

Jesus in Mk.xiii:19-20, the most likely influence on the author's thinking at this point. It is also worth noting that in his resumé of this section in vs 19, he is very much in line with the thinking of inter-Testamental Judaism, when he refers to God as a faithful Creator (κτίστης).¹ As Bigg suggests, I Peter probably chose this title for God here, "because it involves power which is able, and love which is willing, to guard His creatures", and he goes on to say that this "shows in a striking way how deeply the Old Testament affected his thoughts".² The choice of this title for God might also imply that the author regards the God-willed suffering of the faithful as an act of eschatological recreation.

Such recurring instances of Jewish turns of phrase and thinking in the common patterns of persecution teaching in the New Testament, make it abundantly clear that the material was derived from the early Jewish church centred in Jerusalem.

A most interesting feature emerges when I Peter iv:12-19 and James i:2-18 are examined side by side as follows:-

I Peter iv:12 - 19

James i:2 - 18.

12 Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ ἐνδοξάζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν παρουσίᾳ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ὡς
13 γνωστῇ, ὡς ἦσαν ὁμοιωθέντες, ἀλλὰ καθ' ὡς κατακαίετε τοὺς τοῦ
14 Χριστοῦ παθήματα χαίρετε, ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ
15 ὑμεῖς ἀγαλλιάσεσθε, ὅτι ἐνδοξάσθε ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν
16 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμεῖς ὁμοδοξάσμεθα. ὅτι
17 ἡ γὰρ τῆς ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φανερὸς ἡ καίτης ἡ κακοποιὸς ἡ ὡς ἀλ-
18 λοτριμολογοῦν· εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός, μὴ ἐλπιέσθε, δοξαζέτω ἐν τῷ
19 Θεῷ ἐν τῷ δεῖναι τούτῳ.

12 Ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ δοξαῖσθαι, τὸ κρῖναι, ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ
13 εἰ πρώτοι ὡς ὑμῶν, τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀποδοῦντων τῷ Θεῷ τὸν φόβον
14 ὑμῶν· καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μὲν σφίγεται, ὁ δὲ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ
15 φανίσταται; ὥστε καὶ οἱ πᾶσχοιτες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ πιστῶ
16 κτίστη παρατιθέμενοι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγαθήνῃ.

12 Πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε, ἀδελφοί μου, ὅταν πειρασμοὶ περι-
13 πίσσητε πεικίλους, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως
14 καταργεῖται ὑπομονῇ. ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλει ἔχει, ὅσα ἴτε
15 τέλει καὶ δόκλοι, ἐν μηδενὶ λεπτόμηναι. εἰ δὲ τις ὑμῶν λειπεται
16 σοφίας, αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ δίδοντος Θεοῦ πᾶσαν ἀπλῶς καὶ μὴ ἐκ αἰ-
17 ζουτος, καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ.

18 Ὁ μάρτυς ἀνὴρ, ὃς ὑπομένει, πειρασμῶν, ὅτι δοκιμὸς γινώσκων
19 ἀληθεύει τὸν στίβον τῆς ζωῆς, ἐν ἡμετέροις δὲ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγα-
20 τοῖς ἐνδοξάζει.

12 Μὴ πλανᾶσθε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσα δοκίμη ὡς ἀγῶν καὶ πᾶν
13 δοκίμιον τέλειον ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν καταβαλλόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ Πειρασμοῦ τῶν φάτων,
14 παρ' ὃ οὐκ ἐστὶ παραλλαγή· ἡ τροπὴ ἀποκρίσεως. βουλήθετε
15 ἀκούεσθαι ἡμῶν λόγου ἀληθείας, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμῶν ἀπαρχὴν τιναν τῶν
16 αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων.

1. In a similar passage Jas. i:18 uses κτίστης to describe believers as creatures of God. See p. 122 infra.

2. C. Bigg, op. cit. p. 182.

Similar ideas and expressions appear in exactly the same sequence of thought - joy, reproach, blessing, God's creation - indicating their common indebtedness to a corpus of catechetical paraenetic which may still have been current in an oral form.

χαίρετε - πάντων χαρὸν ἡγήσασθε (I Pet. iv:13 - Jas. i:2.)

These parallel verses¹ express the same paradox of exultation in the midst of suffering in the expectation of the Parousia. The thought has striking parallels with the Q passage in Mt. v:12 (Lk. vi:23),² but is developed further in I Peter by being given a Christological interpretation along the lines of Acts v:41.³ James does not apply it to specific suffering, but refers rather to diverse unspecified temptations.

ὀνειδίζεσθαι (I Pet. iv:14 - Jas. i:5.) This word is frequently used to describe the insults heaped on God's people in the LXX version of the Psalms,⁴ while in the New Testament it has also become associated with the indignities which Jesus had to endure.⁵ Similarly here, I Peter uses it to describe the reproaches which Christians have to endure. Admittedly James uses ὀνειδίζεσθαι in a different context where he denies that God reproaches those who appeal to Him in prayer, but its importance in the present argument is that it occupies the same position in the sequence of thought in James as it does in I Peter.

-
1. See also I Pet.i:6. Parallels between this section of I Pet. and other NT books will be discussed later.
 2. See also Rom.viii:17; 2 Cor.i:5-7; Phil.iii:10f; 2 Tim.ii:11; Heb.x:32-39; xi:26; xiii:13-14.
 3. See H. Conzelmann, *TDNT* IX, p. 368.
 4. See Ψ xli:11; liv:13; lxviii:10.
 5. See Matt.xxvii:44; Rom.xv:3; Heb.xi:26; xiii:13. See also J. Schneider, *TDNT* V, pp. 238-242.

μακάριοι. (I Pet. iv:14 - Jas. i:12.) The parallel here will be much closer if with Dibelius¹ we treat James i:12 as an isolated saying and reject Spitta's view that the "one who endures" refers to the rich man in the preceding section. We may then see in these parallel verses the sacred paradoxes of the New Testament Beatitudes where "the pre dominating estimation of the Kingdom of God carries with it a reversal of all customary evaluations".² Indeed εὐδαιμονίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι (I Pet. iv:14), so strikingly resembles the Q passage in Matt. v:11-12, that these Verba Christi must have been known to the writer in almost the very form in which they have been transmitted to us in Matthew's Gospel. While this is the only New Testament passage where ὄνομα Χριστοῦ occurs, the idea of suffering for the Name is a common phrase as evidenced in Matt. xix:29. Similarly James maintains that his readers are blessed because they endure trials. For them the light of future glory shines over the sorry state of their present condition, and reflects the kind of thinking about heroic suffering which is expressed in 2 Mac. vi:12-17, 30f; 4 Mac. ix:29-32; 1QH ix:9-12, 24. Such thinking was based on the Judean church's interpretation of Jesus' suffering in terms of the Suffering Servant of Isa. l:4-9 and lii:13-liii:12, and the general apocalyptic appreciation of the suffering of the faithful as an indication of the imminence of the Kingdom of God,³ which was a cause for great rejoicing. Their own experience suggested that the time was near,⁴ for everywhere in the contemporary diaspora converting to Christ entailed disputes with fellow Jews in the synagogues and derisive scorn from the Gentiles.

κτίστη - κτισμάτων. (I Pet. iv:19 - Jas. i:18.) I Peter follows the thinking of intertestamental Judaism in speaking of God as a faithful Creator (κτίστης). This word is not used elsewhere in the New Testament, but occurs frequently in the LXX,

1. Op. cit. p. 88. 2. F. Hauck, *TDNT* IV, p. 368.

3. Cf. Matt. iii:2; Mk. i:15. 4. I Pet. iv:7.

the Apocrypha and Philo.¹ At the same point in the sequence, James uses the related word *κτίσμα* to describe believers as creatures of God, when he too encourages his readers to stand firm in their suffering. We have already noted the similarities between Jas.i:18 and I Pet.i:3, 23 in terms of the thought of rebirth.² That comparison revealed that this verse of James is best understood in a soteriological context similar to I Peter. If we also interpret Jas.i:18 and I Pet.iv:19 in this way, it may well be that the authors regard the result of God-willed suffering of His faithful followers as an act of eschatological recreation.

Individually, these similarities of language and expression may not amount to much, but collectively, together with the fact that they occur in exactly the same sequence, they are most striking. This occurrence can only be explained if both writers were influenced in their thinking by the common pattern of catechetical instruction on joy in the midst of suffering, in which joy, reproach, blessing, and God's creation, featured in the same sequence of thought.

That sequence *χαρά - θνείσις/θνήσκω - μωδολος - κτίσμα / κτίσις* reflects the way in which the primitive Judean church modified the Old Testament views of suffering in the light of Jesus' passion and resurrection. His suffering was a divine necessity³ which had been laid upon the Son of Man. It had atoning worth, because he was willing as the sinless one to give His life for sinners⁴ in perfect obedience to God's judgement.⁵ From such an interpretation of the passion of Christ, the primitive Judean church approached its own experience of suffering. Being united with the risen Lord, in His body the church, believers not only served His cause, but by sharing His suffering also participated in the atoning work of

1. See W. Foerster, *TDNT* III, pp. 1000-1035. Cf. T.Jud.ix:12; Sir.xxiv:8; 2 Mac.i:24.

2. See pp. 36-38 supra. 3. See Mk.viii:31.

4. Rom.v:6-8; I Pet.ii:24; iii:18. Cf. I Pet.i:18f; Mk.x:45.

5. Phil.ii:8; Heb.v:8.

Christ.¹ Thus suffering was the inescapable lot of the Christians.² However, it was no longer simply the result of the individual's sin.³ Instead suffering had been elevated to become part of the missionary activity of God's people in His plan to deal with the sinfulness of mankind. The great tribulation⁴ which would come upon the human race had started with the passion of Christ and would continue until His Parousia,⁵ which was expected shortly.⁶ Christians, therefore, would endure suffering patiently,⁷ without fear or anxiety,⁸ because of the certainty of Christ's final triumph over all the powers of evil,⁹ which they would experience in their own lives.¹⁰ Hence while purging the dross of self-love from the believers,¹¹ their short lived suffering¹² allowed them to share in God's glory.¹³

Consequently, in the life of a Christian there would be the joy (χαρά) of faith in Christ, which in contemporary experience led to reproach (ὀνειδος) from Jews and Gentiles alike. Paradoxically, this sharing in the suffering of Christ meant that they would also share in Christ's triumph which was a real blessing (μακάρισμα) as it heralded their eschatological rebirth or recreation (κτίσις/κτίσις) as members of Christ in the Kingdom of God shortly to be revealed.

-
1. Rom.viii:31-39; xii:4-21; 2 Cor.i:5; iv:10f; Phil.iii:10; Col.i:24; 1 Thess.ii:13-16; 1 Pet.iv:12-13.
 2. Acts xiv:22; Rom.viii:17; 1 Cor.xii:26; Phil.i:29f; iii:10; 1 Thess.ii:14; iii:4; 2 Tim.iii:12; 1 Pet.iii:14; iv:13; v:1.
 3. 1 Pet.iv:15.
 4. Dan.xii:1; Matt.xxiv:21; Mk.xiii:19; Lk.xxi:23; Rev.vii:14.
 5. Matt.xxvi:39; Mk.xiii; 2 Thess.i:5. 6. 1 Pet.iv:7.
 7. Rom.v:3f; 1 Thess.iii:3; 1 Pet.ii:21-23.
 8. Matt.vi:25-33; x:26-31; Lk.xii:4,7,32; 1 Cor.vii:29-32; Phil.iv:6; 1 Pet.iii:14; v:7; Rev.ii:10.
 9. 1 Cor.xv:27; Phil.ii:10f; Rev.v:5; vi:2; xvii:14; xx:9,14f.
 10. Rom.viii:37; 1 Cor.xv:57; 1 Pet.v:10; Rev.ii:7,11,13,17,26; xii:11; xxi:7.
 11. 1 Pet.i:7; Jas.i:2. Cf. Rom.v:3.
 12. 1 Pet.i:6; Rom.viii:10. 13. Rom.viii:18; 1 Pet.iv:13.

Such an interpretation of suffering went far beyond the highest views of any Roman or Greek moral philosopher, or even the ideas of later Christians who had given up hope of an imminent end. While it was rooted in the Old Testament ideas of God's purposes and the problem of suffering, it re-interpreted that problem in the light of Isaiah's and Christ's suffering, combining it with an eager expectation of the final Parousia, which would shortly vindicate His victory. Historical circumstances suggest that such theological thinking could only have developed in a pre 70 AD Judaeo-Christian community. The fact that both I Peter and James reflect that same view, reveals their indebtedness to that community.

There are still a number of other expressions in this section of I Peter which need to be examined.

iv:16 ὡς Χριστιανός. It appears that this name did not originate among the followers of Christ themselves.¹ Acts xi:26 records that they were first called Χριστιανοί in Antioch shortly after they had converted a large number of Gentiles. From this account it is obvious that the followers of Jesus referred to themselves as μαθηταί and that the new term was a nickname, like Ἰουδαῖοι and Καίσαριοι, coined by the local populace or Roman officialdom to distinguish them from the Jews. Indeed the use of the verb χριστιάζω in Acts xi:26 suggests that Χριστιανοί may even have been a term of derision. Luke, who clearly knew the church at Syrian Antioch, places the initial use of the name within the context of events of the 40's of the first century AD, namely the contemporary persecution by Herod Agrippa I, as narrated in Acts xii:1. It probably evoked the name Χριστιανοί as a parallel to their foes, the Ἰουδαῖοι.² Moreover, Acts xi:20 describes how it was at Antioch that the word was first spoken to the Greeks, making it possible for pagans to see Christianity as something other than a Jewish sect. Appropriate names for the converts would not be long in coming. By the 60's the term Χριστιανός must have been well

1. See H.B. Mattingly, "The Origin of the Name Christiani", *JTS* ns 9:26-37, 1958.

2. See H. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1971, pp. 367f. Cf. J.H. Elliott, *HPH*, op. cit. pp. 73f, 87 et passim.

established, because the "smart" Herod Agrippa II uses it again in Acts xxvi:28 in mocking Paul's attempts to convert him. Similarly, Tacitus describes how in 64 AD Nero trumped up a charge against a sect "whom the common people *were calling* (appellabat - the tense is significant) Christians (Chrestianos)".¹ These factors make the view that the term Χριστιανός had a late provenance untenable. Grundmann has suggested that an important consequence of the early use of the term was that the Church would now be "viewed as a separate society rather than as a section of the Jewish synagogue".² Furthermore, they would become distinguishable as a separate fellowship in the eyes of Government authorities and lose the protection as a *religio licita* which they enjoyed as a Jewish sect. This is the situation implied in I Peter's admonition not to be ashamed to suffer as a Christian.

1. Annals 15.44. See p. 215 *infra*.

2. W. Grundmann, *TDNT* IX, p. 537.

iv:17 ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίναι. This phrase emphasizes the nearness of the Parousia. Now is the time for judgement to begin,¹ as may be seen from the eschatological woe expressed in the following verse, which reflects the heightened expectations in Judaism leading to the revolt of 66 AD.²

iv:17 οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ. In view of the Jewish disposition of the author, this expression is obviously a reference to Israel. It implies that the addressees are Jews and that the unbelievers are fellow diaspora Jews who do not accept the Gospel. This is borne out by T. Benj.x:8 which reveals that terms like δίκαιος - πρᾶ are typical of Jewish piety, as are ἀσεβής and ἁματωλός - γῶς and γῶη.³ Similarly the LXX uses ἁματωλός to translate κῶν. These words, as Rengstorf points out, are used to describe Jews and are not concerned with Gentiles.⁴

iv:19 παρατιθέσθαι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν suggests the words of Jesus from the Cross as recorded in Lk.xxiii:46, which are a quotation of Psalm xxxi:5. It is not possible to determine absolutely whether the author was merely thinking of the Psalm, or whether its importance was enhanced by Jesus' use of it as He was dying. However, its use in Luke would suggest that the latter is more likely, reflecting as it does, an early tradition in which believers were urged to imitate Christ, which is prominent throughout the letter. If Peter is the author, it may also be based on his experience recorded in John xxi:18-22.⁵

1. Cf. Mk.xiii:35; Lk.xix:44; Jn.vii:6; xii:31; Rom.xiii:11; 1 Cor.vii:29 and possibly Jas.iv:14.

2. See Str-B III, p. 336.

3. Cf. Zeph.iii:11 and Dan.ix:5 where the LXX uses ἀσεβέω.

4. K.H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* I, pp. 317-333.

5. Cf. 1 Pet.ii:21; Eph.v:1.

iv:17 ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρῖναι. This phrase emphasizes the nearness of the Parousia. Now is the time for judgement to begin,¹ as may be seen from the eschatological woe expressed in the following verse, which reflects the heightened expectations in Judaism leading to the revolt of 66 AD.²

iv:17 οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ. In view of the Jewish disposition of the author, this expression is obviously a reference to Israel. It implies that the addressees are Jews and that the unbelievers are fellow diaspora Jews who do not accept the Gospel. This is borne out by T. Benj.x:8 which reveals that terms like δίκαιος - צדק are typical of Jewish piety, as are ἀσεβής and ἀμαρτωλὸς - פשע and רשע.³ Similarly the LXX uses ἀμαρτωλὸς to translate כח. These words, as Rengstorff points out, are used to describe Jews and are not concerned with Gentiles.⁴

iv:19 παρατιθέσθαι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν suggests the words of Jesus from the Cross as recorded in Lk.xxiii:46, which are a quotation of Psalm xxxi:5. It is not possible to determine absolutely whether the author was merely thinking of the Psalm, or whether its importance was enhanced by Jesus' use of it as He was dying. However, its use in Luke would suggest that the latter is more likely, reflecting as it does, an early tradition in which believers were urged to imitate Christ, which is prominent throughout the letter. If Peter is the author, it may also be based on his experience recorded in John xxi:18-22.⁵

1. Cf. Mk.xiii:35; Lk.xix:44; Jn.vii:6; xii:31; Rom.xiii:11; 1 Cor.vii:29 and possibly Jas.iv:14.

2. See Str-B III, p. 336.

3. Cf. Zeph.iii:11 and Dan.ix:5 where the LXX uses ἀσεβέω.

4. K.H. Rengstorff, *TDNT* I, pp. 317-333.

5. Cf. 1 Pet.ii:21; Eph.v:1.

v:1 Ἰπρεσβυτέρους...συνἰπρεσβύτερος. The language here is parallel to Paul's speech to the elders at Miletus in Acts xx:18-35. In both passages, the elders are regarded as shepherds of the flock over whom they must exercise oversight (ἐπισκοποῦντες). The origin and development of the ministry is greatly disputed as there was no uniform nomenclature for the leaders of the churches in the first century and the New Testament presents us with contradictory evidence.¹ Yet one very interesting observation must be made. In the first generation πρεσβύτεροι were officials of the Judean church. Acts xiv:23 marks the last occasion when Paul, who was still in the company of Barnabas and therefore still as missionary of the Jerusalem mission, appointed πρεσβύτεροι. Except for Acts xx:17, where he is addressing elders from the Ephesian church which was also a Jerusalem foundation,² no mention is made of πρεσβύτεροι in the Pauline churches,

-
1. See J.H. Elliott, "Ministry and Church Order in the New Testament: A Tradition-Historical Analysis (I Pt 5:1-5)", *CBQ* 32:367-391, 1970; E. Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament*, London: SCM, 1961; M.H. Shepherd, "Ministry, Christian", *IDB* III, pp. 386-388 & "Elder in the N.T.", *IDB* II, pp. 73-75; G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* VI, pp. 651-680; J.B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, London: MacMillan, 1913, pp. 181-269; B.H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, London: MacMillan, 1929.
 2. It should be borne in mind that Paul did not found the Ephesian church. When he started his work there, he already found twelve "disciples" there, who knew nothing of the Holy Spirit and had only been baptised into the "Baptism of John" (Acts xix:1-7). Similarly, Apollos from Alexandria (where he was probably converted by Jerusalem missionaries) only knew the Baptism of John and had to be put right by Priscilla and Aquila. These incidents suggest that the first mission to Ephesus was probably undertaken by the Jerusalem church. Such a view is confirmed by the fact that there was a large Jewish population there. (See W.M. Calder, "Asia Minor", in *A Companion to the Bible*, T.W. Manson, ed. pp. 157-171, 1950; D.C. Pellett, *IDB* I, pp. 257-259.) Further, Asia, of which Ephesus was the capital, was one of the areas which was originally closed to Paul by the Holy Spirit. (Acts xvi:6) John, the other "pillar" of the Jerusalem church with Peter and James (Gal.ii:9) is also traditionally associated with the church at Ephesus. Hence it is not surprising that the Ephesian church reflects the Jerusalem pattern of *elders* as church leaders. Moreover, Eph.i:14 and I Pet.ii:9 describe their readers as περιποίησις and λαός εἰς περιποίησιν which is the LXX rendering of הָאֱלֹהִים בְּךָ, the exclusive name for Israel in Ex.xix:5.

nor does Paul ever refer to himself as "an elder". The term is also singularly absent from his letters. A quick glance at a concordance confirms that where the term does occur elsewhere in the New Testament, it is always in a Judean church context.¹ This indicates that the Gentile churches under the leadership of Paul developed their own hierarchy of ministry, while the congregations addressed by I Peter, James and the author of the Apocalypse continued with the Judean form of Church Government which the first missionaries had brought to them from Jerusalem. I Peter definitely leaves the impression of an early stage in the evolution of Judean church leadership. Goppelt² argues that, despite the temptations implicit in the office of elder as suggested in verses 2 & 3, Acts xx and I Pet.v:1-4 reflect the same stage of development. For instance, there are no distinctions between ministries as in 1 Tim. iii:1-13; v:17-19 and Tit.i:5-9; the elders are not regarded as the custodians of sound tradition and doctrine; nor is there an hierarchical system such as emerges in the letters of Ignatius very early in the second century. In this discussion it is also worth noting that F.J. Foakes-Jackson³ has drawn attention to the similarity between Paul's description of the church as purchased (περιποιήσατο) by the Lord with His own blood in Acts xx:28 and I Peter ii:9, where they are described as God's possession (περιποίησις). This further enhances the view that Acts xx:18-35 and I Peter reflect the same stage of development. We also cannot avoid the vexed problem of the interpretation of συμπεροβύτερος. Together with i:1 and v:12-14, it is the only description of the person of the author given in I Peter. Scholars who deny the Petrine authorship of this letter, have interpreted it as either "part of the apparatus of

1. See Jas. v:14; Rev.iv:4 et al. See also A.S. Geyser, "The Twelve Tribes in Revelation. Judean and Judaeo Christian Apocalypticism", *NTS* 28:388-399, 1982.

