

Persians, to whom she gave herself in works of wonderful sympathy, ability, and self-denial, till at last she gave her life. She was known all over the country as Khánum Maryam, that is, Lady Mary. Her biography has been written with much success by Clara C. Rice, and published under the title of *Mary Bird in Persia* (Church Missionary Society; 3s. 6d.).

This is an example of her tact:

'At a time when there was much opposition in Isfahan, Mary Bird was asked to call on the wife of one of the mullás who had shown himself violently opposed to Christianity. This lady presided at the samovar, and poured out tea, a cup being handed by a servant to her guest. The latter, however, observed that her hostess did not herself take any tea. Something seemed to warn her of

danger, and she bethought herself of the Persian custom of asking any one remarkable for holiness to bless the cup by taking the first sip. This compliment she paid to her hostess, and an awkward pause ensued, during which she turned and examined some of the pictures on the walls. At last the hostess said to her servant: "Take away this tea, it is quite cold, and bring me another teapot." The teapot was brought, fresh tea made, and hostess and visitor each had a cup. Mary Bird eventually withdrew after a prolonged visit, without having shown the least sign of alarm. A negro servant who followed her to the door of the house whispered to her in the passage, "How did you know that it was poisoned?" The habitual coolness which she exhibited in danger was the result of her faith, and made a strong impression.'

The Alleged Paulinism of First Peter.

BY THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc., D.D., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND THEOLOGY, NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

THE usual modern attitude towards the content of First Peter is tersely expressed by Wernle when he says: 'Is not everything in 1 Peter from the first line to the last Pauline language and Pauline thought?' (*Einführung in d. theolog. Studium*, p. 137). This is a position which has virtually become a dogma. And the present writer must acknowledge that he was one of its convinced adherents until recently, as the result of an independent study of the Epistle for a special purpose, he was compelled to alter his standpoint.

The question ought not to be mixed up with that of the authorship, although, obviously, the discussion of the one is bound, at a variety of points, to have a bearing upon the other. But it is advisable in the case of a document which is so largely impersonal to determine first of all the dominant features of its religious thought independently. When that has been done it may be possible with more or less probability to venture upon deductions from the facts ascertained.

The greater part of the Epistle is occupied with practical exhortations. These are based either on an appeal to the disposition of Christ, which is assumed to be a matter of common knowledge in the Church, or on passages from the Old Testament,

quoted singly or in centos, and quite possibly derived from a compilation of passages constructed for Christian use. We may presuppose that such compilations would be made almost as soon as Christian missions began to have any organization at all. Traces of their use occur in Paul's Epistles, as well as in the discourses of Peter reported in the first half of Acts. Hence it is illegitimate in the case of similar references in Paul and 1 Peter to commonplaces of Old Testament religion and ethics, to assume that the one author has borrowed from the other, unless in each instance the context suggests some special relationship. When we remember that the emergence of the Christian gospel must have aroused keen discussions between Jews and Christians both on theological and on ethical questions, it would be hazardous to assign, for example, to Paul as his peculiar property positions which cannot be directly traced to his epoch-making spiritual experience.

To express this otherwise, we must leave far more room than we are wont to do for the influence of a primitive Christian theology earlier than Paul and independent of his creative power, a process of reflexion on fundamental religious facts

and ideas which would continue to operate after Paul had entered the Church, although at a later stage it was almost bound to be affected by his widely diffused energy. For, strangely enough, the obvious fact is constantly ignored in scholarly discussions that the main content of the Christian faith was the same for Paul as for the primitive Palestinian community. Too frequently it is assumed that the chief feature in the thought of that community must have been the recollection of Jesus' life and teaching. But if we are not arbitrarily to presuppose that the entire New Testament is a product of Paul's missionary influence, we are obliged to recognize that for the Jewish-Christian section of the Church from its beginning as well as for Paul the fundamental conviction was that Christ had conquered death and thus vindicated His function as inaugurator of the Messianic Age. This conviction determined the various directions in which the thought of the first Christians should move. The opening chapters of Acts, already referred to, give ample evidence as to some of these. And the artlessness with which different aspects of the positions adopted are placed side by side without any attempt at systematizing them bears testimony to the general accuracy of the representation. The main emphasis is laid upon such facts as the Messiahship and exaltation of Jesus and the gift of the Spirit which is regarded as their corollary, the identification of Jesus with the predicted Servant of Jahweh who suffers for the sins of the people in the working out of the Divine purpose, the hope of salvation in Him alone, and the practice of Baptism in His name.

