

## **PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS IN PAUL'S THEOLOGY: AN EXEGESIS OF EPHESIANS 6:10-12**

**Solomon I. Aguh & Tom Udo Tom Ekpoto**

School of Biblical Studies, Jos  
Corresponding author's email: tom\_ekpot@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

The language of principalities and powers is found throughout the New Testament, including the epistles of Paul, the Apostle. Some Christians are confused about the meaning of these terms, especially as they relate to spiritual warfare every Christian is engaged in. Since the principalities and powers provide or constitute the context in which Christians are to live out their faith, it follows that an understanding of Paul's teachings on these phenomena and the Christian relation to them is critical for faithful Christian discipleship. In order to provide balance idea about the terms, critical historical method of analysis was carried out on Ephesians 6.10-12. The exegetical analysis reveals that the terms refer to the deceptions of the Devil rather than just malevolent spirits. Mysterious powers of the Devil manifested in African cultures are only part of these manifestations. Understanding of how these phenomena are manifested in the local communities are important in the Christian warfare.

**Keywords:** Principalities, Powers, Authorities,

### **Introduction**

The issue of principalities and powers is a debatable issue among Christians around the globe, but the seriousness of this issue among African Christians in view of their background, is more intense. The belief in the existence of spiritual powers that operate in the air causing mishaps on innocent people, forms Africans' worldview when reading Paul's teaching on "principalities" and "powers." Thus, the reading of Paul's passages on "principalities," "rulers" and "powers" immediately reflects on the mind of an ordinary African Christian the existence of Satanic malevolent spirits operating in the air, causing havocs on the children of God. These

"principalities", "powers," and "rulers" and so on, are understood to be spirit-beings, each with unique intelligence and supernatural abilities, and committed to serving Satan (Fape 3). According to this interpretation, Satan and his demons exercise astonishing, almost unlimited capacity to undermine God's aims, and much of the world's evil stems from their ongoing effort to do so (Garret 10). Viewing these terms through the lens of African cosmology, some African theologians add their understanding to the words according to their belief system, forcing the definition of words, which otherwise did not have that meaning the culture gives. Consequently, the horrors of misfortune and

poverty in Africa have forced the language of “principalities and powers” upon those who were attempting to find explanations for what some deemed to be beyond normal psychological analysis. It is therefore not uncommon to hear African Christians casting and binding “evil spirits” in every of their prayer and worship service.

Consequently, in some Christian assembly, there have been prayers said against the “principalities” and “powers” that people believe are looming over African villages and cities, against Christians and churches; in business places, homes, even in school (Igenozia 47). But one wonders why the continuous prayers of these types had no notable effect on the demons and the host of powers that control some people and areas in Africa despite the constant prayers said against them? Why, in the face of regular prayers that occur around the clock against demonic forces, have Satan and his demons not been weakened, much less rendered inoperative? Why has there been no appreciable impact on the life style of African people despite the constant casting away of demons by so called “prayer warriors? Or is it the case that there is a misunderstanding of what the principalities and powers actually stand for? Jonas Clark in her article “The Armor of God and Ten Spiritual Warfare Weapons,” specifically mentions that the principalities and powers refer to host of demons (2). Importantly, are some of the “powers” hypostatized abstractions (e.g., sin, death, height, depth, etc.) or are they real forces for Christians to combat? Since Paul mentions the cosmic struggle every Christian is engaged in, it is tempting to conclude that some cosmic supernatural forces is in view.

But some Christian scholars are of the view that the belief in Satan and other evil spirits is thus consigned to the realm of myth and superstition (cf. Bultmann 5). Such wholesale denials of the existence of the demonic realm ignore the overall biblical evidence and contemporary pointers in that direction and rob the Christian faith of its continuing relevance and dynamism (Igenozia 41).

On the other hand, confusion sets in when the Paul the apostle commands his readers to subject themselves to authorities in his writing to Titus: “Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work” (3.1). How are they supposed to submit to these authorities in the above passage and wrestle with the authorities in Ephesians 6?

The principalities and powers are mentioned in the New Testament under a variety of names which appear to be interchangeable: “spirits,” “lords,” “angels,” “thrones”, “rulers,” “authorities,” and so on. Reflecting the bi-directional working of these forces, some scholars applied the terms sometimes to heavenly, spiritual realities and sometimes to earthly officeholders or structures of power (Garrett 30; Wink 54). Walter Wink finds that *archē* and *archōn* refer to “human power arrangements” (Col. 1.16), as well as “spiritual powers, good or evil.” *Exousia* primarily refers to “human arrangements of power, with occasional use to designate spiritual beings” (54). In that way, one would differentiate the malevolent cosmic forces from the earthly office holders to whom Christians should submit (cf. Tit. 3.1).

But the question is, “which phenomena are meant by these powers which Christians are to battle against?” While scholars agree that the

concepts of the principalities and powers are crucial for Christian life and teaching, there is little agreement on how to understand the powers. How are we to interpret Paul's language of principalities, powers, and rulers? The passages with these terms do not yield its value by a surface investigation, but upon greater effort it reveals a wealth of meaning. Hence, the purpose of this article is to examine Paul's concepts of "Principalities," "rulers," and "powers" especially in the Ephesians epistle. To this end, this article explores the use of the words in other literatures before and during Paul's time, while carrying critical exegetical analysis of the key passage with regards to these terms. The value of this study is evident when it is discovered that the precise meaning of these terms in their various contexts continues to be a matter of scholarly debate as mentioned previously. And since the study of the "principalities" and "powers" cannot be isolated from context and context-driven questions, these writers provide a cross-cultural perspective to the study by investigating how the powers are interpreted in the African context in light of African indigenous religious beliefs and practices.

