



THE EXALTATION OF CHRIST: THE ELEVATION – ACCLAMATION IN DEUTERO-PAULINE HIGH CHRISTOLOGY¹

Ergo Naab

Abstract

The purpose of article is to analyse cultural meaning of keywords in the text Ephesians 1:20–23 and to find what may have been the author's main motive for using these words in such ambitious and powerful constructions. Subsequent is form-critical and historical analysis of the keywords in the context of this Christological statement. The main topic of the paper is centred on four ancient Greek words that are related with principalities, powers, and all things in the above mentioned statement. We can conclude that the author of the Deutero-Pauline epistle used Hellenistic epistolography with citations from Hebrew scripture and fashioned the form of the statement according to his own liturgical purposes.

Keywords

Kerygma, eschatology, exaltation, principalities, powers, dominion.

The story about the cross and Christ's suffering was usually interpreted from the perspective of conception of his resurrection and exaltation. In the early phase of Christianity (in the authentic epistles of Paul) the elevation of Jesus was associated with the hope of his return and fulfilment of Parousia. Later, the conception of bidding of Parousia, envisioned Jesus's heavenly power as a present aspect of the eschatological

¹ This article was supported by the Deutsches Nationalkomitee des Lutherischen Weltbundes and Die Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche in Norddeutschland.

realm. The *Corpus Paulinum* is a good example of this sort of dynamic. The present aspect of Christ's eschatological power will emerge in the epistles of Paul's school of thought. The epistles are dated between 60–130 CE and this period could be divide contingently into two sub period: a) epistles to Colossians and Ephesians (60–100 CE); b) Second epistle to Thessalonians (100–130 CE).² The first of these periods signifies the era when the borders of Christian religion became more or less fixed. Christian religion differentiated itself from Judaism and solitary churches connected into a broader ecclesiological framework. In the second period, the Church became more protectionist and needed to defend itself against false teachings and heresies.³ The best example for the present aspect of eschatology of Paul's school is the former period – the epistles of Colossians and Ephesians. There is an estrangement from the future aspect of eschatology in the Jesus exaltation motif in the epistles (Hahn 1965: 132).⁴ This sort of disproportionate eschatology works well with the social-political conception of power which even now because of its importance has not decreased.

In this paper I will examine the considerable exaltation acclamation in the epistle to the Ephesians. It is a short description of the elevated Christ as the cosmic ruler and head of the church. (Barth 1974: 160). The purpose of my paper is to analyse cultural meaning of keywords in the text and to find what may have been the author's main motive for using these words in such ambitious and powerful constructions. In this pericope (Eph 1:20–23) occur the same spatial cosmic dimension that characterise the whole epistle. (Sampley 1993: 19). The main keywords are: ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις, κυριότης. Subsequent is form-critical and historical analysis of the keywords in the context of this Christological statement.

² Margaret Y. MacDonald divides *Corpus Paulinum* into three chronological categories: (1) the formation of the Church (authentic epistles of Paul which are dated between 35–55 CE); (2) stabilised period of Church (60–100 CE); (3) protection period of Church (100–130 CE). (MacDonald 1988: 2–10).

³ Well known apologists as Justin Martyr and Irenaeus.

⁴ Timo Eskola has argued that there wasn't a polarized view of eschatology among the first Christians that would have been limited eschatological thinking only for the apocalyptic end of the world. (Eskola 2001: 277–284).

TEXT AND CONTEXT

The epistle with title ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ⁵ could be divided into two parts: theological and practical.⁶ The epistle's thematical consistency, beginning from the first chapter, emanate from a broad perspective, although the whole epistle is quite paraenetic in style. It begins with an invocation with cosmic imagery and purpose (Eph 1:3–14) and continues with a description of church, family and household to emphasise the individual believer's responsibility (Sampley, 22). A Christological statement is part of introductory blessing that includes the author's grateful address to his readers in the 1. Century Ephesus (1:15–16).⁷

Prolegomenous blessing (Eph 1:15–23)

- a) Intercessory prayer (1:15–19)
 - i. Gratitude (1:15–16)
 - ii. Intercessory (1:17–19)
- b) *Christological statement* (1:20–23)

Diversely from the Prolegomenous blessing, there is eulogia without reference to the subject of gratitude in Eph 1:3–14. Gratitude (1:1–16) makes a convenient transition from eulogy to Intercessory (1:17–19). The Christological statement (1:20–23) is focused on the exaltation of Christ. Keywords that tie the statement with the previous part of intercessory prayer are: δύναμις (v 19 and 21) and ἐνέργεια (v 19 and 20). God's „power“ that „worked“ thorough Christ and resurrected him from the dead is „working“ in believers (1:17–18). God's power works thorough Christ in the Church and enables the Church to be the place of divine abundance (πλήρωμα).

⁵ Earliest evidence for words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ (Eph 1:1) originate from later manuscripts. Brooke F. Westcott said that the name of the city in this verse is inarguable later but justified addition to the text. (Westcott 1909: 20). Bruce Metzger also supports this view and therefore appears ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in editions of Nestle Aland (NA) and United Bible Societies only in brackets. (Metzger 1994: 532).

⁶ Whole epistle divides clearly into two parts: Eph 1:1–3:21 and 4:1–6:24.

⁷ Textologically pericope Eph 1:20–23 is quite unified. In NA27 in verse 20 the phrase καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ is supported by manuscripts P92 from the 3rd Century, Codex Vaticanus and some manuscripts from IX (majuscule) and XII (minuscule) Centuries; and Latin versions. Possible alternative reading is καθίσας αὐτὸν (supported by Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, minuscules from IX Century, and Latin versions).

