

THE SOCIO-RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF
THE RECIPIENTS OF I PETER :
AN ATTEMPT TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF
DATE, AUTHORSHIP AND ADDRESSEES OF
THE LETTER

Jan Hendrik Leonard Dijkman

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Arts
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
in fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Johannesburg 1984

A B S T R A C T

The parameters of an investigation into the socio-religious conditions of the recipients of I Peter are determined by the date and authorship assigned to the letter, on which there is no consensus. To resolve this problem, a comparative study of the language and theological thought of I Peter and the other NT books is undertaken. On the grounds of exact verbal parallels, similar sequences of thought, the use of the participle as an imperative and typical Hebraic expressions, found in the Petrine speeches in Acts, the Pauline epistles, Ephesians, James and Hebrews, it is argued that the NT authors used an early Jerusalem Catechism as a common basis.

Confirmation of this hypothesis leads to the conclusion that I Peter was written in the same period as the epistles of Paul and James. Its Petrine authorship is suggested by the way in which he quotes the LXX, catechetical codes and baptismal rites, and weaves this material into his own language. From Greek inscriptions of the period in Palestine, it is clear that Peter would be sufficiently proficient in Greek to compose the letter.

Therefore, the socio-religious investigation of I Peter's addressees is focused on the early sixties of the first century. Arguments are produced to show that the addressees were Jewish "exiles of the Dispersion" (i:1), converted to Christianity by the Jerusalem mission to the circumcised. As ~~many~~ many had lapsed from practising Judaism and became involved in various trade guilds and the attendant social and civic bacchanalia. Their Christian conversion and consequent change of life-style be an affront to their former Jewish and pagan companions, evoking i ~~ment~~ment, harassment and abuse. A comparison between them and modern sects indicates that the trials and persecutions were not due to official Imperial policy, but were reactions to the exclusivism which the Christian way of life engendered. I Peter provided the apostolic witness and encouragement required to build them up into a "spiritual house" and "a royal priesthood". (ii:5,9)

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own, unaided work.
It is being submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not
been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other
University.

..... *Jan Hendrik Leonard Dijkman*

Jan Hendrik Leonard Dijkman

Ninth day of March, 1984

*To the Glory of God
and
to my wife Anne
and our children
Paul, Nicholas and Gregory,
with affection and gratitude*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
DECLARATION	iii
DEDICATION	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
PREFACE	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
 1. INTRODUCTION	 1
State Persecutions	1
Literary Relationships	3
Catechetical Code Theories	4
Haustafeln	8
A Later Pastoral Stratum ?	10
The Style and Genre of the Letter	19
Verba Christi	21
LXX Quotations in I Peter	22
The Addressees	23
Method and Criteria for Study	24
Thesis	24
 2. THEOLOGICALLY AND ETHNICALLY SIGNIFICANT WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS IN I PETER IN RELATION TO THE N.T.	 25
Jewish Influences	141
Parallels with other New Testament Epistles	142
I Peter and the Speeches of Acts	148
Verba Christi	153
Gospel Contexts of Verba Christi in I Peter	157
Conclusion	164
 3. I PETER IN I CLEMENT AND THE POST-HERMETIC WRITINGS	165
The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	165

I Clement	166
The Shepherd of Hermas	168
The Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas	170
The Letters of Ignatius	171
Polycarp's Letter to the Philippians	172
Papias	174
The Epistle to Diognetus and 2 Clement	175
Melito of Sardis, Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius	176
 4. I PETER'S USE OF SCRIPTURE WITH THE CATECHETICAL AND BAPTISMAL CODES OF THE EARLY CHURCH	 178
Introductory Formulae	179
The Use of LXX Material	181
Influences from Pseudepigraphical Works	183
Assimilation of Catechetical Vocabulary and Expression	186
Knowledge of Greek among the Jews in Palestine	188
Silvanus	189
The Epistle of James as a Literary Parallel	192
 5. I PETER AND THE SOCIO-RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF ITS ADDRESSEES	 195
I Peter's Description of the Addressees	196
The Interpretation of <i>ἐκκλησία</i>	197
Different Attitudes towards Gentiles in Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism	199
Missions to the Circumcised and Uncircumcised	202
The Geographical Area Referred to in the Address ..	206
Population and Religious Cults of the Area	208
Social Implications of the Terms <i>παροικιοι</i> , <i>κατεργασμένοι</i> and <i>οἰκέται</i>	209
Relationships with Judaism	214
<i>Χριστιανοί</i> as a Distinguishing Term	215
The Sectarian Character of the Communities Addressed ..	216
Harassment by Local Jews and Pagans	220
Internal Effects of Social Polarization	223
The Occasion for the Composition of I Peter	225
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 230

P R E F A C E

It was Professor A.S. Geyser who first drew my attention to the fact that I Peter was a neglected book in New Testament study for many years. He referred me to an article by J.H. Elliott entitled "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: I Peter in Recent Research", (*JBL* 95:243-254, 1976), which is really a long review of the third edition of F.W. Beare's *The First Epistle of Peter*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947; 2nd ed. 1958; 3rd ed. 1970). Amazingly, in 23 years, Beare had only been able to make a few emendations to his original text, reflecting the lack of attention accorded to I Peter in New Testament research. This pattern of benign neglect was further underlined in a discussion with Prof. Lars Hartman, a prominent Biblical Scholar from Uppsala. As soon as he heard that I was interested in I Peter, he exclaimed, "What more is there to say after Selwyn?". He was referring, of course, to E.G. Selwyn's monumental work, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, (London: MacMillan, 1946; 2nd ed. 1947), in which he arrives at conclusions diametrically opposed to those of Beare.

The reason for this state of affairs is that neither the *religionsgeschichtliche* nor the literary critical methods have produced any "assured" results on the questions of date, authorship and addressees. Nor is there any agreement on the letter's dependence or independence of Pauline material, or its associations with state persecutions under Nero, Domitian or Trajan.

In this research, therefore, a new line of approach is attempted, by undertaking a comparative study of the language and theological outlook of I Peter and the rest of the New Testament. Special attention is also given to the knowledge of the Jewish background of the New Testament writers which has come to light with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other archaeological evidence from Palestine and Asia Minor.

Unless otherwise stated, the texts of the Scripture references are taken from the *Revised Standard Version*, (London/New York: Collins, 1952. NT 2nd ed. 1971), Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, (26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979), A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, (4th ed. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950), and R. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*, (7th ed. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951).

I am most indebted to Professor A.S. Geyser for his constant encouragement and thought-provoking suggestions, which opened my mind to the vast treasury of Jewish thought and tradition which the New Testament writers inherited.

My thanks are also due to the Inter-Library loan services of the University, the Community of the Resurrection in Rosettenville, Prof. A.S. Geyser, Prof. R.H. Fuller, the Revds. S.C. Hall, R.A.A. Hirst and A.J. Sharland, the Rt. Revd. L.E. Stradling and the Revd. Dr. J. Dalziel for the loan of books, without which this research would have been impossible. Finally, I must express my appreciation to my Bishop, the Rt. Revd. T.J. Bavin, for his support and to my parents, my wife and children for their love and encouragement to pursue this study in the midst of my duties as Chaplain and Lecturer at the University.

J.H.L. Dijkman
Lent 1984

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANSU	Acta seminarii neotestamentici Upsaliensis
APOT	R.H. Charles (ed.), <i>Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament</i>
BAG	W. Bauer, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , tr. & rev. W.F. Arndt & F.W. Gingrich
BDB	F. Brown, S.R. Driver, & C.A. Briggs, <i>Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
BETL	Sibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensum
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
EJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentery
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur ZNW
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
ConNT	<i>Coniectanea neotestamentica</i>
CQR	<i>Church Quarterly Review</i>
DB	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible</i>
DBSup	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément</i>
EBib	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>
EvQ	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
ExpT	<i>Expository Times</i>
FRLANT	<i>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</i>
HDAC	J. Hastings (ed.) <i>Dictionary of the Apostolic Church</i>

HDB	J. Hastings (ed.) <i>Dictionary of the Bible</i>
HibJ	<i>Hibbert Journal</i>
HKNT	Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	G.A. Buttrick (ed.), <i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i>
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LCC	The Library of Christian Classics, J. Baillie, J.T. McNeill, H.P. van Dusen, (eds.)
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LD	Lectio divina
Meyer	H.A.W. Meyer, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTSMS	New Testament Studies Monograph Series
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies, B. Metzger, (ed.)
PW	Pauly-Wissowa, <i>Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
PWSup	Supplement to PW
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RivB	<i>Rivista biblica</i>
ST	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
Str-B	H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament</i>

- | | |
|------|--|
| TDNT | G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.),
<i>Theological Dictionary of the New
Testament</i> |
| TDOT | G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringren (eds.),
<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old
Testament</i> |
| TLZ | <i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i> |
| TT | <i>Theology Today</i> |
| UUA | Uppsala universitetsårsskrift |
| ZNW | <i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche
Wissenschaft</i> |

1. INTRODUCTION

Authorship, object and date of I Peter remain unsolved problems of New Testament scholarship. On the assumption that the letter reflects a state of persecution, many scholars have associated it with various persecutions of Christianity under Roman Emperors ranging from Nero (64 AD) to Trajan (110). The connection with the Neronic persecutions has been forcefully proposed by those who have been prepared to accept the Petrine authorship of the letter on other grounds, since that is the only official state persecution known to have occurred within the life-time of the Apostle Peter.¹ The disadvantage of this theory is that there is no evidence that the Neronic persecution spread to Asia Minor, the area to which the letter is addressed and, moreover, a strong tradition would have it that the apostle himself fell an early victim to that persecution. Very little is known of the persecution under Domitian. Nevertheless, the book of Revelation is often assigned to this period, and on the grounds that both I Peter and Revelation refer to Rome as Babylon, it has been suggested that the persecutions referred to in the letter

1. See C. Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, ICC 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902, p. 87; C.E.B. Cranfield, The First Epistle of Peter, London: SCM, 1950, p. 10; O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, London: SCM, 1953, pp. 82-86; L. Goppelt, Der Erste Petrusbrief, Meyer Bd 12/1, 8th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, pp. 27-37; J.N.D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude, BNTC, London: Black, 1969, p. 30; J. Moffat, The General Epistles, James, Peter, and Judas, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928, pp. 85-87; Bo Reicke, The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude, 2nd ed. New York: Doubleday, 1964, p. 72; J.A.I. Robinson, Redating the New Testament, London: SCM, 1976, pp. 150-169; E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, 2nd ed. London: MacMillan, 1947, pp. 56-63; C. Spicq, Les Epitres de Saint Pierre, Paris: Gabalda, 1966, p. 26; J.W.C. Wand, The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, London: Methuen, 1934, pp. 12-17.

are those instituted by Domitian.¹ Much has also been made of the co-incidental fact that one of the places mentioned in the opening address of I Peter is Bithynia, where Pliny the younger was Governor in the reign of the Emperor Trajan. The correspondence between Pliny and Trajan on the very question of the conviction and punishment of Christians has fortuitously been preserved. Proponents of a later date and consequent pseudonymous authorship for I Peter, have emphasized the similarity between the author's admonition concerning suffering for the name of Christ and details of the treatment proposed for Christians according to the Pliny letters.² Many other features of that exchange, however, do not match the details of I Peter. This greatly reduces the validity of the Pliny connection.

Lately, such attempts to relate the epistle to official state persecution by Roman Emperors have been questioned on two counts. On the one hand, in redating the whole New Testament, it has been suggested that, in terms of the new chronology of all the other books, I Peter should be assigned to the life-time of the Apostle Peter.³ This argument of necessity restricts the persecutions mentioned in the letter to Nero. On the other hand, the assumption that I Peter

-
1. See E. Best, I Peter, London: Oliphants, 1971, pp. 63-64; N. Brox, Der erste Petrusbrief, Zurich: Benziger Verlag, 1979, pp. 38-41; R. Knopf, Die Briefe Petri und Judä, Meyer Bd 12/1, 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912, p. 11; W.G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, London: SCM, 1975, p. 425; H. Windisch (rev. by H. Preisker), Die Katholischen Briefe, HNT, 3rd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1951, pp. 50-51.
 2. See F.W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970, pp. 28-38; H. Koester, Introduction to the New Testament, 2v., Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, II p. 294; A.R.C. Leaney, The Letters of Peter and Jude, Cambridge: CUP, 1967, pp. 8-10; C. Milo Connick, The New Testament: An Introduction to Its History, Literature and Thought, 2nd ed. Encino: Dickenson, 1978, p. 354; N. Perrin, The New Testament: An Introduction, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974, pp. 257-258.
 3. See J.A.T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament, London: SCM, 1976, pp. 140-169.

reflects a particular persecution has also been questioned. It is held that the impression the letter conveys is not that of judicial persecutions by the government, but an atmosphere of suspicion, hostility and brutality on the part of the local population, which tended to create trouble with the police for the Christians.¹

Literary relationships with the Pauline epistles

Since many so-called "Paulinisms" have been detected in I Peter, its relation to the Pauline epistles has long been the subject of much scholarly study and debate.² At first various literary associations were postulated. Thus in the ICC series of commentaries, Sandy and Headlam³ could claim that I Peter was directly dependent on Romans, whereas Bigg denied this, rating the resemblances to I Peter as "quite superficial, attaching only to current commonplaces".⁴ Again C.L. Mitton⁵ believes that in terms of literary relationship I Peter draws unmistakably from Ephesians, for where Ephesians, Colossians and I Peter have common material, I Peter is always closer to Ephesians than to Colossians. This view has found acceptance amongst those scholars who for other reasons postulate a late date for I Peter. So, for instance, F.W. Beare believes that this will "establish more clearly than ever the literary dependence of I Peter upon several, if not all, of the epistles of the Pauline

-
1. See C.F.D. Moule, "The Nature and Purpose of I Peter", *NTS* 3:1-11, 1956.
 2. See J.H. Elliott, "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: I Peter in Recent Research", *JBL* 95:243-254, 1976.
 3. The Epistle to the Romans, 5th ed. Edinburgh: Clark, 1902, pp. lxxivff.
 4. C. Bigg, op. cit. p. 20.
 5. The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose, Oxford: OUP, 1951, pp. 176-197, See also C.L. Mitton, "The Relationship between I Peter and Ephesians", *JTS* ns 1:67-73, 1950.

corpus".¹ Yet in a final paragraph, Mitton² admits that the literary dependence could be the other way round if I Peter was earlier than Ephesians.³

Catechetical code theories

Studies on the Primitive Christian Catechism by A. Seeberg⁴ and Archbishop Philip Carrington⁵ have suggested a way out of this impasse by advancing the idea that the epistle writers made use of a common oral or written source of instruction. Following this lead, E.G. Selwyn in his monumental work⁶ found additional parallels between I Peter and I and II Thessalonians, Hebrews and James and argued forcefully that the similarity between these letters showed that their authors were drawing on *Verba Christi*, common catechetical, liturgical, hymnic and paraenetic material. Carrington reconstructed this material under four main divisions: (a) *deponentes* - the renunciation of heathen idolatry and vice, which he thought was based on the Levitical holiness code; (b) *subiecti* - the law of humility; (c) *vigilate* - the duty of watchfulness and prayer; (d) *resistite* - the duty of resisting the devil and remaining steadfast in the faith. In I Peter these elements of common paraenesis appear as follows:-

-
1. The First Epistle of Peter, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970, p. 219.
 2. Op. cit. p. 197.
 3. In this connection it is worth noting that neither C.K. Barrett, (The Epistle to the Romans, BNTC London: Black, 1957) nor C.E.B. Cranfield (The Epistle to the Romans, 2v. ICC, Edinburgh: Clark, 1975/79) make any mention of literary relationships between Romans and I Peter in their introductions.
 4. Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit, Leipzig: Deichertschen, 1903.
 5. The Primitive Christian Catechism, Cambridge: CUP, 1940.
 6. The First Epistle of St. Peter, 2nd ed. London: MacMillan, 1947, pp. 365-466.

