

A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF 1 PETER

by

ERVIN RAY STARWALT

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

MAY 2005

Copyright © by Ervin Ray Starwalt 2005

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is difficult to know where to begin in acknowledging those who have contributed to the process leading to the completion of this dissertation. The journey started over two decades ago. It was during my studies in Greek and Hebrew at Dallas Theological Seminary that I first became interested in the study of the way language works and, in particular, the way texts are constructed. The faculty there first introduced me to discourse linguistics. Later, Dr. Mal Couch, President of Tyndale Seminary, encouraged me to pursue advanced studies in this area; he has continued to encourage me as I have gone through the process of many years of study.

Then, there are those at the University of Texas at Arlington who deserve thanks. First are the members of my committee: Drs. Robert Longacre, David Silva, Charles Chiasson, and Lewis Baker. Dr. Longacre imparted his passion for text analysis. Dr. Silva has given valuable counsel many times over. Dr. Chiasson and Dr. Baker have constantly encouraged me to see this dissertation to its end. A special thanks goes to Dr. Donald Burquest, my committee chair, who skillfully guided me through the development and completion of this dissertation. Second, I should acknowledge the Dr. Susan Herring's contribution as a teacher and mentor. Third, I wish to acknowledge Dr. Audrey Wick, my boss in the English Department. She would not allow me to quit.

Next, I wish to acknowledge some of those friends who studied with me as graduate students. Dr. Peter Unseth, Dr. Scott Berthiaume, David Singleton and myself

often gathered to talk linguistics, sharing with each other what we were currently working on. Dr. Deborah Johnson-Evans has listened to me talk about the analysis of 1 Peter so many times that she likely could have written the dissertation herself.

Then, there is my family. My children are young adults now, but for most of their lives their father has been a student. So thanks to John, Peter, Ruth, and Nathan. Also, thanks to my father (now deceased), my mother, my brother, and my sister who supported me in this endeavor.

Finally, a most special thanks to my wife, Sharon Leverna Herrell-Starwalt. Even in her illness, she encouraged me to keep going. Though she did not make it with me to the end of this project, she deserves much credit. She made this dream possible.

April 25, 2005

ABSTRACT

A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF 1 PETER

Publication No. _____

Ervin Ray Starwalt, PhD.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2005

Supervising Professor: Donald A. Burquest

The study focuses on two problems. The first concerns the structure of the text. The text is considered to be notoriously difficult to outline. The second problem is the function of the participle in 1 Peter. The letter is considered to contain some of the classical examples in the New Testament of the imperatival participle (e.g. 2:18; 3:1, 7, 9), the participle used independently in place of a finite imperative verb.

The text is analyzed in terms of salience. Generally, commanding clauses, primarily indicated by the presence of imperative verbs, are those clauses which move the argument along. Locally, other sentences and paragraphs are of less salience. A semantic outline or tree of the text is developed based on this principle.

Based upon the semantic analysis of the structure, the imperatival participles in 2:11-3:12 are analyzed. The structural analysis demonstrates that the imperatival

participles are not truly independent; they can be shown to have an imperative verb as their head. A further analysis of the macrostructure of this section suggests that the participles function to hierarchically layer the commands in the text. This layering allows readers to attend to a limited number of commands at one time so that they can process the text efficiently. Thus, the communicative purpose of the discourse dictates the selection of the participle in these commanding sentences, a decision formerly thought by many to be local.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background to the Problem.....	1
1.2 The Problem.....	2
1.3 Background of the Text.....	4
1.4 Methodology.....	6
1.4.1 Textual Basis	6
1.4.2 Preliminary Analyses.....	7
1.4.2.1 Textual Charting.....	7
1.4.2.2 Intra-sentential Analysis.....	10
1.4.3 Primary Analyses.....	10
1.4.3.1 Structural Analysis	10
1.4.3.2 Imperative Participle Analysis	13
1.5 Literature Review.....	14
1.5.1 Understanding the Text's Structure.....	14
1.5.2 Theories on the Imperative Participle.....	15

1.5.2.1	Grammarians	15
1.5.2.2	Commentators on 1 Peter	20
1.5.2.3	Other Scholarly Analyses of 1 Peter	22
1.5.2.4	Summary of the Survey	23
1.5.3	Linguistic Theory	25
1.5.3.1	Theoretical Basis	25
1.5.3.2	Theory Applied.....	28
1.6	Contribution of the Study	30
2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF 1 PETER.....	32
2.1	Introduction.....	32
2.2	Formulaic Introductory Greeting: 1:1-2	35
2.3	Body-Introduction: 1:3-2:10.....	37
2.3.1	Prologue: 1:3-12.....	38
2.3.2	Introduction: 1:13-2:10.....	47
2.4	Body-Middle.....	70
2.4.1	Overview of 2:11-3:10	70
2.4.2	Initial Generic Commands: 2:11-12	75
2.4.3	Specific Commands: 2:13-17	82
2.4.4	Specific Thesis 1: Slaves Submit: 2:18-25.....	96
2.4.5	Specific Thesis 2: Wives Submit: 3:1-6.....	103
2.4.6	Specific Thesis 3: Husbands Honor: 3:7	106
2.4.7	Specific Thesis 4: Everybody: 3:8-12.....	108

2.4.8 Overview of 3:13-4:11	112
2.4.9 Not Fear, But Consecration: 3:13-3:19	114
2.4.10 Think Like Christ: 4:1-6.....	133
2.4.11 Be Sober Minded: 4:7-11	138
2.5 Body-Close: 4:12-5:11	145
2.5.1 Commit Yourself to God in Suffering: 4:12-19	145
2.5.2 Leaders and Followers Act in Humility: 5:1-5.....	152
2.5.3 Rely on God and Be Ready: 5:6-11	158
2.6 Formulaic Close: 5:12-14.....	162
2.7 Summary of the Letter	164
3. IMPERATIVIAL USE OF THE PARTICIPLE	166
3.1 Introduction.....	166
3.2 Structure and Participles in 2:11-3:12	171
3.3 Why Participles?.....	177
3.4 Response to Achtemeier: Are Participles Really Commands?.....	183
4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	186
4.1 Summary.....	186
4.1.1 Summary of the Structure.....	186
4.1.2 Summary of the Imperativial Participle.....	189
4.2 Implications.....	190
4.3 Limitations of the Present Research.....	191
4.4 Suggestions for Further Research.....	192

Appendix

Semantic Outline (Tree) of 1 Peter	195
REFERENCES	214
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	226

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Views of the Imperative Participle	24
2. Display of 1:1-2	37
3. Display of 1:3-12	46
4. Display of 1:13-16	55
5. Display of 1:17-21	57
6. Display of 1:22-25	59
7. Display of 2:1-3	62
8. Display of 2:4-8	66
9. Display of 2:9-10	70
10. Overview of the Basic Structure	75
11. Display of 2:11-12	81
12. Display of 2:13-17	95
13. Display of 2:18-25	101
14. Display of 3:1-6	104
15. Display of 3:7.....	108
16. Display of 3:8-12	112
17. Display of 3:13-14a.....	118
18. Display of 3:14b-16	124

19. Display of 3:17-18	129
20. Display of 3:19-22	132
21. Display of 4:1-6	137
22. Display of 4:7-11	144
23. Display of 4:12-15	149
24. Display of 4:16-18	151
25. Display of 4:19.....	152
26. Display of 5:1-5	157
27. Display of 5:6-8	160
28. Display of 5:9-11	162
29. Display of 5:12-14	164
30. Macrostructure of 2:11-3:12	183

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Problem

The application of discourse or text linguistic principles to the study of New Testament texts is a fairly recent development in the field of Greek New Testament studies. For example, commentaries on New Testament books have traditionally focused on an understanding of the sentence or, at most, the verse (e.g. Bigg 1909; Kelly 1969). Godet's (1883) discussion of the organization of the argument in his commentary on Romans is usually considered noteworthy because commentaries have typically not considered structural issues. That bias toward focusing on issues at the sentence level or lower is changing, but some Greek scholars still have reservations about the usefulness of discourse analysis for exegetical work. Wallace (1996: xv), for example, affirms the significance of discourse analysis, but believes that "the methods, terminology, and results tend to be unstable and overly subjective." For him, it appears that syntactic studies and discourse studies are separate fields of inquiry.

Nevertheless, the interest in discourse and how it can aid in understanding a text is growing. Two examples of this interest are the publication of two books, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (Cotterell and Turner 1989) and *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis* (Black 1992). It is

significant that these two books are published by mainstream publishers of biblical studies, Intervarsity Press and Broadman Press respectively. Both books illustrate the application of discourse analysis not only to narrative texts, but also to hortatory texts. Both books reflect a conviction that discourse or text analysis can make a significant contribution to the exegesis and translation of biblical texts. This conviction motivates this dissertation. Just as Robertson (1934) sought to ground his New Testament Greek grammar in the best and most current linguistic theory and understanding of his day, so current Greek scholarship should seek to apply the best of today's linguistic advances, the particular concern here being that of text linguistics. For Robertson linguistics was comparative philology; through the application of comparative philology, he sought insights into Greek grammar for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of New Testament texts. Since his day, the linguistic understanding of how texts are produced has greatly improved. This dissertation applies some of the insights of text linguistics in the analysis of the hortatory text of 1 Peter in order to come to a clearer understanding of its structure as a hortatory text and to explain the use of a grammatical category whose existence is debated, the imperatival participle.

1.2 The Problem

The structure of 1 Peter has posed a problem for Greek New Testament scholarship. The text is considered to be notoriously difficult to outline. Bigg (1909: 6) states the following about the epistle: "There is no definite plan or logical evolution of a train of thought." As Martin (1992: 5) observes, early attempts to

understand the text's organization consisted of composing a list of the subjects discussed in 1 Peter without any attempt to interrelate the topics. Thematic analyses have been attempted, but are now generally seen as inadequate (Martin 1992: 14). Still others have suggested that the letter is a composite. For example, Hart (1910: 3) claims that the letter has two conclusions: one at 4:11 and another at 5:10. Thus, he suggests that 1 Peter is not really a unified document. Martin (1992) does a metaphorical analysis of the text and claims that the metaphors are the key to understanding the text's structure. Thurén (1995) and Campbell (1995) analyze the text rhetorically based on the Toulmin model and the classical model respectively. Still, as Martin (1992: 31) observes, no consensus exists as to the structure of 1 Peter. Part of this lack of consensus may be attributed to the fact that no one has, as of yet, attempted a rigorous investigation of the text's structure (Ellicott 1986: 10). Such an investigation is the focus of chapter 3.

A second and related problem in 1 Peter concerns the use of the participle: can the participle function as an independent imperative verb? The discussion of this question can be found in the New Testament Greek grammars and commentaries, dating back for more than a century. 1 Peter is at the center of this debate. The section of 2:11-3:12 contains a group of participles that are considered to be classic examples of the imperatival participle: for example, *slaves submitting to your masters in all fear* (οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις), and *wives submitting their own husbands* ([αἱ] γυναῖκες, ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν). Specifically, the participles in 2:18, 3:1, 3:7, and 3:9 are often called

imperative. The claim is that these participles do not get their imperative mood from a nearby imperative verb as expected according to the canons of Greek grammar (Robertson 1934: 133-134; Blass et al. 1961: 215; Martin 1992: 205; Wallace 1996: 622-623), but instead they function independently as finite verbs themselves.

The present analysis seeks to answer the question as to whether or not these participles in 1 Peter are examples of the imperative participle and demonstrates that, in fact, they are not. A semantic analysis of this section's structure is essential in order to be able to understand how the participle functions within the text. In addition to ascertaining how the participle functions relative to the surrounding text, this analysis seeks an explanation for why the participle and not the finite imperative verb is used in this section. Politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1978; Ricketts 1999) may offer some explanation for the use of participles here, but even more important for the analysis of this text is the theory of macrostructures (van Dijk 1977; 1980). Such an analysis can demonstrate how the participles help the readers process the text.

In addition, this discourse analysis of the participle demonstrates how discourse analysis can impact or inform more traditional syntactic concerns.

1.3 Background of the Text

1 Peter is a circular letter that was written to the Christian churches dispersed throughout the Roman provinces of Pontus (combined with Bithynia after 65 BCE), Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia in Asia Minor (for the background of the text see Guthrie 1970; Ellicott 2000). It is generally assumed that the list of the provinces

in the introduction of the letter gives the circuit that the letter's courier traveled, beginning at Pontus and ending at Bithynia. The combined territory of these provinces covered about 129,000 square miles with an estimated population of 8,500,000. The Jewish population in the region at this time was about one million. Of the general population, it is estimated that about 40,000 were Christian by 67 CE with the number rising to perhaps 100,000 by 100 CE.

These provinces were ruled in succession by the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans. The region was partly Hellenized, at least to the extent that Greek was the language of commerce at the time. Though under Roman rule, the region was diverse, and typically, local cultural norms prevailed. Christianity as a new religion was viewed with suspicion not only by Rome, but also by the local population. The Romans, however, were generally unconcerned with upstart religions in the provinces unless they interfered with Roman rule; the problems the letter addresses appear to be of local origin. Converts to Christianity found themselves in conflict with the social and religious customs of the communities they resided in.

The problems of date and authorship are intertwined. Those who argue that Peter wrote the letter generally suggest a date somewhere around 60-66 CE (cf. Guthrie 1970: 795-796; Davids 1990), although some suggest that Peter may have survived the persecution of Nero in Rome and that thusly the letter may be dated later. Others argue that the text is a pseudonymous letter in which the identification of Peter as the author in the introduction is merely a literary device to lend more authority to the

letter (Ellicott 2000: 84-97). Since the letter was known by Clement in 96 CE (Davids 9), it must have been written before that date.

The present analysis takes the traditional view that Peter was the author, and that the letter was most likely written somewhere between 60-66 CE. It is difficult to be certain about the precise history of a document almost two thousand years old. Both sides of this issue suggest hypotheses in support of their view that cannot be validated without further evidence. In light of this, the more traditional suggestion of the date and authorship is accepted. The newer theories need more substantive evidence if they are to disprove the old. It should be noted, however, that the issue of date and authorship has little direct bearing on the present research. A demonstration that the text forms a unified whole cannot by itself prove that Peter or Pseudo-Peter(s) wrote the letter. Scholars on both sides of this issue now accept the unity of the letter (Achtmeier 1996; Schreiner 2003).

1.4 Methodology

1.4.1 Textual Basis

The present semantic analysis is based upon the critical text of the fourth revised edition of the United Bible Societies (Aland et al. 1983). Previous editions were consulted to compare the past and most recent decisions about sentence punctuation (Aland et al. 1966, 1968, 1975). For the purpose of this analysis, a sentence is defined as the Greek colon whose termination is indicated in the Greek text by either a colon (a raised dot), a period, or a question mark (see Terry 1992: 109-110). These three punctuation marks are counted as full stops because if only periods and question

marks are counted, the sentences become too long for meaningful analysis. The last two editions of the text have seven fewer full stops, resulting in seven fewer sentences as compared to the previous editions. In only one case is the reading of the previous editions followed in the analysis: the full stop at the end of 4:9 is maintained due to the discourse structure. The Nestle-Aland text (Nestle et al. 1993) was consulted, but not for the purpose of determining sentence structure. This particular text has an expanded list of variants in its critical apparatus that is helpful at times for gaining an understanding of how the ancient scribes understand a particular reading or proposition in the text.

1.4.2 Preliminary Analyses

1.4.2.1 Textual Charting

Based on the above understanding of what constitutes a sentence, two preliminary analyses of the UBS text were first conducted in order to gain some initial insight on the structure and the details of the text. First, the book was charted using a variation of Longacre's charting method (as presented by Hwang 1996). In this method, the basic unit is the sentence; each sentence is further divided into clauses and clauses into phrases. The text is charted under four columns: (1) introducers, (2) preposed dependent clauses, (3) main/independent clauses, and (4) postposed dependent clauses. On the left side of the spreadsheet, sentences are numbered and the text is laid out in order, left to right and top to bottom down the sheet.

The introducer column lists introductory elements in the sentence or clause, such as vocatives, exclamations, time/locative phrases and coordinate conjunctions. This column is further divided into two sections: sentence initial (S-in) and sentence medial (S-med). This helps to distinguish elements that introduce a sentence from conjunctions that occur medially and connect two independent clauses in a sentence.

Within the three major columns, the word order of the major constituents, the subject (S), the predicate (P), and object (O), is recorded as it occurs in the text. The preliminary charting assumed a constituent order of SPO. Such a display of the major constituents of the sentence may trouble those who think that the unmarked constituent order is PSO. Yet, for expository and hortatory texts, it may be argued that subject first is less marked since the subject often is fronted because of topicalization. Hwang suggests that subcolumns for S, P, and O be ordered to reflect the basic and most frequent constituent word. The theoretical implications of the choice of SPO as the basic word order are, however, mitigated by the fact that the actual order of a clause is noted. Differing constituent orders are noted by inserting analytic notes in the chart in brackets. For example, if S comes after P as in *So thought the man*, the note [in O] is placed in the S column and the postposed subject is put in the O column (thus the actual order is preserved in the chart). When a constituent is not overtly expressed, it is marked by a dash (--). In addition, since constituents other than SPO may occur in a clause, the labels will need to be interpreted broadly. For example, P may include more than just the bare verb; it may include prepositions functioning as verbal particles (*set off* for example) and adverbs

that occur before or within the verbal phrase. In addition, O may contain direct/indirect objects and various complements such as time and locative phrases, anything other than S and P that occurs after the verb (providing a label for every possible constituent would make the chart difficult to read).

This charting method has several useful features: it treats the sentence as the basic unit, keeps grammatical constituents together, distinguishes between independent and dependent clauses, groups introducers together so that their signal and boundary functions are highlighted, and provides a text in chart form so an analyst can work directly with the chart in analyzing the text. A very brief sample of the charting method applied to the English translation of 1 Peter 2: 1-2 is given below:

Introducer		preposed dependent			independent			postposed dependent		
S-in	S-med	S	P	O	S	P	O	S	P	O
Therefore		--	laying aside	all malice ...						
	like newborn babes				=	desire	the pure milk of the word			
	that							you	may grow	unto salvation

This method of analysis is a useful aid in identifying the independent sentences and their distribution. It also allows one to visually note distinguishing textual features.

1.4.2.2 Intra-sentential Analysis

The second preliminary analysis consisted of analyzing each sentence itself for its propositional content and the ordering of that propositional content. This is a bottom-up approach to understanding the text, and it conforms to some ideas of the more traditional form of biblical analysis by restricting itself to the sentence. Hypotheses about these details of the text were either altered or confirmed by the process of the larger semantic structural analysis. The purpose of this detailed analysis of the contents of each sentence was to obtain a firmer grasp of the details of the text. This consisted of analyzing each sentence for all verbal ideas that might be present in the text, whether they are manifested as verbs, verbals, nouns, adjectives, or adverbs. Longacre's (1996) discussion and theory of how predications combine was useful here. Also helpful were Beekman and Callow's (1974) and Kathleen Callow's (1998) discussions on how propositions are structured. The primary text consulted for the process of propositionalizing the sentences of the text was that of Larson (1998).

1.4.3 Primary Analyses

1.4.3.1 Structural Analysis

After the preliminary intra-sentential analysis, the primary semantic structural analysis was performed. Following Longacre (1992: 110), the basic scheme of the letter is assumed to be that of any normal hortatory text. Hortatory texts typically have four schematic elements: (1) establishment of the authority of the writer, (2) presentation of a problem, (3) commands which may or may not be mitigated, and (4)

provision of motivation. In a hortatory text such as 1 Peter the backbone of the text is formed by those clauses or sentences which contain command forms of the verb. Typically, commands are expressed by imperative verbs, but in Greek some prohibitions may be expressed by a negation of a subjunctive verb and a command can be expressed by a performative verb (*I-exhort*). Thus, the task of tracking the mainline of the argument in the text is essentially that of tracking the clauses that contain the thirty-five imperatives of the text, plus the few other instances of commands expressed by subjunctive and performative verbs.

The chunking of the text involves both a top down and bottom up approach. The major divisions and sections of the text, for example, were mainly discerned by surface features that indicated a major break: a conjunction, a certain noun form (e.g. vocatives), a scriptural quote (Old Testament), a doxology, and so forth. Markers of thematic unity were also helpful in the chunking process: for example, the repetition of words or synonyms.

The lowest level in this analysis consists of the sentence. The structural analysis is an analysis of how the text is semantically structured at the sentence level and up. Sentences are locally related to other sentences and paragraphs to form paragraphs, and so forth. In this analysis, a paragraph is minimally the combination of two sentences. Larger paragraphs may consist of combinations of sentences and/or paragraphs. At times, the analysis proceeds in this fashion, relating sentence to sentence semantically and then the resulting paragraph to another sentence or to a paragraph and so forth. At times the process consists of a combination of top down

and bottom up analysis. This particular analysis constitutes the major portion of this investigation of the text.

As mentioned above, the basic assumption is that clauses containing imperative verbs are the most salient. Other sentences perform some sort of supportive role to the head imperatival sentence. In other words, the imperative sentence serves as the head of its paragraph. All of the other sentences in some way support the command sentence, giving reasons, evidence, comments, and so on. The supporting paragraphs may have, and usually do have, other sentences or paragraphs embedded within them so that multiple bands of salience exist within the text. The result is that the text is analyzed as a layered text with the imperatives forming the mainline and pushing the argument along. The supporting text typically consists of numerous embedded paragraphs. The relation of each sentence and paragraph is analyzed according to its semantic relationship to the surrounding text.

This system of analysis follows the scheme presented by Longacre (1996). The method of displaying the outline of the text as a semantic tree also comes from him. In addition, for the catalogue of possible semantic relations between sentences and paragraphs the primary text consulted here is again that of Longacre (1996). Longacre also discusses in his text (and elsewhere) how texts tend to build toward a climax or a peak. Instances of peak are often observed in the analysis of the text of 1 Peter, but the structure of peak is not rigorously analyzed. In addition to Longacre's text the above texts that were consulted for the propositional analysis also had helpful discussions on determining the semantic structure of a text above the sentence level.

Other texts were helpful in the analysis of the letter. Beekman, Callow, and Kopesec (1981) and Bailey (1976), were consulted for how a text may be analyzed as a field (sandwich structures and chiasms), and several works on Greek connectors were consulted (Heckert 1996, Buth 1992, Levinsohn 1987/2000), as well as the standard lexicon of Bauer (1958) and the lexicon organized by semantic domains by Louw and Nida (1988).

Finally the standard commentaries proved to be of aid in determining the semantic relations within the texts. The six most consulted works are as follows: Achtemeier (1996), Archia and Nida (1980), Davids (1990), Ellicott (2000), Michaels (1988), and Schreiner (2003). These commentaries are valuable because, unlike most of their predecessors, they consider how the text is organized structurally (Archia and Nida to a lesser extent), though in a less rigorous manner than the present analysis. Their comments and suggestions, at times at variance with one another, are evaluated in light of the linguistic evidence.

1.4.3.2 Imperative Participial Analysis

The structural analysis of the text forms the basis for the analysis of the imperative participle. The hierarchical structure of 2:11-3:12 is closely examined in order to determine where the imperative participle fits and functions within the hierarchy. Based on this, a determination is made as to the validity of the imperative participle as a legitimate grammatical category. In addition, the frequency of the various command forms is counted in the text. Based on the results, theoretical solutions are sought to explain why the participle is used as a command form in 2:11-

3:12. The structure of the text is examined for an explanation that is consistent with both politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1978/1987) and macrostructure theory (van Dijk 1977/1980).

1.5 Literature Review

The presentation of the literature relevant to this study of 1 Peter is selective and representative because it is impossible to truly survey all the literature on a biblical text. Ellicott (2000) in his commentary lists works pertaining to 1 Peter for some 150 pages, and he still fails to cover all the literature.

1.5.1 Understanding the Text's Structure

The structure of 1 Peter has posed a problem for New Testament Greek scholars. Two men represent the more extreme view that the letter has no coherent structure. First, Bigg (1909: 6) denies that the letter has any logical plan. Then, Hart (1910: 3-4) denies the basic unity of the letter; he thinks that it is a composite of two letters.

Later scholars began to recognize that the letter did have a structure, but they still were not sure just what the structure was. Dalton (1965: 123-129) became the first to consider in a systematic way the structure of 1 Peter, but still Talbert (1986: 141) notes the lack of consensus on the organization of the text. Ellicott (1986: 10) also comments on the lack of agreement concerning the structure of the text, a problem that he attributes to fact that no one has ever done a thorough study of the text's structure.

Even today, the structure of 1 Peter is a matter of debate (Prasad: 2000: 58-74). Though more recent exegetical commentaries accept the unity of the text and consider

matters of textual structure, an advance over most past works, an examination of the outlines presented in these commentaries on 1 Peter reveals considerable diversity in attempts to lay out the structure (see Achtemier 1996; Davids 2000; Ellicott 2000; Michaels 1988; Schreiner 2003).

The present text analysis of 1 Peter demonstrates that that the text is a coherent hortatory letter. As a hortatory text, the letter's mainline of development can be tracked by following the commanding sentences; the mainline consists primarily of sentences containing finite imperative verbs although other ways more marked ways of indicating the mainline are noted in this study. The misunderstanding of how a hortatory text is put together has led a misinterpretation by some of the imperatival participle, the next problem.

1.5.2 Theories on the Imperatival Participle

1.5.2.1 Grammarians

The participle is a verbal adjective; as such, it may be used as a verb, a noun, an adjective, or an adverb:

- (1) a verb: *among yourselves having love* (εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἔκτενῆ ἔχοντες) (1 Peter 4: 8).
- (2) a noun: *the one wanting to love life . . . , let-him-stop his tongue* (ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν . . . παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν) (1 Peter 3:10).
- (3) an adjective: *a living hope* (ἐλπίδα ζώσαν) (1 Peter 1:3).
- (4) a noun: *the ones . . . being guarded by faith* (τοὺς . . . φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως)

This apparent flexibility in usage makes mastery of this form difficult, so difficult that mastery of the participle is often equated with mastery of Greek syntax itself (Wallace 1996: 613). One particular difficulty that has been an issue of debate for over a century now concerns the use of the participle as an independent imperative.

First, there is a group of grammarians who reject outright or who have serious reservations as to the existence of the imperatival participle. Butmann (1873) rejects the idea of an independent imperatival participle; he says that the participle is always dependent. A few years later, Winer (1877) states that the independent participle is very rare and that when it does occur it is a case in which the writer has lost track of how he started the sentence (anacoluthon); in other words, it is a grammatical mistake. Take for example John 1:38 where the nominative participle *believing* does not agree the genitive noun *belly*: *the one believing in me, out of his belly will flow living water* (ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ρεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος). He comments on 1 Peter 3:1 and 2:18, which are considered to be two of the best examples of the independent imperatival participle: he says that the two commanding participles (*slaves submitting to your masters* and *wives submitting to their own husbands*) go back to and are connected to the imperatives in 2:18. Thus, while Winer allows for the occasional occurrence of the imperatival participle in the New Testament, he believes that such cases are merely the result of a syntactic error by the writer.

Boyer appears to analyze the imperatival participle in a similar way as Butmann and Winer, but he seemingly contradicts himself. In his first article (1984), he

categorically states that all instances of the so-called imperatival participle can be shown to have an imperative as their head (e.g. *submitting* in 1 Peter 2:18 and 3:1 depend on the imperative verb *submit* (ὑποτάγητε) in 2:13): in other words, this independent use of the participle does not exist; it is the result of faulty analysis. Then only a few years later (1987), he suggests that such occurrences of the form should be understood as a periphrastic form with the imperative copula elided. If such participles are essentially and notionally periphrastic constructions, then they can function independently as imperatives. However, in this case, he still contends that the head imperative verb dominates the participles (as in 1 Peter 2:13, 2:18 and 3:11), giving them imperative force. The conjecture of an elided periphrastic construction is not needed if the imperative verb imparts its modal force to the participles.

Another group of grammarians either argue or assume that the use of the participle independently of a finite imperative verb is a genuine development of in the Greek language. J. H. Moulton (1908) is the first to suggest that the imperatival participle in the New Testament is indeed a development of Hellenistic Greek. He observes that certain concluding statements in the papyri appear to substitute the participle for the imperative. One example of a concluding comment is found in FP 112 (99 C.E.): *attend(ing) to Zōilōi* (ἐπέον Ζωίλωι) *and don't look askance at him*. This appearance of the participle in concluding statements combined with the fact that the imperatival form of the copula *be* does not appear in the Greek New Testament leads him to reject Winer's analysis that such uses of the participle are a mistake, and to conclude that the independent participle used for the imperative does indeed exist.

Many of the major intermediate and advanced grammars accept his analysis of the participle in the papyri.

Robertson (1934), in his mammoth grammar on New Testament Greek, cites and accepts Moulton's analysis. He does qualify his acceptance, however, by noting that many of the so-called imperatival participles can be shown to be in actuality dependent upon an imperative. He gives 1 Peter 5:6-7 as an example of a participle that is semantically imperative due to its dependency upon an imperative: *Be-humbled (imperative) therefore under the mighty hand of God . . . casting (aorist participle) your cares upon him*. Yet, even though he counsels care in classifying a participle as independently imperatival, he still accepts the category as valid.

Blass, Debrunner, and Funk (1961) suggest that the imperatival participle is probably the result of a grammatical inconsistency that became grammaticalized: the elision of the imperative copula became grammatical. The category, for them, is an accepted fact of New Testament Greek.

Turner (1963) also assumes that the imperative participle was common in Greek. He, like Moulton, does not accept the suggestion that an imperatival copula has been elided since the imperative of *be* never appears in the New Testament.

Porter (1992) in his grammar reviews the debate over whether or not the imperatival participle exists, but in the end, he cites Moulton's evidence from the papyri as conclusive evidence that the form does exist.

Yet another group of grammarians hold that the independent use of the participle as an imperative is due to second language interference. Daube (1947) does not

question that participles may act independently as an imperative, but he does disagree with Moulton's suggestion that this usage is a development of Hellenistic Greek. He faults Moulton's analysis of the papyri: he argues that all of Moulton's examples of the imperatival participle, except for two, do not clearly use the participle as an imperative (they could be translated as indicatives). Of the two examples from the papyri that Daube accepts as valid, one has severe grammatical difficulties throughout the text, thus calling into question the author's grammatical ability; the other text's imperatival participle occurs in the more formulaic close of the letter. In fact, all of Moulton's examples are found in the closing. Daube is suspicious of this; he makes the case that until clear examples are found in the body of a papyri text, the theory of an independent imperatival participle originating in Hellenistic Greek is merely conjecture. Rejecting Moulton's theory, he makes the case that this particular use of the participle is due to Semitic influence, in particular Tannaitic Hebrew where participles are used to stipulate that which is customarily accepted normative conduct, rules of the community. He gives the example of *Mekitha Exodus 21:2* which translates literally as *a Hebrew slave working only during the day*. Here the participle gives what is apparently a command, a common expression in Tannaitic writings. Nonetheless, Daube's argument with Moulton is over the evolution of the form, not its validity in New Testament Greek.

Zerwick (1963) follows the basic analysis of Daube in suggesting that the imperative participle is the result of language interference: it is likely due to the influence of the Semitic languages of either Hebrew or Aramaic.

Fanning (1990) argues that the second language interference from Hebrew led to the further development of the use of the independent participle for the imperative verb. In other words, the use of the imperatival participle was a rare Greek construction that already existed in Hellenistic Greek that the influence of Hebrew caused to be used more extensively. Thus, he takes a middle or combined view, suggesting that both Moulton and Daube's theories have validity.

Finally, there are those who accept the imperatival use of the participle as a feature of New Testament Greek, but they do not indicate a theory of origin. For example, Wallace (1996), in his intermediate grammar, lists the imperatival participle as one example of the use of the independent participle. He advises caution in identifying any participle as imperatival; he observes that nearly all examples of this use are found either in Romans 12 or in 1 Peter.

1.5.2.2 Commentators on 1 Peter

The works of the commentators generally reflects the argument that takes place in the grammars. First, there are those who do not believe that the participle can be used independently as an imperative. In his commentary on 1 Peter, Bigg (1909) links the so-called imperatival participles back to an imperative verb. He suggests that this is the case for those participles that are considered to be the classical examples of independent usage: 1 Peter 2:18; 3:1, 7, 8-9. He believes that the imperatival mood comes from one of the preceding imperatives in 2:17. Hart (1910) offers a similar analysis, stating that, for example, the apparent imperatival participle in 2:18 resumes the imperative force of either *submit* in 2:13 or *honor* in 2:17.

Among the more recent commentators, Michaels (1988) understands the imperative mood to be the result of its connection to an imperative verb. For example, he (135) states that the participial command to submit in 2:18 depends upon the imperative *submit* in 2:13. Davids (1990), though he makes no explicit comment in his text, translates 2:18 thusly: *Household slaves should do this (submit) to their own master*. Apparently, he understands the participle as dependent on the imperative *submit* in 2:13, just as Michaels does.

Next, Selwyn (1947), in whose commentary Daube's article is published, follows Daube in seeing the imperatival participle as a proven category, and in understanding it as developing under the influence of the Hebrew imperatival participle. Kelly (1969), also apparently following the analysis of Daube, understands such uses of the participle to reflect the use of the participle as an imperative in Hebrew.

Ellicott (2000) recognizes that these participles have a connection to a previous imperative. For example, he comments that the participle in 2:18, *submitting*, continues the idea of *submit* found in 2:13, but he does not see how the participle (and those that follow in 3:1, 7, 9) grammatically connects to the previous imperative. Therefore, he treats such participles as independent imperatival participles.

Schreiner (2003) thinks that those who see these participles as dependent or instrumental must take them back to all four imperative verbs in 2:17 (he oversimplifies their analysis here), a position he finds difficult to accept. He questions how the imperative command to love the brothers fits with the following command for slaves to submit to their masters. Thus, since he cannot see a connection to the

imperative verbs in 2:17, he suggests that the so-called imperatival participles are just that, participles used independently of any finite imperative verb.

Achtemeier (1996) interprets the use of the participles differently from the either those who see the imperative use of the participle as dependent on a head or those who see it as used independently as an imperative. He argues that the imperatival participle is adverbial, giving the means by which the previous imperative is carried out. Denying that such participles carry any imperative force in the Greek; he suggests that the problem, apparently, is one of translation into English.

Finally, several commentators do not comment on the problem. Although they do translate these participles as imperatives in English (see for example, Reicke 1964; Marshall 1991; Boring 1999), this is most likely because these participles (whether taken as independent or dependent) translate into English most easily as imperatives.

1.5.2.3 Other Scholarly Analyses of 1 Peter

In his grammatical analysis of 1 Peter, Hamblin (1959) rejects Bigg's idea that imperatival participles are, in actuality, dependent upon a previous imperative. Instead, he analyzes such participles (102) as periphrastic constructions in which the imperative *be* verb is elided. Thus, in his analysis these participles are independent.

Fink (1967), in his dissertation on Peter's style, agrees with Daube's criticism of Moulton's theory of the independent imperatival participle based upon the papyri. He is equally critical of Daube's theory of Hebrew origin, commenting that Tannaitic Hebrew's use of the participle appears nowhere in the biblical literature, that much of the written material to which Daube refers may be dated after the New Testament

epistles, and that the suggested codes that supposedly underlie such participles cannot in reality be found. In short, he rejects both theories, and instead suggests that the participles under consideration in 1 Peter are used to spell out the details of a preceding imperative.

Nichols (1984) in his discourse analysis of 1 Peter argues that the imperatival participles of 2:18, 3:1, 7, 8-9 have no grammatical relation to the preceding imperatives in 2:13-17; on the other hand, he still contends that they are in some way related (he does not specify how) to the imperative *submit* in 2:13. He thinks that it is this imperative that gives 2:11-3:12 thematic unity.

Martin (1992), in his metaphorical analysis of 1 Peter, rejects the idea of the independent imperatival participle. For example, he takes all of the commanding participles in 2:18-3:9 back to *honor* in 2:17.

Finally, Campbell (1995), in his classical-rhetorical analysis of Peter's letter, sees the commanding participles of 2:18-3:9 as dependent, but he says that they are dependent on all of the imperatives found in 2:11-17.

1.5.2.4 Summary of the Survey

Greek New Testament scholarship is divided as to whether or not a truly independent participle can be used as a substitute for an imperative verb. Some take the occurrences of so-called imperatival participles as a result of syntactic confusion (the writer made a mistake), or else they posit an elided imperative copula that provides the mood for the participle. Others believe that this type of participle is a true development of Hellenistic Greek, and others posit underlying language

interference from Tannaitic Hebrew (or perhaps Aramaic). Yet, both of these theories are arguments over the genesis of this use of the participle; neither questions the validity of the basic analysis as to the existence of an imperatival participle. Others, however, do question the idea that a participle can take on the imperative mood without in some way being linked to a finite imperative verb.

Table 1 below summarizes the positions of the various authors surveyed. The table shows that the majority of grammarians, following Moulton's lead, posit the existence of the independent imperatival participle, but the commentators and other scholars are about evenly divided as to whether or not the imperatival participle exists.

Table 1 Views of the Imperatival Participle

	Grammarians	Commentators	Others
Independent imperatival participle exists	Moulton Robertson Daube Blass et al. Turner Zerwick Fanning Porter	Selwyn Kelley Ellicott Schreiner	Hamblin Nichols
Participle taken as dependent on head verb	Butmann Winer Boyer	Bigg Hart Michaels Davids Achte-meier*	Fink Martin Campbell

It should be noted that Achtemeier holds an unusual position in his interpretation of the participle. He agrees with the scholars who see the participle as dependent on a

finite verb, but he differs from them in that he sees the focus of such participles as adverbial and essentially denies that they carry imperative force at all.

