

# I PETER

A HANDBOOK ON THE GREEK TEXT



MARK DUBIS

# 1 PETER

# BHGNT

Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament

*Martin M. Culy*

General Editor

## OTHER BOOKS IN THIS SERIES

*Luke* Martin M. Culy, Mikeal C. Parsons,  
and Joshua J. Stigall

*Acts* Martin M. Culy and Mikeal C. Parsons

*Ephesians* William J. Larkin

*1, 2, 3 John* Martin M. Culy

**1 PETER**  
A Handbook on the Greek Text

Mark Dubis

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 2010 by Baylor University Press  
Waco, Texas 76798-7363

*All Rights Reserved.* No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission in writing of Baylor University Press.

Scripture translations are the author's.

*Cover Design* by Pamela Poll Graphic Design

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Dubis, Mark, 1960-

1 Peter : a handbook on the Greek text / Mark Dubis.

p. cm. -- (Baylor handbook on the greek new testament)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-932792-62-1 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Bible. N.T. Peter, 1st--Criticism, Textual. 2. Bible. N.T. Peter, 1st Greek--Versions. I. Title. II. Title: First Peter.

BS2795.52.D83 2010

227.92048--dc22

2010020208

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper with a minimum of 30% pcw recycled content.

*To Benjamin and Matthew*



## CONTENTS

Series Introduction	ix
Abbreviations	xv
Introduction	xix
1 Peter 1:1-2	1
1 Peter 1:3-12	4
1 Peter 1:13-21	22
1 Peter 1:22-2:10	35
1 Peter 2:11-17	58
1 Peter 2:18-25	70
1 Peter 3:1-7	83
1 Peter 3:8-12	96
1 Peter 3:13-22	104
1 Peter 4:1-6	128
1 Peter 4:7-11	139
1 Peter 4:12-19	145
1 Peter 5:1-11	158
1 Peter 5:12-14	173
Glossary	179
Bibliography	185
Grammar Index	193
Author Index	199



## SERIES INTRODUCTION

The Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament (BHGNT) is designed to guide new readers and seasoned scholars alike through the intricacies of the Greek text. Each handbook provides a verse-by-verse treatment of the biblical text. Unlike traditional commentaries, however, the BHGNT makes little attempt to expound on the theological meaning or significance of the document under consideration. Instead, the handbooks serve as “prequels” to commentary proper. They provide readers of the New Testament with a foundational analysis of the Greek text upon which interpretation may then be established. Readers of traditional commentaries are sometimes dismayed by the fact that even those that are labeled “exegetical” or “critical” frequently have little to say about the mechanics of the Greek text and all too often completely ignore the more perplexing grammatical issues. In contrast, the BHGNT offers an accessible and comprehensive, though not exhaustive, treatment of the Greek New Testament, with particular attention given to the grammar of the text. In order to make the handbooks more user-friendly, authors have only selectively interacted with secondary literature. Where there is significant debate on an issue, the handbooks provide a representative sample of scholars espousing each position; when authors adopt a less known stance on the text, they generally list any other scholars who have embraced that position.

The BHGNT, however, is more than a reliable guide to the Greek text of the New Testament. Each author brings unique strengths to the task of preparing the handbook. As a result, students and scholars alike will at times be introduced to ways of looking at the Greek language that they have not encountered before. This feature makes the handbooks valuable not only for intermediate and

advanced Greek courses but also for students and scholars who no longer have the luxury of increasing their Greek proficiency within a classroom context. While handbook authors do not consider modern linguistic theory to be a panacea for all questions exegetical, the BHGNT does aim both to help move linguistic insights into the mainstream of New Testament reference works and, at the same time, to help weed out some of the myths about the Greek language that continue to appear in both scholarly and popular treatments of the New Testament.

### **Using the Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament**

Each handbook consists of the following features. The introduction draws readers' attention to some of the distinctive features of the biblical text and treats some of the broader issues relating to the text as a whole in a more thorough fashion. In the handbook proper, the biblical text is divided into sections, each of which is introduced with a translation that illustrates how the insights gleaned from the analysis that follows may be expressed in modern English. Following the translation is the heart of the handbook, an extensive analysis of the Greek text. Here, the Greek text of each verse is followed by comments on grammatical, lexical, and text-critical issues. Handbook authors may also make use of other features, such as passage overviews between the translation and notes.

Each page of the handbook includes a header to direct readers to the beginning of the section where the translation is found (left page header) or to identify the range of verses covered on the two facing pages (right hand header). Terminology used in the comments that is potentially unfamiliar is included in a glossary in the back of the handbook and/or cross-referenced with the first occurrence of the expression, where an explanation may be found. Each volume also includes an index that provides a list of grammatical phenomena occurring in the biblical text. This feature provides a valuable resource for students of Greek wanting to study a particular construction more carefully or Greek instructors needing to develop illustrations, exercises, or exams. The handbooks conclude with a bibliography of works cited, providing helpful guidance in identifying resources for further research on the Greek text.

The handbooks assume that users will possess a minimal level of competence with Greek morphology and syntax. Series authors generally utilize traditional labels such as those found in Daniel Wallace's *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Labels that are drawn from the broader field of modern linguistics are explained at their first occurrence and included in the glossary. Common labels that users may be unfamiliar with are also included in the glossary.

The primary exception to the broad adoption of traditional syntactic labels relates to verb tenses. Most New Testament Greek grammars describe the tense system as being formally fairly simple (only 6 tenses) but functionally complex. The aorist tense, it is frequently said, can function in a wide variety of ways that are associated with labels such as “ingressive,” “gnomic,” “constative,” “epistolary,” “proleptic,” and so forth. Similar functional complexity is posited for the other tenses. Positing such “functions,” however, typically stems not from a careful analysis of Greek syntax but rather from grappling with the challenges of translating Greek verbs into English. When we carefully examine the Greek verb tenses themselves, we find that the tense forms do not themselves denote semantic features such as ingressive, iterative, or conative; they certainly do not emphasize such notions; at best they may allow for ingressive, iterative, or conative translations. Although many of the other traditional labels are susceptible to similar critique, the tense labels have frequently led to exegetical claims that go beyond the syntax, e.g., that a particular aorist verb *emphasizes* the beginning of an action. For this reason, we have chosen not to utilize these labels. Instead, where the context points to an ingressive nuance for the action of the verb, this will be incorporated into the translation.

### Deponency

Although series authors will vary in the theoretical approaches they bring to the text, the BHGNT has adopted the same general approach on one important issue: deponency. Traditionally, the label “deponent” has been applied to verbs with middle, passive, or middle/passive morphology that are thought to be “active” in meaning. Introductory grammars tend to put a significant number

of middle verbs in the New Testament in this category, despite the fact that some of the standard reference grammars have questioned the validity of the label. Robertson (332), for example, argues that the label “should not be used at all.”

In recent years, a number of scholars have taken up Robertson’s quiet call to abandon this label. Carl Conrad’s posts on the B-Greek Internet discussion list (beginning in 1997) and his subsequent formalization of those concerns in unpublished papers available on his website have helped flesh out the concerns raised by earlier scholars. In a recent article, Jonathan Pennington (61–64) helpfully summarizes the rationale for dispensing with the label, maintaining that widespread use of the term “deponent” stems from two key factors: (1) the tendency to attempt to analyze Greek syntax through reference to English translation—if a workable translation of a middle form appears “active” in English, we conclude that the verb must be active in meaning even though it is middle in form; and (2) the imposition of Latin categories on Greek grammar. Pennington (61) concludes that “most if not all verbs that are considered ‘deponent’ are in fact truly middle in meaning.” The questions that have been raised regarding deponency as a syntactic category, then, are not simply issues that interest a few Greek scholars and linguists but have no bearing on how one understands the text. Rather, if these scholars are correct, the notion of deponency has, at least in some cases, effectively obscured the semantic significance of the middle voice, leading to imprecise readings of the text (see also Bakker and Taylor).

It is not only middle voice verbs, however, that are the focus of attention in this debate. Conrad, Pennington, and others also maintain that deponency is an invalid category for passive verbs that have traditionally been placed in this category. To account for putative passive deponent verbs, these scholars have turned to the evolution of voice morphology in the Greek language. They draw attention to the fact that middle morphology was being replaced by passive morphology (the  $-\theta\eta$ - morpheme) during the Koine period (see esp. Conrad, 3, 5–6; cf. Pennington, 68; Taylor, 175; Caragounis, 153). Consequently, in the Common Era we find “an increasing number of passive forms without a distinctive passive

idea ... replacing older middle forms” (Pennington, 68). This diachronic argument leads Conrad (5) to conclude that the  $-\theta\eta-$  morpheme should be treated as a middle/passive rather than a passive morpheme. Such arguments have a sound linguistic foundation and raise serious questions about the legitimacy of the notion “passive deponent.”

Should, then, the label “deponent” be abandoned altogether? While more research needs to be done to account for middle/passive morphology in Koine Greek fully, the arguments, which are very briefly summarized above, are both compelling and exegetically significant. “The middle voice needs to be understood in its own status and function as indicating that the subject of a verb is the focus of the verb’s action or state” (Conrad, 3; cf. Taylor, 174). Consequently, users of the BHGNT will discover that verbs that are typically labeled “deponent,” including some with  $-\theta\eta-$  morphology, tend to be listed as “middle.”

In recognizing that so-called deponent verbs should be viewed as true middles, users of the BHGNT should not fall into the trap of concluding that the middle form emphasizes the subject’s involvement in the action of the verb. At times, the middle voice appears simply to be a morphological flag indicating that the verb is intransitive. More frequently, the middle morphology tends to be driven by the “middle” semantics of the verb itself. In other words, the middle voice is sometimes used with the verb not in order to place a focus on the subject’s involvement in the action but precisely because the sense of the lexical form itself involves subject focus.

It is the hope of Baylor University Press, the series editor, and each of the authors that these handbooks will help advance our understanding of the Greek New Testament, be used to further equip the saints for the work of ministry, and fan into flame a love for the Greek New Testament among a new generation of students and scholars.

Martin M. Culy



## ABBREVIATIONS

<i>1 Clem.</i>	<i>1 Clement</i>
<i>1–2 En.</i>	<i>1–2 Enoch</i>
1–2 Macc	1–2 Maccabees
1st	first person
2nd	second person
4 Macc	4 Maccabees
3rd	third person
acc	accusative
act	active
<i>al</i>	other manuscripts
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
aor	aorist
ASV	American Standard Version
BDAG	Bauer, Danker, Arndt, Gingrich, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT</i> , 2000
BDF	Blass, Debrunner, Funk, <i>A Greek Grammar of the NT</i>
dat	dative
<i>Did.</i>	<i>Didache</i>
ESV	English Standard Version
ET	English translation
fem	feminine
fut	future
gen	genitive
HCSB	Holman Christian Standard Bible
impf	imperfect

impv	imperative
ind	indicative
inf	infinitive
JB	Jerusalem Bible
Jdt	Judith
KJV	King James Version
LN	Louw and Nida, <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i>
LDGNT	Runge, <i>Lexham Discourse Greek New Testament</i>
LSJ	Liddell, Scott, Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i>
LXX	Septuagint
masc	masculine
mid	middle
MT	Masoretic Text (Hebrew Bible)
NA <sup>27</sup>	Nestle-Aland, <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 27th ed.
NASB	New American Standard Bible, 1995 ed.
NCV	New Century Version
NEB	New English Bible
NET	New English Translation
neut	neuter
NIV	New International Version
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NLT <sup>2</sup>	New Living Translation, 2nd ed.
nom	nominative
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
opt	optative
OT	Old Testament
pass	passive
<i>pc</i>	a few other manuscripts
pl	plural
<i>pm</i>	a great many other manuscripts
pres	present
prf	perfect

ptc	participle
REB	Revised English Bible
RSV	Revised Standard Version
sg	singular
subj	subjunctive
s.v.	under the word ( <i>sub verbo</i> )
TEV	Today's English Version
Tob	Tobit
<i>T. Reu.</i>	<i>Testament of Reuben</i>
<i>T. Sol.</i>	<i>Testament of Solomon</i>
voc	vocative
Wis	Wisdom of Solomon



## INTRODUCTION

The Greek of 1 Peter has more than its fair share of syntactical challenges for the Greek student, and it is the aim of this volume to be of assistance in navigating those challenges. Readers will likely want to use this volume in conjunction with a traditional commentary for complementary analysis of the context, message, and meaning of this book. The major recent commentaries are those of Michaels, Achtemeier (1996), and Elliott (2000), all of which give attention to syntactical issues (although Achtemeier particularly stands out in this regard). One will also find help (even on technical matters) in commentaries of lesser scope (e.g., Schreiner's commentary makes a fine contribution). For a survey of recent trends in research on 1 Peter, one can consult Dubis (2006), Webb, and the bibliographies of Casurella and Mills.

One of the goals of this series is not only to apply traditional syntactical analysis to the text of the New Testament but also to acquaint readers with more recent developments among grammarians and linguists. One particular area to which I would like to draw attention is that of Greek word order. Greek teachers often take pains to break English-speaking students of an improper reliance on word order, and as a result Greek students can sometimes develop the impression that word order in Greek is inconsequential, which is certainly not true. Numerous specialized studies on Greek word order have appeared, but I have found the work of Stephen Levinsohn (adapted and popularized by Steve Runge, one of Levinsohn's disciples) to have particular explanatory power. See especially Levinsohn (1–67) and Runge (2010, §§9–13). Levinsohn argues that Greek is a verb-initial language so that clausal constituents that appear before the verb, i.e., that are “fronted,” (with the exception of conjunctions and the like) are marked as being either:

(a) “focal,” that is, the most important new information in the clause, or (b) a “point of departure,” which refers to information that is already established by the preceding context or is readily knowable and that provides readers/hearers with a certain context within which they should understand the remainder of the clause. Consider the following sentence: “I have three points to make. As for the first, I cannot stress its importance enough.” The phrase “as for the first” is a (topical) point of departure, helping the reader to not lose track of the flow of the argument. This point of departure gives the reader (a) a framework within which to interpret what follows (“I cannot stress its importance enough” relates only to the “first point”), and also (b) a connection that helps the reader relate the following comment to the preceding context (here “as for the first” identifies the following comment as one of the three points just mentioned). Points of departure in non-narrative literature such as 1 Peter are frequently topical, implying a shift from the preceding topic (in narrative literature, on the other hand, points of departure often involve shifts in location, participants, or time). Runge uses different labels for these same phenomenon. Instead of point of departure, Runge uses the term “frame of reference” or simply “frame,” and instead of Levinsohn’s “marked focal element,” Runge speaks of “emphasis.” In other words, “emphasis” for Runge refers to the clause’s most important new information that is fronted in order to give it more prominence. Note that all sentences by their very nature contain new or “focal” information (this is what keeps the argument or story moving forward), but this focal information is only “emphatic” (in Runge’s terms) when it is specially marked by placing it prior to the verb. In this volume, I typically use Runge’s terminology unless I am describing or interacting with the work of Levinsohn.

Here are a few basic rules to get us started with this approach to word order. When two constituents are fronted (i.e., precede the verb), you should expect the first fronted constituent to be a frame. The second fronted constituent may be either a second frame or an emphatic element. Typically, only one fronted constituent will be emphatic. I recommend Runge (2010) as a place to start for further information on this topic, and from there you can move on to the more detailed treatment that appears in Levinsohn.

Levinsohn's work goes well beyond the treatment of constituents fronted vis-à-vis the verb. This handbook does not draw upon these latter discussions, but it is my hope that the discussion that follows will whet the reader's appetite to further investigate this often neglected area of study.

One other issue that is a topic of contemporary discussion among grammarians has to do with deponency and the middle voice. The *Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament* series adopts the viewpoint that "deponency" is a misguided label, a viewpoint with which I concur. I encourage the reader to carefully read the paragraphs on this topic in the Series Introduction. Significant is the work of Kemmer, who has identified certain semantic domains that typically appear in the middle voice across a whole range of languages that have middle forms. I have applied Kemmer's categories to the middle forms herein, occasionally resorting to a similar list developed by Miller. In this way, I hope that students of the Greek New Testament can begin to internalize the types of Greek verbs that often appear in the middle voice.

I would like to express my appreciation to President David Dockery, Provost Carla Sanderson, and the Pew Summer Research Grant Committee of Union University for the Pew Summer Research grant that assisted me in the completion of this project. At a number of points in the manuscript, my arguments regarding Greek word order have benefited from my correspondence with Stephen Levinsohn, to whom I extend my appreciation. I also thank Steve Runge for my beneficial interaction with him on this topic. Thanks go as well to my student assistant Albert "Shep" Shepherd for his help in preparing the grammar index and abbreviations list and to Nellene Benhardus and Michael Brown for other research assistance. I am also grateful to the staff of Baylor University Press who lent their support to the project and saw it through to completion. My special thanks go to Marty Culy for his meticulous editorial review of my manuscript. His insights, probing questions, and careful attention to detail were all that one would hope for from an editor. Finally, I want to acknowledge the loving support and encouragement of my wife, Beth, during this project. To our two sons, Benjamin and Matthew, this handbook has been dedicated.



## A HANDBOOK ON THE GREEK TEXT OF 1 PETER

### 1 Peter 1:1-2

<sup>1</sup>Peter, an apostle of Jesus the Christ, to the exiles, that is, the diaspora of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, who are chosen <sup>2</sup>according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, by the Spirit's sanctifying work, and for the purpose of obeying Jesus the Christ and being sprinkled with his blood. May grace and peace be multiplied to you.

**1:1 Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας,**

**Πέτρος.** Nominative absolute. Such nominatives only appear in introductory material, such as the opening formula of a letter, this does not constitute a sentence (Wallace, 49–51).

**ἀπόστολος.** Nominative in apposition to Πέτρος.

**Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** Although modern Christians often think of “Christ” as part of Jesus’ personal name, for early Christians Χριστός retained much more of its original titular meaning, “Christ” or “Messiah,” even when appearing alongside the personal name “Jesus” (see Selwyn, 122; see also Wright 1992, whose argument regarding Pauline literature has relevance for 1 Peter). Taking Χριστοῦ as a title, the genitive Ἰησοῦ alone modifies ἀπόστολος while Χριστοῦ is in apposition to Ἰησοῦ. Ἰησοῦ is a subjective genitive.

**ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις.** Dative of recipient, an epistolary feature explained by Klauck (18) as originating in an oral messenger formula, “Thus says A to B.” Since both of these terms are technically adjectives, the question arises as to which is nominalized and

which is functioning adjectivally. The suggestion of Michaels (7) that *παρεπίδημος* is the adjectival term is unlikely in light of the fact that *παρεπίδημος* is substantival in 2:11 and in its three other occurrences in biblical literature (LXX Gen 23:4; Ps 38:13; Heb 11:13). Achtemeier (1996, 81) and Jobes (75) understand both *ἐκλεκτοῖς* and *παρεπίδημος* to be substantival, though *ἐκλεκτοῖς* is more likely adjectival, as in 2:9. Significant debate exists as to whether *παρεπίδημος* (“alien, exile”) and related vocabulary elsewhere in 1 Peter is metaphorical or not. Against the metaphorical interpretation, see Elliott (1990); in favor of it, see Achtemeier (1989, 222–28). For a summary of the debate, see Dubis (2006, 213–17); I side with Achtemeier.

**διασπορᾶς.** This term harkens to the Babylonian exile and is used both of (a) the *region* outside of Palestine in which dispersed Jews live (e.g., Jdt 5:19) as well as (b) the Jewish *people* living outside of Palestine (e.g., 2 Macc 1:27). In the present context, the term could likewise refer to either a region or people. If (a) is correct, then *διασπορᾶς* is a genitive of place (“in the diaspora,” so BDAG, 236.2; Achtemeier 1996, 83). Since the metaphor is concerned more with who the readers are rather than where they are, option (b) is more likely correct (so most commentators). If so, then *διασπορᾶς* is best taken as an exegetical genitive. Others take *διασπορᾶς* as an attributive genitive (“scattered foreigners”), but this does not take into account that *διασπορά* is almost a technical term at this point (see Schmidt, 99). Scholars normally take this term not to indicate that the recipients are Jewish (as did ancient commentators) but as a reapplication of the language and experience of OT Israel to the primarily Gentile Christian recipients of 1 Peter (see 1:14, 18; 2:9; 4:3–4).

**Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας.** If, as argued above, *διασπορᾶς* refers to people, then these genitives are genitives of place. If, however, *διασπορᾶς* were to refer to a region, then these genitives would not be appositional since these places did not constitute the full extent of the *διασπορά*; instead, all these proper nouns would be exegetical genitives, giving further specificity of location to *διασπορᾶς* (this would be an example of the subset of exegetical genitives in which the genitive gives

specification to a larger category represented by the head noun; Wallace, 95–96).

**1:2 κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.**

**κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ.** Standard. This is the first of a series of three prepositional phrases in this verse, all of which modify *ἐκλεκτοῖς* in verse 1 (contra Selwyn, 119, who regards it as modifying *both* *ἐκλεκτοῖς* and *ἀπόστολος*, and Grudem, 50, who regards it as modifying the entire description of the recipients in v. 1).

**θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**πατρὸς.** Genitive in apposition to θεοῦ.

**ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος.** Means, not locative/sphere (contra Grudem, 52).

**πνεύματος.** Subjective genitive.

**εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** Purpose (contra Agnew; Elliott 2000, 319, who interpret the *εἰς* as causal).

**αἵματος.** Objective genitive.

**Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** See 1:1 on Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Structurally, the genitive Ἰησοῦ could modify both elements of the preceding compound noun phrase or just αἵματος. Given the parallel prepositional phrases that precede, in which statements are made about the other two persons of the Trinity, Ἰησοῦ likely relates to the noun phrase ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος in its entirety, thus requiring that the genitive Ἰησοῦ has a function with reference to both parts of the compound noun phrase. With respect to αἵματος, Ἰησοῦ is a possessive genitive; with respect to ὑπακοὴν, Ἰησοῦ is an objective genitive. Despite the fact that many versions interpret Ἰησοῦ in a similar way (RSV, NRSV, ESV, NJB, TEV, NIV, NASB), most commentators resist this (Achtemeier 1996, 87, calls it a “grammatical monstrosity”!) and offer a number of alternative interpretations. Many read ὑπακοὴν absolutely (e.g., Selwyn, 120). Beare (76–77) and Jobes (72) suggest that ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν is a hendiadys, expressing one idea (covenant establishment) with two words, but this seems to be a misapplication of hendiadys (which properly refers to the coordination of two terms that really

have a subordinate relationship, with one term implicitly modifying the other; for example, the hendiadys “nice and warm” semantically expresses “nicely warm”). Elliott (2000, 319) reads Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as a subjective genitive with respect to both ὑπακοῆν and ῥάντισμὸν, i.e., Jesus obeys and he also sprinkles his own blood (see also Agnew). This view, however, spoils the way in which these three prepositional phrases are ordered in keeping with the unfolding *ordo salutis* (“order of salvation”) with respect to the recipients (see Jobes, 68).

**χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη.** The nouns χάρις and εἰρήνη are fronted for emphasis (so LDGNT). The anarthrous character of these nouns helps to identify them as fronted for emphasis, not as a topical frame. Material that is emphatic (or marked as “focal” in Levinsohn’s terms) is new information and thus not definite to the reader. Frames (or “points of departure” in Levinsohn’s terms), however, “refer to information that is accessible in the context or switch from information that is accessible in the context” and, thus, frames are often arthrous (Levinsohn, 42). As for the fronting of the pronoun ὑμῖν, pronouns often move with constituents that are fronted for emphasis (such as χάρις and εἰρήνη here) to a preverbal position (see Levinsohn, 39–40).

**χάρις . . . καὶ εἰρήνη.** Nominative subject of πληθυνθείη.

**ὑμῖν.** Dative indirect object of πληθυνθείη.

**πληθυνθείη.** Aor pass opt 3rd sg πληθύνω. The optative frequently appears in prayers in the NT, as is the case here. God is the implicit agent.

### 1 Peter 1:3-12

<sup>3</sup>Worthy of praise is the God and Father of our Lord, Jesus the Christ, who in keeping with his vast mercy brought us to new life through God’s resurrection of Jesus the Christ from the dead in order that we might have an enduring hope, <sup>4</sup>namely, so that we might have an incorruptible, undefiled and unfading inheritance, which has been preserved in heaven for you, <sup>5</sup>who are being guarded by God’s powerful action through faith for a salvation that is about to be revealed in the last time.

<sup>6</sup>You rejoice because of this coming time although, if necessary, you now briefly have been distressed in the midst of various trials

<sup>7</sup>in order that what emerges from this test, namely, your faith—which is more valuable than gold, which perishes yet is tested with fire—might be found to result in praise, glory and honor at the revelation of Jesus the Christ. <sup>8</sup>Although you have not seen him, you love him, and although you do not now see him, you believe and rejoice in him <sup>9</sup>because you are receiving the outcome of your faith, namely, your salvation.

<sup>10</sup>It was about this salvation that prophets who prophesied about the grace destined for you earnestly investigated, <sup>11</sup>inquiring into whom or what time the Spirit of the Christ in them was indicating by predicting the sufferings destined for the Christ and the glories after these things. <sup>12</sup>To them it was revealed that it was not for their benefit but for yours that they were conveying these things, which have now been announced to you through the ones who proclaimed the gospel to you by the Holy Spirit who was sent from heaven—things which angels long to look into.

**1:3 Εὐλογητός ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν δι’ ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν,**

**Εὐλογητός ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ.** The implied εἰμί here theoretically could take a number of forms. Although an optative form (“may the God and Father be blessed”) is sometimes suggested (so Michaels, 15), the implicit εἰμί is most likely present indicative in light of usage in the LXX (1 Chr 29:10; Ps 118:12; Tob 3:11). This sentence, literally construed as “God is one who is worthy of praise” (see LN 33.362), indirectly exhorts “you should praise God!” and thus means something not far from the optative analysis.

**Εὐλογητός.** Predicate adjective.

**ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ.** Nominative subject of an implied ἐστίν. This phrase provides an example of Granville Sharp’s rule, which states that when a phrase has the pattern article-substantive-καὶ-substantive, the two substantives refer to the same person as long as the substantives are both personal, singular and not (from a Greek perspective) proper names (see Wallace, 274). Here Sharp’s rule tells us that θεός, paired with πατὴρ, refers specifically to the first person of the Trinity.

**τοῦ κυρίου.** Modifies the preceding compound noun phrase. With respect to θεός, this is a genitive of subordination. With respect to πατήρ, this is a genitive of relationship.

**ἡμῶν.** Genitive of subordination (“Lord over us”). As the one who offers the expression of praise to God here, Peter naturally includes himself, using a first person plural pronoun twice in this verse before switching back in verse 4 to the rhetorical target of his discourse, i.e., “you.”

**Ἰησοῦ.** Genitive in apposition to κυρίου.

**Χριστοῦ.** See 1:1 on Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος.** Standard. This is the first in a series of four prepositional phrases that modify the following ἀναγεννήσας. Fronted for emphasis.

**αὐτοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**ἀναγεννήσας.** Aor act ptc masc nom sg ἀναγεννάω (attributive). Modifies ὁ θεός καὶ πατήρ (and especially πατήρ). Just as γεννάω can refer to the act of “birth” (Rom 9:11) or “conception” (Matt 1:20), some commentators understand the cognate ἀναγεννάω to mean “born anew” while others understand it to mean “conceived anew.” Achtemeier (1996, 94) argues that the use of ἀναγεννάω in verse 23 alongside σπορά (“seed”) means that conception is in view there, and he is likely correct. On the basis of this use, he further argues that ἀναγεννάω here also refers to “conception.” Unlike in literal pregnancy, however, there is no gestation period in the metaphorical application of this term. Consequently, it is difficult to press a distinction between “conception” and “birth” without more contextual support, and these two meanings possibly collapse together here (see this metaphor again with the cognate ἀρτιγέννητος in 2:2, which clearly refers to a new birth with its reference to nursing infants). Although grammatically this is an adjectival participle, semantically it functions as a ground for the preceding mitigated command, i.e., the recipients should praise God because he has brought them to new life.

**ἡμᾶς.** Accusative direct object of ἀναγεννήσας.

**εἰς ἐλπίδα ζωῶν.** The preposition εἰς is sometimes taken as result (Elliott 2000, 333), but it is best to understand εἰς as purpose/goal (Davids, 52), pointing to one of God’s intentions in regeneration: “so that you might have a living hope.”

**ζῶσαν.** Pres act ptc fem acc sg ζάω (attributive). BDAG (426.5) categorizes this under the definition “to be life-productive, offer life,” but “hope that offers life” seems tautological since the hope here *constitutes* life in its fullness. Instead, this participle anticipates the emphasis in verse 4 on the permanent nature of what is yet to come, and is thus rendered as “enduring” above (see the similar participial use of ζάω in v. 23 where it forms a doublet with μένω; for more on “doublets,” see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον).

**δι’ ἀναστάσεως.** Means, modifying ἀναγεννήσας, though some view this phrase as modifying ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν (e.g., Schreiner, 62).

**Ἰησοῦ.** Since the focus of this verse is on the activity of God the Father, Ἰησοῦ is likely an objective genitive instead of a subjective genitive (Michaels, 19–20).

**Χριστοῦ.** See 1:1 on Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**ἐκ νεκρῶν.** Separation. The translation “from the dead,” although convenient, can obscure the fact that νεκρῶν is plural and has in view all of those who have died.

**1:4 εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον, τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς**

**εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον.** Purpose. This phrase, also beginning with εἰς, is in apposition to τοῦ εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν in verse 3, further elaborating on the recipients’ future hope. The metaphor of “inheritance” builds upon the imagery of the father-child relationship between God and the recipients.

**ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον.** Moore (5) defines a doublet as “two or more words or constructions . . . which occur together and which are so redundant in context that, for translation purposes, they may be rendered as a single term.” Moore’s definition goes on to say that the doublet’s function may be to add emphasis, in which case a translation should bring out this emphasis. By Moore’s definition, the three conjoined adjectives here would be a three-term “doublet,” or better, a “triplet” (although unfortunately Moore, 60, himself excludes ἀμίαντον from the triplet). The function of this triplet is, indeed, to add rhetorical

emphasis and, further intensified by the alliterative alpha-privative on each term, this triplet serves to emphasize the perfection and eternity of the recipients' inheritance. If the triplet were collapsed, it could be rendered as "absolutely incorruptible." For more detailed explanation of doublets, see Moore, especially the introductory material on pages 5–19 as well as his canonically ordered listing of 869 suspected doublets in the NT.

**τετηρημένην.** Prf pass ptc fem acc sg τηρέω (attributive). God is the implicit agent.

**ἐν οὐρανοῖς.** Spatial.

**εἰς ὑμᾶς.** Advantage.

**1:5 τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοιμὴν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.**

**ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ.** Means. Fronted for emphasis.

**θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**φρουρουμένους.** Pres pass ptc masc acc pl φρουρέω (attributive). God is the implicit agent as the preceding ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ makes clear.

**διὰ πίστεως.** Also means, although secondary to the means reflected above in ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ. Horrell suggests that πίστεως might refer to God's faithfulness, but given that πιστ- cognates appear three times in the immediate context with reference to the recipients' faith (1:7, 8, 9), it is more likely that πίστεως here also refers to their faith. The writer does not specify whether the object of faith is the Father or Jesus. If a choice must be made, the unstated object of faith is most likely Jesus, since he is the explicit object of faith elsewhere in the immediate context (1:8; contra Achtemeier 1996, 97).

**εἰς σωτηρίαν.** Purpose. Many scholars maintain that this phrase modifies ἀναγεννήσας and is used with εἰς ἐλπίδα (v. 3) and εἰς κληρονομίαν (v. 4) to reflect a threefold purpose of God's regenerative work (see, e.g., Achtemeier 1996, 97; Schreiner, 61). Nevertheless, it more naturally introduces the purpose of φρουρουμένους given this participle's closer proximity (see the synonymous τηρέω with εἰς in 2 Pet 2:4, 9; 3:7). This view also stands in contrast to Jobes (89–90), who takes εἰς as a temporal

marker, “until that time when salvation is revealed” (although she rightly understands εἰς σωτηρίαν to modify φρουρουμένων).

**ἐτοίμην.** This adjective of readiness is elsewhere followed by an exegetical infinitive as here (Luke 22:33; Acts 23:15; Ps 111:7).

**ἀποκαλυφθῆναι.** Aor pass inf ἀποκαλύπτω (exegetical to ἐτοίμην). God is the implied agent who will reveal the fullness of salvation.

**ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.** Temporal. The commonly argued lexical distinction between καιρός (as a critical time of significance) and χρόνος (as the passage of time) is misguided (see Dubis 2002, 143–44).

**1:6 ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον [ἐστίν] λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς,**

**ἐν ᾧ.** Causal. For ἐν with ἀγαλλιάω, marking the ground of rejoicing (contra Michaels, 27), see, for example, John 5:35; LXX Ps 9:3; 19:6. A number of possible antecedents of ᾧ have been suggested: (1) the various salvific realities described in verses 3–5, reading ᾧ as neuter (affirmed by many scholars, including Elliott 2000, 339; for a clear example of this use, see ἐν ᾧ in 4:4); (2) θεός καὶ πατήρ or Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in verse 3 (so Hort, 41); (3) the immediately preceding καιρός at the end of verse 5 (so Michaels, 27–28 and Martin 1992a, 59–64, although both have a different understanding of related matters than I do); (4) no antecedent at all, but rather to take ἐν ᾧ as used absolutely and to translate it as “while” or “therefore.” Option (3) is the most likely explanation since καιρός offers an explicit and a highly proximate antecedent. This third option is also supported by the cascading structure of verses 3–12 in which one clause or phrase picks up where the preceding one left off. Various syntactical structures serve this cascade (e.g., the participial phrase τοὺς . . . φρουρουμένων in v. 5 modifies ὑμᾶς at the end of v. 4), but it is the use of relative clauses that is especially noteworthy (e.g., v. 8’s two relative clauses modify Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in v. 7; v. 10’s relative clause modifies σωτηρίαν in v. 9; v. 12’s second relative clause modifies αὐτά at the end of the previous clause). This pattern makes it more likely that the relative clause with which verse 6 begins is modifying the noun at the end of the

previous clause, namely, *καιρός*. Although Selwyn (126) criticizes this interpretation, asserting that *καιρός* is “scarcely a large enough element in the previous sentence to carry the weight of this rich and significant relative clause,” he fails to notice that since this “last time” is the time in which the realities of verses 3-5 will come to fruition, *καιρός* serves as an embodiment of the preceding verses. Verse 5’s *καιρός* is thus a metonymy for what verses 3-5 describe. In sum, while the antecedent of *ὅ* is best taken as *καιρός* in keeping with option (3) above, the recognition that *καιρός* is a metonymy leads to an interpretation not far from option (1).

**ἀγαλλιᾶσθε.** Pres mid ind (or impv) 2nd pl ἀγαλλιάω. In an article devoted to this form (here, as well as in v. 8 where it reappears), Martin (1992b) identifies three possible interpretations: (1) present indicative with present meaning, (2) present indicative with future meaning, and (3) present imperative. As for option (3), Martin rightly argues that the indicative mood is more appropriate in this blessing section; the tone of the letter does not shift to direct exhortation (and the use of the imperative mood) until verse 13. Although Martin argues for option (2), option (1) is more likely since in verse 8 ἀγαλλιᾶσθε parallels ἀγαπάτε, a present tense verb with present meaning. Some wrongly assume that the tense of ἀγαλλιᾶσθε *must* be future if the antecedent of the *ὅ* that opens verse 6 is *καιρός* (e.g., Achtemeier 1996, 100; Schreiner, 66), failing to note that the recipients find present joy in what the future time will bring. Although BDAG (4) labels this present form as usually being deponent, it is best taken as a middle used to describe an emotional state (Kemmer, 130–32, 269; see the Series Introduction on “Deponency” for a critique of the deponent label). On the middle voice of this specific verb, see Conrad (15).

**ὄλιγον.** Temporal adverb functioning as a temporal frame. Adverbs are sometimes, as here, derived from adjectives in their accusative neuter form (see Wallace, 293).

**ἄρτι.** Temporal adverb functioning as a second temporal frame. The “now” of the recipients’ suffering provides an antithesis to the “last time” of verse 5 (not to future rejoicing, as Martin 1992b, 309, argues).

**εἰ δέον [ἔστιν].** The footnotes in the NET suggest that *ἔστιν* is not original and that an implied optative form of *εἰμί* is to be sup-

plied here, resulting in a fourth class condition rather than a first class condition (see 3:14, 17). The loss of an original ἔστιν, however, can be explained by homoioteleuton or on the basis that a scribe may have found the present ἔστιν to be jarring when followed by the aorist λυπηθέντες. Fronted as a third frame, an adverbial frame of condition.

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition, if ἔστιν is indeed original. Here the assumption reflects reality (see BDAG, 278.3; BDF §372), although it is expressed as a condition in order to draw the recipients into the logic of the exhortation (Wallace, 694).

**δεῖν.** Pres act ptc neut nom sg δεῖ (present periphrastic). Fronted for emphasis (so LDGNT). Acts 19:36 is the one other instance in the NT where a participial form of δεῖ is used periphrastically (Culy and Parsons, 379).

[**ἔστιν**]. Pres act ind 3rd sg εἰμί. The implied subject is the suffering that is reflected in λυπηθέντες. The brackets in the text of the UBS<sup>4</sup>/NA<sup>27</sup> indicate that, while the editors favored the inclusion of ἔστιν, its originality is questionable.

**λυπηθέντες.** Aor mid ptc masc nom pl λυπέω (concessive, not causal, contra Selwyn, 127). The aorist participle here reflects antecedent time (so NIV, NRSV; contra RSV, NET); the recipients rejoice despite the fact that they have already undergone various trials. This interpretation stands against those who would see the suffering of the recipients as only potential, not actual; see further Dubis (2002, 72–76). Furthermore, as Michaels (28) notes, the use of ἄρτι means that the recipients' past suffering extends into the present (which also explains the preceding present ἔστιν). The usage of λυπέω in the Greek Bible suggests that λυπηθέντες serves as an example of a θη- verb form that, though traditionally taken as passive or passive deponent, is better read as a middle (see the Series Introduction on “Deponency”). Describing an emotional state of grief or distress, the middle voice corresponds to Kemmer's semantic class of “emotion middle” (130–32, 269).

**ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς.** The preposition is sometimes translated as means (e.g., Elliott 2000, 339), but if λυπηθέντες has a middle instead of passive sense, then ἐν would be circumstantial (so BDAG, 327.2.b).

1:7 ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου, εὐρεθῆ εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause modifying λυπηθέντες in verse 6.

**τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου.** This lengthy construction, headed by δοκίμιον, is fronted as a topical frame (which is incorrectly truncated by LDGNT).

**τὸ δοκίμιον.** Nominative subject of εὐρεθῆ. The noun δοκίμιον is a metallurgical term which is sometimes translated as “testing” (Martin 1992a, 64–67) or as a quality manifested through such testing, i.e., “genuineness” (RSV, NRSV), but here it seems best to take it to refer to the tested and approved product of a metallurgical process (see LXX Ps 11:7 where δοκίμιον has this meaning, standing in parallel to “refined silver”). Thus, δοκίμιον is here a metaphor for that which emerges authenticated from the testing that the recipients are enduring (i.e., their faith, as the genitive πίστεως clarifies).

**ὑμῶν.** Subjective genitive, modifying πίστεως.

**τῆς πίστεως.** Epexegetical genitive to δοκίμιον. With a similar result, Wallace (90) takes πίστεως as an attributed genitive (“genuine faith”), but this requires reading δοκίμιον as an abstract quality, “genuineness,” which is a meaning not clearly attested elsewhere in biblical Greek. Those who translate δοκίμιον as “testing” would take πίστεως as an objective genitive. Some others understand πίστεως partitively (so Bigg, 104, who translates τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως as the “tested residue of your faith”). Bigg’s understanding, however, emphasizes the purification of faith when it is the authentication of faith that appears to be more in view.

**πολυτιμότερον.** This comparative adjective (as marked by the –τερ suffix) is in a predicate position. Some commentators account for this position by arguing that the adjective stands as a predicate of εὐρεθῆ (e.g., Kelly, 54: “may be found to be more precious than gold”; so also Selwyn, 130; Martin 1992a, 64). This explanation is awkward, however, since the prepositional phrase εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν already serves as a predicate of

εὐρεθῆ. It is better to understand an implicit copulative verb here: “being more valuable than gold.” Such a predicate construction is unusual, but see Goodwin §972 and Gal 1:4; see also BDF §269.3. On a separate point, note also that the comparative adjective modifies δοκίμιον, not πίστεως (at least not directly). Translations that apply πολυτιμότερον to “faith,” however, are not ultimately problematic since the exegetical genitive πίστεως identifies the metaphorical δοκίμιον as “faith.” The key significance of noting that πολυτιμότερον modifies δοκίμιον, not πίστεως, is that it eliminates “testing” as a potential meaning for δοκίμιον here.

**χρυσίου.** Genitive of comparison.

**τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου.** This is a rare construction in which a single article modifies two participles that are joined by δέ. For another example of this construction, see *T. Job* 25:8 (σὺ εἶ ὁ τοῦς χρυσεύς κραβάττους ἔχων νῦν δὲ καθήμεος ἐπὶ κοπρίας, “You are the one having golden couches but now sitting on a pile of dung”; see also 32:4). This construction is a stylistic feature of 1 Peter, appearing again in 2:10. Note also the joining of two adverbial participles with δέ in verse 8. These arthrous participles modifying the anarthrous χρυσίου are in the third attributive position, a position that is common with participles although not with adjectives proper (Wallace, 618).

**ἀπολλυμένου.** Pres mid ptc neut gen sg ἀπόλλυμι (attributive). The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “spontaneous events associated with inanimate beings” (142–47, 269).

**διὰ πυρὸς.** Means. Embedded within a lengthy topical frame, this phrase is fronted with respect to δοκιμαζομένου for emphasis.

**δὲ.** Postpositive with respect to διὰ πυρὸς. Traditionally, δὲ has been understood to have an adversative and sometimes copulative force. More recent studies have argued that δὲ has one core function, which is as a marker of a new development in the author’s argument or narrative (which encompasses its use in both contrastive or copulative contexts). Heckert (40) notes that this use of δὲ has been described variously as marking the “next step” in an argument or marking a “significant change.” This observation is valid not just for δὲ in isolation, but also for its occurrence in set constructions

such as μέν-δέ and negative-positive constructions (using οὐ/μή and δέ). This next developmental step may occur at a low level in the discourse, marking a step between simple phrases, or at a higher level, marking a step between larger units. For further discussion, see the entire chapter of Heckert (37–57), and also Levinsohn (69–93, 112–18), Buth (1981, 1991, 1992) and Runge (2010, §2.2–3). Here δέ functions at a low level, marking δοκιμαζομένου as a distinct new development, building upon the immediately preceding foil, τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου. Although δοκιμαζομένου is an attributive participle, *semantically* it is the contraexpectation in a concession-contraexpectation relationship (in English a concessive clause is usually introduced by “although” or “even though”), yielding in context “which, although it perishes, is tested with fire.” Numerous translations, however, represent δοκιμαζομένου as though it were the concessive element rather than ἀπολλυμένου, apparently taking δοκιμαζομένου as an adverbial concessive participle modifying ἀπολλυμένου (e.g., NIV, “which perishes even though refined by fire”; so also NASB, ESV), but this puts the accent on ἀπολλυμένου rather than on δοκιμαζομένου, which the context suggests is the true focal point (correctly in NRSV: “gold that, though perishable, is tested by fire”; so also RSV, NET).

**δοκιμαζομένου.** Pres pass ptc neut gen sg δοκιμάζω (attributive).

**εὐρεθῆ.** Aor pass subj 3rd sg εὐρίσκω. Subjunctive with ἵνα.

**εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν.** Result. The implicit verbal idea in each element of this triplet might be understood to have God as its object (i.e., resulting in the praise, glorifying, and honoring of God), but is much more likely to have believers as its object (so NJB, NLT<sup>2</sup>, TEV). The triplet emphasizes how exceedingly God or Christ will honor believers at the Parousia. On the function of “doublets” and “triplets,” see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον.

**ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** Temporal.

**Ἰησοῦ.** If God is the implied agent of the revealing of Jesus, then this is an objective genitive. If we should understand that Jesus reveals himself, it is a subjective genitive. The similar phrase in 4:13 can only be objective, which argues for the same understanding here.

**Χριστοῦ.** On this term, see 1:1 on Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**1:8 ὄν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὄρωντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκκλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξαμένῳ**

**ὄν.** Accusative direct object of ἀγαπᾶτε. For the sake of readability, my English translation begins a new sentence here.

**οὐκ ἰδόντες . . . μὴ ὄρωντες.** On the distinction between the negatives οὐ and μὴ, Winer (593) comments: “Οὐ stands where something is to be directly denied (as matter of fact); μὴ, where something is to be denied as mere matter of thought (in conception and conditionally): the former is the *objective*, the latter the *subjective* negative.” Although in classical Greek, participles appear with οὐ, by NT times οὐ has given way to μὴ. In any case, the switch of negatives here is eye-catching. BDF §430.3 views the οὐκ with the first participle emphasizing more the “inactuality” of the past seeing (see also Martin 1992a, 67, who comments, “the author can factually state that they have not seen him, but he cannot be so sure about the present,” since they might see the revealing of Jesus at any time).

**ἰδόντες.** Aor act ptc masc nom pl ὄραω (concessive). When an aorist participle modifies a present main verb, the aorist tense typically indicates that the action of the participle is antecedent to the action of the main verb, as here.

**ἀγαπᾶτε.** Pres act ind 2nd pl ἀγαπάω. Some take this verb as an imperative, although most agree that it is not until verse 13 that we encounter 1 Peter’s first imperatival form (see Martin 1992b and the following comments on ἀγαλλιᾶσθε).

**εἰς ὃν.** The preposition εἰς introduces the object of the main verb ἀγαλλιᾶσθε (so Achtemeier 1996, 103).

**ἄρτι.** This adverb modifies the following participle ὄρωντες. Fronted as a temporal frame.

**ὄρωντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ὄραω (concessive, modifying ἀγαλλιᾶσθε). The implicit object is Jesus.

**πιστεύοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl πιστεύω. Although this participle could be taken as causal, it is best (with most translations) taken as attendant circumstance, modifying ἀγαλλιᾶσθε.

**δὲ.** Introduces the next step in the argument (the belief and joy

that the recipients experience despite not seeing Jesus). On the use of *δέ* as a marker of development, see 1:7 on *δέ*.

**ἀγαλλιᾶσθε.** Pres mid ind 2nd pl ἀγαλλιάω. Some (e.g., Martin 1992b; Michaels, 34) take this as a futuristic present, pointing to the joy that the recipients will have when Jesus returns. The joy in view, however, is more likely present since (a) ἀγαλλιᾶσθε stands in parallel with ἀγαπᾶτε, which has a present force, and (b) main verbs typically share the same time reference with the present participles that modify them (here ὁρῶντες and πιστεύοντες both refer to the present time as ἄρτι makes clear); see Marshall, 42–43. For a critique of Thurén, who argues that ἀγαλλιᾶσθε is an intentionally ambiguous form, with an indicative force being applicable to one group of readers and an imperative force to another group, see Jobs (93). On the class of the middle voice, see 1:6 on ἀγαλλιᾶσθε.

**χαρᾶ.** Cognate dative. Here the dative is cognate in meaning, not form, and serves to emphasize the intensity of the joy that the recipients experience. See Wallace, 168–69.

**ἀνεκκλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξαμένῳ.** This doublet serves, in addition to the preceding cognate dative, to emphasize the recipients' great joy. On “doublets,” see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον.

**δεδοξαμένῳ.** Prf pass ptc fem dat sg δοξάζω (attributive).

**1:9 κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως [ὑμῶν] σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν.**

**κομιζόμενοι.** Pres mid ptc masc nom pl κομίζω (causal, modifying ἀγαλλιᾶσθε in v. 8; not temporal, contra Michaels, 35). Futuristic present. Wallace's distinction between futuristic presents that are “completely futuristic” and those that are “mostly futuristic” is helpful here (535–37), with the latter label being applicable here. The reception of this salvation, in its present realization (see v. 12) as well as in its anticipated consummation, is identified as the cause for the present rejoicing of the recipients (so NIV, NRSV, TEV). This participle is best taken in relation to 1:8's ἀγαλλιᾶσθε alone rather than ἀγαπᾶτε as well (so Elliott 2000, 344; contra, e.g., Schreiner, 70). The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer's semantic subclass of “indirect (or self-benefactive) middle” (17, 78–81, 268).

**τὸ τέλος.** Accusative direct object of κομιζόμενοι. Τέλος is best understood as the result, not the purpose, of faith (Schreiner, 71). So “result” or “outcome” (NASB, RSV) is a better translation than “goal” (NIV, NET).

**τῆς πίστεως.** Genitive of producer (i.e., faith produces the τέλος, which is defined as salvation in what follows). This label only applies in a penultimate rather than ultimate sense because salvation is ultimately God’s work. Rather than “faithfulness,” the use of the cognate verb in verse 8 suggests that “faith” is the correct rendering here (contra Achtemeier 1996, 104).

[ὕμῶν]. Subjective genitive. Although this pronoun is omitted by a few manuscripts (notably B) and replaced in others with ἡμῶν (1505 *pc*), ὑμῶν has wide support as original (Ⲙ A C P Ψ 048 33 ℳ; so Michaels, 26). On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίν].

**σωτηρίαν.** Accusative in apposition to τέλος.

**ψυχῶν.** Objective genitive. The noun here should not be understood to reflect Greek dualism between body and soul, but rather in the Hebraic sense of the whole person (see the use of this noun with this latter sense elsewhere in 1 Peter, especially in 3:20). To avoid confusion by modern readers, Achtemeier (1996, 104) aptly suggests translating σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν as “your redemption” or “the rescue of your lives.”

**1:10** *περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν προφηταὶ οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες,*

**περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας.** Reference. This is an internally headed relative clause (a relative clause in which its antecedent is embedded). Culy and Parsons (3) argue that such relative clauses serve to intensify the expression: “concerning this very salvation.” This repetition of σωτηρία from the previous verse also serves as a linkword between the paragraph in verses 10-12 and the conclusion of the preceding paragraph in verses 6-9 (Elliott 2000, 345).

**ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν.** That these terms are synonymous (and thus form a doublet) is indicated by the use of ἐραυνώ by itself in verse 11 to recapitulate the action of both these verbs (Michaels, 40). This doublet (see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον) emphasizes how earnestly the prophets made their

inquiry and is collapsed in my translation to “earnestly investigated.” Although Kistemaker (55) argues that the prepositional prefix ἐξ- serves to add yet further emphasis to these verbs (see also NIV, “searched intently and with the greatest care”), the appearance of ζητέω and ἐκζητέω alongside one another in the LXX (Deut 4:29; 2 Chr 20:4; 26:5; Prov 11:27; Isa 8:19; Jer 36:13; Ezek 34:12) argues against such an additional intensifying force (so Greeven, 894).

**ἐξεζήτησαν.** Aor act ind 3rd pl ἐκζητέω.

**ἐξηραύνησαν.** Aor act ind 3rd pl ἐξηραυνάω.

**προφήται.** Nominative subject of ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν. Although Selwyn (259–68) argues that the prophets here are NT prophets and is followed by Warden, he has persuaded few others. For a critique of Selwyn and an argument that the prophets here are OT prophets, see Dubis (2002, 108–10). Michaels (40) suggests that the anarthrous form gives the recipients free range to reflect on various prophets that might suit the description.

**περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος.** Fronted for emphasis.

**περὶ τῆς . . . χάριτος.** Reference.

**εἰς ὑμᾶς.** Goal, modifying χάριτος, “destined for you” (see BDAG, 290.4.d).

**προφητεύσαντες.** Aor act ptc masc nom pl προφητεύω (attributive). On the third attributive position, see 1:7 on τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου . . . δοκιμαζομένου.

**1:11 ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας.**

**ἐραυνῶντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἐραυνάω (amplification). Verse 11 elaborates on the object of the prophets’ inquiry introduced in verse 10, with the participle serving to take up and expand upon verse 10’s finite verbs ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν (the latter verb being cognate to this participle). Wallace (649–50) uses the label “redundant” for such participles, but the label “amplification” is better in this instance, underscoring that the participle has a true function.

**εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν.** Elliott (2000, 345) understands the εἰς as working only with ἐδήλου, while Michaels (41) understands

the εἰς as working only with ἐραυνῶντες (see LXX Gen 31:33 for εἰς with ἐρευνάω, which represents an earlier spelling of ἐραυνάω according to BDF §30.4; BDAG, 389). Instead, it is best to view εἰς as tersely serving double duty to introduce the object of both verbs (Achtmeier 1996, 109). Michaels contests that δηλώω is “never used with εἰς” but at least one extrabiblical example appears in a second century A.D. Greek text (Vettius Valens, *Anthologiarum libri ix*, 2.3).

**τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν.** Interpreters are divided as to whether to interpret τίνα as an interrogative adjective modifying καιρὸν (e.g., ASV, “what time or what manner of time,” similarly NIV, NJB, TEV) or as an interrogative pronoun (e.g., RSV, “what person or time,” similarly NASB, NET, ESV, NRSV). Opting for the former adjectival view are Michaels (41) and Achtmeier (1996, 109). Following Kilpatrick’s statistical argument, Jobes (101–2) argues that the pronominal interpretation is most likely since τίς appears over one thousand times in the NT but is used less than twenty times as an adjective. It is this pronominal interpretation that is adopted here (see also Kilpatrick; Grudem, 74–75), although Jobes’ further suggestion that τίνα be parsed as a neuter accusative plural (“what things”) seems less likely than the usual parsing as masculine accusative singular, applied to the Messiah.

**ἐδήλου.** Impf act ind 3rd sg δηλώω.

**ἐν αὐτοῖς.** Spatial, modifying πνεῦμα.

**τὸ . . . πνεῦμα.** Nominative subject of ἐδήλου.

**Χριστοῦ.** Genitive of association or a genitive of source (“the Spirit who was later sent forth from the Christ”), which would suit verse 12’s reference to “the Spirit sent from heaven.” In light of verse 12’s clear use of πνεῦμα with reference to the third person of the Trinity, it is unlikely that we should take Χριστοῦ here as an exegetical genitive (contra Achtmeier 1996, 109–10).

**προμαρτυρόμενον.** Pres mid ptc neut nom sg προμαρτύρομαι (means). The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class/subclass of “emotion middle/speech action” (133–34, 269).

**τὰ . . . παθήματα καὶ τὰς . . . δόξας.** Accusative direct object of προμαρτυρόμενον.

**εἰς Χριστὸν.** Goal, modifying παθήματα. The εἰς has been

variously interpreted as (a) connoting advantage (so REB, “sufferings in Christ’s cause”; BDAG, 290.4.b.β); (b) temporally (so Scott, 237: “the sufferings which lead up to Messiah, or to Messiah’s coming”); and (c) as equivalent to the genitive phrase τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 4:13 and 5:1. Most likely is the rendering by Hort (54), who reads this phrase in light of 1:10’s parallel phrase, εἰς ὑμᾶς, with both phrases reflecting the OT prophets’ perspective (“the sufferings destined for Messiah”; so also NRSV, NAB). For the notion of messianic woes here, see Dubis (2002, 110–17). For further discussion of the options for εἰς, see Jobes (99–100).

**μετὰ ταῦτα.** Temporal, modifying δόξας. The antecedent of ταῦτα is τὰ εἰς Χριστόν παθήματα.

**δόξας.** Of the ten uses of δόξα in 1 Peter, this is curiously the only plural form (on this use, see Dubis 2002, 114–17).

**1:12 οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτά, ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς [ἐν] πνεύματι ἀγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι.**

**οἷς.** Dative indirect object of ἀπεκαλύφθη.

**ἀπεκαλύφθη.** Aor pass ind 3rd sg ἀποκαλύπτω. God or the Spirit is the implicit agent here.

**ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτά.** This substantival ὅτι clause functions as the subject of ἀπεκαλύφθη.

**οὐχ . . . δὲ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction in which the negated clause, οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς (διηκόνουν), serves to emphasize the positive clause, ὑμῖν . . . διηκόνουν, introduced by δὲ. Negative-positive constructions involve a negated phrase or clause that serves as a foil for a positive phrase or clause (usually introduced by δέ or ἀλλά); thus, the function of the negated element is to emphasize the positive element (e.g., in English, “not cold but hot”). On negative-positive constructions, see further the discussion in Runge (2010, §4.3), who uses the alternative label “point-counterpoint set.” On δέ as a development marker in negative-positive constructions, see 1:7.

**ἑαυτοῖς.** Dative of advantage (so TEV: “not for their own benefit”). This pronoun, which stands in parallel to the fronted ὑμῖν,

should also be understood as fronted. Thus, this word is an example of “temporary focus,” which refers to bringing a constituent temporarily into focus in anticipation of a switch to a subsequent corresponding constituent (ὑμῖν), where the real focus lies (Levinsohn, 55–57). Placing a negative immediately before a constituent, as here, is one way of bringing a constituent into focus (see Levinsohn, 49). On the meaning of “focus,” see the Introduction.

**ὑμῖν.** Dative of advantage. Fronted for emphasis.

**διηκόνουν.** Impf act ind 3rd pl διακονέω. BDAG (229.1) notes that this term can refer to the activity of intermediaries, including the delivery of a message, a connotation present here since the prophets served as God’s spokespersons (see NJB).

**αὐτά.** Accusative direct object of διηκόνουν. An alternative view understands αὐτά, referring to the prophets’ insights, to be the subject of διηκόνουν, but the similar use in 4:10 of a pronoun as the direct object of διακονέω in 4:10 makes an alternative unlikely (Achtemeier 1996, 111). Here the antecedent includes all the items of prophetic inquiry and communication mentioned in verses 10–11.

**ἄ.** Nominative subject of ἀνηγγέλη. Note that neuter plural subjects frequently take singular verbs. The antecedent is the preceding αὐτά.

**νῦν.** Fronted as a temporal frame.

**ἀνηγγέλη.** Aor pass ind 3rd sg ἀναγγέλλω.

**ὑμῖν.** Dative indirect object of ἀνηγγέλη.

**διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων.** The use of διὰ plus the genitive indicates that the agency of the evangelists here is intermediate since ultimate agency is usually expressed by ὑπό plus the genitive (see Wallace, 432–34). The ultimate agent is God himself, who employs these evangelists as his heralds.

**τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων.** Aor mid ptc masc gen pl εὐαγγελίζω (substantival). The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class/subclass of “emotion middle/speech action” (133–34, 269).

**ὑμᾶς.** Accusative direct object of εὐαγγελισαμένων.

**[ἐν] πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.** Means, modifying not ἀνηγγέλη but rather the more proximate εὐαγγελισαμένων. On the meaning of the

brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίν]. The meaning is unaffected by the question of whether ἐν is original or not.

**ἀποσταλέντι.** Aor pass ptc neut dat sg ἀποστέλλω (attributive).  
**ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ.** Source.

**εἰς ἄ.** Direction. Εἰς in association with παρακύπτω depicts bending toward something (see John 20:11; Sir 21:23). The antecedent is the preceding αὐτά.

**ἐπιθυμοῦσιν.** Pres act ind 3rd pl ἐπιθυμέω.

**ἄγγελοι.** Nominative subject of ἐπιθυμοῦσιν.

**παρακύψαι.** Aor act inf παρακύπτω (complementary). Rather than “stooping,” the image likely refers to stretching to look through a window (LXX Gen 26:8; 1 Chr 15:29), here the windows of heaven from which angels peer (cf. *1 En.* 9:1).

### 1 Peter 1:13-21

<sup>13</sup>Therefore, by girding up the loins of your minds, that is, by being sober-minded, set your hope fully upon the grace that will be brought to you at the revelation of Jesus the Christ. <sup>14</sup>As obedient children, do not conform yourselves to your former lusts when you were ignorant, <sup>15</sup>but, just like the Holy One who called you, you yourselves also be holy in all your conduct; <sup>16</sup>for it is written, “Be holy because I am holy.”

<sup>17</sup>And if you invoke as your “father” the one who will impartially judge according to the work of each person, then conduct yourselves with fear during the time of your sojourn, <sup>18</sup>because you know that it was not with perishable things such as silver or gold that you were redeemed from the futile way of life that your ancestors taught you; <sup>19</sup>instead, it was with the precious blood—like that of a totally perfect lamb—of Christ, <sup>20</sup>who was chosen before the world was created, but was revealed at the end of times for you, <sup>21</sup>believers through him in God, who raised him from among the dead and gave glory to him with the result that your faith and hope are in God.

**1:13** Διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν νήφοντες τελείως ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**Διὸ.** This conjunction indicates that what has preceded in 1:1-12 serves as a motivational ground for the following exhortations.

**ἀναζωσάμενοι.** Aor mid ptc masc nom pl ἀναζώννυμι (means). While this participle could be read as attendant circumstance (i.e., coordinate with the main verb) with an imperatival force (so RSV), this participial construction (as well as the following νήφοντες) can be understood well as means (so Schreiner, 77–78); see the comment on τελείως later in this verse. On the debate regarding imperatival participles in 1 Peter, see 1:14 on συσχηματιζόμενοι. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “grooming” (53–55, 268).

**τὰς ὀσφύας.** Accusative direct object of ἀναζωσάμενοι.

**τῆς διανοίας.** Epexegetical genitive. This is an example of a subcategory in which the head noun (ὀσφύας) is a metaphor for which its genitive noun provides an explanation (Wallace, 95–96).

**ὑμῶν.** Possessive genitive.

**νήφοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl νήφω (means). This participle stands in apposition to ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, clarifying the meaning of this metaphorical participial construction. Both ἀναζωσάμενοι and νήφοντες modify ἐλπίσατε (contra Jobes, 110–11, who views νήφοντες as modifying ἀναζωσάμενοι). Despite the shift in tense from the present νήφοντες to the aorist ἀναζωσάμενοι, they are both contemporaneous with ἐλπίσατε (contra Grudem, 77, who does not note that an aorist participle can be contemporaneous with the main verb if the latter is also aorist).

**τελείως.** Adverb of degree. Some scholars (e.g., Hort, 65; Michaels, 55) read this adverb as modifying νήφοντες. Τελείως appears in the LXX and early Christian literature both before and after the verb it modifies, and thus the context must dictate one’s choice here. Applying τελείως to ἐλπίσατε is preferable (with most recent commentators). Read this way, τελείως is fronted for emphasis (contra LDGNT), naturally following the preceding participles of means: it is by means of mental preparation and discipline that one is able to set one’s hope *fully* on the coming eschatological consummation.

**ἐλπίσατε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl ἐλπίζω. This is the letter’s first

bona fide imperative verb, marking as hortatory the new unit that 1:13 begins.

**ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν.** The preposition ἐπὶ introduces χάριν as the object of ἐλπίζατε (not ground, contra Hort, 66; see Rom 15:12; 1 Tim 4:10; 5:5; 6:17).

**φερομένην.** Pres pass ptc fem acc sg φέρω (attributive). The implied agent is God or Christ. The present tense is futuristic (contra Hort, 67), as is made clear by the following ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**ὑμῖν.** Dative indirect object of φερομένην.

**ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** Temporal. Elliott (2000, 356–57) understands this as referring to Jesus’ first coming (see 1:20), but both other uses of ἀποκάλυψις in the letter (1:7; 4:13) refer to the second coming. On this phrase and its constituents, see also 1:7, where the exact same phrase appears.

**1:14 ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς μὴ συσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις**

**ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς.** Ὡς appears twenty-seven times in 1 Peter and functions in four different ways in this book: (1) to introduce a comparative clause (2:2, 12, 25; 3:6; 4:11[2x], 12; 5:8); (2) to introduce a comparative phrase (1:19, 24[2x]); (3) to identify the role or capacity in which someone acts (1:14; 2:5, 11, 13, 14, 16[3x], 3:7[2x]; 4:10, 15[2x], 16); (4) to introduce other semantic relations (manner in 5:3; standard in 5:12). When ὡς functions as (1), an ellipsis is often present (so that the clausal verb itself is often implied, as in 2:2). When functioning as (3), ὡς almost always introduces a metaphor (but not in 2:13, 14). In these instances, it is the metaphor that introduces a comparison between the topic and the image; the ὡς itself bears little or no comparative force and is best translated “in the capacity/role of. . .” On this latter function, see BDAG (1104.3), which notes that ὡς can function as a “marker introducing the perspective from which a person, thing, or activity is viewed or understood as to character, function, or role.” It is this use of ὡς that is present here in verse 14; the focus is on viewing the activity of “not conforming” from the perspective of the recipients’ role as obedient children. This is an instance of a common ground-

ing of ethical imperatives in the NT upon the indicative; here the recipients are to be the obedient children that they *are* (so also Michaels, 56–57). This phrase takes on a causal sense, as the motivation for the following participle’s appeal (so Hart, 48). Fronted as an adverbial frame.

**τέκνα ὑπακοῆς.** Elliott (2000, 357) reads this as a Semitism and says, “The expression ‘children of X,’ like ‘sons of X,’ identifies an essential quality or power by which its referent is controlled.” Understood this way, the meaning is essentially the same as an attributive genitival phrase, “obedient children.”

**τέκνα.** This nominative noun is the second component in a ὡς construction involving the implied nominative ὑμεῖς, which is the referent of συσχηματιζόμενοι.

**συσχηματιζόμενοι.** Pres mid ptc masc nom pl συσχηματίζω (imperative). The question as to whether participles can function independently with an imperatival force is a matter of some debate. Moulton (1:180) regards such use as “established beyond question by the papyri,” but Daube (1981) heavily criticizes Moulton’s examples. Daube, nevertheless, admits that imperatival participles appear in 1 Peter and elsewhere in the NT. (Daube’s criticism of Moulton has to do with whether Moulton is correct to find the origin of imperatival participles within Hellenistic Greek; Daube argues instead for a Hebrew or perhaps Aramaic origin, deriving from early rabbinic usage.) Daube, however, has had his own critics (Meecham, Salom, Porter 1989). With these critics, I believe that Daube himself has misread the evidence of the papyri and that the evidence does indeed support Moulton’s contention for the presence of an independent imperatival use of the participle in that literature. As for other grammarians, Robertson (946) comments that 1 Peter provides “unmistakable examples” of the imperatival participle (see also Porter 1999; S. Snyder, 197–98). Most commentators find examples of independent imperatival participles within 1 Peter, with Achtemeier being an important exception. Achtemeier ardently opposes an independent (as well as dependent) imperatival use, even when he is pressed to locate the main verb at some distance from the participle (e.g., he relates the participles in 3:1, 7, 9 to the imperatives in 2:17); for this same reluctance with similar

solutions in 1 Peter, see Boyer as well as Winer. I do find independent imperatival participles in 1 Peter (as well as dependent participles of attendant circumstance that modify imperatives and take on their imperatival force). See the comments on 1:13, 14; 2:1, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 8, 9, 16; 4:8, 10; 5:7. Although Achtemeier (1996, 120) views the present participle, συσχηματιζόμενοι, as a participle of means (e.g., modifying γενήθητε in v. 15), the vast majority of commentators take it as an independent imperatival participle; the conjunction ἀλλὰ that opens the next verse is decisive in this regard (Schreiner, 79), marking this participial phrase as the prohibitive counterpart to the positive command ἅγιοι . . . γενήθητε in verse 15. The middle voice (“conform yourselves”) corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “direct reflexive” (42–52, 268).

**ταῖς . . . ἐπιθυμίαις.** Dative complement of συσχηματιζόμενοι. Although ἐπιθυμία can bear a positive nuance, it almost always bears a pejorative meaning in the NT, as it does in its other three occurrences in 1 Peter (2:11; 4:2, 3).

**πρότερον.** Adverbs are sometimes derived from the accusative neuter singular of adjectives, which adverbial form can in turn be used adjectivally (here modifying ἐπιθυμίαις). On adverbs used as adjectives, see BDF §434.

**ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ.** Circumstance, modifying ἐπιθυμίαις.  
**ὑμῶν.** Subjective genitive.

**1:15 ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε,**

**κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον.** Standard/Reason. See BDAG (512.5.a.δ), which notes that κατὰ often marks not only the standard but also simultaneously the reason, as is true here (so Elliott 2000, 359–60). This phrase is interpreted in two ways. First, some take the participle τὸν καλέσαντα as substantival and ἅγιον as a predicate adjective (so NIV: “just as he who called you is holy”). Second, others take τὸν καλέσαντα as adjectival and take τὸν . . . ἅγιον as a title, “the Holy One” (so NASB, NET: “like the Holy One who called you”). In support of the first view is the use of ἅγιος as a predicate adjective three times in the next few clauses (most translations adopt this view; so also Achtemeier 1996, 121). In support

of the second view is the use of ὁ ἅγιος (“the Holy One”) elsewhere as a title for God (e.g., Isa 40:25; Hab 3:3; Sir 48:20; 1 John 2:20). Decisively in favor of this second view, though, is that κατά is a preposition, not a subordinating conjunction, which means that no verb (implied or not) can appear in the prepositional phrase (so Michaels, 51, 58, who describes the first view as “all but impossible”; most commentators adopt this second view). Fronted as an adverbial frame (contra LDGNT).

**καλέσαντα.** Aor act ptc masc acc sg καλέω (attributive; see above). A participle of this verb appears again adjectivally in 5:10 (and substantivally in 2:9).

**ὑμᾶς.** Accusative direct object of καλέσαντα.

**καὶ αὐτοὶ.** Fronted as a topical frame.

**καὶ.** Adverbial additive use of καί: “also.” Runge (2010, §16) describes this use of καί as “thematic addition,” functioning to alert the audience to look for another thematically related element. Here καί functions to help the recipients to make the connection between the holiness of God and the holiness that the recipients themselves should pursue.

**αὐτοὶ.** Intensive pronoun modifying the implied subject of γενήθητε. See 2:5.

**ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ.** Levinsohn (38) notes that in copular clauses, focal complements usually precede the copula as here; he further argues that even though this is the default order, the complement in these cases is still more prominent than if it followed the copula. On the meaning of “focal,” see the Introduction.

**ἅγιοι.** Predicate adjective of γενήθητε.

**ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ.** Reference.

**γενήθητε.** Aor mid impv 2nd pl γίνομαι. Though traditionally taken as a passive deponent (this is an example of a θη- verb form that is better read as a middle (see the Series Introduction on “Deponency”). Conrad (18–21) discusses all forty-five occurrences of the aorist “passive” forms of γίνομαι in the NT and classifies this form in verse 15 as ambiguous with regard to whether it is middle (“you are to become holy”) or passive (“you are to be made holy”). Given the context’s emphasis upon the recipients’ ethical responsibility, however, it seems that the middle voice is most likely (see

this middle use of γίνομαι also in 2:7; 3:6). The middle voice corresponds to Miller’s semantic class of “state” (429).

**1:16 διότι γέγραπται [ὅτι] ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιός [εἰμι].**

**διότι.** Providing a scriptural basis for the preceding exhortation, this conjunction is a “marker used to indicate why something just stated can reasonably be considered valid” (BDAG, 251.3). All three occurrences of διότι in 1 Peter introduce OT citations (see also 1:24; 2:6).

**γέγραπται.** Prf pass ind 3rd sg γράφω. This form appears frequently in the NT as an introductory formula for OT citations (e.g., Matt 21:13; Mark 1:2; Rom 9:13).

**[ὅτι].** Introduces direct discourse. Elliott (2000, 363) attributes the omission of ὅτι as well as other variations in this verse to a scribal discomfort with the frequency of ὅτι (used twice) and the similar διότι. One’s decision here does not affect the meaning. On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίν].

**ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιός [εἰμι].** Most commentators understand this citation to derive from Lev 19:2, the Greek of which (ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν; MT: אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל) most closely aligns with this citation, although very similar language also appears in Lev 11:44-45; 20:7, 26.

**ἅγιοι.** Predicate adjective. On the fronting of this constituent, see 1:15 on ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ.

**ἔσεσθε.** Fut mid ind 2nd pl εἰμί. The future indicative is used imperatively. This often occurs in OT citations in Greek, as here, due to the similar use of the Hebrew imperfect, which often is used as a future indicative but can also be used imperatively (see Wallace, 569–70). For this imperatival future, some manuscripts substitute a bona fide imperative form of γίνομαι (ἄ), under the influence of the use of this verb in the preceding verse. With respect to the voice of ἔσεσθε, all future forms of εἰμί in the NT appear in the middle voice (for an explanation of this phenomenon, see Conrad, 8) and would correspond to Miller’s semantic class of “state” (429).

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause, providing the motivational

grounds for the preceding clause, emphasizing God's holiness as a basis for the exhortation that the Israelites (and recipients of 1 Peter) be holy.

**ἐγώ.** Used as a topical frame, shifting the topic from the subject of ἔσεσθε to God.

**ἅγιος.** Predicate adjective. On the fronting of this constituent, see 1:15 on ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ.

**[εἰμι].** Pres act ind 1st sg εἰμί. Michaels (52) slightly favors the omission of this verb, believing that it arises from an attempt to parallel ἔσεσθε in the previous clause, although he acknowledges that an original εἰμί could have been omitted to bring it into line with the verbless clause in Lev 19:2b. One's decision here does not affect the meaning. On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἔστιν].

**1:17 καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε,**

**καὶ.** The conjunction marks what follows as closely related to what precedes. Here, as in verses 14-16, verse 17 issues a further imperative related to Christian conduct that is based upon God's identity and the recipients' status as God's children. On the function of this conjunction, Levinsohn (124) argues that καὶ (as opposed to δέ) "constrains the material it introduces to be processed as being added to and associated with previous material. . . . In contrast with δέ, the material it introduces does not represent a new development with respect to the context."

**εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε . . . ἔργον.** Fronted as a conditional frame.

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition, assumed to be true for the sake of argument. On the use of a condition when its reality is assumed, see 1:6 on εἰ.

**πατέρα.** Accusative complement in an object-complement double accusative construction. Fronted for emphasis within the conditional clause/frame.

**ἐπικαλεῖσθε.** Pres mid ind 2nd pl ἐπικαλέω. Although this verb can refer to calling someone by a certain name in both the active

(Matt 10:25) and passive voices (Acts 1:23; 11:13), in the middle voice it often refers to calling upon or invoking a deity in prayer (Acts 7:59; 1 Cor 1:2). Thus, those versions that translate “address as Father” (NASB, NJB, NET) have treated the verb as though it were active (as in  $\text{P}^{72}$ : καλεῖτε) rather than middle. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “indirect (or self-benefactive) middle” (17, 78–81, 268) since the verb anticipates that God will somehow respond to the prayer. For this verb with a similar object-complement double accusative construction, see 2 Cor 1:23.

**τὸν . . . κρίνοντα.** Pres act ptc masc acc sg κρίνω (substantival). Accusative direct object of ἐπικαλεῖσθε (contra Bigg, 116–17, who takes the participle as the complement rather than the object). The criteria for distinguishing objects from complements in double accusative constructions is the same as distinguishing subjects from predicate nominatives. Subjects “win” over predicate nominatives (and direct objects over complements) according to the “pecking order” of (1) pronoun, (2) arthrous noun or proper name, (3) anarthrous noun (so Wallace, 42–46, 184). Here the arthrous participle (functioning as a noun) ranks higher than the anarthrous πατέρα, and thus the participle is the direct object (note that πατέρα is not a proper name by Wallace’s criteria since he does not regard nouns that may be pluralized as proper names; see 46, n. 30). The participle’s present tense is likely futuristic, i.e., “the one who will judge,” and refers to the final judgment (see 4:5; contra Grudem, 81, who understands this participle to refer to God’s discipline in the present life).

**ἀπροσωπολήπτως.** Adverb of manner.

**κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον.** Standard.

**ἐκάστου.** Subjective genitive.

**ἔργον.** Collective singular noun referring to all of one’s thoughts and actions (BDAG, 391.1.c.β).

**ἐν φόβῳ.** Manner. Fronted for emphasis (so LDGNT; Elliott 2000, 365).

**τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον.** On the fronting of this constituent, Levinsohn (41–42) notes that when a clause or sentence begins with a frame (or “point of departure”) and is followed by an

emphatic (or “focal”) constituent, a third non-verbal constituent (which is neither a frame nor emphatic) can also appear in a pre-verbal position as long as it is “given information and is of a supportive nature.” Following the conditional frame and the emphatic ἐν φόβῳ, this phrase is an example of such a third constituent.

**τὸν . . . χρόνον.** Accusative indicating extent of time.

**τῆς παροικίας.** Genitive of time.

**ὑμῶν.** Subjective genitive.

**ἀναστράφητε.** Aor mid impv 2nd pl ἀναστρέφω. This verb form, though traditionally taken as passive deponent, is better read as a middle (“conduct yourselves”); on this matter, see the Series Introduction on “Deponency.” The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “direct reflexive” (42–52, 268).

**1:18 εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρμοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαράδοτου**

**εἰδότες.** Prf act ptc masc nom pl οἶδα (causal). This participle introduces a motivational ground for the preceding imperative. The same use of εἰδότες to support an imperative occurs in 5:9.

**ὅτι.** Introduces the clausal complement of εἰδότες, which constitutes the remainder of this sentence and runs all the way through verse 21.

**οὐ . . . ἀλλὰ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μὴ . . . δὲ) in which the negated clause, οὐ φθαρμοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαράδοτου, serves to emphasize the positive clause introduced by ἀλλὰ in verse 19: τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ (ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαράδοτου).

**οὐ φθαρμοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ.** Fronted for emphasis. On temporary focus and the use of the negative, see 1:12 on ἐαυτοῖς. The real focus follows in the noun phrase headed by αἵματι in verse 19.

**φθαρμοῖς.** Dative of means. Substantivized adjective. One manuscript (8\*), substitutes a genitive of price (BDF §179.1), which would suggest a background in the manumission of slaves or the ransom of prisoners of war, but this variant is secondary.

For debate on the relevant background, see further Achtemeier (1996, 127).

**ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ.** Compound dative phrase in apposition to φθαρτοῖς. These nouns are also examples of hyponyms, which refer to something that is a subset of a broader category. As “fork” is a hyponym of “silverware,” so silver and gold are hyponyms of “perishable things.”

**ἐλυτρώθητε.** Aor pass ind 2nd pl λυτρόω.

**ἐκ τῆς ματαίας . . . ἀναστροφῆς.** Separation (so BDAG, 296.1.c).

**ὑμῶν.** Subjective genitive.

**πατροπαραδότου.** Attributive adjective. Although this may appear to be a predicate adjective, it is not. When an arthrous noun has two or more adjectival modifiers, the intermediate position between the article and noun may become too crowded, forcing at least one of the attributive modifiers to be placed *anarthrously* after the noun (see BDF §269; Winer, 166; Hort, 76; Culy and Parsons, 261; for other examples, see 3:19-20; 4:12; Eph 2:11; Acts 13:32; 4 Macc 16:20).

**1:19 ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ,**

**τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ.** The verb ἐλυτρώθητε from the negative clause in the preceding verse is implied here (as well as the prepositional phrase ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου).

**τιμίῳ αἵματι.** Dative of means.

**ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου.** Comparative phrase, alliteratively modifying αἵματι. This phrase implies a recurrence of the modified αἵματι as the head noun of ἀμνοῦ, i.e., “precious blood like the blood of an unblemished and spotless lamb.”

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative phrase.

**ἀμνοῦ.** Possessive genitive modifying the implicit αἵματι within the comparative phrase.

**ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου.** This doublet (see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον), “unblemished and spotless,” emphasizes

the lamb's perfection and could be collapsed in translation to "completely unblemished."

**Χριστοῦ.** Possessive genitive modifying the explicit occurrence of αἵματι, with the comparative phrase nested in between. Χριστοῦ, being held in abeyance until after the comparative phrase, is thus emphasized (so also Michaels, 66). This positioning also serves to clarify Χριστοῦ as the referent of the participles in the next verse (Achtmeier 1996, 129).

**1:20 προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἑσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς**

**προεγνωσμένου.** Prf pass ptc masc gen sg προγιγνώσκω (attributive). While a literal rendering might identify Christ as "fore-known" (NASB, NET, ESV), other translations speak of Christ as "chosen" (NIV, TEV) or "destined" (RSV). These latter renderings are more appropriate since for 1 Peter, as Kelly (76) rightly remarks, "God's foreknowledge includes His creative will and determination" (so BDAG, 866.2).

**μὲν . . . δέ.** On the postpositive positioning of these conjunctions, see 2:4 on μὲν . . . δέ. The conjunction μὲν is "prospective," alerting readers from the outset that the clause introduced by μὲν is only part of the story; the rest of the story (indeed, the most important part) will follow in the clause introduced by δέ. Thus, Levinsohn (170) argues that μὲν is used to background information, i.e., μὲν marks the information in its clause as secondary in importance in comparison to the information in the δέ clause (see also Runge 2010, §4.1; BDF §447.5). Here God's action in eternity past of choosing Christ (the μὲν clause) is paired with and anticipates the δέ clause, which speaks of God's revealing Christ at the end of time in the incarnation—it is this latter δέ clause that 1 Peter emphasizes, since the context focuses upon the eschatological privileges that the recipients share. This same backgrounding of the μὲν clause and corresponding prominence of the δέ clause is true of the other three appearances of this correlative construction in 1 Peter (2:4; 3:18; 4:6). On δέ as a development marker in μὲν-δέ constructions, see 1:7 on δέ.

**πρὸ καταβολῆς.** Temporal.

**κόσμου.** Objective genitive.

**φανερωθέντος.** Aor pass ptc masc gen sg φανερῶ (attributive). This form could be taken as middle (“who appeared”), but the parallel with the passive προεγνωσμένου favors a passive reading. God is the implicit agent.

**ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων.** Some variant readings, misreading ἐσχάτου as attributive rather than substantival, use the plural ἐσχάτων (Ⲫ<sup>72</sup> P Ⲙ) or the singular τῶν χρόνου (Ⲭ\* Ψ) in order to achieve noun-adjective agreement (Michaels, 52).

**ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου.** Temporal. The preposition ἐπί followed by the genitive describes “time within which an event or condition takes place” (BDAG, 367.18.a).

**τῶν χρόνων.** Partitive genitive.

**δι’ ὑμᾶς.** Advantage (see LN 90.38).

**1:21 τοὺς δι’ αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἶναι εἰς θεόν.**

**τοὺς . . . πιστοὺς.** The following preposition (εἰς) suggests that πιστοὺς has an active meaning (“believing”) rather than a passive one (“trustworthy”); so rightly Michaels (68) and BDAG (821.2). To find εἰς in conjunction with the adjective πιστός is uncommon, although εἰς often appears with the cognate verb πιστεύω (see Matt 18:6; John 1:12), thus explaining the origin of variants that here substitute various (participial) forms of πιστεύω. It would be unusual for an adjective to modify a pronoun, and thus it is best to take this adjective as substantival (“believers”), standing in apposition to ὑμᾶς at the end of verse 20 (so Schreiner, 88–89).

**δι’ αὐτοῦ.** Means, indicating Christ’s mediatorial role in the recipients’ trust in God (see Acts 3:16).

**εἰς θεόν.** The noun θεόν is the conceptual object of the verbal idea implicit in πιστοὺς.

**τὸν.** This definite article does double duty, modifying both ἐγείραντα and δόντα.

**ἐγείραντα.** Aor act ptc masc acc sg ἐγείρω (attributive).

**αὐτόν.** Accusative direct object of ἐγείραντα.

**ἐκ νεκρῶν.** See 1:3.

**δόξαν.** Accusative direct object of δόντα. Fronted for emphasis.

**αὐτῷ.** Dative indirect object of δόντα. Pronouns often move with constituents that are fronted for emphasis (such as δόξαν here) to a preverbal position (see Levinsohn, 39–40).

**δόντα.** Aor act ptc masc acc sg δίδωμι (attributive).

**τὴν πίστιν . . . καὶ ἐλπίδα.** Accusative subject of εἶναι. Fronted as a topical frame (so LDGNT). The joining of the two substantives under the same article indicates a close relationship between the two, probably since both look forward to what God will provide in the future (especially following the mention of Christ’s resurrection and glorification, realities in which the recipients also expect to share). Dalton (1974, 273–74) takes ἐλπίδα as a predicate nominative (“so that your faith may also be your hope in God”); on the statistical unlikelihood of this syntactical construction, see Grudem (86).

**ὑμῶν.** Subjective genitive, modifying both πίστιν and ἐλπίδα.

**εἶναι.** Pres act inf εἶμι. Used with ὥστε to indicate the result of the preceding compound participial phrase (BDAG, 1107.2.a.β; TEV, NRSV, NIV). Although some read the infinitive clause as indicating purpose (KJV, ASV; Elliott 2000, 379), ὥστε only rarely is used in this way (see Wallace, 591, n. 5); the emphasis here seems to be more on the recipients’ faith and hope as the effect of Christ’s resurrection and glorification rather than as its intention.

**εἰς θεόν.** The noun θεόν is the conceptual object of the verbal ideas implicit in πίστιν and ἐλπίδα.

### 1 Peter 1:22–2:10

<sup>22</sup>Since you have purified yourselves by obeying the truth in order that you might show sincere brotherly love, love one another ongoingly from a pure heart <sup>23</sup>because you have been born again not by a perishable seed, but by an imperishable one, namely, through the perpetually enduring word of God. <sup>24</sup>For “all flesh is like grass, and all its glory is like the flower of the grass; the grass withers and the flower falls off, but the word of the Lord endures forever.” Now this is the word that was preached to you.

<sup>2:1</sup>Therefore, get rid of all ill will and all deceit and acts of hypocrisy and envy and all disparaging speech <sup>2</sup>and, like newborn infants, yearn for the pure milk that has to do with the word in order that by it you might grow toward salvation, <sup>3</sup>if you have tasted that the Lord is good.

<sup>4</sup>By coming to him, a living stone, which was rejected by humans but which is a valuable chosen stone in God's sight, <sup>5</sup>you yourselves, as living stones, are also being built into a spiritual house for a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices that are acceptable to God through Jesus the Christ. <sup>6</sup>For it stands written in Scripture: "Behold, I am placing in Zion a stone, a cornerstone, a valuable chosen stone, and the one who trusts in it will definitely not experience shame."<sup>7</sup>Therefore, as for you who believe, there is honor, but as for those who do not believe, the following scriptures apply: "Regarding the stone that the builders rejected, this stone has become the head of the corner" <sup>8</sup>and "a stone that produces stumbling and a rock that causes offense." They stumble because they disobey the word, to which they also were destined.

<sup>9</sup>You, however, are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession, so that you might proclaim the praiseworthy deeds of the one who called you out of darkness into his wonderful light. <sup>10</sup>Formerly, you were not a people, but now you are God's people; you were ones who had not been shown mercy, but now you are ones who have been shown mercy.

**1:22** Τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον, ἐκ [καθαράς] καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς

**Τὰς ψυχὰς.** Accusative direct object of ἡγνικότες. In view here is a new direction in the purity of the whole person (so Achtemeier 1996, 136) and not just an inward and spiritual cleansing of the "soul" (contra Grudem, 88; see also 1:9 on ψυχῶν). Fronted as a topical frame along with ὑμῶν (contra LDGNT).

**ὑμῶν.** Epexegetical genitive.

**ἡγνικότες.** Prf act ptc masc nom pl ἀγνίζω (causal). This participial phrase provides a motivational ground for the following imperative ἀγαπήσατε. Achtemeier (1996, 136), however, takes it

as temporal (“now that you have sanctified your lives”), arguing that the ground is instead provided by the participle ἀναγεγεννημένοι in verse 23. Instead, I would argue that both participles provide grounds, with the second participial phrase in verse 23 offering a parallel to this one. It is likely that the initial act of conversion is in view here, not some later stage in the ongoing process of sanctification (contra Grudem, 87–88; see the critique by Schreiner, 92–93).

**ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ.** Means (not sphere, contra Selwyn, 149).

**τῆς ἀληθείας.** Objective genitive. Some manuscripts (K L P ℔ *pm*) add the theologically motivated διὰ πνεύματος after ἀληθείας.

**εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον.** Purpose (so NET; not result, which does not suit the following imperative very well, contra Grudem, 89). Christian conversion involved aiming toward a realization of the ultimate Christian value, i.e., love. Because this was their commitment at conversion, the following imperative exhorts the recipients to now live up to it.

**ἐκ [καθαρᾶς] καρδίας.** Source. Fronted for emphasis (so LDGNT). The adjective καθαρᾶς may be an expansion that conforms to the use of ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας elsewhere (1 Tim 1:5; 2 Tim 2:22; so Michaels, 72). Nevertheless, given the weight of the external evidence, it is more likely that καθαρᾶς is original and was later omitted due to homoioarcton (i.e., due to the similar beginning of καθαρᾶς and καρδίας, a scribe’s eye accidentally skipped over καθαρᾶς). On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίν].

**ἀλλήλους.** Accusative direct object of ἀγαπήσατε. Given the use of φιλαδελφία earlier, this term in context refers particularly to other Christians, not human beings in general (Achtmeier 1996, 137). On the fronting of this pronoun, see 1:21 on αὐτῶ.

**ἀγαπήσατε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl ἀγαπάω.

**ἐκτενῶς.** Adverb of manner. This term may mean “fervently” or “constantly, ongoingly.” The majority of translations find the former meaning here (as well as in 4:8), a meaning that ἐκτενῶς and its cognates regularly bear in the NT (so Spicq, 1:460–61). Nevertheless, most recent commentators (e.g., Michaels, 75–76) rightly opt for the latter meaning, which suits the context’s emphasis on permanence in verses 23–25.

**1:23 ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου διὰ λόγου ζώντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος.**

**ἀναγεγεννημένοι.** Prf pass ptc masc nom pl ἀναγεννάω (causal). On the meaning, see 1:3 on ἀναγεννήσας. While ἡγνικότες in verse 22 describes conversion from the perspective of human activity, ἀναγεγεννημένοι describes it from the perspective of divine activity (so also Schreiner, 94), with the perfect tense of both participles highlighting the parallel between them. Ἀναγεγεννημένοι thus serves to strengthen and expand the motivational ground provided by the participial phrase headed by ἡγνικότες.

**οὐκ . . . ἀλλὰ.** This correlative construction uses ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς as a foil to place emphasis on the constituent introduced by ἀλλὰ, namely, ἀφθάρτου (σπορᾶς).

**ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς.** Means.

**σπορᾶς.** Only here in the NT. Although Selwyn (150) suggests the meaning “sowing” or “origin,” σπορά here has the same meaning as the more common σπέρμα, especially following ἀναγεγεννημένοι (see *T. Reu.* 2:8 for the association of σπορά with reproductive activity). Here the metaphor of God’s reproductive “seed” is applied to God’s word, whether the gospel message or the word announced through OT prophets, mentioned in the next verse.

**ἀφθάρτου.** Means. The prior ἐκ σπορᾶς implicitly stands at the opening of this phrase.

**διὰ λόγου ζώντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος.** Means. This phrase is appositional to (ἐκ σπορᾶς) ἀφθάρτου (with the shift from ἐκ to διὰ likely being an example of stylistic variation and thus without exegetical significance; contra LaVerdiere, 91–92). A number of textual variants have arisen here, seeking to clarify whether the participles modify λόγου or θεοῦ. Seeking to more clearly relate the participles to θεοῦ, Ψ reverses the order of ζώντος θεοῦ. Seeking to more clearly relate the participles to λόγου, a few manuscripts add the definite article τοῦ before θεοῦ, and one minuscule omits θεοῦ altogether. The Vulgate clearly applies the participles to God (*per verbum Dei vivi et permanentis*) and a few commentators adopt this view (so Hort, 92; Michaels, 76–77; see LXX Dan 6:27), but most modern English translations understand the participles to modify λόγου. This latter understanding best suits the context in light of

both the parallel with (ἐκ σποράς) ἀφθάρτου and the following scriptural citation in 1:24-25 that (again using μένω) emphasizes the enduring character of God's word, not of God himself.

**ζώντος . . . καὶ μένοντος.** These participles constitute a doublet (see 1:4 on ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον), which is rendered as “perpetually enduring” in the translation. For more on the meaning of ζώντος, see 1:3 on ζώσαν.

**ζώντος.** Pres act ptc masc gen sg ζάω (attributive).

**θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**μένοντος.** Pres act ptc masc gen sg μένω (attributive). Some manuscripts add εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα following μένοντος (K L P ℞), but this is most likely a scribal harmonization of this verse with verse 25.

**1:24 διότι πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου· ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν·**

**διότι.** On the function of this conjunction in 1 Peter, see 1:16. The conjunction introduces a citation of Isa 40:6-8, which continues through the first part of the next verse. For a detailed analysis of 1 Peter's use of Isa 40:6-8, and comparisons with the LXX and Hebrew, see Schutter (124–26). First Peter follows the LXX, most notably in the omission of the Hebrew MT Isa 40:7; the other variations are relatively minor.

**πᾶσα σὰρξ.** Nominative subject of an implied ἐστίν. The term σὰρξ refers to human beings by way of synecdoche (a figure of speech where a part refers to the whole, or vice versa) with clear reference to the weakness and frailty of present human existence. This reference to the feebleness of the human condition apart from God is programmatic for the later appearances of σὰρξ (with the possible exception of 3:21) and contributes to the letter's broader contrast between that which is perishable and that which is imperishable. Even though it appears in a verbless clause, we are probably meant to read πᾶσα σὰρξ as a topical frame (so also LDGNT).

**ὡς χόρτος.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative phrase, which here functions adjectivally (“grass-like”). See BDAG (1104.2.c.β) on the combination of ὡς with a substantive to create a phrase that functions as a predicate adjective.

**χόρτος.** This nominative noun is the second component of a *ὡς* construction involving the nominative *σάρξ*.

**πάσα δόξα αὐτῆς.** Even though it appears in a verbless clause, we are probably meant to read this phrase as a topical frame.

**πάσα δόξα.** Nominative subject of an implied *ἔστιν*.

**αὐτῆς.** Possessive genitive. The antecedent is *σάρξ*. This pronoun follows the MT (note the pronominal suffix on *יְהוָה*) against the leading manuscripts of the LXX, which read *ἀνθρώπου*, apparently clarifying the synecdoche present in *σάρξ*.

**ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου.** See *ὡς χόρτος* above.

**ἄνθος.** This nominative noun is the second component of a *ὡς* construction involving the nominative *δόξα*.

**χόρτου.** Partitive genitive, or perhaps genitive of place (for the latter, see Michaels, 78: “flowers . . . in the grassy fields”).

**ἐξηράνθη.** Aor mid ind 3rd sg *ξηραίνω*. This is an example of a *θη-* verb form that, though traditionally taken as passive or passive deponent, is better read as middle (see the Series Introduction on “Deponency”), corresponding to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “spontaneous events associated with inanimate beings” (142–47, 269). Porter (1999, 38–39), among many other grammarians, describes this as a gnomic (or “omnitemporal”) aorist, noting further that in the NT most examples of gnomic aorists relate to natural processes (see also *ἐξέπεσεν* below).

**ὁ χόρτος.** Nominative subject of *ἐξηράνθη*.

**τὸ ἄνθος.** Nominative subject of *ἐξέπεσεν*. Fronted as a topical frame.

**ἐξέπεσεν.** Aor act ind 3rd sg *ἐκπίπτω*.

**1:25 τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. τοῦτο δὲ ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.**

**τὸ . . . ῥῆμα.** Nominative subject of *μένει*. Fronted as a topical frame.

**δὲ.** Introduces the next step in the argument (the permanency of God’s word). On the use of *δέ* as a marker of development, see 1:7 on *δέ*.

**κυρίου.** Subjective genitive. The leading manuscripts of the LXX read *τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν* (corresponding to the MT *יְהוָה לָנוּ*). First

Peter's use of κυρίου here is understood by Elliott (2000, 391) to be a Christianizing of the OT citation since κύριος routinely refers to Jesus in 1 Peter (so Schutter, 125–28). This understanding is likely, especially in light of the word play in 2:3. I do not agree with Elliott, however, that κυρίου should thus be taken as an objective genitive (“the word about the Lord”). The phrase τὸ . . . ῥῆμα κυρίου in verse 25a is still part of the citation from Isaiah and refers to Yahweh's word to ancient Israel, namely, the promise of restoration from exile. Only in verse 25b does the gospel message enter the picture, now being equated with Isaiah's promised end of exile (see Dubis 2002, 52–53).

**μένει.** Pres act ind 3rd sg μένω.

**εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.** Temporal. This idiom (“until the age”) means “forever.” See the similar idioms in 4:11 and 5:11.

**τοῦτο.** Nominative subject of ἐστίν. In the identification of the subject, this pronoun ranks over the arthrous noun τὸ ῥῆμα (see 1:17 on τὸν . . . κρινοντα). This word begins Peter's interpretation of Isa 40. The antecedent is the Isaianic τὸ ῥῆμα at the opening of this verse. Fronted as a topical frame (contra LDGNT).

**δέ.** Introduces the next step in the argument, namely, an interpretation of the preceding OT citation. On the use of δέ as a marker of development, see 1:7 on δέ.

**ἐστίν.** Pres act ind 3rd sg εἰμί.

**τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.** Focal complements appear after the copula (instead of their usual fronted position; see 1:15 on ἄγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ) when a deictic element, such as the demonstrative pronoun τοῦτο, begins the sentence (see Levinsohn, 39).

**τὸ ῥῆμα.** Predicate nominative. The choice of ῥῆμα here instead of λόγος is dictated by the use of ῥῆμα in the preceding citation.

**εὐαγγελισθὲν.** Aor pass ptc neut nom sg εὐαγγελίζω (attributive). The choice of words is influenced by the two uses of the participle εὐαγγελιζόμενος in Isa 40:9.

**εἰς ὑμᾶς.** Although Achtemeier (1996, 142) takes this phrase as expressing advantage (“for your benefit”), it is best to take it simply as the use of εἰς following a verb of speaking to introduce the addressee (BDAG 289.1.b.β).

**2:1 Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑποκρίσεις καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλιάς,**

**Ἀποθέμενοι.** Aor mid ptc masc nom pl ἀποτίθημι (attendant circumstance, functioning imperatively; on this function, see Wallace, 640–45). Here the participle takes on the imperatival force of the main verb (ἐπιποθήσατε in v. 2); it is not an independent imperatival participle (so also Michaels, 84). On independent imperatival participles in 1 Peter, see 1:14 on συσχηματιζόμενοι. The middle voice likely corresponds to a semantic class of “self-control” (see Kemmer, 270) rather than “grooming” (Kemmer, 54–55) unless the clothing metaphor is continued from 1:13, as Michaels (83) suggests. Although ἀποτίθημι can refer to disrobing, it does not in most NT contexts. This imperatival participle heads a phrase that, with its various vices, serves as a counterpoint to the positive imperatival clause in the next verse.

**οὖν.** Levinsohn (126–29) observes that οὖν can be used three ways: inferential, resumptive, or a combination of both inferential and resumptive functions. When used resumptively, οὖν usually follows a digression that is used to support or strengthen what precedes it. The οὖν then introduces further material that goes on to resume and advance the argument prior to the digression. When οὖν combines both an inferential and resumptive function the resumptive features are all present, but the material that οὖν introduces resumptively also relates inferentially to the digression (i.e., the digression supports both what precedes and follows). It is this latter use that we find here. After beginning to exhort the recipients in 1:22 about their relationships with one another, Peter grounds this exhortation with 1:23–25, including the citation of Isa 40:6–8. That digression complete, the οὖν in 2:1 signals the resumption of Peter’s exhortation in 1:22 about relationships with fellow Christians (note, e.g., the cognate linkage between ἀνυπόκριτον in 1:22 and ὑποκρίσεις in 2:1). Additionally, the material in 2:1–3 is grounded inferentially by the digression of 1:23–25 (especially through the linkage between λογικὸν in 2:2 and 1:23–25’s theology of the word).

**πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑποκρίσεις καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλιάς.** Accusative direct object of Ἀποθέμενοι.

One or more of the list's three plural forms take a singular form in some manuscripts, but these variants are most likely a secondary attempt to conform to the opening singular forms and, in the case of ὑπόκρισις and φθόνος, to typical NT usage. The plural forms suggest various manifestations of these sins (Robertson, 408).

**πάσαν . . . πάντα . . . πάσας.** These uses of πᾶς refer to “everything belonging, in kind, to the class designated by the noun,” that is, “every kind of, all sorts of” (BDAG, 784.5).

**κακίαν.** Some commentators (and translations) treat this as a generic term, which is then fleshed out by the specificity of the following vices in the list (e.g., Bigg, 125; NLT<sup>2</sup>: “all evil behavior”). Alternatively, κακίαν could itself bear a more specific meaning (RSV, “malice”; NJB, “spite”). The latter option is supported by the chiasmic structure of the list, which suggests that κακίαν has specificity on a par with the other terms modified by πᾶς (i.e., δόλον and καταλαλιάς).

**καταλαλιάς.** Although frequently translated as “slander” (e.g., RSV, NIV), this term may bear a less formal meaning (NJB, “carping criticism”; TEV, “insulting language”).

**2:2 ὡς ἄρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ ἀξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν,**

**ὡς ἄρτιγέννητα βρέφη.** Fronted as a comparative frame.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative clause involving ellipsis.

**ἄρτιγέννητα βρέφη.** Nominative subject of ἐπιποθοῦσιν in the ellipsis ἐπιποθοῦσιν γάλα.

**ἄρτιγέννητα.** See 1:3 and 1:23 for a similar metaphorical use of the related verb ἀναγεννάω.

**τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα.** Accusative direct object of ἐπιποθήσατε. Fronted for emphasis. The only other NT instance of two non-conjoined regular adjectives in the first attributive position is τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν in John 17:3. Some manuscripts insert a καί after λογικὸν, according to the more usual pattern (e.g., 3:4). BDF (§269) says that the present use results from ἄδολον γάλα being a common expression.

**λογικόν.** This adjective is usually taken as either indicating the metaphorical nature of the “milk” here (with many translations rendering λογικόν as “spiritual”) or as continuing the word theology in 1:23–25, meaning “having to do with the word” (KJV, “milk of the word”). For an argument for the latter view, see McCartney, who highlights parallels between 2:1–2 and 1:22–23 (Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν paired with τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες, ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη with ἀναγεγεννημένοι, and most importantly λογικόν with διὰ λόγου). See also Kittel, who notes that this adjective can bear the meaning “belonging to speech” (though he does not find it in the NT), and LSJ’s similar definition “of or for speaking or speech.” Also see Moulton (2:377–79), who says that the suffix –ικός bears the meaning “belonging to,” “pertaining to,” or “with the characteristics of,” which applied here would mean “pertaining to λόγος,” with λόγος referring contextually to the word of God.

**ἄδολον.** “Unadulterated, pure” (LN 79.98). This term is part of the milk metaphor and does not here mean “without guile” (contra ASV), although there is nevertheless a play on words with δόλος in verse 1, contrasting the recipients’ old and new ways of life.

**ἐπιποθήσατε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl ἐπιποθέω.

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause.

**ἐν αὐτῷ.** Means. The antecedent of αὐτῷ is γάλα. Fronted as an adverbial frame.

**αὐξηθήτε.** Aor mid subj 2nd pl αὐξάνω. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “spontaneous events associated with animate beings” (142–47, 269), metaphorically applied (see also the Series Introduction on “Deponency”).

**εἰς σωτηρίαν.** Goal: “so as to receive salvation” (BDAG, 290.4.e). This prepositional phrase is omitted by the majority text, perhaps for theological reasons or perhaps through homoioarcton with the εἰ that begins verse 3.

**2:3 εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστός ὁ κύριος.**

**εἰ ἐγεύσασθε.** Drawn from LXX Ps 33:9 (ET 34:8; MT 34:9), the twofold imperative γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε that is found in the leading manuscripts of the LXX (similarly the MT: יִשְׁעֶיךָ יְהוָה) is altered

here to form a conditional clause. Further, since the preceding metaphor of milk has to do with tasting alone, Peter's citation also omits the LXX's second imperative και ἴδετε ("and see"), though a few manuscripts include it.

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition. On the use of a condition when its reality is assumed, see 1:6 on εἰ. Numerous manuscripts substitute the strengthened form εἴπερ.

**ἐγεύσασθε.** Aor mid ind 2nd pl γεύομαι. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer's semantic subclass of "perception middle" (136–37, 269). This metaphorical application of γεύομαι refers to the recipient's cognitive or emotional experience of Christ (BDAG, 195.2).

**ὅτι χρηστός ὁ κύριος.** These words are identical to those of the LXX (MT: יהוה ייִשׁוּעַ כְּרִיסְטוֹס).

**ὅτι.** Introduces the clausal complement of ἐγεύσασθε.

**χρηστός.** Predicate nominative. The adjective means, "kind, loving, benevolent" (BDAG, 1090.3.b.β). The referent of the play on words is brought out by those numerous manuscripts that substitute Χριστός here (ℱ<sup>72</sup> K L *al*). The adjective χρηστός and Χριστός would have been pronounced identically when 1 Peter was originally read (Achtmeier 1996, 148), thus facilitating this textual variant.

**ὁ κύριος.** Nominative subject of an implied ἐστίν. For the pecking order of subjects versus predicate nominatives, see 1:17 on τὸν . . . κρίνοντα. Given the play on χρηστός and Χριστός and the following relative clause, which also serves to identify κύριος here as Christ, it is christologically significant that κύριος translates the tetragrammaton יהוה in the original Hebrew of the OT citation.