2. L. Goppelt, op. cit. pp. 319-320 contra Bornkamm, op. cit. p. 666.

3. F.J. Foakes-Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931, p. 192.

pseudepigraphy" and "meek-modesty"¹ or as "self-effacement of apostolic status".² In turn, we may ask whether a pseudonymous author would not have chosen the higher title which correctly belonged to Peter, under whose name he was writing. Such arguments, however, fail to take proper account of the fact that up to Acts xvi "presbyters" and "apostles" are mentioned in the same breath,³ forming one college to direct the affairs of the Jerusalem church. Peter would have been a member of that group both as ἀπόστολος and πρεσβύτερος, and it would therefore be quite appropriate that having already called himself an apostle in I Pet.i:1, he should emphasize the importance of pastoral oversight in v:2-3 by associating himself with that responsibility of the eldership as well. Moreover, as "the Twelve" soon disappear from the Jerusalem scene, A.S. Geysler⁴ suggests that they were incorporated into the new governing and administrative body of elders under James. Therefore Peter could most aptly be described as a "fellow elder".

v:1 μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων. To understand the New Testament usage of μάρτυς it is important to bear in mind that it is used both in the sense of witness to ascertainable facts and in the sense of confessing convictions.⁵ Those scholars who deny the Petrine authorship of the letter argue that here μάρτυς is used in the sense of confessing a conviction, implying that the writer was simply someone who testified to Jesus and the Resurrection rather than an eye witness of His passion.⁶ Another interpretation, in line with the thought of I Pet.ii:2, is that it implies personal participation in the sufferings of Christ as well as "in the glory

-
1. F.W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970, p. 198.
 2. See J.N.D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude, BNTC, London: Black, 1969, p. 198, who lists the various views.
 3. Acts xv:2,6,22f; xvi:4. Cf. Acts xi:30 where πρεσβύτεροι seem to be in charge of the Jerusalem church.
 4. Op. cit. pp. 388-399. 5. See H. Strathmann, *TDNT* IV, p. 489.
 6. See Acts xxii:15; xxvi:16.

that is to be revealed" of the following clause. In this sense the author would see himself as a sympathisant of the passion of Christ and would come very close to the technical use of the word in Acts xxii:20, where Paul in his prayer in the Temple refers to Stephen as τοῦ μάρτυρός σου.¹ Such interpretations, however, are very forced attempts to wriggle out of the obvious implication that in the phrase under discussion, the author is claiming to be an eye-witness of the facts of the passion of Christ, just as Acts vii:58 describes Saul of Tarsus as an eye-witness of the stoning of Stephen. Acts i:21-27 clearly proves that this is the correct interpretation of μάρτυς,² for to qualify as a member of The Twelve, the candidate must have personally witnessed everything in the life of Jesus from the baptism of John to the Resurrection.³ Hence I Peter uses the word in the same sense as the early Judean church, and there is nothing spectacular in his thought here which would indicate that the import of later usages of the word should be read into the phrase.

v:2 ποιμένας. The thought of God's chosen people as His flock is deeply rooted in the O.T.⁴ Further, in the Psalm of Solomon xvii:45 the Messiah is represented as "shepherding the Lord's flock in faith and righteousness". Similarly in the Damascus Document of Qumran⁵, we read of the "mebaqquer" or overseer, sustaining the people "as a shepherd his flock". Yet the thought here in I Peter bears specially on the hazardous duties of leadership, as is shown by the warning against the temptation to dominate in verse 3. In broader terms, the picture of the "good shepherd" as drawn in John x:11-16 seems to be suggested. The shepherd may be called to lay down his life for the sheep, to bring others into the fold, to see that the flock

-
1. The sense of blood witness or martyr is not applicable to I Peter here.
 2. Cf. Acts i:8,22; ii:32; iii:15; v:32; x:39,41; xiii:31.
 3. N.B. Acts i:21, ἐν παντί χρόνῳ ᾧ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς.
 4. E.g. Ps.xxiii; Isa.xl:11; Jer.xxiii:1-4; Ezek.xxxiv:1-10.
 5. 6QD xiii:9.

is provided with spiritual nourishment even in the presence of its enemies. The same thought underlies Jesus' teaching in Mk.vi:34; Matt.xviii:11-14 and Lk.xv:3-7. Further, one cannot overlook the threefold pastoral charge to Peter recorded in John xxi:15-17, where in the second charge ποιμαίνε is used in caring for the sheep. The charge to the elders here in I Peter would derive a special poignancy from the command which Peter himself had received, if he were the author. Moreover, "the flock", "the sheep" and "the lost sheep" are fairly commonly used as prophetic metaphors for the tribes in the dispersion,¹ just as in Matt.xv:24 Jesus refers to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel". Such a description would be most meaningful if the addressees were descendants of the "lost tribes" of Israel who had been settled in that area by Tiglath Pileser and Nebuchadnezzar, or had been moved there by Antiochus the Great.²

v:3 κατακυριεύοντες. One of the greatest temptations to those in official positions is to extend their power and authority. The true ideal for the Christian leader is taught by Jesus in Mk.x:42-45,³ where the compound κατακυριεύω is also used. Probably the author had this teaching in mind as he thought of the perfect example set by the chief Shepherd Himself. I Peter's command that the younger (νεώτεροι) should be subject to the elders (πρεσβύτεροι) is very reminiscent of Jesus' command in Lk.xxii:26. Again in I Peter, the elders are to be τῶτοι of humble-mindedness to the flock, which recalls Jesus' prime example of humble service described in Jn.xiii:4-5,⁴ which the author sums up in the very unusual but picturesque word ἐγκοιμῶμαι.⁵ There is also a common eschatological reward motif. When the chief Shepherd appears, an unfading crown of glory will be given. This is paralleled in the Q passage in Lk.xxii:25-30 and Matt.xix:28 which allocates the disciples a share in His glorious Kingdom.

1. Isa.xl:11; Jer.xiii:20; Ezek.xxxiv:12,31; Hab.iii:17; Zech.xi:7.

2. Jos.Ant.12:iii:4, recounts how Antiochus the Great resettled 2,000 Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylon into the Anatolian areas of Phrygia and Lydia.

3. Cf. Matt.xx:25-28.

4. Cf. The Judean confessional hymn in Phil.ii:6-11. 5. I Pet.v:5.

v:5-9. Among the many parallels between these verses and the writings of the New Testament, those with James iv:6-10 appear to be the most significant and may best be examined by setting them out as follows:-

I Peter v:5 - 9

5 ὁμοίως, καίτοι, ὑποτάσσεται τῷ κυρίῳ, ὡς ὁ
θεὸς ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, ὅτι
ἡ κεφαλή τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τοῦ σώματος
τοῦ σώματος, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός. ①
6 ὑποτάσσεται οὖν ὑμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ, ὡς
τῷ κυρίῳ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ
θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς
ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ. ②
7 ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς
ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ. ③
8 ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς
ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ. ④
9 ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς
ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ. ⑤

James iv:6 - 10

6 ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς
ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ. ①
7 ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς
ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ. ②
8 ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς
ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ. ③
9 ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς
ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ. ④
10 ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς
ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός
ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται
τῷ θεῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ θεῷ. ⑤

Here too, there is a striking parallel of content and sequence of thought in the two passages, namely, (i) a quotation of Prov.iii:34; (ii) an exhortation to submit to God; (iii) a call to resist the devil.

The quotation from the LXX version of Prov.iii:34, expresses an idea which is axiomatic to the Old Testament and is splendidly proclaimed in the Magnificat.¹ Notably in this citation ὁ θεός is substituted for the original κύριος and is paralleled in its Petrine form in Jas.iv:6.² In both instances the quotation is followed by the injunction, "Submit then, to God".³

1. Lk.i:51-53.

2. This change is a notable characteristic of the early Judean church, for I Peter, James and Paul alike, always distinguish between ὁ θεός and ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (see Rom. v:1,11; vi:23; Jas.i:1; I Pet.i:3.). As this distinction faded after the first century in the Greek church, its presence in I Peter indicates the priority of the letter and the Jewishness of its author.

3. ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ. Jas.iv:7.

v:5, 6 ταπεινοφροσύνην...ταπεινοῖς...ταπεινώθητε. An example of the humility in service before God which is enjoined here, can be found in Paul himself as he quotes his own example to the elders in his speech at Miletus in Acts xx:19. It is a thought which he expresses in further detail in Phil.ii:3-11 and illustrates by quoting the words of an ancient Kurios hymn of the Judean Church.¹ The thought of the quotation from Prov.iii:34 is typically Jewish, for as Grundmann shows in his study of ταπεινός,² the high estimation which the New Testament writers give to this word group in regarding it as a virtue, contrasts dramatically with the low appraisal accorded it in Greek literature where it is treated contemptuously. Hence the New Testament authors clearly carry on the tradition of the Old Testament and the Hasidim in their high evaluation of humility. This virtue is so important because it is ascribed to the character of God Himself. In Ps.cxiii:5-6 God is represented as being incomparably high and great, and yet He humbles Himself to take note of the things which are created, while in Ps.xviii:35, the greatness of God's servants is attributed to the humility which God has displayed towards them.³ Such lowliness is closely connected in its derivation with affliction, which is sometimes brought upon men by their fellows and sometimes attributed directly to the purpose of God. Such affliction is always calculated to produce humility of spirit. So, for instance, the Qumran Community call themselves "the poor" אֲבִיּוֹנִים⁴ and the "lowly" עֲנִיִּים and in their Rule ענוה is demanded. "All should act in true unity, gracious humility, loving concern, and right thinking towards their neighbours in the community of holiness and as sons of the eternal fellowship".⁵ Other Essene groups and separatist communities also took pride in practising a deliberate life of poverty.⁶ Even

1. Cf. E. Lohmeyer, KYRIOS JESUS, op. cit. and R.P. Martin, An Early Christian Confession, op. cit.

2. See W. Grundmann, *TDNT* VIII, pp. 1-26.

3. Cf. Prov.xv:33; xviii:12.

4. 4QpPs 37,ii:9-10.

5. 1QS ii:24.

6. Cf. CD vi:21; xiv:14; Jos.Ant.18:xx; Bell.2:cxxii; Philo, *Quod.Omn.Prob.Lib.*84; Plin. *Hist. Nat.*V.xvii:4.

the little that can be deduced about the followers of John the Baptist, suggests that they adopted similar practices.¹ In its religious development in Judaism, therefore, the word אביון and its Greek translation πτωχός or πενής or Latin equivalent "pauper" became a term of honour.² Similarly, humility appears as a prized attribute of the Judean church as reflected in the Palestinian Q material of Matt.v:3 and Lk.vi:20,³ which states that humility is a quality to be lauded and that God's blessing is frequently poured upon those who possess it. Corresponding teaching is given in Lk.xiv:11, where the impersonal passive in typical Jewish fashion denotes God as subject, as in Jas.iv:5,10 and I Pet.v:6. Likewise, James associates the humble brother with the poor in i:9-10, and also keeps up a running attack on the rich (both inside and outside the community) who are in opposition to the ταπεινοί⁴ and the πτωχοί⁵ throughout the rest of his letter.

It is against this background that we need to examine the earliest statements about the Jerusalem church which occur in Gal. ii:9-10 and Rom.xv:26. According to the Galatians passage, the "Pillars" of the Jerusalem church laid only one obligation on Paul - to remember "the Poor" - μένον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν - while in Rom.xv:26 Paul refers to πτωχοί τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ. The *crux interpretum* here is whether πτωχοί τῶν ἁγίων is to be taken as a partitive or a semitic descriptive genitive. Traditionally from the Vulgate's "pauperes sanctorum qui sunt in Hierusalem" to the New English Bible's "the poor among God's people at Jerusalem" it has been interpreted as a partitive genitive. It even features as an example of the use of the partitive genitive in New Testament

1. Cf. Lk.iii:10-12; Matt.xi:7-11.

2. See E. Bammel, *TDNT* VI, pp. 900-909.

3. See J. Jeremias, *The Sermon on the Mount*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963, pp. 13-18; A.J.B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964, p. 119.

4. Jas.i:9; iv:6,(10).

5. Jas.ii:2,3,5,6.

Greek in Blass-Debrunner¹ and C.F.D. Moule.² Not surprisingly, therefore, L.E. Keck, who fully documents and discusses this terminology in two articles,³ still accepts the traditional view.

Yet, the honourable qualities associated with אביון in its Semitic environment and the many Semitisms in the theological thought of James and I Peter as well as their Jerusalem catechetical source, justify A.S. Geyser in questioning the traditional view, and taking πτωχοί τῶν ἁγίων of Romans xv:26 as a semitic descriptive genitive instead.⁴ The high religious esteem accorded to "poverty" in the Semitic world also confirms Holl's earlier theory that the πτωχοί of Gal. ii:9f and Rom. xv:26 refer, not to the destitute among the Christians, but to the Jerusalem church as a whole, and that ἅγιοι⁵ and πτωχοί are virtually equivalent self-designations of the early church in Jerusalem.⁶ Hence, E. Bammel regards πτωχοί as a shortened form of the solemn πτωχοί τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ = אביונים ועניים בירושלים. It was not a phrase coined by Paul, but "a self-designation or title of the primitive (Jerusalem) community".⁷

-
1. F. Blass, A. Debrunner and R.W. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: CUP, 1961, § 164.1.
 2. C.F.D. Moule, An Idiom-book of New Testament Greek. 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP, 1960, p. 210.
 3. L.E. Keck, "The Poor among the Saints in the New Testament", *ZNW* 56:100-129, 1965 and "The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity", *ZNW* 57:54-78, 1966.
 4. A.S. Geyser, "The Earliest Name of the Earliest Church", *De Fructo Oris Sui*, A. van Selms FS. Leiden: Brill, 1971, pp. 58-68.
 5. Rom.i:7; xvi:15; 1 Cor.i:2;xvi:1; 2 Cor.i:1;ix:1; Eph.i:1; Phil.i:1; Col.i:2 et al.
 6. K. Holl, "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde", *Sitzungsbericht der Berliner Akademie* 1921, pp. 920-947, reprinted in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* II, Tübingen, 1928, pp. 44-67.
 7. E. Bammel, *TDNT* VI, p. 909.

Greek in Blass-Debrunner¹ and C.F.D. Moule.² Not surprisingly, therefore, L.E. Keck, who fully documents and discusses this terminology in two articles,³ still accepts the traditional view.

Yet, the honourable qualities associated with אביון in its Semitic environment and the many Semitisms in the theological thought of James and I Peter as well as their Jerusalem catechetical source, justify A.S. Geyser in questioning the traditional view, and taking πτωχοί τῶν ἁγίων of Romans xv:26 as a semitic descriptive genitive instead.⁴ The high religious esteem accorded to "poverty" in the Semitic world also confirms Holl's earlier theory that the πτωχοί of Gal. ii:9f and Rom. xv:26 refer, not to the destitute among the Christians, but to the Jerusalem church as a whole, and that ἅγιοι⁵ and πτωχοί are virtually equivalent self-designations of the early church in Jerusalem.⁶ Hence, E. Bammel regards πτωχοί as a shortened form of the solemn πτωχοί τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ = אביונים ועניים בירושלים. It was not a phrase coined by Paul, but "a self-designation or title of the primitive (Jerusalem) community".⁷

-
1. F. Blass, A. Debrunner and R.W. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: CUP, 1961, § 164.1.
 2. C.F.D. Moule, An Idiom-book of New Testament Greek. 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP, 1960, p. 210.
 3. L.E. Keck, "The Poor among the Saints in the New Testament", *ZNW* 56:100-129, 1965 and "The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity", *ZNW* 57:54-78, 1966.
 4. A.S. Geyser, "The Earliest Name of the Earliest Church", *De Fructo Oris Sui*, A. van Selms FS. Leiden: Brill, 1971, pp. 58-68.
 5. Rom.i:7; xvi:15; 1 Cor.i:2;xvi:1; 2 Cor.i:1;ix:1; Eph.i:1; Phil.i:1; Col.i:2 et al.
 6. K. Holl, "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde", *Sitzungsbericht der Berliner Akademie* 1921, pp. 920-947, reprinted in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* II, Tübingen, 1928, pp. 44-67.
 7. E. Bammel, *TDNT* VI, p. 909.

v:6 ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ Θεοῦ echoes a typical Old Testament phrase "A mighty hand" ἡρῖν τ' which can either indicate God's acts of deliverance,¹ or His discipline.

v:7 πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν is a direct quotation of the LXX version of Ps.lv:22, ἐπίρριψον ἐπὶ Κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου.³ Meanwhile the thought of casting all one's cares upon God recalls the words of Jesus in the Q passage incorporated in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount in Matt.vi:25-32 and in Lk.xii:22-34 and possibly also in Lk.xii:11-12.

v:8 Νηψάτε, γρηγορήσατε. These exhortations to be sober and watch recall Luke's version of Jesus' commands in Gethsemane.⁴ γρηγορήσατε is also reminiscent of Paul's injunction to the elders of Ephesus who had come to him at Miletus, in Acts xx:31. There Paul describes the opponents of the flock as wolves, rather than the roaring lion in this verse. This lends weight to the view presented by E.G. Selwyn⁵ that at this point I Peter and I Thessalonians are based on a common compilation of oral or written admonition. In line with I Pet. v:5-6 and Acts xx:19, which we have just discussed above, it could have come from the same catechism of the early Judean church which we sought to isolate there.

v:8 ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος resembles Lk.xxii:31-32, where, although the metaphor is different, the Devil is seen as an adversary of Christ's disciple. In both passages everything turns on the disciple's faith by which, if it is strong enough, he will be able to overcome the adversary. The connection of these two passages is further strengthened by the admonition to stand firm in the faith as a member of the brotherhood and the command to Peter to strengthen

1. See Ex.iii:19; vi:1; Deut.ix:26.

2. See Job xxx:21; Ps. lxxii:4; Ezek.xx:34-35.

3. Cf. Wis.xii:13.

4. Lk.xxi:34,36. See pp. 114f supra.

5. Op. cit. pp. 452-456. Selwyn's argument to support this view is set out on p. 137 infra.

his brethren. It is noteworthy that ὁ ἀντίδικος is an exact translation of יוֹא - the adversary,¹ while ὁ διάβολος is an explanatory qualification. It suggests that I Peter is using ἀντίδικος to express the concept of Satan in the time honoured sense of Jewish lore.²

This exhortation to withstand the devil is also paralleled in Jas. iv:7 and Eph.vi:11 - στήναι πρὸς μεθοδίας τοῦ διαβόλου. In Ephesians the readers are urged to oppose him with the whole armour of God in vss 10-17.³ The use of the term ὁ διάβολος is a departure from the usual Pauline use of the transliteration Σατανᾶς from the Hebrew יוֹא, indicating that here Ephesians is also dependent on a common pattern of Judaeo Christian ethical teaching. While Paul expresses a similar thought in urging the Colossians to "continue in the faith, stable and steadfast",⁴ he does not mention the devil, which makes a direct relationship between him and I Peter at this point very doubtful. In addition, Selwyn⁵ has presented the view that at this juncture I Peter and 1 and 2 Thessalonians are based on a common admonition. Although the verbal parallels are not exact, he argues that these passages are linked because 1 Thess.iii:13; 2 Thess.ii:17 and iii:3 all use σπουάζειν which has the same root as στήναι. Moreover, he argues that this admonition was compiled with persecution in view. But Paul does not apply it in that context in Thessalonians. Instead, he places it in a general exhortation and only in 1 Thess. iii:13 loosely connects it with the coming of the Lord. This again makes any direct relationship between I Peter and the Thessalonian correspondence doubtful.

