

DAVID J. CLARK

DISCOURSE STRUCTURE IN EPHESIANS, WITH SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSLATORS

The author is a retired UBS translation consultant, and is now serving as a voluntary part-time translation consultant with the Institute for Bible Translation. He is based in Woking, England.

Introduction

Discourse analysis is broadly the attempt to see how language uses patterns in units larger than the sentence. In this article we shall try to use two approaches that are complementary:

- 1) A structural analysis will look at the text from a formal point of view, to try to see how the paragraphs are structured and how they fit together (or why they don't).
- 2) To this analysis, observations are added in terms of rhetorical categories that were recognized in the ancient world itself.¹

Not only does Ephesians draw on the OT, but its argumentation and semantic structure are based on classical patterns of rhetoric: we find an *exordium*, a *narratio*, a *digressio*, an *exhortatio*, and a *peroratio* (these terms are explained where they are first used in the text below). On the other hand, quotations, mostly but not all (see 5.14) from the OT, form the foundation of ways of argumentation that are interesting, if at times perhaps surprising to the modern reader.

In looking at the text from different perspectives, we hope to provide arguments and points of view that may not be familiar to translators. It is not our aim to provide a single set of right answers to all questions, but rather to see what sort of problems arise, and why. In the end, translators themselves have to decide how to solve the problems of representing the Greek text as well as possible in terms of their own language and culture. We shall not discuss questions of authorship, interesting though they are, but for the sake of simplicity we shall refer to the author of Ephesians as Paul. This, at any rate, is how the letter is presented.

Discourse analysis: aims and methods

What do we do in preparing an analysis of the discourse structure of a text? Primarily we observe the details of how the text is put together.

- 1) The analysis must be done on the text in the language in which it was originally written, in this case Greek.
- 2) We look not just at the general meaning of the text, but at how paragraphs are constructed, how they are linked or not linked, where repetition of words occurs, unusual word order, changes of verb mood, and so on.

¹ For the observations on rhetorical categories and for other helpful comments, I am much indebted to my colleague Dr Lénart de Regt. We shared the teaching in a translation seminar on Ephesians in Moscow that gave the initial impetus to preparing this article. Stimulating comments on an earlier draft were also made by Rev Dr Paul Ellingworth and Rev Dr Ernst Wendland. Credit for such defects as remain is mine alone.

- 3) We shall always view with great caution the punctuation in the printed Greek text because this is not found in the oldest manuscripts, and is the result of editorial decisions by modern scholars. They have not usually studied the discourse structure, so different editions (even UBS4 and NA27) have different punctuation and different paragraph breaks, some of which are very hard to understand.
- 4) When the main breaks in the text are established, the relationships of the different topics will stand out, and the focus in the intention of the writer will be clearer and sharper. This should lead to more intelligible and meaningful translation, provided that translators are familiar with the correct usage of the corresponding discourse-marking and rhetorical techniques of their own language.

Overview of Ephesians

Both structurally and rhetorically this letter breaks easily into two halves more or less equal in size but quite different in structure. These are chs. 1–3 and 4–6. Even a quick look at the outline below shows that the first half consists of a relatively small number of relatively long sections, whereas the second half consists of a relatively large number of relatively short sections. The analysis that follows is in English, but the detailed outline is based on the Greek. English glosses are taken from the RSV whenever possible, but when something more literal is needed to show the Greek structure, I have provided my own.

Principal divisions of Ephesians

Part 1	1.1–3.21	Mainly theological content
1.1-14	1.1-2	Opening greetings
	1.3-14	Doxology (anacoluthon with no explicit main verb)
1.15–2.10	1.15-23	Thanksgiving and prayer (indicative main verb 1.16)
	2.1-10	Theological reflection (indicative main verbs 2.5, 6)
2.11-22	2.11-12	Exhortation (imperative main verb 2.11)
	2.13-18	Further theological reflection (indicative main verbs 2.13, 14, 17)
	2.19-22	Theological conclusion
3.1-19	3.2-13	Digression (indicative verbs 3.2, 8, 13)
	3.1, 14-19	Prayer (indicative main verb 3.14)
3.20-21	Doxology (no main verb)	
Part 2	4.1–6.24	Mainly ethical content
4.1-16	General instructions to believers how to behave (indicative verb with imperatival infinitive 4.1) NB περιπατῆσαι 4.1 (walk)	
4.17-24	General instructions to believers how not to behave (indicative verb with imperatival infinitive 4.17) NB περιπατεῖν 4.17 (walk)	