**2:4 πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι λίθον ζῶντα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδοκιμασμένον παρὰ δὲ θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον,**

**πρὸς ὃν.** Spatial. Such prepositional redundancy is routine with compound verbs.

**προσερχόμενοι.** Pres mid ptc masc nom pl προσέρχομαι (means). The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer's semantic class of "translational motion" (69–70, 269). Numerous

translations take this participle imperatively, “come to him” (so, e.g., RSV, JB, NEB), but this hinges on an imperatival reading of the main verb *οικοδομείσθε* in verse 5, which is unlikely.

**λίθον ζώντα.** Accusative in apposition to *ὄν*. This phrase anticipates the OT citations in verses 6–8 that are held together by the catchword “stone.”

**ζώντα.** Pres act ptc masc acc sg *ζάω* (attributive).

**μὲν . . . δέ.** The *μὲν* indicates that the rejection of Christ by humans is secondary to God’s own view of Christ. For further discussion of the function of this correlative construction, see 1:20. Both *μὲν* and *δέ* are always postpositive in the NT, both normally appearing in the second position within the clause. Here *δέ* appears in the usual second position, even though it splits the prepositional phrase, while *μὲν* appears in the less common third position (see Robertson, 424). The fronting of *ἀνθρώπων* prior to *μὲν* serves to set up the contrast with *παρὰ . . . θεῷ* more forcefully (for examples of this force in instances where *μὲν* appears in other positions than the second, see the heightened contrast between the fronted *κατὰ πρόσωπον* and *ἀπὸν* in 2 Cor 10:1 and between the fronted *νῦν* and *πάλιν* in John 16:22).

**ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων.** Agency. Fronted for emphasis (so LDGNT).

**ἀποδοκιμασμένον.** Prf pass ptc masc acc sg *ἀποδοκιμάζω* (attributive).

**παρὰ . . . θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον.** Parallel to the preceding participle *ἀποδοκιμασμένον*, we should understand an implicit participle *ὄντα* to be present in this clause.

**παρὰ . . . θεῷ.** Here, the preposition marks “a participant whose viewpoint is relevant to an event,” i.e., “in the sight of God” (see LN 90.20). Even though this phrase appears in a verbless clause, parallel to *ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων*, we should similarly understand it to be fronted for emphasis.

**ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον.** Predicate accusative. Although this expression is regularly taken as two parallel adjectives, it is more likely that *ἐκλεκτὸν* is substantival and *ἐντιμον* is adjectival (“valuable chosen [one]”), anticipating the appearance of this same phrase in verse 6 (for further discussion, see 2:6 on *ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον*).

2:5 καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνεγέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους [τῷ] θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**καὶ αὐτοὶ.** Fronted as a topical frame, shifting from the topic of Jesus in verse 4 to the recipients here.

**καί.** Adverbial additive use of καί: “also.” On distinguishing the adverbial use of καί from its conjunctive use, see Titrud (8–9). One can easily identify καί as adverbial if it appears postpositionally since καί is always adverbial in this position. But here the καί is in an initial position and thus another principle must be brought to bear. Applicable to the present context (where καί appears between προσερχόμενοι in v. 4 and οἰκοδομεῖσθε here), Titrud (9) states, “When καί is found between an indicative verb and a participle . . . , the καί is an adverb and not a conjoiner.” This observation is a corollary of the more general principle, also noted by Titrud, that a conjunctive καί joins “grammatical units of equal rank” (see also Levinsohn, 99–102). Here καί functions to help the recipients to make the connection between their identity as λίθοι ζῶντες and Christ’s identity as a λίθον ζῶντα (v. 4).

**αὐτοὶ.** Intensive. Although αὐτός is third person when used as a personal pronoun, αὐτός can be used intensively with all persons (as well as all genders and numbers; see Robertson, 686). Here it modifies the second plural subject of οἰκοδομεῖσθε.

**ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες.** Fronted as an adverbial frame.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce the role that the recipients fill as God is building them into a spiritual temple, namely, the role of “living stones.”

**λίθοι ζῶντες.** This nominative noun phrase is the second component in a ὡς construction involving the second plural subject of οἰκοδομεῖσθε.

**ζῶντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ζάω (attributive).

**οἰκοδομεῖσθε.** Pres pass ind 2nd pl οἰκοδομέω. BDAG (696.2) and others sometimes read this verb as imperative, with the voice being either middle (“build yourselves up”) or permissive passive (“let yourselves be built up”; so also NRSV, TEV, NCV). However, no clear examples of the middle or permissive passive of οἰκοδομέω

appear elsewhere in the NT or LXX. Furthermore, taking this verb as a simple passive indicative (with God as the implied agent) best fits the surrounding context of 2:4–10, which contains no other imperatives and is focused upon the recipients' existing identity, which God has brought about. An indicative translation is adopted by KJV, ESV, NET, NIV, NLT<sup>2</sup>, and NASB. In keeping with the additive force of καὶ above, some manuscripts secondarily substitute the compounded verb ἐποικοδομεῖσθε (⌘ A<sup>c</sup> C *al*) to make clear that Christians are built “on” Christ (who is the “cornerstone”; see v. 6).

**οἶκος πνευματικός.** Complement in a double nominative subject-complement construction. Some understand this nominative as appositional to the ὑμεῖς implied in οἰκοδομεῖσθε (Schreiner, 105), but this leaves the verb awkwardly without a complement. Applying insights from Culy (83–87), this is better read as a double nominative construction that derives from the double accusative object-complement construction “God is building you to be a spiritual house” (taking οἰκοδομέω as a verb of the category “making,” which category frequently takes double accusatives; Wallace, 186). When the accusative construction is passivized, the direct object “you” is “advanced” to become the nominative subject and the complement “spiritual house” is now changed to a nominative to agree with the subject (for a similar argument, see Achtemeier 1996, 155, even though on p. 149 he calls this phrase appositional).

**οἶκος.** The meaning of this term can be architectural (“house”) or communal (“household”). Elliott (2000, 414–18) argues strongly for the latter but, in light of the imagery of “stones” in verses 4–8, the metaphor is architectural here. More specifically, this “house” is a temple, which is supported by (a) the use of οἶκος for the temple in the LXX (e.g., 1 Kgs 9:1; Ezra 1:7), and especially (b) the imagery of priesthood and sacrifices here. On the meaning of οἶκος, see also 4:17 on οἴκου.

**πνευματικός.** The οἶκος here and the θυσίας below are so described because of their association with the Spirit of God.

**εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον.** Purpose (as supported by the three occurrences of εἰς with οἰκοδομεῖσθε in the LXX, all of which are telic; see Achtemeier 1996, 156).

**ιεράτευμα.** Like other collective nouns with the -εσμα suffix, Elliott (2000, 419–20) energetically argues that *ιεράτευμα* is also a collective term, meaning “body of priests,” that refers to the church’s corporate identity rather than to the status of *individual* Christians as priests. As true as this lexical point may be, the priestly status of individual Christians would seem to logically follow from the priestly identity of the church as a whole (so Schreiner, 106–7).

**ἀνενέγκαι.** Aor act inf ἀναφέρω (purpose). This is a cultic technical term for offering sacrifices (BDAG, 75.3).

**πνευματικὰς θυσίας.** Accusative direct object of ἀνενέγκαι.

**εὐπροσδέκτους.** This adjective has a predicate force, “that are acceptable.”

[τῷ] θεῷ. Dative of reference. On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίν].

**διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** The parallel with Heb 13:15 supports taking this phrase as modifying ἀνενέγκαι, but the word order argues for taking this phrase as modifying εὐπροσδέκτους, which yields the better sense. On the meaning of the phrase, see 1:21 on δι’ αὐτοῦ.

**Χριστοῦ.** See 1:1 on Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**2:6 διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ· ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἀκρογωνιαίον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον καὶ ὁ πιστευῶν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κατασυνθῆ.**

**διότι.** On the function of this conjunction in 1 Peter, see 1:16 on διότι.

**περιέχει.** Pres act ind 3rd sg περιέχω. This verb, used impersonally, can be used of a document (here Isaiah) containing something: “it stands or says in the scripture” BDAG (801.3.b). Robertson (392), on the other hand, views the following scriptural citation as the subject of the verb.

**ἐν γραφῇ.** Spatial. Based on the unusual omission of the article before γραφῇ, Selwyn (163) argues that this phrase refers to a documentary source other than Scripture, but he has found few followers, especially when the following words are those of Isa 28:16. The first half of 1 Peter’s citation represents a somewhat different and abbreviated form of Isa 28:16 than the LXX; the second half is

identical to the LXX (or nearly so, depending on one’s resolution of the LXX variants related to ἐπ’ αὐτῷ).

**ἰδοῦ.** BDAG (468.1) observes that this particle is a “prompter of attention,” which focuses attention on what follows.

**τίθημι.** Pres act ind 1st sg τίθημι.

**ἐν Σιών.** Spatial.

**λίθον.** Accusative direct object of τίθημι. If 1 Peter follows the pattern of the LXX and MT, then λίθον stands alone, followed by a series of appositives.

**ἄκρογωνιαίον.** Accusative in apposition to λίθον. The adjective ἀκρογωνιαίον is most likely substantival here, as in both the LXX and MT. This is a Septuagintal *hapax legomenon* and only appears elsewhere in the NT in Eph 2:20. Jeremias (792), citing *T. Sol.* 22.7–23.4, interprets ἀκρογωνιαίον as a “final stone” or topstone in the building, although virtually all translations and most recent commentators understand the term as “cornerstone.” This latter understanding is supported by (a) the stumbling that the stone causes (v. 8), and (b) the LXX’s own repeated reference to τὰ θεμέλια, both of which relate the stone to the lower part of the building. For a further defense of “cornerstone” and a critique of Jeremias’ interpretation, see McKelvey.

**ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον.** Accusative in apposition to ἀκρογωνιαίον. Although these two terms are regularly taken as two adjectives attributively modifying ἀκρογωνιαίον (so RSV, NIV), ἐκλεκτὸν is most likely substantival (see 2:4). This finds support in the similar phrase that appears in LXX Isa 28:16: πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν (“valuable chosen [one]”; MT: יָבֵטֵן יָבֵטֵן, “tested stone”). This solution eliminates the unwieldy appositive ἀκρογωνιαίον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον, a problem that numerous textual variants attempt to address through transposition and omission of words.

**καί.** On the function of καί, see 1:17.

**ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ.** Fronted as a topical frame.

**ὁ πιστεύων.** Pres act ptc masc nom sg πιστεύω (substantival).

**ἐπ’ αὐτῷ.** Most translations translate αὐτῷ as “him,” but my translation above carries the metaphor through to the end of the citation by translating “it.”

**καταισχυνθῆ.** Aor mid subj 3rd sg καταισχύνω. The subjunctive

is used with οὐ μὴ, which expresses emphatic negation. Though traditionally taken as a passive (“be put to shame”) or passive deponent, this is another example of a θη- verb form that is probably better taken as a middle, “experience shame” (see the Series Introduction on “Deponency”). The middle voice fits Kemmer’s semantic class of “emotion middle” (130–32, 269). This is an example of litotes (Beare, 124), the negation of a word in order to affirm or emphasize its opposite; in other words, “he will definitely not experience shame” is to be equated with “he will definitely experience honor.”

**2:7 ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, ἀπιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας**

**ὑμῖν.** Dative of reference (so Hort, 118–19). Although this could be read as a dative of possession, the parallel with the following ἀπιστοῦσιν, which cannot be taken as a dative of possession, argues against that label here. Alternatively, the pronoun could be read as a dative of advantage (so Achtemeier 1996, 161), reading the following ἀπιστοῦσιν as a dative of disadvantage; however, in conjunction with the scriptural citation it introduces, ἀπιστοῦσιν seems best taken as a dative of reference (although the disadvantage label would work well with the citation in v. 8, the opening citation in v. 7 is more “about” unbelievers than describing a “disadvantage” accruing to them). Fronted as a topical frame to make the topical shift from the generic believer at the end of verse 6 to the Christian recipients specifically (contra LDGNT, which labels ὑμῖν as emphatic).

**οὖν.** This is a straightforward inferential use of οὖν that introduces a conclusion grounded in the preceding scriptural citation, particularly focusing on the πιστ- lexical root and the “shame/honor” contrast (on the uses of οὖν, see 2:1).

**ἡ τιμὴ.** Nominative subject of an implied ἔστιν. Most translations wrongly understand τιμὴ to refer to Jesus. So, for example, the NRSV, “To you then who believe, he is precious” (similarly KJV, RSV, NET, TEV, NIV, NLT<sup>2</sup>). Instead, expanding on the last few words of the preceding quotation, τιμὴ refers to the eschatological

honor that believers themselves will experience (see τιμή in 1:7), and, indeed, already bear (e.g., 2:9–10; see also ESV: “the honor is for you who believe”).

**πιστεύουσιν.** Pres act ptc masc dat pl πιστεύω (attributive; contra Hort, 118, who views it as an appositional substantival participle). On the use of attributive participles to modify pronouns, see BDF §412.5. The participle echoes the ὁ πιστεύων of the just-cited quotation, with the quotation’s ἐπ’ αὐτῷ being implicit. Although the participle is part of the topical frame along with ὑμῖν, it is likely separated from ὑμῖν in order to bring it into clearer contrast with ἀπιστοῦσιν (see Winer, 688; BDF §473).

**ἀπιστοῦσιν.** Pres act ptc masc dat pl ἀπιστέω (substantival). Dative of reference (see the comment on ὑμῖν above). Fronted as a topical frame to make the topical shift from “you who believe” to “unbelievers.”

**δέ.** Introduces the next step in the argument. After noting the implications of how believers respond to the stone of Isa 28:16, the text goes on to note the implications of unbelievers’ response by introducing other “stone” texts from Ps 118 and Isa 8. On the use of δέ as a marker of development, see 1:7 on δέ.

**λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνία.** This quotation is juxtaposed to ἀπιστοῦσιν, indicating that it is understood with reference to unbelievers. The quotation is from Ps 118:22 (LXX Ps 117:22) and is almost identical to the LXX except that the major LXX witnesses have an accusative form of λίθος, arising from inverse attraction to the following relative pronoun. The originality of λίθος in 1 Peter, however, is uncertain since the NT manuscript witnesses are divided between λίθος (Ⓜ<sup>72</sup> Ⓝ<sup>2</sup> A B C\* *al*; perhaps accommodating to the following οὗτος) and λίθον (Ⓝ\* C<sup>2</sup> P Ψ Ⓜ<sup>7</sup>; perhaps a harmonization to the LXX), although the meaning is unchanged (see Achtemeier 1996, 149). The LXX very closely follows the MT.

**λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες.** This phrase is headed by the nominative λίθος, which is picked up resumptively by the following οὗτος. This phrase is the logical subject of ἐγενήθη (and would be the actual subject if οὗτος were absent). Runge (2010, §14) labels such constructions “left-dislocations” and

describes their main use as introducing new topics, which is the case here. He further notes that the redundant element that is associated with such dislocations (here οὔτος) helps the reader to identify the end of the left-dislocation and the beginning of the main clause (especially when the left-dislocation is long and complex).

**ὄν.** Accusative direct object of ἀπεδοκίμασαν.

**ἀπεδοκίμασαν.** Aor act ind 3rd pl ἀποδοκιμάζω.

**οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl οἰκοδομέω (substantial). Nominative subject of ἀπεδοκίμασαν.

**οὔτος.** Nominative subject of ἐγενήθη. Fronted as a topical frame that resumptively picks up λίθος ὄν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες. Following such dislocations, a pronoun like οὔτος is sometimes called a “pronominal trace” (e.g., Runge 2010, §14).

**ἐγενήθη.** Aor mid ind 3rd sg γίνομαι. On the middle voice, see also 1:15 on γενήθητε. That this verb is not to be read as a passive (contra Conrad, 18) is further supported by the Hebrew underlying the citation,  $\text{הָיָה}$ , which is not passive. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “spontaneous events associated with animate beings” (142–47, 269).

**εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνία.** In conjunction with γίνομαι (or εἰμί or λογιζομαι), εἰς followed by the accusative can serve as a substitute for a predicate nominative. This usually occurs with OT citations, as here, reflecting the common usage of the Hebrew verb  $\text{הָיָה}$  followed by the preposition  $\text{לְ}$  with the meaning “to become,” a construction present in the OT background of Ps 118:22 (see Wallace, 47–48).

**κεφαλὴν γωνία.** This phrase is synonymous with ἀκρογωνιαῖον in 2:6. On the debate as to whether this is a “topstone” or “cornerstone,” see 2:6 on ἀκρογωνιαῖον. The NIV’s “capstone” represents a minority view among English translations. Selwyn (163) is correct to argue that “extremity and not height is the point connoted.” On the appearance of this focal complement after the copula, see 1:25 on τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

**γωνίας.** Partitive genitive.

**2:8 καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου· οἱ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν.**

**καὶ.** Marks the following OT citation as closely bound to the

preceding citation in verse 7, both of which use the catchword λίθος (as does also the first citation in v. 6).

**λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου.** This OT citation lifts two key phrases from Isa 8:14, somewhat modified in syntax and vocabulary from its LXX form (λίθου προσκόμματος . . . πέτρας πτώματι). The syntax is actually closer to the MT (לִּישׁוּן מְכַשֵּׁת . . . הַיָּהוּדִים).

**λίθος . . . καὶ πέτρα.** The citation, headed by these two nouns, may be viewed as a freestanding quote or it may be viewed as more integrated with the surrounding context. The latter seems to be more likely, in which case these nouns would be a compound predicate nominative of ἐγενήθη in verse 7, standing parallel to the preceding εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, although not replicating its eis-with-accusative construction.

**προσκόμματος.** Genitive of product (“a stone that causes stumbling”).

**σκανδάλου.** Genitive of product (“a rock that causes offense”).

**οἱ.** Nominative subject of προσκόπτουσιν. The antecedent is ἀπιστοῦσιν. Since accents were added many centuries after 1 Peter was written, it is possible that Peter wrote the article οἱ rather than the relative pronoun οἷ. If so, the article would modify the participle ἀπειθοῦντες, which would serve as the substantival subject of προσκόπτουσιν. Such a reading, however, would lead to a very unusual word order with the verb (προσκόπτουσιν) embedded in its subject (οἱ . . . ἀπειθοῦντες). Thus, it is best to read οἷ to be rightly accented as a relative pronoun (so Achtemeier 1996, 162).

**προσκόπτουσιν.** Pres act ind 3rd pl προσκόπτω.

**τῷ λόγῳ.** Dative direct object of ἀπειθοῦντες (so most English translations). Alternatively, λόγῳ could be the direct object of προσκόπτουσιν (so KJV, ASV), since προσκόπτω can also take a dative direct object (Rom 9:32). Additionally, Hort (122) and some others read λόγῳ with both προσκόπτουσιν and ἀπειθοῦντες. These alternatives, however, are not likely here since there is already an implicit object of προσκόπτουσιν (i.e., the stone, which is Jesus). Reading λόγῳ with ἀπειθοῦντες, on the other hand, finds support in 3:1, where ἀπειθέω also takes the dative object τῷ λόγῳ (see also 4:17).

**ἀπειθοῦντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἀπειθέω (causal). Verbs sometimes appear in the final position of a clause or verb phrase for the sake of emphasizing the verb itself. Unfortunately, this can create ambiguities. In the phrase τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες, the question arises whether τῷ λόγῳ is fronted for emphasis (or as a frame) or whether the participle is being emphasized in the final position. Here the latter seems to be the case (so LDGNT). For tips on resolving ambiguous word order, see Levinsohn (40–45).

**εἰς ὃ.** Goal. Although ὃ could refer to the immediately preceding phrase τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες or to προσκόπτουσιν (so Hort, 123), it more likely refers to the entirety of the thought expressed in οἱ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες (Achtmeier 1996, 162). Note that the neuter relative pronoun is used to refer to verbal ideas, whole sentences, and with more generalized conceptual antecedents (see Robertson, 713–14).

**καί.** Adverbial additive use of καί: “also.” Most English translations do not explicitly account for the καί, and it is likewise ignored by most commentators. Given the use of τίθημι in verse 6 and here again in verse 8, the καί functions to help the recipients make a connection between God’s sovereign choice with respect to Jesus and God’s sovereign choice with respect to those who reject Jesus. On this use of καί for thematic addition, see 1:15.

**ἐτέθησαν.** Aor pass ind 3rd pl τίθημι. Under the semantic domain of “control, rule,” Louw and Nida (37.96) notes that τίθημι can mean “to assign someone to a particular task, function, or role.” BDAG (1004) translates “consign” here, and the NLT<sup>2</sup> appropriately renders, “so they meet the fate that was planned for them.” The implied agent is God. With respect to the controversial theology here, Bigg (133) comments: “Their disobedience is not ordained, the penalty of their disobedience is.” Against this, however, Grudem (108) notes the plural of ἐτέθησαν: It is not a penalty or a principle that is ordained, but persons.

**2:9 ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκοτῶντος ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς.**

This verse represents a chiasmic fusion of texts from Isa 43:20-21

and Exod 19:6. The first (of the four) titles corresponds to τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν in LXX Isa 43:20 (MT: **עַמִּי בְּחַרְתִּי**), and the fourth title along with the following purpose clause corresponds to the similar title and infinitival purpose clause in LXX Isa 43:21 (λαόν μου ὃν περιεποιησάμην τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγεῖσθαι; MT: **עַם-וִי יִצְרַתִּי לִי תִהְיֶה לְךָ תִּפְרַח**). The second and third titles correspond exactly to phrases in the LXX of Exod 19:6 (MT: **מִמֶּלְכֶת כְּהֲנָנִים וְנֹגֵי קָדְשׁ**).

**ὁμεις**. Nominative subject of an implied ἐστε. Even though this pronoun appears in a verbless clause, it serves as a topical frame, shifting the topic from the unbelievers in verses 7b-8 to the believing recipients here.

**δε**. Introduces the next step in the argument, shifting from the immediately preceding reference to unbelievers to a description of believers here. On the use of δε as a marker of development, see 1:7 on δε.

**γένος ἐκλεκτόν**. Predicate nominative.

**βασιλειον ιεράτευμα**. Nominative in apposition to γένος ἐκλεκτόν. Elliott (2000, 435–37) takes βασιλειον as a substantive rather than an adjective, but the parallelism with the other titles argues against this. See also 2:5 on ιεράτευμα.

**ἔθνος ἅγιον**. Nominative in apposition to βασιλειον ιεράτευμα.

**λαός**. Nominative in apposition to ἔθνος ἅγιον.

**εις περιποίησιν**. Purpose. God is the agent of the event “possessing” that is embedded in the noun περιποίησιν, i.e., Christians are a people who have been created for the very purpose of belonging to God.

**ὅπως**. Introduces a purpose clause, modifying the verbal idea in περιποίησιν (as in the LXX’s infinitival construction).

**τὰς ἀρετὰς . . . τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θανμαστόν αὐτοῦ φῶς**. Levinsohn (58–60) describes two reasons why a constituent might be discontinuous, with only a portion of the constituent (here τὰς ἀρετὰς) being in a fronted position: (1) only the fronted portion of the constituent is marked as focal (i.e., “emphatic” in our terms); (2) even though the whole constituent is focal, only the postverbal portion of the constituent relates to what follows. Here the former seems to be the case.

**τὰς ἀρετὰς.** Accusative direct object of ἐξαγγείλητε. The noun ἀρετὰς may refer to ethical traits (see NET’s “virtues”) or the “manifestation of divine power” (BDAG, 130.2). In keeping with the latter definition and in light of the underlying Hebrew תְּהִלָּה (“praise”), it is best to interpret ἀρετὰς as “praiseworthy deeds,” referring to God’s salvific activity in Christ (see Michaels, 110–11, RSV, NRSV).

**ἐξαγγείλητε.** Aor act subj 2nd pl ἐξαγγέλλω. Subjunctive with ὅπως.

**τοῦ . . . καλέσαντος.** Aor act ptc masc gen sg καλέω (substantival). Genitive of producer. BDAG (503.4) says that, as an extension of the meanings “summon” and “invite,” καλέω can take on the sense, “choose for receipt of a special benefit or experience.”

**ἐκ σκότους.** Separation. Fronted for emphasis.

**ἡμᾶς.** Accusative direct object of καλέσαντος. On the fronting of this pronoun, see 1:21 on αὐτῶ.

**εἰς τὸ θαυμαστόν . . . φῶς.** Goal/spatial, metaphorical.

**αὐτοῦ.** Genitive of source.

**2:10 οἱ ποτε οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεγμένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλεθέντες.**

**οἱ ποτε οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ.** The accent on οἱ might lead one to read it as a relative pronoun; however, since it stands in parallel with the following article οἱ, οἱ itself is likely also an article. In this case, its accent would derive from the enclitic ποτε (for a similar appearance of an article to which a subsequent ποτε loses its accent, see Eph 2:13: ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν, “you who formerly were far away”). Note that articles are proclitics and, like enclitics, usually have no accent of their own (although they lose their accent to the word that follows instead of to the word that precedes). When a proclitic article is followed by an enclitic (like ποτέ), the article takes an acute accent (Carson 1985, 49). This article nominalizes the entire expression ποτε οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ (“formerly-not-a-people-but-now-people-of-God ones”), which stands in apposition to the λαὸς in verse 9. With this appositive (and the parallel appositional construction that follows), yet another OT text is drawn upon, this time from Hosea.

**ποτε.** Temporal adverb.

**οὐ . . . δὲ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μή . . . δὲ) in which the negated verb phrase ποτε οὐ λαός serves to emphasize the positive phrase νῦν . . . λαός θεοῦ, which is introduced by δὲ.

**οὐ λαός.** An allusion to the name of Hosea's second son (LXX: Οὐ-λαός-μου; MT: אֲשֶׁר לְ; Hos 1:9; 2:25 [ET 2:23]).

**νῦν.** Temporal adverb, paired with the preceding ποτε.

**θεοῦ.** Possessive genitive.

**οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλεθθέντες.** Like the preceding construction nominalized by οἱ, the article οἱ also nominalizes what follows (“ones not having been shown mercy but now having been shown mercy”). On the single article applied to two participles joined by δέ, see 1:7 on τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου.

**οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι.** This is an allusion to the name of Hosea's daughter, Οὐκ-ἠλεημένη (MT: אֲשֶׁר; Hos 1:6, 8, 2:25 [ET 2:23]), although here in a plural form in concord with the plural recipients.

**οἱ . . . ἠλεημένοι.** Prf pass ptc masc nom pl ἐλεέω (substantival).

**οὐκ . . . δὲ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:8 on μή . . . δὲ) in which the negated οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι serves to emphasize the positive νῦν ἐλεθθέντες, which is introduced by δὲ.

**οὐκ.** On the classical use of οὐ with the participle instead of μή, see 1:8 on οὐκ ἰδόντες . . . μή ὀρώντες, BDAG (645.2.b.γ) further notes the tendency of the LXX to use οὐ to translate אֲשֶׁר with Hebrew participles (so also BDF §430).

**νῦν.** Temporal adverb.

**ἐλεθθέντες.** Aor pass ptc masc nom pl ἐλεέω (substantival).

## 1 Peter 2:11-17

<sup>11</sup>Beloved, I urge that you, as sojourners and exiles, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against you, <sup>12</sup>and keep your conduct among the Gentiles virtuous in order that, because of your good works (that is, because seeing them) they might praise God on the day of his visitation with regard to that very thing that leads them now to disparage you as evildoers.

<sup>13</sup>Submit to every human creature in authority for the sake of the Lord, whether to the emperor as one who is supreme, <sup>14</sup>or whether to governors as ones having been dispatched by him for the punishment of those who do evil and for the praise of those who do good, <sup>15</sup>because this is God's will, namely, to silence the ignorance of foolish people by doing good. <sup>16</sup>Submit as free people, and not as ones using their freedom as a cover for evil, but as slaves of God. <sup>17</sup>Honor everyone, love the brotherhood, fear God, honor the emperor.

**2:11 Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς·**

**Ἀγαπητοί.** Vocative. Both Michaels (114) and Achtemeier (1996, 81) understand the implicit agency here to refer to both God and the author (i.e., “ones loved by God and me”). Nevertheless, the implicit agent is likely just Peter himself (see TEV’s “my friends”), given that this vocative expression is stereotypical (sometimes making explicit that the author is the agent, as in 1 Cor 10:14 and Phil 2:12, where ἀγαπητοί appears with the subjective genitive μου). This vocative helps mark a transition to a major new unit (Martin 1992a, 194).

**παρακαλῶ.** Pres act ind 1st sg παρακαλέω. Introduces a mitigated command, i.e., a command that is made indirectly without using a straightforward imperative form.

**ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς.** This entire infinitival construction (along with its additional modifying units, extending through v. 12) is indirect discourse. A clause of indirect discourse is a specialized form of an object clause that follows a verb of perception or communication (here, παρακαλῶ) and indicates the content of what is perceived or communicated (Wallace, 603–5).

**ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους.** Fronted as an adverbial frame.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς

functions to introduce the role in which the recipients are to abstain from fleshly lusts, namely, in their role as “sojourners and exiles.”

**παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους.** These two accusative nouns are the second component in a ὡς construction involving the accusative subject of ἀπέχεσθαι, an implied ὑμᾶς. They should not be taken as accusative subjects of the infinitive ἀπέχεσθαι (contra Beare, 135). On the debate regarding whether these terms are metaphorical, see 1:1 on ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις.

**ἀπέχεσθαι.** Pres mid inf ἀπέχω (indirect discourse). If this were converted to direct discourse, it would be an imperative. Some manuscripts (ℱ<sup>72</sup> A C L P 33 *al*) and commentators (such as Michaels, 114) read the imperative ἀπέχεσθε, which perhaps is an itacism (Beare, 135; in Buth’s reconstructed Koine and in Modern Greek, αι and ε are pronounced the same way) or a correction of the anacoluthon in verse 12. In any case, the choice of variants does not change the meaning. The middle voice fits Kemmer’s semantic class of “self-protection or self-preservation” or, alternatively, “self-control” (270).

**τῶν . . . ἐπιθυμιῶν.** Genitive of separation, metaphorical (so BDF §180.5). On the pejorative use of this noun, see 1:14 on ταῖς . . . ἐπιθυμίαις.

**σαρκικῶν.** BDAG (914.2) defines σαρκικός as “pertaining to being human at a disappointing level of behavior or characteristics.”

**αἵτινες.** Nominative subject of στρατεύονται. Wallace (343–45) notes that ὅστις can be either “generic” or “qualitative” (excluding other instances where ὅστις is simply confused with ὅς). While the generic label refers to a whole class (e.g., “whoever,” “whichever”), the qualitative label “focuses on the nature or essence of the person or thing in view,” which one can normally translate intensively (“the very one who,” “who indeed”). Wallace labels αἵτινες here as qualitative and translates “the *very things that* wage war against the soul.” See also BDAG (730.2b) and Hort (133).

**στρατεύονται.** Pres mid ind 3rd pl στρατεύω. The use of the middle corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “naturally reciprocal events” (102–8, 268).

**κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς.** Opposition.

**ψυχῆς**. BDAG (947.2.d) understands this verse to speak “of the struggles of the passions within the human soul.” However, as elsewhere in 1 Peter, I understand ψυχή here to refer to the whole person (see 1:9 on ψυχῶν). Thus, this verse speaks of evil desires that war against “one’s self” or “one’s life” (so Achtemeier 1996, 81: “your very lives”).

**2:12 τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς.**

**τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν**. Fronted with respect to ἔχοντες, this phrase serves as a topical frame, shifting to a concern in verse 12 with how one’s conduct impacts the church’s witness to unbelievers.

**τὴν ἀναστροφὴν**. Accusative direct object of ἔχοντες in an object-complement double accusative construction.

**ὑμῶν**. Subjective genitive.

**ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν**. Association, modifying ἀναστροφὴν, and thus included within the topical frame.

**ἔθνεσιν**. Since the recipients are described as OT Israel (e.g., 2:9), this may be a metaphorical reference to unbelievers (so NET’s “non-Christians” and NLT’s “unbelieving neighbors”).

**ἔχοντες**. Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἔχω (attendant circumstance with imperatival force). This is sometimes taken as means (i.e., “abstain from fleshly lusts by keeping one’s conduct good”; so, e.g., Achtemeier 1996, 172). Nevertheless, “abstaining from fleshly lusts” and “keeping one’s conduct good” have equal semantic weight, and thus it is best to take ἔχοντες (which is still a part of the imperatival indirect discourse that began in v. 11) as a participle of attendant circumstance that takes on the imperatival force of ἀπέχεσθαι (so, e.g., Elliott 2000, 465; Jobes, 173; and most English translations, including the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NET, and NIV; for more on this use of the participle, see 2:1 on Ἀποθέμενοι and 1:14 on συζηματιζόμενοι). One might expect the case of the participle to be accusative, in agreement with an implied accusative subject of the infinitive ἀπέχεσθαι in verse 11. But sometimes infinitives in Greek will take an implied *nominative* subject. For example, when

an infinitive implicitly shares the same subject as its governing verb, the implicit subject of the infinitive is often in the nominative case so that modifiers that agree with this implicit subject are also nominative (BDF §405; e.g., 2 Cor 10:2; Phil 4:11; Col 1:9-12). This rule does not apply here since the implicit subject of ἀπέχεσθαι in verse 11 (“you”) is not the same as the subject of its governing verb παρακαλῶ (“I”). Nevertheless, Eph 4:1-3 gives another example of a situation in which, even when the preceding rule does not apply (and even when the subject of the infinitive is *explicitly* accusative), modifiers of an infinitival subject also appear in the nominative rather than in the accusative (ὕμᾱς, the explicit accusative subject of the infinitive περιπατήσαι, is modified by the nominative participles ἀνεχόμενοι and σπουδάζοντες). The nominative ἔχοντες here seems to be an example of this same phenomenon; contra Martin 1992a, 194, who explains the nominative ἔχοντες by linking it with Ὑποτάγητε in v. 13).

**καλήν.** Accusative complement in an object-complement double accusative construction (so Wallace, 308). Translations such as “maintain good conduct” (RSV, NET) mask the predicate position of καλήν; more in line with the grammar is the ESV’s “Keep your conduct among the Gentiles honorable.” Note that in an object-complement construction, the complement does not have to be a noun, but can be an adjective as here (or a participle or infinitive; see Wallace, 182–83).

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause.

**ἐν ᾧ καταλαοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν.** Fronted as a topical frame (so LDGNT).

**ἐν ᾧ.** Reference. English translations frequently adopt a concessive rendering (“though” in NRSV, NET, NIV; “even if” in NLT<sup>2</sup>; “whereas” in KJV; see also BDAG, 329.7), but this appears to derive more from contextual considerations than the use of ἐν ᾧ itself. The translation of ἐν ᾧ as “when” (ESV, TEV; Fink, 34) is also unlikely since ἐν ᾧ relates καταλαοῦσιν to δοξάσωσιν, and these events are not contemporaneous. Instead, ἐν here connotes reference (“with reference to that which”; on the embedded demonstrative pronoun, see BDAG, 726.1.b.α). For a similar interpretation, see Bigg (136). In other words, the hope is that unbelievers will one

day glorify God with regard to that very thing (i.e., the Christian faith) that they currently speak ill of. A very similar construction appears in 3:16.

**καταλαλοῦσιν.** Pres act ind 3rd pl καταλαλέω.

**ὑμῶν.** Genitive direct object of καταλαλοῦσιν.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative clause involving ellipsis: “people slander you (as they slander) evildoers.”

**κακοποιῶν.** Genitive direct object of an implicit καταλαλοῦσιν.

**ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων.** Fronted for emphasis. The most promising ways of viewing this phrase are (a) as causal; or (b) as a partitive construction that serves as the direct object of ἐποπτεύοντες, meaning “seeing some of your good works” (so Achtemeier 1996, 178; for similar constructions, see BDF §164.2, which cites the following examples of partitive prepositional phrases that function as direct objects: Matt 23:34; Mark 6:43; Luke 11:49; 2 John 4; Rev 2:10). Since the partitive force seems out of place here (and is lacking in the underlying Jesus tradition that appears in Matt 5:16), option (a) is preferable. It is tempting to take this prepositional phrase and the following ἐποπτεύοντες as modifying the preceding καταλαλοῦσιν (“they slander you as evildoers because of your good works, when they see [them]”). This understanding of the syntax makes more sense of the present form of ἐποπτεύοντες (the “seeing” would be contemporaneous with the “slandering”) than understanding ἐποπτεύοντες with the future δοξάσωσιν (in which case the “seeing” and the “glorifying” would not be contemporaneous, a fact that motivates part of the textual tradition to substitute an aorist form for the present ἐποπτεύοντες; this also leads Hort, 137, and Achtemeier 1996, 178, to the view that ἐποπτεύοντες refers to unbelievers’ future remembrance of the believers’ past good works). Despite the difficulty of the present ἐποπτεύοντες, it still seems best to read the prepositional phrase with δοξάσωσιν given the strong parallel with the Jesus tradition that presents “seeing good works” as a cause for “glorifying” God (cf. 1 Peter’s ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεὸν with Matt 5:16’s ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ κατὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν). Against the view of Achtemeier and Hort is that the “seeing” in

Matt 5:16 is best understood as a “seeing” (and resulting conversion) that takes place in this present life.

**ἐποπτεύοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἐποπτεύω (causal). This participle is appositional to the preceding causal prepositional phrase ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων, elaborating on how the recipients’ good works could lead to others glorifying God, i.e., because others see them (see also previous comment).

**δοξάσωσιν.** Aor act subj 3rd pl δοξάζω. Subjunctive with ἵνα. BDAG (258.1): “praise, honor, extol.”

**τὸν θεόν.** Accusative direct object of δοξάσωσιν.

**ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς.** Temporal. The term ἐπισκοπῆς embeds the event “visit,” of which God (or Christ) is the implicit agent. The semantic meaning of the phrase, then, is “on the day on which God visits (the world).” On similar constructions with ἡμέρα, see Wallace, 81, n. 26. Commentators debate whether this phrase has in mind the judgment of unbelievers or holds out hope for their salvation before that day, but the verbal parallels with 3:1-2 suggest the latter.

**ἐπισκοπῆς.** Genitive of time.

**2:13 Ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον, εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς υπερέχοντι,**

**Ὑποτάγητε.** Aor mid imprv 2nd pl ὑποτάσσω. Though traditionally taken as a passive or passive deponent, this is another example of a θη- verb form that is better viewed as middle (see the Series Introduction on “Deponency”). This middle corresponds to Miller’s semantic class of “reciprocity” (427). Miller and Kemmer differ regarding this category, with Kemmer maintaining that the type of action must be the same for both parties, which is not true for Miller, who speaks simply of situations in which “the removal of one party would render the verb meaningless.” Some manuscripts (P ℵ) insert an οὖν following Ὑποτάγητε, which is a secondary attempt to aid the transition from the general admonition in verses 11-12 to the specific exhortations in verses 13-17. The original is less awkward, however, than the scribes (or Michaels, 121) thought since, according to Levinsohn (118–20), asyndeton is commonly

used when connecting units that have a generic-specific relation to one another.

**πάση ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει.** Dative complement of ὑποτάγητε. Elsewhere in the NT, κτίσις refers to the world or beings that God has created. Here it is frequently rendered as “institution” (RSV, NRSV, NET; so also BDAG, 573.3), although evidence is lacking for this usage in ancient Greek literature. Alternatively, Michaels (123–24) opts to understand this phrase as a reference to all people, thus anticipating the command to “respect everyone” in verse 17. Another option is to view the phrase as a programmatic heading, anticipating the other created beings to which 1 Peter will urge submission (i.e., masters, husbands, church leaders). Nevertheless, the appositive correlative construction that immediately follows suggests that it is simply governing rulers that are in view, not people in general or other persons with authority within the household or church (so also Elliott 2000, 489). Perhaps Peter uses such a general expression in order to highlight that the emperor and his governors are human creations of God, and nothing more (see Achtemeier 1996, 182–83; Schreiner, 128).

**διὰ τὸν κύριον.** Cause.

**εἴτε βασιλεῖ.** The correlative conjunction εἴτε introduces a clause with an implicit repetition of ὑποτάσσω from the main clause, i.e., “whether (you submit) to the emperor.”

**βασιλεῖ.** Dative complement of an implied form of ὑποτάσσω. Translations are divided in rendering βασιλεὺς here (and in v. 17) as “emperor” (RSV, ESV, NRSV, TEV; so also BDAG, 170.1) or more generically as “king” (KJV, NET, NIV), the latter of which could include not only the emperor but lesser vassal kings as well. Decisive in favor of “emperor,” however, is that all the areas in which the recipients lived (1:1) were overseen at this time by provincial Roman governors, not vassal kings (Marshall, 82). The noun functions as a topical frame (so LDGNT).

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Although Michaels (126) takes ὡς here (and in v. 14) as causal, it seems to introduce in this correlative construction not a grounds for obeying the imperative (which is given in διὰ τὸν κύριον), but a further description of the role that the βασιλεὺς plays (so BDAG, 1105.3.a.a), namely, that of “one who is supreme.”

**ὑπερέχοντι.** Pres act ptc masc dat sg ὑπερέχω (substantival). This dative substantive is the second component in a ὡς construction involving the dative βασιλεῖ.

**2:14 εἶτε ἡγεμόσιν ὡς δι’ αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν.**

**εἶτε ἡγεμόσιν.** In parallel to εἶτε βασιλεῖ in verse 13, the correlative conjunction εἶτε once again introduces a clause with an implicit repetition of ὑποτάσσω from the main clause, i.e., “whether (you submit) to governors.”

**ἡγεμόσιν.** BDAG (433.2) defines this noun as “head imperial provincial administrator, governor in the provinces.” Here, it functions as a topical frame (so LDGNT).

**ὡς.** See 2:13 on ὡς, where ὡς also introduces the role of the ἡγεμόσιν.

**δι’ αὐτοῦ.** Agency. Since διὰ with the genitive usually expresses intermediate agency (see 1:12 on διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς), some commentators believe that this phrase alludes to the ultimate agency of God that stands behind the emperor’s intermediate agency (so Hort, 141; Grudem, 120). Nevertheless, there do seem to be rare instances where διὰ expresses ultimate agency (for examples, see BDF §223.2 and Wallace, 434, n. 79); and it seems likely that we have this same usage here. Fronted for emphasis.

**πεμπομένοις.** Pres pass ptc masc dat pl πέμπω (substantival). This dative substantive (similar to ὑπερέχοντι in v. 13) is the second component in a ὡς construction involving the dative ἡγεμόσιν.

**εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν.** This compound prepositional phrase, in which both accusatives ἐκδίκησιν and ἔπαινον serve as objects of the preposition εἰς, indicates a two-fold purpose of the “sending.”

**κακοποιῶν.** Objective genitive.

**δὲ.** Introduces the next step in the argument, supplementing the mention of the punishment of those who do evil with mention of the praise of those who do good. On the use of δὲ as a marker of development, see 1:7 on δέ.

**ἀγαθοποιῶν.** Objective genitive.

**2:15 ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθοποιούντας φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν,**

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause. Some understand this clause to modify the closing words of verse 14, ἔπαινον . . . ἀγαθοποιῶν (e.g., Hort, 142), a view which finds some support in the lexical associations of ἀγαθοποιούντας here and ἀγαθοποιῶν in verse 14. But this view is unlikely since (a) ὅτι typically modifies a verb; for ὅτι to modify a genitival noun construction would be highly unusual; and, (b) logically, the ὅτι clause does not flow very well from verse 14; one is almost forced to supply a transitional thought between verses 14 and 15 (e.g., “you should be such persons”), in which case the ὅτι would then depend on implicit information. Avoiding this awkwardness, it is better to understand the ὅτι to modify Ὑποτάγητε in verse 13 (this verb is not too removed from thought for ὅτι to modify it, which is evident from the fact that the ὡς clauses in v. 16 also modify Ὑποτάγητε). The ὅτι clause is not parenthetical as some (e.g., Michaels, 127) argue.

**οὕτως.** This adverb functions as a predicate adjective. On adverbs used as adjectives, see 1:14 on πρότερον. Numerous commentators (e.g. Hort, 143; Kelly, 110) argue that οὕτως here is retrospective (i.e., anaphoric), referring to the idea of “doing good” in verse 14. More likely, οὕτως is prospective (i.e., cataphoric), anticipating the infinitival clause headed by φιμοῦν (including its modifying participle ἀγαθοποιούντας). Although it is true that οὕτως is usually retrospective in the NT, numerous examples of prospective usage also appear (see BDAG, 742.2; BDF §434). Indeed, Gen 29:26 (which BDAG cites) provides an excellent parallel since there οὕτως also is a predicate adjective that functions prospectively, similarly anticipating a subsequent exegetical infinitive. Runge (2010, §3.3.3) describes such a use of οὕτως as a “forward-pointing adverb,” the function of which is to give emphasis to its “target,” which in this case is the following infinitival clause. Οὕτως is temporarily brought into focus before turning to the real focus in this sentence, i.e., the following infinitival clause. On temporary focus, see 1:12 on ἑαυτοῖς. On the word order (emphatic complement before copula), see 1:15 on ἄγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ.

**ἐστίν.** Pres act ind 3rd sg εἰμί.

**τὸ θέλημα.** Nominative subject of ἐστίν.

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**ἀγαθοποιούντας.** Pres act ptc masc acc pl ἀγαθοποιέω (means).  
The referent is ὑμᾶς, the implied accusative subject of φιμοῦν  
(which is made explicit in some manuscripts, secondarily).

**φιμοῦν.** Pres act inf φιμώω (exegetical of οὕτως).

**τὴν . . . ἀγνωσίαν.** Accusative direct object of φιμοῦν.

**τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων.** Subjective genitive.

**2:16 ὡς ἐλεύθεροι καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῦ δοῦλοι.**

The most significant question regarding these three parallel ὡς clauses is what they modify. Elliott (2000, 495–96) views them as modifying ἀγαθοποιούντας in verse 15, but this is unlikely since if they were modifying this participle (or the infinitive φιμοῦν), we would expect the substantives ἐλεύθεροι, ἔχοντες, and δοῦλοι to be in the accusative case in agreement with the implied ὑμᾶς that is the referent of the participle and the subject of the infinitive (the accusative case of the participle makes it less likely that the analysis of ἔχοντες in 2:12 applies here). Beare (143–44) takes them as functioning independently with imperatival force. Michaels (121) translates these clauses as modifying what follows in verse 17, but it is more likely that these ὡς clauses, like the causal clause in verse 15, modify the imperative Ὑποτάγητε in verse 13 (so, e.g., Bigg, 141; Schreiner, 131), qualifying the required “submission.” As for the structure of these three ὡς clauses, the last two clauses are joined together by means of a correlative μὴ/ ἀλλά construction (note that ὡς θεοῦ δοῦλοι is the most prominent element; see 1:8 on μὴ . . . δὲ). This correlative construction offers a clarification of the first clause. So the second and (especially) the third ὡς clauses limit the first: the recipients are free with respect to governing authorities, but their freedom has certain bounds determined by the ethical norms of the will of God, to whom they are ultimately subservient. On this analysis, the main break in the verse is after the first clause (so TEV; contra RSV, NIV). On the function of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. In each of the three ὡς clauses here, ὡς functions

to introduce the roles that the recipients are to fill (or, in the second clause, are not to fill) as they submit to authorities.

**ἐλεύθεροι.** This nominative noun is the second component in a ὡς construction involving an implicit nominative, which is best understood as the implied subject, ὑμεῖς, of Ὑποτάγητε in verse 13.

**καὶ.** Not contrastive (contra Michaels, 129), but introducing a supplementary explanation of ἐλεύθεροι.

**ἐπικάλυμμα.** Accusative complement of a double accusative object-complement construction. For the pecking order of objects versus complements, see 1:17 on τὸν . . . κρίνοντα. This term can be used literally of a material covering (LXX Exod 26:14; 2 Sam 17:19) or metaphorically (e.g., LXX Job 19:29) as “a stratagem for concealing something,” the latter of which applies here (BDAG, 373). Various translations as “excuse” (NLT<sup>2</sup>), “cover-up” (NIV) or “pretext” (RSV). Fronted for emphasis.

**ἔχοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἔχω (substantival). The function of this participle is clear from the parallel structure with the two nominative substantives ἐλεύθεροι and δοῦλοι in the other two ὡς clauses. On the nominative case, see ἐλεύθεροι above.

**τῆς κακίας.** Objective genitive, modifying ἐπικάλυμμα.

**τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.** Accusative direct object of ἔχοντες. The definite article distinguishes this direct object from its complement.

**θεοῦ.** Possessive genitive. Ordinarily, one would expect the genitive noun to follow its head noun. Not surprisingly, some manuscripts (A P 33 ℣) reverse the order of θεοῦ δοῦλοι. The genitive noun, however, is fronted here to emphasize Christians’ status with respect to God. On the preposing of genitives, see Levinsohn (62–67).

**δοῦλοι.** On the nominative case, see ἐλεύθεροι above.

**2:17 πάντας τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε, τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε.**

The direct object is fronted in each of the four clauses, effecting a topical shift in each instance (i.e., “with respect to everyone, honor them; with respect to fellow believers, love them; etc.”). These four phrases form a chiasm, with commands about relationships with non-Christian society forming the outer pair and commands about

relationships with believers and God forming the more prominent inner pair. Note how the two appearances of the verb τιμάω contribute to the chiasm.

**πάντας.** Accusative direct object of τιμήσατε.

**τιμήσατε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl τιμάω.

**τὴν ἀδελφότητα.** Accusative direct object of ἀγαπάτε.

**ἀγαπάτε.** Pres act impv 2nd pl ἀγαπάω.

**τὸν θεόν.** Accusative direct object of φοβεῖσθε.

**φοβεῖσθε.** Pres mid impv 2nd pl φοβέω. The middle voice fits Kemmer's semantic class of "emotion middle" (130–32, 269).

**τὸν βασιλέα.** Accusative direct object of τιμάτε. On the meaning of βασιλέα as "emperor," see 2:13 on βασιλεῖ.

**τιμάτε.** Pres act impv 2nd pl τιμάω.

### 1 Peter 2:18-25

<sup>18</sup>Household slaves, submit to your masters with all reverence, not only to good and easygoing masters but even to depraved ones. <sup>19</sup>For this is something that God favors, namely, if one endures hardships while suffering unjustly because of one's consciousness of God. <sup>20</sup>For what is the honor if you persevere when you sin and are beaten as a result? But if you persevere when you do good and suffer as a result, this is something that finds favor in God's sight. <sup>21</sup>For you were called to this because Christ also suffered for you, leaving an example behind for you in order that you might follow in his footsteps. <sup>22</sup>He did not sin nor was treachery found in his mouth. <sup>23</sup>Although he was maligned, he never maligned in return; although he suffered, he never threatened; instead, he kept on entrusting himself to the one who judges justly. <sup>24</sup>He himself bore our sins in his body on the cross in order that we might live with respect to righteousness by having died with respect to sin. By his wound you were healed. <sup>25</sup>For you were going astray like sheep, but now you have returned to the shepherd and overseer of your lives.

**2:18 Οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντί φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις, οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σκολιοῖς.**

**Οἱ οἰκέται.** Jobes (184–85) views this as a true vocative, the

effect of which is to elevate the status of slaves through directly addressing them (so also with reference to “wives” in 3:7). This is problematic since true vocatives do not appear with the article, and as a result, this is usually viewed as an articular nominative used as a vocative (e.g., Elliott 2000, 513; BDF §147.3). Wallace (71) notes that the nominative for vocative is encroaching on the vocative to the extent that in the NT there are twice as many nominatives for vocatives as true vocatives. Vocative phrases can serve a variety of functions, one of them being to focus on a certain class of people in the general audience, here slaves (see Barnwell, 9–10). Cognate to οἶκος (“house”), οἰκέτης can refer specifically to household or domestic slaves but can also refer to slaves more generally (BDAG, 694). Although Achtemeier (1996, 194) argues for the latter, most commentators (e.g., Michaels, 138; Spicq, 1:384) adopt the former interpretation, seeing the exhortations to these (household) slaves as part of a broader household code in 1 Peter. This debate is less consequential if, as Elliott (2000, 514) asserts, most slaves in Asia Minor were, in fact, domestic slaves.

