



John-Christian Eurell

Peter's Legacy in Early Christianity

The Appropriation and Use of Peter's Authority
in the First Three Centuries

Dissertationes Theologicae Holmienses No. 1

This study combines traditional historical-critical methods with the sociological theories of Max Weber and Pierre Bourdieu in order to discuss how Peter's authority is portrayed and used to create legitimacy in Christian texts from the first three centuries. The New Testament texts that mention Peter are discussed together with other early Christian writings that in one way or another relate to Peter as an authoritative figure. Peter emerges as a central figure in the diverse early Christian movement and is used to a high degree to discuss theological legitimacy. The main divide is between those who argue that legitimate theology should have a conservative point of departure based on traditional material handed down from the earthly Jesus and an apostolic succession based on interpersonal relations and those who argue in favour of a more progressive point of departure which places more emphasis on contemporary charismatic experiences. Both these perspectives are used by groups of various theological persuasion in order to argue their own position. Peter is sometimes used to legitimise a theological position with reference to Peter's relationship to the earthly Jesus and sometimes to discredit traditions concerning the earthly Jesus by pointing out that Peter did not understand his true message. Peter is used as both positive and negative example for both these ways of creating legitimacy.



Enskilda Högskolan
Stockholm

ISBN 978-91-88906-10-6 • www.ehs.se/dtb



9 789188 906106



Peter's Legacy in Early Christianity

Dissertationes Theologicae Holmienses

Dissertations from Stockholm School of Theology

www.ebs.se/dth

Editors:

Joel Halldorf

Jonas Ideström

Thomas Kazen

Samuel Rubenson

Susanne Wigorts Yngvesson

No. 1

John-Christian Eurell

Peter's Legacy in Early Christianity

The Appropriation and Use of Peter's Authority
in the First Three Centuries

Enskilda Högskolan Stockholm
2021

Peter's Legacy in Early Christianity: The Appropriation and Use of Peter's Authority in the First Three Centuries

Dissertation presented at Stockholm School of Theology, University College Stockholm, to be publicly examined in Room 219 at Åkeshovsvägen 29, Bromma, January 29, 2021, at 13:00, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Theology (Biblical Studies: New Testament). The examination will be held in English.

Faculty examiner: Outi Lehtipuu, Senior Lecturer in Biblical Studies, University of Helsinki.

Supervisor: Rikard Roitto, Associate Professor of Biblical Studies, University College Stockholm.

Assistant supervisor: James A. Kelhoffer, Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Uppsala University.

Abstract

This study combines traditional historical-critical methods with the sociological theories of Max Weber and Pierre Bourdieu in order to discuss how Peter's authority is portrayed and used to create legitimacy in Christian texts from the first three centuries. The New Testament texts that mention Peter are discussed together with other early Christian writings that in one way or another relate to Peter as an authoritative figure. Peter emerges as a central figure in the diverse early Christian movement and is used to a high degree to discuss theological legitimacy. The main divide is between those who argue that legitimate theology should have a conservative point of departure based on traditional material handed down from the earthly Jesus and an apostolic succession based on interpersonal relations and those who argue in favour of a more progressive point of departure which places more emphasis on contemporary charismatic experiences. Both these perspectives are used by groups of various theological persuasion in order to argue their own position. Peter is sometimes used to legitimise a theological position with reference to Peter's relationship to the earthly Jesus and sometimes to discredit traditions concerning the earthly Jesus by pointing out that Peter did not understand his true message. Peter is used as both positive and negative example for both these ways of creating legitimacy.

Petrus eftermäle i den tidiga kristendomen: Om hur Petrus auktoritet approprieras och används under de första tre århundradena

Akademisk avhandling presenterad vid Teologiska högskolan Stockholm, Enskilda Högskolan Stockholm, för disputation i sal 219, Åkeshovsvägen 29, Bromma, 29 januari 2021 kl. 13.00, för graden teologie doktor i bibelvetenskap med inriktning mot Nya testamentet. Disputationen kommer att äga rum på engelska.

- Opponent:* Outi Lehtipuu, docent och universitetslektor i bibelvetenskap, Helsingfors universitet.
- Handledare:* Rikard Roitto, docent och högskolelektor i bibelvetenskap, Enskilda Högskolan Stockholm.
- Bitr. handledare:* James A. Kelhoffer, professor i Nya testamentets exegetik, Uppsala universitet.

Sammanfattning

Denna studie kombinerar traditionella historisk-kritiska metoder med Max Webers och Pierre Bourdieus sociologiska teorier för att diskutera hur Petrus auktoritet gestalts och används för legitimitetskapande i kristna texter från de tre första århundradena. De nytestamentliga texter som behandlar Petrus diskuteras jämte andra tidigkristna texter som på ett eller annat sätt relaterar till Petrus som auktoritetsfigur. Petrus framträder som en central gestalt i den mångfacetterade tidigkristna rörelsen och används i hög utsträckning för att diskutera teologisk legitimitet. Skiljelinjen går mellan de som menar att teologin bör ha en konservativ utgångspunkt baserad på det som traderats från den jordiske Jesus samt en apostolisk succession baserad på mellanmänskliga relationer och de som menar att teologin bör ha en mer progressiv utgångspunkt i bemärkelsen att teologin borde utvecklas i linje med karismatiska erfarenheter som gjorts i samtiden. Bakom dessa två förhållningssätt döljer sig emellertid en mångfald av teologiska inriktningar som använder dessa perspektiv för att på olika sätt legitimera sin egen teologiska position. Petrusgestalten används omväxlande för att legitimera en teologisk position med hänvisning till Petrus relation till den jordiske Jesus och omväxlande för att avfärda trovärdigheten hos traditioner från den jordiske Jesus genom apostlarna genom att påvisa att Petrus inte tycks ha förstått Jesu sanna budskap. Petrus används som både positivt och negativt exempel för båda dessa sätt att skapa legitimitet.

Enskilda Högskolan Stockholm

Enskilda Högskolan Stockholm erbjuder utbildningsprogram i mänskliga rättigheter och demokrati, samt i teologi/religionsvetenskap. Högskolan grundades 1993 genom en sammanslagning av utbildningsinstitutioner med rötter från 1866. Teologiska högskolan Stockholm är den samlade benämningen på högskolans båda teologiska avdelningar, Religionsvetenskap och teologi, samt Östkyrkliga studier. Högskolan för mänskliga rättigheter och demokrati är benämningen på utbildningarna i mänskliga rättigheter och demokrati. Forskarutbildningen i Bibelvetenskap bedrivs inom inriktningarna Gamla testamentets/Hebreiska bibelns exegetik respektive Nya testamentets exegetik. Utbildningen är både bred och djup, och innefattar bland annat filologiska, historiska, litterära, teologiska, socialvetenskapliga, ideologikritiska och hermeneutiska perspektiv

University College Stockholm

University College Stockholm offers programmes in Human Rights and Democracy and in Theology/Religious Studies. The university college was founded in 1993 through a merger of educational institutions with roots dating back to 1866. Stockholm School of Theology is the common designation for the two theological departments: Religious Studies and Theology, and Eastern Christian Studies. Stockholm School of Human Rights and Democracy is the designation for the programmes in Human Rights and Democracy. The doctoral programme in Biblical Studies provides specialisations in Old Testament/Hebrew Bible exegesis and New Testament exegesis. The programme offers both breadth and depth, and includes among other things philological, historical, literary, theological, and hermeneutical perspectives, as well as perspectives from social science and ideological criticism.

© 2021 John-Christian Eurell

ISBN: 978-91-88906-10-6

Page and cover design by Carl Johan Berglund. Typeset in EB Garamond.
Printed by BoD – Books on Demand, Norderstedt, Germany.

Stockholm School of Theology
University College Stockholm
Åkeshovsvägen 29, 168 39 Bromma, Sweden
www.ehs.se

Preface

This dissertation is in many ways the result of many years of struggle. With a first degree from a rather obscure institution, my path in the academy was all but self-evident. In this process I am most grateful to the support of Professor James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala) as well as my former teacher Docent Anders Gerdmar (Scandinavian School of Theology) for encouraging me to pursue further study and research. I am very happy that Professor Thomas Kazen admitted me to the master's programme at the Stockholm School of Theology and some years later also to the brand-new doctoral programme at this institution. The Stockholm School of Theology has proven to be a dynamic research environment with a broad competency in biblical studies. The interest for this study was sparked when I wrote my master's thesis on Peter in the Matthean redaction in 2013, and Peter has been a significant part of my thought world ever since.

For the completion of this dissertation, I am grateful for access to the Carolina Rediviva library in Uppsala, which has provided the necessary library resources of this project. I am also thankful to Docent Jörgen Magnusson (Mid Sweden University) for inviting me to join his course in Coptic with short notice.

A number of competent people have commented on my thesis and helped me improve it in many regards over the years. The comments of my supervisor Docent Rikard Roitto (Stockholm) have always been initiated and well-reflected and the same can be said of my secondary supervisor, Professor James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala). I am also thankful for the comments from the biblical studies faculty at Stockholm School of Theology: Professor Thomas Kazen, Docent Rikard Roitto, Dr. Hanna Stenström, Dr. Carl Johan Berglund, Docent Åke Viberg, Dr. Josef Forsling, and Dr. Miriam Hjälms as well as my fellow doctoral students Sara Häggström, Lisa Plantin, and Jessica Alm. Parts of the material have also been presented in Uppsala, Lund, Reykjavik, and Leuven and my arguments have been sharpened by the responses. Finally, I am also thankful to Docent Tord Fornberg (Uppsala) for his careful and detailed examination of my text in connection to the final review of my thesis, which resulted in several significant improvements.

As the latter part of my research process has been defined by a global pandemic and working from home, I am especially thankful for the fellowship with my children John-David, Jonas, and Lydia and my lovely wife Cecilie. Despite the advances in digital communication, they have provided my closest research fellowship in the final stages of this project.

Storvreta in November 2020

John-Christian Eurell

Contents

Preface	7
Contents	9
Abbreviations	15
1. Introduction	17
1.1 History of Research	18
1.1.1 Critical Research Prior to Cullmann	18
1.1.2 Oscar Cullmann and the Ecumenical Debate.....	20
1.1.3 The Development of Peter-Images	22
1.1.4 The Peter-Images of Various Early Christian Texts	23
1.2 The Purpose of This Study.....	26
1.3 Means for Assessing the Evidence	27
1.3.1 Reconstructing Narrative Settings as “Spheres of Influence”	27
1.3.2 A History of Ideas Approach	31
1.3.3 Tools for Sociological Analysis.....	34
1.3.4 Research Procedure	38
2. Peter and Paul—A Complicated Relationship	39
2.1 Peter in Galatians	39
2.1.1 The Meeting with Peter (Gal 1:15–24)	40
2.1.2 The Meeting at Jerusalem (Gal 2:1–10)	42
2.1.3 The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11–21).....	45
2.1.4 Conclusion: Peter in Galatians	48
2.2 Peter in First Corinthians.....	49
2.2.1 The Cephas Party (1 Cor 1:10–17).....	50
2.2.2 Cephas and his Wife (1 Cor 9:5).....	52
2.2.3 Christ Appeared to Cephas (1 Cor 15:5).....	52
2.2.4 Conclusion: Peter in First Corinthians.....	54
Excursus A: Simon—Cephas—Peter	55

2.3	Peter in Acts	58
2.3.1	The Choice of a New 12 th Apostle (Acts 1:11–26).....	61
2.3.2	Peter’s Sermon at Pentecost (Acts 2:14–41).....	63
2.3.3	Peter Heals a Lame Beggar and its Consequences (Acts 3–4).....	64
2.3.4	Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 4:36–5:11).....	65
2.3.5	Peter’s Miraculous Shadow (Acts 5:12–16)	66
2.3.6	Peter Before the Sanhedrin Again (Acts 5:17–42)	67
2.3.7	The Visit to Samaria (Acts 8:14–25).....	68
2.3.8	Peter Visits Galilee (Acts 9:32–43).....	68
2.3.9	Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10:1–11:18).....	69
2.3.10	Peter in Prison (Acts 12:1–19).....	72
2.3.11	The Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:1–35)	73
2.3.12	Conclusion: Peter in Acts	74
	Excursus B: Paul and the Apostolic Criteria	76
	Excursus C: James.....	78
2.4	Conclusion: Peter and Paul—Two Perspectives.....	81
3.	Peter in the Canonical Gospels	85
3.1	Peter in the Gospel of Mark.....	90
3.1.1	Analysis: Peter in the Markan Narrative.....	91
3.1.2	Conclusion: Peter in the Gospel of Mark	95
3.2	Peter in the Gospel of Matthew	96
3.2.1	Analysis: Peter in the Matthean Redaction	97
3.2.2	Conclusion: Peter in the Gospel of Matthew	107
3.3	Peter in the Gospel of John	111
3.3.1	Analysis: Peter in the Johannine Narrative	113
3.3.2	Conclusion: Peter in the Gospel of John.....	129
	Excursus D: Peter, the Beloved Disciple, and the Redaction of the Fourth Gospel	131
3.4	Peter in the Gospel of Luke	135
3.4.1	Analysis: Peter in the Lukan Narrative	136
3.4.2	Conclusion: Peter in the Gospel of Luke.....	141
3.5	A Note on the Significance of Synoptic Hypotheses	142
3.6	Conclusion: Peter in the Canonical Gospels	144
4.	<i>In Nomine Petri</i>: Literature Claiming Petrine Authorship	147
4.1	Peter in First Peter.....	148
4.1.1	Introductory Matters	148

4.1.2	The Construction of Peter in First Peter.....	152
4.1.3	First Peter and Paulinism.....	156
4.1.4	How Does First Peter Work as a Pseudepigraphical Letter?	157
4.1.5	Conclusion: Peter in First Peter	161
4.2	Peter in the Preaching of Peter	162
4.2.1	Analysis of Relevant Passages.....	164
4.2.2	Conclusion: Peter in the Preaching of Peter.....	166
4.3	Peter in the Apocalypse of Peter.....	167
4.3.1	Peter’s Function in the Narrative.....	171
4.3.2	Why Peter?.....	175
4.3.3	Conclusion: Peter in the Apocalypse of Peter.....	177
4.4	Peter in Second Peter.....	177
4.4.1	Introductory Matters	177
4.4.2	Second Peter as a “Testament of Peter”.....	179
4.4.3	Second Peter as a Creative Compilation of Sources.....	182
4.4.4	The Construction of Peter in Second Peter.....	185
4.4.5	Second Peter and Paul.....	190
4.4.6	Conclusion	192
4.5	Peter in the Gospel of Peter	193
4.5.1	I, Simon Peter.....	194
4.5.2	“I With My Companions was Grieved”.....	195
4.5.3	Serapion’s Reaction.....	195
4.5.4	Justin’s Possible Quotation of the Gospel of Peter	197
4.5.5	Conclusion.....	199
4.6	Peter in the Letter of Peter to Philip.....	200
4.6.1	Analysis of the Narrative.....	201
4.6.2	Conclusion.....	203
4.7	Peter in the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles.....	205
4.8	Peter in the Coptic Apocalypse of Peter	209
4.9	Peter in the “Act” of Peter	211
4.9.1	The Coptic Act of Peter.....	211
4.9.2	Pseudo-Titus.....	213
4.9.3	The Acts of Nereus and Achilleus.....	214
4.9.4	Conclusion.....	215
4.10	Peter in the Martyrdom of Peter.....	216
4.11	Conclusion: Peter in Early Pseudo-Petrine Writings.....	218

5. Peter in Other Early Christian Sources	221
5.1 Peter in First Clement	221
5.2 Peter in Second Clement.....	228
5.3 Peter in the Ignatian Correspondence	230
5.4 Peter in the Papias Fragments	234
5.5 Peter in the Epistula Apostolorum	238
5.6 Peter in the Apocryphon of James.....	239
5.7 Peter in the Gospel of Thomas	242
5.8 Peter in the Gospel of Mary	248
5.9 Peter in the Gospel of Judas	253
5.10 Peter in Marcion.....	256
5.11 Peter in the Gospel of the Ebionites.....	258
5.12 Peter in the So-Called Leucian Acts	259
5.12.1 Peter in the Acts of Andrew	259
5.12.2 Peter in the Acts of John	263
5.12.3 Peter in the Acts of Paul.....	264
5.12.4 Peter in the Acts of Thomas	266
5.12.5 Conclusion: Peter in the Leucian Acts	267
5.13 Peter in Some Church Fathers	267
5.13.1 Peter in Irenæus.....	268
5.13.2 Peter in Tertullian	268
5.13.3 Peter in Clement of Alexandria.....	270
5.13.4 Peter in Origen	272
5.13.5 Peter in Cyprian and Stephen	275
5.13.6 Conclusion: Peter in Some Church Fathers.	278
5.14 Peter in the Pseudo-Clementines	279
Excursus E: The <i>Actus Vercellences</i>	287
5.15 Peter in the Fayum Fragment.....	288
5.16 Peter in the Pistis Sophia.....	290
5.17 Conclusion: Peter in Other Early Christian Sources.....	293
6. Summary and Conclusions	295
6.1 Summary of the Results	295
6.2 Conclusions.....	296
6.2.1 Assessment of Sociological Categories.....	297
6.2.2 Peter's Authoritative Function in Early Christian Discourse.....	298
6.2.3 Chronological Development	299
6.2.4 Geographical Dimensions	301

6.2.5 Implications for Our Understanding of Early Christianity	303
Appendix: Related Archaeological Evidence.....	305
Bibliography.....	309
Index of Ancient Literature.....	357
Index of Modern Authors	369
Index of Subjects.....	377
Dissertationes Theologicae Holmienses.....	379

Abbreviations

Abbreviations follow *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL, 2014). In addition to this, the following abbreviations are also used.

AASFDHL	Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum
ADAIK	Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe
AFLNWG	Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Geisteswissenschaften
ARGU	Arbeiten zur Religion und Geschichte des Urchristentums
<i>ASE</i>	Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi
BCNHE	Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, section études
BCNHT	Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, section textes
BENT	Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament
BHR	Bibliothèque historique des religions
BKV	Bibliothek der Kirchenväter
BThSt	Biblich-Theologische Studien
BibW	Bibleworld
CBib	The Century Bible
CCSA	Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum
CopIS	Copenhagen International Seminar
EAA	Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité
<i>EAJT</i>	East Asia Journal of Theology
ECL	Early Christianity and Its Literature
EHPR	Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses
<i>Exp</i>	The Expositor
FENTK	Forschungen zur Entstehung des Urchristentums des Neuen Testaments und der Kirche
<i>FT</i>	Feminist Theology
FTS	Frankfurter theologische Studien
<i>GFA</i>	Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft
HAW	Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft
<i>IKZ</i>	Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift
ITL	International Theological Library
JCTC	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies

<i>JECH</i>	Journal of Early Christian History
<i>JLA</i>	Journal of Late Antiquity
KAL	Kommentare zur apokryphen Literatur
KAV	Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern
KNT	Kommentar till Nya testamentet
KNT(Z)	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, herausgaben von Theodor Zahn
MBCB	Mnemosyne: Bibliotheca Classica Batava
<i>MJK</i>	Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies
<i>NKT</i>	Ny kyrklig tidskrift
NTAp	Neutestamentliche Apokryphen
NThG	Neue Theologische Grundrisse
NTR	New Testament Readings
PS	Patristica Sorbonensia
<i>RHR</i>	Revue de l'histoire des religions
<i>ROC</i>	Revue de l'Orient Chrétien
SAAA	Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles
SESJ	Soumen Eksegeettisen Seuran julkaisuja
SF	Studia Friburgensia
SH	Subsidia hagiographica
SK	Schriften zur Kultursoziologie
SKCO	Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients
SPNT	Studies on Personalities of the New Testament
<i>STb</i>	Studia Theologica (Czech Republic)
TA	Theologische Arbeiten
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
TBT	Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann
TH	Théologie historique
TrC	Tria Corda. Jenaer Vorlesungen zu Judentum, Antike und Christentum
<i>TZTh</i>	Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie
UaLG	Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte
VCSup	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae

I. Introduction

Peter is one of the most famous characters in the history of Christianity. He is the most well-known of the disciples of the earthly Jesus and—not least through the account in Acts—has a central role in common conceptions of Christian origins. The significance of Peter for Christian beginnings was a theme already in early Christian literature. The evidence available strongly suggests that Peter was a significant character for the formation of Christianity, albeit not in a uniform manner. Whereas some believers would emphasise their Petrine heritage in order to argue their legitimacy as transmitters of authentic Jesus tradition, others would seek to undermine Peter's credibility in favour of a different approach to what should be a legitimate interpretation of the Jesus tradition. In such discussions, the commonly believed characteristics of the historical Peter were assumed, but the historical Peter was not a part of the discussion himself. This study does not deal with the historical Peter, but with the conceptions of this apostle in early Christianity. Peter was used to bring legitimacy and authority to certain teachings and movements but was also slandered in order to discredit communities that claimed legitimacy through Peter. Already at the time of the earliest extant reference to Peter in Galatians, written during Peter's lifetime, Jesus himself appears to have become a more or less mythological character, and the question for the Jesus-believers was not whether Jesus was right, but rather how to access accurate and legitimate Jesus tradition.¹ In this dissertation I will study the emergence of Peter as an authoritative figure for the purposes of legitimation during the first three centuries C.E.

The studied time period contains a great variety of sources and situations. The canonical New Testament contributes with a great deal of evidence for the study of Peter in this period, but also extra-canonical texts, not least Nag-Hammadi documents, make a significant contribution. There is also a significant number of documents that in various ways claim Petrine origin that are of importance. Also some scattered references in church fathers give insight into the discussions pertaining

¹ Pauline Christology indicates that Jesus had already become a more or less mythological figure, see Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 98–153.

to Peter as an authoritative figure. A number of questions arise as one approaches the Peter-images of early Christian writings. Who are they describing, how are they describing him, and why are the portraits of Peter so different? In this study I wish not only to point out the differing conceptions of Peter in early Christian texts, but also discuss the possible objectives of the various authors for portraying Peter as they do.

1.1 History of Research

The role of Peter as an authoritative figure in early Christianity has been an important issue in significant turning-points in Christian history. The role and legitimacy of the Roman papacy as successors of Peter has been a significant parameter in large ecclesial controversies such as the Great Schism of 1054 and the Protestant reformation in the 16th century. However, speaking of a papacy in the first three centuries would be an anachronism. Nevertheless, discussions of Peter as an authoritative figure were present long before one could speak of a papacy. Earlier research has often interpreted these discussions through the lens of either the modern papacy or in order to understand the historical Peter. The present study does not aim at solving any of these problems, but instead has the purpose to understand early Christian discussions on legitimacy and authority, and the significant role played herein by the prevalent Peter-image.

1.1.1 Critical Research Prior to Cullmann

The modern quest for understanding Peter as an authoritative figure in early Christianity began with the Tübingen school under the influence of Ferdinand Christian Baur. Inspired by Hegelian dialectics, early Christianity was divided into two branches: one Hellenistic, headed by Paul, and one Jewish, headed by Peter.² The main idea was that the antitheses of Pauline and Petrine Christianity would eventually merge into the synthesis of *Frühkatholizismus*.³ This synthesis was

² Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paulus: der Apostel Jesu Christi: Sein Leben und Werke, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristentums*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Fues's, 1866–1867), I:290–343.

³ A contemporary critic of Baur is Bernhard Weiß, *Der petrinische Lehrbegriff: Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie, sowie zur Kritik und Exegese des ersten Briefes Petri und der petrinischen Reden* (Berlin: Schutze, 1855).

often viewed as a degeneration of Christianity from a Lutheran perspective.⁴ For Baur, the point of departure was the dispute between Peter and Paul that he claimed to be present in the *Kerygmata Petrou*, a hypothetical source of the *Pseudo-Clementines*. This was used as interpretative key for analysing the Corinthian correspondence, and ultimately early Christianity at large.⁵ The Paulinism/Petrinism dichotomy was appropriated *in absurdum* by Gustav Volkmar who argued among other things that Mark was a biography of Paul and that Revelation was a distinctively anti-Pauline (and thus Petrine) Apocalypse.⁶ Despite the outdated use of Hegelian dialectics, the Tübingen school made contributions relevant to contemporary research. Albert Schwegler's conclusion from the 1840s that the traditions about Peter swelled way beyond the historical records from the second century and onwards is well illuminated in the present study.⁷ A more extreme view of the development of Peter as an authoritative figure was argued by Arthur Drews, who questioned whether Peter had ever existed as a historical person, and suggested that he was the result of mythical fiction with the purpose of defending the Roman papacy.⁸ This was a part of Drew's reaction to the first quest for the historical Jesus, and he suggested that Jesus was an entirely mythological figure with no historical precedent.⁹ He argued that Christianity was merely a

⁴ Cf. Ernst Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912), 83–178. See also Ferdinand Hahn, *Exegetische Beiträge zum ökumenischen Gespräch. Gesammelte Aufsätze I.* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 39–75.

⁵ Ferdinand Christian Baur, “Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des paulinischen und petrinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom,” *TZTh* (1831): 61–206. For a thorough discussion on Baur's methodological contribution combined with an analysis of his flaws, see Werner Georg Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament: Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme* (Freiburg: Alber, 1958), 145–258; Anders Gerdmar, “Baur and the Creation of the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy,” in *Ferdinand Christian Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums*, ed. M. Bauspeiss et. al., WUNT I/333 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 107–28.

⁶ Gustav Volkmar, *Die Religion Jesu und ihre erste Entwicklung nach dem gegenwärtigen Stande der Wissenschaft* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1857) 119–83.

⁷ “Die kirchlichen Ueberlieferungen über Petrus, im Laufe des zweiten, dritten, vierten Jahrhunderts zu ziemlichen Umfang angeschwollen, verdanken ihren Ursprung zum Theil der Sage.” Albert Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Fues, 1846), 1:131.

⁸ Arthur Drews, *Die Petruslegende: Ein Beitrag zur Mythologie des Christentums* (Frankfurt a.M.: Neuer Frankfurter, 1910).

⁹ See Arthur Drews, *Die Christusmythe*, 2 vols. (Jena: Diedrichs, 1910–11).

development within Gnosticism.¹⁰ The ideas of the Tübingen School were revived by Michael Goulder in the 1990s, and at times appear to lie behind unconscious presuppositions of various scholars, but have no greater outspoken following by the contemporary scholarly community.¹¹

1.1.2 Oscar Cullmann and the Ecumenical Debate

The most influential study of Peter of all times was published by Oscar Cullmann in 1952, and the latest English edition of his work was printed in 2011.¹² Cullmann sought to enable a broader ecumenical debate concerning Peter, including both Protestant and Catholic scholars, as well as secular historians, by meeting the standards of modern historiography.¹³ Although Cullmann's work is still the main reference work for Petrine questions, it is methodologically outdated. The use of exclusively canonical material is unacceptable for historical reconstruction when other relevant material is also available, and the treatment of the differences between the sources as simply differing access to traditions concerning the historical Peter rather than results of editorial tendencies of the authors became untenable already in the 1950s. Thus, a study of Peter as an authoritative figure written in the 21st century cannot credibly have Cullmann's study as its point of departure.

Cullmann's hope to stir an ecumenical debate concerning Peter was indeed realised in the decades following his publication. Paul Gaechter published a book on Peter in 1956, which partially gave a catholic response to Cullmann's work.¹⁴ Protestant scholarship on Peter was also evaluated from a Catholic perspective by Franz Obrist.¹⁵ The key point of controversy was the interpretation of Matt 16:18–

¹⁰ Arthur Drews, *Die Entstehung des Christentums aus dem Gnostizismus* (Jena: Diederichs, 1924). Although Drew's position is largely forgotten today, it received enough attention in its day for Albert Schweizer to discuss it in *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1913), 483–97, and Drew's book on Peter was published in English in 2007.

¹¹ Michael Goulder, *St. Paul versus St. Peter: A Tale of Two Missions* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994); idem., *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001).

¹² Oscar Cullmann, *Petrus: Jünger—Apostel—Märtyrer* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1952). References to Cullmann in the footnotes refer to the second edition of the work from 1960.

¹³ An often overlooked, yet rather ambitious work is that of Karl Gerold Goetz, *Petrus als Gründer und Oberhaupt der Kirche und Schauer von Geschichten nach den altchristlichen Berichten und Legenden: Eine exegetisch-geschichtliche Untersuchung*, UNT 13 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1927), which treats Peter as an authoritative figure not only in the canonical New Testament, but also other early Christian texts which were available at the time.

¹⁴ Paul Gaechter, *Petrus und seine Zeit: Neutestamentliche Studien* (Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1958).

¹⁵ Franz Obrist, *Echtheitsfragen und Deutung der Primatstelle Mt 16, 18f in der deutschen protestantischen Theologie der letzten dreißig Jahre*, NTAbh 21 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1961).

19. In America, Catholic and Protestant scholars wrote a book on Peter in the New Testament together.¹⁶ Whereas this development from the protestant perspective meant the abandonment of a consciously anti-Petrine discourse, it from the Catholic viewpoint lead to an increased focus on the ecumenical significance of the papacy.¹⁷ Although Catholic and Protestant scholars increased their agreement concerning the life of the historical Peter, the problem of Peter's relation to the papacy remained unresolved. Rudolf Pesch used an apologetic approach to prove that the Catholic claims of papal primacy are clearly ascribed to Peter in the New Testament,¹⁸ whereas Peter Dschulnigg preferred to speak of a legitimate post-biblical development on basis on Peter's central role in the New Testament.¹⁹ In Protestant scholarship, there was an increased interest in Peter both as historical figure but also as narrative character.²⁰ More recently, Helen K. Bond and Larry W. Hurtado have edited an anthology titled *Peter in Early Christianity*, which introduces various problems and themes related to Peter and discusses them briefly.²¹ However, the chapters are too brief and general to deal in depth with the question of Peter as an authoritative figure in early Christianity. On the Catholic side, Regis Burnet published a study on the twelve apostles and their reception history that deals with the Peter-image of many of the texts that will be studied in this dissertation.²² Also

¹⁶ Raymond E. Brown, Karl P. Donfried, and John Reumann, eds., *Peter in the New Testament: A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1973). See also Albert Brandenburg and Hans Jörg Urban, eds., *Petrus und Papst: Evangelium, Einheit der Kirche, Papstdienst*, 2 vols. (Münster: Aschendorff, 1977–1978).

¹⁷ Heinrich Stirnimann and Lukas Vischer, eds., *Papsttum und Petrusdienst*, Ökumenische Perspektiven 7 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lembeck/Knecht, 1975); Joseph Ratzinger, ed., *Dienst an der Einheit. Zum Wesen und Auftrag des Petrusamts* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1978); PHEME PERKINS: *Peter: Apostle for the Whole Church* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994). It is also worth mentioning a significant orthodox contribution to this ecumenical discussion of Peter, John Meyendorff (ed.), *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1992; 1st ed. 1963).

¹⁸ Rudolf Pesch, *Simon Petrus, Päpste und Papsttum 15* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1980); idem., *Die biblischen Grundlagen des Primats*. (Freiburg: Herder, 2001).

¹⁹ Peter Dschulnigg, *Petrus im Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996).

²⁰ Some notable examples are Bertil Gärtner, *Simon Petrus—människan och ledaren* (Göteborg: Församlingsförlaget, 2003); Martin Hengel, *Saint Peter: The Underestimated Apostle*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010); Jürgen Becker, *Simon Petrus im Urchristentum*, BTS 105 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 2011); Christfried Böttrich, *Petrus: Fischer, Fels und Funktionär*, BG 2 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2013).

²¹ Helen K. Bond and Larry W. Hurtado, eds., *Peter in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015).

²² Regis Burnet, *Les douze apôtres: Histoire de la réception des figures apostoliques dans le christianisme ancien* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 131–256.

the recent *Petrusliteratur und Petrusarchäologie: Römische Begegnungen* discusses a number of questions related to Peter's development as an authoritative figure,²³ as does the recent *The Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter: The Anchors of the Fisherman*.²⁴ Furthermore, the proceedings of the 2019 Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense bear the name *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader*, which clearly alludes to the title of Cullmann's classic work *Petrus: Jünger—Apostel—Märtyrer*.²⁵ Gene L. Green has attempted at constructing a theology of Peter based on Mark, First Peter, and the Petrine speeches in Acts.²⁶ Despite multiple endorsements, the academic credibility of this study is miniscule as the presupposition that these sources originate with the historical Peter is beyond the bounds of likelihood.

1.1.3 The Development of Peter-Images

A shortcoming in the research reviewed thus far is the lack of discussion of the development of the image of Peter. Although this perspective was present already at the time of the Tübingen School, it was lost in the debate following Cullmann's study, apart from the discussion of whether or not the development from the "biblical" Peter to the Roman pontiff was legitimate. In 1985, Terence V. Smith made a significant contribution to our understanding of the development of the Peter-image as he studied attitudes toward Peter in the first two centuries, with special emphasis on polemic contexts.²⁷ In the 1990s, Christian Grappe made a more thorough study of Peter-images in the first two centuries that essentially confirmed Smith's results.²⁸ The significance of the development of Peter-images was also noted by Joachim Gnllka.²⁹ Markus Bockmuehl has studied the memory of Peter in early Christianity, thus contributing to our knowledge of the development of

²³ Jörg Frey and Martin Wallraff (eds.), *Petrusliteratur und Petrusarchäologie: Römische Begegnungen*, Rom und Protestantismus 4 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020).

²⁴ Roald Dijkstra (ed.), *The Early Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter (60–800 CE): The Anchors of the Fisherman*, Euhormos 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2020).

²⁵ Judith M. Lieu (ed.), *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader* (Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming).

²⁶ Gene L. Green, *Vox Petri: A Theology of Peter* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019).

²⁷ Terence V. Smith, *Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity. Attitudes towards Peter in Christian Writings of the First Two Centuries*, WUNT II/15 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1985).

²⁸ Christian Grappe *D'un Temple à l'autre. Pierre et l'Église primitive de Jérusalem*, EHPR 71 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1992); idem., *Images de Pierre aux deux premiers siècles*, EHPR 75 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1995).

²⁹ Joachim Gnllka, *Petrus und Rom: Das Petrusbild in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten* (Freiburg: Herder, 2002).

Peter-images over time.³⁰ However, it is somewhat problematic that Bockmuehl is satisfied with treating Peter-traditions as “memories” that can be put together into a larger picture. As time evolves, we might expect that the Peter-character is exploited for various purposes, and that an adding up of “memories” does not necessarily accurately represent the historical Peter.

1.1.4 The Peter-Images of Various Early Christian Texts

Parallel to the more overarching studies of Peter, there have been numerous studies on the images of Peter in various books. These studies are significant since they show that the Peter-image did not only develop from the second century and onwards, but already in the first century. Georg Strecker studied Peter’s role in light of the Matthean redaction in the 1960s and concluded that Peter is a typological figure that illustrates what it means to be a Christian and was followed by Rolf Walker.³¹ Reinhart Hummel disagreed with their conclusion, and instead argued that Matthew reflects a development within contemporary Judaism that makes Peter into a kind of “supreme Rabbi,” and was in turn followed by Günther Bornkamm and Christoph Kähler.³² In response to these developments in German-speaking scholarship, Jack Dean Kingsbury developed an intermediate position arguing that the primacy of Peter was of exclusively salvation-historical importance, i.e. Peter was the first to be called, but his calling did not differ in any other way from those of the other disciples.³³ More recently, Arlo J. Nau has argued that Matthew has a very negative view of Peter.³⁴ Robert H. Gundry goes even further and suggests that the Matthean Peter is an apostate who is “headed for hell.”³⁵ This

³⁰ Markus Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter in Ancient Reception and Modern Debate*, WUNT I/262 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); idem., *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory: The New Testament Apostle in the Early Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2012).

³¹ Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*, FRLANT 82 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962); Rolf Walker, *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium*, FRLANT 91 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

³² Reinhart Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium*, BEvT 33 (München: Kaiser, 1963); Günther Bornkamm, “The Authority to ‘Bind’ and ‘Loose’ in Matthew’s Gospel: The Problem of Sources in Matthew’s Gospel,” *Perspective* 11 (1970): 37–50; Christoph Kähler, “Zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte von Matth. Xvi. 17–19,” *NTS* 23 (1976): 36–58.

³³ Jack Dean Kingsbury, “The Figure of Peter in Matthew’s Gospel as a Theological Problem,” *JBL* 98 (1979): 67–83.

³⁴ Arlo J. Nau, *Peter in Matthew: Discipleship, Diplomacy, and Dispraise*, GNS 36 (Collegeville, PA: Liturgical, 1992).

³⁵ Robert H. Gundry, *Peter—False disciple and Apostate according to Saint Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015), 104.

position is not very convincing and seems to be driven mainly by an anti-Catholic sentiment, and, in the case of Gundry, a desire for a pre-70 dating of Matthew.³⁶ To the contrary, David C. Sim argues that Paul “lost” the dispute at Antioch (Gal 2), and that Peter established a community practicing “Christian Judaism” which is ultimately responsible for Matthew’s Gospel.³⁷ Thus, the research efforts on the Matthean Peter-image cannot be said to have reached anything near a consensus.

Although Matthew has received the most attention in relation to Peter due to its significant Petrine *Sondergut*, the Peter-image has also been studied in the other Gospels. Ernest Best has studied the composition of Mark and concluded that whoever wrote the Gospel redacted his sources in order to portray Peter as positively as possible.³⁸ Wolfgang Dietrich studied Peter in Luke and Acts and concluded that he has a very special leading position in this text corpus.³⁹ The Fourth Gospel has received somewhat more attention, as it has previously been considered as having an anti-Petrine bias.⁴⁰ Kevin Quast argued in favour of the significant role of Peter in the Fourth Gospel.⁴¹ This view was further developed by Richard Bauckham and Tom Thatcher.⁴² However, these studies treat Peter as one character among many in the Fourth Gospel. More recently, John’s Peter-image has been discussed in his own right by Bradford B. Blaine, Judith Hartenstein, and Tanja

³⁶ See discussion in John-Christian Eurell, review of *Peter—False Disciple and Apostate according to Saint Matthew* by Robert H. Gundry, *SEÁ* 83 (2018): 231–33.

³⁷ David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism. The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998). The thesis of Matthew as anti-Pauline is also developed by Gerd Theißen, “Kritik an Paulus im Matthäusevangelium? Von der Kunst verdeckter Polemik im Urchristentum,” in *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur*, ed. O. Wischmeyer and L. Scornaieni, BZNW 170 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 465–90.

³⁸ Ernest Best, “Peter in the Gospel According to Mark,” *CBQ* 40(1978): 547–58.

³⁹ Wolfgang Dietrich, *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften*, BWANT 14 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1972).

⁴⁰ See Alv Kragerud, *Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium* (Oslo: Osloer Universitetsforlaget, 1959), 53–66; Arthur H. Maynard, “The Role of Peter in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 30 (1984): 531–48; G. F. Snyder, “John 13:16 and the Anti-Petrinism of the Fourth Gospel,” *BR* 16 (1971): 5–15. See discussion in Rudolf Schnackenburg, “On the Origin of the Fourth Gospel,” *Perspective* 11 (1970): 223–46; Raymond F. Collins, “The Representative Figures of the Fourth Gospel—II,” *DRev* 94 (1976): 118–32. See also D. H. Gee, “Why did Peter Spring into the Sea? (John 21:7),” *JTS* 40 (1989): 481–89.

⁴¹ Kevin Quast, *Peter and the Beloved Disciple: Figures for a Community in Crisis*, JSNTS 22 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989).

⁴² Richard Bauckham, “The Beloved Disciple as Ideal Author,” *JSNT* 49 (1993): 21–44; Tom Thatcher, “Jesus, Judas, and Peter: Character by Contrast in the Fourth Gospel,” *BSac* 153 (1996): 435–48.

Schultheiß.⁴³ Significant contributions to the understanding of the Peter-image of the Fourth Gospel have also been made by Michael Labahn and Fredrik Wagener.⁴⁴

There are also a number of studies that discuss the Peter-image in all four canonical Gospels. Most well-known is the dissertation of Timothy Wiarda, which deals primarily with aspects of Peter's personality such as enthusiasm and self-confidence in order to survey Peter's psychological traits.⁴⁵ A narrative-critical analysis of Peter in the Gospels has been made by Richard J. Cassidy.⁴⁶ Also Finn Damgaard deals with the Peter-image in all four Gospels. He presupposes the Farrer hypothesis and that John knew and used all Synoptics and treats the Gospel tradition as a form of "rewritten Bible."⁴⁷ He argues that Matthew connected Mark to Peter, but wanted his Gospel to supersede Mark, and therefore modified the portrait of Peter in his Gospel. Damgaard argues that Matthew portrays Peter ironically, in order to show his flaws and thus discredit Mark. He suggests that Luke is not satisfied with Matthew's "ironic" image of Peter, and thus restores more of a positive image of Peter in his Gospel. Damgaard goes on to argue that John added the beloved disciple to the Synoptic Peter-passages in order to portray him as the only reliable witness to the stories of both Jesus and Peter. Damgaard's study is speculative, but rightly draws attention to the consciousness of Peter-images of the respective Gospels.