1. The call to put away the sins and desires characteristic of their former life among the Gentiles. (I Pet.ii:1,11)
2. The call to Christian humility, subjection and the subordination of self-interest. (Particular classes, like wives, husbands and slaves are given special attention)¹
In addition, all have obligations to the state and should be subordinate to one another as Christians.
(I Pet.ii:12 - iii:12)
3. The call to watch and pray, which regularly occurs at the end of most New Testament epistles. In I Peter it occurs in each of the closing exhortations. (I Pet.iv:7; v:8f.)
4. The call to resist the devil and to persevere, for the end (parousia, judgement, salvation) is near. (I Pet.v:8f.)

Alongside this, Selwyn² isolated common patterns of teaching on persecution which is viewed as :-

1. A ground for rejoicing. (I Pet.i:6 - 7, 11)
2. A test of character. (I Pet.iii:13 - 17)
3. A fiery trial, which is a sign of the imminence of God's judgement and sifting of the Church. (I Pet.iv:12 - 19)
4. A call to resist the devil who uses persecution as his principal weapon. (I Pet.v:8f.)³

1. This special instruction was also the subject of the *Haustafeln*, which will be discussed later.

2. Op. cit. pp. 439-468.

3. This element is common to both the catechetical and the Persecution form, hence its duplication.

Within the catechetical teaching Selwyn identified certain fundamental principles which suggested to him that there had been a fusion of Jewish and hellenistic concepts such as might have arisen within circles of hellenistic Judaism.¹ To emphasize the Jewish precedents for this material he added an appended note on "Participle and Imperative in I Peter",² by D. Daube, because in the New Testament catechetical lists the writers use a participle instead of the imperative which would normally be expected in Greek. Daube demonstrated how this practice is found regularly in contemporary Hebrew, where it reflects the Rabbis' habit of using the Hebrew participle when framing codes of conduct. The catechetical codes, which reflect the same characteristic, most likely therefore passed through a Jewish or Jewish Christian stage. The fact that they have not been altered to comply with normal Greek grammar, suggests that there was great respect for their original verbal formulation. Such esteem implies that these rules originated very early in the Christian Church under the apostolic authority from Jerusalem. Significantly, this use of the participle also occurs in Acts xv:20, 29 in the Apostolic Decree issued from Jerusalem,³ further corroborating the view that these catechetical codes found their origin in Jerusalem. Indeed, Selwyn may be correct in supposing that at first, prior to the Apostolic Decree, they were used in the Judaeo-Christian milieu as a type of holiness code, simulating Levitical teaching. Later, as the Church expanded into a wider sphere, they would be used as a code of behaviour to guide the new converts in disentangling themselves from their former way of life in Gentile society.⁴

1. Op. cit. p. 437.

2. D. Daube, Participle and Imperative in I Peter, Appended Note in E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, 2nd ed. London: MacMillan, 1947, pp. 467-488.

3. James i:27 may also be regarded as a parallel, since the same idea is expressed by ἀσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ... Cf. Eph. iv:22 where ἀποτίθεσθαι is used.

4. Op. cit. p. 400.

Within the catechetical teaching Selwyn identified certain fundamental principles which suggested to him that there had been a fusion of Jewish and hellenistic concepts such as might have arisen within circles of hellenistic Judaism.¹ To emphasize the Jewish precedents for this material he added an appended note on "Participle and Imperative in I Peter",² by D. Daube, because in the New Testament catechetical lists the writers use a participle instead of the imperative which would normally be expected in Greek. Daube demonstrated how this practice is found regularly in contemporary Hebrew, where it reflects the Rabbis' habit of using the Hebrew participle when framing codes of conduct. The catechetical codes, which reflect the same characteristic, most likely therefore passed through a Jewish or Jewish Christian stage. The fact that they have not been altered to comply with normal Greek grammar, suggests that there was great respect for their original verbal formulation. Such esteem implies that these rules originated very early in the Christian Church under the apostolic authority from Jerusalem. Significantly, this use of the participle also occurs in Acts xv:20, 29 in the Apostolic Decree issued from Jerusalem,³ further corroborating the view that these catechetical codes found their origin in Jerusalem. Indeed, Selwyn may be correct in supposing that at first, prior to the Apostolic Decree, they were used in the Judaeo-Christian milieu as a type of holiness code, simulating Levitical teaching. Later, as the Church expanded into a wider sphere, they would be used as a code of behaviour to guide the new converts in disentangling themselves from their former way of life in Gentile society.⁴

1. Op. cit. p. 437.

2. D. Daube, Participle and Imperative in I Peter, Appended Note in E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, 2nd ed. London: MacMillan, 1947, pp. 467-488.

3. James i:27 may also be regarded as a parallel, since the same idea is expressed by ἀποτρίβειν ἑαυτὸν τὸ πρῶτον ἀπὸ... Cf. Eph. iv:22 where ἀποτρίβειν is used.

4. Op. cit. p. 400.

In a later study, Daube included the subsection material in a wider context of catechetical instruction, and argued that this arose directly from Jewish models.¹ From a variety of sources he reconstructed the characteristic pattern of instruction for proselytes preparing for baptism, as recommended by the Tannaim. For this purpose he identified five categories of teaching: (1) the test, in which would-be converts are warned of the trials and afflictions awaiting them; (2) commandments about rituals, duties and moral obligations, including subsectionist teaching; (3) exhortations to charity, mainly in the sense of almsgiving; (4) penalties for transgressions or apostasy; (5) rewards of faithfulness and expectations in the world to come. However, while assigning a special place to charity, the Tannaite plan said nothing about humility and subordination. Daube tried to solve the difficulty by suggesting that one version emphasized love while another concentrated on humility and subordination.² While the categories proposed by Daube do not tally exactly with those listed by Carrington and Selwyn, they have, nevertheless, firmly established the Jewish provenance of the catechetical material under review.

The hypothesis of a primitive catechism underlying the epistles of the New Testament stimulated further work by M-E. Boismard,³ Rudolf Bultmann,⁴ Birger Gerhardsson,⁵ R. Deichgräber,⁶ and

-
1. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London: Athlone, 1956, chs. 4 & 5.
 2. Ibid. p. 130.
 3. "Une liturgie baptismale dans la Prima Petri", *RB* 63:182-208, 1956 and *RB* 64:161-183, 1957; Quatre Hymnes Baptismales dans la Première Epître de Pierre, LD 30 Paris: Cerf, 1961.
 4. "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief", *ConNT* xi:1-14, Lund, 1947.
 5. Memory and Manuscript, Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity, Lund: Gleerup, 1961.
 6. Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen, Göttingen: V & R, 1967.

E. Lohse¹ who applied a Form Critical approach to the subject. Their studies confirmed Selwyn's main thesis, although they criticized the details of his suggested solution as too formal and stylized. They believed that the authors of the epistles show a much freer and easier approach to this material. While they draw on a common fund of Christian teaching both in content and form, they freely adapt, expand and recast that material to suit the particular needs of their message.

Haustafeln

Parallel to the catechetical researches were enquiries into the origin and purpose of the primitive Christian *Haustafel*.² This designation of certain New Testament passages as "household tables"-*Haustafeln* - was derived from Martin Luther's German translation of the Bible, in which he introduced the term as a sub-title above Ephesians v:21-vi:9 and Colossians iii:18-iv:1. Later he used it as a description for similar teaching in his Small Catechism.³ For a long time scholars thought that the *Haustafeln* were adapted from the Stoics.⁴ More recent study of the New Testament catalogues of virtues and vices has revealed that the process of their formulation was far more complicated. Consequently, the influence attributed to Stoicism has diminished considerably, while a greater role has been ascribed to the Oriental-Jewish background.⁵ It has become clear, therefore, that simple source-critical methods fail to ex-

1. "Paränese und Kerygma im I Petrusbrief", *ZNW* 45:68-89, 1954.

2. See J.E. Crouch, The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel, Göttingen: V & R, 1972, pp. 9-101.

3. See K. Weidinger, Die Haustafeln: Ein Stück Urchristlicher Paränese, Leipzig: Hinrich, 1928, pp. 1-2.

4. See A. Vögtle, Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament, NTAbh XVI, 4/5, Münster, 1936, pp. 6-7.

5. See S. Wibbing, Die Tugend und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumran Texte, BZNW 25, Berlin: Topelmann, 1959, pp. 14-117.

plain their evolution adequately, and that they permit only two solutions to the problem: Either the *Haustafel* has a pre-Christian origin in a Hellenistic¹ or Jewish² environment, or else it is a specifically Christian creation.³

To establish the true religionsgeschichte of the *Haustafel*, J. E. Crouch posed two questions which had to be investigated:⁴ Firstly, what were the sources of the materials which were included in their formulation, and secondly, what impelled Christian teachers to formulate them? He concluded that the *Haustafel* was formed from Hellenistic Jewish rather than specifically Christian material, but that Christian teachers recast them to deal with the particular problems in Christian churches. Therefore, it would be legitimate in a limited and relative sense only, to speak of the *Haustafel* as a Christian creation. The Christian teachers who compiled the *Haustafeln* did not cease being Jews when they became Christians, and thus it was to be expected that their heritage of Jewish *Chokhma* would be reflected in their Christian formulations. The letter which the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem addressed to Gentile believers,⁵ provides an excellent example of such abiding influence.⁶

-
1. See M; Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon*, HNT III.2, Tübingen: Mohr, 1913. See also K, Weidinger, loc. cit.
 2. As proposed by E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon*, Meyer Bd 9/2, 12th ed. Göttingen: V & R, 1961 (1930), pp. 152-154.
 3. This is the view of K.H. Rengstorf. See his "Die neutestamentlichen Mahnungen an die Frau, sich dem Manne unterzuordnen", O. Schmitz FS, Witten, 1953, pp. 131-145, and *Mann und Frau im Urchristentum*, Köln: Opladen, 1954, pp. 25-46. See also D: Schroeder, *Die Haustafeln des Neuen Testaments. Ihre Herkunft und ihr theologischer Sinn*, (Diss.) Hamburg, 1959.
 4. Op. cit. p. 147.
 5. Acts xv:23-29.
 6. See also Gal.ii:2-10, Paul's report of the requirements which the "pillars" laid down for his Gentile converts.

A later pastoral stratum ?

Very recently, W. Munro¹ has rejected the view that such common catechetical material in Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, the Pastoral Epistles and I Peter was incorporated from earlier traditional sources. Instead she argues that it was a subsequent addition forming part of an extensive layer or stratum which was only included during a full scale redaction of the Pauline corpus during the first half of the second century. Because the additional material reflects the Roman ideological viewpoint and characteristics of style, she believes that it was designed to inculcate submission to the Imperial authorities and to gain Christian support for the institutions of Graeco-Roman society.

This is a fascinating but not a plausible hypothesis, since it fails to take account of the very forces at work in the preservation of the writings of revered apostolic writers, which led to the formation of the Canon. As applied to I Peter, Munro's theory becomes even less attractive, because its fundamental assumptions are questionable.

To pursue her argument, she postulates a late date for I Peter,² solely on the strength of the theories of scholars who adopt that view.³ Yet it is not a foregone conclusion that I Peter is as late as she assumes. Even C.L. Mitton admitted that there was a possibility that I Peter could have been earlier.⁴ Moreover, J.A.T. Robinson⁵ has questioned such late dating for I Peter along with the other New Testament books.

1. W. Munro, Authority in Paul and Peter. The identification of a Pastoral Stratum in the Pauline Corpus and I Peter, NTSMS 45, Cambridge: CUP, 1983.

2. Op. cit. p. 3.

3. C.L. Mitton, op. cit. pp. 280-315; O.D. Foster, The Literary Relations of 'The first epistle of Peter', New Haven: 1913. A.E. Barnett, Paul Becomes a Literary Influence, Chicago: 1941, pp. 52-69; F.W. Beare, op. cit. pp. vii, 215f.