### **The Use of *Alche* and *Exousia* in The Old Testament**

Since the Old Testament gives a background to the New Testament, it is ideal to trace the meaning of the word from the Jewish culture. However, the Old Testament has its limitation in this regard. When Clinton Arnold admitted, "it is not adequate to say Paul derived his terms for evil spirits exclusively from the Old Testament" (90), he was saying that the Old Testament itself was a limited source. He is, to a certain degree,

correct. There is a general lack of specialized language in the Old Testament referring to spiritual powers. According to Hyunju Bae, the speculation regarding evil spirits came to bloom only under the influence of foreign ideas, especially under the impact of the Persian dualistic systems of Zoroastrianism and Zurvanism (1-2). But the belief in evil spirits was widespread in the Old Testament to be sure, as numerous warnings prohibit participation with such beings and their prophetic voices (Deut. 13.5; Jer. 29.8-9).

The idea of prince of devil spirits ruling or controlling a region is mentioned in the book of Daniel 10.12-13. Daniel was visited by an angel in response to his prayer to God. This angel, who was sent by God to answer Daniel's prayer, was delayed for 21 days because of a battle that took place between God's angel and "a prince of the kingdom of Persia." Daniel's conversation with the angel suggests the fact that there is an "invisible war" going on in the heavenlies between the forces of evil and the forces of God. The spiritual battle, for this angel, was of such magnitude that Michael, the archangel of God and designated prince of Israel, assisted the angel in battle. Another enemy of God, the prince of Greece, is also mentioned in Daniel 10.20-21. The book of Daniel thus presents an excellent example of how these unseen spiritual entities fight to increase and maintain their realms of influence and control in order to hinder God's purposes. In addition, as previously stated, these princes are named after the nations or rather their principalities in which they rule (Arnold 90). Thus, while it is true that Paul's New Testament vocabulary for power may be linked to the Jewish apocalypticism of the second temple period

(Barth 170-76), it also true that Paul was equally dependent upon earlier Hebrew Scriptures for his development of New Testament terms and themes which described the spiritual realm (Johnson 2). But this search for Paul's "powers" is not essentially based in terminology as much as it is based in a concept or in an idea.

### **The Use of *Alche* And *Exousia* in the New Testament**

The search for clear antecedents to Paul's language of power may at first appear disappointing. Looking through the intertestamental literature, it would be fair to summarize the meaning of the terms *alche* ("rule") and *exousia* ("authority") by concluding these are the typical words for power in the days of Paul. If this is the case, dealing with the terminology is not a challenge as much as dealing with unspecified identities. It is important to know who or what these powers are. Some authors believe that Paul's identification of principalities and powers will be identifiable to the Greco-Roman world but will not be borrowed from its (largely pagan) belief structures (cf. Witherington III 56, Morrison 17-24).

Walter Wink finds the powers to be "the normal, daily" conversation which described the political, religious, and economic structures and functionaries with which people had to deal with (14). It was far from the case that these terms had specialized meaning in the audience of Paul, especially when it came to their use in defining any kind of heavenly hierarchy. In this context, the word *arche* is not intended to speak of a supernatural evil and manipulative spiritual power. In fact, the word *arche* was only interpreted to refer to

angels and demons. But to understand the use of the terms in Paul's theology, it is ideal that the principal passage these terms feature should be analyzed exegetically.

### **African Cultural Perspective of Principalities, Powers and Rulers**

Newell Elymas writes in his article, "Body, Suffering and Healing Biblical and African Perspectives," that Africans in their existential conditions "are not fighting against fresh-and-blood enemies; but against principalities, powers, rulers of this dark world and against spiritual wickedness in high places (1). However, the manifestation of these principalities and powers differ somewhat from Paul's concept. Elymas further writes that African Indigenous Religions see suffering as a disharmony caused in a person, a family and a society as the result of supernatural causation from evil spirits, charms and curses inherited or cast by enemies. Relating to the case of Job, Elymas is of the view that while medical science views sickness as caused by pathological, physiological and psychic factors, the Bible presents spiritual reasons as basic causes of pains and sufferings (1). His view of suffering and pain reflect the views of cosmology in African context. Several illnesses are branded "none hospital disease," an idea which has led to several unfortunate death. Some Africans believe that the forces of darkness, which operate everywhere targets everybody. They do not require any special reason before they attack. The fact that a person is successful in life is enough to incur the wrath of wicked people. Bunmi Adedeji thus writes:

Our environment suggests to us that there are foes everywhere and that you do not necessarily have to offend people before they seek to harm you. There are people who take delight in testing their powers on others. This makes people justify those who seek to possess some powers for defensive purposes (78).

It is therefore common to see Africans fortify themselves against attack or onslaught of enemies whom they do not even know. Since African Christians have this background, their concept of principalities and powers reflects their major cultural beliefs, which sometimes are manifest during prayers.

### **The Spiritual Background of Ephesians**

The social context of the first century was largely influenced by the different religions operative at the time. The contemporary Western world is often accused of having a very bipolar - 'sacred versus secular' - worldview. Clinton E. Arnold in explaining the religious climate of the Western Asia, where Ephesus was located, writes that the people deep interest in supernatural power and the demonic realm gripped the inhabitants of the Hellenistic world in the first century A.D. This was seen in a number of traditions, especially in the magical beliefs and practices of the time. Western Asia Minor was not exempted from these influences; on the contrary, the area was renowned for its flourishing magical activity which involved the spiritual "power" (Arnold 22). People were taught to honour the gods, as these gods had great influence in people's life (visagie 18). The Greek gods were thought to be more powerful than human beings, but not omnipotent nor omniscient (Aune 919). The

gods were also considered to be immanent and active; able to influence events and people on earth (Croy 929; Aune 918). This explains why Demetrius was against Paul's preaching in Ephesus in Acts 19. Artemis was considered to be a supremely powerful deity; hence she could use her power for the benefit of her followers in the face of other opposing "powers" and spirits (Arnold 22).

It would be no overstatement to say that, the city of Ephesus, and probably the whole region of Asia Minor was claimed to be possessed by some superstitious beliefs on magic and spiritual power at the time Paul wrote the epistle to Ephesians (cf. Eph. 1.21; 3.10; Rev. 2.13). Unfortunately, to these people who were pre-occupied with such pervasive superstitious beliefs, these "powers" were neither visible nor inclined to be benevolent but were rather thought to be spiritual in nature and diabolical in intention. They therefore had to be continually counteracted by spiritual means, namely, through magical practices and through various appeals to Artemis (Wendland 343). Clinton E. Arnold describes the fear-laden interaction between the "unseen world" of spirits and the practice of magic on the part of the masses:

The overriding characteristic of the practice of magic throughout the Hellenistic world was the cognizance of a spirit world exercising influence over virtually every aspect of life.

