

Table of Contents

Preface	7
<i>Eric Wong</i>	

Matthew

Matthew's Perspective on Roman Political Authorities	9
<i>Boris Repschinski</i>	

The Synoptic Appropriation of Isa 6:9-10: Implications for the Synoptic Problem	43
<i>Jonathan W. Lo</i>	

Ανομία in Matthew: an Exegetical Analysis of Its Subject	75
<i>Masashi Sawamura</i>	

Matthew's Implicit Criticism on Paul	89
<i>Eric Kun Chun Wong</i>	

Paul

Dialectic of ἀλήθεια and ἐλευθερία in Galatians	121
<i>Eugene Eung-Chun Park</i>	

Table of the Lord Versus Table of Demons: A New Proposal for the Necessity of Divisions in Eating the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 11.17-22	137
<i>Sin Pan Ho</i>	

Revisiting the Carmen Christi: An Alternative Reading of Philippians 2:5-11 in Light of Paul's Perspective on Humiliation and Exaltation in Philippians 3:7-11	153
<i>Rachael Tan</i>	
When academic Debate Meets Translation Decisions	179
<i>Chun Li</i>	
The Passage from Death to Life: Paul's Notion of Death with Christ in Rom 6.....	191
<i>Teresa Kuo</i>	
1 Peter as a Pseudonymous Letter: On its Historical Background.....	207
<i>Manabu Tsuji</i>	
Others	
Honor and Authority Redefined in Luke 22:24-30	231
<i>Yang Yan</i>	
Adam in the Beginning and Jesus at the End: The Intertextual Construction of 'Adam-Christ Typology' in Lucan Narrative.....	247
<i>David Chengxin Li</i>	
Competing Spiritualities: Reading John 6 in Global Perspective	275
<i>William Loader</i>	

1 Peter as a Pseudonymous Letter: On its Historical Background

Manabu Tsuji
Hiroshima University, Japan

1 Introduction

The First Letter of Peter (hereafter: 1 Peter or 1 Pet) represents itself as a circular letter from the apostle Peter to Christians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia (1:1).

While there are still advocates of authenticity, the letter is widely seen as pseudonymous (as will be described later, this view is correct). However, if this is the case, we need to ask why the author created such a letter setting like 1:1.

To begin, why is “Peter” selected to be the author? This fundamental question is important given that 1 Peter has much in common with the Pauline and pseudo-Pauline letters. If the author of 1 Peter has knowledge of the Pauline letters and wrote his letter under their influence, why did the author borrow the name of Peter rather than Paul?

Other matters that need questioned are why the letter uses the odd expression “from Babylon to the chosen exiles of Diaspora in Pontus, Galatians, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia,” and whether this origin and destination are actual or fictional. In the following sections, I will take up these questions concerning the history of the formation of 1 Peter.

2 Preliminary Consideration: Question of Authorship

As mentioned above, the majority of exegetes regard the name “Peter” as a pseudonym. The main reasons for this view, asserted since the 19th century, are as follows:¹

- 1) Why did Peter need to write to churches that he was not familiar with? Peter devoted himself to missionary work mainly with the Jews of Palestine, as the agreement of the Apostolic Council shows (see Gal 2:9). In addition, the contents of 1 Peter were too general to be an answer to the specific questions sent from these churches to Peter.
- 2) The letter is addressed not to Jewish Christians but to Christians in pagan lands, and the recipients are those who converted from paganism (1:8, 12; 2:10, 12; 4:3). But Peter understands himself as the apostle for the circumcised, sc. Jews (cf. Gal 2:8).
- 3) The letter reflects the circumstances under which Christianity has already spread not only in Asia Minor but throughout the Roman Empire by the missionaries (1:12; cf. also Eph 4:11; 2 Tim 4:5), who were exposed to objections and persecution (5:9). This indicates that it was written (or at least set) after Peter’s lifetime.
- 4) The author does not argue about the relationship between Christianity and Judaism, which was quite important to Peter (Gal 2:12, 13; Acts 10:9ff.).
- 5) The author is familiar with the text of the Old Testament—such literacy cannot be expected from Peter, a Galilean fisher. Besides, its interpretation and comments are very similar to those of Paul; also typical Pauline expressions and terms appear in the letter.

In addition to these points listed by Cludius, the following facts are frequently pointed out as indications of pseudepigraphy: (6) the fact that the author calls

¹ Cludius (1808, pp. 296–303) is considered to be the first one who threw doubt on the authenticity of 1 Peter (cf. Schnelle, 2002, p. 479 note 83). The following points (1) to (5) are mentioned by Cludius. The work of J. S. Semler, who is an advocate of pseudonymity before Cludius was referred to by Brox (1989, pp. 43–47) is *Paraphrasis in epistolam I. Petri cum Latine translationis varietate et multis notis* (Halle, 1783). (Brox does not give the name of this book.) Semler lists passages in 1 Peter, where the author appears to depend on the Pauline letters.

himself “fellow elder” (συμπρεσβύτερος) in 5:1² and (7) the fact that the author refers to Rome (5:13) as “Babylon.”³

These arguments raise sufficient doubt about the authenticity of this letter. The connection between Peter and the churches in the destination areas is unknown; and if Gentile Christians are the intended readers, Peter cannot be the author of this letter, not only because he must have been exclusively involved in the mission with the Jewish people (cf. Gal 2:9) but also because we have no evidence of Christianity taking root in the destination areas during Peter’s lifetime, let alone by his mission. However, given the fact that we are short of historical information both about Christianity in this era and about Peter’s theology and language ability, each of the arguments (1) to (5) is by itself not decisive against the letter’s authenticity.⁴ (However, the echo of the Pauline expressions is to be discussed below.)

On the other hand, (6) is a fairly important argument against the genuineness of 1 Peter, because it is hard to imagine that the historical Peter himself would have called himself “elder.”⁵ (7) is also a strong argument against the authenticity because the use of “Babylon” to refer to Rome appears only in the literature after 70 AD (4 Ezra 3:1f., 28, 31; syrBar 67:7f.; Sib III 300–302; V 137–161; Rev 14:8; 16:19; 18:2, 10, 21).⁶

² Brox (1989, p. 228): “He gives up partly his Petrine (sc. apostolic) fiction”; Feldmeier (2005, p. 155): “Möglicherweise fällt hier der reale Verfasser aus seiner Fiktion, der Apostel zu sein, heraus und spricht als das, was er ist, als christlicher Presbyter.”

³ E.g., Hunzinger (1965, pp. 67–77), and Doering (2009, p. 646 note 9).

⁴ Doering (2009, p. 646 note 9) also says that “no single argument can be considered compelling” and the judgment can be made only “by the cumulative weight of arguments.”

⁵ Pace Elliott (2000, 817) and Doering (2009, pp. 652–656), who both interpret this expression as emphasizing the responsibility that Peter shares with “elders” in the church communities. Elliott thinks this designation possible because Papias calls the apostles, including Peter, “elders” (Eusebius, *HE*, 3.39.4). According to Campbell (1993, p. 519), this title “did not exclude members of the Twelve, since it was never the title of an office separate from that of apostle.”

⁶ Jobes (2005, p. 14) argues that it was always possible after 63 B.C., namely after Rome put Palestine under control, that Rome would be referred to as “Babylon.” Notably, there are no currently accessible examples of the use of Babylon in place of Rome before 70 A.D. Also unconvincing is Thiede’s explanation (Thiede, 1986, pp. 532–538) that it is possible for Peter to use this metaphor because the Jewish Diaspora in Rome during his time must have compared Rome to Babylon in awareness of Mic 4:10, and this comparison was also known to non-Jews. But the first reason is nothing more than imagination. And the Gentile Christian who received this letter would not understand this metaphor unless they knew that Peter actually sent this letter from Rome.

