THE PRODUCT OF A PETRINE CIRCLE?
A REASSESSMENT OF THE ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF 1 PETER.

David G. Horrell

Department of Theology
University of Exeter
Exeter, EX4 4QH, UK

1. Introduction

Although still relatively neglected compared to the Pauline *Hauptbriefe*,[1] 1 Peter is nevertheless subject to considerable debate, not only over such *Einleitungsfragen* as date and authorship,[2] but also concerning quite basic judgments as to the character, theology and purpose of the letter. For many years, especially in German scholarship, 1 Peter has been described as a 'Pauline' document, whether that is meant in the sense of its direct literary dependence on Romans or Ephesians, its generally Pauline theological perspective, or that 1 Peter stands in the post-Pauline tradition along with the other Pauline NT pseudepigrapha. For example, W.G. Kümmel, in his influential *Introduction to the New Testament*, boldly affirms that 'there can be no doubt that the author of I Pet stands in the line of succession of Pauline theology' (Kümmel 1975: 423). Helmut Koester and more recently Hans Hübner and Udo Schnelle are among those who express similar judgments about 1 Peter's dependence on

---

[1] The 'benign neglect' of an 'exegetical step-child', of which J.H.Elliott could write in 1976 (Elliott 1976; cited below from the reprint in Talbert 1986), however, has since been somewhat redressed, not least through the work of Elliott himself (on which see below). A significant number of commentaries and monographs have been published in the years since 1976, reflecting a healthy interest in the epistle. For a bibliography of works to the mid 1990s, see Casurella 1996, and now also Elliott 2000:155-304.

[2] Most scholars favour pseudonymity and a date sometime in the last three decades of the first century CE, though arguments are also mounted in favour of Peter's own authorship of the letter and a date in the 60s CE, or, occasionally, for an early second-century date. Here the letter will be regarded as a pseudonymous composition written between about 75 and 95 CE; for arguments see Horrell 1998:6-10; Achtemeier 1996:1-43; Elliott 2000:134-38 (who suggests between 73 and 92CE).

the Pauline tradition.[3] Among English-speaking commentators, F.W. Beare is convinced that 1 Peter exhibits the signs of Pauline influence and of literary dependence on a number of the Pauline letters (Beare 1970: 44-45, 219).

Others have long argued that 1 Peter is, in Ceslas Spicq's words, 'une Épître de la Tradition', an epistle which incorporates diverse and varied strands of early Christian tradition and which should not be one-sidedly labelled 'Pauline'.[4] Many recent commentators accept that there are some parallels between 1 Peter and the Pauline tradition, but suggest these may have come from the sharing of common Christian tradition, and stress equally the influence of other Christian traditions within the letter (e.g. Michaels 1988:xliii-xlv; Achtemeier 1996:23).

In recent years, the increased emphasis upon 1 Peter's distinctive character has contributed to what John Elliott calls 'the liberation of 1 Peter from its "Pauline bondage"' (Elliott 1976:9).[5] According to Elliott, writing in 1976, 'the theory of a Petrine dependence upon Paul must now be rejected in favor of a common Petrine and Pauline use of a broadly varied (liturgical, parenetic, and catechetical) tradition' (Elliott 1976:8; cf. 2000:37-40). Elliott's alternative view of the epistle is forcefully stated: '1 Peter is the product of a Petrine tradition transmitted by Petrine tradents of a Petrine circle' (Elliott 1976:9; cf. 1981:271-72; 2000:127-30).[6] On this basis, while accepting that the letter is formally pseudonymous, Elliott maintains that 1 Peter is 'authentically Petrine in the sense that it expresses the thoughts, the theology, and the concerns of the apostle Peter as shared, preserved and developed by the group with which he was most closely associated' (Elliott 1980:253-54; cf. 2000:127-30, 889-90). Elliott elsewhere makes it clear that he sees this Petrine circle as based in Rome and as treasuring not only distinctively Petrine traditions but more generally those of the Roman Christian community (including Paul's letter to the Romans); hence there are diverse and varied traditions woven into the epistle, which represents the Roman community's letter of

---

[3] See Koester 1982:292-93; Hübner 1993: 387-95; Schnelle 1998: 410-11. For Hübner, 1 Peter is the 'Höhepunkt der Wirkungsgeschichte der paulinischen Theologie' (p.387).

[4] Spicq 1966a:15; cf. also 1966b:37; Selwyn 1952: 17-24, 365-466; Goppelt 1993:26-36.

[5] Elliott (2000:40) reiterates the plea: 'It is high time for 1 Peter to be liberated from its "Pauline captivity" and read as a distinctive voice of the early Church.'

[6] In his 1971 commentary, E. Best also made the similar suggestion that 'the epistle was pseudonymous but emerged from a Petrine school' (1971:63).

encouragement and exhortation to the suffering Christians of Asia Minor (Elliott 1983; 1985:196-98; 1993:85; 2000:130-34). Further weight has been added to the notion of 1 Peter's distinctively Petrine character by Jens Herzer's book-length examination and critique of the hypothesis of the 'Paulinism' of 1 Peter: Herzer's conclusion is that direct Pauline influence on 1 Peter is neither provable nor probable.[7]

The view of 1 Peter as the product of a Petrine group or school (probably in Rome),[8] promoted especially by Elliott, seems to be growing in influence. Ralph Martin, for example, has recently suggested that 'the insight that a document like I Peter may well be the final product of a group associated with Peter in his lifetime and intent on publishing his teaching after his demise is gaining ground, and holds out the most promise for future understanding' (Martin 1994:92). Clifton Black similarly finds Elliott's view broadly convincing: '1 Peter probably was the product of a distinctive group, or circle, within primitive Christianity, perhaps originating in Rome, which aligned itself with the witness of the apostle Peter' (Black 1994: 64). Kathleen Corley also comments that 'the argument for a separate Petrine school is gaining wider acceptance' (Corley 1995:350). While Elliott and Richard Bauckham prefer to speak of a 'circle' or 'group' of Petrine associates (Bauckham 1983: 146), Marion Soards has suggested that 1 Peter, along with 2 Peter and Jude, provides evidence for the existence of a 'Petrine school', analogous to the other ancient schools which existed at the time (Soards 1988). Soards's arguments are on the whole weak and unconvincing, either extrapolating illegitimately from literary similarities to common community (or, more precisely, 'school') origin, or taking characteristics common to early Christianity as a whole (such as the use of the Jewish scriptures, specifically the LXX) as indications of the existence of a particular school within early Christianity. The three letters — 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude

---

[7] Herzer 1998; for an overview and critique, see the review in Horrell (2000).

[8] The view that the letter originated in Rome is widely held and seems to me the most probable hypothesis (see e.g. Elliott 1981:290 n.15; 1983; 2000:131-34; Goppelt 1993:48; Achtemeier 1996:64, Horrell 1998:7-8, etc.). Some scholars, however, have pointed out that if the letter is pseudepigraphal, then the description of its origin as from 'Babylon' (i.e. Rome; 1 Pet. 5:13) may also be a part of the pseudepigraphical framework (Brox 1975:95). Lindemann (1979:253) and Herzer (1998:264-66) suggest an origin in Asia Minor, in the areas to which the letter is addressed.

— are too different to support the idea of a common school origin.[9] Nevertheless, in some form, the view of 1 Peter as the distinctive product of a Petrine group in Rome seems to be gaining ground. Indeed, Elliott notes in his recent commentary that '[n]umerous scholars now consider the theory plausible, if not probable' (2000:127).

The aim of this essay is to assess how valid it is to regard 1 Peter in this way.[10] This will involve a brief consideration of some of the Christian (Pauline and other NT) traditions evident in the letter, some appraisal of the evidence (or lack of it) for a 'Petrine group' in Rome, and (if 1 Peter is not the product of a distinctive Petrine group) an attempt to answer the question as to why it was written in the name of Peter (1:1), and mentions Silvanus and Mark (5:12-13). It will be argued that 1 Peter is best seen as the product of a consolidating Roman Christianity rather than of a specifically Petrine circle or school, a circle for which there is no substantive evidence.

2. Pauline traditions in 1 Peter

A comprehensive study of every suggested parallel between the Pauline tradition and 1 Peter cannot be attempted in the space available here; even in his monograph-length investigation of the supposed 'Paulinism' of 1 Peter, Herzer examines only a selection of the possible texts and themes (Herzer 1998:12, cf. 4). However, an illustrative selection of a variety of parallels, confronting in particular the arguments of Herzer's recent book, will serve to demonstrate the links between 1 Peter and Pauline language and tradition.

2.1. The epistolary frame

In both the opening and the closing verses of 1 Peter a number of similarities with the typical Pauline pattern can be seen, while differences and distinctive ideas at the same time indicate that 1 Peter is certainly not simply an imitation of a Pauline letter. For example, the description of Peter as □□□□ .□□□□□□ . .□□□□□□˜ .□□□□□□□˜ (1:1) is reminiscent of Paul, although Paul generally has □□□□□□□˜ .□□□□□□˜ rather than

[9] Note the brief dismissal in Bauckham 1990:147.

[10] The argument will proceed on the assumption (which I grant is not indisputable) of the letter's pseudonymity (see n.2 above).