4. Op. cit. p. 197.

5. Op. cit. pp. 140-169.

The assumption that the subordination passages fit awkwardly into their present contexts is spurious. Munro fails to appreciate that the isolation of common paraenetical material in I Peter arose, not from disjointed literary forms, but from common subject matter and verbal resemblances in the respective letters. Hence her proffered reconstruction of I Peter appears very artificial, for there are no "awkward seams" in the epistle, and the only literary break occurs between verses 11 and 12 of chapter four. It is precisely for this reason that scholars have commended I Peter for its fluent Greek and literary style.¹ Consequently Munro is forced to acknowledge that "the later material in I Peter extends so far beyond the subjection material, *that the earlier version of the document may actually be regarded as a source incorporated into a later, expanded epistle*".² By this admission she concedes the essential literary unity of the letter. A far more logical explanation of the occurrence of similar paraenetic passages in I Peter and the other New Testament epistles is that the original authors used a common catechetical source in instructing their readers.

Munro maintains that the concern of the later pastoral material was "to achieve dissociation from Judaism".³ In associating I Peter with such an aim, she has totally ignored the close verbal resemblances of Jewish thought and expression which the letter has with the epistle of James. For both of these authors a break from Judaism would be utterly unthinkable, particularly if I Peter is also addressed to the circumcised.⁴ Even Paul's anguish for his kinsmen in his attempts to reconcile Jew and Gentile in Romans 9 - 11 militates against Munro's thesis, and she has to concede that "the Pastoral epistles show a far clearer separation from Judaism than the later stratum in the ten-letter corpus".⁵ Her explanation

1. As Munro herself admits, op. cit. p. 6.

2. Ibid. p. 37, italics mine. 3. Ibid. p. 2.

4. See Gal. ii:9, where Paul reports that while he went to the Gentiles, James, Cephas and John would go to the circumcised.

5. Op. cit. p. 110.

of this difference as an intensification of the conflict with Jewish gnosticism and the increase of Gentile over Jewish influence in the church "*with the passage of time*",¹ further weakens her argument that the addition of a pastoral stratum to I Peter and the Pauline corpus was contemporary with the composition of the pastorals. Instead it suggests that the pastorals were produced later and reflect an adaptation of the original paraenetic material to accomodate the shift in Judaeo-Christian relations.

In Munro's opinion the main purpose of the subjection material is to support the "major institutions of Graeco-Roman society: the patriarchal household, slavery, the imperial state and the army",² along the lines of Stoic paideia. To evaluate such a point of view, the exact meaning and history of ὑποτάσσω must be investigated. This word has no antecedents other than those in the LXX,³ yet of the 21 occurrences listed in Hatch and Redpath,⁴ there is only one (Theod. Dan.vi:13) in which the specific idea of obedience is expressed. In the New Testament ὑποτάσσεσθαι occurs 30 times. Occasionally it clearly means obedience as in Rom.viii:7, but generally that is not the predominant thought. Usually the word is used to indicate the proper attitude of a Christian to the leaders of the church - 1 Cor.xvi:16; to the civil authorities - Rom.xiii:1 & 5; 1 Pet.ii:13f; Tit.iii:1 (where it is coupled with πειθαρχεῖν suggesting that the author felt that the idea of obedience was not necessarily included in ὑποτάσσεσθαι); to God - Jas.iv:7; of Christian wives to their husbands - Eph.v:22; Col.ii:18; 1 Pet.iii:1 & 5; of the νεώτεροι to the πρεσβύτεροι - 1 Pet.v:5; of the Church to Christ - Eph.v:24; and of a reciprocal obligation ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ.⁵ This reciprocal obligation of ὑποτασ-

1. Op. cit. p. 110, italics mine. 2. Ibid. p. 2.

3. See G. Delling, *TDNT* VIII, pp. 39-46.

4. E. Hatch & H.A. Redpath, Concordance to the Septuagint and other Greek Versions of the O.T. (including the Apocryphal Books), Oxford: Clarendon, 1897.

5. Cf. the variant which adds ὑποτασσόμενοι in 1 Pet.v:5b. Cf. also 1 Clem.xxxviii:1f.

ὁμεινολ has caused difficulties in interpreting the word. Cranfield is surely correct in following Calvin's view that ὑποτάσσεσθαι does not mean "obey" in this context but "subjection" in the sense of recognizing "that one is placed below the other person by God".¹ In I Pet.ii:13f. and Rom.xiii:1 & 5 therefore, it means submitting to the civil authorities, who act as God's servants and the instruments of Christ's kingly rule, οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ. This reason for Christian submission expresses a truth already familiar to the Jews through much of the teaching of the Old Testament, particularly Deutero-Isaiah xlv:1, "Thus says the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have grasped, to subdue nations before him and ungird the loins of kings..."² which I Peter must also have known because he so frequently alludes to this author. Moreover, Strack-Billerbeck have shown that this idea was very familiar to Rabbinical Judaism as well.³ Hence even the Jews were taught that no matter how pagan the imperial government was, it had to be acknowledged as a divinely appointed ἐξουσία. Failure to render it the appropriate ὑποτάσσεσθαι would be rebelling against God's ordering, and would invoke not just the civil power's reaction, but divine judgement. Similarly, both Peter and Paul stress that Christian duty knows no bounds. In I Peter they must honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God and honour the emperor.⁴ According to Romans they must render to all their dues.⁵ Both passages recall Pirke Aboth iii:17, "Rabbi Ismail said: Be serviceable to superiors, willing to the government, and kindly disposed to all men" and iv:1, "Who is honoured? He who honours mankind". They also reflect the early Christian practice of adding phrases of theological reflection or Christian teaching like διὰ συνείδησιν

1. C.E.B. Cranfield, "Some observations on Romans xiii:1-7", *NTS* 6:241-249, 1960, p. 243.

2. Cf. 2 Sam.xii:8; Isa.v:24-30; Jer.xxvii:5f; Dan.ii:21,37f; iv:17,25,32; v:21; Wis.vi:3; 1 Enoch xlvi:5.

3. See Str-B III pp. 303-304.

4. I Pet.ii:17.

5. Rom.xiii:7.

θεοῦ¹ or διὰ τὸν Κύριον² to original Jewish documents.³

If we follow the suggestion of Cranfield⁴ and take τῷ τόν φόβον in Romans xiii:7 to refer to God, it would clearly be parallel to I Peter ii:17 with its four crisp commands. Both passages would then list the fear of God as the third command. Further, it is also noteworthy that in this verse in I Peter, the wording of Proverbs xxiv:21, "my son, fear thou the Lord and the king !" has been significantly altered. Clearly the author wishes to make a distinction between obligations to God and to the Emperor. God is to be feared (φοβεσθε) but the Emperor is to be honoured (τιμᾶτε). According to the proposed interpretation of Romans xiii:7, Paul supports that distinction, which is far more likely to have been derived from the primitive Jewish church, than from a later school of redactors, who wished to dissociate Christians from Judaism and elicit support for the Roman government.⁵

At this point it should be noted that James does not include any teaching on obedience to the state as is found in I Peter and the Pauline epistles.⁶ Munro's proposed cavalier revision and

1. Rom.xiii:5.

2. I Pet.ii:13.

3. See Eph.v:22, ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ ; Col.iii:18, ἐν Κυρίῳ ; 1 Clem. xxi:6, τὸν Κύριον "Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν...ἐντραπόμεν... Hence E. Bammel, "The Commands in I Peter II.17", *NTS* 11:279-281, 1965, suggests that the author has adapted a Jewish Haus-tafel and added διὰ τὸν Κύριον to turn it into a Christian ethic.

4. C.E.B. Cranfield, op. cit. pp.247ff. Cf. C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, ICC, 2v. 6th ed. Edinburgh: Clark, 1975/79, pp. 669-673.

5. Jesus' saying in Mk.xii:17, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's", was probably taken to imply "honour" to the Emperor and "fear" to God.

6. In his views, James appears to be much closer to Qumran, the Pharisees and Zealots. Hegesippus' story, although it has many legendary traits, relates that James was nicknamed Oblias, "bulwark of the people". (E.H. II, xxiii:7, LCL I, p. 170.) The Oblias part naturally derives from a misreading of the majuscule ΟΒΑΔΙΑΣ - ὠβαδίας = עבדיה = Obadia = "servant of God" (and Lord Jesus Christ. - Jas.i:1)

editing of so many New Testament letters by the insertion of a pastoral stratum, fails to explain why the epistle of James went unscathed in this process. Why did the later revisers, who were so intent on gaining support for the Roman administration, fail to include such pastoral counsel in that letter? Or, if James is as late as Munro assumes, why does it not reflect the general pro-Roman attitude which she attributes to these later church leaders? A far more convincing solution to the whole problem is to be found in dating James much earlier and in accepting that the author uses catechetical material for his own purposes. The reason for his omission of references to obedience to the state may then be explained as a reflection of the Jewish theocratic point of view. As God's chosen people there was no way in which they could be subject to any authority other than God.¹

While in terms of Munro's thesis, the instruction to slaves to submit to their masters in Ephesians vi:5-9 and Colossians iii:22-iv:1 may be viewed as an injunction supporting the Roman system of slavery, it is impossible to interpret I Peter ii:18-25 in this way. Like James i:1, I Peter shares the Jewish theocratic belief that Jews can only be the slaves of God - δούλοι θεοῦ - and none other.² Hence, when he does refer to his readers' servitude in ii:18, he is very careful to describe them as οἰκέται rather than δούλοι, so that he can clearly differentiate between their relationship to God and other men. In this regard he shares a remarkable quality with

1. Such a view would tally with the situation in Judea between 42-66 AD. Josephus Ant. 19:viii:2 and Acts xii:21-23 recount how Herod Agrippa allowed himself to be honoured as a god and consequently died in 42 AD. The successive Roman Procurators, who ruled Judea after Herod, were ever more loathsome to the Jews, whose eschatological expectations were running very high at that time and culminated in the outbreak of the Jewish War in 66 AD.

2. K.H. Rengstorff, *TDNT* II, pp. 261-280 has listed the precedents for δούλος θεοῦ in the LXX where it is used to denote all Israel, (Deut.xxxii:36) as well as particular important individuals such as Moses, (1 Kgs.viii:53,56: Mal.

James, in that neither of them offer paraenesis for δοῦλοι, reflecting instead the "slaveless" society of the Judean church as opposed to the Hellenistic churches. This is an added indication of the Judean provenance of the Petrine teaching on servitude and exposes a major flaw in Munro's thesis, for no later pro-Roman editor would have reserved such a fine distinction between οἰκέται and δοῦλοι specially for I Peter while ignoring it in all the other epistles he was revising.

Furthermore I Peter goes on to develop the thought of Christ as an example to the servant along the same lines as the Christ hymn of Phil.ii:6-11, which also derives from the early Judean church.¹ I Peter's exhortation occurs in a lyrical passage which is sometimes seen as a "Song of the Suffering Servant", because it is based on Isaiah liii. Jesus, during his earthly ministry, was treated as a much-abused servant, thus setting an example to other οἰκέται. Therefore they are urged to immitate Christ, who by his actions has set the Christian free from sin to live for righteousness. The thought is deeply influenced by his Christological interpretation of Isaiah liii, which according to Jeremias, "derives

iii:24) David and some prophets in their relationship to God (1 Kgs.viii:56; Jer.vii:25; Amos iii:7). I Pet.ii:16 similarly applies it to Christians. (Cf. Herm.Vis.1:2,4) Elsewhere in the NT it denotes particular individuals like prophets (Rev.x:7; xi:18) and apostles (Acts iv:29; Tit.i:1). Paul adds it to his self-designation as an apostle in Rom.i:1, while the two titles are also combined in 2 Pet.i:1. Thus for I Peter his readers are strictly δοῦλοι θεοῦ as they live under a Theocracy. Unlike the people of the Ancient Near East, amongst whom loyal subjects would generally describe themselves as δούλοι of their king or ruler, Jews could never be slaves of anyone but God.

1. E. Lohmeyer, KYRIOS JESUS: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil.2:5-11, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961 and R.P. Martin, An Early Christian Confession, London: tyndale, 1960 have shown conclusively that this was an early confessional hymn of the primitive Judean church.

from the Palestinian, pre-Hellenistic stage of the primitive Church".¹ This additional evidence for the Judean provenance of I Peter's instruction to οἰκέται serves to refute Munro's view that it was a later pro-Roman interpolation.

The next item in the subjection code lays down the behaviour which is expected of a Christian amongst members of the family, particularly in the relationship between husband and wife, which is set out in I Pet.iii:1-7. The main thought is that the chaste behaviour of wives, together with their fear of the Lord, is a silent testimony by which their husbands will be won over to faith. In the development of this theme in verses 3ff, there is a marked relationship to 1 Tim.ii:9-12. Both passages concentrate on the need for modesty in outward dress and demeanour in much the same language. D. Daube has argued that the term κεραίω in I Pet.iii:1 is derived from the rabbinic vocabulary,² which again indicates that the author is drawing on common Jewish tradition. While pagan moralists and Jewish teachers alike, have protested against luxury and ostentation in almost every age, this passage has a distinctive Jewish flavour about it. It stresses the quiet spirit, which the Jews believed to be highly prized in the sight of God. This way of thinking is clearly set out in 1 Sam.xvi:7, "Do not look on his appearance...for the Lord does not see as a man sees; man looks on the outward appearance, but the Lord looks on the heart". The same sort of thinking can be found in James ii:1-9, which once more suggests a Jewish context for the catechetical material being used here.³ This view is further enhanced by the way in which the author in iii:5-6 refers the ladies to the example of Sarah. She was regarded as the matron par excel-

1. J. Jeremias, *TDNT* V, p. 709. Cf. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, Welwyn: Nisbet, 1952, p. 94.

2. See D. Daube, "Κεραίω as a missionary term", *HTR* 40:109-112, 1947.

3. I Peter has summarized this whole idea in the *hapax legomenon* ἀπροσωπολήπτως in i:17, which, as we shall see later, is an expression typical of Jewish piety.

lence of the Chosen People.¹ He clearly follows the rabbinic interpretation of Gen.xviii:12² in regarding Sarah's manner of speech about her husband as demonstrating her obedience to him. Thus, if the wives he is addressing do what is right, they will truly be Sarah's daughters and need not fear πτόνους. This expression, borrowed from Prov.iii:25, unmistakably reflects the Jewish context of the thought. At iii:2 we may follow Selwyn³ and Best⁴ in taking ἐν φόβῳ to refer to God rather than to the husband on the grounds that the exhortation receives its strength from the wife's relationship to God. Such an understanding of "fear of God" as reverence, is characteristically Jewish as may be seen from Ps.cxi:10, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom".⁵

In concluding this paraenetic series (I Pet.iii:8-12), the author again emphasizes the thought of subjection - ὑποτάσσεσθαι - which sees the Christian life as the imitation of Christ. He ends this avowed summary of the catechetical virtues with a quotation from Ps.xxxiv:12-16 (LXX ψ xxxiii:13-17) which again underlines the thoroughly Jewish nature of this subjection material.

