

EPHESIANS 2:3c AND *PECCATUM ORIGINALE*

DAVID L. TURNER

INTRODUCTION

THE student of hamartiology soon discovers that Eph 2:3c is a standard proof text for and often occurs in the various presentations of original sin (*peccatum originale or habituale*). It may well be that after Rom 5: 12-21 this passage is the most important in the NT on this doctrine. All branches of Christendom, including Reformed, Lutheran, Anglican, Arminian, and Roman Catholic¹ have depended

¹ *Reformed*: The Calvinistic theologians normally view this verse as asserting hereditary depravity. See for example: Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1941) 240; John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (LCC 20, 21; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960), I. 249, 254; 2. 1340; R. L. Dabney, *Lectures in Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976 reprint) 328, 341; Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975 reprint), 2.243-44; W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology* (3 vols.; reprinted; Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, 1979), 2. 217-19; and A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1907) 578-79. See also the Westminster Confession (6:4) and Shorter Catechism (Question 18): *The Confession of Faith* (Halkirk, Caithness: Publications Committee of the Free Church of Scotland, 1962 reprint) 40, 290. *Lutheran*: It is evident that Martin Luther viewed Eph 2:3c as support for hereditary sin. For brief citations from Luther and references to relevant passages see E. W. Plass, ed., *What Luther Says* (3 vols.; St. Louis: Concordia, 1959), 3. 1295, 1300, 1361 (#4151,4167, 4385). See also article 2 of the Augsburg Confession and the Formula of Concord (1. 1-3) in the Concordia Triglot: *The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1921) 44, 105, 779. The Lutheran theologian Francis Pieper also views Eph 2:3c in this manner. See his *Christian Dogmatics* (4 vols.; St. Louis: Concordia, 1950), I. 427, 528, 530, 542. *Anglican*: While the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England do not contain proof texts, the language of Article 9 shows that its framers understood original sin to refer to "the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam." This definition implies a reference to Eph 2:3c. For an exposition of the conservative Anglican view, see Gilbert Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, rev. by J. R. Page (London: Scott, Webster, and Geary, 1837) 139-51 and W. H. Griffith-Thomas, *The Principles of Theology: An Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles* (6th ed.; London: Vine Books, 1978) 155-75. *Arminian*: Theologians such as Miley and Sheldon spend considerable time with Eph 2:3c. While they admit "original sin," they deny that man is held responsible or guilty because of it. See John Miley, *Systematic Theology* (2 vols.; New York: Eaton and Mains, 1892), 1.512;

upon this passage in formulating their hamartiological positions. There are those, however, who deny that this passage has any a relevance to original sin.² Their arguments are not to be taken lightly. The purpose of this paper is to determine whether Eph 2:3c actually supports the concept of original sin, find if so, what that contribution is.

One point of definition must be clarified first: this paper deals with original sin proper rather than the broader area of man's depravity. Kuehner thus explains this term:

It is so named because (1) it is derived from the original root of mankind; (2) it is present in each individual from the time of his birth; (3) it is the inward root of all actual sins that defile the life of man.³

It is true that "original sin" is often used with all three of these concepts in mind. As "original sin" is used in this paper, however, a narrower concept is implied: "the phrase original sin designates only the hereditary moral corruption common to all men from birth."⁴

and H. C. Sheldon, *System of Christian Doctrine* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1903) 316-17. John Wesley preached a sermon on original sin, evidently from Eph 2:3c on January 24, 1743 at Bath, England. This message showed he certainly believed that original sin was taught in this text. However, his doctrine of prevenient grace probably caused him to deny that man was guilty or under wrath due to original sin. See John Wesley, *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley* (4 vols.; New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., n.d.), 1. 413; and A. S. Wood, *The Burning Heart: John Wesley, Evangelist* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967) 232-36. *Catholic*: Both Augustine and Aquinas used Eph 2:3c to support original sin, though they had quite different understandings of man's sinfulness. See *Saint Augustine, Saint Augustine's Anti-Pelagian Works*, trans. by P. Holmes and R. E. Wallis; rev. by B. B. Warfield, *A Select library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* (vol. 4; New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1887) 50, 122, 150, 236, 290-91. One wonders why G. M. Lukken translates Augustine's *natura* (Latin for nature = **fusij**) as "second nature." See Lukken's *Original Sin in the Roman liturgy* (Leiden: Brill, 1973) 330. For Aquinas, see *Original Sin* (*Summa Theologiae*, 26; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963) 11 (Question 81:1). For a modern Catholic perspective see A. M. Dubarle, *The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin*, trans. by E. M. Stewart (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1964) 188-89 and Ferdinand Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, trans. by J.C. Stoddard (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1956), 2. 589.

²Among many denials, see Markus Barth, *Ephesians* (AB; Garden City, NY:

Doubleday, 1974), I. 231; N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., Ltd., 1927) 113, n. I; and George B. Stevens, *The Pauline Theology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), 152-58.

³Fred C. Kuehner, "Fall of Man" in the *Wycliffite Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. by C. F. Pfeiffer, et al. (2 vols.; Chicago: Moody, 1975), I. 589.

⁴A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972 reprint of 1879 edition) 324. It cannot be asserted too strongly that "original" does not refer to man's original character as created by God, but to his original character as a descendant of Adam.

The investigation, then, relates to the legitimacy of using Eph 2:3c as a proof text for the hereditary moral corruption of man's nature.

The term "nature" is used incessantly in articulating the doctrines of theology proper (specifically relating to the trinity), Christology (one person with two "natures"), anthropology (human "nature"), and hamartiology (sin "nature," old "nature"). However, there is often confusion in the way this term is used. In this writer's view, it is imperative to distinguish between a "person" as a substantive entity and a "nature" as a complex of attributes in any of these branches of theology.⁵ Therefore, the term "nature" will be used here to refer to a complex of attributes. Attributes are viewed as innate characteristics, not acquired habits.

Only an exegetical theology can be a valid biblical theology. Therefore, the paper is primarily exegetical. The three sections handle (1) preliminary matters of exegesis, (2) the Semitic nature, of **tekná** ... **ofghj**, and (3) the crucial word **f usei**. The conclusion summarizes the exegesis and briefly interacts with other views from the perspective that Eph 2:3c does indeed support the idea of hereditary moral corruption.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Context

A well-known approach to the book of Ephesians views its first three chapters as primarily doctrinal and its second three chapters as primarily expounding duties based upon doctrine. After his normal epistolary introduction (1:1-2), Paul breaks out into praise to the triune God for his glorious salvation (1:3-14). Next he explains his prayerful desire that the Ephesians might apprehend a greater knowledge of their glorious position in the body of Christ (1: 15-23). The first three verses of chap. 2 serve to remind the Ephesians of their sinful past so that they might better appreciate the love, mercy, and grace of God who saved them by grace through faith for good works (2:4-10). The remainder of chaps. 2 and 3 further explains God's gracious program of uniting Jew and Gentile in Christ's body, the church (2: 11-3: 13). Chap. 3 ends, as did chap. I, with a majestic prayer for the Ephesians' spiritual growth which concludes with a stirring doxology (3:14-21).

⁵See J. O. Buswell, Jr., *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962), 1.55,2.56. R. E. Showers comes to the similar conclusion that nature refers to character or "inherent disposition." See his "The New Nature," (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary, 1975) 23.

Text

At first glance into the critic I apparatus of the V.B.S. text,⁶ it appears that there are no textual variants in 2:3. The Nestle text's apparatus reveals that manuscripts A and D have the second person **ufeiʒ** instead of the first person **hʒeiʒ** in the first clause of the verse.⁷ Tischendorf's more exhaustive apparatus shows that manuscripts A, D, E, F, G, K, L, and P have **hʒen** instead of **hʒeqa** as the main verb in 2:3c.⁸ Since these two forms are parsed identically, no change in meaning is involved. A variant more important for exegesis changes the word order of the phrase from **tekna fusei oʒhhʒ** to **fusei tekna oʒghʒ** (mss A, D, E, F, G, L, and P, and some versions).⁹ At first glance, this reading seems to place much more emphasis upon the crucial term **fusei**. However, none of the above variants have sufficient support to render the text of the passage questionable. This study, therefore, will proceed with the text of Eph 2:3c as it stands in the Nestle, U.B.S., and Trinitarian Bible Society (textus receptus) texts.