- 4.25-32 Specific instructions how not to behave (imperative verbs second person 4.25, 26, 30, 32; third person 4.26, 27, 28, 31)
- 5.1-6 General instructions how to behave (imperative verbs second person 5.1, 2, 5; third person 5.3, 4) NB περιπατεῖτε 5.2 (walk)
- 5.7-14 General instructions both how not to behave and how to behave (imperative verbs third person 5.6; second person 5.7, 8, 11) NB περιπατεῖτε 5.8 (walk)
- 5.15–6.9 General instructions both how not to behave and how to behave (imperative verbs second person 5.15, 17, 18, 25; 6.1, 2, 4, 5, 9; third person 5.33) NB περιπατεῖτε 5.15 (walk)
- 5.15-21 All believers
- 5.22-24 Wives
- 5.25-33 Husbands
- 6.1-3 Children
- 6.4 Parents
- 6.5-8 Slaves
- 6.9 Masters
- 6.10-22 Final instructions to all believers (imperative verbs second person 6.10, 11, 13, 14, 17)
- 6.23-24 Closing greetings

Ephesians 1.1-14

This section consists of the formal opening of the letter (1.1-2), followed by a long and complex doxology (1.3-14).

1.1-2

The opening greetings are fairly typical of ancient letters; this opening is in ancient rhetorical terms referred to as the *inscriptio*. No main verb is expressed, but the sense is a wish for grace and peace to be experienced by the readers. In translation the wish is normally expressed either by the verb used, or by an optative form.

1.3-14

In UBS4/NA27 this paragraph is printed with full stops at the ends of vv. 6, 10, and 12, but there is no secure reason for doing so, and some editions such as Souter and BFBS print this as a single sentence. If taken this way, it is the longest single sentence in the NT. If the paragraph is broken up, the units beginning in 1.7, 11, and 13 are relative clauses, and not fully formed sentences. From a translator's point of view, it may be helpful to have the paragraph broken up, but from the point of view of discourse analysis, it really is syntactically a single sentence. In view of its length, it is all the more remarkable that formally it does not contain a finite main verb! One has to understand the adjective Εὐλογητὸς in 1.3 as a wish: "May God be blessed." In translation, this is usually expressed by a full verb. In 1.3 there is also the

first occurrence of the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, which recurs in 1.20; 2.6; 3.10; and 6.12. There is no observable pattern in these recurrences.

The rest of the sentence is a string of relative clauses, which in translation are usually expressed as main verbs. The first one extends from ὁ εὐλογήσας (who has blessed) in 1.3 down to the end of 1.6, and describes the activity of God the Father in blessing his people. There are three principal actions mentioned. The first is carried by the participle ὁ εὐλογήσας, the second by the indicative verb καθὼς ἐξελέξατο (even as he chose) in 1.4, and the third by the participle προορίσας (destined) in 1.5. The second action seems to be syntactically subordinated to the first by the conjunction καθὼς (even as).

This part of the sentence concludes in 1.6 with a reference to Christ as the agent through whom God shows grace to people. The rest of the paragraph (1.7-14) is an expanded description of how people are blessed through Christ. It is in three sections each introduced by ἐν ᾧ (“in him” in RSV in 1.7, 11, 13; literally “in whom”). A second occurrence of the phrase ἐν ᾧ in 1.13 seems to be a resumption of the first occurrence rather than a new aspect of the description.

In all, this paragraph is syntactically complicated, but not brilliantly structured. It would not have got high marks from the classical Greek stylists: Paul’s fervent faith gets the better of his syntactic sensibility! However, it is a powerful and eloquent ascription of praise to God for the work of Christ. As such, this paragraph functions as the *exordium*, that is, the introductory part of the letter, before the main topic is set out more systematically and reflectively. It illustrates the fact that the ability to write in a convincing and moving way does not depend solely on the ability to control syntax in a strict manner. We shall see this again in ch. 3.

Ephesians 1.15–2.10

This section falls into two parts, 1.15-23 and 2.1-10, the first initiated by the phrase Διὰ τοῦτο (For this reason) in 1.15, and the second marked by the inclusio of περιεπατήσατε/περιπατήσωμεν (you once walked/we should walk) in 2.2 and 2.10. Although in rhetorical terms there is a transition from the *exordium* to the *narratio* at 2.1, nevertheless in formal terms, there is no closure marker at the end of 1.15-23, and no major opening marker at the beginning of 2.1, so 1.15–2.10 is regarded formally as a single unit. This is the main point in Ephesians where formal and rhetorical criteria pull in opposite directions.