Peter-images are rarely discussed for texts other than the canonical Gospels, although there is in fact a multitude of texts for which such inquiry is justified. Although Peter is discussed in relation to First and Second Peter, these discussions

⁴³ Bradford B. Blaine, Jr., *Peter in the Gospel of John. The Making of an Authentic Disciple*, SBLAC-Bib 27 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007); Judith Hartenstein, *Charakterisierung im Dialog. Maria Magdalena, Petrus, Thomas und die Mutter Jesu im Johannesevangelium im Kontext anderer frühchristlicher Darstellungen*, NTOA 64 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007); Tanja Schultheiß, *Das Petrusbild im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT II/329 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

⁴⁴ Michael Labahn, "Simon Peter: An Ambiguous Character and His Narrative Career," in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. S. A. Hunt, D. F. Tolmie, and R. Zimmermann, WUNT I/314 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 151–67; Fredrik Wagener, *Figuren als Handlungsmodelle: Simon Petrus, die samaritanische Frau, Judas und Thomas als Zugänge zu einer narrative Ethik des Johannesevangeliums*, WUNT II/408 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 219–340.

⁴⁵ Timothy Wiarda, *Peter in the Gospels: Patterns, Personality and Relationship*, WUNT II/127 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

⁴⁶ Richard J. Cassidy, *Four Times Peter: Portrayals of Peter in the Four Gospels and at Philippi*, Interfaces (Collegeville, PA: Liturgical, 2007).

⁴⁷ Finn Damgaard, *Rewriting Peter as an Intertextual Character in the Canonical Gospels*, CopIS (London: Routledge, 2016).

rarely go further than discussing the plausibility of Petrine authorship and the possible existence of a Petrine school. Peter is not analysed as a literary character and his role as an authoritative figure is not treated in detail, despite these issues being of crucial importance for understanding the original purpose and message of the texts.⁴⁸ When one exceeds the limits of the Christian canon one finds a large number of pseudepigraphic texts that are connected to Peter and significant developments in the understanding of Peter as an authoritative figure. A number of the Nag Hammadi texts have been argued to imply controversy between Petrine and other groups in early Christianity.⁴⁹

1.2 The Purpose of This Study

The Peter-images in the Christianity of the first three centuries indicate that conceptions of Peter as an authoritative figure were often presupposed and discussed in relation to questions of authenticity, legitimacy, and dismissal of opponents. The purpose of this study is to map the various ways in which Peter is perceived as an authoritative figure in various early Christian texts and discuss possible implications of our understanding of early Christianity. I will not only map the various perspectives, but also discuss how they relate to each other and how they might apply to early Christian discourses on authenticity, legitimacy, and opposition. As a result, we will gain an increased understanding of the ecumenical dynamics of the diverse early Christian movement. Some themes will be reoccurring, e.g. the significance of Peter as a follower of the earthly Jesus, but others will be related to a more specific context. The time frame which will be treated is Christianity in the first three centuries C.E., i.e. the New Testament but also other significant early Christian texts of various variants of Christianity. We will first deal with Peter as an authoritative figure in the Pauline epistles and Acts, and then turn to the canonical Gospels. Thereafter, we will discuss texts that are attributed to Peter in one

⁴⁸ An exception to this is Lutz Doering, "Apostle, Co-Elder, and Witness of Suffering: Author Construction and Peter Image in First Peter" in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*, ed. J. Frey et al, WUNT 1/246 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 645–82.

⁴⁹ Gregory J. Riley, *Resurrection Reconsidered: Thomas and John in Controversy* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995), suggests controversy between Johannine and Thomasine groups, and could perhaps be expanded to include also Petrine groups. Similar issues are also discussed in Hartenstein, *Charakterisierung im Dialog*. It is also possible to argue for a controversy with a Petrine group from e.g. Gos. Mary. However, to move from textual references to constructions of opposing early Christian groups is a hazardous endeavour that will be avoided in this study due to its speculative nature.

way or another, canonical or not. Finally, we will discuss references to Peter as an authoritative figure in other early Christian texts.

1.3 Means for Assessing the Evidence

Before we engage directly with the texts, we must discuss the theoretical and methodological tools with which we will engage with the texts. A significant presupposition for this study is the diversity of early Christianity. Neither early Christianity, nor the canonical New Testament is one streamlined movement or collection of texts but shows a significant variety of thought. Thus, by simply “adding up” all information about Peter in early Christian sources, one does not necessarily obtain a portrait of the view of Peter in early Christianity. As different understandings of Peter as an authoritative figure emerge from the texts, these must be contrasted against each other. This will result in some similarities, but also significant differences. Both the similarities and the differences are relevant for understanding the image of Peter as an authoritative figure in early Christian imagination.⁵⁰

As there was no such thing as a closed and generally agreed New Testament canon in the studied period, a restriction to the canonical texts would be anachronistic and confessionally motivated. Many texts of divergent positions have probably been lost, and the portion of literature that is preserved from the period is not necessarily proportionally representative of the period itself. I will use the material available, while being aware that it may not be proportionally representative for the period.

1.3.1 Reconstructing Narrative Settings as “Spheres of Influence”

In order to discuss how the Peter-image of a certain text may have been used for discussing authenticity and legitimacy as well as for dismissing opponents, the original setting and audience of the text must be reconstructed to a certain degree. Mirror-reading of texts in order to reconstruct their contexts has long been a standard procedure in biblical studies. However, this procedure for reconstructing the Gospel audiences has been questioned by Bauckham, who suggests that the Gospels were in fact not written to particular communities, but rather to “all

⁵⁰ On the problems involved with using early Christian texts for historical reconstructions, see Jens Schröter, “Konstruktion von Geschichte und die Anfänge des Christentums: Reflexionen zur christlichen Geschichtesdeutung aus neutestamentlicher Perspektive,” in *Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit: Beiträge aus geschichtstheoretischer, philosophischer und theologischer Perspektive*, ed. J. Schröter and A. Eddelbüttel, TBT 127 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 201–19.

Christians.”⁵¹ Bauckham is not necessarily wrong in arguing for a wider circulation being anticipated for the texts, and the wild and diverse speculations by some biblical scholars about the Gospel audiences and communities show that there are significant pit-falls in mirror-reading that must be dealt with.⁵² Yet, his critique focuses on reconstructions of the Gospel audiences as sectarian communities,⁵³ while not acknowledging the more moderate approaches. Furthermore, he limits his critique to the four canonical Gospels, whereas the anachronism of the concept of canon suggests that canonical texts should be treated on the same historical premises as other early Christian texts.⁵⁴

None of the New Testament texts were written in a vacuum.⁵⁵ They were written to fill particular needs of particular audiences in particular situations. They have been further edited in particular situations to deal with particular needs not anticipated during the original composition of the text. The Synoptic problem is a significant example of how Mark’s narrative is reused in Matthew and Luke to meet the particular needs of their respective audiences. The fact that these texts were widely circulated in early Christianity does not diminish the importance of the particular situations of their composition.⁵⁶

As for John’s Gospel, it is widely agreed that the text has undergone several redactions, and these redactions were due to particular circumstances. Likewise, letters were written to address specific needs in specific contexts. The early circulation of Galatians does not make it less of a communication into a specific situation.

⁵¹ Richard Bauckham, “For Whom Were the Gospels Written,” in *The Gospels for All Christians*, ed. R. Bauckham (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 9–48. Similar ideas have also been proposed by Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000).

⁵² The problem of mirror reading was noted and discussed already by John M. G. Barclay, “Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case,” *JSNT* 31 (1987): 73–93.

⁵³ Cf. J. Andrew Overman, *Matthew’s Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990).

⁵⁴ See Thomas Kazen, “Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in Light of Extra-Canonical Texts,” *NTS* 51 (2005): 561–78. An (in my opinion failed) attempt to responding to Kazen’s critique is found in Michael F. Bird, “Sectarian Gospels for Sectarian Christians? The Non-Canonical Gospels and Bauckham’s *The Gospels for All Christians*,” in *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*, ed. E. W. Klink, LNTS 353 (London: T & T Clark, 2010), 27–48.

⁵⁵ This is forcefully argued in an article by Philip Esler, “Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham’s *Gospels for All Christians*,” *SJT* 51 (1998): 235–48.

⁵⁶ David C. Sim, “The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham,” *JSNT* 84 (2001): 3–27, argues that Bauckham’s main contribution is to start a discussion on scholarly presuppositions, whereas the thesis proposed by Bauckham lacks evidence.

Also, pseudonymous letters aim at addressing specific issues in specific contexts, rather than being general expositions of theology. When attempting to mirror-read a pseudepigraphical letter, matters are further complicated since not only the situation of the audience, but also that of the author, must be reconstructed.⁵⁷ A pseudepigraphical letter has not necessarily ever been sent as a letter, but may use the letter form as a means creating an impression of authenticity.⁵⁸

Reconstructing the situations of the audiences is a complicated issue that must be done with caution, since the text itself is often the only information at our disposal.⁵⁹ A full reconstruction of the circumstances behind the text is not possible. However, since the context of the composition is to a certain extent reflected in the text, cautious mirror reading can still give significant information concerning the social and historical setting of the original audience. Whereas some conclusions can be drawn with a rather high degree of certainty, others are more of suggestions and possibilities that cannot be proven in other terms than degrees of probability.

The critical issue is the transformation from mirror-reading of literature to construction of historical realities. Paramount in the Christian narrative of beginnings of Christianity is the idea of the orthodox *Großkirche* that preserved the authentic faith and protected it from the influence of various heterodox groups that emerged.⁶⁰ Although Walter Bauer successfully argued for the diversity of early Christianity, he clinged to the basic idea of an orthodox *Großkirche*.⁶¹ The anachronism of this model of Christian origins was pointed out by Bart D. Ehrman in the 1990s, who instead coined the term *proto-orthodoxy*.⁶² This term has the advantage of acknowledging the anachronism of speaking of “orthodoxy.” However, it also gives the impression of a homogenous movement, which is not the case.

⁵⁷ See David Lincicum, “Mirror-Reading a Pseudepigraphic Letter,” *NovT* 59 (2017): 171–93.

⁵⁸ On pseudepigraphy in Antiquity, see Wolfgang Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*, HAW 1:2 (München: Beck, 1971).

⁵⁹ See the fine assessment of the theme by Adele Reinhartz, “Gospel Audiences: Variations on a Theme,” in *The Audience of the Gospels*, 134–52.

⁶⁰ This view is defended by e.g. H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church* (London: Mowbray, 1954).

⁶¹ Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, 2nd ed., BHT 10 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1964). So also Rudolf Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 5th ed., NThG 1 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953), 440–543; James D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM, 1977).

⁶² Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: University Press, 1993). As pointed out by Arland J. Hultgren, *The Rise of Normative Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1994), even such a term must allow for a rather large degree of diversity at this point in history.

Much of what so-called proto-orthodox texts claim would later be considered heterodox. James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester prefer speaking of trajectories through early Christianity, and thus more accurately acknowledge the complexities of the matter.⁶³ However, the term trajectory carries with it the sense of being coherent and predictable, which is not the case for developments in early Christianity.⁶⁴ David Brakke argues that what is often referred to as “orthodoxy” or “proto-orthodoxy” in fact includes a number of competing and disparate groups, none of them fully representing what would later be considered “orthodoxy.”⁶⁵ The landscape to Ehrman is a race with an easily defined winner, but in fact has no winner, according to Brakke.⁶⁶

Although I view it as both legitimate and necessary to speak of communities, it is important that such terms are more clearly defined. Historically speaking, communities and groups must have been involved, but they were not necessarily as mutually exclusive as often assumed. Significant progress has been made in the 21st century in the area of early Christian social identity issues. Judith M. Lieu has argued in favour of a universal/translocal identity that was shared by Christians of various types through a common narrative.⁶⁷ Philip A. Harland has further nuanced our understanding of early Christian communities by his study of ancient associations, suggesting that early Christian communities were by no means isolated from society.⁶⁸ It is hard to imagine that communities that were not sectarian and exclusive toward society in general would be totally isolated from other, like-minded early Christian communities. As argued by Raimo Hakola, it is necessary that community hypotheses are reconsidered in light of these perspectives and made less sectarian and more fluid.⁶⁹ Rather than speaking of Matthean or

⁶³ James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1971).

⁶⁴ When I speak of trajectories in this dissertation do not speak of types as Christianity as such, but rather developments of certain specific phenomena without claiming that this development to be uniform.

⁶⁵ David Brakke, *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

⁶⁶ David Brakke, “Early Christian Lies and the Lying Liars Who Wrote Them: Bart Ehrman’s *Forgery and Counterforgery*,” *JR* 96 (2016): 378–90.

⁶⁷ Judith M. Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: University Press, 2004).

⁶⁸ Philip A. Harland, *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities* (London: T & T Clark, 2009).

⁶⁹ Raimo Hakola, *Reconsidering Johannine Christianity: A Social Identity Approach*, BibW (New York, NY: Routledge, 2015).

Johannine sects, we might speak of *spheres of influence*. Rather than thinking of Matthew as a Gospel that speaks to an isolated sectarian community it should be viewed as an attempt at forming an identity around the Matthean theological understanding. Although the person or people responsible for the construction of the Gospel might be thought of as exclusively Matthean, the audience was not necessarily as exclusive. John 21 shows clear indications of an awareness of intragroup relationships. Various texts have various strategies for increasing their influence. Whereas some might argue that their teachings are in some way superior to those of other groups, that are not necessarily bad but simply inferior, other texts seek to boost their influence by undermining the credibility of other groups.

I will therefore refer to the narrative contexts of various early Christian texts as spheres of influence. The Peter-images of the respective texts are constructed in order to create authority and legitimacy, but sometimes also to discredit opposing spheres of influence. Although these spheres of influence are to a certain extent corresponding to groups or communities, their nature is ideological rather than social. The doctrinal orthodoxy and exclusivity of the groups are more the result of the ideals of the leaders of the sphere than the reality of the *collegia*.

1.3.2 A History of Ideas Approach

The approach of this study is to examine the history of ideas relating to Peter, more specifically the ideas of Peter as an authoritative figure. Such a history of ideas requires the discussion of two dimensions of the Peter-image in the relevant texts: the social memory of Peter and the author's use of history. Although theories of social memory have sometimes been used for arguing in favour of the historical accuracy of biblical texts, this is not a correct use of the concept, as it was developed by Maurice Halbwachs.⁷⁰ Social memory can be thought of as an ideological *Sitz im Leben*.⁷¹ The author and original audience of a text share a common narrative

⁷⁰ Maurice Halbwachs, *La mémoire collective* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950); *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1952). See also idem., *On Collective Memory*, ed. L. A. Coser (Chicago, IL: University Press, 1992). On the abuse of social memory in New Testament exegesis, see Paul Foster, "Memory, Orality, and the Fourth Gospel: Three Dead-Ends in Historical Jesus Research," *JSHJ* 10 (2012): 191–227. For an accessible introduction to Social Memory theory, see Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: University Press, 1989).

⁷¹ See Samuel Byrskog, "A New Quest for the *Sitz im Leben*: Social Memory, the Jesus Tradition, and the Gospel of Matthew," *NTS* 52 (2006): 319–36.

and points of reference, within which the purposes of the author are developed.⁷² As pointed out by David L. Eastman, social memory is “not based on objective history but on the values and demands of their own contexts.”⁷³ With this understanding of social memory as point of departure, we can discern the *use of history* of the respective authors. The concept of use of history (*historiebruk*) has evolved in Nordic scholarship as a combination of social memory theory and German history education theory,⁷⁴ and can be defined as “the communicative process in which aspects of the historical culture are applied to communicate meaning and action-oriented messages.”⁷⁵ The authors of the studied texts use the social memory of Peter as an authoritative figure among their audiences in order to argue for their own legitimacy as well as for dismissing their opponents. Although often-times overlooked in biblical studies, the change and development of social memory in relation to contemporary needs is a crucial aspect of Halbwachs’ theory.⁷⁶

The critical issue for a study of this type is how to distinguish between the social memory of the relevant sphere of influence and the use of history of the author. The main tool for this endeavour will be redaction criticism in a somewhat broadened sense.⁷⁷ The term *Redaktionsgeschichte* was coined by Willi Marxsen in the 1950s as a continuation and development of the form criticism of the early 20th

⁷² Jens Schröter, “Memory and Memories in Early Christianity: The Remembered Jesus as a Test Case,” in *Memory and Memories in Early Christianity. Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Universities of Geneva and Lausanne (June 2–3, 2016)*, ed. S. Buttica and E. Norelli, WUNT 1/398 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 79–96, speaks of social memory in terms of “living tradition”

⁷³ David L. Eastman, *The Many Deaths of Peter and Paul* (Oxford: University Press, 2019), 211.

⁷⁴ Cf. Klaus Bergmann, Annette Kuhn, Jörn Rüsen, and Gerhard Schneider (eds.), *Handbuch der Geschichtsdidaktik* (Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1985).

⁷⁵ See Kenneth Nordgren, “How to Do Things with History: Use of History as a Link between Historical Consciousness and Historical Culture,” *Theory & Research in Social Education* 44 (2016): 479–504 (481). Peter Aronsson, *Historiebruk—att använda det förflutna* (Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2004), 17, defines *historiebruk* as “the process where parts of [sources, artefacts, rituals, customs and statements concerning the past] are activated in order to create integral meaning and action” (*Historiebruk är de processer då delar av historiekulturen aktiveras för att forma bestämda meningsskapande och handlingsorienterade helheter*). See also Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: University Press, 1983).

⁷⁶ See Maurice Halbwachs, *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte: Étude de mémoire collective* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1941).

⁷⁷ For an introduction and appraisal of redaction criticism, see Joachim Rohde, *Die redaktionsgeschichtliche Methode. Einführung und kritische Sichtung des Forschungsstandes*, TA 22 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965); Kari Syreeni, *The Making of the Sermon on the Mount: A Procedural Analysis of Matthew’s Redactional Activity. Part I: Methodology & Compositional Analysis*, AASFDHL 44 (Helsinki: Soumalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 3–56.

century.⁷⁸ In contrast to the form critics, who sought to identify the different traditions underlying the texts, redaction criticism treats the composers of the texts as creative authors with an agenda, rather than mere collectors of material. Günther Bornkamm argues that Matthew⁷⁹ not only incorporates Markan traditions, but also reinterprets them for his own purposes.⁸⁰ Hans Conzelmann uses redaction criticism to argue that Luke was driven by theological motives, rather than being a mere recounter of history.⁸¹

Redaction criticism has been most readily applied to the Synoptic Gospels. Assuming Markan priority, it is a well-defined endeavour to study how Matthew and Luke edit the Markan material for their own theological purposes. As for Acts, it can partially be viewed as a reception and redaction of the Pauline epistles, structuring the material therein in a way appropriate for Luke's purposes. However, Luke is not solely a compiler of material, but a creative author who shapes his material in line with his own concerns, and as for this study we will pay special attention to how he reshapes the portrait of Peter as an authoritative figure compared to Paul.

It is important to remember that redaction criticism not only deals with how one source edits another, but really discusses the composition and ideological motives motivating the author to give the text a certain form. This is the way in which I will work with use of history. For the other texts treated in this study, this aspect of redaction criticism is paramount, as we do not have specific "source texts" to which we can compare the work of the redactor. We will discuss the ideological motivations underlying the creative compositions of the respective authors, in order to discern what view of Peter as an authoritative figure they reflect. Material from earlier sources is often reused, and more "traditional" redaction criticism thereby has its place in the analysis, but it cannot be limited to the strictly

⁷⁸ Willi Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus. Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*, FRLANT 49 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

⁷⁹ For the sake of brevity, I speak of the authors by their traditional names. This should not be seen as a statement concerning the authorship of the texts, but rather as a simple way of referring to the author(s)/editor(s) of a certain text. This system will be used consistently not only for the Gospels, but also for other (obviously pseudepigraphic) literature.

⁸⁰ Günther Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, ed. G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H. J. Held, NTL (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1963), 15–57.

⁸¹ Hans Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*, BHT 17 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1954).

comparative method often employed in e.g. Synoptic studies.⁸² *Kompositionsgeschichte* is a term that is often referred to synonymously with redaction criticism and indicates more fully the questions at stake.⁸³ However, use of history includes both redaction, composition and other aspects that might be relevant to each individual text. Since I will study a multitude of texts of various genres and origins, it is necessary with a broad approach. However, the discussion will focus mainly on the redaction and composition of the present text rather than the underlying traditions. Yet, the extent to which underlying traditions affect the composition of the text must not be belittled.

1.3.3 Tools for Sociological Analysis

In order to analyse the various spheres of influence, it is necessary to create a language for the means by which they seek to influence their audiences. Since this to some extent implies going from a literary to a historical level in the study of the text, we need some tools for analysing these sociological phenomena. However, there is a risk that the application of various sociological models on ancient texts presents results that are more dependent on the sociological models than on the source material itself.⁸⁴ Existing sociological models will therefore be used for creating a language for discussing the phenomena reflected in the texts, rather than providing a complete interpretative framework. Extant models of authority have a great deal of categorical overlap, often on the basis of rather diffuse criteria. If one would choose to use one sociological model as framework into which all Petrine material were to be placed, one would most certainly be forced not only to

⁸² See Ernst Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968), 23–25. See also discussion in William G. Thompson, *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Mt. 17,22–18,35*, AnBib (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970), 4–5, n. 19.

⁸³ Graham Stanton, “The Origin and Purpose of Matthew’s Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980,” in *ANRW* II.25.3., ed. W. Haase (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1985), 1889–1951 (1895), argues that redaction criticism and composition criticism are two different things, where redaction criticism analyses the theological purposes of the author, whereas composition criticism focuses on the structure of the text. Such a division of the work can of course be made, but I consider both aspects to be part of the concept of *Redaktionsgeschichte*, which analyses the theological/ideological thrust of the author/redactor.

⁸⁴ See the debate in David G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 1–59; Philip Esler, Review of *The Social Ethos*, *JTS* 49 (1998): 253–60; Horrell, “Models and Methods in Social-Scientific Interpretation: A Response to Philip Esler,” *JSNT* 78 (2000): 83–105; Esler, “Models in New Testament Interpretation: A Response to David Horrell,” *JSNT* 78 (2000): 107–13.

misrepresent some of the evidence, but also overlook significant features in the texts that do not fit into the proposed categories. The variety of texts that constitute the research material of this study requires a certain degree of conceptual flexibility. In order to analyse Peter as an authoritative figure in early Christian literature, I will use the conceptual frameworks of Max Weber and Pierre Bourdieu. They will not be presented as opposing or even corresponding theories for analysing authority, but as two ways of analysing authority that can both be helpful for analysing different aspects of the Peter-images. The use of Weber and Bourdieu is by no means all-encompassing, but some of their analytical categories will be used heuristically since they aptly describe phenomena in the texts.

Weber defines authority (*Herrschaft*) as “die Chance, für einen Befehl bestimmten Inhalts bei angebbaren Personen Gehorsam zu finden.”⁸⁵ He argues that there are three types (*Typen*) of authority, namely rational (*rationalen*), traditional (*traditionalen*), and charismatic (*charismatischen*) authority.⁸⁷ The *rational* type pertains to a type of *legal* authority which can be exercised due to authority of a certain office.⁸⁸ The *traditional* type draws from the perceived antiquity of traditions and the tradition that certain people can legitimately exercise certain authority. The *charismatic* type emphasises the exceptional nature of the leader as well as of his teachings and writings.⁸⁹ The problem with especially Weber’s third category is that is very broad. As we deal with texts speaking to situations after the death of the charismatic leader, we will often discuss this category in terms of

⁸⁵ Weber uses the terms *Herrschaft* and *Autorität* rather synonymously, but for this study it is more relevant to speak of authority than domination, see Bengt Holmberg, *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*, ConBNT 11 (Lund: Gleerup, 1978), 125. See also Robert Bierstedt, “The Problem of Authority,” in *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, ed. M. Berger, T. Abel, and C. H. Page (New York, NY: van Nostrand, 1954), 67–81.

⁸⁶ Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1976), 1:28. English translation: “the plausibility that a command with a certain content will be obeyed by specific persons.”

⁸⁷ Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 1:124. See also idem., “Die drei reinen typen der legitimen Herrschaft: Eine soziologische Studie,” *Preussische Jahrbücher* 187 (1922): 1–12. For a discussion and elaboration upon Weber’s definitions of these categories, see Reinhard Bendix, *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1960), 289–411.

⁸⁸ Grappe, *D’un Temple*, uses Weber to study the sociology of the early Jerusalem church with Peter as its leader. The problem with Grappe’s approach is that it presupposes the historicity of Acts. I will stay on a literary level, arguing from conceptions and ideals rather than presupposing historical realities.

⁸⁹ On Weber and *charisma*, see Thomas Ekstrand, *Max Weber in a Theological Perspective* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 167–84.

institutionalised charisma.⁹⁰ In the post-apostolic period, this often appears as the charisma of *office* (*Amtcharisma*).⁹¹ The charisma of office could be described as a *rational* authority derived from the charisma of a predecessor. Weber argues that Charismatic authority must be institutionalised following the death of the charismatic leader if the movement is to survive.⁹² This is done both by the means of ritual, hierarchy, and definition of orthodox teaching.⁹³ These three types of authority are always found in combinations, never simply in their pure forms in history.⁹⁴ Weber's theories have endured a lot of criticism over the years but have still proven to be helpful despite their deficiencies.⁹⁵

The emergence of Peter as an authoritative figure in early Christian texts will also be discussed in terms of cultural and social capital, as suggested by Pierre Bourdieu.⁹⁶ *Cultural capital* mainly deals with educational qualifications of various types. In the case of Peter, this mainly pertains to his legacy as an apostle and follower of the earthly Jesus. *Social capital*, on the other hand, deals with the status that comes with group affiliation. For this study, the most relevant aspect of this is the way in which group affiliation is affected by association to Peter.

The concept of *cultural capital* will be used to analyse how Peter was conceived in early Christian imagination, whereas *social capital* describes how Peter's cultural capital is transformed in order to bring authoritative meaning in new contexts that appear after his death. Bourdieu divides cultural capital into three dimensions, that are all relevant in different ways when studying Peter. The

⁹⁰ This is discussed and developed in Winfried Gebhardt, *Charisma als Lebensform. Zur Soziologie des alternativen Lebens*, SK 14 (Berlin: Reimer, 1994).

⁹¹ The charisma of worldview (*Weltbildcharisma*) is of course also of significance, as the ideas of the charismatic figure create the framework for the worldview of the followers. However, since we have no surviving artefacts from the historical Peter, it is not possible to study how specifically Petrine ideas are potentially incorporated into the worldview of early Jesus-believers.

⁹² See discussion in Keith A. Roberts, *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1990), 147–54.

⁹³ See Gerd Theißen, *Erleben und Verhalten der ersten Christen: Eine Psychologie des Urchristentums*, 2nd ed. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 2017), 385–94.

⁹⁴ However, Charismatic authority can be present in its pure form at the time of its origin, see discussion in Bendix, *Max Weber*, 302–05.

⁹⁵ For a critique of Weber that is relevant for Biblical studies, see Holmberg, *Paul and Power*, 124–91. See also John Howard Schütz, *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority*, SNTSMS 26 (Cambridge: University Press, 1975), 1–21; Maragret Y. Macdonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalisation in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*, SNTSMS 60 (Cambridge: University Press, 1988), 10–30.

⁹⁶ Pierre Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. John G. Richardson (New York, NY: Greenwood, 1986), 241–58.

embodied state relates to Peter's history as a follower of the earthly Jesus. The *Bildung* that provides basis for his cultural capital is his participation in the ministry of Jesus and the first-hand knowledge of his teaching.⁹⁷ It also relates to Peter leaving everything behind to follow Jesus, which ultimately results in martyrdom. This aspect of Peter's cultural capital is thus embodied in his own persona and cannot be directly transferred to anyone else. Thus, this aspect of Peter's cultural capital died together with him. Yet, it is kept alive through texts that narrate events from his life in order to have Peter speak to issues in their own time. Peter's cultural capital also exists in its *objectified state*, meaning that his cultural capital is embodied in the material artefacts left behind, such as writings. Yet, in this state, Peter's cultural capital is only effective to the extent that it is appropriated by agents in relevant struggles. Since we have no authentic Petrine artefacts, we can preclude that allegedly Petrine artefacts were used for invoking Petrine authority in this way. The *institutionalised state* is described by Bourdieu as the significance of e.g. an academic degree. In Peter's case, it is his relationship to the earthly Jesus that provides him with a valuable *curriculum vitæ*.

An issue related to Peter's own cultural capital is the social capital he creates among later followers in the early Christian movement. The collectively owned capital is related to the notion of a connection to the apostle Peter that gives the group its legitimacy, and thereby also to the social memory of the sphere of influence. Peter's cultural capital is converted into social capital of various early Christian spheres of influence. I will argue that many early Christian authors seek to boost Peter's cultural capital, in order to translate this into social capital in their respective communities. We will also see examples of how Peter's cultural capital is diminished in order to diminish the social capital of the groups identifying with Peter.⁹⁸

The categories of Weber and Bourdieu overlap, although Bourdieu mainly deals with what Weber would call charismatic authority. I will not attempt to synthesise the systems, nor will I regard them as all-encompassing frameworks in which every reference to Peter fits clearly and perfectly, but rather as points of

⁹⁷ The German "Bildung" has no satisfactory English translation. Bildung refers not only to formal education, but also to other aspects of personal formation.

⁹⁸ My thought on cultural and social capital and the translation process between them is influenced by James A. Kelhoffer, *Persecution, Persuasion and Power: Readiness to Withstand Hardship as a Corroboration of Legitimacy in the New Testament*, WUNT 1/270 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 9–25.

reference in order to structure a discussion of sometimes very different texts.⁹⁹ I shall argue that the authors of the respective texts construct Peter as an authoritative figure in such a way that it legitimises their own positions, whether it be the legitimacy of certain teachings or the legitimacy of certain leadership.¹⁰⁰

1.3.4 Research Procedure

In my analysis of the respective texts I will follow the same basic procedure, with slight modifications with respect to the nature of the individual texts. I will first attempt to situate the text in its historical context and discuss its possible connections to other relevant texts for this study. Hereafter follows a detailed discussion of the relevant texts where the portrait of Peter is analysed. This aims at relating the purpose of the text to its sphere of influence and analysing its use of history and its effect. To this point, my analysis can be regarded as typical historical-critical research. It is when I compare the different texts of various historical origin that the language created by a heuristic use of Weber and Bourdieu is of great significance. My assessment of the respective texts from sociological perspective is often found at the end of the discussion of each text and is based on an overall assessment of the detailed textual analysis. This sociological categorisation enables a discussion of the development of how Peter is used as an authoritative figure on a macro level, despite the lack of historical-literary connections between the texts as such. In a broader perspective, the use of sociological analysis also presents the opportunity for future research on other material by making comparisons with the development of Peter as an authoritative figure.

⁹⁹ As noted by Andrew D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6*, AGJU 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 3–5, the strict application of modern sociological models on ancient texts might present very predictable, albeit not necessarily relevant, results.

¹⁰⁰ See Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 1:122.

2. Peter and Paul—A Complicated Relationship

Peter and Paul are the two leaders of early Christianity¹ that are most well-known to the Christian world. This is due to the central role they play in the New Testament, which has shaped the common conception of Christian origins. Yet, the relationship between these two central figures is not entirely clear, although the available texts reflect some aspects of their relationship. This chapter will discuss the view of Peter in Pauline Christianity and in Paul's letters. This will be compared to the portrait of Peter in Acts. Although differing in the time and location of their composition, the Pauline epistles and Acts refer to roughly the same time and events. Acts shows the connection between Paul and the early Jesus movement, and thus it is relevant to discuss and compare the similarities and differences in how Peter is portrayed as an authoritative figure in these texts. The Pauline epistles (Galatians and First Corinthians) are the earliest literary sources to mention Peter, and the only sources written during Peter's own lifetime.

2.1 Peter in Galatians

Galatians and First Corinthians are roughly contemporary, but it is likely that Galatians is written before First Corinthians.² If we presuppose a North Galatian hypothesis, Galatians can be dated to the mid-fifties. The exact nature of the opponents and conflict in Galatia is much debated and will only be touched upon when relevant for the analysis of the Peter-image.³ Galatians 1:18–2:14 is a section devoted

¹ Χριστιανός was used as a term of Christian self-definition from at least the final quarter of the first century, cf. John-Christian Eurell, "Becoming Christian: On the Identification of Christ-Believers as Χριστιανοί." *JECH* 10 (2020): 1–19. The term is anachronistic in regard to Peter and Paul, but I still use it for the sake of consistency.

² Philipp Vielhauer, *Geschichte der Urchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 79–81, 110–11, suggests a dating around 54/55 C.E. and Robert Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1979), suggests 53 C.E.

³ The complexity of such an undertaking is discussed by Barclay, "Mirror-Reading."

to Paul's encounters with and relationship to the leaders of the Jerusalem church, particularly Peter. Paul appears to give a chronological account of his dealings with Peter so far. Paul tells about three episodes that have been important in his relationship to Peter: the Jerusalem trip where he stayed with Peter for fifteen days, the Jerusalem council, and the incident at Antioch.

2.1.1 The Meeting with Peter (Gal 1:15–24)

In Gal 1:15–24, Paul defends his apostolic status. He stresses his independence by pointing out that he did not ask the Jerusalem apostles permission before starting his ministry.⁴ Philip Esler argues that Paul here attempts to counter suggestions that he had from the beginning been closely linked, or even subordinate to, the leaders in Jerusalem.⁵ Paul emphasises that it was not necessary for him to have Peter's approval before starting his ministry. Paul portrays himself as on equal standing with the Jerusalem apostles. This is an important point for him to make, since it strengthens the claim that his gospel is of divine origin, rather than human.⁶

Two Greek words in Paul's account concerning his relationship to Peter and the Jerusalem apostles deserve closer study. In 1:16, he makes clear that he did not *προσανατίθηναι* with flesh and blood, and in 1:18 he *ἱστορήσασκεν* Κηφᾶν. Johannes Behm argues that *προσανατίθηναι* has the meaning of "presenting one's cause."⁷ BDAG prefers translating it as "taking up a matter" or "consult with."⁸ Paul makes clear that he has not asked anyone permission to start his ministry, and thus does not recognise some special authority of the Jerusalem apostles to legitimise his ministry. The flesh and blood that he is referring to does not relate specifically to Peter, but to the group of Jerusalem apostles as a whole. However, when he finally goes to Jerusalem three years later, his main interest is to visit Peter. When describing his purpose with the visit, he uses *ἱστορέω* and relates it to Peter. This is the only place where this word is used in the New Testament, and it has the meaning of

⁴ In contrast to Paul's own account, Luke stresses that Paul actually desired to join the apostles in Jerusalem, but was prohibited from doing so, since the authenticity of his conversion was doubted (Acts 9:26). However, Luke also notes that Barnabas presented Saul/Paul to the apostles shortly after his conversion (Acts 9:27). The accounts in Galatians and Acts of Paul's early encounters with the Jerusalem apostles can hardly be reconciled.

⁵ Philip Esler, *Galatians*, NTR (London: Routledge, 1998), 126.

⁶ George Lyons, *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1985), 159.

⁷ Johannes Behm, "προσανατίθηναι," *TDNT* 1:353–54.

⁸ BDAG, s.v. *προσανατίθηναι*.

“visit in order to get to know.”⁹ This is the same word that is the basis for the modern English word “history.” A *ιστωρ* in antiquity would be someone who was acquainted with the facts.¹⁰ Bengt Holmberg points out that the choice of this word here is “anything but unintentional.”¹¹ It is close at hand to presume that Paul wished to confer with Peter and gain information concerning the Jesus tradition and Christian origins.¹²

The exact meaning of *ιστορέω* in this context is disputed. Otfried Hofius has criticised the notion of Dunn¹³ and Kilpatrick,¹⁴ that *ιστορέω* had this sense of information-exchange to it.¹⁵ Hofius argues that *ιστορέω* cannot have the sense of acquiring information in *Koiné*, but rather should be seen as a visit in order to personally know Peter. Jürgen Becker contends that the visit has nothing to do with Paul’s apostolic mission whatsoever.¹⁶ However, Dunn replies that getting to know someone personally will normally involve exchange of information, especially when a visit lasts for fifteen days.¹⁷ In the words of C. H. Dodd: “we may presume they did not spend all the time talking about the weather.”¹⁸ F. F. Bruce notes that although there is evidence that *ιστορέω* was used of making acquaintance rather than transferring information in *Koiné*, we can be quite sure that a visit by Paul to Peter would include an exchange of information.¹⁹ Although Bruce’s suggestion that Paul went to Jerusalem to *interview* Peter is probably too strong, I

⁹ Herrmann Martin Friedrich Büchsel “*ιστορέω*,” *TDNT* 3:391–96.

¹⁰ Büchsel, “*ιστορέω*.”

¹¹ Holmberg, *Paul and Power*, 16.

¹² As suggested also by Biörn Fjärstedt, “Synoptic Tradition in 1 Corinthians: Themes and Clusters of Theme Words in 1 Corinthians 1–4 and 9” (ThD diss., Uppsala, 1974), 34.

¹³ James D. G. Dunn, “The Relationship Between Paul and Jerusalem According to Gal 1 and 2,” *NTS* 28 (1982): 461–78.

¹⁴ George Dunbar Kilpatrick, “Galatians 1:18 *ΙΣΤΟΡΗΣΑΙ ΚΗΦΑΝ*,” in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: University Press, 1959).

¹⁵ Otfried Hofius, “Gal 1:18 *ιστορήσαι Κηφᾶν*,” *ZNW* 74 (1984): 73–85.

¹⁶ Jürgen Becker, “Der Brief an die Galater,” in *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser*, ed. J. Becker and U. Luz, *NTD* 8/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 9–106 (30).

¹⁷ James D. G. Dunn, “Once More Gal 1:18 *ιστορήσαι Κηφᾶν*. In Reply to Otfried Hofius,” *ZNW* 76 (1985): 138. Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (Lund: Gleerup, 1961), 297–99, argues that the normal thing for two Jewish teachers to do was to transmit doctrinal statements and “transmit halakha,” and this is a typical NT example of this practice.

¹⁸ Charles Harold Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments: Three Lectures with an Appendix on Eschatology and History* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936), 26.

¹⁹ Frederick Fyvie Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1982), 98.

consider it plausible that exchange of information concerning the Jesus tradition is a probable motive for Paul's visit.²⁰ Considering the independence underlined by Paul, I also have a hard time seeing why Paul would desire to become personal friends with Peter without receiving information concerning Jesus. If Paul simply desired to know Peter as a personal friend, it is perplexing that he waits 14 years until his next visit, which occurs mainly to settle a theological conflict concerning the gentile believers' relation to Jewish customs.

Paul most likely visited Peter in order to acquire accurate knowledge concerning the Jesus tradition. He is still not seeking approval from Peter and the other Jerusalem apostles, but visits them in order to gain more information concerning Jesus and the beginning of the Christian movement.²¹ Thus, the importance of Peter in this passage lies in his presumptive first-hand knowledge of the Jesus tradition. This indicates that Peter even for Paul represented some kind of *traditional* authority, an *embodied* cultural capital with which it is necessary to associate. At the same time, Paul focuses mainly on his own *charismatic* authority and *embodied* cultural capital in order to strengthen his position in the coming conflict.

2.1.2 The Meeting at Jerusalem (Gal 2:1–10)

It is disputed whether this meeting in Jerusalem is meant to reflect the same event that is referred to in Acts 15. The main arguments against equating these two meetings with each other are that it would be strange if the incident at Antioch happened after the meeting, and that the meeting in Galatians is private (*κατ' ἰδίαν*), whereas the meeting in Acts 15 is a public event (Acts 15:6, 12, 22). However, Galatians clearly attempts at giving a chronological account, and the reason for Paul's anger at Peter is exactly his failure to keep the agreement.²² Even though Paul describes his intention to have a private meeting with the Jerusalem apostles, the *ψευδάδελφοί* (false brethren; 2:4) present at the meeting indicate that a larger group than just the apostles was gathered.

Paul underlines that he went to Jerusalem *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν* (according to a vision; 2:2). Thus, he once again emphasises his own independence as an apostle, since he was not summoned by the Jerusalem apostles, but went there by own initiative. Heinrich Schlier argues that Paul was concerned that his gospel was not

²⁰ Bruce, Galatians, 98; PHEME PERKINS, *Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 208.

²¹ James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, BNTC (London: Black, 1993), 74.

²² As pointed out by Dunn, *Galatians*, 89, Galatians claims to give a chronological account, and should therefore be treated as such.

genuine and valid (thus running in vain; 2:2).²³ However, this would contradict his defence that he did not need approval for his gospel. It is more likely that the running in vain does not refer to the authenticity of Paul's gospel, but to the Galatians who might leave the Pauline gospel in order to be circumcised.²⁴

In Gal 2:7–8, Paul equates his own apostolic status with that of Peter and claims that the other Jerusalem apostles also acknowledge this. These verses infer that the apostolates of Peter and Paul have equal authoritative status, the only difference being that Peter worked toward the circumcised whereas Paul worked toward the uncircumcised. It is also worth noting that Paul uses the term Πέτρος in Gal 2:7–8, whereas he usually uses Κηφᾶς.²⁵ In v. 9, James, Peter, and John, who were considered to be the στῦλοι (pillars), offered Paul their “right hand of fellowship.” Paul here admits that the trio of James, Peter, and John was perceived to be special in some way, and now these special apostles offer Paul fellowship. However, he is still sceptical concerning the qualities of these apostles, commenting that they δοκοῦντες στῦλοι (appeared to be pillars).²⁶ Paul conveys a picture where he is accepted into the early Christian apostolic elite, and receives status equal to that of the Jerusalem apostles.²⁷

The Jerusalem Meeting is concluded with the Jerusalem apostles offering “the right hand of fellowship” to Paul and Barnabas. Handshakes were not customary in Roman deal making.²⁸ Esler argues that the origin of this type of deal-making is to be found in the Septuagint.²⁹ In First and Second Maccabees, the giving of right hands is frequently used as a means of bringing peace in a conflict. In most of these cases, the hand is offered by the superior party to their suppliants, and it is never a gesture used by equals. Esler argues that Paul and Barnabas should here be seen as the superior party, that eventually agree on κοινωνία (fellowship), although this contradicts his own claim that the superior party is normally the one offering the

²³ Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater*, 5th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 87.

