

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1. Problem Statement

Although Peter is one of the pillar Apostles in the early church, unlike the letters of Paul, his epistle 1 Peter has been neglected by modern scholars. In 1976 Elliott criticized modern scholarship for regarding 1 Peter as “one of the step-children of the NT Canon.”<sup>1</sup> Since Elliott’s rebuke, almost three decades have passed. Up to now quite a number of scholarly works have appeared with an increased interest being paid to its authorship. In this vein, with reference to its authorship, there seems to remain two main streams among contemporary scholars, namely, those who argue that it is an authentic letter *versus* those who argue that it is a pseudonymous letter regarding 1 Peter.<sup>2</sup>

There are modern critical issues that are relevant to the authorship of 1 Peter. These relate to the linguistic problem, the historical problem, the doctrinal problem, and the practice of pseudonymity. In particular, modern scholarship has focused on the linguistic and historical problems of 1 Peter, drawing attention to the practice of pseudonymity in the ancient Greco-Roman world, and asserts that 1 Peter is a pseudonymous letter.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> John H. Elliott, “The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research,” *JBL* 95 (1976): 243.

<sup>2</sup> See Mark Dubis, “Research on 1 Peter: A Survey of Scholarly Literature Since 1985,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 4/2 (2006): 199-202.

<sup>3</sup> Since H. H. Cludius (1808), modern scholarship has doubted the authenticity of 1 Peter.

Those who argue that 1 Peter is a pseudonymous epistle basically favor the hypothesis that it originated from within a Petrine group in Rome that included Silvanus and Mark<sup>4</sup>, disregarding the possibility that Peter, as a contemporary of Paul, might have used an amanuensis while writing his epistle. This was the prominent practice of first century letter writers, including Paul. Those, on the contrary, who contend that 1 Peter is an authentic epistle, fundamentally favor the amanuensis hypothesis as well, appealing to Peter's statement in 1 Pet 5:12, *Dia. Silouanou/ u`mi/n tou/ pistou/ avdelfou/( w`j logi,zomai( diV ovli,gwn*

---

See J. E. Huther, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of Peter and Jude*, Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament, trans. D. B. Croom (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1881), 35-36. This view was followed by H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1885), 494; B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (London: Macmillan, 1929), 122; Adolf Jülicher and D. Erich Fascher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1931), 193; E. F. Scott, *The Literature of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1932), 220; E. J. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), 267; F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter: the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1947), 24-25; E. Best, *1 Peter* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971), 176-77; Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed., trans. Howard Clark Kee (London: SCM Press LTD, 1975), 424; J. H. Elliott, "Peter, Silvanus and Mark in 1 Peter and Acts: Sociological-Exegetical Perspectives on a Petrine Group in Rome," in *Wort in der Zeit*, ed. W. Haubach and M. Bachmann (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980), 250-53; *Idem*, *1 Peter*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 37B (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 127-34; Hans Conzelmann and Andreas Lindemann, *Interpreting the New Testament*, 8<sup>th</sup> ed., trans. S. S. Schatzmann (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), 273; William L. Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 7; Leonhard Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, trans. J. E. Alsup (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1993), 370; Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, Hermeneia Series (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 43; Bart H. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 434-36; David Horrell, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude*, Epworth Commentaries (London: Epworth Press, 1998), 6-7; Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 400-01; Jacob Prasad, *Foundations of the Christian Way of Life according to 1 Peter 1, 13-25: An Exegetico-Theological Study*, Analecta Biblica 146 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000), 46; Donald P. Senior, *1 Peter*, Sacra Pagina Series, vol. 15 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2003), 5-6. As an example of the majority attitude toward 1 Peter, see David G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987), 161-79. See also Lewis. R. Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 49-51.

<sup>4</sup> See Best, *1 Peter*, 63; Senior, *1 Peter*, 5-6; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 127-30; M. L. Soards, "1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude as Evidence for a Petrine School," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II Principat 25.5, ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1988), 3827-849.

e;graya (“By Silvanus, a faithful brother as I regard him, I have written briefly to you”) and identifying Silvanus as its amanuensis. The Greco-Roman epistolary evidence, however, shows that the formula *graw dia, tinoj* identified *only* the letter-carrier.<sup>5</sup> To this end, the current arguments for and against the authenticity of 1 Peter are probably insufficient, and require further investigation. This is the stimulus for the study.

## 2. Research History

The authenticity of 1 Peter has been intensively queried mainly on the basis of the uses of excellent Greek and the Old Testament (LXX) in the epistle; since Acts 4:13 describes the Apostle Peter as an illiterate and ordinary (*avgraw,mmatoi, kai. ivdiw/tai*) person. However, scholars in the field of letter writing in antiquity argue that letter writers in the Greco-Roman world accepted the assistance of an amanuensis.<sup>6</sup> Employing amanuenses was a common practice in first-century letter

---

<sup>5</sup> For details of the discussion, especially see E. Randolph Richards, “Silvanus was not Peter’s Secretary,” *JETS* 43 (2000): 417-432. This conclusion even dates back to the mid of the seventeenth century. See Alexander Nisbet, *An Exposition of 1 and 2 Peter* (Geneva Series, 1658; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1982), 210; John Brown, *1 Peter*, vol 2 (Geneva Series, 1848; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1975), 623-26; Robert Leighton, *Commentary on First Peter* (KRL, 1853; reprint; Grand Rapids, 1972), 510; A. J. Manson, Alfred Plummer, and W. M. Sinclair, *The Epistles of Peter, John, and Jude* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957), 115; Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 424; John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), 168-69; J. R. Michaels, *1 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1988), 306; J. H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Social-Scientific Criticism of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1981), 279; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 348-50; Senior, *1 Peter*, 152. Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, The New American Commentary, vol. 37 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2003), 248-49; Karen H. Jobes, *1 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 321. This will be discussed in chapter 4.

<sup>6</sup> Prominent scholars among those who maintain this position are J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles*, Harper’s New Testament Commentaries (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963), 25-27; Gordon Bahr, “Paul and Letter Writing in the First Century,” *CBQ* 28 (1966): 465-77; *Idem*, “The Subscriptions in Pauline Letters,” *JBL* 87 (1968): 27-41; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “New Testament Epistles,” in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. R. E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968), 226; William G. Doty, *Letters in Primitive Christianity*, New Testament Series (Philadelphia:

writing.<sup>7</sup> Specifically, Kelly points to “the intractability of ancient writing materials and the resulting slowness of penmanship” and argues that an amanuensis was given great freedom in the course of composing epistles.<sup>8</sup> Bahr states that in the first century an amanuensis generally wrote “the body of the record,” and the author subscribed his name to the document.<sup>9</sup> Bahr also indicates that an amanuensis’ important roles were “the taking of dictation” and “the preparation of the final draft of the letter.”<sup>10</sup> Murphy-O’Connor expresses an opinion similar to Bahr’s when he points out that “a concluding paragraph, normally brief, in the author’s handwriting showed that he had checked the final draft and assumed responsibility.”<sup>11</sup> Murphy-O’Connor contends that the sender might allow the amanuensis “to make minor changes in the form or content of the letter when preparing the final text from the rough dictation copy or from a preliminary draft prepared by the author himself.”<sup>12</sup> Ellis supports Bahr’s argument when he stresses that a reliable and talented secretary had some freedom in writing letters in the ancient world, and concludes that Paul gave his amanuensis some autonomy in writing his letters in the case that the amanuensis

---

Fortress Press, 1973), 40-41; Richard Longenecker, “Ancient Amanuenses and the Pauline Epistles,” in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. Richard Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 281-97; E. Earle Ellis, “The Pastorals and Paul,” *The Expository Times* 104 (1993): 45-47; Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings*, JSNTSup 101 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 45-51; David Trobisch, *Paul’s Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 29-33; Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer*, Good News Studies, vol. 41 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1995); M. Luther Stirewalt Jr, *Paul, the Letter Writer* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003), 1-24; E. Randolph Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. 42 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991); *Idem*, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004); Bruce N. Fisk, “Paul: Life and Letters,” in *The Face of New Testament Studies*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 291-92.

<sup>7</sup> See Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing*, 59-80.

<sup>8</sup> See Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 25-27.

<sup>9</sup> Bahr, “The Subscriptions in Pauline Letters,” 29.

<sup>10</sup> *Idem*, “Paul and Letter Writing in the First Century,” 468.

