G. 6:10–20: Put on the Armor of God

V. Closing Remarks

A. 6:21–24: Paul's Final Words of Grace and Peace

MODERN INTERPRETIVE QUESTIONS

Since the 1960s, a most heated discussion has enveloped the interpretation of Paul. Two camps emerged, known, with a singular lack of creativity, as the old perspective and the new perspective. The "old" way of reading Paul is to stress his emphasis on forgiveness of sins and justification of the individual sinner through Christ's work on the cross and his resurrection. The new perspective challenges that Paul was quite interested in the relationship between Jews and Gentiles and how the work of Christ af-

Introduction

fects each community as well as the newly forming church. In Ephesians, we have both of these convictions represented as two sides of the same coin. The redemptive work of Christ takes material shape in creating a new people of God made up of Jews and Gentiles. The new community is not a serendipitous result of Christ's resurrection; rather it is the tangible, everyday proof of God's surpassing power to make all things new. The empty tomb evidences Christ's resurrection, and his appearance to his disciples and apostles (including Paul, 1 Cor 9:1-2; 15:8) was a testimony many clung to even in the face of martyrdom. But the ramifications of the resurrection are not limited to the salvation of the human soul, or even to restoring the kingdom to Israel as the disciples wondered aloud to Jesus (Acts 1:6). God's plans are much bigger. They include the whole creation, and the evidence of Jew and Gentile together as equal participants in community is the daily confirmation Paul points to that God is indeed at work in Christ. The Letter to the Ephesians is a six-chapter exposition on the mystery of God's wisdom revealed in this salvation plan.

Ironically, those who reject Pauline authorship of the letter (see a full discussion below) often point to the focused attention the church receives in Ephesians for support of their contentions. But the emphasis on church is a natural and essential aspect of Christ's work on the cross, and so the extensive discussion in Ephesians about the church should not give rise to suspicions that the letter is deutero-Pauline, that is, attributed to Paul but not written under Paul's direct influence. Indeed the church is a necessary part of God's redemptive plan, which is to make all creation new. The church, as the body of Christ (who is its head), is an instrument through which God works to restore his creation, until the final event when God will establish the new heavens and new earth, when Christ hands over the kingdom to the Father (1 Cor 15:28). The church as the body of Christ represents (imperfectly) Christ to the world, and as such it is not a pleasant, though secondary, consequence of God's work of redemption. Instead the church signals, by the empowering Spirit, the gospel to the unbelieving and seeking world. Said another way, the church is best understood, not as a collection of saved individuals or a group pledging particular doctrines (Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant), but as a living organism. By walking in the good works prepared for it by God (Eph 2:10), the church led by Christ, the head, witnesses to God's power and love. Ephesians pushes us toward a healthy vision of the church and away from a purely individualistic understanding of salvation.

AUTHORSHIP OF EPHESIANS

Pauline authorship of Ephesians is contested, with several reasons put forward to suggest Paul did not write the epistle. For some, the language, its terms and grammar, sound too different from the undisputed letters (Romans, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, Philemon) to be written by the same hand. For others, the theology, especially ecclesiology and soteriology, are sufficiently distinct to warrant pause in proclaiming Pauline authorship. Again, the apparent acceptance of Greco-Roman social status quo—the hierarchy of father, wife, children, slaves—speaks against this letter being written by the same author who penned 1 Corinthians. These concerns should not be dismissed lightly; however, they are capable of interpretation in a way that holds to Pauline authorship. Moreover, postulating a deutero-Pauline status for Ephesians does not solve all problems; indeed, it can create new ones, such as demonstrating the relative acceptance of pseudonymous⁵ authorship and pseudepigraphic⁶ work in the ancient world, their acceptance within the early church, and the reason for detailed personal information in Ephesians. In the end, I suggest the balance of the evidence weighs on the side of Pauline authorship, but I invite the readers to examine the evidence below to satisfy themselves on the matter.

