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ABSTRACT
A brief literature study is undertaken to ascertain the nature of the obvious relatedness between eschatology and pneuma in general in Pauline understanding. After the entire Ephesians was subjected to a discourse analysis (cf. Lemmer 1986), Ephesians 1:3-14, a segment with overt eschatological perspectives is further investigated as regards stylistic and rhetorical features. Since Ephesians 1:3-14 is an argumentative text, special attention is given to the perlocutionary function. The distinctive relatedness between eschatology and pneuma is scrutinized. Furthermore the information thus yielded is fitted into the entire "framework" of eschatology-pneumatology in Pauline thought.

INTRODUCTION
The purpose of this study of Ephesians 1:3-14 is to reflect what contribution can be made to the wider topic of "The relatedness of Spirit and eschatology in Pauline theology". This is bound to elicit the issue of the authenticity of Ephesians. To the latter issue brief attention will be given below (0.1).

0.0 The wider orbit of pneuma and eschatology in the corpus Paulinum.
Generally speaking there is a dearth in theology on the Holy Spirit when it comes to New Testament theologies (e.g. Kümmel 1973; Goppelt 1981). This also applies to where the Pauline message *per se* was formalized (e.g. Ridderbos 1975; Bornkamm 1969). Fortunately the situation is slightly different when viewing the theological discussion in general, for example that which is reflected in monographs and articles. Of course the situation is altogether different when it comes to eschatology. However limi-
ted our perception of this aspect remains there is a plethora of material on this topic.

Two fundamental issues in the relatedness between pneuma and eschatology have been debated to some extent: (i) the essentially eschatological character of "Pauline pneumatology" (e.g. Hamilton 1957; Ridderbos 1968; Bruce 1977; Dunn 1975, etc.), compare also the brief survey of Coetzee (1984:236-239), and (ii) the relationship between Christ and the Spirit (e.g. Hermann 1960; Verseeg 1980; Dunn 1975; Vorster 1971; the latter in an article on 2 Cor. 3, the other in monographs).

It should be pointed out that in certain respects these two fields of study are so inextricably interwoven that they have to be studied together as one. This is clearly seen in the brief survey of the following three contributions, namely that of Hamilton (1957), Turner (1975) and Beker (1980).

Hamilton's (1957) main thesis runs as follows: Firstly: the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ (the whole issue of identity), and the Spirit continues the work of Christ in the believers - He must "... impart to his own the risen Christ's life of resurrection and exaltation" (26). Secondly: the Spirit primarily belongs to the future, and His "... witness of the post-resurrection action can be understood only when viewed as a breaking in of the future into the present" (26). Thirdly: the Spirit is in the present to "realize" the future in a provisional but real now, as the Spirit works in the life of the individual believers as well as when the church meets.

In an article titled "The significance of Spirit endowment for Paul", Turner (1975:66) posits that Paul's contribution to this topic "... lies in the interaction of his modified apocalyptic and his Christocentric pneumatology". As regards the first aspect, Paul received a future and apocalyptic focus for his understanding of the work of the Spirit; as regards the latter - it was his vision of the risen Lord, raised and glorified in the Spirit, that gave him his Christology.

Beker (1982:278ff.) in his treatment of "The Function of the Spirit" within the eschatological framework, identifies the same three functions as Hamilton, however in a different order, namely: "... (1) as preliminary to the final glory of God; (2) as operative in the embattled ethical situation of believers in the world; and (3) as cruciform, because it is defined by the resurrection power of a crucified Messiah".
0.0.0 Conclusion
In every way the field of pneuma-eschatology is indeed very comprehensive. It seems a practical suggestion to propound that this topic should be studied basically around four focal points: (i) from the Old Testament eschatology (as taken up in the New Testament); (ii) related to the Christ, the Christ event and the exalted Christ; (iii) around the experience of the church, among others its worship and "embattled ethical situation" (Beker 1982:278); and (iv) from the focal point of the future or the eschaton. This would then include a time dimension (the future or the end) and a modal dimension (e.g. dōxa as a state of existence, etc.). Study of this aspect also entails study of the Spirit as the One who invaded or impinged upon this age, bringing with himself the aiōn mellōn eis aiōnon toīton, and this may prove that not only is the eschatological perspective a sine qua non to understand pneumatology in the corpus Paulinum, but also vice versa.

0.1 The authenticity of Ephesians
The stance taken in this paper is that Paul is the author of this letter and for the following reasons: (i) the problems concerning Pauline authorship are not insurmountable, compare for example Roberts (1984:117-124) and (ii) the letter is compatible with other Pauline writings (Van Roon 1974 in his monumental work on this issue); (iii) although Beker (1980:3) views Ephesians as a pseudepigraphal work, the very hermeneutical principle posited by him (1980:11-36), namely that of contingency, makes it possible that this letter may have been written by Paul. Roberts (1984:123) also refers to the fact that the actual contingent situation of author and readers determined the form and content of this letter. However, he does not use this concept.