1.15-23

As with 1.3-14, different printed editions of the Greek text vary in their punctuation. UBS4 and NA27 place a full stop after 1.19, but other editions such as Souter and BFBS treat 1.15-23 as a single sentence. Syntactically this is more convincing, as the whole of 1.20-21 is a relative clause. It would be syntactically possible to begin a new sentence at 1.22, but the available editions do not do that. Nevertheless since it is not syntactically clear in Greek how 1.22-23 would relate to 1.15-21 if they were all one sentence, it is better in translation to treat them as a separate sentence.

The opening words of 1.15 Διὰ τοῦτο (For this reason) relate back to the whole of 1.3-14, and give the reason why Paul prays as he does in the following verses. In other words, the *exordium* of 1.3-14 still continues in 1.15-23, but the positive reference to the addressees serves to gain the sympathy of the readers, and thus functions as what ancient rhetoricians called a *captio benevolentiae*. The main verbs that dominate the structure of the paragraph are found in 1.16, οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνεῖαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου (I do not cease to give thanks for you, remembering you in my prayers). The rest of 1.17-21 (at least) is the content of Paul's prayer. In terms of the syntax, there is actually only one prayer request, represented by the verb δώῃ (may give) in 1.17. The whole of 1.18-21 is subordinate to this. As in 1.3-14, Paul's passion overrides his syntax, and so it is not clear just how 1.22-23 relate to 1.15-21. Semantically they seem to be part of the prayer, and form its theological climax. If this is so, a participle ὑποτάξας (having put under), parallel to καθίσας (having seated) in 1.20 would have been smoother than the finite verb ὑπέταξεν (he has put . . . under). The finite verb is perhaps found here because this clause is a citation of Ps 8.7 in the Septuagint, and a finite verb occurs there. Syntactically this has the effect of making these verses a separate sentence.

There is in this paragraph one other oddity that should be noted. In 1.17, the Greek for "you" is in the dative case, whereas the next reference to "you" at the beginning of 1.18 is in a different case. If one includes [ὑμῶν], as printed in UBS4 at v. 18, then it is in the genitive, and if not, then it is in the accusative in the participle πεφωτισμένους (being enlightened). This is a relatively small stylistic infelicity and does not obscure the meaning.

2.1-10

After the long introduction, the theological reflection of Part 1 of the letter actually begins here in 2.1. This is where the speech of praise has stopped and the *narratio* (2.1-3.21) begins. This term does not mean "narrative," but is used in the rhetorical sense of "setting out the issue," namely the redemption of mankind through Christ into a single body.

The paragraph 2.1-10 is again rambling and not well polished syntactically. 2.1-7 forms one sentence, 2.8-9 another, and 2.10 a third. Souter prints 2.1-9 as a single sentence, but BFBS, UBS4, and NA27 are on firmer ground in taking 2.8-9 as separate. Certainly these two verses contain a finite verb and constitute a well-formed sentence. There is no doubt that 2.10 is a separate sentence.

The basic structure of 2.1-7 is simple: ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκρούς ("you being dead" in 2.1) συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ ("[God] made us alive together with Christ" in 2.5) καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ([God] raised us up with him, and made us sit with him" in 2.6). The last two verbs take up the statements applied to Christ in 1.20, ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ καθίσας (having raised him from the dead and made him sit) and apply them to the believers. Thus the main verbs in this paragraph have a close link with the central part of the previous paragraph. This is one reason for taking these two paragraphs together as one section.

The basic structure is complicated by two factors. The first is the repetition of ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν . . . (you being dead through trespasses) in 2.1 as καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν (we being dead through trespasses) in 2.5. The change of pronoun from second person plural to first person plural makes it seem that the writer has lost track of his original train of thought. This change in the outward form is probably triggered by the phrase ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς (he loved us), at the end of 2.4, but semantically it seems most likely that it resumes the opening phrase of 2.1. Theologically the statement remains true whether Paul is addressing the Ephesian believers solely or including himself with them.

