Further Verba on Verba Christi in First Peter

Robert H. Gundry – Santa Barbara, California

In large measure, Dr. Ernest Best has devoted a recent article, entitled “I Peter and the Gospel Tradition” (1), to a negative critique of a previous article of mine, “‘Verba Christi’ in I Peter: Their Implications Concerning the Authorship of I Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition” (2). With the understanding that both he and I mean to argue positions rather than engage in personal attacks, we may well turn to some features in Dr. Best’s article which merit attention.

Broadly, I argued for a rather long string of allusive quotations of dominical sayings in 1 Pt with a few allusions to dominical actions along the way, for a Petrine pattern in that these allusions derive from parts of the evangelical tradition in which the Apostle Peter played a prominent role or would have taken special interest, and for the conclusion that a combination of Petrine authorship for 1 Pt and authenticity of the gospel tradition referred to best accounts for the undesigned coincidences. Again broadly, Best drastically reduces the number of allusions and thereby precludes inferences concerning the authenticity of the gospel tradition, eliminates any Petrine pattern, and reaches a negative conclusion concerning Petrine authorship of 1 Pt. In his discussion Best includes a number of improbable allusions to dominical sayings suggested by C. Spicq (3) and others(4).

(1) NTS 16 (1970) 95-113.
(2) NTS 13 (1967) 336-350.
The results have been a commendable comprehensiveness of treatment and an unfortunate blurring of the picture so far as the more probable allusions are concerned.

Best begins with some general observations (1). The first is that the Apostle Peter would usually have made his own translation of the Aramaic sayings of Jesus into Greek. That may be questioned and qualified, however, on several counts: (a) it is not impossible that an apostle would follow Greek translations of Jesus' teaching which had gained some acceptance in the early church; (b) if Peter gave his amanuensis any freedom at all, we should allow for the possibility that the amanuensis assimilated verba Christi in the epistle to the Greek evangelical tradition with which he was acquainted; (c) it is possible, if not probable, that Jesus sometimes spoke in Greek(2) with the result that Peter could have drawn on some dominical sayings which were cast in Greek from the very first; (d) if Peter and other apostles preached in Greek at least outside Palestine, the Greek form of Jesus' sayings in the gospels may in some measure derive from the apostles. Best admits this last possibility in the case of 1 Pt vis-à-vis Mk, which according to Papias contains Peter's recollections of Jesus' ministry. However, Best demands that if this be so, "we should expect a special link between the Epistle and that Gospel". But that demand leaves out of account the notable fact that by comparison with other gospels Mk contains little of Jesus' teaching. Allusions to dominical teaching in a Petrine epistle would therefore bear more similarities to the gospels with larger amounts of that teaching.

In all of this, Best is concerned to establish two principles. The first is that if Peter wrote 1 Pt, "we should... expect to find not so much close verbal reminiscences as reminiscences of thought which

(1) Pp. 95-96. Here and below I follow the order of Best's discussion.
(2) See, e.g., evidence set out in my article, "The Language Milieu of First-Century Palestine", JBL 83 (1964) 408, and J. SEVENSTER, Do You Know Greek? (London 1968). Cf. the statement of Morton Smith, "...Palestine was hellenized from Dan to Beersheba... Greek was commonly understood and might well be the language a traveling preacher would choose if he had to speak to a mixed crowd in Galilee" ("Aretologies, Divine Men, the Gospels, and Jesus", Paper presented at the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, October, 1970, New York City). There is a growing literature on the use of Greek in first century Palestine. See the survey by J. A. FITZMYER, "The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.", CBQ 32 (1970) 501-531.
could be translated back into the same Aramaic as that of the gospel tradition”. It is odd, then, that in the following pages of his article Best should repeatedly appeal to the presence or absence of close verbal reminiscences in assessment of possible allusions. Indeed, how else are we to determine allusions? Similarity in thought does not by itself justify our claiming an allusion. At least some close verbal similarity is also needed. And if the “thought” can be “translated back into the same Aramaic as that of the gospel tradition”, we should expect Greek forms deriving from the Aramaic to bear close verbal similarities to each other even though they are not directly related, as in the case of independent early Greek translations of the Hebrew scriptures.

The second principle Best is concerned to establish is that “unusual verbal reminiscences of the existing Greek text of the Gospels would suggest dependence of the author on the gospel tradition rather than directly on the teaching of Jesus himself”. That inference comes only by failure to keep open the possibilities of apostolic and secretarial use of Greek tradition and of apostolic and even dominical origin of at least some of the Greek tradition. As we shall discover, however, the “unusual” similarities which Best sees between 1 Pt and the Greek gospels are either not unusual or non-allusive at all.

Best goes on to note that “small reminiscences” of the gospel tradition prove nothing about Petrine authorship of the epistle if Silvanus was not merely the amanuensis, but the direct author. True enough. It is also correct “that knowledge of the gospel tradition on the part of any author in the NT does not logically imply that he was present when that part of the gospel tradition was spoken by Jesus.” However, the case for Petrine authorship rests on reminiscences which are neither small nor few and on their Petrine pattern in that they come from dominical sayings and incidents in which Peter played a special role or would have entertained a particular interest (1).

Best’s final general consideration requiring our notice is that allusion to a less original form of the gospel tradition would work against authorship of the epistle by Peter. But is it true that one who heard and saw Jesus firsthand would never have used a developed form of tradition? Did not the apostles themselves share in the development and adaptation of the gospel tradition? Regular use of less

(1) See my earlier article, where the matter receives detailed treatment on pp. 345 ff.
original forms of tradition would arouse suspicions adverse to apostolic authorship. We shall see however that very seldom, if at all, does that happen in 1 Pt.