Lastly, it may be pointed out that a number of scholars are not prepared to accept Pauline tradition, it being one of the so-called antilegomena. Therefore any study done on this letter on pneuma and eschatology should be somehow relevant for the outline proposed in 0.0.0 above.
1 TEXTUAL STUDY

1.0 The nature of the text
After a discourse analysis of the entire Ephesians was made, it
was found that there is a pertinency about unity and about the
inclusion of the gentile believers in the salvific purposes of God.
In the light of what Combrink (1984:30-31) proposed, it would be
fallacious to purport this to be the author's intention.
However, it does give one a fair idea of the "aboutness" or
topic of the text. Compare Combrink (1984:32-33) on the deter­
minability of this.
Judging from the macrostructure as well as the rhetorical fea­
tures, and accepting this to be a circular letter (cf. the whole issue
on Ephesians 1:1, text-critically and grammatically), it may be that
what we have in front of us is a letter either written to instruct
new Christians (1:15), or more probably some kind of ieretic writ­
ing in which the author had to explain to gentile Christians their
position in the salvific economy of God, as well as his own role in
making this known (cf. 1.4 below).

1.1 Methodological considerations
Basically a discourse analysis was made along the lines set out in
was also taken of aspects of style and rhetoric as set out in Nida
et al. (1983), remembering that the latter two aspects frequently
overlap (cf. Snyman 1983:93). For the sake of time and brevity
this essay does not reflect all the steps of a discourse analysis, only
those pertaining to the more relevant parts. Compare, however, the
appendix for a diagrammatic portrayal of the entire Ephesians 1:3-
14, which constitutes Pericope II.

1.2 A description of the structure of Pericope II and its related­
ness within its immediate context
Pericope II reflects three structural foci. Reading it from comma
3:a, it commences with a shout of praise: Eulogētōs ho theōs ktl.
typical of the Jewish berakah prayer (cf. Kirby 1968:83ff.; Roberts
1983:28-29). This idea of praise to God is reiterated at various
points in the pericope: comma 3:e(iii) eis épainon dōxēs ktl.;
comma 6d eis tō eikai hemās eis épainon dōxēs autoū; comma 8:a
(ii) eis épainon tēs dōxēs autoū. These are taken as indicative of
structural demarcation (cf. also Roberts 1983:30; but contra Krüger 1982:15-16 who divides this stretch into four clusters), and so indicate the end of three respective clusters structurally, as well as constitute three climactic endings. Looking at this pericope from this perspective, the main structural framework or theme and emphasis is "that God may be praised".

When one views the pericope from the focus of God's blessings (i.e. reading from comma 3:b: ho eulogēsas hemās en pāsē eulogia pneumatikē ktl.), then other aspects move to the foreground: Firstly, it seems as if the entire pericope is directed toward one ultimate goal, namely the pneuma who is the arabhōn ies klēronomias (cola 7:c-8a), taking into consideration that the list of God's blessings is firstly typified as pneumatikē (comma 3:b - cf. the explanation below (1.5.1), where it was decided that pneumatikē connotes that which is caused by the Spirit).

This indicates that despite the seeming diversity of blessings, the author moves from the generic to the specific. The implications of this for the structure of the pericope is that it may be compared with an inverted triangle or wedge. The second focal point that emerges, is broadly speaking the accentuation of the eschatological-pneumatological perspective (cf. 1.5.2-3). A third focal point is the changing of personal pronouns, when the author for the first time in this entire pericope moves from hēmās as direct object nominal to humās in comma 7:a. This has distinct rhetorical implications to which we shall return later on.

There are no definite anaphoric links with Pericope I other than reference to some of the "actants" (ho theōs, Christos 1ēsoas) for the entire discourse that has been mentioned in cola 1 and 2.

Furthermore there is nothing within Pericope II that overtly refers to the following pericopes, although it has been found that all the themes in the rest of the letter are basically contained in this pericope (cf. Kirby's reference (1969:127) to Maurer who holds that this part was composed by the author as an introduction and that it contains within itself a miniature of all the teachings of this epistle).

Furthermore, stylistically it will be an anticlimax if certain of the themes introduced in this section are not taken up again and developed further.
1.3 The function of Ephesians 1:3-14 as part of an exordium within the probable rhetorical structure of Ephesians.

Admittedly the matter of rhetoric is a complex one as regards the New Testament writings, both from the point of view of ancient literature (cf. Lausberg 1960 - the entire treatise) as well as from the point of view of modern literary approaches (one becomes acutely aware of this by reading the papers contained in *Neotestamentica* 18 arranged around the topic of "Reading a text").