The second complicating factor is the intrusive clause χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι (by grace you have been saved) in 2.5. This statement anticipates the fuller development of this theme in 2.8-9, but does not fit at all into the syntax in 2.5. Printed editions place these words between dashes (BFBS, UBS4, and NA27) or in brackets (Souter) to indicate their awkwardness. Once again Paul's enthusiasm overcomes his sense of style, and one feels that the words are tumbling out of his mouth faster than the scribe could put them on paper. In translation it will probably be necessary to put these words in brackets, possibly running 2.5-6 together and putting the bracketed material at the end.

As already noted, the occurrence of περιπατήσωμεν (we should walk) in 2.10, repeating the same root περιεπατήσατε (you once walked) in 2.2 serves to round off the paragraph.

Ephesians 2.11-22

The opening conjunction Διὸ (Therefore) seems to provide a rather general link with the whole of 2.1-10 rather than a specific link with 2.10. UBS4 and NA27 place full stops at the ends of vv. 12, 13, 16, 18, and 22. Souter and BFBS are similar except that they do not have a full stop at the end of 2.16. UBS4 begins a new paragraph at 2.14; and NA27, a new subparagraph at 2.14. From a discourse perspective this is doubtful. The main verb μνημονεύετε (remember) in 2.11 is imperative, but the main verb ἐγενήθητε (you have become) in 2.13 is indicative, as are the main verbs in 2.14-22. The change of verb mood suggests that a new paragraph may begin at 2.13 rather than 2.14, a view that can be supported by the contrast between ποτὲ (at one time) in 2.11 and νυνὶ δὲ (But now) in 2.13. The statements in 2.14-18 are introduced by γάρ (For) which links them closely with 2.13.

The break in NA27 between 2.18 and 2.19 on the other hand does find support from a discourse perspective. 2.19-22 begins with ἄρα οὖν (So then), a form frequently used to introduce the conclusion or summing up of an argument. It can therefore be inferred that these verses do stand slightly apart from those that precede.

The discourse structure of this section may therefore be set out as:

- 2.11-12 Exhortation to consider the past
- 2.13-18 Reflection on the present
- 2.19-22 Theological conclusion

We may note a structural similarity between 2.17 and 1.22. In both places an indicative main verb introduced by καὶ (and) occurs after a series of participles, and in both places the syntactic relationship between that verb and what has preceded is not entirely clear. It is interesting to observe that none of the available Greek texts begin a new sentence at 1.22, but UBS4 and NA27 do begin a new sentence at 2.17, a good example of lack of consistency in making punctuation decisions.

Ephesians 3.1-19

This section provides another example of rough style, probably induced by strong emotion. The section begins with the phrase *Τούτου χάριν* (because of this) linking it with the theological conclusion at the end of ch. 2. This is intended to be the basis for a further prayer, but instead of expressing his prayer Paul embarks on a long digression covering 3.2-13. In classical rhetorical terms, this *digressio* of 3.2-13 interrupts the *narratio*. This is not to say, however, that the *digressio* is not relevant to the rest of Part 1 and serves no purpose. On the contrary, when Paul speaks of himself in this *digressio*, his witness as apostle to the Gentiles is bound up with the uniting of Jews and Gentiles in the same body (in the rest of Part 1, but particularly in ch. 2).

3.1-7 is in fact an anacoluthon with no finite main verb. Paul then repeats *Τούτου χάριν* (because of this) at the beginning of 3.14, and comes at last to his real prayer in 3.14-19. In translation, because the gap between the beginning of the prayer in 3.1 and its continuation in 3.14 is so large, it will usually be best to insert into 3.1 some verb of prayer, such as “I pray” (compare GNT). 3.14 will best begin a new paragraph as in GNT.

3.1-13

3.1-7 shows a high degree of syntactic subordination, but also a marked theological depth. These two features go together elsewhere, for instance in the letter to Titus. It is almost as if Paul slips his most important insights into his text as asides. They are there for the careful and perceptive reader (or hearer), but in such a way that they do not distract the more naïve reader/hearer from the simpler thoughts.

In 3.8-13, all the available printed Greek texts begin new sentences at 3.8 and 3.13. There is no conjunction at the beginning of 3.8, so that the connection with the preceding verses is not fully explicit. It seems to depend on a verbal link rather than a logical link. The mention in 3.7 of τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι (the grace of God given to me), taking up the topic of 3.2, seems to lead Paul to expand on this theme. Again, in 3.8-12 there is a long sentence with deep syntactic subordination matched by deep theological content.

