

‘in every letter’? Some Possible Evidence for the Authorship of Ephesians

Michael Dormandy, University of Cambridge, UK

Abstract

A neglected passage in Ignatius of Antioch may be significant evidence for Pauline authorship of Ephesians. Ignatius of Antioch writes to the Ephesians that Paul remembers them ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ. This has generally been translated ‘in every letter’. I submit however that it should actually be rendered ‘in a whole letter’ and that this whole letter is the canonical letter to the Ephesians. The general rule for this πᾶς-construction suggests that my proposed reading is wrong, but there are a number of relevant exceptions to this general rule. It is also implausible that Ignatius intended the meaning ‘in every letter’, since Paul rarely mentions the Ephesians in his writings. Foster identifies references to Ephesus or the Ephesians in four letters in the Pauline corpus and argues that Ignatius is referring to these four letters. I argue that Ignatius cannot be alluding to the references identified by Foster, since these references are mostly negative. Other scholars suggest that Ignatius is exaggerating. I argue that my proposed reading is a more plausible exaggeration, since, on my reading, Ignatius genuinely thought that Paul had written an entire letter to the Ephesians, even though Paul does not ‘remember’ specific details of their life. I argue that Ignatius is likely to have known the canonical letter to the Ephesians, because he seems to allude to it. I also argue that he is likely to have known it as a letter to the Ephesians, since he must have been able to distinguish it by name from the other letters of Paul with which he was clearly familiar. I thus suggest that this passage in Ignatius’ letter to the Ephesians is an early ascription of the New Testament Ephesian letter to Paul.

Paper

In the debate over the authorship of Ephesians, one particular Patristic reference has been neglected. In this paper, I will argue that a phrase in Ignatius of Antioch's letter to the Ephesians (henceforth 'IE') can arguably be understood as evidence that Paul is in fact the author of the Ephesian letter traditionally ascribed to him (henceforth 'Ephesians'). I claim only that my interpretation of the IE passage is reasonable, not certain, and that this has implications for the debate over the authorship of Ephesians. Ignatius scholarship generally rejects my proposed reading and few introductions to commentaries on Ephesians even discuss the passage, so even my modest claims make a significant contribution to the discussion.

The relevant passage, IE xii.2, is printed below, with the phrase under consideration in italics.

Οἶδα τίς εἰμι καὶ τίσιν γράφω. ἐγὼ κατάκριτος, ὑμεῖς ἠλεημένοι· ἐγὼ ὑπὸ κίνδυνον, ὑμεῖς ἐστηριγμένοι. πάροδος ἐστε τῶν εἰς θεὸν ἀναιρουμένων, Παύλου συμμύσται, τοῦ ἡγιασμένου, τοῦ μεμαρτυρημένου, ἀξιομακαρίστου, οὗ γένοιτό μοι ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη εὐρεθῆναι, ὅταν θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω, ὅς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.¹

The most natural translation of ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ is 'in every letter', such that Ignatius is saying that Paul remembered the Ephesians in every little he wrote. I suggest an alternative translation: 'in a complete letter, in a whole letter, in all of his letter'. This would mean that Ignatius is telling the Ephesians that Paul wrote them a

whole letter. That would make this perhaps the earliest ascription of Ephesians to Paul.

Neither Holmes nor Lightfoot lists any significant textual variants.² According to Cureton, the phrase is changed completely in the longer recension of Ignatius and the whole section is omitted in the Syriac version.³ The Armenian has the verb in the first person. However, this is unlikely to be original, since firstly it appears in no Greek evidence and secondly by the principle of *lectio difficilior*: the difficulties of the third person reading will occupy us for the remainder of this paper, so we can well imagine the Armenian translator altering it. We can thus focus on the Greek text in the form given above.

I will briefly survey the Ignatius scholarship and then put forward the arguments for my proposed reading.