Change in person

The attentive reader of Ephesians 1-2 will notice that Paul speaks in the first person plural¹⁰ and addresses the Ephesians in the second person.¹¹ The question arises as to why Paul shifts from first person to second person and then back again to first person (see I: 12-14; see also 2: 1-3 for the opposite shift). Does his first person plural "we" refer to himself and the Ephesians or does it mean "we Jews," as opposed to "you (Ephesians) Gentiles"? In interpreting 2:3c **hʒeqa**

⁶Kurt Aland, et al., ed.; *The Greek New Testament* (3rd ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1975) 666-67.

⁷Nestle, Eberhard, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (24th ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergischen Bibelanstalt, 1960) 491.

⁸Constantine Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (3 vols.; editio octavo critica major; Lipsiae: Giesecke and Derrient, 1872), 2. 671. The *textus receptus* also has **hʒen** instead of **hʒeqa** see **H KAINH DIAQHKH** (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1976) 355.

⁹Tischendorf, *NT Graece*, 2. 671. Another very obscure reading listed by Tischendorf is **tekna oʒghʒ fusei**. For a rather full textual apparatus on this verse see S. D. F. Salmond, "The Epistle to the Ephesians" in *The Expositors Greek Testament*, ed. by W. R. Nicoll (5 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974 reprint), 3. 285.

¹⁰Notice the first person plural pronouns in 1:2, 3 (2x), 4 (2x), 5, 6, 8,9, 12, 14, 17, 19; 2:3, 4, 5, 7, 14 and the first person plural verbs in 1:7, 11; 2:3 (2x), 9, 10, 14, 18. The question is whether these first person plural expressions ("we," "us") relate to Paul and the Ephesians or to Paul and other Jews, exclusive of the gentile Ephesians.

¹¹Notice also the second person pronouns in 1:2, 13 (2x), 15, 16, 17, 18; 2:2 (2x), 8,11,13,17,22; 3:1 and the second person verbs in 1:13; 2:2,5,8, II, 12, 13, 19 (2x), 22. These expressions undoubtedly refer to the Ephesians collectively.

then refers either to Paul and his readers¹² or to Paul and other Jews.¹³ The final comparative clause, **ωὗ καί οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι** refers either to the rest of the Gentiles,¹⁴ or to humanity in general, including Jews and Gentiles.¹⁵ The position taken here is that "we" is a reference to Paul and the Ephesians, and "the rest" is a reference to mankind in general. It is not until 2:11ff. that a discernible distinction can be made between "we" (Jews) and "you" (Gentiles).¹⁶

Word order

That the word order of 2:3c was considered difficult at one time or another is evident from the textual variants which change the order from **τεῖς μαρτίαι αἱ τοῦ κόσμου** to **μαρτίαι τοῦ κόσμου** and **μαρτίαι τοῦ κόσμου**. Robertson notes that this word order is unusual, but offers no explanation.¹⁷ Winer lists some other instances in Paul where the genitive is "separated from its governing noun by another word" and suggests that this word order was necessary so that "an unsuitable stress was not to fall on **μαρτίαι**"¹⁸ Abbott finds the position of **μαρτίαι** to be unemphatic and even uses this as an argument against interpreting it to support the doctrine of original sin.¹⁹ Alford agrees that there is no emphasis on **μαρτίαι** but states that "its doctrinal

¹²For the view that "we" in 2:3c refers to Paul and his readers, Jews and Gentiles alike, see John Eadie. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (reprinted; Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, 1977) 130-31; Charles J. Ellicott, *Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (reprinted; Minneapolis: James Family, 1978) 45; William Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary: Exposition of Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967) 109-10; R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961) 410; and S. D. F. Salmond, "Ephesians," 285-86.

¹³For the view that "we" in 2:3c refers to Paul and other Jews, excluding the gentile Ephesians (**οὗτοι**, 2:1), see T. K. Abbott, *The Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897) 43; Francis Foulkes. *The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians* (Tyndale New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963) 70; Charles Hodge. *An Exposition of Ephesians* (Wilmington, DE: Associated Publishers and Authors, Inc., n.d.) 37; and H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Ephesians*, trans. by M. J. Evans (reprinted; Winona Lake, IN: Alpha Publications, 1979) 363.

¹⁴Abbott, Ephesians, 46; Foulkes. *Ephesians*, 70; and Meyer, Ephesians, 368.

¹⁵Eadie, Ephesians, 137; Ellicott. *Ephesians*, 46; and Lenski, Ephesians, 412.

¹⁶The writer agrees entirely with Hendriksen on this point. See his *Ephesians*, 109-10.

¹⁷A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934) 419, 503.

¹⁸G. B. Winer. *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, rev. by G. Liinemann; trans. by J. H. Thayer (Andover: Warren H. Draper, 1886) 191.

¹⁹Abbott, *Ephesians*, p. 45 states that the original sin view "gives a very great emphasis to **μαρτίαι**, which its position forbids."

force...is not thereby lessened."²⁰ Another differing opinion is offered by Nigel Turner:

I would say the position is very emphatic: the word comes as a hiatus in a genitive construct construction (Semitic), so that it must go closely with *tekna* and suggests a meaning, "natural children of wrath."²¹

At this juncture, it seems that Abbott's contention lacks proof. As Alford stated, even if **f usei** is not emphatic, its doctrinal force is not negated. The meaning of **f usei** is more crucial to its doctrinal import than its position in the sentence. However, Turner's view deserves careful consideration, especially when: it is noted that this is the only place in the NT where this type of construction is interrupted in this way.²²

Syntax of 2:1-3

Only three questions can be noted briefly here. The first concerns the logical and grammatical connection of 2:1 (**kai>u[phaj]...**) with the preceding prayer of Paul. Westcott's view that **u[phaj]** in 2:1 is "strictly parallel" to **kai>panta upetacen** and **auton edwken** in 1:2²³ seems untenable in view of the climactic nature of 1:22-23 in concluding Paul's prayer. Rather, 2:1 is better viewed as a specific application to the Ephesians (The position of **kai>u[phaj]** is emphatic of the power of God mentioned previously (1:19ff.)²⁴

A second consideration is the anacoluthon in 2:1. Paul's exposition of sin in 2:2-3 breaks the sentence begun in 2:1. Evidently the main verb lacking in 2:1 (for which **u[phaj] o[ta]j nekrouj** was to be the direct object) is finally supplied by **sunezwopoihsen**. The adjective **nekrouj**, describing man's problem in 2:1, is answered by the verb **sunezwopoihsen** in 2:5.

The third syntactical question relates to the connection of 2:3c to the preceding. In 2:3 the subject **h[peij]** has a compound predicate.

²⁰ Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament*, rev. by E. F. Harrison (4 vols.; Chicago: Moody, 1958), 3. 91.

²¹Nigel Turner, personal letter to this writer, February 2, 1980.

²²The Semitic construct construction mentioned by Turner will be discussed in the next chapter. Table 2 lists every NT instance of this construction. Eph 2:3c is the only instance where another word interrupts between metaphorical **u[phaj]** or **tekna** and its following genitive.

²³B. F. Westcott, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (reprinted; Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, 1976) 29.

²⁴For this view see Abbott. *Ephesians*, 38-39; Ellicott. *Ephesians*, 42; and Meyer, *Ephesians*, 356. Perhaps the **kai>** in 2:1 is to be understood as emphatic ("indeed"). See H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1955) 250-51.