²⁴ Betz, *Galatians*, 88.

²⁵ On the shift from Cephas to Peter in Gal 2:7–8, see Excursus A.

²⁶ For further discussion on in δοκοῦντες στῦλοι relation to Pauline theology, see Charles Kingsley Barrett, “Paul and the ‘Pillar’ Apostles,” in *Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii*, ed. J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik (Harleem: Bohn, 1953), 1–20.

²⁷ Roger D. Aus, “Three Pillars and Three Patriarchs: A Proposal Concerning Gal 2:9,” *ZNW* 70 (1979): 252–61, argues that the three pillars are an indication of the church viewing itself as the new Israel, with the three pillars as the three new “patriarchs.”

²⁸ Barry Nicholas, *An Introduction to Roman Law* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 194–95.

²⁹ Esler, *Galatians*, 133. Cf. 1 Macc 6:58; 11:50, 62, 66; 13:45, 50; 2 Macc 4:34; 11:26; 12:11; 13:22; 14:19.

hand.³⁰ However, as Paul tells the story, it is quite the opposite. Although Paul is presented as the one initiating the meeting, the discussion appears to be an attack on the Pauline mission, an attack that even includes infiltration by false brethren. Paul and Barnabas are not the superior party but defend themselves without yielding to the attacks (Gal 2:5). Finally, when the superior party *γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν* (understood the grace that was given; 2:9), they offer Paul and Barnabas their right hand of fellowship. Too much emphasis should not be put on Esler's theory of handshakes, considering its scarce attestation and the fact that Esler's conclusion contradicts his hypothesis (although he himself does not admit this). If Esler's theory would be correct, it would suggest that Peter is the one with higher authority to whom Paul submits.

An interesting detail is that although the Jerusalem meeting is between James, Peter, and John on the one hand, and Peter and Barnabas on the other, the only people mentioned in the conclusion in 2:7 are Peter and Paul.³¹ Despite the high concentration in this scene of significant authoritative figures in early Christianity, Peter and Paul are singled out as the two most significant.³² Hans Dieter Betz points out that Peter's mission is called apostolic (v. 8), whereas Paul's mission is not, despite being given equal status.³³ However *ἀποστολή* could be inferred to apply to the description also of Paul's work. What is crucial for understanding the view of Peter as an authoritative figure in this text, is to see that Paul piggybacks on the status of Peter by presenting himself as being of equal status as Peter, albeit with a different calling. He hereby enhances his own charismatic authority by adding elements of traditional authority that can be derived from association with Peter.

We may also note that the implications of the *κοινωνία* (fellowship) between Paul and Barnabas and the Jerusalem apostles is somewhat dubious. Although *κοινωνία* is a common concept in Paul, it is used in a number of different ways.³⁴ In this context, it is plausible that it concerns the nature of the relationship between

³⁰ Gibson, *Peter*, 221, criticises Esler's theory of the giving of the right hand, arguing that there are also examples of mutual giving and taking of right hands, and thus one cannot make a principle out of who is the superior party.

³¹ One could discuss if the order of the names of the "pillars," James, Peter and John, might suggest that James had now succeeded Peter as the leading figure in Jerusalem. However, such an exercise would be far to speculative when it only deals with this short text.

³² Donald Guthrie, *Galatians*, CBib (London: Oliphants, 1974), 81, suggests that this is because Peter's work among the Jews was viewed as a close parallel to Paul's work among the gentiles.

³³ Betz, *Galatians*, 98.

³⁴ Esler, *Galatians*, 133.

the Pauline mission and the Jerusalem apostles. However, it is likely that *κοινωνία* also concerned more explicit issues of table-fellowship.³⁵ Eating and drinking combined with theological conversation was a central aspect of Pauline Christianity.³⁶ This is the backdrop toward which we can understand why the incident at Antioch was so controversial.³⁷

It is evident that Paul is eager to emphasise his independence as well as his perseverance when his gospel is questioned in his account of the meeting at Jerusalem. Yet, a careful reading of the text indicates that Paul was not the superior apostle at the meeting, although the so-called pillars eventually agreed that Paul's gospel was from God. Peter is portrayed as a leading figure in the Jerusalem establishment, to whom even Paul must relate, even while stressing his own independence. When serious theological conflict emerges, Peter and the Jerusalem apostles were the place to turn to get an authoritative ruling on the issue, thus suggesting some kind of *rational* authority. Considering the discussion on Peter in the previous verses in Galatians, perhaps the idea would be that since Peter and the Jerusalem apostles knew the earthly Jesus, they might find a solution to the conflict in line with his teachings.

2.1.3 The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11–21)

The account of the incident at Antioch is directly related to the preceding passage. Paul uses the introductory particle *δέ* to draw attention to Peter's inconsistency.³⁸ In setting the background for this incident, one might assume from Gal 2:11 that Paul, Barnabas, and Titus had travelled to Antioch after the meeting in

³⁵ Esler, *Galatians*, 134. See also Matthias Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft. Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern*, TANZ 13 (Tübingen: Francke, 1996), 153–58. It should be noted that alternative interpretations have been proposed. Josef Hainz, “Gemeinschaft (*κοινωνία*) zwischen Paulus und Jerusalem (Gal 2,9f),” in *Kontinuität und Einheit: Festschrift für Franz Mußner* (Freiburg: Herder, 1981), 30–42, argues that *κοινωνία* should be understood as the opposite of excommunication, thus preserving the unity of the church in a time previous to the development of ecclesiastical hierarchy. I agree that this is an important aspect, but also think that table-fellowship is a means of manifesting this unity.

³⁶ Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2003), 54, 173–217.

³⁷ Josef Hainz, *Koinonia. “Kirche” als Gemeinschaft bei Paulus*, BU 16 (Regensburg: Pustet, 1982), 134, instead argues that the *κοινωνία* is an expression that Paul and the Jerusalem apostles proclaim the same gospel. Although true that this is the conclusion of the meeting, the meaning of *κοινωνία* is more specific than this interpretation seems to imply, and a connection to the banquet is very likely.

³⁸ Guthrie, *Galatians*, 84.

Jerusalem.³⁹ At first, Peter's visit at Antioch is a success. The *κοινωνία* between the two missions results in table fellowship between Peter and the Gentile believers at Antioch. This idyllic harmony suddenly comes to an end as *τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* (some from James) enter the scene.⁴⁰ In fear of the circumcised, Peter, the Jewish believers—and even Barnabas—retract from the *κοινωνία* with the Gentile believers.⁴¹ Obviously, this is not in accordance with the deal that had just been made at Jerusalem, a deal of which also James had been a part.⁴² This description of those “from James” and Peter's submissive attitude toward them raises questions concerning the relationship between Peter and James as authoritative figures. One easily gets the impression that Peter respects and submits to the authority of James.⁴³ However, Paul explicitly states that Peter acts as he does not from fear of James, but from fear of the circumcised. It is thus quite plausible that the reason for the actions of Peter and his companions is to avoid causing calamities by starting rumours of the disciples leaving Jewish customs, rather than an expression of their subordination to James.⁴⁴

Many have noted that this section of Galatians contains much military vocabulary.⁴⁵ The expression *ἰστημι κατὰ πρόσωπον* (oppose to one's face) is used in the Septuagint when someone is resisting a determined military assault, usually

³⁹ Esler, *Galatians*, 135. Esler also argues that they had come to Jerusalem from Antioch, which seems reasonable.

⁴⁰ Bengt Holmberg, “Sociologiska perspektiv på Gal 2:11–14(21),” *SEÅ* 55 (1990): 71–92, argues that Jews and gentiles did not normally eat together, and the issue here was this new Antiochan invention of table fellowship. Hal Taussig, *In the Beginning Was the Meal: Social Experimentation & Early Christian Identity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2009), 165–67, suggests that exclusive Jewish table-fellowship was a means for Jews to protest against the Roman occupation, and the mixed meals therefore lead to a social experiment with uncertain consequences for the uniqueness of the Jewish community. However, James D. G. Dunn, “The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11–18),” in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. M. Nanos (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 199–234, argues that there were many exceptions to this rule as well as a certain degree of variation regarding their interpretation. Furthermore, it is not obvious exactly what the problem was in Antioch.

⁴¹ For a survey on the discussion concerning the incident at Antioch, see Gibson, *Peter*, and Magnus Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch* (London: Routledge, 2003), 129–66.

⁴² Holmberg, *Paul and Power*, 34, argues that Paul here makes clear that he, unlike Barnabas, was not subject to Peter's halakhic authority. By this Paul stresses that the authority of the gospel is superior to the apostolic halakha.

⁴³ On James as an authoritative figure, see excursus C.

⁴⁴ The notion that the men were “from James” does not necessarily imply that they had been sent by James but might as well indicate that they were from Jerusalem.

⁴⁵ Betz, *Galatians*, 108; and Esler, *Galatians*, 135.

without success.⁴⁶ This might suggest that Paul viewed Peter's actions as an attack that resumed the hostilities that were settled in Jerusalem. Peter's actions are also described in military terms. Ὑποστέλλω (withdraw, retreat) has connotations of military strategy, and perhaps should be seen as a tactical manoeuvre.⁴⁷ Peter did not act from theological convictions, but rather from fear.

Although Paul underlines his independence from the Jerusalem apostles, he is still careful to portray his mission as in continuity with that of the Jerusalem establishment. The nature of the relationship between 2:11–14 and 2:15–21 is disputed, and some scholars suggest that the entire unit 2:14–21 should be held together as a Pauline speech.⁴⁸ If correct, this is significant to the depiction of the relationship between Peter and Paul, since Paul speaks of him and Peter as ἡμεῖς (we), thus indicating that they are partners rather than opponents.⁴⁹ Although Paul refers to his party in the conflict as ἡμεῖς in 2:4–5, he can hardly be referring to the same group, which included Titus who is Greek (2:3), when saying ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι in 2:15. Otto Bauernfeind is probably correct in describing 2:14–21 as a *Redereferat*, but we must keep in mind that its primary purpose in its present form is rhetorical rather than historical.⁵⁰ The purpose of 2:14 is to underline the hypocrisy of Peter to Paul's Galatian readers, whereas 2:15–21 is primarily a theological exposition aimed at the Galatians, although formally addressing Peter.⁵¹

The portrayal of Peter in this story is not very flattering. He is portrayed as a hypocrite who cannot stand up for himself but gives in to pressure. In this way Paul does not display him as a leader worthy of respect.⁵² At the same time, it is clear that the actions of Peter are of great importance, since the other Jews—and

⁴⁶ Esler, *Galatians*, 135. Cf. Deut 7:24; 9:2; 11:25; 2 Chron 13:7. See also similar phrases in Josh 1:5; 23:9.

⁴⁷ Betz, *Galatians*, 108.

⁴⁸ René Kieffer, *Foi et justification à Antioche: interprétation d'un conflit*, LD 111 (Paris: Cerf, 1982), 13–80; Jonas Holmstrand, *Markers and Meaning in Paul: An Analysis of 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Galatians*, ConBNT 28 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1997), 157–65.

⁴⁹ Cf. Holmstrand, *Markers and Meaning*, 160.

⁵⁰ Otto Bauernfeind, "Der Schluß der Antiochenischen Paulusrede," in *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis: Festschrift für Karl Heim* (Hamburg, 1954), 64–78. In the unlikely event of a verbatim quotation of Paul's speech in Jerusalem, the odd shift between 2:14 and 2:15 would be most suspicious.

⁵¹ This is the view of most interpreters, see Betz, *Galatians*, 113–14.

⁵² Gibson, Peter, argues (following Bruce, Betz, Longenecker, Fung, Carson, Witherington, Perkins and Cummins) that Peter withdrew from table fellowship due to concern about violent nationalism in Judea, and the effect it could have on the Jerusalem church if it became known that an important Christian leader ate with Gentiles. A similar hypothesis is proposed by Bo Reicke, "Der Geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiochia-Episode Gal 2, 1–14," in *Studia Paulina*, 172–87.

even Barnabas, the one that went to Jerusalem together with Paul to settle this issue, follow him in his hypocrisy. Thus, Peter is portrayed as an authoritative figure in the respect that people, especially Christians of Jewish descent, followed him. Peter's conduct is normative, which implies that Peter was viewed as a *rational* authority, interpreting the practical implications of the Jesus tradition. Yet, Paul also describes someone whose integrity does not meet up to the standards that would be required from someone in Peter's position.

2.1.4 Conclusion: Peter in Galatians

The picture of Peter as an authoritative figure emerging from Galatians is diverse. On the one hand, Paul wishes to downplay the role of Peter and the Jerusalem apostles, and argues that he himself has equal apostolic authority. Yet, the information and first-hand experience of the teachings of Jesus make Peter special. Peter's actions are also seen as halakhically normative. There is a sense of frustration in Paul's relation to Peter and how he was viewed as an authoritative figure. Peter was held in high esteem as a follower of the earthly Jesus, but his weak character did not justify his normative function in the eyes of Paul. Peter and the Jerusalem establishment was an entity to which Paul was forced to relate, although he would rather be without.⁵³

The portrait of Peter as an authoritative figure of Galatians has several dimensions. In Weberian terms, Peter is portrayed as having *rational* authority to the Jewish believers who follow his normative halakha without questioning that his position changes over time. Peter is also portrayed as having *traditional* authority together with the pillars in Jerusalem due to their connection to the earthly Jesus. However, *charismatic* authority is only embodied in Paul himself, who argues that he does not need the first two types of authority. Turning to Bourdieu, Paul *embodies* his cultural capital, and through arguing from his cultural capital, Paul strengthens the social capital of belonging to Pauline Christianity. Peter was a significant figure who could not be overlooked in the Pauline sphere of influence. Paul can neither criticise Peter, nor can he ignore him due to his fame and authoritative status. Rather, he seeks to piggyback on his status in order that he might speak authoritatively in his own right, without having to refer to Peter.

⁵³ There is no reason to view Paul's critique of Jerusalem in Gal 4:25 as a critique of the Jerusalem establishment (including Peter), especially considering his positive view of the heavenly Jerusalem in 4:26. Rather, Paul contrasts the teaching of his Judaising opponents with his own gospel.

2.2 Peter in First Corinthians

First Corinthians is normally dated to around the mid-fifties C.E. and is thus written around the same time as Galatians.⁵⁴ Peter is mentioned in three sections of the letter, but in contrast to Galatians, where Peter is an acting character in the story, he is more of a distant entity referred to for other reasons than his own actions. First Corinthians has historically been at the centre of the discussion of Baur's theory of Paul and Peter as opposing entities, which he based to a great extent on this letter.⁵⁵ Baur joined the parties of Paul and Apollos into one group, and the parties of Cephas and Christ into another, arguing that Peter's group represented Jewish Christianity and Paul's represented Hellenistic Christianity.⁵⁶ If one does not share Baur's theoretical framework and underlying presuppositions, it is hard to see that his theory can be derived from the text as such. Also Michael Goulder, who has tried to revive Baur's thesis, has to go far from the text of the letter itself to find arguments for his case.⁵⁷ Thus, I do not consider this type of reading fruitful to discern the portrait of Peter as an authoritative figure that Paul conveys in this text.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Charles Kingsley Barrett, "Cephas and Corinth," in *Abraham unser Vater: Festschrift für Otto Michel*, ed. O. Betz, M. Hengel, and P. Schmidt (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 1–12, suggests 53–54; Günter Bornkamm, *Paul* (New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1969), 70 suggests 54; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 4, suggests 54–55; Robert Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1979), 104, suggests 55–56; Hans Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 2nd ed., KEK 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 18, n. 31 suggests 55; Andreas Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2000), 17, suggests 54–56.

⁵⁵ Baur, "Christuspartei."

⁵⁶ Baur's thesis is dismissed by Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 201–29; and Stephen Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1961* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), 19–28. Kümmel describes four critical points against Baur's thesis: 1. There was not a single Jewish-Christian movement in the first two centuries, but rather a great variety of views. 2. The Jewish Christianity had no permanent influence on the Church. 3. Paul was friendly to Peter in the epistles and cites him as an ally. 4. Baur's criticism is determined by Hegelianism. An attempt at rebutting these charges against Baur can be found in Goulder, *Paul and the Competing Mission*, 5–15.

⁵⁷ Goulder, *Paul and the Competing Mission*.

⁵⁸ If anything, Baur's hypothesis may show that it is possible to reinterpret and re-characterise a literary figure to the extent that it is hard to find traces of the new interpretation of the figure in the source texts themselves. This could be viewed as an extreme parallel to the interpretations of the Peter-figure that were made in early Christianity.

2.2.1 The Cephas Party (1 Cor 1:10–17)

In First Corinthians, as in Galatians, Paul mentions Cephas in relation to conflicts. In this case, there is a division in the church at Corinth, where some members claim to be “of Cephas.” However, this division is not necessarily as serious as sometimes argued.⁵⁹ It was serious enough to worry Paul, but the believers were still unified enough to listen to Paul, even though one of the parties was “of Paul.”⁶⁰ All four factions were still within the Pauline sphere of influence. The nature of the division is somewhat uncertain: Judaising, pneumatic, enthusiastic or even individualistic ideas have been suggested as background to the division.⁶¹ There is no suggestion that anyone would reject Paul, and Paul does not specifically attack Peter and his party, but rather all parties, including the one “of Paul.”⁶² Conzelmann argues that the church at Corinth still exists as a whole, and all groups recognise the traditional creed reflected in 11:23ff and 15:3–7.⁶³ Thus, he argues, the error is not in a specific teaching, but rather that they have confessed themselves to slogans depending on who converted them. Another possibility could be that the membership of a certain group was determined by baptism. However, whereas Paul claims he had not baptised many, it is disputed if Peter ever visited Corinth, and Christ most certainly did not personally baptise anyone at Corinth.⁶⁴ Anyhow, these factions of the Corinthian church seem not to have been all too organised, but rather individual, thus the references to “I belong to Paul” etc.⁶⁵

Although it has been suggested that the notion of a Christ-party is a later addition, there is no textual foundation for such a position.⁶⁶ Goulder argues that the fact that Paul asserts his friendship with Apollos, but not with Peter, clearly shows that Peter and Paul were at odds with each other.⁶⁷ Peter was way more significant

⁵⁹ Johannes Munck, *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte*, Acta Jutlandica 26 (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1954), 127–161, suggests that the church is outwardly united, but, when it meets, divided into parties.

⁶⁰ Charles Kingsley Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Black, 1968), 41.

⁶¹ Conzelmann, *Korinther*, 51–53. See also Sumney, *Identifying Paul's Opponents*.

⁶² Conzelmann, *Korinther*, 51–53.

⁶³ Conzelmann, *Korinther*, 51–53.

⁶⁴ Already Chrysostom questioned whether there was really a Christ party. He argued that ἐγὼ δε χριστου was Paul's own slogan, as if Paul wished to say, “you confess to men, I confess to Christ.” However, if this is correct, it is hard to find a link between vv. 12 and 13, cf. Conzelmann, *Korinther*, 51.

⁶⁵ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 59.

⁶⁶ William F. Orr and James Artur Walther, *1 Corinthians* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 150.

⁶⁷ Goulder, *Paul and the Competing Mission*, 23.

than Apollos in early Christianity, and thus a simple way of solving the conflict would have been to say that “I planted, [those of] Cephas watered.” However, unless one does suppose that Peter personally visited Corinth, it seems more relevant to mention someone who actually did, and thus provide a relevant example. Paul’s lack of affirmation of friendship with Peter might imply that their relationship was complicated. The narrative in Galatians indicates that this may well have been the case.⁶⁸ However, Paul still refers to him in 1 Cor 9:5; 15:5. The importance of Peter was probably more or less self-evident to the Corinthians due to his historical importance, whereas Apollos might need a confirmation in order to be trusted for apostolic ministry.

A background issue for the conflict and division at Corinth is the question whether Peter himself ever visited the city. Charles Kingsley Barrett argues that it is probable, but not certain, that Peter would have visited Corinth, since this would explain the emergence of a special Cephas-group.⁶⁹ He suggests that this Cephas group would adhere to food laws that were kept by the Jerusalem party, similar to the controversy we studied in Antioch above. Barrett evokes 9:5 which mentions Peter’s wife in his favour, since they would have met her if she travelled with Peter. However, it is probable that Peter’s marriage was known in early Christianity, and therefore this argument does not prove that Peter actually paid Corinth a visit.⁷⁰ More recently, Stephan Witetschek has argued that Peter visited Corinth on his way to Rome, but must himself admit that he only shows that this possibility should not be excluded, and that it is understandable that later Christians developed such a tradition.⁷¹ Yet, I contend that First Corinthians does not indicate that Peter visited Corinth.

It is hard to draw any definite conclusions about Peter as an authoritative figure from this text. It is clear that Peter was in some way viewed as an important authoritative figure, just like Paul, Apollos, and Christ(!). We have concluded that this was not an authority connected to baptism, but the exact nature of the authority as such is not spelled out and can therefore not be satisfactorily discerned.

⁶⁸ Gerd Lüdemann, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel*, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 2:122, argues that a tension between Peter and Paul can still be detected in the text since a) Paul does not invoke his unity with Cephas and b) he acts as being attacked by Cephas.

⁶⁹ Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 44.

⁷⁰ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 57.

⁷¹ Stephan Witetschek, “Peter in Corinth? A Review of the Evidence from I Corinthians,” *JTS* 69 (2018): 66–82.

2.2.2 Cephias and his Wife (1 Cor 9:5)

The reference to Peter's wife in 1 Cor 9:5 is a significant indicator of Peter's significance as an authoritative figure, despite its brevity. Paul is defending his apostleship and his chosen way of life. He compares himself to the other apostles, specifically mentioning the brothers of the Lord and Cephias, who are married. Although we have discussed this reference in relation to the possibility that Peter visited Corinth, the purpose of the text is not to disclose such a visit.⁷² Paul argues that all the apostles except Barnabas and himself received support from their churches and had wives. While defending his position as an apostle, he at the same time distances himself from other established apostles through choosing to abstain from such privileges. Among the other apostles, he only mentions Cephias by name. This suggests that he had a more prominent position than the other apostles. In doing so he also portrays Cephias and the other apostles as the norm for apostleship, a norm he argues that he has freely chosen to defer from.

Paul makes clear that his choice of lifestyle has a higher purpose, for being free from all he can also be a servant to all, that he might win more (9:19). It is not far-fetched to suspect an embedded criticism of how Cephias and the apostolic establishment manage their business. Galatians makes clear that Paul dislikes how Peter and the Jerusalem apostles are influenced by Judaising forces. Whether it be "false brethren" (Gal 2:4) or "men from James" (Gal 2:12), these people influence not only the practical decisions, but also the theology of the Jerusalem apostles. Paul distinguishes himself from the Jerusalem apostles through contrasting their lifestyles. By doing so, he also implies that the other apostles, including Peter, are potentially corrupt. This subtle critique is not evident from First Corinthians itself, but read toward the background of the more or less contemporary Galatians, this subtle critique emerges as a plausible reading.

Although Paul defines himself through his difference from Peter and the other apostles, it is significant to note the apparent conception of Peter in Corinth. Peter and his married, waged lifestyle is normative. Peter's way of life is authoritative to the community, and Paul is an exception from the norm set by Peter.

2.2.3 Christ Appeared to Cephias (1 Cor 15:5)

In 1 Cor 15, Paul attempts to summarise the gospel that he preached to the Corinthians. He quotes some kind of early creed, where it is stated that Christ first

⁷² Such an interpretation would also imply that the brothers of the Lord visited Corinth with their wives.

appeared to Cephas.⁷³ This appearance is not recorded in the canonical Gospels, although allusions to this thought may be found in Luke 24:34 and Mark 16:7. Barrett contends that Paul is citing a formula that he had not made up himself, since Paul continues by saying that Christ appeared to the group of the twelve disciples, which is a pre-Pauline concept.⁷⁴ The verbs *παράδιδωμι* (pass on) and *παραλαμβάνω* (receive) clearly indicate that this concerns the passing on of earlier tradition.⁷⁵ Gordon D. Fee argues that Cephas was a “Pauline” way of referring to Peter, since the rest of the New Testament prefers calling him Peter.⁷⁶ However, this creates a problem for the contention that Paul here quotes a creed. Fee solves this problem by arguing that Paul may very well have felt free to substitute Peter with Cephas since this was his preferred way of referring to him. Although possible, this solution seems less likely, considering that Paul seems to have no objections toward occasionally referring to him as Peter in e.g. Gal 2:7–8. Apart from the problematic passage in Gal 2:7–8, Cephas is not only the “Pauline” way of referring to Peter, but the only way of referring to him known from the fifties. Regardless of its universality, Cephas was clearly the standard designation for Peter in the early Pauline mission, according to all available evidence.⁷⁷

If Paul is referring to an early creed, not much can be said of his view of Peter as an authoritative figure from this verse, since it is not essentially formulated by

⁷³ Conzelmann, *Korinther*, 303. Some have argued that this should not be viewed as a creed, cf. Klaus Wengst, “Der Apostel und die Tradition: Zur theologischen Bedeutung urchristlicher Formeln bei Paulus,” *ZTK* 69 (1972): 145–62; and Dieter Lührmann, “Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung: zur Geschichte der Paulinischen Tradition,” *ZTK* 67 (1970): 437–52. Some have also argued that the credo ends with verse 4 our after “he appeared” in v 5, thus excluding the reference to Cephas, with reference to Paul’s use of Cephas in the dative case. However, the majority regards the creed to last at least include v. 5 and continue to v. 7, see Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 1203.

⁷⁴ Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 341. Orr and Walther, *First Corinthians*, 321, note that it would actually be more accurate to speak of the eleven, but the twelve is such a strong concept that it is maintained, although the number as such is not accurate.

⁷⁵ “παραλαμβάνω,” BDAG, 767.

⁷⁶ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 729.

⁷⁷ Since First Peter is written from Peter, and not Cephas, despite in many ways being deutero-Pauline, the Pauline terminology must have shifted at some point. Gal 2:7–8 shows an awareness of the double name-options for referring to Peter early on. One possibility is that “Peter” became the standard designation following the composition of Mark’s Gospel and its successors. However, such hypothesising cannot go beyond mere speculation.

Paul himself.⁷⁸ However, the fact that Paul feels obliged to refer to Peter when summarising his gospel could indicate something of the importance Peter held even in early Pauline Christianity. Conzelmann regards this creed as being the historical reason for the status of Peter in the primitive church.⁷⁹ Conzelmann also argues that Peter founded the circle of the twelve, and that these two authoritative entities are legitimised by being the first ones to whom Christ appeared after his resurrection.⁸⁰ First Peter, and then the twelve. The word εἶτα refers only to time, and thus discusses chronology rather than rank. Still, Paul's reflections upon the creed indicate that he might interpret it in this way. Paul stresses that Christ also appeared to him (15:8) as the last in a list of significant Christ-followers. Paul uses this picture of him as the last real apostle to encounter the resurrected one to shape a picture of his own humility. The listing of appearances is used by Paul as a kind of ranking of the apostles, from Peter first to Paul last. Speaking against this would be the mentioning of Christ appearing to 500 at once. However, it fits nicely into Paul's rhetoric of authority "from below" present earlier in the letter. Just as he does not claim his rights as an apostle in ch. 9, here he presents himself as the least of apostles. And from this position he argues his value due to his own merits, rather than that he happened to be a follower of the earthly Jesus.

2.2.4 Conclusion: Peter in First Corinthians

In First Corinthians, Paul does not deal with Peter as a person, but rather uses the conception of Peter and his position in the church, which he contrasts with his own apostleship. First Corinthians makes clear that Peter was an important figure in the Jesus narrative also in Pauline Christianity. At the same time, Peter was a symbol for the Jerusalem establishment. Paul distances himself from the

⁷⁸ Adolf von Harnack, "Die Verklärungsgeschichte Jesu, der Bericht des Paulus (I. Kor. 15, 3ff.) und die beiden Christusvisionen des Petrus," *SPAW.PH* (1922): 62–80, argues that 15:5f and 15:7f refer to formulas seeking to legitimise Peter and James respectively. However, his thesis has not gained any greater following.

⁷⁹ Conzelmann, *Korinther*, 312.

⁸⁰ However, Günter Klein, *Die zwölf Apostel: Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee*, FRLANT 59 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), 113, argues that the entire concept of "the twelve was invented by Luke when writing Acts. So also Norbert Brox, *Zeuge und Märtyrer: Untersuchungen zur frühchristlichen Zeugnis-Terminologie*, SANT 5 (München: Kösel, 1961), 50–52. This passage challenges this thesis, since the concept of "the twelve" is included in a supposedly pre-Pauline creed. However, as noted by Walter Schmithals, *Das kirchliche Apostelamt: Eine historische Untersuchung*, FRLANT 61 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), 56–77, the concepts of "the twelve" and "apostle" appear to have been referring to overlapping, yet not synonymous, concepts at first, only to be merged by Luke.

established apostles and claims his independence. He argues that his independence makes him a more trustworthy witness to the authentic gospel since he minimises the risk of corruption by being dependent upon no one.

We find several examples of different types of authority in First Corinthians. The conflict in Corinth pertains to from whom *rational* authority is to be derived. The creedal formulations in 1 Cor 15 also suggest that Peter was viewed as a *traditional* authority in Corinth. Peter/Cephas obviously enjoys a great amount of *charismatic* authority and *embodies* cultural capital in Corinth, since his lifestyle is normative. The Corinthians wish to be in continuity with the leader with the greatest cultural capital in order to boost their own social capital as true Christ-believers. Paul argues to strengthen his own cultural capital through arguing for his *embodied* cultural capital. Just as in Galatians, Paul piggybacks on the status of Peter within his sphere of influence but presents himself as humbler and more genuine. He is not only the last apostle to whom Christ was revealed, but also one who does not accept the benefits of the apostolate.

Excursus A: Simon—Cephas—Peter

The use of a number of different names for the same person is by no means an unusual phenomenon in the New Testament. Saul/Paul, Silvanus/Silas, and Matthew/Levi are just a few well-known examples of this. The main character of this dissertation has three names: Simon, Cephas, and Peter. As we have noted above, Paul alternates between Κηφᾶς and Πέτρος in Galatians, which has led some scholars to conclude that Cephas and Peter were different persons.⁸¹ Since Paul consistently refers to Κηφᾶς with the exception of Gal 2:8, it has also been suggested that the change of names here is due to a quotation from an official document.⁸²

⁸¹ Bart Ehrman, "Cephas and Peter," *JBL* 109 (1990): 463–74. Ehrman's hypothesis is severely criticised by Dale C. Allison, "Peter and Cephas: One and the Same," *JBL* 111 (1992): 489–95. I choose to consider Peter and Cephas as referring to the same person, although it is not entirely self-evident. I have a hard time seeing why Paul would spend so much time discussing and meeting with the unknown Cephas or being angry with his behaviour at Antioch. If Cephas was, in fact, an important leader in the Jerusalem church, like James, we could expect him to be mentioned in Acts—but here we find only Peter. This is of course an argument from silence but considering the Pauline outlook of Acts it would be strange that the hypothetical Jerusalem leader which Paul discusses the most is not mentioned. If he was such a well-known and important person, people would expect some kind of reference to his position.

⁸² Cullmann, *Petrus*, 18, suggests that Paul is quoting from an official document from the Jerusalem council which reads Peter rather than Cephas. However, the grammar of v. 7, using first person singular cannot be part of such a non-adapted quotation. Apart from this, Hans Dieter Betz,

Another possibility is that Paul uses Cephas to underline the Jewishness of Peter in light of his conflict with Judaizers and Peter when referring to him as an orthodox Christian apostle.⁸³ Yet another option is to view Gal 2:7b–8 as a non-Pauline interpolation.⁸⁴ A further possibility could be that Κηφᾶς is a title that is used when Peter is referred to as leader of the Jerusalem apostles.⁸⁵ None of these suggestions solve the riddle of the shift between Cephas and Peter in Galatians in a satisfactory way, and the manuscripts that change Κηφᾶς into Πέτρος in Gal 1:18; 2:9, 11, 14 indicate that this problem was identified early on.⁸⁶

In order to credibly understand the shift between Cephas and Peter in Galatians, it is necessary to place the names of Peter in some kind of historical trajectory. The earliest New Testament texts that mention Peter are the Pauline epistles, which (apart from Gal 2:7–8) consistently call him Cephas. The latest text is Second Peter, in which he is called Simeon Peter (Συμεὼν Πέτρος; 2 Pet 1:1). All Synoptic Gospels mention that Jesus gives Simon the name Peter (Mark 3:16||Matt

Galatians, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1979), 97, regards the style of these two verses as typically Pauline. However, he does admit that it is possible that the terms of apostles of circumcision and uncircumcision, which are unique, may well reflect an underlying official statement.

⁸³ J. K. Elliott, “Κηφᾶς: Σίμων Πέτρος: ὁ Πέτρος: An Examination of New Testament Usage,” *NovT* 14 (1972): 241–56, suggests that Paul uses Cephas to stress the Jewishness of Peter. Karl Holl, *Der Kirchengriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde* (Berlin: Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1921), argues that Peter was the name of the missionary, while Cephas was the name of the apostle at Jerusalem. Yet others have argued that vv. 7–8 are influenced by Matt 16, see Ernst Barnikol, *Der Nichtpaulinische Ursprung des Parallelismus der Apostel Paulus und Petrus (Galater 2:7–8)*, NENTK 5 (Kiel: Walter Muhlau, 1931); and Erich Dinkler, “Der Brief an die Galater—zum Kommentar von Heinrich Schlier,” in *Signum Crucis: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament und zur Christlichen Archäologie* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1967), 270–82.

⁸⁴ William O. Walker, “Galatians 2:7b–8 as a Non-Pauline Interpolation,” *CBQ* 65 (2003): 568–87.

⁸⁵ This would explain why Paul still refers to him as Πέτρος in relation to his missionary activity. When Paul refers to Κηφᾶς he would thus be referring to Peter in the role of leader of the Jerusalem apostles. This interpretation could also explain some other peculiarities, such as 1 Cor 15:5, where the Lord first appeared to Κηφᾶς, and then to the twelve. The twelve were at this point eleven in number, since Judas was excluded, and apart from Peter, ten would seem to be a more accurate number. But if assuming “the twelve” to be a title or technical name of the group as such, the wording of this creed would make more sense, mentioning “the Cephas” and “the twelve” as important authoritative entities in early Christianity.

⁸⁶ This is especially remarkable since the same tendency editorial tendency cannot be found for First Corinthians. When choosing between Peter and Cephas in Galatians, it is probable that Peter was chosen by the scribes used because it was more widely spread in their time, see Stephen C. Carlson, *The Text of Galatians and Its History*, WUNT II/385 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015); 131; Guthrie, *Galatians*, 72; see also James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 298 n. 561.

16:16–18||Luke 6:14) but appear to know nothing of the name Cephas. The only clear disambiguation of the terms is found in John 1:42, which states that Jesus gave Simon the name Cephas which means Peter. It is possible that this disambiguation was added at a late stage in the redaction of the Gospel in order to reconcile Pauline and Synoptic ways of referring to Peter and bring order in the midst of onomatological confusion.

Since Cephas is the Aramaic counterpart to Peter, it is natural to assume it was under this name that he was first known among the Christ-believers. There is no evidence of anyone having the name Πέτρος in pre-Christian times, neither in Greek, nor in Aramaic (ܩܦܫܐ), and the name can therefore be considered something of a Christian invention where the meaning of the name (rock) was of special significance.⁸⁷ Also the possible creedal reference to Cephas in 1 Cor 15:5 supports the idea that Peter was first known under this name. Yet, the reference to Peter in Gal 2:7–8 suggests that it had become increasingly popular to translate Cephas into Peter by the fifties. With the spread of the Jesus-movement to groups not familiar with the Aramaic language, a translation into Greek was a way of maintaining the stable and credible connotations of the name of one of the most prominent early Christian leaders.⁸⁸ It is possible that Paul wants to underline the stability of Peter's judgment in Gal 2:7–8 by supplying the Greek translation of his name, but this cannot be proven. Despite being the first known author to use the translation Πέτρος, it is unlikely that this translation was popularised by Paul, since he primarily refers to him as Cephas. On the other hand, it is possible that the Gospel writers pick up this translation as they construct their accounts of Jesus' ministry in which Peter plays a significant role.

Regardless of its origin, the Greek translation "Peter" quickly gains popularity and replaces Cephas by the time that the Gospels were written.⁸⁹ However, this change in terminology does cause some confusion as the Pauline epistles begin circulating. This might be the background for John's disambiguation of the terms

⁸⁷ J. C. Fenton, *Saint Matthew* (London: SCM, 1977), 268. However, other names derived from πέτρος and πέτρα have been attested according to Chrys C. Caragounis, *Peter and the Rock*, BZNTW 58 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 17–25, but the name Πέτρος as such can only be found after the introduction of Christianity.

⁸⁸ The fact that Paul uses Cephas rather than Peter despite claiming to be the "apostle to the gentiles" indicates how widespread and significant the name of Cephas had been in the first Christian decades.

⁸⁹ If we imagine that the Jesus-movement began in the thirties, Galatians was written in the fifties and Mark around 70, this means that Galatians and First Corinthians were written even temporally quite in the middle between Cephas and Peter being the self-evident terms for referring to Peter.

(John 1:42). We may also note that First Clement uses both Cephas and Peter (1 Clem 5:4; 47:3). It is also significant to point out that with the shift from Cephas to Peter in the Gospels comes also the idea that his original name was Simon.⁹⁰ By the time that Luke writes, the tradition that the Lord has appeared to Cephas (1 Cor 15:5) is modified so that he has appeared to Simon (Luke 24:34).⁹¹ The idea that Peter was originally called Simon is introduced already in Mark (1:36) and appears to have been widespread in early Christianity. With the translation of Cephas to Peter, the name Simon seems to have gained importance, together with the narrative of Simon having his name changed into Peter by Jesus himself.

2.3 Peter in Acts

Peter is indisputably one of the main characters in the book of Acts. He is the central leader of Christianity in the first half of the book, and thus sets the agenda that continues throughout the text.⁹² Most scholars agree that Luke and Acts are written by the same author.⁹³ The geographical origin of Luke-Acts is an unresolved issue, as well as the identity of the author of the work.⁹⁴ Antioch,⁹⁵ Caesarea⁹⁶

⁹⁰ The original source for this is Mark's Gospel, which has in turn (if the proposed relationship between the canonical Gospels in the next chapter is correct) influenced the other Gospels.

⁹¹ It was evidently a popular thought among early Christians that Simon was one of the two disciples going to Emmaus, cf. Rupert Annand, "He Was Seen of Cephas: A Suggestion about the First Resurrection Appearance to Peter," *SJT* 11 (1958): 180–87.

⁹² Parts of Acts have at times been viewed as derived from various Petrine sources, see Wilhelm Soltau, "Petrusaneddoten und Petruslegenden in der Apostelgeschichte," in *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. C. Bezold (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1906), 2:805–15.

⁹³ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, AB 31 (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1998), 49; Johannes Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles*, AB 31 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967), xlvi. The nature of the literary relationship between Luke and Acts is, however, debated, see Andrew F. Gregory and Kavin Rowe (eds.), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2010). The single authorship has also been challenged by Patricia Walters, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*, SNTSMS 145 (Cambridge: University Press, 2009), but her thesis has not yet gained any greater following.

⁹⁴ On suggestions from the early Church, see Alfred Wikenhauser, "Die altkirchliche Überlieferung über die Abfassungszeit der Apostelgeschichte," *BZ* 23 (1935/36): 365–71.

⁹⁵ August Strobel, "Lukas der Antiochener," *ZNW* 49 (1958): 131–34.

⁹⁶ Hans Klein, "Zur Frage nach dem Abfassungsort der Lukasschriften," *EvTh* 32 (1972): 467–77.

Macedonia,⁹⁷ and Rome⁹⁸ are common suggested origins of the work, but certain conclusions cannot be drawn.⁹⁹

The dating of Acts is much disputed as well. It is sometimes argued that Acts would have ended differently if the author had access to more information, thereby indicating an early date.¹⁰⁰ However, this argument cannot be sustained.¹⁰¹ It is more probable that Acts ends as it does for literary reasons.¹⁰² Since the late 19th century, it has been suggested that Luke-Acts is in fact dependent on Josephus.¹⁰³ This view has been revived in recent years by e.g. Steve Mason and Richard

⁹⁷ Etienne Trocmé, *Le "livre des actes" et l'histoire* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1957), 74–75.

⁹⁸ Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 2.22.7.

⁹⁹ An Ephesian origin is suggested by Richard I. Pervo, "The Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Letters: Aspects of Luke as an Interpreter of the *Corpus Paulinum*," in *Reception of Paulinism in Acts*, ed. D. Marguerat, BETL 229 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 141–55.

¹⁰⁰ The main arguments for an early (mid-sixties) dating are: 1. Paul's death is not mentioned. Paul's house arrest is the last information available to the author. 2. The tone of the text is positive and full of joy—would this really be the case if one was aware of the martyrdom of Paul? 3. The lack of reference to the destruction of the temple in 70 CE is strange. 4. The lack of knowledge of the Pauline epistles and lack of harmonisation with these might also speak for a date before the Pauline corpus was collected. (As for the last of these arguments, I argue that Acts actually tries to straighten out some problems that he finds in the Pauline epistles). An early dating is argued by e.g. Charles Cutler Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts*, HTS 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916); A. J. Mattill, Jr., "The Date and Purpose of Luke-Acts: Rackham Reconsidered," *CBQ* 40 (1978): 335–50; Colin J. Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*, WUNT 1/49 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989).