The goal of the magicians was to discern the helpful spirits from the harmful ones and Learn the distinct operation and the relative strengths and authority of the spirits.

Through this knowledge, means could be constructed (with spoken or written formulas, amulets, etc.) for the manipulation of the spirits in the interest of the individual person

(18).

It is interesting to note that, these strong superstitious beliefs in magic and spirits are just as prevalent among some contemporary African communities as it was among the Ephesians during the Hellenistic period. Bayo Abijola says that, "The African world of this century is still dominated by supernatural thoughts of witches, ghosts, spirits, demons and powers which are believed to be against the welfare of man" (127). Therefore, Paul's approach in dealing with this problem among the Ephesians may be the only effective approach in confronting these beliefs among the Africans who share almost the same background experience with the Ephesians. But it is important to understand the meaning of the terms employed by Paul the Apostle in dealing with this problem.

#### **An Exegetical Analysis of Ephesians 6.10-12.**

In 6:10 the apostle writes "finally, be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his power." The Greek words, *tou loipou* literally translated as "the rest," "remaining," or "finally" as in conclusion (Hoehner 820). It is disputed as to whether this word introduces a logical conclusion like the inferential "henceforth," or if it introduces the last part of a series. F. F. Bruce interprets this to mean, "for the rest of the encouragement" (Bruce 420), which began in Ephesians 4:1. That would indicate bringing the exhortation to a logical conclusion. Meyer agrees also with Bruce's translation, and he says it means, "what you still have to do in addition to what has been mentioned" (Meyer 534). But Kenneth L. Boles is of the opinion that based on this context, it seems best to take it as "finally," in the sense of a climatic part of the exhortation, even though the expression can

also point to the future, "for the remaining time of the Ephesians life" (Boles 332). In the "Textus Receptus" (late Mss), the word rendered "finally" is *iston loipon* (accusative case), which means "for the rest"; but some Greek texts like USB, have *tou loipou* (genitive case), "as from now on" (Earle 326). Markus Barth understands the phrase to have a temporal sense, "For the remaining time" (759). If the accusative reading is adopted, this word introduces the final section of the letter, which contains some practical exhortations (Hoehner 820). From Ephesians 4:1 to 6:9, Paul gives practical applications for the believers concerning how to live out their new relationship in Christ among believers and non-believers alike. Now in this section that deals with the spiritual warfare and the panoply (6.10-20), which marks the end of the epistle, he describes the conflict of wicked forces against believers and the proper Christian attitude towards the battle (Pattermore 125) and encourages them to be strengthened in the Lord in order to be able to stand against the wiles of the evil one (v.11). Therefore, it is safe to render this word as finally, in the sense of bringing exhortation to its logical end, even though it may also serve as point of emphasis.

The words "finally," is followed by a present passive imperative of *endunamou*, which means, "to empower" (Roger 448). And here, the passive form (*endunamousthe*), means "be empowered"; "be strengthened"; or "be dynamic" (Earle 326). It also means Paul uses the same word in 1 Corinthians 16:13 to mean "draw on your inner reserve of strength" (Best 590). According to Daniel B. Wallace, with the present, the force generally is to command the action as an ongoing process

(Wallace 485). Therefore, this can be translated, “continue to be strong.”<sup>1</sup> This word has an Old Testament precedent. In a critical situation in the life of David, probably when the Amalekites ruin his home, and he was discouraged, he strengthened himself in the Lord (1 Sam. 30:6). But the idea of divinely imparted strength finds its usage without the phrase “in the Lord” in Joshua 1:6-9, where God charged Joshua to “be strong and courageous” (Bruce 408); also, in Kings where David charged Solomon to “be strong” (1 Kings 2.2).

The phrase *en kuriuo* (in the Lord) now shows the means, or the sphere of this empowerment, namely “in the Lord.” The use of instrumental dative “in” with the impersonal dative is of theological significance in the Bible supra-terrestrial locality (Kittel 537). In the New Testament, “in the Lord” is not found prior to Paul and is rarely found outside Paul’s epistles (Kittel 541). The context of this passage under consideration shows that the war is that of God and the Lord provides the weapons (Eph. 6:11), and therefore the Lord gives the empowerment. Ernest Best puts it in full, “Let the Lord make you strong” (Best 590). Outside the Lord, William Hendrikson pictures believers as branches removed from a tree, and obviously cannot survive on their own (270). Therefore, “be strong in the Lord” means, “be strong in Christ.” In a general sense, the phrase denotes membership of Christ and the church (Phil. 1.13; 3.7). This was probably in contrast to the means of empowerment among other Gentiles. Hence, J.

Exell says that, the strength required is not primarily physical strength, neither does it apply directly to intellectual strength nor moral strength, because even the pagans have some intellectual strength and some were morally good (634). The real battle is with the devil and his arts, and a hero is definitely the one who wins in the conflict. Therefore, where comes the strength? The apostle places it in the Lord. The Lord is pictured in the Old Testament as a mighty warrior who leads and empowers his army (Psalm 35.1-5; Isa. 42.13).

In verse 10b, the apostle introduces the nature of the strength with a conjunction “and,” and (epexegetical) joining the first and the second parts together. The second part (“in the strength of his power”) thus compliments the first and combine to show the source and nature of strength needed for the battle (Hoehner 270). Thus, the second part expressed “in the might of his strength,” signifies the sphere of the power. This is similar to the phrase in Ephesians 1:19 “his great power.” In the two passages, the following nouns are associated with the word power: *kratos* which means bodily strength (Earle, *Word* 326) and *ischus*, which means “strength” that is possessed (Mounce 421), “power, ”might” (Earle, *Word* 326). But in this text the word *ischus* is used to mean “ability” in the sense of power to accomplish something (Danker 484), or strength in the sense of superior force of dominion or latent power (Rogers and Rogers 436). And in this verse, “his strength,” refers to the Lord’s inherent strength. The phrase “in the power of his might,” could therefore be taken as an attributive genitive, meaning “by means of his mighty power (Bratcher 156),” as in NIV; or as genitive of source, “in the might of his

<sup>1</sup>. This conflict was not peculiar to the apostolic time. It was a war that was expected to last throughout the rest of human existence on earth.

strength” as in ASV, RSV, NRSV, etc. This defines the nature of strength that the believers needed for the encounter.

