

Fathers and Brothers,

We were tasked to read and evaluate John Punt's paper on Ephesians 2:11-12. John's work focused on verse-by-verse analysis with a broader view to the redemptive-historical features of the text. We were blessed to read and were encouraged to meditate on the wonderful reality of the church's identity in Christ by the Spirit.

John writes at a skilled academic level. We'll note that the first few paragraphs of the paper read as if it were an informal blog post and not an academic paper. This created a bit of a jarring shift when he pivoted to a more academic style at the end of page 1.

Below, we evaluate his work in view of the standards set in the student handbook.

- **The paper should be not more than 40 pages (not including title page, appendices, and bibliography), in a 12 point font with standard margins.**

Mr. Punt met this requirement with a 34-page paper.

- **The paper should include an analysis of the historical context, dating, and authorship of the passage**

While Mr. Punt did do this in pages 2-4 of his paper, this section could be a bit stronger.

Some of his claims about date and context were unsubstantiated by footnote or external reference. His quotation of Charles Hodge on whether scholars have doubted Pauline authorship of Ephesians is likely out of date.

There is also very little regarding background, context, and culture. Mr. Punt might've benefited by citing the founding of the church in Ephesus (see Acts 19).

- **The paper should include textual analysis, showing an ability to use the critical apparatus and to draw well reasoned conclusions between variant readings**

Mr. Punt clearly demonstrated his ability in this area.

- **The paper should include the student's own translation of the text, word studies of key terms, and a verse-by-verse analysis of the text that shows the student's understanding of morphology, idioms, metaphors, plays on words, key ideas in the text, etc.**

Mr. Punt expressed his skill in word studies, key terms, verse-by-verse analysis and other hermeneutical/exegetical skills. He showed a deep engagement with the text, Biblical imagery (such as that of house, temple, wall, etc.). His exegetical conclusions were rich and insightful. It was clear that Mr. Punt had profited spiritually from rich study of the text.

A few minor concerns:

- The reader is left to assume that the translations of each verse(s) were his. A footnote indicating "author's translation" would have been helpful.
- In a few places, he may pile on too many academic or literary terms without definition. For example, at the top of page 20, he mentions a double-inclusio, without making clear what the double-inclusio is. In these areas, Mr. Punt could grow in combining academic rigor with ready readability.
- Mr. Punt might also work on not using too many long quotations of authors, especially authors with whom he will later disagree.

• The paper should provide some kind of outline, diagramming, structural analysis, and/or literary analysis that demonstrates the overall flow of the text and makes explicit the key theme (or themes) of the passage.

While this could have been a bit clearer, this was done on p.27-28 in the ordo/historia analysis. This analysis of ordo/historia was excellently done.

• The paper should include a theological analysis, paying attention to key theological issues in the church which the text addresses and what doctrines of the faith the passage informs.

This was done from p.26-28, with a focus on the redemptive-historical theological themes.

• The paper should include a meditation, sermon outline, statement of propositions with development, or other summary of the work that shows the student's ability to apply the fruits of exegesis to the edification of the church.

The end of the paper concludes with applications on the purity of worship, warning against pietistic factionalism, and remembering God's blessing on the church. While helpful, a few more applications were warranted based on the amount of exegetical work done. It would have been nice to see a sermon outline attached in this section as well.

• Footnotes should be used rather than endnotes Footnotes should be in a widely accepted standard format (e g , Chicago style, SBL, Turabian, etc) Proper credit is to be given for all quotations.

These were well done.

We recommend that this exam be sustained.

Joel Hart and Aaron Murray