¹⁰¹ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 52. Fitzmyer compares the early view with the discussion about the Markan ending, where very few would argue that Mark ends in 16:9 due to the fact that the author knew nothing more. G. W. Trompf, "On Why Luke Declined to Recount the Death of Paul: Acts 27–28 and Beyond," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talberg (New York, NY: Crossroad, 1984), 225–39 also discusses the issue. For further argument for an early dating, cf. John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1975), 86–117.

¹⁰² W. A. Strange, *The Problem of the Text of Acts*. SNTSMS 71 (Cambridge: University Press, 1992), has suggested that Acts was published posthumously by different editors, thus explaining the two dominant textual traditions as two editions of the published text. This is an interesting suggestion that could explain some central text-critical issues. But even in these "edited" editions, the story would end as it ends, and the text we have at our disposal thus must be treated as intentionally ending where it ends

¹⁰³ Max Krenkel, *Josephus und Lucas: Der schriftstellerische Einfluss des jüdischen Geschichtschreibers auf den Christlichen* (Leipzig: Haessel, 1894); J. E. Belsler, "Lukas und Josephus," *TQ* 77 (1895): 634–62; F. Crawford Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907), 108; Heinrich Koch, *Die Abfassungszeit des lukanischen Geschichtswerkes: Eine historisch-kritische und exegetische Untersuchung* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1911), 35–36; Hans Wendt, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, KEK 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), 42–43.

Pervo.¹⁰⁴ Others have suggested that Luke-Acts uses First Clement,¹⁰⁵ and even that Luke-Acts is a response to Marcionism.¹⁰⁶ An increasing number of scholars are now accepting an early second-century dating for Luke-Acts.¹⁰⁷ It is unlikely that Acts would have been written after Marcion, and thus a dating between Josephus and Marcion, i.e. ca 100–130 C.E. is to be preferred.¹⁰⁸ Knut Backhaus concludes that a dating in 100–130 C.E. is most tenable of the alternatives available.¹⁰⁹ The consensus dating in the 80s, which has been dominant since the 1950s, is a compromise between an early and a late dating with no actual evidence in its favour. This intermediate dating seeks to make justice to Luke's recognition of other attempts at recounting the events of the life of Jesus (Acts 1:1), and makes it possible for Acts to have been written after Luke's Gospel, which is dependent on Mark.¹¹⁰ It was originally proposed by Adolf von Harnack, who dated Luke-Acts to 78–93 C.E.¹¹¹ However, Harnack revised his position in favour of an early dating in the sixties only a few years later.¹¹² Although the dating of Luke-Acts is not an

¹⁰⁴ Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003); Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006).

¹⁰⁵ See H. Benedict Green, "Matthew, Clement and Luke: Their Sequence and Relationship," *JTS* 40 (1989): 1–25.

¹⁰⁶ See Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts. A Defining Struggle* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006). However, although Luke-Acts admittedly treats features relevant for refuting Marcionism, these ideas were not necessarily invented by Marcion, although he is most known for advancing them.

¹⁰⁷ See John R. Townsend, "The Date of Luke-Acts," in *Luke Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (New York, NY: Crossroad, 1984); Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*, WUNT II/169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001); Pervo, *Dating Acts*; Justin R. Howell, *The Pharisees and Figured Speech in Luke-Acts*, WUNT II/456 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 77–81; Knut Backhaus, "Zur Datierung der Apostelgeschichte: Ein Ordnungsversuch im Chronologischen Chaos," *ZNW* 108 (2017): 212–58.

¹⁰⁸ See discussion in Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 24–26.

¹⁰⁹ Backhaus, "Datierung."

¹¹⁰ See Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1987), xxxiii; Martin Hengel 1979, 66; Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, KEK 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 86; Rudolf Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte, vol 1*, EKKNT (Zürich: Benziger, 1986), 28; Gerhard Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte, 1. Teil*, HTKNT (Freiburg: Herder, 1980), 118–21.

¹¹¹ Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897), 2.1:250.

¹¹² Adolf von Harnack, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament. III. Die Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908), 217–21; idem., *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament. IV. Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte und zur Abfassungszeit der synoptischen Evangelien* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911), 63–87.

issue that is easily settled, I agree with Backhaus that a dating in the early second century is most tenable.

The relationship between Paul and Acts is a significant, yet complex, issue. Although the author of Luke-Acts is often identified as a Pauline associate, the texts themselves make no such identification.¹¹³ Since Paul is a significant figure in Acts, it is highly unlikely that the author of Acts would not have known of a collection of Pauline epistles—especially if he was writing in the early second century.¹¹⁴ The differences between Acts and the Pauline epistles should not be harmonised, but rather Acts should be read toward the backdrop of the (probably more historically accurate) Pauline epistles in order to see how Acts reshapes the Pauline traditions and narratives that he might address issues in his sphere of influence.¹¹⁵ What is particularly significant to this study is the central role held by Peter in the first half of Acts.

2.3.1 The Choice of a New 12th Apostle (Acts 1:11–26)

In this introductory scene of Luke's post-Jesus account of the early Christian movement, Peter emerges as the given leader of the group. The same group that took farewell of Jesus at the Mount of Olives is gathered in prayer. This prayer gathering lasts several days (v. 15). At one point, Peter speaks up about the necessity of filling Judas' place in the group of the twelve. Peter states that it is necessary that this person has the same experience and first-hand knowledge of Jesus as the other disciples. Thus, Judas' successor must have followed Jesus from his baptism until his ascension. Only two people apart from the original twelve meet these

¹¹³ A certain Luke is mentioned in Phlm 24, but also in Col 4:14 and 2 Tim 4:11. It is also quite common to see parallels between the Pastoral letters and Luke-Acts, leading some to suggest that they share the same author, see C. F. D. Moule, "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal," *BJRL* 47 (1965): 430–52; August Strobel, "Schreiben des Lukas? Zum sprachlichen Problem der Pastoralbriefe," *NTS* 15 (1969): 191–210; Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles* (London: SPCK, 1979). Although it is quite possible that Luke evolved as a mythologically significant Pauline associate in deutero-Pauline Christianity, it is more likely that the reason for the similarities between the Pastorals and Luke-Acts is the post-Apostolic situation.

¹¹⁴ Burkitt, *Gospel History*, 110–11, argues that Luke-Acts must be the genuine records of a fellow-traveller of Paul, but there are numerous other ways of accounting for the so-called we-source.

¹¹⁵ See discussion in Pervo, "Paul of Acts." Dependence on the Pauline epistles is also argued by Lars Aejmelaeus, *Die Rezeption der Paulusbriefe in der Miletrede (Apg 20:18–35)*, AASF 232 (Helsinki: Soumalainen tiedeakatemia, 1987); idem., "The Pauline Letters as Source Material in Luke-Acts," in *The Early Reception of Paul*, ed. K. Liljeström, SESJ 99 (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2011), 54–79; Steve Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians*, SNTSMS 108 (Cambridge: University Press, 2000); Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 51–148.

qualifications, one of them being Matthias. After praying, the lot is cast in favour of Matthias, who is added to the eleven so that they once again are a group of twelve apostles.¹¹⁶

Peter is the person that “gets things done” in the post-ascension but pre-Pentecost situation. He is the leader not only of the apostles, but of the whole group of Christ-believers in Jerusalem.¹¹⁷ By taking action, he shows that the mission somehow will continue. Peter’s style of leadership is different from what is found in the Pauline epistles. The whole group of people, including both men and women, apostles and other followers, are engaged in finding people in the group that might fit the prerequisites set up by Peter. These prerequisites indicate the criteria of apostleship in Luke-Acts. In order to be an apostle, one must have first-hand knowledge of Jesus’ life from his baptism to his ascension. From this point of departure, the mission of the apostles is then to be “witnesses of the resurrection” (v. 22).¹¹⁸ Weiser concludes that the twelve in Luke’s account become “Garanten, die durch den Dienst ihres Zeugnisses die Brücke von Jesus zur Kirche bilden.”¹¹⁹ Such a definition of apostleship would rule out Paul from apostleship.¹²⁰ Although Paul claims to have encountered the risen Christ, he cannot claim being a first-hand witness of the earthly Jesus.¹²¹

Richard Pervo notes that the author leaves many questions unanswered in this text: Why is Peter the leader? Why is a twelfth apostle needed? Why did not Jesus

¹¹⁶ One might speculate whether the author of Acts, apart from the symbolic significance of having twelve apostles, wished to legitimate the legacy of a certain Matthias. This could in that case be an indication of the origin of the text. However, Matthias plays no further role in the text, and the main purpose of his inclusion is thus probably the fulfilment of the number twelve.

¹¹⁷ Bo Reicke, *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde: Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1–7*, ATANT 32 (Zürich: Zwingli, 1957), 22.

¹¹⁸ See discussion in Gerhard Schneider, *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk*, BBB 59 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1985), 61–85.

¹¹⁹ Alfons Weiser, “Die Nachwahl des Matthias (Apg 1, 15–26). Zur Rezeption und Deutung urchristlicher Geschichte durch Lukas,” in *Zur Geschichte des Urchristentums*, ed. G. Dautzenberg, H. Merklein, and K. Müller (Freiburg: Herder, 1979), 97–110. English translation: “Guarantees through the ministry of their testimonies that create the bridge from Jesus to the Church.” The same view is also supported by Charles Kingsley Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994–1998), 1:95.

¹²⁰ Barrett, *Acts*, 1:95, argues that “Luke may be concerned not to attack Paul (in light of the book as a whole this is inconceivable) but Paulinists who regarded him as the only apostle.”

¹²¹ Klein, *Zwölf Apostel*, 210–16, develops this thought and claims that Luke, while maintaining the important and formative role of Paul, defines the apostolic office in such a way that it excludes Paul, and only includes the 12 who had witnessed Jesus’ ministry.

choose one himself before his ascension?¹²² By leaving these questions unanswered, the author brings attention to the nature of apostleship, as it is explained in 1:21–22. Pervo argues that apostleship in Acts centres on, but cannot be reduced to, witnessing of the resurrection.¹²³ A popular conception throughout the years has been to view the choice of Matthias as wrong; they should really have waited for Paul.¹²⁴ However, there is no such indication in the text, and the criteria put forth in Acts clearly do not fit Paul.¹²⁵ Peter, on the other hand, not only emerges as a leader of the early Christian community, but also functions as someone who passes on tradition, through the retrospective summary with which he starts his speech. At the same time, Peter's leadership is not purely human. Luke shows that God works through the leadership of Peter and the apostles.¹²⁶

2.3.2 Peter's Sermon at Pentecost (Acts 2:14–41)

The introduction of Peter in this passage is very similar to the previous one. 1:15 states that Peter *ἀναστὰς* (rose up), and here Peter *σταθείς* (stood). However, this time he does not step up alone, but together with the other eleven constituting the group of “the twelve.”¹²⁷ The following sermon follows closely the apostolic program set up by Peter (Acts 1:22–23) by telling the story of the life and death of Jesus, and then, together with the twelve, claiming to be a witness of his resurrection (Acts 2:32). The collectiveness of “the twelve” in the sermon is significant. Peter is the spokesman of twelve, but after the sermon people approach Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀποστόλους (Peter and the rest of the apostles; 2:37). Yet, it is Peter alone who answers the people's question. He also continues to witness to the people (v. 40).

¹²² Pervo, *Acts*, 48.

¹²³ Pervo, *Acts*, 49.

¹²⁴ See Frederick Fyvie Bruce, *The Book of Acts*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988), 47–48.

¹²⁵ Bruce, *Acts*, 48, argues that Paul himself would have dismissed the idea that he was the twelfth apostle, on equal standing with Peter and the others. It is speculative to discuss what Paul's opinion would have been about a text written after his death, but as we have seen earlier in this study, he does argue for an equal standing as the Jerusalem apostles, while at the same time distinguishing himself from them. Paul's conception of his own apostleship in relation to the original apostles is ambivalent, as it claims equality, superiority, and inferiority all at once.

¹²⁶ See Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, “Die Zuwahl des Matthias (Apg 1,15 ff),” *ST* 15 (1961): 35–67.

¹²⁷ It should be noted that D reads that Peter stood up with the ten apostles, thus not including Matthias that was chosen shortly before. On the other hand, D together with some other witnesses also adds a *πρῶτος*, which could be viewed as further increasing Peter's prominence (cf. discussion on Matt 10:2).

Peter emerges as the leading figure together with the rest of “the twelve.” The apostolic ministry concerns retelling the Jesus-tradition and giving testimony to the resurrection. In the following section 2:42–47, Peter is not explicitly mentioned, but it is said that the group of believers devoted themselves to ἡ διδασχῆ τῶν ἀποστόλων (the teaching of the apostles; 2:42). This portrays the twelve apostles as transmitters of the traditions concerning the life and teachings of Jesus. Fitzmyer argues that the διδασχῆ here must be more than the κήρυγμα concerning the death, resurrection, and significance of Christ witnessed in Peter’s sermon.¹²⁸ Rather, this could refer to “what the church of Luke’s own day was teaching.” Peter’s role is that of a spokesman and initiator. Apart from this the twelve seem to be of equal rank.

2.3.3 Peter Heals a Lame Beggar and its Consequences (Acts 3–4)

Just as in the previous stories, Peter is not alone, but is joined, this time by John. Peter is the spokesperson whereas John plays a rather passive role. Although they are approached together by the beggar, it is Peter that speaks to and heals him. When approached by the crowd, Peter once again recounts the Jesus story, focusing on his death, and explaining how Jesus is the fulfilment of the messianic promises.

When the temple authorities arrive, they are upset that Peter and John καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν (are proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection from the dead; 4:2). This is not the exact equivalent of the apostolic witness in Acts 1:22. However, it could be viewed as either a misunderstanding or a pretext from the authorities to stop Peter’s teaching. In his defence before the Sanhedrin it is clear that Peter’s emphasis is not on the resurrection of the dead, but on the resurrection of Jesus (4:10).¹²⁹ Peter is described as being filled with the Spirit (4:8), which places this speech in continuity with his speech at Pentecost.

This passage also contains the Sanhedrin’s impression of Peter and John. The Sanhedrin is amazed at their boldness, especially as they are ἀγράμματοί και ἰδιῶται (uneducated and common; 4:13). Both these designations point at their lack of education.¹³⁰ Still, the Sanhedrin has nothing to say in opposition. Hereby, Acts shows that the testimony about Jesus is more valuable than education. The

¹²⁸ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 270.

¹²⁹ Barrett, *Acts*, 1:226, notes that Peter alone speaks in 4:8, and John temporarily disappears from the story. He argues that the original tradition which Luke draws from only was about Peter, and John is a figure added by Luke (who apparently did not proofread his text well enough).

¹³⁰ BDAG, s.v. ἀγράμματος; Heinrich Schlier, “ιδιώτης,” TDNT 3:215–17.

Sanhedrin forbids them to φηγγεσθαι μηδὲ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (speak and teach in the name of Jesus; 4:18). Acts underlines that it is the teaching and proclamation of Jesus that makes the apostolic mission successful. Peter and the apostles are in themselves uneducated men, but the teaching about Jesus is so powerful that the authorities want them to quit. Peter and John answer the Sanhedrin by once again referring to the apostolic mission in Acts 1: οὐ δύναμεθα γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἄ εἶδαμεν καὶ ἡκούσαμεν μὴ λαλεῖν (we cannot keep from speaking what we have seen and heard; 4:20). Hereby, the apostolic enterprise is further emphasised. Peter is portrayed as speaking about Jesus in the power of the holy Spirit, in such a way that the learned of his day were speechless.

2.3.4 Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 4:36–5:11)

This story has a harsher tone than the idyllic picture of the early church in the first chapters of the Acts.¹³¹ The generous Barnabas is contrasted with the wicked Ananias and Sapphira in a manner that carries undertones from stories in the Hebrew Bible.¹³² In this narrative, a new Peter-image emerges.¹³³ Nothing is said concerning the story about Jesus and the resurrection. The purpose is instead to create φόβος (fear) in the church (cf. Luke 5:5, 11).

Just as in the earlier passages, Peter is portrayed as exercising a leading position together with the other apostles (5:2) but he is the only active apostolic character in the story. Peter's divine insight has increased remarkably since the first chapter. Now there is no need for church hearings and lot casting—God has revealed to Peter the fraud of Ananias and Sapphira. Peter's strong conclusion concerning Ananias' actions, that he had οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ (lied not only to men, but to God; 5:4), implies that lying to the apostles is the equivalent of lying

¹³¹ Barrett, *Acts*, 1:262, argues that this story fits badly into its literary context. One minute everyone is expected to put all their money before the apostle's feet, and the next minute Peter claims that this was voluntary—and yet they lied. Barrett suggests that the selling of all possessions might be required to assume leadership positions in the church. However, such speculation cannot be answered from the text itself and must therefore be set aside. It is more fruitful to study the purposes Luke might have had for including this story here.

¹³² Munck, *Acts*, 40, sees here a clear reference to the story about Achan in Joshua 7, whereas Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 319 also lists Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10) and Abijah (1 Kings 14), and Adam and Eve (Gen 1) as relevant parallels.

¹³³ For a summary of suggested interpretations of the passage, cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 318–20.

to God.¹³⁴ The twelve, headed by Peter, have divinely given authority.¹³⁵ They can both acquire knowledge from God and pronounce God's judgment on humans. Gottfried Schille argues that this story is originally a "reinen Petrus-tradition" (i.e. a tradition about Peter which has circulated independently) in which Peter is portrayed as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ (divine man).¹³⁶ Roloff contends that this is not the case, since Peter does not say "you have lied to *me*". Thus, this is not a portrayal of Peter as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ, but rather an example of "die Fähigkeit des Charismatikers."¹³⁷ I think Roloff is essentially correct. Peter makes no claims to be a θεῖος ἀνὴρ, and it does not fit Luke's picture of Peter as a whole. However, this episode clearly depicts the apostle Peter as being empowered by the Spirit in such a way that he possesses special spiritual abilities. Still, Roloff is not accurate in his argumentation, since Peter actually says that Ananias has lied to him personally when saying οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ, although Peter is not the only person he has lied to.¹³⁸

The most significant contribution of this story to the Peter-image of Acts is the shift of perspective. Apostolic authority moves from preserving and teaching the Jesus tradition and proclaiming the kingdom through miracles to the exercise of church discipline. Peter and the apostles are no longer solely transmitters of the message about Jesus, but also God's tools for discipline in the church.¹³⁹

2.3.5 Peter's Miraculous Shadow (Acts 5:12–16)

The pattern from the earlier passages in Acts is quickly detected also here. The apostles teach and perform miracles, but Peter is the outstanding superstar of the

¹³⁴ Yet, Conzelmann, *Acts*, 48, makes the point that Peter does not pass any judgment or suggest any punishment—this is left to God himself.

¹³⁵ Contra Bruce, *Acts*, 104, who argues that Luke was not interested in Peter, Ananias and Sapphira as persons, but only the fact that the holy Spirit was working in the early church. However, in view of the role Luke ascribes to Peter in the rest of his narrative, this must be seen as a simplification. Bruce may be right that this is the author's main objective here, but the portrait of Peter is not insignificant to Luke—it constructs the framework for the theology and view of history that he wishes to convey.

¹³⁶ Gottfried Schille, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, HKNT (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1983), 148. For more on the concept of θεῖος ἀνὴρ, see Ludwig Bieler, *ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ: Das Bild des "göttlichen Menschen" in Spätantike und Frühchristentum*. (Wien: Höfel, 1935).

¹³⁷ Jürgen Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, NTD 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 94.

¹³⁸ Although the literal translation of the phrase is "you have not lied to men, but to God" it is natural to understand it as meaning "you have not lied *only* to men, but also to God," since it is quite obvious that they have indeed lied to men, see Robert F. O'Toole, "You did not Lie to Us (Human Beings) but to God," *Biblica* 76 (1995): 182–209 (190). (It is unfortunate that the title of this article does not reflect the understanding of this formulation that is expressed on p. 190).

¹³⁹ It should also be noted that this is the first text in Acts where the ἐκκλησία is mentioned.

movement. The focus of the apostolic ministry is now on miracles. People from the surroundings come to be healed and are laid on the streets so that at least Peter's shadow might fall upon them, although the healings are reported to have been performed by the hands of the apostles (5:12).

In one way, this passage could be seen as a continuation of the apostolic role as exercised in the previous verses. The apostolic ministry is no longer focused on teaching, but rather on the miraculous divine authority given to the apostles (thus making relevant again the discussion on *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* above). The apostles not only pronounce immediate judgment, but also perform healings. The Peter-image of the previous narrative is continued. Whereas the beginning of Acts 5 points out how Peter's apostolic authority can be used to punish, the latter part focuses on how it can be used to heal the sick and proclaim the gospel through these actions. The authority of Peter and the apostles increases as the "divine connection" between them and God increases.

2.3.6 Peter Before the Sanhedrin Again (Acts 5:17–42)

In this story, the theme of the apostles as transmitters of the Jesus tradition and witnesses of the resurrection is combined with the miraculous lifestyle set out at the beginning of the chapter. When imprisoned due to their miracle gatherings in the temple, an angel releases them and tells them *πορεύεσθε καὶ σταθέντες λαλεῖτε ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ λαῷ πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης* (go and stand in the temple and speak to them everything concerning this word of life; Acts 5:20). Here they are told to stand (*ἵστημι*) in the temple and preach, which once again could be a reminder of the preaching at Pentecost, where Peter stands in the same way.¹⁴⁰

The apostles are once again collected to the Sanhedrin and accused of preaching in the name of Jesus, despite the Sanhedrin's forbidding them to do so (5:28), and thus filling Jerusalem with their *διδασχῆ*. In this account, Peter does not act as the sole spokesman for the apostles: *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι* (Peter and the apostles answered; 5:29).¹⁴¹ Peter could still be interpreted as the spokesperson of the apostles, but the use of the plural indicates that all apostles are implied. The answer consists of a testimony of Jesus and his resurrection (5:30–32), something that is also resumed by all the apostles following their beating (5:42).

¹⁴⁰ Barrett, *Acts*, 1:284.

¹⁴¹ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 331–32, argues that 5:29–32 is a typical Petrine speech, resembling that in 4:8–12. While this is true, Luke still chooses to attribute this speech not to Peter alone, but to "Peter and the apostles." Thus, in order to discern the view of Peter in Acts, we must treat the speech as the author seems to wish to convey it.

The apostles argue that it is necessary to obey God more than men and thereby view their activities as part of fulfilling a divine commandment.

The special mentioning of Peter apart from the apostles (5:29) is significant. It indicates that Peter is not simply the one of the apostles who is responsible for being the spokesperson of the group, but there is something peculiar about him that distinguishes him from the other apostles. The reason for this, however, is not clear in this text.

2.3.7 The Visit to Samaria (Acts 8:14–25)

When the apostles hear that the “word of God” has been received in Samaria, they work as a collegium and decide to send Peter and John to check it out. The apostles are the carriers of God’s power, and the new converts do not receive the Holy Spirit until the apostles lay their hands on them. Thus, Acts gives the impression that the apostles have a monopoly on the Holy Spirit.¹⁴² The apostles, including Peter, are significant authoritative figures, as the spread of the gift of the Holy Spirit is dependent on their actions.

In this text, the apostles meet Simon, who offers them money to give him the power that whoever he lays his hands on will receive the Holy Spirit (8:19). Peter responds to Simon and refutes him as being evil. Here, as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, Peter has a divine ability of discerning the motives and evil thoughts of other believers. Simon had come to faith through the miracle ministry of Philip (8:13), but, being a magician, is portrayed as having been more interested in the miracles following the apostles, than in their teaching about Jesus. After having transmitted the Holy Spirit to the believers at Samaria and refuted Simon, Peter and John witness (supposedly of the resurrection) and teach in many Samaritan villages, thus fulfilling their original apostolic mission.

2.3.8 Peter Visits Galilee (Acts 9:32–43)

In this text the context has changed significantly since the introduction of the apostolic mission in Acts. Luke has just accounted for Paul’s conversion, but still wants to portray Peter as the initiator of the gentile mission. For the first time in Acts, Peter is not accompanied by any of the other apostles but acts on his own. The story contains two miracle accounts but does not expand the Peter-image in any other way than the notion of Peter travelling around and visiting Christ-

¹⁴² Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 400, suggests that Luke teaches that the gift of the Spirit comes only through the apostles, or, in time, through those sent forth by them (cf. 10:44–48; 18:25–27; 19:2–6; 20:29–30).

believing communities. This tour of the newly founded churches outside Jerusalem sets the backdrop for the coming event of gentile conversion.¹⁴³

2.3.9 Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10:1–11:18)

Peter's meeting with Cornelius is one of the most significant accounts of Peter as an authoritative figure in Acts, as well as a programmatic theological discourse, setting the scene for the rest of the book, which focuses almost exclusively on the gentile mission.¹⁴⁴ It is reasonable to view this turning point in the story as a theological issue of major importance to Luke. Due to the rich content of this discourse, we must divide it into six smaller units, in order to analyse it in a detailed and clear manner.

The first unit contains Cornelius' vision (Acts 10:1–8). Luke makes clear that the initiation of the gentile mission occurs on God's command, and not through human initiative. Cornelius is reported to be a Godfearer, sympathetic toward Judaism and the Jewish people. Still, God does not consider this enough, but says that his prayers will be answered through a certain Simon called Peter. It is uncertain why Acts suddenly calls him Simon, after consistently using only Peter (Simon is used in the beginning of Luke's Gospel but after Luke 6:14 and in Acts until now, Peter alone has been his designation). Fitzmyer argues that Luke does this in order to emphasise that Peter was not someone who was known to Cornelius.¹⁴⁵ Another suggestion would be that Peter was also known under his original name in the region of his origin, and a tradition stemming from there might thus call him Simon Peter. Apart from Peter's name and the notion that he was probably not known to Cornelius, we do not acquire much information about Peter here.

The second unit contains Peter's vision (Acts 10:9–22). This text concerning Peter's vision is the core of the chapter. It lays the foundation for Peter's argumentation at the Jerusalem council in Acts 15 and thus for the Pauline mission which occupies most of the remaining chapters in Acts. The starting point for this episode is related to Peter's physical condition—he was hungry. Fitzmyer argues that this hunger symbolises Peter's spiritual status, whereas Jervell makes a connection

¹⁴³ Pervo, *Acts*, 252, notes that Peter (this time without John) is once again inspecting the results of Philip's missionary activities.

¹⁴⁴ Pervo, *Acts*, 264, notes that this is the longest story in Acts (10:1–11:18), containing 66 verses, and is rivalled only by Paul's journey to Rome which is 60 verses.

¹⁴⁵ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 451.

between ecstatic experiences and fasting.¹⁴⁶ In any case, the content of the vision comes across as relevant for the hungry apostle. There have been many suggestions as to the assortment of species in the vision.¹⁴⁷ The most reasonable interpretation seems to be that there would be both clean and unclean animals available in the descended sheet.¹⁴⁸ The main point of the vision is expressed in 10:15: ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν, σὺ μὴ κοίνου (what God has made clean, you should not regard as defiled). This does not pertain primarily to food (we do not get to know whether Peter gives in and kills an animal or two, and the dietary restrictions seem to continue to be in force even in Acts, cf. Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25), but is primarily a preparation for the Gentile mission that Peter will initiate at Cornelius' house.

It is evident that the meaning of the vision is not ambiguous to Peter, as he is described as perplexed (10:17). The arrival of the men from Cornelius is clearly connected to the meaning of the vision (10:20–22). Peter also uses the vision for arguing in favour of the gentile mission later in Acts (cf. Acts 11:1–18; 15:7–11). The Spirit tells Peter to accompany the men from Cornelius while he is reflecting upon the vision (10:19–20). The presentation of the double visions of Cornelius and Peter as such also indicates that they deal with the same issue—namely the initiation of the gentile mission. The men from Cornelius are invited in to spend the night. Considering the physical state of the apostle, it is reasonable to suppose that they dined together.

The third unit contains the account of when Peter and Cornelius meet (Acts 10:23–33). Peter does not follow the men from Cornelius alone, but is joined by some brethren (10:23), who could later bear witness of this extraordinary event. Cornelius prostrates himself at Peter's arrival, which indicates that he viewed Peter as some kind of heavenly being (10:25).¹⁴⁹ Peter corrects Cornelius in this regard and underlines his own humanity (10:26).

Peter presents his interpretation of the vision, namely that no humans should be called common or unclean (10:28). It should be noted that fellowship between Jews and gentiles was not forbidden as such, although it made the Jews ritually impure.¹⁵⁰ Cornelius then recounts his vision to Peter and the others gathered and expresses his delight in Peter's arrival.

¹⁴⁶ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 454; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 305.

¹⁴⁷ John R. L. Moxon, *Peter's Halakhic Nightmare*, WUNT II/432 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 70–73, gives a good summary of this discussion.

¹⁴⁸ Thus Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 305, who also notes that there seems to be a reference to all animals and birds in the creation, cf. Gen 1:24, 28, 30; 6:20; Rom 1:23.

¹⁴⁹ Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 308.

¹⁵⁰ Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 308, n. 159; Moxon, *Peter's Halakhic Nightmare*, 66.

The fourth unit contains Peter's sermon (Acts 10:34–43). Peter starts by summarising his reflections upon the two visions that have been presented to the people: God is not *προσωπολημψία* (biased).¹⁵¹ This reflects the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew **אֵל אֵלֹהִים אֵלֹהִים**.¹⁵² The point is that God does not show partiality; he does not have respect to person. Peter concludes that it is not a matter of ethnicity, but of fearing God and doing what is righteous. After this conclusion follows a typical Lukan Peter-speech, where he tells his testimony about the earthly Jesus and testifies of his resurrection. Peter connects to the apostolic mission he has been depicted as carrying out throughout Acts, but also adds a new dimension by widening the scope of the apostolic enterprise to concern people of gentile descent.

The fifth unit deals with the gentiles' response to the message (Acts 10:44–48). In response to Peter's speech, God is once again portrayed as taking the lead in initiating the gentile mission. There is no time for the customary apostolic laying on of hands—God fills the gentiles present with the Holy Spirit, and they speak in tongues. Thus, God is depicted as sanctioning the gentile mission—and Peter has but to conclude that baptism cannot be withheld from these new gentile believers. Although Peter plays a central role in this text, it is clear that he is just an instrument to God, who takes the measures necessary to initiate the gentile mission. The brethren that have come along with Peter are amazed at the results. These are now called the believers “of the circumcision”—the same term that is used for Peter's opponents in the next section.

The sixth unit contains an account of Peter reporting about his experiences to the leadership in Jerusalem (Acts 11:1–18). In this passage, Acts gives a fairly detailed summary of the previous chapter, in order to underline the significance of this event.¹⁵³ The news about the success of Peter's gentile mission has now reached Jerusalem. This follows a pattern also found in 8:14 (Samaria), and 11:22 (Antioch), and gives the impression that Jerusalem supervises all missionary activity.¹⁵⁴

When discussing the gentile mission, Peter is opposed by “those of the circumcision.” It is hard to avoid connecting this description to the brethren who accompanied Peter at Cornelius' house who are also referred to in this way in 10:45. Pervo

¹⁵¹ The form, structure and development of Peter's sermon has been subject of much discussion. For a summary of the discussion, see Schneider, *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte*, 251–79.

¹⁵² Eduard Lohse, “*πρόσωπον*,” in TDNT 6:768–80. The Septuagint normally renders this *λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον*, which in turn forms *προσωπολημψία* in the New Testament.

¹⁵³ Barrett, *Acts*, 1:491.

¹⁵⁴ Pervo, *Acts*, 284, notes that such centralisation is historically unlikely and was certainly not accepted by Paul. Pervo argues that its primary function in Acts is not to promote hierarchy, but to show that the leaders in Jerusalem endorsed the gentile mission.

rightly points out that this phrase encompasses every male believer in Jerusalem. Still, it is likely that Gal 1–2 is the external source of this passage.¹⁵⁵ Luke desires Peter to deal with the conflict concerning gentile believers by introducing a circumcision party already here. However, such a faction would only have existed if there was a circumcision free party—and at there is no indication that the conflict has escalated to that point in the narrative.

The reaction of the other apostles at Jerusalem is only summarily recounted. The various concerns that may have been present concerning Peter's visit at Cornelius were immediately resolved in response to Peter's story. Peter acts as a leader of the Jerusalem apostles who is immediately believed and followed.

It is evident that Luke desires Peter to be the initiator of the gentile mission, thus giving it apostolic legitimacy. He emphasises that this was not a human idea of Peter but God's initiative, performed through Peter. Furthermore, Luke traces the origin of the party "of the circumcision" to this event, as a movement started in reaction toward Peter's ministry, and thus rebuked by Peter from its very beginning. Moreover, Luke underlines the unity between the Jerusalem establishment and the missionary enterprise toward the gentiles. Luke also describes how the apostolic mandate still carries the same content as in the beginning of Acts—witnessing about Christ and his resurrection. In summary, Luke writes a story of earliest Christianity where the Jerusalem apostles, especially Peter, prepare the way for the Pauline mission to the gentiles, and thus cannot be portrayed as an antithesis to Paul. Paul is presented shortly before the Cornelius account, which is in turn immediately followed by the mission of Barnabas and Paul to Antioch (Acts 11:19–26). This is hardly a coincidence and produces the background and theological/historical legitimation of the Pauline mission to the gentiles. It is also quite plausible that this event is intended to present an historical framework for the conflict in Gal 2.

2.3.10 Peter in Prison (Acts 12:1–19)

Although this text has sparked debate on a number of Peter-related issues, the significance for the purpose of this study lays in the death of James and the appearance of another James.¹⁵⁶ With the death of James, the brother of John (Acts 12:2),

¹⁵⁵ Pervo, *Acts*, 284.

¹⁵⁶ Donald Fay Robinson, "Where and When did Peter Die," *JBL* 64 (1945): 255–67, suggests that Peter's arrest in fact ended with his death as he "went to another place." However, considering Peter's role in Acts 15 combined with Paul's account of the incident at Antioch following this council, I regard

another of the twelve leaves the church. Together with Peter and John, he forms the “inner circle” of Jesus among the twelve in Mark. Yet, Peter does not initiate a new round of inquiry to find a substitute for him too. The qualifications set up in the beginning of Acts ruled out the possibilities of having yet a process of that sort. Instead, a new leading figure is introduced independently of the twelve apostles. Another James, most likely the brother of Jesus, is mentioned as someone important to talk to in 12:17. James is called one of the brethren, but in Acts 15 it is evident that he has assumed a leadership position in the Jerusalem church.¹⁵⁷ It is unclear how the authority of James is related to that of Peter. It is not certain whether James now assumes an authoritative position previously held by Peter as leader of the Jerusalem church and thus replaces him, or if James assumes this position and the local authority coming with it, while Peter still has “universal” authority not restricted to his position as leader in Jerusalem, but rather to his relationship to and calling from the earthly Jesus.

2.3.11 The Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:1–35)

This is the last episode in Acts where Peter is mentioned. This passage uses Petrine authority to legitimise the Pauline mission for the gentiles once and for all. After this council, Luke is finished dealing with Peter, and the Pauline mission becomes the centre of attention.¹⁵⁸

The narrative backdrop for the story is that some Jewish believers from Judea (thus a parallel to the “men from James” in Gal 2:12) who have arrived at Antioch, are teaching that circumcision is necessary for salvation.¹⁵⁹ Paul and Barnabas are

it highly unlikely that the author of Acts here conveys a message concerning Peter’s death. Robinson is also supported by Warren M. Smaltz, “Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?,” *JBL* 71 (1952): 211–16.

¹⁵⁷ Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 335, argues that James was such a well-known person to Luke, that he considered a further introduction (like the threefold introduction of Paul) to be superfluous.

¹⁵⁸ Although there are significant differences between Acts and Gal 2, I think Luke knew Galatians, but rephrased the story to fit his own theological purposes, see Heikki Leppä, “Luke’s Selective Use of Gal 1 and 2: A Critical Proposal,” in *The Early Reception of Paul*, 91–124.

¹⁵⁹ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 541, argues that this party should not be connected to the “men from James” mentioned in Gal 2:12, since here they are reported to have come to Antioch after the council. However, I do not view it as implausible that Luke is here referring to the same group. Luke actually writes that the men who have preached the circumcision are described by the apostles and elders as “τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν”. He places the incident at Antioch before the council rather than after it, thus avoiding the clash between Peter and Paul that is not fitting in his “Peter as precursor of Paul”-system. As we have seen above, he has also related to the party of “the circumcision” before it is really historically motivated for them to have come into existence. Thus, these tensions between the chronology of Paul Luke and Paul

sent to Jerusalem to discuss this issue with the apostles and *πρεσβύτεροι* (elders) at Jerusalem (thus reflecting a tradition similar to Gal 2:1–10). Two arguments are put forth in favour of the gentile mission, and against the circumcisionists. Peter tells of his experience at Cornelius' house, and Paul and Barnabas tell of their mission to the gentiles. James gives the impression of being some kind of president of the meeting, but his argumentation in his conclusion of the meeting is based not on his own authority, but on the testimony of Peter (15:13–21). James is the one who announces the decision, and thereby raises the question of his own authoritative position. The text does not disclose whether James has succeeded Peter in Jerusalem, but through his authoritative position in Jerusalem he has a responsibility for the men from Judea that had arrived at Antioch (Acts 15:1). The notion in Galatians of these troublemakers as “men from James” supports such a suggestion. In this case it makes sense that he, as the authoritative leader of the Jerusalem Church, would have to make a statement of his position.

If this council is referring to the same event that is accounted for by Paul in Gal 2:1–14, it is interesting to note that although both versions conclude that circumcision is not necessary for salvation, the description of Peter differs quite a lot. In Galatians, Peter is described as apostle to the Jews, whereas Paul is apostle to the gentiles. In Acts, there is no such distinction. Rather, it is stressed that the gentile mission is started by Peter, and then (throughout Acts) continued by Paul.

2.3.12 Conclusion: Peter in Acts

Peter is clearly one of the most significant characters in the book of Acts. In the first half of the book, he is the leader of the early Christian movement, but then disappears from the story in order for Luke to tell the story of the Pauline mission. At the beginning of Acts, Peter never acts alone, but always together with some or all of the apostles in the group of “the twelve,” acting as a kind of spokesperson and president of the group. As the mission expands beyond Jerusalem, Peter visits Galilee and Cornelius without the other apostles, thus preparing the way for the gentile mission. However, Peter is eager that the gentile mission is in continuity with the Jerusalem apostles.

Acts presents a clear definition of the mission of the apostles already in the first chapter, namely, to be transmitters of the Jesus tradition and witnesses to the

should rather be seen as a part of Luke's attempt at reconciling conflicts in the early church by portraying Peter and Paul as companions without internal friction. As we have already noted above, Paul's chronology of encounters with Peter does not fit very well together with what we find in Acts.

resurrection of Christ.¹⁶⁰ This is a theme that reoccurs virtually every time Peter appears in Acts. All his speeches, including the one at Cornelius' house, contain these elements. It is important for Luke to stress the continuity between the Jerusalem apostles and the gentile mission, between Peter and Paul. Acts has a strong tendency of portraying Peter as the precursor of the Pauline mission, and portraying Paul as inheritor of Peter's vision of Christianity. One reason for this could be that Luke sought to defend Pauline Christianity, and thus stress its continuity with Peter and the early church in Jerusalem.¹⁶¹ The lack of links to the earthly Jesus would naturally be the weak point in arguing Pauline apostolic authority. It has long been recognised that legitimisation is a central objective of Acts, although the exact nature of what is to be legitimised is debated.¹⁶² The prologue of Luke 1:1–4 indicates that the author of Luke-Acts was somehow dissatisfied with the present works available and thus wishes to present a version that is more in line with his own views.¹⁶³ When Paul is linked as a successor of Peter, this problem is conveniently solved. Thereby it is legitimate to speak of Acts as a form of “apologetic historiography.”¹⁶⁴

Turning to Weber's terms for classification of authority, Peter in Acts clearly assumes a form of *charismatic*, but also *traditional* authority. Peter *embodies* ideal apostleship due to his relationship to the earthly Jesus, but also through his charismatic abilities. Although this is the overall pattern of Acts, it is also significant to note that the abilities of Peter's character are somewhat fluctuant. The all-knowing Peter in the Ananias and Sapphira narrative is rather clueless when he has the vision of the clean and unclean animals, and his leadership at the Jerusalem council is by

¹⁶⁰ However, there are two exceptions: Acts 14:4, 14, where Paul and Barnabas are called apostles. Four explanations for this have been proposed. I here follow Daniel Marguerat, *Paul in Acts and Paul in His Letters*, WUNT 1/319 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 79. a) Luke forgot himself in the passing; b) Luke knows he should not name Paul as apostle, but his admiration for him is such that the title escaped him; c) the title “apostles” does not apply here to Barnabas and Paul, but to a larger group; d) the term *ἀπόστολος* is not used in its Lukan sense here, but designates the messengers in the way of primitive Christianity and of Paul. For my own position on this issue, see excursus B.

¹⁶¹ Schwegler, *Nachapostolische Zeitalter*, 2:74–75 argues that Luke seeks to reconcile Peter and Paul. His exposition is clearly influenced by the dichotomy created by Baur but is correct in noting the “joint forces” of these apostles in Acts.