The two main verbs, **apēstraf hmen** and **hēqa** portray first the acts and then the state of the Ephesians' past lives. Two **eh** plus relative pronoun phrases are the means of connecting both v 1 to v 2 and v 2 to V 3.²⁵

THE ALLEGED SEMITISM

General definition of Semitisms

The precise nature and literary identity of the language of the NT has long been a matter of scholarly debate. Gone are the days when the NT was viewed as "Holy Ghost Greek," written in a mystical language unrelated to the secular world²⁶ It is commonly recognized today that the NT was written largely in *koine* Greek, the language of the people, rather than in the polished literary style of classical Greek.²⁷ More controversial is the degree of influence exercised by

²⁵The writer would like to introduce the question of a chiasmic arrangement in 2:1-3. This is merely a tentative suggestion, not a dogmatic conclusion. Note that vv. 1 and 3b both have verb forms which refer to a *state of being* (**ontaj** present participle of **eiti** and **hēqa** imperfect indicative of **eiti**). Also note that vv. 2 and 3a, both of which begin with prepositional phrases in **eh** have verbs which present analogous concepts of *habitual behavior* **periepathsate** and **apēstraf hmen**, probably constative aorists. The possible ABBA chiasmus, diagrammed below, has as its first and fourth elements the idea of sin as a *state*, while its second and third elements view sin as *activity*. Let the reader analyze this and decide whether it is intentional or merely coincidental. Whether or not chiasmus is accepted, it is evident that *conceptually* 2:3b is similar to 2:1, and that 2:2 is similar to 2:3. For some insights and additional sources on chiasmus, see Nigel Turner, *Syntax (A Grammar of New Testament Greek, 3; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963) 345-47; and J. H. Moulton, Style (A Grammar of New Testament Greek, 4; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1976) 3, 6~, 87, 97ff., 116, 147. 116, 147.*

2:1 A: **kai>u[ra]j ontaj nekrouj**

toij paraptwnasin kai>taij a[ma]rtiaij u[pe]w[th]

2:2 B: **eh aij pote periepathsate kata>ton ai[on]a tou?kosmu toutou, kata>ton a[ra]xonta thj e[ph]ousiaj tou?a[ra]roj, tou? pneumatoj tou?nu[n] e[ph]ergou[nt]oj eh toij u[pe]w[th] thj a[pe]i[re]iaj.**

2:3 B1 **eh ois kai>h[ra]ij pantej apēstraf hmen pote eh ta[i]j epiquniaij thj sarkoj h[ra]w[th], poiou[nt]ej ta>qel[le]mata thj sarkoj kai>tw[th] dianoiw[th],**

2:3b A1: **kai>hēqa tekna f usei o[ra]ghj wj kai>oi[lo]ipoi<**

²⁶See Adolf Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. by A. Grieve I (reprinted; Winona Lake, IN: Alpha, 1979) Deissmann viewed the "Holy Ghost Greek" theory as a corollary of verbal inspiration. In deprecating one, he deprecated the other, as if the doctrine of verbal inspiration ruled out the personalities and culture of the human authors of Scripture. This indicates a need for conservatives to adequately articulate a Bibliology which avoids the pitfalls of both errantism and docetism.

²⁷This writer is aware that this statement is perhaps over-simplified. Obviously the style of the NT writers varies exceedingly; Luke and the author of Hebrews both used a rather polished style.

Semitic culture and language upon the NT writers. Related to this influence are the literary similarities and disparities between the NT and the LXX.²⁸ Deissmann directed much of his labors against an extreme theory of heavy dependence on the LXX and emphasized the living nature of language and the various circumstances present in the lives of the NT writers.²⁹ One must take care, however, to notice the Semitic background of the NT writers.³⁰

The terms Hebraism, Aramaism, and Semitism are all used to describe Semitic influence upon the I vocabulary and style of NT Greek. As Moule states, "this ugly and rather jargonistic word seems to have 'come to stay' as a term to describe features of Greek which are tinged with either Aramaic or Hebrew."³¹ Moule's definition is perhaps over-simplified, since other works distinguish between "Semitisms" and "secondary Semitisms." A Semitism proper (or primary Semitism) is defined as "a deviation from genuine Greek idiom to a

²⁸For a concise discussion of Semitisms and a valuable bibliography on the subject, see C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* (London: Cambridge University, 1959) 171-91. For a more current discussion and bibliography see Weston Fields, "Aramaic New Testament Originals?" (unpublished Postgraduate Seminar paper, Grace Theological Seminary, 1975). H. St. John Thackeray discusses the nature of LXX Greek from the perspectives of its ~~koine~~ basis and its Semitic element. See his *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1909) 16-55.

²⁹Deissmann stated "The theory indicated is a great power in exegesis, and that is not to be denied. It is edifying and what is more, it is convenient. But it is absurd. It mechanises the marvellous variety of the linguistic elements of the Greek Bible and cannot be established either by the psychology of language or by history." See his *Bible Studies*, 65. In Deissmann's view the key to understanding NT Greek was not found in the "translation Greek" of the LXX but in the inscriptions and papyri of the NT period (80-84).

³⁰While respecting the work of Deissmann and J. H. Moulton in relating NT Greek to secular Greek, C. F. D. Moule cautions that "the pendulum has swung rather too far in the direction of equating Biblical with 'secular' Greek; and we must not allow these fascinating discoveries to blind us to the fact that Biblical Greek still does retain certain peculiarities, due in part to Semitic influence...and in part to the moulding influence of the Christian experience, which did in some measure create an idiom and a vocabulary of its own." See his *Idiom-Book*, 3-4; cf. 188. Similarly Nigel Turner speaks of the "strongly Semitic character of Bibl. Greek.;" Turner views the language of the NT to be as unique as its subject matter. See his *Syntax*, 9.

³¹Moule. *Idiom-Book*, 171. For additional discussions of Semitisms see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian literature*, trans. and rev. by R. W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961) 3-4; James H. Moulton, *Prolegomena* (A Grammar of New Testament Greek, I; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908) 1-20; J. H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, *Accidence and Word Formation* (*A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 2; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1920) 412-85; A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*, 24-29, 88-108; and G. B. Winer, *Grammar*, 238.

too literal rendering of the language of a Semitic original."³² In this sense, Eph 2:3c is not a Semitism (primary). A secondary Semitism, however is a possible but unidiomatic Greek construction, which strains ordinary Greek usage to conform to a normal Semitic construction."³³ It is only in this secondary sense that the term Semitism relates to Eph 2:3c.

*A specific Semitism: **teknā of ghj***

Hebrew syntaxes and lexicons often note the use of **ן** in the construct state followed by a noun expressing quality, character, or other attributes.³⁴ According to Gesenius, this construction is used "to represent a person...as possessing some object or quality, or being in some condition."³⁵ While normal Greek or English idiom would simply supply an adjective, Davidson states,

The genius of the [Hebrew] language is not favorable to the formation of adjectives, and the gen. is used in various ways as explicative of the preceding noun, indicating its material, qualities, or relations.³⁶

Certain other Hebrew words are used comparatively, often with this type of "qualifying genitive:" **אִישׁ**, **בְּעַל**, and **בֵּית**. Two good examples of **ן** in this construction are **בְּן הַכּוֹת** (Deut 25:2, a "son of stripes" = "deserves beating") and **בְּנֵי-חַיִל** (2 Kgs 2:16, "sons of strength" = "strong men"). For further examples, see Table 1.

³²Moulton and Howard. *Accidence and Word Formation*, 14, 477. This definition assumes Hebrew or Aramaic NT source documents or perhaps; even originals. This theory has been evaluated in Fields' work cited in n. 28.

³³Moulton and Howard. *Accidence and Word Formation* 477. Nigel Turner's definition is similar. He describes Semitisms as "those Greek idioms which owe their form of the frequency of their occurrence to Aramaic, or Hebrew, or to an influence which might equally well apply to both languages." See his *Style*, 5.

³⁴See A. B. Davidson. *Hebrew Syntax* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901) 30-33; W. R. Harper. *Elements of Hebrew Syntax* (5th ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899) 30-31; S. P. Tregelles. *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949) 126, sec (7); Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 1. 133; and Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906) 121, § 8; H. Haag, "ן" *TDOT*, 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 152-53. For this in the LXX see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 41-42.