Best proceeds to the specifics of his argument by taking up possible allusions gospel by gospel — in the order John, Mark, Luke, and Matthew. For several reasons, he denies an allusion in 1 Pt 1,21, τοῦς δὲ αὐτοῦ [Christ] πιστοῦς εἶς θεόν, to the sayings recorded in Jn 14,1,6: πιστεῦετε εἰς τὸν θεόν, καὶ εἶς εἰμὲ πιστεῦετε ... οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δί εἰμοῦ (!). For πιστεῦετε + εἶς regularly occurs in Jn and occasionally crops up elsewhere in the NT. Similarly, διὰ + the genitive with reference to Christ occurs frequently in the NT. Best fails to note, however, that only in 1 Pt 1,21 and Jn 14,1 is θεός the object of πιστ- + εἰς, and only in these two passages is believing εἰς (τὸν) θεόν specifically allied to the agency of Christ (!).

Best further attempts to undermine the allusion by separating vv. 1 and 6 in Jn 14 and thus splitting apart belief in God (v. 1) from the agency of Christ (v. 6) so that their combination in 1 Pt 1,21 could not come from a homogeneous tradition later recorded in Jn. Nevertheless, there are reasons to hold the verses and phrases together. "God" is identified as "Father" in vvs. 1 and 2. V. 6 picks up the term "Father" again. Believing in God the Father (v. 1) parallels coming to the Father. Therefore, it is only natural that believing in God and in Jesus (v. 1) should be equivalent to coming to the Father through Jesus (v. 6). Thus, to "know" Jesus is to "know" the Father; to "see" Jesus is to "see" the Father (vv. 7 ff.). The belief in God through Jesus in 1 Pt 1,21, then, does parallel the agency of Jesus in believing God in Jn 14,1 ff.

Noting that Jn uses πιστός only once (and that elsewhere and without εἶς), Best points to the difference between the verbal and adjectival forms of πιστ- in Jn 14,1 and 1 Pt 1,21 respectively. But this is due merely to the exigency of weaving an allusive quotation into one's own sentence structure. The basic reference remains the same: belief in God through Jesus. Elsewhere Best himself frequently allows for such modifications in allusive quotations: in the changes

(!) Pp. 96-97.

(1) The sole and only partial exception is Acts 3,16 (in an account of a sermon by Peter!): ἢ πίστις ἢ δὲ αὐτοῦ. But here God is not mentioned as the object of the faith.
from present imperative (Jn 13,34-35) to aorist imperative (1 Pt 1,22) (1), from “treasure” (Lk 12,33) to “inheritance” (1 Pt 1,4) (2), from “for the sake of the Son of man” (Lk 6,2,2) to “in the name of Christ” (1 Pt 4,14)(3), and from δέωσιν (Mt 5,10) to πάσχειν (1 Pt 3,14)(4). And between Mt 5,16b and 1 Pt 2,12b, “the clearest parallel in the whole of I Peter”, variations are “largely explicable in terms of normal Matthean and Petrine usage” — “your Father in heaven” versus “God”, the addition of “in the day of visitation” in 1 Pt, “men” versus “Gentiles” (5), and (I add) τοιούτοις versus ἐπιτεύγνωτες. Besides these, Best is even more lenient toward rather radical differences in wording between those passages in 1 Pt and 1 Clement where he sees connexions (6).

Finally with regard to this allusion, Best suggests that in Jn I assume a stenographic report of Jesus’ teaching and argues that the difficulty of determining the original tradition in the fourth gospel precludes detection of a Petrine allusion to the original form of any dominical saying recorded in that gospel. I simply do not hold that in Jn the words of Jesus are always recorded verbatim. But is it advisable to hold that the ipsissima verba of Jesus never sound through? All that is necessary for Petrine allusions to sayings later recorded in Jn is that at least in these instances likenesses in distinctive phraseology favor some closeness of reproduction.

In 1 Pt 1,22 and 4,8 (cf. 3,8), the command to love one another repeats what Jesus says according to Jn 13,34-35; 15,12. But Best attempts a reductio ad absurdum by arguing that use of this saying by Paul would favor his being an original disciple as much as its use by the author of 1 Pt (2). If this instance were viewed singly, Best would be correct. As clearly stated in my earlier article, “Independent weight cannot be given to logia from the Sermon on the Mount, the eschatological warnings to watch, and the command to love one another; because they occur in other New Testament epistles” (8). Not even a unique allusion to a verbum Christi will support Petrine

(1) P. 97.
(2) P. 104.
(3) P. 105.
(4) P. 109, n. 2.
(6) Pp. 112-113.
(7) P. 97.
(8) P. 348.
authorship of the epistle and authenticity of that logion so long as the allusion stands isolated. Significance in these respects arises from a number of probable allusions taken together with their Petrine pattern. Best himself reasons in this fashion when he writes concerning Lk 12 that "the only likely parallels [to 1 Pt] are Lk. xii. 33 and xii. 35, and if these are accepted then xii. 32 and xii. 42 should probably also be drawn in" (1). But though he reasons cumulatively for his own sake, Best fails to deal with my identical kind of reasoning that the several suggested allusions to the activity and remarks of Jesus in the Upper Room (2) support one another, just as he omits any review of the Petrine pattern in the accumulated allusions for which I argued. That very pattern supports the actuality of those allusions.

Best thinks that "Love one another" was a variant for an original saying, "Love your neighbor", and cites the association of ἀγάπηκριτος with love in Ro 12,9; 2 Cor 6,6; and 1 Pt 1,22 as confirmation. But why should the association of ἀγάπηκριτος imply the unoriginality of "Love one another"? And in view of the universality of the command in the epistles one may question the dictum that Jesus never told his disciples to love "one another". Accepting the dictum for the sake of argument, however, we may recall that even an apostle might occasionally use a developed and accepted form of a dominical saying.