This dissertation demonstrates that the older grammarians are correct in their evaluation of the use of the participle as an imperative; the so-called imperatival participle does have finite imperative as its head. Their intuitions were accurate although they lacked the linguistic tools to support their analysis. The present study provides the textual linguistic tools that supports their understanding of how the participle functions.

1.5.3 Linguistic Theory

The problems of the overall structure of 1 Peter and of the imperatival participle are related. Both concern questions that require a thorough examination of the structure of the text in order to suggest an answer. Several scholars present models for analyzing texts; while theorists may consider elements that are unique to their studies, there is also a core that is the virtually the same for all. In fact, there appears to be considerable cross-fertilization in the field. The following gives some of the more relevant literature for the theory and method used in this study of 1 Peter. Also included is a brief survey of some who have applied some of the principles of text analysis to specific New Testament hortatory texts.

1.5.3.1 Theoretical Basis

The basic linguistic theory that informs this study is that of Robert Longacre (1983/1987). He presents a scheme of formal semantics whereby the relations between sentences and groups of sentences may be classified. Included in his theory

of intersentential relations is a theory of relative dominance so that within a local span of text, certain sentences or paragraphs are seen to be in a head-daughter or dominant-ancillary relation. This allows the analyst to distinguish the more salient portion in the text from those that are less salient. Central to this concept is the idea that texts have a mainline and offline. In other words, in a text, certain clauses or sentences move the text forward and the rest is merely an elaboration of an online element in this flow of the text. For hortatory documents, the imperative signals mainline.

Others have suggested similar methods for analyzing texts. Beekman and Callow (1974), though some of their terminology is different, offer a very similar system of semantic relations for describing and displaying the semantic structure of a text. In their approach, the semantic hierarchy is correlated to the grammatical hierarchy (concept to word, proposition to clause, and configuration to paragraph) and skewing between the two is discussed. Later, the text of Beekman, Callow, and Kopesec (1981) offers what is essentially the same system of semantic relations.

Next, Cotterell and Turner (1989) present a system of analysis that follows that of Beekman, Callow, and Kopesec above. They reject the traditional system of diagramming sentences because it fails to adequately show the semantic relations between the parts and the semantic hierarchy in the text. They discuss meaning relations between sentences and propose a scheme for analyzing the structure of New Testament texts, providing example analyses from selected portions of Hebrews and of Ephesians.

Finally, Kathleen Callow (1998) and Mildred Larson (1998) both outline a system that is very similar to that of Beekman and Callow. In fact, all of the above linguists are using essentially the same method of analysis even though their labels may differ at times.

Two scholars who ostensibly suggest a different method of analysis are Mann and Thompson (1988). They offer rhetorical structure theory as a method for discovering and displaying the structure of a text. Like others working in text analysis, they discuss the nuclear/satellite structural patterns and the function of hierarchy in a text. Though some of their terminology and their method of displaying the structure of texts differ from the others, it is still essentially the same idea for looking at text organization.

The analysis of the imperatival participle proposed here relies on the structural analysis above derived by the application of the above theory. This analysis identifies just how the participle functions semantically within the text. Explanations for why 1 Peter uses participles where one might expect the finite imperative verb can be found in politeness theory and macrostructure theory. Brown and Levinson (1978/1987) present an elaborate theory of command mitigation in social interactions. In addition, Ricketts (1999), basing his work on Brown and Levinson, discusses how more demanding commands in ancient Greek texts often required that the author mitigate them in some way. Miller (1992) in his discussion of how the participle is used as a command form in Romans 12 conjectures that some sort of mitigation must be involved. Finally, the macrostructure theory of van Dijk (1977, 1980) offers a basis

for grounding semantic structure in cognitive theory. He suggests that good texts are semantically organized so that the short-term memory is not overloaded. In other words, the layered structuring of a text is more than a stylistic feature of that text. It enables coherent text production on the part of the text producer and meaningful processing of the same text by the reader.

1.5.3.2 Theory Applied

Different scholars have applied some of the above methods of textual analysis to different New Testament epistles. Friberg (1978) uses the theory of Beekman and Callow to analyze the discourse structure of Galatians. He analyzes how concepts, propositions, and paragraphs are constructed and connected in that book. He also examines how boundaries are determined in the text and, in addition, provides a thematic outline and a propositional display of the book. He concludes that inter-paragraph relations are almost always semantically determined and that rigorous lower-level analysis leads to accurate inter-paragraph analysis.

Nichols (1984) in his analysis of 1 Peter again follows the principles of Beekman and Callow to examine the structure of the text at the paragraph level and above. He only looks at the semantic relations among the larger units of the text, basing his study on the orthographic paragraphs of the Greek text. He concludes that the structural analysis of the larger units of his text is a helpful tool for interpreting some of the details of the letter and for translation. A problem, that he acknowledges, is that he rarely considers how sentences combine to form paragraphs. Neither does he

seriously consider the importance of embedding and salience for determining structure. All of this renders his higher level analysis less certain.

In his discussion of exhortation and mitigation in 1 John, Longacre (1983) lays out the paragraph structure in relation to notional and surface structures. He notes a fundamental schema that has relevance for the study of 1 Peter: he observes that the basic schema of hortatory discourse (problem, command, and motivation) is repetitive and recursive, running throughout the text.

Terry (1993/1995) applies the theory of Longacre in his analysis of 1 Corinthians. Among his several analyses, he analyzes and provides displays of the semantic structure of certain portions of the text, observing how paragraphs are structured and how boundaries are signaled. He analyzes salience in the text, and he also discusses macrostructures and provides a display of the macrostructure of the ten discourses in the text. He also analyzes how sections of argument of his text build to a climax, much as a good story does. The surface structure features that indicate such climaxes, referred to as *peak* by Longacre (1996), may include any number of grammatical and lexical changes from the rest of the text in order to indicate the stress or tension in that portion of the text.

The theory of Longacre and of Terry, who follows Longacre, is essentially the theory that form the basis of this study. The schema he proposes for the study of hortatory texts is followed in this study, and his system of notional relations is used in the analysis of 1 Peter. The idea of salience is useful in determining that which is

locally dominate in the text, and the concept of macrostructures proves helpful in determining the function of the participle.

1.6 Contribution of the Study

The present research addresses two historical problems for New Testament Greek scholarship that are at least a century old. First, as the literature review reveals, the structure of 1 Peter has been seen as problematic for quite some time, and modern scholarly analyses have not produced any sort of consensus on the text's structure. Different methodologies have been applied to the structural analysis of the text: thematic analysis, rhetorical analysis (ancient and Toulmin), metaphorical analysis, grammatical diagramming, and so on. More recently, commentators on 1 Peter have become more sensitive to the semantic structuring of the text, but no one has attempted a detailed discourse analysis in an attempt to lay out the text's structure in its entirety.

Second, of a broader relevance to the study of Greek New Testament is the focus on the imperatival participle. Numerous arguments denying and supporting its existence have been offered. The present research proposes to suggest a discourse solution to answer the question of the imperatival participle's existence. In brief, it can be shown to not exist in 1 Peter. In addition, this research offers an explanation for how the participle functions within the text and why the author would resort to its use. The author uses the participle to mitigate commands and to organize the text into a hierarchy of propositions that makes text processing easier for the reader.

Third, the analysis of the participle has broader linguistic implications. The analysis of the participle also demonstrates that the boundary between syntax and discourse grammar cannot be clearly demarcated. Broader discourse concerns intrude into what scholars have more traditionally referred to as syntax. Gross structuring of the text to enable communication can affect the lexical and syntactic choice of a word at the sentence level, such as the choice of a participle where a finite imperative verb might be normally expected.

CHAPTER 2

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF 1 PETER

2.1 Introduction

A hortatory text such as 1 Peter has a four-part schema (Longacre 1992: 110):

- (1) the establishment of the writer's authority,
- (2) the submission of a problem,
- (3) the impartation of commands, and
- (4) the presentation of motivation.

Peter spends little time establishing his authority in this letter: he identifies himself as an apostle in the letter's opening (1:1), and reveals that he was a witness of Christ's passion in 5:1. References to the problem of the readers suffering for their faith are interspersed throughout the letter, and motivational and commanding materials are usually intertwined. Except for the introductory positive evaluative statement of the readers' condition, all the motivation is embedded within online hortatory statements.

This schema is helpful for understanding the text of 1 Peter, but by itself it will not lead to a better understanding of the structure of this letter. The following discourse analysis seeks to present a rigorous examination of the text by laying out the semantic structure of the text at the sentence level and above, following primarily Longacre's model (1983/1996) of semantic relations.

The analysis presented below divides the body of the text into three major divisions: the body introduction, 1:3-2:10; the body middle, 2:11-4:11; and the body conclusion 4:12-5:11. Peter uses the vocative adjective *beloved* (ἀγαπητοί) to directly address his readers at the start of the last two divisions. Vocatives are often used to signal a transition (Campbell 1995: 99; Longacre 1983: 7, 30). The use of the vocative *beloved* followed by a command: *I-exhort you . . . to abstain* (παρακαλῶ . . . ἀπέχεσθαι), a performative plus the infinitive in 2:11; and *don't you-be-surprised* (μὴ ξενίζεσθε), an imperative, in 4:12 indicates a transition to another division of the letter (Michaels 1988: xxxvii, 115, 257). This coupling of the vocative with a command is a common stylistic device in New Testament letters for indicating a new start in the argument (Michaels 1988: 115; see Rom. 12:1; 1 Cor. 1:10; 2 Pet. 3:8, 14, 17). Further indications that the vocative *beloved* indicates a new start are that in 2:11 it appears after a lengthy Old Testament quote which appears to close out 1:13-2:10 in a climactic fashion (Dalton 1965: 76), and that in 4:12 it immediately follows a doxology (Schreiner 2003: 216).

The first division (1:3-2:10) consists of two major sections: an opening motivational section (1:3-12) and a hortatory section (1:13-2:10). The opening motivational section encourages the readers to be thankful to God for the salvation he has provided to them. The hortatory section then gives four basic commands: (1) to hope on the gift they will receive at Christ's appearance, (2) to be holy, (3) to love one another, and (4) to earnestly desire God's word or message to them. Some analyze the closing motivational paragraph of 2:6-10 as a section or they take all of

2:1-10 as a different section because of the motivational material in 2:4-10 (Michaels 1988: xxxviii). However, as this analysis will demonstrate later, the concluding motivational paragraph of 2:4-10 is embedded in a hortatory paragraph, 2:1-10, unlike that of 1:3-12. This paragraph confirms that God has chosen the readers to be his special people.

The second division (2:11-4:11) is the body middle. It is the most extensive and complicated division of the text. It is divided into two sections: 2:11-3:12, and 3:13-4:11. The first section applies the basic command to DO GOOD to the response to and the use of authority. All are to submit to governing officials. Slaves and wives are to submit to different to those over them, their masters and husbands respectively. Husbands are to honor their wives, and finally everyone again are to have a compassionate attitude toward one another, they are to bless those who insult them. The second section continues the idea of DOING GOOD. The readers are commanded to commit themselves to Christ, to take on Christ's attitude toward suffering, and to commit themselves to pray, love, and serve one another.

The third division, the body conclusion (4:12-5:11) contains three sections: 4:12-19, 5:1-5, and 5:6-11. Here, Peter acknowledges that suffering as a Christian is normal and to be expected. The readers are commanded to entrust themselves to God in DOING GOOD even in suffering. Next, the elders and young men are told to use and respond to authority in an appropriate manner. Elders must be exemplify considerate care, and the young men ought to submit. Finally, the readers are exhorted to humble themselves before God. They are to resist their supernatural enemy, the devil.

The introductory greeting (1:1-2) and closing greeting (5:12-14), though they fit within the formulaic structure of ancient Greek letters of the day, have an unusual thematic coherence with the body proper. They are not on the main line of the text, but the author uses the greeting to foreshadow themes he wishes to discuss in the body of the letter, and he uses the close to sum up the importance of what he has written to them. For completeness they are included in the analysis.

2.2. Formulaic Introductory Greeting: 1:1-2

The introductory greeting is a single sentence that makes up verses one and two (vv. 1-2; see table 2 below for the Greek text with its translation; the text appears throughout this work at the end of an analysis of a portion of text; see the Appendix for the whole semantic tree of the letter). The introductory formula is one commonly found in ancient Greek letters and is a typical formula for Christian letters of the early church: A to B plus greetings (Ellicott 2000: 307; Davids 1990: 45). Thus, the greeting consists of three moves.

First, in v. 1a the author identifies himself as Peter the apostle, thus establishing his authority to make the exhortations that are to follow in this hortatory text. His only other reference to his authoritative position occurs in 5:1 where he identifies himself as a witness of Christ's sufferings. As an apostle Peter held a position of authority that was recognized by the church, a position limited to only a few (see John 21:15-19; Gal. 1:18). Even scholars who see this text as a pseudonymous letter recognize that the identification of the author as Peter is for the purpose of establishing authority (e.g. Ellicott 2000: 124-126).

Second, the recipients are identified and their spiritual or religious situation is described. First, the intended readers are identified as residing in Roman provinces that were located in Asia Minor north of the Taurus Mountains (Ellicott 2000: 316). Next, and more thematically important, comes the description of the recipients' religious standing, a description that is lexically dense. The author uses the description in vv. 1b-2a not only as an address of introduction, but also to foreshadow themes that will be important in the immediately following text and also throughout the entirety of the letter (Ellicott 2000: 321-322). Many of the terms are important in the supportive or motivational and/or in the hortatory portions of the text. For example, v. 1 identifies the readers as a people chosen by God, the *elect* (ἐκλεκτοῖς). The terms resurface in a key motivational paragraph: Jesus and believers are called *elect* in 2:4-10. In addition, a related word *call* (καλέω) appears several times in the text (1:15; 2:9, 21; 3:9; 5:10), reinforcing the idea that the readers are especially chosen by God. Next, the idea that the readers do not entirely fit within their own culture as indicated in v. 1 by the word *aliens* (παρεπιδήμιος) forms the background or context for the commands in 2:11 and following. Furthermore, the word *obedience* (ὀπακοήν) in v. 2 appears again in the hortatory paragraphs of 1:14 and 1:22 as well in a supportive statement (3:6). The related term *submit* (ὑποτάσσω) also appears in hortatory material (see 2:13, 18; 3:1; 5:5) as well as in supportive paragraphs (see 3:4, 22). Finally, the phrase *sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ* (ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) in 1:2 foreshadows an ongoing concern with Christ's suffering and death (see 1:11, 19; 2:21-24; 3:18; 4:1, 13; 5:1). The example of Christ in his

suffering forms the basis for Christian conduct and is especially pertinent to the issue of unjust suffering that the readers faced (see 4:1).

Third, in v. 2b the more formulaic salutation occurs: *may grace and peace be multiplied to you*. The blessing of grace and peace is a common salutation in New Testament letters (see Rom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:3; 2 Cor. 1:2; Gal. 1:3; Phil. 1:1; Col. 1:2; 1 Thess. 1:1; and 2 Thess. 1:2; Tit. 1:4; Phil. 3; 2 Pet. 1:2). Yet, even here Peter foreshadows an important theme by the use of the word *grace* (χάρις). The word appears nine more times in the letter (1:10, 13; 2:19, 20; 3:7; 4:10; 5:5, 10, 12). Thus, even in a greeting that is supposedly fairly formulaic, Peter manages to introduce important themes that he will discuss in the letter.

Table 2 Display of 1:1-2

1: 1-2 Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας, κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.

Peter an apostle of Jesus Christ to the chosen sojourners of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father by the sanctification of the Spirit, to obedience and sprinkling of blood of Jesus Christ, grace to and may peace be multiplied.

2.3 Body-Introduction: 1:3-2:10

Many understand the prologue, 1:3-12, to be a separate division of the text, introducing the whole text (Achte-meier 1996: 73, 90). Such an analysis of the prologue's relationship to remaining portions of the text is formally correct. Ancient letters of the time customarily open their letters with a blessing (Davids 1990: 51). While an understanding of the formal customs for letter writing is helpful in

analyzing the text, the present analysis is focused on the semantic relations in the text. The prologue may introduce the entire text, but semantically it is most closely related to the following section that starts with 1:13. The praise of God for his blessings in 1:3-12 leads to the commands that follow in paragraphs that make up 1:13-2:10. This is evidenced by the fact that the first command to hope on God in 1:13 opens with the inferential conjunction *wherefore* (διὸ) Thus, the introductory division of the letter is analyzed as consisting of two sections: first a persuasive or motivational prologue (1:3-12), that leads into a second hortatory section (1:13-2:10).

2.3.1 Prologue: 1:3-12

Many commentators on the prologue state that 1:3-12 forms a single sentence made up of three parts (Achtemeier 90; Ellicott 2000: 329). Part one consists of vv. 3-5, and the next two major parts, vv. 6-9 and vv. 10-12, are introduced by a preposition plus a relative pronoun, *in which* (ἐν ᾧ) in v. 6 and *concerning which* (περὶ ἧς) in v. 10. However, the Greek text of the United Bible Societies (Aland et al. 1993) analyzes this section as consisting of five sentences: vv. 3-5, vv. 6-7, v. 8, vv. 10-11, and v. 12. Agreeing with the analysis of the United Bible Society, A. B. du Toit (1974: 64) gives a semantic argument for seeing the use of the relative pronoun as signaling another sentence (or colon as he terms it). He argues that the relative pronoun, especially the preposition plus a relative, carries sufficient semantic weight to be considered a separate unit, and thus, the relative sentences in this section should be considered as separate sentences. He further argues that the relatives could be replaced by the third person personal pronoun without changing the meaning. For

example, *in which* (ἐν ᾧ) could be substituted for *in this* (ἐν αὐτῷ) in v. 6: *in this* (namely, the provision of salvation described in vv. 3-5) *you rejoice although for a little while being grieved by various trials is necessary*. His semantic argument explains why the Greek text is punctuated as it is, and this analysis follows his suggestions by analyzing the section as five sentences. This prologue forms the rhetorical basis for the argument that is to follow; as such, its basic moves need to be analyzed for the purpose of determining the nuclear component. The salience of the different parts in this motivational section needs to be distinguished in order to help determine the relationship of the prologue to the argument that follows.

The text-type of the introductory paragraph, vv. 3-12, is persuasive. It provides motivation for the argument that follows. Just as vv. 1-2 form a formulaic introduction, so this section forms a formulaic prologue whose purpose is to prepare the readers for what is to follow by introducing topics that are to be discussed and by gaining the goodwill of the readers (Campbell 1995: 33). According to Martin (1992: 47-49), the thanksgiving formula is a Christian version of the health-giving formula common to ancient letters during the time of 1 Peter's composition (see 2 Cor. 1:3 and Eph. 1:3). More specifically, it is a Christian rendition of the Jewish version of the formula common to the time (Ellicott 2000: 230-231). According to Martin (1992: 51), the thanksgiving provided the context from which the author wanted his readers to read and evaluate his argument. In other words, the thanksgiving prepares the audience for the argument. Achtemeier (1996: 91 n. 13) recognizes the motivational nature of this passage and labels it a *prooemium*, which prepares the listeners to listen

to the plea that follows. Thus, the history of the letter-writing conventions of the time suggests that this paragraph should be classified as persuasive or motivational.

Yet, some still assert that the prologue contains hortatory material; if so, its semantic value is hortatory and not motivational. For example, A. B. du Toit (1974: 70-71) argues that the verb *you-love* (ἀγαπάτε) in v. 8 and the verb *you-rejoice* (ἀγαλλιᾶσθε) in v. 6 and v. 8 are imperatival (they are either indicative or imperative according to form; context determines which). He, consequently, makes v. 8 the nuclear portion of this section; as a result, he formulates (1974: 72) the theme of this section as “From God you have received a glorious expectation of things to come: rejoice in it in spite of affliction.”

Thus, one may also see an implied exhortation in v. 3 in the blessing of God. One may rightly see underlying hortatory implications in this passage. However, the formulaic expectation as stated above runs counter to overt commands. It will be shown in the following analysis that the text makes good sense and fits together as an indicative motivational statement. Peter writes about God’s wonderful provision and the believers’ response to that provision. In addition, he records how the Old Testament prophets and even angels have valued what has been provided for them. Peter is calling them to esteem what they have even more.

Depending on the view taken on the relationship of vv. 6-7 to vv. 3-5, this section’s structure may be taken differently (see table 3.2 below for a semantic outline of vv. 3-12). The difficulty is in determining the antecedent of *in which* (ἐν ᾧ) in v. 6. Three main views exist.

First, Troy Martin (1992: 59-64; cf. Michaels 1988: 27-28) argues that *in which* at the beginning of v. 6 is a reference to *the last time* (καιρῷ ἔσχατῷ) at the end of v. 5. He reads the passage as follows: (v. 5) *the ones by the power of God being guarded through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time*. (v. 6) *In which you rejoice*. This would fit the grammatical requirements of the case, and *in which* (masculine or neuter in form) would be taken as a masculine relative pronoun referring back to the masculine noun *time*. *In which* then is seen as a temporal connector with an English translation of something like *then*. Those who take this view also take the verb *you-rejoice* (ἀγαλλιᾶσθε) as a present tense verb used with a future meaning, an interpretation possible in the Greek New testament (see John 4:25; Rev. 22:20; Wallace 1996: 535-537; Fanning 1990: 221-226). According to this interpretation, the passage reads *Then (in that future time) you will rejoice*. Although possible a futuristic present is possible here, it is preferable to first seek an interpretative solution that will allow the present tense to be taken in its normal function (Achte-meier 1996: 100). Contextually, the passage makes better sense if *rejoice* refers to a present experience (Fink 1969: 149). The point is that the readers are currently rejoicing in spite of their trials, not that they will rejoice. Thus, the futuristic interpretation is problematic.

Second, Robertson (1933: 83; he does not think this view likely) says that *in which* may refer back to either or both of the masculine nouns *God* or *Jesus Christ* in v. 3: *blessed by the God and father of our lord Jesus Christ*. The problem with this view is that the intervening and lengthy relative clause, starting at v. 3b and

continuing through v. 5, makes it unlikely that *in which* refers back to *God* or *Jesus Christ*.

If either the first or second view is the correct reading, then vv. 6-7 are a comment on a lexical item, *the last time, God, or Jesus Christ*. This interpretation would make the entire section structure a cascading series of embedded comment paragraphs (A comment develops a lexical item of the previous sentence; see Longacre 1996: 115-116 for the structure of comment paragraphs). Furthermore, such an explanation would fit with the tendency within this section to prefer chain structures (note the three prepositional phrases signaled by *to*, εἰς, in vv. 3-5: *God rebirthed us to a living hope . . . to an inheritance . . . to a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time*).

Third, an alternate view preferred by many (Fink 1969: 150; Ellicott 2000: 338-339) is to see *which* as a neuter pronoun referring back to the sentence in vv. 3-5 in its entirety. This view of the structure requires that *in which* be taken as a causal conjunction denoting some sort of clausal relation between vv. 3-5 and vv. 6-7. Some suggested translations for *in which* are *wherefore* (Selwyn 1947: 126), *therefore* or *for that reason* (Achte-meier 1996: 100), and *consequently* (Ellicott 2000: 338). Thus, in this view, vv. 3-5 form the grounds for vv. 6-7, and such an analysis would fit the semantics of the two sentences. God's provision of hope, inheritance, and salvation are the basis of the rejoicing mentioned at the opening of v. 6. The relation between the two sentences may be taken as either that of reason or result. If vv. 3-5 and vv. 6-7 form a reason paragraph, then vv. 6-7 would be the thesis and dominate. If this is a

result relationship, the reverse is true: the grounds for rejoicing, vv. 3-5, would dominate. Michaels (1988: 26), for whom *in which* refers to *time* (the first view above), sees a digression starting at v. 6. If so, both the joy of salvation and the problem of suffering is backgrounded to the salvation provided by God. This interpretation would fit with this section, vv. 3-12, serving as the basis for the whole text: Christians are to act in response to God's wonderful provision of salvation. Furthermore, lexical evidence indicates that salvation is the dominant theme of this section: the word *salvation* (σωτηρίαν) appears at the end of vv. 3-5 and vv. 6-9 and then becomes the topic of all of vv. 10-12.

Thus, the analysis here is that the sentence of vv. 6-9 gives the result of vv. 3-5. The clause *in which you rejoice* at the beginning of v. 6 is the nuclear clause for this long sentence and indicates the result of God's provision of salvation. The rest of v. 6 gives the circumstance in which the readers rejoice: they rejoice even though they suffer. A postposed purpose clause in v. 7 gives the purpose for such suffering: suffering tests their faith so that it may found to be an honorable faith at the return of Christ.

The result statement of vv. 6-7 then forms the thesis of a comment paragraph. The relative pronoun *whom* (ὃν) at the beginning of v. 8 refers back to *Jesus Christ* in the purpose clause at the end of v. 7, thus initiating the comment on Christ. The comment itself, vv. 8-9, presents two antithetical clauses in which the concession margin is composed of participles: *whom (Jesus Christ) having not seen you love; whom not (now) seeing, but because trusting, you rejoice greatly*. Again, as in v. 7, a

postposed clause occurs at the end of v. 9: *having received the end of your faith the salvation of your souls*. In other words, the readers rejoice because they have salvation.

Next vv. 8-9 form the thesis of the next embedded paragraph. As before, the tail of the previous verse (v. 9) is commented upon the head of the next sentence (vv. 10-11): v. 10 opens with the prepositional phrase *concerning which salvation*. The rest of the sentence comments on the valuable nature of this salvation which the readers have been given: the prophets (of the Old Testament) sought to find out more about the gift of grace (salvation) that they prophesied about (v. 10); more specifically, the prophets wanted to know the time of Christ's sufferings and his glorification (v. 11).

Vv. 10-11 form the thesis of the last embedded paragraph in this section. The masculine plural relative pronoun *to-whom* (οἷς) refers back to *prophets* in v. 10 (the only plural masculine noun in the sentence) and begins the last comment in this series of comment paragraphs, v. 12. The readers are told that it was revealed to the prophets that they ministered not for themselves, but on behalf of the readers; they ministered the very things that had been proclaimed as good news to the readers by preachers who had been empowered by the Spirit who was sent from heaven. A final clause in the sentence tops off the valuable nature of these believers' salvation: even the angels want to know about it. If the Old Testament prophets and even angels have shown such an interest in the issues concerning the salvation of these believers, surely it is very precious indeed.

In summary, in this section (vv. 3-12) vv. 3-5 form a blessing; God is blessed for granting them a religious conversion experience (they were *reborn*, ἀναγεννήσας) that is described by three prepositional phrases: *you were reborn unto a hope, unto an inheritance, unto a salvation*. These three terms, *hope, inheritance, and salvation* are a basic description of one thing: the salvation of these believers. Vv. 3-5 can be summarized as *we bless God for the salvation he has given us*. The term *salvation* that occurs at the end of v. 5 is a key term that appears again at the end of v. 9 and at the start of v. 10. It is a major theme that runs throughout the prologue (vv. 3-12). V. 6 begins the result paragraph: these believers rejoice in their salvation, even though they suffer; and furthermore, suffering matures their faith (v. 7). Then begins a series of comments on Jesus Christ who is to appear again (vv. 8-9), on the salvation that is the result of their faith (vv. 10-11), and on Old Testament prophets who prophesied this salvation (v. 12).

The prologue gives the basis for the hortatory argument that is to follow. God has given these Christians a wonderful salvation that they rejoice in; moreover, the Old Testament prophets greatly valued this salvation, and even angels value it. The underlying hortatory import is that the readers should value their salvation in the same way. This message, most likely, was not new to the readers, but it served to reinforce the necessary positive attitude that is needed for them to be successful in facing persecution for their faith. Peter, in an aside (vv. 6-7; he delays an extensive consideration of suffering for one's faith; but see 4:12-19), acknowledges the problem they face, but he focuses on the valued salvation, what these believers have received.

Table 3 Display of 1:3-12

Reason: Result ¶

THESIS (Reason): 1:3-5 Εὐλογητὸς 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, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον, τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοιμὴν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to the riches of his mercy has regenerated us to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and unfading, that has been kept in the heavens for you, the ones who by the power of God are being guarded through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed at the last time.

Result: Comment ¶

THESIS (Result): 1:6-7 ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον [ἐστὶν] λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου, εὐρεθῆ εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ:

In which you exult, though for a little while now, if it is necessary that you be grieved by various trials, in order that the proving of you the faith, much more precious than gold which perishes; yet through fire being tested, it may be found to praise and glory and honor at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Comment: Comment ¶

THESIS (Comment): 1:8-9 ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὄρωντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως [ὑμῶν] σωτηρίαν υἱῶν.

Whom not having seen you love, in whom though now not seeing but believing, you rejoice with unspeakable and glorious joy, obtaining the end of the faith salvation of your souls.

Table 3—Continued

Comment: Comment ¶

THESIS (Comment): 1:10-11 Περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες, ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρούμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας.

Concerning which salvation the prophets who prophesied concerning you sought and searched concerning the grace coming to you, searching for what or what sort of time the spirit of Christ who was in them was making clear to them, testifying beforehand of the sufferings destined for Christ and after these glories.

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

To whom it was revealed that not to themselves but to you they were ministering these things which now were announced to you through the ones who have evangelized you by Spirit Holy sent forth from heaven, into which things angels long to look.

2.3.2 Introduction: 1:13-2:10

With v. 13 begins what some classify as the body proper of the letter or as the body introduction (Achtmeier 1996: 114). The conjunction *therefore* (διό) marks the transition, signaling that 1:13-2:10 gives the inference that is based on 1:3-12 (Van Rensburg 1990: 294). In addition, the aorist imperative verb *hope* (ἐλπίζατε) signals a transition from the indicative mood of vv. 3-12 to the imperative. The verb *hope* picks up a theme from 1:3 where the *living hope* is given as a reason for blessing. Now the author commands his readers to act on that hope (Achtmeier 1996: 117). The two participles *girding up* (ἀναζωσάμενοι) and *being sober*

(νήφοντες) lend grammatical and conceptual complexity to the command by giving two subordinate tasks that must be carried out if the main task is to be accomplished (Campbell 1995: 58-59). The participles, therefore, have imperative force from the finite imperative *hope*. Thus, the transitional conjunction, the shift to the imperative, and the subordinate commanding participles serve to signal a new section. The readers are commanded to hope on the grace that they will receive when Christ returns.

The semantic relation of v. 13 to the next sentence (vv. 14-16) and the following sentences is problematic. No connector (asyndeton) is given by the writer to signal the relationship. Ellicott (2000: 380) gives the two propositions equal weight, and he reflects this in the way he outlines the text where he makes hope and holiness coordinate propositions (82; Achtemeier 1996: 73, 118). He argues that the passage is both an inclusion and a chiasmic structure (355; in tagmemic terms, he is applying field analysis). He lays out the structure as follows:

- A. Hope (v. 13),
- B. Holiness (vv. 14-16),
- B'. Holiness (vv. 17-21b), and
- A'. Hope (v. 21c).

He sees the inclusion, *hope* in vv. 13 and 21c, as indicating a unit or paragraph. The chiasm then indicates two theses that are apparently, for Ellicott, of equal salience: hope and holiness.

Ellicott's analysis, however, has some problems. For one, chiasm and inclusion often mark prominence. Inclusion often marks the outer elements as most prominent, and chiastic formations usually mark the outer elements as most prominent when the number of elements are even and the inner elements as most prominent when they are odd in number (Beekman et al. 1981: 120; cf. Rom. 2:12-15; Heb. 7:27-28). Thus, the inclusion and chiasm in 1:13-21 would support the view that *hope* is dominate over *holiness*. Apparently contradicting this observed tendency, Bailey (1976: 50) says that inversions in the Old and New Testaments often serve to emphasize the center. Yet, all the biblical examples he cites (51-53; cf. Dan. 3:13-30; Lu. 18:18-30; Gal. 3:5-14) in support of his observation have an odd number of elements. Regardless, these observations as to the nature of chiastic structure suggest that Ellicott's analysis of the text as a chiastic structure is problematic since it makes the command to hope more salient than the command to be holy, a view that he does not subscribe to. In addition, the first three elements in 1:13-21 are represented by on-line imperative verbs: (1) *completely hope on the grace being brought to you* in v. 13, (2) *you-shall-be holy* in vv. 14-16, and (3) *conduct yourselves with reverence* in vv. 17-21a. This string of imperatives in these three sections suggest a continuance of the mainline argument. On the other hand, the second occurrence of *hope* in this passage is found in v. 21c, a deeply embedded purpose clause (*so that your faith and hope to be in God*). This clause is the last element in the lengthy sentence of vv. 17-21, and it occurs at the end of the postposed material that supports the nuclear command found in v. 17 (*with reverence conduct the time of your sojourn*). Specifically, the purpose clause (v. 21)

gives the purpose of v. 21b, the purpose of God raising Christ from the dead and glorifying him. Thus, since the second occurrence of *hope* is embedded within the paragraph of vv. 17-21 which has as its head the command *conduct yourselves in reverence*, it is not really parallel to the command *hope* v. 13. In summary, Ellicott's analysis of the patterning of key words in the surface structure fails to account for the embedded nature of the text. 1:13-21 appears to not be organized as a chiasm, and if it is, the chiasm most likely indicates a prominence for *hope* that would invalidate Ellicott's analysis. His analysis cannot be used to support the idea of the coordination of vv. 13 and vv. 14-16 (or that vv. 13-17 form a distinct unit). This does not disprove that the two command sections are not coordinate; it only means that the ideas of inclusion and chiasm do not apply here.

Van Resenburg (1990: 295) sees the relationship between v. 13 and vv. 14-16 as inference in a base-inference relationship (he does not use this terminology, but he does state that the relation is inferential): people who hope should be assumed to be holy. Such a classification of the relationship would suggest that vv. 14-16 are dominant to v. 13 (see Larson 1988: 336; Beekman and Callow 1974: 289-290 for a discussion of the grounds-conclusion relationship). Michaels (1988: 52) states that vv. 14-16 give the content of *hope*, which would indicate an orienter-CONTENT relationship (caps indicate prominence; he does not use this terminology; cf. Larson 1998: 321). In this case the content is more dominant. His outline (1988: xxxvii) shows vv. 14-16 as dominant.

In contrast to the above scholars, Prasad (2000: 87-90; see du Toit 1974: 60) claims that v. 13 forms an introduction to the body of the text. The asyndetic relationship between v. 13 and vv. 14-16 is seen as an indication of a new unit beginning with vv. 14-16; thus, v. 13 forms a heading for what follows. In other words, v. 13 belongs to the schema of a Greek letter and is not part of the paragraph structure. Prasad bases his argument on White's research on the ancient Greek letter, which segments the letter body into three parts: body-opening, body-middle, and body-close (1972: 2). According to White (1972: 53), the letter opening may provide the connection between the motivation and the following argument. Martin (1992: 70-71) analyzes the relation between these verses the same way, again following White's research. Martin sees v. 13 as the basic statement from which the rest of the text is developed; in other words, the rest of the text is an explication or amplification of the command *hope* here (see White 1972: 18-19).

Even though he analyzes v. 13 as part of the formulaic structure of the letter, Martin (1992: 74) does note White's warning that where the body-opening ends and where the body-middle begins is not always easy to determine. Transitions to the body-opening and to the body-closing are usually major transitions, but transitions to the body-middle may be indicated by either a major development such as a new subject, for example, or by a minor one such as the further development of the same subject (White 1972: 2 n. 6). In fact, identifying the body-opening in 1 Peter has proven to be difficult. Scholars' use of White's research, which focuses on papyri and Pauline letters, may account for some of the confusion here. 1 Peter does not seem to

follow the scheme that Paul used, and this fact may make the letter more difficult to analyze (Thurén 1990: 86). It is possible that no body-opening exists. If so, 1:13 functions as a transition from the motivational section of vv. 3-12 and serves to introduce the theme of the section 1:13-2:10: the readers should hope fully. Thurén (1990: 86 n. 40) comments: "In a sense this statement introduces the whole letter, but as such remains on a very theoretical level."

At least three other solutions have been suggested (see Thurén 1990, 85-86). (1) One common first century body-opening formula is an expression of joy. Rousseau (in Thurén 1990: 85, n. 38) suggests that 1:3-8 with its expressions of joy (v. 6 and v. 8) may be taken as the body opening. But this misses the point of vv. 3-12, which serves as motivation for all that follows. (2) Another body-opening formula is that of a request. Thurén (1990: 85 n. 39) discusses the possibility that 1:10-12 contains an implied request that the readers show the same interest in the message of salvation as the prophets and angels. He cites Hebrews 1:1-2 as a parallel passage: *After God had spoken to our forefathers through the prophets at many times and in various ways, he has in these last days spoken to us* Thurén rejects this view because the allusion to Hebrews is not clear enough, but there are more relevant textual reasons to reject such a view. Vv. 10-12 function as a comment on salvation; such a suggestion ignores the structure of vv. 8-12 which consists of a series of three embedded comment paragraphs. In addition, while the ultimate purpose of vv. 10-12 may be hortatory, the immediate purpose is persuasive. Neither the notional nor the surface structure of this sentence is truly hortatory, as would be expected of a body-opening. (3) All of 1:13-

2:10 has been suggested as the body-opening (Schutter in Thurén 1990: 85 n. 37). Achtemeier (1996: 73) labels 1:13-2:10 body opening; while he sees v. 13 as opening the hortatory body, he does not posit a schematic phrasal body-opening. Thurén rejects this view because it is too long according to the conventions of the ancient Greek letter. However, if 1 Peter does not consistently follow the letter schemata proposed by White, then 1:13-2:10 may be a body-opening.