Gerhard Kittel thus writes that, in the Greek Hellenistic world, power was considered as a cosmic principle in regards to the world and its mysteries; the world was therefore thought of as a manifestation of the forces working in, by and on it. These forces were hidden from man, but to do anything one was expected to participate and know them (288). Therefore, the only way of bringing these forces under control was for Christians to be empowered in the *ischus* (superior power) of the Lord. In the place of the neutral idea of God, the patriarch and the Jews had a personal God (Exod. 3.15). In the place of the neutral forces of nature, there was the “power” and “might” of the personal God, which does not operate in terms of immanent law, but rather carried out his will in accordance with his direction (e.g., the falling of the wall of Jericho [Josh. 6.2-15]).

The world-views of these two cultures seem to have influenced the minds of people in the New Testament time. Previously the apostle had prayed that his readers “be strengthened” by the Spirit of God in their inner being (Eph. 3.16). Here, he tells how this power of God can be effective in their lives – in enabling them to resist the forces in the world that are hostile to their well-being (Bruce 403). Nothing so far suggests that these powers are of witchcraft.

However, the apostle unveiled the nature of this contest in verse 12a when he writes, “For our struggle is not against enemies of blood and flesh.” In military strategy, one must never underestimate the power and armor of the opposing force (Barker and Kohlenberger

783). And Paul does not want to make such a mistake, as he gives a realistic report of the enemy’s potential. “We are not fighting human opposition,” or more literally, “our fight is not against human beings”; but against all innumerable host of evil spirits. No human opposition is mentioned in this context. However, the apostle’s antithesis is not absolute since he does not deny the possibility of believers being deceived by fellow human beings (O’Brien 466).

There is a textual variant in the use of the personal pronoun. Most modern Greek texts (e.g., Alexandrianus, Codex Bezae, USB, 1998 ed.), have the first person possessive pronoun, “our battle.” But some manuscripts (e.g., P<sup>46</sup> and Vaticanus) and some ancient versions (including the Old Latin and Syriac) show an alternative reading with the second possessive pronoun, “your battle” (Bratcher and Nida 159). The latter suggests that the “fight” under discussion was peculiar only to Paul’s audience not including Paul and other Christian communities. MacDonald says that the scribes had the natural tendency of harmonizing the verse with the use of the second person plural (you) in the rest of the verses, hence the use of “your battle” in some ancient manuscripts mentioned above (344). But the use of the second person possessive pronoun agrees with Paul’s request for prayers for other saints (Eph. 6:18b).

This Greek word *pale* (battle) occurs only here in the New Testament, and it means, wrestling (Danker 752). Barth says it is not just any kind of wrestling, but “a hand-to-hand wrestling” is designated by the Greek word (762). But since the context gives a picture of a soldier armed for combat, it would be inappropriate to use a specific word for



“wrestling” (Bratcher and Nida 159). Therefore, a more general term like “fight”; “to struggle” (NIV); “contending” (RSV); or “battle against” be preferred. This battle can be traced back to Genesis 3.15, where the conflict was announced and the battle begins (Leach 53). And since then, every page of the Scripture reveals the trail of hot hostility of Satan against the children of God. Hal Lindsey and Carole C. Carlson observe that Adam and Eve gave in to Satan without a fight, thus giving Satan some sense of victory in the battle (61). Against this attitude of Adam, Paul wants his readers to be ready for a combat, least they give in like Adam and Eve. If this is compared to the struggle that started at Eden, idea of anti-social forces is questionable.

The Greek words *sarka* and *haima*, are literally translated “flesh” and “blood.” The biblical word flesh has several connotations, depending on the context in which it is used. When the Bible speaks of the flesh as an enemy, it does not mean human being per se, but it refers to the evil capacity within each human being (Dickson 59). But the words (flesh and blood) put together in a phrase mean human beings (Bratcher and Nida 159). The idea here is that, the fight is not against a fellow human. This therefore would mean that Christians should not consider a fellow human being as his enemy.

In Ephesians 6.12b, the apostle states that the fight is against principalities, against power, and against rulers of darkness. Paul had previously warned his readers against human deception manipulated through evil trickery (4.14). This cast one’s mind to the deception of Adam and Eve. To differentiate this enemy from the human agency, he presents four descriptions of the beings that

represent the danger for Christians. They are, rulers, authorities, cosmic masters, and spiritual powers of evil in the heavenlies. Do these refer to four different groups of enemies? The NIV inserts “and” between the last two groups, but there is no conjunction separating the different designations in the Greek text (cf. UBS). Some people believe that these refer to different groups of enemies (Liefeld 158), while others suggest that these are different ways of describing the same general group of supernatural enemies (Liefeld 158). This single enemy theory agrees with the enemy whom Peter describes as the Devil as “your adversary” (1 Pet. 5:8). If a single enemy is in view, why did Paul recommend different types of weapons against a single foe? R. Kent Hughes says that this enemy operates through different groups of forces that form a vast organized hierarchy against believers, adopting different schemes (215). And Stephen Pattemore identifies them as forces with at least the potential of causing harm to Christians in one way or the other (“Principalities,” 128). Paul calls them “forces of evil” to designate that they all come from the same source. This goes back to the nature of the enemy whose schemes are diverse (Eph. 6:11), therefore, they require different weapons of combat (v.13). Do these terms refer to the practice of witchcraft in African worldview?