Blessings in the Pauline epistles⁸ are partial modifications from Hellenistic epistles where the author gives thanks to the gods or an entreaty for somebody before the gods, after which comes argumentations about gratefulness. At the same time these reflect not only Hellenistic epistolography, but early Christian liturgical style as well, which of course derive from Jewish worship service. For this reason, Pauline epistolographical blessings are the best examples of the interaction of prayer genres between Hellenism and Judaism. There are influences from Hellenistic epistolography in the introductory blessing from the point of form and function, and it contains Jewish liturgical substances. The Christological statement (1:20–23) reflects typical judaistic eulogy (*ḥarākāh*) which was usually used in the beginning and at the end of prayers. (Lincoln 2002: 50). In the intercessory part of the prolegomenous blessing, the author of the epistle turns back to the eulogia-liturgical style (as it was in (1:3–14), with repeating some of its topics. The intercessory part flows into liturgical Christology emphasising the future aspect of eschatological high spot: „[N]ot only in this age but also in the age to come“ (1:21b)⁹.

Structure. Pericope Eph 1:20–23 belongs to the passage 1:15–23 and is a complex sentence that constructed form four shorter clauses:

- 1) **20** Ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις
21 ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

This clause consist of a credal structure:

- 20a** Ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ
20b ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν
20c καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις

⁸ Other prolegomenous blessings in *Corpus Paulinum* (Phil 1:1–11; Col 1:1–14), are a bit different because of the lack of Christological disposition.

⁹ Here and afterwards: *The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989).

There are two subordinate clauses in verse 21 and a chiasm in a:

21a ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου,

21b οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι

2) **22a** καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ

3) **22b** καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ

4) **23** ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου

The verbs that dominate in first and second clause (v 20 and 22) are: ἐνεργέω, ἐγείρω, καθίζω, ὑποτάσσω, δίδωμι. The substantives that dominate in the dependent clause of first clause and in second and fourth are: ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις, κυριότης, ὄνομα, αἰών, σῶμα, κεφαλή, πούς and adjective πᾶς. There is also semantic dependence between the second, third and fourth clause (v 22–23) that is typical Pauline anthropology about church as body (σῶμα) and its head (κεφαλή) as Christ; everything (τα πάντα) is subordinated under his feet (τοὺς πόδας). This sort of Christ-picture is compatible with the conception about resurrection which ties the whole pericope figuratively into one compound.

The structure of the first subordinate clause is chiasmic with its framed case-forms of the word πᾶς. A chiasmic structure seems to be also in the clause where the main keywords that are related with hierarchical and power conceptions (ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις, κυριότης) are delivered in sequence: the words ἀρχή and κυριότης have slightly different meanings than words ἐξουσία and δύναμις – first are titles, the latter have more power driven meaning. At the same time, it is possible that all the pericope is presented in chiasma for there seems to be some earlier hymnal layers in it.¹⁰

The Genre. It is relevant to define the genre of the pericope because there are similar Christological statements in several New Testament documents where Ps 110 is expounded.¹¹ A quote from this Old Testament kingship

¹⁰ In the structure of the first clause could be noticed *parallelismus membrorum* between participles (ἐγείρας, καθίσας) and verbs (ὑπέταξεν, ἔδωκεν). (Lincoln, 51).

¹¹ Ps 110:1 becomes in late Jewish theology a standard utterance and the first Christian Christological statements are based on it.

psalm is the reason why the exaltation of Christ could be differentiated between form and structure. The social context of statements can be slightly different, however, the *Sitz im Leben* of New Testament writings (especially *Corpus Paulinum*) are associated mainly with liturgical, kerygmatic, or catechetical purpose.

The social context of our pericope is presumably liturgical because the letter to the Ephesians is particularly homiletical in style (Barth, 153). The four verses of the text consist of several hymnal elements: (a) there is a summarised message about the kerygma of Christ; (b) emphasises the cosmic amplitude of governance of Christ; (c) continuity of thought of presumed hymn will interrupt the context and the previous and following verses overlap only partly with the thought of the context.

There are two straightforward quotes from the Psalms: in verse 20 a quote from Ps 110:1 and verse 22 a quote from Ps 8:7. The pericope ends with emphasis on the importance of the church (which is referred to as $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ v 23), but the central focus is on Christ's cosmic regime. The liturgical style of the Ephesians makes the pericope comparatively unique. In contrast to some other hymnal or homological statement,¹² the verses here consist of a major eulogy to the resurrected and exalted Christ. Clear reference to Christ humiliating death on the cross is absent, however, allusion to this could be found in verse 20. The interpretations of Christ's death and resurrection are not as closely related in the epistle to the Ephesians as they are in Paul's authentic epistles (1Cor 15:3–4; Rom 4:25; Phil 2:6–11).¹³ We could call it „elevation-hymn“ based on certain hymnal elements in the pericope which portrays Christ in a high position, but the text contains several phrases that could derive from catechetical and/or liturgical tradition. Moreover, there is the missing topic about Christ's death and its meaning which was so characteristic in Christianity, so it cannot be defined as a hymn nor homological formulaic sentence in an ordinary sense.

The lack of determinative arguments to define genre could be in the fact that in both cases, the author of the pericope designed existing material for liturgical purposes. In consideration of the homiletical and parenetical

¹² Phil 2:6–11; Rom 4:25; 1Tim 3:16; Eph 4:9–10.

¹³ Christ' death is mentioned in Eph 1:7, it is interpreted in Eph 2:13–18 and alluded in Eph 4:9–10 and 5:2, 25.

style of the Ephesians one should not exclude the catechetical purpose of the epistle and the pericope may be considered as homology or doxology in context of Church service. Conventionally there is a custom to rely on pre-existing categories of genres, regardless of the quality. Consequently, our text could be considered as acclamation of eulogia, homology or doxology. In my point of view, it should be acclamation, because this term of category seems to be conveniently ambivalent to define the genre.

CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE KEYWORDS

The purpose of the following analysis is to present conceptions and meaning of the chosen keywords of the author of the epistle to the Ephesians. I will handle: (a) the background and meaning of phrase καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ; (b), the possible context and tradition-historical context of power-related linguistic forms: ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις, κυριότης; (c) the word πάς that is repeatedly related to governments and power and which has a broader tradition-historical meaning; (d) anthropological motif (κεφαλή and σῶμα).

Cultural concepts in the phrase: καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ. There was an intimate relationship between rulers and God amongst the ancient people and this is why in the archaeological findings and in ancient literature occur deifications of rulers and their exaltations to the throne. Sitting on the throne was something that separated gods from humans, it emphasised honour and dignity. Gods often appear to sit in front of humans who are standing and praying (TDNT 3: 442, *s.v.* καθίζω). In the early historical period of Israel there was the Ark of the Covenant that represented Yahweh's earthly throne where Yahweh „who are enthroned above the cherubim“ „sits“ (*jōšēb*) on the throne (2Kings 19:15) as a king of kingdoms.¹⁴ Also in the book of Isaiah the prophet saw Yahweh „seated on a high and lofty throne“ (Is 6:1 NJB). The Jewish apocalyptic texts provide descriptions of the apocalyptic court which „takes seats“ (κρῆθριον ἐκάθισεν; Dan 7:10. 26 LXX; Mat 19:28; 25:31). Similar are descriptions of earthly adjudicators and elders who are „sitting“ in their

¹⁴ The Jewish theocratic ideal seems to be featured in the metaphors about the rule of the king. (Eskola, 49).

position (Judges 4:5; 2Kings 6:32). In Rome, all higher authorities like magistrates and procurators, were speaking from the *Sella curulis* – dismountable chair made from ivory and was meant to be on a chariot (Greek: βῆμα – a raised place or tribune). (TDNT 3: 442, *s.v.* καθίζω). For example, King Herod Agrippa I and high priests followed the same practice (Ap 12:21; 23:3).

In the same way was expression „at the right hand“ (or „at the side“: ἐκ δεξιῶν) used in the ancient Near East, where the king was positioned beside a certain protector god of the city or nation. In Hellenistic use, the word δεξιῶν was used as the general meaning of virtue and it was related with social position of honour and privilege. (TDNT 2: 38, *s.v.* δεξιῶν). In Judaism, the right side of the human being was related with good impulses and it was religiously important for the rabbis.¹⁵ The right side of Yahweh is the side of protection and favour (Ps 80:17; Jer 22:24), and Yahweh’s right hand is related with victory (Ps 20:6; 44:3; 48:10; Js 41:10), with power and strength (Ex 15:6; Ps 89:13; Is 48:13).

In the New Testament, sitting on a throne is related to liturgical expression about divine dignity and position (Mat 5:34; 23:22). Behind all these texts where Jesus is exalted to the high position, the influence of Ps 110:1 (κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου) is explicit. There is not always a direct citation nor description of the word „throne“ but it is replaced by the phrase: „sitting at God’s right hand“ (Col 3:1 par). In the sermon of Peter, the act of the exaltation of Jesus is described as God’s action which he committed with his right hand (Acts 2:33–36; 5:31).¹⁶ The Old Testament testimonial about ‚sitting at God’s right hand‘ or as imperative in the primitive formulaic sentence: „κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου“, is transmitted to Jesus as marker of celestial ruler. Exalted Jesus has the throne of the Messiah at

¹⁵ Based on Dt 33:2 they understand that human is ‚righteous‘ when his or her heart follows the Torah which is situated on the right hand of God. Because the heart of the fool inclines to the left (Eccl 10:2), it means ungodliness and coveting of riches and honour which situates on the left hand of God (Prov 3:16). In the old rabbinic synagogue traditions Abraham and David sat on the right hand of God (this tradition was related to Ps 110:1). (TDNT 2: 40, *s.v.* δεξιῶν).

¹⁶ Peter’s sermon (Acts 2:22–36) has always had a crucial role in the research of New Testament Christology, because the text most certainly consists of the earliest tradition about Jesus’ enthronement. The focus here is to the Psalm Christology, central are allusions to Psalms 16, 132 and 110 that support Davidic messiah expectations that is combined with the enthronement of Jesus. (Eskola, 160–162).

the right hand of God and he dominates (presently) in the ruling position. Psalm 110 had definitive importance to the *Corpus Paulinum*.¹⁷

Thus, in the ancient world the metaphor about sitting at god's right hand symbolised honour, dignity and potential of power. In the Hebrew Bible as well as later Jewish writings the people and other transcendent beings were positioned „at the right hand“ or „on the throne“. But in Hellenistic culture the elevation of gods and kings along with deified rulers was a broadly known and widespread phenomenon. Therefore, the expression „καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ“ has direct religion-historical meaning that is related with social power and domination.

Interpretation possibilities of linguistic forms: ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις, κυριότης. Substantives ἀρχή (regime), ἐξουσία (power), δύναμις (force, might), κυριότης (person of dominance) are central concepts in Christology with which the present meaning of power and dominance is attributed to Christ. These substantives are abstract and with indefinite reference and the question is what kind of leverage, power or dominance is considered with these.¹⁸

Firstly, considering the meaning of the word δύναμις, derived from δύνα that relates to capability and potentiality. Therefore, δύναμις could be considered in the sense of attempt or ability to achieve a certain form of dominance.¹⁹ In the LXX δύναμις is related in one way with celestial dominance („whole array of heaven“, 2 Kings 17:16; 21:3, 5; 23:4), (O'Brien 1999: 41) but more in context of earthly kingship and „military strength“ (Ps 110:2; 2Kn 18:20).²⁰ In the *Corpus Paulinum* the word δύναμις is used

¹⁷ David M. Hay explains the popularity of Ps 110:1 with fact that the imagery of sitting on the right hand of a certain god was a universally known metaphor during the Hellenistic era (one shouldn't underestimate the influence of LXX) and it was a poetically useful phrase to integrate in different hymns, declarations or acclamations. (Hay 1989: 158–161).