The description of the devil as a roaring lion, prowling around and seeking someone to devour, is very pertinent in trying to establish the source of the teaching given here. While Perdelwitz⁶

1. See T.H. Gaster, *IDB* IV, pp. 224-228.

2. For an extensive exposition of the Jewish concept of יוֹא, see Str-B I, pp. 136-149.

3. See P. Carrington, *op. cit.* pp. 39-40. 4. Col.i:23.

5. E.G. Selwyn, *op. cit.* pp. 452-456.

6. R. Perdelwitz, *op. cit.* pp. 101-102.

sees a parallel with the lions of the goddess Cybele in Asia Minor, Goppelt¹ vehemently denies that there is any connection between them and the symbolism in this passage. He argues most forcefully that this image of the devil as a roaring lion is a traditional image taken over from the Old Testament. In Judaism persecutors were often described as lions. Thus in Ψ xxi:14 we read ἤνοιξαν ἐπ' ἐμέ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ὡς λέων ὁ ἀρπάζων καὶ ὠρυόμενος.² This psalm would have been specially familiar in the early church because of its association with the passion of Jesus.³ Similarly, the writers at Qumran adopted this image in describing the adversary,⁴ while Heb. xi:33 testifies to its use in the Jewish circles of the early church. Moreover, the fact that a Jewish writer like James joins I Peter in referring to the devil as ὁ διαβόλος rather than using the Grecized rendering of ἰουδαῖος - Σατανᾶς, points to a Jewish rather than a Greek-Christian origin of this term. It also suggests that in this matter Ephesians follows the same Jewish tradition as distinct from the Pauline practice outlined above. All of this increases the evidence that a Jerusalem Catechism lies behind the teaching presented by I Peter and James in these passages.

As an alternative explanation, Boismard⁵ suggested that the parallels between I Peter v:5-9 and James iv:6-10 have arisen because both authors were using a common baptismal hymn. The difficulty of that view soon becomes apparent when the passages are placed side by side as has been done above. If the writers both had the same hymn in mind, one might reasonably expect that the poetic rhythm of the hymn would have caused far more of the hymnodic language to have been kept intact, just as happened with the quotation from Prov.iii:34, where both authors have emended the LXX version

1. Op. cit. pp. 339-341.

2. RSV Ps.xxii:13, "They open wide their mouths at me, like a ravening and roaring lion".

3. Cf. vss. 7,8,9,16-19,24. 4. 1QH v:9,13f; 4QpNah i:5.

5. Op. cit. pp. 133-163.

by replacing the original *Κύριος* with *ὁ Θεός*.¹ Yet nothing of the sort happens in the subsequent verses. While the basic thought pattern is the same and similar phrases occur, there are differences in application and expression in a number of respects. In I Peter the quotation is adduced to reinforce his instruction to the younger members to submit to the elders for the good of the community, whereas in James it is used to illustrate the abundance of God's grace. While James simply claims that God will exalt them if they humble themselves and resist the devil, I Peter places this exhortation in an eschatological setting by adding *ἐν καιρῷ* in verse 6 and by connecting the devil with the suffering of the brotherhood throughout the world. He also omits James' simple claim that if they resist the devil he will flee from them, a claim which lacks any eschatological significance. Moreover, both writers add so much extraneous material, that it is improbable that they were inspired by a common hymn. What does emerge, however, is a common pattern of Judaeo-Christian teaching on resistance to the devil, despite the varied trials and persecutions to which their readers may have been subjected. Most likely the basic teaching and stock motifs on resistance to the devil formed part of the regular pre-baptismal catechetical instruction in view of the danger of persecution to which the members of the church might be liable. Indeed, the teaching here probably provided the seed-bed of the fully developed baptismal ceremony in later years, in which the solemn renunciation of Satan became a dramatic part.²

v:10 *καταρτίσει, σπρίξει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει*. A number of manuscripts³ omit *θεμελιώσει*, but the majority, including P 72 support it. Its insertion is hard to explain if we assume that it

1. See p. 132 supra.

2. See Hippolytus, *Trad. Apost.* xxi:9; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. myst.* i:2-9.

3. A, B, the Vulgate and a number of cursives probably omit it through homoioteleuton.

was originally absent. Its inclusion in the text enhances the view that the thought of this verse is inspired by the teaching in the Q passage relating the parable of the house built on the rock rather than on the sand in Matt.vii:25 and Lk.vi:48. The point of the parable, the same as that of this passage in I Peter, is that only a firmly based faith can survive any storm, persecution or suffering that may be experienced.

v:12.¹ Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ...δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα. Selwyn² has suggested that the good Greek of I Peter must have been due to Silvanus "by whom" the Apostle Peter wrote the letter. The precise role of Silvanus as amanuensis will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.³ Here it is sufficient to note that there is no reason to dispute the identification of Silvanus with the Silas of Acts and the associate of Paul and Timothy in the Thessalonian epistles.

v:13 ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι. The obvious parallel here is with Revelation⁴ where Babylon is used as a pseudonym for Rome. Historically there were two Babylons, one in Mesopotamia and the other in Egypt on the site of modern Cairo.⁵ Yet there is no tradition associating Peter with either of them. Documents from Peter's life time and later Judaism use Babylon as a code name for Rome.⁶ Therefore, because Babylon as a pseudonym was already well known and the author so casually introduces the term, it is argued that he uses the name in the same sense. Yet unlike Revelation, I Peter does not betray the same bitterness towards the capital city, and even urges his

1. For discussion on the doxology in v:11, see iv:11 p. 117 supra.

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

3. See chapter 4 infra.

4. Rev.xiv:8; xvi:19; xvii:5; xviii:2,10,21.

5. See E.G. Selwyn, op. cit. p. 243.

6. 2 Apoc. Bar.xi:1-2; 1xvii:7; 2 Esdr.iii:1,2,28; Sib.Or.v:143, 157-159; and in the Rabbinic literature, see Str-B III, p. 816.

readers to be subject to Caesar,¹ suggesting that the root cause of his readers' problems stemmed not from the Imperial Government, as such, but from the Jewish elements in their immediate society. Hence in this letter it may well be an overstatement to associate the simple reference to Babylon with the savage hatred of Rome and its technical use as a code name in the Apocalypse. Instead it is possible that I Peter was written from the original Babylon, which was the capital of the diaspora of the Jews. In this study it has become clear that the addressees were Jews who had become Jesus believers through the mission to the circumcised and had subsequently endured trials and harassments at the hands of fellow Jews. Within such a Jewish context there is much to be said for associating the letter with Babylon in Mesopotamia at a date prior to Peter's traditional visit and subsequent martyrdom in Rome.

Results

A number of important results emerge from this examination of Theologically and ethnically significant words and expressions in I Peter.

Jewish influences

The letter reflects extensive influences of the Old Testament and Palestinian Judaism, which provide the key to the author's religious understanding. Indeed, the force and meaning of a number of his turns of phrase are lost if this background is ignored,² suggesting that the addressees must have had a similar cultural and religious heritage. In this respect additional material from Qumran and other inter-Testamental Jewish writings provide mounting evidence for the inherent Judean character and style of the epistle.

1. I Pet.ii:17.

2. I Pet.i:1,12,13,17,20,23; ii:11,12; iv:12-19; v:2.

readers to be subject to Caesar,¹ suggesting that the root cause of his readers' problems stemmed not from the Imperial Government, as such, but from the Jewish elements in their immediate society. Hence in this letter it may well be an overstatement to associate the simple reference to Babylon with the savage hatred of Rome and its technical use as a code name in the Apocalypse. Instead it is possible that I Peter was written from the original Babylon, which was the capital of the diaspora of the Jews. In this study it has become clear that the addressees were Jews who had become Jesus believers through the mission to the circumcised and had subsequently endured trials and harassments at the hands of fellow Jews. Within such a Jewish context there is much to be said for associating the letter with Babylon in Mesopotamia at a date prior to Peter's traditional visit and subsequent martyrdom in Rome.

Results

A number of important results emerge from this examination of Theologically and ethnically significant words and expressions in I Peter.

Jewish influences

The letter reflects extensive influences of the Old Testament and Palestinian Judaism, which provide the key to the author's religious understanding. Indeed, the force and meaning of a number of his turns of phrase are lost if this background is ignored,² suggesting that the addressees must have had a similar cultural and religious heritage. In this respect additional material from Qumran and other inter-Testamental Jewish writings provide mounting evidence for the inherent Judean character and style of the epistle.

1. I Pet. ii:17.

2. I Pet. i:1,12,13,17,20,23; ii:11,12; iv:12-19; v:2.

readers to be subject to Caesar,¹ suggesting that the root cause of his readers' problems stemmed not from the Imperial Government, as such, but from the Jewish elements in their immediate society. Hence in this letter it may well be an overstatement to associate the simple reference to Babylon with the savage hatred of Rome and its technical use as a code name in the Apocalypse. Instead it is possible that I Peter was written from the original Babylon, which was the capital of the diaspora of the Jews. In this study it has become clear that the addressees were Jews who had become Jesus believers through the mission to the circumcised and had subsequently endured trials and harassments at the hands of fellow Jews. Within such a Jewish context there is much to be said for associating the letter with Babylon in Mesopotamia at a date prior to Peter's traditional visit and subsequent martyrdom in Rome.

Results

A number of important results emerge from this examination of Theologically and ethnically significant words and expressions in I Peter.

Jewish influences

The letter reflects extensive influences of the Old Testament and Palestinian Judaism, which provide the key to the author's religious understanding. Indeed, the force and meaning of a number of his turns of phrase are lost if this background is ignored,² suggesting that the addressees must have had a similar cultural and religious heritage. In this respect additional material from Qumran and other inter-Testamental Jewish writings provide mounting evidence for the inherent Judean character and style of the epistle.

1. I Pet. ii:17.

2. I Pet. i:1,12,13,17,20,23; ii:11,12; iv:12-19; v:2.

Parallels with other New Testament epistles

There are significant parallels between I Peter, the Pauline epistles, Ephesians and James. Occasionally exact verbal correspondences occur between all these writers,¹ although parallels between I Peter and one of the other letters are more frequent.² In other passages where the wording is not exactly the same, the writers nevertheless follow the same sequence of thought. The differences within such corresponding passages rule out any direct dependence as a plausible explanation of the similarities. Instead the most promising solution to the problem of I Peter's literary relationship with the other New Testament epistles, is the hypothesis that all the early Christian writers used a Primitive Christian Catechism which Seeberg, Klein, Carrington and Selwyn have isolated,³ since this accounts for both the similarities and the differences between their works. From this it becomes clear that the author of I Peter draws heavily on common catechetical teaching. Where this common material does not consist of direct quotations from the Old Testament, it nonetheless betrays such typical traits of Jewish thought and expression, that it too must have passed through a Jewish or Jewish Christian stage in its formulation. By not altering Hebraisms in this material to comply with normal Greek expression and grammar,⁴ the writer, along with the other New Testament authors, shows that he regarded the original verbal formulation very highly. Such esteem can only be explained if the material originated in the very early Judean church and was endowed with Apostolic authority.

1. I Pet.i:6,7; ii:18-25; iii:1-7,8-12,21; iv:3.

2. I Pet.i:24-25; ii:13-17; iii:5-12; iv:8,12-19; v:5-9.

3. A. Seeberg, Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit, Leipzig: Deichertschen, 1903; G. Klein, Der Älteste Christliche Katechismus und die Jüdische Propaganda-Literatur, Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1909; P. Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism, Cambridge: CUP, 1940; E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, 2nd ed. London: MacMillan, 1947.

4. Such as imperatival participles, see I Pet.ii:1; iii:1.

Common liturgical material

Another suggested explanation of the similarities between the New Testament writers has been that at some points they are referring to common liturgical or hymnodic material. The present study has shown, particularly in I Pet.v:5-9, that the possible hints and allusions to hymns are far too vague and scattered in comparison to the treatment of Proverbs, which is quoted verbatim. If the writers were indeed inspired by the poetic and rhythmic expression of hymns, it might reasonably have been expected that they would have retained a much larger proportion of the hymnodic language intact. Thus while odd liturgical phrases occur in I Peter, they do not constitute the common factor with the other epistles.

A primitive Jerusalem catechism

A far more plausible solution is to postulate a common catechetical source for the authors' quotations, adaptations or allusions. It would explain the similarities as well as the differences between the New Testament writers. Moreover, the way in which Jewish traits of thought and expression are preserved in this common teaching shows that it came from the Apostles in Jerusalem, who were the highest authority in the early Judean church. Therefore such material is most appropriately described as a primitive Jerusalem catechism.

I Peter and James

The fact that a manifestly Jewish letter like that of James of Jerusalem reflects the same scheme of teaching, further enhances the view that this common catechetical teaching had an overriding Jewish content and flavour. Indeed, the most likely centre for the compilation of such teaching would be the headquarters of the early church as it blossomed out of Palestine into the wider world, namely, Jerusalem, which since 42 AD had been under the leadership of James, the Lord's brother. This consideration confirms the thesis that a Jerusalem catechism is the common source linking the corresponding paraenetic material in the New Testament documents.

Again, we have noted that, with one exception, James regularly quotes from the LXX instead of the Hebrew text of TNK as one might have expected from such a Jewish writer. Moreover, his additional insertion of a definite Semitism in i:11 clearly shows that we are dealing with a Jewish thinker. Hence the objection to the Petrine authorship of I Peter on the grounds that a Jewish apostle would only use the Hebrew text rather than the LXX, has lost all merit. Paradoxically, the similar practice of James and I Peter on this matter proves exactly the opposite. It was, in fact, the most natural thing for a Jewish writer to quote from the LXX when he was writing in Greek, even if, as may be true of James, he was addressing fellow Jews exclusively.¹

I Peter and Hebrews

Some very interesting and close parallels also emerge from a comparison of the thoughts and expressions in I Peter and the letter to the Hebrews. Indeed, if Montefiore² (and Luther) are correct, and Apollos of Alexandria wrote Hebrews, one can expect him to repeat the Jerusalem catechism, for he would have been a convert of the Jerusalem missionaries.³

1. A full discussion of this point is given in chapter 4 below.

2. See H.W. Montefiore, The Epistle to the Hebrews, BNTC London: Black, 1964, pp. 9-18.

3. Alexandria was the intellectual and literary centre of the Jewish Dispersion. The LXX had been produced there and, when in the second century AD its Christianity came to the fore, it had clearly developed from the Judaism of that city, with its philosophic apologetic, allegorical exegesis and Biblical commentary. Undoubtedly, therefore, the "mission to the circumcised" from Jerusalem (according to Gal.ii:9) must have laid the foundations of Alexandrian Christianity. Apollos would have learnt all that he knew about Jesus and his profound understanding of the OT from those Jerusalem missionaries. Using his gift of eloquence (1 Cor.ii:2-4; 2 Cor.xi:6) he enthusiastically proclaimed the truth as he knew it, when he arrived in Ephesus. (Acts xviii:24f.) Although he had been taught the way of the Lord as a catechumen, he only knew the baptism of John (Acts xviii:25) and a conspicuous gap in his knowledge concerned the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the consequent rite of Christian baptism. This was made good by the patient instruction of Priscilla and Aquila. (Acts xviii:26) According to Acts xix:1-7, Paul found 12 other disciples at

Archbishop Carrington has in fact found traces of his postulated Primitive Christian Catechism in Hebrews.¹ When the author turns to ethical exhortation, after ten and a half chapters of theological reflection, his traditional piety comes to the fore. There the same leading features of the catechetical instruction can be found. From Hebrews x:19 onwards Faith, Hope, Love, and the need for endurance are stressed, with examples from a gallery of Old Testament heroes of faith. Then in chapter twelve the leading

Ephesus who similarly knew only the baptism of John and had not heard that there was a Holy Spirit, which corroborates the view that the church at Ephesus was also founded by Jewish missionaries from Jerusalem. (See note 2, p. 127 supra) Meanwhile Apollos, armed with letters of recommendation from the brothers in Ephesus, had arrived in Corinth where he publicly and vigorously refuted Jewish objections to Christian teaching in true Alexandrian style. (Acts xviii:27-28) Unfortunately this led to factions in the Corinthian church, (1 Cor. i:12) which Paul had to correct, (1 Cor. iv:6) showing that both he and Apollos were working together under the hand of God. (1 Cor. iii:4-6) They probably arose because some members of the Corinthian congregation preferred Apollos' polished eloquence to the style of Paul and other missionaries. From 1 Cor. xvi:12 it seems that despite Paul's request, Apollos did not return to Corinth, because he wished to lessen the controversy which his preaching had aroused.

1. Op. cit. pp. 41-44.

words of the catechetical pattern appear, *Deponentes* - ἀποθέμενοι¹ πάντα καὶ τὴν ἐπιπελάσαντα ἁμαρτίαν...² *Subiecti* - ὑποταγησόμεθα;³ *Vigilate* - προσεύχεσθε.⁴ Although γρηγορεῖν is missing here, it is associated with prayer in other catechetical passages.⁴ Only the *Resistite* - στήτε - ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ - is missing. Instead the author warns against diverse and strange teachings.⁵ Thus the Primitive Jerusalem Catechism, which is reflected in I Peter and the other epistles, was also known to the author of Hebrews.

Selwyn has drawn attention to a special relationship which appears to exist between Hebrews xiii:20, 21 and I Peter.⁶ Whenever I Peter closely resembles I and II Thessalonians, its language is also echoed in these two verses of Hebrews. While Selwyn considers very tentatively that this may be an indication of the hand of Silvanus in the composition of all these epistles, it is more probable that the author is making use of a prayer current in the liturgy of the primitive Church.

