

# Assessment of *The Passion* *Translation* of Ephesians

**Darrell L. Bock, PhD**

Senior Research Professor of New Testament Studies

Dallas Theological Seminary

I will work one paragraph unit at a time. I will treat this as a paraphrase and not a translation, because it is NOT a translation. This rendering is only a paraphrase, at best. That is an issue already with how this text is presented, but paraphrases can be helpful in drawing out the text where accurate. The appeal to Aramaic manuscripts for a Greek text makes no sense to me (often pointed out in my notes as to why this is neither relevant nor called for). Claims that there are fresh readings there that are legitimate are an exaggeration of the work's quality and misrepresent the original Greek text.

## **1:1-2**

This is adequate as a paraphrase.

## **1:3-14**

The opening fails to acknowledge God as the core subject of this note of praise. The blessing is extended to God. In the translation, we are made the subject with a note to praising God at the end of v. 3.

“...the same love he has for us he has for the Blessed One...” I’m not sure where that is in this passage. We are in his family through Jesus and in him.

It is only grace that is said to be lavished on us in v. 8.

The revelation to us of what God has done takes place in the context of his wisdom and insight in the mystery, not within us but for us. Like the above reversal in v. 3, the emphasis turns from God to us, too much (v. 9).

The absence of “uniting all things in him” is understated in v. 10, as it is abstracted as opposed to being connected to God.

## **1:15-23**

The sentence on “advertisement” in v. 19 is added in.

## **2:1-10**

The exercise of power brings them to life in vv. 1-6, not the “fullness.”

He gave us a citizenship in heaven (raised us up). The “power” language here is unclear. It is by his authority that we are seated, but we do not have that authority, we have access to it.

The call is to live (walk) in the good works of v. 10. The use of “fulfillment” can obscure the call that is the core of Eph. 4-6.

## **2:11-22**

v. 14: This verse is not so much about “prejudice” as it is about the distinction among people and access to God.

“Law of commandments and ordinances” is not ethnic hatred, nor a legal code that is said to condemn us (that is Romans 3 but not here - for if we all sinned, there would be no separation, as all would be in the same boat), but the distinct way of living that separated Jews and Gentiles.

Reconciliation is the theme here at the landing point, not just the end of hatred.

v. 22 is not about individuals, as the text seems to imply, but each community of believers. v. 21 is about all the church everywhere, seen as one.

## **3:1-13**

v. 1: The added phrase “because of my love for Jesus Christ” is not explicit in the text, but could well be why he accepts the role of bondservant.

v. 2: “Gospel” in place of “stewardship” is not quite right. Stewardship is a calling and role in administering the faith.

vv. 7-8: “Messenger” in place of “minister” or “servant” is not quite the same either. This is about more than his message; it is about his entire service to God, though v. 8 does highlight the proclamation.

v. 12: There is nothing about being “kings” in this verse. The reference in the note to Aramaic texts is not relevant. The point is about being accepted and able to engage with God.

## **3:14-21**

v. 14: “Awe” is not in the text.

v. 15: “Family” is probably about nations versus fathers and children.

v. 19: This is a fairly expansive rendering of the verse.

v. 20: This is too anthropocentric a rendering. This is not about our dreams and expectations, but about what God is capable of in relationship to his will through us. It implies that this is about miracles more than an enabling presence to walk in his will, as the next three chapters show.

## **4:1-16**

v. 7 is not about grace in general, but an enablement rooted in grace, a grace gift that serves the church.

v. 8 looks unclear. The reference to “captives” refers to the defeat of forces arrayed against us, and then the spoils of that victory are given to us.

v. 13: It is not clear that a “perfect new man” is a corporate image.

v. 15: “. . . truthing in love” probably refers to more than expressing truth. It means living it.

v. 19: Selfishness should be noted.

vv. 22-24: Probably not an inner man image, but a corporate identity one: the way of life found in Adam versus the way of life in Christ. To not be the like the world, but like the saints.

v. 30: The first sentence is not in the text at all (it repeats an idea in 1:13-14).

v. 32: Compassionate (the idea of the verse) is not the same as “affectionate.”

## **5:1-14**

v. 1: His rationale may be true, but it is not in this text. “As beloved children” is, but the rest is not (at best it might be implied).

v. 2: In the original, this is a comparison. That is lost in the translation. Walk AS Christ walked. (It is these kinds of nuances that often have gone missing in the book.)

v. 3: Italics is an addition to the text.

v. 4: “Worship” is not the same as “thanksgiving.” (The latter is in the text.)

v. 5: Again, the portion in italics is an explanatory addition.

v. 11: “Reveal truth” is vague. The text reads “expose” those deeds.

v. 13: The verse only mentions exposure and making evident the erroneous acts. “Everything that reveals truth is light to the soul” is not in the text. The fact that light exposes is what this verse and the next highlights.

## **5:15-21**

v. 20 is probably about thanksgiving for brothers and sisters in Christ, not every person.

## **5:22-33**

v. 22: His note correctly notes that the verb “submit” is not in the verse, but ignores the likelihood that this is the idea from v. 21, as normally a sentence lacking a verb picks it up from the past context.

v. 24: The verb is “submit” there, not just “devote.”

v. 32 actually reverses the emphasis in the verse on Christ and the church as the mystery Paul is mainly addressing as the example. Christ and the church are the example for our oneness.

v. 33: “Love” and “respect” are in the verse. “Gracious” and “devoted” are not quite the same thing. Gracious regard and honor are better alternatives.

## **6:1-9**

v. 1: Italics are not in the text. The rationale is doing what is right (nothing about the Lord’s help).

v. 5: “Employed” ≠ “slaves.” To remove this is to remove a key difference the passage has about two distinct contexts. This is how we apply it, but that is not the context of the original.

v. 7: “...and with love” is not in the text. Only obeying with enthusiasm (rebellion is the opposite contextually).

v. 9: “...caretakers of the flock” is not contextual at all. These are the masters of the slaves. “Do not threaten” is the exhortation, not “forgiving them.”

## **6:10-24**

v. 10: Nothing about this being the “most important” is “last.” Simply a transition to the last topic. The last sentence of the verse is not present (though it could be implied by the next verse).

v. 13 states as a coming reality what the verse states as a possibility, provided they respond. The difference is important in an exhortation.

v. 15 probably should mention the term “gospel” that is about peace is present in the verse.