**ὑποτασσόμενοι.** Pres mid ptc masc nom pl ὑποτάσσω (imperative): “accept the authority of” (NRSV, NLT<sup>2</sup>), “be subject to” (ESV, NET), “submit yourselves” (TEV, NIV). In keeping with the foregoing translations, most commentators likewise view ὑποτασσόμενοι as an example of an independent imperatival participle (e.g., Elliott 2000, 516; Michaels, 138). Achtemeier (1996, 189, 194) disputes the majority opinion, however, and argues that this is a participle of means related to the four imperatives in verse 17 (so also Winer, 442). Boyer (174) ties this participle (as well as those in 3:1 and 3:7) to Ὑποτάγητε in 2:13. Several variants seek to eliminate the independent use of the participle here by (a) changing the participle to an imperative form, (b) making the participle part of a periphrastic construction, or (c) making the participle part of a subordinate clause by changing Οἱ to ὡς. On the debate regarding imperatival participles in 1 Peter, see 1:14 on συσχηματιζόμενοι. On the class of middle voice, see verse 13 on Ὑποτάγητε.

**ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ.** Manner. Some translations interpret the implicit object of the “fearing” to be slavemasters (e.g., TEV: “show them complete respect”; so also RSV, NIV; BDAG, 1062.2.b.β).

Nevertheless, most recent commentators (e.g., Achtemeier, 194–95) understand this phrase to speak of fearing God, as is supported by the use of φόβος and φοβέω elsewhere in 1 Peter (see especially 1:17 and 2:17, but also 3:2, 6, 14, 16) and the similar concern for pleasing God in verse 19’s διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ.

**τοῖς δεσπόταις.** Dative complement of ὑποτασσόμενοι.

**οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σκολιοῖς.** Serves expegetically to further clarify ὑποτασσόμενοι . . . τοῖς δεσπόταις.

**οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ.** This correlative construction gives ascensive force to the second element in the construction: “not only to good and easygoing masters but even to depraved ones.”

**μόνον.** On the derivation of adverbs from adjectives, see 1:6 on ὀλίγον.

**τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν.** Dative complement of an implied repetition of ὑποτασσόμενοι. The implicit modified noun of these adjectives is δεσπόταις.

**ἐπιεικέσιν.** On the meaning, see the helpful discussion in Spicq (2.34–38).

**τοῖς σκολιοῖς.** Dative complement of yet another implied repetition of ὑποτασσόμενοι. The implicit modified noun of this adjective is again δεσπόταις. Σκολιός literally means “bent, crooked” but also means, by metaphorical extension, “morally bent or twisted” (BDAG, 930.2). Most commentators and translations understand this as being in contrast with ἐπιεικής (“easygoing”) and thus give it the more specific meaning of “harsh, cruel.” In the NT (Acts 2:40; Phil 2:15) and LXX, however, this term bears a more general meaning of “wicked” or “unscrupulous,” a sense it likely has here as well (so Schreiner, 137: “morally bankrupt”).

**2:19 τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσχω ἀδίκως.**

**τοῦτο . . . χάρις.** This represents the apodosis of the conditional construction in this verse.

**τοῦτο.** Nominative subject of an implied ἐστίν. For the pecking order that distinguishes subjects from predicate nominatives, see 1:17 on τὸν . . . κρίνοντα. The demonstrative pronoun is cata-

phoric, anticipating the protasis: εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσχω ἀδίκως. Runge (2010, §3.3.2) describes such constructions as “forward-pointing demonstratives,” which serve to mark their “targets” (in this case, the protasis of the conditional construction) as thematically prominent (see also LDGNT on this verse). The demonstrative τοῦτο is temporarily in focus before shifting to the truly focal element, namely, the protasis (see 1:12 on ἑαυτοῖς).

**γάρ.** Introduces a motivational ground for the exhortation in verse 18, particularly the closing words regarding submitting to unscrupulous masters.

**χάρις.** Predicate nominative. The term χάρις can refer to the favor or reward that one receives from a benefactor; by metonymy, χάρις here refers to an action that brings about the favorable disposition or reward of God (BDAG, 1079.2.b). See also 2:20; 5:12.

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition.

**διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ.** Cause. This prepositional phrase is fronted for emphasis.

**συνείδησιν.** This term can mean either “conscience” or “consciousness.” Selwyn (176–78) argues for “conscience,” but the following θεοῦ is difficult to handle in this case (Selwyn’s genitive of “inner reference” is unconvincing). The following θεοῦ instead suggests that the sense is “consciousness,” a view followed by virtually all recent translations and commentators.

**θεοῦ.** Objective genitive (so Wallace, 119).

**ὑποφέρει.** Pres act ind 3rd sg ὑποφέρω.

**τις.** Nominative subject of ὑποφέρει.

**λύπας.** Accusative direct object of ὑποφέρει.

**πάσχω.** Pres act ptc masc nom sg πάσχω (temporal): “while suffering” (RSV, ESV, NRSV).

**ἀδίκως.** Adverb of manner.

**2:20 ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ’ εἰ ἀγαθοποιούντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ.**

Achtemeier (1996, 196) finds a chiasm across all of verses 19-20 (so also Michaels, 142), but it seems more likely that the chiasm

extends across verse 20 alone (a: apodosis; b: protasis; b': protasis; a': apodosis). Thus, ποῖον . . . κλέος is to be interpreted in light of τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ. As for the relationship between verses 19 and 20, verse 20 is an amplifying restatement of verse 19. Though not a part of a chiasm encompassing both verses, τοῦτο χάρις does form an inclusio that brackets the two verses as a larger segment (as both Achtemeier and Michaels affirm).

**ποῖον . . . κλέος.** The apodosis of the first conditional construction. This rhetorical question functions to “emphasize a known fact” (Larson, 259; thus NLT<sup>2</sup>: “Of course, you get no credit for . . .”).

**ποῖον.** Predicate nominative. Although this interrogative pronoun often appears attributively, it can also be used substantively. Given the chiasmic parallelism of this verse, it is better to understand ποῖον . . . κλέος as grammatically parallel to τοῦτο χάρις, with an implied form of ἔστιν standing between each pair of words (contra BDAG, 843.1.a.β). In questions, “the question word [here ποῖον] is the focus and the rest of the sentence, the presupposition” (Levinsohn, 54).

**γάρ.** Introduces a confirmatory elaboration of verse 19; this elaboration consists of the negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μή . . . δὲ) that comprises the present verse, with the positive element appearing in the conditional clause introduced by ἀλλ’ (εἰ ἀγαθοποιούντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ) and the negative element being implicit in the semantic force of the opening rhetorical question of this verse (ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε;), i.e., “you do *not* get credit if you sin and are beaten.”

**κλέος.** Nominative subject of an implied ἔστιν. The translation “credit” that appears in many English versions (so also BDAG, 547) does not quite capture the meaning of “acclaim” that this noun carries (which also fits the book’s overarching honor/shame motif). Better is Louw and Nida (87.5): “honor, fame, good reputation” (see also Josephus, *Ant.* 4.105, 6.165, 7.14). Parallel to τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ, κλέος refers to honor in God’s eyes, though it proleptically anticipates honor before others at the eschaton (1:7).

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition.

**ἀμαρτάνοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἀμαρτάνω (temporal).  
**κολαφιζόμενοι.** Pres pass ptc masc nom pl κολαφίζω (temporal). This verb refers to being struck or beaten with the hand or fist (Matt 26:67; Mark 14:65; see BDAG, 555). Although syntactically parallel with ἀμαρτάνοντες (and thus technically temporal), semantically κολαφιζόμενοι refers to a temporal event that results from ἀμαρτάνοντες: “when you do wrong and are beaten *for it*” (RSV, emphasis mine; so also ESV, NRSV, NLT<sup>2</sup>, TEV, NIV).

**ὑπομενεῖτε.** Fut act ind 2nd pl ὑπομένω. The future tense is most conveniently rendered in English with the present tense (see Michaels, 133–34, citing BDF §372.1c). Due to the rare use of εἰ with the future (BDAG, 277.1.a.α) and motivated by a desire to assimilate to the present ὑποφέρει in verse 19, it is not surprising that some manuscripts (Ⲣ<sup>72</sup> Ψ *al*) substitute a present form here (also for ὑπομενεῖτε below).

**ἄλλ’.** Marks a contrast between the negative and positive elements of the negative-positive construction in this verse (see γὰρ above).

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of another first class condition.

**ἀγαθοποιούντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἀγαθοποιέω (temporal).

**πάσχοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl πάσχω (temporal). As with κολαφιζόμενοι in the parallel participial construction above, although πάσχοντες is syntactically parallel to ἀγαθοποιούντες (and thus technically temporal), semantically it refers to a temporal event that results from ἀγαθοποιούντες.

**ὑπομενεῖτε.** See above.

**τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῷ.** The apodosis of the second conditional construction.

**τοῦτο.** Nominative subject of an implied ἐστίν. The demonstrative pronoun is anaphoric, with its referent being the preceding protasis: εἰ ἀγαθοποιούντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε. On identifying this as the subject rather than predicate, see 2:19 on τοῦτο.

**χάρις.** Predicate nominative. On the meaning of this term, see 2:19 on χάρις.

**παρὰ θεῷ.** Here, the preposition marks “a participant whose viewpoint is relevant to an event” (LN 90.20; BDAG, 757.2).

**2:21** εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ,

**εἰς τοῦτο.** Purpose. The referent of the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun encompasses all three verbs in the clause ἀγαθοποιούντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε at the end of verse 20. This threefold scope of τοῦτο cannot be truncated to just one element, contra NLT<sup>2</sup> (“God called you to do good”). The prepositional phrase is fronted as a topical frame. Since the τοῦτο is anaphoric, this topical frame represents “renewal” of this topic, which can occur when a new point is introduced (the new point here is that the recipients have been “called” to the antecedent of τοῦτο); on the renewal of frames (i.e., points of departure in Levinsohn’s terms), see Levinsohn (12–13).

**γὰρ.** Introduces a motivational grounds to endure suffering for doing good as a Christian (vv. 19–20).

**ἐκλήθητε.** Aor pass ind 2nd pl καλέω.

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause.

**καὶ Χριστός.** Fronted for emphasis.

**καί.** Adverbial additive use of καί: “also.” The postpositive appearance of καί after ὅτι clearly marks it as adverbial (see 2:5). Here καί functions to help the recipients make the connection between Jesus’ faithful suffering for doing good and that to which they are likewise called.

**Χριστός.** Nominative subject of ἔπαθεν.

**ἔπαθεν.** Aor act ind 3rd sg πάσχω. Some manuscripts (P<sup>81</sup> & Ψ<sup>al</sup>) secondarily substitute ἀπέθανεν (“died”), narrowing the more general reference to Jesus’ suffering.

**ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.** Louw and Nida 90.36 note that ὑπὲρ can be “a marker of a participant who is benefited by an event or on whose behalf an event takes place—‘for, on behalf of, for the sake of.’”

**ὑμῖν.** Dative of advantage, modifying ὑπολιμπάνων. Fronted as a topical frame, shifting attention from Jesus to the recipients, for whom Jesus’ faithful suffering has implications.

**ὑπολιμπάνων.** Pres act ptc masc nom sg ὑπολιμπάνω (purpose). Achtemeier (1996, 199) views this participle as indicating the result of Christ’s suffering. Distinguishing between purpose and result

involves deciding whether intentionality is involved or not, respectively. Peter seems to portray Jesus as suffering with an intention to leave an example for others, rather than the example being an unintended byproduct of his suffering.

**ὑπογραμμὸν.** Accusative direct object of ὑπολιμπάνων.

**ἵνα.** Introduces a clause that gives the ultimate purpose of the Jesus' suffering, while ὑπολιμπάνων gives its penultimate purpose.

**ἐπακολουθήσητε.** Aor act subj 2nd pl ἐπακολουθέω. Subjunctive with ἵνα.

**τοῖς ἴχνεσιν.** Wallace (158) regards this as a “dative of rule,” but ἐπακολουθέω is routinely followed by the dative (e.g., 1 Tim 5:10; LXX Lev 19:4; Deut 12:30; Josh 14:8), and thus it seems best to describe ἴχνεσιν as simply a dative direct object of ἐπακολουθήσητε.

**αὐτοῦ.** Genitive of reference.

**2:22** ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ,

This verse corresponds exactly to LXX Isa 53:9b except for 1 Peter's introductory ὃς and its use of ἁμαρτίαν instead of the LXX's ἀνομίαν (MT: **עַל לֹא-הָמָּם עָשָׂה וְלֹא מִרְמָה בִּפְיוֹ**).

**ὃς.** Nominative subject of ἐποίησεν. This is the first in a series of four parallel relative clauses (vv. 22, 23, 24a, 24b). Due to the difficulty of replicating this Greek structure in English, most English translations begin a new sentence with each relative clause, as in my translation above.

**ἁμαρτίαν.** Accusative direct object of ἐποίησεν. Fronted as a topical frame.

**ἐποίησεν.** Aor act ind 3rd sg ποιέω; “do, commit” (BDAG, 840.3c).

**εὐρέθη.** Aor pass ind 3rd sg εὐρίσκω.

**δόλος.** Nominative subject of εὐρέθη. BDAG (256): “taking advantage through craft and underhanded methods”; it is further glossed as “deceit, cunning, treachery.” This term is used more generally in 2:1, but here it specifically describes Jesus' response to his persecutors, namely, Jesus did not stealthily plot against those who so plotted against him.

*ἐν τῷ στόματι.* Spatial, metaphorical.  
*αὐτοῦ.* Possessive genitive.

**2:23** ὃς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδορεῖ, πάσχων οὐκ ἠπείλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως·

**ὃς.** Nominative subject of ἀντελοιδορεῖ. For simplicity, I have begun a new sentence here in my translation.

**λοιδορούμενος.** Pres pass ptc masc nom sg λοιδορέω (concessive). The translation “abused” (so NRSV) obscures the fact that this verb connotes abusive speech, not abuse in general (see its other three NT occurrences in John 9:28; Acts 23:4; and 1 Cor 4:12). Although most English translations take this participle temporally, it may be better to take it concessively since one might typically expect a person to respond to abusive speech in kind.

**ἀντελοιδορεῖ.** Impf act ind 3rd sg ἀντιλοιδορέω. The cognate relationship with λοιδορούμενος highlights that Jesus did not engage in tit-for-tat vengeance. Michaels (145–46) understands this imperfect and the others in this verse to point to “Jesus’ consistent refusal to retaliate in kind even after repeated provocations.” To bring this out in his translation, he uses “never.”

**πάσχων.** Pres act ptc masc nom sg πάσχω (concessive). On the concessive label, see above on the parallel participle λοιδορούμενος. On the meaning of πάσχω, see 2:21 on ἔπαθεν.

**ἠπείλει.** Impf act ind 3rd sg ἀπειλέω. Based on the reciprocity in the preceding parallel line, Louw and Nida (33.291) suggests translating, “when he suffered, he did not say he would make them suffer” (see also NET, NLT<sup>2</sup>). On the force of the imperfect, see above on ἀντελοιδορεῖ.

**παρεδίδου.** Impf act ind 3rd sg παραδίδωμι. The implicit direct object is variously understood as (a) Jesus’ enemies (Michaels, 147), (b) Jesus’ cause (e.g., Kelly, 121; BDAG, 762.2), or (c) Jesus’ own self (e.g., Bigg, 146). Option (c) is supported by the parallel with 4:19, where the synonymous παρατίθημι has the explicit direct object τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν. Adopting this last option, most English translations supply “himself” as the direct object (so KJV, NIV, ESV, NRSV, NET). On the imperfect tense, see above on ἀντελοιδορεῖ.

**δὲ.** Introduces the positive clause in a negative-positive con-

struction (see 1:12 on μή . . . δε). The negative part of this construction appears in the two parallel clauses that open this verse.

**τῷ κρίνοντι.** Pres act ptc masc dat sg κρίνω (substantival). Dative indirect object of παρεδίδου.

**δικαίως.** Adverb of manner.

**2:24** ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν, οὐ τῷ μάλωπι ἰάθητε.

**ὃς.** Nominative subject of ἀνήνεγκεν. For simplicity, my translation begins a new sentence here.

**τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν.** This clause has similarities with a number of verses from Isa 53: οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει (v. 4); τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει (v. 11b); and αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν (v. 12). Specific similarities with 1 Peter appear across these verses: verse 4 contains the phrase τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν with the first plural pronoun; verse 11b contains the fronted personal pronoun αὐτὸς; and verse 12 contains the identical verb form ἀνήνεγκεν (so Achtemeier 1996, 201).

**τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.** Fronted as a topical frame.

**τὰς ἁμαρτίας.** Accusative direct object of ἀνήνεγκεν.

**ἡμῶν.** Subjective genitive. Given 1 Peter’s routine use of the second plural, the introduction of a first plural form here, not seen since 1:3, is surprising. In all likelihood, it arises from the influence of Isa 53:4. This first person reference continues through the rest of the clause before reverting to the second plural in the next relative clause.

**αὐτὸς.** Intensive. Fronted for emphasis: even though the sins were ours, *he himself* bore them.

**ἀνήνεγκεν.** Aor act ind 3rd sg ἀναφέρω. This term usually has the meaning of bringing forward or offering a sacrifice (see 2:5 on ἀνεύγκαί), but that meaning does not work well here since its direct object is τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν. The same problem is present in Isa 53:11, 12. Beare (150) helpfully cites Num 14:33 in which ἀναφέρω appears with the meaning “bear the punishment of.” Moses and Aaron are to announce to those who refused to enter the promised land that their children will “bear your harlotry”

(ἀνοίσουσιν τὴν πορνείαν ὑμῶν) by wandering in the wilderness for forty years (as in Isa 53:12, ἀναφέρω translates the Hebrew נָשָׂא). Interestingly, the context of Num 14 involves the suffering of one group for the sins of others. It is this meaning that ἀναφέρω bears in Isa 53:11, 12 and 1 Pet 2:24 (as well as the closely parallel Heb 9:28).

**ἐν τῷ σώματι.** Spatial, metaphorical.

**αὐτοῦ.** Possessive genitive.

**ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον.** Spatial. TEV translates “to the cross” (so also Michaels, 147–48), but this should be read as “on the cross” against the backdrop of ἐπὶ ξύλου in Deut 21:22-23 (even though an accusative form is used here, not the genitive of the LXX; the locative meaning “upon” is available in both cases).

**ξύλον.** This term can refer to (a) a tree (Rev 2:7), (b) wood (1 Cor 3:12), or (c) objects made from wood such as clubs (Matt 26:47), stocks (Acts 16:24), or a cross (e.g., Acts 5:30; Gal 3:13) as here (so BDAG, 685.2.c). The translation “tree” (KJV, RSV, ESV, NET, NIV) might give the impression that ξύλον’s range of meaning is narrower than it is. One does better simply to translate “cross” (so NRSV, NLT<sup>2</sup>, TEV).

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause.

**ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν.** On the question of incorporation-into-Christ theology here, see Dubis (2002, 103–4).

**ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις.** Dative of reference.

**ἀπογενόμενοι.** Aor mid ptc masc nom pl ἀπογίνομαι (means). This term appears only here in the NT and LXX. The verb can mean “be away from, depart from” or “die.” Although some opt for the first meaning (e.g., NRSV; Michaels, 148–49), the latter is favored by (a) the contrast with ζήσωμεν, and (b) the dative ἀμαρτίαις, since one would expect a genitive of separation if the first meaning applied here (Osborne, 400–401; most translations). The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “spontaneous events associated with animate beings” (142–47, 269).

**τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ.** Dative of reference. The translation “for righteousness” by Michaels (148) suggests a dative of advantage (see also BDAG, 426.3.b), but the parallel with ἀμαρτίαις makes this reading unlikely. Achtemeier’s view (1996, 203) that δικαιοσύνη

is a dative of sphere is also less suitable than a simple dative of reference.

**ζήσωμεν.** Aor act subj 1st pl ζάω. Subjunctive with ἴνα.

**οὐ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε.** Some scribes bring this clause into conformity with LXX Isa 53:5b: τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν (MT: וְנִלְוֵנוּ אֶת־מִלְחָמוֹ וְהִתְקַדְּשָׁנוּ). In the UBS<sup>4</sup>/NA<sup>27</sup>, 1 Peter uses the relative pronoun οὗ instead of the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ, and a second plural form of ἰάομαι rather than the LXX's first plural form, which 1 Peter uses according to Osborne (401–3) to shift attention from all Christians earlier in verse 24 to Gentile readers (more specifically, slaves) in this clause, continuing into verse 25.

**οὗ.** Objective genitive. For simplicity, my translation begins a new sentence here.

**τῷ μώλωπι.** Dative of means. BDAG, 663: “welt, wale, bruise, wound caused by blows.” This is a metonymy for Jesus' death, not a simple reference to his scourging (so also Schreiner, 146; Elliott 2000, 536–37).

**ἰάθητε.** Aor pass ind 2nd pl ἰάομαι. The application of the image of healing here treats sin metaphorically as a disease or, more likely, as a wound, paralleling Jesus' own wounds (see BDAG, 465.2.b). The verb is placed in the final position for emphasis (see 2:8 on ἀπειθοῦντες).

**2:25 ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλὰ ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.**

**ἦτε . . . ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι.** These words echo those of Isa 53:6a: πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν (MT: וְנִלְוֵנוּ אֶת־מִלְחָמוֹ). A comparison of verse 25 and Isa 53:6a illustrates the synonymous meaning of the traditionally middle form πλανώμενοι and the θη-morphology in ἐπλανήθημεν. Rather than the first plural, 1 Peter uses a second plural form, continuing the reorientation to the second plural after verse 24a.

**ἦτε.** Impf act ind 2nd pl εἶμι.

**γὰρ.** Introduces an explanation of the last relative clause in verse 24, explaining the reason this “healing” was necessary (ἦτε . . . πλανώμενοι). The ἀλλά clause then introduces the result of the healing (ἐπεστράφητε). For the connection between healing

(ἰάομαι) and turning (ἐπιστρέφω), see Isa 6:10 (ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς), another Isaianic text that may lie behind the connection that γὰρ makes (for this background, see Michaels, 150; Schreiner, 146).

**ὡς πρόβατα.** Fronted as a comparative frame (so LDGNT).

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative clause involving ellipsis: “you were going astray as sheep (go astray).”

**πρόβατα.** Nominative subject of an implied form of πλανάω.

**πλανώμενοι.** Pres mid ptc masc nom pl πλανάω (imperfect periphrastic). A term used of animals, including sheep, straying to the point of being lost (LXX Exod 23:4; Deut 22:1). The masculine gender of this participle marks it as part of a periphrastic construction with ἦτε, with the participle’s masculine referent being the second plural subject of ἦτε. Many manuscripts (Ⲣ<sup>72</sup> C P Ψ 33 Ⲙ) substitute the neuter πλανώμενα, making it an adjectival participle that modifies the immediately preceding πρόβατα. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “translational motion,” that is, motion that involves movement through space from one place to another (69–70, 269).

**ἀλλὰ.** Introduces a contrast with the preceding clause.

**ἐπεστράφητε.** Aor mid ind 2nd pl ἐπιστρέφω. On the pairing of this verb with πλανάω, see especially LXX Ezek 34:4, 16 (a chapter that, along with Isa 53, serves as background here). This verb is best taken not simply as “turned” (so NLT<sup>2</sup>) but as “returned” (so RSV, ESV, NIV). This is an example of a θη- verb form that, though often taken as a deponent passive (so BDAG, 382.4.b), is better read as middle, corresponding to Kemmer’s semantic class of “translational motion” (69–70, 269) like πλανώμενοι above. For other examples of middle θη- forms of ἐπιστρέφω, see Mark 5:30; 8:33; and John 21:20. Some manuscripts (C 1739 *al*), misunderstanding the middle voice of the verb, substitute an active form here. Alternatively, numerous commentators understand this verb to be a true passive (so TEV’s “you have been brought back”). The problem with this interpretation is that the θη- forms of this verb routinely have a middle meaning. Indeed, of the five occurrences of its θη- forms in the NT and its fifty occurrences in the LXX, I do not

find one clear example of a true passive form. As a result, although numerous commentators argue for a passive interpretation here (so Achtemeier 1996, 204; Elliott 2000, 538–39; Bertram, 728), it is not supported by lexical usage elsewhere in the Greek Bible (correcting Dubis 2002, 57).

**νῦν.** Temporal adverb, highlighting the contrast between the recipients' former and present circumstances.

**ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.** Goal (so BDAG, 364.4.b.e; see also LN 84.17). Note that the object τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον is an example of Granville Sharp's rule (see 1:3 on ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ), which tells us (if it were not already obvious) that ποιμένα and ἐπίσκοπον refer to the same person. The doublet (see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον), ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον, emphasizes the redemptive protection that Christ offers.

**τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.** On the meaning, see 1:9 on ψυχῶν. To avoid the dualistic connotations of the rendering “of your souls” (so most English translations), I translate “of your lives” (following Elliott 2000, 538).

**τῶν ψυχῶν.** Objective genitive with respect to both ποιμένα and ἐπίσκοπον (contra Michaels, 152, who relates this genitive only to ἐπίσκοπον, an interpretation made unlikely by the doublet character of ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον).

**ὑμῶν.** Possessive genitive.

### 1 Peter 3:1-7

<sup>1</sup>Correspondingly, wives, submit to your own husbands in order that, even if some disobey the word, they might be gained without a word through the conduct of their wives <sup>2</sup>because they have observed your pure, reverent conduct. <sup>3</sup>Let not the external adornment that consists in braiding hair and wearing gold jewelry or putting on clothes be what beautifies you, <sup>4</sup>but let the unseen person of the heart, that is, the unfading trait of a humble and quiet spirit—which is of great worth in the sight of God—be what beautifies you. <sup>5</sup>For this is how the holy women who hoped in God in the past also beautified themselves, namely, by submitting to their own husbands, <sup>6</sup>as Sarah obeyed Abraham and called him “lord,”

whose children you have become if you do good and are not at all afraid of anything that might frighten you.

<sup>7</sup>Correspondingly, husbands, live considerately with your wives as weaker vessels, giving honor to them as those who are also coheirs of the gift of life, in order that your prayers might not be hampered.

**3:1 Ὁμοίως [αἱ] γυναῖκες, ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα καὶ εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθῆσονται,**

**Ὁμοίως.** Despite the parallel exhortation to slaves in 2:18, this adverb is unlikely to modify the following ὑποτασσόμεναι with the meaning “as servants should submit to their masters, wives should likewise submit to their husbands” (contra Elliott 2000, 553), since this same pattern of submission does not apply to the next unit that ὁμοίως introduces (the exhortations to husbands in 3:7). Rather, ὁμοίως seems to function in a looser transitional sense, i.e., “in the same way that slaves have God-given responsibilities with respect to their masters (and, as 3:7 elucidates, husbands have God-given responsibilities to their wives), wives too have their own responsibilities.” The usual translations (“likewise,” “in the same way”) are subject to misunderstanding, especially in 3:7 and 5:5. More appropriate is “correspondingly,” which suggests not that the responsibilities are identical, but that they are nevertheless associated in some way (Michaels, 157, appropriately describes ὁμοίως as having a “reciprocal” function in 3:7 and 5:5).

**[αἱ] γυναῖκες.** This vocative serves to shift from the exhortations for slaves to those for wives. On the nominative-for-vocative and its function here, see 2:18 on Οἱ οἰκέται. If the article is not original, then this is a true vocative. Against the originality of the article, see Michaels (154); in its favor, see Metzger (620). The other uses of the nominative-for-vocative in 2:18 and 3:7 are articular. On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστὶν].

**ὑποτασσόμεναι.** Pres mid ptc fem nom pl ὑποτάσσω (imperative). On the class of the middle voice, see verse 13 on Ὑποτάγητε. Like the use of ὑποτασσόμενοι in 2:18, Achtemeier (1996, 209) reads this participle as a participle of means, modifying the commands in

2:17. The distance of the participle from 2:17 (or 2:13, if one follows Boyer), however, makes it more likely that this is an independent imperatival participle (Michaels, 157; Elliott 2000, 554; Schreiner, 148). For further discussion on imperatival participles, see 2:18 on ὑποτασσόμενοι and 1:14 on συσχηματιζόμενοι.

**τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν.** Dative complement of ὑποτασσόμενοι.

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause.

**καὶ εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ.** Fronted as a conditional frame.

**καὶ.** The ascensive adverb modifies the conditional clause: “even if . . .” (rightly ESV, NRSV, NET, NLT<sup>2</sup>).

**εἴ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition, assumed to be true for the sake of argument.

**τινες.** Nominative subject of ἀπειθοῦσιν.

**ἀπειθοῦσιν.** Pres act ind 3rd pl ἀπειθέω.

**τῷ λόγῳ.** Dative direct object of ἀπειθοῦσιν. The “word” that is in view here is the gospel message (so NLT<sup>2</sup>: “the Good News”).

**διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς.** Means. Fronted as emphatic; this is the key element of the purpose clause, which is further developed in the following verses.

**τῶν γυναικῶν.** Subjective genitive.

**ἄνευ λόγου.** Negative means, supporting διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς by way of contrast (see BDAG, 78). On the fronting of this third supportive constituent, see 1:17 on τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον.

**κερδηθήσονται.** Fut pass ind 3rd pl κερδαίνω. On the use of κερδαίνω in the sense of winning someone over to a certain point of view (here conversion to the Christian faith), see Matt 18:15; 1 Cor 9:19-22; Daube. The implicit agents are the wives (winning each one’s respective husband). Although the subjunctive mood is expected following ἵνα, the future indicative functions as an equivalent in such purpose clauses (see Wallace, 571; BDF §369.2; BDAG, 475).

**3:2 ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν.**

**ἐποπτεύσαντες.** Aor act ptc masc nom pl ἐποπτεύω (causal). Most English translations render this temporally (“when,” so RSV,

ESV, NET, NIV), which would be appropriate if the participle were present tense (so  $\text{ᾠ}^{72}$   $\text{ἄ}$  *al*; perhaps harmonizing with the present  $\text{ἐποπτεύοντες}$  in 2:12; so Elliott 2000, 558), since this would mark the “observing” as contemporaneous with  $\text{κερδηθήσονται}$  in verse 1. However, the aorist participle  $\text{ἐποπτεύσαντες}$  ( $\text{ἄ}$  A B C P  $\Psi$   $\text{ᾠ}$ ) identifies the “observing” as antecedent action, suiting a causal interpretation (see Selwyn, 183). Michaels (158) notes the antecedent action but still translates temporally, “once they have observed.” Nevertheless, the causal relation seems quite strong in context; so rightly TEV’s “because.”

$\text{τήν} . . . \text{ἀγνήν ἀναστροφὴν}$ . Accusative direct object of  $\text{ἐποπτεύσαντες}$ .

$\text{ἀγνήν}$ . Although this adjective might mean “chaste” in light of the following context (so KJV, ASV; see 2 Cor 11:2), it likely has a more general meaning of “holy” (e.g., 1 John 3:3; so Achtemeier 1996, 210; contra Michaels, 158). Note the use of the cognate verb in a general sense in 1:22, which Michaels himself notes.

$\text{ἐν φόβῳ}$ . Manner, modifying  $\text{ἀναστροφὴν}$ . The implicit object of the “fearing” is not the unbelieving husbands (contra BDAG, 1062.2.b.β) but God, as most commentators affirm. On this point, see 2:18 on  $\text{ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ}$ . Most translations bring out this Godward orientation by rendering this phrase as “reverent” (contrast ESV’s “respectful”).

$\text{ὑμῶν}$ . Subjective genitive.

**3:3 ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἕξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος**

$\text{ὧν}$ . This genitive relative pronoun introduces the syntactically difficult verses 3-4, and the difficulty of these verses hinges on how to interpret  $\text{ὧν}$  itself. Achtemeier (1996, 213, n. 11) apparently reads this relative pronoun as a predicate of  $\text{ἔστω}$ , the subject of which is  $\text{ὁ ἕξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος}$ , with the genitive case of the relative pronoun being possessive (similarly Elliott 2000, 561; RSV). This would yield the sense “Let not external adornment . . . be yours, but let the unseen person of the heart . . . be yours.” This understanding becomes difficult to carry through in verse 4 (does not everyone

have an unseen/inner person?). More likely, the predicate is not ὧν but rather an implied repetition of κόσμος, which ὧν modifies as an objective genitive. Verse 4 parallels this same construction, with ὧν ἔστω and the predicate κόσμος from verse 3 once again implied. The Greek text of verses 3-4, with implied elements supplied, would thus be ὧν ἔστω (κόσμος) οὐχ ὁ ἕξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος ἀλλ' (ὧν ἔστω κόσμος) ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος. This yields the translation, "Let not the external adornment that consists in hairstyles, jewelry and clothes be that which beautifies you (lit., 'your adornment'), but let the unseen person of the heart be that which beautifies you." Goppelt (221) also understands a repetition of κόσμος to be implicit, as does the KJV and ASV.

**ἔστω.** Pres act impv 3rd sg εἰμί. It is rare to find an imperative in a relative clause, but 1 Peter manifests a penchant for this construction (see 5:9, 12; Heb 13:7; 2 Tim 4:15; Robertson, 949).

**οὐκ . . . ἀλλὰ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μή . . . δὲ) in which the negated clause in verse 3 serves to emphasize the positive clause introduced by ἀλλὰ in verse 4.

**ὁ ἕξωθεν . . . κόσμος.** Nominative subject of ἔστω.

**ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων.**

In these three genitival phrases, the first genitive in each phrase (ἐμπλοκῆς, περιθέσεως, and ἐνδύσεως) is expegetical (further explicating κόσμος), and the second (τριχῶν, χρυσίων, and ἱματίων) is objective. Note that these three genitive phrases are adjectival, modifying κόσμος; they do not function (nor does ἕξωθεν) as the predicate as some translations suggest (ESV, NET; although these translations may well arise from the difficulty of rendering this construction in English rather than a misunderstanding of the syntax; see also KJV, ASV).

**ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων.** Some English translations add an adjective such as "fine" (RSV, NRSV, NET, NIV) or "beautiful" (NLT<sup>2</sup>). The lack of an adjective in the Greek suggests that the command regarding hairstyles, jewelry, and clothing is not absolute, but one of emphasis, stressing the importance of inner adornment while

not completely prohibiting external adornment (so Achtemeier 1996, 212–13).

**3:4 ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφάρτῳ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελής.**

**ὁ κρυπτός . . . ἄνθρωπος.** Subject of an implicit ἔστω. The phrase ὢν κόσμος is also implied (see 3:3 on ὢν).

**τῆς καρδίας.** Exegetical genitive, interpreting the vague κρυπτός . . . ἄνθρωπος (so Selwyn, 184). Although Wallace (124–25) views this as a possible example of a metaphorical genitive of place, it is more likely that the “hidden person” is being equated with the “heart” than being said to have its location there.

**ἐν τῷ ἀφάρτῳ.** Here, the preposition is a “marker of specification or substance” (BDAG, 330.12; so also TEV, NET, NIV; Selwyn, 184; Winer, 483; contra those who take it as expressing association, e.g., Achtemeier 1996, 213; Bigg, 152; ESV, NRSV). In other words, this phrase specifies the particular qualities in mind with regard to the κρυπτός . . . ἄνθρωπος. This phrase thus parallels the exegetical genitives in verse 3. Although Elliott (2000, 565) understands ἀφάρτῳ as a masculine adjective modifying an implied κόσμος, it should probably be read as a neuter substantival adjective, “the incorruptible thing,” which the following genitival phrase further defines. The adjective thus sets up a contrast with the external beauty of the preceding verse, which fades with time.

**τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος.** Exegetical genitive.

**πνεύματος.** Here, “disposition” (BDAG, 833.3.c; Selwyn, 184).

**ὃ.** Nominative subject of ἐστὶν. As for its antecedent, the options are (a) the neuter ἀφάρτῳ, (b) the neuter πνεύματος, (c) all of the immediately preceding words in verse 4 (on this use of the neuter relative pronoun, see 2:8 on εἰς ὃ). Most recent commentators favor (c), as does Achtemeier (1996, 214). Proximity, however, favors πνεύματος, which in any case sums up the preceding context since it stands at the end of a series of exegetical constructions (πνεύματος defines ἀφάρτῳ, which in turn defines κρυπτός . . . ἄνθρωπος).

**ἐστὶν.** Pres act ind 3rd sg εἰμί.

**ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.** The preposition marks “a participant whose viewpoint is relevant to an event” (LN 90.20).

**πολυτελής.** Predicate adjective.

**3:5 οὕτως γάρ ποτε καὶ αἱ ἅγιοι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμου ἐαυτὰς ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν,**

**οὕτως.** Adverb fronted as a comparative frame (so LDGNT). This adverb could be (a) anaphoric, pointing backward to the way in which verses 3-4 exhort wives to beautify themselves (RSV; Kelly, 130–31), or (b) cataphoric, pointing forward to the participial phrase ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν (ESV, TEV; Arichea and Nida, 92). The cataphoric use of οὕτως in 2:15 (the one other use of οὕτως in 1 Peter) argues in favor of a cataphoric use here as well, as does the smoother integration of the participial phrase into the context if οὕτως is taken as cataphoric.

**γάρ.** This conjunction introduces, by way of illustrative reference to OT matriarchs, a motivational ground for the exhortations in verse 1-4.

**ποτε.** Temporal adverb. Fronted as a temporal frame (Levinsohn, 104).

**καὶ αἱ ἅγιοι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν.** Fronted for emphasis (Levinsohn, 104).

**καὶ.** Adverbial additive use of καὶ: “also.” The postpositive appearance of καὶ clearly marks it as adverbial (see 2:5 on καὶ). Here καὶ helps the recipients to make the connection between the way holy women in the past beautified (ἐκόσμου) themselves and the adornment (κόσμος, vv. 3-4) that the recipients should seek. On the use of καὶ for thematic addition, see 1:15.

**αἱ ἅγιοι γυναῖκες.** Nominative subject of ἐκόσμου.

**ἐλπίζουσαι.** Pres act ptc fem nom pl ἐλπίζω (attributive). The time of the present participle is contemporaneous with the imperfect main verb ἐκόσμου. Michaels (163) is correct that “hope and faith are virtually synonymous in this epistle.”

**εἰς θεὸν.** The noun θεὸν is the conceptual object of ἐλπίζουσαι.

**ἐκόσμου.** Impf act ind 3rd pl κοσμέω. Many English translations interpret the imperfect here as customary (“used to adorn”; so RSV, ESV, NRSV; similarly NIV, TEV).

**ἐαυτάς.** Accusative direct object of ἐκόσμων. Reflexive pronoun.

**ὑποτασσόμεναι.** Pres mid ptc fem nom pl ὑποτάσσω (means; so ESV, NRSV, NET, and TEV; Achtemeier 1996, 215; contra Wallace, 639, who labels result). On the classification of this middle form, see 2:13 on Ὑποτάγητε.

**τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν.** Dative complement of ὑποτασσόμεναι.

**3:6 ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα, ἥς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιῶσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν.**

**ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα.** Although recent secondary literature has debated alternative OT backgrounds here (Kiley; Martin 1999; Sly; Spencer), most commentators rightly look to Gen 18:12, the only biblical text in which Sarah explicitly calls Abraham κύριος.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative clause that identifies a specific example of verse 5's broader category of ἄγναι γυναῖκες (BDAG, 1104.2.d.α; NLT<sup>2</sup>: “for instance”).

**Σάρρα.** Nominative subject of ὑπήκουσεν. Fronted as a topical frame.

**ὑπήκουσεν.** Aor act ind 3rd sg ὑπακούω.

**τῷ Ἀβραάμ.** Dative direct object of ὑπήκουσεν. Although ὑπακούω often takes a genitive direct object (so usually in the LXX and papyri), it can also take a dative (BDAG, 1028.1).

**κύριον.** Accusative complement in an object-complement double accusative construction. Fronted for emphasis. This term can be used by a son (Matt 21:30) or daughter (LXX Gen 31:35) addressing a father or, more generally, as a term of respect (i.e., “sir” in Matt 25:11; John 12:21; see BDAG, 577). Various translations as “lord” (RSV, ESV, NRSV, NET) or “master” (NIV, NLT<sup>2</sup>, TEV).

**αὐτὸν.** Accusative direct object of καλοῦσα. As for deciding whether αὐτὸν or κύριον is the direct object, pronouns win over anarthrous nouns (although the reverse would hardly make sense here; see also 1:17 on τὸν . . . κρίνοντα). On the fronting of the pronoun, see 1:21 on αὐτῷ.

**καλοῦσα.** Pres act ptc fem nom sg καλέω (attendant circumstance). Michaels (154, 164) takes the participle as temporal, and Achtemeier (1996, 215) takes it as instrumental. It is best, however, to take καλοῦσα as coordinate with the main verb (so NIV, NRSV, TEV, NLT<sup>2</sup>), with ὑπήκουσεν reflecting Sarah’s behavior in the broader Abrahamic narrative (Gen 12:5, 11-12; 13:1; 18:6) and καλοῦσα reflecting the specific words of Gen 18:12.

**ἧς.** Genitive of relationship, modifying the familial term τέκνα.

**ἐγενήθητε.** Aor mid ind 2nd pl γίνομαι. On the middle voice, see 1:15 on γενήθητε and 2:7 on ἐγενήθη. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “spontaneous events associated with animate beings” (142–47, 269). Some translations bring out the past reference of the aorist by supplying “now” (e.g., “you are now her children,” RSV; so also ASV, TEV). The aorist suggests that the addressees are already Sarah’s children, pointing to their conversion (rightly Elliott 2000, 573), when the recipients took on the identity of “Israel” (contra Beare, 156, who suggests this may be a gnomic aorist).

**τέκνα.** Predicate nominative. Though numerous translations render this “daughters” (NRSV, NLT<sup>2</sup>, NIV, TEV), this is the more generic term “children” (rightly Michaels, 166).

**ἀγαθοποιῶσαι . . . μὴ φοβούμεναι.** Most translations take these participles as conditional (so RSV, TEV, NIV; Kelly, 131). A temporal understanding (so NLT<sup>2</sup>: “You are her daughters when you do what is right without fear”; similarly NET; Achtemeier 1996, 205) runs against the once-for-all nature of the metaphor “becoming children.” Although Beare (156–57) ties these participles not to ἐγενήθητε but to ἐκόσμουν in verse 5, with ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα, ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα treated as parenthetical, this is an unlikely reading since it results in an overloading of ἐκόσμουν with modifying participles (ὑποτασσόμεναι, ἀγαθοποιῶσαι, and φοβούμεναι) and, moreover, this reading finds a parenthesis where there are no clear textual indicators of one. Forbes argues against the conditional view and favors taking the participles as result, which fails to sufficiently account for the exhortational tone of the context (Forbes, 108, goes on to argue that the participles carry an additional imperatival force). The hortatory

tone likewise undercuts labeling the participles as means (contra Bigg, 153–54). Michaels (166–67) takes them as purely imperatival, which would have more likelihood if the main verb ἐγενήθητε were an imperative. All in all, the majority opinion, which takes these participles as conditional, is best, exhorting the recipients to Christian endurance as a manifestation of the reality of their salvation (for further defense of this position, see especially Schreiner, 157–58).

**ἀγαθοποιῶσαι.** Pres act ptc fem nom pl ἀγαθοποιέω (conditional; see above).

**καί.** This conjunction binds φοβούμεναι closely to ἀγαθοποιῶσαι, validating a translation such as the NET: “you do what is good and have no fear *in doing so*” (emphasis added; so NLT<sup>2</sup>). On this function of καί, see 1:17 on καί.

**μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν.** Proverbs 3:25 is the only verse in the LXX where φοβέω and πτόησις appear alongside one another (LXX: οὐ φοβηθήσῃ πτόησιν; MT: לֹא יִפְּחַדּוּ אֶת־לֵבָבָא). Thus this text is the likely background, especially when 1 Peter uses this same chapter of Proverbs elsewhere (5:5 cites Prov 3:34).

**μὴ . . . μηδεμίαν.** Some minuscules omit μὴ since μηδεμίαν already bears a negative meaning by itself, but μηδεὶς sometimes appears with another negative in an emphatic sense as here: “no fear at all” (see BDAG, 647.1).

**φοβούμεναι.** Pres mid ptc fem nom pl φοβέω (conditional; see above). The middle voice fits Kemmer’s semantic class of “emotion middle” (130–32, 269). Unlike here, this verb and its cognate noun in 1 Peter usually connote a healthy and proper fear or reverence (1:17; 2:17, 18; 3:2, 16; but see 3:14).

**μηδεμίαν πτόησιν.** Accusative direct object of φοβούμεναι. The meaning of πτόησιν is debated. Πτόησις can refer to fear (a) objectively, i.e., something frightening that is external to oneself, or (b) subjectively, i.e., fear that arises within oneself. BDAG (895) opts for the latter, but the parallel line in the Prov 3:25 background favors the former. Thus, this is not a cognate accusative (contra Selwyn, 185; with Goppelt, 225).

**3:7 Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως, συνοικοῦντες κατὰ γνώσιν ὡς ἀσθενεστέρω σκευεῖ τῷ γυναικείῳ, ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ συγκληρονόμοις χάριτος ζωῆς εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν.**

**Οἱ ἄνδρες.** Nominative for vocative (see also 2:18 on Οἱ οἰκέται).

**ὁμοίως.** Relating ὁμοίως all the way back to the command to “honor all” in 2:17 is unlikely (contra Bigg, 154). For a more likely explanation, see 3:1 on Ὁμοίως. Although adopting a different interpretation for ὁμοίως in 3:1, Elliott (2000, 574) here rightly translates it “in turn.”

**συνοικοῦντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl συνοικέω (imperative). Paralleling the use of imperative participles to open the exhortations to slaves (2:18) and wives (3:1), an imperative participle also opens this exhortation to husbands. Most commentators and grammarians understand this participle imperatively (e.g., Michaels, 167; Wallace, 651; BDF §468.2). Furthermore, English translations are virtually unanimous in using an imperative rendering here. Resisting an imperative interpretation of the participle, Achtemeier (1996, 217) takes it as means, modifying the series of imperatives in 2:17, as he also understands the participles in 2:18 and 3:1 (but 2:17 is now growing quite remote). On the debate regarding imperative participles in 1 Peter, see 1:14 on συσχηματιζόμενοι. The verb συνοικέω appears only here in the NT. In the majority of the fourteen occurrences in the LXX, the term refers to a husband living with his wife, bringing with it associations of the prerogatives of marriage (note that συνοικέω sometimes translates the Hebrew לַיְיָ ( “to marry”; see Deut 24:1; Isa 62:5).

**κατὰ γνώσιν.** Standard. Literally, “according to knowledge” (KJV, ASV). The semantic object of this knowledge is unclear. One option is that this is knowledge of God and his will (one minuscule manuscript, 1175, makes this understanding explicit by adding θεοῦ after γνώσιν). Achtemeier (1996, 218), who sees this phrase as parallel to ἐν φόβῳ in 3:2 and διὰ συνειδησιν θεοῦ in 2:19, takes a similar approach, arguing that it refers to “the man’s knowledge of what God requires of him.” The context, however, suggests that the specific knowledge that is in view is that contained in the two

ώς constructions: husbands should be aware of both their wives' weakness and their status as coheirs, and treat them accordingly (so Selwyn, 186; most translations, e.g., NLT<sup>2</sup>: "treat your wife with understanding"; RSV: "considerately").

**ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ.** Many translations (KJV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV; so also Bigg, 154; Kelly, 132) construe these words with the following ἀπονέμοντες rather than the preceding συνοικοῦντες. The punctuation of UBS<sup>4</sup>/NA<sup>27</sup>, however, is preferred in order to maintain the parallelism between the two ὡς constructions, ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει and ὡς καὶ συγκληρονόμοις χάριτος ζωῆς, each modifying its own respective participle. Furthermore, if γυναικείῳ is taken as the indirect object of ἀπονέμοντες, this leaves συνοικοῦντες without a direct object.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce the role/capacity of wives.

**ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει.** This dative phrase is the second component in a ὡς construction involving the dative τῷ γυναικείῳ.

**ἀσθενεστέρῳ.** Comparative, as is indicated by the -τέρ suffix. This adjective is usually understood to refer to weakness in physical strength (see LXX Num 13:18; Judg 16:13; so Michaels, 169; Achtemeier 1996, 217; BDAG, 142; see also TEV: "they are more delicate than you").

**σκεύει.** Although applied to women here, σκεῦος is used of men elsewhere in the NT (e.g., Paul in Acts 9:15). Since the adjective ἀσθενεστέρῳ is comparative, this adjective implies that both men and women are "vessels." Thus σκεῦος does not mean "wife" here as it does in the rabbinic literature (so Bigg, 155). Michaels (169) understands it simply as an (embodied) person. Similarly, Achtemeier (1996, 217) understands the metaphor to refer to human beings as creatures (with an implication of accountability before God).

**τῷ γυναικείῳ.** Dative direct object of συνοικοῦντες. The adjective γυναικείος means "pertaining to being a woman" (LN 9.36). Elliott (2000, 576) treats this as appositional to σκεύει ("a weaker vessel, the feminine one"), but, apart from its awkwardness, this requires postulating an implicit object of συνοικοῦντες. It is much better to understand γυναικείῳ itself as the substantival object of

συνοικοῦντες (“woman/wife”). Rather than referring to wives, Achtemeier (1996, 217) understands γυναικεῖω to refer to women in general (likewise, he understands ἄνδρες above to refer to men in general). Against this view, however, is (1) the reciprocal nature of these exhortations, so that an exhortation to husbands (not men in general) naturally follows the preceding unit’s exhortations to wives, and (2) the use of συνοικέω, which in biblical literature usually refers to marital relations.

**ἀπονέμοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἀπονέμω (imperative). An implicit repetition of the preceding τῷ γυναικεῖω (now pluralized) serves as the dative indirect object of this participle. This participle, following συνοικοῦντες, is frequently also taken as imperatival (e.g., Michaels, 167). Achtemeier (1996, 218), who rejects an imperatival interpretation of συνοικοῦντες, takes the participle as “circumstantial.” Although Elliott (2000, 575) reads συνοικοῦντες as imperatival, he understands ἀπονέμοντες as a participle of manner (which he, 578–79, supports by noting that there is no conjoining καί that coordinates ἀπονέμοντες with συνοικοῦντες). Nevertheless, the parallel structure between the ὡς constructions associated with each participle argues that these participles are indeed coordinate and that ἀπονέμοντες, like συνοικοῦντες, is also imperatival.

**τιμῆν.** Accusative direct object of ἀπονέμοντες.

**ὡς.** On its use, see ὡς above.

**καί.** Adverbial additive use of καί: “also.” The appearance of καί after ὡς clearly marks it as adverbial, as does the fact that it does not coordinate constituents of equal rank (see 2:5). Here καί connects the wives’ identity as “weaker vessels” with their identity as “fellow heirs” (so also Michaels, 168). On this use of καί for thematic addition, see 1:15 on καί.

**συγκληρονόμοις.** This dative is the second component in a ὡς construction involving an implied repetition of γυναικεῖω (now pluralized), which serves as the dative indirect object of ἀπονέμοντες. Συγκληρονόμοις is a substantival two-termination adjective (thus having identical masculine and feminine forms). This gender ambiguity explains how a key variant συγκληρονόμοι (A C P Ψ ℞), omitting the final sigma of the original can apply

this term to husbands, not wives. Contra the RSV, which adopts this variant (“since you are joint heirs”), this reading is probably secondary, arising in part from the confusing shift to a plural form from the singular γυναικείω (so Michaels, 155; Metzger, 621–22). Given its relation to the feminine γυναικείω, συγκληρονόμοις is clearly feminine.

**χάριτος.** Objective genitive. Rather than the heavily theological “grace,” this term simply means “gift” here (so NRSV, NIV, TEV; see also BDAG, 1080.3.b).

**ζωῆς.** Epexegetical genitive. Since in 1:4 the language of inheritance (κληρονομία) describes something that is future, this life that is the inheritance of coheirs (συγκληρονόμος) is likely also viewed as future eschatological life (rightly TEV: “they also will receive . . . God’s gift of life”; contrast NLT<sup>2</sup>, which seems to understand ζωῆς with reference to the present life of salvation: “she is your equal partner in God’s gift of new life”).

**ἐγκόπτεσθαι.** Pres pass inf ἐγκόπτω. “Hinder, thwart” (BDAG, 274). Used with εἰς τὸ to denote purpose (not result; contra Wallace, 594, since the husbands are exhorted to act with the intention of avoiding any hindrance to their prayers). This infinitive modifies both συνοικοῦντες and ἀπονέμοντες.

**τὰς προσευχάς.** Accusative subject of ἐγκόπτεσθαι.

**ὑμῶν.** Subjective genitive. The antecedent can be either (1) husbands (Bigg, 158; Achtemeier 1996, 218), or (2) husbands and wives (Beare, 158; Michaels, 171). In favor of (2) is the mutuality of the language of “coheirs” (Elliott 2000, 580), and that a couples’ common prayer life would be a natural concern for Christian husbands (see 1 Cor 7:5), and that, on this view, the source of the hindrance of prayers is readily discernible since strained marital relations would discourage couples from coming together in prayer. Decisive in favor of (1), however, is that the exhortations of this verse are addressed directly to husbands and the text gives no clear indication that the referent has shifted away from husbands alone.