The particular terms used here to describe the enemy are in themselves morally neutral, though in Pauline language, they invariably indicate something sinister (Barker and Kohlenberger 783). Christopher Forbes suggests these terms used by Paul have little demonstrable background in pre-Christian Jewish thought, but they have an extended

history in Greek philosophy (“Paul’s,” 63). Their usage is mentioned above in book of Daniel as earlier stated. But since Paul was addressing Christians with a Gentile background, it is possible that the Ephesian Christians knew these terms and probably had used them as well.

But again, who are these “principalities,” “powers,” “rulers of darkness,” and “spiritual host”? This has received several responses from different scholars. Some believe that Paul had supernatural forces in mind (cf. Snodgrass 349). But Forbes’ idea is that Paul used these terms to signify some abstract forces, which he personalized (“Paul’s,” 63). Hughes suggests that, the words used, indicate a superior rank of power above man (158). John R. W. Stott is of the view that they may refer to different ranks of evil spirits in the hierarchy of hell (263). But Van Rheenen viewing from the perspective of African cosmology see them as “powers in human structure” (120). These are subjective opinions. However, these spirits have the following characteristics: (a) they are powerful, hence, Paul calls them “the world rulers,” (b) they are wicked, the apostle describes them as spiritual hosts of wickedness, (c) they are cunning since they employ different schemes.

The first term used to describe them is *istias archas* (“principalities”) (NKJV). Paul used some of these terms in Romans 8:38-39, where he uses concrete terms, sheer poetic abstractions and metaphors to describe the enemy (Forbes, “Paul’s” 62). Paul also uses similar expression in Colossians 2.10-15, where Christians are pictured as being complete in Christ (Pattemore, “Principalities” 123). In the book under study (Ephesians), the

apostle had previously mentioned some of these terms in (1.21; 3.10), and in the first of these passages, he affirmed Christ’s power as being superior to theirs. In these passages, however, they seem to be neutral not evil powers. Instead, here in Ephesians 6, they are evil powers with which believers have to contend (Liefeld 158). According Forbes, this term had an extended history in Greek Philosophy, where it was used mostly to describe abstract forces, which he personified (“Paul’s” 63).

The term *arche* (“ruler” or “principality”) was used in reference to primal substances out of which all else is generated (Forbes, “Pauline” 52). The term appears 58 times in the New Testament, and of this number, eight times it is translated “principality” (Earle, *Word* 296). Joseph H. Thayer suggests that in the context of Ephesians, Paul used this term in reference to angels (of darkness) and demons holding dominions entrusted to them (77). Frederick William Danker’s explanation is close to Thayer’s, when he writes, “Also of angelic and demonic power since they were thought of as having political organization” (138). Abijola believes that Paul was referring to the demonic forces of legalism in the Jewish and Gentile worlds (122). Some other theologians believe that Paul was alluding to the structure of thoughts like tradition, convention, authority, etc, as embodied in Ephesus and its institutions (Foulkes 179; Barth 800). In Michael O. Fape’s opinion, the principalities and powers were working through human agencies to bring the work of Christ to a halt (74). Even though the Jewish system was not evil and was never thought to be, yet Satan worked behind it to destroy the cause of Christ (cf. Acts 15.1; Gal. 1-3). Stott

thus says that the real enemies in this context are the spiritual forces that stand behind some human institutions and control the lives of men (270). Arnold adds that Paul had in mind the powerful influences of societal attitudes, habits and preferences that are at odds with God's standards of holiness (*Powers* 124). These are opinions, but Paul states that these are powerful spiritual beings. What is the meaning of these spiritual beings in the context of African belief on spiritual forces?

Satan's power though hidden, is still real. Though different terms are used by some people to describe Satan, making it seem as an abstract figure or a mystic concept (cf. Wall 2), it is necessary to note that, Satan operates through the events of history (O'Brien, "Principalities" 9). Therefore, he can only explore his power using real life experiences. This is thus true in life experiences of African people.

The second term in describing the enemy is *isexousia*, "ruler" signifies primacy in power, hence "leader." The Greek word *exousia* comes from *exestin*, which denotes freedom to act (Hoehner 826). Accordingly, the noun implies the right to exercise some authority. Since the apostle states that this is not "a fight against flesh and blood," the term must refer to "rulers" who are spiritual beings (O'Brien, *Letter* 5).

The third descriptive term is *kosmoskratoras tou skoto toutou*, "rulers of darkness of this age." The word translated "power" or "world rulers" is *kosmoskratoras* (the world power), and the qualifying phrase, *tou skotous tou aiuneos toutou* (of this dark world), indicates that these potentates belong to the present evil age of darkness (O'Brien 466), from which believers

have already been delivered (cf. Eph. 5.8,11; Col. 1.13). This designation, "power of this dark world" (NIV), seems to be foreign to LXX and even to other New Testament canonical books (O'Brien 467). Liefeld says that this phrase was rooted in astrological thought, because this world was considered to be under the direct influence of the planets, which themselves represent personal forces. Later on, the term was used in a broad sense in reference to all-powerful figures including emperors and pagan gods (Liefeld 159). Hughes suggests that this term may refer to a high-ranking fallen angel like the angel-prince of Persia and Greece who hindered the archangel in his errand (215). In the non-canonical writings of the Jews, there was the idea of variety of ranks among the angels, and in the later rabbinical literature it took a strange and elaborate form (Earle, *Word* 297). But in the New Testament time, the distinction of ranks is not very clear even though the mention of archangel (1 Thess. 4:16; Jude 9) seems to suggest such hierarchy.

The majesty of Yahweh is upheld by the Old Testament, which also recognized but condemned the worship of foreign deities and powers (Exod. 20.2-5b). However, in spite of this, Israel struggled with the influence of foreign deities and powers such as the Canaanite Baal (Exod. 32.4. 6.19). According to Abijole, these inferior beings were regarded as supernatural, but inferior divinities who formed the heavenly council (119).

Based on this perspective, Arnold suggests that, Paul in Ephesians 6 was referring to pagan deities like Diana of Ephesus who was considered by her worshippers a powerful being in the Roman world (*Ephesians* 68). But this understanding does not match, in the

sense that the apostle spoke of idols as having no will power (1 Cor. 8.4). The “power” pictured by Paul here is real.