Although he admits "a close association of words and ideas" between 1 Pt 2,25; 5,2,4 and Jn 10,11; 21,16 in the portrayals of Jesus as a self-sacrificing and episcopal shepherd, Christians as sheep or a flock, and the ministry of elders as shepherding, Best still rejects an allusion (3). He thinks that the Apostle Peter would have described himself as a fellow shepherd rather than a fellow elder (5,1). But if the author speaks of himself as a fellow elder and then speaks of the work of elders as shepherding, he implies that his own work as

(1) P. 105.
(2) Concerning belief in God through Jesus, love toward one another in conjunction with lowlymindedness, resistance to Satanic attack against the faith of disciples, the uses of στέρ-, καταχωρίω, and νεώτερος, and Jesus' girding himself to wash the disciples' feet in comparison with ἐγκυκλιότατη in 1 Pt 5,5. For references and discussion see my earlier article, pp. 340, 344-345, 347, and for further discussion in the light of Best's individual criticisms, see below, passim.
(3) Pp. 97-98.
an elder is shepherding. And he has just addressed the leaders as “elders” — it would have been clumsy to address them initially with the figurative term “shepherds” — so it naturally follows that he should write of himself as a “fellow elder” and then move on to their common ministry under figurative language borrowed from Jesus’ commission to him, “Shepherd my sheep”. Although the image of flock and shepherd is very common, we should allow some weight to the self-sacrificing as well as overseeing character of Christ’s shepherding in both Jn 10,11.14 and 1 Pt 2,24-25. Only in these two passages does the shepherd Jesus give his life for the life of the sheep (though separate elements of this thought appear elsewhere).

The shepherding image for Christian ministry appears much less commonly in the NT. In 1 Cor 9,7 the metaphor occurs, not technically for elders, but as only one illustration among others of the principle that workers deserve the fruit of their labor. In Eph 4,11 shepherds simply appear alongside apostles, prophets, and evangelists. Though “flock” appears in Acts 20,28, it is “bishops” who are exhorted to shepherd the “church”. We may therefore more easily relate the logia “Shepherd my sheep” and “Shepherd the flock” in Jn 21,16 and 1 Pt 5,2 respectively, perhaps with a sidelong glance at the term “flock” in v. 32 of Lk 12, a chapter containing other logia alluded to in 1 Pt and accepted as such by Best (7). The connexion between 1 Pt 5 and the tradition in Jn 21 receives further confirmation from the common use of ἄρτορος (8).

But Best displaces dominical logia as sources with a primitive catechetical instruction for ministers (9), or an ecclesiastical code (4). Yet these possibilities do not deter him from later accepting an allusion in this same passage, 1 Pt 5,2-4, to the saying which appears in Lk 12,32 (6). Why then should they deter us here? Use of a catechism or code on Peter’s part would not rule out adaptation and interpolation. Moreover, we shall see so many distinctly Petrine allusions

(7) Pp. 103-105.
(4) So M. E. BOISMAARD, SDB, VII, 1419 ff.
(6) Pp. 103, 105.
to *verba Christi* in 1 Pt 5,1-5 that borrowing from a code or catechism becomes doubtful (1).

Best denies that the joy of those who believe in Jesus even though they have not seen him (1 Pt 1,8) reflects the dominical beatitude upon those who have not seen Jesus and yet believe (Jn 20,29) (2). He cites 2 Cor 5,6-8 and compares Heb 11,27. However, 2 Cor 5,6-8 has to do with courage rather than joy; and in that passage the phrase “not by sight” is not specifically related to inability to see Jesus. Heb 11,27 is quite the opposite, for there it is said that Moses “endured” as though he *did* see the invisible. On the other hand, 1 Pt 1,8 and Jn 20,29 share forms of ὑφέω, ἐλθον, and πιστεύω in interconnexion. Both specifically connect the inability to see with Jesus himself. And both speak of bliss. Such a series of concurrences, missing elsewhere, casts doubt on the judgments that there is nothing unusual in the similarity between the verses and that “the idea is one that would have arisen easily”. We might rather think that in the face of inability to see Jesus, sorrow rather than joy would be the idea to arise more easily.

Similarities between statements concerning spiritual rebirth (Jn 3,3 ff.; 1 Pt 1,3.23; 2,2) likewise fail to impress Best: “... the precise words are not identical” (3). But the difference between ἀνα-γεννάω and γεννάω ἄνωθεν is much less extensive than those differences which Best allows elsewhere, and easily explicable as a variant in translation from Aramaic or Hebrew or as a difference in preference as to Greek style. Best argues for “an important difference” between the resurrection of Christ and the incorruptible seed of God’s Word as the means of regeneration in 1 Pt and baptism as the means in Jn. But we should not expect rebirth to be tied to the resurrection of Christ as early as Jn 3. The connexion comes naturally after his resurrection. And the resurrection and baptism are readily related (Rom 6,1 ff.; Eph 5,14), as are baptism and the Word (Eph 5,26), the Spirit and resurrection (Rom 8,10 ff.), rebirth and seed (1 Jn 3,9), and Spirit and Word (Jn 6,63) (4). The multiplicity of these

---

1. This is a possible weakness in Elliott’s article, mentioned above.
2. P. 98.
3. P. 98.
4. Τὰ ῥήματα ἐκ γων λεκάληκα υἱὸν πνεύμα ἐστίν... Although ῥήματα occurs here and λόγος in 1 Pt 1,23, in the latter passage ῥήμα alternates in vv. 24-25.
associations casts doubt on the importance of the distinction between the stated means of rebirth. And if within 1 Pt alone the author links rebirth with *both* the resurrection of Christ (1,3) and the seed of God's Word (1,23 ff.), why should a difference in *modus operandi* be thought crucial?

Best also points to the concept of rebirth elsewhere in the NT where there is no relation to the tradition recorded in Jn 3 (Ti 3,5; cf. Jas 1,17 ff.). But there is nothing about rebirth in Jas 1,17 ff. And in Ti 3,5 the phrases might well reflect the tradition recorded in Jn 3. παλιν- and ἄνα- correspond to the Johannine ἀνωθεν. The noun- γενεσία corresponds to the verb γεννάω. διὰ λογοῦ matches ἐξ ὁμοθετίας. In both, cleansing is associated with the Spirit. And "Not by works of righteousness which we have done" may recall the Phariseeism of Nicodemus.

Best argues further that the concept of regeneration "was, in fact, part of the religious atmosphere of Asia Minor to which 1 Pet. was directed. There is thus no reason to assume dependence of Peter here on the teaching of Jesus". No evidence is cited concerning "the religious atmosphere of Asia Minor". A look at the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (1), vol. I, 673, 686, will show how scanty and late is the evidence for the idea of individual, spiritual regeneration in a pagan milieu.