³⁵W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (2nd English ed.; ed. by A. E. Cowley; Oxford: Clarendon, 1910) 417. Examples of the construction are given on 418.

³⁶Davidson, *Syntax*, 32.

Many Greek grammars and lexicons note that **uibj** and **teknon** are sometimes used in a manner equivalent to this Hebrew construction. It is described in various sources as the "Hebraic genitive,"³⁷ the "genitive of relationship,"³⁸ the "attributive genitive,"³⁹ the "adjectival genitive",⁴⁰ the "genitive of quality",⁴¹ and the "genitive of a thing."⁴² All of these terms describe the same grammatical feature: instead of modifying a noun with a simple adjective, the word **uibj** or **teknon** is followed by a noun in the genitive which modifies the noun. For example, instead of describing a person as "peaceful" (**eiḥnikoj**), he is described as a "son of peace" (**uibj eiḥnhj**, Luke 10:6). For further NT examples, see Table 2.⁴³

Although an impressive array of scholars view Eph 2:3c as a Semitism,⁴⁴ some deny or diminish the Semitic influence. Adolf Deissmann in his *Bible Studies* made a case for **uibj** or **teknon** followed by the genitive as a genuine Greek idiom. Distinguishing such expressions in the gospels (which he regarded as translation Greek) from those in the Pauline and Petrine epistles, he concluded concerning the latter:

In no case whatever are they un-Greek; they might quite well have been coined by a Greek who wished to use impressive language. Since, however, similar turns of expression are found in the Greek Bible [LXX], and are in part cited by Paul and others, the theory of analogical formations will be found a sufficient explanation.⁴⁵

³⁷Moulton and Howard, *Accidence and Word Formation*, 440. M. Zerwick similarly refers to the "Hebrew genitive." See his *Biblical Greek* (English ed.; Rome: .Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963) 14.

³⁸Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *Grammar*, 89.

³⁹Robertson, *Grammar*, 496-97.

⁴⁰Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 174-75.

⁴¹Turner, *Style*, 90.

⁴²J. H. Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901) 635; and W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, rev. by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker (2nd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979) 834.

⁴³Table 2 has been adapted from a list in Moulton and Howard, *Accidence and Word Formation*, 441.

⁴⁴To mention only a few scholars, see Arndt and Gingrich, *Lexicon*, 839; Alexander Buttman, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek*, trans. by J. H. Thayer (Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1880) 161-62; C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 174; Moulton and Howard, *Accidence and Word Formation*, 441; Albracht Oepke, "**paij ...**" *TDNT*, 5 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967) 639; Thayer, *Lexicon*, 618; and Winer, *Grammar*, 238. Nearly all critical commentaries also view **tekna ... oḡghj** as a Semitism.

⁴⁵Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 166. Evidently "analogical formation" meant that NT writers used a Greek idiom analogous to the Hebrew idiom.

Deissmann's argumentation was twofold. First, he supplied inscriptional evidence of similar pure Greek idiom.⁴⁶ Second, he pointed out that even the translators of the LXX did not slavishly translate metaphorical **תָּ** with **uibj**.⁴⁷ While Moulton and Milligan followed Deissmann,⁴⁸ this writer must agree with the majority of scholars, who view Eph 2:3c as a genuine Semitism. Nigel Turner's statement seems adequate: "The LXX translators so often faced the problem of the construct state in its adjectival function...that apparently the habit of using a genitive of quality had been caught by Paul..."⁴⁹

Three lingering questions

While most scholars view **tekna** in 2:3c as synonymous with **uifi**, there are a few dissenters. In 2:2 Paul used the Semitic **toij uifij thj apeiqlaj**. Why then in the next verse did he switch from **uibj** to **tekna**? Was this unconscious, or for literary variety, or was it a subtle emphasis of a birth concept (**teknon** from **tiktw**, "to beget,")?⁵⁰ It is interesting to note that there seem to be comparatively few instances in the LXX where **teknon** translates metaphorical **תָּ**.⁵¹ As seen in Table 1, **uibj** is the predominant word. However, as shown in Table 2, there are six NT instances where **teknon** seems to be used in the Semitic metaphorical sense. Only further study will show whether this change from **uibj** to **teknon** is exegetically significant. Presently, however, such significance seems doubtful.

⁴⁶Ibid., 165-66.

⁴⁷Ibid., 164. I

⁴⁸J. H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976 reprint) 649.

⁴⁹Turner, *Style*, 649. It is interesting to note that scholars before Deissmann (when NT Greek was explained as either Semitic or derived from classical) and after Deissmann (when NT Greek is viewed in its koine context) are agreed that Eph 2:3c is a Semitism.

⁵⁰C. F. Ellicott, citing Bengel as in agreement, states that **tekna** is not simply identical with the Hebraistic **uifi** "ver. 2 ..." He believes that the word connoted "a near and close relation" to God's wrath. See his *Ephesians*, 46 and Alford, "Ephesians," 3. 91. M. R. Vincent views **tekna** as emphasizing the connection to wrath by birth. See his "The Epistles of Paul" (Word Studies in the New Testament, 3; reprinted; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969) 375. The great American theologian Jonathan Edwards also noted the change from **uibj** to **teknon** and saw in it an emphasis on birth. See his *Original Sin (The Works of Jonathan Edwards, 3; New Haven/London: Yale University, 1970)* 301. In opposition to this view see J. Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (2nd ed.; London: James Clarke and Co., n.d.)

⁵¹This writer has not done the concordance work necessary for dogmatism on this point. However, thus far he has found **teknon** for metaphorical **תָּ** only in Hos 2:4; 10:9. Isa 57:4 has **tekna apwleiaj** for **עַשְׂרֵי תַלְמִידִים**

In the introductory section on word order, the writer has already presented several opinions on the sequence of words in this phrase. At this point the question of word order must be directed to the question of Semitic influence. Of all the OT examples of metaphorical **יָד** and the NT examples of metaphorical **uibj/teknon** only in 2:3c does a word intervene between the term "son" and the qualifying genitive. This fact seems to make **f usei** quite emphatic. Is this unique word order relevant to the question of Semitism? Perhaps this indicates that 2:3c is more emphatic than a normal Semitic construction.⁵²

While the nature of the genitive—whether subjective or objective—is not broached in many sources, it is an important question.⁵³ The ambiguity of such constructions is evident from the NIV's translation ("those who are anointed:" objective) and margin ("two who bring oil:" subjective) of Zech 4:14. In Eph 2:2 **toij uibij thj apeiqeiaj** must be subjective. However, 2:3c is normally taken as objective: **tekna... ofghj** means those who are presently under God's wrath (cf. John 3:18, 36; Rom 1:18; 9:22) or those who are worthy of God's wrath (Eph 5:6; Col 3:6). It is grammatically possible that **tekna... ofghj** should be understood as those characterized by wrath in the same sense that the **toij uibij thj apeiqeiaj** are characterized by disobedience. In other words, is this wrath another aspect of man's rebellion against God? Is it his own wrath against others? While this interpretation does not commend itself to this writer, it deserves further consideration.⁵⁴

THE CRUCIAL WORD: **f usei**

In many ways, the doctrinal import of this passage depends upon the sense of this word. The preceding discussion of the Semitic background of the phrase **hēqa tekna f usei ofghj** does not really assert or deny that *peccatum originale* is taught in Eph 2:3c. While the Semitic idiom certainly does not specify *why* men are under God's wrath or *when* they come under it. These two questions must be answered from the exegesis of **f usei**. If **f usei** refers to innate character, then the sense of hereditary moral corruption is supported. If **f usei** legitimately can be viewed as an acquired characteristic ("second nature"), then this verse should not be used to support the

⁵²Buttmann (*Grammar*, 387) views this as hyperbaton, an inverted construction used for emphasis and perspicuity. Arndt and Gingrich (*Lexicon*, 877) cite an instance in Plutarch with **f usei** in this position.