Pearson, in the seventeenth century, took the phrase in the way I suggest, as did Stahl and Krüger, but they have not been followed by many.⁴ Lightfoot, Schoedel and Bauer all read the phrase as meaning ‘in every letter’.⁵ Amongst translators, the significant majority (five out of seven consulted) write ‘in every letter’, or similar.⁶ Only two opt for some variation on ‘in all his letter’.⁷

What therefore justifies my interpretation? There are two types of argument to be considered: linguistic and contextual. We must establish first whether my proposed reading is within the possible semantic range of the relevant $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ -construction and then whether or not it is the correct meaning, based on the context in IE.

In assessing the linguistic arguments, it is important to focus on the particular $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ -construction used in the passage. $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ is followed by a singular, anarthous, countable, common noun. Kühner, Blass and Gerth treat this construction specifically: ‘ $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ ἄνθρωπος (rarely ἄνθρ. $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$) [means] each individual person, that is each to whom the predicate “person” applies; πάντες ἄνθρωποι, all that is called “person”, all the world’.⁸ This is also the view taken by Johnston in his monograph specifically on $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$, though he considers only $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ in the New Testament.⁹ This restriction makes his work less valuable since, besides the fact that we are concerned with $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ in a non-canonical author, there is no reason why texts which would later be considered canonical should have a special value as sources of grammatical evidence (whatever other special value they might have).

Two other grammarians, Wallace and Moule, agree that that the rule of Kühner *et al.* generally holds, but they cite a number of exceptions, some of which we will now consider.¹⁰ Most of the examples below are from the Greek New Testament or the Septuagint. This is not because I value canonical examples more highly, but rather because these two corpora are a readily available source of Hellenistic and Koine Greek, with which Ignatius would have been familiar and which would have influenced his language.

οἱ ἐπεῖτε ἀπίκοντο παντὶ στόλῳ ἐς τὴν Σικελίην¹¹

This example is from Herodotus. The meaning is clearly ‘when [they] came to Sicily with an entire army’. Herodotus is of course much too early to be significant evidence for Ignatius, but it is important to include non-Jewish examples, since Jewish writers

frequently wrote ‘semitised’ Greek. This means that they are not, on their own, a reliable guide to the non-Jewish Greek of Ignatius.

καὶ νῦν κατὰ πρόσωπον πάσης ἐκκλησίας κυρίου καὶ ἐν ὧσιν θεοῦ ἡμῶν
φυλάξασθε καὶ ζητήσατε πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν¹²

κατὰ πρόσωπον πάσης ἐκκλησίας κυρίου clearly means ‘before the face of the whole assembly of the Lord’. It is possible that here we are dealing with an implicitly proper noun, since there is only ever possibly one assembly of the Lord, but this is nevertheless an example of πᾶς being used with an anarthous, countable, singular, grammatically common noun and meaning ‘whole’ rather than ‘every’.

ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὐξεῖ εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον¹³

Although some manuscripts include the definite article after πᾶσα, I follow the editors of NA²⁸ in omitting it. I translate the text: ‘in whom a whole building, joined together, grows into a holy temple’. It refers to one whole building, not every building, because in the previous verse there is one foundation and in the next verse, one dwelling place. Lightfoot argues, when commenting on the passage under discussion in IE, that πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ in *Eph.* 2:21 should be translated ‘every building’. He reasons that the verb in the next verse is plural and that in the writer’s mind it therefore takes many individual buildings to make a dwelling.¹⁴ However, given that there is one foundation in the previous verse, it is surely more natural to take the words to mean a single building. Johnston suggests that οἰκοδομὴ in this context is an implicitly proper noun, like the previous example.¹⁵ However, this is much less clear in the Ephesians example, since there is no obvious single building in mind. Although the Jerusalem temple is clearly in the background, the writer is not

saying that the readers will grow into the Jerusalem temple. Thus this is a valid counter-example to the general rule, close in time and place to Ignatius.