In summary, the semantic relationship between the two sentences of v. 13 and vv. 14-16 are taken by most scholars in one of three ways: (1) as coordinate theses of equal salience, (2) as a ground-INFERENCE relation in which the inference of vv. 14-16 is more salient, or (3) as an introduction-THESIS relation where again vv. 14-16 are more salient. And each of these suggested semantic relations would fit within the range of the possible semantic relationships that asyndeton can be used to signal. By itself asyndeton marks nothing (Starwalt 1999: 145-147; Buth 1992: 154-146), but depending on the context, it can mark addition relations (coordinate theses; Healy 1979: 21; 23), it can mark inferential relations (Van Rensburg 1990: 295; Healy 1979: 24), and it can indicate the border between an introductory sentence and the nucleus of the larger unit (Healy 1979: 21).

To some degree, the different analyses are the result of different scholars making different plausibility judgments. Structural ambiguity exists due to the asyndeton between v. 13 and vv. 14-16. This ambiguity makes many different analyses plausible (see Mann, et al. 1992: 61-62 for causes of multiple analyses). The multiple analyses indicate that most likely v. 13 is an area of transition that serves more than one

function: v. 13 is a hinge sentence that marks the transition from the motivational *prooemium* to the body of the text, and in doing so, it also marks the transition to the next sentence as well as the next paragraph (see Terry 1995: 95-98 for a discussion of the way elements can blend and overlap, referred to as wave features, at paragraph transitions; Pike 1982: 26-29).

This ambiguity and the multiple analyses call into question as to just how the structure of the text here is to be understood. The simplest analysis is to take the command *hope* in v. 13 as the first of four coordinate propositions: (1) v. 13 commands the readers to *hope*, (2) vv. 14-16 along with vv. 17-21 may be taken together as paraphrase theses that indicate the same basic idea, the readers are to *be holy*, and (3) vv. 22-25 command these believers to *love*, and (4) finally, a fourth proposition (2:1-10) occurs as an implication of vv. 22-25: since the word or gospel is eternal, Peter commands his audience to desire it as an infant yearns for milk so that they may *grow up* in their salvation. The support for this is that all the propositions are imperatives, and this suggests that they are likely on the same band of salience. Also, there seems to be a pattern in the use of asyndeton in 1:13 – 2:10. Propositions are alternately linked by no connector and then with a connector as follows:

v. 13 *wherefore* ($\Delta\iota\omicron$) *hope*: a causal relation referring back to 1:3-12.

vv. 14-16 \emptyset *be holy*: a new command.

vv. 17-21 *And* ($\text{K}\alpha\iota$) *conduct yourselves in reverence*: a similar command.

vv. 22-25 \emptyset *love one another*: a new command

2:1-10 *Therefore* (οὖν) putting aside all evil . . . desire the word (spiritual milk):
a new command, an inference of vv. 22-25.

If the boundary-marking function of asyndeton observed here (Healy 1979: 20), then asyndeton may be seen as functioning to group portions of the text as equally salient additive propositions.

According to this analysis, vv. 14-16 and vv. 17-21 are taken as paraphrase: equivalent theses. The relation between vv. 14 and 15 (parts a and b of this sentence) form a negated antonym paraphrase. V. 14 commands the readers to not be conformed (a participle here) to their former desires, but rather they are to be holy. In the universe of 1 Peter's argument, the choice is binary: obey your former desires or be holy. V. 16 cites an Old Testament command found in Leviticus as evidence to support the command to be holy. V. 16 might be analyzed as a reason predicate or it could be analyzed as an attestation predicate that cites the evidence for the command; Longacre (1996: 112), however, doubts that this relation exists at the sentence level. The nuclear predicate is the command to be holy in v. 15.

Table 4 Display of 1:13-16

THESIS: Coordinate ¶

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

Therefore girding up the loins of your mind, being sober, hope on the grace
being brought to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

THESIS 2: Amplification paraphrase ¶: 1:14-21

Table 4—*Continued*

THESIS 1: 1:14-16 ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς μὴ συσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς
 πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα
 ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε, διότι
 γέγραπται [ὅτι] Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος [εἶμι].

As children of God do not fashion yourselves to the to the passions of your former ignorance, but as the one calling you is holy, also yourselves be holy in all conduct because it has been written that you shall be holy because I am holy.

Vv. 17-21 comprise a long sentence. Its nuclear predication found in v. 18 is the command to the readers to conduct themselves *in fear* or *with reverence* (ἐν φόβῳ) to God. Vv. 18-21 give a lengthy reason why they should do so: because they know the cost of their redemption, the death of Christ who has now been manifested and whom God raised and glorified so that they might believe and hope in God. Notable parallels exist between the two propositions found in vv. 14-16 and 17-21. V. 14 opens with the phrase *as children of obedience* and v. 17 opens with *and if the father you call upon*. In v. 15 they are commanded to be holy in all their *conduct* (ἀναστροφῇ) and in v. 17 the imperative verb is *conduct-yourself* (ἀναστράφητε). The two sentences say about the same thing: being holy and reverencing God are nearly synonymous. In addition, the conjunction *and* (καὶ) introduces v. 17 (v. 17 contains the nuclear clause; vv. 18-21 are supportive as noted) and shows the close relationship between the two sentences. In other words, *and* signals to the reader that the two propositions are closely connected and that they do not indicate any significant change (Buth 1992: 157). Thus, lexical and syntactic considerations suggest that the semantic relationship between the two is one of paraphrase (see

Longacre 1996: 113). The paraphrase could be viewed as equivalent paraphrase where each proposition is equal in salience since the difference between the commands to be holy and to reverence God is slight. On the other hand, the command to be holy could be seen as nuclear because the Old Testament command adds focus, and although the difference is slight, the command to reverence does add information to the command to be holy. Still again, the sentence of vv. 17-21 is marked by its sheer length (five verses long), and the fact that both it and the sentence of vv. 15-16 have on-line imperative verbs. However, it is clear that vv. 17-21 do provide further definition and detail as to what being holy means. Thus, the semantic relation between this sentence and the previous command to be holy in v. 16 is taken to be that of amplification paraphrase.

Table 5 Display of 1:17-21

Amplification: 1:17-21 Καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε, εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ, προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἶναι εἰς θεόν.

And if as father you call upon the one who impartially judges according to each one's work, conduct yourselves in fear in the time of your sojourn, knowing that not with perishable things as silver or gold you were redeemed from of your worthless conduct handed down from your fathers, but with precious blood as of a lamb unblemished and unspotted—the blood of Christ, having been foreknown before the foundation of the world yet being manifested in the last times because of you, the ones who through him trust in God, the one having raised him from the dead who has given glory to him, so that the your faith and hope be in God.

Next, vv. 22-25 form an attestation paragraph. V. 22 give a new command: love one another. Again the typical pattern occurs: introductory participial clause followed by an aorist imperative verb in vv. 22-23 (which constitute one sentence in the text). In this case the participle is a perfect participle and gives the basis for the command or the preliminary state: *Your souls having been purified* (ἡγνικότες) *by an obedience to the truth*. Since their souls have been purified by their obedience to the truth (of the Gospel) for the goal of unfeigned brotherly love (v. 22a), they are commanded *love* (ἀγαπήσατε) *one another constantly* (v. 22b; see Ellicott 2000: 386). Another causal perfect participle at the start of v. 23, *having-been-rebirthed* (ἀναγεγεννημένοι), adds another reason for constant love: the *word* (λόγος) that rebirthed or regenerated them is itself living and constant or abiding. This theme is supported in vv. 24-25 by a quote from Isaiah 40:6-8. This quote provides further evidence for the command to love.

The evidence (vv. 24-25) is made up of a contrast paragraph. The contrast paragraph is analyzed as having the contrast given first in v. 24: *because all flesh is as grass and the glory of it as grass. The grass dries up and the flower falls off*. Then the thesis as given second in v. 25: *But the word of the Lord abides forever. And this is the word having-been-announced-as-good-news to you*. V. 25a continues the theme of the abiding nature of the word of God that was found in v. 23; thus, the simile in v. 24 is supportive of the more locally thematic discussion of the word in v. 25.

The contrast statement of the contrast paragraph consists of a simile paragraph. The simile in v. 24a comes first: humans are like grass and the flowers of the grass.

Then in v. 24b the thesis, the point, of the simile is given: people die; they are not enduring. The thesis statement of the contrast paragraph is found in v. 25. Again as in the contrast statement of v. 24, this statement has another paragraph embedded within it, a deixis or identification paragraph. V. 25a gives the thesis stating that God's word is eternal. Then, in v. 25b that word is further identified so the readers cannot be mistaken as to the identity of the word: this word is the gospel that has been proclaimed to the readers.

Table 6 Display of 1:22-25

THESIS 3: Attestation ¶

THESIS: 1:22-23 Τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον, ἐκ [καθαρᾶς] καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος.

The souls of you having been purified by the obedience to the truth resulting in unfeigned brotherly love, from a pure heart earnestly love one another, because you have been regenerated not from perishable seed but imperishable through the living and abiding word of God.

Evidence: Contrast ¶

Contrast: Simile ¶

Simile: 1:24a διότι πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου:

Because all flesh is as grass and the glory of it as the flower of grass.

THESIS: 1:24b ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν:

The grass dries up and the flower falls off.

THESIS: Identification ¶

THESIS: 1:25a τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Table 6—*Continued*

But the word of the lord abides forever.

Identification: 25b τοῦτο δὲ ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

And this is the word having been proclaimed as good news to you.

The next section (2:1-3) opens with the conjunction *therefore* (οὖν). Many argue that the conjunction signals an inferential relationship between the forgoing material (1:22-25) and 2:1-3 (Ellicott 2000:395 and Achtemeier 1996: 144; for the use of this conjunction see Porter 1992: 214-215). Thus, the conjunction could be taken as causal, indicating that 1:22-25 (love because of the enduring word) give the reason for what follows (thesis: therefore, intensely desire the word). If so, 2:1-3 is more salient than 1:22-25. However, most who see an inferential relation here suggest that the relationship is one of result. Achtemeier (1996: 144) calls the sentence in 2:1-3 consecutive, meaning that it indicates result. The implication of his analysis is that 1:22-25 is more dominant than 2:1-3, a thesis-result relationship. However, those who see the relation as one of result are not consistent in their analyses. 2:1-3 is taken to be as salient or as more salient than 1:22-25 (see the outlines of Ellicott 2000, 82 and Achtemeier 1996: 73).

If not for the *therefore*, the relationship between the two predications could be taken as one of comment where 2:1-3 takes up the term *word* that is found in the supportive clause in v. 23: believers are to love one another because they have been regenerated by the enduring word. Vv. 24-25 then comment in a supportive fashion as

to the enduring nature of the word. Yet, as before, such an analysis would yield two predications of unequal salience: again 2:1-3 would be the less salient command.

Such interpretations do not fit with the fact that the sentence comprising 2:1-3 is strikingly similar in structure to the other online commands in 1:13-2:15 (see 1:13, 1:14-16, and 1:22-23). The subordinate clause in 2:1 gives a command in participial form (*putting off all evil . . .*) that supports the nuclear command in 2:2 (*intensely desire the word*). The two commands most naturally should be taken as equal in salience and as moving the argument along.

The key to understanding the semantic force that *therefore* indicates is found in the structure of the previous paragraph. The causal participle *having-been-regenerated* or *reborn* (ἀναγεγεννημένοι) in 1:23 gives the reason for the command to love in v. 22, and the following vv. 23-25 give additional support as an attestation paragraph (see the analysis on these verses above). The supportive attestation paragraph does not move the argument of this hortatory section forward. The supportive material ends with the Old Testament citation and its explanation. Then *therefore* signals the return to mainline argument. This interpretation fits with one of the major uses of οὖν, the resumptive. Levinsohn (2000: 127) states that in such cases, supportive material occurs as an interruption to the topic. *Therefore* indicates the return to topic. In addition, Levinsohn (citing Heckert 1996: 118) also comments that in such cases the οὖν also indicates an inferential relationship, that of a conclusion that may be drawn from the supportive material. Buth's analysis (1992: 147) is similar: "Οὖν is resumptive after background material, but only when

thematic development and a close connection is implied.” The underlying inferential meaning helps to establish the close connection. All of this suggests that *therefore* in this context signals a complex semantic relationship, which would explain the different and at times inconsistent interpretations.

Thus, 2:1-3 gives a coordinate imperative thesis: the readers must desire the word. There is an underlying inference based on the supportive material in 1:23-25: the permanency of the word should make the believers want it even more, but the primary semantic import of the main clause gives another equally salient command in addition to the previous three.

Table 7 Display of 2:1-3

THESIS 4: Comment ¶

THESIS: 2:1-3 Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑποκρίσεις καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλιὰς, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ ἀύξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν, εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος.

Putting away therefore all malice and all guile and all hypocrisies and envies and all evil speakings, as newborn babes desire the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow into salvation, since you tasted that good the Lord.

Some find the relationship of vv. 1-3 and vv. 4-10 perplexing. A common theme is sought to tie the metaphor of 2:1-3, the command to desire the word like babies desire milk, to the metaphor of Christ as the foundation stone and Christians as building blocks (stones) in vv. 4-8. Many suggestions seek for the source of the metaphors in hopes that knowing the source will establish a connection: the language reflects the elements (milk and stone) of some mystery religion, it mirrors the

language of a Qumran document, or it comes from some Old Testament quote (see Achtemeier 1996: 153). But none of these attempted solutions seek for a functional connection. Martin (1992: 177-178) suggests a thematic solution: growth is the common theme that connects the stone metaphors (and the other metaphors in vv. 4-10) to the metaphor of babies desiring milk. And Martin is right: growth in v. 3 and being built up into a house in v. 5 both share the idea of growth. Nevertheless, the problem of Martin's solution is that it does not recognize the different discourse function of each paragraph. The sentence of vv. 1-3 is hortatory, and the following sentences are supportive and motivational. The author is doing much more than developing a common theme about growth. In fact, the themes of vv. 1-3 and vv. 4-10 are different. Growth is not the point of the baby metaphor itself (the idea of growth is contained in the subordinate *that* (*iva*) clause that indicates the purpose of earnestly desiring the word). The point is that as babies constantly desire milk, so Christians should desire the word. In contrast, vv. 4-10 focus primarily on the unique and honored status of believers that is derived from the unique status of Christ. The problem of all of these solutions is that they fail to look at the discourse structure of the text.

Ellicott (2000: 407-408) is more sensitive to the overall discourse structure. He sees 2:4-10 as forming a (doctrinal or motivational) climax or peak. He observes that 1:3-12 and 2:4-10 form a kind of doctrinal inclusion around the middle hortatory portion of 1:13-2:3. 1:3 began with God's mercy and 2:10 ends with God's mercy. There is a convergence of key lexical terms (a sort of lexical crowded stage; see

Longacre 1996: 40): *holy* (2:5, 9 (2x); cf. 1:15-16, 19, 22), *believe* (2:6, 7; see 1:7, 8, 9, 21; (*dis*)*obedience* (2:8; cf. 1:14, 22), *word* (2:8; cf. 1:23; 2:2), *election* (1:9 and its synonyms in vv. 9-10; cf. 1:15), and *mercy/grace* (2:10 (2x); 1:13). There is also the piling up of Old Testament citations and allusions: v. 4: *rejected stone* (Psalm 118:22); *to God honored* (Isaiah 28:16; v. 5); *holy priesthood* (Exodus 19:6, Isaiah 61:6); v. 6: *Behold I place in Zion a corner stone* (Isaiah 28:16); v. 7: *the stone the builders rejected, this has become the head stone* (Psalms 118:22); v. 8: *a stone of stumbling and a rock of scandal* (Isaiah 8:14); v. 9: *elect nation* (Isaiah 43:20; Deut.7:6; 10:5); *kingdom of priests* (Exodus 19:6, Isaiah 61:6); *holy people* (Exodus 19:6); *people for a possession* (Isaiah 43:21, Exodus 19:5, Deuteronomy 4:20, 7:6, 14:2); *to declare the virtues* (Isaiah 43:21); *called into his marvelous light* (Isaiah 9:2); and all of v. 10 (Hosea 2:23).

Within its own paragraph, 2:1-3 forms the thesis of a comment paragraph, vv. 1-10. V. 3 gives a reason why the readers should desire the word: since they have tasted *that the lord is good* (ὅτι χρηστός ὁ κύριος). *Good* (χρηστός) is a pun on *Christ*, (χριστός); the pun helps to make quite clear who is being referred to in the following comment in vv. 4-5. The relative pronoun *whom* (ὃν) in v. 4 refers back to *lord* and begins the comment on Christ. The comment with its embedded paragraphs, vv. 4-10, is the second major motivational paragraph in the text, the first being 1:3-12. This motivational paragraph is composed of several embedded paragraphs. First there is an attestation paragraph (vv. 4-6) that is, second, followed by an embedded result paragraph (vv. 6-8). Next the result paragraph has an embedded amplification

paragraph whose thesis consists of vv. 7-8. This thesis is, itself, a comment paragraph with the comment occurring in v. 8b. Finally, the amplification of the thesis (vv. 7-8) is found in vv. 9-10 which in turn consists of a summary paragraph whose thesis is v. 9 followed by the summary in v. 10.

Next focusing on the portion of the paragraph after 2:1-3, within its own paragraph the sentence of vv. 4-5 first forms the thesis of an attestation paragraph: since the readers have come to Christ who is rejected by men but precious to God, God is building them up into a spiritual house so that they might offer spiritual sacrifices (not clearly defined yet) to God. The status of Christ, of unbelievers, and of believers is taken up in the evidence that follows, beginning with v. 6. *Wherefore* (διότι) *it stands in scripture* signals the beginning of the evidence or basis of the previous statement in vv. 4-5 (Achteimer 1996: 159). The evidence cited in v. 6 is found in Isaiah 28:16: *Behold I-place is Zion a corner stone, chosen, precious* (ἐντιμον) *and the one believing* (ὁ πιστεύων), *in him shall not be ashamed* (καταισχυνθῆ).

The next sentence, v. 6, forms the thesis of a result paragraph. Vv. 7-8a give the implications of the statement in v. 6 (Schreiner 2003: 110). *Therefore* (οὖν) at the beginning of v. 7 indicates an inferential relationship (Bauer 1958: 593; Louw and Nida 1988: 783-784) and states the logical result of v. 6. The sentence opens by saying *to you then who believe* (πιστεύουσιν) *honor* (τιμῆ) *but to the unbelieving* (ἀπιστοῦσιν. . .) V. 7a thus picks up again the word *believing* from the final clause in v. 6, and the word *honor* states in a positive manner what *not be ashamed* means in

v. 6 (Achtemeier 1996: 160; Schreiner 2003: 110). The sentence is not only about those who believe; it also gives the contrasting condition of those who do not believe. Vv. 7b-8a cite Psalm 118:22 and Isaiah 8:14 in order to assert that those *who do not believe*, ἀπιστοῦσιν, have rejected the *corner stone* (Christ) and they have found him to be a *stone that causes them to stumble and a rock that causes them to fall*. In other words, they find Christ offensive (see Louw and Nida 1988: 308-309).

Table 8 Display of 2:4-8

Comment: Attestation ¶

THESIS: 2:4-5 πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι λίθον ζῶντα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδοκιμασμένον παρὰ δὲ θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνευρέγκαι πνευματικᾶς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους [τῷ] θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

To whom coming, a living stone, on the one hand rejected by men but on the other hand to God chosen, precious, also you yourselves as living stones are being built up a spiritual house for a holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.

Evidence: Result ¶

THESIS: 2:6 διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ, Ἴδου τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον κρογωνιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ.

Therefore it is contained in scripture, behold I place in Zion a cornerstone, chosen, precious, and those who believe on him will never be ashamed.

Result: Amplification ¶

THESIS: Comment ¶

THESIS: 2:7-8a ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, ἀπιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου:

Table 8—Continued

To you therefore the who believe honor, but to the unbelieving a stone which the builders rejected, this one became the head of the corner and a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence:

Comment: 8b οἱ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν.

Who stumble at the word, being disobedient, unto which also they were appointed.

The paragraph could perhaps be analyzed differently (than as is suggested above) as a comment (Achte-meier 1996: 160) or as a paraphrase paragraph. As noted above, vv. 7-8a do pick up on different lexical items from the end of v. 6: *believing* occurs in both sentences and *not ashamed* in v. 6 is paraphrased by *honor* in v. 7; this might suggest that a comment or amplification of v. 6 is ensuing. Yet, to do so requires *therefore* be understood as a resumptive conjunction where the conjunction introduces the return to a previous topic after an intervening comment (see Heckert 1996: 98-100). Appearing to make such an analysis, Michaels (1988: 104) argues that the prepositional phrase *upon him* in the clause *and the ones-believing upon him shall not be ashamed* (at the end of v. 6) constitutes a move off the topic of those who believe, to the topic of the one they believe in. He, then, suggests that the appearance of *therefore* in conjunction with *believing* in v. 7 signals a return to the topic of the believers themselves. However, the prepositional phrase *in him* hardly constitutes a deviation from the topic. The phrase most likely does not appear in v. 7 because it is not needed, being understood. Those who believe in Christ are still the topic. Thus,

therefore is better taken to indicate an implication or result whose head is the final clause in v. 6.

Third, embedded within the result slot is a comment paragraph. Vv. 7-8a form the thesis, which is an antithetical sentence. The first clause of the sentence, v. 7a, affirms that believers are honored by God; in contrast, the rest of the sentence, vv. 7b-8a depicts the unbelievers' rejection of a Christ who has been exalted (he became the *corner stone*) and how they find Christ offensive (they *stumble* and *fall* over this *stone*). V. 8b then comments on these unbelievers. Multiple lexical items signal the comment: two lexical items are repeated in this comment: *stumble* from v. 8a and *unbelieving* from v. 7b. In addition, the pronoun *who*, οἱ, refers back to the *unbelieving ones*, the dative participle in 7b (Achtemeier 1996: 162). They are offended by the word (Gospel) because they do not believe, a condition that God has appointed them to.

Fourth, embedded within the result statement is an amplification paragraph. As previously noted, this amplification consisting of vv. 9-10 forms a climax to paragraph and to the body-opening. In the semantic display below vv. 7-8 form the thesis and vv. 9-10 form the amplification. To be more precise, vv. 9-10 amplify v. 7a, that God honors these believers. It may be possible to analyze the relationship here as that of comment. Both vv. 7a and 9 start with the pronoun *you: to you therefore* (ὑμῖν οὖν) in v. 7a and *you but* (ὑμεῖς δὲ) in v. 9 (Michaels 1988: 107). If this is so, v. 9 is seen as adding a further comment upon the readers. However, the additional material in vv. 9-10 is clearly more than just a comment. This additional

material clearly amplifies what it means in v. 7a to be honored by God. The repetition of the pronoun *you* in v. 9 signals a return to the topic of believers being honored. Furthermore, in support of this view is that *but* ($\delta\epsilon$) at the beginning of v. 7b indicates a contrastive change of topic, and $\delta\epsilon$ does the same again at the beginning of v. 9 (see Heckert 1996: 51). Thus, the text in rapid fashion discusses believers, presents a short excursus on unbelievers, and then returns to the topic of believers.

Fifth, the amplification paragraph has an embedded summary paraphrase paragraph. The thesis, v. 9, is expounded by a series of Old Testament citations. A series of four honorific titles are given to indicate the honored status of believers: a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, and a people of possession (possessed by God). A postposed purpose clause, v. 9b, indicates why the readers are God's special people: *that you might proclaim the virtues of the one who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light*. V. 10 finally summarizes the series of honorific statements found in 9a: they are a people whom God has chosen and had mercy on.

Thus ends a major motivational section in the text. Peter supports his final command in this division of the text with a long comment paragraph that consists of a long attestation paragraph. In 2:6-10, Peter quotes or alludes to twelve or thirteen different Old Testament passages (see the reference apparatus in the UBS text, Aland et al. 1993). Peter has sandwiched his commands with two major motivational paragraphs. In 1:3-12 he extols how great God must be to have granted them such a wonderful salvation. Now, he ends this portion of his letter by telling his readers that they have been elected to a very honored position as God's people. This series of

quotes ends the body introduction and prepares the way for the commands to follow starting in 2:11-12.

Table 9 Display of 2:9-10

Amplification: Summary ¶

THESIS: 2: 9 Ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς:

But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for possession by God, so that you may report the virtues of the one having called you out of the darkness into the marvelous light:

Summary: 2:10 οἱ ποτε οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες.

Who once were not a people, but now are a people of God, who had not received mercy, but now have received mercy.

2.4 Body-Middle.

2.4.1 Overview of 2:11-3:12.

Following the long series of Old Testament scriptural citations that close out the body introduction, the vocative in 2:11 *beloved* (ἀγαπητοί) signals the opening of a new section (cf. same usage in 4:12). Having established the identity of the readers as God's chosen people (2:9-10), this portion of the text opens with a command via the performative plus the infinitive (v. 11): *I-exhort (you) . . . to-abstain from fleshly desires* (παρακαλῶ . . . ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν). While v. 11 tells the readers what they should not do, the next sentence, v. 12, tells them what they should do: they are to have good conduct among the gentiles, namely unbelievers. As others have noted (Ellicott 2000: 465; Michaels 1988: 117), it is this participial clause

having good conduct among the gentiles (τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν) that indicates the main thrust of the command, and it also is the thesis of the discussion that follows (see the discussion of vv. 11-12 below). DOING GOOD thematically unifies the entire section; the more generic command for the readers to DO GOOD is further specified in the following verses.

The command in v. 12 is further specified in 2:13-3:12 in two ways. First, as will be shown, the different command verbs or verbals spell out more exactly what DOING GOOD involves. Second, the scope of those addressed is different: Peter begins by addressing the entire church community and then speaks to three subgroups within the community: slaves, wives, and husbands; he finally ends as he started with an exhortation to everyone within the community of believers. The concerns that Peter addresses generally relate to relationships with different groups of outsiders, although the last two paragraphs do deal with believers' relationships with others who also believe. The sentences in 2:13-3:12 consist of five thematically unified paragraphs. The first three are closely related. They consider DOING GOOD by focusing on the necessity of believers to be submissive in certain hierarchical social institutions (Ellicott 2000: 488). First, 2:13-17 commands all the readers to submit to civil authorities. Next, 2:18-25 considers the submission of slaves to their masters; and finally, 3:1-6 tells wives to submit to their husbands. The basic justification for the command to submit is that good behavior can bear a positive witness to nonbelievers (2:12, 15, 19; 3: 1).

In v. 13 the imperative verb *submit* (ὑποτάγητε) is more specific than *having good conduct* in v. 12, though the command is still addressed to all the readers. The issue is that of how a citizen DOES GOOD in the civil arena. All believers do that by submitting to the governmental authorities. But in the next two paragraphs, though the command is still the same, the scope of those addressed by the command has been reduced to first slaves and then to wives. Again, hierarchical relations are in view, but now the relations are those of a typical household in the ancient world (Ellicott 2000: 513, 551-552). Slaves are to submit to their masters and wives to their husbands.

Some scholars believe that the next two paragraphs, 3:7 and 3:8-12, continue the theme of submission. Davids (1990: 122), for example, argues that the command to the husbands to *live according to knowledge* and to *show the wives honor* are applications of the command *submit* in v. 13. He comments that such a command was highly unusual for that age. Michaels (1988: 130) concurs with Davids' analysis when he argues that *honor* and *submit* are synonyms. If *honor* equals *submit* then the command to husbands in 3:7 is an example of those in the superordinate position being told to submit to their subordinates, their wives. 3:8 then would involve mutual submission of equals to equals and, in some cases, those of higher rank, leaders, to those of lower status, followers. Achtemeier (1996: 187, 217, 220-222) also argues that *honor* and *submit* mean virtually the same; more specifically, Achtemeier (1996: 187) considers all of the text after 2:17 to be an application of the command *honor all* in that verse; and *honor all*, in turn, points to and serves as a synonym for the command *submit to-all* in v. 13.

Yet, as Ellicott (2000: 601) observes, the unifying theme of the entire section is DOING GOOD. 2:12 commands that believers DO GOOD and the section ends with a supportive quote from Psalms 34:12-16 which focuses on the necessity of believers pursuing the good. The concept of DOING GOOD occurs both on-line in the commands and off-line in the supporting material. For example, the idea of DOING GOOD appears in the supportive material of 2:13-17 by means of a word that lies within the semantic domain of DOING GOOD (καλήν) (see Louw and Nida 1988: 742). In v. 14 one purpose of governors is to praise the *ones-who-do-good* (ἀγαθοποιῶν); in v. 15 the reason for believers' submission to political authorities is that it is God's will that by *doing-good* (ἀγαθοποιούντας) they silence the false accusations of unbelievers. In 2:18-20 two more synonyms along with *doing-good* appear in supportive material. In v. 19 slaves are to submit to even evil masters because this is *commendable* or *grace* (χάρις) before God. In v. 20 bearing punishment for wrongdoing has no *merit* (κλέος); and in v. 20b suffering for *doing-good* is *commendable* (χάρις). In 3:1-6 wives are to manifest *reverent pure conduct* (ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνήν ἀναστροφὴν, v. 2); and in v. 6 wives are the children of Sarah if they do good (ἀγαθοποιῶσαι). Finally, in the quote of Psalms 34:12-16 that supports the commands of 3:8-9 the word *good* (ἀγαθόν) appears twice (vv. 10 and 11). The quote exhorts its readers to have good conduct and not bad. Furthermore, in consideration of the role of husbands in 3:7, the social structure of marriage in the first century world (Ellicott 2000: 585-599) would have made it highly unlikely that subordination would have been conceived as their

proper duty. Rather 3:7 picks up the thesis of 2:11. For husbands, DOING GOOD consists in living with their spouses in a considerate manner and in honoring them.

Finally, the last paragraph of this section may be taken as an application of DOING GOOD. Again, in the close of this section, all believers are addressed: *and finally all. . .* The first sentence opens with a series of five imperatival adjectives and two participles: *(be) like-minded, sympathetic, love-the-brothers, tenderhearted, humble, not returning evil for evil, abuse for abuse, but rather blessing*. A total of eight propositions (*abuse for abuse* has the participle elided) close the section with a flourish. Each proposition gives an example of DOING GOOD that is more specific than the command in 2:12. The participle *blessing* sums up or gives the purpose of all the good actions: believers are called to bless others. Finally as mentioned above the quotation of Psalms 34:12-16 affirms that the theme is that of DOING GOOD. The quote closes out the paragraph and the section.

In summary, it may be observed that all the commands in this section involve some more specific application of DOING GOOD. Peter uses the generic-specific template to apply his generic command in v. 12 to various situations that his readers face. As will be demonstrated in what follows *having good conduct* in v. 12 leads to the more specific command *honor* which in turn is even more specifically applied four times for the audience. By moving up or down the generic-specific hierarchy, Peter manages to use a number of terms that more specifically apply the opening generic command DO GOOD. Table 10 presents an overview of the basic structure of the section.

Table 10 Overview of the Basic Structure

2:11-12 Avoid fleshly lusts; DO GOOD

2:13-17 (DOING GOOD more specifically involves that everyone) Submit, love, fear, and honor

2:18-25 (Honor more specifically involves that) Slaves submit to masters

3:1-6 (Honor more specifically involves that) Wives submit to their husbands

3:7 (Honor more specifically involves that) Husbands understand and honor their wives.

3:8-12 (Honor more specifically involves that) Believers be compassionate and bless others.

2.4.2 Initial Generic Commands: 2:11-12

The opening of this section is composed of two sentences, v. 11 and v. 12. The first sentence (v. 11) addresses the readers with the vocative *beloved*. The vocative was often used in ancient Greek texts during the Roman period to indicate a major transition (Prasad 2000: 103; White 1972: 15). And here at the start of v. 11, the vocative *beloved*, ἀγαπητοί, signals the end of the long motivational section and a return to argument. Vv. 11-12 introduce the following section (2:13-3:12).

Following the vocative address in v. 11, Peter commands his readers via the performative verb plus the infinitive: *I-exhort* (you) . . . *to-abstain* (παρακαλῶ . . . ἀπέχεσθαι) *from fleshly desires*. After telling his readers what they are to avoid, Peter in the second sentence (v. 12) tells them what they are to do: *having good conduct of you* (τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν . . . ἔχοντες καλήν) *among the gentiles*. These two generalized commands are preparatory for the coming more specific command to follow.

The use of the finite verb in v. 11 in conjunction with the participle in v. 12 constitutes the first major problem in this section of the text. The relationship between these two sentences has been taken in various ways. For example, Achtemeier (1996: 177) states that the second sentence gives the means for carrying out the command of the first: one avoids DOING BAD by DOING GOOD. He resists the idea that the second sentence has imperatival force and treats the participial clause as an oblique statement. Though he does not discuss the issue, his interpretation suggests that the participial clause in v. 12 has only a loose semantic relationship to the command in v. 11 (see Robertson 1934: 1124 for the semantics of circumstantial or adverbial participles). Arguing in a fashion similar to Achtemeier, Schreiner (2003: 121) classifies the use of the participle of the sentence of v. 2 in the same way, calling it instrumental. The translation that he suggests for the participle is virtually the same: “*by keeping your conduct good among the Gentiles.*” Again the bad is avoided by doing good. Yet, Schreiner differs in his analysis in further asserting that, though instrumental, the participle *having* has imperatival force due to its relation to the main verb of *I-exhort (you) to-abstain*. Schreiner’s analysis here is consistent with the common understanding of New Testament Greek scholars’ understanding of mood in participles. Participles have no mood independently to themselves, but instead they receive it from the surrounding context (Turner 1963: 150); here the context is hortatory due to the command in v. 11. Schreiner’s addendum to his first analysis anticipates that of another set of Greek New Testament scholars who assert that the second sentence is imperative. Ellicott (2000: 465) holds that due to the context the

participle *having* (he glosses it as *maintain*) must be imperatival. He recognizes that the structure is a bit unusual and notes that it appears to be different from other imperatival participles (2:18; 3:1, 7, 9; 4:8, 10). In a similar fashion, Michaels (1988: 117) states that the second sentence is also a command due to its close proximity to the verb *to-abstain* in the first sentence. He comments further that it is the second sentence that gives the main thrust of the section that follows. However, he does not explain why or how the sentence with a morphologically reduced verb like a participle should be the sentence that becomes thematic for the section. Finally, the New Testament Greek grammarian Fanning (1990: 386-387) supports Ellicott's and Michaels's analysis of the participle. He explains the genesis of an imperatival participle such as the one here. It is a development of the use of the participle as an adverbial adjunct to the imperative. "The independent imperatival participle can be seen in instances where a participle is dependent on an imperative-like verb, but only by 'lax agreement'" (1990: 386). By 'lax agreement' Fanning means that the case of the participle may appear in another case than the case of the subject of the previous command such as the case here in v. 12: *having* in v. 12 is nominative while the command *to abstain* in v. 11 has no nominative subject. Following Daube (1946: 467-488), he (1990: 387) suggests that the imperatival participle is the result of language interference: New Testament writers who used the Greek participle as an imperative were influenced by the Hebrew imperatival participle such as is found in household codes in early Mishnaic Hebrew. While perhaps this may explain the evolution of this use of the participle, it still does not explain why or how. To say that

such participles are found in household codes may give a possible explanation of the sociological setting, but it does not shed much light on the function of the participle within this section or in this particular instance; neither does it explain the relationship of the two sentences under consideration other than to say that both sentences are imperatival and that the second is dependent upon the first.

The first step in addressing the issue is to identify the specific relationship between the two sentences. As noted previously, the two have contrasting elements. V. 11 talks of conduct to avoid and v. 12 of conduct to practice. That which is to be avoided is bad conduct or more exactly *fleshly desires* (σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν) and that which is to be practiced is *good conduct* (ἀναστροφὴν καλήν). These two terms, *fleshly desires* and *good conduct* are antonyms as are their respective predicates, *to-avoid* (ἀπέχεσθαι) and *having* or *maintaining* (ἔχοντες). And together both predications set up a semantic opposition of a negative versus a positive by means of lexical choice. *Fleshly desires* and *to-avoid* are inherently negative while *having* and *good conduct* are inherently positive (see Givón 1993: 202). Avoiding bad conduct and maintaining good conduct are two poles of a binary opposition, an opposition where the statement of one implies the other (see Jakobson 1990: 316). For example, lexical items may exhibit this binary characteristic: saying that something is *tall* entails the idea of *short*. But here the binary involves the entirety of each predication: saying that one should avoid bad, entails that one do good and vice versa. In other words the two sentences refer to the same activity, but from a different pole or perspective. They are two sides of the same coin. To present it another way, one may

argue that the two sentences set up an expectancy chain where one lexical item infers the other. "For example, if someone says, 'He aimed his gun, and he _____,' the hearer will most likely fill in the blank with the word *shot/fired*" (Longacre cited in Larson 1998: 431). In the same way, the command to not be bad sets up the expectation of a command to be good. The bipolar nature of the two sentences and the fact that they do constitute an expectancy chain would account for the reduced morphology of the participle in the second sentence. If the writer wished to communicate the close conceptual integration of the two predications, the use of the participle in the second sentence would do just that. Therefore, if the sentences are referring to the same activity but in different ways the relationship between them is not one of contrast, which one might first posit based on the contrasting elements. Rather, a paraphrase relationship exists.

