WORD BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

WORD BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

VOLUME 49

1 PETER

J. RAMSEY MICHAELS

General Editors

David A. Hubbard
Glenn W. Barker*

Old Testament Editor

John D. W. Watts

New Testament Editor

Ralph P. Martin

WORD BOOKS, PUBLISHER • DALLAS, TEXAS

WORD BIBLICAL COMMENTARY
1 PETER
Copyright © 1988 by Word, Incorporated

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Main entry under title:

Word biblical commentary

Includes bibliographies.
1. Bible—Commentaries Collected Works.
BS491.2.W67 220.7´7 81-71768
ISBN 0-8499-0248-7 (vol. 49) AACR2

Printed in the United States of America

The author's own translation of the Scripture text appears in italic type under the heading *Translation*.

In memory of Donald Fullerton
who instructed me years ago
in the facts of my redemption
(1 Peter 1:18

Table of Contents

Editorial Preface
Author's Preface
Main Bibliography

INTRODUCTION

GREETING (1:1–2)

REBORN TO HOPE (1:3–5)

REJOICING AND FAITH (1:6–9)

THE WITNESSES OF SALVATION (1:10–12)

HOPE AND HOLINESS (1:13–21)

ETERNAL LOVE (1:22–25)

SPIRITUAL MILK (2:1–3)

THE NEW BUILDING (2:4–10)

GOOD CONDUCT AMONG THE GENTILES (2:11–12)

THE CIVIL OBLIGATION (2:13–17)

SERVANTS (2:18–25)

WIVES AND HUSBANDS (3:1–7)

LOVE OF ENEMIES (3:8–12)

A PROMISE OF VINDICATION (3:13–17)

THE JOURNEY TO HEAVEN (3:18–22)

FREEDOM FROM SIN (4:1–6)

MUTUALITY IN THE CONGREGATIONS (4:7–11)

THE FIERY TRIAL (4:12–19)

APPEAL TO ELDERS (5:1–5)

HUMILITY AND EXALTATION (5:6–11)
CONCLUSION AND FINAL GREETINGS (5:12–14)

EDITORIAL PREFACE

The launching of the *Word Biblical Commentary* brings to fulfillment an enterprise of several years' planning. The publishers and the members of the editorial board met in 1977 to explore the possibility of a new commentary on the books of the Bible that would incorporate several distinctive features. Prospective readers of these volumes are entitled to know what such features were intended to be; whether the aims of the commentary have been fully achieved time alone will tell.

First, we have tried to cast a wide net to include as contributors a number of scholars from around the world who not only share our aims, but are in the main engaged in the ministry of teaching in university, college, and seminary. They represent a rich diversity of denominational allegiance. The broad stance of our contributors can rightly he called evangelical, and this term is to be understood in its positive, historic sense of a commitment to Scripture as divine revelation, and to the truth and power of the Christian gospel.

Then, the commentaries in our series are all commissioned and written for the purpose of inclusion in the *Word Biblical Commentary*. Unlike several of our distinguished counterparts in the field of commentary writing, there are no translated works, originally written in a non-English language. Also, our commentators were asked to prepare their own rendering of the original biblical text and to use those languages as the basis of their own comments and exegesis. What may be claimed as distinctive with this series is that it is based on the biblical languages, yet it seeks to make the technical and scholarly approach to a theological understanding of Scripture understandable by—and useful to—the fledgling student, the working minister, and colleagues in the guild of professional scholars and

teachers as well.

Finally, a word must be said about the format of the series. The layout, in clearly defined sections, has been consciously devised to assist readers at different levels. Those wishing to learn about the textual witnesses on which the translation is offered are invited to consult the section headed *Notes*. If the readers' concern is with the state of modern scholarship on any given portion of Scripture, they should turn to the sections on *Bibliography* and *Form/Structure/Setting*. For a clear exposition of the passage's meaning and its relevance to the ongoing biblical revelation, the *Comment* and concluding *Explanation* are designed expressly to meet that need. There is therefore something for everyone who may pick up and use these volumes.

If these aims come anywhere near realization, the intention of the editors will have been met, and the labor of our team of contributors rewarded.

General Editors: *David A. Hubbard*
Glenn W. Barker[*]
Old Testament: *John D. W. Watts*
New Testament: *Ralph P. Martin*

Author's Preface

If one must write commentaries, I have discovered that there are certain advantages to writing on 1 Peter. For one thing, it is short, as biblical books go. Any commentary is a formidable task, but a commentary on 1 Peter is the work of a decade at most, not of a lifetime. For another, 1 Peter has not been overworked to quite the same extent as the Gospels and the letters of Paul. There are still some things left to say. What biblical book is more "packed" with insight and direction for Christians living—as virtually all Christians do—in societies which do not share their values?

I discovered also certain advantages in writing for the Word Biblical Commentary series. It is a good series in that the first few volumes to appear (not least the volume on Jude, 2 Peter by Richard J. Bauckham) have set an extremely high standard for the rest of us. The editors of the series had the wisdom to allow 1 Peter a volume of its own instead of joining it (as is too often done) with 2 Peter and Jude, or even with the "Catholic Epistles" as a larger miscellaneous collection. 1 Peter is short enough to be manageable in a single volume, yet too distinctive to be treated adequately in much less than that.

For these reasons, my work on this commentary over the past several years has turned out to be both a privilege and a pleasure. In the completion of the task I am indebted, directly or indirectly, to more people than I can possibly name. Although I had no personal mentor in the study of 1 Peter (my only tangible qualification at the time I was given the assignment was a 1967 article I had written in the journal *New Testament Studies*), I am particularly thankful to two individuals who gave me both the enthusiasm and the discipline needed for a career in biblical studies: the late Ned Stonehouse of Westminster Theological Seminary and Krister Stendahl of Harvard, now bishop of Stockholm. With regard to 1

Peter itself, I have been helped immeasurably by the work of many scholars who have been this way before, above all by the commentaries of F. J. A. Hort, E. G. Selwyn, J. N. D. Kelly, and Leonhard Goppelt, and the monograph of William J. Dalton, *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits* (1965).

The last three years have been crucial for me in completing this commentary. I have appreciated both the encouragement and the critical feedback of my colleagues at Southwest Missouri State University, especially Robert Hodgson and Charles Hedrick. I also wish to thank the administration and the Faculty Research Committee of SMSU for a grant to pursue studies in the Boston area on 1 Peter during the summer of 1986, and the National Endowment for the Humanities for a grant to participate in a 1987 summer seminar at Yeshiva University in New York on "The Classical and Christian Roots of Anti-Semitism." In connection with the latter I completed a paper on "1 Peter and the Jews" which contributed significantly to the *Introduction* of this commentary. I am grateful to my colleagues in that seminar, and in a very special way to its director, Louis H. Feldman, for his candid, thoughtful, and thought-provoking comments on my efforts. So far I have had time to pursue only a few of the avenues he opened up for me, but I appreciate more than I can say his unfailing willingness to go the extra mile in sharing his time and expertise with colleagues from different areas of specialization.

The summers of 1986 and 1987 were very productive for me, and I want to thank my wife Betty, not just for spending them with me, but for being willing to type a lot of pages during those weeks we were away from home and from the computer. I expect that when I reread my own work in years to come, almost every passage in 1 Peter will call to mind personal memories (as well as second thoughts about the text), and they will be mostly happy ones.

J. RAMSEY MICHAELS
Springfield, Missouri
January 1988

Main Bibliography

A. MODERN COMMENTARIES

Arichea, D. C. and **Nida, E.** *A Translator's Handbook on the First Letter from Peter*. New York, London, Stuttgart: UBS, 1980.

Barbieri, L. A. *First and Second Peter*. 2d ed. Chicago, 1978.

Bauer, J. B. *Der erste Petrusbrief*. Die Welt der Bibel 14. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971.

Beare, F. W. *The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. 3d ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970.

Best, E. I Peter. NC[B.] London: Oliphants, 1971.

Bennett, W. H. *The General Epistles: James, Peter, John, Jude*. Century Bible. New York, 1901.

Bigg, C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. IC[C] Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910.

Blenkin, G. W. *The First Epistle General of Peter*. Cambridge: U[P,] 1914.

Brox, N. *Der erste Petrusbrief*. 2d ed. EK[K] Zürich: Benziger, 1986.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *The First Epistle of Peter*. London: SC[M,] 1950.

———. *1 and 2 Peter and Jude*. TB[C] London: SC[M,] 1960.

Danker, F. W. *Invitation to the New Testament: Epistles IV*. Garden City, NY: Image, 1980.

Felten, J. *Die zwei Briefe des hl. Petrus und der Judasbrief*. Regensburg, 1929.

Fronmueller, G. F. C. *The Epistles General of Peter*. Trans. J. I. Mombert. New York: Charles Scribner, 1869.

Goppelt, L. *Der erste Petrusbrief*. ed. F. Hahn. KE[K.] Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1978.

Gunkel, H. *Der erste Brief des Petrus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1906.

Hauck, F. *Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes*. 8th ed. *NT*[D]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.

Hiebert, D. E. *First Peter: An Expositional Commentary*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1984.

Holtzmann, O. *Die Petrusbrief. Das Neue Testament*. Giessen, 1926.

Holzmeister, U. *Commentarius in Epistulas SS. Petri et Judae Apostolorum I: Epistula prima S. Petri Apostoli*. Paris: Lethielleux, 1937.

Hort, F. J. A. *The First Epistle of St. Peter 1:1–2:17*. London: Macmillan, 1898.

Kelly, J. N. D. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*. HNT[C] New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Knopf, R. *Die Briefe Petri und Judae*. KE[K.] Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1912.

Leahey, A. R. C. *The Letters of Peter and Jude*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: U[P,] 1967.

Margot, J. C. *Les Épîtres de Pierre*. Commentaire. Geneva: Editions Labor et Fides, 1960.

Michl, J. *Die katholischen Briefe*. 2d ed. Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1953.

Moffatt, J. *The General Epistles: James, Peter, and Judas*. Moffatt N[T] Commentary.

London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947.

Mounce, R. H. *A Living Hope: A Commentary on 1 and 2 Peter*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Reicke, B. *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*. A[b]. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964.

Reuss, J. *Die katholischen Briefe*. Würzburg: Herder, 1959.

Schelkle, K. H. *Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief*. Freiburg: Herder, 1963.

Schlatter, A. *Die Briefe des Petrus*. Erläuterungen zum N[T.] Berlin, 1953.

Schneider, J. *Die Kirchenbriefe*. Neue Testament Deutsch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967.

Schrage, W. and **Balz, H.** *Die katholischen Briefe*. *NT*[D] Göttingen, 1973.

Schwank, B. *Der erste Brief des Apostels Petrus*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1963.

Schweizer, E. *Der erste Petrusbrief*. 3d ed[.] Zürich, 1972.

Selwyn, E. G. *The First Epistle of Peter*. 2d ed[.] London: Macmillan, 1947.

Senior, D. *1 and 2 Peter*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1980.

Soden, H. von. *Briefe des Petrus*. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1899.

Spicq, C. *Les Épîtres de saint Pierre*. S[B] Paris: Gabalda, 1966.

Stibbs, A. M. and **Walls, A. F.** *The First Epistle General of Peter*. TNT[C] London: Tyndale, 1959.

Vaccari, A. *Le Lettere cattoliche*. La Sacra Biblia. Rome, 1958.

Wand, J. W. C. *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. WC. London: Methuen, 1934.

Windisch, H. and **Preisker, H.** *Die katholischen Briefe*. HN[T.] 3d ed[.] Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951.

Wohlenberg, G. *Der erste und zweiter Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief*. 3d ed[.] Kommentar zum N[T.] Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1923.

B. OTHER WORKS: BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Antoniotti, L.-M. "Structure littéraire et sens de la première Épître de Pierre." *RevTho*[m] 85.4 (1985) 533–60.

Ashcraft, M. "Theological Themes in 1 Peter." *Theological Educator* 13 (1982) 55–62.

Balch, D. L. "Hellenization/Acculturation in 1 Peter." In *Perspectives on First Peter*. NABP[R] Special Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer U[P,] 1986. 79–101.

———. *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*. SBLM[S.] Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.

Barr, A. "Submission Ethic in the First Epistle of Peter." *Hartford Quarterly* 20 (1961) 27–33.

Bauer, J. B. "Der erste Petrusbrief und die Verfolgung unter Domitian." In *Die Kirche des Anfangs.* F[S] *H. Schuermann*. Leipzig: St. Benno Verlag, 1977. 513–27.

Beare, F. W. "The Teaching of First Peter." *AT*[R] 26 (1944/45) 284–96.

———. "The Text of 1 Peter in Papyrus 72." *JB*[L] 80 (1961) 253–60.

Best, E. "1 Peter and the Gospel Tradition." *NT*[S] 16 (1969/70) 95–113.

Blanchetiêre, F. "Juifs et non Juifs. Essai sur la Diaspora en Asie Mineure." *RHP*[R] 54 (1974) 367–82.

Blevins, J. L. "Introduction to 1 Peter." *RevEx*[p] 79 (1982) 401–13.

Boismard, M.-E. *Quatre hymnes baptismales dans la première épûtre de Pierre*. L[D] Paris: Cerf, 1961.

Boobyer, G. H. "The Indebtedness of 2 Peter to 1 Peter." In *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*. Manchester: Manchester U[P,] 1959. 34–53.

Bornemann, W. "Der erste Petrusbrief—eine Taufrede des Silvanus?" *ZN*[W] 19 (1919/20) 143–65.

Brandt, W. "Wandel als Zeugnis nach dem I. Petrusbrief." In *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum:* F[S] *O. Schmitz*. Witten, 1953. 10–25.

Brown, R. E.; Donfried, K. P.; and **Reumann, J.** *Peter in the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1973.

Brown, R. E. and **Maier, J. P.** *Antioch and Rome*. New York and Ramsey, NJ: Paulist, 1983.

Brox, N. "Zur pseudepigraphischen Rahmung des ersten Petrusbriefes." *B*[Z] N[F] 19 (1975) 78–96.

———. "Situation und Sprache der Minderheit im ersten Petrusbrief." *Kairos* N[F] 19 (1977) 1–13.

———. "Tendenz und Pseudepigraphie im ersten Petmsbrief." *Kairos* N[F] 20 (1978) 110–20.

———. "Der erste Petrusbrief in der literarischen Tradition des Urchristentums." *Kairos* N[F] 20 (1978) 182–92.

Bultmann, R. "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief." In *Exegetica*, ed[.] E. Dinkler. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1967. 285–97.

Calloud, J. and **Genuyt, F.** *La première Épître de Pierre: Analyse sémiotique*. L^D Paris: Cerf, 1982.

Carrington, P. "Saint Peter's Epistle." In *The Joy of Study:* F^S *F. C. Grant*. New York, 1951.

Chase, F. H. "Peter (Simon)." *D*^B(H); 3:756–79.

trmd;. "Peter, First Epistle of," *D*^B(H); 3:779–96.

Chevallier, M.-A. "Condition et vocation des chrétiens en diaspora. Remarques exégétiques sur la 1re Épître de Pierre." *RS*^R 48.4 (1974) 387–400.

Clemen, C. "Die Einheitlichkeit des 1. Petrusbriefes." *TS*^K 78 (1905) 619–28.

Combrink, H. J. B. "The Structure of 1 Peter." *Neo*^t 9 (1975) 34–63.

Cothenet, E. "Le realisme de l'esperance chretienne selon 1 Pierre." *NT*^S 17 (1981) 564–72.

Cross, F. L. *1 Peter: A Paschal Liturgy*. London: Mowbray, 1954.

Cullmann, O. *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*. 2d ed^. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.

Dalton, W. J. *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18–4:6*. AnBi^b Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.

———. "The Church in 1 Peter." *Tantur Yearbook* (1981/82) 79–91.

Davies, P. E. "Primitive Christology in 1 Peter." In F^S *to Honor F. W. Gingrich*. Leiden: Brill, 1972. 115–22.

Delling, G. "Der Bezug der christlichen Existenz auf das Heilshandeln Gottes nach dem ersten Petrusbrief." In *Neues Testament und christliche Existenz.* F^S *H. Braun*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1973. 95–113.

Elliott, J. H. *The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2:4–10 and the Phrase* basileion ierateuma. NovTSu^p. Leiden: Brill, 1966.

———. *1 Peter: Estrangement and Community*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1979.

———. "1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy: A Discussion with David Balch." In *Perspectives on First Peter*. NABP^R Special Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer U^P, 1986. 61–78.

——— "Peter, Silvanus, and Mark in I Peter and Acts." In *Wort in der Zeit.* F^S *K. H. Rengstorf*. Leiden: Brill, 1980. 250–67.

———. "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research." *JB*^L 95 (1976) 243–54.

Ferris, T. E. S. "A Comparison of 1 Peter and Hebrews." *CQ*^R 111 (1930) 123–27.

———. "The Epistle of James in Relation to 1 Peter." *CQ*^R 128 (1939) 303–8.

Filson, F. W. "Partakers with Christ: Suffering in First Peter." *In*[t] 9 (1955) 400–12.

Fink, P. R. "The Use and Significance of *en hōi* in 1 Peter." *Grace Journal* 8 (1967) 33–39.

Foster, O. D. "The Literary Relations of 'The First Epistle of Peter' with Their Bearing on Date and Place of Authorship." *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 17 (1913) 363–538.

Furnish, V. P. "Elect Sojourners in Christ: An Approach to the Theology of I Peter." *PST*[J] 28 (1975) 1–11.

Glaze, R. E. "Introduction to 1 Peter." *Theological Educator* 13 (1982) 23–34.

Goldstein, H. *Paulinische Gemeinde im Ersten Petrusbrief*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975.

Gundry, R. H. " 'Verba Christi' in I Peter: Their Implications Concerning the Authorship of I Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition." *NT*[S] 13 (1966/67) 336–50.

———. "Further Verba on Verba Christi in First Peter." *Bi*[b] 55 (1974) 211–32.

Hall, R. "For to This You Have Been Called: The Cross and Suffering in 1 Peter." *Rest*[Q] 19 (1976) 137–47.

Hill, D. "On Suffering and Baptism in 1 Peter." *Nov*[T] 18 (1976) 181–89.

Hillyer, N. "First Peter and the Feast of Tabernacles." *Tyn*[B] 21 (1970) 39–70.

Holdsworth, J. "The Suffering in 1 Peter and 'Missionary Apocalyptic.'" *JSN*[T] Supplement Series (1980) 225–32.

Jones, P. R. "Teaching First Peter." *RevEx*[p] 79 (1982) 463–72.

Jonsen, A. R. "The Moral Teaching of the First Epistle of Peter." *Sciences Ecclésiastiques* 16 (1964) 93–105.

Kirk, G. E. "Endurance in Suffering in 1 Peter." *BSa*[c] 138 (1981) 46–56.

Krafft, H. "Christologie und Eschatologie im 1. Petrusbrief." *Ev*[T] 10 (1950/51) 120–26.

Lea, T. D. "1 Peter—Outline and Exposition." SWJ[T] 25 (1982) 17–45.

Leaney, A. R. C. "I Peter and the Passover: An Interpretation." *NT*[S] 10 (1963/64) 238–51.

Lohse, E. "Parenesis and Kerygma in 1 Peter." *ZN*[W] 45 (1954) 68–89. Reprinted in *Perspectives on First Peter*. NABP[R] Special Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer U[P,] 1986. 37–59.

Love, J. P. "The First Epistle of Peter." *In*[t] 8 (1954) 63–87.

Maier, G. "Jesustradition im 1. Petrusbriefe?" *Gospel Perspectives* 5 (Sheffield: *JSO*[T] Press, 1985) 85–128.

Martin, R. P. "The Composition of I Peter in Recent Study." *VoxEv* 1 (1962) 29–42.

Massaux, E. "Le texte de la 1a Petri du Papyrus Bodmer." EphThLov 39 (1963) 616–71.

McCaughey, J. D. "On Re-Reading 1 Peter." *ABR* 31 (1983) 33–44.

McNabb, V. "Date and Influence of the First Epistle of St. Peter." *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 45 (1935) 596–613.

Meecham, H. G. "The First Epistle of St. Peter." *ExpTim* 48 (1936/ 37) 22–24.

Millauer, H. *Leiden als Gnade. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Leidenstheologie des ersten Petrusbriefes*. Europäische Hochschulschriften. Bern: Herbert Lang, 1976.

Miller, D. G. "Deliverance and Destiny: Salvation in First Peter." *Int* 9 (1955) 413–25.

Mitton, C. L. "The Relationship between 1 Peter and Ephesians." *JTS* 1 (1950) 67–73.

Moule, C. F. D. "The Nature and Purpose of 1 Peter." *NTS* 3 (1956/57) 1–11.

Munro, W. *Authority in Paul and Peter: The Identification of a Pastoral Stratum in the Pauline Corpus and in 1 Peter*. SNTSMS. Cambridge: CUP, 1983.

Nauck, W. "Freude im Leiden. Zum Problem einer urchristlichen Verfolgungstradition." *ZNW* 46 (1955) 68–80.

Neugebauer, F. "Zur Deutung und Bedeutung des 1. Petrusbriefes." *NTS* 26 (1979) 61–86.

Neyrey, J. "First Peter and Converts." *Bible Today* 22 (1984) 13–18.

Olson, V. S. *The Atonement in I Peter*. Diss. Union Theological Seminary (Virginia), 1979.

Perdelwitz, R. *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des I. Petrusbriefes. Ein literarischer und religionsgeschichtlicher Versuch*. Giessen: A. Töpehnann, 1911.

Perrot, C. et al. *Études sur la Première Lettre de Pierre*. LD. Paris: Cerf, 1980.

Philipps, K. *Kirche in der Gesellschafl nach dem 1. Petrusbrief*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1971.

Pryor, J. W. "First Peter and the New Covenant." RTR 45.1 (1986) 1–4; 45.2 (1986) 44–51.

Radermacher, L. "Der erste Petrusbrief und Silvanus." *ZNW* 25 (1926) 287–99.

Ramsay, W. M. *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 70*. 5th ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897. 279–95.

Reicke, B. *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism: A Study of 1 Pet. iii. 19 and Its Context*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1946.

Richard, E. "The Functional Christology of First Peter." In *Perspectives on First Peter*. NABPR Special Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer UP, 1986. 121–39.

Robertson, P. E. "Is I Peter a Sermon?" *Theological Educator* 13 (1982) 35–41.

Russell, R. “Eschatology and Ethics in I Peter.” *Ev*^{Q} 47 (1975) 78–84.

Schattenmann, J. “The Little Apocalypse of the Synoptics and the First Epistle of Peter.” *TToda*^{y} 11 (1954/55) 193–98.

Schierse, F. J. “Ein Hirtenbrief und viele Bücher. Neue Literatur zum Ersten Petrusbrief.” *B*^{K} 31 (1976) 86–88.

Schlatter, A. *Petrus und Paulus nach dem ersten Petrusbrief*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1937.

Schlier, H. “Eine adhortatio aus Rom. Die Botschaft des ersten Petrusbriefes.” In *Strukluren christlicher Existenz.* F^{S} *F. Wulf*. Würzburg: Herder, 1968. 59–80, 369–71.

Schmidt, D. H. *The Peter Writings: Their Redactors and Their Relationship*. Diss. Northwestern University, 1972.

Schmidt, P. “Zwei Fragen zum ersten Petrusbrief.” *ZW*^{T} 51 (1908) 24–52.

Schröger, F. *Gemeinde im ersten Petrusbrief. Untersuchungen zum Selbstverständnis einer christlicher Gemeinde an der Wende vom 1. zum 2. Jahrhundert*. Passau, 1981.

Selwyn, E. G. “Eschatology in 1 Peter.” In *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology:* F^{S} *C. H. Dodd*. Cambridge, 1964. 374–401.

Senior, D. R. “The First Letter of Peter.” *Bible Today* 22 (1984) 5–12.

Shimda, K. *The Formulary Material in First Peter*. Diss. Union Theological Seminary (New York), 1966.

———. “Is 1 Peter a Composite Writing?” *Annals of the Japan Biblical Institute* 11 (1985) 95–114.

Sleeper, F. “Political Responsibility According to I Peter.” *Nov*^{T} 10 (1968) 270–86.

Spicq, C. “La 1^{a} Petri etie témoignage évangelique de saint Pierre.” *S*^{T} 20 (1966) 37–61.

Spörri, T. *Der Gemeindegedanke im ersten Petrusbrief*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1925.

Sylva, D. “A 1 Peter Bibliography.” *JET*^{S} 25.1 (1982) 75–89.

———. “1 Peter Studies: The State of the Discipline.” *BT*^{B} 10.4 (1980) 155–63.

Talbert, C. H. “Once Again: The Plan of 1 Peter.” In *Perspectives on First Peter*. NABP^{R} Special Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer U^{P,} 1986. 141–51.

Thornton, T. C. G. “I Peter, A Paschal Liturgy?” *JT*^{S} n^{s} 12 (1961) 14–26.

Thurston, R. W. “Interpreting First Peter.” *JET*^{S} 17 **(1974) 171–82. Unnik, W. C. van.** “The Teaching of Good Works in 1 Peter.” *NT*^{S} I (1954/55) 92–110.

———. “Christianity According to 1 Peter.” *ExpTi*^{m} 68 (1956/57) 79–83.

Villiers, J. L. “Joy in Suffering in 1 Peter.” *Neo*^{t} 9 (1975) 64–86.

Wand, J. W. C. "The Lessons of First Peter: A Survey of Recent Interpretations." *In*[t] 9 (1955) 387–99.

Winbery, C. L. "Ethical Issues in 1 Peter." *Theological Educator* 13 (1982) 63a–71.

———. "Introduction to the First Letter of Peter." SWJ[T] 25 (1982) 3–16.

Wolff, C. "Christ und Welt im 1. Petrusbrief." *TL*[Z] 100 (1975) 333–42.

Introduction

Stephen Neill once characterized 1 Peter as "the storm centre of New Testament studies" (*The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1961* [London: Oxford U[P,] 1964], 343). Bishop Neill was writing in reference to the two major—and very different—commentaries in English on the epistle, namely those of E.G. Selwyn and F. W. Beare: "Now if two scholars can arrive at such widely divergent results, both on the basis of theoretically scientific methods of study, something must have gone seriously wrong somewhere. If it were possible to come nearer to agreement as to the date and origin of this beautiful and perplexing letter, this would provide us with another of those fixed points from which fresh studies could radiate in every direction, and perhaps new certainties be attained. It may be that definite solutions of this Petrine problem will forever evade us; we must pursue the matter in hope, and not lie down too easily under the frustration of mutually contradictory solutions" (344).

Bishop Neill's challenge has gone largely unanswered. Twelve years later, J.H. Elliott could describe 1 Peter not as a "storm centre," but as "an exegetical step-child" that needed rehabilitation (J. H. Elliott, "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research," *JB*[L] 95 [1976] 243–54). Elliott was referring not only to a relative lack of interest in the epistle among N[T] scholars in the preceding decades, but to a failure of the N[T] fraternity to pay adequate attention even to the studies that had been done. In particular, he cited the fact that Beare's conclusions in his 1947 commentary remained substantially unchanged and unaffected by subsequent research in his second (1958) and third (1970) editions.

Historical Attestation

The "benign neglect" of which Elliott speaks (243) is no new thing. In view of the prominence of the Apostle Peter both in the Gospels and in later Christian tradition, it is surprising that almost from the beginning the two epistles attributed to him in the N[T] have occupied a rather modest place in the canon and in the historical reconstruction of Christian beginnings. This is explained in part (although only in part) by the brevity of 1 and 2 Peter, especially in comparison with a corpus of a dozen or more letters attributed to Paul. The expectation of what a N[T] letter should be is shaped so largely by Paul's epistles that it is

difficult not to read 1 Peter as simply another piece of "deutero-Pauline" correspondence—in much the same way that Colossians, Ephesians, and the Pastorals are often read today. Some writers treat 1 Peter as if it is trying to be a Pauline letter but not quite succeeding. In the case of 2 Peter, an additional factor is of course the lack of early testimony in the church in favor of Petrine authorship, and the almost universal doubt among modern scholars that the Apostle Peter actually wrote it (cf., e.g., R. J. Bauckham, *Jude, IIPeter* WB[c] 50 [Waco: Word, 1983], 158–63). Although similar doubt has been expressed about 1 Peter (see, e.g., Beare's commentary), it is not for lack of historical attestation in the ancient church. The epistle has been well known and consistently acknowledged as Petrine from the second century well into modern times.

1. The earliest evidence for the existence of 1 Peter is the reference of 2 Peter to itself as "this second epistle," with the claim that "in them [i.e., in both epistles] I am arousing your sincere understanding with a reminder" (2 Pet 3:1). The difficulty is that the "reminder" (i.e., to "remember the words once spoken by the holy prophets and the command of the Lord and Savior through your apostles," 3:2) shows little awareness of the actual content of 1 Peter. Yet the author of 2 Peter is making a claim for Petrine authority in this chapter that is at least equal to that of the Apostle Paul "in all his epistles" (3:15–16; note the uses of en ai", "in them," in 3:1, 16). In the absence of any other known letter of Peter to which 2 Pet 3:1 could be referring, it must be assumed that 1 Peter is in mind.

2. The letter from Polycarp of Smyrna to the Philippians in the early second century provides clear evidence of a familiarity with 1 Peter in at least one geographical area to which the epistle was addressed (i.e., western Asia Minor). The following references are striking:

Pol. Phil. 1.3, "in whom, though you did not see him, you believe with inexpressible and glorious joy—into which [joy] many desire to enter …" (cf. 1 Pet 1:8, 12).

ibid., 2.1, "Therefore, girding up your loins … believing in him who raised our Lord Jesus from the dead and gave him glory" (cf. 1 Pet 1:13, 21).

ibid., 2.2, "not returning evil for evil, or insult for insult, or blow for blow, or curse for curse" (cf. 1 Pet 3:9).

ibid., 6.3, "zealots for the good" (cf. 1 Pet 3:13).

ibid., 7.2, "attending to prayers and persevering in fasts" (cf. 1 Pet 4:7).

ibid., 8.1–2, "he who bore our sins in his own body to the tree, who did no sin, neither was deceit found in his mouth, but for our sakes, that we might live in him, he endured all things. Let us then be imitators of his endurance, and if we suffer for his name, let us glorify him. For this is the example he gave us in himself, and we have believed this" (cf. 1 Pet 2:24, 22; 4:16).

ibid., 10.2–3, "all of you be subject to one another, having your conduct among the Gentiles blameless, that you might receive praise for your good works, and that the Lord may not be blasphemed in you. Woe to the one through whom the name of the Lord is blasphemed" (cf. 1 Pet 5:5; 2:12; 4:14).

3. Eusebius cites a mid-second-century tradition common to Papias of Hierapolis (also in western Asia Minor) and to Clement of Alexandria, that "Peter mentions Mark in his first epistle, which (they say) he composed in Rome itself, which he indicates by referring to the city metaphorically as Babylon, in the words 'the [congregation] in Babylon, chosen with you, sends her greetings, as does Mark, my son'" (Eusebius, HE 2.15.2; cf. 1 Pet 5:13; see also HE 3.39.17: "The same writer [i.e., Papias] uses quotations from the First Epistle of

John, and likewise from that of Peter”).

4. Irenaeus, near the end of the second century, was the first writer to cite passages from 1 Peter with explicit mention of Peter as the author: e.g. ad[v] *Haer.* 4.9.2, “Peter says in his epistle,” and 5.7.2, “this is what was said by Peter” (each followed by a quotation of 1 Pet 1:8); 4.16.5, “Peter says” (followed by a quotation of 1 Pet 2:16). The testimony of Irenaeus is significant because Irenaeus was active not only in Asia Minor but also in the West (i.e. Lyons in Gaul; for this geographical area, cf. also the apparent allusions to 1 Peter in the letter from the martyr churches of Lyons and Vienne, preserved by Eusebius: e.g. HE 5.1.26//1 Pet 5:8; 5.2.5//1 Pet 5:6).

5. Tertullian alludes to 1 Peter occasionally, and cites Peter by name in *Scorpiace* 12 (“Addressing the Christians of Pontus, Peter says …, ”followed by 1 Pet 2:20–21, 4:12–16; on the limitation to Pontus, see below, “Structure and Integrity”). Two other, less specific citations are *Scorpiace* 14//1 Pet 2:13; Orat 20//1 Pet 3:1–6.

6. Clement of Alexandria alludes to Peter’s epistle frequently and in a number of instances cites it by name (e.g. Paed 1.6//1 Pet 2:1–3; 3.11//1 Pet 2:18; 3:8; 3.12//1 Pet 1:17–19; 4:3; 3:12–13; *Strom.* 3.12//1 Pet 2:11–12, 15–16; 4.18//1 Pet 1:21–22, 1:14–16; 4.20//1 Pet 1:6–9) and is said to have commented in his “Outlines,” or *Hypotyposeis*, on “all the canonical scriptures,” extending to “the Epistle of Jude and the remaining Catholic Epistles” (Eusebius, HE 6.14.1).

7. Eusebius attributes to Origen the testimony that “Peter, on whom the church of Christ is built, against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail, has left one acknowledged epistle, and, it may be, a second one, for it is doubted” (HE 6.25.8, from a portion of Origen’s Commentary on John that is not extant).

8. Knowledge of 1 Peter (along with 2 Peter and Jude) in Egypt in the third or early fourth century is further supported by the Bodmer Papyrus (^{P72}), which contains 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude in their entirety. In general, from the time of Clement, Origen, and Tertullian on, 1 Peter is well known and rather consistently cited both in the East and the West.

Other early evidence is more problematic. 1 Clement, written near the end of the first century, has close ties to 1 Peter in several ways. Both epistles are associated with Rome, and Clement refers explicitly to the Apostle Peter in *1 Cle*[m] 5.4. The two share some common themes and often draw on common traditions (e.g. *1 Cle*[m] 12.7//1 Pet 1:18–21; *1 Cle*[m] 16.3–17//1 Pet 2:21–25; *1 Cle*[m] 22.2–6//1 Pet 3:10–12, based on Ps 34:13–17; *1 Cle*[m] 30.2//1 Pet 5:5, based on Prov 3:34; *1 Cle*[m] 49.5// 1 Pet 4:8, based on Prov 10:12; *1 Cle*[m] 64.1//1 Pet 2:4–5, 9), yet none of this qualifies as hard evidence for literary dependence. 1 Peter is not listed in the Muratorian Canon (also linked to Rome), but because of uncertainties about the provenance of this canon and because of the corrupt state of its text, no firm conclusions can be drawn from the omission (for the text, see D. J. Theron, *Evidence of Tradition* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958], 113). It has been conjectured that a reference to 1-2 Peter has dropped out of the statement that “We accept only the apocalypses of John and of Peter, although some of us do not want it [Apocalypse of Peter? 2 Peter?] to be read in the Church.” It is significant that the Muratorian Canon also omits 1 John, even though it was explicitly quoted at an earlier point; a strong possibility must be allowed that 1 Pet 5:13 was similarly quoted in connection with the Gospel of Mark just before the fragmentary present text begins (see F. H. Chase, “Peter, First Epistle of,” *HD*[B] 3:780–81).

Aside from the four Gospels and the letters of Paul, the external attestation for 1 Peter is as

strong, or stronger, than that for any N^T book. There is no evidence anywhere of controversy over its authorship or authority. The testimonies of Papias, Polycarp, and Irenaeus, however, suggest that it may have had a more immediate impact in the areas to which it was sent (i.e., Asia Minor) than in the place from which there is reason to believe it originated (i.e., Rome; see below, Authorship and Date).

STRUCTURE AND INTEGRITY

In the broadest sense, the structure of 1 Peter is marked out by two occurrences of the direct address, "Dear friends" (agaphtoi) in 2:11 and 4:12. These divide the epistle into three parts, 1:1–2:10, 2:11–4:11, and 4:12–5:14.

1. The theme of the first part is the identity of the people of God established on the basis of the great salvation Christ has accomplished (and is accomplishing) on their behalf. Their identity as a "chosen" people is affirmed programmatically in the address (1:1–2) and confirmed in the concluding pronouncements of 2:9–10 so as to form an inclusio. More broadly, there is an inclusion between the emphasis on the identity of Christians in the first section (1:1–12) and last section (2:1–10) of part one. In the first section, they are "chosen" as heirs of divine salvation, while in the last their election is confirmed by the metaphor of priesthood.

This identity as God's people rests on the experience of "salvation" (1:5, 910; 2:3b), or rebirth (1:3, 22–23; 2:2–3). The body of the letter begins with an unfolding of this salvation (1:3–12) as hope in the present (vv 3–5) and joy in the future (vv 6–9), with prophets on earth and angels in heaven as its inquisitive witnesses (vv 10–12). In a very general sense 1 Pet 1:3–12 corresponds to 2 Pet 1:3–11, and both introductions fit the description of what Jude said he first intended to write about "the common salvation" (Jude 3). It is not surprising that these early Christian letters directed to an extremely wide audience focus attention right at the outset on matters that all Christians everywhere have in common: the universals of Christian experience, centering on conversion, faith, and hope.

The second or middle section of part one (1:13–25) anticipates to some degree the theme of parts two and three of the letter, i.e., the responsibilities of the people of Cod. A series of exhortations to holiness (vv 13–16), reverence (vv 17–21), and love (vv 22–25) are grounded in Scripture (vv 16, 24–25) and tradition (vv 18–21), rehearsing in different language the salvation described in vv 3–12. The admonition to love is further grounded in an appeal (vv 22–23) back to the experience of rebirth first announced in v 3.

The third and last section of part one (2:1–10) maintains at first the tone of exhortation (vv 1–3), but brings it to a distinctly spiritual focus on the theme of desiring Christ and coming to him (vv 3–4). This leads into Christology, formulated on the basis of three biblical texts using the metaphor of the "stone" (vv 4–8). With Christ as the foundation of a metaphorical temple, the author develops the related metaphors of priesthood and sacrifice (vv 5, 9) to highlight the identity and mission of the Christian community as an elect people of God (vv 9–10).

2. The address, "Dear friends, I appeal to you," in 2:11 marks a shift from the identity of God's people to their consequent responsibility in a hostile world. If 1:3–2:10 expanded on their identity as "chosen people" (cf. 1:2), the reference to them as "aliens and strangers" in 2:11 serves as a reminder that they are at the same time "living as strangers" (again cf.

1:2) in contemporary society. Their mission to the world (i.e., to the "Gentiles") is summarized generally in 2:11–12 and specifically in 2:13–3:12. They are to be characterized first by respect for everyone (2:13, 17a), specifically for those in political authority at every level (2:13–17). The author takes the opportunity to sum up concisely the obligations of believers to all people, to each other, to God, and to the emperor (v 17), but the accent throughout is on how Christians are to treat their actual or potential enemies. Precisely because they are "strangers" in the larger society, their calling is to "seek peace" with their fellow citizens (cf. 3:11) as far as possible.

It is this emphasis that dominates the so-called household duty codes (2:18–3:7), in which the author describes the responsibilities of Christian slaves to their masters, especially unbelieving and even cruel masters (2:18–25), and the responsibilities of Christian wives to their husbands, especially unbelieving husbands (3:1–6). In connection with slaves, Peter introduces the example of Christ as he fulfilled the role of Isaiah's suffering servant (2:21–25), and in connection with wives he introduces the example of the holy women of Israel's past, like Sarah (3:5–6). In the first instance, his interest is in the theme of loving one's enemies; in the second he describes the responsibilities of wives not only to husbands who believe (like Abraham) but more specifically to those who do not. Only in his brief word of advice to Christian husbands (3:7) does Peter return to the theme of the relationship of Christians to each other (cf. 1:22b; 2:17b). In 3:8–12, however, the obligations of believers to each other and to enemies are in view simultaneously. The Scripture in vv 10–12 serves as a transition to the following section.

The awareness of enemies, and thus of hostility within the social order, requires a promise of vindication, and this the author supplies in 3:13–4:6. The promise proper (3:13–17) is reinforced by the work of Christ in achieving victory over death and the powers of evil (3:18–22) and by a reminder of God's righteous final judgment (4:1–6). Part two of 1 Peter draws to a close with a brief summary of the obligations of Christian believers to each other in their worshiping communities in the light of the imminent "end of all things": mutual love expressing itself in mutual hospitality and ministry (4:7–11). Part two of the letter concludes with a doxology (4:11b).

3. Once again the address, "Dear friends," marks a major division in the outline (4:12). The question is whether this is a sharper or more significant break than the one at 2:11. The presence of a doxology in 4:11 could suggest that it does. It is common to discern a heightened intensity in the way the author speaks of suffering in 4:12–19 in comparison to the way he has spoken of it in section two: either it is said that the suffering is now a present reality instead of a future prospect (because of the present participles in 4:12), or it is a real and imminent danger instead of a remote or theoretical possibility (because of a shift from the optative mood to the indicative in the conditional sentence of v 14). Yet suffering was as much a present reality back in 1:6–7 as it is here; there is little if anything in 4:12–14 that is more intense in its depiction of suffering than those verses in the first chapter—and the theme of vv 15–19 is little more than a reiteration of themes from part two (cf., e.g., 2:15–16, 18–20, and 3:13–17).

What then distinguishes part three of the letter from part two? Strictly speaking, the division marker in 2:11 was not the term "Dear friends" by itself, but the whole expression, "Dear friends, I appeal to you." In part three, the words, "I appeal to you," do not appear at 4:12 but are deferred to 5:1: "To any elders among you, therefore, I appeal as fellow elder." A possible distinction, therefore, between part two and part three of 1 Peter is that the latter is focused specifically on the elders of the congregations being addressed (at least the ones

that had elders). The parallel with 2:11 suggests that already in 4:12 the author's real intent is to make his appeal to the elders. The effect is to make the vague expressions of mutuality in 4:7–11 ("to one another" or "toward each other") more specific. The point the author is coming to is that the "elders" must fulfill their obligation to the "younger" (i.e., the rest of the congregation), and that the "younger," accordingly' must defer to their leadership (5:1–5).

If this is the case, what is the purpose of the intervening section (4:12–19)? This material is not, for the most part, new to the author's argument. In one sense it is a digression; Peter cannot resist going over the ground he has covered in part two one more time, and he does so with eloquence. In another sense, however, it lays an indispensable basis for the direct appeal to elders coming up in 5:1–4. The judgment "beginning from the house of God" in 4:17 alludes to an ancient judgment described in Ezek 9:6 as beginning from the "elders" of Israel (see *Form/Structure/Setting* on 4:12–19). The purpose of 4:12–19 is thus to provide a reason for focusing on elders in the congregations of Asia Minor. Having addressed his "dear friends" generally as "aliens and strangers" in 2:11, Peter now stakes out common ground with the elders among them "as your fellow elder and witness" (5:1), in order to build cohesion in the face of social threats to the people of God in the Roman Empire.

There is thus a kind of overlapping effect between part two and part three of 1 Peter. On the one hand, the plea for faithfulness in the face of a "fiery ordeal" in 4:12–19 reiterates the encouragement in suffering and the exhortations to do good expressed in part two (e.g., 2:15–16, 18–25; 3:13–4:6). On the other, the admonition to mutual love, hospitality, and ministry in 4:7–11 anticipates the main theme of part three as it becomes explicit in 5:1–5 (cf. especially the accent on mutuality in v 5). The two passages have in common an emphasis not only on the corporate life of the Christian community as the key to its survival but also on God himself as the source and center of that corporate life. The God-centered character of 4:10–11 is echoed in 5:5, and even more in 5:6–11, with its concluding doxology (5:11, corresponding to 4:11b).

The final greetings in 5:12–14 help frame the epistle as a whole by their correspondence to the introductory greetings in 1:1–2 (e.g., "Babylon" in v 13 answers to "diaspora," while "chosen along with you," v 12, corresponds to "chosen people" in 1:1). The preceding discussion yields the following outline of 1 Peter:

I. Greeting (1:1–2)
II. The Identity of the People of God (1:3–2:10)
1. A Great Salvation (1:3–12)
   i. Salvation as Hope (1:3–5)
   ii. Salvation as Joy (1:6–9)
   iii. The Witnesses of Salvation (1:10–12)
2. A New Way of Life (1:13–25)
   i. A Life of Holiness (1:13–16)
   ii. A Life of Reverence (1:17–21)
   iii. A Life of Genuine Love (1:22–25)
3. A Chosen Priesthood (2:1–10)
   i. Receiving the Word (2:1–3)
   ii. Coming to Christ in Worship (2:4–5)
   iii. Argument from Scripture (2:6–8)

iv. An Identity Affirmed (2:9–10)

III. The Responsibilities of the People of God (2:11–4:11)

1. The Mission of God's People in the World (2:11–12)
2. Respect: The Key to Living in the World (2:13–3:12)
   i. Respect for Everyone (2:13–17)
   ii. Deference of Slaves to Masters (2:18–25)
   iii. Deference of Wives to Husbands (3:1–6)
   iv. Respect of Husbands for Wives (3:7)
   v. Once More: Respect for Everyone (3:8–12)
3. The Promise of Vindication (3:13–4:6)
   i. Suffering for Doing Good (3:13–17)
   ii. The Vindication of Christ (3:18–22)
   iii. Living for the Promise (4:1–6)
4. Mutual Love: The Key to Christian Community in the End Time (4:7–11)

IV. The Responsibilities of a Church and Its Elders (4:12–5:11)

1. The Fiery Trial (4:12–19)
   i. Suffering and Glory (4:12–14
   ii. Suffering as a Christian (4:15–19)
2. The Responsibilities of a Church under Judgment (5:1–11)
   i. The Elders (5:1–4)
   ii. The Rest of the Congregation (5:5)
   iii. Humility and Trust in God (5:6–7)
   iv. Warfare against the Devil (5:8–11)

V. Final Greetings and Benediction (5:12–14)

1 Peter, when outlined in this way, appears to be tightly structured, a single letter composed all at one time and actually sent. Yet some have found reason to question its integrity, largely on the basis of a supposed break after 4:11 (e.g., the doxology in 4:11b is as appropriate an ending to the body of a letter as the doxology in 5:11). It has been suggested (by C. F. D. Moule and others) that a "first edition" of the letter (consisting of 1:3–4:11) dealt with persecution as a rather remote possibility (evidenced by the optatives of 3:14, 17) and that a postscript was added later (consisting of 4:12–5:11) in which it is announced that the "fiery trial" has now broken out and that the last judgment is near. Such a theory would not violate the integrity of the letter if the postscript was added before the letter was actually sent. But if 4:12–5:11 is a second communication, or the fragment of one, then 1 Peter as we have it is a composite work.

In any case, the question remains whether the epistolary ending in 5:12–14 once followed directly on 4:11, or whether it was added along with 4:12–5:11. The possibilities seem almost endless. Moule suggested that two forms of the letter were sent, one for congregations not yet under actual persecution, consisting of 1:1–4:11 and 5:12–14, and a more terse and urgent one for those actually in the "fiery trial"—the latter consisting of 1:1–2:10 and 4:12–5:14. Even the genre of 1 Peter (see below) has come into the discussion. Was 1 Peter in its entirety an actual letter? Many scholars in the first half of this century (e.g., Windisch, Preisker, Beare) argued that while 4:12–5:11 is epistolary in character and aimed at a specific situation in a specific church, 1:3–4:11 is not (both 1:1–2 and 5:12–14 are, according to this hypothesis, said to belong with 4:12–5:11). The whole of 1:3–4:11 is said to lack any reference to a particular life situation and to be characterized by rhetorical eloquence and an impressive homiletical style (as, e.g., in 1:3–12). Thus 1:1–2

and 4:12–5:14 are said to constitute an actual letter into which something quite different has been incorporated: in some reconstructions a baptismal homily, in others a baptismal liturgy, consisting of 1:3–4:11.

Whether or not even this violates the integrity of 1 Peter depends on whether these somewhat disparate elements were the work of a single person or group, and whether the combining of them was the work of the same person or group. Much attention has been given to the supposed baptismal character of 1:3–4:11. The only explicit reference to baptism is in 3:21, but previous references to spiritual rebirth (1:3, 23; 2:2) have fueled a number of baptismal hypotheses, some of them quite elaborate. H. Preisker, in his revision of the commentary of H. Windisch, imagined a complete liturgy made up of a "prayer-psalm" (1:3–12), followed by a teaching discourse (1:13–21) leading up to the baptism of the candidates between 1:21 and 1:22 (the act of baptism itself is unmentioned, according to the theory, because it was a ritual that Christians kept secret); a short dedication follows (1:22–25), then a "festal song" ascribed to a charismatic (2:1–10), an exhortation (2:11–3:12), and so on (see F. W. Beare for a complete summary). This tour de force is mentioned only to show how quickly scholarly hypotheses can get out of hand. F. L. Cross, who viewed the baptismal liturgy as part of an Easter or Christian Passover liturgy, saw in 1 Peter an opening prayer (1:3–12), a formal charge to the candidates (1:13–21), a welcome to the newly baptized (1:22–25), an address on the sacramental life leading up to the Lord's Supper (2:1–10), an address on the duties of discipleship (2:11–4:6), and final admonitions and doxology (4:7–11). Even the last section (4:12–5:11) is not a real epistle in his construction but an address to the whole congregation gathered with the newly baptized candidates.

The difficulty with theories of this kind is their failure to explain why such varied liturgical materials were taken up into a letter to be sent to presumably distant congregations that knew nothing of the original setting. Or, if the letter was not actually sent, why the letter format was adopted at all. Several features argue for the basic integrity of 1 Peter as a real epistle: (1) There is no manuscript evidence for any break at 4:11 or any other point in 1 Peter. (2) As we have noted, the awareness of a "fiery trial" is evident not only in 4:12 but in 1:6–7 as well. (3) The expression "Dear friends … I appeal to you," is common both to 1:3–4:11 and 4:12–5:11, and analogies with certain forms of address in the letters of Paul and others in the N^T suggest that this terminology is characteristic of early Christïan epistles in general (see *Form/Structure/Setting* on 2:11–12. (4) Also characteristic of N^T letter writers (especially Paul) is the incorporation of both catechetical and liturgical material into epistles to individuals (e.g. 1-2 Timothy, Titus), to specific congregations (e.g. Philippians, Romans, Colossians), and even wider audiences, regional or worldwide (e.g. Ephesians). When this is the case, it is a matter of relatively small units of tradition, not a whole liturgy or catechism, and there is no reason to think it is otherwise in 1 Peter. The evidence for homiletical or liturgical elements in this letter is more appropriately assessed under the heading of "sources" (see below) than as an issue affecting integrity.

The unity and integrity of 1 Peter will be the working basis of this commentary, with only one small qualification. Previous discussion has centered on the presumed break after 4:11 but without giving adequate attention to the function of 4:7–11 in the letter as a whole. This brief section makes two basic points: first, that the "end of all things" is near (4:7a); second, and consequently, that Christians must make a concerted effort to minister and show love and hospitality to each other in their respective congregations. What is striking is that these are the same two issues addressed in 4:12–5:11, except that in the longer passage ministry

is the work of the elders, who deserve deference and respect for their faithful labors (5:1–5). The widely disparate length of the two sections conceals the fact that to some degree they are doublets. If we take the text of 1 Peter as it stands, 4:12–5:11 can be regarded as an elaboration of 4:7–11 with particular application to those congregations ruled by elders. If there is a distinction between the two sections, it has to do with congregational structure, not with the degree of intensity of persecution or of the expectation of the end. Viewed in this light, 1 Peter becomes an all-purpose circular letter to a large number of distant congregations largely unknown to the author. He assumes that some of these congregations have elders like his own (he calls himself an elder in 5:1) and that others do not (cf. the absence of the designation "elder" in all the letters of Paul except for the Pastorals). The admonitions in 4:7–11 would be applicable to all, but those in 5:1–5 only to the first group. Wherever there were authority structures based on seniority, it was helpful to appeal to these and build on them for the sake of fostering cohesion in the face of the ever real threat of persecution. Presumably it would be at the discretion of the person delivering the letter (Silvanus, 5:12; see *Comment*), and of the leadership of each individual congregation (whether elders or not) to determine which directives to emphasize.

Another possibility is that the author had direct or indirect acquaintance with a few congregations that he knew were under the leadership of elders. This would help to explain his rather more explicit language in 4:12–19. It is intriguing to wonder whether the mention in Tertullian (*Scorpiace* 12, citing 1 Pet 2:20–21 and 4:12–16) of Peter's letter to "the Christians of Pontus" (rather than to all five provinces mentioned in 1:1) could reflect a traditional awareness of a single congregation (or at least a smaller grouping of congregations) to which the author particularly wished to speak (cf. also Cyprian, *Treatises* 36, 37, 39: "the Epistle of Peter to them of Pontus," citing 1 Pet 3:4, 4:15–16, and 2:21–23, respectively). Such a theory cannot be proven, for "Pontus" may be simply a cipher for the five provinces, yet it remains a possibility that for some congregations the "operative" letter from Peter (i.e., the one to which they were meant to pay attention) was 1 Pet 1:1–4:11, 5:12–14, while for others it was 1:1–4:6; 4:12–5:14. With regard to the first of these sequences, the "surprise" of 4:12 appropriately picks up the "surprise" of 4:4 (see Comment on 4:12); with regard to the second, the "grace" of 5:12 follows as well the reference to "grace" in 4:10 as it does the "grace" of 5:10. Whatever distinctions may have existed among the recipient congregations, however, the simplest hypothesis is that Peter's epistle functioned among them as a single unified piece of correspondence.

Sources and Literary Affinities

If most of the features in 1 Peter that are thought to call its integrity into question are actually attributable to the sources used in the letter, it is necessary to look more closely at those sources. Because the Jewish scriptures are the only source explicitly acknowledged by the author, they are the place to start, but attention must be given as well to the Gospel tradition, to rhetorical or hymnic forms familiar to the author in connection with Christian worship or instruction, and to other known writings such as the letters of Paul.

Scripture

The author of 1 Peter quotes the LX^{x} explicitly in 1:16 (Lev 19:2, introduced by dioti

gegraptai oti, "for it is written that"), 1:24–25 (Isa 40:6–8, introduced by dioti, "for"), 2:6 (Isa 28:16, introduced by dioti periecei en grafh, "for it says in writing") and 3:10–12 (Ps 33[34]:13–17, introduced by gar, "for"). In other places he weaves into his argument the words of Scripture without signaling a formal quotation: as, e.g. in 2:3 (cf. Ps 33[34]:9), 2:7–8 (cf. Ps 117[118]:22, Isa 8:14), 2:22–25 (cf. Isa 53:4–12), 3:14–15 (cf. Isa 8:12–13), 4:18 (cf. Prov 11:31), and 5:5b (cf. Prov 3:34). In still others he alludes in passing to the biblical history generally (as in 1:10–12; 4:6), or to specific passages or stories from the Scripture, as, e.g. in 1:22 (cf. Jer 6:15), 2:9 (cf. Exod 19:6; Isa 43:20–21), 2:10 (cf. Hos 1:9–2:1; 2:13), 3:6 (Sarah and Abraham; cf. Gen 18:12), 3:20 (the Noah story), 3:22 (cf. Pss 8:7; 110:1), 4:8 (cf. Prov 10:12), 4:14 (cf. Isa 11:2), 5:8 (cf. Ps 21[22]:14); see *Comment* on these texts.

Whatever the author's manner of introducing Scripture, he consistently brings to it a Christian, often Christological, interpretation. For instance, those called to be holy are the Christian readers of the epistle (1:15). The "word of the Lord" that remains forever is the gospel of Jesus Christ (1:25); Jesus is both the "choice precious Stone, a cornerstone in Zion" (2:4, 6), and the sinless and guileless servant of Isa 53 (2:22–25). Sarah's use of the term "Lord" in addressing Abraham sets for Christian wives an example of deference to their husbands (3:6). The Psalmist's promises to "those who choose to love life and to see good days" are promises of vindication to Christian believers in the face of impending persecution (3:10–12). They, consequently, are the ones told to "have no fear," and the "Lord" they are to "revere" is Jesus Christ (3:14–15). The "humble" to whom God "gives grace" are the Christians, and the "proud" whom God opposes are their oppressors (5:5b). Clearly the Jewish scriptures are a major source for the author of 1 Peter, and an authority to which he appeals at decisive points.

GOSPEL TRADITION

There has been lively debate about the extent of Peter's use of the Gospel tradition. R. H. Gundry argued for a large number of allusions to sayings of Jesus, centering particularly on material linked in the tradition to the Apostle Peter (cf. also the studies of C. Spicq and G. Maier). E. Best, on the other hand, found only a few of the proposed allusions convincing. It is well to focus on instances about which there is something close to consensus. The most convincing parallels are to sayings from the Sermon on the Mount, whether in its Matthean or Lukan form: e.g. Matt 5:10, Luke 6:22//1 Pet 3:14; Matt 5:11//1 Pet 4:14a; Matt 5:12//1 Pet 1:8, 4:13; Matt 5:16//1 Pet 2:12; Luke 6:28//1 Pet 3:9, 16; Luke 6:32–34//1 Pet 2:19–20. The "impartiality" of the allusions (as between Matthew and Luke) suggests that Peter is drawing not on the finished Gospels but on pre-Synoptic tradition (i.e. the Q material in some form). References to being "born again" (anagennan) in 1 Pet 1:3, 22 (cf. 2:2) may well be derived from a variant form of the sayings attributed to Jesus in John 3:3,5 (cf. anagennhqhte in Justin, Justin, *Apol.* 1.61.3), but there is no way to be certain. The same is true of the sayings of Jesus about help from the Holy Spirit in time of persecution (i.e. Mark 13:11; Matt 10:19–20; Luke 12:11–12) and about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (i.e. Mark 3:28–30//Matt 12:31–32; Luke 12:10) in relation to 1 Pet 4:14 (the latter question is complicated by the textual question in 4:14b).

Beyond this, suggested parallels to 1 Peter in Luke 12 (e.g. 12:11//1 Pet 3:15–16; 12:22//1 Pet 5:7; 12:33//1 Pet 1:4; 12:35//1 Pet 1:13; 12:42//1 Pet 4:10) and elsewhere are

problematic. Although the verb grhgorhsate, "wake up," in 1 Pet 5:8 echoes the Gospel tradition (e.g. Luke 12:37; Matt 24:42, 25:13; Mark 13:37; Mark 14:37–38//Matt 26:40–41), both the tense of the verb (aorist instead of the present grhgoreite) and the accompanying verb nhyate, "pay attention" (cf. 4:7), indicate that 1 Peter is not drawing directly on sayings of Jesus but relying instead on common catechetical material developed earlier from such sayings (as, e.g. in 1 Thess 5:6, 8; Rev 3:2, 3). The same is probably true of such parallels as Mark 10:45//1 Pet 1:18; Matt 11:29//1 Pet 1:22a; John 13:34–35//1 Pet 1:22b; Mark 12:13–17//1 Pet 2:13–17; and Matt 23:12, Luke 14:11, 18:14//1 Pet 5:6.

The preceding examples demonstrate that, for the most part, the parallels in 1 Peter to the Gospel tradition are of the same type as in the letters of Paul. An additional factor, however, is the place of the Apostle Peter himself in the Gospel story: e.g. as the rock on which the Church will be built (Matt 16:18–19; cf. 1 Pet 2:4–5), as the undershepherd of Christ's flock (John 21:15–17; cf. 1 Pet 2:25; 5:1–4), or as one whom Satan desires to conquer (Luke 22:31–32; cf. 1 Pet 5:8). These parallels are thought by some (e.g. Gundry, Spicq) to have a bearing on the issue of Peter's authorship of the epistle, and are, consequently, better assessed in that connection (see below).

If there is a recurring theme in the Petrine use of the Gospel tradition, it is a consistent interest in the command of Jesus, "Love your enemies." Although Luke 6:35 ("Love your enemies and do good") is nowhere cited in 1 Peter, the sentiment it expresses governs much of the argument of part two (2:11–4:11; cf. e.g. 2:12, 15, 17, 18–20, 23; 3:1–2, 9, 10–12, 15–16; 4:1; see also 4:19). The ethical thrust of the epistle is to equate the radical command to love one's enemies with the doing of good in a variety of social situations in Roman society.

RHETORICAL AND HYMNIC FORMS

Certain passages in 1 Peter exhibit a style and structure so distinctive as to suggest other sources beyond the Jewish scriptures and the Gospel tradition.

1. The most extensive block of such material is the so-called household duty code consisting of 2:18–3:7 (or 2:13–3:9, depending on one's definition) and perhaps echoed in 5:5 as well. Such codes were a semi-stereotyped way of setting forth the obligations of various groups within the Greco-Roman household: slaves and masters, wives and husbands, children and parents, the young and the old (see *Form/Structure/Setting* on 2:13–17).

There is no specific known household code that Peter can be clearly shown to have used as a source. It is more a matter of adopting or imitating the form than of taking over some particular literary expression of that form. The simplest N^T example of the code, Col 3:18–4:1, has been expanded and interpreted in certain important respects in Eph 5:21–6:9. The version of the code found in 1 Peter differs from both of these in that slaves are addressed but not masters, wives at some length but husbands only in a single verse, and children and parents not at all. The address to the "younger" in 5:5 appears to be modeled on the form of the household duty code (cf. Pol. *Phil.* 4–6; *1 Cle*^{m} 1.3) even though its context in 1 Peter is not the household but the Christian congregation. The address to the "elders" in 5:1–4, on the other hand, is thoroughly at home in the ecclesiastical context Peter has given it, with no apparent kinship to the household duty codes (see *Form/Structure/Setting* on 5:1–5).

The other distinctive feature of the household duty code in 1 Peter is its orientation toward those outside the Christian community, i.e., toward actual or potential enemies. This emphasis comes to expression first in a prefaced section on the responsibilities of Christian believers to all their fellow citizens, in particular to the emperor and his local representatives (2:13–17). It continues with specific mention of deference to cruel masters (2:18–20) and unbe lieving husbands (3:1–2) and concludes with the appended in 3:9 not to "return evil for evil, or insult for insult, but on the contrary, bless—for this is what you are called to do" (cf. 2:23). The traditional household duty code functions in 1 Peter in much the same way as do the sayings of Jesus: the command to "submit" or "defer" to those in authority (whether in the household or in society at large) is drawn into the circle of "love your enemies" and "do good" in order to provide the readers with a pattern for living under difficult circumstances.

2. A number of passages in 1 Peter are said to have been taken from early Christian hymns or creedal formulations. Although in principle this is a plausible suggestion, it is far from easy to disentangle the traditional elements from the author's own impressive and imaginative rhetoric (demonstrated, e.g., in 1:6–9, 10–12; 4:12–14). The most convincing examples to be proposed are 1:18–21, 2:21–25, and 3:18–22 (1:3–5 is too integral a part of the author's introduction to the body of his letter to warrant serious consideration). Each of the three begins with a phrase that might be understood as transitional to a source of some kind: "as you know" (lit., "knowing that," eidote" oti) in 1:18; and "for Christ also" (oti kai Cristo") in 2:21 and 3:18 (both times with the verb "suffered").

The case for a hymnic or creedal source is weakest in 2:21–25, where the author's language is adequately explained by his use of Isa 53:4–12 (see *Form/Structure/Setting* on 2:18–25). In 1:18–21 the contrast between corruptible things like gold or silver and the "precious blood of Christ," introduced by ou … alla ("not … but"), is probably attributable to the author's own style rather than to a source (cf. a similar contrast in 1:23). So too is the play of sounds (cf. 1:4) in the expression w amnou amwmou kai aspilou ("like that of a faultless and flawless lamb"). The most "hymnic" feature, and the one most likely to have come from a source, is the contrast in v 20 between the participial phrases, "foreknown before the creation of the world" and "appeared in the last of the ages." 1 Peter has little interest elsewhere in the world's beginnings, and the appearing or "revelation" of Christ everywhere else in the letter is future (e.g., 5:4: cf. 1:7, 13; 4:13). v 20 has the look of a hymnic fragment focused on the situation of the readers by the phrase di¼ uma" ("for your sake") with which the verse concludes (see Comment on 1:20). Participles are also the key to the reconstruction of a possible source in 3:18–22, built around three rather symmetrical expressions, "put to death in the flesh … made alive in the spirit … gone to heaven" (see *Form/Structure/ Setting* on 3:18–22). Beyond this it is possible that the author may be drawing on traditional creedal formulations in v 18 and v 22, but the text resists any clear distinction between source and redaction.

LITERARY AFFINITIES

It might seem easier to prove the dependence of 1 Peter on known literary documents than on purely hypothetical sources, but in actuality it is not. There is, e.g., no conclusive evidence that 1 Peter knows or makes use of any of the letters of Paul (contrast 2 Pet 3:15–16). There are parallels with Ephesians and Colossians (e.g., the household duty

codes: also 1 Pet 2:4–5//Eph 2:19–22), but they are not of the kind that suggests literary dependence. The same is true of James. The parallels between 1 Peter and James are attributable to a common use of either the same biblical texts (e.g., James 1:10–11//1 Pet 1:23–24; James 4:6–7//1 Pet 5:5–6) or similar codes of ethical instruction (e.g., James 1:2//1 Pet 1:6; James 4:7//1 Pet 5:6, 8; see *Form/Structure/Setting* on 5:6–11).

Somewhat more convincing are a few parallels with Romans, a letter of Paul addressed to the very city from which 1 Peter was probably written. For example the conjunction of two texts from Isaiah, 28:16 and 8:14, is found both in Rom 9:33 and 1 Pet 2:6, 8 (but not in Matt 21:42, Acts 4:11, or *Barn.* 6.2). Where Paul applies the combined citation to Israel's failure to attain the righteousness she sought (Rom 9:31–32), Peter applies it to all (Jew and Gentile alike) who reject the Christian message. 1 Pet 2:13–14 could be appropriately read as a clarifying interpretation of Rom 13:1–4 in which such vague expressions as "the higher authorities" (13:1), "the authority" (13:1–2), or "the rulers" (13:3) are concretized as "the emperor" (1 Pet 2:13; cf. v 17), or "magistrates … sent by him" (2:14). Paul's vagueness is perhaps attributable to his emphasis on imperial authority as the Christian's protection (e.g., Rom 13:4a). To say too loudly or too clearly, "The emperor is our protector," would risk alienating hostile elements in the population and put the emperor in the delicate position of appearing to cater to a special interest group if he fulfilled Paul's expectation. Because 1 Peter has no such emphasis (not even in v 14), and because it is in any case written to communities far removed from the seat of imperial power, there is no risk in speaking plainly, and Peter does so.

The admonitions of 1 Pet 3:8–9 and the advice to congregations in 1 Pet 4:7–11 echo in several respects Paul's advice to the congregations at Rome itself in Rom 12, while the list of pagan vices in 1 Pet 4:3 recalls a similar list in Rom 13:13. The style and structure of 1 Pet 4:6 is strangely reminiscent of Paul's formulation about the work of Christ in Rom 14:9. In each of these instances, the parallel between Romans and 1 Peter is consistent with a direct literary relationship between the two letters, but by no means requires it. The thought that 1 Peter, written from Rome, shows the positive influence of Romans, written by the Apostle Paul to Rome, is intriguing, but the case remains unproven. Even where 1 Peter appears to be reflecting the thought or language of Paul, it always develops the Pauline ideas, images, or proof texts in such an independent fashion that a direct literary relationship is difficult to establish.

The uncertainty is even greater with respect to Hebrews, another first-century document that may have been written to Rome. The reference to Christian believers as "aliens and strangers" (1 Pet 2:11:cf. 1:1) parallels the description of Abraham and Sarah and their predecessors in Heb 11:13, in agreement with Peter's own notion of biblical saints and prophets as Christians before the coming of Christ (cf. 1 Pet 1:11; 3:6). The single verse, 1 Pet 4:6, is appropriately read as a capsule summary of a list of biblical heroes similar to that in Hebrews 11 (see Comment on 4:6; for the idea that the pre-Christian dead were "evangelized," cf. Heb 4:2, 6). The reference in 1Pet 4:1 to Christ being "through with sin" (see *Comment*) is illumined by such passages as Heb 4:15 and 9:28 ("apart from sin") and 7:26 ("separated from sinners"). Examples of this kind could be multiplied, but again they fall short of proving literary dependence either way. They are equally well explained by a common time (the latter half of the first century) and perhaps too by a common orientation to the Christian community at Rome. If Peter knows and makes literary use of any contemporary Christian document, he is independent enough in his own purposes that his

reliance on it remains well concealed.

AUDIENCE: GENTILE CHRISTIANS

Any discussion of the audience of 1 Peter should begin with a caution: the fact that the epistle is directed to a circle of churches located over a wide geographical area and apparently far away from the author and his own congregation means that he may not have known specifically the ethnic and social composition of his audience. The question of audience must therefore be addressed from the author's limited point of view. What assumptions—right or wrong—did he make about the individuals and congregations to whom he was writing? It must be acknowledged at the outset that 1 Peter sends mixed signals in answer to this question. The phrase "exiles of the dispersion" (or diaspora) in 1:1 builds on the notion of the Jews as a people scattered in the world ever since the Babylonian captivity of 586 B.C. (or, for the ten northern tribes, the Assyrian invasion of 721). The clear impression is that the readers of the epistle are Jewish Christians (for an even more distinctly Jewish expression in a Christian document, cf. "twelve tribes of the diaspora" in James 1:1). The impression is reinforced in 1 Pet 2:11, where the readers are called "aliens and strangers" in the cities and provinces where they live, and in 1:17, where they are told to "spend your allotted time … in reverent fear" in their places of exile.
No N^T letter is so consistently addressed, directly or indirectly, to "Israel," that is (on the face of it) to Jews. Jesus Christ is described in 2:1–10 as a cornerstone laid "in Zion" (2:6), while the community that trusts in him is called "a chosen race, the king's priesthood, a holy nation, a people destined for vindication—all to sound the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (2:9). The extended description comes from Exod 19:6 and Isa 43:21, biblical passages that referred originally to the Jews in their desert wanderings. Yet the exile and not the exodus is the dominant theme in 1 Peter. The author's reference point is not so much Israel before she had a land (contrast Heb 11:13) as Israel dispossessed of her land. Even the place of origin claimed for the epistle—Babylon (5:13)—contributes to this impression.

The same perspective governs the way in which those outside the community are described. They are "Gentiles" (2:12; 4:3), apparently in contrast to the Christian readers of the epistle who think of themselves as "Jews." The mission of Christian believers in 1 Peter is viewed in much the same way as that of the Jews in the Jewish apocalypse of Baruch: "I will scatter this people among the Gentiles that they may do good to the Gentiles" (*2 Apoc. Bar.* 1.4). So successful was the author of 1 Peter in appearing to write to Jews that the Christian historian Eusebius in the fourth century A.D. took him at his word. Peter, he claims, "wrote to those of the Hebrews in the Dispersion of Pontus and Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" because he had preached Christ "to those of the circumcision" in that part of the world (HE 3.4.2–3; cf. 3.1.2). Many commentators on 1 Peter through the centuries have followed Eusebius in that judgment.

Yet in the face of all this evidence, there is a near consensus that 1 Peter was in fact directed to a predominantly Gentile Christian audience. Peter reminds his readers of "the impulses that once drove you in your ignorance" (1:14), and of "the empty way of life that was your heritage" (1:18). They are "believers in God" not by virtue of their ancestral religion but only through Jesus Christ, who was raised from the dead "so that your faith and

hope might be in God"—implying that previously it was not (1:21). Later in the epistle we are told plainly: "There was time enough in the past to have done what the Gentiles wanted, as you went along with them in acts of immorality and lust, drunken orgies, feasts, revelries, and lawless acts of idolatry. Therefore they are surprised when you do not plunge with them into the same flood of dissipation. Blasphemers, they will answer to the One who stands ready to judge the living and the dead" (4:3–5).

Such words are scarcely intelligible in relation to a Jewish Christian audience. They describe how Jews as well as Christians regarded the Gentile world, not how Christians (or anyone else) ever regarded the Jews. Even in 2:10, immediately after such distinctly Jewish designations as "a chosen race," "the king's priesthood," "a holy nation," and "a people destined for vindication," Peter adds significantly, "Once you were no people but now you are God's people; once destitute of mercy you have now received mercy." These words, drawn loosely from Hos 2:23, do double duty from the author's perspective, for they rehearse the experience both of ancient Israel and of the contemporary Gentile Christians in Asia Minor to whom the epistle was actually sent. The best explanation of the data is that 1 Peter was written primarily to Gentile Christians in Asia Minor, but that the author, for his own reasons, has chosen to address them as if they were Jews.

GENRE: AN APOCALYPTIC DIASPORA LETTER TO "ISRAEL"

Even though the testimony of Eusebius is not a reliable guide to the audience of 1 Peter, his mistake was a natural one. He perceived that 1 Peter was a diaspora letter, and in fact the diaspora letter in Judaism was a well-known means of formal communication from Jerusalem to Jewish communities scattered in Babylon (Jer 29:4–23), Assyria (*2 Apoc. Bar.* 78–87), or Egypt (2 Macc l:l–10a; 1:10b–2:18). That this epistolary form influenced early Christian correspondence can be seen not only from the Epistle of James (1:1) but from the letter of the Jerusalem Council (also attributed to James) addressed "to the brothers in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia who are Gentiles" (Acts 15:23–29). Like the Jerusalem letter in the Book of Acts, 1 Peter is addressed to Gentiles and is even written "through Silvanus" (5:12; cf. Acts 15:22–23a: "Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders to choose … Judas called Barsabbas, and Silas [evidently the same as Silvanus: BG^{D,} 750], leading men among the brethren, having written [the letter] through their hand" (the letter itself follows in Acts 15:23b–29). Unlike the Jerusalem letter, however, 1 Peter does not address its audience explicitly as Gentiles but as Jews facing the hostility of "Gentiles" in the Roman provinces. Unlike all other diaspora letters, 1 Peter claims as its place of origin not Jerusalem, as the genre seems to require, but "Babylon," symbolically the place of exile par excellence, and geographically (in all likelihood) Rome (see Comment on 5:13). Even the Christian epistle of James was probably no exception to the rule that diaspora letters were sent from Jerusalem. Although its place of origin is not stated, the strength of traditions associating James with Jerusalem could well have made an explicit claim to that effect unnecessary.

In many other respects, 1 Peter and James form a matched pair within the N^{T} canon. They are Christian diaspora letters roughly similar in length, one directed (probably from Jerusalem) to scattered messianic Jews (i.e. Christians) who are real Jews, and the other directed from "Babylon" to scattered "Jews" who are in fact Gentile Christians. Their status

as a pair is indirectly confirmed by the presence in the canon of two other short epistles: 2 Peter, which defines itself as "second" (2 Pet 3:1) in relation to a "first" letter of Peter, and Jude (close to 2 Peter in content), whose author identifies himself right at the start as "brother of James" (Jude 1).

If this is a genuine grouping in the N^T canon, what does it imply? A possible answer may be found in Gal 2:7–10, where Paul tells of his visit to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus to meet the "pillars" of the Jewish Christian congregation there—James, Peter, and John. According to Paul, "they saw that I had been given the task of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, just as Peter had been given the task of preaching the gospel to the Jews. For God, who was at work in the ministry of Peter as an apostle to the Jews, was also at work in my ministry as an apostle to the Gentiles. James, Peter, and John, those reputed to be pillars, gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship when they recognized the grace given to me. They agreed that we should go to the Gentiles, and they to the Jews. All they asked was that we should continue to remember the poor, the very thing I was eager to do."

It appears that this parceling out of the world has contributed in some measure to the formation of the N^T canon. Paul's share of the mission is reflected in the twelve or thirteen letters ascribed to him in the $N^{T,}$ all presuming a predominantly Gentile Christian audience (sometimes explicitly, as in Romans). James's mission to the Jews as agreed on in the meeting mentioned in Gal 2 is represented by the Epistle of James, and that of John by the apocalyptic circular letter commonly known as the Book of Revelation. Peter's part in the same Jewish mission finds its canonical expression in 1 Peter. The fact that the epistle's actual readership is Gentile does not change the fact that its genre is that of a diaspora letter to Israel. The agreement involving Paul, Barnabas, Peter, James, and John was one thing; the actual development of the mission was quite another. Paul and Barnabas were to go to the Gentiles, Peter and James and John to the Jews. As it turned out, the Gentile mission seems to have grown and flourished to the extent that it required the attention not only of Paul and Barnabas, but of Peter and John as well. Peter is represented in the Book of Acts as announcing to the elders at Jerusalem that "from the early days among you God chose that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe" (Acts 15:7). 1 Peter stands as further evidence that by the last decades of the first century a wide circle of Gentile churches in Asia Minor were understood as falling within the scope of Peter's authority. Yet they are addressed here as Jews, or the true Israel, perhaps because the Jewish community was still understood as the proper sphere of Peter's ministry according to the agreement described in Galatians.

The presence of the Book of Revelation in the N^{T-a} long apocalyptic letter attributed to John, another party to the Jerusalem agreement—raises the further question whether 1 Peter is also in any sense an apocalyptic letter. Although the concluding reference to "Babylon" gives the letter a vaguely apocalyptic cast, there are no formal features characterizing 1 Peter as "apocalyptic" in any genetic sense. Yet at least one of the Jewish diaspora letters, *2 Apoc. Bar.* 78–87, is appended to an apocalypse and is distinctly apocalyptic in its content. It is a letter "to the nine and a half tribes which were across the river," that is to the "brothers who were carried away in captivity" (78.1). Baruch the seer says at the end, "I folded it, sealed it cautiously, and bound it to the neck of the eagle. And I let it go and sent it away. The end of the letter of Baruch, the son of Neriah" (87.1). The use of the eagle as messenger implies that the letter is a message from God himself (cf. Baruch's letter to Jeremiah in Bar. 7.1–23).

This apocalyptic diaspora letter is especially rich in parallels to 1 Peter (parallels in thought, not in terminology), e.g., *2 Apoc. Bar.* 78.3, "Grace and peace be with you" (cf. 1 Pet 1:2, and almost all N^T letters); 78.3, "the love of him who created me" (cf. 1 Pet 1:3); 78.4, "Are we not all, the twelve tribes, bound by one captivity as we also descend from one father?" (cf. 1 Pet 5:9, "your brotherhood throughout the world"); 78.6, "if you think about the things you have suffered now for your good so that you may not be condemned at the end and be tormented, you shall receive hope that lasts forever and ever" (cf. 1 Pet 1:6, 13); 82.1, "I have written to you that you may find consolation with regard to the multitude of tribulations" (cf. 1 Pet 5:12); 82.2, "that the end which the Most High prepared is near, and that his grace is coming, and that the fulfillment of his judgment is not far off" (cf. 1 Pet 1:13; 4:7, 17); 82.7, "but like grass which is withering they will fade away" (cf. 1 Pet 1:23); 83.2, "And he will surely judge those who are in his world, and will truly inquire into everything with regard to all their works which were sins" (cf. 1 Pet 1:17; 4:5). Although the parallels are not the kind that suggest literary dependence, both documents exhibit a contrast between present suffering and a distinctly apocalyptic future vindication in the framework of reflection on the Jewish experience of exile and dispersion. The framework is obviously not carried through so consistently in 1 Peter as in *2 Apoc. Bar.* 78–87, for redemption is not viewed in 1 Peter as a regathering of the "exiles," yet the present predicament of the people of God in the world is set forth in a similar way in both letters. 1 Peter is neither an apocalyptic message borne on eagle's wings like *2 Apoc. Bar.* 78–87, nor a vision from God through the risen Christ, like the Book of Revelation. It is "true grace from God" (5:12), a foretaste of the fuller "grace to be brought to you" at the last day "when Jesus Christ is revealed" (1:13), and in that limited sense "apocalyptic" in character.

Implications of Audience and Genre: The Jewishness of 1 Peter

The genre of 1 Peter as a diaspora letter to "Israel" even though its intended audience is predominantly Gentile raises the question of how this author viewed the actual ethnic Jewish communities that must have existed alongside the Christian congregations both in Asia Minor and in Rome. The answer is that Peter simply ignores them; he writes as if they do not exist. Some (e.g., J. H. Elliott) have proposed that, in part at least, they are the enemy, the potential or actual persecutors of Christians. Although this may have been the case to some extent in parts of Asia Minor at a later time (see, e.g., *Mart. Pol.* 12.2–13.1, where Jews are said to have cooperated with the Romans in the execution of Polycarp), there is not a shred of evidence for such a notion in 1 Peter. On the contrary, the slanderers of the Christian movement are consistently viewed as "the Gentiles." Quite likely they slandered the Jews in a similar way and for similar reasons. In 1 Pet 2:4–8, where the author has a golden opportunity to blame the Jews for rejecting and stumbling over Christ, the true cornerstone, he carefully avoids doing so: the Stone is "rejected by people generally," v 4 (cf. 4:6). All kinds of people, not the Jews in particular, are the disobedient "builders" of Ps 118:22. Thus there is no hint of exclusivity or possessiveness in Peter's identification of his Gentile Christian readers as Jews, and therefore as heirs to the ancient Jewish promises (contrast Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 81–82). The actual Jewish community is simply ignored.

In this respect, 1 Peter stands in contrast to most other early Christian uses of such

biblical texts as Ps 118:22. The same text is cited in Matt 21:42–43 to prove that "the kingdom of God will be taken from you [i.e., the Jewish 'high priests and Pharisees,' v 45] and given to a nation [i.e., the Gentile Christian churches] accomplishing its deeds" (the displacement tendency is carried still further in early Christian redaction of the Jewish apocalypse of 4 Ezra: e.g., 4 Ezra 1:24–25, 35; 2:10). Even though Peter designates his Gentile Christian audience as a "holy nation" (2:9), he has no equivalent theme of displacement. Nor does he link his two Isaiah quotations (i.e., 28:16 and 8:14) to Israel's failure to attain its own standards of righteousness (as Paul did in Rom 9:31–33). He has even less in common with the second-century *Epistle of Barnabas* (6.2–4), where the same biblical texts form part of a series of citations about the "Son of God" and his Passion at the hands of "the synagogues of the wicked" (*Barn.* 5.13; cf. 6.6), leading to pronouncements of judgment against Israel (6.7), and promises for Gentile Christians of entering "the good land which the Lord swore he would give to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob … a land flowing with milk and honey" (6.8), so as to become "heirs of the covenant of the Lord" (6.19). More bluntly, the author of *Barnabas* warns his readers to "take heed to yourselves, now, and do not be like some, heaping up your sins and saying that the covenant is both theirs and ours. It is ours; this is how they lost it forever when Moses had just received it … they turned to idols and lost it" (*Barn.* 4.6–8; cf. Exod 32). The reference in *Barnabas* to "some" (tisin) who say that "the covenant is both theirs and ours" (i.e., that is belongs both to the Jews and the Christians) probably has in mind certain "judaizing" Christians (as the author of *Barnabas* regarded them) who did not share the displacement theory. Although the brevity of 1 Peter makes it difficult to be certain, Peter's use of covenant language without any theory of displacement suggests that his epistle fits Barnabas' description rather well. If 1 Peter is indeed written from Rome—a community familiar with Paul's metaphor of Judaism and Christianity as one olive tree, and of Gentile Christians and Jews as heirs to a single covenant (Rom 11:13–24)—such a possibility is all the more attractive.

How can 1 Peter represent a "judaizing" type of Gentile Christianity and at the same time be influenced by Paul? The notion of "judaizing" has been so long associated with Paul's opponents in Galatians, and with the issue of Gentile observance of the Jewish law that it is difficult to think about it in any other way. If 1 Peter were a judaizing document and Peter a judaizing Christian in this sense, the epistle would recall the confrontation between Paul and Peter described in Gal 2:11–14. Yet in fact 1 Peter is as silent about the law and legal observance as it is about the Jews. The law is quite simply not an issue in this epistle (not even in 3:20, where W. J. Dalton has argued for a reference to circumcision in the phrase, "putting away the filth of the flesh"; see Comment). The silence could mean either indifference to legal observance, or a tacit agreement between author and readers as to what kind of legal observance was appropriate. Because it is not easy to tell which is the case, the law is not a helpful starting point.

1 Peter is linked to Judaism not by the law, but by a shared self-understanding. The author sees himself and his readers as a community situated in the world in much the same way the Jews are situated, and sharing with the Jews a common past. This tendency—whether we call it "judaizing" or "philosemitic"—is based on the hearing and acceptance of certain Jewish stories, both biblical and extrabiblical: about prophets and their visions (1 Pet 1:10–12), about evil spirits (3:19) and angels (1:12; 3:22), about Noah and his companions (3:20), about Sarah and Abraham (3:6) and all the righteous dead who believed God's message and were condemned for it (4:6), but most of all about Jesus the

Jewish Messiah (2:21–25; 3:18–19, 22). The last of these stories was what convinced many Gentile Christians that all the other stories—and more—were theirs as well. The Jewish past became their past. If they began to see themselves as "honorary Jews" (Krister Stendahl's term), they also began to see the heroes and heroines of the Jewish stories they loved as "honorary Christians." The prophets had the "Spirit of Christ" in theme (1:11); the wives of the patriarchs "hoped in God" (3:5), even as Gentiles do now by virtue of Jesus' resurrection (1:21); Noah's deliverance "through water" prefigured Christian baptism (3:20–21); the vindication of the righteous dead of the past anticipated that of Christ and Christian believers (4:6). Although he does not use the metaphor, Peter's vision is fully consistent with Paul's notion of one olive tree representing one people of God. Yet Peter bypasses entirely the issue of the Jews' salvation, which both occasioned and dominated Paul's argument in Rom 9–11. Neither the observance of the Jewish law nor the fate of the old Israel is a significant issue in this epistle.

All of this raises the question of where 1 Peter belongs, whether theologically or sociologically, in the emergence of Gentile Christianity as a new religion distinct from Judaism. In particular, what assumptions is the author making about his Gentile Christian readers?

ARE THEY PROSELYTES?

For the sake of Jesus the Jew, and the Jewish heritage they valued so highly, these Gentile Christians were taking on themselves—or trying to—both the praise and contempt that the Jews experienced in Roman society. Although there is no proof that they were actual proselytes to Judaism, they are depicted as doing something rather close to what proselytes were expected to do, i.e. (in the words of one modern Jewish scholar), to "identify fully with the past, present, and future of the Jewish people and live in accord with *halakah*, the Jewish way of life. The Tannaim expected the convert to become part of the nation of Israel and to suffer its collective destiny. It was not, in their view, possible to convert and at the same time to avoid the lot of the Jewish people. Only a convert who understood and was willing to accept the mission of the people of Israel could be accepted for proselytism" (H. Schiffmann, "At the Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition II* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981], 124; cf. a baraita in the Babylonian Talmud, Yeb 47a–b: "A proselyte who comes to convert at this time, we say to him: Why did you decide to convert? Do you not know that Israel at this time is afflicted, oppressed, down-trodden, and rejected, and that tribulations are visited upon them?").

Such descriptions of the proselyte fit the intended readership of 1 Peter quite well. Although Peter makes no mention of *halakah*, or "the Jewish way of life," in the formal sense in which the Tannaim understood it, he does refer frequently to the anastrofh, or pattern of conduct, that he wants to foster among his readers (1:15; 2:12; 3:2, 16; cf. 1:17). Drawing on the "holiness code" prescribed for priests in Leviticus, he writes: "As obedient children, do not yield to the impulses that once drove you in your ignorance, but like the Holy One who called you, be holy in all your conduct, for it is written, 'Be holy because I am holy' " (1 Pet 1:15–16; cf. Lev 19:2; also 11:44; 20:7, 26).

ARE THEY PRIESTS?

The language of priesthood continues in the next chapter, where the Gentile readers of the epistle are described as "a spiritual house for a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (2:5), as well as "a chosen race, the king's priesthood, a holy nation" (2:9). E. G. Selwyn characterizes Peter's understanding of the church as of "a neo-Levitical community, at once sacerdotal and sacrificial" (459–60; cf. 369–72). Similar terminology was applied in ancient Jewish tradition not to a special order of priests but to the entire community of Israel. This is true of Lev 19:2, the text cited in 1 Pet 1:15 (addressed to "all the congregation of the people of Israel"), and it is true of Exod 19:6, to which Peter alludes in 2:9 ("a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," addressed to "the house of Jacob … the people of Israel," 19:3). The priestly notion of holiness is brought to realization in 1 Peter in "conduct," or anastrofh, and in Rabbinic Judaism in *halakah*. Either way it becomes a pattern for living applicable not just to a few but to the entire people of God (cf. also the priestly terminology which the Essene community at Qumran applied to itself in 1Q^{S} 8.5–10, "that tried wall, that precious cornerstone … an agreeable offering, atoning for the land," and 9.4–5, "prayer rightly offered shall be as an acceptable fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of way as a delectable free-will offering").

No one will seriously argue that the Gentile Christians to whom 1 Peter was written were actual proselytes to Judaism, still less that they were priests. Peter is dealing here in metaphors. J. H. Elliott (in *The Elect and the Holy*) has argued convincingly that Peter's priestly language is a metaphor for a sense of election and the basis for an ethical call to holiness. But what links, real or imagined, with Judaism made such metaphors and word plays appropriate or necessary?

Are They God-fearers?

Is it Peter's assumption that some of his readers are—or have been—"God-fearers"? There is no denying the prominence of this group in the Book of Acts, where the terminology appears first in connection with Peter's convert Cornelius (Acts 10:2) and where Peter himself is represented as recognizing the validity of their experience: "Truly I perceive that Cod shows no partiality, but in every nation any one who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him" (10:34–35). The author of 1 Peter probably did not even know which (if any) of the Gentiles he addressed in Asia Minor had already been God-fearers before becoming Christians, and which of them first gained this status by receiving the Christian message from Jewish (or even Gentile) Christian missionaries (cf., e.g., 1:12, 25). In either case he saw them as having come to "hope in God" (the Jewish God) through Jesus Christ (1:21), acquiring thereby the status of Sarah's (and Abraham's) children (3:5–6). Although not Jewish by either birth, circumcision, or full legal observance, they could be addressed as Jews because of their allegiance to the God of the Jews as revealed in Jesus.

Are They Noachians?

Still another factor contributing to Peter's "judaizing" view of his Gentile Christian readers may have been the decision of the Jerusalem Council described in Acts 15:22–29. Gentile converts were to be accepted under "no greater burden than these necessary things: that you abstain for what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from unchastity. If you keep yourselves from these you will do well.

Farewell" (vv 28–29). If there was indeed a tacit agreement on some kind of legal code for Gentile Christians that made it unnecessary for Peter to refer to the Jewish law in his epistle, some form of the Jerusalem decree may well have been its basis (certain variations in wording—e.g., the omission in Codex Bezae [or D] of the phrase, "and from what is strangled," along with the addition of a negative form of the so-called Golden Rule—suggest that the decree may have been interpreted differently in different Gentile communities). Similarities have long been noted between the terms of the Jerusalem Council's decision and the so-called Noachian commandments that were supposed to antedate the law of Moses and to govern the behavior even of Gentiles (cf., e.g., Str-B 2:729–39). Possibly the abrupt references to Noah and the flood in the two NT letters that bear Peter s name (i.e., 1 Pet 3:20–21; 2 Pet 2:5; cf. 2 Pet 3:5–9) are evidence that the readers of these letters were viewed (or viewed themselves) as "Noachians" in the sense of being subject to the terms of the Jerusalem Decree (especially striking is the designation of Noah as a "preacher of righteousness" in 2 Pet 2:5; by contrast, Noah is not mentioned in the Jewish Christian Epistle of Jude, which in most respects closely parallels 2 Pet 2).
Caution is in order on this point, because other explanations lie close at hand. Peter was probably influenced by the Gospel tradition, where Jesus was remembered to have said, "As it was in the days of Noah, so it will be in the days of the Son of man: they ate, they drank, men and women married, until the day when Noah entered the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all" (Luke 17:26; cf. Matt 24:37–39). Moreover, the geographical area to which 1 Peter (and probably 2 Peter as well: cf. Bauckham, *Jude*, 2 Peter, 171) was written may have been an additional factor. Josephus claims that Noah's ark "settled on a mountain-top in Armenia" (*Ant.* 1.90) and that the Armenians consequently "call that spot the Landing-place, for it was there that the ark came safe to land, and they show the relics of it to this day" (1.92; cf. 1.93–95 and Josephus, *C. Apion.* 1.130). Although Armenia is situated to the east of the provinces addressed in 1 Peter, it is possible that Peter associated the Noah traditions with the distant provinces to which he was writing.

Two further points are worth mentioning in this connection. First, the genre of 1 Peter as a diaspora letter to Gentiles corresponds broadly to the genre of the Jerusalem Decree itself (even if it is only coincidental that both are written "through Silvanus"). Second, the Book of Revelation provides evidence that the Jerusalem Decree was remembered and applied at least in western Asia Minor. Twice John the Prophet condemns those who "eat food sacrificed to idols and practice immorality" (in Pergamum, 2:14, and in Thyatira, 2:20), adding significantly in the second instance: "But to the rest of you in Thyatira … I do not lay on you any other burden" (cf. Acts 15:28, "no greater burden than these necessary things"). Obviously Peter says nothing about the Jerusalem Decree explicitly. He may have been aware of the influence of Paul in some of the areas to which he was writing, and consequently of broader as well as narrower interpretations of the decree. He focuses therefore on "conduct" or "way of life" in the most general possible sense, without defining in legal terms what "good conduct" entails. All he says is that Christian believers must "do good" (2:14–15, 20; 3:6, 11, 17; 4:19; cf. "good works" in 2:12), a virtue consisting of a proper balance between "submission" or "deference" to civil (2:13–17) or social authority (i.e., in the household, 2:18–3:7), and remaining faithful to one's confession of Jesus as Christ and Lord (e.g., 1:6–7; 3:15–16; 4:13–16; 5:6–9).

WHAT ABOUT THE REAL JEWS?

Whatever its precise background, the vision of 1 Peter is that the Gentiles to whom it is written have become, by virtue of their redemption in Christ, a new priesthood in the world, analogous to the ancient priesthood that was the people of Israel. Consequently they share with the Jews the precarious status of "aliens and strangers" in the Roman world. The absence of any mention of real Jews suggests the possibility that there may have been a tacit alliance between (Gentile) Christian and Jewish communities either in Rome or Asia Minor or both in the face of a common enemy—the enemy being not the Roman Empire as such, but hostile public opinion among the pagan citizenry. The readers of the epistle are called to glorify God in their daily lives and hold out even to those who scorn and slander them a new religion and a new hope. The harder question is whether these Gentile Christians were offering a new religion to Jews as well. 1 Peter is too brief and too focused on the threat to its readers from Roman society to provide an answer to that question. Unlike Paul in Rom 9–11, Peter is not trying to solve "the Jewish problem" but to provide a basis for Christian or Jew alike to survive and do the will of God in the Roman Empire.

This perspective on the relation between Gentile Christianity and the Jewish people was a most fragile one, for it could lead easily—and it did—to the notion that the Christian church had displaced the "old" Israel once and for all. Yet that notion never appears in 1 Peter itself. The epistle must be respected for what it is, and for the stage of Christian self-definition that it represents. Later developments should not cloud our perception of this short letter in its own time. If the displacement of the Jews as God's people by the Gentile Christian church came to full expression in the second-century *Epistle of Barnabas*, the strain of "judaizing," or philosemitism, noticeable in 1 Peter was heightened and exaggerated in the figure of Peter that emerged in later Jewish Christianity, in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, especially the strongly judaizing anti-Paulinist of the *Epistle of Peter to James* (see E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2:111–12). The latter probably owes more to the tradition of the confrontation between Paul and Peter at Antioch in Gal 2:11–14 than to 1 Peter. Closer to 1 Peter (although by no means identical) is a speech attributed to Peter in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*: "Thus the Hebrews are not condemned because they did not know Jesus … provided they only act according to the instructions of Moses and do not injure him whom they did not know. And again the offspring of the Gentiles are not judged who … have not known Moses, provided only that they act according to the words of Jesus and do not injure him whom they did not know.… In all circumstances good works are needed; but if a man has been considered worthy to know both teachers as heralds of a single doctrine, then that man is counted rich in God" (*Hom.* 8.7.1–2, 5; Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 2:564).

Peter never goes so far as to endorse such a "two-track" approach to salvation, for to him Jesus is unmistakably the only way (1 Pet 2:6–8; cf. Acts 4:11–12). Yet his respect for Judaism and its ancient traditions is profound. The type and degree of pro-Jewishness represented by 1 Peter seems not to have been a stable or enduring point of view in early Christianity. It was, on the contrary, all too easily modified in one direction or the other. For this reason it is all the more necessary that the testimony of this letter on the subject of Jew and Gentile be heard, along with the mutually conflicting perspectives of Paul, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the Pseudo-Clementine literature.

AUTHORSHIP AND DATE

For convenience, the author of 1 Peter will be referred to throughout the commentary as "Peter." This practice does not imply that the issue of authorship is by any means settled, yet the question of whether Peter was actually the author cannot be avoided. The author unmistakably introduces himself as "Peter, apostle of Jesus Christ" (1:1). The only personal references after this initial self-introduction are the first person verbs, "I appeal to you" (with parakalw) in 2:11 and 5:1a (the latter elaborated by a self-designation as "fellow elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ, and a sharer as well in the glory about to be revealed," 5:1b), and a final self-reference in 5:12–13: "I have written you these few lines through Silvanus, (whom I consider a faithful brother), to make an appeal [parakalwn] and to bring testimony that this is true grace from God" (v 12; he adds in v 13 a greeting from "Mark, my son").

With these exceptions, the author consistently keeps his personality out of the letter. He is content to let his arguments stand on their own merit, without taking advantage of his supposed identity as the apostle Peter.

PETER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

"Peter" is of course prominent among the disciples of Jesus in all the Gospels, and where he comes into the story it is often with a touch of irony. There is first the irony of his name: he is originally "Simon, son of John," but when his brother Andrew introduces him to Jesus, Jesus tells him that "you shall be called Cephas (which interpreted means Peter)" (John 1:42). Both the nickname "Cephas" in Aramaic (cf. 1 Cor 1:12; 9:5, 15:5; Gal 1:18; 2:9, 11, 14) and "Peter" (i.e., Petro") in Greek compare a person to a "rock." The wordplay is more evident in the classic passage in Matt 16:18, where Jesus tells Simon, "You are Peter [Petro"], and on this rock [petra] I will build my congregation [ekklhsia]." In view of the importance attached in another saying of Jesus to "building on the rock" (Matt 7:24–27//Luke 6:47–49), the importance of this pronouncement can scarcely be overlooked. Yet the pronouncement can be read either seriously, as if to say, "You are indeed a strong foundation," or ironically, as if to say, "Some rock you are!" The section as a whole favors the ironic reading. In a few short verses immediately following Simon's acknowledgment of Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (v 16), Matthew employs a loosely chiastic structure to lift "Peter" up to a height of insight, only to bring him down to a depth of ignorance (the parallel in Mark 8:31–33 presents only the down side of this pattern):

a. There is an emphasis on revelation: "Blessed are you, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven" (v 17).
b. Simon is given a name: "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my congregation" (v 18a).
c. There is a promise of victory over death: "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (vv 18b–19).
d. The disciples are told to maintain secrecy about Jesus being the Christ (v 20).
d´. Jesus does explain to the disciples "that he must go to Jerusalem and suffer many

things from the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed" (v 21).

c´. There is a promise of victory over death: "and rise the third day" (v 21). Peter is unable to accept these predictions about what will happen to Jesus (v 22).

b´. Peter is given a name: "Get back in line, Satan! You are a scandal to me" (v 23a).

a´. Peter is no longer the recipient of revelation: "for your concern is not with the things of God, but with human things" (v 23b).

The fact that the channels of revelation have dried up for Peter is dramatized by his proposal at the transfiguration scene that shortly follows: "Lord, it is good for us to be here; if you wish I will make three tabernacles, one for you and one for Moses and one for Elijah" (Matt 17:4; Mark 9:6 and Luke 9:33 add explicit comments to the effect that Peter did not know what he was saying). Beyond this, Peter's threefold denial of Jesus is attested in all four Gospels. The all-too-human Peter of the Passion narrative is one with the other disciples and one with the reader of the Gospels as well, even though the reader may enjoy the irony and smile at Peter's facile confidence.

The denial of Peter in Matthew and Mark is predicted in the context of Jesus' announcement that "You will all will be scandalized, for it is written, 'I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered, but after I am raised up I will lead you into Galilee" (Mark 14:27–28//Matt 26:31–32). When Peter declares that even if all are "scandalized," he himself will not be, Jesus predicts his threefold denial. Not even Peter's professed willingness to die rather than deny Jesus blunts the force of this prophecy (Mark 14:29–31//Matt 26:33–35). In Matthew, the verb "scandalize" echoes Jesus' rebuke to Peter ("You are a scandal to me") in 16:23 and stands as an ironic shadow over this "rock" among Jesus' disciples (cf. Matt 18:6–9//Mark 9:42//Luke 17:1–2). In Matthew too, Peter is never reinstated. The denial is the last we hear of him. Mark, however, subtly implies Peter's reinstatement in the word of the young man at Jesus' tomb to the women: "Go tell his disciples and *Peter* that he leads them into Galilee" (16:7, italics added). Just as Peter was singled out in the prediction of scattering, so he is singled out in the announcement of resurrection and promise of restoration. The verb "lead" (proagein), both in Mark 14:28//Matt 26:32 and Mark 16:7//Matt 28:7, is probably chosen to emphasize the role of Jesus—specifically the risen Jesus—as shepherd, and of the disciples as his flock.

The reinstatement of the erring Peter is more explicit in Luke and John. In Luke it is built into the very prediction of Peter s denial, which stands in a different context from that of Mark and Matthew. The effect is to reduce the irony and to make of Peter a more serious, even heroic, figure: "Simon, Simon! Look, Satan has asked for you in order to sift you like wheat! But I have prayed for you, that your faith may not give out; and you, when you have turned around, must strengthen your brothers!" (Luke 22:31). Only after this, and after Peter s reply ("Lord, with you I am ready to go to prison and to death") does Jesus predict the threefold denial (22:32–33). Thus the reader knows from the start that everything will turn out all right as far as Peter is concerned. After Jesus' resurrection, the disciples returning from Emmaus are told, "The Lord is really risen and has appeared to Simon" (24:34; cf. Mark 16:7, although the appearance in Luke is in Jerusalem and not Galilee). This is the last mention of Peter in Luke's Gospel. He does not fulfill there the role of strengthening his brothers, yet by taking up the reins of leadership in the first part of the Book of Acts, he brings Jesus' prayer for him to realization.

In John's Gospel the reinstatement of Peter is even more explicit, although the note of irony returns. Corresponding to his threefold denial is a threefold affirmation of his love for Jesus

(John 21:15–17). That the denial scene in John 18 is still in view in chap. 21 is signaled by parallel references to a "charcoal fire" in 18:18 and 21:9. Jesus' first question to Peter ("Simon of John, do you love me more than these?") mocks the rash statement attributed to Peter not in this Gospel but in the Synoptic tradition (cf. Mark 14:29//Matt 26:33). The ambiguity of the use of two different words for "love" in the exchange between Jesus and Peter (i.e., agapan, "choose" or "prefer," and figein, "be a friend") has given rise to an enormous discussion, and admits of no definitive solution (see G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, WB[c] 36 [Waco, TX: Word, 1987] 394). Peter's "grief" at Jesus' persistent questioning, however, suggests that the reinstatement of Peter in John's Gospel, although real, is not unqualified or free of irony. John 21:15–17 is closely linked to vv 18–23 (with the characteristically Johannine "Truly, truly, I say to you," v 18a, as a transition). This concluding section is divided into two parts, the first dealing with Peter's future (vv 18–19), and the second comparing his future with that of the beloved disciple (vv 20–23). Both are heavy with irony.

THE DEATH OF PETER

The saying in John 21:18 is customarily taken as a prediction of Peter's martyrdom, largely because of a parenthetical comment by the narrator in v 19a: "This he said signifying by what death he [Peter] will glorify God." The comment is important as part of the data on the basis of which scholars have concluded that Peter suffered martyrdom for his faith in Christ, presumably in the sixties at the time of Nero's persecution of the Christians in Rome. This is of importance in relation to the authorship of 1 Peter, because in most discussions the authorship of the epistle has been inextricably linked to the question of date. The death of Peter under Nero is customarily taken as a fixed point of reference: if Peter wrote it, it must be earlier than, say, A.D. 64–65; if it is not, then the Apostle Peter cannot be the author. But is the tradition of Peter's martyrdom in the sixties certain enough to justify such clear-cut alternatives? On what historical evidence does the tradition rest?
The witness of John 21:18–23 is more ambiguous than is commonly assumed (again see Beasley-Murray, 394). In itself, v 18 does not speak clearly of martyrdom but has the appearance of a traditional proverb or riddle about youth and old age: "When you were young, you used to get yourself ready and go wherever you wanted; when you are old, you will stretch out your hands, and someone else will get you ready and take you where you do not want to go." The picture fits an aged man in a nursing home as well as it does a gallant warrior for Christ suffering martyrdom. It is the narrator's comment in v 19a that tilts the image in the latter direction, possibly on the basis of the expression, "you will stretch out your hands." This expression, not strictly necessary to the proverblike pronouncement in which in stands, became in early Christianity a recurring picture of crucifixion (cf., e.g., *Barn.* 12.4; *Did.* 16.6; Justin, *Dial.* 90.5, 91.3; Justin, *Apol.* 1.35; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 5.17.4, Dem. 46, 79). Yet in themselves, even these words could be taken as simply a part of the proverb, an old man's gesture of helplessness or resignation. Nor should it be overlooked that even the narrator's comment does not speak expressly of martyrdom, only of death.<
p>Two other comments of this kind in John's Gospel do speak of a martyrdom, the crucifixion of Jesus himself (cf. 12:33; 18:32). In 21:18 the characteristic Johannine word for crucifixion, uyoun ("lift up," or "exalt, 12:32, 34; cf. 3:14; 8:28) is conspicuous by its absence. The accent in 21:18 is clearly on the differences between Peter's death and that of

Jesus, not on the similarities. The most striking difference is that Jesus dies willingly, even on his own initiative (John 10:15, 18; cf. 19:30) while Peter dies against his will. Even though Peter had earlier said, "I will lay down my life for you" (13:37b, using the same expression Jesus used in 10:15, 18), Jesus had questioned his resolve, and in connection with that questioning had predicted Peter's threefold denial (13:38). The description of Peter's old age and death in 21:18 does nothing to change the doubts that Jesus harbored in the earlier scene. Jesus' word to Peter in this verse is a prediction of Peter's old age, and (if we can trust the narrator) of his death. It may or may not be a prediction of his martyrdom, but in any case it hardly qualifies as an unambiguous prophecy of a glorious or heroic martyrdom (is an unwilling martyr still a martyr?). The phrase "glorify God" in v 19 is surely appropriate to the death of any true believer, as is Jesus earlier promise to Peter that "You will follow me later" (13:36b; cf. 12:26; 14:3; 17:24). If the comment does refer to Peter's martyrdom, it makes no statement as to when that martyrdom would take place, except that it would be when Peter was old. Indeed, if we press the grammar of v 19, it is not even absolutely certain that Peter is already dead at the time of the narrator's comment. The statement is that Jesus was "signifying by what death [Peter] will [not would] glorify God." Although it is fair to assume that futurity from the standpoint of Jesus the speaker is not necessarily equivalent to futurity from the narrator's standpoint, it is at least worth noting that the grammatical construction in 12:33 and 18:32 is different: Jesus signified "by what death he was going to die" (with the imperfect hmellen as a helping verb). It is probably true that Peter was dead at the time the narrator inserted the comment, yet the possibility cannot be excluded that he was simply old and helpless, awaiting the end.

The irony of John 21:15–19 is placed in its larger Johannine context in vv 20–23, where Peter's future is compared with that of the beloved disciple. This is the last of several passages where these two individuals are seen in relation to each other. At the supper before the last Passover the "disciple whom Jesus loved" is seated closest to Jesus, so that Peter has to lean over and ask him what Jesus has just said (13:24). When Mary Magdalene tells the two that she has found the tomb of Jesus empty, the beloved disciple outruns Peter to the tomb but allows Peter to look into the tomb first; the account tells what Peter saw but nothing of his reaction (20:3–7; according to some manuscripts of Luke 24:12 Peter was "amazed"); then the beloved disciple, on looking into the tomb, "saw and believed" (John 20:8). In chap. 21, when Jesus appears to the disciples fishing at the Lake of Tiberias, it is the beloved disciple who has to tell Peter, "It is the Lord" (21:7). At Jesus' crucifixion the beloved disciple is present, along with the women (19:25–27). Peter, with all the others, is conspicuous by his absence (cf. 16:32; 18:8). In chap. 18, at the time of Peter's triple denial of Jesus, an unnamed disciple (possibly the beloved disciple) is present (18:15–16) as a contrast to Peter, and as a potential witness to Peter's shame. It is therefore no surprise when Peter is gently rebuked for his curiosity about the beloved disciple's fate in 21:20–23: "If I decide that he remains until I come, what is that to you? As for you, follow me!" (v 21; cf. v 23). Whether both men were dead at the time this passage was written, whether Peter was dead and the beloved disciple alive, or whether both men were alive cannot be determined from the language. Although the first two possibilities are more likely than the third, none of the three can be absolutely ruled out.

If the witness of John's Gospel to Peter's martyrdom, much less his glorious martyrdom in the Neronian persecution, is far from clear, the same is true of 2 Peter, where the statement, made in Peter's name, that "I know that I must soon be divested of my body, as our Lord Jesus also informed me" (2 Pet 1:14) carries no real hint of martyrdom (the adjective

tacinh, as Bauckham [199] rightly notes, means "soon," not "sudden," as if to suggest the violent death of a martyr). This is especially significant if, as most scholars believe, 2 Peter was written after Peter's death. The death to which 2 Peter refers appears to be a natural death, however much he may have regarded it as a way of glorifying God. If the revelation from Jesus to which the text refers is the saying now found in John 21:18 (cf. Bauckham, 200–201), then 2 Peter supports an interpretation of that passage along the lines here suggested. Nor does 1 Peter itself support the notion that the Apostle Peter died as a martyr. The self-designation martu" in 1 Pet 5:1 should be understood as "witness," in the sense of one who proclaims the saving message of the suffering Christ, not as "martyr" (see *Comment* on 5:1).

The earliest "martyr" text for the Apostle Peter is *1 Cle*[m] 5.4, and even this text leaves ample room for doubt that the author is referring to martyrdom in the usual sense of that word. Clement is warning against envy and jealousy, and making the point that not only the righteous of the old covenant (chap. 4) but "the good apostles," Peter and Paul, were done in by enemies who practiced these vices (5.1–7). Peter, he writes, "because of unrighteous envy endured not one or two, but many hardships, and having thus borne witness (outw marturhsa") went to the place of glory that he deserved" (5.4: cf. the summary of Paul's life in 5.5–7, culminating in the same participle, marturhsa": "having borne witness before the rulers, he departed the world and was taken up to the holy place," v 7). Although Peter's "witness" or "testimony" is linked to the hardships he faced during his lifetime, nothing that is said even here precludes a natural death, whether in his case or in that of Paul.

It is only in somewhat later sources that Peter's violent martyrdom is indicated, with increasing confidence and specificity: e.g., the Rainer fragment of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, where the risen Jesus tells Peter, "Go into the city which rules over the west … and drink the cup which I have promised thee [cf. Mark 10:39] at the hands of him who (is) in Hades, that his destruction … may begin and thou mayest be worthy of the promise" (Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 2:679); also the full martyr account in *Acts of Peter* 30–41 (Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 2:314–22), in which Peter, fleeing Rome, meets the risen Jesus coming to Rome to be crucified again (*Acts Pet* 35); Peter returns to the city and is finally crucified upside down (38–39; for this detail, cf. Origen in Eusebius, HE 3.1.2–3; also the notice in Tertullian, *Scorpiace* 15, apparently based on John 21:18, that "Another fastened Peter with a belt when Peter was bound to the cross"). Eusebius claims that at the time of Nero, "Paul was beheaded in Rome itself, and that Peter likewise was crucified, and the title of 'Peter and Paul,' which is still given to the cemeteries, confirms the story" (HE 2.25.5), citing a Roman writer named Caius for the location of the remains of the two apostles on the Vatican hill and the Ostian Way respectively (2.25.6–7), and Dionysius of Corinth for the martyrdom of the two at the same time (2.25.8).

Alongside such traditions of Peter's martyrdom must be placed certain other accounts in which Peter lived long enough in Rome to ordain Clement as his successor. This is seen in Roman tradition (e.g., Tertullian, PraescrHaer 32) and in Jewish Christianity in the *Epistle of Clement to James* , prefaced to the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*, chap. 2: "Since, as I have been taught by my Lord and Teacher Jesus Christ, who sent me, the days of my death have drawn near, I lay hands on this Clement as your bishop" (Peter mentions his death here in much the same way as in 2 Pet 1:14, while the reference to his martyrdom in chap. 1 is as ambiguous as the earlier reference in *1 Clement*). All such traditions are of course

suspect as efforts to strengthen Peter's connection with Rome and the authority of the Roman church (this is even more true of the tradition of the fourth-century *Catalogus Liberianus* to the effect that Peter remained in Rome for twenty-five years; see, e.g., O. Cullmann, *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, trans. F. V. Filson [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953], 113). Yet they are not necessarily *more* suspect than the texts that make of Peter a glorious martyr in the time of Neroú One does not have to take seriously all the later traditions about apostolic succession in the Roman church to allow that Peter may have lived in Rome for a long time. William M. Ramsay (*The Church in the Roman Empire* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1893], 283) concluded, on the one hand, that "The tradition that he lived for a long time in Rome is … strong," and, on the other, that "he cannot have been in Rome long before the Neronian persecution … therefore a long residence there is impossible unless he lived to a much later date." Consequently, Ramsay argued simultaneously for Petrine authorship of 1 Peter and for a date around A.D. 80 (cf. 284–95).

Although it is doubtful that one can be as specific as Ramsay was about date, the fact remains that the time and circumstances of Peter's death remain unknown. His death cannot be used as a firm point of reference to decide either way the question of the authorship of 1 Peter. While Petrine authorship is obviously compatible with a date in the early sixties, it does not require it. The work of William Ramsay almost a century ago still stands as a valid warning against linking the question of the authorship of 1 Peter too closely to the question of its dateú

PETER AND 1 PETER

What picture of the Apostle Peter emerges from 1 Peter? The most noticeable feature is that the irony characterizing much of the portrayal of Peter in the Gospel tradition has largely disappeared (just as it has in Luke-Acts, 2 Peter, and most later traditions). Instead of applying to Peter, ironically or otherwise, the designation "rock" or "stone," the author of 1 Peter applies it with utmost seriousness to Jesus himself (2:4–8). Jesus is "the living Stone" (v 4), the "choice and precious cornerstone in Zion" (v 6), and for unbelievers a "stone of stumbling and a rock to trip over" (v 8). This use of the word "rock" (petra) in parallelism with "stone" (liqo") in v 8 is the one possible touch of irony remaining in 1 Peter. The phrase, "a rock to trip over" (petra skandalou), taken from Isa 8:14 LXX, echoes in a curious way Jesus' scathing rebuke to "Peter" (Petro") in Matt 16:23 ("You are a scandal [skandalon] to me"), as well as the prediction about Peter and all the disciples that they would be "scandalized" because of him (Mark 14:27//Matt 26:31). For the most part, 1 Peter foregoes irony and assigns the designation of "stone" to the one to whom it ultimately belongs.

The same is true of the notion of Jesus as shepherd, as emphasized both in Mark 14:27–28//Matt 26:31–32 and in John 21:15–17. It is likely that the former of these texts, which (in Mark at least, v 28) contains in itself the basis for overcoming the irony with which Peter and the other disciples are depicted, governs the argument of 1 Pet 2:24–25. Christ is described in 2:24 as the one who "carried our sins in his body to the cross," and the one by whose "wounding you have been healed." Then, abruptly in v 25, he is "the Shepherd and Guardian of your souls" The missing link in the chain of Christ's deeds is his resurrection from the deads The image of Christ as Shepherd implies in 1 Peter his resurrection, just as in Mark 14:28 it is as the Risen One that he assumes the role of

Shepherd to his scattered sheep (see Comment on 2:25; cf. also Heb 13:20). For the notion that the sheep have "turned" (epestrafhte) to their Shepherd, cf. Peter's own "turning" (epistreya") in Luke 22:32. The exchange between Jesus and Peter in John 21:15–17 finds its parallel in 1 Pet 5:1–4, where Peter tells the elders to "Shepherd the flock of God that is in your care" (v 2) so that "when the chief Shepherd appears you will receive the unfading crown of glory" (v 4). Although he establishes common ground with the elders as "fellow elder," as "witness to the sufferings of Christ," and as "sharer in the glory about to be revealed" (v 1), he makes nothing of his own role as shepherd. Although there are undeniable allusions in 1 Peter to the role assigned to the Apostle Peter in the Gospel tradition, these allusions are low keyed, subtle, and without the irony so evident in the crucial Gospel texts. The tendency to remove the irony is the same tendency visible in Luke-Acts and is understandable either on the assumption that the author of 1 Peter is Peter himself or that it is someone who took Peter's ministry rather seriously. Whichever may be the case, the author of 1 Peter has attempted to put Christ rather than the apostle at the center, while at the same time taking the apostle seriously as Christ's servant and authoritative messenger.

Is Peter the Author?

As in the case of most N^T books other than the letters of Paul, the discussion of the authorship of 1 Peter is a futile discussion if its purpose is anything approaching absolute certainty. This is especially the case with regard to arguments from style because there is no acknowledged Petrine corpus with which 1 Peter can be compared. The only other N^T letter attributed to Peter is generally viewed as less likely than this one to have been written by him. No one knows what the Apostle Peter's literary style must have looked like. It has been frequently suggested that the elegant Greek of 1 Peter does not appear to be the work of a Galilean fisherman whose native tongue was Aramaic and who, with John, was regarded by the religious authorities in Jerusalem as an "unschooled" and "simple" man (Acts 4:13). But if, as appears likely, 1 Peter was a semi-official communication from the Christian community at Rome (similar in this respect to *1 Clement*), addressed as a diaspora letter to a wide circle of congregations on the far frontiers of the Roman Empire, then it need not be assumed that Peter composed it personally. The elegant Greek style could well be the work of a professional to whom Peter made known his ideas and whose finished work Peter approved (the testimony of Papias, after all, is that Peter, for a different purpose, made use of Mark as his "interpreter": Eusebius, HE 3.39.15). The theory of a professional scribe, or amanuensis, has customarily been linked with the reference to Silvanus in 5:12, but the phrase "through Silvanus" more likely identifies the bearer of the letter (see Comment on 5:12). The assumption that Peter had professional help in the composition of this letter by no means requires that the name of his amanuensis be known. If this is the case, then stylistic considerations, of little value in any instance, are worthless.

Perhaps the most formidable objection to Petrine authorship of 1 Peter has been the impression that in certain respects this letter represents a stage in the development of Christian thought at least a few decades later than Peter's death. For example, as we have seen, the issue of faith in contrast to the works of the law so prominent in the letters of Paul is not an issue. The perspective of 1 Peter is in some respects more like that of Matthew or of Luke-Acts than of the Apostle Paul. Criticisms of the authenticity of 1 Peter are not always consistent because at the same time there have always been some who doubted

Petrine authorship because this letter was seen as the work of a Paulinist—i.e., a "deutero-Paulinist," comparable to the supposed author(s) of Colossians, Ephesians, or the Pastorals. The difficulty with this approach is that, lacking a clear standard for what primitive "Petrine" material would look like, Paul is arbitrarily made the standard for the first generation of Christian theology, as if Paul were somehow normative or typical of Christian thought in those early decades. Paul's difficult struggles with a variety of opponents suggest just the opposite.

Certain characteristics of 1 Peter do, however, point to a date later than that normally assigned to Peter's death:

a. The reference to "Babylon" in 5:13 suggests that by the time 1 Peter was written the Roman armies had already destroyed Jerusalem and the Jewish temple (this would give special poignancy also to 4:17). "Babylon" as a designation for Rome is not attested before A.D. 70, but becomes frequent in both Christian and Jewish sources soon after 70.
b. In 5:13, too, the phrase "the [congregation] in Babylon" seems to presuppose a single Roman community of Christians, in contrast to both Romans and Hebrews (which give the impression rather of house churches or scattered communities) but in agreement with *1 Clement* near the end of the first century (see, e.g., *1 Clem* 1.1, "the church of God which sojourns in Rome"). Beyond this, if 1 Peter knows and makes use of Paul's letter to the Romans or the Epistle to the Hebrews or both (a view which is plausible but not quite certain: see above, Sources and Literary Affinities), then a date in the last quarter of the first century is likely.

c. The compliant attitude urged toward the Roman emperor and his magistrates in 1 Pet 2:13–17 (cf. Paul in Rom 13:1–7) is hard to visualize either during the reign of Domitian (contrast the portrayal of the Roman Empire as a beast from the sea in the Book of Revelation) or at the time of the Neronian persecution. Although Peter writes of a "fiery ordeal" (4:12) and of the present as a "time for the judgment to begin from the house of God" (4:17), the actual abuse of Christians with which he seems most concerned is verbal abuse (e.g., 2:12, 15, 23, 3:9, 16; 4:4, 14b). Because there is little evidence of outright persecution, a time between Nero and Domitian is indicated. The apocalyptic language of 1:1–6, 8; 4:7, and 4:12–19 is undeniable, but it is unlikely that this language is occasioned primarily either by events in Rome, where the letter was written, or in the provinces of Asia Minor to which it was directed. A more likely explanation is that events elsewhere—specifically the destruction of Jerusalem by Roman armies in A.D. 70—contributed decisively to its apocalyptic tone (see Comment on 4:17). This evidence confirms a date between 70 and 80.

d. Arguments for a later date have often appealed to a letter from the younger Pliny, writing to the emperor Trajan about A.D. 110 from Bithynia, an Asian province to which 1 Peter was directed (*Epistles* 10.96). Pliny asks for advice from the emperor about procedures to be followed in dealing with Christians:

> I have never been present at an examination of Christians. Consequently, I do not know the nature or extent of the punishments usually meted out to them, nor the grounds for starting an investigation and how far it should be pressed. Nor am I at all sure … whether a pardon ought to be granted to anyone retracting his beliefs, or if he has once professed Christianity, he shall gain nothing by renouncing it; and whether it is the mere name of Christian which is punishable, even if innocent of crime, or rather the crimes associated with the name.

Uncertain as to the grounds for punishment, Pliny describes for the emperor the procedure he has been following:

> For the moment this is the line I have taken with all persons brought before me on the charge of being Christians. I have asked them in person if they are Christians, and if they admit it, I repeat the question a second and third time, with a warning of the punishment awaiting them. If they persist, I order them to be led away for punishment; for, whatever the nature of their admission, I am convinced that their stubbornness and unshakeable obstinacy ought not to go unpunished. There have been others similarly fanatical who are Roman citizens. I have entered them on the list of persons to be sent to Rome for trial (*The Letters of the Younger Pliny* [Baltimore: Penguin, 1963], 293–94).

Pliny goes on to speak of an "anonymous pamphlet … which contains the name of a number of accused persons":

> Among these I considered that I should dismiss any who denied that they were or ever had been Christians when they repeated after me a formula of invocation to the gods and had made offerings of wine and incense to your statue (which I had ordered to be brought into court for this purpose along with the images of the gods), and furthermore had reviled the name of Christ [lit. "cursed Christ," *maledicerent Christo*]: none of which things, I understand, any genuine Christian can be induced to do (ibid., 294).

He affords as well a glimpse into the history of the Christian movement in his province:

> Others, whose names were given to me by the informer, first admitted the charge and then denied it; they said that they had ceased to be Christians two or more years previously, and some of them even twenty years ago. They all did reverence to your statue and the images of the gods in the same way as the others, and reviled the name of Christ (*Christo maledixerunt*). They also declared that the sum total of their guilt or error amounted to no more than this; they had met regularly before dawn on a fixed day to chant verses alternately amongst themselves in honour of Christ as if to a god, and also to bind themselves by oath, not for any criminal purpose, but to abstain from theft, robbery, and adultery, to commit no breach of trust and not to deny a deposit when called upon to restore it. After this ceremony it had been their custom to disperse and reassemble later to take food of an ordinary, harmless kind; but they had in fact given up this practice since my edict, issued on your instructions, which banned all political societies. This made me decide it was all the more necessary to extract the truth by torture from two slave-women, whom they call deaconesses. I found nothing but a degenerate sort of cult carried to extravagant lengths (ibid.).

Pliny's language makes it clear that the situation he describes has gone on for at least two decades. As for the situation in his own time (i.e., in A.D. 110):

> a great many individuals of every age and class, both men and women, are being brought to trial, and this is likely to continue. It is not only the towns, but villages and rural districts too which are infected through contact with this wretched cult. I think though that it is still possible for it to be checked and directed to better ends, for there is no doubt that people have begun to throng the temples which had been almost entirely deserted for a long time [*diu intermissa*]; the sacred rites which had been allowed to lapse are being performed again, and flesh of sacrificial victims is on sale everywhere, though up till recently scarcely anyone could be found to buy it. It is easy to infer from this that a great many people could be reformed if they were given opportunity to repent (ibid., 294–95).

Trajan's answer to Pliny (*Epistles* 10.97) is of equal interest:

> You have followed the right course of procedure, my dear Pliny, in your examination of the cases of persons charged with being Christians, for it is impossible to lay down a general rule to a fixed formula. These people must not be hunted out; if they are brought before you and the charge against them is proved, they must be punished, but in the case of anyone who denies that he is a Christian, and makes it clear that he is not by offering prayers to our gods, he is to be pardoned as a result of his repentance however suspect his past conduct may be. But pamphlets circulating anonymously must play no part in any accusation. They create the worst sort of precedent and are quite out of keeping with the spirit of our age (ibid., 295).

Despite the emperor's concern for fairness, the answer to Pliny's inquiry is that the mere confession of the Christian name, if there are legitimate accusers to call attention to it, and if the confessor persists in his commitment, is sufficient grounds for punitive action. This is supported by Justin Martyr's perception a generation later. Justin writes to the emperor Antoninus Pius in his *First Apology* that "those among yourselves who are accused you do not punish before they are convicted; but in our case you receive the name as proof against us" (Justin, *Apol.* 1.4.4). His hope is that "the deeds of all those who are accused to you be judged, in order that each one who is convicted may be punished as an evil-doer, and not as a Christian [cf. 1 Pet 4:15–16]; and if it is clear that any one is blameless, that he may be acquitted, since by the mere fact of his being a Christian he does no wrong" (Justin, *Apol.* 1.7.4).

Similarities to the situation presupposed in 1 Peter are readily apparent in these second-century sources: the emphasis on slander or accusation (cf. 1 Pet 2:12; 3:16; 4:4), even to the point of "anonymous pamphlets" (which the emperor repudiates as evidence); the distinction between punishing Christians for specific crimes and punishing them simply for being Christians (cf. Pet 4:15); and the requirement that suspected Christians dissociate themselves from the movement by "cursing Christ" (contrast 1 Pet 4:16). The implication of Pliny's correspondence is that the situation he describes has gone on in Bithynia for quite some time. It is not a question of a particular "persecution" in the history of the church, but of an on-going precarious situation for those identified as Christians in the provinces to which 1 Peter was written. The range of Pliny's questions demonstrate that there was as yet no fixed imperial policy toward Christians, and Trajan confirms explicitly that this is the case. Even as Justin Martyr's *Apology* reflects a situation that has developed further than the situation described in Pliny, so 1 Peter reflects a situation that has not developed as far. Emperor worship, e.g., to which Pliny alludes twice (with references to "your statue") plays no role whatever in 1 Peter: it is hardly imaginable that 1 Pet 2:13–17 could have been written in such a confrontational setting. The importance of Pliny's testimony is not that it pinpoints the date of 1 Peter, but that it reflects a situation that must have gone on for some time and that presupposes the existence of flourishing Christian communities in Bithynia and Pontus during the last decades of the first century.

None of these considerations with regard to the date of 1 Peter is conclusive by itself, but together they point to a date later than the Neronian persecution. If the evidence for the time and circumstances of Peter's death is inconclusive, then even a date this late does not necessarily rule out Petrine authorship. Clearly it does not prove Petrine authorship either, and this is why the discussion of authorship yields little certainty. Positively it can be said that the interpretation of the Christian message in 1 Peter is well within the parameters set

by the Gospels and the letters of Paul, yet without being simply derivative from Paul. If the letter does not directly cite words of Jesus which Peter might be assumed to have remembered, it does play upon some of them in subtle ways which show an awareness of the Peter story in the Gospel tradition, and it does so without making extravagant claims for "Peter" as a giant in the Roman (much less the universal) church. There is a restraint in 1 Peter that distinguishes it from the apocryphal literature and to some degree even from 2 Peter. Those who argue that a genuine letter of Peter would have reflected more on the sayings and life of Jesus should remember that one of the arguments against the genuineness of 2 Peter has always been that this letter laid too obvious claim to apostolic authority by doing precisely this (cf., e.g., 2 Pet 1:14, 16). By contrast, the restraint of I Peter enhances its credibility as a genuine communication from an aged "Apostle of Jesus Christ" to a Christian "diaspora" in Asia Minor, on behalf of the church at Rome (or "Babylon") not long after the destruction of Jerusalem by Roman armies. 1 Peter does not have the characteristics of a pseudonymous writing in the usual sense of the word; if Peter is not its author, the letter should probably be regarded as a product of the Roman church not long after his death, bringing his authority to bear posthumously on issues about which the authors believed they knew Peter's mind and perspective. The burden of proof still rests with those who choose the latter alternative; the traditional view that the living Peter was personally responsible for the letter as it stands has not been, and probably in the nature of the case cannot be, decisively shaken.

THEOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

In keeping with the modest place it has had in the N^T canon, 1 Peter has seldom been treated as an independent witness to a N^T theology. This is explainable in part by its brevity, in part by its traditional association with 2 Peter (it is not easy to derive a single theology from 1 and 2 Peter viewed together), and in part perhaps by the difficulty of extracting normative theological teaching for the church from such passages as 1 Pet 3:18–22 and 4:6 as they are usually interpreted. It is easier to regard 1 Peter as a footnote to the Pauline corpus and let it go at that. As we have seen, this practice creates a tendency to assign to Peter a secondary status in the canon and to reinforce doubts about its apostolic authorship.
The question must therefore be asked whether or not 1 Peter has a theology of its own, and if it does, what that theology looks like in relation to the theologies of other N^T witnesses (not only Paul, but John, the synoptic writers, and Hebrews). This question will be discussed in relation to trinitarian categories (God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit), not because these categories are the only ones or even the ones best suited to the material in 1 Peter, but rather because they are the categories with which Christian readers are most familiar. Although 1 Peter begins with a formulation easily viewed as trinitarian (i.e., 1:2, "[chosen] in the foreknowledge of God the Father and consecrated by the Spirit for obedience and sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ"), there is no emphasis on the Trinity in the letter as a whole. Yet the persons of "God" and "Christ," and the notion of "Spirit" or "Holy Spirit" (personal or not) are natural and appropriate headings for a survey of the theological perspective of this letter (as they are for virtually every other N^T book).

GOD IN 1 PETER

In keeping with the precedent set by Paul's letters, 1 Peter accents "God the Father" right at the start (1:2–3). God is Father both to Jesus Christ and to Christians (1:3), but the latter relationship is the one immediately defined, with the claim that Cod "in his great mercy gave us new birth by raising Jesus Christ from the dead" (1:3b). Peter is less interested in the eternal relationship between the Father and the Son than in the present relationship between the Father and Christian believers (cf. 1:17). God the Father of Christians is at the same time Creator of all, Christians included (2:13; 4:19), and future Judge of believer and unbeliever alike (1:17; 2:23; 4:5). This affects not only the way in which Christians are to worship God but also the way they are to treat unbelievers. Because God is sovereign, there is no need to seek retaliation or vengeance; their vindication, and consequently the punishment of the unjust, is in God's hands, not theirs.

The most important aspect of God's relation to Jesus Christ for Peter is not (as, e.g., in John's Gospel) the eternal Father-Son relationship in heaven, but the historical fact that God raised Jesus from the dead (1:3, 21; 3:22). God was the one in whom Jesus placed his trust (2:23), just as Christians must do now, and God did not—and will not—disappoint such trust. God is the decisive actor in all the key redemptive events that run through 1 Peter. He foreknows everything that happens (1:2, 20). When Peter cites a tradition to the effect that Christ as the redemptive Lamb was "foreknown before the creation of the world" but "appeared [lit. "was made known"] in the last of the ages" (1:20), he means "foreknown *by God*," and "made known *by God*." If God is the initiator of redemption, God is also its end, for the purpose of Christ's death was to "bring you to God" (3:18).

The God-centeredness of 1 Peter is especially adapted to the letter's Gentile audience. Peter addresses primarily not Jews who have come to embrace their Messiah but Gentiles who have come to know God—the God of the Jews—for the first time through the good news of Jesus and his resurrection. This is made clear above all in 1:21: "Through him [i.e., Jesus] you are believers in God [ei" qeon], who raised him from the dead and gave him glory, so that your faith and hope might be in God [ei" qeon]." In similar fashion, baptism is "an appeal to God [ei" qeon] out of a good conscience" (3:21). God is the one who "called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (2:10; cf. 1:15; 2:21; 3:9; 5:10). Christian ministry and worship as described in 1 Peter is therefore thoroughly God-centered: cf. especially 4:10–11 ("God's diversified grace … words from God … strength tha God provides … so that in all things God may be glorified"; Jesus Christ is mentioned only in the doxology at the end of v 11, while the parallel doxology in 5:11 centers on "the God of all grace who called you in Christ to his eternal glory"). Elsewhere in the letter, such phrases as "out of a conscious commitment to God" (2:19), "grace before God" (2:20), "the flock of God" (5:2), "before God" (kata qeon, 4:6; 5:2), "humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God" (5:6), and "true grace from God" (5:12) reinforce this impression.

The knowledge of God is a new and wonderful thing to the intended readers of 1 Peter, and never something to be taken for granted. To them God is the object not merely of respect, or even love, but of "reverent fear" (1:17). Their responsibility to God governs every other relationship: to their fellow citizens, to the emperor, and even to each other (2:17). Although Peter makes no sharp distinction between God the Father and Jesus Christ at this point, the notion of "reverence" or "reverent fear" (fobo") is linked *explicitly* only to the former (love, on the other hand, is linked explicitly to Jesus in 1:8, not to God). Christian salvation in 1 Peter begins and ends with God, the God of the Jews, who is both Creator

and Judge of the world. The experience of Christians, like that of the Jewish "holy wives" in ancient times, is above all an experience of "hoping in God" (3:6; cf. 1:21) in the sense of awaiting God's final salvation.

CHRIST IN 1 PETER

If God is the Actor in the work of human salvation, Jesus Christ is the Agent, and therefore the one with whom the theology of 1 Peter is most directly concerned. The Christological material in this letter is complex enough to be considered under three headings: revelation, salvation, and ethics:

Revelation. The most immediately relevant fact for the readers of 1 Peter is that Christ is, for the time being, invisible (1:8). Eventhough he is in heaven (3:22), the Christian hope is not that he will "come" as a distant visitor but that he will be "revealed" as one who is somehow already present, although unseen. The "revelation of Jesus Christ" (1:7, 13) at the last day means for his people the revealing of "salvation" (1:5), and "glory" (4:13; cf. 5:4, "when the chief Shepherd appears, you will receive the unfading crown of glory"). They are even now sharers and beneficiaries of this glory (5:1). Although they do not yet see it, this glory rests upon them even (indeed especially) in the most trying of circumstances, when they are slandered and insulted for their faith (4:14). They will "rejoice" beyond measure when they see Jesus Christ (1:8; cf. 4:13b), but in the meantime they can "be glad" (4:13a) for the privilege of following Christ in a path that leads through suffering to the glory that will be revealed. Through it all, their inheritance, "incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading," is "reserved in heaven" (1:4). Because the heavenly Christ is at the same time present with his people, they are able to "revere in your hearts the Lord Christ … ready to answer anyone who demands from you an accounting of the hope that is yours" (3:15). In one instance Peter refers to the coming of Christ in history as an "appearance" (1:20, "foreknown before the creation of the world … appeared in the last of the ages"), but more typically the "appearing" or disclosure is future.

The emphasis in 1 Peter on Christ's future "revelation" (lit. "apocalypse") is paralleled in the N^T only in 2 Thess 1:7 (cf., however, Rom 8:18–19, where similar language is used of believers themselves). In other passages the phrase, "revelation of Jesus Christ" refers to a present prophetic or visionary experience of some kind (Gal 1:12; Rev 1:1; cf. 1 Cor 14:6, 26). Peter claims no such "apocalypse" as a seer or prophet to bolster his authority. His perspective is not "apocalyptic" in this sense, nor does he seem to put much stock in apocalyptic traditions. The only past "revelation" to which he refers is actually a nonrevelation: God revealed to the ancient prophets that their prophecies were not for them but for a future time—Peter's own time (1:12a). What counts for Peter is not a series of strange or impressive apocalyptic visions but simply the proclamation of the Christian gospel by its appointed messengers (1:12b). His gentle "put down" of Jewish apocalyptic traditions (even while making use of them!) is evident also in 3:18–22, where Christ succeeds in doing what Enoch was never quite able to do: i.e., to heal the scars left in the world by the "Watchers" of Gen 6 and their evil offspring (see Comment on 3:19; *Explanation* on 3:18–22).

Although not "apocalyptic" in genre, 1 Peter nevertheless shares with certain Jewish apocalyptic writings the notion of a Christ now hidden but waiting to be revealed. This notion is especially evident in two apocalypses written after the destruction of Jerusalem in

A.D. 70, *4 Ezra* (e.g. 7.28, "the city which now is not seen shall appear, and the land which now is hidden shall be disclosed … my son the Messiah shall be revealed with those who are with him"; 12.32, "this is the Messiah whom the Most High has kept until the end of days"; 13.32, "then my son will be revealed"), and *2 Apoc. Bar.* (e.g. 29.3, "when all that which should come to pass … has been accomplished, the Anointed One will begin to be revealed"; 39.7, "at that time the dominion of my Anointed One … will be revealed"; 51.8, "For they shall see that world which is now invisible to them, and they will see a time which is now hidden to them"; 73.1, "then joy will be revealed and rest will appear"). The main difference in 1 Peter is that the "Anointed One" or "Messiah" to be revealed is none other than Jesus of Nazareth, who "went to heaven" (3:22) and is therefore hidden until God makes him visible again (for a similar perspective attributed similarly to Peter, cf. Acts 3:20–21). A second difference, as already noted, is that 1 Peter (unlike *4 Ezra* and *2 Apoc. Bar.*) is not itself a "revelation." Unlike the diaspora letter appended to *2 Apoc. Bar.* 78–87, 1 Peter is not an apocalyptic message borne on eagle's wings (cf. *2 Apoc. Bar.* 77.19, 87.1), nor is it like the Book of Revelation a direct communication from God through the risen Christ. At most it is "true grace from God" (5:12), a testimony from one Christian congregation to others in similar circumstances. To this degree at least, the letter itself foreshadows the "grace to be brought to you" at the great future "apocalypse" of Jesus Christ (1:13). Its testimony is that the decisive revelation is future, that God will be the Revealer, and that the content of the revelation will be Jesus Christ himself and not a set of teachings about Jesus. The teachings about Jesus are already known. They are few and easily summarized: he suffered and died, rose from the dead, and went to heaven (3:18–22). The Christology of 1 Peter is essentially a development of these three affirmations.

Salvation. Having introduced near the beginning of his letter the hope of final salvation (1:5, 9), Peter specifies the basis of this "salvation" or "grace," announced long ago by the prophets, as "the sufferings intended for Christ and the glorious events that would follow" (1:11). The "sufferings" are further described in 2:21–25, while the "glorious events" are mentioned in 1:21 ("raised him from the dead and gave him glory") and developed in richer detail in 3:18–22 ("put to death in the flesh … made alive in the spirit," v 18; "gone to heaven," v 22). Broadly speaking, the Petrine gospel is the same as the gospel of Paul (e.g. 1 Cor 15:2–4), or of the author of Luke-Acts (e.g. Luke 24:26, 46), or of the author of Hebrews (e.g. 2:9, 10; 12:2).

What distinguishes Peter from Paul is his extensive use of the notion of *imitatio Christi*. The path of Christ from suffering to resurrection to heaven is the path intended for Christians as well. This is evident above all in 2:21: "To that purpose [i.e. suffering for doing good] you have been called, for Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that you might follow in his footsteps." Christ's example is then set forth as an example of nonretaliation (2:22–23). The imitation, however, is not limited to Christ's suffering. The end to which Christians are called is "that you may inherit blessing" (3:9) and enter into "eternal glory—after you have suffered a little" (5:10). The purpose of Christ's suffering is to "bring you to God" (3:18)—not merely to faith or hope in God (as in 1:21) but into God's very presence in heaven. Having completed his own journey, Christ as "Shepherd and Guardian of your souls" (2:25) now leads his flock home (cf. Mark 14:28). Their responsibility is not simply to "believe" in God or in Christ but to "follow" Jesus who has gone on before them. Christian believers have "come" to Jesus as a "living Stone" (2:4) or "turned" to him as their "Shepherd and Guardian" (2:25), but their relationship to Jesus is

not an end in itself. Salvation is complete only when he has "brought them to God," and for this it is necessary that they "follow" him.

The emphasis in 1 Peter on discipleship, or following Jesus, invites comparison not so much with Paul as with the Gospel tradition: e.g., the narratives of the initial call of Jesus' disciples (Mark 1:17, 20//Matt 4:19, 22; Luke 5:11; John 1:43), the first clear intimations of suffering and death as part of discipleship (Mark 8:34//Matt 16:24//Luke 9:23), and certain Johannine traditions associated specifically with Peter. The last are especially noteworthy: Jesus tells Peter in John 13:36, "Where I go you cannot follow now, but you will follow later," and his last words to Peter in the entire Gospel are "Follow me" (21:19) and "as for you, follow me" (21:22). The urgency of these commands lives on in the letter that bears Peter's name.

It is likely that other Petrine metaphors such as "growing up to salvation" (2:2) or "being built into a spiritual house for a holy priesthood" (2:5) are similar in their import. The latter, to be sure, has a corporate aspect not intrinsic to the notion of "following." But when the following is viewed as the reuniting of a scattered flock with their great Shepherd now risen from the dead (2:25; cf. Mark 14:28), the imagery is not so different as it might first appear. Salvation in 1 Peter is viewed sometimes as a hidden reality waiting to be unveiled, and for which its beneficiaries in turn are waiting (1:5), and sometimes as the goal toward which they are actively moving (1:9; 2:2). Peter does not try to resolve the tension or rationalize these two models into one totally consistent pattern but allows them to inform as they will the life situations in which his readers actually find themselves.

It remains to take note of the distinctly Petrine cast given to each of the three affirmations on which salvation rests: i.e., that Christ suffered and died, rose from the dead, and went to heaven. That the cross achieves redemption is clear from 1:18, where Peter introduces the image of Christ as the sacrificial lamb. Although the imagery may well come from earlier tradition, it is obviously a tradition Peter endorses, for his own introductory formulation to the entire epistle concludes with a reference to "obedience and sprinkling with the blood of Christ" (1:2b; cf. Exod 24:3–8). More typically, Jesus is seen not as a passive victim but as an active sin-bearer (if not quite the fully developed High Priest of the Epistle to the Hebrews): "He himself carried our sins in his body to the cross, so that we, having parted with those sins, might live for what is right. By his wounding you have been healed" (2:24). In contrast to some later formulations, sin in 1 Peter is not simply "atoned for" or "forgiven" with the tacit implication that if remnants of it persist they will be overlooked, and forgiveness guaranteed in any case. Rather, sin is literally taken away, carried to the cross and left there. It is assumed that the redeemed have "parted with those sins" and are ready to "live for what is right." Christ, when he suffered, was "through with sins" (4:1), not any sins of his own, of course (cf. 2:22), but the sins he carried (cf. 2:24; 3:18). Peter's command is that his readers "arm yourselves with the same resolve … so as to live out your remaining time in the flesh no longer for human impulses but to do the will of God" (4:1–2). Peter does not build his ethics on the kind of "realism" that assumes sin is inevitable in the human situation. He assumes instead that a sinless life is possible because of what Christ has accomplished, and he urges it on his readers without apology or qualification. At the same time, knowing that Christians need each other in order to obey such commands, he urges them to "remain constant in your love for each other, for love covers many sins" (4:8, on which see Comment). The cross is the basis of Peter's ethics, but not the cross in distinction from the sufferings that preceded it. Peter does not

distinguish sharply between the events of Passion week (e.g., 2:21–23) and the actual crucifixion of Jesus (2:24). Christ "suffered" for believers both as an example (2:21, referring to that which preceded his death, vv 22–23) and as their sin-bearer (3:18; 4:1, referring to the death itself).

The emphasis in 1 Peter on Jesus' resurrection is consistent and unmistakable. It is "by raising Jesus Christ from the dead" that God gives to Christians "new birth" and a "living hope" (1:3), and "through the raising of Jesus Christ" that "baptism saves" (3:21). The purpose of Christ's resurrection is "so that your faith and hope might be in God" (1:21). If the cross is the basis of Christian ethics, the resurrection is the basis of Christian experience. Peter's identification of baptism with the resurrection of Jesus stands in contrast to the view of Paul, who saw Christ's death reenacted in Christian baptism, and his resurrection reenacted in the believer's subsequent life in the Spirit (see, e.g., Rom 6:4, "We are buried with him in baptism to death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead … we too might walk in newness of life"; cf. also Col 2:11–12; 3:1). In 1 Peter too there is a death of the old life and an embracing of the new, but baptism is identified with the latter, not the former. Peter is quite emphatic that baptism is "not the removal of the filth of the flesh but an appeal to God out of a good conscience" (3:21). Faith in God (cf. 1:21) takes away the "filth of the flesh" by cleansing the heart and conscience (cf. 1:22), and so prepares a person to turn to God, but baptism is the actual turning. Baptism is the individual's "appeal to God out of a clear conscience," and as such it "saves," not in itself but "through the raising of Jesus Christ." In this sense faith is like Christ's death, and baptism is like his resurrection. Baptism "saves," in Peter's view, not because it automatically confers grace (it is, after all, a human act, not God's act), but simply because it marks the beginning of the journey to God that for Peter constitutes Christian salvation (see *Explanation* on 3:18–22). It is quite apparent that Peter's interpretation of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ in relation to Christian experience is neither a perfect carbon copy nor a pale shadow of Paul's interpretation of these saving events. It is a theology of Christian salvation in its own right, worthy of attention alongside the other major witnesses within the N^T canon to the meaning and significance of Christ's saving work.

Christ's journey to heaven (3:19, 22), if not a unique contribution of 1 Peter to N^T theology, is at least a distinctive one, and unique in the significance assigned to it. It is not essentially different from what is described elsewhere in the N^T as an "ascension" or "exaltation" (cf., e.g., John 3:13; 6:62; 20:17; Acts 2:33; 5:31; Eph 4:8–10; for the precise expression, "going to heaven," used synonymously with "taken up to heaven," cf. Acts 1:11). Peter's use of terminology loosely adapted from Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:7 indicates that his understanding of this upward journey is much the same as that of other N^T writers (see Comment on 3:22). What is unique in 1 Peter is not the journey, nor even the prospect that Christian believers will follow Christ on his journey (a prospect left implicit in any case), but rather what happened on the way. Only here, outside the Gospel tradition, does a N^T writer reflect significantly on Jesus' ministry of exorcism. Peter's claim is that in going to heaven, Jesus completed the subjection of demons or evil spirits that began during his earthly ministry. Peter makes this claim in the context of a very specific assumption about the origin of demons: i.e., that they were the offspring of the ancient unnatural union between the angelic "sons of God" and "the daughters of men" described in Gen 6:1–2, and the cause of the sin that brought universal judgment on the world in Noah's time. It is not at all clear that they are also the cause of sin, or of the oppression of Christians, in Peter's

time, but at least Christ's subjection of them, along with every other supernatural power in the universe (3:22), guarantees to the Christian readers of 1 Peter a favorable outcome in their present struggles against human adversaries who similarly "disobey" the word of God (cf. 2:8; 3:1; 4:17b). For Peter, the resurrection of Jesus is not complete without the journey to heaven, and the same is true of the resurrection of believers that Peter sees as beginning with baptism. Baptism is the beginning of Christian experience, not the end; in baptism Christians have embarked on an *imitatio Christi*, a journey to heaven in the footsteps of their Savior and Shepherd. Salvation in its simplest terms is following Jesus, and the Synoptic Gospels testify to this simplicity. The soteriology of 1 Peter echoes that of Jesus and the Synoptics, except that the journey with Jesus is widened and extended to encompass earth and heaven.

In this respect, 1 Peter bears a certain resemblance to John's Gospel especially Johannine traditions about Peter (John 13:36; 21:19, 22), yet its closest kinship within the N^T is with the Epistle to the Hebrews. This can be seen in the notion of Christ as "pioneer of their salvation," made "perfect through suffering" (Heb 2:10), or as "source of eternal salvation to all who obey him" (Heb 5:9), or "as a forerunner in our behalf" (Heb 6:20), or as "the pioneer and perfecter of our faith" (Heb 12:2). The kinship is easily obscured by the fact that in Hebrews the image of Christ as pioneer or forerunner takes the more precise form of Christ as High Priest going on ahead into the Holy of Holies in heaven for his people (e.g., Heb 6:20; 8:1–2; 9:11–14; 10:19–22). 1 Peter, despite its interest in the Christian community as a chosen priesthood in the world (2:4–10), never brings the idea of priesthood to a focus in Jesus himself (not even in 2:24; see Comment). Nonetheless, the notion of the journey to heaven and of following the trail of Jesus through suffering to vindication is probably closer to the perspective of Hebrews than to that of any other N^T work.

Ethics and Salvation. Once the soteriology of 1 Peter is firmly grasped, the ethical teaching of the letter is self-evident, for it too is governed by the *imitatio Christi*. The ethics of 1 Peter are simple, if not simplistic, being summed up finally in the single generalized notion of "doing good" (agaqopoiein; cf., e.g., 2:12, 15, 20; 3:6, 13, 17; 4:19), derived either from Ps 33[34]:15 (as cited in 3:11) or from a saying of Jesus similar to Luke 6:27, 33. Stated negatively, the command is to "do no sin," on the assumption (mentioned above) that Christ, by his death, put an end to sin once and for all (cf., e.g., 2:1, 11, 24; 3:10; 4:1–2).

Peter's emphasis, although vague, is on action: "doing good," not "being good," is what is required. Implicitly or explicitly, the requirement of doing good interprets most other commands in the letter, from the biblically derived command to "be holy" (1:15–16), where "conduct" is the proper sphere of holiness, to the repeated admonitions to "defer" or "be subject" to those in authority, whether government officials, slave owners, or husbands (2:13, 18; 3:1). The point is not that one "does good" by deference or subjection, but just the opposite: i.e., that one fulfills the conventional social expectations of the culture by "doing good." This means that "doing good" is not simply identifiable with maintaining the social status quo. Peter has a rather more specific meaning in mind than his terminology suggests. To "do good" is to do the will of God, especially in situations where one suffers for it (cf. 2:15; 3:17; 4:19), but even more specifically it is to fulfill the spirit (if not the letter) of Jesus' command to love one's enemies. Peter never quite brings himself to use the actual expression, "Love your enemies," which so dominates the ethic of Jesus in the Synoptic tradition. Rather, in the spirit of John's Gospel, he speaks more narrowly of "love

for the brotherhood" (2:17; cf. 1:22; 3:8; 4:8). Yet unlike the Gospel of John, 1 Peter makes a serious attempt to do justice to the command to love one's enemies as well, not in those precise terms, but in its recurring emphasis on humility, gentleness, and nonretaliation as the proper responses toward those who slander and oppress the Christian community (see, e.g., 2:12, 13, 15–17, 18–20; 3:1–4, 8–9, 14–16). This emphasis, more than any other, summarizes for Peter what "doing good" means in actual life-situations. In the broadest sense such behavior is right because it is the "will of God," but concretely it means following the teaching and example of Jesus (cf. 2:21–23).

Salvation and ethics in 1 Peter finally add up to much the same thing. The letters of Paul and nineteen centuries of Christian history would lead us to expect that this would raise acutely the question of salvation through good works as opposed to salvation through faith alone. Yet this is not an issue in 1 Peter. The reason is that the point made in the letter of James is in 1 Peter already taken as self-evident: faith validates itself in action, to the extent that faith and action are indistinguishable. Salvation is gained by "believing" (1:8, 21; 2:7), yet no less by "growing" (2:2), "coming" (2:4), or "following" (2:21). Salvation is as much (or more) the end of Christian experience as the beginning (1:7, 9). Because salvation is eschatological, "hope," no less than faith, is its watchword (1:3, 13, 21; 3:5, 15), and the doing of good (while there is still time) is its necessary expression.

THE SPIRIT IN 1 PETER

An investigation of the references to the "Spirit," or "Holy Spirit," in 1 Peter shows that the supposed "trinitarian" emphasis in 1:2 is somewhat misleading. The Spirit will not have the same importance in the rest of the letter as God or Jesus Christ, nor the same importance as in the letters of Paul. The Spirit in 1 Pet 1:2 is the power by which Christians are set apart from the world as God's chosen people, while in 1:12 the Spirit is the power by which the proclamation of the Christian message takes place. Later, in 3:18 and 4:6, "spirit" is used in contrast to "flesh," as an indicator of God's power to raise the dead, and once (in 3:4), it refers to the God-given new disposition of a Christian believer ("that imperishable quality of a humble and quiet spirit"). Yet the Spirit in 1 Peter is not what defines the new age that began with the coming of Christ. The prophets long ago had "the spirit of Christ," and by that spirit foretold "the sufferings intended for Christ and the glorious events that would follow" (1:11). In keeping with the Gospel tradition, the Spirit will rest on Christians when they are confronted by their enemies (cf. Mark 13:11; Matt 10:19; Luke 12:11–12), so that insults hurled against them are actually blasphemies against the Spirit of God (4:14). The role of the Spirit in 1 Peter, however, little beyond this, and even here goes the Spirit functions in much the same way as in the case of the ancient prophets—i.e., as a pointer to the fuller glory to come (4:14a, "the [spirit] of that glory, even the Spirit of God").