The final sentence of the paragraph in 3.13 begins with διὸ (So). As in 2.11 this seems to form a general link with 3.1-12 rather than a specific link with any particular part of it. The Greek does not indicate who is the subject of the infinitive ἐγκακεῖν (to lose heart). Most translations take the subject to be the Ephesian believers, but does this really make the best sense? The theme of 3.8-12 has been God’s grace shown to Paul, and there has been no second person reference since 3.4. If Paul intended a change of subject at this point, it

would surely require to be marked by a pronoun, and it is not. It therefore seems more likely both syntactically and semantically that Paul is praying for himself at this point, that in the light of God's grace (3.8) and wisdom (3.10), he will not give up his ministry despite the hardships of his situation in prison. This view is represented in the alternative renderings in RSV and NRSV (that I may not lose heart), but is very much a minority view. However, it is the view that receives most support from discourse analysis.

3.14-19

This is another single sentence in Greek. It begins by repeating *Τούτου χάριν* (because of this) from 3.1, but this time Paul really does express his prayer in 3.16-19. It contains three instances of *ἵνα* (in order that) followed by a subjunctive verb (vv. 16, 18, and 19). It is possible that these three *ἵνα* clauses are co-ordinate with each other, but if this were so, one might expect them to be linked with *καί* (and), and they are not. It therefore seems better to regard the second and third clauses as governed by what precedes them, and marking increasingly deep subordination. In many languages such a succession of purpose clauses cannot be included within a single sentence, so translators will need to break this paragraph up into several sentences.

Ephesians 3.20-21

This doxology is a very short unit to be treated as a separate section, and indeed it could be taken as the conclusion to the previous section. It is treated as separate because it does not have particularly close links either syntactically or semantically with 3.1-19. Moreover, if taken as a separate unit, it balances the doxology at the beginning in 1.3-14, and is like that section in that it has no main verb. It forms a fitting close to the first half of the letter, and is marked by the particle "Amen" in v. 21. Thus, the addressees may realize already during this doxology of 3.20-21, and not just after it is over, that the first major part of the letter is drawing to a close. The more narrowly theological part of the letter is complete; and from this point on, the focus changes to Christian ethical conduct.

Possible chiasmic pattern in Ephesians 1-3?

In the first half of the letter, it remains only to raise the possibility that there is a chiasmic pattern present. It is not as clear or as strongly marked as in other parts of the Bible, but is worth mentioning. Leaving aside the formal opening of the letter in 1.1-2, we have already noticed that there are doxologies in 1.3-14 and 3.20-21. There are also prayers in 1.15-23 and 3.1-19 (or more specifically 3.1, 14-19). Again there is theological reflection in 2.1-10 and 2.13-22. This leaves only 2.11-12 at the centre. This unit is the only one in which an imperative verb occurs. The pattern could be set out as follows:

- 1.3-14 Doxology (anacoluthon with no main verb)
- 1.15-23 Thanksgiving and prayer (indicative main verb 1.16)
- 2.1-10 Theological reflection (indicative main verbs 2.5, 6)
- 2.11-12 Exhortation (imperative main verb 2.11)
- 2.13-22 Further theological reflection (indicative verbs 2.13, 14, 17, 19)
- [3.2-13 Digression (indicative verbs 3.2, 8, 13)]
- 3.1, 14-19 Prayer (indicative main verb 3.14)
- 3.20-21 Doxology (no main verb)

It is interesting to notice that 3.2-13, the passage that is syntactically the most awkward, is also the very passage that fits least well into the chiasmic structure. In this unit, Paul went off at a tangent both syntactically and semantically!

The other interesting point here is that often the theme that occurs at the central point of a chiasm is what comes into focus in the next unit. In the present case, the central unit contains the only imperative verb in the first half of the letter. In the second half of the letter where ethical instruction predominates, imperatives become frequent. In terms of rhetorical categories, most of the second half of the letter, 4.1-6.9, is an *exhortatio*, and the same applies to the central unit of the first part, 2.11-12. The first and second halves of the letter are a combination of two classical rhetorical genres: the epideictic and the deliberative genres respectively.¹ That is, the theological reflection of Part 1 is an oration of praise and points to something glorious, while the exhortations of Part 2 persuade the addressees to follow certain recommendations and take a particular course of action.