The determination of dominance of one sentence relative to the other will help in classifying the precise type of paraphrase presented here. The fact that the first sentence contains the finite performative verb plus the infinitive, signaling an imperatival proposition, may be seen to suggest that the command to avoid bad conduct is dominant or more salient. But certain features of the two sentences alter their relative salience. First, if as suggested above, these two sentences form an expectancy chain, then the end of the chain, the end product, would most likely be most salient. Second, positive propositions are cognitively more salient than negative ones. Givón (1993: 190-191) states that positive events tend to be more salient because they connote change. The change of positive events is less frequent than the

stasis of negative events. Non-events form the background while events form the foreground of more informative positive actions. Third, DOING GOOD is the dominant theme throughout this section (see overview above). The immediate context suggests that DOING GOOD is thematic for this section (2:11-3:12). The finite imperative verb of 2:13, *submit to every human creature*, and those of 2:17, *you-honor all, you-love the brethren, you-fear God, you-honor the king*, are more specific instantiations of DOING GOOD. And again 2:18, 3:1, and 3:7 respectively all give further and more specific actions that represent good behavior: *slaves submitting to masters, wives submitting to your own husbands*, and *husbands dwelling with your wives according to knowledge and giving (them) honor as fellow-heirs*. In addition, 3:4 commands a specific type of positive conduct, although the imperative verb has been elided: *(let) your (adornment be) the hidden person of the heart*. Furthermore, the final set of commands in this section, vv. 8-9, focuses primarily on DOING GOOD. V. 8 gives a string of five imperatival adjectives, stating the positive actions the believers are to practice. Then, v. 9 commands the readers via a participle *not rendering* (μὴ ἀποδιδόντες) to not return *evil for evil or abuse for abuse*. However, even here the end focus is upon good behavior because the verse and sentence ends with the command for positive action: *but rather bless* (τοῦναντίον δὲ ἐβλογοῦντες). Finally, the theme of DOING GOOD appears lexically in supportive or motivational material in the text. For example, it appears as a substantival participle in v. 14, *ones-doing-good* (ἀγαθοποιῶν) and as an instrumental participle in v. 15, *by-doing-good* (ἀγαθοποιούντας).

The arguments for vv. 11 and 12 being an expectancy chain and for v. 12 containing the thematically dominate predication suggest that the relation between the two sentences is that of negated antonym paraphrase. Although no negative particle is present in v. 11, the infinitive *to-abstain* itself semantically negates its complement, *fleshly desires*. Such an analysis makes v. 11 the paraphrase and v. 12 the thesis (see Longacre 1996:113). This analysis also implies that the participle is an imperative. An alternate analysis that may be possible is to take both sentences as equally dominant. However, this would require taking the two members of the expectancy chain as of equal salience, and it would ignore the thematic dominance of DOING GOOD in the section. Yet, this analysis would also suggest that the predicates in the two sentences are in a chaining relationship.

The proposal here then is that 2:11-12 and 2:13-17 stand in a generic-specific relationship with 2:11-12 giving the generic or more general commands. The emphasis is on DOING GOOD, and just what DOING GOOD involves is further specified in 2:13-17.

Table 11 Display of 2:11-2:12

Generic-Thesis: Negated Antonym Paraphrase ¶

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

Beloved, I exhort you as aliens and sojourners to abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul.

Table 11—*Continued*

THESIS: 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.

You having good conduct among the nations, so that, wherein they speak against you as evildoers, by observing your good works they may glorify God in the day of visitation.

2.4.3 Specific Commands: 2:13-17

This section has a series of commands that further specify what the command to have good conduct involves. What the generic command *I-exhort (you) to abstain from fleshly lusts* and, in particular, the command *having good conduct among the gentiles* means is presented in more detail. GOOD CONDUCT is spelled out in more detail in v. 13 (the first of five finite imperative commands in this paragraph): *submit to every human creature or human authority* (ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει).

The definitions of *submit* and *creature/authority* in this verse are debated. Many modern commentators say that *submit* does not mean to submit, but rather *subordinate-oneself-to* (Achteemeier 1996: 182), or *defer-to* or *respect* (Michaels 1988: 123-124). Michaels, for example, argues that *submit* does not mean *obey* (ὀπακούω) a word which he claims refers to a submission that is so radical so as to be total. He claims that Peter could not be asking his readers to totally submit to any human or human institution. Such unreserved obedience is appropriate only in reference to Christ (see 1:2, 14, 22). Michaels' interpretation of *submit* has interpretive consequences for the understanding of this paragraph, and even the rest of the entire section (2:13-3:12), as well as meaning in this verse. If *submit* means

respect, then it and the verb *honor* (τιμᾶω) in v. 17 are synonyms (Achte-meier 1996: 187; Ellicott 2000: 498; Michaels 1988: 130). If this is the case, then all of 2:13-3:9 is about submission/respect. Not everyone who interprets the semantic relationship of these key words in this way consistently applies their interpretation to the rest of the text. Achtemeier (1996: 206-209) and Ellicott (2000: 574-575) observe that in the New Testament World wives were required to submit to their husbands and husbands held the dominant position. Thus, they understand the relationship between the husband and wife in 3:1-7 to be hierarchical. Husbands manage the household: they do not submit. Others, Davids (1990: 122) for example, are consistent. Davids claims that what is being commanded of husbands in 3:7 is an act of submission. *Submit* and *honor* are not distinct terms. According to this interpretation, the command to wives in 3:1 to submit to their husbands, and the commands in 3:7 for the husbands to live with their wives in an understanding way and to honor them as fellow-heirs, are all examples of what the word *submit* means in 2:13, *respect*. Finally, this overall understanding of the text is used to determine the meaning of the word *creature/authority*. Forester (1965: 1034-1035) argues that since submission in the text takes place between people (wives to husbands and husbands to wives), the definition of κτίσει must be *creature* (Achtemeier 1996: 179-189; Ellicott 2000: 489). The word *human* is added to make sure that the audience understands that *creature* means humans. He is arguing that the word cannot be used to refer to governing institutions or authorities (see Bauer 1958: 456; Arichea and Nida 1980:

71-72). In other words, the command in v. 13 is to respect all humans, of which the king and governor are two examples.

However, the scholars who espouse the view just presented can be shown to be mistaken in their understanding of key words, and of the overall structure of the paragraph and section. First, concerning the word *submit*, in 3:5-6 *submit* and *obey* are used as synonyms. In these two verses Sarah's obedience to Abraham is used as a specific example of the submission practiced by the holy women of old to their husbands: *formerly also the holy women who hoped on God were adorning themselves, submitting, ὑποτασσόμεναι, to their own husbands, as Sarah obeyed, ὑπήκουσεν, Abraham calling him lord. . . .* Thus, Michaels' understanding of the meaning of *submit* does not match the way Peter uses the word in the text. Submission does involve obedience, but such obedience is not total as Michaels suggests the word *submit* must mean if obedience is involved. The slaves in 2:19-21 are commended for suffering at the hands of their masters specifically because they do what their consciousness of God requires them to do. Slaves are to suffer as and because they are Christians (cf. 4:16). Therefore, slaves' submission to their masters is not total as Michaels defines *submit*. Otherwise, they would not be punished for doing what they know God wants them to do in 2:19. Second, if *submit* does mean to obey, then *honor* in 2:17 is not synonymous with it. Another explanation must be given as to why *honor* appears or how it functions in v. 17. *Honor* is a more generic term than *submit* even though it is not as general as *having good conduct* (see Bigg 1909: 141-142). One may honor subordinates or superiors, but one may submit only

to superiors. In addition, then it is not necessary to understand all of 3:13-3:9 to be thematically concerned with submission. Instead, the thematic unity is that of DOING GOOD (cf. 2:11-12). DOING GOOD may involve submission or honoring (and honoring may be further specified; cf. v. 17bc; vv. 8-9), depending on the context of the relationship involved. Finally, the meaning of *creature/authority* can be determined by the immediate context. Admittedly, the meaning is not certain. The word can mean *creature*, but it can also be used to refer to ruling institutions or authorities (Louw and Nida 1988: 477; 514-515). The immediate context of the following clauses in v. 13b and v. 14a clarifies the meaning of the word. The readers are told to submit to *every human creature/authority, whether to the king as one in authority, or to governors as those who are sent by him*. . . . Thus, it seems likely that κτίσει should be glossed as *authority*. Louw and Nida (1988: 477) suggest that *every human authority* might be glossed as *every person who has the right to rule*.

To sum up this lexical and structural overview, the imperative verb *submit* is more specific than the generic command to do good in v. 12. The command is further specified in the propositions that follow in v. 13b and v. 14a: it is a command to submit to governmental authorities, to the king in v. 13b and to his representative, the governor in v. 14. Then in v. 17 four imperative verbs occur: *honor all*, (πάντας τιμήσατε), *love the brethren*, (τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε), *fear God*, (τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε), and *honor the king* (τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε). Michaels (1988: 123; see Ellicott 2000: 485) observes that the imperative of v. 13 and those in v. 17, especially 17d, form an inclusion signifying that these vv. 12-17 are a unit. V. 13 begins with an

imperative concerning the readers' proper response to the king, and v. 17d concludes the cluster of imperatives in v. 17 with a command relating to the king once again. The occurrence of imperative verbs on either end of the paragraph suggests that the paragraph has coordinate theses. It is possible to analyze the four imperatives in v. 17 as an amplification of *submit* in v. 13 (so Achtemeier 1996: 187). But doing so would suggest that these imperatives are less salient (see Longacre 1996: 113-114). Furthermore, the piling up of imperatives here is a striking feature that suggests that they are on the mainline of the argument. And lastly, to suggest that these last four imperatives are an amplification would ignore the fact that the command to DO GOOD in v. 12 forms the head of this paragraph. It would also ignore that the idea of DOING GOOD continues in this paragraph lexically, though in the supportive or motivational material. Governors are to be submitted to because they praise the *ones-who-do-good*, v. 14b; the readers are to squelch foolish talk by *doing-good*. Thus, each command in this paragraph is a more specific example of DOING GOOD.

In addition to the suggestion of Achtemeier above as to the nature of the four imperative clauses in v. 17, others have offered suggestions. One suggestion is that the first imperative, an aorist verb, *honor everyone* is the general command and the last three present imperatives (*love the brethren, fear God, honor the king*) the more specific application of the aorist (Martin 1992: 204; see the New English Bible). However, Ellicott (2000: 498-499) argues that loving the brethren and fearing God are not specific applications of honoring in v. 17a. Instead, he suggests that the four imperative verbs form a chiasm of the form a b b' a'. The two outer commands to

honor give the readers duty to outsiders, while the two inner commands, to love the brethren and to fear God, give the contrasting duties within the believing community. However, Ellicott's (2000: 485, 498) reason for rejecting *honor* as a general term of which *love* and *fear* could be specifications is that he interprets the text in a similar fashion as Michaels (1988: 123-124, 130; see above). He defines *submit* and *honor* as synonyms. If *honor* essentially means to submit, then *love* and *fear* do not semantically fit as a further specification of the term. Yet, as argued previously, *submit* and *honor* are not synonyms (Schreiner 2003: 132).

Others (Achteimer 1996: 187; Davids 1990: 103) also note the chiasmic structure, but are unable to posit an organizing principle. Beekman, Callow, and Kopesec (1981: 120; cf. Rom. 2:12-15; Heb. 7:27-28) offer an explanation of sandwich or chiasmic structures that may apply here. They observe that when a chiasm has an equal number of elements, such as found here, the outer parts tend to be prominent. If so, then the focus in v. 17 is upon *honor*. *Honor* is a general or generic term (Bigg 1909: 142). It is more specific than *doing-good*, but more general than *love* or *fear* (see Larson 1998: 71-76 for generic-specific relationships between lexical items). Admittedly, contextually *honor the king* is a reference to submission, but to suggest that this means *submit* and *honor* are synonyms (Michaels 1988: 130), results in a confusion of contextual considerations and lexicography. However, the two occurrences of *honor* are not equally general in that the scope of application of the command is more general in the first command, and it is more specifically applied to the king in the latter. This suggests that the analysis of Martin (1992: 204) is

correct. The three present imperatives, *love the brethren, fear God, honor the king*, are more specific applications of the more general opening arist imperative *honor everyone*. The sandwiching of the series of imperatives with the word *honor* further serves to indicate that honor is in focus here. If this analysis is correct, it has implications for how the remaining paragraphs in this section relate to this paragraph.

Specifically, if the generic imperative *honor* is the focus of v. 17, then the following participles in 2:18, 3:1, 3:7, along with the adjectives and participles in 3:8-9 function as specific applications of this command. The following two major paragraphs open with the participle *submitting* at the head: slaves *submitting* (ὑποτασσόμενοι) to their masters in 2:18 and wives *submitting* (ὑποτασσόμεναι) to their husbands in 3:1. As *submit* in 2:13 is a specification of DOING GOOD in 2:12, now *submitting* becomes a specific application of the more generic term *honor*.

This analysis also accounts for how the commands in 3:7 (that husbands are to live with their wives in an understanding way and to honor their wives as fellow heirs) and the following string of commands in 3:8-9 relate: all are further specifications of *honor* in 2:17 which itself is a specification of *doing-good* in 2:12 (Achtemeier 1996: 217 n. 159 also sees 2:17 as the head of the remaining paragraphs even though he interprets the text differently). As before, Peter is using the generic-specific relationship between key lexical items to lay out his argument.

Still, the structure of the paragraph of vv. 13-17 itself presents problems in analysis. First, the relationship of v. 15 to vv. 13-14 is debated. Second, the relationship of v. 16 to v. 15 is also taken in more than one way. In fact, the third

corrected edition (1975) and the fourth edition (1983) of the United Bible Societies' text punctuate the text differently from the third uncorrected edition (1968) and previous editions. In previous editions v. 16 is a separate sentence from v. 15, but in the third (corrected) and fourth editions vv. 15 and 16 are a single sentence.

First, the relationship of v. 15 (*thus is the will of God, by doing good to silence the foolish ignorance of men*) to the preceding sentence of vv. 13-14 (*submit to every human authority, whether to the king . . . or to governors being sent by him to punish evil-doers and to praise doers-of-good*) is taken in two primary ways.

(1) Many scholars see the verse as a continuation of the command to submit in v. 13 (Kelly 1969: 110; Selwyn 1946: 173). The sentence opens with first a conjunction and then an adverb: *because thusly* (ὅτι οὕτως) *is the will of God*. The sentence continues as follows: *doing-good you silence the ignorance of foolish men*. *Because* is clearly causal, signaling that what follows gives the reason for what precedes. How *thusly* is being used here is not quite so clear. The basic argument is that *thusly* is almost always anaphoric in the New Testament and is always so in 1 Peter (Achtmeier 1996: 184; see 3:5). If taken this way, the opening of the verse is saying *thusly submit to all human creatures*, and the following infinitive clause, *to silence* (φίμοῦν), is an amplification of submitting. Such an interpretation would have the command to submit continuing as topic, though elided, throughout the sentence of vv. 14-15.

(2) The other solution is to take *thusly* as referring forward. In a similar fashion as in the first view above, Michaels (1988: 127) argues that v. 15 is explanatory due

to the causal conjunction *because* (ὅτι). But according to his explanation, *thusly* is cataphoric, referring forward to the infinitive clause with its participle. The will of God is that by doing good the readers silence the foolish talk about themselves. Michaels comments that in v. 15 *thusly*, οὕτως, is used in place of the pronoun *this*, τοῦτο. He notes that *this* is often used cataphorically (see John 6:39, 40; I Thess. 4:3; 5:18). In fact, *this* is used cataphorically in 1 Peter 2:19. But Michaels does not explain why the author chooses *thusly* instead of *this*. Even if one allows for the overlapping of semantic domains, the choice of one word over the other must be accounted for.

Ellicott (2000: 494) offers a third explanation. He agrees with the first view that *thusly* is normally anaphoric and that it is so here, but he deviates from most others in seeing that it refers back to the genitive participle *of-the-ones-doing-good* (ἀγαθοποιῶν) at the end of v. 14. In this view, the vv. 14-15 exhibit tail-head linkage, and DOING GOOD becomes the focus (*doing-good* is a semantically broad term of which the command *submit* is a more specific example; cf. discussion of 2:12 above). The adverb *thusly* activates the more general idea of DOING GOOD brought up at the end of v. 14. Then, the accusative participle *doing-good* further resumes the idea of good actions and applies it more specifically to believers (Ellicott 2000: 494). The repetition of the participle *doing-good* in conjunction with the adverb *thusly* serves to topicalize the idea of DOING GOOD within the sentence comprised by vv. 15-16. In fact, if not for the conjunction *because* at the beginning of the sentence, this sentence might be analyzed as the comment of a comment paragraph because it does pick up

and continue to comment on the participle *doing-good* at the end of v. 14. Thus, while *thusly* grammatically refers back, it might be said that semantically the opening clause of v. 14 does refer both ways: to the previous participle and to what follows. The opening clause is a link that marks DOING GOOD as topic. The grammar and semantics of this sentence serve to emphasize that the will of God is not just to silence accusers, but also to specifically to do it by the good behavior of believers (Michaels 1988: 127).

Though Ellicott's solution may appear unlikely to some, it is a possible linguistic solution. Terry (1995: 95-98) discusses how analyzing transitions between paragraphs can at times be difficult. He comments (1995: 96) about transitional material: "The analyst who is trying to decide to which section this bit of text belongs is faced with a difficult choice, for in some sense it belongs to both sections." In this case, the referent of a clause is in question due to what may be called wave features of the text (see Pike 1982: 24-29). Pike (1982: 24) observes that analyzing language into chunks, though useful, may yield an analysis that is somewhat false. He suggests (1982: 26-27) that in those areas of grammatical transition one must look for what is being put in focus. *Thusly is the will of God* links the two instantiations of *doing-good*. *Submit* is the topic of vv. 13-14. But v. 14 ends with the more general comment about DOING GOOD, and the text supports the command to submit in vv. 15-16, but it does so by considering the more generic topic of DOING GOOD of which submission is a specific example.

The determination of the meaning of the clause *thusly is the will of God* in v. 15 impacts the understanding of the next problem, that of the relationship of v. 16 (*as free men and not as having your freedom as a cloak for evil, but as slaves of God*) to the surrounding text. Depending on how the context is perceived, the syntactic relationship of v. 16 to the verses immediately before it and after it may be taken in three different ways: (1) it may refer forward to the four imperatives in the next verse, v. 17, (2) it may refer back to the imperative *submit* (ὑποτάγητε) at the beginning of v. 13, or (3) it may refer back to the participle *doing-good* (ἀγαθοποιούντας) in v. 15.

Michaels (1988: 128), supporting the first position that v. 16 refers forward to the imperatives following sentence, suggests that it is best to take v. 16 as going with v. 17. He finds linking the verse to *submit* in v. 13 to be awkward. He comments that if it is connected to v. 13, it is an awkward expression because it appears to be a new beginning. He rejects the possibility that the verse may refer back to the accusative participle *doing-good* because the implied subject of the participle would be the accusative pronoun *you* (ὑμῶς) (in agreement with the participle). He thinks that the referent of *free* and *slaves* ought to be of the same grammatical case, and the adjective *free* (ἐλεύθεροι) and the noun *slaves* (δοῦλοι) in v. 16 are nominative. Therefore, he claims that the nominative case of these two words suggests that this verse fits best with the following imperatives since the subject of the verbs would be nominative.

In support of the second position that v. 16 must refer back to the imperative of the previous sentence in v. 13 are those scholars who see v. 16 as a comment on or amplification of the imperative *submit* (ὑποτάγητε) in v. 13 (Achte-meier 1996: 186;

Selwyn 1946: 173). According to this interpretation, the implied *you* (ὁμεῖς) of the imperative verb *submit* in v. 13 is qualified by v. 16. If correct, the participle *having* (ἔχοντες) in this verse likely continues the imperative mood from the imperative in v. 13 (although Achtemeier 1996: 186 prefers to take the v. 16 as an attributive clause, giving an attribute of the implied *you* in v. 13).

Next are those who connect v. 16 to v. 15 and argue that v. 16 qualifies *doing good* (ἀγαθοποιῶντας) in v. 15. Michaels (1988: 495-496) notes the occurrence of *God* (θεός) in the first clause of v. 15 and the last clause of v. 16. He sees this as an inclusion, which would indicate that these two verses are a unit. He also points out that vv. 15 and 16 contain contrastive lexical items: v. 15 has *doing good* and v. 16 has *not having freedom as an excuse for evil* (κακίας) (Hart 1910: 60). The two verses then would in combination form a negated antonym paraphrase sentence (see Longacre 1996: 78; vv. 11-12). With this analysis, one could see an elided proposition after the opening adjective of v. 16: *as free (doing good)*. This is the interpretation taken in this analysis of the text. Such an analysis sees v. 16 as embedded supportive material.

The structure of the paragraph then is analyzed as follows. Vv. 13-14 is the thesis of a reason paragraph. The thesis is that believers are to submit to governing authorities. Then, the reason statement comes in the sentence in vv. 15-16. The reason is because it is God's will that by doing good they silence unbelievers' accusations, providing that they use their freedom not as a cover for evil, but rather that they do good out of their dedication (as slaves) to God. If the punctuation of the third edition

of the UBS text and previous were used, then v. 16 might be seen as an amplification of v. 15, amplifying how the goal of the participle *doing-good* (so as to silence ignorant men) is to be accomplished. Yet, dividing vv. 15-16 into two sentences adds little to the structural analysis, so the analysis here follows the punctuation of the fourth edition of the UBS text. Finally, v. 17 returns to the main-line of imperative verbs, and therefore relates back to the on-line imperative of v. 13 and not the supportive reason for vv. 13-14 given in vv. 15-16. V. 17 gives a climactic coordinate thesis to the thesis of v. 13: *honor everyone, love the brethren, fear God, honor the king*. The rapid fire of the four imperatives signals a climax in the text so far (Davids 103). Peter here and elsewhere (see 2:9; 3:8-9) often ends a paragraph or section by using certain surface structure markers of climax, and here he marks the climax of this paragraph by multiplying imperatives. And he does so in a way that puts the emphasis on *honor*, the two outer imperatives in the clause. The emphasis on honor might suggest an analysis that sees the second coordinate thesis as a generic of *submit*, but since two of the imperatives in this string (*love* and *fear*) definitely cannot be related to *submit* in a generic-specific hierarchy, the best analysis is to see these four imperatives as coordinating with *submit* in v. 13 to give further specifications of *having good conduct* in v. 12.

The result of this is as follows. First, it can be seen that the imperative verbs are a more specific application of *having good conduct* in v. 12. Yet, while all of the imperative verbs are more specific, they are not all of the same level in the hierarchy of specificity. In the second coordinate thesis of v. 17 the term *honor* appears that is

somewhere midway in the hierarchy between the general command to DO GOOD and the more specific commands *submit*, *love*, and *fear*. This midway generic term becomes the link to the sections that follow. This term forms the head of a series of coordinated paragraphs, which use forms other than the finite imperative to fill the imperative slot. In 1:18 the specific way that slaves honor their masters is by *submitting*, and wives in 3:1, likewise, honor by *submitting* to their husbands. For husbands, again participles indicate the specific way husbands honor their wives: *living with their wives according to knowledge* and *honoring them as fellow heirs*. Lastly, in vv. 8-9 the mandated conduct of the readers to those in the believing community is given by a series of adjectives (v. 8), and then again to those who are outside of the Christian community and who may abuse them it is given by two participles. This final sentence of 3:8-9 has as its head, as the previous three paragraphs, the imperative *honor all* in 2:17. Thus, this analysis of the structure of 2:13-17 has consequences for the analysis of the rest of the section. It demonstrates how each of the following paragraphs is not an island to itself, but that each has a head from which its non-finite imperative form receives its imperative mood.

Table 12 Display of 2:13-17

SPECIFIC-THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: Reason ¶ 2:13-16

THESIS: 2:13-14 Ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον, εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν:

Table 12—Continued

Submit to every human authority because of the Lord, whether to the king as being in authority, or to governors as through him being sent for vengeance on evildoers but for praise of welldoers.

Reason: 2:15-16 ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθοποιούντας φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν, ὡς ἐλεύθεροι καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῦ δοῦλοι.

Because so is the will of God, by doing good to silence the ignorance of foolish men, as free men and not as having your freedom as a cloak for evil but as of God slaves.

THESIS 2: 2:17 πάντα τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε, τὸν θεὸν φοβείσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε.

Honor all, love the brotherhood, fear God, honor the king.

2.4.4 Specific Thesis 1: Slaves Submit: 2:18-25

2:18-25 gives the first of four coordinate paragraphs that specify how *honor* in 2:17 should be practiced by various populations within the community of believers. The paragraph itself is a large reason paragraph; the thesis of the reason paragraph is expressed in v. 18. By means of the participle *submitting* (ὑποτασσόμενοι) this verse specifies an application of *honor* in 2:17; it picks up and returns to the theme of submission in 2:13: it commands believing slaves to submit to their masters. The last half of the verse amplifies the command: they are to submit to both good and harsh masters. The commands in the preceding vv. 13 and 17 are addressed to all believers; now the exhortation's audience is narrowed to a specific segment of the readers, slaves. Just as the author supported his first command in v. 13, so he now does beginning with v. 19.

The reason for submitting in v. 18 begins with v. 19. *For* (γάρ) at the beginning of v. 19 indicates that the sentence gives a reason for the command to submit, even to harsh masters (Achte-meier 1996: 195-196; see Wallace 1996: 674 for causal *for*). V. 19 then gives the thesis of an amplification paragraph consisting of vv. 19-20. The thesis is that unjust suffering is commendable if one suffers unjustly because of their consciousness of God (of what God wants). The interpretation here is that the pronoun *this* (τοῦτο) at the beginning of the verse is cataphoric; it refers to the following *if* clause (Achte-meier 1996: 196; Michaels 1988: 139); that which is commendable is enduring unjust suffering because of one's consciousness of what God wants. By contrast, some see *this* as anaphoric, referring to *submitting* in v. 18 (Arichea and Nida 1980: 78-79), and Ellicott (2000: 536) argues that *this* is both anaphoric and cataphoric. Yet, the same clause, *this is commendable*, occurs again in v. 20b where the *this* in the clause *this is commendable to God* clearly (anaphorically) refers to doing good while suffering unjustly in v. 20b, and again in v. 21a *this* (anaphorically) refers to continuing to do good while experiencing unjust suffering in v. 20b. Although these latter two uses of *this* in vv. 20b and 21a are anaphoric, they both indicate that in the immediate context of vv. 19-21 *this* is referring to the endurance of unjust suffering. Thus, it is likely that the opening use of *this* in v. 19 also (although cataphorically) refers to enduring unjust suffering as the other two uses do.

The amplification of v. 19 is found in v. 20. Again *for* (γάρ) in v. 20a introduces a sentence, but this time instead of giving another reason, the sentence gives

additional information, expanding on what commendable behavior is. It does so by explaining what commendable behavior is not in the sentence in v. 20a and by reiterating in the next sentence in v. 20b what it is. As will be explained in more detail below, the two sentences making up v. 20 form a unit (a contrast paragraph), and together they amplify what is said in v. 19. Calling v. 20 an amplification of v. 19 suggests that the two *for*s that introduce each must have some semantic difference. The use *for* at the beginning helps to clarify the relation of v. 19 to v. 18. V. 19 gives the reason why slaves should submit to their masters, even harsh ones: it is because suffering unjustly for God is commendable. The two sentences of v. 20, on the other hand, do not exactly appear to be giving a reason so much as clarifying or amplifying what is meant in v. 19. By means of this amplification statement in v. 20, Peter delays leaving the topic of the merit of unjust suffering, and thereby locally marks the topic as important. If this is so, then the *for* that opens v. 20 is not exactly introducing a reason, but rather further explicating a reason. The *for* in v. 19 can be translated as *because*, but here such a causal translation does not seem to fit. Louw and Nida (780), in line with this observation on *for* here, comment that while *for* is basically an indicator of cause or reason, in some contexts the relation is tenuous. Wallace (1996: 673; see Bauer 1958: 151-152) suggests that *for* can, in addition to cause, signal an explanation; he suggests that in such contexts *for* may also be glossed as *you see, that is, or namely*. Thus, it appears that *for* has some semantic flexibility so that it may be used in causal or explanatory contexts. In conclusion, the relationship of v. 20 to v. 19 is analyzed as that of amplification (additional information is given in v. 20); this

understanding of the semantic relation between the two sentences is consistent with the possible uses of the introductory conjunction *for*.

The two sentences comprising v. 20a and v. 20b form an embedded contrast paragraph. The first is a question that assumes a negative answer: no, enduring beatings because one has sinned is not commendable. While the surface structure is that of a question, notionally it is not a request for information, but instead it is a marked way of making an assertion, an assertion that gives the readers the writer's evaluation (see Beekman and Callow 1974: 241-242) of the behavior described in the sentence: again, that assertion is that enduring punishment for bad behavior is not meritorious. The second sentence presents the climactic contrastive statement: suffering for DOING GOOD is commendable. The adversative *but* (ἀλλά) suggests contrast between the two sentences. In such contrastive relationships the contrast "pivots on a dual opposition" (Longacre 1996: 104). The word denoting doing bad *sinning* (ἁμαρτάνοντες) in v. 20a is opposed to *doing-good* (ἀγαθοποιούντες) in v. 20b; V. 20a opens with an interrogative adjective and a noun, *what merit* (ποῖον κλέος), indicating that there is no merit in enduring for sin. Though v. 20a is a question it is semantically a negative statement: there is no *merit* for enduring because of sin. The following sentence of 20b is a positive statement: enduring for sin is *pleasing* (χάρις) to God. *Enduring* (ὑπομενεῖτε) appears in both sentences; unmeritorious endurance in v. 20a is contrasted with meritorious endurance in v. 20b. The point of these two sentences is that suffering for *doing-good* pleases God. The two sentences are analyzed as of unequal salience since the second sentence is the one

that makes the point of the paragraph. V. 20a and 20b are labeled in the display as contrast and Thesis respectively (see Longacre 1996: 104-105). Taken together, these two sentences clarify (or amplify) just what kind of suffering, *πάσχω*, in v. 19 finds favor with God.

Next, v. 20 serves as the thesis for a reason paragraph. 2:21-23 gives the reason why in v. 20 enduring unjust suffering is acceptable to God. The occurrence of *this* at the end of v. 20 and its repetition in v. 21a indicate that the same topic is under consideration in both verses, but now in v. 21 a reason for such is given for why it is meritorious to suffer for doing good in v. 20b: *for to this you were called*. Then the *that* (*ὅτι*) clause in v. 21 begins an explanation (that continues until the end of the sentence, v. 23) of why believers are called to suffer. To summarize, it is because Christ also suffered unjustly for them and has set the example that the readers are to follow. However, all of this, vv. 21b-23, is in support of v. 21a (*for to this you were called*), which is the nuclear clause of the sentence.

Next, the reason, vv. 21-23, is the thesis of a comment paragraph. The comment begins with v. 24. The pronoun *who* (*ὅς*) in v. 24 picks up the *who* in vv. 22 and 23 and gives a further comment about Christ (*who* introduces deitic clauses in vv. 22 and 23 that are quite like comments that appear at the paragraph level; but here in vv. 22-23 they appear intra-sentence). The comment is *who* (Christ) *bore our sins in his body upon a tree, in order that having-died to sin, we might live to righteousness; by whose wound you were healed*.

It is possible also to see paraphrase here. The reason in vv. 21-23 for believers being willing to suffer is because Christ suffered for them. V.24 could be taken as a further description of the suffering of Christ: he bore the sins of the believes on the cross. However, the appearance of *who* at the beginning of v. 24 is taken here to indicate a comment is taking place.

This section ends with a final reason. V. 24 forms its thesis, and v. 25 gives the reason. The clause *by whose wound you were healed*, a metaphor that ends v. 24, serves to summarize the content of v. 24: Christ suffered so that they might be made whole morally and spiritually (Arichea and Nida 1980: 85-86). *For* (γάρ) introduces v. 25 which gives the reason why Christ suffered so they would be converted. Christ suffered to give these formerly spiritually lost people someone, namely Christ himself (*the shepherd and overseer*), to care for them.

Table 13 Display of 2:18-25

SPECIFIC-THESIS 1: Reason ¶

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

The household slaves submitting in all fear to the your masters, not only to the good and gentle but also to the harsh.

Reason: Amplification ¶

THESIS: 2:19 τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσχων ἀδίκως.

For this is commendable if because of a consciousness of God anyone bears up under griefs while suffering unjustly.

Amplification: Contrast ¶

Table 13—*Continued*

Contrast: 2:20a ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε;

For what credit is it if when sinning and buffeted you endure?

THESIS: Reason ¶

THESIS: 2:20b ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιούντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ.

But if doing good and suffering you endure, this is commendable with God.

Reason: Comment ¶

THESIS: 2:21-23 εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς ἰχνεσιν αὐτοῦ, ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, ὃς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδορεῖ πάσχων οὐκ ἠπέλκει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως:

For to this you were called, because also Christ suffered in behalf of you, leaving behind to you a pattern that you should follow in the footsteps of him, who did no sin neither was found any deceit in his mouth, who while being reviled did not retaliate, while suffering did not threaten, but delivered himself up to the one who judges righteously.

Comment: Reason ¶

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

Who the sins of us himself he bore in his body on the tree, so that having died to our sins we might live to righteousness, by whose wound you were healed.

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

Table 13—*Continued*

For you were as sheep wandering, but you have turned now to the shepherd and overseer of your souls.

2.4.5 SPECIFIC-THESIS 2: Wives Submit: 3:1-6

3:1-6 gives the second coordinate thesis in this large coordinate paragraph which has 2:17 as its head (Martin 1992: 205; cf. Ellicott 2000: 553 who sees all of 2:13-17 as the head). This is evident because 3:1 starts with the word *likewise* (ὁμοίως) followed by the repetition of the participle *submitting* (ὑποτασσόμεναι). Just as slaves submit to their masters, so wives are to submit to their husbands. Wives are commanded to submit to their husbands for the purpose of converting their unbelieving husbands to faith in Christ. The theme of DOING GOOD surfaces in v. 2. In this verse the participle *having-observed* (εποπτεύσαντες) (taken in this analysis as causal; so Arichea and Nida 1980: 88; see Michaels 1988: 158 for a temporal interpretation) gives the reason why these wives' husbands may be converted without a word from their wives. The wives will win their unbelieving husbands without a word (v. 1b) because (v. 2) the husbands observe the wives' *reverent and pure conduct* (ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆν ἀναστροφὴν).

This command in vv. 1-2 forms the thesis or head of a comment paragraph; the comment occurs in vv. 3-4. *Of whose* (ὧν) refers back to *wives* in v. 1. The next word in the verse, the imperative *let-it-be* (ἔστω) with the following description of conduct further specifies what submission is about. It is an inner character, a humble and calm disposition that is commanded in contrast to attention to the outer person's adornment. The appearance of an imperative verb in a comment is somewhat unusual.

Yet, the mention of submission again in v. 5 and obedience in v. 6, which gives support for the command, confirms that the command about adornment is an extension of the command to submit in v. 1.

Next, the command that women should attire themselves with meekness and a quiet spirit in vv. 3-4 forms the thesis of a reason paragraph. The reason for the command is given in vv. 5-6. Wives are to adorn themselves with a humble and quiet spirit because the holy women of old did so as an act of submission to their husbands (v. 5); Sarah's obedience to Abraham is given as a specific example of these women (v. 6). The last clause of v. 6 applies the significance of Sarah's example to the women readers: *of whom (Sarah) you became children if you do good (ἀγαθοποιῶσαι) and do not fear any intimidation*. In other words, these women are like Sarah (see Arichea and Nida 1980: 94 for the metaphorical term *children*) if they DO GOOD. Again the thematic generic idea of DOING GOOD occurs here in the supporting material. Finally, DOING GOOD does not mean compromising their faith, since part of following Sarah's example involves not being intimidated by their unbelieving husbands.

Table 14 Display of 3:1-6

SPECIFIC-THESIS 2: Comment ¶

THESIS: 3:1-2 Ὁμοίως [αἱ] γυναῖκες, ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα καὶ εἰ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται, ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφήν ὑμῶν.

Likewise the wives being submissive to the own husbands, so that even if any are disobedient to the word, through the wives' conduct without a word they will be gained, having observed your pure reverent conduct.

Table 14—Continued

Comment: Reason ¶

THESIS: 3:3-4 ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἕξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφάρτῳ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, ὃ ἔστιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελής.

Whose adornment let it not be the outward braiding of hairs and the putting on of gold or of garments but the hidden man of the heart in the incorruptible adornment of the humble and quiet spirit, which is of great worth before God.

Reason: 3:4-6 οὕτως γὰρ ποτε καὶ αἱ ἅγαι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτάς ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίῳις ἀνδράσιν, ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα, ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιούσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν.

For thus formerly also the holy women the ones hoping in God were adorning themselves submitting to their own husbands, as Sara obeyed Abraham calling him lord, whose children you became if you do good and not fear any intimidation.

2.4.6 Specific Thesis 3: Husbands Honor: 3:7

The single sentence of 3:7 makes up the third coordinate thesis of this section. As in 2:18 and 3:1 the plural article plus the vocative (here *the husbands*, οἱ ἄνδρες) signifies the specific group of people addressed. In addition, the adverb *likewise*, ὁμοίως, that appeared at the beginning of 3:1, also appears here. These features have led some to conclude that 3:7 continues the theme of submission that dominates paragraphs 2:23-27, 2:18-25, and 3:1-6. For example, Davids (1990: 122; Kelly 1969: 132) contends that the head of the participial command in this sentence, *dwelling-with according to knowledge* (συννοικοῦντες κατὰ γνῶσιν), is the command *submit to every human authority* in v. 13. As previously noted, he sees *husbands dwelling-with*

(your wives) according to knowledge as an expression of submission on the part of the husbands to their wives, though he does admit that such a command involving the idea of submission would be seen as culturally unusual.

