

Thurs. 11th - 9:30

CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 56: Number 1

JANUARY 1992

Ministry: Rethinking the Term <i>Diakonia</i> Karl Paul Donfried	1
Eternal Bringer of Breath James Winsor	16
Philosophical Presuppositions in the Lutheran-Reformed Debate on John 6 Lowell C. Green	17
Book Reviews	39
Books Received	67
Indices to Volume 55 (1991)	
Author Index	69
Title Index	74
Scripture Index to the Homiletical Studies	77



Norman Rethmer
Ind.

Ministry: Rethinking the Term *Diakonia*

Karl Paul Donfried

I. The Problem of Ministry Today

William Lazareth, Bishop of the Metropolitan New York Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, presented a paper to a gathering of theologians of the ELCA in Chicago in August of 1990 (as well as to the Task Force on Ministry during its autumn meeting) entitled "The Ministry of the Word of God: One Divine Office in Various Human Forms."¹ The essence of his proposal is this: "I favor one ministerial office of the Word of God, subdivided into two ordained expressions: (1.) Word and Sacraments—covering the public ministries of pastors and bishops; and (2.) Word and Service—covering the public ministries of deacons and teachers."²

Although Lazareth's paper contains a number of keen and helpful insights, I am concerned about his use of the term "service" and his linkage of that term with the title "deacon" as an expression of the "one ministerial office of the Word of God . . ." The first of my queries is the use of the term "deacon" in this proposal. As is well known, the contemporary reappearance of the category "deacon" emerges largely from the proposal that the church universal consider the practice of a three-fold ministry. This attempted revival of the order of deacon has been fraught with ambiguity. Even in those churches, especially the Roman Catholic and the Episcopal, which actively employ such an office, I have been less than impressed with the specificity of its focus. Thus, to have a person of Lazareth's intellect and ecclesiastical experience tackle the issue is to be warmly welcomed; whether his suggestions assist us in achieving the desired clarity of purpose and specific focus remains to be seen. My basic unease with his proposal is this: even if one is, in principle, willing to make functional distinctions within the one office of the word of God, there does not appear, however, any compelling theological or historical foundation for distinguishing, on the one hand, a ministry of deacons and teachers from that of pastors within that one office of ordained ministry while *not* distinguishing, on the other hand, between the ministry of bishops and pastors within that one ministry. I should suggest that Lazareth's recommendations involve at least three areas requiring further discussion: (1.) An essential component of ordained ministry involves public "service," a term that is never defined in his essay; for the moment, at least, I have to assume that Lazareth still holds to the definition stated under

his supervision in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, namely, that deacons "represent to the Church its calling as servant in the world."³ (2.) The function of deacon is linked specifically to this public service. (3.) The function of deacon is specifically linked to the word of God.

Since my major concentration will be on the first of these perspectives, a very brief comment with regard to the last is appropriate now.⁴ The magnificent new study by John Collins entitled *Diakonia* is based on a meticulous survey of the ancient and early Christian use of *diakonia* and its word-group. Collins has determined that "the preaching of the word has no place in the history of the diaconate as preserved in the earliest documents."⁵

Turning now to the central thesis of Lazareth, it must be argued against him that the office of deacon, while fluid throughout the history of the church, originated in conjunction with the office of bishop. Hippolytus, for example, could describe him as the "mind and soul" of the bishop⁶ and say that the deacon is ordained "in the service of the bishop (*in ministerio episcopi*) to do what is ordered by him."⁷ Even when the focus of the bishop's ministry was enlarged, deacons served as assistants of the bishops. To suggest now a separate order of deacons without a separate order of bishops would be a bizarre theological innovation rather reminiscent of the "deacons' court" in Calvinism. Whether the office of bishop is a ministry of unity which all churches require is a matter under intense consideration in the various ecumenical dialogues today. Without attempting to decide that issue here, I should ask, however, whether such an episcopal office is not even more required when one adds a specific order of deacons? Once one begins to specify the different functions of the one ministry of Christ, then one must surely first assert the great significance of the office of oversight and unity before one adds a diaconal function to it. Lutherans have always recognized some form of *episcopē* which is, at least geographically, different from that of the local pastor. I should hold that not to specify the importance of this episcopal role of leadership in teaching, discipline, and unity is to do a disservice to the office of bishop *and* pastor, to continue the confusion between the two, and to insure that the office of bishop will continue in its paralyzing

ambiguity. To specify, therefore, within the one office of ordained ministry *only* the order of deacon is both theologically unwarranted and ecclesiologically enigmatic.