Finally in this connexion, Best fails to deal with the presence of a whole cluster of Johannine motifs in the Petrine passage: mutual love, obedience, truth, seed, logos, abiding, life, and corruption versus corruption. These confirm an allusion to a dominical saying about rebirth.

Too subtle to have been contrived, the agreement between the Petrine allusions to dominical sayings in Jn and the association of Peter and John according to the fourth gospel and Acts support both the authenticity of the sayings and the actuality of the allusions to them.

The last connexion between 1 Pt and Johannine tradition has to do with the correspondence of τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκυμονώσαθε (1 Pt 5,5) with the action of Jesus according to Jn 13,4: καὶ λαβὼν λέντον διέξοσεν ἐκπτών. In both passages the point is humility in service to others. Peter figures prominently in the Johannine narrative. Jesus states clearly that he has given his disciples an example

(1) *TWNT* I, 671-672, 685-687.
to follow. Other allusions in 1 Pt 5 to what happened and was said at the Last Supper (1) strengthen the case for an allusion here. Thus, we have more than "very slender" evidence (2). The difference in diction arises from the fact that we are dealing with an allusion to an act of Jesus, rather than a saying with certain wording to be followed.

The discussion shifts to allusions in 1 Pt to tradition recorded in Mk. Correctly, Best undermines a direct allusion in 1 Pt 1,18 to the saying which appears in Mk 10,45 (3). In my earlier article I did not appeal to such an allusion here. It is a different matter with the parallel between 1 Pt 5,3-5 and Mk 10,42-45 (par. Mt 20,25-28; Lk 22,25-30. Best notes that although κατακυρίευον occurs only in the Petrine and Marcan passages, the word turns up eighteen times in the LXX (4). But never in the LXX does the word apply to the relationship between the leaders of God's people and the people themselves. In this respect the parallel between 1 Pt and Mk is unique — and striking, given non-occurrence elsewhere in the NT. Moreover, there are the use of νεώπερος in both 1 Pt and the Lucan parallel, stress on the exemplary character of leaders' conduct in all passages concerned, and the proffering of eschatological reward. Best says nothing about these. He does ask why, if there is an allusion, use of Mk 10,43-45a is not made in 1 Pt 5. But that is unreasonably asking Peter to quote at much greater length than he does elsewhere.

Best is surely correct in denying an allusion to Mk 14,27-28 in 1 Pt 2,25, for the passages go back to Zech 13,7 and Is 53,6 respectively (5). (No claim to such an allusion appeared in my earlier article.) He also succeeds rather well in questioning an allusion to the commands γρηγορεῖτε και προσεύχεσθε (Mk 14,38 = Mt 26,40) in 1 Pt 5,8-9: νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε... (6). He notes that νήψω does not necessarily refer to prayer, points to the close parallel in 1 Thes 5,6: γρηγορώμεν και νήψωμεν (cf. 5,8), and concludes that 1 Pt 5,8-9 "depends on this tradition rather than Mk xiv 38". But may not both Paul and Peter draw their exhortations from a common source, a dominical saying in which νήψω has displaced the προσεύχεσθε of the synoptic

(1) See below.
(2) Best, p. 99.
(3) Pp. 99-100.
(4) P. 100.
(5) P. 100.
(6) P. 100.
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tradition but carries the connotation of prayer? At least in its last occurrence before 1 Pt 5,8-9 νήφω is tied to prayer: νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς (4,7).

Best argues persuasively that the exhortation to readiness for the making of a Christian apology “to everyone who asks” (1 Pt 3,15) does not go back to the example of Jesus when on trial, for Jesus’ behaviour fails to exemplify Christian witness (1). However, Best is not so persuasive in denying an allusion by way of contrast to Peter’s lack of readiness to abide by a profession of discipleship when queried during Jesus’ trial (Mk 14,66-72, cf. 29-31) (2). We lack verbal parallels simply because we are dealing with the recollection of an incident rather than the quoting of a logion. And although Peter was asked only to identify himself, whereas the addressees in 1 Pt “have already been suffering in some way, whether by public or private insult and accusation”, Peter was asked to identify himself with specific reference to discipleship. Within the context of Jesus’ trial, that self-identification clearly posed the threat of dire consequences. Moreover, in 1 Pt 3,13-17 the persecution begins with verbal assault, as in the story of Peter’s denials.

We come now to the use of Ps 118(117 LXX),22 in 1 Pt 2,4,7; Mk 12,10; Mt 21,42a; and Lk 20,17. Best raises the question whether the author of 1 Pt may depend on Lk because, like Lk, he quotes only Ps 118,22, but Mk and Mt quote also Ps 118,23 (3). Maybe so, but the answer lies in doubt, for several reasons: (1) an allusive quotation of both verses in the psalm would have gone beyond the normal length of allusive quotations in 1 Pt; (2) the shorter quotation fulfills the contextual need in 1 Pt; (3) the inclusion of Ps 118,23 in Mk and Mt may represent an extension of the quotation unknown to the author of 1 Pt; (4) it has not been my thesis that Peter used the gospels anyway, but only that he used traditions deriving from his own memory and independently written by others in the gospels. Of course, Best takes the common view that even the shorter quotation of Ps 118,22 alone probably comes from the early church rather than from the lips of Jesus. Some scholars dissent, however (4); and

(2) I missed this allusion in my earlier article.
(3) P. 101.
(4) Cf. Plebig and Cranfield. See my earlier article, p. 350, n. 4, for fuller references. In a recent dissertation at St. Andrews University,
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in any case, so long as Jesus introduced the use of the psalm — and this is likely in view of its widespread use in the NT — we need not decide whether the quotation closed the parable.