Dauids' understanding of the passage has three problems, however. First is the cultural problem of the idea of a husband submitting to his wife in the ancient Mediterranean world. Such an idea would have been incomprehensible to both the Christian and non-Christian communities (Ellicott 2000: 574-581; see Eph. 5: 22-33; Col. 3:18). Equity, not equality is the idea that Peter presents here (Ellicott 2000: 581). Husbands in 3:7 are to fulfill their reciprocal duty. Second, Davids' view of 2:13 cannot be justified contextually (see 2:13-17 above). His understanding of 3:7 depends upon reading 2:13 as *you-submit to every human creature*. The argument is that since believers are to submit to everyone in 2:13, 3:7 must be an example of the husbands submitting in a way appropriate for them. But Peter is not exhorting his readers in 2:13 to submit to everyone, but to political authorities (see the discussion of 2:13 above). The concept of submission involves a hierarchical relationship where the one lower in social rank submits; citizens submit to kings and governors (2:13-16), slaves to masters (2:18-15), and wives to husbands (3:1-6). Thus, contextual considerations suggest that the theme of submission does not extend to v. 7. In addition, Schreiner observes (2003: 133) that no clear example of a requirement that all believers should submit to everyone can be found in the New Testament. Third, *likewise* (ὁμοίως) can stress similarity and mean something on the order of *in the same way* (Bauer 1958: 567), but it can also be used in contexts where the idea of

similarity is greatly mitigated. It can be used to list related subjects in which case it means *also* (Bauer 568; Ellicott 2000: 574). Indeed, ὁμοίως is used in just this way in 1 Peter 5:5a. 5:1-4 considers how the elders of the Christian community are to rule over (*shepherd*) its members, while 5:5a says, “*Also* (ὁμοίως), *younger men, submit to the elders.*” The only similarity between the commands to rule and to submit is that they each address a responsibility of certain members of a community. In the same way, the use of ὁμοίως in 3:7 signals a transition in a discussion that lists household responsibilities, a transition from the responsibilities of wives to that of husbands (slaves were the first household members addressed; see Ellicott 2000: 513-514).

Recognizing some of the problems of suggesting that the submission is a concern for husbands, Achtemeier (1996: 217) takes the head of the participle *dwelling-with* to be the commands in 2:17. He does not single out any one of the commands as dominant, but Bigg (1909: 154) observes that the command *honor all* is more general than the others in 2:17. Thus, as previously argued, it is this command to honor that becomes the head for the rest of the text, and it is this interpretation that makes better cultural and contextual sense of the commands to the husbands. Husbands are exhorted to act in a way that honors their wives. Husbands are first told to live (*dwelling-with*, συνοικοῦντες) with their wives according to knowledge. Then they are told to honor (*showing honor*, ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν) their wives as fellow heirs. The two participles give the specific applications of the more generic command to honor in 2:17 (which itself is a specification of DO GOOD in 2:12). The structure of both participial clauses is the same: a participle followed by a ὡς phrase. First,

husbands are commanded to dwell together with, συνοικοῦντες, their wives with understanding or consideration (Ellicott 2000: 575) because (ὡς) their wives are weaker. Second, the next participle refines the initial command by giving an even more specific one (Ellicott 2000: 578-579): husbands are to honor their wives because (ὡς) their wives are fellow-heirs. Motivation for husbands to act thusly is found in a final purpose clause: so that their prayers might not be hindered.

Table 15 Display of 3:7

SPECIFIC-THESIS 3: 3:7 Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως, συνοικοῦντες κατὰ γνῶσιν ὡς ἄσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ, ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ συγκληρονόμοις χάριτος ζωῆς εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν.

The husbands also, dwelling with them according to knowledge as with a weaker vessel—the wife, showing her honor also as co-heirs of the gift of life so that your prayers not be hindered.

2.4.7 Specific Thesis 4: Everybody: 3:8-12

Some scholars see 3:8-9 as a summary of 2:13-3:7 (Davids 1990: 123-124). If so, this sentence might be seen as a summary paraphrase. However, with a summary paraphrase, the summary contains less information than the structure it summarizes (see Longacre 1996: 114). That is not the case here. Five adjectives along with two participles add even more detail to what has gone before.

Consequently, most prefer to call vv. 8-9 a conclusion that makes the fourth and final development of the commands in 2:13-17 (Achtmeier 1996: 220-221; Ellicott 2000: 600-601; Michaels 1988: 73-174). Martin (1992: 204; Bigg 1909: 154) more specifically understands the head of this set of commands to be the command in 2:17, *honor all*—the analysis taken here. Additional reasons can be given for classifying

these verses as a conclusion. First, as Achtemeier (1996: 220-221) observes, the opening structure of these verses is the same as that of the sections in 2:18, 3:1, and 3:7: an address (here *all*), an adverb (here *finally*) and a description of how the commands of 2:17 (Achtemeier treats all four imperatives of 2:17 as the head) are to be fulfilled. Second, the clustering of five adjectives plus two participles that give what are apparently commands at some level appears to represent some sort of climax in the section. Again as he did in 2:17, Peter multiplies terms or commands in the surface structure of the text to indicate a climax of the discussion (see Longacre 1996: 36; 46-50). Ellicott (2000:617) entertains the idea of a climax here, but he rejects it saying that it is only “a minor conclusion within a longer and more embracing line of thought.” He is right in observing that the climax of the text does not occur here, but what he does not consider is that a section may have a climax within itself. The clustering of imperatival adjectives plus non-finite verbal imperatives aptly brings to a close the application of the thematic command that the readers are to practice, DOING GOOD. The imperatival adjectives name attributes or attitudes that normally result in good conduct: all the readers are to be *like-minded, sympathetic, loving the brothers, compassionate, humble*. Slaves, wives, and husbands have been addressed, and now all of the readers are exhorted just as all were exhorted in 2:13-17. In fact, the word *all* (πάντες) here forms a possible inclusion with *all, πάση*, in 2:17 (Ellicott 2000: 601). This inclusion suggests that the head is the command *honor all* in 2:17. Thus 3:8-9 is the fourth and final coordinate thesis. V. 8 indicates how the readers are to honor those inside the believing community and v. 9 returns the focus, as in 2:13-

17, 2:18-25, and 3:1-6, to how they must act if they are to honor outsiders who abuse them.

3:8-9 then is a lengthy thesis statement. The use of the adjective *like-minded* (ὁμόφρονες) to open this string of five adjectives suggests that this string of adjectives concerns behavior that is to be practiced among church members; moreover, the other four adjectives (*sympathetic, loving, compassionate, and humble*) also indicate that which would be seen as normative conduct towards fellow believers (see Arichea and Nida 1980: 97-98). In addition in v. 9, they must not retaliate by returning *evil for evil or abuse for abuse, but instead a blessing*. The sentence ends with a final causal clause that gives the reason why they must return a blessing: *because you were called to this in order that you might inherit a blessing*.

At the same time, this thesis of 3:8-9 forms the head of an attestation paragraph. The evidence that the readers are to practice the good conduct in vv. 8-9 is provided by a quotation of Psalms 34:12-16 in vv. 10-12. Peter finally gives scriptural evidence for his commands. 3:10-11 constitute the first sentence of the citation, and these two verses form the thesis of a reason paragraph. The thesis is *For the one who wants to love life and to behold good days, let-him-stop the tongue from evil and the lips not to-speak deceit, and let-him-turn from evil and let-him-do good, let-him-seek peace and let-him-pursue it*. The final evidential statement appears in v. 12. This verse functions as a reason statement in support of the commands given in its thesis in vv. 10-11. The readers are commanded to avoid evil and to pursue good because God cares for those who live righteously, but he is against those who practice evil.

Peter uses this Old Testament quote to signal the end of this section. It not only relates to the immediately previous commands of vv. 8-9, it also returns to the thematic statement of 2:11-12. First, the flourish of commands continues from vv. 8-9 into Peter's evidence. This part of the quotation has five third person imperatives and six imperatival clauses (*to-speak* in the prohibition against speaking deceit is an infinitive). Three of the six are prohibitions concerning conduct to be avoided. Such conduct is twice characterized by the generic term *evil* (κακοῦ) and once by the more specific term *deceit* (δόλον). In v. 9 Peter has just admonished his readers to not return *evil* for *evil* and but rather they are to *bless* (an antonym of *deceit*). The final three commands are about behavior to be practiced. The first of these three imperatival clauses uses the generic term *good* (ἀγαθόν) for the activity to be done; then, the pursuit of the more specific term *peace* (εἰρήνην) is commanded in the final two exhortations. Second, in addition to lexically connecting this quote with the commands in vv. 8-9, this interplay between avoiding evil and DOING GOOD also ties it to the head of this section. In 2:11-12 he exhorts his audience, giving them two generic commands: to avoid *fleshly lusts* and to do the *good* (καλήν); by their good works, the readers are to demonstrate to their accusers that they are not *evil-doers*, (κακοποιῶν). The generic term *evil* (κακός) appears in both passages and the synonyms for *good*, ἀγαθός here and καλός in 2:12. Peter is closing out this section as he started, exhorting his readers to avoid evil and to DO GOOD.

Finally vv. 10-11 is also the thesis of a attestation paragraph. The evidence given to avoid evil and to pursue good is found in v. 12: it is because God cares for those

who live righteously and he is opposed to those who do evil, an allusion Hosea 2:23. Peter alludes to Hosea to further support his evidence in v. 9. Hosea also says that the readers are God's special people.

Table 16 Display of 3:8-12

SPECIFIC-THESIS 4: Attestation ¶

THESIS: 3:8-9 Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχοὶ, ταπεινόφρονες, μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας, τούναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε.

Finally, all be of one mind, sympathetic, loving brothers, compassionate, humble-minded, not giving back evil for evil on the contrary but blessing because to this you were called so that a blessing you might inherit.

Evidence: Attestation ¶ 3:10-12

THESIS: 3:10-11 ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χεῖλη τοῦ μὴ λαλήσαι δόλον, ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν, ζητησάτω εἰρήνην καὶ διωξάτω αὐτήν:

For the one wishing to love life and to see good days, let him restrain his tongue from evil and his lips to not speak deceit, but let him turn away from evil and let him do good, let him seek peace and pursue it.

Evidence: 3:12 ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν, πρόσωπον δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά.

Because the eyes of the lord are on the righteous, and the ears of him listen to their prayers but the face of lord is against ones doing evil.

2.4.8 Overview of 3:13-4:11

In contrast to the previous section of 2:11-3:12, 3:13-4:11 is not as elaborately or as tightly organized. The first paragraph, 3:13-22, presents the issue of suffering and how the readers are to respond to it in the most direct manner thus far in the text.

Then the next paragraph gives an inference based on the embedded supporting material in the previous paragraph that seeks to motivate the readers by giving the example of Christ's suffering: they are to have the same attitude as Christ did about suffering. Finally, the last paragraph communicates a sense of urgency and provides the climax for the section and division with a series of commands.

This present analysis follows Davids (1990: 129-130), who says that vv. 13-14a borrow the terms *good* and *bad* from the cited Psalm in order to turn the focus of the argument to the topic of suffering. The terms are essentially used to formulate a comment relation (Davids does not use this terminology); this is an atypical use of the comment semantic relation which is usually used to subordinate a statement to the previous one (see 1:6-12 in Table 3), but here the following comment is online, as the command forms in vv. 14b-15 indicate (perhaps indicating a rise in tension and movement toward a climax in the text). The second paragraph, 4:1-6, points out an inference that may be drawn out of the discussion of Christ's suffering in 3:18-22. Since Christ was willing to suffer as he did for the readers, they also ought to think about suffering the same way as he did. Finally, the last paragraph, 4:7-11, gives the climax: *the end of all is near*; thus, the readers are exhorted to be sober and alert so they can pray. A series of commands follow in vv. 9-11 that describe how believers are to relate to one another in such times. This closing paragraph is similar structurally to the closing paragraph of the previous section, 3:8-12. It also uses lexical items that are not finite imperatives to indicate commands, and it has a

distinctive terminating structure; but instead of a scriptural citation, it closes with a doxology.

2.4.9 Not Fear, but Consecration: 3:13-3:22

3:13-14 introduces a new section and paragraph. As mentioned above, the lengthy quote of an Old Testament passage signals the end of a section (see 2:6-10). The opening two sentences, 13-14a, announce the topic that is to be the focus of this section and of the paragraph itself: suffering. The strategy here is similar to that found at the start of the body middle in 2:11-12, except the announcement of the topic here appears in a non-command form and is not as salient as the following hortatory sentence. The following hortatory material in the sentence of vv. 14b-16 tells the readers how they are to respond to suffering; the rest of the paragraph, vv. 17-22, supports the commands. Peter uses a similar structural strategy to open this section to that which he used to open the immediately previous one in 2:11-12. All of these considerations point to the start of a new section.

The previous section deals with the basic issue of doing good, especially doing good in a manner appropriate to one's position in society; and it ends with a quote of Psalm 34:12-16 that emphasizes the necessity of DOING GOOD and avoiding evil. V. 13 opens with the conjunction *and* (καί) which indicates what the relationship to the previous section is. Many argue (Achtmeier 1996: 229; Michaels 1988: 185) that v. 13 gives a conclusion or inference from the previous material. They see some sort of inference being made based upon the Psalm. In order to harmonize their analysis of the passage and the appearance of the conjunction with that analysis, they gloss the

conjunction *and* as *therefore, then, and and so* (conjunctions suggesting inference). This, however, is not the basic meaning of *and*; *and* is an additive conjunction. It usually joins elements that are of the same level, and it indicates some sort of continuity within the context (Heckert 1996: 74). Furthermore, *and* is used when the author wishes to suggest that what follows is not a development of the preceding (Levinsohn 1992: 32). Davids (1990: 129) offers an analysis of the text that fits with the basic meaning of *and*. He observes that v. 13 of this new section repeats two lexical items: the substantival participle *one-doing-evil* (ὁ κακῶσων) echoes the last word in the quote at the end of v. 12, *evil* (κακά) and the genitive noun *good* (ἀγαθοῦ) repeats the word *good* (ἀγαθός) that appears twice in the quote (once each in vv. 10 and 11). The author is picking up on the theme of the previous material and refocusing it to consider more directly the issue of suffering for doing the right or good thing. The rhetorical question asks *and who are the-ones-doing-evil to you if you are zealots for the good?* Peter is turning the argument now to a consideration of suffering. The semantic relationship is one of comment; Peter uses the terms *bad* and *good* in the rhetorical question in such a way so as to redirect the discussion of good and bad to a discussion of suffering. To label the relation as comment here does suggest, as it normally would, that vv. 13-19 are subordinate to the previous material (see the comment paragraphs in 1:6-12 in Table 3). Yet, this is unlikely because vv. 14-15 have three finite verbal commands: two subjunctives of prohibition (*do not fear nor be troubled*) and an imperative (*sanctify Christ in your hearts*). These command forms indicate that this section is on the command-line of the text. Apparently

comment relations that are used for the subordination of sentences and paragraphs elsewhere in the text can also be used to bring another topic into focus and online, a topic that has until now been backgrounded. Peter has touched on this subject before, particularly in the material that supports his command that slaves submit to their masters (2:18). There slaves are told that suffering at the hands of harsh masters for being just is good (2:19-21). Now the same idea resurfaces, but its application here is to all believers, not just slaves, and it is not buried so deeply in supportive material.

In 3:13 Peter asks a rhetorical question that along with its answer in v. 14a is misunderstood by the majority of the scholarly Greek New Testament community: *who will harm you if you become zealots for the good? But if you suffer on account of righteousness you are blessed.* Most take the two sentences as a syllogism that is stating some sort of philosophical/theological truth that is absolutely always true. Thus, they take the suggestion that the question implies that no one will harm the readers if they do good, as a statement that must refer to the future eschatological reward or some sort of spiritual reward since the text elsewhere mentions ways that believers during the present time are suffering (1:6-7; 2:12, 19-21; 4:12-19; 5:9-10; see Achtemeier 1996: 229; Arichea and Nida 1980: 103-104; Ellicott 2000: 619-620; Michaels 1988: 184-186; Schreiner 2003: 168-173). The answer in v. 14a is then seen as some sort of clarification (suggesting some sort of paraphrase relation) of the assertion made in v. 13. What is being clarified is that abuse by unbelievers cannot ultimately harm believers since they are spiritually blessed if they suffer for doing the right thing (Schreiner 2003: 170-171). However, to make this understanding of the

passage work, an unusual meaning for *but* (ἀλλά) must be posited. Schreiner (2003: 170) glosses the conjunction as *indeed*, and Michaels (1988: 185) as *what is more*.

Dauids' (1990: 130) understanding of the text fits better with the grammar of the text. He observes that v. 13 is not a syllogism, but a proverbial statement. Peter is not stating that those who do good never suffer, but that as a general rule they will not. The rhetorical question here presents a proverbial statement in a very marked way: if you zealously pursue good, no one will harm you (at least generally this is so). Such a proverbial statement is consistent with the idea presented in the quote from Psalms 34:12-16 in vv. 10-12 above. The quote essentially affirms that God blesses those who DO GOOD; if so, one might reasonably expect that blessing to present itself as protection from persecution. However, v. 14 suggests that the proverb may not always hold true. Peter does not absolutely say the readers will suffer, but he does propose the idea that they may suffer. The introductory clause *if indeed you should suffer* (εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε) with its optative verb forms a fourth class conditional clause that views the reality of the proposition as undetermined or less likely (Robertson 1933: 113). In other words, Peter as of yet holds out the likelihood for his readers that they will not suffer, but it is possible (a possibility that becomes actualized later; see 4:12). And this potentiality for suffering runs counter to the expectation that good behavior brings blessing or fair treatment. Not only does DOING GOOD not always result in being left alone, but in addition persecution itself is presented as a blessing. If one interprets the passage in this manner, then the use of *but* in the passage fits with the normal range of meaning for the conjunction. Heckert (1996: 16-18) in his

research found that *but* basically signals contrast. More relevant to this passage, he says that when *but* appears without the use of a lexically negative word (as in the text here) the clause it introduces gives a counter expectation of the previous clause. He gives John 16:20 as an example: you will be sorrowful, *but* your sorrow will turn into joy.

What this analysis suggests is that the semantic relationship between vv. 13 and 14a is that of contrast; it is a specific type of contrast: counter-expectancy. Peter is here using a tactic similar to the one he uses in 2:11-12 to introduce a thematic topic for a section, but with a new twist. There he uses an expectancy chain: avoiding fleshly desires in 2:11 can be expected to necessitate DOING GOOD in v. 12. DOING GOOD then becomes thematic for the section that follows. Peter here opens with the normal expectation that DOING GOOD lets one avoid persecution, but he then introduces the counter-expectation. These two verses introduce what he wishes to discuss in this section: what his readers are to do when this happens. Thus, the relation between vv. 13 and 14 is that of contrast (as depicted in the display). The second sentence, v. 14, is apparently dominant since it is introducing the point that Peter wishes to discuss; therefore, it is labeled Thesis in the display and the less salient question that comprises v. 13 is labeled Contrast (see Longacre 1996: 104 for contrast paragraphs with a member of lower salience).

Table 17 Display of 3:13-14a

Introduction: Contrast ¶

Contrast: 3:13 Καὶ τίς ὁ κακῶσων ὑμᾶς ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε;

Table 17—*Continued*

And who is the one harming you if you become zealots for good?

THESIS: 3:14a ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι.

But if indeed you should suffer because of righteousness, you are blessed.

Since vv. 13-14a contain no hortatory verbs and the next sentence starts a series of exhortations, the paragraph is of less salience than the immediately following sentence. Vv. 13-14a serve as an introduction to the section.

The sentence comprised of vv. 14b-16 gives the thesis of the larger paragraph that makes up this entire section of 3:13-22 and returns the argument to the hortatory mainline. In this sentence several commands appear. V. 14b opens with the conjunction *but/and* (δέ) followed by two negated subjunctive verbs: *the fear of them you-fear not nor you-be-trouble* (τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ παραχθῆτε). The two negated aorist subjunctive verbs function as commands with the force of imperatives here; the New Testament writers never use second person negated aorist imperatives in prohibitions (Porter 1992: 221). The first imperative clause of v.14b has a marked construction: the clause consists of the cognate accusative where the object of the verb and the verb consist of the same root word: *the fear of them do not fear*. Peter is using redundancy to make his point even more emphatic (see Bullinger 1898: 405). And furthermore, the second clause *neither be troubled* continues the piling on of like and similar terms. Such a redundancy makes these commands quite salient, especially with respect to the previous introductory remarks in vv. 13-14a. In combination with such rhetorical underlining of v. 14b, the

conjunction *but/and* indicates that this opening clause is a salient development of the preceding introduction (see Heckert 1996: 40-51 and Levinsohn 2000: 112-114 for this use of δέ). Both Heckert (1996: 47) and Levinsohn (2000:112) observe that a basic function of *but/and* is not only to mark material that develops the previous statement, but it is also used to signal movement from the less salient to the more salient material. Their observations on the use of *but/and* are in accord with the observation that v. 14b marks the beginning of a move up in the salience scheme to the backbone of the argument and that 14b-16 is the most salient sentence in the paragraph or section.

After telling his readers what not to do in v. 14b, Peter proceeds to tell them positively what they are to do. The next clause in the sentence, v.15a, gives a positive command: *and/but* (δέ) *sanctify* (ἀγιάσατε) *the lord, the Christ, in your hearts*. It may be argued that the command of this clause is more salient than the previous negative commands in v. 14b. This is suggested by two factors: first, in constructions that involve a positive and negative pole, the positive one is generally more salient (Givón 1984: 348, 350-351), and second, the author has just shown a tendency to prefer bipolar contrastive constructions in which the latter predication or sentence is dominant (see 3:13-14). Yet, in this particular case, the command to not be afraid in 14b receives considerable rhetorical underlining by means of the cognate accusative (*do not fear the fear of them*); in addition, the command is stated twice by means of verbs that are basically synonymous (*fear* and *be-troubled*). Also, it may be argued that in the context of suffering (v. 14a), fear would be a normal response. Thus, the

command to not fear would be salient against the backdrop or assumption that persecution normally elicits fear. The sentence has a coordinated nucleus: don't fear but sanctify Christ in your heart.

The rest of the sentence in vv. 15b-16 has no more finite verbs, imperatival subjunctives or imperatives, used to indicate commands. However, many New Testament scholars, though not all, interpret the sentence as having three more imperative constructions. The first debated construction is the clause introduced by the adjective *ready* (ἔτοιμοι): *ready always to give an account to those who ask you about the hope among you*. Achtemeier (1996: 233; see Hamblin 1959: 28) argues that the clause is not imperatival, but that instead it gives the means by which the readers sanctify Christ in their hearts. He assumes that the participle *being* (ὄντες), though not present in the text, is still present underlyingly; thus, the clause of v. 15b is in actuality a participial clause of means. Accordingly, a likely gloss of the passage would be *sanctify Christ in you hearts by being ready*. . . . Ellicott (2000: 626) understands the grammar of the clause differently: he sees the lack of a finite verb in the clause (the lack of any verbal in the nucleus of this clause also supports his analysis) as an indication that the clause is functioning independently. According to his interpretation, the clause gives another command just as the prohibitive subjunctives in v. 14b and the imperative of v. 15a did. Schreiner (2003: 174), similar to Achtemeier, suggests the possibility of an elision of the participle *being* in order to make the clause sensible grammatically. However, he differs from Achtemeier in that he understands the clause to be imperatival in force. He sees the adjective *ready* as

functioning as an imperative, regardless of the grammatical explanation one may wish to give for the construction of the clause. In other words, he argues that contextually the clause *ready to give an account* gives another command. Rather than being afraid, having committed themselves to Christ, the readers ought to be ready to offer an explanation of their faith to those that ask (Davids 1990: 131-132). If one sees the participle *being* as understood, then the clause could be classified as a participial clause of attendant circumstance. In this case, the verbal idea (implied participle) would be an action that in some way coordinates with the previous command(s) and the clause would get its imperatival mood from the previous command(s) (see Wallace 1996: 640-645 for participles of attendant circumstance). However, such a grammatical interpretation adds little to Ellicott's analysis above. Grammatical explanations for the form of the clause may be tentative, but contextually the clause functions imperatively. This is not the first time that Peter has used what may be called a reduced form to fill the imperatival slot (see 3:8).

If the previous clause is taken as functioning imperatively, then most likely the next in v. 16a is to be taken in the same way. There Peter writes *but (give your account) with meekness and fear* (ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου). Even those who interpret this clause as indicating the manner in which the readers were to give their testimony, still recognize that it gives a command. For example, Achtemeier (1996: 234) interprets the clause as giving the manner in which the readers are to bear witness of their faith to unbelievers. However, he also sees the clause as a warning to

the readers; the clause is not merely informational, but rather it instructs the readers on how they are to conduct themselves.

The structure of the first part of this sentence, vv. 14b-15a, is that of a prohibition followed by a positive command. Continuing this pattern (though in a reduced form), here in v. 16a only the positive command of a binary negative/positive structure appears. The negative part of the warning has been elided. Likely, the deleted prohibition concerns the possibility that the readers might answer in a retaliatory or threatening way; they should not do so (see 2:13). This interpretation explains the appearance of *but* (ἀλλά) at the beginning of the clause. Typically *but* indicates a contrast (cf. 1958: Bauer 38), but because Achtemeier (1996: 234) and Ellicott (2000: 629) do not see this clause as one half of a negative/positive construction, they have trouble accounting for the conjunction *but*. They gloss it as *yet* or *but surely*. However, it is not necessary to amend the contrastive force of *but* if one sees the clause as a reduced binary structure.

The final disputed form in this section is the participial clause in 16b: *having a good conscience* (συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν). Achtemeier (1996: 233-234) argues that the participle gives the attendant circumstance of the previous commands (for him this includes the prohibitions of 14b and the imperative of 15a). However, as observed previously in the discussion of v. 15b, even if one concludes that the participle is attendant circumstance, this does not mean that the participle is not functioning as an imperative here. This sentence is striking because of the concentration of command forms in a single sentence, and also due to the fact that it

combines commands with finite verbs in the imperative slot, an adjective, a prepositional phrase, and a participle. The author starts out by giving commands with verbs that have the full morphology of a command (two prohibitive subjunctives and an imperative) and then the following directives appear with no verb at all or a verb with reduced morphology. All of these features suggest the high salience of the sentence relative to the rest of the text in this section.

Vv. 14b-16 then form the thesis of the following reason paragraph. The reason given in v. 17 that it is better to suffer for DOING GOOD than evil, if God wills that one suffer. The sentence's introductory connective *for* (γάρ) in this case indicates that the sentence it introduces supports the previous sentence. The readers are to sanctify Christ in their hearts and give a reason for their hope in a humble and reverent way with a clear conscience because it is better to suffer for DOING GOOD than for doing evil. This idea that it is better to suffer for doing good is repeated frequently in the text (see 2:18-20; 3:6, 9; 4:19). Michaels (1988: 191-192) misunderstands this sentence, reading it as a statement that the Christian readers are better off than those who do evil. He rejects the normal interpretation of the sentence because it is repetitious, forming what he calls a tautology. He is forgetting the circular or repetitious nature of arguments in the near eastern world.

Table 18 Display of 3:14b-16

Reason ¶

THESIS: 3:14b-16 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ παραχθῆτε, κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἕτοιμοι αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαὶν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου, συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ

Table 18—*Continued*

καταλαλείσθε καταισχνθῶσιν οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφὴν.

But the fear of them do not fear nor be troubled, but as lord revere Christ in your hearts, be always ready to give a defense to everyone asking you a word concerning the hope that is in you, but with humility and fear, have a good conscience, so that whereas you are spoken against the ones slandering you may be shamed by your good conduct in Christ.

Next, the predication in v. 17, stating that it is better to suffer for *doing good* (ἀγαθοποιῶντας) than for doing evil (κακοποιῶντας), forms the thesis of another embedded reason paragraph. Peter continues his use of the binary here: good versus bad. In contrast to the previous binary constructions, the positive pole occurs first, possibly due to thematic and cohesive attraction to the ending of the previous sentence of vv. 14b-16, *the good in Christ conduct*. The same binary template, positive then negative, continues in v. 18. V. 18 opens with the conjunction *because*, ὅτι, signaling that the following material gives a reason based on an evident fact (see Louw and Nida 1988: 781 for this use of ὅτι). The fact that forms the basis for DOING GOOD even though one suffers for it, is that the righteous Christ suffered for these believers, *a righteous one for unrighteous ones* (δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων) (a positive/negative binary opposition as in v. 17), in order that he might bring them to God. The means by which Christ brings believers to God is given by a pair of participial clauses at the end of v. 18 (Hamblin 1959: 114-115): *having-been-put-to-death in the flesh* (θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ) and *having-been-made-alive in the spirit* (ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι). Again the binary opposition occurs, this time the negative first and the positive second. The two clauses taken together refer to Christ's

physical earthly death and to his resurrection to a glorified human existence (Davids 1990: 137; Michaels 1988: 204-205; cf. 4:6). Due to the predominance of the bipolar opposites in this section thus far, it is unlikely that *spirit* here refers to the Holy or divine Spirit (so Schreiner 2003: 184). The understanding presented here of the binary opposition of being put to death in the flesh, but being made alive in the spirit has interpretative implications for the following sentence of vv. 19-20.

The next sentence, vv. 19-20 is the most difficult to understand in 1 Peter. This difficulty is such that it has caused scholars to question whether or not the embedded paragraph of vv. 18-22 really relates to the previous text of vv. 13-17. First, it is problematic as to precisely what the passage is about. Second, because of this difficulty of determining precisely what is being referred to, some have argued that the passage itself, and indeed all of vv. 18-22, is a digression and not really well connected to its context (e.g., Beare 1970: 170; cf. 1990: Davids 145). Ellicott (2000: 648-650; see Achtemeier 1996: 243-246; Davids 1990: 138-141) outlines four major understandings of the text of vv. 19-20.

(1) An ancient interpretation, going back at least to Augustine (Achtemeier 1996: 244), is that these verses refer to the pre-incarnate Christ preaching through Noah to the wicked people of Noah's day. It is unclear what relationship such an event has to the idea in v. 17 that it is better for the reader to DO GOOD, however. Furthermore, it does not account for the fact that the previous sentence, v. 18, ends with a focus on Christ's death and resurrection; that is, it does not develop this concept. If this view is correct, then vv. 19-20 and thus vv. 18-22 must be seen as a digression.

(2) Others (Bigg 1909: 162) argue that this passage is about a second chance of salvation for the pre-flood generation; during the time between his death and resurrection, Christ went and preached salvation to the wicked who perished in the flood. But such a view also gives inadequate grounds for the believers to persist in doing good; why should the readers continue in the face an hostile audience if they will receive a second chance anyway (Achte-meier 1996: 244; cf. Schreiner 2003: 188)? Also, this view assumes that the word that refers to those to whom the proclamation was made, *spirits* (πνεύμασιν), refers to humans, but *spirits* never appears in the New Testament in any clear reference to dead humans unless it is qualified by an adjective to make clear the referent (Achte-meier 1996: 255, n. 181; see Heb. 12:23). Finally, if *in which* (ἐν ᾧ) at the beginning of v. 19 refers back to *spirit*, the last word in v. 18 (as suggested below in the discussion of v. 18), it can be argued that it was in this mode of spiritual existence that Christ went to the dead before his resurrection. However, this interpretation ignores that the opposition of flesh and spirit in v. 18 refers to the death and resurrection. The sequence that is most natural in the text is death, resurrection, and procession to the spirits in prison.

(3) The third interpretation is that the verses refer to Christ descending to the realm of the dead before his resurrection and announcing salvation to the people of Noah's day who had repented just before their death in the flood (Ellicott 2000: 649 credits the Roman Catholic scholar Robert Bellarmine 1586 as the first to suggest this view). Like the others, however, this view does not clearly give a reason why

believers should DO GOOD in the midst of persecution, and it does not, as in theory (3) above, do justice to the opposition of flesh and spirit.

(4) The final view, as the interpretation that is assumed in this analysis of the structure, is that the background for Jesus' proclamation to the spirits is the book of *1 Enoch* (Ellicott 2000: 649-651). According to this tradition, *spirits* refers to evil angelic beings that caused the great evil that existed in the pre-flood world and who were therefore imprisoned (see 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6). The proclamation, in this case, is not one offering salvation to condemned humans, but an announcement of victory by the resurrected Christ over defeated angelic foes (see 3:22). Christ makes this pronouncement as he journeys through the heavens, where he visits these fallen angels imprisoned in one of the lower heavens (see Ellicott 2000: 654-655 for the cosmological background). This understanding makes the two uses of the participle *having-gone* (πορευθείς) in v. 19 and in v. 22 refer to the same event, an event that is consistent with the ending proposition of v. 18, which refers to the resurrection of Christ. Thus, this interpretation makes v. 19 flow naturally out of v. 18 where the resurrected Christ is presented at the end of the verse (Schreiner 2003: 186). The grounds that this passage presents for 3:13-17, specifically v. 17, is the resurrection and its results: the resurrection results in Christ's defeat of even the most powerful of evil beings (see v. 22), and the readers have access to the one who has defeated supernatural foes because the salvation (baptism) mediated by Christ is theirs. They will be delivered as surely as Noah and his family were.

Table 19 Display of 3:17-18

Reason: Reason ¶

THESIS: 3:17 κρείττον γὰρ ἀγαθοποιῶντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιῶντας.

For it is better to suffer for doing good, if God will so wills, than to suffer for doing wrong.

Reason: Comment ¶

THESIS: 3:18 ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζῶοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι:

Because indeed Christ once for sins died, a righteous man in behalf of unrighteous men, that he might bring you to God on the one hand having been put to death in flesh but on the other hand having been made alive in spirit.

With the above understanding of the passage, vv. 19-20 is posited as a comment upon v. 18. The sentence opens with the prepositional phrase *in which* (ἐν ᾧ). The prepositional phrase may be taken as a circumstantial construction meaning *in which occasion* (Ellicott 2000: 652). In this case the context of all of v. 18 forms the circumstance in view. If this is right, vv. 19-20 would be more salient than v. 18; then v. 18 would be the circumstance and vv. 19-20 the thesis of a circumstance paragraph. An alternate view is to see *in which* as a reference to the immediately previous word *spirit* at the end of v. 18. This is grammatically possible since *which* can be taken as a neuter pronoun (it is either masculine or neuter) and *spirit* is a neuter noun (Schreiner 190). If *spirit* is understood as a reference of the Holy Spirit, then *in which* gives the means by which Christ goes and proclaims to the imprisoned spirits. But the better interpretation (as argued in the discussion of v. 18 above) is to

take *spirit* as a reference to the spiritual existence of Christ after the resurrection (so Archia and Nida 1980: 114-117). Either understanding of the referent of *spirit* lends itself to the same structural analysis of the semantic relationship between the two sentences. V. 18 is the thesis of a comment paragraph, and vv. 19-20 form its comment with *spirit* being the word that is used as a point of departure. Such an analysis also fits with Peter's tendency to prefer right branching structures in supportive material (see 2:18-25).

The last half of the sentence, v. 20, gives further context concerning whom Christ addressed: *it was to the ones who disobeyed when God was being patient in the days of Noah, while the ark was being constructed in which a few, that is eight people, passed through the water.* The last word in this sentence, the neuter noun *water* (ὕδατος) is picked up by the neuter relative pronoun *who* (ὅ) that begins the last sentence of vv. 21-22. However, not all see the pronoun as anaphoric. Selwyn (1946: 203) sees it as making a cataphoric reference to word *baptism* (βάπτισμα). But Selwyn interprets the sentence in a different way. He takes *antitype* (ἀντίτυπον) as in apposition to *you* (ὁμᾶς); as a result, he glosses the first portion of the verse as *And water now saves you too, who are the antitype of Noah and his company, namely the water of baptism.* This is an unusual understanding of the content. He is trying to smooth out the syntax of the sentence, but has instead made it more difficult. The more natural reading is to take the pronoun *who* as anaphoric, referring to *water* at the end of v. 20 (Schreiner 2003: 193 n. 324; Robertson 1933: 19).

Thus, again a comment paragraph is formed. Vv. 19-20 is the thesis while vv. 21-22 make a comment on the water. The water is a symbol of baptism that now saves believers. In other words, as those of Noah were saved as stated in v. 20, now these believers (*you*, v. 21) are saved through baptism (taking baptism as a synecdoche for salvation; see Campbell 1995: 185). And that salvation is made possible *through the resurrection of Jesus Christ* (the end of v. 21). Another relative pronoun *who* (ὅς) at the opening of v. 22, refers back to *Jesus Christ* at the end of v. 21 and begins an intrasentence comment on him. He is vindicated; he is raised to a position of honor by God; and all of his supernatural enemies are put into submission.

Ending with the enthronement of Christ and the subjugation of evil spiritual beings, the point of the paragraph of vv. 18-22 gives a reason why the readers should persist in doing good (v. 17): though they may suffer, Christ still rules over all, and through the salvation “they are also joined to the resurrected reigning Christ” (Davids 1990: 147). Though they may suffer now, their future is secure.