□□□□□□˜ □□□□□□□˜[11] (cf. 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; but note Gal 1:1; Tit 1:1). Similarly, the phrase □□ □□□ □□□□˜□ □□□˜ □□□□ □□ (1 Pet. 1:2) is a characteristically Pauline greeting (Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Gal 1:3; Eph 1:2; Phil 1:2; Col 1:2; 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:2; Phlmn 3; note also Rev 1:4), although a notable difference is the verb □□□□□□□□□ □ which follows in 1 Peter, a verb unknown in the Pauline tradition but found, for example, in Jewish epistolary tradition (Dan 4:1; 6:26 [LXX: Theodotion]) and in the greetings of Jude, 2 Peter, and *1 Clement*. The common features of the Pauline tradition and 1 Peter may here be contrasted with the letter openings of James, 1-2-3 John and Jude. The author of 1 Peter may possibly not have been conscious that the tradition of Christian epistolography which he followed was shaped by Paul,[12] but that would not negate the *de facto* Pauline influence on the letter-form.

In the letter closing, the most striking link with Paul is the exhortation □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□ (1 Pet. 5:14), which is paralleled only, and almost precisely, in Paul (Rom. 16:16; 1 Cor. 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; 1 Thess 5:26). The only significant distinction is that Paul describes the kiss as a *holy* kiss (□□ □□□□ □□□□□□) rather than one of love (□□□□ □□). For Herzer (1998: 77-80) this difference is enough to establish the independence ('Eigenständigkeit') of 1 Peter from Paul, the similarity being explained by their common adoption of an early Christian tradition. Certainly, as Herzer suggests, greeting with a kiss may have become a widespread and not exclusively Pauline custom in early Christianity, and even if it was introduced to the Roman church by Paul (Rom 16:16) the author of 1 Peter may not have been aware of the Pauline link. Nevertheless, since the custom is known to us (aside from 1 Peter) only through the Pauline letters, and since Paul may have been responsible for its introduction to the Roman Christians, to speak of 1 Peter's *independence* from Pauline tradition here does not do justice to the available evidence.

---

[11] As Herzer (1998:31-34) points out, but overinterprets, arguing against any indebtedness of 1 Peter to the Pauline letter-form and pressing the case for 1 Peter's independence; see further Horrell 2000.

[12] So Herzer (1998:83), who denies that the epistolary frame of 1 Peter indicates any dependence on Paul or the Pauline tradition.

2.2. The expression □□□ □□□□□□ ˜□

The expression □□□ □□□□□□ ˜□, so frequent and typical in Paul, occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in 1 Peter (3:16; 5:10; 5:14). We may agree with Herzer that the formula is used in 1 Peter in a distinctive way, and conveys the distinctive theology of the letter rather than a blandly reproduced Paulinism.[13] It is also possible, as Herzer suggests, that the formula had become an independent Christian expression used without awareness of its Pauline origins, though given its absence from the rest of the New Testament this seems a less than probable suggestion (Herzer 1998:102-106). Once again, insofar as our evidence allows us to say anything, the distinctively Pauline character and origin of the formula is clear: the use of the phrase □□□ □□□□□□ ˜□ in 1 Peter most likely indicates the influence of Pauline tradition.[14]

2.3. The term □□□□ □□□

Another term found in the New Testament only in the Pauline letters and 1 Peter (4:10) is □□□□ □□□, used to describe the varied gifts given to the members of the Christian community. The exhortation in 1 Peter to every Christian to use their gifts in service of one another, □□□□□□□□ □□□□ ˜□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□ (4:10), is widely regarded as a clear sign of indebtedness to Pauline tradition.[15] Herzer once again demurs, emphasising the differences between the Pauline and Petrine usage (e.g. the tendency in the Pauline letters to emphasise the *giving* of the gifts [□□ □□□□: Rom 12:6; 1 Cor 12:7ff.], compared with receiving [□□□□□ □□] in 1 Peter) and linking the view of gifts in 1 Peter to the tradition in Acts 6, with the division of labour between the two tasks of proclamation and service (1 Pet.

---

[13] Herzer 1998:84-106. Again, however, Herzer overstresses the differences and their significance for 1 Peter's independence; he concedes, for example, (p.104) that the idea expressed in 1 Pet. 5:10 is paralleled in Rom. 8:17, but points out that Paul there uses □□ □ rather than □□□. That there are significant differences need not be denied, but an *identical* use of phrases or expressions is surely most unlikely in any subsequent adaptation or transmission of tradition (cf. the Pastorals' presentation of the Pauline tradition!).

[14] Cf. Brox 1979:161: '…zeigt aber ein weiteres Mal das paulinische Kolarit des 1 Petr.' Even Elliott concedes that the 'in Christ' theme may be distinctively Pauline (2000:38).

[15] E.g., on 4:10 Brox comments: 'Der paulinische Charakter ethischer Elemente des 1 Petr ist an dieser Stelle aber immerhin besonders deutlich' (Brox 1979: 207).

4:11; Acts 6:1-4; Herzer 1998:158-72). But while the general and illustrative twofold exhortation □□□.□□□.□□□□□˜.… □□□.□□□.□□□□□□□□˜ (1 Pet. 4:11) is very broadly reminiscent of Acts 6, the language of □□□□ .□□□ is distinctively Pauline, and the similarities between 1 Pet. 4:10-11 and Rom. 12:6-8 close enough to suggest again the (direct or indirect) influence of Paul (perhaps specifically Romans) on 1 Peter.

2.4. The paraenetic tradition

Close similarities between the paraenesis in 1 Peter 3, Romans 12 and 1 Thessalonians 5 have often been noted.[16] Particularly striking are the parallels between Rom 12:17, 1 Thess 5:15 and 1 Pet 3:9:

> □□□□□□˜.□□□□˜□.□□□□□˜.□□□□□˜.□□□□□□□□.□□□□..□□□□□□□ .□□□□□ .□□□□˜.□□□□ .□□□□ □□ .□□□□ □□□□□□ .□□□□(Rom. 12:17)
>
> □□□□˜□□.□□..□□□.□□□□˜□.□□□□□˜.□□□□□˜.□□□□.□□□□□□˜□..□□□□□ ˜.□□ .□□□□□.□□˜.□□□□□□˜□.□□□ .□□□□.□□□□˜..□□□□.□□□□□ .□□□□.□ □□˜.□□□□.□□ .□□□□. (1 Thess. 5:15)
>
> □□˜.□□□□□□□□.□□□□.□□□□˜□.□□□□□˜.□□□□□˜.□..□□□□□□□ .□□.□□□□ □˜.□□□□□□□ .□□..□□□□□□□□□ .□□.□□˜. □□□□□□□□˜□□□□.□□□□.□□□□.□□□˜□□.□□□□□ .□□□□.□□□□.□□□□□□□ .□□ .□□□□□□□□□ .□□□□..(1 Pet. 3:9)

Given the similarities between this teaching and that found in the Sermon on the Mount/Plain (Matt 5:44; Luke 6:27-28), it is not unlikely that these passages share a common source in early Christian (dominical) paraenesis.[17] However, the precise linguistic parallels between the texts listed above do not derive from the synoptic tradition, so again, as far as our evidence shows, the particular formulation of paraenetical tradition found in 1 Peter seems to reflect Pauline influence, with Paul's letter to the Romans quite possibly being one of the channels through which this teaching was known to the Roman church and thus to the author(s) of 1 Peter.

---

[16] See further Piper 1980:218-23, who sets out the parallels on p.219. Cf. also Selwyn 1952:407-13; Michaels 1988:174.

[17] Cf., for example, Piper 1980:221; Michaels 1988:175; Herzer 1998:255-56.

2.5. Christian obligations within the state and household

1 Peter's teaching about the Christian's obligations to the state and within the household also displays clear parallels with the Pauline tradition. Again it is possible, and not infrequently suggested, that both the Pauline and Petrine versions derive from shared early Christian tradition.[18] However, the parallels are such as to suggest some particular link between 1 Peter and the Pauline tradition. 1 Pet 2:13-14 appears to echo Rom 13:1-7, particularly in its use of □□□□□□ .□□□ and its reference to the authorities as those who reward right and punish wrong (cf. also 1 Tim 2:1-4; Titus 3:1). 1 Peter's adaptation of 'household code' material also suggests some proximity to the deutero-Pauline *Haustafeln* (Col 3:18–4:1; Eph 5:21–6:9; 1 Pet 2:18–3:7).[19] These Christian *Haustafeln* clearly have non-Christian literary antecedents (see esp. Balch 1981), and the code in Colossians (probably the earliest such code in the New Testament) has a neat and precise structure, suggesting at least some prior tradition of formulation. Broadly comparable but less directly parallel texts in *Did*. 4.10-11 and *Barn*. 19.7 also indicate that some forms of 'household' teaching came into early Christianity independently of the Pauline tradition. But 1 Peter's household-code teaching and exhortations about submission to the governing authorities seem to reflect the influence of Pauline tradition — at least to as great an extent as do the Pastorals. One of 1 Peter's distinctive contributions is to draw together the Pauline teaching on the state with that on the household. Certainly 1 Peter presents this teaching in a distinctive manner, motivating and justifying the expected conduct in ways which vary from what is found in Paul (cf. Herzer 1998:227-44). But so do the Pastoral Epistles, where Titus 3:1 presents only a concise summary of the teaching elaborated in Rom 13:1-7, and 1 Tim 2:1-2 introduces the appeal to pray 'for kings and all who are in high positions', and where various elements of *Haustafel* teaching appear rather than the complete and balanced 'tables' of Colossians and Ephesians (see 1 Tim 5:1–6:2; Tit 2:1-10).

2.6. Further specific parallels

In addition to the parallels already mentioned, there are a number of places in 1 Peter where the influence of Pauline thought and language has been suggested. Examples include 1 Pet 1:14 (□□□□□□□□□□□ .□□□□□...) and Rom 12:2 (□□□□□□□□□ .□□□□□...), the only two

---

[18] Cf. Selwyn 1952:426-39; Herzer 1998:227.

