

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

*CAMBRIDGE GREEK TESTAMENT FOR  
SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES*

GENERAL EDITOR : R. ST JOHN PARRY, D.D.,  
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF  
PETER

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

London: FETTER LANE, E.C.

Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET



Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS

New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.

Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

*All rights reserved*

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF  
**PETER**

Edited by

THE REV. G. W. BLENKIN, M.A.

Vicar of Hitchin, and Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral Church,  
late Fellow of Trinity College

*WITH NOTES AND INTRODUCTION*

Cambridge:  
at the University Press

1914

**Cambridge :**

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PREFACE  
BY THE GENERAL EDITOR

**T**HE General Editor does not hold himself responsible, except in the most general sense, for the statements, opinions, and interpretations contained in the several volumes of this Series. He believes that the value of the Introduction and the Commentary in each case is largely dependent on the Editor being free as to his treatment of the questions which arise, provided that that treatment is in harmony with the character and scope of the Series. He has therefore contented himself with offering criticisms, urging the consideration of alternative interpretations, and the like; and as a rule he has left the adoption of these suggestions to the discretion of the Editor.

The Greek Text adopted in this Series is that of Dr Westcott and Dr Hort with the omission of the marginal readings. For permission to use this Text the thanks of the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press and of the General Editor are due to Messrs Macmillan & Co.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

*July 1914.*

## PREFACE

THE completion of this commentary has been unavoidably delayed by the thronging duties of parochial work since my departure from Cambridge. In the Notes and Introduction I have relied chiefly upon the study of other New Testament Books and of the Septuagint with which the Epistle is saturated. The opinions adopted are in many cases based upon the views of other commentators too numerous to mention. I must, however, express my indebtedness to the commentary of Dr Hort upon the earlier portion of the Epistle, and to that of Dr Bigg upon the whole book, even where I fail to concur with his views. For the problems of date and authorship I have derived most help from the exhaustive articles of Dr Chase on S. Peter and 1 Peter in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and not without full consideration have I ventured to differ from some of the conclusions of Professor Ramsay in *The Church in the Roman Empire*.

My thanks are due to the Syndics of the University Press for their patient forbearance and to the General Editor for his great kindness in reading the proofs and for much valuable criticism.

G. W. B.

July 1914.

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION ... ..	ix—lxxxviii
Chapter I. The Life and Character of St Peter	ix—xix
„ II. The Authorship of the Epistle ...	xx—xxvii
„ III. The Canonicity of the Epistle ...	xxvii—xxix
„ IV. The Place of Writing ... ..	xxix—xxxiii
„ V. The Date of the Epistle ... ..	xxxiii—liii
„ VI. Relations between 1 Peter and other N.T. Books ... ..	liii—lxix
„ VII. The Readers ... ..	lxix—lxxv
„ VIII. The Occasion and Purpose of the Epistle ... ..	lxxv—lxxxı
„ IX. Doctrine in 1 Peter ... ..	lxxxı—lxxxvi
„ X. The Greek Text and Versions ...	lxxxvi—lxxxvii
„ XI. Literature ... ..	lxxxvii—lxxxviii
II. TEXT ... ..	1—8
III. NOTES ... ..	9—128
IV. INDEXES ... ..	129—132



## INTRODUCTION

### 1. THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF ST PETER

Simon (or Symeon Acts xv. 14; 2 Pet. i. 1) was son of Jonas (Mt. xvi. 17) or John (Jn i. 42, xxi. 15—17) and brother of Andrew. His home was at Capernaum but he may have originally come from Bethsaida (Jn i. 44). He was married at the time of his call (Mk i. 30) and in later years his wife accompanied him on his missionary travels (1 Cor. ix. 5). He and his brother were partners with James and John as fishermen.

*His calls.* (a) *To personal friendship with Jesus* (Jn i. 41—42). Probably both he and Andrew had been disciples of the Baptist. Andrew having found the Messiah brings Simon to our Lord who at once recognizes in him latent possibilities which will develop into Rock-like strength of character.

(b) *His call to discipleship* (Mt. iv. 18—19; Mk i. 16—18) took place while he was fishing. He and Andrew are summoned to follow Jesus with a promise that they shall be “fishers of men.” St Luke (v. 1—11), either following a different tradition or more probably describing a later repetition of the call to discipleship, records it after the healing of Simon’s wife’s mother and other miracles in Capernaum. Our Lord borrows Simon’s boat from which to preach. An extraordinary draught of fishes convinces Simon that Jesus must possess more than human powers. He exclaims “Depart from me for I am a sinful man, O Lord,” but is assured “From henceforth thou shalt catch men.”

(c) *The call to Apostleship* was perhaps some six months later, when our Lord selected twelve to be His special companions to

be trained as Messengers (Mk iii. 14). On their first Mission they were sent "two and two," and it is a plausible conjecture that St Peter's companion was St John. They had previously been partners, and together with Andrew, they formed the innermost circle of the Twelve at the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk v. 37), at the Transfiguration (Mk ix. 2), in Gethsemane (Mk xiv. 33). Peter and John "made ready the Passover" (Lk. xxii. 8). At the Last Supper Peter made signs to John (Jn xiii. 24). They alone entered the High Priest's palace at the Trial (Jn xviii. 15). They alone visited the Sepulchre on hearing of the empty tomb (Jn xx. 2—10). It was of St John's future that St Peter asked the Risen Lord (Jn xxi. 20).

Peter and John together healed the cripple (Acts iii. 1—10), together they were arrested by the Sanhedrin (iii. 11), together they visited Samaria (viii. 14). They with James the Lord's brother were regarded as "pillars" of the Church and supported St Paul's work among the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 9).

*St Peter's Character as portrayed in the Gospels* is that of a warm-hearted, impulsive man ready to dare all and doubt nothing, but, until he had been "sifted as wheat," his confidence was partly self-confidence which failed in the hour of trial; his impulsiveness led him at times to act and speak hastily.

*His impulsiveness in action* may be seen in

- (a) his request to walk on the water (Mt. xiv. 28 ff.),
- (b) his proposal to make three tabernacles at the Transfiguration (Mk ix. 5—6),
- (c) his conduct about the tribute money (Mt. xvii. 24 ff.),
- (d) drawing his sword to smite the High Priest's Servant (Jn xviii. 10),
- (e) entering the Palace at the Trial and then denying his Master (Mt. xxvi. 69 ff., etc.),
- (f) entering the sepulchre (Jn xx. 6),
- (g) jumping into the water to hasten to the Risen Lord (Jn xxi. 7 ff.).

*His impulsiveness of speech* led him at times to criticize or contradict his Master.

"All men seek for Thee" (Mk i. 37). "This shall never be unto Thee" (Mt. xvi. 22). "Thou shalt never wash my feet";

"Not my feet only, but also my hands and my head" (Jn xiii. 8 ff.). "Yet will I not deny Thee" (Mt. xxvi. 35, etc.). "Why cannot I follow Thee even now?" (Jn xiii. 37).

The same impulsiveness led him to ask constant questions. "Why say the Scribes that Elias must first come?" (Mt. xvii. 10). "Speakest Thou this parable unto us or even unto all?" (Lk. xii. 41). "How oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him?" (Mt. xviii. 21). "We have left all...what then shall we have?" (Mt. xix. 27). "What shall be the sign of Thy Coming?" (Mt. xxiv. 3; Mk xiii. 3). Who is to be the traitor? (Jn. xiii. 24). "Lord, whither goest Thou?" (Jn xiii. 36). "Lord, and what shall this man do?" (Jn xxi. 21).

But that same impulsiveness made St Peter the spokesman of the rest in confessing Christ. "Of a truth Thou art the Son of God" (Mt. xiv. 33). "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Jn vi. 68—69). That confession may have been based upon impulse rather than settled conviction, and so was received without comment by our Lord—but when (Mt. xvi. 16) St Peter made the same confession in answer to a definite test of their faith our Lord bestowed a special blessing upon him. "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church." The "rock" has been variously explained to mean (a) the truth just asserted by St Peter, (b) St Peter's faith, (c) St Peter's character as typical of the other Apostles, who with the prophets are described as the foundations upon which the Church is built (Eph. ii. 20; cf. Rev. xxi. 14). But if the words are understood in a more personal sense they may mean that St Peter is to support the first stones of the "ecclesia," the new Israel of God, as we find that he did in the earlier chapters of Acts. A Rabbinic legend, commenting on Numbers xxiii. 9 with Isaiah li. 1—2, uses similar language of Abraham: "As soon as God perceived that there would arise an Abraham He said 'Behold I have found the "petra" upon which to build and lay foundations'" (see Chase, Hastings' *D. of B.*, iii. 795).

St Peter is also made a "steward" of the kingdom to whom the keys are entrusted (cf. Isaiah xxii. 22) and the "scribe" who has authority to "bind or loose," declaring what God has pronounced to be obligatory or otherwise. But in Mt. xviii. 18 the

same power of "binding" or "loosing" is conferred upon all the Apostles.

But with all his faults St Peter was specially dear to his Master, as may be seen from the prayer that his faith might not fail and the charge to strengthen his brethren (Lk. xxii. 32), the pitying glance in the hour of his shame (Lk. xxii. 61), the special message about the Resurrection (Mk xvi. 7). He was the first of the Twelve to see the Risen Lord (Lk. xxiv. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5), and finally on the lake side St Peter greatly forgiven proved how greatly he loved, and was entrusted with a share in the Good Shepherd's own work and learned that he should glorify God by sharing his Master's fate in death (Jn xxi. 15 ff.).

In the Acts of the Apostles St Peter seems at once to take the lead among his brethren. He proposes the election of a new Apostle (i. 15 ff.) and was the spokesman on the Day of Pentecost. In the successive stages of the development of the Church traced by St Luke, (a) Jerusalem, (b) Judaea, (c) Samaria, (d) "unto the uttermost part of the earth" (i. 8), St Peter takes the initiative. He, with St John, performs the first miracle (iii. 1—8) and acts as spokesman when they are tried by the Sanhedrin (iii. 11 ff.). He asserts his primacy in the first visitation of judgment (v. 1—11). Although all the Apostles are described as working "signs and wonders," St Peter's personality seems to have created the greatest impression, so that his very shadow was thought to bring healing (v. 15). When the Apostles were imprisoned and miraculously released St Peter again acted as spokesman before the Sanhedrin (v. 29 ff.).

The persecution which followed St Stephen's martyrdom scattered the Christians but thereby extended the Gospel to Samaria, and in that stage again St Peter with St John is sent by the Apostles to superintend this new development and set his seal upon the work begun by Philip (viii. 14 ff.).

Again in the period of rest which followed St Paul's conversion St Peter undertakes a missionary tour "throughout all quarters" (ix. 32) and healed Aeneas at Lydda and Tabitha at Joppa (ix. 33—43).

But the greatest conquest of all still awaited him. It was by his mouth that "God made choice among them that the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe" (Acts x., xv. 7).

For that venture of faith, even in spite of his Master's world-wide commission, St Peter's impulsiveness was barely prepared. His old habit of contradiction is seen in his protest against "anything common or unclean" (x. 14). But no sooner did he learn that God was "no respecter of persons" than he boldly vindicated his action in baptizing Cornelius and his companions at Caesarea. The door was thus opened to the Gentiles and the final stage of world-wide development had begun. Here St Peter's primacy as a pioneer seems to have been completed. His courage and steadfastness had given solid support for laying the foundations of the Church, and from that time the work passed chiefly into other hands.

These events probably took place very soon after St Paul's conversion (c. 34 or 35 A.D.), and apparently Jerusalem was for some years longer St Peter's headquarters. He was the only Apostle present, except James the Lord's brother, when St Paul visited Jerusalem three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18). On that occasion the Christians were at first afraid to receive St Paul until Barnabas brought him to the Apostles and told the story of his conversion and subsequent work in Damascus (Acts ix. 26).

Shortly before the death of Herod Agrippa in 44 A.D. St James was martyred and St Peter imprisoned. Being released by an angel he left Jerusalem and "departed to another place" (xii. 17). The tradition that he then went to Rome seems certainly inconsistent with the evidence of St Paul's Epistles.

A very wide-spread tradition represents St Peter as the founder and organizer of the Church in Antioch, and he may probably have made Antioch a centre for mission work among the Syrian Jews as an "Apostle of the Circumcision" (Gal. ii. 7).

We next hear of him at the Apostolic Conference at Jerusalem in A.D. 49 (or ? 51). On that occasion St Paul had a private conference with St Peter, St John and James the Lord's Brother as the reputed "pillars" of the Church. It is possible that they may have suggested some compromise, such as the circumcision of Titus (Gal. ii. 3), as a concession to Jewish prejudices. But to this St Paul would not agree, regarding it as a breach of principle to circumcise a Gentile like Titus, despite his prominent position. Ultimately the three leaders fully accepted St Paul's

position, and at the public conference (Acts xv. 7—11) St Peter acted as spokesman. He reminded the Assembly that he himself had been selected to admit the first Gentile converts. By bestowing the gift of the Holy Spirit upon Cornelius and his companions God had confirmed that new departure, and had placed Jews and Gentiles on the same level, purifying their hearts by the gift of faith instead of demanding the bodily purification of circumcision. It would therefore be tempting God to impose upon Gentiles the yoke of the Law, which the Jews themselves had found insupportable. In fact the Jewish disciples themselves had learned to depend for salvation not upon the Law but upon faith in the free grace of the Lord Jesus. As a result of this speech St James, the Lord's brother, who presided at the Conference as the resident head of the Church in Jerusalem, proposed that Gentiles should not be required to adopt circumcision or observe the whole Law. It was however thought wise to impose certain restrictions upon them, by demanding that they should abstain from meats offered in sacrifice to idols, from fornication, and from blood or meat containing blood. (On the meaning of these regulations, see Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 71 f., Lake, *Earlier Epp. of St Paul*, pp. 48 ff.).

It was probably soon after this Conference that St Peter himself came down to Antioch (Gal. ii. 11). Remembering perhaps the vision which had bidden him to "call no man common or unclean" and anxious to "give the right hand of fellowship" to St Paul's work, St Peter at first mixed freely with the Gentile Christians and shared their meals. Such a step was, not unnaturally perhaps, regarded with some apprehension by the stricter Jewish Christians at Jerusalem. They had no doubt regarded it as an extremely liberal concession to exempt Gentiles from observing Jewish customs. But, if leading Jewish Christians, like St Peter, were now proposing to abandon their own customs and adopt those of Gentiles, they felt that unnecessary liberality was being shewn, which would inevitably distress or even alienate the Jewish majority in the Church, without conferring any real benefit upon the Gentile minority. James, the Lord's brother, would naturally be appealed to by his flock. On a previous occasion some of them had unwarrantably claimed his authority in endeavouring to impose the Law

upon Gentile Christians at Antioch and he had been obliged to repudiate their action (Acts xv. 24). But now he may have thought it wise to send a cautious warning to the more impulsive St Peter that his liberal policy was causing great offence to Jewish Christians. Thereupon St Peter and the other Jews, even including Barnabas, withdrew from eating with the Gentiles. Such vacillation seemed to St Paul to be a real breach of principle. He realized that Gentile Christians would inevitably feel that they were regarded as inferiors so long as they were uncircumcised, and would either become a separate Church or feel bound to observe the Law as necessary in order to obtain full recognition in the Church, even though it might not be essential for salvation. Thus St Peter's action was virtually reimposing the Law, and implied that those who had deliberately abandoned it were committing a transgression. Yet it was to seek justification in Christ that they had done so, and thus Christ would be the cause of their sin, which is impossible. There is no evidence to shew how St Peter received this protest. Probably he accepted the principle laid down by St Paul, but as his own mission was specially to "those of the circumcision" he would seldom have any cause to act upon it. Thus the Judaizing opponents of St Paul, exaggerating St Peter's position, set up a rival party at Corinth who claimed to be followers of Cephas. Silas at any rate, though himself one of the delegates from the Church at Jerusalem, must have cordially supported St Paul, otherwise he would not have been selected as the companion of his second Missionary journey. Barnabas must also have speedily repented of his temporary vacillation, as St Paul originally invited him to accompany him. But if, as is not improbable, St Mark was among the Jews who "withdrew" at Antioch, this may have confirmed an impression, produced by his previous withdrawal from the first Missionary journey, that St Mark was not yet in full sympathy with St Paul's attitude towards Gentiles.

After this incident we have no knowledge of St Peter's movements for several years, except an incidental notice (1 Cor. ix. 5) that his wife accompanied him on his mission work.

The existence of a Cephas party at *Corinth* affords no sufficient grounds for supposing that St Peter himself visited Corinth, though it may have given rise to the tradition mentioned by

Dionysius Bp of Corinth (c. 170 A.D.) that St Peter and St Paul both worked in Corinth (Eus. *H. E.* ii. 25).

The tradition that St Peter visited *Pontus* and other provinces of Asia Minor, mentioned by Origen (Eus. *H. E.* iii. 1), Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxvii. 6), the Syriac Doctrine of the Apostles and the Acts of Andrew, is probably only based upon the opening salutation in 1 Pet. and is not supported by other references in the Epistle to the evangelization of those districts.

*Antioch in Syria* is described as a special centre of St Peter's work. Thus Origen (in *Luc. Hom.* vi.), possibly borrowing from a second century list of Antiochene Bishops, describes Ignatius as "the second Bishop of Antioch after the blessed Peter" (cf. Eus. *H. E.* iii. 36). Chrysostom and Theodoret also connect St Peter with Antioch, and later tradition describes him as having been Bishop of Antioch for seven years. The Clementine Romance, despite its Ebionite inventions about the supposed hostility of St Peter towards Pauline teaching, seems itself to have originated in Syria, and is probably correct in making that district one of the chief centres of St Peter's activity.

*Rome.* St Peter's work and martyrdom in Rome are attested by evidence so early, so wide-spread and so unanimous that even the most determined opponent of Papal claims could not dispute it with any success.

For a full discussion of the evidence Dr Chase's Article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and Lightfoot, *Clement of Rome*, ii. pp. 481 ff. should be consulted.

*Clement of Rome* (chapter 5) (c. 95 A.D.) seems to select the martyrdoms of SS. Peter and Paul because they took place in Rome.

*Ignatius of Antioch* (c. 115 A.D.) (*ad Rom.* c. iv.) says "I do not command you as Peter and Paul"—again probably selecting the two Apostles who had worked in Rome.

*Papias of Hierapolis* (c. 130 A.D.) (Eus. *H. E.* iii. 39, cf. ii. 15) probably described 1 Pet. as written from Rome (see p. xxviii).

*Dionysius of Corinth* (c. 170 A.D.) (Eus. *H. E.* ii. 25) describes St Peter and St Paul as visiting Italy and suffering martyrdom.

*Irenaeus of Lyons* (c. 190 A.D.) (*Haer.* iii. 1) says "Matthew published a Gospel...while Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church in Rome." (*Haer.* iii. 3) "The Churches of



Rome founded by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul...They entrusted the ministration of the bishop to Linus... after Linus Anencletus, after Anencletus in the *third* place from the Apostles Clement is elected bishop."

*Clement of Alexandria* (c. 200 A.D.) (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 14) says "When Peter had preached the word publicly in Rome the bystanders...exhorted Mark to write out his statements."

*Tertullian of Carthage* (c. 200 A.D.) is the earliest writer who describes the mode of St Peter's death and places it in the reign of Nero at Rome. He also (*de Baptismo* 4) speaks of those whom Peter baptized in the Tiber and (*de Praescriptione* 32) says that Clement was ordained by Peter.

*Gaius the Roman presbyter* (c. 200—220 A.D.) speaks of the tombs of St Peter and St Paul as still existing at the Vatican and the Ostian Way (Eus. *H. E.* ii. 25).

*Origen of Alexandria* (c. 250 A.D.) (Eus. *H. E.* iii. 1) says that St Peter was crucified head downwards at Rome. This last detail is also found in the Gnostic Acts of Peter, which possibly originated in Asia Minor in the second century and contain also the "Domine quo vadis?" legend and the story of St Peter's conflict with Simon Magus in Rome. The Catholic Acts of Peter, which contain similar details, cannot in their extant form be earlier than the fifth century.

#### *The date and duration of St Peter's visit to Rome.*

*Eusebius* (*H. E.* ii. 14) describes St Peter as coming to Rome in the reign of Claudius and there contending with Simon Magus, "the author of all heresy," and (ii. 17) he mentions a report that Philo in the reign of Claudius became acquainted at Rome with Peter who was preaching there.

*The Chronicon of Eusebius* (?based upon Julian Africanus, c. 221 A.D.) in the Armenian version assigns St Peter's visit to Rome to the third year of Caius 39—40 A.D. and adds that he remained there as "antistes" of the Church twenty years, but in a later passage the martyrdom of Peter and Paul at Rome is placed in the 13th year of Nero, i.e. 67—68 A.D.

Jerome places St Peter's arrival in the second year of Claudius 43—43 A.D. and says that he held the bishopric 25 years, placing the martyrdom of Peter and Paul in 68 A.D.

*The Liberian Catalogue of Roman Bishops* (354 A.D.) describes St Peter as Bishop of Rome for 25 years but dates it 30—55 A.D., apparently assuming that he was made a Bishop by our Lord and that his see must have been Rome.

*The Liber Pontificalis* has several contradictory notices :

- (a) that St Peter held the Bishopric of Antioch for 7 years,
- (b) that he entered Rome in the reign of Nero and held the Bishopric of Rome for 25 years,
- (c) that he was in the reigns of Tiberius, Caius, Claudius and Nero,
- (d) that he suffered martyrdom together with St Paul in the 38th year after the Crucifixion, i.e. 67 A.D.

It would seem therefore that there is no mention of St Peter as Bishop of Rome until the fourth century, and the earlier lists of Bishops all reckon Linus as the first bishop. The 25 years' episcopate may perhaps have been based upon a legend that our Lord ordered the Apostles to wait 12 years before going out into the world. This story was contained in the *Preaching of Peter*, probably an early second century book, quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 5), and also in the *Gnostic Acts of Peter*, which represented St Peter as coming to Rome when the 12 years had expired and there contending with Simon Magus. But the story is placed after St Paul's departure to Spain, which would imply a much later date. If however the Crucifixion is dated 30 A.D. 12 years would bring us to 42 A.D. and this would leave 25 years before the traditional date of St Peter's death.

The evidence of the first three centuries suggests a comparatively late date for St Peter's work in Rome, placing it after previous work in Antioch, Corinth or Asia Minor, coupling it with St Paul's work in Rome which certainly did not begin until about 59 A.D., and connecting it with the issue of Gospels by St Matthew and St Mark or with the Neronian persecution.

This later date is far more consistent with the language of St Paul's Epistles. The Epistle to the Romans alike by its statements and its silence makes it incredible that St Peter was then in Rome or had previously worked there. The ignorance of Christianity professed by the Jews in Rome on St Paul's arrival (*Acts* xxviii. 22), even if it was wilfully exaggerated, is

hardly consistent with the view that St Peter had been working in Rome.

In the Epistles of his first Roman Captivity St Paul mentions numerous fellow-workers, including St Mark and others "of the circumcision," but is absolutely silent about St Peter.

Therefore it is most difficult to believe that St Peter worked in Rome earlier than 61 A.D.

On the other hand there is considerable evidence that St Peter did work in Rome *for a considerable time*, and a fair amount of early evidence that *St Peter and St Paul worked together* in Rome. It is therefore a very plausible conjecture of Dr Chase (Hastings' *D. of B.*, iii. 778) that St Peter may have come to Rome on St Paul's invitation about the time of St Paul's release, and that they worked there together for a time before St Paul started on the Missionary work implied in the Pastoral Epistles, and that St Peter remained in Rome with St Mark, until he was summoned to Jerusalem in 63 or early in 64 to take part in the election of Symeon Bp of Jerusalem. Dr Chase suggests that St Peter returned to Rome and was one of the earliest victims of the Neronian persecution in 64 A.D. This would tally with his burial place being in the Vatican near the hideous scenes of Nero's gardens.

If however the traditional date 67 or 68 A.D. is accepted for St Peter's martyrdom, we must assume that he was absent from Rome during the first fury of the persecution and returned or was brought to Rome only to be martyred at the end of Nero's reign, possibly after St Paul's death.

The "first trial" and protracted remand of St Paul, referred to in 2 Tim., and the invitation to Timothy to join him before winter and bring Mark with him seem hardly consistent with the view that the first fury of the Neronian persecution was then raging.

The Mission work implied in the Pastoral Epistles also demands a longer period of liberty than would be the case if St Paul was executed in 64 A.D. It is therefore easier to date St Paul's martyrdom about 67 A.D., and if St Peter had already suffered we should have expected St Paul to refer to his death.

For an account of the various apocryphal writings ascribed to St Peter and a discussion of the legends about his conflict with Simon Magus the Article "Simon Peter" in Hastings' *D. of B.* should be consulted.

## 2. AUTHORSHIP.

The chief arguments *in favour of the Petrine authorship* are:

A. *External.*

The Epistle is quoted as the work of St Peter by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and other early writers (possibly including Papias), while the Second Epistle of St Peter, which is certainly very early even if not genuine, refers to a previous epistle bearing the name of St Peter which most probably means our Epistle.

The attestation of the Epistle by so many witnesses widely separated in place and circumstances shews that it had a circulation and authority in the early Church such as it could hardly have acquired unless it was regarded as the work of some leading Apostle.

B. *Internal.*

(1) The Epistle itself claims to be written by Peter an Apostle of Jesus Christ, and the opening salutation can only be rejected on one of two theories:

(a) that it is an interpolation added in the second century to a document which was previously circulated anonymously. This view has been suggested by Harnack but it is most improbable. A treatise such as "Hebrews" or a homily such as 2 Clement might have been circulated anonymously, but 1 Peter reads distinctly like a letter, and as such must surely have had some writer's name attached to it from the first. Moreover if this letter was originally anonymous, it is difficult to account for its subsequent ascription to St Peter rather than to St Paul to whose writings it has a decided resemblance.

(b) that the Epistle is a forgery. For this no adequate reason can be assigned, unless we are to adopt the theory of the Tübingen school that St Peter and St Paul and their respective followers were diametrically opposed to one another and that this Epistle, as well as the Acts of the Apostles, was written by some well-meaning forger of the second century, who desired to promote the union of the two branches of the Church by attributing Pauline views to the leading Jewish Apostle St Peter. Apart from this theory, which is now discredited by nearly all

critics, no adequate motive can be suggested for the supposed forgery in St Peter's name. The Epistle denounces no heresy, it supports no special system of doctrine or Church organization. It shews no traces of any legends or stories about St Peter's life. It is addressed to an enormous district, large parts of which are connected with no known Apostolic missionary work. Silvanus is elsewhere connected with St Paul rather than St Peter. Why, therefore, should any forger have selected his name as the amanuensis, or bearer, of the Epistle? On the other hand Silvanus (Silas) is described in Acts xv. 22 as one of the "chief men among the brethren" in Jerusalem and therefore was certainly well known to St Peter—and unless the writer of this Epistle was a man of recognized apostolic authority he would hardly have been likely to have commanded the services of one so influential as Silvanus as his subordinate.

(2) Again in v. 13 the writer speaks of "Mark, my Son," and such a claim to parental relationship to St Mark not only indicates the writer's evident importance, but also agrees with the unanimous testimony of tradition that St Mark was in special attendance upon St Peter.

(3) In v. 1 the writer describes himself as "a witness of the sufferings of Christ" and evidently implies that he is testifying what he himself heard and saw (cf. the graphic imperfects in which he describes our Lord's conduct during His trial and Passion, ii. 23).

(4) There are also several coincidences of thought and language between this Epistle and the speeches of St Peter as recorded in Acts.

In his speeches St Peter constantly emphasizes the fact that the Apostles are "witnesses" Acts i. 22, ii. 32, iii. 15, v. 32, x. 39, 41, cf. 1 Pet. v. 1, but in Acts the "witness" is of the resurrection whereas in the Epistle it is of the sufferings of Christ.

Christ is spoken of as "the just" Acts iii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 18.

His sufferings are regarded as "foreordained" Acts ii. 23, iv. 28, 1 Pet. i. 20; and as having been foretold by the prophets Acts iii. 18; 1 Pet. i. 11.

The same passage about the stone disallowed by the builders

becoming the headstone of the corner is quoted Acts iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 4, 7.

The Cross is spoken of as "the tree" Acts v. 30, x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 24 (elsewhere only Acts xiii. 29, and Gal. iii. 13 quoting from the O.T.).

The descent into Hell is referred to Acts ii. 31 "That Christ's soul was not left in Hell," cf. 1 Pet. iii. 19.

Christ is described as being raised from the dead by God Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, iv. 10, v. 30, x. 40; 1 Pet. i. 21.

The judgment of "the quick and the dead" (a phrase which elsewhere occurs only in 2 Tim. iv. 1) is mentioned in Acts x. 42 and 1 Pet. iv. 5.

The exaltation of the ascended Christ at the right hand of God is emphasized in Acts ii. 33 and 1 Pet. iii. 22.

The transgression and fall of Judas to go to "his own place" is recognized as a fulfilment of Scripture Acts i. 16, 25, and may suggest the same idea of an underlying purpose of God with regard to the consequences of man's guilt as is implied in 1 Pet. ii. 8 "them which stumble at the word, being disobedient, whereunto they were appointed."

The importance of Baptism is emphasized in Acts ii. 38, x. 47, 48; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 21.

God is described as "no respecter of persons" Acts x. 34; 1 Pet. i. 17. His choice of the Gentiles to be His "people" is referred to by St James as having been shewn by St Peter in Acts xv. 14, and Gentiles are certainly included in the "people of God" in 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10—and the "purification of their hearts by faith" Acts xv. 9 may be compared with 1 Pet. i. 22 "seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth."

The chief arguments which have been urged *against* the Petrine authorship are:

(1) *That the references to organized persecution point to a late date outside the probable limits of St Peter's life.* In answer to this it may be argued (p. xli ff.) that the allusions to persecution do not *necessarily* imply a persecution organized *by the state*, and that even if they are so explained they are not inconsistent with what we know of the Neronian persecution to which St Peter's martyrdom is usually assigned. It is moreover possible (though

not in the opinion of the present writer probable) that St Peter's life may have been prolonged until 70—80 A.D.

(2) *That the Epistle is written in good idiomatic Greek*, and shews an appreciation of the niceties of the language in the use of tenses, prepositions and synonyms. The writer must have been a diligent student of the LXX., probably including the Apocrypha, and he is saturated with its language. Besides this he uses sixteen Classical words not found in the LXX. or N.T. and several other Greek words (chiefly compounds) for which there is no contemporary or earlier authority. Such literary attainments, it is urged, are incredible in a Galilean peasant like St Peter, who is described in Acts iv. 13 as "ignorant and unlearned" (*ἰδιώτης καὶ ἀγράμματος*), and is stated by Papias and other early Fathers to have required the services of St Mark as his interpreter (*ἑρμηνευτής*). Dean Armitage Robinson says (*Study of the Gospels*, p. 16) "It is extremely probable that St Peter could not write or preach, even if he could speak at all, in any language but his mother tongue, the Aramaic of Galilee." Similarly Dr Swete (*St Mark*, Int. p. xx) says "Simon Peter, if he could express himself in Greek at all, could scarcely have possessed sufficient knowledge of the language to address a Roman congregation with success." On the other hand Lightfoot (*Excursus on St Peter in Rome*, Clement, Vol. ii. p. 494) says "When Mark is called *ἑρμηνευτής* the interpreter of Peter, the reference must be to the Latin, not to the Greek language. The evidence that Greek was spoken commonly in the towns bordering on the Sea of Galilee is ample, even if this had not been the necessary inference from the whole tenour of the New Testament." In view of the large element of Greek life in Galilee, it is certainly probable that St Peter had some knowledge of colloquial Greek from the first. The epithets "ignorant and unlearned" applied to the Apostles need not mean more than that they had no professional training in Rabbinic schools. Although there is no warrant for the idea that the "gift of tongues" enabled the Apostles to preach at will in foreign languages, we may well suppose that in choosing St Peter as one of His messengers our Lord discerned in him intellectual as well as spiritual gifts and fitted him for his work by blessing the use which he made of those gifts. In his intercourse with Hellenists at Jerusalem, with Jews of the Dispersion

on the day of Pentecost, and with Cornelius the centurion St Peter must almost certainly have spoken in Greek, yet there is no hint of the employment of an interpreter, and his knowledge of the language would steadily increase during his sojourn in Jerusalem and his missionary work (see 1 Cor. ix. 5) when Antioch was perhaps his headquarters. Moreover he would be dependent upon the study of the LXX. in "searching the Scriptures." It is generally agreed (Edersheim, Nöldeke, etc.) that Hebrew was only familiar to scholars in the time of our Lord. Apparently Jewish children were taught to read Hebrew and the lessons in the Synagogue were still read in Hebrew (except possibly among the Hellenists). But already an "interpreter" was required to give an Aramaic paraphrase, though this did not take written form in the Targums until a much later date. Hebrew Manuscripts seem to have been very costly, whereas Greek Manuscripts were quite cheap. Thus even in Galilee it is probable that the LXX. was "the people's Bible." It would therefore be by no means impossible for the language of the Epistle to be chiefly St Peter's own, though it is conceivable that his amanuensis (possibly Silvanus, as the style is quite unlike that of Mark, his only other known companion) may have assisted him in expressing his thoughts in an idiomatic form.

(3) *The comparative absence from the Epistle of allusions to the facts or teaching of our Lord's earthly life.*

It is urged that if the Epistle was written by St Peter, the close companion of Christ, we should find more signs of a vivid remembrance of His life and teaching. But it is surprising how few facts concerning our Lord's life and ministry are found in any of the N.T. Books outside the Gospels. The story of His words and works must have been constantly preached by the Apostles, as we learn from St Luke's preface and from the unanimous tradition that St Mark's Gospel was based upon the preaching of St Peter. Yet in the recorded speeches of St Peter in Acts the only references to events before the Passion are three allusions to the Baptism and two to the Miracles of our Lord. Similarly in the Epistles of St John and of James, the Lord's brother, very few facts are alluded to. Therefore the absence of such direct allusions in 1 Peter can only be used as an argument against its genuineness if the same is applied also to the other speeches and



epistles attributed to Apostles. On the other hand, if they were late forgeries, such allusions would almost certainly have been introduced to support their professed Apostolic authorship.

But although direct allusions to our Lord's Life and Work are rare there are numerous indirect allusions and undesigned coincidences which support the Petrine authorship.

As in St Peter's speeches in Acts the author lays special stress upon the fact that he was a "witness" of Christ's sufferings, and, although the word *μάρτυς* does not in itself necessarily mean a "spectator," the vivid imperfects in ii. 23 seem to describe the author's own recollection of the scene of Christ's Trial and Passion.

The implied contrast between himself and his readers *ὁ υἱὸς ἰδὼντες ἀγαπήτε* i. 8 is not only an indirect claim to have been himself an eyewitness but suggests a reminiscence of our Lord's words to St Thomas, Jn xx. 29.

The instruction to gird themselves with humility to serve one another, v. 5, would come most naturally from one who had been so put to shame by the Lord Jesus in girding Himself to wash the disciples' feet, when none of them would demean themselves to do the slave's duty.

The exhortation to watch (*γρηγορεῖν*) and to resist the devil in his attempts to devour them by making them deny their faith in the hour of danger, v. 8, would have special force if it came from one who had himself fallen, in spite of his Master's warning that Satan had desired to have him and his companions to sift them as wheat, because he failed to watch and pray, from one whose faith had been saved from utter failure by his Master's prayer and who now that he is converted desires to strengthen his brethren.

The charge to his fellow-presbyters to shepherd (*ποιμαίνειν*) the flock of God is the same that was given to St Peter on his repentance, Jn xxi. 16.

There are also numerous echoes of our Lord's sayings in the Epistle.

1 Pet. i. 4. The Christian's inheritance reserved in heaven.

Mt. xxv. 34. Inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world, cf. Mt. v. 5, vi. 20.

1 Pet. i. 6. ἀγαλλιᾶσθε...λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς.

1 Pet. i. 8. ἀγαλλιᾶτε χαρᾷ...δεδοξασμένη...

1 Pet. iv. 13. καθὼ κοινωρεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἵνα...χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι.

1 Pet. i. 10 f. The search of the prophets...now revealed.

1 Pet. i. 11. The prophets foretold the sufferings of Messiah and the glory which should follow them.

1 Pet. i. 13. Gird up (ἀναζωσάμενοι) the loins of your mind.

1 Pet. i. 17. εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε.

1 Pet. ii. 2. ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη.

1 Pet. ii. 6 f. λίθον ἀποδοκιμασμένον ἀκρογωνιαίον.

1 Pet. ii. 12. The sight of your good works will cause men to glorify God.

1 Pet. ii. 17. Fear God, honour the king (cf. Prov. xxiv. 21).

1 Pet. ii. 21. Follow Christ's steps by enduring suffering.

1 Pet. ii. 23. παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρινόντι δικαίως, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 19, πιστῷ κτίστη παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς.

1 Pet. ii. 25. Sheep going astray, cf. Is. liii. 6.

1 Pet. iii. 9. Blessing for reviling.

1 Pet. iii. 13. τίς ὁ κακῶσων;

1 Pet. iii. 14. εἰ καὶ πάσχετε διὰ δικαιοσύνην μακάριοι.

τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, cf. Is. viii. 12, 13.

1 Pet. iii. 16. οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες.

1 Pet. iv. 7. νῆψατε εἰς προσευχάς.

Mt. v. 12. χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· οὕτως γὰρ ἐδίωξαν κ.τ.λ.

Lk. x. 24. Many prophets...desired to see the things which ye see.

Lk. xxiv. 26. Behoved it not the Messiah to suffer these things and to enter into his glory?

Lk. xxiv. 46. So it is written that the Messiah should suffer.

Lk. xii. 35. Let your loins be girded about (περιεζωσμένοι).

Mt. vi. 9, Lk. xi. 2. The Lord's Prayer.

Mt. xviii. 3. ἐὰν μὴ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία.

Mt. xxi. 42, from Ps. cxviii. 22.

Mt. v. 16. That they may see your good works and glorify your Father.

Mt. xxii. 21. Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.

Mt. x. 38. Take up his cross and follow me.

Lk. xxiii. 46. εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου.

Mt. ix. 36. Sheep having no shepherd.

Lk. xv. 4. The lost sheep.

Lk. vi. 28. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους.

Lk. x. 19. οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσει, cf. Lk. xxi. 18.

Mt. v. 10. μακάριοι οἱ διωγόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης.

Mt. x. 26. μὴ φοβηθῆτε αὐτοῦς.

Lk. vi. 28. τῶν ἐπηρεάζοντων ὑμᾶς.

Mt. xxvi. 41. γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε.

1 Pet. iv. 14. *εἰ ὀνειδίξασθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ μακάριοι.*

1 Pet. v. 1. Witness of sufferings fellow-sharer of glory.

1 Pet. v. 3. *κατακυριεύοντες.*

1 Pet. v. 6. *ταπεινώθητε... ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ.*

Mt. v. 11. *μακάριοι ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν... ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ.*

Lk. xxiv. 47. Ye are witnesses of these things.

Mt. xix. 28, Lk. xxii. 30. When the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory ye also, etc.

Mt. xx. 25. *οἱ ἀρχόντες τῶν ἔθνων κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν. οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν.*

Mt. xxiii. 12. *ὅστις ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν ὑψώθησεται.*

### 3. CANONICITY.

With the exception of the First Epistle of St John, the First Epistle of St Peter is the only one among the Catholic Epistles "of whose authority there never was any doubt in the Church."

It was rejected by the heretic Marcion because he only accepted the Pauline books of the N.T. Theodore of Mopsuestia is also said by Leontius to have rejected "the Epistle of St James and the other Catholic Epistles in order," but probably this only means 2 and 3 John, 2 Peter and Jude, which were not accepted by the Syrian Churches. There is however some evidence which tends to shew that originally none of the Catholic Epistles were included in the Syrian Canon, but 1 John, 1 Peter and James had been accepted by them long before Theodore's time.

It is also omitted in the present text of the Muratorian fragment, which gives a list, possibly drawn up by Hippolytus, of the books accepted in the Church of Rome at the end of the second century. But this list, as we have it, is admitted to be incomplete. Some suggest that St Peter and his Epistle may have been mentioned in the lost portion dealing with St Mark's Gospel, while Zahn thinks that a passage, which in the existing text deals with the Apocalypse of Peter, may have originally referred to his first Epistle.

With these insignificant and doubtful exceptions the evidence for the reception of 1 Peter by the Church is extraordinarily strong.

In the fourth century *Eusebius* includes it among those books which are "generally received" (*H. E.* iii. 25. 2) and says that "the

Fathers of former days quoted it in their writings as indisputably authentic." This statement is amply supported by facts.

In the third century *Origen* (quoted by Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25) says "Peter has left one acknowledged Epistle," and he quotes v. 13.

*Clement of Alexandria* constantly quotes the Epistle by name and wrote a commentary on it in his Hypotyposes, of which fragments in a Latin translation by Cassiodorus are still extant.

*Tertullian* at Carthage also quotes it as the work of St Peter.

*Hippolytus* (on Dan. iv. 59), writing in Rome or the neighbourhood, quotes the words "which things the angels desire to look into" side by side with quotations from St Paul.

In the second century *Irenaeus*, who was brought up in Asia Minor and afterwards came to Lyons and Rome, and who therefore represents three of the chief centres of Christendom besides being closely connected with Polycarp and other survivors of the Apostolic age, is the earliest writer who quotes the Epistle by name. We have also numerous traces of the Epistle :

(a) *In Martyrdoms* such as the Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs (c. 180) and the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (177 A.D.) (Eus. *H. E.* v. 1).

(b) *In Apologists.* Theophilus (*ad Autolyceum* ii. 34) and Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 103) have apparent quotations from it.

(c) *Heretics* such as the Valentinians both Western (Marcosians quoted by Irenaeus i. 18) and Eastern (in Clem. Al.) and Basilides (Clem. Al. *Strom.* iv. p. 600) seem to quote the Epistle.

(d) *The writer to Diognetus* certainly and the *Didache* probably quote words from 1 Peter.

(e) There are possible allusions to it in *The Shepherd of Hermas*.

(f) *Papias* Bp of Hierapolis is stated by Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 39) to have used it as a witness, and in ii. 15 Eusebius says that Papias confirms the story given by Clement of Alexandria that St Peter approved Mark's action in writing his Gospel, and then, quoting either from Clement himself or from Papias, says that "Peter mentions Mark in his former Epistle which, they say, he composed in Rome itself, and that he signified this by describing the city by the metaphorical name Babylon." This last state-

ment that Babylon in the Epistle means Rome is not found in any of the extant writings of Clement of Alexandria and is therefore probably derived from Papias, and the fragment of Papias on Mark, quoted in Eus. iii. 39, refers back to some previous statement of his ("as I said") about St Mark's connexion with St Peter.

(g) *Polycarp* (c. 115 A.D.) is stated by Eusebius to have used 1 Peter, and in the extant Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians there are at least eight direct quotations from 1 Peter. It is true that these are not by name nor are they introduced by the formula *εἶδοτες ὅτι* which Polycarp frequently employs in quoting from St Paul, to whom he does refer by name, probably because St Paul had founded the Philippian Church and had himself written a letter to them. But in quoting from the O.T., the Gospels and Acts Polycarp's quotations are anonymous, therefore there is no necessity to assume, as Harnack does, that Polycarp did not know the Epistle as the work of St Peter.

(h) *Clement of Rome* (c. 95 A.D.) has several words and phrases from 1 Peter, e.g. "the precious blood" of Christ, "his marvellous light," Christ's humility (illustrated by Isaiah liii. and Ps. xxii.) our example (*ὑπογραμμός*), a word which is peculiar to St Peter in the N.T. Besides this Clement has two quotations with the same variation from the LXX. as 1 Peter, viz. "Love covers a multitude of sins" and "God (*θεός* not *Κύριος* as the LXX.) resisteth the proud." This however also occurs in the same form in St James and in Ignatius, *Eph.* v.

(i) In 2 Pet. iii. 1 the writer says "this is the *second* Epistle which I am writing to you beloved." This book, even if it is not authentic, is admitted to be extremely early, and if we could be certain that the words refer to our 1 Peter it would shew that it was already known as the work of the Apostle. But if 2 Peter is not genuine it might of course be referring to some previous epistle by the same writer which is now lost.

#### 4. THE PLACE OF WRITING.

In v. 13 St Peter sends the following salutations to his distant readers in Asia Minor *Ἀσπάζεταιται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλωνίᾳ συνεκλεκτῇ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου*. In the notes on that verse reasons are given for adopting the view that *ἡ συνεκλεκτή* refers to a church

and not to an individual. But in either case the words ἐν Βαβυλῶνι must almost certainly refer to the place from which St Peter was writing.

Three possible interpretations have been suggested.

A. *Babylon on the Euphrates.*

In favour of this it may be urged:

(1) That in a letter literal language rather than metaphorical is what would naturally be expected at any rate in the more prosaic details of the address from which and to which the letter is sent. (2) That Babylon was one of the most important centres of the Jewish dispersion. (3) That St Peter was especially appointed to work among "those of the circumcision" and therefore would be very likely to visit such an important Jewish centre as Babylon was.

In answer to these arguments it may be urged:

(1) That the words *συνεκλεκτῇ* and *υἱός* in the immediate context are both to some extent metaphorical and would therefore suggest a metaphorical meaning for Babylon to St Peter's readers. Also the opening salutation *ἰ. ἰ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς* is almost certainly metaphorical and does not refer to the Jewish dispersion. Moreover the letter was not sent "through the post" so that there was no necessity for a "post-mark" or address to explain the writer's present abode. Silvanus would give them all necessary information. (2) That, whereas it is true that there had been a very large Jewish colony down to the reign of the Emperor Caius, we learn from Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. α) that about the year 40 A.D. great disasters fell upon the Babylonian Jews. Many of them were massacred, while others fled to Seleucia and thence to Ctesiphon. It is therefore very doubtful whether any considerable Jewish colony existed in Babylon at the time when I Peter was written. (3) That there is no evidence or tradition to connect either St Peter or St Mark with Babylon or the far East, nor is there any evidence for the existence of a Christian Church in Babylon.

B. *Babylon in Egypt.*

The only arguments for this view are:

(1) That it affords a literal interpretation of the name.

(2) That there was a large Jewish colony in Egypt.

(3) That tradition does connect St Mark, the companion of St Peter, with Egypt.

But against this view it may be urged :

(1) That in the first century Babylon in Egypt seems to have been only a fortress and military station and therefore a most unlikely place for the work of St Peter and his companions.

(2) That no tradition connects St Peter's name with Egypt.

### C. Rome.

This seems to have been the generally accepted view until the Reformation, when opposition to Papal claims caused some Protestant writers to set aside as far as possible all connexion between St Peter and Rome. But there is early, wide-spread and unanimous tradition that St Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome, and fairly ample evidence for his previous work in Rome. His companion St Mark was certainly in Rome towards the end of St Paul's imprisonment, and was again invited to come to Rome shortly before St Paul's death. Tradition also describes him as having been St Peter's interpreter in Rome and as writing his record of St Peter's Preaching primarily for the Romans.

Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 15) in the passage referred to above (p. xxviii) mentions the tradition that 1 Peter was composed in Rome and that Rome is intended by the metaphorical name Babylon—and it is not improbable that he found this tradition in the writings either of Papias or of Clement of Alexandria to whom he had just referred. In the fragment of Papias on St Mark's Gospel (*Eus. H. E.* iii. 39) Papias refers back to some previous statement of his own about St Mark's connexion with St Peter, and Eusebius tells us that Papias made use of 1 Peter. There is no passage in the extant writings of Clement of Alexandria which explains Babylon as meaning Rome in 1 Peter, but he does describe the Second Epistle of St John as being addressed "ad quamdam Babyloniam Electam nomine, significat autem electionem Ecclesiae Sanctae." The Rev. J. Chapman, O.S.B. (*Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1904), suggests that 2 John was addressed to the Church in Rome. The words of Clement do not however state that he regarded 2 John as addressed to the Church in Rome and therefore do not prove that he interpreted Babylon in 1 Peter to mean

Rome. They certainly shew that he treated the name Babylon as metaphorical, but if he regarded 2 John as addressed to some Asiatic Church he may have regarded any church in the heathen surroundings of some great city or of the Roman Empire as being "in Babylon."

In Jewish apocalyptic literature Babylon seems certainly to mean Rome—*e.g.* the Sibylline Oracles v. 158, the Apocalypse of Baruch xi. 1. The dates of these are however somewhat uncertain and may refer to a period after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, which would give additional force to the name Babylon as applied to Rome. In the Apocalypse of St John however there is no clear reference to the Fall of Jerusalem, but Rome is described as Babylon because she is "the harlot" as contrasted with the Church the Bride of Christ; the centre and ruler of the nations; the source of iniquity and impurity; a great trading centre; enervated by luxury; the arch-persecutor of the saints, with whose blood she is drunken. This last feature would hardly be true of Rome before the Neronian persecution, but it is only one of many reasons for comparing Rome with Babylon. We have no right to assume therefore that the name of Babylon was first used for Rome in the Apocalypse of St John. The language of Old Testament prophecy about the relations of the successive World-powers to the Kingdom of Messiah may well have prompted a comparison between Rome and Babylon even before the outbreak of organized persecution. It is therefore by no means incredible that St Peter might describe Rome as Babylon, despite his other language about the Emperor and Magistrates, as early as the reign of Nero and possibly before the great persecution of 64 A.D.

The arguments in favour of Rome may be summarized as follows:

(1) The widespread tradition that St Peter did work in Rome. (2) The presence of St Mark, who is connected with Rome in St Paul's Epistles, and with St Peter in Rome in early tradition. (3) The objections to interpreting the name Babylon literally, either of Babylon on the Euphrates or of Babylon in Egypt, force us to adopt some metaphorical meaning for the name. (4) Such metaphorical use is suggested: (*a*) by the immediate context *συνεκλεκτή*, (*b*) by the general tenour of the



Epistle in which the titles and experiences of Israel are applied to the Christian Church. (5) If the name is metaphorical it would naturally be understood to mean Rome, and its appropriateness would be easily recognizable to St Peter's readers even before the Apocalypse of St John. (6) No other interpretation except Rome seems to have been known to early writers. (7) The general tone of the Epistle, especially in regard to persecution, duty towards the state, and the universality of St Peter's teaching would suggest that he was writing from Rome.

#### 5. THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

Evidence for the date of the Epistle may be deduced from the following considerations.

##### A. *The apparent traces which it shews of other N.T. books.*

(1) The Epistle of St James (see p. liii ff.). The most probable date of St James' death is 62 A.D. but his Epistle may have been written earlier.

(2) The Epistle to the Romans (see p. lx ff.), which was probably written in the spring of 58 A.D. (though some would date it 56 or 57 A.D.).

(3) The Epistle to the Ephesians (see p. lxiv ff.), which was probably written towards the close of St Paul's imprisonment in Rome ?61 or 62 A.D.

(4) The Epistle to the Hebrews, which Westcott dates 64—67 A.D., but the coincidences with Hebrews are too uncertain to form a serious argument.

It is not necessary to assume that these Epistles were already familiar to St Peter's readers, but only that St Peter himself knew them. He had been closely connected with James, the Lord's brother, in Jerusalem, and if he wrote from Rome would certainly have access to Romans, and a copy of Ephesians which was written from Rome would probably be preserved there. Moreover St Mark, who was St Peter's companion at the time of writing, was certainly with St Paul when he wrote to the Colossians (Col. iv. 10) and was probably therefore present when Ephesians was written, as Colossians and Ephesians were both despatched by the same messenger Tychicus, and Ephesians is

almost certainly referred to in Col. iv. 16 as the letter which the Colossians are to exchange with the Church in Laodicea. Possibly, as Dr Chase suggests (*Hastings' D. of B.* iii. 778), St Paul may have himself been still in Rome when St Peter reached the city.

If then a knowledge of the Epistle to the Ephesians is implied in 1 Peter the date cannot be earlier than 61 or 62 but need not necessarily be much later.

B. *The Spread of Christianity which it implies in so many of the provinces of Asia Minor.*

Ramsay (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 285) says "they that make St Peter write to the congregations of Pontus during Nero's reign remove the story of early Christianity from the sphere of history into that of the marvellous and supernatural."

"If Christianity," he says, "was extending along the main line of intercourse across the Empire between 50 and 60, it is inconceivable that, before A.D. 64, (1) it had spread away from that line across the country into the northern provinces; (2) so much organization and intercommunication had grown up as is implied in 1 Peter."

In answer to this sweeping criticism it may be urged:

(a) That the story of the spread of Christianity recorded in Acts or implied in St Paul's Epistles is confessedly incomplete and is practically limited to St Paul's own work or influence, and parts of this even are only incidentally alluded to, e.g. the evangelization of the province of Asia (Acts xix. 10) and the spread of Christianity in Rome before St Paul's visit.

(b) That we have not the slightest warrant for supposing that during all this time other Apostles or Missionaries were doing nothing to fulfil their Master's commission "to go into all the world."

(c) That the spread of Christianity in the provinces of Asia and Galatia is described in Acts and St Paul's Epistles. Therefore only Pontus, Bithynia and Cappadocia remain to be accounted for.

(d) That Ramsay himself (p. 10) says that one great line by which the trade of Central Asia was carried to Rome was by

the road from the Cilician gates through Tyana and Caesarea of Cappadocia to Amisos, the great harbour of the Black Sea in Pontus. Therefore this would be a natural line for the spread of the Gospel.

(e) That Jews from Pontus and Cappadocia were present on the day of Pentecost, and presumably therefore visited Jerusalem on other later occasions. Therefore some of them or other traders may have helped to introduce Christianity in those districts.

(f) That St Paul himself on his second journey contemplated a missionary journey in Bithynia (Acts xvi. 7), evidently regarding it as a suitable sphere for work. It is not, therefore, incredible that Silas, who was his companion on that journey, may have afterwards carried out the plan which was then abandoned.

The description of Silas in 1 Pet. v. 12 as *ἑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ* would naturally suggest that he had already worked among the readers of the Epistle.

(g) That Aquila, who was certainly an ardent missionary in Ephesus and Rome and was evidently widely known in "all the Churches of the Gentiles" (see Rom. xvi. 4), was himself a Jew of Pontus and may not improbably have visited his native country during his sojourn in Asia.

(h) That the Epistle does not necessarily imply that all the districts named were fully Christianized or that all the Churches in them were as yet organized. Possibly some of them had not yet regular presbyters.

Therefore, while we may admit that a late date would leave more time for the spread of Christianity over so wide an area of which we are told so little in the N.T., there appears to be nothing either "marvellous" or "supernatural" involved in the supposition that the Epistle was written in the reign of Nero.

C. *The relation of the State towards Christianity implied in the Epistle, and the language used about the Emperor and Magistrates.*

In order to form a fair estimate of this question it is necessary to compare the notices of persecution contained in 1 Peter with the evidence afforded (a) by other Books of the N.T., (b) by other accounts of the imperial policy towards Christianity.

*Notices of persecution and suffering for the sake of Christ in the New Testament.*

In the Acts of the Apostles persecution against Christians is almost entirely instigated by the Jews.

The Sanhedrin arrested, imprisoned and flogged the Apostles, and put St Stephen to death. Saul was allowed to make a house to house visitation and had a mandate from the High Priest to extend his work of persecution as far as Damascus, apparently unchecked by the Roman Procurator.

Agrippa I executed James the Son of Zebedee and imprisoned St Peter.

Henceforward the hatred of the Jews was mainly directed against St Paul. His death was plotted at Damascus (Acts ix. 23, 24; 2 Cor. xi. 32) and at his first visit to Jerusalem (Acts ix. 29). On his first journey he was expelled from Antioch in Pisidia and Iconium (Acts xiii. 50, xiv. 5) and almost stoned to death by the mob at Lystra (Acts xiv. 19). On his second journey he was flogged and imprisoned by the magistrates at Philippi (xvi.) on the charge of "teaching customs not lawful for Romans to observe." At Thessalonica the politarchs merely bound over Jason and his friends to keep the peace, although a political charge had been brought (xvii. 7—9). At Corinth, when a purely religious charge was brought, Gallio, the proconsul, dismissed the case as being no offence against Roman Law (xviii. 12—16). On his third journey St Paul and the Christians were attacked because they interfered with the trade of the silversmiths at Ephesus, but the town clerk repressed any attempt at mob-violence (xix. 23—41). From Corinth St Paul was obliged to return by land to escape a plot of the Jews (xx. 3). At his last visit to Jerusalem he was seized on the charge of having taken Greeks into the Temple, but Lysias the chief captain rescued him from the mob and, discovering that he was a Roman citizen, protected him against the plots of the Jews to kill him, by sending him to be tried before Felix. There the charges were sedition, heresy and sacrilege, to the first and third of which St Paul successfully pleaded "not guilty," and, although he owned himself to be "a Nazarene," *i.e.* a Christian, Felix, Festus and Agrippa all admitted that he had "done nothing worthy of bonds or of death." Having exercised his privilege as a Roman citizen St Paul was sent to Rome for trial but was

leniently treated by the officials and remained in custodia militaris for two years. But he confidently expected release as soon as his case was heard and only mentions martyrdom as an unlikely contingency (Philippians ii. 17). Not until his second imprisonment, probably in the reign of Nero, does St Paul describe himself as being "in bonds as a malefactor" (2 Tim. ii. 9) and "ready to be offered" (iv. 6).