The phrase, “of this darkness” indicates that they manifest their power in “darkness” (Stott 264). Robert Bratcher and Eugene A. Nida suggest that, this phrase could also be translated, “of this dark time in which we live” (160), darkness indicates the absence of God. A similar concept is seen in Acts 13:27, where it describes the Jewish rulers who crucified Jesus. Paul also used a similar expression when he spoke of the pre-conversion life style of his readers, when they had followed the ways of this world and of the ruler of the kingdom of the air (Eph. 2.2).

The book of Acts indicates that some dwellers of Ephesus, just like some African societies today (Fape 43), were involved in the practice of magic and allied trades (Acts 19.13,19). But Forbes points out that by the first century, allegory was a universally accepted way of dealing with the problem of myth (“Pauline” 56). Since the Greeks’ culture was full of myths, Paul could have used their concepts to teach them about the real struggle.

Literally, darkness may be viewed as the absence of light. But spiritually, it is a place where God is not found (J. Ferguson 45). In Greek, three concepts are conveyed by the group of words connected with *stotous*. Apart from the literal and religious overtones mentioned above, the concept also has ethical implications (C. Brown 420). The absence of light leaves room for evil, and then sin. In this sense, darkness may be described as evil. It is sometimes used inter-changeably with the term night. Figuratively, it means, “obscurity, blindness, powerlessness or death” (C. Brown 420). In the Old Testament, night was used to

describe the opposite of the period of sunlight (cf. Gen. 7.4). It was viewed as the time during which all sorts of evil took place (cf. Gen. 19.33; Jer. 49.9). It is considered to be a synonymous with insecurity, ignorance, and vulnerability (Chapman 86). Many people, who have never experienced complete physical darkness fail to grasp the vivid imagery of passages like this one. Sometimes, this lack of comprehension affects their judgment. Therefore, they lose the power to see the brightness of good, and so seem to lose sight of what darkness means (Chapman 86). The apostle mentioned darkness in Ephesians 5.8 where it was used in reference to children of “disobedience,” those who are under the power of sin (Hoehner 827). The word (*stotos*) is used also here in that sense, referring to a place where the God of light does not dwell; thus, he (God) transferred his own into the realm of light (Col. 1:13). For this reason, Apostle John warns, “Do not love the world or the things in the world” (1 John 2:15a). Hence, the “world rulers of darkness” refers to the spirits that operate in the mind of people, causing them to disobey God.

The final description of the enemy *tapneumatika tes ponerias en tois epouranois* (“against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places”), does not point to a separate category of cosmic powers, but it is a comprehensive term covering all classes of hostile spirits, while the next phrase, “in the heavenly realms” indicate their locality [dative of sphere] (O’Brien, *Letter* 467). The phrase *tapneumatika tes ponerias*, denotes the hostile character of the enemy, which is illustrated by him sending fiery missiles against believers. The term *poneros* (evil) has its first occurrence in the New Testament in Matthew 6:13, where

Jesus taught his disciples to pray for deliverance from "evil one." Jesus also used similar term in describing the one who snatches the word of God from the heart of unfruitful hearers of the Gospel (cf. Matt. 13.19). In each case, the Devil whose aim is to erode the faith of believers by causing them to sin is implied (Arnold, *Ephesians* 68).

Verse 11 now suggests how the strength that innately existed in the Lord was to be gotten. This passage calls to arms, in view of impending danger. This seems to be an external counterpart of the earlier thought he introduced on the inward growth and edification of the church (4.12, 16). Paul emphasized that the body of Christ must be built up and strengthened as a united force so as to be ready for the inevitable encounter with evil. Such readiness however demands the preparation of the individual through the use of the means provided by God (Barker and John 782). In light of the impending "struggle," the apostle encourages his readers to equip themselves with God's provided armor or what he calls *panoplia*, "full armor" (vv. 11,13). Without a conjunction, Paul introduces *endusasthe*, which is an imperative of entreaty (Mounce 307).

The call to "put on" recalls a similar instruction to the Thessalonians' Christians (1 Thess. 5:8), though the armor in the Thessalonians' passage does not parallel the one under study. Paul now provides reason for the previous command, "be strong" (Eph. 6.10). For they need both divine strength and the armor, which are all provided by God, not only because of the nature and power of the devil, but because he employs many "insidious wiles" (Hoehner 822).

Since the Devil works within the events in human history, his attacks often take different forms in different periods. In Job's attack, the Devil's desire was to prove the finest man (Job) to be hypocrite, therefore, he used both natural phenomena (Job 1.16.19) and human agencies against Job (1.14-15,17; 2.9).

### Application

Paul never used the language of "demon possession," a concept that is found in the Gospels (Arnold, *Powers* 128). The nouns (ruler, authority, power, etc.) in the passage under study (Eph. 6) seem to indicate specific spirit beings, which he also mentions it in another of his letter (cf. Rom. 8.38). These spirit beings were going to engage believers in a conscious spiritual conflict (Arnold, "Exorcism" 71). Arthur equally confirms that this conflict started right at Eden when Eve submitted to the desire of the devil (183) as earlier mentioned. Klyne Snodgrass maintains that since non-material realm exists, it should be admitted that there is a battle going on between good and evil, God and the Devil are opposing one another (349). But it should be kept in view that, though the Devil claims authority in the world, God is still the only legitimate Lord (Snodgrass 349).

In the context of the Ephesians, it is apparent that the apostle was writing of the battle that he himself had experienced (cf. Rom. 7.14-23). Paul had begun to fight against this during his preaching ministry in Ephesus, and many of them who practiced magic and sorcery, and probably were members of the church, brought their magic books and burned them publicly (Acts 19.18-19), showing their conviction of God's power over the Devil to which they had yielded loyalty before their conversion (Eph. 2.1-3). The apostle alerted

them to be ready because the Devil does not give up easily. Their loyalty to Christ is enough to instigate hostility against them. Hence, they should stand their ground.