Hence, in contrast to Munro's thesis, this study will attempt to show that the call to subjection in I Pet.ii:12-iii:12 reveals many traits and expressions of thought which are so typically Jewish, that it is totally out of character to interpret it as a later pro-Roman interpolation attempting to dissociate Christians from Judaism.

-
1. Cf. Isa.1i:2; Heb.xi:11. With Rebecca, Leah and Rachel, she was accounted one of the four mothers of the people, see Str-B I, pp. 29-30.
 2. "After I have waxed old, shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also." See Str-B III, p. 764.
 3. Op. cit. pp. 143-144, & 183.
 4. Op. cit. p. 117.
 5. Cf. Sir.xl:26; Pirke Aboth iii:13.

The most promising solution to the problem of I Peter's literary relationships with the other New Testament epistles is the hypothesis that all the early Christian writers used a "Primitive Christian Catechism", as this would account for the similarities as well as the differences between their works. Further evidence will be presented to show that the common source was an early Jerusalem or Judean church catechism, based on the teaching of Jesus and evolved from it by Peter, James, John and other leaders of the primitive Jerusalem church.

The style and genre of the letter

The language, theological thought and expression of I Peter have also been the subject of debate. Objections to its Petrine authorship have been raised on the grounds of its literary style. It is alleged that a "simple" and "untrained" fisherman like Peter would have been unable to produce such excellent Greek.¹ To counteract this difficulty, Selwyn suggested that the final form and language of the letter are the work of Silvanus, Peter's amanuensis.²

Various other hypotheses have been proposed with respect to the genre of I Peter. Because of the obvious allusions to baptism in i:22-23 and ii:1-3, it seemed natural to suggest the baptismal liturgy as its life situation.³ R. Perdelwitz⁴ first argued that the major part of I Pet. i:3-iv:11 is a baptismal homily to which the author added i:1-2 and iv:12-v:12 to turn it into a letter, for in the first part the addressees' suffering is regarded as "potential", whereas in the latter section it is "actual". As an adherent of

1. See Acts iv:13 where Peter and John are described as ἀγράμματοι and ἰδιῶται in the eyes of Israel's leaders.

2. Op. cit. pp. 9-17.

3. See also i:3, "we have been born anew to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead".

4. R. Perdelwitz, Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des 1. Petrusbriefes, Giessen: Töpelmann, 1911.

the "history of religions" school, Perdelwitz found many affinities with the mystery cults in the letter and concluded that it must have been composed by a pseudonymous author in the second century. W. Bornemann¹ followed A. Harnack in suggesting that i:3-iv:11 is an address on Psalm xxxiv by Silvanus in his old age, while B.H. Streeter² regarded the letter as an original baptismal sermon by the elder Aristion, whom the Apostolic Constitutions mention as first bishop of Smyrna. According to H. Windisch³ this homily was made up of traditional paraenesis, an introductory hymn in i:3-12, and Christ-hymns in i:18-21 and ii:21-25. R. Bultmann identified a further series of rhythmic stanzas or hymnic material in iii:18-22.⁴

In a revision of Windisch's commentary H. Preisker presented a theory that the basic form of I Peter is a baptismal liturgy which Silvanus adapted and sent out as a letter from Rome.⁵ Stylistically Preisker identified the following elements: a prayer psalm - i:3-12; a teaching discourse preceding the baptism - i:13-21; a baptismal dedication - i:22-25; a hymn attributed to pneumatics - ii:1-10; a paraenetic homily culminating in a congregational christological hymn - ii:11-iii:12; an apocalyptic discourse - iii:13-iv:7a; a closing exhortation - iv:7b-11; an apocalyptic discourse at a public post baptismal service - iv:12-19; a paraenetic exhortation - v:1-9; a blessing - v:10; and a doxology - v:11.

-
1. W. Bornemann, "Der erste Petrusbrief - eine Taufrede des Silvanus?", *ZNW* 19:143-165, 1919/20.
 2. B.H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, London: MacMillan, 1929, pp. 136-139.
 3. H. Windisch, *Die Katholischen Briefe*, HNT, 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1930, pp. 49-82.
 4. R. Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief", *ConNT* XI, 1947, pp. 1-14.
 5. H. Preisker, "Anhang zum ersten Petrusbrief", *Die Katholischen Briefe* (rev. of H. Windisch), HNT, 3rd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1951, pp. 152-162.

While acknowledging the basic validity of Preisker's divisions, except in the concluding section of the epistle, E. Lohse¹ suggested that they represent different kinds of traditional material incorporated into a pastoral letter. He also found Jewish influences of a hellenistic rather than a Palestinian type, in the quotations from the LXX and affinities with certain passages in Tobit, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Sirach, and Pseudophocylides. By contrast, he believed that the psalm-like passage in 1:3-12 had some affinity with Palestinian texts and the Damascus document of the Qumran sect.

The Paschal Liturgy proposed by F.L. Cross² is another variation of Preisker's theory. He argued that I Peter reflected second century paschal and baptismal procedures as set out in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus and in Melito's Homily on the Passion.³ By admitting that the traditional material could be much earlier, he left the matter of date quite open. However, T.C.G. Thornton pointed out that before the second century, there is no evidence for any connection between the words *πάσχειν* and *πάσχα* and the Passover (*πάσχα*) in Egypt on which Cross's theory largely depends.⁴

Verba Christi

A different approach to the problems of the origin of I Peter was revived by R.H. Gundry⁵ and C. Spicq⁶ who, on the basis of

-
1. E. Lohse, "Paränese und Kerygma im 1 Petrusbrief", *ZNW* 45: 68-89, 1954.
 2. F.L. Cross, *1 Peter: A Paschal Liturgy*, London: Mowbray, 1954.
 3. See S.G. Hall, *Melito of Sardis on Pascha and Fragments*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
 4. T.C.G. Thornton, "1 Peter, A Paschal Liturgy?", *JTS* ns 12: 14-26, 1961.
 5. R.H. Gundry, "'Verba Christi' in I Peter: their implications concerning the authorship of 1 Peter and the authenticity of the Gospel tradition", *NZTS* 13:336-350, 1967.
 6. C. Spicq, "La 1 Petri et le témoignage évangélique de saint Pierre", *ST* 20:37-61, 1966.

Selwyn's¹ category of *verba Christi*, have drawn attention to a most fascinating feature of the epistle. Its allusions to dominical sayings refer to contexts in the Gospels which are either closely associated with the Apostle Peter, or cover subjects which would be of special interest to him. This position was vigorously attacked by E. Best,² who for other reasons accepts a late date and pseudonymous authorship for the letter. He attempted to show that the connections with the Gospels were confined to two blocks of Lucan material (chapters 6 & 12), two isolated sayings in Matthew, and one in Mark. Subsequently, Grundy effectively countered Best's argument, showing that I Peter contains frequent allusions to dominical sayings and incidents, which are not only authentic reminiscences but also reflect Peter's particular concerns.³ Much of this argument turns on the question whether I Peter reflects later or earlier Gospel tradition. In this study, therefore, careful attention will have to be given to the exact form of the Gospel logia, for if it can be shown that I Peter alludes to a Marcan or pre-Q form of those sayings, the argument for its early dating and apostolic authorship will be greatly enhanced.

LXX quotations in I Peter

The author's frequent Old Testament quotations from the LXX have been advanced as another reason for denying its Petrine origin. It is held that Peter would have made many more references to the life and teaching of Jesus, which he had witnessed himself, than to the Old Testament. Moreover, it is assumed that as a Palestinian Jew, Peter would have quoted the Hebrew Scriptures rather than the LXX.

1. Op. cit. pp. 23-24.

2. E. Best, "I Peter and the Gospel Tradition", *NTS* 16:95-113, 1970.

3. R.H. Grundy, "Further Verba on *Verba Christi* in First Peter", *Bib* 55:211-232, 1974.

In order to evaluate such arguments, it will be necessary to examine very carefully the use which the author makes of the Old Testament, as well as the catechetical and liturgical materials which were developing within the early church. Such a study must also take account of the findings of J.N. Sevenster,¹ who, on the basis of archaeological inscriptions and texts from the Palestine of that era, has argued conclusively that Greek was widely spoken and written there in the life-time of Peter. This is confirmed by the very existence of the Synagogues, which used the LXX as their "missionary Bible" long before the birth of the Christian church. Since the Jewish communities in the diaspora also used the LXX, it would have been most natural for a Jewish apostle to quote from the version which was familiar to his readers and in the language which they normally used. The epistle of James provides clear evidence of a Jewish writer making such use of the LXX. Furthermore, the very nature of I Peter as a letter offered little opportunity to touch on the general life and teaching of Jesus. Indeed, the first generation church was so intent on preparing people for the imminent parousia, that there was hardly time to develop a biographical interest in Jesus.²

The addressees

A related and equally unsolved problem concerns the identity of the addressees of the letter. Scholarly opinion is sharply divided on this point. Some insist that they were Jews in the Greek diaspora, others that the "exiles of the dispersion" were Gentiles, spiritually exiled on earth by reason of their conversion,

-
1. J.N. Sevenster, Do you know Greek?, NovTSup XIX, Leiden: Brill, 1968. See also E.M. Meyers and J.F. Strange, Archaeology, the Rabbis and Early Christianity, London: SCM, 1981; A.W. Argyle, "Greek among the Jews of Palestine in New Testament Times", *NZS* 20:87-89, 1973.
 2. Barring the odd references in Rom.i:3, Gal.iv:4 and 1 Cor. xi:25-26; xv:3-7, the same is true for Paul as well.

which turned them into a "holy nation, God's own people" and granted them true citizenship in heaven.¹

Method and criteria for study

A new line of approach is required to resolve these varied questions posed by I Peter. A careful study of the letter and the environment which it projects must be made in an endeavour to find a corresponding set of conditions in the early history of Christianity. In order to achieve this, theologically and ethnically significant words and expressions of I Peter will be analysed and compared with the language of the rest of the New Testament and some early Christian authors. On the basis of such a comparison, it should be possible to determine the correct place of I Peter in the evolution of early Christian thought and expression, thus providing a relative date for its composition. Further comparison of the religious, social and political climate reflected by the letter with the situation described by Jewish and Roman authors of the time, will be needed to set a more precise date, which in turn will make it possible to determine the condition and identity of its addressees.

Thesis

The examination of I Peter which follows will, therefore, be an attempt to prove the thesis that in addressing Jewish converts of the Jerusalem mission to the circumcised, who as *ἀπολυτοὶ* in Asia Minor were experiencing resentment, harassment and abuse from former Jewish and pagan companions, the apostle Peter expresses himself in the language of the LXX and an early Jerusalem Catechism (which he helped to formulate), as he encourages them to become a "spiritual house" and "a royal priesthood".

1. See W.G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, London: SCM, 1975, p. 418.

2. THEOLOGICALLY AND ETHNICALLY SIGNIFICANT WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS IN I PETER IN RELATION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

To assess the precise place of I Peter in the New Testament corpus, it needs to be examined in relation to the rest of that literature. In this chapter, therefore, we will be examining the parallels in thought and language between I Peter and the New Testament books. Inevitably, we will have to investigate the possibility of an early Jerusalem Catechism or other liturgical material forming a link between these documents as emerged from earlier studies of I Peter's relationship to the Pauline epistles,¹ and proposed in the Thesis of this study.² Careful note will also have to be taken of ethnical traits and modes of expression which provide clues in determining the author's cultural heritage and background.

i:1-2. The opening salutation contains the names of the sender and the recipients, which was customary in Jewish and Hellenistic official correspondence. It is expanded by thoughts of the Christians as "the elect", and by theological and Christological expressions reminiscent of the Christ hymn in Phil.ii:6-11, which is of Judean origin.³ The thoughts of sanctification and obedience expressed in this formula, are themes that the writer will take up later in his letter.

i:1 ἐκλεκτοῖς. This concept of the elect is derived from the Old Testament understanding of בחירה - the election of Israel.⁴

1. See pp. 3-19 supra.

2. See p. 24 supra.

3. Although all the elements are present, there is no hint of the Trinitarian doctrine which developed in the gentile church after AD 70, indicating that the author is closely associated with the early Judean church.

4. See Deut xiv:1-2; iv:37; vii:6-7; Jer xxxiii:23-26; Ezek xx:5; Isa xli:8-9; xlii:1. Cf. 2 Mac v:19; Acts xiii:17. See also H. Seebass, *TDOT* II, pp. 82-86; G. Schrenk, *TDNT* IV, pp. 190f; G.E. Mendenhall, *IDB* II, pp. 76-82.