Why does Lazareth propose the category of deacon as a subdivision of ordained ministry? It is because this expression of the office of the word has something to do with a public ministry of service in distinction to an expression of the office of the word in the sacraments. Here Lazareth reveals a presupposition about ministry as service that is widespread in contemporary Christianity, although as a Lutheran he is somewhat guarded from the more radical forms of diaconal distortions which abound today. To what extent should the *diakonia*, as a term specifically related to the work of the church, be interpreted as *service*? Did not the early Christians "have more in mind when they adopted the title 'deacon' than a fellow Christian engaged in the kinds of service to which they were all in fact obligated"?⁸ For many today, *diakonia* means service to the world and that definition, in turn, either consciously or unconsciously, then defines the mission of the church. Referring to the ministry of the ordained, Max Thurian, for example, suggests that "these people represent the Servant Christ in the servant church so that all the faithful may become servants of one another and servants of their sisters and brothers in the entire human family."⁹ Although speaking in quite another context, Arthur Darby Nock, almost as if he were reacting against this modernist trend, correctly commented that Jesus is "a saviour rather than a pattern."¹⁰ When the primary purpose of the church is *diakonia* understood as service to the world and when Jesus becomes the pattern of that service, then the *Predigtamt* (to use the unambiguous German term used in Augustana 5) is derived from and delegated by the community itself, and the ministry of the laity and the clergy are collapsed to such an extent that a New Testament scholar of the stature of Eduard Schweizer can insist that the idea of "office" is inappropriate for the modern church.¹¹ When, as in the case of Thurian, the ministry of the ordained is oriented toward service rather than the word, just how is the service of the church to be distinguished from the various humanitarian projects alive in the world? Unless we answer this question with theological integrity, the possible consequence of our negligence will be the prostitution of the church to the world. When we talk about

diakonia just what are we, in fact, intending to say? Are we talking about a ministry controlled by the agenda of Jesus Christ or one by the ideologies current in our society? Josephus tells the illuminating story of Paulina, a chaste woman committed to the cult of Anubis. Knowing that she was to spend a night in the temple as part of her religious devotion, Decius Mundus, being in love with Paulina, waited for her. Thinking that he was the god Anubis, Josephus reports that Paulina participated in sexual intercourse with him and that "all night she ministered to him [*autō diakonēsato*]."¹² Such is the description of one form of ministry! Yes, just what ministry are we talking about when we speak so ambiguously about the ministry of the church? The Greek term *diakonia* is quite analogous to the term *hoplon* ("weapon," "tool," "instrument") that Paul uses in Romans 6:13; we can use our bodies either as instruments of sin or as instruments of righteousness. *Diakonia*, like *hoplon*, is a neutral term waiting to be placed in a context. Therefore, we must urgently ask what kind of ministry is meant and what purpose is it to serve.

II. The Use of the Term *Diakonia* in the New Testament

A. *The Definition of the Problem*

Several key passages in the New Testament can be used to illustrate the problem of defining *diakonia*. Mark 10:42-45 and Luke 22:25-30 have been selected from the gospels. Ephesians 4:11-12 provides an epistolary illustration of the problem.

1. *Mark 10:42-45 and Luke 22:25-30*

Two key verses in the gospels are Mark 10:45, "For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many," and Luke 22:27, "For which is the greater, one who sits at table, or one who serves? Is it not the one who sits at table? But I am among you as one who serves." Everyone must admit that Mark 10:45 has a clear soteriological intent, but Luke 22:27, according to many, has no such intent. This view has significantly shaped the understanding of *diakoneō* well beyond this verse. Perhaps the most influential contribution to the modern understanding of *diakonia* as service is the monograph of Wilhelm Brandt¹³ in which he inserted, with virtually no textual justification,

the categories of care, concern, and love into the interpretation of the *diakonia* word-group. With regard to this gospel text he would urge that "service is the expression of messiahship; the Christ serves."¹⁴ Is this what the term *diakoneō* means in Mark or Luke? Again, what is the basis for such a meaning for the *diakonia* word-group? How do such interpretations relate to the radically different meanings of the term found in Romans 13:4, where the Roman ruler is described as a *diakonos*, and Galatians 2:17, where it is asked if Christ is a *diakonos* "of sin"?