A further interesting possibility has been put forward by Prof. C.F.D. Moule.⁷ He suggests that in addition to the catechetical material which we have already examined, there may also have been some teaching, "designed to meet the objections of Jews and also pagans who expressed a sense of outrage that Christians should have no sacrificial system."⁸ He calls this item of teaching "the theme of the new sanctuary and sacrifice."⁹ The kernel of this tradition is to be found in Acts vi:13f., where Stephen is accused of opposing the temple and the law, claiming that Jesus would destroy the temple

1. Heb.xii:1=I Pet.ii:1-2; Jas.i:21.

2. Heb.xii:9=I Pet.ii:13; iii:18; v:6-7; Jas.iv:7,10.

3. Heb.xiii:18. 4. Col.iv:2; Eph.vi:18; I Pet.iv:7.

5. Heb.xiii:9. 6. Op. cit. pp. 464-466.

7. C.F.D. Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament", *JTS* ns 1:29-41, 1950.

8. Ibid. p. 29.

9. Ibid.

and change the Mosaic customs. Stephen expounds this view in his defence in chapter 7. There the line of argument, that nothing humanly manufactured - χειροποίητος - can really be the abode of God, is exactly the same as that followed by the author of Hebrews. The basis of all this may indeed be a memorable saying of Jesus, "Destroy this temple",¹ with which the LXX version of Psalm x1:6² was closely associated. Moule³ lists the occurrence of the key-words of this proposed teaching, showing how they appear in the work of the different New Testament writers.⁴ This, he believes, indicates that the early Christian catechism also embraced such an apologia to Judaism. Thus, according to Moule, in answer to the outraged questions why the Christians had no temple, no priesthood, no sacrifice or circumcision, the catechumens would be taught to answer:-⁵

-
1. Matt.xxvi:61; xxvii:40; Mk.xiv:58; xv:29; Jn.ii:19.
 2. Quoted in Heb.x:5-9 with the famous LXX addition, "a body hast thou prepared for me".
 3. Op. cit. p. 41.
 4. ναός (τόπος): Mk.xiv:58; Jn.ii:19-21; Acts vi:13f; xxi:18
1Cor.iii:16f; vi:19; Eph.ii:21f.
οἶκος: Acts vii:47; 1Tim.iii:15; Heb.iii:3; x:21; 1Pet.ii:5.
χειροποίητος: Mk.xiv:58; Acts vii:48; xvii:14; Eph.ii:11
Heb.ix:24.
ἀχειροποίητος (οὐ χειροποίητος): Mk.xiv:58; Col.ii:11;
Heb.ix:11.
λογικός: Rom.xii:1; 1Pet.ii:2.
πνευματικός (τοῦ πνεύματος, ἐν πνεύματι): Jn.iv:23; Rom.i:9;
ii:29; 2Cor.iii:8; Eph.ii:22; Phil.iii:3(cf. Heb.ix:14)
1Pet.ii:5 (βλθ).
σῶμα (σώματα): Jn.ii:21; Rom.xii:1; 1Cor.vi:19;x:16 (N.B.v:18)
xi:29; xii:13; &c., Eph.ii:16; iv:16; v:23(?); Col.i:18,
22; ii:17(?),11,19; iii:15; Heb.x:5,10.
εὐάρεστος (εὐαρεστεῖν, εὐπρόσδεκτος): Rom.xii:2; Heb.xii:28;
xiii:16; 1Pet.ii:5.
 5. Op. cit. p. 39. Note that Revelation (iv;v;xix) and Qumran (1QH) hold the same views about having a temple not made with hands, and instead of blood offerings they give praise-offerings to God. Cf. Test. Levi 3 which speaks of spiritual and bloodless sacrifice, - λογική καὶ ἀναιμακτος προσφορά.

'We *have* a temple not made with hands, a temple which is the Body of Christ, in which we are built together as living stones; for we are the temple of the living God. The veil of the temple at Jerusalem was rent at the death of Christ, for his death abolished the old barriers between priest and people, Jew and Gentile, God and man. He is our great High Priest; and we are a kingdom of priests; we all have access, in Christ, into the holy place.

'We *have* an altar and we *have* a sacrifice. The sacrifice is the Body of Christ, his obedient self-surrender; and in him we too offer ourselves, our souls, and bodies, our praise and our deeds of kindness. These are the sacrifices which are well-pleasing to God; it is thus that we worship in spirit and in truth - spiritually as opposed to materialistically, really as opposed to symbolically.

'Circumcision, too, we practice:¹ it is the putting off of selfishness. Just as Christ on the cross divested himself of his mortal body and thus left the forces of evil no handhold; so the Christian who in Christ dies to self, is circumcised spiritually; he has stripped off all self-centredness; he has clothed himself with Christ.

'And all this was itself witnessed to by the Law and the Prophets: Judaism, taken seriously and properly understood, bears witness to its own supersession by the New Covenant.'

In the light of this "body of Christian apologia to Judaism", Moule² believes that some of the references to persecution are far more likely to refer to conflict with Jews than to official action by the Roman authorities.³ The death of Stephen at Jewish hands corroborates the view that the persecutions referred to in Hebrews, are to be regarded as pogroms organised by Jews of the Temple hierarchy against Jewish Christians. This in turn has a bearing on the persecutions alluded to in I Peter, suggesting that they too need not necessarily have been due to official Roman action, but were caused by private and unofficial harassment.

From this comparison it becomes very clear that like I Peter, the Letter to the Hebrews is also indebted to the teaching of the Primitive Catechism. Moreover, both epistles reveal

1. Cf. Rom.ii:25-29.

2. Op. cit. p. 40.

3. Before AD 70 such Jews would most likely have belonged to the Temple hierarchy.

'We *have* a temple not made with hands, a temple which is the Body of Christ, in which we are built together as living stones; for we are the temple of the living God. The veil of the temple at Jerusalem was rent at the death of Christ, for his death abolished the old barriers between priest and people, Jew and Gentile, God and man. He is our great High Priest; and we are a kingdom of priests; we a'l have access, in Christ, into the holy place.

'We *have* an altar and we *have* a sacrifice. The sacrifice is the Body of Christ, his obedient self-surrender; and in him we too offer ourselves, our souls, and bodies, our praise and our deeds of kindness. These are the sacrifices which are well-pleasing to God; it is thus that we worship in spirit and in truth - spiritually as opposed to materialistically, really as opposed to symbolically.

'Circumcision, too, we practice:¹ it is the putting off of selfishness. Just as Christ on the cross divested himself of his mortal body and thus left the forces of evil no handhold; so the Christian who in Christ dies to self, is circumcised spiritually; he has stripped off all self-centredness; he has clothed himself with Christ.

'And all this was itself witnessed to by the Law and the Prophets: Judaism, taken seriously and properly understood, bears witness to its own supersession by the New Covenant.'

In the light of this "body of Christian apologia to Judaism", Moule² believes that some of the references to persecution are far more likely to refer to conflict with Jews than to official action by the Roman authorities.³ The death of Stephen at Jewish hands corroborates the view that the persecutions referred to in Hebrews, are to be regarded as pogroms organised by Jews of the Temple hierarchy against Jewish Christians. This in turn has a bearing on the persecutions alluded to in I Peter, suggesting that they too need not necessarily have been due to official Roman action, but were caused by private and unofficial harassment.

From this comparison it becomes very clear that like I Peter, the Letter to the Hebrews is also indebted to the teaching of the Primitive Catechism. Moreover, both epistles reveal

1. Cf. Rom.ii:25-29.

2. Op. cit. p. 40.

3. Before AD 70 such Jews would most likely have belonged to the Temple hierarchy.

traces of the "Jewish Apologia" which Prof. Moule has isolated. This is a clear and significant indication of the Jewish character of the common teaching utilised by the authors of the New Testament documents. The fact that traces of this tradition can also be found in such an enigmatic work as the Letter to the Hebrews, shows how readily in propagating the Christian message, such Jewish teaching and thinking could be combined with Platonic ideas of shadowy earthly copies of the heavenly realities. All these factors add further support to the thesis that the common guideline and inspiration behind the epistles of the New Testament is to be found in an early Jerusalem Catechism.

I Peter and the Speeches of Acts

The many and striking parallels between expressions in I Peter and Peter's speeches in Acts become manifest if tabulated next to each other. By way of further comparison and evaluation similarities with Paul's speeches, official church pronouncements and narrative material in Acts are also listed.

I Peter	Speeches of Peter	Narrative about Peter	Speeches of Paul	Official Church Pronouncements	Other Narrative
1:2	2:23				
3:15			20:32; 26:18		
1:4			20:32		
1:5, 9, 10	4:12		13:26, 47		16:17
1:5; 3:15; 4:5			21:13		
1:5, 20	2:17				
1:6, 8; 4:13	2:26				
1:6			20:19		

I Peter	Speeches of Peter	Narrative about Peter	Speeches of Paul	Official Church Pronouncements	Other Narrative
1:16	3:6				
1:10				15:17	
1:10	2:17,18				19:6;21:9
1:12			20:20,27		14:27;15:4 16:38;19:18
1:14	3:17		17:30		
1:17	10:34				
1:17			13:17		
1:18			14:15		
1:19					8:32
1:20	2:23;3:18				
1:21	2:32;3:15;4:10				
1:22;3:21	15:9		18:6;20:26 24:18		21:24,26
1:22		12:5	26:7		
1:24		12:7			
1:25	11:16				
2:1,16	8:22				
2:4-8	4:8-12				
2:5			20:32	15:16	9:31
2:7	4:11				
2:8	1:16		13:47		

I Peter	Speeches of Peter	Narrative about Peter	Speeches of Paul	Official Church Pronouncements	Other Narrative
2:9			13:26		7:19
2:9					2:11
2:9			26:18		
2:11					7:6,29
2:11				15:20,29	
2:12				15:14	
2:14f,20f; 3:6, 17	10:38				
2:17	10:26				
2:18		10:7			
2:19;3:16,21			23:1;24:16		
2:24	5:30;10:39		13:29		
2:22-25	3:13,26;4:27,30				8:32f
3:13		12:1			7:6,19; 14:2,18
3:15			22:1;26:2		19:33; 25:16;26:1
3:18	3:14				7:52
3:22	2:33-36;5:31				7:56
4:3	10:28				
4:4					17:20
4:4					13:45;18:6
4:5	10:42				

I Peter	Speeches of Peter	Narrative about Peter	Speeches of Paul	Official Church Pronouncements	Other Narrative
4:9		6:1			7:38
4:13		5:41			
4:16					11:26;26:28
5:1-4			20:28-31		
5:1	1:22;2:32;3:15 10:39,41		13:31;22:15, 20:26;16		1:6
5:5-6			20:19		
5:8			20:31		

The large amount of common paraenetic material which Acts shares with this epistle is specially noteworthy. Understandably, by far the greatest number of parallels are to be found in the speeches of Peter and Paul as recorded in Acts. Even the masterful resumé of the decisions of the Jerusalem Council given by James in Acts xv and the speech attributed to Stephen before his martyrdom in Acts vii, have significant parallels with this epistle. Under the heading "other narrative", most of the parallels occur in other speeches in Acts. Obviously the author of I Peter is well versed in the characteristic language of the early Judean church leaders, as it is reflected in the sources used by Luke.

Evaluation of Material common to I Peter and the Speeches of Acts

In the course of this comparison, attention has also been drawn to the parallels with other New Testament writings which strongly suggest that there must have been an underlying fund of common paraenetic and catechetical material. So, for instance, in I Pet.ii:4-10 we have been able to distinguish a $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ complex surrounding the interpretation of Ps.cxviii and other Old Testament texts which appear to have been collected into a "testimonium" book and to have been expounded Christologically. This would have been most useful in the Judean church when they engaged in arguments with Jews over the claim of the new faith that Jesus was the Christ.

I Peter	Speeches of Peter	Narrative about Peter	Speeches of Paul	Official Church Pronouncements	Other Narrative
4:9		6:1			7:38
4:13		5:41			
4:16					11:26;26:28
5:1-4			20:28-31		
5:1	1:22;2:32;3:15 10:39,41		13:31;22:15, 20:26;16		1:8
5:5-6			20:19		
5:8			20:31		

The large amount of common paraenetic material which Acts shares with this epistle is specially noteworthy. Understandably, by far the greatest number of parallels are to be found in the speeches of Peter and Paul as recorded in Acts. Even the masterful resumé of the decisions of the Jerusalem Council given by James in Acts xv and the speech attributed to Stephen before his martyrdom in Acts vii, have significant parallels with this epistle. Under the heading "other narrative", most of the parallels occur in other speeches in Acts. Obviously the author of I Peter is well versed in the characteristic language of the early Judean church leaders, as it is reflected in the sources used by Luke.

Evaluation of Material common to I Peter and the Speeches of Acts

In the course of this comparison, attention has also been drawn to the parallels with other New Testament writings which strongly suggest that there must have been an underlying fund of common paraenetic and catechetical material. So, for instance, in I Pet.ii:4-10 we have been able to distinguish a *λογος* complex surrounding the interpretation of Ps.cxviii and other Old Testament texts which appear to have been collected into a "testimonium" book and to have been expounded Christologically. This would have been most useful in the Judean church when they engaged in arguments with Jews over the claim of the new faith that Jesus was the Christ.

However, the most important parallels with I Peter are to be found within the sermons and speeches of Peter which he delivered in Jerusalem according to Acts chapters i-xii. Luke apparently used a Jerusalem or Palestine source for this section of Acts,¹ which implies that its catechetical teaching must have originated in the Judean church. This view is further strengthened by the fact that we have also found a number of close resemblances with the official pronouncements made by James at the Council of Jerusalem, as well as with the official circular letter issued by that body. Indeed, P. Carrington² first suggested that Christianity was presented as a neo-levitical community and that I Peter and Acts xv summarize the conditions for membership. It becomes very feasible, therefore, to suggest that the origin of this catechetical material is to be sought in the Jerusalem church which was led by Peter, James and John, whom Paul, in Gal.ii:9 calls the "Pillars" of the church.

1. Many Semitisms have been detected in the first twelve chapters of Acts. This led C.C. Torrey (The Composition and Date of Acts, Harvard Theological Studies I, 1916, pp. 67-68) to argue that this part of the book was simply a translation of an Aramaic document. While it is agreed today that Torrey overstated his argument, (cf. M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967, p. 1) we may with F.F. Bruce ascribe chapters 1-12 "to a Jerusalem source, without necessarily supposing that all the information they contain was derived from one source only". (Commentary on the Book of Acts, 3rd ed. London: MMS, 1962, p. 23. When Luke visited Jerusalem and Palestine with Paul, he must have met many witnesses who could supply him with details of the early days of the Jerusalem church under the charismatic ministry of Peter. According to Acts xxi:8-10, Luke spent several days in Caesarea at the house of Philip who could have supplied him with the material presented in Acts vi-viii: 3. Some of it Luke may even have obtained from Paul himself, who, together with Barnabas, could also have given an account of the founding of the Antiochene church and their first Missionary Journey. Thus, while he probably did not use an Aramaic document, we can certainly hold the view that Luke based his account in chapters 1-12 on Jerusalem and Palestinian oral sources.

2. Op. cit. pp. 13-21.

Attention must also be drawn to the significant fact that I Peter and Peter's speeches according to Acts reflect the same indebtedness to Jewish religious ideas and expressions. In turn, these observations cannot but have a decisive bearing on the question of the date and authorship of I Peter, for they indicate that the letter fits in very well with Acts' description of the first leader of the church at Jerusalem.

This is confirmed by further parallels, such as those between I Pet.iv:4, 14 and Acts xiii:45; xvii:20; xviii:6 and I Pet.iv:16 and Acts xi:26; xxvi:28, which reflect the same reactions of society to the Christians. The Jews are incensed at the Messianic claims the Christians make for Jesus, and cause trouble and unrest. Gentiles are amazed at the way Christians stand aloof from all the social pleasures of the world. From such initial reactions it was but a short step for anger and astonishment to be translated into harassment and persecution. Clearly both these New Testament writings reflect a similar Judean milieu.

Verba Christi

In the course of this investigation many allusions to Jesus logia and Gospel traditions were examined. In order to evaluate I Peter's relationship to the correct stages of the Gospels' formation, special note is taken of Mark,¹ Q and Q resembling material,² Matthew, Luke and John. The results of this survey may be tabulated most conveniently as set out in the following pages.

1. See Eusebius, H.E.III.39:15-16, where Mark is described as Peter's ἐρμηνεύτης - interpreter. Cf. O. Cullmann, *Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr*, London:SCM, 1953, pp. 70-152.

2. Since I Peter may reflect pre-Q Jesus logia.

<u>I PETER</u>	<u>MARK</u>	<u>Q (Q Resembling)</u>	<u>MATTHEW</u>	<u>LUKE</u>	<u>JOHN</u>
1:1	13:20-22				13:18 & 15:16
1:3 & 23	10:14f.	(Mt. 12:18-21)	12:18-21		3:3-8
1:4		Lk. 12:22-40 (Mt. 6:19-34)			
1:8					20:29
1:10-12				24:25-27,46	
1:13		Lk. 12:35,41,45			
1:16		(Mt. 5:48)	5:48 (Q?)		
1:17	12:14				
1:18	10:45; 7:13-13		20:28; 15:2-9		
1:19					1:29,36
1:20			13:35; 25:34	11:50	17:2,4
1:21					14:1,5; 1:7
1:22; 3:8					13:34f; 15:12,17
2:2	10:15; 9:42				
2:4 & 7	12:10		21:42		
2:5	14:58; 15:29		16:18		2:19
2:9 & 12			3:16		
2:12					18:30
2:12				19:44 (14:11; 18:14)	

<u>I PETER</u>	<u>MARK</u>	<u>Q (Q Resembling)</u>	<u>MATTHEW</u>	<u>LUKE</u>	<u>JOHN</u>
2:13-17	9:33 ?		17:26f.		
2:18ff.		Lk. 6:27ff.			
2:19f.		Lk. 6:32-35			
2:21	8:34				13:15
2:23	15:5	Mt. 5:38-48; Lk. 6:29-35			
2:25 & 5:2 & 4	6:34 14:27	Mt. 18:12 Lk. 15:4-7	10:6 15:24		10:11ff.
3:1		(Mt. 18:15)	18:15 (Q?)		
3:3		Lk. 6:27f. Mt. 5:39 & 44			
3:14 & 4:13f.		(Mt. 5:10)	5:10 (Q?)		
3:16		Lk. 6:28; Mt. 5:44		6:28	
3:18-22 & 4:5,6		Mt. 24:38ff Lk. 17:26f			
4:7	14:38		26:41	21:34-36; 22:46	
4:8	12:30-33			7:47	13:34f; 15:12-17
4:10	13:37	(Lk. 12:41-44)		12:41-44(Q?) 16:1-12	
4:11			5:16		
4:13		Mt. 5:12; Lk. 6:23			
4:14		Mt. 5:11-12	19:29		

<u>I PETER</u>	<u>MARK</u>	<u>Q (Q Resembling)</u>	<u>MATTHEW</u>	<u>LUKE</u>	<u>JOHN</u>
4:16	13:19f				
4:19				23:46	
5:2	6:34	Mt. 18:11-14 Lk. 15:3-7			10:11-16 21:15-17
5:3-5	10:42-45	(Lk. 22:25-30)	20:25-28	22:25-30(Q?) (1:51-53)	13:34f.
5:7		Mt. 6:25-32 Lk. 12:22-31		12:11-12	
5:8				21:34,36 22:31-32	
5:10		Mt. 7:25 Lk. 6:48			
<u>TOTAL NO. OF REFERENCES</u>	22	15+(?) = 22	16	17	19

From this table it soon becomes apparent that the allusions to the specific sayings, teachings and deeds of Jesus, cover an even spread of the Gospel tradition. Even if Q is inflated with Q resembling material, the number of allusions to Mark's Gospel remain significantly higher in view of Mark's comparative brevity in relation to the other gospels. Other than that no particular Gospel source can be said to dominate the allusions in I Peter. While, therefore, none of these traditions can be regarded as a special source used by the author, the parallels with Mark confirm the early church's association of Peter with that Gospel and the letter's ascription to him in I Pet.1:1.