However, by applying to Ephesians elements of the basic ancient rhetorical model - consisting basically of an *exordium* (or prelude), a *confirmatio* (supporting arguments), and *peroratio* (conclusion) - as Church (1978:17-33) and Wuellner (1976:330-351) have respectively done to Philemon and Romans, one can detect the progression or coherence of the general arguments within Ephesians.

Because of the many affinities between Ephesians and Romans (cf. van Roon 1974:59ff.), one is inclined to assign the rhetorical style in Ephesians - as Wuellner does to Romans - mainly to *epideictic* or demonstrative rhetoric. To typify *epideictic* we quote Wuellner (1976:342-343) who defines it as that "... which is concerned with judgement about some present situation .... The significance and importance of *epideictic* oratory is based on its intent to strengthen the disposition toward action by increasing adherence to the values it lauds" (italics mine, cf. also Wuellner 1976:470).

Since space prohibits the furnishing of arguments it can merely be posited that Ephesians 1:3-14 (the praise section of the berakah) probably constitutes the major part of the *exordium* (taking Eph. 1:15-23 to be still part of the same, but being the *transitus* between the *exordium* and the *confirmatio*).

Generally the *exordium* may be circumscribed as the prelude which is intended "... primarily to establish the appropriate mood and to secure the goodwill of the hearer, both by praise itself and by linking that praise to the subject in question" (Italics mine, cf. Church 1978:20; Lausberg 1960:150-152 draws even finer distinctions, which cannot be reflected here).

If the following posit can be accepted as a hypothetical argumentative situation, then Ephesians 1:3-14 suits the above definition of an *exordium*: A notion arose among the more recent gentile converts within some Christian communities in Asia Minor...
(those converts probably had no personal contact with Paul, cf. 1:15) that: (i) the apostle Paul, himself a Jew, had a closer affinity with converts from Judaism (cf. 3:2-13), and (ii) that the whole idea of the inclusion of the gentiles into the redemptive purposes of God was an "afterthought", relegating the gentile converts to some inferior position in the economy of God.

Because of these two factors a reaction set in within the addressed communities: toward Paul, as well as toward Jewish believers - thus a rift threatened.

In the part of the *exordium* under discussion, we notice two relevant factors regarding the above hypothetical situation: (i) one of the significant sub-themes (cf. Eph. 1:3-14) is indicated by the morpheme which indicates prior activity or decision (cf. Nida et al. 1983:126-128). Almost each one of these occurrences are linked to the prior activities or decisions of which God is the causative agent (cf. e.g. commata 3:c, 3:e, 5:c, 6:b); (ii) as will be seen clearly below (1.5), ultimately the author proves that these readers from gentile background share with the Jewish believers in the Messiah, in being the effected subject of the decisions and actions of God. Notice again how this identification is brought about by the changing of pronouns: initially (Eph. 1:1) there is no singling out of any groups (Jews or gentiles); he merely speaks of *tois hagiois* and *hemeis*. Toward the end of Pericope II a differentiation is made: compare colon 6:e: *tois proelpikotais en to Christo* as qualification of the *hemeis* in comma 6:a (*eklerothemen*) and then in colon 7:a: *en hō kai humeis ktl.* It was pointed out above (1.3) that there is a definite pertinency in moving from the *hemin* in comma 5:b to the *hemeis* in comma 6:a and then again to the *hemeis* in comma 7:a. Immediately after the latter he again refers to *hēmōn* (comma 8:a), which this time includes both Jews and gentiles. It should be pointed out as regards *proelpikotas* (comma 6:e) that in the light of the entire *confirmatio* (Eph. 2:1-6:9), *proelpikotas* seems to refer to the Jews - although the author does sometimes seemingly use the pronouns indiscriminately (cf. Eph. 2:4).

Conclusion: The structure then seems to accentuate a rational and an emotional appeal to the "ex-gentiles" among the readers. Furthermore, Paul "disarms" the probable antagonism and antipathy of his readers, placing strategically within the *exordium* the praise section of a *berakah* (with which they were probably familiar). In this he enumerates the blessings of God, by blessing God...
(cf. the paranomasia in colon 3: - Eulogēiōs, eulogēsas, eulogia that accentuates this fact). In this way, as well as by the use of pronouns, he establishes rapport with them, since they could identify with his argument - they are included in God's plan. Structurally cluster C constitutes the acme of the entire pericope. This is seen by the anaphoric use of en hō and the climactic ending on eis épainon tēs dōξēs autō. This also has rhetorical implications: it is exactly the eschatological-pneumatological blessings or perspectives contained in this cluster (cf. 1.5.3 below) that are the arguments whereby in this part of the rhetorical structure the probable desired results of identification and unity are to be effectuated.