<sup>11</sup> Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer*, 7.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid*, 13-14.

was “a spiritually endowed colleague.”<sup>13</sup>

As regards the recent investigation of the role of an amanuensis, Randolph Richards’ inquiry is remarkable. Richards groups the role of amanuenses in letter writing of the first century into three categories: “transcriber,” “contributor,” and “composer,”<sup>14</sup> and concludes that Paul’s amanuensis served an intermediate role “between the extremes of transcriber and composer.”<sup>15</sup> In particular, Richards points to the misconception concerning amanuenses, which is “termed the Stenographers vs. Cowriter Fallacy.”<sup>16</sup> Richards argues against Marshall’s suggestion that Paul dictated his letter to a secretary<sup>17</sup>, and insists that Paul gave his amanuensis a free hand and supervised him.<sup>18</sup> He states that “the author was assumed responsible for every phrase and nuance, no matter the secretarial process.”<sup>19</sup> In other words, Paul checked his amanuensis’ final draft since he was ultimately responsible for the letter.<sup>20</sup>

In this regard, as the Pauline epistles themselves show, Paul generally (probably) used amanuenses in writing his (all) letters allowing some freedom. Thus, like Paul, Peter, as a first century letter writer and a contemporary of Paul, almost certainly employed a secretary in the composition of his epistle, giving him greater freedom. An alternative option that is relevant to the authorship of 1 Peter, many other scholars<sup>21</sup> basing their views on this practice insist that Peter wrote 1 Peter

---

<sup>13</sup> Ellis, “The Pastorals and Paul,” 45.

<sup>14</sup> Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing*, 64.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 93.

<sup>16</sup> Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing*, 29.

<sup>17</sup> Richards, *Ibid.*, 29, criticizes Marshall for viewing an amanuensis as a stenographer.

<sup>18</sup> See *Ibid.*, 29-30; I. Howard Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, International Critical Commentary (London: T&T Clark LTD, 1999), 64-65.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>20</sup> *Idem*, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, 127.

<sup>21</sup> See E. H. Plumptre, *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1879), 159; J. W. C. Wand, *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (London: Methuen, 1934), 29-30; Kenneth Wuest, *First Peter in the Greek New*

using an amanuensis, which helps explain the linguistic problem of 1 Peter, that is, the excellent Greek and the use of the Old Testament (LXX). Specifically, Silvanus (Silas) has been identified as the amanuensis of 1 Peter, based on Peter's statement in 1 Pet 5:12. However, there is disagreement with regard to interpreting  $\text{D}\iota\alpha\ \text{S}\iota\lambda\omega\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon / \dots \epsilon\grave{\gamma}\rho\alpha\gamma\alpha$ . The debate concerns the identification of Silvanus as the amanuensis or as the letter-carrier, but Greco-Roman epistolary evidence makes clear that the formula  $\text{g}\rho\alpha, \text{f}\omega\ \text{d}\iota\alpha, \text{t}\iota\omicron\upsilon\omicron\text{j}$  identifies solely the letter-bearer.

Remarkably, Peter refers not only to Silvanus (Silas) as a letter-carrier, but also to Mark as a greeter in 1 Pet 5:13. In this vein, it should be mentioned that Tertius, who was the amanuensis of Romans, greets its recipients,  $\alpha\nu\sigma\pi\alpha, \text{z}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \text{u}\grave{\alpha}\mu\alpha / \text{j}\ \epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omega$ .  $\text{T}\epsilon, \text{r}\text{t}\iota\omicron\upsilon\omicron\text{j}\ \omicron\grave{\alpha}\ \text{g}\rho\alpha, \gamma\alpha\text{j}\ \text{t}\eta. \text{n}\ \epsilon\upsilon\text{p}\text{i}\text{s}\text{t}\omicron\lambda\eta. \text{n}\ \epsilon\upsilon\text{n}\ \text{k}\text{u}\text{r}\iota, \omega\mid$  (Rom 16:22). If Silvanus was the amanuensis for 1 Peter, he might well have greeted its addressees, but Peter does not mention this. In light of this practice, Peter's statement in 1 Pet 5:13,  $\text{V}\text{A}\sigma\pi\alpha, \text{z}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \text{u}\grave{\alpha}\mu\alpha / \text{j}\ \text{h}\grave{\alpha}\ \epsilon\upsilon\text{n}\ \text{B}\alpha\text{b}\text{u}\text{l}\omega / \text{n}\iota\ \text{s}\text{u}\text{n}\epsilon\text{k}\text{l}\epsilon\text{k}\text{t}\eta. \text{k}\alpha\iota. \text{M}\alpha / \text{r}\text{k}\omicron\text{j}\ \omicron\grave{\alpha}\ \text{u}\iota\grave{\alpha}, \text{j}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$  (She who is in Babylon, chosen together with you, greets you, and so does Mark my son), implies the possibility that

---

*Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1942), 132; E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Thornapple Commentaries (London: Macmillan, 1955), 241; Allan Stibbs and A. F. Walls, *First Epistle General of Peter* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1959), 175; C. E. B. Cranfield, *I and II Peter and Jude: Introduction and Commentary*, Torch Bible Commentaries (London: SCM, 1960), 121; Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. rev. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990), 779; Everett F. Harrison, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1971; reprint, 1987), 404-05; Bruce M. Metzger, *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1983), 256; Simon Kistemaker, *New Testament Commentary: Peter and Jude* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 207; Peter Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1990), 198; I. Howard Marshall, *1 Peter* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1991), 173-74; Norman Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter and Jude*, New International Biblical Commentary (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 151; Joe Blair, *Introducing the New Testament* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 197; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation*, rev. ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 481. D. A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 2005), 645. For the commentaries on 1 Peter, specifically see D. A. Carson, *New Testament Commentary Survey*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2007), 136-40.

Mark could be the amanuensis of 1 Peter. It is obvious that Mark was with Peter while he was composing the epistle.<sup>22</sup> Mark was clearly a very literate man, and if, as is likely, he was Peter's amanuensis, and the author of the Gospel of Mark on the grounds of the references in the early church including Papias' note, and since Peter almost certainly used amanuenses while writing his epistle, as Paul did, then, it is reasonable to assume that Mark is the amanuensis for 1 Peter.

It should also be noted that Peter's statement in 1 Pet 5:13, *Ma/rkoj o` ui`o, j mou*, plays a crucial role as a historical reference implying the steady relationship between Peter and Mark. Nonetheless, scholars, including those who defend Petrine authorship of 1 Peter, have neglected Peter's statement in 1 Pet 5:13, *VAspa, zetai u`ma/j h` evn Babulw/ni suneklekth. kai. Ma/rkoj o` ui`o, j mou*, and have focused on that in 1 Pet 5:12.

As for 1 Peter's Greek style, Kelly and Achtemeier have cautiously pointed out that its Greek quality seems not to be worthy of the lavish tributes and should, therefore, not be overstated.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, Schutter has indicated Semitisms in the epistle and has argued that the author of 1 Peter might have been Jewish.<sup>24</sup> Most of all, one must pay attention to Jobes' recent observation on the Greek style of 1 Peter. She offers a fresh key to the controversy with regard to the authenticity problem of 1 Peter. She explores more objective standards for resolving whether the author of 1 Peter was a native speaker of Greek or not, indicating that estimations of its Greek quality have usually been subjective.<sup>25</sup> Modifying and developing Martin's syntactic

---

<sup>22</sup> See R. H. Gundry, "'Verba Christi' in I Peter: Their Implications Concerning the Authorship of I Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1966): 336-50; *Idem*, "Further Verba on Verba Christi in I Peter." *Biblica* 55 (1974): 211-32.

<sup>23</sup> See J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1969), 31; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 2.

<sup>24</sup> See Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 83-84.

<sup>25</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, 326-27.

analysis method<sup>26</sup>, Jobes investigates the presence of “Semitic interference” in 1 Peter, and concludes that the author of 1 Peter was not a native speaker of Greek, referring to the possibility that Mark would have been the amanuensis of 1 Peter.<sup>27</sup>

Finally, in view of the OT use in 1 Peter and Mark’s Gospel there exist surprising literary connections between them; particularly, the quotation of Ps 118:22 in both Mark 12:10 and 1 Pet 2:7, the quotation of (allusion to) the suffering Servant of Isa 53 in 1 Pet 2:22-25a and Mark 10:45, the quotation of (allusion to) Ezek 34 in Mark 6:34 and 1 Pet 2:25b, and the quotation of (allusion to) Isa 40: 8 in 1 Pet 1:25 and Mark 13:31b. 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark significantly underline the suffering of Christ and apply to it the imagery of the rejected stone of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 and that of the suffering servant of Isa 53. Isaiah and the Psalms seem to be the most important canonical books among the OT to the authors of 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark, considering that they cite and allude to them so profoundly. The imagery of Christ as the messianic shepherd of Ezek 34 is highlighted by both 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark; the phrasing of *h=san w`j pro,bata mh. e;conta poime,na* (“they were like sheep without a shepherd”) in Mark 6:34 is used in the Gospel of Mark *alone* among the parallel accounts of the miracle of the five loaves and the two fish in the four Gospels.