Seemingly stronger is the argument that the use of λοθος in both 1 Pt and the synoptics works against any connexion with Peter and his name Πέτρος, for λοθος refers to a dressed stone, and πέτρα (from which Πέτρος) to raw rock. But this completely overlooks the lack of such a distinction in κόσμος. It also overlooks Peter’s coordination of λοθος and πέτρα with reference to Christ in a conflate quotation of Ps 118,22 and Is 8,14 (1 Pt 2,7-8). In other words, Peter’s initial use of λοθος stems from the LXX in the initial quotations of Is 28,16 (1 Pt 2,4,6) rather than from an avoidance of πέτρα, which as a matter of fact is not avoided but appears as a synonym in v. 8 (1). Use by Peter of Ps 118,22 as reported in Acts 4,11 tends to confirm interest in the stone-motif because of his own nickname. We may question the reliability of the reportage in Acts, but the agreement of such disparate materials as the synoptic tradition, Acts, and 1 Pt forms a threefold cord not quickly broken.

On the other hand, there is a difference between the synoptics and Acts/1 Pt. According to Mt 16,18 Peter is the rock, but in Acts/1 Pt Jesus is the stone/rock; and in 1 Pt believers also are stones. But the claimed reference is to Mk 12,10 and parallels, where Jesus is the stone, as also in 1 Pt. Mt 16 (cf. Jn 1,42) comes in only to show why Peter would be specially interested in this motif. Because interest in the motif was not confined to Peter (cf. Rom 9,32-33), independent significance cannot be attached to it. Nevertheless, it is striking that the most extensive use and development of the motif occurs in an epistle claimed to be written by an apostle whose nickname means “rock”.

Best is correct to dismiss allusions to Peter’s confession of Jesus as the Christ (Mk 8,29) in 1 Pt 1,7-9 (so Selwyn), to the sayings about little children (Mk 9,36; 10,15 par.) in 2,2 (so Chase), and to “Render unto Caesar...” (Mk 12,13-17 par.) in 2,13-17 (Best does not here name his opponent in argument).

K. Snodgrass has argued forcefully for the originality of the quotation’s connexion with the preceding parable.


(2) See further my earlier article, p. 346, n. 4.
Introducing the section on possible allusions to Lucan tradition, Best begins, "Gundry has suggested that there are a number of contacts between First Peter and Luke xii" (1). But without attributing the suggestions to anyone else, Best proceeds to demolish a couple of suggested allusions which appear no place in my earlier article. I could not agree more that 1 Pt 5,7 depends on Ps 54,23 rather than on the tradition in Lk 12,22 (or Mt 6,25) and that 1 Pt 1,24 depends on Is 40,6-8 rather than on the tradition in Lk 12,28 (or Mt 6,30).

Coming to 1 Pt 5,2-4 and the tradition in Lk 12,32, a connexion I did draw, Best expresses some doubt by noting that the image of the shepherd and flock is common. But seeing the accompaniment of eschatological reward in just these two passages and noting the association with two other more certain allusions to Lk 12, Best accepts the allusion here (2). Interestingly, he has earlier denied more extensive allusions to the tradition in Jn 10,11.14; 21,15.16.17 under the motif of shepherd and flock.

The allusion in 1 Pt 1,4 to the saying about the indestructible treasure in heaven (Lk 12,33; par. Mt 6,20) Best finds acceptable, but argues that the author of 1 Pt depends on a Lucan or pre-Lucan form less original than the Matthean; and this a firsthand hearer such as the Apostle Peter would not have done (3). But are we so sure a firsthand hearer would not have used a modified form, or modified it himself? It is not even sure that 1 Pt is significantly closer to the Lucan form. In the plural of ὄφρανος Lk and 1 Pt agree against Mt, but that reflects a common Semitism. Best also claims that "Luke's ἀνέκλαπτον (not in Matthew) comes near to I Peter's idea of indestructibility". Rather, 1 Pt's idea of indestructibility, contained especially in ἀφθαρτόν, relates to Lk's οὐδὲ σὺς διαφθείρει. Best wrongly relates Lk's ἀνέκλαπτον ("inexhaustible, unailing") to ἀφθαρτόν in 1 Pt. The idea of indestructibility appears clearly in Mt, too. Again, the greater closeness in wording between 1 Pt and Lk (ἀφθαρτόν/οὐδὲ... διαφθείρει versus Mt's οὔτε... ἀφανίζεται) may be fortuitous agreement in translation from a Semitic original rather than dependence on Lucan tradition.

Best properly corrects my statement that κληρονομία (1 Pt) and ἡγεσία (Mt and Lk) are translational variants, but admits the suita-

(1) P. 103.
(2) P. 105.
(3) Pp. 103-105.
bility of the modification in 1 Pt. The two words are closely associated, as shown in the story of the rich young ruler, who asked what he might do to “inherit” eternal life and received answer that he should sell all and give to the poor to have “treasure in heaven” (Mk 10,17,21; par. Lk 18,18,22; Mt 19,21).

In other respects, 1 Pt’s τετηρημένην corresponds to Mt’s θυμόν κλέπται ὡς διορύσσουσιν οὔδὲ κλέπτουσιν as easily as to Lk’s shorter ὡς κλέπτης οὐκ ἐγγίζει. And 1 Pt’s εἶς οὐμάς answers to Mt’s ομόν (bis) as easily as to Lk’s ἐκτοτίς. Therefore, 1 Pt’s greater closeness to Lk in the plural of οὕρανός and in ἀρθροτον need only indicate translations of a Semitic original which come nearer to Lk than to Mt simply because they were more natural and literal (1). Best’s contention that the Matthaean form as a whole looks more original because of its better parallelism becomes irrelevant because 1 Pt need not depend on a corrupted Lucan form.

Concerning a connexion between the exhortations to “gird the loins” for the Parousia of Jesus (1 Pt 1,13) and for the coming of the master (Lk 12,35), Best notes the difference between the compounds ἀναξωσάμενοι and περιεξωσμέναι respectively, distinguishes a metaphorical reference to the Parousia in the latter from an explicit reference in the former, and calls attention to the commonness of the metaphor of girding (Prv 31,17; Jr 1,17; Eph 6,14; Ex 12,11) (2). However, only in the Petrine and Lucan passages does the metaphor of girding the loins bear an eschatological reference. The transition from a metaphorical to an explicit reference was inevitable, especially since in the Lucan material the χόριος is shortly identified with Jesus (v. 42). The difference between the compounds may represent translational variants or personal preferences in diction. In 1 Pt νήφωντες seems to reflect the parable’s warning against surfeiting.