Because the readers are chosen by God, they are now per force exiles of the dispersion in this world, a thought which is developed further in ii:4-10. They are a γένος ἐκλεκτός (ii:9) because through Christ the chosen corner-stone - λίθος ἐκλεκτός - they are built into a spiritual temple. The expression γένος ἐκλεκτός seems to hark back to Isa. xliii:20, בְּחִירֵי עַם, and must have become a typical religious term of self description for Jews as may be seen in IQM xii:1 and 5, where the Qumran community is also described as בְּחִירֵי עַם קוֹדֵשׁ, "the elect of the holy people".¹ Judging from the account of its beginnings in Acts, the Jerusalem church did not use ἐκκλησία to describe itself. In the speeches of Acts ἐκκλησία occurs only once, namely in Paul's address to the Ephesian Elders at Miletus.² Instead, the Jerusalem church viewed itself as the elect remnant of Israel which was destined to find salvation in Zion,³ and the restored tabernacle of David which God Himself had promised to build.⁴ Jerusalem was thus the divinely appointed locale for those who awaited "the times of restitution of all things".⁵ From this it is easy to understand that the Jerusalem church would describe itself as the ἐκλεκτοί which would have been in keeping with its claim to be the elect remnant of Israel. Etymologically this would also make sense as ἐκλεκτοῖς is a straight translation of the Hebrew בְּחִירֵי⁶ which describes those chosen by God. It is remarkable that I Peter, who is the only New Testament author other than Luke to mention the name Χριστιανός,⁷ prefers to address his letter to the ἐκλεκτοί in conformity with the preferred self-indication of the Jerusalem church. While Paul uses this word in the body of his epistles, it never features as an appellative in

1. See B. Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament, Cambridge: CUP, 1965, pp. 71-88.

2. Acts xx:28.

3. Joel ii:32; Acts ii:17ff.

4. Acts xv:16; Matt. xvi:18.

5. Acts iii:21.

6. See Bauer, Arndt & Gingrich, p. 242. (Henceforth referred to as BAG)

7. Acts xi:26; xxvi:28; I Pet. iv:16.

the opening of his letters addressed to Gentile congregations. Instead he uses κλητός in a synonymous sense. This is an indication that I Peter is not "deutero-pauline". Moreover, in contrast to the Gentile addressees of the Pauline letters, it suggests that the recipients of I Peter were Jewish Christians who would appreciate the Judaic concept of "election".¹ Further confirmation of the Jewish background of this appellation may be found in the fact that in the New Testament only I Peter and Hebrews refer to their readers as ἑνὸι καὶ παρεπιδόμοι² like the wandering Patriarchs of old. The election is also referred to the πρόγνωσις of God. In the New Testament the noun only occurs here and in Acts ii:23 in Peter's first sermon, suggesting some continuity of thought. Unlike Paul, I Peter does not discuss the problem of predestination. He writes simply as a devout Jew unaffected by the metaphysical difficulty which this thought presents,³ and expresses the same thoughts about Christ in i:20. Yet when Paul uses the identical word in his speech before Agrippa in Acts xxvi:5, he is simply referring to a fact commonly known in Jewish circles in Jerusalem.

As God's elect the addressees of I Peter can expect trouble from this world. The connection between being the elect and facing trouble in the world also appears in Mk.xiii:20 and 22, which state that the elect are in danger of being led astray by false Christs. John xiii:18 applies the notion to the disciples after the foot-washing episode. One of them who was chosen will be led astray and betray Jesus. Then in John xv:16 and 19 the theme is developed further along lines typical of I Pet.ii:9-17. Because they are chosen, they must be a loving community in a world which hates them as it hated their master.

-
1. For the development of "election" as a cognate way of expressing the church idea in ἑκκλησία and its LXX translation in ἐκκλησία see K.L. Schmidt, *TDNT* III, pp. 494-518; P.S. Minear, *IDB* I, pp. 607-609.
 2. I Pet.i:1; ii:11; Heb.xi:13.
 3. See R. Bultmann, *TDNT* I, pp. 39-718; E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, London: SCM, 1955, pp. 51-55.

While I Peter writes to the elect *παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς*... James i:1 is addressed to *ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*. At various times in the history of Israel some or all of the tribes were transplanted to other countries by their heathen victors.¹ In addition to this, many Jews, in pursuit of commerce, sought homes in foreign lands. In Acts there is scarcely a place mentioned that does not have at least one synagogue. Indeed, Josephus cites Strabo as saying: "Now these Jews are already gotten into all cities, and it is hard to find a place in the habitable earth that hath not admitted this tribe of men, and is not possessed by it".² These, then, were the Jews of the dispersion. Mayor³ has argued that while James intended his epistle for all Christian Jews, he may have aimed particularly at the Eastern dispersion, while I Peter was addressed to the diaspora in Asia Minor because the believers in that section would probably be less likely to have been acquainted with the Epistle of James.

Yet the real question at stake here is whether James and I Peter are using *διασπορά* in exactly the same sense. As K.L. Schmidt remarks, it is so easy to be caught in a circular argument here. If the addressees are regarded as Jewish Christians *διασπορά* will be interpreted literally, but if Gentile Christians are singled out, the term must be taken figuratively.⁴ We may agree that when James writes to "the twelve tribes in the dispersion" he is manifestly addressing Jewish Christians. I Peter, however, does not address his readers as "the twelve tribes", but as temporary residents living in the midst of the dispersion. He does not call them "the twelve tribes" since there is no indication that any members of the

1. See 4 Ezra xiii:40-53. See also *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Vol. 6, pp. 8-19 on "Diaspora" and Vol. 14, pp. 762ff., on "Sambatyon".

2. Jos. Ant. 14:vi1.

3. J.B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, 2nd ed. London: Mac-Millan, 1897, pp. cxii-cxx.

4. K.L. Schmidt, *TDNT* II, p. 102.

tribes Judah and Benjamin from the Jerusalem area are among his addressees, in contrast to James who may well include them with his readers in Syrian Antioch.¹ I Peter, therefore, sees them as members of the ten northern "lost tribes" across the "Sambatyon"² who have come to life again through Jesus.

An argument against this supposition is the description of the former state of the addressees as ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις,³ referring to the time of their ignorance, and μάταιας ὑμῶν ἐναστροφῆς πατροπαράδοτου⁴ - futile ways inherited from your fathers. Moreover, in iv:3-5 he also says to them that the time is over "for doing what the Gentiles like to do, living in licentiousness, passions, drunkenness, revels, carousing, and lawless idolatry".

While these passages might suggest that the readers were Gentiles, careful consideration shows that they apply just as well to a large fringe of Jewry in the dispersion who, especially since Alexander the Great, had lapsed from the pure practice of their religion and embraced the excesses of the Greek way of life. Indeed, I Pet.i:14 infers that they had lost their Jewish identity because they had, to a large extent, adopted such predominantly Greek practices. This view still encounters difficulties when it is applied to i:18.⁵

1. James' addressees most likely included the fugitives from Judea mentioned in Acts viii:1; xi:19ff and xiii:1ff in addition to the local diaspora Jews who had converted to the church in Antioch, where an exceptionally large Jewish colony had existed since the third century BC. Thus representatives of all Twelve Tribes would be included amongst them. See *IDB* I, pp. 145-147.

2. See 4 Ezra xiii:40-53. See also *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Vol. 14, pp. 762-764.

3. I Pet.i:14.

4. I Pet.i:18.

5. For a full discussion of this problem see W.C. van Unnik, *De Verlossing I Petrus 1:18-19 en het probleem van den Eersten Petrusbrief*, Amsterdam: NHUM, 1942. An English translation appears in *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik*, Part Two, *NvTSup* XXX, Leiden: Brill, 1980. See also

Conceivably *καταλα ἀναστροφή* (futile ways) could refer to lapsed Jews, but when it is quite naturally set alongside *πατροπαράδοτος*, implying that it is a tradition handed down from their fathers, it causes great difficulty. It is deemed very questionable whether Jewish Christians like James or Peter would ever describe their Jewish heritage in this way, or refer to fellow Jews as those who "once were no people".¹ In resolving these questions of detail, we must not overlook the general image of this passage, which is that of slavery or rather manumission. The author is arguing that it is through the precious blood of Christ that his readers have been set free. To a very large extent the Jews in the Near East were mainly slaves who had been set free by Babylonians, Persians, Syrians and Greeks who had been their successive masters. Thus their social status was that of "freedmen" or *libertini*.² By contrast Gentiles were not *libertini* but *liberi*. The general image of the passage is therefore more applicable to Jews in the dispersion than to Gentiles. It is within this context that we need to examine *πατροπαράδοτος*. This word does not appear anywhere else in the New Testament, but in other Greek literature it describes anything that is literally or figuratively inherited.³ It is noteworthy, however, that wherever else in the New Testament a *παράδοσις* is mentioned disparagingly, it refers to a Jewish tradition.⁴ In view of this, it could be

W.C. van Unnik, "The Critique of Paganism in I Peter 1:18", *Neotestamentica et Semitica*, Studies in honour of Principal Matthew Black, ed. E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox, Edinburgh: Clark, 1969, pp. 129-142.

1. I Pet.ii:10.
2. Paul himself most probably belonged to a family of *libertini*. See Acts vi:9. Cf. *IDB* II, p. 325; *Str-B* II, pp. 661-665.
3. *BAG* p. 642.
4. See Matt.xv:2,3,6; Mk.vii:3,5,8,9,13; Gal.ii:8. Matt.xxiii:15, "...you traverse sea and land to make a single proselyte, and when he becomes a proselyte, you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourselves", reflects the same sentiment.

argued that ἀναστροφῆς πατριπαράδοτου refers to their ancestral Jewish trust in the saving power of the temple sacrifices in contrast to the eternal sacrifice of Jesus Christ.¹ In such a comparison there would be nothing inherently difficult about the author's description of their Jewish tradition as μάταια if he were addressing Jewish Christians. Indeed, such a description would be all the more forceful if, as we have suggested above, the addressees were descended from members of the "lost tribes" whose Jewish identity had been lost under the Greek practices which they had adopted. It would be quite natural for law observant Jews from Galilee or Judea to describe such practices as futile. From this point of view, the imagery of Hos.i:9f. would most aptly describe converts with such a background as those who "once were no people",² for Hosea's *אֵין עָמִי* were *Israelites* (and not Gentiles) who became disloyal to God. Like all Jewish Christian apocalyptists, the author interpreted the coming of Jesus as the initiation of the restoration of the people.³ Previously they were a "no people" *אֵין עָמִי*⁴ and yet they will become a numerous people "like the sand of the sea".⁵ He is referring to a Midrash on Hosea which stresses that God resuscitates His lost People. I Peter, therefore, sees his readers as descendants of the "lost"

-
1. See Heb.v:1-9. According to Str-B III, p. 763, the Rabbis certainly accorded such saving power (Entschuldigungsgrund) to the tradition of the fathers.
 2. I Pet.ii:10. On this point L. Murillo, on page 333 in "El 'Israel de las Promesas, O Judaismo y Gentilismo en la Concepción Paulina del Evangelio", *Bib* 2:303-335, 1921, quotes A. von Harnack with approval when he writes, "Wenn das Volk *sein Gesetz* nicht mehr hält, ist es das jüdische Volk nicht mehr; dann findet also die besondere Verheissung, die es hat, *kein Volk mehr*, bei dem sie sich erfüllen kann". (*Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, p. 36, in *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, III, 1906-1911.) Clearly, therefore, the οὐ λαός in I Pet.ii:10 refers to Jews who did not observe the Torah.
 3. See A.S. Geyser, "Some Salient New Testament Passages on the Restoration of the Twelve Tribes of Israel", *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. BETL LIII, 1980, and A.S. Geyser, "The Twelve Tribes in Revelation", *NTS* 28:388-399, 1982.
 4. Hos.i:9.
 5. Hos.i:10. Cf. ii:22.

tribes who were cut off from the Judean mainstream, consisting of the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin. In the diaspora they had lost their identity and become a "no (longer) people". It is important to note that in Old Testament usage, the word Hosea uses for people - *עַם*, refers *predominantly* to Jews, whereas *גוֹי* usually indicates Gentiles.¹ In the LXX *עַם* is translated by *λαός* while *גוֹי* is rendered *τὰ ἔθνη*. That this is also the usage which I Peter adopts, is confirmed by the way in which he distinguishes his readers from *τὰ ἔθνη* in iv:3-5. The grammatical structure of verse 3 must be determined in the light of the theme of the passage, which makes a clear distinction between past and present - the will of men and the will of God. If the antecedent of *πεπορευμένους* was *τὰ ἔθνη*, one would have expected a congruent plural neuter with it. As it stands it could also refer to *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις* in verse 2. Within the general theme of their context, these verses can, therefore, be interpreted as a clear indication that the readers were believers drawn not from the Gentiles, but from diaspora Jews.

On these grounds, therefore, it should be concluded that *διασπορά* should be interpreted literally in both James and I Peter. They are both addressing Jews who actually lived in the dispersion.²

i:2 ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος... ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
ἁγιασμός is a verbal substantive derived from *ἁγιάζειν*. As such it is only used in the New Testament epistles where it may be translated "consecration",³ in a sacrificial sense of making an offering acceptable or "hallowed" to God. In the present context it is due to the Spirit (taking the construction as the genitive of the subject) and is also part of God's eternal purpose and foreknowledge of the atonement wrought in Christ. Here *ἁγιασμός* is linked sacrificially

1. See R.E. Clements, *TDOT* II, pp. 426-433. Cf. K.L. Schmidt, *TDNT* II, pp. 364-372 and H. Strathmann, *TDNT* IV, pp. 29-39.

2. A similar view is expressed by J.H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless. A Sociological Exegesis of I Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. London: SCM, 1982, pp. 37-49. (Hereafter referred to as HFH.)

3. See Blass Debrunner E 109.

tribes who were cut off from the Judean mainstream, consisting of the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin. In the diaspora they had lost their identity and become a "no (longer) people". It is important to note that in Old Testament usage, the word Hosea uses for people - *עַם*, refers *predominantly* to Jews, whereas *גוֹי* usually indicates Gentiles.¹ In the LXX *עַם* is translated by *λαός* while *גוֹי* is rendered *τὰ ἔθνη*. That this is also the usage which I Peter adopts, is confirmed by the way in which he distinguishes his readers from *τὰ ἔθνη* in iv:3-5. The grammatical structure of verse 3 must be determined in the light of the theme of the passage, which makes a clear distinction between past and present - the will of men and the will of God. If the antecedent of *πεπορευμένους* was *τὰ ἔθνη*, one would have expected a congruent plural neuter with it. As it stands it could also refer to *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις* in verse 2. Within the general theme of their context, these verses can, therefore, be interpreted as a clear indication that the readers were believers drawn not from the Gentiles, but from diaspora Jews.