[19] See further Horrell 1998:45-65.

occurrences of this verb in the NT; 1 Pet 2:24 (
□□□□.□□□˜□.□□□□□□□ .□□□.□□□□□□□□ .□□□□□.□□˜□.□□□□□□□□ .□□□.□□ .□□□
□□) and Rom 6:11, 18
(□□□□□□˜□.□□˜□.□□˜□.□□□□□□□ .□□.□□˜□□□□.□□˜ .□□˜□.□□□□ …
□□□□□□□□□□□ .□□□□.□□˜ .□□□□˜ .
□□˜□.□□□□□□□ .□□.□□□□□□□ .□□□□.□□˜□.□□□□□□□□ .□□□).[20] Both here and in other parallels we have considered, the fact that many of the suggested links are specifically with Romans is striking, though there are also close links with Ephesians,[21] and with other NT writings (see below). Most recent authors agree that the evidence is not such as to prove *literary* dependence,[22] but the hypothesis that 1 Peter shows the influence of Romans seems highly plausible, especially given a Roman origin for 1 Peter.[23]

2.7. Conclusion

Taken together the above observations lead to the conclusion that 1 Peter shows clear signs of awareness of and dependence upon Pauline language and tradition.[24] In some cases the parallels may indicate shared use of common Christian tradition, but in others it is clear that,

---

[20] See further, e.g., Brox 1978b:183-84.

[21] The parallels with Ephesians were investigated in detail by Mitton (see Mitton 1951:176-97). Cf. also Michaels 1988:xliii-xlv; Elliott 1976:7-8. Shimada 1998:57-99 offers a detailed critique of Mitton.

[22] See Shimada 1998: 100-66 for a detailed rebuttal of this position in relation to Romans.

[23] Cf. Elliott 1976:8, who suggests, however, that 'the author of 1 Peter was dependent less on a letter of *Paul* than on a cherished document of the *Roman community* from which he wrote. The influence, then, would be more Roman than Pauline.' Cf. also Elliott 1983:186 n.5 ('Numerous echoes of Paul's letter to the Romans in 1 Peter...'); 2000:37-38; Best 1971:32-36. Nevertheless, what the Roman community cherished was, after all, a letter of Paul's!

[24] Even Elliott, who is concerned to detach 1 Peter from dependence on the Pauline tradition, acknowledges that '[i]t is possible, if not probable, that the Petrine author was familiar with one or more of Paul's letters (esp. Romans)' (Elliott 2000:37). Elliott's suggestion that the influence of Romans was not through 'direct literary borrowing' but only from Romans as a part of 'the body of teaching and traditional exhortation collected at Rome' (2000:38) does not alter the fact that this is an indication of Pauline influence on 1 Peter (cf. also n.23 above).

as far as our evidence allows us to see, the material is distinctively Pauline. There are too many points of contact, in terms both of specific words or phrases and of elements of theology or paraenesis, to justify the view that 1 Peter is *independent* of Paul, as Herzer argues. Herzer's work valuably investigates the distinctive ways in which the author of 1 Peter presents his material, compared with Paul; but this distinctive use does not imply independence. Indeed, on this criterion one could equally well argue that the Pastorals are independent of the Pauline tradition! The distinctiveness Herzer discerns reflects not independence but the ways in which language and tradition are (inevitably) reinterpreted and reapplied over time. Whether the author of 1 Peter knew Romans as such or not, and whether or not he was conscious of the extent to which the Christian traditions he knew stemmed from Paul, does not materially affect this conclusion. But if the Roman provenance of 1 Peter is accepted, then historically plausible explanations for the author's awareness of Pauline material may certainly be found both in Paul's letter to the Romans and in Paul's having been taken to Rome under arrest, prior to his execution in the 60s CE, quite apart from any knowledge of Pauline traditions through the travels of Christian believers and the sharing of letters.

However, this conclusion must not mistakenly be read as (re)asserting the 'Pauline' character of 1 Peter. Elliott, Herzer, and others are right to insist that the letter must not be labelled 'Pauline' and located simply within the stream of deutero-Pauline tradition. Some of the expressions and traditions evident in 1 Peter are of Pauline origin or indicate proximity to the Pauline tradition, but there is much in the letter that is not at all Pauline, and even that which is Pauline is presented in a distinctive way within the letter.

3. Non-Pauline traditions in 1 Peter

Even more than in the investigation of possible Pauline parallels, here I can present only a sample of the non-Pauline traditions in 1 Peter. However, an exhaustive survey is unnecessary to establish the conclusion relevant to the argument of this essay, namely that 1 Peter draws on varied Christian traditions some of which are independent from the Pauline tradition.

3.1. The address to diaspora exiles

While the epistolary frame of 1 Peter seems to reflect some indebtedness to the specifically Pauline letter-tradition (see §2.1. above), the opening address of 1 Peter is by no means thoroughly Pauline. We have already mentioned that the verb □□□□□□□□□ .□, which

concludes the otherwise Pauline greeting □□ .□□□ . □□□□˜□ . □□□˜ . □□□□□ .□□ (1:2) seems to reflect a Jewish-Christian influence. This impression is further reinforced by the address □□□□□□□□□˜□ □□□□□□□□ .□□□□ . □□□□□□□□˜□ . (1:1) only the first word of which appears in the Pauline letters (and □□□□□□□□□ . appears in a prescript only in Tit 1:1).[25] The description of the believers as □□□□□□ .□□□□□, and as □□ .□□□□□□ (both terms are found in 2:11; cf. 1:17), quite apart from its overall significance for the strategy of 1 Peter,[26] draws on a scriptural image and is closely paralleled in the NT in Heb 11:13 (also in Acts 7:6, 29; Eph 2:19. Cf. Gen 23.4 and Psa 38:13 [LXX], where both □□ .□□□□□□ . and □□□□□□ .□□□□□ occur together). The distinctively Jewish term □□□□□□□□ . is found elsewhere in the New Testament only in John 7:35 and James 1:1 (cf. e.g. LXX Deut 28:25; 30:4; Psa 146:2; Isa 49:6; 2 Macc 1:27). The opening address of the letter, then, seems to reflect a distinctive Jewish-Christian influence, alongside its Pauline characteristics.

3.2. Gospel traditions

There is some disagreement over the extent of 1 Peter's knowledge and use of gospel traditions. However, for the purposes of the present argument, substantial engagement with the debate is unnecessary. While I am unconvinced by those who see extensive parallels which point towards the authenticity of 1 Peter,[27] the important points in the present context are uncontentious: 1 Peter does contain some clear allusions to the gospel traditions,[28] though, in common with virtually all early Christian epistles, it does not explicitly or clearly quote

---

[25] Herzer (1998:34) is therefore almost, but not quite, correct when he states in relation to these three terms: 'Keiner dieser Begriffe findet sich in den Präskripten des Corpus Paulinum.'

[26] See esp. Elliott 1981, though his argument that the terms refer to the actual socio-political status of the addressees has not won widespread acceptance; see e.g. Feldmeier 1992; Achtemeier 1996:174.

[27] E.g. Spicq 1966b; Gundry 1967; 1974. Note the critical comments of Brox 1978b:187-90.

[28] This is agreed by Best (1970), who takes issue with the arguments of Gundry (1967) concerning the extent of gospel allusions in 1 Peter and the conclusions to be drawn from these. For further discussion of the use of gospel tradition in 1 Peter, see Maier 1985; Metzner 1995.

from them (contrast 2 Pet. 1:17-18).[29] Whether the author knew of these traditions specifically as Jesus-traditions or only as Christian paraenetical tradition is hard to determine. It is possible, moreover, that some of the teaching known to the author of 1 Peter was known to him via the Pauline tradition (cf. §2.4. above). But the author of 1 Peter's knowledge of *some* gospel traditions, independently of Paul, seems virtually certain. The clearest allusions in 1 Peter are to parts of the Sermon on the Mount, e.g. 1 Pet. 2:12 (Matt. 5:16); 1 Pet. 3:14 (Matt. 5:10); 1 Pet. 4:14 (Matt. 5:11-12).

3.3. The christological interpretation of Isaiah 53

To discuss the influence of Isaiah 53 on New Testament Christology is to intrude into another area of continuing debate in which widely divergent positions are taken (see e.g. Bellinger and Farmer 1998). Nevertheless, for our purposes here, once again the relevant conclusions are relatively uncontroversial. While Paul occasionally quotes from or alludes to parts of Isa 52:13–53:12, the fourth so-called servant song (e.g. Rom 4:25; 10:16; 15:21), this passage is hardly prominent in his christological reflection. On the other hand, its influence on 1 Pet 2:21-25 is obvious and profound, with several phrases from Isaiah 53 directly quoted in this section of 1 Peter.[30] Furthermore, important for 1 Peter's Christology are the image of the spotless lamb whose blood was shed (1 Pet. 1:19), probably derived from Isa 53:7 as well as from the Passover sacrifice, and the picture of the 'sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ' (1:2), again derived from the imagery of the Jewish sacrificial system (cf. Heb 9:11-27; 12:24; Exod 24:3-9; Num 19). These influences on 1 Peter distinguish its Christology from that of Paul, who refers only infrequently to the blood of Christ and only once in passing to Christ as □□˜ .□□ .□□□ .□□□□˜□ and seems when he does so to be echoing tradition (1 Cor. 5:7; cf. John 1:29, 36; Acts 8:32).[31] On the other hand, they link 1 Peter to those traditions of early Christianity that saw Christ's death primarily in terms derived from the Jewish sacrificial system (cf. esp. Hebrews) and found in Isa. 52:13–53:12 an important source for christological reflection (cf. Acts 8:28-35).