Best correctly notes that γρηγοροῦσατε in 1 Pt 5,8 bears no necessary relation to γρηγοροῦντας in Lk 12,37 because of the word’s frequency elsewhere in the NT. I have not claimed any special relation. But we may fairly say that the use of γρηγορέω goes back to dominical tradition such as that contained in Lk 12,37.

In the depiction of the Christian as a servant in God’s house who supervises the use of divine gifts for others (1 Pt 4,10), Best sees a

(1) This would be so, e.g., if Jesus used ηψ. Cf. HATCH–REDPATH, s.v. Φθέρειν, διαφθέρειν, and ἀφανίζειν.

(2) Pp. 104-105. However, Best finally accepts the allusion.
possible allusion to Lk 12,42; par. Mt 24,45 (cf. 1 Cor 4,1-2) missed by me (1). He goes on to argue against Petrine authorship by noting that the writer of 1 Pt agrees with Lk in the use of ὀξύνόμος against Mt's less appropriate and therefore more original δοῦλος: a hearer of Jesus would not have used the less original ὀξύνόμος. Again we have the unwarrantable assumption that a hearer of Jesus would not have used a somewhat developed tradition or have developed it himself. Besides, it is doubtful that Mt's δοῦλος is more original than ὀξύνόμος. Even Lk (as well as Mt) has δοῦλος four times in the next and following verses for the same person, as was again natural and almost inevitable because of the term κύριος. Well-known for his systematizing, Mt has simply assimilated an original ὀξύνόμος to the following and predominant δοῦλος.

Concerning the word νήφω in 1 Pt 1,13; 4,7; 5,8 the term appears in a similarly eschatological exhortation in 1 Thes 5,6,8 (2). But its frequency in 1 Pt, the way in which it neatly summarizes the parabolic and prosaic warnings against drunkenness in Lk 12,45 and 21,34 respectively (both passages to which other allusions are made in 1 Pt), and the striking agreement between 1 Pt 4,7 and Lk 21,34-36 in connecting sobriety with prayer, as Paul does not, suggest that the author reflects dominical sayings directly rather than depends solely on ecclesiastical tradition.

Summarizing the material in Lk 12, Best reemphasizes that "the alleged reminiscences of the teaching of Jesus in this section are... if reminiscences at all, of the Lukan or pre-Lukan form of the tradition and not of the original teaching of Jesus" (3). But in his preceding discussion Best has claimed this only for the two allusions related to Lk 12,33 and 42 in 1 Pt 1,4 and 4,10-11 respectively. And we have seen that in these instances the agreements between 1 Pt and Lk are not necessarily unoriginal to the words of Jesus. Therefore the argument that the author of 1 Pt cannot have been an original disciple fails to carry conviction.

Best seems to accept an allusion in 1 Pt 4,13-14 to the beatitude recorded in Lk 6,22 (par. Mt 5,11-12), but questions whether Jesus said ἐνεκα τοῦ λοφοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου if he spoke the beatitude at all (4).

(1) Pp. 104-105.
(2) Pp. 104.
(3) P. 105.
(4) P. 105. Of course, discussion of the Son of man would take us too far afield.
Omission of the phrase, however, leaves the beatitude vapid because the persecution and slander become baseless. Even if a beatitude similar to this existed in pre-Christian Judaism, Jesus may have utilized it for his own purposes.

Although the section heading begins, "Gundry also detects...", I did not in my earlier article suggest any relationship between the manifestly unparallel verses 1 Pt 3,16 and Lk 6,26. In that article I admitted that the exhortation in 1 Pt 3,9 to bless rather than return evil for evil lies closer to Rom 12,14.17 than to Lk 6,27-28 (1). But the word λοιδοφίλων, where Rom and Lk have καταράμοι, and four other allusions to the same Lucan passage — in 1 Pt 2,18 ff. (Lk 6,27 ff.); 3,14; 4,13-14; and 1,6 (Lk 6,22-23) — unsettle Best's deduction that 1 Pt 3,9 rests on common catechetical tradition "rather than" on any saying of Jesus (2). It becomes preferable to think of the direct recollection of a dominical saying with influence from a catechetical tradition. Still under the leading statement, "Gundry also detects...", and again without attribution to anyone else, Best gives a misimpression that I saw a relationship between the forms of ἐπιρέξω in 1 Pt 3,16 and Lk 6,28 (3). If there is a relationship — and the concentration of allusions to Lk 6 may favor the supposition more than he or I have thought — it is not certain that 1 Pt depends on Lk (against Mt's διωκόντων), for, as Best himself says, ἐπιρέξω "is not an unusual word".

Concerning the allusion in 1 Pt 2,19-20 to the saying recorded in Lk 6,32-33 (par. Mt 5,46), Best suggests that the author of 1 Pt depended on Lk rather than on Jesus' original saying because otherwise "we have to assume that he [the author of 1 Pt] hit on the same good Greek phrase [χάριν in a rhetorical question] as did Luke" (4). But there is no reason Peter could not have known a Greek rendering upon which Lk also drew, especially if "the two Lukan verses go back very well into Aramaic..." (5). By the same token, even though Peter translated independently, agreement with the basic words in another natural and easy translation should not surprise us.

(1) P. 342.
(2) P. 105.
(3) P. 105.
(4) P. 106.
Yet again it falsely appears from Best's discussion that I related the command to be holy because God is holy (1 Pt 1,16) to Jesus' command to be merciful like the Father (Lk 6,36), whereas Peter rather quotes from the OT (1). I also agree with Best in denying a whole string of allusions suggested by and, in these instances, attributed to Chase, Scharfe, and Spicq (2). 1 Pt 5,3-5 (cf. Lk 22,25-30) has already been discussed in connexion with Mk 10,42.