### 1 Peter 3:8-12

<sup>8</sup>Now finally, all of you, be united in spirit, compassionate, loving toward fellow believers, tenderhearted, humble. <sup>9</sup>Do not repay

evil with evil or reviling with reviling, but rather bless because you were called to this in order that you might inherit a blessing.<sup>10</sup> For the one who wants to enjoy life and see good days must keep his tongue from evil and his lips from speaking deceit.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, he must turn away from evil and do good; he must strive for peace and pursue it,<sup>12</sup> since the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous and his ears are receptive to their pleas, but the face of the Lord is against those who commit evil acts.

**3:8 Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχοι, ταπεινόφρονες,**

**Τὸ . . . τέλος.** Adverbial accusative. An idiom (literally, “the end”) that serves as “a marker of a conclusion to what has preceded, but not necessarily the conclusion of a text” (LN 61.17, which further glosses τέλος as “finally, in conclusion”). Along these lines, Achtemeier (1996, 222) understands the phrase to mark verses 8-12 as the last in the series of exhortations extending over 2:13–3:12.

**δέ.** Introduces the next step in the argument, shifting from the preceding exhortations to specific groups to a general exhortation to all the recipients. On the use of δέ as a marker of development, see 1:7.

**πάντες.** Vocative (see the use of πάντες with an imperative in 5:5b).

**ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχοι, ταπεινόφρονες.** These words are normally understood in an imperatival sense. Michaels (176) describes the adjectives themselves as functioning imperatively, but it is best to understand an implicit imperatival verb of being to be present (so BDF §98), with the adjectives all serving as predicates. Perhaps we should understand the imperative ἔστε here (rather than γίνεσθε or the imperatival future ἔσεσθε) since, in light of the fact that ἔστε appears nowhere in the NT or in the LXX, the omission of ἔστε might be idiomatic (see Moulton, 1:180). Also possible, though less likely, is an implicit imperatival participial ὄντες (so Selwyn, 188). Achtemeier (1996, 220) understands an implicit participle ὄντες to be present, but he rejects an imperatival meaning, choosing instead to view these adjectives and the participles in the next verse as being dependent

upon the imperatives in 2:17 instrumentally (“by”). He has convinced few others of this, with the great majority of commentators adopting an imperatival understanding as here.

**3:9 μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας, τοῦναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε.**

**μὴ . . . δὲ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μὴ . . . δὲ) in which the negated participial phrase, headed by ἀποδιδόντες, serves to emphasize the positive participial phrase, headed by εὐλογοῦντες, which is introduced by δὲ.

**ἀποδιδόντες . . . εὐλογοῦντες.** For Achtemeier’s rejection of an imperatival sense, see 3:8 on ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχοί, ταπεινόφρονες. Most recent commentators rightly take these two participles as independently imperatival (so, e.g., Elliott 2000, 606), especially in light of the imperatival force of verse 8. On the debate regarding imperatival participles in 1 Peter, see 1:14 on συσχηματιζόμενοι.

**ἀποδιδόντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἀποδίδωμι (imperatival).

**κακὸν.** Accusative direct object of ἀποδιδόντες. BDAG (501) notes that this term can refer to (1) acts that stem from evil motives, (2) acts that cause evil or harm, or (3) a combination of the first two meanings, which is the case here.

**ἀντὶ κακοῦ.** Exchange.

**λοιδορίαν.** Accusative direct object of an implied ἀποδιδόντες. BDAG (602) glosses this term as “speech that is highly insulting, abuse, reproach, reviling.”

**ἀντὶ λοιδορίας.** Exchange.

**τοῦναντίον.** This merging (or “crasis”) of the definite article and the adverb ἐναντίον (BDAG, 330.2) serves adverbially as “a marker of an alternative serving as an emphatic contrast,” meaning, “on the contrary, rather, instead” (LN 89.134).

**δὲ.** Introduces the next step in the argument, turning the discussion from retaliatory responses to a response of blessing others. On the use of δέ as a marker of development, see 1:7.

**εὐλογοῦντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl εὐλογέω (imperative). Here “bless” means “to ask God to show his favor and grace upon those who have conferred injury upon them” (Schreiner, 164–65).

**ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε.** The τοῦτο and subsequent ἵνα can be read in two ways: (1) τοῦτο is anaphoric (as in 2:21), pointing backward to εὐλογοῦντες, with ἵνα functioning to introduce a purpose clause, yielding the sense “because you have been called to bless others in order that you might inherit a blessing” (so Michaels, 178; Achtemeier 1996, 224; NLT<sup>2</sup>); or (2) τοῦτο is cataphoric (as in 4:6), pointing forward to the ἵνα clause, which functions exegetically to define τοῦτο, yielding the sense “because this is what you have been called to, namely, inheriting a blessing” (so Bigg, 156; Kelly, 137; Goppelt, 234; NRSV). Option (1), the anaphoric reading, is most likely given the following scriptural citation, which describes the prospect of experiencing “good days” (v. 10) and God’s favor (v. 12) as a grounds for its call to good behavior toward others. This reading also conforms to 2:21 earlier, where the clause εἰς τοῦτο . . . ἐκλήθητε also appears with a similar anaphoric reference that relates to one’s response to unjust suffering.

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause that functions as a motivational ground for the imperative εὐλογοῦντες. Some manuscripts (P 31) add an expansionistic εἰδότες beforehand, transforming ὅτι into a marker of a clausal complement (perhaps under the influence of 1:18).

**εἰς τοῦτο.** Goal. Although the anaphoric τοῦτο (see above) could refer to all that precedes in verses 8-9, given the lexical correspondence between εὐλογίαν and εὐλογοῦντες, as noted above, the antecedent of τοῦτο is most likely εὐλογοῦντες alone. Fronted as a frame, renewing and thereby maintaining attention on the topic of “blessing” in order to make an additional point about it (on “renewal” of a frame, see 2:21 on εἰς τοῦτο).

**ἐκλήθητε.** Aor pass ind 2nd pl καλέω.

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause.

**εὐλογίαν.** Accusative direct object of κληρονομήσητε. Fronted as a topical frame.

**κληρονομήσητε.** Aor act subj 2nd pl κληρονομέω. Subjunctive with ἵνα.

**3:10** ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χεῖλη τοῦ μὴ λαλήσαι δόλον,

ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς. This whole participial construction, headed by ὁ . . . θέλων, functions as the subject of παυσάτω, and is fronted as a topical frame. These words form the opening of a scriptural citation, which runs from here through the end of verse 12 and comes from LXX Ps 33:13-17 (ET 34:12-16), which mostly follows the MT (34:13-17). This portion of the citation appears in the LXX as follows: τίς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθὰς (Ps 33:13; ET 34:12). The Hebrew MT (בַּיּוֹם יִשְׂמַח בְּחַיֵּי חַיָּוִת וְיִשְׂמַח בְּחַיֵּי חַיָּוִת) uses the adjective “good” differently: “Who is the man who delights in life, who loves days, in order that he may see good.”

ὁ . . . θέλων. Pres act ptc masc nom sg θέλω (substantival). In the LXX, ὁ θέλων is not the subject but an attributive modifier of the subject. It is also part of a rhetorical question in the LXX rather than a command.

γὰρ. Introduces the scriptural citation in verses 10-12 as a motivational grounds for the exhortations in verses 8-9.

ζωὴν. Accusative direct object of ἀγαπᾶν. In the LXX, this word functions as the direct object of ὁ θέλων. Here, ζωὴν (as well as ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς below) is reapplied in an eschatological fashion so that it now refers to the life of the world to come (see especially Schreiner, 166–67). Contained within the larger topical frame, ζωὴν is fronted (with respect to ἀγαπᾶν) for emphasis.

ἀγαπᾶν. Pres act inf ἀγαπάω (complementary). Here ἀγαπάω has the sense of “enjoy, take pleasure in” (so BDAG, 5.2; TEV, NLT<sup>2</sup>). This infinitive is a departure from the LXX and MT, both of which have participial forms here (where the participial phrase “loving days” stands parallel to the preceding “delighting in life”). By substituting an infinitival form along with the following καί, the text in 1 Peter breaks the original parallelism and, instead, puts ἀγαπᾶν in parallel with ἰδεῖν.

ἰδεῖν. Aor act inf ὁράω (complementary). Here ὁράω has the sense of “experience” (so BDAG, 280.4).

ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς. Accusative direct object of ἰδεῖν.



As for structure, the first two clauses exhibit contrastive parallelism, and the second two clauses exhibit synonymous parallelism.

**ἐκκλινάτω.** Aor act impv 3rd sg ἐκκλίνω. The basic meaning of ἐκκλίνω is “turn away” (e.g., LXX Num 22:33; Deut 29:17), which is also the case with the MT’s כָּרַח.

**δέ.** Introduces the next step in the argument, shifting from addressing sins of speech to addressing sins in general. This conjunction is omitted in many manuscripts (ⲛ C<sup>2vid</sup> P Ψ 33 1739 Ⲙ), probably arising not only from its absence in the LXX (so Achtemeier 1996, 220) but also from a scribal failure to discern the subtle change in focus between verses 10 and 11. On the use of δέ as a marker of development, see 1:7 on δέ.

**ἀπὸ κακοῦ.** Separation. Note that sometimes verbs compounded with one preposition (here ἐκ in ἐκκλινάτω) can be followed by a different preposition (see Robertson, 561).

**ποιησάτω.** Aor act impv 3rd sg ποιέω.

**ἀγαθόν.** Accusative direct object of ποιησάτω. Substantial adjective.

**ζητησάτω.** Aor act impv 3rd sg ζητέω.

**εἰρήνην.** Accusative direct object of ζητησάτω. Rather than a general state of well-being, here, as in both the LXX and MT (שָׁלוֹם) the reference is to peace within personal relationships (see BDAG, 287.1.b).

**διωξάτω.** Aor act impv 3rd sg διώκω.

**αὐτήν.** Accusative direct object of διωξάτω.

**3:12** *ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ὄτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν, πρόσωπον δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιῶντας κακά.*

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause. This ὅτι does not appear in the LXX nor is a causal conjunction used in the MT. Thus, compared to the LXX and MT, the text of 1 Peter makes more explicit the function of verse 12 as a motivational grounds for the series of third person imperatives in verses 10-11.

**ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου . . . ὄτα αὐτοῦ . . . πρόσωπον . . . κυρίου.** Even though these three subjects appear within verbless clauses, their initial position suggests that these three constituents are topical frames (so LDGNT). Regarding the anarthrous quality of

ὄφθαλμοὶ κυρίου, the LXX follows the Hebrew here, which requires the omission of the article (in construct with Yahweh). The other two phrases ὡτα αὐτοῦ and πρόσωπον . . . κυρίου similarly follow the required anarthrous character of the Hebrew. On this type of Semitism in the NT, especially in OT citations such as here, see BDF §259.3. All three expressions are anthropomorphisms.

**ὄφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ὡτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέξιν αὐτῶν.** This portion of the citation corresponds precisely to the LXX (Ps 33:16; ET 34:15), which closely follows the MT (34:16):  
 עֵינָיו יְהוָה אֶל־צַדִּיקִים וְאָזְנוֹ אֶל־שׁוֹמְרֵי־הַתּוֹרָה.

**ὄφθαλμοὶ.** Nominative subject of an implied εἶσθ.

**κυρίου.** Possessive genitive. In the MT, the tetragrammaton is used here, probably reapplied christologically in 1 Peter in light of 2:3's earlier reapplication of the divine name from this same psalm (Michaels, 181; contra Achtemeier 1996, 227).

**ἐπὶ δικαίους.** In a narrow sense this phrase reflects the direction/goal toward which God's eyes are oriented (see LN 84.17), but within the fuller context of this image, it refers to benefaction (so TEV: "the Lord watches over the righteous"). On the use of the imagery of God's ὄφθαλμοὶ being ἐπὶ someone (reflecting the Hebrew אֶל עֲשֵׂי־דָם) as expressing benefaction, see LXX Ps 32:18-19 (ET 33:18-19), where this language is followed by a benefactory purpose clause.

**καὶ.** Functions to mark the next clause as closely joined with the preceding clause, anticipating the new development introduced by δέ in the subsequent clause. On this function of καὶ, see 1:17.

**ὡτα αὐτοῦ.** On the position and anarthrous nature of this phrase, see above on ὄφθαλμοὶ κυρίου.

**ὡτα.** Nominative subject of a second implied εἶσθ.

**αὐτοῦ.** Possessive genitive.

**εἰς δέξιν αὐτῶν.** Like ἐπὶ δικαίους above, this phrase narrowly refers to direction/goal, but within context denotes benefaction (so TEV: "the Lord . . . listens to their prayers"). The LXX's εἰς, just like ἐπὶ above, translates the Hebrew אֶל, suggesting that both the εἰς and ἐπὶ should be understood similarly. On the use of οὐς with εἰς, referring to God's ears being benefactorily attentive to prayer, see LXX Neh 1:11; 1 Kgs 8:52; 2 Chr 6:40.

**δέησιν.** BDAG (213) defines this noun as an “urgent request to meet a need, exclusively addressed to God,” which suits the meaning of the Hebrew  $\text{קָרָאָה}:$  “cry for help.”

**αὐτῶν.** Subjective genitive.

**πρόσωπον δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιῶντας κακά.** This portion of the citation corresponds precisely to the LXX (Ps 33:17a; ET 34:16a), which closely follows the MT (34:17):  $\text{עַל־בְּעֵשׂוֹרָה־הַיְהוָה־יִבְנֶה}.$  Some later witnesses, under the influence of the LXX, expand the citation by including the modifying purpose clause in Ps 33:17b (ET 34:16b), which refers to the removal of the wicked and their memory from the land/earth.

**πρόσωπον.** Nominative subject of an implied ἔστιν.

**δὲ.** Introduces the next step in the argument, shifting from God’s attitude toward those who practice righteousness to a description of God’s attitude toward those who engage in evil deeds. On the use of δὲ as a marker of development, see 1:7.

**κυρίου.** Possessive genitive.

**ἐπὶ ποιῶντας κακά.** Opposition (see LN 90.34). The use of ἐπὶ in this phrase represents, on the part of the LXX translator, a contrastive word play (i.e., paronomasia) with the immediately preceding use in the phrase ἐπὶ δίκαιους. The intentionality of this word play finds support in that the Hebrew behind ἐπὶ here (the preposition  $\text{עַל}$ ) differs from that in the previous phrase (the preposition  $\text{עַל־}$ ) and the LXX translator could have used εἰς in the phrase ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ δίκαιους (e.g., LXX Ps 10:4; ET 11:4).

**ποιῶντας.** Pres act ptc masc acc pl ποιέω (substantival). Accusative with the preposition ἐπὶ.

**κακά.** Accusative direct object of ποιῶντας. The plural number of this neuter substantival adjective suggests that the text refers to specific acts of evil-doing (“evil deeds”), not to a generalized abstraction (“evil”).

### 1 Peter 3:13-22

<sup>13</sup>And who is the one who will harm you if you are dedicated to that which is good? <sup>14</sup>But even if you should suffer for what is right, you are blessed. Now do not fear what they fear nor be distressed, <sup>15</sup>but honor the Lord, that is, Christ, as holy in your

hearts, by always being ready to give a defense to everyone who asks you for a statement concerning the hope that is in you, <sup>16</sup>but speak with meekness and reverence and keep a clear conscience in order that the ones who vilify your good conduct in Christ might be ashamed with respect to that regarding which you are defamed. <sup>17</sup>For it is better to suffer for doing good, if the will of God should so determine, than to suffer for doing evil, <sup>18</sup>because Christ also suffered once for all for sins, a righteous person for the sake of unrighteous persons, in order that he might bring you to God by being put to death in the flesh but being made alive by the Spirit, <sup>19</sup>by whom he made proclamation when also going to the spirits in prison <sup>20</sup>who formerly disobeyed when God was patiently waiting in the days of Noah, when the ark was being built, in which a few (that is, eight persons) were saved by water, <sup>21</sup>which now saves you also, who are an antitype; the water I have in mind is baptism, which is not the removal of physical dirt but the pledging of a good conscience to God. It saves you through the resurrection of Jesus the Christ, <sup>22</sup>who is at the right hand of God, after having gone into heaven with angels and authorities and powers having become subject to him.

### 3:13 Καὶ τίς ὁ κακῶσων ὑμᾶς ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε;

**Καὶ.** This conjunction is often regarded as (a) transitional and perhaps best left untranslated, as in the NIV and TEV (see LN 91.1), or (b) inferential (e.g., Achtemeier 1996, 229). The conjunction is best understood, however, as more closely connecting what follows to what precedes (on this function of καί, see 1:17). More particularly, in addition to the eschatological motive in the citation in verses 10-12, the καί introduces a second motivational ground for verses 8-9.

**τίς.** Interrogative pronoun serving as predicate nominative. On the question word being the focal element in questions, see 2:20 on ποῖον. The usual priority that is given to pronouns in distinguishing between subjects and predicate nominatives (see 1:17 on τὸν . . . κρίνοντα) does not apply in the case of interrogative pronouns (Wallace, 43, n. 20). Here, τίς introduces a rhetorical

question that serves to emphasize a known fact: “Surely no one will harm you if you are dedicated to that which is good.” On this function of rhetorical questions, see 2:20 on ποῖον . . . κλέος.

**ὁ κακῶσων.** Fut act ptc masc nom sg κακῶω (substantival). Nominative subject of an implied ἐστίν. This could refer to (a) physical harm, or (b) ultimate eschatological harm. Schreiner (169–70) argues for option (b) on the basis of verse 12’s emphasis that God is on the side of the righteous. But the contrastive parallelism between verses 13 and 14 argues against this view: κακῶσων parallels πάσχοιτε and τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ parallels διὰ δικαιοσύνην. This parallelism suggests that κακῶσων has the same meaning as πάσχοιτε, namely, physical suffering. As further support, all of the other five NT instances of κακῶω refer to physical suffering, not ultimate eschatological harm. Schreiner avoids the force of this contrastive parallelism by translating ἄλλ’ in verse 14 as “indeed” instead of “but,” a possible (BDF §448.6) but rare meaning of ἀλλά. So it is best to follow option (a), in which case the idea expressed by the rhetorical question is hyperbolic, emphasizing that those who adopt the course of life advocated in verses 8-12 (not retaliating, seeking peace, etc.) will by such righteous conduct quell antagonism toward them. For further discussion, see Dubis (2002, 74–75). This is one of only thirteen future participles in the UBS<sup>4</sup>/NA<sup>27</sup> edition of the NT. (Wallace, 567, who counts only twelve, missed the one in Rom 8:34.)

**ὑμᾶς.** Accusative direct object of κακῶσων.

**ἐάν.** Introduces the protasis of a third class condition, the apodosis of which appears in the preceding rhetorical question.

**τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ.** On the fronting of this complement, see 1:15 on ἄγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ.

**τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.** Objective genitive.

**ζηλωταὶ.** Predicate nominative.

**γένησθε.** Aor mid subj 2nd pl γίνομαι. On the question of deponency and γίνομαι, see 1:15. The middle voice corresponds to Miller’s semantic class of “state” (429).

**3:14 ἄλλ’ εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι. τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε,**

**ἄλλ’**. Introduces a contrasting exception to the generalized situation of the previous verse (see also v. 13 on ὁ κακώσω).

**εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε**. Following verse 13, which says that Christians will not generally suffer if they do good, this clause introduces an exception to that general rule.

**εἰ**. Introduces the protasis of a fourth class condition. After noting that there are no complete fourth class conditions in the NT, Wallace (484) says of this verse, which is missing an explicit optative verb in the apodosis: “This text comes as close as any to a complete fourth class condition in the NT” (see also Wallace, 699–700). If complete, the apodosis would also have an optative with the particle ἄν, both of which Wallace’s translation suggests are implied here (see also μακάριοι later in this verse).

**καὶ**. Adverbial ascensive use of καί: “even.”

**πάσχοιτε**. Pres act opt 2nd pl πάσχω. A number of manuscripts secondarily substitute the more common indicative form. Much has been made of the optative mood here, including sophisticated arguments against the unity of the letter, postulating that 1:3–4:11 represents a time when suffering is a mere possibility while 4:12–5:11 represents a time when suffering is an unquestioned reality (e.g., Cross, 28–41). For further discussion of the impact of the optatives upon this issue, with a defense of the letter’s unity, see Dubis (2002, 72–76). The assessment of Kelly (141) is on target: “The risk, always imminent but . . . most of the time a threat rather than an actuality, is itself sufficient to explain the optative.”

**διὰ δικαιοσύνην**. Cause.

**μακάριοι**. Predicate nominative. The word constitutes the apodosis along with an implied form of εἰμί (as in 4:14), although some question remains as to what mood or tense this implied εἰμί bears. The translation of Wallace (484) suggests an optative form, but Caragounis (182, 186–88) argues that 1 Peter uses an intentional mixed condition, with the implied form most likely being the present indicative ἐστέ since the optative “would have been too unreal.” The English translations are divided regarding the tense of this implied verb, with some using a present form (so KJV, NRSV, NET, NIV, TEV; see also Elliott 2000, 622) and others using a future form (so RSV, ESV, NLT<sup>2</sup>). The similar use of μακάριοι in 4:14 speaks of

present blessing, which tilts the choice in favor of a present (and indicative) reading here as well.

*τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ παραχθῆτε.* Represents a citation of LXX Isa 8:12b, which reads τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆτε οὐδὲ μὴ παραχθῆτε and closely follows the MT: *וְיִרְאוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֲנִי וְאַתָּה וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא־יִרְאוּ אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־עָלָה עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל.* Thus, the differences between 1 Peter and the LXX are as follows: (a) instead of the LXX's singular αὐτοῦ, 1 Peter uses the plural αὐτῶν; (b) instead of the LXX's use of the double negative οὐ μὴ with both verbs (subjunctives of emphatic negation), 1 Peter uses only μὴ (prohibitive subjunctives). The citation from Isaiah continues into the next verse where Isa 8:13a is cited. With respect to (a), some commentators view the LXX as reinterpreting or misunderstanding the Hebrew text, shifting from a subjective genitive construction in the Hebrew ("do not fear what the people fear," with the singular pronominal suffix in Hebrew referring to the collective singular *עַם* in Isa 8:12a, which refers to the unbelieving general populace of Judah) to an objective genitive in the LXX ("do not fear him," with the genitival noun having shifted referent from "people" in the MT to the king of Assyria in the LXX; so Beare, 163–64; Kelly, 142; Michaels, 186–87). More likely, however, the LXX reflects a literal translation of the Hebrew and the antecedent of the LXX's αὐτοῦ is simply λαός (Isa 8:12a), a collective singular that translates the collective singular *עַם* in the Hebrew text. Most commentators who view the LXX's αὐτοῦ as following the MT's subjective genitive nevertheless believe that 1 Peter reinterprets the LXX as an objective genitive (e.g., Selwyn, 192; Carson 2007, 1038). Most translations also render φόβον αὐτῶν as an objective genitive construction (RSV: "have no fear of them"; similarly, ESV, NET, TEV). This is quite possible, though I would suggest that 1 Peter retains the subjective genitive that appears in both the LXX and MT, a reading that is quite consistent with the letter's countercultural emphasis: though the recipients' neighbors may fear the suffering and shame that Christians experience, the recipients themselves should not. Although it is difficult to find commentators that adopt this understanding, a number of English translations do (NRSV: "Do not fear what they fear"; similarly, NIV, HCSB). As for the pluralization of the LXX's αὐτοῦ

to αὐτῶν in 1 Peter, this is required by the omission of the LXX's collective singular antecedent λαός.

**τὸν . . . φόβον αὐτῶν.** Fronted as a topical frame.

**τὸν . . . φόβον.** Accusative direct object of φοβηθήτε. On the meaning of this noun and its cognate verb here, see 3:6 on φοβούμεναι.

**δέ.** This conjunction appears in the LXX, but within 1 Peter it could also serve to introduce the next step in the argument, namely, the OT citation of Isa 8:12b. On the use of δέ as a marker of development, see 1:7.

**αὐτῶν.** Subjective genitive. Against an objective genitive interpretation, see above. No explicit antecedent appears here, arising from the insertion of a citation. The context here, however, clarifies that this pronoun refers to the readers' persecutors (see also BDF §282.3 on the *constructio ad sensum* use of the pronoun here).

**μὴ . . . μὴδὲ . . . δέ.** These words organize a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μὴ . . . δέ) in which the two negated imperatives serve to emphasize the positive clause that is introduced by δέ in verse 15.

**φοβηθήτε.** Aor mid subj 2nd pl φοβέω (prohibitive subjunctive). The middle voice fits Kemmer's semantic class of "emotion middle" (130–32, 269).

**ταραχθῆτε.** Aor mid subj 2nd pl ταρασσώ (prohibitive subjunctive). The middle voice fits Kemmer's semantic class of "emotion middle" (130–32, 269; contra BDAG, 990.2, which adopts a permissive passive reading: "do not let yourselves be intimidated").

**3:15 κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἔτοιμοι αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαὺν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος,**

**κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε.** These words are from Isa 8:13 (though modified here in a christological way), continuing verse 14's citation from Isa 8. The LXX reads κύριον αὐτὸν ἀγιάσατε (MT: יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה יְהוָה). The text in 1 Peter differs from the LXX as follows: (a) it includes δέ; and, more significantly, (b) it substitutes Χριστὸν for the LXX's αὐτὸν.

**κύριον . . . τὸν Χριστὸν.** This construction could be taken in two ways: (a) as an object-complement double accusative construction, in which τὸν Χριστὸν is the direct object of ἀγιάσατε and κύριον is the complement: “honor Christ as the Lord” (Selwyn, 192); or, (b) as appositional, with κύριον as the direct object of ἀγιάσατε and τὸν Χριστὸν in apposition to κύριον: “honor the Lord, that is, Christ” (so ESV, though it makes “Lord” appositional to “Christ” rather than the reverse; see also KJV; Bigg, 158; Elliott 2000, 625). Distinguishing between double accusative and appositive constructions is sometimes a problem, as Wallace (183) notes. Most English translations follow option (a). The OT background, however, argues in favor of option (b) since the MT (literally, “Yahweh of hosts, him honor as holy”) can only be understood in an appositional sense, with both אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה (“Yahweh of hosts”) and הוּא (“him”) being marked with the direct object marker. The LXX provides a literal translation of the MT, even following its word order, with κύριον translating the direct object “Yahweh of hosts” and αὐτὸν translating the appositive “him.” First Peter follows this same appositional structure, although it makes a christological move by substituting τὸν Χριστὸν for the LXX’s αὐτὸν. This appositional interpretation also makes the fronting of κύριον . . . τὸν Χριστὸν much easier to explain than does the double accusative reading. The entire construction is to be read as one constituent fronted for emphasis (so also LDGNT). Arguments against this interpretation on the basis of the arthrous nature of τὸν Χριστὸν and the anarthrous nature of κύριον (see 1:17 on τὸν . . . κρίνοντα) are complicated by the fact that κύριος in the LXX routinely translates the anarthrous tetragrammaton from the Hebrew.

**κύριον.** Accusative direct object of ἀγιάσατε.

**δὲ.** See 3:14 on μὴ . . . μηδὲ . . . δὲ. The conjunction introduces the next step in the argument, shifting from the prohibition in verse 14b (“don’t fear what others fear”) to a positive command (“honor the Lord as holy”).

**τὸν Χριστὸν.** Accusative in apposition to κύριον. Some manuscripts substitute θεὸν (P 28; so KJV), accommodating to the LXX. The earliest and strongest evidence supports Χριστὸν as original.

**ἀγιάσατε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl ἀγιάζω.

**ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις.** Spatial.

**ὑμῶν.** Possessive genitive.

**ἔτοιμοι.** Beare (164) describes this adjective itself as imperatival, coordinate with the preceding imperatives (similarly, many translations begin a new imperatival sentence here). But it seems more likely that this adjective introduces material that is subordinate to the preceding imperative ἀγιασάτε (so ESV). Along these lines Achtemeier (1996, 233) argues for an implicit participial form ὄντες, functioning as a circumstantial participle of means. Whether a participial or imperatival form of εἰμί is implied, ἔτοιμοι would function as a predicate adjective.

**ἄει πρὸς ἀπολογίαὶν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον.** Beare (164) understands ἀπολογίαὶν to refer to “defence in a court of law” and similarly says that παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον “can only apply to judicial interrogation.” Although ἀπολογία does often refer to a formal judicial defense in the NT (Acts 25:16; 2 Tim 4:16) and the other language is likewise amenable to such a formal setting, most commentators find the reference to “always” and “everyone” here to suggest everyday and routine encounters (so Kelly, 142–43; Michaels, 188).

**ἄει.** Temporal adverb.

**πρὸς ἀπολογίαὶν.** Purpose.

**παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι.** Dative of reference. Less helpful is using the label “dative of recipient” (so Wallace, 148–49), which is usually used with dative elements in epistolary prescripts.

**τῷ αἰτοῦντι.** Pres act ptc masc dat sg αἰτέω (substantival). BDAG (30) understands this verb followed by λόγον to mean “demand an accounting.”

**ὑμᾶς λόγον.** Wallace (181–82) would describe this kind of construction as a subcategory of a double accusative, namely, a person-thing double accusative construction in which ὑμᾶς serves as the “person” and λόγον as the “thing.” Culy (92–96) argues that all such constructions should be distinguished from bona fide double accusative constructions, which involve an object and a complement. Frequently, so-called person-thing double accusatives constructions are really instances in which an indirect object has “advanced” to the status of a direct object, Culy argues (e.g.,

ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλὰ, “he began to teach them many things,” is not a person-thing construction but an instance of an indirect object αὐτοῖς that has “advanced” to the status of direct object). Here in verse 15, a subjective genitive (asking for “*your* accounting”) has advanced to that status of a direct object. For a similar application of Culy’s principles to a double nominative construction, see 2:5 on οἶκος πνευματικὸς.

**λόγον.** BDAG in this verse defines λόγος as “a formal accounting” (600.2.a) or, alternatively, as a “reason, ground” (601.2.d).

**περὶ τῆς . . . ἐλπίδος.** Reference, modifying λόγον.

**ἐν ὑμῖν.** Spatial, modifying ἐλπίδος. Although Michaels (189) argues for the corporate interpretation, “among you,” the context suggests an individualized sense here, parallel to the earlier ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις (Kelly, 143).

**3:16 ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου, συνειδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαεῖσθε καταισχυνθῶσιν οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφήν.**

**ἀλλὰ.** Introduces a limitation on the kind of ἀπολογία or λόγος that the preceding verse envisions (see BDAG, 45.2). Perhaps arising from scribal misunderstanding of this less common use of ἀλλὰ, some manuscripts (P 049 ℵ) omit this conjunction.

**μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου.** Manner. What is modified by this phrase is unclear due to ellipsis (most translations supply an imperative “do,” such as the NIV: “do this with gentleness and respect”). Contextually, perhaps an imperative form of λέγω, cognate to verse 15’s λόγον, is a better choice.

**φόβου.** Most translations understand this verbal noun to speak of an attitude directed toward non-Christian inquirers (“respect”; NIV, ESV, NET, TEV, NLT<sup>2</sup>), but given the use of this lexeme elsewhere in 1 Peter, it is better to understand it as an attitude toward God (“reverence”; RSV, NRSV), as may also be true of πραΰτητος. A secondary variant adds θεοῦ after φόβου (321 Ethiopic), clarifying a later scribal reading that understands φόβου to be directed toward God.

**συνειδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν.** Rather than reading this as a double accusative object-complement construction, the anarthrous

character of *συνειδησιν* suggests that *ἀγαθὴν* is an attributive adjective (contra Beare, 165; by way of contrast, note the arthrous *ἀναστροφὴν* in 2:12's double accusative construction alongside the adjective *καλὴν*; see Michaels, 183). The constituent *συνειδησιν . . . ἀγαθὴν* is emphatic, though *ἀγαθὴν* follows *ἔχοντες* in order to bring it into relation with the second appearance of *ἀγαθὴν* in this verse (on the discontinuity of this constituent, see 2:9 on *τὰς ἀρετὰς . . . τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς κατέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς*).

**συνειδησιν . . . ἀγαθὴν.** Accusative direct object of *ἔχοντες*.

**ἔχοντες,** Pres act ptc masc nom pl *ἔχω* (attendant circumstance, functioning imperatively; see 2:1 on *Ἀποθέμενοι*). Although this participle could conceivably be related to verse 15's *ἀγιάσατε* or an implied *ὄντες*, it is best to relate it to the implicit imperative of *λέγω* already proposed. For those who treat *ἔχοντες* as imperatival, see Beare (165); Elliott (2000, 629); TEV, NRSV. On the debate regarding imperatival participles in 1 Peter, see 1:14 on *συσχηματιζόμενοι*.

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause.

**ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε.** Reference ("with reference to that which you are reviled"). For a very similar construction, see 2:12 on *ἐν ᾧ* (see also Robertson, 721; Beare, 165). This contrasts with common temporal translations (e.g., "when"; RSV, ESV, NET, TEV; Fink, 34; Achtemeier 1996, 236), a sense which does not seem to fit the construction in 2:12 to which the present construction stands in parallel. Fronted as a topical frame.

**καταλαλεῖσθε.** Pres pass ind 2nd pl *καταλαλέω*. A strong secondary tradition (⋈ A C P 33 ℣) uses an active form of the verb and expands the text to conform to 2:12 (*καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν*; Michaels, 183–84, 190; contra Selwyn, 194).

**καταισχυνθῶσιν.** Aor mid subj 3rd pl *καταισχύνω*. Elliott (2000, 632–33) argues that this is a true (divine) passive, as reflected in many translations: "be put to shame" (see BDAG, 517.2). This reading interprets *καταισχυνθῶσιν* eschatologically, but this is unlikely since the exhortation to maintain a clear conscience is much more likely to be grounded in a missiological motive, introduced by *ἵνα* ("in order that they might be shamed in the here and now and, as a result, come to Christ"), than a motive rooted in the hope that

God will deal unbelievers eschatological shame and condemnation. Furthermore, the passive is unlikely given its usage in the LXX (see 2:6 on οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ). Instead, this word is best taken, as in 2:6, as a middle that fits Kemmer’s semantic class of “emotion middle” (130–32, 269).

**οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἐπηρεάζω (substantival). Nominative subject of καταισχυθῶσιν. This verb means, “to mistreat, with the implication of threats and abuse” (LN 88.129).

**ὑμῶν.** Subjective genitive, modifying τὴν ἀγαθὴν . . . ἀναστροφὴν.

**τὴν ἀγαθὴν . . . ἀναστροφὴν.** Accusative direct object of ἐπηρεάζοντες (see Michaels, 190; contra Bigg, 159, and Selwyn, 194, who take this phrase as the direct object of καταισχυθῶσιν).

**ἐν Χριστῷ.** Association, modifying ἀναστροφὴν. On the meaning of this vague phrase in the NT (also in 5:14), see the select bibliography in Wallace (362, n. 58; see also Dubis 2002, 103–4).

**3:17 κρεῖττον γὰρ ἀγαθοποιῶντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιῶντας.**

Michaels (191–92) identifies this verse as a “‘better’-proverb, or *Tobspruch*,” a form that he describes as marked by (a) the word “good” or “better,” (b) two infinitives marking a contrast, and (c) a word of comparison, ἢ or μᾶλλον (on this form, see further G. F. Snyder). Michaels, following Snyder, argues that these forms typically represent “eschatological alternatives.” Thus, he reads the “suffering for doing good” in this age being paired with “suffering for doing evil” in the age to come. But the traditional interpretation of this verse (that the recipients should be sure that their suffering is not for evil behavior) fits a theme that appears elsewhere in the book (2:20; 4:15–16; see especially Achtemeier 1996, 237–38, who notes among other arguments that Michaels’ position is further weakened if καταισχυθῶσιν in 3:16 is not understood eschatologically; for more on a non-eschatological reading, see 3:16 on καταισχυθῶσιν).

**κρεῖττον.** Predicate comparative adjective, linked to the subject infinitive πάσχειν by an implied ἐστίν. Modifying the infinitive

form, κρείττον is neuter. On the neuter gender of the infinitive in qualified terms, see Wallace (588–89).

**γάρ.** Introduces a motivational ground for the preceding exhortations regarding responding to one’s persecutors.

**ἀγαθοποιούντας.** Pres act ptc masc acc pl ἀγαθοποιέω (causal, modifying πάσχειν; contra Kelly, 145, who translates temporally, “when,” as he also does for the following κακοποιούντας).

**εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ.** Literally, “if the will of God should will.” Bigg (159) describes this as an “emphatic pleonasm.” This is also a metonymy in which God’s will stands for God himself.

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of an incomplete fourth class condition. Here we are dealing with an intentional mixed condition (see 3:14 on μακάριοι), and thus πάσχειν should be viewed as the subject of an indicative ἐστίν rather than of an optative form.

**θέλοι.** Pres act opt 3rd sg θέλω. On the implications of the optative for the unity of the letter and the nature of the recipients’ suffering, see 3:14 on πάσχοιτε. Some manuscripts substitute an indicative form for the less common optative.

**τὸ θέλημα.** Nominative subject of θέλοι.

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**πάσχειν.** Pres act inf πάσχω. Subject of an implied ἐστίν.

**ἢ.** Comparative particle.

**κακοποιούντας.** Pres act ptc masc acc pl κακοποιέω (causal). This participle adverbially modifies an implied repetition of πάσχειν in the comparative clause.

**3:18 ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι.**

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause that provides a motivational ground for the assertion in verse 17 (and more broadly to the whole of vv. 13-17; so Achtemeier 1996, 243–46; Schreiner, 180–81).

**καὶ Χριστὸς.** Fronted as a topical frame.

**καὶ.** Adverbial additive use of καί: “also.” The postpositive appearance of καί after ὅτι clearly marks it as adverbial (see 2:5). Here καί marks a thematic connection between the recipients’ suffering for doing good and Christ’s suffering for doing good (this

connection does not involve the adverbials ἅπαξ or περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν). Some manuscripts secondarily omit καὶ altogether (so also NIV, TEV, NLT<sup>2</sup>).

**Χριστός.** Nominative subject of ἔπαθεν.

**ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν.** These two constituents apparently are fronted for emphasis, but this is a problem since the context (which seeks to motivate the recipients to suffer faithfully) does not support an emphasis upon ἅπαξ. Levinsohn (personal communication) thinks that the word order may stem from a traditional creedal source (which others also find here), and thus the word order does not fit the context of 1 Peter neatly.

**ἅπαξ.** Temporal adverb. Here, this term does not simply mean “once” (KJV, ASV, ESV, NET) but bears the fuller meaning “once and for all” (TEV; similarly RSV, NRSV, NIV, NLT<sup>2</sup>). Note that the translation “once for all,” especially when followed by “the righteous for the unrighteous,” can be misunderstood to equate “all” with “the unrighteous.” This is incorrect since ἅπαξ is strictly temporal.

**περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν.** Reference (so BDAG, 798.1.g; and Selwyn, 196, who comments that “Peter prefers to reserve the preposition ὑπὲρ for the persons benefited, as here and in ii.21”). This contrasts with BDF (§229.1), which reads περὶ as equivalent to ὑπὲρ, denoting cause.

**ἔπαθεν.** Aor act ind 3rd sg πάσχω. Despite strong external evidence for the variant ἀπέθανεν (“died”;  $\Phi^{72}$   $\aleph^{*}$  A C<sup>2vid</sup> 33 *al*; so RSV, NIV, TEV), most recent commentators accept ἔπαθεν as original (B P  $\mathfrak{M}$ ; so Achtemeier 1996, 247; contra Kelly, 148), especially given the additive use of καὶ (yielding, if ἀπέθανεν were original, the contextually unlikely “also died”). On a similar scribal substitution of ἀπέθανεν for ἔπαθεν, see 2:21 on ἔπαθεν. For other variants, see Metzger (622–23).

**δικαίος.** Nominative in apposition to Χριστός. The anarthrous adjective is substantival and carries generic reference: “a righteous person” (see Wallace, 254).

**ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων.** Representation/advantage.

**ἀδίκων.** The anarthrous adjective is substantival and carries generic reference like δικαίος: “unrighteous persons.”

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause (contra Beare, 168, who takes it as exegetical).

**ὑμᾶς.** Accusative direct object of προσαγάγη. Fronted as a topical frame. Although some English translations opt to read the variant ἡμᾶς (8<sup>2</sup> A C K L 33 *al*; so KJV, ASV, RSV, ESV), most recent commentators rightly argue that ὑμᾶς is more likely original (9<sup>72</sup> B P Ψ 28; e.g., Michaels, 195; so also NRSV, NET, NIV, TEV, NLT<sup>2</sup>).

**προσαγάγη.** Aor act subj 3rd sg προσάγω. Subjunctive with ἵνα.

**τῷ θεῷ.** Dative indirect object of προσαγάγη.

**θανατωθεῖς . . . ζωοποιηθεῖς.** These two participles are here taken as participles of means, modifying προσαγάγη (contra Michaels, 203, who views them as functioning independently), since it is through Christ's death and resurrection that he brings sinners into relation with God. Rather than modifying the preceding προσαγάγη, Elliott (2000, 644) views the participles as modifying what follows, translating them in parallel with πορευθεῖς, a third participle, in verse 19. Although there is indeed a progression in verses 18-19 from crucifixion to resurrection to ascension (see v. 19 on καί), his suggestion is unlikely, especially since it is based upon taking πορευθεῖς as the main verb of the relative clause in verse 19 instead of ἐκήρυξεν (see his translation on p. 637).

**θανατωθεῖς.** Aor pass ptc masc nom sg θανατώ (means; see above).

**μὲν . . . δέ.** The μὲν marks the crucifixion of Jesus as having been trumped by that which appears in the δέ clause, namely, the resurrection. For further discussion of the function of this correlative construction, see 1:20 on μὲν . . . δέ. On the postpositive positioning of these conjunctions, see 2:4.

**σαρκὶ . . . πνεύματι.** Patristic interpreters commonly viewed these nouns as referring to the body and the spirit of Jesus (see also BDAG, 833.2, 915.2.a). Although this makes sense of the first part of the parallel (for σὰρξ in the sense of “body” in 1 Peter, see 3:21; 4:1, 2), the second part of the parallel is problematic. In what sense could Jesus' spirit, distinct from his body, be said to be “made alive”? This suggests that Jesus' spirit was at some point “dead,” an unthinkable notion within the broader confines of NT theology. In more recent times, this interpretation has been generally

abandoned. Instead, most recent commentators understand these nouns to refer to two modes or spheres of existence, not constituent parts of Jesus. Thus, Dalton (1989, 138) comments, “the flesh-spirit distinction . . . refers to two orders of being, the flesh representing human nature in its weakness, its proclivity to evil, its actual evil once it opposes the influence of God; the spirit representing the consequence of God’s salvation, the presence and activity among us of the Spirit of God.” Those who represent this majority view usually read the datives as datives of reference/respect or datives of sphere (e.g., Michaels, 204). Alternatively, Achtemeier (1996, 250) argues that, following the passive participles, the most natural reading is to take the datives as datives of instrument (better, datives of agency), understanding σάρξ to refer to humanity, as it does in 1:24. Read this way, Jesus was “put to death by humans, but made alive by the Spirit.” This interpretation maintains the parallelism between the two datives. Another advantage of this interpretation is that πνεύματι is given its full personal sense, referring to the Spirit of God (contra Dalton 1989, 141, who takes πνεύματι “impersonally”), allowing for a straightforward interpretation of the following ἐν ᾧ . . . ἐκήρυξεν as referring to the Spirit empowering Jesus’ proclamation. Achtemeier’s interpretation, however, must be rejected in light of subsequent appearances of the dative σαρκί in 4:1 (twice), which refers to suffering in the body (see also other occurrences of σάρξ in 3:21; 4:2, 6, which also refer to the body). Consequently, the most likely reading of θανατωθεῖς . . . σαρκί is a reference to the bodily death of Jesus (“being put to death with respect to the body”). Following this reference to Jesus’ death, the following ζωοποιηθεῖς . . . πνεύματι is best understood as a reference to Jesus’ resurrection, with the most natural interpretation of πνεύματι being a dative of agency (rather than a dative of sphere; so NIV; Wallace, 343). The potential weakness of this interpretation is that the two datives, σαρκί and πνεύματι, are then read differently; but such is clearly the case in passages like 1 Tim 3:16 (ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι), as Schreiner (183–84) has noted. On the use of σάρξ in 1 Peter, see also 1:24 on πᾶσα σάρξ and 4:2 on ἐν σαρκί.

**ζωοποιηθεῖς.** Aor pass ptc masc nom sg ζωοποιέω (means; see

above). The pairing of ζωοποιηθεις with θανατωθεις strongly suggests that ζωοποιηθεις refers to Jesus' bodily resurrection, not some other type of "enlivening" between Good Friday and Easter morning (contra Wand, 100; seemingly also suggested by the TEV's "He was put to death physically, but made alive spiritually").

### 3:19 ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεῖς ἐκήρυξεν,

**ἐν ᾧ.** Means. Despite the complicated discussions regarding the antecedent of the relative pronoun, the natural reading is to understand the antecedent as the immediately preceding πνεύματι (so Martin 1992a, 61–62; contra Selwyn, 197, who takes the antecedent broadly as the preceding context in v. 18). Alternatively, if the majority view of the correlative participial construction at the end of verse 18 were followed (see 3:18 on σαρκί . . . πνεύματι), then the ἐν would indicate sphere or reference. The relative pronoun is taken as neuter in all of these alternatives.

**καὶ.** Adverbial additive use of καὶ: "also." The postpositive appearance of καὶ after ἐν ᾧ clearly marks it as adverbial (see 2:5 on καὶ). Adverbial uses of καὶ usually mark the immediately following word or phrase as the item that is added thematically (see Titrud, 4–5; Levinsohn, 101). Thus, some understand καὶ to mark τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν as the additive element (so, e.g., Titrud, 6, who understands καὶ to be ascensive, "even," a special subcategory of additive καὶ; see Runge 2010, §16.2), but it is difficult in this case to see what the spirits would stand in an additive relation to. Bigg (162) sees the spirits as being additive to the people to whom Jesus preached during his earthly ministry, but this latter reference is not explicit in the context. Alternatively, καὶ can sometimes mark an entire proposition as additive (see, e.g., Heb 7:2). If true here, the additive element would be τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεῖς. This makes much better sense contextually, since the καὶ can then be understood to mark this participial phrase as additive to the propositions in the preceding two participial phrases, θανατωθεις . . . σαρκί and ζωοποιηθεις . . . πνεύματι (similarly Elliott 2000, 651), thus completing the threefold crucifixion-resurrection-ascension paradigm. For a reference to the ascension here, see the following analysis of the identity of the spirits in prison.

**τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν.** Fronted for emphasis within the participial phrase.

**τοῖς . . . πνεύμασιν.** Dative of destination, modifying πορευθεῖς. Although this noun is usually taken as the dative indirect object of ἐκήρυξεν, the word order makes this unlikely and especially so if καὶ marks the entire participial phrase as additive (see above). Nowhere else in the NT do we find the contiguous sequence dative noun/adverbial participle/verb when the dative serves as the indirect object of the verb. As a result, πνεύμασιν should be taken with πορευθεῖς. Nevertheless, an implicit repetition of this noun is to be understood as the indirect object of ἐκήρυξεν. The identification of the πνεύμασιν, along with the timing and purpose of the proclamation to them, are key interpretative issues in this difficult passage. Dalton (1989, 25–66) summarizes the history of interpretation, identifying the three major views: (1) The spirits are souls of human beings who died during the days of Noah to whom Christ made proclamation during the period between his death and resurrection in the realm of the dead, either (a) to convert them, (b) to announce good news to those who had been converted before their death, or (c) to condemn them; (2) The spirits are sinful human beings from the days of Noah to whom, when they were alive, the pre-incarnate Christ made proclamation through the person of Noah; or (3) The spirits are demonic spirits to whom Christ proclaimed his victory either (a) between his death and resurrection, or (b) during his ascension to heaven. Option (3b), argued persuasively by Dalton (1989), has approached the status of a near consensus among recent commentators and is the view also adopted here. Πνεῦμα is seldom used in the plural of human spirits, and never so without additional modification (Heb 12:23; perhaps also 1 Cor 14:32; Rev 22:6). Rather, the over thirty plural uses of πνεῦμα in the NT typically refer to angelic (usually demonic) beings (e.g., Matt 8:16; 12:45; Luke 10:20). An especially helpful starting point to this challenging text is the essay by France. For a summary of the history of interpretation and recent scholarly literature, see further Dubis (2006, 220–21).

**ἐν φυλακῇ.** Spatial, modifying πνεύμασιν. A few manuscripts (614 *pc*) secondarily substitute ἐν τῷ ᾄδῃ (“in Hades”), attempting to clarify the mysterious “prison” or under being the influence of the later theology of Christ’s *descensus ad inferos* (Achtmeier 1996, 239; see view 1 above). View (2) takes this phrase to refer to Noah’s contemporaries being imprisoned in sin, the metaphorical nature of which appears as special pleading (so Kelly, 153). The view adopted here (3b), takes this prison as being in the heavenly places, corresponding to certain early Jewish understandings (see 2 *En.* 7:1-3). The understanding of Michaels (208), “in refuge,” has found few followers (see esp. the critique by Schreiner, 186).

**πορευθεῖς.** Aor mid ptc masc nom sg πορεύομαι (temporal). Against the view that this verse refers to events between Jesus’s death and resurrection, the order of the Greek participles θανατωθεῖς . . . ζωοποιηθεῖς . . . πορευθεῖς is noteworthy, with the progression suggesting that verse 19 refers to events *after* Jesus’ resurrection. Those who relate this passage to a *descensus ad inferos* theology understand πορευθεῖς to refer to a “going” into Hades (so Selwyn, 200). If such were the case, however, the verb καταβαίνω would have been more appropriate (Kelly, 155–56). Instead, the context and the identical use of πορευθεῖς in verse 22 with reference to Christ’s ascension both suggest that the ascension is also in view here. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “translational motion” (69–70, 269).

**ἐκήρυξεν.** Aor act ind 3rd sg κηρύσσω. This verb is often translated as “preach,” which may suggest to some that Christ’s message here is one that actively encourages the hearers to respond with faith and repentance (see LN 33.256, which uses the present verse as an example text: “to publicly announce religious truths and principles *while urging acceptance and compliance*”; emphasis added). On the contrary, κηρύσσω is a verb with a more neutral sense of “make proclamation, announce,” the message of which can be either positive or negative and, although usually religious in the NT (e.g., Matt 4:17), can have a more general sense as well (e.g., LXX Gen 41:43; 1 Macc 10:63). Here the direct object of ἐκήρυξεν is left unstated.

**3:20 ἀπειθήσασιν ποτε ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὀκτῶ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος.**

**ἀπειθήσασιν.** Aor act ptc neut dat pl ἀπειθέω (attributive). On the absence of the article with this attributive participle, note the position of the preceding ἐν φυλακῇ and see 1:18 on πατροπαραδότου. Some, nevertheless, render ἀπειθήσασιν as an adverbial participle of cause (ESV; Schreiner, 190–91) or time (NET, “after”).

**ποτε.** Temporal adverb.

**ὅτε.** Subordinating conjunction introducing a temporal clause, modifying ἀπειθήσασιν.

**ἀπεξεδέχετο.** Impf mid ind 3rd sg ἀπεκδέχομαι. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “translational motion,” here in the negation of such action (69–70, 269).

**ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἀπεξεδέχετο.** Literally, “the patience of God was waiting.” The phrase ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία is a metonymy for God himself.

**ἡ . . . μακροθυμία.** Nominative subject of ἀπεξεδέχετο.

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive (note the existence of a cognate verb μακροθυμέω).

**ἐν ἡμέραις.** Temporal.

**Νῶε.** Genitive of time, i.e., time within the lifetime of Noah. Indeclinable noun.

**κατασκευαζομένης.** Pres pass ptc fem gen sg κατασκευάζω. Genitive absolute, temporal. Wallace (655) notes that, although genitive absolutes can express any of the adverbial uses of the participle, approximately ninety percent of these constructions are temporal.

**κιβωτοῦ.** Genitive subject of κατασκευαζομένης. Louw and Nida (6.44) comment, “The central meaning of κιβωτός is ‘box’ or ‘chest,’ but it was apparently applied to Noah’s ark in view of the type of construction and the fact that Noah’s ark resembled more a barge than a seagoing vessel.” Levinsohn (181–83), citing others, including Healey and Healey (1990), argues that the genitive absolute is a “switch-reference marker,” marking a change of subject between the participial phrase and the clause to which it is

subordinate (see also 3:22; 4:1, 4, 12; 5:4). Here the genitive absolute construction marks a switch from μακροθυμία, the subject of the clause introduced by ὅτε, to κιβωτοῦ, the subject of the genitive participial phrase. Due to some exceptions, Fuller calls into question this switch-reference function, but these exceptions number only a handful out of over three hundred occurrences. Fuller counts five clear examples in which genitive absolute constructions have the same subject as the main clause, namely, Matt 1:18; Mark 8:1b; Acts 21:34; 28:6; and Heb 8:9 (the second example being clearly invalid). Levinsohn argues that these exceptions can be accounted for by features of other cross-linguistic switch-reference devices (e.g., a shift in semantic role). All six genitive absolute constructions within 1 Peter exhibit a switch-reference function. This genitive absolute construction follows its main clause, unlike most such constructions (so also in 3:22, but the usual order appears in 4:1, 4, 12; 5:4).