Ancient Letter-Writing Practices

The letter itself claims to be from Paul, who states his name and then describes himself as an apostle of Christ Jesus (1:1) and later as a prisoner of Christ Jesus (3:1, see also 4:1, 6:20). Most of the undisputed letters begin with Paul declaring himself an apostle of Christ Jesus, although the formula is not rigidly followed, for in 1 Cor 1:1 he declares he was called as an apostle, while to the Romans he announces himself a slave of Christ Jesus who was called to be an apostle. The opening description of Paul in Ephesians, then, does not present any immediate hint of irregularity

5. This term for our purposes does not include *nom de plume* such as Samuel Clemens' pen name Mark Twain.

6. Pseudepigraphy is a label of a work whose author uses another, usually better known name, while pseudepigrapha refers to a particular set of extra-canonical or post-canonical works. The term pseudonymity identifies the author as using another name, which may take the form of a *nom de plume* or a borrowed name from a well-known author.

Introduction

concerning authorship. Nor does the statement that Paul was a prisoner suggest pseudonymity. Paul notes in 2 Cor 11:23 that he has been imprisoned numerous times. He speaks of himself as a prisoner in Phlm 1, 9, and as being in chains in Col 4:3, 18. Acts 16:23–26 indicates that Paul was put in stocks, chained in an inner part of the prison in Philippi. The evidence raises at least two questions: Would someone writing in Paul's name have included his claims of imprisonment? And were these chains seen in a positive or negative light? Looking at the first question, did Paul's numerous imprisonments become a leitmotif of Paul's life such that any person writing decades after Paul would need to include reference to his chains? This answer is related to our second question, which might be answered in one of two ways, based on how we understand Paul's chains to be understood within the early church. In the larger society, being in chains was shameful; Paul likewise recognized that his chains could be understood in this way.⁷ But he also celebrates them as a symbol of his apostleship and faithful witness to the gospel message's power to upset the religious and social status quo. One might argue that it would be rather presumptuous for an author to remake Paul's actual chains into a literary theme which served to encourage boldness and faithfulness in service to Christ. In the letters to Philemon and Colossae Paul reflects deeply on the reality of his chains; thus "for individuals to write in Paul's name and bind themselves, figuratively, with Paul's chains, a considerable audacity would be required."⁸ Cassidy raises an important point often overlooked in authorship discussions, namely the fact that if Paul did not write the letter, then whoever did sought to speak not only with the apostle's voice, but with the authority of one who was in chains for Christ. Those claiming deuterio-Pauline status usually explain that the disciple was writing in Paul's name to bring Paul's ethics and theology up to date for the new generation of believers. Surely that could be done without also assuming the moral authority of one who suffered so specifically and for such duration as Paul. The moral implications of claiming the voice of one who suffered greatly should give pause to the suggestions that one of Paul's own followers would strike such a pose.

Throughout both the disputed and undisputed Pauline letters, we have the author declaring that he is writing to his congregations, and to-

7. Rapske 1994: 283–312.

8. Cassidy 2001: 87.

day we imagine him sitting quietly at his desk, pen in hand etching strange Greek characters on papyrus scrolls. In the ancient world, however, most people did not write down their own letters but used the services of a scribe. In some cases it was a personal slave or employee, in others it was a hired service. In our particular situation, this means that Paul did not actually write *any* of his letters, if by that one means that he put pen to papyrus. Rather, Paul used the services of others, a scribe or amanuensis, to take down his letter. Thus when Paul declares to the Galatians or the Thessalonians that he is writing to them, he is describing his personal signature and closing remarks (Gal 6:11; 2 Thess 3:17). How much of the scribe's own personal style infused the letter? This is difficult to determine, but the range of scribal activity extends from taking dictation syllable by syllable, to composing a letter based on general instructions. In almost all cases, the author would review the letter draft before a final copy was made and sent. We also do not know if Paul used the same scribe several times. One scribe identifies himself as Tertius (Rom 16:22; see also 1 Pet 5:12), but we do not know if he wrote any of Paul's other letters. Romans was likely written from Corinth during Paul's third missionary journey, and we would have to postulate that Tertius was with Paul in other cities or over the course of his journeys to suppose that he wrote other letters, which is not an impossible scenario, but one for which we have no information. We should not forget that for several letters Paul is imprisoned (Philippians, Colossians, Philemon), which further complicates his options. We should pause for a moment to observe that Paul coauthors most of his letters; this fact has not usually penetrated discussions about authenticity. This is a rare, almost unique innovation, for we have no evidence that Cicero, Seneca, or Pliny the Younger, for example, ever co-authored a letter. It seems that Cicero's friend Atticus did write one letter with a group of people,⁹ and Richards identified six coauthored letters out of the 645 private letters from the Oxyrhynchus corpus, but these are not at all similar to Paul's letters.¹⁰ Only Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles are authored by Paul alone (with the aid of a scribe). How involved were Titus, Timothy, and Sosthenes in the content and style of Paul's other letters? Was it merely courteous of Paul to note his coworkers, or did they have significant input with content and style? Anthony