Necessarily, the most serious objection to their faith which had to be met in the earlier period of the Christian mission was that of a *crucified Messiah*. The Palestinian Churches must have realized to the full the 'scandal' of the Cross. It was a crime on the part of men. None the less it was permitted by God; nay, in the case of one possessed by the Spirit of God, it must have been predetermined by the Divine wisdom. The conflicting elements had to be reconciled. For this as for other features of the Messianic programme, the Old Testament was carefully explored. It need not surprise us that the clue was found in the Suffering Servant, a figure which, according to the earliest tradition, lay especially near to the heart of Jesus. Hence, Is 53 was made the

chief basis for interpretation of the death of the Messiah. So that it may be asserted without exaggeration that the pivotal elements in the faith of the primitive Christian society are precisely those which are paramount for Paul, the Messiahship of Jesus and its full realization in the Parousia, and the bearing of the Cross upon His Messianic functions.¹

Giving these considerations their due place, let us try to estimate the content of 1 Peter in its relations to Paulinism.

In 5¹² the author definitely states his aim in writing as being 'to testify that this is what the true grace of God means' (Moffatt). A survey of the Epistle reveals that 'the true grace of God' primarily includes the 'living hope' made possible by the resurrection of Christ, and the manifold mercy bestowed on believers by their bountiful Father in heaven. It may be at once suggested that the very use of this term 'grace' (*χάρις*) is a proof of Pauline influence. It is true that Paul, by choosing 'grace' as one of his special watch-words, has immensely widened its religious significance. But the term is not of his coinage, although some hasty assertions appear to imply that. Wetter, *e.g.*, in his recent study, *Charis*, makes the statement that 'the religious meaning of *χάρις* is not to be found in the Old Testament' (p. 7). He reaches his position by an investigation of the use of the term in the LXX, in which it constantly appears as a translation of חַן. It is not difficult to prove that in an overwhelming majority of instances the noun occurs in the phrase, 'to find grace' (or, 'favour') in the sight of God or man. But if he had studied the usage of the corresponding verb חַנַּן, he would have discovered the deeper significance of the Divine 'grace' in the shape of redemption from enemies, from calamities, and from sin, again and again attested for the prophets and (especially) for the Psalms. One need not controvert the hypothesis that Hellenistic usage was an important factor in Paul's choice of the word, and probably in that of our author. But this ignoring of the Old Testament background, which has become so common in present-day scholarship, distorts the balance of

¹ See an impressive statement by Wernle (*Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, April 1915, p. 17) which concludes thus: 'It is essential for Paul's theology that it sets the Messiah expected by Israel in the centre, and that the work of this Messiah means a turning-point in the world's history.'

facts in the historical investigation of religious terms and conceptions.

For what reason has the writer emphasized the grace of God? Chiefly on account of the trials through which his readers are passing. These are a sharp test of their faith. Especially severe is the pressure of persecution. They are tempted to compromise with the lower moral standard of their environment in order to escape suffering. But they must remember Christ. He also was a sufferer, a sufferer for righteousness's sake. And He has left His followers an example to copy. The two passages in which the writer dwells on the significance of Christ's sufferings (2²²⁻²⁴ 3¹⁸) are in no sense theological speculations. They are an unconstrained expansion of the exhortation to endure. And the form in which they are introduced suggests that they represent positions long since assumed in the Church.

We must refer to their content at a later point. Meanwhile let us observe the dominant features of the Epistle. These, as might be expected from the situation which confronted the writer, are essentially practical. The paramount place is given to the *hope* of the heavenly inheritance which awaits believers. So prominent is this conception that the author has often been called the apostle of Hope. But the title cannot be thus restricted. The emphasis on hope simply represents the fundamental Messianic outlook of the primitive Christian community, which is reflected at so many points in this Epistle. Messianic aspiration has been transformed. Christ, who is exalted at God's right hand, has become the pledge of eternal life for all who trust Him. The Messianic 'promise' of the Old Testament has been liberated from its earthly and material associations. It is now God's 'eternal glory,' the perfected 'salvation.' I am inclined to agree with Beyschlag's view, that in our Epistle the outlook of the Christian hope towards the salvation yet to be revealed somewhat overshadows the conviction, so characteristic of Paul, that salvation is already a possession of the believer.

The position seems to be borne out by the remarkable emphasis laid on what the writer describes as 'the revelation of Jesus Christ.' That idea is so integral to his thought that, in one form or another, it occurs with extraordinary frequency in this short Epistle. Here, again, we breathe the characteristic atmosphere of the primitive Church. No doubt the expectation of the Parousia receives

full prominence in Paul. But his later letters indicate a marked decline in the vividness of that expectation: in any case, he has only twice employed the description so typical of our author (2 Th 1⁷, 1 Co 1⁷). It is true that the latter, as a rule, groups the eschatological accompaniments and consequences of the 'revelation of Jesus Christ' under the category of 'glory,' which is often regarded as a Pauline term. But there is no ground for this assumption. One may venture to assert that there is not a single shade of meaning in the New Testament uses of *δόξα* which has not its counterpart in the Old Testament *Kabod*, apart from the Christian setting into which it has been transferred. And the area of its occurrence in the New Testament outside the writings of Paul is sufficient proof of its currency throughout the Church.