Concerning a possible allusion in 1 Pt 5,8-9 to the saying about Satan's attack on Peter's faith and the command that Peter strengthen his brethren (Lk 22,31-32), Best asks why this material does not appear in the traditionally Petrine Mk if it is authentic (3). But must we demand Mk to include all of Peter's reminiscences? Conversely, need we deny that in an epistle Peter might have recalled something which failed to come to Mk's attention? Best also queries why Peter should have used διάβολος instead of the Lucan and original Σατανᾶς. The answer is simple: Peter translates for the benefit of his Gentile readers where Lk, as elsewhere, transliterates. Best finally asks why the metaphor shifts from sieve to wild animal. I suggest that the intensity of persecution, emphasized previously in the epistle, led to a strengthening of metaphor. Best asks too much in requiring everything to be the same and fails to deal with the positive indications of an allusion: (a) the correspondence between διάβολος and Σατανᾶς; (b) the common issue of πίστις, which if strong will bring victory over the Adversary's attack; (c) the similarity between στερεωτ and στερέωσον, and (d) the fulfilling in 1 Pt of the dominical command, στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφοῖς σου.

Best doubts an allusion to Lk 23,46 in 1 Pt 4,19 (4) because Jesus commits his πνεῦμα but 1 Pt exhorts the readers to commit their ψυχή (5). But the two terms are used interchangeably in this connexion throughout the Christian and Jewish literature of the period. Although God appears as Father in Lk and as Creator in 1 Pt, Peter may have wished to guard the special relationship of Jesus to God as Father. That the saying in Lk stems from Ps 30,6 neither makes it inauthentic (Jesus could quote the OT, too) nor rules out Petrine use of a domini-

(1) P. 106.
(2) Pp. 106-108, points a-h and k under 3.
(3) P. 107.
(4) Supported in my earlier article, pp. 343-344, as well as by Spicq, whom Best cites.
(5) P. 108.
cal logion drawn from the OT. Nor does Stephen’s similar committal of his spirit at martyrdom. Besides, Stephen commits his spirit to the “Lord Jesus” (Acts 7,59). In view of the reference to οἱ πάσχοντες Best is probably wrong in thinking that in 1 Pt death is not in view. In the immediately preceding verses we read of fiery trial which is already coming to pass, fellowship in the sufferings of Christ (who died!), crimes such as murder punishable by death, and terrifying judgment on both unbelievers and the house of God (vv. 12-18). Ἐν ἀγαθοποιίᾳ merely indicates the kind of activity in and for which a Christian should die if need be. The motifs of innocent suffering and trustful self-committal to God in death, expressed with παρατίθεμεν, establish the allusion.

Whatever our view of the Lucanisms in Lk 24,25-26 and the authenticity of the context, the similarities of the two sayings there with 1 Pt 1,10-12 are impressive. Best mentions the prophets, the sufferings of Christ, and his subsequent glory, but thinks the similarities arise independently as Christian attempts to explain the death and resurrection/glory of Jesus in terms of the OT (1). He fails to note two additional similarities which strengthen the case for an allusion to authentic sayings, viz., the formal use of Ξριστός alone and the use of ταύτα for the sufferings. The difficult plural δόξας instead of Lk’s singular supports the allusion, for the more difficult reading is more likely original. Peter probably used a form earlier than the smoothed out tradition in Lk. Thus, contrary to Best, we detect several allusions to Lucan passages outside as well as within chapters 6 and 12.

Passing to allusions to material which appears in Mt, Best is right to reject connexions between 5,5 and 1 Pt 3,1-4 in the (too common) elements of meekness (so Spicq) and inheritance (so Chase) (2).

A relationship between 1 Pt 3,14 and the beatitude of those who suffer ἐνεχθεν δικαιοσύνης (Mt 5,10) is indubitable. Only Best argues that 1 Pt depends on an inauthentic addition of δικαιοσύνη in the pre-Matthaean tradition since the same addition appears elsewhere in comparison with Lk (Mt 5,45; 13,17; 23,29). Possibly the whole of Mt 5,10 is a construct (3). The questions raised are too large for thorough discussion here. But I would briefly note that by comparison with Lucan parallels the better parallelisms in Mt 5,45; 13,17; and

(1) P. 108.
(3) P. 109.
23,29 may well favor closer adherence to the original words of Jesus — and thus justify δικαιοσύνη — on the Matthaean side (1). For example, Lk betrays his loss of the parallelism in the beatitude on those who see and hear Jesus’ ministry (so Mt 13,17) by omitting from the beatitude those who hear and yet retaining a reference to hearing in the δικαιοσύνη-clause of the following statement. I suggest that Lk’s “kings” is an adaptation of a more original “righteous men” (so Mt) for the benefit of Gentile readers. “Prophets and righteous men” is a more likely combination on the lips of Jesus than “prophets and kings” in connexion with desire to experience the eschaton. Similarly, the reference to divine causation of rain upon the righteous and unrighteous in Mt 5,45, but not in Lk 6,35, looks like the kind of Palestinian touch Jesus might include. Again, by comparison with Mt’s “prophets . . . righteous men” (23,29) Lk possibly betrays a loss of parallelism in dropping “righteous men” (11,47) by combining “prophets” with his favorite “apostles”, an Ersatz for “righteous men”, in v. 49. Since Abel and other unnamed martyrs in the OT were not all prophets, Jesus presumably refers also to “righteous men”. So the presence of δικαιοσύνη in Matthaean passages, including 5,10, does not indicate inauthenticity. The parallelism in that beatitude may, on the contrary, favor its authenticity.

1 Pt 4,13-14 has already been discussed in connexion with Lk 6,22. Since Best seems to accept an allusion (2), the only needed corrective is to note that 1 Pt lies closer to Mt not only in the speaking of evil against believers, but also in the use of ἀγαλλία. 1 Pt depends on an earlier form, elements of which made their way separately into Mt and Lk. There is no problem with Mt 5,16b and 1 Pt 2,12b. Significantly, however, Best allows a number of adaptations in 1 Pt (3) of the kind which elsewhere he uses to argue against an allusion. A number of other parallels with Mt have already been discussed here and in Best’s article (4). I agree with Best’s rejection, under the points j and l, of allusions suggested by Spicq and Chase.