From the manner of the OT use in both 1 Peter and Mark’s Gospel, a striking feature remains. In the case of Mark’s Gospel, the author cites or alludes to the OT in a conflated and integrated way.<sup>28</sup> Mark 12:1-11, 10:45, and 13:31 exhibit

---

<sup>26</sup> See R. A. Martin, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974), 5-43.

<sup>27</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, 19, 320-21, 337.

<sup>28</sup> See E. Earle Ellis, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), 49, 141; J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,” *NTS* 7 (1960/61): 319-21; H. C. Kee, “The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16,” in *Jesus und Paulus*, ed. E. Earle Ellis and E. Grässer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 175-78; *Idem*, *Community of the New*

this pattern. Equally, in the case of 1 Peter, the author also cites or alludes to the OT in the same way, manifested in 1 Pet 2:6-8 and 2:22-25. These similarities may originate from the collegueship of Peter and Mark based on their common ministries, and the linguistic characteristics of Mark have influenced Peter.<sup>29</sup> Here in lies the contribution of this study.

### 3. Hypothesis and Methodology

The thesis of this study is that Mark was the contributive amanuensis for 1 Peter with Peter allowing a freer hand in the composition. This study will investigate the relationship between 1 Peter and Mark from five angles by means of a historical and comparative approach. *First*, the study will survey the major proposals regarding the authorship of 1 Peter. *Second*, first-century letter writing will be studied as a practical and supportive background to this inquiry. *Third*, the process of Paul's letter writing will be examined in light of first-century letter writing for the practice of using an amanuensis and Peter's employment of an amanuensis. *Fourth*, the close relationship between Peter and Mark through their ministry based on 1 Pet 5:13 and the references to Mark in the early church, including Papias' note reported by Eusebius, will be explored as evidence of a historical connection between two individuals. *Fifth*, the syntactic correlation, the distinctive features of terminology, and the significant and frequent use of  $\omega\`j$  for a simile between 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel will be investigated as possible evidence that implies linguistic connections

---

*Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1977), 46-47; Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 15; Rikki E. Watts, "Jesus' Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 126, 128; Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction* (London/New York: Continuum, 2001), 21.

<sup>29</sup> The base for this possibility originally comes from George W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *The New International Greek Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1992), 50-51.

between them. *Finally*, the common Old Testament quotations (allusions) in 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark, specifically, the quotation of Ps 118:22 in both Mark 12:10 and 1 Pet 2:7, the quotation of (allusion to) the suffering Servant of Isa 53 in 1 Pet 2:22-25a and Mark 10:45, the quotation of (allusion to) Ezek 34 in Mark 6:34 and 1 Pet 2:25b, and the quotation of (allusion to) Isa 40: 8 in 1 Pet 1:25 and Mark 13:31b, and their conflated and integrated use of the OT will be studied as possible evidence for surprising literary connections between them. The study will conclude with a summary and relevant conclusions.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE AUTHENTICITY PROBLEM OF 1 PETER

#### 1. 1 Peter in the Ancient Church

In respect of a discussion of the authenticity of 1 Peter, it is significant that there was no noteworthy doubt as regards its Petrine authorship before the nineteenth century, except for the fact that Muratorian Fragment did not contain it at the end of second century.<sup>1</sup> There seem to be some parallels between 1 Peter and Clement of Rome's *Epistle to the Corinthians*.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, Polycarp<sup>3</sup> seems to cite 1 Peter in his *Letter to the Philipians*, although he does not mention his source. Irenaeus<sup>4</sup> adduced it as a Petrine epistle in the second century and shortly after it

---

<sup>1</sup> However, Muratorian Fragment not only excludes Hebrews, James, and 3 John, whereas including Wisdom of Solomon and Apocalypse of Peter, but also contains so many clerical errors. Thus, the absence of 1 Peter from Muratorian Fragment should not significantly effect one's judgment regarding its position as legitimate or canonical. Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 7, also comments that "the Muratorian fragment may omit I Peter precisely because its true author was known there." On this issue, specifically see B. F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1889), 211-20; A. B. du Toit, "Historical Section: Survey of the Development, Closure, and Later History of the New Testament Canon," in *Guide to the New Testament*, vol. 1, ed. A. B. du Toit, trans. D. Roy Briggs (Pretoria: N. G. Kerkboekhandel Transvaal, 1979), 237-50; Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 191-201.

<sup>2</sup> J. B. Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Macmillan Co., 1889; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989), 44, 56. See also C. A. Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark LTD, 1902), 8.

<sup>3</sup> Lightfoot and Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 123-30. See also Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 9.

<sup>4</sup> Irenaeus *Against the Heresies* 4.9.2; 4.16.5; 5.7.2, trans. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol.1 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1975).

was attested as Petrine by Tertullian<sup>5</sup> and Clement of Alexandria.<sup>6</sup> Subsequently it was confidently deemed as Scripture in the early church until the nineteenth century.<sup>7</sup> As such, doubt of the authenticity of 1 Peter is a modern tendency.

## 2. Critical Questions about the Authenticity of 1 Peter

The authorship of 1 Peter has been a longstanding point of debate. After Cludius (1808) raised doubts about the genuineness of 1 Peter<sup>8</sup>, this view was followed by Holtzmann, Streeter, Jülicher, Fascher, Scott, Goodspeed, Beare, Best, Kümmel, Elliott, Goppelt, Conzelmann, Lindemann, Schutter, Achtemeier, Ehrman, Horrell, Schnelle, and Senior.<sup>9</sup> This line of criticism among modern scholars especially focuses on the linguistic and historical problems of 1 Peter, drawing attention to the practice of pseudonymity in the Greco-Roman world.

### 2.1. The Linguistic Problem

In 1947, a commentary on *The First Epistle of Peter* was published by Beare. This is seen as a major landmark in the history of the criticism of 1 Peter. As noted in the preface by the author himself, this work is the first English commentary

---

<sup>5</sup> Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 4.13, trans. Peter Holmes, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1976).

<sup>6</sup> Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 12.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 7-15; Davids, *First Epistle of Peter*, 7.

<sup>8</sup> See Huther, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 35-36.

<sup>9</sup> Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 494; Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, 122; Jülicher and Fascher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 193; Scott, *The Literature of the New Testament*, 220; Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 267; Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter: the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, 24-25; Best, *1 Peter*, 176-77; Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 424; Elliott, "Peter, Silvanus and Mark in 1 Peter and Acts: Sociological-Exegetical Perspectives on a Petrine Group in Rome," 250-53; *Idem*, *1 Peter*, 127-34; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Interpreting the New Testament*, 273; Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 7; Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 370; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 43; Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 434-36; Horrell, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 6-7; Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, 400-01; Senior, *1 Peter*, 5-6.

that upholds that 1 Peter is pseudonymous.<sup>10</sup> Most of all, it is generally accepted that the author of 1 Peter uses excellent Greek including an elegant style and frequently quotes the Old Testament (LXX).<sup>11</sup> However, Acts 4:13 describes the Apostle Peter as an illiterate and ordinary (αἰσχρογράμματοι, καὶ ἰδιώται) person. On this point, Beare contends that “it would be a most unusual feat for him, ‘unlearned and ignorant’ as he was (Acts 4: 13), subsequently to become so versed in the Greek Old Testament as the author of our Epistle.”<sup>12</sup> Beare goes on to argue that “he [the author of 1 Peter] writes some of the best Greek in the whole New Testament, far smoother and more literary than that of the highly-trained Paul. This is a feat plainly far beyond the powers of a Galilean fisherman, . . . but that he [the Apostle Peter] should ever become a master of Greek prose is simply unthinkable.”<sup>13</sup> Later, this line of criticism was supported by Best<sup>14</sup> and Achtemeier.<sup>15</sup> While pointing to the use of sixty two *hapax legomena*, unnoted Semiticisms, and considerable rhetorical characteristics in 1 Peter, Achtemeier deals with this issue in detail and concludes that 1 Peter is a “care of composition.”<sup>16</sup> However, Achtemeier’s view seems to be balanced, noting that “the quality of its Greek ought nevertheless not [to] be exaggerated.”<sup>17</sup> While acknowledging that the author of 1 Peter employs “a limited range of rhetorical conventions,” Kelly identifies 1 Peter’s style as “unimaginative, monotonous and at times clumsy,” and asserts that “its style certainly does not deserve the extravagant eulogies it has received.”<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter: the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, ix.

<sup>11</sup> Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 763.

<sup>12</sup> Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter: the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, 27.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 28.