From African perspective, it is important to admit, firstly that, “demons” exist and that they are capable of exerting influences on people. Secondly, though “demons” exist, they do not have power to determine life; and thirdly, the Devil deserves avoidance and not attention. To this end, Snodgrass writes, “While believers should be aware of the Devil’s scheme to delude the minds of people, yet they are instructed to submit to God and fear him, not demons” (349). The Devil manifests his powers through people’s cultures and beliefs. His delusion forces people into wrong life style that keeps them away from the kingdom of God. This is not different in the Devil’s manifestation in Africa. Instead of looking for the principalities and powers as abstract beings, Christians should look into some of the cultural practices and beliefs that harbor demonic practices. Religious leaders, instead of casting abstract forces, should watch out for attitudes and habits in the lives of their members that are inimical the growth of Christianity and even person development.

In what follows, the defensive and offensive weapons of Christians are listed, but surprisingly, the weapons of attack are not listed except the “sword” (Eph. 6.17). Ernest Best mentions that some Jewish and Christian scholars suggest that the “missiles” of the Devil (verse 16) include things like, deception, strife, distress, error, sexual promiscuity, flattery, injustice, lying arrogance, idolatry, heresy, false prophets, and pretended signs and wonders (594). This probably explains why most of the weapons are defensive, and

the only offensive weapon being the sword. This agrees with the exhortation in Jude verse 3, when the writer calls Christians to contend for the faith that was once delivered to the saints. However, this does not deny the existence of evil power wherein the Devil capitalizes in deceiving some people.

### Summary

The exegetical analysis reveals that the battle every Christian is invited to is to attack any form of belief or practice that attempts to replace God in their lives. Since, the enemy is targeting the internals, the weapons involve inner preparation. Jude 3 states that Christians are to contend for the faith that was once delivered. That is what the Devil is targeting.

### Conclusion

The writer of Luke Gospel (4.5-7) records the devil, taking Jesus up into a high mountain, shewing Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the Devil then said to him that, all the power in the world will be given to Him (Jesus) and the glory of them; if only He will worship him (Satan). Jesus overcame the Devil because He knew the Devil does not have any gift to offer. Satan's major success, in deceiving a nation, is due to a lack of discernment on the part of the people. The people are blind to the invisible forces of supernatural evil that are operating and influencing their visible human agents of political, social, religious and philosophical programs.

The devil controls the kingdoms of the world and we are not to underestimate his influence and power, nor believe that this is the will of God. God is telling us to "stand"

against these evil forces by equipping ourselves with the power of God, and looking unto Christ as our example

## WORKS CITED

- Abijole, Bayo. "St. Paul's Concept of Principalities and Power in African Context." *African Theological Journal* 17.2 (1988):122, 127.
- Abbott, T. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1897.
- Achtemeier, Paul J., Ed. *Harper Colin Bible Dictionary*. San Francisco: Harper, 1996.
- Adebayo, Abimbola. "Girl, 20 Killed Over Alleged Witchcraft Pushed Down From 3-Story Building." P. M. News (Lagos). 2004. February 10, 2004. <<http://allafrica.com/stories/200402100438.html>>
- Adedeji, Bunmi. *Christian Trademarks*. Ibadan: Salem Media Ltd, 1995.
- Aland, Barbara, et al, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001.
- Arnold, Clinton E. *Crucial Questions about Spiritual Warfare*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997.
- . *Ephesians: Power and Magic*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.
- . "The 'Exorcism' of Ephesians 6.12 in Recent Research: A Critique of Wesley Carr's View of the Role of evil Powers in First-century (AD) Belief." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (1987): 71-87.
- . *Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul's Letters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Arndt, William F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1979.
- Arnold, C.E. *Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1989.
- Arthur, Kay. *Lord is it Warfare?* Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1991.
- Aune, D. E. 2000. Greco-Roman Religion. In Evans, C.A. & Porter, S.E. (eds), *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, 917-926. Downer Grove: IVP. 2000, p. 919
- Bae,Hyunju. "The Symbolism of Evil Power in 1 and 2 Corinthians: Power, Wisdom, and Community." *Ph.D. Dissertation*., Drew University, 2001.
- Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider, Eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Barclay, William. *And He Had Compassion – The Healing Miracle of Jesus*. Valley Forge, PA: Judson, 1976.
- Barker, Kenneth L. and John R. Kohlenberger. *NIV Bible Commentary*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Barth, Markus. *Ephesians: Translation and Commentary*. Ch. 4-6. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1986.
- Best, Ernest. *The International Critical Commentary – Ephesians*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1988.

- Birch, Bruce C. "The First and Second Books of Samuel." *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 2. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- Birch, George A. *The Deliverance Ministry*. Camp Hill, PA: House, 1988.
- Boles, Kenneth L. *The College Press NIV Commentary – Galatians and Ephesians*. Joplin: College, 1993.
- Bratcher, Robert G. and Eugene A. Nida. *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Ephesians*. New York: UBS, 1982.
- Bratman, Michael. "A Desire of One's own." *The Journal of Philosophy*, C.5 (2003): 221.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W., Ed. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Brown, Colin. ed. *Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Brown, Raymond E., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland Murphy, Ed. *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Bruce, F. F. *The New International Commentary on the New Testament – The Epistles to the Colossians, To Philemon and to the Ephesians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Bultmann, R. "New Testament and Mythology," in H. W. Bartsch, Ed., *Kerygma and Myth*, ET, London: SPCK, 1953
- Chapman, S. A. "Light in a Grey World." *Expository Times*, 110.3 (1998): 86.
- Clark, Jonas. "The Armor of God and Ten Spiritual Warfare Weapons." <http://www.jonasclark.com/pdf-reports/ARMOROFGOD-AND-YOURSPIRITUALWEAPONS-jcm-Oct2013.pdf>
- Clarke, Adam. *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973.
- Croy, N. C. Personal Religion. In Evans, C.A. & Porter, S.E. (eds), *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, 926-931. Downer's Grove: IVP. 2000, p. 929;
- Aune, D.E. 2000. Greco- Roman Religion. In Evans, C.A. & Porter, S.E. (eds), *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, 917-926. Downer's Grove: IVP. 2000, p. 918
- Danker, Frederick William, Ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1952.
- Dickason, C, Fred. *Demon Possession & the Christian*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1987.
- Douglas, J. D., Ed. *The New International Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987.
- . *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to Ephesians*. Grand Rapids. Baker, 1979.
- Earle, Raph. *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Bakers, 1973.
- . *Word Meanings in the New Testament*. 1 Vol. Ed. Grand Rapid: 1986.
- Edwards, Earl. "Powers of Darkness Demon Possession." *Settled in Heaven Applying the Bible to Life*. 1996 Annual Freed-Hardeman University Lectureship. Henderson, TN: FHU, 1996.
- Edwards, Mark J. *Ancient Commentary on Scripture*. Vol. 8. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999.
- Elymas, Newell. "Body, Suffering and Healing Biblical and African erspectives."