I have not considered examples involving proper names (*e.g.* *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται*, *Rom.* 11:26) or abstract qualities (*e.g.* *πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην*, *Matt.* 3:15), because these are irrelevant, since these concepts do not really exist in the plural. Nevertheless, if anything, these examples strengthen the case for my reading, since they show *πᾶς* regularly being used with singular, anarthous nouns in a sense much closer to my proposed one than to any other.

Ultimately, of course, general rules about the Greek language are less important than how Ignatius uses *πᾶς*. Unfortunately for me, he bears out the rule identified by Kühner *et al.*. Ignatius uses *πᾶς* with an anarthous, singular, countable, common noun fourteen times, excluding the text under discussion in this paper, and all have the meaning ‘every’.¹⁶ ‘every’ is arguably a more common idea than ‘one complete’, so we should expect the significant majority of Ignatius’ uses of the construction to mean ‘every’. The more important issue is what construction he uses when he is undoubtedly saying ‘one complete’. The standard Greek adjective for ‘complete’ is ὅλος and Ignatius uses this word four times to express that meaning, so he was clearly familiar with it.¹⁷ However, none of these occurrences are followed by an anarthous singular noun, so they do not prove that ὅλος, followed by an anarthous singular noun, was, for Ignatius, the standard way to express one complete, but indefinite, entity. We must also bear in mind that so little of Ignatius’ writing is preserved, that it would be foolish to be dogmatic in any claims about his habitual use of language.

It should also be noted that in his letter to Polycarp (viii.1), Ignatius uses ἐπιστολάς, in the plural, proving that he knew the plural form of the word and so could without difficulty have written πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς in IE xii.2, if he wanted to refer to every one of Paul's letters. The absence of any occurrence of the plural form of ἐπιστολή in the extant Ignatian corpus would hardly be evidence that he did not know that plural form, but its occurrence is nevertheless proof that he did.

To summarise the linguistic evidence, the general rule for the use of πᾶς tells against my reading. There are very occasional exceptions, but none in Ignatius, although Ignatius' extant corpus is so small that this may not mean much. The linguistic evidence thus renders my proposed reading rather unlikely, but not impossible.

Let us now consider the contextual evidence. It is difficult to read the phrase as 'he remembers you in every letter', because Paul simply does not mention the Ephesians in every letter, so there is little sense in which he can be said to remember them. This is true whether you restrict the corpus to the undisputedly Pauline letters or include all the letters attributed to Paul in the New Testament. Various scholars who favour 'in every letter' have made different attempts to deal with this problem.

Foster begins by identifying the times when Ephesus or the Ephesians are mentioned in the Pauline corpus. This happens in four letters. He identifies a number of literary parallels between those letters and Ignatius' work and concludes that these four were the only Pauline writings known to Ignatius. The references Foster finds are *1Cor.* 15:32; 16:8; *Eph.* superscription and 1:1; *1Tim.* 1:3; *2Tim.* 1:18 and 4:12 and in some

manuscripts *2Tim.* subscription. He excludes mentions of Asia.¹⁸ For reasons of space, I do not quote the texts in full.

Can these references be said to constitute ‘remembering in every letter’? I will now argue that they cannot. I do not here dispute Foster’s positive claim that there is a literary connection between these four letters and the Ignatian corpus. I challenge him on two points: firstly his implied negative claim that Ignatius knew no more of Paul and secondly his view that the mentions in these four Pauline letters can, on their own, account for the phrase we are discussing in IE.