In harmony with all these facts is the conviction which pervades the Epistle that the Christian community has entered into possession of the hereditary privileges of Israel. They are the genuine 'people of God.' This conception, which came to exert so powerful an influence in the early Church, has found its classical New Testament expression in 1 P 2^{9, 10} (Moffatt): '*You are the elect race, the royal priesthood, the consecrated nation, the people who belong to Him, that you may proclaim the wondrous deeds of Him who has called you from darkness to His wonderful light—you who were once no people and now are God's people, you who once were unpitied and now are pitied.*' The words in italics represent Old Testament quotations and reminiscences. They corroborate the impression made by the entire Epistle, of a Christian missionary who lived in the Old Testament: who linked the prophets to the history of the Messianic revelation with a boldness which has no parallel in the New Testament. 'Even prophets,' he declares, 'have searched and enquired about that salvation [*i.e.* the complete Messianic redemption realized in Christ], the prophets who prophesied of the grace that was meant for you; the spirit of Messiah within them foretold all the suffering of Messiah and His afterglory, and they pondered when or how this was to come; to them it was revealed that they received this ministry¹ not for themselves but for you, re-

¹ Moffatt, accepting Rendel Harris' conjecture of *διενοούντο* for *διηκόνουν*, translates: 'they got this intelligence.' I see no reason for departing from the ordinary text, which yields excellent sense.

garding all that has now been disclosed to you through the holy Spirit sent from heaven' (1 P 1¹⁰⁻¹², Moffatt). Although the background of Paul's religion is to be found fundamentally in the Old Testament, there is no position taken up by him in his Epistles which can be compared with this.

Hence we are quite prepared to discover that Deutero-Isaiah constitutes the explicit basis of our author's statements regarding the *Death of Christ*. Up to this point we have come upon nothing characteristically Pauline in the thought of 1 Peter. Here, if anywhere, Paul's theology must reveal itself. Let us first examine two references which are valuable as indicating directions followed by the writer's mind in contemplating the subject. In the opening paragraph he addresses his readers as 'chosen . . . with a view to obedience and sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ' (1¹⁻²). The clue to his language is, of course, to be found in Ex 24^{7f}, where we read that Moses 'took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath spoken will we do, and *be obedient*. And Moses took the blood [of the animals already sacrificed] and *sprinkled it on the people*, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you upon all these conditions.' The passage is that which colours the thought of Jesus at the Last Supper. Curiously enough, the Covenant-ceremonial receives no place among the metaphors which Paul uses to bring out the significance of the Death of Christ. When he does make use of the Covenant-conception, it is to emphasize the idea of God's gracious initiative in salvation as contrasted with the contract-notion of Legalism. The other reference occurs in 1¹⁸⁻²⁰. As a motive to seriousness of life, the author urges: 'It was *not* by perishable *silver* or gold that *you were ransomed* from the futile traditions of your past, but by the precious blood of Christ, a lamb unblemished and unstained. He was predestined before the foundation of the world and has appeared at the end of the ages for your sake' (Moffatt). The words italicized suggest, according to his wont, a reminiscence of Is 52³: 'Thus speaks the Lord [to the captive daughter of Zion]: You were sold for nothing, and not with silver shall you be redeemed' (ὄυ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε).

His mind is still under the influence of Deutero-Isaiah when in this connexion he proceeds to speak of Christ as 'a lamb unblemished and un-

stained.' Needless difficulties have been raised on this point. It is said that the image of the 'lamb' in Is 53⁷ has nothing to do with sacrifice, but simply represents perfect meekness and gentleness. But when the reference is to a lamb led to the slaughter, and this in a context in which it is declared that the Lord laid on His Servant 'the iniquity of us all,' it is mere pedantry to deny the sacrificial association. And when we remember the intimate connexion of Jesus' words about His own death with Passover ceremonial, it is safe to say that the writer, in speaking of redemption by the blood of Christ as of 'a lamb unblemished and unstained,' would inevitably combine the idea of the paschal lamb with that of the Servant who, in having his soul made an offering for sin, and in bearing the iniquities of his people, was described by the prophet as 'a lamb that is led to the slaughter.' Paul never compares Christ with a spotless lamb. In an isolated passage (1 Co 5⁷), he speaks of Him as 'our passover sacrifice,' but draws no inferences from the statement.