**εἰς ἧν.** Spatial. Although the meaning “in, inside” is usually associated with ἐν, εἰς is in the process of absorbing ἐν in the NT period, a process that has been entirely realized in Modern Greek (BDF §205; contra Achtemeier 1996, 264, who finds εἰς suggesting the doubled sense that “they entered [into] the ark and were saved in it.” The antecedent of ἧν is κιβωτοῦ, which is feminine, following the same paradigm as ὁδός.

**ὀλίγοι.** Nominative subject of διεσώθησαν. The substantival adjective is fronted for emphasis, with the small number of those saved in the flood being an encouragement to a persecuted minority (France, 272). Some manuscripts (C P Ψ ℞) secondarily read the feminine ὀλίγαι, accommodating to the following ψυχαί.

**τούτ’ ἔστιν ὀκτώ ψυχαί.** This clause provides a parenthetical explanation of ὀλίγοι.

**τούτ’.** Nominative subject of ἔστιν. Anaphoric use of οὗτος.

**ἔστιν.** Pres act ind 3rd sg εἰμί.

**ὀκτώ ψυχαί.** Predicate nominative. On the meaning of ψυχή, see 1:9 on ψυχῶν. On the word order, see 1:25 on τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθῆν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

**διεσώθησαν.** Aor pass ind 3rd pl διασώζω. BDAG (237): “bring safely through.”

**δι' ὕδατος.** This phrase has been taken either instrumentally (“by”; TEV, KJV; Porter, 150), or spatially (“through”; BDAG, 224.A.1.b; Achtemeier 1996, 265–66). Against the OT background, the instrumental reading would seem unlikely since the focus of the flood narrative is upon water as an instrument of judgment, not salvation. So it would make sense to read water here as something to be saved *from* rather than saved *by*. But verse 21 overthrows this intuitive reading since it identifies water not as that which judges but as that which saves (contra Schreiner, 194: “the waters of baptism are the waters of destruction”). Furthermore, the additive καὶ ὑμᾶς in verse 21 (i.e., water saves “you also”) makes clear that Noah and his family are viewed as being saved by water. Thus, δι' ὕδατος most likely is instrumental, though exactly how to conceive this is challenging. Perhaps we are to understand the rising waters as lifting Noah above the level of the flood’s destruction and, as the waters recede, safely depositing him in the new world order. Possibly we should understand a play on words here, with the meaning of διὰ bearing a pregnant ambiguity (France, 273: “Peter is deliberately exploiting the ambiguity of the word διὰ to assist . . . its typological application”; see also Dalton 1989, 195; Selwyn, 202–3).

**3:21 ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,**

**ὁ.** Nominative subject of σώζει. The antecedent is the immediately preceding neuter noun ὕδατος, not the entire phrase διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος (contra Beare, 174, who also reads the weakly attested variant ᾧ for ὁ).

**καὶ ὑμᾶς.** Fronted as a topical frame, along with its appositive ἀντίτυπον.

**καὶ.** Adverbial additive use of καὶ: “also.” The postpositive appearance of καὶ after ὁ clearly marks it as adverbial (see 2:5; contra NRSV, NET, NIV, NLT<sup>2</sup>, which all take it as conjunctive). Here καὶ marks ὑμᾶς (its immediately following constituent, as is typical) as additive to the ὀλίγοι in verse 20, with both groups experiencing their own kind of salvation (compare σώζει here with διεσώθησαν in v. 20) in a water-related event.

**ὕμᾱς.** Accusative direct object of σῶζει.

**ἀντίτυπον.** Nominative in apposition to ὕμᾱς. Numerous alternative solutions exist. Kelly (160) understands ἀντίτυπον to modify ὕδατος adjectivally (“through water: which thus prefigured now saves you too”). Elliott (2000, 668–69) also takes it as adjectival, but as modifying βάπτισμα instead. Achtemeier (266) takes it as substantival, standing in apposition to ὁ, with the following βάπτισμα also standing in apposition to ὁ. These alternative interpretations understand ἀντίτυπον to identify the waters of baptism as the antitype of the waters of the flood (so BDAG, 91.1; LN 58.69; and most English translations, e.g., NLT<sup>2</sup>: “And that water is a picture of baptism”). Though this water parallel is undoubtedly present, a much more straightforward reading of the syntax emerges by taking ἀντίτυπον as a collective singular substantival adjective that appositionally modifies the immediately preceding ὕμᾱς. The word order especially favors this. Thus it is the recipients themselves (and all Christians by extension) who are explicitly identified as the antitype, forming a counterpart to the ὀλίγοι in verse 20, who are the type (with both groups representing a small God-fearing minority of the general populace; see also Selwyn, 203–4; France, 273). On the meaning of ἀντίτυπος, France further comments, “Here we have the beginning of its technical terminology” (see τύπος in Rom 5:14).

**νῦν.** Temporal adverb, fronted as a temporal frame.

**σῶζει.** Pres act ind 3rd sg σῶζω.

**βάπτισμα.** Nominative in apposition to ὁ, which refers in turn to the preceding ὕδατος. The water that saves is now explicitly identified with baptism. More precisely stated, it is not the baptismal waters that save, but faith and repentance. Thus, baptism here is a metonymy for the saving faith and repentance that are so closely associated with baptism.

**οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ρύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν.** This correlative construction constitutes a lengthy appositive to βάπτισμα, headed by the contrasting terms, ἀπόθεσις and ἐπερώτημα.

**οὐ . . . ἀλλὰ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μὴ . . . δὲ) in which the negated noun phrase οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ρύπου (baptism is not merely

something external) serves to emphasize the positive noun phrase introduced by *ἀλλά*: *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν* (baptism represents the orientation of one's inner person). The criticism of Michaels (216), who comments that "it is unlikely that the present passage intends to say anything so banal as that baptism's purpose is not to wash dirt off the body," fails to appreciate the function of such correlative negative-positive constructions. Often the negative clause is "banal," as a way of giving prominence to the positive clause (see, e.g., the negative clause in 1:23, which makes the quite obvious statement about regeneration, "you have not been born by a perishable seed").

**σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου.** Although Dalton (1989, 199–206) finds a reference to circumcision here and is followed tentatively by Achtemeier (1996, 268–69), one finds no critique of the Jewish community elsewhere in the letter (for further critique, see Michaels, 215–16).

**σαρκὸς.** Ordinarily, *σαρκὸς* would follow *ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου*. Here it is fronted for emphasis (see also 1:24 on *πᾶσα σὰρξ*), in parallel with the following *συνειδήσεως*. Although *σαρκὸς* is often read as a genitive of separation (so Wallace, 108, 119; NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NLT<sup>2</sup>), the parallel with *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς* suggests that it is an attributive modifier like *ἀγαθῆς* (so TEV: "bodily dirt"; NET: "physical dirt").

**ἀπόθεσις.** Nominative in apposition to *βάπτισμα*.

**ῥύπου.** Objective genitive; "dirt as refuse in contrast with soil" (LN 79.55).

**συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς.** Objective genitive (so, e.g., Achtemeier 1996, 271–72). Some commentators read a subjective genitive instead, i.e., "conscience's pledge/appeal" (e.g., Michaels, 216). The objective genitive, however, is favored by (a) the parallel with the objective genitive *ῥύπου*; and (b) the fact that the objective reading makes explicit the content of the pledge or appeal (*ἐπερώτημα*), which is absent from the text if one reads the genitive as subjective (see Schreiner, 196). This genitival phrase is fronted with respect to its head noun, *ἐπερώτημα*, highlighting the parallel with the also fronted *σαρκὸς* of the preceding negated clause.

**ἐπερώτημα.** Nominative in apposition to *βάπτισμα*. This NT *harapx legomenon* has been interpreted as (a) "appeal," based in

part on the use of the cogate verb ἐπερωτάω (especially its use as “request” in Matt 16:1; so RSV, ESV, NRSV, BDAG, 362.2; Michaels, 216; Schreiner, 196–97); or (b) “pledge” or “promise” (so NIV, NET, TEV). On the basis of a contractual use of this term in the papyri, many commentators adopt the latter usage (e.g., Dalton 1989, 206–10). Dalton (1989, 207) further comments, “there is no example anywhere in the whole range of Greek writing where it [i.e., ἐπερώτημα] means ‘request.’” The parallel use of συνείδησιν ἀγαθὴν in verse 16, which refers to believers ongoingly acting in a way that is consistent with their Christian commitments, also supports the meaning “pledge.” Taken this way, baptism is a pledge to maintain behavior that is pleasing to God, which fits the following context of 4:1-3 especially well (Selwyn, 209–10). Thus, it is an expression of the repentance that baptism itself represents.

**εἰς θεόν.** The noun θεόν is the conceptual indirect object of the verbal idea implicit in ἐπερώτημα.

**δι’ ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** Means, modifying σώξει. Its great distance from this verb is partly the result of the long appositive following βάπτισμα. As a result, I begin a new sentence in my translation, “It saves you through . . .,” as does the NIV, TEV, NLT<sup>2</sup>. Alternatively, this phrase could be taken with the more proximate ἐπερώτημα, in which case it would refer to the baptized person’s understanding that his new life of obedience is only realized through the empowering resurrection life of Jesus.

**Ἰησοῦ.** Given the passive ζωοποιηθεῖς in the nearby verse 18, Ἰησοῦ is most likely an objective rather than a subjective genitive (see 1:3 on Ἰησοῦ).

**Χριστοῦ.** On the meaning and use of Χριστός, see 1:1 on Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**3:22 ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ [τοῦ] θεοῦ πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων.**

**ὃς.** Nominative subject of ἐστὶν.

**ἐστὶν.** Pres act ind 3rd sg εἰμί.

**ἐν δεξιᾷ.** Spatial.

**[τοῦ] θεοῦ.** Possessive genitive. On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίν]. Michaels (196) argues that the definite article

is likely secondary, accommodating to other NT examples of the phrase “at the right hand of God,” all of which use the definite article. But its inclusion results in an exception to Appollonius’ Canon, which may have led scribes to omit it.

**πορευθεῖς.** Aor mid ptc masc nom sg πορεύομαι (temporal). On the class of the middle voice, see the comment on this identical form in verse 19, which also refers to Christ’s ascension.

**εἰς οὐρανόν.** Spatial: “extension toward a goal which is inside an area” (LN 84.22).

**ὑποταγέντων.** Aor mid ptc masc gen pl ὑποτάσσω. Genitive absolute, temporal. This form could be taken as middle (NIV: “in submission”; see also RSV, NET, NLT<sup>2</sup>) or as passive (ESV: “having been subjected”; see also KJV, ASV, NRSV). The other middle uses of θη- forms of this verb in 2:13 and 5:5 (see also 2:18; 3:1, 5) favor a middle use here as well. On the class of this middle voice, see 2:13 on Ὑποτάγητε.

**αὐτῷ.** Dative complement of ὑποταγέντων.

**ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων.** Genitive subject of ὑποταγέντων. This triplet (see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον) serves rhetorically to emphasize that all kinds of angelic (or, more specifically, demonic) beings are now in subjection to Christ. These beings are to be equated with the τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν in verse 19. Here the genitive absolute marks a switch from ὅς, the subject of the relative clause, to ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων, the compound subject of the genitive participial phrase (see 3:20 on κιβωτοῦ). Note also that the first (masculine) noun ἀγγέλων, rather than the two following (feminine) nouns, governs the gender of the participle ὑποταγέντων. On the use of the latter two terms for angelic beings, see 1 Cor 15:24; Eph 1:21.

### 1 Peter 4:1-6

<sup>1</sup>Therefore, since Christ suffered in the flesh, you also must arm yourselves with the same mindset, because the one who has suffered in the flesh has given up on sin <sup>2</sup>in order to no longer live the remaining time in the flesh according to what humans crave but according to what God wills. <sup>3</sup>For the time that has past is more than enough to have done what the Gentiles desire, because you

have engaged in acts of immorality, lust, drunkenness, partying, drinking bashes and disgusting idolatry, <sup>4</sup>with regard to which they are surprised because you are not now running with them into the same extreme of self-indulgence, with the result that they revile you. <sup>5</sup>They will give an account to the one who is ready to judge the living and the dead. <sup>6</sup>For this is why the gospel was preached also to the dead, namely, that although judged in the mortal body as humans see fit, they might live by the Spirit as God sees fit.

**4:1 Χριστοῦ οὖν παθόντος σαρκὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ὄπλισασθε, ὅτι ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας**

**Χριστοῦ.** Genitive subject of παθόντος. Fronted as a topical frame. Here the genitive absolute construction marks a switch from the subject of the genitive participial phrase, Χριστοῦ, to the subject of the main clause, ὑμεῖς (see 3:20 on κίβωτοῦ).

**οὖν.** This is a resumptive use of οὖν (on the uses of οὖν, see 2:1). After the digression in 3:19-22 about the spirits in prison, baptism, and Jesus' ascension and session (introduced by ὅτι), this οὖν resumes the thought of 3:18 (not just 3:18a, contra Selwyn, 208), which likewise speaks of Christ's suffering in the flesh, even to the point of being put to death (ἔπαθεν, θανατωθεὶς . . . σαρκὶ). As is often the case with resumptive uses of οὖν, it also introduces an inference from the material in the digression, suggesting that vindication vis-à-vis one's enemies follows faithful suffering, although this connection is not explicitly made until the end of verse 6.

**παθόντος.** Aor act ptc masc gen sg πάσχω. Genitive absolute, causal. Numerous manuscripts add ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (κ<sup>2</sup> A P ℳ) or ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (69 1505 pc), but these variants have most likely arisen secondarily under the influence of similar phrasing in 2:21 and 3:18 (see Achtemeier 1996, 275; contra Selwyn, 208).

**σαρκὶ.** Dative of reference (so Selwyn, 209; lit. "with reference to the flesh"). On the further connotations of σὰρξ, see 1:24 on πᾶσα σὰρξ.

**καὶ ὑμεῖς.** Fronted as a topical frame.

**καὶ.** Adverbial additive use of καί: "also." For the adverbial identification of καί, see 2:5. Here the καί helps the recipients make the connection between their resolve and that of Jesus.

**ὑμεῖς.** Nominative subject of ὀπλίσασθε.

**τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν.** Accusative direct object of ὀπλίσασθε. Fronted for emphasis. BDAG (337): “the same way of thinking,” here referring to a willingness to suffer.

**αὐτὴν.** Identical adjectival use of αὐτός: “same.”

**ὀπλίσασθε.** Aor mid impv 2nd pl ὀπλίζω. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “direct reflexive” (42–52, 268), i.e., “arm yourselves.” This NT and LXX *hapax legomenon* is a military term that here has a figurative application (LN 77.10).

**ὅτι.** This phrase could be read either as (a) causal (e.g., Michaels, 225, and most translations); or (b) epexegetical to ἔννοιαν (e.g., Achtemeier 1996, 278). Causal is more likely, with ὅτι introducing a motivational grounds for the imperatival clause: believers should be willing to suffer physically for their commitment to Christ because in doing so they demonstrate the genuineness of their commitment to give up on sin in order to pursue a new course of life (see the baptismal pledge in 3:21). As Achtemeier (1996, 278) himself notes, ὅτι frequently appears with a causal force in conjunction with imperatives elsewhere in 1 Peter (1:16; 3:9, 11–12; 4:16–17; 5:5). Against most interpreters, this causal clause extends all the way through verse 2.

**ὁ παθὼν σαρκί.** Fronted as a topical frame. The referent of this phrase has been understood as (a) Christ (e.g., Michaels, 226–29), or (b) believers (e.g., Achtemeier 1996, 278–79). Although Kelly (167) argues that option (a) “is the only exegesis which satisfactorily explains the singular,” the singular form ὁ παθὼν may be read in support of option (b) as a generic singular (see the generic use of the singular in 2:19; 4:11, 15, 18; and especially in the participial constructions in 2:6; 3:10, 13). Option (a) suffers from the difficulty of applying the words πέπνται ἁμαρτίας to Christ. Furthermore, the following context, which speaks of the recipients’ abandonment of their former sinful ways and the resulting persecution that comes to them, significantly argues in favor of option (b). Finally, the contextual strength of option (b) is highlighted all the more by Michaels’ (223) unpersuasive treatment of ὁ παθὼν σαρκί πέπνται ἁμαρτίας as parenthetical.

**ὁ παθὼν.** Aor act ptc masc nom sg πάσχω (substantival). Nominative subject of πέπνται.

**σαρκί.** See *σαρκί* above.

**πέπνται.** Prf mid ind 3rd sg *παύω*. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “direct reflexive” (42–52, 268), i.e., “stop oneself” (see BDAG, 790.2, which translates “is through with sin”; contra Kelly (166), who takes it as passive: “freed from . . . sin”).

**ἀμαρτίας.** Genitive of separation (so Wallace, 109; BDF §180.6). Achtemeier (1996, 280) rightly comments that ἀμαρτίας “refers not to a power that controls human beings, but to acts that go counter to God’s will, as is clear in this context in v. 2.”

**4:2 εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βῶσαι χρόνον.**

**εἰς τὸ.** See below on *βῶσαι*.

**μηκέτι . . . ἀλλὰ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on *μη . . . δὲ*) in which the focal element of the negative clause, ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις, serves to emphasize the focal element of the positive clause (introduced by ἀλλὰ), θελήματι θεοῦ.

**μηκέτι.** Negative temporal adverb, modifying an implied *βῶσαι* within the negative clause. This term is not fronted but is in its usual position as a negator (contra LDGNT).

**ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις.** This phrase stands parallel to the emphatic θελήματι θεοῦ in the following positive clause. The fronting of ἀνθρώπων before the head noun draws attention to the contrast that is being set up.

**ἀνθρώπων.** Subjective genitive.

**ἐπιθυμίαις.** Dative of rule, “according to, in conformity to,” with most interpreters; not a dative of advantage (NIV, ESV) nor a dative of means (RSV, NRSV). On the pejorative connotation of this noun, see 1:14 on *ταῖς . . . ἐπιθυμίαις*.

**θελήματι θεοῦ.** Fronted for emphasis.

**θελήματι.** Dative of rule (see above on *ἐπιθυμίαις*).

**θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ . . . χρόνον.** On the discontinuity of this constituent, see 2:9 on *τὰς ἀρετὰς . . . τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς κατέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς*. Here, even though the

whole constituent is emphatic, the postverbal χρόνον helps to make the connection with the following contrastive ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος. This entire phrase (contra LDGNT) thus represents an unusual second emphatic constituent in a fronted position (usually only one constituent is fronted for the purpose of emphasis) for the sake of contrasting the two time periods.

**τὸν ἐπίλοιπον . . . χρόνον.** Accusative extent of time, modifying βιώσαι.

**ἐν σαρκί.** Spatial, modifying χρόνον. This phrase cannot quite be equated with “in the body,” since this would lead to the implication that the future life is not bodily. Rather, we should understand σαρκί to speak of the weakness of pre-resurrection human existence (as is clear in the use of σάρξ in 1:24). One might then translate the phrase, “in this mortal body,” which allows for a future, imperishable, resurrection body (see also 4:1 on σαρκί). Note that translations such as “the rest of his earthly life” (NIV; similarly NET, NRSV) carry the unfortunate implication that the life of the world to come is not “earthly” (see Rom 8:18-21 as a corrective).

**βιώσαι.** Aor act inf βίω. Used with εἰς τὸ to denote purpose (KJV, ESV, RSV, NRSV; contra BDAG, 647.b, which labels it result, as does NIV; Bigg, 167). Although this clause is often taken to modify the imperative ὀπλίσασθε in verse 1 (e.g., Elliott 2000, 718), it probably modifies instead the immediately preceding πέπανται ἀμαρτίας. It is thus best to understand the causal clause introduced by ὅτι in verse 1, against most interpreters, as extending through this infinitival clause, with the implicit subject of the infinitive being αὐτόν (referring to ὁ παθὼν σαρκί; so also Bigg, 167) rather than ὑμᾶς (contra, e.g., Elliott 2000, 718), not shifting to the second plural form until verse 3 (though clearly the generic singular has the plural recipients in view the whole time). This infinitival clause thus represents the ultimate intention of ὁ παθὼν σαρκί in forsaking sin: he turns from sin in order to devote himself to doing the will of God for the rest of his life.

4:3 ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἔθνῶν κατειργάσθαι πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις, οἰνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις, πότοις καὶ ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρίαις.

**ἄρκετος**. Predicate adjective. Achtemeier (1996, 281) identifies this as an example of meiosis, i.e., understatement (so Michaels, 230: “‘Enough’ is actually more than enough—too much in fact”).

**γάρ**. Introduces a motivational ground for verse 2 (as indicated by the repetition of χρόνος), explaining why the recipients should live the rest of their lives according to God’s will and not human lusts (Schreiner, 202).

**ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος**. Nominative subject of an implied ἔστιν. Numerous manuscripts secondarily supply a plural pronoun (ὐμῖν or ἡμῖν) as a dative of reference modifying the implied ἔστιν following the γάρ. This has the effect of clarifying the implied subject of the following infinitive κατειργάσθαι, marking a shift from the earlier generic third singular. Interestingly, these variants only appear here in verse 3, not in verse 2, suggesting that ancient scribes understood verse 2 to continue the third singular subject from verse 1, as argued above (see 4:2 on βιώσαι).

**παρεληλυθὼς . . . κατειργάσθαι πεπορευμένους**. Beare (180) comments: “The three perfects . . . one after another emphasize the thought that this part of theirs is a closed chapter.”

**παρεληλυθὼς**. Prf act ptc masc nom sg παρέρχομαι (attributive).

**τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν**. Fronted as a topical frame (contra LDGNT).

**τὸ βούλημα**. Accusative direct object of κατειργάσθαι.

**τῶν ἐθνῶν**. Subjective genitive.

**κατειργάσθαι**. Prf mid inf κατεργάζομαι (exegetical, clarifying ἄρκετος). The middle voice corresponds to Miller’s semantic class of “self-interest” (429).

**πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις, οἰνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις, πότοις καὶ ἄθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρίαις**. This is an idiom (literally, “to go/live in something”), which here refers to living a life characterized by the given vice list. The subgroups within the list are: (a) ἀσελγείαις and ἐπιθυμίαις, both referring to sexual sins; (b) οἰνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις, and πότοις, referring to wild partying fueled by alcohol; and (c) idolatry. On the plural forms of the sins, see 2:1 on πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑποκρίσεις καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλίαις.

**πεπορευμένους.** Prf mid ptc masc acc pl πορεύομαι (causal). The referent/agent of this participle is an implied ὑμᾶς, accusative subject of κατεργάσθαι, which explains the accusative plural form of πεπορευμένους. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “translational motion” (69–70, 269).

**ἀσελγείαις.** This term refers to sexual sin (elsewhere appearing with κοίτη (Rom 13:13), πορνεία (2 Cor 12:21), and μοιχεία (Wis 14:26)).

**ἐπιθυμίαις.** Although this term can refer to generic desires, following ἀσελγείαις it is best taken as another reference to sexual sin.

**ὀνοφλυγίαις.** A NT and LXX *hapax legomenon*: “drunkenness.”

**κώμοις.** This noun appears twice elsewhere in the NT, both times in association with drunkenness or drinking parties (paired closely with μέθη in Rom 13:13; see also Gal 5:21), as here (so Spicq, 3:354). In 2 Macc 6:4, κῶμος appears in a context that speaks of the sexual carousing of Gentiles within the temple precincts once this area was dedicated to Zeus. Given this common association of κῶμος with sexual immorality, some translations render the term “orgies” here (ESV, TEV), but this reads too much of the context into the meaning of the term.

**πότοις.** For the use of this term as “drinking party” (BDAG, 857), see LXX Prov 23:30, Jdt 12:10; 13:1.

**ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλοατρίαις.** The adjective ἀθέμιτος could refer to violation of God’s law (Acts 10:28), but here it is usually understood to describe idolatry in more general terms: “wanton, disgusting, unseemly” (BDAG, 24.2).

**4:4 ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται μὴ συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τῆς ἀσωτίας ἀνάχυσιν βλασφημοῦντες,**

**ἐν ᾧ.** Reference (so ESV). The neuter singular ᾧ refers to the entire thought of πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις ... εἰδωλοατρίαις in verse 3 (contra Achtemeier 1996, 283, who argues for “no direct antecedent”). On this use of the neuter relative pronoun, see 2:8 on εἰς ὃ.

**ξενίζονται.** Pres mid ind 3rd pl ξενίζω. The third plural subject

refers to τῶν ἐθνῶν of verse 3. The middle voice fits Kemmer's semantic class of "emotion middle" (130–32, 269).

**συντρεχόντων.** Pres act ptc masc gen pl συντρέχω. Genitive absolute, causal (not temporal, contra ESV, TEV). This term is used literally elsewhere in the NT ("to run with someone" in Mark 6:33; Acts 3:11; it is usually also literal in the LXX, except for Ps 49:18, where the context is similar to here). In the present verse, the verb is used figuratively, intensifying πεπορευμένους in verse 3 (from "walking" to "running") and thus referring to an eagerness to join others in sinful practices. The συν- prefix indicates that the recipients participated in such practices previously with those who are now surprised. A few manuscripts make these former associates explicit by secondarily supplying the dative αὐτοῖς in conjunction with συντρεχόντων.

**ὑμῶν.** Genitive subject of συντρεχόντων. Here the genitive absolute construction marks a switch from the implied subject of the main clause, αὐτοί, to the subject of the participial phrase, ὑμῶν (see also 3:20 on κιβωτοῦ).

**εἰς τὴν . . . ἀνάχυσιν.** Spatial, used metaphorically.

**τὴν . . . ἀνάχυσιν.** This is a NT and LXX *hapax legomenon*, and thus a play on words with the OT flood is unlikely (for which κατακλυσμός is used instead; see, e.g., LXX Gen 7:17; 2 Pet 2:5). Louw and Nida (78.26) classify this term under the semantic domain of "degree." The term extends the literal meaning of "flood" to refer to "an extremely high point" (in negative terms), and thus ἀνάχυσις can be translated "extreme."

**αὐτὴν.** Identical adjectival use of αὐτός: "same."

**τῆς ἀσωτίας.** Epexegetical genitive. BDAG (148) comments that this noun "denotes 'wastefulness' . . . then reckless abandon, debauchery, dissipation, profligacy, especially exhibited in convivial gatherings." Thus, it appears naturally in association with κώμοις and πότοις of verse 3 (see 4:3 on κώμοις; see also Eph 5:18, where Paul associates ἀσωτία with inebriation).

**βλασφημοῦντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl βλασφημέω. Beare (181) understands the participle to function substantivally as an interjection, "blasphemers!" (cf. Michaels, 233–34), though no other participle in 1 Peter functions in such an exclamatory way.

Achtemeier (1996, 284) understands it to modify what *follows* causally, but with a relative pronoun immediately following the participle, this is an awkward proposal. These interpreters all understand the implicit object to be God or Jesus (with “blaspheme” then being an appropriate translation). A much more natural reading arises by taking βλασφημοῦντες as a participle of result, modifying ξενίζονται (TEV: “and so they insult you”; NRSV, NLT<sup>2</sup>; Schreiner, 203–4). Note also the excellent parallel in Acts 13:45, cited by Elliott (727), where the exact term βλασφημοῦντες appears without an explicit object in the final position in the sentence, functioning also as an adverbial participle (though not result). In any case, instead of God or Jesus, the implicit object is ὑμᾶς, since the letter frequently describes the recipients as objects of verbal abuse (2:12, 15; 3:9, 16; 4:14), making “revile” a more suitable translation.

#### 4:5 οἱ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ ἐτοίμως ἔχοντι κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

οἱ. Nominative subject of ἀποδώσουσιν. The antecedent is τῶν ἐθνῶν in verse 3. For simplicity, my translation begins a new sentence here.

ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον. This idiom (literally, “to repay a word/matter”) means “to give an account” (BDAG, 110.2.c; see Matt 12:36; Luke 16:2). Achtemeier (1996, 286) notes that this phrase “is forensic language, and means to answer a legal challenge in court for some activity,” here applied to the final judgment.

ἀποδώσουσιν. Fut act ind 3rd pl ἀποδίδωμι.

λόγον. Accusative direct object of ἀποδώσουσιν.

τῷ ἐτοίμως ἔχοντι κρίναι. Achtemeier (1996, 286) notes that ἔχω in conjunction with an adverb is idiomatic: thus, ἔχειν κακῶς means “to be sick” (e.g., Matt 4:24). Other examples include Mark 16:18 (καλῶς ἔξουσιν, “they will be well”); 1 Tim 5:25 (τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα, “the things being otherwise”); and 2 Macc 14:11 (δυσμενῶς ἔχοντες, “being hostile to”). Thus, ἔχειν ἐτοίμως means “to be ready.”

τῷ . . . ἔχοντι. Pres act ptc masc dat sg ἔχω (substantival). Dative indirect object of ἀποδώσουσιν.

κρίναι. Aor act inf κρίνω (epexegetical to ἐτοίμως).

ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Accusative direct object of κρίναι.

**ζώντας.** Pres act ptc masc acc pl ζάω (substantival).

**4:6** εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι.

**εἰς τοῦτο.** Purpose.

**τοῦτο.** Cataphoric, anticipating the following ἵνα clause (contra Grudem, 170).

**γὰρ.** Although there is a connection between this verse and verse 5 by means of the repeated use of κρίνω and νεκρός, γὰρ is best taken as relating verse 6 to the mistreatment of believers described in verse 4 (and more broadly in vv. 1-5), providing an explanation of God's vindication of mistreated believers: though society judges them worthy of persecution in this life, they will experience the vindication of resurrection at the time of the final judgment (see Dalton 1989, 231).

**καὶ.** Adverbial additive use of καὶ: "also." The postpositive appearance of καὶ after εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ clearly identifies the conjunction as adverbial (see 2:5 on καὶ). Here it marks νεκροῖς as additive, helping the recipients make a connection between the preaching of the gospel to living unbelievers, whose negative response to Christianity and whose consequent destiny has just been described in the verses 4-5, and the preaching of the gospel to believers who are now dead, whose positive response to the gospel when they were alive will consequently lead to a reversal of the judgment that unbelievers had made upon them (contra the ascensive rendering, "even," of most English translations).

**νεκροῖς.** Dative indirect object of εὐηγγελίσθη. The "dead" have been understood as (a) unbelievers who died before the coming of Christ to whom Christ offered salvation in the realm of the dead; (b) OT saints to whom Christ, in the realm of the dead, announced his accomplished salvation; (c) the "spiritually" dead, i.e., non-Christians; (d) Christians who heard and believed the gospel when alive, but who had since died. For a brief discussion and critique of these four options, see Dalton (1989, 51–60). The first two options understand 3:19 with reference to a descent into the realm of the dead, which is unlikely (see 3:19 on τοῖς . . . πνεύμασιν and πορευθεῖς). Option (c) stumbles over the use of νεκροῦς in the

preceding verse, where it refers to the physically dead, as is made clear by its pairing with ζῶντας. Option (d) is more likely (see Dubis 2002, 73; Dalton).

**εὐηγγελίσθη.** Aor pass ind 3rd sg εὐαγγελίζω.

**ἵνα.** Introduces a clause that is exegetical to τοῦτο (so also BDAG, 476.1.e).

**κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι.** Some translations interpret the first part of this correlative construction with reference to the universality of death (so NLT<sup>2</sup>: “they were destined to die like all people”; ESV, NRSV, TEV; Beare, 182). But this entire construction is best understood in light of the parallel correlative construction in 3:18: θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι. In other words, the first part of the construction refers to physical persecution from unbelievers, and the second part refers to the resurrection of the body by the Spirit (see 3:18 on σαρκὶ . . . πνεύματι). Interpreted in light of the parallel in 3:18, σαρκὶ is a dative of place (“in the mortal body”) and πνεύματι is a dative of agency. The use of κατὰ ἀνθρώπων elsewhere in the NT refers to a way of thinking or behaving that is characteristic of sinful humanity or at least uninformed by a specifically Christian perspective (Rom 3:5; 1 Cor 3:3; 9:8; 15:32; Gal 1:11; 3:15). Κατὰ ἀνθρώπους bears the same sense here despite the plural form. In this light, the first part of the construction refers to the passing of judgment from an unbelieving perspective. With regard to the latter part of the correlative construction, the phrase κατὰ θεὸν is sometimes interpreted to refer to living “the way God does” (ESV; similarly NRSV, TEV). The phrase κατὰ θεὸν, however, is best understood by the one other use of this phrase in the letter (5:2), where it refers to the elders shepherding willingly “as pleases God.” If we read this same meaning in the present verse, the correlative construction sets forward the following contrast: On the one hand, unbelievers have judged Christians in this mortal life as they have sinfully seen fit; on the other hand, God will also act as he sees fit, vindicating believers through resurrection by the Spirit in the life of the world to come.

**κριθῶσι.** Aor pass subj 3rd pl κρίνω. Subjunctive with ἵνα.

**μὲν . . . δὲ.** Like 3:18, the μὲν marks the verdict of human beings upon believers as having been trumped by the contents of the δέ

clause: the verdict of God vindicates believers through resurrection. Numerous versions rightly capture the force of the clause introduced by μὲν using a concessive translation (“though”; RSV, ESV, NRSV, NET). For further discussion of the function of this correlative construction, see 1:20. On the postpositive positioning of these conjunctions, see 2:4 on μὲν . . . δὲ.

**κατὰ ἀνθρώπους.** Standard (LN 89.8; see also above).

**σαρκί.** Dative of place, modifying κριθῶσι. On the meaning of this term, see 4:2 on ἐν σαρκί.

**ζῶσι.** Pres act subj 3rd pl ζάω. Subjunctive with ἵνα.

**κατὰ θεόν.** Standard (LN 89.8; see also above).

**πνεύματι.** Dative of agency, modifying ζῶσι (not spacial “in the spirit” as in many translations).

### 1 Peter 4:7-11

<sup>7</sup>The end of all things has drawn near. Therefore, be exceedingly clearheaded for the purpose of prayer. <sup>8</sup>Above all, keep your love toward one another constant because love covers a multitude of sins. <sup>9</sup>Be hospitable to one another without grumbling. <sup>10</sup>In keeping with the fact that each one of you has received a gift, serve one another with it, as good managers of the manifold benevolence of God. <sup>11</sup>If anyone speaks, let him speak as one speaking the words of God; if anyone serves, let him serve as one serving from the strength that God supplies. Do so in order that in all things God might be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom belongs glory and power forever. Amen.

**4:7 Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν. σωφρονήσατε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς·**

**Πάντων . . . τὸ τέλος.** Fronted as a topical frame.

**Πάντων.** Subjective genitive. This substantival adjective refers to the whole created order (“all things”), and thus is neuter, not masculine (rightly Achtemeier 1996, 293; contra Elliott, 745, who understands Πάντων to refer to all “times”; see also 1:20). For the use of the neuter plural with respect to all creation, see, e.g., Rom 11:36; 1 Cor 8:6; 15:27-28; Eph 1:22.

**δὲ.** Although difficult to bring out in translation, δὲ introduces a

new development in the argument (see 1:7 on δέ) that builds upon what precedes: the judgment of which verses 5-6 speak is now described as “near” (see Selwyn, 216).

**τὸ τέλος.** Nominative subject of ἤγγικεν.

**ἤγγικεν.** Prf act ind 3rd sg ἐγγίζω. On the use of the perfect tense here, see verse 17, which refers to the final judgment as having already begun.

**σωφρονήσατε . . . καὶ νήψατε.** Both of these verbs refer to thinking in a clear and composed way, and thus they are best taken as a doublet (see 1:4 on ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον) that emphasizes the need for eschatological clearheadedness. Since σωφρονέω and νήφω can be contrasted with drunkenness (indeed, the basic meaning of νήφω is “to be sober”), we should understand this exhortation to contrast with the unrestrained partying described in verse 3 (which gives no thought to God’s coming judgment).

**σωφρονήσατε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl σωφρονέω.

**οὖν.** This is a simple inferential use of οὖν (on its various uses, see 2:1), which introduces exhortations (not just the doubled exhortation regarding clearheadedness but also the other exhortations in the following verses; Achtemeier 1996, 294) that are motivationally grounded in the nearness of the end.

**νήψατε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl νήφω.

**εἰς προσευχάς.** Purpose. Elliott (749) properly regards the plural as referring to “the plurality of acts of praying.”

**4:8 πρὸ πάντων τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοῦς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες, ὅτι ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.**

**πρὸ πάντων.** Rank/priority: “above all” (see Jas 5:12). Fronted as an adverbial frame.

**τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοῦς ἀγάπην.** Fronted as a topical frame (contra LDGNT).

**τὴν . . . ἀγάπην.** Accusative direct object in an object-complement double accusative construction.

**εἰς ἑαυτοῦς.** Directional, modifying ἀγάπην.

**ἐκτενῆ.** Accusative complement in an object-complement double accusative construction. Fronted for emphasis. On adject-

tives in such constructions, see 2:12 on καλήν (see also Robertson, 789–90). The same debate occurs regarding the meaning of this adjective as occurs with its cognate adjective in 1:22 (see 1:22 on ἐκτενῶς). Some take ἐκτενῆ to mean “fervent” (KJV, ASV, NET; NIV: “deeply”; ESV and TEV: “earnestly”; Kelly, 177) and others take it as “unfailing” (RSV) or “constant” (NRSV; BDAG, 310; Michaels, 246). The supporting proverb that follows makes no comment regarding the “earnestness” of love, but the gnomic nature of this proverb could be interpreted to refer to the need to forgive the sins of others on an ongoing basis. The use of the citation in *1 Clem.* 49:5, which is immediately followed by “love endures all things and patiently bears all things,” also favors the translation “constant” (Beare, 185).

**ἔχοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl ἔχω (imperative). Achtemeier (1996, 295) takes this participle as modifying the participles in verse 7, but the intervening πρὸ πάντων suggests that it should be taken as an independent imperatival participle. Schreiner (211–12) notes that even if Achtemeier is correct, the participle ends up carrying imperative force. On the debate regarding imperatival participles in 1 Peter, see 1:14 on συσχηματιζόμενοι.

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause in the form of a scriptural citation, which serves as a motivational ground for the preceding exhortation.

**ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.** The citation of Prov 10:12 here is much more closely aligned with the MT than the LXX in this instance (LXX: πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικούντας καλύπτει φιλία, “love covers all the ones who do not love strife”; MT: כַּבֵּרֶת אֶת־כָּל־עֲוֹנוֹתֶיךָ לֶאֱמֶן, “love covers all sins”).

**ἀγάπη.** Nominative subject of καλύπτει. Fronted as a topical frame, shifting attention slightly from the previous topic, τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοῦς ἀγάπην, to the generic ἀγάπη here.

**καλύπτει . . . ἁμαρτιῶν.** For the idiom of “covering sin,” see LXX Ps 84:3 [ET 85:2], where this expression (ἐκάλυψας . . . τὰς ἁμαρτίας) parallels “forgiving iniquity” (ἀφῆκας τὰς ἀνομίας). Thus, this expression should be understood to refer to forgiving the sins of others.

**καλύπτει.** Pres act ind 3rd sg καλύπτω. An important variant

uses the future *καλύψει* here (ⲡ<sup>72</sup> ⲛ P 049 ⲉ). Perhaps this future was original, and the present form is an accommodation to the present *καλύπτει* in the LXX of Prov 10:12. On the other hand, the future form could be an accommodation to a future reading of the Hebrew imperfect form in Prov 10:12 or the future form in the citation of this same OT text in Jas 5:20. Also, the eschatological context of verse 8, with its discussion of future judgment, could easily lead a scribe to shift from a present to a future verb. All in all, the present seems more likely to be the original reading (A B K Ψ 33 *al*); so Michaels, 243; Achtemeier 1996, 292.

*πλήθος*. Accusative direct object of *καλύπτει*.

*ἁμαρτιῶν*. Partitive genitive.

#### 4:9 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους ἄνευ γογγυμοῦ,

*φιλόξενοι*. Predicate adjective. Implicit here is an imperatival ἔστε (Elliott 2000, 751; see 3:8 on the similar adjectives *ὁμόφρονες*, *συμπαθεῖς*, *φιλάδελφοι*, *εὐσπλαγχνοι*, and *ταπεινόφρονες*). Alternatively, Michaels (357) understands the adjective itself to function as an imperative. Achtemeier (1996, 296) finds an implicit ὄντες here, dependent on the imperatives in verse 7 (as he also reads ἔχοντες in v. 8, arising from his general reluctance to interpret participles as imperatival).

*εἰς ἀλλήλους*. The preposition marks *ἀλλήλους* as an “involved experiencer” (see LN 90.59) of the verbal idea implicit in *φιλόξενοι*.

*ἄνευ γογγυμοῦ*. The preposition is a marker “of negatively linked elements” (LN 89.120).

*γογγυμοῦ*. This onomatopoeic term refers to an “utterance made in a low tone of voice,” whether expressing satisfaction or, as here, dissatisfaction (BDAG, 204). A number of manuscripts read a plural *γογγυσμών* (P 049 ⲉ), a secondary reading that envisions repeated acts of grumbling.

#### 4:10 ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ.

*ἕκαστος*. Nominative subject of *ἔλαβεν*. Fronted as a topical

frame, focusing attention on each Christian's gift and consequent responsibility.

**καθώς.** Louw and Nida (89.34) note that καθώς can be “a marker of cause or reason, often with the implication of some implied comparison.” Here καθώς connotes cause (see BDF §453.2), motivationally grounding the following participial exhortation (contra BDAG, 493.2; and Elliott 2000, 753, who take it as indicating extent or degree: “to the degree that one has received a gift”).

**ἔλαβεν.** Aor act ind 3rd sg λαμβάνω.

**χάρισμα.** Accusative direct object of ἔλαβεν.

**εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες.** Lit. “serve it to one another” (similarly BDAG, 229.2.a).

**εἰς ἑαυτοὺς.** Benefaction (see LN 90.41). The reflexive pronoun sometimes appears as a substitute for the reciprocal pronoun ἀλλήλων (BDF §287; BDAG, 269.2). Fronted for emphasis.

**αὐτὸ.** Accusative direct object of διακονοῦντες. The antecedent is χάρισμα. On the fronting of this pronoun, see the comment on 1:21, αὐτῷ.

**διακονοῦντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl διακονέω (imperative). Most English translations render this participle with an imperative form (note the imperatival tone of the preceding verses) and understand it to begin a new sentence in verse 10. On the debate regarding imperatival participles in 1 Peter, see 1:14 on συσχηματιζόμενοι.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce the role in which the recipients should employ their spiritual gifts.

**καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι.** This nominative noun is the second component in a ὡς construction involving the implied nominative ὑμεῖς that is the referent of διακονοῦντες.

**ποικίλης χάριτος.** Objective genitive. The many dimensions of God's χάρις are manifested in the various χαρίσματα that individual Christians have (see Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12; see NLT<sup>2</sup>: “his great variety of spiritual gifts”).

**θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**4:11** εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια θεοῦ· εἴ τις διακονεῖ, ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν πᾶσιν δοξάζηται ὁ θεός διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἔστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων, ἀμήν.

**εἴ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition.

**τις.** Nominative subject of λαλεῖ. Fronted as a topical frame within the conditional clause.

**λαλεῖ.** Pres act ind 3rd sg λαλέω.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative clause involving ellipsis, modifying an implicit repetition of λαλέω (best read as a third singular imperative).

**λόγια.** Accusative direct object of a second implicit form of λαλέω (probably participial; see the translation). This analysis contrasts with Bigg, 174, who reads λόγια as nominative (“let him speak as the oracles of God speak”), which runs counter to the parallel construction that follows (rightly Selwyn, 219).

**θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**εἴ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition.

**τις.** Nominative subject of διακονεῖ. Fronted as a topical frame within the conditional clause.

**διακονεῖ.** Pres act ind 3rd sg διακονέω.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative clause involving ellipsis, modifying an implicit repetition of διακονέω (best read as a third singular imperative).

**ἐξ ἰσχύος.** Louw and Nida (89.3) note that ἐκ can be “a marker of the source from which . . . something is physically or psychologically derived.” This phrase modifies a second implicit form of διακονέω (probably participial; see the translation).

**ἧς.** Genitive by attraction to its antecedent ἰσχύος. One would instead expect ἧν, since χορηγέω usually takes its direct object in the accusative (2 Cor 9:10; 1 Macc 14:10). Accusative attraction to a genitive antecedent is a particularly common variety of attraction (Wallace, 338–39).

**χορηγεῖ.** Pres act ind 3rd sg χορηγέω.

**ὁ θεός.** Nominative subject of χορηγεῖ.

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause, modifying the exhortations of the two preceding conditional constructions.

**ἐν πᾶσιν.** Reference. Fronted for emphasis. Πᾶσιν is a neuter substantival adjective: “all things.”

**δοξάζεταιται.** Pres pass subj 3rd sg δοξάζω. Subjunctive with ἵνα.

**ὁ θεός.** Nominative subject of δοξάζεταιται.

**διὰ Ἰησοῦ.** Here, διὰ is a marker “of the means by which one event makes another event possible” (LN 89.76), and Ἰησοῦ is a metonymy for Jesus’ work, which makes it possible for the recipients to glorify God through their speaking and serving.

**Χριστοῦ.** On the meaning, see 1:1.

**ᾧ.** Dative of possession. The antecedent could be either God (Achtmeier 1996, 299) or Jesus (Michaels, 253). Despite the proximity of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the antecedent is probably θεός, given the verbal tie between δοξάζεταιται and δόξα (see also 2:12 and 5:11 with reference to God; so Achtmeier 1996, 299).

**ἔστιν.** Pres act ind 3rd sg εἶμι. This is an indicative, not an optative form, despite the fact that some English translations render this as a prayer wish (e.g., NIV: “To him be the glory . . .”).

**ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος.** Nominative subject of ἔστιν.

**τὸ κράτος.** “Exercise of ruling ability, power, rule, sovereignty” (BDAG, 565.3).

**εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.** Temporal. This idiom (“until the ages of the ages”) means “forever.” See 1:25 on εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

**τῶν αἰώνων.** Partitive genitive.

**ἀμήν.** Transliteration of the Hebrew אָמֵן: a “strong affirmation of what is declared—‘truly, indeed, it is true that’” (LN 72.6). Here, it marks the conclusion of this unit of the letter (Achtmeier 1996, 300).

### 1 Peter 4:12-19

<sup>12</sup>Beloved, do not be surprised because of the fiery ordeal among you, which is taking place to test you, as if something strange were happening to you, <sup>13</sup>but to the degree that you share in the messianic sufferings, rejoice, in order that you might really rejoice at the revelation of his glory. <sup>14</sup>If you are reviled as ones bearing Christ’s name, you are blessed, because the glorious Spirit—indeed, the

Spirit of God—rests upon you. <sup>15</sup>By no means let any of you suffer as a murderer or a thief or a criminal or as a busybody, <sup>16</sup>but if anyone suffers as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him praise God as one who bears this name <sup>17</sup>because the time for judgment to begin with the house of God has come; but if it has begun first with us, what is the destiny of the ones who disobey the good news about God? <sup>18</sup>And if the righteous person is barely saved, where will the ungodly sinner appear? <sup>19</sup>Therefore, let the ones who suffer according to what God wills entrust themselves to a faithful creator while doing good.

**4:12 Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένη ὡς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος,**

**Ἀγαπητοί.** Vocative.

**μὴ . . . ἀλλὰ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μὴ . . . δὲ) in which the negated imperatival clause in this verse serves to emphasize the positive imperatival clause introduced by ἀλλὰ in verse 13.

**ξενίζεσθε.** Pres mid impv 2nd pl ξενίζω. On the category of the middle voice, see 4:4 on ξενίζονται. The middle form there suggests that ξενίζεσθε is likewise middle, not passive here.

**τῇ . . . πυρώσει.** Dative of cause (so BDF §196; Wallace, 167–68). Some who misread the verb as a passive may instead opt for means. This term appears elsewhere only in Rev 18:9, 18 in the NT and in Amos 4:9 and Prov 27:21 in the LXX. Proverbs 27:21 is the most important biblical parallel, where πύρωσις refers to metallurgical refinement, translating the Hebrew פְּרִיזָה or the parallel פְּרִיזָה, terms for a crucible or smelting-pot (the cognate πυρόω is likewise usually used in metallurgical contexts in the LXX). This metallurgical usage highlights the parallel between this verse and 1:6-7. In order not to obscure this parallel, translations such as the RSV’s “fiery ordeal” or the KJV’s “fiery trial,” which retain the imagery of fire, are preferable to translations such as the NIV’s “painful trial.” Paralleling “the time of the crucible” at Qumran, πύρωσις refers to the anticipated eschatological ordeal, involving the persecution of the faithful (see *Did.* 16:5; for further discussion and interaction with the related thesis of Sander, see Dubis 2002, 76–85).

**ἐν ὑμῖν.** Spatial, modifying πρῶσει.

**πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν.** On the fronting of this complement before γινομένη, see 1:15 on ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ.

**πρὸς πειρασμὸν.** Purpose. On the eschatological connotations of πειρασμός, see Dubis (2002, 85–95).

**ὑμῖν.** This pronoun could be taken with the preceding πειρασμὸν (Achtmeier 1996, 306) or the following γινομένη (Elliott 2000, 772). In favor of the latter, γίνομαι appears elsewhere with the dative of the person affected (see BDAG, 197.4.b). Nevertheless, this option creates an unlikely degree of redundancy between ὑμῖν γινομένη and ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος (rightly Michaels, 261). Thus, it is better to take the pronoun with πειρασμὸν, in which case it is best taken as a dative of reference (contra Michaels, who takes it as a dative of possession).

**γινομένη.** Pres mid ptc fem dat sg γίνομαι (attributive; contra Bigg, 176, who takes this as a causal participle). On the absence of the article with this attributive participle, note the position of ἐν ὑμῖν and see 1:18 on πατροπαραδότου and 3:20 on ἀπειθήσασιν. On the question of deponency with this verb, see 1:15 on γενήθητε. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “spontaneous events associated with inanimate beings” (142–47, 269).

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative clause involving ellipsis: “as (you would be surprised) if something strange were happening to you.”

**ξένου.** Genitive subject of συμβαίνοντος. Here the genitive absolute construction marks a switch from the subject of the main clause, an implied ὑμεῖς, to the subject of the genitive participial phrase, ξένου (see 3:20 on κιβωτοῦ). The subject ξένου is fronted for emphasis (so also LDGNT).

**ὑμῖν.** Dative of reference. On the fronting of this pronoun, see the comment on 1:21, αὐτῶ.

**συμβαίνοντος.** Pres act ptc neut gen sg συμβαίω. Genitive absolute, conditional. This participle is synonymous with γινομένη. For the dative with συμβαίω, indicating the person affected, see, e.g., Mark 10:32; Acts 3:10; 20:19; 2 Pet 2:22.

**4:13** ἀλλὰ καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι.

**ἀλλὰ.** See 4:12 on μὴ . . . ἀλλὰ.

**καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν.** Fronted as an adverbial frame (see LDGNT).

**καθὸ.** Adverb of degree: “to the degree that” (LN 78.53).

**κοινωνεῖτε.** Pres act ind 2nd pl κοινωνέω.

**τοῖς . . . παθήμασιν.** Dative direct object of κοινωνεῖτε.

**τοῦ Χριστοῦ.** Although Χριστοῦ is usually taken to be a subjective genitive that strictly refers to Jesus’ sufferings, I have argued elsewhere that the phrase τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων has a broader referent. Drawing upon the messianic woes tradition in early Judaism, this phrase refers to both the sufferings of Jesus *and* believers. An attributive rendering of the genitive Χριστοῦ within its phrase, i.e., “messianic sufferings,” allows for this breadth of meaning (see also 1:11; 5:1; LN 24.78). For a fuller summary of the issues here, see Dubis (2001) and, with specific attention to this phrase in 4:13, see Dubis (2002, 96–104).

**χαίρετε.** Pres act impv 2nd pl χαίρω.

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause.

**καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.** Fronted for emphasis.

**καὶ.** Adverbial additive use of καί: “also.” The postpositive appearance of καί after ἵνα clearly marks it as adverbial (see 2:5 on καὶ). Here καὶ marks the following prepositional phrase as additive, helping the recipients make the connection between a present joyful response to suffering and the experience of greater future joy at the Parousia.

**ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει.** Temporal.

**τῆς δόξης.** Objective genitive (see also 1:7 on Ἰησοῦ).

**αὐτοῦ.** Possessive genitive.

**χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι.** These two verbs are essentially synonymous and have the force of a doublet (see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον), emphasizing the single idea of future joy (see, e.g., TEV’s “full of joy” or NIV’s “overjoyed”). The contrast of the earlier χαίρετε (referring to the present) with the intensified χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι (referring to the future) serves to emphasize the fuller experience of joy that lies ahead at the eschaton

(rightly Michaels, 261–62: “be glad, so that . . . you may rejoice all the more”). The middle voice for χαρήτε and ἀγαλλιώμενοι fits Kemmer’s semantic class of “emotion middle” (130–32, 269).

**χαρήτε.** Aor mid subj 2nd pl χαίρω. Subjunctive with ἵνα.

**ἀγαλλιώμενοι.** Pres mid ptc masc nom pl ἀγαλλιάω (manner). On the class of the middle voice, see the further comment on 1:6, ἀγαλλιᾶσθε.

**4:14 εἰ ὀνειδίξεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται.**

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition. Against translating εἰ as “when” following Achtemeier (1996, 307), see Schreiner (221) and 1:6 on εἰ.

**ὀνειδίξεσθε.** Pres pass ind 2nd pl ὀνειδίζω. This verb focuses on the verbal rather than physical abuse toward the recipients (rightly Achtemeier 1996, 307).

**ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ.** Most English translations take this phrase as causal (e.g., TEV: “because you are a Christian”). Most likely, however, it denotes sphere, in the sense that one operates with a certain status or identity as a result of the name that one bears. The phrase ἐν ὀνόματι frequently appears with this meaning in the NT, though only here with a passive verb (Matt 21:9; 23:39; Mark 11:9; Luke 13:35; 19:38; John 12:13; Acts 16:18; Eph 5:20; Col 3:17; 2 Thess 3:6; see also the arthrous ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ in 4:16).

**Χριστοῦ.** Possessive genitive.

**μακάριοι.** This predicate adjective along with an implied copula εἶστε (which some manuscripts secondarily add) form the apodosis of this verse’s condition.

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause, providing evidence for the preceding assertion (μακάριοι).

**τὸ . . . τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται.** This text is dependent on Isa 11:2, the only LXX text that contains the vocabulary complex of πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπί, and ἀναπαύω (ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ; MT: הַרְחִיקֵנוּ מִפְּנֵי הַקְּדוֹשׁ). Peter’s alteration of Isaiah’s future ἀναπαύσεται to a present tense suggests that Peter understands Isaiah’s promise now to be fulfilled (Michaels,

265). For further discussion of this OT background, see Dubis (2002, 118–29).

**τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα.** Fronted as a topical frame (so also LDGNT). Kelly (187) calls this construction “bafflingly difficult.” This difficulty arises in light of the second appearance of τὸ (if this τὸ were absent, the καὶ would not be problematic; see, e.g., Matt 11:25; 28:19). The phrase has been understood as (a) a hendiadys (see BDF §442.16; Elliott 2000, 782: “the divine Spirit of glory”; though, if it were a hendiadys, it would be better to translate it “the Spirit of the glorious God”; on hendiadys, see the comment on 1:2, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ); (b) an exegetical expression (“the Spirit of glory—indeed, the Spirit of God”; see TEV, NRSV, NET; Kelly, 187), in which case the καὶ is best taken as explicative rather than conjunctive; or (c) expressing two distinct subjects of ἀναπαύεται with the καὶ being conjunctive and τὸ τῆς δόξης being either a reference to the Shekinah (Selwyn, 222–24; similarly the Twentieth Century New Testament, “the divine Glory and the Spirit of God are resting upon you”) or the eschatological glory just mentioned in verse 13 (Achtemeier 1996, 309; Schreiner, 222–23). Proponents of option (c), especially Selwyn, point to a number of similar constructions in the LXX, where a neuter article appears before a genitive substantive (although τὸ τῆς δόξης appears nowhere in the LXX). A choice between (b) and (c) is difficult, but option (b) is more closely aligned with the Isa 11:2 background, which modifies πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ with a number of exegetical genitival phrases (on the repetition of the τὸ, see also Robertson, 785, who argues that it is for the sake of emphasis). Numerous variants seek to eliminate the awkwardness of this construction, though the given text is well attested.

**τὸ . . . πνεῦμα.** Nominative subject of ἀναπαύεται.

**τῆς δόξης.** Attributive genitive.

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** Exegetical genitive.

**ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς.** Spatial, metaphorical. Fronted for emphasis (so also LDGNT).

**ἀναπαύεται.** Pres mid ind 3rd sg ἀναπαύω. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “translational motion,” here in the negation of such action (69–70, 269). Here the image

of “resting upon” has “the implication of beneficent result” (see LN 13.25, which translates, “the Spirit of God continues to be with you”). Following this word, some manuscripts (P Ψ ℞) add a correlative construction, which the KJV includes, “on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified.” Michaels (265–66) argues for its originality, but it is likely a secondary scribal commentary on the blasphemy of the Spirit (against its originality, see Achtemeier 1996, 303).

**4:15 μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιὸς ἢ ὡς ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος.**

**μὴ . . . δὲ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μὴ . . . δὲ) across all of verses 15-16 in which the negated imperatival clause in verse 15 serves to emphasize the positive imperatival clause in verse 16 (which also has its own embedded negative-positive construction). Notice also the chiasmic arrangement of verses 15-16’s negative-positive construction (which is aided by the ellipsis of τις πάσχει in v. 16a): a – the third singular imperative πασχέτω in verse 15a; b – the use of ὡς in verse 15b; b’ – the use of ὡς in verse 16a; and a’ – the third singular imperatives αἰσχυνέσθω and δοξαζέτω in verse 16b.

**γάρ.** BDAG (190.3) notes that γάρ can be used to introduce an exclamation or strong affirmation, translating the opening of this verse: “by no means let any of you suffer.”

**τις ὑμῶν.** Fronted for emphasis (LDGNT).

**τις.** Nominative subject of πασχέτω.

**ὑμῶν.** Partitive genitive.

**πασχέτω.** Pres act impv 3rd sg πάσχω.

**ὡς . . . ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce the roles in which the recipients should *not* suffer.

**φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιὸς ἢ ὡς ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος.** This series of nominative nouns provides the second component in a ὡς construction involving the nominative τις. Most understand κακοποιὸς, following “murderer” and “thief,” to refer to criminal wrongdoing (“criminal”; NRSV, NET, NIV, TEV). Thus, the final term in the list, marked by ὡς, would represent a shift from

criminal wrongdoing to being a social pariah if the usual rendering is accepted (see the following comment).

**ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος.** Much investigation has gone into this term, the meaning of which is difficult to establish with certainty since it appears nowhere else in biblical or nonbiblical Greek except for three late instances in the fourth and fifth centuries C.E. The majority rendering is “busybody” or “meddler” (KJV, ESV, NIV, TEV; LN 88.245), which has several points in its favor (see Michaels, 267–68). For an argument that the term refers to defrauding or embezzling, matching the other criminal terms in the list, see the excursus in Achtemeier (1996, 311–13). For further discussion, see Dubis (2002, 131–33).

**4:16 εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός, μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ.**

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition. Despite the contextual parallels with verse 14, the elided phrase is not ὀνειδίξεσθε, as Achtemeier (1996, 313) contemplates, but rather τις πάσχει (implied from v. 15), as suggested by the parallel between ὡς Χριστιανός here and ὡς φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιὸς ἢ ὡς ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος in verse 15.

**δὲ.** Introduces a significant change from suffering for corrupt behavior in verse 15 to suffering as a Christian.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce the role in which the recipients may legitimately suffer (in contrast with the illegitimate roles in v. 15).

**Χριστιανός.** This nominative noun is the second component in a ὡς construction involving the implied nominative τις. This term also occurs in Acts 11:26 and 26:28.

**μὴ . . . δὲ.** This correlative pair organizes a negative-positive construction (see 1:12 on μὴ . . . δὲ) in which the negated imperative αἰσχυνέσθω serves to emphasize the positive imperatival clause, δοξαζέτω . . . τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ, which is introduced by δὲ. The entire construction forms the apodosis in the conditional statement.

**αἰσχυνέσθω.** Pres mid impv 3rd sg αἰσχύνω. This verb connotes not simply subjective shame, but anticipates the potential of a con-

crete denial of one's faith (for further discussion, see Dubis 2002, 135–39). The middle voice fits Kemmer's semantic class of "emotion middle" (130–32, 269).

**δοξαζέτω.** Pres act impv 3rd sg δοξαζάω.

**τὸν θεόν.** Accusative direct object of δοξαζέτω.

**ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ.** The "name" in view is Χριστιανός, not Χριστός (though the two cannot be divorced). If Χριστός were the immediate referent, we might take ἐν as means, but this does not suit Χριστιανός well. A number of translations take it causally (NRSV, NET, TEV, NLT<sup>2</sup>), which is less likely here than in verse 14. Instead, the prepositional phrase is best taken as indicating sphere (so also Selwyn, 225), as the similar anarthrous phrase earlier was also understood (see v. 14 on ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ; for arthrous parallels, see John 5:43; 10:25; 14:26; 17:11-12; Acts 9:27-28; 1 Cor 5:4; Jas 5:10). In the new *Editio Critica Maior*, ὀνόματι (UBS<sup>4</sup>/NA<sup>27</sup>) has been replaced with μέρει ("matter"), which occurs in P 049 307  $\mathfrak{M}$ . Despite the much stronger manuscript evidence for ὀνόματι ( $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$   $\aleph$  A B  $\Psi$  33 *al*), this latter reading is adopted on the basis that it is easier to explain a scribe changing μέρει to ὀνόματι than vice versa. In favor of the now new reading is Michaels (257, 269–70); opposed are Achtemeier (1996, 303–4) and Elliott (2000, 796). The variant μέρει could have arisen out of scribal discomfort over the shift in the referent of ὀνόματι in verse 14 (where it refers to Χριστός) to its referent in verse 16 (Χριστιανός).

**4:17 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;**

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause, giving a motivational grounds for the preceding exhortations. Although Elliott (2000, 797) understands ὅτι to modify all of verses 12-16, and a number of commentators understand it to modify verse 16 alone (e.g., Achtemeier 1996, 315), it most likely modifies verses 15-16 (so Michaels, 270) in light of the tight conjunction of these two preceding verses via their chiasmic negative-positive construction (see 4:15 on μὴ . . . δὲ). Consequently, verse 17 provides motivational grounds for both verse 15 and verse 16: in light of the eschatological judgment, the

recipients should avoid the sins of verse 15 and, as verse 16 exhorts, hold fast to their faith unashamedly, praising God in the midst of their suffering.

**[ὁ] καιρὸς.** Nominative subject of an implied ἐστίν (contra Michaels, 270, who takes it as the predicate nominative of an implied ἐστίν, with no difference in meaning). On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίν]. The manuscript evidence is divided on the presence of the article (Michaels, 257, opposes inclusion; Elliott 2000, 797, supports it).

**τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ.** The strongest candidate for the OT background here is Ezek 9:6, the only text in the LXX that uses the language of “beginning from the temple” (LXX: ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου ἄρξασθε; MT: וְהָיָה שִׁדְרֵי הַיָּדָיִם). Elliott (1990, 243) argues that the phrase τῶν ἁγίων μου as well as οἶκος in Ezek 9 are references to the elders of Ezek 9, and from here he argues that 1 Peter’s use of τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ is likewise a communal image. But τῶν ἁγίων in the LXX frequently refers to the temple, so the Septuagintal translator is not deviating from the reference to the temple in the Hebrew text. Furthermore, Ezek 9:6 distinguishes the elders from the οἶκος (the elders are inside the temple). Thus, 1 Peter’s reference to τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ should be understood not communally but as a metaphorical reference to the temple (rightly Johnson, 285–94, who concludes regarding the LXX’s use of οἶκος qualified by the genitive θεοῦ or κυρίου, “In the LXX ‘house of God’ refers exclusively to a sanctuary in which God meets his people”; see also Michaels, 271; Achtemeier 1996, 316; 2:5 on οἶκος). For further discussion and critique of Elliott, see Dubis (2002, 151–53).

**τοῦ ἄρξασθαι.** Aor mid inf ἄρχω (epexegetical). The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “spontaneous events associated with inanimate beings” (142–47, 269).

**τὸ κρίμα.** Accusative subject of ἄρξασθαι.

**ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου.** Spatial. Used with ἄρχομαι, ἀπὸ marks a starting point (BDAG, 105.2.a).

**οἶκου.** This term is often understood as a familial term (“household”; RSV, ESV, NRSV, NLT<sup>2</sup>; “family” in NIV), but given the OT background, this is much more likely to be a reference to the temple (see further above).

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** Possessive genitive.

**εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ’ ἡμῶν, τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ.** This conditional statement structurally and conceptually anticipates the following scriptural warrant, i.e., the citation of Prov 11:31 in verse 18. The rhetorical question in the apodosis is used for the sake of emphasis, stressing how terrible will be the judgment upon unbelievers (on this function of rhetorical questions, see 2:20 on ποῖον . . . κλέος). Peter uses an *a fortiori* argument here (an argument moving from the lesser “to the stronger”): the beginning is not as severe as the later full brunt of the judgment (Selwyn, 226).

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition, involving an implied repetition of a form of ἄρχω (ἤρξατο). On the use of a condition when its reality is assumed, see 1:6 on εἰ.

**δὲ.** Introduces the next step in the argument (see 1:7 on δέ), shifting attention from the judgment of God’s people to the judgment of unbelievers.

**πρῶτον.** Temporal adverb, modifying the implicit ἤρξατο.

**ἀφ’ ἡμῶν.** Spatial (see above on ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου), modifying the implicit ἤρξατο.

**τί.** This interrogative pronoun serves as the predicate nominative.

**τὸ τέλος.** Nominative subject of an implied ἐστίν.

**τῶν ἀπειθούντων.** Pres act ptc masc gen pl ἀπειθέω (substantival). Subjective genitive.

**τῷ . . . εὐαγγελίῳ.** Dative direct object of ἀπειθούντων.

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** This genitive could either be subjective (BDAG, 403.1.b.β.2; TEV: “the Good News from God”), referring to the good news that God has announced, or more likely, objective, referring to the good news that Christians have announced about God to the society that persecutes them.

**4:18 καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβῆς καὶ ἀμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται;**

**καὶ.** The conjunction marks a close relationship between verse 17 and its scriptural warrant in verse 18 (see also 1:17 on καὶ).

**εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σφάζεται, ὁ ἀσεβῆς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται.** This is an exact citation of LXX Prov 11:31 (with the exception of the omission of μὲν following εἰ ὁ, which a few manuscripts, including ℱ<sup>72</sup>, secondarily supply). On the structure of this conditional statement and the force of the rhetorical question in the apodosis, see verse 17 on εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ’ ἡμῶν, τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ. Here the rhetorical question emphasizes a known fact: “Certainly, the ungodly sinner will appear nowhere (in the world to come)” (see also 2:20 on ποῖον . . . κλέος). For a detailed analysis of Prov 11:31 and its application in 1 Peter, including analysis of the somewhat dissimilar Hebrew original (MT: אִם־יִהְיֶה־שֹׁפֵט־בְּיָמֵי־צַדִּיקִים־יִצְדַּק־יְהוָה), see Dubis (2002, 163–71).

**εἰ.** Introduces the protasis of a first class condition. On the use of a condition when its reality is assumed, see 1:6 on εἰ.

**ὁ δίκαιος.** Nominative subject of σφάζεται. Fronted as a topical frame within the conditional clause (itself also a frame). Generic singular.

**μόλις.** Adverb of degree. Fronted for emphasis within the conditional clause.

**σφάζεται.** Pres pass ind 3rd sg σφάζω. A few manuscripts, including ℱ<sup>72</sup>, secondarily read a future instead of present form here in order to better parallel the future φανεῖται or make the futuristic force of σφάζεται explicit.

**ὁ ἀσεβῆς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς.** Nominative subject of φανεῖται. Fronted as a topical frame. This phrase meets the criteria for Granville Sharp’s rule (see 1:3 on ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ), which means that the two substantival adjectives (both generic singulars) refer to the same person. In order to bring this out in translation, this phrase is rendered as a hendiadys: “ungodly sinner.”

**ποῦ.** Interrogative adverb of location. Fronted for emphasis.

**φανεῖται.** Fut mid ind 3rd sg φαίνω. Instead of asking what will “become of” the ungodly sinner, this verb in context asks where the ungodly sinner will “appear.” An intriguing conceptual parallel is found in 1 En. 38:2 (“where will the dwelling of sinners be?”), with the answer being given: “they shall be driven from the face of the earth.” If Peter’s line of thought is similar, this rhetorical question emphasizes (see 2:20 on ποῖον . . . κλέος) that the sinner will appear

nowhere in God's new creation (see Dubis 2002, 167–68). The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer's semantic subclass of "spontaneous events associated with animate beings" (142–47, 269).

**4:19 ὥστε καὶ οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ πιστῶ κτίστη παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγαθοποιῇ.**

**ὥστε καὶ.** Introduces an exhortation that is motivationally grounded by the preceding verses 12–18. For a discussion of καὶ, which is left untranslated by most English translations, see Michaels (272–73), who argues that it does not mark οἱ πάσχοντες as additive to others who are *not* suffering (contra Kelly, 194), nor does it mark παρατιθέσθωσαν as additive to "glorifying God" in verse 16 (contra Bigg, 181–82). Instead, Michaels takes the καὶ with ὥστε and glosses the phrase, "so then," following Beare (195), who views it as "serving as connective to the whole sentence" (so Achtemeier 1996, 317).

**οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ.** Fronted as a topical frame.

**οἱ πάσχοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl πάσχω (substantival). Nominative subject of παρατιθέσθωσαν.

**κατὰ τὸ θέλημα.** Standard ("according to what God wills"). The TEV gives the correct idea: "because it is God's will for them," not NLT<sup>2</sup>: "in a manner that pleases God."

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive.

**πιστῶ κτίστη.** Dative indirect object of παρατιθέσθωσαν. Fronted for emphasis.

**παρατιθέσθωσαν.** Pres mid impv 3rd pl παρατίθημι. The middle form of this verb refers to entrusting someone with something, and the middle voice corresponds to Kemmer's semantic class of "emotion middle" (130–32, 269).

**τὰς ψυχὰς.** Accusative direct object of παρατιθέσθωσαν. On the meaning, see 1:9 on ψυχῶν. Here τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν is best rendered "themselves" (so NRSV).

**αὐτῶν.** Possessive genitive.

**ἐν ἀγαθοποιῇ.** The preposition ἐν is here "a marker of attendant circumstances . . . 'with, while at the same time'" (LN 89.80; so most English translations), not means (contra Achtemeier 1996, 318; TEV: "by their good actions").

### 1 Peter 5:1-11

<sup>1</sup>Therefore, I—a fellow-elder and witness of the messianic sufferings and also one who shares in the glory that is about to be revealed—urge the elders among you: <sup>2</sup>Shepherd the flock of God that is yours, watching over them not obligatorily but willingly as God desires, and not greedily but eagerly, <sup>3</sup>and not as domineering those apportioned to you but being examples for the flock. <sup>4</sup>And once the chief shepherd is revealed, you will receive the unfading crown of glory as a reward. <sup>5</sup>Correspondingly, younger men, submit to the elders. All of you, put on humility with respect to one another because God opposes the proud but shows favor to the humble.

<sup>6</sup>Humble yourselves, therefore, under the mighty hand of God in order that he might exalt you in due time, <sup>7</sup>casting all your anxiety on him because he cares for you. <sup>8</sup>Be extremely vigilant! Your enemy, the devil, is prowling about like a roaring lion seeking someone to devour. <sup>9</sup>Resist him, being strong in faith, knowing that sufferings like these are being brought to completion by your brotherhood throughout the world. <sup>10</sup>As for the God of all grace, who in Christ [Jesus] called you into his eternal glory—after you have suffered briefly, it is he who will restore, strengthen, and establish you, and give you a solid foundation. <sup>11</sup>To him belongs sovereignty forever. Amen.

**5:1 Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων, ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός.**

**Πρεσβυτέρους . . . ἐν ὑμῖν.** Fronted as a topical frame, marking a topical shift to a specific subgroup of the recipients.

**Πρεσβυτέρους.** Accusative direct object of παρακαλῶ. This is an example of the “advancement” of a conceptual indirect object to the status of direct object; the conceptual direct object is the imperatival clause in verses 2-3. In other words, the underlying concept is “I urge ‘shepherd the flock, etc.’ to elders” (see 3:15 on ὑμᾶς λόγον). This substantival adjective is comparative, as indicated by the -τερ suffix. The term sometimes refers exclusively to an age category

(i.e., older men), but the following context makes it clear that its primary reference here is to church leaders (for further discussion, see 5:5 on *πρεσβυτέροις*).

**οὖν.** This is a simple inferential use of *οὖν* that introduces exhortations grounded in the preceding eschatological teaching (on the uses of *οὖν*, see 2:1). The conjunction was omitted by some scribes (P Ψ ℳ), apparently due to the difficulty of seeing the connection between this paragraph and the preceding one (Achtmeier 1996, 320). This connection is made, in part, via Ezek 9 (which stands as a background to 4:17 and continues its influence in this paragraph), a text in which judgment begins with leaders (*πρεσβύτερος*). For more on this association of *Πρεσβυτέρος* here with Ezek 9, see Jobes (300). The association should be extended to include the observation that Ezek 9:5-6 describes this judgment as also including young men (*νεανίσκος*) as well as the rest of the community (thus also providing a backdrop for *νεώτεροι* and *πάντες* in 5:5).

**ἐν ὑμῖν.** Association, modifying *Πρεσβυτέρος*.

**παρακαλῶ.** Pres act ind 1st sg *παρακαλέω*.

**ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς.** Nominative in apposition to the first singular subject of *παρακαλῶ*. Some manuscripts add *ὡς* before this phrase to provide a smoother connection with *παρακαλῶ*. This noun phrase meets the criteria for Granville Sharp's rule (see 1:3 on *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ*), which means that both of these nouns refer to the same person (a fact that is clear enough contextually without the aid of Sharp's rule). Of greater interest is that the union of these two nouns under a single article serves to closely associate the leadership position of Peter with the idea of witnessing the messianic sufferings, an association that reflects the reality that elders (whether Peter or those he addresses) are especially likely to suffer because of their leadership roles.

**μάρτυς.** For more on the meaning of this term as "eyewitness" (contra Michaels, 280–81) and the meaning of this verse as a whole, see Dubis (2002, 104–7).

**τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων.** On the meaning of this expression, see 4:13 on *τοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

**τῶν . . . παθημάτων.** Objective genitive.

**ὁ . . . κοινωνός.** Nominative in apposition to *ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς*.

**καί.** Adverbial additive use of **καί**: “also.” The postpositive appearance of **καί** after the article clearly marks it as adverbial (see 2:5). Here **καί** helps the recipients make the thematic connection between **παθημάτων** and **δόξης**: Peter’s identity is shaped by both suffering and glory.

**τῆς . . . δόξης.** Objective genitive.

**μελλούσης.** Pres act ptc fem gen sg **μέλλω** (attributive).

**ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι.** Pres pass inf **ἀποκαλύπτω** (complementary).

**5:2 ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπισκοποῦντες] μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως κατὰ θεόν, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως,**

**ποιμάνετε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl **ποιμαίνω**. See verse 1 on **Πρεσβυτέρους**.

**τὸ . . . ποίμνιον.** Accusative direct object of **ποιμάνετε**.

**ἐν ὑμῖν.** Reference, modifying **ποίμνιον**: “the flock with respect to you.” See NRSV “in your charge” (similarly also NIV, TEV). In this way, **ἐν ὑμῖν** is effectively distributive in force (see Elliott, 824). The other major option is to take this phrase as pointing to association: “among you” (KJV, ESV, NET).

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** Possessive genitive.

**[ἐπισκοποῦντες].** Pres act ptc masc nom pl **ἐπισκοπέω**. Louw and Nida (53.70) define this term as “to have responsibility for the care of someone, implying a somewhat official responsibility within a congregation.” On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on **[ἐστίν]**. This participle is omitted by some manuscripts (**8\*** B 322 323; so also RSV), apparently as redundant following **ποιμάνετε** (or perhaps for ecclesiastical reasons; see Elliott, 824). Since **ἐπισκοπέω** is indeed essentially synonymous with the preceding **ποιμαίνω**, it is best to understand **ἐπισκοποῦντες** (along with its modifiers, all adverbials of manner) as a restatement, amplifying the generic imperatival clause **ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ** (“shepherd the flock of God among you”) by explaining more specifically in what way elders should do this. Taken this way, **ἐπισκοποῦντες** would be a participle of attendant circumstance that shares the imperatival force of **ποιμάνετε** (cf. Achtemeier 1996, 325).

**μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως.** This correlative construction

uses the negated adverb ἀναγκαστῶς in order to emphasize the positive adverb ἔκουσίως introduced by ἀλλά: “not obligatorily, but *willingly*.”

**ἀναγκαστῶς.** Adverb of manner, modifying ἐπισκοποῦντες: “under compulsion” (ESV, NRSV); “merely as a duty” (NET).

**ἔκουσίως.** Adverb of manner, modifying ἐπισκοποῦντες.

**κατὰ θεόν.** Standard. This phrase, which appears elsewhere seven other times in the NT, usually has the sense of “according to God’s will” (so the ESV: “as God would have it”; see also TEV, NRSV, NIV).

**μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως.** This correlative construction uses the negated adverb αἰσχροκερδῶς in order to emphasize the positive adverb προθύμως introduced by ἀλλά: “not greedily, but *eagerly*.”

**αἰσχροκερδῶς.** Adverb of manner, modifying ἐπισκοποῦντες.

**προθύμως.** Adverb of manner, modifying ἐπισκοποῦντες.

**5:3 μηδ’ ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου.**

**μηδ’ . . . ἀλλὰ.** This correlative construction uses the negated adverbial phrase ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων in order to emphasize the positive adverbial phrase introduced by ἀλλά: τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου.

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to constrain the participles κατακυριεύοντες and γινόμενοι, clarifying that both participles express manner (contra Michaels, 285, who views the ὡς as stylistic and euphonic rather than having any real impact upon the verse’s meaning).

**κατακυριεύοντες . . . γινόμενοι.** Despite the argument of Achtemeier (1996, 327) that these participles are substantival, the parallel with the adverbs in verse 2 suggests that these participles are also adverbial modifiers of ἐπισκοποῦντες.

**κατακυριεύοντες.** Pres act ptc masc nom pl κατακυριεύω (manner). This term can be used positively (LXX Gen 1:28), but here it has a pejorative sense (“domineering”; RSV, ESV).

**τῶν κλήρων.** Genitive direct object of κατακυριεύοντες. Κλῆρος usually refers to a “lot” used to make a decision or to gamble, but

by metaphorical extension it can also refer to the circumstances or responsibilities that come to someone by God's providential hand (e.g., LXX Jer 13:25). Here it refers to the flocks that are the responsibility of the elders (NIV: "those entrusted to you"). Some manuscripts (61 88 321 326 915 1751 *pc*) substitute a (genitive or accusative) singular form here, uncomfortable with the contrast between the plural κλήρων and the surrounding singular forms of ποιμνιον (vv. 2, 3). This incongruity is only apparent since the original plural form is distributive, referring to the various individual churches that the elders in various locations serve.

**τύποι.** Predicate nominative. Some manuscripts, instead of a plural form, substitute an individualizing singular form. On the fronting of this complement, see 1:15 on ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ.

**γινόμενοι.** Pres mid ptc masc nom pl γίνομαι (manner). The middle voice corresponds to Miller's semantic class of "state" (429).

**τοῦ ποιμνίου.** Genitive of reference. Here, the genitive tells for whom they are to be examples. This phrase is not fronted along with τύποι because the emphasis is upon τύποι (on the use of discontinuous constituents in order to emphasize the first constituent, see Levinsohn, 58–60).

**5:4 καὶ φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος κομιεῖσθε τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον.**

**καὶ.** This conjunction serves to more closely connect the following motive clause (all of v. 4) with the exhortations of verses 2-3. On this function of καὶ, see 1:17.

**φανερωθέντος.** Aor pass ptc masc gen sg φανερώω. Genitive absolute, temporal. This form could be middle or passive (see the Series Introduction on "Deponency"). The identical form appears in 1:20, where it is most likely passive since it stands in parallel with another passive participle. Although not adopted by most English translations, this usage in 1:20 tips the scale in favor of a passive interpretation here as well (with God being the implicit agent of the "revealing"; so also Elliott, 2000, 834).

**τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος.** Genitive subject of φανερωθέντος. Here, the genitive absolute construction marks a switch from the subject of

the genitive participial phrase, τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος, to the second plural subject of the main clause (see 3:20 on κιβωτοῦ).

**κομῆσθε.** Fut mid ind 2nd pl κομίζω. The translation “receive” (so most translations) does not do full justice to this term. Louw and Nida (57.126) rightly define κομίζω as involving some kind of recompense: “to receive as a type of compensation” (see, e.g., 2 Cor 5:10; Eph 6:8; less explicitly in 1:9). The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic subclass of “indirect (or self-benefactive) middle” (17, 78–81, 268).

**τὸν ἀμαράντινον . . . στέφανον.** Accusative direct object of κομῆσθε.

**τῆς δόξης.** Instead of an attributive genitive (TEV: “glorious crown”), it is best to take this as an epexegetical genitive (so also BDAG, 944.3). This is an example of a subcategory of the epexegetical genitive in which the head noun (στέφανον) is a metaphor and its genitive noun provides an explanation of the metaphor (Wallace, 95–96): “crown” is interpreted as being future “glory.”

**5:5 Ὅμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις· πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε, ὅτι [ὁ] θεὸς ὑπερφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.**

**Ὅμοίως.** On the use of this adverb in 1 Peter, see 3:1. A number of variants arise from scribes supplying additional transitional markers after Ὅμοίως, such as δέ and δέ καί.

**νεώτεροι.** Vocative. This substantival adjective is comparative, as is indicated by the –τερ suffix. The two most likely interpretations of this word are (a) younger men, or (b) the rest of the church community (i.e., the non-elders). Arguing from a parallel description in *1 Clement* that describes the opposition of the “young” to the church elders (οἱ νέοι ἐπὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, “the young against the elders”; 3:3), Achtemeier (1996: 331–32) argues for option (b). To understand the “young” as the non-elders in the community, however, necessarily involves interpreting the “young” as including both men and women, which even in *1 Clement* is not supportable since *1 Clem.* 1:3 and 21:6 refer to the “young” (νέοι) in distinction from women (γυναῖκες). In other words, the νέοι are young men, not the entire non-elder community. The same is true here, a view

that is further supported by the Ezek 9:6 background in which the cognate νεανίσκος (which also appears in conjunction with references to women, both παρθένος and γυνή) clearly refers to young men. For further discussion, see 5:1 on οὖν.

**ὑποτάγητε.** Aor mid imper 2nd pl ὑποτάσσω. On treating the voice as middle, see 2:13 on Ὑποτάγητε.

**πρεσβύτεροις.** Dative complement of ὑποτάγητε. When paired with νεώτεροι, this term might be taken to refer exclusively to age (“older men”). Nevertheless, given the clear application of this term to church leaders in the preceding context, this is the primary connotation here as well (though church elders would also typically be “elder” with respect to both age and rank; note that the Ezek 9:6 background uses πρεσβύτερος twice, once with respect to age and once with respect to rank).

**πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις.** Kelly (205) entertains the possibility that these words do not go with what follows but with what precedes: “Younger men, submit to the elders and, all of you, (submit) to one another.” He rightly rejects this restructuring, however, on the basis that it would leave the following clause without any introductory conjunction.

**πάντες.** The vocative marks an exhortational transition to a more comprehensive group of addressees. The “all” addressed here could refer to (a) others not yet addressed in verses 1-5a, i.e., everyone besides the church elders and young men, or (b) the entire community—elders, young men, and everyone else. Option (b) is preferred since the exhortation to humility in this verse is grounded in a scriptural citation that is not limited in its application (i.e., everyone in the entire community wants to receive God’s χάρις, “grace, favor,” and no one wants to be opposed by God), and furthermore, the exhortation in verse 6, which expands upon verse 5’s theme of humility by continuing the use of the ταπεινο- word group (Ταπεινώθητε in v. 6), clearly addresses the entire community.

**δὲ.** Introduces the next step in the argument (see 1:7), shifting from exhortation to young men to an exhortation to the entire community.

**ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην.** Fronted for emphasis. The word order suggests that ἀλλήλοις is to be read adjectivally with

ταπεινοφροσύνην rather than with ἐγκομβώσασθε (though the meaning is unaffected).

**ἄλληλοις.** Dative of reference.

**τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην.** Accusative direct object of ἐγκομβώσασθε.

**ἐγκομβώσασθε.** Aor mid impv 2nd pl ἐγκομβόομαι. This term does not appear elsewhere in the NT or LXX. Achtemeier (1996, 332–33) postulates that this verb derives from ἐγκόμβωμα, a term “probably identifying a garment or apron a slave tied over other garments in order to perform certain menial tasks.” Note the TEV’s rendering: “put on the apron of humility.” The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “grooming” (53–55, 268), here metaphorically applied.

**ὅτι.** Introduces a causal clause, which serves as a motivational ground for the immediately preceding exhortation.

**[ὁ] θεὸς ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοὺς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.** This is a citation of Prov 3:34 (LXX: κύριος ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσει, ταπεινοὺς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν; MT: אִם-לֵלֵךְ לְעֵינַיִם הָאֵלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָרֶם לְעֵינַיִם אֵלֹהִים אֲנִי). 1 Peter follows the LXX exactly except for the initial use of [ὁ] θεὸς instead of κύριος.

**[ὁ] θεός.** Nominative subject of ἀντιτάσσεται. On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίν]. Fronted as a topical frame here, as is κύριος in the LXX.

**ὑπερηφάνους.** Dative direct object of ἀντιτάσσεται.

**ἀντιτάσσεται.** Pres mid ind 3rd sg ἀντιτάσσω. The use of the middle voice with this verb (which BDAG, 90, notes appears only in the middle in its literature) corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “naturally reciprocal events” (102–8, 268). This verb appears in a final position for emphasis, as in the LXX (see 2:8 on ἀπειθοῦντες).

**ταπεινοὺς.** Dative indirect object of δίδωσιν. Fronted as a topical frame here, as in the LXX.

**δὲ.** Introduces the next step in the argument (see 1:7), shifting from God’s action toward the proud to a description of God’s action toward the humble.

**δίδωσιν χάριν.** The translation, “shows favor,” follows the TEV.

**δίδωσιν.** Pres act ind 3rd sg δίδωμι.

**χάριν.** Accusative direct object of δίδωσιν.

**5:6 Ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τῆν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ,**

**Ταπεινώθητε.** Aor mid impv 2nd pl ταπεινώω. Though traditionally taken as passive (so Wallace, 441, in a permissive sense) or passive deponent, this is another example of a θη- verb form that is better taken as middle (see Series Introduction on “Deponency”; so Michaels, 295). The basic sense of this verb is spatial in the sense of becoming “low” (see Ezek 17:24; Isa 40:4). The middle voice thus corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “nontranslational motion” (67–68, 268), although here metaphorically extended (note the pairing of this verb with ὑψώση, which also has a metaphorically spatial sense). Note also the similar usage in LXX Gen 16:9, where the angel of the Lord instructs Hagar regarding Sarai, ταπεινώθητι ὑπὸ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, which clearly means that Hagar is to submit to the authority of Sarai (see BDAG, 990.3). Similarly, the recipients of 1 Peter are to submit to the authority of God, especially as expressed in God’s sovereign control of the circumstances of suffering in which they find themselves (vv. 7-10).

**οὖν.** This is a simple inferential use of οὖν (on its various uses, see 2:1). Here, the conjunction introduces an exhortation that is grounded upon verse 5’s citation of Prov 3:34, in the same way that the material that precedes this citation is also grounded upon it, all held together by the ταπεινο- cognates.

**ὑπὸ τῆν κραταιὰν χεῖρα.** Spatial, metaphorical. BDAG (1036.2) describes this use of ὑπό as a “marker of that which is in a controlling position.”

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** Possessive genitive.

**ἵνα.** Introduces a purpose clause, modifying ταπεινώθητε.

**ὑμᾶς.** Accusative direct object of ὑψώση. Fronted as a topical frame.

**ὑψώση.** Aor act subj 3rd sg ὑψώω. Subjunctive with ἵνα. This verb, which can refer to a literal spatial elevation, can also be used metaphorically to refer to a heightening of one’s honor and esteem, as here (see BDAG, 1046.2).

**ἐν καιρῷ.** Temporal. Some scribes felt uncomfortable with the absolute use of this phrase, resulting in many manuscripts supplying ensuing modifiers such as ἐπισκοπῆς (A P Ψ 33 *al*; influenced

by 2:12). Nevertheless, this phrase is used absolutely elsewhere in the NT and LXX, and in these instances means either (a) “at the proper time” (Matt 24:45; Luke 12:42), or (b) “in due course” (Sir 19:9; 39:34). Although either meaning would work here, since 5:10 has duration of time in view, option (b) is slightly to be preferred. In either case, though, it is the time of the Parousia that is implicitly in view.

**5:7** *πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ’ αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν.*

*πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ’ αὐτόν.* This portion of verse 7 derives from LXX Ps 54:23 (ET 55:22): ἐπίρριπον ἐπὶ κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου (MT: יָרִיחוּ לִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל).

*πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν.* Accusative direct object of ἐπιρίψαντες. Fronted for emphasis (along with ὑμῶν).

*ὑμῶν.* Subjective genitive.

*ἐπιρίψαντες.* Aor act ptc masc nom pl ἐπιρίπτω. This participle is best taken as attendant circumstance, taking on the imperatival force of ταπεινώθητε (RSV, NIV, TEV; see also 2:1 on Ἀποθέμενοι and 1:14 on συσχηματιζόμενοι). Alternatively, some take it as a participle of means (NET; Wallace, 340, 630).

*ἐπ’ αὐτόν.* Spatial, metaphorical.

*ὅτι.* Introduces a causal clause, which serves as a motivational ground for the preceding exhortation.

*αὐτῷ.* Dative of reference. Fronted as a topical frame.

*μέλει.* Pres act ind 3rd sg μέλω. This impersonal verb functions with αὐτῷ (lit. “it is a care with respect to him”) to convey the idea, “he cares.”

*περὶ ὑμῶν.* Reference.

**5:8** *Νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε. ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος ὡς λέων ὠρνόμενος περιπατεῖ ζητῶν [τινα] καταπιεῖν.*

*Νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε.* This doublet (see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον), which also occurs in 1 Thess 5:6, stresses the crucial importance of alertness in the face of an unappeasable enemy, the devil. See also the similar doublet in 4:7: σωφρονήσατε . . . καὶ νήψατε.

**Νήψατε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl νήψω.

**γρηγορήσατε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl γρηγορέω.

**ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος ὡς λέων ὠρνόμενος περιπατεῖ ζητῶν [τινα] καταπιεῖν.** This clause serves as the motivational grounds for the preceding double exhortation, Νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε. A significant number of manuscripts (Ⲣ<sup>72</sup> Ⲛ<sup>2</sup> L Ψ 33 Ⲙ *al*) reflect a secondary effort to make this grounds-exhortation relationship explicit by adding ὅτι after γρηγορήσατε.

**ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος.** The subject ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν along with its appositive διάβολος is fronted to mark the topical shift from “you” to “the devil.”

**ὁ ἀντίδικος.** Nominative subject of περιπατεῖ. BDAG (88) notes that this term can mean (a) more specifically, “accuser” or “plaintiff” in a legal context (see Job 1:6-11), or (b) more generally, “enemy.” Michaels (299) rightly concludes that the context is “not judicial” but rather one of worldwide antagonism (v. 10), in favor of option (b).

**ὑμῶν.** Objective genitive.

**διάβολος.** Nominative in apposition to ἀντίδικος. This substantive adjective (lit. “slanderer”) functions as a title in the NT and refers to the devil. In the NT, it almost always appears, unlike here, with the article. Nevertheless, Wallace (248–49) argues that this singular noun is monadic, i.e., a “one-of-a-kind noun” and, thus, is definite even when anarthrous. Of course, it is also definite by virtue of standing in apposition to a definite noun.

**ὡς λέων ὠρνόμενος.** This participial phrase is fronted for the sake of emphasis. On the OT background, see LXX Ps 21:14 (ET 22:13): ὡς λέων ὁ ἀρπάζων καὶ ὠρνούμενος (MT Ps 22:14: לָשׂוֹן הַרְגֵם הַרְגֵם).

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς functions to introduce a comparative clause involving ellipsis: “like a roaring lion (prowls around).” The force of the comparison is that the devil is actively engaged in a quest to destroy Christians like a lion who actively prowls about that it might destroy and consume its prey (see LN 20.52).

**λέων.** This nominative noun is the second component in a ὡς construction involving the nominative διάβολος.

**ῥοιόμενος.** Pres mid ptc masc nom sg ῥοιόμεναι (attributive). The middle voice of this onomatopoeic verb corresponds to Kemmer's semantic class/subclass of "emotion middle/speech action" (133–34, 269) or "nontranslational motion" (67–68, 268).

**περιπατεῖ.** Pres act ind 3rd sg περιπατέω. Note the use of ἐμπεριπατέω in reference to the devil in LXX Job 1:7; 2:2.

**ζητών.** Pres act ptc masc nom sg ζητέω (manner).

[τινα]. Accusative direct object of ζητών, not καταπιεῖν, as favored by the word order. On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἔστιν]. On the textual variations of this phrase and a defense of the present text, see Metzger (626–27). For a defense of its omission (the shorter and more difficult, though less-supported reading), see Michaels (292–93).

**καταπιεῖν.** Aor act inf καταπίνω (purpose). The implied direct object is αὐτόν, with τινα as its antecedent.

**5:9 ὃ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῇ ἐν [τῷ] κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.**

**ὃ.** Dative direct object of ἀντίστητε.

**ἀντίστητε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl ἀνθίστημι. On the use of the imperative within a relative clause, see 3:3 on ἔστω.

**στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει.** Michaels (300) rightly notes that this phrase serves to interpret ἀντίστητε. It is probably best to read an implied participle ὄντες here, functioning as a participle of manner that modifies ἀντίστητε ("resist him being strong in the faith").

**στερεοὶ.** Predicate adjective. This adjective can mean "firm, solid" (Heb 5:12, 14), but it can also be applied to individuals with the meaning "strong" (LXX Ps 34:10; Jer 38:11).

**τῇ πίστει.** Dative of reference.

**εἰδότες.** Prf act ptc masc nom pl οἶδα (causal). The causal participle introduces a motivational ground for the preceding exhortation, "Resist him!" For this same use of εἰδότες to support an imperative, see 1:18; although there εἰδότες is followed by ὅτι, the meaning in both instances is "knowing that" (see this use of οἶδα without a following ὅτι in Luke 4:41; 1 Clem. 62:3; contra Beare, 206, who argues that οἶδα without a following ὅτι means to "know how to, be able to").

**τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῇ ἐν [τῷ] κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.** This infinitive clause functions as the clausal complement of εἰδότες. A number of manuscripts make this function more explicit by inserting a preceeding ὅτι (as in 1:18).

**τὰ αὐτὰ.** Accusative subject of ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. Here τὰ αὐτὰ functions as a substantival identical adjective (lit. “the same things”). Beare (206), on the other hand, takes τὰ αὐτὰ as the direct object of ἐπιτελεῖσθαι rather than its subject, requiring a middle reading of ἐπιτελεῖσθαι and a different construal of the dative ἀδελφότητι: “showing yourselves able to fulfill the same meed [i.e., deserved share] of sufferings as your brotherhood.”

**τῶν παθημάτων.** Epexegetical genitive (contra BDF §164, which labels it as partitive).

**τῇ . . . ἀδελφότητι.** Dative of agency (so Achtemeier 1996, 343; contra Wallace, 373–75, 434–35, who is inclined to argue that the NT does not use a dative by itself to express agency; but see the examples in Elliott 2000, 862, n. 758; see also BDF §191). Contra Selwyn (239), who views it as a dative of disadvantage, and Michaels (292, 301), who views it as a dative of respect.

**ἐν [τῷ] κόσμῳ.** Spatial, modifying ἀδελφότητι, identifying the “brotherhood” in view as being not just Christians in close proximity but those throughout the world. On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίv].

**ὑμῶν.** Genitive of relationship.

**ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.** Pres pass inf ἐπιτελέω (indirect discourse after εἰδότες, a verb of perception; see also 2:11 on ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς). Translations such as “undergoing” (NIV, NRSV), “being experienced” (ESV), “going through” (TEV), or “enduring” (NET) fail to communicate the goal-orientation of ἐπιτελέω. This verb indicates that it is the completion of these sufferings that is in view. It is better, then, to understand this verse to affirm that these sufferings are being “accomplished” (see KJV, ASV, NASB) or “brought to completion” by Christians worldwide, which explains the reference in the next verse to suffering “briefly” (ὀλίγον). This verb appears in a final position in the infinitival construction for emphasis (on this word order, see 2:8 on ἀπειθοῦντες).

For further discussion of this verse against the backdrop of messianic woes, see Dubis (2002, 70–72).

**5:10 Ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάσης χάριτος, ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ [Ἰησοῦ], ὀλίγον παθόντας αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει.**

**Ὁ . . . θεός.** This nominative noun phrase, along with its modifiers, is an example of a left-dislocation (so LDGNT), which serves to introduce a new topic (shifting from the devil in vv. 8b-9 to God in vv. 10-11; see Levinsohn, 14). It is picked up with the resumptive αὐτὸς when the verb is introduced. On left-dislocations, see 2:7 on λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες.

**δὲ.** Introduces the next step in the argument (see 1:7), shifting from the preceding exhortations to the promise in verse 10.

**πάσης χάριτος.** Genitive of product (so BDAG, 451.3.e). Achtemeier (344) opts for a “genitive of quality,” referring to a gracious God, but the presence of πάσης makes this analysis awkward.

**καλέσας.** Aor act ptc masc nom sg καλέω (attributive). The aorist here points to past time (contra the TEV: “who calls you”).

**ὑμᾶς.** Accusative direct object of καλέσας.

**εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον . . . δόξαν.** Here εἰς refers to an “extension toward a special goal” (LN 84.16).

**αὐτοῦ.** Given the honor/shame motif in 1 Peter, this is perhaps best taken as a subjective genitive (“God called you to his eternal glorifying/honoring of [you]”). Alternatively, if construed as the glory emanating from God into which believers enter, this would be a genitive of source.

**ἐν Χριστῷ.** Association (TEV: “in union with Christ”; see also BDAG, 327.4.c; Elliott 2000, 865). This phrase could be (a) adjectival, modifying δόξαν, or (b) adverbial, modifying καλέσας. Selwyn (240) argues that both (a) and (b) are meant, an unlikely option syntactically. Michaels (302) and others argue that the lack of an article prior to this phrase (when δόξαν itself is arthrous) argues against the adjectival use. This is not conclusive, however, due to the crowding created by both αἰώνιον and αὐτοῦ between δόξαν and its definite article (see 1:18 on πατροπαραδότου). Although word order slightly favors option (a), other NT usage (e.g., 1 Cor

7:22) favors option (b). On the meaning of this phrase, see 3:16 on ἐν Χριστῷ.

[**Ἰησοῦ**]. Genitive in apposition to Χριστῷ. On the meaning of the brackets, see 1:6 on [ἐστίν]. This is most likely not original since, as Metzger (627) argues, scribal tendencies are strongly expansionistic in connection with sacred names. Thus, it is omitted in most English translations (but not in KJV, NLT<sup>2</sup>).

**ὀλίγον**. Temporal adverb. Fronted for emphasis (so LDGNT). On the formation of this adverb, see 1:6.

**παθόντας**. Aor act ptc masc acc pl πάσχω (temporal). The referent is the earlier ὑμᾶς.

**αὐτός**. This pronoun is resumptive rather than intensive (“himself”), and marks the beginning of the main clause after the left-dislocation construction (see above on Ὁ ... θεός).

**καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει**. These terms have significant semantic overlap (BDAG gives “strengthen” as one gloss for each of the last three terms). Thus, one might describe them as a four-term “doublet” (see 1:4 on ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον; note that Moore’s definition of doublet does not require that terms be joined by a conjunction). In light of a doublet’s function of adding rhetorical emphasis, a loose paraphrase for this highly emphatic “quadruplet” might be “God will make everything right beyond your wildest dreams.” As for the textual tradition, it is quite varied. Some manuscripts supply ὑμᾶς as a direct object, which is implicit in any case. Some have only three verb forms instead of four (so also ASV, RSV), probably having omitted one form accidentally via homoioteleuton. Other manuscripts change one or more future indicative forms to optatives.

**καταρτίσει**. Fut act ind 3rd sg καταρτίζω.

**στηρίξει**. Fut act ind 3rd sg στηρίζω.

**σθενώσει**. Fut act ind 3rd sg σθενόω.

**θεμελιώσει**. Fut act ind 3rd sg θεμελιόω.

**5:11 αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.**

**αὐτῷ**. Dative of possession (“belonging to him,” i.e., “his”).

**τὸ κράτος**. Nominative subject of an implied form of εἶμι. The implied verb could be optative (“may sovereignty be his”), as most English translations render it, but it is more likely indicative (“sov-

reignty is his<sup>29</sup>) given the explicit use of the indicative ἐστιν in the similar doxology earlier (4:11).

**εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.** Temporal. See 1:25 on εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

**ἀμήν.** A particle regularly used at the close of doxologies (see BDAG, 53.1.a).

### 1 Peter 5:12-14

<sup>12</sup>It is through Silvanus—a brother who, as I esteem him, is faithful to you—that I have written to you briefly, exhorting you and testifying that this is what God truly favors. Stand in it! <sup>13</sup>The coelect one in Babylon greets you, and so does Mark, my son. <sup>14</sup>Greet one another with a kiss of love. May peace belong to all of you who are in Christ.

**5:12** Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογιζομαι, δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στήτε.

**Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογιζομαι.** Fronted as a topical frame (so LDGNT).

**Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ.** Intermediate agency (see 1:12 on διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς). This phrase has frequently been understood to point to Silvanus as the amanuensis, but most scholars (even proponents of Petrine authorship) now agree that it instead refers to Silvanus as the courier of the letter (see Richards). The key NT parallel to this verse, using the same verb γράφω in conjunction with a prepositional phrase headed by διὰ, is Acts 15:23, which describes Judas and Silas, two couriers chosen to deliver a letter containing the apostolic decree. With regard to these men, Acts 15:23 says that the council thought well of γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν (“writing through their hand”).

**Σιλουανοῦ.** BDF §125.2 suggests that Σιλουανός is a Latin form and Σιλᾶς is a Greek form of the same Semitic name.

**ὑμῖν.** Although ὑμῖν is usually taken as an indirect object of ἔγραψα, its presence within the fronted constituent Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογιζομαι suggests that it needs to be explained on the basis of its function within this constituent. An older and now forgotten interpretation probably gives the correct reading, i.e., to understand ὑμῖν as modifying πιστοῦ (or perhaps

the whole phrase, τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ), yielding the reading, “through Silvanus, a brother who is faithful with respect to you” (so Fairbairn, 2:312, who cites Luther among others; I owe this reference to Levinsohn). For the combination of πιστός with the simple dative, see Acts 16:15; 1 Macc 7:8; Sir 33:3; 37:13.

**τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ.** Genitive in apposition to Σιλουανοῦ. This phrase represents a stereotypical epistolary commendation of a letter courier.

**πιστοῦ.** Although this adjective is used in the sense of “believing” in 1:21, in the context of this commendation, it most likely means “faithful, trustworthy” (see this use in 4:19 of God).

**ὡς.** On the use of ὡς, see 1:14 on ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. Here ὡς introduces a clause involving the semantic relation of standard-congruence. According to the standard by which Paul reckons faithfulness, Silvanus has indeed been faithful.

**λογίζομαι.** Pres mid ind 1st sg λογίζομαι. This verb has an implicit αὐτόν as its direct object, referring to Silvanus. The middle voice corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “cognition middle” (134–42, 269).

**δι’ ὀλίγων.** Manner: “briefly” (so BDAG, 224.3.b; LN 67.106; lit. “through a few things, i.e., words or letters”). Fronted for emphasis (so LDGNT).