---

[29] See further Thompson 1991:37-63. The eucharistic words (1 Cor. 11:23-25) are an exception, for obvious reasons, i.e. their liturgical use in Christian worship.

[30] See further Elliott 1985.

[31] Aside from eucharistic passages (1 Cor 10:16; 11:25, 27) Paul mentions the blood of Christ only in Rom 3:25 and 5:9. Cf. Herzer 1998:126-30.

3.4. Shared paraenesis in James and 1 Peter

Among a number of parallels between James and 1 Peter probably the most extensive are found between 1 Pet. 5:5-9 and James 4:6-10.[32] The different order and precise content of the teaching in each epistle indicate that a direct literary relationship is unlikely, but a common dependence on established teaching, including reflection on some of the same scriptural verses, is highly probable. Both authors (alone in the New Testament, though cf. Luke 1:51) quote Prov. 3:34 (LXX) with exactly the same alteration from the LXX text (1 Pet 5:5; James 4:6);[33] both urge their readers to humble themselves before God, who will then exalt them (1 Pet 5:6; James 4:10), and to resist the Devil (1 Pet 5:8-9; James 4:7). Although the idea of resisting the Devil (by putting on the armour of God) is paralleled also in Ephesians (Eph 6:11, 16), the similarities between James and 1 Peter in these verses are much closer, with a series of parallels unique to these two early Christian epistles. Whatever the precise nature or origin of this exhortation, it is clearly a tradition known (in some form) to the authors of both James and 1 Peter, and distinct from the Pauline tradition.

3.5. Christological creeds

Three passages in 1 Peter are often thought to contain credal formulae, concise and rhythmic traditional expressions of the story of Christ's saving work and subsequent exaltation: 1:18-21; 2:21-25; 3:18-22. It is notable that there is to some extent a logical sequence in these three passages, as they focus in turn on different phases in the 'story' of Christ: in 1:18-21 we read of Christ 'destined before the foundation of the world' (v.20), in 2:21-25 of his suffering and passion, and in 3:18-22 of his having 'gone into heaven… at the right hand of God' (v.22).[34] It may be debated whether these sections contain traditional credal formulae, or whether in fact they are the author's own work.[35] The important point in the context of the present argument is that these traditions, while paralleled to some extent in the Pauline corpus (cf. esp. 1 Tim. 3:16; 2 Tim. 1:9-10; Titus 2:14), do not represent specifically Pauline

---

[32] Cf. also 1 Pet. 1:1//James 1:1; 1 Pet. 1:6-7//James 1:2-3; 1 Pet. 1:24//James 1:10-11; 1 Pet. 2:1-2//James 1:21. See further, e.g., Spicq 1966b:38 n.5; Brox 1978b:186.

[33] Both have □□ ˙ □□□ ˙□ in place of the LXX's □□ ˙□□□□.

[34] Cf. Horrell 1998:69, further 32-34, 52-55, 69-74.

[35] Achtemeier, for example, (1996:126, 130-31 etc.) is cautious about identifying traditional credal/liturgical material and is inclined to attribute such material to the author of the epistle.

formulations. To the extent that they are traditional, they would seem to reflect a broader, common Christian confession, like the shared apostolic kerygma Paul cites in 1 Cor 15:3ff.

3.6. Conclusion

While the investigation of non-Pauline traditions in 1 Peter has necessarily been selective and brief, enough has hopefully been done to establish a relatively uncontroversial conclusion: 1 Peter draws on a range of Christian traditions.[36] Some, as we saw in the previous section, are distinctively Pauline; others, as we have seen above, are clearly un-Pauline or are shared in common with Paul without a distinctively Pauline origin being evident. These non-Pauline traditions in 1 Peter demonstrate the author of 1 Peter's awareness of a wide range of early Christian material and also thereby indicate the inappropriateness of labelling 1 Peter 'Pauline'. Other parallels might profitably have been investigated — for example, those with Hebrews, explained perhaps by a common Roman provenance[37] — but we have assembled sufficient material to be able to affirm the widespread view that 1 Peter is indeed an 'epistle of tradition', both Pauline (*pace* Herzer) and non-Pauline.[38] This conclusion, however, should also be subject to an important qualification: 1 Peter is by no means merely a compilation of early Christian tradition, but rather a creative and distinctive letter into which a wide range of Christian traditions are incorporated.[39] But if this is right, what does this indicate about the character and origins of the letter? Specifically, is there evidence to support the idea that the

---

[36] For a much more detailed recent survey, see Elliott 2000:20-41, who concludes that 'various forms of diverse traditions have been employed and combined by the Petrine author' (p.37).

[37] For a Roman provenance for Hebrews see e.g. Lindars 1991:17-18; cf. Heb 13:24.

[38] This view of 1 Peter as an epistle which contains a variety of early Christian traditions, with some points of contact with Paul, is indeed widely held; cf. e.g. Bovon 1978; Brox 1978b and n.36 above. However, the (re)establishing of this conclusion is important in view both of the challenge of Herzer's recent monograph and of the attempt here to appraise the validity of the Petrine circle theory of the origins of 1 Peter.

[39] Cf. Bovon 1978, who sets out the range of influences and traditional themes in 1 Peter, including Jewish and pagan as well as the predominant Christian traditions, while also pointing to the originality of the letter.

letter originated within a Petrine circle in Rome, a circle which preserved and presented distinctively Petrine traditions?

4. A Petrine tradition from a Petrine circle?

'One can say for sure that, if our "letter" [sc. 1 Peter] lacked the first word *Peter*, no one would have come to suppose that it was written by Peter… It would be much easier to believe that it was written by Paul.'[40] Adolf Jülicher and Erich Fascher's assertion raises a still pertinent question, even though the range of traditions and materials in the letter prevents our accepting the suggestion that 1 Peter is characteristically Pauline: Is there anything other than the name □□ .□□□□ (1:1) that marks it out as specifically *Petrine*? The name □□ .□□□□ is not of course to be lightly dismissed as insignificant to the letter's interpretation, but for the moment I leave it aside to focus on the content of the letter.

In the body of the letter, there is little evidence which could indicate a distinctively Petrine tradition. One might point to the prominence of 'rock' imagery in 2:4-8 and relate this to Jesus' recorded naming of Simon as 'rock' (□□ .□□□□) in Matt 16:18 (cf. John 1:42).[41] However, quite apart from the fact that the word in 1 Pet 2:4-8 is □□ .□□□, except in 2:8, where Isa 8:14 (LXX) is quoted, the 'stone' texts which form the basis of 1 Peter's midrashic exegesis here were used elsewhere and recognised as important texts for early Christian reflection (Psa 117:22 [LXX]; Isa 8:14; 28:16).[42] Indeed, it is significant to note that the two Isaiah texts are linked already in Rom 9:33 (though not in a way that would suggest 1 Peter's literary dependence on Romans here).

---

[40] 'Man kann unbedingt behaupten, daß, wenn unserm "Briefe" [sc. 1 Peter] das erste Wort *Petrus* fehlte, niemand auf die Vermutung, er sei von Petrus verfaßt, geraten sein würde… Wie viel leichter würde man … an Abfassung durch P. [sc. Paulus] glauben.' (Jülicher and Fascher 1931: 192-93, quoted in part by Brox 1975:78). Cf also Beare 1970: 44: 'It is certainly true that if the name "Peter" did not stand at the head of the Epistle, it would never have occurred to anyone to suggest him as the author.'

[41] Cf. Spicq 1966b:56-61; further Gundry 1967.

[42] See Mark 12:10-11, quoting Psa 117:22-23 (par. Matt 21:42-44; Luke 20:17-18: allusions to Isa 8:14 are also added in Matt and Luke's accounts, if Matt 21:44 is original); Rom 9:32-33; 10:11. See further Elliott 1966; Bauckham 1988:309-13.

The exhortation to the elders to 'shepherd the flock' (□□□□□ .□□□□ . □□˜ . □□□ . □□□□˜□ □□□ .□□□□□ □□□˜ . □□□□; 5:2), given by one who is described as □□□□□□□□□ .□□□□□ . □□□˜ . □□ .□□□□ . □□˜□ . □□□˜ □□□□□□□˜ □□□□□□ .□□□ (5:1) might also be taken to indicate a specific connection with Peter (cf. John 21:16). However, with regard to the shepherd imagery, the tradition of Jesus urging Peter to shepherd his sheep (John 21:16), along with the imagery of Jesus as the Good Shepherd (John 10:1-18), is found only in John's gospel, so whether or not it is authentic it is clearly a tradition known and preserved within Johannine circles and therefore does not necessarily indicate 1 Peter's production by a specifically Petrine circle. Moreover, the use of the imagery of shepherd and sheep to describe pastoral leadership is rooted in scripture (Ezek 34:1-31) and so can hardly with confidence be regarded as the specific imagery or tradition of a Petrine group. Indeed, a close parallel to the exhortation in 1 Pet. 5:2 is found in Acts 20:28, where the departing Paul (!) addresses the elders of the Ephesian church. With regard to the description of 'Peter' in 5:1, there are no grounds on which to associate the term □□□□□□ .□□□□□ specifically with Peter[43] and many commentators agree that the reference to Peter as □□ .□□□□ . is meant not in the sense of someone who was with Jesus and who watched his painful death (which in any case, according to the synoptics, Peter did not)[44] but of someone who bears witness to, who proclaims, Christ's suffering and death (cf. 1:10-12) and who follows in his footsteps in suffering (2:21; 4:13). Hence 'Peter' is presented as a *co*-elder and witness, sharing a 'common bond' with those elders who are here addressed.[45] Even if the intention is to present Peter as an eminent and unique authority (cf. Beare 1970:198), this is done in terms available to early Christian groups generally and does not indicate the preservation of a distinctively Petrine tradition.