Besides these recorded instances St Paul describes himself (2 Cor. vi. 5) as having suffered blows and imprisonments and (2 Cor. xi. 23, 24) as having been five times scourged by the Jews and thrice beaten with rods, probably by provincial magistrates. Thus on several occasions not only Jews but the heathen mob took part in the attack. The intervention of the magistrates was also involved.

Other Christians besides St Paul were evidently exposed to persecution. Thus (Acts xiv. 22) Paul and Barnabas warned their converts in Asia Minor that "we must pass through many afflictions to enter the Kingdom of God." In 1 Thess. i. 6, iii. 3, 2 Thess. i. 4—6 St Paul refers to the afflictions which they have suffered at the hands of their fellow-countrymen and urges them not to be shaken by them. He asks the Galatians (iii. 4) "Have ye suffered so many things in vain?" (evidently from Jewish opponents).

The Philippians are urged not to be "terrified by their adversaries." It is a sign of God's favour to be allowed to suffer in Christ's behalf. They are taking part in the same contest of suffering which they formerly saw and now hear of St Paul himself being engaged in (Phil. i. 28—30). Aquila and Priscilla must on some occasion have incurred danger of death to save St Paul as they are described as having "risked their own necks for his life" (Rom. xvi. 4). Andronicus and Junias (Rom. xvi. 7), Aristarchus (Col. iv. 10) and Epaphras (Philemon 23) are described as St Paul's "fellow-prisoners." In 2 Cor. xi. 23 St Paul, in claiming that his share of persecution, blows and imprisonments has been "more abundant" than that of others, does imply that other Christians had also suffered, though to a less degree than himself.

St James, writing probably not later than 62 A.D. to "the twelve tribes of the dispersion" (which may mean the whole

Christian Church and not merely Jewish Christians in the neighbourhood of Palestine), reminds them that the rich blaspheme the good name which Christians bear and drag them before courts of law, but he encourages his readers to endure manifold trials as a testing of their faith (Jas i. 2, 3), using the selfsame phrases which St Peter employs.

The writer to the Hebrews (x. 32) reminds them how in the early days of their Christianity they had been made a spectacle by sufferings, reproaches and afflictions; how they had sympathized with those in bonds and submitted patiently to the plundering of their goods. He urges them to imitate Christ in facing the dangers which are now in store for them. They must accept suffering as a loving chastisement from God, emulating the heroes of faith in the O.T. They have not yet resisted unto blood (xii. 4), but they are bidden to remember those who are in bonds and those who are suffering hardship because they themselves are "in the body" and may therefore ere long share the same fate. This may possibly refer to the Neronian persecution, and in that case is an indication of the way in which it spread into the provinces. In the Apocalypse, whether it refers to the period just after Nero's reign or to the reign of Domitian, we have evidence for a more organized persecution. Many have been slain for the word of God vi. 9, including Antipas at Pergamos ii. 13. Rome is drunken with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus xvii. 6, xviii. 24.

#### *The Attitude of the State towards Christianity.*

The policy of Rome towards the subject-nations of the Empire was to allow each of them to retain their own religion on the following conditions: (1) that it was a national religion and was content to take its place side by side with other national religions, without claiming to be absolute, (2) that it did not cause political or other disturbance, (3) that it managed its own religious disputes. Now Judaism did of course claim to be absolute, and repudiated all other Gods than Jehovah as dumb idols, but at the same time it was so intensely national that the Romans not only allowed it toleration but even granted special privileges and exemptions to the Jews.

At first therefore, when Christianity was regarded by Roman

officials, like Gallio, as "a question of words and names and Jewish Law," it shared the same protection as Judaism. On several occasions, as we have seen, the magistrates restrained the attacks made upon St Paul.

In 2 Thessalonians ii. 6, 7 St Paul regards the policy of the reigning Emperor apparently as a restraining influence which makes for toleration.

In Romans xiii. 1—4 he describes civil magistrates as God's delegates for avenging wrongdoing, whose praise may be obtained by doing what is good. Nevertheless there was from the very first an inevitable antagonism between the Empire and the Church. The bigotry of the Jews and their open hostility towards Christians would soon make it obvious that Christianity was no mere sect of Judaism. As an absolute religion which could admit of no compromise with idolatry, no worship of the Emperor side by side with that of Jehovah, it could not fit into the Roman system any more than Judaism. Besides this it was not even a national or hereditary religion but a new "superstition," which soon came to be regarded as a "pestilent superstition" for various reasons. It claimed to provide a universal bond of brotherhood, higher and more paramount than that of the Empire, whereas under Nero Emperor-worship was steadily growing stronger as the necessary link to unite the many nationalities and many gods of the subject-nations. It also caused divisions in families and interfered with the religious rites which formed so large a part of social and municipal life. In many cases, as at Philippi and Ephesus and afterwards (as Pliny shews) in Bithynia, trades which were connected with idolatry were considerably affected by the spread of Christianity. Again no conscientious Christian could take part in the public games and religious festivals or acquiesce in the criminal profligacy of their neighbours. Consequently Christians came to be regarded as gloomy and morose, "enemies of the human race," or else as officious "busybodies." Having thus incurred popular odium the Christians would often be compelled to hold their meetings in secret, and the foul imagination of malicious enemies ere long interpreted the Eucharist and Agape or Love Feast as involving cannibalism and incestuous lust. Even as early as St Paul's arrival in Rome the Jews there told him that their only

knowledge of Christianity was that it was everywhere spoken against (Acts xxviii. 22), and according to Tacitus it was because the Christians were already hated by the mob for their supposed crimes, and were regarded as guilty wretches deserving the extremest form of punishment, that Nero a few years later selected them as scapegoats on whom to vent the popular fury and divert suspicion from himself in connexion with the great conflagration in Rome.

From the first therefore Christianity had been an unlawful religion and one which was inevitably in conflict with the state. No official edict was really necessary to legalize the punishment of Christians, and it is quite possible that persecution may have been countenanced in the provinces by some magistrates before the outbreak of the Neronian persecution. Naturally however the policy of Nero in treating Christians as outlaws would be regarded as giving imperial sanction to persecution, and the Emperor's example would soon be widely followed in the provinces. In the Neronian persecution it is disputed whether Christians suffered merely for their religion "as Christians" or only for other crimes which were attributed to them. Some forty years later in the reign of Trajan Pliny, the governor of Bithynia, in his letter to the Emperor shews that he had himself put Christians to death for the name only, if they obstinately refused to recant, and the rescript of Trajan in reply gives imperial sanction to this procedure, implying that it was not necessary to prove any further crime beyond the fact of being a Christian. But Christians, he says, are not to be sought out, and anonymous accusations are not to be accepted. Ramsay however (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 256) argues that punishment for the name of Christian alone was not in vogue until about the time of Vespasian (70—79 A.D.), whereas previously some further crime was always alleged. But there is no sufficient evidence of any such change of policy, and the account of the Neronian persecution given by Tacitus seems most naturally to imply that as early as 64 A.D. Christians in Rome suffered for the name only. The object of Nero, he says, was to divert suspicion from himself of having caused the great fire in Rome. This he could most easily do by shifting the odium on to the Christians who were already generally hated and credited with all kinds of crimes, and as votaries of



an unlawful religion they could be tortured or executed to satisfy the popular thirst for vengeance. Several of those who were first arrested, says Tacitus, "confessed." What was the nature of this confession? Surely not that they were guilty of arson but that they were Christians. The number of victims was extremely large (*ingens multitudo*), including, according to Clement of Rome, matrons, girls and slaves. Now it is obviously impossible that all of these could have been legally proved guilty of arson, and Tacitus says that they were charged not so much with arson as with "hatred to the human race." This probably refers to their religious views, which made Christians run counter to all the religious ideas, the social festivities, and the moral standard of the times. So also Suetonius in his account of the Neronian persecution says that Christians were punished as votaries of a new and pestilent superstition.

In the light of this evidence for the persecution of Christians both before and during the reign of Nero, we must now consider whether the allusions to persecution in 1 Peter necessarily imply that the Neronian persecution was in progress or even demand a later date.

In i. 6, 7 St. Peter describes his readers as having been put to grief for the time being, if so it must needs be, by manifold trials which are a testing of their faith. The keywords of this passage however *ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς* and *δοκίμων τῆς πίστεως* are apparently borrowed from St James, who probably died in 62 A.D. and therefore wrote before the outbreak of the Neronian persecution. Therefore as borrowed by St Peter the words need not imply any persecution organized by the state.

Similarly in iv. 12 the phrase "fiery trial" (*πύρωσις*) is a metaphor from the refining of gold, like *δοκίμων* in i. 7, and does not necessarily refer to death by burning such as was inflicted by Nero.

In ii. 19 Christian slaves are described as suffering unjustly at the hands of capricious masters, but here "suffering" is defined as being "buffeted."

In iii. 14 the possible contingency (*εἰ καὶ πάσχωτε*) of suffering for righteousness' sake is regarded as a blessed thing—with an evident allusion to our Lord's words Mt. v. 10. But such suffering is regarded as by no means inevitable. It may be

averted by a zealous devotion to what is good (iii. 13). If Christians only maintain a good conscience by persistent good conduct those who revile them will be shamed into silence (iii. 16). Suffering for righteousness' sake therefore is only an uncertain contingency, expressed by the optative which is very rare in the N.T., *εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε*, "supposing that you should be called upon to suffer," "if God's will should require that of you" (*εἰ θέλοι* iii. 17).

In ii. 12 Christians are described as being spoken against as evil-doers or malefactors (*κακοποιοί*), but the spectacle of their good deeds will cause their heathen neighbours to glorify God in "the day of visitation" (see note on ii. 12).

In iii. 9 They are not to requite evil for evil or reviling for reviling.

In iv. 4 Men revile Christians and regard them as fanatics for refusing to join in the profligate excesses of the day.

In iv. 14 It is a blessed thing to suffer reproach in the name of Christ.

In iv. 19 Any who suffer according to the will of God are bidden to commit their lives by doing good to the safe keeping of God as a faithful Creator who may be trusted to guard His own handiwork.

None of the above passages necessarily imply any organized persecution conducted by the state. They might be used of the insults, abuse, social boycotting, unjust accusations, and rough usage such as Christian converts in a heathen country have constantly had to endure. There are however other passages to which Ramsay (*Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 280—281, 290—295) appeals as clearly pointing to organized official persecution.

(a) In iii. 15, in a passage dealing with suffering for righteousness' sake, Christians are bidden to be "always ready to give an answer (*ἀπολογία*) to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you." This, says Ramsay, implies persecution after trial and question. Now it is quite true that *ἀπολογία* is used of a legal defence in Acts xxv. 16 and 2 Tim. iv. 16, and such legal defence might be included in St Peter's use of the word. But the words *ἀεί* "at any time" and *παντί* "to any person" imply that the reference is more general, and *ἀπολογία* is used in a non-legal sense in Acts xxii. 1 and 1 Cor. ix. 3 and

most probably in Phil. i. 7, 16, though the last passage might possibly refer to St Paul's first trial. It can hardly therefore be assumed that St Peter is necessarily referring to legal trials. His language may well mean that Christians are always to be ready to shew their colours and give a reason for their hope when any opponent challenges them, cf. Col. iv. 6 "that ye may know how to answer each one."

(b) Again in iv. 14—16 Ramsay (p. 292) argues that "the words 'Let none of you suffer as a murderer or as a thief (*sic*)... but if (a man suffer) as a Christian let him glorify God in this name' have no satisfactory meaning, unless those to whom they are addressed are liable to execution: the verb in the second clause is understood from the preceding clause and must have the same sense"; and (p. 281) he argues from this same passage that Christians suffer for the Name pure and simple, which, according to his theory, was not the case in the reign of Nero. He would therefore date the Epistle about 75—80 A.D. (cf. p. xlvi). In this case the Petrine authorship can only be maintained by supposing that St Peter's life was prolonged beyond the reign of Nero. Again (p. 293) Ramsay argues that "in the Roman Empire the right of capital punishment belonged only to a small number of high officials. No Asian Christian was liable to suffer death except through the action of the governor of his province. If therefore the Christians are liable to suffer unto death, persecution by the state must be in process."

In answer to these arguments it may be urged:

(1) That, even if the passage indisputably proved that the penalty of death was inflicted for the Name of Christian pure and simple, it may refer to the Neronian persecution or possibly even to earlier persecution in which provincial magistrates themselves anticipated the policy of Nero towards Christians—or connived at lynch law on the part of the mob.

(2) That, even if "the Name of Christian pure and simple" is implied as a legal charge in this passage, it cannot be proved that the penalty of death was necessarily inflicted.

Of the earlier charges specified "murder" would no doubt be punished with death—but "theft" would surely not incur that penalty ordinarily, while *κακοποιός* is too general a term to be

limited to abominable offences or criminal acts necessarily punishable with death—and ἀλλοτριεπισκοπος (which probably refers to tampering with other peoples' concerns—interfering with their families or their trade) can hardly have constituted a capital offence under Roman Law in ordinary cases. It seems therefore by no means a conclusive argument that the word "suffer," as supplied in the second clause, must imply death because it would bear that sense in *one* of the preceding cases. The balance of probability, so far as this particular passage is concerned, seems to be rather on the other side. Moreover verse 14 speaks of "being reproached in the name of Christ," and this also suggests that the suffering intended does not refer exclusively or even primarily to death. Again, whereas the first three words are coupled together with ἡ, implying that they are all legal charges, ἀλλοτριεπισκοπος is separated from them by the repetition of ὧς, so that it may be intended as a ground of complaint or dislike rather than as a definite legal charge, and in that case it is hardly safe to assume that "the Name of Christian pure and simple" was a definite legal charge.

(c) In v. 8 Christians are bidden to "be sober, be vigilant, because their adversary the devil goeth about seeking to devour." This passage does probably refer chiefly to the temptation to deny their Faith in the hour of danger and persecution, because the next verse speaks of the same experiences of *suffering* as being accomplished in the Christian brotherhood in the world. This certainly shews that the sufferings of the Asian Christians were not unique but were shared by other Christians elsewhere, but it is hardly sufficient to prove that an organized persecution was in progress affecting the whole Church simultaneously. The word ἀντίδικος might be used of Satan as "the accuser of the brethren" before God (Rev. xii. 10) without necessarily implying that Satan is represented by some human prosecutor in an actual legal trial on earth, and the words περιπατεῖ ζητῶν are part of the simile of the prowling lion in search of prey and need not necessarily imply that Christians are being "sought out for trial by Roman officials," as Ramsay suggests (p. 281). If however the words are thus literally interpreted they would merely point to a date before the rescript of Trajan which forbade such search for Christians.

The following conclusions may therefore be suggested :

(1) that the Epistle does not *necessarily* imply that an official persecution organized by the state was in progress, although some passages would certainly admit of that interpretation ;

(2) that if such organized persecution is implied the evidence is not inconsistent with what is known of the Neronian persecution.

Dr Hort (1 *Pet.* Int. pp. 1 and 3) says that the Epistle "was written during a time of rising persecution to men suffering under it" and he suggests that this was either

(1) the persecution begun by Nero, or (2) a persecution arising out of it, or (3) a persecution in Asia Minor, independent of any known persecution bearing an Emperor's name and perhaps even a little earlier than Nero's persecution, as may be suggested by the language used in the Epistle about the Emperor and his officers.

The Emperor and magistrates are described in language, evidently borrowed from Romans xiii. 1 ff., as God's agents to exact vengeance on evil-doers but for the praise of them that do well. With regard to this point Dr Chase (*Hastings' D. of B.*, vol. iii., p. 785) argues "that a Christian teacher writing from Rome *after* Nero's attack on the Church to fellow-Christians in the provinces should adopt St Paul's language" [which was written when he still regarded the Roman State as the "restraining power" and still looked to the Emperor as the protector of the Church] "only making it more explicit and emphasizing its hopefulness seems inconceivable."

In answer to this argument it might be urged :

(a) That St Peter expressly points his readers to Christ as the example of patience under injustice, and Our Lord recognized the authority of Pilate as being "given him from above," despite the judicial crime in which he was taking part. He also told His followers that they would be brought before rulers and kings for His name's sake, and yet bade them bless and pray for their persecutors.

(b) That later Fathers, who certainly wrote during or after periods of violent persecution, in which the state had shewn the

greatest cruelty and injustice towards Christians, nevertheless use equally strong language about civil rulers.

*E.g.* Clement of Rome, c. 96 A.D., says (cc. lx. lxi.) "Give concord and peace to us and to all that dwell on the earth—while we render obedience to Thine Almighty and most excellent Name and to our rulers and governors upon the earth. Thou, O Lord and Master, hast given them the power of sovereignty through Thine excellent and unspeakable might, that we, knowing the glory and honour which Thou hast given them, may submit ourselves unto them, in nothing resisting Thy will."

Still it must be admitted that it would have been easier for St Peter to speak so hopefully about civil rulers before the outbreak of the Neronian persecution rather than during or after it, and this would add some slight support to other considerations which also point to an early date for the Epistle.

D. *The probable date (a) of St Peter's death, (b) of an occasion when St Peter, St Mark and Silvanus were present together in Rome, as is implied in v. 12, 13.*

(a) Ramsay, who dates this Epistle 75—80 A.D., suggests that St Peter's life may have been prolonged to that date on the following grounds: (1) that the evidence for St Peter's martyrdom in the reign of Nero is not very early; (2) that there must be some foundation in fact for the strong tradition that St Peter worked *for a long time* in Rome, whereas if he died in the reign of Nero it is hardly possible that he can have resided long in Rome.

The evidence for St Peter's death in the reign of Nero is as follows:

(1) Clement of Rome (c. 96 A.D.) (cc. v., vi.) couples the martyrdoms of St Peter and St Paul closely together, placing that of St Peter first, and says that "to them was gathered a great company of the elect, who, being the victims of jealousy, by reason of many outrages and tortures became a noble example among us."

It is argued (Dr Chase, Hastings' *D. of B.*, iii. 769) that "the great company" must refer to the Neronian victims, and as they are described as being "gathered to" (*συνθροίσθη*) Peter and Paul it is suggested that those two Apostles were among the

earliest victims and must consequently have been put to death in A.D. 64 or 65, as the great fire which served as the pretext for Nero's persecution happened in July 64 A.D.

In answer to this it may be urged :

(a) That when once Nero had set the example of persecuting the Christians such persecution was more or less chronic, and therefore later victims than those of Nero's reign may be included in "the great company."

(b) That Peter and Paul are named first, not necessarily because they were the earliest victims, but because they alone were Apostles and therefore the ringleaders to whom both earlier and later victims might be described as being "gathered."

(c) That the traditional date for St Paul's death is 67 or 68 A.D., i.e. three or four years after the fire when the first violence of the Neronian persecution had spent itself. If persecution was more or less chronic from 64 A.D. onwards such later date for St Paul's martyrdom is by no means impossible and is more consistent with the evidence of the Pastoral Epistles. The extended missionary work implied in them can with difficulty be accounted for if the period between his release from his first imprisonment and his death was only two or three years. Again in 2 Tim. St Paul speaks of his "first defence" and yet contemplates surviving till the winter and invites Timothy and Mark to join him in Rome. This evidence implies a lengthy remand and comparative safety for other well known Christians to visit Rome and is hardly consistent with the theory that St Paul suffered in the first outbreak of the Neronian persecution.

It is therefore possible, or even probable, that neither St Peter nor St Paul were present in Rome in 64 A.D. and that consequently they escaped martyrdom until a later date.

Still Clement does couple the martyrdoms of St Peter and St Paul together and that of St Paul was almost certainly in Nero's reign.

(2) Dionysius of Corinth (c. 170) (as quoted by Eus. *H. E.* ii. 25. 8) after speaking of the joint work of Peter and Paul in Corinth, says that, "having gone together (or 'to the same place') to Italy and taught, they suffered martyrdom *at the same time.*"

(3) Tertullian (c. 200) (*Scorp.* 15) says "Nero was the first to stain the rising faith with blood at Rome." "Then Peter is 'girded by another' when he is bound to the cross." Then Paul etc.

(4) Origen (c. 250) (*ap. Eus.* iii. 1) mentions St Peter's death by crucifixion in Rome before St Paul's martyrdom, and dates the latter in the reign of Nero.

(5) Commodian (c. 250) (*Carmen Apologeticum* 820 f.) speaks of Peter and Paul as suffering in Rome under Nero.

(6) The Chronicon of Eusebius. The Armenian version puts the Neronian persecution, when the Apostles Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom in Rome, in the thirteenth year of Nero, i.e. 67—68 A.D., while Jerome's version gives the fourteenth year of Nero, i.e. 68 A.D., as the date.

(7) The Catholic Acts of Peter (ed. Lipsius, p. 172 f.) (probably fifth century but based upon a second century document) connect with St Peter's death a prophecy that "Nero should be destroyed not many days hence."

(8) The lists of Roman Bishops give Linus as the first Bishop after the Apostles with 12 years' episcopate, then Anacletus as second Bishop with 12 years' episcopate, followed by Clement as third Bishop. Eusebius dates the accession of Clement in 92 A.D. which would place the appointment of Linus in 68 A.D., but Lightfoot would date Clement's accession 86—88 A.D. which would place Linus 62—64 A.D.

If Linus is regarded as succeeding to the Bishopric on St Peter's death this would corroborate the Neronian date for the martyrdom.

Irenaeus however describes Linus as being appointed Bishop by St Peter and St Paul, the founders of the Church in Rome, and no writers of the first two centuries or more describe St Peter himself as Bishop of Rome. Therefore Linus may have been Bishop in St Peter's lifetime, and in that case his accession affords no clue for the date of St Peter's martyrdom.

(9) It seems probable that St Mark's written record of St Peter's preaching (which was either our second Gospel or at least the basis of it) was written before the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and Irenaeus states that Mark wrote it after the  $\xi\xi\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma$



of Peter and Paul, which probably means after their death. Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Jerome on the other hand represent St Mark as writing during St Peter's lifetime. But Irenaeus is more likely to represent the tradition current in Rome, and St Peter's death would make the need of a written record much stronger. Moreover "the presbyter" quoted by Papias (Eus. iii. 39) describes St Mark as having to rely upon his memory of what St Peter preached, and this suggests that St Peter was dead.

The general consensus of tradition therefore seems to place St Peter's martyrdom in the reign of Nero, and this would make 68 the latest possible date for the Epistle.

(b) We have next to consider the most probable date at which St Peter, St Mark and Silvanus were in Rome together.

The apparent traces of the Epistle to the Ephesians contained in 1 Peter make it unnecessary to consider any earlier date than 61 A.D., and reasons have been given above (see p. xviii f.) for the view that St Peter had not worked in Rome before that date. On the other hand there is a strong tradition that St Peter worked *for a considerable time* in Rome, and there is some evidence that St Peter and St Paul *worked together* in Rome. There is therefore reasonable ground for presuming that St Peter arrived in Rome very soon after Colossians and Ephesians were written and before St Paul left the city. We know from Col. iv. 10 that St Mark was already in Rome, "touching whom," St Paul says, "ye received commandments, if he come unto you receive him."

This suggests three questions:

(a) What were these "commandments"? (b) Why had it been necessary to send them? (c) Why does St Paul go out of his way to refer to them?

A plausible answer is (a) that the commands were the words which follow, namely instructions which had been sent to the Colossians (probably by St Paul himself) to receive St Mark if he passed that way on his journey to Rome; (b) that such instructions were necessary because St Mark, as a previous deserter, whom St Paul had declined to accept as a fellow-worker (possibly, as Dr Chase suggests, because St Mark was not in full sympathy with his policy towards the Gentiles)

might well have been coldly received unless his journey was known to have St Paul's full concurrence, (c) that St Paul desired to shew the Colossians how fully St Mark's visit to Rome had justified the hopes which he had formed in preparing for it. As one of the leading representatives "of the Circumcision" St Mark had been a great comfort to him at a time when others were preaching Christ out of faction (Phil. i. 17).

If this explanation be accepted there is no ground for believing that St Mark was thinking of leaving Rome in 61 A.D. and contemplating a possible visit to Colossae. He may therefore have remained in Rome and been St Peter's companion there from 61 to 64 A.D. On the other hand it suggests that St Mark's visit to Rome had been carefully arranged for and undertaken with St Paul's concurrence, if not at his request.

Dr Chase (Hastings' *D. of B.*) hazards a further conjecture that St Peter's own visit to Rome was also at St Paul's request. St Paul's ardent desire was to unite Jewish and Gentile Christians in One Body, and if this could be accomplished in a mixed Church like that of Rome, the capital and meeting-place of the Empire, the problem would be largely solved for the rest of Christendom. This had been the great object of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Its fulfilment would be enormously furthered if St Peter the Apostle to "those of the Circumcision" and Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles were seen working together in Rome. Such an object-lesson of unity would shew how completely "the middle wall of partition" was broken down. In any case, whether it were at St Paul's request or on his own initiative, St Peter would certainly welcome such an opportunity of again "giving the right hand of fellowship" to St Paul's work. He had himself been chosen to "open the door" to Gentile converts. It was he who advocated their exemption from Circumcision and the observance of the Law. If on one occasion at Antioch he withdrew from intercourse with Gentiles it was obviously not from any personal bigotry of his own but merely out of deference to Jewish scruples. There is no evidence that he resented St Paul's outspoken rebuke when once he realized that his conduct involved a breach of principle.

Although his own sphere of work had been specially among those of the Circumcision he must have been genuinely distressed

on finding himself claimed by Judaizers as a supposed opponent of St Paul.

There is therefore no reason to distrust the early tradition that St Peter and St Paul did "work together" and jointly founded the Church in Rome. If this was the case it can only have been just after St Paul's release in 61 A.D., and the whole tenour of St Peter's Epistle is easiest to explain if it was written during or just after such a period of fellowship with St Paul.

With regard to St Peter's other companion Silvanus (or Silas) we are told nothing of his movements after St Paul's Second Missionary journey. Certainly Silvanus cannot have been in Rome before or during St Paul's first imprisonment, otherwise so faithful a fellow-worker would inevitably have been mentioned in his Epistles. It is therefore quite possible that St Peter, St Mark and Silas might have been together in Rome at any time from 62 A.D. (or late in 61 A.D.) till the middle of 64 A.D. It is less easy to find an occasion when they might be there together later in Nero's reign.

If St Peter was in Rome during the first violence of the Neronian persecution he would almost certainly be one of the first victims. It is however possible that he may have returned to Jerusalem to take part in the election of Symeon as Bishop of Jerusalem after the death of James the Lord's brother—which happened most probably in 62 A.D. Eusebius *H. E.* iii. 11 quotes a tradition that the surviving Apostles came together from all parts for the election of Symeon.

It is true that Eusebius places this event after the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but he was apparently misled by a rhetorical exaggeration of Hegesippus (*Eus.* ii. 23) who speaks of Vespasian commencing the siege immediately after the murder of James. But the account given by Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 9. 1), which is also quoted by Eusebius, would place the death of James in 62 A.D., and in this case the election of Symeon was presumably not long deferred. Some time however would necessarily elapse before the news of James' death could reach Rome, and further delay would be necessary to summon a meeting of the scattered Apostles (say) in 63 or early in 64 A.D. If then St Peter did leave Rome before the persecution broke out he may have escaped martyrdom until nearly the end of Nero's reign (or possibly even until a later

date). On the other hand it seems inconceivable that either St Peter or Silvanus were in Rome when 2 Timothy was written shortly before St Paul's martyrdom—and if St Peter had then been recently put to death St Paul would surely have referred to the fact. St Mark was certainly then somewhere in the East as St Paul asks Timothy to bring him with him to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 11). It is certainly difficult to believe that St Paul was writing during the first fury of the Neronian persecution, but if he was writing in the autumn of 64 A.D. and St Mark did come to Rome "before winter" in answer to his request, then he may have remained in Rome after St Paul's death as St Peter's companion, and there would still remain some three years (65—68 A.D.) within the reign of Nero when 1 Peter might have been written. But if, as seems on the whole more probable, St Paul's death is placed as late as 67 A.D. there would be hardly time for St Peter's visit to Rome before Nero's death.

*E. The Silence of the Epistle about St Paul.*

Arguments from silence are always precarious, but it is certainly difficult to believe that St Peter, if he wrote from Rome shortly after St Paul's martyrdom, could have failed to mention it. Unless therefore we adopt Ramsay's view that 1 Peter was written several years after St Paul's death, and we set aside the tradition that St Peter himself was put to death in the reign of Nero, the absence of all mention of St Paul is more easily explained on the assumption that St Paul was still alive. In this case there are two alternatives. (1) That St Paul was still in Rome but that his old colleague Silvanus, the bearer of this Epistle, was charged with all necessary tidings about him. Possibly, as Dr Chase suggests, Silvanus was being sent on a mission to Asia Minor on St Paul's behalf.

(2) That St Paul had already left Rome and had himself gone to Asia. He certainly contemplated such a journey soon after his release, as he asked Philemon to prepare him a lodging at Colossae (Philemon 22). In this case also Silvanus would perhaps be able to give tidings of St Paul to St Peter's other readers.

The various arguments as to the date of 1 Peter may therefore be summed up as follows:

(1) The traces of other Books point to a date not earlier than 61 or 62 but not necessarily much later.

(2) The spread of Christianity in the Northern provinces of Asia Minor is not impossible during the reign of Nero.

(3) The relations between the Church and the State which are implied are not inconsistent with what is known of the Neronian persecution, and would even admit of a date shortly before that persecution broke out.

(4) There is not sufficient evidence to set aside the tradition that St Peter suffered martyrdom in the reign of Nero, so that 68 A.D. is the latest date consistent with the Petrine authorship of the Epistle.

(5) That St Peter, St Mark and Silvanus might have been together in Rome between 61 and 64 or possibly, but less probably, at the end of Nero's reign after St Paul's death.

(6) That the absence of all mention of St Paul is less difficult to explain before St Paul's death than shortly after that event.

Therefore the evidence seems to be slightly in favour of dating the Epistle between 62 and 64 A.D., and such a date would suit one of the apparent objects of the Epistle, namely to promote the union between Jewish and Gentile Christians.

## 6. RELATIONS BETWEEN 1 PETER AND OTHER N.T. BOOKS.

### (a) 1 Peter and James.

1 Pet. i. 1 *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς.*

Jas i. 1 *ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ.*

Three views are possible :

(a) That both Epistles employ the word *διασπορά* in its *literal* sense of the Jewish Dispersion. In this case either writer might have used the phrase independently of the other. To St James writing from Jerusalem Jewish Christians in other lands would naturally be thought of as "in the Dispersion." St Peter writing from the Roman centre of "the Dispersion" might quite naturally use the phrase of another district of the Dispersion. But if one writer did derive the word from the other the borrower was probably St Peter.

(b) It may be *literal* in St James and *metaphorical* in St Peter. In this case the natural inference would be that St Peter, with his mind evidently full of the thought of the Christian Church as the new Israel of God, borrowed St James' greeting to the Dispersion and applied it to his scattered readers as the "new Dispersion."

(c) That both St James and St Peter use the word *metaphorically* of the Christian Church. Certainly that suits the general tenour of St Peter's Epistle, and Parry adduces strong arguments for its use in that sense by St James.

If the report of St James' speech (Acts xv. 14—20) may be accepted as representing his actual arguments, he did speak of God choosing a people (*λαός*) for His Name from among the Gentiles to be included in the restored "tabernacle of David"; and the language of the prophets about the ideal Jerusalem, coupled with our Lord's words about "gathering together His elect," might suggest to one writing from Jerusalem the idea of the Church as forming the Twelve Tribes of the ideal Israel of God at present "scattered abroad." But if so it is a pregnant seed-thought suggesting the totality and the underlying unity of the Church despite present appearances. St James makes no attempt to expand it in the remainder of his Epistle, and, unless it was an idea already familiarized to the readers either by St James himself or other teachers, they would not readily grasp its meaning.

In St Peter on the other hand the idea is elaborated and worked out by other titles—"holy nation," "royal priesthood," etc.

It is however more likely that St Peter should have thus expanded a pregnant thought of St James' than that St James should have chosen one single title out of St Peter's list.

It is almost impossible to date St Peter's Epistle earlier than 61 A.D.; if it was written from Rome, and if St James' martyrdom was in 62 A.D. there would be barely time for St Peter's Epistle to become known to him and still less to his readers. This argument affects also all the other passages under discussion in the two Epistles and suggests that St Peter borrowed from St James rather than vice versa.

1 Pet. i. 6 f. ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κ.τ.λ.

Jas i. 2 f. πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἠγήσασθε ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κ.τ.λ.

In these passages the verbal correspondence is so close and the order of the words in the last clause so unusual that there must be some direct literary connexion between the two writers.

St Peter is referring to outward trials and persecutions, which form one of the main topics of his Epistle. He works out the idea of *δοκίμιον* by a comparison with the refining of gold, with an apparent allusion to Prov. xxvii. 21 *δοκίμιον ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσῶ πύρωσις* (to which he reverts again in iv. 12) *ἀνὴρ δὲ δοκιμάζεται διὰ στόματος ἐγκωμιαζόντων αὐτὸν* and Prov. xvii. 3 *δοκιμάζεται ἐν καμίνῳ ἄργυρος καὶ χρυσός, οὕτως ἐκλεκταὶ καρδίαὶ παρὰ Κυρίου.*

It may therefore be argued that St Peter borrowed a pregnant thought from St James and elaborated it from the Old Testament, at the same time softening down the uncompromising stoicism of St James *πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἠγήσασθε* by adding *ὀλίγον ἄρτι, εἰ δέον, λυπηθέντες*. Such expansion and mitigation of an allusive paradox might be natural on the part of the borrower while the reverse process would be less probable.

On the other hand the ordinary view is that in St James also the words refer to *external trials*, which is not a prominent topic in his Epistle, and that he immediately deserts it to discuss temptations to sin. In this case the words are rather disconnected in St James and it might be argued that he borrowed them from St Peter as a kind of text. Parry however (*St Jas.* p. 32 ff.) argues that St James is throughout referring to *temptations to sin* and begins with the startling paradox "Count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations."

In this case the words are connected with their context in St James, but it might be argued that such psychological analysis as St James bases on them is more subtle and therefore presumably later than the lessons of practical experience which St Peter gives. But, whereas the psychological phase would naturally be later than the practical in the same person, it is hardly a conclusive argument as to the relative dates of writings by two different persons. St Peter might have borrowed a subtle

idea from St James and either understood it or applied it in a more practical sense to outward trials.

1 Pet. i. 23 ff. ἀναγεγεννημένοι...διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος...ἀποθέμενοι οὐκ ἅσαν κακίαν.

Jas i. 18, 21 βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας...διὸ ἀποθέμενοι...περισσεῖαν κακίας...δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον.

Here St James begins by referring to "the manifestation of God's will in *creation* as a strong warrant and incentive for resistance to temptation" (Parry). In St Peter the only allusion to creation is in iv. 19, that God is "a faithful creator" who may be trusted in all trials not to neglect His own handiwork.

St Peter on the other hand is referring to the word of *regeneration* by which man is begotten anew as a new creature.

But St James goes on to urge his readers to receive the implanted word (λόγος ἔμφυτος), which seems to mean the fiat of creation after God's likeness, as an active redemptive principle now implanted within the man who receives it, and this must be the word of regeneration, the new principle of life given in Christ Jesus.

Both St Peter and St James shew that those who are thus begotten by the word of God must put away all malice. In St Peter this is urged as a necessary *result* of being so begotten. If the seed from which they spring is the incorruptible word of God which abides for ever, its fruit should be shewn in a love which is equally incorruptible and abiding, and this involves putting away all malice, etc. In St James the putting away of malice is rather a necessary *preliminary* in order to receive the implanted word. Thus the treatment of the subject is very different in the two writers. Whichever was the borrower has welded the idea into his own argument without any slavish imitation. But St James's appeal to the fiat of creation is more subtle and obscure than the appeal to regeneration by St Peter. It would therefore seem that St Peter has adopted one part only of St James' message, possibly not having himself grasped the allusion to the Gospel of Creation.

The contrast between corruptible seed and the word of God living and abiding for ever is emphasized by St Peter by a quotation from Isaiah xl. 6 πᾶσα σὰρξ χόρτος καὶ πᾶσα δόξα ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου, ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν,



τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. In i. 24 he quotes the whole passage with three variations from the LXX. ὡς being inserted after *σάρξ*, *αὐτῆς* substituted for *ἀνθρώπου* and *Κυρίου* for *τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, all of which readings may possibly have been found in the text of the LXX, used by St Peter. Now the main point in St Peter's use of the passage is the last clause, "the word of the Lord abideth for ever," but the earlier portion is also very appropriate to his argument. The fading glory of grass is a fitting emblem of "the corruptible seed," the vain manner of living which his readers had inherited from their heathen forefathers. Moreover the whole passage in Isaiah is a gospel of redemption and new birth for God's exiled people in Babylon, based upon the lastingness of God's promise as contrasted with the vanity of human schemes. It is therefore very suitable to describe the new birth of the New Israel, ransomed from their old heathen surroundings.

St Peter therefore might quite well have selected the passage independently. But in view of the other traces of his indebtedness to St James, it is not unlikely that the quotation was partly suggested to his mind by the fact that in Jas i. 10 a few phrases ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου...ἐξήρανε τὸν χόρτον καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξέπεσε had been applied to the transitoriness of earthly riches.

1 Pet. ii. 11 ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς.

Jas. iv. 1 ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν; ἐπιθυμεῖτε.

In St Peter the words are an injunction to Christians, as strangers and sojourners, to abstain from the mutinous desires of the flesh which are at war against their true self (*ψυχή*). They must maintain an honourable standard in all their dealings with heathen neighbours.

In St James pleasures are regarded as hostile occupants of the members, resisting a lawful authority which is not named, and this causes quarrels and fightings. There is therefore not any close connexion of thought between the two passages.

Possibly St Peter may have had St Paul's words in Rom. vii. 23 in his mind. βλέπω ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου. The use of *σαρκικός* in a bad sense is decidedly Pauline, but *ψυχή* must not be identified with

πνεῦμα—e.g. Gal. v. 17 ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος—*ψυχή* is the essential “self” in man, of which his bodily life is only a secondary element.

1 Pet. iv. 8 ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλήθος ἁμαρτιῶν.

Jas v. 20 one who converts a sinner καλύψει πλήθος ἁμαρτιῶν.

In Prov. x. 12 the LXX. reads μῖσος ἐγείρει νείκος πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία—but the Hebrew is “love covereth all sins.”

It is possible that some Greek text of Proverbs x. 12 may have read καλύπτει πλήθος ἁμαρτιῶν—or ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλήθος ἁμαρτιῶν may have been an unwritten saying of Christ, as Resch suggests—because it is introduced by φησί in Clem. Al. *Paed.* iii. 12 and by λέγει Κύριος in *Didascalia* ii. 3. But otherwise the words in Jas v. 20 can hardly be regarded as a quotation at all. In St Peter on the other hand there does seem to be an obvious reference to Proverbs x. 12 and, unless πλήθος ἁμαρτιῶν occurred in the Greek text used by him or in some familiar saying, it seems probable that the variation from both the LXX. and the Hebrew was suggested by the phrase in St James.

It is less easy to suppose that St Peter originated this variant form of an O.T. proverb, and that St James borrowed part of it from him and used it in a sense which is very different from that in Proverbs and 1 Peter.

1 Pet. v. 5—9 ὁ θεὸς ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσεται ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν. Ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ...ὁ διάβολος...ᾧ ἀντίστητε.

Jas iv. 6 ὁ θεὸς ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσεται ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν. ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ· ἀντίστητε δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ...(10) ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον Κυρίου καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς.

Here both writers quote the same verse, Prov. iii. 34, with the same variation from the LXX. ὁ θεός for Κύριος. In St James the quotation is naturally suggested by the preceding words μείζονα δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν which Parry (*St Jas.* 40) explains to mean that God not only imparted a living soul to man in creation and therefore jealously demands its sole allegiance to Himself, but also bestows an even greater favour in the gift of regeneration—(cf. the λόγος ἀληθείας and the ἔμφυτος λόγος). This gift can only be received with meekness and humility (cf. ἐν πραύτητι). Proud self-will, which seeks its own pleasure and the friendship of the

world, inevitably means hostility to God—God “ranges Himself against” (*ἀντιτάσσεται*) the proud. Therefore “range yourselves under” (*ὑποτάγητε*) God—and thereby take your stand against the devil. The pleasures of sin can only end in wretchedness, whereas humble submission to God leads to true greatness.

According to this interpretation the language about humility does form a natural part of the argument of St James and is not (as some have suggested) a rather disjointed digression based upon a quotation introduced merely to support *δίδωσιν χάριν*.

In St Peter also the passage suits the context in which it occurs. He had just urged the “elders” not to “lord it over” the flock, and “the younger” on the other hand to “submit” to the elders. All parties must gird themselves with humility to serve each other, “for God resisteth the proud but gives favour to the humble.” Such “favour” is being conferred upon them even in their present sufferings. It is the God of all favour who is calling them to His eternal glory in Christ through suffering. But that favour can only be won by humble submission to God, coupled with steadfast resistance to the devil, who attempts to utilize such sufferings as an opportunity to “devour” his prey.

Thus in St James the quotation from Proverbs was suggested by the words *δίδωσιν χάριν*, whereas St Peter borrows it to emphasize the need of humility. Then each writer turns to the other idea contained in the quotation. If this coincidence stood alone it might be argued that each quoted the same verse independently of the other (the common variant from the O.T. *ὁ θεός* for *Κύριος* being possibly found in their text of the LXX.). But, in view of the other coincidences between the two Epistles, it is more probable that St Peter has borrowed from St James, giving a more practical application to the somewhat subtle ideas suggested by him.

Besides some coincidences in language, *e.g.* *παρακύψαι* 1 Pet. i. 12, Jas i. 25; *καλή ἀναστροφή* 1 Pet. ii. 12, Jas iii. 13; *τὸν στέφανον τῆς δόξης* 1 Pet. v. 4; *τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς* Jas i. 12, there are also coincidences of thought.

Thus it has been suggested (Parry, *St Jas.* p. 69) that the striking phrase in Jas ii. 1 *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης* may explain St Peter's language about “glory.” The title “our glory” seems to be applied to Christ in St James because in the

Person of Christ the divine ideal which manhood was destined to attain is revealed. So in 1 Pet. iv. 13, 14, those who are partakers of Christ's sufferings will rejoice in the revelation of His glory. To be reproached in the name of Christ is a blessed thing because it means that the Spirit of God, the characteristic sign of that glory, the consummation of manhood in Christ, is already resting upon them. The same idea underlies v. 1, 4, 10.

But, although there is undoubted contact between the two Epistles and St Peter seems to have borrowed phrases, thoughts and arguments from St James, there is no servile adherence or imitation. St Peter and St James had for years been fellow-workers in Judaea, and all through his missionary work St Peter doubtless kept in touch with his old colleague at Jerusalem and would be acquainted with his Epistle almost as soon as it was written, and he re-echoes some of its thoughts and expressions in his own letter. But he alters and adapts them very freely, and the general tone and method of his letter is very different from that of St James.

(b) 1 Peter and Romans.

1 Pet. i. 14. *μη συσχηματιζόμενοι.*

Rom. xii. 2. *μη συσχηματιζέσθε.*

This word occurs nowhere else in Biblical Greek.

1 Pet. i. 17. *τον απροσωπολημπτως κρίνοντα κατά τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον.*

Rom. ii. 6, 11. *ὁς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ... οὐ γάρ ἐστι προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.*

Here St Paul teaches that there will be no favouritism between Jews and Gentiles, a thought which St Peter expressed at his visit to Cornelius Acts x. 34. St Peter on the other hand shews that God's children have no right to look for favouritism from Him as their Judge.

1 Pet. i. 20 f. *προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς (Gentiles) τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς.*

Rom. xvi. 25 f. *μυστηρίου χρόνους αἰωνίους σεσιγημένου φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν... εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.*

Here St Peter omits the characteristic Pauline word "mystery" but has the same idea of an eternal purpose of God for the inclusion of the Gentiles on terms of faith.

1 Pet. i. 21. τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

Rom. iv. 24. τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

Here St Peter's phrase πιστοὺς εἰς θεόν is unique, and the language about the resurrection is an almost creed-like phrase which occurs frequently in St Peter's speeches as well as in St Paul's Epistles.

1 Pet. i. 22. εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον. ii. 17. τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε.

Rom. xii. 9, 10. ἡ ἀγαπή ἀνυπόκριτος. τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι.

1 Pet. ii. 5. ἀνεύγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους θεῷ.

Rom. xii. 1. παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν.

Here St Peter is describing the Christian Church, the New Israel of God as a holy priesthood, whereas in Romans St Paul describes himself as the sacrificing priest who presents the Gentiles as an offering to God, but he does also urge his readers to present themselves as a sacrifice—and contrasts their "reasonable" or spiritual sacrifice with that of dead animals, and St Peter has the same idea.

1 Pet. ii. 6 ff. Ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαίον ἐντιμον, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κατασχυνηθῆ...καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου, κ.τ.λ.

Rom. ix. 33. Ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχυνηθήσεται.

Here we have a combination of two passages Isaiah xxviii. 16 and viii. 14 (St Peter also introducing a third passage from Psalm cxviii. 22 about the stone which the builders rejected). Both have the same variations from the LXX. τίθημι ἐν Σιών instead of ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών and λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου instead of οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματος συναντήσεσθε οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι, which is a loose paraphrase of the Hebrew and entirely inverts Isaiah's meaning by inserting a negative. St Peter and St Paul give an accurate translation of the Hebrew but are hardly likely to have selected independently the same Greek words, which do not occur in any known version. It is however possible that they might have borrowed from a common source, either a Greek Bible the text of which differed from the

LXX., or from an early catena of Old Testament Messianic passages in which the passages about "the Stone" were grouped together. This however is pure conjecture, and in view of the other undoubted coincidences between 1 Peter and Romans it is simpler to suppose that St Peter borrowed the composite quotation from St Paul, working it out in fuller detail and adding the verse from Ps. cxviii. which our Lord had quoted of himself and St Peter had used in one of his speeches Acts iv. 11.

1 Pet. ii. 10. *ὃ ποτε οὐ λαὸς  
νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι  
νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες.*

Rom. ix. 25. *καλέσω τὸν οὐ  
λαὸν μου λαὸν μου, καὶ τὴν οὐκ  
ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην.*

The passage is taken from Hosea ii. 23: St Peter agrees with the majority of MSS. of the LXX. which read *ἠλεημένην* instead of *ἠγαπημένην* which is found only in the Vatican MS. It might therefore be argued that St Peter is quoting independently from the LXX. But in Hosea the words refer to the restoration of renegade Israelites whereas St Paul applies them to the admission of the Gentiles, and it is in that sense that St Peter almost certainly employs the passage.

1 Pet. ii. 13—17. *ὑποτάγητε  
πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν  
κύριον· εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέ-  
χοντι, εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ  
πεμπομένοις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακο-  
ποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν  
(ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ)  
...πάντας τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα  
ἀγαπάτε, τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν  
βασιλεία τιμᾶτε.*

Rom. xiii. 1. *πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξου-  
σiais ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέ-  
σθω· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ  
θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὐσαι ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέ-  
ναι εἰσὶν.*

3. *οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶν  
φόβος τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ ἀλλὰ τῷ  
κακῷ.*

4. *τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ καὶ ξεῖς  
ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς...θεοῦ γὰρ διά-  
κονός ἐστιν, ἕκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ  
τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι.*

7. *ἀπόδοτε πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς,  
τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὴν  
τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν.*

In this passage we have not only a number of common words and phrases but the same ideas occur in the same order.

1 Pet. ii. 24. *ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις  
ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσω-  
μεν.*

Rom. vi. 11. *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς  
λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν  
τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν  
Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.*

In both passages the old life of sin is regarded as being ideally terminated in the death of Christ.

1 Pet. iii. 8f. *ὀμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, ... ταπεινόφρονες, μὴ ἀποδίδοντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας τούναντιον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες.*

1 Pet. iii. 18. *Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν [ἀπέθανεν]... θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι.*

Here the emphatic words *ἅπαξ* and *ἐφάπαξ* are used to shew that Christ's death was the termination of the regime of sin once and for all, and the ushering in of a life of spiritual activity.

This, says St Paul, is the ideal for those who claim to share Christ's death in Baptism.

This, says St Peter, is the blessed purpose of sufferings in the flesh, whereby Christians are sharing in the sufferings which culminated in death for Christ.

1 Pet. iii. 21. *ὕμᾱς... σώζει βάπτισμα... συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

St Paul shews that in Baptism we represent the burial of our old sinful self and the rising again of the new self. We claim to share in the death and resurrection of Christ. So St Peter shews that life comes out of death. In the sufferings of Christ the death of His Flesh terminated the regime of sin and set His Spirit free for new life. In the Flood the same water which drowned the guilty world was the medium by which Noah and his family were preserved for a kind of resurrection life. So in Baptism there is a death unto sin and a new birth or resurrection to righteousness in virtue of the resurrection of Christ.

1 Pet. iv. 1. *ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπανται ἁμαρτίαις.*

St Paul is arguing that death cancels all previous obligations. A slave can no longer be brought into court by his previous owner. The master must lose his case and the slave be acquitted if his

Rom. xii. 14—19. *εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς· εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε. χαίρειν μετὰ χαίροντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαίωντων. τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες· μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι... μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδίδοντες.*

Rom. vi. 10. *ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ, ὁ δὲ ζῆν ζῆν τῷ θεῷ.*

Rom. vi. 4 (cf. Col. ii. 12). *συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτισματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὡσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν... οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καιρόνῃ τῃ ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν.*

Rom. vi. 7. *ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.*

death certificate can be produced. So those who claim to have died with Christ in baptism are exempt from the claims of their old master Sin. Their duty now is to share the resurrection life of Christ.

St Peter is continuing his argument about suffering in the flesh. He has shewn that Christ's sufferings and death were the termination of the regime of sin once and for all—and that in Baptism we claim to have risen with Christ from a similar death to sin. Sufferings in the flesh therefore should be welcomed as a means by which that ideal death unto sin may be made a greater reality and help us to live unto God in the spirit.

The language and the illustrations used by St Peter are very different from those employed by St Paul—but the ideas are intensely Pauline.

1 Pet. iv. 3. ἐν ἀσελγείαις...  
οἰνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις, πότοις.

1 Pet. iv. 9—11. φιλόξενοι εἰς  
ἀλλήλους... ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν  
χάρισμα, εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακο-  
νοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης  
χάριτος θεοῦ· εἰ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια  
θεοῦ· εἰ τις διακονεῖ, ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος  
ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός.

Rom. xiii. 13. μὴ κώμοις καὶ  
μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις.

Rom. xii. 3—13. ἐκάστῳ ὡς ὁ  
θεὸς ἐμέρισε μέτρον πίστεως... ἔχον-  
τες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν  
τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα, εἴτε προ-  
φητεῖαν... εἴτε διακονίαν... τὴν φιλο-  
ξενίαν διώκοντες.

Here we have similar language about the diligent use of diverse gifts—but St Paul employs his favourite illustration of the Body and its members, each with its own function to discharge for the good of the whole, while St Peter uses the illustration of stewards entrusted with their Master's goods.

1 Pet. iv. 13. καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε  
τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε  
ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης  
αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι.

1 Pet. v. 1. μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ  
Χριστοῦ παθημάτων, ὁ καὶ τῆς με-  
λουσύνης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοι-  
νωρός.

Rom. viii. 17. εἴπερ συμπά-  
σομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν.

Rom. viii. 18. λογίζομαι γάρ  
ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν  
καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν  
ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς.

(c) *1 Peter and Ephesians.*

Most commentators recognize some connexion between the two Epistles, and Seufert actually attributed them to the same author. Weiss and Kühn assign the priority to 1 Peter, but the general



view is that St Peter was influenced by St Paul's Epistle. Abbott (*Intr.* p. xxiv) says that "the parallelisms between these two Epistles are so numerous that the Epistles may almost be compared throughout." Dr Hort (*Intr.* p. 5) says that "the connexion, though very close, does not lie on the surface. It is shewn more by identities of thought and similarity of structure between the two Epistles as wholes than by identities of phrase."

Again (*Prolegomena to Ephesians*, p. 169) he says "The truth is that in the First Epistle of St Peter many thoughts are derived from the Epistle to the Ephesians, as others are from that to the Romans, but St Peter makes them fully his own by the form into which he casts them, a form for the most part unlike what we find in any Epistle of St Paul's."

The connexion between the two Epistles might plausibly be accounted for by the suggestion that St Peter had come to Rome towards the end of St Paul's first imprisonment there or just after his release. The object of his visit was not improbably to support St Paul's great work of binding together Jews and Gentiles in one Body. Either from St Paul himself or from St Mark, who had been St Paul's companion when Ephesians was written, St Peter learns the inspiring thoughts which St Paul had addressed to the Churches of Asia in that Epistle, and without any slavish imitation he himself echoes some of the same ideas in his own letter, welcoming the Gentiles as members of the New Israel of God. Among such echoes of St Paul's thought or language the following passages may be noted.

In 1 Pet. i. 3 we have the same benediction *εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, cf. Eph. i. 3. This occurs also in 2 Cor. i. 3 and in itself might possibly be a mere coincidence, as such benedictions were a common formula in the letters of devout Jews. But the whole substance of 1 Pet. i. 3—5 corresponds with Eph. i. 18—20, with the same emphasis upon the Christian's "hope" and "inheritance" grounded upon the "resurrection of Christ."

In 1 Pet. i. 7 the proved genuineness of Christian faith resulting *εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν* may be compared with *εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ* Eph. i. 6 and *εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ* i. 12, 14.

In 1 Pet. i. 10—12 the thought that the admission of the

Gentiles was not understood in former times but is now revealed by the Spirit is very similar to that in Eph. iii. 5, but St Peter adds that the prophets themselves had a revelation that their message was not for themselves.

The thought in 1 Pet. i. 12 that the extension of God's favour to the Gentiles is watched by angels with wondering eyes, as opening up a fresh vista of God's all-embracing love, has no parallel in the N.T. except in Eph. iii. 10, where the manifold wisdom of God is described as being made known to heavenly powers by means of the Church. But the actual phrase *παράκλυσαι* as applied to angels in St Peter may have been borrowed from the Book of Henoch ix. 1.

The description of heathenism as a condition of walking in vanity, *ματαιάς ἀναστροφῆς* 1 Pet. i. 18, and ignorance, *ἄγνοια* i. 14, may be compared with Eph. iv. 17, 18. For the call from darkness to light ii. 9, cf. Eph. v. 8.

The idea that redemption through Christ was foreordained before the foundation of the world but is only now manifested 1 Pet. i. 20 is expressed in varying language in Eph. i. 4 *ἐξέλεξαστο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* i. 8, 11, ii. 10, iii. 11.

The designation of Christians as *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς* and therefore bound to abandon the fashion of their former lusts in the days of their ignorance and model their lives after God (*κατά*) 1 Pet. i. 14, 15 is the antithesis to the description in Eph. ii. 1—3 of the *νιοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας, τέκνα ὀργῆς* walking in lusts *κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος*.

The description of Christians as being built into a spiritual temple (*οἶκος*), followed by the quotation from Isaiah describing Christ as the *ἀκρογωνιαίον* 1 Pet. i. 5 f., may be compared with Eph. ii. 20, where Gentiles are described as being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets into a holy temple (*ναός*) Jesus Christ Himself being the *ἀκρογωνιαίον*.

The exhortations to servants and wives to shew due subjection for the Lord's sake, recognizing earthly relationships as institutions of God to be respected *διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ* in all fear, 1 Pet. ii. 13—25, is less mystical than St Paul's description of marriage as an earthly picture of the union between Christ and the Church, Eph. v. 22—23, but not dissimilar.

The injunction to be *ἔσπραγγνοι*, refraining the tongue from

evil 1 Pet. iii. 8—10, is not unlike that in Eph. iv. 31—32, the word *ἔσπλαγχνος* being found nowhere else in the N.T.

The thought that one great purpose of Christ's death was to present the Gentiles to God *ἵνα ὑμᾶς* (v. l.) *προσαγάγῃ* 1 Pet. iii. 18 may be compared with Eph. ii. 18, that it is by the Cross that both Jews and Gentiles have access (*προσαγωγή*) to the Father.

The language about the Ascension of Christ 1 Pet. iii. 21—22 *δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων* may possibly be based upon some early creed-like formula, but it certainly resembles Eph. i. 20 *ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος*.

The following arguments a priori suggest the probability that St Peter made use of St Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians.

(1) St Paul was a man of much higher education and a far more prolific writer than St Peter. Therefore it is less likely that he borrowed from St Peter than vice versa.

(2) St Peter's Epistle seems to have been written from Rome, and it is difficult to believe that he had worked in Rome before the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians were written.

(3) On the other hand both of those Epistles would almost certainly be brought to St Peter's notice when he did visit Rome, if not earlier. One of them was addressed to Rome and would be well known there. The other was written from Rome, probably in the presence of St Peter's companion St Mark (cf. Col. iv. 10), and was addressed to the Churches of Asia, who formed an important section of St Peter's readers.

(4) Romans was written about 57 A.D. at Corinth in the midst of active mission work. Ephesians about 61 A.D. in a prison lodging at Rome. It is therefore less likely that St Paul on two occasions, separated by four or five years, at places widely distant from each other, would quote from St Peter's Epistle than that St Peter on one occasion writing from Rome should quote from two Epistles of St Paul.