It is both impossible to prove and intrinsically unlikely that Ignatius knew only these four Pauline letters. In Foster’s own words ‘Establishing literary dependence is difficult’.¹⁹ This is even more so when attempting to establish the absence of literary dependence. The fact that Ignatius never quotes, say, Second Corinthians, does not prove he had never read it. In particular, it is implausible to think of Ignatius, a key leader in Asia Minor, who faced issues of Judaizing among his churches, not to have heard of Galatians, since it is written to Christians in Asia Minor about Judaizing.²⁰ Space prevents detailed discussion of two notoriously difficult problems in New Testament Studies, the location of the Galatians and the nature of their heresy, but this point is not essential to my argument. I assume that Foster follows the majority critical opinion in rejecting Pauline authorship of the Pastorals. His argument only requires that Ignatius thought them to be by Paul. The question is largely irrelevant to my present argument, but if, following the consensus, they are pseudonymous, that strengthens my case, because Foster must explain how someone so near to both Paul

and to the true author of the Pastorals could have been deceived regarding their authorship.

I also question Foster's positive suggestion that the mentions of Ephesus or the Ephesians in the four relevant letters can be what Ignatius is referring to in IE xii.2. Ignatius clearly means to imply that Paul remembered the Ephesian Christians positively. He is trying to flatter the Ephesians throughout his letter and the reason for this phrase seems to be to tell them how valued they are by the great apostle Paul. They are so important to Paul that he either mentions them in every letter or devotes a whole letter to them. However, the references identified by Foster are almost always to the city, not the Ephesian people, let alone the Ephesian Christians, and they are often negative, relating to opposition faced by Paul in Ephesus. Ignatius is trying to make the Ephesians think that Paul valued them, so he is hardly going to remind them that Paul wrote about fighting wild beasts in their city.

An alternative explanation to Foster's is offered in varying details by two German scholars, Rathke and Bauer. Bauer faces the difficulty of phrase in IE xii.2 and, pressed between the manifest absence of mention of the Ephesians in all Paul's letters (though he does note the passages cited by Foster) and the standard translation of the construction, concludes this is an exaggeration and points out that this would hardly be unusual in Ignatius, whose style is marked by exaggeration.²¹ Rathke similarly rejects some contemporary scholars who apparently favoured my interpretation and suggests that Ignatius is exaggerating.²²

Exaggeration is certainly a plausible explanation for the phrase, if the translation ‘every letter’ is preferred. Ignatius often exaggerates and uses grand language, particularly in his letter to the Ephesians. The rhetorical motive for the exaggeration is also clear. As already discussed, Ignatius wants to flatter the Ephesians by telling them they were dear to Paul’s heart.

However, I argue that my proposed reading is even more consistent with Ignatius’ rhetorical strategy. My reading of course also involves significant exaggeration. The author of Ephesians can hardly be said to remember his readers in a complete letter, since the readers and their particular concerns are rarely explicitly mentioned. Indeed, Ephesians is often said to be, of all the letters in the Pauline corpus, the least concerned with its addressees. However, on my reading the exaggeration is significantly more credible. It functions as rhetorical flattery to tell the Ephesians that Paul remembers them in an entire letter, when in fact he has written them an entire letter, even if that letter does not refer to them frequently. This is especially plausible given a point made by Pearson: of all the letters in the Pauline corpus, Ephesians contains among the fewest negative references to the recipients. There is little or no rebuke. In this sense, it makes sense that Ignatius single out the Ephesian church as remembered by Paul in an entire letter. They are the only church, to which Paul writes an entire letter that is predominantly positive.²³ However it is false beyond the point of reasonable exaggeration, even for as seasoned an exaggerator as Ignatius, to say that a handful of references to the city, most of them negative, constitute a positive reference to the Ephesian Christians in every letter. My proposed reading is thus a more plausible exaggeration than the alternative.

Further, Ignatius' use of ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in IE xii.2 is significant. He does not merely claim that Paul remembers the Ephesians, but that he remembers them in Christ Jesus. Being 'in Christ' is a significant theme throughout Ephesians, including in the opening greeting of the letter. This proves nothing, but at least hints that Ignatius has Ephesians in mind in the passage in question.

We therefore have a situation where the linguistic evidence is against my reading, but does not entirely rule it out, and the contextual evidence favours it. I therefore submit that it deserves a 'place at the table', although it is certainly not proven.