It should be pointed out that the analysis here differs from those of most Greek scholars in that it sees this section as a series of embedded paragraphs that support the main line imperatives in vv. 14-16. While vv. 18-22 may be seen as a structural unit because they focus on the significance of the death and resurrection of Christ, these sentences still form an embedded paragraph (made up of a series of embedded paragraphs) that are of less salience than the head of vv. 14-16 with its imperatives. The supporting chain of embedding begins with v. 17. This structural observation becomes relevant when it is necessary to consider the relationship of larger

paragraphs to each other. Some see the entire paragraph of 3:13-17 as the thesis of the embedded paragraph (Achte-meier 1996: 246; Ellicott 2000: 639). More precisely they say that 3:18-22 supports 3:13-17, but as a matter of practice they do not seriously consider embedding. Thus, while they can divide the text into larger paragraphs, they do not always clearly see how these units interconnect, and they may at times fail to note the relative salience of paragraphs. For example, Achtemeier (1996: 73) and Ellicott's (2000: 83) outlines suggest that both 3:13-17 and 3:18-22 are of equal salience. The analysis here takes more seriously the observation of Davids (1990: 128; see Arichea and Nida 1980: 110), who says that v. 18 gives the reason for v. 17. Davids, in contrast to many other scholars, treats 3:13-22 as a unit.

Table 20 Display of 3:19-22

Comment: Comment ¶

THESIS: 3:19-20 ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, ἀπειθήσασιν ποτε ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος.

In which indeed to the spirits in prison having gone, he made proclamation to ones who formerly disobeyed when the patience of God was waiting in days of Noah while an ark was being prepared, in which a few, that is eight souls, were saved through water.

Comment: 3:21-22 ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σφάζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ [τοῦ] θεοῦ πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων.

Which figure now saves you even baptism, not the removal of dirt from the flesh but the pledge of a good conscience to God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is at the right hand of God having gone into heaven, having had subjected to him angels and authorities and powers.

2.4.10 Think Like Christ: 4:1-6

The paragraph of 4:1-6 is analyzed here as consisting of a reason paragraph, whose thesis (4:1-2) is supported by the reason given in 4:3. This reason itself forms the thesis of a comment paragraph. The sentence of 4:4-5 comments on 4:3, and in turn 4:4-5 forms the thesis of a second comment paragraph with 4:6 giving the final comment. The arguments that support this analysis are given as follows.

The use of the aorist imperative verb *you* (pl.)-*arm-yourselves* (ὀπλίσασθε) along with the inferential conjunction *therefore* (οὖν) (for inferential *therefore* see Heckert 1996: 94-96; Wallace 1996: 673; cf. 2:1) signals a return to the mainline of the argument in the text, following the string of comment paragraphs in vv. 18-22. Peter now states an inference that can be deduced from the discussion of the suffering of Christ and his vindication in 3:18-22 (Ellicott 2000: 711). In particular, as Achtemeier (1996: 277) points out, this verse returns to the issue of the innocent suffering of Christ that is found in 3:18, the head of 3:18-22. The use of the rare genitive absolute construction, *Christ having-suffered* (Χριστοῦ παθόντος), highlights and makes the grounds for the following command even more salient. Peter is becoming ever more clear about the fact that the readers will suffer. The preposed genitive absolute participle gives the cause or reason (Achtemeier 1996: 277 n. 15) for the command for the readers to arm themselves (ὀπλίσασθε) with the Christ's way of thinking about suffering. The postposed causal clause (*because those who suffer have ceased from sin*) gives a proverbial statement about suffering disciplining believers in

obedience so that they do not sin and are thus able to resist the *lusts* (ἐπιθυμίας) of men and do the *will* (θελήματι) of God (v. 2).

This first sentence, vv. 1-2, thus forms the thesis of a reason paragraph; the thesis is the command for the readers to arm themselves with *the same way of thinking* (τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν) about suffering as Christ did. Two reasons for the command are found preposed and postposed to the sentence nucleus of vv. 1-2. V. 1a gives the basic reason that supports the command; this reason is highlighted by the use of the genitive absolute in the introductory participle clause *because Christ suffering in the flesh* (Χριστοῦ παθόντος σαρκί). The participial is causal (see Achtemeier 1996: 277 n. 15). Peter, by use of this genitive absolute construction, refers back to the suffering of Christ in 3:18-22 and introduces the command with the basis for obedience: Christ's example. Next, the postposed clause of vv. 1c-2 gives another reason: the one suffering ceases to sin (1c) with the result that, εἰς, (v. 2; see Davids 1990: 147) that person no longer behaves in a lustful manner, but rather in a manner that is in accordance with God's will. The second sentence, v. 3, gives another reason why they are to think like Christ about suffering: the readers have spent enough time in their past participating in the lustful activities of their non-believing neighbors. Peter argues that his readers have already spent enough of their lives living as the lifestyle of their non-believing contemporaries. Expanding on the noun phrase *lusts of men* in 1c, he catalogues some of the immoral activities they used to participate in. The activities listed were likely those common to members of clubs or guilds of the Greco-Roman world (Ellicott 2000: 725).

The reason given in 4:3 then forms the thesis of a comment paragraph. The comment occurs in the following sentence of vv. 4-5. The comment, found in v. 4, is that the unbelievers are surprised that readers no longer participate in the social activities of the community as they once did as 4:1b states they once did. The verse reads more literally as *In which they think it strange (that) you are not running with them. You are not running with* (μη συντρέχόντων ὑμῶν) is a genitive absolute participial construction (rare in hortatory texts); its use makes this statement more marked. The relative clause in v. 5 further comments upon those who are surprised: they will have to give an account to God who judges the living and the dead.

Yet, not all would agree with this analysis that v. 4 is a comment on v. 3. Achtemeier (1996: 283) argues that the introductory prepositional phrase *in which* (ἐν ᾧ) of v. 4 is a causal construction; thus he would see this as a reason paragraph. Two other meanings for *in which* that have been suggested include result (Van Rensburg 1990: 287 n. 8) and inference glossed as *therefore* (Schreiner 2003: 203). However, Robertson (1933: 123) agrees with the analysis presented here when he takes the prepositional phrase as an anaphoric reference to the description of the forbidden behavior, glossing the phrase as *in which*. This is the simplest explanation of the phrase, and it makes sense of the semantic relationship between the two sentences. The mention of forbidden activities naturally leads to a comment on the reaction of the unbelieving community to this change in behavior.

Next, 4:4-5 is the thesis of another embedded comment paragraph. The comment occurs in 4:6, a verse that scholars have found to be extraordinarily difficult (see

Ellicott 2000: 731-740 for a survey of difficulties). Just what the passage refers to is unclear to many interpreters. The verse reads: *For this reason indeed the gospel was preached to the dead, (in order) that though they might be judged in the flesh according to men, they might live in the spirit according to God.* In order to explain the interpretation taken here, it is necessary to give a summary of the understanding of this verse upon which the semantic analysis presented here rests. The passage does not refer back to a descent of Christ into hell in 3:19 (the view of Biggs 1909: 170-172). Rather the verse is about the believers who have heard the Gospel and who are now dead. Evangelists preached the gospel to them so that (purpose) although they were harshly judged by unbelieving human standards while they were alive, they might live in their spiritual existence according to God's standards (cf. Ellicott 2000: 739-740; Schreiner 2003: 205-210). The phrase *into this* (εἰς τοῦτο) that opens v. 6 in this interpretation is taken as to refer cataphorically to the following *that* (ἵνα) clause (Achteimer 1996: 286-287). The dependent *that* clause in the second half of the verse gives the purpose of the first half (Schreiner 2003: 205-206).

Based on this understanding of v. 6, the analysis of the semantic relationship between vv. 4-5 and v. 6 suggests that v. 6 gives a comment upon the previous sentence; more specifically it is a comment on the relative clause in v. 5, that God judges the dead and living. As might be expected, not all see such a relationship. Achteimer (1996: 286) suggests that v. 6 is causal, giving the reason for v. 5. This interpretation suggests that the passage is saying that unbelievers shall have to give an account to God who judges, because the Gospel was preached to believers who are

now dead. The combination of the two predications in this case makes for an awkward explanation of the meaning here. In addition, such an interpretation assumes that *for* (γάρ) here must be indicating reason, but *for* can be analyzed as suggesting several other relationships (Bauer 1958: 151-152). Levinsohn (1992: 58-59; see Heckert 1996: 30-32), for example, says that *for* is often used to introduce a parenthetical comment that offers a significant explanation or exposition of a previous assertion. In this case, the significant comment is that although believers suffer wrongly, they will be vindicated, an idea that mirrors the experience of Christ in 3:18-22. Peter writes about God who *judges* (κρίναι) the *living* (ζῶντας) and the *dead* (νεκρούς). In v. 6 all three terms appear again as he comments on the fate of the believing dead.

Table 21 Display of 4:1-6

Reason ¶

THESIS: 4:1-2 Χριστοῦ οὖν παθόντος σαρκὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ὀπλίσασθε, ὅτι ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον.

Therefore Christ having suffered in the flesh, you also arm yourselves with the same way of thinking, because the one suffering in the flesh has ceased from sin so that he no longer lives his remaining time in the flesh in the lusts of men but in the will of God.

Reason: Comment ¶

THESIS: 4:3 ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις, οἰνοφλυγίαις, κόμοις, πότοις καὶ ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρίαις.

Table 22—Continued

For the time past is sufficient to have done the will of the gentiles walking in licentiousness, lusts, drunkenness, carousals, drinking bouts, and lawless idolatries.

• Comment: Comment ¶

• THESIS: 4:4-5 ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται μὴ συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τῆς ἀσωτίας ἀνάχυσιν βλασφημοῦντες, οἱ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ ἐτοιμῶς ἔχοντι κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

Wherein they are surprised because you are not running with them in the same of excess of dissipation blaspheming you, who will give an account to the one who is ready to judge the living and the dead.

Comment: 4:6 εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι.

For this reason indeed the good news was preached to the dead, that they might be judged indeed according to men in flesh, but might live according to God in spirit.

2.4.11 Be Sober-Minded: 4:7-11.

This paragraph bears a striking structural resemblance to the paragraph of 3:8-9. In 3:8-9 a series of adjectives and participles are used with imperatival force. Here imperative verbs are followed by participles, an adjective, a participle, and two clauses that have the command portion of the clause elided. The command forms and the shorter sentences in this paragraph suggest that the argument is coming to a climax and that this paragraph serves to close out this section. Furthermore, the presence of the doxology at the end of v. 11 and the fact that in the next paragraph v. 12 opens with the vocative *beloved* (ἀγαπητοί) (*beloved* opens 2:11 also), suggests that not only is this paragraph closing out the section of 3:13-4:11, but it also is

closing out the larger division of the letter on DOING GOOD, 2:11-4:11 (Achtermeier 1996: 276).

The paragraph opens with a short sentence, v. 7a: *the end of all is near*. Peter is picking up on the idea of the end that discussion of judgment implies in vv. 5-6 (Ellicott 2000: 744). The end will be a time of judgment. The end of the age is a stock New Testament concept that is often used as motivation for related exhortations (Achtermeier 1996: 294; cf. Rom. 13:11; Phil. 4:4-6). This sentence gives the circumstance that should motivate the readers to respond to the commands that follow (see Achtermeier 1996: 293). V. 7b counters with the conjunction *therefore* (οὖν) indicating that what follows is a logical implication of the previous statement (see Heckert 1996: 94-96). Thus, this paragraph consists of the less salient circumstance in v. 7a and of the thesis of vv. 7b-11 (see Longacre 1996: 111 for circumstance paragraphs).

The thesis is analyzed here as a coordinate paragraph, consisting of four coordinate theses. The first coordinate thesis is found in v. 7b. There the readers are exhorted to be sensible and self controlled so that they might pray. The two imperative verbs *be-sensible* (σωφρονήσατε) and *be-self-controlled* (νήψατε) are virtually synonymous. Many scholars think that the two imperatives most likely form a hendiadys: the two near synonyms rhetorically underline that the readers must be in complete control of themselves (Achtermeier 294; Archia and Nida 1980: 138). Michaels (1988: 245; see 1:13) understands the two imperatives to be programmatic; in other words, they command a process of maintaining mental alertness. The two

commands are given with a view toward a single purpose that is given in the prepositional phrase that follows the verbs: the readers are to be sensible and self-controlled *unto prayer* (εἰς προσευχάς) (Davids 1990: 156; Michaels 1988: 246). Since the two imperatives are so close in meaning and appear to function as a (compound) unit, these two verbs are presented in the display as one thesis. This thesis with its finite imperative verbs initiates what appears to be a series of commands, even though the grammatical constituents of all the following theses are not finite imperatives (see 3:8-12).

Coordinate thesis two is found in v. 8. Peter marks the prominence of this thesis with the opening introduction of the sentence: he says *before/above all* (πρὸ πάντων) they are to have (literally *having*, ἔχοντες) love for one another. The prepositional phrase *above all* indicates the importance of a new topic (Davids 1990: 157). In addition, the participial clause *having love for one another* continues the imperative mood of the previous imperatives in v. 7b (Michaels 1988: 246; cf. 2:11-12). As Schreiner notes (2003: 211-12), even for those who do not see the participle here as an imperative participle (Achte-meier 2000: 295), the participle still contextually functions as a command. The readers are commanded to constantly love one another. Further, motivation for love is given in a postposed dependent clause: they are to love *because love covers a multitude of sins*. While the meaning of this clause is debated (Achte-meier 1996: 296-296; Michaels 1988: 247), it is taken here to mean that if you love someone you will forgive that person (Ellicott 2000: 751-752). The clause

appears to be an allusion to Proverbs 10:11, where the idea is that of forgiving the offenses of others.

The third coordinate thesis consists of a short sentence that has no verb in its surface structure. It says *(be) hospitable* (φιλόξενοι) *to one another without grumbling*. Again, as in v. 8, no finite imperative occurs; in fact, no verbal of any sort occurs in this sentence. As the argument of the paragraph proceeds, verbal elements increasingly fail to appear in the surface structure; the result is such that here the verbal idea is found in the adjective *hospitable* which indicates what Peter desires the readers to do. Hospitality was valued in the culture at large, but the nature of the church at this time made hospitality a necessity if the church was to exist. Churches met in homes and traveling missionaries depended on the hospitality of other believers since dependable or good lodging did not exist (Arichea and Nida 140).

The third corrected edition (Aland et al. 1975) and the fourth edition (Aland et al. 1983) of the United Bible Societies' text have removed the full stop at the end of v. 9. The Nestle text upon which the UBS text is based in the most recent 27th edition (Nestle-Aland et al. 1993) continues to place a stop after v. 9. The full stop of the previous UBS editions and of the Nestle text has been maintained here, because the structure posited below suggests that a full stop is called for. V. 9 commands hospitality while vv. 10-11 deal with the command to minister or serve others.

The fourth coordinate thesis found in vv. 10-11 is more complicated. It is analyzed as a generic-specific paraphrase paragraph. V. 10 gives a more general command, and v. 11 gives two more commands that are more specific examples of the

command in v. 10. In v. 10 the readers are commanded to use their gifts of service received from God to minister to one another as good stewards of God's manifold grace. The participle *servicing* (διακονοῦντες) gives a general command to serve. The two sentences that follow, vv. 11a and 11b, give two commands that are more specific instantiations of the first. *Speak* (λαλέω) refers to the various speaking ministries such as preaching or teaching, and *serve* (διακονέω) refers to any of several ministries of service such as caring for the poor or leading (Arichea and Nida 1980: 142; Schreiner 2003: 215). In other words, the author has subdivided that general idea of ministry into two more specific categories of which even more specific examples could be given. Thus, vv. 11a and 11b form a coordinate paragraph that amplifies the command to serve found in v. 10. The actual parallel commands in these verses have the imperative constituent elided: v. 11, *if anyone speak, Ø as the oracles of God*, and *if anyone serve, Ø as from the strength which God provides*. A postposed clause gives the reason for such ministry: so that God might be glorified. Finally, a closing postposed clause gives a doxological comment on God: to him is the glory and power forever.

This analysis of this paraphrase paragraph is not without its problems. The semantic diagram would suggest that the more specific commands of vv. 11a and 11b are less salient because they are buried deeper in the structure. However, that does not seem to be the case. As mentioned before, this paragraph exhibits signs of being a climatic ending to the section. The commands appear to be cascading in a rapid-fire cadence, and no one of them appears to have been intended to be more salient. Thus,

another solution suggests itself: vv. 10, 11a, and 11b may be analyzed as three additional coordinate theses, giving a total of six. However, this difficulty in analysis suggests that this skewing between the surface and deep structure is occurring. As the paragraph progresses, more elements of the surface structure fall out: v. 7b has finite imperatives; in v. 8 a participle picks up the imperative mood; in v. 9, no verbal is found, but an adjective communicates the command in the surface structure; in v. 10, again as in v. 8, a participle gives the command; in v. 11 indicative verbs occur in the preposed conditional clauses (if clauses), but the corresponding command that follows each condition has the underlying command deleted in the surface structure, and instead an adjunct of the underlying verb appears in the form of a prepositional phrase to indicate the desired action; and additionally to make the structure even more complex, v. 10 semantically is in a generic specific relationship with v. 11a and 11b., but the surface structure of the sentences signals coordination, not subordination. All of this appears to indicate this paragraph is an area in the text where the normal underlying semantic structure and the surface structure may be out of phase, indicating some sort of climax in the argument. And that is what is to be expected, considering the paragraph's position in the division in which it occurs. This paragraph closes out the body middle; Peter ends this larger portion of the text, whose theme is DOING GOOD, with a flourish. He closes by commanding his readers to do good in specific ways within the believing community.

Table 22 Display of 4:7-11

Circumstance ¶

Circumstance: 4:7a Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν.

Now the end of all things has drawn near.

THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: 4:7b σωφρονήσατε ὄν καὶ νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς:

Therefore, be sober-minded and be self-controlled in prayers.

THESIS 2: 4:8 πρὸ πάντων τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες, ὅτι ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.

Before all things have fervent love among yourselves, because love covers a multitude of sins.

THESIS 3: 4:9 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ.

Be hospitable to one another without murmuring.

THESIS 4: Generic-Specific Paraphrase ¶

GENERIC-THESIS: 4:10 ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ.

Each one accordingly as he received a gift to each other ministering it as good stewards of manifold grace of God.

SPECIFIC-THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: 4:11a εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια θεοῦ:

If anyone speaks, let him speak as it were the oracles of God.

THESIS 2: 4:11b εἴ τις διακονεῖ, ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν πᾶσιν δοξάζεται ὁ θεὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἔστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων, ἀμήν.

Table 22—*Continued*

If anyone ministers as by strength which God supplies, that in all God might be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom is the glory and the power to the ages of the ages, amen.

2.5 Body-Close: 4:12-5:11

The final division of the letter's body is composed of three sections. The first section, 4:12-19, addresses the necessity for these Christians to persist in doing good even though God wills that they suffer for it. Peter here makes it clear that suffering is to be expected. The following section, 5:1-5, consists of an inference that is based upon the thematic statement of the previous section; there in v. 19 the readers are commanded to commit themselves to God in DOING GOOD. That more general command leads the author to make an inference from it that applies to relationships within the believing community. More specifically Peter exhorts both leaders and followers to act with humility: leaders are to lead with humility and followers are to be humble so they might follow. The final section, 5:6-11, gives the implication of the scriptural quote of Proverbs 3:34. If God gives grace to the humble, then they must submit themselves to God who will empower them and resist their supernatural enemy, the devil. This section addresses the real source of the persecution. Unbelieving neighbors are not the real enemy, the devil is.

2.5.1 Commit Yourself to God in Suffering: 4:12-19.

4:12-19. This opening paragraph of the final concluding division of the body of the letter opens with the vocative noun *beloved* (*ἀγαπητοί*) at the beginning of the sentence of vv. 12-13. Coming after the closing doxology of the previous section that

closes the body middle, the vocative signals a new major section as it did in 2:11 (Davids 1990: 164; Michaels 1988: 257). Once again Peter addresses a major theme of the letter, the necessity for the readers to continue to do the good even if they suffer (see 2:18-19; 3:14-17; 4:1). But this time the discussion is more extensive than in any of the previous sections. The passage contains six finite imperative verbs (yet no imperative participles), so it is distinctly hortatory. The paragraph is analyzed as an inference paragraph with the thesis postponed until the final sentence of the paragraph. This is the first major paragraph in the text structured in this way. This novel structure combined with the appearance of six finite imperatives within a span of eight verses (and eight sentences as well) and an Old Testament quote indicate that Peter is reaching a climax of some sort in his argument. Indeed, this is the most specific and extensive span of text dealing with innocent suffering (cf. Achtemeier 1996: 307). This paragraph explicitly lets the readers know that suffering for being a follower of Christ is normal and to be expected.

Vv. 12-13 is the thesis of a reason paragraph. This sentence contains two commands; and as he has done elsewhere, Peter pairs commands, giving the negative one first, followed by the positive command (see 3:14-15; 2:11 which is semantically negative followed by the positive in 2:12). First the readers are told not to be surprised or to think it strange (μη̄ ξενίζεσθε) that they suffer. Peter is picking up on the reaction of the nonbelievers or Gentiles in 4:4 who are surprised (ξενίζονται) that these believers no longer participate with the Gentiles in activities they used to do with them. Though their nonbelieving neighbors may be surprised at their behavior,

here Peter tells believers that they ought not be surprised by their neighbors'. The positive imperative (v. 13) tells the readers that instead (ἀλλά) they should rejoice (χαίρετε) when they share in Christ's sufferings. The postposed *that* (ἵνα) clause gives the purpose of such rejoicing: in order that they may have even greater joy when Christ gloriously appears again (see 1:7). It appears that the positive command is more salient than the negative one since the immediately following sentence relates to the positive imperative *you-rejoice*.

The following sentence, v. 14, gives the reason for the command to rejoice. The preposed *if* clause gives the circumstance in which these believers are blessed. The *if* clause is a condition of the first class (Robertson 1933: 127), and thus it affirms the reality of the situation: suffering is assumed as normal. When the readers are insulted (εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε), the readers are blessed. The nuclear clause is reduced to one word, the adjective *blessed* (μακάριοι). Peter informs his readers that having to bear insults because they follow Christ is in actuality a blessing. This reason or explanation is given in the postposed *because* (ὅτι) clause: they are blessed because *the glory and spirit of God* (τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα) rests on them (*rests on you* (pl.) is a metaphor for constant presence; see Arichea and Nida 1980: 149). The two genitive phrases *the of glory* and *the of God* both have *spirit* as their head. The phrase *of glory* contrasts with the insults in the opening *if* clause of the sentence. They have received the spirit, that which is glorious; such glory (or honor) outweighs the insults of their persecutors (Davids 1990: 167-168). Moreover, this spirit is God's own spirit, the divine spirit (Ellicott 2000: 782-783). In short, the fact that they are persecuted

indicates that God's spirit abides with them (Achteemeier 1996: 309). A variant reading lends justification to this interpretation. Byzantine manuscripts (cf. UBS text) add at the end of the sentence an appositional statement to *spirit* whose meaning might be glossed thusly: *the spirit which they who persecute you slander, but which you glorify*. In other words, the abuse these Christian receive is really an abuse of the spirit and is due to the fact of the spirit's presence among or in believers (Davids 1990: 167-168; Michaels 1988: 265-266), and thus they are blessed.

While giving the reason why believers should rejoice in v. 13, at the same time the statement that Christians are blessed when they suffer then becomes the thesis of an embedded warning that follows in v. 15; and thus a warning paragraph is formed. The warning in v. 15 is *let not any of you suffer* (μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω) *as a murder or a thief or a evildoer, or as a meddler*. Michaels (1988: 266) observes that the connector *for* (γάρ) that introduces this verse is usually used to give an explanation of the preceding; he thinks that the appearance of the imperative in such a clause is unusual. Yet, the verse does relate back to v. 14 in that it gives a qualification (and a reminder) as to what type of suffering brings blessing (Davids 1990: 168). This qualification has appeared before in the text (3:14, 17). However, Michaels' observation is valid: the appearance of an imperative verb in this embedded paragraph shows that the imperative can be used for supporting material that is not online in the local argument. This skewing of deeper semantic salience and surface structure may be one of several indications of the climatic nature of this paragraph.

Table 23 Display of 4:12-15

Inference ¶

Evidence: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: Reason ¶

THESIS: 4:12-13 Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένη ὡς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίοντος, ἀλλὰ καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι.

Beloved be not surprised at fiery trial among you coming as a test to you as though it was a strange thing happening to you, but insofar as you share in the sufferings of Christ rejoice, so that also at the revelation of his glory you may rejoice exulting.

Reason: Warning ¶

THESIS: 4:14 εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται.

If you are reproached in name of Christ, you are blessed because the of glory and the spirit of God rests upon you.

Warning: 4:15 μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτῃς ἢ κακοποιὸς ἢ ὡς ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος:

For let not anyone of you suffer as a murder or as a thief or as an evildoer or as a meddler.

Schreiner (2003: 218) seems to suggest that v. 15 is more closely related to v. 16 than it is v. 14. Possibly he is reflecting Michaels' astonishment that an imperative could appear in an explanatory sentence. Two features of the text suggest that Schreiner's interpretation is hardly likely. First, the connector δέ, translated often as *but* or *and*, introduces the sentence of v. 16. While one can see a contrast between suffering as a wrong doer and suffering as a Christian and thus translate the

conjunction as *but* (δέ) primarily is used to mark development, and it may specifically mark development to more relevant material (Levinson 2000: 112; see Buth 1992: 152). Friberg and Friberg (1981: 835-837) in their discussion of the conjunction also observe that *but* can indicate a move from less salient material to the more salient; they refer to it as superordination of the following clause. Thus, the use of *but/and* here would be consistent with a return to mainline after a digression from the main flow of the argument. Second, the paragraph demonstrates Peter's common preference for presenting a negative command with a positive command in a sentence. In vv. 12-13 appears *be not surprised* and *rejoice* while in v. 16 *let him not be ashamed* is followed by *let him glorify*. Thus, bipolar commands occur in the two sentences that comprise these verses. The contrast is found in the predicates and not in an adjunct as that of vv. 15-16. This suggests that the predications of v. 15 and v. 16 are not as tightly connected as in vv. 12-13 and v. 16. Thus, v. 15 is not analyzed as a constituent of v. 16.

Therefore, v. 16 returns to the command mainline, and is seen to constitute a second thesis, parallel to the thesis of vv. 12-13. The readers are commanded to not be ashamed of being abused because they are identified as Christians, but rather they are to glorify God because of such abuse. This thesis forms the head of a reason paragraph, the reason following in v. 17a. The reason for glorifying God is that God has begun judging the world; he has begun the process with his own people.

Further embedded within this paragraph is a comment paragraph. The reason in the reason paragraph above, v. 17a, becomes the thesis of a comment paragraph. The

comment in v. 17b picks up on the word *judgment* in v. 17a and makes an observation about the nature of judgment. The rhetorical question is asked that if judgment begins with God's people what will happen to those who disobey God? The implication is that it will be worse. This comment receives confirmation in v. 18 by the citation of an Old Testament passage, Proverbs 11:31. Thus, the rhetorical question of v. 17b forms the thesis of an embedded attestation paragraph. The attestation might be translated as *if it is hard for the righteous to be saved, what will happen to sinners?* Thus ends the embedding in paragraph found in vv. 16-18.

Table 24 Display of 4:16-18

THESIS 2: Reason ¶

THESIS: 4:16 εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός, μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ.

But if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name.

Reason: Comment ¶

THESIS: 4:17a ὅτι [ὁ] καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ:

Because the time has come to begin the judgment from the house of God.

Comment: Attestation ¶

THESIS 1: 4:17b εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν, τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ;

And if first from us, what is the end of the ones disobeying the gospel of God?

Attestation: 4:18 καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβῆς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται;

Table 24—Continued

And if the righteous is scarcely saved, what will become of the ungodly and the sinner?

Therefore (ὥστε) connects v. 19 with the rest of the text. *Therefore* is used to indicate that this sentence gives an inference or conclusion that may be drawn from the previous argument (Achtemieier 1996: 317; Davids 1990: 173; see Bauer 1958: 899-900 on the use of ὥστε). Arichea and Nida (1980: 153) gloss the sentence thusly: *so then, those who suffer because it is God's will for them, should by their good action trust themselves completely to their Creator, who always keeps his promise.* The concluding sentence does not relate back to just the immediately preceding sentence but to the theme of suffering that runs throughout the paragraph (Schreiner 2003: 229). Suffering is the topic of vv. 12-16; it is the topic of both theses, vv. 12-13 and v. 16. The author concludes with the foundational idea that the readers must trust God and continue to DO GOOD, the unifying theme of 2:11-4:11.

Table 25 Display of 4:19

THESIS: 4:19 ὥστε καὶ οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ πιστῶ κτίστη παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγαθοποιίᾳ.

Therefore indeed let the ones suffering according to the will of God commit their souls in doing good to a trustworthy creator.

2.5.2 Leaders and Followers Act in Humility: 5:1-5.

The conjunction *therefore* (οὖν) indicates the start of a new paragraph (cf. 2:1; 4:1). The function of *therefore* is not immediately apparent; in fact many translations omit the conjunction because of that (see KJV; NIV). *Therefore* may indicate that what follows is a conclusion of the preceding (Louw and Nida 1988: 783-784). Both

(1992: 157) analyzes the conjunction as a marker of significant change in the discourse but still indicating close connection to what has preceded. Heckert (1996: 94-96) argues that the basic meaning of *therefore* is that of inference. Thus it appears that some inference is being signaled.

Commentators on the letter have suggested various inferences that would show the connection of this paragraph to the previous. The statement in 4:17 where Peter says that judgment begins with God's house is taken as a possible allusion to Ezekiel 9:6 where the punishment of Judah began with the execution of the elders in the temple. It is suggested that the thought of what happened to the elders in Ezekiel prompts Peter's mind and leads him into a discussion of the elders (Michaels 1988: 277-279). Davids' (1990: 174-175; see Achtemeier 1996: 322; Schreiner 2003: 231) view is that the topic of suffering naturally leads to a discussion of the respective roles of elders and younger members because suffering puts pressure on the church in such a way that unity within the church could be threatened. Yet, most likely the connection is the final command of the previous paragraph, v. 4:19. There the readers are commanded to commit themselves to God their creator by *doing-good* (ἀγαθοποιῆσθε). DOING GOOD has been thematic since 2:11-12. Behavior that is commanded in a generic way for all believers is now taken up by considering more specific commands for two specific groups of members in the believing community (Ellicott 2000: 813; Beare 1970: 197). Thus *therefore* indicates that what follows is an inference or application of the command to believers to DO GOOD.

The different understandings of how this portion of the text relates to the previous paragraph have led scholars to posit different themes for 5:1-5. The following are some of the suggested summary headings for this paragraph: “Appeal to Elders” (Michaels 1988: 276), “The Inner-Church Response to Suffering” (Davids 1990: 174), “Exhortations for Elders and Younger Ones” (Schreiner 2003: 230), and “Maintaining Unity of the Community” (Ellicott 2000: 809). In fact, Ellicott (2000: 809; 845-846; cf. Campbell 1995: 219-221) excludes 5:b (*All of you, clothe yourselves with humility toward one another.*) from this paragraph, seeing it as part of the next paragraph because the command is addressed to all the readers rather than the two groups in 5:1-5a. However, present analysis suggests that 5:b is the key command for understanding the theme of this passage. The argument and display below will demonstrate that this is the generic command of which all of the specific commands in 5:2-5a are more specific instantiations. The DOING GOOD at the end of 4:19 now manifests itself in humility, a humility necessary for both leadership and those who follow.

The paragraph is analyzed as a specific-generic paragraph. Vv. 1-5a comprise the specific thesis and 5b the generic. The specific thesis contains the finite imperative verb *shepherd* (ποιμάνετε) in v. 2 that is followed by the participle *overseeing* (ἐπισκοποῦντες) which continues the imperative mood of the finite verb. The participle is followed by three couplets that apply more specifically to conduct to avoid followed by conduct to embrace. The shorter generic thesis in v. 5b has the finite imperative verb *clothe-yourself* (ἐγκομβώσασθε); the readers are to put on

humility. The presence of these imperatives structures in both theses suggests that both are on the mainline in the argument. Thus, the labels of generic thesis and specific thesis are given to reflect this, although it may be claimed that v. 5b is more salient in the argument since it is thematic for the entire paragraph.

The specific-thesis, vv. 1-5a, is composed a coordinate paragraph. The first coordinate thesis is found in vv. 1-4 where Peter exhorts the elders. The second coordinate thesis addresses younger men.

The first sentence in the paragraph, v. 1, is analyzed as an introduction to an introduction paragraph. Peter tells the elders that he is going to exhort them. *I-exhort* (παρακαλῶ) is the same performative verb found in 2:11, but there it was followed by an infinitive that gave the content of the exhortation: *I-exhort [you] . . . to abstain*, (παρακαλῶ . . . ἀπέχεσθαι). *I-exhort* plus the infinitive functions as an imperative, giving a command, but in this sentence in 5:1 no complement to the verb occurs. Thus, this sentence does not directly command the readers, but instead it prepares the readers for the commands that are to follow. In addition, in preparation for the commands to follow, Peter identifies himself to his audience by calling himself a *fellow-elder* and as one who also will share in the coming glory of Christ's return. And he further reminds the readers of his authority (see 1:1) as one who saw Christ suffer (some see the proposition here as a reference to the fact that he witnesses to Christ's suffering as the elders do; see Davids 1990: 176-177). Finally, he reminds them that he, like them, has a share in the glory that will be theirs when Christ returns. This opening sentence thus not only affirms Peter's authority, it also creates a

sense of empathy or identity with the readers and thereby softens the commands to follow by making them less bald.

The more salient thesis of the introduction paragraph contains a reason paragraph whose thesis is found in vv. 2-3. The elders are told to *shepherd*, ποιμάνατε, or to take care of those whom they are responsible for. The participle *overseeing*, ἐπισκοποῦντες, further specifies the command. Elders are commanded to oversee their charges in three ways: not because they have to but willingly, not greedily but eagerly, nor lording it over them but becoming an example to those that follow. The reason is given in v. 4. When Christ the chief shepherd returns, the elders will be rewarded with *the unfading crown of glory* (τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον). They will receive enduring honor from their lord. Thus ends the first thesis of the coordinate paragraph found in vv. 1-5a.

The second thesis, v. 5a, next addresses commands to the younger men, those who are not elders or leaders in the believing community. The sentence is introduced by the adverb *likewise* (ὁμοίως) (see 3:1, 7). As in 3:7 where the husbands were given a different command (to treat wives with respect) than were the wives (to submit to their husbands), so also here the adverb suggests appropriate reciprocal action of those who are not leaders. They are told to *submit* (ὑποτάγητε). And as in 3:7 the specific action that is commanded here can be found to be grounded in a more general command, the command that follows in v. 5b.

In this analysis v. 5b forms the generic thesis of this paragraph. The commanded actions of both the elders and the young men are more specific applications of this

command. All are commanded to *put on humility* (τὴν απεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε). The second half of the sentence rhetorically underlines the command by giving scriptural grounding for it from Proverbs 3:34: *because God opposes the proud, but to the humble he gives grace*. Thus the organizing theme of the paragraph is humility. Leaders are to be humble so as to not abuse or take advantage of those that they lead; followers are to be humble so they can submit to another's leadership.

Table 26 Display of 5:1-5

Generic-Specific ¶

SPECIFIC-THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: Introduction or Summary ¶

Introduction: 5:1 Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων, ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός:

Elders therefore I exhort, who am the co-elder and witness of Christ's sufferings, and a partaker also of the glory about to be revealed.

THESIS: Reason ¶

Thesis: 5:2-3 ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπισκοποῦντες] μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως κατὰ θεόν, μὴδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως, μὴδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου:

Shepherd the flock of God among you, exercising oversight not unwillingly but willingly according to God, not greedy for profit, but eagerly, nor as lording it over those entrusted to your care, but becoming examples for the flock.

Reason: 5:4 καὶ φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος κομειῖσθε τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον.

Table 26—Continued

And when the chief shepherd appears, you will receive the unfading crown of glory.

THESIS 2: 5:5a Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις:

Likewise, younger men, be submissive to elders.

Generic Thesis: 5:5b πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε, ὅτι [Ο] θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.

And all gird yourselves with humility to one another, because God opposes proud men, but he gives grace to humble men.

2.5.3 Rely on God and Be Ready: 5:6-11.

5:6-11 is analyzed as a coordinate paragraph. The first coordinate thesis of the paragraph is in vv. 6-7 in which Peter commands his audience to be humble before God and to cast their cares on him. In the second coordinate thesis, commands in vv. 8-9 are given pertaining to how the believers are to deal with their supernatural enemy, the devil. The second thesis statement itself is composed of two coordinate theses found in v. 8 and v. 9. The second of these theses, v. 9, is comprised of a contrast paragraph (vv. 9-10) and the contrast in v. 10 is commented on in v. 11.

As in 5:1 the sentence of vv. 6-7 opens with the inferential conjunction *therefore* (οὖν). The appearance of this conjunction coupled with the fact that v. 5 ended with a quote suggests that v. 6 begins a new paragraph. The previous quote from Proverbs 3:34 says that God opposes the proud but he gives grace to the *humble* (ταπεινοῖς). If that is so, then the command in v. 6 gives the logical inference. If God is gracious to the humble, the readers ought to humble themselves to a powerful God in order that

God may exalt them in time. The postposed participial clause *casting* (ἐπιρίψαντες) *all your cares upon him* continues the imperatival force stating that the believers should cast their cares upon God because he cares about them. Those cares would include the sufferings that they were experiencing that were the focus of the first paragraph of this section (see 4:12-16,19).

The mention of the cares of these Christians leads to a set of commands concerning the supernatural source of their cares, the devil. Two commands are given in v. 8a; with no connector to suggest any relationship to the previous sentence, the appearance of these commands indicates the start of a new unit and a change of subject (see Buth 1992: 157 on asyndeton). The focus is now on believers' response to their supernatural enemy.