Internal evidence is not conclusive and diametrically opposite views have been taken. Many critics, including Lightfoot, Hort,

Sanday and Headlam, regard St Peter as having borrowed from St Paul. On the other hand the elder and younger Weiss and Kühl assign the priority to St Peter. Bigg (*St Peter*, 15 ff.), while admitting that St Peter must have read St Paul's Epistles and that his amanuensis may have often heard St Paul preach, denies any direct borrowing on St Peter's part from Romans or Ephesians. He argues that St Peter shews no trace of the fundamental topics dealt with in Romans, nor of the characteristic Pauline figure of the "one body." Romans and 1 Peter, he says, have a few not very remarkable phrases and a couple of obvious, practical topics in common but are otherwise as different as possible. The common composite quotation from Isaiah, with the same divergence from the LXX., may possibly be explained by the theory that they both borrowed from a common source, possibly an early collection of Messianic prophecies.

Sanday and Headlam (*Rom.* lxxv f.) on the other hand say "the resemblance (between 1 Peter and Romans) is too great and too constant to be accidental." Besides the common composite quotation (possibly derived from a common source) not only do we find the same thoughts, such as the metaphorical use of the idea of sacrifice (*Rom.* xii. 1; 1 *Pet.* ii. 5), and the same rare words, such as *συνσχηματίζεσθαι*, *ἀνυπόκριτος*, but in one passage (*Rom.* xiii. 1—7; 1 *Pet.* ii. 13—17) we have, what must be regarded as conclusive evidence, the same ideas occurring in the same order. Nor can there be any doubt that of the two the Epistle to the Romans is the earlier. St Paul works out a thesis logically and clearly. St Peter gives a series of maxims for which he is largely indebted to St Paul. For example, in *Romans* xiii. 1—7 we have a broad general principle laid down. St Peter, clearly influenced by the phraseology of that passage, merely gives three rules of conduct.

In St Paul the language and ideas come out of the sequence of thought; in St Peter they are adopted because they had already been used for the same purpose.

(d) *1 Peter and Hebrews.*

There are certainly some resemblances between the two Epistles.

Both are addressed to Churches which were in danger of persecution. Therefore in both suffering is regarded as a loving

discipline, in Hebrews as a fatherly chastisement of beloved sons, in 1 Peter as a crucible to test the purity of their faith.

Both contain warnings against apostasy and resentment under injury.

Both appeal to the example of Christ, exalted through suffering, as the model of patient endurance—suffering being a prelude to glory—1 Pet. i. 11, iv. 13, v. 10; Heb. ii. 10, xii. 1—3.

Again both Epistles regard Christianity as the natural outcome of Judaism, and shew that Christians have a spiritual priesthood, 1 Pet. ii. 5; Heb. x. 19—22. But the writer to the Hebrews, addressing Jewish readers who hankered after the old regime, shews the imperfections of the old sacrificial system as being merely the shadow of which Christianity is the reality. St Peter on the other hand, writing chiefly for Gentile readers, claims for them all the old titles and privileges of Israel.

Both writers lay stress upon the moral effects of the death of Christ as the termination of the regime of sin—once and for all *ἀπαξ*, 1 Pet. iii. 18; Heb. ix. 26, and use the same sacrificial language, not found elsewhere of Christ, offering up our sins, *ἀναφέρειν ἁμαρτίας* 1 Pet. ii. 24; Heb. ix. 28. The duty of Christians therefore is to have done with sin. But this idea is more probably derived by St Peter from Romans.

But, with the exception of the word *ἀντίτυπον* 1 Pet. iii. 21; Heb. ix. 24, the verbal coincidences between the two Epistles can nearly all be accounted for from the Old Testament.

It is therefore probable that both writers drew from the common store of ideas and phrases that belonged to Judaistic Christianity, and both represent the liberal school of Jewish Christians who recognized that old things had passed away and become new in Christ.

## 7. THE READERS OF THE EPISTLE.

A. *Their home.* The Epistle is addressed to the Christians scattered throughout the Roman provinces which constituted the region now called Asia Minor, with the exception of the coast-land south of the Taurus mountains. The history of each province and the probable means by which Christianity was introduced into it are discussed in the notes on i. 1. The

district is certainly a wide one but great facilities for travel were provided by the Roman Empire. Apparently Silvanus was proposing to make a circular tour starting from some seaport in Pontus and ending his journey somewhere on the coast of Bithynia. Such a tour to visit the chief centres of Christianity in a vast district is just what we find in St Paul's missionary journeys.

B. *Their nationality.* Were they Jewish or Gentile Christians? Most of the Greek Fathers, e.g. Origen (*Eus. H. E.* iii. 1), Didymus and Eusebius (iii. 4), seem to have held the view that St Peter's readers were Jews by birth. This opinion was shared by many commentators after the Reformation, such as Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius and Bengel, and it is supported by some recent critics including B. Weiss and Kühl. On the other hand the Latin Fathers Augustine and Jerome held that it was addressed to Gentile converts (though in one passage, *Viri Illust.* 1, Jerome repeats Origen's statement that St Peter preached to those of the Circumcision in the dispersion). Most modern critics of all schools support the view that the Epistle was chiefly addressed to Gentiles, although no doubt there were numerous Jewish Christians among them.

The arguments in favour of the view that the readers were *Jewish* Christians are as follows:

(1) That the special sphere of work assigned to St Peter was among "those of the Circumcision" (*Gal. ii.* 8—9). In answer to this it may be said that the arrangement was not absolute and in no way precluded St Peter from addressing Gentile Christians, just as St Paul, although especially the Apostle of the Gentiles, constantly worked among Jews, always offering the Gospel "to the Jew first," and addressing them by name in parts of the Epistle to the Romans.

(2) That the Epistle is expressly addressed to "the sojourners of the dispersion," *παρεπιδήμιους διασπορᾶς*, which, it is argued, most naturally refers to the Jewish dispersion. But reasons are given (p. liii f. and note *ad loc.*) for explaining *διασπορά* in a metaphorical sense.

(3) That the constant direct or indirect allusions to the Old Testament imply a degree of familiarity with the O.T. on the

part of the readers which would be hardly possible for Gentile converts from heathenism. In answer to this it may be urged that the O.T. was "the Bible" of the Apostolic Church whether Jew or Gentile.

(4) That several passages in the Epistle would most naturally refer to Jews, *e.g.* the words of Hosea, quoted in ii. 10 "which in time past were no people but are now the people of God," were originally spoken to Israelites. But in Romans St Paul applies them to the admission of the Gentiles, and they are much more forcible if addressed to Gentiles in 1 Peter.

Again in ii. 25 the readers are described as having *strayed away* but having now *returned* to the Shepherd. This, it is urged, could only properly be said of Jews, because they alone had been previously under the Shepherd. But by creation and by God's design all men are "the sheep of His pasture"—whether they belonged to the Jewish "fold" or not.

Again in iii. 6 the women are described as having become the daughters of Sarah by well-doing. Here it is urged that the word "become" cannot be emphasized as pointing to the admission of Gentiles to God's family, because Gentile women would have "become" daughters of Sarah by their conversion and not by their subsequent conduct. But very possibly the words about Sarah  $\eta\varsigma \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\theta\eta\tau\epsilon \tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\alpha$  are a parenthesis, and the words which follow about well-doing etc. may refer to the conduct of the holy women of old. Also  $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$  may be better rendered "whose daughters you proved yourselves to be." This would have additional force if addressed to Gentiles as being included in the seed of Abraham in Christ, cf. Rom. iv. 16; Gal. iv. 21—31.

None of the above arguments therefore necessitate the view that the readers were Jewish Christians. On the other hand there are several passages in the Epistle which almost certainly refer to Gentiles.

(a) In i. 14 the readers are bidden not to "fashion themselves according to their former lusts in the days of their ignorance." It is true that ignorance ( $\alpha\gamma\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ ) is once used by St Peter of the conduct of Jews in crucifying Christ (Acts iii. 17), and St Paul uses the verb  $\alpha\gamma\nu\omicron\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  of his own conduct in persecuting the Christians (1 Tim. i. 13), but elsewhere, Acts xvii. 30; Eph. iv. 18,  $\alpha\gamma\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$  is specially used of heathenism.

(b) In i. 18 they are described as having been redeemed from their vain (*ματαιάς*) manner of life handed down by their fathers (*πατροπαραδόσου*). The last word taken by itself might seem to suggest Jewish traditions, but heathenism had equally strong hereditary claims upon its followers, and the phrase "vain things" was constantly used of idolatry in the LXX. and also in Acts xiv. 15; Eph. iv. 17 (*ματαιότης*).

(c) In ii. 9 they are described as having been "called out of darkness into God's marvellous light." Similar language is used of St Paul's mission to the Gentiles (Acts xxvi. 18 quoting Isaiah xlii. 7, 16) and "darkness" is specially used of heathenism in Rom. i. 21; Eph. iv. 18, v. 8, but in Col. i. 13 St Paul regards all Christians (*ἡμᾶς*) as rescued out of the power of darkness.

(d) In iv. 2—4 they are no longer to live the remainder of their life in the flesh according to the lusts of men, but according to the will of God. For the time past of their lives is sufficient for them to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, walking (as they have done) in wantonness and unlawful idolatries. Yet the Gentiles think it strange that they do not join them in their profligate excesses. If this language was addressed to Jewish Christians it would imply that the Jews of the Dispersion had generally lapsed into heathenism and immorality, whereas there is no evidence for such wholesale apostasy. Again it would hardly have been a surprise to their neighbours if Jewish settlers had a different standard of religion and morality. But Gentile converts would doubtless be regarded as fanatics if they abandoned the habitual practices of their own relations and friends.

(e) There are several passages in the Epistle in which St Peter emphasizes the idea that God's mercies, long reserved and foretold, have at last been *extended* to his readers (*εἰς ὑμᾶς*).

After coupling himself with his readers in i. 3 "God hath begotten us (*ἡμᾶς*) again," in the next verse he speaks of the inheritance as having been all along kept in reserve (*τετηρημένην*) to be extended to them (*εἰς ὑμᾶς*). The concluding words of verse 5 *ετοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* may also (as Dr Chase suggests *Hastings' D. of B.* iii. 795) refer to the inheritance and not to the immediately preceding substantive *σωτηρίαν*. In this case the meaning may be that the inheritance



was kept in reserve ready to be revealed when "the fulness of the time" was come in the Messianic age of the Christian dispensation, cf. i. 20 *φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἑσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς*, cf. also Romans xvi. 25—26 and Eph. iii. 5, where the admission of the Gentiles as fellow-heirs (*συγκληρονόμα*) is described as being now revealed (*ἀπεκαλύφθη*).

In i. 10—12 St Peter says that the prophets who prophesied of the favour of God destined to be extended to you (*τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος*) learned by revelation that it was not for themselves but for you (*ὑμῖν*, so W.H. not *ἡμῖν* as T.R.) that they were ministering.

In i. 25, after quoting the message of good tidings originally addressed to the Jews in Babylon that "the word of the Lord endureth for ever," he says this is the word which has been preached as good tidings reaching to you (*εἰς ὑμᾶς*).

In ii. 4 the readers are described as "coming" (*προσερχόμενοι*) to the living stone that even they (*καὶ αὐτοί*) may be built into a spiritual Temple, because faith is the one requisite for sharing the preciousness of the stone laid in Zion; therefore it belongs to you (*ὑμῖν*). You who were previously not a people are now the people of God; and all the old titles of honour addressed to God's chosen people Israel are now true of you (*ὑμεῖς*), cf. Ephesians ii. 20—22 where Jews and Gentiles are built into one Temple united by one corner stone (*ἀκρογωνιαίον*).

In iii. 18 the best text is *ὑμᾶς*, and the meaning seems to be that it was only by His death that Christ was able to win access (*προσαγωγή*) to God for Gentiles (cf. Eph. ii. 18 *προσαγωγή*).

In i. 12 the extension of God's favours to you (Gentiles) opens up a fresh vista to the angelic students of God's mysterious purpose for the world, cf. Eph. iii. 10.

If then we regard the Epistle as addressed primarily to Jewish Christians much of its meaning is lost. There were doubtless numerous Jewish settlers in the provinces of Asia Minor, but the bulk of the inhabitants, and therefore presumably of the Christians, were Gentiles, and it is to them that the Epistle is primarily addressed. One great object of St Peter is to assert the truth which he had championed at the Apostolic conference (Acts xv. 14), that God had "visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name."

C. *The circumstances of the readers.* We have no certain evidence as to when and by whom they had been converted. St Peter makes no claim that he had himself worked among them, and the statement of Origen (*Eus. H. E.* iii. 1) to that effect is probably based only upon the salutation of this Epistle.

In i. 12 St Peter merely refers to "those who preached the Gospel to you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." Some of them doubtless were converts of Paul and Barnabas on the first missionary journey, others of Paul, Silas and Timothy on the second journey, others may have been converted by Epaphras, or Aquila and Priscilla. Again the description of Silvanus in v. 12 "as a faithful brother to you" very probably may refer to his previous work in the provinces addressed.

In ii. 2 they are described as "new-born babes," but this does not necessarily imply that they were very recent converts. The phrase denotes rather the simple childlike tastes which even the maturest Christian should retain (*cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 20 "in malice be ye babes"). St Peter assumes that there were presbyters in some at any rate of the Christian communities which he addresses, and such presbyters are exposed to the temptations of "lording it over the flock" (v. 3) or of seeking office for the sake of sordid gain, neither of which would be probable dangers in an infant church, even if the latter warning refers to the management of Church funds rather than to official stipend. The Christians are already a marked body among their heathen neighbours. Their lives have a conspicuous influence upon the world around. They are exposed to constant obloquy, insults, injustice, even bodily violence for the sake of their religion. The advice to servants, without any corresponding instruction to Christian masters such as we find in Ephesians and Colossians, may suggest that most of the Christians were of humble rank, but this argument from silence must not be overpressed, as the passage is dealing with submission and patience under unjust treatment, and it would have involved a slight digression to teach masters their duty towards their servants.

There is no reference to any controversial questions about Circumcision or clean and unclean meats, such as we find in St Paul's earlier Epistles. But even in Ephesians and Colossians these do not seem to have been such burning questions as had

been the case a few years earlier. Possibly Jewish influence was not so strong in the northern provinces. At any rate St Peter, in welcoming the Gentiles as included in the New "Israel of God," abstains from referring to minor questions of ritual and deals only with general principles of Christian conduct.

Moreover the perils, to which Christians were now exposed, were not so much from the Jews or from false brethren as "perils among the heathen."

#### 8. THE OCCASION AND PURPOSE OF THE EPISTLE.

The order in which the provinces are named in i. 1, coupled with the fact that Pontus and Bithynia, which formed one Roman province, are mentioned separately, one at the beginning and the other at the end of the list, probably indicates the route which Silvanus, the bearer of the Epistle, proposed to follow. It would seem that he intended to land at one of the seaports in Pontus, possibly Sinope, and travel south through Galatia and Cappadocia and then eastwards, again passing through part of Galatia to Asia and thence northwards, regaining the shore of the Black Sea somewhere in Bithynia. Such a route implies an extensive and organized missionary journey, and it may be conjectured that Silvanus was either intending to revisit districts where he had already been working (cf. v. 12) or, as Dr Chase suggests (*Hastings' D. of B.* iii. 791), he may have been undertaking the journey as St Paul's messenger. At any rate St Peter avails himself of the opportunity afforded by this proposed journey of Silvanus to send a letter to the scattered Christians of that vast district. No doubt there were many Jewish Christians among them but the majority were Gentiles, and it is to them that St Peter chiefly addresses himself. One of the chief objects of St Peter's visit to Rome was probably to promote union between Jews and Gentiles in the Church. That object, as we know from Acts, was no less dear to Silvanus. It would therefore be a real strength to him in his mission to the provinces of Asia Minor to have such a letter as this, written by the recognized leader of the Jewish Christians, welcoming the Gentiles as members of the New Israel of God.

Moreover it was a time of threatened danger and rising

persecution. Satan was going about "desiring to have them" in the smelting fire which was to test their faith. It was therefore a fitting opportunity for St Peter, who had himself known the shame of falling in the hour of trial, when Satan had "sifted him as wheat," to fulfil his Master's command, "When thou hast turned again strengthen thy brethren."

In v. 12 St Peter says that his object in writing to them was (a) to encourage them, (b) to testify that this is in very truth the "grace" or "loving favour" of God, and bid them stand fast in it. What is this "favour"? Does it refer only to the immediately preceding section about persecution or to the whole theme of the Epistle? Probably to the latter, including the thought of suffering as one item in God's work of loving favour. Their privileges were part of God's eternal purpose, the extension of God's "favour" to Gentiles (i. 10) had been long foretold and is now revealed.

It is on that "favour" that they are to set their hope (i. 13). Husbands and wives are fellow-heirs of the "favour" or free gift of life iii. 7. God's "favour" is only bestowed upon the humble v. 6: let them therefore humble themselves to bear the discipline of suffering which He is sending upon them. It is the God of all "favour" who called them to eternal glory in Christ (v. 10): if the road to that glory leads through a short tract of suffering it is no mark of disfavour but rather of favour, because such suffering is the prelude to the glory.

The three main topics of the Epistle are: (a) the privileges of Christians, (b) the consequent duties of Christians, (c) the present trials of Christians. These three topics respectively form the theme of the three sections into which the Epistle may be divided: (a) i.—ii. 10, (b) ii. 11—iv. 11, (c) iv. 12—v. 14. But the Epistle is no formal treatise capable of being strictly analysed, and the three topics are to some extent interwoven throughout.

(a) *The privileges of Christians.*

They are the New Israel of God, chosen by God's foreknowledge, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, sprinkled with the Blood of Christ as the Covenant Victim. They are begotten to a living hope of attaining to an incorruptible inheritance which has all along been kept in reserve for them. Prophets long ago foretold this

extension of God's favour to them. Angels are watching this development of God's all-embracing plan of love with eager eyes. They have been ransomed from slavery, as Israel was from Egypt. They are living stones built into a holy Temple of which Christ is the corner stone. They are a holy nation, a peculiar people, a royal priesthood. They are begotten by the word of God who lives and abides for ever. They are called to eternal glory.

(b) *The duties of Christians.*

Such privileges carry with them corresponding responsibilities. In the first section therefore St Peter bids his readers to gird themselves for active service with sober earnestness and confident hopefulness (i. 13). They must prove themselves obedient children. In the days of their ignorance it was more excusable to follow the shifting fashion of their own wayward desires, but now they have been called by One who is all-holy and therefore they must be holy (14—16). In claiming God as their Father they must remember that He is also the Judge, by whom everyman's work must be tried, and He will not shew partiality or favouritism to His children. They must therefore pass their time as sojourners in the world in reverent fear of offending God (17).

The seed from which they are begotten is nothing less than the word of God who lives and abides for ever, its fruits in their lives should therefore be of the same character. Their love for their fellow-members in God's family must be heartfelt and unrelaxed. Malice, guile, hypocrisy or unkind talk must be put away (i. 22—ii. 1).

In the exercise of their "holy priesthood" they must offer spiritual sacrifices to God (ii. 5). As a "peculiar people" it is their task to proclaim the excellences of the God who has called them out of darkness (ii. 9).

In the second section the duties of Christians are emphasized in fuller detail. They must remember that they are only settlers in the world whose true home is in heaven, but there are all kinds of fleshly lusts carrying on a constant campaign against their soul, and from these they must abstain (ii. 11). They must set an example of honourable conduct to the heathen among whom they live (12).

Though they are not of the world they are in the world and must submit to all the institutions which God has appointed for its orderly governance. The state, the household, the family are all intended to be earthly copies of divine ideals. As citizens they must honour the Emperor and magistrates, Christian liberty must not be misused as a cloak for social or political anarchy. They are only free because they are God's bondslaves. As such they must give all men their due honour, and towards their brethren in Christ this means love. Though they can no longer worship the Emperor, reverent fear of God in no way excludes but rather demands honour to the Emperor (ii. 13—17).

As members of an earthly household the fear of God should prompt servants to submit to their masters, even though they may be unreasonable and awkward to deal with. To suffer injustice with patience will win God's verdict of "well done." It is the path which the Master trod and the servant is called to tread in His steps (ii. 18—22).

As members of an earthly home wives should submit to their husbands even though they are still heathen. The spectacle of a Christian wife's chaste conduct is a more potent force than argument to win her husband to the cause of Christ. Instead of outward finery the wife's truest adornment is a meek and quiet spirit. If they claim to have proved themselves true daughters of Sarah they must imitate her submission. The saintly women of old owed their charm to their persistence in well-doing, undisturbed by any excited exhibition of panic (iii. 1—6). But such submissive conduct on the part of the wife involves a corresponding duty on the part of a Christian husband. Husband and wife not only share an earthly home but are also co-heirs of the gift of life. Both are "chosen vessels" of God, but the wife is cast in a more fragile mould and therefore needs to be treated with the greater honour. Conjugal intercourse must be based upon this conception, otherwise the blessing promised to united prayer will be curtailed (iii. 7).

Besides such particular duties there are obligations binding upon all Christians alike. Unanimity, sympathy, love as brethren, tenderness, humility should be the characteristics of the Christian society. There should be no spirit of retaliation of "evil for evil, or reviling for reviling." Rather curses should

be met with blessings, for blessing is the special inheritance to which Christians are called.

The allusion to evil and reviling suggests advice as to how it may be avoided by devoted well-doing (iii. 13). But if, in spite of all their efforts, Christians are called upon to suffer for righteousness' sake they must not be panic-stricken. If only they keep the presence of Christ as their Master enshrined in their hearts, they will silence their revilers by living Christ-like lives, and must be ready to answer for their faith with meekness and reverent fear.

Suffering should be faced in the same spirit with which Christ met His sufferings in the flesh (iv. 1). Their past career of heathen profligacy has been all too long. The remainder of their earthly life must be regulated by the will of God and not by the wayward desires of man (iv. 2). Christians should live in watchfulness and soberminded prayer because the end of all things is approaching. Above all their love towards one another should never be relaxed (iv. 7 f.).

They are stewards whom God has entrusted with varied gifts to be used in His service. Claims upon their hospitality should be met without a murmur. Those who have gifts of utterance must remember that their message is not their own but God's. Those whose duty it is to minister must do their work with all the strength that God gives them (iv. 10 f.).

In c. v. St Peter gives a special message to the Presbyters. He bids them shepherd God's flock not under a sense of compulsion or with any sordid mercenary motives but willingly and gladly, not domineering over those entrusted to their care but leading them by their example (v. 1—4).

Those who are junior in age or office should humbly submit to their seniors.

In short all Christians should gird themselves with humility in their relations towards each other, and above all in their attitude towards God, humbly submitting to whatever discipline of suffering He may impose upon them. To be anxious and worried is to distrust God's loving care (v. 5—7).

(c) *The present trials of Christians.*

In i. 7 the varied trials through which Christians have to pass

are described as the smelting fire to test the purity of their faith.

In ii, 12 Christians are liable to be denounced as malefactors.

In ii, 18 servants who suffer wrongfully are to bear it patiently. By so doing they may imitate Christ's example and follow in His steps.

In iii, 9 Christians are to meet revilings with blessings. (iii, 13) Zealous devotion to what is good will probably spare them from injury, but if they should be required to suffer for righteousness' sake it is a blessed thing. If only they maintain a good conscience by persistent good conduct they may shame their maligners into silence. But if God's will should require them to suffer it is far better to suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing. Let them consider the sufferings of Christ. His death was:

(a) The termination of sin once and for all (*ἀπαξ*). (b) The opportunity for new and wider service. By dying He was able to win access to God for the Gentiles (*ὑμᾶς*). Set free by death His human spirit was quickened for new activity in the world of spirits. He went and preached to the spirits in prison. (c) It was the prelude to glory. He who then suffered and died is now seated at the right hand of God, supreme over angels, principalities and powers.

(iv, 1) Christians should therefore face sufferings in the flesh, armed with the same conceptions which enabled Christ to endure the Cross and despise the shame. They should regard suffering in the flesh as a means of terminating the old regime of sin and fleshly life, to live a new life unto God in the spirit.

In iv, 12 St Peter again reminds his readers that sufferings are a smelting fire to test their faith and character. They must not therefore be regarded as a strange misfortune happening by chance. It should be a matter of joy to have fellowship in Christ's sufferings in order that they may have exultant joy at the revelation of His glory. To be reproached in the name of Christ is a blessed thing for it means that the spirit of that "glory" is already resting upon them.

The process of judgment is already beginning and it starts with God's own household first. Even in these initial stages of judgment the process by which the righteous are judged and



saved is a painful one, but how far more terrible will the final stages be when the ungodly and sinners are dealt with. Those who suffer according to God's will should commit their lives to Him, as to a faithful Creator, who may be trusted to deal justly with His own handiwork.

In v. 6—10 Christians should submit humbly to God's hand in patiently enduring suffering. In one sense their sufferings are the work of Satan, for he employs them to try and devour his prey by inducing Christians to give way. But in another sense they are the accomplishment of a divine purpose of loving favour, and that same purpose is being accomplished in the Christian brotherhood in other parts of the world. In calling His children to His eternal glory in Christ God requires them to pass through a brief period of suffering, and He will provide them with what is necessary to refit, stablish and strengthen them.

#### 9. DOCTRINE IN 1 PETER.

Nearly every clause in the Creed can be supported by passages in the Epistle.

<i>I believe in</i>	i. 2. According to the foreknowledge of
<i>God the Father</i>	God the Father.
	i. 3. Blessed be the God and Father of
	our Lord Jesus Christ.
	i. 17. If ye invoke as Father.
<i>Almighty</i>	iv. 11. To whom is the glory and the
<i>(παντοκράτωρ)</i>	κράτος for ever.
	v. 6. The mighty hand of God.
<i>Maker of heaven</i>	iv. 19. A faithful creator.
<i>and earth</i>	
<i>And in Jesus</i>	i. 3. Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.
<i>Christ His only</i>	
<i>Son</i>	
<i>our Lord</i>	iii. 14. Sanctify Christ as Lord in your
	hearts.
<i>who was incarnate</i>	Christ's Body ii. 24, Flesh iii. 18, iv. 1,
	Blood i. 19, Human spirit iii. 18 are
	referred to.
<i>who suffered</i>	i. 11. The sufferings destined for Messiah.

- ii. 21. Christ suffered for us.
- ii. 23. When He suffered He threatened not.
- iv. 1. Christ having suffered in the flesh.
- iv. 13. Ye have fellowship in the sufferings of Christ.
- v. 1. A witness of the sufferings of Christ.
- i. 2. Sprinkling of the Blood of Christ.
- ii. 24. Who bare our sins in His own Body on the tree.
- iii. 18. Christ died (*ἀπέθανε*) for sins once, being put to death in the flesh.
- iii. 19. He went (in His human spirit quickened by death) and preached to the spirits in prison.
- i. 3. By the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.
- i. 21. God raised Him from the dead.
- iii. 21. By the resurrection of Jesus Christ.
- iii. 22. Having gone into heaven.
- i. 21. God raised Him from the dead and gave Him glory.
- iii. 22. Who is at the right hand of God, angels and principalities and powers being made subject to Him.
- i. 7, 13. At the revelation of Jesus Christ.
- iv. 13. At the revelation of His glory.
- v. 4. When the chief Shepherd is manifested.
- In St Peter the judgment is ascribed to God rather than to Christ.
- i. 17. If ye invoke as Father Him who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work.
- iv. 5. Who shall give account to Him who is in readiness to judge the quick and the dead.
- But in v. 4 the bestowal of the crown of life
- was crucified*
- dead*
- He descended into Hell*
- He rose again*
- He ascended into heaven*
- He sitteth at the right hand of God*
- He shall come again with glory.*
- To judge both the quick and the dead*

*I believe in  
the Holy Ghost*

*Who spake by  
the prophets*

*The Holy Catholic  
Church*

is connected with the manifestation of the chief Shepherd, i.e. Christ.

- i. 2. In sanctification of the Spirit.  
i. 12. Those that preached good tidings to you by the Holy Ghost sent from heaven.  
iv. 14. The Spirit of the glory even the Spirit of God doth rest upon you. (See note *ad loc.*)

- i. 20. Prophets—searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ (or Messiah) which was in them was signifying in testifying beforehand the sufferings destined for Messiah. (See note *ad loc.*)

The full divinity of the Holy Spirit is implied by the fact that He is coupled with God the Father and mentioned before Jesus Christ in i. 2. Also the fact that the inspiration of O.T. prophets and Christian teachers is ascribed to Him, and that He now rests on believers in their sufferings presupposes His divinity and omnipresence.

As there are so many indirect traces of Ephesians in this Epistle it is somewhat strange that neither the word *ἐκκλησία* nor the illustration of the Body of Christ should be found in it.

But in i. 1 Christians are called *ἐκλεκτοί*. They are built as living stones into a spiritual temple of which Christ is the chief corner-stone. They are *γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν*. In other words they are the New Israel of God, which is practically what our Lord meant when He spoke of building His *ἐκκλησία* in the promise to St Peter, Mt. xvi. 18. Again the description of Christians as being "in Christ" iii. 16, v. 14 implies

that they are regarded as members of His Body. Christians are a brotherhood, the house of God. The Christian society from which St Peter is writing is ἡ συνεκλεκτή.

iii. 21. Baptism doth save us.

*I believe in  
one Baptism for  
the remission of  
sins*

*The resurrection  
of the body*

This is not expressly mentioned but is implied in the "living hope" to which Christians are begotten again by the resurrection of Jesus Christ i. 3, and the instruction to rejoice in sufferings as a prelude to glory would be meaningless apart from a sure and certain hope of resurrection.

*The life  
everlasting*

Is implied in the "inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away" i. 4, and also in the "crown of glory" v. 4, and the eternal glory to which Christians are called v. 10.

Thus the only clauses of the Apostles' Creed for which no direct support is afforded by the Epistle are :

~~He came down from heaven.~~

Was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

Under Pontius Pilate.

Buried.

The Communion of Saints.

*St Peter's conception of God.*

He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ i. 3. He is our Father but also our Judge, and will not shew any undue favouritism to His children i. 17. He is a faithful creator and therefore His creatures can entrust their souls to His keeping in perfect confidence despite man's cruelty or injustice iv. 19. He cares for us and therefore we can cast all our anxiety upon Him v. 7. He is a Being of absolute holiness who demands that His children should be holy i. 15—16. He lives and abides for ever i. 23. His purpose of redemption was foreknown to Him before

the foundation of the world i. 2, 20. It is He who begets us again to a living hope i. 3. He calls us i. 15. He is a God of all favour, even in the discipline of suffering by which He calls us to glory v. 10. His eyes are over the righteous and His ears open to their prayer but His face is against those that do evil iii. 12. All human institutions whether in the state, the household or the family are ordained by Him ii. 13—iii. 7. He is the Shepherd and Overseer of our souls ii. 25. The Church is His flock v. 2. His temple ii. 5. His house iv. 17. Christians are His stewards and are intended to use all His varied gifts in His service iv. 10. He resists the proud but gives grace to the humble v. 5.

*St Peter's conception of Jesus Christ.*

He is very Man. He suffered in the flesh iv. 1, was put to death in the flesh iii. 18, and thereby was quickened in His (human) spirit for further work in the unseen world. His blood as the Covenant Victim is sprinkled upon Christians i. 1. It was the price of their redemption i. 19. In character He was sinless, a Lamb without spot or blemish i. 19. He did no sin neither was guile found in His mouth ii. 22. He was patient under sufferings and injustice, because He committed Himself to the just judgment of God ii. 23. In fact He was the ideal Servant of the Lord described in Isaiah liii. He is our example ii. 21, our High Priest through whom our spiritual sacrifices must be presented ii. 5. He presents men to God iii. 18. He has ascended into heaven and is at the right hand of the Father exalted above all angelic powers iii. 22.

Suffering in His name is a high privilege iv. 14. He will be manifested as the chief Shepherd v. 4. His revelation is referred to i. 7, 13.

A few passages, if isolated and exaggerated, might be misinterpreted as suggesting that Christ was a subordinate Being, e.g. He was foreknown by God i. 20, raised from the dead by God i. 21, chosen by God ii. 4. In i. 3 God is described as His God and Father.

But such a view is disproved by numerous other passages. He is our Lord i. 3. He is coupled with the Father and the Holy Spirit i. 2. He is to be sanctified as Lord in our hearts iii. 15, language which in Isaiah viii. 13 is applied to Jehovah of hosts.

Similarly other passages which refer to Jehovah in the O.T., "O taste and see that the Lord is gracious" (Ps. xxxiv. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 3) and the stone of stumbling—the corner-stone (Isaiah xxviii. 16—of the presence of Jehovah) 1 Pet. ii. 6, are applied to Christ. The description of Christians as being "in Christ" iii. 16, v. 14 implies His divinity. It is only "through Christ" that Christians are faithful as resting in God. "Through Him" their spiritual sacrifices are offered ii. 5. "Through Him" God is glorified by the faithfulness of His members iv. 11. "In Him" Christians are called by God to eternal glory v. 10.

Again St Peter's doctrine of the atonement is that Christ bare our sins ii. 24, that by His stripes we were healed ii. 24—that His death was the termination of the regime of sin once and for all iii. 18, and is intended to produce similar death unto sin in His members ii. 24, iv. 1, that by His blood the Gentiles were redeemed from the slavery of sin i. 18, that by dying Christ presented them (who were once far off) to God iii. 18.

All this would be unintelligible if St Peter regarded Jesus as nothing more than a human martyr.

## 10. THE GREEK TEXT AND VERSIONS.

### *The Greek Text.*

(1) Uncial Manuscripts written in capitals.

α. Codex Sinaiticus (fourth century), discovered by Tischendorf at Mount Sinai, now at St Petersburg.

A. Codex Alexandrinus (fifth century) in the British Museum.

B. Codex Vaticanus (fourth century) in the Vatican Library at Rome.

C. Codex Ephraemi (fifth century), a palimpsest with some of the works of Ephraem Syrus (299—378) written over the original text, now in the Royal Library at Paris.

K. Codex Mosquensis (ninth century) contains the Catholic and Pauline Epistles and came from the Monastery of St Dionysius on Mount Athos.

L. Codex Angelicus (ninth century) contains part of Acts, the Catholic Epistles and the Pauline with part of Hebrews. It belongs to the Augustinian Monks at Rome.

P. Codex Porphyrianus (ninth century) contains the Acts, all the Epistles, the Apocalypse and a few fragments of 4 Maccabees. It was found by Tischendorf in 1863 in the possession of Bishop Porphyry. It is a palimpsest with fragments of the commentary of Euthalius written over the original text.

These are the only uncial MSS. of the Catholic Epistles.

(2) *Minuscules* or cursive MSS. expressed by numerals. Of these the most important are:

13 (= 33 Gosp. 17 St Paul) (ninth century).

31 (= 69 Gosp. 37 St Paul) (fourteenth century) at Leicester.

34 (= 61 Gosp. 40 St Paul) (fifteenth or sixteenth century).

(3) *Versions.*

*Latin.* Only a few fragments of 1 Peter are extant in Old Latin vss. *m* (=the speculum of Mai) and *g*. The Latin Vulgate (lat. vg) was made by Jerome 385 A.D., of which countless MSS. are extant.

*Syriac.*

(a) The Peshitto (syr vg) (? third century).

(b) The Harclean (syr hl) (seventh century) based on an older version of Philoxenus (sixth century).

*Egyptian.*

(a) The Bohairic or Memphitic, the version of Lower Egypt (? second century).

(b) The Sahidic or Thebaic, not much later, the version of Upper Egypt.

*Armenian* (fifth century).

## 11. LITERATURE.

For a fuller list of literature bearing upon the Epistle see Dr Chase's Article, Hastings' *D. of B.* iii. 817 f.

The following commentaries or books may be mentioned in alphabetical order:

Alford, fourth edition, 1871.

Bigg, *International Critical Commentary*, 1901.

Chase, Articles on "St Peter," and "I Peter," Hastings' *D. of B.*  
iii. 756—796.

Cook, *Speaker's Commentary*, 1881.

Hort, on 1 *Peter* i. 1—ii. 17, 1898.

Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, 1897.

Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 1894.

Kühl, sixth edition, Meyer's *Commentary*, 1897.

Leighton, *Devotional Exposition*, 1845.

Lightfoot, "St Paul and the Three" in *Galatians*, 1865.

Lightfoot, "St Peter in Rome" in *Clement II*, 481 ff.

Mason, in *Ellicott's Commentary*, 1883.

Masterman, on 1 *Peter*, 1900.

Plumptre, in *Cambridge Bible for Schools*, 1880.

Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893.



## ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Α

**1** <sup>1</sup> ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας, καὶ Βιθυνίας, <sup>2</sup> κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρός, ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος, εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.

<sup>3</sup> Εὐλόγητος ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζώσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν, <sup>4</sup> εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον, τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς <sup>5</sup> τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἔσχατῳ. <sup>6</sup> ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, <sup>7</sup> ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου εὗρεθῆ εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. <sup>8</sup> ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπάτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὀρώντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶτε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῳ, <sup>9</sup> κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν.

<sup>10</sup> Περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν

προφηῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες,  
<sup>11</sup> ἔραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν  
 αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ εἰς  
 Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας· <sup>12</sup>οἷς  
 ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτά, ἀ  
 νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς  
 πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, εἰς ἃ  
 ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι.

<sup>13</sup> Διὸ ἀναξωσάμενοι τὰς ὁσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν,  
 νήφοντες τελείως, ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν  
 χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. <sup>14</sup>ὡς τέκνα  
 ὑπακοῆς, μὴ συνσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ  
 ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις, <sup>15</sup> ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα  
 ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ  
 γενήθητε, <sup>16</sup> διότι γέγραπται [ὅτι] Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ  
 ἄγιος. <sup>17</sup> καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτος  
 κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς  
 παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε· <sup>18</sup> εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ  
 φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλγτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας  
 ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου, <sup>19</sup> ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ  
 αἵματι ὡς ἄμνου ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ,  
<sup>20</sup> προεγνωσμένοι μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερω  
 θέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς <sup>21</sup> τοὺς δι'  
 αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν  
 καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα  
 εἶναι εἰς θεόν.

<sup>22</sup> Τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες  
 ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπό  
 κριτον ἐκ καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενωῶς,  
<sup>23</sup> ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ  
 ἀφθάρτου, διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος·

<sup>24</sup> διότι

πάσα σάρξ ὡς χόρτος,  
καὶ πάσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου·  
ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος,  
καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν·

<sup>25</sup>τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

τούτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

**2** <sup>1</sup>Αποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑπόκρισιν καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλιὰς, <sup>2</sup>ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ ἀύξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν, <sup>3</sup>εἰ ἐγεγασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος. <sup>4</sup>πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι, λίθον ζῶντα, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδοκιμασμένοι παρὰ δὲ θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον <sup>5</sup>καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομείσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, ἀνευέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· <sup>6</sup>διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ

Ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον  
ἔντιμον,

καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχνηθῆ.

<sup>7</sup>Ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν· ἀπιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας <sup>8</sup>καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου· οἱ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθῶντες· εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν. <sup>9</sup>Ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτὸν, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς· <sup>10</sup>οἷ ποτε οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἤληθμένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλεθθέντες.

**11** Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἵτινες

στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς· <sup>12</sup>τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα, ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν, ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσι τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς.

<sup>13</sup>ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον· εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, <sup>14</sup>εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπόμενοις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν· <sup>15</sup>(ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιούντας φιμοῖν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν·) <sup>16</sup>ὡς ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῦ δούλοι. <sup>17</sup>πάντας τιμῆσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε, τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε. <sup>18</sup>Οἱ

οικέται ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις, οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σκολοῖσι. <sup>19</sup>τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσχων ἀδίκως· <sup>20</sup>ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιούντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ. <sup>21</sup>εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ· <sup>22</sup>ὁς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδέ εἰρήνη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· <sup>23</sup>ὁς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει, πάσχων οὐκ ἠπέλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρῖνοντι δικαίως· <sup>24</sup>ὁς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν· οὐ τῷ μῶλωπι ἰάθητε. <sup>25</sup>ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλὰ ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.

**3** <sup>1</sup>Ὁμοίως γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις

ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται<sup>2</sup> ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφήν ὑμῶν. <sup>3</sup>ὣν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἕξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος, <sup>4</sup>ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ ἡσυχίου καὶ πραέως πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελής. <sup>5</sup>οὕτως γὰρ ποτε καὶ αἱ ἅγαι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμου ἐαυτάς, ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίῳ ἀνδράσιν, <sup>6</sup>ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ, κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα· ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι καὶ μὴ φοβοῦμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν. <sup>7</sup>Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως συνοικοῦντες κατὰ γνώσιν, ὡς ἀσθενε-  
στέρω σκευεῖ τῷ γυναικείῳ ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν, ὡς καὶ συκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν. <sup>8</sup>Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχνοί, ταπεινόφρονες, <sup>9</sup>μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λαιδορίαν ἀντὶ λαιδορίας τοῦναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες, ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε.

<sup>10</sup>ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαθῆν

καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς

παύσατω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ

καὶ χεῖλη τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον,

<sup>11</sup>ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν,  
ζητήσάτω εἰρήνην καὶ διωξάτω ἀγνῆν.

<sup>12</sup>ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους

καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν,

πρόσωπον δὲ Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά.

<sup>13</sup>Καὶ τίς ὁ κακῶσων ὑμᾶς ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε; <sup>14</sup>ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην,

μακάριοι. τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ  
 παραθῆτε, <sup>15</sup> κίριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς  
 καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἔτοιμοι αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαὶν παντὶ τῷ  
 αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ  
 μετὰ πραύτητος καὶ φόβου, <sup>16</sup> συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν,  
 ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε καταισχυνθῶσιν οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες  
 ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφὴν. <sup>17</sup> κρεῖττον γὰρ  
 ἀγαθοποιούοντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, πᾶσχειν ἢ  
 κακοποιούοντας. <sup>18</sup> ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἄπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν  
 ἀπέθανεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ  
 θεῷ, θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι·  
<sup>19</sup> ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν,  
<sup>20</sup> ἀπειθήσασίν ποτε ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ μακρο-  
 θυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ εἰς  
 ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὁκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι'  
 ὕδατος. <sup>21</sup> ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βᾶπτισμα,  
 οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς  
 ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,  
<sup>22</sup> ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν ὑποτα-  
 γέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων.

**4** <sup>1</sup> Χριστοῦ οὖν παθόντος σαρκὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν αὐτὴν  
 ἔννοιαν ὀπλίσασθε, ὅτι ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπανται  
 ἁμαρτίαις, <sup>2</sup> εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ  
 θελήματι θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον.  
<sup>3</sup> ἄρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὸς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν  
 ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι, πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις,  
 ἐπιθυμίαις, οἰνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις, πότοις, καὶ ἀθεμίτοις  
 εἰδωλολατρίαις. <sup>4</sup> ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται μὴ συντρεχόντων  
 ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τῆς ἀσωτίας ἀνάχυσιν, βλασφη-  
 μούντες· <sup>5</sup> οὐ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ ἑτοίμως κρίνοντι  
 ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· <sup>6</sup> εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροὺς εἰρηγε-

λίσθη ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι.

<sup>7</sup> Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν. σωφρονήσατε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς· <sup>8</sup> πρὸ πάντων τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἔκτενῆ ἔχοντες, ὅτι ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν· <sup>9</sup> φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ· <sup>10</sup> ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα, εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ· <sup>11</sup> εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια θεοῦ· εἴ τις διακονεῖ, ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός· ἵνα ἐν πάσιν δοξάζεται ὁ θεὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.

<sup>12</sup> Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένη ὡς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος, <sup>13</sup> ἀλλὰ καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι. <sup>14</sup> εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται. <sup>15</sup> μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιὸς ἢ ὡς ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος· <sup>16</sup> εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός, μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ. <sup>17</sup> ὅτι [ὁ] καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν, τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ ; <sup>18</sup> καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ [δέ] ἄσεβης καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται ; <sup>19</sup> ὥστε καὶ οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ πιστῶ κτίστη παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐν ἀγαθοποιίᾳ.

**5** <sup>1</sup> Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συνπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων,

ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός,  
<sup>2</sup>ποιμίνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποιμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ, μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς  
ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως, μὴδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως,  
<sup>3</sup>μὴδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων ἀλλὰ τύποι  
γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου· <sup>4</sup>καὶ φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχι-  
ποιμένοιο κομεισθε τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον.  
<sup>5</sup>Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις. Πάντες  
δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε, ὅτι  
[ὁ] θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν  
χάριν.

<sup>6</sup>Ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ,  
ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ, <sup>7</sup>πάσαν τὴν μέριμναν ἡμῶν  
ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπὶ αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν.  
<sup>8</sup>Νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε. ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος  
ὡς λέων ὠρνόμενος περιπατεῖ ζητῶν καταπιεῖν· <sup>9</sup>ᾧ  
ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει, εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν  
παθημάτων τῇ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτε-  
λεῖσθαι. <sup>10</sup>Ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάσης χάριτος, ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς  
εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὀλίγον  
παθόντας αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει.  
<sup>11</sup>αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

<sup>12</sup>Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς  
λογίζομαι, δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα, παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρ-  
τυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰς ἣν στήτε.  
<sup>13</sup>Ἀσπάζεταιται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ καὶ  
Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου. <sup>14</sup>Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν  
φιλήματι ἀγάπης.

Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.



# NOTES

## CHAPTER I

### 1. 1—2. SALUTATION.

1 I, Peter, am writing this letter as the commissioned Apostle of Jesus Christ and you, my readers in various Roman provinces of Asia Minor are God's chosen people, the new Israel of God, although (like the Jews of the Dispersion) you seem to be strangers in a foreign  
2 land. My commission as an Apostle and your position as members of the chosen people are not the result of chance. They are based upon the fact that God, our Father, from the first contemplated us as His children and His agents, and He effected His purpose for us by consecrating us to His service by the Holy Spirit, pledging us to obedience (like Israel at Sinai) as sprinkled with the blood of the covenant victim, Jesus Christ.

May God's gifts of favour and peace be increased by all that you have to undergo.

The salutation closely resembles the salutations of St Paul's epistles and is probably formed after their model. It designates the writer and his authority, the readers and their privileges, and indicates one of the leading thoughts of the Epistle that Christians were set apart by God's foreknowledge to be His chosen people, consecrated for a priestly life of sacrifice as covenanted members of Christ.

1. Πέτρος. His old name Simon is only used in narrative passages before his call as an Apostle, but our Lord afterwards addressed him as Simon, Simon Bar Jona, or Simon son of John, and St James in his speech at the Apostolic Conference, Acts xv. 14, speaks of him as Συμεών. In St John's Gospel he is called Simon Peter 17 times and Peter 15 times, but in the other Gospels and in Acts Peter, the Greek form of the name given to him by our Lord, seems to have been his regular title. In 2 Pet. however the salutation is given in the name Συμεών Πέτρος. The Aramaic form Κηφᾶς, which occurs in 1 Cor. and Gal., may possibly be employed by St Paul because it was used by the Judaizing party against whom he was writing.

ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ occurs in seven of St Paul's Epistles as an assertion of his authority in writing. So here St Peter states his authority for addressing churches with which he had little, if any, personal connexion.

The full name Jesus Christ is extremely rare in the Gospels and only occurs in the opening verses of Matt. and Mk, twice in Jn, i. 17 and xvii. 3, and in the best text of Matt. xvi. 21, just after St Peter's confession of Jesus as the Christ, when our Lord began a new stage in His teaching and as the Christ announced His Passion. In the Acts and Epistles Jesus Christ becomes a regular proper name, while Christ Jesus is a kind of confession of faith.

ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς. The word διασπορά occurs first in the LXX. of Deut. xxviii. 25 describing the scattering of Israel if they are disobedient to God, and it is occasionally used in the later books of the O.T. In the N.T. it only occurs twice elsewhere, Jn vii. 35, "Will he go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks?" Jas. i. 1, "To the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion." In both these passages the word is generally supposed to refer to the Jewish Dispersion (but see Introduction, p. liii f.). So here some commentators would interpret the phrase literally and regard St Peter as addressing *Jewish* Christians only. But many passages in the Epistle (see Introduction) imply that the majority of the readers had been heathen, though in many towns it is morally certain that the nucleus of the Christian congregation would be derived from the Jewish congregation, as we find in St Paul's missionary work. St Peter however does not merely mean *scattered strangers*, but uses the word διασπορά deliberately. Salmon suggests that it means "members of the Roman Church whom Nero's persecution had *dispersed* to seek safety in the provinces." Ramsay, who dates the Epistle as late as 80 A.D., finds a reference to the Fall of Jerusalem which left the Church a "*dispersed*" body with no recognized centre. More probably the word is used metaphorically, not merely in the sense that Christians are a scattered body of sojourners in the world, but one of the titles of the old Israel is transferred to the Church, the new Israel of God. Just as the Jewish Dispersion served to spread the knowledge of Jehovah more widely, so the Christian Church scattered far and wide is the new "Dispersion" and has a similar work to do for God in the heathen world around. So elsewhere in the Epistle St Peter constantly applies to the Christian Church titles which originally belonged to the Jewish nation.

ἐκλεκτοῖς. In the O.T. divine "Election" is spoken of (a) in the choice of Israel as a nation, (b) in the choice of individual Israelites

to perform special functions for Israel, *e.g.* Abraham, Moses, Saul, David, Solomon, Zerubbabel, the tribe of Judah, or for priestly work, Aaron and the Levites. In each case the choosing by God was not a reward. It was not an act of favouritism on God's part. Those chosen were selected not for their own sake or to the exclusion or "reprobation" of others, but to do some special work for God, and if they were untrue to their mission they would forfeit their position. Here St Peter probably means that the Church is the new Israel of God, "a chosen people." As a corporate body the Church is chosen "to tell forth God's excellencies" and to complete the work of Christ her Head, but every member of that body has his own work to do and was chosen by God for that work. To have been thus chosen by God is not a guarantee of final salvation unless those chosen are faithful to their position. But to be one of "the elect people of God" is a "state of salvation," to which we are brought by God and not by chance, and we must pray for "grace to continue in the same unto our life's end."

**παροικητοῖς**, cf. ii. 11. In one sense St Peter's readers were *sojourners* because they lived among heathen. In another sense all Christians are in this world merely sojourners whose home is in heaven.

**Pontus, etc.** It is generally admitted that the names are used in their imperial sense as denoting Roman provinces and not in the popular or geographical sense. The order in which the various provinces are mentioned affords no clue to the place of writing. On the one hand Pontus is in the E. and therefore nearly the last in geographical order from Rome, but on the other hand it is in the N. and therefore not the first in geographical order from Babylon. Again, Pontus and Bithynia formed one Roman province, therefore there must be some reason for their being named separately first and last in the list. Probably the provinces are named in the order in which Silvanus was expected to visit them, landing perhaps at Sinope in Pontus and making a circuit round to the coast of the Euxine again somewhere in Bithynia.

The provinces named include all Asia Minor north of the Taurus Mountains, which were a natural frontier shutting off the provinces of the south coast.

**Pontus.** The old kingdom of Pontus was conquered by Rome in 65 B.C., when Pompey defeated Mithridates and the maritime district of the Euxine W. of the Halys was joined to the recently formed province of Bithynia, a further strip of coast to the E. being added about 100 years later. The rest of the districts remained

independent for a time but were afterwards incorporated in the Roman province of Galatia, and early in the 2nd century were transferred to Cappadocia. The chief towns of Provincial Pontus along the coast from W. to E. were Heraclea, Amastris, Sinope and Amisos. All of these were thriving seaports with extensive commerce, the most important being Sinope, which was a Roman colony. In such centres of trade there were certain to be numerous Jewish settlers. In Acts ii. 9 we read that Jews from Pontus were present in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and it is conceivable that the first knowledge of Christianity may have been introduced into Pontus by them. Again Aquila, who had married a Roman wife, Prisca or Priscilla, is described in Acts xviii. 2 as "a Jew, a man of Pontus by race," and it is possible that he may have helped to evangelize his native country during his visits to the East. In any case there was constant commercial intercourse between Pontus and other centres of early Christianity, and the Church may well have been established in Pontus about the middle of the first century (though Ramsay, *Ch. in Rom. Emp.* p. 225, regards 65 A.D. as the earliest probable date).

At any rate Pliny, the governor of Bithynia, writing apparently from Pontus to the Emperor Trajan about 112 A.D., speaks of many Christians of every age, every rank and of both sexes, not only in the towns but also in the villages and the country, through whom the temples had come to be well-nigh deserted and the sacred rites to be long suspended. This points to the fact that Christianity was of considerable standing in the district, and one suspected person who was examined declared that he had been a Christian but had abandoned the faith 25 years previously. Sinope was the birthplace of Marcion, a semi-Gnostic teacher, who came to Rome in 140. He had been a wealthy shipowner and his father is described as a bishop.

**Galatia.** The Roman province included all the central part of Asia Minor and extended from Pontus on the N. to the Taurus Mountains on the S. It embraced Paphlagonia, part of the old kingdom of Pontus, part of Phrygia including Antioch and Iconium, and part of Lycaonia including Lystra and Derbe, but it derived its name from the north central district, Galatia Proper, which had been occupied by Gaulish immigrants in the 3rd century B.C. They were conquered by the Romans under Manlius in 189 B.C. but retained semi-independence until 25 B.C., when Galatia Proper was made a Roman province. The chief towns in this district were Ancyra, Pessinus and Tavium. The southern part of the Roman province of Galatia was certainly evangelized by St Paul during his first missionary journey. Lightfoot and others hold that St Paul also visited Galatia

Proper on his second and third journeys, and that the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to that district, but Ramsay maintains that St Paul only wrote to the churches of the southern part of the Roman province of Galatia and never visited the northern district at all.

**Cappadocia** was the district east of Galatia and came into the possession of the Romans in 17 A.D., but it was treated as an unimportant frontier district, governed only by a procurator until 70 A.D. when it was considerably enlarged and made a regular province under a pro-praetor. From 76—106 it was under the same governor as Galatia, though otherwise the two provinces were distinct. The fact that it is here mentioned as if it was an important province has been urged as a slight argument in favour of dating the Epistle after 70 A.D., but if Silvanus was to visit this district it is difficult to see by what other name than Cappadocia it could be designated. Jews from Cappadocia were present on the day of Pentecost. Otherwise nothing is known of the introduction of Christianity there, but Caesarea, the chief town of Cappadocia, was on the great trade-routes from Syrian Antioch to the Black Sea and from Ephesus to the East.

**Asia.** The Roman province included all Asia Minor west of Galatia, the capital being Ephesus. St Paul had been forbidden by the Spirit to preach there on his second missionary journey (Acts xvi. 6), but stayed in Ephesus for three years during his third journey, "so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord both Jews and Greeks" (Acts xix. 10). Several of St Paul's Epistles were addressed to this district, the Epistle to the Ephesians being almost certainly a circular letter to be passed on from Ephesus to the churches of the Lycus valley. The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon imply the existence of a considerable Christian body in Colossae, Laodicea and Hierapolis, though St Paul had apparently never visited those places in person (Col. ii. 1). The two Epistles to Timothy contain directions to him as head of the Church in Ephesus. Ephesus was also the home of St John in his later years; there his Gospel and Epistles were probably written and the letters to the Seven Churches in the Apocalypse are addressed to that district. In the beginning of the 2nd century the letters of Ignatius are addressed chiefly to churches of Asia and imply a developed organization with bishops, presbyters and deacons; while Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who was martyred at the age of 86 in 155—156 A.D., is another link with the Apostolic age.

**Bithynia** had been bequeathed to the Romans by its last king, Nicomedes III, in 74 B.C., and was joined with Pontus and formed into a united province by Pompey in 65 B.C. St Paul attempted to

enter Bithynia when precluded from preaching in Asia on his second missionary journey, but "the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not" (Acts xvi. 7). We have no evidence to shew how Christianity was introduced there, but there were two great roads connecting its chief towns Nicaea and Nicomedia with Antioch in Pisidia in the S. and Ancyra and Syria in the E.

2. This verse probably refers both to St Peter's own position as an apostle of Jesus Christ and to that of his readers as the "chosen" people of God. Just as in Rom. i. 1, 6, 7, St Paul couples himself and his readers together, he himself being "called to be an apostle" (*κλητὸς ἀπόστολος*) and they "called to be saints" (*κλητοὶς ἁγίους*), so here St Peter regards both his own choice to be an apostle and that of his readers to be the new Israel of God as being due to a divine purpose. The verse seems certainly to describe the operation of the three Persons in the Trinity in fitting men to be God's fellow-workers in the world. The Father in His eternal knowledge contemplates them as His chosen agents, the Holy Spirit consecrates and hallows them continuously for their work, which is to obey God's will as covenanted members of Jesus Christ His Son, by whose blood as the true covenant victim they are sprinkled. For other passages where the threefold name is similarly introduced cf. 1 Cor. xii. 4—6; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Eph. iv. 4—6; 2 Thess. ii. 13—14; Titus iii. 4—6; Rom. viii. 16—17.

The occurrence of such passages presupposes a recognized, although still unformulated, belief in the Holy Trinity, which can hardly have originated without some authoritative utterance of our Lord such as the great commission to baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost in Matt. xxviii. 19, or the discourse recorded in Jn xiv.

The three clauses *κατὰ, ἐν, εἰς*, may be taken either as parallel to each other as denoting three different aspects of the divine choice, ascribed to the three Persons in the Holy Trinity, or more probably as successive stages, each dependent upon the preceding: *κατὰ*, the standard of God's eternal design; *ἐν*, the means by which it is worked out; *εἰς*, the aim of that design.

The "call" to a position of privilege and therefore of service is a "link in the chain of providential care which began in the eternal loving purpose of God." This thought is elaborated in fuller detail in Rom. viii. 28—30.

It is however somewhat remarkable that St Paul nowhere refers to "the blood of sprinkling."

*κατὰ πρόγνωσιν*. The substantive does not occur in the LXX. except in the Apocrypha. In the N.T. it only occurs again in St

Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 23) that Jesus was "delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." The verb is used of *men* "knowing beforehand" (Acts xxvi. 5; 2 Pet. iii. 17), but in Rom. viii. 29 it is used of *God* "foreknowing" certain persons whom He also predestinated and called; in Rom. xi. 2 it is used of the "people whom God foreknew" as not being cast away by God despite appearances, and in 1 Pet. i. 20 it is used of Christ as the true paschal lamb "foreknown before the foundation of the world." So here St Peter regards God as having from the first contemplated certain individuals like himself and a society or "chosen people" like his readers to carry on the work of Israel as His agents in the world. Cf. Is. xlix. 1 and Jer. i. 5, "Before I formed thee in the belly I *knew* thee...I sanctified thee. I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations."

**θεοῦ πατρός.** Θεός is never a mere proper name in the N.T. but denotes the power, supremacy, authorship and superintendence of God. πατήρ is frequently used to describe God as *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, but also of God as "*our Father*." Sometimes (as probably here) the two ideas are coupled together because it is only as "a member of Christ" that a man becomes "the child of God" in the highest sense. So our Lord spoke to His disciples of going to "My Father and your Father," and in Romans viii. 29 St Paul says that God's object in choosing men "to be conformed to the image of his Son" was "that He might be the first-born among many brethren."

**ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος** might mean *by the hallowing of our human spirit*, but the context implies that *hallowing by the Holy Spirit* is intended. This is the process in which God's choice takes effect in the equipment of His agents. The root (ἀγ-), see note v. 15, means *to set apart*, so *to consecrate*. Apostles, prophets and every member of the chosen people need a life-long hallowing for their special office. As applied to the whole body of Christians cf. 2 Thess. ii. 13, "God chose you from the beginning unto salvation, ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος," from which passage St Peter may perhaps be borrowing.

**εἰς ὑπακοήν κ.τ.λ.** This choosing by God, this hallowing process employed upon those chosen, is intended *to result in (eis) their obedience*. Unless they fulfil that divine purpose, to have been "known by God" will only increase their guilt. Cf. Amos iii. 2, "You only have I *known* of all the families of the earth: *therefore* I will visit upon you all your iniquities."

**βαντισμὸν αἵματος.** The only instances where *persons* were sprinkled with blood in the O.T. were (a) the sprinkling of a leper with the blood of a bird, Lev. xiv. 6, 7; (b) the sprinkling of Aaron

and his sons with the blood of a ram to consecrate them for their priestly work (Ex. xxix. 21; Lev. viii. 30); (e) the sprinkling of the people by Moses at Sinai when the covenant between God and Israel was ratified (Ex. xxiv. 3—8). It is possible that St Peter may be referring to the second of these as he does elsewhere describe his readers as a body of priests to offer up spiritual sacrifices, and this idea seems to be referred to also in Heb. x. 22, where Christians having access into the Holy of Holies in the blood of Jesus, their great High Priest, are bidden themselves to “draw near” as priests whose hearts are sprinkled and their bodies bathed with pure water, just as the High Priest was sprinkled with blood at his consecration and also bathed before the day of Atonement. According to Hort (1 *Pet.*, p. 23), however, the reference here is to the sprinkling of the whole people at Sinai. Moses proclaimed to the people all the words of Jehovah and all the judgments, and they promise obedience. Then to make it a binding covenant an altar is built and victims are killed by representatives of each tribe. Half of the blood is poured upon the altar as representing Jehovah, while the other half is sprinkled upon the people as the other contracting party in the covenant. The people, having heard the Book of the Covenant read, promise “All that Jehovah hath spoken will we do and be obedient,” and the blood is described as the “blood of the covenant.” This ceremony is referred to in Heb. ix. 7, 11—22, where it is contrasted with the new covenant of which Jesus is at once the mediator and the covenant victim. The blood once shed upon the altar of the cross as the pledge of God’s share in the covenant is also sprinkled upon the people as the pledge of their share in it. Cf. also Heb. xii. 24.

The same idea is also suggested by our Lord’s words in instituting the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, “This is My Blood of the Covenant” or “the new Covenant in My Blood.” It is not only a continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, of the blood outpoured upon the altar of the Cross and accepted by God as the pledge of His share in the Covenant as promising pardon, but it also assures us that we are the covenanted people of God, “very members incorporate in...the blessed company of all faithful people” and as such pledged to obedience.

Dr Chase (*Hastings, D. of B.* III. 794) on the other hand argues that the preposition *eis*, following as it does the *ἐν ἀγιασμῷ*, must point to the *goal* of God’s divine purpose and not to the *initial* pledge of obedience, when the Christian is first admitted into the new covenant by the *initial* sprinkling of blood. He therefore suggests a reference to the sprinkling with water (Num. xix. 9, 13, 20 f.) by which a



faithful Israelite, defiled by contact with a dead body, was sprinkled with the water of separation. So the blood of Christ can purge the conscience of the obedient Christian from *dead* works (Heb. ix. 14); cf. also 1 Jn i. 7, "If we walk in the light...the blood of Jesus *cleanseth* us from all sin." In answer to this it may be urged that initiation into the covenant points forward to a life of obedience as its goal, and to be sprinkled with the blood of Christ, the covenant victim, is not only an initial means of admission but also a source of continuous cleansing in which "our souls are washed through His most precious blood." Again it also pledges us to share the *sacrificial* life of Christ by "presenting ourselves, our souls and bodies as a living sacrifice" to God. Just as in Baptism we are signed with the Cross not merely as a rite of initiation but as a token that we must share Christ's Cross and fight manfully under His banner, so to be admitted into fellowship with Christ by the blood of sprinkling involves fellowship with His sufferings, and this idea would have special force for St Peter's readers who were face to face with persecution (cf. 2 Cor. i. 5; Phil. iii. 10, etc.).

χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. This is St Paul's regular greeting except in 1 and 2 Tim. where εὐεως is added. Some would regard it as a combination of the Greek greeting χαίρειν and the Hebrew greeting  $\text{D}^{\text{h}}\text{p}^{\text{h}}$  = peace, but more probably it represents the old priestly blessing (Num. vi. 24), "The Lord be *gracious* to thee...and give thee *peace*."

πληθυνθεῖτε is perhaps borrowed from "Peace be multiplied to you," Dan. iv. 1, vi. 25. In the N.T. it occurs again in the salutation in 2 Pet. and Jude. St Peter asks that the trials through which his readers have to pass may only *increase* God's gifts of grace and peace.

### i. 3—13. THE HIGH PRIVILEGES AND DESTINY OF THE CHRISTIAN.

#### *Benediction.*

3 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, for by raising Him from the dead He has begotten us, His other children, to  
 4 a new life of hope which is directed towards an inheritance which, unlike Canaan, can never be ravaged, never be defiled, never fade. It is an inheritance which in God's eternal purpose was all through the ages designed to be extended to you Gentiles (*eis ὑμᾶς*) and has been reserved in heaven for that purpose. (The present realization of that inheritance may seem strangely to belie that hope, for you are  
 5 beset by dangers and trials of all kinds), but you are under the watch and ward of God's almighty power if only you have faith to avail

yourself of the deliverance (from all evil) which (like the inheritance) was ready prepared to be revealed in the "last time," *i.e.* the Messianic age which has already begun. Living in that age as you do, you can exult, even though for the time being God may require you to experience sorrow in all kinds of trials, in order that the genuineness of your faith (a far more precious genuineness than that of gold, which is only a perishable substance though trial by fire is employed even for its testing) may be discovered by the Divine Refiner, thereby redounding unto praise and glory and honour for you (and consequently to Himself as perfected in His creatures) in the revelation of Jesus Christ. True you never saw Him in the flesh (as I did) yet you love Him, and, though you cannot now see Him, yet, believing on Him as you do, you exult with a joy too deep for words and already irradiated with heavenly glory, receiving the long-promised end of such faith, namely, the deliverance from evil of your true selves.

- 10 I said that the deliverance was ready prepared, and so it was. The deliverance now revealed to you was spoken of by the prophets, who prophesied about the extension of God's favour to you Gentiles.
- 11 They sought and searched diligently to discover what or at any rate what kind of time the Spirit of the Lord's Anointed which was in them signified when it solemnly declared beforehand in God's name the sufferings destined for the Messiah and the glories which
- 12 were to follow those sufferings; and it was revealed to them that it was not for their own age but for you that they were ministering the messages (of deliverance) which were now openly announced to you by those who brought you good tidings by the Mission of the Holy Spirit from heaven; and this unfolding of God's loving purpose for His creatures is watched with wondering eyes by angels.

The whole passage is an expansion of *ἐκλεκτοῖς κατὰ πρόβρῳσιν θεοῦ* in the salutation, and is intended to shew that the choosing of the Gentiles was no afterthought but part of God's eternal purpose. It has striking similarities with Eph. iii. 5—12, where the mystery of Christ, not made known to other generations but kept secret in God, is described as being now revealed by the Spirit to the apostles and prophets, namely that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs with Israel, and the Church (as the new and world-wide Israel) is the means of making known to angelic beings the manifold wisdom of God in planning the course of the ages.

The three clauses *eis ἐλπίδα ζώσαν, eis κληρονομίαν, eis σωτηρίαν*, might (i) be all taken as dependent directly upon *ἀναγεννήσας*, meaning that the new life is at once a hope, an inheritance, and a state of

salvation; or (ii) the second and third clauses might be taken as expansions of *ἐλπίδα*. It is a hope which is directed towards (*eis*) an inheritance and a deliverance which are already partially realized but not yet consummated; or (iii) as suggested in the paraphrase *eis κληρονομίαν* may be the goal of *ἐλπίς* and *eis σωτηρίαν* of *πίστις*. So *v. 9*, *σωτηρία* is described as *τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως*. Again *πίστις* and *ἐλπίς* are coordinated in *v. 21*, where St Peter repeats all the leading ideas of the earlier section, *προεγνωσμένου... φανερωθέντος ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς*, deliverance (*σωτηρία*) being now expressed by *ἐλυτρώθητε*, while the promise of "inheritance" in Canaan once given by the prophet to the exiles in Babylon is described as good tidings now extended to the Gentiles (*eis ὑμᾶς*).

3. *εὐλογητός*, *worthy to receive blessing* is nearly always restricted to God in the LXX. while *εὐλογημένος*, *one who receives blessing*, is used of men. The same form of benediction occurs in Eph. i. 3 and 2 Cor. i. 3.

ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ. The words are used in the same sense in which our Lord said to Mary Magdalene, "I go to My Father and your Father, to My God and your God," and again on the cross He cried, "My God, My God," but this must not be exaggerated into implying that the Son was Himself a creature as the Arians taught.

κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. St Peter in his speech on the day of Pentecost shewed from prophecy as fulfilled in the resurrection and ascension that God had made Jesus both Lord and Christ, and it seems to have been the earliest and simplest form of Christian creed to say "Jesus is Lord" or "Jesus Christ is Lord." St Peter couples himself with his readers and shews that Jewish and Gentile Christians are one as owning the same Lord.

ἔλεος is specially used of God's mercy in admitting Gentiles to the covenant, cf. Rom. xi. 30—32, xv. 9; Eph. ii. 1—4.

ἀναγεννήσας. The word occurs nowhere else in the Greek Bible except in *v. 23*, and as a Western reading in Jn iii. 5, where in the preceding passage our Lord had said *γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν*. St Paul describes those who are in Christ as *καὶνὴ κτίσις* (2 Cor. v. 17), and in Titus iii. 5 he speaks of the "laver of regeneration" (*παλιγγενεσία*).

St Peter regards the resurrection of Jesus as having ushered in a new life of hope for mankind, reversing the sentence of doom. As members of the Church of Christ they enter into a new order of existence as children of God.

ἐλπίδα ζωσαν, as members of Christ we are here and now "inheritors of the kingdom of heaven" but we are not yet in full

possession of our inheritance. We have only the "earnest" or first instalment of it. But we have "the hope of glory" and this hope is not like the old Messianic hope of the Jews, which had become languid and conventional. Our hope is full of growth and vitality.

4. **εἰς κληρονομίαν.** The goal to which our hope points forward is the spiritual Canaan, "the lot of our inheritance." Unlike the earthly Canaan it can never be ravaged by hostile marauders (*ἀφθαρτων*) or polluted by heathen profanation (*ἀμίαντων*) nor scorched and withered (*ἀμάραντων*).

*κληρονομία* in the O.T. denotes possession rather than heirship. "Originally (S. and H. *Rom.* p. 204) meaning (i) the simple possession of the Holy Land, it came to mean (ii) its permanent and assured possession (Ps. xxv. (xxiv.) 13; xxxvi. (xxxvii.) 9, 11, etc.); hence (iii) specially the secure possession won by the Messiah (Is. lx. 21; lxi. 7); and so it became a symbol of all Messianic blessings."

In the N.T. the subst. occurs 13 times and seems primarily to denote possession of an inheritance rather than heirship to a future inheritance. *E.g.* Acts vii. 5, God gave Abraham no *κληρονομίαν*, *i.e.* present possession in Canaan (but cf. Gal. iii. 18; Heb. xi. 8). Eph. i. 18, Christians are partakers of the *κληρονομία* of the Saints in light (*i.e.* fellow-citizens with the Saints). But as yet we only have an instalment (*ἀρραβῶν*) of our full inheritance, Eph. i. 14; and in Col. iii. 24, "the reward of the inheritance" is regarded as future.

The verb *κληρονομεῖν* occurs 18 times, generally in the future, of inheriting (*i.e.* possessing) the earth, the Kingdom of God, or eternal life. In Matt. xxv. 24 it denotes entering into possession of the Kingdom.

*κληρονόμος* occurs Evv. (3), St Paul (8), Heb. (3), Jas. (1), and sometimes includes the idea of heirship; but in Gal. iv. Christians are described as heirs who have come of age.

In this passage therefore St Peter probably regards Christians as being already in partial possession of the inheritance so long reserved for them. This idea is included in the statement of the Catechism, "In my Baptism...I was made...an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven."

**τετηρημένην...φρουρουμένους.** *τηρεῖν* is to *watch* or *keep safe*; *φρουρεῖν* to *stand sentry over* either to prevent escape, as in 2 Cor. xi. 32 (where the parallel passage in Acts ix. 24 has *παρατηρεῖν*), or to guard against attack, protect. Cf. Phil. iv. 7; Gal. iii. 23.

Here the perfect participle, *τετηρημένην*, means that the inheritance destined by God to be extended to the Gentiles (*εἰς ὑμᾶς*) has been safely laid by in reserve in heaven all through the long years of

silence when God's mercy in including the Gentiles in the covenant was not yet made known (cf. Rom. xvi. 25; Eph. iii. 5—11; 1 Pet. i. 11—12). The present participle, *φρουρουμένους*, describes the present position of Christians as heirs who still need God's constant protection in order to attain to final salvation.

*ἐν οὐρανοῖς* suggests another mark of superiority of the Christian's inheritance as compared with the earthly Canaan.

5. *ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ* may describe the *fortress* in which or the *garrison* by which the Christian is guarded.

*διὰ πίστεως*. Faith in God's promised deliverance is the condition by which man must avail himself of the divine protection.

*εἰς σωτηρίαν*. It is simpler to connect the words with those which immediately precede them rather than with *ἀναγεννήσας* or *ἐλπίδα*. In this case they may be dependent on *φρουρουμένους* if *σωτηρία* is understood in the sense of final and completed deliverance. But the words which follow seem rather to regard the deliverance as something which Christians are already receiving, something predicted by prophets but now proclaimed. It seems better therefore to couple *διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν* together. (For *εἰς σωτηρίαν* governed by a substantive cf. Rom. i. 16, *δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν*; x. 1, *δέσμις εἰς σ.*; 2 Cor. vii. 10, *μετάνοιαν εἰς σ.*; and cf. Rom. x. 10, *ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σ.*)

*σωτηρία* (S. and H. *Rom.* p. 23), "The fundamental idea contained in the word is the removal of dangers menacing to life and the consequent placing of life in conditions favourable to free and healthy expansion." In the earlier books of the O.T. it denotes deliverance from physical peril (Jud. xv. 18; 1 Sam. xi. 9, 13, etc.). But gradually it tended to be appropriated to the great deliverances of the nation, e.g. the Passage of the Red Sea (Ex. xiv. 13, etc.) and the Return from Exile (Is. xlv. 17, etc.). Thus by a natural transition it was associated with the Messianic deliverance in the lower forms of the Jewish Messianic expectation (Ps. Sol. x. 9, xii. 7; Test. XII. Patr. Sym. 7; Jud. 22; Benj. 9, 10) [the form used in all these passages is *σωτήριον*, cf. Lk. ii. 32]. In this sense of Messianic national deliverance it is used in Lk. i. 69, 71, 77. It was also associated with the higher form of the Christian hope, Acts iv. 12, xiii. 26, etc.

In this latter sense *σωτηρία* covers the whole range of the Messianic deliverance both in its negative aspect as a rescuing from the wrath under which the whole world is lying and in its positive aspect as the imparting of "eternal life," cf. 1 Thess. v. 9, 10. The *σωτηρία* is not yet fully complete. Christians have to grow towards it (1 Pet. ii. 2), to work it out (Phil. ii. 12), they may neglect it (Heb. ii. 3). It is nearer than it was when they first became believers (Rom. xiii. 11). It is

to perfect our salvation that the Return of Christ is awaited (Heb. ix. 28). But "now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor. vi. 2); the deliverance is already at work for those who have faith to accept it. They do here and now receive that deliverance of their true selves, their true lives (*σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν*), which is the goal of their faith.

*ἐτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.* Dr Chase (Hastings, *D. of B.* III. 795) connects these words with *κληρονομίαν*, and interprets *ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* in the same sense as *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων* in i. 20 as referring to the Messianic age which is described in prophecy as "the last days" (Is. ii. 2; Hos. iii. 5; Mic. iv. 1). The actual phrase, *καιρὸς ἐσχατος*, does not occur, but *καιρὸς* is used in eschatological passages in Daniel and in the N. T. (e.g. 1 Pet. iv. 17; Rev. i. 3). According to this interpretation the clause is correlative to *τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς*. It is however more natural to take the clause with the immediately preceding word *σωτηρίαν*, in which case *καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* might mean either "the last day"—or as Dr Hort would explain it—"a season of extremity," "when things are at their worst." The phrase is so used in Classical writers (Polyb. xxix. 11, 12; Plut. *Syl.* XII. 458r). But there is no instance in Biblical Greek of *ἐσχατος* in that sense, and neither of the two last interpretations make it reasonably possible to connect *ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε* with *καιρῷ*, which is grammatically the natural antecedent. It would involve taking *ἀγαλλιᾶσθε* either as an imperative or as a quasi future.

But, if *καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* is taken in the sense of the Messianic age, the *καιρὸς* which the Prophets sought to ascertain (v. 11), the clause may still refer to *σωτηρίαν* if *ἐτοίμην* is understood as practically equivalent to *ἡτοιμασμένην*. This is virtually the purport of vv. 10, 11, and the clause thus becomes correlative to *κληρονομίαν τετηρημένην* and would mean that the *σωτηρίαν*, which the readers are described as already receiving, was all along in readiness to be revealed "when the fulness of the time was come."

In any case *ἐτοίμην* means more than *μέλλουσιν* (v. 1). The thought that God's plan of salvation was prepared beforehand as a new revelation to Gentiles as well as being the realization of Israel's hopes occurs in Lk. ii. 30—32, *τὸ σωτήριόν σου ὃ ἡτοίμασας...φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραὴλ*.

6. *ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε.* Dr Hort, recognizing the difficulty of connecting these words with *καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* in the sense of "season of extremity," would make *ᾧ* masculine—"In whom," i.e. Christ. This would match the following phrase: *εἰς ὃν πιστεύοντες ἀγαλλιᾶτε*. But if *καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* means the Messianic age in which the readers were living, *ἐν ᾧ* can be taken in its more obvious grammatical connexion

and would mean "living in that age as you do." Another interpretation would be to take ἐν ᾧ as neuter (cf. ii. 12, iv. 4) = wherein, *i.e.* in the thought of your new birth and its privileges.

ἀγαλλιᾶσθε must be taken as present indicative (not imperative) in view of the ἀγαλλιάτε in v. 8. The active only occurs again in Lk. i. 47 and in Rev. xix. 7 (*v. l.*). Dr Hort suggests that the middle voice may here denote a state of exultation caused by God's dealings, while the active regards exultation more as their own act. But a more usual distinction is that the middle denotes inward feeling and the active merely states a fact (*e.g.* ὑστερεῖν = to lack; ὑστερεῖσθαι = to feel a sense of want).

ὀλίγον may mean either for a little time or to a small degree, cf. v. 10, ὀλίγον παθόντας. The relative shortness of their sufferings is perhaps only one feature of their slightness as compared with the glory which is to follow.

ἄρτι = just for the moment.

εἰ δεόν may mean, seeing that such sufferings are part of the appointed order of things, "These things must come to pass" (Mk xiii. 7, etc.), or it may imply some uncertainty whether some of the readers at least may escape persecution; cf. iii. 17, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

λυπηθέντες = ye have been put to grief. The word denotes not merely sufferings but the mental distress caused by them. The aorist participle does not necessarily mean that the grief is ended before the exultation can begin. Christian exultation does not preclude the presence of sorrow, cf. 2 Cor. vi. 10, "as sorrowful yet always rejoicing." Aorist participles coupled with an aorist frequently denote an action contemporaneous with that of the verb, *e.g.* προσευξάμενοι εἶπον, Acts i. 24, and there is no reason why this should not be the case when they are coupled with a present tense, although the present participle is generally employed, but the aorist may have a summarizing force describing what may be a long continued experience as a single whole which has to be completed.

ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς = surrounded as you are by a variety of trials. The phrase, together with τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως, is borrowed from Jas. i. 2, 3. (See Introduction, p. lv.)

7. τὸ δοκίμιον. It is commonly stated that τὸ δοκίμιον must be a substantive and is equivalent to δοκιμεῖον = a means of testing. It certainly has that meaning in Proverbs xxvii. 21, δοκίμιον ἀργυροῦ καὶ χρυσοῦ πύρωσις = fire is the test for silver and gold, from which passage St Peter probably borrows the word πύρωσις in iv. 12.

In Jas. i. 3, from which St Peter is probably borrowing, the

meaning *process* of testing would give a good sense, but in St Peter the meaning required is the approved character which is the *result* of testing. Dr Hort therefore prefers the reading given in four cursive MSS. 25, 56, 69, 110, τὸ δοκίμιον (neuter adjective) = *the approved element or genuineness of your faith*—as opposed to spurious faith which proves to be dross. For such a construction cf. 2 Cor. viii. 8, τὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης γνήσιον. But Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 259—262, shews that in the Fayyám Papyrus documents δοκίμιος or δοκιμείος occurs several times as an adjective applied to gold and was a recognized variant for δόκιμος (cf. ἐλευθέριος for ἐλεύθερος, καθάριος for καθαρὸς). He would therefore regard δοκίμιον as an adjective in Ps. xii. 6, τὰ λόγια κυρίου λόγια ἄγνα ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον δοκίμιον τῇ γῆ κεκαθαρισμένον ἑπταπλασίως = “the words of the Lord are pure words, genuine silver, purified by fire, seven times refined, for the land.” So in 1 Chron. xxix. 4, Zech. xi. 13, some MSS. of the LXX. read δοκιμίον, δοκίμιον or δοκιμείον for δοκίμιον and δόκιμον.

Arethas on Apoc. ix. 4 (*Cramer Cat.* p. 315) probably uses οἱ δὲ τὸ δοκίμιον ἐαυτῶν διὰ πυρὸς παρεχόμενοι to mean those who prove their genuineness. So Oecumenius interprets τὸ δοκίμιον as meaning τὸ κεκρμένον, τὸ δεδοκιμασμένον, τὸ καθαρὸν. Probably therefore both in St Peter and in St James τὸ δοκίμιον is a neuter adjective and means proved genuineness. In this case the passage in St James is more closely allied to Rom. v. 4, but whereas St Paul regards patient endurance as productive of approved genuineness (δοκιμῆ), St James reverses the process and regards faith already tested and proved genuine as a ground for future endurance.

χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, *i.e.* gold, a property of which it is to perish. The meaning may be either: Gold, despite its perishable character, is not destroyed but only purified by the fire, so a *fortiori* your faith will survive and will only be purified by trials; or, if it is worth while to employ trial by fire to test a perishable substance like gold, a *fortiori* such a process may be employed to arrive at a far more valuable result, viz. to prove the purity of your faith. Therefore suffering is not a strange chance but part of God's loving purpose (cf. iv. 12).

εὐρεθῆ may be taken with εἰς ἔπαινον = *result in praise*, etc., or better with πολιτιμότερον. The purity of your faith *discovered* by this trial by fire is a far more valuable discovery than that of the purity of refined gold. The discovery is made by God as the refiner.

ἔπαινον δόξαν τιμὴν might refer either to men or to God, that those who emerge from the trial will receive praise, glory and honour from God, or that the approved character of His children will redound



to God's own glory. Possibly both ideas are included, for God is always glorified when men attain His loving purpose.

**ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (objective genitive). The phrase is certainly sometimes used of the final revelation of Christ at the Second Advent (cf. 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7; and (?) Rev. i. 1).

The absence of the article does not preclude the meaning "the revelation of Jesus Christ," because where the noun in the genitive is anarthrous the noun which governs it frequently becomes anarthrous also, e.g. *θελήματι θεοῦ*, iv. 2, but *τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ*, iii. 17; cf. *δι' ἀναστάσεως* Ἰ. X., i. 3; *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, i. 20.

But that final revelation is only the climax of a long series of progressive revelations whenever Christ is revealed *to* or *in* any of His members (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 1; Gal. i. 12, 16; and (?) Rev. i. 1), and this thought is not excluded here though it culminates in the final revelation. So there are many "comings of the Son of Man" in various crises of history but all lead up to His final Coming.

**8. οὐκ ἰδόντες** states a historical fact that they had not seen Christ in the flesh as St Peter himself had done (cf. Jn xx. 29).

**μὴ ὁρῶντες** describes their present condition, *though (for the present) you cannot see Him*. No stress can be laid on the distinction between *οὐ* and *μὴ*, though some would explain *μὴ* as suggesting the mental condition of the readers.

**εἰς δὲν** must be taken with *πιστεύοντες*. *πιστεῦεν εἰς* is the commonest construction in the N.T., and almost the only one used by St Peter and St John. It means faith which *enters into union with Christ*.

**ἀνεκλαλήτω** occurs only here in the N.T., a joy which is too deep for utterance.

**δεδοξασμένη**. The Christian's joy even in the midst of sorrow is irradiated by the unseen glory of heaven.

#### *Suffering and Glory.*

**δόξα** (S. and H. *Rom.* p. 84). "There are two quite distinct meanings of this word. (1) = opinion (not in N.T.) and thence 'favourable opinion,' 'reputation' (Jn xii. 43; Rom. ii. 7, 10, etc.). (2) As a LXX. translation of **כְּבוֹד** it means:

"(1) Visible brightness or splendour (Acts xxii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 40).

"(2) The brightness which radiates from the presence of God, e.g. at Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 16), the pillar of cloud (Ex. xvi. 10), or in the Tabernacle or Temple (Ex. xl. 34; 1 Kings viii. 11), especially on the Mercy Seat (Ex. xxv. 22; so Rom. ix. 4).

“(3) This visible splendour symbolized the divine perfections, the majesty or goodness of God as manifested to men (Lightfoot on Col. i. 11; cf. Eph. i. 6, 12, 17; iii. 16).

“(4) These perfections are in a measure communicated to man through Christ (2 Cor. iii. 18; iv. 6). Both morally and physically a certain transfiguration takes place in the Christian partially here, completely hereafter.”

The incarnate Christ was not only the revelation of God to man, He also revealed man to himself, shewing what God's ideal for man is. Man was created to be the *δόξα* and *εἰκὼν* of God (1 Cor. xi. 7), but in his present condition man comes terribly far short of the glory intended for him by God (Rom. iii. 23).

Although man was intended to be crowned with glory and honour (Ps. viii. 5) it is only in the person of Christ that this has been attained (Heb. ii. 9), “In Him little by little under the conditions of human existence the absolute ideal of manhood was revealed.” So it is only “Christ in us” which constitutes “the hope of glory,” the possibility of attaining the divine ideal for man (Col. i. 27), Jesus Christ is our glory (Jas. ii. 1). The revelation of the sons of God (as they were meant to be) for which the created universe waits is the revelation of the glory intended for us (Rom. viii. 18—21).

But it was only through suffering that manhood in the person of Christ entered into glory. That was the pathway to glory indicated in O.T. prophecy. In such descriptions as that of the Suffering Servant of the Lord the prophets were pointing to (*eis*) Christ, describing sufferings destined for Him (cf. Acts ii. 25, *αὐτὸ λέγει εἰς ἀθρόν*; cf. Eph. v. 32; Heb. vii. 14), but those sufferings are straight-way followed by corresponding stages in the attainment of glory, *τὰς μετὰ τὰῦτα δόξας*. The plural probably denotes successive manifestations of glory, *e.g.* in the Betrayal (Jn xiii. 31) when the ideal of self-sacrifice was revealed, in the Cross (Jn xii. 23) when the fruitfulness of such sacrifice was shewn, in the Resurrection as the victory over death (1 Pet. i. 21), in the Ascension as the enthronement of manhood with God (Jn vii. 39), and finally in His triumphant Return completed in all His members (Col. iii. 4).

The same pathway of suffering is employed by God in bringing His other sons to glory, *i.e.* to their ideal perfection. It is only by suffering with Christ that we can be glorified with Him (Rom. viii. 17; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 10—12). The light affliction which is but for a moment worketh for us a far more exceeding weight of glory (2 Cor. iv. 17). Present sufferings are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed (Rom. viii. 18). So St Peter regards the trials of

Christians as a refining process which will result in glory at the revelation of Jesus Christ (i. 7).

Fellowship in Christ's sufferings should be a cause of joy that they may rejoice with exultation at the revelation of His glory (iv. 13). To be reproached in Christ's name means that a mark or characteristic of the glory which is one day to be theirs (*τὸ τῆς δόξης*) is already resting upon them (iv. 14).

It is as a *μάρτυς* of Christ's sufferings that St Peter is a partaker of the glory which is to be revealed (v. 1). It is the God of all favour who called them to His eternal glory in Christ after a little suffering (v. 10). So the joy which Christians should have in the midst of their trials and griefs is *δεδοξασμένη*, already irradiated with the glory to which such sufferings really belong (i. 8).

9. *κομίζόμενοι*. The middle voice denotes either receiving back a possession, Matt. xxv. 27, or receiving a promised gift, Heb. x. 36, xi. 39, and probably xi. 19, that Abraham received his long promised son figuratively out of death because his own body and that of Sarah were "as good as dead," or receiving a reward earned, 2 Cor. v. 10; Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 25; 1 Pet. v. 4.

So here by faith in the long prepared *σωτηρία* Christians do receive already some of the blessings of that *σωτηρία* which is the goal of that faith—namely, the deliverance, the passage from death into life of man's true self, the divine life or soul of which his bodily life is but the image.

*τῆς πίστεως*. The insertion of the article does not necessarily mean "your faith" nor "the Faith" in the sense of the doctrines of the Christian Faith, although the faith which is implied certainly means Christian faith in God's mercy through Christ.

A noun in the genitive governed by another noun bearing an article generally takes the article. But *τῆς πίστεως* in vv. 7 and 9 may refer back to *διὰ πίστεως* in v. 5 = *the above-named faith*; cf. Rom. iii. 29, *ἐκ πίστεως... διὰ τῆς πίστεως*; Jas. ii. 14, 15, *πίστω... ἡ πίστις*.

10. Plumptre (*Camb. Bible*, 1 Pet., p. 98) and others would explain the passage which follows as referring to New Testament prophets or preachers of the first days of the Church, who constantly uttered inspired warnings of a coming time of persecution for Christians which would be followed by glory. Such persecution however did not come immediately, and so the prophets gradually realized that their message was not for their own generation. Now however their warnings are being fulfilled in the Neronian persecution. In support of this view it is urged that "*the Spirit of Christ*" would be more

appropriate to Christian prophets than to those of the O.T. and that τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα means sufferings of Christians as members of Christ which pass on to Him as their Head. But this interpretation is somewhat unnatural; moreover St Peter had himself been one of the earliest preachers of the Church, and he distinctly contrasts the ministry of the prophets with the proclamation which is now made by the Mission of the Holy Spirit. The reference is probably to the numerous passages in the O.T., especially in the later prophets, which predicted the admission of the Gentiles (τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος, the free favour of God as reaching unto you Gentiles).

χάρις (see Robinson, *Eph.* pp. 221 ff.) is specially used by St Paul (a) in connexion with his own mission as the apostle to the Gentiles, (b) of the Gentiles as the recipients of the Universal Gospel.

So in Acts it is used eight times in passages which deal with the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles. "The surprising mercy of God, by which those who had been wholly outside the privileged circle were now the recipients of the divine favour, seems to have called for a new and impressive name which might be the watchword of the larger dispensation."

It is in this sense that St Peter uses the word here. He may have in mind the numerous O.T. passages quoted by St Paul (Rom. ix., x., xv.) to shew that the inclusion of Gentiles was always contemplated.

Such predictions were accompanied by solemn asseverations of sufferings destined for the (coming) Messiah, τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα, yet each prophecy of suffering was crowned with a prophecy of subsequent glory; cf. Lk. xxiv. 26, "Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into His glory" was the lesson which our Lord expounded from the Scriptures to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus.

ἐκζητεῖν, to seek out; ἐξερυνᾶν, to search by minute investigation.

προφῆται. Even prophets, despite their divine mission, were less privileged than Christians. They sought and searched for the full meaning of God's messages which they delivered. Now that meaning is fully proclaimed, cf. Matt. xiii. 17.

11. εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν, searching (to discover) what or what manner of season was pointed to (εἰς). If God withheld from them the precise time when His promises were to be fulfilled, they desired at least to know whether it was to be in the immediate or only in the distant future.

πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ can hardly mean "the Spirit which spake of

Christ," taking *Χριστοῦ* as an objective genitive. Nor is it likely to mean merely the Spirit which in after days dwelt in Christ. It might mean the Spirit belonging to or proceeding from Christ Himself. Certainly the Holy Spirit is described as *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*, Rom. viii. 9; *πνεῦμα* 'I. X., Phil. i. 19; *πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ*, Acts xvi. 7; *πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ*, Gal. iv. 6. In Jn i. 9, 10, the Logos is described as having been all along in the world; a light was coming into the world to lighten every man. So Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 36, describes the prophets as moved by the divine Logos and sometimes speaking in the person of Christ, *ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ*; and Clem. Al. *adv. Haer.* iv. 7. 2, says: *Qui adventum Christi prophetaverunt revelationem acceperunt ab ipso Filio.*

According to this interpretation Christ is described as inspiring the prophets by His Spirit to predict the sufferings destined for Himself.

But (see Hort, p. 52) we must remember that *Χριστός*, with or without the article, was not originally a proper name, but a title, "Messiah," "the Lord's Anointed," and, although Jesus Christ was *the* Messiah, the nation, the kings, and the prophets were also the Lord's anointed; cf. Ps. cv. 15, "Touch not mine anointed (*τῶν χριστῶν μου*) and do my prophets no harm." Similarly in language which our Lord afterwards applied to Himself the prophet in describing his own mission, Is. lxi. 1 ff., says, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He anointed me" (*ἐχρισέν με*). In this sense the prophets shared in the Messiahship of their Divine Master, and the Spirit which spake by them was the Spirit of the Lord's anointed, *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*.

*ἐδήλου προμαρτυρόμενον* should probably be coupled together. *δηλοῦν* does not necessarily mean "to make plain." The prophets were only able to discover part of what was meant. The word is used of making a communication to a person (1 Cor. i. 11; Col. i. 8), or of signifying or implying something indirectly (Heb. ix. 8, xii. 27).

*μαρτύρεσθαι* means literally "to call to witness," so "to protest" as in the presence of witnesses; cf. Gal. v. 3; Eph. iv. 17, *μαρτύρομαι ἐν Κυρίῳ*. So here the sense seems to be that the Spirit which spake by the prophets asseverated in God's name, "Thus saith the Lord."

*τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα* does not merely mean "the sufferings of Christ," cf. v. 1, but "sufferings destined for the Messiah," cf. *τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος* just above; cf. *εἰς ὑμᾶς*, v. 4; or "pointing to" Christ, cf. Acts ii. 25, *Δαυεὶδ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν*. The sufferings described by the Prophets (*e.g.* Ps. xxii., and esp. Is. liii.) only received their fulfilment in Christ.

In one sense the sufferings of O. T. saints were unconsciously on Christ's behalf, and as it were "passed on" to Him (cf. Moses bearing the reproach of Christ, Heb. xi. 26), just as Christians now "fill up what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ," Col. i. 24, but it may be doubted whether St Peter intended to include that thought.

12. οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη. In answer to their searching enquiry the prophets, says St Peter, though "it was not for them to know the times and seasons which the Father set within His own authority," were nevertheless permitted to realize that the messages which they were delivering as God's *ministers* (δικηόνου) were not for their own times or their own people only, but that the manifestation of Messiah belonged to the far future and to all mankind. The teaching of the prophets had of course a *primary* message for their own times, but this did not exhaust its meaning.

ἄνθ' means the Christian dispensation as contrasted with the earlier age of the prophets.

ἀνηγγέλη. The word occurs in Is. liii. 15, οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ὄψονται, a passage which St Paul applies to his own missionary work among the Gentiles, Rom. xv. 21, and so here St Peter, in thinking of the announcement to Gentiles, perhaps borrowed the word from St Paul. The verb ἀναγγέλλειν in the N. T. retains its proper classical meaning of *announcing in detail*. So here the several facts of the Gospel and the implicit teachings and hopes involved in them are announced by Christian teachers.

ὑμῖν. The T. R. reads ἡμῖν, which would mean "us Christians," but all the best MSS. read ὑμῖν, which suggests the Gentiles.

διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς, *by the agency of those who gladdened you with good tidings*. εὐαγγελίσασθαι is used with an acc. of the person in Lk. and Acts, where the subject of the message is not given, otherwise the dative is used. The preachers referred to would include St Paul, Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, Epaphras (see Col.), and others whose names are unknown, but St Peter does not definitely claim any personal share in the work, and we have no evidence that he had ever visited Asia Minor.

πνεύματι ἀγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ. The T. R. has ἐν, an early Alexandrian interpolation, and the simple dative is almost unique. The "dynamic" dative describes that *in virtue of which* a thing exists or is done. The "instrumental" sense is only one aspect of this. πνεῦμα ἅγιον without the article might mean *one who is none other than a spirit of holiness* (cf. Heb. i. 2, ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ = one who is a Son and no mere prophet). It was the same Holy Spirit who "spoke by the prophets," but the mode of His operation

was different. The outpouring of the Spirit, His mission to the world as *sent* (*ἀποσταλέντι*) by the Son from the Father did not take place until after the Ascension, cf. Jn vii. 39, *οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐπω ἐδοξάσθη*.

**παρακύψαι.** *κύπτειν* and its compounds are used of bending the body up, down, or forwards, e.g. *κύψας*=stooping down, *συγκύπτειν*=to be bowed together, *ἀνακύπτειν*=to straighten oneself or look up. So *παρακύπτειν* means to stretch the head forward to look into or down upon something. It is used of St John "peeping into" the tomb (Jn xx. 5) and again in Jas. i. 25 of a man who "glances into the perfect law of liberty." So in the *Book of Henoch* (ix. i. p. 83, ed. Dillm.), from which St Peter may be borrowing here, it is used of the four archangels "looking down" upon the earth out of the sanctuary of heaven.

The angels are described as spectators of the Christian's conflict in 1 Cor. iv. 9, *θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν...ἀγγέλοις*. They rejoice over one sinner that repents, Lk. xv. 10. They were watching the unfolding of the mystery of God's loving purpose for the world in the Incarnation (*ᾧφθῃ ἀγγέλοις*, 1 Tim. iii. 16). So here the admission of the Gentiles is a further unfolding of that mystery pointing forward to "the final consummation of all things," and each stage is watched with eager longing eyes by God's angels as they "look down" upon the world. Similarly in Eph. iii. 10 St Paul says that the admission of the Gentiles into the Church is a making known of the manifold wisdom of God to principalities and powers in heavenly places.

This thought adds dignity to the position of Christians as God's "chosen people." Their "election" is due to the Father's foreknowledge, it is effected by the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, and sealed by the sprinkled blood of Christ as the covenant victim. They are begotten to a new life by the resurrection. A glorious inheritance is theirs. Their salvation was no new thing—no afterthought. It was the subject of anxious search on the part of the prophets who foretold it, and its future development is watched by angels with eager anticipation.

#### INTRODUCTORY EXHORTATION FOUNDED UPON THE BENEDICTION.

##### i. 13—ii. 10.

13—25. The new life of hope, faith and privilege to which you have 13 been begotten involves corresponding responsibilities on your part. You must gird up the loins of your mind in readiness for active service, have all your faculties under perfect command, and set your

hope upon God's favour which is ever being brought to you in the  
14 progressive unveiling to you of Jesus Christ. Remember that as  
God's children you are pledged to hearken to His voice and follow  
His guidance. You must not follow the fashion of your old heathen  
days, when you had no rule of life beyond your own erratic impulses.  
15 You have been called by the Holy One, therefore you yourselves also  
16 must shew yourselves to be holy in all your dealings. The ideal  
which God has laid down for you is nothing less than to imitate Him.  
17 You must not presume upon your sonship (any more than might the  
Jews). In addressing God as "Our Father" you must remember  
that He is also your Judge. Under the New Covenant as under the  
Old, He will shew no favouritism to the children of the covenant if  
their works prove them to be unworthy of favour. Do not then be  
over confident or reckless. In all your sojourning as strangers in the  
world your dealings with those around you must be regulated by a  
sense of responsibility, by a reverent fear of being untrue to your high  
18 position. You are God's ransomed people rescued (like Israel from  
Egypt) from the slavery of your old vain heathen life, a slavery  
intensified by the inherited instincts and habits of past centuries of  
ancestors. Remember how much your deliverance cost. It was no  
19 perishable ransom of silver or gold. It was nothing less than the  
inestimably precious Blood of Christ, who is our true Paschal Lamb,  
20 without inherent blemish or external stain of sin, a victim designated  
by God before the foundation of the world, but only manifested in  
the fulness of time at the end of the long series of periods of  
21 preparation for the sake of you Gentiles who through Him are  
faithful as resting upon God who raised Him from the dead and  
crowned Him with glory. God Himself then is the centre and object  
22 not only of your faith but also of your hope. In your conversion and  
your Baptism you profess, by virtue of the obedience which springs  
from your possession of the truth, to have purified and consecrated  
your souls to enter into the spirit of your sonship by unfeigned love  
from the heart for your brethren in Christ. Fulfil that vow of  
consecration then by loving one another, not fitfully but with  
23 strenuous and steady earnestness. A living and abiding love such as  
that is alone consistent with the new life into which you have been  
begotten. Your character, your love, ought to conform to the seed  
from which you are sprung, and that seed is no transient, perishable  
thing; it is incorruptible, it is the Word of God who liveth and  
24 abideth for ever. For (to apply to you the prophet's message  
assuring exiled Israel of the certainty of God's promise of deliverance  
despite the weakness of all human hopes) the natural life of



heathenism is perishable like grass, its brightness and attractiveness is as transient as that of flowers, it soon withers and wastes, but the word of Jehovah abideth for ever. And that word, originally spoken to Israel, is the message of good tidings which was extended to you Gentiles.

13. **Ἰδοὺ** sums up all the preceding verses=on the strength of such a position of privilege and dignity.

**ἀναζωσάμενοι.** Girding up the loins is a symbol of prompt readiness for active service as opposed to slackness and indolent heedlessness. So our Lord told His disciples that they must have their loins girded as servants waiting for their lord (Lk. xii. 35), but **ἀναζ.** only occurs here and in Prov. xxxi. 17.

As St Peter in v. 18 describes his readers as "ransomed" by the Blood of the true passover lamb, it is possible that he may also have in mind the direction to Israel to "have their loins girded" at the first Passover (Ex. xii. 11) in readiness to avail themselves of the deliverance and start on their journey to inherit the Promised Land. So Christians need to brace up their minds, otherwise their hope will not be set towards the favour which is being brought to them, and they may forfeit the deliverance and the inheritance.

**νήφοντες τελείως.** *τελείως* is generally joined with the following word *ἐλπίζατε*; so A.V. *hope to the end*, R.V. *set your hope perfectly on*. But St Peter's usual custom is to join adverbs with the preceding word, and so it is better here to translate *being perfectly sober*.

The Christian must not only have his mind braced for action (*ἀναζωσάμενοι*), but all his faculties must be under perfect control, with no confusion, no unhealthy excitement.

**ἐπι.** *Set your hope in the direction of.* You must turn to God's free favour to you as the ground upon which your hope of glory must rest.

**φερομένην.** The word is used in Acts ii. 2 of the "rushing mighty wind." Here the idea seems to be that God's loving favour is continually being conveyed to mankind in the ever-widening, ever-deepening revelation of Jesus Christ in the expansion of the Church and the daily life and experience of the Christian. But in this life we only see Him "in a glass darkly," but one day the veil will be entirely removed and we shall see Him "face to face."

14. **ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς.** The form of the expression is a Hebraism (cf. sons of Belial), but (as in the parallel passage, Eph. ii. 2, *τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας*) the phrase is used by St Peter to mean more than merely "obedient children." "Children of obedience" are those who belong to obedience as a child to its mother. The impulses and principles

which mould their lives are derived from it, and they are the representatives or exponents of it to others. To have been "begotten again" by God (v. 3) demands the character of obedience on the part of His covenant children. They must ever listen to His voice and follow His guidance, striving to be like their Father.

**μὴ συνσχηματιζόμενοι.** The word is a late and rare one, and only occurs again in Rom. xii. 2 (where it is contrasted with μεταμορφοῦσθαι). σχῆμα denotes the *outward changeable fashion* in contrast with μορφή, the *permanent and essential form*; cf. Phil. iii. 21. So here conduct which is ruled by capricious desires has no consistent inner principle or fixed pattern (μορφή), but is unstable and at the mercy of transient outward circumstances, "the fashion (σχῆμα) of this world which passeth away" (1 Cor. vii. 31).

**ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν.** In St Peter's speech, Acts iii. 17, ἀγνοία is used to describe the condition of the *Jews* in rejecting and crucifying Christ, but it is much more commonly used of the *heathen* world, cf. Acts xvii. 30; Eph. iv. 18. So here St Peter is probably contrasting the present condition of his readers with their former condition as heathen when they had no knowledge of God on which to model their lives.

**15. κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον** (cf. Eph. i. 4, iv. 1, v. 1, etc.). *After the model of Him that called you, Who is holy.* Here we have the true model (εἰκὼν) to which men's lives are to be conformed (σύμμορφοι, cf. Rom. viii. 29; Col. iii. 10). The original purpose of God in creation was that man made in His image should grow into His likeness. "By divers portions and in divers manners" culminating in the Incarnation the divine likeness has been gradually revealed, and those who are "called" into covenanted relationship with God are bidden to be "imitators of God as beloved children," Eph. v. 1.

ἅγιος, like the Hebrew שֶׁדֶּה, meant originally "set apart," distinct from ordinary things. It was at first applied to persons (e.g. Ex. xxii. 31), places (Ex. iii. 5, etc.) or things (1 Kings vii. 51) which were "set apart" for religious use, regarded as being connected with the presence or service of God. It is not easy to decide how the same word came also to be applied to God Himself. Some would suggest that it was because God was regarded as "set apart," separated from what was common or unclean. Others think that as things set apart for God were required to be without stain or blemish, the word ἅγιος applied to them acquired the meaning of "pure," "unblemished," and, as applied to persons, moral purity as well as physical would gradually be understood as being necessary. In this

sense (the idea of "set apart" being lost sight of) the word might be applied to God. And in proportion as the conception of God became elevated and purified so the idea of God's Holiness would acquire a more awful purity (*e.g.* Is. vi. 3). But in either case, when once the word *ἅγιος* had come to be applied to God, the idea of what "holiness" must mean in God would react upon all the lower applications of the word to men. Those who claimed a special relationship to God would be understood as requiring to have a moral character conformable to that of God.

Generally in the N.T. the title *ἅγιος* describes the Christian's privilege, as one whom God has "set apart" for Himself, rather than the Christian's character. But such consecration to God demands a corresponding character, and here St Peter emphasizes that demand by quoting the standard laid down in the "Law of Holiness," "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy," Lev. xi. 44, 45, xix. 2. In the former passage the words are connected with things which were to be regarded as clean or unclean, but in the latter they are connected with various moral laws.

**γενήθητε.** *Shew yourselves to be, prove yourselves* worthy of the title which you claim in every detail of your dealings with other men. *ἀναστροφή* = your converse or intercourse with those around you.

17. **εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε.** *If ye invoke as Father.* *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* in the middle does not mean merely to call a person by a certain name or title, but to *invoke* or *appeal to for aid*. It is the word used by St Paul, Acts xxv. 11, "I appeal unto Caesar," and of St Stephen appealing and saying, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," Acts vii. 59. Here there is very probably an allusion to the invocation of God as "Our Father" in the Lord's prayer. But the words may also be borrowed from Jer. iii. 19, where some MSS. of the LXX. read *εἰ πατέρα καλεῖσθέ (or ἐπικαλεῖσθέ) με*, though the best text is *εἶπα Πατέρα καλέσετέ με*.

The sense of sonship which allows us to invoke God as "Our Father" "in the words which Christ Himself hath taught us" does not warrant any presumption on our part. We must not forget that God is also "the Judge of all the earth."

**ἀπροσωπολήπτως.** The adverb occurs nowhere else in the Greek Bible, but the adjective is used by the Fathers, and the substantive *προσωπολήπτως* occurs in St Peter's speech to Cornelius, Acts x. 34, and *προσωποληψία* in Rom. ii. 11 with reference to God. It is not a classical word, but is based upon the Hebrew נָשָׂא פָּנָי, *to receive the face of*, so to favour a person, either in a good sense *to receive favourably* or in a bad sense of undue favour,

partiality. As applied to God in the N.T., it is generally used with reference to His dealings with Jews and Gentiles, that both are treated alike by Him. But, on the other hand, equality of favour implies impartiality of judgment for all. The children of the new covenant will not be treated with undue leniency if their works prove them to be unworthy of God's favour any more than were the children of the old covenant, as they were warned by Moses, Deut. x. 17.

**κρίνοντα.** The present participle may be a reminder that God's judgment is not merely future but continually exercised, or it may be merely a descriptive participle.

**κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον** (cf. Rom. ii. 6 ff.). Every man, whether he be Jew, Gentile or heathen, is judged according to the sum of his personal actions in thought, word and deed.

**ἐν φόβῳ.** The thought of God as "Our Father" can give us hope and love, but the reminder that He is also our Judge should inspire us with reverent fear. Not the shrinking fear of the slave (Rom. viii. 15), for that is "cast out" by perfect love (1 Jn iv. 18), not the fear of the coward (1 Pet. iii. 14), but the fear of being untrue to God, which makes a man bold in the face of all other dangers (Matt. x. 28 ||).

**παροικίας.** In one sense these Asiatic Christians were *sojourners* among a heathen population with whom they were brought into constant intercourse (*ἀναστράφητε*). In another sense all Christians are men whose true "citizenship is in heaven" (Phil. iii. 20). This world is not their home, but only the place of their temporary sojourn.

18. **εἰδότες.** The thought of what their deliverance has cost increases the responsibility of Christians to "walk worthily."

**λυτρώθητε, ἡμεῖς** were *ransomed*. The word is used of deliverance from slavery or from exile, e.g. of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt (Ex. vi. 6, xv. 13, etc.). So St Stephen speaks of Moses as *λυτρωτής*. Again Isaiah lii. 3, speaking of the deliverance from Babylon, says, *ὁ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε*. In Lk. ii. 38 Anna "spoke of Jesus to all those that were looking for the redemption (*λύτρωσιν*) of Jerusalem" (B.V.), referring to the Messianic kingdom as the deliverance from foreign rule; cf. Lk. xxiv. 21, "We hoped that it was He which should redeem (*λυτρώσθαι*) Israel." Similarly Christians are to welcome the signs of the coming of the Son of Man as a token that their *redemption* draweth nigh, i.e. their deliverance, Lk. xxi. 28. So sin is regarded as a state of slavery from which man needs deliverance, and in Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, St Paul defines *ἀπολύτρωσις* as *ἄφεσις παραπτωμάτων* or *ἁμαρτιῶν*, *letting go free from sins*, and in Titus ii. 14 he says that "Christ Jesus gave Himself on

our behalf that he might *redeem* (λυτρώσῃται) from all iniquity and purify unto himself a people for his own possession," just as Israel were made God's "peculiar people" by being "purchased and redeemed of old." So here St Peter regards the old heathen life of his readers as a state of slavery from which they have been ransomed. But besides the mere idea of rescue or deliverance the word λυτροῦσθαι suggests also deliverance by the payment of a ransom by another, and the ransom given for man's deliverance from the slavery of sin was the life-blood of Christ Himself; cf. Matt. xx. 28; Mk x. 45, "The Son of Man came...to give His life a ransom for many" (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν); cf. 1 Tim. ii. 6, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. So here the blood, as representing the surrendered life, is the ransom; cf. Rev. i. 5, "to him that loosed us (λύσαντι, not λούσαντι = washed, as T.R.) from our sins (ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ) at the price of his own blood." We must not, however, over-press the metaphor and ask to whom the ransom was paid. Most of the early Fathers regarded the ransom as paid to the devil as being the slave-owner. Such a thought is abhorrent to us, yet the other suggested alternative that the price was paid to the Father would imply that the Father's pardon required to be bought, whereas "God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son," and in one passage (Acts xx. 28) the Father Himself seems to be described as the ransomer or purchaser. Cf. Rev. xiv. 3, 4.

ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς. This is the state of slavery out of which (ἐκ) they were rescued.

ματαίας. The adjective is used in 1 Kings xvi. 13, 2 Kings xvii. 15, of idolatry; so in Acts xiv. 15 Paul and Barnabas speak of turning ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαίων, i.e. idolatrous practices, and St Paul speaks of the heathen as walking ἐν ματαιότητι, Eph. iv. 27.

μάταιος = aimless, purposeless, and describes the futility of life without God.

πατροπαράδοτου. This word has been used as an argument that the readers had been Jews, whose παράδοσις is frequently spoken of disparagingly in the N.T., but the word would be equally applicable to Gentiles. Their ancestral heathenism was intensified by the accumulated habits of centuries.

19. ἄμνου. Cf. Jn i. 29. The reference is most probably to the pasover lamb, which, though not actually the ransom paid for deliverance from Egypt, was closely connected with that deliverance and did redeem the firstborn of Israel from the destroying angel. So the regulation about the paschal lamb, "Not a bone of him shall be broken," was applied to our Lord in Jn xix. 36, and in 1 Cor. v. 7

St Paul says Christ our Passover (*i.e.* paschal lamb) is sacrificed for us, and in Rev. xv. 3 the Song of the Lamb is associated with the Song of Moses.

**ἄμωμος**, *without blemish*. There was an old Greek word μῶμος, meaning *blame*, from which a poetical word, ἄμωμος, *blameless*, was derived, but this is not the meaning in the Bible. The word μῶμος in the LXX. was borrowed to translate the Hebrew word מִטְמָא (mîtm) = *blemish*. So when an adjective was needed to translate the word מְצֻה = *perfect, free from blemish*, an adjective ἀμωμος was formed from μῶμος. The word is used again of Christ as an unblemished sacrifice in Heb. ix. 14; of Christians in Eph. i. 4, Col. i. 22, Phil. ii. 15 *v.l.*, Jude 24; of the Church, Eph. v. 27; and of those that follow the Lamb, Rev. xiv. 5.

**ἄσπιλος** = *without spot*; cf. 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Pet. iii. 14; Jas. i. 27. Christ was free alike from inherent blemish and from external defilement.

20. **προεγνωσμένου** = *designated beforehand* as God's appointed agent. This was true not only of the Messiah as the long-expected King, but also of the suffering Messiah, the Lamb. This is the usual interpretation of Rev. xiii. 8, "whose name hath not been written in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world" (ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου), but see R. V. margin.

In Eph. i. 4 God is described as having chosen us in Christ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and one factor in the execution of God's purpose is "redemption by Christ's blood." Again, in Matt. xxv. 34, the Kingdom is said to have been prepared for God's children ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and in Rev. v. 9 the Lamb slain is said to have purchased men for God of every nation to be a kingdom and priests by His blood. In St Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost Jesus is described as being delivered up (ἐκδοσον) by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge (προγνώσει) of God, Acts ii. 23.

**φανερωθέντος**. The eternal purpose of God was not *manifested* to the world until the "fulness of the times" was come; cf. 1 Tim. ii. 6 and Rom. xvi. 25, 26.

**ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων**, *at the end of the times*, cf. καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, v. 5. The Christian dispensation is regarded as the climax for which all the earlier periods of God's dealings with the world were preparatory. Cf. 1 Cor. x. 11, the story of Israel in the wilderness was written "for our admonition upon whom the ends of the ages are come"; Heb. i. 2, God has spoken to us by the Son, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων; ix. 26, Christ sacrificed Himself "at the end of the ages," ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων.

21. **ὅτι ὑμᾶς**, for the sake of you Gentiles, cf. Eph. iii. 5; Rom. xvi. 26. The revelation of Christ was made for your sake, because it is through Christ that you are enabled to be *faithful as resting upon God* (πιστῶς εἰς θεόν). πιστῶς in the LXX. never means "believing" or trustful, but is used to translate the Hebrew word **יָסַד** = firm, secure. As applied to persons, a firm friend is one who is *trustworthy*, and so πιστῶς acquired the meaning *trustworthy, faithful*. But in the N.T. the active use of πίστις, viz. *belief*, is much more common than the passive trustworthiness, fidelity, and so the adjective πιστῶς is occasionally used in the sense of *believing*—e.g. six times in the Pastoral Epp., possibly also in Eph. i. 1 and Col. i. 1—and with a new application of Abraham's old title in Gal. iii. 9. It is also used in the sense of a *believer* as opposed to ἀπίστος, an unbeliever, in Jn xx. 27; 2 Cor. vi. 15; and without ἀπίστος in Acts xvi. 1. But there is no instance of πιστῶς in the sense of *believing*, followed by a preposition. So here Hort would translate "faithful as resting on God" rather than *believers in God* (as the R.V.). If St Peter had intended this he would have written πιστεύοντας, which is the reading of the T.R. Moreover, in that case, the words which follow at the end of the verse would be a meaningless repetition. The remembrance that death led to resurrection and glory in the case of Christ enables the Christian to be "faithful unto death" as leading to the crown of life; cf. Heb. ii. 9, Jesus is crowned with glory and honour *because of* the suffering of death, and this perfecting of the Captain of their salvation through sufferings befits God's purpose in bringing many sons to glory; cf. Rom. viii. 17.

ὥστε might be taken as a final particle = *in order that*, i.e. God's purpose in raising Christ to glory was that your faith and hope should be centred upon Himself. More probably it is here a consecutive particle = *so that*. St Peter sums up the *result* of all that he has said, and shews that God is the foundation and the goal of human faith and hope.

22. St Peter continues his exhortation, which has been interrupted by a reminder to his readers of their high privilege (vv. 18—21).

**ἡγνικότες**. The adjective ἄγνός in the O. T. means (a) *ceremonially pure*, free from defilement; (b) *morally pure*, which is its only meaning in the N.T. The verb ἀγνίζειν is nearly always used in the ceremonial sense in the O. T. and four times in the N.T., but here and in Jas iv. 8, 1 Jn iii. 3 it denotes *moral purification*. In accepting baptism, St Peter implies, you symbolized your cleansing from defilement, you consecrated yourselves to God's service. The

perfect participle denotes the abiding consequences of a past action. You profess to be men who have purified and consecrated themselves.

ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας, *in virtue of your obedience which is prompted by the truth*; cf. i. 2, ἐν ἀγιασμῶ...εἰς ὑπακοήν. Your old life was one of ignorance (i. 14). Now God has revealed the truth to you, and the possession of that truth, telling you of your sonship to God, sets before you a standard of obedience, "Be ye holy, for I am holy." Your self-consecration consists in and depends on your obedience to that standard. It is meaningless unless you are τέκνα ὑπακοῆς.

εἰς φιλαδελφίαν. Self-consecration as obedient children of God necessarily *pledges you to (eis) love of the brethren*. φιλαδελφία does not mean merely "brotherly love," but love of the Christian brotherhood; cf. ii. 17, and 1 Jn v. 1. There can be no true sonship of God without true brotherhood with the other children of "Our Father."

ἀνυπόκριτον. This love of our brethren in Christ must be no mere cant phrase, no unreal pretence. Cf. Rom. xii. 9, 2 Cor. vi. 6. It must spring from the heart and must be *intense (ἐκτενῶς)*, not fitful or capricious, but steady and strenuous. For ἐκτενής, applied to love, cf. iv. 8, and to prayer cf. Lk. xxii. 44, Acts xii. 5; cf. also Acts xxvi. 7.

23. ἀναγεγεννημένοι; cf. i. 3, the only other place where the word occurs. The verses which follow state the obligation and the source of Christian love. They have been brought into a new state of existence, they are born into a new divine sonship, and it is their common sonship which constitutes their new brotherhood with each other. Love is the essential characteristic of life derived from God, for "God is Love." The proof of true sonship is to inherit the Father's nature; cf. 1 Jn iv. 7, πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται. Christian love must be unfeigned (ἀνυπόκριτος) and earnest (ἐκτενής), because the seed from which it springs is nothing less than "the word of God who lives and abides for ever." The fruit of that seed therefore must also be "living" and "abiding," with no fading, no decay.

διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος. ζῶντος καὶ μένοντος are generally explained as agreeing with λόγου on the following grounds: (1) that the point of the quotation which follows is that the word (ῥῆμα) of God abideth for ever; (2) that some epithet is needed for λόγου, the seed of Christian life, as contrasted with φθαρτῆς σποράς; (3) that the phrase ζῶν λόγος occurs in Heb. iv. 12; cf. λόγια ζῶντα, Acts vii. 38 and Jn vi. 63, where our Lord says that His ῥήματα are ζωή.



On the other hand, the two epithets ζῶν and μένων are together applied to God in Dan. vi. 26, and the contrast with σπορά φθαρτή is even more marked by tracing the source of Christian life to the abiding life of God Himself.

Λόγου means more than the Gospel message by which these Asiatic Christians were converted. That is described as ῥῆμα at the end of v. 25. It means God's whole utterance of Himself in the Incarnation, in Scripture, in preaching, in the inward voice of conscience. In Jas i 18 the original creation of man is attributed to the λόγος ἀληθείας. The divine image was implanted in man, endowing him with a capacity for knowing God and hearing His voice. Here the reference is rather to man's new creation as a Christian (cf. Intro. p. lvi.).

24. διότι is used again to introduce a quotation in i. 16 and ii. 6.

The quotation is taken from Isaiah xl. 6—8, and agrees with the LXX. in omitting the words "because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it." But it differs from the LXX. (1) by inserting ὧς, (2) by substituting αὐτῆς for ἀνθρώπου, (3) by substituting Κυρίου for τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Possibly, however, all of these changes already existed in the LXX. text used by St Peter. In the T.R. the first two have been altered here to agree with the usual text of the LXX. The words originally referred to the message of hope to the exiles in Babylon. Human help is weak and perishable, but God's promise of restoration can never fail. Parts of the same passage are quoted in Jas i. 10—11 to shew the transitoriness of riches (see Intro. p. lvii.).

ἄνθος χόρτου means bright flowers such as the scarlet anemones which were characteristic of Palestine.

ἐξηράνη...ἐξέπεσον, the aorists are the LXX. rendering of the Hebrew perfect, which describes what has constantly been observed to happen. Accidentally this agrees with the classical idiom known as the "gnomic aorist," used in proverbial sayings, but the only instance of such a "gnomic aorist" in the N.T. is Jas i. 11, where the same passage of Isaiah is quoted in the context, and possibly in Jas i. 24.

St Peter is contrasting the transitory character of heathen life, despite its many attractions, with the new life offered by God.

τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθῆν εἰς ὑμᾶς. ῥῆμα is the spoken (or written) utterance of the λόγος or meaning which the speaker desires to convey. The Christian message, like that to the exiles in Babylon, is one of good tidings (εὐαγγελισθῆν) of deliverance, εἰς ὑμᾶς, extended to, the Gentiles.

## CHAPTER II

## ii. 1—10. GENERAL EXHORTATION CONTINUED.

1 If then such sincerity and strenuousness of love is demanded in the new life imparted by the word of the living and abiding God, you must put away everything which is inconsistent with such love, every kind and form of malice whether secret or open, all guile and  
2 hypocrisy, all evil-speaking. If, as you profess, you have been born again you must have the spirit of little children, nay of new-born  
3 babes at their mothers' breasts. If (as the Psalmist says) you have once tasted and seen how gracious the Lord is, you must crave for the milk which cannot be adulterated, milk to nourish the rational or  
4 spiritual element in your being, in order that thereby you may grow unto full salvation. You Gentiles (are not merely, as I said, the new  
"Dispersion"), you are brought in as "Proselytes," joined not only to a holy people but to the manifested Christ who is their Head. He is the stone which men rejected, but which with God is chosen and  
5 precious, and moreover a living stone, in union with whom you yourselves also as living stones are gradually being built up (not to form an earthly Temple in which the Most High can never truly dwell), but to form a spiritual shrine intended for a holy work of  
6 priesthood to offer up (not material but) spiritual sacrifices, acts of self-oblation to God for the service of the community and as such acceptable to God through Jesus Christ as your Mediator and Head.  
7 This is no new idea; it stands thus in writing in the words of Isaiah, "Behold I lay in Zion a stone that is elect, a corner-stone that is held precious, and he that believeth on it shall not be put to shame."  
8 Faith, therefore, is the condition laid down by the prophet for being united with the corner-stone, and having fulfilled that condition it is to you that the "preciousness" of that stone belongs (though it was  
9 laid in Zion and you are for the most part Gentiles). But for such as are disbelieving the prophet's words are also true. The judgment of worldly authorities who claim to be builders has been reversed. Christ, the stone whom they rejected, has become the head of the corner, and for them He is a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence, for they stumble at the word of God, rebelling against it. Yet even this stumbling, this rebellion, is no thwarting of God's purpose! It is part of His loving plan (to make room for the inclusion of you Gentiles that ultimately the Jews may be brought back) (cf. Rom.

xi. 11). But all the titles of honour addressed to Israel of old now 9 belong to you Christians. You are a chosen race, a body of priests in the service of the great King, a holy nation, a people whom God has made His own possession (as Malachi said) in order that you may tell forth the excellences of Him who called you out of the darkness of heathenism into His marvellous light. Aforetime you were not a 10 (chosen) people but now you are the people of God. Then you were not (special) recipients of God's mercy but now that mercy has been extended to you in your conversion.

1. ἀποθέμενοι οὖν. In the first three verses of this chapter St Peter shews (a) what must be put away (οὖν) as inconsistent with the strenuous love involved in the new life, (b) the spiritual hunger for divine food by which that life must be maintained and developed, and so in v. 4 reverts once more to the high privileges and corresponding responsibilities of the new Israel of God.

ἀποτίθεσθαι in the middle frequently suggests the idea of *stripping off*, like clothing, e.g. of the works of darkness to put on the armour of light, Rom. xiii. 12, or of the old self to put on the new, Eph. iv. 22. But in the parallel passage, Col. iii. 8—10, the *stripping off* (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι) of the old self is coupled with *putting away* (ἀπόθεσθε) of anger, malice, etc., and in Jas i. 21 (see Introduction, p. lvi.) and 1 Pet. iii. 21 ἀποτίθεσθαι and ἀπόθεσις are used of putting away filthiness. So here certain unhealthy humours must be got rid of from the system in order that the spiritual appetite necessary for growth unto salvation may assert itself.

κακία in classical Greek means vice in general as opposed to ἀρετή, virtue, but in the N.T. the word occurs generally as one of a list of vices and means *malice*. Malice of every kind, whether open or secret, deceit and unreality, envyings of the advantages enjoyed by others, and all varieties of evil-speaking among Christians are utterly inconsistent with unfeigned love of the brethren and fervent love from the heart.

2. ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη, as *new-born babes*. The words evidently refer to ἀναγεγεννημένοι in i. 23. βρέφη is nowhere else used in this figurative sense, the usual word employed being νήπιοι. ἀρτιγέννητα also occurs nowhere else. The phrase must not however be exaggerated as implying that the readers were very recent converts. Many of them must have been Christians of long standing.

γάλα. In 1 Cor. iii. 2 and Heb. v. 12 the necessity for a "milk diet" is referred to as a sign of immaturity incapable of digesting the more solid food to which mature (τέλειοι) Christians ought to advance, but no such idea is intended here. There is a true sense in which the

Christian should never grow out of infancy. As our Lord said, Matt. xviii. 3, "Except ye become as little children (*παιδία*) ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," and in 1 Cor. xiv. 20 St Paul bids his readers *τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε*, cf. Ep. ad Diog. App. 11, *Οὗτος ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὁ καινὸς φαρεῖς καὶ παλαιὸς εὐρεθεῖς, καὶ παντὸτε νέος ἐν ἁγίῳ καρδίας γεννώμενος*. So here Christians, whatever may be their standing, are to retain the simple innocent cravings of a babe at his mother's breast who desires no other food.

*λογικὸν γάλα* can hardly be translated *milk of the word* as in the A.V. It means milk to feed your reason (*λόγος*). So R.V. *spiritual milk*. *Λόγος* in Greek has a double meaning, (1) word, (2) reason, but there is no instance of the latter use in the Bible. Even the *Λόγος* doctrine in Jn i. 1 is probably not the same as that in Philo where it includes both the wisdom of God and God's utterance of Himself or Word. In St John it probably represents merely the Word of God, *i.e.* the medium of communication with the world, which was regularly used in the Targums in passages where God is described in the O.T. as speaking or appearing to men. On the other hand *λογικός* in the sense of "rational," though not so used in Plato and Aristotle, was a favourite word with the Stoics and passed into common use—*e.g.* in Philo. In later ecclesiastical writers ἡ *λογικὴ ψυχὴ* denotes the highest element in the soul—*τὸ πνεῦμα*.

The only other passage in the N.T. where *λογικός* occurs is in Rom. xii. 1, where Christians are bidden to present their bodies as "a living sacrifice to God which is their reasonable service," *λογικὴν λατρείαν*, *i.e.* rational service as contrasted with the offering of an irrational animal. As St Peter also three verses later goes on to speak of Christians "offering up spiritual sacrifices," it is probable that the passage in Romans was in his mind, and from it he may have borrowed *λογικόν* in a sense unsupported by any Biblical use of *λόγος*. At the same time his immediately preceding language about Christians being begotten again by the word of God (*λόγου*) was probably suggested by St James' language about the word of truth as the origin of man's creation followed by an instruction to receive the *ἐμφυτον λόγον*. St Peter may therefore mean that the *λογικόν* or spiritual element in man, deriving its new birth as it does from the *Λόγος* of God, is also fed by the *Λόγος*, just as a mother feeds her babe at her own breast. So Clement (*Paed.* i. 6, p. 127) says, "He who regenerated us nourishes us with His own milk, the Word, for everything which gives birth to aught else seems at once to supply nourishment to its own offspring." In this case, although *λογικόν γάλα* cannot be translated "milk of the word" but milk to feed your

reason or spirit, at the same time "the Word of God" is the milk by which spiritual life must be nourished if it is to grow unto salvation.

**ἄδολον.** R.V. *which is without guile, or unadulterated.* The adj. does not occur again in the N.T. but *ἄδολως* is found in Wisdom vii. 14, and cf. 2 Cor. iv. 2, *δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.* In one of the Fayyûm Papyri *ἄδολον* coupled with *καθαρόν* is used of unadulterated wheat. Just as mother's milk is by its very nature unadulterated, so the food which God supplies to His children is free from any of the contaminating influences found in the sustenance which heathenism offers to the soul of man. But the special element of adulteration intended here is *guile* which has been referred to just above (*πάντα δόλον*).

**ἐν αὐτῷ** = in virtue of that food.

**εἰς σωτηρίαν,** cf. i. 5. Christians are already in a state of salvation but must "grow in grace" in order that God's work in them may be completed.

3. **εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστός ὁ κύριος.** The words are doubtless borrowed from Ps. xxxiv. 8, "O taste and see that the Lord is gracious," where *χρηστός* is merely the LXX. rendering for the Hebrew "good" and has not the special sense in which it is used of wine in Lk. v. 39. In the N.T. *χρηστός* as used of God denotes graciousness, lovingkindness. In Heb. vi. 5 we have a similar expression of "tasting that the word (*ῥῆμα*) of God is good (*καλόν*)."

**ὁ κύριος** in the Psalm means Jehovah whereas in the N.T. it commonly refers to Christ. In this passage St Peter immediately goes on to speak of Christ, but it is not safe to argue that he identifies Jehovah with Christ. But in receiving Christ we do taste of the goodness of the Father.

4. **πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι.** The words were perhaps suggested by the LXX. of v. 5 of the same Psalm xxxiv. which St Peter has just quoted *προσελθατε πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ φωτισθήτε,* where the Hebrew is "they looked unto him."

In other passages of the LXX. the word *προσερχεσθαι* is used of *drawing near* to God for worship, sacrifice or prayer. In this sense it is used with a dative in Heb. iv. 16, xii. 22, of Christians approaching God through Christ as their High-priest and sacrifice, and this idea may perhaps be included here, as St Peter goes on to describe Christians as having a priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices. But besides this the verb was used, Ex. xii. 48, 49; Lev. xix. 33; Num. ix. 14; Is. liv. 15, of a sojourner (*προσῆλυτος*) coming to sojourn as a stranger among the Jews, and Dr Hort suggests that this idea would be quite in accordance with St Peter's conception. His readers are not merely

the new dispersion (*διασπορά*, i. 1), they are also the new *proselytes* of the new Israel, but instead of being united merely to a holy people they are united to Christ Himself and are admitted to full priesthood. We have a similar thought in Eph. ii. 11—22, from which passage St Peter goes on to borrow, that those who were once far off are *brought nigh* in Christ and built up into one temple of which Christ is the corner-stone.

**λίθον ζῶντα.** The addition of ζῶντα brings out the thought that the union between Christ and His people is not a mere juxtaposition like that of dead objects but a growth in which living stones are incorporated with a living stone.

**ἀνθρώπων** has a wider reference than “the builders” and includes both Jews and Gentiles.

**ἀποδοκιμασμένον**, *refused as unsuitable*. **λιθόλογοι** (see Robinson, *Eph.* p. 261) were employed to test stones. Those which were rejected were perhaps marked *ἀδόκιμος* = Latin *reprobatus*. The language of Ps. cxviii. may have been suggested by some actual incident in the rebuilding of the Temple. The same verb is used by our Lord of His rejection by the chief priests and elders, Mk viii. 31; Lk. ix. 22.

**ἐκλεκτόν.** The Hebrew of Is. xxviii. 16 is “a tried stone” or “stone of proving,” **יִתְבַּח יִתְבַּח**, but the LXX. translators evidently read **יִתְבַּח יִתְבַּח**, *i.e.* a chosen stone. The same change occurs in the LXX. of Prov. xvii. 3 and the converse in Prov. viii. 10.

**ἐντιμον** in Is. xxviii. 16 represents a Hebrew word meaning *precious*, *i.e.* costly, and the word *ἐντιμος* is used in the same sense in 1 Sam. xxvi. 21; Ps. lxxii. 14; Is. xliii. 4, but in the N.T., Lk. vii. 2, xiv. 8; Phil. ii. 29, it means honoured or honourable.

5. **οἶκος πνευματικός**, *a spiritual house* as opposed to a “house made with hands” like the Jewish temple, in which God could never really dwell, cf. Acts vii. 48. For the same idea that the Christian society is God’s true temple, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 16; Eph. ii. 22.

**εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἄγιον.** *eis* is inserted in the R.V. marg. and by W. H., “A spiritual temple for a holy act of priesthood.” The ordinary text omitting *eis* takes *ἱεράτευμα* as a nominative in apposition to *οἶκος* apparently in the sense of a *body of priests*, which is the meaning of the word in v. 9 where it is quoted from the LXX. of Ex. xix. 6 and represents the Hebrew word “priests.” Here if *eis* is read with the best MSS. the sense is rather “an act of priesthood” which is explained by the words which follow.

**ἀνεγκάει.** *ἀναφέρειν* is used of the priest who actually *offers up* the sacrifice, whereas *προσφέρειν* could be used also of the worshipper.

Thus ἀναφέρειν is used of Abraham offering up Isaac in Jas ii. 21, of the high-priests in Heb. vii. 27, and of Christians in Heb. xiii. 15.

πνευματικὰς θυσίας, spiritual as opposed to material sacrifices, cf. πνεύματι λατρεύοντες, Phil. iii. 3; λογικὴ λατρεία, Rom. xii. 1, of Christians presenting their bodies as a living sacrifice. Just as Christ sacrificed His life for the service of others so His members must give themselves in daily self-oblation for the service of the Christian community.

εὐπροσδέκτους, it is only with such spiritual sacrifices that "God is well pleased."

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. All our sacrifices can only be offered to God or be acceptable to Him, when presented through the agency of our ascended High-priest, cf. Heb. xiii. 15, δι' αὐτοῦ ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως. So in every Eucharist Christ is the true priest, and the earthly priest is only the divinely authorized spokesman of the priestly body of worshippers. Similarly our prayers are offered "through Jesus Christ our Lord."

6. περιέχει. The substantive περιοχή means (1) the contents of a book, (2) a clause or passage. It is used in Acts viii. 32 of the passage which the eunuch was reading. Here the verb is intransitive and impersonal=*it stands thus in writing*, the best MSS. read γραφῆ without the article. The plural αἱ γραφαί is used of "Scripture" as a whole and ἡ γραφή in the N.T. means a particular passage. Here St Peter appeals to the fact that there is written evidence to support his statements.

λίθον. Three passages from the O.T. all containing the same metaphor of a stone are here combined together.

(a) Ps. cxviii. 22, "The stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner." The Psalm was probably written after the return from Babylon, and meant that the kingship of Jehovah, though long ignored by the kings and princes of Judah who claimed to be the builders of the nation, has now at last been recognized as the true bond of union for the restored nation. This passage was applied to Christ at the end of the parable of the wicked husbandmen, Matt. xxi. 42; Mk xii. 10; Lk. xx. 17, and again by St Peter in his defence after healing the impotent man, Acts iv. 11. Here the passage is alluded to in v. 4 and quoted in full in v. 7.

(b) Is. xxviii. 16, "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone of sure foundation. He that believeth shall not make haste." The passage was probably written at the time of Sennacherib's invasion and meant that the

presence of Jehovah is the one and only source of protection for Judah, and that intrigues with Egypt, etc., are utterly useless.

(c) Is. viii. 14, "(He shall be for a sanctuary;) but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence (to both the houses of Israel)."  
This passage was written in the reign of Ahaz when Israel and Syria were invading Judah. The meaning is that Jehovah will be a sure refuge to those who trust in Him, but will cause the overthrow of unbelievers.

Neither of the two passages from Isaiah therefore had primarily any direct reference to Messiah, but from the Targums and other Jewish books it seems clear that "the stone" was regarded as a regular title of Messiah, and from the application of Ps. cxviii. 22 to Christ the other passages in which the word *λίθος* was used in the LXX. came to be similarly applied. So again in 1 Cor. iii. 11 St Paul speaks of Jesus Christ as the foundation (*θεμέλιον*), and in Eph. ii. 20 as the chief corner-stone, *ἀκρογωνιαίον*, and in later Christian writers who traced the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ "the stone" is used as one of His regular titles. St Paul (Rom. ix. 33) and St Peter both combine the same two passages of Isaiah and both have some common variations from the LXX.:

(1) both read *ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών* instead of *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών*,

(2) both read *πέτρα σκανδάλου* instead of *πέτρας πτώματι*,

(3) both omit *εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς*,

(4) both insert *ἐπ' αὐτῷ* after *πιστεύων*.

As there are many other coincidences of thought between St Peter and St Paul (especially Romans and Ephesians) the natural inference is that the changes were introduced by St Paul and borrowed by St Peter. But it has been suggested that possibly a collection of O.T. passages, arranged according to their subjects, suitable for proving from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ, was made at a very early date. Certainly such collections were afterwards used, e.g. the Testimonia of Cyprian, where one of the chapters shews that Jesus was styled "the stone." If such a collection was already extant when St Peter and St Paul wrote they may have both borrowed independently from it, and the same theory might explain other composite quotations in the N.T.

*ἐν Σιών*, the promise was made for Israel and was first fulfilled in Israel by the Incarnation and so is efficacious for the new Israel which is the expansion and archetype of the old.

*ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον*. The order of the words in the T.R. is thus reversed in the best MSS. as in the LXX., in which case *ἀκρογωνιαῖον*



is probably a substantive, a stone that is elect a chief corner-stone that is held precious. The corner-stone perhaps means that which unites two walls; so in Eph. ii. 20 where ἀκρογωνιαῖον occurs again the idea is that Jews and Gentiles are united in Christ.

ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ. πιστεύειν ἐπί with the dative suggests the basis on which faith rests. Except in this passage quoted here and in Rom. ix. 33, x. 11 this construction only occurs in Lk. xxiv. 25 and 1 Tim. i. 16.

οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ. In Isaiah the Hebrew is "shall not make haste," i.e. flee in panic, עָזַבְתָּ לְךָ, but the LXX. evidently read עָזַבְתָּ לְךָ=shall not be put to shame, i.e. will never find his confidence belied.

7. ὤμῳ. The A.V. renders "unto you that believe He is precious," i.e. in your eyes. The R.V. marg., "In your sight...is the preciousness," or "For you...is the honour," but the R.V. text is *For you is the preciousness*, i.e. the preciousness implied in the epithet ἐπιτιμον concerns you Christians; its value in God's sight is for your benefit and accrues to you.

ἀπιστοῦσιν=for such as disbelieve. This is the reading of B and C, whereas the T.R. reads ἀπειθοῦσι=disobedient, as in v. 8. The dative is probably not governed by ἐγενήθη but is a dative of reference. For such as are disbelieving the Psalmist's words are true.

8. λίθος προσκόμματος. The stone of stumbling is the loose stone against which the traveller strikes his foot, while πέτρα σκανδάλου, the rock of offence, is rather the native rock rising up through the path, which trips him up. σκάνδαλον is constantly used of Christ as being a stumbling-block to the Jews.

προσκόπτουσιν—ἀπειθοῦντες, probably both words conjointly govern λόγῳ—who stumble at the word being disobedient to it.

εἰς δὲ καὶ ἐτέθησαν. (See S. and H. Rom. ix.—xi. and Hort, 1 Pet. p. 123.) The words must be neither explained away nor exaggerated. The stumbling of the disobedient, according to St Peter, was no accident nor due only to their own conduct, but part of God's primal purpose. The corner-stone in Zion and the men who should stumble at it were both of God's appointing. For this use of τίθημι, cf. Acts xiii. 47; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; Jn xv. 16. It is of course perfectly true that certain results are the inevitable nemesis attached to certain conduct, and in that sense it might be said that stumbling was appointed by God as the nemesis of disobedience. But this does not exhaust St Peter's meaning. The stumbling seems to be regarded as not merely a secondary part of God's purpose, conditional on man's disobedience, but as part of His primal purpose. On the other hand

St Peter does not say that any persons were reprobated to damnation. To the question, "Did they stumble in order that they might fall?" asked by St Paul in Rom. xi. 11, St Peter would without doubt have given St Paul's answer, "God forbid, but rather through their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles." St Peter, as we have seen, has throughout been emphasizing the fact that the privileges formerly restricted to Jews have now been extended to Gentiles, and there is little doubt that in quoting the passage about the stone of stumbling, employed by St Paul in discussing the apostasy of Israel, St Peter in these words *εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐπέθησαν* is briefly summarizing St Paul's argument, in which he shewed that Israel's apostasy, guilty though it was, was designed to subserve God's eternal purpose of love. The stumbling of disobedient Jews made room for the admission of believing Gentiles, that thereby Israel in return might be roused to godly jealousy to value and accept the privileges which once they so madly rejected.

9. St Peter applies to his Gentile readers, as the new Israel of God rescued from the slavery of sin, titles of honour which were used (1) in Ex. xix. 5 of Israel as the Covenant people rescued from Egypt, (2) in Is. xliii. 20 of the mission for which God was restoring them from Babylon.

Just as within the nation a special body of priests was chosen to do God's work for the benefit of the whole nation, so among the nations of the world Israel was to be the "priestly nation" through whom all nations were to be blessed, and this is true also of the Church, the new Israel of God.

**γένος ἐκλεκτόν** from Is. xliii. 20.

**βασιλειον ἱεράτευμα** from Ex. xix. 5 where the Hebrew is "a kingdom of priests." The LXX. evidently intended both words as substantives, "a body of kings, a body of priests," so in Rev. i. 6 and v. 10, *βασιλειαν ἱερείς τῷ θεῷ*. Here however *βασιλειον* is almost certainly an adjective and the old Hebrew expression which meant a priestly kingdom or nation is changed into "a royal priesthood or body of priests." The epithet royal here probably means *priests in the service of the king*, not as in the Apocalypse that Christians are kings as well as priests.

**ἔθνος—λαός**. Two different Hebrew words were applied to Israel. *ἔθνος* describes their position as one of the nations of the world, who were distinguished from others by being consecrated (*ἁγίον*) to God. *λαός* describes them as the covenant people of God. In the Epp. *ἔθνος* is nowhere else used of Israel, but in the Gospels and Acts it is used of Israel in speaking to foreigners like Pilate or Felix, or of

the conduct of foreigners towards Israel. In Jn xi. 50 Caiaphas says, "It is expedient that one man should die for the people (λαός) and not that the whole nation (ἔθνος) should perish," where ἔθνος might mean the population as distinct from the community or the civil organization, that the Romans would deprive them of all national existence.

**λαός εἰς περιποίησιν.** The sense though not the actual Greek phrase is borrowed from Ex. xix. 5 where the Hebrew is "Ye shall be a peculiar possession," הַבְּרִית, but the LXX. rendering is λαός περιούσιος, which is the phrase used by St Paul in Tit. ii. 14, "Christ gave himself on our behalf that he might ransom us from all lawlessness and purify for himself a peculiar people, zealous for good works." The same Hebrew word הַבְּרִית is however translated *εἰς περιποίησιν* in Mal. iii. 17, "They shall be to me in the day which I make (*i.e.* my appointed day) for a special possession" (not as A.V. "they shall be mine in the day that I make up my jewels"). The substitution of *εἰς περιποίησιν* for the LXX. *περιούσιος* would be further suggested to St Peter by Is. xliii. 21, a passage from which he has already borrowed the words *γένος ἐκλεκτόν*. There Israel are described by God as *λαόν μου ὃν περιποιήσάμην τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγείσθαι*. The same verb *περιποιείσθαι* is used of God *purchasing* the Church in Acts xx. 28 and of men losing their lives in attempting to secure them as their own, Lk. xvii. 33. The substantive *περιποίησις* is used of God's rights of possession over the Church in Eph. i. 14. Elsewhere it is used of *winning* (a) salvation, 1 Thess. v. 9, (b) glory, 2 Thess. ii. 14, (c) life, Heb. x. 39.

**ἀρετὰς.** In classical Greek *ἀρετή* originally meant excellence or eminence of any kind, but gradually it came to be used of moral excellence only, *i.e.* virtue. In the passage which St Peter is quoting, Is. xliii. 21, and in three other passages it represents the Hebrew "praise." In the two other passages where it occurs in the O.T. it represents the Hebrew "glory" or "majesty." Here the idea is that Christians are intended to manifest God's own excellencies by their lives, cf. Matt. v. 16, "that they may see your good works and glorify your Father." The only other places where *ἀρετή* occurs in the N.T. are Phil. iv. 8 and 2 Pet. i. 5.

**ἐκ σκότους κατέσαντος.** Used of the admission of Gentiles, Acts xxvi. 18; Eph. v. 8; Col. i. 13. So here St Peter almost certainly refers to the transition from heathenism.

**θαυμαστόν.** God's light is described as "marvellous" because by it our eyes are opened to see "wondrous things."

10. οὐ λαός...οὐκ ἠλεημένοι. In Hos. i. 6, 7, ii. 23, the faithlessness of Israel to Jehovah her true bridegroom is described under the figure of the prophet's faithless wife who deserts him for false paramours. The children are therefore called by symbolical names, Lo-ammi="not my people" and Lo-ruhamah="not having obtained mercy." But when their mother is at last restored their names are changed to Ammi and Ruhamah. In Hosea the words refer to Israelites but in Rom. ix. 25 St Paul applies the passage to the admission of the Gentiles. So here St Peter, probably borrowing from St Paul, is almost certainly referring to the admission of Gentiles to be the new "Israel of God."

οὐκ ἠλεημένοι...ἐληθέντες. The perfect participle denotes the long-continued state in which they had lived as heathen, while the aorist refers to the crisis of their conversion, though of course the effects of that mercy are still continuous. Neither St Peter nor St Paul mean that the heathen or the unconverted Jew had no share in God's mercy. The reference is to the special mercy of the gift of the Gospel.

The Second Section of the Epistle, ii. 11—iv. 11, contains an exhortation to renounce heathen principles of conduct and adopt Christian principles, which will necessarily transform the various social relationships and duties of life.

A. EXHORTATION TO PURITY OF MOTIVE AND CONSEQUENTLY TO PURITY OF LIFE IN THE PRESENCE OF HEATHEN. ii. 11, 12.

- 11 If you are God's chosen people, citizens of heaven, your present surroundings are not your home; you are only, as it were, sojourners in a foreign land, living among strangers; I beseech you to remember this. In your own hearts you will find mutinous desires of the flesh  
12 which make war against your true self. In your dealings with the Gentiles around you you must take care that your behaviour is deserving of respect so that, in the very matter in which they speak against you as a "pestilent sect," they may at length (under the pressure of a day of visitation, when God in judgment brings the truth home to them) by the recollection of (ἐκ) your good works have their eyes opened to be beholders indeed and so come to give glory to God.

B. SOCIAL DUTIES. ii. 13—iii. 12.

- 13 This warfare against heathen principles of living does not mean the subversion of the necessary bonds of society. Rather it deepens and intensifies them. God has instituted various forms of authority among men, and to those you must submit yourselves for His sake.

(a) To CIVIL RULERS, whether it be to the king as supreme ruler 14 in the Empire or to subordinate magistrates, as officers sent (by God) through the agency of the king to execute vengeance upon evil-doers but to commend well-doers. For this is one of the ways of God's 15 own working. His will is that by well-doing men should silence the purblind calumnies of the senseless sort of men who attack them. In submitting to such institutions you will not be reverting to the old 16 yoke of slavery from which you were ransomed. You will only be obeying "the law of liberty." Instead of acting like men who misuse their liberty as a cloak of their malice, you will be acting as the bond-servants of God ("whose service is perfect freedom"). It is your 17 duty in general to honour all men, in particular to love your brethren in Christ, to fear God, to honour the king.

The same principle applies to all your social relationships. 18

(b) HOUSEHOLD SLAVES (despite the fact that in Christ there is neither bond nor free) must, with a full sense of the fear of God, submit themselves to their masters, and that not only to those who are good and considerate but also to those who are unfair or capricious. For if a man recognizes his service as part of God's discipline for him, 19 and for that reason submits to the hardships of unjust treatment, God will approve (or thank him for) his conduct. I say "unjust 20 treatment" for there is nothing heroic in submitting to be buffeted for actual faults. But if you have to suffer in spite of doing good work and bear it patiently, such conduct does find favour with God (or even His "Well done"), because you will be responding to God's 21 call which was to follow Christ. He also suffered on your behalf, and in all His sufferings He left you an outline sketch to fill in by following in the track of His footsteps. He was the ideal sufferer 22 described in Is. liii., "He did no sin," "No deceit was found in His mouth." When I saw Him being reviled He was not reviling in 23 reply. When He was being ill-treated He was not threatening vengeance. No, He was all through committing His cause to God whose verdict is always just (however unjust man's sentence may be). In His own Person "He bore our sins." When His Body was offered 24 up upon the Cross our sins "laid upon Him" were included in it. Sins therefore ought to find no place in us. Christ died as our sin-bearer in order that we might regard ourselves as dead to sin and break off all connexion with sins and live (as risen with Him) to righteousness. By His precious scars you Gentiles were healed. For the prophet's words are true of you. You were straying like lost 25 sheep, but now in your conversion you returned to the good Shepherd, who was all along watching over your souls though you knew it not.

11. Having described the high privileges of the new Israel of God, St Peter proceeds in this second section of the Epistle to draw various moral lessons from them. In *vv.* 11 and 12 he describes the personal duty of the Christian as regards self-conquest, remembering the influence which his life will have upon others.

**ἀγαπητοί** only occurs again in St Peter in *iv.* 12 at the beginning of the third section of the Epistle, but it is common in other books.

**παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους.** The same two ideas have already been presented in *i.* 1 *παρεπιδήμοις* and in *i.* 17 *παροικίας*. In classical Greek *πάροικος* means "a neighbour" and *μέτοικος* is the word for a resident alien which is the Biblical sense of *πάροικος*. In Hebrew two words were used for foreign sojourners.

(a) **גֵר** (*Gér*), *i.e.* one who comes as a guest, is generally translated *προσέλυτος*, which originally merely meant an immigrant but eventually was used of foreigners who adopted the Jewish faith, "a proselyte," but eleven times it is translated *πάροικος*.

(b) **בְּשִׁיבָה** (*Tóshav*) or settler was generally used of temporary residents. It is always translated *πάροικος*, except in three passages where **גֵר** and **בְּשִׁיבָה** occur together. In two of these it is translated *παρεπίδημος*, and *πάροικος* is transferred to **גֵר**.

In Gen. xxiii. 4 Abraham in asking leave to purchase a burial place says, "I am a stranger (*πάροικος*) and a sojourner (*παρεπίδημος*) with you," and in Ps. xxxix. 12 man's life on earth is described as that of a "stranger and sojourner." So in Heb. xi. 13 the patriarchs are shewn to have described themselves as "strangers and sojourners," not with reference to the old home from which they had migrated but because they desired a heavenly fatherland.

**σαρκικών.** The flesh is here used, as in St Paul, in a bad sense as opposed to the spirit. The flesh is not however regarded as being in itself bad. It is "a good servant but a bad master." Fleshly desires include selfishness, envy, etc., as well as such things as fornication or drunkenness, cf. Gal. v. 19 ff.

**αἰτίνας** = such as by their very nature.

**στρατεύονται.** These fleshly desires are described as mutineers raising an insurrection against the true self. *ψυχή* in the N.T. does not mean "soul" in the modern sense of the word, *i.e.* the highest element in man. Originally it meant "life" and then the "true self" of a man, of which his bodily life is only a transient phase. The same idea of an internal warfare in man is found in Rom. vii. 23, "I see a different law in my members (*ἀντιστρατεύμενον*) taking up war against the law of my mind," and in Jas iv. 1, "your pleasures

that war (στρατευομένων) in your members." (See Introduction, p. lvii.)

12. τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν...καλήν. καλήν is the predicate. Your intercourse with the heathen round you must be such as commands their respect. In iii. 16 the enemies of the Christians are described as reviling their ἀναστροφὴν ἀγαθὴν. ἀγαθός denotes that which is intrinsically good in itself and its results, whether it is recognized as such or not, while καλός is that which commends itself as good.

ἐν ᾧ sometimes means "while" as in Mk ii. 19; Lk. v. 34, xix. 13; Jn v. 7. But here it means *in the very matter in which*, cf. iii. 16, ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε; iv. 4, ἐν ᾧ ζενίζονται = wherein.

κακοποιῶν. In Mk iii. 4; Lk. vi. 9 the verb κακοποιεῖν seems to retain its original meaning of "doing an injury," but in the LXX. it has a wider meaning "evil-doing." So also in 1 Pet. iii. 17 it = ποιῶντας κακά of iii. 12. The adjective κακοποιός is used three (or four) times in 1 Pet. (ii. 14 (iii. 16, v.l.), iv. 15) and seems to have been a favourite term of abuse directed against Christians. Possibly it represents the Latin *maleficus* by which it is translated in iv. 15 by some of the Latin Fathers. Suetonius (Nero 16) speaks of Christians as men of a novel and pestilent (*maleficae*) superstition, while Tacitus, Ann. xv. 14, describes them as being hated *per flagitia*, and in the immediate context he includes Christianity among the *atrociosa aut pudenda* which poured into Rome. Gwatkin (*Ch. Hist.* i. 76) therefore considers that foul charges of immorality, such as were prevalent in the 2nd cent., were brought against Christians even before the Neronian persecution. But κακοποιός is a vague and comprehensive term. It was used of our Lord, Jn xviii. 30, v.l., while the two thieves are called κακοῦργοι, Lk. xxiii. 32, a term which St Paul applies to his own treatment, 2 Tim. ii. 9.

ἐποπτεύοντες. The T.B. reads ἐποπτεύσαντες which might possibly denote coincident action with that of the main verb, but more naturally antecedent action = glorify God having beheld. But the best reading is the present participle which suggests that the "beholding" is coincident with the glorifying. It is therefore doubtful whether τὰ καλὰ ἔργα should be understood as the object of ἐποπτεύοντες as A.V. and R.V.

ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες does not merely mean ἐποπ... τὰ καλὰ ἔργα. ἐκ denotes the result, the recollection or impression carried away, and ἐποπτεῖν may have a more special meaning than mere "beholding." It is not used in the LXX. but by Sym. Pss. x.

14, xxxiii. 13 of God as watching over human conduct, and it is so used in Attic poetry; in late Greek prose the verb is used in a general sense of watching or beholding. There was however a technical use of *ἐπόπτης* to denote one who was initiated in the mysteries and Plato uses the verb in that sense, so Clem. Al. Strom. iv. 152, etc., uses the phrase *ἐποπτεύω τὸν θεόν*.

In 2 Pet. i. 16 the spectators of Christ's glory in the Transfiguration are described as *ἐπόπται*, possibly with a trace of this technical meaning.

So here the meaning may be that by the recollection of your good works their eyes may at last be opened and so they will glorify God. *ἐποπτεύειν* is used again, however, in iii. 2 of husbands being converted by beholding the chaste conduct of their wives, but even there the idea of "seeing behind the scenes," or being "initiated into the secret of" would be quite appropriate.

*ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς*. The following explanations have been given of the phrase (1) the day when Christians are brought to trial, (2) the day when their enemies are themselves judged, (3) the day when God's mercy "visits" or comes home to them.

In the O.T. God is sometimes described as "visiting" people in mercy, e.g. to deliver them from Egypt or from Babylon, and so our Lord weeping over Jerusalem lamented her misuse of "the time of her visitation" evidently referring to lost opportunities of blessing, cf. Lk. i. 78, "The dayspring from on high shall visit (*ἐπισκέψεται*) us." But elsewhere God is described as "visiting" sinners with judgment, so *ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς* in Is. x. 3. But frequently God's judgments are themselves a means of bringing His mercy home to men. So here St Peter seems to anticipate some judgment of God which will open the eyes of heathen opponents and lead them to give glory to God through the memory of His servants' lives. The whole passage manifestly alludes to our Lord's words, Matt. v. 16, "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

13. St Peter now turns to the duties of Christians in the various social relations of life. He has shewn that this world is not their home and that they must not adopt the fashion of this world as their standard. But this does not imply disorder or anarchy. The necessary bonds of society are not to be destroyed but rather fulfilled. This world, though not man's home, is his school, and its institutions are appointed by God. The state, the household, the family are all intended to be pictures of the kingdom, household and family of God. In loyal obedience to the Emperor and governors, in faithful



service to earthly masters, in loving submission to family ties men may learn their true relation to God.

13. *πάση ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει*. This might mean every institution created or ordained *by* men, so A.V. and R.V. "Every ordinance of man," and in classical Greek *κτίσις* is more frequently ascribed to men than to God. But in the LXX. and N.T. *κτίζειν* and words derived from it are exclusively applied to God's work. So in Romans St Paul describes "the powers that be" (kings, magistrates, etc.) as "ordained of God," and here St Peter regards the fundamental institutions of human society, the state, the household, the family as part of God's plan for the organization of mankind. The words may therefore be translated "*every (divine) institution among men.*"

*διὰ τὸν κύριον* for *Christ's sake*, imitating His loyal submission to authority.

14. *βασιλεῖ* = here primarily the Emperor. If, as seems probable, the Epistle was written during the later years of Nero, loyalty to such an Emperor would be extremely difficult for Christians unless they regarded him, despite his unworthiness, as the representative of a divine institution.

With St Peter's language about obedience to civil rulers cf. Rom. xiii. 1—4.

*ὑποτάγητε...ὡς ὑπερέχοντι  
εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν  
ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν*  
(see *Introduct.* p. lxii).

*ὑποτασέσθω ἐξουσίαις ὑπερχούσαις  
ἐκδικος...τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι  
τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ καὶ ἔχεις ἔπαινον*

*ὑπερέχοντι*, as *supreme*, i.e. as compared with subordinate magistrates; cf. 1 Tim. ii. 2.

*ἡγεμόσιν* refers chiefly to provincial governors.

*δὲ αὐτοῦ*. Such governors are here regarded not as sent *by* the king, but *by* God *through* the king as His agent. Cf. Jn xix. 11, also Rom. xiii. 1, 2, 4, 6.

*ἐκδίκησιν...ἔπαινον*. The retribution on crime inflicted by the magistrates, and the praise which well-doers receive in consequence of their recognition by the magistrates is only an earthly echo of God's retribution or approval.

15. *οὕτως* may refer to the words which follow, viz. silencing ignorance by well-doing. But *οὕτως* is regularly used retrospectively to sum up some preceding statement. So here St Peter means that by employing civil magistrates for the praise of well-doers God indicates His own method of working. His plan is that His servants should silence (literally "gag") senseless ignorant calumnies by well-doing, including loyal submission to civil authority.

**τῶν ἀφρόνων.** The article might mean “those senseless men who have been described as speaking evil of you,” or “men such as are senseless and reckless in their charges.”

**ἀγνοσία,** *pu*-blindness, is a much stronger word than *ἀγνοία*. It describes the ignorance which cannot and will not recognize the truth. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 34 only.

**16. ὡς ἐλεύθεροι.** The nominative connects the verse with *v.* 13. In submitting yourselves to the institutions of human society you will not be reverting to the old bondage of your heathen life from which you have been ransomed. The service of God is “perfect freedom” (*cui servire est regnare*), the freedom to do what you ought rather than what you like. Old institutions must be submitted to not as a bondage to men but as ordinances of God.

**ἐπικάλυμμα κακίας.** Christian liberty affords no pretext for churlish, scornful, contempt towards heathenism and its institutions, rather it requires you to “honour all men.”

**ὡς θεοῦ δούλοι,** cf. Rom. vi. 22 and 1 Cor. vii. 22.

**17. τιμῆσατε... ἀγαπάτε... φοβείσθε... τιμᾶτε.** Here we have an aorist imperative followed by three present imperatives. The usual distinction between aorist and present imperatives is that the present is used in *general* precepts and the aorist in *individual* cases, the aorist denoting “point” action and the present “linear,” see J. H. Moulton’s *Grammar*, p. 129. Sometimes, however, the aorist imperative is used in general precepts to inculcate a new duty not previously recognized. So in Rom. vi. 13, *μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὄπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ*, the present imperative may mean, do not continue your old practice of presenting your members as instruments of unrighteousness for sin to use, but begin a new practice and present yourselves to God. But another explanation is, do not *time after time* present...but present yourselves *once and for all* to God, the aorist denoting something which is to be done to the end as a complete whole. So here some would explain that to “honour all men” is a new duty never realized until now, whereas honour to the king is an old duty which is not to be abandoned, although he can no longer be worshipped as a God. The objection to this view, however, is that love for the brotherhood, for which the present imperative is used, would also be a *new* duty not possible until they were admitted into God’s family. Possibly the aorist *πάντας τιμῆσατε* states the Christian’s duty as a *whole* to be fulfilled to the end and the three present imperatives expand it by three *general* precepts.

But St Peter has a marked preference for aorist imperatives which

he uses 22 times (against 9 presents) as being more forcible, but in expanding his injunction he borrows a passage from the O.T. in which the present imperative φοβοῦ occurred and therefore he assimilates the other two imperatives to it.

τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε. The words are borrowed from Prov. xxiv. 21, "My son, fear God and the king," but instead of coupling God and the king together with the same verb φοβεῖσθε St Peter treats "honour the king" as a subordinate form of the reverence due to God, just as "honour to all men" is a subordinate form of that love which can only reach its highest form in the reciprocal love of Christians as brothers.

18. *The duty of Servants to Masters* (cf. Camb. Gk. Test. Col. p. lxviii. ; Lightfoot Col. 317 ff.).

Slavery was interwoven with the texture of society under the Roman Empire. To prohibit slavery would have been to tear society into shreds, and bring about a servile war with its certain horrors and doubtful issues. The Gospel therefore nowhere directly attacks slavery as an institution. It lays down universal principles which were ultimately to undermine the evil, but there is not a syllable which could appeal to the spirit of political revolution. Yet the numbers of the slave population were enormous, and their lot was often intensely hard. The slave had no recognized relationships, no conjugal rights. He was absolutely at his master's disposal; for the smallest offence he might be scourged, mutilated, crucified or thrown to the beasts. When men in such a position were for the first time taught that "there is no respect of persons with God, that in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free," that masters and slaves are brothers in Christ, they might easily have been excited to assert their liberty in a spirit of open rebellion or sullen discontent. St Peter therefore, like St Paul in Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22; 1 Tim. vi. 1, instructs Christian slaves to regard service to earthly masters as part of their service to God.

18. οἰκέται, literally *members of a household* so *domestic servants*, including perhaps freedmen as well as slaves, δοῦλοι, which is the word used by St Paul. In the Pentateuch, however, and in Proverbs οἰκέτης is frequently used in the LXX. to translate the same Hebrew word which is rendered δοῦλος in other books. In the N.T. οἰκέτης occurs only in Lk. xvi. 13; Acts x. 7; Rom. xiv. 4.

ὑποτασσόμενοι. Cf. Lightfoot on Col. iii. 16, "The absolute participle being (so far as regards mood) neutral in itself, takes its colour from the general complexion of the sentence."

Here the participle is a virtual imperative referring back to *ὑποτάγητε* in v. 13 (see J. H. Moulton *Gram.* 180 ff.). This is a very common use in 1 Pet. e.g. iii. 1 *ὑποτασσόμεναι*, iii. 7 *συνοικοῦντες*, iii. 8—9 where participles and adjectives stand side by side (cf. Rom. xii. 9—19 with imperatives and infinitives added), iv. 8, 10 and (?) ii. 12 *ἔχοντες*.

For St Paul cf. Col. iii. 16; 2 Cor. ix. 11, 13; Eph. iv. 2, 3; for papyri see J. H. Moulton, p. 223.

*ἐπεικέσιν* (see Mayor on Jas iii. 17). In the LXX. *ἐπεικῆς* occurs only in Ps. lxxxvi. 5 of God being "ready to forgive," and this agrees with the definition given in Aristotle (*Eth.* vi. 11) *τὸν ἐπεικῆ μάλιστα φάμεν συγγνωμονικόν*, and (*Eth.* v. 14) it is contrasted with strict justice. So (*Rhet.* i. 13, 17) it is explained in the sense of "merciful consideration" which does not insist upon the strict letter of the law. In Homer it means "seemly," "decorous" as opposed to *δεικῆς*. So Plato uses it of respectable, well-behaved people; in *Rep.* 397 D it is applied to one who had been described as *μέτριος*—a moderate man, so also Thuc. i. 76. Thus in Plato and Aristotle it was used colloquially in the sense of *σπουδαῖος* or *ἀγαθός*.

In the N.T. it is twice joined with *ἀμαχος* 1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. iii. 2, and in Jas iii. 17 with *εἰρημική* and *εὐπειθής*. In Acts xxiv. 4 Tertullus begs Felix to hear him of his clemency (*ἐπεικία*). In 2 Cor. x. 1 St Paul beseeches his readers by the *πραῦτης καὶ ἐπεικίας* of Christ rather than by the "boldness" of stern magisterial methods. In Phil. iv. 5 *τὸ ἐπεικέες* may mean readiness to forego one's rights, the special duty urged in chap. ii.

So here it probably means "considerate" masters who do not enforce their rights tyrannically.

Thus, although etymologically *ἐπεικῆς* was connected with *εἰκός* = what is fit and reasonable, its later meaning seems to have been influenced by a supposed connexion with *εἰκω* = "I yield."

*σκολοίς*. In LXX. of crooked paths or perverse persons. In N.T. Lk. iii. 5 (from Is. xl. 3); Acts ii. 40 and Phil. ii. 15 (from Deut. xxxii. 5) "a crooked generation." Here it means unfair, awkward to deal with.

19. *τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις* (see Robinson *Eph.* p. 221 ff.). Besides its special Christian sense of God's free favour, especially as bestowed upon Gentiles, *χάρις* in the N.T. retains (a) some of its purely Greek significations, (b) the significations which it acquired in the LXX. as a translation of *יְיָ* = favour.

So here A.V. "this is thankworthy," something which meets with God's "Well done, good and faithful servant," cf. Lk. vi. 32, 33,

34 "What thank have ye?" xvii. 9, "Doth he thank that servant" (χάριν ἔχει).

R. V. "This is acceptable," something which finds favour with God, cf. Lk. i. 30, ii. 52; Acts ii. 47, vii. 46, etc. This is a very common meaning in the O.T. and is probably intended here.

Σὶδ συνέιδησιν θεοῦ. A. V. and R. V. "conscience towards God," but when *συνείδησις* is followed by an objective genitive it means rather *consciousness of*, e.g. conscious sense of sins Heb. x. 2, a conscious sense of the idol's existence 1 Cor. viii. 7 T.R. (v.l. *συνήθεια*). So here it means prompted by a conscious sense of God's presence and will, cf. Eph. vi. 7; Col. iii. 23 ὡς τῷ θεῷ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις. Such consciousness of the watchful presence of a just God, who demands submission to authority from them, can enable servants to bear man's injustice with patience as Christ did.

20. κλέος occurs nowhere else in the N.T. and only once in the LXX., Job xxviii. 22, where it means "fame." Here it means that there is no credit, nothing which men count heroic in patient submission to punishment which is deserved. *κολαφιζόμενοι* from *κόλαφος* a fist, so "to buffet." Cf. Mt. xxvi. 67; Mk xiv. 65; 1 Cor. iv. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 7 but it is not found in the LXX. nor in classical Greek.

21. εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε. The call to follow Christ is not only to imitate Him in well-doing but also to share His sufferings, cf. v. 10; Mt. xvi. 24; 1 Thess. iii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Heb. ii. 10.

If the Captain of salvation was made perfect through suffering the same process is employed by God in bringing His other sons to glory.

ὑπολιμπάνων. *λιμπάνειν* is a late form for *λείπειν*, *leaving behind*.

ὑπογραμμός (in classical Greek *ὑπογραφή*), means a drawing to be traced over, or an outline to be filled in and coloured, cf. *ὑπότύπωσις*, a rough model, 1 Tim. i. 16; 2 Tim. i. 13. Neither *ὑπολιμπάνειν* nor *ὑπογραμμός* occur again.

ἐπακολουθεῖν, *to follow close upon*, like climbers treading in the steps of an Alpine guide. Cf. 1 Tim. v. 10, 24; Mk xvi. 20.

ἔχουσιν, cf. Rom. iv. 12; 2 Cor. xii. 18.

22. ὁς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὔρεθῆ δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. In the LXX. of Is. liii. 9, the words are *ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ δόλον ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ*. The description in Is. liii. of the ideal servant of Jehovah, suffering as the representative of the people, is quoted by St Peter in these verses (22—24) as being fulfilled in Christ.

23. οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει. The imperfects ἀντελοιδόρει, ἤπειλει, παρεδίδου are sometimes explained as denoting the habitual attitude of the life of Christ as opposed to the one definite act of the crucifixion ἀνήνεγκεν. But more probably the imperfects describe St Peter's own recollections of our Lord's sufferings of which he claims to have been a witness v. 1, "When I saw Him being reviled and threatened, He was all the while using no revilings or threats but was committing His cause to God." The aorists ἐποίησεν, εὐρέθη, ἀνήνεγκεν on the other hand describe His life and death as a whole.

τῷ κρίνοντι δικάως. The Vulgate reads "*judicanti injuste*," submitted to him that was judging unjustly, *i.e.* Pilate. But no Greek text reads ἀδικως, and the real meaning is that Christ could patiently submit to man's injustice because He committed His cause to the just judgment of God, cf. 2 Thess. i. 4.

24. ἀνήνεγκεν is the word used in Is. liii. 12, "He bare the sins of many," and the numerous reminiscences of that chapter in this section make it almost certain that St Peter is borrowing the word from it, coupling with it the word ξύλον probably from Deut. xxi. 23. The same phrase from Isaiah is also borrowed in Heb. ix. 28, ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπασι προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας. In that passage ἀναφέρειν seems certainly to retain something of its ordinary sacrificial meaning of "offer up" (cf. 1 Pet. ii. 5; Jas ii. 21 ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, Heb. vii. 27, xiii. 15). (In the Gospels ἀναφέρειν merely means "take up" (Mt. xvii. 1; Mk ix. 2; Lk. xxiv. 51).) So Chrysostom explains the words in Heb. ix. 28 as meaning that, just as when we offer up an offering we present our sins for pardon that God may take them away, so Christ offered up our sins to the Father not for judgment but for removal. Westcott considers that the sacrificial idea is present in the phrase, but explains that Christ carried to the cross the burden of sins (not, primarily or separately from the sins, the punishment of sins) and there did away with sin and sins. So here St Peter may regard our sins laid upon Christ as being included in the sacrificial victim, the Body of Christ "offered up" upon the Altar of the Cross.

Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 88), while admitting that the word ἀναφέρειν was perhaps suggested to St Peter by the reminiscences of Is. liii. which pervade this section, argues that we have no right to assume that St Peter must have used it in the same sense as the LXX. translators of Is. liii. 12, who may have meant "suffered the punishment of" as representing the Hebrew נָשָׂא. In that case, says Deissmann, St Peter would have added ἐπὶ τῷ ξύλῳ, whereas ἐπὶ with the accusative would mean "carry up to."

(In answer to this it may be argued that in Is. liii. 11 ἀνοίσει τὰς ἀμαρτίας is the LXX. translation of an entirely different verb לָבַד (used also in the second clause of Is. liii. 4, where it is translated ὀδυνᾶται), and this word does mean to "load oneself with a burden," and that burden might be described as "carried up to the Cross.")

Deissmann disputes the sacrificial meaning of ἀναφέρειν in this passage on the ground that the sins could hardly be described as offered up. He would explain the words as meaning that, when Christ "bears up to" the cross the sins of men, then men have them no more; the "bearing up" is a "taking away," without any special idea of substitution or sacrifice. He also quotes a contract, *Pap. Flind. Petr.* 1. xvi. 2, *περὶ δὲ ὧν ἀντιλέγω ἀναφερομεν [.....] ὀφειλημάτων κρηθήσομαι ἐπ' Ἀσκληπιάδου.* The editor supplies the missing portion...*ων εἰς ἐμέ* and the sense may be that certain debts of another person have been imposed upon the writer (cf. *Aesch.* 3. 215; *Isoc.* 5. 32). If such a forensic meaning was intended by St Peter, the meaning would be that the sins of men are laid upon the Cross, as in a court of law a debt in money is removed from one and laid upon another. We might compare the forensic metaphor in *Col.* ii. 14 where the *χειρόγραφον* drawn up against mankind is taken away by being nailed to the Cross.

ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ. The body of Christ is the organism through which His life is fulfilled. His earthly body was the instrument of His perfect obedience and self-sacrifice, "A body hast thou prepared Me," *Heb.* x. 5. "By the offering of that body (alike in the perfect service of His life and the voluntary endurance of death) we have been sanctified," *Heb.* x. 10. St Paul in *Rom.* vii. 4 says, "Ye were made dead to the law through the body of Christ." So here it is the sin-bearing victim. But elsewhere in St Paul the body of Christ means the organism by which His life and work are *still* carried on, viz. the Church in which Jews and Gentiles are made one. Of that body He is still the Head and the source of its life and growth. Into it Christians are incorporated by Baptism, and are sustained by partaking of His life. Each has to contribute in building it up. On its behalf St Paul rejoices in sharing the sufferings of Christ.

In view of St Peter's apparent use of Romans and Ephesians in so many passages, it is certainly surprising that he shews no trace of this striking Pauline conception of the body of Christ.

ξύλον is used for a gallows tree in *Deut.* xxi. 23, "Cursed is every one that hangeth upon a tree," quoted in *Gal.* iii. 13. But the only other passages where it is used for the Cross are in St Peter's speeches, *Acts.* v. 30 and x. 39, and by St Paul, *Acts.* xiii. 29. In

Rev. xxii. 2 etc. it is used for "the tree of life" and in Lk. xxiii. 31 of "the green tree." In Acts xvi. 24 it means "the stocks," and in the plural Mt. xxvi. 47, "staves."

**ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι**, *breaking off all connexion with sins*, being dead to them. The verb occurs nowhere else in the LXX. or N.T. For the dative after compounds of ἀπό, cf. ἀποθνήσκειν τῷ νόμῳ, Gal. ii. 19, τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, Rom. vi. 2.

The purpose of Christ's sacrifice, as stated here and generally in the N.T., is not to save man from the punishment of sin so much as from its power, to put an end to the regime of sin. The same idea is suggested in iv. 1, ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπαιται ἀμαρτίας, Christians are to welcome sufferings as the process by which the ideal "death unto sin," symbolized by their baptism into Christ's death, is made real in the persons of His members. The same thought of being dead to sin as living members of the crucified and risen Lord is expressed more fully in Rom. vi. 1—11; cf. Gal. v. 24; Col. ii. 12, iii. 2.

**μώλωψ** is the scar or wheal caused by a blow. The phrase is quoted from Is. liiii. 5. The slaves to whom St Peter was writing might find help to be brave and patient, when their bodies were perhaps bruised and bleeding from some cruel blow, by the thought that they were sharing in suffering like that by which their Saviour had won life and healing for them.

**25. ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι** (T.R. *πλανώμενα*). St Peter means, You Gentiles may well apply to yourselves the language of Is. liii. about those healed by the suffering Servant of the Lord, for you were indeed wandering like lost sheep, as the speakers in that chapter describe themselves.

**ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον**. *The Shepherd and overseer or guardian* who was all along watching over your lives. You were all along His sheep though previously "not of this fold," cf. Jn x. 16, your conversion may therefore be described as *returning* to Him.

For *ποιμήν* applied to Christ, cf. Jn x. 11; 1 Pet. v. 4; Heb. xiii. 20; cf. Rev. vii. 17 "The Lamb shall be their shepherd."

**ἐπίσκοπος**. The verb is used of God "seeking out" His sheep in Ezek. xxxiv. 11. In Acts xx. 28 St Paul tells the elders at Miletus that the Holy Spirit has appointed them as *ἐπίσκοποι* to shepherd (*ποιμαίνειν*) the Church of God. In the LXX. *ἐπίσκοπος* is used of overseers, and so it came to be adopted in the N.T. as a title of those who had the oversight of the Church.



## CHAPTER III

## iii. 1—12. SOCIAL RELATIONS CONTINUED.

The same principle of submission to authority as part of God's 1 will applies also to WIVES (in spite of the fact that in Christ there is neither male nor female). Wives should submit to their husbands; deeds speak louder than words. To be spectators of the effects of 2 the fear of God as seen in the pure lives of their wives may silently win husbands, who are persistently deaf to the spoken message of the Gospel. The wife's truest adornment should be not outward 3 but within, the inner character of a heart clad in the imperishable 4 ornament of a spirit which is placid in itself and gentle towards others. That is a jewel of great price in God's estimation.

Such was the self-adornment practised by the wives of whom we 5 read in the ancient story of the chosen people. Their hopes were set on God and consequently they submitted to their husbands. Take 6 for example the case of Sarah, whose daughters you Gentile women became when you were admitted to the new "Israel of God." She obeyed Abraham and called him "Master." Such wives did good work, and were never scared or "flustered" into deserting the path of duty. This involves a corresponding duty on the part of 7 HUSBANDS. You must appreciate the meaning and dignity of human life and marriage. You share an earthly home with your wives; you also share the same spiritual inheritance, God's free gift of life in the highest sense of the word. Your wife, like yourself, is "a chosen vessel" of God, but she is cast in a more fragile mould and therefore needs all the gentler handling and the more honour. Any lower, more selfish, more sensual view of marriage will be a hindrance to your prayers.

To sum up mutual duties in general. All of you must strive to 8 be of one mind. Feel for one another, love one another as brothers in Christ, be tender-hearted, be humble-minded. Do not requite evil 9 with evil or abuse with abuse. Rather bless your revilers, for the inheritance of blessing is the end and object of your calling as Christians. As the Psalmist says, A man who has made up his mind 10 to love life and see good days must check his tongue from what is evil and his lips from uttering anything deceitful. He must turn 11 aside from evil and do good. He must seek peace and follow it up. So, and so only, can he attain true life, true happiness, for the eyes 12 of the Lord are over the righteous and His ears are open to their prayers, but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil.

iii. 1—6. *The duty of Christian wives.*

1. **ὁμοίως.** In accordance with the same principle of submission to God's ordinances for mankind. The wife, like the slave, was raised to new dignity by the Gospel; and, especially in cases where the husband remained a heathen while the wife had become a Christian, the duty of submission to marital authority needed to be consecrated and ennobled by its recognition as part of God's will.

In Eph. v. 22—24 St Paul regards marriage as the earthly picture of the union between Christ and the Church. The husband's duty therefore is loving self-sacrifice and the wife's is reverent submission.

St Peter however shows no trace of this among the thoughts which he borrows from Ephesians. In Col. iii. 18 St Paul merely describes the submission of wives to their own husbands as "fitting in the Lord." In 1 Cor. vii. he urges a Christian wife not to seek separation from a heathen husband if he is willing to live with her in peace, and one reason for this is that she may be the means of converting her husband.

**τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν.** The insertion of *ἰδίοις* here and in Eph. v. 22 and Tit. ii. 5 is not an implied warning against unfaithfulness, but states the husband's claim. "Submit because they are bound to you by special ties."

Deissmann, *Bib. Stud.* p. 123, argues that in the LXX. *ἴδιος* is often used to translate the possessive pronoun (suffix) and sometimes where the Heb. has no possessive at all. So in late Greek and Inscriptions, etc., it is used merely as equivalent to *ἑαυτοῦ* or *ἑαυτῶν*, cf. 1 Cor. vii. 2. But J. H. Moulton, *Gram.* p. 87 ff., thinks that the sense of "own" is retained in many passages in the N.T.

**ἀπειθεῖσιν τῷ λόγῳ.** The same phrase was used in ii. 8, *ἀπειθεῖν* implies more than mere disbelief (*ἀπιστία*). It is used in the LXX. to represent Hebrew words meaning *to despise* or *to rebel*. So here some husbands are described as deliberately setting themselves against the truth.

**κερδηθήσονται.** The future indicative is read by the best MSS. instead of the subjunctive in the T.R. There are several instances of a future indicative after *ἵνα* in the N.T. (see Winer-Moulton *Gram.* p. 361), sometimes in the same sentence with a subjunctive, e.g. Rev. xxii. 14. The indicative cannot, however, be pressed as implying a more certain result than the subjunctive.

**ἀνευ λόγου.** A.V. and R.V. *without the word*. The absence of the article however denotes some distinction from *τῷ λόγῳ* in the preceding clause. The meaning is that deeds speak louder than

words, and the constant spectacle of the wife's conduct will be a silent witness to the truth of Christianity, with the power to win over the husband without any spoken testimony or argument. For *κερδαίνειν* of winning a person, cf. Mt. xviii. 15 and 1 Cor. ix. 19.

2. *ἐποπτεύσαντες*, see note on ii. 12. The idea of *seeing behind the scenes* would aptly describe the husband's opportunities of observing his wife's character. But it may mean merely *looking on at a spectacle*.

*ἐν φόβῳ* might refer to the reverence of the wife for her husband, cf. Eph. v. 33. More probably however it means *the fear of God*, as also in ii. 18 where slaves are to submit to their masters *ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ*, cf. i. 17, iii. 15; Eph. v. 21; Col. iii. 22; 2 Cor. v. 11, vii. 1.

3. We have a similar description of true and false adornment for women in 1 Tim. ii. 9—10.

*χρυσία* is often used of gold ornaments, 1 Tim. ii. 9; Rev. xvii. 4, xviii. 16.

*κόσμος* is used in the LXX. in the sense of *ornament* but only here in the N.T.

4. *ὁ κρυπτός ἄνθρωπος*, cf. Rom. vii. 22 *τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον*.

*ἄνθρωπος* does not mean man as opposed to woman but is a neutral term, like homo. Here it means *the inner character*, cf. *τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον...τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον*, Eph. iv. 22—24.

*ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ*. Probably a neuter adjective used as a substantive = the incorruptible apparel.

*ἡσυχίος* is used in Is. lxvi. 2 of "a contrite spirit." Here it means *tranquil* as opposed to restless, fussy, or perturbed. Only in 1 Tim. ii. 2, a tranquil (*ἡρεμον*) and quiet (*ἡσυχίον*) life. The substantive *ἡσυχία* is used of *silence* in Acts xxii. 2; 1 Tim. ii. 11, and of *quietness* in 2 Thess. iii. 12 as opposed to restless excitement.

Bengel distinguishes *πραῦς* as meaning "qui non turbat," *ἡσυχίος* "qui turbas aliorum, superiorum, inferiorum, aequalium fert placide." Also *πραῦς*, he says, refers to feelings, *ἡσυχίος* to words, look, or conduct.

*πραῦς* = mild, gentle, meek as opposed to self-seeking and aggressive, cf. Mt. v. 5, xi. 29, xxi. 5.

*πολυτέλης*. Such an ornament is like a costly jewel in God's estimation, cf. Mk xiv. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 9. In the LXX. it is used of gold and precious stones.

5. *αἱ ἅγαι γυναῖκες* perhaps = *women of the chosen people*.

6. *κύριον καλοῦσα*. The only passage where Sarah is actually described as calling Abraham her "lord" is in Gen. xviii. 12, but St Peter is referring to her habitual attitude towards Abraham.

**ἦς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα.** Those who regard the epistle as addressed to Jewish readers explain *ἐγενήθητε* to mean *whose true daughters you proved yourselves*; but the words are much more forcible if addressed to Gentiles. Just as St Paul describes the Gentiles as becoming true sons of Abraham by sharing his faith, so St Peter describes Gentile women as having become true daughters of Sarah by their admission into the new covenant people of God, cf. Gal. iii. 29; Rom. iv. 11.

**ἀγαθοποιούσαι κ.τ.λ.** These words are generally connected with *ἐγενήθητε* if (or so long as) *ye do well*. But if Gentile women are addressed they did not *become* daughters of Sarah by doing well.

The R.V. margin refers them to *αἱ ἅγαι γυναῖκες* and treats the passage about "Sarah—whose daughters ye became" as a parenthesis. Holy women of old adorned themselves by submitting to their husbands, by well-doing and by tranquillity.

**πτόσιν.** R.V. text "put in fear by any terror" (objective acc.) but R.V. margin "afraid with" (cognate acc.). The substantive occurs only in Prov. iii. 25 "be not afraid of sudden fear," but the verb is frequently used in the LXX. of alarm or panic. So it is used in Lk. xxi. 9, xxiv. 37. Here it means not interrupting the quiet discharge of home duties by any excitement or panic.

**7. συνοικεῖν** here only in N.T. but is frequently used in the LXX. of marital intercourse and doubtless the sexual aspect of marriage is specially included here as in 1 Cor. vii. 3—5; 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4.

**κατὰ γνῶσιν**, cf. Rom. x. 2 and 1 Thess. iv. 5 where the duty of Christians with regard to gratifying the bodily appetites is contrasted with the conduct of heathen *τὰ μὴ εἰδῶτα τὸν θεόν*. One aspect of this *γνώσις* is that "our bodies are the temple of the Holy Ghost."

**σκεύει.** In 1 Thess. iv. 4 Christians are bidden to abstain from fornication and each is to know how *κτᾶσθαι τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος* (lit. acquire his own vessel) in sanctification and honour. In that passage some interpret *σκεῦος* to mean "body," that a man ought to get the mastery over his own body, but others refer *σκεῦος* to the wife as being an instrument for the husband's use. St Peter however probably regards the wife not as the *σκεῦος* of her husband but of God, cf. Acts ix. 15 *σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς*; Rom. ix. 21—23 *σκεῦη ἐλέους*; 2 Cor. iv. 7 *ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσι*.

The comparative *ἀσθενεστέρῳ* implies that the husband and wife are both *σκεῦη*. *ἀσθενής* is generally used of bodily sickness or infirmity, or of lack of power or robustness. But St Peter does not use the word in any depreciatory sense, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 22. *τὰ ἀσθερέστερα μέλη* in the body are all important (*ἀναγκαῖα*).

**γυναικέω**, an adj. "the female."

**ὡς καὶ συγκαληρονόμοι.** The *καὶ* emphasizes the fact that husbands share in something far better than the marital intercourse of an earthly home (*συνοικοῦντες*). Husbands and wives are *also* co-heirs of an eternal life, cf. Rom. viii. 17; Eph. iii. 6; Heb. xi. 9.

B some curs. Vulg. Arm. read *συγκαληρονόμοι*=live with your wives remembering that they are also co-heirs with you.

**χάριτος ζωῆς.** *χάρις, ζωή, συγκαληρονόμοι* all refer to the privileges which St Peter has referred to in Chap. i., *ἀναγεννήσας... εἰς κληρονομίαν... τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος... τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν.* The free favour which God bequeaths as their inheritance is life in the highest sense of the word (*σωτηρία ψυχῶν*).

**ἐγκόπτεσθαι** (KL etc. *ἐκκόπτεσθαι*=cut off). *ἐγκόπτειν* (cf. Acts xxiv. 4; Rom. xv. 22; Gal. v. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 18 and subst. 1 Cor. ix. 12) was originally a metaphor from military operations, "to break up a road by destroying bridges, etc." Originally it governed a dative of the person, *e.g.* Polyb. xxiv. 1, 12. So here some texts read *προσευχαῖς* but the acc. is the regular construction in the N.T. For the passive, cf. Rom. xv. 22. *ὑμῶν* might refer to the husbands only, that their prayers will be frustrated if any wrongs done to their wives cry out against them (cf. Jas v. 4). More probably both husbands and wives are included in *ὑμῶν*.

In 1 Cor. vii. St Paul says that married persons may abstain from conjugal intercourse for a time by mutual consent that they may give themselves unto prayer. Even the lawful gratification of bodily appetites may tend to deaden spiritual life. But besides this St Peter may mean that failure to recognize their divine co-heirship will hinder husband and wife in the exercise of that united prayer to which our Lord attached special efficacy, Mt. xviii. 19 (*συμφωνήσουσιν*=utter a united voice).

8. **τὸ δὲ τέλος,** *finally*, an adverbial expression not used elsewhere in the N.T. St Paul generally uses *λοιπὸν* or *τὸ λοιπὸν*=all that remains to be said. The phrase does not imply that St Peter was intending to draw his Epistle to a close, but merely sums up the instructions given above about special social duties, by enumerating various aspects of practical *ἀγάπη* applicable to all alike (*πάντες*).

**ὁμόφρονες,** *like-minded*, only here in Biblical Greek, but *ὁμοθυμαδόν* is frequently used in Acts and *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν* occurs in Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. ii. 2, iv. 2 and *τὸ ἐν φρονεῖν* in Phil. ii. 2.

**συμπαθεῖς,** *compassionate, sympathetic*, the adjective here only in N.T., but the verb is used Heb. iv. 15, x. 34.

**φιλιάδελφοι** only here in the N.T. but cf. ii. 17; Rom. xii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 7.

**εὐσπλαγχοί**, *tender-hearted*, only here and Eph. iv. 32.

**ταπεινόφρονες**, *humble-minded* (only here in the N.T.), is used in Prov. xxix. 23. *ταπεινοφροσύνη* is used v. 5 also Acts xx. 19; Eph. iv. 2; Phil. ii. 3; Col. iii. 12.

9. **μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ**. So Rom. xii. 17 and 1 Thess. v. 15. Doubtless St Peter is borrowing from St Paul, but the words may have been a kind of proverb and the converse *ἀποδίδωσι κακὰ ἀντὶ αγαθῶν* occurs in Proverbs xvii. 13.

**λοιδορίαν...εὐλογοῦντες**, cf. 1 Cor. iv. 12 *λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν*. The words are an unmistakable echo of the Sermon on the Mount "Bless those that curse you" Mt. v. 44; Lk. vi. 28.

**εἰς τοῦτο...ἵνα**. *εἰς τοῦτο* regularly points forward to the *ἵνα* which follows it and not backwards to the words which precede it, see Jn xviii. 37; Acts ix. 21, xxvi. 16 (infinitive instead of *ἵνα*); Rom. ix. 17 (*εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ὅπως*), xiv. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 9; Eph. vi. 22; Col. iv. 8; 1 Tim. iv. 10 (*ὅτι*); 1 Pet. iv. 6, and the same is true of *διὰ τοῦτο* followed by *ἵνα* or *ὅπως*. So here St Peter does not mean that Christians were called to be cursed nor to meet cursing with blessing, though both would be true. The object, he says, for which you were called is to inherit blessing, therefore it is your duty to bless others, cf. Mt. vi. 15.

The inheritance of blessing is only partially ours in this life, cf. Mt. xxv. 34 "Come ye blessed of my Father inherit (*κληρονομήσατε*) the kingdom."

10—12. From Ps. xxxiv. (12—16) quoted in ii. 3 "Taste and see that the Lord is gracious." It is a Psalm of confident trust in God's protection of the righteous in spite of their constant afflictions. It would therefore be specially appropriate to the times of threatened persecution in which St Peter was writing.

10. **ὁ θέλων ζῶην αγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας αγαθάς**. In the LXX. the words are *ὁ θέλων ζῶην, αγαπᾶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν αγαθάς*. St Peter's phrase must mean "He who is determined to love life," *i.e.* to set his affections on spiritual life. In another sense our Lord has said "He that loveth (*φιλῶν*) his life (*ψυχὴν*) loseth it" Jn xii. 25.

11. **ἐκκλινάτω**. The word is used in a bad sense, "turning aside," "gone out of the way," in Rom. iii. 12 quoting from Ps. xiv. 3 and so often in the LXX., but in Rom. xvi. 17 it is used of "keeping out of the way of" and so also in Proverbs.

**διωξάτω**. It may need prolonged effort to overtake peace.

12. **ἐπὶ δικαίους...ἐπὶ ποιούντας κακά**. The preposition (*ἐπὶ*) is the same in both cases, but in one case God's eyes look down in love and in the other in wrath, cf. Ex. xiv. 24.

iii. 13—iv. 6. GOOD AND EVIL DOING IN RELATION TO SUFFERING AT THE HANDS OF HEATHEN, ILLUSTRATED BY THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST AND THEIR EFFECTS.

13—16. Such is God's prescribed method for those who desire to see good days. If only you zealously devote yourselves to what is good 18 my injunction not to requite evil with evil will be almost unnecessary, for who is likely to do evil to you in that case ?

But even supposing that such an optimistic view is falsified and 14 you do have to suffer, not merely in spite of doing right but because of it, you should count such an experience a happy thing.

Only do not fear what your enemies try to make you fear, do not let yourselves be troubled. Rather fear with reverence the in- 15 dwelling presence of Christ as Lord and Master in your hearts to be set apart as a sanctuary which nothing must profane. Be ready always boldly to confess Him if any one calls upon you to give an account of your position and hope as Christians, not in any arrogant or self-confident spirit but with meekness and fear, taking 16 care to maintain your conscience in all innocence, so that in the matter which provokes so much obloquy, I mean the name of Christian, those who revile your good manner of life as professed members of Christ may be shamed into silence.

13. *καὶ τὸς ὁ κακῶσαν ὑμᾶς.* The verb *κακοῦν* is used of the Egyptians ill-treating the Hebrews Acts vii. 6, cf. vii. 19, xii. 1, xviii. 10. But in Acts xiv. 2 it is used of the Jews making the Gentiles ill-affected towards the Christians.

Here it might mean (1) *Who can do you any real harm?* cf. the Litany "being hurt by no persecutions," or more probably (2) *Who is likely to ill-treat you?* In several passages St Peter seems to regard suffering for Christ's sake as no more than a possibility for some at least of his readers, cf. i. 6 *εἰ δέον*, iii. 14 *εἰ καὶ πάσχετε*, iii. 17 *εἰ θελοὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ*. He still regards magistrates as being for the praise of those who do well ii. 14, and he speaks hopefully of influencing opponents by good works, silencing the ignorance of senseless men by well-doing and making them ashamed iii. 16.

*ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε.* *If ye prove yourselves enthusiasts for what is good.* *ζηλωταὶ* is the reading of the best texts for *μιμηταὶ imitators* T.R. The word is used in 1 Cor. xiv. 12 *ζηλωταὶ πνευμάτων*, Tit. ii. 14 *καλῶν ἔργων*, Acts xxi. 20 *νόμον*, Gal. i. 14 *τῶν πατρικῶν παραδόσεων*. In Lk. vi. 15, Acts i. 13, it is used of Simon the Zealot or Canaanite.

14. *εἰ καὶ πάσχετε.* The *καὶ* throws the emphasis upon the words

which follow, e.g. 1 Cor. vii. 21 *εἰ καὶ δύνασαι ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι* means "if you *do* have the chance of obtaining your freedom." So here the meaning is "If after all you *should* be called upon to suffer" in spite of what I have said as to its improbability.

*εἰ* with an optative expresses a contingency which is regarded as being quite uncertain. It is very rare in the N.T. (see J. H. Moulton *Gram.* p. 196), and, except in passages which are virtually *oratio obliqua* (Acts xx. 16, xxvii. 39, xxiv. 19, etc.), it occurs only here and in v. 17, and 1 Cor. xiv. 10, xv. 37, *εἰ τυχού*=perhaps. This passage is evidently based upon our Lord's words Mt. v. 10 "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake."

*τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.* "Fear not their fear neither be troubled, but sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord." The quotation is taken from Is. viii. 12, 13 where the prophet is instructed by God not to share in the general panic caused by the invasion of Judah by Israel and Syria in the reign of Ahaz. The presence of the Lord of Hosts is the one true object of reverence and of fear, of reverence because He is a sanctuary or place of asylum to those who trust Him, of fear because He is a stone of stumbling to the disobedient (cf. ii. 8). So St Peter bids his readers not to admit thoughts of terror with which their persecutors try to inspire them, but to set up Christ as the one object of reverent fear, the Lord and Master in their hearts.

In the LXX. *τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν* probably means the fear which others feel, i.e. the general panic, though some would explain it to mean "that which they worship" i.e. heathen Gods. This would give a possible meaning in 1 Pet. if the passage refers to attempts to induce Christians to revert to heathenism. But more probably it means—their threats, the fear which they try to inspire in you.

**15. ἀγιάσατε.** The verb is occasionally applied to God in the LXX. e.g. of Moses and Aaron failing to sanctify Him in the eyes of the people. (Deut. xxxii. 51.) In Isaiah it was perhaps selected because Jehovah is described as the sanctuary "or place of asylum to be consecrated as an object of fear." So here Christians are to treat the indwelling presence of Christ, as Lord and Master in their hearts, as a kind of sacred shrine which must never be surrendered or profaned by cowardly fears or inconsistent conduct.

*τὸν Χριστὸν.* The T.R., with KLP etc., reads *Κύριον τὸν Θεόν* which would mean "God as Lord" *Κύριον* being the predicate, not as A.V. "the Lord God." In Isaiah the words are merely "Sanctify Jehovah." The constant transference to Christ of language referring to Jehovah in the O.T. is one indication of the full Divinity ascribed to Christ by N.T. writers.



ἔτοιμοι αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογία. The question whether this implies formal trial and organized persecution, as Ramsay suggests, is fully discussed Intr. p. xlii. The addition of αἰεὶ and παντὶ make it more probable that St Peter means that Christians are always to be prepared to shew their colours and give a reason for their hope whenever any one challenges them, cf. Col. iv. 6.

μετὰ πραύτητος καὶ φόβου. Meekness not arrogance or self-assertion must be their attitude towards these questioners. φόβου might mean respect and deference towards those in authority, but more probably it means *fear of God* as in i. 17, ii. 18. To deliver God's message and champion God's cause is a grave responsibility which should make them ask "who is sufficient for these things?"

16. συνείδησιν ἀγαθὴν, cf. iii. 21. *A good conscience, mens conscia recti*, is essential if the defence offered by Christians is to convince their opponents. To this St Paul laid claim in making his defence, Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16, cf. also 1 Tim. i. 5, 19.

ἐν ᾧ, in the matter in which, cf. ii. 12 with which the T.R. assimilates this verse, reading καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν instead of merely καταλαλεῖσθε.

καταισχυνθῶσιν, may be shamed into silence. Cf. Lk. xiii. 17.

ἐπηρέαζοντες, the word means spiteful abuse in Aristotle but is used of false accusations in other classical writers, and this meaning would be appropriate here, but in Lk. vi. 28 it is translated "despitefully use."

ἀγαθὴν ἀναστροφὴν. Cf. note on καλὴν ἀναστροφὴν, ii. 12.

ἐν Χριστῷ, in Christ, of whom you claim to be members.

iii. 17—iv. 6. *The blessedness of suffering in the flesh.*

The interpretation suggested for this confessedly difficult passage may be best explained by a paraphrase of the whole section with illustrations from other parts of the N.T. Other interpretations of it will be discussed in an additional note (p. 87).

*Paraphrase.* To suffer for well-doing, if the will of God should 17 so will, is better than to suffer for evil-doing, because to suffer innocently is what Christ also did, thereby (as explained above ii. 21) leaving us an example, and to imitate Him must in any case be good. But the value of suffering is enormously enhanced when we consider the purpose and effects of Christ's sufferings.

(a) When His sufferings culminated in death (reading ἀπέθανεν 18 for ἔπαθεν) it was the doing away of sin (περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν) once for all (ἀπαξ), cf. Rom. vi. 10; 1 Pet. ii. 24, iv. 2.

(b) Death was to Him an opportunity for wider and more fruitful service. He Himself said "I have a baptism to be baptized with and how am I straitened until it be accomplished." Again when certain Greeks desired to see Him He replied "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone, but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." So it was only by dying that Christ could atone for the unrighteous (*ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων*), only by dying that He could present you Gentiles (reading *ὑμᾶς* as W.H.) to God. Cf. Eph. ii. 13, 18.

(c) The reason of this was that the death of His flesh was the quickening of His Spirit, a setting of it free for a new and wide-reaching activity.

19 (d) This activity was not confined merely to the unrighteous who are alive like yourselves. In His Spirit thus quickened by death He  
20 proclaimed (good) tidings to the spirits in prison. Of these the most notorious and typical examples were the spirits of those who suffered in the flesh as a punishment for evil-doing in the olden days of Noah, when they rejected God's long continued offer of mercy all through those years while the ark was being prepared.

[In the book of Enoch (x. lxxxix. etc. see Charles, *Eschatology*) from which St Peter appears to borrow several phrases in the Epistle, there is constant reference to the Flood; and the spirits of those who were judged in this life are assigned a separate place in Sheol (c. 12). For the idea that bodily suffering, even when it is a punishment for sin, may be a factor in the salvation of the soul, cf. 1 Cor. v. 5, "To deliver unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus"; 1 Tim. i. 20, "Whom I have delivered unto Satan that they may learn (by chastisement, *παθειθῶσι*) not to blaspheme." Also 1 Cor. xi. 32, "When we are judged (with sickness and death) we are chastened of the Lord that we may not be condemned with the world."

Again in the statement that "it will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment" our Lord implies that the inhabitants of those cities must not be regarded as eternally damned because they were so terribly judged in the flesh. For further ideas about "the Harrowing of Hell" see additional note (p. 83).]

(e) In the Flood the same water which drowned the guilty world floated the ark and so saved Noah and his family from perishing. Water was not only the means by which the defilements of the world were cleansed but was also the medium by which Noah and his family passed from the old world into the new, as it were through death into  
21 a new resurrection life. Thus the Flood may be regarded as the copy of the spiritual reality of "death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness" which is now represented in Baptism. When we pass beneath the water of Baptism we represent the drowning of the old sinful self, the putting off of the filth of the flesh. But the saving efficacy of Baptism lies in the new birth unto righteousness, the profession (in

answer to interrogation) of having a good conscience toward God, which is represented by our emerging from the water, claiming to share in the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

In every case therefore suffering and death are factors in the termination of the regime of sin and the attainment of a new life. In Christ's case we find that by dying in the flesh once and for all for sins (not His own but those of others) He was thereby quickened in spirit for new and wider service. In the case of those who perished in the Flood their judgment in the flesh led to their receiving the good tidings of Christ bidding them to live in the Spirit (cf. iv. 6). In the case of Noah and his family the water of destruction was the means of their salvation; and the same lesson of dying in order to live is taught in Baptism.

(f) There remains one further thought that suffering culminates 22 in final glory. The Lord who rose from the dead is now seated at the right hand of God exalted above angels, principalities and powers. So we too "if we suffer with Him shall also be glorified with Him." This conception of suffering in the flesh as a termination of the iv.1 regime of sin, a quickening of the spirit for new service and a factor in attaining glory, was the armour with which Christ equipped Himself in His earthly life (cf. Heb. xii. 2, "For the joy which was set before him he endured the cross despising the shame." Heb. v. 8, "He learned obedience by the things that He suffered.") Let it be your armour also in meeting persecution and equipping yourselves for service. In your Baptism you claim ideally to have shared in Christ's death, and any sufferings in the flesh which you may have to undergo are only helping to make that ideal a reality for you, helping to terminate the regime of sin, that the time which remains for you to 2 live in the flesh should be no longer devoted to the lusts of men but to the will of God. I say "the time which remains," for that which 3 is past, your old heathen days, is all too long to have worked out the wishes of the Gentiles, walking as you have done (*πεπορευμένους*—perfect participle) in wanton immoralities, lusts, wine-bibblings, revelings, drinking-bouts, and unlawful idolatries. Your heathen neigh- 4 bours no doubt regard you as fanatics, and revile you for refusing to plunge headlong into the same excess of prodigal recklessness with them. But (like Noah's contemporaries) they will have to render an 5 account to God, whose judgment is in perfect readiness both for the living and the dead. Such judgment of the dead is perfectly just 6 because they also received the message of good tidings, and the purport of the message to them was the same which God gives to you. Your suffering in the flesh is a call to live in the spirit. Their

judgment in the flesh after the pattern of men was a call to live in the spirit after the pattern of God.

17. ἀγαθοποιούντας, cf. ii. 15, 20.

εἰ θέλοι. The optative is read by the best MSS. instead of the indicative and denotes a possible but uncertain contingency, cf. iii. 14.

18. ὅτι καὶ Χριστός. The καὶ suggests that Christians are only called upon to do what Christ *also* did, namely, to suffer innocently. But St Peter at once expands the idea by shewing the blessed results of Christ's sufferings.

ἅπαξ means "once for all" not "once upon a time" which would require ποτέ. Cf. Rom. vi. 10, "the death that He died He died unto sin once (ἐφάπαξ)." Again in Hebrews ix. 26 Christ's sacrifice for the doing away of sin *once* offered (ἅπαξ) is contrasted with the oft-repeated sacrifices of Judaism.

There are numerous coincidences of thought between this section of St Peter and Romans vi., and the idea here seems to be that Christ's death was the termination of the regime of sin, cf. ii. 24, iv. 1.

Christ's death was "suffering for evil-doing" because it did pay the inevitable penalty of sin, not His own but that of others. Your sins, says St Peter, were included in Christ's death and it was intended to set you free from sin. Therefore "suffering for evil-doing" is no longer a necessary penalty for you if you are in Christ, but at the same time suffering for well-doing may help to make your freedom from sin more real.

ἀπέθανεν is read by NAC and all the vss. and is adopted by W.H. and R.V. marg. instead of ἔπαθε, which is read by BKLP, A.V. and R.V. The MSS. evidence is fairly evenly divided. If ἀπέθανε was the original reading it might be altered to ἔπαθε to match the preceding πάσχειν, cf. also ii. 21, iv. 1. On the other hand ἔπαθε might be changed into ἀπέθανε to match θανατωθεὶς which follows. Either reading would give a good meaning but ἅπαξ suits ἀπέθανε best.

περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν. Cf. Gal. i. 4; 1 Jn ii. 2, iv. 10. Elsewhere ἐπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν is used. περὶ ἁμαρτίας is used in the LXX. for "the sin-offering," cf. Heb. x. 6, 8; Rom. viii. 3.

δίκαιος is used as a special epithet of Christ in one of St Peter's speeches, Acts iii. 14, cf. 1 Jn ii. 1, "Jesus Christ the righteous," and Jas v. 6, ἐφρονέσατε τὸν δίκαιον may possibly refer to Christ.

προσαγάγη probably means *present*, give access to the presence of God, cf. προσαγωγή Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12. In the LXX. προσάγειν is frequently used of presenting victims as an offering to

God. So here Christ in offering Himself as our sin-offering might be regarded as offering us to God. Again in the LXX. it is used of presenting Aaron and his sons for the priesthood, and this idea would also suit St Peter's conception of Christians as "a royal priesthood" ii. 5, 9. But in all these O.T. passages the primary idea of the verb is "to bring near," and in this verse the context is not sufficiently explicit to shew that the word is used in a sacrificial or priestly sense.

ὑμᾶς is read by B. 31. Syr. Arm. and W.H. and probably means "you Gentiles," cf. Eph. ii. 13.

The T.R. and both A.V. and R.V. read ἡμᾶς which would include all Christians.

θανατωθεῖς. The verb is used of the Jews condemning our Lord to death, Mt. xxvi. 59, xxvii. 3; Mk xiv. 55.

ζωοποιηθεῖς is contrasted with θανατοῦν in 2 Kings v. 7, "Am I God to kill and to make alive?" In the N.T. it is used in Jn v. 21 of God and the Son raising and quickening the dead, cf. Rom. iv. 17, viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 22; Gal. iii. 21. In 1 Tim. vi. 13, T.R. it is used of God quickening all things. In Jn vi. 53 the spirit is described as "quickening" in contrast with the flesh, and in 2 Cor. iii. 6 the spirit giveth life as contrasted with the old law of "the letter."

In this verse the T.R. reads τῷ πνεύματι evidently meaning "the Holy Spirit," so A.V. "quickened by the Spirit." For this rendering we might compare Rom. viii. 11.

But here, as in iv. 6, σὰρξ and πνεῦμα are contrasted and the meaning is that by the death of His human flesh the human spirit of Jesus was, as it were, born into a new spiritual existence. It was alive all through His earthly life but was limited by the restrictions of the flesh until it was set free by death, cf. Lk. xii. 50, "I have a baptism to be baptized with and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." Even the body of the Risen Lord was a spiritual (πνευματικόν) body, as our resurrection bodies will be, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44, but St Peter seems to regard Christ's new spiritual activity as beginning immediately after death and even before His resurrection.

19. ἐν ᾧ most naturally means, in that *human* spirit thus quickened by death and not the *divine* Spirit of Christ in which He had all along been working in the world, cf. i. 11.

πνεύμασι is used of the dead in Heb. xii. 23, "the spirits of just men made perfect" and this interpretation is here confirmed by νεκροῖς in iv. 6. It naturally seems to mean that those who heard Christ's message were in a disembodied state, as He himself also was.

φυλακῆ sometimes means *sentry-watch* but far more commonly *prison* and is almost certainly so used here.

πορευθεῖς naturally suggests a change of sphere and is frequently used of the Ascension, as in *v.* 22. So here it seems to refer to the descent into Hell, and we thus have a natural chronological sequence θανατωθεῖς—ζωοποιηθεῖς—πορευθεῖς—(δι' ἀναστάσεως) πορευθεῖς εἰς οὐρανόν.

ἐκήρυξεν is constantly used of preaching the Gospel but never of proclaiming bad tidings. So here it probably means good tidings, cf. εὐηγγελισθη νεκροῖς, *iv.* 6.

20. ποτε. The days of their disobedience are described as being long past at the time when the tidings was preached to them.

ἀπεξεδέχετο is read by nearly all Greek MSS. The reading of the T.R. ἀπαξ ἐξεδέχετο seems to have been a conjectural reading of Erasmus—but ἀπαξ ἐδέχετο is read by some cursives; ἀπαξ would imply that the time of Noah was the only occasion when God exercised such patience.

ἀπεκδέχεσθαι is used several times by St Paul of Christians waiting for the return of Christ etc. but except in this verse the object or person waited for is always expressed.

εἰς ἣν is probably a "pregnant construction" = *by entering into which ark*, cf. Mk xiii. 16; Acts vii. 4; 1 Pet. v. 12 etc. It is not probably governed by διεσώθησαν (as Dr Bigg suggests who contrasts it with εἰς θεόν which he connects with σώζει).

ψυχαί is used of living persons in Genesis xlvi. 22 and Acts ii. 41, vii. 14, xxvii. 37; Rom. xiii. 1.

διασώζειν is used of *making a person perfectly whole*, Mt. xiv. 36; Lk. vii. 3, of St Paul being *brought safely through* to Felix, Acts xxiii. 24, and of escaping safe to land, Acts xxvii. 44, xxviii. 1, 4.

δι' ὕδατος might mean merely, *were brought safely through the water*. But more probably it means *were saved by means of water*. The same water which drowned the guilty bore in safety the inmates of the ark. This makes the analogy with the water of Baptism more forcible. So in the first prayer in our Baptismal Office, "Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family from perishing by water," the words "by water" should probably be connected with "save" and not with "perishing." The prayer specifies three instances in which God has employed "water" mystically (a) the Flood, (b) the Red Sea, (c) the Baptism of Jesus.

NOTE. For similar instances where the meaning of σώζεσθαι διὰ has been disputed, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 15 σωθήσεται οὕτω δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός—where the sense is probably not *saved as it were by means of fire* but *escape as it were through the fire* like a man whose house is burned over his head; 1 Tim. ii. 15 σωθήσεται

διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, which might mean that woman shall be brought safely through the pain and peril of childbearing—but more probably=saved by means of the childbearing, which was part of the penalty of woman's sin (Gen. iii. 16), but by which she has attained her truest dignity, especially when it culminated in the childbearing by woman of the Incarnate Son of God.

21.  $\delta$  is omitted by  $\aleph^*$  73 aeth. but is read by all the best authorities. The T.R. reads  $\phi$  which is found in several cursives, and Hort regards  $\delta$  as a primitive error for  $\phi$  on the ground that it is impossible to take ἀντίτυπον as an epithet agreeing with βάπτισμα and scarcely less difficult to take it with  $\delta$  as the R.V. which (water) after a true likeness (or antitypically). But ἀντίτυπον may be taken as a neuter substantive and not as an adjective, which antitype namely Baptism. In this case Baptism would not be the ἀντίτυπον of which the Flood was the τύπος, but both the Flood and Baptism are regarded as the ἀντίτυπον or earthly copy of the same spiritual reality, namely death unto sin as the prelude to new birth unto righteousness.

ἀντίτυπον. Cf. Hebrews ix. 24 where the copies of the things in the heavens ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, i.e. the earthly tabernacle and its accessories, are described as ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν because they corresponded to "the pattern (τύπος) in the mount" which was shewn to Moses.

In 2 Clement xiv. the visible Church in its external bodily form (σάρξ) is the earthly copy (τὸ ἀντίτυπον) of the spiritual Church (τὸ ἀθένητικόν), and Lightfoot, p. 247, explains that τὸ ἀθένητικόν means the autograph letter, the original document in God's own handwriting, as it were, of which the ἀντίτυπον is the blurred transcript. So in Irenaeus i. 5, 6 the Church is described by the Valentinians as ἀντίτυπον τῆς ἄνω ἐκκλησίας. Again, in the Apostolic Constitutions v. 14, vi. 30, vii. 25, and other Fathers, the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are described as ἀντίτυπα of the Body and Blood of Christ. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of Baptism as the ἀντίτυπον of Christ's sufferings, while Caesarius describes Baptism as the ἀντίτυπον of Circumcision. Other writers speak of the brazen serpent as the ἀντίτυπον of Christ.

In all these passages therefore (except Caesarius) the ἀντίτυπον is the copy as opposed to the reality, and naturally inferior to it. In this passage, however, we can hardly imagine that St Peter regards the Flood as the pattern (τύπος), of which Baptism is merely the copy, ἀντίτυπον. Therefore, as suggested above, it seems better to take ἀντίτυπον as a substantive. The same earthly copy, namely, saving by means of water, which was presented in the Flood, is again presented in Baptism. Now, as then, it represents the same heavenly original, life issuing out of death. This rendering enables us to

retain the usual meaning of *ἀντίτυπον*. Lightfoot (*Clement* ii. 247) however regards *ἀντίτυπον* here as the finished work of which the Flood was only the rough model, *τύπος*. In support of this view it may be argued that *τύπος* does sometimes mean the *copy* and not the *pattern*, e.g. Acts vii. 43, the images (*τύποι*) of your gods; 1 Cor. x. 6, 11, the experiences of Israel in the wilderness happened, *τυπικῶς*, i.e. as earthly copies of spiritual originals. Rom. v. 14, Adam is the *τύπος* of Christ. So here, it is said, the Flood, in which by the self-same water the guilty world was destroyed while the inmates of the ark were borne in safety by it, was an earthly picture (*τύπος*) of death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness, of which Baptism is the true expression, *ἀντίτυπον*. The objections to this view, however, are (a) that it is contrary to the general use of *ἀντίτυπον*; (b) that Baptism is not in itself "the original," but only "the outward and visible sign," and the "means whereby we receive" the inward and spiritual grace of death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness.

*σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου*. *σαρκὸς* might be governed by *ῥύπου*, putting away of the filth of the flesh, as A.V. and R.V., or it might be putting away of filth on the part of the flesh (subjective genitive).

*ἀπόθεσις*, the substantive occurs again only in 2 Pet. i. 14, of "putting off the tabernacle of the body," i.e. death. So here it might be equivalent to *θανατωθεὶς σαρκί*, the death of the old self in Baptism as contrasted with the new birth, *δι' ἀναστροφῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. But the addition of *ῥύπου* makes this improbable; cf. Jas i. 21. The meaning probably is that the saving efficacy of Baptism cannot be obtained by the mere cleansing of the body (such as was effected by Jewish ceremonial washings and circumcision), but a right attitude of the conscience toward God is demanded. If any contrast between Baptism and Circumcision is suggested here, as in Col. ii. 11, we may compare St Peter's speech at the Apostolic Conference, Acts xv. 9, where, in arguing against the necessity of imposing circumcision upon Gentile converts, he reminds his hearers of the case of Cornelius, where "God made no distinction between us and them, *having cleansed their hearts by faith*" (though their bodies were still unclean from the Jewish point of view).

*συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς*. Cf. iii. 16; Acts xxiii. 1; 1 Tim. i. 5, 19. In Heb. ix. 14 the cleansing of the conscience from dead works by the blood of Christ is contrasted with the cleansing of the flesh by Jewish ordinances.

*ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν*. *εἰς θεόν* must almost certainly be taken either with *ἐπερώτημα* or with *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς* and not with *ὥσκει* (as Bigg in antithesis to *διεσώθησαν εἰς τὴν κιβωτῶν*).



The following renderings have been suggested :

- (a) Prayer to God proceeding from a good conscience.
- (b) Prayer to God for a good conscience.
- (c) The inquiry (or appeal) of a good conscience toward God, R.V. margin.
- (d) The answer of a good conscience toward God, A.V.
- (e) The interrogation of a good conscience toward God, R.V.

The substantive *ἐπερώτημα* occurs nowhere else in the N.T. and only once in Theodotion's version of Dan. iv. 17. The demand (or matter), viz. the judgment upon Nebuchadnezzar, is by the word of the holy ones, i.e. the angels.

The verb *ἐπερωτᾶν* is frequently used in the N.T., but always in the sense of asking a question except in Matt. xvi. 1, of demanding a sign. In the LXX. *ἐπερωτᾶν* is used in Ps. cxxxvii. 3 of demanding a song, but as addressed to God it means to "enquire of" or "consult." So in Is. lxxv. 1, quoted in Rom. x. 20, *ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν*. This is the only passage in the N.T. where the verb is used with reference to God.

The only passage in the LXX. where *ἐπερωτᾶν εἰς* is used is in 2 Sam. xi. 7 of David enquiring after the welfare (*εἰς εἰρήνην*) of Joab and the army.

There is therefore not much support for the rendering, inquiry, appeal, or prayer of a good conscience addressed to God, and none apparently for the A.V. rendering "answer," taking *ἐπερώτημα* as the thing asked for, i.e. the answer. In late Byzantine writers on law *ἐπερώτημα* is used for a "stipulation" or "agreement," and this would give a good sense here, but there is no evidence for this use of the word at the time when this Epistle must have been written. Very possibly it refers to the questions and answers in Baptism—the "interrogation" whether the candidates have repentance and faith, which virtually constitute "a good conscience toward God." Robinson (Eph. v. 26) suggests that *ἐν ῥήματι* in that passage refers to some form of Baptismal confession.

The confession of faith demanded from the eunuch, Acts viii. 37, although only a Western insertion, is at least early evidence that such interrogations were usual, and the original use of creeds was as a Baptismal profession. The usual formula was *ἀπορᾶσση τῷ Σατανᾷ*; Dost thou renounce Satan? to which the answer was *ἀπορᾶσσομαι*. *συντάσση τῷ Χριστῷ*; Dost thou join the ranks of Christ? to which the answer was *συντάσσομαι*, and then a creed was recited in answer to an enquiry as to the candidate's faith. Some such interrogation or

examination to test whether the conscience was in right relationship toward God (*ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως εἰς θεόν*) St Peter regards as the necessary condition to obtain "saving" grace in Baptism, as contrasted with a mere ceremonial cleansing of the body such as was practised by both Jews and heathen. Compare St Peter's words to Simon Magus just after he had received the outward rite of Baptism, "thy heart is not right before God." So now, even in Infant Baptism, the sponsors, as representing the child, are required publicly to acknowledge that repentance, faith and obedience are the necessary conditions for continuing in the state of salvation to which we are admitted by Baptism.

**δὲ ἀναστάσεως.** The "new birth unto righteousness" involved in this right relationship to God is only ours in virtue of Christ's resurrection, and this is symbolized in Baptism. When the person baptized sinks under the water the death and burial of his old self is represented. When he emerges from the water he is regarded as rising to a new life. This idea is expanded in detail by St Paul in Romans vi. 3 ff. Cf. also Col. ii. 12. Possibly the same idea may be intended in the difficult words, "What shall they do that are baptized for the dead?" 1 Cor. xv. 29, which some critics interpret to mean that in Baptism men act on behalf of their own dead selves; they represent their death and resurrection, and this becomes an acted farce if any resurrection of the dead is an impossibility.

St Peter shews so many apparent traces of the Epistle to the Romans that St Paul's language in Rom. vi. almost certainly influenced him in this section. But we have no right to assume that this idea of Baptism, as representing death and resurrection with Christ, was originated by St Paul. He appeals to it as a thought which must surely be familiar (*ἣ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι*, Rom. vi. 3) to his readers in Rome, although he had never yet preached there himself. Therefore it may have been a favourite theme of other Christian teachers, although the elaboration of it was probably due to St Paul.

**22. ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ.** Some MSS. of the Vulgate and the Latin writers, Augustine, Fulgentius, Cassiodorus and Bede, add the words "having swallowed up death that we might be made heirs of eternal life," but there is no Greek authority for this addition. The first part of it may be derived from Is. xxv. 8, quoted by St Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 54, *κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος*. The second clause may be based upon 1 Pet. i. 3, *ὁ ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς...δὲ ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν εἰς κληρονομίαν...*, and the phrase *κληρονομεῖν ζωὴν*

*αἰώνιον* occurs in Matt. xix. 29; Mk x. 17; Lk. x. 25, xviii. 18; cf. Tit. iii. 7.

Possibly there may be a double purpose in this reference to the Session of Christ at God's right hand:

(a) That as it was to present us to God that Christ died, therefore the Christian who claims in Baptism to share Christ's resurrection must set his affections on things above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, cf. Col. iii. 1.

(b) That suffering and death culminated in glory in Christ's case, and the same will be true for His followers.

The doctrine of Christ's Session at the right hand of God is based upon our Lord's application to Himself of Ps. cx. 1, "Sit thou on my right hand," etc. It is stated in Mk xvi. 19, in St Peter's speeches in Acts ii. 33, 34, v. 31, by St Paul in Rom. viii. 34, Col. iii. 1, and Eph. i. 20, where there is a similar mention of the subordination of angelic powers. Cf. also Heb. i. 3—13, viii. 1, x. 12, xii. 2.

*ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἔξουσίων καὶ δυνάμεων.* R.V. *angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.* Possibly, however, *ἀγγέλων* may govern the two substantives which follow, as in the Book of Henoch lxi. 10, a book of which St Peter seems to shew other traces, "*angels of power and angels of principalities*" are mentioned among the various grades of angels.

For *ὑποταγέντων* cf. 1 Cor. xv. 27; Eph. i. 22; Heb. ii. 8, all of which passages are based upon Ps. viii. 7, which originally described the sovereignty of man.

For the exaltation of Christ above all grades of angels, cf. Eph. i. 21; Rom. viii. 38; Col. ii. 10, and in Col. i. 16 various grades of angels are described as having been created by, in and for Christ.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTE A.

##### *The Descent into Hell.*

In the Gospels the only passage which bears upon the subject is the promise to the penitent thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," Lk. xxiii. 43.

In St Paul we have three possible allusions to the subject:

Rom. x. 7, "Say not...who shall descend into the abyss, that is to bring Christ up from the dead?"

Rom. xiv. 9, "For to this end Christ died and lived again that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living."

Eph. iv. 9, "Now this, He ascended, what is it but that He also descended into the lower parts of the earth?" This verse might, however, merely mean that Christ came down from heaven to the lower sphere of this earth, and so refer to the Incarnation (but see Robinson, *ad loc.*).

**In St Peter,**

Acts ii. 27, 31, In his speech on the day of Pentecost St Peter quotes Ps. xvi. 8—11, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades," and shews that it was true of Christ.

**In this Epistle,**

iii. 19 states that Christ, being put to death in the flesh but quickened in spirit, went in that spirit and preached to the spirits in prison who were disobedient in the days of Noah.

iv. 6 states that good tidings was preached to the dead in order that, despite their judgment in the flesh, they may live according to God in the spirit.

The only N.T. writer therefore who says anything about the object of our Lord's descent into Hades or of His work there is St Peter. We have, however, no evidence as to the source from which he derived his teaching. According to early Jewish conceptions there were social and national distinctions in Sheol, and in the second century B.C. moral and ethical distinctions between the righteous and the wicked among the dead were introduced, but there was no idea of any moral improvement or possibility of change in the condition of the dead. Unless, therefore, we are prepared to treat St Peter's words merely as a pious conjecture, we must believe either that he learned these mysterious facts from the mouth of the Risen Lord Himself, or that it was specially revealed to him "not by flesh and blood but by the Father in heaven."

**In the Early Fathers** the descent of Christ to Hades is constantly referred to.

**In the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter** three men are seen coming forth from the tomb, two of them supporting the other, and a cross following them; and the head of the two reached to heaven, but that of Him who was led by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens saying, "Thou didst preach (*ἐκήρυξας*) to them that sleep," and a response was heard from the Cross, "Yea."

**Ignatius** (*ad Magn.* ix.) says, "Even the prophets, being His disciples, were expecting Him as their teacher through the Spirit. And for this cause He whom they rightly awaited when He came raised them from the dead" (cf. *ad Philad.* ix.).

**Justin Martyr** (*Dial.* 72) quotes a passage from Jeremiah, "The Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel, who lay in the graves and descended to preach to them His own salvation." This passage he accuses the Jews of having cut out from their copies of the Scriptures. It does not, however, occur in any extant MSS. of the LXX., but Irenaeus quotes it several times (once as from Isaiah, once as from Jeremiah, and in other passages anonymously (see iii. 20, iv. 22, 33, v. 31), in the last of which he definitely connects the preaching with the three days between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection). Irenaeus says nothing, however, about the Jews having cut out the words, and, from the fact that he assigns them to two different prophets, it would seem that the words were not contained in the current text of the LXX. If we could assume that this passage was known to St Peter, he might be referring to it, but there is no sufficient evidence for this, and St Peter's reference to those who were disobedient in the days of Noah would not be explained by this passage.

**Irenaeus** also (iv. 27) relates a discourse which he heard from "an elder" (*i.e.* a Christian of the generation before his own) who had heard it from personal companions of the apostles and their disciples, "that the Lord descended to the parts beneath the earth preaching His Advent there also and declaring remission of sins as available for those who believe in Him; but those have believed in Him whose hopes were set on Him, that is, those who foretold His Advent, just men and prophets and patriarchs."

**Hermas** (*Sim.* ix.) describes the apostles and first teachers of the Gospel as preaching to those who had previously fallen asleep, of whom he mentions the prophets and the ministers of God as well as the first two generations of mankind which preceded them.

**Clement of Alexandria** (*Strom.* ii. 9), quoting the above passage of Hermas, extends the preaching to pious heathen as well as Jews, and in *Strom.* vi. 6 he says that the Apostles followed the example of our Lord by preaching in Hades, but, while Jesus preached there only to the Jews, they addressed themselves to the righteous heathen.

**In the Apocryphal Preaching of Thaddeus** to Abgarus King of Edessa, quoted in Eusebius *H. E.* i. 13, Christ is stated to have descended into Hades and burst the bars which from eternity had not been broken, and raised the dead, for He descended alone, but rose with many, and thus ascended to His Father.

**Tertullian**, *de Anima* 55, speaking of the days between the death and resurrection of Christ, says "He descended to the lower parts of

the earth that there he might make patriarchs and prophets partakers of Himself."

**Hippolytus**, *de Antichristo* 45, represents John the Baptist after his death as preaching in Hades that the Saviour will come there also to deliver the souls of the saints.

**Origen** (*contra Celsum* II. 43) says, "With His soul stripped of His body Christ associated with souls stripped of their bodies, converting to Himself those even of them who were willing or those who for reasons which He Himself knew were more fitted for it."

In the **Apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus**, the date of which is uncertain, but which may be based upon a second century work, the two sons of the aged Symeon are described as having been raised from the dead, and giving an account of Christ's work in Hades, that He delivered Adam from the penalty of his sin, and brought the patriarchs from a lower to a higher blessedness, and emptied the prison house and set the captives free, and erected the Cross in the midst of Hades that there also it might preach salvation.

**Marcion** accepted the descent of Christ into Hades, but, according to his opponents, regarding the Demiurge, the God of the O.T., as a different God from the God of the N.T., he maintained that the righteous men and prophets under the old dispensation, as being subjects of the Demiurge, refused to listen to Christ's preaching, and only Cain and the other wicked characters of the O.T. listened and were saved.

**Athanasius** (*de Incarnatione*), arguing against the Apollinarians, who denied that Christ had any human spirit (*πνεῦμα*), says that the Lord appeared in Hades in an incorporeal state to shew the souls there present the presence of His own soul as having received the bonds of death, so that He might burst the bonds of the souls which were held fast in Hades.

**Gregory Nazianzen** inquires whether we are to suppose that Christ, appearing in Hades, did save all without exception, or did save there, as He does here, only such as believed.

**Cyril of Alexandria**, in commenting on Jn xvi. 16, says, "After three days He came to life again, having preached also to the spirits in prison. For thus there was the fullest manifestation of His love to men, I mean, in the fact that He not only saved those who were still alive upon the earth, but also to those who had already departed and were seated in darkness in the recesses of the abyss He preached deliverance as it is written."

Also *de Incarnatione* he says that the soul of Christ went to Hades and appeared also to the spirits there.

**Jerome**, commenting on Ephesians, says that our Lord and Saviour descended into Hell that He might lead with Him in triumph to heaven the souls of the saints that were shut up in prison.

**Augustine**, in his letter to Euodius 164, argues that the prophets and patriarchs were already in happiness and enjoyed the presence of God, and therefore needed no translation by the descent of Christ to Hades. Others who were in the pains of hell were released, but it would be very rash to suppose that Christ released all whom He found there. But Augustine confesses himself to be very doubtful whether 1 Pet. iii. 19 can be satisfactorily explained as referring to the descent into Hell, and he suggests the possibility of its referring to the Spirit of Christ preaching to the world in the days of Noah.

In **Credo**s the clause "He descended into Hell" is not contained in the Nicene Creed. It occurs first in the creed drawn up by the Homoeans at Sirmium to be presented to the Western Council at Ariminum 359, "He descended into Hell (*eis τὰ καταχθόνια*) and disposed matters there; at the sight of whom the door-keepers of Hades trembled."

In **Western Credo**s the clause first occurs in the Creed of Aquileia, as given by Rufinus about 400 A.D. He states that it was not contained in the Creed of Rome nor in the Eastern Credo's, but argues that it was meant to be included in the statement that Christ was buried. He quotes this passage of St Peter in support of it.

In the **Articles of 1553** the English copy runs as follows, "As Christ died and was buried for us, so also it is to be believed that He went down to Hell. For the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection, but His ghost departing from Him was with the ghosts that were in prison or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St Peter doth testify." In the Latin form of the article there had been an additional clause that "by His descent the Lord did not deliver any from prison or from torment." In our present 3rd article only the first sentence of the above article is retained, but this passage of St Peter is still appointed as the Epistle for Easter Eve, implying that it is to be interpreted of the work of Christ between His death and resurrection.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTE B ON **iii. 19.**

Other interpretations of this confessedly difficult passage are

A. That it does refer to the descent into Hell, but (1) the "preaching" was a proclamation of condemnation and not an offer of pardon. The objections to this view are that in iv. 6 (which most

probably refers to the same "preaching") *good tidings* (εὐαγγελισθη) is stated to have been preached to the dead. Also κηρύσσειν is the word used in the Gospels of "proclaiming the Gospel of the kingdom" Mt. iv. 23, "preaching repentance" Mt. iv. 17, "preaching deliverance to the captives...and proclaiming the acceptable year of the Lord" Lk. iv. 18, 19. In the Acts and Epistles it is constantly used of preaching the Gospel or preaching Christ, but there is no instance of its use for proclaiming condemnation, and it would be hardly intelligible in that sense here without some words to explain it.

Or (2) that the good news was only preached in Hades to the spirits of the righteous, such as Abel, Abraham and other O.T. saints. This was a favourite idea in early writers (e.g. the Gospel of Nicodemus, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Tertullian). But the context expressly defines the spirits to be "those who were disobedient in the days of Noah." There is no hint whatever that O.T. saints in general are intended, and ἐν φυλακῇ could hardly mean *in God's safe keeping* (cf. "The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God") nor, as Calvin suggested, *the watch tower* from which the souls of the righteous in Hades were eagerly looking for the advent of their deliverer.

Or (3) that the passage does refer to those who perished in the Flood, but only to those who turned to God in their dying agony. But St Peter makes no allusion whatever to their repentance, but only to their disobedience.

Or (4) a more tenable interpretation would be to explain "the spirits in prison" as meaning *evil angels* whose influence was paramount in the world in the days of Noah, cf. Gen. vi. 2, "The sons of God saw that the daughters of men were fair," etc. This seems to have been generally understood of immoral intercourse between angels and women, which caused the destruction of the world by the Flood. In the Book of Enoch there are constant references to this sin of the angels, and in Chapter lxvii. "the angels who have shewn injustice and who led astray are shewn to Noah inclosed in a flaming valley, but the waters of judgment are a *healing of the angels and a death to their bodies.*" St Peter seems to shew traces of the Book of Enoch in other passages and there is some slight similarity between this description in Enoch and St Peter's words, iv. 6 "judged in the flesh after the pattern of men but living in the spirit after the pattern of God." St Jude, who quotes the Book of Enoch by name, says, v. 6, "Angels which left their proper habitation, he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." But this would give no support to the view that the spirit of Christ preached to them during His descent into Hell.



B. Another interpretation, supported in one passage by Augustine and also by Aquinas and Bishop Pearson, is that the passage does not refer to the descent into Hell at all, but to the preaching of the Spirit of Christ in the world in the preaching of Noah. In i. 11 the Spirit of Christ is described as working in the prophets of the O.T., and it is true that it was by the indwelling Spirit of Christ that Noah was a preacher (*κήρυξ*) of righteousness.

But the objections to this view are :

(1) That it destroys the natural sequence of thought in the passage, in which *θανατωθεῖς*, *ζωοποιηθεῖς*, *πορευθεῖς*, *ἐκήρυξε* seem most naturally to describe successive stages in the work of Christ, whereas this view would refer the "preaching" to the distant past.

(2) *πορευθεῖς* like *πορευθεῖς εἰς οὐρανὸν* in 22 suggests the idea of a "journey" or change of sphere such as the descent into Hades rather than the omnipresent work of Christ in the world before the Incarnation. At the same time we must not introduce too materialistic ideas of space in dealing with the unseen world either of Hades or of Heaven.

(3) The recipients of the proclamation are described as *πνεύμασιν ἐν φυλακῇ* and this can hardly mean "those who were living men at the time when they received the message but are now spirits in the prison-house of Hades." Nor is it likely that the contemporaries of Noah in their lifetime would be described as "spirits confined in the prison-house of sin and unbelief or in the prison-house of the body."

(4) The spirit in which Christ preached is identified with that in which He was quickened by the death of His flesh, and thus most naturally means His *human* spirit—whereas His work in the world in the days of Noah could only be that of His *divine* Spirit.

## CHAPTER IV

1. **ὄν** sums up the various lessons drawn from the sufferings of Christ in the preceding verses iii. 18—22, that suffering in the flesh is (a) a termination of the regime of sin, (b) an opportunity for new and wider service in the spirit, (c) the prelude to future glory.

**παθόντος σαρκί**, refers to *ἀπέθανεν, θανατώθεις σαρκί* in iii. 18.

**τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ὀπλίσασθε**, *arm yourselves with the same attitude of mind* towards suffering with which Christ armed Himself to face suffering and death, cf. Heb. xii. 2 ff.; Phil. ii. 5 ff.

**ἔννοια** only occurs again in Heb. iv. 12 where it refers to the action of the reason as opposed to *ἐνθύμησις* the action of the affections.

**ὀπλιζειν** occurs nowhere else in the N.T. but *καθωπλισμένος* is used of "the strong man armed" Lk. xi. 21, and the Christian's armour is referred to in Eph. vi. 11; 1 Thes. v. 8; Rom. xiii. 12.

**ὄτι** might be translated *that* = arm yourselves with the thought *that*, but more probably it means *because*.

**ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πάντα ἁμαρτίας**. Bigg explains this to mean "he that in meekness and fear hath endured persecutions, rather than join in the wicked ways of the heathen, can be trusted to do right; temptation has manifestly no power over him." He denies any connexion between this passage and St Paul's words, Rom. vi. 7 *ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανῶν δεδικαιώται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. In Romans St Paul is borrowing a Rabbinic formula, "When a man is dead he is free from the law and the commandments." Delitzsch describes this as a well-known *locus communis* or stock phrase, and in this case St Peter's language might be independent of St Paul's. But this is hardly possible in view of the numerous coincidences with Romans in other parts of the Epistle, and a careful comparison shews that St Peter is following the same line of thought as St Paul. St Paul's argument is that in Baptism the Christian professes to have shared in Christ's death and resurrection. Now Christ died to sin once and for all (*ἐφάπαξ*). He is no longer under the dominion of death. He lives unto God. So the baptized Christian is ideally dead to the regime of sin. Death has cancelled the old bonds of slavery. If sin tries to reclaim him as his slave, sin will lose his suit on the ground that the slave is dead. He is acquitted against the claims of sin and is therefore bound to live unto God and not revert to the old life of sin.

Similarly St Peter has just described Christ as having died (or suffered) for sins once (*ἅπαξ*) to present us to God (cf. ii. 24, "who himself bare our sins in his body upon the tree that we having died (*ἀπογενόμενοι*) unto sins might live unto righteousness"). His death in the flesh was the quickening of His spirit for new service to God with whom He now reigns in glory. Then, having shewn how the Flood symbolized the termination of the old guilty world and the salvation of Noah's family for a new and purified world, St Peter describes the same putting off of defilement and resurrection to live with a good conscience toward God as being symbolized by Baptism. That is the ideal to which Christians are pledged in Baptism, but it is an ideal which needs to be realized by painful efforts and watchful prayer, so long as they still live in the flesh. Bodily sufferings, instead of being resented as a hardship and a hindrance, should be welcomed as a factor in emancipating man from the thralldom of sin and enabling him to live unto God in the spirit. Though they still have to live in the flesh their life must no longer be regulated by the wayward desires of men but by the will of God.

2. *εἰς τὸ* may be taken (a) with *ὀπίσασθε* in order that ye should no longer live, etc. as R.V., or (b) as A.V. and R.V. marg. with *πέπνυται* that he should no longer live, etc.

*ἐπιθυμίαις*, the many variable lusts of men are contrasted with the single unvarying purpose of God. So Heracleon ap. Origen on Jn tom. xx. 24 says that the devil has not *θέλημα* but *ἐπιθυμίας*.

*βίωσαι*. Nowhere else in the N.T. but cf. Job xxix. 18, with an accusative, and absolutely in Prov. vii. 3. *βίωσις*=manner of life Acts xxvi. 4.

*ἐπίλοιπον*, here only in N.T.

3. *ἄρκετός γάρ*. The *γάρ* explains *ἐπίλοιπον*, I say "what remains of your life" for the sinful past has been all too long.

*βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν*. The T.R. reads *θέλημα* as in the previous verse of the will of God. The distinction between *βούλημα* and *θέλημα*, like that between *βούλεσθαι* and *θέλειν*, is somewhat disputed. *θέλημα* is much more common than *βούλημα* and is constantly used of the will of God, though it is also used of the will of men or of the flesh, while *βούλημα* is used of God in Rom. ix. 19 and *βούλεσθαι* in Heb. vi. 17; Jas i. 18; 2 Pet. iii. 9, while *βουλή* is several times used of God, and in Eph. i. 11 we have *κατὰ τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θελήματος*. The predominant N.T. usage seems to be that *θέλειν* denotes the will which proceeds from character or inclination, while *βούλεσθαι* denotes more deliberation. For the two words occurring together, see Mt. i. 19, *Ἰωσήφ... μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι ἐβουλήθη λάθρα ἀπολύσαι αὐτήν*,

1 Tim. v. 12 and 14, *γαμῶν θέλουσιν...βούλομαι οὖν*, cf. also 2 Pet. iii. 9 contrasted with 1 Tim. ii. 4.

**τῶν ἔθνῶν.** Those who regard the Epistle as addressed to Jewish readers explain this as referring to their previous laxity in conforming to the customs of their heathen neighbours, but it is more natural if addressed to Gentiles, cf. Eph. iv. 17.

**κατεργάσθαι**, *to have wrought*, the word is coupled with *ποιεῖν* and *πράσσειν* in Rom. vii. 15 and means to put into execution or carry into effect.

**πεπορευμένοις**, the perfect participle denotes *walking as you have done* until recently. The verb is generally used of a literal journey but of following a certain line of conduct here and in 2 Pet. ii. 10, iii. 3; Jude 11, 16, 18; Lk. i. 6; Acts ix. 31, xiv. 16.

**ἀσελγείαις** = *wanton immorality*, shameless acts etc., Mk vii. 22; Jude 4; 2 Pet. ii. 2, 7; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. v. 19; Eph. iv. 19 and in the plural in Rom. xiii. 13 where it is coupled with *κῶμοις καὶ μέθαις*. **οἰνοφλυγίαις**, *wine-bibblings*, a classical word only found here in Biblical Greek though the verb occurs Deut. xxi. 20; Is. lvi. 12. It denotes excessive drinking, debauch. **κῶμοις**, *revellings*, cf. Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 21. **πότοις**, *carousings*, drinking-parties, only here in the N.T. In the LXX. it is sometimes used of banquets, Gen. xix. 3; 2 Sam. iii. 20; Esther vi. 14. **ἀθεμίτοις**, lit. contrary to law and justice. In the only other passage where it occurs in the N.T. it is used of intercourse with Gentiles as being unlawful for Jews, Acts x. 28. So here those who regard the readers as Jews explain it to mean illegal for you to take part in, but more probably it means illicit, abominable deeds which are contrary to what is right (*fas*). It occurs in 2 Macc. vi. 5, vii. 1, x. 34.

**εἰδωλολατρίαις.** Of idol-worship in 1 Cor. x. 14, but in Col. iii. 5 it is used as an explanation of covetousness, greed being regarded as the idolatry of Mammon, cf. Eph. v. 5, 1 Cor. v. 11. In Gal. v. 20 it is included among the works of the flesh, but, though coupled with sins of drunkenness and immorality, should probably be understood literally of tampering with false gods, the word which follows being *φαρμακεία*, sorcery. Here the plural may denote various forms of idolatry, or the abominable vices which were so frequently connected with idolatry and which would be wrong for Gentiles to practise no less than for Jews.

4. **ἐν ᾧ**, *wherein, in which respect.*

**ξενίζονται.** In the active the verb is used transitively of entertaining strangers, Acts x. 23, xxviii. 7; Heb. xiii. 2, and once of "surprising doctrines," Acts xvii. 20; cf. Polyb. 3, 114. 4; Joseph.

*Ant.* 1. 1. 4. In the middle it generally means to lodge, Acts x. 6, 18, 32, xxi. 16. But here and in verse 12 it is passive and means "are surprised," cf. Polyb. 1. 23. 5, etc. The surprise here attributed to their heathen neighbours would be hardly intelligible if the readers were Jews, as there is no evidence that the Jews of the Dispersion had so generally taken part in heathen excesses that their abandonment of them would excite astonishment, whereas such new strictness on the part of the Gentile converts would provoke criticism.

**συντρεχόντων** probably denotes unrestrained indulgence, *running headlong after*, not merely concurrence.

**ἀνάχυσιν**, only here in Biblical Greek. Philo uses the word in a good sense of the out-pouring of the soul, but here it means the excess or flood of riot in which a dissolute life pours itself out.

**ἀσωτίας** from a privative and *σώζω*, the spendthrift character which squanders itself and its goods recklessly. This is the definition adopted by Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* iv. 1, 4 and it suits the description given of the Prodigal Son, Lk. xv. 13 *ζῶν ἀσώτως*, so also Theophylact on Eph. v. 18, but Clement Al. explains it as meaning the conduct of one who is *ἀσωτος*, i.e. one who cannot be saved, an abandoned reprobate. The substantive occurs again in Eph. v. 18, *οἶνος ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία* and Tit. i. 6. LXX. Prov. xxviii. 7; 2 Macc. vi. 4.

**βλασφημοῦντες**, *railing at you, reviling you*, cf. Matt. xxvii. 39 ff.; Rom. iii. 8. The word does not necessarily imply blasphemous language toward God (as in Mt. ix. 3; Acts xix. 37; Rev. xiii. 6, etc.), nor foul accusations against Christians, but might include taunts and reproaches against them as being gloomy, morose or fanatical.

5. οἷ. For this abrupt and emphatic use of the relative, cf. Rom. iii. 8.

**δίδοναι** or **ἀποδίδοναι λόγον** is used of rendering account in Mt. xii. 36; Lk. xvi. 2; Acts xix. 40; Rom. xiv. 12; Heb. iv. 13, xiii. 17.

**τῷ ἐτοίμως κρίνοντι**. The T.R. reads *ἐτοίμως ἔχοντι κρίναι* for which phrase cf. Acts xxi. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 14 and *ἐν ἐτοιμῷ ἔχειν*, 2 Cor. x. 6.

Bengel explains "Paratus est Judex; nam evangelio prædicato nisi finis restat." The living will soon have heard the Gospel, the dead have already done so, therefore all is ready for the judgment. But the reading of the best MSS. *ἐτοίμως κρίνοντι* means not so much that the judgment is ready to be executed but that God judges readily "with the unerring precision of perfect knowledge" (Chase, Hastings *D. of B.* iii. 795). He knows the opportunities which He has afforded

to all and their consequent responsibility in accepting or rejecting His message.

ζῶντας καὶ νεκροῦς, the judgment of "the quick and the dead" is referred to again only in St Peter's speech to Cornelius, Acts x. 42, where Christ is the appointed Judge and in 2 Tim. iv. 1, but cf. Rom. xiv. 9. Here the personality of the Judge is not stated, but in i. 17, ii. 23 God is spoken of as judging.

6. εἰς τοῦτο γάρ. εἰς τοῦτο does not refer to what precedes, viz. that the Gospel was preached to the dead in order that they might fairly be included in the judgment. That idea may perhaps be suggested by the γάρ. But wherever εἰς τοῦτο or διὰ τοῦτο in the N.T. is followed by *ὡς*, *ὅπως* or an infinitive it points forward to the object of the action, e.g. Jn xviii. 37; Acts ix. 21; 2 Cor. ii. 9; Col. iv. 8; Eph. vi. 33; 1 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Jn iii. 8. So here the object for which good tidings was preached to the dead was that they might live unto God in the spirit despite their judgment in the flesh. This is the same message which is being taught to the living by their sufferings in the flesh.

καὶ νεκροῖς. Various attempts have been made to explain this passage:

(a) As referring to the spiritually dead in trespasses and sins (so Augustine, Cyril, Bede, Erasmus, Luther, etc.). But, having used νεκροῦς in its literal sense of the physically dead in the previous sentence, it is hardly credible that St Peter here employs the word metaphorically.

(b) As referring to those who have died since they heard the Gospel (so Bengel, who regarded it as impossible that anyone could receive the Gospel after death). According to this view the words have been explained by Van Soden as a message of encouragement, that Christians who received the Gospel but have since been judged in the flesh by dying will share in eternal life (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 13—18). Hofman, on the other hand, regards it as a warning to blasphemers, that those who escape punishment in this life will not be exempted from judgment after death. Such interpretations, however, do not naturally follow from the words, and if St Peter had meant to describe "those who have since died," he would have written κεικοιμημένοις or τεθνηκόσιν.

(c) Another interpretation is "those who hear the Gospel in their lifetime but who will be dead before they are judged."

The most natural interpretation of the words is that good tidings was preached to those who were dead at the time when they received the message.

The passage must be considered in connexion with iii. 19, though three important differences must be noticed :

(a) In iii. 19 one particular generation of the dead is specified, viz. those who being disobedient perished in the great typical judgment of the ancient world. Here νεκροίς, though not necessarily universal in its scope, is presumably as wide as the preceding ζώντας και νεκρούς. Many of the Fathers, e.g. Ignatius, Hermas, Clement Al., Irenaeus, seem to restrict the preaching in Hades to the just alone, but in view of the special mention of those who were formerly disobedient in iii. 19 it would seem as if the proclamation was made to all. St Peter is, however, silent as to the results of the preaching. In Hades, as on earth, it may have been rejected by many.

(b) In iii. 19 the agency of Christ as the herald (ἐκήρυξεν), through His spirit quickened and set free by death, is emphasized. Here the agent is not specified, but the character of the message is defined as being good tidings (εὐηγγελισθη) and stress is laid upon the recipients of the message (και νεκροίς). The agent and the occasion may, however, be identical both in ἐκήρυξεν and εὐηγγελισθη, though early Fathers, e.g. Hermas and Clement Al., ascribed preaching of good tidings in Hades to the Apostles.

(c) In iii. 19 nothing is said about the purpose of the proclamation, whereas here it is emphasized as being in order that though judged in the flesh they might live in the spirit.

ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν...ζῶσι δέ. The μὲν clause is practically subordinate to the δέ clause, though on the one hand they are judged yet on the other they may live. The aorist κριθῶσι denotes the one crisis of judgment while the present ζῶσι points to continuous life in the spirit. In one sense all who die may be regarded as "judged in the flesh." Cf. Wisdom iii. 4

"For though they be punished in the sight of men,  
Yet is their hope full of immortality."

Possibly however, in view of the fact that the disobedient who perished in the Flood are specially mentioned as being preached to in iii. 19, the judgment in the flesh here also refers to those whose death was markedly a punishment. σάρξ and πνεῦμα are contrasted in iii. 18 and virtually in iii. 21 and iv. 2.

κατὰ ἀνθρώπους...κατὰ θεόν. κατὰ ἀνθρώπους, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 3 περιπατεῖτε κατὰ ἄνθρωπον = ye conduct yourselves as men do; 1 Cor. ix. 8; Rom. iii. 5; Gal. iii. 15 λέγειν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον = to speak according to human modes of thought, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 32; Gal. i. 11.

κατὰ θεόν is used in Rom. viii. 27 of the Spirit making intercession

for us *κατὰ θεόν*, which might mean *in the presence of God* but more probably *in accordance with God's will*, cf. 2 Cor. vii. 9, 11 (xi. 17 *κατὰ κύριον*), Rom. xv. 5 (*κατὰ Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν*). In Eph. iv. 24 it means after the image of God, cf. 1 Pet. i. 15 *κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς*, after the model of Him that called you. Here the meaning might be *in the estimation of men...of God* but more probably it means *judged as it is fit that men should be judged but live as God lives*.

7—11. Having urged the necessity of terminating the regime of sin, St Peter next gives a summary of what life according to God in the Spirit should be. It is a life of sober-mindedness, of watchful prayer, of strenuous love, of faithful stewardship in administering God's varied gifts of grace, so that in all things God may be glorified in them as members of Christ, to whom be glory and dominion to endless ages, Amen.

7. πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν. The mention of God's readiness to judge both the quick and the dead leads St Peter to remind his readers *that the end of all things has drawn nearer*. Our Lord compared the coming of the Son of Man to the Flood, as coming unexpectedly upon those who were living in careless, self-indulgent ease, eating and drinking, and He warned His disciples to watch (*γρηγορεῖτε*) and not prove wicked servants who eat and drink with the drunken. St Luke in a parallel passage represents St Peter as asking whether the warning to watch is addressed to all, and in reply our Lord shews the special responsibility of "the faithful and wise steward" (*οἰκονόμος*) who is appointed to give out food to the Master's household. The persecution of Christ's followers for His name and the preaching of the Gospel among all nations were to be signs of His coming and "then shall the end come," Mt. xxiv. 14. Thus there seem to be constant echoes of our Lord's teaching all through this passage of St Peter: (a) The allusion to the Flood (iii. 20 and ? iv. 6). (b) The surprise of the Gentiles when Christians refuse to join in their drunkenness and immorality may be a comparison with the conduct of Noah's contemporaries. (c) The special responsibility of those who are "stewards (*οἰκονόμοι*) of the manifold grace of God." (d) The persecution of Christians in Christ's name as a sign that the judgment is beginning. (e) Indirectly the fact that his Gentile readers are representatives of "all the nations" to whom the Gospel was to be preached would be another of the signs predicted by our Lord that the "end had drawn nearer."

σωφρονήσατε οὖν, *be ye therefore of sound mind*. The verb is used of the Gadarene demoniac being restored to his right mind, Mk v. 15; Lk. viii. 35, and in contrast to being "beside oneself" in 2 Cor. v. 13.



In Rom. xii. 3 it is opposed to *ὑπερφρονεῖν* and in Tit. ii. 6 it is used in the sense of being sober-minded. In 4 Macc. i. 31 *σωφροσύνη* is defined as *ἐπικράτεια τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν*. So here in view of the approaching "end of all things" Christians are bidden to be sober-minded, not carried away by self-indulgence nor by unhealthy excitement.

*νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς*, cf. Mk xiv. 38; Lk. xxi. 36. For *νήψατε*, cf. i. 13; all their faculties must be under control and quietly devoted to prayer.

8. *τὴν...ἀγάπην ἕκτενῇ ἔχοντες*. *ἕκτενῇ* is the predicate. It is assumed that they have love towards one another, but they are bidden to maintain it in a fervent, strenuous condition, cf. i. 22.

*ἑαυτοῦς*. For *ἀλλήλους* as often in N.T. and also class. Greek.

*ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν*. The words are borrowed from Prov. x. 12 "Hatred stirreth up strife but love covereth all transgressions." The LXX. however is *πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία* but the versions of Aquila and Theodotion read *ἐπὶ πάσας ἀθεσίας καλύψει ἀγάπη*. On the relation of this passage to Jas v. 20 see Intr. p. lviii. In Proverbs there can be little doubt that the meaning is Love refuses to see faults, it passes over without notice and so forgives the sins of others. St Peter's form of the words occurs in Clem. 1 Cor. 49 where Lightfoot explains it, Love forgives the sins of others, which he thinks is probably the meaning in St Peter. Similarly in St James he explains that the sins of the man who is converted are buried from the sight of God, being wiped out by the conversion and repentance of the sinner.

But in 2 Clem. 16 the same words are quoted as follows: "Almsgiving is good as repentance from sin (is good). Fasting is better than prayer but almsgiving (is better) than both. But love covereth a multitude of sins and prayer from a good conscience rescues from death...for almsgiving removes the load of sin." The meaning adopted is evidently that love atones for the sins of him who loves, the rest of the passage being borrowed from Tobit xii. 9 "Almsgiving rescues from death and it purgeth all sin." Cf. Daniel iv. 27 "redeem thy sins by almsgivings and thine iniquities by acts of pity to the poor," Ecclesiasticus iii. 3 "He that honoureth his father shall atone for sins," Ecclesiasticus iii. 30 "almsgiving shall atone for sins," Ecclesiasticus iii. 14 "pity for a father...shall be imputed to thee for good against thy sins." Tertullian *Scorp.* 6 explains the words as meaning that love wins forgiveness for a man's own sins, so also Origen in Hom. Lev. ii. 4, illustrating them by Lk. vii. 47 "Her sins which are many are forgiven her for she loved much." Clement Al. *Paed.* iii. 12 quotes the words with the

formula *φησι*. Consequently Resch regards them as one of the unwritten sayings of Christ, but as the preceding passages in Clement are quotations from the O.T. this explanation is doubtful, but in *Didascalía* ii. 3 the words are quoted with the formula *λέγει Κύριος*. Clement Al. *Strom.* ii. 15 explains the words as referring to God's love in Christ which forgives men's sins, but in *Quis div. salv.* 38 he says that love working in a man enables him to repent and put away his own sins.

For the idea that deeds of love to others affect a man's own pardon, cf. Lk. xvi. 9; Mt. xxv. 34—40. On the whole the *primary* meaning in St Peter probably is that *love forgives the sins of others*, but our Lord said "If ye forgive men their trespasses your heavenly Father will forgive you," therefore by love which forgives others a man does enable God's forgiveness to be extended to himself.

9. *φιλόξενοι*. The duty of hospitality to strangers, commended by our Lord, Mt. xxv. 35, is also enjoined in Rom. xii. 13 and Heb. xiii. 2. In 1 Tim. iii. 2 and Tit. i. 8 it is demanded as one of the special qualifications for an *ἐπίσκοπος*. In the primitive Church Christian travellers would be exposed to certain annoyance and possible danger unless the Christians of the place received them into their houses, and without such aid the missions of itinerant preachers (*ἀπόστολοι*) would have been almost impossible (cf. Tit. iii. 13; 3 Jn 6—8, 10; Philemon 22; Rom. xvi. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 4—14). At the same time such hospitality must have been a somewhat serious tax upon Christians who were by no means well off, and from the regulations given in the *Didache* we gather that there was before long a real danger that unscrupulous strangers might impose upon the generosity of the Church.

So here St Peter urges his readers to exercise hospitality ungrudgingly, remembering that any gifts which they possess, whether in worldly goods or faculties for service, are only entrusted to them as stewards to use them for God. For the duty of giving cheerfully, cf. 2 Cor. ix. 7; Rom. xii. 8. In this latter passage, as here, charitable duties are coupled with those of preaching, teaching or ministering, as varied *χαρίσματα* given by God to the several members of the Body of Christ.

For *γογγυσμός* cf. Phil. ii. 14.

10. *καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα*. The aorist most naturally refers to their conversion or their baptism but, if worldly goods to be used in hospitality are included as a *χάρισμα*, these would be possessed before conversion, and the aorist may refer to God's endowment of His future stewards.

**διακονοῦντες.** *διακονεῖν, διακονία* and *διάκονος* can be used of any kind of ministry or service. Thus our Lord uses it of His own work and it is used of the ministry of angels, or of prophets, 1 Pet. i. 12, or of apostles, but it is specially used of ministering to the *wants* of others. The word is used both in its general and special sense in Acts vi. 1—4 where *διακονία* is first used of the distribution of alms (cf. *διακονεῖν τραπέζαις*) and then of “the ministry of the word” *i.e.* preaching. Again in Rom. xii. 7 *διακονία* is mentioned as a special duty, side by side with prophesying, teaching, exhortation. So here *διακονοῦντες* is first used generally of all kinds of Christian service and then specially *εἰ τις διακονεῖ*.

There are such numerous echoes of Rom. xii., xiii. in 1 Pet. (see Int. p. lx) that there can be little doubt that in this passage about the use of various *χαρίσματα* St Peter is borrowing from Rom. xii. 6 ff. but instead of employing St Paul’s characteristic illustration of the body and its members he uses that of stewardship.

**οἰκονόμοι.** *οἰκονομία* means primarily “the office of a steward” or “household management,” but the latter meaning was used in a very wide sense of any kind of provision or arrangement, cf. the English word “dispensation,” so in Eph. i. 10, iii. 2, 9; Col. i. 25 it is used of God’s plan or arrangement; but in 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2, ix. 17 St Paul speaks of his own stewardship and says that he and his fellow-workers should be regarded as “stewards,” so Tit. i. 7 the *ἐπίσκοπος* must be blameless as being “the steward of God” (cf. the Parable of the unjust steward and Lk. xii. 42). In the latter passage the steward, though himself a slave, is evidently regarded as being in a position of authority over the other servants, but here St Peter seems to regard every man as an *οἰκονόμος*. As members of “the household of God” each one is responsible for using what his Master has given him for the benefit of the household in accordance with God’s “housekeeping arrangements.”

**ποικίλης χάριτος.** All the different gifts (*χαρίσματα*) are bestowed by God’s free favour (*χάρις*) which shows itself in a variety (*ποικίλης*) of forms (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 4—11; Rom. xii. 3—8).

11. **εἰ τις λαλεῖ.** In classical Greek *λαλεῖν* has generally a disparaging sense to *chatter* but in the N.T. it means *to talk*, to utter one’s thoughts, and is frequently used of God. Where it is contrasted with *λέγειν* it denotes the sound, pronunciation or form of what is said while *λέγειν* refers to the meaning and substance. *λαλεῖν* is frequently used in the N.T. of teachers, of our Lord, the apostles and others. So here the context implies that the “speaking” is a gift of God’s grace which they have to administer as stewards.

and the primary reference is to the utterances of prophets or teachers, whether in preaching (*προφητεία*), exhortation or teaching (cf. Rom. xii. 6—8), but other unofficial utterances of Christians may be included, such as their answers to those who demand an account of their hope (iii. 15): cf. Mt. x. 20 where the Spirit of their Father is promised to speak in the mouth of His persecuted children.

**ὡς λόγια θεοῦ.** Bigg takes *λόγια* as a nominative=speaks as Scripture speaks, with sincerity and gravity, but it is better to take *λόγια* as an accusative. Anyone who undertakes to speak for God must do so in meekness and fear. He must remember that his message is not his own but God's. He must not parade his eloquence, nor speak lightly and thoughtlessly.

*λόγια* occurs again in Acts vii. 38 of Moses receiving "living oracles," *i.e.* the Law at Sinai; in Rom. iii. 2 of the Jews being entrusted with "the oracles of God" where it probably means the O.T. Scriptures in general. In Heb. v. 12 the Hebrews "need to be taught again the rudiments of the beginning of the oracles of God," *i.e.* elementary Christian truths. In Philo *λόγια* is certainly used of the narrative portions of the O.T., as well as of the Law or the utterances of the prophets. So in Christian writers *τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου* or *Κυριακὰ λόγια* may sometimes denote the Gospels and not merely "Sayings of our Lord," *e.g.* in Polycarp, Papias, Eusebius, Ephraem Syrus.

**ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος.** Any services for others, rendered by the Christian as a "minister" or servant of Christ, must be performed (a) modestly, because they are not due to his own strength, (b) strenuously, because God supplies him with strength.

**χορηγεῖ** (see Robinson on Eph. iv. 16). In classical Greek *χορηγός* means the leader of a chorus. Thence *χορηγεῖν* means (a) to be a chorus leader, (b) to furnish a chorus at one's own expense, providing all necessary requisites to place a play upon the stage, and so (c) in late Greek, Polybius, Philo, Josephus and in the LXX. it means to supply, provide, or equip. In the N.T. *χορηγεῖν* only occurs again in 2 Cor. ix. 10 but the compound *ἐπιχορηγεῖν* is found in 2 Cor. ix. 10; Gal. iii. 5; Col. ii. 19; 2 Pet. i. 5, 11, and *ἐπιχορηγία* in Eph. iv. 16; Phil. i. 19.

**ἵνα...δοξάζηται ὁ θεός,** cf. ii. 12 and Mt. v. 16 "that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

**διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** Just as the prayers of Christ's members are offered to God "through Jesus Christ" as their Head and spokesman, so their good works redound to God's glory through

Him. In Rom. xvi. 27 and Jude 25 glory is offered to God through Jesus Christ.

ὁ ἔστιν ἡ δόξα. Grammatically ὁ might refer to θεός but in 2 Tim. iv. 18 a similar doxology is addressed to "the Lord," *i.e.* Christ, so also 2 Pet. iii. 18; Rev. i. 6. Therefore here, as also in Heb. xiii. 21, the ὁ may refer to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ which immediately precedes it. δόξα occurs in 14 of the 16 doxologies in the N.T. and κράτος in 6, while εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων occurs in 8 and εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας in 5, ἀμήν being appended to all of them, marking the formula as liturgical. The concluding doxology in the Lord's prayer is not found in the best texts either in Mt. or Lk. and is a liturgical addition.

12 ff. Having described two of the results of Christ's sufferings in the flesh as being applicable also to His members, *viz.* (a) the termination of sin, (b) a life of service in the spirit, St Peter now begins the concluding section of his epistle with the third characteristic of suffering, that it is the process by which Christ's members are brought to glory as He was. This thought was introduced by the concluding words of the last section.

Sufferings are not to be regarded with surprise, as though some 12 strange mischance was interrupting or thwarting God's loving purpose. Rather they are coming to pass in the orderly fulfilment of that purpose. They are a refining process (*cf.* i. 7), a trial by fire intended to test the genuineness of Christians. In proportion as they have 13 a personal share in the sufferings of the Christ they should rejoice, as a preliminary to the exultant joy which will be theirs when the glory of Christ, as the Head of manhood made perfect in Him, is revealed.

It is a happy thing to be reproached in the name of Christ, as 14 belonging to Him. Suffering is the distinctive characteristic of glory under present conditions. Those who bear the reproach of His Name are, as it were, the House of God, the Sanctuary (*cf.* ii. 5) on which the Shekinah and the Spirit of God are resting. But care 15 must be taken that it really is Christ's reproach which they bear. To suffer for some crime or for unwarranted interference in the affairs of others would only be a disgrace. But to suffer as "a Christian" 16 is no disgrace. Rather it is a title by which they may glorify God.

(In announcing the coming judgment upon Israel Ezekiel described "the end as come" (vii. 2) and the judgment as beginning "at the sanctuary" (ix. 6), *cf.* Malachi iii., where "the refining fire purifies the sons of Levi first before judgment descends upon sinners.")

So now "the time is come that judgment should begin with 17

the house of God." If its initial stages, as it affects Christians, are thus painful, how far more terrible will its final stage be for those 18 who disobey the good news of God. If the righteous can only be saved thus hardly, where will the ungodly and sinners appear?

19 Those, then, who suffer according to the will of God (and not for disobedience to that will) should commit their souls (or lives) into His keeping as a faithful creator who can be trusted not to deal untruly with His own handiwork. This they must do not merely by passive submission but by active obedience in doing what is good.

12. ἀγαπητοί seems to introduce a fresh section as in ii. 11.

πυρώσει (see Intr. p. xli) not "fiery trial" but "trial by fire," referring to the refining of gold by smelting as in i. 7. The phrase is probably borrowed from Prov. xxvii. 21 δοκιμίον ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσῶ πυρώσις, cf. Ps. xvii. 3 "thou hast tried me" (ἐπύρωσας). In the N.T. πυρώσις occurs again only in Rev. xviii. 9—18 of the "burning" or conflagration in which "Babylon is destroyed."

For fire as a testing, purifying agent cf. Mk ix. 49; Lk. xii. 49; 1 Cor. iii. 13. Elsewhere fire is the destroying agency of judgment. St Peter reverts to the theme of "suffering for righteousness' sake." His readers are bidden not to be amazed at it or resent it as some strange misfortune which is happening to them by chance (συμβαινοντος). Rather it is coming to pass in the ordered sequence of God's purpose (γινομένη) to test and try their character.

γινομένη being without the article might be taken as a predicate, "do not be surprised that the fiery trial in your midst is taking place," but in classical Greek a complex epithet is frequently put partly between the article and the substantive and partly outside.

13. καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε = in proportion as you have personal fellowship in the sufferings of the Christ. Christians are regarded not merely as suffering with (συμπάσχοντες) Christ (Rom. viii. 17), but as members of His body they have a personal share in His sufferings, cf. Phil. iii. 10; Col. i. 24; 2 Cor. i. 5. Suffering was the necessary prelude to glory in the case of Christ their Head, therefore His members can rejoice in present sufferings as being the prelude to glory in which they too will share when it is revealed. For rejoicing in suffering cf. Mt. v. 12; Lk. vi. 23; Acts v. 41; 2 Cor. vi. 10; Phil. ii. 17; Col. i. 24, etc.

χαίρετε ἵνα might possibly be explained as in Jn viii. 56 "Your father Abraham ἠγαλλίασατο ἵνα = rejoiced in the effort to see my day." Abraham's joy was that of anticipation and not that of present realization. So the joy of Christians in suffering is prompted

by their anticipation of their exultation in the glory which is to follow. But it is simpler to regard joy in suffering as a preparation for the final joy. (See J. H. Moulton, *Gram.* pp. 205 ff.)

**χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιάμενοι.** ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι denotes exultant joy. Here such exultation is only regarded as possible when suffering culminates in glory, the joy during the process of suffering being of a more chastened character. But in i. 6, 8 ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι is used of the Christian's present joy despite his griefs. The two words are combined in Mt. v. 12; Rev. xix. 7.

14. εἰ ὀνειδίξεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, cf. Ps. lxxxix. 50—51 "Remember, O Lord, the reproach of thy servants...wherewith they have reproached (ὀνειδίσαν) the footsteps of thine anointed" (τοῦ χριστοῦ σου), cf. also Heb. xi. 26 τὸν ὀνειδισμόν τοῦ χριστοῦ as preferred by Moses to all the treasures of Egypt, and Heb. xiii. 13 "bearing His reproach," also Ps. lxix. 9 "the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me." This verse is an unmistakable echo of the beatitude in Mt. v. 11. This is the only passage where the actual phrase ὄνομα Χριστοῦ occurs, and it is probably employed because it is as χριστιανοί that they are likely to suffer, but cf. Mk ix. 41 ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε and see note on v. 16.

τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται. So BKL very many cursives, lat. vg. Syr. vg. Clem. Al. Cyr. Al. Tert. Fulg., but the lat. vg. and Syr. vg. omit καὶ.

But NAP many good cursives, Ath. Did. Cyp. (twice) add καὶ δυνάμει after δόξης and have various modifications, e.g. good cursives, many versions and Cyprian omit καὶ τὸ and the best cursives Syr. hl. and Cyr. have ὄνομα either instead of or combined with πνεῦμα.

Syr<sup>p</sup>. reads quia nomen et spiritus gloriae et virtutis (= δυνάμει) dei. Sah.: spiritus gloriae et virtutis dei. Vg<sup>od</sup>.: quoniam quod est honoris gloriae et virtutis dei et qui est ejus spiritus, where quod may agree with nomen understood, or τὸ τῆς δόξης was taken in the sense "that which appertains to the glory."

At the end of the verse the T.R. with KLP Vulg. Syr. hl.\* Theb. and Cyp. (twice) adds κατὰ μὲν αὐτοὺς βλασφημεῖται κατὰ δὲ ὑμᾶς δοξάζεται, and in lat. codd. and Cyp. this is introduced with quod evidently agreeing with nomen. This addition (not found in NAP some cursives Vulg. some codd. Syr. vg. hl. txt. Memph. Arm. Ephr. Tert.) was evidently intended as an explanation of ὀνειδίξεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ. ὅτι τὸ (ὄνομα) τῆς δόξης ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται. Its phraseology is borrowed from Rom. ii. 24 (from Is. lii. 5) (cf. Jas ii. 7; Rev. xiii. 6, xvi. 9), coupled with v. 16 of this chapter δοξαζέτω τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ.

It is possible that some of the numerous various readings in this passage were liturgical insertions borrowed from early forms of the Lord's Prayer. In Lk. xi. 2 D reads ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς (*ā super nos*). This addition of ἐφ' ἡμᾶς Dr Hort (following Sanday) suggests may be a trace of a clause sometimes used in the Lord's Prayer, probably when the prayer was used at "the laying on of hands," ἐλθέτω τὸ πνεῦμά σου (τὸ ἅγιον) ἐφ' ἡμᾶς (καὶ καθαρῶσάτω ἡμᾶς). This addition is found in Cod. Ev. 604=700 Gregory, and the first part of it seems certainly to have been known to Tertullian (*adv. Marcion*. iv. 26 where the argument implies that Marcion used this form) and Gregory Nyss. (*de Orat. Dom.*), also Maximus (vii cent.).

Dr Chase, however (*Texts and Studies, The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*), argues that there were two separate developments of petitions in the Lord's Prayer, (a) a clause asking that the Holy Spirit may come upon us, used at the laying on of hands, and thence passing into a liturgical form used in eucharistic prayers (*e.g.* in the Didache), (b) at Baptism the clause Hallowed be Thy Name was expounded as being the Name τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς or δ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν (see the Eucharistic thanksgiving, Didache x.) of Jer. vii. 12; Neh. i. 9.

The preceding liturgical doxology in v. 11 might not unnaturally suggest reminiscences of the Lord's Prayer and account for such insertions as καὶ δυνάμει (lat. virtutis), δόξα καὶ δύναμις being one of the earliest forms of doxology added to the Lord's Prayer (*e.g.* in the Didache).

The absence of πνεῦμα or its equivalent in some texts and the substitution or addition of ὄνομα may suggest that the original reading was merely τὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ or τὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ὄνομα. If no substantive was expressed ὄνομα would be supplied from the preceding verse while πνεῦμα would be a natural insertion from Is. xi. 2 ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πνεῦμα Κυρίου, and such an insertion might further be facilitated by liturgical forms of the Lord's Prayer. If the original reading was ΘΕΟΥΟΝΟΜΑ it might easily be altered into ΘΕΟΥΠΝΕΥΜΑ or ΘΕΟΥΠΝΑ, the letters ON being omitted from their similarity to the preceding ογ.

τὸ τῆς δόξης. The A.V. and R.V. supply πνεῦμα. There is no parallel for the phrase τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς δόξης (but cf. ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης, Acts vii. 2; τὸν Κύριον τῆς δόξης, 1 Cor. ii. 8). The Holy Spirit is however described as τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, and as His work is to "glorify" Christ by revealing Him (Jn xvi. 14) He might in that sense be described as τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς δόξης. Or τῆς δόξης may be taken as a title of Christ. So Mayor on Jas ii. 1 adopts a suggestion of



Bengel that τῆς δόξης means that Jesus Christ is the true Shekinah or visible manifestation of God, just as He is the Λόγος or Word of God. In support of this view Bengel quotes this passage in 1 Pet. and Eph. i. 17, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. ὁ πατήρ τῆς δόξης, and Lk. ii. 32, to which Mayor adds Jn i. 14; Heb. i. 3, etc. According to this view τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς δόξης would mean "the Spirit of Christ who is the visible manifestation of God," and the passage might thus be quoted in support of the clause in the Creed, "who proceedeth from the Father and the Son." But if πνεῦμα governs τῆς δόξης, καί should be translated "even," otherwise the second τὸ would strictly imply that the Spirit of God is another Spirit.

It is therefore better to take τὸ τῆς δόξης as a substantival expression meaning "the mark or characteristic of the glory." For the neuter article thus used with a genitive, cf. Mt. xxi. 21, τὸ τῆς σύκης; Jas iv. 14, τὸ τῆς αἰρίων; 2 Pet. ii. 22, τὸ τῆς παρουσίας; cf. τὰ τῆς σαρκός, Rom. viii. 5; τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης, Rom. xiv. 19. St Peter regards suffering as the necessary mark or characteristic of glory under present conditions. As members of Christ Christians will ultimately share in the revelation of His glory, *i.e.* manhood perfected and summed up in Christ. Here and now they participate in the preliminary stages of that glory by personal fellowship in His sufferings. To be reproached in the name of Christ is an indication that the glory is already resting upon them. So it was of His approaching sufferings that the Incarnate Christ said "now is the Son of Man glorified and God is glorified in Him" (Jn xiii. 31), cf. Col. i. 24, 27; 2 Cor. iv. 17; Eph. iii. 13.

The above idea of suffering as a characteristic of glory would be equally intended if St Peter was referring to the Shekinah as the glory which was resting upon his readers. St Paul uses ἡ δόξα in that sense in Rom. ix. 4 (? cf. Heb. i. 3, ix. 5; 2 Pet. i. 17). It is possible also that Jas ii. 1 may mean that Jesus Christ is present as the true Shekinah among those who are gathered together in His name (Mt. xviii. 20), cf. *Pirke Aboth*, iii. 3: Whenever two men sit together and are occupied with the words of the Torah, the Shekinah is with them.

There are also probable allusions to the Shekinah in passages where σκηνη and σκηνοῦν are used apparently as a transliteration of the Hebrew word שֶׁכֶן, שִׁבְתָּ e.g. Jn i. 14, ὁ λόγος ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. Rev. xxi. 3, ἰδοὺ ἡ σκηνη τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν.

So in this passage St Peter goes on to describe the sufferings of Christians as a judgment which begins with the House of God, apparently meaning the temple and referring to Ezekiel ix. 6 "begin

at my sanctuary.' Similarly in speaking of their sufferings as a *πίρωσις* or "trial by fire" he may be alluding to Malachi iii. 1—5 where the Lord is described as visiting His temple like a refiner's fire. St Peter has already described His readers as being built up as a *πνευματικός οἶκος*, ii. 5, and the reference to "the House of God" in iv. 17 would be more intelligible if he had just described Christians as the resting-place of the Shekinah. This interpretation might give some support to the view that *ὄνομα* should be understood with *τὸ τῆς δόξης*. In the O.T. "The Name of God" (see Westcott, *Epp. S. Ju.*, 232) denotes the manifestation of Himself which God has been pleased to give, and "the Name" and "the glory" are closely allied.

Thus 1 Kings viii. 20, Solomon's Temple is built for "the Name of the Lord," and v. 21, "the glory of the Lord filled the House." So St Peter may mean that in bearing "the Name of Christ" Christ as the Shekinah is resting upon them, and the present manifestation of "Christ in them" is their fellowship in His sufferings.

It may be of interest to compare Rev. xiii. 6 where the Beast who makes war against the Saints is described as "blaspheming the Name of God and His tabernacle" (*σκηνή*), which Andreas explains thus *σκηνή δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ ἐν σαρκὶ τοῦ λόγου σκηνώσις καὶ ἡ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀνάπαυσις* (cf. vii. 15).

15. The question whether the "suffering" referred to in this passage implies a legal persecution conducted by the state, and its consequent bearing upon the date of the Epistle has been fully discussed in the Introduction (p. xliii f.). It may therefore suffice here to give a brief summary of the conclusions which were there adopted.

(a) That *πάσχειν* in other passages of this Epistle, as well as in St Paul's Epistles, is an inclusive word, and can denote any form of violence, buffetings, insults, slander, boycotting, without necessarily implying organized legal persecution such as torture and execution.

(b) That legal persecution is perhaps contemplated as a possibility from the fact that suffering *ὡς Χριστιανός* is coupled with at least three legal offences (*φρονεῖς, κλέπτῃς, κακοποιεῖς*). But the fourth word *ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος*, which is separated from the others by the repetition of *ὡς*, denotes rather an alleged nuisance than a statutable offence and the same may therefore be true of *Χριστιανός*.

(c) That, even if legal persecution for the name Christian apart from other imputed crimes is intended, there is no necessity to postulate a later date than the reign of Nero.

*μὴ γὰρ...πασχέτω.* The *γὰρ* means "Take care that it really is Christ's reproach that you bear and do not incur suffering by any criminal act or social indiscretion."

**φονεύς, κλέπτης, κακοποιός.** Some would explain these as referring to such *false* charges as were brought against Christians, cf. the note on ii. 12 when *κακοποιός* is certainly described as a *false* charge. But Christians would have no choice in selecting what *false* charges their accusers should employ, and the merit of suffering unjustly for Christ would be the same, whatever the charge might be, provided that it was false. Therefore here St Peter must mean "Take care that no such charge can be brought with truth against you" (cf. ii. 20). In such a country as Asia Minor in days when violence and dishonesty were rife it might be by no means improbable that some imperfectly converted Christians might fall away and be guilty of such crimes. Clement of Alexandria tells a story of a favourite young convert of St John who became the leader of a band of brigands.

**ἀλλοτριεπισκοπος** = "a meddler in other men's matters" R. V. occurs nowhere else. In the Vulgate it is translated "alienorum appetitor," so Calvin and Beza "alieni cupidus" *i.e.*, one who covets other people's money. In one of the Fayyûm papyri 2nd cent. A. D. ἀλλοτριῶν ἐπιθυμητής is coupled with ἄδικος. More probably it refers to the charge of being busybodies, interfering in the affairs of others. In their zeal for purity and truth Christians may not infrequently have been indiscreet, and exasperated their neighbours by officious attempts to reform their morals or eradicate their heathen superstitions. So Epictetus speaking of the Cynic *Encheir.* iii. 22 says, οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἀλλότρια πολυπραγμανεῖ ὅταν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἐπισκοπῇ ἀλλὰ τὰ ἴδια, cf. Horace, *Sat.* ii. 3. 19, "Aliena negotia curo excussus pro-priis" (see Chase, *Hastings D. of B.* iii. 783 f.).

But besides being thus regarded as a social nuisance, as meddling busybodies, Christians may have been attacked on a more legal charge for causing divisions in families (cf. Matt. x. 35, 36) or for interfering with trade (cf. Acts xvi. 19 the masters of the divining girl at Philippi, and xix. 24—27 the silversmiths at Ephesus—so also Pliny describes the trade in fodder and animals for sacrifices as having been seriously affected by the spread of Christianity). Such interferences with family or commercial life would cause disunion and discord, rousing discontent and disobedience, and as such would be an offence against the state. This is the explanation adopted by Ramsay who insists that an organized persecution conducted by legal methods is implied. But though the three preceding words are *legal* charges coupled together with ἡ, ἀλλοτριεπισκοπος seems to be separated from them as a different *kind* of offence by the repetition of the ὡς<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> There is no warrant for the view of Jülicher that ἀλλοτριεπισκοπος means

16. **Χριστιανός.** **Α** reads *Χρηστιανός* here and in the two passages of Acts where the word occurs, while **B** reads *Χρειστιανός*. These variations may be merely errors of sound on the part of copyists, but Blass argues that *Χρηστιανός* was the original form of the nickname as used by heathen opponents of Christianity. The name "Christiani" was certainly so used, and Apologists like Justin Martyr and Tertullian argue that it is unfair to punish men for a name which by its very derivation (*χρηστός*) denotes goodness. The termination *-ianos* is originally Latin, e.g. *Caesariani*, *Pompeiani*, but it was speedily adopted in Greek both in Palestine and in Asia, e.g. *Ἡρωδιανοί*. St Luke says that the name *Χριστιανοί* was first applied to Christians in Antioch, Acts xi. 26. In the Ignatian Epistles it is used as an honourable title by Christians of themselves, but originally it was evidently a nickname given either by the Roman officials or the Gentile mob at Antioch, as the Jewish nickname for Christians was "Nazarenes" (Acts xxiv. 5). It was thus used as a scornful nickname by Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 28) "With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian" (R. V.). So here it describes the title which will be used by enemies at whose hands Christ's followers will have to suffer. The letter of Pliny to Trajan (c. 110 A.D.) implies that it was a familiar title, which had evidently long been in use in his time, and that it had already been the custom to put Christians to death for the name only, and the rescript of Trajan merely gives imperial sanction to this existing form of procedure. The most natural interpretation of Tacitus' account of the Neronian persecution almost certainly implies that Christians were even then punished for the name only. Certainly the Christians themselves, knowing their innocence of other charges, would regard themselves as suffering under Nero for the name Christian only, even if the magistrates who tried the case did not admit this as technically true in legal phraseology (but see *Intr.* pp. xl, xliii f.).

One fact at any rate is clearly shown by Tacitus, viz. that *Χριστιανός* was already a popular nickname in 64 A.D. Therefore the statement of Lipsius that the name Christian did not exist at all until the time of Trajan is amply refuted by both secular and Biblical evidence.

*ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ* is the reading of the best MSS. but the T.R. with KLP and later MSS. reads *ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ*—on that account. Even if *ὀνόματι* be read it is possible that it ought to be translated

"delator," i.e. a malicious informer, while Bigg's suggestion, that it means one who takes part in trades or practices which do not befit a Christian but are *ἀλλότρια*—i.e. alien and unlawful for him—is most improbable. It is not likely that Christians would suffer at the hands of their heathen neighbours merely for being inconsistent Christians.

“account,” cf. Mk ix. 41, *εἰς ὄνομα ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ* = “on the score of your being Christ’s” (? Mt. x. 41, *εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου, δικαίου*—). Cf. the similar use of nomen in Latin.

Deissmann *Bib. Stud.* pp. 146, 196 gives several illustrations of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* used of purchases etc. made on behalf of a person or a god, *i.e.* designated as their property (cf. *βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ ὄ.*). So here to be reproached *ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ* may mean “because you belong to Christ” and *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦτο* = “on that account.” But from the constant references in the N.T. to the Name of Christ as being “called upon” Christians (*ἐπικληθέν*) (Jas ii. 7), “carried” (*βαστάζειν*) Acts ix. 15, “glorified in them” 2 Thess. i. 12 etc., “held fast” Rev. ii. 13 etc., it is more probable that St Peter includes the more literal sense of “Name” and refers to the name *Χριστιανός* used as a term of abuse and ground of accusation, cf. Pliny (*Epp.* x. 96). Although this passage must not be overpressed as implying that *Χριστιανός* was a definite legal charge as yet, it was undoubtedly a recognized ground of complaint used to injure Christians. In Acts v. 41, 3 Jn 7, (? Jas v. 14) *τὸ ὄνομα* is used absolutely (so Ign. *Eph.* iii. 1 etc.).

17. *ὅτι [ὁ] καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ.*

The sufferings of Christians are the *initial* stages in the judgment of the world. The process of judgment begins with God’s own house first. *οἶκος* might mean merely *household* (cf. Heb. xii. 7, where chastisement is regarded as a proof of sonship), but it may mean God’s *temple*—and the idea that judgment is to begin at God’s house may be borrowed from Ezekiel ix. 6, where God’s agents of punishment are instructed to “begin at my sanctuary” (LXX. *ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου*). Again in Malachi iii. 2, 3, the coming of the Lord is compared to a refiner’s fire (cf. *πύρωση* in verse 12): He will come to His Temple and purify the sons of Levi and purge them as gold and silver that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness...pleasant unto the Lord. Then, when the purification of the priesthood is accomplished, sudden judgment will descend upon sinners and all who do not fear God. So St Peter (ii. 5) has described his readers as a spiritual house or temple—a priesthood to offer sacrifices acceptable to God, and (iv. 12) their sufferings are regarded as a refining or “trial by fire.” If the purging of God’s own house is thus painful how far more terrible will be the judgment of sinners which follows it. For the idea that the judgment of aliens will be more terrible than that of God’s own city cf. Jeremiah’s language about Jerusalem xxv. 29, xlix. 12<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> An entirely different interpretation of the passage is given by Selwyn (*St Luke the Prophet*, pp. 141 ff.). He connects it with the Book of Henoch (of

**τί τὸ τέλος.** *τέλος* may mean: (a) *What shall be the end or fate of?* or (b) *what shall be the final stage of the judgment?* as contrasted with its initial stages (*ἀρξασθαι—πρώτον*) as seen in the sufferings of Christians.

**18. εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται κ.τ.λ.** The quotation is taken from the LXX. of Prov. xi. 31 where the Hebrew is "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; how much more the wicked and the sinner." The righteous is regarded as being "hardly saved" because of the painful nature of the "fiery trial" through which he has to pass. To share Christ's glory he has to share Christ's reproach. He has to "come out of great tribulation," and his robes must be "washed in the Blood of the Lamb" by personal fellowship in his Master's sufferings, Rev. vii. 14.

**19. ὥστε.** The view of suffering inculcated in the preceding verses enables Christians to glorify God for permitting them to suffer in Christ's name, and they can do this with perfect trust because they can *also* (*καί*) feel that they are committing their souls (or lives) to the keeping of the God who made them, and He can be relied upon not to deal untruly with His own handiwork.

**παρatiθεσθαι.** In the sense of entrusting a deposit to safe keeping of. our Lord's dying words Lk. xxiii. 46 quoting Ps. xxxi. 5 *εις χεῖράς σου παρatiθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου*, cf. Acts xiv. 23, xx. 32; 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 2.

**κτίστης** is used of God in the prayer of Jonathan, 2 Macc. i. 24, but does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.

**ἐν ἀγαθοποιῶ.** The way in which Christians are to shew their trust is by continued well-doing in spite of their sufferings. There must be active obedience as well as patient endurance.

which there are probably traces elsewhere in this Ep.), in which the history of the world is divided into "Weeks." In the "Eighth Week" the House of the Great King (so Selwyn interprets *βασιλείου* in ii. 9 to mean Royal Palace) will be built in glory for evermore. After that in the "Ninth Week" the righteous judgment will be revealed to the whole world and all the works of the godless will vanish from the whole earth, &c.

So St Peter has described his readers as living stones built into God's house, and here he means, if a man suffer as a Christian, a follower of the Messiah, let him not be ashamed, for though persecuted now unjustly by his fellow-men and so "saved with difficulty," he will share the approaching victory of Messiah the Great King, whose spiritual house is now being built in glory with us first. The Seven Weeks are past and the Eighth is now at its close, and *we* of this generation are "the house of the Great King." If the judgment begins with the building of us, what shall be the end of those who reject the Gospel which we preach?

This interpretation is very improbable. In this section St Peter is not referring to the "building up" of Christians as a Temple, but to the "trial by fire" which they have to undergo. The righteous as God's Temple are the first to undergo judgment, whereas in Henoah during the eighth week sinners are delivered into the hands of the righteous.

## CHAPTER V

v. 1—5. Let me then address a special word of exhortation to 1 those of you who are “elders” in the Church. I do not wish to dictate to you as an Apostle, but to plead with you as one of yourselves, an “elder” both in office and in age. What I have said about suffering as leading to glory is a very real thing to me, for I can bear personal testimony to the sufferings of the Christ to which I have appealed, and I realize my share in the glory which is one day to be revealed. Let me give you the same charge which my Master 2 gave to me. Shepherd the flock of God which is in your midst, not as an irksome duty under a sense of compulsion, but as a labour of love; not with any sordid mercenary motives, but with eager enthusiasm. Nor, again, must you domineer over the charges 3 allotted to your care. Rather you should serve as models for the flock to imitate. Then when the Chief Shepherd (the unseen partner 4 in your pastoral work) is manifested to the world you shall receive the victor’s crown of glory, composed of flowers that cannot fade. Such unassuming conduct on the part of the “elders” carries with it 5 a corresponding claim upon those of you who are juniors to shew due submission to them. In fact, all of you, whatever your position may be, should gird yourselves with humbleness of mind to serve one another (as the Lord Jesus did at the Last Supper). For God opposes Himself to the haughty, but gives favour to those who are humble-minded.

1. *πρεσβυτέρους οὖν*. The *οὖν* definitely connects the advice to Elders with the preceding section. In iv. 17 St Peter probably referred to Ezekiel ix. 6, where the judgment ordered to “begin at the sanctuary” was first executed upon *τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ᾧ ἦσαν ἔσω ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ*. The “refining” (cf. *πύρωσις* iv. 12) of the Sons of Levi as the preliminary to judgment upon sinners in Mal. iii. 1—5 might further suggest the special responsibility of “elders” as *οἰκονόμοι* (cf. iv. 10) in the new “house of God.”

The word *πρεσβύτερος* originally suggested the reverence due to seniority in age, and still retained much of its original meaning when it became a title for a definite office in the Church. The office of presbyter was not divorced from the qualifications and associations of

age. Thus the *πρεσβύτεροι* are still put in contrast to *νεώτεροι* or *νέοι* by Polycarp, *ad Phil.* v., Clem. *ad Cor.* i., and in *Church Ordinances* c. 18 presbyters are required to be men of mature age. So here St Peter probably uses the word partly in the sense of "seniors," although he is primarily employing it in its official sense of "Elders," *i.e.* Church officers. The title was doubtless borrowed from the Jewish synagogue, though the duties of Christian Elders were not wholly identical with those of Jewish Elders. We first hear of Elders at Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30, receiving the offerings brought from Antioch by Paul and Barnabas. In Acts xv. 6, 22, 23 the Elders are coupled with the Apostles in the Conference, in choosing delegates and in writing an official letter to other churches. In Acts xxi. 18 the Elders, together with James the Lord's brother, receive St Paul and his companions at his last visit to Jerusalem and advise him how to conciliate Jewish prejudices. In Acts xiv. 23 Paul and Barnabas appoint Elders in every city on their first missionary journey, and in Acts xx. 28 St Paul, having summoned the Elders of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus, reminds them that they are overseers (*ἐπίσκοποι*) to shepherd (*ποιμαίνειν*) the Church of God. So here the T.R. inserts *ἐπισκοποῦντες* after *ποιμάνετε*. Elders are also mentioned in Jas v. 14, where they are to pray for the sick and anoint them with oil. But in St Paul's epistles the *title* *πρεσβύτεροι* is not found except in the Pastoral Epistles, written at the close of his life, where *ἐπίσκοποι* and *πρεσβύτεροι* almost certainly refer to the same officers, though *ἐπίσκοπος* may denote one special aspect of their duties. Possibly the *title* *πρεσβύτερος* did not for some time come into very common use in the Gentile Churches to which St Paul wrote, but there is little doubt that there were such officers in all churches from the first, and they are probably intended by the *ἐπίσκοποι* to whom a salutation is sent in Philippians i. 1 (*σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις*) and by the "pastors and teachers" in Eph. iv. 11. The special duties of the Elders seem to have been government and teaching. The absence of the article in this verse may denote *such as are Elders*.

**ὁ συνπρεσβύτερος.** Possibly St Peter here avoids calling himself *ἀπόστολος*, though he used that title of himself in the opening salutation, because he desires to set an example of humility to the Elders. His injunction not to "lord it over" others would lose much of its force if he himself asserted his own apostolic authority. He therefore deliberately couples himself with those to whom he appeals. Dr Hort, however (*The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 222), says "St Peter seems to join with this (the official sense "Elder") the original or etymological sense (*i.e.* senior in age) when he calls himself a fellow-



elder, apparently as one who could bear personal testimony to the sufferings of Christ." The title Elder is used of himself by St John in his second and third epistles. In Papias and Irenaeus it seems to be used of those who belonged to the older generation who were immediate companions of the Apostles.

**μάρτυς** means *one who bears witness*, and does not in itself mean an eyewitness or spectator, the word for which is *αὐτόπτης* (cf. Lk. i. 2), but from the stress laid upon personal companionship with Jesus as a necessary qualification to be a *μάρτυς* in Acts i. 22, etc., there is little doubt that St Peter here means that he is testifying what he has himself seen (cf. Jn xix. 35; Acts xxii. 15).

St Peter, while coupling himself with the Elders, reminds them that his language about suffering and glory is the testimony of one who actually witnessed Christ's sufferings and who is assured of his personal share in the glory which is to follow. Harnack (*Chronologie*, p. 452) explains *μάρτυς* to mean a witness to Christ's sufferings by means of the sufferings which he had himself endured for the Name of Christ.

**κοινωνός** = *partner with Christ*, not *with you*. For the latter meaning we should have *συκοινωνός* (cf. Mt. xix. 28).

**τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης**. Cf. Rom. viii. 18.

2. **ποιμάνετε** denotes the duty of feeding, protecting and ruling. St Peter is apparently handing on to the Elders the same charge which our Lord gave to him, Jn xxi. 16; cf. Acts xx. 28. In Eph. iv. 11 *ποιμένες καὶ διδάσκαλοι* probably refer to the *local* officers, *i.e.* presbyters.

**τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν** must be coupled with *ποίμνιον* and not, as Calvin renders it, "so far as lieth in you" (cf. Rom. xii. 18) = *that portion of God's flock which is among you, i.e.* in your town or district, not (as Bengel and Luther) *which depends upon you*.

**ἐπίσκοποι** is read by the T.R. with AKLP etc., m. Vulg. Syrr. (add *πνευματικῶς* Syr. vg.) Memph. Arm. Aeth. R.V<sup>1</sup>.; but NB, two cursives, Hieron. etc. omit the word, so W.H., R.V. margin.

If the word is accepted it would support the identification of *πρεσβύτεροι* with *ἐπίσκοποι* in the N.T. In any case St Peter uses *ἐπίσκοπος* of Christ as the *ποιμήν*, ii. 25.

**ἀναγκαστῶς**, *under a sense of compulsion*, resenting as a burden the duty imposed upon you, but *voluntarily* (*ἐκουστως*). In another sense God's workers are "under compulsion" to work faithfully because their stewardship is not due to their own choice only, but is imposed upon them by God, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 16, 17. Here, however, the reference is to the spirit in which they perform their work, "not grudgingly or of necessity" (2 Cor. ix. 7).

Some MSS. NAP add *κατὰ θεόν*, which might mean "as God shepherds His flock," but more probably "in accordance with God's will as He would have you do."

*μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς*, not in the spirit of a hireling anxious only to make some sordid (not necessarily ill-gotten) gain. The phrase may imply that it was customary for Elders to receive some stipend, but possibly refers to their duties as treasurers of Church funds. In Tit. i. 7 one of the qualifications for an *ἐπίσκοπος* is that he should not be *αἰσχροκερδής*, and so also of deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 8; cf. also Tit. i. 11 of false teachers who overturn whole households *αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν*.

*προθύμως*, with the ready mind which is not content merely to do the minimum of prescribed duty, cf. 2 Cor. viii. 11, 12.

3. *κατακυριεύοντες*. The word is used in the LXX. in Jer. iii. 14 of God as being master or husband of His people, but elsewhere of subduing a city, taking possession of a country, or of sin getting the mastery over a person. In the N.T. it is used in Acts xix. 16 of the demoniac at Ephesus "mastering" the exorcists, and also by our Lord after the ambitious request of James and John, Matt. xx. 25; Mk x. 42. He instructs His disciples that true greatness among His followers is not to seek for mastery over others as Gentile rulers do, but to be minister or servant of all. This saying of our Lord probably suggested St Peter's advice to the Elders in this passage, cf. Matt. xxiii. 8—12.

*τῶν κληρῶν*. In later times *κληρῶς* and its Latin form *clerus* came to be used in the sense of "Clergy" (*κληρικοί*), but there is no evidence of this use earlier than Tertullian, and this technical use of the word was not derived from the Jewish priesthood, but was a gradual development. *κληρῶς* = (1) the lot by which an office was assigned; (2) the office thus assigned by lot (cf. Acts i. 17, 26), and so (3) the body of persons holding the office (*Oecumenius, ad loc.*, Suidas). Elsewhere in the N.T. it is used of "casting lots," or of a "lot" or "inheritance." Here it must mean the flocks allotted to the care of the Elders. In Deut. ix. 29 (see Bigg) *κληρῶς* is used of the people of Israel as being the portion specially belonging to Jehovah—and that verse also contains the words *τῇ χειρὶ σου τῇ κραταίῃ*—which St Peter uses in v. 6. Possibly, therefore, he regards the various communities of Christians as parts of God's estate entrusted to His stewards or shepherds. But in this case we should have expected the singular, and it is simpler to understand *κληρῶν* as meaning the charges allotted to the presbyters, although there is no parallel for this. The Elders seem always to have acted as a body, and there is no evidence of a

single Elder having the charge of anything corresponding to a special "parish." The plural here therefore denotes the flocks in all the different towns, each of which was assigned to the joint care of the Elders of that town.

**τύποι** is here used in its ordinary sense of "pattern" or "model." The Elders must lead by example and not drive their flock by masterful methods. Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 7; and in Phil. iii. 17, 2 Thess. iii. 9 St Paul points his readers to his own "example."

4. **φανερωθέντος**. The Chief Shepherd is always present among His under-shepherds, and at last His presence will be manifested. The verb is used of the First Coming of Christ in i. 20 and 1 Tim. iii. 16, but here it refers to the Second Advent as in Col. iii. 4; 1 Jn ii. 28, iii. 2.

**ἀρχιποίμενος**. The word occurs nowhere else. It refers to Christ, who was described as ποιμήν in ii. 25. Our Lord described Himself as "the good Shepherd," Jn x., and in Mt. xxv. 32 compared His work as Judge to "a shepherd separating the sheep from the goats." In Heb. xiii. 20 He is called "the great Shepherd of the Sheep." Here St Peter uses the title "chief shepherd," to remind the presbyters that in shepherding God's flock they are working under and with the good Shepherd Himself.

**κομισθε**. Cf. note on i. 9.

**ἀμαράντινον** is not quite the same as ἀμάραντον (= unfading, cf. i. 4), but means *made of amaranth*, a supposed unfading flower. Adjectives in -ινος denote the material of which a thing is made, e.g. ξύλινος, λίθινος, ὀστράκινος.

**τῆς δόξης** is not simply a "genitive of quality," but "of apposition" or "epexegetic." The crown *consists in* sharing the glory; cf. στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς Jas i. 12; Rev. ii. 10. The phrase στέφανος δόξης occurs in Jer. xiii. 18; cf. Ps. viii. 6 δόξη καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφάνωσα αὐτόν.

**στέφανος** might possibly mean a festal garland, but more probably *the victor's crown*, which is its regular meaning in the N.T. as contrasted with δίδημα, the royal crown. But στέφανος is used of the crown of thorns, which was certainly intended as an emblem of royalty, and in the Apocalypse also it may denote a royal crown, as it does sometimes in the LXX.

5. **ὁμοίως**; cf. iii. 1. Such unassuming conduct on the part of the presbyters demands a corresponding or reciprocal duty of submission on the part of those who are under their authority.

**νεώτεροι**. *Ye younger* probably refers to age and not to office, as also in 1 Tim. v. 1; Tit. ii. 6, in which case πρεσβυτέρους also in this

verse means *older men* in general, and not official "elders" as in v. 1. At the same time such "elders" would generally, though not always, be seniors in age. Polycarp, v. 6, however, borrowing from St Peter, mentions νεώτεροι between his instructions to διάκονοι and πρεσβύτεροι, and says that it is right to submit to the "elders" and deacons as to God and Christ. Therefore he probably interpreted πρεσβυτέροις here in an official sense, but the warnings which he gives to νεώτεροι are against impurity and lust, and are therefore suited to younger men rather than to minor officials of the Church. Others, however, explain νεώτεροι to mean subordinate officers of some kind who performed the menial duties. In support of this they refer to Acts v. 6, where the νεώτεροι carried out Ananias for burial. But in v. 10 those who buried Sapphira are called νεανίσκοι, evidently referring to the same persons. Therefore in both verses it probably means merely "young men," cf. Lk. xxii. 26.

πάντες sums up the duties of all alike, whether presbyters or their flock, whether seniors or juniors.

ἀλλήλοις. The dative denotes the persons whose interests are affected (dativus commodi et incommodi), and is used loosely with various verbs; so here *gird yourselves to serve one another or in your dealings with one another*. There is no need to supply ὑποτασσόμενοι as the T.R. does.

ἐγκομβώσαθε (see Suicer, Bigg, *ad loc.*). κόμβος, according to the glossaries, means *a knot*, a button in later Greek (Kennedy, *Sources*), and so ἐγκόμβωμα may mean a garment tied on over others. Suidas uses κόμβος of a knot by which a pair of sleeves were fastened behind the neck, possibly to leave the arms free for action, while Pollux describes it as a little white garment which slaves wore over their tunic. Hesychius in one passage uses the substantive of a kind of blacksmith's apron, but elsewhere he explains the verb as meaning to put on a robe or to wrap oneself. Longus, *Pastoralium*, describes a shepherd casting off his ἐγκόμβωμα in order to run fast. In this case the meaning here may be merely that humility is the proper robe for a Christian (cf. iii. 3, 4). But, if the word was specially used of a slave's dress or apron, it is better to translate as the R.V. "*gird yourselves with humility*," in which case there is doubtless a reference to our Lord girding Himself with a towel at the Last Supper as an example of humility and service (Jn xiii. 4).

ταπεινοφροσύνην, *lowliness of mind*, in classical Greek would denote a mean-spirited or grovelling attitude of mind. It is only in Christian phraseology that humility is recognized as a virtue. The humility of Christians towards one another must not be merely

superficial and limited to outward demeanour, but must be prompted by an inward attitude of mind. Cf. Col. iii. 12 *ἐνδύσασθε... ταπεινοφροσύνην*.

[ὁ] θεός ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσεται κ.τ.λ. From Prov. iii. 34, occurs also in Jas iv. 6 with the same variation from the LXX., viz. ὁ θεός for Κύριος. (See Introduction, p. lviii f.)

**ὑπερηφάνους** from *ὑπέρ* and *φαίνομαι*, those who are conspicuous above others, so in a bad sense, *haughty*. The word is frequently used in the LXX. and Lk. i. 51; Rom. i. 30; 2 Tim. iii. 2.

**δίδωσιν χάριν**. In the LXX. *δίδοναι χάριν* means to give a person favour or acceptability in the eyes of another (Gen. xxxix. 21; Ex. xii. 36). So in Prov. iii. 34 the meaning is that God gives the lowly acceptance before true men as well as before Himself, and this may be the meaning in St James, viz. that God gives a far truer acceptance than can be won by courting the friendship of the world, but Parry explains, "bestows a greater favour," i.e. the gift of regeneration. Here the thought of acceptance with man, which God grants to the humble, is subordinated to the higher acceptance with God. It is only the humble who "find favour" with God.

6—14. The way therefore to attain true greatness, to be exalted 6 in God's good time, is to humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, submitting patiently to whatever trials He sends you; casting 7 all the burden of your anxiety upon Him in full assurance of His loving care for you.

But this does not justify any neglect of precaution on your 8 part. You must have all your faculties under perfect control and be on the watch, for you have an active opponent to deal with. The devil, like a roaring lion, is ever prowling round you, hunting for some prey to devour. (Do not let the fear of suffering terrify you into submission.) Stand your ground against him with the solid 9 front which faith can give. Remember that you do not stand alone. You are part of a band of brothers, stationed like yourselves in the world. Your experience is not peculiar. The same discipline of suffering is being carried out by God's will in their case also. But 10 however painful your experience may be, remember that it is sent by God whose every thought is loving favour. His final purpose for you, to which He called you, is to share His own eternal glory as members of Christ (your glorified Head). After passing through a short period of suffering He Himself will equip you fully, He will stablish you, He will give you the needful strength for the fight. To Him be the 11 might of victory to all eternity. Amen. Silvanus, the bearer of this 12 short letter, is one whom I regard as a faithful brother to you. My

object in writing to you is to encourage you and to give my testimony to the fact that your position as Christians and the sufferings which it involves are in very truth a sign of God's loving favour. Stand fast then to maintain it.

13 The sister Church in Rome, the new Babylonish exile of the new Israel of God, which shares with you God's call to be His chosen people, sends you her greeting, as also does Mark, my son in the faith.

14 Greet one another with a kiss of love. May God give the blessing of peace to all of you as members of Christ.

6. **ταπεινώθητε οὖν.** Such humility towards fellow-Christians is only the outward expression of humility towards God, just as obedience to rulers, masters or husbands was shewn to be based upon fear and subjection towards God. In their present circumstances of "trial by fire" such humility towards God must be shewn by patient, trustful acceptance of suffering as part of His loving purpose. They must not resent it as "a strange chance" or be fretful with anxiety (*μέριμνα*). Suffering for Christ is in itself a position of favour (cf. Phil. i. 29). To bear it humbly is the condition for being exalted to full and final favour.

**κραταιὸν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ.** The "mighty hand" of God is generally used in the LXX. of God's power in deliverance, e.g. from Egypt, Ex. iii. 19; Deut. ix. 29, etc., but in Ezek. xx. 34 it is used of God's power in judgment, in scattering His people in exile. So here God's "mighty hand" is shewn in judgment, but that same "mighty hand" will exalt those who humbly submit to His discipline.

**ὑψώσῃ,** for the exaltation of the lowly cf. Matt. xxiii. 12; Lk. i. 52, xiv. 11, xviii. 14.

**ἐν καιρῷ.** AP and some cursives and versions add *ἐπισκοπῆς* from ii. 12. Here it means *in His own good time*. Christians must not be impatient if God seems "to tarry long with them."

7. **ἐπιρρίψαντες.** The words are borrowed from Ps. lv. 22 *ἐπιρρίψον ἐπὶ Κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου καὶ αὐτός σε διαθρέψει*. In times of danger the Christian is to cast all the burden of his anxiety or alarm (*μέριμνα*) upon God with confident trust in His loving care (*μέλει*). The A.V. *casting all your care upon Him for He careth for you* misses the distinction between the two words.

8. **νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε.** Such absence of anxiety, such self-abandonment to God's care does not warrant any slackness or want of watchfulness, cf. 1 Thess. v. 6. Here *νήψατε* is more metaphorical, cf. i. 13, iv. 7. For *γρηγορεῖν* as a precaution against temptation cf. Matt. xxvi. 41.

**ὁ ἀντίδικος.** The word denotes literally an opponent in a court of law, as in Matt. v. 25; Lk. xii. 58, xviii. 3. Here Blass (*Grammar. N.T. Gk.* p. 163) regards it as virtually an adjective agreeing with *διάβολος*, as the latter word would otherwise require the article, unless it is to be taken as a proper name.

**διάβολος** is used thirteen times in Job to represent the Hebrew Satan, as also in Zech. iii. 1 where Satan is seen in vision standing at the right hand of Joshua the High Priest as his accuser, cf. Ps. cix. 6 "Let Satan (=an accuser) stand at his right hand." In 1 Chron. xxi. 1 Satan stands up against Israel rather as a tempter than an accuser. In the N.T. both *διάβολος* and *Σατανᾶς* are used and the two titles are combined in Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2. *διάβολος* suggests malicious accusation, Satan spitefully accuses men to God, cf. Job i. 9 "doth Job fear God for nought?" and Rev. xii. 10 "the accuser (*κατήγωρ*) of our brethren." He also accuses God to men, making them doubt or distrust His love or power, and similarly he accuses men to each other.

**λέων ὠρυόμενος**, a roaring lion, cf. Ps. xxii. 13 (*ὡς λέων ὁ ἀρπάξων καὶ ὠρυόμενος*).

**περιπατεῖ**, cf. Satan's description of himself in Job i. 7 I come "from going to and fro in the earth and walking up and down in it" (*ἐμπεριπατήσας*).

**ζητῶν καταπιεῖν**, seeking to devour (B). A adds *τινα*=whom he may devour, while **SKLP** have *τινά*=someone to devour.

The particular form of temptation to which St Peter refers is that of denying the faith through fear of suffering or persecution. This is seen from the words which follow *τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων*. So in the letter written by the Churches of Lyons and Vienne during the persecution of Marcus Aurelius those who at first denied the faith and afterwards repented and stood firm are described as being "devoured" by the beast and afterwards disgorged alive by him. It was this very temptation to which St Peter himself had yielded when he denied his Master in the hour of danger, when "Satan desired to have the disciples to sift them as wheat." He is now fulfilling Christ's command "Do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren" (Lk. xxii. 32).

Ramsay, who insists that official organized persecution is referred to, explains *περιπατεῖ ζητῶν* as describing the searching out of Christians which was prohibited by the rescript of Trajan, and therefore he shews that the Epistle is certainly earlier than 112 A.D. But, while we accept the early date, there is no necessity to interpret this metaphorical description of Satan prowling about like a lion in

search of prey as being literally fulfilled by the human persecutors who acted as Satan's agents.

In other passages in this Epistle the sufferings of Christians are described as being in accordance with God's will. The fact that they are here connected with Satan is not contradictory to that view. In Job's case Satan was permitted by God to employ suffering to try his faith, and St Paul's "thorn in the flesh" is described as "the messenger of Satan" though given to him by God to humble him. So here the sufferings of Christians, though permitted by God's loving purpose as a smelting fire of purification, are at the same time instigated by Satan and are made use of by him to overwhelm his victims if possible by making them deny the faith.

9. **ἡ ἀντίστασις**, whom withstand, cf. Jas iv. 7 and Eph. vi. 11, 13.

**στερεοί**. The adjective means *firm, solid, compact*, so in Heb. v. 12, 14 it is used of "solid food" and in 2 Tim. ii. 19 of a "firm foundation." The verb is used in Acts xvi. 5 of the churches being "consolidated in the faith," and in Col. ii. 5 St Paul rejoices to see *τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ στερέωμα τῆς ἐς Χριστὸν πίστεως* on the part of his readers, where Lightfoot explains *στερέωμα* in a military sense "solid front" or "close phalanx" and compares 1 Macc. ix. 14. So here St Peter urges his readers to face the foe with a solid front, shoulder to shoulder not merely with their fellow-Christians in Asia Minor but as part of one great brotherhood who are all engaged in the same conflict in the world.

**τῇ πίστει** may mean *your faith* as the R.V. or *the faith* R.V. marg. In the former case the meaning would be *do not allow the bulwark of your faith and trust in God to be broken through, or standing firm in virtue of your faith*. In the latter case the meaning is *standing firm for the Faith*, the cause of Christ. So Phil. i. 27 *συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* = joining in the contest in which the Faith of the Gospel is engaged, cf. 1 Tim. iv. 1 *ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως* = some will desert from the Faith; 2 Tim. iv. 7 *τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγωνίσμαι...τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα*, cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 8; 3 Jn 8.

**εἰδότες**. The thought that they are not alone, that their sufferings are not exceptional but are shared by the whole Christian brotherhood, is, on the one hand, a message of encouragement reminding them that, despite the insignificance of each detachment, they are part of one glorious army. On the other hand, it is a reminder of their responsibility not to weaken the cause of others by any cowardly surrender in their part of the field of battle.



τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων is an unusual and irregular construction, τὰ αὐτὰ being practically treated as a substantive, the same kinds of sufferings, the same "trial by fire."

ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ might possibly mean in other parts of the world as contrasted with Asia Minor, but probably it means in the same worldly surroundings as yourselves, cf. Jn xvi. 33, xvii. 11. The world is the battle-ground of the Church Militant.

ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, are being accomplished. In their case, as in your own, their sufferings are no chance but the working out to its completion of God's loving purpose.

Usually εἰδέναι followed by an infinitive means to know how to do something (Lk. xii. 56; Phil. iv. 12) and ὅτι or a participle is used of knowing that something is the case, but the accusative and infinitive are used in that sense in Lk. iv. 41 and so here.

Another rendering suggested (Hofman, see Bigg's note) is knowing how to pay the same tax of suffering as your brethren in the world (cf. Xen. Mem. iv. 8, 8) but this meaning is improbable, as elsewhere (30 times in LXX., 10 in N.T.) ἐπιτελεῖν = to finish or accomplish. E. F. Brown (*Journ. Theol. Stud.* viii. 450) quotes Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 3 for taking ἐπιτελεῖσθε in that passage as a middle voice, possibly in a sacrificial sense (cf. Hdt. ii. 63, iv. 186). So here he renders knowing how to bring to (sacrificial) perfection, for (the benefit of) your (whole) brotherhood which is in the world, the same things in the way of sufferings (as they bear). For a share in Christ's sufferings regarded as a contribution on behalf of the church cf. Col. i. 24.

10. πάσης χάριτος. The God of all grace or of every grace. St Peter's readers might be tempted to doubt God's favour towards them because of their sufferings. He therefore assures them that the same loving favour, which called the Gentiles (cf. i. 10 τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος), is being exercised even in their sufferings, because they are to culminate in eternal glory, and in the meanwhile God's favour will be shewn in equipping His followers with all needful strength.

εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν probably points forward to the consummation of the glory as it will be finally revealed. But just as Christians share in eternal life here and now, so also they share in eternal glory. They have been called "out of darkness into God's marvellous light" (ii. 9), and even in their sufferings something of the glory already rests upon them, iv. 14.

ἐν Χριστῷ is probably used, as in the final salutation, of the incorporation of Christians in Christ. It is as "members of Christ" that they are called to share God's glory. The expression "in Christ" is intensely Pauline but we have no warrant for supposing that the idea was peculiar to St Paul. It underlies much of St John's language

in his Epistles and sums up numerous sayings of our Lord recorded in the fourth Gospel.

*ὀλίγον παθόντας*, for *ὀλίγον* cf. i. 6. Here it probably means *for a little while* as contrasted with eternal glory, but the brevity of the Christian's sufferings is only one aspect of their slightness.

Westcott and Hort join *ὀλίγον παθόντας* with the verbs which follow, that God will perfect, stablish and strengthen them after they have suffered a little while. But stablishing and strengthening at any rate would be more necessary *during* the time of suffering rather than *after* it. Therefore, if the words are to be thus connected, the aorist participle might be explained as summing up as one idea the whole period of suffering *during* which God's help will be given. The A.V. and R.V. place a comma both before and after the words "after ye have suffered for a little while" leaving it uncertain whether they are to be joined with the preceding clause or with the verbs which follow. It seems better however to take *ὀλίγον παθόντας* with *καλέσας*, that God has called them to eternal glory after a brief discipline of suffering, because (a) this gives the most natural meaning to the aorist participle, viz. *after* you have suffered, (b) it is somewhat characteristic of St Peter's style to put an emphatic participle at the end of a clause, e.g. *πάσχων ἀδίκως*, ii. 19; *βλασφημοῦντες*, iv. 4.

*αὐτὸς*, shall Himself, etc. Besides the mutual support which members of the brotherhood may give to one another they have the assurance of God's own support.

*καταρτίσει* either *restore* R.V. marg. or *perfect* R.V. The verb is used in Matt. iv. 21; Mk i. 19 of the disciples *mending* their nets; in Gal. vi. 1 of *restoring* one who has been overtaken by a fault; in 1 Thess. iii. 10 of *making good* deficiencies. Again in 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 11 it may refer to the *restoration* needed by the Corinthian Church in consequence of their party factions, etc. So here it may mean that the Christian when bruised and battered by persecution will be *refitted* and *restored* by God's grace.

Elsewhere however the word means *to fit out* or *equip perfectly*; so Lk. vi. 40 "everyone when he is perfected shall be as his Master"; and this may be the meaning here, that God will not leave His followers insufficiently equipped for the fray.

*στηρίξει*, shall stablish you. The word is used of fixing a thing firmly, making it stable. St Peter when warned of his fall was bidden "when once thou hast turned again *stablish* thy brethren" (Lk. xxii. 32). St Paul uses it frequently of God, Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Thess. ii. 17, iii. 3, while it is used of men in 1 Thess. iii. 2; Jas v. 8; Rev. iii. 2.

**σθενώσει**, *shall strengthen you*. The verb occurs nowhere else in the Greek Bible and **σθένος** is only found three times in the LXX. and never in the N.T., though *ἀσθενής*, *ἀσθένεια* and *ἀσθενεῖν* are frequently used of bodily or moral weakness.

[**θεμελιώσει**], *shall settle you, give you a firm foundation*, is added by nearly all MSS. except AB Vulg. Aeth. and is retained in the R.V. marg.

In all the above verbs the T.R., following most of the later MSS., instead of the future indicative, reads the 3rd person 1st aorist optative *καταρτίσαι κ.τ.λ.* = may he perfect (or restore) you, etc.

11. **αὐτῷ** here refers to God whereas in iv. 11 the doxology was probably addressed to Christ.

Probably *ἐστίν* not *ἔστω* should be understood, as *ἐστίν* is found in iv. 11 but no verb is expressed in any of the other doxologies in the N.T. and some of them are apparently precatory. So here the R.V. renders "to Him be the dominion," etc. The T.R. inserts *ἡ δόξα καὶ* from iv. 11.

**κράτος** is only used of God in the N.T. It occurs only in one of St Paul's doxologies, 1 Tim. vi. 16, but is found in Jude 25; Rev. i. 6, v. 13.

12. **διὰ Σιλουανοῦ**. *διὰ* may refer (a) to the scribe by whom the Epistle was written or (b) to the messenger by whom it was conveyed. In favour of (a) it may be urged that St Paul certainly employed amanuenses to write his Epistles and that there is strong probability that St Peter did the same. As a Galilean fisherman, it is argued, he could only have a very imperfect knowledge of Greek and, according to tradition, required the services of Mark as his "interpreter," so that he could hardly have composed such an Epistle himself.

Zahn therefore, following out the suggestion of earlier German writers, maintains that St Peter entrusted the composition of the letter to Silvanus, adding only the last few verses himself, as St Paul usually did. Selwyn, with an ingenuity which is hardly likely to find many supporters, identifies Silvanus with St Luke and argues that he not only wrote this Epistle for St Peter but had also acted as St Paul's amanuensis in his Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians, thus accounting for the coincidences between 1 Pet. and those Epistles. Against (a) it may be urged

(1) that if so important a person as Silas wrote the Epistle but was not the bearer of it we should have expected him to send a salutation himself, as he would certainly be known to some of the readers, having worked in Galatia with St Paul on his second journey,

(2) that the Epistle does not read like a joint production in which

St Peter furnished the ideas while another was responsible for the language.

Therefore it is more probable that Silvanus was the messenger by whom the letter was sent. *δα* is certainly used in that sense in Acts xv. 23 and it is almost certainly used of the messengers in some of Ignatius' Epistles. The commendation of Silvanus would have special force if he was starting on a missionary journey through Asia Minor and St Peter availed himself of the opportunity to send this letter to the churches which Silvanus proposed to visit.

*Silvanus* is generally assumed to be the Silvanus who is mentioned by St Paul in 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 19, from which passages we gather that he was St Paul's companion and fellow-worker in Corinth during his second missionary journey. This in turn makes it practically certain that Silvanus is to be identified with Silas who was St Paul's chief companion at the same time and place according to Acts. In this case we know that Silas was one of "the leaders among the brethren," presumably in Jerusalem, who was chosen together with Judas, called Barsabbas, to convey to the Church in Antioch the decisions of the Apostolic Conference, Acts xv. 22. He was therefore presumably a Jewish Christian (cf. Acts xvi. 20 "these men, viz. Paul and Silas, being Jews") but was prepared to adopt a liberal policy towards Gentiles. In Antioch he worked for some time as a "prophet" or preacher and was chosen by St Paul to accompany him on his second missionary journey. Such a colleague, representing as he did the mother Church of Jerusalem, would be very valuable in helping to unite the Jewish and Gentile Christians in Asia Minor. With the same object St Paul delivered the decrees of the Apostolic Conference to the Asiatic Churches. Thence St Paul and Silas crossed to Macedonia, being debarred from preaching in Asia or Bithynia as they proposed to do. At Philippi they were imprisoned together and, as St Paul uses the plural "they have beaten us...being Romans," it would seem that Silas was also a Roman citizen. This may possibly account for the Roman form of his name<sup>1</sup>.

From Philippi Silas accompanied St Paul to Beroea and remained there with Timothy for a time, when St Paul left for Athens instructing

<sup>1</sup> It is generally held that Silas is merely a contraction for Silvanus (of Δουκάς for Δουκανός, Παρμενᾶς for Παρμενίδης), the termination -ᾶς being used as an abbreviation for all kinds of longer name-endings. Others however consider that Silas was his original Hebrew name and that Silvanus is merely a latinized form of it. So Jerome derived Silas from Sh'liach=one sent=ἀπόστολος. If however Silas was his original name we might have expected it to be lengthened into Silanus, which was a well-known Latin name, rather than Silvanus, the name of a somewhat objectionable pagan God.

them to join him there as soon as possible. From Athens they were again apparently sent back to Macedonia to report progress there (see 1 Thess. iii. 1) and again joined St Paul in Corinth (Acts xviii. 5). After this we hear nothing more of Silas except in this verse, where we find him with St Peter and St Mark apparently in Rome. As he is not mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans it is practically certain that he had not yet visited Rome in 57 (?). Again he cannot have been in Rome during St Paul's first imprisonment, otherwise he must surely have been mentioned among the fellow-workers of the circumcision who were a comfort to St Paul. Nor again was he in Rome during St Paul's second imprisonment when he wrote 2 Tim. in which he says "Only Luke is with me." The visit of Silvanus to Rome must therefore apparently be placed either just after St Paul's release about 61 or 62 or after St Paul's death. There is therefore an interval of at least eight or ten years during which we know nothing of Silas. It is hardly likely however that one who had been such an ardent missionary with St Paul should have abandoned the work altogether. Therefore it is quite possible that he may have revisited the scenes of his former labours in Asia Minor and carried out the original design of preaching in Bithynia, possibly extending the work into Pontus and Cappadocia also.

The emphatic position of *ὑμῶν* suggests that it should be taken with *τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ* rather than with *ἐγγραφα* from which it is widely separated in the sentence. In this case St Peter may well be referring to the past work of Silvanus among the Asiatic Christians. We have no evidence as to the reason of his visit to Rome. He may have come there as a Roman citizen in the interval between two missionary journeys. He may have come to visit his old colleague St Paul, or possibly at St Paul's request he may have come with St Peter to aid in uniting the Jewish and Gentile Christians. For such a task his past experience in Jerusalem, Antioch and in the mission field would give him special qualifications.

*πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ*, cf. the commendation of Tychicus, the bearer of Col. and Eph., Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7. *ὡς λογιζομαι*, not as in the A.V. *as I suppose*, as though St Peter had any doubt about his faithfulness, but as in the R.V. *as I reckon*. In view of the fact that Silas had been St Paul's companion and that Judaizers in Asia tried to represent that St Peter and St Paul were opposed to one another, such a commendation of Silvanus from St Peter would be an indication that he still "gave the right hand of fellowship to St Paul's work." If, as Dr Chase suggests, Silvanus was at the very time being sent to Asia Minor as St Paul's delegate, St Peter's commendation would have even greater importance.

δὲ ἄλλων, cf. Heb. xiii. 22. Even in so long and systematic an Epistle as Hebrews the writer feels that the vastness of his subject is but slightly represented by his letter. So here St Peter may be apologizing for the brevity of his letter and contrasting it in thought with the fuller teaching which Silvanus will be able to give by word of mouth.

ἔγραψα is the epistolary aorist, "*I am writing.*"

παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν. St Peter here sums up his object in writing. His purpose is to encourage his readers and to give (or add ἐπι...) his testimony to the truth of God's favour to them.

ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν occurs nowhere else in Biblical Greek but συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν is used in Heb. ii. 4 of God attesting the message of the Gospel by signs and wonders.

ταύτην. It is not quite clear what special aspect of God's favour is here intended. The reading of the T.R., *εἰς ἣν ἐστήκατε* (KLP etc.), *wherein ye stand*, would seem to mean the position which you occupy is the true view of God's free favour. So some critics regard it as a testimony to the truth of Pauline Christianity as taught and accepted in Asia Minor.

But in this case St Peter would surely have expressed himself more clearly. The best MSS. (NB and many cursives) read *εἰς ἣν στήτε*, *wherein* (or *to secure which*, *eis*) *stand fast*. This leaves *ταύτην* undefined and we have consequently to discover what is intended from the Epistle itself. In the concluding chapter St Peter has urged humility as the condition for receiving God's favour (*χάριον*) v. 5, and such humility must be exercised not merely towards fellow-Christians but towards God by patient endurance of sufferings as a prelude to final glory. The God of all favour (*χάριτος*) called them to share His glory by passing through a discipline of sufferings. Such sufferings are not inconsistent with God's favour but rather are signs of it, even though they are made use of by Satan to tempt them to apostasy. In i. 10 St Peter had spoken of the extension of God's favour to the Gentiles (*τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος*), as predicted by the prophets and watched by angels, and in i. 13 he urged his readers to set their hope upon the favour (*χάριον*) which is being borne to them in the revelation of Jesus Christ. Probably therefore St Peter means that the object of his letter is (a) to encourage his readers in their trial by fire, exhorting them to lead lives consistent with their faith and hope, and (b) to assure them that their position as the new Israel of God is no accident but the fulfilment of God's eternal purpose of loving favour. Their very sufferings are part of that same loving favour. Therefore he urges them to stand fast to secure (*eis*) its final consummation in eternal glory.

13. ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή. *She that is elect together with you.* Some commentators explain this as referring to St Peter's wife. The arguments in favour of this view are

- (a) that we know from 1 Cor. ix. 5 that she accompanied St Peter in his missionary work.
- (b) Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 11) tells a story that she suffered martyrdom before her husband, and was encouraged by him to "remember the Lord" as she was led away for execution. Therefore, it is urged, she must have been a well-known personage in the early Church.
- (c) that the accompanying salutation from Mark, "my son," makes it more probable that ἡ συνεκλεκτή also refers to an individual, whereas such a metaphorical description of a church would be hardly intelligible in a letter, though it might be used in Apocalyptic literature.

In answer to the last objection, it may be urged, that Babylon is most probably used in a metaphorical sense and this would suggest that ἡ συνεκλεκτή is also metaphorical, especially as other words in the Epistle, e.g. διασπορά in the opening salutation, seem also to be metaphorical.

It is therefore better to explain ἡ συνεκλεκτή as referring to a church. This is the interpretation of  $\aleph$ , in which ἐκκλησία is added, as also in the Vulgate, Peshito and Armenian Versions and in Theophylact and Occumenius.

In support of this view it may be urged that "the elect lady" κυρία ἐκλεκτή in 2 John and "the children of thy elect sister" almost certainly refer to churches. Clement of Alexandria describes 2 John as addressed "ad quendam Babyloniam Electam nomine, significat autem electionem Ecclesiae Sanctae."

The Rev. J. Chapman O.S.B. (*Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1904) suggests that 2 John was addressed to the Church in Rome, in which case it is a plausible conjecture that Clement identified the Κυρία ἐκλεκτή of 2 John with ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή in 1 Pet. Clement in his *Hypotyposes* makes no comment on these words of St Peter, but in commenting on the next words "Mark my son" he says that the Romans persuaded Mark to commit to writing what Peter preached. Therefore there is little doubt that he regarded 1 Peter as being written from Rome.

In the Book of Henoch ὁ ἐκλεκτός (xl. 5, xlv. 3, 4, etc.) is used as a title of the Messiah. It is therefore just possible that ἡ συνεκλεκτή might denote the Bride of ὁ ἐκλεκτός. In Ephesians, from which St Peter so frequently borrows, St Paul describes the Church as the Bride of Christ (Eph. v. 23—32). In the Apocalypse

the New Jerusalem is described as the Bride, the Lamb's wife, and in the *Shepherd* of Hermas the Church is represented as a woman.

**Βαβυλῶνι.** For the three interpretations of this name cf. *Introd.* pp. xxix ff., where arguments were given to shew that Rome is almost certainly intended.

**Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου.** *υἱὸς* does not necessarily imply that St Mark was a convert of St Peter, though this is possible, as it was to the house of St Mark's mother that St Peter went on his release from prison. The more usual word for a convert would be *τέκνον*. *υἱὸς* may merely mean that he has been like a son to St Peter. In early tradition Mark is constantly described as the companion of St Peter.

The attitude of St Mark towards Gentile Christians has been discussed in the Introduction (p. xlix f.).

St Mark was certainly in Rome when Colossians was written, towards the close of St Paul's first imprisonment, and may have remained there as St Peter's companion until just before the outbreak of the Neronian persecution. But he was again in the East when 2 Tim. was written, as St Paul asks Timothy to bring him with him to Rome. This visit in company with St Peter must therefore be placed either soon after St Paul's release or after St Paul's death.

**14. φιλήματι ἀγάπης.** "A holy kiss" is ordered as a Christian greeting by St Paul in Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26. At first it was used as a personal greeting, but in the second century it became part of the Eucharistic service and is referred to by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, the Apostolic Constitutions, Cyril of Jerusalem and Chrysostom. Afterwards it was used as a greeting in the services for Baptism, Marriage and Ordination.

**εἰρήνη** was the regular Hebrew greeting. Our Lord instructed His disciples to use it on arriving at a house, and Himself employed it when He appeared to them after the Resurrection. As a farewell greeting however the usual form was "depart in peace," cf. Acts xvi. 36. St Paul uses it together with *χάρις* in the opening salutations of all his epistles, but his farewell greeting is usually *χάρις*. He does however use *εἰρήνη* in Eph. vi. 23 and *εἰρήνη σοι* occurs in 3 Jn 15.

**ἐν Χριστῷ** is a very favourite phrase of St Paul to denote the position of Christians as members of Christ, and the same idea has already been expressed by St Peter in iii. 16 and v. 10. Such language evidently implies a full belief in the divinity of Christ.



## INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Acts, parallels in, xxi f.  
 Advent, the second, 25, 33, 102, 115  
 Antioch, S. Peter in, xiii ff., xvi  
 Aorist, gnomic, 41; participles, 23, 52, 122  
 Apostolic Conference, xiii f.  
 Article, use of the, 27, 66  
 Ascension, the, 82 f.  
 Asia, 13  
 Authorship of 1 Pet., xx ff.  
  
 Babylon, xxx f., 127  
 Baptism, lxiii, 74, 78 ff.  
 Bithynia, xxxv, 13 f.  
 Blood of Sprinkling, 15 f.  
 Body of Christ, 63  
  
 Canonicity of 1 Pet., xxvii ff.  
 Cappadocia, xxxv, 13  
 Chase, Bp, xix, xlv f., xlix f., lxxv, 16, 22, 104  
 Christian, the name, 108  
 Christians, duties of, lxxvii, 52 f.; privileges of, lxxvi f.; sufferings of, lxxix ff.  
 Corinth, xv  
  
 Date of 1 Pet., xxxiii ff.  
 Dative, dynamic, 30  
 Deissmann, 24, 62, 66, 109  
 Dispersion, the, liii f., 10  
 Doctrine of 1 Pet., lxxxii f.  
  
 Election, 10 f.  
 Emperor, duty to the, xlv, 53, 57  
  
 Empire, attitude towards Christianity, xxxviii ff.  
 Ephesians, relation of 1 Pet. to, lxiv ff.  
  
 Favour, lxxvi, 28, 126  
 Flood, the, 74, 78 ff.  
  
 Galatia, 12  
 Gentiles, 1 Pet. addressed to, lxxi ff.  
 Glory, 25 f., 104 f., 121  
 God, S. Peter's conception of, lxxxiv f.  
  
 Hebrews, relation of 1 Pet. to, lxviii f.  
 Hell, descent into, 83 ff., 94 f.  
 Henoch, Book of, 31, 74, 88, 109 n., 127  
 Hort, Dr, xlv, lxv, 16, 22, 29, 39, 45, 49, 79, 112  
 Husbands, exhortation to, lxxviii, 68  
  
 Imperatives, aorist and present, 58  
 Imperfect, graphic, 62  
 Inheritance, 20  
  
 James, relation of 1 Pet. to, liii f.  
 Jesus Christ, S. Peter's conception of, lxxxv f.; allusions to life and work of, xxiv f.; allusions to sayings of, xxv f.  
 Judgment, 93 f., 109  
  
 Lamb, Christ as the, 37

- Lord's Prayer, traces of the, 35,  
104
- Mark, xxi, xxxiii, xlix f., 128
- Marriage, 66
- Messiah, 29
- Messianic Age, 22
- Middle Voice, 23, 27, 43
- Name, The, xliii, 103, 108
- Nero, xl f., xlvi ff.
- Optative with *ei*, 72, 76
- Parry, liv f., lvi, lviii f., 117
- Participles, aorist, 23, 52, 122;  
imperative, 59 f.; perfect, 20,  
52, 92
- Paul, S., connexion with S. Peter,  
xiii ff., xix, 1 f.; silence of 1 Pet.  
about, lii f.
- Persecution, xxxvi ff.
- Peter, S., at Antioch, xiv f.; his  
calls, ix f.; his character, x ff.;  
knowledge of Greek, xxiii f.;  
martyrdom, date of, xlvi f.; the  
Rock, xi; visit to Rome, xvi ff.,  
1 f.
- Pliny, xxxix f., 108
- Pontus, xvi, xxxv, 11 f.
- Predestination, 14 f., 49
- Presbyters, lxxix, 111 f.
- Prophets, 27 f.
- Ramsay, Prof., xxxiv, xlii f., xlvi,  
10, 73, 107, 119
- Readers, nationality of the, lxix f.
- Rome, xvi f., xxxi, xlvi ff.
- Romans, relation of 1 Pet. to,  
ix ff.
- Salvation, 21
- Sanday and Headlam, lxxviii, 20,  
25, 49
- Shekinah, 105
- Silvanus, xxxv, li, lxxv, 123
- Slaves, exhortation to, lxxviii,  
53, 59
- Spirit of Christ, 28 f., 77
- Spirit, the Holy, 15, 32
- Spirits in prison, 74, 77 f., 88,  
94 f.
- Stone, Christ as the, lxi, 47 f.
- Suffering, lxxx, 25 ff., 71, 73 f.,  
101, 106
- Tacitus, xl f.
- Trinity, the Holy, 14
- Versions, lxxxvii
- Wives, exhortation to, lxxviii, 65 ff.

## INDEX TO NOTES ON GREEK WORDS

- ἀγαλλιᾶν* i. 6, 8, iv. 13, p. 23  
*ἅγιος* i. 12, 15, 16, ii. 5, 9, iii. 5,  
 pp. 15 f.  
*ἀγνίσειν* i. 22, p. 39  
*ἀγνώσια* ii. 15, p. 58  
*ἄδολος* ii. 2, p. 45  
*αἷμα* i. 2, 19, pp. 15 f.  
*ἀσχροκερδῶς* v. 2, p. 114  
*ἀκρογωνιαίως* ii. 6, p. 48  
*ἄλλοτρισεπίσκοπος* iv. 15, p. 107  
*ἀμαράντινος* v. 4, p. 115  
*ἄμωμος* i. 19, p. 38  
*ἀναγεννᾶν* i. 3, 23, p. 19  
*ἀναφέρειν* ii. 5, 24, pp. 46, 62  
*ἀνάχυσις* iv. 4, p. 93  
*ἀντίδικος* v. 8, p. 119  
*ἀντίτυπον* iii. 21, p. 79  
*ἀπογίνεσθαι* ii. 24, p. 64  
*ἀπόθεσις* iii. 21, p. 80  
*ἀποκάλυψις* i. 7, 13, iv. 13, pp. 25,  
 33  
*ἀπολογία* iii. 15, pp. xlii, 73  
*ἀπροσωπολήπτως* i. 17, pp. 35 f.  
*ἀρετή* ii. 9, p. 51  
*ἀρχιποίμην* v. 4, p. 115  
*ἀσωτία* iv. 4, p. 93  
  
*βασιλεῖον* ii. 9, p. 50  
*βούλημα* iv. 3, p. 91  
  
*γάλα* ii. 2, p. 43  
*γραφή* ii. 6, p. 47  
  
*διά* ii. 14, iii. 20, v. 12, pp. 57, 78,  
 123  
*διάβολος* v. 8, p. 119  
*διακονεῖν* i. 12, iv. 10, 11, p. 99  
*διασπορά* i. 1, pp. liii f., 10  
*διδόναι χάριν* v. 5, p. 117  
*δικαίος* iii. 18, p. 76  
  
*δοκίμιον* i. 7, pp. lv, 23 f.  
*δόξα* i. 7, etc., pp. 25 f., 104 f.  
  
*ἐγκομβοῦσθαι* v. 5, p. 116  
*ἐγκόπτειν* iii. 7, p. 68  
*ἔθνος* ii. 9, p. 50  
*εἰ καὶ* iii. 14, pp. 71 f.  
*εἰ* with optative iii. 14, 17, p. 72  
*εἰδέναι* with acc. and inf. v. 9,  
 p. 121  
*εἰδωλολατρία* iv. 3, p. 92  
*εἰς* i. 2, 3, 10, 11, 21, 25, v. 12,  
 pp. lxxii, 6, 16, 18, 28, 39, 41,  
 126  
*εἰς τούτο* ii. 21, iii. 9, iv. 6, pp. 61,  
 70, 94  
*ἐκ* ii. 12, p. 55  
*ἐκλεκτός* i. 1, etc., p. 10  
*ἐκτενής -ως* i. 22, iv. 8, p. 40  
*ἐλεος* i. 3, p. 19  
*ἐνοια* iv. 1, p. 90  
*ἐπαινος* i. 7, p. 24  
*ἐπερώτημα* iii. 21, p. 81  
*ἐπηρεάζειν* iii. 16, p. 73  
*ἐπεικῆς* ii. 18, p. 60  
*ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* i. 17, p. 35  
*ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν* v. 12, p. 126  
*ἐπισκοπή* ii. 12, p. 56  
*ἐπίσκοπος* ii. 25, p. 64  
*ἐπιτελεῖσθαι* v. 9, p. 121  
*ἐποπτεύειν* ii. 12, iii. 2, pp. 55 f.,  
 67  
 (ἐρμηνεύτης p. xxiii)  
*ἐσχάτος* i. 5, 20, pp. 22, 38  
*ἔτοιμος* i. 5, p. 22  
  
*ζηλωτής* iii. 17, p. 71  
*ζωοποιεῖν* iii. 18, p. 77  
  
*ἡσύχιος* iii. 4, p. 67

θέλημα iv. 2, p. 91

ἴδιος iii. 1, p. 66

ἱεράτευμα ii. 5, p. 46

κακία ii. 1, p. 43

κακοποιός ii. 12, iv. 15, pp. xliii,  
55

κακοῦν iii. 13, p. 71

κατά iv. 6, pp. 95 f.

κατακυριεύειν v. 3, p. 114

καταρτίζειν v. 10, p. 122

κλέος ii. 20, p. 61

κληρονομία i. 4, p. 20

κλήρος v. 3, p. 114

κτίσις ii. 13, p. 57

λαλεῖν iv. 11, p. 99

λαός ii. 9, pp. 50 f.

λίθος ii. 4, pp. 47 f.

λογικός ii. 2, p. 44

λόγιον iv. 11, p. 100

λόγος i. 23, iii. 1, pp. 40 f., 66

λυτροῦσθαι i. 18, pp. 36 f.

μάρτυς v. 1, p. 113

μάταιος i. 18, p. 37

μῶλωψ ii. 24, p. 64

νεώτερος v. 5, pp. 115 f.

ξενίζεσθαι iv. 4, pp. 92 f.

ξύλον ii. 24, p. 63

οἰκονόμος iv. 10, p. 99

οἶκος iv. 17, pp. 109 f.

ὄνομα iv. 14, 15, pp. 103, 108 f.

παρακύπτειν i. 12, p. 31

παρεπίδημος i. 1, ii. 11, pp. 11, 54

παροιμία i. 17, p. 36

πάροικος ii. 11, p. 54

πατροπαράδοτος i. 18, p. 37

περιποίησις ii. 9, p. 51

πιστός εἰς i. 20, p. 39

πνεῦμα i. 2, iii. 18, 19, pp. 15, 77

πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ i. 11, pp. 28 f.

πρεσβύτερος v. 1, pp. 111 f.

πρόγνωσις i. 2, pp. 14 f.

προμαρτύρεσθαι i. 11, p. 29

προσάγειν iii. 18, pp. 76 f.

προσέρχεσθαι ii. 4, p. 45

προφήτης i. 10, pp. 27 f.

πύρωσις iv. 12, pp. xli, 102

ῥαντισμός i. 2, pp. 15 ff.

σκεθός iii. 7, p. 68

στερεός v. 9, p. 120

στέφανος v. 4, p. 115

στηρίζειν v. 10, p. 122

συμπρεσβύτερος v. 1, p. 112

συνείδησις ii. 19, p. 61

συνεκλεκτός v. 12, p. 127

συνσχηματίζειν i. 14, p. 34

σῶμα ii. 24, p. 63

σωτηρία i. 5, p. 21

σωφρονεῖν iv. 7, p. 96

ταπεινοφροσύνη v. 5, p. 116

τηρεῖν i. 4, p. 20

ὑπερήφανος v. 5, p. 117

ὑπογραμμός ii. 21, p. 61

φιλαδελφία i. 22, p. 40

φίλημα v. 14, p. 128

φιλόξενος iv. 9, p. 98

φόβος iii. 2, 14, pp. 67, 72

φυλακή iii. 19, pp. 78, 88 f.

χάρις i. 10, ii. 19, v. 6, 10, 12,  
pp. 28, 60, 117, 121, 126

χορηγεῖν iv. 11, p. 100

Χριστιανός iv. 16, p. 108

Χριστός i. 11, p. 29