do these words allude? They appear to  
be a citation from Prov. iii. 25, where it  
is said to him that obeys the counsels of  
wisdom, “*Be not afraid of sudden fear,  
nor of the desolation of the wicked when  
it cometh.*” If this be so, the *fear* spoken  
of is not subjective, “with any amazement,” as A. V., but some external cause  
of terror, And such a meaning would suit  
very well with the context, in which as in  
ver. 14, the Apostle is often encouraging  
his readers to bear affliction and persecution cheerfully.  
So that we interpret it with Estius, “which while ye do,  
there is no cause to fear any evil: as, that  
of displeasing your husbands by your  
chaste and holy lives: lest they should  
treat you servilely if you shew yourselves  
ready to obey: for we know the sex is  
liable to vain fears, And even if you have  
unkind husbands, try to appease them  
rather by silence and patience, than by  
many words.” With regard to the much-disputed question whether by the preceding  
injunction all ornament of dress is forbidden, or only the making such ornament  
*the adorning,* it may safely be left to the  
Christian wisdom of believing women, to  
be not unwise, but understanding what  
the will of the Lord is, in this as in other  
similar matters. Within the limits of propriety and decorum, the common usage is  
the rule. There is sin in singularity, both  
as ministering to pride in ourselves, and as  
giving offence to others and discommending our holy religion. As Leighton well  
says, “There may be in some an affected  
pride in the meanness of apparels; and in  
others, nuder either neat or rich attire, a  
very humble unaffected mind…” Seneca  
says: “Great is he who enjoys his earthenware as if it were plate, and not less great  
is the man to whom all his plate is no  
more than earthenware ”).

**7.]** *Duty of husbands to their wives.*  
**Ye husbands, in like manner** (in like manner, i. e., there is a certain *honour* due to  
the wife, as to the husband and the master  
before. This again must be connected with  
the general precept in ii. 17), **dwelling  
according to knowledge** (in an intelligent  
and reasonable manner, well aware of the  
*weakness* spoken of below) **with the feminine as with the weaker vessel** (some,  
as the A. V., join these words with *giving  
honour.* But this mars the parallelism and  
the sense. For the Apostle prescribes two  
things: 1) consideration for the wife, as of  
the weaker sex: 2) honour for the wife, as  
a fellow-heir of the grace of life), **giving**  
(apportioning) **honour as to those who are  
also** (besides being your wives) **fellow-inheritors** (with you) **of the grace of life**  
(i.e. God’s gracious gift of life eternal: ch. i.  
4, 13 suffice to clear the meaning, the former  
explaining *inheritance*, the latter, *grace*):  
**in order that your prayers be not hindered.** The hindrance meant seems to be,  
that which would be occasioned by the man  
not giving his wife proper honour as a fellow-heir of the grace of life; in which case the peculiar promise of advantage in social  
united prayer would be lost: see Matt. xviii.  
19. According to this view, the  
united prayers of man and wife are meant.  
And so most of the Commentators.

**8, 9.]** *General summary exhortations  
to mutual forbearance and love.*  
{8} **Finally, all [being]** (the construction is  
still carried on from ch. ii. 17) **of one mind,  
sympathizing** (the meaning is not, as in  
A.V., confined to cases of sorrow: the “*rejoicing with them that do rejoice*” is also  
included), **loving the brethren, compassionate** (towards the afflicted), **humble-minded** (the word forms a note of transition