¹⁸ In Col 1:16 is presented three words in different collation (κυριότητες, ἀρχή, ἐξουσία).

¹⁹ In contrast to ἰσχὺς that is related more to ‚ability‘ not so much to ‚achievement‘. (TCWSD 2000, s.v. δύναμις)

²⁰ In LXX the word „δύναμις“ happens 400 times in a universal sense as: ability, power, living force, strength, energy etc; in military sense as: military force, army, troops, etc; in economic sense as: wealth, resource, aid etc; in spiritual sense as: ability to provide miracles; in theological sense as: Gods power and dominion; in political sense as: supreme, authority, tyranny etc; in rhetorical sense as: faculty of speech, eloquence etc. (Wink 1984: 17).

36 times and 13 times in Deutero-Pauline letters. In general meaning δύναμις is synonymous with ἐξουσία and ἐνέργεια. In Rom 8:38 exist ἀρχή and δύναμις in one listing with angels (ἄγγελοι), but the entire context (v 38–39) is quite dimensional. In addition, the word ἄγγελος means „messenger“ and it could be attached to celestial beings as well as earthly persons. (Wink 1986: 69). In such an ambitious context the word δύναμις is focused to earthly rule and especially to military-political power.

Secondly, the closest relation in meaning amongst the four keywords with the word δύναμις is the word ἐξουσία – it marks executive ability or power, dominion over things and beings; it is also the right something to do or leave undone. As a verb (ἐξουσιάζω) it means ‚implementing authority‘. (TCWSD 2000, *s.v.* ἐξουσιά). Its meaning in LXX depends on the context,²¹ but generally is it used many times in relation to persons and not a single time in sense of celestial powers (Wink 1984: 15–17). In the New Testament ἐξουσία is used abstractly in a celestial as well as in an earthly sense. Apostle Paul used it in the sense of God’s „righteousness“ (Rom 9:21) as well as apostolic „right“ to live from the gospel (1Cor 9:4–6,12,18; 2Thess 3:9) and authority for building up the Church (2Cor 10:8; 13:10). ἐξουσία also define Christian freedom (1Cor 8:9) and freedom of will (1Cor 7:37). The New Testament writings are in uncial position in front of LXX and other Hellenistic writings because it attributes the meaning of ἐξουσία to celestial powers.²² There is no use of ἐξουσία in the sense of heavenly powers neither in LXX nor in Hellenistic writings.

Thirdly, the linguistic forms ἀρχή and κυριότης have roots that relates with the titles ἄρχων and κύριος. ἀρχή marks always temporal and chronological as well as spatial or hierarchical priority and primality (TCWSD 2000, *s.v.* ἀρχή). The phrase ἀρχή και ἐξουσία appears in Plato in the context where powers, rulers and geopolitical areas are described in relation with concrete officials and authorities (EDNT 1 1990: 161–163, *s.v.* ἀρχή). There is an unopposed terrestrial meaning in the LXX: ἀρχή refers to position of power, structure, government, domination, hegemony

²¹ The word „ἐξουσιά“ appears in LXX approximately 50 times and in New Testament 102 times in sense of: 1) freedom, righteousness; 2) ability, power; 3) authority, authorization, guarantee. (EDNT 2: 9–12, *s.v.* ἐξουσιά).

²² There exists discussion about ἐξουσία (as well as the other three keywords), on how much is it possible to attribute its meaning only to celestial powers.

etc.²³ According to Philo of Alexandria ἀρχή is an abstract power structure or dominion and Josephus used it only for terrestrial persons in possession (*ibid.*) Apostle Paul and writings of his school of thought expanded ἀρχή to a twofold interpretation opportunity and it resonates with terrestrial as well as cosmic dimensions: ἄγγελοι, δυνάμεις (Rom 8:38), εἶτε θρόνοι εἶτε κυριότητες (Col 1:16), ὀνόματος (Eph 1:21), τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας (Eph 6:12); sometimes with expression: ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (Eph 3:10; 6:12).

Fourthly, the word κυριότης appears in the descriptions of position of authorities and powers and its meaning is quite unique in New Testament as well as in patristic writings (TCWSD 2000, *s.v.* κυριότης). It is found only four times in the New Testament and significantly in Deutero-Pauline writings: Ephesians (1:21) and Colossians (1:16).²⁴ Friedrich Schröger claims that this linguistic form is used in these epistles from the Jewish apocalyptic and demonological point of interests. Based on the writings of Philo of Alexandria, Qumran texts and to the book of Enoch, he states that these are angels, demons and spirits that derive from Iran-Babylonian culture (EDNT 2: 331–332, *s.v.* κυριότης). This kind of view and cultural understanding may be combined in the theological background of Paul's school and in this way also part of their worldview, but intention and the contemporary Hellenistic context of the epistles demands a different explanation.