On these grounds, therefore, it should be concluded that *διασπορά* should be interpreted literally in both James and I Peter. They are both addressing Jews who actually lived in the dispersion.²

i:2 *ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος... ὁ παντοῦν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.
ἀγιασμός is a verbal substantive derived from *ἀγιάζειν*. As such it is only used in the New Testament epistles where it may be translated "consecration",³ in a sacrificial sense of making an offering acceptable or "hallowed" to God. In the present context it is due to the Spirit (taking the construction as the genitive of the subject) and is also part of God's eternal purpose and foreknowledge of the atonement wrought in Christ. Here *ἀγιασμός* is linked sacrificially

1. See R.E. Clements, *TDOT* II, pp. 426-433. Cf. K.L. Schmidt, *TDNT* II, pp. 364-372 and H. Strathmann, *TDNT* IV, pp. 29-39.

2. A similar view is expressed by J.H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless. A Sociological Exegesis of I Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. London: SCM, 1982, pp. 37-49. (Hereafter referred to as HFH.)

3. See Blass Debrunner E 109.

with ἐλεγκτοῖς and must be understood as "first fruits" - ἀρίστη. With Heb.xii:24, the author adopts the metaphor - ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ - sprinkling the blood of Jesus Christ, to describe the atoning worth of the sacrificial death of Jesus. Here it is worth noting that ῥαντισμός does not occur in any of Paul's writings, which may be an indication that I Peter and Hebrews represent a Jerusalem tradition separate from that of Paul. Further, the fact that in verse 4 the author continues to use the sacrificial epithets ἀφθαρτον, ἀμίαντον and ἀμόραντον to describe κληρονομία suggests that his thoughts on the Atonement wrought in Christ are deeply influenced by the sacrificial Temple worship in Jerusalem, clearly revealing the close connection which he and his readers had with the church in that city.

i:3-5. M-E. Boismard has detected a portion of a liturgical text here. He believes that the parallel expressions and thoughts between Titus iii:4-8 and these verses of I Peter betray an underlying baptismal hymn and argues that Tit.iii:8, "The saying is sure", indicates that the author is using a known source.¹

The underlying form of the doxology in these verses begins like a typical Jewish prayer. An excellent example may be found in the Eighteen Benedictions שמונה עשרה (Shemoneh 'Esreh) which each ended with the refrain, "Blessed be thou, O Lord".² Parallels may be

1. See M-E. Boismard, *Quatre Hymnes Baptismales dans la Première Epître de Pierre*, LD 30, Paris: Cerf, 1961, pp. 15-56. Cf. R. Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrus-brief", *ConNT* xi:1-14, Lund, 1947; F.L. Cross, *I Peter, A Paschal Liturgy*, London: Mowbray, 1954; O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, London: Lutterworth, 1949; D.G. Delling, *Worship in the New Testament*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962; J.D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, London: SCM, 1977; C.F.D. Moule, *Worship in the New Testament*, London: Lutterworth, 1961; J.T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*, Cambridge: CUP, 1971; E.G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 2nd ed. London: MacMillan, 1947, pp. 17-18.

2. See E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish people in the age of Jesus Christ*, Revised ed. Vol. II, Edinburgh: Clark, 1979, pp. 455-463.

found in Pss. lxxiii:19 and lxxii:18. Other passages like 2 Cor.i:3; Eph.i:3 and Lk.i:68 show very clearly that this idiom was taken over by the primitive church and adapted to suit their particular purpose.

i:3, 23 ἀναγεννήσας, ἀναγεγεννημένοι...διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ and ἀρτιγέννητα (ii:2). Reminiscences of the idea behind ἀναγεννάω may be found in the language of the Pagan Mysteries,¹ while the same thought is also prevalent in the "birth mystery" of the Corpus Hermeticum xiii:1 where τὸν τῆς παλιγγενεσίας occurs.² However, the mere fact that the change in the initiates could be described as ἀναγέννησις or παλιγγενεσία does not necessarily mean that I Peter was indebted to the mystery cults for the expression. Indeed, such an association of ideas appears to be ruled out by the comparative late redaction of the Poimandres between the middle of the first and the third centuries AD,³ unless an incredibly late date for I Peter is accepted. Moreover, as we shall see in a moment,⁴ the widespread use of terms like παλιγγενεσία and ἀναγεννᾶν in late Judaism and early Christianity shows that the concept was the common property of the Mediterranean world of the first century. Hence Büchsel⁵ and J.M. Robinson⁶ have argued that the thought behind ἀναγεννᾶν in I Peter is based on the Jewish practice of proselyte baptism. When speaking or writing Greek, the Jews used πάλιν γενέσθαι or παλιγγενεσία to express the idea of "rebirth" or "recreation".⁷ In particular, it was applied to the status of converts to Judaism. Thus we find "Rabbi Yose saying, 'A newly converted proselyte is like a newborn child' (Yebamoth, 48b)⁸ and R. Judah, in *Tractate Gerim* (ii.6), says that

1. R. Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des 1. Petrusbriefes*, Giessen: Topelmann, 1911, pp. 45-49, argued that the letter presents Christian Baptism as an initiation superior to that of the taurobolium.

2. A.D. Nock, ed. *Hermès Trismégiste, Corpus Hermeticum*, 4v. (Collection des Universités de France) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945-1954, Vol. II, p. 200.

3. See F.L. Cross, ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, London: OUP, 1957, p. 631; C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge: CUP, 1954, p. 11.

4. See *infra*. 5. F. Büchsel, *TDNT* I, p. 675.

6. J.M. Robinson, *IDB* IV, pp. 24-28. 7. F. Büchsel, *TDNT* I, p. 674.

8. יבמות פ"ד כ"ג. Cf. Str-B II, p. 423.

a convert is 'like a babe one day old'.¹ Since this Jewish idea of rebirth is closely connected with the rite of proselyte baptism, its affinities with I Peter are much closer than anything which might be gleaned from pagan sources. But *παλιγγενεσία* may also be applied to the rebirth of the world. In Mos.2.65, Philo applies it to the world after the deluge, and in the early church it is taken up by I Clement who writes, *Νῦν...παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν*.² Schürer shows further that in an eschatological sense the expression was applied to the renewing of the world in the time of the Messiah.³ That application is particularly clear in Matt. xix:28, where in response to Peter's question, Jesus is quoted as saying: "Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel". In the light of the similar eschatological setting of I Peter, and the apostle's association with the saying in Matthew, it is very likely that *ἀναγεννάω* must be interpreted in the same way as a *reborn people* and applied to the dispersed and lost tribes of Israel, who will be restored as God's people in the coming Kingdom. This would be consistent with the literal interpretation of *διασπορά* adopted above.

The only direct verbal parallel with *ἀναγεννάω* which can be found is a doubtful reading of John iii:3 in some Latin Manuscripts, which have probably led to its patristic use.⁴ Nevertheless, these are the only passages in the New Testament in which *γεννάω* and a form of *ἀνα* are put together. Furthermore, the thought here ties in very well with Jesus' teaching about the new birth in His discourse with Nicodemus. The nidus of this concept may well be in Mk.x:14f. Certainly when the fathers use *ἀναγεννάω* in their account of Baptism,⁵ there seems little doubt that it was taken from I Peter.

1. E.G. Selwyn, op. cit. p. 306. Cf. E. Sjöberg, "Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung im palästinischen Judentum", *ST* 4:44-46, 1951/2.

2. I Clem.ix:4.

3. E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th ed. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1901-11, Vol. II, pp. 636ff.

4. See C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, London: SPCK, 1960, p. 171.

5. See Justin, *Apol.* i:61; Clem. *Hom.* ix:26.

The expression is also close to Johannine thought with references to love, obedience, truth, seed, logos, abiding, and life clustered around the occurrences of ἀναγεννώ and ἀπτιγέννητος. Again, in both I Pet.i:3, 23 and John iii there is the contrast between corruption and incorruption, which are left and entered by rebirth.

Another parallel has often been noted between these verses and Jas.i:18, ἀπεκύησεν...λόγῳ ἀληθείας. For many years there has been a debate about the meaning of this expression in James. Is it to be interpreted cosmologically or soteriologically?¹ However, the study of the scrolls of the Qumran community has introduced a new element into this debate. In his studies, O. Betz has confirmed the view that the metaphor of a spiritual birth may already be found in pre-Christian Judaism.² Such evidence lends great weight to the soteriological interpretation of James i:18 in the sense of the eschatological restoration of the elected people. Not surprisingly, therefore, H. Greeven, in his revision of M. Dibelius' commentary on the Epistle of James can write, "this verse can be understood only in terms of the milieu of a Christian faith and life".³ Yet he cautions us not to over-estimate the Christian character of this passage, for James has evidently "taken over this concept from the language of the community...and he has in no way deepened the concept or expanded it".⁴ More recently Sophie Laws has summed up the situation as follows. "The language of James may, then, be coherently interpreted in terms of either creation or conversion, but in neither case is his language wholly familiar in expression of the idea. This may indicate that there should not be an absolute choice between

-
1. See L.E. Elliott-Binns, "James 1:18 : Creation or Redemption?", *NTS* 3:148-161, 1957. Cf. E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, London: SCM, 1955, p. 18.
 2. O. Betz, "Die Geburt der Gemeinde durch den Lehrer", *NTS* 3: 314-326, 1957, p. 322. Cf. E. Sjöberg, "Neuschöpfung in den Toten-Meer-Rollen", *ST* 9:131-136, 1955.
 3. M. Dibelius, A Commentary on the Epistle of James, rev. H. Greeven, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976, p. 107.
 4. Ibid.

them."¹ Thus far, we can only say that there may be a correlation between I Peter and James at these points if we are correct in interpreting James i:18 within the context of the apocalyptic expectation of the restoration of the Kingdom in primitive Judaeo-Christian belief.

There are, however, further factors which should be considered. Attention must also be drawn to the parallel use of λόγος in verse 23, λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ and the variation of it in James, λόγῳ ἀληθείας. In contrast to ῥῆμα in the LXX version of Is.xl:6-9 from which I Peter quotes in vs. 24, he deliberately chooses λόγος. He uses it in the simple sense of the message which was preached about Jesus, Crucified and Risen, which is completely in keeping with the use of the word by early Christians,² in contrast to its rich religious and philosophical use in the Johannine literature. This interpretation is manifestly endorsed by vs. 25b τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς, even though his use of Isaiah dictates the use of ῥῆμα instead of λόγος. Thus the meaning of vs. 23 is that the new birth, which was tantamount to entering the "Kingdom", was brought into being through the preaching about Jesus. Although in i:3 the new birth is said to have been effected through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, there is no real difference in the teaching, because in any case the preaching about Jesus was preaching about Him as the risen Christ. It certainly seems, therefore, that the author of I Peter is making use of an expression that had already become fixed in the vocabulary of the early Christians.

1. S. Laws, A Commentary on the Epistle of James, BNTC. London: A. & C. Black, 1980, p. 78.

2. Cf. Acts iv:29; xiii:44,46; 1 Cor.xiv:36; 2 Cor. ii:17; Col.i:5,25. This is corroborated by Acts xi:19 with its unqualified use of λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον εἰ μὴ μόνον Ἰουδαίοις. See also Acts ii:5; xi:1; xiii:5; xiv:25 and 2 Tim.ii:11, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος.

At first sight it might appear that there is a world of difference between I Peter and James in their use of λόγος. Yet in Dibelius' commentary¹ a number of difficulties, which beset the cosmological interpretation of i:18, are listed. Immediately we are faced with the problem of interpreting ἀπαρχήν - firstfruits. Advocates of the cosmological view have to interpret it as meaning that humans have pre-eminence among created things, for in Genesis 1 man is last and not first in the order of Creation.² Again, if we were to equate the idea of "first" with "best" and think of the best being presented to God as "first fruits"³ as a sacrifice, we have moved very far from the meaning of the whole passage in vss. 13 - 18, where James is thinking of God's good gifts to man. This whole passage makes far more sense if it is read in a soteriological context, and taken to refer to the first members of the resucitated people of God. Then the first fruits may be interpreted as the first converts as is done in Rom. xvi:5; 1Cor. xvi:15 and 1Clem. xlii:4. The same sort of idea occurs in an eschatological context in 1Cor. xv:20,23 and 1Clem. xxiv:1, where Christ is portrayed as the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep. The "word of truth" by which God begat these first fruits according to James would then undoubtedly refer to the gospel, the message preached about Jesus Christ, Crucified and Risen.

Clearly, then, in these verses in I Peter and James λόγος has an ambivalent meaning. Yet in both epistles it is best understood in a soteriological context.

We may, therefore, conclude that there is a correlation of thought between I Peter and James at these points and that we may also interpret ἀπεκύησεν as referring to rebirth, as it is expressed

1. Op. cit. p. 106.

2. Cf. Gen.ii:5ff.

3. See Ex.xxiii:19. Cf. Did.xiii:3ff.

in I Peter, and apply it to the restoration of God's people. However, it is impossible to trace a literary connection here. Even Boismard's suggestion that together with 1 John iii:1-11 they reflect a common hymn or baptismal liturgy,¹ is stretching poetic licence too far. The most that can be said is that each author develops in his own way, the common Christian teaching of rebirth which followed for those who accepted the preaching of the word.

i:3 ἐλπίδα ᾤσαν. The concept of hope in I Peter is essentially determined by the Old Testament where it is generally regarded as confidence in God's power and will to restore the exiles.² Hence specific objects of hope are less frequently mentioned than the basis of hope, namely, God, His faithfulness, or His name. Consequently the LXX has to use almost impossible or rare Greek expressions like ἐλπίζειν (ἐλπίς) ἐπὶ (with the dative or accusative),³ εἰς,⁴ or ἐν to express the Hebrew concept.⁵ While this hope may be directed towards God's present deliverance from distress,⁶ it is more specifically associated with the eschatological future and the restoration of His people to the land.⁷ In I Peter there is a similar emphasis on the parousia when the resurrection of Jesus is interpreted as the fulfilment of the Old Testament hope. It clearly echoes Matt. xii:18-21, where Jesus' mission is interpreted in terms of Isa. xlii:1-4.