1.4 Ephesians 1:3-14 amongst the letter elements
As regards its epistolographic position Ephesians 1:3-14 constitutes an introductory thanksgiving together with Ephesians 1:15-16. It is a widely accepted fact that although thanksgivings more frequently constitute an element in the ancient letters, both Hellenistic and Jewish, these can also be combined with a blessing which is of course a more proper description of Ephesians 1:3-14 (see Doty 1973:31-33; Van Roon 1974:46ff.). However, this combination with the blessing is more reminiscent of Jewish style (cf. Robinson's research as referred to by Doty 1973:33).

As far as the function of the berakah within an introductory thanksgiving is concerned, suffice it to refer to the rather extensive research done by O'Brien (1977). His findings basically confirm the above findings on the rhetorical structure (cf. O'Brien 1977:261-263). He, however, identifies other functions, namely: (i) the introduction of theological motives; (ii) evidence of the apostle's deep pastoral and apostolic concern; (iii) a didactic function; (iv) a paraenetic purpose.

1.5 Detailed analysis of relevant internuclear units in Pericope II (Ephesians 1:3-14)
1.5.0 Introductory remarks
Thus far the analysis of the wider discourse has been undertaken to comply with the truism referred to by Nida (1981:89) when stating: "One simply cannot know the meaning of all the details without knowing the meaning of the whole, nor can one understand the meaning of the whole without having determined the meaning of the parts". This is a dialectic process, in Nida's words
(1981:89): "... in actuality analysis operates in both directions at the same time". It is to the analysis of "the parts" that attention will now be given.

Two further observations have to be made at this stage: (i) although in the light of Nida's remark every nuclear unit is important for the understanding of the whole, only the more relevant parts for the overall topic in each cluster will now be analyzed; (ii) because certain smaller units will be ignored, the coherence in the discourse may be impaired. Attention will therefore have to be given to the coherence between clusters, as it influences the relevant nuclear units.

1.5.1. Cluster A
Comma 3:b relates to comma 3:a in a subordinate way, qualifying it in a substantial sense, because of the content of the blessings set out in the rest of the pericope. The definite article before eulogēsas functions as a relative pronoun "who", because of the participle. En pāsē eulogia pneumatikē en tols epouraniois, characterizes eulogēsas. All the blessings that follow after kathōs (comma 3:c) are then generically characterized as en pāsē eulogia ktl. To illustrate the relatedness of the above three prepositional phrases, the following portrayal is presented:

Firstly, en pāsē eulogia pneumatikē qualifies as indirect object nominal eulogēsas, being the content of the latter. "Spiritual bless-
ings" is further characterized as *en tois epouraniois*: that is the sphere or locality where these blessings are bestowed. After a fairly extensive analysis, it was found that "sphere" - in the sense of "sphere or locality of existence" is the connotation for *epouraniois*. Lincoln (1973) who conducted a comprehensive and thorough investigation of *epouraniois*, would concur with the above connotation. Working from the point of view of denotation his findings can be summarized as follows: he found that *epouraniois* refers rather to an Old Testament, Qumranic and apocalyptic conception of heavens, than to some idealistic Hellenistic heaven. Furthermore the church is now involved on two levels of existence: terrestrial and celestial (479). *Epouraniois* also links up with other eschatologic strands in Pauline thinking, such as the "two-age doctrine" and the "kingdom of God".

The following results from an immediate constituent analysis (for exemplary use of this method cf. Vorster 1979:16,186-187) confirm the distinctly eschatological "loadedness" of *epouraniois* (space does not permit a full discussion of all six occurrences of *epouraniois* in Ephesians). In 1:20-21 it designates an authoritative realm; in 2:6 it is the sphere of the exalted Christ, incorporating representatively those who are in union with him by faith; while 6:12 surprisingly states that inimical forces are also present in this realm. This summary affirms the strong sense of locality contained in the lexeme under discussion, but it also confirms the distinctly eschatological reference contained therein.

To return to *en Christō*: it characterizes the previous units (which are in closer proximity to one another, i.e. semantically as well as positionally) as the "circumstance" under which *en pneumatike* as well as *en epouraniois* is made both available and effective.

Further remarks on *pneumatike*: only two possibilities of meaning should be considered for comma 3b, namely (i) spiritual over against material; (ii) spiritual in reference to that which pertains to, or emanates from the divine Spirit, or that which shows forth his effects (so Thayer 1889:523). The following reasons are offered for the acceptance of the last possibility: (i) because of the distinct (however metaphorical) sense of *epouraniois* and its proximity to *pneumatike*, it exercises a modifying function on the latter, it should obviate any objection that *pneumatike* merely refers to the unseen; (ii) most scholars (cf. e.g. Roberts 1983:3; Barth 1974:101;
Gnilka 1977:62 etc.) are in agreement that "spiritual" here refers to the work of the Spirit (Gnilka 1977:62: "... mit dem Geist sich vermittelnder ist."); (iii) this sense is furthermore borne out by the climax of the pericope where there is specific reference to the Holy Spirit (commata 7:c-8:a). With the latter finding Barth (1974: 101-102) concurs: "It is probable that in Eph. 1:3 by 'spiritual blessing' is meant that decision, action, and revelation of God which has culminated and been 'sealed' when the 'Holy Spirit' was given to both Gentiles and Jews (1:13-14; 4:30).