The argument that 1 Peter represents a specifically Petrine tradition is severly limited not least by lack of evidence (cf. Black 1994: 64). Aside from 1 and 2 Peter — which may or may not convey anything specifically Petrine but which are in any case very different from one another — we know very little about any distinctively 'Petrine' formulation of the

---

[43] It is of course widely used in a range of NT writings to refer to Christian leaders (Acts, James, Pastorals, 2-3 John): see Campbell 1994.

[44] So Achtemeier 1996:323.

[45] Cf. e.g. Michaels, 277-81; Achtemeier 1996:323-24; Kelly 1969:198-99; Brox 1979: 229-30. Otherwise Beare 1970:198.

gospel.[46] Moreover, what we do know — his role as apostle to the Jews (Gal 2:7), his siding with the people from James at Antioch (Gal 2:11-14), etc. — has no significant bearing on the content of 1 Peter, which simply applies to *Gentile* Christians[47] exclusively Jewish identity descriptions (2:9, etc.) without giving any indication that the extent of obedience to Jewish law or relations between Jewish and Gentile Christians are contentious issues.[48]

From the gospels we know of Peter's prominence as a disciple of Jesus, and also of his increasing authority as a leader within the Christian churches (Matt 16:18-19; John 21:15-19). But evidence from Matthew and John — which appear to represent two quite different strands of early Christianity —about the high regard for Peter as leader of the Christian movement does not demonstrate the existence of a Petrine circle which preserved traditions about Peter and promoted his distinctive teaching. On the contrary, it demonstrates Peter's increasing prominence within Christian circles *generally* (see further below). The pseudo-Petrine literature, with its varied provenance and character, also supports this view, rather than the idea of a specifically Petrine group or school.[49]

In Acts we do have records of speeches and sermons of Peter, which could conceivably contribute to the recovery of a distinctively Petrine theology. But the closest parallels between Acts and 1 Peter are not found specifically in the places in Acts where Peter's voice is recorded (e.g. Acts 20:28//1 Pet. 5:2) and the speeches in Acts reflect Lukan theology as much as that of their speakers. Any parallels with 1 Peter are likely to reflect

---

[46] Cf. Brox 1978a:114: 'Wir kennen keine Originalurkunden authentischer petrinscher Theologie.'

[47] The (predominantly) Gentile audience is indicated in 1:14, 18; 2:10; 3:6; 4:3-4.

[48] 'Language that the OT uses to describe Israel is taken over and applied without remainder to the new people whose existence is grounded, as was Israel's, in God's election' (Achtemeier 1996:67; see 67-73; also Richardson 1969:171-75). This is one of the arguments in favour of the letter's pseudonymity: not only is the specific focus of the historical Peter no longer evident, but the consciousness of 'Christian' identity (cf. 4:16) seems to have moved beyond that of the period in which Paul and Peter were alive. Cf. Horrell 1998:7.

[49] Cf. Brox 1978a:115; further Perkins 1994:131-67.

either the common use of early Christian kerygma and tradition or a common outlook shared by both Luke and the author of 1 Peter.[50]

In view of all this it must be acknowledged that we have very little evidence revealing any distinctive or particular way in which Peter formulated the Christian gospel, and even the little evidence there is gives us no firm reasons to conclude that 1 Peter has a distinctively Petrine character.[51] If 1 Peter were authentic, then it would of course constitute a unique piece of evidence for precisely such a 'Petrine' formulation of Christian theology.[52] However, if on other grounds 1 Peter is thought to be pseudonymous, then the body of the letter gives us no grounds on which to say that it is 'the product of a Petrine tradition transmitted by Petrine tradents of a Petrine circle' (Elliott 1976:9). Evidence for such a judgment could only be found, then, in connection with the names found in the letter — Silvanus, Mark, and, of course, Peter — to which we now turn.

5. The names in 1 Peter: Silvanus and Mark

John Elliott claims that 1 Peter 'is the product not of a single individual but of a *group* of which Peter, Silvanus and Mark were chief representatives' (Elliott 1980:250; cf. 2000:127-30, 889-90). The names in 1 Peter are, for Elliott, a crucial part of the evidence to support the theory of 1 Peter's production by a Petrine circle.

In his most recent major work, Elliott (2000:127-29) offers seven reasons in support of the 'Petrine group' theory. The first two are based on the observation — rooted both in NT evidence and in what is sociologically 'likely' — that 'Peter, like Paul and others, worked in groups or teams' (p.128). While this observation is true, it does not by any means establish

---

[50] Cf. Black 1994:64-65. As Black points out, 'many of the formal similarities between Peter's address in Acts 15:7-11 and 1 Peter, delineated by Elliott [1980:264 n.31], are replicated in other speeches in Acts, not all of which are delivered by Peter.'

[51] Cf. Brox 1977:3; 1978a:114-15, who argues that apart from the name Peter there is nothing distinctively Petrine about the content of 1 Peter.

[52] For this reason at least, arguments over authenticity are significant. Elliott (1980; 2000:130) offers his Petrine circle theory as a means of somewhat circumventing the debate about authorship — it is pseudonymous but nevertheless represents genuinely and specifically Petrine material — but this is successful only if we grant his argument that the letter reflects Petrine traditions preserved by a Petrine circle, precisely the point at issue here.

that, by the time of 1 Peter's writing,[53] there was a distinctively *Petrine* group in Rome — which is, of course, the crucial point. The remaining five points are all based upon 'the explicit naming of Silvanus and Mark in 1 Pet 5:12-13' which 'makes sense if they were actually intimate colleagues of the Apostle Peter' (p.128). While Elliott is right that there is evidence in Acts to link Peter, Silvanus and Mark, as we shall see below the evidence does not establish any strong link, especially in the case of Mark. Moreover, what we do know of Silvanus and Mark would suggest that their links were both with Peter/Jerusalem and with Paul, thus undermining Elliott's earlier claim that the collaborative character of the early Christian mission implies the existence of a distinctively Petrine group.

There is obviously no doubt that the naming of the author of the letter as Peter serves to connect the document specifically with that apostle and thus claims *his* authority for the teaching sent in his name. If the letter is neither authentically by Peter, nor specifically Petrine in content and origins, then some plausible explanation is needed as to why it was written in his name. An attempt at such an explanation will be offered below (§7). What is necessary here is to see first whether the names Silvanus and Mark add any weight to the idea that the letter originated in a Petrine circle.[54]

It is widely agreed that the Silvanus mentioned in 1 Pet. 5:12 is to be identified with the Silas/Silvanus known from the book of Acts and the letters of Paul.[55] According to Acts, Silas travelled to Antioch, along with others, bearing the apostles' letter after the Jerusalem council (Acts 15:22-35) and subsequently became a co-worker of Paul's (Acts 15:40–18:5).

---

[53] Dated by Elliott to between 73 and 92 CE (see Elliott 2000:134-38).

[54] It is possible that another (female) individual — □□ . □□□ . □□□□□□ ˜ □□ . □□□□□□□□□□ . — sends greetings along with Mark in 5:12. However, most commentators agree that the reference is almost certainly collectively to the □□□□□□□□ .□ 'in Babylon' rather than to a specific woman, such as Peter's wife (so e.g. Brox 1979:247; Beare 1970: 210). Otherwise Elliott 1981:272, who suggests that 'an unnamed Christian "sister"' is in view here, though he more recently argues for a corporate reference, specifically to the 'brotherhood' (□□□□□□□ .□□□) (Elliott 2000:880-82).

[55] Achtemeier (1996:351), however, suggests that he may simply be another Silvanus, otherwise unknown to us, who was entrusted with the delivery of the letter. If this were the case, then we would have no other evidence with which to link Silvanus to any particular circle, Petrine or Pauline.

Paul refers to him, along with Timothy, as a co-author of 1 Thessalonians (1 Thess 1:1; cf. 2 Thess 1:1) and co-founder of the Corinthian church (2 Cor 1:19). His mention in 1 Peter may therefore be seen as a further indication, and perhaps explanation (if Silvanus was involved in co-writing the letter), of the Pauline influences upon 1 Peter. Silvanus has featured prominently in discussions of 1 Peter's authenticity, the reference to the letter having been written □□□˜ . □□□□□□□□□˜ perhaps indicating his role as secretary.[56]

More recently, however, authors such as Norbert Brox, Elliott, Herzer and others have pointed to the links between Silvanus and Peter. If, as seems most likely, the phrase □□□˜ . □□□□□□□□□˜ describes Silvanus as the bearer, rather than the writer, of the letter[57] then the parallel with Acts 15:22-23 is significant: there Silvanus (along with Barsabbas) — □□□□□□□ . □□□□□□□ . □□□□ . □□□ . □□□˜□ . □□□□□□□□˜□ — is sent from the Jerusalem congregation to deliver a letter from the Jerusalem apostles (most notably, Peter and James) to the Gentile believers in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia.[58] Whether the reference to Silvanus in 1 Peter is historical or part of the pseudepigraphical construction, it might signify to the addressees the idea that a Petrine representative is again delivering a Petrine letter to Gentile churches.