-
1. M-E. Boismard, "Une Liturgie Baptismale dans la Prima Petri", *RB* 63:182-208, 1956, pp.203f; *RB* 64:161-183, 1957, pp. 167ff.
 2. See Jer.xxix:11; xxxi:17 and Hos.ii:14-23, which all promise the restoration of the exiles as a people in their own land.
 3. Cf. I Pet. i:13, ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν.
 4. Cf. I Pet.i:21, ἐλπίδα εἶναι εἰς θεόν; iii:5, ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεόν.
 5. See R. Bultmann, *TDNT* II, pp. 517-523.
 6. See ψ xii:5; xxxii:17,21; cxviii:81,123.
 7. See Isa.xxv:9; xxvi:8; li:3-8; Jer.xxix:11; xxxi:16f; Mic.vii:7; ψ xlv:1.

i:4 κληρονομίαν...ἐν οὐρανοῖς. This whole passage in summary form recalls the words of Christ as reported in the Q tradition in Lk.xii:22-40 (Matt.vi:19-34). The general contrast between the perishable things of this world and the imperishable future reward in heaven for the followers of Christ is the same in both passages. κληρονομία in I Peter and θησαυρός in Lk.xii:33 express the same idea.¹ ἀφθαρτος "imperishable" expresses the clause οὐδὲ σὴς διαφθείρει in Lk.xii:33 in a single word. Similarly, τετηρημένην "guarded" in I Peter corresponds to κλέπτῃς οὐκ ἐγγίζει "no thief approaches". Both passages have the phrase ἐν (τοῖς) οὐρανοῖς describing the locale of the believers' reward. Again εἰς ὑμᾶς "for you" corresponds to ἑαυτοῖς "for yourselves" in the Lucan version.² While this passage in Luke is similar to Matt.vi:19-21, there are many differences, and the Matthean version is not as close to the wording in I Peter. These differences suggest that at the time of writing, I Peter's source was a fluid corpus of Jesus teaching, which subsequently (+ 52 AD) became fixed in a written Q, and they defy any theory of literary dependence of I Peter on either of the Gospel writers. Possibly Matthew is drawing on his special M source here, while Luke quotes the Q version of the saying.³ Further, the subsequent verse in I Peter conveys the conviction that the coming of the Kingdom with all its benefits is very near, as does Luke. The fact that the early church in Jerusalem attempted to practise the voluntary poverty recommended in Luke, suggests that the saying could well go back to Jesus Himself.

i:5,9,10 διὰ πίστεως εἰς αὐτόν. Throughout the New Testament salvation is linked to faith in Christ's person and work. Both I Peter and Acts reflect the same tension between salvation as a

-
1. See additional note on κληρονομία, in B.F. Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews, Grand Rapids:Eerdmans, 1974, p. 167.
 2. See M-E. Boismard, "Une Liturgie Baptismale dans la Prima Petri", *RB* 63:182-208, 1956, p. 197.
 3. See T.W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, London:SCM, 1950, p. 114.

present historical experience and a future eschatological event, which is heightened by the early expectation of the Parousia.¹

i:5, 20 ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ / ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων. These two verses represent two views of the ἐσχάτον prevalent in the New Testament. While on the one hand the Christians look forward to the last days with eager expectation,² on the other it has already arrived with the coming of Jesus.³ In his speech according to Acts ii:17, Peter combines these two views by interpreting the outpouring of the Spirit as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel which associates that event with the same "last" period.⁴

i:6-7 and iv:13. The resemblance between these verses and James i:2f., is so remarkable that it is not surprising that literary dependence between the two epistles has been widely postulated. However, in our discussion here, we must not lose sight of the fact that the passage in James is also strikingly similar to Romans v:3-5, as may be seen from the following table :-

I Pet. i:6, 7; iv:13.

ἐν τῇ ἀπολλύσει, ὅτι οὐκ εἶ
ἐκείνῳ ἀπολλύντες ἐν ποικίλῃ
πειρασμῷ, ὅτι τὸ δοκίμιον τοῦ
τοῦ πνεύματος ἡλικιωτέρων καὶ
τοῦ ἀπολλύμενου, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ
δοκιμασίου, ἀλλὰ ἐκ
πειρασμοῦ...

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ τὸν
καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν
ἐν τῇ ἀπολλύσει τοῦ
καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν
καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν

James i:2-4.

ἡμεῖς καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν
δοκίμιον καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν
καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν
καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν
καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν
καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν

Rom. v:3-5.

οὐ μόνον ἐκείνῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς
ἐν τῇ ἀπολλύσει, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ
δοκιμίου καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν
καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν
καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν

1. See W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII, pp. 995-997.

2. I Pet. i:5.

3. I Pet. i:20.

4. In apocalyptic terminology there is a technical difference between χρόνος and καιρός. See BAG p. 396, section 4. See also O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, London: SCM, 1962, pp. 37-50.

The paradoxical theme of exultation in suffering trials, runs not only through the whole of I Peter, but also recurs in a host of other New Testament passages.¹ In these references it is given an eschatological setting, and the short duration of the present afflictions is contrasted with the eternal glory which is to come. Such apocalyptic eschatology anticipated that the last cosmic convulsions of the power of evil would come before the end, and bring with them inevitable suffering for the believers of God. I Peter, James and Paul, together with the rest of the Twelve, manifestly expected the end and its attendant suffering, in their own life times.² Hence it was natural for Paul to include such teaching, even in a closely woven argument like that of Romans chapter five. Indeed, the fact that the other New Testament writers also reproduce it independently, confirms that it was a regular topic in early catechetical instruction. It is not surprising, therefore, that Selwyn assigns these passages to his "persecution form".³

While Selwyn may be correct in thinking that this teaching was based on the reported sayings of Jesus,⁴ W. Nauck⁵ and J.A. Sanders⁶ have most convincingly shown that this thought was also very well established in Palestinian Judaism. Such an heroic

1. See Matt.v:11f; Lk.vi:22f; Acts v:41; xvi:25; xx:19; Rom. viii:18; 2 Cor.iv:17; vi:10; vii:4; viii:2; I Thess.i:6; Heb.x:32-36.

2. Like Jesus and all the first century Judean church, Peter and James were scions of Jewish apocalypticism. 1QM and 1QH reveal that the Qumran Community likewise expected great travail before the end.

3. E.G. Selwyn, op. cit. pp. 450f.

4. Ibid.

5. "Freude im Leiden, zum Problem einer urchristlichen Verfolgungstradition", ZNW 46:68-80, 1955.

6. Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism, New York: Colgate Rochester Divinity School, 1955.

attitude of rejoicing at being made to suffer in God's cause was inspired by the cruel sufferings of Jews in Maccabean times which they interpreted as glorious experiences for God. The parallel between I Peter here and Wisdom iii, which refers to these times, is very close indeed viz.¹ :-

I Peter i:6 - 7

6 In this you rejoice, though now for a little while you may have to suffer various trials,
7 so that the genuineness of your faith, more precious than gold which though perishable is tested by fire, may redound to praise and glory and honour at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Wisdom iii:4 - 5

4 For though in the sight of men they were punished, their hope is full of immortality.
5 Having been disciplined a little, they will receive great good, because God tested them and found them worthy of himself;
6 like gold in the furnace he tried them, and like a sacrificial burnt offering he accepted them.

This is just the kind of Jewish thinking one would expect the Jerusalem church to assimilate and re-interpret in the light of its conviction of an early Parousia and the imminent return of Christ, who had suffered Himself. Quite naturally, such teaching would be included in their regular instruction to new converts. Thus the obvious Jewish background to the common catechetical paraenesis which the New Testament writers are using in the wide range of passages we have cited, lends strong support to the thesis that the source of that common teaching is to be found in a Jerusalem Catechism.

i:6, 8 ἀγαλλιάσθε. In terms of the suffering which the Christians have to endure, one would expect their exultation to belong to the future as in iv:13. Hence some of the early fathers and some MSS substitute ἀγαλλιάσεσθε in i:6 and 8.² But in its context in i:6 and 8 and even in iv:13, the joy of the "End" overflows into the present, lightening the plight of the readers. Similarly in Acts

1. Cf. 2 Macc.vi:28-30; 4 Macc.vii:22; ix:29; xi:12; Jdt.viii:25ff.

2. See E.G. Selwyn, op. cit. p. 258.

ii:26, Peter can quote Psalm xvi:9 to describe the joy which is brought by the resurrection of Christ into the life of the believer. This expression of apocalyptic eschatological joy reveals that I Peter, like James, lives and writes at a time when the expectation of an impending end was still very much alive, namely before 70 AD.

i:6 ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς. The use of the plural of πειρασμός in I Peter, James and Acts xx:19 indicates a variety of harassments, petty persecutions and social discrimination which were attendant upon their new condition as Jesus believers or Χριστιανοί.¹

i:8 ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπάτε...καὶ δεδοξασμένην. While the contrast between faith and sight is common in the New Testament, this passage and John xx:29 are the only two verses which specifically relate belief without seeing to Christ and add the spiritual happiness which this brings with it. Needless to say, this passage has often been adduced in support of the view that the author was an eyewitness of Jesus.² Moreover, while the aorist ἰδόντες in John xx:29 may be "timeless", it can also be taken to refer to contemporaries of Thomas who had not personally seen Jesus resurrected, but had still believed. In this sense the expression in I Peter would be most appropriate for Jewish believers in the diaspora, who were separated from Jesus not by time, but by distance.

i:10-12 προαγγέλλεται. In this passage the author states that it was by the "Spirit of Christ" that the prophets spoke of τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας. (The sufferings in store for Christ and the glory to follow). In Luke xxiv:25-27 & 46 we find the risen Jesus Himself using the Scriptures in this way. The disciples on the way to Emmaus were rebuked for their dullness and lack of belief in "all that the prophets have spoken! Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" The reference to the prophets, the movement from

1. See H. Seesemann, *TDNT* VI, p. 29.

2. See E.G. Selwyn, *op. cit.* p. 131.

ii:26, Peter can quote Psalm xvi:9 to describe the joy which is brought by the resurrection of Christ into the life of the believer. This expression of apocalyptic eschatological joy reveals that I Peter, like James, lives and writes at a time when the expectation of an impending end was still very much alive, namely before 70 AD.

i:6 ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς. The use of the plural of πειρασμός in I Peter, James and Acts xx:19 indicates a variety of harassments, petty persecutions and social discrimination which were attendant upon their new condition as Jesus believers or Χριστιανοί.¹

i:8 ὅν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε...καὶ δεδοξασμένην. While the contrast between faith and sight is common in the New Testament, this passage and John xx:29 are the only two verses which specifically relate belief without seeing to Christ and add the spiritual happiness which this brings with it. Needless to say, this passage has often been adduced in support of the view that the author was an eyewitness of Jesus.² Moreover, while the aorist ἰδόντες in John xx:29 may be "timeless", it can also be taken to refer to contemporaries of Thomas who had not personally seen Jesus resurrected, but had still believed. In this sense the expression in I Peter would be most appropriate for Jewish believers in the diaspora, who were separated from Jesus not by time, but by distance.

i:10-12 προφηταί. In this passage the author states that it was by the "Spirit of Christ" that the prophets spoke of τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας. (The sufferings in store for Christ and the glory to follow). In Luke xxiv:25-27 & 46 we find the risen Jesus Himself using the Scriptures in this way. The disciples on the way to Emmaus were rebuked for their dullness and lack of belief in "all that the prophets have spoken! Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" The reference to the prophets, the movement from

1. See H. Seesemann, *TDNT* VI, p. 29.

2. See E.G. Selwyn, *op. cit.* p. 131.

suffering to glory, the formal title *Χριστός*, and the use of the demonstrative pronoun *ταῦτα* for the sufferings provide minute verbal resemblances and a general meaning identical to the tradition of Luke xxiv.¹ As the account of the appearances on the way to Emmaus is peculiar to Luke, it may safely be assigned to his special L material, which he obtained during his stay in Jerusalem and Caesarea while Paul was imprisoned there.²

i:10 *ἐξεζητησάν*... In summing up the deliberations of the Council in Acts xv:17, James uses *ἐξεζητέω* of righteous people searching for God. In I Peter i:10 this meaning is greatly strengthened by the addition of *ἐξεπευνών* to stress the diligence of the prophetic search.³

i:12. *κατακύπτω* is used, in its primary sense, of the disciples and Mary Magdalene stooping to peer into the sepulchre in Luke xxiv:12 and John xx:5, 11, while in James i:25 it is used metaphorically of "bending over" to peer into a mirror. A most interesting Jewish parallel occurs in Enoch ix:1, where it is used of the angels Michael, Uriel, Raphael and Gabriel looking down from heaven upon the earth.⁴ This passage from Enoch was probably the most influential in I Peter's thought, since he too associates this action with angels. In the light of the baptismal associations of this epistle, his thought here may well be the earliest expression of the belief, developed later in the church, that the angels took an attentive interest in baptism. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem could speak of baptism as "the wonderful seal, at (the) sight of which devils tremble, which angels acknowledge".⁵ According to I Peter, the angels longed

1. See W.C. van Unnik, "The Teaching of Good Works in I Peter", *NTS* 1:92-110, 1954, p. 98.

2. See A. Plummer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, ICC, 5th ed. Edinburgh: Clark, 1960, p. xxiii.

3. See H. Greeven, *PDNT* II, p. 894.

4. See R.H. Charles, *APOT* II, p. 192 and M.A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1978, Vol. I, p. 23; Vol. II, p. 84.