The modifying relatedness between the three prepositional phrases (in comma 3:b) can be summed up as follows: In union with the Christ both Jewish and gentile believers (cf. the "general" hémos may share and partake of the blessings that the Spirit bestows or mediates; these blessings are redolent of the heavenly realm, that locality or sphere where the Christ is exalted to the right hand of God (1:20; 2:6). A more complete perspective will be drawn later.

1.5.2 Cluster B
Grammatically this cluster consists of two lengthy sentences (cf. the appended diagram), the first constituting cola 4 and 5, and the second colon 6.

Cola 4 and 5: although strung together here by means of several relative pronouns and prepositions, this sentence nevertheless expresses one train of thought. This implies that the entire sentence is cast under the denominator of redemption (and eventually reconciliation). (Compare ἀπολύτροσιν; ἄφεσιν). Semantically the kaiá in colon 4:a is the fulcrum, joining the reconciliatory aspects to the latter cognitive aspects (sophia; phronēsei; gnòsis ktl.) that the grace of God makes available. There is a correspondence between the section before the preposition kaiá and that which follows. The correspondence lies in the fact that the reconciliatory acts brought about in the Christ, correlate with (being the content of) what has cognitively been made known as God's "eternal" purpose (proétheto).

The implication of the former fact is that it places the redemptive acts of God in an eschatological perspective. This can be seen in the summary discussion of proétheto. oikonomian ktl. and anakephalaiōsasthai (below). However, it also casts God's purpose within a redemptive and (per implication) within a reconciliatory
framework. (i) *Proètheto* characterizes the content of *eudokian* (colon 5:b) and connotes the idea of "a determined purpose"—compare Ephesians 3:11. (ii) *Oikonomian* ktl. further characterizes the content, as "a set of arrangements", referring to God's plan to bring about salvation to mankind within the course of history (this possible connotation is confirmed by Roberts 1983:35). *Toù plerômatos tôn kairôn* here qualifies the "arrangement". This collocation is taken here not as meaning "when the time is right" (so Newman 1971:144-145), but as "the arrangement whereby the times' completeness is to be brought about" (cf. also Lindemann 1975:79; Roberts 1983:35). Ultimately this can be transformed as "God has made an arrangement, whereby he will complete the times". (iii) *anakephalaiôsasthai*: this infinite clause further qualifies the content of the *oikonomia*—namely, it typifies the arrangement whereby the times are to be brought to completion (cf. Caragounis 1977:95; Roberts 1983:35, whose results confirm this view). The nature of the act of *anakephalaiô* can be summarized as follows: the notion of "bringing under one head" is rejected. Both Thayer (1889:39) and Bauer (1957:55) confirm that the sense here is rather that of "bringing together for (being in the medium form) or in the Christ". The previous context of the cluster bears out that the act of *anakephalaiô* has a reconciliatory dimension. It refers to God's reconciliation of heaven with earth and vice versa. This is further underscored by the following remark: "Wit dus deur v10 beklemtoon word, is nie die hoofskap van regering van Jesus nie .... Nou egter het die heilswerk van Christus 'n integrasiepunt gebring waarder die twee vyandige sfere (hemel en aarde) met mekaar versoen is" (brackets mine, Roberts 1983:36).

The position of the prepositional phrases *en autô* (comma 5:c: (iii)) accentuates the fact that the above "bringing together" takes place *en tô Christô* (comma 5:c:(ii)), the *en* here taken instrumentatively. The *en hô* of colon 6:a resumes not only the "means whereby" but in fact the notion contained in *anakephalaiô* of which *en tô Christô* qualifies the manner, casting *eklêrôthêmên* within the perspective of the eschatological-redemptive act.

*Klerôô* is a hapax legomenon within the New Testament, complicating the determining of its connotation. Two possibilities can be considered: (i) "have obtained an inheritance": besides the fact that this generally has little support, Robinson (1903:146) furnishes sound grammatical reasons for the rejection of this possibility, (ii)
"we were appropriated/chosen as God's possession/inheritance": the transformation of Newman (1971:101) seems to do justice both to the fact of probably Old Testament reference, as well as possible developments to a more transitive sense of klerōō. "... in whom we were chosen as God's own people ...". The following reason corroborates this choice: both the preceding and the succeeding contexts contain notions of "choosing" as well as "possession" (the latter will be seen in cluster C).

Although hēmēis is the noun phrase in eklērōthēmen in the surface structure, a transformation as the one suggested by Newman (above) shows that the real subject nominal must be theōs. Nevertheless the author intended at this stage not to focus on theōs but on hēmēis.