These observations, therefore, make it highly probable that 1 Peter is pseudonymous. But, in my view, the decisive evidence for this conclusion is that 1 Peter is strongly influenced by the Pauline and pseudo-Pauline letters as it is only explicable under the premise that the author wrote this letter in a post-Pauline environment.

3 1 Peter and Pauline Christianity

3.1 Connection with the Pauline Tradition

It has been pointed out that 1 Peter is very close to Pauline Christianity. H. -M. Schenke and K. M. Fischer assert that this letter is obviously under the influence of the Pauline tradition such that the sender's name must have been "Paul" and was only mistakenly replaced with "Peter" in the process of text tradition.⁷

1 Peter is said to have had close contact with the Pauline tradition, as demonstrated by the following points:⁸

- 1) The form of the opening section closely resembles that of the Pauline letters, sharing the same names of sender and addressees (1:1–2a) followed by the same greeting "grace and peace to you" (1:2b) and thanksgiving (1:3ff.). Especially noteworthy is a verbal agreement between 1:3a and 2 Cor 1:3a (εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). This indicates that the author of 1 Peter consciously imitated the letter formula of Paul.⁹
- 2) Silvanus (5:12) and Mark (5:13) are both co-workers of Paul (for Silvanus, cf. 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Cor 1:19; 2 Thess 1:1; Acts 15:22, 27, 32, 40; 16:19–25, 29; 17:4, 10, 14f.; 18:5. For Mark, Phlm 24; Col 4:10; 2 Tim 4:11; Acts 12:12, 25; 13:5, 13, 15:37, 39), while their contacts with Peter are unknown anywhere else.¹⁰
- 3) The key concepts and expressions of Pauline theology, e.g., "grace" (χάρις: 1:2, 10, 13; 2:19–20; 4:10; 5:10, 12), "righteousness" (δικαιοσύνη: 2:24;

⁷ Schenke and Fischer, 1978, pp. 200–203. They suppose that the original text read not Π/ΕΤΡ/ΟΣ but Π/ΑΥΛ/ΟΣ (ibid., p. 203).

⁸ Cf. Schnelle (2013, p. 488) and Horrell (2008, pp. 36–38).

⁹ "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" is a characteristic expression of Paul. Cf. also 2 Cor 11:31.

¹⁰ Papias says that Mark was a translator of Peter (Eusebius, *HE* 3.39.15); however, this may be a tradition created from 1 Peter. It was not known before Papias (Schenke and Fischer, 1978, p. 200).

3:14), “revelation” (ἀποκάλυψις: 1:7, 13; 4:13), “Freedom” (ἐλευθερία: 2:16; cf. Gal 5:13), “call” (καλεῖν) into salvation (1:15; 2:9, 21; 3:9; 5:10), and “chosen” (1:1; 2:9), dominate the theology of 1 Peter. Paul’s characteristic use of the phrase “in Christ” (ἐν Χριστῷ) is found only in 1 Pet 3:16; 5:10, 14 in non-Pauline documents of the New Testament.

- 4) There are many points of contact between the hortatory materials of 1 Peter and Pauline paraenesis, among which the agreement between 2:13–17 and Rom 13:1–7 (exhortation to obey the rulers) stands out as being quite remarkable.
- 5) In addition, 1 Peter shares striking similarities to phrases and concepts in the Pauline letters. For example, 1 Pet 2:4–8 corresponds to Rom 9:32–33 on a verbal level. The phrase in 3:18 “that he might bring us to God” (ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγη τῷ θεῷ) is also found in Eph 2:18 (see also Eph 3:12; Rom 5:2).¹¹

1 Peter certainly does not reflect all the key statements of Pauline theology such as “justification by faith” (cf. Rom 3:28; Gal 3:16), but this is more or less also true of the Deutero-Pauline letters. Even though the distinct Paulinism is missing, the influence of the Pauline theology exists unquestionably.

Exegetes who affirm the close relation between 1 Peter and Paul used to assume a direct literary dependence,¹² whereas in recent years one can see a strong tendency to explain the connection rather in terms of the indirect, traditional influence of the Pauline language. This latter view is based upon the observation that the differences in language and theology between the two are too large to signify a direct dependence.¹³

¹¹ Barnett (1941, pp. 51–69) lists the following passages as certainly (= A) or probably (=B) depending upon Pauline letters given in the bracket: 1 Pet 1:1 (Eph 1:1, B); 1:2 (Rom 8:29 et al., A); 1:3 (Eph 1:3–20, A); 1:12 (Eph 3:5, B); 1:14–15 (Rom 12:2, B; Eph 2:2–3, B); 2:13–17 (Rom 13:1–7, B); 3:18 (Rom 5:6, B); 4:7–11 (Rom 13:11, 12; 12:3, 6, 9, 13, A); 4:13–14 (Rom 8:17–18, B); 5:1 (Rom 8:7–18, B).

¹² According to Herzer (1998, p. 5), J. D. Michaelis already espoused this view (Michaelis, 1777, p. 1168): “The author of 1 Peter seems to have read the Pauline epistle to Rome shortly before writing.” Although Herzer mentions only the 3rd edition (1777), Michaelis had already stated this in the 2nd edition (Michaelis, 1766, p. 1625). (The 1st edition [1750] was not accessible.) Jülicher and Fascher (1931, p. 196): “a pale copy of Pauline works.” Furthermore, Holtzmann (1892, pp. 313–315): “1 Peter has a collection of Pauline epistles before his eyes”; Barnett (1941, p. 68): “traces of acquaintance [are] clearest for Romans, Ephesians, Galatians, and II Corinthians, but with the likelihood of acquaintance with several other letters of the corpus.” Shimada (1998b, p. 100 note 2) gives a lengthy list of the scholars who are of this view. On the history of research, cf. also Herzer (1998, pp. 2–11).

¹³ E.g., Vahrenhorst (2016, p. 46), Horrell (2008, p. 38) and Schrage (1985, p. 60–61). Lindemann (1979, p. 257)

3.2 Negative Evaluation: Kazuhito Shimada & Jens Herzer

On the other hand, by emphasizing the differences, some scholars tend to deny the relationship between Peter and the Pauline Christianity.

Kazuhito Shimada, a Japanese specialist on 1 Peter, analyzes the passages that are said to be directly dependent on Romans and Ephesians and declares that “a direct literary dependence of 1 Peter on Romans cannot be demonstrated.”¹⁴ Shimada states that this also holds true for Ephesians.¹⁵ In coming to this conclusion, Shimada demands a quite rigid reproduction of the preceding text as evidence of a direct literary dependence. According to him, the following points should be proven.

- 1) A passage should be quoted explicitly and extensively (and the author and writings, from which he allegedly quotes, should be identified, if possible).
- 2) From a context-analytical point of view, both the original and the reproduced passages or phrases should be exactly the same, or at least very similar.
- 3) The phrases (if possible, with the same word order) or words should be identical, or be replaced with paronyms of similar meaning.
- 4) The concepts represented should be the same or very close.

Only on the basis of *cumulative* evidence of the kinds listed above, can one rightfully surmise a direct literary dependence.¹⁶

Jens Herzer, who accepts Shimada’s criteria, reaches the same conclusion, denying the direct dependence of 1 Peter on Pauline or deutero-Pauline letters and finding instead that one can talk about the influence of Pauline tradition only in an extremely restricted way.¹⁷

3.3 Flaws in Shimada’s Arguments

Shimada's criteria are, however, unrealistic in that he over-prioritizes verbal congruence (i to iii) and through his strange presupposition that those who quote a text should understand it exactly in the same way as its original author did (iv).

states that direct literary suggestions can be regarded as likely, but not be proven, because Pauline usage is presupposed, whereas his understanding is not present.

¹⁴ Shimada, 1998b, p. 163.

¹⁵ Shimada, 1998a, pp. 95–97.

¹⁶ Shimada, 1998b, pp. 105–106. Italics by Shimada.

¹⁷ Herzer, 1998, pp. 257–261.

Quite misleading is Shimada's premise that the existence of verbatim conformity is indispensable for proving a direct literary dependence, because, as Annette Merz says: "By restricting to cases where three or four words are matched, other intertextual associations such as imitation of structure (e.g., argument form, typology) or sarcastic dissimulation [Verfremdungen] etc. are excluded."¹⁸ Even a "quotation" is not always verbatim as quotations often contain modifications.¹⁹ Shimada misses this point and thus overlooks a variety of connections between texts. However, this is certainly the point emphasized through a concept of "Intertextuality," which has come to be referred to repeatedly in recent years. In addition to quotations, "Intertextuality" includes phenomena like parody, hints, gestures, gathering poems (cento), imitation, plagiarism, collage, montage, and adaptation of old poems.²⁰

As criterion for proving literary dependence, Shimada also requires that the concepts represented in the original and reproduced text are the same (iv). However, in cases of parody or caricature, it would be impossible to expect to identify the exact concept. For example, when the author of James says that "faith without works is dead" (Jas 2:26), he doubtlessly keeps Paul's Letter to the Romans (chapters 3–4) in mind. But the notion of "works" (ἔργα) in James 2 is not identical with Paul's "works of the Law" (ἔργα νόμου), as the lack of "Law" clearly shows. The reader often understands the text differently from the author. Again, Shimada's restrictions on this matter are too narrow.

Therefore, when considering the relationship between 1 Peter and the Pauline letters, it is faulty to apply such strict criteria as Shimada does. The differences between the texts, as pointed out by Shimada (and Herzer), should—of course—be taken into consideration. However, such differences should not be perceived as necessarily excluding a literary connection, as is clear from the viewpoint of

¹⁸ Merz, 2004, p. 99. [...] is an explanatory addition by Tsuji.

¹⁹ Walker (1985, p. 10): "An author may, for whatever reason, simply prefer a vocabulary more compatible with his/her own style, situation, or purpose, or she/he may also be using another source or sources whose vocabulary is viewed as more suitable." Friedman (1991, p. 155): "Writers seldom duplicate their influential precursor(s); rather, they often work within a certain framework established by other writers or generic conventions, but vary aspects of it in significant ways. The interesting question for the critic has been how the successor(s) adapted, assimilated, revised, transformed, altered, reshaped, or revised the precursor(s)." Aelius Theon (1st Century A.D.) advises in his *Progymnasmata* ("preliminary exercises") to learn how to recite not "by the same words" but also "by other words" (Chrie, 101.8–9).

²⁰ Cf. Tsuchida (2000, pp. 58–59).

Intertextuality. In the following (2.4 and 2.5), we revisit the points mentioned in 2.1, examining them in further detail.

3.4 1 Peter and the Pauline Letters

3.4.1 Dependence on Pauline language

In its opening, 1 Peter strongly echoes the Pauline letters; for instance, the sender's self-identification "Peter, the Apostle of Jesus Christ" (Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) is very close to that of 2 Cor 1:1 (Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; see also 1 Cor 1:1 and Rom 1:1). Moreover, "foreknowledge of God" (πρόγνωσις; see προγινώσκω in Rom 8:29; 11:2), "sanctification by the Spirit" (ἀγιασμός; this word appears almost only in the Pauline letters, and the identical expression ἀγιασμός πνεύματος is seen in 2 Thess 2:13),²¹ and "obedience" (ὕπακοή; 1:2, 14, 22) are words found exclusively in the Pauline letters and 1 Peter. Furthermore, the dependence on the Pauline letters is obvious in the first doxology at the end of the greeting (v. 3): "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ!" (εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, RSV). This is an exact replica of the greeting in 2 Cor 1:3, not only verbally, but also contextually. Thus, there is no doubt that this opening section follows 2 Corinthians (cf. also Rom 1:6; 2 Cor 11:31. This phrase is also seen in Eph 1:3, i.e., a pseudo-Pauline letter whose author must have imitated the Pauline style).

Another passage that obviously illustrates dependence on Paul is 1 Pet 2:6–8. In v. 6a the author quotes Isa 28:16;²² though the sentence "Behold, I lay in Zion a stone" (ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον) differs from the text of Septuagint (ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον), it corresponds verbally with Rom 9:33, where Paul cites the same LXX passage.²³ V. 7 is a quotation from LXX Ps 117:22,

²¹ Rom 6:19, 22; 1 Cor 1:30; 1 Thess 4:3, 4; 1 Tim 2:15. Cf. also Heb 12:14.

²² This is obviously not a citation from the Hebrew text, because the next passage "the one who believes in him will not be put to shame" (v. 6b) is in accordance with LXX, but differs from the Hebrew text ("one who believes will not be in haste").

²³ The expression "cornerstone chosen and precious" (ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἐντιμον) is also cited from Isa 28:16 LXX. The author of 1 Peter probably added it, which Paul in Rom 9:33 did not refer to, by citing Isaiah text directly. The variant reading ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐντιμον (B C 49 1243 pc sa^m bo), which was accepted as original until Nestle²⁵, is to be regarded as a secondary correction in accordance with LXX. The author of 1 Peter probably altered the word order so that the "cornerstone" can be read clearly as apposition to the "stone."

while v. 8 “stone of disturbance and rock of stumbling” (λίθος προσκόμματος και πέτρα σκανδάλου) again corresponds verbatim with Rom 9:33. The latter goes back to Isa 8:14 (ὡς λίθου προσκόμματος ... πέτρας πτώματος), but differs from LXX in the Greek word for “stumbling.” The author of 1 Peter, therefore, evidently referred to Rom 9:33. This passage offers definitive evidence of literary dependence on the Pauline letter(s).²⁴

1 Peter contains additional expressions that strongly suggest the author’s knowledge of Pauline letters. The compound “willingly acceptable” (εὐπρόσδεκτος, 2:5) is rarely found outside the New Testament (NT),²⁵ while in the NT only Paul and 1 Pet use it (Rom 15:16, 31; 2 Cor 6:2; 8:12). Of these passages, Rom 15:16 speaks of the offering in the priestly service, which is “willingly acceptable” to God, i.e., the very same context as 1 Pet 2:5. The obscure expression “a people *for possession*” (λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, 2:9) makes sense when read in the context that Paul uses it in the sense of reaching to the possession of *salvation*: “God has destined us for possession of salvation (εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας) through our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thess 5:9).²⁶ Εἰς περιποίησιν is used also in the Deutero-Pauline letters in a similar religious meaning (2 Thess 2:14; Eph 1:14; also Heb 10:39), indicating that it was widely recognized as a characteristic Pauline expression.

These observations lead to the conclusion that the author of 1 Peter is familiar with the Pauline letters, particularly Romans. He probably knows 2 Corinthians as well, for he uses the same introduction, and, in 5:12, spells the name of his co-worker “Silvanus” as in 2 Cor 1:19 (cf. also 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1), not “Silas” as in Acts. In addition, the existence of Pauline expressions such as “εἰς περιποίησιν” (2:9/1 Thess 5:9) suggests that the author has access to several Pauline letters, perhaps in a form of *Corpus Paulinum*, i.e., a compilation of the Pauline letters.

²⁴ So also, e.g., Tagawa (2015, p. 283).

²⁵ E.g., Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft*, 2.801C; Porphyry, *To Marcella*, 24. Liddell/Scott/Jones, s.v. gives only a few examples.

²⁶ Before the NT, this word was found only in LXX 2 Chr 14:13(12); Mal 3:17; Plato, *Definitions* 415c.

3.4.2 Common Hortatory Material

In 2:13–17, the author urges obedience to authority. Though this passage strongly resembles Rom 13:1–7, exegetes tend to attribute it to a common oral tradition rather than direct dependence on Rom 13.²⁷

However, there are also many verbal agreements between these passages. 1 Pet 2:13: “Be subject to [...] the king as governor” (ὑποτάγητε [...] βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι) is almost identical with Rom 13:1: “Let every one be subject to the governing authorities” (ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω). It is also worth noting that these phrases are both placed at the beginning of the paragraph. The remark in 1 Pet 2:14 that governors are sent for “retaliation” (ἐκδίκησις) against wrongdoers overlaps with what Paul in Rom 13:4 states: “the one who is in authority is a servant of God and retaliator (ἐκδικος) against the wrongdoer.”²⁸ Besides, the expressions in v. 14f., such as “wrongdoer” (κακοποιός), “one who does good” (ἀγαθοποιός) and “doing good” (ἀγαθοποιέω) find their correspondents in Rom 13:3, although the use of compound words is a characteristic of 1 Peter.²⁹ Also the end of the paragraph clearly corresponds to that of Rom 13:1–7: The phrase “honor *all people*” (πάντας τιμήσατε) is quite similar to the beginning of Rom 13:7: “Pay duties to *all*” (ἀπόδοτε πᾶσιν τὰς ὀφειλάς). And the closing imperative “Fear God, honor the king” (τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε) is probably a modification of a somewhat ambiguous expression of Paul: “Fear to whom the fear is due, honor to whom the honor is due” (τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν).³⁰ In this way, close connections between 1 Pet 2:13–17 and Rom 13:1–7 can be seen

²⁷ Cf. Wilckens (1974, pp. 211–213).

²⁸ The author of 1 Peter says that governors are sent by the king (sc. emperor). However, the king is a part of the “human creature” (ἀνθρώπινη κτίσις, NRSV: “human institution”), i.e., what is created by God (2:13). Thus, it is God’s will that the governors do their duty.

²⁹ ἀγαθοποιέω is used also in Lk 6:9, 33, 35; 3 John 11. But ἀγαθοποιός is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT; κακοποιός appears only in 1 Peter in the NT (2:12, 14: 4:15).

³⁰ In addition, the admonition to “love the brotherhood” (τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε) can be seen as influenced by Rom 13:8 (“to love one another”). If this is the case, the author of 1 Peter owes all the verbs in v. 17 (“love,” “fear” and “honor”) to Rom 13:7–8.

throughout the paragraph on both a wording level and a structure level. This makes it impossible to deny the direct relationship between these texts.³¹

Moreover, both passages share a similar context—as Rom 13:1ff. is to be read as a practical application of the preceding admonition: “Do not repay anyone evil for evil but also take thought for what is honorable (προνοούμενοι καλῶ) in the sight of all” (12:17, NRSV). Similarly, the author of 1 Peter talks about obedience to authority (2:13–17) right after the admonition to “conduct yourselves honorably (τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ... ἔχοντες καλήν) among the Gentiles, so that, though they malign you as evildoers, they may see your honorable deeds” (1 Pet 2:12, NRSV). It is hardly possible to explain this agreement as coincidence of similar traditions.

The list of vices in 4:3 also reveals an acquaintance with Rom 13. The vices such as “licentiousness” (ἀσέλγεια), “desire” (ἐπιθυμία), and “revel” (κῶμος) all appear in Rom 13:13f., and “drunkenness” (οἴνοφλυγία) is equal to “drunkenness” (μέθη) in Rom 13:13. (“Carousing” [πότος] in 4:3 is a hapax legomenon in the NT, yet almost synonymous with κῶμος in Rom 13:13.)³²

3.5 1 Peter as a “Pauline” Letter

As stated above, the author of 1 Peter is acquainted with the letters of Paul and affected not only by his language but also by his moral teachings, e.g., obedience to the rulers and the list of vices.³³ Moreover, important concepts of the Pauline theology such as “grace” (χάρις), “righteousness” (δικαιοσύνη), as well as “freedom” (ἐλευθερία) appear in 1 Peter,³⁴ and the expression “in Christ” (ἐν Χριστῷ), known as a characteristic Pauline term, is seen only in 1 Peter (3:16;

³¹ It gives further support for the hypothesis of literary dependence that none of the above mentioned correspondence appears between Rom 13:1–7 and 1 Tim 2:1–3/Tit 3:1–2, where the same theme of obedience to the authority appears. In my view, both 1 Tim 2:1–3 and Tit 3:1–2 presuppose Rom 13:1–7. Cf. Tsuji (2008, pp. 99–110).

³² As Tagawa (2015, p. 318) points out, it belongs to the Pauline characteristics to refer to “idolatry” (εἰδωλολατρία, 1 Pet 4:3) in the context of the list of vices. Cf. Gal 5:20; Col 3:5.

³³ Furthermore, so-called “household codes” (German: Haustafeln) in 1 Pet 2:18–3:17 have a lot in common with those found in Deutero-Pauline letters (Col 3:18–4:1; Eph 5:22–6:9; 1 Tim 6:1–2; Tit 2:9–10); this suggests not just a common oral tradition, but an intertextual relationship between 1 Peter and (a part of) Deutero-Pauline letters, though we do not go into the details of the discussion here.

³⁴ χάρις: 1:2, 10, 13; 2:19, 20; 4:10; 5:10, 12. δικαιοσύνη: 2:24; 3:14. ἐλευθερία: 2:16.

5:10, 14) outside of the Pauline corpus.³⁵ Consequently, there is no doubt that 1 Peter is under the influence of Pauline Christianity.

It is true that the author of 1 Peter does not develop some important elements of Pauline theology such as the teachings on justification or on the Law. However, this holds also true for the Deutero-Pauline letters, i.e., in other imitations of Pauline letter,³⁶ the authors of Colossians and 2 Thessalonians do not even mention “righteousness” and neither do Ephesians or the Pastoral Letters speak of “God’s righteousness” as Paul repeatedly does. The typical Pauline term of “justification by faith” is found only in Tit 3:5–7; though even there one can discern big differences from Paul—the keyword “faith” does not appear and “righteousness” is treated like a virtue practiced by humans. Remarks on the Law and its precepts can be found in Col 2:16–17, 21–23, and Eph 2:11–15, but they are far from the theological argument that Paul developed in Gal 3.

Between the Deutero-Pauline letters and 1 Peter there are striking similarities in that they inherit ethics from Paul rather than his theology. The so-called “household codes” (see note 33) are derived from Paul’s conservative suggestions found in 1 Cor 7:21f. and 14:34f., while the admonition of obedience to the ruler (Rom 13:1–7; 1 Pet 2:13–17, see above) was inherited also by the Pastoral Letters (1 Tim 2:1–3; Tit 3:1f.).³⁷

Thus, between the Deutero-Pauline letters and 1 Peter, there are no significant differences in terms of influence of Pauline Christianity. Except for the author’s name “Peter,” 1 Peter can thus be included in the “Deutero-Pauline” letters. The question remains, however, why did the author borrow the name “Peter” rather than “Paul?”

³⁵ Cf. Schnelle (2013, p. 488).

³⁶ See also Schnelle (2013, p. 488).

³⁷ Cf. Tsuji (2008, pp. 99–110).

4 The Setting for 1 Peter

4.1 Addressee of the Letter

The destinations of 1 Peter are “Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia” (1:1). The names³⁸ listed here have a feature in common—they are the places where Paul either did not visit for his missionary activity or could not achieve success (Galatia).

Pontus is mentioned in Acts 2:9. The crowd who witnessed the Pentecost event included Jews of the Diaspora from Pontus. In addition, Priscilla and Aquila, the couple who once acted together with Paul, were from Pontus (Acts 18:2). However, nowhere is it written that they became Christian in Pontus; it is a much greater possibility that they were introduced to Christianity in Rome. Acts 2:9 does not offer evidence that Christianity had been already spread in Pontus, much less by Paul.

In Galatia, Paul conducted missionary work, but it is unlikely that he achieved the positive results that he desired. His letter to Galatians testifies that the Galatian communities were leaning towards Christianity brought there later by other missionaries and away from the Gospel preached by Paul (Gal 1:6–9). They must have felt displeased with this letter, which denounces them with a discriminating tone (cf. 3:1: “You foolish Galatians!”). Galatian communities would not have donated any contributions to the Jerusalem church that Paul collected (cf. 2 Cor 8–9).³⁹ It is interesting in this regard that, in 2 Timothy, a Crescens is said to have left Paul and gone to Galatia (2 Tim 4:10). This is of course a fiction, but even the existence of a description of a person who left Paul and went to Galatia probably suggests that Galatia was outside the sphere of Pauline Christianity when the Pastoral Letters were written (probably at the beginning of the 2nd century).

³⁸ It has been discussed, whether they designate Roman provinces or simply geographical names. However, the latter is more probable because the author treats Bithynia and Pontus as separate areas, though they were united from the 1st century BC through the 7th century AD as a Roman province. It is nothing but pure speculation that the author misunderstood the Roman provinces because of insufficient knowledge about the geography of Asia Minor (*pace* Brox, 1989, p. 26).

³⁹ This is also inferred from the fact that Paul does not refer to the Galatians in his report of the donation (Rom 15:26; 2 Cor 9:2–4). If Paul could have repaired the relations with the Galatians, he would have written about that, as is the case with the Corinthians (cf. 2 Cor).

Also Cappadocia is mentioned in Acts 2:9, but this cannot be evidence of penetration of Christianity there. Nor is the relationship of Cappadocia and Paul indicated anywhere in the NT.

Among the places enumerated in 1:1, Asia seems to have the closest relation with Paul. Paul tried to go there on the way to his second missionary journey, but was, for some reason, unsuccessful (Acts 16:6). After that, he stayed in Ephesus for a short time on the way to Jerusalem (18:18–21). Although he seems to have preached the gospel on that occasion (v. 19f.),⁴⁰ it was not until his third missionary journey that he fully developed his activity there (19:1–20). During his two-year stay (19:10), a number of people in Ephesus would surely have been affected by Paul; however, “all those living in Asia” (v. 10) is doubtlessly Luke’s exaggeration.⁴¹ Even in Ephesus, “non-Pauline” schools of Christianity had been founded before Paul (cf. Acts 18:24–19:3; see also Rev 2:1–7). That “Paul has persuaded and drawn away a considerable number of people” in Asia (Acts 19:26) is also an overstatement by Luke. In other words, Paul’s activities in Asia were virtually restricted to Ephesus (and perhaps its surroundings?). Moreover, it is highly conceivable that non-Pauline groups of Christianity were spreading in other parts of Asia in parallel with the Pauline mission. Such circumstances may be reflected in the fact that Acts 16:6 states that the Holy Spirit hindered Paul from entering Asia.

As for Bithynia, Acts also offers an interesting account: Paul and Timothy attempted to go down there from Mysia, but the “Spirit of Jesus” did not allow them (16:7). What this expression means is unknown, but, in any case, Paul could not enter and carry out his missionary plan there.

Therefore, none of the places enumerated in 1 Pet 1:1 has a close connection to Paul. In other words, this letter was addressed to the Christians living in the regions that did not belong within the sphere of Pauline Christianity. In my view, this is the very reason why the author chose the name “Peter” instead of “Paul” as a pseudonym. The real author could not attribute this letter to Paul, because it was addressed to those who were not converted through the Pauline mission. In order to convey the message of Pauline Christianity to those Christian in the “non-Pauline” regions, the author attributed this letter to Peter, the central figure of the earliest Christianity.

⁴⁰ See e.g., Witherington, 1998, p. 558.

⁴¹ Witherington (1998, p. 576): “somewhat hyperbolically.”

4.2 Silvanus and Mark (5:12f.)

1 Peter refers to Silvanus and Mark (5:12f.), who play very important roles for this letter. By connecting them with Peter, the author reveals why a letter from Peter shows influence of Pauline language and ideas as these two were known to be former co-workers of Paul.

The letter claims to have been “written through Silvanus” (διὰ Σιλουανῶ ... ἔγραψα, 5:12). This same expression appears in Acts 15:23, where the apostles and the elders are said to have “written (sc. the Apostolic Decree) through their (= Judas and Silas in v. 22) hand” (γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν), meaning that these two did not actually write the letter, but merely delivered it. Therefore, many exegetes regard Silvanus not as amanuensis (nor translator) of the letter, but as carrier.⁴²

This interpretation finds support in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, in which he uses the same expression for his letter's bearer (IgnRom 10:1; IgnPhld 11:2; IgnSm 12:1. Cf. also Polyc 14:1).⁴³ Moreover, here Silvanus is not referred to as co-sender of the letter as is the case in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, nor is he sending his regard through Peter as Mark does (1 Pet 5:13).⁴⁴ Thus, it appears appropriate to see Silvanus as carrier of this letter.⁴⁵ “I consider” (ὡς λογίζομαι), a Pauline expression for emphasizing his judgment (2 Cor 11:5; further Rom 3:28; 8:18; Phil 3:13), is then to be taken as a stamp of approval for the one who delivers this letter.

Silvanus held an important position in the Church of Jerusalem. He conveyed the Apostolic Decree to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas (Acts 15:22; in Acts, he is called “Silas”⁴⁶). After staying in Antioch, he accompanied Paul's second

⁴² E.g. Spicq (1966, pp. 177–179); Vahrenhorst (2016, p. 200); Seethaler (1986, p.65); Elliott (2000, pp. 872–875); Achtemeier (1996, p. 350).

⁴³ See Schoedel, 1985, p. 191. Elliott (2000, p. 872) gives attestations from papyrus letters.

⁴⁴ Spicq, 1966, p. 178.