However, a number of counter-points also need to be given due consideration. Silvanus's link specifically with Peter is hardly strong: the apostolic letter he delivers is sent from the leaders of the Jerusalem church and not solely from Peter (Acts 15:22); both Silas *and* Barsabbas are sent as representatives from the Jerusalem church; and they travel *with* Paul and Barnabas back to Antioch (i.e. a party of four departs with the letter). Moreover, Silas/Silvanus is more prominent as a companion and fellow missionary of Paul's (Acts 15:40–18:5; 2 Cor. 1:19; 1 Thess. 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1). If Silvanus has links with Peter, then, through his prominent position in the Jerusalem congregation (and this should not be denied),

---

[56] A case argued especially by Selwyn 1952, who defended the authenticity of the epistle by arguing for Silvanus's role as Peter's secretary, suggesting that some of the problems traditionally associated with Petrine authorship (e.g. the quality of the Greek, the Pauline influences, etc.) could thus be overcome. Note the criticisms of Beare 1970:212-16.

[57] See e.g. the convincing arguments of Brox 1975:83-90; Achtemeier 1996:350-51.

[58] Cf. Brox 1975:89-90; Elliott 1980:262-63; Herzer 1998:69-71. Brox, it should be noted, does not see this evidence as supporting a Petrine circle origin for 1 Peter, but draws rather different conclusions (see below).

he also has strong — indeed, rather stronger — links with Paul. There is really no basis for the view that Silvanus was a member of a specifically Petrine group in Rome.

The case of Mark is broadly similar. The Mark of 1 Pet 5:13 is generally identified with the (John) Mark known both from Acts and the Pauline letters. The description of Mark in 1 Peter as □□ . □□□□ .□ . □□□ suggests a close and affectionate relationship between Peter and a more junior Christian, possibly one converted by Peter. However, in the New Testament there is only one indirect piece of evidence to link the two: in Acts 12:12, on his miraculous release from prison, Peter goes to the house of Mary the mother of John Mark.[59] Mark at this time was away from Jerusalem, which seems to have been his home base (cf. Acts 13:13), probably in Antioch with Barnabas and Paul (cf. Acts 11:30; 12:25). Mark also joined Paul and Barnabas on a missionary journey, though only as far as Perga in Pamphylia (Acts 13:13). According to Luke, when Barnabas later wished to take Mark on another mission journey, Paul resisted the idea of joining again with the one who had previously left them, and disagreed with Barnabas to the extent that they went their separate ways, Paul with Silas, Barnabas with Mark (Acts 15:36-40).[60] From Philemon 24, assuming that the Mark there named is the same person, it seems that Mark was subsequently active once again among Paul's co-workers, an impression reinforced by his positive mention in Col 4:10 and 2 Tim 4:11. Thus, evidence for Mark's connection with Peter is slim and tenuous, while his links with Paul and the Pauline mission are significantly more extensive.

An important and oft-cited reference connecting Peter and Mark is of course the somewhat later report of Papias, recorded by Eusebius, that Mark 'followed Peter', became Peter's interpreter (□□□□□□□□□□ .□), and 'wrote accurately all that he remembered, not, indeed, in order, of the things said or done by the Lord' (*HE* 3.39.15; cf. 2.15.1-2). The historicity of these remarks is certainly not beyond doubt, and it has been suggested that the connection of Peter with Mark has actually been derived from 1 Pet. 5:13 (Vielhauer

---

[59] Cf. Brox 1975:90; Elliott 1980:260. The (indirect) link is missed by Black 1994:65: 'it is only at 1 Peter 5:13 that a connection is established in the New Testament between Mark and Peter'. See further Körtner 1980: 162-72, who concludes that it is unlikely that Mark was actually a co-worker of Peter's (p.171).

[60] On these details, see Elliott 1980:260.

1975:260-61).[61] But even if Papias is right to record a connection between Peter and Mark, that hardly proves the existence of a Petrine 'circle' responsible for 1 Peter. There may be similarities to be noted between the Gospel of Mark and 1 Peter,[62] but there are also features of Mark which suggest that it is a 'Pauline' Gospel (see e.g. Marcus 2000). As in the case of 1 Peter, the most plausible answer to the question of Pauline or Petrine influence may be not either/or, but both/and. One particular problem for the view that both Mark and 1 Peter represent the Petrine traditions of a Petrine circle is that the gospel traditions most clearly echoed in 1 Peter — those from the Sermon on the Mount — are *not* found in Mark![63] So Mark's Gospel and 1 Peter can hardly both be regarded as literary products of the same distinctive (Petrine) circle.

Clifton Black is therefore right to conclude that the names Silvanus and Mark are unlikely to have been 'originally regarded as paradigmatic of Petrine Christianity... it appears much more probable that Mark, like Silvanus, was remembered in rather minor though consistently positive association with the Pauline tradition' (Black 1994:66). The names Silvanus and Mark cannot substantiate the idea of a specifically Petrine circle in Rome, a group whose Petrine theology is recorded in 1 Peter (cf. also Brox 1978a:112-14). The names in 1 Peter may or may not be part of the pseudepigraphical construction of the epistle, but either way, if the 'group' they represent is responsible for the letter it is a group which has links with Paul and the Pauline tradition as much as with Peter, and which may be better labelled 'early Christian' than 'Petrine'.

---

[61] In Vielhauer's opinion, the 'Papiasnotiz' concerning the link between Peter and Mark is 'historisch wertlos' (p.261).

[62] See Dungan 1983; Elliott 1985:195-97. On the other hand, just as many suggest that without the name 'Peter' noone would have thought to connect 1 Peter with the apostle Peter, so Vielhauer (1975:260) suggests that: 'ohne die Papiasnotiz käme niemand auf die Idee, im MkEv persönliche Erinnerungen des Petrus zu suchen und zu finden'.

[63] Dungan (1983) argues that the similarities between Mark and 1 Peter lend some support to the Griesbach hypothesis, with both documents representing attempts at reconciliation, bridge-building, between Jewish and Pauline Christianities. Apart from the other arguments to be ranged against the Griesbach hypothesis, here it would be odd, if both documents represented a similar reconciling tendency, for 1 Peter to echo precisely those Gospel traditions which the supposedly irenic Mark chose to omit.

6. 1 Peter as the product of a Roman Christian synthesis?

We may begin to draw the argument of this essay together and attempt to reach some conclusions concerning the character of 1 Peter and its place in early Christian history. 1 Peter shows the influence of Paul and the Pauline tradition, but is not a 'Pauline' letter; it also draws on other strands of early Christian tradition and exhibits its own distinctive character. Neither the content of 1 Peter nor the names mentioned in it (except that of Peter himself) can provide sufficient evidence to support the idea that 1 Peter represents Petrine tradition preserved and recorded by a Petrine circle or school. On the contrary, *both* the content of the epistle *and* the names within it combine to support the view that 1 Peter reflects both Jewish-Christian (Jerusalem) and Pauline traditions — both Silvanus and Mark have Jerusalem connections, as well as being Pauline co-workers. As such, 1 Peter does not appear to be the product of a Petrine circle, nor indeed of a Pauline circle, but rather of a Roman Christianity in which diverse and sometimes opposing Christian traditions were drawn together.

Further evidence from slightly later documents from the church at Rome, 2 Peter and *1 Clement*, also adds plausibility to this argument. In terms of literary content 2 Peter is much more closely related to Jude than to 1 Peter: much of the central section of Jude (vv. 4-18) is taken up in 2 Pet 2:1–3:3.[64] By contrast, there are few clear echoes of 1 Peter,[65] although the author of 2 Peter clearly knows of the former epistle and explicitly aims to continue its admonitory purpose (2 Pet 3:1). Indeed, the differences between 1 and 2 Peter render implausible the view that they both emanate from a single 'school' (so Bauckham 1983:146). As seems to be the case with 1 Peter, the author of 2 Peter is aware of Paul and his letters, though clear echoes of the Pauline corpus are few (cf. Bauckham 1983: 147-48). Paul and his letters are highly regarded — Paul is □□ . □□□□□□□□ ˜ □ □□□□ ˜ □ . □□□□□□□ . □ and his letters are ranked as scripture (2 Pet 3:15-16) — though the letters are acknowledged to be hard to understand and subject in some quarters to distorted and deviant interpretation (3:16). With its explicit self-connection to 'Peter's' former letter, 2 Peter is usually seen as originating in the same location as 1 Peter (i.e. probably Rome) and being addressed to the same (or some of the same) areas (see 1 Pet 1:1: Horrell 1998:136-37). As such, and with its

---

[64] See Horrell 1998:140-42, and other studies mentioned there.

[65] Though see Boobyer 1959; Dalton 1979; Fornberg 1977:12-13, who suggest points of connection between the two epistles.

explicit mention of the two great apostles, Peter and Paul, it adds plausibility to the view of 1 Peter as an earlier example of a synthesising Roman Christianity.