2. Ephesians 4:11-12

A key passage in Ephesians is 4:11-12, "And His gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, to equip the saints, for the work of *diakonia*, for building up the body of Christ . . ." This text raises two important and interrelated questions: (1.) What is the meaning of *diakonia*? Does *diakonia* refer to the distinctive role of the pastor-teacher or to the role of the community at large? (2.) Should there be a comma after "saints"? Along with older translations, the first edition of the Revised Standard Version agreed that there should be a comma following "saints," thus supporting the interpretation that *diakonia* pertains to the teachers. Subsequent editions of the Revised Standard Version eliminated the comma, thus revealing a substantial shift in interpretation. The result of this shift is well articulated by Markus Barth. By removing the comma after "saints" and so no longer relating this clause to the teachers, Barth can claim that "the aristocratic-clerical and the triumphalistic-ecclesiastical exposition" of the text has been removed. The "traditional distinction between clergy and laity does not belong in the church. Rather, the whole church, the community of saints together, is the clergy appointed by God for a ministry to and for the world."¹⁵ How can one explain why this text, also cited by Lazareth in support of his proposal in its anti-clericalist form,¹⁶ has undergone such a substantial change in interpretation from one edition of the Revised Standard Version to the next? It is undoubtedly related to a subtle, but fundamental distortion of the meaning of the *diakonia* word-group.

There have been two major challenges to the primary understanding of *diakonia* as service to the world, of *diakonia* as carrying out works of mercy. The first was made by Dieter Georgi in which he forthrightly asserted that the New Testament term *diakonia* "almost never involves an act of charity."¹⁷ He stated, furthermore, that a *diakonos* would better be understood as "God's plenipotentiary envoy" along the lines of the wandering Cynic preachers. Georgi's challenge has remained largely unheeded, perhaps because the focus of his book, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*, did not permit exposure of his thesis to a wide audience. It might also be that, while some agreed with his criticism of the mistranslation of *diakonia* and *diakonos*, they took issue with his idea of Cynic parallels and his overall interpretation of the background of 2 Corinthians.

A significant new voice has been added to the debate by John N. Collins in *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources*, a superb volume just published by Oxford University Press.¹⁸ He vastly expands, deepens, corrects, and modifies Georgi's essentially correct insight. He is particularly critical of the work by Brandt (*Dienst und Dienen im Neuen Testament*)¹⁹ and Beyer in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*,²⁰ which Collins argues is dependent on the incorrect interpretations of the nineteenth-century German Evangelical diaconates, who used the titles "deacon" and "deaconess" with "the mistaken understanding that the apostolic diaconate was essentially for works of mercy."²¹ Collins, even in such passages as Acts 11:29 and Acts 12:25, convincingly demonstrates that the notion of "mission" is more correct than "assistance." If such is in fact the case, then "few places would remain in the NT where the words might unequivocally express the idea of service of the needy."²² As a result of an extensive analysis of the word-field of *diakonia* and its relatives in the Greek sources, Collins concludes that, when "the Greek words supposedly underlying this concept [of *diakonia* as service] are traced through Christian works of the time, they introduce us not to works of service but to worlds of angels, revelation, prophecy, and to some of the stranger corners of cosmology."²³ Furthermore, "the modern conceptualization of '*diakonia*' exemplifies also what Barr calls elsewhere 'premature theological evaluations of biblical linguistic data . . .'"²⁴

B. *The Use of the Term Diakonia in the Non-Christian Sources*

Collins' analysis of the non-Christian sources reveals the following key meanings of the group of words which includes *diakonia*:

(1.) The word-group includes reference to the work of a courier or go-between.²⁵ There is an interesting relationship here between *diakonos* and the verb *diōkō*, from which one can more clearly understand the work of a "runner" as an essential component of *diakonos*. There is a sense of delivering something from God. The church, from this viewpoint, is seen as God's delivery-service, a people on a godly mission.²⁶