However, in the course of this comparison we came across a number of instances where the author could be drawing on a catechetical tradition common to himself and the other Gospel writers.¹ This is

1. See I Pet.iii:9,14,18-22; iv:8; v:3-5 as examples.

borne out by other recent studies of epistolary parallels to the Gospel tradition,¹ which suggest that the authors used a common nucleus of Jesus logia. Peter, Paul and James turn those sayings into exhortation, whereas the Gospel writers expand them with narrative material about Jesus. In this connection, it is most interesting to see how in this comparison the Q and Q resembling material featured equally with the other Gospel parallels. Thus it would appear that the material which subsequently crystalized into a written Q formed part of the earlier common catechetical fund while still in an oral stage. Indeed, if that were correct, it would furnish a further reason for the growing importance accorded to the Q material, so that it was eventually incorporated into the works of Matthew and Luke alike.² Taking this a step further, we may well ask what is implied when we find such correspondence in thought and expression between pre-Q passages, Paul, James and I Peter. The suggestion in this thesis is that we are dealing with traces of a Jerusalem Catechism which was agreed upon when Paul went to Jerusalem to lay before James, Cephas and John the gospel he preached among the Gentiles, lest somehow he should have "run in vain".³

The Gospel contexts of Verba Christi reflected in I Peter

Approaching the question from a slightly different angle, R.H. Gundry⁴ has drawn attention to a most fascinating feature of the *Verba Christi* in I Peter. They all refer to contexts in the Gospels which

1. J.P. Brown, "Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form-History", *NTS* 10:27-48, 1953; R.H. Gundry, "'Verba Christi' in I Peter: Their Implications concerning the Authorship of I Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition", *NTS* 13:336-350, 1967; E. Best, "I Peter and the Gospel Tradition", *NTS* 16:95-113, 1970; R.H. Gundry, "Further Verba on Verba Christi in First Peter", *Bib* 55:211-232, 1974; J.H. Elliott, "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: I Peter in Recent Research", *JBL* 95:243-254, 1976.

2. At the same time it would also be an important indication of the primitive origin of I Peter.

3. Gal.ii:2. Cf. Gal.ii:1-10. 4. Op. cit. p. 350.

are either closely associated with the Apostle Peter, or cover subjects which would be of special interest to him. We need to examine this feature further, and discover how far it applies to all the Gospel allusions which we have found in this epistle in addition to those examined by Gundry.

I Pet.ii:13-17 alludes to Jesus' statement about the freedom of sons, which occurs in his conversation with Peter about the Temple Tax in Matt.xvii:24-27.¹ This saying probably constituted the original kernel, to which the author of Matthew added guidance on the Christian attitude to taxes in general.² Presumably the Jewish Christians continued to pay their dues to Jerusalem to avoid giving offence, although they knew that their standing and acceptability with God was independent of such obligations.³

The author's allusions to the Sermon on the Plain in Lk.vi:27-29 and 32-35⁴ in which Jesus speaks of blessing, joy, and patience in suffering, are set immediately after the Twelve were chosen and named Apostles.⁵ A sermon following that event would have made an indelible impression on Peter, who was the first to be chosen and, in addition, was given the name Peter. Such an argument is inevitably speculative, for it cannot be proved that the sequence of events and sayings in Luke vi is strictly historical. Nevertheless, since most scholars agree that the Lucan form of the saying in vss 27-28 is the closest to the original,⁶ one can reasonably infer that Peter, the

1. See p. 83 supra.

2. Even the sceptical Bultmann accepts this when he writes: "This is a problem of the Church, for which it seeks advice from Jesus in this case perhaps by using a dominical saying handed down in the tradition". See R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford: Blackwell, 1972, p. 35.

3. See H.W. Montefiore, "Jesus and the Temple Tax", *NTS* 11:64-71, 1964.

4. I Pet.ii:18-20; iii:9 & 16; iv:13. 5. Lk.vi:13.

6. See p. 87 supra.

"first of the Apostles"¹ would have been present when it was first uttered.

Undoubtedly, the stone motif in I Pet.ii:4 & 7 alluding to Mark xii:10 and parallels would interest the author if he was Peter. Had not Jesus made a great word play on his name "Cephas-Peter-Rock"?² Admittedly Peter uses λίθος instead of πέτρος and πέτρα which figure in the Gospel texts concerned. This can be explained, however, as due to the influence of the Old Testament quotation of Ps.cxviii:22 used by Jesus in Mk.xii:10 which I Peter similarly cites. From Paul's use of πέτρα and λίθος as figures for Jesus in Rom.ix:33, it is clear that they are synonymous and that both terms would engage the attention of Peter because of his name. Further corroboration of his concern with this theme comes from Acts iv:11, where he applies the same saying to Jesus as the rejected cornerstone.³

Obviously Jesus' teaching about "winning over a brother" in Matt.xviii:15⁴ is not clearly understood by Peter who goes on to ask how often he should forgive his brother. This evokes the famous reply, "I do not say to you seven times, but seventy times seven".⁵ Bultmann believes that Matthew has reformulated an ancient dominical saying "into a disciplinary Church regulation".⁶ I Peter, on the other hand, retains the more intimate sense of κερδαίνω in the original utterance.⁷

Jesus' call to follow His example of suffering by taking a cross⁸ and His example of service⁹ is alluded to in I Pet.ii:21. Both of the Gospel references involve Peter. The saying in Mark follows

1. Matt.x:2, πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος.

2. Matt.xvi:18; Mk.iii:16; Jn.i:42. See also O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, London: SCM, 1953, pp.20-21.

3. See pp. 64-68 supra. 4. Cf. I Pet.iii:1. 5. Matt.xviii:21f.

6. R. Bultmann, op. cit. p. 141. 7. See p. 92 supra.

8. Mk.viii:34.

9. Jn.xiii:15.

the incident where Peter has been rebuked severely for wanting to stop Jesus from going to face rejection and suffering at Jerusalem, "Get behind me, Satan! For you are not on the side of God, but of men".¹ While the prediction of the passion in the Gospel narratives may be regarded as a secondary reconstruction, the call to immitate Christ is too deeply imbedded in the tradition not to have originated in a dominical saying which had a profound effect on Peter and the other disciples alike.²

The eschatological discourse on the Mount of Olives in which Jesus exhorts the disciples to watch and pray,³ is alluded to in I Pet.i:1, 13,20; iv:7 and v:8-9. According to Mark it was given in response to a private question by Peter, James, John and Andrew, "Tell us, when will this be?"⁴ It would be completely true to character, as portrayed in the Gospels, if Peter actually asked the question as their spokesman.⁵

Within the same context, Jesus speaks about suffering for His name's sake, which I Pet.iv:14 refers to as suffering for the name of Christ - ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ.⁶ In Matt.x:1-6, Peter is the first of the 12 disciples who are named and then sent out into the world as sheep in the midst of wolves. There they will be hated for His name's sake.⁷ Even when the same idea is expressed slightly differently, such as having to give up "houses, brothers, sisters... for my name's sake",⁸ we find that the saying is in response to a statement and question by Peter: "Lo, we have left everything and followed you. What then shall we have?"⁹ The beatitude in Matt.v:11-12 in which Jesus sums up this idea so succinctly, would therefore make a deep impression on Peter.

1. Mk.viii:31-33.

2. See p. 88 supra.

3. Mk.xiii; Matt.xxiv; Lk.xxi:5-36.

4. Mk.xiii:4.

5. See also I Pet.iii:18-22; iv:5-6.

6. For the derivation of this term from *ὄνα* in the sense of "for the authority" or "according to the injunctions and commandments" of Christ, see H. Bietenhard, *TDNT* V, pp. 261-280.

7. Matt.x:22.

8. Matt.xix:29.

9. Matt.xix:27.

I Pet.v:3-5 alludes to Jesus' statements about authority and ministry as reported in Mk.x:35-45.¹ In that context, the evangelist records the request made by James and John to sit at Jesus' right and left in His glorious kingdom of the future. The other ten disciples, including Peter, were indignant. Peter may well have seen this as a challenge to his leadership, which had been conferred upon him by none other than Jesus Himself. The Lucan parallel² gives the Lord's Supper in the Upper Room as the setting for this dispute. Whatever the original context of this leadership struggle may have been, it seems inescapable that Peter was personally involved and could not fail to be struck by the words of Jesus as He settled the dispute.³

Similarly, we have seen that I Peter's exhortations to love and serve one another humbly, are reminiscent of Jesus' practical example in the foot washing episode in John xiii.⁴ Here again Peter is deeply involved. At first he objects, "Lord, do you wash my feet?"⁵ and a conversation between him and Jesus ensues. Further in the same chapter, after the command to love one another,⁶ it is again Peter who asks where He is going and offers to lay down his life for Him.⁷ Jesus warns Peter that he will deny Him three times before the cock crows.⁸ Further allusions to Jn.xiv:1,6 in I Pet.i:21 suggest the same context.

The injunction to gird up loins and live soberly; to practise hospitality as good stewards; the reference to the community as a flock; and the contrast between perishable things on earth over against the imperishable heavenly reward,⁹ all allude to Luke xii:32-48.¹⁰ Once

1. Cf. Matt.xx:20-28. 2. Lk.xxii:24-30. 3. See p. 131 supra.

4. Cf. I Pet.i:21f; iii:8; iv:8; v:3-5. See pp. 115f. supra.

5. Jn.xiii:6. 6. Jn.xiii:34. 7. Jn.xiii:36f.

8. Jn.xiii:38. 9. I Pet.i:4,13; iv:10; v:2.

10. R. Bultmann would argue that in Lk.xii:35-59 we are dealing with a "primitive stage of serializing the dominical sayings without reference to their context". (Op. cit. p. 322.) Even if the evangelist understood the teaching to be addressed to the whole church, Peter could still have been present when the teaching was first given.

again it is Peter who interrupts and asks, "Lord, are you telling this parable for us or for all?"¹

According to Mark xiv:32-38 and the parallel passage in Matt. xxvi:36-41, Jesus takes Peter, James and John with Him apart from the other disciples as He agonises in the Garden of Gethsemane. When He comes back and finds them sleeping, Jesus upbraids Peter for sleeping. The command to watch and pray in I Pet.iv:7 is an obvious allusion to this incident, which must have been indelibly imprinted in Peter's mind.

The references to sheep and "shepherding the flock" in I Pet.ii:25² and v:2,4 allude to a poignant conversation between Jesus and Peter after the Resurrection, "Simon son of John, do you Love me?... Tend my sheep".³ The memory of this moving encounter could well have highlighted the shepherd motif in John x:11-16 for Peter.⁴

In I Pet.i:10-12, where the author contrasts Jesus' past suffering and future glory, we noted that there was an allusion to Jesus' conversation with the disciples walking to Emmaus.⁵ When these disciples returned to Jerusalem in great excitement to report that they had seen Jesus, they were greeted with the news that He had also appeared to Peter.⁶ In view of this experience it is most natural to assume that Peter would take a keen interest in their report.

1. Lk.xii:41.

2. Admittedly this is also a quotation from Isa.liiii:6.

3. Jn.xxi:15-17.

4. While we must not lose sight of the question of the historical reliability of the Fourth Gospel, we can agree with C.K. Barrett, who writes, "there is no sufficient evidence for the view that John freely created narrative material". Hence it is possible to "pick out from John simple and sound historical material". (The Gospel according to John, 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1978, p. 141.)

5. Lk.xxiv:25-27. See pp.44-45 supra.

6. See 1 Cor.xv:5, where Paul confirms the appearance of the Risen Christ to Peter.

We must also not lose sight of the references to the suffering of Jesus in this epistle.¹ Together with the allusion in I Pet. iv:19 to Jesus' final word from the Cross,² they suggest that the Crucifixion made an indelible impression on the mind of the author. I Pet. i:18 is often adduced to support the view that the author was an eyewitness of Jesus' passion.³ It could be argued that Peter did not actually see the Crucifixion because the Gospels are silent on this point and only tell of him going out and weeping.⁴ Yet closer scrutiny of the passion narratives reveals that even after all the disciples fled and forsook Jesus,⁵ Peter followed Him at a distance,⁶ right into the courtyard of the High Priest's house. This action eventually led to his final denial of Jesus before the cock crew twice.⁷ We may safely assume, therefore, that Peter would want to see what happened to Jesus. Even though Peter broke down and wept,⁸ he would not be able to tear himself from the scene. Judging by his character, it is quite likely that he was among those who "stood at a distance and saw these things".⁹ It would be impossible to wipe the memory of these things from his mind, particularly as they would later form the central pivot of his preaching.

Significance of the Gospel contexts of Verba Christi reflected in I Peter

Individually the Gospel passages just examined may not always prove beyond any historical doubt that Peter was present when the dominical sayings were uttered, but collectively they point to such a conclusion. It is preposterous to ascribe every mention of Peter in those contexts merely to the inventive whim of the evangelists. Instead, the recurring appearance of his name in those accounts suggests that the tradition of Peter's involvement in the Gospel narratives has a strong kernel of historical truth behind it.

1. I Pet. i:11,19; ii:23-24; iii:18; iv:1,13; v:1.

2. Lk. xxiii:46. 3. See p. 44 supra.

4. See E.G. Selwyn, op. cit. p. 131. 5. Mk. xiv:50.

6. Mk. xiv:54. 7. Mk. xiv:66-72. 8. Mk. xiv:72.

9. Lk. xxiii:49.

Thus it becomes clear that all the Gospel passages alluded to in I Peter, with the exception of John iii:3-8 and possibly John xx:29, have a Petrine association. This evidence demands some explanation.

It is unthinkable that a pious forger, who lived late enough to know all four Gospels, would have refrained from quoting his sources more directly. One cannot imagine him restricting himself to cleverly inserting such allusions to the Gospel tradition which Peter, more than any one else, would most likely have remembered. Judging by other Apocryphal New Testament writings,¹ such excellence in faking documents so true to historical reality simply did not exist. Nor can we regard it as a chance occurrence. Mathematically the probabilities are infinitesimally small. On the other hand, it would hardly be accidental that the Gospel allusions in a book claiming Petrine authorship should stem from those parts of the Gospel tradition which we would have expected Peter to remember.

Furthermore, the Gospels were all originally written in Greek and do not offer an exhaustive collection of Jesus logia.² By contrast, the Peter of the Gospels would have heard them in Aramaic and would have had to translate them into Greek for an epistle like this. Hence the real measure of coincidences is difficult to gauge accurately. Yet, judging the influences of Jesus' sayings and deeds on the writer of I Peter by the admittedly incomplete standard of the written Gospels, it is not too much to say that his mind is saturated with the words and works of Christ. In dealing with situations and questions which were quite different from those which first evoked the words and deeds of Jesus, the author instinctively brings the substance of that teaching to bear on the immediate needs of his addressees. Thus the allusions to Peter in the Gospels and Petrine reminiscences in the letter greatly favour accepting the claims I Peter makes for itself in its opening address.³

1. See M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford: OUP, 1955. Cf. B.M. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha", *JBL* 91:3-24, 1972.

2. John xx:30-31; xxi:25. 3. I Pet.i:1.

Conclusion

All the evidence, then, supports the view that the common link behind the thoughts and expressions of the New Testament writers and I Peter is to be found not in literary dependency, but in a central body of paraenetic material. This teaching was so influential, that it was used by almost every New Testament author. Indeed, it was so highly respected that in many instances its original verbal formulation was kept intact, even if it was used in a different context, and sometimes it was even allowed to interrupt the flow of thought in a passage. Furthermore, these formulations reveal many definite traits of Jewish thought and expression, as well as a common expectation of the imminent Parousia.¹

From the history of the early church, it is evident that such highly esteemed Jewish Christian paraenetic material could only emanate from the church at Jerusalem, which was controlled and directed by Peter, James and John, the so-called pillars of the church,² prior to James' death in 62 AD. Hence the most appropriate term to describe this influential body of teaching is a Primitive Jerusalem Catechism.

In addition the numerous reflections of pre-Q Jesus logia in I Peter support a date between the fifties and sixties of the First Century for its composition, while the significantly higher proportion of Marcan parallels, the Petrine reminiscences in the Gospel allusions and its distinctive Jewish character and style strongly favour the epistle's ascription to Peter.

1. See pp. 123-125 supra.

2. See Gal.ii:9.

3. I PETER IN I CLEMENT AND THE POST-HERMETIC WRITINGS

The evidence presented in the previous chapters has revealed very clearly that while there are links between I Peter and the other New Testament writings in language, expression and Theological tenets, the closest affinities are to be found with James, Ephesians, the Pauline Epistles and Revelation. The most probable explanation of such links is the supposition of an early Jerusalem Catechism, which most of the New Testament writers, in common with I Peter, used to good effect in their teaching. It effectively explains the similarities between I Peter, the Pauline Epistles, Ephesians and James, indicating that they are contemporaneous in their provenance. Indeed the evidence suggests that this paraenetic derives from Jerusalem teachers between the fifties and sixties of the First Century.

As far as I Peter is concerned, the dating of its composition in that early period should be tested by examining the frequency with which subsequent early Christian authors refer to it. However, to make such a test effective, there will have to be some consensus of scholarly opinion about the dating of such later works.

To put such an investigation further into perspective, it is very informative to compare I Peter with the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which are generally thought to be a combination of Jewish and Christian materials.¹ They offer some very interesting similarities with I Peter which should be considered. The following are Petrine words and phrases which occur in these Testaments:-

1. For a convenient summary of modern research on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs by M. Philonenko, M. de Jonge and others, see J.H. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research*, Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976. Cf. H.D. Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*, Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977. See also H.C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A New Translation and Introduction", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, J.H. Charlesworth, ed. London: DLT, 1983, Vol.1, pp. 775-828.

Test. XII. Patri.I Peter

Jo. 18	ἀγαθοποιία	iv.19
Benj. 5	ἀγαθοποιεῖν	ii.15, iii.17
Nephth. 4	κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος	i.3
Jo. 19	ἄμνος ἁμμος	i.19
Gad 6	ἀγαπᾶτε οὖν ἀλλήλους ἀπὸ καρδίας	i.22
Benj. 8	ἀναπαύεται ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ	iv.14
Aser 4	οὐ θέλει ἡμέραν ἀγαθὴν ἰδεῖν	iii.10
Levi 3	λογικὴ καὶ ἀναιμακτὸς προσφορά	ii.2

They give us an indication of the kind of vocabulary which the early Christians of Jewish origin would probably use. Care must therefore be taken to distinguish between the use of a common vocabulary and actual quotations of I Peter. With that proviso, we may now begin this comparison.

I Clement

The general consensus is that this letter is to be dated in 95 or 96 AD because of its obvious use of New Testament documents like Romans, Ephesians, Hebrews and James, its knowledge of 1 Corinthians, and its influence on later letters like the Epistle of Polycarp.¹

In terms of simple vocabulary, there are close connections between I Peter and I Clement. Quite a number of words peculiar to I Peter² as well as some of its vocabulary which is very rare in the rest of the New Testament writers,³ appear in I Clement.

1. See M.H. Shepherd, *IDB* I, pp. 648-649.

2. ἀγαθοποιία, ἀδελφότης, ἀπροσωπολήμιττος, ὑπογραμμός.

3. ἀγαθοποιεῖν, ἁμμος, ἀντίτυπον, ἄρκετός, ἄσπιλος, παροιμία.

The opening greeting in I Clement, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ παντοκράτορος θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθεῖν, is most likely an expansion of χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθεῖν in the salutation of I Peter i:2, similarly expanded again by the author of 2 Peter i:2. It is also important to note that grace and peace are not found in this combination with πληθυνθεῖν anywhere else in the New Testament.

Clement's reference to the blood of Christ "which was precious to his Father" in vii:4, ἀτενίσταμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γινώμεν ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, is very reminiscent of I Pet. i:19, τιμίῳ αἵματι... Χριστοῦ. In fact that whole expression is peculiar to I Peter in the New Testament.

Again, I Pet. ii:9, ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκοτῶν ὑμῶν καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς, appears to be the inspiration behind I Clement xxxvi:2, εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς,¹ and lix:2, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκοτῶν εἰς φῶς. This is another incidence of a phrase which is peculiar to I Peter in the New Testament.

In I Pet. ii:22f. Christ's work is interpreted in terms of Isaiah liii. This interpretation is taken up by I Clem. xvi:3 - 14 and might be a reflection of his knowledge of I Peter, although he may also have received it as part of the tradition of early Christian testimony in their mission to their fellow Jews.

Both Clement and I Pet. ii:6 follow the common Jewish practice of using the Old Testament Patriarchs as ready examples in their teaching and Clement, the Roman even goes as far as referring to them as "Fathers" in iv:8.

There are also two Old Testament quotations common to I Peter and I Clement in which they both make the same deviation from the LXX text. In quoting Prov. x:12, they both read ἀγάπη καλύπτει/

1. θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ are omitted by Clement of Alexandria in quoting this passage.

καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν while the LXX has πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φίλῳ.¹ In their quotation from Prov. iii:34 they both replace the LXX κύριος with θεός.² In these two instances I Clement may be dependant on I Peter, but we cannot rule out the possibility that he is also making use of early catechetical material from Jerusalem, as was suggested in the discussion on these Old Testament quotations in I Peter and James.³

These close parallels of expression and vocabulary manifestly reveal some link between I Peter and I Clement, even though they do not prove direct dependence conclusively. Some of the similarities could also be due to Clement's use of a common Christian tradition and vocabulary, or even the "Jerusalem Catechism" which had spread to Rome by 96 AD. Nevertheless there is a very high probability that I Clement knew I Peter and the evidence certainly does not militate against a possible early date for the latter.⁴ Moreover, it is most unlikely that a pseudonymous letter written after 70 AD would already have gained such authority in the Roman church by 96 AD, that it could be quoted or referred to without any mention of the author's name.

The Shepherd of Hermas

Another extra-Biblical work of the early church is the Shepherd of Hermas. Its Visions, Mandates and Similitudes develop the theological doctrine of repentance for those who have sinned after

-
1. I Pet.iv:8 = I Clem.xlix:5. Cf. p. 116 supra.
 2. I Pet.v:5 = I Clem.xxx:2. Cf. Jas.iv:6 and p. 132 supra.
 3. See p. 116 supra.
 4. This view is confirmed by D.A. Hagner, The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome, NovTSup XXXIV, Leiden: Brill, 1973, pp. 239-246, who, after examining every possible allusion, however vague, finds the same parallels as those listed here.

καλύπτει πλῆθος ἀμαρτιῶν while the LXX has πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία.¹ In their quotation from Prov. iii:34 they both replace the LXX κύριος with θεός.² In these two instances I Clement may be dependant on I Peter, but we cannot rule out the possibility that he is also making use of early catechetical material from Jerusalem, as was suggested in the discussion on these Old Testament quotations in I Peter and James.³

These close parallels of expression and vocabulary manifestly reveal some link between I Peter and I Clement, even though they do not prove direct dependence conclusively. Some of the similarities could also be due to Clement's use of a common Christian tradition and vocabulary, or even the "Jerusalem Catechism" which had spread to Rome by 96 AD. Nevertheless there is a very high probability that I Clement knew I Peter and the evidence certainly does not militate against a possible early date for the latter.⁴ Moreover, it is most unlikely that a pseudonymous letter written after 70 AD would already have gained such authority in the Roman church by 96 AD, that it could be quoted or referred to without any mention of the author's name.

The Shepherd of Hermas

Another extra-Biblical work of the early church is the Shepherd of Hermas. Its Visions, Mandates and Similitudes develop the theological doctrine of repentance for those who have sinned after

1. I Pet. iv:8 = I Clem. xlix:5. Cf. p. 116 supra.

2. I Pet. v:5 = I Clem. xxx:2. Cf. Jas. iv:6 and p. 132 supra.

3. See p. 116 supra.

4. This view is confirmed by D.A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, NovTSup XXXIV, Leiden: Brill, 1973, pp. 239-246, who, after examining every possible allusion, however vague, finds the same parallels as those listed here.

καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν while the LXX has πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία.¹ In their quotation from Prov. iii:34 they both replace the LXX κύριος with θεός.² In these two instances I Clement may be dependant on I Peter, but we cannot rule out the possibility that he is also making use of early catechetical material from Jerusalem, as was suggested in the discussion on these Old Testament quotations in I Peter and James.³

These close parallels of expression and vocabulary manifestly reveal some link between I Peter and I Clement, even though they do not prove direct dependence conclusively. Some of the similarities could also be due to Clement's use of a common Christian tradition and vocabulary, or even the "Jerusalem Catechism" which had spread to Rome by 96 AD. Nevertheless there is a very high probability that I Clement knew I Peter and the evidence certainly does not militate against a possible early date for the latter.⁴ Moreover, it is most unlikely that a pseudonymous letter written after 70 AD would already have gained such authority in the Roman church by 96 AD, that it could be quoted or referred to without any mention of the author's name.

The Shepherd of Hermas

Another extra-Biblical work of the early church is the Shepherd of Hermas. Its Visions, Mandates and Similitudes develop the theological doctrine of repentance for those who have sinned after

1. I Pet.iv:8 = I Clem.xlix:5. Cf. p. 116 supra.

2. I Pet.v:5 = I Clem.xxx:2. Cf. Jas.iv:6 and p. 132 supra.

3. See p. 116 supra.

4. This view is confirmed by D.A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, NovTSup XXXIV, Leiden: Brill, 1973, pp. 239-246, who, after examining every possible allusion, however vague, finds the same parallels as those listed here.

Baptism. Its date and provenance are a matter of debate, but the general consensus is that it was written in Rome as well, somewhere between 100 and 140 AD.¹ The following quotations point to the author's acquaintance with I Peter:-

I PeterHermas

- | | | | |
|--------|----------|-------------|--|
| i:7 | Vis. IV | iii:4 | ὥπερ γὰρ τὸ χρυσιὸν δοκιμάζεται διὰ τοῦ πυρός... |
| iii:20 | Vis. III | iii:5 | διὰ ὕδατος ἐσώθη καὶ σωθήσεται. |
| v:7 | Vis. III | xi:3 | ἐπερίψατε ἑαυτῶν τὰς μερίμνας ἐπὶ τὸν |
| | | & IV ii:4,5 | κύριον. |

The image of I Pet. ii:5 in which believers are described as λίθοι ζῶντες may also have triggered off the thought behind the account of the stones in the Tower in Vis. III v. Further, Mand. VIII x:10 lists several Petrine words so closely together in its catalogue of Christian virtues, that they strongly indicate dependence on I Peter.² Again it is quite feasible that I Pet. iii:19 and iv:6 inspired the expanded treatise which discusses the salvation of the pre-Christian righteous dead in Sim. IX xvi:5-6, while I Pet. iv:13-16 could have induced Sim. IX xxviii:5-6 with its theme of being blessed in suffering for the name of the Lord.

As none of these similarities correspond to any part of I Peter which appears to derive from the early Jerusalem Catechism, there is a strong possibility that Hermas is using I Peter rather than some form of common Christian teaching.

1. See M.H. Shepherd, *IDB* II, pp. 583-584.

2. φιλόξενος, ἡσύχιος, ἀδελφότης, ἀγαθοποίησις (= ἀγαθοποιία).

The Didache

The Didache or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" may also be dependent on I Peter. The first part of this composite document is always termed "The Two Ways", and is thought to be based on an original Jewish "Two Ways" used for catechetical purposes among Proselytes. While J.A.T. Robinson¹ argues for an early date of 40 - 60 AD for at least parts of the Didache, the more general consensus is that in its present form it dates from about 90 - 110 AD.² There is only one reference in i:4 which could be a possible quotation from I Pet. ii:11,³ but it could just as well have been reproduced from the early Jerusalem Catechism, and, therefore, is not much help in trying to establish a date for I Peter.

The Epistle of Barnabas

Closely associated with the Didache, however, is the Epistle of Barnabas, which also has a doctrine of the "Two Ways" in chapters 18 - 20. It is generally dated between the late first and early second century.⁴ Possibly the author betrays a more direct knowledge of I Pet. i:17 in Barn. iv:12, ὁ κύριος ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνει τὸν κόσμον. While ἀπροσωπολήπτως expresses a common idea among pious Jews that God is a righteous God who makes no distinction between people whatever their estate,⁵ the term itself was coined by the author of I Peter, since it appears nowhere else in the New Testament and only again appears in I Clement i:3 in a quotation from I Pet. i:17.

1. J.A.T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament, London: SCM, 1976, pp. 324-327.

2. See M.J. Shepherd, *IDB* I, pp. 841-843.

3. ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκινῶν καὶ αἱματικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν.

4. See W. Eltester, *IDB* I, pp. 375-376.

5. See pp. 48-49 *supra*.

The Didache

The Didache or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" may also be dependent on I Peter. The first part of this composite document is always termed "The Two Ways", and is thought to be based on an original Jewish "Two Ways" used for catechetical purposes among Proselytes. While J.A.T. Robinson¹ argues for an early date of 40 - 60 AD for at least parts of the Didache, the more general consensus is that in its present form it dates from about 90 - 110 AD.² There is only one reference in i:4 which could be a possible quotation from I Pet. ii:11,³ but it could just as well have been reproduced from the early Jerusalem Catechism, and, therefore, is not much help in trying to establish a date for I Peter.

The Epistle of Barnabas

Closely associated with the Didache, however, is the Epistle of Barnabas, which also has a doctrine of the "Two Ways" in chapters 18 - 20. It is generally dated between the late first and early second century.⁴ Possibly the author betrays a more direct knowledge of I Pet. i:17 in Barn. iv:12, ὁ κύριος ἀπροσπολήπτως κρίνει τὸν κόσμον. While ἀπροσπολήπτως expresses a common idea among pious Jews that God is a righteous God who makes no distinction between people whatever their estate,⁵ the term itself was coined by the author of I Peter, since it appears nowhere else in the New Testament and only again appears in I Clement i:3 in a quotation from I Pet. i:17.

-
1. J.A.T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament, London: SCM, 1976, pp. 324-327.
 2. See M.J. Shepherd, *IDB* I, pp. 841-843.
 3. ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκινῶν καὶ σαματικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν.
 4. See W. Eltester, *IDB* I, pp. 375-376.
 5. See pp. 48-49 supra.

The argument for the dependence of Barnabas on I Peter would be strengthened if Barn vi:2 also proved to be another quotation from I Pet. ii:6. This however is unlikely, because Barnabas in common with Rom. ix:33 and I Pet. ii:6, is referring to Isa. xxviii:16 and renders the LXX almost exactly when he writes, 'Ιδοὺ ἐμβαλῶ τίθημι εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον...¹ whereas the other two deviate from the LXX in writing 'Ιδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον. Hence the similarity between I Peter and Barnabas here cannot be ascribed to direct literary dependence. Its occurrence is due simply to their common reference to the Isaiah passage. When Barn. vii:2 describes the Son of God as one destined to judge the living and the dead, κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, it is very reminiscent of I Pet. iv:5. Yet, as this phrase, "the living and the dead", was one of the earliest to become fixed in a liturgical or credal context,² no literary dependence can be deduced from its use.

Thus while most of these similarities between I Peter and Barnabas do not preclude the possibility of the author's knowledge of I Peter, it is only his use of the term ἀπροσπαλήπτως which tips the balance in favour of the conclusion that he did know and use it.

The Letters of Ignatius

Among the most famous documents of early Christendom are the Letters of Ignatius, third Bishop of Antioch in Syria, which he wrote from Smyrna and Troas en route to Rome and martyrdom.³ It is generally agreed that he died during the reign of Trajan (98 - 117 AD).⁴ In his letter to the Ephesians v:3, Ignatius follows the Petrine form of I Pet. v:5 in his quotation of Prov. iii:34, Ὑπερηβάτους ὁ

1. The LXX reads, 'Ιδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ...

2. See p. 111 supra.

3. See Eusebius H.E. iii:36.

4. See M.H. Shepherd, *IDB* II, pp. 678-679.

θεὸς ἀντιτίθεται, yet like I Clement,¹ he could be using early catechetical material and not necessarily I Peter or James iv:6.

Polycarp's Letter to the Philippians

A more convincing case of dependence on I Peter can be made out for Polycarp's letter to the church at Philippi. Numerous expressions in it resemble those of I Peter. Generally this letter of the Bishop of Smyrna is thought to have been composed at the end of Trajan's reign in 117 AD.²

The following list reflects the similarities between I Peter and Polycarp's letter to the Philippians.³

<u>I Peter</u>		<u>Polycarp to the Philippians</u>	
i:8	ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε	i:3	εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες πιστεύετε
i:13	Διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς σάβλας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν..	ii:1	Διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς σάβλας ὑμῶν...
i:21	τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα...	ii:1	πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόντα αὐτῷ δόξαν...
ii:11	ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἵτινες στρα- τεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς. ⁴	v:iii	...πάσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρα- τεύεται.

1. See p. 168 supra. 2. See M.H. Shepherd, *IDB* III, pp. 839f.

3. Parts of Polycarp's letter are only extant in the Latin translation included in this list.

4. Cf. Gal.v:17.

I PeterPolycarp to the Philippians

ii:12	τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλὴν	x:2	conversationem vestram irreprensibilem habentes in gentibus.
ii:24	ὅς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον.	viii:1	ὅς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον
ii:22	ὅς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, ἐθρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.		ὅς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.
iii:8	Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμό- φρονες, συμπαιθεῖς, φιλά- δελφοι, εὐσπλαγχοὶ ταπει- νώφρονες. ¹	x:1	fraternitatis amatores, diligentes invicem...
iii:9	μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας	ii:2	μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας
iv:7	νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς.	vii:2	νήφοντες πρὸς τὰς εὐχάς.
v:5	πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκοιμῶσθε	x:2	Omnes vobis inuicem subiecti estate...

This comparison makes it clear that Polycarp knew I Peter. Moreover, The Martyrdom of Polycarp supports such a conclusion, for in x:2 it reports that in his conversation with the Pro-Consul during his trial, Polycarp expressed the injunction of I Pet. ii:13-14 in saying that he had been "taught to render honour... to princes

1. Cf. I Pet. ii:17.

and authorities appointed by God".¹ Yet, when he quotes from this work, Polycarp does not mention Peter by name, neither does he preface such quotations with a citational formula like εἰδότες ὅτι as he does in two citations from Paul. This prompted A. Harnack² to suggest that he was not aware of the Petrine authorship of this work, but as F.H. Chase³ contended years ago, Polycarp also fails to acknowledge his quotations from I Clement and his own teacher, St. John. He probably mentions Paul by name because he wants to remind the Philippians that Paul had also written to them. Moreover, he uses the formula εἰδότες ὅτι to introduce axiomatic and epigrammatic statements by Paul, while the phrases he quotes from I Peter are of a more hortatory character. Despite Polycarp's silence on the authorship of I Peter, his use of the letter reveals that he had a great love for it, and that he also regarded it as an authoritative document. Possibly the work was so well known to his addressees, that he found it unnecessary to refer to its author by name. Most significantly, his spiritual son, Irenaeus habitually refers to it as the letter of St. Peter.⁴ Thus in all probability Polycarp would have regarded it as the work of Peter and conveyed that conviction to his young pupil.

Papias

Polycarp's friend, Papias, is also said to have known I Peter. In writing about him, Eusebius⁵ states that he "used quotations from the first Epistle of John, and likewise from that of Peter".⁶ From

1. Tr. Kirsopp Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, LCL, Vol. II p. 327 -
 Σε μὲν κἄν λόγου ἡξίωσα. δεδιδαγμεθα γὰρ ἀρχαῖς καὶ
 ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναις τιμὴν κατὰ τὸ προσήκον,
 τὴν μὴ βλάπτουσαν ἡμᾶς, ἀπονέμειν.

2. A. Harnack, *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, Leipzig: Deichertschen, 1904, p. 463.

3. See F.H. Chase, *HDB* III, pp. 780-781.

4. See Eusebius, A.H. IV ix:2; xvi:5; V vii:2.

5. See Eusebius, H.E. III xxxix:17.

6. Tr. Kirsopp Lake, Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, LCL, Vol. I p. 299.

this notice it is not clear whether Papias attributed the letter to Peter by actually quoting him by name. We must admit the possibility that he merely adopted "Petrine" phrases without stating their source and that later, in his report, Eusebius ascribes them to Peter. Nevertheless, we can be confident that Papias knew I Peter, even if it cannot be proved conclusively that he ascribed it to Peter.

The Epistle to Diognetus

In the Epistle to Diognetus ix:2, ἅγιον ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων, τὸν δίκαιον ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν, τὸν δίκαιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδίκων, may have been influenced by I Peter iii:18 as well as Rom. viii:32; Eph. i:7 and 1 Tim. ii:6, which are also echoed in the whole passage. On the other hand, like those New Testament writers, the author may similarly be using catechetical or liturgical material. Lack of further evidence precludes the possibility of coming to any conclusion about its relationship to I Peter.

2 Clement

2 Clement is generally held to date from about the middle of the second Century.¹ A probable reference to I Pet. iv:8 can be found in 2 Clem. xvi:4, ἀγάπη δὲ καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν. It might also be argued that 2 Clem. xiv:2, ὡς καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν, ἐφανερώθη δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἵνα ἡμᾶς σώσῃ, was inspired by δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς of I Pet. i:20. The first of these references may also have been taken over from I Clement xlix:5² instead of I Peter. Alternatively, it is conceivable that this adaptation of Prov. x:12, which the writers are quoting, had become a popular saying in the early church. One could speculate further that Peter himself originally adapted the saying from Proverbs to express a maxim based on his own experience of the Lord's love and forgiveness. Subsequently, because the statement was so true of Christian experience, it became an apothegm of the church. Speculation aside, the evidence

1. See M.H. Shepherd, *IDB* I, p.649. 2. See p. 168 supra.

is really too paltry to prove any definite literary relationship, even though it certainly does not preclude the possibility that the author of 2 Clement knew I Peter.

Melito of Sardis

The eunuch Melito flourished at Sardis somewhere between 160 and 170 AD.¹ In his Apology to the Emperor he uses one phrase which is very reminiscent of I Peter i:4, "Haec cum didiceris, Antonine Caesar, et filii quoque tui tecum trades iis haereditatem aeternam quae non perit".² In Pascha 12, Melito describes the Paschal lamb in words which I Pet. i:19 uses of Christ, ὁπίλον ἄμνον καὶ ἄκαρπον,³ while in Pascha 68, καὶ λαὸν περισούσιον αἰώνιον⁴ is very close to the thought expressed in I Pet. ii:9. In arguing for the authenticity of this passage, C. van der Waal makes the point that a glossator would have reproduced the exact text of I Peter instead of the general terminology of Melito.⁵ These parallels from Melito therefore confirm the view that I Peter was most probably known in the churches of Asia Minor by this time.

Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius

It is not necessary to pursue this enquiry any further, save possibly to note that Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-215 AD)⁶ actually commented on I Peter and that Eusebius (c. 260-340 AD),⁷ who divided sacred writings into *Accepted*, *Disputed* and *Spurious* categories, definitely placed this epistle in the first category.

1. See S.G. Hall, Melito of Sardis on Pascha and Fragments, Oxford: Clarendon, 1979, p. xxii.

2. I.C.T. Otto, Corpus apologetarum christianorum, Jena, 1872 ix, p. 423.

3. S.G. Hall, op. cit. p. 6, Line 72. 4. Ibid. p. 36, line 478.

5. C. van der Waal, Het Pascha van onze Verlossing, Johannesburg: De Jong, 1979, p. 76.

6. See Clement of Alexandria, LCL 92, p. xi.

7. See Eusebius Ecclesiastical History I, LCL 153, pp. ix-xiii.

When all the parallels which have been discussed are considered together, it is very clear that none of them contradicts the possibility that the Apostolic Fathers and other writers from I Clement onwards were acquainted with I Peter. In the light of the paucity of references to it in many of these writers, the relatively large proportion of parallels which occur in I Clement and Polycarp become significantly more important.¹ This is particularly true of those passages in I Clement which corresponded exclusively with I Peter and could not be attributed to that author's use of a common Christian vocabulary or catechism. Consequently, they confirm the view, tentatively expressed at first, that I Clement must have known I Peter in the very form in which we have it today.

This definitely restricts the *Terminus ad quem* of I Peter to 96 AD and fits in very well with the results obtained from the comparative study of I Peter and the rest of the New Testament. They point to a composition date contemporary with that of the Epistles of Paul and James, with which I Peter was shown to have so many affinities.

1. They represent two of the largest early church centres, Rome and Antioch, which were founded by missionaries to the circumcised from Jerusalem and not by the Pauline Gentile mission. It seems, therefore, that, like the epistle of James, I Peter was well known and used in both these centres because it reflected the same affinities of thought as the founding church in Jerusalem.