¹⁶² See Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation*, SBLMS 33 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1987); Philip F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, SNTSMS 57 (Cambridge: University Press, 1987).

¹⁶³ See Steve Mason, *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009), 338.

¹⁶⁴ The term is borrowed from Gergory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, NovTSup 64 (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

no means as self-evident as it is in the first chapter of Acts. This may be due to both differing sources, but also other objectives which Luke wishes to achieve with his text. Yet, the main trajectory of Acts from the perspective of this study is to translate Peter's cultural capital into a social capital that can legitimise Paul and the gentile mission. In the narrative, Peter legitimises Paul, but in Luke's contemporary context, he is used to legitimise the Pauline Christianity of his day. Through ascribing the initiation of the gentile mission to Peter and having him embrace the Pauline mission, Pauline/gentile Christianity is legitimised through association with Peter, who is, in turn, associated with the earthly Jesus. It is highly likely that the Lukan sphere of influence identified with the Pauline mission and message. In debates with other early Christian groups, it was a weakness that Paul did not know the earthly Jesus, and the legitimacy of his teaching could therefore be questioned. Through making Peter the precursor and legitimator of the Pauline mission, the Lukan sphere of influence could argue that it managed the legacy not only of Paul, but also of Peter and the early Jerusalem church.

Excursus B: Paul and the Apostolic Criteria

Of the two criteria for the choice of a new twelfth apostle in Acts 1:21–22, Paul cannot claim to be a witness to the ministry of the earthly Jesus but does claim to be a witness of the resurrected Christ (1 Cor 15:5–8). Although it has been debated how these criteria should be understood in relation to the legitimacy of Paul as an apostle in Acts, I consider these criteria to be key features for the legitimisation of Paul in Acts.¹⁶⁵ In Peter's sermon at Pentecost, he preaches corresponding to these two criteria both of the life (Acts 2:22–23) and resurrection (Acts 2:24, 32–33) of Jesus. However, the focus is soon centred around the suffering and resurrection of Jesus (Acts 3:15; 4:10; 5:10). Likewise, Stephen's speech (Acts 7) contains nothing of the life and teachings of the earthly Jesus, but the straw that breaks the camel's back is when he has a heavenly vision of God and the resurrected Jesus (Acts 7:54–60), resulting in his execution. It is in connection to this narrative that we find the first mentioning of Saul/Paul. The next he is mentioned in Acts is when he receives his heavenly vision on the road to Damascus (Acts 9:1–18). On basis on this vision

¹⁶⁵ Since the publication of Klein, *zwölf Apostel*, it has been questioned whether Acts views Paul as an apostle at all, or if he restricts apostolicity to the twelve. I think the approach of Walter Schmithals, *Das kirchliche Apostelamt. Eine historische Untersuchung*, FRLANT 61 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), is more fair in claiming that although the concepts of “the twelve” and “apostle” are overlapping, they are not necessarily synonymous even in Acts. As pointed out by Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1972), 75–112, it is not the title “apostle” that is exclusive, but “the twelve.”

of the resurrected one, Paul immediately begins to preach that Jesus was the Son of God (Acts 9:19–22)—not on the basis of the ministry of the earthly Jesus, but the vision of the resurrected one. When Barnabas takes Paul to the apostles, his argument is not only that he preaches Jesus, but most significantly his vision of the risen one (Acts 9:26–28).

We have already bespoken the significance of the Cornelius episode (Acts 10) for the legitimation of the gentile mission, which is initiated through the divine visions of Peter and Cornelius. Peter's speech at Cornelius' house focuses on both apostolic criteria. He speaks of the ministry of the earthly Jesus from the time of John the Baptist to his resurrection (Acts 10:34–43), in line with the first criterion. Speaking of matters related to the second criterion, Peter underlines that the resurrected Jesus did not appear to everyone, but only to his preordained witnesses, who ate together with him following the resurrection (cf. Luke 24:42–43).¹⁶⁶

The shift of focus from Peter to Paul does not occur until the first mission journey (Acts 13).¹⁶⁷ In connection to this, also Paul speaks both of the ministry of Jesus from the time of John the Baptist (Acts 13:24–25) until his crucifixion and resurrection (Acts 13:27–31, 34, 37). Paul underlines that Jesus appeared to those who are his witnesses (Acts 13:31). It is in this context that Paul and Barnabas are first identified as apostles, when Acts states that some sided with the Jews and others with the apostles (Acts 14:4). It is not a coincidence that Paul and Barnabas are identified as apostles in connection to the first time that their testimony also corresponds to the first apostolic criterion. Their identification as apostles is repeated in 14:4.

Although Paul speaks of the life of the earthly Jesus in Antioch (Acts 13:24–25) and presumably does so when seeking to convince the Jews that Jesus is the Messiah (Acts 18:5, 28), the main point of reference for his preaching is the resurrection. The identification of Paul as leader of the Nazorean heresy (*Ναζωραίων αίρέσεως*; Acts 24:5) indicates that he was linked to the ministry of the earthly Jesus, but the main focus of his preaching as recounted in Acts is on the resurrection. In his defence speech before the authorities, he derives his beliefs from the revelation of the resurrected one (Acts 22:1–21), and explicitly states that he is accused because of the hope of the resurrection of the dead (Acts 24:21; 26:7–8). I think it is significant to see that the resurrected Jesus and the hope of the resurrection are intimately connected to Paul.

¹⁶⁶ Acts 10:40–48 is a fulfilment of Luke 24:41–49.

¹⁶⁷ It should be noted that this journey is approved by the church in Antioch, which is in turn approved by Jerusalem.

At the very end of Acts, Luke further elaborates upon the nature of Paul's divine calling. When Paul tells of his encounter with the resurrected one, he says that Jesus commanded him to be a minister and witness to what he what he saw and what he would be shown (προχειρίσασθαι σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδές [με] ὧν τε ὁφθήσομαί σοι; 26:16). Luke makes clear that Paul's calling as a minister and witness *should* be based on his vision of the resurrected one, just as he himself claims in his letters. However, he also states that it will be on basis of what will be shown to him, thus indicating that he will somehow also receive knowledge concerning other significant aspects—it is not very far-fetched to understand this as at least partially referring to information concerning the earthly Jesus.

In this manner, Acts not only legitimises Paul by making Peter into his precursor, but also through Paul gradually being initiated into the traditions of the earthly Jesus to the degree that he can credibly testify to these. His apostolic status is achieved when he fulfils both apostolic criteria, but his unique calling is based on being a witness of the resurrection—in continuity with his letters.

Excursus C: James

James is a figure that appears frequently together with Peter in early Christian texts, not least those studied in this chapter. Peter and James are the only to be mentioned by name in the credal formulation 1 Cor 15:3–7.¹⁶⁸ Despite Harnack's¹⁶⁹ suggestion that the references to Peter and James respectively indicate that two creeds of opposing fractions respectively have been conflated, it is more likely that the tradition to which Paul refers had the present form.¹⁷⁰ When Paul goes to Jerusalem in order to ἱστορήσαι Κηφᾶν, he also meets with James (Gal 1:18–19).¹⁷¹ James is one of the pillars of the Jerusalem church (Gal 2:9), and Paul's opponents in Antioch are in some way connected to James (Gal 2:12). The material

¹⁶⁸ In addition, it is likely that James is in mind in 1 Cor 9:5.

¹⁶⁹ Harnack, "Verklärungsgeschichte." Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Tradition and Redaction in 1 Cor 15:3–7," *CBQ* 43 (1981): 582–89, argues that 1 Cor 15:6–7 was appended to the traditional formula in 1 Cor 15:3–5 by Paul himself in order to make a smooth transition into speaking of his own revelation of the risen Christ.

¹⁷⁰ See David M. Moffitt, "Affirming the 'Creed': The Extent of Paul's Citation of an Early Christian Formula in 1 Cor 15,3b–7," *ZNW* 99 (2008): 49–73.

¹⁷¹ John Painter, *Just James. The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), 60, argues that Paul chose to see Peter rather than James because Peter was more sympathetic toward the Pauline mission. However, if, as I have argued above, a significant purpose of the journey was to inquire of the life and teachings of the earthly Jesus, Peter is a more relevant person to visit than James, who, despite knowing of the ministry of the earthly Jesus, was most certainly not among his followers at that time.

found in the Pauline epistles suggests that James was a significant figure in early Christianity.

In Acts 12:17, James enters the scene as a self-evident authoritative figure. James is never further identified, which indicates that his significance could be taken for granted among Luke's audience.¹⁷² When we meet him again in connection to the Jerusalem council in Acts 15, he is clearly a leading figure in Christianity in Jerusalem. When Paul visits Jerusalem in 18:22, we gain no information of the leadership of the community. However, during his next and final visit, he visits James and the presbyters and tells them about the mission to the gentiles (Acts 21:15–26). It is widely acknowledged that Acts portrays James as the leader of the Jerusalem Church (Acts 12:17; 15:13; 21:18).¹⁷³

All occurrences of James in the Pauline Epistles and Acts are in some way connected to Peter and have therefore already been discussed in one way or another. However, the final occurrence of James in Acts, where James instructs Paul in Jerusalem, makes no mention to Peter. At this point in Acts, it is made clear that Paul's mission to the gentiles is accomplished.¹⁷⁴ The leaders in Jerusalem are glad for Paul's successful mission, but also worried, since there are rumours that Paul encourages Jews to leave Mosaic practices behind disturbing the people of the city. Paul is encouraged to purify himself in the temple in order to show that he observes the law and does so.¹⁷⁵ At the same time, the result of the Jerusalem council is referred to in order to make clear that it is in line with this agreement. However, this Paul's purification is not enough to convince Paul's opponents. The city riots

¹⁷² Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 187.

¹⁷³ See John Painter, "James and Peter: Models of Leadership and Mission," in *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul. Tensions in Early Christianity*, ed. B. Chilton and C. Evans, NovTSup 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 143–210. Adolf Harnack, *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910), 26, goes so far as to speak of a Jacobian caliphate in Jerusalem. Harnack is criticised by Hans von Campenhausen, "Die Nachfolge des Jakobus. Zur Frage eines urchristlichen 'Kalifats'," *ZKG* 63 (1950/51): 133–44, but supported by Ethelbert Stauffer, "Zum Kalifat des Jacobus. Ernst Kohlmeyer zum siebzigsten Geburtstag," *ZRGG* 4 (1952): 193–214.

¹⁷⁴ Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 186. Cf. Paul's farewell speech in 20:15–37 which presents the background to the situation in 21:15–26.

¹⁷⁵ As pointed out by Jacob Neusner, "Vow-Taking, the Nazirites, and the Law: Does James' Advice to Paul Accord with Halakhah?," in *James the Just and Christian Origins*, ed. B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, NovTSup 98 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 59–82, James' advice is not unproblematic from a halakhic point of view.

against Paul, and he is eventually arrested and sent to Rome.¹⁷⁶ It is significant that Paul submits to the authority of the leadership in Jerusalem, even though his purification in the temple is more or less a direct parallel to Peter's actions in Antioch, when he makes clear that he still follows Jewish customs under pressure from some "from James" (Gal 2:12). Yet, Luke makes sure not to portray Paul as submissive to James against his own conscience. Acts accounts for a Jerusalem visit by Paul between the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15) and the final visit (Acts 21), in connection to which he makes clear that Paul made a vow of his own will (Acts 18:18). Despite not providing any further details concerning this Jerusalem visit, Luke creates the impression that Paul was still an active part of Jewish life in connection to his visits to Jerusalem, which makes the suggestion by James uncontroversial.¹⁷⁷

A question relevant to this study is how the figure of James might relate to Peter and suggest something concerning him as an authoritative figure. Both the Pauline Epistles and Acts indicate that James was an undisputed authoritative figure in early Christianity who had a leading function in Jerusalem. Although Peter and the twelve are the most significant leaders in the Jerusalem church in the beginning of Acts, James has evolved to a significant position in 12:17 and plays a crucial role in the Jerusalem council in Acts 15 and is the sole leader of the Jerusalem church in Acts 21. Yet, this has to do more with Luke's needs in relation to the legitimation of Paul than the Peter-figure as such. Once Luke has used Peter as a link from Jesus to Paul and the gentile mission, Luke addresses other relevant themes in which James plays a significant role. Jakob Jervell argues that since Luke-Acts presents Christianity as authentic Judaism,¹⁷⁸ James is used to defend Paul from accusations of separating from Judaism and in fact presents James¹⁷⁹ as the liberal one and Paul as the strict observer of Jewish customs.¹⁸⁰ This would fit Easton's thesis that Luke seeks to argue that Christianity should be viewed as a

¹⁷⁶ Painter, "Missions," 164, notes that James and the elders in Jerusalem made no attempts to help Paul following his arrest. Conclusions of this nature should not be drawn from Luke's literary construction, which focuses on the literary objectives of Acts rather than describing all aspects of history.

¹⁷⁷ F. F. Bruce, "The Church of Jerusalem in the Acts of the Apostles," *BJRL* 67 (1985): 641–61, argues that Paul willingly did as the leaders of the Jerusalem Church prescribed in order to "relieve their embarrassment" and refers also to 1 Cor 9:20. However, Paul's submissive attitude must be viewed as a product of Luke's literary construction and differs significantly from Paul's attitude in Galatians.

¹⁷⁸ Jervell refers here to Burton Scott Easton, *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers*, ed. F. C. Grant (London: SPCK, 1955), 102–15.

¹⁷⁹ Jervell argues that the reputation of James as righteous must have been widespread and consciously ignored by Luke, cf. Josephus *Ant.* 20.9.1; Quotation of Hegesippus in Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 2.23.4–18.

¹⁸⁰ Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 185–207.

religio licita by the Romans together with Judaism.¹⁸¹ Whereas this is indeed possible, it is of greater significance to the present study that Paul's submission to James rehabilitates Peter from the Antioch-incident in Gal 2. Luke connects the event directly to the result of the Jerusalem council (Acts 21:25). By following Jewish customs due to fear of the circumcisionists (Gal 2:12; Acts 21:22), Paul does exactly what he accused Peter of doing in Antioch.¹⁸² Hereby Luke indicates that concern for Jewish opposition is legitimate. Yet, Acts 21:29 makes clear that Paul did not withdraw fully from his contact with gentiles. As for the question of the differing accounts of the Antioch-episode in Galatians and Acts, we may therefore conclude that Acts not only omits the critique against Peter found in Galatians, but also ascribes similar actions to Paul, in order to balance the critique against Peter for whoever knew Galatians.

2.4 Conclusion: Peter and Paul—Two Perspectives

There are some common features of the Peter-image in Acts and the Pauline epistles. Both recognise that the apostles at Jerusalem have a certain status that is appealed to (Paul admits this only unwillingly, cf. Gal 1:17; 2:2), and both recognise Peter's importance as a transmitter of the Jesus tradition (Gal 1:18; Acts 1:21–22). However, Paul constantly stresses his independence from Peter and the Jerusalem apostles and portrays them as hypocrites (Gal 1:16–17; 2:11–14). Acts does not show the hypocritical sides of Peter but gives a rather ideal presentation of him. Paul presents himself and Peter as called to gentiles and Jews respectively, whereas Acts portrays Peter as an apostle for both Jews and gentiles, and the initiator of the gentile mission (Gal 2:8; Acts 10:1–11:18; 15:7–11). Paul claims that he and Peter have different missions and target groups, whereas Acts stresses the interdependence and continuity between the two missions. Paul emphasises that he did not ask the apostles in Jerusalem before starting his mission (Gal 1:17), whereas Acts portrays him as first seeking contact with them but being refused due to suspicion concerning the authenticity of his conversion, and then being brought to them by Barnabas (Acts 9:26–30). He does not start his missionary enterprise toward the gentiles

¹⁸¹ Easton, *Early Christianity*, 41–57. See also Harry W. Tajra, "L'appel à César: séparation d'avec le christianisme?," *ETR* 56 (1981): 593–98; Klaus Haacker "Das Bekenntnis Paulus zur Hoffnung Israels nach der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas," *NTS* 31 (1985): 437–51.

¹⁸² The relationship between the Jerusalem council and circumcision has different emphasis in Galatians and Acts. Whereas Gal 2:3 underlines that Titus was not circumcised, Acts 16:1 points out that Paul circumcised Timothy, who had a Jewish mother. One might question whether it is coincidental that the Pastoral epistles are allegedly penned to these two Pauline associates.

by himself but was rather recruited by Barnabas (Acts 11:19–25). Paul does recognise the Peter’s salvation-historical importance (1 Cor 15:5), but implies that his lifestyle has corrupted the message, something that Paul’s own lifestyle does not permit (1 Cor 9:19).

Paul and Acts thus have radically opposed views on the relationship between Peter and Paul. They often refer to the same events and phenomena but portray Peter in very different ways.¹⁸³ Paul’s polemical tone toward Peter is due to an ambition of defending the reliability of his own mission. Although the conflict between them is probably somewhat magnified by Paul, it does bear witness to tension between the two apostles in the early Christian movement. Acts, which is written at a later date, seeks to reconcile Paul with the Christian origins and Jerusalem apostles, and specifically, with Peter, and therefore reinterprets and tells his story in a rather different way.

Paul underlines his own *charismatic* authority in his letters and ascribes to Peter only *rational* and *traditional* authority. However, First Corinthians indicates that the recipients of his letters viewed Peter as a *charismatic* authority *embodying* a certain cultural capital. At the time when Acts is composed, the Pauline legacy has a hard time translating into *social capital* due to his lack of credible relationship to the Jesus whose gospel he claimed to be preaching.¹⁸⁴ Acts uses the *embodied* cultural capital that Peter enjoyed in his audience (despite Paul’s letters) and translates it into a *social capital* that legitimises Paul’s gentile mission. When comparing the Pauline epistles and Acts, we thus witness the development of authoritative figures who legitimise Pauline Christianity. Initially, Paul’s embodied cultural capital is sufficient for legitimising the gentile mission, but as time passes, it is necessary to relate instead to Peter’s cultural capital which can be more readily translated into *social capital* in a later generation. This indicates that Peter had developed into not only a *charismatic* authority, but also a *rational* and *traditional*. Although both Peter and Paul could claim *institutionalised* cultural capital through their apostolic status, and Paul could even claim *objectified cultural capital* through his

¹⁸³ Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, 68–70, argues that the tension between Peter and Paul make them into “poles of unity” in the early church.

¹⁸⁴ This is the case regardless if Stanley E. Porter, *When Paul Met Jesus: How an Idea Got Lost in History* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2016) is correct in claiming that Paul was actually acquainted with the earthly Jesus. He makes no clear use of such an acquaintance in his writings although his argument would certainly have benefited from it. In my opinion, the evidence for Porter’s proposal is too slim, but even if he were correct it would not change the results of my study, since there is a great difference in authority for transmitting authentic Jesus tradition between someone who was his disciple and someone who occasionally saw him on the streets of Jerusalem.

epistolary legacy, Peter's connection to the earthly Jesus made Peter into a more credible point of reference as discussions emerged on the nature of the Christian faith and the teachings of Jesus. Common to the spheres of influence of Paul and Luke was the recognition of Peter as a significant link to authentic Jesus tradition. Whereas the Pauline letters partially see this as a problem, Acts appropriates Peter's status within his sphere of influence in order to demonstrate that the Pauline tradition, to which he is much indebted, is genuine. A significant aspect to consider when comparing the Peter-images of the Pauline Epistles and Acts is the fact that both Peter and Paul were alive when Paul wrote, whereas both were dead when Acts was written. During his lifetime, it was possible for Paul to compensate his lack of acquaintance with the earthly Jesus by means of his *charismatic* authority. In later generations the legacy of Paul's *charisma* could not present Pauline Christianity with sufficient cultural capital, and thus Luke decides to piggyback on Peter's *traditional* capital in Acts.

3. Peter in the Canonical Gospels

Peter is the most significant figure in the Synoptic Gospels, second only to Jesus himself. Matthew and Mark mention him 25 times each, whereas Luke mentions him 30 times.¹ Peter is a central figure already in Mark, thus setting the background for his Synoptic successors. Surprisingly often, Matthew and Luke edit the Markan text in order to modify the portrait of Peter. This indicates that the portrait of Peter is significant to them. Whereas Luke prepares his readers for Peter's significant role in Acts, Matthew portrays him as a halakhic authority, which is a concept relevant to his audience. Likewise, Peter has a significant role in John's Gospel, although he has to share the stage with the beloved disciple. Traditionally, the Synoptics and John have been treated separately. However, it appears that textual relationships are not restricted to the Synoptics but include John. I will therefore treat the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, John, and Luke in proposed chronological order to trace the development of Peter tradition in the canonical Gospel tradition.²

Before engaging with the texts, something must be said concerning the relationship between the canonical Gospels. The first serious attempt at solving the Synoptic problem was made by Johann Jakob Griesbach, who argued that Matthew wrote first, then came Luke, using Matthew as a source, and finally Mark, making an abbreviated Gospel using both Matthew and Luke.³ Most contem-

¹ Reinhard Feldmeier, "Die Darstellung des Petrus in den synoptischen Evangelien," in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien. Vorträge von Tübinger Symposium 1982*, ed. P. Stuhlmacher, WUNT I/28 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 267–71. He also concludes that the mentioning of Peter in relation to the amount of words in the Gospels is 1:772 for Matthew, 1:443 for Mark, and 1:648 for Luke.

² In addition to chronology, the sequence of John and Luke is also based on my conclusion that Luke has a more developed view of Peter than John.

³ Formulated by Johann Jakob Griesbach in the 1770s. This view was defended against Markan priority by B. C. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew* (Cambridge: University Press, 1951); William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1964); and Bernhard Orchard, *Matthew, Luke & Mark* (Manchester: Koinonia, 1976). Orchard also renamed his hypothesis

porary scholars would instead argue in favour of Markan priority.⁴ This view won following after B. H. Streeter's classic work, which showed that Markan priority can solve many problems that cannot be solved through Matthean priority.⁵ Streeter argues that the entire Markan text appears in either Matthew or Luke, and frequently in both. However, the text of Mark is significantly abbreviated in Matthew and Luke, who instead add new stories. Both Matthew and Luke follow Mark's order, but the material unique to Matthew and Luke does not agree in order. The problem discussed in our time is that of the interrelation between Matthew and Luke. These two Gospels have several agreements that are not present in Mark. The most common attempt at solving this problem is the so-called Two-Source Hypothesis, claiming that Matthew and Luke share yet another source, apart from Mark.⁶ This hypothetical source is called Q (from the German *Quelle*

as the "Two-Gospel Hypothesis." See also Bernard Orchard and Harold Riley, *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987). In the German speaking world, Markan priority has been criticised by Hans-Herbert Stoldt, *Geschichte und Kritik der Markushypothese* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977). Apart from a critical review by Hans Conzelmann, "Literaturbericht zu den synoptischen Evangelien," *TRU* 43 (1978): 321–27 (321), which was not well received by Stoldt, see William R. Farmer, "The Stoldt-Conzelmann Controversy: A Review," *PRSt* 7 (1980): 152–62. Apart from Conzelmann's brief review, Stoldt has not been answered and is therefore not as well-known as Farmer. Although the eventual English translation of the work in 1980 suggests that critique of Markan priority is more common in the Anglo-American discussion (probably due to the influence of Farmer), the volume was to have been badly received not only in English-speaking, but also in French scholarship, cf. R. Morgan, Review of *History and Criticism of the Markan Hypothesis* by Hans-Herbert Stoldt, *JSNT* 17 (1983): 108–109; Étienne Trocmé, Review of *History and Criticism of the Markan Hypothesis* by Hans-Herbert Stoldt, *RHPR* 63 (1983): 341.

⁴ The idea of Markan priority was first introduced by Gottlob Christian Storr, *Ueber den zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und der Briefe Johannis* (Tübingen: Heerbrandt, 1786), and then argued again in 1838 independently by Christian Hermann Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Hartel, 1838); and Christian Gottlob Wilke, *Der Urevangelist oder exegetisch kritische Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältnis der drei ersten Evangelien* (Leipzig: Fleischer, 1838). The argumentation was further strengthened by the work of Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien: Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* (Leipzig: Engelsmann, 1863). Despite this long history in New Testament research, English-speaking scholarship normally credits the theory to B. H. Streeter, who wrote the first significant study on the subject in English (see next note).

⁵ Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins. Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship & Dates* (London: Macmillan, 1926), 15–181.

⁶ To be accurate, the Two-Source Hypothesis was developed by Streeter into what he called the Four-Source hypothesis (or literally Four Document Hypothesis), adding M and L to the original sources of Mark and Q. However, this development from Two-Source to Four Document hypothesis is generally not viewed as the development of a new theory, and the Four-Source hypothesis and Two-Source Hypothesis may today refer to the same position.

= source). However, both Matthew and Luke have material that is unique to their Gospels, probably originating from other sources. The source of the unique Matthean material is called M, and the source of the unique Lukan material is called L.

The Two-Source hypothesis has been challenged by Austin Farrer's hypothesis, which maintains Markan priority, but argues that Luke used both Mark and Matthew in his composition—thus deeming Q as an unnecessary hypothetical construction.⁷ This hypothesis has been further developed by Michael Goulder, and is today propagated mainly by Mark Goodacre.⁸ The problem with this theory is that it has problems explaining why Luke would in that case omit so much of the Matthean material.⁹ On the other hand, when viewing Luke as a creative redactor and theologian rather than a mere compiler of sources, this is not necessarily a problem.¹⁰ With a late dating of Luke-Acts, it becomes increasingly improbable that Luke would not have known Matthew's popular account.¹¹ It is also quite

⁷ Austin Marsden Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*, ed D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 55–88. For a list of "minor agreements" of Matthew and Luke against Mark, see Frans Neiryck, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark with a Cumulative List*, BETL 37 (Leuven: University Press, 1974). For a thorough discussion and explanation of the minor agreements from the perspective of the two-source hypothesis, see Josef Schmid, *Matthäus und Lukas*, BibS(F) 23 (Freiburg: Herder, 1930).

⁸ Michael Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, JSNTS 20 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); Mark Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospel: An Examination of a New Paradigm*, JSNTS 133 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1996); Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2002). However, the main ideas of the hypothesis were presented already by Edward Lummis, *How Luke Was Written* (Cambridge: University Press, 1915). See also John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1976); and Christina Solmunde Michelsen, "John the Baptist's Ministry in Lk 3.1–20: Is Luke a Writing Reader of Matthew?" (PhD diss., Copenhagen, 2017).

⁹ For an up-to-date survey of the positions and arguments of the respective theories, cf. Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dryer (eds), *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006).

¹⁰ There are, of course, more theories concerning the relationship between the Synoptic Gospels—I have only briefly presented the chief alternatives. Perhaps it would also be appropriate to mention also Pierson Parker's K-theory, suggesting that Mark used an original source, called K. Matthew in turn used K and Q, whereas Luke used K and Q, Pierson Parker, *The Gospel Before Mark* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1953). Another, more recent approach, is that of Delbert Burkett, *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: From Proto-Mark to Mark* (New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2004); and Delbert Burkett, *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: The Unity and Plurality of Q* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009). See also Delbert Burkett, *The Case for Proto-Mark: A Study in the Synoptic Problem*, WUNT I/399 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

¹¹ Eric Franklin, *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew*, JSNTS 92 (Sheffield, JSOT, 1994), argues that Luke in fact wishes to replace Matthew, using Mark as his main source, but incorporating and editing Matthean material of his choice.

possible that Luke would have known both Mark, Matthew and Q. For this study, I shall presume Markan priority, which I regard as the only plausible point of departure for the Synoptic problem. Due to the lack of a satisfactory consensus solution in contemporary research, I will discuss the possible implications of the Lukan redaction keeping in mind the different options, and the possible effects they have on my results.

Recent developments in New Testament scholarship have impacted our understanding of the relationship between Luke and John. The dating of Luke-Acts to the second century not only increases the probability that he would have known Matthew, but also that he would have known John in some form.¹² The traditional view is that John knew all the Synoptics and wrote his Gospel as a supplement to the Synoptic Gospels.¹³ With the publication of the influential work of Percival Gardner-Smith in 1938, the majority position changed into that John wrote independently of the Synoptics.¹⁴ The dominance of this position was enforced with C. H. Dodd's classic study *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, which also argued that John was independent from the Synoptics.¹⁵ In 1979, the question of John's relationship to the Synoptics was reopened as both Bruno de Solages and Frans Neiryck independently published books with the title *Jean et les*

¹² For a survey of the discussions concerning the relationship between John and the Synoptics, see Frans Neiryck, "John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990," in *John and the Synoptics*, ed. A. Deneaux, BETL 101 (Leuven: University Press, 1992), 3–62; Michael Labahn and Manfred Lang, "Johannes und die Synoptiker: Positionen und Impulse seit 1990," in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive*, ed. J. Frey and U. Schnelle, WUNT 1/175 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 443–515.

¹³ Hans Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Wollte der vierte Evangelist die Älteren Evangelien ergänzen oder ersetzen?*, UNT 12 (Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1926), goes further than this and argues that John wished to replace, rather than supplement, the Synoptics.

¹⁴ Percival Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: University Press, 1938). It is remarkable that Gardner-Smith's short study has been so influential. All he proves is that the majority of John's material is unique and not found in any of the Synoptics. While true, this still does not prove much regarding the relationship between John and the Synoptics. As I will show below, the sections where John is dependent on Mark are come in "blocks", and it is quite possible that some of these could be inserted with Markan influence at a later redactional stage. Before the short but influential study of Gardner-Smith, the consensus was that John knew the Synoptics. For a summary of the 19th century German research on John, cf. Franz Overbeck, *Das Johannesevangelium: Studien zur Kritik seiner Erforschung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1911), 1–108.

¹⁵ Charles Harold Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1963).

synoptiques.¹⁶ These efforts were followed by other scholars, culminating in the so-called Leuven-School headed by Frans Neiryck.¹⁷ Whereas Matthean influence on John is hard to prove, Luke and John clearly share some material, and John likely uses Mark as a source.¹⁸ Streeter, Barrett, and Kieffer agree that John is dependent on Mark and Luke, although Barrett suggests that the evidence for Luke is not conclusive.¹⁹ However, a second century dating for Luke-Acts necessitates either an even later dating of John, or a reversed relationship between these two Gospels.²⁰ Another possibility would be that John used Mark and a source somewhat similar to L.²¹ I presuppose that Luke knew and used John in some form, and I will indicate the arguments for this throughout the analysis.²² However, my main

¹⁶ Frans Neiryck, *Jean et les synoptiques: Examen critique de l'exégèse de M-È Boismard*, BETL 49 (Leuven: University Press, 1979); and Msgr Bruno de Solages, *Jean et les synoptiques* (Leiden: Brill, 1979). De Solages seeks to quantify the relationship between the synoptics and John, concluding that there is a 17.6 percent agreement between John and the Synoptics (compared to 90% in Mark/Matt). He concludes that although John knows of the Synoptics, especially Mark, he does not use them as direct sources. Neiryck, on the other hand, is really writing a review on Boismard's commentary to John. Neiryck argues (with Boismard) that John knew all three Synoptics. For an English summary and critique of the arguments of de Solages and Neiryck, see Dwight Moody Smith, *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources, and Theology* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1984), 128–44. For a survey of the research previous to this, see Josef Binzler, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Ein Forschungsbericht*, SBS 5 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1965).

¹⁷ See Neiryck, *Jean et les synoptiques*.

¹⁸ Neiryck, *Jean et les synoptiques*, 46–55; René Kieffer, “Jean et Marc. Convergences dans la structure et dans les détails,” in *John and the Synoptics*, 109–25.

¹⁹ Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 424–26; Barrett, *Johannes*, 62; René Kieffer, *Johannesevangeliet*, 2 vols., KNT 4 (Uppsala: EFS, 1987–1988), 2:501–502.

²⁰ For a history of research on the relationship between Luke and John, see Mark A. Matson, *In Dialogue With Another Gospel? The Influence of the Fourth Gospel on the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Luke*, SBLDS 178 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 21–90, and Dwight Moody Smith, *John Among the Gospels* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001); Kari Syreeni, *Becoming John: The Making of a Passion Gospel*, LNTS 590 (London: T & T Clark, 2019), 35–47.

²¹ This is mentioned as a possibility by Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 396. Jon Amedee Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*, NovTSup 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1963), argues that many of the traditions common to Luke and John originate from a “Jerusalem source.” However, he still concludes that John knew and used Luke.

²² For further discussion on the relationship between Luke and John, see Pierson Parker, “Luke and the Fourth Evangelist,” *NTS* 9 (1963): 317–36; F. Lamar Cribbs, “St. Luke and the Johannine Tradition,” *JBL* 90 (1971): 422–50; Anton Dauer, *Johannes und Lukas*, FB 50 (Würzburg: Echter, 1984); Robert Morgan, “Which Was the Fourth Gospel? The Order of the Gospels and the Unity of Scripture,” *JSNT* 54 (1994): 3–28; Barbara Shellard, “The Relationship of Luke and John: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem,” *JTS* 46 (1995): 71–98; idem., *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*, JSNTS 215 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 2002); Syreeni, *Becoming John*, 35–47.

contention in this regard is that John knew and used Mark. Yet, he does not use Mark as a source in the same way as Matthew and Luke, but more freely in order to create a completely new Gospel.²³

3.1 Peter in the Gospel of Mark

Papias identifies Mark as Peter's interpreter, writing down "accurately what he remembered," but the historical reliability of this statement is dubious (see discussion in 4.4).²⁴ The author of Mark does not identify himself in the Gospel, and the only indication of authorship in the Gospel is the title of the Gospel itself.²⁵ The dating of the text is likewise uncertain. Mark 13 is seen as a key text for determining whether the Gospel was written before or after 70 C.E.²⁶ Marxsen argues that Mark was written from Pella in 66–70 C.E. as a *Flugblatt* to urge the Christians in Jerusalem to come to there to experience the Parousia.²⁷ Marxsen's reconstruction has been criticised by Conzelmann and has no greater following.²⁸ Whereas Matt 22:7

²³ Udo Schnelle, "Johannes und die Synoptiker," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. van Segbroeck et al, BETL 100 (Leuven: University Press, 1992), 1799–1814.

²⁴ Ulrich H. Körtner, *Papias von Hierapolis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 207–08.

²⁵ Dieter Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, HNT 3 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987), 3, argues that Matthew reveals his name in Matt 9:9; 10:3, whereas Luke speaks of himself as "I" in Luke 1:3, and the author of John identifies himself through the epilogue (John 21:24). Richard J. Bauckham, "The Eyewitnesses in the Gospel of Mark," *SEÅ* 74 (2009): 19–39, suggests that Peter and other eyewitnesses are in fact indicated in the Gospel itself. Until the 1980s the Gospels were considered to have circulated anonymously at first, see Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007), 2. However, Martin Hengel, *Die Evangelienüberschriften: Vorgetragen am 18. Oktober 1981*, SHAWPH (Heidelberg: Winter, 1984), challenged this position in 1981. He argues that the Gospel titles are likely quite early and thus reliable. However, he also notes that there is not a scholarly consensus on this issue. Bo Reicke, *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1986), 150, likewise argues that although the title of Mark is not original, it may be dated to around 100 C.E. and perhaps has some historical value.

²⁶ James Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, JSNTS 266 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), argues that Mark should be dated as early as 35–45.

²⁷ Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969). Marxsen also argues that Pella was situated in Galilee.

²⁸ Hans Conzelmann, *Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (München: Kaiser, 1968), 160–63. However, the idea that Mark reflects the Jewish-Roman war is also suggested by e.g. Martin Hengel, "Entstehungszeit und Situation des Markusevangeliums," in *Markus-Philologie: Historische, literaturgeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Evangelium*, ed. H. Cancik, WUNT I/33 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1984), 1–46. Hengel dates Mark to 69 C.E. Samuel George Frederick Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London: SPCK, 1951), 185–205; idem., *Jesus and the Zealots. A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (Manchester: University Press, 1967),

and Luke 19:43 contain direct allusions to the fall of Jerusalem, a Markan parallel is lacking. Mark does include a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in chapter 13, but it is futuristic and too vague to determine for sure whether this is a *vaticinium ex eventu*. Adela Collins suggests that Mark was written during the Jewish war, but prior to 70 C.E., since the eschatological prophecy in total is not fulfilled.²⁹ Still, Eve-Marie Becker argues that Mark and Matthew should be dated on the same side of 70 C.E. since the evidence in both Gospels is so similar.³⁰ If Becker is right, this could imply either that Matthew was composed shortly after Mark, but before 70 C.E., or that both Gospels were composed post-70. Yet, since there is actually a progression of details in Matthew and Luke compared to Mark, I am not entirely convinced by Becker's argument. In either case, an exact dating is impossible to determine, but enough evidence is present to argue for a dating around 70 C.E.

3.1.1 Analysis: Peter in the Markan Narrative

Peter is a significant figure throughout the Markan narrative. Peter is mentioned the first time when he is called by Jesus in 1:16–20. Already here, there is an indication that Peter is a significant figure, since Andrew is referred to as Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος (Andrew, the brother of Simon; 1:16). Since Andrew is identified through his brother, we may presume that Peter was the more well known of the two brothers among the audience of the Gospel. Yet, the calling of Peter is not singled out, but rather placed together with the calling of Andrew, James and John. These disciples (apart from Andrew) will become the inner circle of Jesus' disciples according to Mark.³¹ This is also the group of disciples that witnesses Jesus' exorcism in the synagogue at Capernaum (1:21–28), as well as the first healing

221–282, argues that Mark was composed in Rome around 71–72 C.E. in order that Romans would be able to associate with Jesus in spite of the Jewish rebellion. Similar views have also been formulated by Benjamin W. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?*, HTS VII (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919); idem., *The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1925) However, his argumentation is fragile and fails to satisfactorily explain why Jesus, after all, hung on a Roman cross, even though he argues that the Jews alone were to blame. See critique in Ralph O. Martin, *Mark: Evangelist and Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1972), 76–79.

²⁹ Collins, *Mark*, 11–14. Collins suggests 68–69 C.E. as a probable date of composition. She also refers to Menahem, the leader of the Zealots, who had messianic aspirations, and claims that “many will come in my name” (Mark 13:6) is a reference to him. A similar date is argued by Lars Hartman *Mark for the Nations: A Text- and Reader-Oriented Commentary* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010), 77.

³⁰ Eve-Marie Becker, *Der früheste Evangelist: Studien zum Markusevangelium*, WUNT 1/380 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 53–75.

³¹ This trio is obviously of some historical significance since it is mentioned also in Gal 2:9.

miracle—the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law (1:29–31). As the narrative emerges, the significance of Peter continues to be in the foreground, as the disciples are referred to as Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ (Simon and those with him; 1:36). Jesus and the disciples have stayed overnight in the house of Peter and Andrew, but Jesus departs early in the morning to pray. Peter is described as the one who leads the search after Jesus. Peter appears to be interested in starting a healing ministry with Jesus based in his house, but Jesus prefers being a wandering performer of miracles, and the following chapters are filled with stories of Jesus’ miraculous healings.

Having performed a multitude of miracles and gathered a significant following, Jesus commissions twelve apostles (3:13–19).³² It should be noted that the clause οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν (who were called apostles; 3:14) is missing in many important manuscripts and would thus normally be seen as a harmonisation with the other Synoptics, especially Luke, whose text is verbatim.³³ However, ἀπόστολος is a Matthean *hapax*, and thus it may still be original in the Markan text. Hereafter follows a list of the twelve apostles, beginning with Peter, continuing with James and John, then Andrew, and ending with Judas Iscariot (3:13–19). Thus, the list appears to imply the rank of the apostles. Peter, James and John are singled out as an “inner circle” of apostles in Mark—Andrew was called just as early as these three but is degraded from the inner circle. The reason for Judas Iscariot being last in the list is obvious. The members of the inner circle receive new names from Jesus. Simon receives the name Peter (καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον), and the sons of Zebedee receive the name βοανηργές (sons of thunder). The next time we meet the disciples mentioned by name is in 5:21–43, where Peter, James, and John are singled out to come with Jesus to heal Jairus’ daughter.

The next encounter with Peter in Mark is found in a turning point in Mark’s Gospel where Peter confesses σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός (you are the Christ; 8:27–30). Although various ways of structuring Mark have been proposed, it is widely agreed that 1:1–8:26 and 8:27–16:8 are the two main sections of the Gospel.³⁴ The second section focuses more narrowly on Jesus and his disciples, and the theme of Jesus’ impending death emerges. Peter’s confession of Jesus as the Messiah is the

³² Collins, *Mark*, 215, argues that there are traces of a pre-Markan source with the repetition of the phrase “καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα,” arguing that he, after adding some including remarks of his own in vv. 14–15, returns to the source and thus repeats himself.

³³ See discussion in Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), 80.

³⁴ See Anton Fridrichsen, *Markusevangeliet* (Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, 1952), 39; Friedrich Gustav Lang, “Kompositionsanalyse des Markusevangeliums,” *ZTK* 74 (1977): 1–24.

background and interpretative key to the rest of the narrative. Harald Riesenfeld points out that it is only after Peter's confession that Mark has Jesus reveal his teaching.³⁵ Although Peter's confession of Jesus as the Messiah must be regarded as a positive statement, it is immediately followed by the *Satanswort* in 8:31–33.³⁶ As Jesus starts teaching about his coming suffering, Peter takes him aside to reprove him, whereupon Jesus responds ὑπάγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ (go away from me, Satan; 8:33). The image of Peter that emerges is ambivalent. He is clearly the most prominent disciple who has understood Jesus' true messianic identity but is still reproved since he has not understood the nature of Jesus' messianic calling.³⁷ Six days later, the inner circle of Peter, James, and John go with Jesus to the Mount of Transfiguration (9:2–10). Peter is most prominent of the three disciples who speaks and takes the initiative. He suggests that they build three shelters, but this suggestion does not receive any response. It is evident from the course of events that the suggestion was foolish.