<sup>14</sup> Best, *1 Peter*, 49-50

<sup>15</sup> Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 1-7. See also Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 24-25; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 120.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 3-6.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>18</sup> Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 31. See also A. Wifstrand, “Stylistic Problems in

Prior to Beare's commentary, Selwyn's *The First Epistle of ST. Peter* made its appearance in 1946. With respect to the linguistic problem of 1 Peter, Selwyn, by contrast, powerfully contends that Silvanus, who enjoyed extra freedom while composing the epistle, was the secretary of 1 Peter by reason of close similarity of vocabulary and thought between 1 Peter, the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15, and Thessalonians' correspondence.<sup>19</sup>

It is crucial to observe that by the first century Galilee had already been considerably Hellenized. This fact naturally leads one to believe that native Galileans, including Peter himself, must have known something of Greek.<sup>20</sup> Although 1 Peter frequently quotes the Old Testament (LXX) and Peter was a Palestine Jew, this does not indicate a contradiction, since LXX was the Scripture for the Gentile Churches and it is not convincing to maintain that Peter who had been operating along with Hellenistic Jews was unfamiliar with it.<sup>21</sup>

Concerning the syntax of 1 Peter, one should consider Jobes' recent conclusion on the pseudonymous hypothesis of 1 Peter. She argues as follows:

The pseudonymous hypothesis generally ascribes authorship to a native-Greek speaker of the Petrine school in Rome. If syntax criticism has uncovered Semitic interference in the Greek of 1 Peter that is consistent with a native-Semitic speaker for whom Greek is a second language, then the pseudonymous hypothesis must be modified accordingly . . . . If, however, a pseudonymous Semitic author in Rome is proposed, then further consideration must be given to Silvanus or Mark, and certainly even to Peter himself.<sup>22</sup>

---

the Epistles of James and Peter." *Studia Theologica* 1 (1948): 170-82.

<sup>19</sup> Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 9-17, 365-466. See also Davids, *First Epistle of Peter*, 6-7.

<sup>20</sup> J. L. de Villiers, "Cultural, Economic, and Social Conditions in the Graeco-Roman World," in *Guide to the New Testament*, vol. 2, ed. A.B. du Toit, trans. D. Roy Briggs (Johannesburg: Orion, 1998), 133-42; Kistemaker, *New Testament Commentary: Peter and Jude*, 8; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 120.

<sup>21</sup> Stibbs and Walls, *First Epistle General of Peter*, 25; Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 767-68; Kistemaker, *New Testament Commentary: Peter and Jude*, 9.

<sup>22</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, 19.

As indicated by Spicq<sup>23</sup>, Jobes suggests that Peter would have been in touch with Greek-speaking foreigners since he had been conducting his fishing business with them at the town of Capernaum.<sup>24</sup> This probability unsurprisingly leads one to assume that Peter had been initiated as an apostle of Christ having a certain ability in Greek.<sup>25</sup> Consequently, Jobes astutely points out that “the question of just how ‘good’ the Greek of 1 Peter is takes centre stage. At this point the definition of ‘good’ needs to be objectified.”<sup>26</sup> By reason of “the concept of linguistic interference,” Jobes strongly argues that the main problem is “whether the Greek of 1 Peter shows signs that it was written by a native-Greek speaker or by someone for whom Greek was a second language.”<sup>27</sup>

Jobes has attempted to obtain several standpoints on the relative features of the Greek of 1 Peter by comparing some basics of the syntax of 1 Peter with that of different NT documents, Josephus, and Polybius.<sup>28</sup> She developed and altered Martin’s syntactic analysis approach, which is composed of seventeen criteria<sup>29</sup>, and

---

<sup>23</sup> C. Spicq, *Les Épîtres de Saint Pierre*, La Sainte Bible (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1966), 22-23. See also Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 7.

<sup>24</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, 326.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.* Jobes, *Ibid.*, 327, also indicates that “opinion about the quality of the Greek of 1 Peter is apparently often based on the subjective feel of the text, since there have been no quantitative analyses of Greek syntax of 1 Peter in comparison with other books of NT or other Greek texts.”

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 327.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 331-37.

<sup>29</sup> Jobes’ criteria, *Ibid.*, 327, are as follows: Criteria 1-8: “The relative frequency of occurrence of eight prepositions with respect to the preposition *evn*: (1) *dia*, with genitive, (2) *dia*, in all its occurrences, (3) *ei, j*, (4) *kata*, with the accusative, (5) *kata*, in all occurrences, (6) *peri*, in all occurrences, (7) *pro, j* with the dative, and (8) *u`po*, with the genitive.” Criterion 9: “The relative frequency of occurrence of *kai*, coordinating independent clauses with respect to *de, .*” Criterion 10: “The percentage of articles separated from their substantives.” Criterion 11: “The relative frequency of occurrence of dependent genitives preceding the word on which they depend.” Criterion 12: “The relative frequency of occurrence of dependent genitives personal pronouns.” Criterion 13: “The relative frequency of occurrence of genitives personal pronouns dependent upon anarthrous substantives.” Criterion 14: “The relative frequency of occurrence of attributive adjectives preceding the word they qualify.” Criterion 15: “The relative frequency of occurrence of attributive adjectives.” Criterion 16: “The relative frequency of occurrence of adverbial participles.”

labels S-number as follow: “-1 represents the norm for composition Greek for each of the seventeen criteria, and +1 represents the norm for translation Greek for each of the seventeen criteria.”<sup>30</sup> According to Jobes, the value of S-number of 1 Peter is 0.16, whereas those of Polybius, Josephus, Hebrews, and 1 Thessalonians are -1.68, -1.38, -0.44, and 0.37, respectively.<sup>31</sup> Due to the S-number quantity of 1 Peter, Jobes concludes that “the extent of Semitic interference in the Greek of 1 Peter indicates an author whose first language was not Greek.”<sup>32</sup>

Even though Beare harshly criticizes the argument that Peter used an amanuensis while composing the epistle and disregards it as “a device of desperation,”<sup>33</sup> some other elements should be considered prior to resolving doubts about the authenticity of 1 Peter. Peter’s use of amanuenses is related to the problem, since it is almost certain that Peter, as a contemporary of Paul, utilized an amanuensis while writing his epistles, as Paul did, in light of the practice of first-century letter writing.<sup>34</sup>

## 2.2. The Historical Problem

1 Peter seems to refer to persecuted Christians, and, specifically, suffering for Christ. This would seem to refer to authorized, planned persecution against Christianity. While a severe persecution of Christians existed during the reign of Nero, there is no clear proof that the churches in Asia Minor, which were the addressees of 1 Peter, were persecuted during that period. According to well-established tradition,

---

Criterion 17: “The relative frequency of occurrence of the dative case used without the preposition *evn*.” See also Martin, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents*, 5-43.

<sup>30</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, 330.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 333, 336.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 337.

<sup>33</sup> Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter: the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, 183.

<sup>34</sup> Prior, *Paul the Letter-Writer and Second Letter to Timothy*, 34-35.

Peter died under the reign of Nero (A.D. 54-68). Thus, scholars who reject the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter point to such persecution as being widespread in the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96) or Trajan (A.D. 98-117).<sup>35</sup>

Beare especially indicates the affinity between the circumstances depicted in Pliny the Younger's letter to the Emperor Trajan and that of 1 Peter and strongly argues that the persecution described in 1 Peter took place during the reign of Trajan.<sup>36</sup> By reason of the difficulty of associating the characteristics of persecution referred to in 1 Peter with that of any of three recognized, organized state persecutions, and a dominant agreement that the suffering in the epistle does not indicate official state persecution among contemporary scholars<sup>37</sup>, by contrast, it has been suggested that the situation in 1 Peter favors a date somewhere between the latter periods of the first century.<sup>38</sup> Goppelt dates it within the period A.D. 65-80 during the reign of Nero through to Titus<sup>39</sup>, while Horrell prefers the years A.D. 75-95 under that of Vespasian to Domitian, that is, during the Flavian Dynasty.<sup>40</sup>

Both Selwyn<sup>41</sup> and Kelly<sup>42</sup> see the suffering depicted in 1 Peter, not as official state action but as sporadic and personal. Their observation was supported by Achtemeier. He states: it is

due more to unofficial harassment than to official policy, more local than regional,

---

<sup>35</sup> Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 764.

<sup>36</sup> Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter: the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, 13-15.

<sup>37</sup> This position is supported extensively by not only scholars who accept the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter but also scholars who do not. See Senior, *1 Peter*, 7-8; Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 43; Horrell, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 9; Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 55; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 35-36; Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*, 85-86; Best, *1 Peter*, 42; Jobes, *1 Peter*, 10; Kistemaker, *New Testament Commentary: Peter and Jude*, 18; Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter and Jude*, 5; Davids, *First Epistle of Peter*, 10; Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 10.

<sup>38</sup> Senior, *1 Peter*, 7-8.

<sup>39</sup> Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 46.

<sup>40</sup> Horrell, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 10.

<sup>41</sup> Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 55.