How likely is it that, even if my reading of the Ignatius passage is right, the single complete letter is the letter we today call Ephesians? There is significant likelihood that this letter was known to Ignatius, since his letter to Polycarp contains what is likely to be an allusion to it. In that letter (v.1), we read that husbands are to be encouraged to love their wives ὡς ὁ κύριος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. The verbal parallels with *Eph.* 5:25 are less than overwhelming, since in the latter, the adverb used is καθὼς and the verb of loving is inside the καθὼς-clause. However, it remains likely that Ephesians is a source for the image in Ignatius. The fact that Ignatius knew Ephesians at the time of writing to Polycarp does not of course mean that he knew it when writing to the Ephesians, but it raises the probability significantly.

Is it possible that Ignatius knew Ephesians by a different name? Certainly, a number of significant manuscripts of Ephesians, notably 01, 03 and \mathfrak{P}^{46} , omit the name of the city in 1:1. However, the issue is not whether the earliest text of Ephesians contained the reference to the town, but rather whether or not Ignatius could plausibly have

thought the letter was written to someone other than the Ephesians. All the manuscripts contain the superscription, indicating that the letter is to the Ephesians, and there is evidence that Fathers as early as Irenaeus connected the letter to the Ephesian church.²⁴ Best notes that Ignatius is aware of more Pauline epistles than Ephesians only and that therefore he probably knew each by an individual name, so that they could be distinguished.²⁵ It is most natural to assume this was a name based on the recipients, since the manuscripts typically give such names to the Pauline letters. The only significant possible alternative recipients are the Laodiceans, whom Marcion links to our Ephesian letter. Space forbids me from detailed discussion of this problem, but I follow Best in rejecting the hypothesis that our Ephesians was originally a letter to the Laodiceans.²⁶ It is therefore surely unlikely that Ignatius knew Ephesians by a different geographical name, since there is little or no evidence for an alternative name being in use in Ignatius' time.

At this point, it is worth considering the contribution of Abbott. Abbott argued, as I do, that the verbal allusions indicate that Ignatius knew Ephesians and that Ignatius wanted to flatter the Ephesians, by reminding them how much Paul had written them. He also argues that the grammatical evidence strongly favours 'in every letter'. He concludes that Ignatius cannot therefore have known Ephesians *as a letter to the Ephesians*, since, if he had, it would have been much more effective flattery to refer to this single, entire letter than to exaggerate far beyond the limits of plausibility and claim that Paul mentions the Ephesians in every letter he wrote.²⁷ Abbott, unlike Bauer and Rathke, recognises that claiming that Paul mentions the Ephesians in every letter is an unreasonable degree of exaggeration. He has further, and in my view correctly, realised that this commits him either to 'swallowing the pill' of a

grammatically unlikely understanding of $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ or to positing that Ignatius knew Ephesians by another name. He concludes that the latter is more likely. I submit, by contrast, that it is so unlikely that Ignatius knew Ephesians by another name that the linguistic data, which is strong, but not utterly conclusive, should be rejected.

In summary, although the linguistic arguments for ‘every letter’ are powerful, I submit that they are not so completely decisive as to over-rule the extremely strong evidence that ‘one entire letter’ is the more natural interpretation in the context in IE. The strong linguistic arguments will mean the matter is always open to debate, but the strong contextual arguments mean it is surprising how little attention ‘one entire letter’ has received from scholars. Specifically, it is noteworthy how this passage has been ignored in the debates on the authorship of Ephesians. I append to this paper a table of commentaries on Ephesians. Of fifteen commentary introductions examined, in English and German and ranging as far back as the nineteenth century, only three discuss the passage and all three read the crucial words as ‘in every letter’. Even if my proposed reading were clearly and demonstrably right, it would certainly not prove that Paul wrote Ephesians. My reading is not even required to prove that Ignatius thought Paul wrote Ephesians, since Foster includes Ephesians in his reconstruction of Ignatius’ Pauline corpus. However, my reading is potentially strong evidence that a writer very close in time to Paul thought that Ephesians was written by Paul to the Ephesians.