The relatedness of colon 6 to the preceding discourse should be clarified further: it extends the argument set forth in colon 5, as is indicated by en auto and en hō kai. Furthermore it is co-ordinate to the former part of the discourse. It adds to the previous stretch of discourse and unfolds it still further in that it applies what was set out in the previous section. This implies that the choosing of the Jewish believers (proēlpikōtas) as His own people, is a partial fulfilment of God's "unifying" work.

1.5.3. Cluster C
The relatedness of cluster C to B is very significant: there is a basic parallelism between these two clusters. This parallelism is probably of a progressive nature, extending yet further the idea contained in klerōō in comma 7:a - although this can really only be seen on the semantic level. This also implies a reciprocity between colon 6:a-c and cola 7:a-8:a(i).

The motivation for this relatedness is the following: (i) because of the parallelistic structural position of hēmēis eklērōthēmen in comma 6:a in relation to hūmēis in comma 7:a; both surface structure subject nominals being contained in the hēmōn in comma 8:a; (ii) because of the anaphoric (Nida et al. 1983:188) or initial repetition of en hō in commata 6:a and 7:a - the en hō in comma 7:b not being in such a strategic position as the other two, however, still serves to further the coherence of the argument; (iii) because of the semantic convergence between klerōō and spragizō (see discussion below), both having to do with ownership. Linguistically the relatedness between cluster B and C can be described as
co-ordinate and additive; since the latter extends or unfolds the former on a co-ordinate level.

The implications of this structural and semantic reciprocity are twofold: (i) the same process being described in eklĕrōthĕmen ktl. is more fully explicated in esphragištēte and the latter is brought under the denominator of the former; (ii) cluster C and the perspectives therein contained are being placed obliquely, but certainly within the eschatological perspective of anakephalaiō (5:c), the application of the latter being the events contained in cluster C.

Space prohibits a detailed discussion of the relevant units in cola 7 and 8. The following will have to suffice: The two circumstantial participles akŏlŏsantes and pisteisantes are related to the matrix esphragištēte; the relatedness is not crucial for the immediate discussion and is therefore ignored.

The matrix esphragištēte can be transformed into the active in the deep structure, and although other possibilities exist (Krūger 1982:22; Roberts 1983:42-43), theós is taken as the subject nominal, esphragištēte being parallel to eklĕrōthĕmen (above) where this is the case. This would imply that hĕmeis would be the direct object nominal and Ὁ pneumatī ktl. the indirect object nominal.

The following possibilities should be considered as regards the connotation of the event word sphragizō in this context: (i) the idea of "securing", or (ii) the notion of marking for ownership and then transitively, confirmation of ownership (cf. Louw & Nida 1986, paragraphs 57.87 and 33.484 respectively). The fact of the reciprocity between eklĕrōthĕmen (6:a) and esphragištēte (7:a) is decisive here (cf. above). Since the former is understood as "chosen for God's own people", the translation of the Good News Bible should be followed for the latter, namely: "God put his stamp of ownership on you".

Τὸ pneumatī ... Ὁ hagiō is taken to be the means wherewith the stamp of ownership is given, in fact he is the seal himself. Τὸ hagiō characterizes the Spirit as holy, transformed as: God's own Spirit.

The phrase ἡς evangeliās qualifies the Spirit further, being appositionally linked by means of the genitive. Although other possibilities exist, I want to purport that the general understanding of "the Holy Spirit who was promised" is the intended sense, and for the following reasons: (i) this understanding is in keeping with
the general purpose of the letter, as evinced by a study of both the macro- and rhetorical structures. As was seen above, it seemed as if the author wanted to convince the Gentile readers that they are part and parcel of God's purposes. These purposes and intentions were often revealed by the prophets in Old Testament times and were thus recorded by the way of promises. New Testament kerugma appeals to these (e.g. Joel 2:27 ff. in Acts 2:16-21) as regards the end-time outpouring of God's Spirit. This was probably underlying the author's reference here to: "with the Spirit, the one who was promised" (lit.).

Because of the reciprocity between eklerothemen and esphragishte, it is fairly certain then that the author does not only want to indicate the mode of the signification of the eklerothemen of the Jewish believers, but above all endeavours to indicate that the Gentile believers have similarly, by becoming partakers of this signification (sealing with the Holy Spirit), become God's own possession, thus they are effectively included in the promises of God. That epangelias has this accentuation, is made tenable by its unusual place in the collocation where it occurs; (ii) the denotation of other occurrences of epangelias in Ephesians supports the above view, confer 2:12 and 3:6.

Colon 8 is so defined because it provides additional information to the Spirit (the alternative reading hos instead of ho simply confirms this relatedness). A new aspect is then focussed on in this predicate sentence. The Spirit is also arrabon; the latter aspect being further characterized by tes kleronomias and the latter again by hemon.