The fact that Peter can discuss the exercise of gifts in the Christian community (4:7–11) as well as the responsibilities of elders (5:1–5) without once mentioning the Holy Spirit is not absolutely decisive. Paul, after all, does not mention the Spirit in Rom 12:1–8 (cf., however, 12:11). Yet in the context of 1 Peter as a whole, the omission is at least noteworthy. In Paul's case, Rom 12 was preceded by extensive reflection on the Spirit as the mark of a new age in Rom 8. In 1 Peter, "spirit" is no more significant than "grace" (e.g., 1:10, 13; 4:10; 5:5, 10, 12) or "glory" (e.g., 1:7, 21; 4:13–14; 5:1, 4, 10) as a

designation for God's activity in the world. If there is a difference, it is that "glory" belongs primarily to the future, "grace" to both present and future, and "spirit" to the present and the past. "Spirit" is not so much an entity in itself as a pointer to something or someone else; it is the spirit of Christ, or of God, or of the future glory that belongs to both. On this issue, 1 Peter is closer to second-century Christian literature (e.g., *The Shepherd of Hermas*) than to the letters of Paul.

This brief survey is sufficient to show that 1 Peter has a distinct contribution of its own to make to N[T] theology. This is not the same as saying that it "has" a coherent and self-contained theology. Because of its brevity, a number of one-sided emphases would remain and many important questions would be left unanswered if anyone were so foolhardy as to try to build a complete theology on 1 Peter alone. In the context of a larger canon, however, its testimony stands as a reminder that the first-century church had more leaders and teachers than Paul. 1 Peter has the flavor of a letter that any one of the synoptic writers—or someone like them—might have written if they had chosen to use the epistolary form. It is the work of one who, more than the Apostle Paul, made every effort to do justice equally to the teaching, the example, and the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Greeting (1:1–2)

Bibliography

Agnew, F. H. "1 Peter l:2—An Alternative Translation." *CB*[Q] 45.1 (1983) 68–73. **Chevallier, M. A.** "1 Pierre 1/1 à 2/10: Structure littéraire et conséquences exégétiques." *RHP*[R] 51 (1971) 129–42. **Elliott, J. H.** *A Home for the Homeless*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981. 21–100. ———. "Salutation and Exhortation to Christian Behavior on the Basis of God's Blessings (1:1–2:10)." *RevEx*[p] 79.3 (1982) 415–25. **Furnish, V. P.** "Elect Sojourners in Christ: An Approach to the Theology of I Peter." *PST*[J] 28 (1975) 1–11. **Hemer, C. J.** "The Address of 1 Peter." *ExpTi*[m] 89 (1978) 239–43. **Hiebert, D. E.** "Designation of the Readers in 1 Peter 1:1–2." B[S] 137 (1980) 64–75. **Holzmeister, U.** "Exordium prioris epistulae S. Petri (1 Petr. 1,1–2)." *V*[D] 2 (1922) 209–12. **Hort, F. J. A.** *The First Epistle of Peter, i.1–ii.17*. Additional Notes I–III. 151–84. **Ramsay, W. M.** "Roads and Travel (in N[T].)" *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*. Extra vol. 375–402. **Scharlemann, M.** "An Apostolic Salutation: An Exegetical Study of 1 Peter 1, 1–2." *Concordia Journal* 1 (1975) 108–18. **Verdière, E. A. la.** "Covenant Theology in 1 Peter 1:1–2:10." *TB*[T] 42 (1969) 2909–16.

Translation

> [1]*Peter, apostle*[a] *of Jesus Christ, to a chosen people, living as strangers in the diaspora of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia*[b] [2]*[chosen]*[c] *in the foreknowledge of God the Father and consecrated by the Spirit for obedience [to the gospel]*[d] *and sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ.*

May grace and peace be yours many times over.

Notes

a. Neither the word “apostle” nor any other word in vv 1–2 has the definite article in Greek. The absence of the article does not imply indefiniteness; rather the tendency in epistolary introductions is to omit the article. In N^T epistles this is commonly the case in the writer’s self-identification, in references to God or Christ, and in the “grace and peace” formula. Yet in no other epistolary introduction is the tendency carried quite so far as in 1 Peter, where even the addressees are designated without the use of the article.

b. Several ancient witnesses (^{a}

* 048 and a few other Gr. MS^s; some v^g MS^s, and some *La*^{t} citations in Eusebius) omit Asia from the list, perhaps with the understanding that it referred to the entire territory to which 1 Peter was addressed and was therefore redundant. Asia, however, belongs on the list (as the weight of M^S evidence suggests) because it is used here specifically of the Roman province of that name, not of Asia Minor as a whole. One M^S (^{B*}) omits Bithynia, perhaps on the assumption that because Pontus and Bithynia were one province, the inclusion of both must have been a mistake by earlier scribes. The longer, more difficult, reading represented by all other MS^s and versions is clearly correct.

c. The bracketed word is supplied to make it clear that the three phrases which follow modify the word “chosen” in v 1, not the word “apostle.” If they modified “apostle of Jesus Christ,” they would have been placed between that designation and the designation of the addressees.

d. The bracketed words are supplied to make it clear that the obedience in view is the initial acceptance of the Christian gospel by which a person becomes part of the Christian community. See *Comment*.

Form/Structure/Setting

The form of these two verses defines the form of 1 Peter in its entirety: a letter, an encyclical letter, and a diaspora letter. The epistolary introduction exhibits the three-part structure common to the introductions of virtually all N^T and early Christian letters; first the writer’s self-identification; second, a designation of those being addressed; and third, the salutation proper (most frequently introduced, as here, with the words “grace and peace”).

Customarily a theological formulation of some kind is attached to one or more of these parts. In this case the formulation (consisting of three prepositional phrases introduced by kata, en, and ei" respectively) is attached to the second of the three parts, the designation of the addressees (v 2a). Its placement affords a clue that the issue is not to be the identity of Peter but rather the identity and responsibilities of the chosen people to whom he is writing. The formulation itself is not only triadic, but (with its “God the Father … Spirit … Jesus Christ” terminology) trinitarian in form. With it, Peter contemplates in summary fashion the whole divine work of salvation up to the point at which the readers now standú

If the form of the introduction characterizes 1 Peter as a typical early Christian letter, the listing of five Roman provinces encompassing an area of over 300,000 square miles marks it as an encyclical letter comparable to the Book of Revelation (cf. Rev. 1:11) but geographically wider in its circulation. Although such encyclicals were known in the pagan world (e.g., a circular letter to Asia Minor is pseudonymously attributed to Alexander the Great in the third century— *Pseudo-Callisthenes* 2.11.2), the use of the term diaspora in 1

Peter 1:1 suggests closer kinship with a long tradition of Jewish letters representing themselves as written from Jerusalem to the Jewish dispersion or diaspora communities in Babylon (Jer 29:4–23), Assyria (*2 Apoc. Bar.* 78–87), or Egypt (2 Macc l:l–10a, 10b–2:18). That the diaspora letter form influenced early Christian correspondence can be seen from the Epistle of James (1:1: "James, servant of God and the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes that are in the diaspora. Greetings!") and perhaps as well from the Jerusalem Council's letter "to the brothers in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia who are Gentiles" (Acts 15:23–29). Like the second of these in particular, 1 Peter is a *Gentile* diaspora letter. In Acts 15 the Gentile Christians are addressed as those still under the authority of the Jewish-Christian Jerusalem Church, but in 1 Peter the predominantly Gentile churches of Asia Minor are secure enough in their own identity that they can be addressed by the Jewish Christian Peter as partners in a new Judaism.

The clearest evidence that the themes of 1 Peter are themes appropriate to a diaspora letter is furnished by *2 Apoc. Bar.* 78–87. Although the parallels between this Jewish apocalyptic letter and 1 Peter come far short of suggesting literary dependence either way, each document conveys something of the solidarity of a people widely scattered in the world but sharing in the same experience of suffering and awaiting vindication. See *Introduction*, pp. xlviii–xlix.

Comment

1 Petro" apostolo" Ἰhsou Cristou, "Peter, apostle of Jesus Christ." "Peter" was the Greek equivalent of the Aramaic apK

(*Kēphâa'*, i.e., "rock"), the nickname Jesus had conferred on Simon either at his call (John 1:42) or when Jesus appointed the twelve apostles as a group. Sometimes he is referred to by both names, "Simon Peter" (e.g., often in John) or "Symeon Peter" (2 Pet 1:1; cf. "Symeon" in Acts 15:14), while Paul characteristically uses Khfa" (written in English as "Cephas"), the Greek transliteration of apK

(Gal 1:18; 2:9, 11, 14; 1 Cor 1:12; 3:22; 9:5; 15:5). The Greek name Petro" or "Peter," by itself is probably the name by which this apostle was most commonly known in the Greek-speaking churches (e.g., in Rome—*1 Clem* 5.4; Ign. *Rom.* 4.3; *2 Clem* 5.3). Even Paul deviates twice from his normal usage to speak of Peter as having an "apostolic mission to the circumcision" in distinction from Paul's own mission to the Gentiles (Gal 2:7, 8). Simon's identity as "Peter" was inextricably bound up with his identity as "apostle of Jesus Christ," so that together the two terms reinforce each other.

Peter's use of the phrase "apostle of Jesus Christ" bears comparison with Paul's. Paul identifies himself as an apostle at the beginning of nine of the epistles attributed to him (i.e., Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus). Five of these (2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1-2 Timothy) begin almost identically to 1 Peter, with the words, "Paul, apostle of Christ Jesus" (the word order "Christ Jesus" gives to Christ something of its original function as a title, while Jesus Christ, used in Paul's salutations only in Titus, makes it part of the name). In all nine instances, Paul further explains his self-designation as apostle (e.g., "through the will of God," in 1-2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, and 2 Timothy; cf. 1 Timothy and the longer formulations in Romans, Galatians, and Titus). Only in 1 Peter does the phrase "apostle of Jesus Christ"

stand by itself, without elaboration of any sort.

Hort (18) and Selwyn (119) have argued that this is not the case, because the trinitarian formulation in v 2 modifies *both* "apostle" and "chosen people" (i.e., the same divine initiative and action that made Peter an apostle made the recipients of the epistle a chosen people). It is doubtful that a double reference is intended, or that Peter would have made such a profound point in such a subtle, almost invisible way (contrast Rom 1:1, 6, 7, where Paul explicitly repeats klhto" in such a way as to make it unmistakable that he and his readers share the common experience of being "called").

How is the author's identity as "Peter, apostle of Jesus Christ" reflected in the body of the epistle? Only rarely does he let his identity show by speaking in the first person singular. At two key junctures (2:11 and 5:1), he makes a personal appeal to his readers. "Dear friends," he writes in 2:11, "I appeal to you as aliens and strangers: renounce your natural impulses, for they are at war with the soul." The address as "dear friends" is repeated at the beginning of the last major division of the epistle (4:12), but the personal appeal is postponed to 5:1, where the author once more identifies himself: "To any elders among you, therefore, I appeal as fellow elder and witness to the sufferings of the Christ, and a sharer as well in the glory about to be revealed.…" If this language calls attention to that which the author has in common with his readers, and makes its appeal on that basis, the self-identification at 1:1 calls attention to what is unique to him. Only he, not the recipients of the epistle or their elders, is "apostle of Jesus Christ." It is precisely because of this consciousness of a unique status and authority that he takes pains in 5:1 to establish common ground.

Near the end of the epistle, the "I" of Peter the apostle speaks again: "I have written to you these few lines through Silvanus (whom I consider a faithful brother) to make an appeal and bear testimony that this is true grace from God. For it you must stand" (5:12; cf. also the greeting in v 13 from "my son Mark"). Both in its summarization of the epistle's message and in its special commendation of Silvanus, this passage leaves the reader aware of the unique personal authority of the apostle. Although this authority is not made constantly explicit throughout the epistle, it is assumed at the start with the words, "Peter, apostle of Jesus Christ."

eklektoi" parepidhmoi" diaspora", "to a chosen people, living as strangers in the diaspora." The identity of the recipients is a more central concern to the author than his own identity. They are God's "chosen people living as strangers in the diaspora" in several provinces of Asia Minor. The agreement reached between Paul and Peter in Galatians suggests that the sphere of Peter's apostleship was Judaism ("the circumcision," Gal 2:7) just as Paul's mission was to the Gentiles (2:7–8). In itself, the identification of the recipients of Peter's epistle does nothing to change that impression. Although Peter's greeting is not quite so specifically Jewish as that of James ("to the twelve tribes in the diaspora," James 1:1), the terms eklektoi, parepidhmoi and above all diaspora, appear to be expressions of a Jewish consciousness arising out of the Jewish experience. Since there is no doubt that Peter is addressing Christians, it seems clear that he is writing to communities of Jewish Christians in Asia Minor. Yet the evidence of the rest of the epistle strongly favors an audience predominantly made up of Gentile Christians, "redeemed from the empty way of life that was your heritage" (1:18; cf. 4:3–4). The apparent inconsistency can only be resolved by candidly acknowledging that Peter is addressing certain communities of Gentile Christians as if they were Jews. They are a "chosen people," yet not simply "honorary Jews" in the sense of claiming for themselves the privileges of

"Israel" without corresponding responsibilities. The prerogatives are there, but the responsibilities are there as well; even the social stigma of being Jews in Hellenistic Asia Minor (or in Rome) has been transferred to the Gentile Christian congregations addressed in this epistle (see *Introduction*, p. liv).

The terms eklektoi and parepidhmoi together sum up the recipients' identity. These terms, nowhere else found in combination in biblical literature, appear on first impression to point in quite different directions. One expresses a relationship to God, the other a relationship to human society. One denotes a privileged group (before God), the other a disadvantaged group (in society). Yet the two expressions do not limit or qualify each other. The addressees are "strangers" because of (not despite) being chosen. Their divine election is a sociological as well as theological fact, for it has sundered them from their social world and made them like strangers or temporary residents in their respective cities and provinces. This is Peter's assumption and the basis on which he writes to them.

oi eklektoi, "the chosen," is a fairly common N^T designation for Christians collectively, not with particular reference to God's act of choosing them in eternity past but with reference to their present historical existence and their final vindication. Its background lies in the O^T as a designation of the people of Israel (e.g., 1 Chron 16:13; Ps 105:6; Isa 65:9, 15, 23) and in Jewish apocalyptic literature either in the same way (e.g., *As. Mos.* 4.2) or as a designation of the righteous in Israel who will be protected and vindicated in the last days (e.g., *1 Enoc*^{h} 1.1, 8; 39.6–7; 48.1; 58.1–4; cf. Wisd Sol; 3:9). The latter meaning continues in the Gospel tradition, particularly Jesus' eschatological discourse, where the "elect" are those who survive the time of tribulation and show themselves faithful to Jesus at the end (e.g., Mark 13:20, 22, 27; cf. Matt 22:14; Luke 18:7). The evidence of Mark—as well as Romans (8:33), *First Clement* (nine occurrences), and *Shepherd of Hermas* (nine occurrences, all in the first four visions)—indicates that eklektoi was a familiar term in the Roman church by the end of the first century. Peter draws not so much on its use in denoting a remnant as on its use with reference to all Israel. He concludes the first major division of his epistle by designating his readers "a chosen race [geno" eklekton], the king's priesthood, a holy nation, a people destined for vindication" (2:9), language derived almost entirely from O^T descriptions of Israel (e.g., Exod 19:6; Isa 43:20–21). He concludes the whole epistle with greetings from a sister community "in Babylon, chosen along [suneklekth] with you" (5:13).

parehidhmo" refers to a person residing temporarily in a foreign place. Like eklekto" it can function either as an adjective or a noun, so that the translator may have difficulty determining which is the adjective and which the noun (i.e., the "chosen strangers" or the "displaced elect"). Both words can be used as nouns (i.e., "the elect [who are also] strangers"). The usage of eklektoi elsewhere to denote the whole community of Christian believers (i.e., as virtually equivalent to "church") suggests a certain priority for it here as well. Because eklektoi" is the word that points directly to the action of God, it has to be eklektoi" that is modified and explained by the three-part formulation in v 2. By God's foreknowledge, the Spirit's work of consecration, and the blood of Christ, the readers are a "chosen people"—and consequently "strangers." The first term points to the indispensable basis of Christian identity and the second to its inevitable social expression. parepidhmoi" is the corollary' of eklektoi". The addressees are "strangers" not by race, birth, or circumstances but because divine election has "estranged" them. When Peter begins the second major part of his epistle by appealing to them as "aliens and strangers" (w"

paroikou" kai parepdhmou", 2:11), he is in some sense appealing to their election: he wants them to realize more fully in practice that estrangement from "natural impulses" which their election demands (cf. his use of paroikia, "allotted time" or "sojourn," in 1:17). Although paroiko" in Greek literature called attention to the legal status of resident aliens (i.e., as noncitizens) in a way in which parepidhmo" did not (see Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 24–37), Peter uses the terms almost interchangeably to refer simply to residence in a foreign place. In this respect his usage agrees with that of the LX[X], where the only two occurrences of parepidhmo" are in combination with paroiko" (Gen 23:4; Ps 38[39]:13[12]). The first refers to Abraham among the Hittites in Hebron, the second to the psalmist before God. The only N[T] use of parepidhmo" outside of 1 Peter speaks of O[T] believers (with Abraham in mind as the prime example) who "admitted that they were foreigners and strangers [xenoi kai parepidhmoi] on earth" (Heb 11:13, NI[V]).

Perhaps because of its predominance in the LX[X] (33 occurrences), paroiko" (with its cognates) predominated in early Christian literature as well. With 1 Peter as a precedent, the language of "sojourning" (paroikein) became a frequent, almost stereotyped, part of the salutation of epistles from one church to another: e.g., *1 Cle*[m] ("The church of God that sojourns at Rome to the church of God that sojourns at Corinth"); Pol. *Phil.* ("Polycarp and the elders with him to the church of God that sojourns at Philippi"); *Mart. Pol.* ("The church of God that sojourns at Smyrna to the church of God that sojourns in Philomelium, and to all the parishes [paroikiai"] of the holy and catholic church in every place" [cf. 1 Cor 1:2]); the epistles of Dionysius of Corinth "to the church that sojourns at Gortyna, together with the other parishes [paroikiai"] of Crete" and "to the church that sojourns at Amastris" (Eusebius, HE 4.23.5–6); and the epistle from "the servants of Christ sojourning at Vienne and Lyons in Gaul to the brothers and sisters in Asia and Phrygia" (Eusebius, HE 5.1.3). "Sojourning" or "living as aliens" became an identifying mark of the church, and paroikia came to mean parish (its derivative) or diocese.

Although I Peter stands at the threshold of these developments, paroikoi and parepidhmoi had not yet become technical terms for the church as such. Rather, they reveal something about the church as a certain kind of community: a people not quite at home in the places where they live.

diaspora" further characterizes this community's experience as parallel to that of Israel. diaspora is used twelve times in the LX[X] to refer to the scattering of the Israelites among the Gentile nations as a divine judgment (e.g., Deut 28:25; Jer 13:14[a]

; 15:7; 41[34]:17; Dan 12:2; cf. *T. Ash.* 7.2; John 7:35). From the time of the first departure to Babylon in 586 B.C. all Jews outside of Palestine were by definition in the "diaspora," or in exile from Jerusalem, their true home. Israel's hope was that its people would one day be regathered, its diaspora restored (e.g., Deut 30:4; Ps 146[147]:2; Isa 49:6; 2 Mace 1:27; cf. *Pss. Sol.* 8.28). Instead, when Jerusalem fell to the Romans in A.D. 70, the diaspora lost its one fixed point of reference; all Jews (even those still living in Palestine) were now scattered among the Gentiles, and in that sense "diaspora."

Peter envisions a parallel situation among Christians. The genitive diaspora" implies not that his readers belonged to the Jewish diaspora or were living as strangers among the dispersed Jews, but that they themselves constituted a diaspora, the only diaspora, in fact, that Peter gives evidence of knowing. He sees them not in relation to the Jews (not even as displacing the Jews in the plan of God) but (like the Jewish diaspora itself) always in relation to "the Gentiles" (cf. 2:12; 4:3).

To an extent, they are a worldwide brotherhood (5:9; cf. 2:17). The place from which Peter writes his diaspora letter is not home (as Jerusalem was for the Jewish diaspora) but is itself a place of exile (Babylon, 5:13) and therefore part of the same worldwide diaspora to which his readers be long. This is an epistle from the homeless to the homeless. All that distinguishes the author's own situation (as he sees it) from that of his readers is geography.

Pontou, Galatia", Kappadokia", ἐAsia" kai Biqunia" "of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." The districts listed were Roman provinces comprising all of Asia Minor north of the Taurus mountain range. Philo testifies to the presence of a Jewish diaspora in these regions (*Leg. ad Gaium* 281), and it is likely that synagogues had been the starting point for Christian evangelization. The Book of Acts describes Paul teaching at Ephesus in the province of Asia first in the synagogue and then, when Jewish opposition became strong, for two years in a Greek lecture hall (Acts 19:8–10) where he was said to have had access to "all the Jews and Greeks who lived in the province of Asia" (19:10, NIV). Yet his activities in the regions mentioned in 1 Peter seem to have been limited. Although he "traveled throughout the region of Phrygia and Galatia" (Acts 16:6a, NIV) and evidently made disciples there (cf. Acts 18:23; Gal 1:2), he was at first "kept by the Holy Spirit from preaching the word in the province of Asia" (Acts 16:6b, NIV), and when he and his companions "tried to enter Bithynia … the Spirit of Jesus would not allow them to" (16:7, NIV). These prohibitions may have something to do with Paul's stated reluctance to build on the foundations of others (Rom 15:20–22).

When Paul finally reached Asia, it was clear that other evangelists had been there before him (Acts 19:1–3). Besides those who taught only about Jesus and the baptism of John (19:3) without knowing of the Spirit's coming, there had perhaps been pilgrims returning to "Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia" (Acts 2:9–10) after the sermon of Peter at Pentecost. Paul's friend at Corinth, Aquila, was a native of Pontus, although it is uncertain whether he first heard the Christian gospel there or in Italy (Acts 18:2). Whatever the means, the likelihood is that most of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia was evangelized before, or at least independently of, Paul. Although Paul made inroads in Asia Minor, particularly in the province of Asia, the churches to which Peter writes are, like the Roman church itself, largely non-Pauline in origin and independent of him in their traditions. Pliny, the Roman governor of Bithynia, in his correspondence with the emperor Trajan (about the year 110), witnesses to the vitality of the Christian movement in Pontus in his time and earlier (*Epist.* 10.96; see *Introduction*, pp. lxiii–lxvii).

The order in which Peter names the provinces is curious in that Pontus, with which the list begins, and Bithynia, with which it ends, had been considered a single province since about 64 B.C. The most plausible explanation is still that of Hort (157–84) who suggested that the sequence represents the projected route of the messenger who was to deliver the epistle. The messenger would travel by ship from the Mediterranean and Aegean seas through the Hellespont (or Dardanelles) and the Bosporus straits to the Euxine (or Black) Sea. His entry to Asia Minor would be at one of the Black Sea ports in Pontus, perhaps Sinope (Hort, 176), but more likely Amastris (Ramsay, 383) or Amisus (Hemer, 240) because of easier land access to the interior. Dionysius of Corinth's letter to "the church sojourning in Amastris, together with the churches in Pontus" (Eusebius, HE 4.23.6) provides evidence that Amastris was a port of entry to the Christian community in Pontus in the late second century, but Hemer (240–41) makes a strong case for Amisus as furnishing quicker access to the whole of Asia Minor through Galatia and Cappadocia.

A generally similar land route to the one suggested by Peter's list of provinces is described by Josephus in connection with a visit by Herod the Great and his friend Marcus Agrippa in 14 B.C. starting from Sinope: "Now when they had completed the mission in Pontus on which Agrippa had been sent, they decided not to return by sea; instead, they went successively through Paphlagonia and Cappadocia, and from there traveled overland to Great Phrygia and reached Ephesus, and again sailed from Ephesus to Samos" (*Ant. Jud.* 16.23 [LCL 8.217]). On Hort's hypothesis, the messenger who delivered 1 Peter traveled south from Sinope or Amastris to Ancyra (i.e., Ankara) in Galatia, then possibly as far east as Caesarea in Cappadocia, back again into Galatia by the westward trade route through Iconium and Pisidian Antioch to the cities of provincial Asia mentioned in Rev 2–3, and finally north into Pontus-Bithynia once more, sailing from Asia Minor perhaps at Nicomedia or Chalcedon. Hemer's proposed route is from Amisus south through Amasia (instead of Ancyra) to Caesarea, but for the rest of the way much the same. Either route differs from that suggested for the Book of Revelation (i.e., by W. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches* [London' Hodder and Stoughton, 1904] 183–96) both in its vastly greater scope and in its orientation. The "seven churches in Asia" of Rev. 1:4 are oriented around Ephesus and toward the Aegean Sea. The provinces listed in I Peter encompass that area and much more; they suggest a route oriented rather toward the Black Sea and centering on northern and eastern churches not reached by the journeys of Paul. There is no evidence that Peter had visited these churches either. Whether he had done so, in circumstances now forgotten, or whether he is responding to reports heard in Rome (perhaps through emigrants like Aquila) is uncertain.

2 kata prognwsin qeou patro", "in the foreknowledge of God the Father." Three prepositional phrases recite how the recipients of the epistle came to be what they are. The divine election that severed their ties with the society to which they once belonged is more than predestination in the mind of God in eternity past. It begins there but finds historical expression in the social experience of individuals and a community. It is synonymous with what Peter five times refers to as being "called" (1:15; 2:9, 21; 3:9; 5:10). "The foreknowledge of God the Father" focuses on the beginning of this election or calling and, therefore, belongs in eternity past. Christ himself was "foreknown before the creation of the world" (1:20), and the election of "God's chosen people" is derived from and dependent on Christ's election to be their redeemer and example (cf. 2:4, 5, 9). When applied to God's knowledge of persons (whether of Jesus or his people), "foreknowledge" is more than mere prescience, it involves choice or determination as well (cf. Acts 2:23—the only other NT use of the noun—and Jud 9:6; also the verb proginwskein, "know," in Rom 8:29 and 11:2, as well as 1 Pet 1:20). In this sense God "knows" some people and not others, whereas a general prescience would be all inclusive (cf. the particularized use of "know" in Amos 3:2; Hos 5:3; 12:1 [LXX]; 1 Cor 8:3; Gal 4:9).

qeou patro" in itself leaves open the question whether God is being viewed primarily as the Father of Jesus Christ (cf. 1:3) or of Christians (cf. 1:17). The form of v 2 suggests the emergence of a trinitarian outlook in which God is first of all the Father of Jesus; this is confirmed almost immediately by v 3a ("the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"). V 3b, however, continues with the statement that the same God "gave us new birth," and it is likely that in v 2 both relationships are already presupposed.

en agiasmw pneumato", "consecrated by the Spirit." The genitive is subjective: the consecration wrought by the Spirit of God. The identical phrase occurs in 2 Thess 2:13,

preceded (as here) by a reference to divine election and closely associated with "belief in the truth" as a result of being called "through our gospel to attain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2:14). agiasmo" is also seen in connection with the call of God in 1 Thess 4:7 (cf. v 8, in which God is designated as the One "who gives you his Holy Spirit"). It is, on the one hand, a divine act (cf. 1 Cor 1:30), practically synonymous with the call itself, and, on the other, a moral implication of that call and (in part at least) a human responsibility (cf. 1 Thess 4:3–4; Rom 6:19, 22; 1 Tim 2:15; Heb 12:1, 4; *1 Cle*[m] 30.1; 35.2). In this respect the usage of agiasmo" pneumato" parallels that of dikaiosunh, or "righteousness" (the two stand side by side in 1 Cor 1:30).

agiasmo" pneumato" in the present passage (as in 2 Thess 2:13) is emphatically a divine act and an aspect of Christian initiation. It refers to that separation by which individuals who are strangers and exiles in their world are gathered into a new community of the chosen. The cognate verb agiazein is used similarly in 1 Cor 6:11: "But you were washed, you were consecrated, you were justified by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God." The consecration Peter has in mind takes place through the proclamation of "the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent from heaven" (1:12). Only in connection with this work of setting apart a holy people is the Spirit of God in I Peter designated as "holy" (agion) or associated with agiasmo".

ei" upakohn kai rantismon aimato" Ihsou Cristou, "for obedience and sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ." The last of the three prepositional phrases looks at the human side of Christian initiation. Although upakoh and rantismo" aimato" are closely joined together as objects of the same preposition, the genitive Ihsou Cristou depends only on the latter. To attempt to link "Jesus Christ" both to "obedience" and "blood" would create difficulty by making it an objective genitive in relation to the first (i.e. obedience to Jesus Christ) and a possessive in relation to the second (i.e. Jesus Christ's blood).

Instead, obedience is used absolutely in the sense of a willing acceptance of the gospel. Paul speaks of the "obedience of faith" among the Gentiles (Rom 1:5; 16:26) or of the "obedience of the Gentiles" (Rom 15:18), and characteristically uses upakouein with euaggegion to designate those who "do not obey the gospel" (Rom 10:16; 2 Thess 1:8; for a similar negative constrution with apeiqein, cf. 1 Pet 2:8; 3:1; 4:17). Luke refers to a great number of Jewish priests in Jerusalem who "accepted [uphkouon] the faith" proclaimed by the earliest Christians (Acts 6:7). Peter himself, in mentioning "obedience to the truth" as the means by which his readers have been "purified" (1:22), has in mind their initial acceptance of the proclaimed word (cf. vv 23–25), and it is likely that in v 2 as well upakoh, "obedience," refers to conversion from paganism to Christianity (cf. 1:14, in which the phrase w" tekna upakoh", "as obedient children," presupposes this conversion experience and makes it the basis of a practical ethical appeal). If en agiasmw pneumato" describes conversion as the work of the Holy Spirit, ei" upakohn describes it as a human decision to accept and live by the Christian message.

Such an understanding helps explain why obedience precedes rather than follows the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The latter phrase gives concreteness and vividness to Peter's brief glance at Christian conversion. rantismo" aimato", "sprinkling with the blood," recalls the Jewish sacrificial system, particularly as seen from a distance or in retrospect by the early Christians. The apparent origin of the rantismo" terminology is the ceremony described in Numbers 19 in which ashes from the burning of a red heifer are mixed with water and sprinkled for purification on those who have defiled themselves by

contact with a corpse (the phrase udwr rantismou, “water of sprinkling,” occurs repeatedly in Num 19:9, 13, 20, 21 LX[x]). In *Barn.* 8, this passage in its entirety is applied to Christ’s redemptive death, its imagery of sprinkling being associated with Jesus’ blood rather than with water and ashes (*Barn.* 5.1; 8.3; in the N[T] cf. Heb 9:13–14).

More significantly, Hebrews uses the same ῥαντιθμός/ῥαντίζειν language (where the LX[x] did not) in connection with the institution of the Mosaic covenant: Moses built an altar at the foot of Sinai, and when he had sacrificed cattle he threw half of the blood against the altar; the other half he put in bowls, and read aloud to the people out of the scroll of the covenant the Lord’s commands. When they promised to obey all that the Lord commanded, Moses took the bowls and threw the remaining blood at the people, saying (in the words of Heb 9:20), “This is the blood of the covenant which God commanded you” (cf. Exod 24:3–8; Heb 9:18–21). In Hebrews, the blood of the covenant poured out by Moses corresponds to the “blood of sprinkling” (aimati rantismou) shed by Jesus, the “mediator of the new covenant” (Heb 12:24; cf. 10:29). The participants in this new covenant are invited to “draw near with a true heart in the full confidence of faith, having our hearts sprinkled to cleanse a guilty conscience and having the body washed in pure water” (10:22). Peter lacks the direct reference to Christian baptism (although cf. 3:20), but the close connection between obedience and sprinkling suggests that Exod 24:3–8 is as determinative for his imagery as for that of Hebrews. Without speaking explicitly of a “new covenant” or the “blood of the covenant” (which may in his circles have been reserved for the Eucharist, cf. Mark 14:24; 1 Cor 11:25), Peter relies on language that had perhaps become already fixed among Christians as a way of alluding to the same typology. To “obey” was to accept the gospel and become part of a new community under a new covenant; to be sprinkled with Jesus’ blood was to be cleansed from one’s former way of living and released from spiritual slavery by the power of his death (cf. 1:18). Peter’s choice of images confirms the impression that he writes to communities of Gentiles as if they were a strange new kind of Jew.

cari" umin kai eirhnh plhqunqeih, “may grace and peace be yours many times over.” Peter here follows an early Christian form of salutation common to all N[T] epistles except James and the letter from Jerusalem recorded in Acts 15:23–29 (where a simple cairein, “greetings,” is used; cf. also the letters of Ignatius).

The basic greeting “grace to you [plural] and peace” is found in all of Paul’s epistles except the pastorals (where because the addressee is one person, the form is simply “grace and peace” [Titus] or “grace, mercy, peace” [1-2 Timothy]). In all of these (except 1 Thessalonians) a prepositional phrase with apo follows, identifying “God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ” (in Col 1:2 only “God our Father”) as the source of the greeting. Rev 1:4–5 is similar except that three prepositional phrases with apo are used, introducing a triadic or trinitarian formula.

Perhaps because he has just referred to God the Father, the Spirit, and Jesus Christ, Peter dispenses with the apo-formulation, and instead multiplies rhetorically the force of his greeting with the optative plhqunqeih (cf. 2 Pet 1:2; Jude 2; and the salutations of *1 Cle*[m], Pol. *Phil.* and *Mart. Pol.*). The occurrence of eirhnh umin plhqunqeih in Dan 4:1; 6:26, Theod.; and 4:37c, LX[x], suggests that such a greeting may have been considered especially appropriate in an encyclical letter (cf. also “May your peace be great” [agcy ÷/mlv

] in three diaspora letters from Rabban Gamaliel II, according to *b. Sanh.* 11b).

The words cari" and eirhnh seem to have been almost inevitable in a first-century Christian greeting (besides all the Pauline epistles and Revelation, cf. 2 Peter; 2 John; *1 Cle*[m] eleo", "mercy," replaces cari" in Jude, Pol. *Phil.*, and *Mart. Pol.*). It is unlikely that "grace" and "peace" were chosen deliberately to anticipate any particular theme of the epistle. The "grace to be given you" about which the prophets prophesied (1:10) is defined by its own context rather than by the passing mention of grace in the salutation. The "grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed" (1:13) is in turn defined by the reference to grace in v 10 and by earlier references to the final revelation in vv 5 and 7. Yet Peter's use of cari" even in connection with present experience (4:10; 5:5, 10, 12) suggests that this word more than any other epitomizes for him all that the Christian community receives from God (cf. *Diogn.* 11.5–7).
"Peace" was the traditional Jewish greeting (cf. eirhnh umin in 5:14; the only other use of eirhnh in 1 Peter is in an O[T] quotation in 3:11), while "grace" in N[T] epistles (usually in connection with "God our Father and the Christ") supplied a Christian context for the ancient greeting. It Lord Jesus was God's grace displayed in Jesus that made peace a reality.

Explanation
The function of the epistolary introduction is to identify the recipients of the letter as God's chosen people living as strangers in the diaspora and to lay a theological basis for their identity. This theological basis extends only as far as their baptism. All that Peter knows of them is that they are communities of baptized Christians and consequendy, like the Jews, "strangers" to the cities and provinces where they live. Not a clue has yet been dropped that their estrangement means suffering for them or that their baptism has given them hope of vindication. As Peter holds out to them grace and peace, the issues to be addressed in his epistle have not even been raised, yet the resources for addressing those issues—the redemptive work of God through Christ, and the resultant character of the community thus redeemed—are already in place.

Reborn to Hope (1:3–5)

Bibliography
Boismard, M.-E. *Quatres hymnes baptismales dans la première épître de Pierre*. L[D] 30 (1961) 15–56. **Cothenet, E.** "*Le réalisme de l'espérance chrétienne selon I Pierre*." *NT*[S] 27 (1981) 564–72. **Coutts, J.** "Ephesians i.3–14 and I Peter i.3–12." *NT*[S] 3 (*1956/57*) *115–27*. **Grosheide, F. W.** "Kol 3,1–4; 1 Petr 1,3–5; 1 Jo 3,1–2." *GTh*[T] 54 (1954) 139–47. **Hiebert, D. E.** "Peter's Thanksgiving for Our Salvation." *Studia Missionalia* 29 (1980) 85–103. **Kendall, D. W.** *The Introductory Character of 1 Peter 1:3–12*. Diss. Union Theological Seminary (Virginia), 1984. ———. "The Literary and Theological Function of 1 Peter 1:3–12." In *Perspectives on First Peter*, ed. C. H. Talbert. Macon, GA: Mercer U[P,] 1986. 103–20. **Kühschelm, R.** "Lebendige Hoffnung (1 Petr 1,3–12)." *BLi*[t] 56.4(1983) 202–6. **Scharlemann, M. H.** "An Apostolic Descant: An Exegetical Study of 1 Peter 1,3–12." *Concordia Journal* 2 (1976) 9–17. **Toit, A. B. du.** "The Significance of Discourse

Analysis for New Testament Interpretation and Translation: Introductory Remarks with Special Reference to 1 Peter 1:3–13." *Neot* 8 (1974) 54–79.

Translation

[3]*Blessed be*[a] *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who in his great mercy gave us new birth by raising Jesus Christ from the dead. He brought us to a living hope,* [4]*an indestructible, incorruptible, and unfading inheritance reserved in heaven for you,*[b] [5]*who are being protected by the power of God,*[c] *through faith, for a salvation about to be revealed at the last day.*[d]

Notes

a. To make sense in English, the verb "be" is supplied as if there were an optative form (eih) in the Greek text (cf. the immediately preceding optative plhqunqeih in v 2). The verb einai is frequently omitted in formulas of this kind, and when it has to be supplied, as here, it can be understood either as an indicative ("God is blessed") or as an optative ("May God be blessed"). In a confessional context the two are virtually indistinguishable. To call God "blessed" is not to make a theological pronouncement but to offer up to him one's praise Hence the optative.

b. A few ancient Gr. MS^{s} (probably including ^{P72}, although its reading is not absolutely certain), and some MS^{s} of the *La*^{t} v^{g}, have "for us" instead of "for you," thus maintaining the first person confessional style of v 3. This would make for a less abrupt shift to the second person at v 6, with the beginning of a new thought. The more awkward shift, already at the end of v 4, is represented by the overwhelming majority (including the most important) of textual witnesses, and is to be accepted. A very few late MS^{s} begin the use of the second person even in v 3 ("gave you new birth"), suggesting a tendency among some scribes toward consistency throughout.

c. ^{P72} reads simply "by power," while small groups of unimportant MS^{s} read "by the love of God" or "through the Spirit of God." The text as it stands is correct. The omission in ^{P72} is probably accidental, and the other readings may have been explanatory marginal notes that at some point displaced the correct reading in the text.

d. "Day" has been adopted as the translation for kairo" ("time" or "season") because kairo" refers to a particular moment, not to a duration of time. A translation such as "the last time" or "the end time" tends to become virtually synonymous with the plural ("the last times" or "the end times" or even "the last days") and to suggest that Peter has in mind a period of time immediately preceding the end, rather than the end itself. His point is not that kairo" escato" is when the salvation is ready (etoimhn) to be revealed; his point is that kairo" escato" is the precise moment when it actually will be revealed. A term used in the measurement of time, such as "day," "hour," or "moment," is more appropriate to the context and reflects better the usage of kairo" in the LX^{X} and N$^{T.}$

Form/Structure/Setting

In the letters of Paul, the epistolary introduction is customarily followed either by a thanksgiving to God (with eucaristein: Rom 1:8; 1 Cor 1:4; Phil 1:3; Col 1:3; Philem 4; 1

Thess 1:2; 2 Thess 1:3), or by an ascription of praise or blessing to God (with euloghto": 2 Cor 1:3; Eph 1:3). Of the remaining letters attributed to Paul, only 2 Tim 1:3 has a comparable expression (with carin ecein); Galatians, 1 Timothy, and Titus lack this component altogether. 1 Peter follows the second of Paul's models, agreeing word for word with the formula Paul uses in both instances to introduce his word of blessing: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (v 3; cf. 2 Cor 1:3; Eph 1:3).

The agreement is somewhat closer with Ephesians than with 2 Corinthians because Ephesians, like 1 Peter, continues immediately with an aorist participle characterizing God by the redemptive work he has accomplished for those now praising him (i.e., o euloghsa" hma" in Eph 1:3; in 2 Cor 1:4 the participle is present rather than aorist and is separated from the euloghto"-formula). Although the blessing is far more elaborate in Ephesians than in 1 Peter and maintains its liturgical form to the end in a way in which 1 Peter does not (cf. Eph 1:3–14), both passages make a shift at a certain point from the first person plural of confession and worship to the second person plural of preaching (not in the sense of exhortation, but of reminding the readers of their past and present experience, and of what lies in store for them). This point comes in Ephesians at 1:13 but in 1 Peter it comes much earlier, at 1:4. In Ephesians, the alternation of "we" and "you" (1:12–13) affirms a common experience for Jew and Gentile and thus anticipates the crucial discussion in the following chapter of the two groups' oneness in Christ. In 1 Peter, neither the contrast between Jew and Gentile nor their oneness in Christ is at issue. The change from "we" to "you" is therefore a purely stylistic feature betraying the fact that what began as an almost liturgical ascription of praise to God is already giving way to a homiletical summary of the readers' Christian experience (vv 6–9).

This movement in Peter's thought is possible because the euloghto"-expression with which the paragraph begins does not precisely fit the pattern of the Jewish "blessing," or *bĕrākâ*; i.e., it is not a blessing addressed to God as a prayer (cf. hTa JWrB;, "blessed art Thou," throughout the Jewish synagogue liturgy) but a declaration or confession to the worshiping community that God is worthy of praise (cf. Hort, 28; notice that Zachariah's song in Luke 1:67–79, introduced by "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel," is presented as a prophecy [v 67], not a prayer). The effect of such a declaration is to praise God as if it were actually directed toward him (cf. *Note* a*, above), yet the declarative form of praise (derived largely from the LXX) is appropriate to an epistle (cf. already in 150 B.C. the use of euloghto" o qeo" in the apocryphal letter of Suron to Solomon in Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelii* 9.34), and in the present chapter prepares the way for the transition to homily at v 6.

Comment

3 euloghto" o qeo" kai pathr tou kurion hmwn Ihsou Cristou, "Blessed be the Son and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." The background of the expression used here and in Eph 1:3 and 2 Cor 1:3 (cf. also 2 Cor 11:31) is the LXX: e.g., euloghto" kurio" o qeo" (twelve occurrences) or simply euloghto" kurio" (eleven occurrences) or euloghto" o qeo" (thirteen occurrences). Because the title kurio" is so frequently transferred in the NT to Jesus Christ, euloghto" o qeo" becomes the characteristic NT form for blessing God.

In the LXX, this kind of expression with euloghto" can be used either of God in himself, or of God in relation to something—a person, or a people, or even an attribute (e.g.,

“the Lord God of Shem,” Gen 9:26; “the Lord God of my lord Abraham,” Gen 24:27; “the God of truth,” 1 Esd 4:40; “the Lord God of our fathers,” Ezra 7:27; “the God of Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego,” Dan 3:95 [Theod.]; and especially “the Lord God of Israel,” I Sam 25:32; 1 Kings 1:48; 8:15; 2 Chr 2:11; 6:4; Pss 40[41]:14[13]; 71[72]:18; 105[106]:48; and one N^T example, Luke 1:68). What is distinctive about the Pauline-Petrine blessing is that it is directed to God in relation to “our Lord Jesus Christ.” The title kurio", now separated from qeo", is conferred on one who lived—and lives—within the historical memory of the communities being addressed. God is no longer defined in relation to heroes of faith out of the remote past, or in relation to his deliverance of Israel, but in relation to Christ (cf. v 2). Instead of taking God as the known point of departure and designating Jesus in relation to him (i.e., as Son of God), the formula takes Jesus as its reference point. The “God … of our Lord Jesus Christ” (cf. Eph 1:17) is the God whom Jesus worshiped and who raised him from the dead, and the God whom the risen Jesus makes known. He is also Father of Christ (cf. v 2); together the two designations preserve the recollection that Jesus in history announced the gospel of God and claimed God as his Father (cf. Mark 1:15 and esp. John 20:17).

The ancient Jewish formula has been adapted (in 2 Corinthians and Ephesians as well as 1 Peter) to Gentile communities who have come to know Christ first, and through him the God of the Jews (cf. v 21).

o … anagennhsa" hma", “who … gave us new birth.” The LX^X blessing with euloghto" is most often followed by a relative pronoun (o"), although occasionally by an oti-clause or (as here) by a participle (cf. Pss 71[72]:18; 134[135]:21; 143[144]:1; Tob 13:2, all present participles; the one aorist participle is I Esd 8:25).

anagennan is found in the N^T only here and in v 23, and not at all in the LX^X (except for one doubtful variant in Sir, *prol.* 28). It is the equivalent of gennan anwqen in John 3:3, 7 and may have been derived from a slightly different form of that very saying of Jesus (cf., e.g., Justin Martyr, Justin, *Apol.* 1.61.3. “For the Christ also said, Unless you are born again [an mh anagennhqhte], you will never enter the kingdom of heaven”; cf. also Matt 18:3). gennan anwqen is perhaps a Johannine adaptation making possible either the meaning “born again” or–as the use of anwqen in John 3:31 suggests— “born from above.” Certainly the Gospel tradition (cf. Gundry, *NT*[S] 13.4 [1967] 338–39), is a nearer and more plausible source for Peter’s terminology than, e.g., the pagan mystery religions (as proposed by R. Perdelwitz; in refutation, cf. F. Büchsel, *TDN*[T] 1:673–75, and Selwyn, 305–11). anagennan is found in only one (fourth century A.D.) text bearing on mystery religions: Sallustius, *De Deis* 4 (ed. A. D. Nock [1926] 8, 24).

The active voice of anagennan found here is in any case unique, or very close to it. The aorist active participle is virtually a title (“the Begetter” or “the Progenitor,” with the understanding that a new act of begetting has taken place; the closest N^T equivalent is perhaps ton gennhsanta, “the parent,” in 1 John 5:1; cf. Deut 32:18 LX^X). The accent is on “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” as the Father of “us” (the confessing community) as well, and on the divine initiative by which he became Father to the Christians both in Rome and in Asia Minor (cf. v 17).

kata to polu autou eleo", “in his great mercy.” It was out of mercy that God became Father to those who acknowledged Christ as Lord. The experience of the mercy of God is common to all believers, whether (like those being addressed in this epistle) they were “once destitute of mercy” (2:10) or whether (like Peter and other Jewish Christians)

they had long been taught to know "a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness" (Exod 34:6 RSV, where "abounding in steadfast love" renders the Hebrew dmjAbr

and the LXX has the one adjective polueleo"; cf. also Num 14:18; Neh 9:17; Pss 86:5, 15; 103:8; 145:8; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2). The Jewishness of Peter's reference to mercy in this context of blessing can be seen from Ps 65[66]:20 LXX: "Blessed be God [euloghto" o qeo"] who has not turned away my prayer, nor his mercy [to eleo" autou] from me."

What united Jew and Gentile in Christ was a new display of God's great mercy in the decisive act of raising Christ from the dead. Both groups needed this fresh outpouring of mercy, and people from both groups had received it. Whatever distinction existed between the two is transcended in 1 Peter, but Paul in Ephesians provides a glimpse of the distinction in process of being overcome. It is "God, being rich in mercy" (o de qeo" plousio" wn en eleei, 2:4) who unites Gentiles ("you," 2:1) with Jews ("we all," 2:3) in one body in Christ.

Paul comes closer to the perspective (and language) of 1 Peter in Titus 3:5, where "out of his mercy" (kata to autou eleo") God is said to have "saved us through the washing of regeneration [paliggenesia"] and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Here God's mercy is contrasted with works done in righteousness in order to make the point that, except for the "grace" (cari", Titus 2:11), "kindness" (crahstoth", 3:4), and "generosity" (filanqrwpia, 3:4) as well as the mercy of God, that Christ made known, Christians would be no better (and no better off) than their pagan neighbors or the pagan authorities who ruled over them (Titus 3:1–3; cf. 1 Pet 2:11–17; 4:1–6).

Peter's emphasis throughout is on God's grace, both present and future, but if cari" embodies for him all that God gives, eleo" (or more precisely, polu … eleo") is the quality in God himself that motivates the giving. In this respect it corresponds to God's makroqumia, or "patience" (3:20), and it is noteworthy that in all but two of its eleven occurrences in the LXX the compound adjective polueleo" is linked with makroqumo". Out of such qualities, God has saved a people and made them his children.

ei" elpida zwsan, "to a living hope." That the new birth is oriented toward the future can be seen already from the saying of Jesus on which Peter's thought is basedú Jesus had said that those who were not reborn would not "see" (John 3:3) or "enter" (John 3:5; Justin Martyr, Justin, *Apol.* 1.61.3; cf. Matt 18:3) the kingdom of God. Although the kingdom of God, or of heaven, has both a present and a future aspect in the Gospel tradition, such expressions as "seeing" (idein), "entering" (eisercesqai), or "inheriting" the kingdom (klhronoumein, especially in Paul) refer without exception to a distinctly future experience of the reign of God. It is not surprising, then, that Peter's reference to the new birth introduces words of assurance about the future summed up in three prepositional phrases: ei" elpida zwsan (v 3); ei" klhronomian … (v 4); ei" swthrian … (v 5).

What is meant by "a living hope"? It is doubtful that Peter intends a contrast with the "dead" hopes of Judaism. Even though he may agree with the author of Hebrews that Christians have in Christ a "new and living way" (Heb 10:20) and a "better hope" than the Jews (Heb 7:19), this is not the point he is making. If any contrast is intended, it is with the hopelessness of pagan religion (cf. Eph 2:12). The point is that zwsan follows naturally from o anagennhsa": if Christians are a reborn people, they are spiritually alive, and their hope is alive (i.e., it is valid, it will not be disappointed, cf. Rom 5:5). Hope in God, as much as faith in God, is the hallmark of their new life in Christ (v 21); their situation corresponds

to that of "the holy wives who hoped in God long ago" (3:5). Their hope, and not simply their faith, is what they must be prepared to explain and defend when they are challenged (3:15). Just as "faith" can be subjective (the act or state of believing), or objective (the content of belief), so "hope" can refer either to an anticipation (even a certainty) of good things to come or to the content of that anticipation, the good things themselves. The "living hope" of which Peter speaks here is better understood in the second, objective, sense. As such, it appropriately parallels, and is further explained by, the "inheritance" of v 4 and the "salvation" of v 5 (cf. Col 1:5, where Paul speaks of "hope" in much the same way that Peter speaks of the "inheritance").

di¬ anastasew" £Ihsou Cristou ek nekrwn, "by raising Jesus Christ from the dead." The redemptive act by which God has brought about new birth for a new people is finally made explicit as the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Grammatically, the phrase di¬ anastasew" £Ihsou Cristou is linked to o … anagennhsa", not (as some have suggested) to the immediately preceding zwsan. The main point is not that the hope is a living one because Jesus has been raised, but that God has made believers his children by raising Jesus from the deadú At the same time, the word order of the clause does create an inevitable association in thought between zwsan and anastasi": resurrection means life, and makes life possible (cf. John 1 1:25). The redundant ek nekrwn at the end of the clause (which is *not* found with di¬ anastasew" £Ihsou Cristou in 3:21) creates a verbal contrast (zwsan … ek nekrwn, "living … from the dead"), which reinforces that association in thought.

In itself, anastasi" £Ihsou Cristou is ambiguous because the act of "resurrection" can be either transitive or intransitive (i.e., either "raising" or "rising" from the dead). If it is the former, £Ihsou Cristou is an objective genitive (i.e., God raised Jesus Christ); if the latter, £Ihsou Cristou is a subjective genitive (i.e., Jesus Christ arose). The difference is small in any case, but since God the Father is the subject of v 3 in its entirety (and in particular of the clause introduced by o … anagennhsa"), he is also to be understood as the subject here (cf. the use of the verb anistanai with ek nekrwn in Acts 13:34; 17:31).

The conclusion does not prejudge the meaning of di¬ anastasew" £Ihsou Cristou in 3:21 where the context is not God-centered to quite the same degree. In both passages, however, the resurrection of Jesus is closely connected with the initiation experience of Christians, here designated metaphorically as rebirth and there made explicit as baptism. It is possible that the connection rests on an early Christian understanding of Jesus' resurrection as a new "begetting" of the Son by the Father, based on Ps 2:7 LX^{x} (egw shmeron gegennhka se; cf. Acts 13:33; Heb 1:5; 5:5), but the relationship is too indirect to admit anything approaching certainty. Nor is it likely that the "living hope" mentioned in v 3 is meant as a purely individualized hope of bodily resurrection made possible by the raising of "Christ the firstfruits" (1 Cor 15:23; cf. the raising of the dead as the "hope" of Judaism according to Acts 23:6; 24:15; 26:6–8; 28:20). Although similarly based on Jesus' resurrection (cf. v 21), Peter's "living hope" is more comprehensive than simply being raised individually as Jesus was raised. It includes that but encompasses everything that the Christian community expects as its future divine vindication.

4 ei" klhronomian afqarton kai amianton kai amaranton, "an indestructible, incorruptible, and unfading inheritance." The noun klhronomia occurs almost two hundred times in the LX^{x}, not necessarily in the strict sense of an inheritance handed down in a family but with the meaning of a "sanctioned and settled possession" (Hort, 35), however

acquired or assigned. Often it refers to the land of Canaan, promised and given to the Israelites as their home and property, or to particular portions of the land given to particular tribes. Peter's use of the term, however, is most closely related to N^T passages that speak of "inheriting" (klhronomein) either "the kingdom" (Matt 25:34; 1 Cor 6:9–10; 15:50; Gal 5:21; cf. klhrouomia in Eph 5:5 and klhronomoi in James 2:5) or "eternal life" (Matt 19:29; Mark 10:17; Luke 10:25; 18:18) or an equivalent (e.g., "the earth" [Matt 5:5], "incorruption" [1 Cor 15:50], "salvation" [Heb 1:14], "the promise" [Heb 6:12], "blessing" [1 Pet 3:9], "these things" [Rev 21:7]). It is likely that Peter's thought is still being shaped by the traditional saying of Jesus about rebirth that seems to underlie v 3: "Unless you are born again, you will not inherit the kingdom of heaven"—i.e., a saying similar in form to Justin Martyr's citation in Justin, *Apol.* 1.61.3, except that the characteristically Pauline notion of "inheriting" the kingdom replaces that of "entering" it.

klhronomia thus refers to the future inheritance itself, not to a status enjoyed already as God's children and heirs (cf. 3:7; Rom 8:17; Gal 4:7). As an eschatological gift from God, it stands beyond all the uncertainties of the present age. It is afqarton kai amianton kai amaranton, "indestructible, incorruptible, and unfading." The three adjectives with the negating prefix a represent a classic negative way of characterizing persons or things that strain one's descriptive powers (cf., e.g., the characterization of Melchizedek in Heb 7:3, of Jesus as High Priest in Heb 7:26 or as the sacrificial lamb in 1 Pet 1:19, or of God as king in 1 Tim 1:17). These particular adjectives are at times used singly to refer to rewards awaiting the righteous: e.g., a "crown" (with afqarton [1 Cor 9:25]; with amarantinon [1 Pet 5:4]) and "prizes" (with amiantwn [Wisd Sol 4:2]). The rare amaranto" is found in early Christian apocalyptic descriptions of the end time in *Sib. Or.* 8.409–12 ("that I one day may give thee immortal fruits, and thou shalt have light eternal and life unfading, when I bring all men to proof by fire. For I shall smelt all things, and separate them into purity" [Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 2:738]) and *Apoc. Pet.* 15 ("and the earth itself budding with flowers which fade not [amarantoi" anqesin] and full of spices and plants which blossom gloriously and fade not and bear blessed fruit" [Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 2:681–82]).

Each of these words in its own way drives home the point that the inheritance of which Peter speaks is an eternal one (cf. Heb 9:15). In general, asqarton refers to freedom from death and decay, amianton to freedom from uncleanness or moral impurity, and amaranton to freedom from the natural ravages of time (as, e.g., in the fading of flowers, cf. v 24).

tethrhmenhn en ouranoi", "reserved in heaven." Only an inheritance "reserved in heaven" is safe from damage and decay. Peter's terminology here rests not only on the phrase "kingdom of heaven" from the Gospel tradition, but probably also on certain specific sayings of Jesus: e.g., "Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is great in heaven" (Matt 5:12); "Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust deface and where thieves break in and steal, but store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust defaces and where thieves do not break in or steal" (Matt 6:19–20); and "Make for yourselves garments that do not grow old, an inexhaustible treasure in heaven, where no thief approaches and no moth does damage" (Luke 12:33).

The passive participle tethrhmenhn points indirectly to the action of God in preserving an inheritance for his chosen people (en ouranoi", "in heaven," virtually a circumlocution for God, confirms this), while the perfect tense of the participle suggests that God's action had its beginning in eternity past (cf. "in the foreknowledge of God the Father" [v 2];

"foreknown before the creation of the world" [v 20]). Common in Jewish apocalyptic literature was the notion that "the lot of the righteous" (*1 Enoc*[h] 48.7), or the heavenly Jerusalem, understood as Paradise (*2 Apoc. Bar.* 4.6; cf. 4 Ezra 7:26), or even the messianic Son of Man himself (*1 Enoc*[h] 48.6; 62.7) was preserved and hidden with God until the time of the end. In a more general way, *2 Apoc. Bar.* also speaks of the "glory" (48.49) reserved for the righteous.

Analogous to Peter's use of tethrhmenhn here is Paul's use of perfect participles in speaking of the long-hidden "mystery" that Jew and Gentile would become one body in Christ (e.g., to musthrion to apokekrummenon [Col 1:26; Eph 3:9]; musthriou … sesighmenou [Rom 16:25]), or, more generally, of the wisdom of God at work in the good news of redemption through Christ (qeou qofian en musthriw thn apokekrummenhn [1 Cor 2:7]). The difference between Paul and Peter is that in the epistles attributed to Paul the things kept secret have now been revealed, while in 1 Peter they are yet to be revealed (cf. vv 5, 7, 13). The inheritance "reserved" in heaven through many ages is still being held in reserve for God's people, in much the same way that the kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels is "prepared from the creation of the world" for those who will "inherit" it on the day of judgment (Matt 25:34, again with the perfect passive participle; cf. Mark 10:40 // Matt 20:23). Paul comes closest to Peter's thought in Col 1:5, where he uses a present participle to speak of "the hope laid up for you in heaven."

It is possible, in view of the three preceding adjectives, that threin carries here the particular connotation of keeping something "unharmed or undisturbed" (BG[D], 815), i.e., that the inheritance is kept afqarton, amianton, amaranton in heaven. Yet the use of the verb elsewhere for the storing up of either "good things" (*Mart. Pol.* 2.3) or judgment (*Mart. Pol.* 11.2; cf. 2 Pet 2:17; Jude 13) until the last day suggests that nothing so subtle is in view. The purity implied by the three negative adjectives is reinforced by en ouranoi" but not specifically by tethrhmenhn. For the thought, cf. *Diogn.* 6.8: "Christians sojourn among corruptible things [paroikousin en fqartoi" (cf. 1 Pet 2:11)], waiting for the incorruptibility which is in heaven [thn en ouranoi" afqarsian]."

ei" uma", "for you." With these words an abrupt transition is accomplished from the confessional "we"-style of vv 3–4 to the homiletical "you"-style that will dominate the rest of the epistle. The phrase ei" uma" is similar in meaning to umin used as a dative of advantage; i.e., ei" uma" is chosen here to bring out the implication that from the very beginning the inheritance was intended "for your benefit"; cf. BG[D] § 229.4g. The inheritance was preserved for the recipients of this epistle (cf. v 10, where ei" uma" occurs with this meaning, even though it is equivalent to the umin of v 12).

5 tou" en dunanei qeou frouroumenou" dia pistew", "who are being protected by the power of God, through faith." The readers are identified not as Gentiles, in contrast to the author (as in Eph 1:13, kai umei"), and not as Jews either (as they were, metaphorically, in v 2), but simply as those "protected by the power of God" (cf. Peter's final promise to them in 5:10). Because their real need for this protection does not become clear until v 6, frouroumenou" makes its appearance simply as a synonym for tethrhmenhn, lending rhetorical balance to vv 4–5 as a whole. The inheritance is "reserved" for the believers, and the believers are "guarded" or "protected" until they come into their inheritance (for a similar pattern, cf. the use of threin in connection with future judgment in 2 Peter and Jude: the wicked are "reserved" for judgment [Jude 6; 2 Pet 2:4, 9; cf. 3:7], while at the same time judgment is "reserved" for them [Jude 13; 2 Pet 2:17]).

Because of this symmetry of language, the question of the actual dangers against which (or through which) the recipients of the epistle are being protected does not immediately arise. The phrase dia pistew", however, anticipates to dokimion … th" pistew" (v 7) and to telo" th" pistew" (v 9). Their "faith" must be tested by "various ordeals" (vv 6–7) and the end of that process of testing will be salvation (vv 7, 9). It is in reference to these "ordeals" (as yet unspecified) that they are being "protected by the power of God."

Together, the phrases "by the power of God" and "through faith" explain how the protection of believers takes place: the accent on God as the initiator of the action, presupposed from the beginning of v 3, becomes explicit again in the phrase en dunamei qeou. The power that raised Jesus Christ from the dead (v 3) is the power that ensures the safety of those reborn through him. pisti" here is not mere intellectual assent, nor does it refer (like upakoh) primarily to a person's conversion or initial acceptance of the Christian gospel. It is faith understood as continuing trust or faithfulness. Ironically, in 1 Peter, upakoh is the term used for the giving of allegiance, while pisti" characteristically refers to the maintaining of allegiance—almost the exact opposite of what is suggested by the respective English words "obedience" and "faith." God protects his people by his power as they wait to come into their inheritance, but what is required of them in the meantime is faithfulness to their "Lord Jesus Christ" (v 3) and (as they will find out) the steadfast endurance of suffering (cf. again *Mart. Pol.* 2.3, where the ones for whom "the good things … are preserved" are "those who have endured").

ei" swthrian etoimhn apokalufqhnai en kairw escatw, "for a salvation about to be revealed at the last day." "Salvation," as elsewhere in 1 Peter (i.e., vv 9–10; 2:2) is essentially future. It is the final display of the "power of God," no longer simply to "protect" his people, but to vindicate them, once and for all, against their enemies, and usher them into their inheritance. Like the inheritance itself, God's salvation exists already in his saving intent. It is present but not yet visible; it needs only to be "revealed," and the moment of its revelation is very near.

This salvation is "about to be revealed at the last day" (en kairw escatw). Peter is not speaking of the "times" or the "ages" in a generalized sense (as, e.g., in v 20), but of one decisive moment when God will bring to an end the world as it has always been (cf. 4:7), and make a new beginning. This moment of the revealing of salvation can also be designated in personal terms as the moment "when Jesus Christ is revealed" (vv 7, 13), i.e., as the event elsewhere in the N^T called the "coming" or parousia (a word not found in 1 Peter) of the Lord. Or it can be called the revealing of his "glory" (doxa, 4:13; 5:1). The terminology varies, but Peter clearly awaits a sudden, supernatural intervention of God in history, both for salvation (vv 5, 9, 13) and judgment (1:17; 4:5, 17), and this expectation powerfully shapes much of what he writes. Although he does not try to fix the exact time, Peter regards the salvation as ready (etoimhn) to be revealed (cf. God as tw etoimw" econti krinai, "the One who stands ready," in 4:5; also the references to what God has "prepared" in Matt 25:34 and in 1 Cor 2:9). etoimhn reinforces and intensifies the phrase "reserved" in heaven." The "chosen people" stand on the threshold of their inheritance; its unveiling is both imminent and certain.

Explanation

The blessing with which the body of the epistle begins praises God for his initiative in

raising Jesus Christ from the dead, and so bringing to birth as his children a new people. This is a confession that Peter and his readers make in common, and in making it Peter largely reinforces the confession of faith already implicit in his greeting. Rebirth is another metaphor for the consecration by the Spirit and sprinkling with the blood of Jesus mentioned in v 2.

If there is a new note sounded here, it is that of power—the power of God displayed in Jesus' resurrection. It is this note of divine power, and in particular the resurrection of Jesus as the supreme expression of it (so far), that directs Peter's thought toward the future and toward heaven. The hope, the inheritance, the salvation all belong to the future. The hope is "living" by virtue of Jesus Christ's victory over death; the inheritance is a heavenly one, untouched by anything that belongs to the present world; the salvation is "ready" in God's hand but still invisible to human eyes as it waits to be revealed. There is a triumphalism here, but it is a triumphalism of the future and of the world above. Nothing that Peter says precludes a realistic assessment of the present circumstances of himself and his readers. He has not yet begun to make that assessment, but his earlier reference to the situation of "living as strangers in the diaspora" (v 1), along with his passing mention in v 5 of the need for faithfulness suggests that he is aware of those circumstances and will soon speak of them directly.

It is instructive to compare Peter's perspective on redemptive history with that of Paul in Gal 3:23: "Before faith came, we were guarded under law, locked up until the faith that was to come should be revealed." Paul's vocabulary is strikingly similar to that of Peter (i.e., "guarded" or "protected," "faith," and "to be revealed"), but his time perspective is strikingly different. Paul sees "faith" in relation to "law," and consequently in relation to the past, as fulfillment. Peter sees "faith" in relation to "salvation" understood as future, and thus as faithfulness or endurance, the appropriate response to the ambiguities and dangers of the present age. To Paul, faith belongs to the "already," while to Peter it points to the "not yet." He will make this clearer in vv 6–9.

Rejoicing and Faith (1:6–9)

Bibliography

Dautzenberg, G. "Swthria yucwn (1 Petr. 1,9)" *B*[Z] N[F] 8.2 (1964) 262–76. **Hill, D.** "On Suffering and Baptism in 1 Peter." *Nov*[T] 18 (1976) 181–89. **Nauck, W.** "Freude im Leiden: Zum Problem einer urchristlichen Verfolgungstradition." *ZN*[W] 46.1 (1955) 68–80. **Reynolds, S. M.** "The Zero Tense in Greek: A Critical Note." *WT*[J] 32.1 (1969/70) 68–72. **Thomas, J.** "Anfechtung und Vorfreude: Ein biblisches Thema nach Jakobus 1,2–18, im Zusammenhang mit Psalm 126, Röm 5,3–5, und 1 Petr. 1,5–7 formkritisch untersucht und parakletisch ausgelegt." *K*[D] 14 (1968) 183–206. **Villiers, J. L. de**. "Joy in Suffering in 1 Peter." *Neo*[t] 9 (1975) 64–86. **Zerwick, M.** *Biblical Greek*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1963. 110–11.

Translation

[6]*Then you [will]* rejoice[a]*—though*[b] *now for a little you must*[c] *suffer affliction*[d] *in various*

ordeals. [You must suffer][7] *so that the genuineness*[e] *of your faith—a quality more precious than gold which, though perishable, is [also] tested by fire—may be found to result in praise, glory, and honor at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed,* [8]*You have never seen*[f] *him, but you love him. Even now, without seeing, you believe in him, [and] you [will] rejoice*[a] *with inexpressible and glorious delight* [9]*when you each receive the outcome of yourg faith, your*[g] *final salvation.*[h]

Notes

a. Most of the important ancient MS[s] read the present middle agalliasqe both in vv 6 and 8, but a few make one or the other active voice (i.e., in v 6: adalliasante" P[72]; in v 8: agalliate, B, probably the first copyist of C, a few later minuscules, and the citations of Origen). The active voice (which is rare) makes little if any difference in meaning; the only effect of these variants is to make the forms of this verb in vv 6 and 8 no longer identical.

There is also a tendency in quotations to read these verb forms as future: e.g., in v 6, *exultabitis* in several v[g] MS[s]; in v 8, in Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 4.9.2 (*gaudebitis*), 5.7.2 (*exultabitis*), and Pol. *Phil.* 1.3 *La*[t] (*gaudebitis*). The M[S] evidence, however, favors agalliasqe in both places, overwhelmingly in v 6 and adequately in v 8. Only the reading agalliate in v 8 (favored by Hort, 45) has appreciable M[S] support, but its ending is probably to be explained by scribal confusion with agapate one line above.

b. The translation "though" is based on a concessive understanding of the participle luphsente" (BD[F] § 418.3).

c. The manuscript tradition is divided as to whether estin is to be read after ei deon. It is included by B, the original copyist of a

, and a few of the minuscules, but omitted by the majority of both uncials and minuscules (e.g., P[72], the corrector of a

A C P Y 048). The difference is roughly equivalent to the difference in English between "if necessary" and "if it is necessary"—i.e., no difference at all in meaning. The breadth of evidence slightly favors omission but no clear-cut decision is possible.

d. Some MS[s] read, instead of the nominative participle luphqente", the accusative luphqenta" (first copyist of a

L and a number of minuscules) or the infinitive luphqhnai (a very few minuscules, some v[g] MS[s], and one Coptic version). The effect of these variants is to link the word grammatically to ei deon (i.e., "since it is necessary [for you] to be afflicted," rather than "[You] being afflicted, as is necessary"), but there is no real difference in meaning.

e. A few MS[s] (e.g., P[72] P[74] and minuscules 23 36 69 206 429) read to dokimon instead of to dokimion, and it is always possible that to dokimion is an assimilation to James 1:3. Either form is to be understood as the neuter singular of an adjective meaning "genuine" (either dokimo" or dokimio") used as a noun with the meaning "genuineness" (cf. BD[F] § 263.2).

The adjective dokimio", although not attested in literary Greek, is found in the papyri (A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901] 259–62). Despite the

parallel with James 1:3, dokimion is the more difficult reading, and in view of the weight of manuscript evidence in its favor, is to be preferred.

f. idonte" ("having seen") is supported by the oldest uncial MS^{s} ($^{P72\ a}$

$^{B)}$ as well as other important Alexandrian and Western witnesses (^{C,} a few minuscules, *La*^{t} and other versions and the earliest citations by the church fathers); eidote" ("knowing") is the reading of A K Y, the majority of later minuscules, and the later patristic citations. If idonte" is the original reading (as the evidence indicates), the change to eidote" was probably the result of a mistake in dictation or hearing. It is doubtful that a scribe would have deliberately changed idonte" to eidote" because ouk eidote" hardly makes sense with agapate (cf. Gal 4:81). Once the accidental change was made, however, eidote" (normally used as a present participle) may have been understood as a perfect—which in a formal sense it is (cf. BG^{D,} 555)—with a past meaning: once you did not know Christ, but now you know and love him. In this case the more difficult reading (eidote") is *not* the correct one.

g. The pronoun umwn is omitted by ^{B,} a very few minuscules, the Coptic Sahidic version, and certain patristic citations. A few other minuscules and versions read hmwn (which is clearly out of place in the context), umwn however, has strong and widespread support (^{a}

$^{A\ C\ P}$ Y 048, the great majority of later minuscules, and the Latin and Syriac versions), and is probably to be accepted. It is implied in any event because the definite article with pisti" points back to umwn th" pistew" in v 7 as well as pisteuonte" in v 8. There is a possibility (although not a strong one) that umwn could be taken with swthrian yucwn rather than th" pistew".

h. lit. "salvation of souls." See *Comment*. The use of "each" in the preceding clause is intended to bring out the plurality and individuality of "souls."

Form/Structure/Setting

Once agalliasqe is accepted as the correct reading in vv 6 and 8, the two occurrences of this verb form can be seen as the key to the structure of vv 6–9. The second agalliasqe is a resumption of the first; everything between them (vv 6b–8a) is a digression. The main thread of Peter's rhetoric can then be expressed in one sentence: "Then you will rejoice with inexpressible and glorious delight, when you each receive the outcome of your faith, your final salvation" (en w agalliasqe … cara aneklalhtw kai dedoxasmenh, komizomenoi to telo" th" pistew" umwn swthrian yucwn). The theme of the sentence is joy, specifically eschatological joy. The joy of which Peter speaks is anchored in the future (i.e. the "last day") by the en w with which v 6 begins (see Comment) and by the concluding participial clause that comprises v 9.

The digression, which has faith as its theme, can be divided into two parts: (a) faith perfected through ordeal (vv 6b–7) and (b) faith in place of sight (v 8a). The first consists of a brief reference to present circumstances (v 6b), along with a statement of the eschatological outcome of the testing of the believers' faith (v 7). The end of this statement (i.e. "at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed," v 7b) brings the time perspective back to the "last day" and the revealing of salvation mentioned at the end of v 5, and thus appears to terminate the digression—but not quite. The word "revelation" (apokaluyi") occasions

one further thought before returning to the main theme of joy. The fact that Jesus Christ is to be "revealed" must mean that he is not now visible. Peter pauses in v 8a to acknowledge that this is the case and to reiterate one more time the necessity of faith. The resumptive agalliasqe finally brings the double digression to an end and focuses the reader's attention once again on the "salvation about to be revealed at the last day" (v 5). Peter makes his eschatological perspective explicit in v 9: the job comes "when you each receive the outcome of your faith, your final salvation"—i.e., when "the salvation about to be revealed" is revealed, and Jesus Christ is visible once more.

Comment

6 en w agalliasqe, "then you [will] rejoice." The answers to two questions raised by these introductory words largely determine the interpretation of vv 6–9 as a whole. First, what is the antecedent of en w? Second, is agalliasqe to be understood as a present imperative, a present indicative with a present meaning, or a present indicative with a future meaning? The two questions are closely intertwined; neither can be answered without giving attention to both.

The most plausible antecedent for en w is the immediately preceding en kairw escatw of v 5. If this is the antecedent, en w might be understood as making "the last day" either the *object* of rejoicing (cf. the expression agalliasqai en found occasionally in the LX[x] in the sense of rejoicing "at" or "over" something or someone), or the *time* at which the rejoicing takes place. The second alternative is by far the more likely; the object of one's rejoicing is normally a person or a great event, not the time at which something takes place. The use of en with kairw escatw closely followed by en w makes it natural to understand the latter as a temporal expression equivalent to "then" or "on that (future) day" (cf. Tyndale: "in the which tyme ye shall reioyce": see Bigg, 103; Goppelt, 99).

Such an interpretation obviously requires that agalliasqe, although present in form, be understood as if it were future. For many commentators (e.g., Hort, 39; Selwyn, 126; Kelly, 53) this consideration alone is enough to prompt a search for alternatives: either that en w points back to "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," the subject of o … anagennhsa" in v 3 (Hort, 40), or that it refers in a more general way to vv 3–5 in their entirety (i.e., "in this confidence" or simply "therefore"; cf. Kelly, 53; Beare, 86).
If one of these alternatives is adopted, than agalliasqe could be either indicative or imperative. A present indicative with its normal present meaning, however, raises the question of how Peter knew his readers were joyful in spite of their "various ordeals." It is not the sort of thing one takes for granted. In the "indicative" sections of this epistle (i.e., the sections where he is describing the work of God, or the spiritual experience of his readers), Peter confines himself to things he can assume to be true of all Christians: that they are "purified" and "born anew" (vv 22–23), that they love Jesus (v 8), that they are being built as a "spiritual house" (2:5), and that they have made a break with the paganism of their past (4:4). He even assumes in a general way their faithfulness through the ordeals they have faced so far (cf. the use of pisti" in vv 5–9). Jubilation (especially in the face of suffering) is a different matter. That it should have been present in some believers is not surprising, but what is doubtful is that from the beginning of his epistle Peter would attribute joy to all his readers without explanation or qualification, and without direct knowledge of their feelings or circumstances.

The problem is somewhat lessened if agalliasqe is taken as an imperative (e.g., Nauck, 71–72). There is precedent in the Gospel tradition for an exhortation to rejoice in the face of suffering (cairete kai agalliasqe, Matt 5:12; cf. v 11). Peter gives evidence of familiarity with such words of Jesus in 4:13–14, where the exhortation to "be glad" (cairete, v 13) is followed by a beatitude (makarioi) on those who are "ridiculed for the name of Christ" (v 14; cf. makarioi este, Matt 5:11). James begins the body of his epistle with an admonition to consider the "various ordeals" one encounters (same vocabulary as Peter's) an occasion for joy (James 1:2). Two factors, however, weigh against the imperatival interpretation. First, there is a definite shift at v 13 (marked by dio) to exhortation and to the imperative mood, and the imperatives, when they come, are aorist rather than present (elpisate, v 13; genhqhte, v 15; anastrafhte, v 17). Although not impossible, a present imperative in v 6 would be abrupt and premature.

Second, there is no possibility of an imperatival understanding of agalli-asqe in v 8, linked as it is to the preceding indicative agapate. The great advantage of taking agalliasqe as an indicative in v 6 is that it preserves consistency between Peter's usage in vv 6 and 8. It is not likely that he would repeat exactly the same verb form after a significant digression, only to put it to an entirely different use.

The best option remains the present indicative with a future meaning. In "confident assertions regarding the future," especially prophecies (BD[F] § 323), a present tense can stand for the future. If "the time element is established by the context" (in this instance, en w linked to the preceding en kairw escatw), the present "becomes semantically a 'zero' tense, taking a future meaning from the context" (Reynolds, 69). Such an understanding accounts for agalli-asqe in v 6, and will be found applicable in v 8 as well. It is this interpretive insight, not a primitive textual tradition, that most plausibly explains the persistence of the future verb forms *exultabitis* and *gaudebitis* in Latin translations of vv 6 and 8 (especially v 8; see *Note* a*, and cf. also Origen's interpretation in *Exhortation to Martyrdom* 39).

oligon arti ei deon [estin] luphqente" "though now for a little you must suffer affliction." The use of arti ("now") means that luphqente", though aorist, must refer to an experience of suffering that extends into the present (cf. the use of aorist passives with nun in 1:12; 2:10, 25; and with a present meaning—though without nun—in 1:20; 2:21, 24; 3:6, 9). It is wrong to assume that the meaning of oligon is that the suffering has gone on for a short time. The point of reference is the future, as in the case of the oligon paqonta" ("after a little suffering …") with which the epistle draws to a close in 5:10. If oligon refers to time (BG[D], 563.3a) the apparent meaning is that the suffering will not continue much longer—a corollary of the statement that the future salvation is "about to be revealed, v 5. If it refers to degree or extent, the meaning is that the present ordeals are insignificant in comparison to the "eternal glory" (5:10) that lies ahead (cf. Rom 8:18; 2 Cor 4:17). The placement of ogigon next to arti suggests that the focus of Peter's interest is more on time than on extent; oligon reinforces the etoimhn of v 5 and helps sustain the eschatological expectancy pervading vv 3–9.

ei deon, whether estin is expressed or understood (see *Note* c*), should be read as a first class conditional clause, referring in this instance to what is actually the case: i.e., not "if need be" but "since it is necessary" or "by necessity." The suffering is no mere contingency but has (as the aorist luphqente" indicates) already begun (cf. Kelly, 53–54). The conditional clause here is comparable to the clause in 4:14 introduced by ei

oneidizesqe, “in being ridiculed.” There is little ground for arguing, as some have done, that Peter moves in his epistle from the “vague possibility” of suffering in 1:3–4:11 (Beare, 26) to suffering as an actual present experience in 4:12–5:14 (cf. Zerwick, 110–11). Suffering is assumed to be a present reality already in chap. 1.

deon is the participle of the impersonal dei (cf. BG[D], 172.6). Peter’s language recalls Jesus’ warning that certain things “must take place [dei genesqai] but the end is not yet” (Mark 13:7; cf. Dan 2:28; Rev 1:1; 4:1; 22:6) or Paul’s early reminder to churches in the East that “we must [dei] through many afflictions enter the kingdom of God” (Acts 14:22). Even the sufferings of Jesus himself were viewed as a divine necessity (cf., e.g., dei in Mark 8:31 and parallels; Luke 17:25; 24:7, 26; John 3:14; 12:34; Acts 3:21; 17:3), and it is entirely appropriate that Peter’s first explicit reference to the sufferings of the Asian churches puts these sufferings in a similar framework. It is perhaps because of this widely acknowledged necessity that he later tells his readers not to “be surprised at the fiery ordeal you face … as if something strange were happening to you” (4:12).

luphsente" refers not so much to grief, as when a person grieves for a lost friend, but to the actual pain or suffering of persecution (cf. again Origen’s comment on this text in *Exhortation to Martyrdom* 39, where he notes the use of the word luph for physical pain in Gen 3:16).

The passage delineates two time periods: the present, characterized by grief in this sense, and the future, characterized by joy. Peter is not speaking paradoxically of joy *in* suffering (as he is, e.g., in 4:13) but eschatologically of joy *after* suffering. The same temporal sequence is found in John 16:19–22 where the “grief” of a woman in labor followed by “joy” at the birth of her child serves as a metaphor for the disciples’ situation in the world. Their “grief” at Jesus’ absence will give way to “joy” when they see him again.

en poikiloi" peirasmoi", “in various ordeals.” Virtually the same phrase (peirasmoi … poikiloi") occurs in James 1:2. The meaning of peirasmoi—i.e., as ordeals, or experiences of testing, not “temptations” in the sense of inducements to sin (cf. BG[D], 640.1)—will be immediately explained by the lengthy purpose clause that comprises v 7. The “fiery ordeal … to put you to the test” is described as singular in 1 Pet 4:12 but plural here (cf. ta auta twn paqhmatwn, “the same kinds of suffering,” in 5:9). 1 Peter and James could easily have chosen such a phrase independently of one another. Although their agreement does not in itself indicate a direct literary relationship between the two epistles, it must be carefully assessed along with the evidence of certain other parallels (cf. vv 7, 24; 5:5–6).

Because Peter does not have direct knowledge of the particular “ordeals” facing the churches to which he writes—any more than of the sufferings of the “brotherhood throughout the world” (5:9)—he uses vague terms such as ta auta and poikiloi to encompass a whole range of possible troubles. The readers themselves could fill in the specifics, and Peter leaves it to them to do so (although he does venture to introduce hypothetical examples of denunciation or slander in 2:12 and 3:16).

Selwyn (129) finds the diversity of the ordeals illustrated in Heb 11:35–40, as well as in Jewish descriptions of the tortures undergone by the Maccabean martyrs (e.g., 4 Macc 17:7; 18:21), but it is doubtful that Peter (or James) had anything so specific or so heroic in mind.

7 ina to dokimion umwn th" pistew" … eureqh, “so that the genuineness of your faith … may be found.” The long clause introduced by ina explains the divine purpose and

the final outcome of the readers' experience of suffering: i.e., the perfecting of their faith. The faith to which Peter refers is the faithfulness (dia pistew") mentioned in v 5.

The phrase to dokimion umwn th" pistew" is duplicated exactly in James 1:3, in the immediate context of James's reference to "various ordeals," but with a subtle difference in meaning, to dokimion in James refers to a process (the testing of faith; the genitive "of faith" denotes the object of this process). But to dokimion in 1 Peter is virtually equivalent to the faith itself ("the genuineness of your faith" or "your faith insofar as it is genuine"; cf. Paul's expression, to th" umetera" agaph" gnhsion, "the sincerity of your love," in 2 Cor 8:8). So closely equivalent are they that in comparing the faith of his readers to "gold … tested by fire" in the clause that follows, Peter grammatically links to dokimion (instead of h pisti") with the expression "more precious than gold" (polutimoteron crusiou). The function of the ina-clause as a whole is not so much to assert directly that the readers' faith is proved genuine by a process of testing (for that is assumed from the start by the use of to dokimion) as to extol the value, in God's sight, of this "genuine faith" and to affirm its ultimate (i.e., eschatological) significance.

The verb euresh ("be found"), by which this affirmation is carried out, is used here as a somewhat stronger equivalent of the verb einai ("to be"), taking as its predicate either polutimoteron (i.e., the genuine faith is found to be more precious than gold) or the construction ei" epainon kai doxan kai timhn (i.e., the genuine faith is found to result in praise, glory, and honor). While the first of these alternatives is widely adopted in the commentaries (e.g., Hort, 42; Selwyn, 130; Kelly, 54), the second is more often the choice of translators (e.g., v^g Tyndale, KJ^v/A^v, RS^v, NE^b, NI^v). The second is favored by the word order and is probably correct.

polutimoteron crusiou tou apollumenou dia puro" de dokimazomenou, "a quality more precious than gold which, though perishable is [also] tested by fire." If this phrase is not the predicate of "found," it must be understood as standing in apposition to "the genuineness of your faith," and therefore as somewhat parenthetical. Its function is to clarify the abstract and rather obscure to dokimion by introducing the metaphor of gold (crusiou … dokimazouenou). Peter uses the metaphor to make two distinct points. First, genuine faith is more precious to God than gold because gold is perishable (the perishability of precious metals is one of Peter's characteristic themes, v 18), while faith, like the inheritance for which it waits (v 4), is indestructible and eternal. Second, gold nevertheless (de) has something in common with genuine faith, in that it is "tested by fire" (cf. e.g., Ps 65[66]:10: "For you, O God, have tested us [edokimasa" hma"]; you have tried us [epurwsa" hma"] as silver is tried"; also Prov 17:3; 27:21; 1 Cor 3:13; Rev 3:18; Her^m *Vis.* 4.3.4.). Although the theme of faith "tested by fire" is implicit here, its importance at the present stage in Peter's argument should not be exaggerated. It comes to expression within a parenthesis, and there only indirectly, as part of a metaphor. Peter will return to this theme and make it explicit in 4:12, and much of his epistle will be devoted to spelling out concretely what it entails, but for the moment his interest centers more on faith's vindication at the last day.

For the thought of the whole passage, cf. the description of the righteous in Wisd Sol 3:5–6: "And having borne a little chastening [oliga paideuqente"], they shall receive great good; because God tested them [epeirasen autou"] and found them [euren autou"] worthy of himself. As gold [w" cruson] in the furnace he proved them [edokimasen autou"], and as a whole burnt offering he accepted them. And in the time of

their visitation [en kairw episkoph" autwn] they shall shine forth" (*APO*[T] 1.539).

ei" epainon kai doxan kai timhn en apokaluyei Ihsou Cristou, "to result in praise, glory, and honor at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed." The prepositional phrase takes the place of a predicate nominative after eureqh (as it sometimes does with einai, "to be," and ginesqai, "to become"; BD[F] § 145.1). The construction is not unlike Paul's characteristic lagizesqai ei" ("to be reckoned as" or "counted as"; cf. BD[F] § 145.2), and may properly be translated "to be found as," "turn out to be," or "result in" (cf. Paul's use of eureqh with ei" in Rom 7:10: a command meant to give life instead turned out as death).

In the present passage both the passive eureqh and the purpose clause of which it is a part implicitly point back (like the participles of vv 4–5 and the ei deon of v 6) to the sovereign action of God. It is God who crowns genuine faith with "praise, glory, and honor" at the last day (cf. 5:4). Each term (epaino", doxa, timh) can be used either for that which human beings offer to God or for that which God confers on them. Because of the way in which God is understood in this epistle (and in the N[T] generally), the two alternatives are not to be set against each other but regarded as two sides of a single coin. If "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" is a God of grace, then it is in giving that he receives (cf. the expression, "to the praise of the glory of his grace" in Eph 1:6, 12, 14). In honoring he is honored, in glorifying he receives glory, and in praising he is praised. There is a certain ambiguity in the three unmodified nouns, "praise, glory, and honor," with the hint of a double reference that cannot be overlooked. Yet the priority is clear. Peter has in mind *explicitly* the praise, glory, and honor that God bestows on his servants, and only implicitly the praise, glory, and honor that is his in the act of giving.

These three terms inevitably suggest the notion of reward, specifically as eschatological reward, for they are all part of the "salvation" for which the Christian community waits (cf. vv 5, 9, 10). They are not "prizes" awarded on the basis of merit but simply the eschatological equivalent of "genuine faith" itself. At the last day the virtues of faithfulness and endurance are no longer necessary—because persecution is no longer a threat—and are exchanged for a different currency. Faith gives way to vindication, and "praise, glory, and honor" are different ways of expressing this vindication. They are three in number mainly for rhetorical effect (cf. Rom 2:7, "glory and honor and immortality"; 2:10, "glory and honor and peace"). Peter could have mentioned only two of the three (cf. "glory and praise," Phil 1:11; "glory and honor," Heb 2:7, 9; *1 Cle*[m] 45.8), or added, e.g., "blessing" to his list (cf. 3:9) without an appreciable change in meaning. "Glory," conspicuous elsewhere in the epistle (4:13; 5:1, 4, 10) is given no special prominence here, perhaps because the three terms are being used almost interchangeably. To some degree, they are illumined by their opposites: the contrast between "honor" and "shame" in 2:6–7, and between "commendation" or "praise" and "punishment" in 2:14 supports the insight that the basic element in all three is vindication "at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed."

en apokaluyei Iihsou Cristou is the personalized equivalent of "the salvation about to be revealed at the last day" (v 5). The revealing of that salvation is the revealing of Jesus Christ himself (cf. v 13). The assumption of this epistle is not that Jesus is absent from his people, so that he must "come." Rather, he is present with them but invisible; therefore he must "be revealed."

8 on ouk idonte" agapate, "you have never seen him, but you love him." The transition is not so abrupt as it may seem. If the term "revealed" implies that Jesus Christ is

now invisible, the relative clause that follows makes this explicit. Peter's focus (at least from v 4 on) has been on the experience of his readers, and he continues in the second person: "You have not seen him." Although Peter does not explicitly include himself in this statement, neither does he exclude himself by introducing an emphatic umei". His point is not (as, e.g., Selwyn, 131, and Kelly, 56, have suggested): "You have not seen him—but I have, as an apostle and eyewitness" (cf. 2 Pet 1:16). The reference is neither "a pointer to Petrine authorship" nor "a lifelike touch inserted by someone claiming to write in the Apostle's name" (Kelly, 56). Peter's intent is simply to make a generalization about the experience of all Christian believers. None of them (himself included) have ever seen Jesus Christ in the way they will see him at the time when he is revealed.

The notion of loving God or Jesus is associated in several other N[T] texts with this final revelation. James speaks of the "crown of life" (cf. 1 Peter 5:4) and of the "kingdom" to which the poor are heirs, promised by God "to those who love him" (toi" agapwsin auton, James 1:12; 2:5). Paul is represented as awaiting a "crown of righteousness" that the Lord will confer on "all who love his appearing" (pasi toi" hgaphkosi thn epifaneian autou, 2 Tim 4:8). In a passage even more akin to the present one, Paul quotes from an unknown source the words, "The eye has not seen, the ear has not heard, nor has there come up in the human heart the things which God has prepared for those who love him" (toi" agapwsin auton, 1 Cor 2:9). Although Paul does not refer here to the future appearing of Jesus Christ, several other ancient uses of this quotation do (e.g., *1 Cle*[m] 34.8; *2 Cle*[m] 11.7, 14.5; *Mart. Pol.* 2.3), and it may be that the same saying has contributed to Peter's choice of words as well.

The wider background is God's covenant with Israel and his self-identification as the one "showing steadfast love [LX[X:] eleo"] to … those who love me and keep my commandments" (Exod 20:6, RS[V]; cf. Deut 5:10; 7:9, Neh 1:5; Dan 9:4). Love for the Lord God is the identifying mark of his people whether in the O[T] or the N[T] (Deut 6:4–5; Mark 12:30), and thus virtually the equivalent of trust or faith (cf. E. Stauffer in *TDN*[T] 1:52; also Goppelt, 103). In the N[T,] love for God has become interchangeable with love for Jesus, just as faith in God is interchangeable with faith in Jesus (note the centrality of love for Jesus in Peter's own experience according to John 21:15–17).

Especially pertinent is the fact that Jesus' promise in his farewell discourses to become visible to his disciples after his departure from the world is made conditional on their love for him (John 14:21) and on their consequent obedience to his message (14:22–24). The tested "faith" of 1 Pet 1:6–7 and the love for Jesus mentioned in v 8 are simply two expressions for the same basic commitment, the one that defines every Christian community and determines its stance in the world until Jesus Christ is finally revealed.

ei" on arti mh orwnte" pisteuonte" de agalliasqe, "Even now, without seeing, you believe in him, [and] you [will] rejoice." The equivalence of love and faith is confirmed by the immediate occurrence of pisteuein, used like agapan in connection with "not seeing." Strict logic seems to require the indicative pisteuete, corresponding to agapate (cf. Irenaeus's paraphrases in *Adv. Haer.* 4.9.2 and 5.7.2), but Peter wants to bring his thought full circle back to agalliasqe, with which it began in v 6. The real parallelism of the relative clauses is as follows:

1.

on ouk idonte" agapate

2.
ei" on … pisteuonte" de agalliasqe

The preposition ei" depends on pisteuonte" (although the common construction pisteuein for "believe in" is not found elsewhere in 1 Peter, ei" occurs in 1:21 with both the adjective pisto" and the noun pisti"). pisteuonte" carries the main thought of the clause, while arti mh orwnte" (despite its correspondence to ouk idonte" in the preceding clause) is somewhat parenthetical here, and strictly preliminary and subordinate to pisteuonte". In addition to defining the love of which Peter speaks in the first clause, pisteuonte" links the references to pisti" in vv 5–7 with the concluding reminder of faith's vindication in v

The notion that faith outweighs sight as a way of knowing and a basis for living is a fairly common N^T theme (e.g. John 20:29; 2 Cor 4:18; 5:7; Heb 11:1, 3), but why the repetition of the theme of not seeing Jesus? Does arti mh orwnte" merely repeat and reinforce ouk idonte", or does it carry the thought further? The arti calls attention to a shift from aorist to present participle; it is also to be noted that while orwnte" is negated (as a participle normally is) by mh, the negative with idonte" is ouk (which regularly negates only indicatives in N^T Greek, BD^F § 426). The shift of negatives further accents the shift in the time reference. The real distinction in the two participles is perhaps that ouk idonte" (like ofqalmo" ouk eiden in 1 Cor 2:9) points to what is necessarily and universally the case—i.e. that Christ and the salvation he brings are hidden from human view until the moment of his revelation—while arti mh orwnte" focuses more specifically on the "various ordeals" (v 6) now confronting Peter and his readers. The phrase arti mh orwnte" recalls the ogigon arti … luphsente" of v 6: the trials facing the Christian community are as burdensome as they are because Christ the Deliverer is not yet in sight. The adverb arti looks both backward and forward. Even now (as in the past, but in contrast to the future) Christian believers cannot see Jesus. When they finally see him revealed, their grief will turn to joy (cf. John 16:19–22).

The end of the digression that began after agalliasqe in v 6 comes so abruptly as to create an ambiguity. agalliasqe, repeated here from v 6, is linked both to the preceding participle pisteuonte" (referring to present affliction and endurance) and to the following participle komizomenoi, "when you receive" (referring to future vindication). Which of the two fixes its time reference? The parallelism of function with agapate could fix the rejoicing in the present, but the resumptive character of agalliasqe requires that (as in v 6) a future rejoicing is in view. The decisive link is with komizomenoi, and the eschatological tone is heightened by the accompanying reference to "inexpressible and glorious delight." In the translation the ambiguity has been removed by inserting "and" between the references to believing and rejoicing.

cara aneklalhtw kai dedoxasmonh, "with inexpressible and glorious delight." Peter draws on two terms to express the idea of rejoicing: agallian (vv 6, 8; 4:13) and χαίρειν/χαρά (v 8; 4:12–13). If a distinction can be made on the basis of only six occurrences, it is that χαίρειν/χαρά seems to be Peter's general term for either present or future joy, while agallian focuses more particularly on the believer's future delight "at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed" (v 7). The combining of the two, both here and in 4:13, has the rhetorical effect of heightening an already strong sense of eschatological

expectancy.

The joy awaiting the Christian community at the last day is "inexpressible and glorious." Several commentators (e.g. Beare, 89; Selwyn, 131) mention 1 Cor 2:9 in connection with aneklalhtw: the joy to come, like the revelation to come, is beyond not only human sight and hearing but human speech as well—cf. Paul's use of anekdihght in 2 Cor 9:15 and of anexeraunhta and anexicniastoi in Rom 11:33 (Rom 8:26 is probably different in that alalhtoi" means only unspoken, not unspeakable).

It must be admitted that what is "indescribable" or "unsearchable" or "untraceable" in these Pauline passages (as in 1 Cor 2:9 itself) is not the future consummation of God's purposes but his present redemptive plan in Jesus Christ (cf. the discussion of Col 1:26; 1 Cor 2:7, etc., in connection with v 4 above). Ignatius uses the adjective aneklalhto" of the star that appeared at Jesus' birth (Ign. *Eph.* 19.2), while Polycarp, adopting the very language of 1 Peter, attaches the whole phrase cara aneklalhtw kai dedoxaqmenh directly to the verb pisteuete (omitting agalliasqe entirely) so as to locate the "inexpressible and glorious joy" of the Christian believer unmistakably in the present (Pol. *Phil.* 1.3 Greek; Latin is different). The point of aneklalhtw in our passage is that whether present or future, the joy (and the revelation on which it is based) defies all human efforts at understanding or explanation.

dedoxasmenh further characterizes this joy as "glorious" (lit. "glorified"). The other four uses of doxazein in 1 Peter refer to human beings "glorifying God" by their words or by their conduct (2:12; 4:11, 14b, 16), but dedoxasmenh here is more closely related to several uses of the noun doxa with reference to the splendor of God himself, conferred by grace on those he loves (e.g. v 7; 1:21; 4:13–14; 5:1,4,10). The "glorious delight" of which Peter speaks is the joy that inevitably follows when faith is "found to result in praise, glory, and honor at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed" (v 7), or (according to 4:13) "the time when his glory is revealed." It is an overwhelming joy, radiant with the glory of that day.

The theme of the joy of God's people at the last day is conspicuous both in the Hebrew Scriptures and in later apocalyptic literature. In several passages this joy is associated with the vision of God and with the glory of the age to come, much as it is in 1 Peter: e.g. Isa 60:5, "Then you shall see and be radiant, your heart shall thrill and rejoice" (RS^{V}); 4 Ezra 7:98, "They shall rejoice with boldness, be confident without confusion, be glad without fear, for they are hastening to behold the face of him whom in life they served, and from whom they are destined to receive their reward in glory" (*APO*^{T} 2:589; cf. also Isa 61:3, 7, 10; *1 Enoc*^{h} 104.2–4).

9 komizomenoi to telo" th" pistew" umwn, "when each receive the outcome you of your faith." The participial clause adds nothing new to Peter's argument (contra Hort, 47) but simply reiterates the thought of v 7b. Its purpose here is to fix the time of the believers' rejoicing: they will rejoice "on receiving the outcome" of their faithfulness—i.e. when their faithfulness is "found to result in praise, glory, and honor at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed" (v 7b).

komizomenoi to telo" comes close to the idea of collecting a reward (cf. komieisqe in 5:4), and it is tempting to assign to to telo" the meaning (in a metaphorical sense) of "tax" or "customs duty" (BG^{D}, 812): "collecting the payment due you by virtue of your faith." It is not likely, however, that Peter would introduce such a subtle and complex metaphor so abruptly. to telo" should be given its more normal sense of end, outcome, or result. The faithfulness of Christian believers has as its proper end the "salvation about to

be revealed at the last day" (v 5). In this, its telo", genuine faith comes to fruition as "praise, glory, and honor at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed" (the single word telo" fulfills much the same function as the expression eureqh ei" in v 7b).

Peter's usage is similar to Paul's in Rom 6:21–22, where telo", in association with karpo" ("fruit" or "benefit"), refers to the final outcome of sin and obedience, respectively, in a person's life (cf. Goppelt, 104). Although Peter is not speaking metaphorically (as Paul is), his meaning is that his readers will rejoice when they collect the full benefit of their faith (cf. NIV on Rom 6:21–22).

swthrian yucwn, "your final salvation." Peter now further defines the "salvation" of v 5 as "salvation of souls" (see *Note* h*), probably to avoid promising his readers exemption from physical suffering and death. swthria by itself can mean physical deliverance (BGD, 801), and he is offering no guarantees of that. Yet yuch here is not the "soul" in distinction from the body (as in much of Greek thought; Dihle, *TDNT* 9:608–17) but rather a person's whole life or self-identity (cf. Dautzenberg, 272–75). The promise of salvation given here assumes both the supreme value of the yuch (cf. Mark 8:36–37) and the paradox of Jesus' pronouncement that "whoever wants to save his life [thn yuchn autou swsai] will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it" (Mark 8:35; cf. Matt 16:25–26; Luke 9:24–25; John 12:25). Although the yuch Peter has in mind is bodily life, it is also a life transcending physical death. His terminology is not that of resurrection, yet the hope of personal resurrection (on the basis of the resurrection of Jesus, cf. vv 3, 21) is implied.

As in v 5, swthria lacks the definite article (cf. also 2:2). The plural yucwn lends to the phrase a certain concreteness it otherwise lacks. Peter has in mind the salvation of a specific group of people (cf. the "eight souls … saved through water" in 3:20) and, despite the absence of an article or possessive pronoun, the context makes it clear that the readers of the epistle—together with their "brotherhood throughout the world" (5:8)—are the group that is meant. The use of the anarthrous plural yucai in an indefinite way to refer to a quite definite group (i.e., the elect or the righteous) is reminiscent of several passages in the book of Wisdom (e.g., 2:22; 3:1, 13; 7:27). Especially significant is Wisd Sol 3:13, where "the time of their visitation" (en kairw episkoph" autwn, 3:7) is characterized further as the "visitation of souls" (en episkoph yucwn); see Comment at 1 Pet 2:12, 25.

Explanation

Without using any future verbs, Peter draws a sharp contrast in vv 6–9 between the present and the future. Christians are suffering now, but soon they will rejoice. The are embattled now ("guarded by the power of God," v 5), but soon they will be victorious. Their faith is being tested now, but soon it will prove itself purer and more precious than gold. Whether they live through their trials or not, the final outcome of their faith will be salvation, with the "praise, honor, and glory" from God (v 7) that salvation brings. Although they cannot yet see Jesus, whom they love, they soon will see him revealed in all his glory.

The contrast drawn here is a simple one. Hope for the future is Peter's basis for consolation in the present. His main point is little different from that of Paul in Rom 8:18:

> I consider that our present sufferings are not worth comparing with the glory that will be revealed in us. (NIV; cf. 2 Cor 4:17–18)

or from that of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount:

> Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth. (Matt 5:4–5, NIV).

Jesus pronounces the suffering ones already "blessed," and it is but a short step further to speak of the vindication itself as present instead of future ("Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," Matt 5:10, NIV) and call for present rejoicing (Matt 5:12).

Yet it is a step Peter does not take in the present context. When he does take this step later in his epistle (4:13), he does not tell his readers to rejoice because they are suffering (a rather masochistic notion) but to rejoice because in suffering for the sake of Christ they are sharing the experience of Christ himself (4:13–14). When Paul goes so far as to tell his readers that they— and he—already "rejoice in our sufferings" (Rom 5:3, NIV; using a different verb from those in 1 Peter), he explains carefully what he means: They "rejoice in the hope of the glory of God" (5:2), and suffering is what finally leads to hope (5:3–4). James tells his readers to "consider it pure joy" when they face "trials of many kinds" (James 1:2, NIV), but he too explains that this is because "the testing of your faith develops perseverance" which must "finish its work so that you may be mature and complete, not lacking anything" (James 1:3–4, NIV). Neither Peter nor Paul nor James knows of a "paradox" of joy in suffering. Suffering produces sorrow, while joy is the result of vindication. In the present passage, suffering and sorrow belong to the present, while vindication and joy, although very near, belong to the future. Peter's vision transcends the limitations of the present, yet he never denies the hard reality of present suffering or calls it something it is not. In this respect he is true both to the message of hope that is the theme of his letter and the assumptions he feels compelled to make about the life situation of his readers.

The Witnesses of Salvation (1:10–12)

Bibliography

Kilpatrick, G. D. "1 Peter l: 11 tina h poion kairon." *Nov*T 28.l (1986) 91–92. **Michaelis, W.** "parakuptw." *TDN*T 5:814–16. **Selwyn, E. G.** "Exegesis of i.10–12." Additional Note D. *The First Epistle of Peter*. London, 1961. 259–68. **Shimada, K.** "A Critical Note on 1 Peter 1:12." *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 7 (198l) 146–50.

Translation

[10]*Concerning this salvation, prophets—those who prophesied of the grace to be given you—made diligent and careful inquiry.* [11]*They inquired*[a] *into the time and circumstances which the spirit of Christ*[b] *among them was indicating as he predicted*[c] *the sufferings intended for Christ and the glorious events that would follow.* [12]*It was revealed to them that their ministry in regard to all this was not for their own benefit but for yours. And now it*

has been announced to you through those who brought you the gospel with[d] *the Holy Spirit sent from heaven. On these things angels desire to look.*

Notes

a. eraunwnte" here and exhraunhsan in v 10 are late spellings of ereunwnte" and exhreunhsan respectively (BG[D], 274, 306; cf. BD[F] § 30.4).

b. The omission of Cristou by [B] ("the Spirit that was among them") probably represents the effort of a single scribe to avoid the questions raised by the apparent abrupt reference to the preexistent Christ.

c. The verb promarturesqai is found only here in the N[T] and is not attested either in the LX[X] or in classical Greek. The same is true of the verb promarturein, reflected in promarturoumenon, a variant reading found in [P72 A P] and some other witnesses. BG[D] (708) cites one occurrence of each in very late (eighth century A.D.) papyri. It is doubtful that there is any real difference in meaning between the two. Hort's attempt (53–54) to assign to promarturomenon a more subtle meaning than "predict" or "foretell" (i.e., on the analogy of marturesqai, which he interprets as calling God to witness) cannot be judged successful.

d. The preposition en with "Holy Spirit" is missing in some important MS[s] (e.g., [P72 A B] Y 33 and others). The omission is in agreement with Peter's style (cf. 3:18; 4:6), but there is little difference in meaning; in either case the Spirit is being designated as the power that makes the proclamation effective. The simple dative is probably original, with the en added by later scribes to conform to common N[T] usage (BD[F] § 195).

Form/Structure/Setting

To the elaborated and elevated declaration of his eschatological vision in vv 6–9, Peter now adds an explanatory postscript in a more didactic style. He pauses to measure the greatness of the salvation mentioned in vv 5 and 9 with a brief but wide-ranging reflection on the past and present. The curiosity of "prophets" (v 10) and "angels" (v 12) underscores the mystery of the divine plan: God in his sovereignty has long kept secret the salvation soon to be revealed to his chosen ones (cf. Eph 3:4–6).

The emphasis in vv 3–9 on a distinctly future vindication and on faith as the patient endurance of trials could give the impression that God's people are no better off now than before Christ had come. Then, as well as now, faith was based on a promise and was pointed toward the future. What difference had the coming of Christ made? Peter's purpose here is to answer that question even while affirming the solidarity of his readers with the ancient prophets and the ancient people of God. Although he is referring to Jewish prophets, Peter does not designate them as such, either directly or indirectly; he does not wish to distinguish them in this way from his Gentile readers, whom he consistently regards as no less "Jews" in the sight of God.

Peter's argument is midrashic in character in that he reflects on certain biblical and apocalyptic traditions (the latter perhaps both written and oral), and brings them to bear on his own time and situation. The material has a chiastic (a, b, b´, a´) structure built around the common notion that prophets sometimes questioned God about revelations they received, and in reply were given clarification or further insight. The main flow of thought

(except for the last clause) is carried by aorist verbs (exemhthsan kai exhraunhsan, v 10; apekalufqh, v 12a; and anhggelh, v 12b), while participles and imperfect verbs are used in the subordinate clauses. This structure can be shown as follows:

a. Inquiries of prophets in the past
   (exemhthsan kai exhraunhsan … eraunwnte", vv 10–11).
b. Divine revelation to prophets in the past
   (oi apekalufqh, v 12a).
b´. Divine announcement to Christians in the present
   (a nun anhggelh umin v 12b).
a´. Inquiries of angels in the present
   (epiqumousin, v12c).

Although Peter centers his attention on present-day believers only in b´ (umin, v 12b), his use of ei" uma" in v 10 and the ouc eautoi" de of v 12a indicate that his concern throughout is to assure his readers that they belong to the age of fulfillment even though they are still waiting for their salvation. Ancient Jewish prophets and contemporary Gentile believers are coparticipants in one great redemptive plan. Although the role of angels is less clear because Peter speaks of them so briefly, the whole passage is closely bound together as a unit (as well as being linked to what precedes) by the repeated use of relative pronouns: peri h" in v 10, and oi" … a … ei" a in v 12 (in the previous section, cf. en w in v 6, and on … ei" on in v 8). If the reader was left almost breathless by Peter's language and flow of thought at the end of v 5 and again after v 9, by the end of v 12 he will experience much the same effect from the string of relative pronouns.

Comment

10 peri h swthria", "Concerning this salvation." The repetition of the noun with the relative affords Peter a necessary pause, and allows the phrase to function as a kind of heading for vv 10–12.

exemhthsan kai exhraunhsan, "made diligent and careful inquiry." That the two compound verbs, similar in form and meaning, are used for their rhetorical effect and are not clearly distinguishable in meaning is shown by the fact that the single verb eraunwnte" in v 11 serves to recapitulate them both. The same two verbs are linked in Ps 118[119]:2 LX[x] with reference to "searching out" the testimonies of the Lord and "seeking out" the Lord himself with one's whole heart; at several other points in that psalm (although not elsewhere in the LX[x)] they seem to be used interchangeably by the translator to render the Hebrew verb rxm

. In a very different sense, referring to a search for fugitives carried out with hostile intent, cf. 1 Macc 9:26.

Peter, no less than the translator of Ps 119, regards "diligent and careful inquiry" as an act of piety, with the particular goal of attaining knowledge or understanding. The occasional use of eraunan for searching or investigating the Scriptures (cf. John 5:39; 7:52) could suggest that Peter has in view the study of the written text of Scripture, but this is unlikely. The following verse makes it clear that the object of inquiry was the revelation which the prophets were even then receiving by the "spirit of Christ," not the written records of earlier prophets. More than that, the searching and inquiring was itself part of their prophetic activity. This is true whether the prophets are O[T] prophets, later apocalyptic

visionaries, or even (as Selwyn, 134, 259–68, argues) Christian prophets.

profhtai oi peri th" ei" uma" carito" profhteusante", "Prophets—those who prophesied of the grace to be given you." "Prophets"—without the article—is indefinite, but then immediately defined by a clause explaining on what basis Peter calls them prophets. Their sole relevance to the argument is that they "prophesied of the grace to be given you." Even though Peter does not identify them as a fixed group (as if it were "the prophets") known to his readers in connection with either Jewish history or the canon of Scripture, he appears to have at least some specific examples in mind.

Why is he so vague about something of which he could easily have spoken more concretely? The literary technique of using deliberately vague language to refer to something quite specific can be found in the midrashic summary of biblical history from Adam to Moses in the book of Wisdom; see especially Wisd Sol 10:1–11:1, with references to "an unrighteous man" (Cain), "a righteous man" (e.g., Lot, Jacob, Joseph), "a holy people" (Israel), "a nation of oppressors" (Egypt), "a servant of the Lord" or "a holy prophet" (Moses). The same technique is found occasionally in the NT: e.g., Heb 11:35–38 (women … others … still others); 1 Pet 3:20 ("a few—eight souls in all"); 4:6 ("some who are dead"); 2 Pet 1:21 ("people spoke from God"); 2:4 ("angels who sinned"). Sometimes what is left indefinite is defined in the context or associated with figures who are named, sometimes not.

The effect of such a style is to allow full scope either to the reader's knowledge of biblical and postbiblical history or to their imaginations. To Peter in the present context it scarcely matters whether or not his readers are familiar with particular examples of the "diligent and careful inquiry" of which he speaks. They know what prophets are, and all they need beyond this is to understand that these prophets "prophesied of the grace to be given you." The fact that the prophets were Jewish while Peter's readers are Gentiles is irrelevant. The biblical Jewish past is the readers' past; the Jewish prophets ministered to them no less than to the people of their own time. All are members together of one community of faith, spanning many centuries.

The Jew-Gentile distinction that so agitated Paul and his opponents is here simply ignored. To say that the prophets foretold the inclusion of the Gentiles (Hort, 49) or to say that Peter wrote to his Gentile readers as if they (like the prophets) were Jews, amounts to much the same thing as far as Peter is concerned. The force of his words is comparable to that of Jesus' declaration (in similarly indefinite language) to his Jewish disciples that "many prophets and saints [Luke: "prophets and kings"] … longed to see what you now see, yet never saw it; to hear what you hear, yet never heard it" (Matt 13:17, NEb; cf. Luke 10:24). The very limitation of the prophetic witnesses accentuates the greatness of the fulfillment.

Selwyn's argument (134, 259–68) that Peter has in mind contemporary Jewish Christian prophets rather than ancient prophets rests on a valid sense that they and the readers of the epistle belong to the same community of faith, yet fails to appreciate the limitations Peter assigns to their ministry. Their "diligent and careful inquiry" yields only the insight that their prophetic ministry was "not for their own benefit but for yours" (v 12a). The full revelation is announced rather "through those who brought you the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent from heaven" (v 12b)—by no means the same group.

peri th" ei" uma" carito". The "grace to be given you" is not to be distinguished from the "salvation" about which the prophets inquired. Each occurs in a phrase with peri, and when Peter shortly goes on to speak of "the grace to be brought to you when Jesus

Christ is revealed" (v 13), it is prepositional clear that he has in view the eschatological salvation of vv 5 and 9. "Grace" is therefore more than God's predisposition to give (Hort, 49); it is the gift itself. The prophets inquired about the very thing that was the subject matter of their prophecies.

"Grace" takes on here a more distinctly eschatological meaning than in the "grace and peace" formula of v 2. Although it includes all that God gives to his people redemptively (e.g., 4:10; 5:5, 10, 12), it becomes complete only with the gift of life at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed (1:13; cf. 3:7).

11 erauwnte" ei" tina h poion kaiton, "They inquired into the time and circumstances." The preposition ei" is to be taken with eraunan (for the construction, cf. Gen 31:33 LX[X)], not with the verb edhlou that shortly follows (dhloun in itself means to show or point out and is never used with ei"). Although the ei" is not strictly necessary to convey Peter's meaning, it accents the intensity of the prophets' search in much the same way as the combining of the two verbs prefixed with ek does in the preceding verse.

tina h poionkairon. If tina is taken as a pronoun independent of poion kairon, the meaning is "what person or time" (RS[v]; lit., "whom or what time"). This is unlikely because Peter gives no indication of any mystery or doubt about the "person" in whom the hope of salvation centered. The person was "Christ" (probably understood as a name rather than a title), and the spirit who pointed him out was the "spirit of Christ."

It is preferable, therefore, to understand tina as an adjective coordinate with poion, yielding the translation "what or what kind of time" (i.e., the prophets were trying to find out when the promised salvation would be revealed, or in what sort of times—under what circumstances—their prophecies would come to pass). In many instances ti" and poio" are synonymous (BG[D], 684, 819), and it is possible that Peter combines them merely for rhetorical effect. Even if that is so, however, it is legitimate to ask whether his emphasis is on "what" or "what kind of" (i.e., on the exact time, or on the attendant circumstances). The word order and the choice of conjunctions (h rather than kai) suggests that poion interprets and broadens tina. Hort takes the conjunction h as "virtually corrective" in its meaning: "what or at least what manner of season" (51). The rhetorical effect is to make Peter's reference even more general than it starts out to be. He has in mind not only the precise question "when shall these things be?" but several related questions having to do with the future of the world, the signs preceding the end, and the fate of the prophet's own generation.

When the phrase is understood in this way, a number of examples come to mind from the Scriptures and Jewish apocalyptic literature:

Dan 9: Daniel prays for an end to the desolation of Jerusalem, with reference to Jeremiah's prediction that it would last seventy years (9:1–19) and is given the prophecy of the seventy weeks (9:20–27).

Dan 12:5–13: In regard to the visions he has seen, Daniel asks a heavenly messenger, "How long shall it be till the end of these wonders?" and "O my Lord, what shall be the issue of these things?" (12:6, 8, RS[v]). Although certain precise time periods are mentioned (vv 7, 11, 12), the thrust of the answer is that Daniel is to "Go your way … for the words are shut up and sealed until the time of the end" (12:9, RS[v]; cf. v 13: "But go your way till the end; and you shall rest, and shall stand in your allotted place at the end of the days").

*4 Ezra:*Much of this Jewish apocalypse probably written some decades later than 1 Peter is devoted to the question of the time and circumstances of the end. In 4:33, e.g.,

"Ezra," the seer, asks the angel of the Lord, "How long and when shall these things (be coming to pass)? For our years are few and evil" (*APO*[T] 2:566). Pursuing the same question, he later inquires "whether there be more to come than is past, or whether the more part is already gone by us?" (4:45) and "Thinkest thou that I shall live until those days? Who shall be … in those days?" (4:51); in reply he is told the signs that will appear on the earth at the time of the end (*APO*[T] 2:568–70). Further along in the book, Ezra can still say: "Behold, O Lord, thou hast already shown me a great number of the signs which thou art about to do in the last times, but at what time thou hast now shown me?" (*APO*[T] 2:598). Near the end, he raises the question whether it is better to survive or not to survive until that day; he is told that "those who survive [to that time] are more blessed than those that have died" (13:13–24; *APO*[T] 2:617–18).

Hab 2:1–4 and 1QpHa[b]. Habakkuk takes his stand on a watchtower to "look forth to see what he God will say to me" and is told that "the vision awaits its time; it hastens to the end—it will not lie. If it seem slow, wait for it; it will surely come, it will not delay … the righteous shall live by his faith." In the Qumran Habakkuk commentary (1QpHa[b] 7.1–8), this is interpreted to mean "that the final age shall be prolonged, and shall exceed all that the Prophets have said" (tr. G. Vermes, 239).

Such examples are sufficient to show that the prophets who declared to the Jews the promises of future salvation also raised questions (whether to God himself or to the angels through whom they received their visions) about the time and the circumstances of that salvation. If prophets spoke on God's behalf to the people, they also spoke on the people's behalf to God, giving voice to the inquiries and complaints that they knew their prophecies would inevitably raise among their hearers. These questions often become the occasion for further revelation. It is this tradition of prophetic inquiry—more characteristic of apocalyptic literature than of the canonical prophets—that seems to underlie Peter's generalized language.

If the principle is broadened to include those who are not functioning as prophets, examples can be cited even from the N[T]. When Jesus told his disciples that the temple would be destroyed, they asked him, "when will this happen, and what will be the sign of your coming and of the end of the age?" (Matt 24:3, NI[V]). When he appeared to them risen from the dead, they asked, "Lord, are you at this time going to restore the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1:6, NI[V]). Even his opponents inquired "when the kingdom of God would come" (Luke 17:20, NI[V]). The question of the kaipo" was an almost universal one in Jewish thought, whether voiced by the people in general or by prophets on their behalf. In the present context, the kairo" can be linked to the escato" kairo" of v 5. The moment about which the prophets inquired is the now imminent moment of salvation and of a joy beyond words (vv 5–6, 8; cf. 5:6).

edhlou to en autoi" pneuma Crwdtou, "which the spirit of Christ among them was indicating." The imperfect verb refers to a process of revelation that took place in the prophets' ministry, dhloun is used of the Holy Spirit in Heb 9:8, where the O[T] tabernacle and the ritual of the Day of Atonement is said to be the Spirit's means of "showing … that the way into the Most Holy Place had not yet been disclosed" (NI[V]). Peter too uses dhloun of a revelation in the past through the Spirit. It was (as the imperfect tense suggests, BD[F] § 326), however, a revelation not fully accomplished, because the prophets had to make "diligent and careful inquiry" as to its exact meaning. Only in the aorist, apekalufqh ("it was revealed") of v 12 is the revelation clarified and thereby completed, and when it is

completed, it turns out (just as in Hebrews) to be a kind of nondisclosure: the revelation is not for the prophets' own time but for a distant future (cf. Heb 9:9).

Even the "spirit" at work among the prophets in giving them the revelation belongs to that future. The spirit is the "spirit of Christ." In one sense, this expression validates Selwyn's argument (262–63) that the prophets are Christian prophets; the only other use of "spirit of Christ" in the N^T (Rom 8:9) refers to that which actually defines a Christian. Yet for Peter, "Christian prophets" and "O^T prophets" are not mutually exclusive categories. These "Christian" prophets are also "O^T prophets," not in strictly canonical terms but including all Jewish prophets who bore testimony to Jesus Christ before the fact.

It is only the "before the fact" that Selwyn disputes, largely because of the natural difficulty moderns have in comprehending how there could be a "spirit of Christ"—and therefore Christians—before there was a man named Jesus in history. Such, however, appears to have been Peter's outlook, and it is not unique to him among early Christian writers (cf., e.g., *Magn.* 8.2: "For the divine prophets lived according to Jesus Christ"; 9.2: "even the prophets were disciples [of Jesus Christ] in the Spirit and to [him] they looked forward as their teacher"; the question of their salvation is also addressed in *Magn.* 9.2, and *Herm. Sim.* 9.15.4 and 9.16.4–7). In light of such parallels, it is inappropriate to translate Cridto" here or in the following clause as "the Messiah." Even though the prophets' ministry was long before the fact, Peter depicts them as pointing not to an undefined messianic figure but specifically to Jesus Christ. "Christ" is a name to Peter rather than a title, and he writes as if the prophets viewed matters in the same way.

Yet Peter's use and placement of en autoi", "among them," betrays the fact that his identification of the prophets as Christians is not without qualification. Like Ignatius and the author of Hermas, he knows that the prophets' experience was not comparable to that of Christians in his own day in every respect. The phrase to en autoi" pneuma Cridtou hints at distinctions, although without defining any; it could be paraphrased: "the spirit of Christ in the sense in which, and to the degree that, he was present among them." The question remains whether pneuma Cridtou should be regarded as a reference to the Holy Spirit (called "spirit of Christ" because the Spirit was testifying of him) or to Christ himself in his preexistence (cf. 1 Cor 10:4; Heb 11:26). From Peter's standpoint it is a false alternative because for him the two amount to the same thing (cf. Paul's interchangeable use of "Spirit of God," "Spirit of Christ," and "Christ" in Rom 8:9–10).

promarturomenon ta ei" Criston paqhmata kai ta" mnta tauta doxa", "as he predicted the sufferings intended for Christ and the glorious events that would follow." The strong probability that pro- in the compound verb means "beforehand" is rendered virtually certain by the unique phrase ta ei" Criston paqhmara ("The sufferings intended for Christ"), referring to Christ's passion from a standpoint in the past. When Peter wants to speak of the sufferings of Christ from his own temporal point of view, he uses instead the expression ta tou Cristou paqhmara ("the sufferings of Christ," 4:13; 5:1). The ei" Criston corresponds to the ei" uma" of the preceding verse: "grace" was destined for the believers to whom Peter wrote because "sufferings" and "glorious events" were destined for Jesus Christ. The two uses of ei" hint at the sovereign purpose of God behind both the means and the end of salvation.

Peter's summary of the prophets' testimony as "the sufferings intended for Christ and the glorious events that would follow" recalls Jesus' postresurrection words to his disciples in Luke: "How foolish you are, and how slow of heart that you do not believe all that the

prophets have spoken! Did not the Christ have to suffer these things and then enter his glory?" (Luke 24:25–26, NIV; cf. v 46). The focus is on the sufferings of Christ himself rather than of his followers. Selwyn's argument to the contrary (136, 263) that Criston paqhmara means "the sufferings of the Christward road" (i.e., the suffering of Christians with Christ, or for his sake) is unconvincing. The very correspondence in form between uma" and ei" Criston serves to highlight the distinction between them. The prophets' message was that grace and glory awaited the Christians, while sufferings were in store for Christ. It is true that Christians are seen in the NT as sharing in Christ's suffering and (at the last day) in his glorification or resurrection (e.g., Rom 8:17–18; 2 Cor 1:5; Phil 3:10; cf. Col 1:24; 2 Cor 4:17–18), and Peter himself is capable of viewing things in this way (1 Pet 4:13; 5:1; cf. 5:8–9). In the present passage, however, even as the testifying spirit is specifically the "spirit of Christ," so the testimony is of sufferings intended specifically for him.

The phrase ei" Criston is probably understood to modify ta" docxa" no less than ta paqhmata. The plural "glories" is more appropriate with reference to Christ than to Christians. It is not sufficient to say that the "glories" are plural simply because the "sufferings" are plural. Even though ta paqhmata is plural in 4:13 and 5:1 (as well as in Rom 8:18), the "sufferings" are weighed against one future "glory" (doxa, singular) to be revealed to all believers. There is little basis for Selwyn's contention (264) that the plural "is more easily understood of the divers rewards of a number of Christians than of Christ's alone"; the plural is hardly distributive, as if each believer awaits his or her own individual "glory."

Selwyn himself recognized (137) that doxa" here are "triumphs" or "glorious deeds" (the plural concretizes an abstract noun, BDF § 142). In particular they are the glorious deeds of Jesus Christ or of God on his behalf—in either case "glorious events" associated with Jesus (cf. Exod 15:11 LXX; Wisd Sol 18:24; a different concretizing usage is found in Jude 8 and 2 Pet 2:10, where doxai refers to "glorious beings" or angels). The closest parallel to ta" meta tauta doxa" in 1 Peter is probably ta" areta", the "praises" or "mighty deeds" of God as the "one who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (1 Pet 2:9; cf. the linking of doxa and areth in relation to the "one who called us" in 2 Pet 1:3). The "glorious events" that followed Christ's sufferings can perhaps be identified as his resurrection from the dead (1:3; 3:21; cf. 1:21, "gave him glory"), his journey to heaven (3:22) in the course of which he "made a proclamation to the imprisoned spirits who were disobedient long ago" (3:19), and his enthronement "at the fight hand of God … with angels and authorities and powers in submission to him" (3:22). One way of regarding 3:18–22, in fact, is as a recital of some of the "glorious events" to which v 11 alludes.

The last of these "glorious events" is undoubtedly the salvation for which the Christian community waits. The phrase meta tauta ("after these [sufferings]" or simply "later") sets no limits. Peter has in mind what is future from his own point of view as well as what was future to the prophets. The revelation at the last day is itself one of Christ's "glorious deeds" because it is specifically the revelation of him—and his glory—both to his own followers and to the world (cf. vv 7, 13; 4:13; 5:4).

12 oi" apekalufqh oti ouc eautoi" umin de dihkooun auta, "It was revealed to them that their ministry in regard to all this was not for their own benefit but for yours." The prophets' diligent inquiries were rewarded. The passive apekalufqh points to the activity of God (BDF § 130.1; Zerwick, 76, calls it a "theological passive"), whether direct or

through angels (as, e.g. in Dan 9:20–27; 12:5–13, or the visions recorded in 4 Ezra). The very revelation which God gave them set boundaries to the prophets' ministry: the glorious events and the grace of which they spoke were for a much later time. The revelation was simply that the time for full revelation had not yet come (cf. Dan 12:9; *1 Enoc*[h] 1.2; 1QpHa[b] 7.7–8).

Peter seems to have chosen the verb "reveal" (apokaluptew) deliberately. Nowhere else in the entire N[T] or LX[X] is this verb followed by a oti- clause expressing indirect discourse, nor is the construction characteristic of classical Greek (although cf. *T. Lev*[j] 1.2 in certain manuscripts). Peter could as easily have used egnwrisqh ("made known") or even elalhqh ("spoken") with the indirect discourse clause, but perhaps chose apekalufqh instead to make the point that the ancient prophets, no less than N[T] Christians, had a "revelation" even though a provisional and not a final one (cf. Eph 3:4–6, where a similar kind of revelation is given "now … to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit"). The effect of Peter's language is to emphasize not the secondary importance of the prophets' ministry, but the supreme importance of the future redemptive events to which they bore witness.

ouc eautoi" umin de, "not for their own benefit but for yours." The notion that the ancient prophets ministered (and especially that they wrote) for later Christian believers more than for their contemporaries is a common one in Paul's epistles (Rom 4:23–24; 15:4; 1 Cor 9:9–10; 10:11). Peter himself is credited in the book of Acts (2:25–36) with an argument that David in Ps 16:8–11 was speaking not of his own experience but of Jesus and his resurrection, of which "we all are witnesses" (Acts 2:32, RS[v]; cf. 3:18, 24). What is distinctive in our passage is the explicit assertion that the prophets themselves knew by revelation that their prophecies were for a later time.

dihkonoun auta. The verb diakonein, "to serve" or "minister," is not often used with an accusative representing the service rendered (BG[D,] 184184), but it is so used both here and in 4:10 (cf. also 2 Tim 1:18; *Herm. Sim.* 2.10; in Josephus, *Ant.* 6.298, the idiom is used specifically for the delivery of a message). In the present passage the principle that Peter sees operating in 4:10—i.e. that Christians use their spiritual gifts in ministry for each other's benefit—is applied on a much wider scale. "God's richly diversified grace" (4:10b) is understood to encompass both past and present in a single community of faith and love. The prophets ministered to the believers of Peter's day by bearing their prophetic testimony, long before the fact, to "the sufferings intended for Christ and the glorious events that would follow." Although Peter knows that this ministry-in-advance was possible only because the prophecies were written down, and although he will later quote freely from what the prophets and others wrote (e.g. 1:24–25; 2:6–8; 3:10–12), his focus here is not on written prophecy as such but on the charismatic activity that preceded it.

a nun anhggelh umin dia twn anaggelisamenwn uma", "and now it has been announced to you through those who brought you the gospel." The "sufferings destined for Christ and the glorious events that would follow" are here identified as the gospel recently proclaimed in Asia Minor to Peter's readers. Their knowledge of these things is by no means solely dependent on the witness of ancient prophets. They have heard the message for themselves, proclaimed afresh in their own time. Although Peter does not say so, this fresh proclamation and fresh hearing are what actually define the message as the gospel of Jesus Christ, supplying for its content his suffering and vindication. This, for the hearers, is the decisive revelation; the ministry of the prophets simply confirms it.

"Now" (nun) marks Peter's transition from past to present (cf. 3:21). He frequently combines nun with the aorist passive in referring to the readers' recent acceptance of the Christian message or conversion to the Christian faith. "Now" they have heard the proclamation; "now" they have received mercy (2:10); "now" they have turned to Christ their Shepherd (2:25). The nun is sometimes implied but not expressed: they are called (2:21; 3:9); they are healed (2:24); they have become Sarah's children (3:6). In each of these examples the aorist is used where a perfect might have been expected. It is possible that the passive anhggelh, like apekalufqh just above, points to God as the one from whom the message originated, while the phrase introduced by dia designates the messengers through whom the message was delivered (cf. Hort, 59, who notes the references in Matt 1:22 and 2:15 to things spoken "by" [upo] the Lord "through" [dia] a prophet). Alternatively, dia may be used like upo simply to identify those who announced the message, without any implied reflection on its ultimate source (cf. BD[F] § 223.2). The difference is not great because in either case the activity of God is evident from the reference to "the Holy Spirit sent from heaven" that immediately follows.

The verbs anaggellew and enaggelizesqai are virtually interchangeable here (cf. euhggelisqh in 4:6, used in much the same way that anhggelh is used here, although in a past rather than present setting). The "evangelizers" from whom the readers of the epistle heard the message of salvation are anonymous, like those in Hebrews who confirmed to the author and readers of that epistle the salvation "declared at first by the Lord" (Heb 2:3) when they "spoke to you the word of God" (Heb 13:7). The plural substantive oi enaggelisamenoi comes close in its meaning to oi euaggelwtai ("the evangelists"; see Eph 4:11 and cf. Acts 21:8; 2 Tim 4:5). It is possible (although by no means certain) that Peter's terminology is loosely derived either from Isa 52:7 as interpreted in the early church (e.g., in Rom 10:15, where the singular of the LX[X] and the M[T] is read as a plural) or from Ps 67[68]:12[11] LX[X]. In neither of these passages, however, are the recipients of the good news designated, as they are here, by a direct object in the accusative case (uma"). This construction with euaggelizesqai is characteristic of Luke (3:18; Acts 8:25, 40; 14:21; 16:10; in Paul, cf. Gal 1:9), but more commonly an accusative is used for the message proclaimed and a dative for those who receive it (see BG[D], 317). The closest parallel to Peter's language occurs in *Pol. Phil.* 6.3, a passage influenced by 1 Peter itself (cf. *Pol. Phil.* 1.3; 2.1–2; 8.1–2; 10.1–3). Here the "evangelizers" are explicitly identified as the apostles (oi euaggelisamenoi nma" apostoloi). In 1 Peter there is no such limitation' the "evangelizers" may include not only apostles (like Paul), but their associates and followers, as well as some whose only link to the apostles was the message they brought.

pneumati agiw apostaleti apE ouranou, "with the Holy Spirit sent from heaven." The dative is not strictly instrumental in the sense that the proclaimers "use" the Spirit as a power under their control but rather "associative" in that it more loosely designates the "accompanying circumstances and manner" (BD[F] § 198) of the proclamation. In the messengers' announcement of the gospel, the "Holy Spirit sent from heaven" consecrates to God a new people (cf. v 2). The passive participle, especially with the phrase apE ouranou, calls attention once more to the divine initiative, but whether the sender is God (as in other uses of this "theological passive," Zerwick, 76) or Christ (said to have "gone into heaven" in 3:22) is more difficult to say. In N[T] writings, either God the Father (John 14:16, 26; Gal 4:6) or Jesus Christ (John 15:26; 16:7; Acts 2:33) can be identified as the giver or sender of the Spirit (cf. Hort, 62), but Peter does not attempt to be specific here.

The description of the Holy Spirit as “sent from heaven” serves to characterize the gospel message as a heavenly message, and so provides an appropriate setting for the reference to angels that immediately follows (cf. 3:22, where the statement that Christ has “gone into heaven” similarly leads into the thought of “angels and authorities and powers in submission to him”). Although the announcement of salvation through “the sufferings destined for Christ and the glorious events that would follow” is an announcement made on earth, it originates in heaven and as such is a mystery to human beings and angels alike.

ei" a epiqumousin aggeloi parakuyai, “on these things the angels desire to look.” Like profhtai in v 10, aggeloi is without the article. These are “angels” in general rather than a particular group; yet as in the case of the prophets Peter evidently has specific traditions in mind. The notion that some heavenly mysteries are hidden even from the angels who dwell in heaven is found both in Jewish apocalyptic literature (e.g. *1 Enoc*[h] 16.3; *2 Enoc*[h] 24.3) and in the N[T] (e.g. Mark 13:32, and by implication Eph 3:10; 1 Cor 2:6–8 is different in that it focuses on hostile powers in particular). This tradition exists in apocalyptic literature alongside that of the "interpreting angel" who explains God’s mysteries to a prophet or seer (e.g. Zech 1:9; 4 Ezra 4:1; Rev 17:1; 21:9). The very fact that angels know so much enhances the sense of wonder at the things they do not know.

The best commentary on Peter’s brief allusion to the angels is perhaps Heb 1:5–2:18, especially the comparison in 2:2–3 of the “message declared by angels” with the “great salvation … declared at first by the Lord” and “attested to us by those who heard him” (RS[v]). The angels, like the prophets (cf. Heb 1:1), belong to the past; the “world to come” is not theirs (2:5) but belongs to Jesus the Son of Man (2:6–9) and to the humans he claims as his brothers and sisters (2:10–18). The angels in Hebrews, like the prophets in 1 Peter, are engaged in ministry (ei" diakonian, 1:14; cf. dihkonoun in the present context) on behalf of “those who will inherit salvation” (NI[v]; cf. also 1 Peter 1:4–5). While the author of Hebrews referred to prophets only in passing and to angels in considerable detail, Peter has done the opposite. For him the chief representatives of the past are the prophets who lived in the past and inquired about the salvation to come, but as a final note he adds a brief reminder that the diligent search is still going on. Now even the angels, to whom the prophets often directed their inquiries, are trying to find out the mystery of God’s redemptive plan. In similar fashion, angels and N[T] prophets share in a common task and are subject to similar limitations according to Rev 19:10 and 22:9.

Checklang epuqumousin is far less graphic than exezhhsan kai exhraunhsan. The verb recalls Jesus’ statement in Matt 13:17 to his disciples that “many prophets and saints … desired [epequmhsan] to see what you now see, yet never saw it; to hear what you hear, yet never heard it” (NE[b]; Luke 10:24 uses a different verb). The desire of the angels here, like that of the “prophets and saints” in Jesus’ pronouncement, is probably to be understood as an unfulfilled desire (cf. also Luke 17:22), even though this is not explicitly stated.

parakuyai (lit. “to bend over”) sometimes means merely to look or gaze (cf. W. Michaelis, *TDN*[T] 5:816) but is probably chosen here to depict the angels as looking down from heaven on the redemption accomplished through Christ and announced by his messengers (see Hort, 62–63). The same verb is used in I Enoch 9:1, where the four great archangels (Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel) are represented as looking down from heaven on acts of violence committed on earth with the intention of executing judgment (cf. Tertullian, *DeSpect* 27: “omnes angelos prospicere de caelo”). Cognate verbs (diakuptein and ekkuptein) are used in the LX[X] to refer to God looking down from heaven either “to

see if there are any that act wisely, that seek after God" (Ps 13[14]:2; cf. Ps 52[53]:3[2]), or—more characteristically—in connection with acting redemptively on behalf of his people (Ps 101[102]:20[19]; Lam 3:50; cf. Ps 84[85]:12[11]). In the present passage the parakuyai cannot be interpreted in isolation from the epiqumousin: the angels do not actually look down from heaven, either redemptively or in judgment, but merely desire to do so. Peter's emphasis is neither on their activity nor their authority, but on their intense interest in what has taken place and on the limitations of their power and knowledge.

Explanation

This section serves as an appendix to vv 3–9. In measuring the greatness of the salvation awaiting his readers, Peter takes his cue from the "inexpressible … delight" mentioned already in v 8. The salvation, like the joy that accompanies it, is incomprehensible to human beings—even the wisest of prophets—and to angels alike. For all their "diligent and careful inquiry," the prophets understood only as much of the great salvation as God was willing to reveal to them. The angels too "desired" to understand the message of Christ publicly proclaimed in the provinces of Asia Minor with the help of the Holy Spirit, but Peter implies that it was hidden from their eyes as well. The past and its representatives bear an indirect testimony at best to the salvation now revealed in Jesus Christ.

Polycarp's second-century paraphrase of this passage captures the connection between the inexpressible joy of v 8 and the unsearchable salvation of vv 10–12 better than most modern commentators: "in whom, without seeing him, you believe with inexpressible and glorious joy—into which joy many desire to enter, knowing that by grace you are saved, not from works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ" (*Pol. Phil.* 1.3). Polycarp jumps from v 8 directly to the end of v 12, while at the same time generalizing the prophets and angels of vv 10–12 into an indefinite "many" (cf. Matt 13:17 // Luke 10:24) who are not so much probing the divine mysteries as seeking to enter into the joy of the kingdom of God (cf. Matt 25:21, 23). The concluding reference to salvation by grace rather than works (in language derived from Eph 2:8–9) indicates that Polycarp has in mind not the apprehension of prophets and angels but the longing of human beings for the benefits of the promised salvation. In this sense Polycarp "missed the point" of what Peter was saying (for he had a point of his own to make), yet his paraphrase underscores the continuity between vv 6–9 and vv 10–12: the salvation and the joy that God has prepared for those who love him, and whom he loves, are mysteries only God can comprehend. In similar fashion, Clement of Alexandria links 1 Cor 2:9 (see Comment on v 8) with 1 Peter 1:12: "which eye has not seen or ear heard, nor have they entered into the heart of man, which angels desire to look into and to see what good things God has prepared for his saints and for his children that love him" (*Quis Dives* 23).

The effect of Peter's substance and style is to encourage his readers and strengthen their sense of identity. They are the "insiders" while the great prophets of the Jewish past and even the angels in heaven are in some sense "outsiders"—friendly "outsiders" who help bring the plan of God to realization, but "outsiders" nonetheless. There are other outsiders as well, the enemies of the divine plan and of the Christian community throughout the world. They have not yet been explicitly introduced, though Peter has mentioned them indirectly and impersonally, in his vague references to the "various ordeals" (v 6) confronting the readers of his epistle. He will become more specific later on.

Hope and Holiness (1:13–21)

Bibliography

Bultmann, R. "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief." In *Exegetica*, ed. E. Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr, 1967. 285–97. **Dalmer, J.** "Zu 1. Petri 1,18–19." BFC[T] 2.6 (1898/99) 75–87. **Dalton, W. J.** "So That Your Faith May Also Be Your Hope in God." In *Reconciliation and Hope*, F[S] L. L. Morris, ed. R. J. Banks. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974. 262–74. **Déaut, R. le.** "Le Targum de Gen. 22,8 et 1 Pt. 1,20." *RS*[R] 49 (1961) 103–6. **Deichgräber, R.** *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache, Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen*. SUN[T] 5 (1967). **Harris, J. R.** "An Emendation to 1 Peter 1.13." *ExpTi*[m] 41 (1929/30) 43. **Unnik, W. C. van.** "The Critique of Paganism in I Peter 1:18." *Neotestamentica et Semitica*. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black, ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969. 129–42. ———. "De verlossing 1 Petrus 1:18–19 en het problem van den eersten Petrusbrief." *Mededeelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie* 5.1 (Amsterdam, 1942) 1–106. **Vallauri, E.** "'Succincti lumbos mentis vestrae' (1 Piet 1,13); Nota per una traduzione." *Be*[O] 24 (1982) 19–22.

Translation

[13]*Gird yourselves for action, therefore, in your mind, and with full attention set your hope on the grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed.* [14]*As obedient children, do not yield to the impulses that once drove you in your ignorance,* [15]*but like the Holy One who called you,*[a] *be holy in all your conduct,* [16]*for it is written,*[b] *"Be*[c] *holy because I am holy."*[d] [17]*And if you invoke as Father the One who judges impartially according to each person's work, then wherever you are, spend your allotted time there in reverent fear.*

[18]*As you know, you were redeemed from the empty way of life that was your heritage not with perishable things such as silver or gold,* [19]*but with precious blood, like that of a faultless and flawless lamb—[the blood] of Christ,* [20]*who was foreknown before the creation of the world, but who appeared in the last of the ages*[e] *for your sake.* [21]*Through him you are believers*[f] *in God, who raised him from the dead and gave him glory, so that your faith and hope might be in God.*

Notes

a. This clause is usually translated "as he who called you is holy" (RS[v]; cf. NI[v], TE[v]; cf. the expression "he who called you," in 2:9 and 5:10). kata, however, is a preposition ("like" or "in accordance with"), not a conjunction ("as" or "Just as"); it is not equivalent to kaqw". Thus ton … agion ("the Holy One") must be taken as the object of the preposition, with kalesanta as its participial modifier (if ton kalewanta were the object, agion would be left with no grammatical function); cf. Beare, 98.

b. The formula introducing the scriptural quotation varies somewhat in the manuscript tradition, probably because the words dioti gegraptai oti (as in [B] oti and a few other MS[s]) seemed redundant to later scribes, especially in light of a second oti in the following clause. Consequently, the oti ("that") was omitted in the majority of MS[s] (including p[72] [a]

[A] [C] and [P),] while dioti gegraptai was omitted in two later minuscules (33 and 1243).

The oti should probably be retained but left untranslated (the imperative with which the quotation begins makes it virtually untranslatable in English).

c. The future indicative (esesqe) is used imperatively (as frequently in the LX[X,] and in Lev 11:44; 19:2; 20:7, 26 in particular; see BD[F] § 362). Later scribes, influenced by the more common Greek usage and by the preceding gehqhte of v 15, have introduced the imperatival forms geesqe ([K P] and others) and ginesqe (the majority of later MS[s]).

d. The manuscript tradition is closely divided over whether or not the verb "to be" is expressed: egw agio" ([a]

[A* B] and a few others) or egw agio" eimi (p[72] [Ac C P] Y and the majority of later witnesses). The shorter reading agrees exactly with the LX[X] of Lev 19:2, while the eimi is found in Lev 11:44 and in some MS[s] of Lev 20:7, 26. It is likely that agio" is original here, and that the eimi was added at the end to correspond to the preceding aguoi esesqe, although it is also possible that an original eimi was dropped to conform the quotation exactly to Lev 19:2. The difference in meaning is inconsequential.

e. The best ancient MS[s] ([a]

[2 A C] and others) have "last" (singular: escatou) and "ages" (plural: twn cronwn). The majority (including p[72] and [P)] make both plural, while [a]

[*] and Y make both singular. Scribes who overlooked the substantival use of escatou here (BD[F] § 264.5) would tend to make the noun and its apparent adjective modifier agree. The consistently plural rendering had been an option to LX[X] translators (e.g[.,] Gen 49:1; Hos 3:5) for the Hebrew µymyh tyrjaB[

, and for the consistently singular rendering, cf[.] Jude 18.
f. The reading of the majority of ancient MS[s] (including p[72] [a]
[C P] and Y), "those who believe" (tou" … pisteuota"), is probably a scribal alteration of the substantive expression, "believers" (tou" … pistou", as in [A B] and v[g).] The latter is found only here with ei" and is probably to be preferred (cf[.] Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 688), although the difference is slight in any case.

Form/Structure/Setting

With the connective particle dio of v 13, Peter shifts from reflection on the gospel his readers have received and the eschatological hope this gospel has given them, to the ethical responsibilities they now have as a result.

The key to the section as a whole is the "living hope" mentioned first in v 3 and designated in a variety of ways throughout vv 3–12: as an "inheritance" (v 4), as "salvation" (vv 5, 9, 10), as "the outcome of your faith" (v 9), as "the grace to be given you" (v 10), and as "praise, honor, and glory at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed" (v 8). Vv 13–21 are framed by explicit references to this hope: "… with full attention set your hope on the grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed" (v 13); "… so that your faith and hope might be in God" (v 21). The section can be divided into two parts: first, a series of imperatives (and participles dependent upon imperatives) defining the

ethical implications of the central imperative of hope (vv 13–17), and second, a resumption of Peter's celebration of the hope itself and of the work of God by which the hope came into being (vv 18–21). It is no accident that "hope" is a noun in v 3, a verb (imperative) in v 13, and a noun again in v 21.

Hope as an imperative (elpisate) is characterized in v 13 by mental alertness and readiness for action and is focused precisely on what was assumed to be its object in vv 3–9, "the grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed" (v 13b). The ethical content of the hope of which Peter speaks becomes explicit in what immediately follows: a requirement of holiness (vv 14–16), and of the reverent fear of God (v 17).

The first of these requirements is reinforced by a quotation from Scripture (v 16), the first of several in 1 Peter, and both are finally reinforced by an extensive review of God's redemptive work through Christ (vv 18–21). The effect of Peter's imagery in vv 13–16 is to suggest, although not to labor, an analogy between his Gentile readers and the Jewish people in the time of the Exodus. Like the Jews on the night of Passover, they are to gird themselves and be ready for action. The command to "Be holy because I am holy" (v 16) is explicitly cited from texts in Leviticus addressed to the people of Israel in the desert. The notion of "obedience" has already been closely associated with being "sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ" (v 2), an apparent allusion to the institution of the Mosaic covenant in Exod 24:3–8.

The interest in the Exodus is sustained in vv 18–21, introduced by the expression "knowing that" in v 18. Here, with the analogy of Christ to a sacrificial lamb as his centerpiece, Peter rehearses the redemption from slavery on which the Christian hope is built. The Cristou of v 19b serves as a link between the two parts of this rehearsal: the first (vv 18–19) measures the price of redemption, placing it beyond that of perishable silver or gold and designating it as "precious blood, like that of a faultless and flawless lamb"; the second (vv 20–21), building on the identification of the "faultless and flawless lamb" with Christ, proclaims the salvation accomplished through him in a balanced couplet set off by men … de and applies the couplet specifically to the readers of the epistle with the phrase diÆ uma" at the end of v 20.

R. Bultmann (293, 297) identifies this couplet as a fragment (along with 3:18–19, 22) of a once-unified early Christian hymn (cf. also Deichgräber, 169–70). Others (e.g., Le Déaut, *RS*R 49 [1961] 104–5) see it as the extension of a midrashic reflection on Gen 22:8 that began in vv 18–19. The notion of Jesus Christ having "appeared" (fanerwqento") specifically as the Lamb of God is attested in the Gospel of John (1:29, 31) and perhaps implied in 1 John 3:5 as well. It is therefore possible that in splicing v 20 to vv 18–19 with the Cristou of v 19b, Peter is preserving an association in thought already present in the traditions known to him. Yet the two must be regarded as essentially distinct pieces of tradition. The suggestion that v 20 is part of an early Christian hymn is thus a serious possibility, although it cannot be proven. It could as easily be Peter's own turn of phrase in the composition of his letter, modeled after similar kinds of formulations in Jewish apocalyptic literature (see *Comment*). It is doubtful that the "original" (i.e., pre-epistolary) form of such material can be reconstructed with any confidence.

In v 21, the reference to God as the one "who raised [Christ] from the dead and gave him glory" may well be similarly traditional in character, based either on early forms of missionary proclamation or on material used in the instruction of converts (cf. Paul's use of participles with the article to designate "the Lord Jesus Christ" in Gal. 1:4 as "the one who gave himself for our sins" and "God the Father" in Gal. 1:1 as "the one who raised him

from the dead”). If so, it is doubtful that it is of one piece with the material standing behind vv 18–19 or v 20; as vv 18–19 have been linked to v 20 by Cristou, so the formulation in v 20 has been linked to v 21 by the di uma" with which v 20 ends. In few other places is the character of 1 Peter as an epistle composed out of earlier traditions better demonstrated than in vv 13–21, but the recovery of the individual units out of which the section is composed is now virtually impossible.

Comment

13 dio anaz wsamenoi ta" osfua" th" dianoia" umwn, “Gird yourselves for action, therefore, in your mind.” Pulling up one’s robes and tying them around oneself to get ready for action was a familiar metaphor in the ancient world. The people of Israel were to eat the first Passover with “your loins girded, your sandals on your feet, and your staff in your hand; and you shall eat it in haste” (Exod 12:11, RSV). For the phrase “your loins girded,” the LXX has ai osfue" umwn periezwsmenai, and the saying of Jesus in Luke 12:35 (“Let your loins be girded and your lamps burning”) reproduces this phrase from the LXX of Exod 12:11 exactly. Paul in Eph 6:14 also prefers the compound with peri, but in a grammatical construction more akin to Peter’s (perizwsamenoi thn ofun umwn). The LXX uses anazwnnuai with osfu" for “girding the loins” only once, in reference to the “good wife” who “girds her loins with strength” (Prov 31:17; cf. Judg 18:16 B, with skeuh, in reference to being “armed” for battle; 18:16 A has perizwnnunai). The closest parallel to Peter’s language is found in *Pol. Phil.* 2.1, a text clearly derived (like 1.3; see above, p. xxxii) from 1 Peter itself.

Despite the different verbs, the most likely immediate source of the metaphor is the saying of Jesus preserved in Luke 12:35, one of the few uses of the Jesus tradition in 1 Peter on which R. Gundry (*NT*[6], 339; *Bi*[b], 224) and E. Best (*NT*[6], 104–5) are in agreement (cf. also C. Spicq, *S*[T], 44). Peter is indebted to the Gospel tradition not for the precise vocabulary and not even for the metaphor in itself, but for the application of the metaphor to the Christian eschatological hope. The style and the vocabulary are his own, although probably shaped by formulations used in the church for instructing converts and exhorting the faithful (cf. Selwyn, 456). Specifically, Peter’s formulation changes the image of girding the loins from the description of a state, as in Luke 12:35 and Exod 12:11 (with their perfect participles) to a call for immediate action (indicated by his aorist participle). The change of prefix from peri- to ana- (“gird up” rather than “gird about”) may have been intended to heighten this effect (although Eph 6:14 is evidence that the use of the aorist by no means necessitates such a shift).

For such purposes, Peter sees no great value in excessive subtlety. The genitive th" dianoia" umwn makes it obvious even to the most literal-minded of readers that he is speaking metaphorically, and at the same time interprets the metaphor (in 4:1 the metaphor of “arming” oneself is similarly interpreted with reference to one’s ennoia, or “intention”). It is likely that in focusing on the agnoia (“mind” or “understanding”) of his readers, Peter has in view not the natural human intellect but a capacity that is theirs by virtue of their redemption in Jesus Christ (contrast the agnoia of their former way of life in v 14; Paul describes the unbelieving Gentiles in Eph 4:18 as darkened “in their understanding” [th dianoia] and alienated from God because of their “ignorance” [dia thn agnoian]). The currency of the term diaoia in the Roman church to refer to the heart of the Christian

turned toward God can be seen in 1 Clement (21.8, 35.5, and 36.2), although it was also applied to the natural intellect (33.4) and, in 2 Clement (1.6, 19.2), to the darkened mind of the pagan, as in Eph 4:18. Peter's choice of the term may also have been influenced by the Gospel tradition (Mark 12:30 // Matt 22:37 // Luke 10:27) and/or the LX[X] texts of Deut 6:5 on which the Gospel writers' quotations were based. Certainly the emphasis on fastening one's understanding totally on a single supreme purpose aptly builds on the thought of Jesus' reference to Deut 6:4–6. Peter believes the time has come for those who love God with heart and soul and mind to prepare themselves with the same concentration for "the grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed."

nhfonte" teleiw", "and with full attention." If the metaphor of girding the loins has been explained in part by th" dianoia" umwn, it is further interpreted by the participle that follows. In Luke 12:35–37, the meaning of waiting for the Lord with loins girded and lamps burning is summarized by the participle grtggorounta" ("staying awake"). Peter knows grhgorein and uses it in conjunction with nhfein ("to be sober" or "to pay attention") in 5:8 (cf. also 1 Thess 5:6, 8), but the latter term is the more characteristic of his style.

It is doubtful that nhfonte" should be regarded as itself metaphorical (i.e., the metaphor of sobriety or abstinence from wine); it should rather be understood as being attentive or paying attention. Peter uses nhfein in 4:7 (in much the same way grhgorein is used, e.g., in Mark 14:38 // Matt 26:41 and Col 4:2) as an essential quality of effective prayer. In the present passage too, it is likely that nhfonte" functions as grhgorounte" might have done to summarize in more prosaic language the force of Peter's metaphor.