Just as 1 Peter indicates the Roman churches' concern to influence and support Christian communities elsewhere (representing probably the first example of such 'pastoral outreach' from Rome; cf. Ignatius *Rom* 3.1: □□□□□□□ . □□□□□□ .□□□□), so too does *1 Clement*, sent from Rome to Corinth around the end of the first century CE.[66] For the author of *1 Clement*, Peter and Paul are *the* apostolic heroes *par excellence*: they are named together as □□□˜□ . □□□□□□□˜□ . □□□□□□□ .□□□□ (*1 Clem* 5.1-7; cf. also Ignatius *Rom* 4.3). Interestingly there has been debate about the character of *1 Clement* not too dissimilar to the debate about 1 Peter: is *1 Clement* essentially a Pauline/Hellenistic writing (as L. Sanders argued in 1943) or rather a writing dependent on Jewish and Jewish-Christian traditions (as K. Beyschlag argued in 1966)?[67] As with 1 Peter, the truth almost certainly lies in a both/and rather than either/or answer. Like 1 Peter, *1 Clement* is clearly indebted to Paul (see e.g. *1 Clem.* 37.4–38.1; 47.1-4; 49.5) but equally influenced by a range of other traditions, both Christian and non-Christian.[68] All these traditions are woven together in the service of a socially-conservative Christianity which seeks to restore proper 'order' to the church at Corinth (see further Horrell 1996:250-80). *1 Clement*'s clear regard for both Peter and Paul, its use of both Pauline and non-Pauline tradition, the character of its social/ethical teaching, etc., all add plausibility to a similar view of 1 Peter, a slightly earlier letter from the Roman churches. Conversely, aside from the authorial attribution, there is no more reason to regard 1 Peter as a 'Petrine' product than there is 1 Clement.

One major question then remains: why was the letter written in the name of Peter, if it does not represent the specifically Petrine traditions treasured by a Petrine circle? And the corollary questions: why was the letter not written in the name of Paul, and why were Silvanus and Mark mentioned?

---

[66] For discussion of date, see Horrell 1996:238-44.

[67] See further references in Horrell 1996:5 n.26.

[68] See e.g. the use of the Phoenix story in *1 Clem. 25.* On the Stoic parallels in *1 Clement* see Sanders 1943:109-30. The influence of the OT (LXX) is also prominent: on the use of OT and NT tradition in *1 Clement* see Hagner 1973, though he makes rather maximalist claims.

7. Why Peter?

A general reason for writing in the name of Peter is not hard to find: the (growing) prominence and authority of Peter in the early church. Peter was undoubtedly a central figure in the early Christian movement, as the gospels in their varied ways make clear, and had clearly been regarded as a leading authority from early times (1 Cor 1:12, 9:5, 15:5; Gal 2:9 etc.). The writing of a letter under Peter's name seems much more likely to reflect the central place of Peter in early Christianity, and specifically in Rome, than the influence of a distinctively Petrine circle, especially given the lack of substantive evidence for any such circle. As Brox points out, given the author's location in Rome (or his desire to make his letter appear to be of Roman origin) and the widespread knowledge of Peter's final end in Rome, the name of Peter is an obvious choice: 'Because the author is actually, or fictitiously, writing from Rome, he writes under the name of the apostolic authority whose name had through history become linked with Rome'.[69] After all, Peter later came to be regarded as the first 'bishop' of Rome and was from early times regarded as a key figure for the church as a whole (see Perkins 1994:168-73). Who better to send an epistle to the churches scattered in Asia Minor? Indeed, as Pheme Perkins suggests, '1 Peter should be seen as evidence for the universalizing of Peter as a leader for the whole church' (Perkins 1994:120; cf. Koester 1982:293).

Furthermore, it is important to note that the areas to which 1 Peter was addressed are areas in which Paul's missionary activity was distinctly limited: 'in three of the four/five provinces addressed in 1 Pet. neither Paul nor Silvanus, according to Paul's own words or the record of Acts, ever set foot' (Elliott 1980:261). It may be that these provinces were ones in which Peter and/or his associates were active as missionaries, though the absence of evidence

---

[69] 'Weil der Autor tatsächlich oder fiktiv von Rom aus schreibt, schreibt er unter der apostolischen Autorität, deren Namen sich durch die Geschichte an Rom geheftet hat' (Brox 1975:96; see 95-96). Brox argues that there is no need to regard the name Peter as indicating that the letter's content is distinctively Petrine; indeed, it exhibits a Pauline character. Rather, since the apostles' teaching was regarded as essentially in agreement the particular name given to the letter guaranteed its apostolic authority and did not necessarily indicate the presentation of a *particular* individual's tradition (see pp.92-95). See also Brox 1977:2-3 and 1978a:114-20, where he speaks of the 'Petrus-Rom-Tradition', which explains why the name Peter was the most suitable to attach to this letter.

prevents that suggestion being more than a possibility. But there are snippets of evidence pointing to a certain hostility towards Paul in some of these areas: according to Acts 16:7 the 'Spirit of Jesus' would not allow Paul and his companions, Silas and Timothy, to enter Bithynia,[70] and in 2 Tim. 1:15 'Paul' records that everyone in Asia had turned against him. There is little detail to go on here, but these references may provide some further indications as to why the name of Peter was more suited than Paul's to carry authority and command respect throughout the provinces of Asia Minor, quite apart from the general prominence which Peter had attained. Elsewhere too Paul was apparently regarded negatively (cf. Acts 21:17-28; Rom 3:8); his legacy was highly contested, as the Pastoral Epistles show, and his letters were soon seen as dangerously open to diverse interpretations (2 Pet 3:16). There are, then, positive reasons to use the name of Peter, and good reasons also to avoid the name of Paul.

Silvanus and Mark are both known in the traditions as members of the Pauline circle, but are also well-placed to serve as bridge-builders between Paul and Jerusalem, since they both apparently belonged to the church in Jerusalem before travelling with Paul. Certainly there is insufficient evidence to link them with a specifically *Petrine* circle in Rome, a circle for which there is virtually no evidence anyway, but their names may have served to link Peter and Paul and — rather than indicating that the letter is the product of a Petrine circle — to show that the epistle's message, the Roman church's message, is neither Petrine nor Pauline but apostolic, 'the true grace of God' (1 Pet 5:12).[71]

8. Conclusions

While recent work on 1 Peter has done much to reclaim the letter as a distinctive work and not a bland example of 'Paulinism', the idea that 1 Peter is 'the product of a Petrine tradition transmitted by Petrine tradents of a Petrine circle' (Elliott 1976:9) seems difficult to sustain.

---

[70] One might of course note that this report also mentions Silas/Silvanus, who *is* named in 1 Peter. But any hint of 'opposition' towards Silvanus would be just as problematic for the view that he is a key figure in the Petrine circle which produced 1 Peter as for the view that opposition to Paul may form part of the explanation for the letter being written in Peter's name, and not Paul's.

[71] Cf. also Brox 1975; 1977; 1978a. I am grateful to John Barclay for some fruitful suggestions on this section of the essay.

There is no evidence from outside the epistle for the existence of such a circle, nor does the epistle itself lend any substantial support to the thesis, either from its content or from the names mentioned in it. On the contrary, much of the available evidence combines to support the view of 1 Peter as a letter which weaves together a variety of early Christian traditions in its own distinctive attempt to address the situation of the suffering Christians scattered in the 'diaspora', sent under the name of the apostle who came to be seen as 'a leader for the whole church' (Perkins 1994:120): (1) The content of the letter displays no particularly 'Petrine' character; (2) the letter is clearly indebted to Pauline tradition at some points, but also draws on non-Pauline traditions; (3) the names of Silvanus and Mark are connected both with Paul and with Peter/Jerusalem; (4) other writings from early Roman Christianity display a similar tendency in their drawing together of a range of early Christian traditions and their veneration of both Peter and Paul. The main reason to think in terms of a specifically Petrine origin — the sheer fact of the attribution of the letter to Peter — has another plausible explanation, namely the prominence of Peter in early Christianity in general and Rome in particular, combined with the somewhat shaky status of Paul in parts of Asia Minor. Just as Richard Bauckham has raised penetrating questions about the scholarly tendency to interpret the gospels in relation to distinctive early Christian communities — Markan, Matthean, Johannine, etc. — arguing instead that the gospels were written and intended for early Christian groups more generally (Bauckham 1998), so too the evidence we have examined in this essay suggests that 1 Peter is more plausibly seen as a product of early (Roman) Christianity than of a specifically Petrine circle.[72]

Such a conclusion inevitably raises the spectre of F.C. Baur, for whom 1 Peter was an instance of the Roman church's moves to synthesise the opposed factions of Jewish (Petrine) and Gentile (Pauline) Christianity by constructing agreement and unity between Peter and Paul. Thus Baur speaks of a 'vermittelnden Tendenz' in the two Petrine epistles and of Silvanus and Mark as 'Mittelspersonen' (Baur 1860:143-44). To some extent the preceding investigation lends support to Baur's view of 1 Peter as a consolidating, unifying document.[73] But it should not be taken to support the wider theory within which he located this

---

[72] Hence Brox (1977:3) argues that rather than being 'Petrine' the epistle is 'ein Zeugnis des frühen Christentums.'

[73] So Bovon (1978:31) also comments: 'F.C. Baur n'avait pas tort. La fin du premier siècle rapproche, voire réconcilie Pierre et Paul. Cette réconciliation culminera à Rome…'

synthesising *Tendenz* of 1 Peter. There is no evidence that 1 Peter is interested in fostering a theological reconciliation between law-observant and law-free factions,[74] and in any case there are strong reasons to reject Baur's view that this division formed a basic fault-line through earliest Christianity. Elliott and others are surely right to discern the aims and strategy of 1 Peter from the content of the letter itself and not from some grand theory of early Christian history.[75]

However, without reviving Baur's theory, we may nonetheless conclude that 1 Peter, as the earliest instance of the Roman churches' exhortation to Christians elsewhere, does provide evidence of the ways in which leading figures in the Roman churches presented, consolidated and synthesised — and at the same time developed and reinterpreted — a variety of early Christian traditions. Despite the scholarly majority currently in its favour, the view of 1 Peter as the distinctive product of a Petrine tradition from a Petrine circle should be rejected.