<sup>42</sup> Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 10.

and more at the initiation of the general populace as the result of a reaction against the lifestyle of the Christians than at the initiation of Roman officials because of some general policy of seeking out and punishing Christians. That does not rule out the possibility that persecutions occurred over large areas of the empire; they surely did, but they were spasmodic and broke out at different times in different places, the result of the flare-up of local hatreds rather than because Roman officials were engaged in the regular discharge of official policy.<sup>43</sup>

A sociological approach to identifying the circumstances of 1 Peter's addressees has been explored by Elliott. In his 1981 monograph, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*, Elliott observes:

The absence of any evidence of Roman antagonism toward the Christians from 69-92 C.E., correlated with the positive or at least neutral attitude toward the empire manifested in the Christian literature of this period including 1 Peter, indicates a time of toleration and peaceful coexistence. Under Flavian rule the provinces of Asia Minor . . . enjoyed unusually favorable Roman provincial administrators and benefactions.<sup>44</sup>

Elliott not only sees the suffering described in 1 Peter as “a test of faith,” or “a means of discipline,” or “an experience common to the Christian dispersion” such as depicted in James, Hebrews, and Ephesians, but also underlines that the Roman government as it appears in the epistle is merely regarded as “a human institution designed to administer justice (1 Pet. 2:13-14) and worthy of respect (2:17).”<sup>45</sup> Consequently, Elliott places 1 Peter between the years A.D. 73-92 under Flavian rule.<sup>46</sup> However, there could be a flaw in Elliott's conclusion. As acknowledged by Elliott himself, if the suffering described in 1 Peter is not official state persecution, but “a test of faith,” or “a means of discipline,” or “an experience common to the Christian dispersion,” and “the ecclesiastical situation reflected in 1 Peter coincides with that of

---

<sup>43</sup> Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 35-36.

<sup>44</sup> Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*, 86.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 85-86. See also Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 10-11.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

the Gospel and Acts,”<sup>47</sup> it should also be mentioned that 1 Peter could have been written under Neronian rule<sup>48</sup> since there is no obvious evidence that the churches in Asia Minor, which were 1 Peter’s recipients, were persecuted during that period. It would seem implausible to distinguish sharply the social situation of churches in Asia Minor under the reign of Nero, from that experienced under the Flavian house, at least in light of the characteristics of the suffering referred to in 1 Peter.

Although objecting to the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter, Best seems to be unbiased, mentioning that the references to suffering in 1 Peter are not conclusive regarding the date of persecution.<sup>49</sup> This view is upheld by Jobes.<sup>50</sup> With reference to the argument that the suffering referred to in 1 Peter as not being the result of official state persecution, it is simply one piece of data to ponder in a large puzzle and it is rational not to rule out the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter as a *bona fide* possibility.

### 2.3. The Practice of Pseudonymity

The greeting of 1 Peter claims that the author is the Apostle Peter. In spite of the internal evidence of 1 Peter, rejecting Petrine authorship implies that it is pseudonymous. Some scholars have focused on the linguistic and historical problems of 1 Peter by stating that pseudonymity was a common literary tool in antiquity and identify 1 Peter as pseudonymous. However, the most significant issue is whether the epistle which was esteemed as forged had been identified and

---

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 85. See also Best, *1 Peter*, 42.

<sup>48</sup> See Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 87; Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 30; Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter and Jude*, 5. Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 43, also accepts this possibility.

<sup>49</sup> Best, *1 Peter*, 42.

<sup>50</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, 10.

approved by the early church.<sup>51</sup> Donelson notes that in the early church there remains no instance of known pseudonymous works being accepted as authoritative.<sup>52</sup> Nonetheless, Donelson highlights that “if one had a cause which was important enough and a lie could assist, then it is ‘permissible’ to employ a lie,”<sup>53</sup> and concludes that 1 Peter is a pseudonymous epistle.<sup>54</sup> Donelson’s argument is not convincing because of the contrary views that pseudonymity is not consistent with authoritative Christian writings and that the significance of conserving doctrinal legitimacy vindicates a lie.<sup>55</sup>

Using a different approach from Donelson, Meade contemplates the motive of pseudonymity and develops the position of Bauckham.<sup>56</sup> Meade examined Isaiah, Jewish wisdom writings, Daniel, and 1 Enoch, and assumes that these writings’ attribution is principally an insistence on “authoritative tradition,” not on “literary origins.”<sup>57</sup> In this regard, Meade applies this presupposition to some of the New Testament epistles which have been doubted as pseudonymous and views the procedure as “not mere reproduction, but an attempt to reinterpret a core tradition for a new, and often different *Sitz im Leben*” by using the term “*Vergegenwärtigung*,”<sup>58</sup> and concludes that “in the Petrine epistles, attribution is primarily an assertion of

---

<sup>51</sup> Terry L. Wilder, *Pseudonymity, the New Testament, and Deception* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004), 147-48.

<sup>52</sup> Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*, 11-12.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 50-51.

<sup>55</sup> I. Howard Marshall, “Recent Study of the Pastoral Epistles,” *Themelios* 23:1 (1997): 9.

<sup>56</sup> Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 50 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 161-62, remarks on the pseudonymous author’s authority of 2 Peter, “His authority lies in the faithfulness with which he transmits, and interprets for a new situation, the normative teaching of the apostles. ‘Peter’s testament’ is the ideal literary vehicle for these intentions. The pseudepigraphal device is therefore not a fraudulent means of claiming apostolic authority, but embodies a claim to be a faithful mediator of the apostolic message.” On the contrary, Bauckham, “Pseudo-Apostolic Letters,” *JBL* 107 (1988): 492, seems to accept the authenticity of 1 Peter.

<sup>57</sup> Meade strongly claims this assumption repeatedly. See Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon*, 43, 72, 91, and 102.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 133.

authoritative tradition, not of literary origins.”<sup>59</sup> Likewise, Schnelle agrees that pseudonymity should be treated as valid theologically and an indispensable endeavor ecclesiologically to conserve the apostolic teaching for a new generation.<sup>60</sup> Schnelle thus describes pseudonymity not as deceptive but as “adopted authorial designations,”<sup>61</sup> and affirms that 1 Peter is pseudonymous, “permeated and shaped by early Christian traditions that were attributed to Peter and Silvanus.”<sup>62</sup>

Meade says that the early church treated anonymity and pseudonymity in a different way in the first century from following centuries.<sup>63</sup> In particular, Meade insists that the early church had shown “an increasing rejection of anonymity and pseudonymity” since the second century because the growth of heterodoxy resulted in more vigilant discernment between orthodoxy and heresy.<sup>64</sup> It seems that Meade’s conclusion is not legitimate since heterodoxy already existed in the first century and since evidence is not solid for the assumption that anonymity and pseudonymity were quite prevalent in the first century but that the early church rejected them increasingly in the second century.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 190.

<sup>60</sup> Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, 280.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 401.

<sup>63</sup> Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon*, 205.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 206.

<sup>65</sup> Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 82. In respect to Meade’s insistence, Carson and Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 348, also argue that “it is one thing to say that Jews and early Christians wrote pseudonymous apocalypses and acts, and quite another to say that they wrote letters purporting to come from one person but actually written by someone else. For that we need evidence, and Meade supplies none. Meade’s theory sounds like an attempt to make the results work out after one has already brought into the dominant historical-critical assumptions.” Along this line, Guthrie, Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 1027, relevantly points out that “before New Testament epistolary pseudonymity can be assumed, it is not unreasonable to expect that some adequate parallels should be furnished and that some probable link between these and any possible New Testament pseudepigrapha should be established. Meade dismisses such a demand as superficial, but is it not a basic requirement?” For instance, with regard to the authenticity problem of the PE, Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 84, recognizes the problem of pseudonymity, its deception, and suggests a different position. He contends that it is acceptable for one of Paul’s followers to edit and prepare for the publication of the work shortly after Paul’s death. He, *Ibid.*, 92,

On the contrary, as Bauckham indicates, the issue of pseudonymity in the NT has frequently been put “within the very large context of the general phenomenon” of pseudonymity in antiquity, lacking adequate discernment concerning the fact that the pseudonymous epistle is “a genre with some special features of its own.”<sup>66</sup> Even though there existed many pseudonymous writings in the ancient world, it is remarkable that epistolary pseudonymity was extremely infrequent among Jewish apocrypha and pseudonymous works.<sup>67</sup> Carson and Moo properly specify that there were only two epistles in Jewish apocrypha and pseudonymous writings, *The Epistle of Jeremy* and *The Letter of Aristeas*, and highlight that these are not true letters in a real sense since each of them is almost a homily or a narrative.<sup>68</sup> There was no epistolary pseudonymity among Jewish apocrypha and pseudonymous writings in the strict sense.