9. Cicero *Att.* 11.5.1.

10. Richards 2004: 34.

Introduction

Kenny explores this question with a stylometric analysis, focused not on key terms or unusual vocabulary, but on stylistic quirks and traits that an author expresses unconsciously. For example, those from Pittsburgh drink “pop” but in Philadelphia they drink “soda”; both use these synonyms unconsciously and thus reveal their backgrounds. Kenny observed the frequency of subordinate clauses and conjunctions (and, but), and discovered both great diversity and strong commonality between *all* of the Pauline letters.¹¹ Interestingly, letters closest to what is understood as the center of Paul’s thought were those he wrote alone (with a secretary), namely Romans, Philippians, and 2 Timothy. Ephesians, heavily indebted to Colossians (coauthored by Timothy) is farther down the list, but still closer to the center than 1 Corinthians, the only letter coauthored with Sosthenes. This evidence suggests that Paul’s coauthors might have played a larger role in the finished product than has been previously thought.

One final note about letters: in the ancient world, as today, they frequently substitute for the personal presence of the writer. Often Paul will declare that he longs to see his congregation, but must be satisfied with sending them a letter. The implication of this is that we expect that the author knows his audience well. For the most part this holds true for Paul’s letters, with a few important exceptions. In the case of Romans, Paul is introducing himself to the Christian community in the imperial capital in hopes of soon visiting them. Similarly, Paul (with Timothy) writes to the Colossians with authority, although it is one of his coworkers, Epaphras, who founded the church. Yet in both cases, mutual friends are listed at the end of the letters. In fact, Romans has the longest list of personal friends, which might not be surprising if Paul is trying to form a relationship with the Roman church. What would be more natural than to cite common acquaintances? Ephesians lacks both a sense of intimacy with the congregation, as well as names of specific church members, which are unexpected, given that he spent over two years there according to Acts. However, Paul’s communications to the Thessalonians has no personal references, even though Paul founded that church only a few months before writing his letters from Corinth (Acts 18:5; 1 Thess 3:6). Any explanation about Pauline authorship of Ephesians must take into account the relative lack of statements of personal knowledge about the addressees. Most explain this as indicating either that the letter was not written by Paul, or that the

11. Kenny 1986: 99–100.

letter was intended as an encyclical letter to be read by various churches in the vicinity of Ephesus.

External Evidence for Authorship

The latter possibility is reinforced by a particular textual variant. In some of the most reliable manuscripts, the words “in Ephesus” are not found in 1:1 as one would expect. Several questions immediately come to mind, such as whether Paul would write a letter that would be read to various churches. In Col 4:15–16, Paul requests that his letter to them be shared with the nearby city of Laodicea, and the letter he sent to the latter city (not extant) be read by the Colossians. Again, Galatians is also written to the churches in that province. From these examples we could at least conclude that Paul is not opposed to having several churches read each other’s letters. Interestingly, an ancient writer, Marcion (declared a heretic for his views on the Jewish Bible/Old Testament and the person of Jesus) is reported by Tertullian to have identified Ephesians as Paul’s letter to the Laodiceans, but it is unclear, however, whether Tertullian is speaking of the letter itself or the superscription (title page, if you will), and whether Marcion is supplying a missing text or changing an existing text.¹²

Further questions include whether the manuscripts without “in Ephesus” are accurate in their rendering, or whether there is some corruption whereby the relevant locale was omitted. The oldest sources, including P⁴⁶ (third century CE), Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus (both fourth century CE), omit “in Ephesus” in the actual letter, but do include “to the Ephesians” in the superscription. These three manuscripts are of the Alexandrian text type, which suggests a local variant. The rest of the reliable manuscripts, from a variety of regions, including the early Coptic (Egyptian language) translation, incorporate the phrase “in Ephesus.” This list includes the earliest editorial changes in both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. Thus we have excellent external evidence for both readings. Finally, Origen, who lived both in Alexandria and in Caesarea Maritima, in his commentary on Ephesians seems not to have used a manuscript that had the words “in Ephesus.” However, he makes it clear in the text that he believes Paul is writing to the Ephesians, as his opening line in the discussion of Eph 1:1 reads “In the case of Ephesians alone we find