4. I PETER'S USE OF SCRIPTURE WITH THE CATECHETICAL AND BAPTISMAL CODES OF THE EARLY CHURCH

The evidence presented thus far in the previous chapters has shown that the language and theological expression of I Peter is very much in keeping with that of the other New Testament Epistles. No direct literary dependence could be shown to exist between them, but it became clear that I Peter, in common with the other New Testament letter writers, was drawing upon an early Jerusalem Catechism. In turn, this common practice suggested that a date in the fifties to sixties of the First Century for the composition of I Peter would not be out of place. Indeed, I Clement's knowledge of the work, and its use by other Apostolic Fathers, has contributed greatly to the confidence with which such an early date is postulated.

This date places the letter within the life-time of the Apostle Peter and objections to its composition by him must be faced. Mostly the arguments have revolved round the view that Peter would not have depended so much on the Old Testament, let alone the LXX version of it. It is far more likely, they argue, that he would make direct references to the life and teaching of Jesus, which he had experienced at first hand.¹ Moreover, it is held that a simple Galilean fisherman like Peter, who spoke with a pronounced Galilean accent² and who with John was regarded as "uneducated" and "common" by the Jewish leaders,³ could not possibly have produced the beautiful and sensitive Greek of the Epistle.

1. See F.W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970, pp. 44-46; J.H. Elliott, "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step Child: I Peter in Recent Research", *JBL* 95:243-254, 1976; N. Perrin, The New Testament. An Introduction, New York: Harcourt, Bruce Jovanovich, 1974, p. 258. C. Milo Connick, The New Testament: An Introduction to its History, Literature and Thought, 2nd ed. Encino: Dickenson, 1978, pp. 352-354. W.G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, London: SCM, 1975, p. 423.

2. Matt.xxvi:73. 3. Acts iv:13 - ἀγράμματοι; ἰδιῶται.

In order to evaluate such arguments, it is necessary to examine very carefully the author's use of the Old Testament, the early church's catechetical and liturgical material, as well as the common use of Greek in conversation and writing in the Galilee, where Peter grew up.¹ Only after considering all these factors will it be possible to evaluate the nature and extent of Peter's involvement in the composition of the letter.

Just as Paul's letters have a style of their own,² so the author of I Peter may reveal a particular approach in his use of the scriptures of his day and the standard teaching and persecution material of his church.

A striking feature of his scriptural quotations is that they derive, not from the Hebrew text, as one would expect from a Jerusalem based teacher, but from the LXX. This applies as much to lengthy quotations in I Peter as to odd phrases and words. The LXX must therefore have been his readers' Bible if not his own.

Furthermore, only a few of the many and sometimes lengthy quotations from the LXX are introduced by an acknowledgement like γάρ, γράφει, διότι or ὅτι. For example, γάρ introduces his quotation from Ps.xxxiv:12-16 in iii:10-12. διότι γέγραπται in i:16 leads into a combination of texts from Lev.xi:44; xix:2; xx:7, while in ii:6-8 a mosaic of Isa.xxviii:16; Ps.cxviii:22 and Isa.viii:14 is preceded by

-
1. Such a study of the use of Greek has been undertaken by J.N. Sevenster, in his monograph, Do you know Greek, NovTSup XIX, Leiden: Brill, 1968; E.M. Meyers & J.F. Strange, Archaeology, the Rabbis and Early Christianity, London: SCM, 1981, pp. 19-173; A.W. Argyle, "Greek among the Jews of Palestine in New Testament Times", *NTS* 20:87-79, 1973.
 2. As established by O.K. Roller, Das Formŭlar der Paulinischen Briefe, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933. Cf. 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, pp. 27-94; F. Hahn, Mission in the New Testament, London: SCM, 1965, pp. 15-25.

διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ. διότι is used on its own to introduce Isa. xl:6-8 in i:24. The use of ὅτι in iv:8 and v:5 is quite remarkable. It introduces quotations from Prov.x:12 and iii:34, but in both instances the text varies from that of the LXX, the author's usual source. In an earlier chapter the close parallels between the texts in iv:8, v:5 and James v:20 and iv:6-7 respectively were noted.¹ It lead to the conclusion there that the author took these aphorisms not from the LXX, but from an early catechetical corpus which both he and James used in their admonitions. The question now arises, did the author of I Peter reserve the introductory ὅτι for his formal references to catechetical sources?

In comparison with the other New Testament letters, I Peter uses few introductory formulae.² Compare his γάρ, γέγραπται, περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ and διότι to introduce Old Testament texts, with the rest of the New Testament's variety of introductory terms ranging from γέγραπται, λέγει, εἶπεν, φησὶν το πλῆροῦν. Moreover, I Peter never refers to a particular part of the Scriptures as the Law, the Prophets,³ or the Writings, nor does he quote his scriptural authorities like Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Joel, Daniel or Enoch by name. Neither does he introduce a text with such customary verbs as πλῆροῦν, ἔτι πλῆροῦν or τελειοῦν, which occur relatively often in the rest of the New Testament, particularly in Matthew and John. Even James ii:23 has ἐπιληρώσῃ ἡ γραφή...

1. See pp. 115-116 and 132 supra.

2. See B.M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishna", *JBL* 70:297-307, 1951; Idem, *Historical and Literary Studies*, Pagan, Jewish, and Christian, Leiden: Brill, 1968, pp. 52-63; D.A. Hagner, *The use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, *NovTSup* XXXIV, Leiden: Brill, 1973; R.H. Gundry, *The use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, *NovTSup* XVIII, 1967.

3. His reference to the prophets in i:10 is not within the context of a LXX quotation.

A number of fairly lengthy LXX quotations in I Peter have no introductory formula whatsoever. They are in ii:9-10 (Isa.xliii:20-21; Exod.xix:5-6; xxiii:22;¹ Hos.i:6,8-9; ii:1,23.), ii:22,24-25 (Isa.liii:9,12,6.) and iv:18 (Prov.xi:31.).

Apart from the use of introductory formulae and lengthy quotations, the writer has a habit of continually weaving words and phrases which are (possibly unconscious) reminiscences of the LXX, into his own language. E. Best expresses it most accurately when he writes, "there are also many phrases and sometimes complete clauses which the writer uses, not to support his argument, but to advance it, i.e. he expresses the steps in his reasoning through them".² Instances of such use of LXX material may be listed as follows:-

I PeterLXX

i:2	εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη	Dan.iv:1; vi:26. ³
i:4	κληρονομία	Ps.xv:5. ⁴
i:17	Πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε	Ps. lxxxviii:27; Jer.iii:19; Mal.i:6.
i:19	ἀμνός ἁμμος	Num.xxviii:3,9,11.
ii:3	ἐγείνασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος	Ps.xxxiii:9.
ii:4	προσερχόμενοι	Ps.xxxiii:6. ⁵
ii:4	λίθον...ἀποδοκιμασμένον	Ps.cxvii:22.
ii:4	ἐκλεκτὸν...ἐντιμον	Ps.xxviii:16.
ii:11	παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους	Ps.xxxiii:13.
ii:12	ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς	Is.x:3.

1. Cf. Mal.iii:17.

2. E. Best, I Peter, London: Oliphants, 1971, p. 28.

3. Theodotion's Version.

4. In this instance κληρονομία translates the Hebrew *p̄n* in which the inheritance is regarded more as salvation rather than material possessions. See W. Foerster, *TDNT* III, p. 759.

5. See F.J.A. Hort, The First Epistle of St. Peter I.1-II.17, London: MacMillan, 1898, pp. 154-156.

I PeterLXX

ii:17	τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε... βασιλέα	Prov.xxiv:21.
iii:6	κύριου αὐτὸν καλοῦσα	Gen.xviii:12.
iii:6	μὴ φοβούμενοι... πτόησιν	Prov.iii:25.
iii:13	τίς ὁ κακῶων	Is.i:9.
iii:14	τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταπαιχθῆτε Κύριον... ἀγιάσατε	Is.viii:12f.
iii:22	ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ	Ps.cix:1.
iv:14	τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ Πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται.	Is.xi:2.
v:6	ταπεινώθητε... ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα	Gen.xvi:9
v:7	τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιλίψαντες	Ps.liv:23.
v:8	ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος	Ezek.xxii:25.

Moreover, very brief allusions to the LXX lie in words like ἀντίδικος, γυναικεῖος, ἐπίλοιπος, ἱεράτευμα, κατακυριεύειν, καταπίνειν, κληροί, παροιμία, πότος, πύρωσις, ραντισμός, ρύπος and συντρέχειν. There are also a number of expressions which suggest that the author was also acquainted with concepts and words in those parts of the LXX which the Council of Jabne, ca. 90 AD declared apocryphal. They are ἀδελφότης,¹ ἀθέμιτος,² ἐπίσκοπος ψυχῶν,³ κτίστης,⁴ πρόγνωσις,⁵ ὑπογραμμός,⁶ the three epithets ἀφθαρτος, ἀμίαντος, ἀμόραντος⁷ and the combination ἐκζητεῖν καὶ ἐξεραυνᾶν.⁸

1. I Pet.ii:17;v:9 = 1 Mac.xii:10,17; 4 Mac.ix:23;x:3,15; xiii:19,27.

2. I Pet.iv:3 = 2 Mac.vi:5;vii:1;x:34; 3 Mac.v:20.

3. I Pet.ii:25 = Wis.i:6, τῆς καρδιάς αὐτοῦ ἐ. ἀληθείας.

4. I Pet.iv:19 = 2Kgs.xxii:32;Jdt.ix:12;Sir.xxiv:8;2 Mac.i:24; vii:23;xiii:14;4 Mac.v:25;xi:5.

5. I Pet.i:2 = Jdt.ix:6;xi:19. 6. I Pet.ii:21 = 2 Mac.ii:28.

7. I Pet.i:4 = Wis.xii:1;xviii:4.- Wis.iii:13;iv:2;viii:20; 2 Mac.xiv:36;xv:34.- Wis.vi:12.

8. I Pet.i:10 = Mac.ix:26.

Parallels and influences from the Pseudepigraphical works were also noted in the course of the comparative studies in previous chapters. The details may be tabulated as follows :-

I Peter	Enoch	As Mos	T 12 Patr	
i:3			Naphṭ. 4:3	κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος
i:12	1:2;16:3			revelations for a distant generation
i:12	9:1			περαυνῶται
i:19			Jo. 19:9	ἀμνος ἀμμος
i:20	48:6 62:7			πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου
i:22			Gad. 6:3	ἀγαπᾶτε οὖν ἀλλήλους ἀπὸ καρδίας
ii:2			Levi 3:6	λογικὸν ὄρεσεν γάλα
ii:15			Benj. 5:2	ἀγαθοποιεῖν
iii:10			Aser. 4:4	οὐ θέλει ἡμεραν ἀγαθὴν ἰδεῖν
iii:17			Benj. 5:2	ἀγαθοποιούντας
iii:19	9:10 10:11-15			τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν
iv:3		7:3-10		a similar list of vices
iv:14			Benj. 8:2	ἀναπαύεται ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ
iv:19			Jo. 18:3	ἀγαθοποιία

From this table it soon becomes evident that the closest parallels are between I Peter and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. This is not surprising, because for a long time it has been held that the Testaments contain Christian materials as well as having unquestionable affinities with the Qumran literature.¹ As there is no consensus among scholars about the provenance and date of these Testaments, it is not possible to draw any definite conclusions from the parallels with I Peter, other than to note that similarities of thought and language exist between them and that they reflect some of the vocabulary common to the primitive Judaeo-Christian church.²

1. See M. de Jonge, "Christian influence in the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs", *NouvT* 4:182-235, 1960. M. Philonenko, *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les manuscrits de Qoumrân*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1960, reduces Christian interpolations to a minimum and sees a basic kinship with the Qumran documents.

2. See pp. 165-166 supra.

The Book of Enoch too has influenced the author.¹ I Pet.iii:19 is obviously inspired by the expanded accounts of I Enoch 9 and 10, which are based on the brief mention of the Nephilim and the sons of God to whom the daughters of men bore giants according to Gen.vi:4-6. Indeed, the writer's knowledge of I Enoch appears to form the background of his cosmology, as he emphasizes the universal importance of the sufferings of Christ in I Pet.i:10-12.

While readily acknowledging the influence of all these writings on the author, it is even more important for the purposes of the present study, to examine the manner in which he uses the various background thoughts, expressions and phrases in composing his letter.

The way in which he incorporates words and phrases from the LXX, suggests that he is quoting from memory and not from a written text.² This view is confirmed when the longer quotations are examined textually. A comparison of his treatment of Isa.xl:6-8 in i:24 and that in Jas. i:10-11, provides a very good example of the accuracy with which the New Testament writers quote the Old Testament.³ While I Peter follows the LXX much more closely than James, he nevertheless shortens and adapts the text in order to stress his main point, which is to contrast the brevity of earthly beauty with the enduring reliability of the Lord's utterance. In ii:6 the shortened text of his quotation from Isa.xxviii:16 is influenced by his unique combination of Old Testament references in the whole of ii:6-10 in expressing the common Christian attitude towards the Church as the Chosen People of God.⁴ Similarly

1. Especially since the parallels with I Pet. have been found among the scrolls at Qumran. See M.A. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, Oxford: Clarendon, 1978, Vol. 2, pp. 6-8.

2. For an extensive study on this subject, see B. Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity, ANSU XXII, 1961.

3. See pp. 58-60 supra.

4. See J.H. Elliott, The Elect and the Holy, op. cit. pp. 129-145, who rejects the "Testimonia" theory and the Hymn Hypothesis as explanations for the construction of these verses, and argues that the combination is the work of the author himself.

The Book of Enoch too has influenced the author.¹ I Pet.iii:19 is obviously inspired by the expanded accounts of I Enoch 9 and 10, which are based on the brief mention of the Nephilim and the sons of God to whom the daughters of men bore giants according to Gen.vi:4-6. Indeed, the writer's knowledge of I Enoch appears to form the background of his cosmology, as he emphasizes the universal importance of the sufferings of Christ in I Pet.i:10-12.

While readily acknowledging the influence of all these writings on the author, it is even more important for the purposes of the present study, to examine the manner in which he uses the various background thoughts, expressions and phrases in composing his letter.

The way in which he incorporates words and phrases from the LXX, suggests that he is quoting from memory and not from a written text.² This view is confirmed when the longer quotations are examined textually. A comparison of his treatment of Isa.xl:6-8 in i:24 and that in Jas. i:10-11, provides a very good example of the accuracy with which the New Testament writers quote the Old Testament.³ While I Peter follows the LXX much more closely than James, he nevertheless shortens and adapts the text in order to stress his main point, which is to contrast the brevity of earthly beauty with the enduring reliability of the Lord's utterance. In ii:6 the shortened text of his quotation from Isa.xxviii:16 is influenced by his unique combination of Old Testament references in the whole of ii:6-10 in expressing the common Christian attitude towards the Church as the Chosen People of God.⁴ Similarly

-
1. Especially since the parallels with I Pet. have been found among the scrolls at Qumran. See M.A. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, Oxford: Clarendon, 1978, Vol. 2, pp. 6-8.
 2. For an extensive study on this subject, see B. Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity, ANSU XXII, 1961.
 3. See pp. 58-60 supra.
 4. See J.H. Elliott, The Elect and the Holy, op. cit. pp. 129-145, who rejects the "Testimonia" theory and the Hymn Hypothesis as explanations for the construction of these verses, and argues that the combination is the work of the author himself.

in iii:10-12 there are a number of small variations and adaptations from the text of Ps.xxxiii:13-17.

The fact that the author can quote so much of the LXX from memory reveals another feature of his work. Not only is he deeply influenced by the Psalms, Proverbs, Deutero-Isaiah and the prophets, but the whole of his thought and language are so deeply influenced by the LXX version of the Old Testament, that it is not always possible to draw an absolute line between his own work and allusive quotations and adaptations of the language of this inspiring source. Had it not been for our present knowledge of the LXX, we would have failed to become aware of his extensive use of it. Indeed, it would appear that R.H. Gundry's dictum applies equally well to I Peter as it does to Matthew when he writes, "*an allusive quotation rather reflects the language and phrase-forms with which the writer is most familiar and in which he habitually thinks* - all the more so in the case of Jewish authors, whose education from childhood was steeped in O.T. lore".¹ Moreover, C. Rabin has shown from recent researches in the Qumran Scrolls, that the interweaving of scriptural phraseology and one's own words was a conscious literary method in the New Testament period.²

This important stylistic factor needs to be borne in mind in examining the considerable number of words and expressions in the letter which do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, nor in the LXX, nor in any other Greek versions of the Old Testament. At the turn of the Century it was customary to term some of them "classical" since they could be found in the Classical Greek writers.³ They are ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀνάχυσις, ἀντιλοιδορεῖν, ἐμπλοκή, οἰνοφλυγία, πατροπαράδοτος. Such classification however is no longer tenable. As long

1. R.H. Gundry, The use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, NovTSup XVIII, 1967, p. 3.

2. C. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, Oxford: Clarendon, 1958, p. ix; C. Rabin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of the O.T. Text", *JTS* ns 6:174-182, 1955.

3. See F.H. Chase, Peter, First Epistle, *HDB* III, pp. 781-782.

ago as 1948, A. Wifstrand¹ has already demonstrated conclusively that words like these and other classical influences would have come to the New Testament writers by way of the Greek style of the Synagogue.

The remainder of these words peculiar to I Peter are :-
 ἀγαθοποιία, ἄδολος, αἰσχροκερδῶς, ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος, ἁμαράντινος,
 ἀνεκλάλητος, ἀπροσπολήπιως, ἄρτιγέννητος, ἐγκομβοῦσθαι,
 προμαρτύρεσθαι, σθενοῦν, συμπρεσβύτερος, συνεκλεκτός, ὑπολιμπάνειν
 and φιλόφρων.

While they too may have come to the author via the Synagogue, some of them may have been derived from the early catechetical material which he used in his instruction. Indeed, ὑπολιμπάνειν,² ἀντιλοιδορεῖν,³ ἐμπλοκή⁴ and φιλόφρων⁵ all occur in passages which were classified as catechetical.⁶ ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος⁷ and ἀγαθοποιία⁸ both occur in a passage which Selwyn classed as persecution teaching,⁹ while πατροπαράδοτος¹⁰ appears in one of the four hymns which M-E. Boismard attempted to isolate in this epistle.¹¹

We have already noted how this author has adopted the language of the LXX so well and so extensively, that it is often impossible to distinguish between direct quotations and his own style. It follows, therefore, that if he had other material at his disposal, he would use it in the same way. Earlier we noticed how he used ὅτι to introduce catechetical material at iv:8 and v:5, and now we have just seen that some of his peculiar vocabulary also occurs in passages derived from common catechetical and liturgical sources. The most logical explanation is that he has also assimilated the vocabulary and expres-

1. A. Wifstrand, "Stylistic Problems in the Epistles of James and Peter", *ST* 1:170-182, 1948.

2. ii:21. 3. ii:23. 4. iii:3. 5. iii:8.

6. See pp. 4-5 supra. 7. iv:15. 8. iv:19.

9. Op. cit. pp. 439-458. 10. i:18.

11. Quatre Hymnes Baptismales dans la Première Epître de Pierre, LD 30, Paris: Cerf, 1961, p. 14. Cf. pp. 49-50 supra.

sions of his other sources in his style of writing. If we had the text of these sources at our disposal, we would most probably find that much of his special vocabulary originated there, just as our knowledge of the LXX text has enabled us to identify the origin of so many of his other stylistic traits.

Moreover, in attempting to isolate the catechetical sources in his work, one of the distinguishing marks was the use of the participle as an imperative.¹ This stylistic usage is typical of Rabbinic Hebrew, and demonstrates very clearly that this material is cast in a style which originated in the Synagogue teaching. To the Greek ear, it would have sounded strange and unfamiliar, and the temptation would have been very great to correct the language at these points. Yet a Greek-speaking Jew, schooled in the Synagogue, would have no difficulty in accepting it.