⁵³In each case it must be asked whether the noun modified by the genitive is its subject or object. See Turner, *Style*, 90.

⁵⁴Ellicott, *Ephesians*, 171 and Alford, "Ephesians," 3. 91 react against the subjective sense.

doctrine. This section of the paper will survey the etymology of **f usij** and its use in both the extra-biblical and biblicalliterature.⁵⁵ Then the meaning of the word in Eph 2:3c will be discussed.

Etymology

The noun **f usij** seems to be a "verbal abstract"⁵⁶ derived from **f uomai** or **f uw** meaning "bring forth, produce, put forth" (transitive) or "grow, wax, spring up or forth (intransitive)".⁵⁷ It is often used of the natural growth of the physical creation, especially of plant life. Thus, the noun **f usij** is related to the external form of plant life as a state of its growth. It came also to be applied to the natural state of humanity resulting from birth.⁵⁸

Extra-biblical use

In addition to its botanical and anthropological senses, **f usij** "became a key concept among the Pre-Socratic philosophers in considering the nature of the world, and similarly the Sophists in the question of the foundation and basis of law."⁵⁹ In Stoic philosophy, **f usij** became a god of the universe, with whom man must live harmoniously.⁶⁰ The following outline summarizes the diverse usages of the word.⁶¹

I. Origin (of persons and plants)

- A. origin or birth
- B. growth

⁵⁵Due to lack of space, this survey must necessarily be quite brief. For more detailed information see G. Harder, "Nature," (*NIDNTT*, 2; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 2. 656-62; H. Koster, "**f usij**...," *TDNT*, 9 (1974) 251-77; and H. G. Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. and aug. by H. S. Jones (9th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 1964-65.

⁵⁶Koster, "**f usij**" *TDNT*, 9. 252. It is attested as early as Homer (eighth century B.C.). See Harder, "Nature," 656.

⁵⁷Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, 1966.

⁵⁸Koster, "**f usij**..." *TDNT* 9. 252. Other related words are the adjective **f usikoj** ("natural, inborn, native"), the nouns **f usiwna** and **f usiwsij** ("natural tendency, character"), and the verbs **f usiow** ("to dispose oneself naturally"), **f usiologew** ("to discourse upon nature or natural causes"), and **f usiopoiew** ("to remold as by a second nature").

⁵⁹Harder, "Nature," *NIDNTT*, 2. 656.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, 2. 657-58. The citation of Marcus Aurelius' words **w\$ usij, e\$ sou?panta, e@ soi?panta, ei\$ se panta** (cf. Rom 11:36) may provide a vivid illustration of **e| atreusan t^?ktisei para>ton ktisanta** (Rom 1:25).

⁶¹Adapted from Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon* 1964-65.

- II. Natural form or constitution resulting from growth (persons or things)
 - A. nature, constitution
 - B. outward form, appearance
 - C. constitution
 - D. mental character or nature or instinct (animals)
- III. Regular order of nature (men, plants, the world in general)
- IV. Philosophical
 - A. originating power of the universe
 - B. elementary substance of the universe
 - C. concretely for the universe
- V. Concrete term for men, animals or plants collectively
- VI. Kind, sort, or species (of plants)
- VII. Sex (organs or characteristics)

"There is no Hebrew equivalent in the Old Testament for *physis*,"⁶² due to the creator/creature distinction in OT revelation. God is the ultimate reference point instead of **fusij**. Thus **fusij** does not occur in the LXX canonical writings, but only in the apocryphal books of Wisdom and 3 and 4 Maccabees. In these books, usage generally parallels Greek literature. Probably the most significant occurrence is Wis 13: 1: **nataioi men gar pantej aqrwpoi fusei**. Does **fusei** here mean "birth" (cf. NEB "born fools")⁶³ or "nature" (created nature)? If innate created nature is in view, this concept is in contrast to Paul's explanation (Rom 1:19ff.) of the perspicuity of natural revelation.⁶⁴ The Jewish writer Philo modified **fusij** in his unsuccessful attempt to harmonize the OT and Greek philosophy,⁶⁵ Josephus similarly adapted **fusij** using it often to describe the natural topography of the land, human character, and nature as a whole.⁶⁶

⁶²Harder, "Nature," *NIDNTT*, 2. 658.

⁶³*The New English Bible with Apocrypha*: Oxford Study Edition (New York: Oxford University, 1976) 107.

⁶⁴Koster, **fusij**...*TDNT*, 9. 267.

⁶⁵**Fusij** is extremely common in Philo, who viewed it as divine power and agency. See Koster, "**fusij**..." *TDNT*, 9.267-69 and Harder, "Nature," *NIDNTT*, 2. 658-59.

⁶⁶See Koster, "**fusij**..." *TDNT* 9. 279-81; Harder, "Nature," *NIDNTT*, 2. 659-60. One passage from Josephus has been urged in proof that **fusij** need not always refer to innate character but also may refer to acquired characteristics or habits. Thus **fusij** in Eph 2:3c need not refer to sin as in inherited or innate trait but instead to an acquired sinfulness. The passage is found in the Antiquities, 3:8: I. In it he describes the Pharisees' philosophy of punishment in the words of **aewj telai>fusei proj taj lian ekalephne** which is translated "any way they are naturally lenient in the matter of punishments." Eadie describes this as "constitutional clemency" (Ephesians, 135). While it appears that this use may include habitual practice, it is practice which

New Testament use

Fusij occurs 14 times in the NT (12 of these are in Paul). Three related words also occur: (1) the adjective **fusikoj** (three times); (2) the adverb **fusikwj** (once); and (3) the verb **fuw** (three times). All of these occurrences are listed in Table 3. According to Koster, the relative rarity of **fusij** in the NT (as compared with its frequency in extra-biblical literature) is noteworthy.⁶⁷ Abbott-Smith's summary of its occurrences is accurate and concise:

(1) nature (natural powers or constitution) of a person or a thing: Jas 3:1; 2 Pet 1 :4; Eph 2:3

(2) origin or birth: Rom 2:21; Gal 2:15

(3) nature, i.e., the regular order or law of nature: 1Cor 11:14; Rom 1:26; 2:14; 11:21, 24; Gal 4:8⁶⁸

Scholars are agreed that the concept of natural, innate character is present in all but three of these passages: Rom 2:14, 1 Cor 11:14, and Eph 2:3c. Rom 2:14 and 1 Cor 11:14 will be briefly discussed before a more extensive treatment of Eph 2:3c.

Fusij in Rom 2:14. While this may not be "the most important and also the most difficult passage in which Paul uses **fusij**"⁶⁹ it is certainly not an easy text, as the discouraging comments of Sanday and Headlam show.⁷⁰ The hermeneutical problem here is to determine in what sense, if any, do Gentiles **eph** by nature

emanates from natural characteristics. For the original Greek and the English translation see Flavius Josephus, *Josephus (Jewish Antiquities, Books 12-14, The Loeb Classical Library, 1 [London: Wm. Heinemann, 1943]) 314-15 (13:294).*

⁶⁷Koster ("**fusij**...", *TDNT*, 9. 211) finds the absence of **fusij** from such passages as Acts 11 and Romans 1:18-25 as an indicator that Paul would say "nein" to natural theology!

⁶⁸G. Abbott Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* (3rd ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1931) 416. The analysis of W. E. Vine is identical. See his *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* (.Old Tapan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1966 reprint) 103. Arndt and Gingrich's classification (lexicon, 869-10) differs slightly: (1) natural endowment or condition, inherited from one's ancestors:" Gal 2: 15; Rom 2:21; Eph 2:3; Rom 11 :21, 24; (2) "natural characteristics or disposition:" Jas 3:1b; 2 Pet I :4; Gal 4:8; (3) "nature as the regular natural order:" Rom 1 :26; 2: 14; 1 Cor 11:14; and (4) "natural being, product of nature, creature" Jas 3:7a. It is difficult to distinguish between the first and second categories. Other possibilities for **fusij** are simply "physically" in Rom 2:21 and "species" in both instances in Jas 3:1 (cf. **NASB**, **NIV**, and Harder, "Nature, **NIDNTT**, 660-61.