The investigation of James regarding pseudonymous epistles in the early church is remarkable. James points out that apocryphal letters are unimposing and rare.<sup>69</sup> These are *The Letters of Christ and Abgarus*, *The Letter of Lentulus*, *The Epistle to the Laodiceans*, *The Correspondence of Paul and Seneca*, *The Epistle of the Apostles*, and *3 Corinthians*.<sup>70</sup> Similarly, Guthrie emphasizes that there remain merely two pseudonymous epistles which hold the New Testament epistolary

---

writes, “It is not too great a step to a situation in which somebody close to a dead person continued to write as (they thought that) he would have done.” In this case, Marshall, *Ibid.*, indicates that there is no “element of intentional deceit,” and apparently claims that 2 Timothy was much more based on genuine Pauline notes whereas 1 Timothy and Titus were “fresh formulations,” although they originated from Paul’s teaching and possibly even some materials. He, *Ibid.*, concludes that the PE probably seem to be written by a group including Timothy and Titus. However, Marshall’s argument, after all, means that 1 Timothy and Titus are pseudonymous, though he, *Ibid.*, uses the term “allonymity” in a struggle to avoid intentional deceit, and the early church was not successful in perceiving pseudonymous letters.

<sup>66</sup> Bauckham, “Pseudo-Apostolic Letters,” 469.

<sup>67</sup> Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 1012.

<sup>68</sup> Carson and Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 341.

<sup>69</sup> M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, rev. ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), 476.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 476-503. See also Bauckham, “Pseudo-Apostolic Letters,” 483-87.

structure and are ascribed to Paul. The first spurious letter is the *Epistle to the Laodiceans*, which is not found in early Greek manuscripts but emerged in the Latin Church after the fourth century. Its legitimacy has never been seriously entertained.<sup>71</sup> Another fictitious letter issued in the name of Paul is *3 Corinthians*. It is commonly suggested that the Syrian and Armenian churches regarded this epistle as Scripture for a time, but it came from *The Acts of Paul* which Tertullian deemed a spurious work.<sup>72</sup> James states that “the Epistle was on the whole too serious an effort for the forger, more liable to detection, perhaps, as a fraud, and not so likely to gain the desired popularity as a narrative or an Apocalypse.”<sup>73</sup> Simultaneously, it should be stressed that Paul teaches the Thessalonians not to receive pseudonymous epistles in 2 Thess 2:2<sup>74</sup>; a view that seems strongly to imply that the early church did not accept the practice of pseudonymity. At this point, Ellis insists that pseudo-apostolic writings were “a tainted enterprise from the start,” and could not escape the stain of deceit during the period of the early church.<sup>75</sup> He concludes that no one can view the disputed New Testament epistles as pseudonymous and simultaneously consider them as innocent documents which can be retained in the New Testament.<sup>76</sup>

The most recent inquiry into pseudonymity and the early church has been conducted by Wilder. Wilder surveyed the intention and reception of pseudonymity

---

<sup>71</sup> Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 608.

<sup>72</sup> Carson and Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 342.

<sup>73</sup> James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 476.

<sup>74</sup> The statement in 2 Thess 3:17 shows that Paul signed his epistles to prove their authenticity. Nevertheless, many scholars view 2 Thessalonians as a pseudonymous letter. Against this position, Carson and Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 345-46, persuasively argue that “if the author was not Paul (as many scholars think), then our pseudonymous author is in the odd position of condemning pseudonymous authors- a literary forgery that damns literary forgeries. If, on the other hand, the author was Paul, then the apostle himself makes it clear that he is aware of pseudonymity and condemns the practice (at least people are using *his* name).” If 2 Thessalonians is a pseudonymous epistle, the author must have deceived his readers extremely skillfully.

<sup>75</sup> E. Earle Ellis, “Pseudonymity and Canonicity of New Testament Documents,” in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church*, ed. Michael J. Wilkins and Terence Paige (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 224.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*

and categorized it according to five cases. These are the following.<sup>77</sup>

Figure 1. The Intention and Reception of Pseudonymity

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| (1) | “If pseudepigrapha are present in the NT, they were not written to deceive their readers, but nonetheless they were deceived.”  |
| (2) | “If pseudepigrapha exist in the NT, they were not written to deceive their readers and did not deceive their readers.”  |
| (3) | “If pseudepigrapha are present in the NT, they were written to deceive their readers and succeeded.”  |
| (4) | “No pseudepigrapha exist in the NT: they were written to deceive but did not deceive anyone (however, if they are present, they were written to deceive their readers and succeeded).”            |
| (5) | “No pseudepigrapha exist in the NT: they were not written to deceive but did not deceive anyone (however, if they are present, they were not written to deceive, but did deceive their readers).” |

(Source: Wilder, *Pseudonymity, the New Testament, and Deception*, 6, 7, 12, 17, 20.)

In particular, he compares the disputed New Testament epistles with Greco-Roman pseudonymous letters and explores early Christian leaders’ responses to pseudonymity.<sup>78</sup> Wilder’s observation deserves mention. He contends:

The church’s exclusion of pseudepigrapha favors the following positions. First, both the authorship of writings and their content were important criteria for the early church when determining which books were to be recognized or rejected as having normative status. These criteria fit together like two sides of the same coin. If a writing was heretical, it was considered inauthentic, and if inauthentic, then the work was not used publicly in the churches. Only where a writing appeared to meet both of these criteria was it ever recognized as normative and accepted for public reading in the churches. In other words, the early church did not knowingly allow either pseudo-apostolic or heretical works to be read publicly in the churches along with the apostolic writings. Second,

<sup>77</sup> See Wilder, *Pseudonymity, the New Testament, and Deception*, 6-20.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 75-163.

evidence is lacking for a convention of pseudonymity which existed amongst orthodox Christians. Third, one was not to violate a recognized corpus of literature-i.e. the genuine writings of the apostles- by pseudonymously enlarging this body with inauthentic works. Fourth, Christians did not regard the fictive use of another person's name with indifference.<sup>79</sup>

Also, Wilder properly points out that the early Christians frequently delivered authoritative lessons apart from employing pseudonymity on the basis of the fact that Paul often quoted the OT to transmit authoritative teachings into a different circumstance and that a number of the NT documents were written by means of anonymity to convey authoritative instructions.<sup>80</sup> On this point Wilder has testified that the New Testament contains no pseudonymous documents.<sup>81</sup> Consequently, he accepts the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter and concludes that "if pseudonymous letters are present in the NT, enough evidence exists to say that they were written to deceive their readers; moreover, their presence in the NT is prima facie indication that they succeeded in doing so."<sup>82</sup>

In this respect, recognizing 1 Peter as pseudonymous is not an argument concerning the evidence, but an argument regarding presupposition. In other words, it seems likely that scholars who reject the authenticity of 1 Peter basically and necessarily insist that 2 Peter is pseudonymous. Grounded on this assumption, they claim that pseudonymity was a common practice in the early church.<sup>83</sup> Subsequently, the proponents of this presupposition assert that 1 Peter is pseudonymous. However, this conclusion is not legitimate because it is not based on sufficient evidence, but on assumptions. As a result, in the light of the evidence above, it can be said that the early church rejected the practice of pseudonymity, and pseudonymous epistles

---

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 147-48.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 193.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 17-19.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 257-58.

<sup>83</sup> Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 1018.

would not have been included in the New Testament.

### 3. Prevalent Proposals on the Authenticity of 1 Peter

Contemporary scholars have made several proposals regarding the authorship of 1 Peter. These include the pseudonymous hypothesis and the amanuensis hypothesis. The pseudonymous hypothesis rejects the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter as a whole and final form, whereas the amanuensis hypothesis supports Petrine authorship. The amanuensis hypothesis still involves a debate as to whether Peter dictated his letter to an amanuensis syllable by syllable or allowed him freedom in the composition. If this is the case, then there remains a question regarding the extent of the freedom that Peter gave to his secretary in the course of composing his letter.

#### 3.1. Pseudonymous Theory

A number of modern scholars insist that 1 Peter is a pseudonymous epistle, but this position, as noted above, has weak points. Most importantly, the pseudonymous hypothesis has a serious difficulty in explaining the references to persons in Rome and churches in Asia Minor in 1 Peter. In other words, it is inconceivable to accept the assumption that a religious forger creates the references to individuals in Rome and churches in Asia Minor with accuracy.<sup>84</sup>

Another objection to this hypothesis is based on the question why two epistles exist. Namely, there should be a suitable reason for writing two epistles.<sup>85</sup> In this respect, some scholars indicate that there is no sufficient reason for a forger to

---

<sup>84</sup> C. Clifton Black, *Mark: Images of an Apostolic Interpreter* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), 63; Davids, *First Epistle of Peter*, 5.

<sup>85</sup> Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 776-77, 831-32, 1022-023.

create two epistles in spite of the danger of detection.<sup>86</sup> This means that one pseudonymous epistle has less possibility of detection than would two such epistles. The pseudonymous hypothesis does not give a compelling response to this contention.