It is probable that teleiw" is to be taken with nhfonte", not with elpisate. Adverbs ending in w" tend to follow rather than precede verbs which they modify, whether these verbs are imperatives (agaphsate, 1:22) or participles (pascwn, 2:19), unless the participles have the article, in which case the adverb may stand in the attributive position (1:17; 4:5, but cf. 2:23). It is difficult to know what "hoping perfectly" might mean (the usage of teleiw" does not support the view that it means hoping "to the end," as implied in BD[F] § 337.2). On the other hand, being "perfectly attentive" or paying "perfect attention" makes good sense (see BG[D], 810).

elpisate epi thn feromenhn umin carin en apokaluyei Ilesou Cristou, "set your hope on the grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed." The call to attention and the metaphor of girding the loins are strictly preliminary to the imperative of hope. elpisate is the first of many aorist imperatives in 1 Peter (in chaps. 1–2 alone, cf. genhqhte in v 15, anaotrafhte in v 17, agaphsate in v 22, epipoqhsate in 2:2, upotagpte in 2:13, and timhsate in 2:17). These aorists can be called "programmatic"; they have the force of directives, setting a course for the churches to follow in the days ahead (i.e., "during the time of your sojourn," v 17). For such a use of the aorist, cf. BD[F] § 337.2; in the case of elpisate this is valid even though the imperative is not construed with teleiw".

elpisate followed by epi the accusative (contrast 3:5, where the preposition is ei", and in the N[T] cf. only 1 Tim 5:5) shows the probable influence of the LX[X], especially such passages as Pss 32[33]:18; 51[52]:10; 77[78]:22; 146[147]:11, which combine elpizew with epi to speak of hoping for God's salvation or mercy. No one Hebrew verb is the equivalent of elpizein in the LX[X]; it is used to render different words meaning "to trust in" and "to wait for," and older commentators debated whether the preposition pointed to the object or the

ground of the hope (see Hort, 66;). Although Bauer (BG[D,] 252) classified all prepositions with elpizein as pointing to the ground or basis of the hope, it appears (on the analogy of pisteuein, and pisti") that the two ideas are virtually indistinguishable (Bigg, 112–13).

The object of the hope that Peter commands is "the grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed," a phrase combining the en apokaluyei Ihsou Cristou of v 7 with the "grace to be given you" mentioned in v 10. The present participle thn feromehn has a future meaning here, much like o ercomeno" as a designation of the coming Messiah (BD[F] § 323.1). The grace of which Peter speaks, however, does not "come" (as in *Did.* 10.6, in an eschatological context, "let grace come"); it is "brought" or "conferred." The use of ferein instead of ercesqai underscores the sovereign action of God in bringing grace to his people at the "revelation of Jesus Christ" (cf. the passive participles in vv 4 and 5 and the passive verbs in v 12 that similarly imply the initiative of God; see Zerwick, 76). Some have argued that "the force of the participle is strictly present" (Hort, 67, who continues: "The grace is ever being brought, and brought in fresh forms, in virtue of the continuing and progressing unveiling of Jesus Christ"), but this view is difficult to sustain in the face of the preceding reference to "hope" and the distinctly eschatological use of the term "revelation of Jesus Christ" in v 7. The "grace" of which Peter speaks here is the grace of the last day (cf. *Did.* 10.6), not something that belongs to present experience. That this future grace decisively affects the present, and even that it is operative in advance in various ways in the lives of Christian believers, is a point made later in the epistle (5:12; cf. 2:19, 20; 4:10), but it is doubtful that Peter's choice of the present participle here was intended as an anticipation of this theme (as Selwyn, 140, points out, the future participle was hardly an option in any case).

The use of the same verb for the voice from heaven on the "holy mountain" in 2 Pet 1:17, and for prophetic revelation in 2 Pet 1:21, led Bauer to the suggestion (BG[D,] 855) that ferein in our passage refers specifically to proclamation ("hope for the grace that is proclaimed for you at the revelation of Jesus Christ"). Such a construction aims at solving the problem of the time reference: the grace is proclaimed now (cf. v 12) but received only on the future day of revelation. Such a specialized meaning is highly questionable. More likely, Peter chose the participial construction simply as an alternative to the ei" nma" of vv 4 and 10 to make the point that divine grace was his readers' destiny. In classical Greek, ferein carin with the dative was an idiom meaning to do someone a favor (LS[J,] 1979; cf. Selwyn, 140), although the LX[X] prefers instead didonai carin. Peter in fact quotes in 5:5 the didwsin carin of Prov 3:34 LX[X,] probably with reference to the same eschatological cari", "grace," of which he speaks here, but in the present passage, where he is not citing the LX[X,] he aspires to a grander style.

14 w" utekna pakoh", "As obedient children." The use of the word "children" or "sons" with an abstract noun is a widely recognized Semitic idiom (although one not common in LX[X)] referring to people who are characterized by the quality which that noun represents (BG[D,] 808; although cf. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 161–66, who cautions that the basic idea is at home in Greek literature as well). A good N[T] example is 1 Thess 5:5 ("sons of light and sons of day"), in which the idiom is immediately explained: "we are not of the night, or of darkness" (cf. BD[F] § 162.6). A negative counterpart to Peter's terminology here is "sons of disobedience" (en toi" nioi" th" apeiqeia" in Eph 2:2). On this understanding, Peter's emphasis is on the genitive upakoh" (cf. upakoh in vv 2 and 22); he is simply describing his readers as an obedient people, i.e., as those who have

accepted the Christian gospel.

Yet it is possible that the word tekna was chosen for its own sake as well as for idiomatic or stylistic reasons. Peter may have been suggesting that the readers of his epistle were tekna npakoh" by virtue of the "new birth" God had granted them (v 3), and therefore possessed the privilege of addressing God as "Father" (v 17). The only other occurrence of tekna in 1 Peter designates Christian wives as "children" of Sarah (3:6), precisely with reference to the fact that Sarah obeyed (uphkonsen) Abraham. Although it is doubtful that Peter has immediately in mind in our passage the specific notion either of God or of Abraham as Father of the Christian communities to which he writes, tekna may well have seemed to him, because of both these associations, a natural designation for his readers, especially when appealing to their "obedience." w" gives the expression a metaphorical quality, yet serves Peter as a serious form of address; "like the obedient children that you are" (BG^{D,} 898 [III,1a]; cf. 2:2, 11, 16; w" in 3:7).

mh snschmatizomenoi, "do not yield." The only other N^{T} use of this verb is in Rom 12:2, like the present occurrence a prohibition (mh suschmatizesqe). Yet where Paul used an imperative, Peter resumes the participial form with which he began v 13. Although his participles are imperatival in meaning only because of their close connection with elpisate, the contrast with the imperative genhqhte in v 15 makes the imperatival function of mh snschmatizhmenoi more evident than in the case of anazwsamenoi and nhfonte". In its present context, D. Daube (in Selwyn, 482) considers even mh shschmatizomenoi a doubtful example of the participle functioning as an imperative, yet he argues that in the traditions Peter is using, it may (on the analogy of Rom 12:2) have stood at the beginning of a code of ethical instructions, with an imperatival force in its own right (487).

tai" proteron en th agnoia umwn epiqnmiai", "to the impulses that once drove you in your ignorance." The difference between Peter's command and that of Rom 12:2 is one of orientation rather than substance. Paul takes as his point of departure the present age (tw aiwni touyw) and its values, while Peter focuses more specifically on the past lives of his readers in Greco-Roman paganism (in Pauline tradition, cf. rather Eph 4:17–19, 22–24). The meaning is much the same whether the command is to break with the present for the sake of the future or to break with the past for the sake of the present.

It is possible that Peter is using epiqumiai as a neutral term (in the sense of "impulses" rather than "evil desires" or "lusts"; cf. epiqumousin in v 12b), deriving its negative connotation from qualifying words attached to it (sarkikwn in 2:11; anqrwpwn in 4:2; and in the present passage both proteron and en th agnoia umwn). Only in 4:3, perhaps part of a traditional list of vices, is aemitoi" eidwlolatriai" by itself used in an evil sense. Yet Peter is fully capable of redundancy for the sake of emphasis (e.g., the aqemitoi" eidwlolatriai" of 4:3b), and his purpose here is probably to achieve rhetorical effect by heaping one negative term on another (cf. BG^{D,} 293; F. Büchsel in *TDN*^{T} 3:170–71). In any case, epiqumia does not refer exclusively to "lust" in the sense of sexual desire, but more generally to all kinds of self-seeking, whether directed toward wealth, power, or pleasure.

Moreover, Peter's choice of the adverb proteron instead of a corresponding adjective suggests that he is not contrasting past (presumably evil) impulses with good impulses that belong to the present. The only epiqnmiai he knows are the ipiqumiai of the past that must be put aside. When he wants to urge on his readers a more wholesome longing, he uses instead the verb epipodein (2:2).

The characterization of the readers' former life as one lived in "ignorance" (agnoia) is the first implicit acknowledgment that whatever privileges and responsibilities of Israel or of Judaism may be theirs, the readers of the epistle are literally Gentiles (cf. Eph 4:18; Acts 17:23, 30). Although agnoia is used of Jews (as a mitigating factor) with regard to the specific matter of not recognizing Jesus as their Messiah (Acts 3:17; cf. 13:27), Peter has in mind here the more universal ignorance of those who do not know the true God. agnoia is not primarily an intellectual but a moral and religious defect, nothing less than rebellion against God (cf. agnwsia in 2:15). It belongs to the old order of existence that is passing away as a result of the coming of Christ (cf. Ign. *Eph.* 19.3; *Clem. Hom.* 2.15).

The readers of the epistle, like the readers of Ephesians (cf. also Justin, Justin, *Apol.* 1.61.10), are assumed to have been in this predicament before their conversion, but Peter, unlike the Paul of Ephesians, does not address the Jew-Gentile distinction explicitly. The argument of Ephesians (presupposing perhaps that of Rom 1–3) boldly equates the past of the Jewish Christians with that of the Gentiles (Eph 2:3), but the terms by which it does so are terms properly applicable to the Gentile predicament, and have been transferred to the Jews only for the sake of the argument. To the extent that Peter is interested in the identity of his readers as Gentiles at all, his logic is the reverse of Paul's (whether in Ephesians or Romans): instead of equating the Jewish past with that of the Gentiles, he equates the Gentile Christians' present with that of the Jews. They have come out of ignorance to the knowledge of God, and they are called to be a holy people (vv 15–16). The contrast between past (proteron) and present is important not only here but in v 18b ("redeemed from the empty way of life that was your heritage"), as well as later in the epistle (2:10, and especially 4:2–3).

15 alla kata ton kalesanta uma" agion, "but like the Holy One who called you." Although BG^{D} (10) lists 1 John 2:20 as the only N^{T} instance of o agio" as a title for God the Father (and even that as open to question), such expressions as "the Holy One" or "the Holy One of Israel" (o agio" ton Israhl) were common designations for God in the LX^{x} (e.g. Pss 70[71]:22; 77[78]:41; 88[89]:19[18]; Isa 1:4; 5:16; 12:6; 14:27; 17:7; 29:23; 30:12, 15; 31:1; 41:20; 45:11; 55:5). Peter seems to be using the familiar Jewish title here as well, but with kalesanta as a modifier. Elsewhere (2:9, 5:10; cf. 2 Pet 1:3), in agreement with Pauline usage (e.g. in Gal 1:6; 5:8; Rom 9:12), he treats kalesa" as a substantive and a kind of title in its own right. This would make agion in our passage a predicate instead of a title, but Peter's use of the preposition kata rather than a conjunction (such as kaqw") makes such a reading of the text all but impossible (see *Note* a*). In a general way, v 15 is patterned after the O^{T} quotation of v 16, which it anticipates, and agio" in v 16 is a predicate. Instead of anticipating the quotation's exact form, Peter simply introduces o … agio" as a title and allows the quotation to spell out what the title implies for his readers.

The function of the modifier kalesanta is to indicate why the holiness of the God of Israel must be a model for the behavior of these Gentile Christians. Their identity rests in the fact that they have been "called" (2:21; 3:9) by a holy God. Consequently they belong to "him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (2:9; cf. 5:10). They are Gentiles invited to stand before the God of Israel with the same privileges as the Jews and, more to the point in our passage, with the same responsibilities: "Be holy because I am holy."

kai autoi agioi en pash anastrofh genhqhte, "be holy in all your conduct." The

technique of interpreting or applying a text of Scripture before actually citing the text he has in mind is a technique Peter uses both here and in 2:4–6. Moreover, the kai autoi with which he begins his application here parallels the kai autoi of 2:5; the function of each is to make a transition from singular to plural (Holy One … holy ones; living Stone … living stones) and from a title or attribute of God (or Christ) to the corporate responsibilites of his people. The most striking feature of Peter's interpretation of the biblical text is the linking of holiness with anastrofh, "conduct" or daily life (see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 194). A key word in 1 Peter, anastrofh is used here for the first time, and with the widest possible application (en pash aaotrofh; cf. Tob 4:14). Holiness is to characterize the day-by-day conduct of Christian believers always and everywhere. The requirement laid down in this verse that the readers' anastrofh must be "holy" sets the tone for subsequent exhortations that it be "good" (kalhn, 2:12; agaqhn, 3:16), "pure" agnhn, 3:2), and "reverent" (en fobw, 3:2; cf. the en fobw … anastrafhte of 1:17). Holiness, which in many religious traditions epitomizes all that is set apart from the world and assigned to a distinctly ceremonial sphere of its own, is in Peter's terminology brought face to face with the world and with the practical decisions and concerns of everyday life. A religious, almost numinous, quality characteristic of God (or the gods) and of priest, temples, and all kinds of cult objects is boldly translated here into positive ethical virtues: purity and reverence, and above all the doing of good in specific human relationships. In this way Peter begins to develop the ethical implications of the agiasmo" pneumato" mentioned in v 2 (cf. *1 Cle*[m] 30.1: "let us do all the deeds of sanctification" [ta tou agiasmou panta]). The imperative genhqhte, like elpisate, is aorist, not with the meaning "become holy," as if the readers were not holy already (they are a "holy nation," 2:9), but with the meaning "make holiness your trademark once and for all" (cf. BD[F] § 337.2; also Hort, 71: "show yourselves holy").

16 dioti gegraptai oti agioi esesqe oti egw agio", "for it is written, Be holy because I am holy." In the two instances in which Peter interprets or applies his Scripture quotations in advance (i.e., here and in 2:6), he introduces the quotation with a formula. Elsewhere he uses a simple dioti (v 24) or gar (3:10), or otherwise weaves the quotation into the flow of his own thought (e.g., 2:3, 22, 24–25; 4:18; 5:5). The quotation agrees exactly with the LX[X] of Lev 19:2 (see *Note* d[*]; cf. also Lev 11:44; 20:7, 26). The so-called Holiness Code consisting of Lev 17–26 was directed, through Moses, to "Aaron and his sons, and to all the people of Israel" (17:2), while the command in question was for Moses to deliver to "all the congregation of the people of Israel." Selwyn (following Philip Carrington) writes of a Christian Holiness Code underlying 1-2 Thessalonians as well as 1 Peter and of an understanding of the church "as a neo-Levitical community, at once sacerdotal and sacrificial" (459–60; cf. 369–72). There is no doubt that, beginning with the command to "Be holy because I am holy," Peter is addressing his readers in distinctly priestly terms. They are, however, the priestly terms once used for "all the congregation of the people of Israel." The priestly character of the church for Peter is simply an aspect of its identification in his mind with Israel and the Jewish people as "a chosen race, the king's priesthood, a holy nation, a people destined for vindication—all to sound the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (2:9).

17 kai ei patera epikaleisqe ton aproswpolhmptw" krinonta kata to ekastou ergon, "And if you invoke as Father the One who judges impartially according to each person's work." The emphasis of this clause is less on the fact that the readers address God

as Father than on the fact that the One they address as Father is also the final Judge of every human being. Their relation to God as Father is not introduced as something new, but presupposed as a basis of the argument. But why is God's fatherhood introduced at all at this point? Peter began his epistle by identifying God as Father (v 2), both of Jesus Christ and of Christian believers (v 3), but since that point only the tekna upakoh" of v 14 even hinted at the father-child relationship between God and his people. In vv 15–17, Peter is building his case upon two kinds of affirmation: first, what God is in himself (and in relation to the whole world), and second, what God is in relationship to the readers of the epistle in particular. In himself and in relation to the world God is the Holy One and the Judge; in relation to the readers of the epistle he is the One who called them, and he is their Father. Even as in vv 15–16 God's holiness is primary to the argument and the notion of calling is secondary, so in v 17 God's role as Judge is primary while the role of Father is secondary, patera has much the same function in v 17 that kalesanta had in v 15. Peter's point is that if he and his readers have a special relationship to God by virtue of their calling and their new birth, then it is all the more urgent that they remember who he is in himself, and display the reverence that God deserves.

kai ei patera epikaleisqe. Even though "Father" is not where the emphasis lies, Hort goes too far in suggesting that patera rpikaleisqe be "taken together as only a more precise epikaleisqe" (73). It is true that epikaleisqe ("middle voice") means more than simply giving a name. It means to make an appeal to a person or to invoke a deity in prayer (BG^{D,} 294). It is not normally used with "Father" in biblical literature (in the LX^{X,} cf. only Ps 88[89]:27, where the one addressing God in this way is the Davidic king); only rarely, in fact, was God called Father at all in Judaism, and when he was (as in Jer 3:19 or Mal 1:6), the term was more a metaphor than a fixed title. It is likely that Peter's terminology here recalls the characteristic *Abba* of Jesus' prayer life (cf. J. Jeremias, N^{T} *Theology*: *The Proclamation of Jesus*, 61–68), as well as the beginning of the Lord's Prayer (especially in its Lukan form, Luke 11:2). Like Paul (cf. Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6), Peter in this passage identifies Christians as a community by the way in which they address God, and probably in their use of this very prayer.

It is also possible (although somewhat more speculative) that in introducing the thought of God's fatherhood, Peter is continuing the exposition of Lev 19 that he began in v 16 (cf. Selwyn, 143). After the command of Lev 19:2 LX^{X,} the message to Israel through Moses continues: "Let each (ekasto") revere (fobeisqw) his father and his mother, and observe my sabbaths; I am the Lord your God" (19:3). "Reverence" or "fear" was part of every Jewish child's obligation to parents, and Peter, by an argument from lesser to greater, may be identifying it with the obligation of Christians toward God as Father (the en fobw of the next clause would support this, but Peter's use of "each" [ekastou] in the immediate context is probably coincidental).

ton aposwpolhmptw" krinonta kata to ekastou ergon. Instead of a noun, Peter uses a participle to express the idea of God as Judge (cf. 2:23, 4:5). God is the "faithful Creator" (4:19) to whom all human beings, not just Christian believers, are accountable; the scope of ekastou is as wide as "the living and the dead" in 4:5. The principle "To each according to his work" is perhaps based on an adaptation of Ps 61[62]:13 or Prov 24:12 (cf. Matt 16:27; Rom 2:6; 2 Tim 4:14; Rev 2:23; 22:12).

The adverb aprswpolhmptw" is derived from the Hebrew idiom "to receive the face" (µynp acn

) of someone, meaning to show partiality or favoritism. The negative adverbial form used here with the meaning "impartially" is found nowhere else in the N[T.] nor in LX[X] (although cf. *1 Cle*[m] 1.3, and especially *Barn.* 4.12, a passage possibly dependent on 1 Peter and one that confirms the worldwide scope of the impartial judgment). Positive compounds based on the Hebrew idiom are more common (e.g., proswpolhmyia in Rom 2:11; Eph 6:9; Col 3:25; James 2:1; cf. 2:9). Especially noteworthy is the prodwpolhpth" of Acts 10:34, because of its portrayal of this same Peter saying, "In truth I find that God shows no partiality" (cf. Selwyn, 35). The impartiality in 1 Peter, however, is not between Jews and Gentiles but between Christians and unbelievers. Even divine election (v 1) and calling (v 15) are not the same as favoritism. Christians are not exempt from judgment just because they address God as Father; on the contrary, they will face the universal judgment of God before anyone else (4:17; cf. *2 Apoc. Bar.* 13.8–9, where this thought is explicitly linked to God's impartiality). The traditional and conventional language by which Peter refers to the judgment conceals for the moment the enormous difference between what it will mean for believer and unbeliever. "Each person" will "have to answer to the One who stands ready to judge the living and the dead" at the last day (4:5), but for those who call God their Father the day of reckoning begins already in the "various ordeals" (1:6) facing them in Roman society. Not their "works" in the sense of a list of particular good deeds, but their "work" (to … ergon), i.e., their anastrofh (v 15) is at issue.

en fobw ton th" paroikia" umwn cronon anatrafhte, "then wherever you are, spend your allotted time there in reverent fear." The controlling phrase in the last of Peter's three commands is en fobw (lit., "in fear," but because it is the fear of God, "in reverent fear"). The aorist imperative anastrafhte ("conduct yourselves" or "live") resumes the noun anastrofh of v 15, but it is the mention of fear that carries the thought forward. Fear or reverence toward God is explicitly commanded in 2:17, while fear of human enemies or threats is explicitly discouraged in 3:6 and 14 (see Comment on 2:18; cf. 3:2, 16 where fibo" is urged, but where its object is unspecified).

The time frame of the command to live in godly fear, and therefore of the previous imperatives of hope and holiness as well, is fixed by the phrase ton th" paroikia" uumwn cronon. The classic biblical example of a paroikia ("the stay or sojourn of one who is not a citizen in a strange place," BG[D.] 629.1a) was that of Israel in Egypt (e.g., Wisd Sol 19:10; Acts 13:17), and it is likely that Peter has this precedent conspicuously in mind, yet even in Greek inscriptions the term has become a metaphor for human life on earth (e.g., *CI*[G] 9474; *I*[G] 14 [Sic. It.] 531.7: toutou tou biou thn paroikan cited in BG[D.] 629.1b; cf. also Philo, *Conf.* 80). Bauer's interpretation of paroikia in our passage as a figurative expression for "the Christian's earthly life, far from his heavenly home" (BG[D.] 629; cf. also *2 Cle*[m] 5.1) is supported in part by the use of crono" in 4:2–3 for "the rest of your time in the flesh" in contrast to "time enough spent in the past doing what the Gentiles wanted" (cf. Selwyn, 144). J. H. Elliott (*A Home for the Homeless*, 41–49) has warned against spiritualizing the notion of paroikia in this way, rightly emphasizing instead the readers' sociological status as paroikoi ("aliens") and parepidhmoi ("strangers") in the cities and provinces where they live (2:11; cf. 1:1). Yet their paroikia in Roman society will one day come to an end, and in referring to its time or duration (crono") Peter has that end implicitly in view, just as he does in 4:2 in referring to "the rest of your time in the flesh" (i.e., the rest of your lives). Elliott's observation that in both these passages "temporal contrasts are used not to distinguish earthly from heavenly life but present holy from past unholy phases of the

Christian's life" (44) rests on a false dichotomy. Although past and present are indeed contrasted in both contexts (vv 14, 18; 4:3), Peter's attention is also focused significantly on the future (vv 13, 17; 4:5). He urges his readers to maintain an attitude of godly fear as they live out their allotted time in the cities and provinces where they are "aliens and strangers"—i.e., until the end, whether understood as the day when "the grace to be brought to you" is brought (v 13) or the day when "the One who judges impartially according to each person's work" carries out his judgment (v 17). This sense of "until the end," latent in the two previous aorist imperatives elpisate and genhqhte, now becomes explicit in connection with anatafhte. Although Elliott is correct in insisting that 1 Peter has no developed notion of the earthly life of Christians as a pilgrimage and of heaven as their true home (42–43), his own recognition of a contrast between the present life of Christians on earth and the inheritance that awaits them in heaven amounts to much the same thing. The fact that "such temporal contrasts are used to underline the social and religious distinctions between the believers and their hostile neighbors" (43) does not make the contrasts themselves any less real or significant. It is not so farasElliott thinks from 1 Peter to *Diogn.* 6.8 a century later: "Christianssojourn among corruptible things (paroikousin en fqartoi"), waiting for the incorruptibility which is in heaven."

18 eidote" oti ou fqartoi" arguriw h crusiw elutrwqhte, "As you know, you were redeemed, not with perishable things such as silver or gold." The participial expression eidote" oti is used in N^T epistles either with reference to the readers ("for you know …"), to supply the reason for a preceding imperative (e.g., 1 Cor 15:58; Eph 6:8, 9; Col 3:24; 4:1; James 3:1; cf. 2 Tim 2:23, 3:14; Tit 3:11; in 1 Peter, cf. *Note* g on 5:9*), or with reference to the writer ("for I know … " or "for we know …"), simply as a method of expanding on his own teaching or testimony (e.g., Rom 5:3, 6:9; 2 Cor 1:7; 4:14; 5:6; Gal 2:16; cf. 2 Pet 1:14). In the present instance it is the former, but in a rather broad sense: the verses that follow will supply the reason not specifically for the imperative of godly fear in v 17, but for the imperatival thrust of vv 13–17 as a whole: the call to hope expressing itself in holy and reverent behavior.

It has been suggested that eidote" oto introduces a reference to "an elementary Christian belief" (Hort, 75) or "an excerpt from standardized teaching." (Kelly, 72, who notes "in the majority of cases the pithy, even epigrammatic character of the sentence so introduced"). This is frequently the case, although the expression is by no means a formula (Goppelt, 121; see the varied examples listed in $BG^{D,}$ 556.1e). Although neither "pithy" nor "epigrammatic," vv 18–21 are clearly traditional in character, beginning with a reminiscence of Isa 52:3 $LX^{X:}$ "You were sold for nothing, and you will be redeemed without silver" (Dwrean epraqhte kai ou meta argurion lutrwqhsesqe). In keeping with his fondness for the terms fqarto" and afqarto" (vv 4, 23; 3:4), Peter speaks more elaborately of redemption "not with perishable things (ou fqartoi") such as silver or gold" (for the perishability of gold, cf. v 7). Where Isaiah's point was redemption without the payment of a price, Peter's is redemption at a price far beyond silver or gold. The verb lutroun (lit., "to ransom" or "redeem at a price") is common in the $LX^{X,}$ although often without reflection on an actual price paid (thus more generally, "to set free, redeem, rescue" [$BG^{D,}$ 482]; in the $N^{T,}$ cf. Luke 24:21). Isa 52:3 is a rare instance (outside of civil and ceremonial law: e.g., Lev 25, 27; Num 18) in which a ransom price is in view, and there it is in view only negatively. Peter's interest in the ransom price comes not primarily from the $LX^{X,}$ therefore, but from the interpretation of Jesus' death embodied in the Gospel tradition

(specifically the lutron anti pollwn of Mark 10:45 // Matt 20:28). The verb lutroun is used to much the same effect in Titus 2:14, where Jesus himself (edwken eanton) is the ransom. As Paul in Titus draws his language from Ps 129[130]:8 but his thought from Christian tradition, so Peter draws his language from Isa 52:3 but his thought from Christian reflection on Jesus' death (cf. F. Büchsel in *TDN*[T] 4:350–51). The two main differences between 1 Peter and Titus are, first, that God (rather than Christ) is doing the ransoming in 1 Peter (as indicated by the passive elutrwqhte; cf. Goppelt, 121) and second, that Peter delays identifying the ransom explicitly as "Christ" until the end of v 19. The identification comes as the climax of two contrasting clauses set off by ou … alla, in which there is an ascending progression from the thought of ransom (v 18), to ransom by blood sacrifice (v 19), to ransom by the blood sacrifice of Christ (Cristou in v 19b).

Despite the use of Isa 52:3, the dominant echoes here are not of Isa 53 (this being reserved for 2:21–25). Instead, Peter focuses on that part of Jesus' saying in Mark 10:45 which does not come from Isa 53, the luron terminology. To his Gentile readers, elutrwqhte may have suggested not so much the language of the LX[X] as that of the Roman custom of sacral manumission, a legal fiction by which a slave (or his benefactor) paid money into a temple treasury so that the god honored at that temple would "purchase" or "ransom" him from his master; he would then be the property of that god but in relation to society a free person (see A. Deissmann, *LAE*, 319–28). That Peter thought of the readers of his epistle in this way is suggested by 2:16, where he characterizes them "as those who are free … yet as God's slaves." Their redemption is first of all liberation from their past (cf. v 14), now seen as a form of slavery (cf. Melito, *On the Passover*, 67 [S[C] 123.96]).

ek th" mataia" umwn anastrofh" patroparadotou, "from the empty way of life that was your heritage." The anastrofh of the readers' past (cf. Eph 4:22) stands in sharpest possible contrast to the anastrofh required of them now (v 15). Peter uses two adjectives for this former way of life, one derogatory and one merely descriptive. First, it was "empty" or "futile," a common characterization of pagan religion among both Jews and Christians (e.g., Jer 2:5; 8:19; Esth 4:17b; 3 Macc 6:11; Acts 14:15; cf. Rom 1:21; Eph 4:17). Second, it was "inherited"; the adjective patropatadoto" is found neither in the LX[X] nor elsewhere in the N[T.] It occurs with positive connotations (much like the English word "heritage") in Hellenistic literature beginning with the letter of King Attalus III to the people of Pergamum in 135 B.C. (van Unnik, 133; Spicq, 67) and continuing in the Roman historians Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Antiq.* Rom. 5.48.2) and Diodorus Siculus (*Hist.* 4.8.5; 15.74.5; 17.2.2., 4.1). Even in Judaism, the notion that pagan customs were handed down was at least a mitigating factor in the condemnation of pagans for their idolatry (Str-B, 3:763). Van Unnik observes (135–40) that in early Christian literature the term acquired an unfavorable connotation (e.g., Theophilus, a[d] *Autolycum* 2.34; Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 4.4.1–2). This is not invariably the case (Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius, HE 4.23.10, is an exception), and some of van Unnik's examples are questionable either because of date or because he is positing a Greek text on the basis of a Latin or Syriac translation. In any event, v 18 appears to be the earliest instance in which patroparadoto" becomes part of a polemic against paganism. The reason this happens in Christianity rather than in Judaism may be that early Christianity still had a sense of its own newness (cf. vv 12b, 20), and in fact denounced Judaism as well for its "traditions" (cf. Mark 7:8–13). Spicq (67) comments that "*Patroparadotos* correspond à une mentalité juive," citing as a parallel Josephus's use of the phrase "the ancestral laws" (e.g., in *J. W.*

1.477, 648; 2.171, 192, 393). One of the major concerns of 1 Peter is to claim for Gentile Christians a heritage (i.e., the heritage of Judaism as reinterpreted in Christ), but patroparadoto" represents instead the heritage they already have but wish to disclaim, the heritage of Greco-Roman paganism. Peter is not interested in the varied traditions within paganism, nor primarily in its religious beliefs. He sees paganism rather as a unified whole, and more as a way of life (ana" trofh) than as a belief system. As a way of life, it stands in every respect contrary to the way of life required of the Christian communities in Rome and Asia Minor (cf. vv 14–15; 2:11–12; 4:2–5), and in fact constitutes a mortal threat to those communities. By linking mataio" to patroparadoto" Peter makes the point that the "former life not only is a state of ignorance (1:14) and debauchery (4:2f.) but even itsgreatness, in which they had rejoiced, is null and void" (van Unnik, 141; cf. Paul's attitude in Phil 3:3–7 towardthe Jewish traditions in which he was raised).

19 alla timiw aimati w" amnou amwmou kai aspilou Cristou, "but with precious blood, like that of a faultless and flawless lamb—[the blood] of Christ." The completion of the ou … alla contrast focuses the readers' attention on the price of the ransom from slavery. The use of the dative in vv 18–19, as in legal passages in the LX^{X} (e.g., Exod 34:20; Lev 19:20; Num 18:15), rather than the genitive of price (BD^{F} § 179.1), as in 1 Cor 6:20; 7:23, and the Hellenistic inscriptions, signals the blending of sacrificial language with that of the ransoming of slaves. Traditions about Peter in the book of Acts confirm his use of silver or gold as a contrasting point of reference for the unique power and value of the Christian message (Acts 3:6; 8:20). In the present context the perishability of gold and silver is probably intended to enhance the polemic against paganism and idolatry (cf., e.g., Deut 29:16; Dan 5:23; Wisd Sol 13:10; Rev 9:20; *Diogn.* 2.7).

Here the contrast is with the "precious blood" of Jesus Christ. timio" is used of the weak and needy in Ps 71[72]:14. Symmachus (LX^{X} is different; although cf. Ps 115:6 [116:15] LX$^{X)}$, with the meaning that because God values their blood their lives will be spared, but Peter's application to Christ is different. He has already referred to "the blood of Jesus Christ" (v 2), but timio" is probably to be read in light of 2:4 and 6: the blood of Jesus Christ is "precious" because he is God's choice and honored (entimon) cornerstone. timio" is introduced here to accent the comparison and contrast with perishable gold and silver (cf. the polutimoteron of v 7, and the polutele" of 3:4). The earliest explanation of the phrase is from the Roman church just a few decades after the composition of 1 Peter: "Let us fix our attention on the blood of Christ and realize that it is precious (timion) to his Father because, poured out for our salvation, it brought the grace of repentance to the whole world" (*1 Cle*^{m} 7.4; cf. also Melito, *On the Passover* 44 [S^{C} 123.82]). Clement's interpretation, as far as it goes, is true to the intention of 1 Peter, where timiw anticipates Cristou at the end of v 19, and God the Father is the unspoken initiator of all that is celebrated in vv 18–20, the one who pays the ransom with Christ's blood, and having foreknown the great salvation "before the creation of the world" (v 20a), now makes it known to everyone "in these last days" (v 20b).

w" amnou is the only phrase in this passage that might have been drawn from Isa 53 LX^{X}. The point of comparison in the w" amno" of 53:7 is the silence of a lamb at shearing time, while here it is the "faultless and flawless" character of an animal chosen for sacrifice (cf., e.g., Lev 2:19–20). Peter's insistence on the sinlessness of Jesus in matters of speech (2:22–23), however, suggests that he saw the two as interconnected (cf. Melito, *On the Passover*, 44: "The silent lamb once was valuable »timio"¼, but now it has no value

because of the blameless [amwmon] Son”).

amwmo" (the negative of mwmo", “blame,” hence blameless in a moral sense) seems to have been favored by LX[x] translators because of its resemblance in sound to the Hebrew µt

or µymt

, a “blemish” in a ceremonial sense (cf. Hort, 77; Hauck, *TDN*[T] 4:831). The effect was to give a certain moral cast to ceremonial passages in which the word was used. This effect furthers Peter’s purpose of identifying the blameless lamb with the sinless Christ; he links amwmou with aspilou, a term denoting, first, physical, and second, moral cleanliness or perfection (BG[D], 117). aspilo", unlike amwmo", is not a ceremonial term and does not appear in the LX[X]. Ostensibly, these adjectives refer to a sacrificial lamb within a metaphor, but actually they have been chosen with their application to Jesus Christ (and implicitly perhaps even Christians: 2 Pet 3:14; cf. Phil 2:15; James 1:27b) already in view. The paired negative adjectives gain a rhetorical effect by their similar endings and their repeated a-prefix (especially after amnou), recalling the afqarton kai amianton kai amaranton of v 4.

Although Peter’s metaphor recalls the regulations for the Passover lamb according to Exod 12:5, his terminology is drawn not from the LX[x] of that verse (probaton teleion; cf., however Melito, *On the Passover*, 12 [S[C] 123:66], where Exod 12:5 is restated in the terminology of 1 Peter), and probably not exclusively from traditions about the Passover lamb, but in a more general way from the LX[x] and from Jewish sacrificial language. The w" amnou, e.g., recalls Isa 53:7 and Isaiah’s suffering servant; the theme of deliverance from slavery recalls the Passover; the “faultless and flawless” character of the lamb recalls the sacrificial system generally; and the references that follow to Christ being long foreknown and finally made known “at the end of the ages” recall certain Jewish and early Christian traditions about Gen 22:8. 13 and the young ram offered as a sacrifice in place of Isaac (Le Déaut, 104–5; cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Paul*, 141–48). In 1 Peter, as probably in Paul, it is the blending of these several strands that determines the choice of language, and not just one (even in Judaism the earliest midrash on Exodus connects the blood of the Passover lamb with “the blood of the sacrifice of Isaac”: Mek. on Exod 12:13).

Although the reader is held in no actual suspense, Peter achieves a certain dramatic effect by withholding as long as possible the identification of the one being described: the Cristou at the end of the clause thereby links vv 18–19 to v 20. The question this presents is whether the imagery of Christ as the “faultless and flawless lamb” still shapes the terminology in v 20; is Peter celebrating God’s redemptive work through “Christ” simply, or through “Christ the Lamb”?

20 proegnwsmenou men pro katabolh" kosmou, “who was foreknown before the creation of the world.” The men … de construction sets off this clause and the following one as a contrasting pair: “foreknown” in contrast to “appeared,” and “before the world was made” in contrast to “in the last of the ages.” proegnwsmenou recalls the kata prognwsin qeou patro" of v 2, except that here the foreknowledge (i.e., election, or “previous designation to a position or function” [Hort, 80]; see on v 2) refers to Christ rather than Christian believers (cf. eklekton in 2:4, 6). The perfect passive participle proegnwsmenou, like the tethrhmenon of v 4, points to the action of God on behalf of his people, in this case the designation of one to be their redeemer. What is decided from all eternity is not simply that Jesus Christ should come into the world, but that he should fulfill a certain role,

the role intimated already in v 19.

For the phrase pro katabolh" kosmou used, as here, in relation to Jesus Christ, cf. John 17:24 (also John 17:5); and in relation to Christians, Eph 1:4 (also in relation to Moses, in a Greek fragment of *As. Mos.* 1.14, *APO*[T], 2.415). The verb from which katabolh is derived (kataballw) would literally mean "to put down," but its uses are idiomatic: "to sow seed," or "to lay the foundation of a building"; the latter is the metaphor being used here (cf. BG[D,] 409.1). Rev 13:8, despite its reference to Jesus as the Lamb, is a doubtful parallel: the phrase apo katabolh" kosmou ("ever since [not "before"] the beginning of the world") refers not to the death of the Lamb (or to God's knowledge of it), but simply strengthens "not" to "never" (like ei" ton aiwna in John 8:51; 11:26) in asserting the nonelection of those not inscribed in the Lamb's book of life (cf. Rev 17:8).

fanerwqento" de epÆ escatou twn cronwn, "but who appeared in the last of the ages." The participle implies more than a simple contrast with the preceding clause might suggest. fanerwqento" presupposes not only Christ's designation in advance to be the redeemer of God's people, but his actual preexistence (cf. the "spirit of Christ," v 11). There is no direct link between this notion of preexistence and the metaphor of Jesus Christ as the Lamb, apart from the fact that Peter has placed the two side by side. Although there is in Gen 22 the intimation that "God will provide himself the lamb for a burnt offering …" (22:8, RS[v]; cf. Melito, *Fragment 9*; [S[c] 123.234]), and although faneroun is used in John 1:31 in connection with the presentation of Jesus as "Lamb of God" (1:29; cf. 1 John 3:5), the emphasis on God's foreknowledge and the pattern of "once hidden but now revealed" is far wider in its application than the cycle of ideas surrounding the imagery of sacrifice or the Passover. In apocalyptic literature, the Messiah (however understood) was often depicted as existing already in heaven, waiting to be revealed (cf., e.g., *1 Enoc*[h] 48.6: "he was concealed in the presence of [the Lord of the Spirits] prior to the creation of the world, and for eternity"; 62.7: "For the Son of Man was concealed from the beginning, and the Most High One preserved him in the presence of his power; then he revealed him to the holy and elect ones" (*OT*[P], 1.35, 43; cf. 4 Ezra 12:32; 13:52; in early Christianity, cf. *Magn.* 6.1; *2 Cle*[m] 14.2, *Herm. Sim.* 12.2–3). What is said of the Jewish Messiah or of Jesus Christ can be said also of the "mystery" of the plan of salvation realized in him (Rom 16:25–26; Eph 3:5 [9–10).

Peter does not emphasize here the factor of prior concealment, possibly because he has made the point already that the reality of Jesus Christ was only dimly seen by the prophets of the past (vv 10–12). Nor can he be understood as affirming that Christ "appeared" or "became visible" in any final or definitive sense. He and his readers have not seen Jesus in that sense (v 8), for they still await the day "when Jesus Christ is revealed" (vv 7, 13). As in 1 John, the verb faneroun can be used either of Jesus' redemptive work in history or his future coming in glory (cf. fanerwqento" in 1 Pet 5:4; in 1 John, cf. 1:2; 3:5; and 3:8 with 2:28 and 3:2). The latter is the more typical of Peter's usage, while the former is more likely to be traditional. Yet the two can stand almost side by side because of Peter's conviction that "the last of the ages" has now come.

epÆ escatou twn cronwn is not to be equated with the en kairw escatw of v 5. Rather it defines the "now" (cf. Rom 16:26) that stands in contrast to the time "before the beginning of the world." cronoi, to Peter, are periods of time, like a person's lifetime (4:2) or an extended stay in a foreign country (v 17). The phrase epÆ escatou twn cronwn assumes a series of these time periods or "ages" spanning the world's history, and affirms

that the last of these has begun with the appearing of Christ. The grammatical construction is probably derived from the epÆ escatou twn hmerwn of the LX[x] (Hebrew: µymYh tyraB[

; e.g., Num 24:14; Jer 23:20; 25:19 [49:39]; Dan 10:14; in the N[T], cf. Heb 1:2; in 9:26 the author of Hebrews uses a similar grammatical construction with different vocabulary to much the same effect).

diÆ uma", "for your sake." This phrase brings the traditional material of vv 18–20 back to the point from which it started, the Christian experience of the epistle's readers (v 18). The foreknowledge and the appearing were "for your sake." The function of diÆ uma" is similar to that of ei" uma" in v 4b, the first direct address to the readers in the body of the epistle; the prepositional phrase in each case marks a transition from generalized confessional material to a specific application (or reapplication) to the readers, who are then further identified by the definite article (tou") with another prepositional phrase and either a participle (v 5) or an adjective (v 21).

21 tou" diÆ autou pistou" ei" qeon, "through him you are believers in God." The grammatical construction modifying uma" recalls the tou" en dunamei qeou frouroumenou" dia pistew" of v 5. Whereas the earlier passage identified the readers of the epistle as those "protected by the power of God, through faith," the present passage looks more closely at the faith itself and at its object. The use of ei" with pistou" requires that the latter be understood not passively (as "trustworthy" or "dependable"; cf. 4:19; 5:12), but actively (as "trusting" or "believing"; BG[D], 665.2). ei" is not uncommon with the verb pisteuein (v 8, and frequently in the Johannine literature), but occurs nowhere else with the adjective (the closest analogy is Justin, *Dial.* 131.2, where the adjective is used with pro"). Peter seems to have applied to his readers the designation oi pistoi (cf. Acts 10:45; 1 Tim 4:12; Ign. *Eph.* 21.2; *Magn.* 5.2; *Mart. Pol.* 12.3, 13.2), with ei" qeon added to specify the object of their faith. The latter phrase is not superfluous, for it reminds the readers once more of their identity as Gentiles. They are believers in God, not (as Jews would have been) by virtue of their ancestral heritage (cf. v 18b) but through Jesus Christ (diÆ autou). In the same way that "turning to God" (Acts 14:15; 15:19; 26:20; 1 Thess 1:9) is used of Gentiles but not Jews, and the "gospel of God" (Mark 1:14; Rom 1:1; 15:16; 1 Thess 2:2, 8–9) refers primarily to the Christian gospel as proclaimed to the Gentiles, so "believing in God" is an appropriate expression for the experience of Gentile Christians precisely because it summarizes the break they have made with their past (cf. perhaps Heb 6:1: "repentance from dead works and faith toward God"). They are now "the faithful," not in the sense of being themselves dependable or trustworthy (although see Hort, 81–83), but in the sense of trusting or believing in God.

R. H. Gundry finds here an echo of John 14:1,6 (*NT*[S] 13[1967] 339–40; *Bi*[b], 214–15): Jesus tells his disciples to "believe in God" (v 1) and a little later says, "no one comes to the Father except through me" (diÆ emou, v 6, corresponding to diÆ autou in our passage). But in John 14 it is unlikely that "believing in God the Father (v 1) parallels coming to the Father" (Gundry, *Bi*[b], 214). The former, Jesus invites his disciples to do at once, while the latter will take place only later, after Jesus has led the way (John 13:36; 14:2–3; cf. E. Best, *NT*[S], 96–97). A closer parallel is the reference (attributed to Peter himself) in Acts 3:16 to "the faith that is through him" (diÆ autou; i.e., through Christ), even though the faith is not explicitly identified as faith in God.

The importance of diÆ autou is the link it provides with what precedes. The reason it can

be said that the appearing of Christ“ in the last of the times” was for the sake of the epistle’s readers (diÆ uma") is that “through him” they are believers (i.e. became believers) in God. There is a certain stylistic symmetry to diÆ uma" and diÆ autou despite the differing uses of dia. If diÆ autou explains diÆ uma", it is itself explained by the brief summary that follows of the work of God through Jesus Christ (cf. Hort, 83).

ton egeiranta auton ek nekrwn kai doxan autw donta, “who raised him from the dead and gave him glory.” These participles in effect define diÆ autou as diÆ anastasew" ÆIhsou Cristou (1:3; 3:21), understood as the work of God in raising Jesus from the dead. The participle of egeirein is used in Paul’s letters almost as a title, to identify God the Father in this way (Rom 4:24; 8:11; 2 Cor 4:14; Gal 1:1; Col 2:12). Although Paul believes Jesus was “raised from the dead through the glory of the Father” (Rom 6:4), he has no comparable participial expression for the giving of glory to Jesus. The latter appears to be Peter’s own elaboration of what raising Jesus from the dead entails. He uses it to make unmistakably clear that Jesus’ resurrection was not simply a resumption or extension of earthly life, but the beginning of a new and transcendent existence (cf. 3:18–22). The only other N^T reference to God the Father “giving glory” to Jesus is John 17:22, where it seems to refer quite generally to the mission of Jesus in the world. The more familiar expression is that God “glorified” Jesus (doxazein), whether in connection with his mission, his death on the cross, or his resurrection. Peter himself is represented in Acts 3 as announcing first that God “glorified his servant Jesus” (v 13) and then (with similar meaning) that “God raised him from the dead” (v 15). In Luke’s Gospel, for Jesus to “suffer and enter into his glory” (24:26) is to “suffer and rise from the dead the third day” (24:46). In 1 Peter, however, “glory” belongs to the epistle’s characteristic vocabulary, while “raising from the dead” does not. Peter links the “sufferings” and “glory” (or “glories”) of Jesus Christ as a contrasting pair in much the same way that Paul contrasts his death and resurrection (1:11; 4:13; 5:1). The phrase “gave him glory,” therefore, defines for the readers the significance of “raised him from the dead.” The “glory” (i.e. the vindication, or demonstration of divine favor) given to Jesus at his resurrection is the glory they are waiting to see revealed (4:13; 5:1, 4) even as they suffer ridicule for the sake of his name (4:14).

The symmetry of diÆ uma" and diÆ autou at the end of v 20 and the beginning of v 21 is completed in a kind of chiasm: first the participial clause, “who raised him from the dead and gave him glory,” unfolds the meaning of diÆ autou (note the repetition of auton and autw), and then the final clause with wste interprets diÆ uma" in light of the whole phrase tou" diÆ autou pistou" ei" qeon.

wste thn pistin umwn kai elpida einai ei" qeon, “So that your faith and hope might be in God.” Because the wste- clause expresses intended result, or purpose, rather than simple result (BD^F § 391.3; Selwyn, 147–48), it is more than a mere repetition of tou" diÆ autou pistou" ei" qeon. Peter’s additional point is that what is now the experience of his readers (i.e. believing in God) was God’s intention already when he raised Jesus Christ to glory. Although Christian existence centers on Jesus, God the Father is its ultimate source and its ultimate goal; where the accent in v 21a was on diÆ autou, the accent here is on ei" qeon (cf. Hort, 86).

Peter also associates hope with faith as a twin designation of that which believers direct toward God (for ei" qeon with hope, cf. 3:5). Some have proposed that hope (because it does not have the definite article) be taken as a predicate (cf., e.g., Moffatt: “and thus your faith means hope in God”). Yet the “suspicious modernness” that Hort (86) noted about

such a translation in 1898 is even more evident today. Peter is not so much affirming as assuming the close coordination of Christian faith and hope. By introducing hope at this point, he comes full circle back to v 13, where the series of exhortations began, while at the same time reinforcing his insistence in vv 3–9 simultaneously on the hope of salvation as an encouragement to faith, and on faith's testing during the interval before the hope is realized. The placement of ei" qeon at the very end rounds off vv 3–21 as a larger unit with God at the beginning (euloghto" o qeo", v 3a) and at the end, whether in the literary structure or in the horizons of the author's thought. In 1 Peter, faith no less than hope is pointed toward the future, and hope no less than faith is a response to God's work of redemption through Christ (v 3) and governs the conduct of Christians in the present (3:15–16). If there is a new element introduced with the mention of hope, it is the possible implication that the God who raised up Jesus and gave him glory will also raise and glorify those who hope in him (cf. Goppelt, 127, n. 79).

Explanation

Vv 13–21 start out to be a call to action and holy living in light of the great salvation that the prophets have asked about and the readers of the epistle have received. Peter, however, cannot bring himself to leave off celebrating the great salvation itself; he keeps weaving proclamation into his exhortation in such phrases as "the grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed" (v 13), "the Holy One who called you" (v 15), and "the One who judges impartially according to each person's work" (v 17). In vv 18–21 he turns his full attention back to proclamation and confession in the manner of vv 3–12.

Consequently, the ethical impact of the epistle barely begins to make itself felt. The call to action and to a holy and reverent life is general rather than specific. The imperatives of hope and of godly fear have more to do with eschatological expectations than with ethics, and more to do with the readers' relationship to God than with their relationships to each other or to their pagan neighbors. The only word that bears on their social relationships is "conduct," and nothing specific is said about their conduct except that it is to be "holy," a quality traditionally defined in religious or cultic rather than ethical terms. By contrast the conduct they have left behind is described as "empty" (v 18), characterized by "ignorance," and summarized as "impulses" presumably for selfish or material gain (v 14). It can be assumed that the conduct Peter urges is the opposite of all this, but neither the specifics of the "holy conduct" that is required nor the specifics of the social situation that Peter believes his readers are facing have begun to be spelled out—even less so in vv 13–21 than in vv 3–9.

Because of the geographical scope of his epistle and because of the distance (perhaps cultural as well as geographical) between himself and his readers, Peter stays as long as possible on the relatively firm ground of eschatological hope and theological confession before venturing into the more problematic terrain of offering counsel on how to respond to specific challenges from pagan society in the cities and provinces of Asia Minor. He concentrates on the great universals of Christian belief and experience, making free use of traditional materials preserved because of their applicability to all Christians everywhere. His accent throughout is positive, but there is an urgency both to his exhortations and his summary of redemption that betrays an awareness of enemies and of a very real threat.

The threat he sees facing the churches of Asia Minor can be called the threat of their past—"the impulses that once drove you in your ignorance," or "the empty way of life that

was your heritage" (vv 14, 18). If the past has a good side, and in certain respects stands at the service of Christian believers (v 12), Peter knows that it has a dark side as well. The slavery to the world from which Christians have been delivered lies in wait to receive them back at the first opportunity. So far, Peter has tried to counter this danger by reminding his readers of their common confession and common experience of God's redemption in Jesus Christ. It remains for him to counter it by strengthening their self-identity as a community of faith and hope.

Eternal Love (1:22–25)

Bibliography

Bishop, E. F. F. "A Living and Unchanging God in I Peter 1,23." *The Muslim World* 43 (1953) 15–17. **Blendinger, C.** "Kirche als Fremdlingschaft (1. Petrus 1,22–25)." *Communio Viatorum* 10 (1967) 123–34. **Danker, F. W.** "I Peter 1,24–2,17—A Consolatory Pericope." *ZNW* 58 (1967) 93–102 [cf. Danker, *CTM* 38 (1967) 329–32]. **Scharlemann, M. H.** "Why the Kuriou in 1 Peter 1:25." *CTM* 30 (1959) 352–56. **Verdiére, E. A. la.** "A Grammatical Ambiguity in 1 Pet 1:23." *CBQ* 36 (1974) 89–94.

Translation

[22]*Now that you have purified your souls for pure brotherly affection by obedience to the truth,*[a] *love one another unremittingly from the heart,*[b] [23]*you have been born anew, not from the planting of perishable seed but from imperishable, through the word of the living and enduring*[c] *God.* [24]*For "all humanity is like*[d] *grass, and all its glory is like*[d] *the wild flower; the grass withers and the flower falls away,* [25]*but what the Lord has said endures forever." What he has said is the message of the gospel that has been proclaimed to you.*

Notes

a. The majority of MSs add here the words "through the Spirit" (dia pneumato"), but the most important early MSs (p72 a

A B C Y) and the most ancient versions omit them. There is no reason why they would have been dropped if they were original; more likely they were added by scribes to accent the role of the Spirit in conversion (cf. en agiasmw pneumato" in v 2).

b. The majority of the ancient MSs (including p72 a

* C P Y) have a longer reading here, "out of a clean heart" (ek kaqara" kardia"), while A B and some of the OL versions and vg read simply ek kardia" ("from the heart" or "sincerely"). The latter picks up the emphasis on "genuine brotherly love" in the preceding clause, while the longer reading accents the reference to purification with which the verse begins. Despite the external evidence, ek kardia" is probably to be preferred; cf. Rom 6:17 where it occurs as here in connection with the initial obedience of Christians to the truth, or,

as Paul puts it, to the "form of teaching to which you were committed" (NI^{v}). The tendency toward expansion can be seen in one M^{S} of Rom 6:17 (A, which preserves, ironically, the shorter reading in our passage) where ek kardia" becomes ek kaqara" kardia". It is likely that the latter, an early expression of Christian piety found in 1 Tim 1:5 (with agaph) and 2 Tim 2:22 (cf. also Ps 23[24]:4; Matt 5:8; *Herm. Vis.* 4.2.5, 5.7; *Sentences of Sextus* 46b), has influenced the manuscript tradition here on a fairly wide scale. On the other hand, if ek kaqara" kardia" is original, the shortening of the text was probably accidental, triggered by the similar ka- beginning of the two words.

c. The majority of ancient MS^{s} add here ei" ton awna ("forever"), but the earliest and best MS^{s} do not. The added words are an intrusion from the end of the Scripture quotation in v 25a.

d. The omission of "like" (w") in ^{a}

^{2} ^{A} Y and some minuscule MS^{s}, and the substitution of "human" (anqrwpou) for "its" [glory] in ^{P} Y and the majority of later MS^{s}, probably represent scribal efforts to conform Peter's quotation of Isa 40:6–8 more closely to the LX$^{X.}$ The quotation follows the predominant LX^{X} text except at these two points, plus the use of kuriou instead of tou qeou hmwn in v 25.

Form/Structure/Setting

In these verses Peter resumes what he set out to do in v 13: i.e., to spell out the practical implications of Christian faith and hope. Where the imperatives in vv 13, 15, and 16 focused on his readers' responsibilities toward God, he now comes to their ethical obligations to one another. Instead of developing the ethical thrust he continues to reflect, as he has already done in vv 18–21, on its theological basis. The command to "love one another unremittingly from the heart" is framed by two perfect participles, similar in meaning (hgnikote", v 22; anagegennhmenoi, v 23), that reinforce it by looking back once again at the readers' experience of conversion from paganism to Christianity (cf. the references in v 2 to obedience and sprinkling with the blood of Jesus, in v 3 to new birth, and in v 18 to redemption).

The strong and repeated emphasis on initiation into the Christian community coupled with the requirement of brotherly love among believers recalls the Qumran *Manual of Discipline* (*Community Rule*), with its stipulation that those who enter the community must "love all the sons of light, each according to his lot in God's design, and hate all the sons of darkness, each according to his guilt in God's vengeance" and must "purify their knowledge in the truth of God's precepts and order their powers according to His ways of perfection" (1Q^{S} 1.9–11, 12–13 [tr. G. Vermes, 72]). Peter's fascination with Christian initiation in a letter directed to those who are already believers and have been for varying lengths of time prompted some scholars (e.g., H. Preisker, in HN^{T3}, and F. L. Cross, 1 Peter: *A Paschal Liturgy*) to suppose that behind the present epistolary form of this document a baptismal liturgy could be discerned and reconstructed. So confident were they in their reconstructions that the actual baptism of converts was assumed to have taken place between vv 21 and 22. Few have been willing to adopt such a speculative hypothesis; although Peter is speaking the language of Christian initiation and may well be drawing on traditional materials, his literary intentions must be respected. He is writing an actual epistle to Christians in various stages of spiritual growth, not a set of instructions for new

converts or a liturgy for the use of those welcoming new converts into the community.
The centerpiece of the section is an extensive Scripture quotation from Isa 40:6–8 introduced in connection with the second of the two perfect participles and a midrashic application of it celebrating the proclaimed gospel by which the readers of the epistle came to faith (vv 24–25). This ending to the section parallels to some degree the ending of vv 3–12, where Peter focuses similarly on what "has been announced to you through those who brought you the gospel" (v 12). As vv 10–12 are a postscript to vv 3–9, so in a somewhat different way vv 22–25 are a postscript to vv 13–21. The difference is that while vv 10–12 showed how the salvation now proclaimed and "about to be revealed" had its roots in the past and in the ministry of the prophets, vv 22–25 draw on a specific testimony out of the past (i.e., a passage of Scripture) to claim for both the salvation and the message on which it is based an eternally enduring future. Vv 3–12 and 13–25 can thus be seen as corresponding units of theological affirmation and ethical exhortation, respectively, but the ethical exhortation remains largely undeveloped and the nature of the Christian anastrofh still undefined.

Comment

22 ta" yuca" umwn hgnikote" en th upakoh th" alhqeia", "Now that you have purified your souls … by obedience to the truth." Peter makes no attempt at a transition but appears to change direction rather abruptly. Although there is no immediate or obvious connection between hope (v 21b) and purification, the principle expressed in 1 John 3:3 that "everyone who has this hope in him [i.e., in Christ and his appearing] purifies himself just as he [i.e., Christ] is pure" illustrates how hope might have prompted Peter to speak of purification. Alternatively, it is possible that Peter and John are drawing on some common catechetical traditions (R. E. Brown, *The Epistles of John*, AB, 30:432–34). In view of the catechetical importance of the triad of faith, hope, and love (1 Cor 13:13; cf. 1 Thess 1:3; 5:8; Col 1:4–5) it is also possible that a connection between vv 13–21 and vv 22–25 can be seen in the concluding emphasis on faith and hope in v 21 followed by the imperative of love in v 22.

The more significant connection is probably general rather than specific and indirect rather than direct. The participle picks up the thread of redemption and holiness from vv 13–21 and the thread of consecration by the Spirit and sprinkling with the blood of Jesus from the greeting in v 2; the mention of "obedience to the truth" also recalls v 2 as well as the phrase "obedient children" in v 14. Having used both aorist and present participles imperatively by linking them to imperatives (vv 13 and 14), Peter chooses the perfect participle (both here and in the following verse) to avoid this implication (cf. the perfect eidote" in v 18): he is not telling his readers to purify their souls but reminding them that they have already done so.

The phrase "purified your souls" echoes the language of Jer 6:16 LXX, "you will find purification for your souls" (kai eurhsete agnismon tai" fucai" umwn), a passage quoted differently in Matt 11:29 (i.e., with anapausin, a more accurate rendering of the Hebrew /']grm'

, instead of agnismon). It is possible either that Peter has in mind (independently of Matthew) the same biblical text to which Matthew alludes or that he is making use of the phrase as a saying of Jesus preserved in a slightly different form than in Matthew, but in

conformity with the LX[x]. The distinction is subtle: in the one case his point of departure is a passage of Scripture and in the other it is the Jesus tradition as remembered and taught in the churches. Peter obviously makes a direct appeal to Scripture in vv 24–25, but the references in v 22b to the love command and in v 23 to the new birth (cf. Gundry, *NT*[s] 13 [1967] 338–40) suggest that for the moment his appeal (indirect rather than direct) is to the teaching of Jesus as it was used in the instruction of new converts. The parallel with Matt 11:29 suggests the thought that it was by coming to Jesus that they had received purification (cf. 2:4).

The phrase "your souls" (with the article and the possessive pronoun) is found in the Gospel tradition (other than Matt 11:29) only in Luke 21:19, but is common in the LX[x] in the sense of "your lives" and has become part of Peter's own distinctive vocabulary (2:25; 4:19; in a slightly different vein, cf. 1:9; 3:20). Peter introduces it here with emphasis at the beginning of the clause not merely because it is part of the Jeremiah text and the word of Jesus based on that text, but because of its importance to his own argument. The purification he has in mind is not a ceremonial cleansing, but a purification of his readers' everyday lives, the equivalent of holiness in their anastrofh (cf. v 15).

The association of purification with obedience recalls Peter's opening greeting, and (especially in light of the reflection on Christ's "precious blood" in v 19) suggests that the purification of the readers' souls has been accomplished in principle by "sprinkling with the blood of Jesus" (v 2; cf. *Barn.* 5.1; 8.1). "Obedience" is here further qualified as "obedience to the truth": i.e., acceptance of the truth embodied in the proclaimed message of the gospel, in contrast to everything false or unauthentic—specifically "the impulses that once drove you in your ignorance" (v 14) and "the empty way of life that was your heritage" (v 18). The idea of truth or authenticity is reinforced in what follows by the adjective "genuine" (anupokriton) and by the list of vices that must consequently be laid aside according to 2:1: malice, deceit, hypocrisies, jealousies, and slanders (Hort, 87–88, cites as a parallel the use of th" alhqeia" in Eph 4:24 in the context of Eph 4:17–24 as a whole; cf. also 4:21).

ei" filadelfian anupokriton, "for pure brotherly affection." The implication of the purification of which Peter speaks is "brotherly affection," i.e., the mutual love of the members of a family or close-knit community. Paul in his earliest epistle refers to filadelfia as a virtue which his readers already understand and do not need to have explained to them (1 Thess 4:9), and apparently as an implication of their "consecration," or agiasmo" (4:3, 4, 7; cf. 1 Peter 1:2). The author of Hebrews considers it an already-existing characteristic of the communities to which he is writing, and urges only that it "continue" (13:1). For his own part, Peter designates the "brotherhood" as the proper sphere for Christian love to be at work (2:17; in 5:9 the sphere of Christian suffering is similarly "the brotherhood in the world"), and in bringing the household codes to a conclusion he urges all his readers to be "full of brotherly affection" (3:8). The commitment of the Christian community to "truth" requires that the brotherly affection demonstrated there be "genuine" (anupokriton, lit. "without hypocrisy"), but even without the distinctive emphasis of this context on truth in contrast to falsehood, this adjective is characteristically applied in the N[T] to such Christian virtues as love (Rom 12:9; 2 Cor 6:6), faith (1 Tim 1:5; 2 Tim 1:5), and wisdom (James 3:17; cf. also Wisd Sol 5:18; 18:16).

ek kardia" allhlou" agaphsate ektenw", "love one another unremittingly from the heart." There is no doubt that Peter understands brotherly affection and love for one another as equivalent expressions. When Paul told the Thessalonians that they had no need

for him to write to them about brotherly affection, he added that "you yourselves have been taught by God to love one another" (1 Thess 4:9b), and in 1 John the commands to "love one another" (3:11, 23; 4:7, 11–12) and to "love the brother[s]" (2:10; 3:10, 14; 4:20–21) are used interchangeably (although only the former is found in the Gospel of John). In a similar way, the phrase ek kardia" corresponds in meaning to anupokriton (cf. Rom 6:17 and *Note* b*), so that the entire clause, with the exception of the adverb ektenw", echoes the previous reference to genuine brotherly affection. Peter's point is that having purified their souls for the express purpose of displaying genuine affection for each other, they must do exactly that. His emphasis, however, falls less on the genuineness of their love than on the appended adverb ektenw": they must love each other from the heart "unremittingly"; their affection must be constant and enduring, unshaken by adversity or shifting circumstances (cf. ektenh in 4:8). Although ektenw" and its cognates may refer either to the fervency or the constancy of their love (BG^D, 245; the term is more characteristically used of prayer), the latter is more likely in the present context. ektenw", with the aorist imperative agaphsate, maintains the emphasis of the three previous imperatives in vv 13, 15, and 17 on the necessity of fulfilling the commands "until the end" or during the whole of the readers' allotted lifetime. Vv 23–25 in their turn can be understood as the explanation and elaboration of the ektenw" with which v 22 concludes (cf. Hort, 93).

23 anagegennhmenoi ouk ek spora" fqarth" alla afqartou, "You have been born anew, not from the planting of perishable seed but from imperishable." The reference to new birth returns to the thought with which Peter began the body of his epistle, the identification of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" as o … anagennhsa" hma" ei" elpida zwsan (v 3). It is possible that the mention of hope in God (v 21) prompted a further reflection on the experience of new birth by which this hope had come into being for the epistle's readers. Peter explains the experience of new birth here in much the same way that he explained the experience of redemption in vv 18–19, by means of a contrast between perishable and imperishable things introduced by ou[k] … alla. Just as they were redeemed "not with perishable things such as silver or gold" (v 18), so they were born anew "not from the planting of perishable seed but from imperishable."

spora occurs only here in the N^T (the more common word for "seed" is sperma), and appears to have been chosen because it focuses more on the process of sowing than on the seed as such (BG^D, 763). Both spora and sperma can be used either of raising plants or of human procreation, and there is no way to be absolutely certain which metaphor Peter has in mind here. In itself, the language of new birth obviously suggests the latter (cf., e.g., John 1:13; 1 John 3:9), but an essential point in the Scripture quotation that follows is the metaphorical equating of the two, precisely with regard to perishability: "For all humanity is like grass, and all its glory is like the wild flower; the grass withers and the flower falls away. …" It is likely that Peter is anticipating—or at least allowing for—the metaphors of the Scripture quotation by the way in which he speaks of an imperishable sowing or planting.

dia logou zwnto" qeou kai menonto", "through the word of the living and enduring God." The change of preposition from ek to dia is explained by the fact that spora refers to the process of sowing rather than the seed that is sown. The latter is represented by "the word of God," as in Jesus' parable of the sower (Luke 8:11; cf. Mark 4:14), but Peter's interest is not any longer in the metaphor of seed but in the reality to which the metaphor points. As the new birth was said in v 3 to be do anastasew" Ihsou Cristou ek

nekrwn, here it is said to be dia logou zwnto" qeou (cf. Selwyn, 152). It is debated whether zwnto" should be taken with logou or qeou. A first impression is that the fixity of the phrase "the living God" in biblical literature is decisive in favor of the latter. It appears that the purpose of the designation here, as in Acts 14:15; 1 Thess 1:9; and Heb 9:14, is to contrast God with the dead idols of paganism. Because the accompanying participle (menonto") seems redundant with "God" and more appropriate with "word" (cf. especially the end of the Scripture quotation in v 25), many commentators and most English translations have taken both participles with logou: "the living and enduring word of God" (see especially La Verdière, 89–94; for the participle zwn with logo", cf. Heb 4:12).

The issue here is whether the sense of the Scripture quotation should be the determining factor in the interpretation of material preceding the quotation. In the quotation it is clearly "what the Lord has said" or "the message of the Lord" that endures forever (v 25), while if v 23 is viewed by itself the most natural translation of the first phrase is "through the word of the living God," with the second participle a virtual afterthought. The same two participles are applied to God in Dan 6:27 (LX^x and Theod.), and the strongly God-centered thrust of v 21 (with its significant repetition of ei" qeon) favors this interpretation. What lives and endures is not the "word" as a self-contained or self-existent reality but the word as an expression of the living and enduring God. Prior to the seed is the sowing (ek spora") and thus the Sower (cf. Hort, 92, who argues for "referring the abidingness of the new life at once to its highest source, not to the intermediate channel").

Although the addition of kai menonto" to zwnto" qeou may have the appearance of an afterthought, it marks the transition from the participial clause of v 23 to the Scripture quotation in vv 24–25, and from a primary emphasis on the God who endures to a secondary emphasis on his enduring message. It is this quality of permanence that requires of Christian believers permanent and unremitting love (v 22).

24 dioti pasa sarx w" orto" kai pasa doxa auth" w" anqo" cortou, "For 'all humanity is like grass, and all its glory is like the wild flower.' " The quotation from Isa 40:6–8 is introduced with dioti (cf. 2:6), which serves as a shortened equivalent of dioti gegraptai (v 16). The conjunction is not strictly causal but serves as a loose connective ("for"; BD^F § 456.1) introducing the Scripture passage to illustrate and support what has just been said about an imperishable planting through the word of God. Peter follows the LX^x closely. His two deviations in v 24 (first, the use of w" before corto", making the phrase a simile rather than a metaphor; and second, the substitution of auth" for anqrwpou in agreement with the Hebrew) are probably to be attributed not to Peter's editorial activity but simply to his use of a LX^x manuscript tradition different at small points from that reflected in modern critical editions (cf. Hort, 94).

The main point of the quotation is to be found in the positive pronouncement of v 25a that "what the Lord has said endures forever" (Isa 40:8), but Peter sets the stage for that pronouncement by quoting extensively from Isaiah's preceding context (more extensively than the main point by itself requires). Does v 24 have another purpose beyond providing a setting for v 25? The material quoted in v 24 (i.e., Isa 40:6–7) is also cited by James (although much more loosely) in connection with his introductory discourse on wisdom and on the futility of riches (James 1:10–11), without any contrasting reference to the enduring word of God. Peter has no particular interest in the theme of poverty and riches, yet it is likely that his use of Isa 40:6–7 is analogous to that of James. His focus, however, is on Roman culture generally, whether in Rome or Asia Minor, rather than on the rich as a

social class. The first part of the quotation can be understood as a comment on "the planting of perishable seed" to which he referred in v 23: "all humanity" (lit. "all flesh," a common O^T expression) is seen from the standpoint of its mortality, and human mortality is underscored by the metaphor of grass. Because the life cycle of plants is relatively short, and the perishability of plant life is more obvious and visible to humans than their own mortality, grass and flowers become appropriate metaphors (to Isaiah and Peter alike) for the human condition.

If pasa sarx refers to humanity generally, pasa doxa auth" is probably intended to focus on the outward attraction or splendor of pagan society and of the "way of life that was your heritage," a way of life that Peter has already characterized as "empty" (v 18; cf. Hort, 94). He does not deny the external beauty of pagan culture; it is as beautiful in its way as the wild flowers that God placed in the grassy fields, but it is also just as fragile and short lived. anqo" cortou is the $LX^{X's}$ free translation of a Hebrew phrase meaning "flower of the field" (for a more literal rendering see Ps 102[103]:15), and refers to actual flowers, not to the tiny blossoms of the grass.

Peter does not consciously choose the word doxa ("glory") to refer to this outward beauty; his use of Isa 40:6 makes it inevitable. Yet its occurrence in the Scripture quotation creates an appropriate contrast with the eschatological "glory" of Jesus Christ made possible by his resurrection (vv 11, 21) and waiting to be revealed to those who trust in him (v 7; 4:13; 5:1, 4).

exhranqh o corto" kai to anqo" exepesen, " 'the grass withers and the flower falls away.' " The aorist verbs function in Greek as gnomic aorists, a relatively rare use of that tense to express proverbial truths or events universally observed to happen in human experience (BD^F § 333.1). More to the point, they translate Hebrew perfects, which more frequently and characteristically have the same sort of function. For similar references to grass as "withering," cf. Ps 101[102]:11; Isa 51:12; Jer 12:4; and to blossoms as "falling away," cf. Job 14:2; 15:30, 33; Isa 28:1, 4. With these borrowed words, Peter metaphorically pronounces judgment on the world in its self-sufficiency (cf. 1 John 2:17) and on pagan culture in its hostility to the Christian communities both in Rome and Asia Minor. He will make his words of judgment more explicit later in the epistle (1 Pet 2:8; 3:16–17; 4:17–18; 5:5b).

25 to de rhma kuriou menei ei" ton aiwna, " 'But what the Lord has said endures forever.' " The end of the quotation illumines the positive side of Peter's ouk … alla contrast in v 23, the "planting of imperishable seed" and the "word of the living and enduring God." There is no way to tell whether the substitution of kuriou for the tou qeou hmwn of the best LX^X manuscripts (the most significant departure from the LX^X in this quotation) is a deliberate editorial change (Kelly, 81) or (like the other small deviations) simply of working with different LX^X manuscripts (Hort, 94). Still a third possibility is that Peter is influenced by his memory of the Isaiah passage as a whole, in which "Lord" alternates with "God" or "our God" (cf. especially Isa 40:3, where the two stand in parallelism). Whatever the explanation, kuriou lends itself to the author's purposes by making room for an application of the phrase to Christ. rhma kuriou can be appropriately seen as anticipating the crhsto" o kurio" of 2:3 (also taken from a biblical text, Ps 33[34]:9 [8]) and clearly intended to refer to Jesus; cf. also the kurion of Isa 8:13, explicitly identified with ton Criston in 3:15.

The construction rhma kuriou must be understood both in Isaiah and in 1 Peter as a

subjective genitive: the word which the Lord spoke. When kuriou is taken Christologically, the reference is to the message Jesus proclaimed, so that in Peter's context the statement becomes a parallel to Jesus' own pronouncement that "Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away" (Mark 13:31 // Matt 24:35 // Luke 21:33). In effect, Jesus "the Lord" assumes the place of central importance assigned in v 23 to "the living and enduring God." Just as the logo" was of importance there only because it was God's logo", so the rhma is of importance here only because it is Jesus' rhma. Peter's assumption is that what Isaiah knew as the word of the Lord lives on as the message of Jesus, and that for himself and his readers the message of Jesus "endures forever." From the immediate context (vv 22–23) he may have particularly in mind the promise of purification and new birth (cf. Matt 11:29; John 3:3) and the command to love one another (John 13:34).

touto de estin to rhma to euaggelisqen ei" uma", "What he has said is the message of the gospel that has been proclaimed to you." Not content to leave the interpretation of rhma kuriou merely implicit, Peter attaches a comment identifying it with "the message of the gospel that has been proclaimed to you." To Peter, the message of Jesus and the message about Jesus are the same message, just as they are to Mark (1:1, 14–15) and to the author of Hebrews (2:3–4). The gospel is an eternal gospel that promises eternal life and demands eternal love (cf. 1 John 2:17). The passive participle to euaggelisqen may have been prompted by the active participle o euaggelizomeno", which occurs twice in Isa 40:9. Peter does not extend the quotation to v 9 because his attention is focused not on the messengers (as it was in 1:12) but on the message. The occurrence of euaggelizesqai in Isaiah's context, however, affords him an excellent opportunity to identify the eternal word of God with the gospel proclaimed in Asia Minor.

ei" uma" is unexpected after euaggelisqen (umin would normally be used; cf. the dative nekroi" in 4:6). It is probably to be taken as much with to rhma as with euaggelisqen (cf. peri th" ei" uma" carito" in v 10). Peter could have written to rhma to ei" uma" with much the same meaning, but the addition of euaggelisqen from Isaiah links Peter's application of the Scripture passage specifically to v 12 and to the proclamation of the gospel mentioned there. The placement of ei" uma" at the end of the section gives emphasis to what has been a major theme in the epistle's first chapter at least since the ei" uma" of v 4: everything that God planned from the beginning, everything that he accomplished through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, everything still waiting to be revealed, is for the sake of the Christians in Asia Minor who read Peter's words. From the ei" umai" of vv 4 and 10, to the di uma" of v 20, to the ei" uma" of v 25, all of it, punctuated by the repetition of the pronouns umwn (vv 7, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22), umin (vv 12, 13), and uma" (vv 12, 15), is "for you." The repeated pronouns help build the readers' identity, and begin to call them to responsibility. When Peter resumes the second person pronouns in the following chapter (umin oun, 2:7; umei" de, 2:9), he will address more directly and explicitly these major concerns of identity and responsibility.

Explanation

The single command of vv 22–25, to "love one another unremittingly from the heart," is set in a strongly theological context: a reminder of the assured realities of spiritual purification and the new birth, and a contrast between the perishable and the imperishable so important to Peter that it is supported by a lengthy quotation from Scripture. Yet the

command itself is simply repeated without comment from the common tradition of the sayings of Jesus. The reason can only be that Peter considers this theological context absolutely necessary to the understanding of the love command, and more important, to its realization in practice. He knows that brotherly affection among those who are not literally brothers and sisters is impossible without purification of soul, and that mutual love even in a community of shared belief is impossible without the new birth of which Jesus had spoken in the Gospel tradition.

Without these things it is possible to be fond of other individuals and to have a commitment of sorts to a community or a cause. What is always lacking in such cases is that quality of constancy or steadfastness which Peter sums up with the adverb "unremittingly." The love or brotherly affection of which he speaks is an unremitting, imperishable love. Because it has about it something of the nature of "the living and enduring God" it stands over against the world and human culture; in particular it stands over against the culture of Greco-Roman paganism. It binds those who have become "believers in God" into a community distinct from the society in which it finds itself. Although Peter emphasizes at a number of points in his epistle that the readers must not respond in kind when they are ill-treated by their fellow citizens, and although he seems to draw freely on passages in the Gospel tradition in which Jesus either commanded his disciples to love their enemies or demonstrated such an attitude himself (e.g., 2:23; 3:9), he never tells his readers in so many words to "love" their enemies. In 1 Peter as in the Gospel and Epistles of John, love is directed not toward the world but toward the Christian "brotherhood" (2:17; cf. 4:8).

If the common faith and hope (v 21) is the theological bond of the Christian community, love is its practical bond. If faith and hope are what give the community its identity as God's "chosen people" (v 1), love is the visible outworking of that identity. Love for the brother- and sisterhood of believers is as much an eschatological responsibility as the Godward-directed commands of vv 13, 15, and 17. Like the imperatives of hope, holiness, and reverent fear, it is pointed toward the future. Peter's only other use so far of the verb "to love" (agapan) assumed his readers' love for Jesus Christ and for his future appearing. Love in that passage was virtually the equivalent of faith or hope. Love in the present passage represents for Peter the natural and inevitable next step, in a manner not so different from that of 1 John: "No one has ever seen God; if we love one another, God remains in us and his love is perfected in us. … If anyone says, 'I love God,' and hates his brother, he is a liar. For if a person does not love his brother, whom he has seen, how can he love God, whom he has not seen? And we have this command from him, that one who loves God must also love his brother" (4:12, 20–21).

Spiritual Milk (2:1–3)

Bibliography

Francis, J. " 'Like Newborn Babes'—The Image of the Child in 1 Petr 2:2–3." *JSNT* Suppl ser. 3 (1980) 111–17. **Grundmann, W.** "Die NHPIOI in der urchristlichen Paränese." *NTS* 5 (1958/59) 188–205. **Hillyer, N. H.** " 'Spiritual Milk … Spiritual House.' " *TynB* 20 (1969) 126. **Quinn, J. D.**

"Notes on the Text of the p^{72} 1 Pt 2,3; 5,14; and 5,9." *CB*[Q] 17 (1965) 241–49. **Ryan, T. J.** *The Word of God in First Peter: A Critical Study of 1 Peter 2:1–3*. Diss. Catholic University (Washington, DC), 1973. **Snodgrass, K. R.** "1 Peter ii.1–10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities." *NT*[S] 24 (1977/78) 97–106.

Translation

[1]*Get rid of all malice, therefore, and all deceit, as well as hypocrisies,*[a] *jealousies, and slanders of every kind.* [2]*As newborn babies, long for that pure spiritual milk by which to grow up to salvation*[b] [3]*now that you have tasted that the Lord is good.*[c]

Notes

1.a. In most of the ancient MS[s], the first two items on this list ("malice" and "deceit") are singular and the last three plural, but the tendency of a few MS[s] is to make some or all of the last three singular as well. The evidence is strongest in the case of "hypocrisies," which is singular (upokrisin) in [B a]

[1] and two Old Latin versions, yet the plural upokrisei" is to be preferred. "Malice" and "deceit" are set apart from the items that follow by the repetition of "all" (pasan and panta, singular in Greek). It is more likely that the singular dolon ("deceit") would influence scribes to make "hypocrisy" singular (because of their similarity in meaning) than that the plurals at the end of the list would influence a change in the opposite direction. The credibility of [B] in this verse is not enhanced by its unique scribal error fonou" ("murders") in place of fqonou" ("jealousies").

2.b. The words "to salvation" (ei" swthrian) are omitted in the majority of later MS[s] (cf. KJ[v]/A[v]), perhaps because a salvation to which one might attain by spiritual growth seemed inconsistent with a distinctly eschatological salvation waiting to be revealed at the last day (1:4; cf. 1:9). The phrase is found in all the earlier and better MS[s] and should be retained.

3.c. A number of ancient MS[s] (p^{72} [K L] and others) read Cristo" ("Christ") instead of crhsto" ("good" or "pleasing"), in line with a wordplay very common in early Christianity (BG[D], 887; *TDN*[T] 9:488–89). The effect of this variation is to turn a scriptural allusion into a confessional formula ("that the Lord is Christ" or "that Christ is Lord"; cf. 3:15). The earliest of the MS[s] that does this (p^{72}) also inserts episteusate after egeusasqe as an unmistakable indication that "tasting" means believing in Christ. crhsto", found in all other significant MS[s], as well as the LX[X] passage to which Peter is alluding (Ps 33[34]:9a [8a]), is without question the correct reading.

Form/Structure/Setting

In this section Peter continues the practice of juxtaposing participles with aorist imperatives. In 1:13–14 the imperative was preceded by an aorist and a present participle and followed by another present participle (with all the participles consequently functioning as imperatives); in 1:22–23 the imperative was both preceded and followed by perfect participles (signaling Peter's avoidance in that instance of the imperatival meaning). Now he returns to the aorist participle, as in 1:13, and to the use of the participle as an

imperative.

His terminology corresponds to 1:13 also in the adoption of a metaphor having to do with clothing (BG[D,] 101.1b), this time not the metaphor of girding oneself to get ready for action but that of putting off (apoqemenoi) the garments of evil attitudes and deeds. Although Peter is fond of such clothing metaphors (cf. 4:1, 5:5), in this case the imagery is so standardized in N[T] epistles as to be metaphorical only in a very marginal sense (the metaphor has disappeared entirely in the apoqesi" of 3:21). Selwyn classifies Peter's use of apoqemenoi here as part of a traditional catechetical form which he calls *Deponentes*, or the renunciations necessitated by the new life (393–400). The use of apoqemenoi is common enough in catechetical material (cf. Eph 4:25; Heb 12:1; James 1:21, and other forms of the verb in Rom 13:12; Eph 4:22; Col 3:8; only in Rom 13:12 and Eph 4:22 is the clothing metaphor close to the surface). The verb by itself, however, is insufficient to define a catechetical form; if there is a renunciation form here, it is defined simply by the combination of the verb apotiqesqai with a list of vices (cf. James 1:21; Col 3:8, and possibly Eph 4:25, 31). Lists of virtues and vices were a common rhetorical device both in the ancient Jewish and Hellenistic worlds (cf., e.g., S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend-und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament*, BZN[W] 25 [1959]) and apoqemenoi is a natural and obvious way to introduce a list of vices.

The positive counterpart to the renunciation that Peter requires is not expressed (as in some of the parallel passages: Rom 13:12, 14; Col 3:10; Eph 4:24) with the metaphor of "putting on" Christ (enduesqai) as a garment but with the very different image of a newborn baby craving a mother's milk (v 2). The equivalency of this metaphor to that of putting on Christ is shown, however, by the allusion to Ps 33[34]:9[8] LX[X] that immediately follows. To drink the "pure milk" of which Peter speaks is to taste of "the Lord" himself (cf. 1:25), an image capturing the intimacy of the believer's relationship to Christ just as effectively as that of putting him on as a new garment. The result of this relationship is growth, and the goal of growth is "salvation." Peter's language here is drawn from the same cycle of early Christian reflections on the gospel as Eph 4:15 ("let us grow up to him … who is the head, Christ"), or more elaborately, 4:13 ("until we all attain … to the perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ"). Peter's allusion to the psalm personalizes the "salvation" as "the Lord," but where his imagery differs from that of Paul in Ephesians (cf. also Col 2:19) is that Peter has linked the growth metaphor to that of rebirth or becoming a child. Consequently he makes his point with the feminine imagery of milk and (implicitly) of Christ as Mother, instead of the masculine imagery of the "head" or of the "perfect man." Peter's vivid and specific "milk" corresponds to Paul's vaguer and more abstract "supply" or "support" (epicorhgia, Eph 4:16; cf. Col 2:19) in its function of imparting life and growth to the body (cf. Hort, 103), suggesting that what is involved here is not an adaptation of Paul's imagery but an independent development. Both Paul (1 Cor 3:1–2) and the author of Hebrews (5:12–13) used milk (in contrast to solid food) as a metaphor for elementary teaching to new converts, but Peter adopts it instead as an important symbol in its own right (like water in John's Gospel) of the life of God sustaining and perfecting the people of God.

The source of Peter's bold use of this imagery is more difficult to determine, but it may rest on sayings of Jesus about becoming like children in connection with rebirth (e.g., Matt 18:1–4) or on his invitations to the children (or even brefh, "babies," Luke 18:15) to come to him, "for of such is the kingdom of God" (Mark 10:14 // Luke 18:16; cf. Matt 19:14).

There is a subtle change of time perspective between 1:22–25 and 2:1–3: in the former, Peter seems to look back on the conversion of his readers as an event in the past, while in the latter he addresses them as if they are even now (artigennhta) coming to faith in Jesus Christ. For this reason it has been suggested that Peter is making direct use of a baptismal catechism, but there is no way to determine whether or not this theory is true (clearly identifiable baptismal catechisms from the first two centuries, such as *Did*. 1–6 and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, are rather different in character). Rather than being baptismal in the strict sense, Peter's terminology is probably based on the theological assumption that the metaphor of children or infants is applicable to all believers regardless of their stage of spiritual growth (cf. Hort, 100; Bigg, 127; Best, 97).

With the allusion in v 3 to Ps 33[34]:9 [8] ("now that you have tasted that the Lord is good"), Peter looks back to the actual initiation experience of his readers in the manner of 1:22–25. He assumes that they have all come to Jesus for the purification of their souls; they have tasted of the new life he offers and have found it sweet. If 1:22–2:3 were viewed together as a unit, it could be regarded as framed by allusions to scriptural passages (Jer 6:16 and Ps 33[34]:9 [8], respectively), each of which anticipates in its way the promise and call of Jesus with an extended explicit quotation in the center identifying the message of Jesus (rhma kuriou) with the word of the living and eternal God, on the one hand, and, on the other, with the message of the gospel proclaimed in Asia Minor to the epistle's readers.

Comment

1 apoqemenoi oun pasan kakian kai panta dolon, "Get rid of all malice, therefore, and all deceit." The participle is to be understood imperatively because of its dependence on the imperative epipoqhsate. Peter assumes that his readers have purified their souls in a general sense (1:23), but without knowing them personally he cannot say they have rid themselves of the specific vices he names. What is clear to him is that they have a responsibility to do so (cf. the similar command in v 11). apoqemenoi is used not to evoke the metaphor of taking off clothing but more generally of rejecting certain evil attitudes and practices and so ridding oneself of moral defilement. The closest parallel to the present passage is James 1:21: "Therefore get rid of all defilement [apoqemenoi pasan ruparian; cf. apoqesi" rupou in 1 Pet 3:21] and your excessive malice [kakia"], and receive in humility the implanted word [ton emfuton logan] that is able to save your souls." The similarity focuses on the kinds of things that must be rejected, but seems to extend as well to the positive alternative to these things: the humble acceptance of what God has to give. and the consequent hope of salvation. The parallels do not, however, suggest actual literary dependence in either direction, in view of the frequency both of apoqemenoi and of lists of vices in early Christian catechetical material (see *Form/Structure/Setting*).

The list of vices begins with pasan kakian and panta dolon, each a rather general term in itself and each generalized still further by being put in the singular with pa"; in other lists, cf. pasan ruparian in James 1:21; pasa pikria and pash kakia in Eph 4:31; also *1 Cle*[m] 13.1, 35.5). The effect is to subsume under the general headings of "malice" and "deceit," respectively, all possible instances and variations of these evil qualities (cf. BG[D,] 631.1ab). kakia can refer either to evil or wickedness in the most inclusive sense, or (only a little more specifically) to malice or ill will (BG[D,] 397.1a, b]). The distinction is not

(as the translations “malice” or “ill will” might suggest) that the second category has to do with evil intentions not realized in practice, but that it has to do with certain antisocial attitudes and behavior. kakia could be summarized as “mischief” or “bad blood,” the nursing and acting out of grudges against particular people, or against society as a whole. There is no way to tell from this word, or from any of the words on Peter’s list, whether he views these vices as infecting the relationships of his readers to each other (thus as the opposite of the brotherly affection he commands in 1:22), or whether he has in mind the attitude and behavior of Christian believers toward their pagan neighbors and pagan society at large (the latter is the case, at any rate, with the use of kakia in 2:16). The likelihood, therefore, is that he has both kinds of relationship in view; it is insufficient to identify malice and deceit simply as “the two chief types of the vices inconsistent with such a love of the brethren as St Peter has been inculcating above” or to conclude that his list of vices merely “repeats negatively here what he had said positively there” (Hort, 98). Without stating explicitly what he is doing, Peter now begins to speak concretely of how Christians should conduct themselves at every level, both among themselves and in the wider society. On the one hand, he has made it clear that they must reject the anastrofh of the Greco-Roman world (1:14,18). Yet their attitude to that way of life need not be hostile or subversive; their faith is not to be expressed in antisocial conduct. Paul could have summarized Peter’s meaning with the command, “Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good” (Rom 12:21). Although Peter reserves the word “love” for the believer’s relationship to fellow believers, when he comes to the specific things that love implies (both negatively and positively), he makes no particular distinction between fellow believers and fellow human beings.

Selwyn attempts to make a distinction between kakia, which he says embraces “the whole wickedness of the pagan world,” and dolo", “a different class of sins … which threatened the life of believers in spite of, or even in consequence of, their conversion” (153). The other two uses of dolo" in 1 Peter (both found in allusions to Scripture) suggest that, on the contrary, dolo" is as broad in its application as kakia, and as appropriate to the believers’ relationships to pagan society in general as to their relationships to one another. First, dolo" is used in parallelism with amartia in reference to Christ’s suffering at the hands of his enemies: “He committed no sin, nor was deceit ever found on his lips” (v 22, citing Isa 53:9); second, dolo" is used in parallelism with kako" in reference to the proper behavior generally of those whom God has called: i.e., they “must keep the tongue from evil and the lips from speaking deceit” (3:10, citing Ps 33[34]:14 [13]). Deceit is a temptation for Christian believers either among themselves or in relation to their pagan fellow citizens, and Peter has not focused his attention on either of these possible situations to the exclusion of the other.

kai upokrisei" kai fqonou" kai pasa" katalalia", “as well as hypocrisies, jealousies, and slanders of every kind.” The rest of the list shifts from the singular to the plural, which in the case of upokrisei" refers concretely to “the varied forms which hypocrisy assumes” (BGD, 845) and thus serves the same purpose that panta fulfills with dolon (cf. Hort, 99). The mixture of singular and plural in the same list, as well as the occurrence of almost synonymous terms, is not uncommon in early Christian ethical lists (cf., e.g., Gal 5:19–21; also *Did.* 5.1, where upokrisei" and dolo" are found separated by only one other word). Peter’s use of upokrisei" here both adds to the effect of dolon and reinforces the insistence of 1:22 that brotherly affection must be anupokriton.

If “hypocrisies” go with “deceit,” fqonou", “Jealousies” (for the plural, cf. Gal 5:21) can be understood as a specific example of kakia (cf. Titus 3:3, *T. Benj.* 8.1). The same is true of “slanders,” or katalalia", which seem to be viewed here as expressions of jealousy. Peter elsewhere refers to his readers as potential victims rather than perpetrators of slander (2:12, 15; 3:16), but his concern in the present instance is that they themselves not adopt the behavior of those who denounce them, either by trading insults with their enemies (3:9; cf. 2:23) or by speaking evil of one another (cf. James 4:11; also the polemic against katalalia in 2.2–3, 8.3; *Sim.* 9.15.3, 9.23.2–3; also 2 Cor 12:20; *1 Cle*[m] 30.1; 35.5; *Barn.* 20.2; Pol. *Phil.* 2.2, 4.3). The use of “all” with this word embraces both these possibilities while giving to “slanders” a certain emphasis and rounding out the list of vices on the same note with which it began.

2w" artigennhta brefh to logikon adolon gala epipoqhsate, “As newborn babies, long for that pure spiritual milk.” Despite w", Peter is using “newborn babies” (for the phrase, cf. Lucian, *Dialogi Marini* 12.1) not as a simile but as a metaphor: “like the newborn babies you are”—presupposing the rebirth mentioned in 1:23 (cf. w" tekna upakoh", 1:14). The metaphor’s point of comparison is not the smallness or innocence of a baby, but its strong and instinctive longing for a mother’s milk. The imperative epipoqhsate is for Peter the recognition of legitimate “desire,” the equivalent for Christian believers of the “impulses” (epiqumiai) that controlled them in the past (1:14; 2:11; 4:2–3), and (in a different way) of the unfulfilled “desire” (epiqumousin, present indicative) of the angels trying to probe the mysteries of salvation (1:12). To a newborn baby such longing is wholly natural and inevitable, but the longing for the “pure milk” of which Peter speaks is something that must be commanded, and something on which the readers must fasten their attention and effort, like hope or holy conduct or the reverent fear of God or love for each other (cf. 1:13, 15, 17, 22).

What is to logikon adolon gala, and how does a person long for it? The basic metaphor is “pure milk” in the sense of milk from a mother’s breast; at one level logikon simply shows Peter’s self-consciousness about using metaphorical language (somewhat like the th" dianoia" umwn of 1:13). Instead of relying on the metaphor by itself to carry the meaning, he adds logikon as a reminder that he is speaking metaphorically (much as we might add the words “so to speak”). The force of the term is that Peter is referring not to literal mother’s milk but to milk in a “higher” (i.e., metaphorical) sense. logiko", however, meant more to Peter’s contemporaries than what is usually meant by “metaphorical” today. Its primary meaning was “rational” or “spiritual” in the sense of that which distinguished the human or divine from merely material things or from animals (cf. Epictetus, Diss. 1.16.20; 3.1.26; Philo, *Migr. Abr.* 185). In particular, it was used in connection with the spiritualizing of cultic terminology or practice (BG[D,] 476; G. Kittel in *TDN*[T] 4:142–43; in the N[T,] cf. Paul’s logikhn latreian or “spiritual worship,” in Rom 12:1; in Hellenistic Judaism, cf. *T. Lev*[j] 3.6, with reference to worship offered by the angels; in Hellenistic literature, cf. especially logikh qusia in *Corp. Herm.* 1.31; 13.18, 21). A few verses later, however, when Peter himself wants to spiritualize the language of temple and sacrifice, he uses not logiko" but pneumatiko" for “a spiritual house” and “spiritual sacrifices.”

For this reason it is possible that there are other factors at work in the choice of logiko" here. The KJ[v]/A[v] rendering, “sincere milk of the word” (a considerable departure from Tyndale’s “that reasonable mylke which is with out corrupcion”), seems to presuppose a twofold wordplay: first, between adolon and dolon (v 1); second, between logikon and

logou (1:23). The former is unmistakable: "pure milk" is apparently understood as the spiritual food that guards against the vices listed in v 1, deceit in particular. The latter is not so immediate or obvious, yet the parallel with James 1:21 (where the positive side of apoqemenoi is receiving "the implanted word [logon] that is able to save your souls") gives it a certain plausibility. If this parallel is made determinative, then instead of speaking, like James, of longing for the "implanted word" (or, in his own terms, for the "word of the living God") Peter is introducing the metaphor of milk to much the same effect, while retaining "word" as an adjective (logikon) rather than a noun (cf. Bigg, 126–7; Kelly, 85).

It is doubtful that the readers of the epistle would have noticed such a subtle connection. Although Peter may have chosen logikon with 1:23 still in mind and may even be using milk as a metaphor for the proclaimed "message of the gospel" (1:25), the translation "milk of the word" is too explicit (cf. Hort, 100). It shifts the emphasis from "milk," where it belongs, to "word," where it does not belong. The purpose of logikon is not to interpret and thereby dissolve the metaphor, but simply to underscore the fact that it is a metaphor (i.e., that Peter is speaking not of literal milk but of a more excellent, although undefined, "spiritual" milk). The same considerations make it unlikely that Peter is referring to an actual liturgy in which new converts were given milk and honey as a part of their initiation (cf. Hippolytus, *Apost. Trad.* 23.2, 7; Tertullian, adv. *Marcionem* 1.14, *De Corona* 3.3: in the pagan mystery religions, cf. Sallustius, *De Deis* 4; see H. Schlier in *TDNT* 1:646). Not only is honey unmentioned in 1 Peter but the basis of Peter's metaphor of milk is obviously not liturgy (as in v 5) but life: the nurture of children on then mothers' milk.

What then is the "pure spiritual milk"? The uses of the metaphor in 1 Cor 3:2 and Heb 5:12–13, where "milk" is elementary Christian teaching, could suggest that here too it refers to the instruction needed (both elementary and advanced) for the believer to "grow up to salvation" (this is possible even if logikon is not intended to define it as such explicitly). Broader parallels yield a broader understanding of the milk metaphor. In the early collection of hymns known as the *Odes of Solomon*, Christ says of those who are his own: "I fashioned their members, and my own breasts I prepared for them, that they might drink my holy milk and live by it" (*Odes Sol.* 8.14: *OTP* 1:742). Another ode testifies: "A cup of milk was offered to me, and I drank it in the sweetness of the Lord's kindness. The Son is the cup, and the Father is he who was milked: and the Holy Spirit is she who milked him" (19.2; cf. also 35.5: "And I was carried like a child by its mother; and he gave me milk, the dew of the Lord. And I grew strong in his favor, and rested in his perfection" [*OTP* 1:752, 765]). The image of milk from the breasts of the Lord is used in a variety of ways in the *Odes of Solomon*, almost always in some relation to his mercy or kindness (cf. also 4.10; 14.2–3; 40.1). The Semitic roots of such mother/father imagery can be seen in the Qumran hymns, or *Hodayoth*, whether used of God himself (1QH 9.35–36) or of his surrogate, the leader of the community (1QH 7.20–22: cf. Paul in 1 Thess 2:7).

Milk, like blood, or water, or wine, is a natural and appropriate symbol of life (cf. Clement of Alexandria's ingenious attempt to equate milk with the "blood of the Word" in *Paed.* 1.6: e.g., "Thus in many ways the Word is figuratively diescribed, as meat, and flesh, and food, and bread, and blood, and milk. The Lord is all these, to give enjoyment to us who have believed on Him" [ANF, 2.221]). The life of God as the believer's present possession is not a major theme in 1 Peter as it is in John or 1 John (when zwh is mentioned in 1 Pet 3:7 and 10, it is seen more as a future than as a present reality). Yet "living" (zwn or

zwsan) is a key adjective in the epistle, whether applied to God himself (1:23), the Christian hope (1:3), or Christ as "living stone" and believers as "living stones" (2:4–5). The contrast of life with death was implicit in Peter's polemic against paganism, and especially in the contrast between the sowing of perishable and imperishable seed in 1:23, with its accompanying quotation from Isa 40:6–8.

It is doubtful, however, that the significance of "pure spiritual milk" for Peter can be summed up in just one word or concept. It can be understood to represent divine mercy or grace as easily as divine life. Not only the parallels in the *Odes of Solomon* but the larger framework of the first major section of I Peter (1:3–2:10), in which a reference to mercy both begins (1:3, "in his great mercy") and ends the argument (2:10, "now you have received mercy"), gives force to this interpretation. In the immediate context, the result of tasting the "spiritual milk" is trading out "that the Lord is good" (i.e., crhsto", "kind, loving, benevolent" [BGD, 886]). In light of 1:25 there can be no doubt that the medium by which the milk is received is the proclaimed message of the gospel, but the milk itself is more appropriately interpreted as the sustaining life of God given in mercy to his children.

ina en autw auxhqhte ei" swthrian, "by which to grow up to salvation." This clause makes it clear, if it was not clear already, that "milk" in this passage is the spiritual food of all believers and not just recent converts. Milk is the means (en autw) of growth, but the end of the growth process is not adulthood or maturity but "salvation." Although swthria can sometimes mean bodily health or well-being as well as deliverance or salvation (LSJ, 1751), it does not mean "healthy maturity" and does not normally refer to a state into which a person "grows." With ei" swthrian, therefore, Peter drops the metaphor and returns to the eschatological language of 1:3–12 (vv 5 and 9–10 in particular). This is where Peter's imagery differs from that of Ephesians and Colossians, where spiritual growth is either spoken of without reference to a specific end or goal (Col 2:19 // Eph 4:16; cf. the textual variant discussed in *Note* b*) or else with a goal (indicated by ei") that belongs to the metaphorical framework the author is using (e.g., Eph 2:21: "into a holy temple in the Lord" 4:15: "to him who is the Head … Christ" cf. v 13: "into a mature man, into the measure of the full stature of Christ").

It appears that Peter has explicitly defined the goal of spiritual growth as swthria because of the latter's intrinsic importance to his argument in chapter one and throughout the epistle. The basic idea in swthria is deliverance, and in a setting of persecution or oppression the hopes of the oppressed would more naturally be set on God's power and will to deliver and vindicate them than on their own spiritual maturity. "Salvation" is future, both here and in chapter one, but the fact that it is woven here into a metaphor of birth, nurture, and growth gives it a distinctive cast. ei" swthrian in 1:5 points to a decisive act of God "about to be revealed at the last day" believers are "protected by the power of God, through faith" as they wait for the moment of his interventions, ei" swthrian in our passage points to a vindication arising inevitably, almost "naturally," out of the spiritual growth that results from receiving "pure spiritual milk."

These distinctions should not be exaggerated. Instead of setting the one model over against the other, the epistle's readers are intended to allow each to qualify and interpret the other. The very choice of the word swthria rather than another term better suited to the metaphor is Peter's signal that he has in mind the salvation of which he has spoken already in chap. 1. In chap. 1 itself, it is important not to isolate the decisive swthria "revealed at the last day" (1:5) from the "faith" (pisti", vv 5, 7, 9) of the Christian community in the

meantime, as it faces its "various ordeals" (1:6). To the contrary, the fired salvation is the telo", the appropriate outcome of their faith and in a sense its eschatological equivalent (1:9: cf. v 7b, where the genuineness of that same faith is said to turn out as "praise, glory, and honor at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed" see above, p. 31). There is a shift in emphasis between chaps. 1 and 2 but nothing more. The center of interest in 1:3–12 is the hope of final vindication, while in our passage it is the process of spiritual growth that precedes the end. In neither instance, however, is "salvation" seen as anything other than God's decisive intervention on behalf of his people "at the last day," and in neither instance are his people seen as merely waiting passively for their eschatological reward. Rather, they are active participants in the drama of salvation, whether their participation is depicted as having their faith tested and proved genuine in "various ordeals" in pagan society, or as feeding on the life-giving "milk" of God's mercy for the well-being of their minds and souls (cf. James 1:21).

3ei egeusasqe oti crhsto" o kurio", "now that you have tasted that the Lord is good." The metaphor of drinking milk is linked with Ps 33[34]:9a [8a], just as it is in *Odes Sol.* 19.2 (see above, p. 88). In adapting the psalm reference to his purpose, Peter changes the psalm's aorist imperative (geusasqe, "taste") to an aorist indicative, which he places within the "if"-clause of a first-class conditional sentence ("assuming you have tasted …" or "now that you have tasted …" cf. BD[F] § 372.1b). At the same time he omits altogether a second imperative (kai idete, "and see"), probably because the milk imagery in his own context has given to the verb "taste" a certain literal quality it did not have in the psalm and, consequently, has made the accompanying verb inappropriate. The awkwardness of this adaptation is that geuesqai is not normally followed by oti and indirect discourse (cf. only Prov 31:18 LX[X,] the addition of episteusate in [P72] [see *Note* c[*]] may have been occasioned in part by this unusual construction).

Peter's adaptation of the psalm text shifts its time reference from the present or future to the past. Instead of inviting his readers, as the psalmist did, to "taste and see [i.e., learn by experience] that the Lord is good," he assumes on the basis of their Christian confession that they have already done so (i.e., when they "purified their souls" and were "born anew," 1:22–23). A similar assumption is made (in nonfigurative language) about the readers of Ephesians: "assuming that you have heard about him [i.e., Christ] and were taught in him, as the truth is in Jesus" (Eph 4:21, RS[V]). Peter's use of "tasting" as a metaphor for Christian initiation is paralleled in Heb 6:4–5, where the author speaks both of "tasting of the heavenly gift" (immediately defined as becoming "partakers of the Holy Spirit") and (in terms reminiscent of Ps 33[34]:9 [8]) of "tasting that God's message is good" (kalon geusamenou" qeou rhma; cf. Peter's use of rhma in 1:25). This parallel suggests that the psalm reference may have been widely known and used in the early church, and if Peter had not quoted extensively from the same psalm in 3:10–12, it might have been possible to argue that his use of it here is indirect (like the apparent allusion to Jer 6:16 in 1:22) rather than direct.

Although the psalm allusion is direct, Peter has given it his own metaphorical context, with a new application of o kurio" to Jesus Christ (cf. v 4), and of crhsto" to Jesus' kindness in welcoming those who "come to him" (cf. v 4). The allusion to the psalm allows Peter to take full advantage of the pun on crhsto" and the name or title Cristo": God in his mercy or kindness is revealed specifically in Jesus Christ (cf. Titus 3:4–6). If in 1:22 Peter had in mind Jer 6:16 as echoed in the Gospel tradition (cf. Matt 11:29), it is possible

that he associated the image of the "pleasant yoke" (preserved for us in Matt 11:30: "The yoke I have for you is crhsto" and the burden is light") with the "pleasant Lord" mentioned in his favorite psalm (cf. also the description of God as "kind [crhsto"] to the ungrateful and wicked" in Luke 6:35, in a section of the Gospel tradition with which Peter shows signs of familiarity, e.g., in 2:19–20; 3:9, 16).

Explanation

Warnings against evil attitudes and practices have no point if nothing is provided to take their place. While urging his readers to get rid of all kinds of malice and deceit, Peter stirs in them instead a longing for God, and for all that God has to give. This he sums up in the metaphor of a mother's milk, the very life of God given in gentleness and compassion to those who long for it.

Building on the image of rebirth from 1:23, Peter envisions Christian believers as newborn babies forever, growing not toward adulthood (which in Peter's metaphor would be something contrary to their nature) but toward the salvation God has in store for them (cf. 1:5, 9). Salvation is seen not as a last-minute rescue operation from the outside but as the fitting consummation of a process already at work in and among Christian believers. Although the attaining of salvation is a distinctly future experience, the salvation itself is already present in the intention of God, waiting only to be "revealed" (1:5). The present age therefore has a dynamic quality for Christian believers, for they are seen not as standing still while waiting for the new age to dawn but as growing toward the realization of God's purpose for them (as individuals and as a community) and for the world in which they live.
This process of growth has positive ethical implications which are not immediately spelled out, but which receive ample development in the epistle as a whole. The implications of holiness and love have already been introduced briefly, while negatively the putting aside of malice and deceit served as the setting for the growth command itself. Beyond this, there is implicit in Peter's language the notion that those who long for, and receive, the "milk" of Christ's mercy or kindness must display in their own lives these same virtues toward others. The ethical stance that gives evidence of spiritual growth toward salvation can be defined either as the doing of good (2:15, 20; 3:6, 11, 17; 4:19), or (what amounts to the same thing) as the imitation of Christ (2:21–23, 3:8–9).

The New Building (2:4–10)

Bibliography

Barnard, L. W. "The Testimonium Concerning the Stone in the N[T] and in the Epistle of Barnabas." S[E] 3 (1964) 306–13. **Bauer, J. B.** "Könige und Priester, ein heiliges Volk (Ex 19,6)." *B*[Z] N[F] 2 (1958) 283–86. **Best, E.** "I Peter II 4–10—A Reconsideration." *Nov*[T] 11 (1969) 270–93. **Blinzler,J.** "IERATEUMA. Zur Exegese von 1 Petr. 2,5 u. 9." In *Episcopus (*F[S] *M. Faulhaber*). Regensburg, 1949. 49–65. **Cerfaux, L.** "Regale sacerdotum." *RSP*[T] 28 (1939) 5–39. **Colecchia, L. F.** "Rilievi su 1 Piet. 2,4–10." *Revist*[B] 25 (1977) 179–94. **Coomaraswamy, A. K.** "Eckstein." *Speculum* 14 (1939)

66–72. **Coppens, J.** "Le sacerdoce royal des fidéles: un commentaire de I Petr. ii.4–10." In *Au service de la Parole de Dieu (*F[S] *A.-M. Charue*). Gembloux, 1969. **Elliott, J. H.** *The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of I Peter 2:4–10 and the Phrase* basileion ierateuma. NovTSu[p] 12. Leiden, 1966. **Ellis, E. E.** *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957; repr. 1981. 89–90. **Ferguson, E.** "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment." *ANR*[W] II, 23.2 (1980) 1151–89. **Feuillet, A.** "Les 'sacrifices spirituelles' du sacerdoce royal des baptises (1 [P] 2,5) et leur préparation dans l'Ancien Testament." *Nouvelle Revue Theologique* 106/96 (1974) 704–28. **Halas, S.** "Sens dynamique de l'expression lao" ei" peripoihsin en 1 [P] 2,9." *Bi*[b] 65 (1984) 254–58. **Hill, D.** " 'To Offer Spiritual Sacrifices …' (1 Peter 2:5): Liturgical Formulations and Christian Paraenesis in 1 Peter." *JSN*[T] 16 (1982) 45–63. **Hillyer, N.** " 'Rock-Stone' Imagery in I Peter." *Tyn*[B] 21 (1970) 39–70. **Ketter, P.** "Das allgemeine Priestertum der Gläubigen nach dem ersten Petrusbrief." *TT*[Z] 56 (1947) 43–51. **Longenecker, R. N.** *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. SB[T,] ser. 2, 17. 50–53. **Manns, F.** " 'La maison où réside I'Esprit'. 1 [P] 2,5 at son arriére-plan juif." *SBFL*[A] 34 (1984) 207–24 **Marshall, J. S.** " 'A Spiritual House an Holy Priesthood' (1 Petr ii, 5)." *AT*[R] 28 (1946) 227–28. **Minear, P.** "The House of Living Stones: A Study of 1 Peter 2:4–12." *Ecumenical Review* 34 (1982) 238–48. **Pines, S.** "From Darkness into Great Light." *Immanuel—A Bulletin of Religious Thought and Research in Israel* 4 (1974) 47–51. **Plumpe, J. C.** "Vivum saxum, vivi lapides: The Concept of 'Living Stone' in Classical Antiquity." *Traditio* 1 (1943) 1–14. **Schröger, F.** " 'Lasst euch auferbauen zu einem geisterföllten Haus' (1 Petr 2,4–5). Eine Überlegung zu dem Verhältnis von Ratio und Pneuma." In *Theologie-Gemeinde—Seelsorge*. Munich, 1979. 138–45. **Shodgrass, K. R.** "1 Peter ii.l–10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities." *NT*[S] 24 (1977) 97–106. **Steuernagel, V. R.** "An Exiled Community as a Missionary Community: A Study Based on 1 Peter 2:9, 10." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 10.1 (1986) 8–18

Translation

[4]*As you come to him, the living Stone, rejected by people generally but in God's sight choice and precious,* [5]*you yourselves, like living stones, are being built*[a] *into a spiritual house for*[b] *holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God*[c] *through Jesus Christ.* [6]*For it says in writing, Behold, I am laying a choice and precious stone, a cornerstone*[d] *in Zion, and the person who believes in him will never be put to shame.* [7]*This honor belongs to you who believe, but to unbelievers*[e] *the stone which the builders rejected has become the foundation of the corner,* [8]*and a stone for stumbling and a rock to trip over. In disobeying the word they stumble—and to that they too were appointed.*

> [9]*You, however, are a chosen race, the King's priesthood, a holy nation, a people destined for vindication—all to sound the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light,* [10]*Once you were no people, now you are God's people; once destitute of mercy, you have now received mercy.*

Notes

a. Some ancient MS[s] ([a]

[AC] v[g] and others) have the compound epoikodomeisqe in place of oikodomeisqe. The difference is slight; it is possible that the compound form is intended to call attention in advance to Christ as the foundation or "cornerstone" on which the "spiritual house" is built (vv 6, 7; cf. Eph 2:20), or the variant may simply reflect in a more general way the terminology of Eph 2:20; Col 2:7; 1 Cor 3:10–17. Peter does not explicitly develop, as Paul

does, the idea of building on a foundation. Although he finds akrogwniaion and ei" kefalhn gwnia" in the texts that he cites, they do not play a dominant role in his imagery (see *Comment*). oikodomeisqe, the reading of the majority (including the most significant) of the MS^{s}, is to be accepted as original.

b. The preposition ei" ("for" or "to") is omitted in ^{P72}, in the majority of later MS^{s}, and in the v^{g} The effect of the omission is to make ierateuma agion a designation of the Christian community itself (i.e., parallel to oiko" pneumatiko": "a spiritual house, a holy priesthood"; cf. v 9) rather than its function. The evidence for ei" in the earlier MS^{s} is overwhelming: $^{P72\ a}$

$^{A\ B\ C}$ Y and others. Thus ierateuma is not merely synonymous with oiko", but designates the purpose for which the "spiritual house" exists (see *Comment*).

c. Although it does not affect the translation, there is disagreement in the manuscript tradition over whether "God" is expressed with the definite article. The majority of ancient MS^{s} (including $^{P72\ a}$

^{2} and $^{P)}$ read tw qew, while ^{a}

$^{*\ A\ B\ C}$ and some significant minuscules read simply qew. The matter is almost impossible to decide, although the use of the article in Paul's similar formulations (Rom 12:1; Phil 4:18; cf. Heb 13:15) as well as Peter's preference for the article in his more formal expressions of praise or virtue offered up to God (e.g., 2:12, 17; 3:4, 18; 4:11, 16) slightly favors the retention of the article here.

d. There is variation in the Greek word order of the phrase, "choice and precious cornerstone." The majority, and the best, of ancient MS^{s} read akrogwniaion eklekton entimon, but $^{B\ C}$ and a few other witnesses have eklekton akrogwnasion entimon, conforming the word order to the LX^{X} of Isa 28:16. They are suspect for that very reason; Peter seems to have anticipated the word order he prefers already in v 4 where eklekton and entimon are brought together. Alternatively, it is possible that scribes conformed the quotation in v 6 to the language of v 4, but this is less likely in view of the external evidence and in view of scribal tendencies elsewhere to conform quotations to the LX^{X}

e. $^{A,\ P,}$ the Syriac Peshitta and the majority of later MS^{s} read apeiqousin ("disobedient ones") in place of apistousin ("unbelievers"). The variant seems to be influenced by the apeiqounte" of v 8; the witness of $^{P72\ a}$

$^{B\ C}$ Y and other MS^{s} is conclusive in favor of the text as it stands, although ^{B} in v 8 errs in the opposite direction by reading apistounte" instead of apeiqounte".

Form/Structure/Setting

In 1 Peter, as in Ephesians, the metaphor of growth is closely associated with the metaphor of building. In Ephesians, both metaphors describe the church in its corporate existence (Eph 2:21; 4:12, 16), but because the image of the church as the body of Christ is not found in 1 Peter, the shift from the growth metaphor to the metaphor of building is at the same time a shift from an individual to a corporate focus. Having spoken of individual spiritual growth in vv 1–3, Peter now turns his attention to the church as a community of believers (although without using the word ekklhsia).

In keeping with the crhsto" o kurio" at the end of v 3, he comes to ecclesiology by way of Christology. For a third time (cf. 1:16, 24–25) he makes a formal appeal to the Scriptures with a LX[X] quotation introduced by dioti (v 6). The formal quotation (from Isa 28:16) draws to itself two others (Ps 117[118]:22; Isa 8:14) linked to the first by the common designation "stone" (liqo") for Jesus Christ. Peter uses the quotations to emphasize the identity of his readers as "believers" in contrast to the "unbelievers" or "disobedient" with whom they were in daily contact in the provinces of Asia Minor (vv 7–8).

Nowhere else in the N[T] are the three "stone" references brought together. Paul in Rom 9:33 weaves the two Isaiah passages into a single quotation by placing Isa 8:14 in the framework of Isa 28:16. The "stone of stumbling" of the former passage is clearly his immediate center of interest (v 32), but in 10:11 Paul again picks up the last phrase of Isa 28:16, "No one who believes in him will be put to shame." The textual similarities between the quotations in Romans and in 1 Peter (in significant deviation from the LX[X]) suggest either a direct literary relationship or the independent use of a distinctive textual tradition, possibly attributable to an early collection of scriptural testimonies to Jesus as the Messiah (Ellis, 89–90; C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 41–43). Because of the relative dates usually assigned to the two epistles, few would argue that Paul is using Peter. and even if he were, the question of the source of Peter's formulation would remain. If Peter were using Paul, it is unlikely that he would separate out two quotations that Paul had so carefully integrated into one. Moreover, his middle quotation, Ps 117[118]:22, is not found in Paul's epistles (even the indirect allusion in Eph 2:19–21 suggested by Ellis is unconvincing), but (within the N[T]) only m 1 Peter and the Gospels (cf. Mark 12:10 // Matt 21:42 // Luke 20:17; cf. the paraphrase attributed to Peter in Acts 4:11).

Peter is therefore probably dependent not on Paul for his quotations but on an early collection of messianic proof texts, possibly organized around certain key words (in this instance, liqo" or "stone"). Such *Testimonia* (a term going back to Cyprian) or "Testimony Books" (J. Rendel Harris's designation) could have been used either in apologetics (as over against Judaism, for whom the appeal to the Jewish Scriptures would have significance) or in the instruction of new converts. Selwyn's theory (268–81) that all the texts referred to in 2:4–10 were brought together in the form of a hymn in two strophes, although still for purposes of instruction (cf. Col 3:16), is speculative and less convincing.

Whatever the original purpose of the collection on which Peter is drawing, the quotations in their present context in the epistle are part of his instruction of the Gentile readers about their new identity in relation to Jesus Christ.

He reminds them of their new identity in three ways: (1) indirectly, and independently of the three quotations (v 5); (2) directly, on the basis of Isa 28:16 (vv 7–8); (3) directly, in terms drawn loosely from a number of other biblical texts (vv 9–10):

(1) The kai autoi of v 5, introducing the transition from the singular liqon zwnta to the plural liqoi zwnte", defines the readers' identity by their relationship to Jesus Christ, established in vv 2–3 by the metaphor of drinking the milk he offers and finding him "good," and in v 4 by the phrase, "coming to him." The description of Christ, the "living Stone," as "rejected by people generally but in God's sight choice and precious" anticipates the Scripture quotations of vv 6 and 7 (in reverse order, forming a kind of chiasm) but has no clear or obvious function in its immediate context. Its place of prominence is best explained on the understanding that it is meant to apply secondarily to the readers, the "living stones," as well as to Christ. They too are "rejected by people generally but in God's

sight choice and precious," for their identity is to be defined over against those who do not belong to their number. The emphasis, however, is not on the hostility between them and their enemies, but on their priestly calling (never concretely defined) of "offering up spiritual sacrifices" as they are built into a "spiritual house." Strangely (in light of the Epistle to the Hebrews), this priestly calling is never explicitly linked to the priestly activity of Jesus himself. He is simply the one to whom they have come (v 4), and the foundation of their "spiritual house" (vv 6–7).

(2) The readers are identified by the umin oun of v 7, so that the concluding clause of the first quotation ("and the person who believes in him will never be put to shame") is applied directly to them. The contrast between believer and unbeliever, only hinted at in vv 4–5, becomes the major theme of vv 6–8. Attention is centered less on the readers of the epistle than on their enemies. Peter adds to Isa 28:16 two more quotations, both negative in their thrust (Ps 117[118]:22 and Isa 8:14).

The first of these picks up the note of rejection from v 4 (the "men" or "people" who rejected the "living Stone" are specifically linked to the "unbelievers" of Peter's day), while the second identifies Christ as "a stone for stumbling and a rock to trip over" (vv 7b–8). There is no further reflection in this section on the priestly ministry of believers, only on the distinction between them and those who "stumble by disobeying the word [of God]" (i.e., rejecting the message of the gospel, cf. 1:25). Peter rounds off his series of quotations by adding, "and to that they too were appointed" (ei" o kai eteqhsan, corresponding to the tiqhmi of the first quotation in v 6; there are two "appointings" or "destinies"—one, of the "choice and precious stone, a cornerstone in Zion," to vindication, and the other of those who "disobey the word," to shame and stumbling.

(3) The readers are identified explicitly (by the umei" de of v 9) as "a chosen race, the King's priesthood, a holy nation, a people destined for vindication" (v 9), and finally as "God's people" (v 10). The list of positive designations takes up and makes specific the "honor," briefly mentioned in v 7a, of not being put to shame like the unbelievers. Without introducing any further quotations, Peter draws on biblical language from several contexts to describe the status of Christian believers. The extended description in vv 9–10 serves both as Peter's application of the basic Scripture text in v 6, and his clarification of the Christian responsibilities intimated in v 5. In particular, to offer up "spiritual sacrifices" is "to sound the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light."

The heart of vv 4–10 is a midrash based primarily on Isa 28:16 and secondarily on several other biblical texts. Its effect is to assign to the Gentile communities to which Peter is writing an essentially Jewish identity and responsibility (see above, *Introduction*). Their identity is not defined as it is in Paul over against those who are literally Jews (i.e., "Israel according to the flesh") but over against those who have always been the enemies of the Jews themselves: i.e., the unbelieving Gentiles who comprise pagan society both in Rome and in Asia Minor (vv 7b–8). Peter sees his readers not as claimants to the status of "Israel" or "people of God," standing in some sort of rivalry with those who were born Jewish, but purely and simply as "Israel" or as the "people of God." How their status relates to thai of the actual Jewish communities in Asia Minor or Rome is a question he does not even begin to address.

A distinctive feature of the fostering ot this self-consciousness as "Israel" (in addition to the startling fact that those so addressed are Gentiles) is Peter's vision of this new Israel as a priestly community. To be the people of God is not only a privilege but a responsibility, and in particular a priestly responsibility. Before there was a special priestly class in Israel, there was the idealized notion of all Israel as a priesthood (Exod 19:6), and it is to this ancient notion that Peter makes his appeal (vv 5, 9). His vision of the Christian brotherhood

as Israel is at once universal in its scope and priestly in its orientation, a combination that invites comparison with the Jewish community at Qumran.

In a manner reminiscent of 1 Peter, the Qumran *Manual of Discipline (Community Rule*) refers to its community as "a House of Holiness for Israel, an Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron. They shall be witnesses to the truth at the Judgment and shall be the elect of Goodwill who shall atone for the Land and pay to the wicked Their reward. It shall be that tried wall, that precious cornerstone, whose foundations shall neither rock nor sway in their place [Isa 28:16]. It shall be a Most Holy Dwelling for Aaron, with everlasting knowledge of the Covenant ot Justice, and shall offer up sweet fragrance. It shall be a House of Perfection and Truth in Israel that they may establish a Covenant according to the everlasting precepts. And They shall be an agreeable offering, atoning for the Land and determining the judgment of wickedness, and there shall be no more iniquity" ($1Q^S$ 8.5–10; tr. G. Vermes, 85). This "atonement for the Land" is subsequently defined by the statement that "They shall atone for guilty rebellion and for sins of unfaithfulness that they may obtain lovingkindness for the Land without The flesh of holocausts and the fat of sacrifice. And prayer rightly offered shall be as an acceptable fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of way as a delectable free-will offering" ($1Q^S$ 9.4–5; tr. G. Vermes, 87).
Despite certain similarities between the perspectives of I Peter and the Qumran community, there is no real evidence of direct influence. Neither Ps 118:22 nor Exod 19:6 seem to have played a part m the self-understanding of the Qumran community (cf. Goppelt, 140), and even though $1Q^S$ 8.7–8 has apparently been shaped to some extent by Isa 28:16, an important difference is that at Qumran the community itself is the "precious cornerstone," while in I Peter the cornerstone is Jesus Christ, and is in any case not the image (whether for Christ or for tire community) with which Peter is primarily concerned. Beyond this, the fact that the recipients of Peter's epistle are literally Gentiles rather than Jews, and that he apparently expects them to realize their priestly calling in day-by-day engagement with the world rather than in isolation from it, differentiates his epistle and its concerns from Qumran at a very basic level.

At the same time, it is unlikely that the image of the Christian community as a "spiritual house" being buth out of "living stones" was entirely derived from Peter's own creative reflections on Isa 28:16 (even when the other two "stone" texts are taken into consideration as well). There is no doubt that the designation of Christ as Stone was derived from these texts, and it is not hard to see how Peter might have attached to that title the adjective "living" (which he uses also in 1:3 and 23). But the emphasis on the process of budding (like that on the process of growth in 2:2) does not arise naturally out of any of the texts cited. It is more akin to certain formulations in Eph 2:19–21 and 1 Cor 3:9–17 as well as certain Gospel texts in which Jesus uses the metaphor of building either to describe what he will do (Matt 16:18) or what his disciples must do (Matt 7:24–27 // Luke 6:47–49). Not only the decisive promise to Peter himself that "On this rock I will build my church" (Matt 16:18), but the persistence of charges against Jesus that he intended to build a new temple (Mark 14:58 // Matt 26:61; cf. John 2:19) suggest that the building metaphor may have played a significant role in his self-consciousness and his vision of the future. The use of Ps 117[118]:22 in Mark 12:10–11 // Matt 21:42–44 // Luke 20:17–18 confirms this impression with its tacit assumption that a process of building is under way in which the religious leaders of Israel will play no part. Even without pressing a personal link between Jesus' promise to Peter, the "Rock," and the "Stone" imagery in 1 Peter (cf. Spicq, S^T 20 [1966]

57–59; Gundry, *NT*[s] 13 [1967] 346; *Bi*[b] 55 [1974] 221–22; on the other side, cf. Best, *NT*[s] 16 [1970] 101), it appears likely that 1 Peter is drawing here on tradition common to Paul and the Gospel tradition, rooted in Judaism (e.g., Qumran) but especially important to the earliest Christians because of its presence in their traditions of the words of Jesus.

Comment

4 pro" on prosercomenoi, "As you come to him." The meaning of the participle hinges in part on the meaning of the main verb, oikodomeisqe, in v 5. If the latter is an imperative, the participle is probably imperatival as well (cf. 1:13, 14; 2:1), with the meaning "Come to him …" (cf. Goppelt, 141), although it could also be taken as a direct assertion ("Now that you are coming to him … let yourselves be built" cf. the participles in 1:18, 22, 23; these, however, are perfect rather than present participles). If the main verb is read as an indicative, then the participle is almost certainly an assertion rather than a command ("As you come to him … you are being built" cf. Selwyn, 159; Kelly, 89). The logic of v 5 favors the second alternative, which is supported here as well by the likelihood that the indicative mood of the last clause of v 3 ("now that you have tasted that the Lord is good") still governs the author's language (cf. Elliott, *The Elect and the Holy*, 16, 17).

The building metaphor which Peter will develop shortly requires a shift of focus from individual to corporate Christian experience (Selwyn, 157, perceives here "a swift transition from the individual to the institutional aspect of religion, which is nevertheless kept personal throughout"). The participle is therefore best understood as a kind of summary of the Christian mission (particularly in Asia Minor): "as more and more of you come to him." The accent is not on baptism or any other aspect of Christian initiation per se, and not on the community's approach to God in formal worship, but rather on the expansion of the "brotherhood in the world" (5:9) through the continuing proclamation of the gospel message (cf. 1:12, 25) Although this missionary expansion is not synonymous with the process of building described in the following verse, Peter sees it as the necessary prerequisite of that process.

It is often suggested that the LX[x] context of the preceding quotation of Ps 33[34]:9a [8a] is still in view in Peter's use here of prosercomenoi with pro" (cf. 33[34]:6a[5a]: proselqate pro" auton kai fwtisqhte, "come to him and be enlightened"), but it is difficult to be certain because the construction is not uncommon in the LX[x]. Of particular interest is the next line of the psalm (kai ta proswpa umwn ou mh kataiscunqh, "and your faces shall never be put to shame," 33[34]:6b[5b]), in which the last phrase, ou mh kataiscunqh, matches verbatim the phrase from Isa 28:16 LX[x] which Peter picks up in v 6, and which represents for him the "honor" (v 7) reserved for those who believe. Hort finds in the participle a play on the word "proselyte" (proshluto", from the same verb, used in the LX[x] along with paroiko" [cf. v 11] for the Hebrew rG»

, a "sojourner" in the land or, later, a Gentile convert to Judaism): "The Christians of Asia Minor were not only members of a new Dispersion, but were *proselytes* in a new sense, joined not only to a holy people, but to the manifested Christ its Head" (105; cf. 154–56).

liqon zwnta, "the living Stone." The designation liqo" anticipates the Scripture quotations in vv 6–8, and at the same time implicitly identifies the kurio" of v 3 as Jesus Christ. The participle zwnta does not arise out of the quotations, but it is a feature of Petrine vocabulary (cf. 1:3, 23) and it serves here as a characteristic Petrine signal (like

logikon in v 2 or pneumatiko" in v 5) that he is using the word "stone" in a metaphorical rather than literal sense (cf. Selwyn, 158; Goppelt, 141; J. Jeremias in *TDN*[T] 4:279).

Although the phrase "living rock" (*vivum saxum*) is found occasionally in such Roman poets as Virgil and Ovid for rock in its natural state, embedded in the earth (J. C. Plumpe, *Traditio* 1 [1943] 1–14), Peter's use of the phrase "living Stone" is quite different. liqo" refers not to natural rock but to dressed stone ready for use in construction. Because a "stone" is a traditional metaphor for a lifeless thing, to be contrasted with God (Acts 17:29). with Abraham's children (Matt 3:9 // Luke 3:8), or with human beings who can praise God (Luke 19:40), liqon zwnta has the effect of a paradox or deliberate contradiction in terms.
Gods of "wood and stone" (e.g., Deut 4:28; 28:36, 64; 29:16 [17]; 2 Kgs 19:18; Isa 37:19; Jer 2:27, 3:9; Ezek 20:32 LX[X]) are the dead gods of false religions (cf. J. Jeremias in *TDN*[T] 4:264). It is possible that in referring to Christ as the "living Stone," Peter intends to accent once again the contrast between Christ and the "empty way of life that was your heritage" (1:18) as well as the "perishable things such as silver and gold" that belonged to that way of life. If there is a common denominator in Peter's three uses of the participle "living" (i.e., "living hope," "living God," "living Stone"), it is the implied contrast with the hopelessness and idolatry of contemporary paganism.

On the positive side, the designation of Christ as the "living Stone" reinforces the imagery of lift and growth introduced in the previous two verses. The notion of "coming to" the Stone presupposes that it is not only living but life-giving. Although Peter develops no midrash on Jesus as the "spiritual Rock" with the Israelites in the desert, comparable to 1 Cor 10:4 (Jeremias, *TDN*[T] 4:277–78), his close juxtaposition of the growth metaphor with that of building, and of drinking a mother's milk with that of coming to the living Stone allows the first set of images to illumine and enrich the second.

upo anqrwpwn men apodedokimasmenon para de qew eklekton entimon, "rejected by people generally but in God's sight choice and precious." This characterization of Christ as the Stone draws on the language of the first two of the three Scripture quotations that will follow in vv 6–8. The key terms apodedokimasmenon and eklekton entimon anticipate, respectively, Ps 117[118]:22 (v 7) and Isa 28:16 (v 6). Despite the reversal of order, the emphasis is on Isa 28:16, just as it is in the quotations themselves. The effect of the men … de construction (cf. 1:20, 3:18b, 4:6b) is to make the negative phrase, "rejected by people generally," preliminary to the positive conclusion, "in God's sight choice and precious." An interpretive framework is thus created for the quotations before they are explicitly introduced. This framework involves the identification of the "builders" who rejected Christ the Stone (v 7) not with the Jews or their religious leaders (as in Mark 12:10 // Matt 21:42 // Luke 20:17, and by Peter himself in Acts 4:11), but with "people generally" (upo anqrwpwn), that is, with the pagan enemies of Jew and Christian alike in Roman society. It involves also the characterization of the Stone as "choice and precious" (cf. v 6) specifically "in God's sight" (para de qew), in contrast to all human judgment (cf. kata anqrwpou" … kata qeon in 4:6). Perhaps surprisingly, it does not focus on the akrogwniaion of the first quotation (v 6) or the ei" kefalhn gwnia" of the second (v 7); the center of interest is Jesus Christ as the Stone but not (at this point at least) as either the cornerstone or the foundation of a building.

The words eklekton entimon, which in the quotation are metaphorical ("choice and precious" in the sense of well-hewn and valuable for building), take on a distinctly

theological cast because of the phrase para de qew: "chosen" or "elect" in God's purposes and uniquely favored by him. At the heart of Peter's interpretation of these Scripture quotations is the election of Jesus Christ as God's instrument of salvation (cf. 1:20), and through him the election of the believing community (cf. geno" eklekton in v 9).

5 kai autoi w" liqoi zwnte", "you yourselves, like living stones." The readers of the epistle are identified not as those built on the foundation of the "living Stone" but as "living stones" themselves. Christ's life is theirs as well (cf. vv 2–3), and like Christ they are elect and precious to God. The shift from the singular to the plural of this phrase comes as naturally to Peter as a shift from Christ the eklekto" to Christians the eklektoi (cf. 1:1). The basis for the shift is the statement of v 4 that they have "come to him," with the assumption that they have also "tasted" of his goodness (v 3). To believe in Jesus Christ and belong to him is in some sense to be like him. Peter, however, will not press the likeness too far. Only momentarily does he focus attention on Christian believers individually (i.e., as a plurality of "stones"), for his real interest is in their corporate identity. Whether viewed corporately or individually, the identity of the redeemed is never confused with that of the Redeemer.

iikodomeisqe oiko" pneumatiko" ei" ierateuma agion, "are being built into a spiritual house for holy priesthood." The corporate identity of the epistle's readers is summed up in the phrase, "a spiritual house" (oi ko" pneumatiko"), a term that cannot be viewed in isolation from the prepositional phrase defining the house's function, ei" ierateuma agion. The verb oikodomeisqe continues the imagery of "living stones" and must be understood as an indicative, not an imperative (cf. Hort, 109). Even within a metaphor, stones cannot be commanded to "be built up" (passive) or to "build themselves up" (middle), for that initiative rests with the builder. The metaphor makes sense only if Peter is affirming that in fact Christian believers are being built like stones so as to become a certain kind of edifice.

o iko" pneumatiko" might be classified as either a predicate nominative or an appositive (cf. Elliott, 164), but the former is preferable because it is only in "being built up" that the many "stones" are identifiable as one "spiritual house." The construction is virtually equivalent to ei" oikon pneumatikon (cf. the prepositional phrases with ei" in Eph 2:21–22; note also the interchangeability of the predicate nominative and ei" with the accusative in certain constructions with ginesqai and einai, BD[F] § 145.1). Peter's syntax, however, is complicated by the ei" ierateuma agion that immediately follows. What is the relation between "spiritual house" and "holy priesthood"? The use of ierateuma in v 9 as a distinct designation for the people of God argues for a close connection between oiko" pneumatiko" and ei" ierateuma agion. The first, being a cognate, is more directly linked to the verb (oikodomeisqe … oiko"), while the second introduces the new idea of priesthood. The "spiritual house" is more specifically defined as a priesthood, or as a place for priesthood. In itself oiko" (even with pneumatiko" attached) should probably be understood as "house" (or "household") rather than "temple." This is Elliott's conclusion (157–59), but it is less significant than he contends, for the "spiritual house" of which Peter speaks is immediately said to be "for holy priesthood," and it is difficult to imagine a house intended for priesthood as being anything other than a temple of some sort (cf. the discussion of "house of God" in 4:17).

pneumatiko", like logikon in v 2, characterizes the word it modifies as metaphorical, but in a distinctly Christian sense (Selwyn, 281: "almost a Christian coinage"). "Spiritual

house" is a metaphor for the community where the Spirit of God dwells, although Peter's intent is not to call attention to the Holy Spirit per se (as Elliott, 153–54, suggests) or to any particular manifestations of the Spirit in the life of the community. His intent is in a more general way to identify the "house" as a Christian "house," a community belonging uniquely to God and to Jesus Christ (cf. Selwyn, 281–85).

Despite his recognition that oiko" belongs with the phrase ei" ierateuma agion (164), Elliott finds the key to his interpretation of the phrase "spiritual house" in the basileion of v 9, read as a noun with the meaning, "a king's house" (149–53). He regards v 5 as a midrashic interpretation of v 9 in advance, in much the same way that v 4 interprets vv 6–8 in advance (e.g., Elliott, 148, 196). The relation between v 4 and vv 6–8, however, is not at all like that between v 5 and v 9. As Elliott admits (39), vv 9–10 are not a formal quotation but simply a set of titles for Israel (and thus for Christian believers collectively as the new Israel). Although these verses draw heavily on biblical language, they in no way constitute a "text" which Peter can be regarded as interpreting. ierateuma is in fact the only word that vv 5 and 9 have in common. If there is a relationship between the two occurrences of the word, it is probably the reverse of what Elliott maintains (cf. E. Best, *Nov*^{T} 11 [1969] 282: "its use at ii 9 has … probably been suggested by its prior use at ii 5"). Instead of v 5 interpreting v 9 in advance, it is more likely that v 9 interprets or clarifies v 5.

The phrase oiko" pneumatiko" is closely matched by the expression that shortly follows, pneumatika" qusia", a Christian equivalent to the Hellenistic logikh qusia (*Corp. Herm.* 1.31; 13.18, 21; see Comment on v 2). The verse is leading up to an emphasis on "spiritual sacrifices," but to offer such sacrifices (however understood), the readers of his epistle must be constituted a "spiritual house." A distinct corporate identity in Jesus Christ is essential to the offering of authentic Christian worship.

anenegkai pneumatika" qusia" euprosdektou" tw qew dia Ihsou Cristou, "to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." The work of a priesthood is to offer sacrifices. The phrase "spiritual sacrifices" draws to a focus the two preceding expressions, "spiritual house" and "holy priesthood." pneumatika" makes it clear that the priestly activities of the "house" are as metaphorical as the house itself. What is the reality behind the metaphor? If "spiritual sacrifices" are not actual ceremonial observances, what are they, and how are they "offered"?

The use of agion, "holy," with ierateuma in the preceding clause offers one possible clue. Although virtually redundant with ierateuma, agion recalls Peter's use of Lev 19:2 and related passages in 1:15–16, where holiness was to find its realization in daily "conduct," or anastrofh. In the epistle as a whole, however, the ethical obligations of Christian believers to their neighbors are only part of the picture.

Even in the O^{T} the metaphor of sacrifice was used (in contrast to literal sacrifice) for prayer, thanksgiving, or a repentant heart (e.g., Pss 50:13–14, 23; 51:17; 141:2), and in later Judaism the tendency to describe prayer and good works metaphorically as sacrifice became especially strong among groups that did not have access to the Jerusalem temple (the Qumran community, diaspora Judaism, and Judaism after the temple's destruction; cf. Goppelt, 146; J. Behm, *TDN*^{T} 3:186–87). The two most pertinent N^{T} parallels to the offering of "spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God" use similar language either in reference to an all-out personal commitment to do the will of God (Rom 12:1:) or in reference to the two-pronged testimony of praise to God and good deeds to those in need (Heb 13:15–16).

In 1 Peter, as in Hebrews, the "spiritual sacrifices" are first of all something offered up

to God as worship (anenegkai) and, second, a pattern of social conduct. The two aspects cannot be separated, and the priority is always the same. The pattern of social conduct implicit in the "spiritual sacrifices" dominates the central section of 1 Peter in its entirety, but the primary Godward reference of the phrase is reinforced at several crucial points as well: first in the phrase, "acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" in the immediate context, and the expression, "to sound the praises of him who called you," in v 9; then in such expressions as "glorify God" in 2:12 and 4:16, "revere Christ as Lord" in 3:15, "reverence toward God" in 2:17, "conscious commitment to God" in 2:19, "grace before God" in 2:20, and a spirit "precious in the sight of God" in 3:4.

euprosdektou" tw qew dia Ihsou Cristou. That the "spiritual sacrifices" are "acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" supports the view that they are above all acts of worship. Terminology similar to euprosdektou" tw qew is characteristic of several N^T passages that speak metaphorically of sacrifice (e.g. euareston tw qew in Rom 12:1 and Phil 4:18; qusian dekthn in Phil 4:18; euprosdekto" in Rom 15:16; euaresteitai o qeo" in Heb 13:16), so that Peter may simply be using fixed or stereotyped language made almost inevitable by his imagery of "spiritual sacrifices." Yet the whole phrase, "acceptable to God through Jesus Christ," has a natural and definite function in its own context that makes such a conclusion unlikely. euprosdektou" tw qew recalls the para de qew of v 4. As Christ the living Stone was choice and precious specifically "in God's sight," so in similar fashion are the "spiritual sacrifices" offered by his people "acceptable to God."

The concluding phrase, dia Ihsou Cristou, makes the parallelism explicit: such worship is "acceptable" because it is offered up to God "through Jesus Christ." Peter's word order links dia Ihsou Cristou closely to euprosdektou" (cf. Goppelt, 147), although the debate over whether the phrase depends on that adjective or on the verb anenegkai (Elliott, 161; cf. di autou … anaferwmen in Heb 13:15) is an artificial debate involving no real difference in meaning (contra Beare, 123).

dia Ihsou Cristou corresponds in its significance to the di autou of 1:21: even as they have believed in God through Jesus Christ, the readers of the epistle now offer to God acceptable worship through him (cf. the dia Ihsou Cristou of 4:11). This connection between their initial faith and their priestly offering of "spiritual sacrifices" is presupposed in Peter's use of Isa 28:16 and other texts in vv 6–10.

6 dioti periecei en grafh, "For it says in writing." For dioti, cf. 1:16, 24, where the causal force of the conjunction is weakened (as it is here) in introducing Scripture quotations (cf. BD^F § 456.1). The quotation does not give the reason why the Christian community is built into "a spiritual house for a holy priesthood" but merely adds its support to vv 4–5 by introducing the source of some—although not all—of Peter's language (particularly in v 4). The meaning of periecei en grafh is virtually the same as that of the gegraptai of 1:16. periecei is here used intransitively to mean "it is contained" or "it is written" (BD^F § 308; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 11.104).

en grafh without the definite article occurs nowhere else in the N^T (although cf. John 19:37; 2 Tim 3:16; 2 Pet 1:20). Selwyn's inference from this, however, that Peter is "quoting from a documentary source other than a text of Scripture itself" (163) is questionable. Although it is possible that Peter is quoting in vv 6–8 from some kind of testimony book or collection of messianic proof texts (see *Form/Structure/Setting*), it is doubtful that the absence of the article makes this theory more probable than it would otherwise be. Selwyn points out that en grafh in the LX^X means "in writing" rather than

"in Scripture" (ibid.), but even though this is true (in addition to the five references cited by Selwyn, cf. 1 Chron 28:19; Sir 45:11; Ezek 13:9; Dan 10:21 Theod.; 1 Macc 12:21), it does not follow that Peter is referring to something other than Scripture itself. More likely, he uses the generalized periecei en grafh here like the generalized gegraptai of 1:16 (on which Selwyn significantly makes no comment) to refer to what is written specifically in Scripture. Peter's vague and rather abrupt way of referring to biblical history can be seen even in passages where he is not quoting a text (e.g., 1:10–12; 3:5, 20; 4:6) and is all the more evident in his actual citations, most of which (e.g., 1:24–25; 2:3, 7–8; 3:10–12; 4:18; 5:5) have no introductory formula at all. The generalized gegraptai and periecei en grafh represent for Peter similarly lowkeyed and informal ways of introducing specific references to biblical texts.

idou tiqhmi en Siwn liqon akrogwniaion eklekton entimon kai o pisteuwn epi autw ou mh kataisxunqh, "Behold, I am laying a choice and precious stone, a cornerstone in Zion, and the person who believes in him will never be put to shame." Peter's citation of Isa 28:16 differs from the LX[X] at several points: the use of tiqhmi instead of egw embalw, and of en Siwn instead of ei" ta qemelia Siwn; and the omission of polutelh and the redundant ei" ta qemelia auth". The words with which he begins (idou tiqhmi en Siwn) are identical to the words with which Paul in Rom 9:33 begins his composite citation of Isa 8:14 and 28:16, and therefore probably based on textual traditions of the LX[X] derived from earlier Jewish or Jewish Christian adaptations of the Isaiah texts.

The difference between Paul's use of Isaiah and Peter's is that what is laid "in Zion" for Paul is a "stone of stumbling and a rock to trip over" (i.e., for the Jewish people), while for Peter it is a "choice and precious stone, a cornerstone" (i.e., for Christian believers, v 7a). Peter too will look at the negative side in due course (vv 7b–8), but for the moment his focus is on the promise the quotation holds for his readers. He has already shifted his attention from Christology (v 4) to ecclesiology (v 5), and ecclesiology continues as his main interest here. The thrust of the quotation of Isa 28:16 comes in the last clause, "the person who believes in him [i.e., in Christ the Stone] will never be put to shame"; it is only a slight exaggeration to suggest that Peter introduced the quotation solely for the sake of this last clause (which may have caught his attention because of the ou mh kataiscunqh of Ps 33[34]:6b [5b]; see above, p. 98).

The words liqon, eklekton, and entimon in the first part of the Isaiah quotation were anticipated already in v 4, but Peter retains the akrogwniaion from the Isaiah text as well because of its implication that the liqo" of the quotation is a stone on which other stones are built. The oikodomeisqe of v 5 virtually required that the "living Stone" to which the other stones are "coming" (v 4) be a cornerstone or foundation stone, even though only the quotations that immediately follow (cf. akrogwniaion, v 6; ei" kefalhn gwnia", v 7) make this explicit. The one other N[T] use of akrogwniaio" (Eph 2:20) serves to maintain the notion of Jesus Christ as the unique base on which the church is built (cf. 1 Cor 3:11), even when the apostles are brought into the picture as its foundation. The argument of J. Jeremias (e.g., *TDN*[T] 1:791–93) that akrogwniaion refers to a keystone or capstone crowning a completed structure rather than to a foundation stone (cf. *T. Sol.* 22.7; 2 Kgs 25:17 Symm) is weakened (a) by the fact that the whole building process described in vv 4–10 rests on a prior experience of faith in Jesus Christ (v 3), and (b) by the difficulty (which even Jeremias recognizes, *TDN*[T] 1:793) of interpreting the ei" kefalhn gwnia" of v 7 in the same way.

Peter does not rely on imagery alone to get from Christology to ecclesiology. More explicit than either the metaphor of building or of the cornerstone is Peter's straightforward use of o pisteuwn epÆ autw from the quotation to show the relationship between the "living Stone" and the "living stones." epÆ autw is here to be translated "in him" rather than "in it," for Peter is not speaking metaphorically of trusting in a sure foundation but literally of believing in Jesus Christ (cf. Rom 9:33; 10:11). So apt in fact is epÆ autw as a reference to Christ that some (e.g., Goppelt, 148) have regarded it as a Christian interpolation in the LX^X (it is lacking in the M^T and in LX^X $M^{S\ B)}$. This is possible, although Peter does not take it up explicitly in his application of the text in v 7, but contents himself with toi" pisteuousin. If epÆ autw is an interpolation in the LX^X (which is by no means certain), it is one that antedates both Paul and Peter, and probably belongs (along with the introductory idou tiqhmi en Siwn) to early Jewish or Jewish Christian collections of messianic testimonies (see Comment on v 4). Its presence in another closely related Isaiah text (8:14; cf. 8:17) may tend to bear this out (cf. K. R. Snodgrass, *NT*^{S} 24.1 [1977] 99).

ou mh kataiscunqh ("will never be put to shame") is a negative way of expressing vindication (cf. kataiscunqwsin in 3:16 and the mh aiscunesqw of 4:16). It is possible that Peter has in mind the last phrase not only of the quotation immediately at hand (Isa 28:16), but of Ps 33[34]:6b [5b] as well (cf. the echo of the first half of that verse in v 4, the allusion to Ps 33[34]:9 [8] in v 3, and the full quotation of Ps 33[34]:13–17a [12–16a] in 3:10–12).

7 umin oun h timh toi" pisteuousin, "This honor belongs to you who believe." Peter now makes the application to his readers explicit. There is a long tradition in English translation of taking h timh adjectivally (as if it were simply a repetition of entimon) and as a predicate (with Christ as the implied subject), so as to yield the meaning, "To you who believe, he [or the stone] is precious" (e.g., KJ^v/A^v, RS^v, NI^v, NA^b, J^b, GN^b; cf. Best, 106). But the stone mentioned in vv 4 and 6 is precious specifically "in God's sight" (para de qew, v 4). In the immediate context it is not so much a question of how Christian believers perceive Christ as of how God (in contrast to "people generally") perceives him, and of how God consequently vindicates both Christ and his followers.

The great majority of commentators have therefore (rightly) understood h timh as a noun ("the honor" or "the privilege") and as subject of the sentence (e.g., with some variations, Hort, 117–18; Bigg, 131; Selwyn, 164; Beare, 124; Kelly, 93). The "honor" or "privilege" to which Peter refers is final vindication before God, the equivalent of never being put to shame (cf. Goppelt, 149); it is the same vindication already described more fully as "praise, glory, and honor (ei" epainon kai doxan kai timhn) at the time when Jesus Christ is revealed" (1:7).

The application is linked to the quotation that precedes it by the particle oun and by the participle toi" pisteuousin, resuming the o pisteuwn of v 6b. The epÆ autw of v 6b is not resumed because Peter is making no particular effort to emphasize faith in Jesus Christ as distinguished from faith in God (for the Gentile Christians to whom he writes, the two amount to the same thing; cf. 1:21).

apistousin de liqo" on apedokimasan oi oikodomounte" outo" egenhqh ei" kefalhn gwnia", "but to unbelievers the stone which the builders rejected has become the foundation of the corner." Peter will elaborate in vv 9–10 on the "honor" reserved for those who believe, but before doing so he introduces two more quotations (Ps 117[118]:22 and Isa 8:14) contrasting Christian believers with "unbelievers" (apistousin), understood in

the broadest possible terms as "people generally" (upo anqrwpwn, v 4) who reject Christ, "the living Stone."

The first of these quotations (Ps 117[118]:22) occurs also in the Gospel tradition (Mark 12:10 // Matt 21:42 // Luke 20:17), and in each of its N^T occurrences follows the LX^X word for word. "The builders" in the psalm (oi oikodomounte"), identified in the Gospels as the religious leaders of the Jewish people (cf. Mark 12:12; Matt 21:45; Luke 20:19; also the paraphrase attributed to Peter in Acts 4:11), are here understood as citizens and magistrates in Rome and in the provinces (thus presumably Gentiles, 2:12; 4:3) who harass Christians in Peter's community and the communities to which he writes (cf., e.g., the accusers anti questioners of 2:12 and 3:15–16, the "foolish people" of 2:15, the cruel masters of 2:18, the unbelieving husbands of 3:1, and the revelers and blasphemers of 4:4).

Peter intends no speculation on what their "building" enterprise represents (e.g., building a perfect society without God). The metaphor intrinsic to the quotation comes from the Jewish Scriptures and from early Christian anti Jewish polemic that may originally have focused in part on Jerusalem and its temple (cf. the Synoptic context of the quotation in Jesus' temple ministry; also Mark 14:58). Peter's application instead focuses negatively on apedokimasan (cf. v 4) and positively on the building of the "spiritual house" (v 5) as a work of God himself.

Within the psalm quotation, the divine work comes to expression in the passive egenhqh (cf. BD^F § 131.1; Zerwick, 76; see above, p. 45) and the vindication of Christ in the whole phrase egenhqh ei" kefalhn gwnia". It is God (the subject of tiqhmi in the previous quotation) who has made Jesus Christ the "foundation of the corner," presumably (although Peter does not spell it out) by raising him from the dead (cf. 1:3, 21). The second quotation is linked to the first not only by the repetition of liqo" but by the similarity in thought between akrogwniaion and ei" kefalhn gwnia". It is perhaps this similarity that prompted Peter to insert the psalm quotation between two texts from Isaiah (28:16 and 8:14) thai were closely linked not only in Paul (i.e., Rom 9:33) but in the Book of Isaiah itself (cf. K. R. Snodgrass, *NTS* 24.1 [1977] 99). Peter saw in the LX^X of both Isa 28:16 and Ps 117[118]:22 the promise of vindication. In the first quotation, the vindication of Christ is presupposed by the description of the stone as eklekton akrogwniaion entimon (v 6; cf. v 4) and the vindication of Christians is affirmed by the concluding ou mh kataiscunqh. In the second, the vindication of Christ is affirmed in the words egenhqh ei" kefalhn gwnia", but in this case the affirmation is preliminary to another purpose (expressed by still another quotation): i.e., the implication of Christ's victory for "unbelievers."

The placement of apistousin just before the quotation of Ps 117[118]:22 has the effect of making this text (for all its theological importance to Peter) primarily a preface to Isa 8:14 (v 8). Although the psalm quotation serves to define unbelief as the rejection of the "choice and precious stone," in itself it makes no statement about the late of "unbelievers."

8 kai liqo" proskommato" kai petra skandalou, "and a stone for stumbling and a rock to trip over." Peter's third quotation (Isa 8:14), like the first but unlike the second, differs significantly from the LX^X (kai ouc w" liou proskommati sunanthsesqe autw oude w" petra" ptwmati). The LX^X context is one with which Peter shows familiarity (cf. his allusion to Isa 8:12–13 in 3:14–15). In each of his references to Isa 8:12–14, as well as his citation of Isa 28:16, Peter adapts his text with a certain freedom not exercised in connection with Ps 117[18]:22 (cf. Paul's freedom with respect to Isa 8:14 and 28:16 in Rom 9:33). Peter's adaptation here shows the possible influence of M^T (l/vkm rWxlW

1gn÷ >balW

), where “stone of stumbling” and “rock of offense” refer to what the “Lord of hosts” *will* become to sinful Israel rather than to what He *will not* become to those who put their trust in Him (as in the LX[X]). Even apart from any influence of the M[T], the contrast already in place in v 7 between poi" pisteuousin and apistousin virtually required such an adaptation.