⁶⁹Koster, "**fusij**...", *TDNT*, 9. 213.

⁷⁰The impression received when one reads their note on this verse is that rationalists have taken it more literally than orthodox theologians. See William Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902) 59-60. The treatment given this verse

fulfill the law's demands? The clause in question reads **otan gar e@h ta>nh>nomon e@onta fusei ta>tou?nomou poiw@sin, . . .** While orthodox scholars have proposed some plausible solutions to the problem, most of them assume a questionable point. That is, most of them take **fusei** with the following clause, making it modify **poiw@sin**. This writer tends to agree with Cranfield in taking **fusei** with what precedes, modifying **e@onta**. Thus, the difficulties of either toning down **fusei** (viewing it as an acquired "second nature") or implying Pelagianism are eliminated. Instead, the passage is interpreted as describing regenerate Gentiles who practice the law, though by their birth and natural circumstances they do not possess the law. This allows **fusij** to retain its normal meaning. This passage cannot be legitimately used to deny that **fusij** refers to innate character in Eph 2:3c.⁷¹

Fusij in *1 Cor 11:14*. Paul's teaching on hair length is reinforced in 11:14-16 with two arguments. Paul first states that "nature" confirms his teaching (11:14) and then adds that this is the custom (**sunhqeia**) of all the churches. While some expositors may tend to blur the distinction between **fusij** and **sunhqeia** making **fusij** equivalent to acquired habit or style, such exegesis is untenable in light of Pauline usage. Paul in Rom 1:26-27 stated that homosexuality was **para>fusin** obviously referring to mankind's innate sexual orientation resulting from his being created by God.⁷² Therefore, it would seem that Paul in I Corinthians again appeals to the God-given natural order for men and women. The innate sexual orientation of men and women is the basis of Paul's position on hair length. Again, this passage provides no evidence for those who wish to make **fusij** in Eph 2:3c an acquired "second nature."

Use in Ephesians 2:3c

In this writer's view, **fusij** in this passage retains its normal meaning of innate or natural character. While this passage alone

by C. E. B. Cranfield is a decided improvement. See his *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1975), I. 155-57.

⁷¹Francis Foulkes does just this with this passage. See his *The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians* (Tyndale *New Testament Commentaries*; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963) 71. Cf. *Cranfield's stimulating discussion in Romans*, I. 156, 157 with footnotes. Hodge (*Romans*, 55) takes **fusei** with **poiein** but distinguishes between merely Turner, outwardly doing the law and actually spiritually fulfilling the law. This view is also possible.

⁷²This refutes the current claim that homosexuality is the "natural" orientation for some people.

certainly would not sustain the developed Christian doctrine of original sin, it does make a contribution. While the word **fusij** is neutral and in itself has no sinful connotation, this can be supplied from context. There is no contextual connection with Adam's first sin, nor is there any explicit proof of Traducianism. However, this passage does seem to have its place in asserting the hereditary moral corruption of the human race, which corruption results from Adam's first sin and is passed along by natural generation. In addition to the lexical support for this view, many scholarly commentaries have also advocated it.⁷³

The form of **fusij** in this verse is dative. What is its precise significance? The answer to this question is admittedly subjective and interpretive, for the dative case is used to express a wide range of nuance. From most of the English translations, the idea of instrumentality surfaces ("by nature").⁷⁴ Turner and Winer, however, favor the dative of respect idea, which seems milder than instrumentality. Instead of being under wrath "by nature," it is thus "with respect to nature."⁷⁵ A third option is supported by Green who views **fusei** as

⁷³Karl Braune, "Ephesians," *Langes Commentary on the Holy Scriptures* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan) 76-77; John Calvin, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians. Ephesians. Philippians. and Colossians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965) 141-42. Calvin says that "by nature" means "from their very origin, and from their mother's womb. In further comments he critiques Pelagianism and makes an important distinction between two ways the word nature is used: (1) man's original nature created by God, and (2) man's fallen nature corrupted by Adam's sin. John Eadie, *Ephesians*, 133-40. Eadie's extended treatment of 2:3c is one of the best this writer has found. He cites evidence from classical and Jewish Greek writings and interacts with sources who hold opposing views. He concludes thus: "The *modus* may be and is among 'the deep things of God,' but the *res* is palpable; for experience confirms the divine testimony that we are by nature 'children of wrath,' *per generationem*, not *per imitationem*." Charles Hodge, *Ephesians*, 38-39. In his fairly full treatment Hodge briefly deals with the Semitic background, the use of **fusij** and other views. Hodge cautiously states "this doctrine [hereditary depravity] may be fairly implied in the text but it is not asserted" (38). Lenski, *Ephesians*, 412-13. While viewing **fusij** as innate here, Lenski concedes that **fusij** may sometimes mean a "habitually and gradually developed...second nature." This writer is not convinced that such a concession is necessary. It seems that even when **fusij** refers to development or growth it does so in the context of an outward development of an inner nature. Salmond, "Ephesians," 286-87. He also makes the questionable concession that **fusij** can mean habit, but his treatment is very helpful, especially the section refuting Meyer's view, which will be explained later. E. K. Simpson and F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians* (*New International Commentary on the New Testament*; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 46-50. In a stirring manner Simpson defends this view by citing classical authors and interacting with J. A. Robinson, whose views will be explained later.

⁷⁴Robertson, *Grammar*, 530, speaks of this as "instrumental of manner."

⁷⁵Nigel Turner, personal letter; Winer, *Grammar*, 215.

dative of sphere.⁷⁶ While the instrumental idea seems most acceptable, in reality there is little difference between the three possibilities.

The view of **f usij** favored above has not gone unchallenged. Several other views have been suggested and are briefly summarized here.⁷⁷ First, it is asserted by some that **f usei** is the equivalent of an adverb such as **oŋtwj**, **alhqwj**, or **gnhswj**. Thus Paul only says that "we were truly or genuinely children of wrath." The problem with this view is that, while **f usij** may imply this sense, it means much more.⁷⁸ A second view takes the whole expression (**tekna f usei oŋghj**) as a subjective genitive. In this view **oŋghj** is human wrath which characterizes the individuals described. This view is grammatically possible but exegetically and contextually doubtful. A third view is that **f usei** simply means "in or by ourselves," apart from God's grace.⁷⁹ While **f usei** certainly includes this idea, it means much more. Further, this view is vague and does not really answer the question of whether **f usei** refers to original or actual sin.⁸⁰ A fourth view, that **f usij** refers to developed or habitual behavior,⁸¹ (a "second-nature") cannot be sustained from the NT and extra-biblical usage of the word.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that Eph 2:3c is relevant to the doctrine of original sin. The Semitic phrase **tekna... oŋghj** places the unsaved individual as a worthy object of the wrath of God. Perhaps even more is implied by this phrase. The word **f usei** presents the reason or cause for this most perilous of all positions. While it is true that God's wrath is upon all men for their actual sins,

⁷⁶Samuel G. Green, *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1912) 228. He defines sphere in a logical sense as "that in which a quality inheres."

⁷⁷For more detailed interaction see the works of Alford, Eadie, Hodge, Simpson, and Salmond cited previously. These works cite sources holding the opposing views listed here.

⁷⁸Only one source consulted by this writer said that this was a legitimate meaning of **f usij** but the source viewed **f usij** as having this meaning only in Gal 4:8. See Markus Barth, *Ephesians*, I. 231. Even Meyer, who would not agree with the original sin view, denies the validity of this view. See his *Ephesians*, 368.

⁷⁹For advocates of this view see F. W. Beare and T. O. Wedel, "The Epistle to the Ephesians" (The Interpreter's Bible; 10; Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953) 641; C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 174 ("perhaps"); J. A. Robinson, *Ephesians*, 50; and N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin*, I 13 n. I.