Another feature of this epistle is that the author does not seem to follow a particular plan or reveal a logical evolution in his train of thought. His main themes are those of "Hope" and "Courage" in the face of difficulties and trials, which lead to further teaching on suffering, patience and humility. To these he constantly returns with fresh applications and developments, so that many words are repeated frequently.² Indeed the repeated words seem to suggest the thoughts which follow them. Such a connection of ideas is very much like that of an old man talking to his children. No idle speculation is present as in a loving, fatherly and pastoral way he backs up his teaching with concrete rather than abstract images. As James reflects the same characteristics, it suggests that they are contemporaries with similar backgrounds who utilize the same Judean church catechism.

1. See D. Daube, Participle and Imperative in I Peter, Appended Note in E.G. Selwyn, op. cit. pp. 467-487, and pp. 6 & 63 supra.

2. E.g. ἀγαθοποιοῦς -πολεῖν -πολεῖς, ii:14,15,20; iii:6,17; iv:19. ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἀναστροφή, i:15,17,18; ii:12; iii:1,2,16. πᾶσιν, ii:19,20,21,23; iii:14,17,18; iv:1(twice),15,19; v:10.

Hence I Peter's style and his use of the LXX and other catechetical and liturgical material suggests a Jewish Christian author, who is steeped in the LXX and the Synagogue tradition. He is well versed in Christian catechesis and liturgy and in his writing is pre-disposed to express himself by weaving together material and adopting the language of sources already to hand rather than through words of his own.

Could such a description possibly fit Peter the Apostle and original leader of Jesus' disciples?

Such a suggestion immediately raises questions about the knowledge of Greek among the Jews in Palestine at the beginning of the Christian era. This subject has been thoroughly researched by J.N. Sevenster¹ in an examination of archaeological inscriptions and texts from Palestine during that era. His conclusion is that they point "to a knowledge of Greek in broad layers of the Jewish population in Palestine".² Moreover, he believes that on the question of fluency in Greek, no precise distinction can be made between the Jews of Palestine and those in the Diaspora. In practice, the Jews in Palestine and especially those in the Galilee would be forced to write and speak Greek in addition to Aramaic, judging by the Greek documents found in Palestine along with Greek Bible texts and Greek inscriptions on gravestones and the remains of Synagogues. Sevenster's conclusion is supported by Meyers and Strange, who demonstrate that of graffiti scrawled on stone ossuaries in the first centuries BC and AD 26% are in Hebrew or Aramaic, 9% are in Greek and a Semitic language, while 64% are inscribed in Greek alone.³ On the grounds of this evidence, we may accept Sevenster's suggestion that "there is absolutely no reason for rejecting any possibility that Jesus sometimes spoke

1. J.N. Sevenster, Do you know Greek? NovTSup XIX, Leiden: Brill, 1968.

2. Op. cit. p. 188.

3. E.M. Meyers & J.F. Strange, Archaeology, the Rabbis and Early Christianity, London: SCM, 1981, p. 65.

Greek, e.g. when He preached in the Decapolis or in Trans-Jordan (Matth. 4:25; Mark 3:8; 5:20; 7:31; 10:1) or when He spoke with Pilate, or that the earliest apostles and later Jewish leaders of congregations, such as James brother of the Lord, could speak as well as understand Greek in their intercourse with fellow Christians".¹

This still does not mean that they could write a letter like I Peter. In answer to such an objection, Sevenster points to the example of Josephus. His writings provide an example of the knowledge of Greek one could expect a First century Jew to acquire if he applied himself seriously to it. From Josephus' comment in Contra Ap. I:50² and several others, Sevenster shows how "it apparently happened at times that an educated Jew who aspired to the dissemination of his writings in the Greek-speaking world therefore set about to acquire a thorough knowledge of Greek and a better command of the language than that of the compatriots in Palestine".³ Surely the same would hold good for Peter and James, who were entrusted with the leadership of important Jewish-Christian congregations in Palestine and the Diaspora, particularly if they wanted to disseminate a special message to those under their pastoral care. Moreover, there have been many examples of great leaders in the Church who had humble beginnings. If they could rise and develop beyond their original environment, there is no reason why Peter should be expected to have remained stuck in his Galilean fisherman's rut for ever after. The burdens of office mature a leader. Why not Peter?

In 1946, long before all the archaeological data and the relevant papyri were available, Selwyn⁴ suggested that the good Greek of

1. Op. cit. p. 190.

2. "Then, in the leisure which Rome afforded me with all my material in readiness, and with the aid of some assistants for the sake of the Greek, at last I committed to writing my narrative of the events."

3. Op. cit. p. 75.

4. Op. cit. pp. 9-17.

I Peter must have been due to Silvanus, "by whom" the author had written the letter.¹ There is no reason for disputing the identification of Silvanus with the Silas of Acts and the associate of Paul and Timothy in the Thessalonian Epistles. But Selwyn ascribes Silvanus' skill as a Greek letter writer to the fact that he was an accredited member of the mother church in Jerusalem. Together with Judas Barsabbas he was sent from Jerusalem to deliver an Apostolic letter to the church at Antioch, where the two of them exercised a prophetic ministry.² (Selwyn's claim that Silas drafted the letter from the Council at Jerusalem is reading too much into the account of Acts.³) As Paul's companion and fellow missionary Silas also preached to Gentiles during the Second Missionary Journey.⁴ In addition, Silas was also a Roman citizen.⁵ Selwyn continues his argument by suggesting that those parts of the Thessalonian letters where the first person plural is used were not written by Paul, but by Silas.⁶

No doubt, Silvanus was an accomplished amanuensis, and worked for Peter in that capacity as well. Yet it has always been a matter of speculation whether he simply took down dictation or formulated the letter from short notes or verbal instructions from the author. Despite Selwyn's theory, it must be accepted that he did not play a major role in the composition of the Thessalonian correspondence,

1. v:12, Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ...δι' ὧν ἔγραψα.

2. Acts xv:22-32.

3. Op. cit. p. 11.

4. Acts xv:36-xviii:22.

5. Acts xvi:37-38.

6. Op. cit. pp. 14-16. According to Selwyn, Paul is only responsible for those passionate passages where the first person singular is used. Of Paul's two companions he singles out Silas on the grounds that in 1 Thess. ii:2 the authors allude to the sufferings and indignities suffered at Philippi, which did not affect Timothy personally, since it is only by inference from Acts xvii:14 that Timothy's presence either at Philippi or Thessalonica can be established.

since those letters are clearly Pauline in character and style.¹ Similarly, Silvanus' role as Peter's amanuensis needs to be re-evaluated in the light of the recent archaeological evidence for the use of Greek in Palestine, which indicates that Peter's abilities in Greek have been sadly underrated. Hence it must be conceded that in speculations over his share in Peter's correspondence, Silvanus' role was overrated in order to compensate for the Apostle's imagined lack of Greek.

Seen in this light, the New Testament references to Silvanus constitute very scant evidence for his prowess as a Greek letter writer. Except for the tantalising first person plural and the appearance of his name together with Paul and Timothy in the Thessalonian letters, there is simply no evidence by which his involvement in the authorship of these letters can be gauged, let alone his ability in writing Greek prose. Nor is Roman citizenship necessarily a guide to literary ability or cultural qualification. Even the so-called "Paulinisms" in I Peter need not necessarily be attributed to Silvanus as has been done in the past. They can also be due to the common use of catechetical and liturgical material by Paul and Peter alike.² Hence all that can confidently be stated about Silvanus is that in addition to being a good amanuensis, he was a powerful speaker - something in which Peter was no less successful. Compared with Peter, Silvanus was a minor leader.

Thus, in assessing the meaning and extent of I Peter v:12, we will have to concede that in I Peter there is a great deal more of Peter than of the literary hand of Silvanus.

1. Indeed, P Kanjuparambil, "Imperitival Participles in Rom 12: 9-21", *JBL* 102:285-288, 1983, has pointed out that in those very passages in the Thessalonian correspondence which Selwyn assigns to Silas, the participle as an imperative, which is so characteristic of I Peter, is missing!

2. See pp. 142-143 supra.

As a further measure in gauging Peter's literary ability, the Epistle of James may be cited as a relevant parallel. Sevenster has argued very forcibly that it must be wholly the work of James the Lord's brother, or of some unknown Hellenistic-Jewish Christian.¹ On the grounds of his research, he favours the first option, since "the possibility can no longer be precluded that a Palestinian Jewish Christian of the first century A.D. wrote an epistle in good Greek".² If this is possible for someone originating from a very humble carpenter's home in Nazareth, there is no reason why a Galilean fisherman, like Peter, burdened with the same responsibilities of caring for the church, should not have acquired similar skills. After all, Peter and his brother Andrew came from Bethsaida,³ on the Eastern side of the Jordan, which was a village of the Gaulanitis, in the vicinity of the Decapolis, which was even more Greek.

James' use of the LXX version rather than the Hebrew text in his Epistle, refutes another argument against the Petrine authorship of I Peter, namely that a Jewish Apostle would use the Hebrew text and not the LXX when quoting from the Old Testament. The research of Sevenster and others, which we have just discussed, reveals how mistaken such an assumption can be. The very existence of the synagogues and the LXX, which was their "missionary Bible" long before the birth of the Christian church, as well as the archaeological evidence, shows how widely Greek was used, not only in the diaspora, but even in Palestine itself in Apostolic times.⁴ The Jewish communities in the diaspora, to whom both James and I Peter are addressed, used the LXX version of the Old Testament and nothing

1. Op. cit. pp. 10-14. 2. Ibid. p. 191. 3. Jn.1:44.

4. See also A.W. Argyle, "Greek among the Jews of Palestine in New Testament Times", *NTS* 20:87-89, 1973, who shows how so characteristically Jewish an institution as the Sanhedrin derived its name from the Greek word συνέδριον for which there is no Hebrew equivalent. The same is true of συναγωγή and it also applies to βουλή in the Talmud. See G. Schrenk, *TDNT* I, p. 634.

could have been more natural for a Jewish Apostle than to quote from the version which was familiar to his readers and in the language which they normally used. Indeed, the Epistle of James provides clear evidence of a Jewish writer making such use of the LXX.

An additional objection to Peter's authorship is that I Peter lacks direct references to the life and teaching of Jesus which Peter had experienced at first hand. Instead he keeps quoting the Old Testament. This study has revealed however, that there are not only many allusions to the Gospel contents, but that they also refer to incidents and teaching which either affected Peter or in which he was directly involved.¹ These allusions proved to be far too subtle for a pseudonymous writer to manufacture and instead support the claim of the writer to be an eyewitness of the sufferings of Christ.² In any case the objection is really insignificant, since the very nature of the letter offered little opportunity to touch on the general life and teaching of Jesus. Moreover, 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. Barring the odd references in Rom. i:3, Gal. iv:4 and 1 Cor. xi:23-26; xv:3-7, the same is true for Paul as well.

Having refuted the negative arguments concerning the Petrine authorship of the letter, one further positive piece of evidence needs to be considered. The examination of the style of I Peter earlier in this chapter demonstrated how the author expressed himself by weaving together the language and expressions from the LXX, the Pseudepigrapha, and the hypothetical Jerusalem Catechism in "synagogue" Greek, rather than in words of his own. That means that much of the language in the letter stems neither directly from the author, nor from an amanuensis, but reflects instead the terminology of the "Scriptures" and "formularies" in use in the Jerusalem church. Indeed,

1. See pp. 157-163 supra.

2. I Pet.v:1.

as one of the three "pillars", Peter was probably a contributor to such formulations and certainly took part in the debates which preceded their final drafting and publishing.² Having been so deeply involved in their original formulation, it would be most natural for him, therefore, to use such terminology and forms of expression in his communications with the faithful.

From observations of the styles of fellow clergymen over the past 20 years, it has come to my notice how some of them have the same habit of weaving material from the liturgy and the Bible into their sermons and parochial letters. On occasions it has been particularly obvious in short devotions broadcast on Radio. It is an excellent way of covering up deficiencies in language and self-expression. Could they have fallen heir to the mantle of Peter?

I would like to think so, for here would be a further answer to the riddle of the good Greek of the Apostle as the author of I Peter, if in earlier argument we have stretched the development of his linguistic ability too far.

1. See Acts xv and Gal. 4:18-ii:2.

5. I PETER AND THE SOCIO-RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS OF ITS ADDRESSEES

It was imperative to solve the problems of date and authorship of I Peter before embarking on an investigation of the socio-religious condition of its addressees, as both are indispensable keys to determine the times and conditions of the recipients.

The conclusions already arrived at in earlier chapters indicate that such an investigation should focus on a period in the fifties and sixties of the first century, within the life time of the Apostle Peter himself.

In the last thirty years a vast amount of comparative religious material has become available with the discovery of such documents as the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi Texts.¹ They provide a much wider and more accurate basis for comparative religious studies than was possible in earlier decades, when parallels were limited to the New Testament and religious literature from the contemporary pagan world. Consequently, scholars previously found traces of a gentile and pagan background to I Peter. R. Perdelwitz, for instance, found such traces in an expression like ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζωῆς (I Pet. 1:3) and argued that the letter's object was to present Christianity as a more excellent mystery than the other mystery cults, and Christian baptism as an initiation superior to that of the taurobolium.² He therefore believed that the form of the letter had been influenced by contemporary mystery religions and that its recipients had formerly been devotees of the cult of Cybele, and therefore of pagan stock.³

1. See R. McL. Wilson, "Nag Hammadi and the New Testament", *NTS* 28:289-302, 1982.

2. R. Perdelwitz, Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des 1 Petrusbriefes, Giessen: Topelmann, 1911, pp. 45-49.

3. Ibid. pp. 103-104.

Such arguments, arising from a paucity of comparative materials, are no longer tenable in the light of recently discovered sources of Palestinian and Jewish origin. Indeed, "it is becoming increasingly evident today that in the scientific study of the New Testament, the Jewish backgrounds rather than the Grecian parallels offer the soundest basis of approach..."¹ The lavish use of Old Testament quotations in I Peter, confirms not only that the author expected his readers to have a first-hand knowledge of Jewish ideas and traditions, which would only be available to persons of Jewish diaspora descent, but also that they formed the background to his own thinking and belief.

Within such a context, the readers of I Peter are described as ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας. In a previous chapter² attention was drawn to the contrasting terminology which Paul and I Peter used to describe their addressees. While Paul consistently uses κλήτος in his opening addresses, I Peter refers to his readers as ἐκλεκτοί. This contrast suggests that their letters were addressed to differing categories of readers. Since the Jerusalem church also used ἐκλεκτός as its self-designation,³ it was argued not only that I Peter had a very close affinity with that church, but that his readers were also Christians of Jewish extraction, in contrast to the mainly Gentile congregations addressed by Paul. Thus I Peter views his readers as the elect remnant of Israel which was destined to find salvation in Zion,⁴ "Because of the obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ".⁵ Such a description would only be possible

1. R.N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity, London: SCM, 1970, p. 24.

2. See pp. 25-27, 70-72 supra.

3. I Pet.i:1, see p. 26 supra. 4. Joel ii:32; Acts ii:17-19.

5. F.H. Agnew, "I Peter 1:2 - An Alternative Translation", *CBQ* 45:68-73, 1983.

if the author was addressing Jewish Christians. Confirmation of this view may be found in his further description of them as *παρεπίδημοι* both here and in ii:11. This is the word the LXX uses to translate the *גֵּר* of Gen.xxiii:4, where Abraham, in search of a burial place for Sarah, is described as *παροίκος καὶ παρεπίδημος* in the secular sense of a resident alien.¹ In ii:11 I Peter uses the same combination of terms - *παροίκους καὶ παρεπίδημους* - manifestly to draw a distinction between his readers and the surrounding Gentiles.² There is no need to attribute a figurative and religious meaning to *παρεπίδημος* in the opening address. In its normal secular sense, it is an accurate description of the situation of Jews or Christian Jews living beyond the borders of Palestine amongst Gentile nations.

The meaning of *διωκόμενοι* in I Peter and James has been discussed earlier,³ and arguments that the term should be interpreted figuratively in I Peter on the grounds that the letter was addressed to Gentiles,⁴ were examined. It was shown that all those passages which are thought to point to Gentile readers,⁵ could apply just as well to a large fringe of Jewry in the dispersion who had lapsed from the pure practice of their religion and had embraced the Greek way of life

1. See W. Grundmann, *TDNT* II, pp. 54-65.

2. A similar distinction between the readers and the Gentiles is made in iv:3-5. See p. 32 *supra*.

3. See pp. 28-32 *supra*.

4. See W.G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, London: SCM, 1975, p. 418, "Since the letter is addressed to Gentile Christians, their designation as 'the elect exiles of the Dispersion' in the regions mentioned is not to be understood literally. What is in view is Christians as members of the true people of God, who live scattered throughout the earth as strangers, since their true home is in heaven. (Cf. Gal. 6:16; Phil.3:20; Heb.13:14; also I Pet.1:17; 2:11) That these Gentile Christians had previously attached themselves to synagogue communities as 'God-fearers' is an arbitrary assumption.

5. I Pet.i:14,18; ii:10-11

instead. Indeed, the way in which I Peter draws a distinction between his readers and τὰ ἔθνη in iv:3-5 was shown, after careful scrutiny of its grammatical structure, to be a clear statement that they were not Gentile, but Jewish Christians.

Are we to say then that there were no Gentile Christians amongst those addressed in I Peter? It seems hardly likely in view of the mixed population of Asia Minor, where prior to 67 AD there were only some 250,000 Jews in a total population of four million, according to one recent estimate.¹

To resolve this question, we need to consider conditions in the dispersion very carefully. Lietzmann described the situation as follows :-²

Everywhere the Jews were successful in grouping round their synagogues a circle of "God-fearers" who were attracted by the spiritual excellencies of the Mosaic religion and turned with inner conviction to its monotheism and its ethical teaching.

The demand for circumcision and the obligation to keep the Law including the ritual prescriptions would have discouraged many of those "God-fearers" from converting completely to Judaism. Only some would have accepted all the conditions including circumcision and become Proselytes.³ In this way the Jewish communities in the diaspora were enlarged in many places by additions from the non-Jewish population. Indeed, the evidence of Acts corroborates this, for at every Jewish synagogue which Paul visited, there were quite

1. See Bo Reicke, The New Testament Era, London: Black, 1968, pp. 302-303.

2. H. Lietzmann, A History of the Early Church, London: Lutterworth, 1963, Vol. I, p. 83.

3. This is also why many more women than men converted to Judaism. See K.G. Kuhn, *TDNT* VI, pp. 733-734.

a number of "God-fearers" from whom he would draw his first converts.¹

Such a description, however, appears to be an over simplification of the actual situation within Judaism at the time. As Kuhn has shown in his discussion of προσήλυτος² it is important to note that Hellenistic Judaism and Later Palestinian Judaism differed in the obligations required of a Gentile wishing to become a member of the Jewish faith. In Hellenistic Judaism those who became full Jews by circumcision were termed προσήλυτοι which corresponded to the Hebrew term גר. Those who did not accept full conversion by circumcision were termed σεβόμενοι or φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν - God-fearers. Now "the concern of Hellenistic Judaism in its missionary activity was not so much that Gentiles should accept circumcision and keep the cultic commandments but that they should believe in the one God and follow the basic ethical demands of the O.T."³ By contrast, προσήλυτος - γρ is interpreted far more strictly in Palestinian Judaism. There it was argued that if a man wished to convert to Judaism, he had to accept circumcision and submit to the Torah in its entirety. Failure to do so would mean that he remained a Gentile and be hardly distinguishable from any other non-Jew.⁴ Josephus' account of the conversion of King Izates, together with his mother Helena and his brother Monobazus, provides an excellent example of the different attitude towards Gentiles adopted by Hellenistic and Palestinian

1. Ἕλληνες Acts xiv:1; xviii:4; xix:10. φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν Acts xiii:16,26. σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν Acts xvi:14; xvii:17; xviii:7. σεβόμενοι Ἕλληνες Acts xvii:4. Cf. Matt. xxiii:15; Acts ii:10; vi:5; xiii:43, where προσήλυτοι are mentioned.

2. K.G. Kuhn, *TDNT* VI, pp. 727-744.

3. Ibid. p. 731.

4. See R.H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha, London: Black, 1949, pp. 166-196.

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.