5. Catechetical Lectures i:3, LCC IV, p. 79.

to see the salvation wrought in Christ, which formed the basis of the Gospel. James in i:25 exhorts his readers to look "into the perfect law, the law of liberty", which J. P. Mayor also regards as a reference to the Gospel.¹ Hence we may conclude that both authors adopt a parallel use of παρακύπτειν with reference to the correct response to the Gospel, and at the same time betray their Jewish heritage in their mode of expression.

i:13 διὸ ἀναζωοῦμενοι τὰς ὁφείας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, νήκροντες parallels a similar eschatological passage in Luke xii:35, "Ἑστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὁφείες περιεζωσμέναι. In the same passage Jesus emphasizes the point with a parable of a drunken servant (vs 45), which is summed up in the single word νήκροντες in I Pet.i:13. Matthew omits Luke xii:41, where Peter asks whether this parable applies to the Twelve (presumably) or everybody. Manson² thinks that this question probably stood in Q but was omitted by Matthew because it was as obscure to him as it was to many commentators. Possibly the author of I Peter was aware of the original context of this mysterious question.

i:13 τελείως ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In this epistle as in Acts³ Christian hope is grounded on the resurrection of Christ.⁴ From i:3; iii:5,15 it is clear that hope is one of the main threads of thought in this epistle. It is thoroughly eschatological and refers to the return of the Lord Jesus at the end of the age,⁵ and the destiny of "God's people". Such a concept of hope is essentially Jewish and is determined by the Old Testament thought of trust in God and the

-
1. Op. cit. p. 70.
 2. T.W. Manson, op. cit. p. 118.
 3. Acts ii:26; xxiii:6; xxiv:15; xxvi:6f; xxvii:20; xviii:20.
 4. See E. Cothenet, "Le Réalisme de L'espérance Chrétienne Selon I Pierre", *NTS* 27:564-572, 1981.
 5. See J. Piper, "Hope as the motivation of love", *NTS* 26: 212-231, 1980, pp. 215-216.

restoration of His Kingdom on earth. Within the framework of Jewish expectations, the imminent fulfilment of that hope was tremendous news, for it was believed that the Messiah would collect and return the "lost tribes" to Jerusalem under His sovereignty.¹ By contrast, in the Greek world it was regarded as self evident that hope was simply man's projection of the future. Thus, in expressing one of the main thoughts of his epistle, the author clearly aligns himself with the thinking of the early Jewish church.²

i:14 ἀγνοία. This word has led to a great dispute about the Jewish or Gentile origin of the Christians addressed.³ While ἀγνοία may be taken as more applicable to those who had been Gentiles, as implied in Paul's speech in Athens in Acts xvii:30, it is probably better to take the word in its breadth and fullness and see the author as thinking not only of ignorance of God and His Law, but also of ignorance of Christ as in Peter's speech in Acts iii:17. Moreover, ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν here is qualified by ταῖς πρότερον ἐπιθυμίαις and τῆς καταιγὸς ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαράδοτου of vs 18, indicating a situation similar to that expressed in Jas.iv:1-4, viz. Hellenistic Jews conforming to "this world", ἡν οὖν οὖν. This is probably a very accurate description of the religious practices of their forebears, as many Jews of the dispersion had been Hellenized since the reign of Alexander.

i:16 ἄγιοι ἔσεσθε is based on Lev.xi:44; xix:2; xx:7 and a Jesus logion preserved in Matt.v:48. The future tense here is equivalent to an imperative as in the Matthean version. The application of ἅγιος to people is typically Hebraic, since "the word ἅγιος never seems to have been applied in pure Greek to men..."⁴ Only in the

-
1. See II Esdras xiii:39-45. Cf. Beracha 10 of the Amida; 1QM.
 2. See R. Bultmann, *TDNT* II, pp. 517-533.
 3. See F.J.A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter I.1-II.17*, London: MacMillan, 1898, p. 69. Also E.G. Selwyn, *op. cit.* pp. 43-44.
 4. O. Procksch, *TDNT* I, p. 89.

LXX does it express the Semitic idea of שֶׁךְ in the sense of people as an exclusive possession of God. The juxtaposition of ἔθνος ἁγίου and λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν in I Pet.ii:9 confirms this interpretation, for λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν conveys the idea of הָלַבּ בְּךָ¹ - "a people that has become (God's own) possession".² The fact that the author can use these expressions without any explanation, indicates that he is not writing with gentiles in mind, but is addressing first generation Christians of Jewish origin, who would still appreciate this concept of a holy people.³

i:17 ἀπροσωπολήπτως. This term, which is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, succinctly characterizes the thought of God as no respecter of persons and may be regarded as an instance of the creation of a religious and moral vocabulary. The strange word ἀπροσωπολήπτως is a combination of πρόσωπον and λαμβάνειν, meaning "to receive the face" of someone, "favouritism" or, as its Hebrew antecedent shows, "to take (a person) at face-value", "to judge by appearance". Thus in the LXX λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον is a literal rendering of פָּנֵי אִשָּׁה in Gen.xix:21; Deut.x:17; Isa.ix:15.⁴ A similar expression הִנֵּה גָדִל כֹּחַ וְיִתְנָה לְךָ - θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον - "you shall not defer to the great" - is found in Lev.xix:15 and reproduced in Jude 16. Peter first applies the notion to the equality of Jew and Gentile in terms of the Gospel in his address to Cornelius and his companions in Acts x:34,⁵ while in the Marcan account of the question of paying tribute to Caesar, the words put into the mouths of the Herodians, "you do not regard the position of men, but truly teach the way of God" (Mk.xii:14), express the same sentiment. The manner

1. Cf. Mal.iii:17.

2. BAG p. 656. Cf. BDB, 688; H. Preisker, *TDNT* VI, p. 57; Blass-Debrunner, E 113 (1).

3. Str-B III, p. 762 confirms that the concept of ὁ ἅγιος of God is common in Jewish literature. Its only appearance in the NT here is a further mark of the Jewishness of I Peter.

4. See Str-B III, p. 79.

5. Cf. Rom.ii:11; Gal.ii:6; Eph.vi:9; Col.iii:25. See also E. Lohse, *TDNT* VI, pp. 779-780.

in which this whole idea affects human relationships is most beautifully expounded in James ii:1-9, and a further application may also be found in iii:1-6, where I Peter exhorts wives to win over their husbands to the faith by their inner attitudes and chaste behaviour rather than by using outward adornment to impress. Thus, by using the word ἀποκαταλήψεις, the author is expressing a common belief among pious Jews that God is a righteous God who makes no distinction between people, high or low, not even those who invoke Him as Father.¹ This way of thinking provides a very important clue to the author's Jewish heritage and background and his association with the Jerusalem church, which he would share with James.

i:17 and ii:11 τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον. While the expression is thematic of this epistle,² it is not very common in the rest of the New Testament, where it tends to be limited to passages urging vigilance upon believers.³ I Peter views the present disposition of his addressees as transitory for παροικία and παροικῶς⁴ denote residence without citizenship rights. In Acts vii:6,29 and xiii:17 the same words are used to describe the Israelites' sojourn in Egypt.⁵ The implied reference to the exodus and exile in I Peter's terminology would be lost on Gentile converts, but would be a most meaningful reminder and symbol for hellenized Jews living in the dispersion.

i:18-21. This passage begins with exactly the same expression, εἰδότες ὅτι, as that used by Paul in Rom.v:3; vi:9; 1 Cor.xv:58; 2 Cor.i:7; iv:14 and v:6,⁶ where in most cases it is also followed

1. Cf. Deut.x:12-18; Amos iii:2 and Barn.iv:12.

2. Cf. παρεπίδημοι in I Pet.i:1.

3. Cf. Eph.v:6; Jas.v:7-9; Rev.iii:20f. 4. I Pet.ii:11.

5. See K.L. & M.A. Schmidt, *TDNT* V, pp. 851-852.

6. Cf. Eph. vi:8-9.

by pithy sentences. This suggests that the author is making use of standardized catechetical or liturgical material. As Goppelt¹ remarks, this section is marked by its poetic character. It also gives far more Christological detail than a simple reference to Christ's saving death, which the argument in hand would require. All of this further enhances the view that established credal, catechetical or liturgical material is being used.

i:18 ἐλυτρώθητε. This verse is immediately reminiscent of Isa. lli:3, "You were sold for nothing, and not with silver shall you be ransomed" - καὶ οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε.² While λυτρώσεται and its derivatives are used extensively in the LXX for all kinds of redemption,³ the early church traditionally applied the concept to Jesus' death in terms of the Suffering Servant passages in Isa. lli:13- liii:12. This strand of the tradition also appears at Mark x:45 and Matt. xx:28.⁴ Elsewhere the same idea is expressed by ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον... ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον,⁵ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν,⁶ and ἡγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς.⁷ In view of the importance of the concept in the Christian faith, it is surprising to find that the use of the actual words λυτρῶν, λυτρώω, λύτρωσις and λύτρωτής are restricted to so few passages. Closer scrutiny, however, reveals that most of these references appear in material with strong Judean associations,

1. L. Goppelt, Der Erste Petrusbrief, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, p. 121.

2. Cf. Tit. ii:14, where λυτρώσεται is used to describe the effect of Christ's passion.

3. See Ex. iv:6; xv:13; xxi:30; xxx:12; Deut. vii:8; Lev. xxv:25-28; Num. xviii:15; Pss. cvi:2; cxxix:8; Hos. xiii:14; Isa. xli:14; xliii:1,14.

4. Cf. Lk. i:68; ii:38; xxiv:21; Acts vii:35; Tit. ii:14; Heb. ix:12. See also F. Büchsel, *TDNT* IV, pp. 340-356; V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, London: MacMillan, 1955, pp. 99-105; C. Bigg, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, ICC, 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Clark, 1902, p. 118.

5. Lk. xxi:19 & 20. Cf. Matt. xxvi:28; 1 Cor. xi:24.

6. Mk. xiv:24.

7. 1 Cor. vi:20.

thus providing contributory evidence for the Jewish provenance of I Peter.

i:18 ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ recalls Peter's expression Ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσίου οὐκ ὑπάρχει in Acts iii:6, where he also contrasts earthly wealth with the gift of God's redeeming love in his words and actions. However, underlying the thought of this verse is the rite of manumission, which involved paying money to the deity.¹

i:18 ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστραφῆς πατροπαράδοτου. It has sometimes been inferred from these words that the author is exclusively addressing the converts from heathenism, who would be among the congregation, just as in Acts xiv:15 Paul and Barnabas speak of idolatrous worship to the people of Lystra. I Pet. iv:3, "Let the time that is past suffice for doing what the Gentiles like to do..." appears to confirm this view, but, as we have already seen,² the grammatical structure and the context of this verse emphasize a distinction between the readers and τὰ ἔθνη, making the admonition most appropriate for hellenistic Jews. There are also many other indications that this epistle is directed to Jews. In i:1 the recipients are described as παρεπιδήμευς διασποράς which closely parallels the opening address in James i:1, ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ. Further their characterization as πόροιχοι in i:17 and ii:11, enhances the view that I Peter is writing to Jews. The fact that ματαίος is quite naturally set alongside πατροπαράδοτος might cause some difficulty. Would Jewish Christians like James or Peter describe their Jewish heritage in this way? Judging from the account in Acts, it is unlikely that James would do so. However in Acts xv:10 Peter, and in Matt. xv:2-6 and Mark vii:3-13 Jesus, together with Paul in Gal. i:14 speak of traditions that have become degenerate because they have ceased to

1. Effectively it was paid into the Temple treasury. See A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978, pp. 318-327.

2. See p. 32 supra.

cleave solely to God's revelation.¹ In his exhaustive monograph on these two verses, Van Unnik² argues that before converting to Christianity, the addressees were former pagans who had joined the Synagogue as "proselytes" whom Talmudic Judaism no longer regarded as Gentiles, but as Israelites in every respect.³ He views this passage as a statement about the work of Christ. The words which are used to describe it only make sense against the background of proselyte sacrifice, which ceased after 70 AD.⁴ Thus these verses are to be understood as an assurance to the readers, whether Jews by birth or conversion, that they have become full Christians through the sacrifice of Christ, for the emphasis is on the great change they experienced in becoming Christians, rather than on the particulars of their past lives.⁵

i:18 μαρτυροῦσθαι. This particular combination of words is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and it may once again be regarded as a succinct definition of the thought expressed in Mark vii:3-13 (Matt.xv:2-9).

-
1. The "pointless" existence implied here resembles the situation denounced in Jas.iv:13-15, although it is primarily an allusion to Isa.111:3-5. See O. Bauernfeind, *TDNT* IV, p. 522.
 2. W.C. Van Unnik, *De Verlossing I Petrus 1:18-19 en het Probleem van den Eersten Petrusbrief*, Amsterdam: NHUM, 1942. An English translation appears in *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik*, Part Two, *NoviSup* XXX, Leiden: Brill, 1980, pp. 41-50.
 3. Yeb. 47b: בישראל הוא לכל דברים. M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, London: SCM, 1974, 2v, Vol. 2, p. 204.
 4. See Van Unnik, op. cit. pp. 89-90. This reference to 70 AD is corroborative evidence of the early and (by extension) Petrine origin of the letter.
 5. For a further discussion of this passage see W.C. Van Unnik, "The Critique of Paganism in I Peter 1:18", *Neotestamentica et Semitica*, Studies in honour of Principal Matthew Black, ed. E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox, Edinburgh: Clark, 1969, pp. 129-142.

Author Dijkman J H L

Name of thesis The Socio-Religious condition of the recipients of I Peter: an attempt to solve the problems of date, authorship and addressees of the letter 1984

PUBLISHER:

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.