Overview of Ephesians 4-6

It is hard to discern any detailed large-scale pattern covering the whole of chs. 4-6. There are, however, some features which help to distinguish units within this half of the letter. In particular the recurrence of οὖν (“therefore” in 4.1, 17; 5.1, 7, 15) marks the beginning of a paragraph. It is accompanied in each case by various forms of the verb περιπατεῖν (literally “to walk”) in 4.1, 17; 5.2, 8, 15). In 4.1-24 instructions are veiled, with indicative verbs followed by an imperatival infinitive; but from 4.25 on, plain imperatives, both second and third person, occur frequently. From 4.1-5.14 we may see something of a pattern in that of the five units (4.1-16; 4.17-24; 4.25-32; 5.1-6; and 5.7-14) all except the centre one (4.25-32) contain general instructions and are identified by both οὖν and the verb περιπατεῖν. The central paragraph has neither of these features, but deals with specific rather than generic instruction. Its beginning is marked by the change to the imperative mood.

Ephesians 4.1-16

In this section the various editions of the Greek text agree in placing full stops at the ends of vv. 6, 7, 8, 10, and 16, plus a question mark at the end of v. 9. Paul begins his instruction section with the polite verb Παρακαλῶ (I beg you [to]) followed by an infinitive. Syntactically 4.4-6 is in apposition to what has preceded, though the connection is a bit loose. Presumably the mention of τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος (the unity of the Spirit) leads on to the list of single entities in 4.4-6 already shared by the author and addressees.

In 4.7-16, there is a lexical inclusio in the mention of Ἐνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ (to each one) in 4.7 and ἐνὸς ἑκάστου (of each one) in 4.16. The quotation from Ps 68.18 in 4.8 (introduced by διὸ λέγει: “therefore it says”) leads to a discussion of its interpretation in 4.9-10. Then follows its application to the life of the church in 4.11-16. This sentence contains the most complex subordination in the second half of the letter, and is also the passage that gives the profoundest theological undergirding to the ethical instruction.

1 Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Dallas: Word, 1990), xli-xlii.

Ephesians 4.17-24

Whereas 4.1-16 provides general instruction on how believers should behave, 4.17-24 by contrast provides instruction on how they should not behave, or rather how they should no longer behave. It is assumed that in their pre-Christian lives they used to behave in the same way as unbelievers still do. Now they have to lay aside all that and become new people in Christ (4.23-24). The section is not syntactically very complex, and needs little comment. It contains two moderately long sentences (17-19 and 20-24) but neither has deep subordination. As in the previous section, the instructions are introduced politely, with verbs of speaking λέγω καὶ μαρτύρομαι (“I affirm and testify” in 4.17) followed by an infinitive.

Ephesians 4.25-32

This section begins with Διὸ rather than οὖν, which occurs more commonly in chs. 4 and 5, though both are translated “therefore” in RSV. Διὸ seems to give a somewhat loose general connection with the whole of 4.1-24 (compare 2.11; 3.13). The syntax is basically very simple, and the paragraph is constructed from a string of imperative verbs (no longer with polite introductions) making eight short sentences. Of the imperatives, some are second person and some third, some positive and some negative, but there is no obvious patterning in their occurrence. The emphasis is more on behavior to avoid than on behavior to encourage, and the advice is fairly detailed. The move to direct imperatives is matched semantically by a move from general principles towards specific aspects of Christian conduct.

Ephesians 5.1-6

As in 4.1 and 4.17, this section is introduced by οὖν (therefore). Again the basic structure is simple, with a string of five imperatives constituting four sentences of fairly general ethical instruction. The paragraph breaks in UBS4 and NA27 are different from each other and both are less than helpful for translators. NA27 begins a new paragraph at 5.3 and continues it till the end of 5.14. UBS4 has 4.25–5.5 in one paragraph, and 5.6-14 in another. Both of these overlook the fact that the occurrence of the combination of οὖν and περιπατεῖτε (walk) in 5.1-2 and 5.7-8 indicates the beginning of new paragraphs at 5.1 and 5.7. This is made even clearer by the contrast of γίνεσθε οὖν (Therefore be) and μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε (Therefore do not be) in these two places. Furthermore, despite the asyndeton at the beginning of 5.6, this verse is clearly a contrast with 5.5 (ἴστε γινώσκοντες “be sure,” against Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω “Let no one deceive you”). For a similar contrast compare 5.17 (Do not be foolish, but understand).