To analyze the above collocation, we begin at kleronomias hemon. For the sake of brevity the following will suffice: the two basic possibilities of understanding to be considered are (i) from the viewpoint that God promised or (ii) from the viewpoint of taking possession. The latter is decided on because of the proximity of hemon which is here taken best as possessive genitive and therefore figurations in the deep structure as subject nominal - i.e. "we will possess". Louw & Nida's (1986) article that suits this context best, is paragraph 57.132 which describes kleronomias "... a valuable, possession which has been received ...". Important is the future aspect in kleronomia.

The relatedness between arrabon and kleronomias, determined by tes is a moot point. This is classified by conventional grammar
either as a partitive or objective genitive. This can be translated literally and respectively as the *arrabōn* from that which we are to possess "or the *arrabōn* for the fact that we will possess". However, it seems fairly certain that the element of a "provisional share" contained in the sense of *arrabōn* modifies the genitive to a partitive sense: "from that". To my understanding Moulton and Milligan (1930:79) still captures the twofold sense contained in *arrabōn* best, namely that of "first instalment" as well as "guarantee". After investigating a number of papiri they conclude: "The above vernacular usage amply confirms the New Testament sense of an 'earnest', or a part given in advance of what will be bestowed afterwards, in 2 Corinthians 1:22, 5:5, Ephesians 1:14". If not contained in the actual sense of the word, we may nevertheless conclude that the first instalment resembles the rest of the expected possession.

In summary: the collocation *arrabōn tēs kleronomias* indicates that the Holy Spirit as *earnest* furnishes God's people with the assurance that they possess God's intended future allotment for them. As first instalment it now already enables them to experience in a limited way what is to come. What is now experienced resembles what is to come.

Along with Krüger (1982:22) *eis apoliuρrōsin tēs peripoiēseōs* is linked to the predicate *hōs estin arrabōn*. It is difficult to determine whether the relational *eis* indicates "result" or "purpose". However, taking Ephesians 4:30 as a parallel but abridged form of 1:14, it seems clear that the purpose (*eis*) of the earnest is the *apoliuρrōsin tēs peripoiēseōs*. The latter then qualifies the purpose of the earnest, which is also the nature of the *kleronomias*.

The sense of *apoliuρrōsin tēs peripoiēseōs* may be summarized briefly, since there is a fair consensus on the understanding of this collocation. Krüger (1982:23) transforms it as "... the freeing of his possession ...". The interpretation of Roberts (1983:42) basically concurs with this. It can be pointed out that there is a reciprocity between *kleronomias* and *peripoiēseōs* - that is between the believers "taking possession of their possession", and "being possessed by God" in a full sense, when he frees them, and vice versa.

This freeing of his possession will be *eis épainon tēs dōxēs autō*. 
2. CONCLUSION

2.0. Introductory remarks
Although the various "approaches" (1.2–1.5) to this stretch of discourse do not differ substantially or even essentially, different emphases can be concluded from them, ultimately serving the author's overall intention. A précis of these results are presented and thereafter a summary is made in which the most salient points are synthesized.

2.0.0 Précis of the perspectives yielded by various approaches to Ephesians 1:3-14
It was seen (1.2 above) that the surface structure reflected three focal points: praise unto God; the gentiles as the subjects of God's intentions and dealings, and the eschatological-pneumatological focus at the beginning as well as of the climax of the pericope.

The probable rhetorical arrangement (1.3 above) is a salient feature of this pericope, reflecting indirectly what may have been the argumentative situation of (the author, as well as) the gentile readers. In this arrangement it is the employment of theological arguments (God's intended and partly fulfilled eschatological-redemptive acts in the Christ) which constitutes the basis of the innate unity and incorporation of God's end-time people. These acts figure under the denominators of redemption and therefore probably reconciliation (cf. *apōlύρισιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱμαινός ... ἀφεσίν ... ἀνακεφαλαίωσαθαι*, cola 4:a & 5:c). The actualization of these acts as well as other of God's predetermined acts are authenticated and indicated by the marking with God's Spirit. The latter arguments are so saliently structured that they seem to serve the purpose of convincing those who have been sealed as undoubtedly incorporated into God's end-time people.