Some scholars have proposed that Silvanus (Silas) was the author of 1 Peter. For example, Goppelt insists that Silvanus wrote 1 Peter after Peter's death.<sup>87</sup> In a related vein, the hypothesis that 1 Peter derives from within a Petrine school in Rome was originally suggested by Best<sup>88</sup> in 1971 and later this view was substantially endorsed by Senior<sup>89</sup> and Elliott.<sup>90</sup> Specifically, an elaborate, extensive, and persuasive attempt to argue in favor of a Petrine group in Rome has been executed by Elliott. Elliott essentially asserts that 1 Peter comes from within a Petrine circle which includes Silvanus and Mark in Rome after Peter's death.<sup>91</sup>

### 3.2. Amanuensis Theory

Many scholars insist that Peter wrote 1 Peter using an amanuensis, as the Pauline epistles themselves show<sup>92</sup>, and this practice helps to explain the linguistic problem, namely, the excellent Greek and the use of the Old Testament (LXX) in the epistle. From the late nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century, Plumptre (1879) and Bigg (1902) upheld in their commentaries that Silvanus not only

---

<sup>86</sup> Wilder, *Pseudonymity, the New Testament, and Deception*, 147-48; Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 831-32; Jobes, *1 Peter*, 321; Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter and Jude*, 2.

<sup>87</sup> Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 370. Even though Goppelt, *Ibid.*, says that "the mention of Silvanus here [1 Pet 5:12] . . . does not correspond to tactics of pseudepigraphy," but his argument after all 1 Peter is a pseudonymous epistle.

<sup>88</sup> Best, *1 Peter*, 63.

<sup>89</sup> Senior, *1 Peter*, 5-6.

<sup>90</sup> Elliott, *1 Peter*, 127-30.

<sup>91</sup> See Elliott, "Peter, Silvanus and Mark in 1 Peter and Acts: Sociological-Exegetical Perspectives on a Petrine Group in Rome," 250-53; *Idem*, *1 Peter*, 127-30; Jens Herzer, *Petrus oder Paulus?*, WUNT 103 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 62-77.

<sup>92</sup> Tertius has been identified as the amanuensis of Romans (Rom 16:22). Paul's other references implying that he needed an amanuensis' help are 1 Cor 16:21, Gal 6:11, Col 4:18, 2 Thess 3: 17, and Phlm 1:19.

was the amanuensis but also the courier of 1 Peter.<sup>93</sup> Later, this position was supported by Wand, Selwyn and Cranfield. They also contend that Silvanus is not merely the amanuensis but also the letter-carrier.<sup>94</sup> Thus Silvanus was responsible for dual-duty. Haenchen, Kistemaker, and Metzger also insist that 1 Peter 5:12 renders Silvanus the amanuensis.<sup>95</sup> Similarly, Harrison notes that Silvanus would be “more than a secretary in the ordinary sense.”<sup>96</sup> In the same vein, Marshall writes that “possibly Silas had a larger share” in composing the epistle.<sup>97</sup> Guthrie confirms that Peter utilized Silvanus as the amanuensis of his epistle on the ground of his statement.<sup>98</sup> Furthermore, Davids writes that Peter allowed Silvanus to pen the epistle using his name.<sup>99</sup> Johnson also accepts the possibility that “the letter could have been dictated to a secretary fluent in Greek,” which means that Silvanus was the secretary.<sup>100</sup> However, as mentioned in the previous chapter, the formula *gra, fw dia, tinoj* identified only the letter-bearer.

The tradition referred to by Eusebius and originated by Papias puts Mark in Rome as Peter’s coworker and his amanuensis.<sup>101</sup> Eusebius reports:

---

<sup>93</sup> Plumptre, *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 159; Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 5-6.

<sup>94</sup> Wand, *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 128; Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 241; Cranfield, *I and II Peter and Jude: Introduction and Commentary*, 137.

<sup>95</sup> Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, trans. Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn, Hugh Anderson, and R. McL. Wilson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 451; Metzger, *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*, 256. Metzger, *ibid.*, adds that “Peter gave him an outline of the content of the letter and left him free to compose the wording; then when the work was finished, Peter added a conclusion in his own hand.” See also Kistemaker, *New Testament Commentary: Peter and Jude*, 207.

<sup>96</sup> Harrison, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 404.

<sup>97</sup> Marshall, *1 Peter*, 174.

<sup>98</sup> Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 779.

<sup>99</sup> Davids, *First Epistle of Peter*, 6. Davids, *ibid.*, 198, also says, “Silvanus is being cited as the real author of the letter per se, although the thoughts behind it are those of Simon Peter.”

<sup>100</sup> Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation*, 481. See also Carson and Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 645.

<sup>101</sup> See Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 46-63. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935), 23, suggests that Mark was Peter’s personal amanuensis as well as



“kai. tou/q’ o`  
presbu,teroj( e;legen\ Ma,rkoj  
me.n e`rmhneuth.j Pe,trou  
geno,menoj( o[sa  
evmnhmo,neusen( avkribw/j  
e;grayen( ouv me,ntoi  
ta,xei( ta. u`po. tou/ kuri,ou  
h' lecqe,nta h'  
pracqe,nta) ou;te ga.r  
h;kousen tou/ kuri,ou ou;te  
parhkolou,qhsen  
aυtw/|( u[steron de,( w`j  
e;fhñ( Pe,trw|\ o]j pro.j ta.j  
krei,aj evpoiēi/to ta.j  
didaskali,aj( avll v ouvc  
w[sper su,ntaxin tw/n  
kuriakw/n poiou,menoj  
logi,wn( w[ste ouvde.n  
h[marten Ma,rkoj ou[twj e;nia  
gra,yaj w`j avpemnhmo,neusen)  
e`no.j ga.r evpoiη,sato  
pro,noian( tou/ mhde.n w-n  
h;kousen paralipei/n h'  
yeu,sasqai, ti evn αυτοι/j)”

“And the Presbyter used to say this, ‘Mark became Peter’s interpreter and wrote accurately all that he remembered, not, indeed, in order, of the things said or done by the Lord. For he had not heard the Lord, nor had he followed him, but later on, as I said, followed Peter, who used to give teaching as necessity demanded but not making, as it were, an arrangement of the Lord’s oracles, so that Mark did nothing wrong in thus writing down single points as he remembered them. For to one thing he gave attention, to leave out nothing of what he had heard and to make no false statements in them.’”<sup>102</sup>

Irenaeus also writes:

“O me.n dh. Matqai/oj evn  
toi/j `Ebrai,oi] th/|  
ivdi,a| diale,ktw|  
aυtw/n( kai. Grafh.n  
evxh, negken

“Matthew also issued a written Gospel among the Hebrews in their own dialect, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and laying the foundations of the church. After

---

his interpreter. See also Senior, *1 Peter*, 5-7; Black, *Mark: Images of an Apostolic Interpreter*, 82-94; Gundry, “Verba Christi” in *I Peter: Their Implications Concerning the Authorship of I Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition*, 336-50; *Idem*, “Further Verba on Verba Christi in I Peter,” 211-32; C. Spicq, “La 1<sup>re</sup> Petri et le témoignage évangélique de saint Pierre,” *Studia Theologica* 20 (1966): 37-61; Stibbs and Walls, *First Epistle General of Peter*, 34-35.

<sup>102</sup> Eusebius *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.39.15, trans. Kirsopp Lake, The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975).



Euvaggeli,ou( tou/ Pe,trou  
kai. tou/ Pau,lou evn  
`Rw,mh|  
euvaggelizome,nwn( kai.  
gemeliou,ntwn th.n  
VEkklhsi,an) Meta. de.  
th.n tou,twn  
e;xodon( Ma,rkoj o`  
maghth.j kai. e`rmhneuth.j  
Pe,trou( kai. auvto.j ta.  
u`po. Pe,trou khrosso,mena  
evggra,fwj h`mi/n  
parade,dwke) Kai. Louka/j  
de, o` avko,louqoj  
Pau,lou( to. u`p v  
evkei,nou khrosso,menon  
Euvaggeli,on evn bi,blw|  
kate,qeto) ;Epeita  
vIwa,nnhj o` maghth.j tou/  
kuri,ou( o` kai. evpi. to.  
sth/qoj auvtou/  
avnapesw,n( kai. auvto.j  
evxe,dwken to.  
Euvagge,lion( evn vEfe,sw|  
th/j vAsi,aj diatri,bwn)

their departure Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, did also hand down to us in writing what had been preached by Peter. Luke also, the companion of Paul, recorded in a book the Gospel preached by him. Afterward, John, the disciple of the Lord, who also had leaned upon His breast, did himself publish a Gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia.”<sup>103</sup>

In light of this tradition, with regard to the possibility that Silvanus would have been Peter’s amanusensis, Hillyer’s observation that “if 1 Peter had been pseudepigraphic, a forger would surely have suggested the apostle’s long-time college Mark as Peter’s amanuensis” is significant.<sup>104</sup> Hillyer goes on to say, “But he [Mark] is mentioned in the very next verse with no hint of being involved in the writing.”<sup>105</sup> The hint is not necessary. As mentioned above, Mark greets its recipients as Tertius who was the

<sup>103</sup> Irenaeus *Against the Heresies* 3.1.1, in *Opera omnia*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* [PG], vol. 7<sup>1</sup> (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1857), 844-45. Translation from, Roberts and Donaldson, ANF, 414.