Ephesians 5.7-14

As already noted, the beginning of a new paragraph is marked by οὖν and περιπατεῖτε in 5.7-8. The content continues to be general ethical instruction. The structure of the paragraph is rather loose and printed editions vary in their punctuation. There is subordination, but it is neither very complex nor very clear. The occurrence of γὰρ (for) no less than four times (5.8, 9, 12, 14) makes the degree of subordination debatable. It is rendered as “for” in RSV in all four cases, the last one being in 4.13 in the English text. The main verbs are μὴ . . . γίνεσθε (5.7: “do not be”), περιπατεῖτε (5.8: “walk”), μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε . . . μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε (5.11: “Take no part . . . but instead expose”), and φανεροῦται

(5.13: “becomes visible”), and it is suggested that translators should take each of these verbs as the kernel of a sentence. This would lead to starting new sentences at the beginning of 5.7; 5.8c; 5.11; and 5.13. The paragraph is rounded off with another citation introduced by διὸ λέγει (“therefore it says,” compare 4.8), but it is not from a single identifiable OT passage. The other feature in this paragraph that should be noted is the recurrence of the ποτε . . . νῦν δὲ (once . . . but now) contrast in 5.8, as in 2.11, 13.

Ephesians 5.15–6.9

This section has the clearest internal subdivisions of any in Ephesians 4–6. Its beginning is also marked by the occurrence of οὖν (therefore) and περιπατεῖτε (walk) in 5.15. It then breaks into seven short paragraphs each addressed to a different group of people. In 5.15-21, no addressees are specified, and the instructions are directed to believers in general. Then follow six specific groups, in three pairs, each addressed with a vocative: wives (Αἱ γυναῖκες 5.22-24) and husbands (Οἱ ἄνδρες 5.25-33), children (Τὰ τέκνα 6.1-2) and parents (οἱ πατέρες 6.4), slaves (Οἱ δούλοι 6.5-8), and masters (οἱ κύριοι 6.9). These are, in fact, the only vocatives found in Ephesians. Each group except the first is instructed with one or more imperative verbs, and an imperative is clearly implied with the first group. It is in fact found in some manuscripts.

The structure of this section is mainly clear, and the most interesting question is how 5.21 relates to its context. UBS4 and NA27 put a full stop at the end of 5.20 and link 5.21 with 5.22ff. BFBS and Souter on the other hand link 5.21 with 5.20, and place a full stop at the end of 5.21. This shows more respect for the syntax of 5.19-21 with its string of four participles before the final participle ὑποτασσόμενοι (being subject) in 5.21. The difficulty with this punctuation is that the previous four participles all refer to verbal activity (in RSV “addressing one another . . . singing and making melody . . . giving thanks . . .”), whereas ὑποτασσόμενοι does not. Nevertheless this seems the less difficult option. If 5.21 is linked with 5.22-24 then the paragraph 5.22-24 has no main verb. When 5.21 is linked with the instructions that precede, then a repetition of the verb ὑποτασσόμενοι in an imperative form is clearly implied in 5.22, and has obviously given rise to the variant readings. These offer both a third person imperative ὑποτασέσθωσαν (let them be subject) and a second person imperative ὑποτάσσεσθε ([you] be subject). In light of the second person imperatives in the following five paragraphs (5.25; 6.1, 4, 5, 9), a second person imperative is clearly preferable in 5.22. In translation it will normally be necessary to include it irrespective of the textual variant chosen. In short, translators are recommended to begin a new paragraph at 5.22, not at 5.21. However, it may be convenient to make 5.21 a separate sentence, as RSV has done, but it is better to attach it to the end of the previous paragraph.

It is not necessary to say a lot about the remaining paragraphs of the section. We may note that the first two, dealing with wives and husbands both include comparisons linking the marriage relationship with the person of Christ. These are presented chiasmically (5.24 ὡς . . . οὕτως . . . : “As . . . so”; compare οὕτως . . . ὡς . . . : “Even so . . . as” in both 5.28 and 5.33), thus subtly strengthening the link between the two paragraphs. The section dealing with

husbands also includes an OT citation from Gen 2.24 in 5.31, and an application of it.

The middle pair of paragraphs dealing with children and parents are both short and simple. The last pair, dealing with slaves and masters, both contain a concluding reason introduced by εἰδότες ὅτι . . . (“knowing that” in 6.8, 9). Except at 5.21, the syntax throughout this section is clear and simple.