Table of Commentaries

| Commentator | Discuss Patristic evidence? | Discuss IE xii.2? | See a reference to Ephesians only? | Pauline authorship? |
|---------------|---|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Abbott | Yes | Yes | No | Yes ²⁸ |
| Barth, Markus | Yes | Yes | No | Yes ²⁹ |
| Best | Yes | Yes | No | No ³⁰ |
| Bruce | No | | | Yes ³¹ |
| Conzelmann | No | | | No ³² |
| Hoehner | Yes | No | | Yes (at least by implication) ³³ |
| Hübner | No | | | No ³⁴ |
| Kreitzer | No | | | No ³⁵ |
| Lincoln | No | | | No ³⁶ |
| Muddiman | Yes | No | | Partly ³⁷ |
| O'Brien | No | | | Yes ³⁸ |
| Porkony | In relation to date and place, not author | | | No ³⁹ |
| Schlier | No | | | Yes ⁴⁰ |
| Schnackenburg | No | | | No ⁴¹ |
| Talbert | No | | | No ⁴² |

Footnotes

1. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translation*, ed. Michael W. Holmes, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, 2007), 192. Emphasis mine.
2. For Holmes, *ibid.*, 192. For Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers, Part II: S. Ignatius. S. Polycarp. Revised Texts with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations and Translations*, ed. J.B. Lightfoot (London, 1889), 65.
3. *Corpus Ignatianum: A complete collection of the Ignatian Epistles, Genuine, Interpolated and Spurious; Together with numerous extracts from them as quoted by ecclesiastical writers down to the tenth century; in Syriac, Greek and Latin: An English Translation of the Syriac Text, copious notes and Introduction*, ed. William Cureton (London, 1849), 29-30, 228-9.
4. Pearson quoted T.K. Abbott, *The Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1897), x. Stahl and Krüger quoted Heinrich Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochen und die Paulusbriefe* (Berlin, 1967), 22 n. 1 and 2.
5. *Apostolic Fathers*, ed. J.B. Lightfoot (1889), 65. William R. Schoedel, *A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, 1985), 73. Walter Bauer, 'Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief' in Walter Bauer, Rudolf Knopf, Martin Dibelius and Hans Windisch (ed.), *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1923), 211. Bauer suggests 'in jedem Brief'.
6. *Apostolic Fathers*, ed. M.W. Holmes (2007), 193. *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. and trans. Kirsopp Lake, Loeb Classical Library (Harvard, 1977), 187. *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. and trans. Bart D. Ehrman, Loeb Classical Library 24 (Harvard, 2003),

- 2:233. *The Letters of Saint Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch*, trans. J.H. Srawley, Translations of Christian Literature Series 1: Greek Texts (London, 1919), 47. *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*, trans. Maxwell Staniforth (Harmondsworth, 1968), 79.
7. *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary, Vol. 4 Ignatius of Antioch*, trans. Robert Grant (London, 1966), 43. *The Writings of the Fathers Down to AD 325. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Volume 1: The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, ed. and trans. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, revised and chronologically updated with brief prefaces and occasional notes by A. Cleveland Coxe (Peabody, 1994), 55.
8. ‘πᾶς ἄνθρωπος (selten ἄνθρ. πᾶς) ein jeder Mensch, d. i. jeder dem das Praedikat Mensch zukommt, πάντες ἄνθρωποι, alles was Mensch heist, alle Welt’. Raphael Kühner, Friedrich Blass and Bernhard Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1890-1904), 2:1:631-2. My translation.
9. J. William Johnston, *The Use of Πᾶς in the New Testament* (New York, 2004), 183.
10. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1996), 253 n. 99. C.F.D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1963), 94-5.
11. Herodotus V.46. *Herodotus’ Histories*, ed. A.D. Godley, Loeb Classical Library 119 (Harvard, 1922), 3:48.
12. 1Chron. 28:8 (LXX).
13. Eph. 2:21
14. *Apostolic Fathers*, ed. J.B. Lightfoot (1889), 65.
15. J.W. Johnston, Πᾶς (2004), 173.