The word κυριότητες seems to be the most intriguing of the four keywords. Mostly because with the word ἀρχή it somehow coalesces all the other power-related words (ἐξουσία, δύναμις) and it is the subject of these words. The concept list of this phrase is chiasmic in structure²⁵ and dynamic in nature: ἀρχή as authority of primality is channelled thorough certain forces (ἐξουσία and δύναμις) and its focus is concrete in κυριότητες which derives meanings from kingship ideology and divine monarchy. Additionally, it is important to notice that κυριότητες is a direct derivative from substantive-adjective κύριος which is a widely known title in a Greco-Roman socio-political context and it marks various hierarchical

²³ The word ἄρχων is used 630 times for endeavour or aspirant of domination, 10 times for spiritual powers, 7 times for hostile as well as good-intentioned angelic powers, all other instances for human leaders and persons in control. (Wink 1984: 13–14).

²⁴ Also in 2Pet 2:10 and Jud 8.

²⁵ The structure of four keywords is part of chiasm (see article 1.1.).

social relations in the patronage system.²⁶ The main innovation of the New Testament is in relation to applying this *kyrios*-title to Jesus of the Nazareth from the kingship-messianic viewpoint.²⁷ Apostle Paul presents his theology in contrast and against the ideology of human deifications: „For though there are things that are called „gods“, whether in the heavens or on earth; as there are many „gods“ and many „lords“ [κύριοι]; yet to us there is one God, /.../ and one Lord [εἷς κύριος], Jesus Christ“ (1Cor 8:5–6).

Thus, the *kyros*-title that is attributed to Jesus acquires a fundamental contrast with the socio-political reality and it assumes acknowledged and legitimised lord as a ruler. Although the word κύριος was also known as an expression of courtesy in Greco-Roman world and it indicated persons in various higher positions, the most unique meaning obtained in relation to the one person in highest position of social hierarchy. There was only one „lord“ in the Greco-Roman world during the first century CE and it was Caesar. Jesus as „Lord“ is also the main Christological topic in the epistle of Ephesians. As Christian „good news“ it certainly should have been effectuated some recognition and socio-political resonances in the addressees of the epistle.²⁸

Adjective πᾶς and its traditional-historical meaning. The keyword πᾶς (πᾶσα, πᾶν: gen. πάντα, τὰ πάντα – „all (things)“) is used in the text in connection with the description of Christ's almightiness. The adjective is mentioned five times in the pericope to describe Christ's dominion over „all things“. It frames: (a) Christological enumeration of governments and powers; (b) πᾶς is subjected under Christ's „feet“; (c) πᾶς introduces an

²⁶ LXX uses „κυριός“ with certain innovations: from one side it is used in translation as a counterpart for the Hebrew word *ādōn, adōnāy* and Aramaic *mārē*, and even for YHWH („I am the Lord“, Ἐγὼ Κύριος, Ex 6:2 par); from the other side, in the LXX is presented as elaborate exaltation-theology about Yahweh's power and majesty: his throne is in heaven (Ps 103:19; Sir 1:8) and he himself is almighty (Κύριος ὁ ὑψίστος, Ps 96(97):9; Sir 26:16; Dan 2:19). (TLNT 2: 341–352, s.v. κυριός).

²⁷ Scholars are in different positions related to the origin of *Kyrios*-title that is attributed to Jesus. Some of them are seeing it derive only from Hellenism (Rudolf Bultmann), when others are sure in its Jewish background (Nicholas T. Wright).

²⁸ Emperor Augustus was called Θεός και Κύριος Καίσαρ Αὐτοκράτωρ in 12. B.C. and his descendants maintained the title κύριος. Nero called himself: Ὁ τοῦ πάντος κόσμου Κύριος Νερῶν (‘Nero, the ruler of the whole cosmos’). (TLNT 2: 341–352, s.v. κυριός).

anthropological motif. As an adverb it means „in all“ (ἐν παντί, v 23).

The word has universal meaning in several texts in the *Corpus Paulinum* (1Cor 3:21–22; 6:12; Eph 6:12). The word πᾶς denotes a structured world of authority institutions and terrestrial as well as celestial powers (visible and invisible) (Barth, 176). The adjective πᾶς denotes the whole universe as creation (Rom 11:36; 1Cor 8:6; Eph 3:9; Col 1:16; Heb 1:3; Rev 4:11), metaphorically as „new creation“ in Christ (2Cor 5:17–18), but principally πᾶς is understood as „cosmos“ or „all potential“ in the most broadest sense, superlative as „biggest“, „most powerful“, „supreme“.²⁹

There was discussion in the pre-Socratic era about conceptions of „cosmos“ and the cosmogonic meaning of πᾶς. And in late Hellenistic philosophy (especially in Stoicism) debated about the origin and heritage of „all things“. Therefore, the formal-Hellenistic use of the word has not been excluded in the *Corpus Paulinum* (TDNT 5: 893, s.v. πᾶς). The uniqueness of the New Testament writings in comparison with thoughts about „all things“ and its nature in the contemporary religious and philosophical literature, is that in the New Testament all such ideas are specifically related and depend upon creation- and salvation history. Although the New Testament writings are ample in soteriology, the tradition that begins from Apostle Paul is based on the Old Testament faith of the personal creator and the conception about „all things“ is focused on the historical and personal meaning of monotheism. But when there is emphasis on God as universal creator (Rom 11:36; Eph 3:9; 1Tim 6:13), then the main argument is not about cosmology but soteriology. New Testament writings are rich in doxology and acclamations which consist of assertions that are similar to those were used in Oriental and in Hellenistic syncretism, but these harmonise implicitly with the personal and ethical conception of Yahweh: „I, Yahweh, have made all things“ (LXX: Ἐγὼ Κύριος ὁ συντελῶν πάντα; Isa 44:24). For instance, in Colossians the cosmology is organically linked with soteriology, and proctology with eschatology: „He himself is before all things, and in him all things hold together“ (Col 1:17; „thrones or dominions or rulers or powers“, v 16). There is new situation because of the cross and resurrection, and Christ is all powerful παντοκράτωρ.