(2.) There is also an emphasis on deed in the word group. The reference is to carrying out a task or effecting things for others, without any connotation of acting slavishly. A good example of this usage is found in Romans 15:25, where Paul is going to Jerusalem "on an errand to the saints" rather than with aid [*diakonōn*] for the saints." Frequently this "acting for someone" or "effecting things for others" is done as the agent of a deity. Josephus, for example, defines the *diakonos* as the "duly sanctioned representative" of the Jewish God.²⁷ Collins summarizes this aspect of his study with these words: "The functions that we have seen designated by words of the *diakon*-group are hugely varied, yet none, so far, have been of a menial nature. The words have been designating actions of an in-between kind or people who operate in an in-between capacity, especially people (or spirits) who implement the intentions or desires of another."²⁸

(3.) It should be noted that, when the word-group is used in connection with house and table, it generally refers to a public, official, or religious occasion. There are few examples of the application of the word-group to domestic service, and those which do occur most frequently refer to a ceremonial waiter,²⁹ a fact not unimportant to the understanding of Luke 22:27.

C. *The Use of the Term Diakonia in the First Christian Writings*

The major consequence of Collins' thorough and careful analysis is that Paul, in a wide range of texts (e.g., 1 Cor. 3:5; 2 Cor. 3:6; 6:4; 11:23), is not talking in some imprecise way about "servants"

of God or of Christ, but about messengers who are on assignment from God or Christ. The apostle's primary concern is to state something about "the communication of the gospel rather than about service to the Lord or to the brethren."³⁰ Even as difficult a text as 2 Corinthians 8:4 is seen in a new light. Rather than translating it as "begging us earnestly for the favor of taking part in the relief [*diakonia*] of the saints," Collins would translate it as "begging us earnestly for a share in the fellowship of the mission of God's holy people." The question now arises as to whether the New Testament passages cited earlier are more easily expounded by means of Collins' analysis or whether they remain stubbornly resistant to it.

1. Mark 10:45

As one would expect, Collins rejects the understanding of the active infinitive *diakonēsai* as "the idea of service to the brethren in the course of daily life, a Christian philanthropy . . ." because it is "unparalleled in other Christian sources and unprecedented in non-Christian sources . . ."³¹ Collins returns to his basic thesis that "the verb designates specific types of undertaking in the areas of message, agency, and attendance . . ."³² Included among the various interpretations of which he is skeptical is the eucharistic interpretation of the Marcan logion, since the connotation of service at table is wholly unnatural in Mark 10:45. The infinitive, the title "the Son of man," and the verb "came" (with its prophetic background) "speak of a particular personal commission under God, and from this point of view the statement is at once more theological than ethical."³³ Collins, along with Fitzmyer,³⁴ argues for the original unity of 45a and 45b, since 45b "defines the sacred role as one of ransom for many through the death of the office-bearer."³⁵ Verse 45 "establishes that the Son of man's *diakonēsai* leads to the opposite of all that is powerful and glorious so that he becomes the absolute standard for disciples who would belong to the kingdom." Collins sees the ethical lesson as being indicated "not by the infinitive as itself a term designating this kind of humiliation, but by the death that the commission to effect the ransom entails for the Son of man."³⁶

How do these points relate to the use of the unusual passive

infinitive "to be served"? Remembering that the verb is primarily concerned with the activity rather than the status of persons, who in this case are "attendants," and who might best be described as "those who come and go at the behest of another,"³⁷ Collins summarizes his understanding of the verse in this way: "The situation envisaged by the statement is that the Son of man is not one who holds such a position in the world as to have attendants—the *diakonoi* of the rich and powerful—coming up to him and being dispatched by him about various tasks of his own choosing; he has his own task to go to, and it is for the purpose of setting the profane grandeur of one way of life against the prophetic dedication of the other that Mark has brought these oddly fitting infinitives together."³⁸

2. *Luke 22:27*

For Collins, Luke is dependent upon Mark and shifts the Marcan context into a supper setting. He portrays Jesus here as a "waiter,"³⁹ not as one who serves but as "the one attending." Verse 26 also has the parallel meaning of "the one attending," for "from Homeric times," adds Collins, "it was the Greek ideal that youths should honour their betters in age by waiting on them."⁴⁰ The advice of Jesus is that the disciples should be like young men who wait on older dignitaries, a role which Jesus Himself adopts in verse 27. Collins cautions a too general understanding of the Greek participle *ho diakonōn* (in the sense of service), since the image of waiter would be "an unnatural figure by which to allude beyond the supper to situations like Jesus' care for the disciples or for the sick."⁴¹ It should be added that Collins also sees, especially in light of the verses that follow, Luke 22:28-30 (as well as Luke 12:37) as a statement about Jesus' redemptive act but one which, for the sake of His more Hellenistic audience, is described in terms much different from those in Mark 10:45.