(1) Elsewhere Best argues for the greater originality of parallelism (p. 104).
(3) “God” for “your Father in heaven”, addition of “in the day of visitation”, “Gentiles” for “men”, and (I add) ἐποπτεῖοντες for ἰδωσιν. Best also allows the change from διώκω (Mt 5,10) to πάσχω (1 Pt 3,14) (pp. 109-110).
(4) Pp. 110-111, points f-i, k, m-o, q-aa.
But Best's final rejection of an allusion in 1 Pt 2,13-17 to Jesus' words in the story of Peter's Penny (Mt 17,25-27) is unwarranted (¹). The freedom of the believer, the necessity of avoiding offence to unbelievers, and the political frame of reference constitute striking similarities. The differences between the passages are hardly "considerable". The distinction between freedom by familial relationship to an earthly king and the freedom of a Christian man is simply a distinction between a metaphor and its meaning. Taxation is the topic in Mt, and 1 Pt speaks more generally concerning Christians and the state. But that hardly calls in question the allusion, for the extension is natural enough. Best himself suggests that the author of 1 Pt might well have alluded to Mk 12,13-17. Yet that passage deals with taxation, too! The passage in 1 Pt may bear conceptual similarities to Rom 13,1-7, but it does not exhibit close verbal resemblances or express the thought of Christian higher freedom, a striking thought shared only by 1 Pt and the saying in Mt. Though 1 Pt 2,13-17 comes from a Haustafel, we should allow liberty for the kind of adaptation and interpolation typical of ancient writers. Besides, the Haustafel may not begin till v. 18. Finally, Best's argument that the original event in Mt 17,24-27 "has been developed so much that we cannot be sure of its original form" assumes the conclusion. Maybe correspondence with 1 Pt tells us that the form is more original than sometimes thought.

Since it is not true that contacts between 1 Pt and the gospel tradition are largely limited to Lk 6 and 12, Best's first conclusion that Peter is excluded from authorship because we would expect a wider distribution of allusions from his pen does not follow (²). The incorrectness of this restriction of allusions also subverts the second conclusion that 1 Pt displays contacts only with sayings. It is natural, however, that allusive quotations of sayings should outnumber references to miracles, parables, and other elements in the gospel tradition. That is also the reason Best's third conclusion — viz., that there is no special link between 1 Pt and Mk so far as sayings are concerned — is insignificant. Mk records relatively little of Jesus' teaching. It is enough to point to the previous discussion with reference to the fourth conclusion that 1 Pt often rests on a developed rather than original form of tradition.

(¹) Pp. 110-111.
(²) Pp. 111-112.
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We have no right to demand with Best in his fifth conclusion that the author of 1 Pt quote dominical sayings instead of OT passages if he really be Peter. Nor should we think "that the author either did not know the appropriate logion or that he considered the authority of the OT superior to that of Jesus". Early Christians generally did not set the OT against Jesus. (When they did, the OT usually suffered.) And Jesus himself appealed to the OT frequently. We may also question the suitability of some of the dominical sayings which Best suggests might have taken the place of the OT. In 1 Pt 4,17a ("Because the time [has come] for judgment to begin at the house of God" — cf. Ez 9,6), the saying about the "green tree" (Lk 23,31) would fit only with difficulty and would not lead into the comparison between judgments on Christians and non-Christians. In 1 Pt 1,24 the author wants a statement about the "word of God", whereas Lk 12,28 has to do with divine provision of physical needs. In 1 Pt 1,16 neither the exhortation to perfection in Mt 5,48 nor the exhortation to mercyfulness in Lk 6,36 would fit so well as the OT quotation because Peter has just exhorted to holiness.

Best again suggests a few other places "where I Peter might have used a gospel logion but did not". But the proper question is not, How many allusions to dominical sayings "might" the author have made but did not? It is rather, How many allusions did he make, and do they display such character and pattern as to constitute significant evidence concerning his identity and the quality of the dominical tradition? What the author "might have" used but did not is balanced, we should remember, by what he may have used from Jesus' unrecorded teaching but which has passed unnoticed through the evangelists' omissions. Concerning the specific places where Best thinks 1 Pt might have used a dominical saying, every one already does contain such allusions (though they are not all acceptable to Best) (?).!

The foregoing discussions also upset the eighth conclusion that "there are no necessary references to events or incidents in which Peter was involved". We should note here not only that Peter was involved, but that in almost all instances he was either deeply involved or had some other special reason to remember the saying or incident. He figured prominently in the issue of the Temple-tax, in the question

(?!) 1 Pt 5,2-4 to Mk 10,42-45; Lk 12,32; 22,25-30; Jn 10, 11, 14; 13,4-5; 21,15-17; 1 Pt 1,10-12 to Lk 24,25-26; 1 Pt 5,8-9 to Lk 22,31-32; and 1 Pt 2,13-17 to Mt 17,26-27. See the discussions above.
which elicited the exhortations to eschatological watchfulness, in the story of Gethsemane, in the incidents and exchanges on the occasion of the Last Supper, in the epilogue to the fourth gospel, and of course in his denials of Jesus and the giving of his own new name (1). It is precisely this inner consistency between the allusions in 1 Pt and the Petrine nature of their contexts in the gospels (1) which calls for recognition of Peter's authorship of the epistle and for recognition of the authenticity of the particular traditions to which allusion was made.

The rest of Best's conclusions need no treatment here, with one exception. Best calls attention to a number of possible parallels between 1 Clement and Lk 6,20b-38 and Matthaean parallels and deduces that since Clement probably knew neither Lk nor Mt, he must have utilized a block of tradition known in Rome also by the author of 1 Pt and included by Lk in his gospel. Very well, but that in no way precludes allusions by Peter to other gospel traditions of special interest to him, for even Best recognizes probable links in 1 Pt with other material in Lk 12 and a couple of other places (Mt 5,10,16). Notably, the standards by which allusions are judged genuine drop in the comparisons between 1 Clement and Lk 6.

We may conclude, then, that good reasons remain for our seeing 1 Pt as dictated by the Apostle Peter in Rome, and for our seeing his dictation as peppered with frequent allusions to dominical sayings and incidents which were both authentic and possessive of special interest to him.

(1) The pattern is drawn out in much greater detail in my earlier article, pp. 345 ff.