Taking all four functions of the introductory blessing (1.4 above) as applicable (although this may need further proof), then the following can be concluded: (i) the eschatological-pneumatological perspective is the most salient theological perspective; (ii) the latter theme is obliquely employed in such a way that it reflects the author's apostolic and pastoral concern for his readers; (iii) what is set out in this introductory part of the letter, is intrinsically didactic and ultimately has a (iv) paraenetic purpose (cf. rhetorical arrangement above, as well as the rest of the letter).
The detailed analysis evinced the following (the clusters are summarized seriatim): Cluster A (1.5.1): the blessings of God are probably not only mediated by the Spirit, in fact they innately emanate from the Spirit of God, and are redolent of the character of the heavenlies – an eschatological designation which refers among others to the realm of God’s immediate presence and rule – which is made accessible in the Christ “incorporatively and instrumentally” (cf. Kourie 1980:74 for this probable double function). The relatedness within the collocation in comma 3:b shows that there is a reciprocity between the first two units (pneumatikē and epouranīxia): by being in the Christ representatively, the believers participate in the heavenly realities (obviously in an oblique sense, because ultimately the heavens are eschatologically intended), which means sharing in the blessings of the Spirit. Sharing in the blessings of the Spirit of necessity implies the sharing of the heavenly reality – the description of this relatedness (eschatological reality and Spirit) is generic of what is furthermore reflected when the argument reaches its climax in cluster C (and obviously beyond that as well). Cluster B (1.5.2): the redemptive work of the Christ has as its aim the bringing together of heaven and earth and vice versa. Even the divine act of incorporating the Jews as God’s (new) people is an eschatological act; toû plerōmatos tôn kairōn implying that God’s arrangement (oikonosmian) whereby he will "complete the times" is the “bringgether”. The argument of the Jews becoming God’s “new” people follows in the wake of the anakephalaiōsasthai, as is indicated by (en hō kai - comma 6:a). Cluster C (1.5.3): the sealing with the Spirit is a sign to the gentile Christians that when they heard the gospel and believed in the Christ, they were also incorporated in the Christ, and so into God’s new people (this is very similar to the entire argument in Acts 10,11 and 15). In this way the seal with the Spirit is an authentication. The importance of being incorporated is further accentuated by the distinctive structural position of evangelias. Here another reciprocity is encountered: on the one hand the seal with the Spirit is a sign of the fulfillment of the end-time promises (cf. Gl. 3:14,18) on the other hand, the coming of the end-time also brought about the coming of the Spirit. However, the coming of the Spirit is not only indicative of the presence of the last days, he is also the guarantee that God will let his people participate in his future allotment for them –
that is the complete "setting free" of their entire being (Good News Bible in Rm. 8:23 for ἀπολύωσις). Moreover, the Spirit is also the harbinger of the future, because he now provisionally and partially, but nevertheless essentially (in nature), actualizes something of the future allotment in the believers' lives. This he can do because he is by nature redolent of the heavenly realm of existence (the eschatological) which is in its fullness only accessible (and comprehensible, cf. Eph. 1:15-23) when the eschatological Spirit - the One who is redolent of, and meets us from the ἐσχατόν (last) and τέλος (end) - enables us to this. Once again we see evidence of a reciprocal interaction: the Spirit brings the future to us, and meeting the future (the ἐσχατόν) in full, will realize that existence of which the Spirit is provisionally and promisingly reminiscent.

2.0.1 Summary
As regards the four focal points referred to in 0.0.0 ((i) Old Testament eschatology; (ii) the Christ and Christ event; (iii) the experience of the church; (iv) the future): it is especially to focal points (i), (ii) and (iv) that the study of Ephesians 1:3-14 contributes. There is one perspective that coalesces all three these foci together, namely the reciprocity between eschatology and pneuma.

The reciprocal relatedness between eschatology and pneumatology may have been unintended in the mind of the author, it nevertheless runs like a thread throughout this passage. This reciprocity "dialectically" holds two aspects together: on the one hand there are the predetermined redemptive intentions and acts of God, of which the coming of the Spirit is a part; on the other hand there is the divine Spirit who comes from the "intended future". By his operation and influence the history of God's end-time people is progressing, not merely to another "synthesis", but toward the ultimate eschatological climax, which is the immediate presence of the glorious God himself (cf. Eph. 1:17-9, 2:18, etc.).

WORKS CONSULTED


Pericope I - Ephesians 1:3-14

God be blessed for he has blessed us

Appendix

Verse no. * colon no.

3 (a) Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
    Χριστοῦ.

(b) ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματική ἐν τοῖς
    ἐπωρανίοις ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ.

(c) καθὼς ἔλεησατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

(d) εἶλαι ἡμᾶς ἐγίνουσα καὶ δώμωσας κατενάπτων αὐτοῦ ἐν
    ἀγάπῃ.

4 (e) ἡδονίσας ἡμᾶς (i) εἰς υἱόθεσιν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

(ii) εἰς αὐτὸν, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος
    αὐτοῦ.

(iii) εἰς ἐπαινον δόθη τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ

(f) ἢς ἔχαριτυσεν ἡμᾶς εἰς τῷ ἔγγυμεν.

5 (a) ξηρὰ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἰματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν
    ἀφορίσεως τῶν παραπτωμάτων, κατὰ τὸ πλῦσθος τῆς χάριτος
    αὐτοῦ.

6 (a) ὡς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἀρονίασι

(b) γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, κατὰ
    τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ.