

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

---

Pauline Heritage in 1 Peter : A Study of Literary Dependence in  
p̄y 1 P e t e r 2 : 1 3 2 5

Aejmelaeus, Anneli

Finnish Exegetical Society  
2011

---

Aejmelaeus , A 2011 , Pauline Heritage in 1 Peter : A Study of Literary Dependence in 1  
p̄y P e t e r 2 : 1 3 2 5 . in K Liljeström (ed.) , The Early Reception of Paul . P  
Finnish Exegetical Society , vol. 99 , Finnish Exegetical Society , Helsinki , pp. 125-147 .

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/217498>

---

unspecified  
publishedVersion

---

*Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.*

*This is an electronic reprint of the original article.*

*This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.*

*Please cite the original version.*

ANNELI AEJMELAEUS

## Pauline Heritage in 1 Peter

### A Study of Literary Dependence in 1 Peter 2:13–25

Reading the First Epistle of Peter may give an attentive reader the peculiar impression of perceiving behind the text the figure of Paul and not of Peter. Many phrases in the epistle are reminiscent of phrases used by Paul, and many thoughts seem very Pauline, although, on the other hand, the formulations may be independent and original. What could be the reason for 1 Peter's Pauline emphases? Could it be a question of literary dependence on Paul's epistles?

A glance at a few commentaries on 1 Peter shows that I am not alone in my impression. Whether or not 1 Peter is dependent on Paul's epistles, or even to be seen as upholding Pauline heritage, is a question discussed in all commentaries—in fact, an issue passionately debated over the centuries.<sup>1</sup> There is, however, no consensus on the issue, at least not on the origins of the Pauline expressions and emphases.<sup>2</sup> Some scholars use much space and resources in dealing with the issue, but only to prove that the resemblances between the epistles of Paul and 1 Peter do not signify literary dependence.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For a short history of research, see Herzer 1998, 2–11.

<sup>2</sup> Against literary dependence on Pauline and Deuteropauline epistles are for instance: Goppelt 1978, 48–51 (sees the origin of 1 Peter in an ecclesiastical tradition that was “von Paulus zwar beeinflusst, aber nicht geprägt”); Brox 1993, 47–51 (claims that in spite of close connections, there is no literary dependence); Elliott 2000, esp. 37–40 (explains the similarities by “a broad stream of early Christian tradition”).

<sup>3</sup> Herzer (1998), who has written the only monograph dealing with the issue so far, begins by referring to “berechtigten Zweifel” (p. 1) and comes to a negative conclusion (p. 257–269);

To associate an epistle that circulates under the name of Peter with the heritage of Paul can at first seem strange at the least. In the sphere of the early church Peter and Paul are usually seen as representing two different parties: the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians. While committing himself to preaching the gospel to non-Jews, without the full obligation of law obedience, Paul himself reports that he had a serious conflict with Peter (Gal 2:14). One would expect to find some traces of such differences and conflicts in 1 Peter, rather than Pauline emphases.

Some traces of the conflict should naturally be visible if 1 Peter actually originated from Peter himself. The fact that 1 Peter is a pseudepigraph, composed by a learned Christian writer who lived around the turn of the first to the second century no longer needs to be argued.<sup>4</sup> The writer reveals himself by his excellent Greek, a literary style that surpasses even Paul's, and that could not be expected from Peter the Galilean. Using the name of Peter, he perhaps wanted to create a literary memorial to the first apostle, to be included in the emerging collection of Christian Scriptures. As substance for the memorial, this writer—working from a distance of two generations—does not seem to have had any significant Petrine heritage or message, no authentic impression of how Peter, in particular, had taught Christianity. In what follows I wish to discuss, on the basis of an example from the text itself, the relation between 1 Peter and the Pauline heritage. Before proceeding to the actual issue, however, a few principles need to be clarified.

## Literary Dependence and Intertextuality

Literary dependence has been on the agenda of biblical studies as long as there has been historical-critical exegesis. To recognize a more extensive quotation of another known text by a biblical writer is hardly a problem, but the definition of or criteria for shorter excerpts, allusions, and echoes—or the lack of such criteria—divide the opinions of scholars, and in the conclusions drawn from the evidence there is, if possible, still less agreement.<sup>5</sup> The current trend of recognizing the intertextual character of all texts, due to the impact of general literary theory on exegetical methodology, offers welcome new grounds for the discussion. It is no longer a matter of a black-and-white decision whether one writer copied another—a decision with possibly unfavourable connotations—but rather of an attempt to observe all the shades and colours of the literary and ideological contexts which each writer necessarily lives in, reacts to in his writing, and draws his concepts from. In exegesis, the application of the concept of intertextuality needs to be limited to the historical aspect, but even with this limitation, it has proved to be a fruitful complement to the exegetical approach.<sup>6</sup>

As for the possible Pauline influence on 1 Peter, it is logical to assume that this influence predominantly originated from Paul's epistles directly or indirectly; in one way or another. Dependence on a literary source can be detected by comparing vocabulary and expressions. A sufficient number of words—preferably combined in a somewhat unusual manner—shared by two texts almost assuredly implies mutual dependence. This type of research has been conducted especially on the relationship between Paul's authentic epistles and the so-called Deuteropauline epistles (Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1–2 Timo-

Shimada (1991 and 1993), who seems to have influenced Herzer and many others, shows a strong tendency to disprove any literary dependence.

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, Schnelle 1994, 456–458, 472. Shimada (1991, 77) connects the question of literary dependence with the question of authenticity: refutation of literary dependence thus works for him as defense of Petrine authorship (esp. note 1).

<sup>5</sup> Shimada (1993, 90) defines literary dependence as “a *conscious* effort on the side of the alleged borrower (in our case Peter[sic!]) to make the quotation or reference look very much like the original text (in our case, Romans).” Out of these premises the outcome of the investigation cannot be anything but negative.

<sup>6</sup> For the application of the concept of intertextuality in exegetical research, see Hayes 1989, 14–21; A. Aejmelaeus 2005, 475–478; Lincicum 2010, 9–11.

thy, Titus),<sup>7</sup> or when researching the question of whether the writer of Acts had used Paul's epistles as his sources.<sup>8</sup>

An interesting discussion of the methodology to be used in detecting literary dependence can be found in E.P. Sanders' already classic article "Literary Dependence in Colossians" that deals with the dependence of Colossians on the authentic Pauline epistles.<sup>9</sup> In order for literary dependence to be demonstrated, according to Sanders, it is necessary that two texts show a *verbatim* correspondence of at least three words—in some cases two very rare words—in a rather limited context. Sanders also considers quoting from memory to represent literary dependence, but merely the use of the same established phrases or terms should not be confused with literary dependence. Heuristically most valuable I find Sanders' insights concerning the probability of literary dependence, which increases (1) if the quotation combines several, to some extent parallel passages, (2) if the quotation has been applied to a new situation, i.e. its context differs from the original, and (3) if the focus of the receiving text differs from that of the model text.<sup>10</sup> In addition, it should be noted that hardly any single quotation can by itself prove literary dependence beyond doubt. However, the weight of the evidence increases the more parallel references there are, i.e., it is cumulative.<sup>11</sup>

In the case of 1 Peter, however, the configuration is fundamentally different from the so-called Deuteropauline epistles. The epistles written under Paul's name deliberately aspire after as genuine Pauline phraseology as possible.<sup>12</sup> Pauline heritage is what these writers—each with his own emphases—clearly wish to, and do, uphold. For them, Paul represents definite theological authority. In their literary formulations

<sup>7</sup> For instance, O. Leppä 2003.

<sup>8</sup> For instance, L. Aejmelaeus 1987.

<sup>9</sup> Sanders 1966.

<sup>10</sup> The argumentation of those who reject the literary dependence of 1 Peter on Pauline literature often sounds, as if the question was whether Paul had been the author of 1 Peter.

<sup>11</sup> Demanding proof with "no room for any reasonable doubt," like Shimada (1991, 106) poorly combines with the character of this inquiry.

<sup>12</sup> See, for instance, O. Leppä (2003, 54) who, following Sanders' methodology, reasonably concentrates in her study of Colossians on *verbatim* agreements with other writings.

they attempt to give an impression of Paul's authentic hand, and this they accomplish by using his authentic epistles as actual models.

It cannot be assumed, however, that the writer of 1 Peter deliberately attempted to reproduce Pauline phrases and emphases.<sup>13</sup> To the contrary, one would think that he would try to conceal any dependence on Paul. In any case, literary dependence cannot be expected to appear in the same way as in the Deuteropauline epistles, as completely identical phrases and trains of thought. For this reason, the criteria of literary dependence need to be adjusted and broadened in the direction of the intertextual approach. The occurrence of the same ideas or images in new formulations should be taken into account.<sup>14</sup> An intertextual connection may also find its realization in a reaction, corrective or complement, to a previous text. The relative rarity of an idea, image, or concept, shared or discussed by two texts, as well as the paucity of texts that could have served as intertexts, enhances the probability of such a connection. Intertextuality in a broader sense could also include the general impact of Pauline theology on Christian teaching, but this kind of influence should clearly be distinguished from literary connections. Even if the intertextual approach rightly pays more attention to the content and message of the texts, the probability of literary dependence is, of course, increased by shared vocabulary and formal features, and even more so by the accumulation of references to one and the same intertext.

<sup>13</sup> As for instance Achtemeier (1996, 19) points out, there is no "deliberate attempt to theologize in the Pauline mode, or to defend Paulinism..." This does not, however, exclude literary dependence. Even if the differences were more significant than the similarities, as Achtemeier maintains, it does not follow that the writer was not at all influenced by his alleged sources.

<sup>14</sup> For the ideal of a historian not to copy his sources *verbatim*, which can be observed in Acts, see L. Aejmelaeus 1987, 96–97.

## Literary Connections to the "Household Codes"

I decided to test my general impression of 1 Peter by studying one passage more closely, namely 2:13–25. It begins a section that is often considered to comprise a "household code," i.e., Christian behavioral instructions to different groups of people (2:11–3:12). Also, the quotation of Isa 53 to support, as it seems, the instructions to slaves makes this passage especially interesting. The use of a central Christological testimony in such a context raises the question of whether this can be considered a "household code" at all.

The common thread running through the alleged "household code" seems to be *submission*. The first point is submission to authorities (2:13), which is reminiscent of the beginning of Rom 13. The number of mutual expressions is indisputable and certainly fulfills Sanders' criteria. Particularly the expression used of the authorities, ὑπερέχω 'to be above,' 'to be prominent,' 'to have power,' occurs in the New Testament only in these two passages (Rom 13:1, 1 Pet 2:13).<sup>15</sup> The verb ὑποτάσσομαι 'to submit,' 'to be subservient' occurs solely in Rom 13:1, 5; 1 Pet 2:13 and Titus 3:1 with regard to authorities, whereas it is used with regard to husbands or masters in the "household codes" in Eph 5:21, 24; Col 3:18; Titus 2:5, 9 as well as in 1 Pet 2:18; 3:1, 5; 5:5.

Likewise when expressing that the authorities give thanks (ἔπαινος) to those who do good and punish evildoers, 1 Pet 2:14 is clearly connected to the wording of Rom 13:3–4. A consideration of the surrounding verses reveals further parallels. Paul's mention of συνείδησις 'conscience' in Rom 13:5 can be seen as reflected in 1 Pet 2:19. Paul's summary in Rom 13:7–8 τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν 'fear to whom fear is due, honour to whom honour is due' and his exhortation for a mutual debt of love may well have inspired the summary in 1 Pet 2:17: πάντας τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε, τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε 'honour everyone, love the brotherhood, fear God, honour the

emperor.' Similarly Titus 3:1 seems to be dependent on Rom 13, but there is no discernible connection between Titus 3 and 1 Pet 2.

## Applying Tradition to a New Situation

The literary dependence of 1 Pet 2 on Rom 13 seems to be clear.<sup>16</sup> At the same time it can be detected that, due to the historical situation, the writer of 1 Peter has a different relationship to authority than Paul.<sup>17</sup> He seems to criticize Paul's notion of the divine origin of authority, though he does this respectfully as if between the lines. In democratic terms, he refers to ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις "human institutions" (κτίσις primarily means 'founding,' 'settling') and thus brings authority down from the pedestal of divine enactment (cf. Rom 13:1). The plural noun ἐξουσίαι 'powers,' 'authorities,' which Paul uses in Rom 13:1 (cf. Titus 3:1), is also not used by 1 Peter, possibly because after Paul the word was strongly attached to demonic "powers," so also in 1 Pet 3:22.<sup>18</sup>

"For the Lord's sake" is, however, still the basis for submission. But 1 Peter does not give the title "servant of God" to the authorities (Rom 13:4 twice θεοῦ διάκονος), but to Christian subjects (2:16 θεοῦ δούλοι). The will of God is carried out by the subjects who do good (2:15), not by the authorities. This is consistent with the overall negative experience with worldly governments that looms in the background of the letter. Submission means suffering, and yet—or perhaps for that very reason—one must submit, for it is the will of God.

According to Paul, submission ought not to be motivated by fear or force alone but by the conscience (Rom 13:5), and according to 1 Peter, it should be done voluntarily, not as servants of men but of God, ὡς ἐλεύθεροι 'as free people' (2:16). The word "free" reminded the

<sup>16</sup> For instance, Lohse (1959, 73–74) explains the similarities by common tradition.

<sup>17</sup> See also Achtemeier 1996, 188.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Eph 3:10, 6:12, Col 1:16, 2:15 (in Eph 1:21, 2:2; Col 1:13, 2:10 the singular is used in the same sense).

<sup>15</sup> The corresponding noun ὑπεροχή is found in 1 Tim 2:2.

writer of the problem of the misuse of freedom, which is dealt with in another epistle by Paul. Although the two verses

Gal 5:13 μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῆ σαρκί

only do not use your freedom as an *opportunity for the flesh*

1 Pet 2:16 μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν

not using your freedom as a *cover-up for evil*

express the misuse of freedom in completely different terms, the connection in the line of thought is indisputable. It is hardly coincidental that both contexts also employ the otherwise unusual form ἐκλήθητε 'you were called':

Gal 5:13 ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε

you were called to freedom

1 Pet 2:21 εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε

to this you have been called' (cf. 1 Pet 3:9).<sup>19</sup>

On the other hand, the idea that Christians are free and servants of God occurs also in Rom 6:22 (ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ 'having been set free from sin and become slaves of God'), a passage that must be referred to again later.

It seems as if the writer of 1 Peter combined different passages from Paul's epistles and applied them to a new situation. Particularly with regard to the teaching on authority, the aim of the text can be said to be different from that of Paul. According to Sanders' criteria, these independent features—contrary to the common opinion—increase the probability of literary dependence.

<sup>19</sup> The form also occurs in 1 Cor 1:9; Eph 4:1, 4; Col 3:15, but not in reference to the way of life of Christians as in 1 Peter.

## Does the Writer Aim at a "Household Code"?

The next theme to be taken up in 1 Pet 2:18 is slaves, differentiated from "servants of God" (θεοῦ δοῦλοι) by the use of another Greek word (οἱ οἰκέται)<sup>20</sup>. The question here is: What does the writer actually intend to say, to exhort slaves or make a statement about them? The participial form used here (ὑποτασσόμενοι 'submitting') does not as such express a command, nor is it connected to any verb in the imperative in the context.<sup>21</sup> 1 Peter is notorious for its difficult use of participles, but in most cases they are accompanied by a main verb in the context by which they can be interpreted. In the context of the alleged "household code", however, there are several participles without main verbs (cf. 1 Pet 3:1, 7). The problem of the verbal forms is intertwined with the broader problem of content: whether 1 Peter is primarily focusing on something other than giving behavioural instructions to different groups of people.

A literary connection to the "household codes," especially to the corresponding passage in Eph 5–6, clearly does exist.<sup>22</sup> The writer begins with a tone of exhortation:

1 Pet 2:11 Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους...

Beloved, I urge you as sojourners... (cf. Eph 4:1).

He takes up for discussion the various relationships between authority and subjects (2:13–17), slaves and masters (2:18–20), wives and husbands (3:1–7), and finally addresses all at once (3:8–12). A further connection to the "household codes" can be seen in the use of the verb "to submit," particularly in the form of a participle, as in Eph 5:21 and 1

<sup>20</sup> In the New Testament, οἰκέτης is rare, occurring additionally only in Luke 16:13, Acts 10:7, and Rom 14:4, whereas it is fairly frequent in the Septuagint, particularly in the Pentateuch and the wisdom writings, with a total of 56 occurrences.

<sup>21</sup> Achtemeier (1996, 194) does not convince by his suggestion that the participle is connected with the preceding imperatives.

<sup>22</sup> Shimada (1991, 103) explains the similarities by "the existence of a kind of moral code pertaining to a household standing behind all these passages"; the differences found by him, however, exclude direct dependence of 1 Peter on Ephesians.

Pet 2:18, 3:1.<sup>23</sup> Other similarities in the wording of the exhortations to submit (ἐν φόβῳ/μετὰ φόβου 'with fear' Eph 5:21, 6:5; 1 Pet 2:18, 3:2; τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν '(your) own husbands' Eph 5:22; 1 Pet 3:1, 5; cf. Titus 2:5) and the similar content as well as grammatical structure in the following general admonitions in 1 Pet 3 and Rom 12 corroborate the case.<sup>24</sup>

Rom 12:14–17 εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας [ὑμᾶς], εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε. <sup>15</sup> χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαίωντων.

<sup>16</sup> τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονούντες, μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονούντες ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς. <sup>17</sup> μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες

Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse them.

<sup>15</sup> Rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who weep. <sup>16</sup> Live in harmony with one another. Do not be haughty, but associate with the lowly. Never be wise in your own sight. <sup>17</sup> Repay no one evil for evil...

1 Pet 3:8–9 Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχνοί, ταπεινόφρονες, <sup>9</sup> μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας, τούναντίον δὲ εὐλογούντες ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε.

Finally, all of you, have unity of mind, sympathy, brotherly love, a tender heart, and a humble mind. <sup>9</sup> Do not repay evil for evil or reviling for reviling, but on the contrary, bless, for to this you were called, that you may obtain a blessing.

<sup>23</sup> Titus 2:5 also employs the participial form, showing a connection with Eph 5:21 but not directly with 1 Peter. The parallel in Col 3:18 uses the verb in the imperative.

<sup>24</sup> A connection between Eph 4:32 and 1 Pet 4:32 can be seen in εὐσπλαγχνοί which on the other hand functions, together with συμπαθεῖς, as a summary expression for Rom 12:15. Even in the case of the parallel between 1 Pet 3:9 and Rom 12:17, Shimada (1993, 123), admitting that "the ideas are almost identical," emphasizes the difference in word-order and concludes that "in view of the numerous differences...it seems unnatural to suppose that Peter [sic] picked up this idea alone without any other traces of literary dependence." According to Lohse (1959, 74) 1 Pet 3:9 takes up a "Herrenwort" (Matt 5:39, 44, Luke 6:27–28).

The dependence of 1 Peter on the "household code" in Eph 5–6 and genuine Pauline exhortations in Rom 12–13 is obvious.

Nevertheless, the main purpose of this passage in 1 Peter does not seem to be the mere bestowal of rules of conduct on the various groups of people after all. For example, children are not mentioned at all, masters do not receive any encouragement, and husbands get by easily compared to slaves and wives. Above all, the appeal to the example of Christ would rather seem to refer to all Christians, not just slaves. The common interpretation that slaves, being quite often unjustly treated, were in need of special encouragement is completely misleading. The main concern in 1 Peter is in fact that Christians, not only slaves, have to suffer.<sup>25</sup>

Thus, despite its outward appearance, the passage at hand does not primarily aim at a "household code." Its essential point of interest is submission, especially submission to innocent suffering and the blessing that accompanies it. The writer only pays attention to parties that must submit. Especially the wives of non-Christian men are an example of how submission and holding on to the Christian way of life can further the cause of the gospel. Suffering for the sake of one's conscience, as a servant of God and as a benefactor, is χάρις 'grace' (2:19, 20).<sup>26</sup> This is what Christians are called to (2:21).

The mention of slaves who submit to their masters, "not only to the good and gentle but also to the unjust," seems to have a double meaning: it can be viewed as a kind of example,<sup>27</sup> and at the same time, it is a hint that even state authorities can be unjust—something not to be said directly.<sup>28</sup> Since slaves indiscriminately serve both good and bad masters, neither should Christian subjects discriminate between good and bad authorities but in every case do good and submit. Eager to get on with his discourse, the writer leaves the sentence incomplete—a par-

<sup>25</sup> The use of τις in v. 19 already takes the discourse to a more general level.

<sup>26</sup> According to Feldmeier (2005, 114–115) there is a shift in the meaning of the word χάρις towards 'credit,' which is found, e.g., in Luke 6:32, 33, 34; 2 Clem. 13.4.

<sup>27</sup> Achtemeier 1996, 192, 194.

<sup>28</sup> Compare the code name Babylon in 1 Pet 5:13.

ticiple without a main verb—so that the passage may be interpreted, not necessarily as an exhortation, but as a statement:

1 Pet 2:18 Οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις...

(As you know) slaves (usually) submit with all fear to their masters...

The following vv. 19–20 already pertain to all Christians, making a distinction between a deserved punishment and innocent suffering, and reveal the writer's specific point.

1 Pet 2:20 ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἀμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιούντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ.

For what credit is it if, when you sin and are beaten for it, you endure? But if when you do good and suffer for it you endure, this is grace in the sight of God.

Among the expressions employed in this passage there is one more that is worth mentioning: *κολαφίζω* 'to beat,' 'to buffet,' a word used by Paul of his own suffering and one appearing in the passion narrative as well (1 Cor 4:11; 2 Cor 12:7; Matt 26:67; Mark 14:65).

### "The Suffering Servant of the Lord" as an Example for Those Suffering

That Christians are called to suffer is motivated by the writer with Christ's example. The passage discussing this theme (2:21–25) reveals connections in many different directions. First of all, attention is drawn to the quotations from several verses of the prophecy of "the suffering servant of the Lord" (Isa 53) according to the Septuagint. Since the quotations are embedded within the text and the whole passage gives a poetic impression, most scholars since Bultmann have considered this to

be a fragment of an early Christian hymn.<sup>29</sup> However, there is no agreement on which parts of the text derive from the hymn and which more probably represent the writer's own comments. On the one hand, Nestle's 26<sup>th</sup> edition arranges the whole passage (vv. 21–25) as verse, whereas Bultmann, on the other hand, reconstructs the hymn in the following manner, attaching importance to the relative pronouns, which are typical of hymnic style in the Greek Bible:<sup>30</sup>

(Χριστός) ὃς ἐπαθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν...

(Christ) *who* suffered for us...

<sup>22</sup> ὃς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν

<sup>22</sup> who "committed no sin,

οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ

and in his mouth no deceit was

στόματι αὐτοῦ,

found,"

<sup>23</sup> ὃς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ

<sup>23</sup> who, when he was reviled, did not

ἀντελοιδόρει, πάσχων οὐκ

revile in return, when he suffered,

ἠπειλεῖ, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ

did not threaten, but entrusted

κρίνοντι δικαίως.

himself to the one who

<sup>24</sup> ὃς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν

judges justly;

αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ

<sup>24</sup> who "himself bore our sins"

σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον,

in his body on the tree,

ἵνα ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις

so that we might die to sins

ἀπογενόμενοι

and live to righteousness,

τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν,

by whose "wounds *we* have been

οὐ τῷ μῶλωπι *ιάθημεν*.

healed".

Whether it is in actual fact a question of quoting an early Christian hymn or of independent, direct quotation of the book of Isaiah is difficult to determine because the writer of 1 Peter also seems capable of scattering Old Testament excerpts within his own text (e.g. 2:4–10). As a skilled writer he might have been able to compose in poetic form as well.

<sup>29</sup> Bultmann 1967, 295–297.

<sup>30</sup> Bultmann 1967, 296. The 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural forms that were changed by Bultmann to 1<sup>st</sup> person plural forms as well as the added relative pronoun are printed in *italics* and the omitted words are marked with three dots in the reconstruction.



Nevertheless, the hypothesis of an early Christian hymn has gained much support.<sup>31</sup> The following points have been used as arguments for it. The allegedly quoted hymn is concerned with the vicarious suffering of Christ, "bearing others' sins", and not with enduring suffering as the present context is. In 1 Peter, Isa 53 is applied in a secondary manner, whereas in the supposed hymn it would have been used in its primary Christological function, as a Scriptural testimony to the meaning of Christ's death "for us." The formulation in the first person plural, which would have most likely been used throughout the hymn, remains in the main part of v. 24, whereas the second person plural (vv. 21, 24 [final phrase], 25) seems to modify the quotation to fit the context of addressing the readers.<sup>32</sup> The unnecessary continuation of the quotation beyond the needs of the context might further indicate indirect quotation of the Biblical text through the hymn.

Problematic for the hymn hypothesis, however, is v. 25, which continues to quote Isa 53, but is generally no longer considered as part of the hymn. The reason for this is the obvious prose form of the verse:

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

For you were "going astray like sheep", but now you have returned to the shepherd and guardian of your souls.

The lack of a reference to the "Scriptures" also seems to suggest an indirect quotation rather than the use of the book of Isaiah. One way or another, the writer must have acquired from the tradition the way of reading Isa 53 as a narrative of Christ's passion. At the time of writing, the application of Isa 53 as a Christological testimony must have already been standard procedure; the writer did not have to find the Bib-

<sup>31</sup> For instance, Goppelt 1978, 205–207; Brox 1993, 129, 134; Schweizer 1998, 55.

<sup>32</sup> Bultmann (1967, 295) argues for the hymn hypothesis with the alternation between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person, the meaninglessness of vicarious suffering in the context, and with the liturgical style. According to Achtemeier (1996, 192–193), these details are "part of the author's own strategy."

lical passage for his own purpose.<sup>33</sup> The mention of Christians being "called to suffer" must have functioned as a catch-word, which occasioned the quotation on Christ's suffering. The unique expression "to suffer for" (v. 21)—instead of "to die for"—however, raises some questions: Was it part of the tradition received by the writer or rather occasioned by the context and thus created by the writer?<sup>34</sup>

### An Existing Hymn or the Writer's Own Creation?

In order to form a justified opinion on the hymn hypothesis, we must look more closely at the text surrounding the quotations from Isa 53 and attempt to determine which parts could possibly originate from the writer and which presuppose quotation of an existing hymn.

According to most scholars, the writer's hand is to be detected in the prose appeal to the example of Christ v. 21:

...ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς  
ἰχνεσιν αὐτοῦ

...leaving you an example, so that you might follow in his steps

<sup>33</sup> Elliott (2000, 548–549), although giving up his earlier acceptance of the hymnic theory, sees in 1 Pet 2:21–25 the earliest proof of the identification of Jesus with the "suffering servant", and regards the combination of vicarious suffering with Isa 53 as a unique contribution of 1 Peter and a specifically Petrine theme. It should not, however, be forgotten that in 1 Cor 15:3 the earliest writer of the New Testament refers to the tradition when he writes that "Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures," using a creedal formulation already combining Christ's *vicarious death* with the "suffering servant" of Isa 53. Even if 1 Peter is to be credited with the coinage of *vicarious suffering* (see following note), it is only a question of varying expressions for the same notion. See A. Aemelaus 2005, 478–484, 491.

<sup>34</sup> Although it is customary to speak of the "passion" of Christ, the verb *πάσχω* is not yet used as a standard expression for it in the New Testament. It occurs in the synoptic passion predictions and especially in Luke-Acts (Matt 17:12, Mark 8:31; 9:21, Luke 9:22; 17:25; 22:15; 24:26, 46; Acts 1:3; 3:18; 17:3), but is not used by Paul (who, nevertheless, speaks of Christians suffering for Christ; Phil 1:29). 1 Peter seems to be the first to coin the expression of vicarious suffering (1 Pet 2:21; 3:18; in both cases the variant *ἀπέθανεν* is clearly secondary). The obvious reason for this coinage was that the verb *πάσχω* enabled the parallelization of the suffering of the Christians under persecution with Christ's suffering and death (see also Schweizer 1998, 57). Cf. 2 Clem. 1.2, Barn. 5.5; 7.5; Ign. Smyrn. 2.1; Mart. Pol. 17.2; Pol. Phil. 8.1–2, which is clearly dependent on 1 Pet 2, uses similarly the verb *ὑπομένω*.

The word ὑπογραμμός, 'example,' 'model,' used here, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. In the First Epistle of Clement, however, it occurs three times (*1 Clem.* 5:7, 16:17, 33:8).<sup>35</sup> It is hardly coincidental that *1 Clem.* 16:17 speaks of the "example" given by Christ after a full and *verbatim* quotation of Isa 53 as well as Ps 22(21):7–9:

*1 Clem.* 16:17 ὁρᾶτε, ἄνδρες ἀγαπητοί, τίς ὁ ὑπογραμμός ὁ δεδομένος ἡμῖν· εἰ γὰρ ὁ κύριος οὕτως ἐταπεινοφρόνησεν, τί ποιήσωμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐλθόντες;

You see, beloved, what is the example which has been given us; for if the Lord thus humbled Himself, what shall we do who have through Him come under the yoke of His grace?

For *1 Clement*, however, Christ's example was not primarily one of "suffering" but of "humility," and specifically, to be followed by the leaders of the congregation.<sup>36</sup> The quotation of Isa 53 clearly stands out in 1 Pet 2:22 and 24:

ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ (v. 22—Isa 53:9 ἀνομίαν)<sup>37</sup>  
τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν (v. 24—Isa 53:12 αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν; 53:4 τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει)

In v. 23, however, there is no direct quotation of the Old Testament, although both the expressions πάσχων οὐκ ἠπειλεί 'when he suffered, he did not threaten' and λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδορεῖ 'when he was reviled, he did not revile in return' are in a way parallel to Isa 53:7 ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη καὶ ὡς ἀμνός

ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ 'like a sheep he was led to the slaughter, and as a lamb is silent before the one shearing it, so he does not open his mouth,' which was apparently connected to the mention of Jesus' silence in the passion narrative. A further source of inspiration might have been the mocking crowd of Ps 22(21):8–9, which is also reflected in the passion narrative.<sup>38</sup>

However, the word λοιδορέω 'to revile,' which is a rare word, points in another direction. The corresponding noun λοιδορία appears again in the summary admonitions in 3:9 when the writer advises the repaying of "reviling with blessing", i.e., it seems to be determined by the context of the writer. As Paul uses the same word combination λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν 'when reviled, we bless' in 1 Cor 4:12,<sup>39</sup> it again seems to be a question of Pauline phraseology, if not direct literary dependence. This particular passage must have been especially interesting to the writer because in 1 Cor 4:9–13 Paul lists afflictions that he has himself suffered.<sup>40</sup>

Thus, the origin of v. 23 as part of the hymn is not entirely convincing. It rather seems as if the writer, in the spirit of Isa 53 and in order to emphasize his own message, has created "refrains" to the preceding quotation.<sup>41</sup> According to the exegesis given in these "refrains," the silence of Christ in his passion meant suppressing natural human reactions, such as reviling and threatening. However, if the hymn did not include the lines with reviling and threatening, then the third line that logically follows can hardly be regarded as part of the hymn either.<sup>42</sup> The expression παρεδίδου 'he trusted his cause' is faintly reminiscent of παρεδόθη 'he was delivered' in Isa 53:12.

In v. 24, the quotation "he himself bore our sins" is complemented by ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον 'in his body on the tree.' Reference to the body of Christ—other than in metaphorical con-

<sup>35</sup> The word also occurs in Pol. *Phil.* 8:2, being, however, dependent on 1 Peter.

<sup>36</sup> As for ἵχνη 'footsteps,' the only other instances are found in two Pauline passages (Rom 4:12, 2 Cor 12:18), but in this case the criteria for literary dependence are not fulfilled.

<sup>37</sup> The word ἀνομία does not occur in 1 Peter, nor does any of its cognates. See Achtemeier 1996, 200.

<sup>38</sup> N.B. that Ps 22(21):8–9 is quoted in *1 Clem.* 16.15–16 after Isa 53.

<sup>39</sup> N.B. the formulation with the same participle + a finite verb 1 Pet 2:23.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. κολαφίζω "to beat" 1 Cor 4:11 par. 1 Pet 2:20.

<sup>41</sup> Bultmann (1967, 298) considered the possibility that the writer would have formulated one of the three cola in v. 23, or perhaps even the whole verse.

<sup>42</sup> According to Achtemeier (1996, 201), v. 23 is "a composition of the writer himself."

texts—is not particularly common (cf. Rom 7:4, Col 1:22, Heb 10:10; Pol. *Phil.* 8.1), and the word “tree” with the meaning of the cross occurs in the New Testament only in Acts 5:30, 10:39 and 13:29.<sup>43</sup> The complement thus does not represent Pauline phraseology, but nevertheless functions as a connecting link to the following genuinely Pauline phrases “die to sin” and “live to righteousness,” which clearly reflect Paul’s discussion of the communion of Christians with Christ sealed in baptism (Rom 6). According to Paul, a Christian is baptized into “the death of Christ,” in order to also partake of the resurrection and live a new life as a servant of righteousness. 1 Pet 2:24 seems to refer primarily to Rom 6:2, 11 and 18, without however quoting Paul’s exact words.<sup>44</sup> However, even Paul varies his expression:

οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ... we who died to sin... (v. 2)  
 οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ  
 ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ so you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and  
 alive to God (v. 11)  
 ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ  
 having been set free from sin, you have become slaves of righteousness (v. 18)

The formulation of 1 Peter can be considered as a sort of medial solution.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup> Schweizer (1998, 60) refers to the shameful death on the cross in the Greco-Roman context.

<sup>44</sup> For instance, the rare verb ἀπογίνομαι ‘to die’ used by 1 Peter, does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament.

<sup>45</sup> For instance, Lohse 1959, 70; Feldmeier (2005, 117–118) sees a shift of emphasis from Pauline justification to ethics in 1 Peter.

## The Relationship to Pauline Tradition

Attempts have been made to disprove the dependence of 1 Peter on Rom 6,<sup>46</sup> and on Paul in general, by claiming that 1 Peter does not contain Paul’s most central theology, the doctrine of justification by faith, nor does it deal with the problem of faith and works.<sup>47</sup> The absence of these subjects can be fully explained by the fact that, at the time of the writing of 1 Peter, the great battles of the apostolic generation are over. Pauline teaching has been generally accepted and can thus appear in a more tame form. “Doing good”, which is encouraged by 1 Peter, has again become important in congregations of primarily Gentile Christian origin. And still, the spirit of the passage is no doubt Pauline. The appeal to do good is justified Christologically, just as Paul justifies it in Rom 6 and also, for instance, in Phil 2. The overall composition of 1 Pet 2 is, in fact, very similar to that of Phil 2, where the so-called “kenosis” hymn is quoted as justification for an appeal to love one another according to the mind of Christ. Bultmann refers to this analogy, although with the intention of supporting the hymn hypothesis.<sup>48</sup> In both cases the assumed quotation of a hymn breaks out of its context.

The weakness of the hymn hypothesis in the case of 1 Pet 2 is that the supposed hymn, which quotes Isa 53, is full of Pauline reminiscences. One who still wants to hold on to the hymn hypothesis must also assume that the hymn was created in one of Paul’s congregations or among those who upheld the Pauline heritage. This of course fits well with those who would deny the literary dependence of 1 Peter on Paul’s epistles. In addition, one still needs to assume that the writer of 1 Peter

<sup>46</sup> Achtemeier (1996, 202–203) does not see in 1 Peter any influence from Rom 6. Feldmeier (2005, 117) thereagainst recognizes the connection.

<sup>47</sup> Herzer 1998, 258–259. Brox (1993, 50–51) rejects literary dependence as an explanation to the undeniable textual connections. Shimada (1993, 87–137) pays attention particularly to the differences between 1 Peter and Romans: “one of the cardinal criteria is *difference*, including terminological, context-analytical and other kinds of differences” (p. 135 note 156).

<sup>48</sup> Bultmann 1967, 285.

independently added one more quotation of Isa 53 and a comment on the “shepherd” and the “guardian” at the end of the hymn (2:25).<sup>49</sup>

A simpler—and therefore more likely—solution, however, is to give up the hypothesis of a hymn and conclude that the writer himself created the whole passage by combining expressions and ideas from Isa 53, on the one hand, and from Pauline epistles, on the other.<sup>50</sup> This appears all the more probable since there seem to be numerous connections to Pauline epistles, even multiple references to one and the same text (Rom 6 parr. 1 Pet 2:16, 24; 1 Cor 4:11, 12 parr. 1 Pet 2:20, 23), throughout the examined text, both within the supposed hymn and in the surrounding context.

Literary dependence on at least Rom 6, 12 and 13, and on the “household code” Eph 5–6 is very clear. The echo of Gal 5:13 might be based on memory—it is a striking expression—but even it can be considered an indication of literary dependence, according to Sanders’ criteria. 1 Cor 4:11–12 could also be based on memory. Some of the other expressions mentioned above may represent common language in general, but this does not suffice as the sole explanation to the entire problem.

On the other hand, however, the writer of 1 Peter exhibits his own literary talent and uses original expressions. These emerge especially in connection with his contemporary message concerning the exacerbated situation of the Christians:

1 Pet 2:15 ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιούντας  
φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν

For this is the will of God, that by doing good you should silence *the ignorance of the foolish* (note the alliteration)

<sup>49</sup> Reference to the congregation as the “flock of Christ” is found in *1 Clement* (1 Clem. 16.1; 44.3), and Christ as the “shepherd” would be part of the same metaphor. Osborne (1983, 403–404) however, argues that the corresponding metaphor in 1 Peter is the “flock of God” (1 Pet 5:2), which means that the “shepherd” here refers to God. Cf. *1 Clement*. 59.3.

<sup>50</sup> For Osborne (1983, 389, 395, 408) the hypothesis is unnecessary: the author simply made use of Isa 53. Elliott (2000, 543–550) sees in 1 Pet 2:21–25 “a creative and original fusion of a variety of Israelite, Hellenistic, and primitive Christian traditions,” which does not presuppose literary dependence on any other sources, neither hymns nor Pauline epistles.

1 Pet 2:19 τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις, εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις  
λύπας, πάσχων ἀδίκως

For this is grace, if for the sake of conscience toward God one endures sorrows while suffering unjustly

For his own message the writer creates a context on the basis of the exhortations to Christian life by the previous generations. He respectfully joins the tradition, but embeds in it his own emphases in view of the new situation. By joining the tradition—both the Christian tradition and that of the Old Testament—he gives his epistle an air of “sacred Scripture.”

## Relation to the First Epistle of Clement

Paul’s literary and theological tradition is not the only source from which the writer of 1 Peter draws. Especially the quotations from Isa 53 raise the question whether *1 Clement* could have been a mediator from which the quotations could have been picked up without direct use of the book of Isaiah (1 Clem. 16.3–14 = Isa 53). In fact, there are several features that support this hypothesis. *1 Clement* also discusses Christ’s “model” of humility, but with a different aim, namely, as an example to Christian leaders, those who “serve the flock of Christ” (1 Clem. 16.1; 44.3). *1 Clement* therefore already uses Isa 53 for a secondary function, not primarily as a testimony to Christ. The phrase ὁ ζυγὸς τῆς χάριτος ‘the yoke of grace,’ although in 1 Clem. 16.17 most probably referring to leadership in a congregation, could have triggered 1 Peter’s description of suffering as grace (2:19–20).

The connection between 1 Peter and *1 Clement* has remained unnoticed by most scholars because they have considered 1 Peter to be the older of the two beyond doubt, and therefore they have completely neglected comparative study of the two.<sup>51</sup> On the other hand, trying to

<sup>51</sup> Osborne (1983, 392, 403) suspects “some relationship between the two letters.”

interpret *1 Clement* as dependent on 1 Peter seems impossible.<sup>52</sup> This is stated by Lohse, who lists several connections between these two epistles.<sup>53</sup> In addition, *1 Clement* employs many Pauline expressions.<sup>54</sup> That 1 Peter quotes the same Old Testament passages as *1 Clement* (Isa 53, Ps 34(33), Prov 3:34<sup>55</sup>), and of the two, *1 Clement* frequently the longer passage, may also be indicative of literary dependence.

A particularly significant case is 1 Pet 4:8 par. *1 Clem.* 49:5 ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν 'love covers a multitude of sins,' which is usually taken as a quotation of Prov 10:12. However, this wording is not found in any known Biblical version, nor does it reflect the exact wording of the Hebrew text (Prov 10:12 וְעַל כָּל-פִּשְׁעֵי תַבְּסָה אַהֲבָה—cf. LXX πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία). Rather it is a question of an original formulation by the writer of *1 Clement* in the context of his counterpart to the Pauline "praise of love" (1 Cor 13, *1 Clem.* 49:4–6).<sup>56</sup>

For Lohse, these connections between *1 Clement* and 1 Peter mean nothing more than a common background community, that is, the Roman congregation.<sup>57</sup> The date of 1 Peter prevents him from stating what is evident from the material he has presented: the writer of 1 Peter made use of *1 Clement*.

<sup>52</sup> For instance, (Goppelt 1978, 52) mentions several similar features, considers the possibility of *1 Clement* having known 1 Peter, and concludes: "So ist eine literarische Bekanntschaft nicht erweisbar"; Brox (1993, 136) considers *1 Clement* to be later but deriving from the same background as 1 Peter; Elliott (2000, 548) seems to be alone in suggesting that *1 Clement* follows 1 Peter in quoting Isa 53.

<sup>53</sup> According to Lohse (1959, 83–85) there is a certain "Nähe und Verwandtschaft" between *1 Clement* and 1 Peter.

<sup>54</sup> For instance, the Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ (52 times in Pauline and 21 Deuteropauline epistles, except for 2 Thessalonians, Titus), which in the New Testament is shared only by 1 Pet 3:16, 5:10, 14, also occurs in *1 Clem.* 1.2, 21.8, 22.1, 32.4, 38.1, 43.1, 46.6, 47.6, 48.4, 49.1, 54.3. According to Herzer (1998, 84–106) this usage in 1 Peter is not dependent on Paul.

<sup>55</sup> Both *1 Clem.* 30.2 and 1 Pet 5:5 read θεός instead of κύριος that is found in Prov 3:34.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. *2 Clem.* 16.4.

<sup>57</sup> Lohse 1959, 85.

## Literary Dependences and Dating

In light of the examined passage, it appears that the writer of 1 Peter, wanting to create a literary memorial for Peter, looked for models of "sacred Scripture" in Christian epistles that were known to him and kept in high esteem in his community, primarily Pauline epistles, both genuine and imitations, but he also utilized other writings such as *1 Clement*. The writer lived in a time when the old controversies had been left behind, the Christian doctrine was being established, and the apostolic writings were already receiving the label of "sacred Scripture." He is trying to rectify the apparent lack of an epistle preserved in the name of Peter.

In attempting to date 1 Peter more accurately, references in the content to a time of persecution are usually considered to be significant. The situation at the beginning of the second century in Asia Minor, of which Pliny the younger reports in his letter to Trajan (ca. 111–113 CE),<sup>58</sup> applies most suitably. On the other hand, 1 Peter is found to be quoted for the first time by Polycarp (ca. 115–135 CE).<sup>59</sup> Considering also the connections to *1 Clement* (ca. 96 CE)<sup>60</sup>, one ends up with a dating to the first decade of the second century in Rome.<sup>61</sup> The notion represented in *1 Clement*, and therefore probably a dominant notion in the congregation at Rome, that Peter and Paul are "the two pillars" of the church (*1 Clem.* 5.2–5), is likely to have even provided the decisive impetus to complete the collection of Christian Scriptures with the missing epistle of the other "pillar."

<sup>58</sup> See Schnelle 1994, 463.

<sup>59</sup> Pol. *Phil.* 8.1 quotes the passage I have examined. See also Elliott 2000, 549. For the dating, see Vielhauer 1978, 562–563.

<sup>60</sup> Vielhauer 1978, 540.

<sup>61</sup> Goppelt (1978, 53) also sees the background of the epistle in the Western Church, especially in Rome, although his dating is decisively earlier 65–80 CE (p. 65). Vielhauer (1978, 588) represents a dating around the turn of the first to the second century, but thinks of Asia Minor as the place of origin.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE FINNISH EXEGETICAL SOCIETY 99

## The Early Reception of Paul

EDITED BY KENNETH LILJESTRÖM

Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society  
Series Editor: Antti Marjanen  
Typography and layout: Perttu Nikander  
Cover and photograph: Kirsi Valkama

ISSN 0356-2786  
ISBN 978-951-9217-53-6

Bookwell Oy, Jyväskylä 2011

Finnish Exegetical Society  
Helsinki 2011