16. *Eph.* ii.2; xix.3 (twice); *Mag.* x.3; *Tral.* ii.3; *Rom.* Prologue (twice); *Phil.* viii.1; *Smyrn.* Prologue (twice); x.1; *Pol.* ii.1, 2; iii.2. πᾶς πόλεμος in *Eph.* xiii.2 is not counted, because the noun is clearly being used in an abstract sense, to mean warfare, rather than a particular war. The various occurrences of χάρισμα are counted, because the word is used as a countable noun, meaning ‘gift’. The edition used was *Apostolic Fathers*, ed. M.W. Holmes (2007).

17. *Eph.* viii. 1; *Rom.* v.3; *Smyrn.* vi.1; *Pol.* viii.2. For the edition, see *ibid.*

18. Paul Foster, ‘The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and the Writings that later formed the New Testament’, in Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, *The New Testament and The Apostolic Fathers 2* (Oxford, 2005), 163-4.

19. *Ibid.* 185.

20. Personal Communication, Matthew Thomas, 4 March 2016.

21. W. Bauer, ‘Die Briefe’ (1923), 212.

22. H. Rathke, *Ignatius* (1969), 21-2.

23. *Tota enim epistola ad Ephesios scripta, ipsos Ephesios, eorumque honorem et curam, maxime spectat...In aliis epistolis apostolus eos ad quos scribit saepe acriter objurat aut parce laudat.* Pearson, quoted T.K. Abbott, *Ephesians* (1897), x.

24. Ernest Best, ‘Ephesians 1:1’ in Ernest Best (ed.), *Essays on Ephesians* (Edinburgh, 1997), 3-4.

25. Ernest Best, ‘Ephesians 1:1 Again’ in Ernest Best (ed.), *Essays on Ephesians* (Edinburgh, 1997), 18.

26. E. Best, ‘Ephesians 1:1’ (1997), 11-2.

27. T.K. Abbott, *Ephesians* (1897), x-xi.

28. T.K. Abbott, *Ephesians* (1897), ix-xiii.

29. Markus Barth, *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation and Commentary on Chapters 1-3*, Anchor Bible Commentary 34 (New York, 1974), 36-7, 49.
30. Ernest Best, *Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1998), 15-7, 36.
31. F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, 1984), 240-3 (this is the page reference given for the authorship of Ephesians in Bruce's index, though it only addresses the issue implicitly; Bruce seems to write assuming Pauline authorship).
32. Jürgen Becker, Hans Conzelmann and Gerhard Friedrich, *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser, Thessalonicher und Philemon*, Das Neue Testament Deutsch 8 (Göttingen, 1981), 88.
33. Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, 2002), 4-6, 60-1.
34. Hans Hübner, *An Philemon, An die Kolosser, An die Epheser*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 12 (Tübingen, 1997), 11.
35. Larry Kreitzer, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, Epworth Commentaries (Peterborough, 1997), 29.
36. Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Waco, 1990), lx.
37. John Muddiman, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, BNTC (London, 2001), 21, 34. Muddiman discusses the word *συμμύσται* in IE xii.2, but, perhaps surprisingly, not the phrase discussed in this paper.
38. Peter O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids, MI, and Leicester, UK, 1999), 46-7.
39. Petr Porkoný, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser*, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 10/II (Leipzig, 1992), 40, 42.
40. Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (Düsseldorf, 1957), 27.

41. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, EKK 10 (Zürich, 1982), 25.
42. Charles H. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, 2007), 10-1.