It may be accidental that Paul uses the verb ἀγοράζω or ἐξαγοράζω and not λυτρώω, but when he introduces the conception of redemption it is on different lines. We have a typical instance in Gal 3¹³ (Moffatt): 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming accursed for us (for it is written, Cursed is every one who hangs on a gibbet).' The same idea is implied in Gal 4⁵. Here the background is not Deutero-Isaiah, nor the Passover-ceremonial, but Dt 21²². The whole conception is, of course, shaped by Paul's personal experience under the yoke of legalism. Such a conception was foreign to the mind of the primitive Church. In two other places he speaks of believers as having been 'bought with a price' (ἠγοράσθητε τιμῆς, 1 Co 6²⁰ 7²³), but the expression is so general that no deduction can be made from it. The same thing may be said of his reference to redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) in 1 Co 1³⁰. This term also appears in Eph 1⁷ and Col 1¹⁴ as equivalent to the forgiveness of sins. No interpretation is attempted. But in Ro 3²⁴⁻²⁵, the situation is more complex: 'justified for nothing by His grace through the ransom (ἀπολυτρώσεως) provided in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as the means of propitiation by His blood, to be received by faith' (Moffatt). Here redemption is intimately associated with the propitiatory death of Christ. Of course this conception can be brought into direct

relation with that emphasized in Gal 3¹³. But it also reveals affinities with Is 53, and this has a real connexion with the thought of 1 P which we have been examining. There is no need to postulate for our passage any direct Pauline influence. The standpoints of the two writers are linked together, probably through the medium of Deutero-Isaiah (chap. 53), with the idea which appears in Jewish literature (*e.g.* 4 Mac 17²² 6²⁷⁻²⁹) that the merits of the righteous avail as a propitiation for sinners.

The two passages in which the Death of Christ receives more explicit treatment exhibit the example of the suffering Christ to Christian slaves persecuted for righteousness' sake. Each of them reflects not merely the thought but also the language of Is 53. Now, when in 2²⁴ he asserts of Christ that 'he bore our sins in his body to the tree,' and in 3¹⁸ that He 'died once for all for sins, the righteous on behalf of the unrighteous, that he might bring us near to God,' we are plainly in the realm of substitutionary ideas. We know how completely Paul was at home in that region. But Paul was not its first explorer. Indeed, this is one of the special cases in which he expressly associates his own position with that traditional in the Church: 'I handed on to you as of first importance, that which I myself received by tradition, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures' (1 Co 15⁸). We can scarcely doubt in view of the terms used that 'the Scriptures' refer mainly to Is 53. Thus we are entitled to say that the author of our Epistle in these crucial passages is faithful to the doctrine which has long been current in the Church, and that it is quite needless to attribute his conception of the Death of Christ to the powerful influence of Paul. It is true that Peter, like Paul, interprets the conception under various aspects, and some of these are found naturally to coincide. But the incidental evidence of the New Testament indicates that his background was derived from the common consciousness of the community, reflecting on the Christian facts in the light of Old Testament ideas.

The relation of our Epistle to Pauline thought is perhaps most easily estimated, when we turn from a doctrine which belongs in its chief outlines to the essential heritage of the entire Church, to other aspects of religious thought, highly important in themselves, but subject to greater fluctuation. Thus, when we examine Peter's view of Faith, we

discover its value for his religious position. But it reveals on the whole an aspect somewhat divergent from that which is so familiar to us in the writings of Paul. For Paul, faith, it need scarcely be said, is the medium of the most intimate union between the individual soul and Christ. It constitutes that attitude of receptivity for which all the Divine gifts are, through Christ, available. Now Peter, of course, would hold, like all Christians of the Apostolic Age, that faith was indispensable for salvation. But we discover the precise significance of his conception in 1^{20, 21}, where he declares how Christ has been revealed 'at the end of the ages on your behalf who through him believe in God who raised him from the dead and gave him glory, so that your faith and hope is in God.' And when we estimate its implications, it is easy to account for the complete absence from our Epistle of even a hint of Paul's normative doctrine of justification, which keeps exclusively in the forefront the direct relation of the soul to Christ.