**ἔγραψα.** Aor act ind 1st sg γράφω. Here, this verb has the delivery of the letter more in mind than its composition (see Michaels, 306). On the parallel in Acts 15:23, note that most translations either do not explicitly translate γράφω (RSV, ESV, NRSV) or, instead of “wrote,” render it as “sent” (NIV, TEV, NET). Regarding the aorist form, it is generally labeled an epistolary aorist (Porter, 37; Michaels, 308), arising from the fact that, from the perspective of the recipients reading the letter, the writing and sending of the letter are in the past.

**παρακαλῶν.** Pres act ptc masc nom sg παρακαλέω (purpose).

**ἐπιμαρτυρῶν.** Pres act ptc masc nom sg ἐπιμαρτυρέω (purpose).

**ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθὴ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στήτε.** Although it is possible that this clause serves as the indirect discourse of both participial verbs of communication, it is more likely that it modifies ἐπιμαρτυρῶν alone (with παρακαλῶν functioning absolutely; so BDAG, 765.2, and most commentators; see also 2:11 on ὡς

παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς).

**ταύτην.** Accusative subject of εἶναι. Michaels (308–10) suggests three options for the referent: (a) eschatological grace, (b) the recipients’ sufferings, or (c) the letter itself. Interpreting the feminine ταύτην to modify an implicit ἐπιστολή, he opts for the last: “Peter’s ‘few lines’ may appear to be only a piece of correspondence but in actuality they are a gift from God” (309–10). As Michaels (309) himself notes, however, “the feminine form is adequately explained by the agreement with χάριν” (BDF §132.1). Close to option (c), I understand the referent to be the general contents and worldview of the letter, i.e., its affirmations regarding the Christian message and ethic. An additional argument in favor of this understanding is that ancient letters sometimes summarize the contents of the letter in the letter closing (see Achtemeier 1996, 349, 352).

**εἶναι.** Pres act inf εἶμι.

**ἀληθῆ χάριν.** Predicate accusative. The same pecking order used to distinguish nominative subjects from predicate nominatives (see 1:17 on τὸν . . . κρίνοντα) also applies to distinguishing accusative subjects of infinitives from predicate accusatives. The pronoun ταύτην here “wins out” as subject over the anarthrous noun χάριν (so also Wallace, 195). On the word order with a deictic subject, see 1:25 on τὸ ῥῆμα. This phrase is a metonymy—to be precise, the Christian faith (see ταύτην above) is not God’s favor but rather it is that which results in God’s favor toward those who embrace it (see also 2:19, 20).

**τοῦ θεοῦ.** Subjective genitive (i.e., what God truly favors).

**εἰς ἡν.** The preposition may be read as either (a) spatial; or (b) purpose. Option (b) is adopted by Michaels (305, 310): “For it you must stand.” This option has in its favor the use of εἰς elsewhere in 1 Peter (e.g., 1:3, 4, 5; 2:8; but see 3:20). As for option (a), in the NT period, εἰς is gradually replacing ἐν, a replacement that is completely realized in Modern Greek (BDF §205; so BDAG, 289.1.a.δ and most English translations). This option has in its favor that, of the places in the NT where εἰς serves as a substitute for a local use of ἐν, a number of these involve the verb ἵστημι (Luke 6:8; John 20:19, 26; 21:4) and, further, as Elliott (2000, 879–80) notes, the concept of “standing in” (ἵστημι with ἐν) appears in several other places in

the NT (Rom 5:2; 1 Cor 15:1; Phil 4:1). Overall, the evidence favors option (a).

**στήτε.** Aor act impv 2nd pl ἴστημι. It is rare to see an imperative after a relative pronoun (see 3:3 on ἔστω). As a result, some manuscripts (P ℞) substitute an indicative form of the verb. Although the aorist active subjunctive is identical to this imperative form, the form is clearly not subjunctive here. On a similar use of this imperative form, see LXX Exod 14:13; Eph 6:14.

**5:13 Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτῇ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου.**

**Ἀσπάζεται.** Pres mid ind 3rd sg ἀσπάζομαι. The use of the middle corresponds to Kemmer’s semantic class of “naturally reciprocal events” (102–8, 268).

**ὑμᾶς.** Accusative direct object of ἀσπάζεται.

**ἢ . . . συνεκλεκτῇ καὶ Μάρκος.** Nominative subject of ἀσπάζεται. The feminine noun συνεκλεκτῇ might be interpreted as a reference to (a) a specific woman, perhaps Peter’s wife, or (b) a church. A few manuscripts (Ⲙ ρϭ) seek to remove the ambiguity by adding ἐκκλησία; some modern English translations clarify similarly (“your sister church”; NRSV, TEV). Reading the feminine form as a reference to a church does seem most likely (so BDAG, 968; see arguments in Achtemeier 1996, 353, including the parallel with 2 John 1). On the compound subject with a singular verb, see Wallace (401–2) who argues that by using a singular verb, the author gives the first subject (here συνεκλεκτῇ) more prominence. Many English translations bring this out: “Your sister church here in Babylon sends you greetings, and so does my son Mark” (NLT<sup>2</sup>; so also RSV, ESV, NRSV, NET, TEV, NIV). The entire community is thus appropriately given greater priority than the individual Mark.

**ἢ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτῇ.** This description in combination with the description of the recipients as “elect” members of the Diaspora in 1:1 forms an inclusio across the entire book.

**ἐν Βαβυλῶνι.** Spatial, modifying συνεκλεκτῇ.

**Βαβυλῶνι.** A few late manuscripts substitute Ῥώμη here, thus interpreting the metaphor.

**ὁ υἱός.** Nominative in apposition to Μάρκος. Here, a metaphor for “a pupil, follower, or one who is otherwise a spiritual son” (BDAG, 1024.2.a).

**μου.** Genitive of relationship.

**5:14 ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης. Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.**

**ἀσπάσασθε.** Aor mid impv 2nd pl ἀσπάζομαι. On the middle voice, see 5:13 on Ἀσπάζεται.

**ἀλλήλους.** Accusative direct object of ἀσπάσασθε.

**ἐν φιλήματι.** Means.

**ἀγάπης.** Attributive genitive, i.e., characterized by Christian love.

**Εἰρήνη.** Nominative subject of an implied form of εἶμι, which is best understood to be optative in light of the explicit optative verb with εἰρήνη as its subject in 1:2.

**ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.** Most translations rightly treat this as all one phrase. It is not necessary to read πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ to be in apposition to ὑμῖν, as does Michaels (313).

**ὑμῖν πᾶσιν.** Dative of possession.

**τοῖς.** The article functions as an adjectivizer, changing the prepositional phrase, ἐν Χριστῷ, into an attributive modifier of ὑμῖν πᾶσιν.

**ἐν Χριστῷ.** Association. On the meaning of this vague phrase in the NT (also in 3:16), see the select bibliography in Wallace (362, n. 58; see also Dubis 2002, 103–4).



## GLOSSARY

*Note: This glossary is not an exhaustive treatment of all labels that appear in this handbook, but instead attempts to provide definitions of terminology that may be less familiar to readers than the usual syntactical phraseology.*

**Adjectivizer** — In Greek syntax, this term refers to an article that is used to change a non-adjective into an adjectival modifier. Thus, in the phrase, ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, the article τῶν changes the prepositional phrase, ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, into an attributive modifier of παντὸς ἔθνους.

**Amplification** — With reference to participles, this term provides an alternative in certain instances to the label “redundant” (see Wallace, 649–50), referring to participles of speaking or thinking that share semantic overlap with the main verb and that serve to amplify the main clause by providing additional information about the content of the aforementioned speech or thought.

**Anaphoric** — Referring back to, i.e., coreferential with, a preceding word or group of words. Thus, pronouns are anaphoric references to participants that have already been introduced into the discourse.

**Anarthrous** — Lacking an article.

**Antecedent** — An element that is referred to by another expression that follows it. Thus, the antecedent of a relative pronoun is that element in the preceding context to which the relative clause provides additional information.

**Apodosis** — The second part (“then” clause) in a conditional construction.

**Arthrous/Articular** — Including an article.

**Ascensive** — In Greek, this term is most often used in relation to conjunctions, especially *καί*. It refers to a usage that is intensive or expresses a final addition or point of focus. In such instances, the conjunction is typically translated, “even.”

**Asyndeton** — Linking clauses without the use of a conjunction.

**Attraction** — Relative pronouns at times take on or “attract” to the case of their antecedent. For example, in the text, Πάντων δὲ θαυμαζόντων ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐποίει εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ (“While everyone was marveling at all that he was doing, he said to his disciples”), the expected case for the relative pronoun would be accusative (οὓς), since it functions as the direct object of ἐποίει. Instead, it has been attracted to the case of its antecedent (πᾶσιν).

**Cataphoric** — Referring forward to, i.e., coreferential with, a following word or group of words. The demonstrative οὗτος is frequently used in this manner.

**Clausal complement** — This type of complement is structurally a direct object, but since it is a clause rather than a noun phrase scholars often use the language of “complement” rather than “direct object.” For example, ὅτι is often used to introduce complement clauses with verbs of speech that represent what was said: λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι δύναται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ (“For I tell you that God is able to raise up children for Abraham from these stones.”)

**Cognition** — A verb of cognition is a verb that refers to some sort of mental process.

**Complement** — In the handbook, this term is used in two ways in addition to its use in the phrase “clausal complement”: (1) A constituent, other than an accusative direct object, that is required to complete a verb phrase. Verbs that include a prepositional prefix often take a complement whose case is determined by the prefix. For example, verbs with the prefix *συν-* characteristically take a dative complement. (2) The second element in a double accusative construction, which completes the verbal idea. In the sentence, “I call my son Superman,” Superman would be the complement.

**Constructio ad sensum** — Lit. “construction according to sense.” A construction that follows the sense of the expression rather than strict grammatical rules, e.g., the use of a plural verb with a subject that is syntactically singular but refers to a group of people.

**Copula/Copular clause** — A copula is a linking verb that joins a subject and predicate into an equative or copular clause. In the copular clause, Ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρὰ ἐστὶν (“This generation is a wicked generation”), the copula is ἐστὶν.

**Crisis** — The merging of two words through the use of contraction, e.g., κἀμοί for καὶ ἐμοί.

**Doublet** — “Two or more words or constructions . . . which occur together and which are so redundant in context that, for translation purposes, they may be rendered as a single term” (Moore, 5). Doublets in Greek, such as τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα tend to serve as a way of intensifying the semantics of the doubled terms.

**Emphasis/Emphatic** — With regard to the topic of word order, this handbook uses emphasis (or the adjective “emphatic”) in (a) a technical sense to refer to a constituent that is the clause’s most important new information that is also fronted with respect to the verb in order to give it prominence, i.e., it is marked as focal; or, (b) in a less technical sense, to refer to prominence attached to certain constituents.

**Enclitic** — A word that usually has no accent, having lost it to the word that precedes it because it is read in such close conjunction with it.

**Equative verb/clause** — An equative verb, like εἰμί, γίνομαι, or ὑπάρχω, is a verb that joins a subject and predicate to form an equative clause (“something is something”), e.g., Ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρὰ ἐστὶν (“This generation is a wicked generation”).

**Focal/Focus** — A focal constituent (i.e., a constituent in focus) is a constituent that is the most important new information in a clause.

**Frame** — An alternative label for a “point of departure.”

**Fronting** — Placing a constituent earlier in the sentence than its default order, especially in a pre-verbal position.

**Genitive of relationship** — Wallace (83) prefers to limit this label to *familial* relationships, but we have followed Young (25–26) in applying it to a variety of social relationships as well, including slaves, friends, and enemies.

**Homoioarcton** — A phenomenon in which words or lines begin with the same or similar letters or words.

**Homoiooteleuton** — A phenomenon in which words or lines end in the same or similar letters or words.

**Inclusio** — An “envelope” or “bookend” structure in which the same or similar language is used to begin and end a unit of discourse.

**Left-Dislocation** — This literary device introduces “the next primary topic of the discourse” (Runge 2010, §14.2) by placing it at the beginning of the sentence and then picking it up with a resumptive pronoun in the actual sentence. For example, “The struggling student in my Greek class, he passed his midterm exam with flying colors.” Sometimes referred to as a “topic construction.”

**Internally headed relative clause** — A relative clause in which the antecedent (head noun) is located inside the relative clause that modifies it.

**Itacism** — In relation to textual criticism, this term refers to an error that arises in transmission through the confusion of sounds.

**Litotes** — A figure of speech in which a statement is made by negating the opposite idea. For example, “she is *not a bad* tennis player” means “she is a *good* tennis player.”

**Marked** — Departing from the normal or neutral pattern, or having additive features. At various levels of grammar, speakers/writers have a choice between various options. One option will typically be viewed as the “default” or “unmarked” member of the set. The other members are “marked.” Something that is “marked” may be more prominent, in focus, emphatic, etc.

**Metonymy/Metonym** — Metonymy is a figure of speech in which one term is used in place of another with which it is associated. In the expression, “he was reading the prophet Isaiah,” the writer (“the prophet Isaiah”) is used as a metonym for his writings (“the book that the prophet Isaiah wrote”).

**Nominalizer** — In Greek syntax, this term refers to an article that is used to change a word, phrase, or clause into a substantive. Most commonly, nominalizers are used to make an adjective or participle substantival.

**Point of departure** — This expression refers to a constituent that occurs at the beginning of a clause or sentence that “provides a starting place for a communication” and “cohesively anchors the subsequent clause to something which is already in the context”

(Levinsohn 2000, 42). Points of departure can be either situational (temporal, spatial, comparative, conditional, or other adverbial relations) or referential, i.e., topical (pp. 8–11).

**Proclitic** — A word that usually has no accent, having lost it to the word that follows it because it is read in such close conjunction with it.

**Prominence** — The “semantic and grammatical elements of discourse that serve to set aside certain subjects, ideas or motifs of the author as more or less semantically or pragmatically significant than others” (Reed, 75–76).

**Protasis** — The first part (“if” clause) in a conditional construction.

**Renewal** — Although frames are often used to shift attention from one constituent to another, frames can also involve “renewal.” One type of renewal involves the repetition of a topic from the immediately preceding context in order to make a new point or provide background information about that topic.

**Synecdoche** — A figure of speech in which one term is used in place of another with which it is associated, specifically involving a part-whole relationship. In the sentence, “Do you have your own wheels?” the word “wheels” stands for the entire “vehicle” of which it is a part.

**Topical frame** — See the entry on “Frame” and “Point of Departure.” A topical frame typically involves a switch in reference from the preceding clause and identifies the topic of the new clause.

**Unmarked** — The unmarked or default choice between two or more options refers to a writer choosing not to signal the presence of some feature (Runge 2010, §9.2).



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achtemeier, Paul J. *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- . “Newborn Babes and Living Stones: Literal and Figurative in 1 Peter.” Pages 207–36 in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer*. Edited by M. P. Horgan and P. J. Kobelski. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- Agnew, Francis H. “1 Peter 1:2—An Alternative Translation.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 68–73.
- Arichea, Daniel C., and Eugene A. Nida. *A Translator’s Handbook on the First Letter from Peter*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1980.
- Bakker, Egbert J. “Voice, Aspect and Aktionsart: Middle and Passive in Ancient Greek.” Pages 23–47 in *Voice: Form and Function*. Typological Studies in Language 27. Edited by B. A. Fox and P. J. Hopper. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1994.
- Barnwell, Katherine. “Vocative Phrases.” *Notes on Translation* 53 (1974): 9–17.
- Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000.
- Beare, Francis Wright. *The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970.
- Bertram, Georg. “ἐπιστρέφω, ἐπιστροφή.” Pages 722–29 in vol. 7 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

- Bigg, Charles. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. 2nd ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.
- Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.
- Boyer, James L. "The Classification of Participles: A Statistical Study." *Grace Theological Journal* 5 (1984): 163–79.
- Buth, Randall. "‘And’ or ‘But,’ So What?" *Jerusalem Perspective* 4 (1991): 13–15.
- . "Οὐν, Δέ, Καί, and Asyndeton in John’s Gospel." Pages 144–61 in *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Edited by D. A. Black. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1992.
- . "Semitic ‘Kai’ and Greek ‘De’." *Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation* 3 (1981): 12–19.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Carson, D. A. "1 Peter." Pages 1015–45 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- . *Greek Accents: A Student’s Manual*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.
- Casarella, Anthony. *Bibliography of Literature on First Peter*. Edited by B. M. Metzger and B. D. Ehrman. New Testament Tools and Studies 23. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Conrad, Carl W. "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb. November 19, 2002." Online: <http://artsci.wustl.edu/~cwconrad/docs/NewObsAncGrkVc.pdf>. Accessed June 8, 2009.
- Cross, F. L. *1 Peter: A Paschal Liturgy*. London: Mowbray, 1954.
- Culy, Martin M. "Double Case Constructions in Koine Greek." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 6 (2009): 82–106.
- Culy, Martin M., and Mikeal C. Parsons. *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2003.

- Dalton, William J. *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18-4:6*. 2nd ed. *Analecta biblica* 23. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989.
- . “‘So That Your Faith May Also Be Your Hope in God’ (1 Peter 1:21).” Pages 262–74 in *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris on His 60th Birthday*. Edited by R. Banks. Exeter: Paternoster, 1974.
- Dauids, Peter H. *The First Epistle of Peter*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Daube, David. “κερδαίνω as a Missionary Term.” *Harvard Theological Review* 40 (1947): 109–20.
- . “Participle and Imperative in 1 Peter.” Pages 467–88 in *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays*, by Edward Gordon Selwyn. 2nd ed. London: MacMillan, 1947. Repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.
- Dubis, Mark. “First Peter and the ‘Sufferings of the Messiah.’” Pages 85–96 in *Looking into the Future: Evangelical Studies in Eschatology*. Edited by D. Baker. ETS Studies. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- . *Messianic Woes in First Peter: Suffering and Eschatology in 1 Peter 4:12-19*. *Studies in Biblical Literature* 33. New York: Lang, 2002.
- . “Research on First Peter: A Survey of Scholarly Literature since 1985.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 4 (2006): 199–239.
- Elliott, John H. *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 37B. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- . *A Home for the Homeless: A Social-Scientific Criticism of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy, with a New Introduction*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990.
- Fairbairn, Patrick. *Exposition of the First Epistle of Peter*. Translated by W. Steiger. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1836.
- Fink, Paul R. “The Use and Significance of *en ōi* [sic] in 1 Peter.” *Grace Journal* 8 (1967): 33–39.
- Forbes, Greg. “Children of Sarah: Interpreting 1 Peter 3:6b.” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 15 (2005): 105–9.

- France, R. T. "Exegesis in Practice: Two Examples." Pages 252–81 in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*. Edited by I. H. Marshall. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Fuller, Lois K. "The 'Genitive Absolute' in New Testament/Hellenistic Greek: A Proposal for Clearer Understanding." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 3 (2006): 142–67.
- Goodwin, William W. *A Greek Grammar*. Rev. ed. Boston: Ginn, 1892.
- Greeven, Heinrich. "ἐκζητέω." Pages 894–95 in vol. 2 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
- Grudem, Wayne. *The First Epistle of Peter: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 17. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Hart, J. H. A. "The First Epistle General of Peter." Pages 1–80 in vol. 5 of *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Edited by W. R. Nicoll. 5 vols. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1910.
- Healey, Phyllis M., and Alan Healey. "Greek Circumstantial Participles: Tracking Participants with Participles in the Greek New Testament." *Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics* 4 (1990): 177–259.
- Heckert, Jakob K. *Discourse Function of Conjoiners in the Pastoral Epistles*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1996.
- Horrell, David. "Whose Faith(fulness) Is It in I Peter 1:5?" *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 48 (1997): 110–15.
- Hort, F. J. A. *The First Epistle of St. Peter 1.1–2.17: The Greek Text with Introductory Lecture, Commentary, and Additional Notes*. London: Macmillan, 1898.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "ἀκρογωνιαίος." Page 792 in vol. 1 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76.
- Jobs, Karen H. *1 Peter*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.
- Johnson, Dennis E. "Fire in God's House: Imagery from Malachi 3 in Peter's Theology of Suffering (1 Pet 4:12-19)." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 29 (1986): 285–94.

- Kelly, J. N. D. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*. Thor-napple Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1969.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. *The Middle Voice*. Typological Studies in Lan-guage 23. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993.
- Kiley, Mark. "Like Sara: The Tale of Terror Behind 1 Peter 3:6." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 689–92.
- Kistemaker, Simon J. *Exposition of the Epistles of Peter and of the Epistle of Jude*. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.
- Kittel, Gerhard. "λογικός." Pages 142–43 in vol. 4 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis*. Translated and edited by D. P. Bailey. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Larson, Mildred L. *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. 2nd ed. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1998.
- LaVerdiere, Eugene A. "A Grammatical Ambiguity in 1 Pet 1:23." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 89–94.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.
- Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *1 Peter*. IVP New Testament Commentary. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1991.
- Martin, Troy. *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*. Society of Bib-lical Literature Dissertation Series 131. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- . "The Present Indicative in the Eschatological Statements of 1 Peter 1:6, 8." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 307–12.
- . "The TestAbr and the Background of 1Pet 3,6." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 90 (1999): 139–46.

- McCartney, Dan G. “λογικός in 1 Peter 2,2.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 82 (1991): 128–32.
- McKelvey, R. J. “Christ the Cornerstone.” *New Testament Studies* 8 (1962): 352–59.
- Meecham, H. G. “The Use of the Participle for the Imperative in the NT.” *Expository Times* 58 (1947): 207–8.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *1 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary 49. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1988.
- Miller, Neva F. “A Theory of Deponent Verbs.” Pages 423–30 in *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Edited by T. Friberg, B. Friberg, and N. F. Miller. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.
- Mills, Watson E. *1 Peter*. Bibliographies for Biblical Research: New Testament Series 17. Lewiston, N.Y.: Mellen Biblical Press, 2000.
- Moore, Bruce R. *Doublets in the New Testament*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1993.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908–1976.
- Osborne, Thomas P. “Guide Lines for Christian Suffering: A Source-Critical and Theological Study of 1 Peter 2,21-25.” *Biblica* 64 (1983): 381–408.
- Pennington, Jonathan T. “Deponency in Koine Greek: The Grammatical Question and the Lexicographical Dilemma.” *Trinity Journal* 24 (2003): 55–76.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- . *Verbal Aspect in the Greek New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek 1. New York: Lang, 1989.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. “Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis.” Pages 75–101 in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*. Edited by S. E. Porter and D. A. Carson. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 113. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Richards, E. Randolph. “Silvanus Was Not Peter’s Secretary: Theological Bias in Interpreting Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ἔγραψα in 1 Peter

- 5:12." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 43 (2000): 417–32.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.
- Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Lexham Bible Reference Series. Bellingham, Wash.: Logos Research Systems, 2010.
- Runge, Steven E., ed. *The Lexham Discourse Greek New Testament*. Lexham Bible Reference Series. Bellingham, Wash.: Logos Research Systems, 2008.
- Salom, A. P. "The Imperative Use of the Participle in the New Testament." *Australian Biblical Review* 11 (1963): 41–49.
- Sander, Emilie T. "ΤΥΡΩΣΙΣ and the First Epistle of Peter 4:12." Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1966.
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. "διασπορά." Pages 98–104 in vol. 2 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *1, 2 Peter, Jude*. New American Commentary 37. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003.
- Schutter, William L. *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.
- Scott, C. Anderson. "The Sufferings of Christ: A Note on 1 Peter 1.11." *Expositor*, 6th ser. 12 (1905): 234–40.
- Selwyn, Edward Gordon. *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1947. Repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.
- Sly, Dorothy I. "1 Peter 3:6b in the Light of Philo and Josephus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 126–29.
- Snyder, Graydon F. "The *Tobspruch* in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 23 (1977): 117–20.
- Snyder, Scot. "Participles and Imperatives in 1 Peter: A Re-examination in the Light of Recent Scholarly Trends." *Filología Neotestamentaria* 8 (1995): 187–98.
- Spencer, Aída Besançon. "Peter's Pedagogical Method in 1 Peter 3:6." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 10 (2000): 107–19.

- Spicq, Ceslas. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Taylor, Bernard A. "Deponency and Greek Lexicography." Pages 167–76 in *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*. Edited by B. A. Taylor, et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Thurén, Lauri. *The Rhetorical Strategy of 1 Peter with Special Regard to Ambiguous Expressions*. Åbo: Åbo Academy Press, 1990.
- Titrud, Kermit. "The Overlooked KAI in the Greek New Testament." *Notes on Translation* 5 (1991): 1–28.
- Valens Vettius. "Anthologiarum libri ix." Pages 1–348 in *Vettii Valentis Antiocheni anthologiarum libri novem*. Edited by D. Pingree. Leipzig: Teubner, 1986. Accessed via Thesaurus Linguae Graecae.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wand, J. W. C. *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen, 1934.
- Warden, Duane. "The Prophets of 1 Peter 1:10-12." *Restoration Quarterly* 31 (1989): 1–12.
- Webb, Robert L. "The Petrine Epistles: Recent Developments and Trends." Pages 373–90 in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*. Edited by S. McKnight and G. R. Osborne. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- Winer, G. B. *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Translated by W. F. Moulton. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1882. Repr., Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock, 2001.
- Wright, N. T. "ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ as 'Messiah' in Paul: Philemon 6." Pages 41–55 in *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

## GRAMMAR INDEX

*This index does not include every mention of a given label but only references in which the label is believed to describe properly the text of 1 Peter.*

- accusative direct object, 1:3, 8, 9, 11, 12<sup>2</sup>, 13, 15, 17, 21<sup>2</sup>, 22<sup>2</sup>; 2:1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9<sup>2</sup>, 12<sup>2</sup>, 15, 16, 17<sup>4</sup>, 19, 21, 22, 24; 3:2, 5, 6<sup>2</sup>, 7, 9<sup>3</sup>, 10<sup>5</sup>, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16<sup>2</sup>, 18, 21; 4:1, 3, 5<sup>2</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>, 10<sup>2</sup>, 11, 16, 19; 5:1, 2, 4, 5<sup>2</sup>, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14
- accusative in apposition, 1:9, 21; 2:4, 6<sup>2</sup>; 3:15
- accusative of time, 1:17; 4:2
- accusative subject of the infinitive, 1:21; 3:7; 4:17; 5:9, 12
- adjectivizer, 5:14
- advancement, 2:5; 3:15; 5:1
- adverb of degree, 1:13; 4:13, 18
- adverb of manner, 1:17, 22; 2:19, 23; 5:2<sup>4</sup>
- adverb (temporal), 1:6<sup>2</sup>, 8; 2:10<sup>3</sup>, 25; 3:5, 15, 17, 20, 21; 4:2, 17; 5:10
- adverbial accusative, 3:8
- alpha-privative, 1:4<sup>3</sup>
- anaphoric constituent, 2:20, 21; 3:9, 20
- ἀντί (exchange), 3:9<sup>2</sup>
- ἀπό (separation), 3:10, 11
- ἀπό (source), 1:12
- ἀπό (spatial), 4:17<sup>2</sup>
- asyndeton, 2:13
- attraction (genitive), 4:11
- attributive genitive, 1:14; 3:21; 4:13, 14; 5:1, 14
- αὐτός (intensive), 1:15; 2:5, 24
- αὐτός (resumptive), 5:10
- cataphoric constituent, 2:15; 3:5; 4:6
- chiasm, 2:1, 9, 17, 20; 4:15-16
- cognate dative, 1:8
- comparative adjective, 1:7; 3:7, 17; 5:1, 5
- complement in double accusative, 1:17; 2:12, 16; 3:6; 4:8
- complement in double nominative, 2:5
- condition (first class), 1:6, 17; 2:3, 19, 20<sup>2</sup>; 3:1; 4:11<sup>2</sup>, 14, 16, 17, 18
- condition (fourth class), 3:14, 17
- condition (mixed), 3:14, 17
- condition (third class), 3:13
- crasis, 3:9

- dative complement, 1:14; 2:13<sup>2</sup>,  
 18<sup>3</sup>; 3:1, 5, 22; 5:5  
 dative direct object, 2:8, 21, 23;  
 3:1, 6, 7; 4:13, 17; 5:5, 9  
 dative in apposition, 1:18<sup>2</sup>  
 dative indirect object, 1:2, 12<sup>2</sup>,  
 13, 21; 2:23; 3:18, 4:5, 6, 19; 5:5  
 dative of advantage, 1:12<sup>2</sup>, 2:21  
 dative of agency, 3:18<sup>2</sup>; 4:6; 5:9  
 dative of cause, 4:12  
 dative of destination, 3:19  
 dative of means/instrument,  
 1:18, 19; 2:24  
 dative of place, 4:6  
 dative of possession, 4:11; 5:11,  
 14  
 dative of recipient, 1:1  
 dative of reference, 2:5, 7<sup>2</sup>, 24<sup>2</sup>;  
 3:15; 4:1, 12<sup>2</sup>; 5:5, 7, 9  
 dative of rule, 4:2<sup>2</sup>  
 δέ (development marker), 1:7, 8,  
 12, 20, 25<sup>2</sup>; 2:4, 7, 9, 10<sup>2</sup>, 14, 23;  
 3:8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18; 4:6, 7,  
 16<sup>2</sup>, 17; 5:5<sup>3</sup>, 10  
 διά (advantage), 1:20  
 διά (cause), 2:13, 19; 3:14  
 διά (intermediate agent), 1:12;  
 5:12  
 διά (manner), 5:12  
 διά (means), 1:3, 5, 7, 21, 23; 3:1,  
 21; 4:11  
 διά (ultimate agent), 2:14  
 double accusative construction,  
 1:17; 2:12, 16; 3:6; 4:8  
 double nominative construc-  
 tion, 2:5  
 doublet, 1:4, 7, 8, 10, 19, 23; 2:25;  
 4:7, 13; 5:8, 10  
 εἰς (advantage), 1:4  
 εἰς (benefaction), 3:12; 4:10  
 εἰς (direction), 1:12; 4:8  
 εἰς (goal), 1:3, 10, 11; 2:2, 8, 9;  
 3:9, 12; 5:10  
 εἰς (in place of ἐν), 3:20; 5:12  
 εἰς (introducing verbal object),  
 1:8, 11, 21<sup>2</sup>; 3:5, 21  
 εἰς (purpose), 1:2, 3, 4, 5, 22; 2:5,  
 9, 14, 21; 4:6, 7  
 εἰς (result), 1:7  
 εἰς (spatial), 2:9; 3:20, 22; 4:4;  
 5:12  
 εἰς (temporal), 1:25; 4:11; 5:11  
 ἐκ (cause), 2:12  
 ἐκ (separation), 1:3, 18; 2:9  
 ἐκ (source), 1:22; 4:11  
 ἐν (association), 2:12; 3:16; 5:1,  
 10, 14  
 ἐν (cause), 1:6  
 ἐν (circumstantial), 1:6, 14  
 ἐν (manner), 1:17; 2:18; 3:2  
 ἐν (marker of attendant circum-  
 stances), 4:19  
 ἐν (means), 1:2, 5, 12, 22; 2:2;  
 3:19; 5:14  
 ἐν (reference), 1:15; 2:12; 3:16;  
 4:4, 11; 5:2  
 ἐν (spatial), 1:4, 11; 2:6<sup>2</sup>, 22, 24;  
 3:15<sup>2</sup>, 19, 22; 4:2, 12; 5:9, 13  
 ἐν (sphere), 4:14, 16  
 ἐν (temporal), 1:5, 7, 13; 2:12;  
 3:20; 4:13; 5:6  
 enclitic, 2:10  
 epexegetical genitive, 1:1, 7, 13,  
 22; 3:3<sup>3</sup>, 4<sup>2</sup>, 7; 4:4, 14; 5:4, 9  
 ἐπί (benefaction), 3:12<sup>2</sup>  
 ἐπί (direction), 3:12<sup>2</sup>

- ἐπί (goal), 2:25; 3:12  
 ἐπί (introducing verbal object),  
 1:13  
 ἐπί (opposition), 3:12  
 ἐπί (spatial), 2:24; 4:14; 5:7  
 ἐπί (temporal), 1:20
- focal/emphatic complement in  
 copular clause, 1:15, 25; 2:7  
 fronting (as adverbial frame),  
 1:14, 15, 16<sup>2</sup>; 2:3, 5, 11, 13; 4:8,  
 12, 13; 5:1  
 fronting (as comparative frame),  
 2:2, 25; 3:5  
 fronting (as conditional frame),  
 1:6, 7, 17; 3:1<sup>2</sup>  
 fronting (as temporal frame),  
 1:6<sup>2</sup>, 8, 12; 3:5, 21  
 fronting (as third frame), 1:6  
 fronting (as topical frame), 1:7,  
 15, 21, 22, 24, 25<sup>2</sup>; 2:5, 6, 7<sup>3</sup>,  
 12<sup>2</sup>, 17<sup>4</sup>, 21<sup>2</sup>, 22, 24; 3:6, 9, 10,  
 14, 16, 18, 21; 4:1<sup>3</sup>, 3, 7, 8<sup>2</sup>, 10,  
 11<sup>2</sup>, 18<sup>2</sup>, 19; 5:1, 5<sup>2</sup>, 6, 7, 8, 12  
 fronting (discontinuous con-  
 stituent), 2:9; 3:16; 4:2  
 fronting (for emphasis), 1:2<sup>2</sup>, 3,  
 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 17<sup>2</sup>, 18, 21,  
 22<sup>2</sup>; 2:2, 4<sup>2</sup>, 8, 9<sup>2</sup>, 12, 14, 16<sup>2</sup>, 19,  
 21, 24; 3:1, 5, 6<sup>2</sup>, 10, 15, 18, 19,  
 20, 21; 4:1, 2, 8, 10, 11, 12<sup>2</sup>, 13,  
 14, 15, 18<sup>2</sup>, 19; 5:5, 7, 8, 10  
 fronting (for renewal of frame),  
 2:21; 3:9  
 fronting (pronouns with  
 emphatic constituent), 1:21,  
 22; 2:9; 3:6; 4:10, 12
- genitive absolute (cause), 4:1, 4  
 genitive absolute (condition),  
 4:12  
 genitive absolute (temporal),  
 3:20, 22; 5:4  
 genitive direct object, 2:12<sup>2</sup>; 5:3  
 genitive in apposition, 1:1, 2, 3<sup>3</sup>;  
 5:10, 12  
 genitive of comparison, 1:7  
 genitive of place, 1:1<sup>5</sup>, 24  
 genitive of product, 2:8<sup>2</sup>; 5:10  
 genitive of production/producer,  
 1:9; 2:9  
 genitive of reference, 2:21; 5:2  
 genitive of relationship, 1:3; 3:6;  
 5:9, 13  
 genitive of separation, 2:11; 3:10;  
 4:1  
 genitive of source, 1:11; 2:9  
 genitive of subordination, 1:3<sup>2</sup>  
 genitive of time, 1:17; 2:12; 3:20  
 genitive subject, 3:20, 22; 4:1, 4,  
 12; 5:4  
 Granville Sharp's rule, 1:3; 2:25;  
 4:18; 5:1
- hendiadys, 4:14, 18  
 homoioarcton, 1:22; 2:2  
 hyponym, 1:18
- ἴνα (epexegetical), 4:6  
 ἴνα (purpose), 1:7; 2:2, 12, 21, 24;  
 3:1, 9, 16, 18; 4:11, 13; 5:6  
 inclusio, 2:20; 5:13  
 infinitive (complementary), 1:12;  
 3:10<sup>2</sup>; 5:1  
 infinitive (epexegetical), 1:5;  
 2:15; 4:3, 5, 17

- infinitive (indirect discourse), 2:11; 5:9  
 infinitive (purpose), 2:5; 5:8  
 infinitive (purpose with εἰς τό), 3:7; 4:2  
 infinitive (result with ὥστε), 1:21  
 infinitive (substantival), 3:10  
 intensive pronoun, 1:15; 2:5, 24  
 internally headed relative clause, 1:10  
  
 καθώς (cause), 4:10  
 καί (adverbial additive), 1:15; 2:5, 8, 21; 3:5, 7, 18, 19, 21; 4:1, 6, 13; 5:1  
 καί (conjoining), esp. 1:17, 2:6, 16; 3:6, 12, 13; 4:18; 5:4  
 κατά (opposition), 2:11  
 κατά (standard), 1:2, 3, 15, 17; 3:7; 4:6<sup>2</sup>, 19; 5:2  
  
 left-dislocation, 2:7; 5:10  
 litotes, 2:6  
  
 meiosis, 4:3  
 μέν . . . δέ construction, 1:20; 2:4; 3:18; 4:6  
 μετά (manner), 3:16  
 μετά (temporal), 1:11  
 metaphor, 1:4, 7, 13<sup>2</sup>, 12, 23; 2:2<sup>3</sup>, 3, 6, 10, 11<sup>2</sup>, 12, 16, 18, 22, 24<sup>2</sup>; 3:4, 7; 4:4, 14, 17; 5:3, 4, 5, 6<sup>3</sup>, 7, 13<sup>2</sup>  
 metonymy, 1:5-6; 2:19, 24; 3:17, 20, 21; 4:11; 5:12  
 middle voice (cognition), 5:12  
 middle voice (direct reflexive), 1:14, 17; 4:1<sup>2</sup>  
 middle voice (emotion), 1:6<sup>2</sup>, 8, 11, 12; 2:6, 17; 3:6, 14<sup>2</sup>, 16; 4:4, 12, 13<sup>2</sup>, 16, 19; 5:8  
 middle voice (grooming), 1:13; 5:5  
 middle voice (indirect/self-benefactive), 1:9, 17; 5:4  
 middle voice (nontranslational motion), 5:6, 8  
 middle voice (perception), 2:3  
 middle voice (reciprocal), 2:11, 13, 18; 3:1, 5, 22; 5:5<sup>2</sup>, 13, 14  
 middle voice (self-control), 2:1, 11  
 middle voice (self-interest), 4:3  
 middle voice (self-protection/preservation), 2:11  
 middle voice (spontaneous event with animate being), 2:2, 7, 24; 3:6; 4:18  
 middle voice (spontaneous event with inanimate being), 1:7, 24; 4:12, 17  
 middle voice (state), 1:15, 16; 3:13; 5:3  
 middle voice (translational motion), 2:4, 25; 3:19, 20, 22; 4:3, 14  
  
 negative-positive construction, 1:12, 18; 2:10<sup>2</sup>, 20, 23; 3:3, 9, 14, 21; 4:2, 12, 15, 16  
 neuter plural subject with singular verb, 1:12  
 nominalizer, 2:10<sup>2</sup>  
 nominative absolute, 1:1  
 nominative for vocative, 2:18; 3:1, 7

- nominative in apposition, 1:1;  
2:9<sup>3</sup>; 3:18, 21<sup>4</sup>; 5:1<sup>2</sup>, 8, 13
- nominative subject, 1:2, 3, 7, 10,  
11, 12<sup>2</sup>, 24<sup>4</sup>, 25<sup>2</sup>; 2:2<sup>3</sup>, 3, 5, 7<sup>2</sup>, 8,  
9, 11, 15, 19<sup>2</sup>, 20<sup>2</sup>, 21, 22<sup>2</sup>, 23,  
24, 25; 3:1, 3, 4<sup>2</sup>, 5, 6, 12<sup>3</sup>, 13,  
16, 17, 18, 20<sup>3</sup>, 21, 22; 4:1<sup>3</sup>, 3, 5,  
7, 8, 10, 11<sup>5</sup>, 14, 15, 17, 18<sup>2</sup>, 19;  
5:5, 8, 11, 13<sup>2</sup>, 14
- nominative subject of an implied  
verb, 1:3, 24<sup>2</sup>; 2:3, 7, 9, 19, 20<sup>2</sup>,  
25; 3:4, 12<sup>3</sup>, 13, 17; 4:3, 17;  
5:11, 14
- objective genitive, 1:2<sup>2</sup>, 3, 7, 9, 20,  
22; 2:14<sup>2</sup>, 16, 19, 24, 25; 3:3<sup>4</sup>, 7,  
13, 21<sup>2</sup>; 4:10, 13, 17; 5:1<sup>2</sup>, 8
- onomatopoeia, 4:9; 5:8
- ὄτι (cause), 1:16; 2:15, 21; 3:9, 12,  
18; 4:1, 8, 14, 17; 5:5, 7
- ὄτι (clausal complement), 1:16,  
18; 2:3
- ὄτι (with subject clause), 1:12
- οὐ versus μή, 1:8
- οὐν (inferential), 2:1, 7; 4:7; 5:1, 6
- οὐν (resumptive), 2:1; 4:1
- οὐτος (resumptive), 2:7
- παρά (viewpoint), 2:4, 22
- participle (amplification), 1:11
- participle (attendant circum-  
stance), 2:1, 12; 3:6, 16; 5:2, 7
- participle (attributive), 1:3<sup>2</sup>, 4,  
5, 7<sup>2</sup>, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 20<sup>2</sup>, 21<sup>2</sup>,  
23<sup>2</sup>, 25; 2:4<sup>2</sup>, 5, 7; 3:5, 20; 4:3,  
12; 5:1, 8, 10
- participle (cause), 1:9, 18, 22, 23;  
2:8, 12; 3:2, 17<sup>2</sup>; 4:1, 3, 4; 5:9
- participle (concessive), 1:6, 8<sup>2</sup>;  
2:23<sup>2</sup>
- participle (condition), 3:6<sup>2</sup>; 4:12
- participle (imperative), 1:14;  
2:1, 12, 18; 3:1, 7<sup>2</sup>, 9<sup>2</sup>, 16; 4:8,  
10; 5:7
- participle (manner), 4:13; 5:3<sup>2</sup>, 8
- participle (means), 1:10, 13<sup>2</sup>; 2:4,  
15, 24; 3:5, 18<sup>2</sup>
- participle (periphrastic), 1:6; 2:25
- participle (purpose), 2:21; 5:12<sup>2</sup>
- participle (result), 4:4
- participle (substantival), 1:12,  
17; 2:6, 7<sup>2</sup>, 9, 10<sup>2</sup>, 13, 14, 16,  
23; 3:10, 12, 13, 15, 16; 4:1, 5<sup>2</sup>,  
17, 19
- participle (temporal), 2:19, 20<sup>4</sup>;  
3:19, 20, 22<sup>2</sup>; 5:4, 10
- partitive genitive, 1:20, 24; 2:7;  
4:8, 11, 15
- περί (reference), 1:10<sup>2</sup>; 3:15, 18;  
5:7
- periphrastic (imperfect), 2:25
- periphrastic (present), 1:6
- possessive genitive, 1:2, 13, 19<sup>2</sup>,  
24; 2:10, 16, 22, 24, 25; 3:12<sup>3</sup>,  
15, 22; 4:13, 14, 17, 19; 5:2, 6
- predicate accusative, 2:4; 5:12
- predicate adjective, 1:3, 7, 15,  
16<sup>2</sup>, 24; 2:15; 3:4, 15, 17; 4:3, 9,  
14; 5:9
- predicate nominative, 1:25; 2:3,  
8<sup>2</sup>, 9, 19, 20<sup>2</sup>; 3:6, 13<sup>2</sup>, 14, 20;  
4:17; 5:3
- πρό (rank), 4:8
- πρό (temporal), 1:20
- proclitic, 2:10
- pronominal trace, 2:7

- πρὸς (purpose), 3:15; 4:12  
 πρὸς (spatial), 2:4  
 rhetorical question, 2:20; 3:13;  
 4:17, 18  
 Semitic influence, 1:14; 3:12; 5:12  
 subjective genitive, 1:1, 2<sup>2</sup>, 3, 5, 7,  
 9, 14, 17<sup>2</sup>, 18, 21, 23, 25; 2:12,  
 15<sup>2</sup>, 24; 3:1, 2, 7, 12, 14, 16, 17,  
 20; 4:2<sup>2</sup>, 3, 7, 10, 11, 17, 19; 5:7,  
 10, 12  
 synecdoche, 1:24  
 temporary focus, 1:12, 18; 2:15,  
 19  
 ὑπέρ (advantage), 2:21; 3:18  
 ὑπέρ (representation), 3:18  
 ὑπό (agency), 2:4  
 ὑπό (spatial), 5:6  
 vocative (true), 2:11; 3:1, 8; 4:12;  
 5:5 (*see* nominative for voca-  
 tive)  
 word play, 2:3; 3:12  
 ὡς (with comparative clause),  
 2:2, 12, 25; 3:6; 4:11<sup>2</sup>, 12, 5:8  
 ὡς (with comparative phrase),  
 1:19, 24<sup>2</sup>  
 ὡς (role/capacity), 1:14; 2:5, 11,  
 13, 14, 16<sup>3</sup>; 3:7<sup>2</sup>; 4:10, 15<sup>2</sup>, 16  
 ὡς (manner), 5:3  
 ὡς (standard), 5:12

## AUTHOR INDEX

- Achtemeier, P. J., xix, 2, 3, 6, 8,  
10, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26,  
32, 33, 36, 37, 41, 45, 48, 51,  
52, 54, 55, 59, 61, 63, 65, 71,  
72, 73, 74, 76, 79, 80, 83, 84,  
86, 88, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96,  
97, 98, 99, 102, 103, 105, 111,  
113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 121,  
123, 124, 125, 126, 129, 130,  
131, 133, 134, 136, 139, 140,  
141, 142, 145, 147, 149, 150,  
151, 152, 153, 154, 157, 159,  
160, 161, 163, 165, 170, 171,  
175, 176
- Agnew, F. H., 3, 4
- Arichea, D. C., 89
- Bakker, E. J., xii
- Barnwell, K., 71
- BDAG, 2, 7, 10, 11, 18, 19, 20, 21,  
24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35,  
39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50,  
55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65,  
66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75,  
77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86,  
88, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 101,  
102, 104, 109, 111, 112, 113,  
116, 117, 123, 124, 125, 127,  
130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136,  
138, 141, 142, 143, 145, 147,  
151, 154, 155, 163, 165, 166,  
168, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175,  
176, 177
- BDF, 11, 13, 15, 19, 26, 31, 32,  
33, 43, 52, 58, 60, 62, 63, 66,  
67, 71, 75, 85, 93, 97, 103, 106,  
109, 116, 123, 131, 143, 146,  
150, 170, 173, 175
- Beare, F. W., 3, 51, 60, 68, 79,  
91, 96, 108, 111, 113, 117, 124,  
133, 135, 138, 141, 157, 169,  
170
- Bertram, G., 83
- Bigg, C., 12, 30, 43, 55, 62, 68, 78,  
88, 92, 93, 94, 96, 99, 110, 114,  
115, 119, 132, 144, 147, 157
- Boyer, J. L., 26, 71, 85
- Buth, R., 14, 60
- Caragounis, C. C., 12, 107
- Carson, D. A., 57, 108
- Casurella, A., xix
- Conrad, C. W., xii, xiii, 10, 27,  
28, 53
- Cross, F. L., 107
- Culy, M. M., 11, 17, 32, 48, 111,  
112

- Dalton, W. J., 35, 118, 120, 124,  
     126, 127, 137, 138  
 Davids, P. H., 6  
 Daube, D., 25, 85  
 Dubis, M., xix, 2, 9, 11, 18, 20, 41,  
     80, 83, 106, 107, 114, 120, 138,  
     146, 147, 148, 150, 152, 153,  
     154, 156, 157, 159, 171, 177  
  
 Elliott, J. H., xix, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11,  
     17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 35,  
     41, 48, 49, 56, 61, 65, 68, 71, 81,  
     83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 91, 93, 94, 95,  
     96, 98, 107, 110, 113, 117, 119,  
     125, 132, 136, 139, 140, 142,  
     143, 147, 150, 153, 154, 160,  
     162, 170, 171, 175  
  
 Fairbairn, P., 174  
 Fink, P. R., 62, 113  
 Forbes, G., 91  
 France, R. T., 120, 123, 124, 125  
 Fuller, L. K., 123  
  
 Goodwin, W. W., 13  
 Greeven, H., 18  
 Grudem, W., 3, 19, 23, 30, 35, 36,  
     37, 55, 66, 137  
  
 Hart, J. H. A., 25  
 Healey, A., 122  
 Healey, P. M., 122  
 Heckert, J. K., 13, 14  
 Horrell, D., 8  
 Hort, F. J. A., 9, 20, 23, 24, 32, 38,  
     51, 52, 54, 55, 60, 63, 66, 67  
  
 Jeremias, J., 50  
 Jobes, K. H., 2, 3, 4, 8, 16, 19, 20,  
     23, 61, 70, 159  
 Johnson, D. E., 154  
  
 Kelly, J. N. D., 12, 33, 67, 78, 89,  
     91, 94, 99, 107, 108, 111, 112,  
     115, 116, 121, 125, 130, 131,  
     141, 150, 157, 164  
 Kemmer, S., xxi, 10, 11, 13, 17,  
     20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 40, 42,  
     44, 45, 51, 53, 60, 64, 70, 80,  
     82, 91, 92, 109, 114, 121, 122,  
     130, 131, 134, 135, 147, 149,  
     150, 153, 154, 157, 163, 165,  
     166, 169, 174, 176  
 Kiley, M., 90  
 Kistemaker, S. J., 18  
 Kittel, G., 44  
 Klauck, H.-J., 1  
  
 Larson, M. L., 74  
 LaVerdiere, E. A., 38  
 LDGNT, 4, 11, 12, 23, 27, 30, 35,  
     36, 37, 39, 41, 46, 51, 55, 62,  
     65, 66, 73, 82, 89, 102, 110,  
     131, 132, 133, 140, 147, 148,  
     150, 151, 171, 172, 173, 174  
 Levinsohn, S. H., xix, xx, xxi, 4,  
     14, 21, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 41,  
     42, 47, 55, 56, 64, 69, 74, 76,  
     89, 116, 119, 122, 123, 162,  
     171, 174, 183  
 LN, 5, 34, 44, 46, 55, 74, 75, 76,  
     78, 83, 89, 94, 97, 98, 103, 104,  
     105, 114, 121, 122, 125, 126,  
     128, 130, 135, 139, 142, 143,

- 144, 145, 148, 151, 152, 157,  
160, 163, 168, 171, 174
- Marshall, I. H., 16, 65
- Martin, T., 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 59,  
62, 90, 119
- McCartney, D. G., 44
- McKelvey, R. J., 50
- Meecham, H. G., 25
- Metzger, B. M., 84, 96, 116, 169,  
172
- Michaels, J., xix, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 16,  
17, 18, 19, 23, 25, 27, 29, 33,  
34, 37, 38, 40, 42, 57, 59, 60,  
64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 73, 74,  
75, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86,  
89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97,  
99, 103, 108, 111, 112, 113,  
114, 117, 118, 121, 126, 127,  
130, 133, 135, 141, 142, 145,  
147, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154,  
157, 159, 161, 166, 168, 169,  
170, 171, 174, 175, 177
- Miller, N. F., xxi, 28, 64, 106,  
133, 162
- Mills, W. E., xix
- Moore, B. R., 7, 8, 172, 181
- Moulton, J. H., 25, 44, 97
- Nida, E. A., 89
- Osborne, T. P., 80, 81
- Parsons, M. C., 11, 17, 32
- Pennington, J. T., xii, xiii
- Porter, S. E., 25, 40, 124, 174
- Reed, J. T., 183
- Richards, E. R., 173
- Robertson, A. T., xii, 25, 43, 46,  
47, 49, 55, 87, 102, 113, 141,  
150
- Runge, S. E., xix, xx, 14, 16, 27,  
33, 52, 53, 67, 73, 119, 182, 183
- Salom, A. P., 25
- Sander, E. T., 146
- Schmidt, K. L., 2
- Schreiner, T. R., xix, 7, 8, 10, 17,  
23, 26, 34, 37, 38, 48, 49, 65,  
68, 72, 81, 82, 85, 92, 99, 100,  
106, 115, 118, 121, 122, 124,  
126, 127, 133, 136, 141, 149,  
150
- Schutter, W. L., 39, 41
- Scott, C. A., 20
- Selwyn, E. G., 1, 3, 10, 11, 12,  
18, 37, 38, 49, 53, 73, 86, 88,  
92, 94, 97, 108, 110, 113, 114,  
116, 119, 121, 124, 125, 127,  
129, 140, 144, 150, 153, 155,  
170, 171
- Sly, D. I., 90
- Snyder, G. F., 114
- Snyder, S., 25
- Spencer, A. B., 90
- Spicq, C., 37, 71, 72, 134
- Taylor, B. A., xii, xiii
- Thurén, L., 16
- Titrud, K., 47, 119
- Valens, V., 19
- Wallace, D. B., xi, 1, 3, 5, 10, 11,  
12, 13, 16, 19, 21, 23, 28, 30,

- 35, 42, 48, 53, 59, 60, 62, 64,  
66, 71, 73, 77, 85, 88, 90, 93,  
96, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111,  
114, 115, 116, 118, 122, 126,  
131, 144, 146, 163, 166, 167,  
168, 170, 175, 176, 177, 179,  
181
- Wand, J. W. C., 119  
Warden, D., 18  
Webb, R. L., xix  
Winer, G. B., 15, 26, 32, 52, 71,  
88, 101  
Wright, N. T., 1