<sup>104</sup> Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter and Jude*, 2.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*

amanuensis of Romans does (Rom 16:22), and, if 1 Peter is authentic and Mark in 1 Peter 5:13 is the same person who wrote the Gospel of Mark, the very intimate relationship between Peter and Mark (Ma/rkoj o` ui`o,j mou) and Mark's ability to write is enough evidence to identify him as the amanuensis for the recipients of the epistle. Michaels also seems to support this point by emphasizing that "the assumption that Peter had professional help in the composition of this letter by no means requires that the name of his amanuensis be known."<sup>106</sup> Most recently, in her 2005 commentary, Jobes also underlines the view that "if the reference to Silvanus is entirely fictional, one wonders why he was chosen rather than someone more widely associated with Peter."<sup>107</sup> Although regarding Silvanus as a courier, Jobes also delivers the option that Silvanus or Mark would have worked as Peter's secretary.<sup>108</sup> Similarly, Michaels seems to favor the possibility that Mark is Peter's secretary indicating not only Papias's testimony but also identifying Silvanus as a letter-courier.<sup>109</sup> Evidently, this implies that Mark more likely would have been the amanuensis of 1 Peter than Silvanus.

In this respect, Hengel's remark deserves to be noted:

There are good historical reasons for what at first sounds an unusual piece of information, that Mark was Peter's interpreter. It is obvious that the Galilean fisherman Simon will never have learnt Greek thoroughly enough to have been able to present his teaching fluently in unexceptionable Greek. The Greek Palestinian John Mark, whose house Peter visited first in the legend of Acts 12.12 ff. after his liberation from prison, was presumably later his companion and indeed interpreter where that was necessary. Peter's Greek will hardly have been pleasing to the fastidious ear of the ancient listener.<sup>110</sup>

Furthermore, Hengel points out that "given its essentially smaller extent, the Gospel of Mark mentions Simon Peter more frequently than the other Synoptic Gospels and

---

<sup>106</sup> Michaels, *1 Peter*, lxii. See also Trobisch, *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins*, 29.

<sup>107</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, 321

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 320-21. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 248-49, also views Silvanus as a letter carrier, but still open the possibility that he would be Peter's amanuensis.

<sup>109</sup> Michaels, *1 Peter*, lxii, 312.

<sup>110</sup> Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 50.

also more frequently than John.”<sup>111</sup> Likewise, Feldmeier describes this relation between Peter and the Gospel of Mark in more detail. Feldmeier scrupulously observes that “Mark mentions Simon/Peter 25 times, Matthew also mentions him 25 times, and Luke 30 times. With a total number of 11078 words in Mark, 18298 in Matthew and 19448 in Luke, that gives a frequency in Mark of 1:443, in Luke of 1:648 and in Matthew of 1:722,” and concludes that “given the approximate equivalence of Luke and Matthew, Peter is therefore mentioned most often in Mark (Mark:Matt. 1:1,65; Mark:Luke 1:1,46).”<sup>112</sup>

In a related vein, in his 1966-67 article, “*Verba Christi* in I Peter: Their Implications concerning the Authorship of I Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition,” Gundry investigated the relation of the Dominical sayings between 1 Peter and four Gospels, and insists not only that “the *verba Christi* in 1 Peter tend to fall into text-plots in the gospels,” but also that these show a “Petrine pattern.”<sup>113</sup> Later, in a different article, “Further Verba Christi on Verba Christi in First Peter,” Gundry concludes that Peter in Rome dictated his epistle to an amanuensis with “frequent allusions to dominical sayings and incidents which were both authentic and possessive of special interest to him.”<sup>114</sup>

Specifically, as respects a distinctive study for the authorship of 1 Peter,

---

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.* This view is also supported by Augustine Stock, *The Method and Message of Mark* (Wilmington, DL: Michael Glazier, 1989), 1-3. See also R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002), 35-41; William L. Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 7-12; Ralph P. Martin, *Mark: Evangelist and Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1972), 80-83.

<sup>112</sup> Reinhard Feldmeier, “The Portrayal of Peter in the Synoptic Gospels,” in *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, ed. Martin Hengel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 59. For a critical approach to the relationship between Mark and Peter, specifically see Black, *Mark: Images of an Apostolic Interpreter*, 201-06. An elaborate and balanced quest for the historical Mark has also been investigated by Black. Black has devoted to identify the historical Mark on the basis of the portraits from the New Testament documents through those of patristic Christianity.

<sup>113</sup> Gundry, “*Verba Christi* in I Peter: Their Implications Concerning the Authorship of I Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition,” 345.

<sup>114</sup> *Idem*, “Further Verba on Verba Christi in I Peter,” 232.

Elliott's inquiry is notable. Elliott basically argues on the ground of the sociological-exegetical perspective that 1 Peter is not derived from "a single individual" but comes from "a group of which Peter, Silvanus and Mark were chief representatives" in Rome after Peter's death.<sup>115</sup> Elliott highlights not only that "the letter [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" but also that it is "a genuine letter composed in Rome and sent to household communities of Christian converts residing in the four Roman provinces of Asia Minor."<sup>116</sup> Elliott also identifies Silvanus as a letter-carrier<sup>117</sup>, and this would seem to imply that Mark was more involved in the composition of the epistle than Silvanus.

However, as pointed out by Jobes, there remains no present proof "from the first century" that the Petrine circle existed in Rome during that period.<sup>118</sup> Furthermore, it should also be considered that both Silvanus and Mark had also been coworkers of Paul. It would seem more impartial to concede that Silvanus and Mark were associates of the Apostles including Paul and Peter rather than of Peter only.<sup>119</sup> Although Elliott seems to be cautious in stating that 1 Peter is basically Petrine in terms that it reflects "the thoughts, the theology, and the concerns of the apostle Peter,"<sup>120</sup> but, after all, his position is that 1 Peter is pseudonymous.

---

<sup>115</sup> Elliott, "Peter, Silvanus and Mark in 1 Peter and Acts: Sociological-Exegetical Perspectives on a Petrine Group in Rome," 250.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 253-54.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 267.

<sup>118</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, 6.

<sup>119</sup> Acts 15:22-33 shows that Silvanus was one of the colleagues for the Apostles in Jerusalem. Silvanus is also identified as one of the co-senders of Thessalonians correspondence. Acts 15:38, Col 4:10, Phlm 24, and 2 Tim 4:11 show that Mark was also a co-worker of Paul. If a Petrine group were in Rome, some of these verses would also seem to support for a Pauline group in Rome including Silvanus and Mark themselves as well.

<sup>120</sup> Elliott, "Peter, Silvanus and Mark in 1 Peter and Acts: Sociological-Exegetical Perspectives on a Petrine Group in Rome," 253.

Nonetheless, Elliott's inquiry offers a significant and astute insight of Mark's involvement in the composition of 1 Peter.

In sum, it seems likely that Peter, as a first century letter writer and a contemporary of Paul, utilized amanuenses while he composed his letters in light both of the practice of first-century letter writing and the evidence shown by the Pauline epistles themselves. In this case, Peter would not dictate word by word, but would allow his amanuensis to have some freedom.<sup>121</sup>

#### **4. Conclusion**

Since Cludius' criticism in the early nineteenth century, there is a stream of modern scholarship concerning the authorship of 1 Peter, that is, that 1 Peter is not Petrine. A number of scholars have questioned the authenticity of 1 Peter on the grounds of the linguistic problem, the uses of excellent Greek and the Old Testament (LXX) in the epistle. They insist that 1 Peter is pseudonymous. However, as noted above, this hypothesis is not acceptable, since the early church rejected the practice of pseudonymity and there remains no example of a pseudonymous epistle in the first century.

Doubt regarding the genuineness of 1 Peter by reason of linguistic and historical problems is a rather modern tendency, thus the conclusion that 1 Peter is not Petrine is hasty. Most important, as examined above, quite a number of scholars have sufficiently advocated the genuineness of 1 Peter by stating that Peter used an amanuensis in writing letters and allowed him freedom on the basis of the practice of first-century letter writing. The linguistic problem must be viewed in light of the internal evidence of 1 Peter, the external evidence in the early church, and the

---

<sup>121</sup> This will be investigated in Chapter 3 and 4, respectively.

practice of first-century letter writing. In sum, considering Peter's use of amanuenses and his allowing a free hand in the process of writing, it is certainly reasonable to include the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter as a real possibility.