The next time we meet Peter is in 10:23–31, where he exclaims: ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήκαμέν σοι (Look, we have left everything to follow you!; 10:28) in response to Jesus' statement that it is impossible for rich people to enter God's kingdom. We do not gain any specific information concerning Peter here, other than the impression that he is the most outspoken of the disciples, perhaps being used as a spokesperson by Mark for giving a voice to the group of apostles. Yet, it should be noted that Peter cannot be reduced to a spokesperson of the disciples, since the disciples are portrayed as speakers at several instances (cf. 5:31; 6:35). The same phenomenon can also be observed in 11:20–26, where Peter exclaims: ῥαββί, ἴδε ἡ συκῆ ἣν κατηράσω ἐξήρανται (Rabbi, behold the fig tree that you cursed has withered; 11:21). In Jesus' eschatological discourse in 13:3–8, the inner circle and Andrew are rejoined in order to be exclusively lectured by Jesus concerning the last things.³⁸

³⁵ Harald Riesenfeld, "Till Markusevangeliets komposition," *SEÅ* 18–19 (1953–1954): 140–160.

³⁶ Hartman, *Mark for the Nations*, 339, argues that whereas the elders, chief priests, and scribes are in opposition of the Son of Man, the disciples are not portrayed as Jesus' opponents, but people who are opposed to him while at the same time being on his side.

³⁷ This can be put in contrast to Mary of Bethany (Mark 14:3–9), who understands the necessity of his suffering. Although there is opposition to her action (14:4), this is not connected to Peter.

³⁸ This is the original group of four disciples according to the Synoptic Gospels, and the same group that accompanied Jesus when Jesus healed Peter's mother-in-law. The main question thus should perhaps not be why Andrew is sometimes included, but rather why Andrew is mostly excluded from this group of more prominent disciples.

The Peter-image develops further toward the end of Mark. Jesus foretells that his disciples will desert him, whereupon Peter exclaims that even if the other disciples leave Jesus, he will not (14:26–31). Jesus answers by foretelling that Peter will deny him three times before the cock crows twice. Peter protests again, claiming that he is ready to die together (*συναποθνήσκω*) with Jesus. Peter is not alone in his protest. Mark makes clear that all the disciples said the same. Yet only Peter is recorded to have received this detailed pronouncement of his denial. Thus, Peter is singled out by Mark both as the most fervent believer in Jesus, but also as the one who would utterly fail in his faithfulness toward Jesus. Although the conclusions about Peter are in a way negative, Mark emphasises Peter's significance and recognises his outstanding role in the community of disciples. Following this pronouncement is the account of the events at Gethsemane (14:32–42). Here, Jesus leaves the larger group of disciples behind, bringing only the inner circle of Peter, James, and John with him, that he might pray. However, when Jesus finds that the trio has fallen asleep, he admonishes only Peter. He also retreats from calling him Peter, to calling him Simon, recognising that he is not living up to his name of being a rock at this occasion.³⁹ Jesus returns three times only to find the disciples sleeping, but the two latter times he admonishes all three disciples. This gives the impression that Jesus at first expected that at least Peter could have been strong enough to stay awake but has to conclude that all three members of the inner circle are equally subjected to their physical fatigue.

The next time we encounter Peter in Mark is when he follows the arrested Jesus and denies him (14:53–72).⁴⁰ The high priest echoes the Petrine confession of Jesus' identity (8:27–30) when asking *σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;* (are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?; 14:61), and thereby Mark brings to mind Peter's confession of Jesus' identity just as Peter is about to deny it. When Peter has denied Jesus three times, he is reminded of Jesus' prediction of his denial (14:72). All three denials are initiated through questions by women. This aims at showing the degree of Peter's fear since he does not even dare to confess to a female slave. Peter's denial grows in scope. First, he denies for a slave girl, then for a group of bystanders, and finally for a large group of people. Mark has the same slave girl pose the first two questions posed to Peter, whereas the third is a result of the

³⁹ Collins, *Mark*, 680.

⁴⁰ For a survey and discussion of the history of interpretation of this account, see Robert W. Heron Jr., *Mark's Account of Peter's Denial of Jesus: A History of Its Interpretation* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991). He deals specifically with Mark but is relevant also to the other Synoptics.

rumour being spread by her about him. Leaving Peter in this state of devastation, Mark moves on to tell the story about Jesus' passion.

Peter is not mentioned again until after the resurrection (16:1–8). The women are told to go *εἰπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ* (tell his disciples and [specially] Peter; 16:7). This could be understood as an indication that Peter was a prominent member of the group, but in this context, it is more plausible that the special reference to Peter should be understood toward the background of his recent denial, as some kind of rehabilitation of Peter.⁴¹

3.1.2 Conclusion: Peter in the Gospel of Mark

Peter clearly plays an important role in Mark's Gospel, not least as the first confessor of Jesus as the Messiah (8:27). Mark describes an "inner circle" of Peter, James, and John among whom Peter seems to be the most prominent disciple. These three all receive new names from Jesus, although the sons of Zebedee must share their name. Peter is the spokesman of both the three and the twelve. However, the role of Peter is more than that of a spokesman. At Gethsemane, he is singled out and especially reprimanded for falling asleep. He is the disciple who confesses Jesus as the Messiah, but also the disciple who is called Satan by Jesus. Toward the end of the Gospel, the women are also told to report especially to Peter about Jesus' resurrection. Peter is really the only disciple of whom we get to know something of the personality and character. Considering that Mark is the first of the Synoptic Gospels to be written, it is astonishing that Peter receives such a central role already in this Gospel. This indicates that many Peter-traditions were present and important among the sources Mark used for his composition.

The Peter-image of Mark is not as easily discerned as that of his Synoptic successors, since we cannot in a reliable way study how he edited his sources concerning Peter. However, some general remarks can be made. It is plausible that Peter in one way or another was held in high esteem in the Markan sphere of influence. Leaving aside Papias' claims of Peter as source of the Gospel, it is quite possible that the author of Mark claimed Petrine authority for his Gospel account within his sphere of influence. Despite the sometimes less than flattering depictions of

⁴¹ The shorter ending of Mark completes this commandment by stating that they (the women) reported briefly what they had been told to those with Peter. Thus, the group of disciples is identified as those who were with Peter, which in that case would indicate him continuing to be a central figure in the group, despite his denial. After all, they had all denied Jesus in one way or another. For a discussion of the ending(s) of Mark, see Kurt Aland, "Der Schluß des Markusevangeliums," in *L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction*. Nouvelle édition augmentée, ed. M. Sabbe (Leuven: University Press, 1988), 435–70.

Peter, he is the first to understand Jesus' identity and is a reliable witness to his teachings. Peter's negative traits were likely known to Mark's audience, and a presentation of him as an impeccable hero would not have been credible. Peter is instead portrayed as the one who is a faithful witness despite his human failures. Since, as I will argue below, the Markan portrait of Peter presents the background for his portrait in the other canonical Gospels, but also in other texts, Mark's presentation of Peter, regardless how it relates to pre-Markan traditions, must be regarded as highly influential. Mark clearly indicates a view of Peter as a *traditional* authority in early Christianity. He was more well-known than the other followers of the earthly Jesus and acted as leader and spokesperson of the disciples. Peter embodied the *cultural capital* of a *charismatic* authority who was full of initiative, but also especially singled out and favoured by Jesus. Through connecting the Gospel narrative to Peter, the cultural capital of the text itself is strengthened, as it becomes part of the cultural capital of Peter himself in its *objectified* state. The translation of this cultural capital into social capital and thereby legitimacy is rather self-evident. Through possessing and believing in the Gospel account of Peter, the follower of the earthly Jesus, one can access the genuine teachings of Christ himself and association with Peter thus becomes association with Jesus, and thereby represents authentic faith.⁴²

3.2 Peter in the Gospel of Matthew

Matthew's Gospel is generally considered to originate from a Jewish-Christian context and is traditionally located to Antioch.⁴³ Matthew has a polemic tone

⁴² The suggestion of Smith, *Petrine Controversies*, 162–90 and others that Mark is anti-Petrine and engages in polemics with a group associated with Peter is unwarranted and requires reading between the lines as well as assuming divisions in early Christianity of which we have no evidence at this time. If one of the main purposes of Mark's Gospel was to discredit Peter, the attempt utterly failed. The portrait of Peter is not as polished as we later find, but he is definitely a significant *traditional* authority for the author of Mark.

⁴³ Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1994); David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew*; Graham N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992). However, alternative locations have been suggested. Aaron M. Gale, *Redefining Ancient Borders: The Jewish Scribal Framework of Matthew's Gospel* (New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2005), 41–63, suggests Sepphoris; Morton Smith, *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels*, SBLMS 6 (Philadelphia, PA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1951), 217–43, suggests Alexandria, and Gerd Theißen, *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics and the World of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992), 33–59, rather argues that the Matthean

toward other Jewish teachers, perhaps arguing that his own position is the true interpretation of Judaism.⁴⁴ It is commonly argued that Matthew must be dated before 100 C.E., since Ignatius of Antioch uses Matthew.⁴⁵ Since Matthew uses Mark, he must have written after 70 C.E. (see discussion in 2.1). This leaves us with a possible date between 70–100 C.E., which fits well with the conventional dating around 80–90 C.E.⁴⁶ The Matthean narrative follows the Markan scheme, and distinctively Matthean alterations of the Peter-image can thus be discerned when Matthew edits the Markan Peter-material.

3.2.1 Analysis: Peter in the Matthean Redaction

Peter is introduced into the Matthean narrative in very much the same way as in Mark, with the calling narrative in 4:18–22. Whereas Mark refers to Andrew as the “brother of Simon,” Matthew abbreviates it to τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ (his brother; 4:18). Apart from his typical abbreviation of the Markan text, Matthew adds an explanation to the identity of Simon, stating that it was Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον (Simon who was called Peter; 4:18).⁴⁷ In this way Matthew makes clear from the beginning the important role that Peter will play in his Gospel. The next time we meet Peter is when his mother-in-law is healed in 8:14–15. However, in contrast to the Markan account, Jesus is not accompanied by an inner circle but

community is a group of wandering monastics. Graham N. Stanton, *Studies in Matthew and Early Christianity*, ed. M. Bockmuehl and D. Lincicum, WUNT I/309 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 64–65, lists several suggestions that have been proposed throughout the years.

⁴⁴ Charles E. Carlston and Craig A. Evans, *From Synagogue to Ecclesia*, WUNT I/334 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 130–85. It must be noted, however, that there are also studies rather placing the Gospel of Matthew in a Hellenistic context, cf. Robert S. Kinney, *Hellenistic Dimensions of the Gospel of Matthew*, WUNT II/414 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

⁴⁵ Sim, *Matthew*, 31. However, as I will discuss in 5.3, I am not certain that the standard dating of Ignatius is correct.

⁴⁶ The conventional dating is based on the assumption that the Birkath ha-Minim was introduced in the synagogue liturgy around 85 C.E., cf. Gale, *Redefining Ancient Borders*, 5. Since the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity does not seem complete in Matthew, scholars have argued that Matthew must have been written before this date, cf. Stanton, *Studies in Matthew*, 67. However, more recent research has questioned the hypothesis of expulsion from the synagogue and it can therefore not be used for dating Matthew, cf. Jonathan Bernier, *Aposynagogos and the Historical Jesus in John: Rethinking the Historicity of the Johannine Expulsion Passages*, BIS 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 27–76. Although dating Matthew to the 80s is not unreasonable, I find it appropriate to leave open the possibility that Matthew’s Gospel may have been composed as late as 100 C.E.

⁴⁷ Joachim Gnllka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, 2 vols., HTKNT (Freiburg: Herder, 1986–1988), 1:101, notes that Matthew always uses the name Peter, either alone or together with the name Simon, the only exception being Matt 17:25.

heals Peter's mother-in-law alone. Matthew states that the mother-in-law served *him* (i.e. Jesus; 8:15), and thereby underlines that Jesus was alone at the healing.⁴⁸ In Mark, this is the first of Jesus' miracles of healing, whereas Matthew places it last in a triad of healings in chapter eight.⁴⁹ Matthew is not interested in telling of how Jesus' career as a miracle worker started in Peter's house, but rather accounts for the healing of Peter's mother-in-law as one of Jesus' many miracles. The same can be observed concerning the story of the healing of Jairus' daughter and the woman with haemorrhage. Whereas Mark restricts this event to the experiences of the inner circle, Matthew omits the references to both the inner circle and Peter, and thus makes it into one miracle story among many toward the end of chapter nine.

The next time we meet Peter is in connection to the commissioning of the twelve. Matthew omits the Markan information that Jesus was the one who gave Simon the name Peter, and simply states that this was the Simon who was called Peter, in order to distinguish him from Simon the Cananean who is mentioned later in the list.⁵⁰ An aspect of the Matthean redaction that is much discussed is *πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος* (first Simon, who is called Peter; 10:2).⁵¹ This *πρῶτος* has been interpreted in various ways.⁵² It can either refer to Peter as the first disciple to be called by Jesus (4:18–20), or he is always mentioned first by tradition, or he has a special theological function in Matthew's conception of the disciples.⁵³ Since Matthew frequently makes Peter the spokesman of the apostles, the latter of these alternatives is most probable.⁵⁴ Davies and Allison interpret this passage as

⁴⁸ The Markan account here says that she served "them" (Mark 1:31).

⁴⁹ By moving this story from the beginning of his Gospel to a later position, Matthew creates a problem, since this story speaks against leaving his house and family to follow Jesus. Perhaps this is the background to why Matthew omits everyone but Jesus and Peter's mother-in-law from the story (who could of course still live in Peter's house even though Peter had left it).

⁵⁰ Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 4 vols., EKKNT 1 (Zürich: Benziger, 1985–2002), 2:83, argues that the concept of the twelve in Matthew is clearly related to his view of Israel, is meant to correspond to the twelve tribes of Israel.

⁵¹ It should perhaps be noted that some witnesses add *πρωτον Σιμωνα* to the Markan text, probably as a harmonisation with Matthew.

⁵² Gundry, *Peter*, 8, suggests that *πρῶτος* might make a wordplay with *Πέτρος*.

⁵³ In John's Gospel, Andrew and John seem to be the first to follow Jesus (John 1:37), but Peter is still the first who Jesus calls himself. In John this calling coincides with the naming of Peter as Cephas.

⁵⁴ Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 61, disagrees with this solution, arguing Peter is merely a representative of the twelve, not in any way special from the others. It seems like Gundry is against any idea of Peter distinguishing himself from the other apostles in any manner. I suspect this has to do with him wanting to

referring to Peter as the chief of the apostles, as first among equals.⁵⁵ Matthew changes the order of the first four names in the list, so that the Markan inner circle no longer has the first three names. Instead, Andrew is second so that the list corresponds better to the order of the calling narrative.

At this point in the Gospel, Matthew includes three significant Peter narratives that are part of the Matthean *Sondergut*. The first of these is introduced in connection to the Markan account of Jesus walking on water (Mark 6:25–52). Matthew significantly expands this story (14:22–33) by including a narrative about Peter walking on water. But by the addition of 14:28–31, Peter becomes a central figure in the Matthean version. Peter calls Jesus κύριος, which could be seen as a reference to the divine name in the LXX.⁵⁶ Peter asks a question concerning Jesus' identity: κύριε, εἰ σὺ εἶ (Lord, if it is you), which then results in all the disciples venerating Jesus and saying ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ (you are truly the son of God). This could be viewed as a parallel to the story of Peter's confession in Matt 16. Here, just as in Matt 16, Peter goes from bold confession to doubt and sinking. This Matthean addition to the text is not unequivocal in portraying Peter neither positively nor negatively. There is a tension between how Peter begins and how he finishes. Initially, Peter is portrayed as bold and full of faith, but in the end of the story Jesus calls him ὀλιγόπιστος (of little faith).⁵⁷ The conclusions of the Markan and Matthean accounts are radically different. Whereas Mark concludes that the hearts of the disciples were hardened, since they did not understand the miracle of the loaves, Matthew has the disciples conclude that Jesus truly is the Son of God. Matthew's description of Peter is negative, in the respect that Jesus calls him ὀλιγόπιστος. However, his actions lead to a confession of Jesus as the Son of God. Thus, Matthew still conveys a positive view of Peter by letting his lack of faith lead to a confession. Peter is portrayed as someone who takes initiative and takes a step of faith, as well as confesses Jesus to be Lord.

avoid an interpretation which could in any way be used as support for a Catholic interpretation of Petrine primacy. Davies and Allison, on the other hand, view this passage as a clear reference to Peter's privileged status. Peter is first in the list because he has the highest status, and Judas is last in the list since he has the lowest status, cf. W. D. Davis and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 3 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988–1997), 2:154.

⁵⁵ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:154.

⁵⁶ Tord Fornberg, *Matteusevangeliet*, 2 vols., KNT 1 (Stockholm: EFS, 1989–1999), 2:286.

⁵⁷ ὀλιγόπιστος is regarded as a typically Matthean word and is always used by Jesus in relation to his disciples (this is the only instance where it is restricted to Peter alone). Apart from Luke 12:28, Matthew is the only New Testament author to use this word, see Georg Braumann, "Der sinkende Petrus. Matth 14, 28–31," *TZ* 22 (1966): 403–14.

The second major Peter narrative is found in 16:13–20. Although the main plot of the text is found already in Mark, the Matthean version of this text is remarkable, and perhaps the most studied text concerning Peter as an authoritative figure. Matthew adds a response from Jesus between Mark 8:29 and 8:30.⁵⁸ This response consists of the renaming of Simon into Peter, and the giving of the keys of the kingdom.⁵⁹ Both these statements have historically been used for attributing certain authoritative capacities to Peter, not least in the Roman-Catholic tradition. Although it is possible that Peter is a nickname with purely secular purposes, it is more probable that the name was given to make a theological point.⁶⁰ We shall now deal with how these two statements show how the Matthean text itself portrays Peter as an authoritative figure.

In response to Peter's confession, Jesus calls Peter the rock on which he will build his ἐκκλησία. The interpretation of this utterance has caused much controversy. A classic stumbling block is the relationship between Πέτρος and πέτρα.⁶¹ As a reaction against the Roman-Catholic interpretation of this verse, Protestants have often connected πέτρα either to Peter's confession of Jesus as the Messiah, or to Peter as a representative of all believers.⁶² Gundry argues that if Jesus had meant Peter personally, he would rather have said "on *you* I will build my church."⁶³ This is obviously a very weak and hypothetical argument. Others have argued that Matthew has here made a bad and misleading translation from the Aramaic spoken by

⁵⁸ Traditionally, this section in Mark has been viewed as the dividing line between the first part of the Gospel, which treats Jesus as a miracle worker, and the second part, which treats Jesus as the suffering servant, see R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 332; Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, BNTC (London: Black, 1991), 200; C. S. Mann, *Mark*, AB. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1986), 33. Thus, it appears that Matthew has used this section in Mark for a point he wishes to make concerning Peter, but also concerning Jesus.

⁵⁹ Luz, *Matthäus*, 2:461–62, argues that Jesus here does not rename Peter, since he is referred to as Peter already earlier in Matthew, but rather he interprets his name. However, the fact that he is called Peter earlier in Matthew is probably due to the fact that he was more well known to Matthew's audience under that name. This is the only indication in Matthew of Jesus changing his name, a tradition present in both Matthew and Luke, but at different places in the chronology of their respective stories.

⁶⁰ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:627.

⁶¹ Some patristic writers related κηφᾶς to the Latin *caput*, assuming a connection between κηφᾶς and κεφαλή; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Aramaic Kepha' and Peter's Name in the New Testament," in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge: University Press, 1979), 267–71.

⁶² The latter can be traced back to Calvin, see George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, ed. D. A. Hagner (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 108.

⁶³ Gundry, *Matthew*, 334; Gundry, *Peter*, 15–30.

the historical Jesus, but also this must be considered a weak and hypothetical argument.⁶⁴

In this text Peter is also given the “keys of the kingdom of heaven.” This is explained as having the authority of loosing and binding. Loosing and binding is also mentioned in 18:18, but here not restricted to Peter.⁶⁵ The two instances where loosing and binding are mentioned are also the only two places where Jesus speaks of the *ἐκκλησία* (16:18; 18:17)—not only in Matthew, but in the Synoptics as a whole.

Christian theology has traditionally understood loosing and binding in Matt 16 as the power of the church to forgive sins or bind someone in their sins.⁶⁶ Most

⁶⁴ In Aramaic, both words would be rendered as כִּיפָא, thus making a distinction between them hard to maintain, cf. Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew*, 2 vols., WBC 33 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1993–1995), 2:470. Although most scholars consider this to be a wordplay reflecting a כִּיפָא - כִּיפָא construction, Caragounis, *Peter and the Rock*, 44–57, argues that כִּיפָא-טַנְרָא is a more plausible solution. However, I regard this hypothesis as far to speculative, since it discusses specific details of a non-extant text. There are no good arguments for such a solution, which is probably the reason why most commentators do not even mention the option. It rather seems like Caragounis is trying to defend some kind of traditional Protestant interpretation of the text, and thus inventing arguments that support his cause. Kari Syreeni, “Petrus och den ende läraren i Matteusevangeliet,” in *Matteus och hans läsare—förr och nu. Matteussymposiet i Lund den 27–28 sept 1996*, ed. B. Olsson, S. Byrskog, and W. Übelacker, Religio 48 (Lund: Teologiska institutionen, 1997), 73, dismisses Caragounis’ standpoint as “protestantiskt önsketänkande” (protestant wishful thinking). It is also significant to note that the parallel to Aramaic is only relevant if one regards this name to be coined in this way by the historical Jesus and accurately recorded by Matthew, which the Jesus Seminar argued was not the case, see Robert W. Funk, Roy W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar, *The Five Gospels. The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1993), 207. As noted by Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, (Leicester: InterVarsity, 1981), 712, the fact that Peter is called Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ in the same context could imply that an interpretation from the Semitic background is preferable. Yet, this dissertation does not deal with issues of the historical figures of Jesus and Peter, but the manner in which they are portrayed by the early Christian authors. The discussion of a possible Aramaic (perhaps oral) *Vorlage* is definitely interesting, but not of direct relevance to my thesis.

⁶⁵ Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 308–309 argues that Paul claims the authority of loosing and binding in 2 Cor 10:8; 13:10. This could in that case be viewed as supporting a conflict between Petrine and Pauline Christianity in a way similar to the reference to 1 Cor 3:11; Matt 16:17 mentioned above. Yet again, this presupposes that these were well established concepts in early Christianity, since the Corinthian correspondence is earlier than Matthew’s Gospel and thereby cannot refer to the Matthean text as such, but rather to some earlier tradition.

⁶⁶ This is probably the result of interpreting the expression in light of John 20:23. However, the connection to forgiveness of sins can also be found in Matt 18:15. See discussion in Birger Gerhardsson, “Nycklamakten enligt Skriften,” in *Himmelrikets nycklar: Predikningar och föredrag hållna vid Kyrklig förnyelses kyrkodagar kring bikten och själavården i Uppsala 1962*, ed. E. Segelberg (Saltsjöbaden: Kyrkligt forum, 1963), 41–74.

modern scholars rather tend to understand these terms as referring to the rabbinic authority to determine whether a commandment is applicable in a specific situation. Loosing and binding are terms also found in Josephus and Targumic material.⁶⁷ A rabbi would “bind” the law if he considered it to be applicable in a certain situation, and “loose” it when he considered it not to be applicable due to certain circumstances.⁶⁸ According to this interpretation, Jesus uses authority to loose and bind several times in Matthew (5:21–23, 31–32, 33–37, 43–48; 12:1–9, 9–14; 15:1–2, 10–20; 15:3–9).⁶⁹ If the keys of the kingdom of heaven symbolise this kind of authority, it implies that Matthew wishes to portray Peter as acquiring some kind of rabbinic authority that makes it possible for him to interpret Jewish halakha.⁷⁰ Jesus says that the scribes have closed the kingdom of heaven for people, and by using the keys of the kingdom of heaven, Peter would now be able to open it again through a correct halakha (Matt 23:13).⁷¹ In this manner Matthew portrays Peter as an authoritative halakhic teacher.⁷²

The loosing and binding are expressed through an unusual Greek construction, where both *ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (it will have been bound in heaven) and *ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (it will have been loosed in heaven) use *εἰμί* in the future tense together with a perfect participle. Julius Mantley argues that this is a periphrastic construction using *futurum exactum*.⁷³ If correct, this could imply that the loosing and binding is conditioned by some preceding heavenly sanction. Some interpret the grammar to mean that the result of the loosing and binding has already been predestined, whereas others argue that God

⁶⁷ Mark Allan Powell, “Binding and Loosing: A Paradigm for Ethical Discernment from the Gospel of Matthew,” *CurTM* 30 (2003): 348–445.

⁶⁸ Tord Fornberg, “Peter—the High Priest of the New Covenant?,” *EAJT* 4 (1986): 113–21, suggests that Peter is here presented as a Christian counterpart to the high priest in Judaism.

⁶⁹ Powell, “Binding and Loosing,” 441–42.

⁷⁰ Herman L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: Beck, 1922), 736, view this as a parallel to Is 22:22. It may also be worth noting that Jesus holds “the key of David” in Rev 3:7. Gale, *Redefining Ancient Borders*, 101, connects the keys to power and authority and refers to parallels in 2 Baruk 10:18; 3 Baruk 11:2; and 4 Baruk 4:4. However, these references reflect a later stage of Judaism and can thus not be viewed as the background for Matthew’s composition.

⁷¹ Gale, *Redefining Ancient Borders*, 101.

⁷² See discussion in Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 635–41.

⁷³ See Julius R. Mantley, “The Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense in Jn 20:23, Mt 16:19, and Mt 18:18,” *JBL* 38 (1939): 243–49. Mantley’s argumentation here is problematic, since his main objective seems to be to discredit what he describes as the sacerdotalism of the Roman-Catholic church. He also connects tense strictly to time, whereas more recent research also considers interpreting Greek tense in terms of aspect.

subsequently ratifies Peter's decisions.⁷⁴ However, the main point here is not the order of the decisions, but rather Matthew wishes to establish that this Petrine loosing and binding activity is synchronised with heaven, and thereby the actions of Peter represent the will of God.

H. M. F. Büchsel opposes the idea that the disciples would act as rabbis, since Jesus prohibits them from identifying as such (23:8).⁷⁵ Strack and Billerbeck argue that the loosing and binding is rather connected to excommunication.⁷⁶ However, it is unusual that the rabbinic concept of loosing and binding is used in this way at this time.⁷⁷ Yet, the possibility cannot be ruled out, since 18:17 is about excommunication.⁷⁸ This verse is preceded by the parable of the lost sheep, which would in that case indicate that excommunication is undesirable and possible to repeal.⁷⁹ The contrast between the keys to the kingdom of heaven and the gates of Hades could indicate that the issue of excommunication is at stake also in chapter 16.

There is a tension between the descriptions of the loosing and binding in Matt 16, which portrays Peter as the only one with this authority, and Matt 18, which describes how a case should be taken through certain instances, where the *ἐκκλησία*—not Peter—is the highest decision-making body. However, Matthew does not necessarily refer to the same thing in these two texts. Even though his intended meaning is probably similar, it is not necessarily identical. Richard H. Hiers argues that the loosing and binding originally referred to demon exorcism but was transformed by Matthew to an authority to solve whatever problems might arise in the community.⁸⁰ With this in mind, it is not strange that Matt 16 and 18 appear to be referring to different things when using the terms of loosing

⁷⁴ See Discussion in Hagner, *Matthew*, 474.

⁷⁵ Hermann Martin Friedrich Büchsel, “δέω,” in *TDNT* 2:60–61. He agrees that the loosing and binding has a rabbinic parallel but notes that the disciples are still advised not to assume such a position. He argues that Matthew wishes to portray Jesus as the only and perfect chief rabbi, meaning that the church does not need rabbis of their own. However, if this were the case, it would be weird that Matthew edits away Mark's references to Jesus as a Rabbi (except Judas' words at his betrayal). Rather, it is probably not a coincidence that Judas is the only one using this term in Matthew, cf. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 97.

⁷⁶ Strack and Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 738.

⁷⁷ Büchsel, “δέω.”

⁷⁸ Excommunication in a manner similar to Matt 18 would not be unique to the Matthean community but resembles the routines for excommunication among other Jewish groups around this time, such as Pharisees and Essenes, see Bridget Illian, “Church Discipline and Forgiveness in Matthew 18:15–35,” *CurTM* 37 (2010): 444–50.

⁷⁹ Bornkamm, “Authority,” 43.

⁸⁰ See Richard H. Hiers, “Binding and Loosing: The Matthean Authorisations,” *JBL* 104 (1985): 233–50.

and binding. One possible interpretation is that Matt 16 alludes to rabbinic authority and shows that Peter has an authority corresponding to the emerging rabbinic authority, even if he is careful not to portray Jesus and his disciples as rabbis. In Matt 18, he uses the same metaphor, but this time to deal with the forgiveness of sins in an ecclesial context.

Following the expanded confession account is Jesus' *Satanswort* toward Peter in 16:21–23. Matthew essentially follows Mark, but adds Peter's formulation, thus making the account more vivid, which is natural considering the expansion of the Markan text that Matthew has undertaken in the previous verses. Both evangelists portray Peter as the most eager member of the group of disciples, who immediately reacts to what Jesus is saying. Both balance between a positive and negative description of Peter in this context, mentioning both his confession and his satanic words. However, Matthew slightly sharpens Jesus' response to Peter by describing him as a *σκάνδαλον* (stumbling block).⁸¹ Thus, Matthew both expands on Jesus' positive response to Peter, and on his negative response. There is a striking parallelism between 16:17 and 16:23, showing a contrast where the Rock becomes a satanic *σκάνδαλον*.⁸² The addition of *σκάνδαλον* is a means by which Matthew tones down the critique of Peter. He shows that it is not Peter himself who is an incarnation of Satan, but rather his suggestion that is a satanic temptation for Jesus.

In the Transfiguration account (17:1–9), Peter calls Jesus *κύριος* (Lord) instead of the Markan *ῥαββί* (rabbi). Matthew consciously removes references to Jesus being a rabbi, in order not to confuse him with the rabbis of emerging rabbinic Judaism. Matthew makes Peter's suggestion of building shelters more personally related to Peter by substituting the Markan "let us" for "I will."

The third Petrine expansion in Matthean *Sondergut* is 17:24–27, dealing with the temple tax.⁸³ Obviously, the temple leaders are familiar enough with Peter as a leading disciple of Jesus to find it appropriate to ask him about Jesus' finances.⁸⁴ After Peter has answered the tax collectors, Jesus engages in a dialogue with him

⁸¹ Mark instead mentions that Peter will *σκανδαλισθήσονται* in Mark 14:14, 29.

⁸² Some have argued that this is an allusion to Is 8:14. This is not self-evident, since the LXX mentions neither *πέτρα* nor *σκάνδαλον*, but instead uses the synonym *λίθος*.

⁸³ As argued by Mikael Tellbe, "The Temple Tax as a Pre-70 CE Identity Marker," in *The Formation of the Early Church*, ed. J. Ådna, WUNT 1/183 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 19–44, the temple tax was an important marker of the Jewish identity, and this passage thus probably reflects a positioning in the Matthean community concerning the connection to Judaism, as a Jewish-Christian community.

⁸⁴ If one would take in consideration the Johannine notion of Judas as responsible for the finances (John 12:6), it would have been more natural to ask him.

on the issue, concluding that the temple tax is not really necessary as such, but can be paid in order not to offend the authorities. The story ends with Peter paying the tax with the coin he found in the mouth of a fish. This is an example of Jesus issuing a halakhic statement.⁸⁵ Although Gundry suggests that Jesus here rebukes Peter,⁸⁶ the dialogue between Jesus and Peter rather reflects that of a rabbi and his student.⁸⁷

There are many possible reasons for including this episode. It affirms the continuity of the Jewish identity of the Matthean sphere of influence by having Jesus adhere to a significant Jewish identity marker. At the same time, Jesus positions himself as not really needing to pay the temple tax but does it in order to not offend the Jewish authorities. The relevant question is why Peter plays such a significant role in this passage. Matthew normally omits unnecessary references to Peter, but here instead elaborates further on Peter's identity in his *Sondergut*. After attributing rabbinic terminology to Peter as an authoritative halakhic interpreter (16:13–20), Matthew gives an example of how Jesus is Peter's rabbinic teacher. In this way he makes clear that Peter's halakhic authority is not dependent on his own ability and judgment, but on that he is Jesus' own rabbinic student, and thus a transmitter of the halakha of Jesus himself.

The next time we encounter Peter is in a passage from the suspected Q-material in 18:21–22. Peter poses a question to Jesus about how many times he must forgive his brother. In the Lukan version, Jesus speaks on own initiative. We cannot find out anything specific about Peter as an authoritative figure here but can note that it is significant to Matthew that Peter is a prominent figure throughout the Gospel. It is uncertain whether Peter was present in Q. If not, it is significant that Matthew adds him to the quotation.⁸⁸

The next Peter-reference thereafter concerns the question concerning the reward for discipleship in 19:29–30. Matthew abbreviates and rephrases the pericope but does not change the way in which Peter is conveyed. He also edits the story about the fig-tree that withered, but this time in such manner that Peter is omitted from the account (21:20–22). The reference to Peter in the eschatological discourse

⁸⁵ Bruce Chilton, *Rabbi Jesus: An Intimate Biography* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 202.

⁸⁶ Gundry, *Peter*, 33–35.

⁸⁷ Luz, *Matthäus*, 2:529.

⁸⁸ James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and Milton C. Moreland (eds.), *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000), 488–91, suggest that the reference to Peter was not part of Q, but a Matthean addition. This passage is designated as Q17:3–4.

is also omitted (24:2–8), although the Markan account was exclusively directed toward the inner circle plus Andrew.

Matthew closely follows Mark's version of the prediction of Peter's denial (26:30–35) and the Gethsemane account (26:36–46).⁸⁹ Just as in Mark, Jesus specifically addresses Peter the first time that he finds the disciples asleep. However, rather than expecting Peter to be more likely to stay awake than the other disciples (Σίμων, καθεύδεις; Mark 14:37), he addresses Peter in the plural (οὕτως οὐκ ἰσχύσατε μίαν ὥραν γρηγορήσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ; 26:40), which indicates that Peter was the leader of the group of disciples. Also the denial scene (26:57–75) follows Mark closely and the question of the high priest to Jesus echoes Peter's confession σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (are you the Christ of God?; 26:63). After denying Jesus three times, Matthew concludes that Peter wept bitterly (26:75), which is the last reference to Peter in the entire Gospel.⁹⁰

The Matthean Peter-image is not only constructed through the editing and expansion of Petrine themes in the Matthean redaction. Also the omissions of Petrine material compared to the Markan source text are of significance. Peter is not only absent when his mother-in-law is healed, but also at the healing of Jairus' daughter and the woman with haemorrhage (9:18–26). Moreover, Peter is substituted for the “disciples” in the story of the fig-tree that withered (21:20–22). However, the most significant omission of Peter is at the empty grave, where the women who are in Mark told to ὑπάγετε εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ (go and tell his disciples, especially Peter; Mark 16:7), which instead reads εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ (tell his disciples; 28:7). The omission of Peter in the Matthean account at first appears strange, since Matthew has introduced several stories that focus on the importance of Peter. Gundry sees this as a proof that Peter is in fact a false disciple, but I think his conclusion is drawn too hastily.⁹¹ We have noted several instances where Matthew omits references to Peter as a part of his general abbreviation of Mark (cf. Mark 1:35–38; Matt 9:18–26||Mark 5:21–43; Matt 20:21–22||Mark 11:20–26; Matt 24:2–8||Mark 13:3–8). The Peter-passages added by Matthew are unique *Sondergut*, such as the walking on water (14:22–23), confession (16:13–20), and discourse on the temple tax (17:24–27). Thus, Matthew's omission of Peter should not be considered to be a conscious downgrading of the importance of Peter, but rather as part of his standard editorial abbreviation, whereas

⁸⁹ In the latter he changes the names of Peter, James, and John into Peter and the sons of Zebedee.

⁹⁰ Gerhardtsson, “Confession and Denial,” 62, argues that Matthew here indicates repentance from Peter's side. Although this seems plausible, it is never clearly spelled out in the text as such.

⁹¹ Gundry, *Peter*, 66.

his unique contributions concerning Peter are found in the Matthean *Sondergut*. Interestingly, the most significant Matthean *Sondergut* concerning Peter is concentrated to chapters 14–17. The omission of Peter from 28:7 indicates that Peter’s significance for Matthew lies not in his role as a witness of the resurrection but rather in his legitimation of Matthean halakha.

3.2.2 Conclusion: Peter in the Gospel of Matthew

Matthew emphasises Peter in his redaction of the Markan text from the very beginning. He immediately identifies Simon with Peter (4:18) and gives Peter a prominent position among the apostles (10:2).⁹² Peter is singled out as the most fervent confessor of Jesus’ identity, and follower of Jesus, while his failures to live up to his promises are also highlighted. This can be seen in relation to the walking on water (14:22–33), the event at Caesarea Philippi (16:13–23), and the transfiguration (17:1–9). The same pattern is also present at the prediction of Peter’s denial, where Peter confesses his loyalty but is answered by Jesus’ prediction. In connection to Peter’s denial (26:57–75) he is the only disciple who continues following Jesus, but still chooses to deny him. Christoph Kähler indeed has a point when suggesting that Matthew’s Gospel can be thought of as a *Petrusevangelium*, since Peter has such a prominent role in the Gospel.⁹³

The Matthean sphere of influence was active in a context where it was necessary to relate to Jewish practices and institutions, and a large portion of its adherents were likely of Jewish descent.⁹⁴ A significant theme in Matthew is ecclesiology,

⁹² I thus disagree with Gundry, *Peter*. Gundry’s main goal appears to be to prove a pre-70 dating for Matthew through making Matthew into a treatise against a living person. A diachronous analysis of the sort we have made above make the prominence of Peter in Matthew undoubtable. See Eurell, review of *Peter—False Disciple*.

⁹³ This is suggested by Christoph Kähler, “Zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte von Matth. Xvi. 17–19,” *NTS* 23 (1976): 36–58; and Wolfgang Schenk, “Das ‘Matthäusevangelium’ als Petrus-evangelium,” *BZ* 27 (1983): 58–80. A radically different (deconstructivist) position is taken by W. W. Bubar, “Killing Two Birds with One Stone: The Utter De(con)struction of Matthew and his Church,” *BibInt* (1995): 144–57, who argues that Matt 16 undermines the foundation for the whole Gospel.

⁹⁴ See Saldarini, *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community*. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 97, argues that Matthew points out the difference between the ἐκκλησία of Jesus (16:18; 18:17), and ἡ συναγωγή, especially in 4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54; 23:34. However a clear distancing to the synagogue can only be found in 10:17 and 23:34. The other passages only state that Jesus taught ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, which is indeed a slight revision of Mark 3:1; 62, but is a formulation also found in Mark 1:39.

also in regard to the Petrine passages.⁹⁵ This indicates that the quest for legitimacy of the Matthean sphere of influence was not primarily in relation to other early Christian contexts, but rather in relation to Judaism. Mark's description of Jairus as εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων (one of the rulers of the synagogue) is changed into ἄρχων εἷς (a ruler), in order not to connect Jesus too closely to the synagogue. Yet, the synagogue is Jesus' natural context. Thus, Saldarini argues, this should not be taken as a sign that the Christian church was institutionalised and separated from Jewish society.⁹⁶ Matthew aimed at distinguishing between his own community and his opponents in the Jewish society, which the Matthean sphere of influence still was a part of. If the Matthean sphere of influence were a sect, such definitions would be arbitrary, but if the Matthean sphere of influence was a community with more fluid borders, this type of discourse makes sense.⁹⁷

Let us now turn to our main subject, namely the Peter-image in Matthew. As I mentioned already in the introductory chapter, there are three main suggestions. Reinhart Hummel views Peter as some kind of chief-rabbi who is guardian of a correct Christian halakha.⁹⁸ Jesus builds his ἐκκλησία on this apostle, and gives him the authority characterised by the keys of the kingdom of heaven.⁹⁹ Georg Strecker views Peter as a prototype of the ultimate Christian who symbolises all believers in Jesus, both past and present.¹⁰⁰ Jack Dean Kingsbury proposes a "middle-way" in

⁹⁵ Tord Fornberg, "Matteus och hans läsare. Några exempel från tolkningshistorien," in *Matteus och hans läsare*, 25–39, notes that Matthew has since early on been used to define Christian ecclesiology, and discusses why this may be legitimate, but has often also been done with disregard to the context and genre of the text.

⁹⁶ Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*, 119.

⁹⁷ Syreeni, "Petrus och den ende läraren," argues that Peter was an important person to a special group within the Matthean community. This accounts for much of the critique toward Peter in Matthew, according to Syreeni, and aims at unifying the Matthean community. Syreeni's proposal as interesting, but highly speculative.

⁹⁸ Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 59–64. However, this idea was proposed already by Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 515.

⁹⁹ George Dunbar Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950), 37–58, studies the Petrine additions in Matthew and concludes that they do not come from a certain Peter-source, Matthew inserts references to Peter in association with legal rulings.