Aside from syntactical changes, the principal difference between Peter’s text and the LX[X] is the substitution of skandalou for ptwmati. skandalon is a legitimate translation of the Hebrew l/vkm

(cf. Lev 19:14; 1 Kgs 25:31; Ps 118[119]:165 LX[X]) and is used in fact to translate it in Isa 8:14 by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. It is likely, therefore, that Peter is simply following different Greek text at this point. His choice of words is strangely coincidental in light of the wordplay in Matt 16:18 between petro" and petra and Jesus’ statement to Peter in Matt 16:23: “You are a skandalon to me.” The occurrence of petra skandalou in a letter attributed to “Peter, apostle of Jesus Christ” (1:1) is indeed striking, but Paul’s use of the same form of the text in Rom 9:33 undercuts any notion that Peter is making a direct wordplay on his own name. Even if he were it is difficult to imagine what his point might have been.

oi proskoptousin tw logw apeiqounte", “In disobeying the word they stumble.” Peter’s application of the two texts, Ps 117[118]:22 and Isa 8:14 (principally the latter), elaborates on the apistousin of v 7 Unbelievers are further characterized as those who stumble by disobeying the word. oi proskoptousin picks up the cognate proskommato" of the last quotation (cf. Rom 9:32) with the understanding that proskommato" and skandalou are part of a parallelism and therefore synonymous. The metaphor of stumbling is immediately explained by tw logw apeiqounte". It is possible grammatically to connect tw logw either with proskooptousin (i.e., “stumble at the word”) or with apeiqoute" (i.e., “disobeying the word”). Peter’s usage elsewhere favors the latter (3:1; 4:17b), but the word order suggests that he took advantage of both associations (cf. Hort, 122: “stumble at the word, being rebellious against it”).

The point of the statement that unbelievers “stumble by disobeying the word” is not that “stumbling” is synonymous with the rejection of the Christian message, but that it is a consequence of that rejection. In simplest terms, it is the opposite of divine vindication, the negative equivalent of the “honor” reserved for Christian believers of not being “put to shame” (vv 6b–7). Like that honor, and like the corresponding shame, it has its reality “in God’s sight” (para de qew, v 4). If there is a difference between “stumbling” and “shame,” it is that the latter is more future-oriented and final (cf. 3:16), while the former describes for Peter the present state of the disobedient (note the present verb proskoptousin). They have not yet fallen victim to divine punishment, but from God’s point of view (i.e., Peter’s) their power is broken and they stand condemned in principle.

The “word” (tw logw) to which the unbelievers are disobedient is “the word of the living God” of 1:23, further defined as “the Lord’s message” or the “message of the gospel” (1:25). Peter can speak interchangeably of disobedience to “the word” (cf. 3:1) or to “the gospel of God” (4:17b). The use of apeiqounte" here to resume the apistousin of v 7 suggests that he equates disobedience with unbelief in much the same way that he equates obedience (upakoh, 1:2, 14) with Christian faith (see Comment on 1:2, 14)

ei" o kai eteqhsan, “and to that they too were appointed.” The antecedent of ei" o is

the "stumbling" expressed in the verb proskoptousin. Peter has chosen eteqhsan to match the tiqhmi with which he began the first quotation in v 6, so forming an inclusion that makes vv 6–8 a unit. His use of with kai accents the repetition ("… and to that they too were appointed"). God is the subject of tiqhmi and (by virtue of the passive voice; see above, p. 45) the implied agent of eteqhsan as well (for tiqhmi as a sovereign act of God, see Gen 4:17 LX^{x} // Rom 4:17, Isa 49:6 LX^{x} // Acts 13:47; 1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11; Heb 1:2; cf. John 15:16). The matching verbs do not represent two distinct "appointings" but one with a twofold result (cf. Paul's use of eqeto in 1 Thess 5:9). In the single act of raising Jesus from the dead (1:3, 21), God has laid the "choice and precious Stone" that means honor and vindication for those who believe, but stumbling and shame for the disobedient (cf. Paul's argument with respect to Israel, Rom 9:21–23).

9 umei" de geno" eklekton basileion ierateuma eqno" agion lao" ei" peripoihsin, "You, however, are a chosen race, the King's priesthood, a holy nation, a people destined for vindication." The words umei" de, picking up the umin oun of v 7, introduce a series of honorific titles spelling out the timh of those who believe. If the "honor" of v 7 was eschatological because of its connection with the ou mh kataiscunqh of v 6b, its basis "in God's sight" (para de qew, v 4) implied a present dignity for Christian believers as well. Vv 9–10 unfold both the present and future aspects of this "honor."

All four of these titles of honor (or five, depending on how they are counted) appear to be adaptations of titles from either Exod 19:6 or Isa 43:20–21, and were therefore originally designations of Israel as the people of God (cf. the specific phrase, "people of God," in v 10). With the use of these titles, Peter makes explicit his basis for consistently addressing his Gentile Christian readers as if they were Jews (see Comment on 1:1). There is no trace of polemic in this practice, however, but only a curious appearance of naïvete. Nowhere in 1 Peter are the readers addressed as a *new* Israel or a *new* people of God, as if to displace the Jewish community. The titles of honor are used with no awareness or recognition of an "old" Israel, as if they were applicable to Christians alone and had never had any other reference. If there is "anti-Jewish polemic" here, it is a polemic that comes to expression simply by pretending that the "other" Israel does not exist.

geno" eklekton ("a chosen race"). The first and the last of the titles come from Isa 43:20–21, the second and third from Exod 19:6 (Elliott's suggestion, 142, that the introductory umei" de is also drawn from Exod 19:6 LX^{x} is doubtful). geno" eklekton echoes the LX^{x} of Isa 43:20, to geno" mou to eklekton. Within 1 Peter, the use of eklekton here for the Christian community as a whole is a corollary of its use for Christ the "living Stone" in vv 4 and 6, recalling as well the eklektoi" of Peter's initial address to his readers as individuals in 1:1.

Possibly (although by no means certainly) on the basis of either this passage or Isa 43:20 itself, geno" ("race" or "stock") became in the second century a collective designation for Christians throughout the world: e.g., *Mart. Pol.* 3.2: "the God-loving and God-fearing race of the Christians"; *Mart. Pol.* 14.1: "the whole race of the righteous" (cf. 17.1); *Diogn.* 1: "this new race" (kainon touto geno"); Tertullian, a^{d} *Nat* 1.8 and *The Preaching of Peter* in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6.5.41 ("the third race.," in distinction from Gentiles and Jews; cf. 1 Cor 10:32). Like *Mart. Pol.*, but unlike the others, 1 Peter has no particular interest in the Gentiles or Jews as "races" distinct from the community of Christians. His single focus at this point is the Christian community itself.

basileion ierateuma. This phrase follows exactly the LX[X] of Exod 19:6, which differs in meaning from the M[T], µymhK tklmm'

, "a kingdom of priests." If basileion is understood as an adjective (i.e., the neuter of basileio", BG[D], 136), then basileion ierateuma is a "royal priesthood" or "king's priesthood" (virtually reversing the relationship implied by the Hebrew, a "priests' kingdom" or "kingdom of priests").

Elliott suggests to the contrary (149–54) that basileion is intended as a noun, with the meaning of "king's house" or "royal palace" (cf. 2 Macc 2:17; Philo, *Sobr.* 66; *ABR* 56). On this interpretation, basileion and ierateuma are two distinct designations for the Christian community: a "king's house," and a "priesthood." The use of two such designations in alluding to Exod 19:6 is paralleled in the phrases, "a kingdom" and "priests to God" in Rev 1:6 (cf. 5:10). Elliott (149, 157–59) identifies the "spiritual house" of v 5 (understood not as a temple but as a household) with the basileion of v 9.

The difficulty with Elliott's interpretation is that each of the other honorific titles in v 9 consists of two parts: a noun and a modifier ("a chosen race … a holy nation … a people for vindication"). The rhetorical effect is best maintained if basileion ierateuma is understood in the same way (cf. L. Cerfaux, *RSP*[T] 28 [1939] 24; J. Blinzler, *Episcopus*, 62). Although it is true that in the other three phrases the noun comes first and the modifier second (Elliott, 151), it is also true that in each instance Peter preserves the word order of the LX[X] passage to which he is alluding, and the word order in Exod 19:6 LX[X] is basileion ierateuma. Elliott has to some degree exaggerated the significance of v 5 for the interpretation of v 9, particularly with ierateuma as one of the two words common to both. [V] 5 is largely focused on the single metaphor of "priesthood" or "spiritual sacrifices," while v 9 introduces a broader range of metaphors for the Christian community: a "race," a "nation," and a "people," as well as a "priesthood."

Elliott's basic contention (e.g., 219–26) that all these metaphors, including priesthood, are simply ways of accenting the election and holiness of the Christian community is not necessarily to be faulted. The purpose of the phrase, "the King's priesthood" is not so much to characterize the Christian community as specifically priestly in its calling or its duties as to complete its identification as "Israel" against the background of Exod 19:6. Yet Elliott's contention does not require the separation he proposes between basileion and ierateuma. If the two are kept together, basileion is best understood (along with the other two adjectives, eklekton and agion) as reinforcing at every opportunity the notion that the believing community of which (and to which) Peter writes belongs uniquely to God. Without mentioning God directly, he portrays a race chosen of God, a nation holy as God is holy (cf. 1:15–16), and a priesthood belonging to God the King.

eqno" agion follows basileion ierateuma, just as it does in Exod 19:6 LX[X] (the kai linking the two phrases in the LX[X] is omitted here because of their incorporation into a longer series). With agion as with eklekton (cf. 1:1), a term used earlier for Christian believers individually is now applied to them corporately as well. They are a "nation" set apart for God by the Spirit (cf. 1:2), to be like him in all their conduct (cf. 1:15).

eqno", like the other nouns in the series, is used with Israel in mind as the prototype. Although in Jewish literature and in the N[T] the plural ta eqnh means predominantly "Gentiles" (in 1 Peter, cf. 2:12, 4:3), the singular eqno" is normally to be translated "nation" and often refers to Israel (e.g., Luke 7:5; 23:2; John 11:48, 50–52; 18:35; Acts 10:22, 24:2, 10, 17; 26:4, 28:19; cf. "nation of Samaria" in Acts 8:9). The beginnings of the

transfer of the singular eqno" to the Gentile Christian movement can be glimpsed in Matt 21:43, in Paul's use of Deut 32:21 LX[X] in Rom 10:19, and in the present passage.

lao" ei" peripoihsin, "a people destined for vindication." This phrase, together with the whole clause that follows, recalls Isa 43:21 LX[X] (not, as in Titus 2:14, the lao" periousio" of Exod 19:5). Peter has changed Isaiah's laon mou on periepoihsamhn to the more future-oriented lao" ei" peripoihsin. In view of Peter's characteristic use of ei" in various eschatological expressions in 1:3–5, and especially the ei" swthrian of 1:5 and 2:2, peripoihsi" could be plausibly understood as a synonym for swthria (cf. BG[D], 650.1) in the sense of future or final salvation (cf. S. Halas, *Bib* 65.2 [1984] 254–58, who translates accordingly, "peuple destiné au salut" [258]).

This interpretation is supported by the fact that three of the other four N[T] occurrences of peripoihsi" use the word similarly as the object of ei" and with a future reference (cf. 1 Thess 5:9; 2 Thess 2:14; Heb 10:39; Eph 1:14 is slightly different). In each instance peripoihsi" in itself means simply "attainment" or "acquisition": to complete the thought of "salvation" an additional noun in the genitive is needed (i.e., swthria" in 1 Thess 5:9; doxh" in 2 Thess 2:14; yuch" in Heb 10:39). In the present passage, the absence of such a qualifying noun, as well as the choice of peripoihsin in place of swthrian, was probably dictated by Peter's desire to echo as much as possible the language of Isa 43:21 even while making his own independent statement (cf. the use of ei" peripoihsin by itself in Hag 2:9b and Mal 3:17 LX[X]). If not the precise equivalent of swthria, peripoihsi" is at least a closely parallel term for future divine vindication (like the timh of v 7).

Of the four titles comprising v 9a, lao" ei" peripoihsin is the only one pointed distinctly toward the future. Once this is recognized, such traditional renderings as "God's own people" (RS[V]) or "a people belonging to God" (NI[V]) are shown to be inadequate. To Peter, it is already the case that the Christian community belongs to God as a unique possession (cf. nun de lao" qeou, v 10); what still awaits is its final vindication against the unbelieving and disobedient.

opw" ta" areta" exaggeilhte, "to sound the praises," echoes to some degree the ta" areta" mou dihgeisqai of Isa 43:21b. Peter, in keeping with his rather free treatment of this LX[X] passage, has replaced dihgeisqai with opw" … exaggeilhte. Elliott argues that both terms involve preaching to the world in the sense of "proclaiming the mighty acts of God" (42), but D. L. Balch (*Domestic Code*, 133) replies that "in contexts where exaggellw refers to 'proclaiming' the praises, deeds, righteousness, or works of God, the proclaiming is always to God in worship" (cf. Pss 9:15[14]; 55:9[56:8]; 70[71]:15; 72[73]:28; 78[79]:13; 106[107]:22; 118[119]:13, 26; Sir 18:4; also Philo, *Plant.* 128).

Although Balch's conclusion that "there is no Septuagint text where this verb is used to refer to mission preaching" (ibid.) is correct, the line of distinction in Jewish worship between praise and testimony is often difficult to draw. There is little difference between saying to God, "How great thou art," and saying to the congregation, "Great is the Lord"; most of the LX[X] uses of exaggellein appear broad enough in their application to allow for either. Whether directed to God or to the worshipping community, the "proclamation" involved in the verb exaggellein belongs in the category of worship, not missionary activity. In changing the dihgisqai of Isa 43:21 LX[X] (i.e., "recount" or "explain," translating the piel of rps

) to opw" … exaggeilhte (for the construction, &cf. Ps 9:15 [14] LX[X]), Peter has chosen an equivalent term, but one more specifically focused on worship

Ironically, Elliott's own suggestion (148) of a parallel between v 5b ("to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God") and v 9b ("to sound the praises of him who called you") supports this interpretation. If the former implied first of all something presented to God as an act of worship (see Comment on v 5), the latter does as well. Without going as far as Elliott in drawing parallels between vv 5 and 9 (e.g., 149–59), it is possible to recognize in both verses a metaphorical depiction of the church (in v 5 as a priesthood; in v 9 with four different religious and political metaphors). Each description ends with a summary of what the church does (vv 5b and 9b), and it is natural to use the two summaries (as Elliott does) to shed light on each other. The first ("to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God") is metaphorical in a way that the second ("to sound the praises of him who called you") is not. The second is appropriately regarded as a dissolving of the metaphor and therefore as an interpretation of the first (not the other way around, as Elliott maintains; see Comment on v 5). Whatever else they may imply, the "spiritual sacrifices" are first of all the praise of God by his people.

ta" areta" (cf. Isa 43:21 LX[X], for the Hebrew hLhT[

, "praise" or "glory") does not refer to God's "virtues" or ethical qualities in an abstract sense but to his praiseworthy deeds (i.e., "praises," BG[D], 106.2; cf. ta" … doxa" in 1:11, the "glorious things" planned and accomplished for Jesus Christ after his sufferings). What Peter speaks of elsewhere as "glorifying God" (2:12; 4:11, 14b, 16) is here described as "sounding his praises" for what he has done (cf. Isa 42:12 LX[X], where ta" areta" autou … anaggelousin parallels dwsousin tw qew doxan). What God has done is immediately defined (in the participial phrase that follows) by who he is.

tou ek skotou" uma" kalesanto" ei" to qaumaston autou fw", "of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." For the designation of God by means of a participle with the definite article (with or without qeo"), cf. 1:3, 17, 21; 2:23; 4:5; 5:10. Peter mentions the divine "calling," a corollary of divine election (cf. vv 6, 9), with the use of either the aorist participle of kalein, as here (cf. 1:15, 5:10) or the indicative aorist passive (2:21; 3:9). The call of God can be a call to final salvation (i.e., "to his eternal glory in Christ," 5:10) or to a certain pattern of behavior (2:21; 3:9; cf. 1:15).

In this passage God's call is "out of darkness into his marvelous light." The "darkness" of which Peter speaks is the same as the "ignorance" (1:14) that belonged to his readers' Gentile past (cf. "the empty way of life that was your heritage," 1:18). It was the darkness of not being a people and of not knowing the mercy of God (v 10). What is the "marvelous light"? The word qaumaston, possibly suggested to Peter's mind by the qaumasth of Ps 117[118]:23 in the immediate context of one of his preceding quotations (cf. Matt 21:42 // Mark 12:11), serves to heighten the contrast between light and darkness, but what is the nature of the contrast itself? Is it a contrast of "then" and "now" (cf. pote … nun, v 10) or between "then" and the final day of salvation (cf. the ei" peripoihsin of the previous clause and the ei" swthrian of v 2)? Is the Christian community living in the "marvelous light" of God, or waiting for it to dawn?

Conversion from paganism to Christianity was commonly viewed by the early Christians as a passage from darkness to light (cf., e.g., Acts 26:18; 2 Cor 4:6; Col 1:12–13; *1 Cle*[m] 36.2, 59.2; *Barn.* 14.5–7), so that believers in Christ viewed themselves in some instances as "light" (Eph 5:8–14) or at least as already living in the light (1 Thess 5:4–5; 1 John 1:5–7; 2:9–11). In 1 Peter, however, the phrase, "into his marvelous light," more likely belongs to the exalted language by which the author characteristically heralds the last

day (cf. "an indestructible, incorruptible, and unfading inheritance," 1:4; "rejoice with inexpressible and glorious delight," 1:8; "so that when his glory is revealed you may rejoice all the more," 4:13; "and when the one great Shepherd appears you will receive the unfading crown of glory," 5:4).

The closest parallel to this phrase in early Christian literature outside of 1 Peter is probably *1 Cle*[m] 36.2: "through him our foolish and darkened understanding blossoms toward the light" (anaqallei ei" to fw", conformed still more closely to 1 Peter by the addition of qaumaston [Codex H] or qaumaston autou [Codex A] before fw"). Here again the "light" is eschatological and future, like the "day" that is drawing near according to Paul in Rom 13:12.

The closest parallel to this passage in 1 Peter itself is 5:10, where God is identified as the One who "called you to his eternal glory in Christ" (o kalesa" uma" e" thn aiwnion antou doxan en Cristw). The divine call is not to something present but to something future. The fact that the concluding phrase ei" thn aiwnion autou doxan corresponds almost perfectly to ei" to daumaston autou fw" suggests that the latter has a future reference as well. The "marvelous light" to which the Christian community is called is nothing other than the "glory" soon to be revealed in the coming of Jesus Christ (cf. 1:7–8: 4:13; 5:1). The elect community lives between the darkness of its pagan past and the light of its eschatological future. Alienated from the one and not yet at home in the other, it is a community of "strangers and foreigners" in the Roman Empire (2:11; cf. 1:1), whether in the West or the East.

10 oi pote ou lao" nun de lao" qeou, "Once you were no people, now you are God's people." The plural article oi picks up the plural "you" of the preceding verse, while pote, used elsewhere in 1 Peter in connection with well-known events from Israel's past (cf. 3:5, 20), refers here to the past life of the epistle's readers in idolatry and paganism (cf. the proteron of 1:14). The paired adverbs, pote … nun, are used not to underscore a parallel between biblical times and present experience (like the pote … nun of 3:20–21) but to underscore a contrast between the past and present status of Gentile Christians before God (like the pote … nuni de of Eph 2:11–13 (cf. Eph 2:2,3).

The phrase ou lao" echoes the LX[X] (ou lao" mon) of Hos 1:9; 2:1 [1:10] (cf. 2:25 [23]). The mou of the LX[X] is dropped because God is not represented as the speaker (cf. the geo" eklekton of v 9, in relation to Isa 43:20 LX[X],) and the effect of the omission is to generalize what Peter is saying. Not only were his readers not the people of God, they were not a "people" (in the sense of a corporate community) at all. For the positive side of the contrast, Peter bypasses the highly appropriate phrase from the LX[X] of Hos 2:1 [1:10], "sons of the living God" (uioi qeou zwnto"; cf. Rom 9:26) in favor of the simpler lao" qeou (cf. the positive lao" mou of Hos 2:25 [23]). With this he echoes the lao" ei" peripoihsin of v 9 and provides a kind of postscript and summary to the four titles of honor listed in v 9a.

oi ouk hlehmenoi unn de elehqente", "once. destitute of mercy, you have now received mercy." The language of "mercy" (cf. 1:3) also comes from Hosea (i.e., ouk<hlehmenh, 1:6, 8 LX[X,] elehsdw thn ouk<hlehmehn, 2:25 [23]), but the structure of the clause, like that of the previous one, is Peter's own, built around the implied contrast of pote and nun. The repetition of oi requires a masculine plural participle in place of the feminine singular of the LX[X] (which reflected simply the particulars of the Hosea story). This first participle is perfect passive, as in the LX[X,] but to express the positive side of the contrast Peter shifts to

the aorist, in keeping with his fondness for aorist passives (whether participles or indicatives) with arti (1:6) or nun (1:12; 2:25) to refer to present Christian experience (cf. also 1:20; 2:21a, 24b; 3:6, 9).

There is irony in the allusion to the names of Hosea's son ("Not my people") and daughter ("Not pitied") in Hos 1–2. Peter uses the terminology to remind his Gentile readers that they are Gentiles. They were not always the people of God but have become so by God's mercy now revealed in Jesus Christ (cf. 1:3; Eph 2:4). Yet the texts in Hos 1–2, like the texts alluded to in v 9 (Exod 19:6; Isa 43:20–21), described Israel's experience, not that of the Gentiles. In their transformation from ou lao", to lao" qeou these gentile Christians of Asia Minor are reenacting a chapter of Israel's own history. The very language that identifies them as Gentiles at the same time confirms their identity (established by the metaphors of v 9) as "Israel." The experience of being "no people" or "destitute of mercy" was Israel's experience by virtue of her disobedience long before it was the experience of these Gentiles. In their past alienation no less than in their present acceptance before God, the Jews are the prototypes for the Christians to whom Peter writes.

Explanation

Peter concludes the first major section of his epistle (1:3–2:10) by drawing the lines for a confrontation. Two groups are differentiated—"unbelievers" and "you who believe"—on the basis of their contrasting responses to Jesus Christ, the "choice and precious Stone" (v 6). The former are on their way to "stumbling" and shame, the latter to "honor" and vindication. The theological contrast between these two groups, with its consequent social tensions, will absorb Peter's interest through the remainder of his epistle.

Of the two groups, believers are the more clearly defined. To Peter they are simply "Israel" as God intended her from the time of the Exodus, a holy people called to worship and praise God in the world. In this sense they are a priesthood; their priestly activity is directed, by definition, toward God. Nothing is said of their responsibility or their social stance toward the other group. For the time being, Peter's focus is on who they are before God, not on how they must behave in Roman society. Yet it can be assumed that he has not forgotten his earlier command to "be holy in all your conduct" (1:15). The specific social obligations of those who believe toward their fellow citizens who do not will be the topic of his next major section (2:11–4:11). Peter will shortly make it clear that Christian conduct not only presupposes enemies but is largely defined in relation to those enemies.

Good Conduct among the Gentiles (2:11–12)

Bibliography

Adinolfi, M. "Stato civile dei cristiani 'forestieri e pellegrini' (1 Pt 2, 11)." *Anton* 42 (1967) 420–34. **Balch, D. L.** "Early Christian Criticism of Patriarchal Authority: I Peter 2:11–3:12." *USQ*[R]

39 (1984) 161–73. **Fink, P. R.** “The Use and Significance of en hōt in 1 Peter.” *Grace Journal* 8 (1967) 33–39. **Jonge, M. de.** “Vreemdelingen en bijwoners, Enige opmerkingen naar aanleding van 1 Pe 2, 11 en verwante teksten.” *NedTT*[s] 11 (1956/57) 18–36. **Meecham, H. G.** “A Note on 1 Peter ii. 12.” *ExpTi*[m] 65 (1953) 93. ———. “The Use of the Participle the the Imperative in the N[T.”] *ExpTi*[m] 58 (1947) 207–8. **Senior, D.** “The Conduct of Christians in the World (2:11–3:12).” *RevEx*[p] 79.3 (1982) 427–38. **Unnik, W. C. van.** “Die Rücksicht auf die Reaktion der Nicht-Christen als Motiv in der altchristlichen Paränese.” In *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche:* F[S] *J. Jeremias*, ed. W. Eltester. BZN[W] 26 (1964) 221–34. ———. “The Teaching of Good Works in 1 Peter.” *NT*[S] 1 (1954/55) 92–110.

Translation

[11]*Dear friends, I appeal*[a] *[to you] as aliens and strangers: renounce your natural impulses, for they are at war with the soul.* [12]*And make sure your conduct among the Gentiles is good, so that in a case where they accuse*[b] *you of doing wrong they may, from observing*[c] *your*[c] *good works, glorify God on the day of visitation.*

Notes

a. A number of important ancient MS[s] ([P72 A C L P] and others) read the imperative apecesqe, while the majority of MS[s] have the infinitive apecesqai, dependent on parakalw. There is no significant difference in meaning. Both infinitive and imperative occur with “appeal” (parakalw) formulas in Paul’s epistles, although the former predominates. In 1 Peter the only other such formula (5:1) is followed by the imperative, as is the only example in Hebrews (13:33).

As to the verb itself, the infinitive apecesqai is used in two memorable N[T] passages having to do with ethics (Acts 15:20, 29; 1 Thess 4:3; cf. 1 Tim 4:3), and scribes are perhaps more likely to have changed an original apecesqe (cf. 1 Thess 5:22) to apecesqai than the other way around. Although Peter usually prefers the aorist imperative to the present, there are exceptions (e.g., 2:17), and in the case of this particular verb, the aorist imperative is so rare as to be hardly an option. apecesqe is probably the correct reading.

b. A few MS[s] ([L P] and others) read the subjunctive katalalwsin in place of the indicative katalalousin for “accuse.” The effect of such a reading is to make the accusative more hypothetical: “in case they should accuse you.” The indicative, however, is clearly to be preferred.

c. The majority of MS[s] (including [A P] and Y) have the aorist participle epopteusante" (“having observed”) in place of the present epopteuonte" (“observing”). The latter is the reading of the earliest and best MS[s], however (e.g., [P72 a B C),] and is to be accepted as original. Possibly the aorist participle was introduced because it seemed obvious to scribes that the “observing” of the good works of Christians by the Gentiles in Asia must precede, both logically and temporally, their “glorifying” of God on the final day of judgment. The participle is instrumental, explaining the ek of the preceding phrase: “from your good works” (i.e., by observing them; see Comment on 3:2).

d. “Your” is unexpressed in Greek but clearly implied. A very few MS[s] make the umwn

explicit, however, while $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ inserts umwn before ton qeon(i.e., "glorify your God…") in the verse's final clause. These editorial alterations are probably traceable to the influence of Matt 5:16.

Form/Structure/Setting

The conjunction of parakalw or parakaloumen with adelfoi is a common stylistic device in N^T epistles marking a division in thought or a fresh start in the argument (e.g., Rom 12:1; 15:30; 16:17; 1 Cor 1:10; 1 Thess 4:1, 10b; 5:14; cf. Heb 13:22). The same function can be assigned here to agaphtoi, parakalw (see 4:12 and 5:1; cf. also the rhetorical uses of agaphtoi in Heb 6:9; 2 Pet 3:1, 8, 14, 17; Jude 3, 17, 20; 1 John 2:7, 3:2, 21; 4:1, 7, 11).

The brief appeal thus introduced is best understood as a heading to 2:11–4:11 in its entirety. The command to "renounce your natural impulses" (v 11) is strictly preliminary to the emphasis on Christian "conduct among the Gentiles" (v 12), and it is the latter emphasis that is made more specific in the major section to follow. In itself the participle econte" ("having" or "maintaining") is grammatically weak, and subordinate to the imperative apecesqe, yet with it Peter introduces both the central thrust of his command and (in the ina-clause of v 12b) the ever-present promise of vindication. The structure of v 12, and several of its key expressions, are important enough to Peter that he will echo them a chapter later (3:16) in a more specific setting of confrontation with the Gentiles. The parallels can be shown as follows (with solid underlinings for exact agreements and broken underlinings for approximate agreements):

2:12

3:16
thn anastrofhn econte"
paired with
suneidhsin econte"
kalhn

agaqin
ina en w

ina en w
katalalawsin

katalalaeisqe

thn agaqhn … anastrofh

Comment

11 Agaphtoi, parakalw w" paroikou" kai parepidhmou", "Dear friends, I appeal [to you] as aliens and strangers." The address agaphtoi (cf. 4:12), Peter's equivalent of the Pauline adelfoi (cf. thn adelfothta agapate, 2:17), is combined with adelfoi in

several N^T passages (e.g., 1 Cor 15:58; Phil 4:1; James 1:16, 19; 2:5). Its point is not only that Peter loves those to whom he writes but that God has loved them and made them his people (cf. 2 Thess 2:13). In this sense agapgtoi has much the same meaning as the ekletoi" of 1:1. In its own context it both reinforces the titles of honor given to the readers of the epistle in 2:9–10 and lays a basis for characterizing them as "aliens and strangers" (w" paroikou" kai parepidhmou" a phrase that takes up explicitly the parepidhmoi" of 1:1).

At the end of his epistle, Peter will characterize all he has written as an "appeal" (parakalwn, 5:12), and in the present passage he uses the first person singular parakalw to bring himself personally and directly into the discourse, presumably as "Peter, apostle of Jesus Christ" (cf. 1:1). The basis of his appeal, however, is not his own identity or status (as in 5:1), but that of his readers. Their identity as "aliens and strangers" in Roman society is what necessitates the moral demands that will follow.

w" paroikou" kai parepidhmou". The object "you" is not expressed; instead Peter characterizes his readers metaphorically as "aliens and strangers" (cf. his use of w" to introduce such characterizations in 1:14; 2:2, 16; 3:7). It is unlikely that Peter is making any sharp distinction between paroikoi and parepidhmoi, still less that a word play is intended (as J. H. Elliott suggests in *A Homer or the Homeless*) on Peter's "house" vocabulary (i.e., oiko", 2:5; 4:17; oikodomeisqe, 2:5; oiketai, 2:18; cf. Paul's wordplay in Eph 2:19). The association of paroikou" and parepidhmou" was for Peter a natural one based on the LX^X (Ps 38[39]:12), and one congenial to his own style (cf. his association of words roughly similar in sound and meaning in 1:4, 10, 19 and 2:4). Yet paroikou", recalling the paroikia of 1:17, does qualify parepidhmou" by adding to the simple notion of geographical displacement that of the lack of citizenship or legal rights (cf. $BG^{D,}$ 629). Peter's purpose is not to define his readers' actual legal or social status in the Roman Empire (Elliott) but simply to further his standing analogy between them and the Jewish people (cf. Heb 11:13; Paul reverses the terminology in Eph 2:12, 19 by applying it to those "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel").

apecesqe twn sarkikwn epiqumiwn, "renounce your natural impulses." The phrase apecesqe eiqumiwn was long familiar in Greek ethical instruction (e.g., Plato, *Phaedo* 82C, 83B; *Laws* 8.835E). On the imperative, see *Note* a* Because they are "aliens and strangers" in Roman society by virtue of their election, Peter urges on his readers a clean moral break with the "natural impulses" of their past (cf. epiqunia in 1:14; 4:2), impulses belonging to the "darkness" out of which they have been called (cf. 2:9). With the adjective sarkikoi Peter characterizes these impulses as merely physical in motivation and intent, centered on self-preservation and material well-being (cf. sarki or en sarki with reference to the realm of physical life in 3:18; 4:1, 2, 6). Such "natural impulses," although not intrinsically evil for Peter, must yield to other, more vital considerations, centered on what he calls "the soul."

aitine" strateuontai kata th" yuch", "for they are at war with the soul." The imagery of one's natural impulses "waging war" against one's ultimate best interests is paralleled in Rom 7:23 and James 4:1, while Paul describes in 2 Cor 10:3–6 the counter-warfare necessary against such inward rebellion. The closest parallel is the apparent combined allusion to this verse and to Gal 5:17 in Pol. *Phil.* 5:3: oti pasa epiqumia kata tou pneumato" st rateuetai ("for every impulse is at war with the Spirit"; note Polycarp's immediately preceding context, "it is good to be cut off from the

impulses of the world”).

kata th" yuch". “Soul” is plural elsewhere in 1 Peter (e.g., 1:9, 22; 2:25; 3:20; 4:19), but singular here, probably in contrast to the plural epiqumiwn (i.e., many impulses besieging each individual soul). Having omitted uma" after parakalw in the preceding clause, Peter omits umwn here as well, resulting in a general principle (like Gal 5:17 and Pol. *Phil.* 5.3) rather than simply a warning to his readers.

Although E. Schweizer calls this “the most strongly Hellenized yuch passage in the N^T,” and “the only N^T passage where yuch plainly stands in opposition to sapx” (*TDN*^T 9:653), “soul” is best understood even here not as the immaterial part of a human being in distinction from “body” or “flesh,” but as a person’s “life” in the sense indicated by Mark 8:35–37 (cf. *TDN*^T 9:644–45). More than mere physical existence, it is the ultimate personal good of peace and security before God. Although no less physical than the life that perishes (cf. 1:24), this life is viewed in 1 Peter in a totally different way, as purified by the acceptance of God’s word (1:22; cf. 3:20–21), placed under God’s protecting care (2:25, 4:19), and destined for eternal salvation (1:9). In light of the emphasis on suffering in the remainder of his epistle, it appears that the principal factors that Peter sees undermining a person’s “life” are the “natural impulses” toward comfort, self-protection, and self-gratification.

12 thn anastrofhn umwn en toi" eqnesin econte" kalhn, “And make sure your conduct among the Gentiles is good.” The possessive umwn, which might have been expected in the preceding clause, brings Peter’s appeal specifically to bear on the social situation of his readers. He had mentioned day-by-day “conduct,” or anastrofh, in 1:15, 17 as the sphere in which to practice holiness and reverence toward God, but the emphasis here is on conduct that can be seen and appreciated as “good” (kalh) even by fellow citizens who are not believers in Christ.

Peter’s consistent way of referring to his Gentile Christian readers as though they were Jews is reinforced on the negative side by designating those *outside* their fellowship as “the Gentiles” (ta eqnh; cf. 4:3). The term traditionally applied by Jews and Christians alike to non-Jews is transferred to non-Christians, so as to become the equivalent of such English words as “heathen” or “pagan” (cf. oi eqnikoi in Matt 5:47; 6:7). The group so designated is a very broad one for Peter, as broad as “people generally” (upo anqrwpwn) in 2:4.

econte", because of its grammatical link to the imperative apecesqe, cannot be considered a true example of a participle used as an imperative (cf. Selwyn, 141; and D. Daube in Selwyn, 487), yet by virtue of that same link it not only functions imperatively but carries the main thrust of Peter’s command. It is, after all, not so much the suppression of natural impulses as the maintenance of good conduct among the Gentiles that will be spelled out more concretely in 2:13–4:6.

ina en w katalalousin umwn w" kakopoiwn, “so that in a case where they accuse you of doing wrong.” Although en w is used (both here and in 3:16) somewhat like a temporal conjunction similar in meaning to “when” or “whenever” (cf. Fink, 34), it has a oncreteness that ote or otan lacks. In effect a demonstrative pronoun is concealed within the relative: “in that in which” (BG^D, 583; BD^F § 294.4). The closest English equivalent is “in case” or “in a case [or situation] where” (cf. Kelly, 105: “in cases where”). Peter uses en to introduce a “case,” or hypothetical situation (the same case here as in 3:16), in which Christians are accused by their fellow citizens of wrongdoing.

The subject of katalalousin is not indefinite or impersonal. The accusers are the

"Gentiles" of the preceding clause, and their accusations are not formal legal indictments but simply "malicious gossip and slander" (Selwyn, 170; cf. apoqemenoi … pasa" katalalia", 2:1), labeling the Christians as "wrongdoers" (w kakopoiwn). Peter does not define the charges more precisely, although he may have them still in mind in 4:15 with the terms "murderer," "thief," and especially "busybody." He takes every opportunity to dissociate "wrongdoing" (kakopoiein, 3:17; cf. 3:12), "wrongdoers" (kakopoio", 2:14; 4:15), and "malice" (kakia, 2:1, 16) from the Christian community, so as to emphasize repeatedly that such accusations are not and cannot be true.

ek twn kalwn ergwn epopteuonte" doxaswsin ton qeon en hmera episkoph", "they may, from observing your good works, glorify God on the day of visitation." The reference to "good works and to "glorifying God" recalls the saying of Jesus found in Matt 5:16: "Let your light so shine before people generally (emprosqen twn anqrwpwn) that they may see your good works (ta kala erga) and glorify (doxaswsin) your Father who is in heaven" (cf. Gundry, *NT*^{S} 13 [1967] 340; Best, *NT*^{S} 16 [1970] 9–10).

ek twn kalwn ergwn. The "good works" correspond to the "good conduct" of v 12a; Peter is apparently drawing on the Jesus tradition to define for his readers the purpose of the conduct he requires. The word order, together with the similarity of the genitive plural (<wn) endings, accentuates the contrast between ek twn kalwn ergwn and the preceding phrase, w" kakopoiwn. The only way to refute accusations of wrongdoing is to "do good." a notion characteristically expressed in 1 Peter by agqopoiein (2:15, 20; 3:6, 17; cf. 3:11, 13), agaqopoio" (2:14), and agaqopoiia (4:19). Goppelt's observation that Peter almost immediately replaces the term "good works" (derived from the Jesus tradition) with the agaqopoiein of 2:15 because the latter corresponded more closely to the ethical vocabulary of Hellenism (162) may well be correct, yet it should not be overlooked that agaqopoiein too is firmly rooted in sayings attributed to Jesus (i.e., Luke 6:27, 33, 35; cf. Gundry, *NT*^{S} 13 [1967], 341).

epopteuonte", a verb used in the N^{T} only here and in a similar context in 3:2 (cf. epoptai, 2 Peter 1:16). In itself, epopteuein means simply to notice or observe (BG^{D,} 305) with no particular connotation of religious conversion. Yet the context, both here and in 3:2, suggests an act of observing that leads to a change of mind or outlook, like having one's eyes opened to something not seen before. In the train of thought of the present verse, epopteuonte" is all that comes between katalalousin and doxaswsin ton qeon. Peter's interest is not in the act or moment of conversion itself (as with kerdhqhsontai in 3:2) but in conversion's *cause* ("from observing your good works") and final *result* (to "glorify God on the day of visitation").

doxaswsin ton qeon en hmera episkoph". Elsewhere in 1 Peter, "glorifying God" is an act of worship performed specifically by Christian believers (cf. 4:14b, 16), and the use of the term here evidently signals repentance or religious conversion at or before the last day (cf. Rev 11:13; 14:7; 16:9). Peter's hope for those who now despised and slandered the Christian community was that they would change their minds and join the chorus of praise to God that distinguished Christians (and Jews?—Peter does not say) from the rest of the world. The scenario was not that Christians would proclaim to them the gospel of Christ. like those who first brought the Christian message to the provinces of Asia (cf. 1:12, 25), but that simply by observing the "good conduct" or "good works" of those who believed in Christ, the accusers would see that their charges were false. Acknowledging the faith of the Christians as true and the God of the Christians as worthy of their worship, they would

"glorify God on the day of visitation" (cf. the scenario played out between a believing wife and an unbelieving husband according to 3:1–2).

Were such lofty hopes reasonable or realistic? What makes them so is that they do not represent for Peter the only possible scenario. In another context he entertains the possibility of a quite different outcome (cf. 3:16). He begins, however, with the more positive vision because he has made Matt 5:16 his starting point. Five features of his interpretation of that saying are significant for understanding his argument. (1) He dissolves the metaphor, "Let your light so shine" (Matt 5:16a; cf. vv 14–15) into a straightforward reference to "good conduct"—this despite his own phrase, "marvelous light," in 2:9. (2) In place of emprosqen twn aqrwpwn, "before people," he has a slightly more specific phrase, rn toi" eqnesin, "among the Gentiles"—this despite his own use of upo anqrwpwn in 2:4. (3) He substitutes his own epopteuonte" (cf. 3:2) for the [idwsin of the Jesus saying. (4) He refers to glorifying "God" rather than "your Father who is in heaven." (5) Instead of leaving indefinite the time of this glorification, he makes it distinctly eschatological by assigning it to the "day of visitation" (en hmera episkoph").

Because the saying of Jesus is known only in its Matthean form, it is impossible to be sure which of these features are Peter's alterations and which are Matthew's. In connection with (2), (4), and (5) especially, Peter's form of the pronouncement could be more primitive. "People generally" (oi anqrwpoi) is a favorite expression in Matthew (cf. Matt 5:13; 6:1,2,5, 14–15, 16, 18; 7:12; 9:8), while the notion of being a "light to the Gentiles" is a familiar one from the Jewish scriptures (cf. Isa 42:6; 49:6) that Jesus himself could have known and used. Similarly, the phrase "your Father" or "your Father in heaven" is so woven into the fabric of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (i.e., Matt 5:45, 48; 6:1, 4, 6, 8, 14–15, 18, 26–32; 7:11; cf. 6:9) that its use in 5:16 may represent Matthew's adaptation of a simple reference to God (cf. *T. Naph.* 8.4: "If you work that which is good, my children … God shall be glorified among the Gentiles through you, and the devil shall flee from you"). Peter's reference to a specific future time (the "day of visitation") at which Gentiles (some at least) will "glorify God" is consistent with the eschatology of Jesus (cf. Matt 8:11 // Luke 13:28–29; Matt 24:14; 25:31–46), but whether such a reference was originally part of the saying recorded in Matt 5:16 is hard to say.

Whatever the exact form of the saying as Peter knew it, his own concern is to adapt it to the social situation of his readers living among the "Gentiles," where the distinction between believer and unbeliever is clearcut, and where the persecutions predicted in the Sermon on the Mount are beginning to take place. Although it is doubtful that Peter knew Matthew's gospel in anything like its present form, he was unquestionably familiar with parts of the Sermon as now preserved in Matthew and other parts as found in Luke. ^{V} 12 could plausibly be regarded as an interpretation of Matt 5:16 in terms of Matt 5:11 (cf. Peter's apparent awareness of Matt 5:10 in 3:14, and of Matt 5:11–12 in 4:13–14).

en hmera episkoph". Peter is not citing a specific text, for phrases similar to this are common in the biblical tradition. The "day or 'time' or 'hour' of visitation" (hDqp[

) is a decisive intervention of God in human affairs, whether for judgment (Isa 10:3; Jer 6:15, 8:12, 10:15; Sir 18:20 [despite its mention of forgiveness]), or for blessing (Wisd Sol 3:7; cf. 3:13; Luke 19:44). At Qumran, the "visitation" (e.g., 1Q^{S} 4.6–8, 11–13) or "time of visitation" (e.g., 1Q^{S} 3.18; 4.18–19, 26; C^{D} [M$^{S\ B]}$ 1.9–11) brings to an end the present age of two contrary spirits in humanity and initiates a new age of eternal blessing for the righteous and eternal destruction for the wicked. Its equivalent in 1 Peter is the joyful "last day" (1:5)

when salvation is revealed, “the end of all things” (4:7; cf. v 17b) when “the living and the dead” are “judged” (4:5), the revelation of Jesus Christ in his glory (1:7, 13; cf. 4:13; 5:1) when “the great Shepherd appears,” and those who have served him faithfully receive glory as their “unfading crown” (5:4). Both judgment and blessing are implied, but Peter’s emphasis falls decisively on the latter (note the absence of the phrase in 3:16, where the accent is on judgment).

It is, in any event, unsatisfactory to interpret hmera episkoph" as simply an indefinite time at which the accusers of Christians see the error of their ways and repent. The motivation for the “good conduct” or “good works” that Peter urges on his readers is distinctly eschatological—salvation for the heathen and glory to God at the last day (cf. Beare, 138; Brox, 115). Peter’s version of the Jesus saying goes beyond that of Matthew by heightening (or perhaps by just preserving) the eschatological perspective of Jesus of Nazareth.

Explanation

This brief section sketches Peter’s “battle plan” for the inevitable confrontation between Christians and Roman society. As battle plans go, it is a gentle one indeed, in the tradition of Paul’s advice to the Romans not to “be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good” (Rom 12:21). Peter starts with the assumption that the first and most immediate conflict is within the Christian believer. That is, between the “natural impulses” toward survival and acceptance in Roman society, and the “soul” or new life focused on God and the approaching “day of visitation.” The resolution of this individual conflict is the key to the resolution of the social conflict between Christians and their detractors.

The conflict in society is won not by aggressive behavior but by “good conduct” or “good works” yet to be defined. Peter’s vision is that the exemplary behavior of Christians will change the minds of their accusers and in effect “overcome evil with good,” but how or under what circumstances this will come about he does not venture to predict. He knows that human life is short and carries with it no guarantees of prosperity or even safety. Although he holds before his readers a vision of their enemies’ repentance and salvation, his more basic conviction is that whether in this way or some other, their cause—and their God—will be vindicated The “day of visitation,” seen here as a time of redemption and rejoicing, can be viewed in other circumstances as an occasion of judgment and shame. Without repeating the actual phrase, Peter will in subsequent contexts expose the darker side of his eschatological vision (cf. 3:16–17; 4:5, 17–18).

The Civil Obligation (2:13–17)

Bibliography

Bammel, E. “The Commands in I Pet. ii.17.” *NT*[S] 11 (1964/65) 279–81. **Balch, D.** *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981. **Goldstein, H.** “Die politische Paränesen in 1 Petr 2 und Röm 13.” *BibLe*[b] 14 (1973) 88–104. **Kamlah, E.**

"UPOTASSESQAI in den neutestamentliche 'Haustafeln.'" In *Verborum Veritas:* F[S] *G. Staehlin*, ed. O. Boecher and K. Haacker Wuppertal, 1970. 237–43. **Schwank, B.** "Wie Freie—aber als Sklaven Gottes (1 Peter 2,16). Das Verhaeltnis des Christen zur Staatsmacht nach dem Ersten Petrusbrief." *Erbe und Auftrag* 36 (1960) 5–12. **Sleeper, C. F.** "Political Responsibility According to 1 Peter." *Nov*[T] 10 (1968) 270–86. **Teichert, H.** "1. Petr. 2,13—eine crux interpretum?" *ThL*[Z] 7a4 (1949) 303–4. **Unnik, W. C. van.** "A Classical Parallel to 1 Peter ii.14 and 20." *NT*[S] 2 (1955/56) 198–202. **Wilson, J. P.** "In the Text of 1 Peter ii. 17 Is panta" timhsate a Primitive Error for panta poihsate?" *ExpTi*[m] 54 (1942/43) 193–94.

Translation

[13]*Defer*[a] *to every human creature for the sake of the Lord, whether to the emperor as sovereign* [14]*or to magistrates as those sent by him to punish wrongdoers and commend those who do good deeds.* [15]*(For God's will is accomplished by doing good* [b]*so as to put to silence*[c] *the ignorance of the foolish).* [16]*As those who are free, without making that freedom an excuse to cause trouble, yet as God's slaves,* [17]*show respect for everyone and love*[d] *for the brotherhood, reverence toward God and respect for the emperor.*

Notes

a. The majority of later MS[s] insert oun, "then" or "therefore," making the transition to the "household codes" of 2:13–3:9 less abrupt, and explicitly making the latter a series of concrete examples of the good conduct required in v 12. That there is an implicit connection is true in any case, but as it stands the transition *is* abrupt, oun does not belong in the text. On the translation "defer," see *Comment*.

b. "You" is understood as the subject, not expressed, ahhough a few MS[s] ([C,] a number of minuscules, and some of the Coptic versions) have inserted uma" into the text after agaqopoiounta".

c. The spelling fimoun is well attested, and clearly to be preferred, although [a]

[*] has the alternate orthography fimoin, adopted by W-H (cf. BD[F,] § 91).

d. In the best ancient MS[s], the first of the commands in this verse is expressed by an aorist imperative (timhsate), while the last three are present imperatives (agapate … fobeisqe … timate). In the majority of later MS[s], however, including [K] and [L,] the second command is also aorist (agaphsate). The later scribes were probably influenced by the preceding timhsate and perhaps by the allhlou" agaphsate of 1:22.

Form/Structure/Setting

The whole section from 2:13 to 3:7 has been widely identified as a *Haustafel* (e.g., A. Seeberg and K. Weidinger) or "household duty code" (see Balch, 1–20) listing the obligations of various members of the household toward one another. The clearest N[T] examples of this instructional form as reconstructed by modern scholars are Col 3:18–4:1 and Eph 5:21–6:9. Three relationships are set forth in these passages: wives and husbands, children and parents, and slaves and masters. The household duty code consists of the mutual obligations of the two parties in each relationship (cf. Balch, 1):

wives, be subject to husbands/husbands, love your wives
children, obey parents/parents, do not anger your children
slaves, obey masters/masters, treat your slaves justly

Because of the close literary relationship between Colossians and Ephesians, it is unlikely that these two examples of the code are independent of each other. The code is simpler in Colossians and there is reason to believe that Ephesians may represent an elaboration of it, but this is not the same as characterizing the code in Colossians as in any way "pure" or "original" or "standard." Many parallels have been cited in Greek and Latin literature, but the most convincing ones are those from the Hellenistic Judaism of the N^T period (e.g., Philo, *Decal.* 165–67; *Hyp* 7.14; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 2.226–27; Josephus, *C. Apion* 190–219; Pseudo-Phocylides, *Maxims* 175–227). Neither these Hellenistic Jewish sources nor Colossians, however, furnish proof of any single standardized household duty code on which Peter—or anyone else—can be assumed to have drawn. At most they exhibit a general similarity of theme and a concern for maintaining proper order in the household, and therefore in a given subculture or in society at large (cf. Balch, 21–80).

What is distinctive about the duty code in 1 Peter? First, the symmetry or mutuality so conspicuous in Colossians and Ephesians is lacking. Only one of the pairs (wives and husbands) is intact, and even here the advice to husbands is limited to one verse (3:7); slaves are addressed, but not masters (2:18–25), and the relationship between children and parents is omitted entirely. Second, an element not usually considered part of the household duty code is introduced. Instead of a heading emphasizing mutuality in Christ (cf. Eph 5:21), Peter's heading (vv 13–17) focuses on the duties of Christians to those *outside* their religious community, particularly to the emperor and those in authority. This is a subject also addressed by Paul (Rom 13:1–7), but not in connection with household duty codes. 1 Peter alone makes his readers' civil obligations the framework in which to present their more specific duties within the household (although partial links can be traced in 1 Tim 2:1–7, 8–15; Titus 2:4–5, 9–10; 3:1–2; see Selwyn, 423).

These two distinctive features are not unrelated. The reason servants are addressed but not masters is that Peter envisions a social situation in which some of his readers are household servants but few—if any—are masters. Wives are addressed at length but husbands only briefly because Peter's concern is for Christian wives married to pagan husbands. The reverse is not a problem. Although he addresses husbands for the sake of completeness, Peter assumes that pagan women married to Christians would ordinarily adopt their husbands' religion and become "co-heirs of the grace of life" (3:7). His emphasis throughout is on those points at which the Christian community faces outward to confront Roman society. Probably for this reason he omits children and parents altogether; the parent-child relationship (at least with regard to younger children) is not normally one in which belief and unbelief confront each other (cf. Kamlah, 238).

The function of vv 13–17 is to give to the household duty code that follows in 2:18–3:7 its distinctively "outward-directed" orientation. The aorist imperative upotaghte in v 13 finds its continuation in the present participles upotassomenoi (2:18) and upotassomenai (3:1, 5). The scope of the command (in contrast to that of upotaghte in 5:5) is universal. The virtue of deference "to every human creature" and "respect for everyone" (vv 13, 17) frames the whole section. Peter sees the Roman citizenry as a whole embodied or personified in the emperor and the provincial governors (v 14). That the "case study" of 2:12 is still in view can be seen in the kakopoiwn of v 14 and the phrase, "to put

to silence the ignorance of the foolish," in v 15 (recalling the katalalousin umwn w" kakopoiwn of 2:12). Peter's confidence is that accusations directed against Christian believers will come to nothing as long as believers "do good," and as long as civil magistrates do what they were appointed to do—"punish wrongdoers and commend those who perform good deeds" (v 14).

Vv 13–17 thus form a transition from the "case study" of 2:12 to the household duty codes. The basic question Peter faces is the same as in 2:12; i.e., how should Christians respond to their enemies or false accusers? He supplies the answer—with submission or deference (however defined) and the doing of good. The former is introduced in vv 13–14, while the latter is made explicit by the parenthetical explanation in v 15. The necessary stance of the Christian community is further described in vv 16–17 with two corollary questions in mind: (1) What have the universal obligations of Christians to their fellow citizens to do with their particular obligations to one another? (2) What do their obligations to the emperor and civil magistrates have to do with their obligations to God? The answer follows in a terse four-part maxim in v 17. The first two and the last two form pairs: respect is for everyone but love is for fellow believers—God deserves reverent fear while the emperor deserves respect.

The two pairs reflect on two sayings of Jesus—the first pair on the command to love enemies (Matt 5:44; Luke 6:27, 35) and the second on the principle that one should "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's" (Mark 12:17//Matt 22:21//Luke 20:25). Peter affirms the spirit of the command to love enemies but qualifies it by carefully distinguishing "love" from "respect." At the same time he makes the saying about God and Caesar more specific by defining in a word his readers' obligation to each. The double use of "respect" at the beginning and end of the sequence, and the placement of the "brotherhood" and "God" side by side in the center (cf. John 13:34; I John 4:20–21) give to the whole maxim a chiastic (*a-b-b-a*) quality, with the obligations of Christian believers to God and each other framed by their secondary obligations to fellow citizens (including enemies), and to civil rulers. It is the secondary obligations that Peter emphasizes by this arrangement, but precisely with the reminder that they *are* secondary.

Comment

13 upotaghte pash anqrwpinh ktisei dia ton kurion, "Defer to every human creature for the sake of the Lord." The imperative upotaghte implies that Peter regards the subjection of which he speaks as a matter of choice, not of nature or necessity. His readers are "free" (w" eleuqeroi, v 16) to cooperate or not cooperate with their fellow citizens and rulers, free to resist or comply with the demands of the civil authority. Peter requires cooperation and compliance not because the state requires it, but "for the sake of the Lord" (dia ton kurion).

Where the household duty codes in Colossians and Ephesians used upotassein for mutual submission (Eph 5:21) and the submission of wives to husbands (Col 3:18; Eph 5:22, 24) and upakouein for the obedience of children and servants (Col 3:20, 22; Eph 6:1, 5), 1 Peter stays with upotassein consistently (2:18; 3:1, 5; cf. 5:5), except for one passing reference to Sarah within a biblical illustration (3:6). Otherwise "obedience" (upakoh) is reserved for a person's relationship to Christ by virtue of accepting the Christian message (1:2, 14, 22). Because "obedience" (upakoh) is a primary and radical commitment while upotassein represents a secondary and more limited one, "respect" or "defer to" is a more

appropriate translation for the latter than "submit to" or "be subject."

pash anqrwpinh ktisei. Although every other N^T use of ktisi" (including pasa ktisi" in Col 1:15, 23; cf. Mark 16:15) refers to a creature or creation of God, Peter's phrase here is often understood (because of anqrwpinh) as a reference to human institutions or authorities (BG^D 456.2; cf. Selwyn, 172). It is easier for some to imagine Peter counseling submission to institutions than to individuals, especially when the adjective "all" or "every" is attached. Yet the examples immediately introduced—the emperor and the local magistrates—are persons, not power structures. Moreover, the conclusion that upotaghte refers to deference or respect rather than total submission makes it appropriate to define its object as "every human creature" (i.e., every person). "Defer to every human creature" simply anticipates the command with which v 17 begins: "show respect for everyone."

The purpose of anqrwpinh is not to define a human creation or institution in contrast to God's creation (BG^D, 68.3; Beare, 141) but to focus on humanity (in distinction from the natural order) as God's creation (cf. Hort, 139). Peter's assumption is that all people, even those who accuse and slander the Christians, are creatures of God (cf. 4:19), deserving of respect and consideration on that ground alone (cf. Kelly, 108–9: "the principle of the redeemed Christian life must not be self-assertion or mutual exploitation, but the voluntary subordination of oneself to others").

dia ton kurion. With this phrase the author is not so much making God the creator explicit (e.g., Kelly, 109) as introducing Christ, the real basis of his appeal (in the N^T household duty codes; cf. en kuriw in Col 3:18, 20 and Eph 6:1; w" tw kuriw in Col 3:23; Eph 5:22). o kurio" refers to Jesus quite consistently in I Peter (cf. 1:25; 2:3; and esp. 3:15; 3:12 is a possible exception). The phrase dia ton kurion is therefore by no means perfunctory or conventional. Peter is already anticipating 2:21–23 and the example set by Jesus' behavior toward his detractors and toward Jewish and Roman authorities at the time of his arrest and trial. Yet no particular distinction is intended between the earthly and the risen Jesus, as if Peter has in mind one and not the other.

eite basilri w" upereconti, "whether to the emperor as sovereign." The transition from "every human creature" to the Roman emperor in particular seems abrupt. The emperor was obviously not typical of the general populace with whom readers of the epistle would come in contact. The same transition occurs in 1 Tim 2:1–2, where it is a matter of intercessory prayer:

> I urge (parkaw) first of all, therefore, that petitions, prayers, entreaties, and thanks be made for all people (uper pantwn anqrwpwn)—for kings and all who are in authority.…

and—in reverse order—in Titus 3:1–2

> Remind them to deter to rulers and authorities and to comply with them, to be ready for every good work, to slander no one, to be peaceable and cooperative, demonstrating humility toward all people (pro" panta" anqrwpou")

Paul makes a similar transition in Romans 12–13 where the command to defer to ruling authorities (13:1–6) is framed by the more general social obligations, whether to fellow citizens (pante" anqrwpoi, 12:16–17) or fellow believers (allhlou", 12:10, 16, 13:8).

The earliest examples of Christian moral instruction, when they looked beyond the Christian community itself, seem to have viewed the state and the general population in

much the same way, urging gentleness and respect toward rulers, fellow citizens, and enemies without much distinction. To Peter the reason is simple: they are creatures of God. Where Peter's terminology differs from Paul's is in focusing specifically on the emperor. Paul—with the emperor in mind—writes abstractly of "sovereign authorities," "the rulers," or simply "the authority." When Peter explicitly mentions "the emperor as sovereign" there is no doubt who he means. If one were sure Peter knew Romans, the phrase basilei w" upereconti could easily be regarded (cf. Hort, 141) as an effort to concretize and clarify the exousiai" uperecousai" of Rom 13:1 (cf. en uperoch in 1 Tim 2:2).

Basileu" was a title applied both to world monarchs (like Alexander the Great or the Roman emperors) and to kings and princes of more limited domain (like Alexander's successors or the Herods). No one other than the emperor would be basieu" both to Peter in Rome (cf. 5:13) and his readers scattered in the five Asian provinces of the empire (1:1; for basileu" as the emperor or Caesar, see John 19:15; Acts 17:7; Rev 17:9; Josephus, *J.W.* 5.563).

14eite hgemosin w" di autou pempomenoi", "or to magistrates as those sent by him." Peter continues to be specific as he brings his appeal closer to where his readers actually live. It is often easier to honor the emperor from a distance than to respect the authority of his local representatives. The term hgemwn was applied to governors or provincial magistrates in the empire, variously called legates, procurators, or proconsuls (e.g., Pliny, the governor of Bithynia, who sought counsel from the emperor Trajan on the question of how he should deal with Christians accused of subversion; *Epist.* 10.96).

It is doubtful that di autou pemomenoi" implies a distinction (cf. Hort, 141) between the emperor as the proximate or mediate source of the authority of the provincial governors and God as the ultimate source (BG^{D}, 180.3.2b). Peter intends simply to derive the governors' authority from—and thus equate it with—the authority of the emperor, not to place both in the framework of some divine chain of command (cf. Beare, 142; Goppelt, 185). Although Peter may have agreed with Paul that "there is no authority except God, and the existing authorities are ordained by God" (Rom 13:1), he never says so explicitly and Paul's teaching should not be read into his argument.

The function of w", both in connection with the emperor and the provincial magistrates, is causal (cf. BG^{D}, 898.3.1b; Goppelt, 187): Christians should defer to the emperor *because* he is sovereign and to the magistrates *because* they are his commissioned representatives.

ei" ekdikhsin kakopoiwn epainon de agaqopiwn, "to punish wrongdoers and commend those who do good deeds." For the responsibility of civil government to "punish" offenders, cf. Paul's phrase ekdiko" ei" erghn (Rom 13:4). The difference is that for Paul civil authority is a "servant of God" (qeou gar diakono" estin) and the punishment it exacts is divine punishment (cf. 12:19). For Peter, punishment by the state is only that and no more. His use of kakopoiwn recalls 2:12 and the hypothetical case presented there. The charge of "doing wrong" is a serious charge because civil government exists for the express purpose of punishing wrongdoers. The use of kakopoiwn provides the opportunity to introduce its opposite, agaqopoiwn, and set up a contrast that will play a significant role in the epistle's argument (i.e., in the quotation of Psalm 34 in 3:10–12 and its exposition in 3:13–17; cf. 3 John 11).

epainon de agaqopoiwn. In agreement with Paul (to agaqon poiei kai ecei" epainon ex auth", Rom 13:3), Peter mentions praise as well as punishment. The use of epaino" suggests that both in Romans and 1 Peter, "doing good" means more than simply obeying

the laws of the state or doing one's duty (cf. van Unnik, *NT*[S] 1 [1954/55], 99: "… people obeying the law are not distinguished in a particular way, their conformity being taken for granted"). Peter introduces the terminology as if he had in mind works of civic virtue or public benefaction, but his immediate context suggests that the real basis of his language is theological, with roots in the LX[X] (cf. Ps 33[34]:15–17, cited in 3:11–13) and the Jesus tradition (cf. Luke 6:35). The agaqopoioi are those who do "the will of God" (v 15) by displaying the "good works" (2:12) that will bring the Gentiles to him (cf. van Unnik, *NT*[S] 2 [1955/56], 199). Peter's assumption is "that the human authorities are supposed to recognize what is 'well-doing'" (van Unnik, *NT*[S] 1 [1954/55], 99). He is counting on Roman justice to resolve any problems raised by reckless charges leveled against the Christian community. Short of "the day of visitation," Christians can take heart in the knowledge that what is "good conduct" in God's sight is also beneficial to society and—even more to the point—recognized as such by the emperor and his appointed magistrates.

Two factors must be taken into account before this view is dismissed as naively optimistic. First, Peter is aware (even from a very limited acquaintance with their situation) that his readers' difficulties are with unruly elements in the general population, not with the governing authorities. These authorities are his readers' first recourse, and Peter's strategy is to view them in a positive light. Second, he wants to foster in his readers a pattern of behavior that gives the lie to all possible charges of subversion or wrongdoing. In attempting to serve God, they must be careful not to offend needlessly the civil authority. To start with the presumption that their responsibilities to God and to the empire must inevitably come into conflict is the surest guarantee that this will be the case. Should it happen that these obligations conflict, the last recourse is the day of visitation (2:12), and Peter has made clear from the outset his firm hope of joy and victory on that day (cf. 1:5–9).

15oti outw" estin to qelhma tou qeou agaqopoiountasfimoun thn twn afronwn anqrwpwn, "(For God's will is accomplished by doing good so as to put to silence the ignorance of the foolish)." The entire verse is parenthetical and explanatory, oti introduces a further brief comment on what has just been said, like the oti of 3:9, 18 or 4:17, or like the gar of 2:19, 21, 25; 3:5, 17; and 4:6. The outw" clause is not retrospective, however (as, e.g., in 3:5; cf. Hort, 143; Selwyn, 173; Beare, 143), but prospective. The explanation is carried by the participle agaqopoiounta", picking up the agaqopoiwn with which the preceding verse ends. The use of the adverb outw"—where the pronoun touto might have been expected (cf. John 6:39, 40; 1 Thess 4:3, 5:18)—focuses attention on *how* the will of God is accomplished rather than on *what* is accomplished. The accent is therefore on agaqopoiounta" more than fimoun; the point is not so much that "the ignorance of the foolish" will be silenced as that it will be silenced *by the doing of good*.

The "will of God" is a characteristic expression in 1 Peter either for circumstances that lie in store for God's people (particularly suffering; cf. 3:17; 4:19) or—as here—for the standard of conduct he requires of them in response (cf. 4:2). There is a certain anonymity associated with the expression wherever it occurs in the epistle. Peter never speaks in so many words of the will of God for "you" (i.e., his readers) although this is always what he means. The momentary anonymity of those being addressed generalizes his pronouncements into universal-sounding principles. In the present instance, Peter has

omitted the subject of the infinitive (presumably uma"; see *Note* b*) in order to concentrate on its participial modifier, agaqopoiounta".

Despite his generalized language, Peter still has the accusations of 2:12 in view. What must be "silenced" (fimoun) is the loose talk implied by the katalalousin of that verse. Peter's confidence is that the good works of Christian believers will transform such slander into glorification and the praise of God on the day of visitation, but his best hope short of that is to shut the mouths of those who make trouble for the Christians (cf. Jesus "putting to silence" the Sadducees in Matt 22:34). The means are the same: agaqopoiounta" here corresponds to ek twn kawn ergwn in 2:12. Peter knows, however, that even with logic on his side, it is only possible to "silence the ignorance of the foolish" with the help of the emperor or his appointed representatives (vv 13–14).

The agnwisia of the accusers is "a lack of religious experience" (BG[D,] 12; cf. 1 Cor 15:34; Wisd Sol 13:1; 1 *Clem* 59.2). More specifically in this context, it is a lack of *Christian* religious experience, an inability to understand the beliefs and practices of one religious community. Agnwwsia here corresponds to the agnoia of the Christians themselves before their conversion (1:14). In itself, the term is descriptive, not derogatory. It becomes derogatory only in association with fimoun. There is nothing wrong with ignorance of a particular religious tradition, but on subjects of which one is ignorant one ought not to speak, and fimoun makes it unmistakably clear that this was an ignorance by no means slow to speak. Careless speech was what made it for Peter "the ignorance of the foolish."

Although agnwsia is not derogatory, afrwbn (common in the LX[X)] is (cf. G. Bertram, *TDN*[T] 9:225, 230–32). This is about as close as Peter comes to trading insults with his readers' enemies (something he expressly forbids in 3:9). The expression "the foolish" (twn afronwn anqrwpwn, with the article) implies an imagined group or class of detractors (cf. oi ephreazonte" in 3:16) defined not by any precise information Peter had about his readers but simply by the case proposed in 2:12. anqrwpwn, left unexpressed in the translation, could have been left out of the text as well, but cf. Peter's use of anqrwpoi elsewhere to refer generally to those who rejected Christ (2:4), or to human nature as the source of impulses or standards in opposition to God or the will of God (4:2, 6).

16w" eleuqeroi, kai mh w" epikalumma ecomte" th" kakia" thn eleuqrian allA w" qeou douloi, "As those who are free. without making that freedom an excuse to cause trouble, yet as God's slaves." The use of the nominative instead of the accusative (which would have agreed with the preceding agaqopoiounta" and the implied uma") links this verse with the imperatives that dominate vv 13–17—either the upotaghte of v 13 or the series of four imperatives in v 17—and thus tends to confirm the parenthetical character of v 15. The tendency of most commentators is to link the sentence with upotaghte (e.g., Hort, 145; Selwyn, 173; Kelly, 111; Goppelt, 187; Brox, 122). Such a link is difficult to express in translation: Kelly's "Live as free men" (107) virtually makes a new beginning, while Goppelt's "(Tut dies) als die Freien" (180) links the sentence more to v 15 than v 13. Once it is recognized that the four imperatives of v 17 resume and expand on the single imperative of v 13, a better alternative presents itself The connection of v 16 with the upotaghte of v 13 is most easily maintained not by suppressing its connection with v 17 but precisely by emphasizing it: "As those who are free … yet as God's slaves, show respect for everyone.…"

w" eleuqeroi … allA w" qeou douloi. Peter has in mind not political or social

freedom (which for household servants [2:18–25] and wives [3:1–6] was limited at best), but freedom in Christ from the "ignorance" (1:14) or "darkness" (2:9) of paganism. The freedom of the epistle's readers was the result of being "redeemed" (elutrwqhte, 1:18) with the blood of Christ. For Peter, as for Paul, this freedom is part of a paradox. Christians are free from all that bound them in the past, but at the same time they are slaves of God committed to full and unqualified obedience (cf. Rom 6:18, 22). The contrasting phrases with w" are more than similes, more even than metaphors; they express for Peter an "actual quality" (BG[D], 898.2. la) of those redeemed in Christ—a spiritual and psychological state of freedom from the old "natural impulses" (cf. 2:11), and a firm commitment of mind and heart to God. The placement of qeou douloi last, to complete the contrast, accomplishes three things. First, it draws to that phrase the main emphasis, decisively qualifying eleuqeroi. Second, it sets the stage for v 17 and establishes priorities among the four imperatives comprising that verse. Third, it anticipates 2:18–25, where the experience of "household servants" (oiketai, a synonym of doloi) becomes a prototype for the experience of Christians generally.

kai mh w" epikalumma econte" th" kakia" thn eleuqerian. These words, sandwiched between "free" and "slaves of God," state for Peter the practical implications of the paradox. In effect they interpret qeou douoi in advance: precisely because Christians are "slaves of God" and have a responsibility to him, they must not use their freedom in Christ as an excuse to despise their detractors or retaliate with harsh words when they are slandered (cf. 3:9). No matter what the provocation, they must not lose respect for their fellow citizens or forget the common humanity they all share (cf. v 13). The kind of freedom the Christians possessed (i.e., spiritual freedom, new life in Christ) was obviously not something that could be used in Roman society at large as "an excuse to cause trouble" or as a justification for antisocial behavior, but it could be so used *among Christians themselves*. Peter's urgent plea is that his readers never exploit their newly won freedom in this way, deceiving themselves and each other.

kai introduces a contrast (anticipating the allA of the next phrase) and is thus equivalent to "and yet." w" is not to be taken with epikalumma alone, but with econte" and the whole accompanying participial phrase. Unlike the two uses of w" with participles in v 14, w" is not causal here (as Goppelt, 187, claims; cf. BG[D], 898.3.1b); it is not even necessary to the sense of the sentence, and appears to have been included only to match the preceding w" eleuqeroi and the concluding w" qeou douloi. The three successive w" phrases represent freedom, qualified or responsible freedom, and slavery to God, respectively.

epikalumma, lit., "covering," is used here metaphorically in relation to evil or misconduct (kakia; cf. Menander, *Fragments* 84 [90], ed. A. Koerte [Leipzig, 1953], 2:41: epikalummA esti kakwn). The expression could refer either to something before the fact (i.e., an excuse or pretext for evil) or after the fact (i.e., a cover-up). The context supports the former; Peter's assumption is that his readers have put aside the kakia of their past life (cf. 2:1), and his concern is that they not take it up again. On kakia, see above, p. 85.

With the imagined situation of 2:12 still in mind, Peter wants his readers to make absolutely certain that no charges of misconduct leveled against them are ever actually true. When freedom becomes the believer's watchword there is as much danger of antinomianism in relation to the laws of the state or the customs of Roman society as there is in relation to the laws of God. Paul, who gained and defended the freedom of Gentile Christians from the burden of the Jewish law, warned his readers against the latter danger

(Gal 5:13; Rom 6:15–22). Peter fears rather the possible assumption by some of his readers that because they are free from the ignorance and darkness of their pagan past, they are free also of their legitimate obligations to the pagan empire and household. Such an attitude would be disastrous because it would bring needless suffering on the Christian community, and yet ironically it would be suffering richly deserved (cf. 2:20; 4:15).

17 panta" timhsate, thn adelfothta agapate, ton qeon fobeisqe, ton basilea timate, "Show respect for everyone and love for the brotherhood, reverence toward God, and respect for the emperor." The four imperatives follow closely on the preceding. It is as "slaves of God" (qeou douloi) that the readers are to "show respect for everyone and love for the brotherhood, reverence toward God and respect for the emperor." That the shift from the upotaghte of v 13 to timhsate … timate carries little or no change in meaning is shown by the fact that the latter, like the former, is directed first toward everyone (cf. "every human creature," v 13) and then specifically to the emperor. The responsibility to everyone receives a certain emphasis from the aorist imperative timhsate (agreeing with upotaghte) in contrast to the three present imperatives that follow. In itself, the aorist imperative needs no particular explanation; it is Peter's customary usage (cf. 1:13, 15, 17, 22; 2:2; 4:1, 7; 5:2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12; the only exceptions are 2:11—if apecesqe is the correct reading—4:12, 13, and the third person imperatives in 4:15, 16, 19). The question is rather why the last three imperatives are in the present tense.

The purpose is not to subordinate the last three to the first, as if "everyone" were then defined as the brotherhood, God, and the emperor (cf. NE[b]). First, the placing of God within a more inclusive category is awkward. Second, no room is left for the very group with which Peter is most concerned—the enemies or accusers of the Christian community. How are they to be treated? A contrast with the brotherhood (signaled by a change in the verb) suggests that they are included (even emphasized) within panta": "respect everyone"—including your fellow Christians, fellow citizens, and even your enemies—but in the case of your fellow Christians, you have a further obligation, "love the brotherhood."

The single aorist imperative at the beginning of the series gives the entire series an unambiguous imperatival quality (by themselves the present imperatives could be read as indicatives; cf. agalliasqe in 1:6, 8 and oikodomeisqe in 2:5), but more important it has the quality of an effective or programmatic aorist: i.e. , begin now to do all these things and keep doing them to the end (BD[F], § 337.2; cf. Selwyn, 174: "Let your motto be: Honour all men, etc."; see above, p. 55). The aorist does not have to be repeated because the single use of it governs the whole series (cf. Bammel, 280; for the opposite phenomenon of a generalized present imperative followed by several specific commands using the aorist, cf. 2 Tim 4:5).

panta" timhsate thn adelfohta agapate. Even though panta" timhsate is not a heading for the whole series, it does function as a kind of heading for thn adelothta agapate. Both commands have to do with groups of people, and "everyone" obviously includes the brotherhood (cf. "your brotherhood in the world," 5:9).

The point of changing the verbs is not to imply that a Christian should not respect or honor fellow Christians as much as others (cf. Rom 12:10). God, after all, has given them honor by laying "a cornerstone in Zion" (2:6–7) and promising them further honor at the last day (1:7). Nor is Peter unaware of Jesus' command to love (agapate) even one's enemies (cf. Matt 5:44; Luke 6:27, 35). The apparent use in 1 Peter 2:19–20 of sayings found in Luke 6:32–34, and in 3:9, 16 of the language of Luke 6:28, make it virtually

certain that Peter knew this tradition. His point in using different verbs is to qualify the tradition by setting some priorities for his readers. He consistently backs away from telling them in so many words to "love your enemies," emphasizing instead their responsibility to love the Christian brotherhood. His accent on mutual love (cf. 1:22; 4:8) corresponds to the new command popular in the communities (probably in Asia) that produced the Gospel and Epistles of John (e.g., "love one another," John 13:34; 1 John 4:7, 11, 4:20–5:2). Peter elsewhere expresses the same command with the aorist imperative (allhlou" agaphsate, 1:22); whether his choice of the present agapate here consciously echoes the agapate of either the synoptic tradition (qualifying the command to love enemies) or the Johannine tradition (reaffirming the command to love each other) is uncertain. It is in any case explained, as we have seen, by the rhetoric of his fourfold sequence. What is certain is that despite his concern to foster deference and respect toward everyone, Peter distinguishes this respect from love, which he seems to define as the cement that binds Christians together into a brotherhood. For other concise N^T expressions of the concurrent duties of a Christian to fellow Christians and to everyone, see 1 Thess 5:15 and Gal 6:10.

thn adelfothta agapate, ton qeon fobeisqe. Although the four imperatives divide naturally into parts, there are no formal features clearly setting off the first two commands from the last two. They are a single series, with each command linked naturally to the one preceding. If the first two and the last two can be viewed as pairs, so too can the first and last (because of the repetition of the verb "respect") and the second and third. The responsibility to love the brotherhood leads to the question of responsibility toward God. The command to love God and neighbor, firmly rooted in the sayings of Jesus (Mark 12:28–34//Matt 22:34–40//Luke 10:25–28), was reinterpreted in the Johannine tradition as love for God and for "brother" (1 John 4:20–21) defined as one who "believes that Jesus is the Christ" and is "born of God" (1 John 5:1–2).

Peter's tendency to shift verbs in this passage suggests that under other circumstances he too might have commanded love for God (although probably not "reverence" for the brotherhood). Although he never refers explicitly to loving God, Peter does mention his readers' love for the Christ they have not seen (1:8). Their posture toward God is more typically one of reverent fear (en fobw, 1:17), praise or glorification (2:9: 4:16), humility (5:6), and trust (5:7). Such a posture fits the present context where Peter addresses them as God's douloi (v 16b).

ton qeon fobeisqe, ton basilea timate. The mention of God leads in turn to a mention of the emperor (cf. v 13b), probably on the basis of Jesus' statement, "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's" (Mark 12:17//Matt 22:21//Luke 20:25; Paul's apparent allusion to that saying in Rom 13:7). Peter's actual terminology, however, may have been more directly influenced by Prov 24:21: "Fear God, son, and the king" (fobou ton qeon, uie, kai basilea). Just as he wants to distinguish between the kind of love appropriate to enemies and the kind appropriate to fellow believers, Peter also distinguishes the kind of fear or reverence due God from the kind due the emperor. This he does again by a change in the verb, returning full circle to the weaker term "respect" (timan) with which the series of injunctions began. Christians are, after all, slaves of God, not of the emperor. No human authority, only Christ, is their Lord (cf. 1:25; 2:3; 3:15). Their primary obligation of reverence toward God (with its corollary of love for their fellow Christians) by no means excludes respect for the emperor and all his subjects—on the contrary, it demands this. The distinction between reverence and respect is not absolute.

While Peter unmistakably counsels against fear of possible mistreatment by enemies (3:6, 14), it is not at once clear whether his uses of foBo" in 2:18 and 3:2, 16 have to do with reverence toward God or respect for those in authority. Each case must be decided in light of its own context.

The agreement of timate with the timhsate at the beginning of the sequence accomplishes two things. First, it forms an inclusion grouping the four commands that comprise v 17. Second, by associating respect for the emperor with respect for everyone, it forms an inclusion with the thought of v 13 as well so as to bind vv 13–17 together as a larger unit centered on the theme of respect for one's fellow citizens and for the Roman state.

Explanation

The most conspicuous feature of this section is its optimism. Christians should defer to their fellow citizens and to the state because the state is their protector against false accusations. Because the purpose of civil authority is to punish wrongdoers and reward those who do good, Christians can silence their accusers simply by doing what is right. Under normal circumstances loyalty to God and loyalty to the empire will not come into conflict.

There is, however, just a hint of a darker side to Peter's vision. Not only is the "ignorance of the foolish" still a factor with which to be reckoned, but the danger exists that Christians themselves may use the freedom they claim in Christ as an excuse for malice or misconduct. Peter therefore takes the opportunity to establish some priorities for his readers. Their responsibilities to others, to each other, to God, and to the state are simultaneously affirmed, but with the tacit understanding that the religious commitment to God and the brotherhood inevitably limits and qualifies the civic commitment to the empire and its citizens. Even while expressing an optimistic vision of Christian life in Roman society, Peter lays the groundwork for coping with a quite different scenario—the distinct possibility of situations in which the demands of God and the emperor will pull Christians in different directions and in which suffering will be the result.

Servants (2:18–25)

Bibliography

Deissmann, A. *Bible Studies*. Edinburgh, 1901. 88–91. **Fee, G. D.** *New Testament Exegesis*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983. 122. **Hall, R.** "For to This You Have Been Called: The Cross and Suffering in I Peter." *Rest*[Q] 19 (1976) 137–47. **Kügler, U.-R.** *Die Paränese an die Sklaven als Modell urchristlicher Sozialethik*. Diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1976. **Olson, V. S.** *The Atonement in I Peter*. Diss. Union Theological Seminary [Virginia], 1979. **Osborne, T. P.** "Guide Lines for Christian Suffering: A Source-Critical and Theological Study of I Peter 2:21–25." *Bib* 64.3 (1983) 381–408. **Patsch, H.** "Zum alttestamentliche Hintergrund von Röm 4,25 und I. Petrus 2,24." *ZN*[W] 60 (1969) 273–79. **Thompson, J. W.** "'Be Submissive to Your Masters': A Study of I Peter

2:18–25." *Rest*[Q] 9 (1966) 66–78. **Unnik, W. C. van,** "A Classical Parallel to I Peter ii. 14 and 20." *NT*[S] 2 (1955/56) 198–202. **Wengst, K.** *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*. Gütersloh, 1974.

Translation

[18]*You servants must with deep reverence defer to your*[a] *masters, not only to masters who are just and fair but even*[b] *to those who are cruel.* [19]*For it is grace when someone suffering unjustly puts up with the afflictions out of a conscious commitment to God.*[c] [20]*What renown is there if you do wrong and are beaten,*[d] *and you patiently endure?*[e] *But when you do good and suffer, and patiently endure*[e]*—then it is grace before God.* [21]*To that purpose you have been called, for Christ also suffered*[f] *for you,*[g] *leaving you an example, that you might follow in his footsteps.* [22]*He committed no sin, nor was deceit ever found on his lips.* [23]*He was insulted, but he would never insult in return; when he suffered, he never threatened [his enemies], but left [them] in the hands of him who judges justly,*[h] [24]*He himself carried our*[i] *sins in his body to the cross, so that we, having parted with those sins, might live for what is right. By his*[j] *wounding you have been healed,*[k] [25]*For you were going astray*[l] *like sheep, but you have turned now to the Shepherd and Guardian of your souls.*

Notes

a. unwn is not found in the earliest and best MS[s], although it is supplied by a few ([a]

Z some v[g] MS[s]). Peter addresses the servants impersonally at first, even though his use of the nominative as a vocative makes it appropriate to supply "you" and "your" in the translation.

b. "Even" or "also" (kai) is omitted in a few ancient MS[s], including p[72] Although the external evidence is not strong, the kai would have been expected after ou monon, and it is easier to see why scribes might have added it than why they would have omitted a kai that was original. This may be an instance in which [p72] has preserved the original reading, kai is in any case legitimately supplied in a translation.

c. In place of the difficult dia suneidhsin qeou, some MS[s] ([c] Y and a few others) read dia suneidhsin agaqhn ("out of a good conscience"), while a very few (p[72] A[*] and two minuscules) exhibit a conflation (either agaqhn qeou [p[72]] or qeou agaqhn [A[*]]). That agaqhn was introduced into the text very early is shown by the witness of p[72], but its introduction is probably attributable to the familiarity in the church of the phrase "a good conscience"; cf 3:16, 21; Acts 23:1; 1 Tim 1:5 (a possible source as well of the reading ek kaqara" kardia" in 1:22; see B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 690).

d. In place of "beaten" (kolafizomenoi), p[72] [a]

2 P Y and a number of other MS[s] have the more general and more expected word "punished" (kolazomenoi), a natural alteration probably traceable to careless reading. "Beaten," the reading of the majority of MS[s] (including [a]

B C v[g),] is correct.

e. The word for “patiently endure” in both parts of v 20 (upomeneite, future) is read as a present (upomenete) in some MS^{s} (p^{72} Y and others in both instances; a number more in one or the other). The more difficult future indicative in a conditional sentence (see BD^{F,} § 372.1c) is to be preferred. Peter’s choice of the future was apparently a corollary of his choice of present rather than aorist participles to designate what preceded the patient endurance, i.e, sin or doing of good, respectively, and the consequent mistreatment. Either aorists followed by a present or presents followed by a future would have served Peter’s purpose of suggesting a sequence, and he opted for the latter.

f. Some MS^{s} (p$^{81\ a}$

Y and others) read “died” (apeqanen) in place of “suffered” (epaqen), probably because of the phrase “for you” (uper umwn) that follows. The expression apoqnhskein uper, “to die for,” in the N^{T} is commonly used of Christ’s redemptive work (John 11:50–51; Rom 5:68; 14:15; I Cor 5:14–15; I Thess 5:10), while pascein uper is used of Christ’s suffering only here; elsewhere in the N^{T} it refers to Christians suffering either for Christ (Phil 1:29; cf$^{.}$ Acts 9:16) or for the Kingdom of God (2 Thess 1:5). It is likely that scribes conformed the unusual epaqen uper umwn to the more familiar-sounding formula. The weight of M^{S} evidence for “suffered” (p$^{72\ A\ B\ K\ P}$ and a majority of all MS^{s}) bears this out.

g. The majority of later MS^{s} (including $^{P)}$ read “for us” rather than “for you” at this point, reflecting the common confusion of hearing between umwn and hmwn, as well as certain familiar passages that speak of Christ dying “for us” (e.g, Rom 5:8; 1 Thess 5:10), and more generally the “we/us/our” terminology of N^{T} confessional passages. The evidence of the earliest and best MS^{s} (p$^{72\ a}$

$^{A\ B\ C}$ y and others), however, conclusively favors uper umwn (“for you”). A similar variation occurs in the next clause (the very next word in Greek) between umin and hmin, and umin is similarly to be preferred. See B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 690.

h. Although the reading adikw" in place of dikaiw" probably originated in certain early Greek MS^{s}, it now exists almost exclusively in the Latin tradition (*injuste*, in one version, two Latin citations by Cyprian, the Latin translation of a citation by Clement of Alexandria, and v$^{g).}$ Its effect is to introduce Pilate abruptly as an unjust judge—a view contrary to that found in much of later Christian literature—but it probably came into being because of the pascwn adikw" of v 19. If Christ’s suffering is the model for his followers, then it too is in some sense adikw". The reading is too weakly attested to be regarded as more than a curiosity.

i. Again there is variation between hmwn and umwn. In this instance, the majority of MS^{s}, including all but two of the most significant ones, follow the LX^{X} of Isa 53:4 in reading hmwn, while p$^{72\ B}$ and a very few others support umwn. The choice is difficult because Peter has been using the second person plural and will return to it with the iaqhte at the end of the verse. Here, however, the confessional hmwn is probably to be preferred because of the solidly attested zhswmen with which the attached purpose-clause comes to an end.

j. For “his.” the maiority of MS^{s} (including ^{a}

$^{*\ L}$ and $^{P);}$ have autou, in addition to the relative ou with which the clause begins (see

BD[F,] § 297). The best of the early MS[s] ($p^{72\ A\ B}$ etc) omit autou. Was autou inserted to conform the reference to the LX[X] of Isa 53:5 or was an original autou editorially removed because of its redundancy? The fact that the redundancy of o" … auto" at the beginning of v 24 was allowed to stand in virtually all MS[s] suggests that redundancy was not an issue and that the shorter reading is probably correct (cf. Moulton, *Grammar*, i, 237).

k. Ahhough the variant reading iaqhmen agrees with the LX[X] of Isa 53:5, the support for it is negligible (minuscule 8 and isolated examples of Latin and other versions). It is surprising in fact that this scribal adaptation to the LX[X] was not made more widely than it was, in view of the first person plurals in the immediately preceding context.

l. A subtle difference exists in the manuscript tradition over whether the word "straying" goes with sheep (planwmena, "you were like straying sheep," in a majority of MS[s], including $p^{72\ C\ P}$ Y), or with the readers of the epistle (panwmenoi, "you were straying like sheep," in [a] [A B] and others). The latter, bolder use of the metaphor is probably original.

Form/Structure/Setting

The household duty code continues with a set of guidelines for the behavior of domestic servants (cf. Col 3:22–4:1; Eph 6:5–9). The exhortation proper (v 18) is supported by appeals first to principles reminiscent of Jesus' moral teaching (vv 19–20; cf. Luke 6:32–34) and then more broadly to his moral example and his sacrificial death (vv 21–25; cf. Isa 53:4–12). Peter does not return at the end, as he did in the preceding section, to the initial command to defer to those in authority. When he reaches the end, it is easy to forget that he is still supposed to be addressing slaves in relation to their masters. Much of the section is as applicable to Christians generally, especially under the threat of persecution, as to household slaves in particular.

The basic command is a participle rather than an imperative: upotassomenoi (v 18), representing a further specific instance of the upotaghte of v 13. Deference to "every human creature" covers far more than a citizen's deference to the emperor or the provincial governor. It includes as well the deference of a domestic slave to his or her master, and of a wife to her husband. Peter focuses on these household situations in order to deal with something his optimistic view of the state and of Roman justice did not allow him to deal with in the preceding section: the possibility of suffering for doing good. While the state exists to punish wrongdoers and reward those who do good, the same is not true of every household. Peter calls attention precisely to the cruel master (v 18) and the unbelieving husband (3:1) in order to address cases where suffering could become a reality for some of his readers—and not just those who were literally domestic servants or wives.

Although most commentators locate the transition from specific advice for domestic servants to general counsel for the whole Christian community between vv 23 and 24, Peter begins to generalize immediately after the exhortation proper, with the ei … ti" clause of v 19. The experience of "putting up with afflictions" (upoferei … lupa") is as broad in its scope as the afflictions (luphqente") mentioned in 1:6 (cf. Brox, 128). Although v 20 has domestic servants particularly in mind, neither it nor anything that follows is limited to them. Their experience, whether actual or hypothetical, becomes a paradigm for the experience of all Christians everywhere in the empire. The position of a household slave was tenuous, subject to the character and moods of the owner. Despite the justice of the

state, the position of Christians in the empire was also tenuous, subject to differing local conditions and sudden changes in the public mood.

Vv 19–20, with the phrase touto … cari" at the beginning and end, could be read as an answer to the thrice-repeated rhetorical question, poia unin cari" estin, in Luke 6:32, 33, 34 (echoed by Peter in the poin … kleo" of v 20). The subject matter is similar but not identical. Jesus asks what "grace" or credit there is to those who give love only in return for love, or do good only in return for good done to them, or loan money only for what they can get in return. The expected answer is "none," setting the stage for the positive command, "Love your enemies, and do good, and lend money without expecting anything in return" (Luke 6:35). Peter supplies a different positive equivalent adapted to his own context of potential suffering: it is "grace" (i.e., a creditatable thing) when a person endures suffering unjustly inflicted for "doing good" but not when the person has done wrong and the suffering is well deserved. Where the saying of Jesus dealt with rewards Peter's adaptation of it deals with punishment. His corollary to the principle thai one should not love or do good simply for the sake of human rewards is the principle that one should patiently endure suffering even when it is unjust and undeserved (i.e., the principle of nonretaliation; cf. Luke 6:27–30). This is Peter's equivalent of "Love your enemies," which he consistently avoids quoting in so many words.

The appeal to the gospel tradition is linked to the appeal to the example of Christ by the ei" touto gar eklhqhte of v 21 (picking up the touto of vv 19a, 20b; cf. Osborne, 389) and the oti kai Cristo" that immediately follows. The former is repeated in 3:9, where it refers, as it does here, to nonretaliation. The latter is repeated in 3:18, where it again introduces an appeal to the work of Christ for salvation. Peter makes no sharp distinction in vv 21–25 between Christ as an example to Christian believers of nonretaliation (vv 21–23) and Christ as redeemer of Christian believers by his death on the cross (vv 24–25). Both aspects are developed in language derived from Isa 53:4–12 $LX^{X.}$ Much of vv 21–25 can be regarded as a midrash or paraphrase of these verses: i.e., of 53:9 in v 22 and of 53:4–6 (with some use of 53:12) in vv 24–25. That Peter could have known Isa 53 in a form close to what is now identified as the LX^{X} can be seen from the exact quotation of Isa 53:1–12 in *1 Clem*. 16.3–14 (a document emanating from the same Roman church that 1 Peter represents).

It has been widely argued (e.g., by Windisch and Preisker, 65; Bultmann, 295–97; Boismard, 111–32; Wengst, 83–86; and Goppelt, 204–07) that Peter is following not only (and not primarily) the text of Isa 53 itself but an early Christian hymn to Christ based on that passage (cf. also 1:20; 3:18–19, 22). A sample (and fairly typical) reconstruction of a hymn that might have served as this source is that of K. Wengst (84):

Cristo" aheqanen uper hmwn

o" amartian ouk epoihsen

oude eureqh solo" en tw stomati autou

o" ta" amartia" hmwn auto" anhnegken

en tw swmati autou ehi to xulon

ina tai" amartiai" ahogenomenoi

th dikaiosunh xhswmen

Three features in the text of vv 21–25 as it stands have been cited as reasons to detect a possible hymnic source:

1. The shift from the second person plural pronouns in v 21 to the first person plural in v 24a-b, and back to the second person plural in vv 24c–25.
2. The repeated use of the relative pronoun o" in vv 22a, 23a, and 24a (for some scholars dividing the reconstructed hymn into strophes or stanzas; cf. o" estin in 1 Tim 3:16, and o" estin in Col 1:15, 18).
3. The thematic shift between Christ's example of endurance and nonretaliation in time of suffering (vv 21–23: relevant to Christian slaves) and his vicarious suffering for sins (vv 24–25: relevant to the entire Christian community).

Each of these factors is important, but each can be explained without recourse to an underlying christologica

(1) The shift in pronouns is as easily attributable to Peter's direct use of the Isaiah text as to his use of a hymn. The second person plural is Peter's consistent way of addressing his readers throughout the epistle, the only exceptions (outside the present passage) being 1:3 and 4:17. Isa 53:4–12, on the other hand, is couched in first and third person plurals. Peter maintains his customary style until he begins to work specifically with the Isaiah text (vv 22–25). His first use of Isa 53 (i.e., 53:9 in v 22) is purely descriptive of Christ's behavior before his Passion and involves no need to choose between personal pronouns. In his second use of it (v 24), he adopts the first person zhswmen of Isa 53:4, 5, which then requires the first person iaqhte in the purpose clause that follows. As the section draws to a close he reverts abruptly to the second person iaqte (v 24c) in preference to the iaqhmen of Isa 53:5 and retains the second person plural through v 25. This is the only shift in the passage that requires explanation, and the most likely explanation is that Peter has chosen to end the section with some reflection on his readers' conversion from paganism to Christianity. The iaqhte of v 24c and the epest rafhte of v 25b match the eklnqhte of v 21, all three with this conversion in mind, while the fire of v 25a glances momentarily at the readers' preconversion state (cf. 1:14, 18; 2:9–10; 4:3). Because the author (presenting himself as the Apostle Peter, a Jew) never includes himself with his readers in such reflections on a distinctly Gentile past (contrast Paul in Eph 2:3–7), Isaiah's first person plural would have been inappropriate.

(2) Peter himself is fond of relative pronouns (cf., e.g., 1:8, 12; 2:8; 3:3, 4, 6, 20–21; 4:5; 5:9, 12), while in the other two instances in which he is widely thought to be using an early Christian hymn (i.e., 1:20; 3:18–19) the distinguishing stylistic feature is the use of contrasting passive participles, not relative pronouns with finite verbs.

(3) The shift from Christ as example to Christ as vicarious sacrifice is natural and almost inevitable in any early Christian midrash on Isa 53, for both aspects are conspicuous in the text. The former, no less than the latter, is applicable to all Christians (cf. 3:9) and not exclusively to household servants. Once it is recognized that vv 21–25 (to say nothing of vv 19–20) have the entire Christian community in view, the shift is quite unremarkable.

There is no need, therefore, to posit an early Christian hymn behind vv 21–25. Peter's text is adequately explained as a midrash on Isa 53:4–12 summarizing both the responsibility (vv 21–23) and the redemptive experience of the epistle's readers. Only v 23, ironically, the verse "which, from the standpoint of style, shows the closest resemblance to parallel members of a hymn" (Osborne, 395), shows no direct influence of Isa 53. Not only Osborne, but several of those who attempt to reconstruct an ancient hymn from vv 21–25 judge v 23 to be "almost certainly the creation of the author himself" (Osborne, 395; cf. Wengst, 85 and Goppelt, 205: with considerably more doubt, Bultmann. 285–97).

Comment

18oi oiketai upotassomenoi en panti fobw toi" despotai", "You servants must with deep reverence defer to your masters." The nominative with the definite article functions as a vocative (BD[F,] § 147.3; cf. 3:1,7), while the present participle functions as an imperative (BD[F,] § 468.2; cf. D. Daube in Selwyn, 467–88). The second person plural, which does not appear until v 20, is therefore implied from the start. The other N[T] examples of the household duty code address Christian slaves as douloi (Col 3:22; Eph 6:5), but because Peter has just referred to all his readers as qeou douloi (v 16), he switches to oiketai in order to focus on household servants as a particular social group (the same group, presumably, as the douloi of Colossians and Ephesians). N[T] and LX[X] usage suggests no discernible difference in meaning. Because Peter reserves the designation "Lord" (kurio") for God or Christ (the only exception being 3:6, where his language is dictated by an O[T] text), he chooses despoth" to refer to slave masters (cf. 1 Tim 6:1; Titus 2:9) instead of the kurio" of Colossians and Ephesians (where the same distinction is maintained by the phrase toi" kata sarka kutioi" in Eph 6:5 and the play on oi kurioi and o kurio" in Eph 6:9 and Col 4:1). For oiketh" and sedpoth" as natural opposites in Hellenistic literature, cf. Prov 22:7 (LX[X),] Dio Chrysostom 14.10, Philo, Philo, *Immut.* 64.

The effect of panti in the phrase en panti fobw is to intensify rather than universalize the reverence of which Peter speaks, yielding the translation "with deep reverence" (cf. BG[D,] 631.1a, d). Although the word order could suggest that the reverence is directed toward slave masters (cf. dia ton despotikon fobon in Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.128), the clear distinction in 2:17 between reverence toward God and respect for the emperor demands that here too fobio" means reverence toward God and not toward human masters. In the admonitions to slaves in the Pauline household duty codes, fear or reverence is directed either explicitly toward God or Christ (foBounenopi yon kurion, Col 3:22) or toward slave masters with the assumption that they somehow stand in Christ's place (meta fobou kai tromou … ws" tw Cristw, Eph 6:5); cf. *Did.* 4.11, where reverence is urged toward masters as God's image or representative (w" tupw qeou). Peter makes no such assumption here; the mention of "deep reverence" is intended to motivate his readers in much the same way as dia ton kurion in v 13 or dia suneidhdin qeou in v 19.

ou monon toi" agaqoi" kai epieikesin alla kai toi" skolioi", "not only to masters who are just and fair but even to those who are cruel." Peter's emphasis throughout the section is not on masters who are "just" (lit. "good") and "fair" to their servants, but on those who are unreasonably cruel (skolio", lit. "perverse"). He recognizes that some masters treat their slaves fairly, however, and he does not assume that these "good" slave owners are necessarily Christians (if he believed there was a significant group of Christian

slave masters in the provinces to which he was writing, he would presumably have addressed them separately, as they are addressed in Col 4:1 and Eph 6:9). The adjectives agaqo" and epieikh" must be understood realistically in the framework of the slave-master relationship. The implication of v 20a is that slaves who "do wrong" can expect to be beaten for it even by masters who exhibit these admirable qualities. It is likely that in using such terms Peter has in mind something closer to simple fairness and moderation than to gentleness or kindness understood as Christian virtues (Selwyn, 175, aptly quotes Suetonius, Aug. 53: "*O dominum aequum at bonum!*").

If the good and fair slave masters are not necessarily Christians, it follows that the cruel ones (toi" skolioi") are not to be equated as a class with those who reject Christianity (as, e.g., by G. Bertram in *TDNT* 7:407–8). Peter is not classifying slave masters on the basis of their religious convictions but on the basis of the way they treat their slaves. Even though his use of skolio" recalls the genea skolia("cruel [or crooked] generation") of Acts 2:40 and Phil 2:15 (cf. Mark 9:19 par.), Peter is not tarring all unbelievers with the same brush. He simply focuses for the moment on those who might cause particular trouble for his Christian readers (cf. the anonymous accusers of 2:12 or "the foolish" of 2:15). Although he sometimes writes as if everyone outside the Christian community (except for the emperor and the provincial governors) fell into this category (cf. "people generally" in 2:4 or "the Gentiles" in 2:12), his brief mention of those who are good and fair makes it clear that this is not his view.

19 touto gar cari" ei dia suneidhsin qeou upoferei ti" lupa" pascwn adikw", "For it is grace when someone suffering unjustly puts up with the afflictions out of a conscious commitment to God." Peter now generalizes what he has just said by imagining a case in which "someone" (ti"), perhaps a slave or perhaps not, endures unjust suffering. "Grace" refers here not to that which God gives freely (as, e.g., in 1:10, 13; 3:7; 4:10; 5:5, 10, 12: cf. BG[D], 878.3b) but to that Milch counts with God or that with which God is pleased (cf. BG[D], 877.2b). Peter's touto gar cari" looks like a positive adaptation of the three-part rhetorical question ("what grace is yours?") attributed to Jesus in Luke 6:32, 33, 34 (poia umin cari" estin: cf. *Did.* 1.3: poia gar cari"). Negative adaptations of the same or similar questions can be found in Ignatius *Pol.* 2.1 (cari" soi ouk estin) and in *2 Clem.* 13.4 (ou cari" umin): for the construction, cf. also certain manuscripts of 1 Cor 9:16 (ouk estin moi cari",[a]

[a] * D* F G).

Because the rhetorical question in Luke sets the stage for a negative answer, the negative adaptation is to be expected. Peter, however, has woven the traditional sayings of Jesus into a new three-part structure in which two parallel positive formulations (touto cari" in vv 19a and 20b) frame a rhetorical question similar to Luke's (i.e., poion kleo" in v 20a). His point is that there is no merit in enduring well-deserved punishment (any more than there is for loving those who love in return) but there is grace (i.e., credit with God) reserved for the patient endurance of unjust punishment or of "suffering for doing good." Peter's emphasis finds its counterpart in the positive statements that frame Luke's three rhetorical questions in 6:32–34 (i.e., the "golden rule" in its positive form in v 31 and the direct command to love enemies in v 35).

The antecedent of touto is the whole conditional clause introduced by ei. Each part of Peter's three-part formulation is linked to a conditional clause envisioning a set of possible circumstances. The first is made into a general principle by the pronoun ti" and the third

person verb upoferei,while the second and third begin to address the readers of the epistle (especially the slaves) directly, with the second person verb upomeneite.

The key word in the first of the three clauses is adikw" ("unjustly"). What counts with God is not patient endurance as a virtue in itself but the endurance of treatment that is unfair or undeserved. It is this which gives point to the emphasis in the preceding verse on masters who are cruel rather than those who are good and fair. Throughout the household duty codes Peter makes clear his readers' obligations to their fellow citizens (2:13, 17a, 18; 3:1) but always with particular attention to actual or potential enemies.

dia suneidhsin qeou. This phrase corresponds to the en pani fobw of v 18. qeou is most naturally taken as an objective genitive, with suneidhsi" understood accordingly as "consciousness" or "awareness" (BG^{D,} 786.1; cf. "consciousness of sins" in Heb 10:2). Some commentators (e.g. Selwyn, 176–77 and Beare, 122) prefer to give suneidhsi" its more common N^{T} meaning of "conscience" in the sense of a specifically moral consciousness (as in BG^{D,} 786.2; cf. e.g. "good conscience" in 3:16, 22, and *Note* c*). The translation, "conscience," however, creates difficulties with the genitive. Is Peter referring to a godly conscience, a God-given conscience, or a conscience accountable to God? The moral dimension of the phrase should not be overlooked, but consciousness or something similar can be retained as the translation with the understanding that Peter is referring to an awareness of God that impels a person to moral decision and action: hence the rendering, "out of a conscious commitment to God," although the simplicity of Selwyn's suggestion "for God's sake" (177) is also appealing.

upoferei ti" lupa" pascwn adikw". The "afflictions" (lupa") mentioned here are not limited to beatings administered to slaves (cf. v 20) but are far more general in scope. Peter seems to have in mind the present necessity that his readers "must suffer affliction (umhqente") in various ordeals" (1:6). lupa" must be taken as the object of "put up with" (upoferei), not of "suffer" (pascwn). pascein never takes a direct object in its eleven other occurrences in 1 Peter, while upoferein is almost never without one in early Christian literature (1 Cor 10:13 is the only exception noted in BGD, 848).

upoferei comes close in its meaning to uponeneite ("patiently endure") in v 20, but the two verbs are not identical, upoferein refers to a passive kind of endurance (i.e. undergoing or submitting to affliction), while upomenein means to "stand one's ground, hold out, endure" (BG^{D,} 845.2) in a more active or positive sense, upomeneite is used absolutely both times it occurs in v 20, while upoferei not only takes lipa" as its object but depends on lupa" for its meaning. The whole expression upofrrei … lupa" is virtually equivalent to the single verb pascein.

The value Peter sees in suffering lies not in the endurance of it as a heroic act but in two other factors: first, the suffering must be the result of a person's "conscious commitment to God," and second, it must be adikw", a word that Peter will explain in the following verse. pascein, which occurs here for the first time in the epistle, will become Peter's characteristic word for the suffering both of Christ (2:21, 23; 3:18; 4:1) and of Christians (v 20; 3:14, 17; 4:15, 19; 5: 10). The verb "suffer" is appropriate, as the verb "die" obviously is not, for Peter's purpose of presenting Christ's passion as an example for his readers to follow.

20 poion gar kleo" ei amartanonte" kai kolafizomenoi upomeneite, "What renown is there if you do wrong and are beaten and patiently endure?" To avoid the overuse of cari", Peter shifts to kleo" ("fame" or "renown"), fairly common in classical Greek but

used only here in the N^T and twice in the LX^X (Job 28:22; 30:8). Only *1 Clement* among early Christian writers uses kleo" in a theological sense (like "glory") for divine approval or reward (*1 Clem.* 5.6; 54.3). Peter could have used it in similar fashion in 1:7 (with "praise, glory, and honor," instead of one of them), but he did not. It is likely that he attributed to kleo" its usual secular meaning. His choice of it here lends to his rhetoric a touch of irony, especially in conjunction with such a strongly theological word for elldurance as upomenein. "What renown is there," he asks, "if you sin and are beaten, and you patiently endure?" Obviously none. Slave masters, even those who are good and fair, are not likely to be impressed by the patient endurance of a disobedient or rebellious slave who (in their terms) gets what he deserves.

The contrasting repetition of upomeneite (here and in the following clause) suggests a gentle satire on the early Christian ideal of upomenein (as seen, e.g., in Mark 13:13 and parallels; James 1:12; 5:11) or upomonh(e.g., Luke 21:19; James 1:3, 4; 2 Peter 1:6; Rev 1:9; 2:2, 3, 19; 3:10: 14:12; cf. F. Hauck, *TDN*^{T} 4:585–88). "Endurance" has value, Peter is saying, only in the context of "doing good" (agaqopoiein); apart from the latter it has no meaning. Christ will be introduced in vv 21–25 as an example of doing good, not as an example of patient endurance. The rare future indicatives both here and in the next clause (upomeneite; cf. $BD^{F,}$ § 372.1c) point to something subsequent to the suffering and to the moral or immoral behavior that prompted it, all of which Peter designates with present participles. Although endurance is good and appropriate behavior, it is necessarily after the fact. Far more important to Peter is a person's consistent moral stance before, during, and after the experience of suffering. The decisive question is whether that stance is one of "sinning" (amartanonte") or of "doing good" (agaqopoiounte").

The choice of "sinning" instead of "doing wrong" (kakopoiounte") in the first of the contrasting clauses can probably be attributed to two factors. First, Peter is unwilling to characterize Christian believers as wrongdoers even when describing a purely theoretical situation (cf. 2:12. 14; 3:17; 4:15; notice also kakia in 2:1, 16). Such terminology excludes almost by definition any genuine commitment to the God of Jesus Christ (cf. the citation of Ps 33[34]:17 in 3:12b). Second, and more important, amartanonte" helps prepare for Peter's discussion in vv 22–24 (based on Isa 53) of "sin" (amartia) and its removal (cf. 3:18; 4:1–2, 8).

Thus, even though Peter continues to address slaves in the framework of the household duty code, his words are chosen with all his readers in mind. "Sin" is a term better suited to offenses against God or the Christian community than to misconduct in the slave-master relationship. kolafizein ("to be beaten"), while obviously appropriate in a context of slavery, is rare outside Christian literature, where it refers to the beating of Jesus after his trial (Matt 26:67//Mark 14:65) and in a figurative sense to hardships suffered by Paul (l Cor 4:11; 2 Cor 12:7). In the present context it is probably not to be limited to physical beatings but is as broad in meaning as the pascein of the next clause. The notion that this term is intended to anticipate vv 21–23 by recalling Jesus' Passion (e.g., K. L. Schmidt in *TDN*^{T} 3:818–21) is overly subtle, because kolafizein itself does not occur in those verses. The repetition of the verb pascein in vv 19, 20, 23 is sufficient for Peter's purpose of linking the sufferings of Christ with the potential sufferings of Christians.

allÆ ei agaqopoiounte" kai pasconte" upomeneite touto cari" para qew, "But when you do good and suffer and patiently endure—then it is grace before God." The words "when you do good and suffer" explain Peter's reference to "suffering unjustly" in

the preceding verse. The emphasis is on doing good (agaqopoiounte"), just as in 2:15, where the same participle referred to doing the will of God with the assumption that such conduct was also beneficial to the Roman state (2:4). In the case of slaves, however, it is difficult to imagine why they would be punished for acts that substantially benefited their masters. Slave masters would have to be not only cruel but ignorant of their own best interests. Doing good must therefore be understood here as doing what pleases God even when it is not to the master's advantage (cf. dia suneidhsin qeou in v 19). Without being more specific, Peter raises here the possibility of Christian slaves at some point facing a conflict between their faith and their household responsibilities. The way to defer to their masters in such circumstances is to do good and take the consequences without complaint or retaliation.

touto cari" para qew. The repetition of touto cari" forms an inclusion with the touto gar cari" of v 19a, framing vv 19–20 as a rhetorical unit. The structure of this unit is chiastic in that the antecedent of touto in v 19a was the conditional clause that followed, while here it is the conditional clause that precedes. The additional phrase para qew ("before God" or "with God"; cf. BG[D], 610.2.2b) makes explicit what was implied already in v 19a (cf. "the living Stone … choice and precious" para de qew in 2:4). The expression "to find or have favor (cari") with someone" is common in the LX[X], occasionally with para (e.g., Exod 33:12, 16; Prov 12:2; cf. 5.1.5; *Sim.* 5.2.10), while in Luke the specific phrase "favor [or grace] with God" is used both of Mary (1:30) and of Jesus (2:52). For an even closer parallel, cf. Philo, *Leg. All.* 3.77, where the name "Noah" in Gen 6:8 is interpreted as "*rest*" or "righteous": "It is inevitable that the person who rests from unjust and sinful acts [see Comment at 4:1], and rests on what is noble, and lives in fellowship with righteousness will find favor with God" (carin … para tw qew; to the passage as a whole, cf. Peter's interest in Noah in 3:20 and his use of the term "rest" in 4:1 and of "righteousness" in 2:24).

21 ei" touto gar ekhqhte, "For to that purpose you have been called" (cf. 3:9). The pronoun touto looks backward rather than ahead, for it corresponds to the repeated touto with which Peter framed vv 19–20. The verb eklhqete points to the readers' conversion from paganism; if the ultimate goal of that conversion is God's "marvelous light" (2:9) or his "eternal glory" (5:10), its nearer goal is holiness (1:15) or, as here, the doing of good even when it means suffering (cf. the varied Pauline statements of the ethical implications of the Christian calling; cf. I Thess 4:7; I Cor 7:15; Gal 5:13; Col 3:15).

oti kai Cristo" "for Christ also." The phrase will recur in 3:18, again introducing an extended reflection on Christ's Passion in connection with suffering for doing good (kai in each instance picks up a preceding occurrence of pascein, in 2:20 and 3:17 respectively). "Christ" (rather than "Jesus") is Peter's characteristic name for Jesus of Nazareth in his suffering and redemptive death (1:11, 19; 3:18; 4:1, 13, 14; 5:1) and in the daily life of the Christian community (3:15, 16; 4:14; 5:14), while "Jesus Christ" (in the genitive) is used in connection with his resurrection from the dead (1:3; 3:21), his place at the center of Christian worship (2:5; 4:11), and his final revelation in glory (1:7, 13).

epaqen uper umwn, "suffered for you." The emphasis from here to the end of v 23 is on Jesus' behavior (in the events leading up to his death) as a example to Peter's readers of "doing good" in the face of both verbal and physical abuse. In v 24, the subject will shift to the redemptive value of Jesus' death for those who follow him (this is the theme of 3:18 as well). The question raised by the words uper umwn is whether they are intended to

anticipate the second stage of the discussion already in v 21. In that case, vv 21–25 would be read as a chiasm (cf. Fee, 122; Goppelt, 199):

a. Christ as the Savior who redeems Christians by his death ("Christ suffered for you …," v 21b).
b. Christ as the Example to Christians of suffering for doing good (" … leaving you an example, that you might follow in his footsteps," v 21c).
b´. Elaboration of the theme of Christ as Example (vv 22–23).
a´. Elaboration of the theme of Christ as the Savior who redeems by his death (vv 24–25).

Does epaqen uper umwn in v 21b anticipate the theme of redemption in vv 24–25? Nowhere else in the N^T is pascein used with uper to refer to Christ's sufferings "for us" or for sinful humanity (see Note f^*). It cannot be assumed that the expression must be interpreted in the same way as when it is said that Christ died for or gave himself for someone.

Although it is possible that Peter substituted the verb "suffered" for "died" in such a phrase for the sake of continuity with vv 19 and 20, it is more likely that the meaning of uper umwn is explained by the clause that immediately follows in v 21c. Christ suffered "for you" (i.e., for your benefit), Peter says, in the sense of "leaving you an example, that you might follow in his footsteps."

In 3:18, when he wants to introduce the thought of redemption or sacrifice for sin in connection with pascein, Peter makes clear what he is doing by the use of the phrase, "for sins" (peri amartiwn), even though he adds as well the expression, ("a just man on behalf of the unjust"; cf. also *Mart. Pol.* 17.2). In the present passage, sin is not mentioned until v 22, and the question of Christ's role in dealing with the sins of Peter's readers is not addressed until v 24. Best (119) makes the helpful observation that "In creating the way Christ is saviour as well as example; thus in verse 24 we pass quite easily from the example of Jesus' sufferings to their redemptive value."

umin upolimpanwn upogammon ona epakolouqhshte toi" icnesin autou, "leaving you an example, that you might follow in his footsteps." upolumpanwn (lit., "leaving behind," found only here in biblical Greek) is a rare equivalent of upoleipwn, accenting Jesus' past existence as a historical figure and his departure from this world to God (see J. A. Bengel, *Gnomon*, 965; cf. 3:22: "now that he has made his journey to heaven"). Peter looks back on Jesus' earthly ministry from the vantage point of his subsequent resurrection and Lordship (cf. nun in v 25: "now" as the risen one, Jesus has become "Shepherd and in v 25: "now" as the risen one, Jesus has become "Shepherd and Guardian of your souls").

upogrammon, "an example," is found only here in the N^T and in the LX^X only in 2 Macc 2:28 (plural, in the sense of "outlines" or "essentials"). Clement of Alexandria's use of it to refer to letters of the alphabet for children to copy (Strom. 5.8.49) is closely related to the more common cognate verb upografein (cf. Plato, *Protag*. 326D). More often in Christian literature it came to mean a model or example in a moral sense: thus especially Christ (*1 Clem.* 16.17, 33.8, and, in dependence on 1 Peter itself, *Pol. Phil.* 8.2); but also Paul (*1 Clem.* 5.7) and even (sarcastically) Kronos, the father of Zeus (*Clem. Hom.* 4.16). Of particular interest is Clement of Alexandria's reference (Paed 1.9) to Ezek. 34:14–16 as presenting to the "Elders" a upogrammo" of Christ's patient and proper care as "Shepherd

of the sheep" (cf. once more 2:25; also 5:1–4). This ethical use of upogarammo" begins (at least in Christianity) with 1 Peter but becomes quite common in patristic literature (Lampe, 1446; G. Schrenk in *TDN*[T] 1:772–73).

ina epakolouqhshte toi" icnesin autou, "that you might follow in his footsteps." The expression is as metaphorical in Greek as in English (for the same verb and noun combination, cf. Philo, *Virt.* 64). It makes little difference whether toi" icnesin is read as "footsteps" or "footprints" (cf. BGD, 384). Because Kelly's point that to follow Christ is not "to reproduce all the details" of his passion but simply "to move in the direction he is going" (120) is true in *either* case, Kelly's insistence on "tracks" as the proper translation is unnecessary. Christ's intent in leaving behind an example is that Christian believers (not just household slaves) might show in their lives the same kind of behavior (cf. Kelly, 120: "the same uncomplaining acceptance") that he himself demonstrated in the course of his sufferings.

Similar uses of icno" can be seen in Paul's declaration of Abraham as the father of those who "march in the footsteps" (i.e., follow the precedent) of Abraham's faith (Rom 4:12), and in his assurance to the Corinthians (2 Cor 12:18) that he and his coworker Titus "walk in the same spirit" or "the same steps"—the two are interchangeable. Closer to the setting in 1 Peter are two later passages pointed more toward the future and toward martyrdom: Ignatius prays to be found "trailing in the footsteps" (upo ta icnh) of Paul "when I attain to God" (Ign. *Eph.* 12.2), while *Mart. Pol.* concludes (22.1) with a prayer to be found "following in the footsteps" (pro" ta ocnh) of the "blessed Polycarp" when Christ's kingdom comes. In none of these instances is it a matter of reenacting in detail the experience of Abraham, Titus, Paul, or Polycarp, only of moving in the same direction toward the same goal, with the same attitude toward one's experiences, whatever they may be.

22 o" amartian ouk rpoihsen oude eureqh dolo" en tw stomati autou. "He committed no sin, nor was deceit ever found in his mouth." The entire verse is an exact quotation of Isa 53:9b LX[X] except for the introductory o" (replacing Isaiah's oti) and Peter's amartian, "sin," instead of Isaiah's anomian, "lawlessness" (cf. Pol. *Phil.* 8.l, but contrast *1 Cle*[m] 16.10, where oti and anomian are retained). The best manuscripts of Isaiah ([B a L]) also lack eureqh, which is found in 1 Peter, Polycarp, and I Clement, but there is little reason to suppose (with Beare, 122) that Peter originated this change. The relative o", repeated at the beginning of vv 23 and 24 (cf. ou in the last clause of v 24), is not evidence that Peter is drawing on an earlier hymn or liturgical form but is simply a characteristic feature of the author's style (see *Form/Structure/Setting*). Its rhetorical effect in the present context is to keep Christ ever before the epistle's readers as the one to be followed at each step of his life—and his death (for his exaltation, cf. the o"-clause in 3:22).

The substitution of amartian for anomian is probably to be explained by Peter's use of amartia" in v 24 (in dependence on Isa 53:4, 11–12) and by his choice of the verb amartanonte", "sinning," already in v 20 as his contrast to "doing good." Note that Isaiah himself places the two words in parallel (53:5), while one early Christian writer quite consciously equates them (1 John 3:4). The point of the statement that Christ committed no sin is not to assert his sinlessness abstractly as an attribute inherent in his divine nature (cf. the metaphor of the "faultless and flawless lamb" in 1:19) but simply to emphasize that his suffering (vv 21, 23) was both unprovoked and undeserved. He suffered not because of any

sin he had committed but rather for doing good, and therefore "unjustly" (cf. vv 19, 20). This above all else is what makes Christ the appropriate example for the epistle's readers.

The second half of the quotation ("nor was deceit ever found on his lips") focuses special attention on sins of speech. Peter's interest in dolo", "deceit" or "treachery," as a sin coming to expression in human speech is seen also in his quotation from Ps 33[34]:13–17 (v 14 in particular) in 3:10: "keep the tongue from evil and the lips from speaking deceit." It is possible that these Scripture quotations from Isa 53 and Ps 33 [34] (which for other reasons were important to him in his argument) influenced Peter in using dolon in 2:1 (alongside kakian) as a rather general designation for evil speech (cf. also the negative adolon in the sense of "pure" in 2:2).

Whatever the reason, "deceit" in 1 Peter always stands in close association with some very general or inclusive term: "malice" or "evil" in 2:1, "evil" in 3:10, and "sin" here in v 22. Peter's emphasis in quoting Isa 53:9b is not so much on the fact that Christ's speech was free of deceit and treachery in particular as that it was free of every kind of evil speaking.

23 o" loidoroumeno" ouk anteloidorei pascwn ouk hpeilei, "He was insulted, but he would never insult in return; when he suffered, he never threatened [his enemies]" (the use of "never" is an attempt to take account of the imperfect tenses). These words are not from Isa 53 (although for the idea, cf. 53:7). They are rather to be understood as commentary on the last clause of v 22, "nor was deceit ever found in his mouth." Peter's attention continues to center on sins of speech, probably because he believes verbal abuse is the principal form of abuse to which his readers are being subjected (2:12, 15; 3:16; 4:4, 14), and he wants to make sure they do not retaliate in kind (3:9; cf. 2:1).

The accent on verbal conflict may be a further indication that Peter has by now widened his implied audience from Christian slaves in relation to their masters, to Christians generally in relation to their unbelieving fellow citizens. As we have seen, the widening process seems to have begun as early as v 19, yet in vv 19–20 the experience of slaves was still at least a paradigm for the experience of the Christian community as a whole (e.g., in the reference to being "beaten" in v 20). Now the slaves seem to be out of the picture altogether; for a slave to refrain from insults and threats toward a master is not so much a mark of Christian virtue as a simple necessity for survival. Peter has in mind rather those situations in which the trading of insults is a real temptation: i.e., in hostile encounters between the epistle's readers and those in Roman society who slander their faith or conduct.

Peter does not follow the Gospel tradition in stating explicitly that Jesus' response to the insults he received was silence (Mark 14:61//Matt 26:63; Mark 15:5//Matt 27:14; Luke 23:9; John 19:9; Justin, Dial. 102.5; cf. Isa 53:7), probably because the response he wants to foster in his readers is not mere silence but "blessing" (3:9; cf. Paul as Christ's apostle in 1 Cor 4:12, "being insulted, we bless"; also Diogn. 5.15). At least once during his Passion, Jesus is said to have "spoken well" (probably in the sense of speaking the truth, John 18:23) rather than of having kept silent. Peter seems to have in mind not only Christ's behavior but his teaching as well (cf. Luke 6:28, "Bless those who curse you, pray for those who denounce you"; although the vocabulary differs from the present passage, cf. 1 Peter 3:9, 16).

The repetition of loidorein or a cognate, with the idea of "insult for insult," is a distinctive feature of Peter's style (Pol. *Phil.* 2.2 is dependent on 1 Peter 3:9; Philo refers to

Demosthenes [cf. Stobaeus, 4QFlor 19.4] for the insight that in a "contest of insults [epi loidotia" amillan] … the victor is worse than the vanquished," Philo, *Agr.* 110). The imperfect tenses with the negative point to Jesus' consistent refusal to retaliate in kind even after repeated provocations (cf. BD[F], § 327; Robertson, *Grammar*, 885).

It is unclear whether these provocations are understood to span Jesus' entire ministry or the last week of his life in particular. Possibly Peter intends to draw specific attention to the Passion only in the pascwn of the second clause. Whatever the implied time reference, this participle marks a progression from verbal abuse to physical abuse, even though Jesus' response to physical suffering is still described in terms of speech: ouk hpeilei, "he never threatened."

The statement is surprising because threats are more to be expected from persecutors than from the persecuted. Peter probably has in mind the sort of counterthreats attributed in early Christian literature to Polycarp in *Mart. Pol.* 11.2 ("You threaten with that which burns for a time … you do not know the fire of the coming judgment and eternal punishment that awaits the ungodly"; cf. *Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas* 18.8). In Jewish literature as well, threats are attributed to the Maccabaean martyrs in 4 Macc. 9:5–9 ("You seek to terrify us with your threat of death by torture … But you, because of your foul murder, will suffer at the hand of divine justice the everlasting torment by fire you deserve," *OT*[P], 2.554; cf. also 4 Macc. 10.11; 2 Macc 7:17, 19, 31, 34–36). Peter's point that Jesus renounced all such threats of final judgment is based in part on the fact that this is the attitude he wants his readers to have under hostile questioning (cf. 3:15–16) and perhaps also in part on what the Gospel tradition both says and does not say about Jesus' Passion (e.g., that he prayed for his executioners' forgiveness, Luke 23:34; that he predicted his own vindication, Mark 14:62; but nowhere that he threatened divine vengeance on those who made him suffer).

The fact that Peter represents Jesus as making no threats of retributive judgment does not mean that he views such a judgment as anything less than a very real and frightening prospect, whether directed against Jesus'persecutors or against the potential persecutors of Christians in his own day. Although Goppelt (209) sharply distinguishes the attitude of Jesus (i.e., Peter's Jesus) from that of the Maccabaean martyrs, the principal difference is simply that Jesus kept quiet about the judgment to come. The judgment itself asPeter sees it is not markedly different (cf. 3:16–17; 4:5, 17–18).

paredidou de tw krinonti dikaiw", "but left [them] in the hands of him who judges justly." The verb paredidou appears unrelated to the uses of the same verb in Isa 53:6, 12. Peter's concluding positive clause describing Jesus' behavior is linked to the two preceding negative clauses by the particle de and by two common features: first, the verb is still in the imperfect tense and, second, although it is a verb that can take an object, it takes none here.

The absence of an object for paredidou has led commentators to supply either "himself" (Selwyn, 180; Bigg, 146; Best, 121) or "his cause" (Kelly, 121) as the object. "Himself" is a natural suggestion in view of Jesus' last words from the cross (John 19:30; cf. Luke 23:46), in view of the almost formulaic expression that Christ "gave himself up" to death (Gal 1:4; 2:20; Eph 5:2, 25; 1 Tim 2:6; Titus 2:14; cf. Mark 10:45//Matt 20:28), and perhaps also in view of Peter's advice to those who suffer to "entrust their lives to the faithful Creator by doing good" (4:19). Yet the immediate context makes it more likely that Jesus' enemies are the implied object here, just as they are of the verbs "insult in return" and "threatened" in the two preceding clauses (Goppelt, 208, comes close to this by supplying "das Gericht," or "the judgment" as the object of the verb, and even Kelly's "his

cause" is moving in this direction).

Although in v 23 paradidonai does not have the grim connotation of "consign" that it has, e.g., in I Cor 5:5 and I Tim 1:20, it functions grammatically in a similar way (i.e., BG[D], 614–15.1b, rather than 2).Jesus leaves his tormentors' fate in the hands of God the righteous judge (cf. Paul's admonition to "leave room for the wrath" in a context of nonretaliation in Rom 12:19). "The One who judges justly" corresponds to "the One who judges impartially according to each person's work" in 1:17 and clearly refers to God (cf. also 4:5).

24 o" ta" amartia" hmwn auto" anhegken en tw swmati autou ep to xukon, "He himself carried our sins in his body to the cross." Peter's attention now returns to Isa 53, especially vv 4 (outo" ta" amartia" hmwn ferei) and 12b (kai auto" amartiasm polwn anhneken). Peter once again (as in v 22) introduces his Isaiah citation with o" (cf. Pol. *Phil.* 8.1, where o" introduces the same citations in reverse order). For the polwn, "many," of Isa 53:12b, which may have seemed too impersonal and too wide in its application (cf. Heb 9:28), Peter substitutes the ta" amartia" of 53:4 (cf. v 5) in order to bring the text to bear on the common experience of himself and his readers. With this, he shifts back from the second person to the first person plural for the first time since 1:3.

Having quoted the words from Isaiah, Peter appends his distinctive Christian interpretation. The phrase en tw swnati autou ("in his body"; cf. Col 1:22; Rom 7:4) interprets the emphatic auto" ("himself," cf. Isa 53:12b; also 53:5, 12a), while epi to xulon ("to the cross") focuses the anhnegken of Isaiah explicitly on the circumstances of Christ's death (Pol. *Phil.* 8.1 appears to represent a further development, in which auto" disappears and is replaced by the phrase tw idiw swmati, "his own body").

cxulon, lit., "wood," was used in ancient literature (especially the LX[X] and Jewish literature) to refer to a stake or gallows (BG[D], 549.1c). It becomes in the N[T] an almost technical word for the cross of Jesus (Acts 5:30; 10:39; Gal 3:13; cf. *Barn.* 5.13), particularly in the expression epi xulou, "on a cross," based in all likelihood on the LX[X] of Deut 21:23 (see Gal 3:13, its earliest Christian occurrence).

Peter's epi to xulon (in the accusative with the definite article) is different, suggesting the translation, "to the cross" (cf. Pol. *Phil.* 8.1, which again follows Peter's language). Some (e.g. Bigg, 147; Schelkle, 85) have gone so far as to suggest here a parallel to the common LX[X] expression for the offering of sacrifice, anaferein epi to qusiasthrion, with the apparent implication that Jesus as High Priest, with the cross as his altar, "offers up" the sins of his people to God as a sacrifice. This proposal has a certain appeal, first because of the use of ahnegken in 2:5 for the offering up of spiritual sacrifices, and second because the image of the Christian community as a priesthood (2:5, 9) naturally prompts a search of 1 Peter for the image of Jesus as High Priest as in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Yet the idea of Jesus offering up our sins as a sacrifice that God accepts is intolerable in any known Jewish or early Christian context (contrast, e.g., the faultless and flawless lamb whose blood is shed for redemption according to 1:19). Schelkle's qualification that the sacrifice is not really the sins but Christ's body that bears the sins (85) is not convincing because sins is clearly the object of the verb (cf. Goppelt, 210). Heb 9:28, often adduced in support of this view, is not a real parallel because anhnegken in itself still means simply "bear" or "carry away," while a different word is introduced for the offering of Christ as a sacrifice.

Other reasons must be sought for Peter's epi to xulon in place of the more common epi

xulou. First, the present passage is no longer linked to Deut 21:23 (as Acts 5:30 and 10:39 are by the participle kremasante"; cf. Gal 3:13); second, the emphasis is not on the shame or curse of being hanged on the cross (as in Acts, Galatians, and *Barn.* 5.13) but rather on the removal of sins which the cross of Christ accomplished (cf. v 24b). This, and not the supposition of a priestly meaning for anhnegken, is the reason for the translation, "He himself carried our sins in his body to the cross"; the point is simply that he carried them away.

ina tai" amartoai" apopgenomenoi th dikaiosunh zhswmen, "so that we, having parted with those sins, might live for what is right" (lit., "for righteousness"). The thought is close to Paul's in Rom 6:11: "So you too must consider yourselves dead to sin, but alive to God through Jesus Christ" (cf. vv 7–8; 2 Cor 5:14b). The contrast with zhswmen, "live," suggests the translation "die," a legitimate rendering of apoginesqai (BG[D], 89), but Peter is less bold than Paul in his use of metaphor (cf. his tendency to add to his metaphors such qualifiers as "in your mind" in 1:13 or "spiritual" in 2:2, 5). In place of apoqnhskein, the common verb for "die," apogineqai serves Peter as a euphemism, with the meaning "to be away" or "to depart." This verb would normally be followed by the genitive of separation (BD[F], § 180; this construction is used with words for sin or evil, e.g., in Thucydides 1.39.3; Josephus, *Ant.* Jud 19.178). In the present passage, the dative tai" amartiai" defines the relationship affected by the death or departure, much like Paul's th amartia in Rom 6:11 (cf. BD[F], § 188.2, not § 189 as the authors suggest). The plural is concrete where Paul's singular is abstract, and the definite article marks a previous reference: "those sins" are the sins mentioned in v 24a and, in Isaiah, the sins Christ carried to the cross. Once again Peter envisions for his readers a clean break with the natural impulses of their Gentile past (1:14; 2:11; cf. 4:2), impulses now exposed as sins in the light of Christ's example and redemptive sacrifice. The only difference between this passage and the ones that speak of the impulses is that here Peter includes himself (and perhaps the Jewish Christianity with which he is identified) as having made a new start by parting with the sins of the past (cf. the statement in 1:3 that God "gave us new birth by raising Jesus Christ from the dead").

ina tai" amartiai apoyenomenoi th … dikalosunh zhswmen, "so that we … might live for what is right." Peter's reason for preferring the dative to the genitive is now made clear. Because the dative is required here (again cf. BD[F], § 188.2), he has introduced it already in the preceding participial construction for the sake of rhetorical symmetry. The renunciation of sins is not an end in itself but is preliminary to the positive goal of living for what is right (i.e., for doing good as set forth in 2:12, 13–17, 18–20). dhswmen points not to the resurrection or the life of the future with God (as, e.g., in 1 Thess 5:10) but to a new kind of life in the present world (cf. Titus 2:12; 1 John 4:9).

Living for dikaiosuh, or "what is right," is to Peter the equivalent of living for God or for Christ (just as "suffering for what is right" in 3:14 is much the same as "being ridiculed for the name of Christ" in 4:14). Pol. *Phil.* 8.1b paraphrases Peter's language: "so that we might live in him." The double contrast (i.e., sin/righteousness, death/life) is characteristic of Paul's argument in Romans (cf. 5:17, 21; 6:12–13, 16–23; 8:10) and keeps alive the distinct possibility of Peter's acquaintance with that epistle (cf. 2:6–8, 13–14).

ou tw mwlwpi iaqhte, "By his wounding [lit., 'by the wounding of whom'] you have been healed." Returning to his biblical text, Peter now cites Isa 53:5b, which he adapts to his own context (contrast the exact quotations in *1 Cle*[m] 16.5 and *Barn.* 5.2). First, he replaces Isaiah's autou with the relative pronoun autou (concluding the series of relative clauses

that began in v 22). Second, by changing Isaiah's iaqhmen to iaqhte, he reverts to the second person plural address which dominates his epistle but from which he had momentarily departed at the beginning of this verse. His purpose is to bring the exhortation back to the point at which it began, the conversion of his Gentile readers, represented by the eklhqhte of v 21a, and in this way to set the stage for v 25.

Like Isaiah before him, Peter uses physical healing as a metaphor for religious conversion, as he will explain in v 25 (in the Gospel tradition, cf. Mark 2:17; Luke 4:23). It is possible, although far from certain, that this verse in Isa 53 caught his attention because of the appropriateness of tw mwlwpi in a section ostensibly addressed to slaves (cf. perhaps the koafizomenoi of v 20). Caution is necessary because the wound or wounding is Christ's alone. tw mwwpi is singular and therefore not to be translated "bruises" or "stripes" (cf. plhgh in a similar context in *Barn.* 7.2). The language is only marginally more appropriate—if at all—for slaves than for any other group of believers (cf. Goppelt, 211).

More to the point is the fact that this term lends itself to Peter's apparent intention throughout vv 18–25 to avoid saying in so many words that Christ "died"; even in the rest of the epistle, the only real exception is the apparently traditional phrase "put to death in the flesh" in 3:18, although the implication is there in later references to his "suffering" (3:18; 4:1) and in two references to his resurrection "from the dead" (1:3, 21). In the present context, Christ "suffered" (vv 21, 23), he "was insulted" (v 23), he even "carried our sins … to the cross" (v 24a); he experienced "wounding," yet Peter views him not as dead for a time and then raised to life but as somehow alive through it all, waiting for his straying sheep to return. Jesus' resurrection is clearly presupposed in the verse that follows but is never made explicit.

25 hte gar w" probata panwmenoi ala epestrafhte nun epi ton poimena kai episkopon twn yucwn umwn, "For you were going astray like sheep, but you have turned now to the Shepherd and Guardian of your souls." The thought of Isa 53:5b directs Peter's attention to 53:6, which he paraphrases in such a way that only the simile w" proBata from the Isaiah text remains intact. Having switched back to his customary second person plural in v 24b, Peter continues by changing the prophet's first person plural eplanhqhmen to a periphrastic in the second person (te … planwmenoi; cf. BD[F], § 353). At the same time, his insertion of a connecting gar links the metaphor of the straying sheep more closely to the metaphor of healing than was the case in Isaiah (once again contrast the exact citation of the Isaiah text in *1 Cle*[m] 16.6). In effect, v 25 defines what Peter means (and what he thinks Isaiah means) by healing.

hte looks back at the pre-Christian past of the epistle's readers (cf. 1:14, 18; 2:10). Where Isaiah (and Jewish tradition in general) saw the straying sheep as the Jewish people alienated from their God (e.g., Ezek 34:5–6; cf. Matt 9:36; 10:6; 15:24, where they are the "lost sheep of the house of Israel"), Peter sees them as Gentiles. Peter's perspective is similar to that of John's Gospel, with its vision of "other sheep … not of this fold" (John 10:16), and of "the scattered children of God" in contrast to the nation of Israel (11:52). Once more Peter adapts to his Gentile readers the terminology of Israel's ancient relationship to God (cf. his application of Hos 1:6, 9 to Gentile Christians in 2:10).

In the last clause of v 25, Peter moves beyond Isa 53 by announcing an end to the straying of the sheep and introducing the figure of the Shepherd. The epestrafte of this clause corresponds to the iaqhte at the end of v 24. Peter may have in mind here, as

Goppelt suggests (211), the association between "turning" and "healing" in Isa 6:10b LX^{x} (mhpote … epostreYwsin kai iasomai autou"), a text well known to N^{T} writers (cf. Matt 13:14; Mark 4:12; Acts 28:27; and note the linking of Isa 53:1 and Isa 6:10 in John 12:38–40), but it is just as likely that "turning" suggested itself naturally as the remedy for "going astray" (note the transitive use of epistrefein for "turning back the wanderers," with God as the subject in *1 Cle*^{m} 59.4, and with church elders as the subject in Pol. *Phil.* 6.1; cf. also *2 Cle*^{m} 17.2).

nun contrasts the present with the past, recalling the pote … nun of 2:10, except that in v 24b pote is only implied, not expressed. The "Shepherd" is clearly Christ (cf. the "Great Shepherd" in 5:4), now viewed as risen from the dead and exercising lordship over the Christian community. The transition between vv 21–25a and this last clause of chapter 2 is rather abrupt. Christ was last mentioned as wounded and carrying sins to the cross after much abuse, while the readers of the epistle were compared to a scattered flock of sheep. Now suddenly the sheep are back together, with Christ (very much alive) as the Shepherd who reunites them. Such a transition recalls other NT passages where Christ fulfills the shepherd role precisely by virtue of his resurrection from the dead: e.g., "I lay down my life, that I might take it again" (John 10:17); "The God ot peace, who brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep" (Heb 13:20); and especially "It is written, 'I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered,' but after I am raised up I will lead you into Galilee" (Mark 14:27–28//Matt 26:31–32; cf. Mark 16:7//Matt 28:7).

The metaphor of Christ as Shepherd (implicit already in Mark 6:34; Matt 10:6; 15:24; Luke 15:3–7//Matt 18:12–14) and the more ancient figure of God as Shepherd of Israel (e.g., Ps 23; Isa 40:11; Ezek 34:11–16; cf. Philo, *Agr.* 50–52) were probably well known to Peter and to his readers. True to his tendency not to leave metaphors unqualified or unexplained, Peter adds the more functional term episkopo" to interpret the metaphorical poimhn (cf. Goppelt, 211). episkopo" combines the ideas of God's close and tireless scrutiny of the human heart, on the one hand, and the protecting care of his people, on the other. Although it is doubtful that the two are ever entirely separated, the emphasis here is on the latter. God as episkopo" in the LX^{x} (Job 20:29; Wisd Sol 1:6) and in Philo (Philo, *Leg. All.* 3.43; *Mut. Nom.* 39, 216; Philo, *Som.* 1.91) is the all-seeing observer and judge (as is Jesus in Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 4.17), but episkopo" in 1 Peter is more pastoral by virtue of its association with poimhn (cf. 5:2 and the accompanying Note b*).
The pastoral sense is clearly seen in *1 Cle*^{m} 59.3, where God is both "the Creator (ktisth"; cf. 1 Pet 4:19) and Guardian (episkopo") of every spirit." It is possible, in fact, that the term episkopo" (which in time acquired the technical sense of bishop) has been chosen with an analogy in view between the risen Christ's care tor his people and the ministry of the older members of Christian congregations to those who are younger (cf. 5:1–4, where the flock to be cared for is designated as God's flock, and where Christ himself is the "great Shepherd"; also Acts 20:28, where the episkopoi who "shepherd the congregation of God" are specifically the Ephesian elders). This analogy is made explicit in Ignatius (*Magn.* 3.1; cf. 6.1) and preserved in the traditional English versions of 1 Peter (note, e.g., the original KJ^{v}: "the shepheard and Bishop of your soules"). Before even beginning to discuss the ministry of Christians to one another (4:7–11; 5:1–4), Peter here establishes the priority and supremacy of the risen Christ's ministry to all who turn to him (cf. the tradition in John 21:15–17 that assigns to Peter the task of shepherding Christ's flock).

twn yucwn umwn, "of your souls." yucai (especially plural) is a common expression in

I Peter for people's lives (cf. 1:9, 22; 3:20; 4:19; in the singular, 2:11), always in some connection with salvation or ultimate well-being. The phrase belongs grammatically either with "Shepherd and Guardian" or with "Guardian" alone, probably the latter because "Guardian of your souls" plausibly interprets the shepherd metaphor. A cognate expression, en episkoph yucwn, "at the examination of souls," is used in Wisd Sol 3:13 for God's investigative judgment at the end of the age (cf. Peter's en hmera episkoph" in 2:12), but the thought here is closer to that of Wisd Sol 3:1, "the souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and no torment will ever touch them."

Explanation

Peter introduces his readers very cautiously to the possibility that they may have to suffer for Christ. Ostensibly he is addressing only household servants, and his emphasis even among them is not on the normal situation in which their masters are just and fair but on abnormal situations in which they are treated cruelly. The point of the passage is not submission or deference for its own sake; this was only the expected thing in the social setting to which and from which he writes. The accent is rather on the proper response to hostility or mistreatment by those who are in power.

The appeal to Christ as the example to those so mistreated is central to the argument of the epistle as a whole (cf. 3:18–4:1), and it is scarcely plausible that Peter introduced it solely to encourage those among his readers who happened to be household servants. Because he writes to all as "God's slaves" (2:16), the servants in the stereotyped household duty code can be used effectively as stand-ins tor all Christian believers in the provinces of Asia Minor. In this way Peter can begin to explore the possibility of widespread suffering for the sake of Christ without seeming to do so. To speculate directly about suffering at the hands of the state could be interpreted as subversive in itself, and in any event Peter has gone on record as expressing confidence in the basic justice of the emperor and his appointed representatives (2:13–14). Because cruel slave masters were an acknowledged fact of lite even in the fairest of political systems, Peter can write most freely of possible afflictions in a household duty code directed to slaves. As we have seers. Peter's emphasis on verbal rather than physical abuse in his rehearsal of Christ's experience (vv 22–23) is further evidence that he has in mind the common experience of all believers in the Roman Empire, not the unique predicament of slaves.

Even in such a context, his readers could hardly miss the point that "suffering unjustly" (v 19) was a real possibility for any of them, and not merely for those in a position of slavery. Using the traditional household duty code as his framework, Peter has provided in this section a summary of the Christian way of discipleship. His goal is that whatever the Christians in Asia Minor may suffer at the hands of the government or the populace will be undeserved and not a punishment tor actual social wrongs that they have committed (v 20). In themselves they are no less vulnerable to wrongdoing, than their pagan fellow citizens, but Peter points them to Christ who (did not yield to sin when he suffered unjustly and who bore their sins away to the cross. When he departed, Christ left behind an example for them to follow, an example of nonretaliation, whether in word or deed, and of quiet confidence in the righteous judgment of God. Those who have followed the way that he made for them will find that it leads back to Christ himself, now risen from the dead, the Shepherd and Guardian of their souls, probably understood here as ministering to his once-scattered flock through his appointed representatives in the Christian congregations (cf. 5:1–4).

Wives and Husbands (3:1–7)

Bibliography

Balch, D. L. *"Let Wives Be Submissive …": The Origin, Form, and Apolegetic Function of the Household Duty Code (Haustafel) in I Peter*. Diss., Yale, 1974; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1979. Cited as *Origin*. ———. *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in I Peter*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981. Cited as *Domestic Code*. **Brox, N.** " 'Sarah zum Beispiel …: Israel im 1 Petrusbrief." In *Kontinuität und Einheit*. F[S] F. Mussner. Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1981. 484–93. **Daube, D.** "Kerdainw as a Missionary Term." *HT*[R] 40 (1947) 102–20. **Fridrichsen, A.** "Till 1 Petr 3:7." *SE*[Å] 12 (1947) 127–31. **Hurtting, J. A.** "A Ruling from First Peter.'" *Ex*[p] 8/23 (1922) 420–27. **Manns, F.** "Sara, modèle de la femme obéissante: Etude de l'arrière-plan juif de I Pierre 3,5–6." *Be*[O] 26 (1984) 65 f., ff. **Patterson, D. K.** "Roles in Marriage: A Study in Submission: 1 Peter 3:1–7." *Theological Educator* 13 (1982) 70–79. **Reicke, B.** "Die Gnosis der Männer nach I. Ptr 3,7." In *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*. BZN[W] 21. Berlin, 1954. 296–304. **Rengstorf, K. H.** "Die neutestamentliche Mahnungen an die Frau, sich dem Manne unterzuordnen." In *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum*. F[S] O. Schmitz. Witten, 1953. 131–45. **Schlosser, J.** "1 Pierre 3,5b–6." *Bi*[b] 64.1 (1983) 409–10. **Scholer, D. M.** "Woman's Adornment: Some Historical and Hermeneutical Observations on the New Testament Passages 1 Tim 2:9–10, 1 Pet 3:3–4." *Daughters of Sarah* 6 (1980) 3–6. **Sylva, D.** "Translating and Interpreting 1 Peter 3:2." *B*[T] 34.1 (1983) 144–47.

Translation

[1]*You wives*[a] *too must defer to your husbands, so that any among them who are disobedient to the word might be won over by their wives' conduct without a word—* [2]*once they have observed*[b] *your reverent and pure conduct.* [3]*Your adornment should not consist of externals, such as your braided hair*[c] *and the gold you put on, or the clothes you wear.* [4]*It is rather the person hidden in your heart, with that imperishable quality of a humble and quiet spirit. It is [an adornment] most lavish in God's sight.* [5]*That was how the holy wives who hoped in God adorned themselves long ago, by deferring to their husbands.* [6]*Sarah, for example, obeyed Abraham when she called him 'Lord.' You have become her children; so do good and let nothing frighten you.* [7]*You husbands too must know how to live with a woman, showing her respect as somebody weaker—even as co-heirs*[d] *of the grace of life.*[e] *That way your prayers will not be hindered,*[f]

Notes

a. The word "wives" (gunaike") has a definite article in the majority of ancient manuscripts ([p72 a

[2 C P] Y and others), while a few important MS[s] (including [p81 a

[* A B)] lack the article. Several factors (the use of the article with andrasin and gunaikwn in the same verse, with andre" in v 7, and especially with oiketai in 2:18) seem to have led scribes to expect the article here as well. Though the lightly attested reading kai (a few minuscules, some v[g] MS[s] and Syr[.)]) provides additional indirect support for the definite article ai, the omission of the article is the more difficult, and probably the original, reading. There is no appreciable difference in meaning; the nominative with the article is equivalent to a vocative (cf. BD[F] § 147.3), while gunaike" without the article is a true

vocative (cf. newteroi in 5:5).

b. In place of the aorist participle epopteusante" some important ancient MS^{s} ($^{p72\ a}$

* and others) read the present epopteusonte" (cf. Note c* on 2:12). It is possible that an original present has been changed to an aorist just as it has in 2:12, but in this case the support for the aorist is stronger (including ^{B} and ^{C} as well as $^{A\ P}$ Y and the majority of later MS^{s}). In view of the frequent tendency of scribes to conform either of two roughly similar passages to the other, epopteusante" is to be preferred, though a firm choice is difficult.

c. "Hair" (tricwn) is omitted is some MS^{s} ($^{p72\ C}$ Y and others). The omission (which spoils the symmetrical threefold reference to hair, jewelry, and clothes) could be accidental, or it could reflect a certain confusion of emplokh with emplokion, used in the LX^{X} to refer to jewelry made of twisted gold (e.g., Exod 35:22; 36:22–25[39:15–18]); empokh" kai periqesw" would then be read with crusiwn: "the fashioning and putting on of gold ornaments." In any event, the omission is unlikely to be original, in view of Peter's apparent use of symmetry and the strong manuscript evidence for tricwn.

d. The majority of ancient MS^{s} (including $^{A\ C\ P}$ Y) have the nominative plural sugklhronomoi", referring to the husbands (the subject of the previous clauses). The earliest and best manuscripts, however ($^{p72\ p81\ a}$

$^{2\ B}$ v^{g} and others), favor the dative plural sugklhronomoi", referring to the wives. The dative is preferable, for w" kai with the dative matches the w" asqenesterw of the preceding clause. Scribes may have been confused by the fact that in the previous clause the husbands were spoken of in the plural and "the woman" in the singular. A plural in this clause was then naturally read as still referring to the husbands, overlooking the parallel between w" and w" kai with the dative. See B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 690–91; Goppelt, 222.

e. "Eternal" has been added to "life" by scribes in ^{p72} (zwh" aiwniou) and supplied in the Syriac Peshitta. The adjective "diversified" (poikilh") has similarly been inserted with "grace" in several manuscripts (^{a}

^{A} and others), probably influenced by the language of 4:10. The simple carito" was evidently too simple for some later scribes. Eternal life is implied in any case.
f. ^{p81} and ^{B} have "you will not be hindered in your prayers" (tai" proseucai" instead of ta" proseuca"), a reading probably introduced by scribes because the verb egkoptein is normally used in relation to persons rather than their activities.

Form/Structure/Setting

This final section of the household duty code that began at 2:13 focuses on wives and husbands (cf. Col 3:18–19; Eph 5:22–33; see also 1 Tim 2:915; Titus 2:3–5). It is the only section of the code that includes the mutual obligations of both parties, though the unevenness of six verses devoted to the wives' obligations and only one to those of the husbands again indicates the author's consistent interest in the "subordinate" or potentially oppressed partner in any given relationship. This is accented in the present passage by a particular reference to Christian wives married to unbelieving husbands (v lb).

The advice to wives, like the preceding advice to domestic slaves, can be divided into three parts: (a) the exhortation to "defer" or "be subject" to the one in authority (vv 1–2; cf. 2:18); (b) a further word of admonition about what is pleasing to God (vv 3–4; cf. 2:19–20); (c) a specific precedent for the kind of attitude or behavior the author has in mind (vv 5–6; cf. 2:21–25). The first two of these elements, though not the third, can be found in 2:13–17 as well (i.e., 2:13–14, 15–17). The concluding advice to husbands (v 7) has no parallel in either 2:13–17 or 2:18–25.

The first part (a) of each section is what gives it the character of a household duty code (cf., e.g., Col 3:18, 20, 22; Eph 5:21, 22; 6:1, 5). The second and third parts (b and c) are what give the code its distinct flavor and function in 1 Peter: i.e., "submission" or "deference" in certain social relationships is defined as "doing good," or doing what God requires, even in the face of hostility or danger (v 6; cf. 2:15, 20). The deference of wives to their husbands is closely associated in this passage with modesty in dress and adornment, just as it is in 1 Tim 2:9–10 and commonly in the Greco-Roman world. Though the author reserves his characteristic term agaqopoiein until near the end of his advice to wives (v 6), he anticipates it with the phrases "reverent and pure conduct" in v 2, and in v 4 "a humble and quiet spirit."

The appeal to precedent, like Peter's appeal to the suffering of Christ in 2:21–25, is midrashic in character. Because he is addressing women, women serve as his examples: probably the wives of Israel's patriarchs. The appeal is in two parts, the first rather general (v 5) and the second more specifically focused on Sarah (v 6). The precedent of the "holy wives who hoped in God" in v 5 is linked to the immediately preceding comments on bodily adornment by the introductory outw" gar pote and by the verb ekosmoun. It is linked to the exhortation with which the section began by the exact repetition of the words upotassomenai toi" andrasin from v 1. This participial expression, though imperatival in v 1 and circumstantial in v 5, forms an inclusion framing vv 1–5 and giving to v 6 the appearance of a postscript or afterthought. From the standpoint of content, however, v 6 plays a crucial role in Peter's argument by bringing the ancient precedents to bear on the experience of the epistle's readers ("you have become her children"), and reminding them once more (in the words, "let nothing frighten you") of the prospect, however slight, of hostility or suffering. It is v 6, as well, that exhibits the author's midrashic interests, not in a merely general way (as in v 5) and not in relation to an extended LX[X] passage (as in 2:21–25), but in relation to just one word (kurio", "Lord") in one biblical text (Gen 18:12 LX[X]). Yet v 6 is not Peter's sole contribution to an already-fixed or stereotyped household duty code. Most of vv 1–5 is best understood as his own composition: e.g., such characteristic Petrine expressions as "disobedient to the word" (v 1), "conduct" (anastrofh, vv 1, 2), "reverence" or "fear" (en fobw, v 2), "observed" (epopteasante", v 2), "imperishable" (tw afqartw, v 4), "hoped in God" (v 5), and the characteristic Petrine technique of appealing to biblical characters or incidents in very general as well as specific ways (v 5).

Only the twice-used participial expression upotassomenai toi" idioi" andrasin is likely to have been taken over unchanged from a formalized household duty code (see Titus 2:5; Eph 5:22, 24; and cf. Col 3:18). Though the material on women's adornment (vv 3–4) closely resembles 1 Tim 2:9–10, the wording of the passage probably represents Peter's independent adaptation of a traditional theme common to Jewish and Greco-Roman literature.

The concluding advice to husbands (v 7) avoids the stereotyped expression "Husbands, love your wives" (Oi andre" agapate ta" gunaika",) common to Col 3:19 and Eph 5:25. A possible reason is that the mutuality implied for Peter in the notion of "love" (cf. 1:22; 4:8) makes it inappropriate to fasten on this command as the special obligation of the husband more than the wife. In any event, Peter bypasses the fixed expression and accents in his own way both the differentiation of the sexes in the marriage relationship (v 7a) and their partnership in the hope of eternal life (v 7b).