²⁹ The synonyms for: „ὅλος“ – consistent, complete, whole (TCWSD 2000, s.v. πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν).

Anthropological motif. There is also an element of using an idea from Deutero-Pauline ecclesiology in the anthropological motif of the pericope (v 22–23; see comparatively Col 1:18a). When 1Cor 15:27 describes Christ's universal rule as something that happens in the future, then here it has already begun.

In Hellenism the word κεφαλή was in common use as something that is „first“, „supreme“, or „remote“, but specifically as something that is „outstanding“, „representative“, or „definite“. The word also designated a person as whole: „lovely person“ (φίλη κεφαλή), „big person“ (μεγάλη κεφαλή). LXX implemented this Greek word usage and included to it some meanings like „ruler of society“ or „head of community“ (Dt 28:13; Isa 9:13, 14); sometimes in comparison with the body in the background (Isa 1:4f; 7:20). In Judaism Adam is named as „king, priest and prophet, lord and leader and head of whole creation“ (TDNT 3: 675, s.v. κεφαλή). Hebrew thought is expressed also in 2Chr 13:12, where in the Masoretic text has the word *ro's*, that could be translated in a bodily sense as ‚head‘ or in social meaning as ‚leader‘, or ‚beginning‘ (Holladay 2000: 329) as it is in LXX: ἰδοὺ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ Κύριος.³⁰ Here the word ‚head‘ has all roles and functions that correlate with ruling.

The Old Testament grasp about „head“ is not enough for describing all Pauline constructions where „head“ and „body“ appear together, because „σῶμα“ is a conception that is not represented in Hebrew and translators use it with certain reservation. LXX doesn't refer σῶμα to an organic body nor to macro nor micro cosmological elements; nor to city nor nation in a social sense (TDNT 7: 1047, s.v. σῶμα). In Hellenism σῶμα represents among other things dead people or animals (*ibid*, 1025) but when Paul uses σῶμα in connection with Christ's body, it always appears in the sense of a living body.³¹

Ephesians 1:20–22 has the Old Testament political aspect of „head“, but the anthropological motif enables one to suppose that in addition to the political meaning also represented are some traditions from the Hellenistic and gnostic circles (TDNT 3 1964: 676–677, s.v. κεφαλή). Verses 20–23 (see also: Eph 4:15–16; 5:23; Col 1:18; 2:10, 19) exposit

³⁰ New Revised Standard Version: „See, God is with us at our head“.

³¹ 1Cor 6:15–17; 10:17; 12:12–27 (1Cor 11:24,29); Rom 12:4–5; Eph 1:22–23; 3:6; 4:4. 15–16; 5:28–30; Kl 1:18, 24; 2:19; 3:15.

Christ as „head“ of the congregation which grows up as „body“ of Christ and that forms a new and perfect human being. One could see the gnostic myth about human-redeemer in the background here and conclude that emphasis in those texts is incumbent on the unity of Christ and Church. Christ as celestial head is present as Church which is the terrestrial form of his body, in the same way Church as Christ's body is present in „the heavenly places“ (Eph 2:6). Christ as head of the Church leads its growth as the first principle that is ἀρχή (Col 1:18), but at the same time as its purpose (Eph 2:15). But the concept of „head“ exceeds its understanding in connection with Church only because Christ as „first human“ is also head of the whole of nature or creation (Col 1:15–20). Because of the date of the epistle we should eliminate the possibility of mythology of classical Gnosticism here, but some influence of the ideas from pre-gnostic redeemer mythology and stoic³² elements may well be probable. Our pericope is unique because the author doesn't use the phrase „his body“ with cosmos or to „all things“ but only to the Church which is clearly „his body“: creation and Creator is clearly separated (Eph 3:9) (Barth, 185).

Especially interesting is the view of some scholars that the Pauline use of Christ as „head“ of the Church is influenced by ancient physicians and anatomists and knowledge about biology, physiology and neurology (Lincoln, 68). Hippocrates (460–380 BCE) supposed that the human brain had great potential and the source of thoughts and consciousness, which is quite opposite to the ancient Hebrew view of physiology where the centre of thoughts was heart, and kidney or intestines were source of emotions (*ibid.*). Nevertheless, Pauline anthropology talks about „head“ not „brain“ and statements that are made in relation to the eyes, heart, and hands, are in perfect correlation with the Old Testament understanding of physiology. Still, as mentioned, the Old Testament is limited in understanding of Pauline anthropology. The same could be said about the Hellenistic myth and contemporary physiological knowledge, which wouldn't resolve the mystery of all the aspects about the ‚head-body‘ figure in Pauline tradition. I propose that in our pericope all three mentioned categories of influence are presented: knowledge about contemporary medicine and

³² In later Stoicism (100 BCE–100 CE) σῶμα is used usually for the human body and the head is seen as the most important unit, and in a metaphorical sense for heaven as divine body (TDNT 7: 1034, s.v. σῶμα).

human physiology is combined with elements from Hellenistic pantheism and the Old Testament view about „head“ on purpose to describe Christ’s authority. Good examples are Philo and Josephus who had used $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ in sense of inorganic and social body (TDNT 7: 1055–1056, *s.v.* $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$). It is probable that this anthropological motif as metaphor is influenced by the contemporary social-political context.