⁴⁵ Goppelt (1978, p. 347) opposes this conclusion based on the following observations: (1) It is inconsistent with the account that Peter wrote this letter through Silvanus “in brief” (δι’ ὀλίγων); (2) one carrier could hardly deliver the letter by himself to all the recipients scattered in wide area of Asia; and (3) this expression can in fact also mean a writer (a letter of Bishop Dionysius of Corinth [late 2nd cent.], in Eusebius, *HE* 4.23.11). However, the expression “wrote in brief” probably refers to the content of the letter and actually means it is a short letter (to 1); it was not impossible for the carrier to actually make the rounds to the recipient locations (to 2); and the example of Dionysius can be an exception because the context makes it clear that it refers to the writer (to 3).

⁴⁶ As stated below, he is consistently called “Silvanus” in the Pauline letters. Ergo, the author of 1 Peter quite probably knew his name through them.

missionary journey (Acts 15:40; see also 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Cor 1:19). However, after that he seems to have left Paul, for he is not mentioned in Paul's subsequent letters.

The author of 1 Peter makes good use of this lack of information about him. As one of the original members of the Church of Jerusalem, Silvanus must have been acquainted with Peter. As a travelling companion of Paul (and co-sender of his letters), he was probably highly proficient in Greek and able to communicate easily with the churches named in 1:1 (at least the reader could suppose he was). The very Pauline content of the letter, as stated above, can be ascribed to Silvanus, who would have then related it to Peter. It must have been easy for the author to create the fiction that he later accompanied Peter, since his activities after Paul's second mission journey were unknown.

The same is true for Mark who is mentioned alongside Silvanus (5:13). He must be identical with John Mark who appears in Acts. If this is the case, then he is from the Church of Jerusalem (Acts 12:12). The expression "my son" (ὁ υἱός μου: 1 Pet 5:13) reflects a close relationship between them, perhaps via baptism by Peter,⁴⁷ rather than a teacher-student relationship.⁴⁸

Mark once participated in Paul's missionary journey (Acts 13:5), but later split up with him (13:13). However, according to Phlm 24, he seems to have joined Paul again. Accordingly, he seems to have stayed in Rome for a certain period.⁴⁹ Our passage goes back to the traditionally accepted belief that Mark was an interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής) and close follower of Peter (Eusebius, *HE* 3.39.15). Thus, there is no doubt that he too is mentioned here as another connecting person between Paul and Peter. In this way, the author implicitly explains the Pauline influence by slipping these names into the letter as those who seem to have brought the Pauline language and ideas to Peter.

⁴⁷ See Vahrenhorst, 2016, p. 202. In similar cases, Paul says "my child" (μου/ἐμοῦ τέκνον: 1 Cor 4:17; Phlm 10. Cf. also 1 Tim 1:2, 18; 2 Tim 1:2; 2:1; Tit 1:4); this expression appears to be kept in mind of the author of 1 Pet, though he uses τέκνον instead of υἱός, which does not make a significant difference in this case (*pace* Achtemeier, 1996, p. 355).

⁴⁸ This relationship is assumed, e.g., by Feldmeier (2005, p. 171).

⁴⁹ The Letter to Philemon was certainly written in Rome. Cf. Schnelle (2013, p. 174).

5 1 Peter as Christian “Diaspora Letter”

1 Peter represents itself as a circular letter sent from a leading figure of Christianity to the churches in the northern part of Asia Minor.

The letter follows the Jewish tradition of a “Diaspora letter,” which is addressed to communities in Diaspora from Jerusalem as the center of Judaism.⁵⁰ The author modifies, however, this letter tradition by describing his letter as being sent from “Babylon” (1 Pet 5:13) sc. land of the Exile, to believers in Diaspora. The name “Babylon” is clearly associated with “Diaspora” at the beginning of the letter (1:1) and forms an “inclusio.”⁵¹

Here “Babylon” does not mean the ancient capital of the Neo-Babylonian Empire (Matt 1:11, 12, 17[bis]; Acts 7:43). As in the Apocalypse of John (14:8; 16:19; 18:2, 10, 21), this name functions as a metaphor for Rome, superimposing the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman Army (70 AD) on the Babylonian Exile. The recipients of the letter could reasonably assume that Peter, who was formerly a representative of the Church of Jerusalem was familiar with this metaphor, which was well known through the Jewish apocalyptic literature (see 1(7) above).

1 Peter thus pretends to be a Diaspora letter that Peter in “Babylon,” sc. in the Roman Captivity,⁵² addressed to the Christians dispersed in northern Asia Minor, namely, a “letter from Diaspora to Diaspora.” This letter tradition was inherited from early Judaism to Christianity and found its successors also in James and 1 Clement. 1 Clement, in particular, is very similar to 1 Peter in that it was sent from Rome to another place of dispersion. Moreover, in 1 Clement as well as in 1 Peter, Rome is presented as a place of Diaspora (cf. 1 Clem insc.: “the church of God that sojourns [παρουκέω] in Rome”),⁵³ as well as the new center of Christianity in place of the destroyed Jerusalem. Another similarity in the letters is their expression of the dispersion using the verb *παρουκέω* (“sojourn,” cf. 1 Pet 1:17; 2:11).⁵⁴

⁵⁰ On the “Diaspora letter,” cf. Taatz (1991) and Tsuji (1997, pp. 5–50).

⁵¹ Doering, 2012, p. 444.

⁵² According to the early Christian tradition, Peter was martyred in Rome. Cf. 1 Clem 5:4.

⁵³ Diaspora letters written in other places than Jerusalem/Judea are also found in early Jewish literature: Baruch, parJer 7:24–34 (letter from Jeremiah to Baruch), 4Q389 = 4QApocJer C^d (from Jeremiah in Egypt to the Captives in Babylon, cf. *DJD XXX* 219–223). See Doering (2012, p. 432) and Horrell (2008, pp. 8–9).

⁵⁴ The relationship between 1 Peter and James/1 Clement requires further consideration. Many exegetes deny the direct literary dependence between 1 Peter and James and explain the similar expressions seen in them as deriving

This setting, however, should be treated as fictional rather than historical information on the letter. Similarly, the Petrine authorship and “Babylon” sc. Rome as the place of origin belong to a literary fiction, calling into question the Roman origin of 1 Peter. The latter possibility cannot be wholly excluded, but if that were the case, it would be difficult to explain why the real author enumerates the addressed communities instead of describing his addressees in more general way, as is seen in James, Jude, and 2 Peter. In my view, the real place of origin was likely in Asia Minor, though not necessarily in one of the areas named in 1:1.⁵⁵

6 Purpose of 1 Peter

6.1 Theme of the Epistle

As mentioned above, the author of 1 Peter was under the influence of Pauline Christianity and was, therefore, familiar enough with the Pauline letters, at least Romans (probably as part of *Corpus Paulinum*), that he could copy its wordings. For what purpose, then, did the author write a Diaspora letter attributed to Peter? In order to answer this question, we have to look back first on the subject of 1 Peter.

The basic subject of the whole letter is enduring trials and sufferings. The terms concerning this theme appear throughout the letter: “trial” (πειρασμός: 1:6; 4:12), “suffer” (πάσχω: 2:19–21, 23; 3:14, 17, 18; 4:1[bis], 15, 19; 5:10; λυπέω: 1:6), “suffering” (πάθημα: 1:11; 4:13; 5:1, 9), as well as “endure” (ὑποφέρω: 2:19; ὑπομένω: 2:20 [bis]). The author exhorts his readers to endure the sufferings they are facing because of their Christian faith (4:12–16), to accept them rather as grace from God (2:19f.), not to be conformed to desires they had before conversion (1:14; 2:11; 4:1–6), and to continue the good way of life

from a common oral tradition. But Schmidt (2013, pp. 308–309) argues for the literary dependence of 1 Peter on James. As for 1 Clement, cf. e.g. Elliott (2000, pp. 138–140), who advocates for its literary dependence on 1 Peter. However, the dependence of opposite direction is to be assumed if 1 Peter was written later than 1 Clement, which is possible.

⁵⁵ Schnelle (2013, pp. 480–481) also prefers Asia Minor to Rome because the letter was first known in the east (Pol 1:3; 2:1–2; 5:3; 7:2; 8:1–2; 10:2; Pap 2:17). According to Brox (1989, pp. 42–43), the place of origin is to be expected in Asia Minor, e.g., Antioch or Smyrna. The Pauline character of this letter, in my view, may point to a place under influence of the Pauline Christianity.

among the Gentiles as holy ones obeying the Holy who called them (1:13–16; 2:9f.).

6.2 Letter of Exhortation from Peter to the Diaspora Communities

As stated above, 1 Peter follows the tradition of the Jewish Diaspora letters, sharing a parallel content particularly to those sent from a person of prophetic authority to the Diaspora (Jer 29:11–23; EpJer; syrBar 78–86 [Letter of Baruch]). The Diaspora Letters, for example, exhorted the readers to abstain from the Gentile lifestyle and keep their Jewish faith. For instance, the letter of Jeremiah in Jer 29:1–23, which seems to have originally been an independent letter and later incorporated into the Book of Jeremiah,⁵⁶ instructs Judeans in Babylon Captivity to obey the words of the Lord and stand firm in the midst of Gentiles. The same is true for the apocryphal Letter of Jeremiah and the Letter of Baruch.

1 Peter is a “Christian version” of this letter tradition. It is a letter of exhortation from Peter, an authority of the earliest Christianity, to the “Diaspora” communities in the northern Asia Minor.⁵⁷

For this “Christian version,” the author makes a modification to the concept of “Diaspora.” The addressees are “Diaspora,” however, not in the sense of the dispersed from Jerusalem (as in the case of the Jewish Diaspora and Jas 1:1) but rather as the exiles in this world (1:1, 17; 2:11). They are dispersed from Heaven, where the inheritance is kept for them (1:4). This idea is seen also in Hebrews (11:13), though instead of the word “Diaspora,” it simply uses “sojourner” (παρεπίδημος).

6.3 Petrine Letter of Pauline Exhortation

This letter of Peter is, however, strongly influenced by Pauline language and ethics, as confirmed above in 2.4 and 2.5. The same is true for the main themes of the letter, namely suffering and endurance. The author gives exhortations according to what he learned from the Pauline letters.

The author understands the sufferings of a Christian in association with those of Christ (1 Pet 2:21–25; 4:1), which is seen already in the Pauline letters (cf. 2 Cor 1:5: “the sufferings of Christ overflow into us”). That he learned this idea

⁵⁶ Taatz, 1991, p. 47.

⁵⁷ Perhaps he knows this letter-type through James. Cf. note 54 above.

from Paul can be proved by the keywords of Pauline theology used in his instructions.

The author offers a reason to obey the ruler of this world: “(You should do right) as free men, but not as those who have freedom as pretext of evil, but as servants of God” (2:16). This is the only passage in 1 Peter where “freedom” appears. The contrast of “freedom” and “servant of God” is strongly reminiscent of Rom 6:22: “Now that you were made free from sin (ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας), and became a servant for God (δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ)” (see also Gal 5:1, 13; 2 Cor 3:17).⁵⁸ Thus, here, the author urges his readers to follow secular rulers “for the Lord (= God)” (2:13) and bases his argument on this passage of Romans.

Other expressions that reflect Romans appear in the context of 2:16. As a paradigm of enduring unjust treatments by harsh masters, the author refers to the Passion of Christ (2:21–24). In v. 24 he speaks of a contrast of sin/righteousness: “So that we, away from sins, live in righteousness,” which obviously goes back to Romans (5:17, 21; 6:12f., 16–23; 8:10). Considering that he mentions not only the contrast of “sin/righteousness” but also “death/life,”⁵⁹ the dependence on Romans 5–8 is beyond doubt.

In order to encourage the Christians—in the midst of various trials (1:6)—to keep on proving the faith in their life, the author thus presents the Passion of Christ as a paradigm, advising them to follow “his steps” (2:21). For this purpose, he incorporates the notions and wordings of the Pauline letters with which he is familiar.

⁵⁸ See also Brox (1989, p. 122).

⁵⁹ The author says in 1 Pet 2:24 not “die to sin” (ἀποθνήσκω τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) as in Rom 6:2 but rather “be away from sins” (ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογίνομαι). He probably replaced the baptismal image in Rom 6 with the expression that better suits the ethical admonition. Here the verb ἀπογίνομαι is accompanied not by a genitive of separation (which should be normally expected; cf. Blass, Debrunner and Rehkopf, 1990, §180) but by a dative of reference (as in Rom 6:2; cf. *ibid.*, §197). This implies that the author of 1 Peter simply replaced “die” (ἀποθνήσκω) of Rom 6:2 with “be away” (ἀπογίνομαι). Cf. Osborne (1983, pp. 400–401). Achtemeier (1996, pp. 202–203) discounts the direct influence of Rom 6 because of the differences of wording (ἀπογίνομαι/ἀποθνήσκω) and of the notion (lack of reference to Christ’s resurrection); as for the difference of wording, see above. Concerning the possibility that one refers to a source text without verbal quotation, cf. above on the error of Shimada and Herzer. Here the author of 1 Peter undoubtedly depends on Rom 6; thus, also correctly Beare (1970, p. 150).

7 Concluding Remarks

1 Peter was thus written as a “Petrine letter with Pauline content.” The author, who probably belonged to a Pauline school in early Christianity, arranged a circular letter addressed to church communities in the northern part of Asia Minor in order to encourage them to maintain their Christian faith despite the trials and sufferings they were facing as religious minority. The influence of Pauline notions and wordings can be found throughout the letter. In terms of its content, it should have been appropriately written as a (pseudo-) Pauline letter.

However, in my view, the author could not attribute this letter to Paul, because it is addressed to the areas where the Pauline mission had not (yet) achieved success. Therefore, he chose as its sender Peter, the central figure of the earliest Christianity, and composed a Christian Diaspora letter sent from Peter in Rome (as Babylon) to Diaspora communities.

As for the place of origin of the letter, it is more appropriate to think of Asia Minor rather than Rome (see above 3.3). The date of composition is almost impossible to determine. As the “trials” and “suffering,” which are repeatedly mentioned in the letter, seem to reflect everyday hostility and antipathy by ordinary people against Christian believers rather than a specific persecution, e.g., by Domitian (81–96 AD)⁶⁰ or by Trajan (98–117 AD),⁶¹ these factors cannot help specifying the date.⁶² As the letter of Polycarp of Smyrna (ca. between 110 and 130 AD?) seems to be dependent on 1 Peter,⁶³ the latter can probably be seen as written before the former. Judging from the fact that the author was familiar with a collection of Pauline letters (*Corpus Paulinum*), which seems to have been formed gradually in the second half of 1st century, 1 Peter is probably not to be dated too early (perhaps, the beginning of the second century AD?).