⁸⁰As Meyer points out (Ephesians, 367), in this view "nothing is explained."

⁸¹For advocates of this view see Foulkes, *Ephesians*, 71; Thayer, *Lexicon*, 660 sec. c; and the Arminian theologians John Miley, *Systematic Theology*, I. 512; and H. C. Sheldon, *System of Christian Doctrine*, 316-17.

Paul's use of **f usij** here indicates a more basic problem. Men's evil deeds are done in a state of spiritual and moral separation from God (2: 1). Man is in this state of spiritual death due to his sinful nature-his hereditary moral corruption. And it is this innate condition which ultimately brings the wrath of God upon him. Men are "natural children of wrath."⁸²

Opposition to this view

Diverse arguments have been offered by the opponents of this view. Some of the arguments are exegetical and deserve an answer. While this could not be done in detail in this study, Appendix I has begun the task. Other arguments are more "logical" in nature but actually seem to place reason over revelation, as in the extreme case of those who would dismiss original sin an immoral monstrosity on a priori grounds.⁸³ The answer to this objection must emphasize that man's present natural state is in a sense also unnatural.⁸⁴ His sinfulness, though included in God's plan, is viewed by God as man's own fault. God cannot be blamed for original sin for he did not create man sinful, but holy. All this aside, however, the final answer is "who are you, O man, to talk back to God?" (Rom 9:20, NIV).

While some would admit to a doctrine of original sin, they would deny that men are accounted guilty for this reason. Shedd summarizes the situation quite well:

The semi-Pelagian, Papal, and Arminian anthropologies differ from the Augustinian and reformed, by denying that corruption of nature is guilt. It is a physical and moral disorder leading to sin, but is not sin itself.⁸⁵

⁸²"Natural children of wrath" is the translation suggested by Nigel Turner in his letter to this writer.

⁸³For example see Charles G. Finney, *Systematic Theology* (Whittier, CA: Col-porter Kemp, 1946 reprint) 244. Finney said that Eph 2:3c "cannot, consistently with natural justice, be understood to mean, that we are exposed to the wrath of God on account of our nature. It is a monstrous and blasphemous doctrine..." On a more modern note, C. H. Dodd spoke of the "figment of an inherited guilt." He asked, "how could anything so individual as guilty responsibility be inherited?" In the same context he also speaks of the "monstrous development of the doctrine of total depravity." See his *The Meaning of Paul for Today* (New York: The New American Library, 1974) 61.

⁸⁴See Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, 2. 219: "As opposed to what is natural in the sense of created by God, man's inability is moral, not natural; but as opposed to what is moral in the sense of acquired by habit, man's inability is natural. When "natural means innate, we assert that inability is "natural." When natural means "created" we assert that inability is "moral," that is, "voluntary." See also Calvin, Ephesians, 141-42.

⁸⁵Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, 2. 198. Even in reformed circles, however, some theologians have attempted to dilute the idea that corruption of nature is guilt. See Nathaniel W. Taylor, *Concio ad Clerum: A Sermon Delivered in the Chapel of Yale*

The Romanist perspective alleviates the guilt of original sin with its understanding of *limbus infantium* and infant baptism.⁸⁶ The Arminian position as articulated by Miley is "native depravity without native demerit."⁸⁷ This position is exegetically and logically untenable. It does not handle **f usij** properly. Neither does it make sense, for the innate disposition to sin, which leads to sin, is not viewed as sinful or guilty. How can the effect be worthy of wrath and the cause be innocent?⁸⁸

Implications for Christian living

The study of Scripture (What does it mean?) is incomplete unless the student asks, "What does it mean to *me*?" In the context of Eph 2:1-10 the answer is not hard to find. The believer is God's workmanship, created for good works. When one contemplates his sinfulness in all its degradation, and when he realizes he deserves only the wrath of God, he then begins to appreciate the glorious gospel of God's grace and realizes a true incentive for a holy lifestyle. C. H. Spurgeon said

A spiritual experience which is thoroughly flavored with a deep and bitter sense of sin is of great value to him that hath had it. It is terrible in the drinking, but it is most wholesome in the bowels, and in the whole of the after-life. Possibly, much of the flimsy piety of the present day arises from the ease with which men attain to peace and joy in these evangelistic days...Too many think lightly of sin, and therefore think lightly of the Savior. He who has stood before his God,

College, September 10. 1828 (New Haven: A. H. Moltby and Homan Hallock, 1842) 1-43. Taylor represented "New School" Presbyterianism.

⁸⁶See S. Harent, "Original Sin" (*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 11, New York: Robert Appleton Co., 1911), 2. 314; and P. J. Toner, "Limbo," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 9. 256. To a lesser degree one wonders whether the Lutheran and Anglican views of baptismal regeneration for infants have also tended to minimize the guilt of original sin.

⁸⁷Miley, *Systematic Theology*, I. 521ff. This is also the basic position advocated by Meyer, *Ephesians*, 367. Meyer believes in a sinful natural constitution which eventually awakens and vanquishes man's "moral will," thereby incurring guilt and wrath. He bases this on his view that Romans 7 describes the experience of the natural man. OveraU, the Arminian doctrine of universal prevenient (preliminary) grace has probably tended to obscure the guiltiness of man by nature. This seems to be the position of John Wesley. See the analysis of his views on original sin in Mildred B. Wynkoop, *A Theology of Love: The Dynamic of Wesleyanism* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1972) 150-55.

⁸⁸See Calvin, *Ephesians*, 141-42; Eadie, *Ephesians*, 136; and Salmond, "Ephesians," 287. Salmond correctly observes that this "is to make a nature which originates sinful acts and which does that in the case of all men without exception, itself a neutral thing." Cf. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, 2. 199-202.

convicted and condemned, with the rope about his neck, is the man to weep for joy when he is pardoned, to hate the evil which has been forgiven him, and to live to the honor of the Redeemer by whose blood he has been cleansed.⁸⁹

TABLE 1
SOME OCCURRENCES OF יָדָאִ IN THE CONSTRUCT STATE
USED METAPHORICALLY*

<i>Text</i>	NASB	NIV
Num 17: 10	rebels or sons of rebellion	the rebellious
Num 24: 17	sons of Sheth or tumult	sons of Sheth or the noisy boasters
Deut 25:2	deserves to be beaten or a son of beating	deserves to be beaten (LXX αἰῶν πλῆγῶν)
Judg 18:2	valiant men or sons of valor	warriors
Judg 19:22	worthless fellows or sons of Belial	wicked men
Judg 21:10	valiant warriors	fighting men
1 Sam 14:52	valiant man	brave man
1 Sam 26: 16	must surely die or are surely sons of death	deserve to die
2 Sam 2:7	valiant or sons of valor	brave
2 Sam 7: 10	the wicked or sons of wickedness	wicked people
2 Sam 12:5	deserves to die or is a son of death	deserves to die
I Kgs I :52	a worthy man	a worthy man
2 Kgs 2:3	sons of the prophets	company of the prophets
2 Kgs 2: 16	strong men	able men
2 Kgs 14:14	hostages	hostages
I Chr 17:9	the wicked or sons of wickedness	wicked people
Neh 12:28	sons of the singers	the singers
Ps 79: 11	those who are doomed to die or children of death	those condemned
Ps 89:22	sons of wickedness or wicked man	wicked man
Isa 57:3	sons of a sorceress	sons of a sorceress
Dan 11:14	violent ones	violent men
Hos 10:9	the sons of iniquity	the evildoers (LXX ταῖς ἐκ ἀδικίαις)
Zech 4: 14	anointed ones or sons fresh oil	of two who are anointed or two who bring oil

* This chart is representative-not exhaustive. It was compiled from examples given in the lexicons and from a similar list compiled by Prof. Donald

⁸⁹C. H. Spurgeon, *The Early Years* (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1962) 54.

Fowler. In each case except Deut 25:2 and Hos 10:9 the LXX renders the construction with **uioj** plus the genitive. Notice the varying degrees of literality or dynamic equivalence used in translating the Hebrew **יְ** constructions.