¹⁰⁰ Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*, 204–05, argues that Peter and the disciples are often used interchangeably. In some instances, Matthew adds Peter where Mark speaks of the disciples (Matt 15:15; 16:23), and in other instances, Matthew inserts the disciples where Mark refers to Peter (Matt 21:20; 24:3; 28:7f).

which Peter is the first disciple, but only in a chronological sense.¹⁰¹ None of these proposals is altogether uncomplicated. Kingsbury's proposal does not do justice to the significance of Peter in the Matthean narrative.¹⁰² The problem with Strecker's suggestion is that it does not explain the numerous elaborations on Peter that Matthew adds to the Markan narrative. Although it may be true in some cases that Peter and the disciples can be mentioned interchangeably, the above study has shown that the redaction concerning Peter is conscious, thus ruling out Strecker's hypothesis.

A version of Hummel's thesis is the most plausible. The fact that loosing and binding is rabbinic terminology, as well as Matthew's addition of Peter's name in passages where Jesus is giving halakhic instructions on ethical conduct (15:15; 17:24–27; 18:21), affirms Hummel's conclusion.¹⁰³ Strecker's critique concerning Matthew's aversion toward rabbis (23:8) is indeed legitimate, not least since all references to Jesus as a rabbi in Mark have been eliminated in Matthew, with the exception of those attributed to Judas (26:25, 49). The tension between Jesus and the scribes and Pharisees also indicates that Matthew wished to distinguish himself from the emerging rabbinic Judaism. Matthew both affirms rabbinic terminology and at the same time positions itself against the emerging rabbinic Judaism. The Matthean vision is to be a part of Israel, not as *συναγωγή*, but as *ἐκκλησία*, working within the framework of Israel without being the equivalent of the surrounding Israel.¹⁰⁴

Although rejecting Hummel's theory as such, Davies and Allison make some reflections that are of interest in this context.¹⁰⁵ They suggest that Peter may have

¹⁰¹ Kingsbury, "The Figure of Peter in Matthew." Kingsbury argues that Peter is a sort of *primus inter pares*—but only in relation to time, i.e. he is the first to be called. Due to this fact, he is also made the spokesperson of the disciples. A key example of this for Kingsbury is Matt 26:35, where Matthew (following Mark) adds the comment "and so said all the disciples" (pp. 71–72).

¹⁰² Furthermore, Kingsbury uses Matt 4:18–22 as primary text, whereas I would rather argue that the primary text on Peter is Matt 16:13–20.

¹⁰³ A similar position is taken by John R. Markley, *Peter—Apocalyptic Seer*, WUNT II/348 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 237. He argues that Peter as an apocalyptic seer reveals the true halakha of Jesus, in contrast to the rabbinic "human" halakha. See also Overman, *Matthew*, 137, who notes that Peter receives special instruction in halakhic matters.

¹⁰⁴ It should be admitted that the problem with this view is that it is uncertain how developed rabbinic Judaism was at this time.

¹⁰⁵ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 650–51. They argue that Peter's many shortcomings disqualify him of any unique status. At the same time, they affirm that Peter de facto seems to have had some kind of special position, since his influence seems to have been greater than that of any other after the ascension.

been viewed by Matthew as an authoritative link, perhaps *the* authoritative link, between Jesus and the Matthean sphere of influence. Davies and Allison speculate that if the Matthean community was situated in Antioch, it is possible that the M-material as such was thought of as originating from Peter himself. This is of course quite speculative, but still interesting to our subject, since this would render Peter as the source of the authoritative Jesus-tradition that Matthew includes in his Gospel. Samuel Byrskog is hesitant in going too far in the “rabbification” of Peter but admits that Matthew ascribes to him some rabbinic quality and concludes that “the disciples will through Peter remain bound to the foundational teaching that Jesus has given once and for all.”¹⁰⁶

The Matthean Peter-image must be understood in relation to the emergence of rabbinic Judaism. Matthew views his sphere of influence as part of Judaism, but still distinct, as some sort of “true Israel.”¹⁰⁷ The rabbinic authority of Peter pertains to halakhic interpretation, not due to his own merit, but due to his close relationship to the earthly Jesus. Thus, Peter’s halakha is not merely human perception, but is a transmission of the halakha of Jesus himself through his most prominent disciple. Likewise, this is the argument used by the Matthean sphere of influence in order to legitimise its own teachings.

The Markan view of Peter as *traditional* authority is naturally transferred from Mark to Matthew, and Peter is the most well-known disciple also to Matthew. Furthermore, Matthew portrays Peter as a *rational* authority, with legal authority for making significant halakhic decisions. The specifically Petrine *Sondergut* strengthens the *charismatic* dimensions of Peter in Matthew and boost his cultural capital in the *embodied* state. These factors combined create potential for translating Petrine authority to Petrine social capital. Through association with Peter, the most famous apostle who received his rational halakhic authority from the earthly Jesus, Matthew can claim to represent the most authentic form of Christianity. Overman suggests that the transfer of authority from Jesus to Peter corresponds to the Weberian concept of the routinisation of charismatic authority, i.e. Jesus chooses Peter as his successor and the successors of Peter who are leaders of the community therefore carry this Petrine authority.¹⁰⁸ Although I do not find it

¹⁰⁶ Samuel Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*, ConBNT 24 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994), 253.

¹⁰⁷ Speaking of “true Israel” is of course problematic for historical reasons. What I am aiming at when using this term is alluding to the idea of a “faithful remnant” in the Hebrew Bible.

¹⁰⁸ Overman, *Matthew*, 136–40.

historically substantiated that this was in fact the case, it is evident that this is the kind of transmission of authority imagined by the Matthean sphere of influence to make them legitimate.

3.3 Peter in the Gospel of John

The origin of the Fourth Gospel is a complicated issue that has yet not received a satisfactory solution, despite massive research efforts over a long period of time. The Gospel is normally dated to around 100 C.E., although the evidence supporting this evidence has proven not to be sufficient.¹⁰⁹ The composition is traditionally located in Ephesus, although other major cities such as Alexandria and Antioch have also been suggested.¹¹⁰ The author of the Gospel is unknown. Traditionally, John, the son of Zebedee has been considered to be author, but there are several other alternatives and there is no consensus on the issue.¹¹¹ The Gospel itself claims to be written by the “beloved disciple” (John 21:24), although the identity of this character is uncertain. John 21 is a later addition to the original text, and therefore the historical value of this reference is dubious. What is clear is that the editor who included the epilogue wished to connect the Gospel to the beloved disciple.

John’s Gospel as we have it today has undergone several redactions.¹¹² My primary task is to discuss the Peter-image in the shape that the Fourth Gospel exists today. However, the Peter-image in John has proven to be rather entangled with the discussions on the redactions of John, and they will therefore be commented upon to the extent that they are relevant. The complexity of the Johannine

¹⁰⁹ A dating prior to the 90s is not probable due to the ἀποσυνάγωγος in 9:22; 12:42; 16:2, see Charles Kingsley Barrett, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, KEK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 142. However, this term could also refer to events during Jesus’ lifetime and is therefore not reliable for the purpose of dating, see Bernier, *Aposynagogos*. The Rylands Papyrus containing John 18:31–33, 37–38 is usually dated between 125–150 C.E., thus setting a *terminus ante quem* around 110 C.E. However, this dating is uncertain, and it might as well be dated to the late second or early third century, see Brent Nongbri, “The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in Dating the Fourth Gospel,” *HTR* 98 (2005): 23–48.

¹¹⁰ See discussion in Barrett, *Johannes*, 143–49; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2 vols., AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966–70), 1:CIII–CIV.

¹¹¹ See discussions in Barrett, *Johannes*, 115–58; Brown, *John 1*, LXXXVII–CIV; and Pierson Parker, “John the Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel,” *JBL* 81 (1962): 35–43. Vernard Eller, *The Beloved Disciple: His Name, His Story, His Thought. Two Studies from the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 43–74, argues that the beloved disciple is to be identified with Lazarus.

¹¹² See discussion in Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1972), 46–54; Syreeni, *Becoming John*.

redaction history is well illustrated by the suggestion of Frederick Russell Hoare that the apostle John had a secretary write his Gospel on unnumbered sheets of papyrus.¹¹³ Overtaxed by the work with the Gospel, the apostle fell into a coma and died, and as he did so the unnumbered sheets of papyrus fell on the floor. The apostle's secretary collected the sheets and ordered them best he could—thus giving us the order we have today. Although historically very unlikely, this attempt at reconstruction well illustrates the problems involved in the structure of the text. Julius Wellhausen argued that behind the present text of the Fourth Gospel there was an original *Grundschrift* that was “die originale Schöpfung einer ausgesprochenen Persönlichkeit.”¹¹⁴ Simultaneously, Eduard Schwartz pulled attention to the problematic “aporias” in the Fourth Gospel through a series of articles on various examples.¹¹⁵ Drawing upon the efforts of Wellhausen and Schwartz, Rudolf Bultmann attempted at recovering the original order of the text, suggesting a radical redistribution of the Gospel.¹¹⁶ However, the Gospel in its present form is the

¹¹³ Frederick Russell Hoare, *The Original Order and Chapters of St. John's Gospel* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1944).

¹¹⁴ Julius Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: Reimer, 1908), 102. He also specifically addresses the apparent traces of redaction in John in Julius Wellhausen, *Erweiterungen und Änderungen im vierten Evangelium* (Berlin: Reimer, 1907).

¹¹⁵ Eduard Schwartz, “Aporien im vierten Evangelium I,” *NAWG* (1907): 342–72; idem., “Aporien im vierten Evangelium II,” *NAWG* (1908): 115–48; idem., “Aporien im vierten Evangelium III,” *NAWG* (1908): 149–88; idem., “Aporien im vierten Evangelium IV,” *NAWG* (1908): 497–550.

¹¹⁶ Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, KEK 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950). Bultmann's proposal is analysed in detail in Dwight Moody Smith, *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1965). For a discussion of the reactions to and criticisms of Bultmann's approach, see Mark L. Appold, *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT II/1 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1976), 148–56. Since, there have been a number of attempts at defending the integrity of the Gospel, see Eugen Ruckstuhl, *Die Literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums*, SF 3 (Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1951), who seeks to defend the literary unity of John by criticising some of the major works that analyse the sources of the Johannine redaction. See also idem., “Johannine Language and Style. The Question of Their Unity,” in *L'Évanile de Jean. Sources, redaction, théologie*, ed. M. de Jonge, BETL 44 (Leuven: University Press, 1977), 125–48. Martin Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (Philadelphia, PA: Trinity, 1989), has suggested that the difficulties in the text can be explained through the Gospel being written under a long period of time, being published by the authors followers after his death. Hugo Odeberg, “Johannesevangeliet tillkomst,” *Erevna* 4 (1947): 89–93, makes a similar suggestion, with the difference that he claims that it was published by John himself.

form intended by its final editor, and must be the point of departure for the discussion, while being aware of the complex redaction history of the text.¹¹⁷

3.3.1 Analysis: Peter in the Johannine Narrative

Peter appears already in the first chapter of John, and consequently in four major sections in chapters 6, 13, 18–20, and 21. We will discuss these sections in the order that they appear in the final version of the Gospel.

The Johannine calling story (1:35–42) differs significantly from the Synoptic versions. John the Baptist identifies Jesus as the *ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* (Lamb of God; 1:36). This declaration by John the Baptist results in two of his own disciples following Jesus and spending the night together with him. One of the disciples is identified as Andrew, Peter's brother, whereas the other disciple is unknown. It is commonly suggested that the other disciple is to be equated with the beloved disciple, but it is strange that he in that case is not identified as such.¹¹⁸ Another possible suggestion is Philip, considering that Andrew and Peter are paralleled by Philip and Nathanael in John 1:43–51, and the close relationship between Andrew and Philip reflected in John 21:21–22.¹¹⁹ Although we cannot be entirely certain, I agree with Udo Schnelle that the unknown disciple is probably intended to be identified with the beloved disciple by the final redactor of the text, especially considering the relationship between Peter and the beloved disciple that will be discussed below.¹²⁰

Although Andrew meets Jesus before Peter, it is evident that Peter is the better-known brother to John's audience, since Andrew is identified as the brother of Peter. In John, Peter is not given the privilege of revealing Jesus' messianic identity.

¹¹⁷ The most comprehensive and detailed contemporary study of the redaction of John's Gospel is the Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 3 vols., ECC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010). This ambitious study suggests a possible history of the redactional stages of John, suggesting that the present version is the third redaction, which was undertaken after the death of the beloved disciple in the 90s. I agree with von Wahlde that the text we now have is a redaction of the Gospel following the death of the beloved disciple (cf. John 21:23). However, von Wahlde's reconstruction of the Gospel origins leaves me unconvinced.

¹¹⁸ George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, WBC 36 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1999), 26.

¹¹⁹ Amos B. Hulén, "The Call of the Four Disciples in John 1," *JBL* 67 (1948): 153–57; Rudolph Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to John* (New York, NY: Herder, 1968), 1:310.

¹²⁰ Udo Schnelle, "Der ungenannte Jünger in Johannes 1:40," in *The Opening of John's Narrative (John 1:19–2:22): Historical, Literary, and Theological Readings from the Colloquium Ioanneum 2015 in Ephesus*, ed. R. A. Culpepper and J. Frey, WUNT 1/385 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 97–117. Yet, this is mainly by means of association. The beloved disciple as such is not introduced until ch. 13, see Frans Neiryck, "The Anonymous Disciple in John I," in *Evangelica II 1982–1991: Collected Essays by Frans Neiryck*, ed. F. van Segbroeck (Leuven: University Press, 1991): 617–50.

Instead, he receives this information from Andrew, who tells him about Jesus. When Andrew brings his brother to Jesus, he immediately proclaims that his name is Κηφᾶς, which is translated Πέτρος (1:42).¹²¹ Thereby, the presentation of Peter is different from the Synoptics already at the outset.¹²² Jesus is confessed as being the Messiah by Andrew in the same context that Peter receives his name. Thus, in contrast to Matt 16 and Mark 8, there is no correlation between confession and name changing in John's Gospel. As Schultheiß notes, Peter is actually the only one of the four disciples mentioned that does not make a confession.¹²³ Christos Karakolis argues that Peter's faith is presupposed from the start, when he accepts Andrew's invitation to meet the Messiah.¹²⁴

We discussed earlier that the πρῶτος that prefixes Peter's name in the list of apostles in Matt 10:2 has been argued to indicate a superior standing of Peter among the apostles. Ismo Dunderberg suggests that the πρῶτον in εὕρισκει οὗτος πρῶτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα (John 1:41) is a correction of the πρῶτος in Matt 10:2, in order to prepare the way for the prominent role of the beloved disciple in John, rather than Peter.¹²⁵ This presupposes that John uses and corrects Matthew.¹²⁶ Another suggestion is that πρῶτον implies that Andrew first went to Peter, and after this, Philip went to Nathanael.¹²⁷ Apart from this, πρῶτος is a well

¹²¹ This identification of the Aramaic Κηφᾶς with the Greek Πέτρος is interesting in relation to our discussions on Κηφᾶς in Paul and Matthew. This is contra the speculative theory of the Aramaic background to Πέτρος presented by Caragounis, *Peter and the Rock*, 44–57, but also speaks against the claims that Paul's references to Κηφᾶς are about someone else than Peter. Although possible, it is unlikely that John would want to identify Κηφᾶς with Πέτρος if they were not originally referring to the same person.

¹²² It is worth noting that Martha confesses Jesus as the Messiah in John 11:27.

¹²³ Schultheiß, *Petrusbild*, 87. Andrew confesses in v. 41, Philip confesses in v. 45, and Nathanael confesses in v. 49.

¹²⁴ Christos Karakolis, "Recurring Characters in John 1:19–2:11: A Narrative-Critical and Reader-Oriented Approach," in *The Opening of John's Narrative*, 17–38.

¹²⁵ Ismo Dunderberg, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Studien zu Joh 1–9*, AASFDHL 69 (Helsinki: Soumalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1994), 68.

¹²⁶ Dunderberg argues that this whole passage reflects knowledge of Matt 16:16–19 in some form. This is of course possible, but this indication is too vague, and combined with the lack of attestation of knowledge of Matt it is too speculative to draw such a conclusion. Dunderberg admits that the connection to Matthew is problematic and suggests that some (oral or written) version of Matt 16:16–19 was available to the author of John's gospel at some point, but not Matthew in its entirety. Blaine, *Peter in the Gospel of John*, 52–55, also argues that John is here dependent on Matthew, but as I have already pointed out, this is a speculative enterprise. It must be admitted that Matthew and John share the embryo of the same renaming-story of Peter, but this does not presuppose a literary relationship between the two gospels.

¹²⁷ Quast, *Peter and the Beloved Disciple*, 32.

attested variant reading.¹²⁸ Another, less attested, variant is *πρωι*. However, *πρωτον* is clearly the *lectio difficilior*, and it is plausible that a copyist would have changed *πρωτον* into *πρωτος* in order to harmonise the text with Matthew. I therefore consider *πρωτον* to be the best reading. *πρωτον* indicates sequence (first Andrew, then Philip), and it is plausible that the anonymous disciple was to be identified with Philip in an earlier version of the Gospel.

Peter is clearly a central figure to John's audience. However, his centrality is downplayed compared to the Synoptics by having the two disciples of John the Baptist be the first followers of Jesus and confess him as Messiah. The first reference to Peter in John does not betray much of the Peter-image. However, it does imply that Peter was well known to the Johannine sphere of influence. It is well known that Peter received his name from Jesus himself, and that his original name was Simon. Although Dunderberg's proposal that John here is dependent on some early version of Matthew cannot be fully substantiated, it is evident that the story of how Simon, the son of John, was called Cephas/Peter was well known also in the Johannine context. Thus, there was a conception of Peter to which the author of John had to relate. The nature of this conception is not evident from this text alone, but it implies that basic information about Peter was considered common knowledge.

After several chapters of silence, Peter appears again in John 6. The placing of this chapter in the greater narrative has been much discussed over the years, since John 6 seems to be an interpolation between chapters 5 and 7.¹²⁹ This discussion is not the matter of our study, but we must note its existence.¹³⁰ John 6 is dependent on Mark 6:30–54; 8:11–33, and reflects a phase in the editorial process where Markan material was incorporated into the narrative.¹³¹ The Markan parallels thus present a background toward which the Johannine account can be compared and analysed.

The second reference to Peter is found in 6:8 and is rather similar to the first. The context is the feeding of the five thousand (6:1–15), which is paralleled in all

¹²⁸ Bultmann, *Johannes*, 70, n. 8, suggests that this reading would imply that after the first one, Andrew, follows the second (unknown) disciple. This "other" disciple (in turn) found Philip.

¹²⁹ Bultmann, *Johannes*, 154, argues that a chapter order of 4, 6, 5, 7 is to prefer. Mary Shorter, "The Position of Chapter VI in the Fourth Gospel," *ExpTim* 84 (1973): 181–83, prefers inserting John 6 in between John 10:21 and 10:22.

¹³⁰ John 6:16–21 reproduces an abbreviated version of the walking on water in Mark 6:45–52 but does not account for Peter's attempt at doing the same in Matt 14:22–33, which might indicate that John used Mark but not Matthew.

¹³¹ Kieffer, *Johannesevangeliet*, 2:501.

Synoptics (Matt 14:13–21; 15:32–39||Mark 6:32–44; 8:1–10||Luke 9:10–17).¹³² Whereas the Synoptics do not mention the names of specific disciples, such names are introduced by John. Philip and Andrew are the two disciples who are active in the story. Peter is mentioned, but only in order to identify Andrew (who is called the brother of Simon Peter), which thus implies that Peter was the more well-known of the brothers.¹³³ The social dynamics of the apostolic group in John differs from the Synoptics. The Synoptics often portray Peter as the spokesperson of the disciples, but here it is Philip and Andrew (once again), who receive the active roles among the twelve.¹³⁴

The next passage is the Johannine parallel to Peter's confession in the Synoptics (6:60–71). This climactic point in Mark is mentioned in passing in by John, although Mark 8:27–33 evidently constitutes its literary background.¹³⁵ The confession occurs following a feeding story in all four Gospels. Yet, the context and content of the texts are different. In the Synoptics, Jesus' ministry is prospering, and people are discussing Jesus' identity. In John, disciples are leaving Jesus because his teaching is difficult (6:60).¹³⁶ Peter's confession is not the Synoptic *σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός* (you are the Christ, with variations), but instead *σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ* (you are God's holy One; 6:69).¹³⁷ Jesus' response to Peter's confession is also quite different. The Markan *Satanswort* is transformed into referring to Judas Iscariot as *διάβολος* (a devil; 6:70–71). Thus, John substitutes the Markan (ambivalent) picture of Peter as a blessed confessor with satanic influences into someone whose confession is purely positive, whereas the responsibility for the negative *Satanswort* is directed toward Judas alone. The Johannine account is significantly less

¹³² Kieffer, *Johannesevangeliet*, 2:501. Dunderberg, *Johannes*, 141–56, also discusses the relationship between John 6:1–15 and the Synoptics, and concludes that dependence on Mark is likely, but dependence/influence from Matthew/Luke is unlikely.

¹³³ The fact that John highlights other disciples than Peter (in contrast to the Synoptics) could indicate that he seeks to counter some kind of overestimation of Peter in order to legitimise e.g. the beloved disciple. However, the text is not negative toward Peter but simply is less interested in his person than the Synoptics. Thus, the purpose is not as much to downplay the role of Peter as to upgrade the roles of the other disciples.

¹³⁴ Emanuel Hirsch, *Studien zum vierten Evangelium*, BHT 11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1936), 60, argues that a redactor has inserted Andrew's name here since he has John 1:40 in mind.

¹³⁵ Kieffer, *Johannesevangeliet*, 2:501.

¹³⁶ It should be noted that Bultmann, *Johannes*, 340–41, considers John 6:60–71 to originally belong to some other part of the Gospel than ch. 6. In his commentary, he suggests that this pericope should be placed between chs. 12–13. Such a placement would make the Petrine confession more climactic in a Synoptic manner, but considering the Synoptic background of ch. 6, it seems more likely that the editor would have added this story together with the other Markan material in ch. 6.

¹³⁷ Schultheiß, *Petrusbild*, 109, argues that Peter's words here better reflect Johannine Christology.

substantial than the Synoptics. Peter is neither the first to confess Jesus as the Messiah (see above), nor does he receive a special blessing from Jesus. In the Synoptics, his confession is the culmination of the people's theories concerning his identity. In John, he confesses Jesus as the holy One of God when other disciples leave Jesus. Jesus' question in the Synoptics is "who do you say that I am?" whereas in John, Jesus asks *μη και υμεις θελετε υπαγειν*; (do not you also wish to go away?; 6:67). John presents Peter as a loyal follower of Jesus. The confession is preceded by Jesus saying *ουδεις δυναται ελθειν προς με εαν μη η δεδομενον αυτω εκ του πατρος* (no one can come to me if it is not granted him from the Father; 6:65). This implies that Peter's confession is not his own idea, but something that he has been granted by God (cf. Matt 16:17).

The editor of John 6 is significantly less interested in Peter than is Mark. Peter is a well-known and significant authoritative figure in early Christianity that must be mentioned. However, the significance of Peter at the time of the redaction is limited. John 6 prefers to stress the collegiality of the disciples, mentioning Andrew and Philip. John 6 shows a similar attitude to Peter, Andrew and Philip as the calling narrative (1:35–42). Although the calling narrative is not dependent on Mark in the same way as John 6, the thematic connections of Andrew being identified through the more well-known Peter as well as the centrality of Andrew and Philip in the narrative suggests that the calling story is part of the same redaction that added John 6. Peter appears as an important authoritative figure that is well known to John. However, relationship to Peter as an authoritative figure is distanced and theoretical. Peter is mentioned more than any other person, apart from Jesus, in John's Gospel—actually more frequently and in any of the Synoptic Gospels.¹³⁸ Although Peter did not play a significant role for the redactor of John 6, he was a significant part of his thought world.

After being absent since John 6, Peter suddenly appears again in John 13 as a central figure throughout the chapter—only in order to disappear again from John 14. In 12:37–50, the author summarises the first part of the Gospel, which has focused on Jesus' public ministry.¹³⁹ John 14–17 contains Jesus' farewell discourse.

¹³⁸ Mentions of Jesus and the disciples in John's Gospel: Jesus 242; Peter 37; Philip 12; Judas Iscariot 11; Thomas 7; Nathanael 6; Andrew 4; Jude 1; Sons of Zebedee 1. The beloved disciple is mentioned 5 times, with the possibility of interpreting the two references to other disciples as an additional two occurrences. Matthew and Mark mention Peter 25 times each, whereas Luke mentions Peter 30 times.

¹³⁹ Kieffer, *Johannesevangeliet*, 2:325. Syreeni, *Becoming John*, argues that the Johannine *Grundskrift* ended here.

John 13 thus is a bridge with narrative material introducing the farewell discourse. John 13 alludes to Mark but is free in shaping the stories in his own way.

Peter first appears in John 13 in connection to the foot-washing narrative (13:1–20). He plays a central part in the story, since Jesus explains his actions through a dialogue with Peter (13:6–11).¹⁴⁰ Kieffer suggests that John has in mind the ambivalent portrayal of Peter in Mark 8:27–33, where he first confesses, but then reveals his limited understanding.¹⁴¹ In the same way Peter here first calls Jesus κύριε and then shows that he has misunderstood the nature of that what Jesus is talking about. Nothing in the narrative suggests that Peter was the first disciple to have his feet washed by Jesus (which could imply rank). Bradford B. Blaine argues that Peter is the last disciple to be washed, since Jesus pronounces all disciples (except Judas) clean in 13:10.¹⁴² The narrative does not suggest anything about Peter as an authoritative figure. Although it is possible to argue that he acts as the spokesman of the apostles, John does not portray Peter as such throughout his Gospel in the Synoptic manner, but has the individual disciples speak for themselves (as we have seen in the examples of Philip and Andrew above). Therefore, it is better to view Peter as acting as a unique figure than a representative of the disciples. Thus far, Peter has not been a central figure in John in the way he is in the Synoptics. But in John 18–21 he will be very central and coupled with the beloved disciple. Perhaps John is preparing the readers for the story of Peter's denial (John 18) by portraying Peter as zealous but of little understanding? In any case, this mentioning of Peter does not make any substantial contribution to how Peter was viewed as an authoritative figure by John and his readers.

Following the foot washing is an account of the last supper, with a discourse on which of the disciples will betray Jesus (13:21–30). The essence of this story is present in all four canonical Gospels. John draws upon the Markan account, but expands it and adds his own, unique details.¹⁴³ Instead of the disciples anxiously asking Jesus μήτι ἐγώ; (Not I?; Mark 14:19), Peter makes sure that the question is answered by Jesus more directly. However, Peter does not ask Jesus himself, but instead makes a gesture to the beloved disciple (here introduced for the first time), who is lying at Jesus' bosom, to ask Jesus (13:23–24). John adds to the portrait of

¹⁴⁰ For a discussion on the role of foot-washing in the Johannine community, see John Christopher Thomas, *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Community*, JSNTS 61 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991). For a survey of historical interpretations of the foot-washing, see Georg Richter, *Die Fußwaschung im Johannesevangelium*, BU 1 (Regensburg: Pustet, 1967).

¹⁴¹ Kieffer, *Johannesevangeliet*, 2:330.

¹⁴² Blaine, *Peter*, 63.

¹⁴³ Kieffer, *Johannesevangeliet*, 2:333.

Peter by including him by name in this story, but his role as an authoritative figure is ambiguous. Peter takes a leading role by taking the initiative and asking Jesus. However, the beloved disciple is closer to Jesus (lying at his bosom), and his question is thus posed through the beloved disciple. We shall elaborate upon the relationship between Peter and the beloved disciple later, but the introduction of the duo is interesting from the start. Peter may be the initiator, voicing the question of the disciples, but the beloved disciple is the one who is close to Jesus and can ask him this controversial question.

Karl Georg Kuhn argues that John's seating indicates that his rank was higher than that of Peter, and that Peter's inability to pose the question himself was due to his inferior rank.¹⁴⁴ Although the cultural background of the meal is important, such an interpretation contradicts Peter's frank attitude in the rest of the Gospel, not least the preceding foot washing.¹⁴⁵ It need not be doubted that John wishes to indicate the higher rank of the beloved disciple by his seating at the meal, but it is not necessarily so that this would be the main reason why the question cannot be posed by Peter. Blaine argues that Peter must have been seated at a place where it was not possible to ask Jesus for himself, since he does not whisper to the beloved disciple, but gestures with his body.¹⁴⁶ However, discussing the practical details of how Peter may have caught the attention of the beloved disciple is superfluous for the purposes of this study, since I am not aiming at reconstructing a historical event, but rather wish to discern the Johannine perspective on Peter as an authoritative figure through the characterisation on Peter in the text. Thus, the relevant conclusions for our study are that the editor here indicates a higher rank of the beloved disciple than Peter, while still maintaining Peter as an important initiating force.

The last Peter-passage in John 13 concerns Jesus' prediction of Peter's denial (13:36–38). Kieffer relates the prediction of Peter's denial to Mark 14:26–31.¹⁴⁷ Peter does not act as the spokesman of the disciples in a Synoptic manner here but asks Jesus a personal question and receives a personal answer. In contrast to the Markan narrative, Peter does not boast of his own abilities on behalf of the other disciples. He does not claim that he will follow even when others do not. He is content with

¹⁴⁴ Karl Georg Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (New York, NY: Crossroad, 1992), 65–93. He bases his argument on the rules for the communal meals at Qumran.

¹⁴⁵ For a survey and discussion on the importance of seating and cultic background to this passage, cf. Blaine, *Peter*, 72 n. 68.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.* It should be noted that there are variant readings suggesting the opposite.

¹⁴⁷ Kieffer, *Johannesevangeliet*, 2:349.

stating that he will follow Jesus—even if it costs him his life. Whereas Mark (and Matthew) only addresses the question of Peter’s denial, John (and Luke) indicates his rehabilitation. Jesus’ prediction is not that of utter failure, but that Peter will deny him now, but follow Jesus unto death at a later point (13:36).

It is hard to say something about Peter as an authoritative figure from this text, but Jesus makes clear that Peter will indeed follow him all the way unto death. This has of course already happened at the time of the composition of the Fourth Gospel, but the prediction as such may function as an indication that Jesus somehow prophetically ordained Peter to martyrdom.

Summing up the results of our analysis of Peter in John 13, it is interesting to note that also this chapter containing much Peter-material has Markan connections, albeit not as obvious as John 6. Whereas Peter is dutifully mentioned in John 6, Peter’s character comes to life in chapter 13. Peter moves from being a flat character in the beginning of John, into an increasingly round character, exposing his dynamic personality.¹⁴⁸ The most significant aspect of John 13 is the introduction of the beloved disciple at the last supper. Peter is described as a zealous and passionate disciple who readily takes the initiative—but the beloved disciple is closer to Jesus. Even though Peter is willing to give his life for Jesus, he is going to deny him.

Peter’s appearance in John 13 is followed by Jesus’ farewell discourse. When the narrative continues, Peter is once again central in the narrative. John follows Mark to a great extent in chapters 18–19.¹⁴⁹ The resurrection account in John 20 also has some Markan connections, making it appropriate to treat them together. The references to Peter increase as the passion draws closer, although Peter is not present at the crucifixion itself.

The first mentioning of Peter in this section of John treats the dramatic events where Peter uses his sword to make armed resistance at Jesus’ arrest (18:1–11). John follows the main structure of Mark but adds details into the narrative. One such detail is the insertion of the name of the disciple who used his sword, Peter, and the name of the soldier, Malchus, who was injured and healed. In Mark, Jesus does not reproach the disciple with the sword, but instead blames the authorities for using violence to arrest him (Mark 14:48). In John (as well as in Matt and Luke), Jesus reproaches the swordsman.

¹⁴⁸ I refer here the designations “flat” and “round” for analysing literary characters coined by Edward Morgan Forster, *Aspects of the Novel and Related Writings* (London: Edward Arnold, 1974), 46–54.

¹⁴⁹ See discussion in Kieffer, “Jean et Marc,” and analysis in Kieffer, *Johannesevangeliet*, 2:439–41.

The Johannine conclusion of the story differs significantly from Mark. The Markan Jesus is deserted by everyone (although someone who tried eventually has to run away naked; Mark 14:50–52). In John, the disciples do not desert Jesus. This could be viewed against the removal of emphasis on Peter that we noted when discussing 6:8. Peter is not alone in not deserting Jesus—the other disciples did not actively desert him either, although they did not physically follow him in the way Peter did. Jesus’ reproach toward Peter is that he was hindering the will of God. It is hard not to see a parallel to Jesus’ words to Peter here and his words to Peter in 13:36–38 discussed above. Now is Jesus’ time to go where he must go, and Peter’s time to follow him unto death has not yet come. By identifying the swordsman as Peter, John undermines Peter’s ethos, since he does not understand that this must happen. Thus, this is a thematic parallel to the *Satanswort* of Mark 8:33.¹⁵⁰

After the account of Peter as swordsman follows an account of how Peter follows and denies Jesus (John 18:12–27). The plot mainly follows the Markan scheme (Mark 14:53–65) but differs in that it introduces another disciple who also follows Jesus. This disciple is not identified, but he allegedly knew the high priest and therefore could follow Jesus all the way.¹⁵¹ Even though Peter is not the disciple who has the opportunity to follow Jesus all the way, the author of John chooses to focus on him and his denial rather than the unknown disciple.¹⁵² The questions are here, just as in the Synoptics, first initiated by a servant-girl and then

¹⁵⁰ Luke is the only one of the evangelists who does not blame one disciple, but states that the disciples (plural) asked Jesus if they should fight with swords (Luk 22:49). Although Peter is only named in John, Luke clearly does not want to blame a single disciple apart from the others but wishes to portray the violent misunderstanding as the position of the disciples collectively. In Luke, this misunderstanding can even be derived from Jesus directly, who speaks of acquiring swords in 22:35–38.

¹⁵¹ William Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905), 101 argues that it is perfectly reasonable that John, the son of Zebedee (whom he considers to be the beloved disciple), knew the high priest.

¹⁵² Just as in the case with the unknown disciple in the calling account (1:40), it is plausible that this character is viewed by the final editor of the text as a reference to the beloved disciple. The question is why John does not develop the character of the beloved disciple to a greater extent in this instance. If one imagines that the tradition concerning Peter’s denial was rather well-known and widespread at the time of John’s final redaction, perhaps too great of an interpolation would not be credible to the readers. However, by making the beloved disciple a key character for letting Peter in through his relationship to the high priest, the beloved disciple is made into a witness of the trial without interpolating severely in the well-known denial tradition. John even has the unknown disciple follow Jesus into the residence, whereas Peter stayed outside. Thus, in a way, the unknown (and supposedly beloved) disciple is described as a disciple who followed Jesus more closely and therefore could give a more credible account of Jesus’ trial.

subsequently repeated by others. The third questioner is a relative of Malchus who had also been in the garden at Jesus' arrest.

The characterisation of Peter is flat compared to the Synoptic Gospels. There is no mentioning of Peter weeping or suddenly remembering Jesus' words. John seems uninterested in Peter's feelings and inner struggle. He recounts the denial story, which was probably well known in early Christianity. Yet, he also introduces an unknown disciple into the story, presumably the beloved disciple, and thus makes the beloved disciple into a witness of Jesus' trial that is more reliable than Peter, since the beloved disciple actually followed Jesus into the residence whereas Peter stayed outside.¹⁵³ Thereby John presents the unknown disciple, rather than Peter, as a reliable witness to the life of Jesus.¹⁵⁴

The last Peter-passage in this part of John's Gospel deals with the events surrounding the empty tomb (20:1–13). The outset of this passage resembles that of the Synoptics, starting with a woman visiting the tomb and finding it empty. But whereas the women in the Synoptics tell the disciples as a group (although Peter is specially singled out in Mark), in John, Mary Magdalene only tells Peter and the beloved disciple. Both Peter and the beloved disciple immediately run to the tomb. The beloved disciple is faster and arrives first, but stays outside the tomb, whereas Peter enters the tomb immediately.¹⁵⁵ The beloved disciple enters the tomb after Peter, sees, and believes (20:8).

There is likely a theological motivation to why John has Mary Magdalene tell only Peter and the beloved disciple, and not all the disciples. Brown suggests that these two disciples are singled out not due to their leading status among the disciples, but because they are the only two disciples recorded to have followed Jesus throughout his passion.¹⁵⁶ Brown is probably correct in assuming that Peter and the beloved disciple are singled out since they are the only disciples to follow Jesus until the end, according to John. However, it is not unlikely that John portrays them in this way in order to legitimate some kind of view of them as especially authoritative figures. The nature of their following "until the end" is also different.

¹⁵³ For a discussion on whether this unknown disciple should be identified with the beloved disciple or not, see Frans Neirynek, "The 'Other' Disciple in Jn 18.15–16," *ETL* 51 (1975): 113–41.

¹⁵⁴ This contrast is especially strong in relation to the Lukan account, where Jesus looks directly at Peter at his denial, thus at the same time implying that Peter had followed Jesus all the way to his trial, just as the unknown disciple in John (cf. Luke 22:54–62).

¹⁵⁵ Luke also mentions Peter running to and entering the tomb, but the beloved disciple is a feature unique to John's Gospel.

¹⁵⁶ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2 vols., AB 29 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966–1970), 2:983.

It is uncertain whether the beloved disciple followed Jesus to the high priest's house or not, since the identity of the "other disciple" who knew the high priest is not revealed.¹⁵⁷ In any case, this other disciple plays a minor role, as Peter's denial is the main focus of the story at this point. At Jesus' crucifixion, the beloved disciple is mentioned, but not Peter. Thus, Peter and the beloved disciple are indeed the two disciples following Jesus after his arrest, but they follow him at different stages and are portrayed differently. Peter's absence should not be viewed as a direct undermining of the Peter-character as such, since he is not present in the Synoptic Gospels either. Rather, John's Gospel takes the opportunity to highlight a significant tradition concerning the beloved disciple without thereby discrediting Peter. John simply adds the beloved disciple to the women present at the crucifixion in Mark 15:40 (Matt 27:55–56) and moves them closer to the cross.

Peter initially follows Jesus, but then denies being his disciple, and is not recorded as being present at the crucifixion. The beloved disciple, on the other hand, is not unambiguously reported to have followed Jesus directly after his arrest, but appears at the crucifixion, together with Jesus' mother and aunt, and Mary Magdalene. Whereas Peter denies being a disciple, the beloved disciple is assigned to take care of Mary, Jesus' mother, and enter in to a mother-son-relationship with her (19:26–27).¹⁵⁸ Although ignored by many commentators, it should be noted that the three women at the cross did indeed follow Jesus until the end to the same extent as the beloved disciple, and Mary Magdalene (the only woman who was not a relative of Jesus at the crucifixion), is the one who finds the tomb empty and tells Peter and the beloved disciple. Mary is also the first to meet the risen Jesus (20:14). Thus, even Mary Magdalene is portrayed in a positive light compared to Peter, since she both was present at the crucifixion and the first to visit the empty grave and meet the resurrected one.

¹⁵⁷ If one identifies the beloved disciple with John, the son of Zebedee, it is unlikely that this Galilean fisherman would have known the high priest. On the other hand, the editor's motive for including an unknown disciple into the account at this point is not due to his concern for historical accuracy, but rather to portray the unknown/beloved disciple as a reliable witness to all stages of Jesus' passion, not only equivalent, but superior to Peter. Whether or not the unknown disciple really knew the high priest is unimportant, since this notion is the pretext for including him in the story at this point. On identifying the beloved disciple with John, the son of Zebedee, see R. Alan Culpepper, *John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), 56–85.

¹⁵⁸ It would be interesting to elaborate on whether this assignment of Mary, the mother of Jesus to the beloved disciple is intended to say something about the beloved disciple as an authoritative figure. If nothing else, it seems to indicate a close relationship between Jesus and the beloved disciple, close enough for Jesus to give the responsibility for his mother to the beloved disciple rather than to his relatives.

John portrays Peter and the beloved disciple as the two disciples who followed Jesus until the end and were the first to witness the empty tomb (or, more accurately, the first after Mary Magdalene). John hereby constructs a basis for viewing Peter and the beloved disciple as reliable authoritative figures. His main focus is on establishing the beloved disciple as an authoritative figure, rather than Peter. The women are urged to tell Peter already in Mark (16:7), and this is probably a well-established narrative when John is composed. John seeks to establish some similar authority for the beloved disciple, and therefore couples him with Peter as primary (male) witness of the empty tomb. It is mentioned twice that the beloved disciple arrived before Peter at the tomb (20:4, 8), but still Peter is the first to enter. John couples the beloved disciple with Peter as primary witness to the resurrection. Although Peter and the beloved disciple do not meet the resurrected Jesus, the nicely folded and arranged grave clothing indicates that the body was not stolen, and from this they understand that Jesus is risen (20:9).¹⁵⁹ Only the beloved disciple is mentioned as believing as a result of what he had seen (20:8), but the conclusion concerning Jesus' resurrection is shared by both Peter and John (20:9).¹⁶⁰

I have argued that John's interest here is not in Peter, but in the reliability and centrality of the beloved disciple. This is attained through coupling him with Peter, who already had a significant status in the Johannine sphere of influence. Peter is presupposed as an authoritative figure by John and his readers, and the beloved disciple is attached to him in order to receive the same, or perhaps even higher status.