12. Tertullian *Marc.* 5.11.12; 5.17.1.

Introduction

the phrase ‘to the saints who are.’”¹³ He has a remarkable interpretation of the awkward Greek, namely that Paul is describing the Ephesians as those who once were not, but now are, through God. He takes his cue from Moses’ encounter with God in the desert, when God reveals who he is by saying “I AM.” In both cases, the verb for “to be” is used. Although we have only fragments of Origen’s commentary on Ephesians preserved, Jerome clearly used it in composing his own commentary.¹⁴ And he probably also used Origen’s prologue as well, wherein Origen makes clear that the letter in question is addressed to the Ephesian church, suffering from an overwhelming attraction to magic and the goddess Diana (drawing on Acts 19:1–20).

If the manuscript evidence is inconclusive, the internal evidence might shift the balance. Usually textual critics prefer the more difficult reading and the shorter reading. If these rules are followed, the omission of the phrase in the original seems assured. In this case, the copyists, aware of the difficult reading, stayed true to the text in front of them, not smoothing out the reading. They would have no apparent reason for omitting the city’s name. In fact, they might have assumed Paul was following the Hellenistic custom whereby a royal decree was often lacking a specific addressee because the declaration was to be read in numerous cities.¹⁵

However, a further critical rule suggests that if a variant reading is nonsensical or uncharacteristic of the author’s work, the longer reading should be supported. In this case, the omission creates an odd reading in Greek and is uncharacteristic of Pauline letters. Normally we find Paul using “to those who are” followed by a place name in his introduction and greetings. Those manuscripts that omit the place name read awkwardly, “to the saints, to those who are, and believers in Christ Jesus.” The problematic reading might be better explained as a copyist error than coming from the original text. Some suggest, however, that the omission indicates this letter was intended as an encyclical epistle to be read in several churches. It was up to Paul’s envoy and letter carrier, Tychicus, to insert the city’s name as he read it to the several churches in small cities in the vicinity of Ephesus. Although no copy of the letter has either a space in the manuscript for a city’s name to be inserted or the preposition

13. Heine 2002: 80.

14. *Ibid.*, 35.

15. Comfort 2008: 577–79.

“in” followed by a blank space, nonetheless, if Tychicus was instructed to insert the name of the city when he read it to the churches, there would be little need to leave a space in the actual text. We might pause for a moment and note that Paul gives Tychicus the responsibility to inform the listeners of his situation (this is true as well in Colossians). It seems that Paul instructed his envoys to communicate more than what was on the page, for example when he reveals in 2 Cor 7:6–16 that he expected Titus to reassure the Corinthians of Paul’s concern for them. Again, the custom of reading the letter publicly to the church was apparently consistent throughout Pauline churches. Even a letter as personal as Philemon was read to the entire church, as indicated by the plural “you” at the beginning and end of the letter. Furthermore, the instructions that Tychicus give details of Paul’s situation (in chains) suggests that the apparent lack of personal details in Ephesians itself might be counterbalanced by Tychicus and by Paul’s personal knowledge of individual communities surrounding Ephesus. Paul’s situation in prison might have prevented him from writing individual letters, but would not prevent Tychicus from passing along specific greetings and encouragements directed orally by Paul through him. An intriguing, but limited parallel could be drawn with contemporary papyrus invitations, many of which lack the name of the addressee. These one-line invitations to a birthday party, wedding, or other festivity depended upon the messenger to include the guest’s name at the time the invitation was read to them.¹⁶ In the end, it seems the evidence is weighed slightly in favor of the letter being addressed to the church in Ephesus, but given Paul’s encouragement to the Colossians to share their letter with the Laodiceans, it is entirely possible that Tychicus, as he traveled from Ephesus to Colossae, read Paul’s letter to the Ephesians to the satellite Christian communities orbiting around the central city of Ephesus.