3. *Ephesians 4:11-12*

Collins concludes that *diakonia* in verse 12 can only be a reference to the specific work of "teachers-pastors." Thus, the *ergon diakonias* of 4:12 "can only be understood as part of this teaching process within the church so that it signifies here, against the

background of the heavenly Christ dispensing his word through teachers, the work done by the kind of 'minister' who dispenses heavenly knowledge (Eph. 3:7; Col. 1:7, 23, 25) . . ."⁴² In Ephesians 3:7 Paul is the example of precisely this kind of *diakonia*, a *diakonia* that coheres well with the exhortations in 4:14 not to be "tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine . . ."

Collins clearly opts for the translation "for the equipment of saints, for the work of ministry" (using a comma), which expresses two separate objectives and naturally accommodates *diakonia* as the work of the teachers.⁴³ He rejects the translation which renders only one objective, namely, "to equip the saints for the work of ministry." From the nineteenth century on this view has been championed by many. Eadie, dependent on Meyer,⁴⁴ specifies his exegesis in this way: "He has given teachers—*eis*—'for the work of the ministry and—*eis*—for the edifying of His body—*pros*—in order to [accomplish] the perfecting of His saints.'"⁴⁵ Collins concludes that those "who find this scheme makes for an inadequate or too passive life for 'saints' in the church are underestimating the role attributed by the author to sound doctrine; it assimilates the whole church into the mystery where growth into the fulness of Christ occurs. No one is left out. No one has more experience of the mystery than anyone else."⁴⁶

III. The Lutheran Confessions

In light of this use of the word-group which includes *diakonia*, it is interesting to look at Article 5 of the Confessio Augustana. In the Latin text the article is entitled *De Ministerio Ecclesiastico* and the opening sentence reads: Ut hanc fidem consequamur, institutum est ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta."⁴⁷ The noun *ministerium* is not left undefined; Augustana 5 never speaks of an unspecified ministry. *Ministerium* is either modified by *ecclesiasticum*, or it is specified as a ministry "to teach the gospel and to administer the sacraments." Whether one accepts the definition of *ministerium* in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* as a "function exercised on behalf of a superior . . .; a particular task, service, commission or aim" or whether one defines it as an "agency, instrumentality in an action,"⁴⁸ the Latin text of the Augustana makes clear what it means

by *ministerium*. It does not refer to some vague notion of "ministry" as service in the way so common today.

The German text of Article 5 reveals a similar precision in terminology when it uses the term *Predigtamt* for the Latin *ministerium*: "Solchen Glauben zu erlangen, hat Gott das Predigtamt eingesetzt, Evangelium und Sakrament geben, dadurch er als durch Mittel den heiligen Geist gibt, welcher den Glauben, wo und wenn er will, in denen, so da Evangelium hören, wirkt, welches da lehret, dass wir durch Christus Verdienst, nicht durch unser Verdienst, ein gnädigen Gott haben, so wir solchs glauben."⁴⁹

In Tappert's translation of the Latin this specificity carries over into English, both in the title, "The Ministry of the Church" (although I would prefer either "Concerning an Ecclesiastical Ministry" or "Concerning a Churchly Ministry") and in the translation of the article itself: "In order that we may obtain this faith, the ministry of teaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments was instituted."⁵⁰ Such, however, is not the case with the translation of the German: *Predigtamt* becomes simply "The Office of Ministry"—the ministry of what is never specified—and the translation of the text of Article 5 also shares somewhat in this same ambiguity: "To obtain such faith God instituted the office of the ministry, that is, provided the Gospel and the sacraments." The explicit linkage in the Latin text between "ministry" with the gospel and sacraments is here weakened.