---

[74] Cf. Brox 1977:2; 1978a:116-20.

[75] However, Elliott also speaks of the letter as representative of 'a body of tradition gradually coalescing at Rome' (Elliott 2000:130). He acknowledges that 1 Peter incorporates a wide diversity of (Roman) Christian traditions and that the early Christian literature associated with Rome shows 'an interest in consolidation, both liturgical consolidation and the binding together of traditions' (in Corley 1983:177; cf. also Elliott 1980:253 n.9, 266-67; 1983:193-94 — though he elsewhere stresses the idea of the 'Petrine group' as 'independent': 1981:271). Black (1994:64) also speaks of 'Petrine Christianity' as 'highly synthetic and amalgamative of other Christian forms'. Such comments are perhaps somewhat closer to Baur than the polemic against his theory would suggest and, moreover, raise questions as to what sense it makes to label this consolidating, synthetic form of Christianity as distinctively 'Petrine'.

REFERENCES

Achtemeier, P.J., 1996 *1 Peter*, Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress.

Balch, D.L., 1981 *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*, Atlanta, CA: Scholars Press.

Bauckham, R.J., 1983 *Jude, 2 Peter,* Word Biblical Commentary 50; Waco, TX: Word Books.

Bauckham, R.J., 1988 'James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude', 303-317 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture,* D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauckham, R.J., 1990 *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Bauckham, R.J., 1998 'For Whom were the Gospels Written?' 9-48 in R.J. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences,* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark

Baur, F.C., 1860 *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte,* Tübingen, repr. Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1966.

Beare, F.W., 1970 *The First Epistle of Peter*, 3rd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bellinger, W.H. and Farmer, W.R. (eds) 1998 *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins,* Harrisburg, PA: TPI

Best, E., 1970 '1 Peter and the Gospel Tradition', *NTS* 16: 95–113

Best, E., 1971 *1 Peter,* New Century Bible, London: Oliphants.

Beyschlag, K., 1966 *Clemens Romanus und der Fruhkatholizismus: Untersuchungen zu I Clemens 1–7*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck

Black, C.C., 1994 *Mark:Images of an Apostolic Interpreter,* Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press

Boobyer, G.H., 1959 'The Indebtedness of 2 Peter to 1 Peter', 34-53 in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, A.J.B. Higgins (ed.), Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bovon, F., 1978 'Foi chrétienne et Religion populaire dans la première Épitre de Pierre', *Études theologiques et religieuses* 53:25-41

Brox, N., 1975 'Zur pseudepigraphischen Rahmung des ersten Petrusbriefes', *BZ* 19:78-96

Brox, N., 1977 'Situation und Sprache der Minderheit im ersten Petrusbrief', *Kairos* 19:1-13

Brox, N., 1978a 'Tendenz und Pseudepigraphie im ersten Petrusbrief', *Kairos* 20:110-20

Brox, N., 1978b 'Der erste Petrusbrief in der literarischen Tradition des Urchristentums', *Kairos* 20:182-92

Brox, N. 1979 *Der erste Petrusbrief,* EKK 21, Zürich: Benziger and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Campbell, R.A., 1994 *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity,* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark

Casurella, A. 1996 *Bibliography of Literature on First Peter,* Leiden: Brill.

Corley, B., (ed.) 1983 *Colloquy on New Testament Studies: A Time for Reappraisal and Fresh Approaches*, Macon, GA: Mercer University Press

Corley, K., 1995 '1 Peter', 349-360 in *Searching the Scriptures, vol.2: A Feminist Commentary,* E.Schüssler Fiorenza (ed.), London: SCM

Dalton, W. J., 1979 'The Interpretation of 1 Peter 3,19 and 4,6: Light from 2 Peter', *Bib* 60: 547-555

Dungan, D.L., 1983 'The Purpose and Provenance of the Gospel of Mark according to the "Two-Gospel" (Griesbach) Hypothesis', 133-56 in Corley (ed.) 1983.

Elliott, J.H., 1966 'The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2:4-10 and the Phrase *basileion hieratuma*', Leiden: Brill.

Elliott, J.H., 1976 'The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research', *JBL* 95:243-54, cited from the reprint in Talbert 1986:3-16.

Elliott, J.H., 1980 'Peter, Silvanus and Mark in I Peter and Acts: Sociological-Exegetical Perspectives on a Petrine Group in Rome', in W. Haubeck and M. Bachmann (eds), *Wort in der Zeit: Neutestamentliche Studien. Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorff zum 75. Geburtstag,* Leiden: Brill, 250-67

Elliott, J.H., 1981 *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*, Philadelphia: Fortress; London; SCM.

Elliott, J.H., 1983 'The Roman Provenance of 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to David Dungan', in Corley (ed) 1983:181-94.

Elliott, J.H., 1985 'Backward and Forward "In His Steps": Following Jesus from Rome to Raymond and Beyond. The Tradition, Redaction, and Reception of 1 Peter 2:18-25', in F.F. Segovia (ed.) *Discipleship in the New Testament,* Philadelphia: Fortress, 184-209

Elliott, J.H., 1993 *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress

Elliott, J.H., 2000 *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB37B; New York: Doubleday

Feldmeier, R., 1992 *Die Christen als Fremde*, Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck.

Fornberg, T., 1977 *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.

Goppelt, L., 1993 *A Commentary on I Peter,* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Gundry, R.H., 1967 '"Verba Christi" in 1 Peter: Their Implication concerning the authorship of 1 Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition', *Bib* 13: 336-350.

Gundry, R.H., 1974 'Further Verba on Verba Christi in First Peter' *Bib* 55: 211-232.

Hagner, D.A., 1973 *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, Leiden: Brill.

Herzer, J., 1998 *Petrus oder Paulus? Studien über das Verhältnis des Ersten Petrusbriefes zur paulinischen Tradition*, WUNT 103; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck

Horrell, D.G., 1996 *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Horrell, D.G., 1998 *The Epistles of Peter and Jude,* London: Epworth

Horrell, D.G., 2000 'Review of Herzer, *Petrus oder Paulus?*', *JTS* 51:287-92

Hübner, H., 1993 *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Band 2: Die Theologie des Paulus und ihre neutestamentliche Wirkungsgeschichte,* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Jülicher, A. with Fascher, E., 1931 *Einleitung in das Neue Testament,* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck

Kelly, J.N.D., 1969 *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, BNTC; London: A. & C. Black

Koester, H., 1982 *Introduction to the New Testament: Vol 2, History and Literature of Early Christianity*, Philadelphia: Fortress

Körtner, U.H.J., 1980 'Markus der Mitarbeiter des Petrus', *ZNW* 71:160-73

Kümmel, W.G., 1975 *Introduction to the New Testament*, 2nd edn, London: SCM

Lindars, B., 1991 *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lindemann, A., 1979 *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion,* BhT 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck

Maier, G. 1985 'Jesustradition im 1. Petrusbrief?', 85-128 in D. Wenham (ed.), *Gospel Perspectives, vol 5: The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels,* Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Marcus, J., 2000 'Mark — Interpreter of Paul', *NTS* 46:473-87

Martin, R.P. 1994 'The Theology of Jude, 1 Peter, and 2 Peter', in A.N. Chester and R.P. Martin, *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter and Jude*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Metzner, R., 1995 *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums im 1. Petrusbrief*, WUNT 2.74; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck

Michaels, J.R., 1988 *1 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary 49; Waco, TX: Word Books.

Mitton, C.L. 1951 *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Perkins, P., 1994 *Peter: Apostle for the Whole Church,* Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Piper, J., 1980 'Hope as the Motivation of Love: 1 Peter 3:9-12', *NTS* 26: 221-231

Richardson, P., 1969 *Israel in the Apostolic Church,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sanders, L., 1943 *L'Hellénisme de Saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme*, Studia Hellenistica; Louvain: Catholic University of Louvain

Schnelle, U., 1998 *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, London: SCM.

Selwyn, E.G. 1952 *The First Epistle of St. Peter,* 2nd edn., London: Macmillan.

Shimada, K., 1998 *Studies on First Peter,* Tokyo: Kyo Bun Kwan.

Soards, M.L., 1988 '1 Peter, 2 Peter and Jude as Evidence for a Petrine School', *ANRW* II.25.5: 3827-849.

Spicq, C., 1966a *Les Épitres de Saint Pierre*, Sources Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda.

Spicq, C., 1966b 'La I[a] Petri et le témoignage évangélique de saint Pierre', *Studia Theologica* 20:37-61

Talbert, C.H. (ed.) 1986 *Perspectives on First Peter,* NABPR Special Studies Series 9; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press

Thompson, M.B., 1991 *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1–15.13,* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press

Vielhauer, P., 1975 *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Vater*, Berlin; New York: de Gruyter

Abstract

Recent studies of 1 Peter, especially by John Elliott, have sought to rescue the letter from its assimilation to the Pauline tradition and to establish the view, now widely held, that 1 Peter is the distinctive product of a Petrine circle. After examining the traditions in 1 Peter, both Pauline and non-Pauline, and the names in the letter (Silvanus, Mark, and Peter), this essay argues that there is no substantial evidence, either inside or outside the letter, to support the view of 1 Peter as originating from a specifically Petrine group. It is much more plausibly seen as reflecting the consolidation of early Christian traditions in Roman Christianity. Despite the scholarly majority currently in its favour, the view of 1 Peter as the distinctive product of a Petrine tradition from a Petrine circle should therefore be rejected.