Comment

1 Omoiw" gunaike", upotassomenai toi" idioi" andrasin, "You wives too must defer to your husbands." The omoiw" is simply a connective ("likewise" in the sense of "also" or "too"), without implication that the deference of wives to husbands is the same as that of slaves to masters (in v 7 and in 5:5 the relationships indicated are not even parallel, but reciprocal). The use of the participle as an imperative follows the precedent of 2:18, and this will continue in vv 6b, 7, and 9. The specific participial phrase about wives "deferring to their husbands," whether imperatival (as here, and implicitly in Eph 5:22; cf. the actual imperative form in Col 3:18), or whether simply descriptive (as in v 5b and Titus 2:5), was probably a standard component in an early Christian adaptation of Jewish or Hellenistic household duty codes.

The redundant idioi" ("your own"; cf. v 5b: Eph 5:22; . Titus 2:5) is used because gunaike" and andre" can mean, respectively, either "women" and "men," or "wives" and "husbands" (BG^{D}, 66.1; 168.1, 2). The phrase "your own men" (i.e., "your husbands") makes explicit what is clearly implied in any case: that the subject is the marriage relationship, not women and men viewed generically. The clarification is unnecessary. Paul, according to the best manuscripts, does not bother with idioi either in Col 3:18 or in connection with the husbands' obligation in Col 3:19 and Eph 5:25. And Peter himself does not hesitate to introduce generic language into a discussion of the marriage relationship in v 7! It is likely, therefore, that idioi" was simply part of a set phrase taken over or remembered from the household duty code.

ina kai ei tine" apeiqousin tw logw, "so that any among them who are disobedient to the word." The clause introduced by kai ei tine" (lit., "even if any … ") represents only a possibility, but it is on this possibility that Peter fastens his attention. The phrase "disobedient to the word" (cf. 2:8) points to situations where Christian wives were married to unbelieving husbands (cf. the phrase, "disobedient to the gospel of God," in 4:17; also perhaps the "disobedient spirits" of 3:19–20). Balch (*Domestic Code*, 99) comments that this "disobedience" entails for Peter "more than passive disbelief. Some husbands were almost certainly among those actively … slandering the Christians" (e.g., in 2:12, 15; 3:9, 16). He suggests further that Peter's advice to women married to such husbands "should be understood against the social background in which a wife was expected to accept the customs and religious rites of her husband" (e.g., see Balch, *Origin*, 240–46). In society's eyes these women were already highly insubordinate just by virtue of their Christian commitment, and Peter is concerned that they not compound the difficulty by abrasive or troublesome behavior (see the graphic description in Apuleius, Metamorphoses 9.14, of a wife, possibly a Christian, who substituted for "our sure religion an only god by herself"). Peter's unqualified advice to Christian wives to "defer to your

husbands" must be seen in this light.

dia th" twn gunaikwn anastrfh" aneu logou kerdhqhsontai, "might be won over by their wives' conduct without a word." For the anastrofh, or "conduct," of Christians, cf. 1:15, and for its power to bring unbelievers to repentance, 2:12. The principal difference is that the verb kerdhqhsontai, "won over," focuses on the actual process of conversion, or changing one's attitude, rather than on the ultimate outcome at the "day of visitation," as in 2:12 (cf. 1 Cor 9:19–22, where the same verb is used as a missionary term equivalent to "save"; also Matt 18:15; see Daube, 109–20). On the future indicative (-sontai) in place of an aorist subjunctive, see BD[F], § 369.2.

aneu logou, "without a word," represents a verbal play on "disobedient to the word" in the previous clause. Those who are impervious to the proclaimed word of the Christian gospel can and will be changed by the unspoken testimony of their own devoted wives (cf. the "humble and quiet spirit" in v 4). The notion of a testimony borne by conduct is common enough in the N[T] (not least in 1 Peter), but this is the only instance in which words are specifically excluded. The author's point is not to forbid verbal testimony by Christian wives but to suggest tactfully that such testimony is not obligatory, and sometimes not helpful (contrast 1 Tim 2:11–12, where silence becomes in certain circumstances an actual obligation for the wife).

2 epopteusante" thn en fobw agnhn anastrfhn umwn, "once they have observed your reverent and pure conduct." Almost as an afterthought, the author explains (somewhat redundantly) the phrase "by their wives' conduct," from the preceding verse. What exactly was implied in the preposition with which that phrase began? What kind of conduct leads someone to conversion? The author's clarification is modeled on 2:12 and, to a lesser extent, 2:18. The participle epopteusante", "once they have noticed," echoes the epopteuonte" of 2:12 which in a similar way followed and clarified a prepositional phrase of its own (i.e., ek twn kalwn ergwn, "from your good works," corresponding to "by their wives' conduct" in the present passage). In each case, "observing" the works or conduct of Christians is what leads their enemies to God (contra Balch, *Origin*, 249). The difference in the tenses of the two participles is more difficult to explain. Probably in 2:12 the participle is used instrumentally ("from the good works—i.e., by observing them"), while here the accent is on temporal sequence ("once they have observed … ").

But what is it about "their wives' conduct" that the unbelieving husbands will notice? That it is "reverent" and that it is "pure." The prepositional phrase en fobw virtually makes of fobo" an adjective, "reverent" (fobo" has no cognate adjective with this meaning; fobero" means "frightful" or "terrifying"). "Reverent" refers to the wives' conduct toward God (cf. 1:17; 2:17, 18) and not toward their unbelieving husbands (the watchword in the latter relationship is the opposite: "let nothing frighten you," v 6; cf. 3:14). It is possible that agno" has been chosen here instead of agio" because its connotation of chastity or sexual purity fits the context of advice to women (cf. BG[D], 12.2); yet Peter can also refer in v 5 to "the holy [agiai] wives." That it appropriately characterizes all Christians, male or female, is indicated by the author's use of the cognate verb, "purify," in 1:22. They have all "purified their souls by obedience to the truth," yet Peter may have included the adjective in his characterization of Christian wives in order to accent for them the virtue of chastity and faithfulness in marriage. Both "reverence" and "purity" are here understood as qualities visible even to "disobedient" husbands. A pagan married to a Christian woman must be able to see that his wife's conduct is "reverent" and "pure" by Roman standards even

though she cannot join him in the worship of his gods. These virtues, while directed toward God and not toward her husband, are nonetheless for her husband's benefit.

In clarifying the phrase "by the wives' conduct" from the preceding verse, Peter substitutes umwn for the more generalized twn gunaikwn in v 1, thus personalizing his advice and resuming the directness of the vocative with which he began (cf. 2:18–20, where he similarly begins with a vocative in v 18, immediately generalizes his appeal in v 19, and settles into the second person direct address only in v 20). In the present instance, he is sparing in his use of the second person, returning to it only in v 6b (egenhqhte), after a more generalized characterization of the proper conduct of women in vv 3–6a.

3 wn estw ouc o exwqen ekplokh" tricwn kai periqesew" crusiwn h endusew" imatiwn kosmo", "Your adornment should not consist of externals, such as your braided hair and the gold you put on, or the clothes you wear." It is important not to confuse the specialized use of kosmo" here as "adornment" (in derivation from the verb kosnein; BG^{D,} 445.1) with its more common meaning of "world" (BG^{D,} 445–47.2–8). Peter is not capitalizing on the use of "world" in some traditions in a negative sense (BG^{D,} 446.7) to make the point that jewelry or braided hair is "worldly," or evil, simply by his choice of vocabulary! Rather, he is contrasting outward adornment with good deeds, in the manner of 1 Tim 2:9–10.

According to Balch, the Neopythagorean Phintys argued in a similar way that a good woman will "avoid excessive ornament, luxury, and superfluous clothes" and "not decorate her person with gold and emeralds." Rather she will "adorn her person through modesty" (*Concerning the Temperance of a Woman*, 153.19–22; see Balch, *Origin*, 106). Perictione, another Neopythagorean, gave instructions about "clothes, bathing, anointing, dressing the hair, and … decoration from gold and jewels. For whatever of a sumptuous nature is employed by women in eating and drinking, in garments and trinkets, renders them disposed to be guilty of every crime, and to be unjust both to their husband's bed and to every other person" (*On the Harmony of a Woman*, 143.10–14), and concluded as well that "the beauty which is produced by prudence and not by these particulars, pleases women that are well born" (143.26–28; see Balch, *Origin*, 103–4; *Domestic Code*, 101). In reference to a statement that "adornment is that which adorns," Plutarch comments: "that adorns or decorates a woman which makes her more decorous. It is not gold or precious stones or scarlet that makes her such, but whatever invests her with that something which betokens dignity, good behavior and modesty" (*Mor* 141E; LC^{L} 2.317–19). Among the Romans, Juvenal associated extravagant dress and makeup with unfaithfulness, denouncing the woman who "encircles her neck with green emeralds and fastens huge pearls to her elongated ears; there is nothing more intolerable than a wealthy woman. Meanwhile she ridiculously puffs out and disfigures her face with lumps of dough; she reeks of rich Poppaean unguents which stick to the lips of her unfortunate husband. Her lover she will meet with a clean-washed skin; but when does she ever care to look nice at home?" (*Satire* 6.457–65; LC^{L,} 121–23). Kindred sentiments (not always so colorfully expressed!) were common both in Judaism and in the Greco-Roman world (cf., e.g., Isa 3:18–24; *1 Enoc*^{h} 8.1; *T. Reub.* 5.1, 5; Philo, *Migr. Abr.* 97; Philo, *Virt.* 39–40; Epictetus, *Enchiridion* 40; Seneca, *Ben* 7.9; cf. Selwyn, 183–84).

The appeal to wives in the matter of adornment is symmetrically arranged. The ouc, "not," of this verse anticipates the alla, "rather." with which v 4 begins. The "adornment [kosmo"] … in externals" seems to anticipate a contrast with a different kosmo" centered

in the heart (cf. 1 Tim 2:9–10), but Peter will shift his attention in v 4 away from "adornment" (whether extravagant or modest!) and toward the "person" herself (anqrwpo").

The negative side of the appeal (i.e., the present verse) is built around three similarly constructed pairs:

i. emplokh" tricwn, lit., "braiding of hairs"
ii. periqesew" crusiwn, lit., "putting on of gold things"
iii. endusew" imatiwn, lit., "wearing of clothes"

Each pair consists of a genitive singular linked to a genitive plural, and describes some aspect of a woman's adornment. The three pairs are not strictly coordinate in that (i) and (ii) are connected by kai ("and") while (ii) and (iii) are connected by h ("or"). The rejected variant that omits tricwn so as to yield two phrases instead of three (see Note c*) at least has the merit of calling attention to a particularly close link between (i) and (ii). Braiding hair and donning jewelry can be viewed together as an extravagance in itself (especially against the background of comments like those above) in a way in which the simple "wearing of clothes" obviously cannot. The incorporation of all three into his appeal suggests that Peter's interest is not so much in denouncing certain modes of dress for their own sake, as in making the more general point that outward adornment—of any kind—is not what counts in the sight of God. Clearly, he did not approve braided hair and conspicuous jewelry with dresses to match, and there is every indication that he shared the viewpoint of his contemporaries that such things were sexually provocative (see, e.g., Balch, *Origin*, 251–53). Yet his polemic against these things is vague and almost perfunctory compared to that of both pagan philosophers and later Christian fathers (see, e.g., Tertullian, *On the Apparel of Women*, AN[F], 4.14–25). His negative appeal in v 3 is important primarily as a way of accenting the positive appeal that follows in v 4. In particular, there is no evidence that Peter is mounting a polemic against the flamboyant dress that characterized women's participation in the Eastern cults of Artemis and Isis (see Balch, *Origin*, 252–53; *Domestic Code*, 101–2). He is simply making sure that Christian women will not be perceived by their husbands—or by society in general—as in any way similar to the female adherents of these cults.

4 all o krupto" th" kardia" anqrwpo" en tw afqartw tou praew" kai hsuciou pneumato" o estin enwpion tou qeou polutele", "It is rather the person hidden in your heart, with that imperishable quality of a humble and quiet spirit. It is [an adornment] most lavish in God's sight."

Where pagan writers referred briefly to "modesty" or "prudence," "dignit)" or "good behavior," Peter (like I Tim 2:9–10) goes into more detail on the positive side. all ("rather") introduces a consistent contrast between exwqen ("external") and krupto" ("hidden"), between kosmo" ("adornment") and anqrwpo" (the "person" under the adornment), and between "hair," "gold," and "clothes," and the "heart" of a woman (cf. Selwyn, 184). Balch (*Dometic Code*, 102) describes the contrast as "eschatological," citing 1:7, where Peter describes the genuine faith of Christians as "far more precious [polutimoteron] than perishing [apollumenou] gold." A similar contrast is evident in 1:18 between "perishable things [fqartoi"] such as silver and gold" and the "precious blood" (timiw aimati) of Christ.

Though Balch's use of the term "eschatological" is not helpful here, the contrast in each

instance is between what human society values and what God values (cf. also the "choice and precious [eklekton entimon] cornerstone," established by God but rejected by human beings, in 2:4, 6). But where Peter used entimo" in 2:4, 6 and timoi" in 1:19 (both with the meaning "valuable," or "precious"), and polutimo" in 1:7 (with the heightened meaning "very precious," in the comparative "far more precious"), here he introduces a different word, polutelh" (lit., "lavish" or "very expensive"). Where the other terms focused on intrinsic value, polutelh" focuses on market value. "Extravagance" or "lavish expense" (poluteleia) was in fact part of the vocabulary used in traditional denunciations of wealthy women and their adornments (it is, e.g., translated "of a sumptuous nature" in the passage from Perictione cited above; cf. polutelh as "lavish" in relation to a woman and her wardrobe in Musonius, *Orations* 40:17–20 Lutz; also "clothing and jewelry of the costly kind" [polutelwn] in Plutarch, *Mor* 141E). Even 1 Timothy uses polutelh" in this derogatory sense (2:9), but Peter has boldly shifted it to the positive side, joining it to the phrase enwpion tou qeou ("in the sight of God") and using it to heighten his dominant contrast between human and divine values (cf. Balch, *Domestic Code*, 102).

o krupto" th" kardia" anqrwpo", lit., "the hidden person of the heart." It is possible, though far from certain, that krupto" hints at the eschatological contrast Balch is proposing (in the sense the what is now hidden will soon be revealed; cf. Col 3:3–4; Matt 10:26//Luke 12:2//Mark 4:22). It is also possible to read this verse in light of Paul's distinction in 2 Cor 4:16 between "our outward person" (o exw hmwn anqrwpo") and "our inner person" (o esw hmwn; cf. Rom 7:22; Eph 3:16), with its accompanying contrast between visible but transient things and the unseen eternal things (cf. 2 Cor 4:17–18). Selwyn may or may not be right that Peter's choice of krupto" instead of krupto" (in contrast to exwqen) "points to his independence of St Paul" (184), but he is surely right in concluding that Peter's "thought here is ethical rather than metaphysical (as in 2 Cor iv. 16)."

th" kardia", "of the heart," defines the "hidden person" to which Peter refers (cf. Rom 2:29). "The heart" suggests sincerity (cf. 1:22). h is the place where one's allegiances are formed, and for Christians the place where their allegiance to Jesus Christ as Lord is firmly rooted (3:15). A person's "heart" is who that person is, at the deepest and most private level, and for Christian wives, according to Peter, it is the wellspring of their beauty.

en tw afqartw tou praew" kai hsuciou pneunato", "with that imperishable quality of a humble and quiet spirit." The neuter to afqarton here denotes a quality of imperishability (BD^{F}, § 263.2) more precisely defined by the words that follow. The vocabulary is characteristic of 1 Peter as a whole: note the "incorruptible" inheritance ot 1:4, the redemption "not with perishable things" in 1:18, and the rebirth "not from the planting of perishable seed but from imperishable" in 1:23. Because Christian women are redeemed and reborn, the imperishable quality (of which Peter speaks is now "natural" to them. It is further defined as belonging to "a humble and quiet spirit." tou pneumato"; need not be definite. Its definite article is accounted for by its dependence on the preceding tw afqartw (see A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 780–81). In particular, it is not the "Holy Spirit" (at least as normally defined; cf., e.g., 1:2, 12; 4:14), but rather the woman's new disposition in Christ (cf. BGD, 675.3c). It is a "humble and quiet" disposition first in the sight of God (as the next phrase indicates), and then in relation to the women's husbands and presumably others as well (cf. *1 Cle*^{m} 21.7: "let [wives] make the gentleness of their tongue known by their silence").

"Humility" in 1 Peter is a virtue required of all Christians, an imitation of Christ himself, and the result of coming to him by faith. For the combination of prau" and hsucio", cf. *1 Cle*[m] 13.4; *Barn.* 19.4; 5.2.3, 6.2.3, and especially 11.8 (in reference to testing prophets): "whoever has the spirit that is from above is humble and quiet and lowly minded" (prau" … kai hsucio" kai tapeinofrwn; 1 Pet 5:5–6). The tests for the Spirit in Christian prophecy are ethical, and the ethical qualities used to test prophets are qualities that should characterize any Christian (cf. also 5.2.6: "Therefore that delicate spirit [the Holy Spirit?] which is unaccustomed to dwell with an evil spirit … departs from such a man, and seeks to dwell with humility and quietness" (meta praothto" kai hsucia"). Peter connects these same qualities with the disposition of a Christian wife, and though he may have assumed that this disposition, or pneuma, was given her "from above" and therefore somehow equivalent to the Holy Spirit (cf. Knopf, 125), he never makes that explicit.

What is clear in any case is that there is nothing distinctly feminine about a "humble and quiet spirit." "Humility," along with "reverence," is urged on men and women alike in situations where their Christian hope is challenged (3:16; the phrase "a spirit of humility" is found in 1 Cor 4:21 and Gal 6:1). Though "quietness" (in the sense of silence: BG[D,] 349.2) is part of a prohibition of teaching by women in 1 Tim 2:11–12, in those places where hsucia is a virtue (as, e.g., 2 Thess 3:12; cf. 1 Thess 4:11; 1 Tim 2:2: cf. *Did.* 3:8; 8.10; also *Pss. Sol.* 12.5), it is never a virtue intended for women alone.

o estin enwpion tou qeou polutele", "It is [an adornment] most lavish in God's sight." 1 Sam 16:6–7 is often cited here: "… for the Lord sees not as man sees; man looks on the outward appearance, but the Lord looks on the heart" (cf. also Matt 6:4, 6, 18). "An adornment" is supplied in the English translation because the likely antecedent of the pronoun o is neither to afqarton nor pneuma but all of v 4 up to this point (Goppelt, 218; Beare, 155–56). As we have seen, the word "adornment," or kosmo", is not repeated from v 3 because the best adornment is the real self (anqrwpo"), yet "adornment" is still the topic of discussion, as the outw" … ekosmoun of v 5 testifies.

On polutelh" as a vice, see above. On the other hand, polutelh is used (in a way characteristic of the LX[X)] of the "lavish, choice and precious cornerstone" in Isa 28:16 (cf. *Barn.* 6.2), but in a form of the LX[X] text with which Peter seems not to be familiar when he cites the passage in 2:6. Though the phrase enwpion tou qeou corresponds in meaning to the para de qew of 2:4 (by which Peter designates Isaiah's "stone" as choice and precious specifically from God's perspective), it is precarious to suggest that the Isaiah text (in a different textual tradition!) is still in his mind a whole chapter later. His use of polutelh" in a positive sense here is more akin to the description in 4.2.2 of the repentant sinner who "no longer does what is evil, but does what is good lavishly [polutelw"] and humbles [tapeinoi] his soul. …" What is from a human standpoint quiet and self-effacing is "in God's sight" wonderfully extravagant! The phrase enwpion tou qeou is what makes the difference. This phrase and its equivalents are used in a wide variety of ways in the LX[X] and N[T,] but the accent here is on God's acceptance or positive verdict on a certain pattern of behavior (cf. BG[D,] 270.3; several of the passages in this category have to do with worship, or with ethical behavior regarded as a form of worship: see, e.g., Luke 1:75; Acts 10:31; 1 Tim 2:3; 5:4; Heb 13:21; 1 John 3:22; cf. Rev 8:4). God views a humble and quiet spirit as a "lavish adornment," obviously not in the sense of frowning on it, but in the sense of accepting it as a prayer from the heart or a generous sacrifice (cf. 2:5).

5 outw" gar pote, "That was how … long ago." The gar (as in 4:6; cf. oti in 2:21; 3:18) introduces illustrative material, as Peter draws O[T] support for his advice to wives. That outw" resumes vv 1–4 in their entirety, and not just vv 3–4, is shown by the repetition that will shortly follow of the words, "deferring to their husbands" (cf. v 1). The "humble and quiet spirit" drew together for Peter the twin themes of wifely submission and wifely adornment, and in effect made them one by defining the latter in terms of the former. The appeal to examples from "long ago" will now reinforce that identification. pote here introduces a parallel with the past (as in 3:20), not a contrast (as in 2:10).

ai agiai gunaike" ai elpizousai ei" qeon, "the holy wives who hoped in God." A group out of the biblical past is here introduced definitely (with the article) rather than indefinitely (like the anarthrous profhtai, "prophets," in 1:10, or nekroi", "dead ones" in 4:6). For similarly definite expressions with agio" (whether past or contemporary in their reference), cf. "the holy prophets" (2 Pet 3:2; cf. Luke 1:70; Acts 3:21), "the holy apostles and prophets" (Eph 3:5), "the holy ones who slept" (Matt 27:52), "the holy angels" (Mark 8:38), or "the holy presbyters" (*Magn.* 3.1). Peter's "holy wives" were Christians before the coming of Christ (see above, pp. 43–44), and therefore examples to be emulated by the epistle's readers. They were "holy," even as Christians are called to be holy (1:15; cf. 2:5, 9), and they "hoped in God" even as Christians do. It is misguided to distinguish their ancient Jewish hope "in God" from a Christian's hope "in Christ." Peter has already established that the Jewish prophets knew "the spirit of Christ" and prophesied of him (1:10–12), while the Christian hope now awakened by the resurrection of Jesus is specifically a "hope in God" (1:21; cf. 1:3). Nor is it plausible that the verb "hoped" is chosen here instead of "believed" because "every devout Jewish mother hoped that she might be the mother of the Messiah" (Selwyn, 185). Rather, hope and faith are virtually synonymous in this epistle (cf. "faith and hope … in God," 1:21; also "hope," where "faith" might have been expected, in 3:15). The same is true in Hebrews: even Selwyn (185) calls attention to Sarah's "faith" in Heb 11:11.

Who were "the holy wives"? Clearly they were "wives" and not just "women," for Peter mentions their husbands. They could be simply the wives of "the righteous" or "the saints" of the O[T] (cf. the "dead" of 4:6) on the assumption that the latter were male, and married. But more likely Peter has in mind a more specific group, the four "matriarchs" of Jewish tradition: Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel, and Leah (the wives of Abraham and Isaac, and the two wives of Jacob). On the basis of such texts as Gen 49:26, Num 23:9, and Deut 33:15, the three patriarchs were compared to "mountains" and their four wives to "hills" (e.g., Tg. Yer. I[I]; *II;* also *Sipr*[e] *Deut* 33:15; Roš. Haš. 11a; see Str-[B] 1:29–30). Like their husbands (cf. *TDN*[T] 1:100), they were "holy," and Peter infers from the single example of Sarah that deference to their husbands was the common pattern of the holy wives' behavior.

ekosmoun eauta", "adorned themselves." The imperfect refers to customary or characteristic action in the past: they "used to adorn themselves" (cf. BD[F], § 325; Robertson, *Grammar*, 884). Peter is speaking metaphorically: the wives of the patriarchs fulfilled the ideal just set forth in vv 3–4.

upotassomenai toi" idioi" andrasin, "by deferring to their husbands." The participle could conceivably be taken as an imperative (Schlosser, 410), resuming precisely the command of v 1a ("you must defer to your husbands"). But (a) either a vocative preceding the participle (as in v 1a) or a second person verb in the context would have been expected as a signal that Peter was returning to direct address; (b) it is unlikely that the

closely related appeals to O^T examples in vv 5a and 6 would have been interrupted by a resumption of the command with which this segment of the household duty code began. The participial construction, therefore, though verbally identical to that of v 1a, must be taken circumstantially and not as an imperative. The repetition of the phrase rounds off vv 1–5a as a unit, even though Peter will elaborate further by singling out Sarah. In their immediate context, these words define the "adornment" of the holy wives—not braided hair, jewelry, or dresses, but quiet deference to their husbands. Peter introduces them as ethical examples for Christian wives; fashion is his metaphor for conduct (cf. anastrofh, v 1), and the core of his ethical demand here and elsewhere is humility and the love of enemies. Obviously the Jewish matriarchs are not perfect examples for this purpose because their husbands were not "disobedient to the word" (v 1), but they are the examples most readily at hand in biblical tradition.

6 w" Sarra uphkousen tw ßAbraam, kurion auton kalousa, "Sarah, for example, obeyed Abraham when she called him 'Lord.'" w" introduces a concrete example (cf. $BG^{D,}$ 897.4a). The reference is to Gen 18:12 LX^X where Sarah, on hearing of the promise of a son, laughed and said, "This has never yet happened to me, and my lord is too old" (o de kurio" mou presbutero"). Peter does not share the Genesis narrator's interest in Sarah's doubt or amusement (18:13–15) but focuses exclusively on her use of the title kurio" (Heb. /÷da) for her husband Abraham (cf. Tanḥuma hrc yyj "Life of Sarah," 29a cited in Str-^{B} 3:764). The explicit designation of a husband as "lord" over his wife was not a commonplace in ancient literature (cf., e.g., Plutarch, *Mor* 252B; and as an address, Esth 5:2a, $LX^{X),}$ despite the everpresent notion of male dominance in marriage. Its occurrence in Gen 18:12 LX^X catches Peter's attention, probably on the basis of earlier interpretive traditions.

There are puzzling aspects to Peter's basically simple argument. First, Abraham (unlike the husbands mentioned in vv 1–2) was obviously not an unbeliever, nor in any way hostile to his wife's faith. Balch's reference to "quiet conduct in response to slander" (*Domestic Code*, 103) is not as appropriate here as it might have been in connection with v 4. Balch does establish (104) a connection in Rabbinic interpretation between Gen 18:12–13 and the command to "seek peace" in Ps 33[34]:15b [14b] (also cited in 1 Pet 3:11), but his conclusion that "both proof texts were used by the author of 1 Peter to stress the importance of Christians seeking peace and harmony in their household relationships and with society" (105), though correct, hardly suggests a real link between the two passages in Peter's mind. Second, the use of kurio" invites confusion with a Christian's allegiance to Christ as Lord (cf. all the other uses of kurio" in 1 Peter: 1:3, 25; 2:3, 13; 3:12, 15). Third, Peter every where else uses the verb upotassesqai ("defer to") rather than upakouein ("obey") in his adaptation of the household duty code (i.e., 2:13, 18; 3:1, 5; cf. 5:5). Other N^T household codes use upakouein of the obedience of children to parents (Col 3:20; Eph 6:1) and slaves to masters (Col 3:22; Eph 6:5), but not of wives in relation to husbands. upakouein occurs nowhere else in 1 Peter, but the three instances of the cognate upakoh (1:2, 14, 22) all refer to Christian conversion or faith in God, not to social relationships. Fourth, the context of Sarah's remark in Gen 18:12 is not quiet deference to her "lord," but amused skepticism at the extravagant promise she has just heard.

The solution to these varied difficulties lies in not reading too much profound theology into Peter's simple language. Where Rabbinic commentators (e.g., *Sipr*^{e} *Num* 6:26, 42[12b], *Lev.*

Rab. [111b] on 9:9; see Balch, *Domestic Code*, 104) tend to struggle with Sarah's apparent insult to Abraham (true though her statement was) in Gen 18:12, Peter ignores the context and fastens instead on one word. That word, kurio", was probably what suggested uphkousate as a natural corollary and, in the present context, a welcome stylistic variation from the immediately preceding and often-repeated upotassesqai. His point is not that Christian wives "revere … the Lord Christ" (3:15) by obeying their husbands, as if the husband played the role of Christ to the wife; the phrase w" tw kuriw, "as to the Lord," in Eph 5:22 (cf. vv 23–24, 25–28) should not be read into 1 Peter. Despite his appeal to the "holy wives" and Sarah in particular, Peter has not forgotten that many of the women he is addressing have unbelieving husbands incapable of playing any kind of a Christlike role in their marriage. His attention is therefore focused on Sarah and her behavior, not on who Abraham was or how he treated her. His argument is from the greater to the lesser: if Sarah "obeyed" Abraham and called him "Lord," the Christian wives in Asia should at least treat their husbands with deference and respect.

Peter passes up the opportunity to capitalize on the great influence Sarah is said to have had on Abraham in certain Hellenistic Jewish traditions. To Philo, Sarah represents "paramount virtue"; in advising Abraham to beget children from Hagar the slave woman, she was pointing allegorically to the "preliminary studies" (grammar, geometry, and music) as the path to philosophy and true wisdom (Philo, *Leg. All.* 3.244–45; cf. Philo, *Cong.* 71–82). Abraham, in fact, "obeys" (uphkousen!) the voice of Sarah according to Gen 16:3, LX^{X}, as Philo is careful to emphasize in Philo, *Cong.* 68 (cf. *Chef* 9). As true virtue, Sarah "produces better conditions in households, city and country, by producing men who are good household managers, statesmanlike and neigh– borly …, introduces the best laws, and sows everywhere the seeds of peace" (*Mut. Nom.* 149–50, LC^{L} 5.219). If Peter is aware of such allegorical reflections on Sarah, they hold no interest for him. He does not want Christian wives to assume the spiritual responsibility of leading their pagan husbands out of darkness into light (cf. "without a word" in v 1), only to be good wives, and not to be discouraged or intimidated by their husbands' unbelief. God will take care of the rest.

h" egenhqhte tekna, "You have become her children." The second person aorist, like the others in Peter's adapted household duty code (eklhqhte in 2:21; 3:9; iaqhte in 2:24b; epestrafhte in 2:25; cf. elutrwqhte in 1:18) probably refers back to Christian conversion (cf. Goppelt, 219). The wives to whom Peter is writing have become Sarah's "children" (tekna; not specifically "daughters") through their faith in Christ expressed in baptism (cf. 3:21). Nothing in this statement applies exclusively to women: Paul viewed *all* Christians as Sarah's offspring no less than Abraham's (Gal 4:23–28, 31), while the author of Hebrews used Sarah along with Abraham as an example of faith in God's promise (Heb 11:11). As Goppelt notes (219), the notion of "Sarah's children" is introduced here on the analogy of "Abraham's children" (Rom 9:7; John 8:39; cf. Matt 3:9 // Luke 19:9). As far back as Isa 51:2, Abraham and Sarah were viewed together as the parents of the Jewish people, and the N^{T} writers claim them without hesitation as parents to the gentile Christians as well. tekna, "children," because of its implication of "an inner similarity of nature" (BG^{D}, 808.2d; cf. John 8:37–40), lent itself more naturally to this adaptation than did sperma, "seed" (despite Paul's ingenious argument in Gal 3:16, 29; cf. Rom 4:16–18). Peter's use of tekna here reflects not so much a distinctive theological stance as simply a desire to foster in his readers the ethical attitudes and conduct traditionally associated with Sarah.

agaqopoiousai kai mh foboumenai mhdemian ptohsin, "do good, then, and let nothing frighten you." Here as in v 5b the question is whether or not the participle should be taken as an imperative. If it is not, the preceding statement is qualified thereby. Either it is conditional: Christian wives have become Sarah's children *if* they do good and let nothing frighten them (Kelly, 131)—or it is explanatory: Christian wives have becooe Sarah's children *in that* they do good and let nothing frighten them (see Beare, 157; the conditional idea persists even in the translation efforts of those who claim to interpret the text differently: see, e.g., Beare, 152; Goppelt, 213). But nowhere else in 1 Peter is Christian conversion or redemption identified with, or made dependent on, anything but the initiative of God in Jesus Christ. Sensing this, some commentators have proposed that all of v 6 up to this point (i.e., w" Sarra…tekna) is parenthetical, so that the participle "doing good," like the participle "deferring" in v 5b, refers not to the Christian wives being addressed, but to the holy wives of the past (v 5) who (a) deferred to their husbands, and (b) did what was good and let nothing frighten them (Bengel, *Gnomon*, 967; Knopf, 129–30; cf. W-H mg; ERV mg). Despite the parallelism, such a construction is very awkward, making Peter lose the thread of his argument in a pair of badly entangled illustrations.

The better alternative, therefore, is to take agaqopoiousai, like most of the present participles in the household duty code, as imperatival in meaning (cf. 2:18;3:1, 7; Best, 127; van Unnik, *NT*[S] 1 [1954] 100–101). Peter's characteristic agaqopoiein, "do good" (2:14, 15,20; 3:17; 4:19; cf. 2:12; 3:11–12) thus interprets, even defines, the upotassesqai, "defer," of the traditional household duty code—not the other way around. His point is that a wife shows true "deference" to her husband by "doing good" (i.e., doing the will of God; cf. 2:15), not that her obligation to "do good" is identified solely and exclusively with wifely submission. There is a subtle difference only hinted at here, which is crucial to the argument of the epistle as a whole. A Christian wife's deference to her pagan husband cannot extend to adopting his religion, for this would be a failure to "do good." If she "does good" by maintaining her allegiance to God even while showing deference to her husband, there is always a possibility, however remote, that her husband may not understand or tolerate her alien religion and that consequently her freedom or safety may be jeopardized. Hence the ominous word of "comfort" with which Peter's advice to wives concludes: "and let nothing frighten you" (lit., "not fearing any terror").

Though Philo makes Sarah an example of fearlessness (*Mut. Nom.* 264–65; *ABR* 205–7; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 2.54–55; cf. Balch, *Domestic Code*, 105), he also uses her to illustrate other qualities not particularly relevant to Peter's argument. It is unlikely, therefore, that Sarah is still in mind here (cf. Kelly, 132; Goppelt, 220). The more probable source of Peter's language is Prov 3:25 (kai ou fobhqhsh ptohsin epelqousan, lit., "and you shall not fear an approaching terror"). Peter's acquaintance with Proverbs is confirmed by his apparent citation of Prov 10:12 (in 4:8), and 11:31 (in 4:17), and with Prov 3 in particular by his citation of 3:34 (in 5:5; cf. James 4:6). The command not to be afraid will be repeated in a context more explicitly related to suffering in 3:14 ("So have no fear of them, and don't be troubled"), but for the present Peter foregoes any hint of why the Christian wives might be afraid. It is worth noting that fobo" in 1 Peter is normally "reverence," and has a positive meaning (1:17; 2:17–18; 3:2, 16). Only in this verse and in 3:14, both based on an O[T] text and both accentuating the idea of fear by the use of a cognate accusative or its equivalent (cf. BD[F], § 152.1; Selwyn, 185), is "fear" something to be avoided. Selwyn's discussion (186) implies that Peter may simply be expressing in a negative way (on the

basis of Prov 3:25) something that could as well have been said positively: "Let the Christian wives do good in serenity of spirit, and leave all else calmly in God's hands" (cf. 4:19). Yet the strong language based on the Proverbs text serves as a reminder that "enemies," in this case husbands hostile to the Christian message, continue to be a major concern throughout this epistle's household duty code.

7 Oi andre" omoiw", sunoikounte" kata gnwsin … tw gunaikeiw, "You husbands in turn must know how to live with a woman." The translation is rather free. omoiw" (see on v 1) functions only to connect related sections of the household duty code, not to point out any real analogy. In this case the relationship is reciprocal: "in turn," or "for your part" (cf. 5:5). Two other characteristics of the household duty codes in 1 Peter are retained in this brief word of advice to husbands: (a) the participles (sunoikounte" here, and aponemonte" in the next line) are imperatival in meaning; (b) the explicit second-person verb or pronoun is postponed: in v 7 umwn comes at the very end (in 2:18–25 the second person verb was introduced in v 20, and in 3:1–6 umwn first appeared at the end of v 2).

The effect of these stylistic features is to give to Peter's words (after the initial vocative) an impersonal, generalizing tone, allowing him to become more direct and personal as he goes along. This tone is further accentuated by referring to "woman" in general (tw gunaikeiw, lit. "the female" or "the feminine") rather than to the Christian wives in particular (for the neuter adjective with an abstract meaning, cf. to afqarton in v 4 or to dokimion in 1:7; the judgment of BD[F], § 263.2, that this construction in the N[T] is peculiar to Paul and Hebrews is scarcely correct). sunoikounte", lit. "dwelling with," refers (much like the English term "cohabit") to the marriage relationship in both its social and sexual aspects "bed and board"). The translation given above has the advantage of simplicity, but the disadvantage of downplaying somewhat the central significance of the phrase kata gnwsin (lit. "according to knowledge") in the verse as a whole. The phrase with kata is adverbial (BG[D], 407.2.5b, b; cf. Reicke, "Gnosis," 299). Peter is not telling husbands simply to maintain a sexual relationship with their wives, but to do so with knowledge or understanding. The translation correctly implies, however, that "living with a woman" is not a mere physical function but something a man must *know how* to do. To Peter, such "knowledge" is specifically Christian, the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ. gnwsi" (cf. BG[D], 163.2) occurs only here in 1 Peter (cf. 2 Pet 1:5, 6; 3:18), but it is probably to be contrasted with the willful or unthinking "ignorance" of an unbeliever (agnoia, 1:14; agnwsia, 2:15). Reicke translates "with understanding" (100), almost in the sense of "with love" ("Gnosis," 299–301), but he does so largely by reading the text in light of Paul's highly distinctive redefinition of "knowledge" as love in 1 Cor 8:1–13 (note that even in Paul, "knowledge" and "love" do not converge until the last day; 1 Cor 8:2; 13:12). The meaning Reicke seeks is indeed present in 1 Peter, but not in kata gnwsin itself. It emerges only because that phrase is further explained in the context as "showing respect" (aponemonte" timhn) to a woman. "Respect" is the term Peter has chosen for the love and understanding a Christian husband owes his wife.

w" asqenesterw skeuei tw gunaikeiw, "with a woman as somebody weaker." The syntax of the dative is ambiguous, for this phrase could be the object of either sunoikounte" (Goppelt, 220) or aponemonte" timhn (Reicke, "Gnosis," 297). Is the woman's "weakness" a special reason for a husband to "know how to live with" her, or a special reason to "respect" her? If "respect" interprets "knowledge," then the difference is slight. No matter which participle governs the dative, a corresponding noun or pronoun

must be supplied as object for the other: i.e., either "know how to live with a woman … showing [her] respect," or "know how to live with [your wives], showing respect to a woman." In both cases Peter has in mind the wives just addressed, and on either rendering the accompanying phrase w" asqenesterw skeuei ("as somebody weaker") must be understood as a reason for understanding and respect, not just for cohabitation (cf. Reicke, "Gnosis," 302). The best argument for this conclusion is the phrase introduced by w" kai, just *after* the mention of "respect," with the kai implying a further and deeper ground for that respect.

w" asqenesterw skeuei, "as somebody weaker." The weakness in view is physical, but the phrase does not mean "the weaker sex" in a generalized sense, skeuo" is always used of a material object, often a piece of pottery, and metaphorically of the human body (BG[D], 754.2; cf. 1 Thess 4:4; 2 Cor 4:7; *Barn.* 21.8). According to 5.1.2; *Barn.* 7.3; 11.9, the skeuo" is the dwelling place of the "spirit," or pneuma, but it is doubtful that the "humble and quiet spirit" of v 4 is still in Peter's mind here; cf. Selwyn, 187. "Wife," a possible alternative in 1 Thess 4:4, would be a redundant translation here; there is little ground for C. Maurer's comment that this verse "is influenced by 1 Thess 4:4, " and thus "a correct commentary on Paul" (*TDN*[T] 7:367). skeuo" in the sense of "body" refers here to a person, but not in such a way as to emphasize either personhood or sexuality. It accents rather the woman's anonymity, hence the indefinite translation "somebody weaker"; cf. the archaic expression "a body" for an unspecified person, as in "If a body meet a body comin' through the rye."

The notion that women are "weak," or "weaker" than men, was a commonplace in the ancient world (e.g., Plato, *Republic* 5.455D, epi pasi de asqenesteron gunh andro", "yet for all a woman is weaker than a man," LC[L], 1.447; cf. *Republic* 5.457A; *Laws* 781A; Thucydides 2.45; *Ep. Arist.* 250; Philo, *Ebr.* 55; for papyri, cf. M-M., 84–85), but Peter uses it not to denigrate women but to foster "respect" (timh), the core of his advice to Christian husbands.

aponemonte" timhn, "showing her respect." For the precise phrase, see *1 Cle*[m] 1.3 (in reference to "the older among you") and *Mart. Pol.* 10.2 (in reference to "rulers and authorities" cf. also *Magn.* 3.1). Reicke, noticing the association of skeuo" (in the sense of "dish" or "vessel") with timh ("honor" or "respect") in Rom 9:21 and 2 Tim 2:20, suggests that Peter is drawing on a traditional metaphor ("Gnosis," 301). Peter's apparent acquaintance with Romans elsewhere in the epistle (e.g., with Rom 9:33 in 2:6, 8, where timh is conspicuous in the context), lends some credence to Reicke's suggestion regardless of whether the metaphor is "traditional" or more specifically Pauline in its origin (cf. also Gos *Truth* 25.25–26.15; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.21.5).

timh and its cognates are used in 1 Peter both in relation to Christian believers (1:7; 2:7) and others (2:17). The choice of the term is perhaps attributable to a desire to cover cases in which the wives are not Christians as well as cases where they are. In addressing wives, Peter's attention is centered on those married to unbelievers, while in addressing husbands, his attention is centered on those married to believers—as the next phrase will show. This is to be expected because of the common presumption in Roman society that a wife would adopt her husband's religion (Balch, *Domestic Code*, 99; *Origin*, 240–46). But the fact that he addresses husbands at all makes it obvious that he assumed *some* wives had Christian husbands. In each segment (vv 1–6 and 7), he makes allowance for exceptions—first in his use of the "holy wives" and Sarah as examples in vv 5–6, and then in his appeal to

generically human as well as specifically Christian considerations in the present argument. It was imperative for believing husbands to "show respect" to their wives for two reasons (w" qualitative, implying a causal relationship, BG[D,] 898.3.1; BD[F] § 425.3): one that would apply in every case and one that would apply in those cases (probably the large majority) where the wife too was a believer.

But why does "weakness" deserve "respect"? Peter might have been expected to urge respect for women *despite* their weakness. Reicke ("Gnosis," 302–3) sees a parallel in 1 Cor 12:22–24, where Paul argues that "the parts of the body which seem to be weaker [asqenestera] are indispensable, and those parts … which we think less honorable [atimotera] we invest with a greater honor [timhn perissoteran] which our more presentable parts do not require." Though it is not at all likely that this specific passage is in view, Peter may well be presupposing the common early Christian conviction that honor in God's sight belongs to those who are (or make themselves) "last," or "least," in the eyes of the world (e.g., Mark 9:33–37; 10:42–45; Matt 18:1–4, 10–14; 19:30; 20:16; 23:11–12; 25:40,45; Luke 14:7–11; cf. 1 Peter 5:5–6). Even where his appeal is ostensibly based on broadly human, even physical, factors, the substance of Peter's argument rests on his Christian faith and Christian tradition.

w" kai sugklhronomoi" carito" zwh", "even as co–heirs of the grace of life." Reicke ("Gnosis," 303) suggests "yet" for kai (cf. BG[D,] 392.1.2g), but this would imply an interest *only* in wives who are "co-heirs of the grace of life." More likely, having urged respect for any wife simply because she is a human being, a woman, and "weaker" than her husband, Peter now supplies an additional (indeed primary) reason for respect when the wife is a believer (w" kai is ascensive: "even as"; cf. BG[D,] 393.2.2,3. The abrupt plural "coheirs" brings the discussion back from "woman" in general to the specific group of wives just addressed in vv 1–6, i.e., the Christian wives of Asia Minor. The other two compounds with sun- in 1 Peter (5:1, 13) serve to link the author and his congregation to the recipients of the letter, but the purpose of sugklhronomoi" here (cf. Rom 8:17; Eph 3:6; Heb 11:9; *Herm. Sim.* 5.2.7–8, 11) is to foster unity among the recipients themselves—a unity grounded in the klhronomia ("inheritance") of 1:4. Wives share with their husbands in the great salvation so eloquently described in 1:3–9.

With these words, Peter takes up again the thread of eschatological interest that dominated 1:3–2:10 but virtually disappeared after the mention of the "day of visitation" in 2:12. In keeping with the genre of the household duty code, he has omitted throughout 2:13–3:6 any explicit reference to the eschatological hope. Instead of continually holding out the promise that the "revelation of Jesus Christ" (cf. 1:7) will bring vindication and a reversal of present circumstances, he has urged humility and deference with apparent confidence that all will be well, even in Roman society as now constituted. Only a few subtle and indirect hints (e.g., in 2:20, 23, 24; 3:6) betray the fact that the future salvation of 1:3–2:10 is still in mind. Peter now reintroduces the eschatological hope in simple—almost deceptively simple—language. For cari", "grace" in an eschatological sense, cf. 1:10, 13. The genitive zwh" is appositional: the grace to be inherited is life (cf. BG[D,] 878.3b). The simple zwh" rather than the more common zwh" aiwniou ("eternal life"; cf. *Note* e[*]) probably anticipates the zwhn of the Scripture quotation in v 10. But what is meant is eternal life with God through Jesus Christ (cf. "live before God" in 4:6).

ei" to mh egkoptesqai ta" proseuca" umwn, "That way your prayers will not be hindered." Peter views the believing husband and wife as a kind of church in miniature (cf.

Paul in 1 Cor 7:5; also Clement of Alexandria's interpretation of the "two or three" gathered in prayer according to Matt 18:20 as the Christian wife, husband, and child, *Strom.* 3.10). The only other use of proseuch in 1 Peter occurs at 4:7, in a series of guidelines for church life, with the implication that to "attend to prayers" (nhyate ei" proseuca") necessitates mutual love, hospitality, and ministry as described in 4:8–11 (in the Gospel tradition, cf. Mark 11:25; Matt 5:23–24; 6:12, 14; 18:15–20). When these same qualities are lacking in a Christian marriage (e.g., when husband and wife do not treat each other mutually as "co-heirs"), their common prayers will be "hindered" (egkoptesqai); whether the hindrance results from simple lack of "attention" on the part of those praying, or from actual divine judgment for disobedience (cf. v 12: God's ears are open to the righteous but not to evildoers) is not specified.

umwn, "your," is the only explicit second person form in the advice to husbands in v 7. Yet it probably does not refer to the husbands alone (as Bigg argues, 155), but to the common prayers of husbands and wives. This final umwn draws together the whole unit dealing with marriage (vv 1–7) so that even wives married to unbelieving husbands (vv 1–2) may have a glimpse of what marriage can becooe in Christd—a household church, with husband and wife living together as a praying community and "co-heirs" of salvation.

Explanation

The advice to wives and husbands stays within the framework of the social structures and behavioral standards of Peter's time. Christian wives obviously do not represent all Christian believers in exactly the same way in which Christian servants do, for Christian husbands are addressed here as well. Yet certain key features—the distinctively Petrine features—in the words addressed to wives are clearly applicable to all Christians: "reverent and pure conduct" (v 2), the "imperishable quality of a humble and quiet spirit" (v 4), and the admonition to "do good and let nothing frighten you" (v 6). A Christian wife—especially one married to an unbelieving husband—is to face her situation in life by living as any Christian should live.

Up to a point, this means doing what society expects. Peter therefore has no hesitation in urging submission or deference of the wife to the husband. That such submission is only "up to a point" is not stated in so many words, but this is clearly implied. Complete deference ordinarily meant wholehearted acceptance of the husband's religion. This was what Roman society expected, but it did not always happen among female adherents of Judaism, or Christianity, or such Eastern cults as those of Isis and Osiris (cf. Balch). To Peter, deference could never extend this far. The lordship of Jesus Christ and the redemption gaingd through him was non-negotiable. For a wife to give that up for her husband would be to give up "an adornment most lavish in God's sight" (v 4) and so abandon her status as Sarah's child (v 6) and one of "a chosen race, the King's priesthood, a holy nation, a people destined for vindication" (2:9). Peter's still optimistic hope is that the opposite will happen: in the face of all of society's expectations, the pagan husband will adopt his wife's religion (vv 1–2)! Characteristically, he is guarded in his optimism: if the husband is not converted, the wife's responsibility is unchanged. She must continue to "do good" and take whatever comes, knowing she has nothing to fear because of the redemption in Christ that is hers (cf. 1:18–21) and because of the salvation to come (cf. 1:3–9).

As for the Christian husband, society's expectations are in his favor. The likelihood is

that if his wife did not share his Christian faith at first, she does by now. Even if she does not, he must "respect" her as he would the emperor, or anyone else, simply because she is God's creation (cf. 2:13, 17). Precisely because she is "weaker," he must resist any impulse to turn his physical superiority and social advantage toward oppression or exploitation. He must understand her and know how to live with her. If—as is far more likely—she believes in Christ, he must "respect" her as an equal in the community of faith and hope. Husband and wife together form a "church"—though the word is used neither here nor anywhere else in 1 Peter—praying and waiting for the "grace" that Jesus Christ will bring (cf. 1:13), the grace that means life with God forever. When a believing husband and wife do not respect each other as equals, their prayers are hollow and their hope uncertain.

A final caution: Peter's warnings against jewelry and extravagant dress in this passage do not necessarily mean that the women, and therefore the Christian communities in Asia Minor to which they belonged, were of the wealthy class. First, the lack of any advice to slave owners tells against such an inference; second, the warnings against lavish adornment were, as we have seen, a very common, almost stereotyped, vehicle for moral teaching in the ancient world; third, Peter was situated over a thousand miles away from the churches to which he wrote, and he was in no position to know their economic status, rich or poor.

Love of Enemies (3:8–12)

Bibliography

Morris, W. D. "1 Peter iii. 10." *ExpTi*[m], 38 (1926/27) 470. **Piper, J.** "Hope as the Motivation of Love: I Peter 3:9–12." *NT*[S] 26.2 (1980) 212–31. **Schwank, B.** "Lecture chrétienne de la Bible (1 Peter 3:8–15)." *AsSeig*[n] 59 (1966) 16–32. **Sisti, A.** "Testimonianza di virtu cristiane (1 Piet. 3,8–15)." *Be*[O] 8 (1966) 117–26.

Translation

[8]*And finally, all of you, be of one mind, sympathetic and full of brotherly affection, good–hearted and humble of mind.* [9]*Do not return evil for evil, or insult for insult, but on the contrary, bless—for* [a]*this is what you are called to do, so that you may inherit blessing.* [10]*For those who choose to love life and see good days must stop the tongue from evil and the lips from speaking deceit,* [11]*They must turn from evil and do good; they must seek peace and pursue it.* [12]*For the eyes of the Lord are on the just and his ears are open to their prayer, but the face of the Lord is set against those who do evil.*[b]

Notes

a. The majority of later manuscripts ([P] and others) have "knowing that" instead of "for" (i.e. eidote" oti instead of oti), but the manuscript support for the simple oti is overwhelming (p^{72} p^{81} [a]

; [A B C K] Y and others), eidote" was added probably as a common form used in Christian

moral instruction (see Comment on 1:18.)
b. At the end of v 12, a few late minuscule MS^{s} add the words "to destroy them from the earth" (tou exoloqreusai autou" ek gh") in an apparent attempt to extend the LX^{x} quotation to the end of Ps 33:17 [34:16] (the LX^{x} has "to destroy the memory of them from the earth"). But Peter's quotation ends more abruptly; he prefers for the time being to leave undefined the fate of "those who do evil."

Form/Structure/Setting

Balch identifies the theme of this passage as "primarily domestic harmony between husband, wife, and slaves" (*Domestic Code*, 88), not harmony among Christians generally. Best, on the contrary, argues that these verses are "not a summary of the preceding instructions" and "probably not part of the social code" (128–29). The truth lies in between. It is true that household duty codes do not normally end with general admonitions of this kind. Yet the distinctly Petrine adaptation of the code began with advice directed to all believers regardless of their station in life (2:13–17), and it is by no means surprising that it should end with the same audience in view. Moreover, the advice to household slaves has been made the vehicle of words on Christian discipleship for every believer (2:19–20, 21–25), while the advice to wives and husbands largely commends virtues incumbent on all and ends with a glimpse of husband and wife as a Christian community in microcosm.

The words to de telo" pante" ("And finally, all of you …") are therefore not surprising at this point. The section they introduce is (as Best rightly perceives) not a summary (in any systematic way) of 2:18–3:7, yet it does reinforce more explicitly and on a more general scale the models of Christian character or discipleship presented there to household slaves and to wives and husbands. If vv 8–12 are not part of the household duty code regarded as an actual source used in the writing of the epistle, the same is obviously true of much of the material within 2:18–25 and 3:1–7. The whole long section that began at 2:13 is now part of an epistle, whatever the origin of certain forms and phrases may be, and in keeping with its epistolary character the point where the section ends is not easy to fix with precision. The adjectives and participles of vv 8–9 maintain the participial form for exhortations used throughout much of 2:13–3:7, and the phrase to de telo" suggests that Peter is now drawing a line of thought to its conclusion. Whether his adaptation of the household duty code concludes after v 9, or after v 12, or after v 13 (or even later?) is more difficult to say. It appears that the quotation from Ps 33 [34] LX^{x} in vv 10–12 is intended as the conclusion, but it must be added that these verses function simultaneously as a transition to the crucial discussion of suffering and vindication in 3:13–4:6. Best's observation (not demonstrated in detail) that "the themes of vv 8, 9 reappear in reverse order in vv 10–11 in the quotation" (129) is valid only in the most general sense; the reference to future hope in v 9b is echoed in v 10a (but also implicitly in v 12b), while the virtues enumerated in vv 8–9 are consistent with the behavior urged in vv 10b–11. But aside from the recurrent of kako" ("evil" or "wrong") in vv 9, 10b, 11 and 12, there are no verbal similarities.

Vv 8–9 find their closest parallel in Rom 12:9–18. This can be shown as follows (cf. Goppelt, 224):

Romans 12
v 8,
"of one mind" (omofrone")
paired with
v 16,
"of the same mind" (to (auto) ... fronounte"; cf v 3)

"sympathetic" (sumhaqei")

v 15,
"rejoice with those who rejoice, weep with those who weep"

"full of brotherly affection" (filadelfoi)

vv 9–10,
"Let love be genuine [cf 1 Pet 1:22] ... devoted to one another in brotherly affection" (th filadelfia)

"humble" (tapeinofrone")

v 16,
"do not be haughty [mhta uyhla fronounte"], but associate with nthe humble [toi" tapeinoi"]"
v 9,
"Do not repay a wrong for a wrong" (mh apodidonte" kakon anti kakou)

v 17a,
"Do not repay anyone a wrong for a wrong" (mhdeni kakon anti kakou apodidonte")

"but on the contray, bless" (tounantion de eulogounte")

v 14,
"Bless [eulogeite] those who persecute you

It is difficult to argue from these verbal parallels alone for Peter's direct use of Romans, for Paul's letters furnish other parallels as well: e.g., "See that no one repays anyone a wrong for a wrong" (mh ti" kakon anti kakou tini apodw, 1 Thess 5:15); "When insulted, we bless" (loidoroumenoi eulogoumen, 1 Cor 4:12). More striking than verbal similarities is the same unannounced transition in Romans and in 1 Peter from conduct mainly in relation to fellow Christians (Rom 12:3–13:1 Pet 3:8) to conduct mainly in relation to unbelievers or enemies (Rom 12:12–21; 1 Peter 3:9). Because Peter is probably acquainted with Romans (a letter sent to the very church from which 1 Peter was written; see *Introduction*, it is quite possible that Peter is dependent on Rom 12 (especially vv 16–17) at this point: cf. v 8, especially the adjectives with which it begins and ends, with Rom 12:16, and v 9 with Rom 12:17. But it is just as likely that Peter and Paul are both dependent on a common catechetical tradition (see Selwyn, 408, 412–13). Goppelt (224)

sees this tradition preserved by Paul in the language of the O^T and Judaism, and by Peter in more Hellenistic terminology—in v 8 at least (a glance at the comparative table just above will show that the parallels to Paul in v 9 are closer than those in v 8). Characteristic of this tradition was a concern to set forth the responsibilities of the Christian convert both to other believers and to everyone in general, including enemies. That 1 Peter shares this concern is clear from 2:17, where both spheres of responsibility are incorporated in the same formulation. A possible reason for the Hellenistic language in v 8 may have been Peter's desire to shorten (and at the same time generalize) the part of the tradition geared toward relationships within the Christian community in order to concentrate on relationships toward those outside. This has been his major (though not exclusive) interest in 2:11–12, 13–17, 18–25; and 3:1–7, and will continue to be in 3:13–4:6. By reducing the obligations toward fellow believers to a Hellenistic list of virtues applicable either within or outside the church (note the absence of ei" allhlou", "to one another," or anything similar, as found in 1:22; 4:7–11; and 5:5–6), Peter shows a general awareness of mutual obligations among Christians while at the same time keeping his primary focus on the broader question of how to act toward enemies.

The Hellenistic terms obviously do not prevent Peter from crowning his appeal with an extensive biblical quotation—something not found in any of the comparable passages in Paul. Apart from adaptations to the epistolary context, the quotation is fairly close to the LX^X (see *Comment*). The text, Ps 33:13–17 [34:12–16] LX^X, is interpreted in part by vv 8–9, in part by vv 13–17, and in part by the thought of 1 Peter as a whole. On examination it proves to be a storehouse of terms and ideas central to 1 Peter's message (cf. the citation of Ps 33:9 [34:8] in 2:3). Just as Peter views O^T believers as Christians before the coming of Christ, sharing the same hope he and his readers share (cf. 1:10–12; 3:5–6, 20–21; 4:6), so he makes the Psalmist's words his own without hesitation, or even formal introduction (as, e.g., in 2:6). Though the citation (e.g., "speaking deceit," cf. 2:1, 22; "turn from evil and do good," cf. 2:14–15, 20; 3:17) is probably not the source of Peter's characteristic vocabulary and surely not the source of his principal concerns, it becomes by its strategic placement a powerful reinforcement to both.

Comment

8 to de telo" pante", "And finally, all of you." The appeal to "all," after more specific appeals, occurs again in the pante" de of 5:5b. The accusative to … telo" is adverbial (BG^D, 811.1d; BD^F, § 160), like the Pauline to loipon (e.g., Phil 3:1; 4:8; 2 Thess 3:1; cf. 2 Cor 13:11; 1 Thess 4:1; Eph 6:10), but with a stronger note of finality (cf. BG^D, 480.3a, b). Peter is obviously concluding not the epistle as a whole, but a specific series of exhortations. The five adjectives that follow are imperatival in the same way that participles have functioned as imperatives in 2:18–3:7; note the return to participles in v 9 (cf. Goppelt, 226; Selwyn 188, puts it differently: the participial imperative, "being," is understood).

omofrone", "of one mind" (not in the LX^X, and only here in the N^T but cf., e.g., Homer, *Iliad* 22. 263; Plutarch, *Mor* 432C, Ps-Phocylides 30, Strabo, *Geog.* 6.3.3). For the idea, however, cf. not only Rom 12:16, but Rom 15:5; 1 Cor 1:10; 2 Cor 13:11; Phil 2:2; 4:2. Both Paul and Peter want their readers to "think alike," not in the sense of holding identical opinions, but in the sense of being agreeable and sensitive to each other's concerns (cf. Acts 4:32), and so united in a common spiritual bond.

sumpaqei", "sympathetic." Again, only here in the $N^{T.}$ The cognate verb "sympathize" (sumpaqein; middle sumpaqhsai) is used in Heb 4:15 of Christ in relation to Christians, and in Heb 10:34 of Christians in relation to each other (cf. 1 Cor 12:26). The choice of the word probably has no direct connection with Peter's characteristic use of pascein ("suffer") in relation to Christ (2:21; 3:18; 4:1a; cf. 1:11) and Christians (2:19; 3:17; 4:1b; 4:15; 5:10) in this epistle. The adjective sumpaqh" (e.g., in Aristotle; cf. also Polybius 2.56.7; Plutarch, *Mor* 536a; Dionysius Halicarnassus, AntRom 2.45.6; Josephus, *Ant.* 19.330; in the $LX^{X,}$ cf. only 4 Macc 15:4, and manuscripts of Job 29:25; 4 Macc 5:25; 13:23) was used to refer to the sharing not just of grief or pain, but of a whole range of emotions and experiences (cf. Rom 12:15; also the association of sumpascei and sugcairei in 1 Cor 12:26: "If one member suffers, all the members sympathize; if one member is glorified, all the members rejoice together"; for similar sentiments in Jewish tradition, cf. Sir 7:34; *T. Iss.* 7).

filadelfoi, "full of brotherly affection"; the adjective occurs nowhere else in the $N^{T,}$ but cf. the noun filadelfia in 1:22 (also "love the brotherhood" in 2:17). The word group ordinarily referred to affection among actual siblings (cf. e.g., Plutarch's treatise *On Brotherly Love*; also 4 Macc 13:21, 23, 26; 14:1; 15:10; Philo, *Jos.* 218), but occasionally took on a more general meaning (e.g., filadelfo" as *"friendly" in Pseudo-Socrates, Epist.* 28.12 and as loving a whole people in 2 Macc 15:15), and in Christianity came to be used of love for fellow believers. For the more common filadelfia in this sense, cf. Rom 12:10; 1 Thess 4:9; Heb 13:1; 2 Pet 1:7; *1 Cle*^{m} 47.5; 48.1). 1 Thess 4:9 in particular indicates that this ideal (probably based on Jesus' remembered commands to "love one another") was from the beginning a conspicuous part of Christian ethical instruction to new converts: Paul has "no need to write" to the Thessalonians about filadelfia because they were already "taught of God" to practice it.

eusplagcnoi, "good-hearted" in the sense of generous or compassionate ("good-hearted" is Selwyn's suggestion, 189, though he understands it more in the sense of "courageous"). "Compassionate" is the meaning in Pr Man 7 (the term is lacking in the $LX^{X),}$ and in *T. Ze*^{b} 9.7. In its only other N^{T} occurrence (Eph 4:32) it refers to an attitude of Christians toward "one another," and the same is implied here. Pol. *Phil.*, a document influenced by 1 Peter, lists it among the qualifications for deacons (5.2) and elders (6.1). ta splagcna (lit., "the intestines") were considered in ancient literature (like the heart, and as the heart still is today) the source of the emotions, especially love and tenderness (e.g., Luke 1:78; 2 Cor 6:12; 7:15; Phil 1:8; 2:1; Col 3:12; Philem 12; 1 John 3:17; see $BG^{D,}$ 763).

tapeinofrone", "humble of mind." The word usually denoted a vice ("meanspirited" or "base") in Greek literature (cf., e.g., Plutarch, *Mor* 336E; 475E), but in Prov 29:23 LX^{X} it has become a virtue (for a similar idea using cognate terms, cf. 1 Pet 5:5–6), and it continues significantly as a virtue in early Christian literature (cf., e.g., Ign *Eph* 10.2; *Barn.* 19.3; 11.8).

Peter's list of virtues begins and ends with adjectives having the same (<frone") ending, and it may not be coincidental that the twin ideals of harmony (omofrone") and humility (tapeinofrone") that frame the list are the ideals governing Rom 12:16 as well.

9 mh apodidonte" kakon anti kakou, "Do not return evil for evil." At the same time that the participial imperative is resumed, the parallel with Rom 12 becomes markedly closer. The whole expression agrees word for word with Rom 12:17, except for mh in place of mhdeni (cf. also 1 Thess 5:15; *Pol. Phil.* 2.2). Though Peter (like Paul) may still have in

mind relationships among believers and incidents that could occur even in that context, he now concentrates more (again, like Paul) on relationships with outsiders, in Peter's case especially with those who slander the Christian community (cf. 2:12, 15). Goppelt rightly observes (225) that although the thought agrees with Jesus' commands in the synoptic Gospels to love enemies, the terminology is more closely related to catechetical tradition largely preserved in Paul's letters. The likely purpose of such tradition was to instill among new converts in the simplest way possible the core of Jesus' teaching on nonretaliation (for similar formulations, cf. Polyaenus, *Strategemata* 5.11 [ed. J. Melber, repr. 1970]; also *Paroemiographi Graeci: Apostol*. 18.33: both cited in BG^{D,} 398.3).

h loidorian anti loidoria", "or insult for insult." *Pol. Phil.* 2.2 (in clear dependence on 1 Peter) has reproduced both this phrase and the preceding one verbatim while adding two more of his own ("blow for blow, or curse for curse"). But the noun loidoria is found in the N^{T} only here and in 1 Tim 5:14, where "the enemy" (probably Satan, 5:15) is explicitly in view. The verb loidorein is used significantly in a context of nonretaliation, both by Paul (referring to himself) in 1 Cor 4:12 and by Peter (referring to Jesus) in 2:23 (on which see *Comment*). Paul's contrast of loidoroumenoi and eulogoumen in 1 Cor 4:12 (cf. also *Diogn*. 5.15, characterizing Christians generally) may have been part of an early catechetical formulation (loosely based on a saying of Jesus similar to Luke 6:28) that influenced Peter as well. In any case, the choice of words (both here and in 2:23) is attributable in part to Peter's apparent fondness for rich and varied vocabulary in describing the sins of speech: cf., e.g., katalalein ("accuse," 2:12; 3:16; cf. 2:1), ephreazein ("denounce," 3:16); blasfhmein ("blaspheme," 4:4, 14b); oneidizein ("ridicule," 4:14a).

The correspondence in vocabulary between this verse and 2:23 strongly reinforces the imitation of Christ set forth in 2:21–25. The rehearsal of Christ's behavior in 2:22–23 was implicitly an appeal to the readers of the epistle to behave in much the same way. Now the appeal is made explicit. Nonretaliation becomes the crown of the household duty code and the centerpiece of the ethical teaching of the entire epistle.

tounantion de eulogounte", "but on the contrary, bless." The positive side of the appeal is not to Christ's behavior, for he was silent in the face of insults (see Comment on 2:23), but to his teaching (Luke 6:28a; cf. *Did.* 1.3). Christians should not necessarily remain silent in all circumstances in which they are accused or slandered, but should instead "bless" their enemies with words of kindness (cf. Rom 12:14; 1 Cor 4:12). Christ's silence is perhaps an appropriate model for Christian wives in specific household situations (cf. v 1), but as a rule his followers should be ready to speak (v 15; cf. Mark 13:11// Matt 10:19–20//Luke 12:11–12) and "blessing" is what defines the character of their speech. This emphasis is not inconsistent with Balch's observations on "quietness" and "humility" (cf. v 4) as a response to "slander" (loidorein) and "suffering" (pascein), based on Musonius, *O*^{r} 10 (*Domestic Code*, 102), for Peter views "blessing" as the verbal expression of those very virtues (cf. v 16).

To "bless" (eulogein) in Greek literature is first of all to "speak well" of someone; the distinctly religious use of the term comes in the LX^{X} and N$^{T.}$ Either meaning could fit the context here, but the following words, "so that you may inherit blessing," are conclusive in favor of the second. To "bless" someone is to extend to that person the prospect of salvation, or the favor of God (cf. BG^{D,} 322). It corresponds to praying for someone (cf. Luke 6:28b; Matt 5:44; *Did.* 1.3) except that the words are directed to the person or persons involved rather than to God. The implied hope is that those who now insult Christian

believers will "glorify God on the day of visitation" (2:12). Though it was the special function of priests in the O^T to "bless" (cf. Num 6:22–26), there is probably only an indirect link between the command here and the depiction of the Christian community as a priesthood in 2:5, 9a (cf. Best, 130). "Blessing," like almost everything believers do, is simply part of their work of "sounding the praises of him who called you …" (2:9b).

oti ei" touto eklhqhte ina eulogian klhronomhshte, "—for this is what you are called to do, so that you may inherit blessing." The phrase ei" touto eklhqhte repeats 2:21a, where touto pointed back to the responsibility of slaves to "do good," even in the face of unjust suffering, in 2:18–20. The phrase here points back in a similar way to a similar responsibility—i.e., to repay abuse and insult with blessing. Some (e.g., Kelly, 137; Goppelt, 228) have suggested instead a reference forward to the ina–clause that follows: "for to this you are called—namely, to inherit blessing" (cf. ei" touto … ina in 4:6). Both the strong analogy with 2:21 and the immediate highlighting of the virtues of vv 8–9 in the psalm quotation of vv 10–12 support the reference to what precedes (cf. Best, 130; Piper, 224–28). Ethically, Christians are called to holy conduct and nonretaliation (cf. 1:15; 2:21); eschatologically, they are called to God's "marvelows light" (2:9) or "eternal glory" (5:10). The thrust of vv 8–12 is ethical, even though Peter affords his readers a momentary reminder of their eschatological reward (cf. Luke 6:37b–38: "… forgive, and you will be forgiven; give, and it will be given you.… with the measure that you measure, it will be measured to you in return"; similarly here, the thought is, "Bless, and you will be blessed").

For the phrase "inherit blessing," cf. Heb 12:17, in reference to Esau's rejection and futile regret (Gen 27:30–40). The choice of the verb "inherit" in Heb 12 is probably linked to the author's use of Esau as an example for "those about to inherit salvation" (Heb 1:14), or the followers of "those who through faith … are inheriting the promises" (Heb 6:12). What Esau failed to do is what Christians must do. The same phrase in 1 Peter recalls the klhronomia ("inheritance") of 1.4 (on which see *Comment*) and, in the present context, the sugklhronomoi ("co-heirs") of v 7. The context of 1:4 reinterpreted the "inheritance," understood in the O^T as the promised land, to refer to an eternal and heavenly salvation to be revealed at the coming of Christ. The same reinterpretation is assumed both here and in v 7. The "grace of life" is an eternal future life, and eulogia, or "blessing," is God's final pronouncement (i.e., bestowal) of eternal well–being on his people at the last day (cf. "praise, glory, and honor" in 1:7, on which see *Comment*; in a very different context, note the inclusion of "blessing," along with "glory," "power," and other terms, in Rev 5:12–13; 7:12). While this future salvation is not the principal ground of the responsibility of Christians to "bless" those who insult them (see especially Piper, 224–28), it is clearly the inevitable outcome of such behavior. The ground of nonretaliation is rather their conversion, the "call" of God made possible by Christ's redemptive death and resurrection (cf. 1:3, 18–21).

10 o gar qelwn zwhn agapan kai idein hmera" agaqa", "For those who choose to love life and see good days" (the form of vv 10–11 is singular; the plural "those" is used only to preserve inclusive language without resorting to "he or she"). The citation of Ps 33:13–17 [34:12–16] LX^X is woven into the argument without formal introduction, linked to what precedes only by gar, "for." The quote, however, is adapted to its new context (contrast *1 Cle*[m] 22.2, where the quote is more formally introduced, and agrees almost verbatim with the $LX^{X)}$. Peter abandons the $LX^{X's}$ rhetorical question ti" estin anqrwpo" o qelwn zwhn ("Who is the person who chooses life," Ps 33:13[34:12]), possibly because

he will use a rhetorical question of his own in v 13 to introduce his further application of the psalm. The result of this change is that the five imperatives (ending in -on) in vv 14–15 [13–14] of the psalm—awkward at best—become even less tolerable. Peter achieves relative smoothness by changing all five of these to third person singular imperatives (ending in -atw, vv 10b–11; cf. Selwyn, 190).

There is one other change, not so easily explained on the basis of Peter's editorial activity. Instead of the infinitive agapan in its first clause, the LX^{x} has the participle agapwn, the thought of which it completes with the phrase that follows, "to see good days." This yields the translation "Who is the person who chooses life, who loves to see good days?" for the verse as a whole. At this point Peter's text is more awkward than that of the LX^{x} (cf. H. Alford, *The Greek Testament, ad loc*.). Although the phrase agapan zwhn is paralleled in Sir 4:12, the phrasing in 1 Peter is redundant because qelein and agapan (which stood in a kind of parallelism in the LX$^{x)}$ are both used in the sense of "choose" or "desire" (cf. Kelly, 137, who translates, "he who desires to choose life"; cf. John 3:19; 12:43). It is doubtful that this variation from the LX^{x} is the product of conscious editing on Peter's part. More likely he is working with a different Greek rendering of the psalm (at least on this particular point) from that now represented in the LX$^{x.}$ His variations from the LX^{x} are thus to be explaingd by a combination of two factors, his own editorial activity and his apparent use of a different textual tradition.

How is the psalm being interpreted? In much the same way that the phrase, "inherit blessing," was interpreted in v 9. "Life," which to the psalmist meant a long and happy life on earth, is to Peter the same as "the grace of life" in v 7—the eternal salvation that is the believer's hope. To "love" that life is equivalent to loving the still invisible Christ who will come revealing that salvation. To "see good days" is to see what is now unseen, the glory in store for Christians at that revelation (see Comment on 1:8). The language of the psalm is the language of this world, but Peter has made it metaphorical of the world to come (cf. Beare, 161; Best, 131; Kelly, 138; not, as Bigg suggests, 157, earthly life "made sweet and delectable by righteousness").

pausatw thn glwssan apo kakou kai ceilh tou mh lalhsai dolon, "must stop the tongue from evil and the lips from speaking deceit." These words follow the LX^{x} verbatim except for the above-mentioned shift to the third person. The psalm's prohibition of evil speech fits admirably into the ethical teaching of the epistle as a whole. Peter has drawn not only on this psalm but on Isa 53:9b (see 2:22) to reinforce his warnings against evil speaking even in the face of severe provocation. dolo", "deceit," in 1 Peter is probably not to be limited to hypocritical speech in particular, but refers very broadly (like kako") to any kind of speech displeasing to God in tone or content (see Comment on 2:1 and 2:22). The phrase apo kakou, "from evil," recalls in the immediate context the kakon anti kakou of v 9, implying that the evil speech against which the readers of the epistle should be on guard is the temptation to retaliate in kind against verbal abuse from enemies. For pausatw, "stop," cf. 4. 1b (see *Comment*), where the unexpected pepautai ("is finished") may well be a further faint echo of Peter's favorite psalm.

11 ekklinatw de apo kakou kai poihsatw agaqon, "They must turn from evil and do good." The repetition of apo kakou confirms Peter's belief that speech and actions are inseparable. Appropriate speech must be accompanied by "doing good," clearly a central theme in the whole epistle (cf. 2:14, 15, 20; 3:6a, 17; 4:19). Whether the psalm is the source of this theme for Peter, or simply a supporting scriptural illustration of it, the command to

"turn from evil and do good" at least provides a clear point of reference for the admonitions to follow in vv 13–17. *2 Clem*. 10.2 makes this command the key to the one that immediately follows: "… if we are zealous to do good, peace will pursue us."

zhthsatw eirhnhn kai diwxatw authn, "they must seek peace and pursue it." Although "peace" is mentioned nowhere else in 1 Peter, Goppelt is probably correct that Peter sees in these words from Psalm 34 the kernel of all he wants to say in vv 8–12 (230). "Peace," whether with everyone (Rom 12:18), or with fellow believers in particular (1 Thess 5:13b; 2 Cor 13:11) was a major concern in N^T ethics (in the Gospel tradition, cf. Matt 5:9; Mark 9:50b), and in early Christian literature generally (cf. e.g., *1 Cle*^{m} 19–20; also Hillel in m. *ʾAbo*^{t} 1:12). For the phraseology here drawn from the psalm, cf. Heb 12:14, in a similarly eschatological context: "Pursue peace with everyone [eirhnhn diwkete meta pantwn] and the holiness without which no one will see the Lord"; also Rom 14:19: "Let us then pursue [diwkwmen] the things of peace and what has to do with building each other up" (cf. 2 Tim 2:22). Balch (*Domestic Code*, 103–4) finds a link between the allusion to Gen 18:12 in v 6a and the reference to peace in the psalm quotation here, on the ground that Sarah and Abraham were used in rabbinic literature as an example of making peace. The text used by the rabbis in this connection was the priestly benediction in Num 6:26 ("… and give yow peace," *Sipre* 42 [12b]), not Ps 34:15. But there is no demonstrable link in 1 Peter.

12 oti ofqalmoi kuriou epi dikaiou" kai wta autou ei" dehsin autwn, "For the eyes of the Lord are on the just, and his ears are open to their prayer." "The Lord," who in the psalm is the God of Israel, is probably understood here as Jesus Christ, a reinterpretation characteristic of 1 Peter (cf. 2:3, alluding to v 9 of the very same psalm; also 3:15, based on Isa 8:13). dikaio" is used in 1 Peter only in two O^T quotations (cf. the citation of Prov 11:31 in 4:18) and in 3:18, where it refers to Christ. dikaiosunh ("Justice" or "what is right") in 3:14 appears to be loosely based on this mention of "the just" in the psalm quotation. Like the psalmist, Peter identifies "the just" with those who "do good," incorporating into his argument the psalm's chiastic structure:

a. "stop the tongue from evil" (v 10b)
b. "do good" (v 11a)
b´. "the just" (v 12a)
a´. "those who do evil" (v 12b)

The first half of the chiasm states the conditions for receiving the promise, first negatively and then positively, while the second half unfolds the promise itself, along with the threat that is its corollary. The promise is of divine care for the safety of "the just" (cf. "Shepherd and guardian of your souls," 2:25) and divine attentiveness to their prayers (cf. v 7b; 4:7). Although its time reference is unspecified, the application that follows (vv 13–17) suggests that Peter intends it to quiet anxieties about the future.

proswpon de kuriou epi poiounta" kaka, "but the face of the Lord is set against those who do evil." Safety and vindication for the just means judgment on their enemies. The context makes the meaning clear even though epi is used in two different ways in two successive clauses—as "on" in a favorable sense, in the preceding clause, and now as "against," in keeping with a common Semitic idiom. The threat of divine retribution against the enemies of the Christian community remains as veiled and implicit here as in the rare instances where it appeared previously in the epistle (e.g., 2:7–8, 23b). Peter's restraint is

shown by his omission of the rest of Ps 33:17 [34:16] from his quotation: "to destroy the memory of them from the earth" (see *Note* b*). Peter stops where he does, *not* because his warning is actually directed against the Christian readers themselves (i.e against "intemperate reaction to persecution"), so that "the drastic threat in the additional clause would be somewhat out of place" (Kelly, 138). Rather, his reluctance to fasten in detail on the fate of the ungodly is a feature carried rather consistently through the entire epistle (cf e.g 3:16b, 17; 4:5, 18b; and see especially 5:5b, which in a similar way is part of a two–pronged O[T] citation: "God opposes the arrogant, but gives grace to the humble").
Thus v 12 lays the basis for the dominant note of comfort and reassurance in vv 13–17 (i.e vv 13–14, 17), while vv 10–11 lay the basis for the subsidiary note of admonition (i.e vv 15–16). Those who do good have no reason to fear because God will reward their justice and punish any who slander or oppress them—never mind how!

Explanation

An issue of theology and ethics raised by this passage is whether Christian believers "do good" because they are "just" in God's sight, or whether they are viewed as "the just" because they "do good." The interpretation here presented has been that the statement of v 9b, "this is what you are called to do," referred back to the lifestyle of harmony, humility, and nonretaliation just described, not forward to the hope of inheriting blessing. The point is that Christian believers will inherit blessing because they have lived in a certain way, not that they live in that way because they have such a hope. In the light of issues addressed in the epistles of Paul and highlighted by the Protestant Reformation, it is tempting to ask where 1 Peter stands on the question of justification by faith versus justification by works. From the perspective of 1 Peter itself, it is a nonissue. 1 Peter was not written to answer a set of Pauline questions. Peter is clear that the initiative in human salvation rests with God (1:3, 21) and that the final "revelation of Jesus Christ," no less than his resurrection from the dead, is made possible only by divine "grace" (1:10, 13; 3:7). "Grace," however, is intended precisely for those who "do good," because their call to new life is at the same time a call to become imitators of Jesus Christ in the path of peace and nonretaliation (cf 2:21–25). Although the "blessing" associated with the future coming of Christ is not something earned by the performance of good works, it nevertheless belongs to those who demonstrate good works. Peter does not see in this position (as a radical Paulinist might) a surrender to legalism because he does not see legalism or the Jewish law as a threat. It is far more important to him to foster unity and cohesion among his readers, and to prepare them for faithful discipleship whatever the social cost.

A Promise of Vindication (3:13–17)

Bibliography

Bryce, G. E. "'Better'-Proverbs: An Historical and Structural Study." SB[L] *Seminar Papers 1972*. 2:343–54. **Dalton, W. J.** *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18–4:6*. AnBi[b]

23. Rome, 1965. 103–12. **Gschwind, K.** *Die Niederfahrt Christi in die Unterwelt*. Münster, 1911. 100–105; 131–32. **Howard, G.** "The Tetragram and the New Testament." *JB*[L] 96 (1977) 76–82. **Johnston, G.** "The Will of God in 1 Peter and 1 John." *ExpTi*[m] 72 (1960/61) 237,239–40. **Knox, J.** "Pliny and 1 Peter: A Note on 1 Peter 4:14–16 and 3:15." *JB*[L] 72 (1953) 187–89. **Lumly, J. R.** "1 Peter 3:17." *Ex*[p] 5/1 (1890) 142–47. **Michaels, J. R.** "Eschatology in 1 Peter iii. 17." *NT*[S] 13 (1966/67) 394– 401. **Ogara, F.** "Quis est qul vobis noceat, si boni aemulatores fueritis? (1 Pet. 3,8–15)." *V*[D] 17 (1937) 161–65. **Omanson, R.** "Suffering for Righteousness Sake (1 Pet 3:13–4:11)." *RevEx*[p] 79 (1982) 439–50. **Reicke, B.** *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism*. Copenhagen, 1946. 122–30. **Stever, A.** "1 Petr 3,17–4,6." *TG*[l] 30 (1938) 675–78. **Zerwick, M.** *Biblical Greek*. Rome, 1963. 110–11.

Translation

[13]*Who then is going to harm you if you are partisans*[a] *for what is good?* [14]*No, even if you should have to suffer in the cause of justice, you are blessed. So have no fear of them, and don't be troubled,*[b] [15]*but revere in your hearts the Lord Christ,*[c] *and always be ready to answer anyone who demands from you an accounting of the hope that is yours.* [16]*Yet*[d] *[do so] out of humility and reverence, with a good conscience, so that in a situation where you are accused,*[e] *those who denounce your good*[f] *conduct in Christ may be put to shame.* [17]*For it is better to suffer for doing good, if God should require it, than for doing evil.*

Notes

a. In place of the word translated "partisans" (zhlwtai), the majority of the later manuscripts (including [K L P)] have the weaker term "followers" (mimhtai), perhaps because of the bad political connotation of zhlwtai in the sense of "Zealots." But zhlwtai, favored by the best and most ancient MS[s] ([P72 a]

[B A] and others), is clearly to be preferred.

b. The words "and don't be troubled" (mhde taracqhte) are omitted in [P72 B L.] They might conceivably have been inserted in a scribal attempt to complete the LX[X] quotation by linking the preceding words from Isa 8:12 with the allusion to 8:13 which immediately follows. But more likely they were original and were omitted accidentally because of the similar endings of fobhqhte and taracqhte in the quotation.

c. The majority of later MS[s] (including [K L P)] read "the Lord God" (kurion de ton qeon) in place of "the Lord Christ." But the witness of such early manuscripts as [P72 a]

[A B C] Y and the Lat. Syr. and Coptic versions, is decisive in favor of "the Lord Christ." While an alteration of qeon to Criston would have heightengd Peter's christological interest, the change in the opposite direction conforms the quotation more closely to Isa 8:13 LX[X,] where auton refers to God (scribes may even have been familiar with LX[X] manuscripts that read kurion ton qeon in that verse).

d. The connective alla is omitted in the majority of later MS[s] (including [K L P] and others), probably because what followed did not seem to stand in sharp contrast to what preceded. But see *Comment*. The M[S] evidence for alla in the earliest and best MS[s] is conclusive.

e. There was a tendency among scribes to conform the phraseology here to that of 2:12b (katalalousin umwn w" kakopoiwn), either consistently (as in [a]

[A C K] and the majority of later MS[s]) or in part (as in v[g] and in isolated *La*[t] Syr[c] and Coptic versions). But the simple katalaleisqe ([a]

[B] Y and a number of other ancient MS[s]) is clearly to be preferred. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 691–92.

f. A very few MS[s] ([C] being the earliest) have "pure" instead of "good," and a different word order (thn en Cristw agnhn anastrofhn). The variant is secondary, prompted by 3:2.

Form /Structure/Setting

The writer now brings the Scripture quotation of vv 10–12 directly to bear on the situation of his readers. The kaka with which the quotation ends is echoed in the o kakwswn of v 13. The first positive injunction of the psalm, poihsatw agaqon, along with its companion piece zhthsatw eirhnhn kai diwxatw authn (v 11) has occasioned the expression tou agaqou zhlwtai in v 13. The accent on the "good" or on "doing good" then continues in the suneidhsin … agaqhn and thn agaqhn … anastrofhn of v 16 and most conspicuously in the agaqopoiounta" of v 17. In the same way the poiounta" kaka of v 12 anticipates and governs the kakopoiounta" of v 17. The application of the psalm is therefore not confined to v 13 but to some extent shapes the writer's train of thought to the end of v 17.

The passage is tightly structured. There is no sharp break between v 13 and vv 14–17. The use of the optative mood in vv 14 and 17 could give the impression of such a break, as if the strong assertion of safety in v 13 were being qualified, at least hypothetically. But such is not the case. Vv 13–14a fit closely together, and their combined emphasis is more on the certainty of blessedness than on the possibility of suffering. The most natural division within the passage as a whole is the division between assurance (vv 13–14a, 17) and admonition (vv 14b–16). The repetition of the verb pascein, together with the use of the optative mood in a conditional clause, links v 17 rather closely with vv 13–14a so as to frame the admonitions of vv 14b–16. V 17, in fact, would follow v 14a quite easily and naturally if the intervening verses did not exist.

The admonitions of vv 14b–16 draw most conspicuously on the LX[X] of Isa 8:12–13. V 14b quotes Isa 8:12 with minor variations, while v 15a is a Christianization of Isa 8:13, the "Lord" in Isaiah's prophecy being interpreted as "Christ." At the same time, there are traces here of an awareness of certain words of Jesus. The exhortation "Have no fear of them," in a context of persecution and Christian confession, recalls Matt 10:26–33 and Luke 12:2–9, while the situation presupposed in v 15 parallels Jesus' instructions to his disciples in the eschatological setting of Luke 21:1 4–15: "Decide in your hearts [en tai" kardiai" umwn] not to worry ahead of time how to answer [apologhqhnai], for I will give you a mouth, and wisdom, which none of your enemies will be able to withstand or deny." The writer of 1 Peter has used the terminology of Isaiah to introduce his own adaptation of this (or similar) apocalyptic material. The distinctly "Petrine" shaping comes in 3:16, which is constructed along the lines of 2:12.

The assurances of vv 13–14a, 17 come to expression in rhetorical forms characteristic of the wisdom tradition. These forms, however—i.e., the rhetorical question of v 13, the

beatitude of v 14, and the *Tobspruch*, or proverb about what is "better," in v 17—are all made to serve an eschatological purpose. The readers are safe from harm, and blessed even in suffering, because their God rules the future and their vindication is near. The day of reckoning will show their lot to be infinitely "better" than that of their oppressors. It is this eschatological factor which binds the assurances and the admonitions of the passage into a unified whole.

Comment

13 kai ti" o kakwswn uma" ean tou agaqou zhlwtai genhsqe, "who then is going to harm you if you are partisans for what is good?" The kai, introducing a conclusion to be drawn from the last part of the preceding Scripture quotation, should be rendered "then" or "and so" (see BD[F,] § 442.2). If Cod is on the side of the righteous and against those who do evil, what harm can possibly come to those who do good? The sentiments here expressed can be found across a wide spectrum of biblical literature: e.g., Pss 56:4; 91:7–10; 118:6; Isa 50:9; Matt 10:28–31//Luke 12:4–7; 21:18; Rom 8:31.

tou agaqou zhlwtai. Reicke calls this a "remarkable expression," and translates it "Zealots for what is good" in contrast to the evil Zealots of the Jewish revolt (A[b], p. 107; cf. pp. xvi–xxii). Yet zhlwth" is fairly common in Hellenistic Greek in connection with the pursuit of various moral ideals: e.g., "virtue" (Isocr. 4B; Philo, *Praem.* 11), "truth" (Epictetus, Diss. 3.24.40), "piety" (Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.30), "piety and justice" (Philo, *Virt.* 175), and (in the N[T)] "good works" (Titus 2:14: zhlwthn kalwn ergwn). The N[T] also uses the term to denote an avid preoccupation with "spirits" (i.e., spiritual gifts, 1 Cor 14:12), and (in distinctly Jewish settings) with "the law" (Acts 21:20), with "God" (Acts 22:3; cf. Rom 10:2), or with the "ancestral traditions" (Gal 1:14). There is no reason to assume any connection with the Zealot movement, either positively or negatively. The phrase refers simply to eager followers or devotees of what is good.

genhsqe. The use of ginesqai does not necessarily mean that the readers are not *now* pursuing the good. The verb (especially in commands and exhortations) often substitutes for einai, with the meaning "to be" or "to show oneself to be" (cf. BG[D] 160).

14 alla. The purpose of this connective is not to set up a contrast to the assurance of "no harm" in v 13, but actually to reinforce that assurance. The question "Who then is going to harm you?" implies as its answer "No one." Building on this answer, the alla of v 14a introduces a beatitude: "What is more (even if you should suffer …) you are blessed" (for such a use of alla, see BD[F,] § 448.6). The safety from harm promised in v 13 corresponds to the blessedness mentiongd in v 14a, and therefore by no means rules out the possibility of "suffering in the cause of justice."

ei kai pascoite dia dikaiosunhn, makarioi "No, even if you should have to suffer in the cause of justice, you are blessed."= These words probably represent a Petrine adaptation of a saying of Jesus very similar to the eighth beatitude in Matthew: makarioi oi dediwgmenoi eneken dikaiosunh" (Matt 5:10; cf. also *Pol. Phil.* 2.3). pascein, with twelve occurrences, belongs to the characteristic vocabulary of 1 Peter, and the placement of makarioi is a characteristic feature of his style. Though makario" appears in the apodosis of a conditional clause in John 13:17; Luke 6:5d; and 8.9, none of these passages exhibits the distinctive beatitude form found here. The closest parallel in thought and structure is 1 Pet 4:14, which similarly reflects Peter's adaptations of a beatitude of Jesus

(see *Comment*).

The use of the rare optative mood here (pascoite) and in v 17 (qeloi) is often urged as evidence that Peter has in view only a remote contingency (perhaps in contrast to the stark present reality implied by the indicative in 4:14). Yet he examines this contingency with some thoroughness; it occupies his attention at least through v 17. Even the reassurance that no one is going to harm those who pursue the good (v 13) suggests that "harm" was exactly what his readers feared. Why then the optative? In each instance, the optative serves to strengthen the rhetorical device by which Peter encourages his readers: the beatitude of v 14 and the *Tobspruch* of v 17. Those who do good are "blessed" *even* in suffering; their lot is "better" than that of evildoers *even* when the will of God permits those evildoers to oppress them (cf. Zerwick, 111). That such things are more than remote possibilities can be seen in this epistle as clearly in what has preceded (1:6–7; 2:18–20) as in what follows (4:12–19; 5:8–10; cf. F. W. Danker, *ZNW* 58 [1967] 100–101).

On the basis of these two optatives (both used in connection with "suffering") a case could be made for translating pascein in vv 14 and 17 as "suffer death" (cf. BGD, 634). This would obviously be a somewhat more remote prospect than merely "suffering." When used of Christ, pascein quite likely refers to his "passion" in its entirety (2:21, 23; 3:18; 4:la). In at least one case (4:1b), "suffer death" seems to be the meaning that is required. Moreover, the oti kai Cristo" of 3:18 links Christ's passion rather closely to the two uses of pascein in the present passage. A similar link, however, is made in 2:21, where it is clear that the preceding uses of pascein (in 2:19 and 20) do *not* mean "suffer death." Nor is this a plausible meaning in the other instances where Christian believers are in view: 4:15, 19; 5:10. Although pascein in 1 Peter can refer to experiences up to, and including, death itself, there is no warrant for actually *translating* it in 3:14, 17 as "suffer death" rather than simply "suffer."

makarioi: this word, determinative for the beatitude form, describes "privileged recipients of divine favor" (cf. BGD, 486). Its meaning overlaps that of the eulogein–eulogia word group (especially the passive participle euloghmeno"; see, e.g., Luke 1:42 and 45). It is likely in the present context that the last clause of 3:9 (ina eulogian klhronomhshte) is still in the writer's mind: the "blessedness" of the readers derives from the certainty that they are to "inherit blessing" (cf. 1:4) at the coming "revelation of Jesus Christ" (cf. 1:7, 13).

ton de fobon autwn mh fobhqhte mhde taracqhte, "so have no fear of them and don't be troubled." The only significant change from the LXX of Isa 8:12 is Peter's substitution of autwn for autou. The meaning of the Hebrew text was "do not fear what they [i.e., the people] fear" (lit. "do not fear the fear of them"). The effect of the singular autou of the LXX had been to focus the fear on the king of Assyria as its *object*: "do not be afraid of him" (lit., "do not fear the fear of him"). Formally, Peter's modification of the LXX represents a move back in the direction of the Hebrew, yet Peter's context shows that he follows the LXX in assuming the pronoun to be an objective genitive: "do not be afraid of them." The autwn of 1 Peter (like the autou of the LXX) thus refers to the enemy, anticipating the implicit reference to accusers (katalaleisqe) and the explicit mention of despisers (oi ephreazonte") in v 16. Selwyn notes correctly that "had St. Peter not been quoting, he could have written mh fobhqhte autou" " (p. 192). If he had done so, the similarity of his thought to that of certain synoptic passages (e.g., Matt 10:26–33) might have been more obvious. But as it is, his use of the cognate accusative ("to fear a fear")

indicates that the Isaiah text is indeed his primary point of departure.

In much the same way, the words mhde taracqhte taken by themselves might recall John 14:1 or 14:27b (mh tarassesqw umwn h cardia), but they owe their form and their presence here to the LX^{X} of Isa 8:12.

15 kurion de ton Criston agiasate, "But revere in your hearts the Lord Christ." Peter continues his midrash of Isa 8:13, substituting ton Criston for the auton of the LX^{X} (kurion auton agiasate, "the Lord himself you must revere"). It is possible to read ton Criston by as appositional to kurion ("the Lord Christ"), or the other way around ("Christ the Lord"). Or ton Criston might be the direct object of agiasate, with kurion as predicate accusative ("Christ as Lord"). Peter's understanding of kurio" as primarily a designation of Jesus Christ was seen earlier in 2:3, as well as in the substitution of kuriou for tou qeou hmwn in 1:25 (citing Isa 40:8). Here his point is not the identification of "the Lord" with "Christ" for its own sake, as if this insight were new to his readers. He assumes the identification, but here makes it explicit in order to anticipate the reference to "Christ" in v 16, and especially in 3:18–4:1. The definite article with Cristo" does not indicate a title here (i.e., the Messiah), nor is it needed to distinguish a direct object from a predicate accusative (i.e., "Christ as Lord"). The article simply calls attention to "Christ" as the controlling word both here and in the following section. ton Criston decisively interprets Isaiah's kurion, probably in apposition: "the Lord, Christ," or simply "the Lord Christ."

agiasate is not to "make holy," but to "acknowledge or declare to be holy," as in the first petition of the Lord's Prayer. The declarative aspect is important both in Jewish literature and in 1 Peter. Just as God's holiness is made known among the Gentiles through his people, Israel (e.g., Ezek 20:41; Sir 36:4), so Christ's holiness is made known by Christians who confess him as Lord, even in the face of interrogation and threats. The task of a holy people is to make known to the world the Holy One who called them (1:15–16; cf. 2:9b). But in the present context, the declarative aspect becomes explicit in Peter's characterization of the Christian apologia that immediately follows in vv 15b–16. The focus of agiasate itself is rather upon the *inward* acknowledgment of Christ's Lordship. This acknowledgment must take place, Peter says, "in your hearts," as the positive counterpart to the "fear" against which he has just issued a warning (the de which links v 15 to v 14b is Peter's own conne ctive and not part of the citation). It is this "holy fear," or respectful awe focused on Christ, that drives out other fears, and makes possible an honest and effective response to interrogation.

en tai" kardiai" umwn, "in your hearts." This phrase does not cooe from Isaiah 8:13, but is paralleled verbally in Luke 21:14, in a context describing how Jesus' disciples will be able to "answer" (apologhqhnai) the religious and secular authorities before whom they are brought to trial. In the heart, Selwyn remarks, is "where fear would reside, if it were present" (193). The parallel with Luke does not establish literary dependence, but does suggest, along with other evidence in the context, an awareness of Jesus' eschatological discourse(s) in a form that may have been known to Luke as well.

etoimoi aei, "and always be ready." Peter has introduced the notion of "readiness" before in an eschatological context, and will do so again. Salvation is "ready" to be revealed in the last time (1:5), and Christ stands "ready" (4:5) to judge the living and the dead. The consequent need for believers to be prepared for his revelation is expressed in 1:13 not by the same word, but by the metaphor of girding the loins. The Gospel tradition can use either this metaphor (Luke 12:35) or the direct command ginesqe etoimoi (Matt

24:44//Luke 12:40) to express the disciples' responsibility to be ready for the coming of the Son of Man. The choice of the same word here may be linked to Peter's desire to portray the appropriate stance of Christian believers in the "last days" (cf. 4:7). Their readiness to respond boldly to those who challenge their Christian hope must be as constant (aei) as their love for one another (cf. ektenw", 1:22; ektenh, 4:8).

pro" apologian, "to answer anyone." This term is used of a formal defense in court against specific charges (as, e.g., Paul in Acts 22:1; 25:16; 2 Tim 4:16; cf. apologeisqai in Acts 24:10; 25:8; 26:1, 2, 24). In a more general sense, apologia refers to an argument made in one's own behalf in the face of misunderstanding or criticism (1 Cor 9:3; 2 Cor 7:11). Perhaps closest in meaning to the present passage is Paul's use of the term in Phil 1:7, 16 where he views his own formal "defense" at his impending trial as an occasion for the "defense of the gospel" on a wider front. Here in 1 Peter, the language of the courtroom is being applied to informal exchanges that can occur between Christian and non-hristian at any time (aei) and under varied circumstances. If Peter is indeed drawing on a synoptic–like tradition (cf. apologhshsqe in Luke 12:11 as well as apologhqhnai in Luke 21:14), it is worth noting that the explicit synoptic references to "kings and governors" (Luke 21:12) or "synagogues, rulers, and authorities" (Luke 12:11; cf. also Mark 13:9; Matt 10:17–18) have been dropped.

panti tw aitounti uma" logou, "anyone who demands from you an accounting." Instead of "kings" or "governors" (contrast 2:13–14), Peter speaks here of "anyone" whose questions might require from his readers a "defense." Unlike apologia, the phrase aitein logon, though appropriate in the context of a judicial hearing, is not itself a technical legal expression, but means simply to demand an accounting or explanation of something (cf. Plato, *Politicus* 285E; and, with apaitein [Pseudo–] Dio Chrysostom 37.30). Taken together, apologia and aitein logon suggest that Peter sees his readers as being "on trial" every day as they live for Christ in a pagan society.

peri th" en umin elpido" , "of the hope that is yours." "Hope" is what distinguishes Christian from non–Christian Gentiles. Eph 2:12 describes the latter as "having no hope and without God in the world" (cf. also 1 Thess 4:13). The readers of 1 Peter, now set free from their ancestral pagan ways, have put their faith and their hope in God (1:21). Through Christ's resurrection, they are reborn "to a living hope" (1:3). It is this hope that separates them from their pagan neighbors and invites the confrontations of which Peter speaks.

en umin, "is yours." Probably the meaning is not "in you" individually, so as to stress the inwardness of the hope, but "among you," i.e., the hope which the readers have in common and which identifies them as Christians. The questioners must know something of this hope in order to demand an explanation of it. To a degree, at least, it is a public matter, and therefore not strictly analogous to the reverence Christians have in their hearts for their Lord. en tai" kardiai" umwn should not be made determinative for the understanding of en umin.

16 alla meta prauthto" kai fobou, "yet [do so] out of humility and reverence." Here as in v 14, alla introduces an additional qualifying point to be made, not a sharp contrast to what has already been said (cf. again BD[F] § 448.6). But is this qualifying phrase (and the next) intended to recommend certain attitudes toward *God*, or toward the human questioners mentioned in the previous verse? The use of fobo" is again reminiscent of Isa 8:12–13. From where Peter's quotation left off, the LX[X] continues with the words kai auto" [i.e., the Lord] estai sou fobo". Even if the quotation does not presuppose these

words from the context, Peter's point that a Christian should not fear human adversaries is unmistakable (cf. also 3:6). It is virtually certain, therefore, that fobo" in v 16 means fear of God (cf. 1:17; 2:17, and see Comment on 2:18 and 3:2). Peter is urging something very close to the reverence for Christ just mentiongd in connection with the Isaiah text.

A more difficult question is whether prauth" refers to humility or gentleness before God, or in relation to one's curious or hostile neighbors. The understanding of fobo" as reverence toward God does not settle the matter with regard to prauth". Peter may simultaneously be urging reverence toward God and gentleness toward human beings (cf. 2:17). But more likely he has in view the same "gentle (prau") and quiet spirit" before God that should characterize Christian women (3:4). If so, prauth" is an inward quality or attitude of mind (cf. 3:3–4), a profound acknowledgment of the power of God, and of one's own poverty and dependence on Him (cf. Matt 5:5). Yet this God–centered quality of the heart finds expression also in one's behavior toward others. With regard to fobo", Peter has said, "Fear God and not man" (cf. Acts 5:29!); with regard to prauth", he counsels humility toward God and therefore (implicitly) toward other people. Because prauth" and tapeinofrosunh are kindred virtues in early Christian literature (Col 3:12; Eph 4:2; *1 Cle*[m] 30:8; cf. Matt 11:29; 11:8), Peter's use of the latter term (with its cognates) offers a possible analogy: i.e., humility toward others (3:8), among believers in particular (5:5), and "under the mighty hand of God" (5:6). While prau"//prauth" may well imply a similar range of meaning, its Godward reference remains primary and basic. The free translation, "out of humility and reverence," is intended to preserve this emphasis.

suneidsin econte" agaqhn , "with a good conscience." "Conscience" in 1 Peter involves a moral or spiritual awareness of God, and of oneself before God, whether explicitly (2:19; 3:21) or (as here) implicitly. The phrase "good conscience" occurs in Acts 23:1; 1 Tim 1:5, 19; *1 Cle*[m] 41:1 (and, with kalo", Heb 13:18; *2 Cle*[m] 16:4). Along with equivalent expressions such as a "clean" (1 Tim 3:9; 2 Tim 1:3; *1 Cle*[m] 45:7; cf. Heb 9:14; Ign. *Trall.* 7:2), or a "blameless and pure" (*Pol. Phil.* 5:3) conscience, it denotes personal integrity before God. This is the stance from which Christian believers are urged to make their "defense."

ina en w katalaleisqe … anastrofhn, "so that in a case where you are accused, those who denounce your good conduct in Christ may be put to shame." The entire clause appears to be modeled on 2:12b. Both are result clauses introduced by ina en w, but they contemplate precisely opposite results! The katalalousin umwn w" kakopoiwn of 2:12b is telescoped in 3:16 into katalaleisqe. Because the passive form of this verb is unknown in the Greek Bible (and virtually unknown in Greek literature generally, Polyb 27.12.2 being a rare exception), the manuscript tradition reflects the persistent efforts of copyists to modify 3:16 back in the direction of the longer active form (*Note* e;[*] cf. Goppelt, 237–38; for another view, see Selwyn, 194).

en Cristw does not refer to the developed Pauline "in Christ" relationship but simply defines the "good lives" required of the readers as Christian (cf. en kuriw in the Pauline household codes). The whole expression umwn thn agaqhn en Cristw anastrofhn of 3:16 recalls, more than anything in 2:12b, the thn anastrofhn umwn … kalhn of 2:12a. The latter, however, is reiterated in v 12b by the reference to "good works." By observing (epopteuonte") the "good lives" or "good works" of Christians, their accusers will repent and "glorify God on the day of visitation." The reaction of the accusers in 3:16 is quite different. Nothing is said of any change of heart. When they are explicitly identified, it is as

those who scorn or denounce (oi ephreazonte") the "good lives" of Christian believers. There is no need to suppose that ephreazein is referring to a level of abuse that goes beyond katalaleisqe. It is true that in Hellenistic literature the word ephreazein "more often connotes spiteful actions than spiteful speech" (Selwyn, 194), but here its object is the anastrofh of Christian believers, not the believers themselves. One can "denounce" someone's conduct, but can scarcely "abuse" or "mistreat" it. Selwyn's suggestion (ibid.) that anastrofh is rather the object of kataiscunqwsin, and that oi ephreazonte" is used absolutely (i.e. "that … your persecutors may be shamed by your good lives"; cf. also Bigg, 159) is improbable. Selwyn is able to cite only one reference (Isocr 60E) for the passive of kataiscunein with an accusative, and none for oi ephreazonte" used without an object. It is more likely that verbal abuse is in mind here, as it probably is in Luke 6:28 (peri twn ephreazontwn uma", parallel to tou" katarwmenou"). The apparent similarity between 1 Peter and Luke, both at this point and in their use of the accusative rather than the customary dative as the object, suggests once again Peter's acquaintance with some form of the Jesus tradition in Greek.

If he draws on such a tradition here, it is simply to reinforce the preceding katalaleisqe. Instead of turning to God (as in 2:12) these accusers persist in their slander. As a result, instead of "glorifying God on the day of visitation," they will be "put to shame" (kataiscunqwsin). Although the "day of visitation" is not mentioned in 3:16, the logic of the parallelism suggests that kataiscunqwsin, no less than the doxaswsin ton qeon of 2:12, has an eschatological reference. "Shame" in the O^T and in Jewish literature often connotes utter defeat anddisgrace in battle, or before God. To be "put to shame" is to be overthrown and left at the mercy of one's enemies. A frequent promise is that those who trust in God will *not* be put to shame or that their enemies will (e.g. Pss 6:11 [10]; 21:6 [22:5]; 24[25]:2,3; 30:2, 18 [31:1, 17]; 34[35]:4; 39:15 [40:14]; 43:8 [44:7]; 69:3 [70:2]; 126[127]:5; Isa 28:16; Jer 6:15; 17:13, 18). Peter has already cited the ou mh kataiocunqh of Isa 28:16 and applied it to the believers to whom he is writing (2:6–7). Implicitly, the ones put to shame are "those who stumble, disobeying the word" (2:8). In 3:16, Peter turns his attention once more to this group, and the judgment that is in store for them. Like the psalmists before him, he looks forward to a turning of the tables, an eschatological reversal of circumstances. Those who now demand an accounting from Christians will themselves have to give an accounting to the Judge of all (cf. 4:5). On the "day of visitation" they will either "glorify God" if they have repented, or be "put to shame" if they have not. The grim second alternative is the one that Peter reflects on here because it provides the framework within which he will begin to address the mystery of Christian suffering.

17 kreitton gar agaqopoiounta" … pascein h kakopoiounta", "For it is better to suffer for doing good … than for doing evil." A near consensus on this verse regards it as simply an extension to all Christians of the advice given to slaves in particular in 2:20. The parallel rests on the occurrence of the verbs agaqopoiein and pascein in both verses, and perhaps also by the fact that both are followed by appeals to the example of Christ introduced by oti kai Cristo". If this view is correct, Peter is setting before his readers the alternative of suffering for doing good or for doing evil in the society in which they live. agaqopoiein then refers to social or civic righteousness, the performance of good deeds in conformity to the laws of the state, while kakopoiein refers to criminal activities justly punishable by the authorities (cf. 2:14–15; 4:15).

There are three difficulties with this interpretation. First, it reduces v 17 to a mere

truism; second, it does not take sufficient account of the form of the statement; third, it does not take sufficient account of the immediate context.

(a) If 3:17 is merely a generalized repetition of 2:20, it appears almost tautological in a way in which 2:20 does not. The statement that suffering for doing good is "better" than suffering for doing evil, is all too easily reduced to saying merely that good is better than evil! In fact, something essential to the meaning of 2:20 has been lost: i.e. the emphasis on "endurance" (upomeneite), and the distinction between endurance that has merit (when one suffers unjustly) and endurance that has no merit (when one suffers for actual wrong committed). Thus 2:20 has a point, but 3:17 appears to have none.

(b) The "better"-proverb, or *Tobspruch*, was first isolated and studied in O^T wisdom literature by W. Zimmerli (*ZA*[W] 51 [1933] 192–95), but the form exists in the N^T as well, whether with kreitton (1 Cor 7:9; 1 Pet 3:17; 2 Pet 2:21), kalon (e.g. Mark 9:43, 45, 47; Matt 18:8, 9; cf. Mark 14:21), or even sumferei (e.g. Matt 5:29, 30; 18:6). The most complete form of the *Tobspruch* in the N^T includes three elements: a word for "good" or "better," two infinitives expressing the actions or experiences being weighed against each other, and a word of comparison (h or mallon). In the synoptic tradition, the *Tobspruch* is characteristically used to set forth eschatological alternatives. It is "better" to enter the kingdom of God minus an eye or a limb than to escape such mutilation and be sent away to eternal fire. It is "better" to drown in the sea than cause an innocent believer to fall into sin. It is "better" never to have been born than to betray the Son of Man. If 1 Pet 3:17 is read as a *Tobspruch* of this kind, it yields a coherent meaning: it is "better" to suffer in this life at the hands of persecutors for doing good, than at God's hand on the "day of visitation" for doing wrong (for the thought, cf. Matt 10:28).

(c) This interpretation finds support in the context. The end of the quotation from Psalm 34 in vv 10–12 had divided all human beings into two groups: the "righteous" (dikaiou") and the "evildoers" (poiounta" kaka). God looks with favor on the one, but sets his face in judgment against the other. The readers of the epistle are invited to pursue the good and to claim the promises of the psalm for their own. The "evildoers" are anonymous at first (e.g. the autwn of v 14b), but assume definite shape in the oi ephreazonte" of v 16. Seen in this light, the distinction of the agaqopoiounta" and kakopoiounta" of v 17 is not (as in 2:13–20) between good and bad citizenship in Roman society as two options for the Christian, but is rather a distinction between two groups that comprise the whole human race: "doers of good," who *may* have to suffer in this age, and "doers of evil" who surely *will* suffer in the next. It is "better" (i.e. more advantageous) to belong to the first than to the second. V 17 is thus to be taken not as a word of admonition (i.e. make sure, when you suffer, that it is for doing good and not for doing evil), but as a word of assurance (i.e. remember, when you suffer, that you are infinitely better off than the evildoers who oppress you). This is why it follows so naturally on vv 13–14a, and helps to frame the admonitions of vv 14b–16 (cf. Michaels, 398–400).

A possible objection to this interpretation is that in the N^T pascein is nowhere else used of the world, or of unbelievers, suffering under the judgment of God. Its characteristic application is to the passion of Jesus Christ or to the persecution of Christians. Two factors should be noted here. First, pascein in 3:17 belongs grammatically with agaqopoiounta"; with kakopoiounta" it is implied but not expressed. Second, it will become clear in 4:17–18 that ultimately God's judgment is all of a piece. Beginning from the "house of God," it finally engulfs the whole world. It is the same reality, whether

viewed as "suffering" or "Judgment," and its separate stages are relativized.
ei qeloi to qelhma tou qeou, "if God should require it." The optative recalls the pascoite of v 14a, and completes the "hypothetical" framework of vv 13–17. Peter has not forgotten that he is examining a possibility rather than an actuality, but it is one to which he has devoted, and will devote, considerable attention. The "will of God" is of course an appropriate term by which to express such a contingency (cf. Matt 26:42; James 4:15; 1 John 5:14). For this expression and for the thought of the verse generally, cf. 4:19.

Explanation

The theme of vindication, introduced in vv 10–12 and understood as eschatological vindication, dominates vv 13–17, and will continue to dominate 3:18–4:6. God will finally vindicate his people no matter what sufferings they may have to face, and will punish their oppressors. If they maintain their integrity before Christ their Lord, they have nothing to fear from anyone's questions or accusations. At this point the precise content of their hope, the means and manner of their vindication, is not specified. Their confidence is simply that in some way Christ will put them in the right and their enemies in the wrong.

The Journey to Heaven (3:18–22)

Bibliography

Bieder, W. *Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi: Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Vorstellung von sog. Descensus ad inferos*. Zürich, 1949. **Bishop, E. F. F.** "Oligoi in 1 Pet 3:20." *CB*[Q] 13 (1951) 44–45. **Brooks, O. S.** "1 Peter iii.21—The Clue to the Literary Structure of the Epistle." *Nov*[T] 16 (1974) 290–305. **Bullinger, E. W.** "The Spirits in Prison." *Selected Writings* (1960) 141–63. **Bultmann, R.** "Bekenntnis und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbriefe." *Exegetica*. Tübingen, 1967. 285–97. **Cook, D.** "1 Peter III.20: An Unnecessary Problem." *JT*[S] n[s] 31 (1980) 72–78. **Canfield, C. E. B.** "The Interpretation of 1 Peter iii.19 and iv.6." *ExpTi*[m] 69 (1957/58) 369–72. **Dalton, W. J.** *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3.18–4.6*. AnBi[b] 23. Rome, 1965. ———. "Interpretation and Tradition: An Example from I Peter." *Gre*[g] 49 (1968) 11–37. ———. "The Interpretation of 1 Peter 3,19 and 4,6: Light from 2 Peter." *Bi*[b] 60.4 (1979) 547–55. **Feinberg, J. S.** "1 Peter 3:18–20, Ancient Mythology, and the Intermediate State." *WT*[J] 48 (1986) 303–36. **Frings, J.** "Zu 1 Petr 3,19 und 4,6." *B*[Z] 17 (1926) 75–88. **Fritsch, C. T.** "TO ANTITUPON." *Studia Biblica et Semitica*. F[S] T. C. Vriezen. Wageningen, 1966. 100–107. **Goodspeed, E. J.** "Enoch in 1 Peter 3,19." *JB*[L] 73 (1954) 91–92. **Grillmeier, A.** *Der Gottessohn im Totenreich*. Freiburg, 1975. **Gschwind, K.** *Die Niederfahrt Christi in die Unterwelt*. Münster, 1911. **Hanson, A. T.** "Salvation Proclaimed: I. 1 Peter 3:18–22." *ExpTi*[m] 93 (1982) 100–115. **Harris, J. R.** "A Further Note on the Use of Enoch in 1 Peter." *Ex*[p] 6.4 (1901) 346–49. ———. "On a Recent Emendation of the Text of St. Peter." *Ex*[p] 6.5 (1902) 317–20. ———. "The History of a Conjectural Emendation." *Ex*[p] 6.6 (1902) 378–90. **Huntzinger, C. H.** "Zur Struktur der Christus–Hymnen in Phil 2 und 1 Petr 3." In *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde*. F[S] J. Jeremias. Göttingen, 1970. 142–56. **Jeremias, J.** "Zwischen Karfreitag und Ostern: Descensus und Ascensus in Karfreitagstheologie des Neuen Testaments." *ZN*[W] 42 (1949) 194–201. **Johnson, S. E.** "The

Preaching to the Dead (1 Pet 3,18–22).” *JB*[L] 79 (1960) 48–51. **Maas, W.** *Gott und die Hölle: Studien zum Descensus Christi*. Einsiedeln, 1979. **Morris, W. D.** “1 Pet iii.19.” *ExpTi*[m] 38 (1926/27) 470. **Nixon, R. E.** “The Meaning of Baptism in 1 Peter 3,21.” S[E] 4 (1968) 437–41. **Peel, M.** *The Epistle to Rheginos*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969. **Reicke, B.** *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism: A Study of 1 Peter iii.19 and Its Context*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1946. **Richards, G. C.** “1 Pet iii.21.” *JT*[S] 32 (1931) 77. **Scharlemann, M. H.** “ ‘He Descended into Hell’: An Interpretation of 1 Peter 3:18–20.” *CT*[M] 27 (1956) 81–94. **Shimada, K.** “The Christological Creedal Formula in 1 Peter 3,18–22—Reconsidered.” *Annual of Japanese Biblical Institute* 5 (1979) 154–76. **Spitta, F.** *Christi Predigt an die Geister*. Göttingen, 1890. **Synge, F. C.** “1 Peter 3:18–21.” *ExpTi*[m] 82 (1970/71) 311. **Tripp, D. H.** “*Eperōtēma* (1 Peter 3:21): A Liturgist’s Note.” *ExpTi*[m] 92 (1981) 267–70. **Vogels, H.–J.** *Christi Abstieg ins Totenreich und das Läuterungsgericht an den Toten*. Freiburg, 1976.

Translation

> [18]*For Christ too once suffered for sins,*[a] *a just man on behalf of the unjust, that he might bring you*[b] *to God. He was put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the Spirit,*[c] [19]*and in that state he*[d] *went and made proclamation to the spirits*[e] *in refuge* [20]*who were disobedient long ago while God was waiting patiently in the days of Noah and an ark was being fashioned in which a few*[f]*—eight souls in all—were saved through water.* [21]*This water—or baptism, which*[g] *corresponds to it—now saves you*[h] *as well. [Baptism is] not the removal of the filth of the flesh, but an appeal to God out of a good conscience. [It saves you] through the raising of Jesus Christ,* [22]*who is at the right hand of God,*[i] *now that he has gone to heaven, with angels and authorities and powers in submission to him.*

Notes

a. The reading “suffered for sins,” based on the peri amartiwn epasen of [B K P] and the majority of later minuscules, is a relatively simple reading appropriate to both the context and Peter’s usage. Because it plausibly explains the other variants, it has the strongest claim to acceptance as the original reading. As in 2:21, some MS[s] tend to substitute “died” (apeqanen) for “suffered” (epaqen), and those that do invariably add to the phrase “for sins” either uper hmwn (“for us”), uper umwn (“for you”), or something equivalent. Although the combined testimony for these longer readings is impressive (e.g., [P72 a

[A],] they are probably conflations of Peter’s phrase peri amartiwn with certain traditional expressions such as “Christ died for us” or “for you” or “for our sins.” See *Note* e on 2:21*; also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 692–63; F. W. Beare, *JB*[L] 80 (1961) 258.

b. In place of “you” (uma") some early MS[s] ([a]

[2A C K L] and others) have “us” (hma"), but the witness of the majority of MS[s], including some of the most important early ones ([P72 B P] and Y) is sufficient to establish the originality of uma". The second person plural continues the terminology of vv 13–17; the first person could have been introduced either accidentally or as a result of the same tendency toward confessional language that is evident elsewhere. See *Note* f on 2:21*.

c. The majority, and the best, of ancient MS^{s} express the contrasting parallelism of these two clauses with a men … de construction in Gr^{r} but the men is omitted in ^{P72} Y and probably ^{A*}. Possibly the omission is linked to the addition of en before pneumati in the second clause in ^{P72}, a variant that disturbs the symmetry of sarki … pneumati (cf. 4:6) and may have appeared to scribes to make a men … de construction inappropriate. Because the en before pneumati is itself not original, but probably an early scribal attempt to prepare for the en w clause that immediately follows, the men … de construction should be left intact.

d. An ingenious conjecture traceable to the Gr. N^{T} published by J. Bowyer in 1763 substitutes ïEnwc ("Enoch") for en w ("in which") at the beginning of the verse. This would make Enoch (cf. Gen 5:24) the subject of the proclamation to the spirits in prison, in accordance with the pseudepigraphic Enoch literature (see *Comment*). A refinement of this conjecture (en w kai ßEnwc, "in which Enoch"), made by J. R. Harris (*Ex*^{p} 6.4 [1901] 346–49; 6.5 [1902] 317–20; 6.6 [1902] 378), found its way into the Goodspeed and Moffatt translations of the N^{T} (cf. E. J. Goodspeed, *JB*^{L} 73 [1954] 91–92). The conjecture has no ancient M^{S} support, and is of interest only in calling attention to how Christ in 1 Peter fulfills a role similar to that of the patriarch Enoch in the pseudepigraphic books of *1* and *2 Enoc*^{h} (cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 136–37).

e. The substitution of pneumati for pneumasin (^{P72}, two minuscules, a few v^{g} MS^{s}) is either an unintentional slip or a further attempt by the scribes responsible for ^{P72} to link the journey and proclamation of v 19 directly (and somewhat redundantly) to the "spirit" mentioned at the end of v 18; either "in which spirit he went and made proclamation even to those in refuge," or "in which [i.e. in the spirit] he went and by the spirit made proclamation even to those in refuge." The effect of the variant is that "those in refuge" are explicitly identified neither as spirits, angels, nor human beings, although the impression is left that they are human beings.

In a different vein, the addition of katakleismenoi" ("locked") after en fulakh in ^{C} and a few other Gr. MS^{s}, as well as some MS^{s} of the v^{g}, looks like an effort to be more specific and less abrupt about the mysterious "prisoners." But toi" en fulakh pneumasin is surely to be preferred on the ground of overwhelming external evidence.

f. A majority of the later MS^{s} (including $^{C\ P}$ and Y) read the feminine oligai for "a few" instead of the masculine oligoi. The latter, however, supported by the best ancient MS^{s} ($^{P72\ A\ B}$ and others), is clearly original. The feminine was substituted on the understanding that "a few" was an adjective modifying "souls" (yucai, feminine); instead it is used here as a noun—"a few" or "a few people" (masculine and thus generic), immediately specified as "eight souls."

g. In place of the nominative relative pronoun o, a very few minuscule MS^{s} have the easier dative (w): "through water, by which baptism also saves you." Another variation ($^{P72\ a}$

and a few other MS^{s}) omits the relative altogether: "through water, and now baptism saves you." Both of these are transparent efforts to make a difficult text more intelligible. o is to be accepted as original, with the majority (including $^{A\ B\ C\ K\ P}$ Y, and others).

h. The majority of later MS^{s} read uma" but hma" (the reading of the earliest and best MS^{s} ($^{P72\ a}$

A B P Y and others) is to be preferred. Although personal pronouns are infrequent in the context, when they do occur they are invariably second person (vv 13–16, 18, 21; 4:1, 4).

i. The word for "God" has the definite article (tou qeou) in the majority of MS^{s} (including P72 a

A C P), but lacks it in several important early MS^{s} (e.g., a

B Y). The fact that all other N^{T} examples of the phrase "at the right hand of God" use the definite article (Acts 2:33; Rom 8:34; Col 3:1; Heb 10:12; cf. Acts 7:55–56) suggests that scribes would have tended to add the article, but not to omit it if it were original. en dexia qeou is therefore probably the correct reading.
After the phrase "at the right hand of God," one O^{L} and many v^{g} MS^{s} have added the words *deglutiens mortem ut vitae aeternae heredes efficeremur* ["swallowing up death so that we might be made heirs of eternal life"]; for the first part, cf. Isa 25:8; for the second, Titus 3:7b, in a context rich in parallels to 1 Pet 1:3–5 as well. See *Form/Structure/Setting* for the possible origin of this secondary gloss.

Form/Structure/Setting
On the long history of the interpretation of these verses, see Selwyn, 314–62; Reicke, *Spirits*, 7–51; Dalton, *Proclamation*, 15–41. Many of the issues raised over the centuries have resulted from a widespread tendency to read certain N^{T} passages simultaneously instead of one at a time. In particular, vv 18–22 are frequently read in the light of 4:6, so that the "spirits" to whom Jesus made a proclamation are understood as the spirits of the dead—usually as the spirits of the evil generation that perished in the flood. At the same time, these verses are read in the light of Eph 4:8–10 so that Jesus' proclamation is set in the context of a descent to "the lower parts of the earth," thus a "descent into hell" (a phrase that found its way into certain forms of the creed). Because it was inconceivable that Jesus would have descended into hell after ascending to heaven (v 22), the descent into hell to preach to the dead—either to assure the salvation of O^{T} believers or to give the wicked a second chance for salvation—was assigned to the three days Christ is said to have spent in the tomb between his death and resurrection. When vv 18–22 are read by themselves, however, they speak neither of a "descent" nor of "hell." Their relationship to 4:6 can be assessed only after interpreting that verse in its proper sequence, and their relationship to other N^{T} passages can be assessed only in connection with particular words and phrases. In this commentary, the question of the place of vv 18–22 in the structure and argument of 1 Peter itself will be given precedence over the question of their place in the later history of Christian doctrine.

The opening words oti kai Cristo", "For Christ too" (cf. 2:21), signal the fact that vv 18–22 have a function similar to that of 2:21–25. The purpose of both passages is to set forth Jesus Christ, first as the supreme example of the behavior required of the epistle's readers, and second as the One who, by his redemptive work, made such behavior possible. After a momentary overlapping in subject matter (i.e., between v 18 and 2:24–25), the present passage moves on from where 2:21–25 left off. The thought of 2:21–25 proceeded from Jesus' behavior during his Passion (2:21–23), to his redemptive death on a cross (2:24a), to the present experience of Gentile Christians now reconciled to "the Shepherd and Guardian of your souls" (2:24b–25). The resurrection of Jesus and his elevation to

divine glory were "missing links" in that illustration, implied perhaps (see Comment on 2:21b, 24b–25) but never made explicit. Here, on the contrary, Jesus' behavior during his Passion goes unmentioned and his "example"—in the usual ethical sense of the word—is only a minor note (v 18a; cf., however, 4:1–2). Although there is significant further reflection on Jesus' death and its redemptive effects (v 18), the weight of emphasis falls on the "missing links" in the previous illustration—i.e., the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, with their accompanying consequences both for the readers of the epistle and for the whole visible and invisible universe. This makes of Jesus an "example" in a broader sense than in 2:21–25—an example not merely of suffering for doing good, but of suffering followed by vindication, the single dominant theme of the last half of 1 Peter (i.e., everything following the quotation from Ps 34 in 3:10–12).

What are Peter's sources for the illustration introduced in vv 18–22, and how is the illustration developed? It was readily apparent in 2:18–25 that the principal source for the illustration was Isa 53, but no single known literary text can be assigned a corresponding role here. There is almost universal agreement that Peter is drawing on traditional material in vv 18–22, but little agreement as to the nature of that material: e.g., did it include an early Christian hymn or confession of faith, possibly used in connection with baptism? Did it incorporate a fragment from a Jewish or Christian midrash on Genesis, or an apocalypse about Enoch or Noah? Answers to such questions are necessarily speculative (see, e.g., Bultmann, 1–14; Boismard, 57–109; and the discussion in Dalton, *Proclamation*, 87–100), but the best starting point is perhaps the symmetrical contrast in v 18b:

qanatwqei" men sarki, "put to death in the flesh"
zwopoihsei" de pneumati, "made alive in the Spirit."

The men … de construction by which Peter balances the contrasting participial expressions is probably his own stylistic trait (cf. 1:20; 2:4; 4:6, 14b), but the rhyming participles (neither verb being found elsewhere in 1 Peter) are more likely to be traditional, especially when linked to a third, the poreuqei" of vv 19 and 22 (for the verb, cf. only 4:3—in a quite different connection). The three together form a plausible series summarizing Christ's redemptive work:

qanatwqei" sarki, "put to death in the flesh" (v 18b)
zwopoihqei" pneumati, "made alive in the Spirit" (v 18b)
poreuqei" ei" ouranon, "gone to heaven" (v 22).

The identical aorist passive participle (<qei") endings, each followed by an additional word or short phrase, produce a striking resemblance to the "mystery of godliness" summarized in almost creedal fashion in 1 Tim 3:16:

o"
"He who was

efanerwqh en sarki
manifest in the flesh,

edikaiwqh en pneumati

justified in the Spirit,

wfqh aggeloi"
seen of angels

ekhrucqh en eqnesin
proclaimed in the nations,

episteuqh en kosmw
accepted in the world,

anelh mfqh en doxh
taken up in glory.

The main differences are that the series in 1 Peter is shorter, simpler, and more clearly a temporal sequence and that it is built around participles rather than a relative pronoun followed by aorist passive indicative verbs (with identical -qh endings). The notion that Jesus was "put to death" and then "made alive" is so common in the N^T (even though the vocabulary used here is untypical) that there is no way to trace the origin of such a simple formula with confidence (the usual expression is "died and rose," or "died and lives"; cf. e.g., Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33–34; Luke 24:7, 46; Rom 6:10; 14.9; 1 Cor 15:3; 2 Cor 5:15; 1 Thess 4:14).

Less common is the statement that Jesus "went to heaven" (poreuqei" ei" ouranon; for the idea, cf. "taken up in glory" in 1 Tim 3:16). Perhaps the closest parallel to the threefold sequence discernible in 1 Peter is found in the Valentinian *Epistle to Rheginos*, or *Treat. Res.* (probably composed in Rome in the second century), 45.25–28:

> So then, as the Apostle said,
> we suffered with him, and
> we arose with him, and
> we went to heaven with him.

The "Apostle" being cited is undoubtedly Paul, not Peter (Peel, 18, 70–72) and the pattern of "we … with him" is probably derived from Paul (cf. Rom 6:8; 8:17b; 2 Tim 2:11). Yet the term "suffered," especially where "died" would have been expected, recalls 1 Peter (e.g., 3:18a—although *not* v 18b; 2:23; 4:1; cf. 1:11), as well as Paul (cf. Rom 8:17b). The phrase "went to heaven" corresponds perfectly to the poreuqei" ei" ouranon of 1 Pet 3:22.

A further point of interest is that the relevant passage in *Treat. Res.* is immediately preceded by the following (45.14–23):

> The Savior swallowed death. You must not be unperceptive: for I mean that laying aside the perishable world, He exchanged it for an unperishing eternal realm. And He raised himself up (having "swallowed" the visible by means of the invisible), and gave us the way to our immortality. (B. Layton, *The Gnostic Treatise on Resurrection from Nag Hammadi* [Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979]

Again the language echoes Paul (1 Cor 15:53–55, especially v 54b, based on Isa 25:8; also 2 Cor 5:4b; see Peel, 67–69). There is also, however, a striking parallel in the long

variant (known only in Latin)just before the words poreuqei" ei" ouranon in 1 Pet 3:22 (see *Note* i*): "swallowing up death so that we might be made heirs of eternal life" (cf. Isa 25:8; also Titus 3:7b). Even though the variant has no claim to originality, it may reflect knowledge (in the West, possibly in Rome) of a tradition about victory over death associated with the sequence, "put to death—made alive—gone to heaven," and known also to the author of *Treat. Res.*. If this is so, then *Treat. Res.*, 1 Peter, and certain later scribes who copied 1 Peter all drew on a traditional summary of the work of Christ, a summary attributed to Paul in some circles, but quite possibly older than Paul and more generally known and used. 2 Tim 2:11, for example, is a "faithful saying" which Paul is represented as quoting, while Rom 6:8 is something Paul says "we believe" and Rom 8:17b occurs similarly in a context appealing to the common baptismal experience of all Christians (i.e. Rom 8:15b–17).

It is not hard to imagine how the sequence "Christ suffered [or died] … Christ rose [or was made alive] … Christ went to heaven" might have become the basis either for reminding Christians that they had died, risen, and gone to heaven with him (besides *Treat. Res.*, cf. also Eph 2:5–6; Col 2:11–13, 20; 3:1), or for inviting them to do so (Rom 8:17b; in Rom 6:8 and 2 Tim 2:11 the dying is in the past while the rising is future). If this was the course of development, then the sequence underlying 1 Pet 3:18–22 represents a relatively early—possibly the earliest—stage of the tradition. The analogy with 1 Tim 3:16 suggests that the words sarki, "flesh," and pneumati, "Spirit," no less than the phrase "to heaven," were part of the formula at that stage poreuqei" could not have stood alone in any case). Their absence in the "we … with him" formulations in Paul and *Treat. Res.* is probably attributable simply to a shift in focus from delineating the stages in the redemptive career of Christ himself to celebrating the identification of believers with him at any or all of these stages. Alternatively, it is possible that Peter himself added sarki and pneumati (cf. 4:6) to distinguish "the sufferings intended for Christ," the main theme of 2:21–25, from "the glorious events that would follow" (cf. 1:11), the theme now to be developed. This would yield an even simpler original sequence: qanatwqei" … zwopoihqei" … poreuqei" ei" ouranon ("put to death … made alive … gone to heaven"). More likely, "flesh" and "Spirit" belonged to the formula from the start.

Whatever the literary or preliterary history of the three–part sequence, the more important issue is the use Peter makes of it in vv 18–22. In v 18b, he sets off the first two elements in the series by the use of men … de, in order to concentrate on the third, poreuqei", in vv 19–22. The function of qanatwqei" sarki in v 18b is simply to carry forward the thought of v 18a (about Christ's redemptive death) so as to set the stage for what follows. Peter forges a strong link between zwopoihqei" pneumati and poreuqei" ei" ouranon, with the result that the latter dominates the entire argumentú The impression is given that Jesus was "made alive in the Spirit" (i.e. rose from the dead), for one purpose—to make a journey—and his heavenly journey is what vv 19–22 are all about. The resurrection does not quite lose its independent significance, for Peter returns to it with the phrase di anastasew" Ihsou Cristou ("through the resurrection of Jesus Christ") in v 2lb. Yet even there it is not the last word, for again it is interpreted as the beginning of a journey to heaven by virtue of which Christ rules over every power in the universe (v 22). The decisive link between "made alive in the Spirit" and "gone to heaven" is accomplished first by the use of en w kai at the beginning of v 19, and second by moving poreuqei" up to v 19 so as to anticipate the complete expression, poreuqei" ei" ouranon, in v 22. The

much–discussed en w (see *Comment*) establishes continuity by connecting pneumati (implicitly at least) with the third as well as the second element in the traditional three–part sequence; not only the "making alive," but the subsequent "journey" of Christ as well is understood to be "in the Spirit." The two events are viewed almost as one continuous divine act. Peter's apparent intent in vv 19–22 is to answer the question. What did this heavenly journey in the Spirit entail, and what did it accomplish for Christian believers? Specifically he wants to show what it meant for "you," the readers of his epistle, in the situations in which he imagines them in the provinces of Asia Minor. The pronoun uma", "you," occurs once in v 18 ("that he might bring *you* to God"), and Peter does not return to it until v 21 ("baptism saves *you* now"), yet the second person pronouns serve as reference points for the whole passage, and the very reason for its existence.

What *did* the journey entail? The expression, "Go and preach" (poreuesqai with khrussein), or "Go and tell" (with apaggellein) occurs in the synoptic Gospels in commands attributed to the earthly Jesus (Matt 10:7; Matt 11:4; Luke 7:22) and to the risen Christ (Mark 16:15; cf. 16:10). It is not surprising, therefore, that Peter connects poreuqei" with ekhruxen to show the risen Christ himself fulfilling a mission of proclamation—although in a far different sphere from that to which he sent the disciples! Whether the "spirits in refuge" (v 19) are the souls of human beings who perished in Noah's flood, or supernatural beings whose misconduct brought on the world the judgment of the flood (see *Comment*), Christ's proclamation to them serves to introduce a cluster of parallels between the "days of Noah" and Peter's own time. Vv 20–21 are a kind of Christian midrash on the Noah story, based on the principle (attributed to Jesus) that "as it was in the days of Noah, so it will be in the days of the Son of Man" (Luke 17:26; cf. Matt 24:37; the saying is probably derived either from Q or from an equally early eschatological discourse known to Matthew and Luke). The analogy is only slightly developed in the synoptic tradition: people ate, drank, and got married until Noah entered the ark and they were taken by surprise by the great flood that destroyed everything (Luke 17:27 // Matt 24:38–39a). When the Son of man comes, the world will be similarly caught unaware by his sudden appearance for judgment (Luke 24:30–31, 34–37; Matt 24:39b–41).

Among the few common features of the two N^T letters bearing the name of the Apostle Peter is the further development of this analogy between Noah's time and their own. 1 Peter calls attention to an explicit analogy that the synoptics could hardly have been expected to mention: as Noah and his family were "saved through water," so "baptism … saves you now" (vv 20–21). The one explicit analogy raises the possibility of several implicit ones as well: "God was waiting patiently" then before bringing judgment on the world, and is presumably waiting patiently again; "few" were saved in those days, and Christian believers are few in comparison to the many who have rejected Christ, the living Stone (cf. 2:4, 7b–8); the time while "an ark was being fashione" was a time of anticipation like the present, when a "spiritual house" is being built to serve God and survive the judgment (cf. 2:5; 4:17). Peter seems to have allowed his readers to make something of these possible parallels or not, as they chose. His main concern (accomplished by the resumption in v 21 of the uma" of v 18a) is to remind them that Christ has saved them—through water—and will keep them safe, just as he saved Noah and his family in ancient times.

2 Peter makes the same point somewhat differently (cf. Dalton, *Bib* 60 [1979] 551–53). There the explicit reference to Noah comes in a series of references to "the angels that sinned" (2 Pet 2:4; cf. Gen 6:1–4), Noah (2:5), and Lot (2:6–8; cf. the association of Noah

and Lot in Luke 17:26–32). Noah was "one of eight" (2 Pet 2:5; cf. 1 Pet 3:20), although no emphasis is placed on eight being "few," and a "proclaimer of righteousness" (i.e., the righteousness of a new world, 2 Pet 3:13). The conclusion in 2 Peter is that "the Lord knows how to deliver the godly from trial and to keep the unjust under punishment until the day of judgment" (2:9). 2 Peter returns to the theme of the flood (without mentioning Noah by name) in 3:6–18, with a comparison of its destructive waters to the fire that will destroy a world now "kept until the day of judgment and destruction of the ungodly" (3:7), although again with an accompanying hope of salvation for the faithful (3:8–13).

If 2 Peter holds in delicate balance the threat of judgment and the hope of mercy (in contrast to Jude 6, which focused exclusively on judgment and omitted mention of Noah altogether), 1 Peter (in this passage at least) is preoccupied with mercy and salvation (cf. Selwyn, 332). The burden of vv 18–22 is that the readers of the epistle have no reason to fear (cf. 3:14), because Christ has won the decisive victory on their behalf by his resurrection and journey to heaven; their baptism is the token of their participation in that victory. Peter ends the section by making poreuqei" ei" ouranon explicit (v 22) and reinforcing it with two other traditional formulations that contemplate the journey's end: (1) "at the right hand of God" (cf. Ps 110:1, and especially Rom 8:34); (2) "with angels and authorities and powers in submission to him" (cf. Ps 8:7, and especially Heb 2:5–9); see *Comment*. The end of the journey in v 22 is depicted clearly enough, but the means by which Christ gained this ascendancy are less clear. The conspicuous mention of angelic powers and their subjection raises acutely the question of the proclamation to the "spirits" in v 19 and what it accomplished. That question is best approached in connection with a more detailed analysis of Peter's language.

Comment

18 oti kai Cristo" apax peri amartiwn epaqen, "For Christ too once suffered for sins." The same phrase, oti kai Cristo", in 2:21 introduced Christ as an example of "suffering," specifically of "suffering unjustly" or "suffering for doing good" (2:19, 20). Here too, "suffering for doing good" is the point of comparison (cf. agaqopoiounta" … pascein, v 17). The kai, "too," does not imply that the analogy between Christ's suffering and that of Christians is exact, for Christ suffered "once" (apax) and he suffered "for sins" (peri amartiwn), i.e., redemptively (cf. Best, 137).

apax can mean "once" in contrast to "now" (like pote in v 20; 2:10; 3:5; see Reicke, *Spirits*, 214), or "once" in contrast to "again and again" (as e.g., in Heb 9:26, 28; cf. efapax in Rom 6:10; Heb 7:27; 9:12; 10:10). Here, by stressing the uniqueness of Christ's suffering, it limits the analogy just introduced. Although the specific contrast in Hebrews between the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice "once for all" and the inadequacy of the repeated animal sacrifices of the O^T priestly system is lacking in 1 Peter, apax does connote sufficiency and completeness. Christ's suffering is over, its purpose fully accomplished. Peter will now reflect on what that purpose was (cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 116–17, who overstates somewhat the similarity between 1 Peter and Hebrews at this point).

peri amartiwn epaqen, "suffered for sins." The expression occurs nowhere else in the N^T, and cannot be assumed to have a technical meaning. peri amartiwn, however, is used in Hebrews in a sacrificial sense (Heb 5:3; 10:26; cf. 1 John 2:2), along with uper amartiwn (Heb 5:1; 10:12) and peri amartia" (Heb 10:6, 8, based on Ps 39[40]:7; also

10:18; 13:11; cf. Rom 8:3). The last of these is by far the most frequent in the LX[x] (18 occurrences in Leviticus alone; cf. also Isa 53:10; plural forms with peri are rare, although cf. Lev 5:5; 16:16, 25; Deut 9:18). Although Peter clearly intends a sacrificial meaning (cf. 1:19; 2:24), the expression he has chosen does not in itself explain precisely what effect Christ's sufferings had on human sins. It simply gathers up into a single phrase the thought developed earlier in 2:21–24. epaqen, which in 2:21 referred to the events leading up to Christ's death, here encompasses the death itself (2:24), with its decisive effect of carrying the sins of Christ's followers away (for paqcein as "die," see BG[D], 634.3a). The effect on sins is for the moment unexpressed, although Peter will return to it in 4:1–2.

dikaio" uper adikwn, "a just man on behalf of the unjust" (cf. *Diogn.* 9.2, where this phrase stands in the center of a series of five similar expressions).

Having used peri in relation to the sins, Peter "prefers to reserve the preposition uper for the persons benefited, as here and in ii.21" (Selwyn, 196). For the word play, cf. Melito, *On the Passover*, 94 [276]: "the unjust murder of the just." For the thought and structure, see *Mart. Pol.* 17.2: "who … suffered as a blameless man [amwmon; cf. 1 Peter 1:19] on behalf of sinners." The innocence or sinlessness of Christ, emphasized not only in 1:19 but in 2:22–23 and 4:1b (see *Comment*), comes to expression here in the familiar term dikaio" (see Matt 27:19; Luke 23:47; 1 John 2:1, 29; 3:7; it is not a title as in Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14). Dalton (*Proclamation*, 121) aptly calls attention to dikaio" in Isa 53:11, and to "the contrast of Is 53 between the righteousness of the servant and the sinfulness of those for whom he suffered."

For a moment, the readers of the epistle are themselves put in the position of the "unjust" who afflict them unjustly (cf. 2:19), i.e., of "the ungodly and sinful" (4:18) or "those who do evil" (3:12), both expressions being used in O[T] citations in contrast to those who are dikaio", or "just." The reference is to Christian believers before their conversion, alienated from God and needing to be reconciled (cf. 1:14, 18b; 2:10, 25a; 4:3). "Just" and "unjust" were familiar expressions for good and bad, the two kinds of people in the world (Matt 5:45; Acts 24:15). Probably because the notion that Jesus Christ "came not to call the just, but sinners," was so firmly rooted in the Gospel tradition (Mark 2:17 // Matt 9:13 // Luke 5:32), it became necessary at times for N[T] writers to characterize the redeemed as "unjust" or "sinners" before God in order to highlight their new status as "just" or "righteous" (cf. Rom 5:6–8; 1 Tim 1:15).

ina uma" prosagagh tw qew, "that he might bring you to God." The death of "the just for the unjust" reconciles the latter to God, with uma" making it unmistakably clear that the "unjust" who needed reconciliation were indeed the epistle's readers (cf. the noun prosagwgh in Rom 5:2; Eph 2:18; 3:12). Peter's language may lend further support to the view that the readers of the epistle were Gentiles who did not know the true God until they became Christians. As Selwyn (196), Kelly (149), and Goppelt (244) all recognize, it is very unlikely that Peter is referring to consecration either as priests (cf. Exod 29:4, 8; 40:12; Lev 8:24; Num 8:9–10; see Dalton, *Proclamation*, 124; Schelkle, 103), or as sacrificial victims (e.g., Exod 29:10; Lev 1:2; cf. Vulgate: *ut nos offeret Deo*). The metaphor of priesthood introduced in 2:5, 9 is not in view here. Nor is there evidence that Peter has in mind access to God expressed primarily in worship—even though true worship inevitably results from reconciliation to God. The focus is rather on religious conversion, the experience of being brought from darkness to light (2:9) and from idols to the God of Israel (cf. 1:21b, "so that your faith and hope might be in God").

Is religious conversion the whole story—or only its first chapter? Is being brought to faith and hope in God the same as being brought to God? Does Peter consider the purpose he describes here as something already fulfilled, or not? If 2:25 is the operative parallel, then the purpose is fulfilled: "… you have returned now to the Shepherd and Guardian of your souls." "The shepherd and Guardian," however, is Christ, not God the Father (see *Comment*), and Christ is not merely the one to whom believers have come, but the one in whose footsteps they must follow (cf. 2:21; see Goppelt, 244). Christ, although not yet visible to them (cf. 1:8; 5:4), is nevertheless leading them home to God as a "Shepherd and Guardian" should (cf. Heb 2:10, where Christ is the forerunner and God is the one leading [agagonta] "many sons to glory"). Coming to God is a process still going on (see Comment on 2:2b, 5, 9), but the certainty of its accomplishment is the reason Christ's followers should not be afraid (cf. vv 13–14). If the immediate benefit of Christ's sacrificial death is religious conversion, its ultimate benefit is eschatological salvation.qanatwqei" men sarki, zwopoihqei" de pneumati, "He was put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the Spirit." While this couplet is not parenthetical, as Reicke (*Spirits*, 107, 113) proposes, neither does it depend grammatically on the preceding verb prosagagh (the view of Dalton, *Proclamation*, 143). It is instead loosely connected to what precedes, both reiterating the thought of v 18a and supplementing it by making Christ's vindication explicit. qanatwqei" recalls synoptic accounts of the judicial proceedings that led to Jesus' death (Mark 14:55//Matt 26:59; Matt 27:1); zwopoiein, on the other hand, is used only here of Jesus' resurrection. Elsewhere in the N^T it refers either to future resurrection (John 5:21; Rom 4:17; 8:11; 1 Cor 15:22), or to the giving of life in a more general sense (1 Cor 15:36; 2 Cor 3:6; Gal 3:21—John 6:63 and 1 Cor 15:45 are open to debate). Nevertheless, the reference to Jesus' resurrection is unmistakable. Efforts (e.g. by Windisch, 71) to distinguish between being "made alive" here and being raised from the dead in v 22 are forced, and appear to be motivated simply by a desire to make room for Jesus' proclamation to the spirits between his death and resurrection. In the history of interpretation, Jesus' two or three days in the tomb have naturally been proposed as the appropriate time for him to have made proclamation to the "spirits in refuge"—especially when this proclamation was identified with the evangelization of the dead mentioned in 4:6. Dalton (e.g. *Proclamation*, 126, 141–42), however, has shown conclusively that the proclamation mentioned in v 19 follows rather than precedes Christ's resurrection. Any attempt to distinguish between zwopoihqei" pneumati and Jesus' bodily resurrection must do so by showing that only Jesus' "soul" or "spirit" was quickened while his body remained in the tomb, and this (as we shall see) is not borne out by Peter's sarki-pneumati distinction.

The verbs qanatoun and zwopoiein are found together in 2 Kings 5:7 LX^x (with reference to the power of God to kill and make alive) and in *Diogn*. 5.12 (adapted from 2 Cor 6:9 with reference to the experience of Christian believers). God is clearly presupposed as the one who brought Jesus to life (cf. Zerwick, 76, on the "theological passive"), and it is even possible (because of the passive voice, and on the analogy of 2 Kings 5:7) that God is the implied subject of qanatwqei" as well. The contrast between "flesh" and "Spirit," however (plus the fact that poreuqei", the last element in the threefold sequence, is not a passive at all, but a middle), suggests the contrary: Jesus was "put to death" by human hands, not by God, but it was God who brought him to life by the power of the Spirit (cf. 4:6).

sarki and pneumati are both datives of espect (BD[F,] § 197; cf. 2:24). They cannot be instrumental because the instrumental idea does not fit sarki; Christ was put to death "in the flesh," but hardly "by the flesh." There is growing agreement that the distinction here indicated by "flesh" and "Spirit" is not between the material and immaterial parts of Christ's person (i.e., his "body" and "soul"), but rather between his earthly existence and his risen state (cf. Rom 1:3–4; 1 Tim 3:16). Dalton comments that flesh and spirit normally refer in the N[T] "to two orders of being, the flesh representing human nature in its weakness, its proclivity to evil, its actual evil once it opposes the influence of God, the spirit representing the consequence of God's incursion into human affairs, the presence and activity among men of the Spirit of God" (*Proclamation*, 127). Dalton's carefully worded statement anticipates his later admission that in some passages in Paul "it is difficult to know whether 'spirit' should be taken as a divine person, or as the new life communicated to man by the presence and activity of this person. One meaning fuses into the other. In Rom 1:3 f. their personal meaning is indicated; in 1 Peter 3:18 it is not clear" (129). This means that the question of whether or not "spirit" should be capitalized in translation (to identify it as the "Holy Spirit" or "Spirit of God") remains an open one. For the sake of the parallelism with "flesh," the lower case is probably more appropriate, yet the parallels with the two other creedal or confessional instances of the "flesh-spirit" distinction in the N[T] (i.e., Rom 1:3–4; 1 Tim 3:16) confirm Dalton's contention that "spirit" refers to that sphere of Christ's existence in which God's Holy Spirit was supremely and most conspicuously at work (*Proclamation*, 129–30). Therefore it is here capitalized in translation. The meaning of the two datives is thus shaped by the respective participles they modify. If "flesh" is the sphere of human limitations, of suffering, and of death (cf. 4:1), "Spirit" is the sphere of power, vindication, and a new life (cf. Beare, 169). Both spheres affect Christ's (or anyone else's) whole person; one cannot be assigned to the body and the other to the soul (cf. E. Schweizer, *TDN*[T] 6:415–37, 447; 7:125–35).

The pairing of the two participial expressions by the use of men … de has the effect of subordinating the first to the second: "though put to death in the flesh, he was made alive in the Spirit" (cf. BD[F,] § 447.5; Dalton, *Proclamation*, 126, 142). The positive benefits of Christ's death have been amply demonstrated already in v 18a; Peter mentions the death again in the couplet comprising v 18b mainly to give force to the decisive second phrase, "made alive in the Spirit." The resurrection is where his emphasis lies, and the resurrection (whether of Christ or of Christians) is characteristically attributed in the N[T] to "spirit," or to the Spirit of God: see, e.g., John 6:63, where "it is the Spirit that gives life" (to pneuma estin to zwopoioun); 1 Cor 15:45, where Christ, the last Adam becomes a "life-giving spirit" (pneuma zwopoioun; the phrase no more implies immateriality than does the preceding description of the first Adam as "a living soul"); and especially Rom 8:11: "If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead [tou egeiranto" … ek nekrwn; cf. l Peter 1:21] dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will also give life [zwopoihsei] to your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwells in you" (note also the interchangeability of zwopoiein with egeirein, the principal N[T] word for "raise"). The statement that Christ was "made alive in the Spirit," therefore, means simply that he was raised from the dead, not as a spirit, but bodily (as resurrection always is in the N[T],) and in a sphere in which the Spirit and power of God are displayed without hindrance or human limitation (cf. 1:21). Death "in the flesh" is conquered and reversed; Jesus Christ is set free to complete a mission of utmost importance for the readers of the epistle.

19 en w kai toi" en fulakh pneumasin poreuqei" ekhruxen, "and in that state he went and made proclamation to the spirits in refuge." The first question concerns the antecedent of en w. Is it the immediately preceding pneumati (NE[b]: "and in the Spirit he went"; cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 137–40), or is it the preceding phrase as a whole: "in which process," or "in the course of which" (Selwyn, 197)? Or is en w used as a relative causal conjunction ("for which reason") or, more likely, as a relative temporal one ("on which occasion"; Reicke, *Spirits*, 103–15; Fink, 35–37; Goppelt, 247). The question is less important than the volume of discussion suggests. If the emphasis in the preceding verse is indeed on Christ's triumph or vindication, then the proclamation indicated here must have been made in connection with that triumph, not in connection with the suffering and death that preceded it. No matter whether en w is translated "in the Spirit" (i.e., in which he was made alive), or "in that state" (i.e., his risen state, or "on that occasion," i.e., when he rose from the dead), or "for that reason" (i.e., because he was raised), or "in which process" (i.e., the resurrection process), the meaning remains much the same. In any instance, the words en w kai serve to link zwopoihqei" closely to the poreuqei" ekhruxen that follows, making Christ's proclamation to the spirits a direct outcome of his resurrection from the dead. Even the translations suggested by those trying to avoid the idea of a temporal sequence tend to imply just such a sequence. Only by further discussion—sometimes at considerable length—are commentators able to blunt the force of that apparent sequence. Selwyn, for example, resorts to vagueness (197): Christ's proclamation to the spirits could have come anywhere in "the whole process described in verse 18, " therefore possibly between the death and resurrection. Reicke, more boldly and more concretely, takes the entire couplet in v 18b ("put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit") as a parenthesis, so that en w kai points back to v 18a (and its main verb, "suffered"), not to the note of resurrection on which v 18 ends (*Spirits*, 107, 113). This, and not the translation of en w, is the core of Reicke's long and elaborate discussion. His comment that the couplet was parenthetically "inserted as a clearer explanation of the main action" (107) is inaccurate because only the first half of the couplet (i.e., "put to death in the flesh") summarizes v 18a; the second half carries the thought decisively forward—precisely in the direction of vv 19–22!