Our exegesis of Ephesians 4:12 has demonstrated the unique and critical role of teaching involved in the *diakonia* of the teacher-pastor. Augustana 5 understood this role well when it spoke about a *ministerium docendi evangelii*. Pastors of the word must be teachers and caretakers of doctrine. There is a remarkable coherence between the definition of the *Predigtamt* in Augustana 5 and the ancient use of the word-group embracing *diakonia*. Augustana 5 emphasizes that those engaged in a *ministerium docendi evangelii* are "a channel for the insistent words of Another's prompting."⁵¹ They are envoys; they speak not by their own authority but by the authority of the one who has commissioned and sent them. Thus, these *diakono*i are neither social workers nor social activists but, in the first and primary place, teachers of the word.

Conclusion

Although, to be sure, I welcome Bishop Lazareth's recommendation that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America institute the category of "deacon" as a dimension of the one holy ministry of word and sacrament, I must disagree with the logic and the details of his proposal. As I have noted, "deacon" in early Christianity is a sacral title, not one indicating service; the deacon functioned primarily as a representative and envoy of the bishop. Thus, I should urge the Task Force on Ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America either to retain the one office of ministry without making formal distinctions or to adopt the historic three-fold specification of that one ministry, namely, bishops, presbyters, and deacons. It is only in the fullness of this latter structure, however, that the order of deacons has its proper location and logical articulation. The description of these responsibilities in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*,⁵² as modified and corrected in this paper, is still convincingly relevant. Lutherans and others would do well to adopt this structure in this generation, not because we have been influenced positively or negatively by current ecumenical recommendations but, rather, because we as Lutherans, guided by Scripture and the confessions, believe that such a view of ordained ministry can effectively serve the word and the upbuilding of the church as we enter the twenty-first century as a Christian minority in an increasingly non-Christian and fragmented world. To develop such an evangelical three-fold structure of the one ministry of the word would be faithful to our tradition and timely for our contextual situation and provide leadership for the one, holy catholic and apostolic church.

ENDNOTES

1. I quote in the following note from his unpublished typescript.
2. Lazareth, p. 29.
3. *Eucharist, Baptism and Ministry* (Faith and Order Paper 11; Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982), p. 27.

-
4. This essay was originally presented to the Fourteenth Annual Symposium on the Lutheran Confessions on January 23, 1991, at Concordia Theological Seminary.
 5. John N. Collins, *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 244. As will be obvious in this essay, I am enormously indebted to this very provocative and creative monograph and I am frequently in dialogue with it.
 6. *Apostolic Constitutions*, 3.19.
 7. *Apostolic Traditions*, 8.
 8. Collins, p. 45.
 9. Collins, p. 35.
 10. *Conversion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p. 210.
 11. *Church Order in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1961), pp. 171-180.
 12. *Antiquities*, 18.74-75.
 13. *Dienst und Dienen im Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh, 1931).
 14. Brandt, p. 80.
 15. Markus Barth, *Ephesians 4-6* (AB 34A; Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1974), p. 479.
 16. Lazareth, p. 30.
 17. Dieter Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), p. 29.
 18. John N. Collins, *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
 19. See note 13 above.
 20. H. W. Beyer, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), pp. 81-93.
 21. Collins, p. 255.

22. Collins, p. 64.
23. Collins, p. 66.
24. Collins, p. 94.
25. Collins, p. 85.
26. Collins, p. 107.
27. Collins, p. 113.
28. Collins, p. 148.
29. Collins, pp. 76, 151, and 166.
30. Collins, p. 206.
31. Collins, pp. 250-251.
32. Collins, p. 251.
33. Collins, p. 251.
34. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel of Luke X-XXIV* (AB 28A; Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1982), p. 1414.
35. Collins, p. 251.
36. Collins, p. 252.
37. Collins, p. 252.
38. Collins, p. 252.
39. Collins, p. 246.
40. Collins, p. 246.
41. Collins, p. 247.
42. Collins, p. 233.
43. For similar interpretations see Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (EKK 10; Zürich: Benziger, 1982), pp. 172-187; Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1958), pp. 190-199.
44. *Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das N.T.: Achte*

Abtheilung Kritisch Exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief an die Epheser (Göttingen, 1859).

45. John Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1883 [reprint, 1979]), p. 308.
46. Collins, p. 234.
47. *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963), p. 58.
48. *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 1111-1112.
49. *Bekenntnisschriften*, p. 58.
50. Theodore G. Tappert, *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 31.
51. Philo, *de spec. leg.* I.65.
52. Faith and Order Paper 111 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982), pp. 26-27, which was formulated under Dr. Lazareth's guidance.