At the same time, it may be frankly admitted that echoes of Paulinism can be traced in 1 Peter. In one of the crucial passages cited above, Peter interprets as the purpose of the atoning death of Christ, 'that we having died (*ἀπογενόμενοι*) to sins, might live unto righteousness' (2²⁴). In this language we cannot miss the influence of one of Paul's central conceptions, as expressed, for example, in Ro 6^{11, 18}: 'Reckon yourselves to be dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus. . . . Having been set free from sin, you became slaves to righteousness.' But it is noteworthy that Peter makes no mention of the idea which is inseparable from this Pauline conception, and which lay so close to his standpoint in the words we have quoted, that of dying or being crucified with Christ and rising with Him to newness of life. Further, the formulation of the thought in Peter reveals a crucial divergence from that of Paul. For while the latter regards the sin with which all connexion is broken as a quasi-personal Power which tyrannizes over men, and invariably speaks of it in the singular (*ἁμαρτία*) as a dominating principle, the former speaks of a death to 'sins' (*ἁμαρτίαι*), which of course mean separate acts of transgression. Our author appears also to be impressed by the Pauline antithesis between flesh and spirit. Thus in 3¹⁸ he describes Christ as 'having been put to death in the flesh (*σαρκί*), but made alive in the spirit' (*πνεύματι*). And again,

in connexion with his curious theologoumenon of the Descent to Hades, he declares the aim of Christ's preaching to the dead to be 'that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but might live to God in the spirit' (4⁶). Yet he has not fallen into line with the Pauline psychology presupposed in this antithesis. For again and again he uses *ψυχή*, 'soul,' rather than *πνεῦμα*, 'spirit,' to describe the religious aspect of the inner life. His usage, therefore, seems to imply that he has adopted an idea which Paul has brought into currency without, perhaps, penetrating its fundamental significance. We may point out in corroboration that he shows no trace of the eschatological construction which Paul has reared on the conception of *πνεῦμα*, and which is essential to the outlook of Pauline thought.

We need not be surprised to overhear these echoes of Paulinism when we recognize that the author reveals his acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans. It is true that the extent of his contact with that document has been seriously exaggerated. But certain phenomena in 1 Peter can scarcely be explained without reference to it, although they are of trivial significance for the author's position. In the passage in which he describes the Christian community as heir to the privileges of Israel (2^{6, 8}) he employs the same quotations from Is 28¹⁶ and Is 8¹⁴ as appear in Ro 9³³. This might be explained from the use by both writers of a collection of proof-texts from the Old Testament in general circulation. But the fact that a few sentences later (2¹⁰) a verse from Hosea (2²⁸) occurs which Paul cites in the chapter which contains the quotations from Isaiah, makes it difficult to believe that the parallelism is accidental. A similar situation is disclosed in chap. 3⁹, where Peter warns his readers against returning evil for evil (*μὴ ἀποδίδοντες κακὸν ἀπὸ κακοῦ*), employing the precise language which Paul has in Ro 12¹⁷. That the identity of phrase is not a

mere coincidence is made probable when it is observed that in both contexts the injunction is introduced between exhortations to humility and admonitions to be at peace with all men. His knowledge of Ro 12 is further suggested when within the same paragraph (2^{2, 5}) are found the rare adjective *λογικός*, 'spiritual,' and the conception of Christians as offering spiritual sacrifices well-pleasing to God, both of which phenomena occur in Ro 12¹. The expressions which belong in common to Ro 13¹⁻¹⁷ and 1 P 2¹³⁻¹⁷ are not so impressive, as here Peter's thought moves on different lines from that of Paul. Some scholars, including Hort and Zahn, have discovered subtle affinities between 1 Peter and *Ephesians*. But while there are a few vague parallels, it is hard to trace any close inter-relation of ideas.

A letter written by Paul to a cosmopolitan Christian community like that of Rome would inevitably become known to a wide circle of readers, more especially as the letter was more of a manifesto than a communication. But most modern authorities are agreed that *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* (1 P 5¹³), which evidently describes the place where 1 Peter was written, is a cryptic name for Rome. So that the writer of this Epistle was in touch with the Roman Church, and therefore in a position peculiarly favourable for gaining acquaintance with Paul's most famous Epistle.

It is not my aim in this paper to discuss the authorship of 1 Peter. All I have attempted is to show that the writer, while revealing certain points of contact with important Pauline ideas and a sympathetic acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans, is not a disciple of Paul, but an earnest representative of the religious thought of the Early Church to which Paul himself was profoundly indebted. In the light of these facts it is no doubt easier to assent to the well-attested opinion that the Epistle (in its thought, if not in its language) is to be referred to the Apostle Peter.

Literature.

THE SEVENTH BISHOP OF NEW YORK.

To know the difference between England and the United States read the biography of *Henry*

Codman Potter, Seventh Bishop of New York, as it has been written by Dr. George Hodges, Dean of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts (Macmillan; 15s. net). No book could bring out more clearly the desire of the