How then should en w be understood? Selwyn's observation that the antecedent "cannot be pneumati, for there is no example in N[T] of this dative of reference … serving as antecedent to the relative pronoun" (197; cf. Reicke, *Spirits*, 108) is a point well taken. If "Spirit" were the antecedent, Peter could have clarified the matter by repeating pneumati after en w (cf. peri h" swthria", "concerning which salvation," in 1:10; also en w qeghmati, "by which will," in Heb 10:10). Yet the effect of this would have been to create an unintended play on words between "Spirit" and "the spirits in refuge," a connection Peter has no interest in pointing out (cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 140–41, over against the view of H. J. Holtzmann that "Christ preached 'as a spirit to the spirits,' just as, in His earthly life, He had preached 'as a man to men' "). It is perhaps best to take as the antecedent not pneumati in particular (with Dalton, *Proclamation*, 138–40, citing the analogy of the Spirit's role in the baptism and temptation of Jesus), but the entire expression, "made alive in the Spirit," which amounts to the same thing (cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 140). Hence the translation, "and in that state."

kai toi" en fulakh pneumasin, "and … to the spirits in refuge" (or, more commonly, "in prison"). The conjunction kai links zwopoihqei" to poreuqei" ekhruxen: Christ who rose

from the dead "also" made a journey in order to complete his work (cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 142–43). The placement of the phrase about "the spirits" immediately after the kai suggests that the simple conjunction may do double duty: Christ went and preached "even" to the spirits who were disobedient to God in Noah's time—i.e., he went to the most remote and unlikely audience imaginable (cf. kai nekroi" in 4:6, even if the reference is different, see *Comment*). This is Peter's way of dramatizing concretely the universality of Christ's lordship, which he will make explicit in v 22: "with angels and authorities and powers in subjection to him" (cf. the universality of such formulations as Phil 2:10–11; Eph 1:21–22; 4:10).

Who are "the spirits"? V 20 clearly locates them "in the days of Noah," just before the flood, but are they the souls of those who perished in the flood (e.g., Beare, 172; Goppelt, 249–50), or are they the "sons of God" of Gen 6:2, understood in Jewish and early Christian tradition as angels whose misbehavior with "the daughters of men" brought about the flood as God's judgment on a sinful world (e.g., Dalton, *Proclamation*, 145–49; Brox, 171–74)? Or do they include both groups (Reicke, *Spirits*, 52–92; Windisch, 71; somewhat equivocally, Selwyn, 198–99)? The plural "spirits" is only once in the N^T used of human beings: "spirits of just people made perfect" (Heb 12:23). There the reference is apparently to the souls of those who have died, but it must be noted that "spirits" by itself does not have that meaning; the "spirits" are identified by a qualifying genitive as the spirits of the "just" (i.e., of human beings; cf. Dan 3:86a $LX^{X)}$. A human being may have a spirit (i.e., a soul, or the life within a person; cf. e.g., Matt 27:50; Luke 23:46; John 19:30; Acts 7:59), but it is not normally said that one is a spirit, much less that a group of human beings collectively are "spirits"—even though this is done with yuch, or "soul," notably in 1 Peter itself (see v 20b; also perhaps 1:9).

On the other hand, "spirit" is frequently used in the $N^{T,}$ for supernatural beings, especially the demons that Jesus confronted in his ministry: e.g., the plural "spirits" (without qualification) in Matt 8:16; Luke 10:20; "unclean spirits" in Matt 10:1; Mark 1:27; 3:11; 5:13; 6:7; Luke 4:36; 6:18; Acts 5:16; cf. Rev 16:13; "evil spirits" in Matt 12:45//Luke 11:26; Luke 7:21; 8:2; Acts 19:12–13 (for the singular, cf. Matt 12:43//Luke 11:24; Mark 1:23, 26; 3:30; 5:2, 8; 7:25; 9:17, 20, 25; Luke 8:29; 9:39, 42; 13:11; Acts 16–16, 18; 19:15–16). Only Rev 18:2 connects "spirit" in this sense with fulakh: Babylon (i.e., Rome) is proclaimed "the fulakh (refuge or haven; $BG^{D,}$;, 868) of every unclean spirit" (as of every unclean bird and beast). Despite the coincidence that 1 Peter is written from "Babylon" (5:13), any temptation to spiritualize fulakh in our passage as the Roman Empire, or the hostile society in which the author and his readers lived, should be firmly resisted.

There is agreement on virtually all sides that Jewish traditions about Enoch (occasioned by Gen 5:24), especially *1 Enoc*^{h}, have influenced Peter's thought (and possibly his language) at this point. "Spirits" is used in *1 Enoc*^{h} for the souls of the dead, but always either with qualifying genitives, as in Heb 12:23 (e.g., *1 Enoc*^{h} 22.3, 9, 12, 13; also 9.3, 10 in the Greek text of Syncellus), or in close dependence on preceding phrases that are so qualified (e.g., 22.6, 13). The "sons of God" who corrupted the human race (Gen 6:1–4) are customarily designated either as "angels" (e.g., *1 Enoc*^{h} 6.2; cf. Jude 6; 2 Pet 2:4) or as "watchers" (e.g., *1 Enoc*^{h} 12.2, 4), not as "spirits," although Enoch reminds them that before they defiled themselves they had been "spiritual [Greek: spirits], living the eternal life" in heaven (15.4, 6, 7). The closest parallel in *1 Enoc*^{h} to the "spirits" in 1 Peter is probably to

be found in 15.8–10: “But now the giants who are born from (the union of) spirits and the flesh shall be called evil spirits upon the earth, because their dwelling shall be upon the earth and inside the earth. Evil spirits have come out of their bodies. … They will become evil upon the earth and shall be called evil spirits. The dwelling of the spiritual beings of heaven is heaven, but the dwelling of the spirits of the earth, which are born upon the earth, is in the earth” (*OT*[P], 1:21–22). Although neither the original text nor the meaning of the passage are entirely clear, its apparent aim is to identify certain known demonic powers (or “evil spirits”) as the indirect offspring of the ancient illicit union between originally holy and “spiritual” angels, and women of the generation before the flood. That union produced “giants” (cf. Gen 6:4 LX[X]) and from these giants came the “evil spirits” or demons, that continue to harass humankind (cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 165). If this passage is brought to bear on 1 Peter, then the “spirits in refuge” are neither the souls of those who died in the flood nor precisely the angels whose sin brought the flood on the earth, but rather the “evil spirits” who came from the angels—probably identified in Peter’s mind with the “evil” or “unclean” spirits of the Gospel tradition. If the authors of *1 Enoc*[h] saw the “evil spirits” of their day as offspring of the angelic “watchers,” there is no reason why Peter may not have viewed the “unclean spirits” of his own Christian tradition in a similar light.

The main difficulty with such a suggestion is that evil or unclean spirits are elsewhere in the N[T] viewed not as being “in prison” (the usual understanding of en fulakh), but very much in evidence and quite active in the world. For this reason, a more neutral translation, “in refuge,” is here proposed. Is it possible to be more precise about the meaning of en fulakh? If the phrase does refer to a “prison,” what kind of prison is it and where is it located? fulakh does not occur in any Greek fragment of *1 Enoc*[h]. Although there is ample reference to the fallen angels being “bound” or thrown into a “prison house” (cf. e.g., *1 Enoc*[h] 10.4–6, 12–14; 13.1; 14.5; 18.14–16; 21.6, 10), the Greek terms are dein (“to bind”), desmwthrion (“prison”), desmoi (“bonds”), sugkleisi" (“confinement”), and sunecein (“to shut or restrain”). Moreover, those imprisoned in *1 Enoc*[h] are the angels themselves, not their demonic offspring. In this respect the evidence of *1 Enoc*[h] coincides much better with Jude 6 and 2 Pet 2:4 than with 1 Peter. The angels are imprisoned in darkness somewhere beneath the earth, and are there to stay—at least until the final “judgment of the great day” (Jude 6). It is hard to see what effect Christ’s proclamation would have on them unless 1 Peter is proposing a quite different scenario from that of *1 Enoc*[h], Jude, and 2 Peter. Did Christ redeem these fallen angels? 2 Peter (which seems to know 1 Peter; cf. 2 Pet 3:1) knows nothing of any such redemption? Did he bring them under subjection (as v 22 would indicate)? If they are already confined in prison, it is hard to imagine what further “subjection” might mean in their case. Did he free them from their prison in order to make them his voluntary subjects? This is possible, but again it would have to be admitted that Jude and 2 Peter present a very different interpretation. Did he announce to them that their final destruction was at last imminent (cf. 4:5, 7, 17–18)? This is probably the best option *if* the spirits en fulakh are understood as the fallen angels consigned “to pits of nether gloom” (2 Pet 2:4).

If the “spirits” are not these angels, but rather their offspring (cf. *1 Enoc*[h] 15.8–10) understood as demons, or “unclean spirits,” then a different interpretation of fulakh may be indicated. The word refers to the act of guarding or to a place that is guarded, ordinarily a prison. Guarding can be either for the purpose of confinement or protection, and fulakh here may be more of a haven or refuge for evil spirits than a “prison” in the usual sense of

the word. That is, the emphasis may be as much (or more) on the safety of those within the fulakh as of those outside it. “Refuge,” as we have seen, is the apparent meaning of fulakh in Rev 18:2, its only other N^T use in connection with “spirits.” This ambiguity in fulakh is illustrated by the English word "security,” which can suggest either confinement or protection. If the “spirits” in our passage are viewed as being “in security” or “in refuge,” then Christ’s proclamation to them takes on new implications.

poreuqei" ekhruxen, “he went and made proclamation.” Although khrussein “proclaim,” is never used of the message Enoch delivers, he is commanded to “go” (poreuesqai) and rebuke the evil angels for their deeds (*1 Enoc*^{h} 12.4; cf. 15.2). Consequently, he says, “I went [poreuqei"] and spoke to all of them together; and they were all frightened, and fear and trembling seized them” (13.3; *OT*^{P}, 1:19). Peter’s use of poreuqei", however, is more likely attributable to his knowledge of a threefold summary of Christ’s work (“put to death … made alive … gone to heaven”; see *Form/Structure/Setting*) than to the Enoch tradition, while the use of poreuqei" with ekhruxen recalls more than anything else certain commissions that Jesus himself gave to his disciples (i.e., in Matt 10:7; Mark 16:15; cf. also Matt 28:10; Matt 11:4//Luke 7:22). Strictly speaking, poreuqei" here is pleonastic, i.e., it lends vividness to the narrative without emphasizing the journey as such (as in English, “went and …, “almost as a helping verb; see $BG^{D,}$ 692.1; $BD^{F,}$ § 419.2). Although poreuqei" has little independent significance here, it anticipates the decisive poreuqei" ei" ouranon (“gone to heaven”) of v 22. There Peter reveals unmistakably that a real journey took place, and only in light of that journey are the full implications of poreuqei" in v 19 made clear. It is more plausible that Christ “went and made proclamation” in connection with his journey to heaven, than that the pleonastic, almost redundant poreuqei" of v 19 signals yet another journey, distinct from the journey to heaven, and possibly in the opposite direction (i.e., to hell, or to the underworld) to make his announcement to “the spirits in refuge.” The two uses of poreuqei" are not equal and coordinate, like “ascended” and “descended” in Eph 4:8–10, but of quite unequal weight, so that the first is most easily understood as dependent on the second for its meaning (see further, Dalton, *Proclamation*, 96–100, 177–84).

Two questions remain: (a) what was the proclamation?; (b) where did it take place? The alternatives as usually stated are: either a proclamation offering forgiveness and redemption to the “spirits,” or a proclamation of judgment and of Christ’s victory over them. khrussein in the N^T usually refers either to Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God or his disciples’ proclamation of the good news of his death and resurrection. Yet in 1 Peter, the characteristic word for the message of redemption is euaggelizein (1:12, 25; 4:6); khrussein is found only here. The question of what the proclamation was cannot be separated from that of who “the spirits” were. One major difficulty with interpreting them either as the fallen angels of Gen 6:1–4 or as the generation that perished in the flood is that these interpretations do not explain why Christ was so vitally interested in events that happened several millennia before he began his ministry. Or rather, why would Peter have thought he was vitally interested in such traditions? If “the spirits” are the “evil” or “unclean spirits” against which Jesus directed the power of the Kingdom of God to set free those who were demon-possessed, the connection is not at all difficult to see. On one occasion, when he drove out these “spirits,” they asked for a haven (Mark 5:10, 12) and he granted their request (Mark 5:13). They feared that he had come to torment them “before the time” (Matt 8:29). There is no direct evidence that he did, although without question he

set limits to their power, and rescued many of their victims. Their kingdom was shaken by Jesus' ministry (cf. Mark 3:23//Matt 12:25//Luke 11:17–22), but not yet overthrown. If "the spirits in refuge" in our text are seen against this background, then Christ's proclamation to them after his death and resurrection may simply have been that their "prison," or "refuge," was no longer inviolate. They too, like all other powers in the universe, must now submit to his sovereignty (cf. v 22, "angels and authorities and powers"). The usual alternatives—i.e., a proclamation of forgiveness or salvation vs. a proclamation of judgment—may not be applicable in such a context. Perhaps the proclamation is more accurately described as one of "domestication," or "taming," by which those formerly "protected" from the presence of God are now invaded by it and made (however unwillingly) subjects of Christ the Lord (cf. Phil 2:10, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth").

Where did the proclamation take place? Where was the "prison," or "refuge," of the unclean spirits? Dalton argues at length (*Proclamation*, 177–84) that it was not under the earth, but somewhere in the heavens, appealing especially to *2 Enoc*[h] 7.1–3, where Enoch is taken "to the second heaven" and shown "a darkness greater than earthly darkness" and "prisoners under guard, hanging up, waiting for the measureless judgment" (*OT*[P], 1:112; cf. also *T. Lev*[i] 3.2). Although Dalton here demonstrates that Jewish traditions about the fallen angels were by no means uniform, he has not demonstrated that the traditions locating their imprisonment and punishment in the heavens were the dominate ones. He is, in any case, still working from the assumption that the "spirits in refuge" in 1 Peter are the fallen angels of Gen 6 rather than the evil spirits on earth which their sin produced.

It may be objected that the distinction is overly subtle, but for Peter the controlling word is "spirits," which probably would have suggested to most first century Christians the unclean spirits very much alive and at work in their world (not least in the narratives they preserved about Jesus), not the fallen angels imprisoned in darkness. Although Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2:4 are evidence that the latter were also known to them as an example (like Sodom) of how God had judged sin in the past, they were—in the very nature of the case—no threat to the Christian community. The same is not necessarily true of "spirits," especially "disobedient spirits," as the early Christians perceived them. If "the spirits in refuge" are demons, it is probably futile to locate their safe havens either above the earth (with Dalton) or under the earth (with most other commentators). The point is simply that Christ went and announced his sovereignty to these spirits *wherever they might be*, in every place where they thought they were secure against their ancient divine Enemy. The location of their strongholds, and hence the geography of Christ's mission to them, is not Peter's main concern.

The attempt of J. S. Feinberg to assign the proclamation to the pre-existent Christ speaking long ago through Noah (an interpretation at least as old as Augustine) must be judged a failure. There is no sign in the text (as, e.g., in 1:11: "the spirit of Christ that was in them") of any backward shift in time reference from the phrases "put to death in the flesh" and "made alive in the spirit" in v 18 to the phrase "went and made proclamation" in v 19. Feinberg's view requires that "from Peter's perspective … the spirits are disembodied and in prison, though they were not in that state when they heard the message." In other words, one needs to supply the word "now" and read v 19 as "preached to spirits *now* in prison" (330). Even aside from Feinberg's questionable argument that the "spirits" are the souls of those who died in the flood (319–29), Peter's careful and explicit distinction between "long ago" and "now" in vv 20–21 makes it highly implausible that an even more significant

"then/now" distinction in v 19 would have been left to the reader's ingenuity and imagination.

20 apeiqhsasin pote ote apexedeceto h tou qeou makroqumia en hmerai" Nwe, "who were disobedient long ago while God was waiting patiently in the days of Noah." It is a matter of "disobedient spirit," not "the spirits of the disobedient" (which would suggest the human beings who died in the flood; see Dalton, *Proclamation*, 148). Yet the verb apeiqein comes not from descriptions in *1 Enoc*[h] of the angels and their evil offspring, but from Peter's own characteristic vocabulary for the enemies of Christ and Christians in his own day (cf. 2:8; 3:1; 4; 17; cf. Reicke, *Spirits*, 138). Although the term is often used in the N[T] for the Jews' rejection of the Christian message (Acts 14:2; 19:9; Rom 10:21; 11:31; cf. *Magn.* 8.2; *1 Cle*[m] 58.1), the "disobedient" in 1 Peter are consistently Gentiles (see Comment on 2:4, 8). His choice of words is not accidental, but suggests a close connection in the author's mind between the "spirits" and the flesh-and-blood opposition he and his readers faced in the Roman Empire. Although there is a historical analogy in vv 20–21 between "then" and "now" (pote in v 20, and nun in v 21), the fact that Christ went and made proclamation, long after Noah's time, to these same "spirits" points to something more than just an analogy. The "disobedient spirits" of long ago still exist, and it is not unlikely that Peter sees their influence behind the ridicule and slander of pagans actively opposed to the Christian movement in his day (cf. Eph 2:2, where "the ruler of the power of the air" is further identified as "the spirit now at work among the children of disobedience" [apeiqeia]). If Christ has visited the spirits, violated their sanctuaries, and brought them under subjection, then Christians have nothing to fear from the interrogation and insults of those who denounce their way of life (cf. vv 14, 16).

Yet for the moment the center of interest is not Christ's recent victory over the "spirits," nor even their ancient "disobedience," but rather the *setting* of that disobedience in the events leading up to the flood, and in the flood itself. pote is used, as in 3:5, to point to a period in biblical history for illustrative purposes. The phrase "in the days of Noah" may well be based on the Gospel tradition and on Jesus' analogy between Noah's time and the time immediately preceding the end of the age (cf. Matt 24:37–39//Luke 17:26–27). In a more general sense the flood (commonly viewed as divine punishment for the sin introduced by the evil angels and spirits of Gen 6:1–4) was already in Jewish literature a classic illustration both of divine judgment and the deliverance of the just (cf. e.g., *1 Enoc*[h] 10.2; 54.7–10; 65.1–67.13; 89.1–9; 106.13–18; *2 Enoc*[h] 34.3, *Jub.* 5. 11; Sir 44:17; Wisd Sol 10:4; 14:6; 4 Macc 15:31; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.74; Philo, *Migr. Abr.* 125; *ABR* 40–46; *Sib. Or.* 1.125). Noah and the flood continued to function in similar ways in early Christian literature (cf. e.g., Heb 11:7; 2 Pet 2:5–6; 3:6–13; *1 Cle*[m] 7.6; 9.4).

In our passage, the two analogies that attract Peter's attention are, first, God's patience or longsuffering, and second, salvation through water. The first is implicit in Peter's language, the second explicit. The reference to God's makroqumia, or "patience," probably focuses on the interval between the sin of the angels (Gen 6:1–4) and the coming of the flood waters on the earth (Gen 7:11), an interval traditionally understood to be specified in Gen 6:3 as 120 years, (cf. Tg. Onq. on Gen 6:3; m. Abot 5.2, however, emphasizes God's patience throughout the ten generations from Adam to Noah). 2 Peter 3:9, 14 speaks similarly of God's makroqumia in the context of an analogy between the time of the flood and the author's own time, but there the makroqumia is associated with the author's time as a fact of experience requiring an explanation: God is so "longsuffering" that he seems to be

doing nothing (cf. 2 Pet 3:3–4), but in actuality he is holding back so as to give the ungodly time to repent (cf. Rom 2:4; Acts 17:30). The concern in our passage, although broadly similar, is not as urgent (on this point at least), for God's makroqumia refers first of all to "the days of Noah" and only secondarily to the situation of the author and his readers. apexedeceto ("await eagerly," BG[D], 83; cf. Rom 8:19, 23, 25) indicates not God's eagerness to punish but his hopeful anticipation of human repentance and reconciliation to him.

kataskeuazomenh" kibwtou, "and the ark was being fashioned." These words fix the scene in the same time period indicated by the previous clause (i.e., Gen 6:5–7:11). For the same verb and noun used of Noah's ark, cf. Heb 11:7. Although Dalton's caution against reading back into 1 Peter the later analogy between the church and Noah's ark is well taken (*Proclamation*, 207), it is possible that Peter did see a parallel between his own time and that of Noah as a time of building and preparation for the age to come (cf. 2:5). What is *not* in the text is any analogy between the ark and the Christian church as the place or the means of salvation (contrast Reicke, *Spirits*, 138–39). The latter role Peter assigns instead to the water that simultaneously destroyed the ancient world and kept the ark afloat. The brief mention of the ark serves principally as a transition to the next clause, with its key statement that Noah and his family were "saved through water."

ei" hn oligoi, toutÉ estin oktw yucai, dieswqhsan diÉ udato", "in which a few—eight souls in all—were saved through water." ei" (usually "into") is used where en (or "in") might have been expected. The comment of Dalton that "Noah and his family enter the ark, and are saved within it" (*Proclamation*, 207) combines the two prepositions in a way that is probably not intended. The attempt of Cook (73) to press the meaning "into" leads him to a forced interpretation of dieswqhsan as "escaped" (74–75) and of diÉ udato" as "through the rising flood waters into the ark," based on a rabbinic interpretation of Gen 7:6–7 (76). It is more likely that ei" was chosen simply to avoid the possibility of an instrumental understanding of "in" (i.e., that the *ark* was somehow the means of salvation; cf. Josephus, *C. Apion* 1.130). This would have obscured Peter's main point that the eight were saved specifically "through water."

The counting of the survivors of the flood with attention to the fact that there were "eight" (i.e., Noah and his wife, his three sons and their wives, Gen 7:13) is attested elsewhere in early Christian literature (cf. 2 Pet 2:5; Theophilus, AdAutol 3.19; *Sib. Or.* 1.280–81), where "eight" was sometimes given a symbolic significance (e.g., representing Sunday, "the eighth day," in which Christ rose from the dead: Justin, *Dial.* 138.1–2; cf. also *Barn.* 15.9). Peter has no interest in such symbolism here; "eight" is worthy of mention only because it is "few," and he wants to remind his readers that "few" were saved back then just as "few" seem responsive to the Christian gospel now (cf. Jesus' sayings in Matt 7:14; 22:14; Matt 9:37; Luke 10:2; Luke 13:23–24; also 1 Cor 1:26; Rev 3:4; in 1 Peter, cf. 2:4, where Christ is said to be "rejected by people generally"). "Few" is hardly as precise as Bishop (44–45) suggests on the basis of Arabic (i.e., more than two and less than eleven!), but is relative to a much larger "many" (see especially Matt 7:14; 22:14).

yucai, "souls," is used five times in the plural in 1 Peter for human beings, each time in connection with their salvation (cf. 1:9, 22; 2:25; 4:19; contrast "spirits" for nonhuman entities in v 19). The plural always refers to whole persons or "selves," not to the soul in distinction from the body (cf. Rev 18:13!). Even in 2:11, the reference is probably not to the immaterial part of a person but to a person's "life" or ultimate well-being (see *Comment*).

yucai is used in a similar context of rescue from the flood in Wisd Sol 14:5.
dieswqhsan di udato", "were saved through water." The preposition dia could be local or instrumental, and the meaning of the verb would differ accordingly: i.e., either "brought safely through the water" (in which water is the threat; BGD, 179.A.I.2: cf. Reicke, *Spirits*, 141–42), or "saved through water" (in which water is the means of salvation; cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 210). Taken by themselves in the natural situation of a life-threatening flood, these words are more plausibly understood in the first of these senses (cf. Wisd Sol 14:5), but v 21a seems to settle the matter in favor of the second: water (i.e., baptism) is that which saves (cf. Herm *Vis.* 3.3.5: "your life was saved and shall be saved through water"). The instrumental interpretation of diaswzein dia … is supported by *1 Clem* 9.4 where God is said to have saved "through him" (i.e., through Noah: dieswsen di autou) the animals that entered the ark. The same verse suggests, however, that even when dia is instrumental, the compound verb diaswzein is particularly suited to a flood story. The likely meaning is that Noah and his family were brought safely through the flood by means of the flood waters themselves (cf. dia puro", "by fire," in 1:7). If it is objected that they escaped only because Noah built an ark that would float, the appropriate (and only possible) answer is that Peter is interested in "water" in the story, not in "wood" (as in Wisd Sol 14:6, and Justin, *Dial.* 138.2), because there is something he wants to say about Christian baptism. If the question is asked, "From what were Noah and his family saved?" the answer is that they were saved from death—not merely from sinners or from a hostile environment (e.g., Reicke, *Spirits*, 143; Dalton, *Proclamation*, 210). As they were "saved through water" from physical death, baptism saves from eternal death.

21 o kai uma" antitupon nun swzei baptisma, "This water—or baptism, which corresponds to it—now saves you as well." The syntax is notoriously difficult. The antecedent of o is probably the immediately preceding udato", "water," not the preceding clause as a whole. The link between Noah's day and Peter's is provided first by the verbs indicating salvation (dieswqhsan … swzei), and second by "water" (di udato", o …). Peter starts to say that the water by which Noah and his family were saved is the water that saves Christians too (kai uma"; "you" in addition to the "eight souls"). That will not do, for it violates the distinction between "then" and "now" (pote … nun) around which vv 20–21 are built. That which now saves Christians is not of course the same water that once saved Noah, but something "corresponding" to it (antitupo", BGD, 76.1), namely, Christian baptism. This is the simplest way of reading the text, although other constructions are grammatically possible and have been defended at great length: e.g., Reicke, "which antitypical baptism now saves you" (making baptisma the antecedent of o; *Spirits*, 149–72); Selwyn (203), "and water now saves you too, who are the antitypes of Noah and his company, namely the water of baptism" (making of antitupon a noun in apposition to uma" understood collectively). Such efforts to interpret antitupon as a substantive meaning "copy, antitype, representation" (as in Heb 9:24; *2 Clem* 14.3) run the risk of complicating Peter's argument unnecessarily and raising more questions than they solve. Baptism is not a secondary "copy" of the flood waters understood as an archetype (cf. BGD, 76.2) but simply a present reality of Christian experience to which Peter finds a correspondence in the Noah story.

Although 1 Peter reflects often on Christian conversion (e.g., 1:18, 21, 22–23; 2:3, 9–10, 24–25), to the extent that it has been said to incorporate a baptismal homily (see *Introduction*), this is the only explicit mention of baptism in the entire epistle. It is also the

only explicit statement in the entire N^T that baptism "saves." The author pauses to summarize parenthetically his own understanding of baptism in order to clarify the sense in which it "saves."

ou sarko" apoqesi" rupou alla suneidhsew" agaqh" eperwthma ei" qeon, "not a removal of the filth of the flesh, but a pledge to God out of a good conscience." The two phrases set off by ou … alla could be understood either as a rhetorical way of accenting baptism's profound significance (i.e., not merely a physical cleansing but a decisive transaction with God), or as a corrective to an actual, and specific, misunderstanding. To some extent, the explanation recalls Josephus' description of the call of John the Baptist to the Jews "to lead righteous lives, to practice justice toward their fellows and piety towards God, and so doing to join in baptism. In his view this was a necessary preliminary if baptism was to be acceptable to God. They must not employ it to gain pardon for whatever sins they committed, but as a consecration of the body implying that the soul was already cleansed by right behavior" (*Ant. Jud.* 18.117; LCL, 9.81–83). Although the "body-soul" distinction is foreign to 1 Peter (and probably to John the Baptist as well!), the strong ethical emphasis on "justice" or "right behavior" (dikaiosunh)is not (cf. 1 Pet 2:24; 3:13–14; also 2:12, 15–17). It is also worth noting that the contrast (mh … alla in Josephus) is an absolute one ("not this, but that") rather than merely a qualification or a way of adding something ("not only this, but also that"; cf. BDF, § 448.1). Whether this is also true in 1 Peter is best determined from an examination of the two phrases one at a time.

ou sarko" apoqesi" rupou, "not the removal of the filth of the flesh." The word order accents sarko", i.e., not "of flesh," yet the point is not that baptism is the removal of spiritual as opposed to physical defilement (cf. 2 Cor 7:1, where the two go together). Rather, apoqesi" is negated as well; the "removal of the filth of the flesh" is being contrasted with something altogether different. Dalton argues at some length (*Proclamation*, 215–24) that this "removal of the filth of the flesh" refers to circumcision. He appeals to Col 3:8–9, where apotiqesqai ("put off," a cognate of apoeqsi" in our text) and apekduesqai ("strip off") are used interchangeably, and especially to Col 2:11, where the latter verb refers to "a circumcision not made with hands, by stripping off the body of the flesh" in connection with Christian baptism (2:12).

A difficulty with his interpretation is that the Colossians passage is establishing a parallel between Jewish circumcision and Christian baptism, while Peter (as Dalton himself insists) is sharply contrasting them. Even though the circumcision in Colossians is "not made with hands," the point of the passage is to draw together the Jewish and Christian practices in a common metaphor, not to set them against each other. Yet Dalton, taking ou … alla absolutely, concludes: "Baptism is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh: it is something quite different, namely …" (*Proclamation*, 219). If circumcision is in view in this first phrase, Peter's point is that baptism is not circumcision—almost the opposite of what Col 2:11 is saying. Moreover, if Peter is here distancing himself and his readers from a specific Jewish practice, it is unique in the whole epistle. Nowhere else does he show the slightest interest in either adopting or avoiding any of the laws or customs of Judaism. His assumption throughout is that not only he, but his gentile readers as well, are true Jews, "an elect stock, the King's priesthood, a holy nation, a people destined for vindication" (2:9); the Jewish past is their past, the promises of the Jewish Bible are theirs, and the way of Christ—his teaching, his example, and his redemptive work—is their way of life. He neither disputes the claims nor repudiates the practices of others who understand

themselves as “true Jews.” In fact he gives no evidence of any particular awareness of a literal Jewish community standing over against the Christian community of which he is a part—unless this phrase is the evidence!

The closest N^T parallel to the negative phrase that Peter uses here is James 1:21: “Remove, therefore” (dio apoqemenoi) “all filth and excess of evil” (pasan ruparian kai perisseian kakia"). Dalton (*Proclamation*, 223) finds here a parallel to Philo (Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.9), who interprets “circumcision” (peritomh) as a “cutting away of what is excessive” (peritth" ektomh). He concludes that James’s language “is derived from circumcision” and that consequently “it would not be surprising if the rite itself could be naturally described as apoqesi" rupou“ (223). There is merit in the argument, but also something missing. Dalton argues only that James’s terminology is related to terminology used elsewhere in connection with circumcision, but in the case of 1 Peter he holds out for a reference to “the rite itself.” If James can use the language of circumcision simply to emphasize the ethical need to put aside the “dirt” of one’s past life, why cannot Peter use similar language in much the same way? This is probably what is going on in Col 3:8–9 as well, although the same point is made without noticeable use of circumcision language in Eph 4:22, and in 1 Peter itself in 2:1 (apoqemenoi oun pasan kakian, “get rid of all malice, therefore”) and 2:11.

It is unlikely that the present passage intends to say anything so banal as that baptism’s purpose is not to wash dirt off the body. What early Christian would have thought that it was? More probably Peter, like James, has moral defilement in view, i.e., the “impulses” that governed the lives of his readers before they believed in Christ (cf. 1:14; 2:11; 4:2; note especially the phrase twn sarkikwn epiqumiwn, “natural impulses,” in 2:11). The “removal of the filth of the flesh” is not a physical but a spiritual cleansing, and Peter’s point is not that such cleansing is an unimportant or unnecessary thing, only that baptism is not it. The analogy of the passage in Josephus cited above (i.e., *Ant.* 18.117) suggests that Peter may simply be insisting that the inward moral cleansing to which he refers is presupposed by the act of water baptism. This interpretation is confirmed by the positive definition of baptism with which the argument now continues.

alla suneidhsew" agaqh" eperwthma ei" qeon, “but an appeal to God out of a good conscience.” The placement of suneidhsew" agaqh" (“of a good conscience”) in an emphatic position at the beginning of Peter’s definition of baptism is significant. The genitive is subjective (cf. Selwyn, 205; Kelly, 161–62), not objective (cf. Goppelt, 258; Dalton, *Proclamation*, 230–32). Baptism is not asking God for “a good conscience”; it is rather “out of a good conscience,” or a pure heart, that a person submits to baptism. Heb 10:22 is a partial, although important, parallel: “Let us approach with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having sprinkled our hearts from an evil conscience and washed our body in pure water.” Sequence is not emphasized in this passage, and the author of Hebrews refers to approaching God in worship, not baptism. yet a clear distinction is made between inward and outward cleansing (i.e., between “heart” and “body”). Peter, having presupposed from the start an inward cleansing among his readers (e.g., “consecrated by the Spirit for obedience and sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ,” 1:2; “having purified your souls by obeying the truth,” 1:22; “get rid of all malice, therefore,” 2:1), now turns explicitly to its outward expression. A “good conscience” is the product of the Spirit’s purifying work in a person’s heart on the basis of “obedience” to the Christian gospel, but “good conscience” by itself does not save. Only God can save, and God’s willingness and

power to save are visibly and audibly invoked in baptism.

suneidhsew" agaqh", "out of a good conscience" (cf. BG[D,] 786.2). Critics of the translation, "good conscience," (e.g., Reicke, *Spirits*, 174–82; Dalton, *Proclamation*, 228–34) rightly insist that the expression refers here to genuine inward purity, not to a mere feeling of innocence. Yet the alternatives suggested—e.g., a good "attitude of mind," "intention," "agreement," "loyalty," "good will," or "good faith"—are so diverse that little is gained by adopting any one of them. The meaning is little different from "a pure heart" (cf. 1:22, *Note* b[*]; also the parallelism of the two expressions in 1 Tim 1:5). It is preferable to retain the traditional word, "conscience," however, because in this verse Peter is not using the human heart as a metaphor but rather attempting to state in ordinary language what a pure heart" represents—i.e., absolute honesty and integrity before God (for the phrase, "good conscience" cf. 1 Tim 1:19, where it is associated with "faith"; also Acts 23:1; *1 Cle*[m] 41.1). Peter himself, having used the phrase, "good conscience" in 3:16 for the attitude with which Christians must face their hostile interrogators, now applies it to the attitude with which they must face Cod himself (the meaning is slightly different in 2:19, where suneidhsi" does not in itself refer to a moral sense, and is qualified not by agaqh but by the genitive qeou, "of God": i.e., out of one's consciousness or awareness of God; see *Comment*, and BG[D,] 786.1).

eperwthma ei" qeon, "an appeal [or pledge] to God." Once "good conscience" is understood to stand in the emphatic position, the meaning of the much-discussed eperwthma becomes somewhat less crucial—although by no means unimportant—for the interpretation of the passage as a whole. eperwthma (from the verb eperwtan, "to ask" or "interrogate") traditionally meant a "question" (BG[D,] 285.1), but "request" or "appeal" (BG[D,] 285.2) would be more appropriate in the present context (for the ambiguity, see 11.2). Greeven (*TDN*[T] 2:688) translates it as "prayer." When such a translation is adopted, the tendency is to make "good conscience" the object of the request or prayer simply because an object of some kind seems necessary.

On the basis of papyri and inscriptions, different translations, such as "contract," "resolution," "stipulation," "oracle," or "pledge," have been proposed (in biblical literature, see Sir 36 [33:3] S; Dan 4:14 Theod.; for other relevant texts, see Reicke, *Spirits*, 182–86, and cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 224–28). Both Reicke and Dalton have capitalized on "pledge" or "contract" as the best option, and have continued to make "good conscience" somehow the object of the pledge, not its motivation: e.g., "an undertaking to a loyal attitude of mind" (Reicke, 185), or "a pledge to God to maintain a right attitude" (Dalton, 224; cf. 230). Although Reicke's evidence for eperwthma as "resolution" or "contract" (cf. [L-S], 618; [M-M,] 231–32) is impressive, the lack of examples in which it is followed by ei" raises some question about the translation "pledge." Moreover, it by no means follows from their view that "a good conscience" is the goal or object of the pledge. Normally a pledge made "in good conscience" or "in good faith" is a pledge made by someone who already claims these qualities (i.e., "out of a good conscience"), not someone who merely aspires to them. Dalton's use of the word "maintain" betrays a tacit recognition of this fact.

Whether Peter is characterizing Christian baptism as an "appeal" or as a "pledge," he clearly views it as an act directed from human beings to God (ei" qeon; cf. "faith" and "hope" ei" qeon in 1:21), not God's act toward them. How is it, then, that baptism "saves"? Probably in much the same sense in which Jesus says on several occasions in the Gospels, "Your faith has saved you" (Matt 9:22//Mark 5:34//Luke 8:48; Mark 10:52//Luke 18:42;

Luke 7:50; 17:19; cf. James 2:14). A purist might properly insist that only God "saves," but salvation can be associated either with the divine initiative or the human response. The two parenthetical phrases set off by ou … alla not only define baptism for Peter, but qualify his statement that baptism "saves." Although it does not wash away sins, it "saves" those with a "good conscience" by appealing on their behalf to God the only Savior.

diJ anastasew" JIhsoou Cristou, "through the raising of Jesus Christ." Because of the immediately preceding parenthesis, this phrase depends on swzei in v 21a: the water of baptism "saves you … through the raising of Jesus Christ"—just as God brings about new birth "through the raising of Jesus Christ from the dead" in 1:3. In both instances, God, who raised Jesus from the dead, is the implied subject (cf. 1:21),just as God was the implied subject in the deliverance of Noah from the disastrous flood (dieswqhsan, v 20). The resurrection of Jesus Christ is what makes an appeal or pledge to God "out of a good conscience" efficacious, and guarantees eternal life to the one baptized. Unlike Paul, who characterizes baptism as a "death" with Christ (Rom 6:3–4a) to be followed by a "resurrection" identified as new life in the Spirit (Rom 6:4b–5; 8–11), Peter links baptism itself with Jesus' resurrection, while Jesus' death represents the inward change of heart that logically precedes it—i.e. "the removal of the filth of the flesh" which Peter so carefully distinguishes from the outward act of water baptism (cf. 4:1).

22 o" estin en dexia qeou, "who is at the right hand of God." The mention of Christ's resurrection brings Peter's thought full circle back to the couplet, "put to death in the flesh, made alive in the spirit," in v 18b, and to the notion of Christ's consequent journey. Now at last he will supply the third element of the sequence in its entirety, "gone into heaven" (poreuqei" ei" ouranon), but in doing so he frames the participial expression with two traditional statements about Christ's exaltation, which is for Peter the end of the journey. The first of these, "who is at the right hand of God," is most closely paralleled in Rom 8:34 (even to the a relative clause introduced by o" … estin). Paul's sequence, in fact, "Christ who died [o apoqanwn], or rather who was raised [egerqei"], who is also at the right hand of God" offers a rather close parallel in thought to Peter's three-part sequence in vv 18–22. It is doubtful that Peter's use of o" estin belongs to any traditional credal formulation (e.g. in some connection with the series of o"-clauses in 2:22–24; cf. also o" estin in the hymnic material found in Col 1:15, 18). More likely, it is simply Peter's way of making a transition from "the raising of Jesus Christ" at the end of v 21 to the traditional phrase poreuqei" ei" ouranon that must shortly follow. (Paul's relative clause in Rom 8:34 appears similarly to be his own ad hoc construction.)

References to the "right hand of God" are fairly common in the N^T in connection with Christ's exaltation, either in direct dependence on Ps 109[110]:1 LX^X (kaqou ek twn dexiwn, "Sit at my right hand"), as in Matt 22:44//Mark 12:36//Luke 20:42; Acts 2:34; Heb 1:13; *1 Cle*^{m} 36.5; *Barn.* 12.10 or more loosely related to that influential text (e.g. Matt 26:64//Mark 14:62//Luke 22:69; Mark 16:19; Acts 2:33; 5:31; 7:55–56; Rom 8:34; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2). Peter's terminology is relatively remote from that of the psalm (e.g. the singular en dexia, with Paul and Hebrews, instead of the plural ek dexiwn; also, without the verb kaqhnai, "sit," or kaqizein, "seat," in agreement with Acts and especially with Rom 8:34). If the definite article is omitted before qeou (see Note i*), Peter's wording en dexia qeou is unique in the N^T. He is neither quoting nor alluding to the well-known Psalm, but simply adopting a phrase that had already become common among Christians to describe Christ's position of royal dignity and authority alongside God the

Father, as a result of his resurrection.

The possibility has already been raised that the long addition after en dexia qeou in certain Latin versions (i.e., "Swallowing up death that we might be made heirs of eternal life," see Note j) may come from an early credal tradition known also to the second-century author of Treat. Res. (see *Form/Structure/Setting*). In view of a number of similarities between vv 13–22 as a whole and Titus 3:1–8 (see Reicke, *Spirits*, 222–25), a parallel should also be noted between the Latin variant and Titus 3:7: "… that we, being justified by his grace, might be made heirs of eternal life" (in the same context, cf. Titus 3:5 with 1 Pet 1:3). It appears that Titus too may have been drawing from a similar stock of tradition, but any detailed reconstruction of this source (or sources) is difficult, if not futile, on the basis of present evidence.

poreuqei" ei" ouranon, "having gone to heaven." The possible history of this phrase in the tradition and its function in vv 18–22 have already been discussed (see *Form/Structure/Setting*). For the notion that Jesus "went to heaven" (or "went into the sky") after his resurrection, cf. Acts 1:10, 12, where he goes visibly (also Luke 24:51b). In Hebrews, Christ is said to have "passed through the heavens" (4:14), entered as a forerunner into the heavenly sanctuary (6:20), and consequently now to be "higher than the heavens" (7:26), while in Ephesians, God has seated Christ "at his right hand in the heavenly places" (1:20; cf. 2:6). In Mark 16:19 (the longer ending) Jesus "was taken up into heaven and set at the fight hand of God." Although the terminology for Jesus' exaltation is diverse, it is not hard to see how the phrase "at the right hand of God" afforded Peter the opportunity to weave into his argument the key phrase, "having gone into heaven," which he had only hinted at before.

upotagentwn autw aggelwn kai exousiwn kai dunamewn, "with angels and authorities and powers in subjection to him." If Ps 109[110]:1 LX^{x} underlies most, if not all, of the N^{T} references to Christ being "at the right hand of God," the same is probably true of Ps 8:7b LX^{x} (panta upetaxa" upokatw twn podwn autou, "you have subjected all things under his feet") in relation to texts that speak of the "subjection" of all things to Christ the exalted Lord. Ps 8:7b is actually quoted and interpreted in 1 Cor 15:27, where it builds on a quotation of the second part of Ps 109[110]:1 in 15:25 ("until he puts all enemies under his feet"). Ps 8:5–7, moreover, is quoted and interpreted in Heb 2:5–9, while Ps 8:7b is quoted, although not interpreted, in Eph 1:22. Each time Ps 8:7b is interpreted, attention centers on the word panta, "all things." Paul makes the qualification that of course panta does not include God, who did the subjecting in the first place, and that finally Christ himself will come under subjection to God (1 Cor 15:27–28). The author of Hebrews notices panta as well, with the observation that although the word is indeed all-inclusive, "still we do not now see all things in subjection" (Heb 2:8). More important for the interpretation of 1 Peter, however, is Eph 1:22, where the citation of Ps 8:7b comes shortly after the reference to Christ being seated at God's right hand in heavenly places (1:20). No explicit attempt is made to interpret panta, yet the intervening words, "far above every ruler and authority and power and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this age but also in the age to come" (1:21), in effect define the panta of the psalm quotation as eloquently as it can ever be defined.

Our passage in 1 Peter, in contrast to 1 Cor 15, Heb 2, and Eph 1, does. not quote Ps 8:7b at all; it is doubtful that even a conscious allusion can be detected. Yet the phrase "with angels and authorities and powers in subjection to him" effectively makes the point that "all

things" are now in subjection to the risen Christ in heaven. The thought, if not the word panta, is interpreted in much the same way here as in Eph 1:22 (cf. *Pol. Phil.* 2.1, which is dependent on 1 Peter: w upetagh ta panta epourania kai epigeia, "to whom are subject all things in heaven and on earth"). Peter has already hinted at Christ's elevation above angels in 1:12b, where, like the prophets of old, the angels desire earnestly to look down on the thing Christ has accomplished on earth, but are unable to comprehend that mystery (see *Comment*). exousiai, "authorities" (BG[D,] 278.3c. b), and dunamei", "powers" (BG[D,] 208.6), are simply other terms for supernatural beings analogous to angels and with a similar status in the universe. Such terms are ordinarily grouped in the N[T.] e.g., "every ruler [arch] and every authority and power" (1 Cor 15:24); "every ruler and authority and power and dominion and every name that is named" (Eph 1:21); "every ruler and authority" (Col 2:10); "to the rulers and the authorities in the heavenly places" (Eph 3:10); "against rulers, against authorities, against the dark forces of the world, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places" (Eph 6:12); "whether thrones or dominions, whether rulers or authorities" (Col 1:16); "the rulers and the authorities" (Col 2:15); "nor angels nor rulers … nor powers" (Rom 8:38). Peter does not venture to define or distinguish his three orders of supernatural beings, and his avoidance of all such terms in 2:13, where he is speaking of civil government (contrast Paul in Rom 13:1–3!) suggests that he does not identify them directly with political entities, or the Roman Empire in particular. Together they add up to "all things," every power, whether good or evil, in the universe (cf. again Eph 1:21b, "every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in the age to come"; also Phil 2:10, "in heaven and on earth and under the earth"). It is likely that "the spirits in refuge" of v 19 represent for Peter the outer reaches of the universality of Christ's rule. If Christ went and made proclamation even to them, "taming" them in the triumph of his resurrection, what other angel or spirit, authority or power in the entire universe can stand outside or beyond his dominion?

Explanation

At the heart of the message of 1 Peter are "the sufferings intended for Christ and the glorious events that would follow" (1:11). If 2:18–25 develops the notion of Christ's sufferings, the present passage sets forth the "glorious events" that followed: his resurrection from the dead, his journey to heaven, and the establishment of his universal dominion over "angels, authorities, and powers," extending even to the strongholds of those untamed "spirits" whose evil influence brought destruction on the world back in Noah's time. The theme of the passage—as of 3:13–4:6 in its entirety—is vindication. The vindication of Christ lays the basis for the vindication of the Christian believer, and Christ's vindication is total. Peter is bolder than either the early Paul or the author of Hebrews in depicting "angels, authorities, and powers" as *already* in subjection to the risen Lord at God's right hand. Christ is not in the process of subjecting them, as in 1 Cor 15:28, nor does Peter contemplate the world around him and candidly acknowledge that "now we do not yet see all things in subjection" to Christ (as in Heb 2:8). The perspective in 1 Peter is more like that of Paul (or the follower of Paul) who wrote Ephesians. Even Eph 1:22, which places Christ "far above" all the heavenly powers (cf. 4:10), does not claim in so many words that all these powers are already in subjection to him. He is still in the process of "filling all things" (cf. 1:23; 4:10b, 13).

Yet even though Peter views Christ as fully vindicated and enthroned in heaven, his vindication is only in principle, not in hard, earthbound fact. Vv 18–22 are Peter's "vision"; they do not describe something self-evident or unmistakable to the believers to whom he was writing. Nothing that he says here precludes his later comparison of the Devil, the great Adversary, to a roaring lion on the loose, seeking Christians as his prey (5:8). Peter knows as well as his readers that the forces of evil have not literally been routed, nor their voices literally silenced (cf. 2:15), yet he offers them a vision of assurance that Christ in his journey to heaven has broken the back of evil; whatever they may have to suffer, they have no need to be afraid (cf. 3:13), nor even surprised (cf. 4:12) when they realize that Christ himself was "put to death in the flesh" before he was "made alive in the spirit." Vindication is real, and Christ's vindication belongs precisely to those who suffer. The purpose of Peter's reference to "disobedient spirits" is not to identify these spirits directly with the slanderers and accusers of Christians in the Roman Empire in Peter's time, but simply to reassure the epistle's readers that if Christ can "subdue" or "tame" the former, how much more easily can he deal with the latter. Although some of the language of vv 18–22 suggests "realized eschatology"—i.e., the conviction that "the future is now," as in the text cited earlier from *Treat. Res.*,

> We suffered with him, and
> we rose with him, and
> we went to heaven with him.

—Peter's actual viewpoint is not that "the future is now," only that in Jesus Christ "the future is assured."

The other issue of note in this passage is the understanding of baptism in 1 Peter. The simple statement that "baptism saves" raises for many (especially Protestants) the specter of "baptismal regeneration," i.e., a view that identifies the new birth with water baptism. It is true that Peter speaks of water baptism in a way that recalls his reference to the new birth in 1:3. Both are said to take place "through the raising of Jesus Christ." The new birth is unmistakably an act of God, who "in his great mercy gave us new birth and brought us to a living hope …" (1:3), while baptism—whether an "appeal" or a "pledge"—is just as unmistakably a human act directed toward God (3:21). A statement such as "baptism saves" is a provisional, not an absolute statement—yet no more provisional than the statement "faith saves." In the final analysis, neither baptism nor faith "saves"; only God saves, and such human acts as faith and baptism are simply ways of approaching God to receive salvation. Years of ecclesiastical tradition and popular reflection have fostered the notion of baptism as cleansing, or the washing away of sins (cf. Acts 22:16), but this is exactly what Peter says it is *not*. Although he does not pause here to reflect on what *does* produce "the removal of the filth of the flesh," it is fair to conclude (from such passages as 1:14, 22; 2:1, 11, 24; 4:1–2) that an individual does this by an act of the mind and will that might fairly be described as "faith" (cf. 1:21). Faith "saves" in that it cleanses the heart and conscience from sin, and so prepares a person to turn to God. Baptism is the actual turning; it is the "appeal to God out of a good conscience," and in that sense, according to Peter, "baptism saves." If "faith" (or repentance, or the voluntary cleansing of the conscience) corresponds to Christ's death (i.e., the removal of sins, cf. 2:24; 4:1), baptism corresponds to his resurrection (v 21b; contrast Paul). One is the inside of the conversion experience; the other is the outside. One is the negative; the other is the positive. Neither is optional for Peter,

and neither is sufficient by itself; together they define what it means to be a Christian, both in one's heart and in a hostile society.

Freedom from Sin (4:1–6)

Bibliography

Blazen, I. T. "Suffering and Cessation from Sin According to 1 Peter 4:1." *AUS*[S] 21.1 (1983) 27–50. **Schweizer, E.** "1 Petrus 4,6." *T*[Z] 8 (1952) 152–54. **Sieffert, E. A.** "Die Heilsbedeutung des Leidens und Sterbens Christi nach dem ersten Briefe des Petrus." In *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 20 (1875) 423. **Strobel, A.** "Macht Leiden von Sünde frei? Zur Problematik von 1. Petr. 4,1f." *T*[Z] 19.6 (1963) 412–25. On 4:6, see also listings on 3:18–22.

Translation

[1]*Now that Christ has suffered in the flesh,*[a] *therefore, you too must arm yourselves with the same resolve—for he who suffered in the flesh*[b] *is through with sin* [c]*—*[2]*so as to live out [your] remaining time in the flesh no longer for human impulses but to do the will of God.* [3]*There was time enough*[d] *in the past to have done what the Gentiles wanted,*[e] *as you went along with them in acts of immorality and lust, drunken orgies, feasts, revelries, and lawless acts of idolatry.* [4]*Therefore they are surprised when you do not plunge with them into the same flood of dissipation. Blasphemers*[f] [5]*they will answer to the One who stands ready to judge*[g] *the living and the dead!* [6]*(for the gospel was proclaimed to those who are dead so that even though condemned in the flesh among people generally, they might live before God in the Spirit).*

Notes

a. The majority of ancient MS[s] (including [a]

[A P)] insert the words uper hmwn between and paqonto"; and sarki; a few others (including [a]

) insert uper umwn, and [a]

[*] reads apoqanonto" in place of paqonto" (cf. Notes e[*] and f[*] on 2:21 and Note a[*] on 3:18). The evidence in favor of the text as it stands ([P72 B] Y and others) is conclusive.

b. "In" is not expressed in the best Gr. MS[s] but is indicated by the dative sarki, as in the line above and in 3:18. The majority of later MS[s], however (including [K P),] have en sarki as in v 2. It is possible that the alteration was made in order to identify the one who in suffering "is through with sin" as an indefinite individual and not as Christ, who "suffered in the flesh" according to v 1a. Scribes may have wanted to avoid any implication that Christ had ever been a sinner; the effect of en sarki would have been to link v 1b more closely to v 2 than to the reference to Christ in v 1a. The manuscript evidence is conclusive,

however, in favor of the simple sarki.

c. In place of "sin" (amartia", genitive singular) some ancient MS^{s} (e.g., ^{a}

^{B} Y) have "sins" (amartiai", dative plural), while very few, mostly late ones, insert apo before amartia". The latter variant simply adjusts Peter's style to a more common usage (pauesqai with apo; BG^{D,} 638); the former is not common usage (pauesqai is not normally followed by a dative) but appears to be a purely accidental assimilation to the epiqumiai" that shortly follows (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 694; Y actually reads amartiai" in both places) or else a more conscious alteration influenced by 2:24 (cf. also Paul's uses of the dative singular in connection with "dying to sin" in Rom. 6:2, 10, 11).

d. Some MS^{s} personalize Peter's style here with the addition of either umin (^{a}

* and others) or hmin ($^{C\ K\ L\ P}$ and others), but in the best and most ancient MS^{s} ($^{P72\ a}$

$^{*\ A\ B}$ Y and others, as well as the *La*^{t} and Syr. versions), Peter keeps his style general and impersonal: there is no pronoun (in the best MS^{s}, none between v 1 and v 4).

Another variant defines the "time" as time "of life" (tou biou), perhaps to make it clear that Peter is referring to the behavior of individuals before their conversion, not to the state of the world before the coming of Christ. This reading, found in $^{K\ L\ P}$ and in the majority of later MSS, makes good sense in light of the ton epiloipon … biwsai cronon, "to live the rest of the time," at the end of the preceding verse, but it is easier to see why scribes might have added it for clarification than why they would have omitted it if it were original. The best MS^{s} ($^{P72\ a}$

$^{A\ B}$ and others) do not have it, and it is almost certainly a later addition.

e. The majority of later MS^{s} (including $^{P)}$ read qelhma for the "will" of the Gentiles (i.e., "what the Gentiles wanted"), but the best and earliest MS^{s} ($^{P72\ a}$

$^{A\ B\ C}$ Y and others) have boulhma ("purpose" or "intention"). Peter consistently uses qelhma for the "will" of God (2:15; 3:17; 4:2, 19; contrast 2 Pet 1:21), and it may be that the scribes changed boulhma to Peter's more common usage without observing the distinction that Peter himself maintained (cf. anqrwpwn epiqumiai" in contrast to qelhmati qeou in v 2).

f. In place of the participle blasfhmounte", certain MS^{s} (^{a}

$^{*\ C*}$ and others) have kai blasfhmousin The effect of this reading is to link the verb more closely to what precedes than to what follows: "This time they are surprised … and they blaspheme [God]" or "they slander [you]." The manuscript evidence is not strong enough to sustain this variant. The more difficult blasfhmounte" is to be preferred, and should probably be taken with what follows.

g. Several variants seem to have arisen from the failure of scribes to understand the idiom etoimw" ecein (BG^{D,} 316). In place of tw etoimw" econti krinai, some MS^{s} have tw etoimw" krinonti ("the One who readily judges," ^{B} Y and others), and some have tw etoimw krinai ("the One who is ready to judge," ^{P72} and others). The text as it stands, however, is supported by the majority of all MS^{s} (including ^{a}

$^{A\ C\ P)}$ and should be accepted as the original.

Form/Structure/Setting

Peter's exhortation to his readers in the face of possible persecution, broken off after 3:17, is now taken up once more. Surprisingly, no immediate use is made either of Christ's resurrection and journey to heaven, or of his supremacy over "spirits" and other supernatural powers, or of Christian baptism. Peter lingers instead at the point where the magnificent digression began—i.e., 3:18a and the theme of Christ's suffering (v 1a). It is Christ's suffering that serves as the basis for a renewed appeal to the readers of the epistle to realize in daily experience the decisive break with the past that first made them Christian (vv 1–2; cf. 2:11). Whether the appeal is direct or indirect depends on whether or not v 1b ("for he who suffered in the flesh is through with sin") is taken as parenthetical. If it is parenthetical then the implied subject of vv 2–3 is "you," following on the kai umei" ("you too") of v 1a. The appeal is therefore direct. If v 1b is not parenthetical, then v 2 at least (and possibly v 3) has as its implied subject the immediately preceding phrase, "he who suffered in the flesh." In the latter case, the reference to living "no longer for human impulses but to do the will of God" applies directly to whoever it is who "suffered in the flesh" and "is through with sin" according to v 1b, and indirectly to the readers of the epistle. The question of whether or not v 1b is parenthical hinges to a considerable degree on the question, "To whom does it refer?" (see *Comment*).

However vv 1–2 are read, v 3 reinforces their appeal with a list of vices reminding the epistle's readers of the evil way of life they have put behind them. Vv 4–6 then accent the surprise and hostility their conversion has aroused among those still devoted to that former way of life (cf. 1:14, 18a), and the accountability before God of those who scorn the Christian way. In general, vv 1–3 focus on Christian behavior, while vv 4–6 describe (or anticipate) the pagan response.

The importance of v 6 within vv 1–6 as a whole should not be exaggerated. In its context, this verse is merely a postscript to the phrase, "the living and the dead," with which v 5 concludesú Why "the dead" as well as the "living"? Because the dead, no less than the living, heard the gospel, and are therefore accountable for the ways in which they responded to it. The gospel of Jesus Christ belongs to the past as well as the present (see *Comment*). This affords Peter an opportunity to make the point that the hostility mentioned in v 4 is no new thing, but part of an age-old conflict, and that the vindication so conspicuous in the career of Jesus (cf. 3:18b) can also be demonstrated on a far wider front.

Comment

1 Cristou oun paqonto" sarki kai umei" thn authn ennoian oplisasqe, "Now that Christ has suffered in the flesh, therefore, you too must arm yourselves with the same resolve." The oun suggests that Peter is now drawing a conclusion from 3:18–22, yet the conclusion is based not on the whole passage but solely on 3:18. The phrase Cristou … paqonto" sarki, "Now that Christ has suffered in the flesh," pulls together the epaqen and the qanatwqei" … sarki of 3:18 into a single expression. Already in the earlier passage, Christ's suffering and death were virtually indistinguishable, so that now the one verb, "suffer," embraces both ideas without risk of misunderstanding. That v 18 is very much in Peter's mind is confirmed by the echo of the oti kai Cristo" of v 18a in the kai umei" of the present verse. The first kai moves from the exhortation of 3:13–17 to Christ as its supreme illustration, while the second marks a resumption of the hortatory style again

after the long and elaborate illustration of 3:18–22.

The exhortation proper is a military metaphor (oplisasqe, "arm yourselves"), somewhat reminiscent of 1:13, with its call to prepare oneself mentally for action. Just as th" dianoia", "of your mind," in 1:13 betrays a certain selfconsciousness in the use of metaphorical language (see *Comment*), so ennoia ("insight," or better, "intention" or "resolve"; cf. LS[J] 570) has a similar effect here. For the precise phrase, "the same resolve," cf. [P] Par 63.22 (165 B.C.) cited in M[M] 216, and there translated, "having come to the same conclusion." What is the "intention" or "resolve" with which the readers are to "arm themselves"? Taken by itself, this sentence could suggest that they are to go out and resolutely seek martyrdom. Just as Christ "suffered in the flesh," they must make absolutely certain that suffering and death is their lot as well, presumably on the theory that this is the only way to "follow in Christ's footsteps" (cf. 2:21). Nowhere else in the epistle does Peter come close to urging such a course of action, or even hint that "suffering" in itself is a good thing. What he praises is never suffering per se, but always "suffering for doing good." It is likely therefore that "the same resolve" has to do not with the sheer fact that Christ "suffered in the flesh" but with the attitude of mind that he brought to that moment of crisis (cf. 2:22–23; also perhaps Phil 2:5).

oti o paqwn sarki pepautai emartia", "for he who suffered in the flesh is through with sin." This translation understands oti as "for," or "because," and the clause it introduces as an explanation of the "intention" or "resolve" to which Peter has just referred. If this is correct, then the "resolve" is not to suffer just for the sake of suffering but to make a clean break with sin. This interpretation appears to be confirmed by vv 2–3. On the other hand, if oti is translated "that" (or "namely, that …"), then the clause it introduces becomes the content of the ennoia of v 1a. In this case, ennoia is more appropriately translated "thought" or "insight," and since it is "the same thought" that Christ had, the apparent implication is that the expression, "he who suffered in the flesh is through with sin," is, if not a word of Jesus, at least an insight he had which led him to do what he did. Although the translation of oti cannot be settled on grammatical grounds, the context strongly supports the first alternative, "for" or "because."

Most commentators understand o paqwn sarki, as "whoever has suffered," and the whole clause as a proverbial saying or statement of a general principle (e.g., RS[V], TE[V]; Goppelt, 268). This necessitates reading the aorist participle o paqwn as generic and the perfect indicative pepautai as gnomic (i.e., they are not linked to a specific time frame but are universal in their application). For the perfect, see BD[F,] § 344 ("rarely used"); for the aorist principle see BD[F,] § 275.6, 413.2, although the examples cited suggest that Peter would have been more likely to use either pa" o paqwn, "everyone who has suffered" or the present o pascwn, "the one who suffers," or even a plural, oi paqonte", if he had intended the generic meaning, "whoever" (cf. also Robertson, *Grammar*, 859). The generic interpretation (i.e., "whoever has suffered in the flesh is through with sin") could imply either that the experience of suffering can purify a person's life from sin (cf. Bigg, 167; Selwyn, 209), or that those who in baptism identify themselves with Christ's suffering and death have put sin behind them and begun a new life (cf. 2:24, and especially Rom 6:1–11). The first of these alternatives has no real basis in the thought of 1 Peter itself and somewhat questionable basis in human experience (Selwyn himself admits that suffering "often hardens and embitters men, and makes them more resolute in evil courses," 209).

The strongest argument for the second alternative (and therefore for a generic

understanding of o paqwn sarki) is the analogy between this phrase and Rom 6:7: o gar apoqanwn didikaiwtai apo th" amartia", "for he who died is justified from sin." If Paul's meaning is that sin cannot be charged against a dead person, then he provides a precedent for a generic interpretation here. That meaning, however, is far from certain in Rom 6:7, for Paul may simply be continuing the thought of 6:6a: "our old nature [o palaio" hmwn anqrwpo"] is crucified with [Christ] … so that we are no longer servants to sin." If so, o apoqanwn is not generic ("whoever dies") but refers back specifically to "our old nature" of the preceding verse. Rom 6:7 is in that case not a general principle of life but a concrete statement of Christian experience (cf. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:310–11).

Similarly, there is in the present passage a specific antecedent for the anonymous participial expression, o paqwn sarki, or "he who suffered in the flesh." It is, of course, the phrase Cristou … paqonto" sarki, "Now that Christ has suffered in the flesh," in v 1a. The parallel is unmistakable, and the natural conclusion is that the second participle, like the first, refers to Jesus Christ (cf. Strobel, 419, citing as a precedent the 1875 article of Sieffert, 423).

The main difficulty with this interpretation is theological: if Christ "is through with sin," or "has ceased from sin," does it not imply that at some point he was a sinner? Clearly, Peter is using Christ as an example (cf. 2:21–23), and just as clearly he is urging his readers to make a clean break with the sins of their Gentile past. Are there not difficulties in attempting to do both things at the same time, and has not Peter fallen into the trap of attributing to Christ precisely the break with a sinful past that he wants to encourage in his readers? Questions of this sort have led most commentators to look in every direction but this one for a solution. It is, after all, Peter himself who reminds his readers that Christ "did not commit sin, nor was deceit ever found in his mouth" (2:22). Yet the suggestion of Sieffert, and of Strobel long after him, is worth exploring. Can the words pepautai amartia", "is through with sin" be understood in a way that does not imply that Jesus was once a sinner? Strobel (424) argues that in Greek usage the verb pauesqai could imply a contrast not only to one's own previous activity or behavior, but to a whole sphere of reality in which one had previously existed and by which one had been affected. He also cites Sieffert (423) to the effect that "sin" may refer to that under which Christ had to suffer, and from which he is freed, now that his "suffering in the flesh" is over. Strobel cites Plutarch, *Mor* 593 E ("those who are *done with* the contests of life"), Diodorus Siculus 17.56.4 ("they would be *spared* lengthy toils and dangers"), Diog. Laert. 6.69 ("to *banish* hunger"), and Aristotle, *On Marvelous Things Heard* 86 ("to *cease from* his pain"); in each instance the italicized word renders pauesqai followed, as here, by a genitive. The examples support Strobel's contention, although they do not of course settle the usage of pepautai here. One of them (the second) even allows for the avoidance of future dangers as well as deliverance from past ones.

Strobel is on shakier ground in pressing his case a step further (420–21). He cites Epiphanius (*Panarion* 30.32) on an early Jewish Christian (Ebionite) interpretation of Lamech's prophecy about Noah (Gen 5:29) that attaches to the verb anapauesqai a causative meaning (i.e., Noah "makes us cease," or "frees us" from our sins, and in this respect becomes a type of Christ). The interpretation is built on a traditional derivation of Noah's name from the Hebrew verb jwn

: cf. Philo, *Leg. All.* 3.77, which Strobel does not cite: "for Noah means 'rest' or 'righteous.' But it cannot but be that he who rests from sinful and unrighteous acts [ton pauomenon

adikhmatwn kai amarthmatwn] and rests on what is noble and lives in fellowship with righteousness, should find favour with God" (LCL 1.353; see also DetPot 121–22). Against this background it would be intriguing to read v 1b in light of the Noah typology of 3:20–21, but the connection is far too subtle to be convincing; the one link that is definitely not made in 3:20–21 is the personal one between Noah and Christ.

In any event, the point of reference for v 1 as a whole is not 3:20–21 but 3:18a. This verse may provide material closer to home with which Strobel's argument can be supplemented and strengthened. In 3:18a, Christ was said to have suffered "for sins" (peri amartiwn). Although that phrase is not at all precise as to the relationship between "sins" and the suffering of Christ, the precedent of 2:24 suggests that what Christ's suffering accomplished was to do away with the sins entirely by carrying them to the cross (see Comment on 2:24 and 3:18). This is confirmed by the adverb apax ("once") accompanying the phrase "suffered for sins" in 3:18a. In view of the strong influence in general of 3:18a on Peter's language in v 1, it is natural to interpret pepautai amartia" in light of the earlier formulation, "Christ … once suffered for sins." He "is through with sin" in the sense that he has finished dealing with it, once and for all; he has put it behind him, says Peter, and so should we. Although the parallel with Rom 6:7, and in general, with the baptismal context of Rom 6 is often cited (e.g., Goppelt, 269; Dalton, *Proclamation*, 244–48), the parallels with Hebrews are perhaps more significant. Of special note is the distinction in Heb 9:28 between Christ's first and second comings: "So Christ, having been offered up once [apax] to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time *apart from sin* [cwri" amartia"] to bring salvation to those who wait for him." The distinction is not that Christ, once sinful, is now sinless, but that the purpose of his first coming was to deal with human sin, and that now, with that purpose accomplished, he has nothing more to do with sin. The phrase cwri" amartia", "apart from sin," is virtually a corollary of apax, "once." According to Heb 7:26, Jesus as a high priest like Melchizedek is now "holy, blameless, unstained, *separated from sinners* [kecwrismeno" apo twn amartwlwn] and higher than the heavens" (it is uncertain whether the phrase cwri" amartia", "without sin," in Heb 4:15 refers to Jesus in his Incarnation, or in his exalted state of having "passed through the heavens," or both). In 1 Peter, therefore, it is not surprising to find that Christ, having "gone to heaven" at God's right hand and with angels subject to him, is also said to be "through with sin."

One difficulty remains with identifying Christ as the one who "suffered in the flesh" and is consequently "through with sin" in v 1b. Taken at face value, the identification would also imply that Christ is the one who "lives the rest of the time in the flesh no longer for human impulses, but to do the will of God." This obviously makes no sense, because Peter knows that Christ's days "in the flesh" are over, and that it is "in the Spirit" that he was made alive and has gone to heaven. It is also clear that v 3 (and v 4 explicitly) refers not to Christ but to Christian believers. The view that v 1b refers to Christ virtually requires that it be considered a parenthesis, so that v 2 is read with v 1a: "arm yourselves with the same resolve … so as to live out [your] remaining time in the flesh not for human impulses but to do the will of God." Strobel (420) tries to avoid this by making Christ's suffering the source of the ongoing victorious power by which the believer is able to make a clean break with sin. This, however, is almost impossible grammatically. Something has to be supplied as the subject of the infinitive biwsai ("live") in v 2, and unless v lb is parenthetical the natural word to supply is "he" (referring to Christ who "suffered in the flesh"), not "you." Those who take o paqwn sarki as "whoever suffers in the flesh" are under less pressure to

make v 1b parenthetical, although it is still an attractive option. If they do not, then the subject of v 2 is still the unidentified "whoever," which serves the author as an indirect and generalized way of addressing "you" (cf. the generalized ti", "someone," in 2:19 followed by the more direct "you" of 2:20).

There is no real difficulty in regarding v 1b as parenthetical. Having reminded his readers that "Christ has suffered in the flesh" and urged them to "arm yourselves with the same resolve," it occurs to Peter that it may not be immediately clear what "intention" or "resolve" Christ had that must be imitated. So he inserts almost as an afterthought, "for he who suffered in the flesh [i.e., Christ] is through with sin." That was his "resolve," indeed the very purpose of his sufferings, and Peter wants to make sure it is equally the resolve of every Christian believer.

2 ei" to … ton en sarki biwsai cronon, "so as to live out [your] remaining time in the flesh." "Your" is supplied on the assumption that the thought of v 2 indeed follows on the exhortation of v 1a. Always conscious of his figurative language, Peter comes back from the metaphor of v 1a to prosaic reality. To "arm oneself" with the same resolve Christ had (i.e., to get rid of sin once and for all) does not actually mean that one dies—probably not even symbolically in baptism; baptism, as we have seen, is linked more to Christ's resurrection than to his death. Rather, one goes on living. The question is, "How, or with what attitude, does such an individual go on living?" (cf. Paul in Gal 2:19–20. "I am crucified with Christ; I live, and yet it is not I, but Christ lives in me, and the life I now live in the flesh [en sarki] I live in faith for the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me").

One's "remaining time in the flesh" is not the relatively short time remaining for everyone until Christ's return (cf. 4:7), but rather the individual's lifetime on earth, whether short or long. This crono", or span of time, is the same as the "allotted time" believers enjoy in whatever places or circumstances they find themselves (lit., "time of your sojourn," 1:17). biwsai, "live out," in contrast to zhn, "live" (e.g., v 6; 2:24), refers to the natural course of human existence rather than to "life" as a supreme value or a divine gift. It refers to one's anastrofh, or "conduct," day by day (cf. the cognate verb anastrafhte, understood similarly as "live out" in 1:17). Both "course of life" and "conduct" in this sense are ethically neutral. Only the context indicates whether one's course of life is good or bad; note that anastrofh is always characterized, either as "holy" (1:15), "empty" (1:18), "good" (2:12; 3:16), or "pure" (3:1–2).

mhketi anqrwpwn epiqumiai", alla qelhmati qeou, "no longer for human impulses but to do the will of God." The phrases defining the course of life appropriate for Christ's followers are set in contrast in a way characteristic of Peter's style: i.e., "not this, but that" (cf. 1:12, 14–15, 18, 23; 2:23; 3:3–4, 9, 21; 4:15–16; 5:2–3; cf. 2:18, 20). For mhketi, "no longer," used in connection with the vices of the Gentile world, cf. Eph 4:17.

anqrwpwn epiqumiai", "for human impulses"; "human" (anqrwpwn, lit. "of human beings") is used here in a negative sense: "merely human" in distinction from, and in opposition to, the will of God (cf. the "impulses" based on ignorance in 1:14 and the sarkikoi, or "natural" impulses that "wage war against the soul" according to 2:11). anqrwpo" is used negatively four times in 1 Peter (cf. 2:4, 15; 4:6) and positively only once (3:4). It is unlikely that Peter intends also a contrast between the plural "impulses" (pulling a person in several directions) and the singular "will of God," for these "human impulses" are indistinguishable from the singular to boulhma twn eqnwn, "what the Gentiles

wanted," in v 3. Nor can the epiqumiai be limited to sexual desires, as they probably are when the term recurs in v 3 within a list of vices. Rather, as Selwyn notes (210), the meaning is as broad as in 1 John 2:16: "all that is in the world—the lust [epiqumia] of the flesh, and the lust [epiqumia] of the eyes, and the pride of life."

qelhmati qeou, "to do the will of God" (lit. "for the will of God," but analogy with "doing what the Gentiles wanted" in the following verse makes it clear that actual deeds are implied). This short phrase is the positive heart of Peter's exhortation in vv 1–6, yet most of his attention in vv 1–2, and all of it in vv 3–4, is given to describing what should not be done. Granted that the "will of God" is to be "through with sin" (v 1) and to reject "human impulses" and all the shameful things the Gentiles like to do (vv 2–3), what is it concretely and positively? Peter does not define it here, but he does define it elsewhere either as "doing good" (2:15) or as "suffering for doing good" (3:17; 4:19). The same definitions are in effect here, and he assumes that by this time his readers know what he means. The best summary is perhaps the fourfold command of 2:17 ("Show respect for everyone, with love for the brotherhood; reverence toward God, and respect for the emperor"), while in the present context the characteristic Petrine intimation that God's will is likely to involve suffering comes to the surface in vv 4–5.

3 arketo" gar o parelhluqw" crono" to boulhma twn eqnwn kateirgasqai, "There was time enough in the past to have done what the Gentiles wanted." The "time … in the past" stands in explicit contrast to the individual's "remaining time in the flesh." These are the two cronoi, or time periods, into which the life of a Christian—particularly a Gentile Christian—is divided. The relegation of the evil life to the past is further demonstrated by Peter's use of a perfect infinitive (kateirgasqai, "to have done") and a perfect participle (peporeumenou", "as you went along") in this verse where present tenses would have been expected.

arketo", "enough," is used ironically, as a piece of understatement. "Enough" is actually more than enough—too much in fact. (Beare, 180; cf. Matt 6:34 and 10:25, its only other N^T occurrences).

to boulhma twn eqnwn kateirgasqai, "to have done what the Gentiles wanted." The designation of unbelievers as "Gentiles" in a letter addressed to Christians who are themselves Gentiles is striking (cf. 2:12), and reflects in a way that is natural and not at all self-conscious Peter's strong conviction that his Gentile Christian readers are actually Jews in God's sight. "The Gentiles" is a thoroughly Jewish designation for those outside one's own community, and Peter adopts it without hesitation (for a similar thought in a Jewish apocalypse, cf. *2 Apoc. Bar.* 83.5: "And let us not now look unto the delights of the Gentiles in the present, but let us remember what has been promised us in the end," *APO*^{T} 2:523).

The boulhma, or purpose, of the Gentiles echoes the "human impulses" of the preceding verse and stands in opposition to "the will of God." There is little difference in meaning here between boulhma and qelhma, but Peter consistently reserves the latter for the will of God. If the analogy between the two expressions holds, then it is more a question of what the Gentiles wanted "you" (i.e. the readers of the epistle) to do than of what they themselves customarily did. Although the two obviously amount to the same thing, Peter wants to leave the impression that his readers were somehow manipulated into adopting the lifestyle of the society in which they lived (cf. v 4, where the Gentiles are now "surprised" that Christians no longer do this).

peporeumenou" en aselgeiai", epiqumiai", oinoflugiai", kwmoi", potoi" kai

aqemitoi" eidwlolatriai", "as you went along with them in acts of immorality and lust, drinking parties, feasts, revelries, and lawless acts of idolatry." poreuesqai, "to go," is used here metaphorically, as peripatein, "walk," is often used in the N[T.] to refer to one's habitual conduct or course of life (BG[D.] 692.2c; cf. biwsai in v 2, and anastrafhte in 1:17; but contrast poreuqei" in 3:19, 22, where a definite journey is involved). For this use of the verb, cf. 2 Pet 3:3 and Jude 16, 18 (with kata, "according to"), where poreuesqai refers similarly to a way of life characterized by epiqumiai, or selfish "impulses" (with en it is more often used in positive connections (e.g. Prov 28:6; *T. Reub.* 1.6, 4.1; *T. Iss.* 3.1; *T. Ashe*[r] 4.5; Luke 1:6; 3.4, 4.4.4; *Vis.* 2.3.2; *1 Cle*[m] 60.2).

en aselgeiai", epiqumiai", "in acts of immorality and lust." The first two vices in the list have to do with sexual excess or abuse. For aselgeia, "immorality" or "sensuality," in N[T] lists of vices, see Mark 7:22; 2 Cor 12:21; Gal 5:19, and especially Rom 13:13 where it is plural, as here, referring to specific acts of immorality rather than immorality in general. aselgeia occurs three times in 2 Pet 2:2, 7, 18 (cf. Jude 4). Particularly noteworthy in connection with 1 Peter are its uses with anastrofh, "conduct," in 2 Pet 2:7 ("immoral conduct") and with epiqumiai in 2 Pet 2:18 ("immoral lusts of the flesh"); for this combination, cf. also Her[m] *Vis.* 3.7.2 ("the lusts of immorality") and in Greek literature, Polyb 36.15.4 ("immorality with regard to physical lusts").

The incorporation of epiqumiai into a list alongside aselgeiai is evidence that Peter is using epiqimiai in a more specific sense than in v 2, or in 1:14 or 2:11, to refer to sexual desire or lust, probably on the basis of traditional lists of vices. The conjoining of the two terms, along with the metaphorical use of poreuesqai, "went along," represents the closest approach of the vocabulary and style of 1 Peter to that of 2 Peter (2:18). It is obviously no accident that 1 Peter sounds the most like 2 Peter when it denounces the same kinds of behavior that 2 Peter denounces. The difference is that 1 Peter is directing its scorn against the world outside the Christian community, while 2 Peter is combating the intrusion of that world into the church itself. In themselves, these parallels are consistent either with the common authorship of 1 and 2 Peter, or with a direct literary relationship between the two, or with the use of common traditions adaptable both to the denunciation of pagans and of heretics. The most likely of these options is the third; if the dependence is direct, it would be hard to say where the priority lies—apart from the intrinsic likelihood that paganism was in the world before it was in the church. While the third option might render the first unnecessary, it hardly excludes it, for the same writer might well be expected to draw from the same stock of traditions in facing different sorts of problems.

The most significant parallel to our passage is probably not 2 Pet 2:18, but Rom 13:13, with its careful topical arrangement of six vices into three sets of two, focusing respectively on food and drink, sexuality, and selfish ambition. There, however, epiqumiai is not found within the list of vices, but after it, in 13:14, as a comprehensive term covering them all (more like the "human impulses" of v 2).

oinoflugiai", kwmoi", potoi", "drunken orgies, feasts, revelries." Peter does not group the vices neatly as Paul does by the repetition of me in Rom 13:13 (cf. rather Gal 5:21). oinoflugiai and potoi are almost synonymous, and are found only here in the N[T.] kwmoi, "feasts" (cf. Rom 13:13; Gal 5:21), and potoi, "revelries," are used together in a bad sense in Diog. Laert. 10.132, Plut. *Mor* 12B, and Appian, *Bell.* Civ. 1.113 just as they are here, while oinoflugia is not the innocent enjoyment of wine, but "drunkenness" (BG[D.] 562; cf. StoicVetFragm 3.397: "an insatiable appetite [epiqumia] for wine"; cf. Arist. *Eth.*

Nic. 3.5.15), or, in the plural, "drunken orgies" (Polyb 2.19.4; Philo, *Mos.* 2.185 Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4.91). Peter has not turned the virtues of the pagan world into vices here but has chosen words which both pagan and Jewish writers most often used in negative ways (for more parallels, see Selwyn, 211–12).

kai aqemitoi" eidwlolatriai", "and lawless acts of idolatry." Peter's Jewish heritage comes to its clearest expression in this last and most emphatic item in his list of vices (the plural, "idolatrous acts," occurs only here in the N[T]). The mention of "idolatry" is what betrays the primarily religious (rather than ethical) nature of the list of vices in this verse. The fact that the list culminates in "acts of idolatry" strongly suggests that the preceding "acts of immorality and lust" as well as the "drunken orgies, feasts, and revelries" are Peter's own generalized characterization of pagan religious practices based more on Jewish and Christian traditions than on first-hand observation (cf. Paul's association of pagan religious meals with idolatry in 1 Cor 10:14–22). "Idolatry" had a central place in Jewish and Christian vice lists because of the first commandment of the Decalogue (in N[T] lists, cf. Gal 5:20; Col 3:5; also "idolater" in 1 Cor 5:10–11; 6:9; Eph 5:5; Rev 21:8; 22:15). For warnings against "idolatry" in particular, cf. *T. Jud.* 19.1; 1 Cor 10:14; *Did.* 3.4, 5.1; *Barn.* 16.7, 20.1; and the general sentiments expressed in many other passages (e.g., Acts 15:20; 2 Cor 6:14–16; 1 John 5:21; and especially Rom 1:18–25). Almost redundantly from a Jewish perspective—but perhaps not for his Gentile readers—Peter characterizes such idolatrous acts as aqemitoi, "lawless" or "wanton" (BG[D], 20; obviously he does not imply by the adjective that other idolatrous acts exist, or can be imagined, that are not "lawless"). aqemitoi" is probably not used with reference to the Jewish law (e.g., the Decalogue) in particular (cf. Acts 10:28; Josephus, *Vit.* 26; *J. W.* 1.650) but in the broader sense of something utterly inappropriate and repugnant to God (cf., e.g., 2 Macc 10:34; Josephus, *J. W.* 4.562; *1 Clem.* 63.2; *Did.* 16.4; *Diogn.* 4.2)

4 en w xenizontai mh suntrecontwn umwn, "Therefore they are surprised when you do not plunge with them." Who are "they"? The unexpressed subject of the verb must be "the Gentiles" mentioned in v 3, identified in Peter's mind with those in Roman society who "denounce" (3:16) the "good conduct" of those who believe in Christ. The relative construction en w (lit., "in which") occurs five times in 1 Peter (cf. 1:6; 2:12; 3:16, 19), and every time it occurs there is a question about its antecedent. In 1:6 and 3:19 there were, as we have seen, plausible antecedents in the contest, while 2:12 and 3:16 were special cases in which en w functioned identically to introduce conditional clauses within a larger purpose clause (see *Comment*). Neither of these circumstances applies here. en w seems to signal a shift from the perspective of the past (represented by the perfect tenses in v 3) back to the present time frame presupposed by the commands of vv 1–2. The perfect infinitive and perfect participle of v 3 give way to a present indicative and a present participle in v 4. It is tempting to assign to en w the meaning "until," as in Luke 19:13 (cf. BD[F], § 383.1), but it is doubtful that such an understanding would have come across clearly to the readers. More likely, en w is simply causal—"in view of this," or "therefore" (cf. BD[F], § 219.2), an interpretation that has the virtue of explaining why the Gentiles "are surprised." Because many Christians had in the past joined their fellow citizens in civic rituals, or in the enjoyment of excessive food, drink and sex, it was natural to assume they would always do so. When they did not (cf. v 2), "surprise"—with implications of disappointment and anger—was the result. For the negative overtones of xenizein ("surprise," akin to qaumazein, "marvel," or evenskandalizein, "shock"), cf. 4:12: Agaphtoi, mh

xenizesqe "Dear friends, don't be surprised"; and specifically in relation to unbelievers, cf. *2 Cle*[m] 17.5.

suntrecontwn umwn, "when … you plunge with them," is literally "when you run with them" ("plunge" is used only because of the words that follow; BG[D,] 793). This "running" (cf. *Barn.* 4.2) or "plunging" is a deliberate, almost comic, exaggeration of the peporeumenou" ("as you went along") of v 3. Although "surprised" clearly describes the reaction of unbelievers to Christian conversion and therefore views conversion momentarily from their perspective, the accompanying reference to "running together" (much less "plunging into a flood of dissipation") is hardly the way these unbelievers would have described their own lifestyle. The language is entirely Peter's as he maintains his polemical stance through the entire section.

ei" thn authn th" aswtia" anacusin, "into the same flood of dissipation." "The same" means both "the same as in the past" (v 3) and "the same as that in which the Gentiles are involved." anacusi", "flood" or "outpouring" (used only here in the N[T),] is a metaphor suggesting rank excess in the seeking of pleasure or self-gratification, aswtia, "dissipation" (cf. aswtw", "wastefully," used of the prodigal son in Luke 15:13), is a broad enough term to cover both drunkenness (cf. Eph 5:18) and sexual misconduct (cf. Titus 1:6). The metaphor defines the "running" or "rushing" of which Peter has just spoken as an impetuous plunge into an open sewer. His denunciation of the pagan world, although very general and in some respects vague, is at the same time remarkably graphic.

blasfhnmounte", "blasphemers" (lit., "blaspheming"). The participle is probably attributive rather than circumstantial, for it defines the very character of those against whom his anger is directed: i.e., all those who "denounce" the Christian lifestyle and will soon be "put to shame" (3:16; cf. 2:7b–8). If (as the verse division suggests), the participle is linked to what precedes, it is possible to understand blasfhmein as another term for ridicule and slander directed against the Christians themselves (BG[D,] 142.1). Because the "Gentiles" are "surprised" (i.e., offended) the sudden change in the behavior those now converted to Christianity, they heap verbal abuse on them (cf. 2:12, 15; 3:9, 16) and blasfhmein (in the sense of "revile" or "defame") is one more term for that abuse (see Comment on 3:9). More likely, blasfhmounte" goes with v 5, or is, at the very least, transitional. In this case, although still occasioned by the "surprise" of v 4, it refers primarily to "blasphemy" of God (cf. BG[D,] 142.2b). Because they are "blasphemers," the prospect that "they will answer to the One who stands ready to judge the living and the dead" (v 5) is not an abstract theological confession but a very real and immediate threat.

The two options are not mutually exclusive, although the second is where the emphasis lies. Peter's assumption is that those who slander Christians for their changed lifestyle are in effect slandering (i.e., blaspheming) God himself, the One who called these new believers "out of darkness into his marvelous light" (2:9b). Whatever is done to, or for, a child of God is done to, or for, God himself (cf. Luke 10:16; John 12:48; 15:18–25; Matt 25:41–46). If the longer reading is accepted in 4:14b (see *Comment*), Peter's explanation is that the very Spirit of God rests on these Christians, so that to "blaspheme" them is to blaspheme the Spirit. At any rate, the abrupt use of such a strong word in our passage reveals unmistakably that the world's "surprise" at the new life of Christians is not a pleasant, or even a neutral surprise, but a genuine offense or "scandal" (cf. 2:8).

5 oi apodwsousin logon tw etoimw" econti krinai zwnta" kai nekrou", "they will answer to the One who stands ready to judge the living and the dead." As Beare aptly

comments, logon apodidonai, lit. "give account," is "the converse of logon aitein, 'call to account' (3:15). The Christian may be called to account before an earthly tribunal; his enemies will be called to account before the tribunal of heaven" (181). Selwyn (213) raises the further possibility of the influence on Peter of a saying of Jesus recorded in Matt 12:36 ("I tell you, on the day of judgment [en hmera krisew"] people will give account [apodwsousin … logon] concerning every idle word that they speak"), with the remark that "The mockings of the heathen were likely to have been 'idle' enough." The language is that of legal obligation (cf. Luke 16:2) or even of the courtroom (cf. Acts 19:40), and the saying of Jesus is one of several in which he is represented as transferring that language to the issue of a person's ultimate accountability before God (cf. e.g., Matt 5:25–26//Luke 12:57–59//Matt 18:34–35). This use of the expression—usually without explicit development of the courtroom metaphor—continues in early Christian literature, whether in reference to accountability for oneself (2.5; cf. Rom 14:12) or a kind of pastoral accountability for others (Heb 13:17; Her[m] *Vis.* 3.9.10; cf. Clem. Alex. *Quis Dives* 42).
Peter's language indeed suggests a reversal of the circumstances imagined in 3:15–16. In the present age Christians are—or might be—questioned about their new faith and hope, even formally interrogated about the implications of that hope for their loyalty (or disloyalty) to the laws of the empire. They are accountable to civil authorities and must know how to respond graciously, yet with integrity, even to the most hostile of questions (3:15; cf. 2:13–15). In the future, the tables will be turned. Those who now ask the questions will have to come up with some answers of their own.

tw etoimw" econti krinai zwnta" kai nekrou", "to the One who stands ready to judge the living and the dead." etoimw" ecein (more literally, "to have in readiness") is an idiom meaning "to be ready" (e.g., Dan 3:5 LX[X]; Acts 21:13; 2 Cor 12:14, and commonly in Greek literature; BG[D], 316). Who is "the One … ready to judge"? The other three N[T] passages that speak of judging "the living and the dead" (i.e., Acts 10:42; Rom 14:9; 2 Tim 4:1) agree in designating Jesus Christ as the universal judge (cf. *Barn.* 7.2). Acts 10:42 is particularly noteworthy in connection with 1 Peter because it is part of a speech attributed to Peter himself, yet the idea that Jesus is "the One ordained by God as judge of the living and the dead" is also of interest to Luke (cf. Acts 17:31) and might be attributable to him. In 1 Peter, "the One who judges impartially according to each person's work" is God the Father (1:17), and it was in the hands of God "who judges justly" that Jesus left the fate of his tormentors at the time of his Passion (2:23). Yet Polycarp, who is clearly dependent on 1 Peter, speaks of Christ "coming as the judge of the living and the dead, whose blood God will require from those who disobey him" (*Pol. Phil.* 2. 1b). *2 Cle*[m], while recognizing that the title "judge of the living and the dead" belongs properly to God, claims it at the very outset for Jesus Christ—precisely as God (w" peri qeou, *2 Cle*[m] 1.1). Peter's own usage suggests that he intended God the Father as "the One who stands ready to judge the living and the dead." His other uses of attributive participles for a divine being—i.e., not only "the One who judges" (1:17; 2:23), but "the One [or the Holy One] who called you" (1:15; 2:9; 5:10), "the One who gave us new birth" (1:3), and "the One who raised him … and gave him glory" (1:21)—refer not to Jesus Christ but to God the Father. At the same time it must be added that the distinction between God and Christ is not of paramount importance to Peter at this stage of his argument. The promise and threat of divine judgment are just as effective—perhaps more so—when the circumstances and results of that judgment, and even the identity of the judge, are left only partially defined.

zwnta" kai nekrou", "the living and the dead." This stereotyped expression is simply a way of saying "all" (cf. "the God and judge of all," Heb 12:23), or "each person" (cf. 1:17, "according to each person's work"). The universality of the phrase is a universality of time: God is Lord and Judge not only over the present, but over the past as well. If "the living and the dead" means "each person," it is each person who has ever lived, from the creation of the world until the day of judgment. It is this peculiarity of the expression that Peter now explores.

6 ei" touto gar kai nekroi" euhggelisqh, "for the gospel was also proclaimed to those who are dead."

It is important to observe that this verse in its context is merely a footnote to v 5. The whole argument extending from 3:13 to 4:5 is much the same whether v 6 is added or not: God will vindicate those who suffer and hold their oppressors accountable at the day of judgment. What then does v 6 accomplish? It calls attention to one half of the stereotyped expression, "the living and dead," in v 5. Why say "the living and dead" instead of "each person" or simply "all"? Why mention "the dead" at all?

Stereotyped expressions are not normally examined in detail. One takes them for granted with their technical meanings. "The living and the dead" refers, as we have seen, to the whole human race throughout history. Yet twice in the N^T (out of four occurrences of the phrase), the author pauses to reflect on a reference to "the living and the dead." One is in this verse; in the other, Paul writes, "For to this end Christ died and lived again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living" (Rom 14:9). Paul's introductory words ei" touto gar match exactly the beginning of v 6. Where Paul's attention is drawn to the fact that Christ's experience corresponds to both aspects of the human condition (death and life), Peter's is drawn to "the dead" in particular. That God will hold those who ridicule the faith of Christians accountable at the last judgment is Peter's main point (v 5), but the phrase with which he has chosen to express it, "the living and dead," points to the universality of that judgment, especially its universality in time.

If judgment applies to the past no less than the present, on what basis are those who lived in the past going to be judged? In a Jewish framework the answer would have been that they will be judged on the basis of their obedience to the law of Moses, or, if they are Gentiles, to some more ancient and universal law (e.g., the so-called Noachic commandments). 1 Peter, however, is written to a Gentile, not a Jewish audience, and its author is not interested in law as a theoretical basis for universal judgment (as, e.g., Paul is in Rom 2). Peter is interested rather in something more immediate and familiar to his Gentile readers—the Christian "gospel," or message of salvation through Jesus Christ (cf. 1:12, 25). The "dead" are included in the judgment along with the living because they too (kai) have heard the gospel. euhggelisqh is a passive with an impersonal subject: i.e., "the gospel was proclaimed" ($BG^{D,}$ 317.2ba), not "Christ was proclaimed" (Selwyn, 214).

To make his case, it was not essential for Peter to demonstrate that all the "dead" had heard the gospel of Jesus Christ, only that some had. If he could show this, it meant that the Christian gospel belonged to the past as well as the present, so that the crisis faced by the readers of his epistle had significant antecedents. His claim is that nekroi, "dead ones," or some among those now dead, heard the Christian gospel in their lifetime, with much the same results that the reception of the gospel had for the Gentile Christians in Asia Minor to whom 1 Peter was written. Earlier in the epistle he set forth the experience of Jesus as a precedent for the experience of his readers, and therefore as a source of encouragement

(2:18–25; 3:18–4:1). The stereotyped phrase, "the living and the dead," now affords him the opportunity to suggest, in very few words, that if he wanted to take the time he could cite a great number of other similarly encouraging examples of the same pattern of suffering and vindication. Because such examples would not be of the same order as the uniquely redemptive "sufferings" and "glories" of Jesus Christ, they are only mentioned in passing, not enumerated. It is not so important to list all these examples as simply to remind his readers that they exist. His point is that the conflict in which the Christians of Asia Minor find themselves is no new conflict but a very ancient one indeed, and that its outcome is always the same. Alluding in the most general way possible to a class of experiences that he might have discussed more specifically and at much greater length, Peter gives the impression that he knows more than he is telling. The technique of making a generalized reference with a number of specific examples in mind is paralleled in 1:10–12, where he speaks vaguely of "prophets" (without the article, like "dead ones" in 4:6) who raised questions with God, or a revealing angel, about the visions and prophecies they received (e.g., Habakkuk, Daniel, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, Enoch; see *Comment*). It is paralleled also in 3:5, where Peter mentions "the holy wives" who "hoped in God" as they submitted to the authority of their husbands. This reference is not quite so general, for the wives of the three patriarchs seem to be in mind, with Sarah singled out in 3:6 as a specific example. Yet the effect is much the same. On the basis of one vague and passing reference, Peter hints at a universal pattern in the history of God's people.

Both the "prophets" of 1:10–12 and the "holy wives" of 3:5–5 are viewed in 1 Peter as Christians before Christ (cf. Ignatius, who claimed that "the divine prophets lived according to Jesus Christ," *Magn.* 8.2, and that "of him even the prophets were disciples in the Spirit, looking forward to him as their teacher," 9.2). Just as Selwyn's argument (262–63) that the "prophets" of 1:10–12 are Christian prophets is in one sense valid (see Comment on 1:11), so there is no reason to quarrel with the suggestion of Dalton (*Proclamation*, 271) that the "dead" in 4:6 are the Christian dead who heard the gospel of Jesus Christ while they were still alive, and whose vindication the author confidently expects (cf. Kelly, 174). Dalton's thorough and cogent argument (263–77) only needs to be refined and broadened. Its main weakness is the unnecessary limitation of "the dead" to Christians who died subsequent to Jesus' death and resurrection, like "those who sleep" in 1 Thess 4 (cf. Selwyn, 337–38). In fact there is no hint in 1 Peter of any particular anxiety about the fate of loved ones who had died, as there is in 1 Thessalonians. While Dalton is correct that "the dead" in v 6 are Christians who heard the gospel in their lifetime, "Christians" in this epistle do not belong to any one period of history. They belong to the past as well as the present, and it is to the past that Peter looks with his brief reflection on the traditional phrase, "the living and the dead." Because the one community of faith spans all the ages, the righteous of Israel's past are freely regarded as Christians before the coming of Christ. Peter has no hesitation in making their experience a prototype and illustration of the experience of the Christians in Asia Minor to whom he directs his letter.

This approach is preferable to the long interpretative tradition that identifies the nekroi as "dead people, in a proper sense, who hear the gospel in Hades, in order to be judged on the Last Day in the flesh, and to live in the Spirit" (Reicke, *Spirits*, 206). Because there is no other point of contact in 1 Peter for such a suggestion, those who hold this view almost invariably link v 6 with 3:19 so as to focus on the generation that died in the Flood as the primary example of the evangelized dead in Hades (Reicke, 209–10, moves cautiously in

this direction). There is little evidence, as we have seen, for identifying the "spirits" of 3:19 as the spirits of dead human beings, and it seems unlikely that Peter would introduce another whole dimension to Christ's journey to heaven without further elaboration. Reicke is forced to suggest that a "general preaching to the dead was possibly a well-known fact to all Christians" (210), but evidence for this at such an early period is lacking. The other consideration that weighs against relating v 6 to an evangelization of those actually dead at the time they are evangelized is the purpose clause that follows. Reicke's view requires that v 6b be understood to mean that the dead will be "judged on the Last Day in the flesh" *as human beings* (i.e., by God), and yet (presumably as a result of that investigative judgment) "live in the Spirit"—also at the last day and also by the grace of God (Reicke, *Spirits*, 206–8). He candidly admits that this creates a difficulty with the parallel phrases in the next clause, kata anqrwpou", lit. "according to humans" or "by human standards," and kata qeon, lit. "according to God," or by God's standards. Reicke concludes, "there is perhaps no possibility to avoid this discrepancy between the two kata's" (208). Whether this is so hinges on the exegesis of the next clause.

ei" touto…ina kriqwsi men kata anqrwpou" sarki, zwsi de kata qeon pneumati "so that even though condemned in the flesh among people generally, they might live before God in the Spirit." The phrase ei" touto, which in 2:21 and 3:9 pointed back to something said just previously, cannot be so understood here. Rather, ei" touto has as its antecedent the ina-clause that shortly follows.

The reason the Christian gospel was preached even to those now dead was the same reason it is preached to those still alive, indeed the only reason it is ever preached—in order that people might be saved (cf. 1:12, 25). The goal of salvation comes to expression in the final words of v 6, "live before God in the Spirit." The sentence, however, is not that simple. There are two contrasting parts to the ina-clause, set in opposition by Peter's characteristic men … de construction (cf. 1:20; 2:4; 3:18) and by the now familiar sarki-pneumati distinction (cf. 3:18; 4:1). There is wide agreement that the first of these units (set off by men) is concessive (e.g., Selwyn, 215; Beare, 182): even though they are "condemned in the flesh among people generally," the goal is that the dead will nevertheless "live before God in the Spirit." The purpose of evangelization is always life with God, but in this instance it is life with God triumphing over human disapproval and condemnation. If condemnation in human eyes is the immediate result of receiving the gospel, the ultimate result is eternal salvation (cf. 1:5, 9; 2.2b).

Checklang sarki … pneumati, "flesh … Spirit." As in 3:18 and 4:1, the contrast is between the circumstances and limitations of a person's physical existence and the new life of the resurrection (in this case a future resurrection).

kata anqrwpou" … kataqeon, "among people generally … before God." The translation is interpretive. The only way to give the preposition kata the same meaning in relation to human beings and in relation to God is to understand it as pointing to a norm or standard (BG^{D,} 407.5a). kata anqrwpou" then means "according to human standards," not as an abstraction, as if there were one agreed standard by which all human judgments were made, but according to standards of human beings viewed as responsible individuals or groups (cf. Selwyn, 215). kata qeon means "according to God's standard," "in God's sight," or "before God." Bauer's more specific suggestion that kata points to "the person according to whose will, pleasure, or manner something occurs" (BG^{D,} 407.5) is also helpful. The translation, "among" human beings (or "people generally"), and "before" (or

"in the sight of") God, is an attempt to do justice (in meaning if not in form) to the symmetry of Peter's language in v 6b (i.e., men … de, kata, … kata, sarki … pneumati, or "flesh … spirit," and kriqwsi … zwsi, or "condemned … live").

If the judgment (kriqwsi) referred to in this verse is indeed human judgment, it cannot be identified with the judgment of God (krinai) on "the living and the dead" at the end of v 5 (contrast Reicke, "Spirits," 205, who insists that "the verb krinein … must in both places denote the same kind of judgment"). As Selwyn rightly observes (215), Peter "does not mean that the dead have been judged as men are judged, which would call for kata anqrwpon, but that they have been according to human standards judged" (for kata anqrwpon in the sense of "as human beings" or "as belonging to the human condition," cf. Rom 3:5; 1 Cor 3:3; 9:8, 15:32; Gal 1:11, 3:15). The closest parallel in 1 Peter itself to the contrast here between human judgment and the judgment of God is the reference in 2:4 to Christ the living Stone, "rejected indeed by people generally [upo anqrwpwn men] but in God's sight [para de qew] choice and precious." The conflicting judgments about Christ find their parallel in conflicting judgments about those who believe the gospel of Christ. The closest parallel to v 6 in Jewish or Hellenistic literature generally is probably Wisd Sol 3:4, written with reference to "the righteous" as a class of people in the Bible and Jewish history. The whole context, Wisd Sol 3:1–7, is rich enough in parallels to 1 Peter to be worth citing in full (from the RSV).

> But the souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and no torment will ever touch them. In the eyes of the foolish they seemed to have died [cf. 1 Pet 2:15] and their departure was thought to be affliction, and their going from us to be their destruction; but they are at peace (Wisd Sol 3:1–3).

The key parallel is in the next verse:

> For though in the sight of men [en oyei anqrwpwn] they were punished, their hope is full of immortality (3:4).

The author of Wisdom then continues:

> Having been disciplined a little, they will receive great good, because God tested them and found them worthy of himself; like gold in the furnace he tried them [cf. 1 Peter 1:7], and like a sacrificial burnt offering he accepted them. In the time of their visitation [cf. 1 Peter 2:12] they will shine forth, and will run like sparks through the stubble (3:5–7).

There is no denying that in the Book of Wisdom the language is about as general as it can be. The "righteous" are all the righteous of the biblical period, and on into the author's time. Specific examples will come later (e.g., Wisd Sol 10:1–11:20), but even then they are couched in deliberately vague language, and without the use of proper names. Because the operative term in 1 Peter is "dead ones" rather than "righteous ones," the focus is more exclusively on the past than in Wisdom, chiefly on the biblical past.

What examples does Peter have in mind? The closest early Christian parallels are probably the heroes and heroines of faith in Heb 11, of obedience, faith, and hospitality in *1 Cle*[m] 9–12, and of humility in *1 Cle*[m] 16–18. Each of these—Hebrews with plausibility and *1 Clement* with certainty—can be assigned to the church at Rome, the likely origin of 1 Peter as well (see *Introduction*). Although Peter's theme of suffering and vindication is not the principal theme of any of these early Christian lists of heroes, it is at least a mincer note

in Heb 11. If the heroes of faith were pleasing to God, they were at the same time enemies to the world, and they made enemies in the world Oust as "the righteous" did in the Book of Wisdom). Abel "offered a better sacrifice than Cain" according to Heb 11:4, and the accompanying reference to his death clearly presupposes his brother's enmity. Noah "condemned the world" when he "became heir of the righteousness that comes by faith" (11:7).

Abraham was "like an alien" when he settled in the promised land (11:9), and all the people of God from Abel to Abraham were "foreigners and strangers on earth" (11:13a; cf. 1 Peter 1:1; 2:11). Of them the author says in summary, "All these died in faith, not having received the things promised, but seeing them and welcoming them from a distance" (Heb 11:13a). It is likely that these pre-Abrahamic saints are among the dead to whom Christ's gospel was preached according to 1 Peter. Because of 3:20–21, interpreters of 1 Peter have concentrated on Noah (or the people of his generation) in connection with the "dead" of 4:6, but in all likelihood Noah and his family were only one example among many of the pattern of suffering and vindication in which Peter is interested. The world's hostility surfaces again in the experience of Moses, who "chose to be mistreated along with the people of God rather than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a short time," and who "regarded disgrace for the sake of Christ of greater value than the treasures of Egypt" (Heb 11:25–27).

The hope of resurrection with which v 6 concludes ("so that … they might live before God in the Spirit") is also characteristic of Heb 11. Abraham believed "that God could raise the dead, and figuratively speaking received Isaac back from death" (11:19). In the last segment of the chapter, suffering and vindication becomes the dominant theme. Saints now dead, like Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, David, Samuel, and the prophets, accomplished great things in their lifetime: they "shut the mouths of lions, quenched the fury of the flames, and escaped the edge of the sword" (11:34). As the account drifts into anonymity, it echoes the experiences of the Maccabean martyrs: "Women received back their dead, raised to life again. Some were tortured and refused to be released, so that they might gain a better resurrection. Some faced jeers and flogging, while others were chained and put in prison. They were stoned, they were sawed in two; they were put to death by the sword. They went about in sheepskin and goatskin [cf. *1 Cle*[m] 17:1], destitute, persecuted—the world was not worthy of them. They wandered in deserts and mountains, and in caves and holes in the ground" (Heb 11:35–38). The chapter concludes: "These were all commended for their faith, yet none of them received what had been promised. God had planned something better for us so that only together with us would they be made perfect" (11:39–40). An equally fitting epitaph would have been Peter's vision that these righteous dead, "though condemned in the flesh among people generally, might live before God in the Spirit." That the reflections in Hebrews on the Jewish experience, especially in Maccabean times, were firmly rooted in Jewish tradition can be seen from a quotation attributed to one of the Maccabean martyrs in 1 Macc 7:14, another striking parallel to the statement in 1 Peter: "It is preferable to die at the hands of men [upÈ anqrwpwn] and cherish the hope given by God [upo tou qeou] to be raised again by him."

A legitimate question remains whether Peter would have used the verb euaggelizein, "evangelize" or "proclaim the gospel" in connection with those who lived long before the coming of Christ. His other uses of this verb (1:12; cf. 4:17b) refer to the contemporary proclamation of the Christian message. The hearing of the gospel in 1:12 stands as much in contrast as in continuity with the experience of the ancient prophets (see *Comment*). Moreover, Heb 11 uses the term "promise" rather than "gospel" in connection with those

who lived before the coming of Christ. Yet when Hebrews is examined more broadly, it appears that "promise" is used of the experience of both ancient and contemporary saints. Also, the only two instances of euaggelizein in Hebrews are significant in relation to 1 Pet 4:6. Of the generation of Israelites who wandered in the desert, the author writes: "For we also have had the gospel proclaimed to us, just as they did (kai gar esmen euhggelismenoi kaqaper kakeinoi); but the message they heard was of no value to them, because those who heard did not combine it with faith" (Heb 4:2). A few verses later, he adds: "It still remains that some will enter that rest, and those who formerly had the gospel proclaimed to them [oi proteron euaggelisqente"] did not go in, because of their disobedience" (Heb 4:6; cf. also the use of proeuaggelizesqai, "to preach the gospel beforehand," in Gal 3:8). There is no evidence of any sharp distinction in Hebrews between the ancient past as a time of "promise" and the present as a time of "gospel," nor is there reason to make such a distinction in 1 Peter.

In his brief footnote to the phrase "the living and the dead," Peter seems to have alluded, in the manner of the Book of Wisdom, to certain well-known Jewish and Christian traditions about the suffering righteous and their ultimate vindication before God. He alludes vaguely and in passing to a certain pattern in Jewish history to which Hebrews and *1 Clement* devote whole chapters. It was probably not important to him how many of the particulars his readers could fill in for themselves. What was more important was that they would see parallels to their own situation in the reference to those "condemned in the flesh by people generally" but destined "to live before God in the spirit."

Explanation

Even though v 6 is an explanatory postscript to v 5, it powerfully affects the significance, if not the meaning, of vv 1–6 as a whole. If there is a single idea that emerges from the section, it is that God is the author of life and not death. He is, as Jesus was remembered to have said, "not the God of the dead, but of the living" (Mark 12:27//Matt 22:32//Luke 20:38). Instead of following up on the triumphant theme of Christ's resurrection and journey to heaven (3:21–22), the section begins with Christ's death as a removal of sin once and for all (v 1). Yet it is immediately clear that death is not the last word, for Christ or anyone else. What is required is not to die with him—even symbolically in baptism—but to live out one's life in obedience to the will of God (v 2). Peter has already indicated that this "time in the flesh" is not the end but only a beginning (cf. "bring you to God," 3:18; "baptism … saves you," 3:21), but in the present passage he makes it explicit only in connection with those who have already died (vv 5–6). If God is indeed the judge of "the living and the dead," then "the dead" too must have heard the gospel, even centuries before Christ's coming. The "gospel of God" (cf. 4:17b) is a universal gospel not only in space (cf. Rom 10:18; Col 1:23) but also in time. And the divine intent in the gospel, wherever and whenever it is proclaimed, is life—i.e., that those who hear it and believe might "live before God in the Spirit (v 6b). It is unlikely that Peter has specifically in mind the saying of Jesus that God is "not the God of the dead but of the living," much less the significant additional words in Luke, "for all live to him" (Luke 20:38). In a formal sense, the point is exactly the opposite: He is the God of *both* the dead and the living. Yet it amounts to much the same thing: God's intent even for "the dead" was life, and those among "the dead" who listened to GOd (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all the righteous) are heirs of that life awaiting the resurrection (cf. Heb 11:13, 39–40). By implication, Peter

holds out the same hope to his readers.

There was, however, and there is, another intent in the world alongside God's intent for life. Its direction is death, and Peter finds it expressed not so much in the immorality, drunkenness and idolatry of the pagan world (v 3) as in the consequent disapproval and condemnation of all who break out of that world to embrace the life of God (v 4). This disapproval and condemnation amounts to blasphemy, and because of blasphemy the final judgment of "the living and the dead" cannot be understood—in spite of God's life-giving intent—as the universal or indiscriminate granting of eternal life. Those who condemn the righteous, past or present, should not be surprised if they face condemnation at the hands of the God whom the righteous worshiped (cf. 2:7b–8; 3:16).

Peter has frequently held out to his readers the hope of life or resurrection directly (e.g. 1:3–5, 21; 3:18, 21), but now he confirms it indirectly by placing them in a long tradition of those who were "condemned in the flesh among people generally," but will "live before God in the Spirit." While human disapproval and slander lead toward death, God's way is the way of those who choose "to love life and to see good days" (3:10, from Ps 34:13). The whole of vv 1–6, in fact, admirably summarizes the thought of the decisive quotation from Ps 34 in 3:10–12, and in so doing brings to a close the extended major segment of Peter's epistle (3:13–4:6) introduced by that quotation.

Mutuality in the Congregations (4:7–11)

Bibliography

Hiebert, D. E. "Living in the Light of Christ's Return: An Exposition of 1 Peter 4:7–11." B[S] 139/555 (1982) 243–54. **Kline, L.** "Ethics for the End Time: An Exegesis of I Peter 4:7–11." *Rest*[Q] 7 (1963) 113–23. **Sisti, A.** "La vita cristiana nell'attesa della parusia (1 Piet. 4,7–11)." *Be*[O] 7 (1965) 123–28. **Spicq, C.** "Prière, charité, justice … et fin des temps (I Pet 4:7–11)." *AsSeig*[n] 50 (1966) 15–29.

Translation

[7]*The end of all things is near. Prepare yourselves mentally, therefore, and attend to prayers,*[a] [8]*Above all, remain constant in your love for each another, for love covers*[b] *many sins.* [9]*Show hospitality toward one another without complaining.*[c] [10]*Whatever spiritual gift each [of you] has received, use it in ministry to each other as good managers of God's diversified grace.* [11]*Whoever does the speaking, [do it] as one bringing words from God. Whoever serves, [do it] out of strength that*[d] *God provides, so that in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom belongs the glory and the might, forever and ever.*[e] *Amen.*

Notes

a. "Prayers" in Greek (proseuca") is without the definite article in the best ancient MS[s], although the article (ta") is added in the majority of later MS[s] (including [K L] and [P].) The

plural of proseuch without the article is relatively infrequent (in the N^T only in a very generalized sense in 1 Tim 2:1), and it appears likely that later scribes added the article in accordance with well established usage.

b. The majority of MS^s (including $^{P72\ a}$

^{L} and $^{P)}$ have the future kaluyei ("will cover") here, but several early and significant MS^s ($^{A\ B\ C\ K}$ and others) have the present kaluptei. A decision is difficult on the basis of the manuscript evidence; the future could be regarded as an assimilation to James 5:20 (Beare, 185; Goppelt, 284) or the present could be an assimilation to the LX^X of Prov 10:12. Because the clause as a whole is so different from the Proverbs passage, however, it is doubtful that a quotation is intended. The eschatological nature of the context favors the future, but the persistence of the present in two later examples of the same pronouncement (both originating from the Roman church: *1 Cle*^{m} 49.5 and *2 Cle*^{m} 16.4) make the present somewhat more probable here as well.

c. Instead of the singular goggusmou, the majority of later MS^s (including $^{K\ L}$ and $^{P)}$ read the plural goggusmwn ("complaints," cf. Phil 2:14), but the overwhelming evidence of the earliest and best MS^s favors the singular.

d. The majority of later MS^s (including $^{P)}$ read "as out of strength, as God provides" (w" instead of h"), while a very few late MS^s read "as a provision out of strength" (w" ex iscuo" corhgian). Although the last of these is obscure enough to explain how the other two might have been derived from it, the external evidence for it is very weak. If the h" is original, w" could easily have crept into the text accidentally because of the two parallel occurrences of w" just above. The evidence of all the earliest MS^s (e.g., $^{P72\ a}$

$^{A\ B}$ Y and the *La*^{t} versions) bears this out.

e. ^{P72} and a number of later MS^s have simply "forever" (ei" tou" aiwna"),omittingtwn aiwnwn. ^{P72} (in this case by itself) also omits the definite articles with "glory" and "power." The apparent tendency of ^{P72} in this verse is to soften the liturgical force and solemnity of Peter's words, possibly because such qualities seemed to belong more properly to the very end of an epistle (see *Form/Structure/Setting*).

Form/Structure/Setting

The short, generalized commands that characterize this section suggest that Peter may be bringing his epistle to a close (cf. 1 Thess 5:12–24; James 5:12–20), an impression that seems to be confirmed by the doxology and the "Amen" of v 11b. This is obviously not the case in the epistle as it stands, for 4:12–5:11 (ending in a similar but briefer doxology) is still to come. There is a thematic correspondence between vv 7–11 and 4:12–5:11: an announcement of the end of the age (v 7; cf. 4:12–19; 5:8–9) is followed by instructions on how Christian believers are to treat one another (vv 8–11; cf. 5:1–5); these instructions are reinforced with a powerful reminder of the sovereignty of God and the necessity of glorifying him (v 11; cf. 5:6–7, 10) and concluded with a doxology (v 11b; cf. 5:11). It appears that vv 7–11 are either an anticipation or a resume of 4:12–5:11 (for an assessment of the differences between the two passages, and possible explanations of their relationship, see the *Introduction*).

If Peter has focused his attention from 2:11 through 4:6 on the question of how Christian believers should think and act in relation to their sometimes hostile fellow citizens, he now turns to the question of how they should treat each other. In terms of the concise series of commands in 2:17, he shifts now from "respect everyone" to "love the brotherhood." In terms of the Gospel tradition, he shifts from "love your neighbor—even your enemy" to "love one another," although the overriding responsibility to "fear God" is dominant throughout. What prompts the change is his reminder that "the end of all things is near" (v 7; cf. v 6, where God "stands ready" to judge). Both here and in 4:12–5:11, it is the nearness of the end and the urgency of the impending crisis that supremely demands unity and cohesion among the people of God. It is perhaps this emphasis that distinguishes this passage from Paul's generalized words to the Roman church in Rom 12:3–13, which it resembles in certain respects; cf., e.g., the accent on clear thinking, or swfronein (Rom 12:3), followed by admonitions to mutual ministry (12:4–8), love (12:9–10), and hospitality (12:13; notice also how Paul continues in 12:14–21 with commands bearing both on relationships to fellow believers and to outsiders, more in the manner of 1 Pet 3:8–9 than of the present passage).

The keynote of the section is mutuality, expressed repeatedly by the phrase ei" eautou", "to each other" (vv 8, 10), and ei" allhlou", "to one another" (v 9; cf. 5:5b). This mutual responsibility governs the imperatives of love and forgiveness (v 8), hospitality (v 9), and ministry (vv 10–11), all under God's sovereignty and in the interest of glorifying God (v 11). Peter makes no distinction here in rank or seniority among his readers (contrast 5:1–5, with its distinction of "elders" and "younger ones"). The responsibilities of love and hospitality fall to everyone, while "ministry" (diakonein), including that of the spoken word, is dependent on the "gift" (carisma), or "grace" (cari") of God. Although Peter's language is consistent with the notion that he is conscious of writing to charismatic congregations like Corinth (1 Cor 12) or like what Paul imagined Rome to be (Rom 12), it is more likely, in light of 5:1–5, that Peter is simply being noncommittal for the moment on the matter of church structure. The principles of mutuality set forth in vv 7–11 are probably ones he regarded as applicable either to structured or relatively unstructured congregations. He will become more specific about structure and pastoral authority when he begins to address "elders" in 5:1.

Comment

7 pantwn de to telo" hggiken swfronhsate oun kai nhyate ei" proseuca", "The end of all things is near. Prepare yourselves mentally, therefore, and attend to prayers." Although the particle de (lit., "and" or "but") signals a connection with what precedes, it need not be translated. The notion that God "stands ready" to judge (v 5) is echoed in the statement that the end of the age is "near," while the universality of that impending judgment of "the living and the dead" is maintained by pantwn, "all things." Rhetorically, the phrase pantwn de to telo", "the end of all things," recalls to de telo" pante", "and finally, all of you," in 3:8, but the meaning of telo" is obviously very different. More to the point is the definition of the telo" (i.e., the end or goal) of a person's faith as the "salvation" soon to be revealed (1:9; cf. 1:5), and the later reference to the telo" (i.e., the finish or termination) of those who reject the Christian gospel (4:17). The use of telo" here spans both possibilities. Peter's immediate intent is neither to console nor to threaten his readers but simply to state a reality. The present order of things will soon come to an

end, and they must be ready for whatever comes. Whether the end is viewed as salvation or as retributive judgment it is always the same event, the object of both hope and warning. The announcement, or rather the reminder, that this event is "near" (hggiken, lit. "has come near") echoes the proclamation of John the Baptist (Matt 3:2) and Jesus (Mark 1:15; Matt 4:17; Luke 10:9, 11) that "the Kingdom of God is near" (also consistently hggiken). Peter's adoption of this terminology from the Gospel tradition corresponds to that of James, except that James's reminder that "the coming of the Lord is near" (James 5:8) is more a word of comfort to the oppressed than a call to alertness or action. Although some have urged that Jesus' proclamation be understood to mean "the Kingdom of God has come" (see, e.g. C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* [1961] 29–30), this is hardly an option either in James or 1 Peter (for other N^T examples of "nearness" terminology in relation to the coming of Christ or the end of the age, cf. Rom 13:11–12; Phil 4:5; Rev 1:3; 22:10). Peter's meaning is neither that the present age has reached its end nor that the end lies somewhere in the indefinite future. His meaning is that the end will be very soon, although he has no interest in setting dates. There is time for action, but no time to waste. Peter sees a continuity between the present situation and the last decisive intervention of God through Jesus Christ (cf. vv 12, 17). In a sense the end-time events are under way; the "end of all things," although still in the future, is very close at hand.

swfronhsate oun kai nhyate ei" proseuca", "Prepare yourselves mentally, therefore, and attend to prayers." The two verbs are almost synonymous here in meaning. Their common emphasis on mental alertness and clear thinking recalls 1:13, where Peter in similar fashion urges mental preparedness ("Gird yourselves for action …") and careful attention in light of "the grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed." The aorist imperatives are "programmatic," setting a course of action for the future, however short or long that future might be (see Comment on 1:13). Here Peter drops the metaphor of girding oneself and substitutes for it the verb swfronein, "to think clearly" or "to keep one's head." The idea is more often expressed negatively in the N^T (e.g. "do not be confused," Mark 13:7//Matt 24:6; 2 Thess 2:2; "do not be disturbed," John 14:1, 27b; 1 Peter 3:14b; or even "do not fear"). The verb nhyate, "attend," corresponds closely to the expression nhqonte" teleiw", "with full attention," in 1:13 (in neither instance is there any hint of the metaphor of sobriety as opposed to drunkenness, as, e.g. in Paul's use of the same verb in 1 Thess 5:6–8).

The main difference between this passage and 1:13 is that Peter's present concern is to bring his readers' alertness and attention to a focus specifically in their prayers. It is likely that the phrase ei" proseuca", "to prayers," is linked in thought to both verbs, not just the second. The importance of prayer in the epistle can be seen in the author's concern for husbands and wives that "your prayers will not be hindered" (3:7b), and perhaps also in the conspicuous reference to the prayers of the righteous near the end of the quotation of Ps 34 that shortly follows ("and his ears are open to their prayer," 3:12). Alertness or wakefulness in prayer is a common N^T theme, above all in the accounts of Jesus and his disciples in Gethsemane (cf. Mark 14:38//Matt 26:41). Although Polycarp in the early second century integrates a command similar to Peter's and possibly derived from it (nhfonte" pro" ta" euca", "giving attention to the prayers") with the terminology of traditions about Jesus in Gethsemane (Pol. *Phil.* 7.2b), there is no evidence that Peter himself is directly influenced by such traditions. Such passages as Luke 21:36; Col 4:2; and Eph 6:18, however, do suggest a rather broadly based N^T interest in prayer (especially alert, clear-headed prayer) as

an essential ingredient in spiritual warfare and in meeting the thais associated with the end of the age (cf. nhyate, grhgorhsate, "Pay attention! Wake up!" in 5:8).

8 pro pantwn thn ei" eautou" agaphn ektenh econte", "Above all, remain constant in your love for each other." The pro pantwn, "above all," with which the verse begins echoes the pantwn, "of all," at the beginning of v 7, even though the meaning of "all" in the two instances is quite different. The effect of the play on words ("all … above all") is, if anything, to heighten Peter's emphasis on mutual love as the most urgent necessity for Christian believers. The participle econte", following closely after an imperative (as, e.g., in 2:12) continues the imperatival idea (cf. the participles in the household duty codes).

The obligation of mutual love among Christian believers was stated already in 1:22, where the adverb ektenw", "unremittingly," corresponds in meaning to the adjective ektenh, "constant," used here (cf. as well 2:17, "love the brotherhood"). The phrase ei" eautou", "for each other" (lit., "for yourselves"), both here and in v 10, denotes mutuality (cf. BG[D], 212.3), no less than the ei" allhlou", "to one another," of v 9, (cf. 1:22; 5:5). Peter's emphasis on constancy in the fulfillment of this obligation is traceable to his assumption that his readers' love is being tested by the thais they are facing and will face (1:6; 4:12; cf. the prediction attributed to Jesus in Matt 24:12 in connection with coming trials that "the love of many will grow cold"). They must be as constant and enduring in their love as the message they have received, the word of God that lasts forever (cf. 1:23–25).

oti agaph kaluptei plhqo" amartiwn, "for love covers many sins." The thought is paralleled in Prov 10:12b (RS[v]: "love covers all offenses"), but Peter is not quoting from a biblical text; his quotations are characteristically from the LX[X], and the LX[X] of Prov 10:12 is considerably different (God is said to "cover sins" in Ps 84:3 [85:2] LX[X], but "love" is not mentioned). Peter is more likely quoting from a contemporary proverb, probably Christian and perhaps loosely based on the Proverbs text (cf. James 5:20 and, in a Roman context, *1 Cle*[m] 49.5 and *2 Cle*[m] 16.4; see Note b[*]; for the phrase, plhqo" amartiwn, "many sins," cf. Ezek 28:17–18).

How does the principle that "love covers many sins" contribute to Peter's argument? Western notions of individualism have prompted the question whether those who show Christian love thereby "cover" their own sins or the sins of the those they love (the Hebrew text of Prov 10:12 has to do with the matter of holding a grudge, while James 5:20 more likely refers to making up for one's own sins before God). This way of posing the question is not particularly helpful. The remark that "love covers many sins" here is probably to be understood in relation to 2:24 and 4:1–2, where Peter argues that his readers are through with their sins in principle, and therefore ought to be through with them in actual practice (for the same sentiments without the explicit mention of "sin," or amartia, cf. 1:14,22; 2:1, 11). How is it possible to be "through with sin" as Christ was? Whether possible or not for the individual, Peter argues that it is possible for Christians corporately by means of the giving and forgiving love that binds them together as a community in Christ (cf. 1:22). The meaning of "cover" in its context in 1 Peter is neither to conceal sin illegitimately (as in Ps 31[32]:5 LX[X], nor precisely to atone for it, but rather to obliterate it or make it disappear. Peter recognizes throughout his epistle the fundamentally social character of sin. Elsewhere it is "social" in the context of Roman society, but its social character here is focused rather on relationships within the various Christian communities being addressed. Whatever its marks on the individual conscience, Peter's assumption is that sin as a social phenomenon

can indeed be blotted out by the love that Christ commanded and demonstrated.

9 filoxenoi ei" allhlou" aneu goggusmou, "Show hospitality to one another without complaining." The adjective filoxenoi, "hospitable," functions here as an imperative, like the adjectives in 3:8. The Christian mission was from the start built on the anticipation of hospitality from at least some of those to whom the mission was directed (cf., e.g., Matt 10:11–13, 40–42; Luke 10:5–7; Acts 16:15, 32–34; 21:7, 17; 28:14). The survival of early Christianity frequently depended on the exercise of Christian hospitality, whether within particular congregations (i.e., in the willingness of individuals to use their homes as house churches, Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19; Col 4:15), or among various congregations (i.e., in the willingness to receive itinerant prophets and teachers: *Did.* 11–13; 3 John 5–6; contrast 2 John 10–11). In view of the remarkably broad area being addressed in 1 Peter, it is natural to suppose that the latter is included, yet in light of what follows in v 10 (i.e., reflecting on the worship that went on in individual congregations) the former is probably where the emphasis lies (cf. Selwyn, 218).

Paul had urged the Roman church to practice filoxenia, "hospitality" (Rom 12:13), and so (if Rome is the destination of his epistle) did the author of Hebrews (13:2). The importance of hospitality in the church at Rome is vividly seen in *1 Cle*[m] 10–12, where Abraham, Lot, and Rahab are commended as examples of that virtue to the church at Corinth. The author of 1 Peter, representing the same Roman church, urges here the same virtue on the scattered congregations of Asia Minor. Although hospitality is sometimes the particular responsibility of the bishops or overseers of a congregation (1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:8), this does not seem to be the case here. Hospitality is simply a concrete expression of mutual love among Christians, and therefore belongs with love (v 8) as a general obligation of the entire congregation, not with the varied responsibilities of ministry determined by each individual's carisma, or "spiritual gift" (vv 10–11). Although not itself a ministry, hospitality provides for Christian ministries the indispensable setting in which to operate.

aneu goggusmou, "without complaining." In a more general connection, cf. Paul's counsel in Phil 2:14 that "all things" be done cwri" goggusmwn, "without complaints." For the precise phrase, cf. *Pss. Sol.* 5.13: "Human kindness (comes) sparingly, and tomorrow, and if (it comes) a second time without complaint [aneu goggusmou], this is remarkable" (*OT*[p] 2:657). Peter warns against grumbling or complaining in connection with hospitality because whenever hospitality is offered there is always the possibility that it may be exploited unfairly (as in the case of the itinerant false prophets mentioned in *Did.* 11.5–6, 12; cf. also *Did.* 4.7: "You shall neither hesitate to give nor complain [goggusei"] in your giving"). Paul makes the same point positively by calling for "cheerfulness" (ilaroth") in connection with acts of mercy or charity (Rom 12:8; 2 Cor 9:7; cf. hdew", "gladly," in *Herm. Sim.* 9.27.2). There is no evidence of any allusion, however subtle, to the complaining of the people of Israel against Moses and Aaron in the time of the Exodus (as in 1 Cor 10:10, and possibly John 6:41, 43; cf., e.g., Exod 16:2–8; Num 14:1–3).

10 ekasto" kaqw" elaben carisma ei" eautou" auto diakonounte" w" kaloi oikonomoi poikilh" carito" qeou, "Whatever gift each [of you] has received, use it in ministry to each other as good managers of God's diversified grace." Like Paul, Peter leads into his discussion of spiritual gifts with the pronoun ekasto", "each" (cf. Rom 12:3b; 1 Cor 12:7, 11; Eph 4:7). This effects a transition from the responsibilities of all believers everywhere in Asia Minor to the responsibilities of particular individuals in their respective congregations. As in Rom 12, but in marked contrast to 1 Cor 12, Peter does not explicitly

attribute the carismata, or "gifts," to the Holy Spirit (Eph 4 does so at least in vv 3 and 4). Peter links the Spirit to prophecy (1:11), to the Christian mission and the experience of conversion (1:2, 12), and to faithfulness under hostile interrogation (4:14), but not directly to mutual ministry in the local congregations. It is possible that both Peter here and Paul in Rom 12 are drawing on traditional lists of gifts and ministries in which "God" rather than the "Spirit" or "Holy Spirit" was emphasized as the source and giver of everything good. This is especially true of 1 Peter, but cf. Rom 12:3b and note the expressions, "well pleasing to God" in 12:1, and "will of God" in 12:2b. The language of 1 Cor 12:4–6 and Eph 4:4–6 suggests a more trinitarian development in those chapters.

The term carisma, for "special gifts of a non-material sort, bestowed by the grace of God on individual Christians" (BG^{D,} 879.2), is one that Peter shares with Paul: see once again 1 Cor 12:4, 9, 28, 30, 31 (cf. 7:7), and especially Rom 12:6, where its close association with cari", "grace," corresponds almost exactly to Peter's usage here (the note of mutuality so important to Peter is sounded as well in Rom 12:5; cf. also *1 Cle*^{m} 38.1).

The series of imperatival participles (interrupted by one adjective) continues with diakonounte", "use in ministry." For diakonein, "serve" or "minister," with a direct object (BG^{D,} 184.2), cf. the ministry of the ancient prophets in 1:12. Where the prophets' ministry was "not for their own benefit [ouc eautoii"] but for yours," the ministry of Christians in their local congregations is precisely ei" eautou", "to each other" (lit., "to yourselves").

w" kaloi oikonomoi, "as good administrators." The context makes it clear that Peter is not referring here to holders of any particular office in the congregations (as, e.g., in 1 Cor 4:1–2, where the term "administrators of the mysteries of God" refers to apostles, or in Titus 1:7, where "God's administrator" refers to overseers or bishops). Rather, he is speaking metaphorically (w": "like the good administrators you are," cf. 1:14) to "each of you"—if not to every individual, at least to a considerable number in each congregation assumed to be exercising their gifts for the benefit of others (cf. Ign. *Pol.* 6.1, where those who are urged to "Give heed to the bishop" are themselves addressed as "God's administrators, stewards, and servants"). The usage in 1 Peter is of particular interest in light of the question attributed to Peter himself in Luke 12:41 ("Lord, are you addressing this parable [i.e., vv 35–40] to us or to everyone?"), and Jesus' ambiguous question in return ("Who then is the faithful wise administrator [oikonomo"] …?") in Luke 12:42.

poikilh" carito" qeou, "of God's diversified grace." Instead of administrators of "God," or of "the mysteries of God," Peter refers here to administrators of "God's diversified grace." Having already used cari", "grace," for the salvation awaiting those who believe in Christ (1:10, 13; 3:7; 2:19, 20 are different), Peter now points to that eschatological "grace" at work even now in the worship and ministries of the Christian congregations to which he writes. In that sense it is poikilh", "diversified"; although it will come all at once, in power, at the "revelation of Jesus Christ" (1:13), it also comes in small increments through the varied ministries of those who speak and those who serve in every congregation.

poikilh" is no part of the vocabulary, of ministry and spiritual gifts which Peter in this passage shares with Rom 12 and 1 Cor 12. The term is used in the N^{T} more often in a bad than in a good sense, referring to diseases (Matt 4:24; Mark 1:34//Luke 4:40), evil pleasures and desires (2 Tim 3:6; Titus 3:3), false teachings (Heb 13:9), and trials (James 1:2; 1 Pet 1:6). The only other use of the term in a positive connection is the reference in Heb 2:4 to

"varied miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit distributed according to his will." In contrast to Hebrews, Peter's emphasis is not on the miraculous but simply on the variety of ministries described in slightly different language by Paul in Rom 12:6–8 and 1 Cor 12:7–11. Although Peter's choice of words has no negative implications here, possibly his reminder that God's grace is "diversified" is intended to help his readers understand even persecution and suffering as authentic expressions of it (cf. 2:19 and 20, and perhaps 5:12).

11 ei ti" lalei, w" logia qeou, "Whoever does the speaking, [do it] as one bringing words from God." ei ti" (lit. "if anyone") does not introduce conditional clauses in this verse, but simply means "one who," or "whoever" (see BG[D], 220.VII). Peter introduces only two examples of "God's diversified grace," speaking and serving (in contrast to seven examples in Rom 12:6–8 and nine in 1 Cor 12:7–11). Having emphasized all along the danger of "evil speaking" (katalalein, 2:1, 12; 3:16; cf. 2:15, 22–23; 3:9, 10), Peter now points to the positive importance of speech as a source of strength and cohesion among Christian believers. "Speaking" (lalein) refers not to ordinary conversation (which would not have to be "a word from God") but to authoritative speech in worship assemblies. While Kelly (180) limits the speaking Peter has in mind to "routine functions like teaching and preaching" (in distinction from "ecstatic utterances"), there is no proof of this in the text. The term could embrace all that Paul includes under "prophecy" (Rom 12:6), "teaching" (Rom 12:7), and "exhortation" (Rom 12:8), as well as "wisdom" and "knowledge" (1 Cor 12:8). "Tongues" (1 Cor 12:10) are less likely to have been included because they seem to have been regarded more as a form of prayer to God (1 Cor 14:2, 28) than as logia qeou, or intelligible words from God to the assembled congregation. The interpretation of tongues, however, cannot be excluded. The difficulty in any attempted reconstruction is that Peter, unlike Paul, enumerates none of the gifts of speech more specifically. It is clear, however, that his focus is not on missionary proclamation (as, e.g., in Acts 4:1; 10:44; 13:42) but on the speech of Christian believers "to each other" (v 10) in a setting of worship.

w" logia qeou, "as one bringing words from God" (lit., "as oracles of God"). Paul uses the phrase, "the oracles of God" (with both definite articles) in Rom 3:2 to refer to the Jewish Scriptures (cf. Heb 5:12, where the same construction refers more generally to all that God has revealed, whether in Judaism or early Christianity; also *1 Cle*[m] 19.1; 53.1; 62.3). The same phrase (again with definite articles) refers in *2 Cle*[m] 13.3–4 to the gospel of Jesus Christ proclaimed to the pagan world (Jesus' words in Luke 6:32, 35 are cited as what "God says"). Peter's logia qeou (without definite articles) is closer to the language of Acts 7:38, where Stephen mentions "living oracles" (logia zwnta) that Moses received from God to give to the people of Israel, and closest of all to Num 24:4, 16, where Balaam begins his prophecy by describing himself as one who hears "oracles of God" (LX[X]: logia qeou, exactly as in 1 Peter).

In effect, Peter is broadening traditional understandings of prophecy so as to include all the teaching and exhortation that goes on in connection with Christian worship. "Whoever speaks" (and therefore not just Christian prophets in a technical sense) should speak as if delivering the very oracles of God (cf. *Did.* 15.1: "Appoint for yourselves overseers and deacons worthy of the Lord … for they too perform for you the work of the prophets and teachers"). Some have suggested that Peter's characteristic use of w", "as" (cf., e.g., 1:14, 19; 2:2, 5; 3:7), reflects a certain caution about such bold identifications (cf. Goppelt, 289: "eine gewisse Distanzierung vom Verglichenen"; more strongly, Kittel, *TDN*[T] 4:139), but

the parallel use of w" in the next sentence makes it doubtful that this is the case (cf. also w" in v 10). Although Peter's self-consciousness in the use of metaphor has been amply demonstrated (see, e.g., Comment on 1:13; 2:2, 4, 5; 4:1), there is no reason to attribute w" in the present verse to that tendency. Rather, w" is used elliptically, both here and in the next sentence (cf. BG[D], 897.2a). Something is needed to take the place of the unexpressed imperative ("do it" or "let it be") that carries forward the thought of both sentences, and w" accomplishes that purpose very well.

ei ti" diakonei, w" ex iscuo" h" corhgei o qeo", "Whoever serves, [do it] out of strength that God provides." The verb diakonein appeared already in v 10 as a comprehensive term for every conceivable kind of ministry. Peter now introduces it again with a slightly more specialized, but still rather general, meaning (cf. Kelly, 180; Goppelt, 290). This time the term encompasses those "practical" ministries which do not involve prophecy or teaching, such as the conduct of worship services, healing, administrative and judicial leadership, and helping or giving to the poor (cf. the distinction between the work of the Twelve and the Seven in Acts 6:1–6). As in the case of the ministries of speech, Peter contents himself with having stated that the grace of God is "diversified"; he does not enumerate the various gifts of "serving" in order to show how diversified it really is (again contrast Paul in Rom 12:7–8: "if service, in our serving … he who contributes, in liberality; he who gives aid, with zeal; he who does acts of mercy, with cheerfulness"; also perhaps 1 Cor 12:9–10: "gifts of healing … the working of miracles … the ability to distinguish between spirits").

The last phrase, ex iscuo" h" corhgei o qeo", "out of strength that God provides," parallels the preceding logia qeou, "words from God." Both phrases center on "God" as the source of everything worthwhile accomplished among his people (cf. the doxology that immediately follows). It is tempting to link the two phrases by appealing to the Balaam oracle of Num 24:4 LX[X], where the phrase logia qeou, "oracles of God," appears in some traditions as logia iscurou, "oracles of the Mighty One" (Origen) or of "God the Mighty One" (Codex A). This is unlikely unless such language had become proverbial and its connection with Balaam half-forgotten. Balaam is remembered in most Jewish traditions and in the N[T] as the first example of false, not true, prophecy (cf. already Num 31:16; also 2 Pet 2:15; Jude 11; Rev 2:14; see R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 81–82).

iscu", "strength," finds its way into N[T] liturgical language as a quality ascribed to God, along with krato", "might," in Eph 1:19 and 6:10, doxa (cf. also Job 12:16; Isa 40:26 LX[X]), "glory," in 2 Thess 1:9, and as one of seven such ascriptions in Rev 5:12 and 7:12. In 1 Peter itself, cf. krato", "might," in v 11b and 5:11; Peter uses yet a third word, dunami", for the "power of God" in 1:5 (cf. "the power of his strength" in *1 Enoc*[h] 1.4). It is possible that ex iscuo" anticipates already the doxology that will solemnly bring to a close these brief admonitions about congregational life and ministry.

The distinctive feature of iscu" here is that God confers it on those who serve him. For the idea that all strength for ministry comes from God, cf. Phil 4:13; in a very different setting, yet one exhibiting the same urgency with which Peter writes, cf. Philo. De. Prov 2.38: "So when a dire famine and dearth of virtue takes possession of states, and folly unstinted is prevalent, God … gives strength and power [iscun kai krato"] to men naturally fitted to rule in order to purify our race"; LC[L], 9.485). Because of the association of the Holy Spirit with power (customarily dunami") in the N[T] (cf., e.g., 1 Thess 1:5; 1 Cor 2:4; Rom 15:13, 19), it could be argued (with Goppelt, 290) that "the strength God

provides" is Peter's equivalent of the Holy Spirit in the present context. An equally plausible case could be made, however, for cari", "grace," or carisma, "gift," as terms fulfilling a comparable function. In any event, Peter's emphasis is not on the Spirit but on God, not on the "gift" but the Giver, and not on the "strength" but on the Strong One who provides it. Where Paul discusses the spiritual gifts in an almost trinitarian framework ("Spirit … Lord … God," 1 Cor 12:4–6; cf. Eph 4:4–6), Peter attributes them all without distinction simply to "God": the grace, the words, the strength and glory and might are God's.

h", "which" (left untranslated), is genitive by attraction to iscuo", its antecedent (BD[F], § 294). corhgein originally meant "to sponsor a chorus" and then "to supply" or "provide" in a more general sense (BG[D], 883; J. A. Robinson, *St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, 187, on Eph 4:16). Both here and in 2 Cor 9:10 (its only other N[T] occurrence), the verb refers to God's generous provision for human needs (cf. also *Ep. Arist.* 259; *Diogn.* 1; 3.4; 10.6). More common in the N[T] are the compounds epicorhgein, "to supply or support," and its equivalent noun epicorhgia, both used in connection with the Spirit (Gal 3:5; Phil 1:19), and with the Christian community as the body of Christ (Col 2:19; Eph 4:16). Peter's thought here is simpler, more like Paul's thought in 2 Cor 9:7–10 and Phil 4:13 than in these passages.

ina en pasin doxazhtai o qeo" dia Ihsou Cristou, "so that in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ." Peter's wish is that every message and every ministry in the congregations of Asia Minor may "glorify God." This phrase, although in the active rather than passive voice, is used in 2:12 of the "Gentiles" (i.e., the pagan adversaries of the Christian community) at the last day, and in 4:16 (cf. v 14b) of Christians who presently suffer ridicule and persecution at the hands of those same adversaries. Here it is applied to activities that go on within the Christian congregations. To "glorify God" is to praise or worship God. The point of the doxology is that the ministry of Christians to one another counts as authentic worship toward God as well, if it is done with "words from God" or "out of the strength God provides." The mention of "God" (qeo") for the third time in half a verse makes the God-centeredness of Peter's brief advice on mutual relationships in Christian congregations unmistakably clear, en pasin, "in all things," points back at least to the activities mentioned in vv 10–11, and probably to all the commands given in vv 7–11 (Paul's language is even broader: "So whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all [panta] to the glory of God," 1 Cor 10:31; cf. Col 3:17). The glorification of God to which Peter refers is, like all Christian worship, dia Ihsou Cristou, "through Jesus Christ" (the same phrase is used of worship in 2:5; cf. also, in connection with Christian initiation, the phrases "through the raising of Jesus Christ" in 1:3 and 3:21, and "through him" in 1:21). dia is to be translated "through," not "by." The meaning of the phrase is not that Jesus Christ glorifies God but that he makes it possible for Christian believers to do so in their shared life and varied ministries.

w estin h doxa kai to krato" ei" tou" aiwna" twn aiwnwn: amhn, "To him belongs the glory and the might forever and ever. Amen." The antecedent of the relative pronoun w, "to whom" or "to him," is uncertain. Is this concluding ascription of "glory and might" a doxology to God or to Jesus Christ? How consistently is the God-centeredness of vv 10–11a carried through to the end? Although "Jesus Christ" is the immediately preceding name, Kelly (181–82) and Goppelt (291) prefer "God" as the antecedent because of the artificiality of ascribing glory to God "through" Jesus Christ, and at the same time

"to" Jesus Christ himself. Selwyn, while recognizing the difficulty, opts for "Jesus Christ" as the antecedent (220) on the basis of the word order, citing as a parallel Rev 1:6, where the identical phrase "the glory and the might, forever and ever. Amen," concludes a doxology to Christ. His view finds additional support in *1 Clement*, where the phrase, "through our Lord Jesus Christ" is twice followed by a doxology introduced, as here, by w, "to whom" (*1 Cle*[m] 20.11–12; 50.7). There is little doubt in either instance that "Jesus Christ" is the antecedent. On the other hand, when Clement wants to make it clear that "God" is the antecedent, he uses a different construction: di ou estin autw h doxa, "through whom [i.e. Christ] is to him [i.e. God] the glory" (58.2; cf. 61.3; 64.1; 65.2; also the Latin of 20.12).

These considerations, especially the word order, make Selwyn's view the more plausible. The argument of Kelly and Goppelt cuts two ways: if it sounds odd to ascribe glory to Christ and to God through Christ almost in the same breath, it sounds redundant to ascribe glory to God twice in quick succession ("so that … God may be glorified, to whom belongs the glory …"). The concluding doxology is probably intended to call attention once again to Jesus' resurrection (cf. 1:21: "in God, who raised him from the dead and gave him glory"). To say that "the glory and the might forever and ever" belongs to Jesus Christ is simply another way of saying that God has raised him to eternal lordship (cf. 3:21–22). The doxology is not a prayer or a wish, but a statement of fact; the verb estin, "belongs" (lit. "is") is indicative, not optative, and the pronoun w, "to him," is dative of possession (BD[F], § 189). The verb is normally left unexpressed in N[T] doxologies, but when it is expressed, it is indicative (cf. Rom 1:25; 2 Cor 11:31). The indicative is appropriate here not because of "the N[T] conviction that God's glory and honour are His by right" (Kelly, 182), but because of the N[T] conviction that Jesus Christ is Lord (cf. 3:15) by virtue of his resurrection from the dead.

It must be admitted that the doxology in 5:11, an abbreviated version of this one and evidently meant to correspond to it, is addressed to God rather than to Christ. Selwyn (220, 248) notices in 1 Peter a "binitarian" tendency to put Jesus Christ and God on the same plane as simultaneously the objects of Christian worship. Such a tendency can be seen both in connection with the explicit designation, "Father" (1:3), and without it, as here (cf. 1:21). To this extent it could be said that the God-centeredness of vv 10–11a is being qualified in v 11b, but from Peter's perspective it is no real qualification. In effect, his doxology is two-pronged, ascribing "glory" to God and to Christ at the same time (Christ's glory is mentioned again very soon in v 13).

The word doxa, "glory," is so common in N[T] "doxologies" as to give the form its name, but krato", "might," is less frequently found (cf. 5:11, where only krato" is used; and Rev 1:6, where "glory and might" are joined exactly as here; also 1 Tim 6:16; Jude 25; Rev 5:13). Not surprisingly, krato" is used of God's inexhaustible power to create and rule (e.g. Eph 1:19, Col 1:11; cf. *1 Cle*[m] 33.3, 61.1), but it can also refer to Jesus Christ (Eph 6:10; cf. Acts 19:20). In language particularly reminiscent of 1 Peter, note the second-century Roman sermon known as *2 Clement*: "And the unbelievers [oi apistoi; cf. 1 Pet 2:7] shall see his glory and might [thn doxan … to krato"], and they shall be amazed [xenisqhsontai; cf. 1 Pet 4:4, 12] when they see the dominion over the world in the hands of Jesus" (*2 Cle*[m] 17.5).

The concluding formula of time, ei" tou" aiwna" twn aiwnwn, "forever and ever" (lit. "to the ages of the ages"), is also echoed in 5:11, but just as "glory and might" is

shortened there to “might,” so “forever and ever” is shortened to the single “forever” (lit. “to the ages”). Peter’s doxology to Christ is the more programmatic and complete of the two; the concluding doxology to “the God of all grace” (5:10) serves to call the earlier one to mind and so to draw God and Christ together in a common affirmation of triumph.

amhn, “Amen” (i.e. “It is true” or “So be it”) occasionally stands at the end of blessings or doxologies in the O^T (e.g. Ps 41:13; Neh 8:6 LX^X; 1 Esd 9:47; cf. 3 Macc 7:23, and especially 4 Macc 18:24, which is indistinguishable from N^T doxologies). In N^T doxologies, the “Amen” becomes almost obligatory and more characteristic of doxologies than of prayers (cf. e.g. 5:11; Rom 11:36; 16:27; Gal 1:5; Eph 3:21; Phil 4:20; 1 Tim 1:17; 6:16; Heb 13:21; 2 Pet 3:18; Jude 25; Rev 1:6; 5:13–14; 7:12). “Amen” here terminates both the doxology and (in effect) the entire series of commands that began with the agaphtoi, “Dear friends,” of 2:11. The stage is now set for another, briefer, series introduced again by agaphtoi in v 12.

Explanation

This passage is transitional. Looking backward, it serves as a kind of postscript to 2:11–4:6 (and in particular to the promise of vindication developed in 3:13–4:6). Its closing doxology forms an inclusion with 2:12: God is “glorified” in the ministry of Christian believers to one another, just as Peter had earlier envisioned their enemies glorifying God on “the day of visitation.” Looking ahead, the passage also anticipates on a small scale the issues to be developed more fully in 4:12–5:11. The hope of vindication at the last day requires corporate unity and cohesion from those who share in that hope, and Peter is here attempting to foster those qualities in the congregations to which he writes (cf. especially 5:1–5). The household duty codes (2:13–3:9) did not have the same purpose (except momentarily, in 3:7). Their presupposition, for the most part, was that “one’s enemies are those of one’s own household” (Mic 7:6; Matt 10:36). Unity and stability to face “the end of all things,” according to Peter, is found not in the household, but in the worshipping and ministering congregation.

The effect of these brief traditional commands with their closing doxology is to establish an equivalency between acts of worship to God and the acts of ministry or kindness that Christian believers perform for one another. Those who instruct others are God’s prophets, whether they claim for themselves that designation or not. Whatever help or service is rendered to fellow believers is the work of God, and at the same time true worship offered up to God through Jesus Christ. The theme of “doing good,” which earlier dominated Peter’s extended reflections on how Christians should treat their enemies, here comes to expression (although without the actual word) in connection with their responsibilities to each other. The result is a “charismatic” yet very practical approach to church life and ministry. Peter is not interested in the mechanics of either the giving of spiritual gifts or the practice of them in the local congregations. The Holy Spirit is not even mentioned. There is no reference to speaking in tongues and only implicit reference to the gift of prophecy (“as … words from God,” v 11a). Peter is content to leave the particulars to each congregation in the provinces of Asia Minor. His concern is simply that all ministries be respected and that God be glorified in the life Christians share together in the places to which he writes. When that is the case, they will be ready for “the end of all things,” and whatever trials may precede it.

The Fiery Trial (4:12–19)

Bibliography

Barr, J. "]rab -MOLIS: Prov XI.31, I Pet. IV.18." *JS*[S] 20 (1975) 149–64. **Bauer, J.B.** "Aut maleficus aut alieni speculator (1 Petr 4,15)." *B*[Z] 22 (1978) 109–15. **Bischoff, A.** ' "ÉAllotri(o)episkopo"." *ZN*[W] 7 (1906) 271–74. **Borchert, G. L.** "The Conduct of Christians in the Face of the 'Fiery Ordeal' (1 Pet 4:12–5:11)." *RevEx*[p] 79 (1982) 451–62. **Erbes, K.** "Was bedeutet allotrioepiskopo" 1 Pt 4,15?" *ZN*[W] 19 (1919/20) 39–44. ———. "Noch etwas zum allotrioepiskopo" 1 Petr 4,15." *ZN*[W] 20 (1921) 249. **Fronmueller, G. F. C.** *The Epistles General of Peter*. New York: C. Scribner's 1867.82. **Garcia del Moral, A.** "Critica textual de I Ptr. 4.14." *Est Bi*[b] 20 (1961) 45–77. ———. "Sentido trinitario de la expresion 'Espiritu de Yave' de Is. XI,2 en I Pdr. IV, 14." *Est Bi*[b] 20 (1961) 169–206. **Hill, D.** "On Suffering and Baptism in 1 Peter." *Nov*[T] 18 (1976) 181–89. **Holzmeister, U.** "Dei … Spiritus super vos requiescit." *V*[D] 9 (1929) 129–31. **Johnson, D. E.** "Fire in God's House: Imagery from Malachi 3 in Peter's Theology of Suffering (1 Pet 4:12–19)." *JET*[S] 29.3 (1986) 28594. **Knox, J.** "Pliny and I Peter: A Note on I Pet 4,14–16 and 3,15." *JB*[L] 72 (1953) 187–89. **Michaels, J. R.** "Eschatology in 1 Pet iii. 17." *NT*[S] 13 (1966/67) 394–401. **Rodgers, P. R.** "The Longer Reading of 1 Peter 4:14." *CB*[Q] 43 (1981) 93–95. **Sander, E. T.** PURWSIS *and the First Epistle of Peter*. Diss. Harvard, 1967. **Strugnell, J.** "Notes on 1Q[S] 1:17–18; 8:3–4 and 1Q[M] 17:89 (I Peter 4:12)." *CB*[Q] 4 (1967) 580–82. **Villiers, J. L. de.** "Joy in Suffering in 1 Peter." *Neo*[t] 9 (1975) 64–86.

Translation

[12]*Dear friends, don't be surprised at the fiery ordeal breaking out among you to put you to the test, as though something strange were happening to you.* [13]*No, to the extent that you share in the sufferings of Christ, be glad, so that when his glory is revealed you may rejoice all the more.* [14]*When you are ridiculed for the name of Christ you are blessed, for the [spirit] of that glory, even the Spirit of God,*[a] *is resting*[b] *upon you, blasphemed indeed on their part, but glorified on yours.*[c] [15]*For none of you must suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or [any sort of] criminal, or [even] as a busybody,*[d] [16]*But if [you suffer] for being a Christian, don't be ashamed, only glorify God in this matter,*[e] [17]*For [it is] time*[f] *for the judgment to begin from the house of God, and if it is from us*[g] *first, what will be the end of those who are disobedient to the gospel of God?* [18]*And "if the just person is barely saved, what will become of the godless and the sinner"?* [19]*So then, let those who suffer when God requires it entrust their lives to the faithful creator in the doing of good.*[h]

Notes

a. Instead of "the [spirit] of that glory, even the Spirit of God," many MS[s] (including [a] [A P] and others) insert kai dunamew" or kai th" dunamew" [autou] after doxh": "the [spirit] of that glory and power, even the Spirit of God." This appears to be an effort to lessen the abruptness of to th" doxh" by making use of the familiar association of "glory" and "power" (as, e.g., in the doxology of the Lord's Prayer in late MS[s] of Matt 6:13 and in *Did.* 8.2 [cf. 9.4, 10.5]; also Rev 15:8). The M[s] evidence for the text as it stands ([P72 B K L] Y and others) is conclusive. Although all the readings are somewhat difficult, this is the

reading that best explains the other two.

b. The verb for "is resting" is anapauetai in the majority of MS^{s} (including ^{a}

$^{*\ B\ P}$ and others), while some MS^{s} read apanapauetai (^{A} Y and others), or the perfect epanapepautai ($^{P72\ a}$

^{2}). The evidence favors anapauetai (cf. B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 695); the compound forms were probably introduced because they are more commonly used when the verb is followed by the preposition epi (see BG^{D,} 59, 282).

c. The majority of the MS^{s} (including ^{P} Y a number of O^{L} and v^{g} MS^{s} and certain Syr. and Coptic witnesses) include the words, "blasphemed indeed on their part but glorified on yours," while the earliest and best MS^{s} ($^{P72\ a}$

$^{A\ B}$ and others) lack them. On this significant textual question, see *Comment*.

d. A number of variants reflect scribal difficulties with the rare term allotriepiskopo" (^{a}

^{B} all Lat. versions and other witnesses). The majority of later MS^{s} (including $^{P)}$ have a fuller spelling (allotrioepiskopo"; see BD^{F,} § 124), while some attempt clarification by the use of etymology (allotrio" episkopo" in A Y and others; or allotrioi" episkopo" in ^{P72}); however, the more difficult compound form (probably as represented by ^{a}

and $^{B)}$ must be allowed to stand.

e. The majority of later MS^{s} (including $^{K\ L\ P)}$ have merei, "matter," at this point, although the earliest and best MS^{s} (including $^{P72\ a}$

$^{A\ B)}$ have onomati, "name." It is hard to see why, if onomati were original, it would have been changed to merei. On the other hand, an alteration of the colorless merei to onomati is quite conceivable in light of the en onomati Cristou of v 14. This appears to be a rare instance in which the majority text preserves an original reading which the earlier and usually more reliable MS^{s} have altered.

f. The majority of the MS^{s} (including $^{P72\ B\ P}$ Y) have the definite article (o kairo"), while some (including ^{a}

and $^{A)}$ omit the article, as in the other instances of kairo" in 1 Peter (i.e. 1:5, 11; 5:6). The article could have been either added or dropped accidentally (especially after oti), but it is slightly more probable that scribes would have added the article to accent the position of kairo" at the beginning of its clause than that they would have omitted it if it were original. There is no discernible difference in meaning.

g. Instead of "from us" (afV hmwn), some MS^{s} (^{a}

$^{*\ AC}$ and others) read "from you" (afV umwn), a natural change in view of Peter's use of the second person plural throughout vv 12–16 (and indeed all the way back to 2:24), but hmwn, the reading of the majority of MS^{s} (including $^{P72\ A\ B}$ and many others) is clearly

preferable. “From us” is appropriate because Peter writes for the moment in universal terms of a judgment affecting the whole world and starting from the Christian “brotherhood throughout the world” (cf. 5:9).

h. Instead of en agaqopoiia, “in the doing of good,” some MS[s] (including P[72] A Y some of the *La*[t] versions and the v[g]) read en agaqopoiiai", “in the doing of good deeds.” A choice between the singular and the plural is difficult. It is possible that scribes may have changed a singular to a plural because of the plural subject and object (i.e., “those who suffer … their lives”) in this verse. The majority of the MS[s] (including [a] B P and others) support the singular reading, which is probably to be preferred.

Form/Structure/Setting

The address agaphtoi, “Dear friends,” recalls 2:11, and seems intended, like the agaphtoi of 2:11, to introduce a new major section in Peter’s letter. For the full introductory expression used in 2:11, however (i.e., agaphtoi parakalw, “Dear friends, I appeal …”), we must look simultaneously at 4:12 and 5:1. Peter addresses his readers afresh as “dear friends,” but delays his specific “appeal” to them (parakalw) until the beginning of the following section, focusing the appeal on one group among them, the “older ones” or “elders” (5:1). The appeal of 5:1–5 will continue the thought of 4:7–11 in that it will be oriented toward the responsibilities of Christian believers to each other in their respective congregations. In that respect it will be a different appeal from that of 2:11–4:6, where the emphasis was more on the responsibilities of Christians to those (even in their own households) who at best did not share their faith, and at worst were actively hostile to it.

Before beginning the new appeal, Peter makes a digression in vv 12–19. The structure of his letter at this point is best described as interlocking: if 4:7–11 looks ahead, anticipating the themes of 4:12–5:11, 4:12–19 pauses to look back, resuming for one last time the themes of 2:11–4:6. These are the themes of how to respond to one’s enemies and how to face hostility and the prospect of suffering. At the start (vv 12–13) the section looks even farther back, to the cryptic references to “various ordeals,” to being “tested by fire,” and to final “joy” in 1:6–8. Now at last Peter describes in fuller, although rather similar language, what he had in mind there. The rhetoric is reminiscent of 1:6–8, but the actual situation to which it refers is simply the accumulation of the grievances and social pressures either sketched or hinted at throughout 2:11–4:6. Although it has often been suggested that there is an intensification or a heightening of the urgency between 4:11 and 4:12 (as if Peter had just heard of a sudden crisis or disaster), there is no real evidence of this. The urgency expressed already in 1:6–8 is firm evidence to the contrary. The difference in tone between 1:6–8 and 4:12–19, on the one hand, and most of 2:11–4:6, on the other, is the difference between a rhetorical summary of the Christian community’s position in a hostile world and a series of directives on how to respond to specific aggravations or challenges.

If vv 12–13 echo 1:6–8, the structure of vv 12–19 as a whole recalls that of 3:13–17. The admonition of vv 15–16 is framed by words of assurance in vv 12–14 and 17–19 (cf. the framing of the admonition in 3:14b–16 by words of assurance in 3:13–14a and 17; see *Form/Structure/Setting* on 3:13–17). The first word of assurance in each instance involves a contrast (cf. the uses of alla in 3:14a and 4:13) and leads up to a beatitude, and the two beatitudes are constructed similarly:

3:14a. "No, even if you should have to suffer in the cause of justice, *you are blessed*" (makarioi).

4:14a. "When you are ridiculed for the name of Christ, *you are blessed*" (makarioi).

In substance the two beatitudes recall Matt 5:10, 11 respectively, but their grammatical structure (i.e., with conditional clauses as an introduction, and with makarioi at the end) is not found elsewhere in the N^T and appears to be a distinctive feature of Petrine style (see Comment on 3:14). It is likely that Peter is drawing on beatitudes already attributed to Jesus in oral or written tradition, and used by Matthew as well (cf. Luke 6:22).

Another feature of Peter's words of assurance to his readers in vv 12–14 and 17–18 is that both involve an argument from the lesser to the greater: i.e., in v 13, "be glad [now], so that … [in the future] you may rejoice all the more"; in vv 17–18, "if [judgment] is from us first, what will be the end of those who are disobedient … if the just person is barely saved, what will become of the godless and the sinner?" In 3:13–17, the argument from the lesser to the greater is not explicit, yet a similar effect is achieved by the anticipation of personal safety in 3:13 followed by a promise of blessedness even in the event of harm or suffering in 3:14a. In 3:17, the weighing of the present suffering of those who do good against the greater future suffering of those who do evil (see *Comment*) makes much the same point (although subtly and with less rhetoric) as the argument in 4:17–18 from present judgment on "the house of God" to the future destruction of the wicked (cf. Michaels, 400).

Peter's language throughout is richly informed by the Jewish Scriptures. The words of assurance in vv 12–14 build up to an allusion in v 14b to Isa 11:2 $LX^{X.}$ those who are ridiculed for Christ are "blessed" because "the Spirit of God is resting upon you" (v 14b). The language is Isaiah's, even though the thought (like that of the beatitude itself) is probably derived from the Gospel tradition (cf., e.g., Luke 12:11–12; Mark 13:11; Matt 10:20). Similarly, in his argument from the lesser to the greater in 4:17–18, Peter makes direct use of Prov 11:31 LX^X (v 18), prefaced with his own application to the situation of himself and his readers (v 17). In this instance, the Scripture and the application share a similar structure consisting of a conditional clause followed by a rhetorical question ("if … then what, or how?"). Moreover, the notion of the judgment of God "beginning from" (tou arxasqai … apo) his own sanctuary or "house" echoes Ezek 9:6 $LX^{X,}$ where the command is given to the avengers in Ezekiel's vision to "begin from my sanctuary" (apo twn agiwn mou arxasqe), and they, accordingly, "began from the men who were elders, inside the house" (kai hrxanto apo twn andrwn twn presbuterwn oi hsan esw en tw oikw). A similar idea (this time in connection with an argument from the lesser to the greater) is found in Jer 32[25]:29 $LX^{X.}$ Both passages have to do with the judgment of God on Jerusalem at the time of the Babylonian exile, and it is likely that Peter is presupposing an analogy between Israel's predicament then and the crisis facing Christians in Rome and in Asia Minor in his day (cf. "Babylon" in 5:13; also "diaspora" in 1:1). If the Ezekiel passage is in mind, it is not hard to understand why he turns his attention so explicitly to the "elders" (presbuterou") in 5:1. The connection is in no way blunted by v 19, which gathers the commands of vv 15–16 into one final admonition in light of the urgent reality of "judgment from the house of God." Without v 19 it would not be altogether clear whether vv 17–18 were intended as an assurance or a warning, but the admonition to trust God in v 19 brings the section to an end on the same note of assurance and peace with which it began.

Comment

12 Agaphtoi, mh xenizesqe th en umin purwsei pro" peirasmon umin ginomenh w" xenou umin sumbainonto", "Dear friends, don't be surprised at the fiery ordeal breaking out among you to put you to the test, as though something strange were happening to you." Peter's abrupt rhetorical summary of the situation of himself and his readers in Roman society begins with negative and positive commands set off by mh (v 12).... alla (v 13). Negatively they are not to be "surprised" (i.e., shocked or upset; see Selwyn, 212). Positively they are to "be glad," for they are "blessed" (vv 13–14).

The imperative mh xenizesqe, "don't be surprised," is further explained by the clause, w" xenou umin sumbainonto", "as though something strange were happening to you." The thought recalls 3:14b, "So have no fear of them and don't be troubled," with its background both in Scripture and in the Jesus tradition (see Comment on 3:14b), but the specific word xenizesqe echoes instead 4:4. The fact that unbelievers are "surprised" at your behavior, Peter says, does not mean that you should be "surprised" at theirs. Although he does not say so explicitly, it is evident from the reference in v 13 to "the sufferings of Christ," and from the allusion in v 14 to Jesus' beatitude on those ridiculed for his sake, that the words and the example of Jesus are the reasons Peter believes a "fiery ordeal" should come as no surprise. If Jesus himself suffered and predicted suffering for his followers, they have no reason to think it strange when his experiences are repeated and his predictions fulfilled (cf. Matt 10:24–25; Luke 6:40; John 13:16; 15:18–21; 16:1–4; 1 John 3:13). Within 1 Peter itself, the inevitability of suffering was intimated already in the ei deon, "must" or "by necessity," of 1:6, based possibly on the conspicuous use of dei, "it is necessary," in the Jesus tradition (see Comment on ei deon in 1:6).

th en umin purwsei pro" peirasmon umin ginomenh, "at the fiery ordeal breaking out among you to put you to the test." purwsi", "fiery ordeal," is used of Sodom's destruction in Josephus, *Ant.* 1.203, and of the eschatological destruction of evil "Babylon" by fire in Rev 18:9, 18. The latter parallel may be significant in view of Peter's own claim in 5:13 to be writing from "Babylon." purwsi" is also eschatological in *Did.* 16.5: "Then the human creation shall come to the fiery ordeal for testing (ei" thn purwsin th" dokimasia"), and many shall be offended and be lost, but those who endure in their faith shall be saved by the curse itself." In 1 Peter, however, the present participle ginomenh, "breaking out," locates the "fiery ordeal" in the contemporary situation of the writer and his readers. Although a present participle can have a future reference in 1 Peter (cf. 1:13), the contrast in v 13 between present suffering and future rejoicing makes it clear that a future meaning is not intended in v 12.

purwsi", "fiery ordeal," occurs in Prov 27:21 LX^{X} in connection with the proving (dokimion) of silver and gold, as the translation of the Hebrew rWk

, "small furnace" or "forge" (see Comment on 1:7). E. T. Sander, however, calls attention rather to a number of Qumran texts (36–50) where the operative Hebrew word is ^{1}rxm

, "crucible," used in parallelism with rWk

in Prov 17:3 and 27:21 (see, e.g., C^{D} 20.27; 1Q^{S} 1.17; 8.4; 1Q^{M} 17.1,9 [twice]; 1Q^{H} 5.16; IVQp Ps 37, 2.19; 4QFlo^{r} 2.1). She concludes that this term (without a necessary connotation of actual fire) acquired at Qumran a "technical meaning: *the* trial of the end-time, the eschatological ordeal or test" (43). Her suggestion is borne out by some, although not necessarily all of the Qumran references. Where the technical use is clearest at

Qumran (as in IVQPs 37, 2.19, and 4QFlor 2.1), [1]rxm

, or "crucible" (like another Qumran expression, "time of visitation"; see Comment on 2:12), seems to have embraced both the testing of the righteous and the final punishment of the wicked (38–39). In our passage, Peter's use of the second person pronoun three times in one verse (en umin … umin … umin) focuses attention exclusively on the former, yet his choice of the word purwsi" probably anticipates his conviction (made explicit in vv 17–18) that the two aspects of the "fiery ordeal" are inseparable. The trials now facing the Christian community are one with the judgment soon to engulf the whole world. Although Sander established no direct lexical link between purwsi" here and [1]rxmThe distinctiveness of 1 Peter in relation to Qumran lies in its further characterization of the "fiery ordeal" as being pro" peirasmon, "to put … to the test" (cf. Goppelt, 297). In this respect his usage is closer to that of Prov 27:21 LX[X] and *Did.* 16.5 where purwsi" is accompanied by a term for proof or testing. Above all, Peter's language here must be interpreted in relation to 1:6–7, where the "various trials" (en poikiloi" peirasmoi", 1:6b) that Christian believers face are understood metaphorically as a means of refining or purifying faith as fire refines gold (1:7). The thought is similar here except that the plural "trials" has become the singular "test," and "fire" (dia puro", 1:7) as one small part of a metaphor in a subordinate clause has given way to a definite "fiery ordeal" (purwsi"), still metaphorical but now with a technical eschatological meaning, and therefore central to Peter's admonition. Peter can describe the judgment of God as purwsi" because he attributes to it the double effect of purifying the righteous whose faith is like gold while destroying the "godless and sinners" (v 18). His accent here on the former stands in a long biblical tradition (in addition to Prov 17:3, 27:21; cf., e.g., Ps 65[66]:10 LX[X]; Jud 8:25–27; Wisd Sol 3:5–6).

pro" peirasmon, "to put … to the test" (lit., "toward testing"), expresses purpose (BG[D], 710.3c; cf. pro" apologian, "to answer," in 3:15), in this instance the purpose of God for his people. Still, the dominating contrast in the verse is between expected and unexpected sufferings, not between design and chance. Although it might appear that the use of two different present participles signals a contrast between that which "comes" (ginomenh, neutral in meaning but closely linked to pro" peirasmon) and that which "happens" (sumbainonto", i.e., by chance), the variation is merely stylistic. The second is as neutral in its implications as the first, with no particular implication of mere chance (for sumbainein in similar contexts, cf. Mark 10:32; Acts 20:19).

The placement of umin, "to you," between peirasmon and ginomenh creates a certain ambiguity, for it could legitimately be taken with either the noun or the participle. If it goes with the participle, it is somewhat redundant after the preceding en umin: the fiery ordeal is both "breaking out among you" and "coming to you." More likely, umin is dative of possession with a noun (cf. Robertson, 536–37), virtually equivalent to umwn: "for your testing," i.e. "to put you to the test" (F. Field, *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, 261; Selwyn, 221).

13 alla kaqo koinwneite toi" tou Cristou paqhmasin cairete, ina kai en th apokaluyei th" doxh" autou carhte agalliwmenoi, "No, to the extent that you share in the sufferings of Christ, be glad, so that when his glory is revealed you may rejoice all the more." The reason why the "fiery ordeal" is not surprising or strange now becomes explicit. It is because the epistle's readers now "share in the sufferings of Christ." Christ's sufferings, mentioned "before the fact" from the standpoint of the ancient prophets in 1:11

("the sufferings intended for Christ"), are here viewed "after the fact" in the perspective of Peter's own time. Although the terminology of "sharing" in Christ's suffering (with koinwnein and its cognates) is new at this point in the epistle (in Paul, cf. Phil 3:10; 2 Cor 1:5–7), the idea it represents has been introduced repeatedly: in 2:19–21; 3:17–18 (both with the expression, oti kai Cristo" epaqen, "for Christ too suffered," 2:21 and 3:18), and 4:1. Christians "share in Christ's sufferings" neither sacramentally in baptism nor in mystical union with him, but simply by following the example of his behavior when facing similar circumstances.

kaqo, "to the extent that" (BG[D], 390.2; BD[F], § 456.4), allows for varying degrees of similarity to Christ's circumstances and his behavior. If it were causal in meaning (i.e., "because," or "inasmuch as"; cf. Goppelt, 298), kaqo would imply that Peter's readers are in fact sharing Christ's sufferings, but whether they are or not in any given situation will depend on the reasons for their suffering and on their response to it, as described in vv 14–16. kaqo koinwneite, "to the extent that you share," is as much an exhortation as a description of present reality.

cairete, "be glad," like agalliasqe, "you rejoice," in 1:6 and 8, probably echoes the saying of Jesus recorded in Matt 5:12a, cairete kai agalliasqe, "be glad and rejoice," but Peter has adapted the two verbs differently. Where agalliasqe was freely put to use as an indicative in 1:6, 8, present in form but future in its reference (see *Comment*), cairete is present and imperative here, just as it is in the Gospel tradition. The principal difference between the argument here and in 1:6–8 is that instead of urging present faithfulness (pisti"; see 1:5, 7) for the sake of future joy, he is now weighing present joy in the face of trials against the far greater joy to come. The thought of joy in suffering, as distinguished from joy after the experience of suffering, is introduced here for the first time (contrast Nauck, 71–72, who finds an exhortation to present rejoicing already in 1:6–8). Although the idea of joy in suffering has ample precedent in Jewish apocalyptic literature (cf. Nauck, 73–76, with reference to *2 Apoc. Bar.* 48.48–50; 52.57; and 54.16–18), Peter's more immediate source is more likely the Jesus tradition in a form close to that found in Matt 5:12 (cf. Gundry, 343). His consistent assumption is that the ground of rejoicing is not suffering as such, but suffering "unjustly" (2:19), or for doing good (2:20), or "in the cause of justice" (3:14), or "for the name of Christ" (v 14), or "for being a Christian" (v 16), all of which amount to much the same thing. Since none of these situations were described as early as 1:6, there was no reason to call for present rejoicing, only for "faithfulness." Not all who suffer, but rather those who show themselves faithful in suffering, are invited to rejoice, now because they are following Christ's example and in the future because they will share his glory.

ina kai en th apokaluyei th" doxh" autou carhte agaliwmenoi, "so that when his glory is revealed you may rejoice all the more." Where Matthew presents Jesus as linking the two verbs for joy rhetorically as synonyms, Peter makes of them a kind of ascending parallelism from present "gladness" in the experience of suffering for Christ to eschatological joy or jubilation on the day "when his glory is revealed." It is possible, although hardly demonstrable, that ina … carhte shows knowledge of a form of Jesus' pronouncement closer to the more future-oriented Luke 6:23. In any event, cairein spans both stages of the ascending parallelism (cf. also cara in 1:8), while agalliasqai is consistently reserved in 1 Peter for future or eschatological joy.

The time of this future joy is set by the phrase, en th apokaluyei th" doxh" autou,

"when his glory is revealed," an expression corresponding almost exactly to en apokaluyei Ihsou Cristou, "when Jesus Christ is revealed," in 1:7 (cf. 1:13; also the "salvation about to be revealed at the last day," in 1:5). Peter has in view here the coming of Christ (cf. also 5:4), and the same "inexpressible and glorious [dedoxasmenh] joy" to which he referred in 1:8b (for eschatological "glory" in the earlier context, cf. also "praise, glory and honor" in 1:7). In 1:11, where the "sufferings intended for Christ" are mentioned for the first time, they are contrasted with "the glorious events [ta" … doxa"] that would follow." These "glorious events," described more specifically in 3:18–22, are summed up as Christ's "glory" (doxa, singular) in 1:21 (cf. Luke 24:26), so that Christian worship in 1 Peter includes ascribing to Jesus Christ "the glory and the might for ever and ever. Amen" (4:11b). Christ's "sufferings" and "glory," therefore (and specifically the privilege of Christian believers to share in both), constitute the framework for the urgent admonitions of the last section of the epistle, both here and in 5:1. This framework is common to 1 Peter and the epistles of Paul (or at least traditions with which Paul was familiar: see especially Rom 8:17–18, and cf. also Rom 5:2–5 and 2 Cor 4:16–17).

14 ei oneidizesqe en onomati Cristou, makarioi, "When you are ridiculed for the name of Christ, you are blessed." Peter's interest in the sayings of Jesus clustered at Matt 5:11–12 continues, although in this instance his language is as close to Luke 6:22 as to Matt 5:11. The parallel consists of a beatitude combined with the verb oneidizein, "ridicule," plus some expression linking the ridicule specifically to a person's commitment to Jesus: "for my sake" (Matt); "for the sake of the Son of Man" (Luke); "for the name of Christ" (1 Peter). In adapting the beatitude form to his own argument, Peter follows the precedent already set in 3:14 (see *Form/Structure/Setting*) except that the introductory conditional clause (ei with the indicative) is a condition presuming reality rather than a remote contingency (i.e., ei with the optative in 3:14, 17). It is unlikely that the difference reflects any heightened urgency or intensity in our passage in comparison with 3:13–17 (as I once thought: Michaels, 399–400; cf. Beare, 165). Nor is the indicative chosen because Peter is speaking only of verbal abuse as distinguished from physical suffering or death (the "if"-clause of v 16 refers at least by implication to the latter). Rather, the indicative is the construction he normally uses in reference to persecution: cf. ei deon (with estin implied) in 1:6 ("must" or "by necessity"; lit. "as it must be"); also the "if"-clauses with the indicative, present in 2:19 and future in 2:20. It is the optative in 3:14, 17 that requires explanation in its own rhetorical context (see Comment on 3:14). At several points in his letter, Peter examines different possible cases or scenarios, some more remote and more drastic than others. Knowing that none of these will apply to all his readers and that some may not apply to any of them, he makes no attempt to distinguish levels of probability with the use of different types of conditional clauses.

"Ridicule" (here in the passive: oneidizesqe) is one of many terms used in 1 Peter for verbal abuse, either that to which Christians are subjected by their unbelieving fellow citizens (2:12, 15; 3:16; 4:4), or that which they themselves are urged to avoid heaping on others (2:1; 3:9–10; cf. 2:23). His choice of oneidizein here, like his choice of ephreazein, "denounce," in 3:16, is probably attributable to his knowledge of the Gospel tradition. The same could be argued of en onomati Cristou, "for the name of Christ" (cf. Matt 10:22; Mark 13:13// Matt 24:9// Luke 21:17; John 15:21). The latter is difficult to prove because the suffering of Christians for "the name" became a common experience in the church entirely apart from sayings attributed to Jesus (e.g., Acts 5:41; 9:16; 21:13; cf.

15:26; 3 John 7; Rev 2:3), and Peter would not have had to draw it from sayings of Jesus.

To suffer ridicule, or worse, for Christ's name was to suffer because of one's allegiance to Christ, whether or not that allegiance was explicitly mentioned either in formal charges or in name-calling directed against Christ's followers. The mention of "ridicule," however, suggests that name-calling was involved. Such verbal abuse "for the name of Christ" was simply a specific instance of suffering "for the cause of justice" (3:14); the "name" is mentioned again in v 16b in certain manuscripts (see *Note* e*), and is in any case implicit in the phrase w" Cristiano", "as a Christian," in v 16a.

oti to th" doxh" kai to tou qeou pneuma efj uma" anapauetai, "for the [spirit] of that glory, even the Spirit of God, is resting upon you." As in the sayings of Jesus on which Peter's words are based, the beatitude is followed by a oti-clause (cf. Matt 5:3–10//Luke 6:20–21; the dependence is closer here than in 3:14, where the oti-clause does not follow). To interpret this clause, it is helpful to distinguish between thought and actual terminology. The Gospel tradition amply attests Jesus' promise that "the Holy Spirit" (Mark 13:11; Luke 12:12) or "the Spirit of your Father" (Matt 10:20) will stand by his disciples and tell them what to say when they are arrested or questioned by the authorities. It is hard not to assume that Peter had these traditions in mind. Yet the specific phrase, "the Spirit of God," and the construction anapauetai epi, "rest upon," shows marked agreement with the language of Isa 11:2a LX^X, kai anapausetai epj auton pneuma tou qeou, "and the Spirit of God [or "a spirit from God"] will rest upon him."

Isaiah's reference is to the messianic "shoot" (11:1) identified in early Christian traditions with Jesus Christ in his baptism (cf., e.g., Matt 3:16, and especially *Gos. Heb.*, frag. 2, in Jerome, Comm on Isa, IV; see Hennecke-Schneemelcher 1:163–64). Peter, not content merely to reproduce a tradition, has edited the text in two ways: first, he has applied its language to Christian believers instead of Jesus Christ himself, probably on the basis of the application of "the name of Christ" to Christians in the preceding clause. Second, he has defined "the Spirit of God" as "the [spirit] of that glory" (i.e., the eschatological glory of Christ mentioned in the preceding verse), probably on the basis of the various "spirits" listed in Isa 11:2b LX^X ("a spirit of wisdom and understanding, a spirit of counsel and might, a spirit of knowledge and godliness …"). If the "Spirit of God" can be the spirit of all those things, it can be as well the spirit of Christ's glory (with the article th" resuming the previous reference in v 13b). For an association between "Spirit" and "glory," cf. 2 Cor 3:8, 17–18.

From a literary standpoint, the words to th" doxh" kai ("the [spirit] of that glory, even …") look like a somewhat awkward editorial insertion (cf. Kelly, 187), but they are more plausibly understood as Peter's own adaptation of a biblical text than as a scribal corruption in the text of his epistle (there is no textual evidence for the latter). With these words, Peter integrates the allusion to Isaiah into his own argument. His replacement of the future anapausetai, "will rest," with the present anapauetai, "rests," testifies to his conviction that the ancient prophecy is now fulfilled in the experience of Christians no less than in the experience of Christ. Isaiah's prophecy and Jesus' own promise converge for Peter in the present reality of the "Spirit of God" among Christians facing ridicule and persecution. The presence of the Spirit is the distinctly Christian touch; the notion that the glory of God rests on those who suffer is attested in Jewish literature as well (e.g., *Sipre Deut* 6.5, par. 32[73b], cited in Str-B, 3.243).

kata men autou" blasqhmeitai kata de uma" doxazetai, "blasphemed indeed on

their part, but glorified on yours." These words are found in the majority, although not in the earliest and best manuscripts of 1 Peter (see *Note* c*), and are commonly regarded as an explanatory gloss inserted by a later scribe. They are found in KJ^{v}/A^{v}, although not in most other English versions, and are seldom discussed in modern commentaries. Several factors, however, favor their retention: (a) The accidental omission of one whole line in early manuscripts is a definite possibility because of the similar endings of anapauetai and doxazetai, and because of the fact that the variant is approximately the length of one line of manuscript. (b) The use of men … de to set off a contrast is in agreement with the style of 1 Peter (cf. 1:20), especially when the contrast is between human rejection and divine acceptance or vindication (cf. 2:4; 3:18; 4:6). The most striking similarity is with 4:6, where the phrases kata anqrwpou" … kata qeon function in a way similar to kata men autou" … kata de uma" in the present variant. kata in both instances has the meaning, "because of," "on the part of," "among," or even "by" (cf. BG^{D,} kata, 407.2.5a). The only difference is that in 4:6 the human judges or despisers are contrasted with God, while here they are contrasted with God's people. (c) The abrupt introduction of autou", "them" (with no antecedent in the context except the agent or agents implied by the passive oneidizesqe, "ridiculed"), is paralleled in 3:14, where autwn, "of them," refers similarly to anonymous enemies or accusers.

These factors argue for a reconsideration of the longer reading on its merits. If it is a gloss, what does the gloss accomplish? If it is original, how does it carry forward the thought of the passage? Westcott and Hort argued in their "Notes on Select Readings" (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, 2:102), on the basis of Latin manuscripts and the testimony of Cyprian, that the implied subject of the verbs blasqhmeitai, "blasphemed," and doxazetai, "glorified," was "the name of Christ" in the preceding clause. Such a connection, however, is very remote and is possible only by deciding in advance that the variant is a secondary development in the Latin tradition. The attempt of Rodgers (94–95) to defend this connection even while accepting the variant as original is as unconvincing as his argument on the basis of Isa 52:5 LX^{x} (which has only the verb in common with our text) that the persecutors in view are Jewish rather than Gentile. More plausibly the subject of the two verbs is the same as the subject of anapauetai, "rests," in the preceding clause: i.e., "the [spirit] of glory, even the Spirit of God." It is a question of "blasphemy of the Spirit" (Matt 12:31; cf. v 32; Mark 3:29; Luke 12:10; cf. Goppelt, 307). The apparent point of the longer text is that blasphemy of the Holy Spirit is a sin committed not by Christians but by their enemies. It is possible that an association between denying Christ and blaspheming the Spirit (as, e.g., in Luke 12:8–10) had led some Christians to fear that they might be guilty of the latter. Because the Spirit of God rests on those ridiculed for the name of Christ, the ones guilty of blasphemy are those who do the ridiculing, not those who are victims of it.

Peter is probably not distinguishing between blasphemy of the Spirit and blasphemy of God (or the name of God: cf. James 2:7), as if one were more serious or more final than the other. The blaspheming of the Spirit mentioned here is equivalent to the blaspheming of God mentioned in 4:4b (on which see *Comment*), and both are viewed as taking place in the verbal abuse heaped on Christians by their enemies in Rome or Asia Minor. For this reason it is possible for "blaspheme" to call forth as its opposite doxazein, "glorify," even though the latter is not used elsewhere in the N^{T} of the Spirit (cf. Rev 16:9, where "blaspheming the name of God" is equated with "not repenting so as to give him glory").

15 mh gar ti" umwn pascetw w" foneu" h klepth" h kakopoio", h w" allotriepiskopo", "For none of you must suffer as a murderer or a thief, or [any sort of] criminal, or [even] as a busybody." How does Peter know that his readers "glorify" the Spirit of God whenever they are "ridiculed for the name of Christ"? He does not, yet he assumes they do, and he makes that assumption the basis of a command. gar, which normally would introduce an explanation (cf. Goppelt, 307; Kelly, 188), instead introduces a command. If they want to make sure they are glorifying the Spirit that rests upon them, they must make sure they are being ridiculed (even suffering, if it comes to that) for the right reason.

To make the point, he begins with wrong reasons. The key to his admonition is kakopoio", "criminal" (cf. 2:12, 14). The mention of murder and thievery is probably not to be taken as evidence that Peter seriously believed his readers were likely to commit these crimes, or even be charged with them (although cf. the warning in Eph 4:28). Kelly observes (189) that these vices "come from a stock catalogue, and his object in citing them is simply to underline, with a rhetorical flourish, the world of difference between paying a penalty when you are guilty of a misdemeanor and paying a penalty which you deserve" (cf. 2:20). Aside from the term "misdemeanor" (murder and theft are hardly that), his observation is correct. Peter brings the brief "catalogue" of crimes abruptly to an end with the generalizing term kakopoio", "wrongdoer," or "criminal." A distinction is in order: although "suffering as a wrongdoer" does not imply formal criminal charges (see Comment on 2:12), it is possible that the situation in view here is of Christians being slandered as "criminals" (i.e., lawbreakers and enemies of the state) by some of their fellow citizens. Such name-calling could lead at some point to formal charges which the local governors would then be obliged to follow up (cf. 2:14), but because of his distance from the actual (and varied) circumstances of his readers, Peter is deliberately vague about the stages of the process.

The more specific translation, "magician" or "sorcerer," for kakopoio" (Selwyn, 225), based on the Latin *malificus* in Tertullian (*Scorpiace* 12.3) and Cyprian (*Testimonia* 3.37), is not convincing because (a) this is not the normal meaning of the Greek word; (b) the Latin *malificus*, in the more general sense of "wrongdoer" (see the translations in AN[F] 3:645; 5:545), is a natural equivalent of kakopoio"; (c) a firm precedent for the more general meaning has already been established in 2:12, 14.

Peter's concern in the passage centers on the much-discussed allotriepiskopo", "busybody" (cf. KJ[V]/A[V]), set off from the epithets that precede it by the repetition of w" "as." This word, found only here in the N[T] and unattested in earlier Greek literature, occurs three more times in later Christian texts (cf. Lampe, 77): twice in Epiphanius in the fourth century (*Ancoratus* 12, *P*[G] 43.37C; *Panarion*, 66.85, *P*[G] 42.165B), and once in Dionysius the Areopagite in the fifth (*Epistle*, 8.1, *P*[G] 3.1089C; BG[D], 40, lists only this one). Since none of these is directly dependent on 1 Peter, it is unlikely that the word is Peter's coinage. The reference in Dionysius is to bishops who encroach on another's diocese. The first text in Epiphanius is part of an exposition of 1 Cor 2:10, to the effect that the Holy Spirit is not probing into alien matters in searching out the "deep things of God," but into that which is his proper concern; the second makes the point that Jesus, when he broke the Sabbath, was not abrogating the work of another, but was, as God, doing his own proper work.

The common idea in these few uses of allotriepiskopo" appears to be that of meddling in things that are none of one's business. The attempt of E. T. Sander (xxxi–xxxvii) to give the term an ecclesiastical interpretation (i.e., "not a pure leader, but an alien or wrong

bishop"; cf. 5:2–3 and the above-mentioned text in Dionysius) cannot be judged successful. There is no reason why false leaders of the Christian flock would necessarily "suffer" for it at the hands of unbelievers. More to the point is Balch's appeal (*Domestic Code*, 93–94) to the self-consciousness of Cynic philosophers who perceived their duty as "overseeing" (episkopein) others: "those who have married; those who have had children; who is treating his wife well, and who is ill; who quarrels; what household is stable, and what is not; making his rounds like a physician, and feeling pulses" (Epictetus, Diss. 3.22.72; LC[L.] 2.157). In defense of this attitude, Epictetus argued that "the man who is in this frame of mind is neither a busybody (polupragmwn) nor a meddler; for he is not meddling in other people's affairs (ta allotria) when he is overseeing (episkoph) the actions of men, but these are his proper concern" (3.22.97; LC[L.] 2.165). Peter's terminology suggests that he may have known of Christians who considered themselves in similar fashion guardians of public morality, and (in contrast to Epictetus) wants to warn his readers against assuming such a posture. Although Balch's further suggestion (94) that Christians may have been victims as well as potential perpetrators of such meddling cannot be proven, it is borne out by the analogy with slander or evil speaking: Christians are warned against practicing it, and at the same time warned that they will be its victims (2:1, 12; 3:16; cf. 3:9).

The defensiveness of Epictetus betrays the fact that "busybodies," whatever their motivation, were not popular in the Roman world. Peter stands in agreement here with most pagan writers (cf., e.g., Plutarch's description in *Mor* 517A of the busybody who "creeps in, searching out with slanderous intent drunken revels and dances and all-night festivals"), and with the Apostle Paul. Paul's expression for being a busybody is periergazesqai (2 Thess 3:11; cf. 1 Thess 4:11) or periergo" (1 Tim 5:13), which he contrasts with hsucia, or "quietness" (2 Thess 3:12; cf. 1 Thess 4:11; also 1 Tim 2:2, 11–12, and 1 Pet 3:4; see Balch, 112, n. 41).

allotriepiskopo" is set off from "murderer," "thief," and "criminal" by the repetition of w" simply because it does not refer to something potentially criminal but to an attitude or a pattern of behavior likely to bring reproach on Christians as a group. It is still possible that Peter chose allotriepiskopo" instead of the more common periergo" with the function of the Christian episkopo", or "overseer," in mind, so as to warn Christians to recognize the limits of their community and not try to legislate morality for others. Peter's conviction, after all, is that Christ alone is the real epiokopo" (2:25). Yet the term in no way suggests that Peter's admonition is directed (like 5:1–3) to leaders of the congregations in distinction from the community as a whole (note the preceding uh … ti" umwn, "none of you").

16 ei de w" Cristiano", mh aiscunesqw, doxazetw de ton qeon en tw merei toutw, "But if [you suffer] for being a Christian, don't be ashamed, only glorify God in this matter." The phrase "for being a Christian" brings out more clearly the meaning of the expression "for the name of Christ," in v 14. Believers in Jesus Christ are referred to as "Christians" elsewhere in the N[T] only in Acts 11:26 and 26:28 ("Christian" being a formation analogous to "Herodian" [BG[D.] 886; cf. 348], with the meaning, "partisans of Christ"). All three instances appear to reflect the viewpoint of Jewish and pagan outsiders toward those who followed and worshiped Jesus. This is evidenced by a variant reading, Crhstiano", or "good fellow" (used ironically) in at least one manuscript ([a]

[*]) each time the designation is used (for a similar confusion, cf. *Note* c[*] on 2:3; in pagan literature, cf. Tacitus, *Annals* 15.44; Suetonius, *Nero* 16; Pliny, *Epistle* 10.96). By the

second century, Cristiano" had been adopted by "Christians" themselves as a self-designation (Ign. *Eph.* 11.2; *Magn.* 4; Rom. 3.2; *Pol.* 7.3; *Mart. Pol.* 3, 10.1, 12.1–2; *Did.* 12.4).

Peter's language does not imply that being a "Christian" was in itself a punishable offense at the time the epistle was written. Pliny, Roman governor of Bithynia (one of the provinces to which 1 Peter was written), was uncertain as late as A.D. 110 "whether the very profession of the name [of Christian] is to be punished, or only the disgraceful practices which go along with the name," and had to ask the emperor, Trajan, in writing (Pliny, *Epistles* 10.96). Trajan's answer was that "no general decision can be made by which a set form of dealing with them [i.e., Christians] could be established. They must not be ferreted out; if they are charged and convicted, they must be punished, provided that anyone who denies that he is a Christian and gives practical proof of that by invoking our gods is to be pardoned on the strength of this repudiation, no matter what grounds of suspicion may have existed against him in the past" (10.97).

The correspondence shows the Roman Empire still feeling its way toward a clear policy. Even if 1 Peter were dated (with Beare, 28–34) in the time of Pliny, it would be difficult to argue that being a "Christian" was in itself a crime, for Pliny's description of the great success of the Christian movement in Bithynia tells conclusively against any notion that Christianity had been outlawed there. As in the case of "busybody," and even the epithets "murderer," "thief," and "criminal," Peter is thinking more of slander and reckless name-calling than of formal judicial proceedings. The "ridicule" of v 14a is still very much in view, and "Christian" is here simply a term of contempt (rather like "Christer" on American college campuses in the 1950s).

mh aiscunesqw, "don't be ashamed" (lit., "let him not be ashamed," with the ti" umwn, "any of you," v 15a, still presupposed as the subject). Peter's conviction is that believers in Christ "will never be put to shame" (ou mh kataiscunqh , 2:6, citing Isa 28:16), while those who slander them will (cf. 3:16). Yet he writes here in the imperative, not the indicative mood. His emphasis is not on what will objectively be the case (i.e., that Christians will be vindicated) but on what his readers' attitude should be subjectively when faced with verbal abuse and physical danger. Peter's aspiration for them corresponds to Paul's aspiration for himself in the wake of imprisonment and the possibility of death (Phil 1:20; cf. 2 Tim 1:12; cf. also the warnings of Jesus in Mark 8:38//Luke 9:26).

doxazetw de ton qeon, "only glorify God." "Shame" and "glorifying God," the only two alternatives for pagans under God's judgment at the "day of visitation" (2:12; 3:16; see Comment), are similarly the two alternatives open to Christians facing human judgment here and now (Michaels, 398; cf. also Paul in Phil 1:20, for whom the choices were either "shame" or "magnifying Christ" in his body through life or death). Peter wants to make sure that his readers' response to threats from without is the glorification of God—precisely the same goal toward which he directed them in their ministries to each other (cf. 4:11, "so that in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ"). Although he does not in this instance spell out concretely how they are to do this, it is a fair inference from 3:15–16 that he wants them to acknowledge their faith in Christ openly and without fear, regardless of the consequences. As in the case of their ministry to one another, glorification of God depends on attitudes and behavior toward other people.

en tw merei toutw, "in this matter" (cf. 2 Cor 3:10; 9:3; also Polyb. 18.18.2). Adoption of the more commonly accepted reading, "in this name," could suggest that 1 Peter stands at a

transition between the use of "Christian" by opponents of the movement (as in Acts and in pagan sources), and its serious use by believers themselves, beginning with Ignatius. Peter would then be saying, "Even though the name 'Christian' is thrown at you by your enemies in derision, wear the name proudly, for that is what you are." Yet transcriptional probabilities favor the reading adopted here (see *Note* c*). Although it was the reading presupposed in the KJ^v/A^v, it is not so much as mentioned in either the UBSGN^T (ed. K Aland, et al.), Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, or the "Notes on Select Readings" in Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in the Original Greek*, 1 (Appendix). Among modern commentators, only Kelly (190–91) takes it seriously enough to offer an explanation of how it came into being if it is not original. He argues that "in this name" was the original reading, but that it should be translated "in this capacity" or "on this account," on the basis of the idiomatic use of the "name" in Jewish literature and in such N^T passages as Mark 9:41 and Matt 10:40–42. Thus merei, although secondary, provides the correct interpretation of onomati.

Kelly has advanced the discussion by addressing a problem that in most commentaries is simply ignored, yet it is doubtful that so much subtlety can be assigned to later copyists. It is hard to believe that they would sacrifice the theological richness of the "name" in favor of such a colorless word as mero", "matter" or "capacity," merely to clarify the meaning for their readers. Examples of such a sophisticated procedure could be cited among ancient translators (just as the principle of "dynamic equivalence" is recognized among modern translators), but there is no evidence that this variant originated in the translation process (e.g., from Greek to Latin). These were not translators but mere scribes or copyists. The more plausible explanation, therefore, is that the prosaic merei is what Peter originally wrote, and that the scribal change went in the opposite direction, either accidentally or deliberately, under the influence of the significant phrase, "in the name of Christ," in v 14a.

Although mero" occurs nowhere else in 1 Peter, the phrase, "in this matter," forms a kind of sequel to 2:12 and 3:16, where a similarly colorless en w served as the author's way of introducing a "case" approach to the prospect of slander and interrogation (see Comment on 2:12). In those passages the pronoun w had no antecedent, no actual word for "case" or "situation" in the context, but if it had, mero" would have been an appropriate word. The vague expression en tw merei toutw, therefore, functions here in much the same way as the en w of 2:12 and 3:16 (it was easier to see this connection in an earlier generation when merei was still widely accepted as the correct reading: see, e.g., Fronmueller, 82).

17 oti kairo" tou arxasqai to krima apo tou oikou tou qeou, "For [it is] time for the judgment to begin from the house of God." oti, "for," introduces a clause explaining why the admonitions of vv 15–16 were necessary: because suffering "for being a Christian" is—or is about to become—a reality. With these words, Peter returns to the thought of v 12 (on which see *Comment*). His readers should not be "surprised" that the long-expected kairo", or "time," variously designated in Jewish and Christian literature as the "messianic woes" (Str-B, 1.950), "birth-pangs" (Mark 13:8//Matt 24:8; cf. 1 Thess 5:3), "hour of trial" (Rev 3:10), or "great tribulation" (Matt 24:21; cf. Mark 13:19; Luke 21:23; Rev 7–14), has now arrived.

kairo" is to be taken as a predicate (with estin, "it is," understood). The nature of the "time" is defined by the articular infinitive (BD^F, § 400.1) as a time for "beginning" (tou arxasqai), specifically the beginning of judgment (cf. Matt 24:8//Mark 13:8, "beginning of birth-pangs"). It is not to be equated (as in Goppelt, 311–12) with the joyful "last day" (en kairw escatw) mentioned as a time of salvation in 1:5, nor with the time of vindication

mentioned in 5:6. It is a time for judgment, just prior to the "end" (i.e., telo" in the next clause). In contrast to 3:17 and 4:6 (see Comment), no distinction is made between believers suffering under human judgment and unbelievers suffering under the judgment of God (cf. perhaps 2 Thess 1:4). Judgment here is "all of a piece," viewed in its totality as the judgment of God. "No longer can there be any implication that the Christian will be spared or will suffer only a little.… Rather, God's wrath is one and it has arrived" (Michaels, 400).

to krima, "the judgment," occurs only here in 1 Peter, although God's role as universal judge is consistently set forth (with the verb krinein) in 1:17, 2:23, and 4:5. o oiko" tou qeou, "the house of God," is the church, although Peter avoids the precise term (see *Introduction*; cf. 1 Tim 3:15, where "house of God" is defined as "the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth"; also *Herm. Sim.* 9.13.9, 9.14.1). The fact that the phrase apo tou oikou tou qeou, "from the house of God," is picked up in the following clause by the inclusive afÆ hmwn, "from us," suggests that Peter has in view not a limited group of congregations but the entire "brotherhood in the world" mentioned in 5:9 (for the first person plural in 1 Peter, cf. only 1:3, 2:24).

As in the case of the "spiritual house" of 2:5, the operative metaphor here is that of the Jerusalem temple (Goppelt, 311; Kelly, 193; cf. BG^{D}, 560. 1b), not that of the household or family (as in Elliott, *Home for the Homeless*, 140–41). For the notion of divine judgment on the temple, cf. Ezek 9:6–7, Mal 3:1; also the Gospel accounts of Jesus cleansing the temple and predicting the temple's destruction. Although Peter introduces no biblical quotation until v 18, a possible link to Ezek 9:6b LX^{X} is provided by the construction arxasqai apo , "to begin from," and by the word "house" in reference to the temple (metaphorically here, literally in Ezekiel; see *Form/Structure/Setting*). It is true that Ezekiel's phraseology is somewhat different: e.g., the plural construction apo twn agiwn mou, either "from my sanctuary" (lit. "from my holy things," BG^{D}, 10.2b), or "from my holy ones"; also "from the men who were elders, inside the house," instead of simply "from the house." Yet the similarity of thought is unmistakable, especially in light of Peter's application of his warning to the plural "us" in the next clause, and then specifically to the Christian "elders" in 5:1 (cf. perhaps the phrase arxamenoi apo twn presbuterwn, "beginning from the elders," in the story of the adulteress in John 8:9).

In view of the analogy commonly drawn in late Judaism between the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple by hostile armies in 586 B.C. and in A.D. 70 (cf., e.g., 4 Ezra 3–14), it is tempting to surmise that "the house of God" is not entirely metaphorical here, but that Peter had in mind the actual situation of Jerusalem and the Jewish temple in his own day. If the temple had just been destroyed, or if it was in serious danger, he might well have seen its plight as a signal of final judgment, first on the people of God (Jew and Gentile alike), and then on the whole world. Though the notion that the righteous suffer first is not always linked directly to Jerusalem or the temple (cf., e.g., 2 Macc 6:14–15, *2 Apoc. Bar.* 13.9–12, B. Qam. 60a, and in the N^{T}, 1 Cor 11:32), an awareness of the temple's destruction and of continuity between Israel and the Christian community may have helped give the present passage its strongly apocalyptic coloring (see *Introduction*).

ei de prwton afÆ hmwn, ti to telo" twn apeiqountwn tw tou qeou euaggeliw, "and if it is from us first, what will be the end of those who are disobedient to the gospel of God?" The form of the rhetorical question probably anticipates the form of the quotation from Prov 11:31 LX^{X} that follows in v 18 (see *Form/Structure/Setting*), although it is in any case appropriate in connection with judgment (cf. Luke 23:31: "For if they do this when the

wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?"). Peter builds his "if"-clause on what precedes (with prwton "first," corresponding to tou arxasqai, "to begin," and afÆ hmwn, "from us," corresponding to apo tou oikou tou qeou, "from the house of God") but develops it into an argument from the lesser to the greater: if it is this bad for us, how much worse for the wicked?

Having introduced "house of God" briefly as a metaphor, Peter now moves on to what the metaphor represents, the people of God, and then negatively to "those who are disobedient to the gospel of God" (i.e., to unbelievers, especially those actively hostile to the Christian faith; on apeiqein, see Comment on 2:8; 3:1, 20a; cf. also 2 Thess 1:8). The "gospel of God" is the standard N^T designation of the Christian message about Jesus Christ as proclaimed to the Gentiles (cf. 1 Thess 2:2, 8–9; Rom 1:1; 15:16; Mark 1:15). For Jews, who already believed in God, the good news was that Jesus was the Messiah, but for Gentiles the good news was that there was one God who had now revealed himself in Jesus Christ (cf. 1:12, 25). Gentiles were now invited to turn "to God from idols, to serve the living and true God and wait for his Son from heaven" (1 Thess 1:9–10a; cf. Acts 14:15; Rev 14:7; see Comment on 1:21). Gentiles who did not believe the good news were not merely denying Christ; in Peter's eyes they were denying and disobeying God. Their "end" (to telo"; cf. 4:7), in contrast to the "end" of those who believe (1:9), is problematic. The rhetorical question implies for them defeat and death (cf. telo" in Rom 6:21; 2 Cor 11:15; Phil 3:19; Heb 6:8).

18 kai ei o dikaio" moli" swzetai, o asebh" kai amartwlo" pou faneitai, "And 'if the just person is barely saved, what will become of the godless and the sinner'?" (lit. "where will the godless and the sinner appear"; cf. $BG^{D,}$ 851.1b). Peter reinforces the rhetorical question of v 17b with another, formulated similarly and taken verbatim (except for the omission of the particle men) from Prov 11:31 $LX^{X.}$ It is more likely that the text from Proverbs helped to shape Peter's rhetoric already in v 17b than that he added it as an afterthought, o dikaio", "the just person"" (corresponding both to "us" in v 17b, and to "those who suffer when God requires it" in v 19), is the Christian believer (cf. epi dikaiou" in 3:12). moli" here means "barely" or "with difficulty" ($BG^{D,}$ 526.1;) rather than "scarcely" (526.3). In the context of 1 Peter, the emphasis of the words moli" swzetai ("is barely saved") is on swzetai: whatever the difficulty, and whether or not they suffer physical death, the "just" will be saved (cf. 1:5, 9–10; 2:2; 3:21). The sure hope of final vindication dominates the entire epistle. Yet this salvation is not necessarily an easy thing or without cost (cf. the Gospel tradition: e.g., Mark 8:35; 13:13, 1920, 22). The terms, "godless" and "sinner," although not used elsewhere in 1 Peter, refer clearly enough to the "disobedient" of the preceding verse, the enemies of the Christian movement. Their fate Peter leaves grimly in question (cf. his vague but ominous language in 2:8, 3:16b–17, and at the end of his psalm quotation in 3:12b).

19 wste kai oi pasconte" kata to qelhma tou qeou pistw ktisth paratiqesqwsan ta" yuca" autwn en agaqopoiia , "So then, let those who suffer when God requires it entrust their lives to the faithful creator in the doing of good." kai (lit. "also") is not to be taken with oi pasconte", "those who suffer" (i.e., in addition to others: Kelly, 194), nor with paratiqesqwsan, "let [them] entrust" (e.g., in addition to glorifying God: Bigg, 181–81), but with wste, "serving as connective to the whole sentence" (Beare, 195). wste kai, "so then," introduces not a "new thought" (Selwyn, 226; cf. Bigg, 181), but (as in 1 Cor 7:38) a conclusion drawn from what has gone before. The idea of suffering

"when God requires it" (lit. "according to the will of God") not only continues the theme of being "ridiculed for the name of Christ" (v 14a), or of suffering "for being a Christian" (v 16), but reaches further back in the epistle to "suffering in the cause of justice," in 3:14, or "suffering for doing good, if God should require it" (lit. "if the will of God should will") in 3:17. The phrase to qelhma tou qeou , "the will of God," or "what God requires," refers not (as in 2:15 and 4:2) to an ethical standard to which Christian believers are expected to conform (see Comment on 2:15), but rather to the inexorable judgment of vv 17–18, insofar as it affects the Christian believer. Clearly, it would be no less the "will of God" for a wrongdoer or a busybody to suffer (v 15), or for the wicked to perish (vv 17–18), because their suffering would be richly deserved. Peter, however, uses the phrase here—in connection with undeserved suffering (cf. 2:19–20)—precisely because the latter is not normally perceived as God's will. As Peter has already shown, undeserved suffering may indeed be the will of God—in the short run—yet it is always "better" than deserved suffering because its final outcome is never in doubt (see Comment on 3:17).

paratiqesqwsan ta" yuca" autwn, "let [them] entrust their lives." This phrase is not synonymous with "glorify God" (v 16b), but defines rather the attitude of mind that makes the glorification of God in a time of crisis possible. Its closest parallel is perhaps Ps 30[31]:6 LXX: ei" ceira" sou paraqhsomai to pneuma mou , "into your hands I entrust my spirit" (prefaced with "Father" and attributed to Jesus on the cross in Luke 23:46). Despite his interest in the passion of Jesus, Peter probably does not have the saying from the cross in mind here; 2:23b is not a real parallel because Jesus "left" (paredidou) not himself but his tormentors "in the hands of the One who judges justly" (see *Comment*). Although Peter's choice of a verb may have been influenced by the psalm text (which became in later Judaism part of a common evening prayer; *Ber.* 5a), the focus of his language is not (like Luke 23:46) on the prospect of death. He simply wants his readers to entrust themselves continually (present imperative) to God's protecting care, whatever the circumstances (cf. the personal confidence of Paul in 2 Tim 1:12, as well as his ministry to various Asian churches in Acts 14:22–23; 20:32). "Lives" (or "souls") is a favorite term in 1 Peter, either in connection with salvation (1:9, 22; 3:20) or (as here) with divine care and guidance (cf. 2:25). yuch is used throughout not for an immaterial "soul" in distinction from the body, but for the whole person, especially with reference to the person's ultimate physical and spiritual well-being (even 2:11 is not an exception; see *Comment*).

pistw ktisth, "to a faithful creator." Only here in the N^T is God explicitly referred to as ktisth", or "creator" (the participle, o ktisa", or "the One who created," is more common: Matt 19:4; Rom 1:25; Eph 3:9; Col 3:10; for ktisth", however, see *1 Cle*[m] 19.2, 62.2, and in Jewish literature, Sir 24:8; 2 Macc 1:24; 7:23; 13:14; 4 Macc 5:25; 11:5; *Ep. Arist.* 16; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.30). Peter prefers here a designation expressing God's common relationship to every human being instead of one that Christians viewed as theirs exclusively (like "Father" in 1:17). A likely reason is that he has just grouped believer and unbeliever together under a single divine judgment (vv 17–18). "Judge" would therefore have been an appropriate term (cf. 1:17; 4:5), but Peter has opted instead for "creator," possibly because he sees God's authority as universal judge resting on his role as creator of all people. Although he has not mentioned creation before (except in a set phrase in 1:20), his reverence for God as creator was implicit in his earlier commands to "defer to every human creature" (2:13; see *Comment*), and to "show respect for everyone" (2:17). pisto", "faithful," or worthy of trust, is appropriate in connection with the verb paratiqesqai,

"entrust" (cf. 2 Tim 2:2). pisto" is used of God or Christ in Paul's phrase, "God is faithful" (1 Cor 1:9; 10:13; 2 Cor 1:18), and similar formulations (e.g., 1 Thess 5:24; 2 Thess 3:3; Heb 10:23; cf. 2 Tim 2:13). In association with God as creator, see especially *1 Cle*[m] 60.1: "You, Lord, created the earth, [you] the faithful one in all generations."

e agaqopoiia, "in the doing of good." This noun occurs four times in *1 Cle*[m] (2.2.7; 33.1; 34.2), but only here in the N[T.] It is difficult to decide whether the preposition en is to be taken instrumentally as "by" (BG[D,] 260.3.1a) or temporally as "while" (BG[D,] 260.2.3]). Is it the author's point that believers "entrust their lives" to God precisely by doing good, or that when they do good they should trust God to protect their lives from danger? The logic of the sentence favors the latter, with "while doing good" as the better translation. The advice to trust one's life to God is, after all, the heart of the sentence; en agaqopoiia simply states the circumstances under which such trust is appropriate. Yet the decision is not that simple because the emphatic position of en agaqopoiia at the end of the whole section gives it too something of the character of an imperative. The participle of the verb agaqopoiein (usually with imperatival meaning) has dominated the ethical teaching of the entire epistle (2:15, 20; 3:6, 17; cf. 2:12, 14; 3:11–12, 13), and it is no surprise to find "the doing of good" standing so emphatically at the end of the author's summary of the proper response to slander and suffering. Peter is really saying two things to his reader: first, entrust your lives to God, for he is faithful and you will be saved; second, be sure always to do good. Although the first is not to be equated with the second (as in the translation, "by doing good"), neither is the second subordinate to the first (as the translation, "while doing good," might suggest). Hence the more ambiguous rendering, "in the doing of good" (cf. perhaps the adverbial use described in BG[D,] 261.3.2]).

Explanation

The most striking feature of this section is its bold emphasis on the sovereignty and initiative of God, even in the suffering of his own people. Earlier in the epistle Peter weighed the suffering of Christian believers at the hands of their enemies against the suffering of those same enemies under the judgment of God (3:16–17). Vindication meant that God's judgment would at last outweigh and cancel the judgment of those who blasphemed him by slandering his worshipers (4:4–5). God's verdict of life for his people would supersede every human verdict of death (4:6).

The reality described in this section is no different, but Peter's way of describing it has changed. Here he attributes all judgment to God, who without favoritism strikes first his own house and then the rest of the world. The notion that God plays no favorites, even when he has an elect people, represents perhaps Peter's acknowledgment of that which every sensitive person can perceive in the natural world. Just as sunshine and rain fall indiscriminately on the bad and the good (cf. Matt 5:45), so the "fiery ordeal" will spare neither believer nor unbeliever. Because judgment, like rain or sunshine, originates from God, it is as inevitable (and in one sense as "natural") as they are. It is a necessity (cf. 1:6), and when its time has come (v 17) nothing can hold it back. Suffering should never come as a "surprise" to the follower of Christ (v 12), for Christ himself was not spared (Rom 8:32a; cf. 2 Pet 2:4). The sufferings of Christians are simply their share in the once-for-all sufferings of Jesus Christ (v 13).

Yet it is not quite true to say that divine judgment is indiscriminate. Those "barely saved" (v 18) are still saved, while those "disobedient to the gospel of God" (v 17) are not. The

elect are still the elect (cf. Mark 13:20, 22, 27). Peter's sober words to his readers as the epistle draws to a close by no means cancel the firm hope of vindication established in 3:10–4:6. God will be "glorified" not only in worship and mutual ministry among Christians (cf. 4:11), but in their daily encounters in Roman society with prejudice, slander, and persecution (vv 14b, 16). This passage (and therefore 1 Peter as a whole) stands in a long Jewish tradition at least as old as Jeremiah and the latter half of Isaiah, in which suffering is viewed primarily as a transaction between God and his own people. The accent is not on blaming the oppressors and threatening them with terrible and certain retribution—although that can be identified as a minor theme (i.e., in the reference to blasphemy in v 14b and in the grim rhetorical questions of vv 17 and 18). The thrust of the passage is rather to remind Christian believers that their hope of vindication is no free ticket to pure and unqualified bliss. Their God has something to say to them first, and the only way for him to say it is through suffering. The entire section can be viewed as an elaboration and expansion of the two words ei deon, "must" or "by necessity," back in 1:6 (see *Comment*). Yet it is important to be aware of what is not said. Although the "fiery ordeal" helps purify the people of God to make them ready for the future day of glory and rejoicing (vv 12–13; cf. 1:7), Peter does not develop any notion that God is burning away their sins or punishing them for past failures (any more than he was punishing Christ for personal sins: see Comment on 4:1). He has explained already in 1:6–7 that the process of suffering tests and perfects the pisti", "faith," or "faithfulness," of those who follow Christ. Although "faith" is not mentioned explicitly in the present section, the concluding admonition to those who suffer to "entrust their lives to the faithful creator" (v 19) makes it clear that faith has been the tacit presupposition all along. What is new as Peter brings his reflections on suffering to a focus is that faithfulness (with the "doing of good" that it produces) makes it possible to rejoice even now (v 13), in the very teeth of slander and oppression, and to experience in advance, through "the Spirit of God" (v 14), the glory of Christ for which his people wait.

Appeal to Elders (5:1–5)

Bibliography

Brown, R. E., K. P. Donfried, and **J. Reumann.** *Peter in the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1973. **Elliott, J. H.** "Ministry and Church Order in the New Testament: A Traditio-Historical Analysis (1 Pt 5,1–5 and parallels)." *CB*[Q] 32 (1970) 367–91. **Harris, J. R.** "The Religious Meaning of 1 Peter [V] 5." *Ex*[p] ser. 8, 18 (1919) 131–39. **Marxsen, W.** "Der Mitälteste und Zeuge der Leiden Christi. Eine martyrologische Begründung des 'Romprimats' im 1.Petrus Brief?." In *Theologia Crucis—Signum Crucis*. F[S] E. Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr, 1979. 377–93. **Michl, J.** "Die Presbyter des ersten Petrusbriefes." In *Ortskirche—Weltkirche*. FSJ. Döpfner. Würzburg, 1973. 48–62. **Nauck, W.** "Probleme des frühchristlichen Amtsverständnisses (1 Ptr 5,2f.)." *ZN*[W] 48 (1957) 200–220. **Riggenbach, B.** "Die Poimenik des Apostel Petrus (1 Petri 5,1–5) nach ihrer geschichtlichen und praktischen Bedeutung." SThZ 7 (1889) 185–95. **Spicq, C**. "La place ou le rôle des jeunes dans certaines communautés néotestamentaires." *R*[B] 76 (1969) 508–27.

Translation

[1]*To any elders among you, therefore,*[a] *I appeal as fellow elder and witness to the sufferings of Christ, and a sharer as well in the glory to be revealed:* [2]*Shepherd the flock of God that is in your care. [Watch over it],*[b] *not out of compulsion but willingly before God,*[c] *not greedily but with enthusiasm.* [3]*Don't lord it over your respective congregations, but be examples to the flock,* [4]*and when the chief shepherd appears you will receive the unfading crown of glory.* [5]*You in turn who are younger must defer to the authority of elders. All of you with each other,*[d] *then, clothe yourselves with humility, for God*[e] *"opposes the arrogant, but gives grace to the humble."*

Notes

a. M^{S} variations reflect scribal questions about the connection of this statement with what immediately precedes (i.e., the significance of oun, "therefore"). The majority of later MS^{s} (including ^{P} and Y) substitute tou" for oun (i.e., "To the elders who are among you"), while a few others (including ^{a}

) conflate the two readings (i.e., "To the elders, therefore, who are among you"). The effect of the substitution is to eliminate the necessity of seeking any real connection to the preceding context. Yet the earliest and best MS^{s} (including $^{P72\ A\ B)}$ retain the more difficult reading oun, and even the conflated text of ^{a}

bears witness to its presence at an early stage of the tradition. oun, "therefore," is clearly original and raises the pointed question of how the appeal of 5:1–4 follows logically from 4:19 in particular or from 4:17–19 or 4:12–19 more generally. On this, see *Comment*.

b. The command to "watch over" (episkopounte") the flock is omitted in certain MS^{s} (including ^{a}

* and $^{B)}$ but is retained in the majority of MS^{s} (including $^{P72\ a}$

$^{2\ A\ P}$ Y the O^{L} versions and the vg). It is difficult to see why scribes would have added it if it were not original since the verse reads quite smoothly without it (the association of poimhn and episkopo" in 2:25 as titles for God or Christ hardly seems a sufficient reason). If, on the other hand, episkopounte" was originally in the text, it is possible that overzealous scribes might have considered it redundant and left it out—although this too is less than compelling. B, however, exhibits a remarkably short text throughout vv 1–4 (omitting kata qeon in v 2, and v 3 in its entirety); so $^{B's}$ witness should be used with caution. Although the editors of both the Nestle and Bible Society texts have chosen (perhaps wisely) to bracket episkopounte", the evidence on balance favors retention.

c. kata qeon, "before God," is omitted in the majority of later MS^{s} and in ^{B} but retained in the rest of the earlier and better MS^{s} (e.g., $^{P72\ a}$

$^{A\ P}$ Y and others). There is little doubt that the phrase was original and was omitted by ^{B} or its prototype either accidentally or because a scribe considered the two pairs of contrasting adverbs set off by mh (or mhde) and alla rhetorically more effective without the phrase than with it.

d. Instead of allhloi", "toward each other," some MS^{s} (^{P72} and others) have en allhloi", "among each other," while the majority (including $^{P)}$ insert upotassomenoi after the pronoun, yielding the translation, "clothe yourselves with humility, being subject to each other"; cf. Eph 5:21). The simple allhloi" (^{a}

^{B} O^{L} most v^{g} MS^{s} and others), however, is the most strongly attested reading and is clearly to be preferred.

e. The definite article with qeo", "God," is missing in ^{P72} ^{B} and a few other MS^{s} but is present in the majority of MS^{s} (including ^{a} ^{A} ^{P} and Y). The confusion over the definite article immediately after oti recalls the question of the article with kairo" in 4:17 (see *Note* e* on 4:17). In the present instance, it is likely that the article was original and was omitted accidentally. Nowhere else in 1 Peter does qeo" stand in the nominative case without the article.

Form/Structure/Setting

The section bears comparison, on the one hand, with the household duty codes of 2:13–3:9 and, on the other, with Peter's directives on mutual ministry within the Christian congregations in 4:7–11. In contrast to the household duty codes, it is noteworthy that he begins here with the responsibilities of those in authority (vv 1–4) rather than of those who owe to them deference or submission (v 5) and that the weight of emphasis falls on the former instead of the latter. The reason for the contrast is that the subject is not how to treat "enemies" (i.e., slave masters or unbelieving husbands in the household or slanderers of Christians in Roman society) but how to treat each other in the shared life of the believing congregation. Peter therefore focuses on those whose responsibility it is to take the initiative in such relationships.

In this respect the similarity to 4:7–11 is closer. The principal difference is that Peter here recognizes an authority in the congregation based on age, or at least on seniority in the faith. The indefinite phrase, "To any elders among you," may hint at his awareness that some of the congregations to which he was writing were ruled by elders (as, in all likelihood, was his own Roman congregation; cf. Heb 13:17; also the strong appeal to the authority of elders in Clement of Rome, e.g., in *1 Cle*^{m} 1.3; 3.3), while some were not. If so, then 4:7–11 may have been intended as an "all-purpose" directive to every congregation, while 5:1–5 was aimed at those congregations, wherever they may have been in the provinces, where pastoral authority rested with a group of elders. This could explain why Peter in v 5b closes out the section on the same note of mutuality (pante" de allhloi") that characterized 4:7–11. The accent on mutuality would be appropriate under all circumstances, but in some congregations "one another" would be defined (at least in part) by the relationship between "elders" and "younger ones."

The occasion (or "excuse") for concentrating on the elders may have been, as suggested above, the allusion in 4:17 to eschatological judgment beginning "from the house of God," and therefore, in light of Ezek 9:6, "from the men who were elders, inside the house." Peter's real reason for doing so, however, is undoubtedly his desire to foster cohesion and unity for a time of crisis in congregations where "elders" are present to give leadership. In a sense he regards them as his representatives in those congregations, and he is quick to establish a common bond between himself and them (v 1). The closest N^{T} parallel is perhaps Paul's address at Miletus to the elders of Ephesus in Acts 20:17–38, where Paul

uses himself as an example in support of a command to "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock (panti tw poimniw), in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians (episkopou"), to shepherd (poimainein) the church of God" (Acts 20:28; in our passage, cf. vv 2–3).

Less significant are the qualifications listed in 1 Tim 3:1–7 and Titus 1:7–9 for the role of "guardian," or episkopo" (a role designated explicitly in Titus 1:5–6 as one performed by "elders"). For example, Peter's threefold "not … but" formulation of vv 2–3 bears a resemblance both to these "qualification lists" and to certain household duty codes not preserved in 1 Peter itself (e.g., Col 3:22; Eph 6:4, 6). Yet a list of qualifications for a task is not quite the same as an exhortation to carry out the task faithfully. Goppelt (318–19) correctly observes that Peter's word to the "elders" is more like the "testamentary" form of Acts 20 or even the advice to Timothy attributed to the Apostle Paul in 2 Timothy. Although the evidence is not sufficient to make a case that 1 Peter as a whole is, like 2 Peter, a testament or farewell discourse (cf. Bauckham, 131–34), there is no denying the testamentlike character of this the only passage in the entire epistle (aside from 1:1) where the author allows his own identity to show through. His "appeal" (parakalw) to the elders brings to a focus the address "Dear friends" (4:12), in light of the urgency intimated in 4:12–14, 17–18. If it is a "farewell," its finality is not grounded in the imminence of the apostle's death (as, e.g., in 2 Pet 1:12–15) but in the imminence of the coming of divine glory and judgment through Jesus Christ (cf. 4:13, 17–18; 5:1b, 4). If it is a testament, it is one that unites Peter and the elders in a common ministry and a common hope. The end is near for author and readers alike (cf. 4:7), but its nearness only makes it more imperative to complete the shepherd's task before it is too late.

The obligations of the "younger," in distinction from those of the elders, are stated as briefly as possible and in a form more reminiscent of the household duty codes (for the upotaghte of v 5a, cf. 2:13a; also the participles of 2:18a and 3:1a; for the adverb omoiw", cf. 3:1, 7). v 5a has the appearance of a mere transition to the generalized appeal to "all of you" in v 5b to "clothe yourselves with humility toward each other." With the latter, he comes full circle back to the emphasis in 4:7–11 on the responsibilities of the entire congregation for mutual love and service. Yet at the same time, the "all" of v 5b recalls the "all" of 3:8, confirming the persistent impression that Peter is structuring his appeal to congregations on the model already established in the household duty codes. He even brings the sequence to a close with a biblical quotation (Prov 3:34 in v 5c), just as he concluded the household duty code with the quotation from Ps 34 in 3:10–12.

If the whole of vv 1–5 is viewed as an adaptation of the Petrine form of the household duty code to a set of instructions to churches or congregations, the reversal of the code's order of "leaders" and "subjects" is probably attributable to the assumption that "beginning from the house of God" (i.e., the people of God regarded as his temple) means "beginning from the elders." This changes into something closer to the form of a testament, with Peter as "fellow elder" sharing in a common testimony to Christ's sufferings and in the hope of a "crown of glory" to reward their common ministries.

Comment

1 presbuterou" oun en umin parakalw o sumpresbutero" kai martu" twn tou Cristou paqhmatwn, o kai th" melloush" apokaluptesqai doxh" koinwno" "To

any elders among you, therefore, I appeal as fellow elder and witness to the sufferings of Christ, and a sharer as well in the glory to be revealed." The translation "any elders" is an attempt to reflect the absence of the definite article with the noun (in contrast to the "servants" of 2:18, the "wives" of 3:1 [although see *Note* a* on 3:1], and the "husbands" of 3:7). Peter does not take for granted that all the congregations to which he is writing are necessarily ruled by elders, but for those that are a special appeal is in order. The particle oun links the appeal very closely to what has preceded in 4:12–19, probably on the ground that the beginning of judgment "from the house of God" places unprecedented demands on any who serve as "elders" in the house (see *Form/Structure/Setting* on 4:12–19; Comment on 4:17). Peter's reference is to the same leadership role in Christian congregations that is mentioned in Acts 14:23; 20:17–18; 1 Tim 5:1–2, 17, 19; Titus 1:5, an outgrowth of leadership patterns based on seniority in Jewish synagogues and the Jerusalem Sanhedrin as well as local ruling councils and in city government in the GrecoRoman world (see, e.g., *TDN*[T] 6:651–61; BG[D], 700; Selwyn, 227–28). Such a role is not consistently designated with this title in the N[T]. Paul can refer more vaguely (with a participle) to those who "preside" over the congregation and/or its worship (1 Thess 5:12; Rom 12:8), while Hebrews (13:7, 17) also uses a participle for "leaders," past or present, in the congregation to which it is directed (probably Rome itself). "Elders" becomes more and more the standard term as time goes on: e.g., throughout *1 Clement* (another document of the Roman church; cf. also *2 Cle*[m] 17.3–5), in Pol. *Phil.* 6.1 (in possible dependence on 1 Peter), and (under the authority of the bishop) in the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch. Yet Paul appealed to seniority as a basis for leadership already in 1 Cor 16:15 ("first converts in Achaia … devoted themselves to the service of saints. … submit to such as these"), and 1 Peter itself is proof that participles and more informal descriptions of leadership continued to be used alongside occurrences of the specific word "elder" (cf. 4:11: "Whoever does the speaking. … whoever serves"). The use of the term "elder" is therefore a precarious basis for dating the epistle.

For the verb parakalw, "I appeal," cf. 2:11, where it is closely linked to the address alaphtoi, "Dear friends," and where attention is called to the status of the addressees as "aliens and strangers." Here, as we have seen, the appeal is widely separated from a preceding address as "Dear friends" (cf. 4:12), and attention is focused (for the moment at least) as much on Peter himself as on his readers. His appeal to elders provides the occasion for an explicit self-reference, the first since his opening phrase, "apostle of Jesus Christ," in 1:1. Peter here identifies himself as "fellow elder," as "witness to the sufferings of Christ," and as "sharer … in the glory to be revealed."

o sumpresbutero" kai martu" twn tou Cristou paqhmatwn, "fellow elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ." The first two designations are linked by a common definite article, sumpresbutero", "fellow elder," is elsewhere unattested in ancient literature (sunpresbeutwn in a second-century B.C. inscription, M[M], 612, is from a different word meaning co-ambassador). If it is Peter's ad hoc formation, it is a wholly natural one on the analogy of sundoulo", "fellow servant" (e.g., Col 1:7; 4:7; cf. Ign. *Eph.* 2.1; *Magn.* 2.1 *Phld.* 4.1; *Smyrn.* 12.2), and sunergo", "fellow worker" (e.g., Rom 16:3, 9, 21; 2 Cor 8:23; Philem 1, 24). Peter's intention is to establish collegiality with the elders in the churches to which he writes. Although his apostolic authority is not made explicit here, the point made by R. E. Brown et al. (152) must be kept in mind: "We should not be deceived by this modest stance as if the author were presenting himself as their equal. He

has already identified his authority as apostolic (1:1); and so the use of 'fellow presbyter' is a polite strategem of benevolence, somewhat as when a modern bishop of a diocese addresses his 'fellow priests.' " Perhaps significantly, the only other N^T instances in which someone identifies himself (rather than another party) with one of these compound sun-formations are Rev 19:10; 22:9, where an angel says to John, "I am a fellow servant [sundoulo"] with you and with your brothers"—another "stratagem of benevolence" by a presumed superior to establish collegiality and (at least in the Revelation passages) to allay fear.

In what sense is Peter the "fellow elder" of those to whom he writes? At the very least, the term implies that he is first of all simply "the elder" (o presbutero"), perhaps in a sense corresponding to that of the author of 2 John (1:1) and of 3 John (1:1). Although not necessarily synonymous with "apostle," the designation is compatible with the latter and in Peter's case perhaps a corollary of it. The two terms are closely associated not only in connection with the Jerusalem church in the book of Acts, where most of Jesus' original disciples remained for a time (e.g., Acts 8:1, 14; 11:1, 30) and continued to exercise leadership (cf. Acts 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16:4), but in later tradition as well. presbuteroi is used in the fragments of Papias to refer to the "disciples of the Lord," including Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John (twice, whether referring to one individual or two), and Matthew (Eusebius, HE 3.39.4). Although Papias is not cited as using the word "apostle," the accompanying discussion by Eusebius (3.39.7) clearly equates the presbuteroi, or "elders," of Papias with the standard term apostoloi, or "apostles." Whether "apostle" is understood specifically as one of the Twelve or more broadly as a disciple of Jesus during his ministry on earth, an "apostle" is in some sense an "elder" to the entire Christian community in the world, not to one church in particular. This apparently is how the author of 1 Peter defines his apostleship in establishing rapport with Christian elders in Asia Minor as "fellow elder." More important, it is in this capacity that he is able to assure them that "the same kinds of suffering are being accomplished in your brotherhood throughout the world" (v 9).

martu", "witness," governed by the same article as sumpresbutero", is virtually equivalent to the rare summartu", "fellow witness." The absence of an emphatic egw in Peter's self-reference (contrast Eph 3:1 and 4:1), confirms the impression that the author's primary interest is not in himself but in the elders to whom he writes. The role of elder for them, no less than for him, is the role of "witness to the sufferings of Christ" and "sharer as well in the glory to be revealed." martu", therefore, is not an eyewitness (as Selwyn, 228, suggests; cf. $BG^{D,}$ 494.2b), for eyewitness to Jesus' sufferings was not a role that Peter and the elders of Asia Minor shared. Even in Peter's case, the Gospels emphasize that he was not an eyewitness either to the scourging or crucifixion of Jesus (even though 2 Pet 1:16 makes him an eyewitness of Jesus' majesty and glory, presumably at the Transfiguration). On the contrary, he deserted Jesus with the others (Mark 14:27, 50), denied three times that he had known Jesus, and at the very most followed from a distance (Luke 22:54; cf. John 18:15–16).

If 1 Peter is written by someone other than Peter, it is remotely possible that martu" could be understood as "martyr" ($BG^{D,}$ 494.3). The pseudonymous author would then be using this opportunity to remind his readers of the apostle's glorious death (Beare, 198; see *Introduction*). But (a) this possibility disappears if Petrine authorship is accepted; (b) a pseudonymous author would have been unlikely to refer to Peter's death in such an offhand

manner (contrast 2 Pet 1:14–15); (c) other early Christian examples of martu" as "martyr" are either used absolutely or with the genitives, "of Christ" (*Mart. Pol.* 2.2), "of Jesus" (Rev 17:6), or an appropriate possessive pronoun (Acts 22:20; Rev 2:13), not with such a construction as "of the sufferings of Christ." The sufferings here are Christ's, as they are throughout the epistle, not Peter's. martu" is therefore best understood simply as "witness," or one who brings a message (BG[D], 494.2c). This role Peter and the elders in Asia Minor share. The common prototype for their ministries is "the spirit of Christ" among the prophets of old, who "predicted [promarturomenon, lit. "bearing witness beforehand"] the sufferings intended for Christ and the glorious events that would follow" (1:11). The construction twn tou Cristou paqhmatwn, "the sufferings of Christ," corresponds grammatically to the same phrase in 4:13 (see *Comment*), in contrast to ta ei" Criston paqhmata, "the sufferings intended for Christ," in 1:11. Nevertheless, whether the testimony is before or after the fact, the sufferings in view are the same.

The element of truth in the interpretation of martu" as "martyr" is that those called to benefit from Christ's sufferings are at the same time called to "follow in 2.his footsteps" (2:21; cf. 3:9), on a path that leads through the glad acceptance of suffering to glory and joy (4:13; cf. Goppelt, 322–23; Kelly, 198–99; Best, 168). Moreover, what is true of every disciple is all the more true of those who give leadership. Just as being a "witness to the sufferings of Christ" does not necessarily distinguish an apostle from other elders, so it does not distinguish an elder from other Christian believers. If elders are examples to the rest of the community (cf. v 3), they are examples meant to be followed, so that what is true of them is in principle true of all.

o kai th" melloush" apokaluptesqai doxh" koinwno", "and a sharer as well in the glory to be revealed." Peter supplies a new definite article for the third self-designation, koinwno", "sharer." koinwno" refers here to one who "shares in" something (BG[D], 439.1b), namely "the glory to be revealed," not one who "shares with" someone (BG[D], 439.1a), namely the elders. There is no umwn, "of you," to link Peter's own hope explicitly to that of the elders. Implicitly, however, the link is there because of the preceding designation, "fellow elder." Just as martu" is virtually equivalent to summartu", "fellow witness," so koinwno" is virtually equivalent to sugkoinwno", "fellow sharer" or "partner" (cf., e.g., Phil 1:7; Rev 1:9). That "the glory to be revealed" holds a particular reward for elders, and thus for Peter himself, is clear from v 4, but this does not change the fact that it is also the common hope of the entire Christian community (cf. 1:7, 13; 4:13). The distinctive terminology used here corresponds to that of Paul in Rom 8:18, weighing "the sufferings of the present time" against "the glory to be revealed to us" (pro" thn mellousan doxan apokalufqhnai ei" hma"). Whether Paul's language impressed itself on the memory of the Roman church or whether Romans and 1 Peter are both dependent on a common turn of phrase used by Jews and early Christians to contrast "present sufferings" and "future glory" is difficult to say (cf., e.g., *2 Apoc. Bar.* 15.8; 4 Ezra 7.16; 2 Cor 4:17). The latter is perhaps more likely because Peter's present infinitive (apokaluptesqai) appears to represent a more vulgar idiom than Paul's aorist (BD[F], § 338.3). It is hard to see why Peter would not have retained the aorist if he were writing with Romans before him (cf. Peter's use of the aorist with "salvation" in 1:5).

The use of kai, "also" or "as well," after the definite article confirms our conclusion that the role of "witness to the sufferings of Christ" in the preceding phrase involved "sharing" in some way in those sufferings. koinwno", "sharer," echoes the koinwneite,

"share in," of 4:13a (used in relation to Christ's sufferings), while the "glory to be revealed" corresponds to the revealing of Christ's glory mentioned in 4:13b. At the same time, the grammatical structure here recalls the earlier reference in 1:5 to a "salvation about to be revealed at the last day." The difference lies not in the use of the term "glory" instead of "salvation" (the two are virtually equivalent in this epistle) but simply in the fact that the emphasis in 1:5 is on the nearness of the salvation ("about to be revealed," with etoimhn), while the emphasis here is on its futurity ("to be revealed," with melloush"). Peter is a "sharer" now in a glory that belongs to the future; his language here has nothing to do with the tradition of his own presence at Jesus' Transfiguration (as Selwyn, 228–29, maintains, citing 2 Pet 1:16) but points once again to the common experience of all Christians, especially under threat of persecution (cf. 4:14, "for the [spirit of] that glory, even the Spirit of God, is resting upon you").

2poimanate to en umin poimnion tou qeou [episkopounte"] mh anagkastw" alla ekousiw" kata qeon, mhde aiscrokerdw" alla proqumw" "Shepherd the flock of God that is in your care. [Watch over it], not out of compulsion but willingly before God, not greedily but out of enthusiasm." The pastoral function of elders now becomes explicit (cf. Acts 20:28). The aorist imperative poimanate, "shepherd" (the only occurrence of the aorist of this verb in the N[T]), is in keeping with the many aorist imperatives in 1 Peter, for it establishes a pattern of behavior to be maintained until the end of the age (BD[F], § 337.2; see Comment on elpisate, "set your hope," in 1:13).

The command to "shepherd the flock of God" echoes the command of Jesus to Peter himself according to John 21:16: "Shepherd my sheep" (poimaine ta probata mou ; cf. "Feed my lambs" in 21:15, and "Feed my sheep" in 21:17). The "flock" belongs neither to the ciders nor to Peter. The emphasis of John's Gospel is that the flock belongs to Jesus, or at least to Jesus and the Father jointly (cf. John 10:11–18, 26–27, as well as 21:15–17). The characteristic phrase in *1 Clement* is "the flock of Christ" (see especially *1 Cle*[m] 54.2: "only let the flock of Christ have peace, with the elders set over it"; cf. 44.3, 57.2). To Peter, however, it is "the flock of God" (cf. "the church of God" in Acts 20:28), in keeping with the God-centered character of the material in 1 Peter on worship and ministry (e.g., vv 5–7; 4:10–11). His emphasis recalls that of the biblical prophets (e.g., "the Lord's flock," Jer 13:17; "the Lord God the Almighty will watch over his flock," Zech 10:3 LX[X]). Although Peter regards Christ as "the chief shepherd" (v 4), the "flock" belongs finally to God (cf. "people of God," in 2:10). tou qeou, "of God," makes this unmistakably clear in a way that even tou kuriou, "of the Lord," would not (for the Messiah "shepherding the Lord's flock," cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17.40).

en umin, "in your care" (lit., "among you"), has the effect of making "the flock of God" distributive. The translation, "among you," although appropriate for the same phrase in v 1, does not work as well here, for the members of congregations are not "among" the elders in quite the same sense in which the elders are "among" the members of the congregations. en umin here is better understood as "near you" or "with you" (BG[D], 258.1.1.c) in the respective cities or villages where the elders were exercising their ministries (by implication, therefore, "in your care"). What is true in the rest of the N[T] of ekklhsia, "church" (a word never used in 1 Peter), is true here of poimnion, or "flock": the one church or "flock of God" in the world is present in every local congregation wherever they may be (cf. Goppelt, 324, n. 18).

[episkopounte"] mh anagkastw" alla ekousiw" kata qeon, "[Watch over it], not

out of compulsion but willingly before God." The participle episkopounte", if original (see *Note* b*), exemplifies the epistle's characteristic pattern of an aorist imperative followed by one or more present participles (cf., e.g., 2:18–3:9 in relation to 2:13, 17; 4:8–11 in relation to 4:7). The verb episkopein, used in the N^T only here and (differently) in Heb 12:15, has not yet taken on the technical meaning, "to serve as bishop" (as, e.g., in Ign. *Rom.* 9.1; Ign. *Pol.* Inscr, and in Her^m *Vis.* 3.5.1). More simply, its effect is to interpret the metaphor of "shepherding the flock" as the responsibility to oversee and care for the needs of a Christian congregation. This function belongs first of all to Christ (see Comment on 2:25). Peter will acknowledge this shortly by his use of the expression, "chief shepherd" (v 4), but for the moment he simply wants to make clear (as he did not in 2:25) that the risen Christ cares for his people by means of the care and responsibility they take for one another. When there are elders in a congregation, the initiative is theirs; when there are not, the responsibilities of mutual love, hospitality, and ministry summarized in 4:8–10 are nevertheless still in effect. The same principle can be maintained even where an office of bishop is presupposed (as in Ignatius, speaking of the church in Syria without him as its "bishop": "Jesus Christ alone shall watch over her—and your love," Rom. 9.1).

anagkastw", "out of compulsion," is rare in Greek literature and occurs only here in the N^T, while the only other N^T use of ekousiw" (Heb 10:26) means "intentionally" rather than "willingly." Together the two adverbs, linked by mh … alla ("not … but"), form an appropriate contrast (cf. kata anagkhn and kata ekousion in Philem 14). The thought recalls 4:9, where Peter urged the practice of hospitality "without complaining" (in relation to ministry, cf. also Heb 13:17). Here he looks more deeply into the heart, at feelings that might or might not lead to the actual voicing of complaints.

The "compulsion" to which Peter refers is clearly a vice and not a virtue. It is what Paul warned the Corinthians against in connection with their giving (2 Cor 9:7: "not reluctantly or under compulsion [ex anagkh"], for God loves a cheerful giver"), and is in no way comparable to Paul's own "compulsion" (anagkh) to proclaim the gospel of Christ (1 Cor 9:16; note also Paul's contrast between ekwn, "willingly," and akwn, "unwillingly," in 9:17). Selwyn (230) calls it "the moral necessity which attaches to the discharge of the duties of an office," but his additional remark that this "is not enough without the right spirit and motives" betrays the fact that he reads the mh … alla contrast as "not only … but also" (cf. BD^F, § 448.1). This softened understanding of the contrast does not work, however, either in the next pair of adverbs ("not greedily but with enthusiasm"), or in v 3. Peter is not setting love over against mere duty, for duty is implied in any case in the phrase kata qeon, "before God," that immediately follows. Kelly (201) is closer to the truth in his comment that "the elders are to serve, not for their own satisfaction in the job, but as glad volunteers in God's service." Peter knows that the human ego is a severe and unhealthy taskmaster and that ministry all too often becomes a compulsive act of self-gratification. He wants it instead to be a free and joyous response to God's love.

ekousiw", "willingly," is where the emphasis lies. This adverb is used in the LX^X for free or voluntary service (Exod 36:2), sacrifice (Ps 53:8 [54:6]), or endurance of suffering (4 Macc 5:23), while the corresponding adjective ekousio" customarily refers to voluntary sacrifices or offerings (e.g., Lev 7:16; 23:38; Num 15:3; 29:39; Deut 12:6; Ps 118[119]:108; 2 Ezra 1:4, 6; 3:5, 8:28; Jud 4:14; 16:18). In a more general way the cognate verb ekousiazein, "to be willing," refers to the willingness of the people of Israel to serve the Lord (e.g., 2 Ezra 2:68; 7:13, 15–16; Neh 11:2; 1 Macc 2:42; some manuscripts of Judg 5:2,

9). A Hebrew equivalent (bdn

) is especially conspicuous in the Qumran literature for the willing acceptance of the conditions for membership in the covenant community (see, e.g., 1Q^{S} 1.7, 11; 5.1, 6, 8, 10, 21–22; 6.13–14; cf. Goppelt, 326). Peter's vision for the elders is that they undertake their ministries as tasks freely chosen, even though in fact their seniority has singled them out for these special responsibilities in their respective congregations. Their calling is to embrace the will of God freely and gratefully and so to make it their own. ekousiw", "willingly," is therefore inseparable in the author's mind from kata qeon, "before God" (cf. BG^{D}, 407.5a, and see Comment on 4:6). The voluntary nature of authentic ministry does not mean that it rests on merely human whims or desires; these only make the servant more compulsive. Like community membership at Qumran, the willing exercise of ministry involves solemn responsibility and accountability to God. This is where "duty," the factor Selwyn wants to contrast with freely given love (230), is shown to be an integral part of such love.

mhde aiscrokerdw" alla proqumw", "not greedily but with enthusiasm." The second contrasted pair (again, with mhde … alla) are not such natural opposites as the first. Obviously, a person can be both greedy and enthusiastic, or neither. The adverb aiscrokerdw", "greedily," appears to be otherwise unattested in ancient Greek literature, although the adjective aiscrokerdh", "greedy" (lit. "fond of dishonest gain"), is fairly common (see BG^{D}, 25). In one sense, "greedily" is a weak translation because the word implies not only greed, but greed that satisfies itself through fraud. Yet despite his strong language, Peter is not warning the elders specifically against fraud, only against being "in it for the money." His choice of words suggests that he considers this as serious as fraud. The connotations of "greed" in English make "greedily" an appropriate translation. Peter's concern presupposes that elders were paid for their labors, probably because this was the custom in his own church. His assumption is supported by the use of the adjective aiscrokerdh", "greedy," in relation to deacons in 1 Tim 3:8, and to "overseers" in Titus 1:7 (cf. v 11; note also Paul's disclaimer in Acts 20:33). Pol. *Phil.* 11 refers to an elder named Valens who had succumbed to "avarice" (*La*^{t}: *avaritia*) and was in need of restoration (cf. the warnings against "love of money" among ministers in 1 Tim 3:3; Pol. *Phil.* 5.2; and *Did.* 15.1, and more generally in 1 Tim 6:6–10; Heb 13:5).

proqumw", "with enthusiasm" (or "eagerly"), is as strongly positive in its meaning as "greedily" is negative (on the word group, see ^{K} Rengstorf in *TDN*^{T} 6:694–700). proqumw" in the present context reinforces and heightens the preceding ekousiw", yielding a cumulative force not unlike that of the English phrase, "ready and willing." Although the financial support of the congregations may help the elders fulfill their ministries, Peter insists that it must never become a necessary inducement for them to serve. Once again the adverb is found only here in the N^{T}, although it is not uncommon in the LX^{X} (cf. 2 Chr 29:34; Tob 7:8 ^{a}

2 Macc 6:28, 11:7; 4 Macc 1:1, 16:16; see also *Mart. Pol.* 8.3, 13.1; *Herm. Sim.* 9.28.2, 4).

3 mndE w" katakurieuonte" twn klhrwn alla tupoi ginomenoi tou poimniou, "Don't lord it over your congregations, but be examples to the flock." With the third contrasted pair (again set off by mndE … alla), Peter switches from adverbs back to participles with the same imperatival force as episkopounte", "watch over," in v 2. The introductory w" has little effect on the meaning (cf. w" in 2:16), but contributes to style and sound by echoing the <w" endings of the four preceding adverbs in v 2. The use of

katakurieuonte", "lord it over," recalls Jesus' warning to his disciples in Mark 10:42, and could represent another instance of Peter's awareness of the Jesus tradition (so Gundry, *NT*[S] 13.4 [1967] 344; differently, E. Best, *NT*[S] 16.2 [1970] 100). Although no direct connection can be proven, Peter's emphasis on servanthood is wholly consistent with the teaching attributed to Jesus in Mark 10:42–45//Matt 20:25–28//Luke 22:25–27, especially when account is taken of his appeal to Jesus as example in 2:21–23. It is doubtful, however, in light of his respect for secular authority (cf. 2:13–17), that Peter is making a point of contrasting (as in Mark 10:42) the behavior of Christian leaders with that of secular authorities. The verb katakurieuein occurs eighteen times in the LX[X], often in the sense of subduing an enemy, or ruling by force over unwilling subjects (cf. also Acts 19:16). The likely meaning here (especially against the background of v 2) is that elders "are not to exercise their power for themselves and therewith against those entrusted to them" (W. Foerster, *TDN*[T] 3:1098).

twn klhrwn, "your congregations" (lit., "the shares"). The translation is by necessity interpretative. klhro" denotes a "lot" (e.g., a pebble or stick), by which decisions were sometimes made in the ancient world; then by derivation a "portion" or "share" in something (e.g., land or an inheritance), traditionally assigned by the casting of lots (cf., e.g., Mark 15:24 and parallels, Acts 1:26); finally a "share" however assigned, but especially "by divine grace" (BG[D], 435.2; cf., e.g., Deut 10:9 LX[X]; Wisd Sol 5:5; Acts 1:17; 8:21; 26:18; Col 1:12).

Peter's use of twn klhrwn, here must be understood in light of the implied parallelism with tou poimniou, "the flock," at the end of the verse (the same "flock of God" mentioned in v 2; for klhro" in relation to sheep and shepherding, cf. *P. Magd.* 6.2–3, 38.4, cited by Spicq, 49–50). The reference is probably not to "the various parts of the congregation … assigned as 'portions' to the individual presbyters or shepherds" (BG[D], 435.2), nor to the role of the elders in "allocating offices and functions" to various individuals in the congregation (Kelly, 202–3, following W. Nauck, 209–13). Kelly finds these "offices and functions" in 4:10–11, but there is no evidence either that these charismatic gifts were exercised at the discretion of elders, or that 1 Peter presupposes anything like the developed ecclesiastical structure Nauck's theory requires (see Goppelt, 327–28). Nor is it plausible that Peter's choice of words has much to do with his use of klhronomia, or "inheritance," in 1:4 (Selwyn, 231: "the several parts of the spiritual klhronomia into which Christians had entered"). Rather, if the "flock of God" is universal in scope (cf. "your brotherhood throughout the world," v 9), then the "shares" are portions of the universal flock under the care of various elders, or groups of elders, i.e., their respective congregations (cf. Goppelt, 327: "die ihnen anvertraute Einzelgemeinde"; Spicq, 48: "leurs paroisses"). They are not spheres of authority assigned to different elders within each local congregation, but the local congregations themselves, the "flock of God that is in your care" (v 2). One does not "lord it over" offices or ministries, but over people, and "the shares" are essentially the people of God distributed in their respective cities and villages.

alla tupoi ginomenoi tou poimniou, "but be examples to the flock." On tupo" as a moral example, see BG[D], 830.5b; cf. Paul as tupo" to his churches in Phil 3:17 and 2 Thess 3:9; Timothy in 1 Tim 4:12; and Titus in Titus 2:7 (Peter uses a different word, upogrammon, in 2:21 for the example of Christ, although with much the same meaning). Here the contrast with "lording it over your respective congregations" places the emphasis not on exemplary moral behavior in general but specifically on setting an example of

humility and servanthood (cf. v 5b; also Mark 10:43–44 and parallels). The elders are to be good leaders of their congregations precisely by being good servants, so that the members of the congregation will in turn become servants to each other.

4 kai fanerwqento" tou arcipoimeno" komieisqe ton amarantinon th" doxh" stefanon, "and when the chief shepherd appears you will receive the unfading crown of glory." arcipoimhn, "chief shepherd," metaphorical here, is used literally of sheep masters in 2 Kings 3:4 Symm, *T. Jud.* 8.1, and contemporary Greek inscriptions (Deissmann, 99–101). Jesus Christ, called poimhn, "shepherd," in 2:25, is here designated arcipoimhn to distinguish him from the elders who, in function if not in name, are viewed as shepherds in their respective congregations. With this title, Peter seems to acknowledge the charge he himself is said to have received from Jesus according to John 21:15–17: "Feed my lambs.… Shepherd my sheep.… Feed my sheep" (cf. Jesus as ton poimena … ton megan, "the great shepherd," in Heb 13:20; also as "good shepherd" in John 10:11, 14).

The same word (fanerwqento") used in 1:20 of Christ's "appearing" on earth for redemption (as a "faultless and flawless lamb," 1:19) refers here to his future appearing in glory (as "chief shepherd"). The chief shepherd's "appearing" is the same event as the "revelation of Jesus Christ" (1:7, 13), or of his "glory" (4:13; 5:1), or of "salvation" (1:5). While the reference to the first "appearing" (possibly based on traditional forms; see *Form/Structure/Setting* on 1:13–21) presents Christ as "lamb," or innocent victim, the reference to the second (probably Peter's own formulation) presents Christ as "shepherd," or glorious victor, who rewards the faithful (for the verb in relation to Christ's "first coming," cf. 1 Tim 3:16; Heb 9:26; 1 John 1:2; 3:5, 8; in relation to the second, cf. Col 3:4; 1 John 2:28; 3:2).

komieisqe, "you will receive" (i.e., "receive payment," or "collect a reward"; cf. BG^{D} 442–43.2). Peter's use of this verb, both here and in 1:9, could suggest that the issue of faith versus works is behind him. This may in fact be the case, yet Paul's use of the same verb in 2 Cor 5:10 (cf. Eph 6:8; Col 3:25; Heb 10:36; 11:39) serves as a reminder that the notion of future glory as payment or reward for a good life is not inconsistent with the principle of salvation through faith alone. The reason Peter introduces the language of remuneration here is rather to set before the elders the proper alternative to shepherding their congregations for financial gain (cf. aiscrokerdw", "greedily," v 2b). They are working for a reward but not for a temporal or corruptible reward. Their reward is designated ton amarantinon th" doxh" stefanon, "the unfading crown of glory" (for "crown of glory" in the LX^{X}, cf. Jer 13:18; Lam 2:15; see also Isa 22:18, 28:5; 1Q^{S} 4.7; 1Q^{H} 9.25; *T. Benj.* 4.1).

The "crown," actually a victor's wreath (cf. BG^{D}, 767; also W. Grundmann, *TDN*^{T} 7:629–31), has to do not with the authority to rule but with a divinely conferred honor (cf. "praise, glory, and honor" in 1:7). The genitive th" doxh", "of glory," is appositional: the "crown" or "wreath" is glory, the same glory to which Peter referred in 1:7, 4:13–14, and 5:1, the glory to be revealed at the future "revelation of Jesus Christ." It must be remembered that "crown" is a metaphor, while "glory" is the reality that interprets the metaphor (cf. "crown of life" in James 1:12, Rev 2:10). The accent is not on the elders as individuals, as if each will have his or her own "crown," but rather on the common glory in which all are "sharers" (cf. koinwno", "sharer," in v 1). This would be true even if Peter had spoken of "crowns" in the plural, but the fact that "crown" as well as "glory" is singular puts it beyond question. The other uses of "glory" in 1 Peter make it clear, in fact, that the

"crown of glory" promised here is not for elders alone, but for all who share in the Christian hope. The elders will receive their "crown" like everyone else in the congregation, for doing what they were called to do (cf. 3:9).

Peter accents the metaphorical character of the crown or wreath by describing it as amarantinon, or "unfading" (cf. the amaranton, "unfading," inheritance of 1:4; see *Comment*). In contrast to 1:4, where the adjective is as abstract as the two adjectives with which it is grouped (afqartou, "incorruptible," and amianton, "undefiled"), Peter probably refers here to actual flowers from which wreaths were made, and makes them part of the metaphor (cf. BG[D], 42; Selwyn, 233). Beare (201) aptly notes that amarantinon is "a denominative adjective formed from amaranto" in its substantival use as the name of a flower" (i.e., the amaranth; for the phrase, "crown of amaranth," cf. Philostratus, *Heroicus* 19.14). The meaning of the metaphor, however, is much the same as the meaning of 1:4: the believer's inheritance is the everlasting glory and honor that comes from Christ alone. Without the explicit development of athletic imagery (as, e.g., in 2 Tim 2:5; 4:7–8), Peter reinforces the argument of Paul in I Cor 9:25 that athletes compete for "a corruptible crown" (fqarton stefanon), but "we for an incorruptible" (afqarton).

5 ïOmoiw", newteroi, upotaghte presbuteroi", "You in turn who are younger must defer to the authority of elders." For the reciprocal use of omoiw" (i.e., as "in turn," or "for your part"), cf. the transition from wives to husbands in 3:7. The style is that of the household duty codes (cf. upotassein, "defer," in 2:13, 18; 3:1, 5); Kelly even suggests that v 5a is a "detached fragment" of that code which Peter has "transferred here for reasons of his own" (204). It is true that roles belonging to the household and roles belonging to worshiping congregations are sometimes dealt with together in early Christian literature (cf., e.g., Pol. *Phil.* 4–6: husbands and wives in 4.1–2, widows in 4.3–5.1, deacons in 5.2, "the younger" and virgins in 5.3, "the elders" in 6.1–3; cf. also *1 Cle*[m] 1.3). Yet there is no concrete evidence for presbuteroi and newteroi ("elder" and "younger") as designations for groups in the individual household (like "children" and "parents" in Eph 6:1–4; Col 3:20–21). The sphere of the "elder/younger" distinction is either the society at large (cf. BG[D], 536.2b) or a religious community within it (even Kelly's discussion, 205, tacitly acknowledges this). Here in 1 Peter it is clearly a matter of a religious community and not the household. The terms "younger" and "elder" fit their present context far better than that of the household duty code. The formal resemblance to the latter is attributable simply to the fact that Peter needs only a brief admonition here and finds it most convenient to pattern it after the household admonitions to "defer" in 2:18 and 3:1 (see *Form/Structure/Setting* and cf. Goppelt, 330). Because a rather full description of the responsibilities of "elders" was given already in vv 1–4, the translation "defer to the authority of" is more appropriate here than simply "defer."

The introduction of newteroi, "younger ones" (cf. 1 Tim 5:1–2; Titus 2:6) has caused some commentators to have second thoughts about presbuteroi. Many commentators speak of a "switch" from "official" elders in vv 1–4 to simply the older members of the congregations in contrast to younger ones in v 5 (e.g., Selwyn, 233; Kelly, 205). Yet the same word is used here as in v 1, and both times it is used without the definite article. If (as is widely acknowledged) the "elders" of v 1 are also "older people," there is little reason to doubt that the "older people" of v 5 are, at the same time, "elders" exercising leadership in the congregations (cf. 1 Tim 5:1–2, 17).

Some have attempted to define newteroi as a distinct subordinate order of ministers

(deacons, perhaps, or else "novices" on the way to becoming elders). This view might appeal either to the newteroi who buried Ananias according to Acts 5:6, or to the parallelism between o newtero", "the younger," and o diakonwn, "the one who serves," in Luke 22:26. Yet neither of these Lukan passages appears to use the term in any technical sense, and the notion of "younger ones" as a distinct order in the congregation remains unproven (note that even in Pol. *Phil.* 5.3, where the "younger ones" are addressed separately, they are told to "defer" both "to the elders and deacons, as to God and Christ").

In 1 Clement, written from Rome a decade or two after 1 Peter (see *Introduction*), the uprising of "the young against the old" (lit "elders," 3.3; cf. Isa 3:5) is later explained as "the steadfast and ancient church of the Corinthians rebelling against its elders" (*1 Cle*m 47.6; cf. 44.3–6; see also 54.2b, "only let the flock of Christ have peace with the elders set over it"). It is likely, therefore, that Peter is using newteroi as a way of addressing the rest of the people to whom he writes (i.e., all those who were not elders). If this was his intent, agaphtoi would have been another option, but he has already used agaphtoi for the very different purpose of marking major divisions in his epistle (i.e., in 2:11; 4:12). Such an interpretation of newteroi implies a generic use of the word (like Peter's use of presbuteroi) rather than a distinctly masculine one (as, e.g., in 1 Tim 5:1; Titus 2:6; Pol. *Phil.* 5.3). Since Peter seems to have little exact knowledge of the forms of ministry in the congregations to which he is writing, he probably intends to leave open the gender of the "elders" as well, both here and in v 1. Although he accomplishes his intent differently, the effect is much the same as in 1 Tim 5:1–2, where male and female "elders" and "younger ones" are mentioned explicitly.

In contrast to the strong emphasis on "submission" or "deference" in the household duty codes, the command to defer to elders is kept very brief. There is no evidence (as, e.g., in 1 Clement in relation to the Corinthians) that Peter knows of any cases of rebellion against the elders' authority. Although his terminology of "elders" and "younger" may have been adapted from a formalized code of some kind encompassing both household and congregation (cf. Pol. *Phil.* 4.1–6.3; *1 Cle*m 1.3), Peter's use of it seems to have much the same purpose as the advice of Paul (1 Thess 5:12–14; 1 Cor 16:15–16), or of the author of Hebrews (13:17), to congregations as a whole: "respect your leaders" (whether the leaders are called "elders" or not).

pante" de allhloi" thn tapeinofrosunhn egkombwsasqe, "All of you with each other, then, clothe yourselves with humility" (cf. 1Q^{S} 5.23–25, describing the order of the Qumran community: "that every man may obey his companion, the man of lesser rank obeying his superior"). pante" de allhloi" is not a postscript to v 5a, as if Peter were saying, "Younger ones defer to the elders, and everyone to each other" (cf. *Note* d*). Rather, these words introduce a new sentence, in which pante", "all," gathers into a single command the preceding advice to "elders" and "Younger ones" alike (cf. 3:8, where pante" performs a similar function for 2:13–3:7). The accompanying allhloi", "toward each other," picks up the note of mutuality sounded in 4:8–10, where the proper stance of believers "toward each other" in their congregations was love (v 8), hospitality (v 9), and service (v 10). Here it is summarized as thn tapeinofrosunhn, "humility" (cf. tapeinofrone", "humble of mind," in 3:8). The readers of the epistle are to "clothe" themselves with humility as with a garment (on the etymology of egkombwsasqe, "clothe," lit. "fasten on," see Selwyn, 234; for the clothing metaphor, cf. anazwsamenoi, "gird yourselves," in 1:13, and oplisasqe, "arm yourselves," in 4:1). It is possible,

although far from certain, that Peter is alluding to the action of Jesus in girding himself with a towel to wash the disciples' feet in John 13:4 (contrast again R. H. Gundry, *NT*[S] 13.4 [1966–67] 345, with E. Best, *NT*[S] 16.2 [1969–70] 99). The vocabulary is in any case different; the metaphor used in 1:13 shows Peter's familiarity with the language of "girding oneself," and he has not chosen that language here.

oti o qeo" uperhfanoi" antitassetai, tapeinoi" de didwsin carin, "for 'God opposes the arrogant, but gives grace to the humble.'" oti, "for" or "because," introduces a Scripture quotation, as in 4:8 (cf. dioti in 1:24 and gar in 3:10, with much the same meaning). The quotation follows exactly the LX[X] of Prov 3:34 (except for o qeo", "God," instead of the kurio", "Lord," of the LX[X]; Peter consistently reserves kurio" for Jesus Christ). The same quotation (with the same faithfulness to the LX[X]) occurs in James 4:6b, where it is linked to its context by the concluding words didwsin carin, "gives grace" (picking up meizona de didwsin carin, "but he gives more grace," from 4:6a). The same text is handled similarly in *1 Cle*[m] 30.2, where the author adds, "Let us then join ourselves to those to whom grace is given from God" (30.3). In 1 Peter, by contrast, the quotation is introduced for the sake of the word tapeinoi", "to the humble" (picking up thn tapeinofrosunhn, "humility," from its own immediate context, while at the same time anticipating the imperative tapeinwqhte, "humble yourselves," with which v 6 begins).

Yet the contrast between Peter's use of Prov 3:34 and the uses to which the text is put in James and 1 Clement is far from absolute. James, for example, accents the thought of tapeinoi" in different words with the appended command, upotagnhte oun tw qew, "yield [or defer] to God," in 4:7 (cf. tapeinwqhte in v 10). Peter, for his part, subtly highlights the quotation's emphasis on divine "grace" in three ways: first, with the promises of v 6 ("when it is time he will lift you up") and v 7 ("he cares about you"); second, with the mention in v 10 of "the God of all grace," who will "prepare, support, strengthen, and establish" the epistle's readers; finally in v 12, with a reference to the epistle itself as "true grace from God."

As for the quotation itself, the attentive reader of the epistle will have no difficulty concluding that the "arrogant" are the despisers of the Christian movement mentioned, for example, in 2:12; 3:16; and 4:4–5, while the "humble" are the believers themselves, depicted as Peter wants them to be. The present tenses of the verbs antitassetai, "opposes" (cf. James 5:6), and didwsin, "gives," are at least in part futuristic. Although divine vindication in 1 Peter is a present certainty (cf., e.g., 3:12), it is fully realized only when "the grace to be brought to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (1:13) actually arrives. Peter's final appeal in vv 6–11 (specifically vv 6b, 10) will be to this future vindication of those who now face ridicule and even suffering at the hands of the "arrogant."

Explanation

The thrust of the passage is not that the prospect of suffering and of the end of the world requires the leadership of "elders"—no elders were mentioned in 4:7–l1, even though "the end of all things" had drawn near. It is rather that in congregations where elders are in charge, the elders have a unique responsibility to prepare the "house of God" for the "judgment" now beginning. Everything demanded of them under "normal" circumstances is demanded with far greater urgency because of the "time" (cf. 4:17). They must guide and

shepherd their charges not for financial gain or ego satisfaction but willingly and without complaint. Instead of taking on themselves more and more "emergency powers," they must become examples of servanthood and humility to the entire "flock of God." Their congregations in turn must respect the elders' authority, but more than that, follow the elders' example by becoming servants to each other in the face of mounting threats among those hostile to their movement in their respective cities and villages. Once again, as in 3:10–12, Peter articulates his hope of vindication through all this in the words of Scripture: God "opposes the arrogant and gives grace to the humble"—now and forever.

Humility and Exaltation (5:6–11)

Bibliography

Davids, P. H. *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGT[C] Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982. 165–68. **Horsley, G. H. R.** *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. North Ryde, N.S.W.: Macquarie University, 1983. 3:50–51. **Lövestam, E.** *Spiritual Wakefulness in the New Testament*. Lund, 1963.60–64. **Ogara, F.** "Adversarius … diabolus tamquam leo rugiens." *V*[D] 16 (1936) 166–73. **Quinn, J. D.** "Notes on the Text of the [P72] 1 Pt 2,3; 5,14; and 5,9." *CB*[Q] 27 (1965) 241–49. **Schwank, B.** "Diabolus tamquam leo rugiens (1 Petr 5,8)." *Erbe und Auftrag* 38 (1962) 15–20.

Translation

[6]*So humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, and when it is time*[a] *he will lift you up.* [7]*All your anxiety you may throw on him, for he cares about you.*[b] [8]*Pay attention! Wake up!*[c] *Your opponent, the devil,*[d] *is on the move like a roaring lion ready to swallow [his prey]*[e] [9]*Resist him, firm in faith, knowing that the same kinds of suffering are being accomplished*[f] *in your brotherhood throughout the world.*[g] [10]*But the God of all grace, who called you in Christ*[h] *to his eternal glory—after you have suffered a little—he will prepare, support, strengthen, and establish*[i] *[you].* [11]*To him belongs the might*[j] *forever.*[k] *Amen.*

Notes

a. Some MS[s] ([A] [P] v[g] and others) add to the simple en kairw, "when it is time," the genitive episkoph" (i.e., "at the time of visitation"). Possibly this change was prompted by the en hmera episkoph", "on the day of visitation," in 2:12 (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 696), but more likely the memory of the phrase en kairw episkoph" autwn, "in the time of their visitation," either in Jer 6:15 LX[X] or Wisd Sol 3:7 (both standing in contexts rich in parallels to 1 Peter) has been at work in the tradition (cf. also Isa 10:3; Jer 10:15; Wisd Sol 3:13; and see Comment on 2:12). In any case the shorter readong is to be preferred. It is unlikely that the majority of MS[s], including the earliest and best ([P72] [a]

and [B]), would have omitted episkoph" had it been original.

b. A few MS[s] (including [a]

[*] have hmwn, “us,” in place of umwn, “you,” a reading that may at first appear to be the more difficult one because of the umwn, “your,” in the preceding clause. The manuscript evidence, however, is too weak. The first person plural probably represents a scribal attempt to make Peter’s words of comfort more general in their application (cf. “from us” in 4:17).

c. A number of ancient MS[s] (including [P72] [a]

[L] Y, the O[L] versions and the v[g)] connect these imperatives to what follows with oti (“because”). This could be another case in which oti followed by o caused textual confusion (cf. 4:17; 5:5), but it is more likely that the transition from the imperatives to a declarative sentence about the “opponent” seemed abrupt to scribes, and that the addition of oti was a natural way of smoothing the connection.

d. A very few MS[s] (including [P72]) add the definite article before diabolo", “devil,” in order to make it clear that it is a title (“your opponent, the devil”) rather than simply an adjective (i.e., “your slanderous opponent”). This is undoubtedly the correct interpretation in any event, but the manuscript evidence is far from sufficient to consider the definite article original.

e. There is great variation in the MS[s]. The reading tina katapiein, “someone to devour,” is supported by [a]

[c] and (with certain slight variations) by [a]

[*] [K] [P] and others. Yet in the majority of MS[s] (including [P72] [A] v[g] and others), the subjunctive katapihappears instead of the infinitive katapiein, evidently as a result of tina being accented as an interrogative (tina: “seeking whom he might swallow”; see BD[F], § 368). [A] few MS[s] (including [B] and Y) have the infinitive katapiein without any pronoun (i.e., simply, “seeking to swallow”). Despite the strong combined manuscript evidence for tina (however accented), this short reading explains well the origin of the others. Possibly a scribe inserted tina because of the harshness of katapiein without an object, and the other variants came into being because of uncertainty over how the added word should be accented and read (cf. Beare, 205). Another scenario (i.e., that tina katapiein was original and that [B] omitted tina either because of the same uncertainty or purely by accident) is also possible (cf. Metzger, *Textual Comity*, 696–97), but less likely in view of the awkwardness of the shorter reading. Hence the translation, “ready to swallow,” with “his prey” supplied.

f. Some important MS[s] ([a]

[A] B[*] and others) have epiteleisqe, so that the clause reads, “knowing that you are accomplishing the same kinds of suffering as your brotherhood in the world.” Although epiteleisqe can be simply a defective spelling for epiteleisqai (BD[F], § 25), the fact that certain late minuscule MS[s] that have this reading (e.g., 614, 630, 1505) also insert the customary oti, “that,” after eidote", “knowing” (cf. 1:18), shows that they were reading the form as a finite verb (cf. [P72], oti … epiteleitai). The infinitive epiteleisqai, the reading of the majority (including B[2] [P] Y and all the Lat. and Syr. versions) is clearly to be

preferred; the oldest examples of epiteleisqe ([a]

[A] B[* K)] are probably defective spellings of the infinitive.

g. The majority of MS[s] (including [a]

[2 A P] Y) lack the definite article with "world" (i.e., en kosmw), while [P72 a]

[* B] and others retain it (i.e., en tw kosmw). The weight of the evidence favors the article. Possibly it was omitted because its presence heightened the mistaken impression that umwn, "your," belonged with kosmw, "world," rather than with "brotherhood" (see BD[F,] § 284.1).

h. The majority of MS[s] (including [P72 A P] Y O[L] versions and v[g)] add "Jesus," but the shorter reading of [a]

and a few later witnesses (en Cristw; [B] adds the definite article) is preferable "in view of the tendency of scribes to add rather than omit sacred names" (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 697).

i. The third of these verbs (sqenwsei) is omitted in some MS[s] ([P72] and certain Lat. versions), and the fourth (qemeliwsei) is omitted in others (including [A B] Y). These are probably accidental omissions due to the similar verb endings. Other textual traditions change one or more of the future indicatives to optatives (e.g., the majority of later MS[s] change "restore" to an optative, katartisai, and supply uma" with it), but these are secondary stylistic modifications.

j. The majority of MS[s] (including [a]

[P)] insert a reference to "glory" (h doxa) before "might" (to krato"), while others reverse the order. The uncertainty of the placement of soxa, as well as the strong manuscript evidence for the shorter reading ([P72 A B] Y and others), strongly suggests that "might" alone is original and that "glory" was added with 4:11 in mind.

k. A longer ending, "forever and ever" (with twn aiwnwn added), is found in the majority of MS[s] (including [a]
[A P] Y and the Lat. and Syr. versions), but these words (missing in [P72 B] and a few other MS[s]) are again probably a liturgical expansion prompted by 4:11.

Form/Structure/Setting

These six verses are most appropriately understood as Peter's exposition of the text of Prov 3:34 LX[X] quoted in v 5b. James, in similar fashion, cites the same text in 4:6b and expounds it in 4:7–10. It is natural to explore the relationship between Peter's use of the text and that of James. Is Peter dependent on James? James on Peter? Are both drawing on a common early Christian exegesis of Prov 3:34? Or do the two have only the text itself in common?

Peter's interpretation centers on tapeinoi", "the humble," from the quotation (cf. tapeinwqhte, "humble yourselves," v 6), and on o qeo", "God," supplied in v 5b as the subject of the quote (cf. vv 6–7, 10). In connection with this God-centered emphasis, however, Peter introduces as well a reference to "your opponent, the devil" (vv 8–9). It is not hard to see how the devil might have come into the picture on the basis of uperhfanoi", "the arrogant," in the quotation. If Peter perceived "disobedient spirits"

behind groups in the Roman Empire who unjustly slandered and accused Christian believers (cf. 3:19), it is not surprising that the devil is within his horizons as well. What is surprising is that the devil is mentioned only here in the entire epistle. The unspoken supposition of vv 8–9 is that believers will be able to "resist" the devil because God "opposes" both him and his proud cohorts. This is tacitly confirmed in v 10 without further mention of the devil. Peter is less interested in apocalyptic battles between God and Satan than in a simple affirmation of God's sovereignty as a basis for quiet confidence and trust (cf. 4:19).

James's interpretation of Prov 3:34 LX[x] is slightly different. Already in 4:6a, he anticipates the phrase, "gives grace," with which the quotation concludes. His exposition of the text in 4:7–10 exhibits the same God-centered quality as Peter's. This is evident in vv 7a, 8a, and particularly in v 10, which concludes James's exposition on much the same note with which Peter began his: "Humble yourselves before the Lord, and he will lift you up." James also combines the notion of humbly submitting to God with that of resisting the devil (v 7b). The rest of James 4:7–10 (i.e., vv 8b–9), however, is quite different from 1 Peter. If it has anything to do with the Proverbs text at all, it is addressed to the "arrogant" and not to the "humble" (cf. James 5:1–6, and possibly the end of 5:6 in particular, "does he not oppose you?"; cf. Davids, 180).

The main point of similarity between Peter and James is the close association between humble submission to God and successful resistance to the devil. There is little evidence here of a direct literary relationship between the two epistles, but it is possible to imagine as a common source a couplet (used perhaps in the instruction of new converts) similar in form and content to James 4:10 and 4:7b:

a. "Humble yourselves before the Lord, and he will lift you up."
b. "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you."

With such a couplet (in addition to Prov 3:34) as their starting point, it is possible that James and Peter have constructed their respective sets of admonitions, each adapted to the author's distinctive purpose. On such a hypothesis, James would have used (a) twice (4:7a, 10) as a frame for the whole, then completed the thought of (b) with a sequel ("Draw near to God, and he will draw near to you," 4:8a), and finally supplied his own denunciatory material (4:8b–9) adapted to the broader context of 4:1–6 and 4:13–5:6. Peter would have led off in vv 6–7 with his own adaptation and expansion of (a), then made (b) the centerpiece (v 9a, "resist") of a significant call to respond to the challenge of persecution (vv 8–9), and finally supplied vv 16–11 as a word of promise and praise.

It is equally plausible, however, that James 4:7–10 and 1 Pet 5:6–11 are simply independent reflections on Prov 3:34 LX[x], with no additional common source (for still another use of this text, cf. *1 Cle*[m] 30.1–3, where the word "arrogance" at the end of 30.1 leads into the quotation in 30.2, and the quotation's statement that "God … gives grace" is picked up significantly in 30.3). There is no question that Peter draws on a variety of traditions in these verses, possibly including sayings of Jesus (in vv 6b, 7, and 8a) as well as early metaphorical descriptions of Christian life in the world as spiritual warfare (e.g., Eph 6:16–17, especially vv 10–11, 13; also 1 Thess 5:6–8). Selwyn assigns the material to a traditional "Persecution-Form" (439–58), but the very different emphases in James and *1 Clement* suggest that the accent on persecution is Peter's own contribution.

Comment

6 Tapeinwqhte oun upo thn krataian ceira ieu qeou, ina umw" uywsh en kairw, "So humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, and when it is time he will lift you up." The expression "they were humbled under their hands" is used negatively in Ps 105[106]:42 of being overthrown by enemies, but Peter uses it in a positive sense here of submission to God's care and protection. The reference to God as tou qeou (with the definite article) recalls the o qeo" of v 5b (in the larger context, cf. v 2 and v 10). The particle oun "so" or "therefore," introduces a conclusion to be drawn from the text just quoted: God "gives grace to the humble"; therefore "humble yourselves" before God (as well as each other: cf. v 5a). The use of the passive tapeinwqhte, "humble yourselves," as a middle is distinctive enough (here and in James 4:10) to lend some support to the notion that Peter and James may be drawing on a common source (see *Form/Structure/Setting*). More frequent is the active voice with the reflexive pronoun, eauton, "oneself," as in Phil 2:8, and in a Synoptic saying of Jesus to much the same effect as Peter's statement here (Luke 14:11, 18:14: "For everyone who lifts himself up will be humbled, and everyone who humbles himself will be lifted up"; cf. Matt 23:12; also Matt 18:4). Although imperatives of tapeinoun are rare, the LX^X provides examples of both the aorist passive, as here (i.e. Gen 16:9; Jer 13:18), and the aorist active imperative, the latter with ta" yuca" umwn, "your souls," rather than eautou", "yourselves," as object (i.e. Lev 16:29; cf. 16:31; 23:27, 32).

Instead of simply "before God" (or "before the Lord," cf. James 4:10), Peter adopts the biblical imagery of God's "mighty hand," a phrase used especially in connection with God's deliverance of Israel from slavery in Egypt (in the Pentateuch alone, cf. Exod 3:19; 6:1, 13:3, 9, 14, 16; Deut 3:24; 4:34; 5:15; 6:21; 7:8, 19; 9:26, 29; 11:2; 26:8; 29:3; 34:12; on the "hand of God," see further E. Lohse, *TDN*^{T} 9:427). The adjective krataian, "mighty," anticipates krato", "might," in Peter's doxology in v 11 while echoing the same ascription in 4:11. The theme of humility, or humiliation, and exaltation is conspicuous in the O^T (e.g. 1 Sam 2:7–8; Isa 1:25; 2:11; 40:4; Ezek 17:24; Job 5:11; Sir 7:11), in the Gospel tradition (not only Luke 14:11 and 18:14; Matt 18:4 and 23:12; but Luke 1:52), and elsewhere in early Christian literature (2 Cor 11:7; Phil 2:8–9; James 1:9, 4:10; cf. also *1 Cle*^{m} 59.3).

The coupling of an explicit or implicit command to humble oneself with an accompanying promise of divine exaltation is limited to this verse in 1 Peter, James 4:10, and the sayings of Jesus (cf. Goppelt, 337). It is quite possible that Peter's language is formulated with the remembered teaching of Jesus in view (to say nothing of Jesus' experience: cf. 3:18–22; also Phil 2:8). It is surprising that Gundry ignores this verse in building his case for Peter's use of the Gospel tradition (Spicq, 44, mentions it only in passing). Whether Peter is aware of a particular saying of Jesus or not, it should be kept in mind that he is first of all interpreting a biblical text, and that the authority to which he here appeals rests in that text, not in the Jesus tradition (cf. Best, 107). The promise that "when it is time he will lift you up," is therefore Peter's application of the principle that God "gives grace to the humble" (v 5b).

en kairw, "when it is time" (lit, "in a time"), can mean simply "the right time" in an indefinite sense (as in Matt 24:45). In the setting of 1 Peter, however, it corresponds to en kairw escatw, "at the last day," in 1:5b (kairo", "[it is] time," in 4:17 is different in that it is qualified by the infinitive, "to begin," that immediately follows; see *Comment*). Peter

has in mind the time "when Jesus Christ is revealed" (1:7, 13), or "the chief shepherd appears" (v 4), i.e., the "end of all things" (4:7; cf. BGD, 395.3). kairo" normally takes the definite article when used in this eschatological sense (e.g., Mark 13:33; Luke 21:8; Rev 1:3; 22:10), but not in prepositional phrases (cf., e.g., pro kairou, "before the time," in Matt 8:29; 1 Cor 4:5, where the "time" is clearly eschatological; also perhaps acri kairou, "until the time," in Luke 4:13). This verse is given a martyrological interpretation in the late second-century epistle from the churches of Vienne and Lyons in Gaul to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, recorded in Eusebius, HE 5.1–3: "They [the martyrs] humbled themselves under the mighty hand, by which they have now been greatly lifted up" (5.2.5; the decisive kairo" is reinterpreted as "now," the hour of the martyrs' death).

7 merimnan umwn epiriyante" epÆ auton, oti autw melei peri umwn, "All your anxiety you may throw on him, for he cares about you." epiriyante", "throw," unlike many participles in 1 Peter, is not strictly imperatival in meaning (cf. Goppelt, 337; Kelly, 208). Peter's imperatival participles are present rather than aorist (with only two possible exceptions, 1:13 and 2:1, where aorist participles stand first in the sentence). The participle epiriyante" reinforces the command given in v 6a without adding a new command. Its effect is simply to define tapeinwqhte, "humble yourselves," as the equivalent of Peter's advice to his readers in 4:19 to "entrust their lives to the faithful Creator in the doing of good" (cf. Kelly's observation that the self-humbling of v 6a is explained here not as "negative self-abandonment or resignation," but as "the positive entrusting of oneself and one's troubles to God"). The thrust of the participle is not that the readers of the epistle are commanded to do this, but that in doing it they have the certainty that God cares for them and will not let them down.

Although not itself imperatival, Peter's warning against thn merimnan, "anxiety," is derived from an imperative in Ps 54:23 [55:22] LXX: epirriyon epi kurion thn merimnan sou, "Throw your anxiety on the Lord" (for other adaptations of this verse, cf. Herm. *Vis.* 3.11.3; 4.2.4–5). Again there are parallels in thought with Jesus' teaching: e.g., whole series of admonitions not to "worry" or "be anxious" (merimnan) in Matt 6:25–34 and in Luke 12:22–32. Closer to Peter's sphere of interest is Luke 12:11: "And when they bring you to the synagogues and the rulers and the authorities, do not be anxious (mh merimnhshte) how or what you are to answer or what you are to say" (cf. 1 Pet 3:15; 4:14). Here too, as in v 6, the real source of Peter's terminology is the biblical text and not the Jesus tradition.

oti autw melei peri umwn, "for he cares about you" (lit. "it matters to him about you"). The impersonal verb melei is used of God's universal care in Wisd Sol 12:13; Philo, *Flacc* 102; and Josephus, *Ant.* 7.45, and ironically of Greek gods in Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 5.34 ("what care do the 'philanthropic' gods have for men.… in comparison with their care for statues?"). Paul too uses it ironically, in 1 Cor 9:9, to shift attention from God's care for oxen to his care for Christian believers. Peter's interest is less in God's universal care for the creation (even though he acknowledges God as "the faithful Creator," 4:19), than in God's special protecting care for those who believe in Christ and face suffering for his sake. Although none of the language comes from the Gospel tradition (with the possible exception of merimna in the previous clause), the thought is very close to that of Jesus in Matt 6:25–34 (e.g., v 26, "Look at the birds of the air.… Are you not of more value than they?"; v 30, "But if God so clothes the grass of the field.… will he not much more clothe you?") and Luke 12:22–32 (cf. vv 24, 28).

8 Nhyate, grhgorhsate: o antidiko" umwn diabolo" w" lewn wruomeno" peripatei zhtwn katapiein "Pay attention! Wake up! Your opponent, the devil, is on the move like a roaring lion ready to swallow [his prey]." Peter has used the imperative nhyate, "pay attention," once before, in relation to prayer (4:7), and it is remotely possible that prayer is implied here as well, perhaps as an alternative to the "anxiety" mentioned in v 7 (cf. Phil 4:6: "Have no anxiety about anything [mhden merimnate], but in everything with prayer and petition … make your requests known to God"). The verb grhgorein is also associated with prayer in the Gospel accounts of Jesus in Gethsemane (Mark 14:38//Matt 26:41) and in Col 4:2 (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 3.1–2). More likely, however, these strong imperatives are simply a call to the readers to prepare themselves in mind and spirit for decisive battle with their one great enemy, the devil (cf. 1:13, where the phrase nhfonte" teleiw", "with full attention," further defined Peter's call to "Gird yourselves for action … in your mind"; also the association of swfronhsate, "prepare yourselves mentally," with nhyate in 4:7).

The two aorist imperatives are both "ingressive" and "programmatic" in setting a new course of action once and for all (like elpisate in 1:13; see BD[F.] § 337.2, and Comment on 1:13). grhgorhsate, "wake up," should be distinguished from the more common grhgoreite, "stay awake," of the Synoptic tradition (cf. Matt 24:42; 25:13; 26:38; 41; Mark 13:37; 14:34, 38; cf. Acts 20:31; 1 Cor 16:13; *Did.* 16.1; also grhgorwmen, "let us stay awake," in 1 Thess 5:6), while nhyate, "pay attention," has a different connotation from the nhfe, "be steady" (RS[v]) of 2 Tim 4:5, or the nhfwmen, "let us be sober," of 1 Thess 5:6, 8 (cf. rather eknhyate dikaiw", "come to your right mind" [RS[v]] in 1 Cor 15:34).

Although the two verbs are used together in 1 Thess 5:6, the closest parallel to Peter's use of them is not in the N[T] but in the second-century epistle from the churches of Vienne and Lyons preserved by Eusebius (see above on v 6). The account refers to a woman named Biblis who had denied Christ under torture, and whom, therefore, "the devil thought that he had already swallowed up" (HE 5.1.25). She was then subjected to further torture to get her to denounce other Christians, but "once on the rack she came to her senses [anenhyen] and awoke [anegrhgorhsen], as if from a deep sleep." The story concludes that "from then on she confessed that she was a Christian, and was counted among the number of the martyrs" (5.1.26).

o antidiko" umwn diabolo", "your opponent, the devil." Here alone in 1 Peter, opposition to the Christian movement is personified in a single "opponent," clearly identified as "the devil." Everywhere else in the epistle the opposition is plural: the "disobedient" of 2:7–8 and 4:17, the "Gentiles" of 2:12, "the foolish" in 2:15, the cruel masters of 2:18, the unbelieving husbands of 3:1, "those who denounce your good conduct" in 3:16, the "blasphemers" of 4:4b, the indefinite "they" in 3:14 and 4:14. antidiko", "opponent," is first of all an antagonist in a lawsuit (BG[D.] 74; cf., e.g., Matt 5:25; Luke 12:58; 18:3), and Peter may have chosen the term because of the possibility of Christians facing formal charges in courts of law (see Comment on 4:15). The setting, however, is not judicial; the word is used here to mean "opponent" or "enemy" in a very general sense.

diabolo", "the devil," refers consistently in the N[T] to Satan (Heb: ÷fc

, "accuser"), regarded in Christian tradition (and in the Judaism of Peter's day) as the archenemy of God and the source of evil in the world. Only when used adjectivally does diabolo" have another meaning (i.e., "slanderous," as in 1 Tim 3:11; 2 Tim 3:3; Titus 2:3;

Pol. *Phil.* 5.2; cf. BG[D,] 182.1). Although it is theoretically possible to read diabolo" as an adjective here ("your slanderous opponent"), it is difficult to imagine who such an opponent might be other than "the devil."

The range of meaning for diabolo", "the devil," and antidiko", "opponent," is quite similar. Just as "the devil," originally (like the Hebrew equivalent, "Satan") the slanderer or accuser in God's court (e.g., Job 2:1; Zech 3:1–2; cf. Rev 12:9–10), became the enemy of God and humanity in the broadest possible sense, so antidiko", "opponent," can have both a narrower and a broader meaning. If the devil is an accuser or a courtroom antagonist here, it is not in the court of heaven (as, e.g., in Rev 12:10), but before pagan magistrates—hardly his traditional role (although cf. Rev. 2:10). Actually, the scene Peter sketches in this verse and the next is not a courtroom proceeding at all whether on earth or in heaven—but a universal conflict between the devil and the people of God, with the whole world as its arena (cf. v 9b).

w" lewn wruomeno", "like a roaring lion." The apparent source of Peter's imagery is a psalm in which Christians took considerable interest in connection with Jesus' passion: i.e., Ps 21:14 [22:13] LX[X,] where the psalmist speaks of "fat bulls" who "opened their mouth against me, like a ravening and roaring lion" (w" lewn o arpazwn kai wruomeno"; cf. Ezek 22:25). The lion, which in some traditions stands for the Jewish Messiah (cf. 4 Ezra 12:31–32) or even Jesus Christ (cf. Rev 5:5), in this psalm represents the enemies of God and of his people. When 2 Tim 4:17 attributes to Paul an allusion to another verse in the same psalm ("I was delivered from the lion's mouth"; cf. Ps 21:22 [22:21]), it is possible (although not certain) that deliverance from physical death is in view, and it is natural to ask whether or not the same is true of 1 Peter.

peripatei zhtwn katapiein, "is on the move, ready to swallow [his prey]." The absolute use of the verb peripatein, "to be on the move" (literally, "to walk around," BG[D,] 649.1a; then more generally "to walk," 649.1c) vividly portrays a pacing hungry lion (cf. also Job 2:2, where Satan is said to have come "from going back and forth over the earth and walking up and down on it"). It Peter indeed has the language of the passion psalm in mind, then the participial phrase zhtwn katapiein, "ready to swallow" (lit. "seeking to swallow"), interprets the arpazwn, "ravening," of Ps 21:14 [22:13]. katapiein, "to swallow" (lit. "drink down"), appears to be Peter's own contribution to the ancient imagery, and raises the question of how he thought Christian believers might be "swallowed" by the devil. The lion in funerary and other ancient inscriptions often represented "the ravening power of death" (Horsley, 50–51), and the verb katapiein, "swallow," reinforces that connotation (cf., e.g., the LX[X] of Num 16:30–33; 26:10; Pss 68:16 [69:15]; 123[124]:1–5; Prov 1:12; Hos 8:8; Jonah 2:1–7; Isa 25:8; in Christian literature the imagery of Isa 25:8 is sometimes reversed, as death itself is "swallowed" by life, or by Jesus' resurrection: cf. 1 Cor 15:54; 2 Cor 5:4; *Treat. Res.* 45.14–23, and the scribal gloss at 1 Peter 3:22; see *Form/Structure/Setting* and Note i[*] on 3:18–22).

Of particular interest (although the enemy is a dragon and not a lion) is Jer 28[51]:34 ("Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, has swallowed me [katepien], as a dragon he has filled his belly with my vitals") and its sequel, v 44 ("and I will take vengeance on Babylon, and I will bring back out of her mouth what she has swallowed"). It is unlikely that Peter has this passage directly in mind, yet it illumines his argument, for two reasons: first, possibly, because of its mention of "Babylon" (cf. v 13, "The [congregation] in Babylon"); second, and more important, because of the apparent use of Jeremiah and of 1

Peter simultaneously in the epistle from the churches of Vienne and Lyons (Eusebius, HE 5.1–2). There the devil "thought that he had already swallowed" (katapepwkenai) Biblis the martyr, and wanted "to condemn her through blasphemy as well" (5.1.25), but was thwarted when she "came to her senses" (anenhyen) and "awoke" (anegrhgorhsen; see *Comment* above). The martyrs' victory, the narrative concludes, "was this, that the beast [i.e., the devil] should be choked into throwing up alive those he earlier thought he had swallowed" (katapepwkenai; HE 5.2.6). While the Jeremiah passage may have to do with deliverance from death, it is clear from this martyrological use of similar imagery that being "swallowed" by the devil refers not to physical death but to spiritual death, i.e., to renouncing one's allegiance to Christ (a similar application to religious faithfulness can be seen in *Joseph and Asenath* 12.9, where Asenath says, "For behold, the ancient and savage lion pursues me closely and his children are the gods of the Egyptians … and their father the Devil tries to swallow me up [katapiein]"). There is every reason to believe that the same is true in 1 Peter (cf. Horsley, 51), for Peter's consistent assumption is that physical death holds no fear for those who know they will "live before God in the Spirit" (4:6: cf. 1:3, 21).

9 w antisthte stereoi th pistei eidote" ta auta twn paqhmatwn th en tw kosmw umwn adelfothti epiteleisqai, "Resist him, firm in faith, knowing that the same kinds of suffering are being accomplished in your brotherhood throughout the world." To "resist" the devil is not the same as "resisting" human adversaries. Jesus, in fact, explicitly forbids the latter according to Matt 5:39a: "But I say to you not to resist the evil one" (mh antisthnai tw ponhrw). That "the evil one" means a human being and not the devil is shown by the concrete examples that immediately follow (5:39b–42). There is no evidence that Peter, who knows portions of the Sermon on the Mount (cf., e.g., 2:19–20; 4:14), is reflecting on this passage in particular. Yet the tradition to which he does appeal, a tradition visible also in James 4:7 and Eph 6:11–13, makes it clear that the principle of "nonresistance," whatever its merits in human encounters, did not extend to the devil or to spiritual warfare. An explicit distinction is drawn in Eph 6:12: "For our combat is not against flesh and blood, but against powers, against authorities, against the world rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavens." For Peter the distinction, although implicit, is no less real. Even though he perceives "disobedient spirits" (3:19) behind those in Roman society who reject and denounce the Christian message, he consistently urges "respect" and "deference" toward the human critics and oppressors. Not so in relation to the devil himself.

The force of this distinction is to emphasize that the sphere of the devil's attack is not "out there" in the threats and slanders of a hostile populace, but within the believer and the believing community. As in the case of Biblis the martyr, the issue of whether or not Christians will be "swallowed" by the devil is up to the Christians themselves. This means that the phrase, stereoi th pistei, "firm in faith," interprets antisthte, "resist." To resist the devil is not to engage in hostile action against anyone, but to trust God (cf. 4:19; 5:6; James 4:7; also Best, 174). The imperatival force of antisthte carries over to the adjective stereoi, "firm," as well (as if to say "be firm"; cf. the imperatival adjectives in 3:8).

The phrase stereoi th pistei, "firm in faith," recalls estereounto th pistei, "they were strengthened in faith," in Acts 16:5; for th pistei, "in faith," as a dative of respect (BD[F.] § 197) in similar expressions, cf. Col 1:23; Ign. *Eph.* 10.2. "Faith" refers here to

personal or communal commitment, just as in 1:5, 7, 9, 21, not to a body of doctrine or a formal system of belief (i.e., "the faith," as, e.g., in Jude 3; cf. Selwyn, 238). The adjective stereo", "hard," usually had negative connotations when applied to people (i.e., "stubborn"; Selwyn, 238), but Peter may well be writing with the stone imagery of 2:4–8 still in mind, drawing from it the further implication of steadfastness or rocklike resolution (cf. the emphasis on o pisteuwn, "the one who believes," in 2:6–7). Selwyn (238) cites Isa 50:7: "I have set my face as a hard rock [w" sterean petran] and I know that I will not be put to shame" (ou mh aiscunqw; cf. ou mh kataiscunqh, "will not be put to shame" in Isa 28:16, cited in 1 Peter 2:6). Although Isa 50:7 is not among the texts to which Peter explicitly appeals (in contrast to Barn. 5.14; 6.3), it may well have contributed to early descriptions of "God's firm foundation" laid in Jesus Christ (2 Tim 2:19), or (as here) to calls for Christian "steadfastness" (especially a call attributed to Petro", the "rock"; see *Introduction*).

eidote", "knowing," followed by the accusative and an infinitive is equivalent to eidote" oti with an indicative (cf. *Note* f*; also 1:18), expressing indirect discourse: "knowing that the same kinds of suffering are accomplished" (for the construction, cf. Luke 4:41b; *1 Cle*[m] 43.6; 62.3; BD[F,] § 397.1). It is a matter of knowing *that* something is true (BG[D,] 555.1). If eidote" were understood as "knowing how" or "being able" to do something (BG[D,] 556.3), then the infinitive epiteleisqai would have to be read as a middle rather than a passive: "knowing how to accomplish the same kinds of sufferings" (reading the accusative ta auta as direct object; see Beare, 206). The difficulty with the second option is that it offers no explanation for the dative th … adelfothti, "the brotherhood," that shortly follows (Beare is forced to admit that this dative is "unusual, standing in direct dependence on auta"; i.e., yielding the translation "knowing how to accomplish the same kinds of sufferings *as* your brotherhood in the world"). The first option makes sense of "brotherhood" either as a dative of respect ("with regard to" or "in" your brotherhood: BD[F,] § 197), or as the indirect object of the verb epiteleisqai, "accomplish" (BG[D,] 302.4: i.e., "laid upon" your brotherhood; the dative of agent, "by" your brotherhood [BD[F,] § 191], is also possible).

The participle eidote" also shares somewhat in the imperatival character of what precedes it. In effect, Peter is saying "know this," as he introduces an important piece of information (cf. 1:18–21, where eidote" introduces a traditional summary of redemption through Christ; also the expression, "knowing this first," in 2 Peter 1:20; 3:3; cf. Luke 12:39; 2 Tim 3:1). The important information—perhaps the most important in the entire letter—is that the believers facing slander and persecution in the Asian provinces are not alone. Peter clearly affirms the solidarity of his own congregation (cf. v 13), and of the Christian brotherhood worldwide, with the distant congregations to which he writes.

The phrase ta auta twn paqhmatwn, "the same kinds of suffering," is less precise than ta auta paqhmata, "the same sufferings" would have been (cf. 1 Thess 2:14). Parallels to this genitive construction are few, but cf. Thucydides 7.75.6, isomoiria twn kakwn, "the equal share of troubles"; somewhat differently, ta usterhmata twn qliyewn, "what is lacking of the tribulations [of Christ]," Col 1:24. It is a partitive genitive (BD[F,] § 164.1: "strictly speaking incorrect"), allowing for the recognition that every experience of suffering is unique. In no one incident or series of incidents are the "sufferings of Christ" in which his people share (4:13; cf. 1:11, 5:1) ever "accomplished" or exhausted, but only in the cumulative experience of the worldwide "brotherhood." ta

auta, “the same kinds,” are viewed as more or less equivalent portions of the whole.
th en tw kosmw umwn adelfothti, “in your brotherhood throughout the world.” For “brotherhood,” cf. 2:17; also “brotherly affection” in 1:22 and 3:8. Only here is Peter explicit about the geographical extent of the “brotherhood.” The meaning of en tw kosmw is not simply that the brotherhood is “in the world” (where else would it be?), but that it is spread throughout the world (cf. diaspora", “scattered,” in 1:1). Despite the word order, umwn, “your,” must be taken with “brotherhood,” and not with “world.” Peter could have omitted umwn altogether (as in 2:17) without changing the sense, but he has been consistent from v 6 on in personalizing his commands (i.e., uma" in v 6; umwn twice in v 7, umwn in v 8), and he is simply maintaining his use of the personal pronoun to the end of the sequence. kosmo", “world,” probably has no connotation here of an evil order opposed to God (as, e.g., in John 8:23; 15:18–19; 17:9, 16; 18:36; 1 John 2:15–17; 5:19; 1 Cor 3:19; Gal 6:14). It is simply (like its synonym oikoumenh) the inhabited earth, as in John 1:10a; 9:5; 17:11; 1 Cor 14:10; 1 Tim 3:16 (cf. “the whole world” in Matt 4:8; Mark 14:9; Rom 1:8; 2 Macc 3:12).

epiteleisqai, “being accomplished,” is sometimes given the highly specialized meaning “to pay a tax” (thus, as a middle, “to pay the same tax of suffering,” or as a passive, “that the same tax of suffering is being paid”; cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* 4.8.8; see, e.g., Best, 175). This view, like the interpretation of telo" as “wages” in 1:9 (see *Comment*) imports into the text a subtle metaphor quite uncharacteristic of an author who is always careful to alert his readers (e.g., with such words as w") when introducing a metaphor. Nor is it likely that epiteleisqai implies a profound notion of a fixed amount of suffering that must be “accomplished” (in the sense of fulfilled) before the end comes (as, e.g., in Col 1:24; cf. Rev 6:11). “Being accomplished” here means something more like “happening” or “taking place,” but Peter has chosen this verb (instead of ginesqai or sumbainein, as in 4:12) simply to include the notion, now well established by his argument, that the sufferings of Christian believers are not a matter of chance but a necessary part of God’s purpose.

10 O de qeo" pash" carito", o kalesa" uma" ei" thn aiwnion autou doxan en Cristw, “But the God of all grace, who called you in Christ to his eternal glory.” Peter concludes the body of his epistle by applying directly to his readers the principle expressed in Prov 3:34 that God “gives grace to the humble” (v 5). God is designated, accordingly, as “the God of all grace” (cf. “God of all consolation” in 2 Cor 1:3). “All grace” corresponds in scope to the “diversified grace” of 4:10, encompassing not only the grace to come at the “revelation of Jesus Christ” (1:13; cf. 3:7), but the grace of “suffering for doing good” (2:19, 20) and the grace of mutual ministries in the worshiping congregations (4:10).

The participial designation of God as o kalesa" uma", “who called you,” parallels tou … kalesanto", “of the One who called you,” in 2:9 (cf. 1:15); the simultaneous accent on past calling and future destiny echoes the thought of 2:9 as a whole (see *Comment*), although in somewhat more conventional terms. God’s “eternal glory” is of course the same future glory mentioned repeatedly in the epistle (1:7; 4:13; 5:1, 4). The absence of a definite article (thn) before en Cristw, “in Christ,” tends to link the phrase with the verb “called” rather than with the noun “glory” (cf. Goppelt, 343; Kelly, 212). For Peter (as for Paul), “in Christ” is both the means of divine calling (as here), and the sphere of present Christian existence (as in v 14; cf. 3:16).
oligon paqonta", “after you have suffered a little.” oligon, “a little,” stands in contrast to

aiwnion, “eternal,” in the preceding clause, just as paqonta", “suffered,” stands in contrast to doxa, “glory” (cf. 1:11; 4:13; 5:1; also Rom 8:18; 2 Cor 4:17). The whole phrase echoes the oligon arti … luphqente" of 1:6. Christian suffering pales in comparison to the great vindication to come.

auto" katartiqei, sthrixei, sqenwsei, qemeliwsei, “he will prepare, support, strengthen, and establish you.” The verse has the appearance of a benediction except that the verbs are not optatives (as, e.g., in Rom 15:13; 1 Thess 3:11–13; 5:23; 2 Thess 2:16–17; Heb 13:20–21), but future indicatives (cf. 2 Cor 13:11; Phil 4:9b; and especially Rom 16:20). Their cumulative effect is to reiterate and reinforce the aorist subjunctive uywsh, “he will lift you up,” of v 6, and so to complete Peter’s interpretation of Prov 3:34 as cited in v 5. This, he concludes, is how God “gives grace to the humble.” The benediction turns out to be a promise of victory or vindication. The victory described is future and eschatological (cf. en kairw, “when it is time,” in v 6), yet because God is the God of “all grace,” the process by which it comes to realization is already underway in the ministries of believers to each other within and among their scattered congregations.

auto", “he,” is emphatic, as in several of Paul’s benedictions (1 Thess 3:11; 5:23; 2 Thess 2:16; 3:16). The four verbs are roughly synonymous. It is possible that the first of them, katartisei, is preliminary to the others in implying restoration, or the setting right of unhappy circumstances (BG^{D,} 417.1a). It can also have the more neutral sense of “prepare” (BG^{D,} 417.1b; cf. the optative in a concluding benediction in Heb 13:21). Selwyn (240) prefers the former because of the immediately preceding reference to suffering. Yet the phrase oligon paqonta", “after you have suffered a little,” is parenthetical. The actual context for katartisei (and its three companion verbs) is the idea that God “called you in Christ to his eternal glory.” The emphatic auto", “he,” keeps the focus of attention on God and the call of God, while the four parallel verbs unfold how this call comes to full realization. For sthrixei, “support,” it is worth noting that Paul’s uses of the same verb, in contexts of pastoral care of ethical admonition, consider it sometimes as a work of God (1 Thess 3:13; 2 Thess 2:17; 3:3; Rom 16:25), sometimes as a responsibility of believers to each other (Rom 1:11; 1 Thess 3:2; cf. Acts 14:22). Although the verb is used in Luke 22:32 to refer specifically to Peter’s responsibility, there is no sure way to link its occurrence here as one of four similar verbs to any form of the Gospel tradition (on sthrizein and cognates in 2 Peter, see Bauckham, 197). sqenwsei, “strengthen,” is rare in Greek literature and without parallel in the LX^{X} or N^{T} (BG^{D,} 749). Peter is multiplying synonyms, perhaps to reinforce the key phrase, stereoi th pistei, “firm in faith,” in v 9 and to keep before his readers to the end of his epistle the implications of the three “stone” quotations in 2:6–8. qemeliwsei, “establish,” recalls the saying of Jesus in Matt 7:25 (cf. Luke 6:48), where the phrase teqemeliwto epi thn petran, “was established on the rock,” corresponds to the initial reference to a wise man who “built” (wkodomhsen, 7:24) his house “on the rock.” In a similar, although far less direct, way Peter’s concluding promise qemeliwsei, “he will establish,” corresponds to the oikodomeisqe oiko" pneumatiko", “you are being built as a spiritual house,” in 2:5 (cf. also, of course, Matt 16:18–19. The verb qemelioun (often perfect passive, as in Matt 7:25) finds its way into Christian moral instruction in Col 1:23; Eph 3:17; Her^{m} *Vis.* 3.3.5; 3.13.4; 4.1.4; for the future indicative with God as subject, as here, cf. Her^{m} *Vis.* 1.3.2).

Conspicuously absent from these promises is any reference to God’s defeat of the devil (cf. v 8) as, e.g., in 2 Thess 3:3, where God will “support you [sthrixei uma"] and protect you

from the Evil One," or Rom 16:20 ("The God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet"). The devil fades out of the picture as abruptly as he came into it. The reason is that the real issue in this passage is not warfare against the devil, but a firm and unshakable commitment to God and to the consequences of God's call. The omission of uma", "you," may be purely stylistic, but more likely it is Peter's way of universalizing the promise: God will "prepare, support, strengthen, and establish" not only the readers of the epistle, but the entire "brotherhood throughout the world" (cf. v 9).

11 autw to krato" ei" tou" aiwna": amhn, "To him belongs the might forever. Amen." This is a shortened form of the doxology in 4:11, this tim, directed to the "God of all grace" (v 10) rather than to Jesus Christ (see Comment on 4:11). Like the first doxology, this too is a statement of fact; the verb estin, explicit in 4:11, should be supplied here as well. Together, the two doxologies link God and Jesus Christ as the sole objects of Christian worship, but in keeping with the God-centeredness of the entire epistle, Peter ends on the note of praise to God. The shorter doxology is also climactic. to krato", "might," receives emphasis here by virtue of standing alone, and so echoes the reference to God's "mighty hand" (thn krataian ceira) in v 6. The effect is to guarantee still further the certainty of the deliverance promised in vv 6 and 10.

Explanation

The clearest promise of vindication in the entire epistle comes here, in Peter's brief explanation of when and how God "gives grace to the humble" (v 5). In Peter's vision, Christian believers are at war with "the devil," their adversary and accuser. Like good soldiers they must "pay attention," "wake up," and "resist." Yet to fight the devil is not to fight their human enemies, but to do good. The real enemy is not outside them, but in themselves. When they confront the devil's fury in their accusers, Peter wants them to know they can never be "swallowed" (v 8) except at their own consent. Nothing their human enemies do can harm them (cf. 3:13) if they remain "firm in faith" under God's "mighty hand." In life or in death, God will establish them on a foundation as solid and secure as bedrock. Nor do they stand alone; they belong to a worldwide "brotherhood," sharing in the same kinds of suffering and built on the same well-grounded hope. On the brotherhood's behalf, Peter presumes to speak strong words of reassurance to the distant scattered congregations of Asia Minor.

Conclusion and Final Greetings (5:12–14)

Bibliography

Elliott, J. H. "Silvanus and Mark in I Peter and Acts." In *Wort in der Zeit*. F^S K. H. Rengstorf. Leiden: Brill, 1980. 250–67. **Gamba, G. G.** "L'Evangelista Marco Segretario—'Interprete' della prima lettera di Pietro?" *Salesianum* 44 (1982) 61–70. **Haselhurst, R. S. T.** "Mark, My Son." *Theology* 13 (1926) 34–36. **Horsley, G. H. R.** *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. 3. Macquarie University, 1983. 141–48. **Hunzinger, C. H.** "Babylon als Deckname für Rom und die Datierung des 1.Petrusbriefes." In *Gottes Wort und Gottes Land*. F^S H.-W. Hertzberg. Göttingen,

1965.67–77. **Manley, G. T.** “Babylon on the Nile.” *Ev*[Q] 16 (1944) 138–46. **Prete, B.** “L’espressione h en Babulwni suneklekth di 1 Pt. 5,13.” *Vetera Christianorum* 21 (1984) 335–52. **Radermacher, L.** “Der erste Petrusbrief und Silvanus.” *ZN*[W] 25 (1926) 287–99. **Smothers, E. R.** “A Letter from Babylon.” *Classical Journal* 22 (1926) 203–9. **Stegmann, A.** *Silvanus als Missionar und “Hagiograph.”* Rottenburg, 1917. **Thiede, C. P.** “Babylon, der Andere Ort: Anmerkungen zu 1 Petr 5,13 und Apg 12,17.” *Bi*[b] 67.4 (1986) 532–38.