HIGH-CHRISTOLOGY OF EPHESIANS AND ITS SOCIAL-POLITICAL IMPLEMENTATION

Terrestrial or Celestial powers? The author of Ephesians seems to believe that powers and dominions have a celestial origin, but they exist behind terrestrial institutions (Eph 6:12). The lexical items that we looked at above found in the New Testament with different sorts of dominions and it always depends on the context what kind of powers are actual in certain texts. But there is also a third possibility which suggests that cosmic powers don’t have separate spiritual existence from terrestrial institutions (Lincoln, 64). Apocalyptic writings suggests that powers and dominions (angels) are the inner mental essence of ancient kingdoms (Dan 10:13; 12:1; Rev 2:1–3:22). Political conceptions and celestial spiritual powers were mingled with each other and spiritual powers dominated through rulers and states structures in Judaism as well as Hellenism (O’Brien, 144). Our pericope states in the same way that all things ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$, $\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$) are subjected to Christ. There are three possibilities for interpretation: demonological, political, and compromise-interpretation. For identification of keywords it is essential to start from their function.

The author of Ephesians could imagine invisible authority as spiritual realm which was presented through concrete and visible rulers and possessors or political manifestations of the Roman Empire.³³ In the Christology of the introductory hymn of the epistle is Christ presented as one who gathers up „all things /.../, things in heaven and things on earth“ (Eph 1:10). In the parallel text in Colossians there is synonymic parallelism in which adjectives follow the meaning of substantives: „[F]or in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible,

³³ Titles are: *caesar, princeps, pontifex maximus, pater patriae, imperator.*

whether thrones or dominions or rulers or powers“ (... ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι; Col 1:16). The text seems to suggest that dominions „in heaven“ are invisible and dominions „on earth“ are visible. In these texts the nondualist view of Christology, is well presented, that doesn't leave any space for tension between spiritual and social dimensions.

We could conclude that the used main keywords refer to: (a) political rulers and possessors in a broader sense; (b) transcendent beings whose power not only inured other similar beings in the pantheon but also to created beings, humans and whole creation. Inhabitants of 1st Century CE Ephesus and the province of Asia knew that their life was influenced and controlled by celestial beings and terrestrial kings (Best 1998: 176). Jewish thought supported primarily this view about angels or demons, but Hellenistic thought was acquainted with gods and apotheosis of some kings and rulers (Bratcher, Nida 1993: 35). Some of the Jewish and Hellenistic aspects were already united in the Hellenistic Judaism, let alone Christianity.

All the conceptions of the letter to the Ephesians are based on broad spatial imagery and there is no individual nor cosmic element that is excluded from Christ's universal dominion; nothing from categories such as good or evil, earthly or heavenly. This view is concluded after four main keywords: „above every name that is named“ (καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου Eph 1:21).

High-Christology and the present aspect of eschatology. The trait of the character of Ephesians is orientation-metaphorically expressed as ‚highness‘ that is focused into ‚lowness‘. It is presented with anthropological imagery in our pericope: the congregation on earth is the body of Christ and the head of the body is in heaven (Eph 1:22–23; Col 1:18). The body incorporates not only the earth, but also the supernatural and heavenly realm. In such a metaphorical and spatial categorisation Christology is bound with ecclesiology, ecclesiology and soteriology: salvation is gained through unification with the heavenly body of Christ (Pervo 2010: 67).

It is worth notice that in Ephesians as well as in Colossians resurrection happens in the act of baptism (Eph 2:6; Col 2:12). When authentic Pauline epistles were espousing Christian identity as humbling, then Ephesians

and Colossians portray the individual believer as one who is exalted into heaven (Eph 2:6). Christians already participate in the cosmic plan due to exaltation of Christ over all principalities and power. The situation of addressees of the epistle is defined as existence in Christ or being with him in the resurrection and exaltation (Sampley, 22).

While cosmological Christology in Ephesians is inseparably united with ecclesiology and soteriology, then important topics rise about unity and households in the parenetical parts of the epistle. But Ephesians is more interested in political unity than speculations about aspirations of cosmic uniformity (Pervo, 74). Celestial soteriology is a model and motivator of terrestrial social uniformity and social structures are inseparably bound with metaphysics. Nevertheless, the epistle is much more resolute against the ‚world‘ than many other Pauline epistles: the ascendance of Christ gives the reason for the poignant social critic (Eph 5:11–14). Remarkable is the ending exhortation of the epistle where the equipment of a Roman soldier is presented to figuratively exemplify the fight ‚against the rulers, against the authorities, against the rulers of the world of this present darkness‘ (πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου, Eph 6:12).

Christ as „head“ at the top of the pyramid of power and dominion is a metaphor that made a contrast to Roman imperial ideology. Christian ‚ἐκκλησία‘ perhaps wasn’t a similar social corporate institution as Roman apparat, but it certainly had some ambition to influence social-political reality.³⁴ Themes that relate to power is not much chanced through history. Even if in our pericope in Ephesians is not explicitly mentioning Roman imperium or emperor, it doesn’t mean that imperial power is ignored. N. T. Wright sees it even precarious to assume that addressees of the epistle were incapable to comprehend political aspects and allusions to imperial power. These allusions may have been the best way to understand the message of Ephesians (Wright 2013: 446).

Contrasts and parallels with the imperial cult come from power ideology and not directly from the cult, but the cult was the medium of ideology. There were three temples of imperial cult in the Asia province

³⁴ Dualistic categories of „light“ and „darkness“ in the Ephesians (Eph 5:8) are functioning quite well in the social-political purposes.

at the end of the 1st Century CE.³⁵ Historian Cassius Dio mentions those temples in Asia and describes them as the system of hero worship (Cary 1914–1927: Dio 51.20.6–9). Temples were allowed to build for Hellenes, who expressed their submission and obedience to Rome. The Imperial cult strengthened the authority and influence of Augustus and his successors in the western part of Asia-Minor.³⁶ Hierarchical networks and the diverse system of imperial cult enabled to apply power-relations between Romans and outlanders in the geographically extensive Roman state.³⁷ But as some scholars (Manfred Clauss, Andreas Bendlin, Pedro Barcelo, Vera Sauer, Ruth Stepper etc.) have convincingly proved that it would be mistake to see the imperial cult only as a political institution, because it had all the characteristics of antic religion: people who partook in the cult could have similar ‚religious feelings‘ or psychic experiences as participants of other religions (Clauss 2001: 116).