⁶⁰ In recent research, it is strongly doubted that Christians would have suffered systematic persecution under the reign of Domitian; cf. Reichert (2013, pp. 283–286). Scholars also tend to deny the traditional view that Domitian demanded the use of title “Lord and God” for himself; see Eck (1997, p. 749).

⁶¹ On the letters between Pliny the Younger and Trajan, cf. Reichert (2013, pp. 286–291).

⁶² Vahrenhorst (2013, p. 75).

⁶³ Cf. Vahrenhorst (2016, pp. 47–50).

8 Bibliography

- Achtemeier, P. J. (1996). *1 Peter*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Barnett, A. E. (1941). *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*. Chicago, IL: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Beare, F. W. (1970). *The First Epistle of Peter* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blass, F., Debrunner, A., & Rehkopf, F. (1990). *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (17th ed.). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Brox, N. (1989). *Der erste Petrusbrief* (3rd ed.). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Campbell, R. A. (1993). The Elders of the Jerusalem Church. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 44, 511–528.
- Cludius, H. H. (1808). *Ursichten des Christenthums nebst Untersuchungen über einige Bücher des neuen Testaments*. Altona: J. F. Hammerich.
- Doering, L. (2009). Apostle, Co-Elder, and Witness of Suffering: Author Construction and Peter Image in First Peter. In Frey J., Herzer J., Janßen, & Rothchild C. K. (Eds.), *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen* (pp. 645–681). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Doering, L. (2012). *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- du Toit, D. S. (Ed.). (2013). *Bedrängnis und Identität. Studien zu Situation, Kommunikation und Theologie des 1. Petrusbriefes*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.
- Eck, W. (1997). Domitianus [1], In *Der Neue Pauly* (vol. III) (pp. 746–750). Stuttgart : J. B. Metzler.
- Elliott, J. H. (2000). *1 Peter*. New York: Doubleday.
- Feldmeier, R. (2005). *Der erste Brief des Petrus*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Friedman, S. S. (1991). Weavings. Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author. In Clayton, J., & Rothstein, E. (Eds.). *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (pp. 146–180). Madison, WI: Wisconsin University Press.
- Goppelt, L. (1978). *Der erste Petrusbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Herzer, J. (1998). *Petrus oder Paulus? Studien über Verhältnis des Ersten Petrusbriefes zur paulinischen Tradition*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Holtzmann, H. J. (1892). *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (3rd ed.). Freiburg i. B.: Mohr.
- Horrell, D. (2008). *1 Peter*. London & New York: T&T Clark.
- Hunzinger, C. -H. (1965). Babylon als Deckname für Rom und die Datierung des 1. Petrusbriefes. In Reventlow, H. G. (ed.), *Gottes Wort und Gottes Land. FS H.-W. Hertzberg* (pp. 67–77). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Jobs, K. H. (2005). *1 Peter*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

William Loader, Boris Repschinski, Eric Wong (Eds.)

Matthew, Paul, and John: Asian Perspectives on New Testament Themes

© 2019 innsbruck university press, ISBN 978-3-903187-66-5, DOI 10.15203/3187-66-5

- Jülicher, A., & Fascher, E. (1931). *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (7th ed.). Tübingen: Mohr.
- Lindemann, A. (1979). *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Merz, A. (2004). Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus. Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Michaelis, J. D. (1766/1777). *Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des neuen Bundes*, zweiter Theil (2nd & 3rd eds.). Göttingen: Verlag der Wittve Vandenhoeck.
- Michl, J. (1968). *Die katholischen Briefe* (2nd ed.). Regensburg: Pustet.
- Osborne, Th. P. (1983). Guide Lines for Christian Suffering: A Source-Critical and Theological Study of 1 Peter 2.21-25. *Biblica*, 64, 381–408.
- Patillon, M. (Trans.) (2002). *Aelius Theon. Progymnasmata*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Reichert, A. (2013). Gegensätzliche Wahrnehmungen einer ambivalenten Krisensituation: Das Plinius-Trajan-Konzept, der 1. Petrusbrief und die Johannesapokalypse. In du Toit, D. S. (ed.). *Bedrängnis und Identität. Studien zu Situation, Kommunikation und Theologie des 1. Petrusbriefes* (pp. 281–302). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter. 281-302.
- Schenke, H. -M., & Fischer, K. M. (1978). *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testament*. Vol. 1: *Die Briefe des Paulus und Schriften des Paulinismus*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Schmidt, K. M. (2013). Die Gnade des Leidens. Die Positionierung des Ersten Petrusbriefes im Gegenüber zum Epheser- und zum Jakobusbrief. In du Toit, D. S. (ed.). *Bedrängnis und Identität. Studien zu Situation, Kommunikation und Theologie des 1. Petrusbriefes* (pp. 303–324). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Schnelle, U. (2013). *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (8th ed.). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schoedel, W. R. (1985). *Ignatius of Antioch*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress.
- Schrage, W. (1985). Der erste Petrusbrief. In Balz, H., & Schrage, W. (eds.). *Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Johannes und Judas* (3rd ed.) (pp. 60–121). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Seethaler, P. -A. (1986). *1. und 2. Petrusbrief/Judasbrief* (2nd ed.). Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- Selwyn, E. G. (1947). *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (2nd ed.). London: Macmillan.
- Semler, J. S. (1783). Paraphrasis in epistolam I. Petri cum Latine translationis varietate et multis notis. Halle: n.d.
- Shimada, K. (1998a). Is I Peter Dependent on Ephesians? – A Critique of C. L. Mitton –. In idem. *Studies on First Peter* (pp. 57–99). Tokyo: Kyobunkwan, 1998.
- Shimada, K. (1998b). Is I Peter Dependent on Romans? In: In idem. *Studies on First Peter* (pp. 100–166). Tokyo: Kyobunkwan, 1998.
- Spicq, C. (1966). *Les Épîtres de Pierre*. Paris: Gabalda.

- Taatz, I. (1991). *Frühjüdische Briefe*. Freiburg [CH]: Universitätsverlag, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Tagawa, K. (2015). *New Testament: Translation and Notes* (Vol. 6). Tokyo: Sakuhin-sha. [Japanese]
- Thiede, C. P. (1986). Babylon, der andere Ort: Anmerkungen zu 1 Petr 5,13 und Apg 12,17. *Biblica*, 67, 32–538.
- Tsuchida, T. (2000). *Strategy of Intertextuality*. Tokyo: Natsume Shobô. [Japanese]
- Tsuji, M. (1997). Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Tsuji, M. (2008). Die Intertextualität von 1 Tim 2,1-3/Tit 3,1-2. In Lampe, P., Mayordomo, M., & Sato, M. (Eds.), *Neutestamentliche Exegese im Dialog: Hermeneutik – Wirkungsgeschichte – Matthäusevangelium*. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Ulrich Luz (pp. 99–110). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Vahrenhorst, M. (2013). Leiden als Gnade. Zum realen Hintergrund einer theologischen Deutung. In du Toit, D. S. (Ed.), *Bedrängnis und Identität. Studien zu Situation, Kommunikation und Theologie des 1. Petrusbriefes* (pp. 61–78). Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.
- Vahrenhorst, M. (2016). *Der erste Brief des Petrus*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Walker, W. O. (1985). Acts and the Pauline Corpus Reconsidered. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 24, 3–23.
- Wilckens, U. (1974). Römer 13,1–7. In idem. *Rechtfertigung als Freiheit. Paulusstudien* (pp. 203–245). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Witherington, B. (1998). *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.