Translation

[12]*I have written you these few lines through Silvanus (whom I consider a faithful brother) to make an appeal and to bring testimony that this is true grace from God.*[a] *For it you must stand.*[b] [13]*The [congregation]*[c] *in Babylon, chosen along with you, sends her greeting, as does Mark, my son.* [14]*Greet one another with the kiss of love.*[d] *Peace to you all, you who are in Christ.*[e]

Notes

a. The article is lacking with qeou, “God,” in certain MS[s] ([P72] Y and others), but the omission probably took place because the accompanying carin, “grace,” had no article. The article is attested by the weight of manuscript evidence (a majority of MS[s] including [a]

[A B)] and should be retained.

b. In place of the aorist imperative sthte, “stand” (the reading of [P72 a]

[A B] and others), the majority of later MS[s] (including [P] and some Lat. versions) have the perfect indicative esthkate used as a present: “you stand.” The relative clause led scribes to expect an indicative (cf. Rom 5:2; 1 Cor 15:1; 2 Cor 1:24), but the manuscript evidence clearly favors the imperative (cf. Goppelt, 350).

c. [A] few MS[s] (including [a]

) insert ekklhsia, “congregation” or “church,” but this is a later clarification. In [P72 A B] and the majority of later MS[s], the reference to a particular congregation is implied but not expressed.

d. A few minuscules, as well as v[g] and the Syr. Peshitto, read agiw in place of agaph" (a “holy” kiss, in agreement with Pauline usage). The tendency toward harmonization, prompted perhaps by the correspondence of the first two letters, accounts for the change. £Agaph", “of love,” is correct.

e. The majority of later MS[s] (including [a]

[K P)] add at the end the name “Jesus” and a concluding “Amen,” but the rest of the earliest MS[s] (e.g., [A B] Y and others) are more likely correct in ending the epistle with the words “in Christ” (cf. *Note* f[*] on v 10; see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 698). The omission of the entire greeting (in [P72] alone) is too narrowly attested to be regarded as original. It probably represents, in its own way, an adaptation to church usage (by allowing each congregation to respond as it chose to the injunction of v 14a).

Form/Structure/Setting

The conclusion of 1 Peter is divided into two parts: the commendation of both messenger and message (v 12), and an official and personal greeting from Peter and his congregation (vv 13–14). The commendation of the messenger is a familiar part of the Pauline correspondence, although not in a set form and not necessarily at the end of an epistle (see, e.g., Rom 16:1–2; 1 Cor 16:17–18; 2 Cor 8:16–19; Eph 6:21–22; Phil 2:25–30; Col 4:7–9; Philem 10–12).

The form of Peter's commendation corresponds rather to that of Ignatius (see *Comment*). What is unique to Peter is that he has woven into the commendation of the messenger a characterization and commendation of the message itself (v 12b). The "official" greeting from Peter's congregation (v 13) and the direct greeting of Peter himself (v 14b) frame one last imperative: "Greet one another with the kiss of love" (v 14a). The four other N^T examples of expressions similar to this (i.e., Rom 16:16; 1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; 1 Thess 5:26) are in letters addressed to single congregations. Here, with a wide circle of congregations in view, the command has the effect of extending the official greeting throughout Asia Minor and so fostering the worldwide unity to which Peter alluded in v 9. The personal greeting at the end is equally broad in its scope.

Comment

12 Dia Silouanou umin tou pistou adelfou, w" logizomai, di' oligwn egraya, "I have written you these few lines through Silvanus (whom I consider a faithful brother)." The word order is distinctive in that umin, "you," interrupts the opening commendation of Silvanus. The core of the sentence is egraya, "I have written," and Peter begins with the two expressions that define this writing: it is "through Silvanus," and it is to "you." The latter he will elaborate with the participial clause to follow. The former is his principal focus at the start. The reference to Silvanus has been made the basis for far-reaching conclusions about the composition of 1 Peter (especially by Selwyn, 9–17; cf. Goppelt, 347; Kelly, 215). Silvanus is said to have been "responsible for drafting the letter on the author's … behalf and on his instructions" (Kelly, 215; see *Introduction*). Such a theory allows commentators to attribute to Silvanus whatever stylistic traits seem incompatible with Peter's authorship, and in effect comes close to making Silvanus the actual author of the epistle. Yet it is doubtful that the simple dia, "through," will bear so much weight. More likely it indicates that Silvanus was the bearer of the letter, at least to its first destination in Asia Minor; cf. grafw umin dia Bourrou, "I am writing to you through Burrhus," in Ign *Phld.* 11.2, *Smyrn.* 12.1; also "through the blessed Ephesians" in Rom. 10.1, "through those sent by you" in *Pol.* 8.1, and *per Crescentem*, "through Crescens," in Pol. *Phil.* 14.1. Although the characteristic verb is grafein, "to write," as here, the expression refers not to the composition of the letter but to its delivery. The same is true of the decree of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15:23: grayante" dia ceiro" autwn, "having written [i.e., sent, v 22] through their hand"—the hand of Judas Barsabbas and of "Silas" (probably the "Silvanus" of 1 Peter; see *Introduction*). For the view that dia refers here to literary composition, Kelly (215) appeals to the letter from Dionysius of Corinth to the church at Rome (Eusebius, HE 4.23.11) referring back to 1 Clement as a letter "written through [dia] Clement" to the Corinthian church. The cases, however, are not the same because *1 Clement* names no individual other than Clement as its author, while 1 Peter obviously does name someone other than Silvanus. If there is an analogy in 1 Peter to Clement's role in

relation to the Roman church, it surely lies with "Peter, apostle of Jesus Christ" (1:1), not with Silvanus. It is "Peter" (whether in reality or as a literary device; see *Introduction*) who speaks even here in the first person (logizomai, "I consider") commending Silvanus to the Asian churches. The possibility that Peter had help in the composition of his epistle (or even that someone composed it for him) is a legitimate one, but it should not be linked to Silvanus on the basis of this reference. If Silvanus had even a small part in writing the letter, it is more plausible that his name would have been linked with Peter's at the outset (as it was with Paul's in 1Thess1:1; 2 Thess 1:1).

tou pistou adelfou, w" logizomai, "whom I consider a faithful brother." The expression, "faithful brother," makes it clear that Silvanus was not only a Christian believer (for pisto" in that sense, cf. 1:21), but a valued co-worker as well (in the Pauline correspondence, cf. especially Eph 6:21–22//Col 4:7–9; also, for "brother," 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Col 1:1; Philem 1). Silvanus was associated with Paul in his mission to the Greek cities of Philippi (Acts 16:19, 25, 29), Thessalonica (17:4), Berea (17:10, 14), and Corinth (18:5: cf. 2 Cor 1:19), but was known to the churches to which 1 Peter is written only by reputation, if at all (cf. Acts 16:6–8, where the Spirit directs Paul and Silas away from Asia and Bithynia). It is not likely, therefore, that the reference to Silvanus constitutes "name dropping"; rather, Silvanus really needs the word of introduction and commendation. The effect of w" logizomai, "whom I consider" (lit, "as I consider") is not to weaken Silvanus's credentials (as if to imply, "that's just my opinion") but to strengthen them. It is one of only four first person singular verbs in the entire epistle (the others being "I have written," in this verse, and "I appeal," in 2:11 and 5:1), and as such it carries the personal authority of the apostle (the closest parallel in Paul is his self-commendation in 2 Cor 11:5, but cf. also Paul's understated "opinions" in 1 Cor 7:25–26, 40).

Some have objected that neither Silvanus nor any other single messenger is likely to have delivered the epistle to all the churches throughout the five provinces mentioned in 1:1 (see, e.g., Goppelt, 347). It is not necessary to the hypothesis to assume that this was the case. Silvanus could simply have carried the letter to its port of entry, probably either Amisus or Amastris on the Black Sea (see Comment on 1:2), and been officially welcomed there and at a few other congregations in the vicinity. His personal greetings from Peter would then have been conveyed by word of mouth from congregation to congregation through the provinces along with the letter itself. This would help to explain Cyprian's otherwise odd references to "The Epistle of Peter to Pontus" (*Testimonia* 37, 39) or "to the people in Pontus" (*Testimonia* 36).

di' oligwn egraya, "I have written … these few lines." It is difficult to see how (as Goppelt, 347, maintains) the qualification of egraya by di' oligwn precludes the idea that Peter is referring here to the sending as well as the composition of his letter. Ignatius clearly used grafw to mean "write and send" (i.e., "through the blessed Ephesians") in Rom. 10.1, where the content is specified as tauta, "these things," and Polycarp seems to have done the same in *Phil.* 14.1 ("*Haec … scripsi per Crescentem*"). In Acts 15:23–29, what is "written" (i.e., sent) through the hand of the two messengers is promptly quoted verbatim. In contrast to Ignatius (although in agreement with the Latin version of Polycarp), Peter uses the epistolary aorist: both the writing and the sending are past from the standpoint of those who will read the letter.

The plural di' oligwn, "these few lines," corresponds in meaning to di' oligwn grammatwn (lit. "with few letters") in Ign. *Rom.* 8.2; *Pol.* 7.3. The expression says little

about the actual length of what has been written (cf. the equivalent dia bracewn in Heb 13:22, at the end of a document more than twice the size of 1 Peter). It was customary in ancient literature either to deprecate "having had to compress so large a subject into such a comparatively restricted space" (Kelly, 216), or to apologize for having exceeded the length of a normal letter in order to do so (see Goppeh, 349). It is doubtful that either of these is Peter's intent here. The fact that di£ odigwn follows close on the oligon paqonta", "suffered a little," of v 10 may suggest that the issues addressed in the epistle, although serious, should be kept in perspective: a "few lines" are sufficient answer to a "little" suffering.

parakalwn kai epimarturwn tauthn einai alhqh carin tou qeou: ei" hn sthte, "to make an appeal, and to bring testimony that this is true grace from God. For it you must stand!" The two participles, both dependent on egraya, "I have written," are not quite parallel in function, for the first refers to ethical exhortation and the second to testimony or proclamation. The indirect discourse that follows (i.e., "that this is true grace from God") is, accordingly, linked only to epimarturwn, "bring testimony," not to parakalwn, "make an appeal." The latter, used absolutely here (as in Rom 12:8), echoes the parakalw, "I appeal," of 2:11 and 5:1, and could be regarded as characterizing either the entire epistle or everything from 2:11 on. It is tempting to go even further by supposing that epimarturwn refers back to 1:1–2:10 (which is, in fact, largely proclamation or testimony), so that together the two participles summarize in chiastic fashion 1 Peter in its entirety. Such a conclusion is surely forced. Not only are there elements of ethical appeal in 1:1–2:10 (e.g., 1:13–21) and of testimony in 2:11–5:11 (e.g., 2:21–25; 3:18–4:6), but the more basic question remains whether the specific testimony "that this is true grace from God" is intended as a summary of what Peter has said before, or as something new that he wants to add in conclusion. The answer to this question depends on the antecedent of tauthn, "this." What exactly is being designated "true grace from God"?

(a) It is possible that Peter has in mind the eschatological cari", "grace," to be brought to Christian believers "when Jesus Christ is revealed" (1:13; cf. 1:10; 5:5; see Goppelt, 350). tauthn in this case, although abruptly introduced, is perhaps explained by the relative clause (ei" hn sthte) that follows: "this in which you must stand is true grace from God." The suggestion would be more convincing if the indicative esthkate, "you stand," were read in place of the imperative (see *Note* b*), yielding an expression very similar to "this grace in which we stand" in Rom 5:2 (cf. Kelly, 216–17). The difficulty is that if the "grace" of 1:13 or 5:5 is Peter's initial point of reference, the solemn pronouncement he builds around it is little more than a tautology: the grace God holds in store for us is true grace from God.

(b) A better option is that tauthn refers to whatever situations of potential or actual suffering readers of the epistle may have been facing (Brox, 245). For the purpose of encouragement or consolation Peter could have referred quite naturally to something unpleasant and not obviously "grace from God" as being exactly that. God's grace is, after all, "diversified," according to 4:10. This would explain more easily the imperative sthte, "stand," with which v 12 concludes; cf. antisthte, "resist," in v 9; also the sthte of Eph 6:14 in a context of "resisting" the devil and "standing" against every evil power (cf. 6:11, 13). This interpretation appears to be supported by Peter's terminology in 2:19–20 (cf. Brox, 244), yet these verses also create difficulty. In speaking of suffering (specifically for "doing good") as cari", or "grace," Peter uses a slightly different expression in 2:20b,

touto cari" para qew, “this is grace before God” (cf. touto gar cari" in v 19a). The antecedents of touto in 2:19a and 20b are the conditional clauses about unjust suffering in vv 19b and 20a, respectively. There is no such antecedent here. The fact that Peter chooses the feminine tauthn here instead of the neuter touto may or may not be significant; Greek usage allowed either (BD[F], § 132.1), and Peter may simply have varied his style. More important is the fact that 2:19–20 describes a pattern of human behavior with which God is pleased (i.e., “grace before God”; see *Comment*), while the present verse refers to something that belongs to God himself and comes from God as a gift (as in 1:13 and 5:5). Although Peter has encouraged his readers to rejoice in the privilege of sharing Christ’s sufferings and promised them that the Spirit of God and of Christ’s future glory rests on them in moments of crisis (4:13–14), he has never quite said that suffering itself is a gift from God. If this is his meaning, then he is introducing it here for the first time, presumably as the implication of all that he has said before. It is surprising that he would make such a profound statement so briefly and abruptly by weaving it into his epistolary conclusion, yet the possibility that he is doing just that cannot be excluded.

(c) A third option is to understand tauthn strictly in the setting of Peter’s commendation of his messenger and message in v 12, without reference to any specific issue addressed (e.g., suffering), tauthn, “this,” would then refer to the epistle itself. Although the feminine form is adequately explained by the agreement with carin, it is possible that Peter’s choice of it in place of the equally possible touto rests on the unexpressed but implied epistolh, “epistle” or “letter” (cf. the unexpressed feminine noun ekklhsia, “congregation” in v 13, on which see *Comment*). Bigg comes close to such a conclusion in remarking that “‘This’ refers to the whole of the contents of the Epistle, whether doctrine or exhortation” (196). The preceding epistolary remarks (“I have written you these few lines”), however, suggest that Peter’s focus is less on the contents than on the epistle itself as a literary entity. It is “true grace from God,” an extension of the author’s ministry as a “good administrator of God’s diversified grace” (4:10). This is how Peter intends it and this is how his readers must receive it. The use of the adjective alhqh, “true,” confirms the impression that the term “grace” is being broadened to apply to something that does not normally bear that name (cf., e.g., John 6:55). Peter’s “few lines” may appear to be only a piece of correspondence but in actuality they are a gift from God to the congregations that read and accept them.

Although (c) is on balance the most plausible of the three alternatives, it leaves in question the meaning of the relative clause ei" hn sthte (lit, “stand to it”) with which v 12 concludes. Does “it” refer to divine grace or to the letter that is its vehicle? Probably to divine grace, mentioned last, although Peter’s point is that his readers will “stand” in the grace of God precisely by attending to his epistle. It appears that ei", “to,” is used here in the sense of en, “in,” as it frequently is in Hellenistic Greek (cf. BD[F], § 206; BG[D], 230.9a). This is not common practice, however, in N[T] epistles. There is no evidence that Peter is avoiding en because of its instrumental use (as in 3:20; see Comment). Certainly the grace of God is the means by which the people of God “stand” through all their trials. Yet something of the proper force of ei" should probably be retained in translation, ei" contributes a note of purpose appropriate to a command: “with this grace in view” (cf. BG[D], 229.4f), or “for this grace,” Peter is saying, “stand.” Grace is both the empowerment and the prize for faithfulness in Christian living, and Peter seems to have chosen ei" over en in order to encompass both ideas. It is doubtful that the imperative sthte, “stand,” represents

either a confusion with the indicative esthkate, “you stand,” or a last-minute shift made in haste (see Kelly, 217). He has prepared for it carefully with a whole series of imperatives from v 6 on, especially the antisthte, “resist,” of v 9 (similarly linked to a relative pronoun). The occurrence of the two cognate verbs in a set of commands parallels Eph 6:13–14 and appears to be deliberate.

13 Aspazetai uma" h en Babulwni suneklekth kai Marko" o uio" mou, “The [congregation] in Babylon, chosen with you, sends her greetings, as does Mark, my son.” ekklhsia, “congregation” (a term never used in 1 Peter) is probably implied here (cf. both the “elect lady” and her “elect sister” in 2 John 1, 13). Another option grammatically is to take the feminine h … suneklekth, “chosen with,” as a reference to a woman, possibly Peter’s wife (the immediate mention of “Mark, my son,” would complete the authorial family). On this interpretation, suneklekth would mean “chosen with me,” rather than “chosen with you.” The difficulty with this is the correspondence between suneklekth here and eklektoi", “chosen,” in 1:1 (cf. 2:9). Brox (247) notes Peter’s fondness for compounds (“inheritance” in 1:4 and 3:9, with “co-heir” in 3:7; “elder” and “fellow elder” in 5:1). Peter is affirming common ground between the suneklekth and his readers, not himself.

Moreover, although there is evidence that Peter had a wife whom he took with him on his journeys (1 Cor 9:5), it is unlikely she would be introduced so abruptly and without a name at the end of an epistle to churches who probably did not know her personally. It is even more unlikely that she, rather than Peter himself, would be linked so explicitly to “Babylon,” the place from which the letter comes. The latter reference is more appropriate to a whole congregation than to an individual family member. Early Christian congregations were commonly identified by the cities where they were located (e.g., Paul’s epistles to congregations in Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, and Thessalonica; also the churches in seven cities mentioned in Rev 1:11; cf. especially Rev 2:13, “I know where you dwell, where Satan has his throne”). “Babylon” is undoubtedly Rome, as in Rev 14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2, 10, 21 (cf. especially 17:18: “the great city that has dominion over the kings of the earth”; in Jewish sources, cf. *Sib. Or.* 5.143, 159, and in general, the perspective of the two apocalypses, 4 Ezra and *2 Apoc. Bar.*, based on the analogy between Jerusalem’s destruction by Babylon in 586 B.C. and by Rome in A.D. 70). This interpretation goes back at least to Papias in the second century, who, according to Eusebius, claimed that Peter “composed it [suntaxai] in Rome itself, which … he himself indicates, referring to the city metaphorically [tropikwteron] as Babylon” (Eusebius, HE 2.15.2; how much of this is Papias’s actual language is difficult to say, but suntaxai, “compose,” is at any rate characteristic of the few quotations of Papias that we possess).

At the same time, it is doubtful that all the sinister associations of “Babylon the Great, Mother of Prostitutes and of the Abominations of the Earth” (Rev 17:5) are present already in 1 Peter. Peter’s earlier admonitions to defer to the Roman emperor and his appointed representatives (2:13–17) preclude any deep-seated critique of the empire or imperial authority. The only thing wrong with “Babylon” is that it is not home. “Babylon” at the end of the epistle is simply the counterpart to “diaspora” at the beginning. It is the place of exile for a community whose natural home is Jerusalem. The author and his readers, wherever they may be, find themselves in the same predicament. “Babylon” establishes for him credibility and common ground with them; he can give them advice on how to respond to opposition because he and his congregation face the same threats they do (cf. v 9). The

designation becomes a metaphor both for an actual city (Rome) and for an experience of alienation not necessarily linked to a particular place.

There were literal Babylons in the ancient world, of course, not only the original Babylon on the Euphrates in Mesopotamia, where Judaism flourished, but a Roman military settlement in Egypt where Cairo now stands (Selwyn, 243, points to "the Roman legionnaires' custom of naming places after military stations where they had previously been on duty" to show how easily names were transferred). Neither of these identifications is very likely, yet a fourthcentury papyrus from the Egyptian Babylon illustrates how easily a name with such rich connotations could acquire a double meaning (Horsley, 141–48). A traveler, probably Jewish, is taken ill after falling from his horse and writes home from Babylon to Oxyrhynchos requesting help. "You too, therefore, please send help to me since I am at a strange (town) [tw onti epi xenh"] and in sickness. I searched for a ship to embark on, and found no-one to search for me; for I am in Babylon" (en th gar Babulwnei eimei; 141–42). There is no doubt that the writer is giving his actual location, yet he appears at the same time to be playing on the association—traditional and natural to any Jew—between being "in Babylon" and being alone in a strange (epi xenh") place. Horsley (147) rightly rejects the notion "that Babylon isa secret name, used for its figurative significance," but a simple play on the connotation of a name is much more plausible. It is not quite the same in 1 Peter, where it is a matter of two metaphorical associations of the name Babylon, one specific (Rome) and one general (alienation or displacement), yet the papyrus text aptly illustrates how easily this particular name could do double duty.

kai Marko" o uio" mou, "as does Mark, my son." The reference is probably to "John who was called Mark," first mentioned in Acts 12:12, whose mother Mary opened her house for prayer to the disciples in Jerusalem. The double name occurs again in Acts 12:25, where he becomes a companion of Barnabas and Saul of Tarsus, and in 15:37. In Acts 13:5, 13 he is called simply "John," and in 15:39 "Mark." He is "Mark" consistently in letters ascribed to Paul (cf. Philem 24; Col 4:10; 2 Tim 4:11). The information that he is cousin to Barnabas (Col 4:10) links him to the Acts accounts and helps explain Barnabas's attachment to him according to Acts 15:37–39. At the same time Paul's warm commendations of Mark (Col 4:10–11; 2 Tim 4:11) suggest that the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas over him, as described in Acts 15:37–39, was only temporary. Even if the references in Colossians and 2 Timothy are questioned by those who doubt Pauline authorship, Philem 24 remains, with its clear mention of Mark among Paul's co-workers, specifically in Rome.

What links did Mark have to Peter? Why is Mark named in a circular letter from Rome to Asia Minor? These questions are more difficult to answer. Col 4:11 identifies Mark as a Jewish Christian, one of only three among Paul's "fellow workers for the kingdom of God," while the book of Acts points to an association between Mark and Peter going back to the early years of the church in Jerusalem (Acts 12:12–17). With a little imagination, one could picture Peter marrying Mark's widowed mother, so that Mark actually became his adopted son. As we have seen, the phrase, "she who in Babylon," does not lend itself to such an interpretation. "Son," therefore, should be understood as "convert" or "disciple" (BG^{D,} 833.1c) in the same way that Timothy is referred to as Paul's "child" (teknon) in 1 Cor 4:17; 1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2 (cf. Titus in Titus 1:4; also Onesimus in Philem 10; of Paul's converts more generally, cf. 1 Cor 4:15; Gal 4:19). uio", "son," in this sense is

attested only in the plural or in relation to a group (e.g., the Pharisees: Matt 12:27//Luke 11:19; Acts 23:6), but Peter seems to have adopted it here to give to his concluding words the ring of a family greeting (cf. his emphasis on the Christian community as a "brotherhood" in 2:17; 5:9). Eusebius attributes a knowledge of this passage to Papias in the mid-second century (see *Comment* above on "Babylon"), in connection with a reference to Mark as a "follower" (akolouqon) of Peter (HE 2.15.1). The tradition of a "presbyter" even earlier than Papias refers to Mark as Peter's "interpreter" (ermhneuth") in the sense that he "wrote accurately all that he remembered … of the things said or done by the Lord" (HE 3.39.15; note that Eusebius mentions again in 3.39.17 Papias's knowledge of this epistle). Despite Papias's acquaintance with this passage, it is not likely that he (or the mysterious presbyter who preceded him) created the tradition of Mark's responsibility for Peter's memoirs out of the simple phrase, "Mark, my son." Rather, Papias provides independent evidence of Mark's association with Peter in Rome. If the style of Mark's Gospel were not so obviously different from that of 1 Peter, he would be a more natural candidate than Silvanus for the role of Peter's amanuensis or literary secretary. Probably he is mentioned simply because he and Peter were working closely together at this time in the Roman church, and because his name would be familiar to at least a few of the congregations where the epistle would circulate (e.g., Colosse, Col 4:10; Philem 24; Ephesus, 2 Tim 4:11).

14 aspasasqe allhlou" en filhmati agaph", "Greet one another with the kiss of love." The corresponding phrase at the end of several of Paul's letters is en filhmati agiw, "with the holy kiss" (Rom 16:16; 1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; 1 Thess 5:26), possibly to accent sexual purity in the expression of love in Christian congregations. Peter's distinctive "kiss of love" picks up the admonitions to mutual love in 1:22 and 4:8, and love for the whole Christian brotherhood in 2:17 (cf. agaphtoi, lit., "beloved," in 2:11 and 4:12). Purity is of course presupposed (cf. 1:22, "Now that you have purified your souls … love one another unremittingly from the heart"), but it is not emphasized here, perhaps because Peter has in mind not a small, intimate circle of believers but a series of semi-official welcomes and greetings in the course of the distribution and reading of his letter from congregation to congregation through the provinces. "Love" in such a setting is less a feeling of warm affection than a guarantee of solidarity, the sealing of an alliance in the face of a perceived threat. Goppelt (354) rightly notes that the "kiss" (filhma) in the ancient world belonged not to corporate worship but to family relationships (cf. G. Stahlin in *TDN*[T] 9:125–27, 138–40). The command to "greet one another with the kiss of love," therefore, maintains and extends the "familial" tone of such terms as "brotherhood," "beloved," or "my son." It is important to recognize that the greeting with a kiss among (and within) the congregations in Asia Minor (aspasasqe) is not different in kind from the greetings sent in this letter (aspazetai) from the Roman congregation, and from Mark in particular. The epistle itself, in fact, is a kind of "kiss of love" from Peter and from Rome, as well as "true grace from God." The fact that it is accompanied by a formal expression of greeting as it circulates from place to place adds nothing to it, but merely dramatizes its intention. All that remains is for Peter to add his own explicit greeting.

eirhnh umwn pasin toi" en Cristw, "Peace to you all, you who are in Christ." Although the verb aspazein, "greet," is not repeated, these words are unmistakably a greeting, this time Peter's own personal greeting, which he saves for last. In his conclusion he has echoed the "grace and peace" greeting of 1:2b, first with his characterization of the whole epistle as

“true grace” in v 12 and now with a final wish of “peace” (cf. 3 John 15). The idea of peace, although not the actual word, has played a major role in his argument. If “love” is what believers should show toward each other, “peace” is their goal in relation to their fellow citizens, even their enemies (cf. especially the words from Ps 34, “Seek peace and pursue it,” in 3:11). Peace, like love and grace and all else to which the epistle aspires, both begins with God and comes from God.

Although the phrase pasin toi" en Cristw, “all … who are in Christ,” is technically restrictive, Peter is not distinguishing those “in Christ” from others among his readers whose faith may be less than genuine. Rather, without knowing them personally, he writes in confidence that “you all” are genuinely and securely “in Christ” (i.e., honest in your affiliation with the Christian movement). His language reminds them one last time of the relationship that must form the basis of their conduct (cf. 3:16, “your good conduct in Christ”). Because they are “in Christ,” it is natural—indeed inevitable—for them to “revere Christ as Lord in your hearts” (3:15), and hence to suffer “as a Christian” (4:16) if the occasion should arise. Implicit in Peter’s formal greeting of peace is a parting imperative—“You are all Christians. Make sure of it, and show it in your life.”

Explanation

The conclusion of 1 Peter places its stamp on the whole epistle by reminding the readers—and all future readers—that such things as letters, greetings, and kisses are not mere courtesies or formalities, at least not in this writer’s world. On the contrary, they are media by which people are touched by divine grace, and by which those who share a common faith touch and support one another in a hostile world. More than mere discourse about religious reality, they convey—indeed they are—that reality for those who give and receive them. In this instance they are ecumenical in scope, as Peter’s congregation in Rome reaches out to distant and little-known groups of believers on the Empire’s frontier, in the conviction that the trials and challenges they all face are broadly similar. This author, and this congregation, believe they have something to give which they have received from God. In these simple concluding words they formally present their gift and start it on its way.

i

---

* Deceased

* Deceased

UBS The United Bible Societies Greek Text (1966)

ed. edited, edition(s), editor

ed. edited, edition(s), editor

NCB New Century Bible [Commentary] (new ed.)

ICC International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh/New York: Clark/Scribner’s)

UP University Press

ed. edited, edition(s), editor

EKK Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament

SCM Student Christian Movement

TBC Torch Bible Commentaries

SCM Student Christian Movement

ed. edited, edition(s), editor

KEK Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
NTD Das Neue Testament Deutsch
HNTC Harper's NT Commentaries
KEK Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
UP University Press
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
NT New Testament
aB Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday)
NT New Testament
NTD Das Neue Testament Deutsch
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
SB Sources bibliques
TNTC Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
HNT Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
NT New Testament
RevThom Revue thomiste
NABPR National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion
UP University Press
SBLMS Society of Biblical Literature [SBL] Monograph Series
FS Festschrift, volume written in honor of
ATR Anglican Theological Review
JBL Journal of Biblical Literature
NTS New Testament Studies
RHPR Revue d'histoire et de philosophic religieuses
RevExp Review and Expositor
LD Lectio divina (Paris: Cerf)
UP University Press
ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
FS Festschrift, volume written in honor of
BZ Biblische Zeitschrift
NF Neue Folge, new series
NF Neue Folge, new series
NF Neue Folge, new series
NF Neue Folge, new series
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
LD Lectio divina (Paris: Cerf)
FS Festschrift, volume written in honor of
DB Dictionnaire de la Bible ed. F. Vigouroux (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1895–1912)
DB Dictionnaire de la Bible ed. F. Vigouroux (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1895–1912)
RSR Recherches de science religieuse

TSK *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*
Neot Neotestamentica
NTS *New Testament Studies*
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
AnBib Analecta biblica (Rome: PBI)
FS Festschrift, volume written in honor of
FS Festschrift, volume written in honor of
NovTSup Supplement(s) to *Novum Testamentum*
NABPR National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion
UP University Press
FS Festschrift, volume written in honor of
JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*
CQR *Church Quarterly Review*
CQR *Church Quarterly Review*
Int *Interpretation*
PSTJ *Perkins (School of Theology) Journal*
NTS *New Testament Studies*
Bib *Biblica*
RestQ *Restoration Quarterly*
NovT Novum Testamentum
TynB *Tyndale Bulletin*
JSNT *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
RevExp *Review and Expositor*
BSac *Bibliotheca Sacra*
EvT Evangelische Theologie
SWJT *Southwestern Journal of Theology*
NTS *New Testament Studies*
ZNW *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
NABPR National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion
UP University Press
Int *Interpretation*
JSOT *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* Biblical Studies
VoxEv *Vox Evangelica (London)*
ExpTim *The Expository Times*
Int *Interpretation*
JTS *Journal of Theological Studies*
NTS *New Testament Studies*
SNTSMS Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
CUP Cambridge University Press
ZNW *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
NTS *New Testament Studies*
LD Lectio divina (Paris: Cerf)
RTR Reformed Theological Review
ZNW *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

[e]d. edited, edition(s), editor
[N]ABPR National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion
[UP] University Press
[E]*vQ The Evangelical Quarterly*
[T]*Today Theology Today*
[B]*K* Bibel und Kirche
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[Z]*WT Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[N]*ovT* Novum Testamentum
[S]*T Studia theologica*
[J]*ETS Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
[B]*TB Biblical Theology Bulletin*
[N]ABPR National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion
[UP] University Press
[J]*TS Journal of Theological Studies*
[n]s new series
[J]*ETS Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[E]*xpTim The Expository Times*
[N]*eot* Neotestamentica
[I]*nt Interpretation*
[S]WJT *Southwestern Journal of Theology*
[T]*LZ Theologische Literaturzeitung*
[UP] University Press
[J]*BL Journal of Biblical Literature*
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[W]BC Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas, TX: Word)
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[P]*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[ib]id. *ibidem*, in the same place
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[ib]id. *ibidem*, in the same place
[c]f. *confer*, compare

ibid. *ibidem*, in the same place
cf. *confer*, compare
ibid. *ibidem*, in the same place
cf. *confer*, compare
ibid. *ibidem*, in the same place
cf. *confer*, compare
ibid. *ibidem*, in the same place
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
adv adverb/adverbial
Haer. *Adversus Haereses (= Panarion)* (Epiphanius)
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
Strom. *Stromateris* (Clement of Alexandria)
P Pesher (commentary)
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
HDB *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. J. Hastings (5 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899)
NT New Testament
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
i.e. *id est*, that is
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example

---

[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[e].g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[Q] "Qumran", "Qere" Qere (To be "read." Masoretic suggested pronunciation for vocalized Hebrew text of the OT), or Quelle ("Sayings" source for the Gospels)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[J]ustin, Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[A]*pol.* Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[V] Vulgate
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[NT] New Testament
[NT]New Testament
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]ar. Baraita

e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
2 *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
2 *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
2 *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
M*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
i.e. *id est*, that is
B*arn.* Barnabas
cf. *confer*, compare
B*arn.* Barnabas
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
1QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
Str-B H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 4 vols. (Munich: Beck'sche, 1926–28)
NT New Testament
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare

[2] Peter 2 Peter
[A]*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[J]osephus, Josephus, *Contra Apionem*
[C]. *Apion* Josephus, *Contra Apionem*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[H]*om. Homiliae* (Chrysostom)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[W]BC Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas, TX: Word)
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[D]*id.* Didache
[D]*ial. Dialogue with Trypho*
[J]ustin, Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[A]*pol.* Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[A]*dv. Haer.* Irenaeus, Against All Heresies
[D]em. Demai
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[t]rans. translation/transitive
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[ib]id. *ibidem*, in the same place
[ibi]d. *ibidem*, in the same place
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[ib]id. *ibidem*, in the same place
[ib]id. *ibidem*, in the same place
[J]ustin, Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[A]*pol.* Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[J]ustin, Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[A]*pol.* Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[l]it. literally
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[l]it. literally
[N]T New Testament
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*

[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[C]*BQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
[R]*HPR Revue d'histoire et de philosophic religieuses*
[R]*evExp Review and Expositor*
[P]*STJ Perkins (School of Theology) Journal*
[E]*xpTim The Expository Times*
[B]S Biblische Studien
[V]*D Verbum domini*
[NT N]ew Testament
[T]*BT The Bible Today*
[a] a. Neither the word "apostle" nor any other word in vv 1–2 has the definite article in Greek. The absence of the article does not imply indefiniteness; rather the tendency in epistolary introductions is to omit the article. In NT epistles this is commonly the case in the writer's self-identification, in references to God or Christ, and in the "grace and peace" formula. Yet in no other epistolary introduction is the tendency carried quite so far as in 1 Peter, where even the addressees are designated without the use of the article.
[b] b. Several ancient witnesses (a
[*] 048 and a few other Gr. MSS; some vg MSS, and some *Lat* citations in Eusebius) omit Asia from the list, perhaps with the understanding that it referred to the entire territory to which 1 Peter was addressed and was therefore redundant. Asia, however, belongs on the list (as the weight of MS evidence suggests) because it is used here specifically of the Roman province of that name, not of Asia Minor as a whole. One MS (B^*) omits Bithynia, perhaps on the assumption that because Pontus and Bithynia were one province, the inclusion of both must have been a mistake by earlier scribes. The longer, more difficult, reading represented by all other MSS and versions is clearly correct.
[c] c. The bracketed word is supplied to make it clear that the three phrases which follow modify the word "chosen" in v 1, not the word "apostle." If they modified "apostle of Jesus Christ," they would have been placed between that designation and the designation of the addressees.
[d] d. The bracketed words are supplied to make it clear that the obedience in view is the initial acceptance of the Christian gospel by which a person becomes part of the Christian community. See *Comment*.
[N]T New Testament
[–]a
[G]r. Greek
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[L]*at Laternanum*

MS Monograph Series or Manuscript
MS Monograph Series or Manuscript
B MT MS, edited by Jacob ben Chayim, Venice (1524/25)
mSS manuscript(s)
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
2 *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
2 *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
i.e. *id est*, that is
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
Ign. Ignatius, *Letter to the Romans*
Rom. Ignatius, *Letter to the Romans*
2 *Clem 2 Clement*
i.e. *id est*, that is
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
OT Old Testament
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
As. *Mos.* (See T. Mos.)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
1 *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
OT Old Testament
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
NT New Testament
OT Old Testament
nIV The New International Version (1978)

LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
Pol. Polycarp to the Philippians
Phil. Polycarp to the Philippians
Mart. Pol. Martyrdom of Polycarp
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
-a
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
Pss. Sol. Psalms of Solomon
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
Leg. De Legatione ad Gaium (Philo)
NIV The New International Version (1978)
NIV The New International Version (1978)
cf. *confer*, compare
NIV The New International Version (1978)
NIV The New International Version (1978)
Ant. Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
LCL Loeb Classical Library
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
Barn. Barnabas

Barn. Barnabas
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
Pol. Polycarp to the Philippians
Phil. Polycarp to the Philippians
Mart. *Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
Theod. Theodotion
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
b. *Sanh.* Babylonian Talmud: tractate *Sanhedrin*
cf. *confer*, compare
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
Pol. Polycarp to the Philippians
Phil. Polycarp to the Philippians
Mart. *Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
cf. *confer*, compare
Diogn. Diognetus
cf. *confer*, compare
OT Old Testament
NT New Testament
LD Lectio divina (Paris: Cerf)
NTS *New Testament Studies*
NTS *New Testament Studies*
GThT Geformelet Theologisch Tijdschrift
Diss. Dissertation
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
UP University Press
BLit Bibel und Liturgie
Neot Neotestamentica
[a] a. To make sense in English, the verb "be" is supplied as if there were an optative form (eih) in the Greek text (cf. the immediately preceding optative plhqunqeih in v 2). The verb einai is frequently omitted in formulas of this kind, and when it has to be supplied, as here, it can be understood either as an indicative ("God is blessed") or as an optative ("May God be blessed"). In a confessional context the two are virtually indistinguishable. To call God "blessed" is not to make a theological pronouncement but to offer up to him one's

praise Hence the optative.
[b] b. A few ancient Gr. MSS (probably including P^{72}, although its reading is not absolutely certain), and some MSS of the *Lat* vg, have "for us" instead of "for you," thus maintaining the first person confessional style of v 3. This would make for a less abrupt shift to the second person at v 6, with the beginning of a new thought. The more awkward shift, already at the end of v 4, is represented by the overwhelming majority (including the most important) of textual witnesses, and is to be accepted. A very few late MSS begin the use of the second person even in v 3 ("gave you new birth"), suggesting a tendency among some scribes toward consistency throughout.
[c] c. P^{72} reads simply "by power," while small groups of unimportant MSS read "by the love of God" or "through the Spirit of God." The text as it stands is correct. The omission in P^{72} is probably accidental, and the other readings may have been explanatory marginal notes that at some point displaced the correct reading in the text.
[d] d. "Day" has been adopted as the translation for kairo" ("time" or "season") because kairo" refers to a particular moment, not to a duration of time. A translation such as "the last time" or "the end time" tends to become virtually synonymous with the plural ("the last times" or "the end times" or even "the last days") and to suggest that Peter has in mind a period of time immediately preceding the end, rather than the end itself. His point is not that kairo" escato" is when the salvation is ready (etoimhn) to be revealed; his point is that kairo" escato" is the precise moment when it actually will be revealed. A term used in the measurement of time, such as "day," "hour," or "moment," is more appropriate to the context and reflects better the usage of kairo" in the LXX and NT.
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[G]r. Greek
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[L]*at Laternanum*
[vg] Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[NT] New Testament
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[*] a. To make sense in English, the verb "be" is supplied as if there were an optative form (eih) in the Greek text (cf. the immediately preceding optative plhqunqeih in v 2). The verb einai is frequently omitted in formulas of this kind, and when it has to be supplied, as

here, it can be understood either as an indicative ("God is blessed") or as an optative ("May God be blessed"). In a confessional context the two are virtually indistinguishable. To call God "blessed" is not to make a theological pronouncement but to offer up to him one's praise Hence the optative.
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
NT New Testament
NT New Testament
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
Theod. Theodotion
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
Justin, Justin Martyr, *Apology*
Apol. Justin Martyr, *Apology*
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
NTS New Testament Studies
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
rsv Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
Justin, Justin Martyr, *Apology*
A*pol.* Justin Martyr, *Apology*
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
i.e. *id est*, that is
Justin, Justin Martyr, *Apology*
A*pol.* Justin Martyr, *Apology*
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
S*ib. Or.* Sibylline Oracles
A*poc. Pet. Apocalypse of Peter*
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
cf. *confer*, compare
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare

[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*iogn.* Diognetus
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]GD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[B]*Z Biblische Zeitschrift*
[N]F Neue Folge, new series
[N]*ovT* Novum Testamentum
[Z]*NW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
[W]*TJ Westminster Theological Journal*
[K]*D* Kerygma und Dogma
[N]*eot* Neotestamentica

[a] a. Most of the important ancient MSS read the present middle agalliasqe both in vv 6 and 8, but a few make one or the other active voice (i.e., in v 6: adalliasante" P^{72}; in v 8: agalliate, B, probably the first copyist of C, a few later minuscules, and the citations of Origen). The active voice (which is rare) makes little if any difference in meaning; the only effect of these variants is to make the forms of this verb in vv 6 and 8 no longer identical. There is also a tendency in quotations to read these verb forms as future: e.g., in v 6, *exultabitis* in several vg MSS; in v 8, in Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 4.9.2 (*gaudebitis*), 5.7.2 (*exultabitis*), and Pol. *Phil.* 1.3 *Lat* (*gaudebitis*). The MS evidence, however, favors agalliasqe in both places, overwhelmingly in v 6 and adequately in v 8. Only the reading agalliate in v 8 (favored by Hort, 45) has appreciable MS support, but its ending is probably to be explained by scribal confusion with agapate one line above.

[b] b. The translation "though" is based on a concessive understanding of the participle luphsente" (BDF § 418.3).

[c] c. The manuscript tradition is divided as to whether estin is to be read after ei deon. It is

included by B, the original copyist of a
, and a few of the minuscules, but omitted by the majority of both uncials and minuscules (e.g., P^{72}, the corrector of a
A C P Y 048). The difference is roughly equivalent to the difference in English between "if necessary" and "if it is necessary"—i.e., no difference at all in meaning. The breadth of evidence slightly favors omission but no clear-cut decision is possible.

[d] d. Some MSS read, instead of the nominative participle luphqente", the accusative luphqenta" (first copyist of a
L and a number of minuscules) or the infinitive luphqhnai (a very few minuscules, some vg MSS, and one Coptic version). The effect of these variants is to link the word grammatically to ei deon (i.e., "since it is necessary [for you] to be afflicted," rather than "[You] being afflicted, as is necessary"), but there is no real difference in meaning.

[e] e. A few MSS (e.g., P^{72} P^{74} and minuscules 23 36 69 206 429) read to dokimon instead of to dokimion, and it is always possible that to dokimion is an assimilation to James 1:3. Either form is to be understood as the neuter singular of an adjective meaning "genuine" (either dokimo" or dokimio") used as a noun with the meaning "genuineness" (cf. BDF § 263.2).
The adjective dokimio", although not attested in literary Greek, is found in the papyri (A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901] 259–62). Despite the parallel with James 1:3, dokimion is the more difficult reading, and in view of the weight of manuscript evidence in its favor, is to be preferred.

[f] f. idonte" ("having seen") is supported by the oldest uncial MSS (P^{72} a
B) as well as other important Alexandrian and Western witnesses (C, a few minuscules, *Lat* and other versions and the earliest citations by the church fathers); eidote" ("knowing") is the reading of A K Y, the majority of later minuscules, and the later patristic citations. If idonte" is the original reading (as the evidence indicates), the change to eidote" was probably the result of a mistake in dictation or hearing. It is doubtful that a scribe would have deliberately changed idonte" to eidote" because ouk eidote" hardly makes sense with agapate (cf. Gal 4:81). Once the accidental change was made, however, eidote" (normally used as a present participle) may have been understood as a perfect—which in a formal sense it is (cf. BGD, 555)—with a past meaning: once you did not know Christ, but now you know and love him. In this case the more difficult reading (eidote") is *not* the correct one.

[a] a. Most of the important ancient MSS read the present middle agalliasqe both in vv 6 and 8, but a few make one or the other active voice (i.e., in v 6: adalliasante" P^{72}; in v 8: agalliate, B, probably the first copyist of C, a few later minuscules, and the citations of Origen). The active voice (which is rare) makes little if any difference in meaning; the only effect of these variants is to make the forms of this verb in vv 6 and 8 no longer identical. There is also a tendency in quotations to read these verb forms as future: e.g., in v 6, *exultabitis* in several vg MSS; in v 8, in Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 4.9.2 (*gaudebitis*), 5.7.2 (*exultabitis*), and Pol. *Phil.* 1.3 *Lat* (*gaudebitis*). The MS evidence, however, favors agalliasqe in both places, overwhelmingly in v 6 and adequately in v 8. Only the reading agalliate in v 8 (favored by Hort, 45) has appreciable MS support, but its ending is probably to be explained by scribal confusion with agapate one line above.

[g] g. The pronoun umwn is omitted by B, a very few minuscules, the Coptic Sahidic version,

and certain patristic citations. A few other minuscules and versions read hmwn (which is clearly out of place in the context), umwn however, has strong and widespread support (a A C P Y 048, the great majority of later minuscules, and the Latin and Syriac versions), and is probably to be accepted. It is implied in any event because the definite article with pisti" points back to umwn th" pistew" in v 7 as well as pisteuonte" in v 8. There is a possibility (although not a strong one) that umwn could be taken with swthrian yucwn rather than th" pistew".

[h] h. lit., "salvation of souls." See *Comment*. The use of "each" in the preceding clause is intended to bring out the plurality and individuality of "souls."

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[i]e. *id est*, that is

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[B] Codex Vaticanus

[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri

[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians

[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians

[L]*at Laternanum*

[M]S Monograph Series or Manuscript

[M]S Monograph Series or Manuscript

[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)

[B] Codex Vaticanus

-a

[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[P] Pesher (commentary)

-a

[A] Codex Alexandrinus

[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[i]e. *id est*, that is

[m]SS manuscript(s)

-a

[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a

[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[i]e. *id est*, that is

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
-a
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[L]*at Laternanum*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[B] Codex Vaticanus
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[li]t. literally
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[*] a. Most of the important ancient MSS read the present middle agalliasqe both in vv 6 and 8, but a few make one or the other active voice (i.e., in v 6: adalliasante" P^{72}; in v 8: agalliate, B, probably the first copyist of C, a few later minuscules, and the citations of Origen). The active voice (which is rare) makes little if any difference in meaning; the only effect of these variants is to make the forms of this verb in vv 6 and 8 no longer identical. There is also a tendency in quotations to read these verb forms as future: e.g., in v 6, *exultabitis* in several vg MSS; in v 8, in Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 4.9.2 (*gaudebitis*), 5.7.2 (*exultabitis*), and Pol. *Phil.* 1.3 *Lat* (*gaudebitis*). The MS evidence, however, favors agalliasqe in both places, overwhelmingly in v 6 and adequately in v 8. Only the reading agalliate in v 8 (favored by Hort, 45) has appreciable MS support, but its ending is probably to be explained by scribal confusion with agapate one line above.
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] c. The manuscript tradition is divided as to whether estin is to be read after ei deon. It is included by B, the original copyist of a
, and a few of the minuscules, but omitted by the majority of both uncials and minuscules (e.g., P^{72}, the corrector of a
A C P Y 048). The difference is roughly equivalent to the difference in English between "if necessary" and "if it is necessary"—i.e., no difference at all in meaning. The breadth of evidence slightly favors omission but no clear-cut decision is possible.
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
[k]JV King James Version (1611) = AV
[a]V Authorized (King James) Version = KJV
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[n]EB The New English Bible
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[H]erm Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress)
[V]*is.* Visions
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[A]*POT* R. H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]T Old Testament
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[NT] New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[A]*dv. Haer.* Irenaeus, Against All Heresies
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare
Ign. Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
[E]*ph.* Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[l]it. literally
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[A]*POT* R. H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[*] h. lit., "salvation of souls." See *Comment*. The use of "each" in the preceding clause is intended to bring out the plurality and individuality of "souls."
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[N]*ovT* Novum Testamentum
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[a] a. eraunwnte" here and exhraunhsan in v 10 are late spellings of ereunwnte" and exhreunhsan respectively (BGD, 274, 306; cf. BDF § 30.4).
[b] b. The omission of Cristou by B ("the Spirit that was among them") probably represents the effort of a single scribe to avoid the questions raised by the apparent abrupt reference to

the preexistent Christ.

[c] c. The verb promarturesqai is found only here in the NT and is not attested either in the LXX or in classical Greek. The same is true of the verb promarturein, reflected in promarturoumenon, a variant reading found in P^{72} A P and some other witnesses. BGD (708) cites one occurrence of each in very late (eighth century A.D.) papyri. It is doubtful that there is any real difference in meaning between the two. Hort's attempt (53–54) to assign to promarturomenon a more subtle meaning than "predict" or "foretell" (i.e., on the analogy of marturesqai, which he interprets as calling God to witness) cannot be judged successful.

[d] d. The preposition en with "Holy Spirit" is missing in some important MSS (e.g., P^{72} A B Y 33 and others). The omission is in agreement with Peter's style (cf. 3:18; 4:6), but there is little difference in meaning; in either case the Spirit is being designated as the power that makes the proclamation effective. The simple dative is probably original, with the en added by later scribes to conform to common NT usage (BDF § 195).

[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)

[B] Codex Vaticanus

[N]T New Testament

[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[A] Codex Alexandrinus

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[B]GD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*

[i.]e. *id est*, that is

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[A] Codex Alexandrinus

[B] Codex Vaticanus

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[N]T New Testament

[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[O]T Old Testament

[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[NT] New Testament

[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

---

[n]EB The New English Bible
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[li]t. literally
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[A]*POT* R. H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*
[A]*POT* R. H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*
[A]*POT* R. H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*
[A]*POT* R. H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*
[1Q]pHab *Pesher on Habakbuk* from Qumran Cave 1
[1]QpHab *Pesher on Habakbuk* from Qumran Cave 1
[t]r. translation, translator(s), translated by, transpose(s)
[NT] New Testament
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]T Old Testament
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[O]T Old Testament
[O]T Old Testament
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[M]*agn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
[M]*agn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
[H]*erm. Sim. Shepherd of Hermas, Similitudes*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is

NT New Testament
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
1 *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
1QpHab *Pesher on Habakbuk* from Qumran Cave 1
NT New Testament
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
T. *Levi* Testament of Levi (from Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs)
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
rsv Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
H*erm. Sim. Shepherd of Hermas, Similitudes*
A*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
i.e. *id est*, that is
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
MT The Masoretic Text [of the Old Testament] (as published in BHS)
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
P*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
P*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[P]*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[2] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[n]EB The New English Bible
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[P]*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]d. edited, edition(s), editor
[B]FCT Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[e]d. edited, edition(s), editor
[R]*SR Recherches de science religieuse*
[S]UNT Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck)
[E]*xpTim The Expository Times*
[e]d. edited, edition(s), editor
[B]*eO* Bibbia e oriente
[a] a. This clause is usually translated "as he who called you is holy" (RSV; cf. NIV, TEV; cf. the expression "he who called you," in 2:9 and 5:10). kata, however, is a preposition

("like" or "in accordance with"), not a conjunction ("as" or "Just as"); it is not equivalent to kaqw". Thus ton … agion ("the Holy One") must be taken as the object of the preposition, with kalesanta as its participial modifier (if ton kalewanta were the object, agion would be left with no grammatical function); cf. Beare, 98.

[b] b. The formula introducing the scriptural quotation varies somewhat in the manuscript tradition, probably because the words dioti gegraptai oti (as in B oti and a few other MSS) seemed redundant to later scribes, especially in light of a second oti in the following clause. Consequently, the oti ("that") was omitted in the majority of MSS (including p^{72} a A C and P), while dioti gegraptai was omitted in two later minuscules (33 and 1243). The oti should probably be retained but left untranslated (the imperative with which the quotation begins makes it virtually untranslatable in English).

[c] c. The future indicative (esesqe) is used imperatively (as frequently in the LXX, and in Lev 11:44; 19:2; 20:7, 26 in particular; see BDF § 362). Later scribes, influenced by the more common Greek usage and by the preceding gehqhte of v 15, have introduced the imperatival forms geesqe (K P and others) and ginesqe (the majority of later MSS).

[d] d. The manuscript tradition is closely divided over whether or not the verb "to be" is expressed: egw agio" (a A* B and a few others) or egw agio" eimi (p^{72} A^c C P Y and the majority of later witnesses). The shorter reading agrees exactly with the LXX of Lev 19:2, while the eimi is found in Lev 11:44 and in some MSS of Lev 20:7, 26. It is likely that agio" is original here, and that the eimi was added at the end to correspond to the preceding aguoi esesqe, although it is also possible that an original eimi was dropped to conform the quotation exactly to Lev 19:2. The difference in meaning is inconsequential.

[e] e. The best ancient MSS (a 2 A C and others) have "last" (singular: escatou) and "ages" (plural: twn cronwn). The majority (including p^{72} and P) make both plural, while a * and Y make both singular. Scribes who overlooked the substantival use of escatou here (BDF § 264.5) would tend to make the noun and its apparent adjective modifier agree. The consistently plural rendering had been an option to LXX translators (e.g., Gen 49:1; Hos 3:5) for the Hebrew µymyh tyrjaB[, and for the consistently singular rendering, cf. Jude 18.

[f] f. The reading of the majority of ancient MSS (including p^{72} a C P and Y), "those who believe" (tou" … pisteuota"), is probably a scribal alteration of the substantive expression, "believers" (tou" … pistou", as in A B and vg). The latter is found only here with ei" and is probably to be preferred (cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 688), although the difference is slight in any case.

[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[n]IV The New International Version (1978)

[t]EV Today's English Version

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[B] Codex Vaticanus

[m]SS manuscript(s)

mSS manuscript(s)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
P Pesher (commentary)
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
P Pesher (commentary)
mSS manuscript(s)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
A Codex Alexandrinus
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
P Pesher (commentary)
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
mSS manuscript(s)
mSS manuscript(s)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
P Pesher (commentary)
-a
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
mSS manuscript(s)
-a
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
P Pesher (commentary)
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
RSR *Recherches de science religieuse*
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
rsv Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)

[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[P]*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[B]*ib Biblica*
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[S]*T Studia theologica*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[D]*id.* Didache
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*id.* Didache
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LS]J Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
Ign. Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
[E]*ph.* Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
[C]*lem. Hom.* Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[J]ustin, Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[A]*pol.* Justin Martyr, *Apology*
[B]GD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[N]T New Testament
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[*] a. This clause is usually translated "as he who called you is holy" (RSV; cf. NIV, TEV; cf. the expression "he who called you," in 2:9 and 5:10). kata, however, is a preposition ("like" or "in accordance with"), not a conjunction ("as" or "Just as"); it is not equivalent to kaqw". Thus ton … agion ("the Holy One") must be taken as the object of the preposition, with kalesanta as its participial modifier (if ton kalewanta were the object, agion would be left with no grammatical function); cf. Beare, 98.
[O]T Old Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[*] d. The manuscript tradition is closely divided over whether or not the verb "to be" is expressed: egw agio" (a
A[*] B and a few others) or egw agio" eimi (p^{72} A^{c} C P Y and the majority of later witnesses). The shorter reading agrees exactly with the LXX of Lev 19:2, while the eimi is found in Lev 11:44 and in some MSS of Lev 20:7, 26. It is likely that agio" is original here, and that the eimi was added at the end to correspond to the preceding aguoi esesqe, although it is also possible that an original eimi was dropped to conform the quotation exactly to Lev 19:2. The difference in meaning is inconsequential.
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[NT] New Testament
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[C]*IG* Corpus inscriptionum graecarum
[I]*G Inscriptiones Graecae*

[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum*
[C]*onf.* Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[D]*iogn.* Diognetus
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] g. The majority of MSS (including a
[2] A P Y) lack the definite article with "world" (i.e., en kosmw), while P[72] a
[*] B and others retain it (i.e., en tw kosmw). The weight of the evidence favors the article. Possibly it was omitted because its presence heightened the mistaken impression that umwn, "your," belonged with kosmw, "world," rather than with "brotherhood" (see BDF, § 284.1).
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[NT] New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[S]C Source chrétiennes
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare

LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
NT New Testament
Antiq. Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews or *Antiquitates*
Rom. Roman
Hist. Historia(e) (Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, Diodorus, Livy, Tacitus, Dio Cassius)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
ad comment on
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
J. *W.* Josephus, *Jewish Wars*
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
Diogn. Diognetus
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
cf. *confer*, compare
SC Source chrétiennes
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
SC Source chrétiennes
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare

Mek. Mekilta
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
As. Mos. (See T. Mos.)
APOT R. H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
rsv Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
cf. *confer*, compare
SC Source chrétiennes
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
1 *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
OTP J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY/London: Doubleday/DLT, 1983-85)
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
Magn. Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
2 *Clem 2 Clement*
Herm. Sim. Shepherd of Hermas, Similitudes
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
Dial. Dialogue with Trypho
cf. *confer*, compare
Ign. Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
Eph. Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
Magn. Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
Mart. Pol. Martyrdom of Polycarp
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
NTS New Testament Studies
Bib Biblica
Bib Biblica
cf. *confer*, compare

[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[Mo]ffatt J. Moffatt, *A New Translation of the Bible* (NT 1913; Reprint London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1926)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[n]. note
[Z]*NW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[C]*TM Concordia Theological Monthly*
[C]*TM Concordia Theological Monthly*
[C]*BQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
[a] a. The majority of MSS add here the words "through the Spirit" (dia pneumato"), but the most important early MSS (p^{72} a
A B C Y) and the most ancient versions omit them. There is no reason why they would have been dropped if they were original; more likely they were added by scribes to accent the role of the Spirit in conversion (cf. en agiasmw pneumato" in v 2).
[b] b. The majority of the ancient MSS (including p^{72} a
[*] C P Y) have a longer reading here, "out of a clean heart" (ek kaqara" kardia"), while A B and some of the OL versions and vg read simply ek kardia" ("from the heart" or "sincerely"). The latter picks up the emphasis on "genuine brotherly love" in the preceding clause, while the longer reading accents the reference to purification with which the verse begins. Despite the external evidence, ek kardia" is probably to be preferred; cf. Rom 6:17 where it occurs as here in connection with the initial obedience of Christians to the truth, or, as Paul puts it, to the "form of teaching to which you were committed" (NIV). The tendency toward expansion can be seen in one MS of Rom 6:17 (A, which preserves, ironically, the shorter reading in our passage) where ek kardia" becomes ek kaqara" kardia". It is likely that the latter, an early expression of Christian piety found in 1 Tim 1:5 (with agaph) and 2 Tim 2:22 (cf. also Ps 23[24]:4; Matt 5:8; *Herm. Vis.* 4.2.5, 5.7; *Sentences of Sextus* 46b), has influenced the manuscript tradition here on a fairly wide scale. On the other hand, if ek kaqara" kardia" is original, the shortening of the text was probably accidental, triggered by the similar ka- beginning of the two words.
[c] c. The majority of ancient MSS add here ei" ton awna ("forever"), but the earliest and best MSS do not. The added words are an intrusion from the end of the Scripture quotation

in v 25a.
[d] d. The omission of “like” (w") in a
[2] A Y and some minuscule MSS, and the substitution of “human” (anqrwpou) for “its” [glory] in P Y and the majority of later MSS, probably represent scribal efforts to conform Peter’s quotation of Isa 40:6–8 more closely to the LXX. The quotation follows the predominant LXX text except at these two points, plus the use of kuriou instead of tou qeou hmwn in v 25.
[d] d. The omission of “like” (w") in a
[2] A Y and some minuscule MSS, and the substitution of “human” (anqrwpou) for “its” [glory] in P Y and the majority of later MSS, probably represent scribal efforts to conform Peter’s quotation of Isa 40:6–8 more closely to the LXX. The quotation follows the predominant LXX text except at these two points, plus the use of kuriou instead of tou qeou hmwn in v 25.
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[m]SS manuscript(s)
-a
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[O]L Old Latin
[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber’s edition)
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[M]S Monograph Series or Manuscript
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[H]*erm.* Hermas
[V]*is.* Visions
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i.]e. *id est,* that is

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1]QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
[t]r. translation, translator(s), translated by, transpose(s)
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[H]NT Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[a]B Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] b. The majority of the ancient MSS (including p^{72} a
[*] C P Y) have a longer reading here, “out of a clean heart” (ek kaqara" kardia"), while A B and some of the OL versions and vg read simply ek kardia" (“from the heart” or “sincerely”). The latter picks up the emphasis on “genuine brotherly love” in the preceding clause, while the longer reading accents the reference to purification with which the verse begins. Despite the external evidence, ek kardia" is probably to be preferred; cf. Rom 6:17 where it occurs as here in connection with the initial obedience of Christians to the truth, or, as Paul puts it, to the “form of teaching to which you were committed” (NIV). The tendency toward expansion can be seen in one MS of Rom 6:17 (A, which preserves, ironically, the shorter reading in our passage) where ek kardia" becomes ek kaqara" kardia". It is likely that the latter, an early expression of Christian piety found in 1 Tim 1:5 (with agaph) and 2 Tim 2:22 (cf. also Ps 23[24]:4; Matt 5:8; *Herm. Vis.* 4.2.5, 5.7; *Sentences of Sextus* 46b), has influenced the manuscript tradition here on a fairly wide scale. On the other hand, if ek kaqara" kardia" is original, the shortening of the text was probably accidental, triggered by the similar ka- beginning of the two words.
[c]f. *confer*, compare

BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
lit. literally
OT Old Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
JSNT Journal for the Study of the New Testament
ser. series
NTS New Testament Studies
TynB Tyndale Bulletin
CBQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Diss. Dissertation

NTS *New Testament Studies*

a 1.a. In most of the ancient MSS, the first two items on this list ("malice" and "deceit") are singular and the last three plural, but the tendency of a few MSS is to make some or all of the last three singular as well. The evidence is strongest in the case of "hypocrisies," which is singular (upokrisin) in B a

1 and two Old Latin versions, yet the plural upokrisei" is to be preferred. "Malice" and "deceit" are set apart from the items that follow by the repetition of "all" (pasan and panta, singular in Greek). It is more likely that the singular dolon ("deceit") would influence scribes to make "hypocrisy" singular (because of their similarity in meaning) than that the plurals at the end of the list would influence a change in the opposite direction. The credibility of B in this verse is not enhanced by its unique scribal error fonou" ("murders") in place of fqonou" ("jealousies").

b 2.b. The words "to salvation" (ei" swthrian) are omitted in the majority of later MSS (cf. KJV/AV), perhaps because a salvation to which one might attain by spiritual growth seemed inconsistent with a distinctly eschatological salvation waiting to be revealed at the last day (1:4; cf. 1:9). The phrase is found in all the earlier and better MSS and should be retained.

c 3.c. A number of ancient MSS (p^{72} K L and others) read Cristo" ("Christ") instead of crhsto" ("good" or "pleasing"), in line with a wordplay very common in early Christianity (BGD, 887; *TDNT* 9:488–89). The effect of this variation is to turn a scriptural allusion into a confessional formula ("that the Lord is Christ" or "that Christ is Lord"; cf. 3:15). The earliest of the MSS that does this (p^{72}) also inserts episteusate after egeusasqe as an unmistakable indication that "tasting" means believing in Christ. crhsto", found in all other significant MSS, as well as the LXX passage to which Peter is alluding (Ps 33[34]:9a [8a]), is without question the correct reading.

mSS manuscript(s)

mSS manuscript(s)

B Codex Vaticanus

–a

B Codex Vaticanus

mSS manuscript(s)

cf. *confer,* compare

kJV King James Version (1611) = AV

aV Authorized (King James) Version = KJV

cf. *confer,* compare

mSS manuscript(s)

mSS manuscript(s)

K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)

L Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a

BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*

T*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)

cf. *confer,* compare

mSS manuscript(s)

mSS manuscript(s)

LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[B]ZNW Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* [ZNW]
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]. *Benj*. Testament of Benjamin, etc.
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[S]*im.* Similitudes
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]iss. Dissertation

[P]hilo, Philo, *De Migratione Abrahami*
[M]*igr.* Philo, *De Migratione Abrahami*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[NT] New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]. *Levi* Testament of Levi (from Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[C]*orp. Herm. Corpus Hermeticum*
[k]JV King James Version (1611) = AV
[a]V Authorized (King James) Version = KJV
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[a]dv adverb/adverbial
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[O]*des Sol.* Odes of Solomon
[O]*TP* J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY/London: Doubleday/DLT, 1983-85)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]*TP* J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY/London: Doubleday/DLT, 1983-85)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1]QH Hôdāyôt (*Thanksgiving Hymns*) from Qumran Cave 1
[1]QH Hôdāyôt (*Thanksgiving Hymns*) from Qumran Cave 1
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[AN]F A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (eds.), The Ante-Nicene Fathers
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[LS]J Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] 2.b. The words "to salvation" (ei" swthrian) are omitted in the majority of later MSS (cf. KJV/AV), perhaps because a salvation to which one might attain by spiritual growth seemed inconsistent with a distinctly eschatological salvation waiting to be revealed at the last day (1:4; cf. 1:9). The phrase is found in all the earlier and better MSS and should be retained.
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]*des Sol.* Odes of Solomon
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[*] 3.c. A number of ancient MSS (p^{72} K L and others) read Cristo" ("Christ") instead of crhsto" ("good" or "pleasing"), in line with a wordplay very common in early Christianity (BGD, 887; *TDNT* 9:488–89). The effect of this variation is to turn a scriptural allusion into a confessional formula ("that the Lord is Christ" or "that Christ is Lord"; cf. 3:15). The earliest of the MSS that does this (p^{72}) also inserts episteusate after egeusasqe as an unmistakable indication that "tasting" means believing in Christ. crhsto", found in all other significant MSS, as well as the LXX passage to which Peter is alluding (Ps 33[34]:9a [8a]), is without question the correct reading.
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[S]E *Studia Evangelica* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (= TU 73 [1959], 87 [1964], 88 [1964], 102 [1968], 103 [1968], 112 [1973]
[B]*Z Biblische Zeitschrift*
[N]F Neue Folge, new series
[N]*ovT* Novum Testamentum
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[R]*SPT Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*
[R]*evistB Revista bíblica*
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[N]ovTSup Supplement(s) to *Novum Testamentum*
[r]epr. reprint, reprinted
[A]*NRW* Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase, (Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[B]*ib Biblica*

[J]*SNT Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
[T]*ynB Tyndale Bulletin*
[T]*TZ Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*
[SB]T Studies in Biblical Theology (London/Naperville, IL: SCM/Allenson)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[S]*BFLA Studii biblici franciscani liber annuus*
[A]*TR Anglican Theological Review*
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[a] a. Some ancient MSS (a

A[c] vg and others) have the compound epoikodomeisqe in place of oikodomeisqe. The difference is slight; it is possible that the compound form is intended to call attention in advance to Christ as the foundation or "cornerstone" on which the "spiritual house" is built (vv 6, 7; cf. Eph 2:20), or the variant may simply reflect in a more general way the terminology of Eph 2:20; Col 2:7; 1 Cor 3:10–17. Peter does not explicitly develop, as Paul does, the idea of building on a foundation. Although he finds akrogwniaion and ei" kefalhn gwnia" in the texts that he cites, they do not play a dominant role in his imagery (see *Comment*). oikodomeisqe, the reading of the majority (including the most significant) of the MSS, is to be accepted as original.
[b] b. The preposition ei" ("for" or "to") is omitted in P[72], in the majority of later MSS, and in the vg The effect of the omission is to make ierateuma agion a designation of the Christian community itself (i.e., parallel to oiko" pneumatiko": "a spiritual house, a holy priesthood"; cf. v 9) rather than its function. The evidence for ei" in the earlier MSS is overwhelming: P[72] a

A B C Y and others. Thus ierateuma is not merely synonymous with oiko", but designates the purpose for which the "spiritual house" exists (see *Comment*).
[c] c. Although it does not affect the translation, there is disagreement in the manuscript tradition over whether "God" is expressed with the definite article. The majority of ancient MSS (including P[72] a

[2] and P) read tw qew, while a

[*] A B C and some significant minuscules read simply qew. The matter is almost impossible to decide, although the use of the article in Paul's similar formulations (Rom 12:1; Phil 4:18; cf. Heb 13:15) as well as Peter's preference for the article in his more formal expressions of praise or virtue offered up to God (e.g., 2:12, 17; 3:4, 18; 4:11, 16) slightly favors the retention of the article here.
[d] d. There is variation in the Greek word order of the phrase, "choice and precious cornerstone." The majority, and the best, of ancient MSS read akrogwniaion eklekton entimon, but B C and a few other witnesses have eklekton akrogwnasion entimon, conforming the word order to the LXX of Isa 28:16. They are suspect for that very reason; Peter seems to have anticipated the word order he prefers already in v 4 where eklekton and entimon are brought together. Alternatively, it is possible that scribes conformed the quotation in v 6 to the language of v 4, but this is less likely in view of the external evidence and in view of scribal tendencies elsewhere to conform quotations to the LXX
[e] e. A, P, the Syriac Peshitta and the majority of later MSS read apeiqousin ("disobedient ones") in place of apistousin ("unbelievers"). The variant seems to be influenced by the

apeiqounte" of v 8; the witness of P^{72} a

B C Y and other MSS is conclusive in favor of the text as it stands, although B in v 8 errs in the opposite direction by reading apistounte" instead of apeiqounte".

mSS manuscript(s)

-a

A Codex Alexandrinus

vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)

cf. *confer*, compare

mSS manuscript(s)

P Pesher (commentary)

mSS manuscript(s)

vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)

i.e. *id est*, that is

cf. *confer*, compare

mSS manuscript(s)

P Pesher (commentary)

-a

A Codex Alexandrinus

B Codex Vaticanus

C Codex Ephraemi Syri

mSS manuscript(s)

P Pesher (commentary)

-a

P Pesher (commentary)

-a

A Codex Alexandrinus

B Codex Vaticanus

C Codex Ephraemi Syri

cf. *confer*, compare

e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example

mSS manuscript(s)

B Codex Vaticanus

C Codex Ephraemi Syri

LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

A Codex Alexandrinus

P Pesher (commentary)

mSS manuscript(s)

P Pesher (commentary)

-a

B Codex Vaticanus

C Codex Ephraemi Syri

mSS manuscript(s)

B Codex Vaticanus

cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
NT New Testament
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
1QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
tr. translation, translator(s), translated by, transpose(s)
1QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
tr. translation, translator(s), translated by, transpose(s)
cf. *confer*, compare
1QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
ST Studia theologica
NTS New Testament Studies
Bib Biblica
cf. *confer*, compare
NTS New Testament Studies
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*ovT* Novum Testamentum
[C]*orp. Herm. Corpus Hermeticum*
[O]T Old Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[A]*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
[N]T New Testament

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[ibi]d. *ibidem*, in the same place
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]. *Sol. Testament of Solomon*
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[M]T The Masoretic Text [of the Old Testament] (as published in BHS)
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[M]S Monograph Series or Manuscript
[B M]T MS, edited by Jacob ben Chayim, Venice (1524/25)
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[k]JV King James Version (1611) = AV
[a]V Authorized (King James) Version = KJV
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[n]AB The New American Bible
[j]B A. Jones (ed.), *Jerusalem Bible*
[g]NB Good News Bible = Today's English Version
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]T The Masoretic Text [of the Old Testament] (as published in BHS)
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[MT] The Masoretic Text [of the Old Testament] (as published in BHS)
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*iogn.* Diognetus
[a]d comment on
[S]*trom. Stromateris* (Clement of Alexandria)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[MT] The Masoretic Text [of the Old Testament] (as published in BHS)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Sobrietate*
[S]*obr.* Philo, *De Sobrietate*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[R]*SPT Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[V] Vulgate
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*ib Biblica*
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)

[n]IV The New International Version (1978)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Plantatione*
[P]*lant.* Philo, *De Plantatione*
[ib]id. *ibidem*, in the same place
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare

LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
USQR *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*
NedTTs Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift
ExpTim *The Expository Times*
NT New Testament
ExpTim *The Expository Times*
RevExp *Review and Expositor*
FS Festschrift, volume written in honor of
ed. edited, edition(s), editor
BZNW Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* [ZNW]
NTS *New Testament Studies*

[a] a. A number of important ancient MSS (P^{72} A C L P and others) read the imperative apecesqe, while the majority of MSS have the infinitive apecesqai, dependent on parakalw. There is no significant difference in meaning. Both infinitive and imperative occur with "appeal" (parakalw) formulas in Paul's epistles, although the former predominates. In 1 Peter the only other such formula (5:1) is followed by the imperative, as is the only example in Hebrews (13:33).

As to the verb itself, the infinitive apecesqai is used in two memorable NT passages having to do with ethics (Acts 15:20, 29; 1 Thess 4:3; cf. 1 Tim 4:3), and scribes are perhaps more likely to have changed an original apecesqe (cf. 1 Thess 5:22) to apecesqai than the other way around. Although Peter usually prefers the aorist imperative to the present, there are exceptions (e.g., 2:17), and in the case of this particular verb, the aorist imperative is so rare as to be hardly an option. apecesqe is probably the correct reading.

[b] b. A few MSS (L P and others) read the subjunctive katalalwsin in place of the indicative katalalousin for "accuse." The effect of such a reading is to make the accusative more hypothetical: "in case they should accuse you." The indicative, however, is clearly to be preferred.

[c] c. The majority of MSS (including A P and Y) have the aorist participle epopteusante" ("having observed") in place of the present epopteuonte" ("observing"). The latter is the reading of the earliest and best MSS, however (e.g., P^{72} a

B C), and is to be accepted as original. Possibly the aorist participle was introduced because it seemed obvious to scribes that the "observing" of the good works of Christians by the Gentiles in Asia must precede, both logically and temporally, their "glorifying" of God on the final day of judgment. The participle is instrumental, explaining the ek of the

preceding phrase: “from your good works” (i.e., by observing them; see Comment on 3:2).
[c] d. “Your” is unexpressed in Greek but clearly implied. A very few MSS make the umwn explicit, however, while P^{72} inserts umwn before ton qeon(i.e., “glorify your God…”) in the verse’s final clause. These editorial alterations are probably traceable to the influence of Matt 5:16.
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[P] Pesher (commentary)
–a
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[C]odex Ephraemi Syri
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[*] a. A number of important ancient MSS (P^{72} A C L P and others) read the imperative apecesqe, while the majority of MSS have the infinitive apecesqai, dependent on paraka|w. There is no significant difference in meaning. Both infinitive and imperative occur with "appeal" (paraka|w) formulas in Paul's epistles, although the former predominates. In 1 Peter the only other such formula (5:1) is followed by the imperative, as is the only example in Hebrews (13:33).
As to the verb itself, the infinitive apecesqai is used in two memorable NT passages having to do with ethics (Acts 15:20, 29; 1 Thess 4:3; cf. 1 Tim 4:3), and scribes are perhaps more likely to have changed an original apecesqe (cf. 1 Thess 5:22) to apecesqai than the other way around. Although Peter usually prefers the aorist imperative to the present, there are exceptions (e.g., 2:17), and in the case of this particular verb, the aorist imperative is so rare as to be hardly an option. apecesqe is probably the correct reading.
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[NT] New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]. *Naph.* Testment of Naphtali (in *T. 12 Patr*.)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[V] Vulgate
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1]QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1]QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
[C]D Cairo (Genizah text of the) Damascus (Document)
[M]S Monograph Series or Manuscript
[B] MT MS, edited by Jacob ben Chayim, Venice (1524/25)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[B]*ibLeb* Bibel und Leben
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of

---

[e]d. edited, edition(s), editor
[N]*ovT* Novum Testamentum
[T]*hLZ Theologische Literaturzeitung*
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[E]*xpTim The Expository Times*
[a] a. The majority of later MSS insert oun, "then" or "therefore," making the transition to the "household codes" of 2:13–3:9 less abrupt, and explicitly making the latter a series of concrete examples of the good conduct required in v 12. That there is an implicit connection is true in any case, but as it stands the transition *is* abrupt, oun does not belong in the text. On the translation "defer," see *Comment*.
[b] b. "You" is understood as the subject, not expressed, ahhough a few MSS (C, a number of minuscules, and some of the Coptic versions) have inserted uma" into the text after agaqopoiounta".
[c] c. The spelling fimoun is well attested, and clearly to be preferred, although a
[*] has the alternate orthography fimoin, adopted by W-H (cf. BDF, § 91).
[d] d. In the best ancient MSS, the first of the commands in this verse is expressed by an aorist imperative (timhsate), while the last three are present imperatives (agapate … fobeisqe … timate). In the majority of later MSS, however, including K and L, the second command is also aorist (agaphsate). The later scribes were probably influenced by the preceding timhsate and perhaps by the allhlou" agaphsate of 1:22.
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
-a
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Decalogo*
[D]*ecal.* Philo, *De Decalogo*
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
[S]*pec. Leg.* Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
[J]osephus, Josephus, *Contra Apionem*
[C]. *Apion* Josephus, *Contra Apionem*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]GD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is

---

[*] b. “You” is understood as the subject, not expressed, ahhough a few MSS (C, a number of minuscules, and some of the Coptic versions) have inserted uma" into the text after agaqopoiounta".
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e].g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i].e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i].e. *id est*, that is
[i].e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[n]EB The New English Bible
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i].e. *id est*, that is
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e].g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

R*estQ Restoration Quarterly*
Z*NW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
R*estQ Restoration Quarterly*
N*TS New Testament Studies*

[a] a. unwn is not found in the earliest and best MSS, although it is supplied by a few (a Z some vg MSS). Peter addresses the servants impersonally at first, even though his use of the nominative as a vocative makes it appropriate to supply "you" and "your" in the translation.

[b] b. "Even" or "also" (kai) is omitted in a few ancient MSS, including p^{72} Although the external evidence is not strong, the kai would have been expected after ou monon, and it is easier to see why scribes might have added it than why they would have omitted a kai that was original. This may be an instance in which p^{72} has preserved the original reading, kai is in any case legitimately supplied in a translation.

[c] c. In place of the difficult dia suneidhsin qeou, some MSS (C Y and a few others) read dia suneidhsin agaqhn ("out of a good conscience"), while a very few (p^{72} A^* and two minuscules) exhibit a conflation (either agaqhn qeou [p^{72}] or qeou agaqhn [A^*]). That agaqhn was introduced into the text very early is shown by the witness of p^{72}, but its introduction is probably attributable to the familiarity in the church of the phrase "a good conscience"; cf. 3:16, 21; Acts 23:1; 1 Tim 1:5 (a possible source as well of the reading ek kaqara" kardia" in 1:22; see B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 690).

[d] d. In place of "beaten" (kolafizomenoi), p^{72} a 2 P Y and a number of other MSS have the more general and more expected word "punished" (kolazomenoi), a natural alteration probably traceable to careless reading. "Beaten," the reading of the majority of MSS (including a B C vg), is correct.

[e] e. The word for "patiently endure" in both parts of v 20 (upomeneite, future) is read as a present (upomenete) in some MSS (p^{72} Y and others in both instances; a number more in one or the other). The more difficult future indicative in a conditional sentence (see BDF, § 372.1c) is to be preferred. Peter's choice of the future was apparently a corollary of his choice of present rather than aorist participles to designate what preceded the patient endurance, i.e., sin or doing of good, respectively, and the consequent mistreatment. Either aorists followed by a present or presents followed by a future would have served Peter's purpose of suggesting a sequence, and he opted for the latter.

[e] e. The word for "patiently endure" in both parts of v 20 (upomeneite, future) is read as a present (upomenete) in some MSS (p^{72} Y and others in both instances; a number more in one or the other). The more difficult future indicative in a conditional sentence (see BDF, § 372.1c) is to be preferred. Peter's choice of the future was apparently a corollary of his choice of present rather than aorist participles to designate what preceded the patient endurance, i.e., sin or doing of good, respectively, and the consequent mistreatment. Either aorists followed by a present or presents followed by a future would have served Peter's purpose of suggesting a sequence, and he opted for the latter.

[f] f. Some MSS (p^{81} a Y and others) read "died" (apeqanen) in place of "suffered" (epaqen), probably because of the phrase "for you" (uper umwn) that follows. The expression apoqnhskein uper, "to die for," in the NT is commonly used of Christ's redemptive work (John 11:50–51; Rom

5:68; 14:15; I Cor 5:14–15; I Thess 5:10), while pascein uper is used of Christ's suffering only here; elsewhere in the NT it refers to Christians suffering either for Christ (Phil 1:29; cf. Acts 9:16) or for the Kingdom of God (2 Thess 1:5). It is likely that scribes conformed the unusual epaqen uper umwn to the more familiar-sounding formula. The weight of MS evidence for "suffered" (p^{72} A B K P and a majority of all MSS) bears this out.

[g] g. The majority of later MSS (including P) read "for us" rather than "for you" at this point, reflecting the common confusion of hearing between umwn and hmwn, as well as certain familiar passages that speak of Christ dying "for us" (e.g., Rom 5:8; 1 Thess 5:10), and more generally the "we/us/our" terminology of NT confessional passages. The evidence of the earliest and best MSS (p^{72} a

A B C y and others), however, conclusively favors uper umwn ("for you"). A similar variation occurs in the next clause (the very next word in Greek) between umin and hmin, and umin is similarly to be preferred. See B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 690.

[h] h. Although the reading adikw" in place of dikaiw" probably originated in certain early Greek MSS, it now exists almost exclusively in the Latin tradition (*injuste*, in one version, two Latin citations by Cyprian, the Latin translation of a citation by Clement of Alexandria, and vg). Its effect is to introduce Pilate abruptly as an unjust judge—a view contrary to that found in much of later Christian literature—but it probably came into being because of the pascwn adikw" of v 19. If Christ's suffering is the model for his followers, then it too is in some sense adikw". The reading is too weakly attested to be regarded as more than a curiosity.

[i] i. Again there is variation between hmwn and umwn. In this instance, the majority of MSS, including all but two of the most significant ones, follow the LXX of Isa 53:4 in reading hmwn, while p^{72} B and a very few others support umwn. The choice is difficult because Peter has been using the second person plural and will return to it with the iaqhte at the end of the verse. Here, however, the confessional hmwn is probably to be preferred because of the solidly attested zhswmen with which the attached purpose-clause comes to an end.

[j] j. For "his." the maiority of MSS (including a

[*] L and P); have autou, in addition to the relative ou with which the clause begins (see BDF, § 297). The best of the early MSS (p^{72} A B etc) omit autou. Was autou inserted to conform the reference to the LXX of Isa 53:5 or was an original autou editorially removed because of its redundancy? The fact that the redundancy of o" … auto" at the beginning of v 24 was allowed to stand in virtually all MSS suggests that redundancy was not an issue and that the shorter reading is probably correct (cf. Moulton, *Grammar*, i, 237).

[k] k. Ahhough the variant reading iaqhmen agrees with the LXX of Isa 53:5, the support for it is negligible (minuscule 8 and isolated examples of Latin and other versions). It is surprising in fact that this scribal adaptation to the LXX was not made more widely than it was, in view of the first person plurals in the immediately preceding context.

[l] l. A subtle difference exists in the manuscript tradition over whether the word "straying" goes with sheep (planwmena, "you were like straying sheep," in a majority of MSS, including p^{72} C P Y), or with the readers of the epistle (panwmenoi, "you were straying like sheep," in a

A B and others). The latter, bolder use of the metaphor is probably original.

[m] SS manuscript(s)

-a
vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
mss manuscript(s)
mss manuscript(s)
p Priestly Source
mss manuscript(s)
c Codex Ephraemi Syri
cf. *confer*, compare
-a
mss manuscript(s)
mss manuscript(s)
-a
vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
mss manuscript(s)
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
i.e. *id est*, that is
mss manuscript(s)
-a
NT New Testament
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
MS Monograph Series or Manuscript
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
P Pesher (commentary)
mss manuscript(s)
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
NT New Testament
mss manuscript(s)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
mss manuscript(s)
vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
mss manuscript(s)
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
-a

[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[P] [P]esher (commentary)
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[P] Pesher (commentary)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)

cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
NT New Testament
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
OT Old Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
Philo, Philo, *Quod Deus Immutabilis sit*
Immut. Philo, *Quod Deus Immutabilis sit*
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
Philo, Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
Spec. Leg. Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
cf. *confer*, compare
D*id.* Didache
lit. literally
lit. literally
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
T*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
cf. *confer*, compare
par. parallel or paragraph
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
D*id.* Didache
P*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
cf. *confer*, compare
-a
D Codex Bezae or Deuteronom(ist)ic
F Codex Ambrosíanus
G Greek translation: as published in *Septuaginta*, LXX ed. A. Rahlfs, 1935. In Daniel, G includes both OG and Th, as published in J. Ziegler's ed., 1954.
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[*] c. In place of the difficult dia suneidhsin qeou, some MSS (C Y and a few others) read dia suneidhsin agaqhn ("out of a good conscience"), while a very few (p^{72} A^{*} and two minuscules) exhibit a conflation (either agaqhn qeou [p^{72}] or qeou agaqhn [A^{*}]). That agaqhn was introduced into the text very early is shown by the witness of p^{72}, but its introduction is probably attributable to the familiarity in the church of the phrase "a good conscience"; cf. 3:16, 21; Acts 23:1; 1 Tim 1:5 (a possible source as well of the reading ek kaqara" kardia" in 1:22; see B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 690).
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[N]T New Testament
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[S]*im.* Similitudes
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Legum Allegoriarum*
[L]*eg. All.* Philo, *De Legum Allegoriarum*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[*] f. Some MSS (p^{81} a
Y and others) read "died" (apeqanen) in place of "suffered" (epaqen), probably because of the phrase "for you" (uper umwn) that follows. The expression apoqnhskein uper, "to die for," in the NT is commonly used of Christ's redemptive work (John 11:50–51; Rom 5:68; 14:15; I Cor 5:14–15; I Thess 5:10), while pascein uper is used of Christ's suffering only here; elsewhere in the NT it refers to Christians suffering either for Christ (Phil 1:29; cf. Acts 9:16) or for the Kingdom of God (2 Thess 1:5). It is likely that scribes conformed the unusual epaqen uper umwn to the more familiar-sounding formula. The weight of MS evidence for "suffered" (p^{72} A B K P and a majority of all MSS) bears this out.
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[C]*lem. Hom.* Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Virtutibus*
[V]*irt.* Philo, *De Virtutibus*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
Ign. Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
[E]*ph.* Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[B] Codex Vaticanus
-a

[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[4]QFlor Florilegium (or *Eschatological Midrashim*) from Qumran Cave 4
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Agricultura*
[A]*gr.* Philo, *De Agricultura*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]*TP* J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY/London: Doubleday/DLT, 1983-85)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[A]*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Agricultura*
[A]*gr.* Philo, *De Agricultura*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Legum Allegoriarum*
[L]*eg. All.* Philo, *De Legum Allegoriarum*
[M]*ut. Nom.* Philo, *De Mutatione nominum*
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Somniis*
[S]*om.* Philo, *De Somniis*
[Cl]em. Alex. Clement of Alexandria
[S]*trom. Stromateris* (Clement of Alexandria)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] b. "Even" or "also" (kai) is omitted in a few ancient MSS, including p^{72} Although the external evidence is not strong, the kai would have been expected after ou monon, and it is easier to see why scribes might have added it than why they would have omitted a kai that was original. This may be an instance in which p^{72} has preserved the original reading, kai is in any case legitimately supplied in a translation.
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[M]*agn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[k]JV King James Version (1611) = AV
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[H]*TR Harvard Theological Review*
[S]*EÅ Svensk exegetisk årsbok*
[E]*xp The Expositor*
[B]*eO* Bibbia e oriente
[f]., ff. following (verse or verses, pates, etc.)
[B]ZNW Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* [ZNW]
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[B]*ib Biblica*
[B]*T The Bible Translator*
[a] a. The word "wives" (gunaike") has a definite article in the majority of ancient manuscripts (p^{72} a
[2] C P Y and others), while a few important MSS (including p^{81} a
[*] A B) lack the article. Several factors (the use of the article with andrasin and gunaikwn in the same verse, with andre" in v 7, and especially with oiketai in 2:18) seem to have led scribes to expect the article here as well. Though the lightly attested reading kai (a few minuscules, some vg MSS and Syr.) provides additional indirect support for the definite article ai, the omission of the article is the more difficult, and probably the original, reading. There is no appreciable difference in meaning; the nominative with the article is equivalent to a vocative (cf. BDF § 147.3), while gunaike" without the article is a true vocative (cf. newteroi in 5:5).
[b] b. In place of the aorist participle epopteusante" some important ancient MSS (p^{72} a
[*] and others) read the present epopteusonte" (cf. Note c[*] on 2:12). It is possible that an original present has been changed to an aorist just as it has in 2:12, but in this case the support for the aorist is stronger (including B and C as well as A P Y and the majority of later MSS). In view of the frequent tendency of scribes to conform either of two roughly similar passages to the other, epopteusante" is to be preferred, though a firm choice is difficult.
[c] c. "Hair" (tricwn) is omitted is some MSS (p^{72} C Y and others). The omission (which spoils the symmetrical threefold reference to hair, jewelry, and clothes) could be accidental, or it could reflect a certain confusion of emplokh with emplokion, used in the LXX to refer to jewelry made of twisted gold (e.g., Exod 35:22; 36:22–25[39:15–18]); empokh" kai periqesw" would then be read with crusiwn: "the fashioning and putting on of gold ornaments." In any event, the omission is unlikely to be original, in view of Peter's apparent use of symmetry and the strong manuscript evidence for tricwn.
[d] d. The majority of ancient MSS (including A C P Y) have the nominative plural

sugklhronomoi", referring to the husbands (the subject of the previous clauses). The earliest and best manuscripts, however (p^{72} p^{81} a
[2] B vg and others), favor the dative plural sugklhronomoi", referring to the wives. The dative is preferable, for w" kai with the dative matches the w" asqenesterw of the preceding clause. Scribes may have been confused by the fact that in the previous clause the husbands were spoken of in the plural and "the woman" in the singular. A plural in this clause was then naturally read as still referring to the husbands, overlooking the parallel between w" and w" kai with the dative. See B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 690–91; Goppelt, 222.
[e] e. "Eternal" has been added to "life" by scribes in p^{72} (zwh" aiwniou) and supplied in the Syriac Peshitta. The adjective "diversified" (poikilh") has similarly been inserted with "grace" in several manuscripts (a
A and others), probably influenced by the language of 4:10. The simple carito" was evidently too simple for some later scribes. Eternal life is implied in any case.
[f] f. p^{81} and B have "you will not be hindered in your prayers" (tai" proseucai" instead of ta" proseuca"), a reading probably introduced by scribes because the verb egkoptein is normally used in relation to persons rather than their activities.
[p] Priestly Source
-a
[c] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[p] Priestly Source
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[Sy]r. Syriac language or text version of the OT, (as published in the Peshitta Insitute edition, 1980)
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[p] Priestly Source
-a
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[*] c. "Hair" (tricwn) is omitted is some MSS (p^{72} C Y and others). The omission (which spoils the symmetrical threefold reference to hair, jewelry, and clothes) could be accidental, or it could reflect a certain confusion of emplokh with emplokion, used in the LXX to refer to jewelry made of twisted gold (e.g., Exod 35:22; 36:22–25[39:15–18]); empokh" kai periqesw" would then be read with crusiwn: "the fashioning and putting on of gold ornaments." In any event, the omission is unlikely to be original, in view of Peter's

apparent use of symmetry and the strong manuscript evidence for tricwn.
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[p] Priestly Source
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[p] Priestly Source
[p] Priestly Source
–a
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
[p] Priestly Source
–a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[p] Priestly Source
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[L]CL Loeb Classical Library
[LC]L Loeb Classical Library
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[T]. *Reub. Testament of Reuben*
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Migratione Abrahami*
[M]*igr.* Philo, *De Migratione Abrahami*
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Virtutibus*
[V]*irt.* Philo, *De Virtutibus*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[*] c. "Hair" (tricwn) is omitted is some MSS (p^{72} C Y and others). The omission (which spoils the symmetrical threefold reference to hair, jewelry, and clothes) could be accidental, or it could reflect a certain confusion of emplokh with emplokion, used in the LXX to refer to jewelry made of twisted gold (e.g., Exod 35:22; 36:22–25[39:15–18]); empokh" kai periqesw" would then be read with crusiwn: "the fashioning and putting on of gold ornaments." In any event, the omission is unlikely to be original, in view of Peter's apparent use of symmetry and the strong manuscript evidence for tricwn.
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[AN]F A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (eds.), The Ante-Nicene Fathers
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*id.* Didache
[P]*ss. Sol.* Psalms of Solomon
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[NT] New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]T Old Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]*agn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

cf. *confer*, compare
OT Old Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
eg. *exempli gratia*, for example
Tg. Yer. II *Targum Yerušalmi II* (optional title)
S*ipre* Sipre
Roš. Haš. Roš Haššana
Str-B H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 4 vols. (Munich: Beck'sche, 1926–28)
cf. *confer*, compare
T*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
cf. *confer*, compare
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
OT Old Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
Heb. Hebrew
cf. *confer*, compare
Str-B H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 4 vols. (Munich: Beck'sche, 1926–28)
cf. *confer*, compare
eg. *exempli gratia*, for example
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
ie. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
eg. *exempli gratia*, for example
S*ipre* Sipre
L*ev. Rab. Midraš Rabbah* on Leviticus
cf. *confer*, compare
Philo, Philo, *De Legum Allegoriarum*
L*eg. All.* Philo, *De Legum Allegoriarum*
cf. *confer*, compare
Philo, Philo, *De Congressu quaerendae Eruditionis gratia*
C*ong.* Philo, *De Congressu quaerendae Eruditionis gratia*
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
Philo, Philo, *De Congressu quaerendae Eruditionis gratia*
C*ong.* Philo, *De Congressu quaerendae Eruditionis gratia*
cf. *confer*, compare

[M]*ut. Nom.* Philo, *De Mutatione nominum*
[L]CL Loeb Classical Library
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[mg] margin (al)
[mg] margin (al)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[M]*ut. Nom.* Philo, *De Mutatione nominum*
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
[S]*pec. Leg.* Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]T Old Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[N]T New Testament
[li]t. literally
[li]t. literally
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[LC]L Loeb Classical Library
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[E]*p. Arist.* Epistle of Aristeas
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Ebrietate*
[E]*br.* Philo, *De Ebrietate*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]*agn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[A]*dv. Haer.* Irenaeus, Against All Heresies
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[H]*erm. Sim. Shepherd of Hermas, Similitudes*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] e. “Eternal” has been added to “life” by scribes in p^{72} (zwh" aiwniou) and supplied in the

Syriac Peshitta. The adjective “diversified” (poikilh") has similarly been inserted with “grace” in several manuscripts (a
A and others), probably influenced by the language of 4:10. The simple carito" was evidently too simple for some later scribes. Eternal life is implied in any case.
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[S]*trom. Stromateris* (Clement of Alexandria)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[E]*xpTim The Expository Times*
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[A]*sSeign* Assemblées du Seigneur
[B]*eO* Bibbia e oriente
[a] a. The majority of later manuscripts (P and others) have “knowing that” instead of “for” (i.e., eidote" oti instead of oti), but the manuscript support for the simple oti is overwhelming (p^{72} p^{81} a
; A B C K Y and others), eidote" was added probably as a common form used in Christian moral instruction (see Comment on 1:18.)
[b] b. At the end of v 12, a few late minuscule MSS add the words “to destroy them from the earth” (tou exoloqreusai autou" ek gh") in an apparent attempt to extend the LXX quotation to the end of Ps 33:17 [34:16] (the LXX has “to destroy the memory of them from the earth”). But Peter’s quotation ends more abruptly; he prefers for the time being to leave undefined the fate of “those who do evil.”
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

cf. *confer*, compare
OT Old Testament
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
OT Old Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
G*eog. Geography* (Strabo)
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
A*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
T. *Iss. Testament of Issachar*
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
Philo, Philo, *De Josepho*
J*os.* Philo, *De Josepho*
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare

[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[T]. *Zeb* Testament of Zebulun (in *T. 12 Patr.*)
[N]T New Testament
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[P]*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]d. edited, edition(s), editor
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[P]*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*id.* Didache
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]*r Orientalia* (Rome)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[NT] New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*id.* Didache
[O]T Old Testament

cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
OT Old Testament
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
ʿAbot Pirqe ʾAbot
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
OT Old Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare

[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[*] b. At the end of v 12, a few late minuscule MSS add the words "to destroy them from the earth" (tou exoloqreusai autou" ek gh") in an apparent attempt to extend the LXX quotation to the end of Ps 33:17 [34:16] (the LXX has "to destroy the memory of them from the earth"). But Peter's quotation ends more abruptly; he prefers for the time being to leave undefined the fate of "those who do evil."
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[O]T Old Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[S]BL Society of Biblical Literature
[A]nBib Analecta biblica (Rome: PBI)
[J]*BL Journal of Biblical Literature*
[E]*xpTim The Expository Times*
[J]*BL Journal of Biblical Literature*
[E]*xp The Expositor*
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[V]*D Verbum domini*
[R]*evExp Review and Expositor*
[T]*Gl Theologie und Glaube*
[a] a. In place of the word translated "partisans" (zhlwtai), the majority of the later manuscripts (including K L P) have the weaker term "followers" (mimhtai), perhaps because of the bad political connotation of zhlwtai in the sense of "Zealots." But zhlwtai, favored by the best and most ancient MSS (P^{72} a B A and others), is clearly to be preferred.
[b] b. The words "and don't be troubled" (mhde taracqhte) are omitted in P^{72} B L. They might conceivably have been inserted in a scribal attempt to complete the LXX quotation by linking the preceding words from Isa 8:12 with the allusion to 8:13 which immediately follows. But more likely they were original and were omitted accidentally because of the similar endings of fobhqhte and taracqhte in the quotation.
[c] c. The majority of later MSS (including K L P) read "the Lord God" (kurion de ton qeon) in place of "the Lord Christ." But the witness of such early manuscripts as P^{72} a A B C Y and the Lat. Syr. and Coptic versions, is decisive in favor of "the Lord Christ." While an alteration of qeon to Criston would have heightengd Peter's christological interest, the change in the opposite direction conforms the quotation more closely to Isa 8:13 LXX, where auton refers to God (scribes may even have been familiar with LXX manuscripts that read kurion ton qeon in that verse).
[d] d. The connective alla is omitted in the majority of later MSS (including K L P and others), probably because what followed did not seem to stand in sharp contrast to what preceded. But see *Comment*. The MS evidence for alla in the earliest and best MSS is conclusive.
[e] e. There was a tendency among scribes to conform the phraseology here to that of 2:12b

(katalalousin umwn w" kakopoiwn), either consistently (as in a
A C K and the majority of later MSS) or in part (as in vg and in isolated *Lat* Syr. and Coptic versions). But the simple katalaleisqe (a
B Y and a number of other ancient MSS) is clearly to be preferred. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 691–92.
[f] f. A very few MSS (C being the earliest) have "pure" instead of "good," and a different word order (thn en Cristw agnhn anastrofhn). The variant is secondary, prompted by 3:2.
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
-a
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[S]yr. Syriac language or text version of the OT, (as published in the Peshitta Insitute edition, 1980)
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[M]S Monograph Series or Manuscript
[m]SS manuscript(s)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[m]SS manuscript(s)

vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
L*at Laternanum*
Syr. Syriac language or text version of the OT, (as published in the Peshitta Insitute edition, 1980)
-a
B Codex Vaticanus
mSS manuscript(s)
mSS manuscript(s)
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
i.e. *id est*, that is
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
aB Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday)
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
Philo, Philo, *De Praemiis et Poenis*
P*raem.* Philo, *De Praemiis et Poenis*
Diss. Dissertation
Philo, Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
S*pec. Leg.* Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
Philo, Philo, *De Virtutibus*
V*irt.* Philo, *De Virtutibus*
NT New Testament
NT New Testament
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
cf. *confer*, compare
P*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
P*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
Z*NW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]DF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*rall.* Ignatius, Letter to the Trallians
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[P]*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[*] e. There was a tendency among scribes to conform the phraseology here to that of 2:12b

(katalalousin umwn w" kakopoiwn), either consistently (as in a
A C K and the majority of later MSS) or in part (as in vg and in isolated *Lat* Syr. and Coptic versions). But the simple katalaleisqe (a
B Y and a number of other ancient MSS) is clearly to be preferred. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 691–92.
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
ibid. *ibidem*, in the same place
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
OT Old Testament
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
OT Old Testament
ZAW Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
NT New Testament
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
CBQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly
NovT Novum Testamentum
JTS Journal of Theological Studies
ns new series
ExpTim The Expository Times
AnBib Analecta biblica (Rome: PBI)
Greg Gregorianum
Bib Biblica
WTJ Westminster Theological Journal
BZ Biblische Zeitschrift
FS Festschrift, volume written in honor of
JBL Journal of Biblical Literature
ExpTim The Expository Times

[E]*xp The Expositor*
[E]*xp The Expositor*
[E]*xp The Expositor*
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[Z]*NW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
[J]*BL Journal of Biblical Literature*
[E]*xpTim The Expository Times*
[S]E *Studia Evangelica* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (= TU 73 [1959], 87 [1964], 88 [1964], 102 [1968], 103 [1968], 112 [1973]
[J]*TS Journal of Theological Studies*
[C]*TM Concordia Theological Monthly*
[E]*xpTim The Expository Times*
[E]*xpTim The Expository Times*
[a] a. The reading "suffered for sins," based on the peri amartiwn epasen of B K P and the majority of later minuscules, is a relatively simple reading appropriate to both the context and Peter's usage. Because it plausibly explains the other variants, it has the strongest claim to acceptance as the original reading. As in 2:21, some MSS tend to substitute "died" (apeqanen) for "suffered" (epaqen), and those that do invariably add to the phrase "for sins" either uper hmwn ("for us"), uper umwn ("for you"), or something equivalent. Although the combined testimony for these longer readings is impressive (e.g., P^{72} a A), they are probably conflations of Peter's phrase peri amartiwn with certain traditional expressions such as "Christ died for us" or "for you" or "for our sins." See *Note* e on 2:21*; also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 692–63; F. W. Beare, *JBL* 80 (1961) 258.
[b] b. In place of "you" (uma") some early MSS (a
[2]A C K L and others) have "us" (hma"), but the witness of the majority of MSS, including some of the most important early ones (P^{72} B P and Y) is sufficient to establish the originality of uma". The second person plural continues the terminology of vv 13–17; the first person could have been introduced either accidentally or as a result of the same tendency toward confessional language that is evident elsewhere. See *Note* f on 2:21*.
[c] c. The majority, and the best, of ancient MSS express the contrasting parallelism of these two clauses with a men … de construction in Gr., but the men is omitted in P^{72} Y and probably A*. Possibly the omission is linked to the addition of en before pneumati in the second clause in P^{72}, a variant that disturbs the symmetry of sarki … pneumati (cf. 4:6) and may have appeared to scribes to make a men … de construction inappropriate. Because the en before pneumati is itself not original, but probably an early scribal attempt to prepare for the en w clause that immediately follows, the men … de construction should be left intact.
[d] d. An ingenious conjecture traceable to the Gr. NT published by J. Bowyer in 1763 substitutes ïEnwc ("Enoch") for en w ("in which") at the beginning of the verse. This would make Enoch (cf. Gen 5:24) the subject of the proclamation to the spirits in prison, in accordance with the pseudepigraphic Enoch literature (see *Comment*). A refinement of this conjecture (en w kai ÉEnwc, "in which Enoch"), made by J. R. Harris (*Exp* 6.4 [1901] 346–49; 6.5 [1902] 317–20; 6.6 [1902] 378), found its way into the Goodspeed and Moffatt translations of the NT (cf. E. J. Goodspeed, *JBL* 73 [1954] 91–92). The conjecture has no ancient MS support, and is of interest only in calling attention to how Christ in 1 Peter

fulfills a role similar to that of the patriarch Enoch in the pseudepigraphic books of *1* and *2 Enoch* (cf. Dalton, *Proclamation*, 136–37).

[e] e. The substitution of pneumati for pneumasin (P^{72}, two minuscules, a few vg MSS) is either an unintentional slip or a further attempt by the scribes responsible for P^{72} to link the journey and proclamation of v 19 directly (and somewhat redundantly) to the "spirit" mentioned at the end of v 18; either "in which spirit he went and made proclamation even to those in refuge," or "in which [i.e., in the spirit] he went and by the spirit made proclamation even to those in refuge." The effect of the variant is that "those in refuge" are explicitly identified neither as spirits, angels, nor human beings, although the impression is left that they are human beings.

In a different vein, the addition of katakleismenoi" ("locked") after en fulakh in C and a few other Gr. MSS, as well as some MSS of the vg, looks like an effort to be more specific and less abrupt about the mysterious "prisoners." But toi" en fulakh pneumasin is surely to be preferred on the ground of overwhelming external evidence.

[f] f. A majority of the later MSS (including C P and Y) read the feminine oligai for "a few" instead of the masculine oligoi. The latter, however, supported by the best ancient MSS (P^{72} A B and others), is clearly original. The feminine was substituted on the understanding that "a few" was an adjective modifying "souls" (yucai, feminine); instead it is used here as a noun—"a few" or "a few people" (masculine and thus generic), immediately specified as "eight souls."

[g]

[h] h. The majority of later MSS read uma" but hma" (the reading of the earliest and best MSS (P^{72} a

A B P Y and others) is to be preferred. Although personal pronouns are infrequent in the context, when they do occur they are invariably second person (vv 13–16, 18, 21; 4:1, 4).

[i] i. The word for "God" has the definite article (tou qeou) in the majority of MSS (including P^{72} a

A C P), but lacks it in several important early MSS (e.g., a

B Y). The fact that all other NT examples of the phrase "at the right hand of God" use the definite article (Acts 2:33; Rom 8:34; Col 3:1; Heb 10:12; cf. Acts 7:55–56) suggests that scribes would have tended to add the article, but not to omit it if it were original. en dexia qeou is therefore probably the correct reading.

After the phrase "at the right hand of God," one OL and many vg MSS have added the words *deglutiens mortem ut vitae aeternae heredes efficeremur* ["swallowing up death so that we might be made heirs of eternal life"]; for the first part, cf. Isa 25:8; for the second, Titus 3:7b, in a context rich in parallels to 1 Pet 1:3–5 as well. See *Form/Structure/Setting* for the possible origin of this secondary gloss.

[B] Codex Vaticanus

[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[-]a

[A C]odex Alexandrinus

* e. The word for “patiently endure” in both parts of v 20 (upomeneite, future) is read as a present (upomenete) in some MSS (p^{72} Y and others in both instances; a number more in one or the other). The more difficult future indicative in a conditional sentence (see BDF, § 372.1c) is to be preferred. Peter’s choice of the future was apparently a corollary of his choice of present rather than aorist participles to designate what preceded the patient endurance, i.e., sin or doing of good, respectively, and the consequent mistreatment. Either aorists followed by a present or presents followed by a future would have served Peter’s purpose of suggesting a sequence, and he opted for the latter.

JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*

mSS manuscript(s)

-a

A Codex Alexandrinus

C Codex Ephraemi Syri

K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)

L Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a

mSS manuscript(s)

P Pesher (commentary)

B Codex Vaticanus

P Pesher (commentary)

* f. Some MSS (p^{81} a

Y and others) read “died” (apeqanen) in place of “suffered” (epaqen), probably because of the phrase “for you” (uper umwn) that follows. The expression apoqnhskein uper, “to die for,” in the NT is commonly used of Christ’s redemptive work (John 11:50–51; Rom 5:68; 14:15; I Cor 5:14–15; I Thess 5:10), while pascein uper is used of Christ’s suffering only here; elsewhere in the NT it refers to Christians suffering either for Christ (Phil 1:29; cf. Acts 9:16) or for the Kingdom of God (2 Thess 1:5). It is likely that scribes conformed the unusual epaqen uper umwn to the more familiar-sounding formula. The weight of MS evidence for “suffered” (p^{72} A B K P and a majority of all MSS) bears this out.

mSS manuscript(s)

Gr. Greek

P Pesher (commentary)

A Codex Alexandrinus

P Pesher (commentary)

cf. *confer,* compare

Gr. Greek

NT New Testament

cf. *confer,* compare

Exp The Expositor

NT New Testament

cf. *confer,* compare

JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*

MS Monograph Series or Manuscript

2 *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch

cf. *confer,* compare

P Pesher (commentary)
vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
i.e. *id est*, that is
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
Gr. Greek
mss manuscript(s)
mss manuscript(s)
vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
mss manuscript(s)
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
P Pesher (commentary)
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
-a
mss manuscript(s)
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
P Pesher (commentary)
mss manuscript(s)
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
P Pesher (commentary)
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
C Codex Ephraemi Syri
P Pesher (commentary)
mss manuscript(s)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
-a
B Codex Vaticanus
NT New Testament

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]L Old Latin
[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[O]T Old Testament
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*reat. Res. Treatise on Resurrection*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*reat. Res. Treatise on Resurrection*
[*] i. The word for "God" has the definite article (tou qeou) in the majority of MSS (including P^{72} a
A C P), but lacks it in several important early MSS (e.g., a
B Y). The fact that all other NT examples of the phrase "at the right hand of God" use the definite article (Acts 2:33; Rom 8:34; Col 3:1; Heb 10:12; cf. Acts 7:55–56) suggests that scribes would have tended to add the article, but not to omit it if it were original. en dexia qeou is therefore probably the correct reading.
After the phrase "at the right hand of God," one OL and many vg MSS have added the words *deglutiens mortem ut vitae aeternae heredes efficeremur* ["swallowing up death so that we might be made heirs of eternal life"]; for the first part, cf. Isa 25:8; for the second, Titus 3:7b, in a context rich in parallels to 1 Pet 1:3–5 as well. See *Form/Structure/Setting* for the possible origin of this secondary gloss.
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*reat. Res. Treatise on Resurrection*
[T]*reat. Res. Treatise on Resurrection*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[T]*reat. Res. Treatise on Resurrection*

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*reat. Res. Treatise on Resurrection*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[Q] "Qumran", "Qere" Qere (To be "read." Masoretic suggested pronunciation for vocalized Hebrew text of the OT), or Quelle ("Sayings" source for the Gospels)
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*ib Biblica*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]T Old Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[NT] New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*iogn.* Diognetus
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[O]T Old Testament

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[NT]New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[n]EB The New English Bible
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is

[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[NT] New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[O]*TP* J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY/London: Doubleday/DLT, 1983-85)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[N]T New Testament

[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[N]T New Testament
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[O]*TP* J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY/London: Doubleday/DLT, 1983-85)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[O]*TP* J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY/London: Doubleday/DLT, 1983-85)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]. *Levi* Testament of Levi (from Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs)
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]*agn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[2] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch
[J]*ub.* Jubilees
[A]*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Migratione Abrahami*
[M]*igr.* Philo, *De Migratione Abrahami*
[S]*ib. Or.* Sibylline Oracles
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]g. Onq. *Targum Onqelos*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[J]osephus, Josephus, *Contra Apionem*
[C]. *Apion* Josephus, *Contra Apionem*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[S]*ib. Or.* Sibylline Oracles
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[D]*ial. Dialogue with Trypho*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[H]erm Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress)

[V]*is.* Visions
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*ial. Dialogue with Trypho*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[A]*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
[J]*ud Judaica*
[LC]L Loeb Classical Library
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
[S]*pec. Leg.* Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[A]*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] b. In place of "you" (uma") some early MSS (a
[2]A C K L and others) have "us" (hma"), but the witness of the majority of MSS, including some of the most important early ones (P^{72} B P and Y) is sufficient to establish the originality of uma". The second person plural continues the terminology of vv 13–17; the first person could have been introduced either accidentally or as a result of the same

tendency toward confessional language that is evident elsewhere. See *Note* f on 2:21[*].
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[S] Syriac
[M] Mishnah
[M] Mishnah
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[*] i. The word for "God" has the definite article (tou qeou) in the majority of MSS (including P^{72} a
A C P), but lacks it in several important early MSS (e.g., a
B Y). The fact that all other NT examples of the phrase "at the right hand of God" use the definite article (Acts 2:33; Rom 8:34; Col 3:1; Heb 10:12; cf. Acts 7:55–56) suggests that scribes would have tended to add the article, but not to omit it if it were original. en dexia qeou is therefore probably the correct reading.
After the phrase "at the right hand of God," one OL and many vg MSS have added the words *deglutiens mortem ut vitae aeternae heredes efficeremur* ["swallowing up death so that we might be made heirs of eternal life"]; for the first part, cf. Isa 25:8; for the second, Titus 3:7b, in a context rich in parallels to 1 Pet 1:3–5 as well. See *Form/Structure/Setting* for the possible origin of this secondary gloss.

NT New Testament
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
NT New Testament
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
Pol. Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
Phil. Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
NT New Testament
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
A*USS Andrews University Seminary Studies*
T*Z Theologische Zeitschrift* (ThZ)
T*Z Theologische Zeitschrift* (ThZ)
a a. The majority of ancient MSS (including a
A P) insert the words uper hmwn between and paqonto"; and sarki; a few others (including a
) insert uper umwn, and a
* reads apoqanonto" in place of paqonto" (cf. Notes e* and f* on 2:21 and Note a* on 3:18). The evidence in favor of the text as it stands (P^{72} B Y and others) is conclusive.
b b. "In" is not expressed in the best Gr. MSS but is indicated by the dative sarki, as in the line above and in 3:18. The majority of later MSS, however (including K P), have en sarki as in v 2. It is possible that the alteration was made in order to identify the one who in suffering "is through with sin" as an indefinite individual and not as Christ, who "suffered in the flesh" according to v 1a. Scribes may have wanted to avoid any implication that Christ had ever been a sinner; the effect of en sarki would have been to link v 1b more closely to v 2 than to the reference to Christ in v 1a. The manuscript evidence is conclusive, however, in favor of the simple sarki.

[c] c. In place of "sin" (amartia", genitive singular) some ancient MSS (e.g., a B Y) have "sins" (amartiai", dative plural), while very few, mostly late ones, insert apo before amartia". The latter variant simply adjusts Peter's style to a more common usage (pauesqai with apo; BGD, 638); the former is not common usage (pauesqai is not normally followed by a dative) but appears to be a purely accidental assimilation to the epiqumiai" that shortly follows (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 694; Y actually reads amartiai" in both places) or else a more conscious alteration influenced by 2:24 (cf. also Paul's uses of the dative singular in connection with "dying to sin" in Rom. 6:2, 10, 11).

[d] d. Some MSS personalize Peter's style here with the addition of either umin (a* and others) or hmin (C K L P and others), but in the best and most ancient MSS (P^{72} a* A B Y and others, as well as the *Lat* and Syr. versions), Peter keeps his style general and impersonal: there is no pronoun (in the best MSS, none between v 1 and v 4).

Another variant defines the "time" as time "of life" (tou biou), perhaps to make it clear that Peter is referring to the behavior of individuals before their conversion, not to the state of the world before the coming of Christ. This reading, found in K L P and in the majority of later MSS, makes good sense in light of the ton epiloipon … biwsai cronon, "to live the rest of the time," at the end of the preceding verse, but it is easier to see why scribes might have added it for clarification than why they would have omitted it if it were original. The best MSS (P^{72} a A B and others) do not have it, and it is almost certainly a later addition.

[e] e. The majority of later MSS (including P) read qelhma for the "will" of the Gentiles (i.e., "what the Gentiles wanted"), but the best and earliest MSS (P^{72} a A B C Y and others) have boulhma ("purpose" or "intention"). Peter consistently uses qelhma for the "will" of God (2:15; 3:17; 4:2, 19; contrast 2 Pet 1:21), and it may be that the scribes changed boulhma to Peter's more common usage without observing the distinction that Peter himself maintained (cf. anqrwpwn epiqumiai" in contrast to qelhmati qeou in v 2).

[f] f. In place of the participle blasfhmounte", certain MSS (a* C* and others) have kai blasfhmousin The effect of this reading is to link the verb more closely to what precedes than to what follows: "This time they are surprised … and they blaspheme [God]" or "they slander [you]." The manuscript evidence is not strong enough to sustain this variant. The more difficult blasfhmounte" is to be preferred, and should probably be taken with what follows.

[g] g. Several variants seem to have arisen from the failure of scribes to understand the idiom etoimw" ecein (BGD, 316). In place of tw etoimw" econti krinai, some MSS have tw etoimw" krinonti ("the One who readily judges," B Y and others), and some have tw etoimw krinai ("the One who is ready to judge," P^{72} and others). The text as it stands, however, is supported by the majority of all MSS (including a A C P) and should be accepted as the original.

[m]SS manuscript(s)

-a

[A] Codex Alexandrinus

[P] Pesher (commentary)

-a

-a

cf. *confer,* compare

* e. The word for "patiently endure" in both parts of v 20 (upomeneite, future) is read as a present (upomenete) in some MSS (p^{72} Y and others in both instances; a number more in one or the other). The more difficult future indicative in a conditional sentence (see BDF, § 372.1c) is to be preferred. Peter's choice of the future was apparently a corollary of his choice of present rather than aorist participles to designate what preceded the patient endurance, i.e., sin or doing of good, respectively, and the consequent mistreatment. Either aorists followed by a present or presents followed by a future would have served Peter's purpose of suggesting a sequence, and he opted for the latter.

* f. Some MSS (p^{81} a

Y and others) read "died" (apeqanen) in place of "suffered" (epaqen), probably because of the phrase "for you" (uper umwn) that follows. The expression apoqnhskein uper, "to die for," in the NT is commonly used of Christ's redemptive work (John 11:50–51; Rom 5:68; 14:15; I Cor 5:14–15; I Thess 5:10), while pascein uper is used of Christ's suffering only here; elsewhere in the NT it refers to Christians suffering either for Christ (Phil 1:29; cf. Acts 9:16) or for the Kingdom of God (2 Thess 1:5). It is likely that scribes conformed the unusual epaqen uper umwn to the more familiar-sounding formula. The weight of MS evidence for "suffered" (p^{72} A B K P and a majority of all MSS) bears this out.

* a. The reading "suffered for sins," based on the peri amartiwn epasen of B K P and the majority of later minuscules, is a relatively simple reading appropriate to both the context and Peter's usage. Because it plausibly explains the other variants, it has the strongest claim to acceptance as the original reading. As in 2:21, some MSS tend to substitute "died" (apeqanen) for "suffered" (epaqen), and those that do invariably add to the phrase "for sins" either uper hmwn ("for us"), uper umwn ("for you"), or something equivalent. Although the combined testimony for these longer readings is impressive (e.g., P^{72} a

A), they are probably conflations of Peter's phrase peri amartiwn with certain traditional expressions such as "Christ died for us" or "for you" or "for our sins." See *Note* e on 2:21*; also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 692–63; F. W. Beare, *JBL* 80 (1961) 258.

P Pesher (commentary)

B Codex Vaticanus

Gr. Greek

mss manuscript(s)

mss manuscript(s)

K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)

P Pesher (commentary)

mss manuscript(s)

e.g. *exempli gratia,* for example

-a

B Codex Vaticanus

BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*

cf. *confer,* compare

mss manuscript(s)

-a
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]ss manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[L]*at Laternanum*
[S]yr. Syriac language or text version of the OT, (as published in the Peshitta Insitute edition, 1980)
[m]ss manuscript(s)
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]ss manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[m]ss manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[m]ss manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[m]ss manuscript(s)
-a
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[m]ss manuscript(s)
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]ss manuscript(s)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri
[P] Pesher (commentary)

[i]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]SJ Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[M]M J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder, 1930)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[t]EV Today's English Version
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Legum Allegoriarum*
[L]*eg. All.* Philo, *De Legum Allegoriarum*
[LC]L Loeb Classical Library
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[l]it. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[A]*POT* R. H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[NT] New Testament
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[T]. *Reub. Testament of Reuben*
[T]. *Iss. Testament of Issachar*
[T]. *Asher Testament of Asher*
[V]*is.* Visions
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[H]erm Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress)
[V]*is.* Visions
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[NT] New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*ell. De Bello Judaico* (Josephus)
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[E]*th. Nic. Nicomachean Ethics* (Aristotle)
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Vita Mosis*
[M]*os.* Philo, *De Vita Mosis*
[P]hilo, Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
[S]*pec. Leg.* Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
[NT]New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[T]. *Jud.* Testament of Judah (in *T. 12 Patr.*)
[D]*id.* Didache
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[J]osephus, Josephus, *Vita*
[V]*it.* Josephus, *Vita*
[J]. *W.* Josephus, *Jewish Wars*
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[J]. *W.* Josephus, *Jewish Wars*
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[D]*id.* Didache
[D]*iogn.* Diognetus
[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[NT]New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[l]it. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[H]erm Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress)
[V]*is.* Visions
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[B]*arn.* Barnabas
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[P]*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]*agn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[l]it. literally
[l]it. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[B]S Biblische Studien
[R]*estQ Restoration Quarterly*
[B]*eO* Bibbia e oriente
[A]*sSeign* Assemblées du Seigneur
[a] a. "Prayers" in Greek (proseuca") is without the definite article in the best ancient MSS, although the article (ta") is added in the majority of later MSS (including K L and P). The plural of proseuch without the article is relatively infrequent (in the NT only in a very generalized sense in 1 Tim 2:1), and it appears likely that later scribes added the article in accordance with well established usage.
[b] b. The majority of MSS (including P^{72} a
L and P) have the future kaluyei ("will cover") here, but several early and significant MSS (A B C K and others) have the present kaluptei. A decision is difficult on the basis of the manuscript evidence; the future could be regarded as an assimilation to James 5:20 (Beare, 185; Goppelt, 284) or the present could be an assimilation to the LXX of Prov 10:12. Because the clause as a whole is so different from the Proverbs passage, however, it is doubtful that a quotation is intended. The eschatological nature of the context favors the future, but the persistence of the present in two later examples of the same pronouncement (both originating from the Roman church: *1 Clem* 49.5 and *2 Clem* 16.4) make the present somewhat more probable here as well.
[c] c. Instead of the singular goggusmou, the majority of later MSS (including K L and P) read

the plural goggusmwn ("complaints," cf. Phil 2:14), but the overwhelming evidence of the earliest and best MSS favors the singular.

[d] d. The majority of later MSS (including P) read "as out of strength, as God provides" (w" instead of h"), while a very few late MSS read "as a provision out of strength" (w" ex iscuo" corhgian). Although the last of these is obscure enough to explain how the other two might have been derived from it, the external evidence for it is very weak. If the h" is original, w" could easily have crept into the text accidentally because of the two parallel occurrences of w" just above. The evidence of all the earliest MSS (e.g., P^{72} a A B Y and the *Lat* versions) bears this out.

[e] e. P^{72} and a number of later MSS have simply "forever" (ei" tou" aiwna"),omittingtwn aiwnwn. P^{72} (in this case by itself) also omits the definite articles with "glory" and "power." The apparent tendency of P^{72} in this verse is to soften the liturgical force and solemnity of Peter's words, possibly because such qualities seemed to belong more properly to the very end of an epistle (see *Form/Structure/Setting*).

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)

[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a

[P]Pesher (commentary)

[N]T New Testament

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[P] Pesher (commentary)

-a

[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[A] Codex Alexandrinus

[B] Codex Vaticanus

[C] Codex Ephraemi Syri

[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)

[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[1] *Clem 1 Clement*

[2] *Clem 2 Clement*

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)

[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[P] Pesher (commentary)
[-]a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[L]*at Laternanum*
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[li]t. literally
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[*] b. The majority of MSS (including P[72] a
L and P) have the future kaluyei ("will cover") here, but several early and significant MSS (A B C K and others) have the present kaluptei. A decision is difficult on the basis of the manuscript evidence; the future could be regarded as an assimilation to James 5:20 (Beare, 185; Goppelt, 284) or the present could be an assimilation to the LXX of Prov 10:12. Because the clause as a whole is so different from the Proverbs passage, however, it is doubtful that a quotation is intended. The eschatological nature of the context favors the future, but the persistence of the present in two later examples of the same pronouncement (both originating from the Roman church: *1 Clem* 49.5 and *2 Clem* 16.4) make the present somewhat more probable here as well.
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[D]*id.* Didache
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*ss. Sol.* Psalms of Solomon
[O]*TP* J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY/London: Doubleday/DLT, 1983-85)
[D]*id.* Didache
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*id.* Didache
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[H]*erm. Sim. Shepherd of Hermas, Similitudes*
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[l]gn. Ignatius, *Letter to the Polycarp*
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, *Letter to the Polycarp*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[l]it. literally
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*id.* Didache
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Enoch* Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LC]L Loeb Classical Library
[N]T New Testament
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[E]*p. Arist.* Epistle of Aristeas
[D]*iogn.* Diognetus
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[li]t. literally
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[li]t. literally
[li]t. literally

i.e. *id est*, that is
OT Old Testament
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
JSS Journal of Semitic Studies
BZ Biblische Zeitschrift
ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
RevExp Review and Expositor
ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
Est Bib Estudios biblicos
Est Bib Estudios biblicos
NovT Novum Testamentum
VD Verbum domini
JETS Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society
JBL Journal of Biblical Literature
NTS New Testament Studies
CBQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly
1QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
1QM *Milḥāmāh (War Scroll)* from Qumran
CBQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Neot Neotestamentica

[a] a. Instead of "the [spirit] of that glory, even the Spirit of God," many MSS (including a A P and others) insert kai dunamew" or kai th" dunamew" [autou] after doxh": "the [spirit] of that glory and power, even the Spirit of God." This appears to be an effort to lessen the abruptness of to th" doxh" by making use of the familiar association of "glory" and "power" (as, e.g., in the doxology of the Lord's Prayer in late MSS of Matt 6:13 and in *Did.* 8.2 [cf. 9.4, 10.5]; also Rev 15:8). The MS evidence for the text as it stands (P^{72} B K L Y and others) is conclusive. Although all the readings are somewhat difficult, this is the reading that best explains the other two.

[b] b. The verb for "is resting" is anapauetai in the majority of MSS (including a * B P and others), while some MSS read apanapauetai (A Y and others), or the perfect epanapepautai (P^{72} a 2). The evidence favors anapauetai (cf. B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 695); the compound forms were probably introduced because they are more commonly used when the verb is followed by the preposition epi (see BGD, 59, 282).

[c] c. The majority of the MSS (including P Y a number of OL and vg MSS and certain Syr. and Coptic witnesses) include the words, "blasphemed indeed on their part but glorified on

yours," while the earliest and best MSS (P^{72} a

A B and others) lack them. On this significant textual question, see *Comment*.

[d] d. A number of variants reflect scribal difficulties with the rare term allotriepiskopo" (a

B all Lat. versions and other witnesses). The majority of later MSS (including P) have a fuller spelling (allotrioepiskopo"; see BDF, § 124), while some attempt clarification by the use of etymology (allotrio" episkopo" in A Y and others; or allotrioi" episkopo" in P^{72}); however, the more difficult compound form (probably as represented by a

and B) must be allowed to stand.

[e] e. The majority of later MSS (including K L P) have merei, "matter," at this point, although the earliest and best MSS (including P^{72} a

A B) have onomati, "name." It is hard to see why, if onomati were original, it would have been changed to merei. On the other hand, an alteration of the colorless merei to onomati is quite conceivable in light of the en onomati Cristou of v 14. This appears to be a rare instance in which the majority text preserves an original reading which the earlier and usually more reliable MSS have altered.

[f] f. The majority of the MSS (including P^{72} B P Y) have the definite article (o kairo"), while some (including a

and A) omit the article, as in the other instances of kairo" in 1 Peter (i.e., 1:5, 11; 5:6). The article could have been either added or dropped accidentally (especially after oti), but it is slightly more probable that scribes would have added the article to accent the position of kairo" at the beginning of its clause than that they would have omitted it if it were original. There is no discernible difference in meaning.

[g] g. Instead of "from us" (afÆ hmwn), some MSS (a

[*] A^c and others) read "from you" (afÆ umwn), a natural change in view of Peter's use of the second person plural throughout vv 12–16 (and indeed all the way back to 2:24), but hmwn, the reading of the majority of MSS (including P^{72} A B and many others) is clearly preferable. "From us" is appropriate because Peter writes for the moment in universal terms of a judgment affecting the whole world and starting from the Christian "brotherhood throughout the world" (cf. 5:9).

[h] h. Instead of en agaqopoiia, "in the doing of good," some MSS (including P^{72} A Y some of the *Lat* versions and the vg) read en agaqopoiiai", "in the doing of good deeds." A choice between the singular and the plural is difficult. It is possible that scribes may have changed a singular to a plural because of the plural subject and object (i.e., "those who suffer … their lives") in this verse. The majority of the MSS (including a

B P and others) support the singular reading, which is probably to be preferred.

[m]SS manuscript(s)

-a

[A] Codex Alexandrinus

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[D]*id.* Didache

---

cf. *confer*, compare
MS Monograph Series or Manuscript
P Pesher (commentary)
B Codex Vaticanus
K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
L Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
mss manuscript(s)
-a
B Codex Vaticanus
P Pesher (commentary)
mss manuscript(s)
A Codex Alexandrinus
P Pesher (commentary)
-a
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
OL Old Latin
vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
mss manuscript(s)
Syr. Syriac language or text version of the OT, (as published in the Peshitta Insitute edition, 1980)
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
-a
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
P Pesher (commentary)
-a
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
L Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a
P Pesher (commentary)
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
-a

[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[P] Pesher (commentary)
–a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[m]SS manuscript(s)
–a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[L]*at Laternanum*
[vg] Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[m]SS manuscript(s)
–a
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[A]*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
[D]*id.* Didache
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[C]D Cairo (Genizah text of the) Damascus (Document)
[1]QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
[1]QM *Milḥāmāh (War Scroll)* from Qumran
[1]QH Hôdāyôt (*Thanksgiving Hymns*) from Qumran Cave 1
[4]QFlor Florilegium (or *Eschatological Midrashim*) from Qumran Cave 4
[4]QFlor Florilegium (or *Eschatological Midrashim*) from Qumran Cave 4
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[D]*id.* Didache
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[li]t. literally
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare

[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] e. The majority of later MSS (including K L P) have merei, "matter," at this point, although the earliest and best MSS (including P[72] a
A B) have onomati, "name." It is hard to see why, if onomati were original, it would have been changed to merei. On the other hand, an alteration of the colorless merei to onomati is quite conceivable in light of the en onomati Cristou of v 14. This appears to be a rare instance in which the majority text preserves an original reading which the earlier and usually more reliable MSS have altered.
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[G]*os. Heb.* Gospel of the Hebrews
[f]rag. fragments
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[St]r-B H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 4 vols. (Munich: Beck'sche, 1926–28)
[*] c. The majority of the MSS (including P Y a number of OL and vg MSS and certain Syr. and Coptic witnesses) include the words, "blasphemed indeed on their part but glorified on yours," while the earliest and best MSS (P[72] a
A B and others) lack them. On this significant textual question, see *Comment*.
[k]JV King James Version (1611) = AV
[a]V Authorized (King James) Version = KJV
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
ANF A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (eds.), The Ante-Nicene Fathers
cf. *confer*, compare
kJV King James Version (1611) = AV
aV Authorized (King James) Version = KJV
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
P*G Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1857-66, 1894)
P*G Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1857-66, 1894)
P*G Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1857-66, 1894)
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
Diss. Dissertation
LCL Loeb Classical Library
LCL Loeb Classical Library
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
n. note
NT New Testament
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
–a
cf. *confer*, compare
* 3.c. A number of ancient MSS (p^{72} K L and others) read Cristo" ("Christ") instead of crhsto" ("good" or "pleasing"), in line with a wordplay very common in early Christianity (BGD, 887; *TDNT* 9:488–89). The effect of this variation is to turn a scriptural allusion into a confessional formula ("that the Lord is Christ" or "that Christ is Lord"; cf. 3:15). The earliest of the MSS that does this (p^{72}) also inserts episteusate after egeusasqe as an unmistakable indication that "tasting" means believing in Christ. crhsto", found in all other significant MSS, as well as the LXX passage to which Peter is alluding (Ps 33[34]:9a [8a]), is without question the correct reading.
cf. *confer*, compare
Ign. Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
E*ph.* Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
M*agn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
Rom. Roman
P*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
M*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
D*id.* Didache
i.e. *id est*, that is

[li]t. literally
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] c. The majority of the MSS (including P Y a number of OL and vg MSS and certain Syr. and Coptic witnesses) include the words, "blasphemed indeed on their part but glorified on yours," while the earliest and best MSS (P^{72} a
A B and others) lack them. On this significant textual question, see *Comment*.
[k]JV King James Version (1611) = AV
[a]V Authorized (King James) Version = KJV
[U]BSGNT United Bible Societies *Greek New Testament*
[e]d. edited, edition(s), editor
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[et] al. *et alii*, and others
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[St]r-B H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 4 vols. (Munich: Beck'sche, 1926–28)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[H]*erm. Sim. Shepherd of Hermas, Similitudes*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[l]it. literally
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[cf]. *confer*, compare

e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
2 *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
B. Qam. Baba Qamma
NT New Testament
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
lit. literally
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
lit. literally
i.e. *id est*, that is
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
lit. literally
lit. literally
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
B*er.* Berakot
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
NT New Testament
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
E*p. Arist.* Epistle of Aristeas
Philo, Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
S*pec. Leg.* Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
1 *Clem 1 Clement*

[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[NT] New Testament
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[i.]e. *id est,* that is
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[C]*BQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
[V] Vulgate
[E]*xp The Expositor*
[s]er. series
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[Z]*NW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
[R]*B Revue biblique*
[a] a. MS variations reflect scribal questions about the connection of this statement with what immediately precedes (i.e., the significance of oun, "therefore"). The majority of later MSS (including P and Y) substitute tou" for oun (i.e., "To the elders who are among you"), while a few others (including a
) conflate the two readings (i.e., "To the elders, therefore, who are among you"). The effect of the substitution is to eliminate the necessity of seeking any real connection to the preceding context. Yet the earliest and best MSS (including P[72] A B) retain the more difficult reading oun, and even the conflated text of a
bears witness to its presence at an early stage of the tradition. oun, "therefore," is clearly original and raises the pointed question of how the appeal of 5:1–4 follows logically from 4:19 in particular or from 4:17–19 or 4:12–19 more generally. On this, see *Comment*.
[b] b. The command to "watch over" (episkopounte") the flock is omitted in certain MSS (including a
[*] and B) but is retained in the majority of MSS (including P[72] a
[2] A P Y the OL versions and the vg). It is difficult to see why scribes would have added it if it were not original since the verse reads quite smoothly without it (the association of poimhn and episkopo" in 2:25 as titles for God or Christ hardly seems a sufficient reason). If, on the other hand, episkopounte" was originally in the text, it is possible that overzealous scribes might have considered it redundant and left it out—although this too is less than compelling. B, however, exhibits a remarkably short text throughout vv 1–4 (omitting kata qeon in v 2, and v 3 in its entirety); so B's witness should be used with caution. Although the editors of both the Nestle and Bible Society texts have chosen (perhaps wisely) to bracket episkopounte", the evidence on balance favors retention.

[c] c. kata qeon, “before God,” is omitted in the majority of later MSS and in B but retained in the rest of the earlier and better MSS (e.g., P^{72} a
A P Y and others). There is little doubt that the phrase was original and was omitted by B or its prototype either accidentally or because a scribe considered the two pairs of contrasting adverbs set off by mh (or mhde) and alla rhetorically more effective without the phrase than with it.
[d] d. Instead of allhloi", “toward each other,” some MSS (P^{72} and others) have en allhloi", “among each other,” while the majority (including P) insert upotassomenoi after the pronoun, yielding the translation, “clothe yourselves with humility, being subject to each other”; cf. Eph 5:21). The simple allhloi" (a
B OL most vg MSS and others), however, is the most strongly attested reading and is clearly to be preferred.
[e] e. The definite article with qeo", “God,” is missing in P^{72} B and a few other MSS but is present in the majority of MSS (including a
A P and Y). The confusion over the definite article immediately after oti recalls the question of the article with kairo" in 4:17 (see *Note* e* on 4:17). In the present instance, it is likely that the article was original and was omitted accidentally. Nowhere else in 1 Peter does qeo" stand in the nominative case without the article.
MS Monograph Series or Manuscript
i.e. *id est*, that is
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
i.e. *id est*, that is
-a
i.e. *id est*, that is
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
-a
mss manuscript(s)
-a
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
P Pesher (commentary)
OL Old Latin
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example

P Pesher (commentary)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
P Pesher (commentary)
B Codex Vaticanus
mSS manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
P Pesher (commentary)
cf. *confer*, compare
-a
B Codex Vaticanus
OL Old Latin
vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
mSS manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
B Codex Vaticanus
mSS manuscript(s)
mSS manuscript(s)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
P Pesher (commentary)
* e. The majority of later MSS (including K L P) have merei, "matter," at this point, although the earliest and best MSS (including P[72] a
A B) have onomati, "name." It is hard to see why, if onomati were original, it would have been changed to merei. On the other hand, an alteration of the colorless merei to onomati is quite conceivable in light of the en onomati Cristou of v 14. This appears to be a rare instance in which the majority text preserves an original reading which the earlier and usually more reliable MSS have altered.
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
V Vulgate
i.e. *id est*, that is
* a. The word "wives" (gunaike") has a definite article in the majority of ancient

manuscripts (p^{72} a
[2] C P Y and others), while a few important MSS (including p^{81} a
[*] A B) lack the article. Several factors (the use of the article with andrasin and gunaikwn in the same verse, with andre" in v 7, and especially with oiketai in 2:18) seem to have led scribes to expect the article here as well. Though the lightly attested reading kai (a few minuscules, some vg MSS and Syr.) provides additional indirect support for the definite article ai, the omission of the article is the more difficult, and probably the original, reading. There is no appreciable difference in meaning; the nominative with the article is equivalent to a vocative (cf. BDF § 147.3), while gunaike" without the article is a true vocative (cf. newteroi in 5:5).
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[NT] New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[2] *Clem 2 Clement*
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[MM] J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder, 1930)
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
Ign. Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
[E]*ph.* Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
[M]*agn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians
[P]*hld.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[S]*myrn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Smyrnaeans
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e]t al. *et alii*, and others
[N]T New Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[l]it. literally

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[NT]New Testament
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*ss. Sol.* Psalms of Solomon
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] b. The command to "watch over" (episkopounte") the flock is omitted in certain MSS (including a
[*] and B) but is retained in the majority of MSS (including P^{72} a
[2] A P Y the OL versions and the vg). It is difficult to see why scribes would have added it if it were not original since the verse reads quite smoothly without it (the association of poimhn and episkopo" in 2:25 as titles for God or Christ hardly seems a sufficient reason). If, on the other hand, episkopounte" was originally in the text, it is possible that overzealous scribes might have considered it redundant and left it out—although this too is less than compelling. B, however, exhibits a remarkably short text throughout vv 1–4 (omitting kata qeon in v 2, and v 3 in its entirety); so B's witness should be used with caution. Although the editors of both the Nestle and Bible Society texts have chosen

(perhaps wisely) to bracket episkopounte", the evidence on balance favors retention.
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
NT New Testament
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
Ign. Ignatius, *Letter to the Romans*
Rom. Ignatius, *Letter to the Romans*
Ign. Ignatius, *Letter to the Polycarp*
Pol. Ignatius, *Letter to the Polycarp*
Herm Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress)
Vis. Visions
Rom. Roman
NT New Testament
NT New Testament
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
1QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
lit. literally
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
Pol. Polycarp to the Philippians
Phil. Polycarp to the Philippians
L*at Laternanum*
cf. *confer*, compare
Pol. Polycarp to the Philippians
Phil. Polycarp to the Philippians
D*id.* Didache
K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
T*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
NT New Testament
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
-a

[M]*art. Pol.* Martyrdom of Polycarp
[H]*erm. Sim. Shepherd of Hermas, Similitudes*
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[N]*TS New Testament Studies*
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[li]t. literally
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[cf]. *confer,* compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[cf]. *confer,* compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[T]. *Jud.* Testament of Judah (in *T. 12 Patr.*)
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[B]GD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[1]QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
[1]QH Hôdāyôt (*Thanksgiving Hymns*) from Qumran Cave 1
[T]. *Benj.* Testament of Benjamin, etc.
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i].e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1]QS *Serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] d. Instead of allhloi", “toward each other,” some MSS (P^{72} and others) have en allhloi", “among each other,” while the majority (including P) insert upotassomenoi

after the pronoun, yielding the translation, “clothe yourselves with humility, being subject to each other”; cf. Eph 5:21). The simple allhloi" (a

B OL most vg MSS and others), however, is the most strongly attested reading and is clearly to be preferred.

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[N]*TS New Testament Studies*

[N]*TS New Testament Studies*

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[LX]X The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[1] *Clem 1 Clement*

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[cf]. *confer*, compare

[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[N]IGTC New International Greek Testament Commentary

[V]*D Verbum domini*

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[C]*BQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly*

[a] a. Some MSS (A P vg and others) add to the simple en kairw, “when it is time,” the genitive episkoph" (i.e., “at the time of visitation”). Possibly this change was prompted by the en hmera episkoph", “on the day of visitation,” in 2:12 (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 696), but more likely the memory of the phrase en kairw episkoph" autwn, “in the time of their visitation,” either in Jer 6:15 LXX or Wisd Sol 3:7 (both standing in contexts rich in parallels to 1 Peter) has been at work in the tradition (cf. also Isa 10:3; Jer 10:15; Wisd Sol 3:13; and see Comment on 2:12). In any case the shorter readong is to be preferred. It is unlikely that the majority of MSS, including the earliest and best (P^{72} a

and B), would have omitted episkoph" had it been original.

[b] b. A few MSS (including a

[*] have hmwn, “us,” in place of umwn, “you,” a reading that may at first appear to be the more difficult one because of the umwn, “your,” in the preceding clause. The manuscript evidence, however, is too weak. The first person plural probably represents a scribal attempt to make Peter’s words of comfort more general in their application (cf. “from us” in 4:17).

[c] c. A number of ancient MSS (including P^{72} a

L Y, the OL versions and the vg) connect these imperatives to what follows with oti (“because”). This could be another case in which oti followed by o caused textual confusion (cf. 4:17; 5:5), but it is more likely that the transition from the imperatives to a declarative sentence about the “opponent” seemed abrupt to scribes, and that the addition of

oti was a natural way of smoothing the connection.

[d] d. A very few MSS (including P^{72}) add the definite article before diabolo", "devil," in order to make it clear that it is a title ("your opponent, the devil") rather than simply an adjective (i.e., "your slanderous opponent"). This is undoubtedly the correct interpretation in any event, but the manuscript evidence is far from sufficient to consider the definite article original.

[e] e. There is great variation in the MSS. The reading tina katapiein, "someone to devour," is supported by a

[c] and (with certain slight variations) by a

[*] K P and others. Yet in the majority of MSS (including P^{72} A vg and others), the subjunctive katapihappears instead of the infinitive katapiein, evidently as a result of tina being accented as an interrogative (tina: "seeking whom he might swallow"; see BDF, § 368). A few MSS (including B and Y) have the infinitive katapiein without any pronoun (i.e., simply, "seeking to swallow"). Despite the strong combined manuscript evidence for tina (however accented), this short reading explains well the origin of the others. Possibly a scribe inserted tina because of the harshness of katapiein without an object, and the other variants came into being because of uncertainty over how the added word should be accented and read (cf. Beare, 205). Another scenario (i.e., that tina katapiein was original and that B omitted tina either because of the same uncertainty or purely by accident) is also possible (cf. Metzger, *Textual Comity*, 696–97), but less likely in view of the awkwardness of the shorter reading. Hence the translation, "ready to swallow," with "his prey" supplied.

[f] f. Some important MSS (a

A B^* and others) have epiteleisqe, so that the clause reads, "knowing that you are accomplishing the same kinds of suffering as your brotherhood in the world." Although epiteleisqe can be simply a defective spelling for epiteleisqai (BDF, § 25), the fact that certain late minuscule MSS that have this reading (e.g., 614, 630, 1505) also insert the customary oti, "that," after eidote", "knowing" (cf. 1:18), shows that they were reading the form as a finite verb (cf. P^{72}, oti … epiteleitai). The infinitive epiteleisqai, the reading of the majority (including B^2 P Y and all the Lat. and Syr. versions) is clearly to be preferred; the oldest examples of epiteleisqe (a

A B^* K) are probably defective spellings of the infinitive.

[g] g. The majority of MSS (including a

[2] A P Y) lack the definite article with "world" (i.e., en kosmw), while P^{72} a

[*] B and others retain it (i.e., en tw kosmw). The weight of the evidence favors the article. Possibly it was omitted because its presence heightened the mistaken impression that umwn, "your," belonged with kosmw, "world," rather than with "brotherhood" (see BDF, § 284.1).

[h] h. The majority of MSS (including P^{72} A P Y OL versions and vg) add "Jesus," but the shorter reading of a

and a few later witnesses (en Cristw; B adds the definite article) is preferable "in view of the tendency of scribes to add rather than omit sacred names" (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 697).

[i] i. The third of these verbs (sqenwsei) is omitted in some MSS (P^{72} and certain Lat. versions), and the fourth (qemeliwsei) is omitted in others (including A B Y). These are

probably accidental omissions due to the similar verb endings. Other textual traditions change one or more of the future indicatives to optatives (e.g., the majority of later MSS change “restore” to an optative, katartisai, and supply uma" with it), but these are secondary stylistic modifications.

[j] j. The majority of MSS (including a

P) insert a reference to “glory” (h doxa) before “might” (to krato"), while others reverse the order. The uncertainty of the placement of soxa, as well as the strong manuscript evidence for the shorter reading (P^{72} A B Y and others), strongly suggests that “might” alone is original and that “glory” was added with 4:11 in mind.

[k] k. A longer ending, “forever and ever” (with twn aiwnwn added), is found in the majority of MSS (including a

A P Y and the Lat. and Syr. versions), but these words (missing in P^{72} B and a few other MSS) are again probably a liturgical expansion prompted by 4:11.

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[A] Codex Alexandrinus

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber’s edition)

[i.]e. *id est*, that is

[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[P] Pesher (commentary)

-a

[B] [C]odex Vaticanus

[m]SS manuscript(s)

-a

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[P] Pesher (commentary)

-a

[L] Leningrad Codes of MT (as published in BHS) or Codex Leningradensis, B19a

[O]L Old Latin

[vg] Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber’s edition)

[c]f. *confer*, compare

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[i.]e. *id est*, that is

[m]SS manuscript(s)

-a

-a

[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)

[P] Pesher (commentary)

[m]SS manuscript(s)

[P] Pesher (commentary)

A Codex Alexandrinus
vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
A Codex Alexandrinus
mss manuscript(s)
B Codex Vaticanus
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
B Codex Vaticanus
cf. *confer*, compare
mss manuscript(s)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
mss manuscript(s)
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
P Pesher (commentary)
P Pesher (commentary)
Syr. Syriac language or text version of the OT, (as published in the Peshitta Insitute edition, 1980)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
K Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
mss manuscript(s)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
P Pesher (commentary)
i.e. *id est*, that is
P Pesher (commentary)
-a
B Codex Vaticanus
i.e. *id est*, that is
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
A Codex Alexandrinus
P Pesher (commentary)
OL Old Latin

vg Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
-a
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
P Pesher (commentary)
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
mss manuscript(s)
mss manuscript(s)
-a
P Pesher (commentary)
P Pesher (commentary)
A Codex Alexandrinus
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
-a
A Codex Alexandrinus
P Pesher (commentary)
Syr. Syriac language or text version of the OT, (as published in the Peshitta Insitute edition, 1980)
P Pesher (commentary)
B Codex Vaticanus
mss manuscript(s)
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
1 *Clem 1 Clement*
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare

---

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[O]T Old Testament
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[LXX] The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[H]erm Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress)
[V]*is.* Visions
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[l]it. literally
[A]*nt.* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*ss. Sol.* Psalms of Solomon
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[D]*id.* Didache
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[r]SV Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc 1957)
[N]T New Testament
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

NT New Testament
i.e. *id est*, that is
Pol. Polycarp to the Philippians
Phil. Polycarp to the Philippians
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BGD W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
cf. *confer*, compare
T*reat. Res. Treatise on Resurrection*
* i. The third of these verbs (sqenwsei) is omitted in some MSS (P^{72} and certain Lat. versions), and the fourth (qemeliwsei) is omitted in others (including A B Y). These are probably accidental omissions due to the similar verb endings. Other textual traditions change one or more of the future indicatives to optatives (e.g., the majority of later MSS change "restore" to an optative, katartisai, and supply uma" with it), but these are secondary stylistic modifications.
cf. *confer*, compare
i.e. *id est*, that is
i.e. *id est*, that is
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
cf. *confer*, compare
cf. *confer*, compare
BDF F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
cf. *confer*, compare
Ign. Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
E*ph.* Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians
i.e. *id est*, that is

[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] f. Some important MSS (a
A B[*] and others) have epiteleisqe, so that the clause reads, "knowing that you are accomplishing the same kinds of suffering as your brotherhood in the world." Although epiteleisqe can be simply a defective spelling for epiteleisqai (BDF, § 25), the fact that certain late minuscule MSS that have this reading (e.g., 614, 630, 1505) also insert the customary oti, "that," after eidote", "knowing" (cf. 1:18), shows that they were reading the form as a finite verb (cf. P[72], oti … epiteleitai). The infinitive epiteleisqai, the reading of the majority (including B[2] P Y and all the Lat. and Syr. versions) is clearly to be preferred; the oldest examples of epiteleisqe (a
A B[*] K) are probably defective spellings of the infinitive.
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[1] *Clem 1 Clement*
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i]e. *id est*, that is
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[M]*em. Memorabilia* (Xenophon)
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[L]XX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT
[N]T New Testament
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[H]erm Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress)
[V]*is.* Visions
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[H]erm Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress)
[V]*is.* Visions
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[F]S Festschrift, volume written in honor of
[E]*vQ The Evangelical Quarterly*
[Z]*NW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
[B]*ib Biblica*
[a] a. The article is lacking with qeou, "God," in certain MSS (P^{72} Y and others), but the omission probably took place because the accompanying carin, "grace," had no article. The article is attested by the weight of manuscript evidence (a majority of MSS including a A B) and should be retained.
[b] b. In place of the aorist imperative sthte, "stand" (the reading of P^{72} a A B and others), the majority of later MSS (including P and some Lat. versions) have the perfect indicative esthkate used as a present: "you stand." The relative clause led scribes to expect an indicative (cf. Rom 5:2; 1 Cor 15:1; 2 Cor 1:24), but the manuscript evidence clearly favors the imperative (cf. Goppelt, 350).

[c] c. A few MSS (including a
) insert ekklhsia, "congregation" or "church," but this is a later clarification. In P^{72} A B and the majority of later MSS, the reference to a particular congregation is implied but not expressed.
[d] d. A few minuscules, as well as vg and the Syr. Peshitto, read agiw in place of agaph" (a "holy" kiss, in agreement with Pauline usage). The tendency toward harmonization, prompted perhaps by the correspondence of the first two letters, accounts for the change. £Agaph", "of love," is correct.
[e] e. The majority of later MSS (including a
K P) add at the end the name "Jesus" and a concluding "Amen," but the rest of the earliest MSS (e.g., A B Y and others) are more likely correct in ending the epistle with the words "in Christ" (cf. *Note* f* on v 10; see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 698). The omission of the entire greeting (in P^{72} alone) is too narrowly attested to be regarded as original. It probably represents, in its own way, an adaptation to church usage (by allowing each congregation to respond as it chose to the injunction of v 14a).
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[P] Pesher (commentary)
-a
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[c]f. *confer,* compare
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[m]SS manuscript(s)
-a
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[m]SS manuscript(s)
[v]g Latin Vulgate (as published in Weber's edition)
[S]yr. Syriac language or text version of the OT, (as published in the Peshitta Insitute edition, 1980)
[m]SS manuscript(s)
-a
[K] Kethib (the written consonantal Hebrew text of OT)
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[m]SS manuscript(s)

[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[A] Codex Alexandrinus
[B] Codex Vaticanus
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] f. Some important MSS (a
A B[*] and others) have epiteleisqe, so that the clause reads, "knowing that you are accomplishing the same kinds of suffering as your brotherhood in the world." Although epiteleisqe can be simply a defective spelling for epiteleisqai (BDF, § 25), the fact that certain late minuscule MSS that have this reading (e.g., 614, 630, 1505) also insert the customary oti, "that," after eidote", "knowing" (cf. 1:18), shows that they were reading the form as a finite verb (cf. P[72], oti … epiteleitai). The infinitive epiteleisqai, the reading of the majority (including B[2] P Y and all the Lat. and Syr. versions) is clearly to be preferred; the oldest examples of epiteleisqe (a
A B[*] K) are probably defective spellings of the infinitive.
[P] Pesher (commentary)
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[N]T New Testament
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[P]*hld.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[S]*myrn.* Ignatius, Letter to the Smyrnaeans
[R]om. Roman
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[P]ol. Polycarp to the Philippians
[P]*hil.* Polycarp to the Philippians
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[R]om. Roman
[P]*hil.* Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[I]gn. Ignatius, *Letter to the Romans*
[R]*om.* Ignatius, *Letter to the Romans*
[P]*ol.* Ignatius, Letter to the Polycarp
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example

[c]f. *confer*, compare
[*] b. In place of the aorist imperative sthte, "stand" (the reading of P^{72} a
A B and others), the majority of later MSS (including P and some Lat. versions) have the perfect indicative esthkate used as a present: "you stand." The relative clause led scribes to expect an indicative (cf. Rom 5:2; 1 Cor 15:1; 2 Cor 1:24), but the manuscript evidence clearly favors the imperative (cf. Goppelt, 350).
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[cf]. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BD]F F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[N]T New Testament
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[S]*ib. Or.* Sibylline Oracles
[2] *Apoc. Bar.* Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[BG]D W. Bauer, F. W. Gingrich and F. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[e.]g. *exempli gratia*, for example
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare

[T]*DNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i.]e. *id est*, that is
[c]f. *confer*, compare
[i]Michaels, J. R., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 49: 1 Peter*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998.