TABLE 2
NT USES OF **uioj** AND **teknon** WITH GENITIVE
IN A METAPHORICAL SENSE

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Text</i>
Matt 9: 15	oi[uiφi>tu?nunf rwñoj
Matt 23: 15	uiφn geenhj
Mark 2:19	oi[uiφi>tu?nunf rwñoj
Mark 3:17	uiφi>bronthj
Luke 5:34	touj uiφuj tu?numgrwñoj
Luke 10:6	uioj eiφnhhj
Luke 16:8	oi[uiφi>tu?aiwñoj toutou (also in 20:34)
Luke 20:36	thj aφastasewj uiφi>
John 17:12	o[uiōj thj aφwleiaj
Acts 4:36	uioj paraklhsewj
Rom 9:8	ta>tekna thj eφaggeliaj
Gal 4:28	eφaggeliaj tekna
Eph 2:2	toij uiφij thj aφeiqeiaj (also in 5:6)
Eph 2:3	tekna f usei oφghj
Eph 5:8	tekna f wtoj
Col 1:13	tou?uiφu?thj aφaphj auφou?
Col 3:6	touj uiφuj thj aφeiqeiaj (textual?)
I Pet I: 14	tekna uφakohj
2 Pet 2:14	kataraj tekna

TABLE 3
NT USES OF **fusij** AND RELATED WORDS.

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Text</i>
	f usij
Rom I :26	methllacan tha fusikna xrhšin ej tha para>fusin
Rom 2:14	otan gar eφnh ... fusei ta>tu?nomou poiwšin
Rom 2:27	krinei?h[ek fusewj aφrobustia
Rom 11:21	eiφar o[qeoj twñ kata>fusin kladwn ouk ef eisato

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Text</i>
Rom 11 :24	ei]gar su>ek th] kata>f usin e]kophj agrielaion, kai>para>f usin e]kentriskhj ej kallielaiou, pos& mallon ou&oi oi[kata>f usin e]kentriskhsontai
1 Cor 11: 14	oude>h[f usij au]th>didaskai u]na] h]peij f usi]oudai&di
Gal 2: 15	h]peij f usi]oudai&di
Gal 4:8	e]loueusatetoij dusei nh>ou&sin qeoi] h]peia tekna f usei o]ghj
Eph 2:3	h]peia tekna f usei o]ghj
Jas 3:7	pa&sa gar f usij qhriwn te kai>peteinwn... danazetai ... t^?f usei t^?a]q]rwpin^
2 Pet 1:4	iha dia>toutwn genhsqe qeiaj koinwnoi>f usewj fusik&oj
Rom 1 :26	meth]lacan thn fusikhn xrh&sin
Rom 1 :27 6	o]hoiwj te kai>oi[a]senej afentej thn fusikhn xrh&sin th] qeleiaj
2 Pet 2: 12	wj a]loga z&a gegennhmena fusika> fusik&wj
Jude 10	osa de>fusik&wj wj ta>a]loga z&a epistantai fuw
Luke 8:6	f uen e]h]ranqh dia>to>nh>e]ein i]k]mada
Luke 8:8	f uen e]poihsen karpon e]katontaplasiona
Heb 12:15	nh<tij r]za pikria] a]w fuousa e]poxl^?

* Adapted from W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, rev. by H. K. Moulton (5th ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1978) 997.

APPENDIX I

ORIGINAL SIN AND GOD'S WRATH: ARGUMENTS AND ANSWERS

I. *Argument from the Context of Ephesians 2:1-3*: The context treats actual sin, not original sin. (See Abbott, *Ephesians*, 45-46; Foulkes, *Ephesians*, 71; Meyer, *Ephesians*, 365-66; George B. Stevens, *Pauline Theology* [NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895] 152ff.)

Answer: 2:1 speaks not only of actual sin but also of sin as a state of separation from God. Even so, this may be an example of an argument leading up to a climactic statement, *ab effectu ad causam*.

II. *Argument from the Word Order of Ephesians 2:3c*: The word order of the phrase must be **f usei tekna o]ghj** for the original sin view to be true. The position of **f usei** is unemphatic. (See Abbott, *Ephesians*. 45; Meyer, *Ephesians*, 366.)

Answer: Interpretation of word order is quite subjective, but there is some reason to view **f usei** in its position between **tekna**

and **ofghj** as quite emphatic. Even if it is not emphatic it could possibly indicate that Paul was implicitly assuming hereditary moral corruption.

III. *Argument from the time Reference of Ephesians 2:3c*: The original sin view "supposes Kat 1'jJ.1f.9a to refer to, or at least include, a time prior to **eh oi\$ ah** (See Abbott, *Ephesians*, 45.)

Answer: Nothing in the original sin view necessitates this supposition. **Øneqa** does refer to the same time as the previous context. At that time, before the Ephesians were converted, they were deserving objects of God's wrath due to innate depravity.

IV. *Argument from the Analogy of Scripture*: The ecclesiastical dogma of original sin is not Pauline. Paul views actual sin as the reason why man is under God's wrath. (See Meyer, *Ephesians*, 366.)

Answer: This argument begs the question. It is true that Paul in other contexts views wrath coming upon men due to actual sin (Rom 1:18; Eph 5:6; e.g.). However, sin, like beauty, "is more than skin deep." The Scripture speaks of man's conception in a state of sin (Psa 51 :5), of his sinful heart (Jer 17:9; Matt 15:17-19), of his sinful mind set (Eph 2:3ab; 4:17-19). The sinful heart (a term implying an innate nature or essence) is viewed in Matt 15:19 and Eph 4:18 as the root of sinful activity. Ultimately man's nature causes him to be under God's wrath.

V. *Argument from Romans 11:17-24*: If Paul views the Jews as inborn children of wrath, he contradicts his teaching in Rom 11:17-24 where he speaks of Jews as the "natural branches" of the olive tree of the theocracy. (See Meyer, *Ephesians*, 366.)

Answer: **Fusij** in Rom 11 is used in an illustration of Israel's favored position in God's program. The natural branches of the olive tree are Jews who are the objects of God's theocratic dealings. The unnatural branches are Gentiles who may become objects of God's grace in Christ. Paul's perspective in Rom 11 is national and positional: the Jews naturally enjoyed God's special theocratic favor and the Gentiles did not. The perspective in Eph 2:3 is quite different. Here individuals, both Jews and Gentiles, are viewed as naturally objects of God's wrath. This is no more contradictory than the words of Hos 3:2. Israel's special position in God's plan is viewed as a reason for her judgment.

VI. *Argument from 1 Cor 7:14*: Paul could not have taught an inborn liability to wrath for this would contradict his words about the children of believers in I Cor 7:14. (See Meyer, *Ephesians*, 366-67.)

Answer: 1 Cor 7: 14 is admittedly a difficult passage. It seems best to view the sanctification and holiness spoken of here not in an experiential moral sense. Instead there is a sense in which the unsaved marriage partner and the children in such a home are set apart by the believer there. This is a matter of privilege and exposure to Christian testimony. It should be noted, however, that whatever "holiness" is spoken of in the verse is true of the unbelieving adult as well as the children. This weakens Meyer's argument considerably.

VII. *Argument from Matthew 18:2ff; 19:14ff:* This view of original sin contradicts the words of Jesus Christ concerning children, especially His promise that whoever becomes like a child will enter the Kingdom of heaven. (See Meyer, Ephesians, 367.)

Answer: Our Lord's exhortation was not to become "morally neutral" or "innocent" as infants are sometime supposed to be. Instead His emphasis evidently was upon the humility (Matt 18:4) and faith (18:6) of the children. It is necessary to exercise child-like faith to enter the Kingdom. Jesus was certainly not making a blanket statement on infant salvation.

This material is cited with gracious permission from:

Grace Theological Seminary
200 Seminary Dr.
Winona Lake, IN 46590
www.grace.edu

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: thildebrandt@gordon.edu