That response is analyzed as consisting of coordinate commands found in vv. 8 and 9. V. 8a give the thesis statement of a reason paragraph. The readers are commanded *be-sober* (νήψατε) and *watch* (γρηγορήσατε). The two commands are virtually synonymous (Campbell 1995: 222), commanding the readers to be prepared; Davids (1990: 189) glosses them as *pay attention*. The reason follows in v. 8b. Again no connector occurs to indicate the relationship, but contextually the relationship is that of reason. The ancient church understood the relationship between these two sentences to be one of reason, as can be seen in the fact that a textual variant exists in which a reason connector *because* (ὅτι) is added (Ellicott 2000: 853; see Nestle-Aland 1993). The reason why these believers should pay attention is that their opponent the devil is seeking to destroy their faith. A metaphor is used to indicate the

power and rapacity of their enemy: *the devil roaring lion walking about seeking someone to devour.*

Table 27 Display of 5:5-8

THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: 5:6-7 Ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ, πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν.

Be humbled therefore under the mighty hand of God, so that he may exalt you in time, casting all your cares cast upon him, because he cares concerning you.

THESIS 2: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: Reason ¶

THESIS: 5:8a Νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε.

Be sober, watch.

Reason: 5:8b ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος περιπατεῖ ζητῶν [τινα] καταπιεῖν:

Your adversary the devil as a lion roaring walks around seeking someone to devour.

The coordinate thesis in v. 9 gives its command by means of the finite imperative to *resist* (ἀντίστητε). Believers are to resist the devil with a faith that is firm. The perfect participle *having-known* (εἰδότες) is causal, giving a reason for resistance (Achtemeier 1996: 342; perfect participles do not continue imperatival mood). They are to resist because they are aware that other Christians are suffering a similar fate elsewhere. In other words, their experience is not unique.

It is possible to see v. 9 as a comment on v. 8b. The pronoun *whom* (ὃν) at the beginning of the verse anaphorically refers back to *devil* in v. 8b. Thus, it might be

argued that v. 9 is making a further comment on v. 8b. However, since v. 9 continues with the finite aorist imperative (the same pattern that was found in 8a), the sentence is analyzed as continuing the command mainline of this paragraph. Not only are the readers to be ready, they are to resist.

Next in v. 9, this need to be in a constant state of resistance because of continual suffering forms the thesis statement of a contrast paragraph. The contrast occurs in v. 10. As Ellicott (2000: 864) points out, v. 10 provides the positive complement to vv. 8-9. V. 10 gives a promise that contrasts with the present condition of the readers in v. 9. Although believers must be in a constant state of vigilance, a state that might wear them down, they are given assurance that they can endure. The very God who chose them and has destined them for eternal glory will restore and establish them. Arichea and Nida (1980: 170-171; cf. Achtemeier 1996: 346) understand the four future tense verbs, *he-will-restore*, *he-will-confirm*, *he-will-strengthen*, and *he-will-establish* to be a promise that is to be fulfilled in their final day of vindication when Christ returns. Others understand (Schreiner 2003: 245; Davids 1990: 195-196; Marshall 1991: 172) this to apply to the believers in their condition of suffering. In other words Peter promises that God will sustain the readers even though they suffer and in the midst of such suffering. Such a reading fits with the context since the constant resistance commanded in v. 9 would raise questions for the readers concerning their ability to endure.

While vv. 10-11 are here analyzed as an embedded comment paragraph, it may be noted that the paragraph could also be analyzed as a terminus paragraph. The

consensus is that this paragraph concludes not only the paragraph and section, but also the entire letter (Davids 1990: 194; Schreiner 2003: 244). Ellicott (2000: 863-864) notes that though the paragraph does contain themes found through the letter, it also contextually fits the argument of the immediate paragraph. Such an observation is not necessarily a problem. A constituent may at times serve multiple functions (see the wave theory of Pike 1982: 24-29).

Table 28 Display 5:6-11

THESIS 2: Contrast ¶

THESIS: 5:9 ᾧ ἀντίσταντε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῇ ἐν [τῷ] κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.

Whom oppose firm in the faith knowing that the same sufferings is laid upon your brotherhood in the world.

Contrast: Comment ¶

THESIS: 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.

Now the God of all grace, the one having called you to the eternal of him glory in Christ Jesus, a little while [after] having suffered he himself will restore, will establish, will strengthen, will ground you.

Comment: 5:11 αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

To him the might to the ages, amen.

2.6 Formulaic Close: 5:12-14.

The typical Greek letter ended with five elements: (1) an oath, (2) a wish for the health of the recipients, (3) a statement of purpose, (4) a mention of the letter carrier, and (5) a brief closing word (Davids 1990: 197; Achtemeier 1996: 348-349; Ellicott

2000: 870). Peter generally follows this template; he states the letter's purpose and he mentions the courier. Instead of wishing for the recipient's health, he extends a blessing of peace. No oath appears, but a greeting from the church in Rome is given along with the command that the readers greet and treat one another as brothers. The greeting, as Davids (1990: 97) observes, most likely reflect the oriental and New Testament valuing of community solidarity (cf. 1 Cor. 13:12). Thus, vv. 12-14 form the terminus of the letter.

The close is composed of two coordinate theses found respectively in 5: 12 and 5: 13-14. The first thesis in v. 12 commends the courier of the letter, Silvanus, to the recipients. As suggested above letters of this period typically gave some sort of commendation to the one who delivered the letter. The phrase *to write through someone* (γράφειν διὰ τινός) appears to be an idiom used to refer to the courier of a letter. Examples of this use are found in papyri (Ellicott 2000: 872; cf. Schreiner 2003: 248). An alternate reading favored by many scholars (Davids 1990: 198; Kelly 1969: 215) understands the construction to refer to Sylvanus' activity as a secretary in helping Peter to compose the letter. Although they can cite an example of instances where *write* plus the preposition indicates the secretary, the customary usage is understood here. In addition to commending the letter carrier, this sentence also commands the readers to commit themselves to the genuine kindness of God that he has written to them about (Arichea and Nida 1980: 173-174).

The second coordinate thesis is itself composed of three coordinate theses. These theses are grouped together because they thematically concern closing greetings. The

first thesis in v. 13 consists of a greeting from the church in Rome, and the second in v. 14a gives a command to the readers to greet one another in a way that shows their love for one another. Finally, v. 14b gives the final coordinate thesis: a blessing of peace.

Table 29 Display of 5:12-14

Close.

Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: 5:12 Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογίζομαι, δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στήτε.

Through Silvanus, your faithful brother, as I reckon, briefly I wrote encouraging and testifying this to be true grace of God, in which take your stand.

THESIS 2: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: 5:13 Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου.

She in Babylon, chosen along with you, greets you and Mark my son greets you.

THESIS 2: 5:14a ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης.

Greet one another with a kiss of love.

THESIS 3: 5:14b εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.

Peace to you all the ones in Christ.

2.7 Summary of the Letter

The constituent analysis of 1 Peter demonstrates the structural integrity of the letter. The first division of the letter has an opening persuasive section that provides

the motivation for the following hortatory section. In that first section Peter commands the readers to hope in grace that Christ provides, to be holy, to love one another, and to desire the word of God. The embedded comment starting in 2:4 and continuing to 2:10 lays out a final motivation for the command in 2:2: the readers have been specially chosen by God to be his people. The problem of suffering is mentioned only briefly and is embedded in supportive material.

The second division of the letter highlights the need to DO GOOD. In the first section, Peter addresses slaves and wives whose duty and accompanying difficulties appear to be paradigmatic for the church at large. The next section considers the possibility of suffering and commands believers to not fear, but rather to follow the model of Christ. Suffering is addressed more directly, but suffering is still not presented as a certainty.

In the last division, Peter reveals the certainty of suffering. It ought not surprise his readers. In light of this he gives instructions for how these believers are to treat one another, and finally he reminds them that they have a supernatural enemy. DOING GOOD in the midst of suffering demands their utmost effort.

CHAPTER 3

IMPERATIVAL USE OF THE PARTICIPLE

3.1 Introduction

Whether or not an independent participle can stand in place of a finite imperative verb is an issue that has been debated for over a century in the New Testament Greek scholarly community. Two basic theories of origin have been suggested in support of the existence of a truly imperatival participle. Many, following the work of J. H. Moulton (1908: 180-183; 223-225), state that the use of the independent participle as an imperative is a development of Hellenistic Greek. These scholars agree with and repeat Moulton's assessment that in the papyri examples can be found of the participle functioning as an imperative independently of any imperative verb (cf. for example, Blass et al. 1961: 468; Robertson 1934: 944-946; Turner 1963: 343; Zerwick 1963: 129-130). Thus, the papyri are taken to provide external evidence for a phenomenon that was formerly thought to occur, if indeed it did, only in the New Testament. Moulton's analysis of the papyri suggests that the use of the participle as a finite imperative verb was part of the vernacular in the New Testament world. Daube (1946: 470) challenges Moulton's theory about the imperatival participial being a Hellenistic development, suggesting instead that it is due to the influence of Tannaitic Hebrew. Their differences, however, concern only their theories of the history of the

development of this particular use for the participle. Neither questions the validity of the category itself.

Fanning (1990: 386-388), who accepts Daube's assessment that Hebrew must be the source for the development of the independent imperatival use of the participle, suggests that the evolution resulting in the imperative participle involved three steps. First, the participle occurred as an adverbial adjunct to an imperative verb; it took on the modal force of the main verb, and thus bore the imperative mood as a dependent verb. He gives the following example: *going* (πορευθέντες) *then make* (μαθητεύσατε) *disciples among all the nations* (Matt. 28:19). Fanning interprets the participle *going* here as an imperative, receiving its modal force from the imperative *make*. This fits with the generally accepted idea of how participles function. That is, in this case, for a participle to have imperative force it must be related to a finite imperative (Robertson 1934: 133-134; Blass et al. 1961: 215; Martin 1992: 205; Wallace 1996: 622-623). The second step, Fanning conjectures, involves a move toward more independence on the part of the participle. Here he suggests the participle became adverbially dependent upon a verb that has a command form, but the agreement with the verb was 'lax', as he calls it. By 'lax agreement' he means that the form of the participle is not in full grammatical concord with the subject of its head verb. In other words, grammatical agreement between the participle and its head verb became reduced, but not absent. Primarily, he is referring to cases where the participle appears in a case that is the nominative form, even though no such form appears in the main clause. He gives 1 Peter 2:11-12 as an example: (v. 11) *Beloved, I exhort (you) as aliens and*

sojourners to abstain from fleshly desires which war against your souls . . . (v. 12) *have* (ἔχοντες) *good conduct among the gentiles*. Fanning's argument is that the nominative participle *having* should relate back to an imperative-like verb. That verb should have a nominative subject because grammatically the nominative participle should agree with the subject of the verb it refers back to, but *beloved* in the first clause is vocative rather than nominative, and the all the other nouns in v. 11 are either accusative or genitive. Thus, the participle *having* relates back to the infinitive *to-abstain* in a looser grammatical fashion than the supposed first stage of development where the participle was in complete grammatical concord with its head verb. Hence, the grammatical relationship to its head or governing verb has been weakened, setting up the final stage of development. In the end, the fully independent participle occurs: a participle that has the mood of the imperative verb without any finite verb as its head. The loosening has become as loose as it can. The examples of this type of participles he gives are 1 Peter 2:18, 3:1, 7, 9, and 4:10. The participles starting with 2:18 and ending with 3:9 are considered to be paradigmatic or classical examples of the independent participle.

Fanning's theory of a three-step gradual evolution of the participle to the point where it began to encroach upon the imperative verb seeks to give a linguistic rationale for the existence of the problematic imperatival participles. His theory is not unique (see Blass et al. 1961: 245), and supporters of either Daube's or Moulton's theory could subscribe to it. Such a process that he describes is not beyond possibility, but the theory does have its problems. The examples of each of the

proposed steps in the process are found in the New Testament, even in precisely the same text—in particular, in 1 Peter. He has, therefore, no diachronic Greek evidence for his theory. Those who reject the idea of an imperatival participle can argue that Fanning's example in 1 Peter 2:11-12 reflects a normal and acceptable variation in the function of the participle. Yet, this criticism may be unfair, since he is not really trying to prove the existence of the imperatival participle, but rather to give a theory of how it came about. He has already assumed that the participle can function in this way based upon Daube's argument that Tannaitic Hebrew used the participle for commands.

Yet, Daube's theory is not without its critics. Fink (1967: 38), on the one hand, commends Daube's critical analysis of Moulton's (1908: 180-183) theory that the participle was used independently as an imperative in the Greek papyri. Moulton bases his position on six examples that he cites and explains in his text. Daube (1946: 468-470) comments that the reading or translation that Moulton takes for four of his examples is suspect, reducing Moulton's six examples to only two. Of the two, one has so many grammatical errors throughout it so as to make it of little value in ascertaining grammaticality. That leaves only one example, which Daube disputes because the example of the supposed imperatival participle (like all six of Moulton's examples) occurs in the close of a letter, a place where expressions might become compressed for various reasons (including carelessness). Thus far, Fink agrees, but when Daube proposes his own theory of Hebraic influence, Fink argues that Daube's theory does not establish itself any better than Moulton's did. First he argues (1967:

38-39) that Tannaitic Hebrew was not written down until the close of the New Testament period, so Peter would not have had access to it as written literature. Though this argument is vitiated due to the fact that oral language can influence the written language (and possibility vitiated even more for those who accept pseudonymous authorship and a late date for the text), it does indicate the uncertainty of the theory. Second, Fink (1967: 39) notes Daube's (1946: 485) own admission that the Hebrew codes that are proposed to underlie the participial injunctions in 1 Peter cannot in reality be found. Third, Fink (1967: 39-40) further notes that Daube himself (1946: 484, 487) admits to the tentative nature of his theory.

In conclusion, the extra-biblical evidence for the imperatival participle is, by itself, inconclusive. All of the theories above assume the existence of this particular use of the participle, and they are attempts to explain a group of participles that appear not to be functioning syntactically in an expected way, particularly as participles that do not seem to have a local imperative verb to supply the imperative mood. Yet, none of the theories thus far have settled the issue, as many scholars can be found who support either side of the basic issue. That fundamental question that refuses to be settled concerns the manner in which these imperatival participles function: are they really independent, or must they be related to an imperative verb? A closer examination of the primary data is needed. Some of that primary data is found in 1 Peter; 2:18-3:9 is considered to be a locus classicus for the much-debated imperatival participle. No one has, up to now, done a discourse or constituent analysis that examines just how 2:11-3:12 is structured at the sentence level and

above. The analysis below demonstrates that if one closely examines the structure of the text, these participles can be shown to function as normal participles are expected to.

3.2 Structure and Participles in 2:11-3:12

The section of 2:11-3:12 is analyzed in chapter three as a generic-specific paragraph. A brief summary is presented here. The reader is referred to chapter three for more details.

The opening paragraph of 2:11-12 is a negated antonym paragraph. The first sentence tells the readers what not to do: *Beloved, I-exhort (you) . . . to-abstain from fleshly lusts*. The performative verb *I-exhort* in conjunction with the infinitive *to abstain* is the equivalent of an finite imperative, giving a general prohibition to the readers. It initiates the return to the imperative mood after a long series of motivational or persuasive paragraphs in 2:6-10 where Peter is persuading his readers that God values them as a very special people who have been set apart to himself. Since they are such a people, they ought not to do certain things.

The next sentence gives the opposing positive command: *having good conduct among the gentiles . . .*. Not only are these believers to avoid certain things, they are also to positively practice certain types of behavior. Up to this point in the text, neither the content of *fleshly lusts* nor that of *having good conduct* has been detailed. Nearly all the scholars consulted (except Achtemeier 1996: 177) accept that this participle has imperative force because of the close proximity of the imperative-like infinitive verbal *to-abstain* in v. 11. The use of the participle in v. 12 indicates that

the two sentences of v. 11 and v. 12 are semantically tied together in an expectancy chain. Here *abstain from fleshly lusts* could be paraphrased as *do not be bad*. Such a negative command, by its very nature infers the positive, BE GOOD, as indicated by the participle. The positive command *having good (καλήν) conduct* becomes thematic for the entire paragraph (Michaels 1988: 117). While the avoidance of doing the wrong thing is found throughout the paragraph (cf. 2:16, 20; 3:3, 9, 10, 12), the emphasis is on not merely the avoidance of evil, but the active pursuit of the good. Synonyms for the word *good* or the concept of DOING GOOD appear several times in the following paragraphs. The following command *submit* in 2:13 is twice supported by statements about the reward and necessity of DOING GOOD by means of the noun and verbal form of the root term *good (ἀγαθός)* in the supportive material of 2:14-15: the governor rewards *those-who-do-good* in v. 14, and in v. 15 it is God's will that the believers *muzzle the foolish ignorance of men by doing-good*. In 2: 19 suffering unjustly on account of God is *commendable (χάρις)* and in 2:19 *doing-good* and suffering is *commendable*. In 3:6 women show that they are true daughters of Sarah by *doing-good*. Finally in 3:10-12 DOING BAD is contrasted with DOING GOOD. Thus, the generic command to DO GOOD is the point of avoiding evil and the theme of the section. The head of the section, 2:11-3:12, is not *submit* in v. 13 as Nichols (1984: 26; see Kelly 1969: 108; Davids 1990: 122) suggests, but the command to DO GOOD.

The following paragraph of 2:13-17 then presents specific applications of that command. The readers DO GOOD by submitting to political authorities; thus, the command *submit* in 2:13. The postposed clause of v. 14 and the reason statement in

vv. 15-15 give justification for the command. Then with a flurry of commands in 2:17, the author brings to a climax this short paragraph that starts with an exhortation that the readers submit to leaders in government; he expands the scope of the commands: *honor all, love the brethren, fear God, honor the king*. This series of imperatives are perhaps the key to understanding how this paragraph and the following paragraphs in this section function. The instances of the imperative verb *honor* bracket the list of four commands, thereby indicating that honor is in some way prominent in this list. Such sandwich structures with an even number of elements generally place prominence on the outer elements (Beekman et al. 1981: 120; see Heb. 7:27-28; Rom. 2:12-15). Also, the first imperative verb *honor* is an aorist verb while all the rest are present imperatives, possibly indicating that it is somehow different from the others. The combination of the bracketing of the commands with the word *honor* and the markedness of the first instance of *honor* due to its aorist tense, suggest that *honor* has become the focus in v. 17 and not submission as in v. 13. It is true that the command to honor the king is a referent to submission, but the term *honor* itself is more general than *submit*. Submission is but one way to honor others, and submission in the context of this text, of the New Testament as a whole, and of the New Testament world is an obligation due to one's superiors. As Schreiner (2003: 133) observes, the idea that believers ought to submit to everyone is not clearly found in the New Testament. *Honor*, on the other hand, may be manifested to both those above, below, or equal to one in authority (cf. 2:18; 3:1, 7, 8-9). The first instance of *honor* in v. 17 is not a command to submit; it is a more

general term. Thus Peter starts with the generic command in 2:12 and moves to the specific application of DOING GOOD in v. 13, that of submission, but in 2:17 he moves back up the ladder of the generic-specific hierarchy with the word *honor*. This word is more general than *submit*, but more specific than *having good conduct*.

Having gone up the generic-specific lexical semantic hierarchy with the word *honor* in 2:18, Peter now goes back down the scale to a more specific word *submit*. Peter gives the command: *Slaves submitting . . . to (your) masters . . .* 2:18 is the first of four coordinate paragraphs that have *honor* in 2:17 as their head and that specify what honor is about in specific situations for certain groups of people. For slaves, honoring all means submitting to masters even if they are cruel. Thus while 2:11-12 forms the head of the section with a participle that has imperatival force due to the command in v. 11, locally here in 2:17-18, the head of v. 18 is v. 17a. The participle gets its imperative mood from the preceding finite imperative verb *honor* in v. 17. V. 18 then is the head of the paragraph, 2:18-25. Vv. 19-25 gives the reason why slaves are to submit: because God wants them to and as a way of following Christ's own example of innocent suffering on their behalf.

Then in 3:1 the same specific command in participial form is applied to wives in the second coordinate thesis of this larger paragraph. Wives are commanded, *likewise, submit (literally submitting) to your own husbands . . .* As in the paragraph of 2:18-25, the command here is followed by supportive paragraphs. In this case a comment paragraph explains, even specifying further, what submission is all about in v. 1: it

does not involve outward appearance, but rather it is a matter of humility, an inward quality.

The next application of *honor* to a specific situation occurs in 3:7, but here the command is to husbands who have the dominant role in the relational hierarchy of husbands and wives. Their specific way of honoring their wives is as follows: *Husbands, likewise living with your wives according to understanding . . . giving them honor as fellow heirs of the grace of life* Taking the commanding participles in 3:7 back to *honor* makes cultural and historical sense of what is known about the social structure of marriage in New Testament world in Asia Minor. Submission is not the issue here as some suggest (Davids 1990: 122). Rather, the issue here is about the matter of treating others appropriately in accordance with one's social position or role, in this particular case the husband's role (see Campbell 1995: 163-166). This particular specification of *honor* that is addressed to husbands is unique. The command for slaves and wives to submit receives extensive support, and the commands directed to all the readers in 3:8-9 also has considerable support, the citation of Psalm 34. Here in 3:7, however, the support is limited to a brief postposed clause in this sentence that tells the husbands that failure to obey will result in God refusing to answer their prayers. The most likely reason for this scarcity of support is that the husbands are in the least difficult position of any of the groups addressed (Schreiner 2003: 159). Slaves and wives, for example, face the more difficult task because of their lack of legal standing in the ancient world. They were more likely to be abused, and because of this abuse, they would most likely find Peter's exhortations

more difficult and in need of more support. Husbands, holding the dominant legal and social position, are thus only briefly warned about the consequences of not treating their wives honorably. Then the author proceeds to the next major point or thesis.

The fourth and final thesis in this specification paragraph is the long series of commands in the form of adjectives in 3:8 followed by two commanding participles in 3:9. This string of five adjectives plus two participles in rapid fire give exhortations of how believers are practically and specifically to honor each other. The adjectives of v. 8 most likely refer to conduct among the community of believers (Davids 1990: 124). Then the adjectives are followed by two participial constructions that indicate how the readers are to respond to the abuse of those outside of the faith. Peter writes in v. 8, *Now finally, all (be) of-one-mind, sympathetic, loving-the-brothers, tender-hearted, humble-minded*, and then he continues in v. 9, *not paying-back evil for evil or insult for insult, but rather blessing*. Then these commands are followed by a lengthy quote from Psalm 34:12-16 in vv. 10-12. The piling up of adjectives and participles along with the sanctioning Old Testament quote all signal a climax to the section. Peter here piles up terms to make the text more vivid and to heighten the tension in this portion of the text much as a good speech writer might use such features to make part of the text more memorable for his audience (see Longacre 1996: 38-50) This string of adjectives and participles may be treated notionally as similar to the verbless clauses that Terry (1995: 120-121) identifies as peak markers (surface structures that indicate a climax in a passage) in 1 Corinthians. They give what Longacre (1996: 48) refers to as a “meaningful cumulative thrust.” This string

concerns how the reader ought to behave both within and outside the community. The earlier commands of 2:18 and 3:1 concern believers' response to unbelievers, and 3:1 envisions how a Christian husband ought to treat his Christian wife. Now the exhortation applies to all believers, not just slaves, wives, or husbands, and the entreaties concern how both those inside and outside the believing community are to be honored. The last participle in this string, *blessing*, concludes the commanding structures. DOING GOOD in the end means blessing even those who insult. Then to drive home his point Peter quotes the Psalm. If the readers desire to really to see good days they will pursue the good since it is known that God listens to those who do the right thing, but he opposes those who practice evil.

3.3 Why Participles?

Why does Peter use participles where he could have used a finite imperative verb? One answer has already been considered. According to Daube, Peter is imitating the Tanaitic Hebrews use of participles in exhortations to the community. While second language interference could be an explanation, as Fink points out (see above), this is not certain.

By contrast, Miller (1992: 173-174) suggests that such participles, which he believes are imperatival participles, are examples of mitigation. The use of the participles allows the writer to be polite, to command without being so direct. Perhaps the more difficult commands are mitigated by making the verb more noun-like (see Ricketts 1999: 70; Brown and Levinson 1978/1987: 207-209); in this case the participles would be, in a way, acknowledging the difficulty of complying with the

request. In addition, he suggests that this usage allows the writer to show solidarity with his audience; according to this interpretation, the softening of the commands tends to create a sense of rapport, toning down Peter's apostolic authority.

There is some merit in Miller's explanation. If the quote in 3:10-12 is excluded (two sentences with four imperatives) because it functions in a supportive manner to the mainline of the argument, seventeen sentences are left in the section. In those sentences, six imperative verbs occur (excluding the performative command in 2:11: *I-exhort you . . . to abstain*) or about one imperative for every three sentences. If the six participles that carry the imperative force from 2:17 were replaced by finite imperative verbs, that would bring the total to twelve imperatives in seventeen sentences (one imperative per 1.4 sentences). Then if the adjectives in 3:8 were replaced by imperative verbs, the number of imperatives would total seventeen, or on average, one imperative for every sentence. Most likely this many bald commands in such a short portion of text would violate the politeness standards of ancient Asia Minor, regardless of the fact that the writer was an apostle.

Epictetus, who lived from about 50-120 C.E., in his *Discourses* (1925) gives advice to his readers, but in a much different fashion than Peter. He generally mitigates his commands, often preferring to introduce advice with the impersonal verb *it-is-necessary* (δεῖ), thus mitigating the directness of his appeal. He also prefers to follow his commands with lengthy examples and stories, thus greatly reducing the density of the commands in his text as compared to 1 Peter 2:11-3:12. Thus, it would

appear that in Peter the number and often baldness (directness) of his commands are likely approaching the culturally acceptable limits for hortatory discourse.

However, more is involved in the structuring of the text than politeness alone. Such a series of imperatives as hypothesized above would not only be impolite, they also would render the text virtually incomprehensible. If everything is equally salient in a text, then the mind has difficulty processing the information. Therefore, well organized texts have a macrostructure that helps the mind to process the message of the text. A macrostructure is the controlling idea organizes the local semantic production in the text, and it helps the writer to indicate what he wishes the reader to understand and remember (van Dijk 1980: 284). In short, it is often what people can remember when they are asked to summarize a text (Terry 1993: 63). Generally, the macrostructure of a text can be deduced by identifying the mainline material of the text (cf. Terry 1993: 64; Longacre 1995); since 1 Peter 2:11-3:12 is an hortatory text, that means that imperative verbs and forms that are equivalent give the most important information, forming the skeleton of the text. This means that the finite imperatives in 2:13 (*submit*) and 2:17 (*honor, love, fear, honor*) indicate those sentences that form the skeleton. The commands in 2:11-12 may also be included. 2:11 has the performative verb used with the infinitive to give a prohibition (*I-exhort you . . . to abstain*) which is the equivalent of the finite imperative; thus, it represents an online predication. In addition, the participial clause in 2:12 *having good conduct*, as previously analyzed, may be seen to be the positive element of an expectancy chain. Thus, the use of the participle here represents the fact that the author wants the

two sentences of 2:11-12 to be seen as a unit. Semantically, this introductory paragraph composed of two sentences tells the readers to NOT DO BAD, but positively to DO GOOD. The other imperatives in the text are considered to indicate offline predications since they are found in embedded paragraphs (cf. 3:3, 10, 11).

In fact, this skeleton itself can be reduced even further to give the idea that controls all of the online predications. Often such controlling concepts are located at the beginning or at the end of a passage (van Dijk 1977: 150). In this case, the controlling idea of 2:11-3:12 is given in 2:11-12, specifically in v. 12: Peter wants his readers to DO GOOD. That this is so is further validated by the quote of Psalm 34 in 3:10-12 that indicates the end of this section. The focus of the quote is on DOING GOOD and the avoidance of bad behavior. Thus, the opening paragraph in this section gives the concept that forms the frame in terms of which all that follows must be understood.

Based on the analysis of the macrostructure thus far, the structure of the information seems to be so organized so that the readers' capacity to attend to major points being asserted is never exceeded. van Dijk (1980: 207) says discourse is processed by the reader as a series of events, actions or state of affairs which he labels FACTS. He further defines FACTS as complex propositions, and in addition, he states that the short-term memory's maximum capacity for these propositions or FACTS numbers about five (van Dijk 1980: 210 n. 5). The consequence of this cognitive limitation is that a text must be organized to prevent cognitive overload. Thus, 2:11-3:12 must be organized so that the readers can follow the developing argument.

Hence, 2:11-12 gives the overarching topic or FACT: DO GOOD. Then this FACT is developed and further specified by five imperative verbs, but they occur in only two sentences: Sentence one, *submit* to political authorities and sentence two, *honor all, love the brethren, fear God, honor the king*). At no time at any level of the hierarchy of the macrostructure of the text, thus far, are more than five FACTS presented. This accounts for the textual structure up through 2:17.

In 2:17 *honor* appears to be marked as in focus or as the dominant predication in the series of commands (as argued in chapter 3). It is a term that is more generic than *submit* in 2:13, and it is more specific than DO GOOD in 2:12. *Honor* now is further specified by four coordinated theses in which the commands are indicated by participles (2:18, 3:1, 7) or by adjectives and participles (3:8-9). In other words, the marked FACT of the previous level in the semantic macrostructure, *honor*, is now developed by four coordinating FACTS. Again the information is packaged so that short term memory is not overloaded. Different groups within the Christian community are exhorted to DO GOOD in their particular context: in 2:18 slaves are to submit to masters, in 3:1 wives are to submit to their husbands, in 3:7 husbands are to live in an understanding way with and honor their wives, and finally everybody in 3:8-9 receives a long list of commands that may be summarized in the final participle in this string, be a blessing (*blessing* in 3:9).

The final exhortation itself in 3:8-9 does present a string of seven commands, perhaps exceeding the expected limitations of short term memory. That is why the last two commands in this string break the pattern and are presented in participial

form: not *paying-back* evil but rather *blessing*. They aptly give the major point of this string: the readers ought to be a blessing. Such an analysis fits with Miller's (1956) research into information processing and short-term memory. He notes that, depending on the sort of data that are being processed, short-term memory can recall from five to nine items. For words the number five constitutes the informational bottleneck that the immediate memory must overcome. As Miller (1956) puts it, "By organizing the stimulus input simultaneously into several different dimensions and successively into a sequence or chunks, we manage to break (or at least stretch) this informational bottleneck." This explains why Peter lists no more than five adjectives. The five adjectives and the two participles divide the commands into two chunks that makes it possible for the readers to follow and recall what he says.

This analysis suggests that Peter was faced with having to communicate a large number of commands to his readers in a relatively short span of text. To accomplish this task, the commands had to be arranged in some sort of hierarchy to prevent the information from becoming too dense. Not all of the commands in the text are of equal importance or salience for the purpose of advancing the argument. They cannot be if the text is to be understood. Thus, this text's macrostructure organizes the text semantically into three levels:

- (a) The general organizing principle for the text occurs first in 2:11-12; it is the most abstract.
- (b) The imperative verbs represent the next level; they apply the organizing principle in a less abstract way.

(c) Finally the participles and adjectives specify what the imperative *honor* means.

These elements in the macrostructure function like mental pegs or reference points in the text. All other features of the text are elaborations of the macrostructure or the skeleton of the text.

An outline of the macrostructure of the commands is represented in Table 30 below. Each lower level may be seen as an elaboration of the one above it. The supportive material is omitted since as an elaboration of the macrostructure, it does not move forward the argument presented in the macrostructure. Key terms that are further specified by terms that follow are bolded.

Table 30 Macrostructure of 2:11-3:12

Level 1: Organizing Principle (2:11-12): Avoid the bad and **DO GOOD**.

Level 2: Principle Specified in Mainline Imperatives (2:13, 17):

submit; honor all, love, fear, honor

Level 3: Honor Specified in Participles, and Adjectives

(1) Submit to Masters (2:18)

(2) Submit to Husbands (3:1)

(3) Be Considerate of and Honor wives (3:7)

(4) Do that which Blesses (3:8-9)

3.4 Response to Achtemeier: Are the Participles Really Commands?

Nearly all scholars recognize that the commanding participles are just that, commands; the ongoing debate has been primarily concerned with the issue of

explaining how they obtain their imperative mood. Achtemeier (1996: 194-195, 208, 217, 222), however, in his commentary on 1 Peter says that the participles do not represent the content of the previous imperative in 2:17, but rather they are the means by which the imperatival content is carried out. He believes that because the participles are grammatically subordinate to the imperatives in 2:17, they cannot continue the imperative mood of the preceding imperatives.

Though he is right about the participles being grammatically subordinate, he allows his grammatical understanding of the text to restrict too severely his interpretation of the semantics of the text, specifically the semantics of the participles (and the adjectives in 3:8). In a command *do X by doing Y*, the adjunct *by doing Y* is a command itself even though it is subordinate to the main command. The mood of the first bleeds over into the second. It is almost like a process: doing Y accomplishes getting X done.

In addition, as the discussion of the macrostructure (and the structural analysis in chapter three) demonstrates, 1 Peter is a text in which the commands are layered, with increasing specificity as they descend in the hierarchy. This particular use of the participle in the text appears to be a strategy for segmenting the text into packages of information that are cognitively manageable.

Next, this analysis of the participle suggests that larger discourse concerns may impact what has been more traditionally called syntactical decisions. The choice of the participle is tied to the overall macrostructure of the text. Attempts to explain the commanding participle use by merely resorting to the syntax of the sentence fail

because they do not recognize that the larger discourse grammar affects the structuring of a sentence.

Finally, the analysis shows that the participles in this text do have a head finite imperative verb. The imperative *honor* in 2:17, which is a specification of DO GOOD in 2:12, is itself further specified by the following participles in 2:18 and 3:1, 7, 9. The head verb is not located within the sentence, but it is there nonetheless. This head verb is located one node or layer up above the sentence level in the hierarchy of the text. The imperative *honor* serves as the head of the participles which may be said to serve as the head in their respective paragraphs. The older grammarians were correct in their assessment that the participles receive imperative force from a previous imperative verb, but they lacked the linguistic tools to validate their claim. This analysis shows that the tools of discourse linguistics confirms that, indeed, the independent imperatival participle does not exist in 1 Peter.

CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Summary

4.1.1 Summary of the Structure

This dissertation analyzes the text of 1 Peter as an integrated whole composed of three divisions. After the introductory formulaic greeting of 1:1-2, the letter opens with a long motivational paragraph that encourages the readers to be thankful and to value their salvation offered through Christ. This is the only motivational paragraph that is not embedded within a larger hortatory paragraph. The following larger hortatory section finds its grounds in this paragraph. This hortatory section is found in 1:13-2:10. Four basic imperative theses are developed. First, the readers are commanded to hope on the grace of Christ. Second, they are implored to be holy, and third, they are told that they are to love one another completely. Finally, the audience is urged to earnestly desire God's word (scripture) because they have experienced the goodness of Christ. The following embedded supportive paragraphs consist mainly of an extended quote from Old Testament scripture that expresses two main points: trust in Christ results in honor before God, and God honors the readers to the extent that he calls them his own people.

The next division of the letter is 2:11-4:11. 2:11-3:12 constitutes a major section. The author addresses the readers directly by means of the vocative noun *beloved*. The

following command in 2:11 *to abstain from fleshly desires* is paired with a commanding participle that commands the readers to DO GOOD. This command is thematic for the entire section and may be seen as the basic macro from which all the following commands flow. The readers are first commanded to submit to governing authorities. The next series of imperatives in 2:17 emphasize that believers ought to honor everyone. This exhortation is further specified by the four paragraphs that follow. The prominent feature in this portion of the text is the use of commanding participles. In the first two, slaves and wives are commanded (by means of participles) to submit to those who are over them: slaves to their masters and wives to husbands. Next, husbands are told to live considerately with their wives and to honor their wives (again participles not imperatives). Lastly and with a climactic rush of commands in the form of five adjectives and two participles the entire believing community is addressed. The final participle in the string likely summarizes the intent of the commands: they are to bless others.

After the quote of Psalm 34 to close out the previous section, the next section in this division begins. The first major paragraph of 3:13-22 picks up and comments on the theme of DOING GOOD in the quote. The introductory comment in the first couple of sentences of this paragraph (3:13-14a) turns the argument to the issue of suffering. 3:13 asserts that those who DO GOOD are not likely to suffer. 3:14a then affirms that even if the readers should suffer they are blessed. Peter's use of the optative verb *suffer* (signifying most remote possibility) indicates that he is not yet willing to fully address the extent to which his readers are likely to suffer. After this introduction, in

3:14b-16 the readers are commanded to not be afraid of those who might harm them, but rather they are to commit themselves to Christ and be ready to explain their faith if asked. The rest of the paragraph, through 3:22, gives support to the commands. It is better to do such good acts because Christ once also suffered for them, suffering which has provided their salvation.

The next paragraph of vv. 4:1-6 gives an inference based upon the example of Christ's suffering in the supportive material of the previous paragraph. Peter commands the readers to think about suffering in the same way as Christ did.

The final paragraph in this section (4:7-11) ends the section in a fashion similar to the final paragraph in 2:11-3:12. After opening imperatives commanding the readers to attend to prayer, a string of commands are expressed by participles, adjectives, and short elliptical command statements. The author in climactic fashion piles up commands to indicate the importance of his commands and to indicate that he is concluding this section of the text and that now he is ready for the concluding division (4:12-5:11).