The unprecedented emphasis of the aspect of eschatology in Ephesians is more understandable when seen in front of the perpetuation of imperial cult in the Asia province. Noteworthy is the Apostle’s profile, who as model-author is prisoner in the centre of the imperium at the time he writes the epistle (Eph 3:1). Paul’s sufferings are presented as an example and one might even say as glorious on behalf of his addressees (3:13). Paul’s prisoner profile compensates slightly the mentioned topic about the humiliation of Christ and message of the cross in the epistle. Nevertheless, it shows that tension between the present and future aspect of eschatology still exists. The future aspect of eschatology should motivate readers to move in an ethical direction (Wright, 388) while the present aspect of eschatology shows that Christianity is not a powerless and unworldly hope, but has all the characteristics of a world religion with potential to make „the wisdom of God in its rich variety /.../ known to the rulers and

³⁵ The first temple was built in Pergamon 29 BCE where the cult of Rome and Augustus were practiced. The second temple was built in Smyrna for Tiberius and his mother Livia in 23 CE and the third temple was built in Ephesus in 89-90 CE for Domitian and this temple had the title „Sebastoi“ (honourables). (Freisen 2001: 25–55).

³⁶ Divine reverences in the Roman imperium were appropriate only posthumous for good emperors, but in the province of Asia was acknowledged with divine acclamation to living emperors because of social-political purposes: Augustus had to ensure his power in the geopolitical area where Mark Antony had previously dominated. (Freisen, 28).

³⁷ John D. Crossan sees Roman imperial ideology as an extremely successful advertising campaign that overflowed everything everywhere (Crossan 2007: 12–13).

authorities [ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις]“ (3:10). It is quite possible that this kind of present aspect of eschatology in Ephesians derives from its contemporary social-political and military-religious context, which is from interaction with the imperial cult.

This article was supported by the Deutsches Nationalkomitee des Lutherischen Weltbundes and Die Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche in Norddeutschland.

Kokkuvõte

Elevatsiooni-aklamatsiooni vorm ja sisu deuteropauliinlikus ülendamis-kristoloogias

Koos tekstidega Kl 1:15–17 ja 2:15 moodustab perikoop Ef 1:20–23 varajase kristluse mõjukaima kristoloogilise avalduse. Kristuse ülendamis-motiivina on see osa kerügmast ning sellel rajanevad olulised kristliku usu dogmaatilised arutlused. Perikoop sisaldab vanatestamentlikke tsitaate, kaasa arvatud tsitaat kuningapsalmist Ps 110:1, mis on üks enim tsiteeritud Vana Testamendi tekste Uues Testamendis. Käesoleva artikli põhiosa keskendub perikoobi olulisemate võtmesõnade (ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις ja κυριότης) mõisteanalüüsile. Keelenditega on osutatud vaimsetele ülemaistele jõududele, mis toimised inimeste ja poliitiliste võimustruktuuride kaudu. Autor on kasutanud hellenistliku epistolograafia vormi, hellenistliku judaismi temaatikat ning tsitaate heebrea pühakirjast selleks, et kujundada kerügmaatilise sõnum liturgilisel eesmärgil. Kuigi puudub teaduslik konsensus nelja võtmekeelendi tähenduse osas, väidab käesoleva artikli autor, et peamine vihje adressaat on nähtav Rooma impeeriumi võimustruktuuris, millega inimesed (eriti idaprovintides) esimesel sajal aastal silmitsi seisisid.

Bibliography

Barth, Marcus. 1974. *Ephesians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., Anchor Bible.

- Best, Ernest. 1998. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark International.
- Bratcher, Robert G., Nida, Eugene A. 1993. *A Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Ephesians*. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Cassius Dio Cocceianus, *Dio's Roman History, with an English translation*. Cary, Earnest. 1914–1927. London: William Heinemann.
- Clauss, Manfred. 2001. *Kaiser und Gott: Herrscherkult im Römischen Reich*. München; Leipzig: Saur.
- Crossan, John D. 2007. *God and Empire: Jesus Against Rome, Then and Now*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- EDNT = Eds. Balz, H., Schneider, G. 1990. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Eskola, Timo. 2001. *Messiah and the Throne: Jewish Merkabah Mysticism and Early Christian Exaltation Discourse*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Freisen, Steven J. 2001. *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John: Reading Revelation in the Ruins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. 1965. *Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Hay, David M. 1989. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Holladay, William Lee. 2000. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of The Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. 2002. *Ephesians*. Dallas: Word, Word Biblical Commentary.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. 1988. *The Pauline Churches*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London, New York: United Bible Societies.
- O'Brien, Peter T. 1999. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Pervo, Richard I. 2010. *The Making of Paul: Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Sampley, J. Paul. 1993. *The Deutero-Pauline Letters: Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

- TCWSD = Zodhiates S. 2000. *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament*. Chattanooga: AMG Publishers, electronic publication.
- TDNT = Kittel, G., Bromiley, G. W. Friedrich, G. (1964–1976) *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- TLNT = Spicq, C., Ernest, J. D. 1994. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Westcott, Brooke F. 1909. *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: The Greek Text with Notes and Addenda*. London, New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Wink, Walter. 1984. *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Wink, Walter. 1986. *Unmasking the Powers: Invisible Forces That Determine Human Existence*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Wright, Nicholas T. 2013. *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978–2013*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.