- <http://www.fedevangelica.it/images/All-egatiPDF/6bda2316fc8782fe5cf8258e21e4c26a.pdf>
- Exell, Joseph. *The Biblical Illustrator: Ephesians*. Grand Rapid: Baker, 1973.
- Evans, Craig A. and Stanley E. Porter. *Dictionary of New Testament background*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Fape, Michael O. *Powers in Encounter with Power: Spiritual Warfare in Pagan Cultures*. Glasgow: Christian Focus, 2003.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Demonology of the Early Christian World*. New York: Mellen, 1980.
- . *Background of Early Christianity*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Ferguson, John. *An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Mysticism and the Mystery Religions*. New York: Seabury, 1977.
- Ferguson, Sinclair B. and David F. Wright. *New Dictionary of Theology*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998.
- Forbes, Christopher. "Pauline Demonology and /or Cosmology? Principalities, Powers and the Elements of the World in the Hellenistic Context." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*. 85 (2002):51-73.
- . "Paul's Principalities and Powers - Demythologizing Apocalyptic." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 82 (2001): 61-88.
- Foulkes, Francis. *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries*. Rev. Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Freedman, David Noel, Ed. *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Gingrich, F. Wilbur. *Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Chicago: Chicago, 1971.
- Goodrick, Edward W. and John R. Kohlenberger III. *The NIV Exhaustive Concordance*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.
- Hawthorn, Gerald F. and Ralph P. Martin. *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Hendriksen, William. *New Testament Commentary Exposition of the Paul's Epistles to the Galatians and Ephesians*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.
- Henry, Matthew and Thomas Scott. *Commentary on the Holy Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973.
- Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians – An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Hughes, R. Kent. *Ephesians: The Mystery of the Body of Christ*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1990.
- Igenoza, Andrew Olu. "Christian Theology and the Belief in Evil Spirits: African Perspective." *The Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology*.
- Johnson, Ronn A. *The Old Testament Background for Paul's Use of Principalities and Powers*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Dallas Theological Seminary, 2004
- Keener, Craig A. *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Kent, Homer A. *Ephesians: The Glory of the Church*. Chicago: Moody, 1971.
- Kittel, Gerhard, Ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.

- Leach, Virgil. *Get Behind Me Satan*. Abilene, TX: Quality, 1977.
- Liefeld, Walter L. *Ephesians*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity 1997.
- Lincoln, Andrew. *Word Biblical Commentary: Ephesians*. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Lincoln, Andrew and A. J. M. Wedderburn. *The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters*. Cambridge: University, 1993.
- Lindsey, Hal and Carole C. Carlson. *Satan: Is Alive and Well on Planet Earth*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *Sacra Pagina: Ephesians & Colossians*. Vol. 17. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000.
- MacKnight, James: *The Apostolical: Epistles*. Vol. 2&3. Indianapolis: Faith & Facts, 1994.
- Meyer, Henrich August Wilhelm. *Critical HandBook to the Epistles to Galatians and Ephesians*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.
- . *Word Biblical Commentary: 1 Peter*. Waco, TX: Word, 1988.
- Morrison, Clinton. *The Powers That Be: Earthly Rulers and Demonic Powers in Romans 13:1-7*, Studies in Biblical Theology, ed. C. F. D. Moule et al., vol. 29. Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1960.
- Mounce, William D. *Basics of Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999.
- Murphy, Edward F. *The Handbook for Spiritual Warfare*. Nashville: Nelson, 1992.
- O'Brien, Peter T. "Principalities and Powers and their Relationship to Structures." *Reformed Theological Review*, 50.1 (1981): 4-10.
- . *The Letter to the Ephesians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Pattemore, Stephen W. "Contextualizing the Supernatural." *The Bible Translator*. 45.3 (1994): 316.
- . "Principalities and Power in Urak Lawoi." *The Bible Translator*. 45.1. (1994): 124-28.
- Robertson, Archibald and Alfred Plummer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary: First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. New York: T&T, 1967.
- Rogers, Cleon L., Jr. and Cleon L. Rogers, III. *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. *The New NIV Application Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Stott, John R. W. *The Message of Ephesians*. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1986.
- Thayer, Joseph. H. *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Vine, W. E. *Amplified Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*. Iowa, IA: World, 1991.
- Visagie, Andre, Jacobus. "Ephesians and Artemis: The influence of the religious climate of Western Asia Minor of the first century AD on the content and Terminology of Paul's Prayer in Ephesians 1:15-23." *Master Of Theology At The Faculty Of Theology, University Of Stellenbosch*. 2010.
- Wall, Charles J. *Devils*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman, 1974.
- Wendland, Ernest R. and Salimo Habchibamba. "A Central African Perspective of on Centralizing the

- Ephesian Potentates, Principalities, and Powers." *Missiology*. 27.3 (July 2000): 341-63
- Wink, Walter. *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Witherington III, Ben. *The Paul Quest: The Renewed Search for the Jew of Tarsus*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998.
- Wong, G. C. I. "Faithfulness to the End: A Pastoral Reading of Daniel 10-12." *Expository Time*. 110.4 (1999): 110
- Wood, A. Skevington. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Ephesians*. Vol. 11. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.