Finally in the paragraph of 4:12-19 Peter is blunt. The readers are going to suffer. He commands them to commit themselves in such suffering to their faithful creator God. The theme of suffering is woven throughout the text; now, Peter addresses the problem head on.

The next paragraph (5:1-5) in the final section commands leaders and followers to treat each other with humility. Specifically that is achieved by leaders not lording it

over their followers and by being examples instead. Followers are commanded to submit to the leadership.

The final paragraph (5:6-11) in the concluding division brings the division and the entire text to a climax. The readers are exhorted to humble themselves before God. A supernatural enemy is brought on stage now for the first time: they must resist the devil. No longer is the conflict merely a human conflict; it is a supernatural conflict.

Thus, in the final section Peter brings everything to a conclusion. Yes, the readers will suffer. In light of this, they must treat each other with humility. Humble dependence on God is necessary since the struggle they face is a cosmic battle.

4.1.2 Summary of the Imperative Participle

The ultimate focus of this research has been the explanation of the so-called imperative participle. To accomplish this purpose the commanding participles in 2:18-3:9 were analyzed and a macrostructure was outlined for the entire section in which they occur (2:11-3:12). Structural analysis demonstrates that the participles at 2:18, 3:1, 3:7, and 3:9 are not really independent at all. They depend upon and are specific applications of the more generic command *honor all* in 2:17. Why are participles used and not finite imperative verbs? One possible answer is mitigation; if all the commands were stated as imperative verbs, there would be an imperative for every sentence on average. More importantly, however, is the fact that an overabundance of imperative verbs would level the text, making every command equal. This would create a string of seventeen commands that would be difficult to

process cognitively. Instead, as the macrostructure reveals, the text is organized so that cognitive processing is possible. The number of items at any level within the layering of the macrostructure never exceeds the capacity of short-term memory to process.

In short, the imperatival participle was shown to not be a valid category in 1 Peter. The participles here function as participles have generally been thought to function, getting their mood from a finite verb. Moreover, the analysis of the participles in the text demonstrates how discourse grammar may affect the syntax of the sentence. The choice of the participle is determined by discourse concerns and not the grammar of the sentence.

4.2 Implications

Apparently, the text of 1 Peter is a carefully crafted text that slowly builds to a concluding climax. The slow buildup to the end delays the really difficult news that suffering is normal until after Peter has been able to prepare his readers. The text hangs together as a hortatory text.

In addition, the textual analysis coupled with the analysis of the participle suggests that discourse linguistics is a useful tool for interpreting the biblical texts. An understanding of the larger discourse matters in a text may suggest solutions to many problems that may not be solved at the sentence level of analysis. Almost two thousand years of comment on the text does not preclude the need to take a fresh look at the text with a new linguistic tool.

4.3 Limitations of the Present Research

One limitation on the present research is the inherent subjective nature of a semantic structural analysis. The caveat of Mann and Thompson (1992: 265) applies here: different analysts may produce different analyses of the same text because a text often has places of ambiguity. Many questions about structure and the use of the commanding participle might, perhaps, be resolved by a native speaker, but without one students of the Greek New Testament must rely on the grammatical and linguistic tools available. Qualitative analyses such as the present study, of necessity, make a number of subjective decisions in the analytical process. To say, however, that the tool has subjective elements to it does not invalidate the tool. Any analysis, even those that are considered quantitative, has inherent subjectivity due to the finite human condition.

Added to this are the ambiguities that are the natural result of the centuries that separate modern analysts from the original writer and readers of the text. Many questions concerning the culture, politics, religion, and even the exact nature of the situation that prompted the letter cannot be answered with precision. The fact that the text has virtually a two thousand year history of interpretation may be seen as advantageous since the analyst may look to this history as a source for how others in the past have understood the text. Yet, that interpretative history is not without its own ambiguities. In fact, the goal of this study is to address two interpretative problems concerning the text of 1 Peter that have a long history themselves.

4.4 Suggestions for Further Research

Due to the complexity of the structural analysis of 1 Peter and of the use of the commanding participle, several attendant analyses that could have been pursued with profit were either only briefly mentioned or ignored. For example, the text repeatedly builds to a climax. Good hortatory texts would be expected to move to a climactic statement where the tension of the argument is greatest (see Longacre 1996: 48-50). Peter repeatedly moves to what appears to be a climax in his argument, and then the tension drops off as he begins a new portion of the argument. Further analysis into these climactic paragraphs should reveal more clearly just what surface feature devices are used to create tension and climax in this text. Certain paragraphs seem to build to a climax, sections appear to build to a climax, and the text as a whole builds to a climax. For instance, in the section of 2:11-3:12 the clustering of the commanding adjectives and participles might be analyzed as surface structure markings of a climactic statement in this portion of the text. Other sections exhibit similar behavior. The text itself is so structured that Peter delays the most explicit affirmation that his readers will suffer until near the end of his letter (4: 12-19). This would seem to be a revelation that would qualify as a climactic disclosure. Some quantitative analyses of such things as sentence length, frequency of certain lexical items, and grammatical structures within certain portions of the text would help in further validating the more casual and intuitive observations as to how the text signals and moves to a climax. Also, although a macrostructure for the section of 2:11-3:12 is developed, a unified macrostructure for the entire text is not suggested. The semantic

structural analysis of the text has laid the groundwork for such an analysis. Next, a study of surface structure patterns (field analysis) could be done. For example, it might be asked: where do chiasms, rhetorical questions, and certain other textual patterns that appear to be organizational templates (Ellicott 2000) occur in the text, and why do they occur where they do? What is their function? Traditionally such features have been asserted to be merely a manner of style (Turner 1976), but a growing understanding of discourse or text linguistics suggests that many stylistic features may have a semantic function within the text.

Relative to the analysis of the participle, a more detailed analysis of all the commanding participles in 1 Peter needs to be done. It could be conjectured that all of them do not function in the same way. Preposed participles and postposed participles may well function differently. Also, the same sort of analysis needs to be expanded to other New Testament texts. Romans 12 is considered to be the other primary location of the imperatival participle. The results of the present study suggest that the imperatival participles in Romans most likely do depend on a finite imperative verb, and thus they are not truly imperatival participles. The implications of this analysis in 1 Peter need to be validated.

Finally, the use of other grammatical forms as command forms in addition to the participle may be analyzed. For example, a string of five adjectives in 1 Peter 3:8 that are intended as commands appear alongside the commanding participles in 3:9. The adjectives apparently receive their imperatival mood the same way as the participles

do in this context. Additional instances of commanding adjectives and other marked commanding forms need to be analyzed to see how they function.

APPENDIX

SEMANTIC OUTLINE (TREE) OF 1 PETER

This appendix presents the outline or tree of 1 Peter in its entirety. In chapter two the outline is presented a part at a time for the purpose of the analysis of each portion of the text that is under discussion. Locally dominant or more salient sentences that serve as the nucleus or head of a paragraph are labeled in caps as THESIS. The tree shows the mainline of the argument and embedding within the mainline. Turning the document on its side so the labels are at the top, may enable the reader to see the embedding more readily.

1 PETER 1-5

Introduction (formulaic introductory greeting)

1: 1-2 Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας, κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθεῖη.

Peter an apostle of Jesus Christ to the chosen sojourners of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father by the sanctification of the Spirit, to obedience and sprinkling of blood of Jesus Christ, grace to and may peace be multiplied.

Introduction

Reason ¶

Reason: Result ¶

THESIS: 1:3-5 Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζώσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον, τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοιμὴν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to the riches of his mercy has regenerated us to a living hope through the

resurrection of Jesus Christ from dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and unfading, that has been kept in the heavens for you, the ones who by the power of God are being guarded through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed at the last time.

Result: Comment ¶

THESIS: 1:6-7 ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον [ἐστίν] λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου, εἰρεθῆ εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ:

In which you exult, though for a little while now, if it is necessary that you be grieved by various trials, in order that the proving of you the faith, much more precious than gold which perishes; yet through fire being tested, it may be found to praise and glory and honor at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Comment: Comment ¶

THESIS: 1:8-9 ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπάτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως [ὑμῶν] σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν.

Whom not having seen you love, in whom though now not seeing but believing, you rejoice with unspeakable and glorious joy, obtaining the end of the faith salvation of your souls.

Comment: Comment ¶

THESIS: 1:10-11 Περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες, ἔραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας.

Concerning which salvation the prophets who prophesied concerning you sought and searched concerning the grace coming to you, searching for what or what sort of time the spirit of Christ who was in them was making clear to them, testifying beforehand of the sufferings destined for Christ and after these glories.

Comment: 1:12 οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνου ἀυτά, ἀ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς [ἐν] πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι.

To whom it was revealed that not to themselves but to you they were ministering these things which now were announced to you through the ones who have evangelized you by Spirit Holy sent forth from heaven, into which things angels long to look.

THESIS: Coordinate ¶

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

Therefore girding up the loins of your mind, being sober, hope on the grace being brought to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

THESIS 2: Amplification paraphrase ¶: 1:14-21

THESIS 1: 1:14-16 ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς μὴ συσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἁγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁγιοὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε, διότι γέγραπται [ὅτι] Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος [εἶμι].

As children of God do not fashion yourselves to the to the passions of your former ignorance, but as the one calling you is holy, also yourselves be holy in all conduct because it has been written that you shall be holy because I am holy.

Amplification: 1:17-21 Καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε, εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαράδοτου ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἁμνοῦ ἁμώμου καὶ ἄσπίλου Χριστοῦ, προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἶναι εἰς θεόν.

And if as father you call upon the one who impartially judges according to each one's work, conduct yourselves in fear in the time of your sojourn, knowing that not with perishable things as silver or gold you were redeemed from of your worthless conduct handed down from your fathers,

but with precious blood as of a lamb unblemished and unspotted—the blood of Christ, having been foreknown before the foundation of the world yet being manifested in the last times because of you, the ones who through him trust in God, the one having raised him from the dead who has given glory to him, so that the your faith and hope be in God.

THESIS 3: Attestation ¶

THESIS: 1:22-23 Τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον, ἐκ [καθαρᾶς] καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος.

The souls of you having been purified by the obedience to the truth resulting in unfeigned brotherly love, from a pure heart earnestly love one another, because you have been regenerated not from perishable seed but imperishable through the living and abiding word of God.

Evidence: Contrast ¶

Contrast: Simile ¶

Simile: 1:24a διότι πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου:

Because all flesh is as grass and the glory of it as the flower of grass.

THESIS: 1:24b ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν:

The grass dries up and the flower falls off.

THESIS: Identification ¶

THESIS: 1:25a τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

But the word of the lord abides forever.

Identification: 25b τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

And this is the word having been proclaimed as good news to you.

and this is the word having been proclaimed as
good news to you.

THESIS 4: Comment ¶

THESIS: 2:1-3 Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑποκρίσεις καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλιάς, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ ἀυξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν, εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος.

Putting away therefore all malice and all guile and all hypocrisies and envies and all evil speakings, as newborn babes desire the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow into salvation, since you tasted that good the Lord.

Comment: Attestation ¶

THESIS: 2:4-5 πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι λίθον ζῶντα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδοκιμασμένον παρὰ δὲ θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν ἐντιμὸν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους [τῷ] θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

To whom coming, a living stone, on the one hand rejected by men but on the other hand to God chosen, precious, also you yourselves as living stones are being built up a spiritual house for a holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.

Evidence: Result ¶

THESIS: 2:6 διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ, Ἴδου τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον κρογωνιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἐντιμον καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ.

Therefore it is contained in scripture, behold I place in Zion a cornerstone, chosen, precious, and those who believe on him will never be ashamed.

Result: Amplification ¶

THESIS: Comment ¶

THESIS: 2:7-8a ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, ἀπιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ

οικοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου:

To you therefore the who believe honor, but to the unbelieving a stone which the builders rejected, this one became the head of the corner and a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence:

Comment: 8b οἱ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν.

Who stumble at the word, being disobedient, unto which also they were appointed.

Amplification: Summary ¶

THESIS: 2: 9 Ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς:

But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for possession by God, so that you may report the virtues of the one having called you out of the darkness into the marvelous light:

Summary: 2:10 οἱ ποτε οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες.

Who once were not a people, but now are a people of God, who had not received mercy, but now have received mercy.

GENERIC THESIS: Negated Antonym ParaphraseCoordinate ¶

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

Beloved, I exhort you as aliens and sojourners to abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul.

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

You having good conduct among the nations, so that, wherein they speak against you as evildoers, by observing your good works they may glorify God in the day of visitation.

SPECIFIC THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: Reason ¶

THESIS: 13-14 Ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον, εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν:

Submit to every human authority because of the Lord, whether to the king as being in authority, or to governors as through him being sent for vengeance on evildoers but for praise of welldoers.

Reason: 15-16 ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθοποιῶντας φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν, ὡς ἐλεύθεροι καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῦ δοῦλοι.

Because so is the will of God, by doing good to silence the ignorance of foolish men, as free men and not as having your freedom as a cloak for evil but as of God slaves.

THESIS 2: Generic-Specific ¶

GENERIC-THESIS: 2:17 πάντας τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε, τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε.

Honor all, love the brotherhood, fear God, honor the king.

SPECIFIC-THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: Reason ¶

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

The household slaves submitting in all fear to the your masters, not only to the good and gentle but also to the harsh.

Reason: Amplification ¶

THESIS: 2:19 τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσχων ἀδίκως.

For this is commendable if because of a consciousness of God anyone bears up under griefs while suffering unjustly.

Amplification: Contrast ¶

Contrast: 2:20a ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε;

For what credit is it if when sinning and buffeted you endure?

THESIS: Reason ¶

THESIS: 2:20b ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιούντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ.

But if doing good and suffering you endure, this is commendable with God.

Reason: Comment ¶

THESIS: 2: 21-23 εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς ἰχνεσιν αὐτοῦ, ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, ὃς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει πάσχων οὐκ ἠπείλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως:

For to this you were called, because also Christ suffered in behalf of you, leaving behind to you a pattern that you should follow in the footsteps of him, who did no sin neither was found any deceit in his mouth, who while being reviled did not retaliate, while suffering did not threaten, but delivered himself up to the one who judges righteously.

Comment: Reason ¶

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

Who the sins of us himself he bore in his body on the tree, so that having died to our sins we might live to righteousness, by whose wound you were healed.

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

For you were as sheep wandering, but you have turned now to the shepherd and overseer of your souls.

THESIS 2: Comment ¶

THESIS: 3:1-2 Ὁμοίως [αἱ] γυναῖκες, ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα καὶ εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται, ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆν ἀναστροφήν ὑμῶν.

Likewise the wives being submissive to the own husbands, so that even if any are disobedient to the word, through the wives' conduct without a word they will be gained, having observed your pure reverent conduct.

Comment: Reason ¶

THESIS: 3:3-4 ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφάρτῳ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελής.

Whose adornment let it not be the outward braiding of hairs and the putting on of gold or of garments but the hidden man of the heart in the incorruptible adornment of the humble and quiet spirit, which is of great worth before God.

Reason: 3:4-6 οὕτως γὰρ ποτε καὶ αἱ ἅγιοι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμουσαν ἑαυτάς ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα, ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιούσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν.

For thus formerly also the holy women the ones hoping in God were adorning themselves submitting to their own husbands, as Sara obeyed Abraham calling him lord, whose children you became if you do good and not fear any intimidation.

THESIS 3: 3: 7 Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως, συνοικοῦντες κατὰ γνῶσιν ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ, ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ συγκληρονόμοις χάριτος ζωῆς εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν.

The husbands also, dwelling with them according to knowledge as with a weaker vessel—the wife, showing her honor also as co-heirs of the gift of life so that your prayers not be hindered.

THESIS 4: Attestation ¶

THESIS: 3:8-9 Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχοι, ταπεινόφρονες, μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας, τοῦναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε.

Finally, all be of one mind, sympathetic, loving brothers, compassionate, humble-minded, not giving back evil for evil on the contrary but blessing because to this you were called so that a blessing you might inherit.

Evidence: Attestation ¶

THESIS: 3:10-11 ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χεῖλη τοῦ μὴ λαλήσαι δόλον, ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν, ζητησάτω εἰρήνην καὶ διωξάτω αὐτήν:

For the one wishing to love life and to see good days, let him restrain his tongue from evil and his lips to not speak deceit, but let him turn away from evil and let him do good, let him seek peace and pursue it.

Evidence: 3:12 ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν, πρόσωπον δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά.

Because the eyes of the lord are on the righteous, and the ears of him listen to their prayers but the face of lord is against ones doing evil.

Introduction: Contrast ¶

Contrast: 3:13 Καὶ τίς ὁ κακῶσων ὑμᾶς ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε;

And who is the one harming you if you become zealots for good?

THESIS: 3:14a ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι.

But if indeed you should suffer because of righteousness, you are blessed.

Reason ¶

THESIS: 3:14b-16 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε, κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἔτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαὶν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραύτητος καὶ φόβου, συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε καταισχυρθῶσιν οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφὴν.

But the fear of them do not fear nor be troubled, but as lord revere Christ in your hearts, be always ready to give a defense to everyone asking you a word concerning the hope that is in you, but with humility and fear, have a good conscience, so that whereas you are spoken against the ones slandering you may be shamed by your good conduct in Christ.

Reason: Reason ¶

THESIS: 3:17 κρεῖττον γὰρ ἀγαθοποιῶντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιῶντας.

For it is better to suffer for doing good, if God will so wills, than to suffer for doing wrong.

Reason: Comment ¶

THESIS: 3:18 ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζῶσθαι δὲ πνεύματι:

Because indeed Christ once for sins died, a righteous man in behalf of unrighteous men, that he might bring you to God on the one hand having been put to death in flesh but on the other hand having been made alive in spirit.

Comment: Comment ¶

THESIS: 3:19-20 ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, ἀπειθήσασιν ποτε ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ὀκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος.

In which indeed to the spirits in prison having gone, he made proclamation to ones who formerly disobeyed when the patience of God was waiting in days of Noah while an ark was being prepared, in which a few, that is eight souls, were saved through water.

Comment: 3:21-22 ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σφίζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ [τοῦ] θεοῦ πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων.

Which figure now saves you even baptism, not the removal of dirt from the flesh but the pledge of a good conscience to God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is at the right hand of God having gone into heaven, having had subjected to him angels and authorities and powers.

Reason ¶

THESIS: 4:1-2 Χριστοῦ οὖν παθόντος σαρκὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἐννοιαν ὀπλίσασθε, ὅτι ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον.

Therefore Christ having suffered in the flesh, you also arm yourselves with the same way of thinking, because the one suffering in the flesh has ceased from sin so that he no longer lives his remaining time in the flesh in the lusts of men but in the will of God.

Reason: Comment ¶

THESIS: 4:3 ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις, οἴνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις, πότοις καὶ ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρίαις.

For the time past is sufficient to have done the will of the gentiles walking in licentiousness, lusts, drunkenness, carousals, drinking bouts, and lawless idolatries.

Comment: Comment ¶

THESIS: 4:4-5 ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται μὴ συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τῆς ἀσωτίας ἀνάχυσιν βλασφημοῦντες, οἱ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ ἐτοίμως ἔχοντι κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

Wherein they are surprised because you are not running with them in the same of excess of dissipation blaspheming you, who will give an account to the one who is ready to judge the living and the dead.

Comment: 4:6 εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπου σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι.

For this reason indeed the good news was preached to the dead, that they might be judged indeed according to men in flesh, but might live according to God in spirit.

Circumstance ¶

Circumstance: 4:7a Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν.

Now the end of all things has drawn near.

THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: 4:7b σωφρονήσατε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς:

Therefore, be sober-minded and be self-controlled in prayers.

THESIS 2: 4:8 πρὸ πάντων τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοῦς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες, ὅτι ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.

Before all things have fervent love among yourselves, because love covers a multitude of sins

THESIS 3: 4:9 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ.

Be hospitable to one another without murmuring.

THESIS 4: Generic-Specific Paraphrase

GENERIC-THESIS 4: 4:10 ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα εἰς ἑαυτοῦς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ.

Each one accordingly as he received a gift to each other ministering it as good stewards of manifold grace of God.

SPECIFIC-THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: 4:11a εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια θεοῦ:

If anyone speaks, let him speak as it were the oracles of God.

THESIS 2: 4:11b εἴ τις διακονεῖ, ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν πᾶσιν δοξάζεται ὁ θεὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

If anyone ministers as by strength which God supplies, that in all God might be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom is the glory and the power to the ages of the ages, amen.

Inference ¶

THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: Reason ¶

THESIS: Reason ¶

THESIS: 4:12-13 Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένην ὡς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος, ἀλλὰ καθὼ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι.

Beloved be not surprised at fiery trial among you coming as a test to you as though it was a strange thing happening to you, but insofar as you share in the sufferings of Christ rejoice, so that also at the revelation of his glory you may rejoice exulting.

Reason: Warning ¶

THESIS: 4:14 εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται.

If you are reproached in name of Christ, you are blessed because the of glory and the spirit of God rests upon you.

Warning: 4:15 μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιὸς ἢ ὡς ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος:

For let not anyone of you suffer as a murder or as a thief or as an evildoer or as a meddler.

THESIS 2: Reason ¶

THESIS: 4:16 εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός, μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ.

But if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name.

Reason: Comment ¶

THESIS: 17a ὅτι [ὁ] καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ:

Because the time has come to begin the judgment from the house of God.

Comment: Attestation ¶

THESIS: 4:17b εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν, τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ;

And if first from us, what is the end of the ones disobeying the gospel of God?

Attestation: 4:18 καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σφύζεται, ὁ ἀσεβῆς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται;

And if the righteous is scarcely saved, what will become of the ungodly and the sinner?

THESIS: 4:19 ὥστε καὶ οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ πιστῶ κτίστη παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγαθοποιίᾳ.

Therefore indeed let the ones suffering according to the will of God commit their souls in doing good to a trustworthy creator.

Generic-Specific ¶

SPECIFIC-THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THESIS 1: Introduction or Summary ¶

Introduction: 5:1 Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων, ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός:

Elders therefore I exhort, who am the co-elder and witness of Christ's sufferings, and a partaker also of the glory about to be revealed.

THESIS: Reason ¶

THESIS: 5:2-3 ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπισκοποῦντες] μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως κατὰ θεόν, μὴδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως, μὴδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου:

Shepherd the flock of God among you, exercising oversight not unwillingly but willingly according to God, not greedy for profit, but eagerly, nor as lording it over those entrusted to your care, but becoming examples for the flock.

Reason: 5:4 καὶ φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος κομείσθε τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον.

And when the chief shepherd appears, you will receive the unfading crown of glory.

THESIS 2: 5:5a Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις:

Likewise, younger men, be submissive to elders.

GENERIC-THESIS 2: 5b πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε, ὅτι [Ο] θεὸς ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσει, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.

And all gird yourselves with humility to one another, because God opposes proud men, but he gives grace to humble men.

THESIS: Coordinate ¶

THEESIS 1: 5:6-7 Ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταίαν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ, πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν.

Be humbled therefore under the mighty hand of God, so that he may exalt you in time, casting all your cares cast upon him, because he cares concerning you.

THEESIS 2: Coordinate ¶

THEESIS 1: Reason ¶

THEESIS: 5:8a Νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε.

Be sober, watch.

Reason: 5:8b ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος περιπατεῖ ζητῶν [τινα] καταπιεῖν:

Your adversary the devil as a lion roaring walks around seeking someone to devour.

THEESIS 2: Contrast ¶

THEESIS 5:9 ᾧ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῇ ἐν [τῷ] κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεισθαι.

Whom oppose firm in the faith knowing that the same sufferings is laid upon your brotherhood in the world.

Contrast: Comment ¶

THEESIS: 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.

Now the God of all grace, the one having called you to the eternal of him glory in Christ Jesus, a little while [after] having suffered he himself will restore, will establish, will strengthen, will ground you.

Comment: 5:11 αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

To him the might to the ages, amen.

Close

Coordinate ¶

THEESIS 1: 5:12 Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογίζομαι, δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στήτε.

Through Silvanus, your faithful brother, as I reckon, briefly I wrote encouraging and testifying this to be true grace of God, in which take your stand.

THEESIS 2: Coordinate ¶

THEESIS 1: 5:13 Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτῇ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου.

She in Babylon, chosen along with you, greets you and Mark my son greets you.

THEESIS 2: 5:14a ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης.

Greet one another with a kiss of love.

THEESIS 3: 5:14b εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.

Peace to you all the ones in Christ.

REFERENCES

Achtemeier, Paul J. 1996. *1 Peter: a commentary on First Peter*. Edited by Eldton Jay Epp. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlos. M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds. 1966. *The Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies.

_____. 1983. *The Greek New Testament*. 3rd ed. New York: United Bible Societies.

_____. 1993. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. New York: United Bible Societies.

Archer, Gleason L., and Chirichigno, Gregory. 1983. *Old Testament quotations in the New Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press.

Arichea, Daniel C. and Eugene A. Nida. 1980. *A translator's handbook on the first letter from Peter*. *Helps for Translators Series*. New York: United Bible Societies.

Bailey, Kenneth E. 1976. *Poet and peasant*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Bauer, Walter. 1958. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. 4th rev. ed. Translated by William F. Arndt and Wilbur Gringrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Beare, F. W. 1970. *The first epistle of Peter: the Greek text with introduction and notes*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Beekman, John, John Callow, and Michael Kopesecc. 1981. The semantic structure of written communication. 5th ed. Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Beekman, John and John Callow. 1974. Translating the word of God. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Bigg, Charles. 1909. A critical and exegetical commentary on the epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Black, David Allen, ed. 1992. Linguistics and New Testament interpretation: Essays on discourse analysis. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- _____. 1995. Linguistics for students of New Testament Greek: A survey of basic concepts and applications. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Blass, Friedrich, A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. 1961. A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Booth, Steven Craig. 1991. A discourse analysis of selected peak markings features in the Gospel of John. Ph.D. dissertation. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Boring, M. Eugene. 1999. 1 Peter. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Boyer, James L. 1984. The classification of participles: a statistical study. *Grace Theological Journal* 5:2: 163-179.

- _____. 1987. A classification of imperatives. *Grace Theological Journal*. 8:1: 35-54.
- Brown, Penelope and Steven C. Levinson. 1978/1987. Politeness: some universals in language use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bullinger, E. W. 1898. Figures of speech used in the Bible. Reprinted 1968. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Buth, Randall. 1992. οὐν, δὲ, καὶ, and asyndeton in Johns' Gospel. In *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. ed. by David Alan Black, Katherine Barnwell, and Stephen Levinsohn, 144-161. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- Butmann, Alexander. 1873. A grammar of New Testament Greek. Trans. J. J. Thayer. Andover: W. F. Draper
- Campbell, Barth L. 1995. Honor, shame, and the rhetoric of 1 Peter. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Callow, Kathleen. 1974. Discourse considerations in translating the word of God. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne, and Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1983. The grammar book: and ESL/EFL teacher's course. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Charolles, M. 1983. Coherence as a principle in the interpretation of discourse. *Text* 3:71-97.
- Cotterell, Peter and Max Turner. 1989. Linguistics and biblical interpretation. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press.
- Dalton, William Joseph. 1965. Christ's proclamation to the spirits: a study of 1 Peter

3:18-4:6. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Daube, David. 1946. Participle and imperative in 1 Peter. In *The First Epistle of St. Peter: the Greek text with Introduction, Notes, and Essays*, by Edward Gordon Selwyn. 2nd ed, 467-488. London: Macmillan and Company.

Davids, Peter H. 1990. *The first epistle of Peter*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

du Toit, A. B. 1974. The significance of discourse analysis for New Testament interpretation and translation: introductory remarks with special reference to 1 Peter 1:3-13. *Neotestamentica* 8: 54-80.

Ellicott, John H. 1981. A home for the homeless: a sociological exegesis of 1 Peter, its situation and strategy.

_____. 1986. The rehabilitation of an exegetical step-child: 1 Peter in recent research. In *Perspectives on 1 Peter*. Ed. by C. H. Talbert, 3-16. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.

_____. 2000. *1 Peter: a new translation with introduction and commentary*. The Anchor Bible, 37b. New York: Doubleday.

Epictetus. 1925. *The discourses as reported by Arrian, the manual and fragments*. Vol. 1. W. A. Oldfather, trans. In *The Loeb Classical Library*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Fanning, Buist M. 1990. *Verbal aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1981. Pragmatics and the description of discourse. In *Peter*

- Cole, ed., *Radical pragmatics*, 143-166. New York: Academic Press.
- Fink, Paul R. 1967. An analysis of Peter's literary style and its contribution to the exegesis of the Petrine epistles. Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary.
- Foley, William A. and Robert D. van Valin, Jr. 1985. Information packaging in the clause. In Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language typology and syntactic description 1: Clause structure*, 282-364. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foerster, Werner. 1965. κτιζω. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 3, Θ-K, ed. Gerhard Kittel, 1000-1035. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Friberg, Barbara and Timothy. eds. 1981. *Analytical Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Friberg, Timothy. 1978. The discourse structure of the Greek text of Galatians. M. A. thesis. University of Minnesota.
- _____. 1982. New Testament word order in light of discourse considerations. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Minnesota.
- Givón, T. 1984. *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction 1*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- _____. 1990. *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction 2*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Godet, Fredrick Louis. 1883. *Commentary on Romans*. Reprint ed. 1977. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.
- _____. 1993. *English grammar: a function based introduction*. vol. 1. Philadelphia:

John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Green, Michael. 1968. The second epistle of Peter and the epistle of Jude: an introduction and commentary. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Hamblin, Robert L. 1959. An analysis of First Peter with special reference to the Greek participle. Th.D. Thesis, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Hart, J. H. A. 1910. The first epistle general of Peter. In *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Ed. by W. Robertson Nicoll, 5: 3-80. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Healy, Phyllis M. 1979. A preliminary analysis of the grammatical and semantic functions of asyndeton. In *Notes on Translation*, 73: 17-25.

Heckert, Jakob K. 1996. Discourse function of conjoiners in the Pastoral Epistles. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Inc.

Hoopert, Daniel Arthur. 1981. The discourse structure of 1 Corinthians 1-4. M.A. thesis. University of Texas at Arlington.

Holy Bible: Authorized King James Version. 1611. New York: The Word Publishing Company.

Holy Bible: New International Version. 1978. New York: New York International Bible Society.

Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2):251-299.

Hwang, Shin Ja J. 1996. Approaching a narrative: charting and chunking. *Class*

- handout for 5303: Grammatical Theory I: Discourse. University of Texas at Arlington, Spring.
- Jacobson, Roman. 1990. *On language*. Ed. by Linda R. Waugh and Monique Monville-Burston. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Kelly, J. N. D. 1969. *The epistles of Peter and Jude*. Blacks New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black (Publishers) Limited.
- Kendall, David W. 1986. The literary and theological function of 1 Peter 1:3-12. In Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on First Peter*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.
- Larson, Mildred L. 1998. *Meaning based translation: a guide to cross-language equivalence*. 2nd ed. New York: University Press of America, Inc.
- Levinsohn, Steven H. 1987. *Textual connections in Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- _____. 1992. *Discourse features of New Testament Greek: a coursebook*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- _____. 2000. *Discourse features of New Testament Greek: a course book on the information structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International.
- Link, Hans-Georg. 1971. Blessing, blessed, happy: εὐλογία. In *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 1: A-F, ed. Colin Brown, 206-215. Grand Rapids: The Zondervan Corporation.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1983. "Exhortation and mitigation in First John." *Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation 9:3-44*.

- _____. 1985. "Sentences as combinations of clauses." In Shopen, ed.,
Language and typology and syntactic description, vol. II, 235-286. Cambridge
University Press.
- _____. 1992. "The discourse strategy of an appeals letter." In Mann, William C.,
and Sandra A. Thompson, ed., *Discourse description: diverse linguistic analyses
of a fund-raising text*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- _____. 1995. Class notes for 6310: seminar in linguistics. University of Texas at
Arlington, fall.
- _____. 1996. *The grammar of discourse*. Rev. ed. New York: Plenum Press.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida, eds. 1988. *Greek-English lexicon of the New
Testament based on semantic domains: volume 1: introduction and domains*.
New York: United Bible Societies.
- Mann, William C., Matthiessen, Christian M. I. M. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1992.
Rhetorical structure theory and text analysis. In *Discourse Description: Diverse
Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-raising Text*. ed. William C. Mann and Sandra A.
Thompson, 39-78. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Martin, Troy. W. 1992. *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*. Dissertation Series:
Society of Biblical Literature, 141. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Marshall, I. Howard. 1991. *1 Peter*. The IVP Commentary Series. Ed. Grant R.
Osborne. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. 1988. *1 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary, 49. Waco: Word
Book Publisher.

- Miller, George A. 1956. The magical number seven, plus or minus two: some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63: 81-97.
Retrieved May 10, 2005, from : <http://.well.com/user/smalin/miller.html>.
- Miller, Neva F. 1992. The imperatival of Romans 12. In *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Ed. by David Alan Black, 162-182. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- Moule, C. D. F. 1959. An idiom-book of New Testament Greek. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moulton, James Hope. 1908. Prolegomena. In James Hope Moulton, ed., A grammar of New Testament Greek 1. Edinburg: T & T Clark.
- Nestle, Eberhard, and Erwin Nestle, Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlos M. Martini, Bruce Metzger. 1993. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Nestle, Eberhard, and Erwin Nestle, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, Allen Wilgren. 1979. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 26th ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Nichols, Thomas David. 1984. An analysis of the larger semantic units of 1 Peter. Th.M. thesis. Dallas Theological Seminary.
- Nida, Eugene A., J. P. Louw, A. H. Synman, and J. v. W. Cronje. 1983. Style and discourse: With special reference to the text of the Greek New Testament. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.
- New English Bible, The. 1970. London: Oxford University Press.

- Pike, Kenneth L. 1982. *Linguistic concepts: an introduction to tagmemics*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.
- Prasad, Jacob. 2000. *Foundations of the Christian way of life according to 1 Peter 1, 13-25: an exegetico-theological study*. *Analecta Biblica*, 146. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico.
- Porter, Stanley E. 1992. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Radney, J. Randolph. 1982. *Some factors that influence fronting in Koine clauses*. M. thesis. University of Texas at Arlington.
- Raymer, Roger M. 1983. 1 Peter. In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary*, ed John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck, 837-858. Wheaton, Illinois: Victor Books.
- Rickets, Ernie Clarence Jr. 1999. *Discourse functions of tense, aspect and mood in ancient Greek hortatory epistles*. Ph.D. dissertation. The University of Texas at Arlington.
- Robertson, A. T. 1934. *A grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. 2003. 1, 2 Peter, Jude. *The New American Commentary*, vol. 37. ed. E. Ray Clendenen. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers.
- Selwyn, Gordon Edward. 1946. *The first epistle of St. Peter: the Greek text with introduction, notes, and essays*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan and Company.
- Starwalt, Ervin. 1999. *Connectors in Koine Greek: the Gospel of John*. *The Conservative Theological Journal* 3 (8): 134-148.

- Stowers, Stanley K. 1986. Letter writing in Greco-Roman antiquity. Library of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Synder, Scot. 1995. Participles and imperatives in 1 Peter: a re-examination in the light of recent scholarly trends. In *Filologia Newtestamentaria*, 8: 187-198.
- Talbert, Charles H. 1986. Once again: the plan of 1 Peter. In Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on First Peter*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.
- Terry, Ralph Bruce. 1992. Some aspects of the discourse structure of James. *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5(2): 106-125.
- _____. 1993. An analysis of certain features of discourse in the New Testament book of 1 Corinthians. Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Arlington.
- _____. 1995. A discourse analysis of First Corinthians. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and Arlington: University of Texas at Arlington.
- Thurén, Lauri. 1990. The rhetorical strategy of 1 Peter with special regard to ambiguous expressions. Åbo: Åbo Academy Press.
- Turner, Nigel. 1963. Syntax. In James Hope Moulton, ed., *A grammar of New Testament Greek 3*. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark.
- _____. 1976. Style. In James Hope Moulton, ed., *A grammar of New Testament Greek*. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1977. Text and context: explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. London: Longman Group Limited.
- _____. 1980. Macrostructures: an interdisciplinary study of global structures in

discourse, interaction, and cognition. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Van Rensburg, J. J. Janse. 1990. The use of intersentence particles and asyndeton in First Peter. *Neotestamentica* 24 (2): 283-300.

Wallace, Daniel B. 1996. Greek grammar beyond the basics: an exegetical syntax of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

White, J. L. 1972. The form and function of the body of the Greek letter. *Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series*. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.

Winer, Georg Benedikt. 1882. A treatise on the grammar of New Testament Greek: regarded as a sure basis of New Testament exegesis. 2nd ed. Trans. W. F. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Zerwick, Maximilian. 1963. Biblical Greek illustrated by examples. Trans. by Joseph Smith. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Ervin Ray Starwalt is the Coordinator of Developmental English at the University of Texas at Arlington. He has been administrating and teaching in the program since 2001. He received, a B.S. in Zoology from the University of Arkansas in 1971, a M.Div. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1976, a S.T.M. in Greek New Testament and literature from Dallas Theological Seminary in 1986, and a Ph.D. in linguistics from the University of Texas at Arlington in 2005. His areas of specialization and research interest include text analysis (how texts are constructed and read), syntax, developmental reading and writing, English composition, ESL, and ancient Greek. He currently resides in Fort Worth, Texas.