Support for this possibility might come from 1 Corinthians, which was penned in Ephesus (1 Cor 16:8). In 1 Cor 16:19, Paul extends greetings from the churches in the province of Asia, which may signal that he sees the Ephesian Christian community not limited to the city limits, but extending to the towns beyond. “Paul here seems to imply . . . that the Christian community of Ephesus was the central Christian community of the province. . . . This suggests that the Ephesian Christian community was a missionary centre, and maintained contact with Christians in other

16. Kim 1975: 391–402.

Introduction

parts of the province.”¹⁷ This follows the Roman assumption concerning the *polis* or city, which understood its influence to cover extensively the surrounding territory outside its walls. For example, even before Paul’s time, most of Italy was seen as part of Rome, broadly speaking. Freeborn Italians had a form of Roman citizenship known as Latin rights citizenship. A similar attitude towards large urban centers outside of Rome continued in the imperial period.¹⁸ This allows for the possibility that someone living even twenty miles (a day’s journey) from the Ephesus city center might be considered (and consider themselves) an Ephesian. Clearly the limit did not extend to Colossae, one hundred miles from Ephesus, or Smyrna, thirty-five miles away.

Internal Evidence

Literary Character of Ephesians

The main internal concerns that surface in any conversation about Pauline authorship of Ephesians focus on the literary character, the theological emphases, and the historical setting implied in the letter. Turning to the first point, we can be more specific in highlighting the singular turns of phrase that some point to as indicative of a deutero-Pauline hand. For example, instead of the usual term “Satan” in Ephesians, Paul speaks of the “devil” (4:27, 6:11). Again, rather than his usual wording “the heavens,” he speaks of “the heavenlies.” These terms hardly indicate theological shifts, but because they are so insignificant they are thought to expose the author’s automatic reflex. Since Paul would think automatically of the evil one as “Satan,” the author of Ephesians, in using “devil,” exposes himself as other than Paul. However, if we apply this logic to his other letters, we see that it is flawed. Paul can use synonyms for an idea or action, even within the same letter. He is not limited to a single term to express his ideas.¹⁹ Again, the lengthy sentences and numerous participial phrases are pointed to as reasons to doubt that Paul composed the letter. For example, his opening thanksgiving runs from 1:3–14 (see also 1:15–23; 2:1–7; 3:2–13, 14–19; 4:1–6, 11–16; 6:14–20). But we find long sentences in other letters, especially when Paul writes doxologically (Rom 1:1–7,

17. Trebilco 2004: 71.

18. Lightstone 2005: 214–25.

19. Hoehner 2002: 24–26.

8:38-9, 11:33-39; 1 Cor 1:4-8; Phil 1:3-8; and 2 Thess 1:3-10) or about doctrine (Rom 3:21-26; 1 Cor 1:26-29), or concerning ethical matters (compare Eph 6:14-20; 1 Cor 12:8-11; and Phil 1:27-2:11). In the past, statistical analysis was used to support a deutero-Pauline position. But more recently this method has been called into question, due in no small part to the lack of material by Paul himself. Even though he has written many letters in the New Testament, the actual corpus is relatively small, failing to provide a statistically significant amount of words from which to draw conclusions. Even more, when Ephesians is compared, for example, with the uncontested Galatians, the results are surprising. The letters are about the same length, and each contain about the same number of terms occurring only in that epistle (41 terms out of 2,429 in Ephesians, 35 terms [or 31 if you subtract proper names] out of 2,220 in Galatians) and similar numbers of terms unique to the epistle but found in the New Testament outside of the Pauline corpus (84 in Ephesians, 90 [(80 if you subtract proper names] in Galatians).²⁰ Phrases we readily associate with Paul, such as “fruit of the Spirit” or “present evil age” or “the marks of Jesus,” are found only in Galatians, but these are not used to disqualify that epistle as written by Paul. Instead, it is recognized that Paul’s audience, the situation faced by Paul and the letter’s recipients, as well as Paul’s theological creativity and energy, all play a role in his choice of expression, style, and mood. Finally, some point to the expressions that serve to identify writers, much as a speaker’s tone of voice and idiomatic turn of phrase serve to identify them. In particular, it is suggested that Ephesians has an unusually high number of the prepositions *kata* (according to or against) and *en* (in). However, Galatians actually uses *kata* with the genitive more than any other Pauline letter. Again, Romans uses *dia* (because of or through) and *para* (beside) more frequently, while Philippians prefers *meta* (after or with) and *peri* (around or concerning). Even more, Ephesians shares with Romans, Galatians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians the special construction *ara . . . oun* (therefore . . . therefore).²¹

20. Ibid., 24.

21. Ibid., 28.