Ephesians 6.10-22

This section is marked as a final section by the introductory words Τοῦ λοιποῦ (Finally) in 6.10. In other words, 6.10-22 form the *peroratio*, that is, the final exhortation and summing up of essential points before the letter is drawn to a close. Although vv. 21-22 are too specific and local to be part of the *peroratio*, they are included in this paragraph because there is no other example in the NT of a new paragraph beginning with a ἵνα clause. The main structure is carried by more imperative verbs in 6.10, 11, 13, 14, and 17. In accordance with this, new sentences begin in 6.10, 11, 13, and 14 in all the available printed editions. There is, however, considerable difference over the punctuation in 6.16 and 17. UBS4 and NA27 have full stops at the end of 6.17, and NA27 even has a new paragraph beginning at 6.18. Souter begins a new sentence at the beginning of 6.17 and continues it to the end of 6.20, and BFBS has a single sentence running through from the beginning of 6.14 to the end of 6.20. In light of the way each of the other sentences is structured around the occurrence of an imperative verb, it seems that Souter’s punctuation is the most convincing from a discourse perspective. Translators are therefore recommended to begin a new sentence at 6.17. There is very little subordination in this section, and no further comment need be made up to the end of 6.20.

In 6.21, however, there is a situation unique in the epistles in that the sentence covering 6.21-22 begins with a purpose clause introduced by ἵνα (in order that). Such clauses much more often come after the main verb to which they are subordinate. 6.21-22 also stand apart from 6.10-20 in that they contain a statement in the indicative rather than commands in the imperative. This could be taken as sufficient reason to detach them from the preceding verses as a separate unit. However, in the few other places where a ἵνα clause begins a sentence (Matt 9.6 and parallels; Matt 17.17; Acts 24.4), it is heavily dependent on what has preceded, so that seems the more likely analysis here. 6.21-22 have no closer semantic link with 6.23-24 than they have with 6.10-20. One wonders whether they started life as an afterthought, inserted after 6.23-24 had been written.

Ephesians 6.23-24

These closing greetings are similar to those in other letters. The two verses form separate sentences. Neither has a finite verb, but as in the opening greeting, the sense is that of a wish.

Greek New Testament editions cited

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993. (Cited as UBS4.)

Aland, Barbara et Kurt, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27 revidierte Auflage. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993. (Cited as NA27.)

H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, 2nd ed. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958. (Cited as BFBS.)

Souter, Alexander, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Editio Altera. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947. (Cited as Souter.)

REVIEW

Piñero, Antonio and Jesús Peláez. 2003. *The Study of the New Testament: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Translated (with revisions) by David E. Orton and Paul Ellingworth from the Spanish, *El Nuevo Testamento. Introducción al estudio de los primeros escritos cristianos* (published by Ediciones el Almendro de Córdoba, S. L., 1995). Leiden: Deo. 552 pp. + 27 pp. indices (of biblical references and of names).

Note well the title of this publication; it is not an introduction to the New Testament, but to “the *study* of the New Testament.” It purports to be “a *reference manual* providing orientation through the different areas of New Testament study and providing knowledge of the tools needed for working in the chosen sphere” (xvi). If one wants to have a feel of the scope of NT scholarship, this is one of the very few books available.

In a way, it is easier to practice NT scholarship than to define it in these days. It is not difficult to imagine how differently scholars would perceive the field among themselves, and what materials to be included; largely, this has much to do with one’s orientation (training, interest, area of expertise, etc.) and expectation. Likewise, this review reflects those of mine, which may differ from that of the original authors.

Generally speaking, the approach undertaken by *The Study of the New Testament* represents a classical one, with a clear focus on the literary (and linguistic) milieu and interpretation of the NT text; this is clearly noted and somewhat defended apologetically in the short “Introduction” (only 3 pages)—indeed a bit short for a 500-page book. Such emphases are important in these days when more than ever, some practitioners are of the opinion that serious study on the NT may be pursued entirely on a contemporary setting with little attention to the historical dimension of the text.

Chapter one (“The History of New Testament Interpretation”) is an excellent exposition to the scholarship involved in the study of the NT, and would help readers who are already acquainted with bits and pieces of NT scholarship to have a panorama of the history of studies. The presentation would be smoother, however, if a more rigorous topical arrangement could be applied (e.g., “textual criticism” is repeated on p. 33 and p. 45). Chapter two (“The Study of the Text of the New Testament”) deals with two major topics: “Canon of the New Testament” and “Text Criticism and the History of the New Testament text,” but with disproportional attention. The less than 8-page discussion on “Canon” is embarrassingly precise, seeing that this is one of the key topics listed on the back