As the centrality of Peter increases in John 18–20, so does the critique. Peter is named as the disciple who used his sword at Jesus' arrest, and is reproached by Jesus. He denies Jesus three times while the unknown disciple follows Jesus into the house of the high priest. Finally, Peter loses the race to the empty tomb to the beloved disciple. They both see the grave clothing indicating Jesus' resurrection—but the beloved disciple is the one who believes. Although Peter's utter failure is emphasised at the arrest and denial scenes, Peter still has the position as one of the two disciples who Mary Magdalene tells about the empty tomb. Although Peter's name is spelled out as the one with a sword at the arrest, the portrait of Peter is not

¹⁵⁹ Quast, *Peter and the Beloved Disciple*, 116. It should be noted that Bultmann, *Johannes*, 530, and Gert Hartmann, "Die Vorlage der Osterberichten in Joh 20," *ZNW* 15 (1964): 189–209, view 20:9 as the result of a later ecclesial redaction.

¹⁶⁰ R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1994), 122, argues that only the beloved disciple (i.e. not Peter) sees and believes. He is true in noting that John emphasises that John believed, whereas Peter is not further analysed in the Gospel, but both disciples appear to have come to the same conclusion in v. 9.

more negative than in the Synoptics. Rather, the beloved disciple is continuously coupled with Peter—but portrayed in a more positive way. If we take the unknown disciple at the denial scene to be the beloved disciple, he follows Jesus all the way without denying him, thus being a witness to the story of Jesus superior to Peter. Mary Magdalene does not only tell Peter, as is stressed in Mark, but Peter and the beloved disciple. The beloved disciple is the fastest to arrive and to believe. Thus, Peter's characterisation as an authoritative figure in the sense of being a reliable witness to the Jesus tradition is not downplayed by John as much as the beloved disciple is portrayed as being a superior witness, even compared to Peter.

Finally, we will now turn to the portrait of Peter in John 21. The origin of John 21 is a much-debated issue. The natural ending of John's Gospel is found in 20:30–31, and chapter 21 is often considered as some kind of appendix.¹⁶¹ It is commonly argued that there is no evidence of the Gospel circulating without the epilogue, and the epilogue must have been added to the Gospel by the author or a redactor at an early stage.¹⁶² However, a fourth century Coptic papyrus containing John 20:19–31 actually suggests that a version ending in 20:31 had some circulation.¹⁶³ As we have noted earlier, reconstructing the redactional phases of John's Gospel is a complicated task, but I think it is uncontroversial to say that John 21 stems from the final redaction which gave the Gospel its present form, and was written in the aftermath of the death of the beloved disciple, as a means of theologically explaining his death, but also legitimising his teachings that were now managed by the Johannine school. Johannes Beutler goes so far as to claim that the purpose for adding chapter 21 is to explain the role of Peter and the beloved disciple.¹⁶⁴

The first story where Peter plays a central role in John 21 is the account of Jesus' appearance at the lake of Tiberias (21:1–14). This story begins by presenting Peter as a leader of the disciples, taking the initiative to return to the fishing industry in Galilee. Although returning to the occupation they held previous to becoming

¹⁶¹ Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 162, calls it a "Nachtrag."

¹⁶² Ulrich Busse, *Das Johannesevangelium: Bildlichkeit, Diskurs und Ritual*, BETL 162 (Leuven: University Press, 2002), 261; W. S. Vorster, "The Growth and Making of John 21," in *The Four Gospels 1992*, 2207–24. See also Hartwig Thyen, "Johannes 13 und die ‚kirchliche Redaktion‘ des vierten Evangeliums," in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kubn zum 65. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 343–56 (344, n. 4).

¹⁶³ See Gesa Schenke, "Das Erscheinen Jesu vor den Jüngern und der ungläubige Thomas: Johannes 10,19–31," in *Coptica—Gnostica—Manichaica: Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk*, ed. L. Painchaud and P.-H. Poirier, BCNHE 7 (Québec: Les presses de l'université Laval, 2006), 893–904.

¹⁶⁴ Johannes Beutler, "Peter on the Way to His Universal Mission in the Gospel of John," in *The Church and Its Mission in the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Memory of Hans Kvalbein*, ed. D. E. Aune and R. Hvalvik, WUNT 1/404 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 85–97.

disciples of Jesus could naturally appear as a negative suggestion, John does not present it as such. Peter's suggestion is here used to explain the sudden change of setting from Jerusalem to Galilee. In this story we once again find Peter and the beloved disciple working together. Peter is the one who takes initiative, both to go out fishing and to throw himself out of the boat to come to Jesus. The beloved disciple is the one who recognises Jesus and helps him see that it is indeed Jesus talking to them. When Jesus tells the disciples to bring fish, Peter is the one who makes sure that this happens. Thus, Peter is portrayed as the person who takes initiative, whereas the beloved disciple is the more reflected disciple who perceives and recognises Jesus. If one presupposes that Peter was already thought of as an important authoritative figure, this could be viewed as a positioning of the beloved disciple in relation to him. Such a positioning would entail recognising Peter's importance as initiating force, while at the same time explaining that the fervent Peter did not see the whole picture—the intimate relationship with Jesus and the recognition of him in a new context would point to the deeper (theological?) understanding of the beloved disciple. Thus, Peter and the beloved disciple are portrayed as significant leaders in different ways. Peter is a significant practical leader in early Christianity, but the beloved disciple is significant due to his theological leadership derived from his unique theological insight.

The next significant Peter-passage is Peter's dialogue with Jesus (21:15–19). This interesting dialogue between Jesus and Peter is put in connection to the previous fishing episode. In one way, the dialogue is a renewal of Peter's calling, and could from that perspective be seen as a parallel to Luke 5, where Peter's calling is also connected to the miraculous draught of fish. The story is ended by Jesus saying to Peter ἀκολούθει μοι (follow me; 21:18).

Jesus asks Peter three times “do you love me” and thus rehabilitates Peter from his threefold denial. Each time that Peter answers, Jesus replies by commissioning him to tend and feed his sheep. This threefold confirmation of Peter's love toward Jesus is some kind of rehabilitation of Peter against the background of his threefold denial in John 18. However, Jesus also designates a special role to Peter in the post-Easter state of the movement to be a shepherd to the sheep. The background for understanding Jesus' saying here is John 10:1–18, where Jesus speaks of himself as the good shepherd.¹⁶⁵ Hence, this text implies that Peter would be an earthly

¹⁶⁵ The pericope on the good shepherd is, as von Wahlde, *Introduction*, 11, notes, a clear example of an *aporia* in John's Gospel, and the parable has clearly undergone redaction. Perhaps the reference to Jesus as the good shepherd rather than the gate can be attributed to the same editor that lies behind the appendix in chapter 21, as a means of explaining Peter's status as an authoritative figure?

substitute for Jesus. This substitutionary role does not consist of being an interim Messiah, but of feeding (βόσκω) Jesus' sheep. Rather than pertaining to physical food, βόσκω in this context should be seen as herding and tending to the needs of the flock.¹⁶⁶

Peter as the shepherd of the flock consisting of the Jesus Movement is a concept that per definition entails authority.¹⁶⁷ Interpreting this statement through John 10, it is paramount for Jesus that the shepherd Peter will not leave the flock when the wolves come, but stay and protect it, and give his life for the sheep (10:15). This is also the prospect Jesus communicates to Peter in 21:18–19. The reference to sheep in another fold in 10:16 is interesting as it could be interpreted as a reference to the Johannine sphere of influence under the leadership of the beloved disciple as distinct from other early Christian spheres of influence. In that case it could refer to some type of group in the early Christian movement who had adhered to Peter as primary authoritative figure in some sense, whereas the Johannine sphere of influence, following the teachings of the beloved disciple were of a different fold, but both belonging to Jesus' flock. The conclusion of 10:16 *καὶ γενήσονται μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμὴν* (and become one flock and one shepherd) could in that case be viewed as a prospect of eventually uniting Johannine Christianity to some Petrine type in the aftermath of the death of the elder/beloved disciple. As Alv Kragerud notes, this ecumenical vision should not be viewed as a description of a historical reality, but as a theological incitement communicated from the redactor to his audience.¹⁶⁸ Peter was dead and buried at the time of John's final redaction, and Peter was not universally seen as the shepherd of the Christian movement. However, to the redactor of John, Peter symbolised some form of Christianity with which he expresses a wish to connect.

The final Peter-passage treats Peter's question about what will happen to the beloved disciple (21:20–24). This dialogue between Peter and Jesus about the destiny of the beloved disciple is paramount in discerning the self-understanding of the final redactor of John's Gospel. The composition relates back to the last supper in 13:21–24, where Peter and the beloved disciple interact to ask Jesus about the

¹⁶⁶ See BDAG, s. v. "βόσκω."

¹⁶⁷ Alv Kragerud, *Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium* (Oslo: Osloer Universitätsverlag, 1959), 53–66 considers this passage to be an early witness to the rise of the monarchical episcopate.

¹⁶⁸ Kragerud, *Der Lieblingsjünger*, 61.

identity of the traitor.¹⁶⁹ John 21:23 indicates that John's original audience had believed that the beloved disciple would live to experience the *παρουσία*, and this passage in the appendix addresses how the death of the beloved disciple should be treated theologically.¹⁷⁰ The longevity of the beloved disciple was interpreted as ordained by Jesus himself, and thus not less significant than the martyrdom of Peter.¹⁷¹

The beloved disciple is introduced into this section of the text as following Jesus and Peter when they had their rehabilitative conversation. This description turns upside down the standard Johannine description of the social relations between Jesus, Peter and the beloved disciple. At the last supper, the beloved disciple lies at Jesus' bosom, whereas here he follows at a distance the important conversation of Jesus and Peter. Thus, the beloved disciple is in a way placed in a somewhat "inferior rank" compared to Peter in the context of Jesus' commissioning of Peter as shepherd of his flock. Although assigning such a central role to Peter in John 21 and assigning to him a significant authoritative position as shepherd, John makes clear that Peter should not consider himself superior to the beloved disciple. Jesus makes clear to Peter that his task is not to inquire of the destiny and ministry of the beloved disciple, but to follow Jesus. Thus, the redactor of John 21, although affirming the legitimacy of Peter-oriented Christianity, emphasises the legitimacy and independence of the beloved disciple and his legacy. The "Petrine" Christianity he refers to may very well be larger, but the authenticity and Jesus-commissioned origin is the same.

Summing up the results of our analysis of John 21, we may conclude that this is the chapter in John where Peter most clearly emerges as an authoritative figure. Peter is the initiator of the fishing trip to Galilee, the disciple who is singled out as and called to be a shepherd for Jesus' flock. At the same time, the reflections around the relationship between Peter and the beloved disciple climaxes. The beloved disciple is described as having a special ability to recognise Jesus, and a destiny and calling by Jesus which is none of Peter's business, whereas Peter emerges

¹⁶⁹ The fact that the editor here so clearly relates back to the incident at the last supper indicates that also this depiction of the dynamics between Peter and the beloved disciple is a result of the same redaction. von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters*, 2:609, notes that a common feature of the occurrences of the beloved disciple is that they have no connection to the surrounding context.

¹⁷⁰ See Hartwig Thyen, "Entwicklungen der johanneischen Theologie und Kirche im Spiegel von Joh 21 und der Lieblingsjüngertexte des Evangeliums," in *L'Évangile de Jean*, 259–300.

¹⁷¹ Labahn, "Simon Peter," 166 argues that the redactor here makes clear that Peter has no authority over the beloved disciple.

as the shepherd of the flock on a larger scale, and initiator whose suggestions gain following with the other disciples.

3.3.2 Conclusion: Peter in the Gospel of John

R. Alan Culpepper has claimed that the characterisation of Peter in John is strikingly similar to the Synoptics.¹⁷² He is right in asserting that there are many similarities in the Johannine and Synoptic portraits of Peter, mainly due to the fact that many of the references to Peter in John are in sections of the Gospel that are dependent upon Mark. However, I argue that Peter plays a different role in John than he does in the Synoptics. Whereas Peter in the Synoptics is a dynamic character, central to the narrative, the function of Peter in John's Gospel is to explain the place and importance of the beloved disciple. He does stand at the forefront of key passages in the Gospel as he does in the Synoptics. In John's Gospel he also represents non-Johannine Christianity.

From the beginning of John until chapter 13, Peter is only mentioned when Mark is used as source text, and Peter's character is flat compared to the Synoptics. Peter's historic legacy is well known in early Christianity, and certain well-known stories about Peter, such as the confession, must be recounted in some way. Andrew is referred to as being Peter's brother, thus indicating that Peter was a well-known figure. When Peter appears again in John 13, the redactor is not content with simply referring to Peter as a means of identification or recounting of well-known events. Peter emerges as an initiator, both at the foot washing and for initiating the beloved disciple to ask Jesus concerning the identity of the one who would betray Jesus at the last supper.¹⁷³ This tendency escalates from John 18 and forward. Peter takes an initiative to armed resistance at Jesus' arrest, although he is reproached for this by Jesus. He also follows Jesus to the house of the high priest. At this point, yet a dimension of Peter is added by the author. Peter emerges as a witness to the non-public events of the ministry of the earthly Jesus. Peter follows Jesus to the house of the high priest but is also the first to enter the empty tomb, thus becoming something of a primary witness to the resurrection. In John 21, Peter is the initiator who takes the disciples fishing in Galilee and is the first to throw himself in the water in order to get to Jesus. Here he is also called to be a shepherd of Jesus' flock. The meaning of this is ambiguous. It could of course be interpreted as a reference to Peter as an authoritative interpreter, but this is less likely. Rather,

¹⁷² Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 120.

¹⁷³ It is significant that Peter changes from flat to round from John 13 and onwards, since this coincides with the introduction of the beloved disciple.

it appears to be a reference to the significant role of Peter in some other type of Christianity to which John wanted to define his relationship.¹⁷⁴ The concluding dialogue between Peter and Jesus about the beloved disciple, combined with the reference to the beloved disciple as the author of the Fourth Gospel in 21:24 rather indicates a view of Peter as an authoritative figure in regard to historical authenticity. Yet, as I have argued above, Peter is not portrayed as the primary witness to Jesus—this function is held by the beloved disciple. Peter is portrayed as a witness to Jesus, but a witness with less insight than the beloved disciple. The beloved disciple is the source of John's Gospel and is coupled with Peter since he was regarded as authoritative in his transmission of the account of Jesus.¹⁷⁵

The sociological analysis of Peter as an authoritative figure has many dimensions in a text with such complex redaction history as John. The Fourth Gospel shows an awareness of Peter as significant *traditional* authority from the very beginning, although it emphasises many other disciples in order to create a legacy of the group of disciples rather than Peter exclusively. However, in the final redaction of the Gospel, both Peter and the beloved disciple are presented as *charismatic* leaders, who *embody* a great deal of cultural capital. The beloved disciple even has cultural capital in its *objectified* state through being associated with the composition of the Fourth Gospel itself. The Fourth Gospel acknowledges a variety of Christianities (10:1–19), but also indicates critique toward the Johannine theological position (6:52–71). The Fourth Gospel obviously reflects a peculiar form of Christianity, but also indicates that this theological tradition wishes to connect with another tradition which it connects to Peter. The Fourth Gospel in its final redaction bears traces of a postapostolic situation where living human beings cannot be used as points of reference for authentic teaching, but *cultural capital* has to be translated into a *social capital* that brings legitimacy. One way of achieving this is to argue that the Johannine tradition, although unique, is not essentially different from forms of Christianity that use Petrine social capital to legitimise their faith. In this way the Fourth Gospel is part of a trend around 100 C.E., where Peter is increasingly used as an authoritative figure to legitimise a certain type of

¹⁷⁴ Oscar Cullmann, *The Johannine Circle* (London: SCM, 1976), 15, argues that Peter represents another branch of the church and is stressed, but Peter as such is never attacked.

¹⁷⁵ Hartwig Thyen, "Entwicklungen," 292, argues that the beloved disciple in Joh 21 is presented not as a rival to Peter's ministry as a shepherd, but rather as a reliable witness (just as Peter), thus authorising the account.

Christianity. In the case of the Fourth Gospel, the cultural capital of the beloved disciple is combined with that of Peter in order to achieve this legitimacy.¹⁷⁶

Excursus D: Peter, the Beloved Disciple, and the Redaction of the Fourth Gospel

A core issue for understanding the role of Peter as an authoritative figure in the Fourth Gospel is the relationship between him and the beloved disciple. Although John's Gospel has at times been considered anti-Petrine, even F. C. Baur, who is in his other works especially fond of anti-Petrine polemics, concludes that no polemic can be found between Peter and the beloved disciple. Rather, he argues that the high authority of Peter in a large portion of Christianity made it necessary to relate to Peter in order to elevate the status of the beloved disciple.¹⁷⁷ Although I have criticised Baur's thesis of a dichotomy between Judaism/Hellenism and Peter/Paul above, I must here agree that the treatment of Peter in the Fourth Gospel does indeed indicate that Peter was held in high esteem in a portion of Christianity to which the redactor sought to relate. As mentioned above, it is plausible that John 21 was added at the final redaction of the Fourth Gospel, in order to explain the role and authority of the beloved disciple, who was a significant figure for the circle for which the Gospel was edited. I will now suggest a theory concerning the redaction history of John based on the development of the relationship between Peter and the beloved disciple. This suggestion is not nearly comprehensive but may give a hint to a possible redactional motive in John. A similar reconstruction was first proposed by Wilhelm Heitmüller in 1914, and later again by Hartwig Thyen in 1977, but I think that the results of this study strengthen and complement their arguments.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁶ See Andrew J. Byers, "Johannine Bishops? The Fourth Evangelist, John the Elder, and the Episcopal Ecclesiology of Ignatius of Antioch," *NovT* 60 (2018): 121–39.

¹⁷⁷ Baur here argues on basis of his well-known dichotomy between Pauline and Petrine Christianity that "[Es mußte] die notwendige Tendenz des Evangelium sein, sich über die schon vorhandenen Formen des christlichen Bewußtseins, welche im allgemeinen die paulinische und petrinische waren, [zu stellen]" see Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr verhältniß zu einander, ihren Character und Ursprung* (Tübingen: Fues, 1847), 345.

¹⁷⁸ Wilhelm Heitmüller, "Zur Johannes-Tradition," *ZNW* 15 (1914), 189–209; Thyen, "Entwicklungen." Thyen repeats and develops his arguments in "Noch einmahl: Johannes 21 und 'der Jünger, den Jesus Liebt'," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts. Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, ed. T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 147–89. Similar proposals have also been made by others, cf. Maurice Goguel, *Introduction au Nouveau Testament, tome II: Le quatrième Évangile*, BHR (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1924), 361–64; Adolf

We presuppose that John 1–20 existed in some form at the death of the beloved disciple and was considered to contain his reminiscences. The Johannine theological tradition had its own distinct character and tradition, tracing its origin to the beloved disciple. Following the death of the beloved disciple, leading figures undertake a redaction of the Gospel of the beloved disciple, in order to both legitimate the uniqueness of the Johannine tradition, but also to undertake a process of becoming less exclusive and relate closer to surrounding Christian groups, who apparently consider Peter to be the source for their knowledge of the earthly Jesus.¹⁷⁹ The main objective of this redaction is to introduce the beloved disciple into the narrative. The beloved disciple is probably an honorary title for their now deceased leader, unique to Johannine Christianity. If John originated in Ephesus there were plenty of opportunities for interacting with other early Christian traditions.¹⁸⁰

The main contribution of the final redaction is the appendix of John 21, describing how the surrounding Peter-centred Christianity indeed had roots going back to the earthly Jesus. At the same time, the uniqueness of the own tradition is emphasised through Jesus' words that affirm the special calling of the beloved disciple. However, the appendix alone is not enough to show that the own, Johannine, type of Christianity is just as authentic as the type referring back to Peter as a link to the earthly Jesus. Therefore, the beloved disciple is introduced into various other texts in the Gospel, making the beloved disciple a reliable and authentic witness to the life and teachings of the earthly Jesus who is comparable to, and often better than, Peter.¹⁸¹ The view of Peter as the foremost of the apostles was well-attested at this time, and thus substituting Peter for the beloved disciple would not be credible. Instead, the beloved disciple is made into the disciple who has a more intimate relationship to Jesus, by portraying him as lying at Jesus'

von Harnack, *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der Alten Kirche*, AKG 19 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931), 126 n. 2; Walter Schmithals, *Johannesevangelium und Johannesbriefe: Forschungsgeschichte und Analyse*, BZNW 64 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 220–34; and Hans-Martin Schenke and Karl Martin Fischer, *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments II: Die Evangelien und die anderen neutestamentlichen Schriften* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1979), 177.

¹⁷⁹ Cullmann, *Johannine Circle*, 95. This is also suggested by Tobias Nicklas, "Gnostic Perspectives on Peter," in *Peter in Early Christianity*, 196–221 (201).

¹⁸⁰ On Johannine Christianity in Ephesus, see Mikael Tellbe, *Christ-Believers in Ephesus: A Textual Analysis of Early Christian Identity Formation in a Local Perspective*, WUNT 1/242 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 30–39. See also Rick Strelan, *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus*, BZNW 80 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996), 301–302.

¹⁸¹ See discussion in Jürgen Becker, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, ÖTK 4 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981), 2:434–40.

bosom during the last supper (13:23). This intimate relationship is also referred to in 21:20. The beloved disciple is also included at the crucifixion, where Mark only includes women (John 19:25||Mark 15:40–41). The intimate relationship between Jesus and the beloved disciple is further emphasised by Jesus’ handing over of his mother for the beloved disciple to take care of (19:26–27).

It is plausible that John 20:2–10 is also composed in the final redaction.¹⁸² By omitting 20:2–10, the narrative about Mary Magdalene makes more sense. Mary arrives at the tomb, leans in, sees the two angels, and finally Jesus, who tells her to go and tell “his brothers.” In the present edition of the Gospel, Mary has already told Peter and the beloved disciple, and this urge is superfluous. By adding 20:2–10, Peter is the first to enter the empty tomb (rather than Mary Magdalene). The beloved disciple is coupled with Peter as the two most important apostles.¹⁸³ As we noted in our treatment of this text, the redactor stresses that the beloved disciple arrived first at the tomb, although Peter entered first, and only the beloved disciple is referred to as believing as a result of entering the tomb.

Finally, there are two ambiguous references to unknown disciples, which are probably meant to refer to the beloved disciple, although this is not clearly spelled out. The first example of this is the second of the two disciples of John the Baptist who instead followed Jesus. As we have noted in our discussion on the text above, this unknown disciple could very well be Philip. John 1:44 mentions that Philip, Andrew, and Peter were all from Bethsaida, which could support such a theory. In any case, it is strange that the unknown disciple is not further mentioned. It is possible that the final redactor of the text removed the name of the unknown disciple (perhaps Philip) in order to create the impression that the beloved disciple was in fact called before Peter. Something similar could also be the case with the unknown disciple in 18:15. The final redactor wished to connect the beloved disciple to this unknown disciple, thus making him into a primary witness to Jesus’ trial, as well as contrasting him with Peter, who denied. If the unknown disciple was originally intended to refer to the beloved disciple, it is strange that nothing more is said about him. Thus, it is plausible that the unknown disciple is added to the

¹⁸² This has been suggested by a multitude of scholars. See Wilhelm Wilkens, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums* (Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1958), 87; and discussion in Walter Schmithals, *Johannesevangelium und Johannesbriefe: Forschungsgeschichte und Analyse*, BZNW 64 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 223–24.

¹⁸³ If one identifies the beloved disciple with John, the son of Zebedee, this could perhaps be viewed as some kind of parallel to the trio of Peter, James, and John in Mark.

narrative in order to create the impression that the beloved disciple is a reliable authority for retelling the story about Jesus.

When discussing the possible motives and features of the final redaction of John's Gospel, we must also discuss the evolution of the text present before the redaction. I consider it plausible that the unique Johannine features of the Gospel were part of a collection of Jesus traditions that were thought of as derived in some way from the beloved disciple. At some point, as a result of interaction with other Christian groups, portions of Markan material were interpolated into the Johannine text, thus explaining the blocks of Markan-based material scattered throughout the Gospel, as I have noted above. It is with these insertions that Peter is first introduced into John's Gospel, albeit as a fairly flat character. The material incorporated reflects stories that may have been considered extra significant in some way, and thus had to be dealt with in one way in order to make the Johannine account reliable in comparison to other accounts one might encounter in other early theological traditions. Thus, texts are added about the walking on water, confession, passion etc. The incorporation of Markan elements is not necessarily a part of the final redaction following the death of the beloved disciple but might as well have been done during his lifetime. Synoptic traditions about significant events were incorporated into the Johannine *Sondergut* to make available to Johannine Christianity a text of equal value and type as the Synoptic Gospels that were used in other early Christian communities. Finally, following the death of the beloved disciple, there was a need to navigate the early Christian ecumenical landscape and discuss the identity of Johannine Christianity in relation to other traditions, that presents the background for the final redaction, which we have discussed in further detail above.

If I am correct in my brief analysis of the motives of the final redaction of the Fourth Gospel, relating the beloved disciple to Peter has been one of the main objectives of this redaction. The final redaction of the Fourth Gospel not only asserts that Peter was a well-known figure to the Johannine Christianity, but also makes clear that surrounding variations of Christianity viewed Peter as their most significant authoritative figure—probably providing for them a link to the earthly Jesus.

3.4 Peter in the Gospel of Luke

Luke and Acts are often thought of as a single work in two parts, often referred to as Luke-Acts.¹⁸⁴ It is rarely disputed that Luke and Acts are written by the same author, but the exact relationship between the two books is ambiguous.¹⁸⁵ Little is known about the author of Luke-Acts, since he does not reveal his identity in the text. The traditional author is Luke the Physician, a fellow worker of Paul, mentioned in the Pauline correspondence.¹⁸⁶

Concerning the issue of dating, Luke must be written after Mark, which it uses as source and before its sequel in Acts. This gives a possible range between 70–130 C.E. Considering that it is likely that the temporal distance between the composition of Luke and Acts should not be too ample, it is appropriate to date Luke to the early second century (see discussion in 2.3).¹⁸⁷ As it is widely acknowledged that Luke shares a number of significant texts with John it is also quite possible that Luke had access to Johannine traditions in some form.¹⁸⁸ A late dating of Luke-Acts also makes it increasingly improbable that Luke would not have known Matthew.

¹⁸⁴ The double title Luke-Acts was coined by Henry J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke: The Diction of Luke and Acts*, HTS 6 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919), and has since then been the standard way of referring to this literature. Normally Luke-Acts are treated together, but due to the thematic approach of this study, Acts has been studied together with the Pauline epistles and the Gospel together with the other Synoptics. In the final analysis the common authorship of Luke and Acts will be kept in mind, and the view of Peter as an authoritative figure in Luke and Acts as a whole will be analysed. However, it should be noted that although having a common author, the manner in which Luke and Acts relate to each other is an issue still to be settled, see Joseph Verheyden, “The Unity of Luke-Acts. What Are We Up To?,” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden, BETL 142 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 3–56.

¹⁸⁵ See Edvin Larsson, “Till debatten om lukasskrifternas enhet och Apostlagärningarnas genre,” *SEÅ* 63 (1998): 189–200; I. Howard Marshall, “Acts and the Former Treatise,” in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 1:163–82; and Mikeal Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993).

¹⁸⁶ This is also argued by Adolf von Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt: Der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte*, BENT (Leibzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1906).

¹⁸⁷ For further discussion on the dating of Luke-Acts, cf. Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, FRLANT 126 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 6–9.

¹⁸⁸ See Barbara Shellard, “The Relationship of Luke and John: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem,” *JTS* 46 (1995): 71–98.

3.4.1 Analysis: Peter in the Lukan Narrative

The way in which Peter is introduced in Luke differs from the other Synoptics. Instead of being introduced at his calling, Peter first appears in connection to the healing of his mother-in-law, which in Luke occurs before his calling (4:38–39). After being tempted in the desert, Jesus first visits the synagogue, and then goes to the house of Peter’s mother-in-law. By having Jesus go directly to Peter’s mother-in-law, Luke indicates that Peter was a person with whom Jesus was already acquainted. Thereby Peter knows about Jesus already before he is called to be an apostle. No disciples are mentioned as following Jesus into the house, which is natural since no disciples have yet been called. However, Luke states that the mother-in-law served “them” after her healing, thus indicating that more people were present, among them possibly Peter.¹⁸⁹ It is no coincidence that Peter’s relationship is earlier than that of the other disciples, since this presents the background for the apostolic criteria in Acts 1:21–22. Luke omits the reference to Peter as leader of the crowd who searches for Jesus the following day (4:42–43), since he has not yet received his calling.

In 5:1–11, Peter finally receives his call to discipleship. The Lukan account is significantly longer than its Synoptic counterparts. In Matthew and Mark, the progression of the story is direct: Jesus enters the scene, sees Simon and Andrew in their boat, and calls them to become fishers of men. In the Lukan version, Simon and Andrew are not fishing but washing their nets. Jesus, who is acquainted with Peter from the healing of his mother-in-law or perhaps even earlier, asks Peter to provide a boat for him to preach from. When Jesus has finished speaking, he asks Peter to catch some fish. Peter informs Jesus that he has been fishing all night without result, but immediately also makes a statement of faith: ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ῥήματί σου χαλάσω τὰ δίκτυα (but at your word, I will let down the nets; 5:5). After doing as Jesus has said, the nets are filled with so many fish that James and John, who also are part of the same fishing enterprise, have to help them.¹⁹⁰ Simon is called Peter for the first time in connection to this event: ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ (but when Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus’ knees; 5:8). After this, Jesus calls Simon to follow him and become a fisher of men, with the result that all four leave their boats and follow Jesus. Peter already here makes a

¹⁸⁹ In contrast to the Matthean account which also has Jesus heal the mother-in-law alone but is more consistent by stating that the mother-in-law served “him.”

¹⁹⁰ Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 2 vols., HTKNT 3 (Freiburg: Herder, 1969–1994), 1:265, argues that the miraculous catching of the fish is meant to foreshadow “die spätere erfolgreiche apostolische Tätigkeit des Simon.”

confession in response to Jesus' extraordinary powers: ἐξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλὸς εἰμι, κύριε (depart from me, Lord, for I am a sinful man; 5:8). It is in connection to this confession of Jesus as κύριος that the name Πέτρος is introduced. Jesus literally calls only Peter, yet all four come along.¹⁹¹ Thus, Peter already here is a leading figure among the disciples—a theme that will continue throughout Luke-Acts.¹⁹² The parallel text in John 21:1–11 should not be neglected, as it is possible that it has served as a source for Luke.¹⁹³ Although there are several differences, the basic framework of the narrative is intact.¹⁹⁴ Luke has placed the story in a more logical place in the narrative compared to John.¹⁹⁵ The theme of calling is present already in the Johannine version, but is underlined by Luke through combining the narrative with the story of Peter's calling as a disciple. In this way he rescues Peter from being a failed disciple who is restored by Jesus into a disciple of high quality from the very beginning.

The next time we encounter Peter is in connection to the commissioning of the twelve disciples (6:12–16). Luke's list of apostles is something of a hybrid between the Markan and Matthean versions. Just like Mark, he states that it was Jesus who gave Simon the name Peter, but in the same manner as Matthew, he omits the reference to James and John being called βoαηρηγές, and places Andrew second in

¹⁹¹ Actually, Luke does not mention Andrew, and thus perhaps "all three came along" would be a formulation better corresponding to the Lukan narrative.

¹⁹² For a discussion on the relationship between these calling accounts and that in John, see S. O. Abogunrin, "The Three Variant Accounts of Peter's Call: A Critical and Theological Evaluation of the Texts," *NTS* 31 (1985): 587–602. As François Bovon, *Luke 1*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2002), 166, notes, Acts 1:21–22 makes clear the importance that the apostles had followed Jesus from the beginning.

¹⁹³ Frans Neiryck, "John 21," *NTS* 36 (1990): 321–36, argues that John is dependent on Luke 5. Although this suggestion is chronologically problematic, it supports the idea of a literary relationship between John and Luke. See also Robert T. Fortna, "Diachronic/Synchronic Reading John 21 and Luke 5," in *John and the Synoptics*, 387–99.

¹⁹⁴ It should also be noted that Marie-Émile Boismard, "Le chapitre XXI de Saint Jean: Essai de critique littéraire," *RB* 54 (1947): 473–500, argues that the author of Luke-Acts is the author of John 21. He argues this due to the number of thematic and linguistic similarities between John 21 and the Lukan texts. I consider his proposal to be implausible, but his observations clearly point toward a literary relationship between John and Luke.

¹⁹⁵ John's transition to Galilee is not very smooth. Whereas the story has been added to the Johannine narrative at the final redactional stage, Luke makes the pericope contribute to his overall portrait of Peter.

the list, identifying him as Peter's brother. However, he does not introduce the Matthean *πρῶτος Πέτρος* (Matt 10:2).¹⁹⁶

The next story containing Peter is the story of the healing of Jairus' daughter and the woman with haemorrhage (8:40–56). Luke not only retains Mark's notion of Peter belonging to the inner circle of apostles, but also adds a reference to Peter, by substituting the general "disciples" in Mark with "Peter." At the same time, Luke includes Jairus and the mother of his daughter when listing who was permitted to be present at the miracle, in contrast to Mark, who only mentions the inner circle. Thus, Luke maintains the reference to the Markan inner circle, but also waters down the importance of the trio by making it less exclusive.

The Petrine confession in 9:18–21 is rather similar to Mark. The Markan *σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός* (you are the Christ), is further specified as *τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ* (the Christ of God). However, the Markan *Satanswort* is omitted (9:22), which must be regarded as a significant editorial decision. Although he does not add a lengthy elaboration on Peter's status as Matthew, the omission of the negative reference to Peter implies a significant re-evaluation of Peter in the narrative.¹⁹⁷ This positive treatment of Peter continues in the account of the transformation in 9:28–36. Here, Luke translates *Ἐπισημοῦ* (Mark 9:5) into *ἐπιστάτα*.¹⁹⁸ Luke also makes some other changes of the text that might be of importance to our study. He changes the order of the three disciples Peter, James, and John into Peter, John, and James. One might speculate whether the order of the names is supposed to imply rank, and if Luke here intentionally confuses James, the brother of John, with James, the brother of the Lord, who is a central figure in his account in Acts.¹⁹⁹ Luke also adds new information to the story, stating that Peter and those who were with him had

¹⁹⁶ Yet, as noted by Jarmo Kiilunen, "Minor Agreements und die Hypothese von Lukas' Kenntnis des Matthäusevangeliums," in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen*, ed. I. Dunderberg, C. Tuckett, and K. Syreeni, NovTSup 103 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 165–202 (177), the order and form of the names, with Andrew following Peter in the list gives the impression that Luke is here influenced by Matthew rather than Mark.

¹⁹⁷ It is possible that the omission of the *Satanswort* is inspired by John 6:66–70, which does the same. However, he does not follow John in any other significant way here, and either way we must conclude that it is Luke's own editorial preferences that are in the foreground here.

¹⁹⁸ Albrecht Oepke, "ἐπιστάτης," TDNT 2:622–23.

¹⁹⁹ It should be noted that James is also mentioned in the earliest available resurrection account in 1 Cor 15. Here he is one of the last in the list of special persons to whom Jesus appeared. 1. Peter. 2. The twelve. 3. 500 brethren. 4. James. 5. All the apostles.

fallen asleep, and woke only to see Jesus' glory.²⁰⁰ Although Peter acts as the spokesperson of the three in all three accounts, his leading position in the group is emphasised by Luke through referring to the disciples as Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ (Peter and those with him; 9:32).

Peter is also mentioned in 12:41–46 on the faithful servant, which is part of the suspected Q-material, present also in Matt 24:45–51. However, Peter is not mentioned in the Matthean version. Whether Peter was actually present in the original source is impossible to say, but it is possible that Luke has added the reference to Peter asking this question, since it could be read as a commissioning of Peter to take care of the Jesus movement after Jesus had gone away.²⁰¹ Considering the high view of Peter in e.g. Matt 16, it is unlikely that Matthew would omit such a reference to Peter.

The dialogue concerning the reward for discipleship (18:24–30) is similar in all three Synoptics. Luke abbreviates the Markan text more than Matthew, but still does not omit any significant details. However, Luke is unique in that he makes a reference to leaving one's wife. This might be for the same reason that he puts the visit at Peter's house before the calling of the disciples, in order to emphasise that even Peter left everything, including his wife, to follow Jesus. Peter's wife does not appear in Acts but is well known to Paul and the Corinthians (1 Cor 9:5).

Following this, Peter is omitted from two Markan episodes. The story of the fig tree is totally omitted by Luke, and the eschatological discourse (21:7–11), which is directed toward the inner circle plus Andrew in Mark is directed toward the disciples in general, just as in Matthew. However, the next time we encounter Peter in Luke, he is added to the Markan narrative. In 22:7–14, Luke specifies the disciples who are sent to prepare for Passover as Peter and John. It is not incidental that Luke mentions these two disciples by name.²⁰² Peter and John (as a decimated version of the trio of Peter, James, and John in Mark) play a significant role in the

²⁰⁰ Perhaps this story of the Markan inner circle falling asleep is inferred from the Gethsemane account. Although the disciples fall asleep also in Luke 22:39–46, this neither speaks of the inner circle in particular nor places it in Gethsemane (see below). Perhaps the story of the inner circle falling asleep was so well known that it could not be omitted, and Luke therefore gives it a new place in the narrative where Peter and the most significant disciples are not uniquely reprimanded for letting Jesus down in his final hour.

²⁰¹ In Robinson et. al., *The Critical Edition of Q*, 366–75, it is argued that the reference to Peter (Luke 12:41) is not part of the Q-material. This text is designated as Q_{12:42–46}.

²⁰² Heinz Schürmann, "Der Dienst des Petrus und Johannes (Lk 22:8)," *TTZ* 60 (1951): 99–101, argues that the names should not be considered to be inferred from some unique Lukan source, but rather are a theological statement by the author, pointing out that Peter and John are "die Größten und Führenden" apostles.

beginning of Acts, and this it is not unlikely that Luke wishes to stress their important role among Jesus' disciples already here.²⁰³

The portrait of Peter is increasingly positive as Luke's Gospel approaches the end. The Lukan account of Peter's denial (22:31–34) presents a rather different perspective than the other Synoptics from the outset. Instead of Jesus saying to all the disciples that they will desert from him, Jesus turns specifically to Peter (who is now referred to as Simon) in what seems to be a conversation in confidence and tells him that Satan has demanded to sift the disciples as wheat. Thereby, Jesus presents a motive for the desertion of the disciples. Jesus assures Peter that he has prayed specifically for him, that his faith may not fail. Jesus also commissions Peter that once he turns back, he is to strengthen his brothers.²⁰⁴ Thus, Jesus gives Peter a special role in recollecting the disciples after his departure and strengthening them in the faith. This passage displays significant similarities with John 13:36–38, and they both place this dialogue in the context of the last supper.²⁰⁵ However, Luke develops the dialogue to also include an explicit reference to Peter's rehabilitation, leadership in the early Jesus movement, as well as an allusion to his martyrdom. Thereby he quite transparently prepares the reader for Peter's significant role in Acts.

The account of the events at Gethsemane (22:39–46) differs significantly from the other Synoptics. Luke's account is neither restricted to the inner circle of Peter, James, and John, nor is it specifically placed in Gethsemane, but at the Mount of Olives in general. Moreover, Luke completely omits Peter from the story. The denial account is also significantly modified (22:54–71).²⁰⁶ Just as in the other Synoptics, the questions to Jesus εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός/σὺ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (if you are the Christ/ are you the son of God?; 22:67, 70) echo Peter's confession in 9:18–21. However, rather than accounting first for the trial of Jesus and subsequently Peter's denial, Luke reverses the order and does not have Jesus questioned by the

²⁰³ This is argued by Joel B. Green, "Preparation for Passover (Luke 22:7–13): A Question of Redactional Technique," *NovT* 29 (1987): 305–19.

²⁰⁴ Schneider, *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte*, 146, views this as a Lukan parallel to Matt 16:17–19.

²⁰⁵ Barrett, *Johannes*, 62–63, argues that John is here dependent on Luke and point out that John is here more similar to Luke than to Mark. However, I argue that the dependence is probably the other way around, i.e. Luke here leaves his Markan prototype and instead inserts a Johannine perspective that better fits his purposes.

²⁰⁶ Luke does not necessarily follow a different source adding new information, but rather reworks the flow of the text, see Birger Gerhardsson, "Confession and Denial Before Men: Observations on Matt 26:57–27:2," *JSNT* 13 (1981): 46–66.

Sanhedrin until the next day. This facilitates the uniquely Lukan feature that Jesus, turns around and looks at Peter as the cock crows. The problem with the Lukan account is that it gives the impression that Jesus and Peter are in the same courtyard. Hereby, Luke can claim that Peter was an eyewitness also to this event in Jesus' life. In contrast to the other Gospels, one of those who questions Peter is male.

Although Luke does not mention Peter's presence at the crucifixion, he adds a phrase in 23:49 that appears to mediate between John and the Synoptics. Mark and Matthew mention some women observing the crucifixion from a distance (Mark 15:40||Matt 27:55–56), whereas John moves the women closer to the cross and adds the beloved disciple (John 20:25–27). Luke follows Mark in placing this group of people at a distance, but places with the women all of Jesus' acquaintances (*πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ*), thereby harmonising the traditions. Through this measure, Luke also ensures that Peter is portrayed as a reliable witness also of Jesus' crucifixion.

The last reference to Peter in Luke is found in the resurrection account (24:1–12). In Mark, the women are specifically urged to tell Peter about the empty grave. In Luke, the women are reported to have told the eleven about what they had seen and heard, but they were not believed. But Peter gets up and runs to the tomb, finding only the linen clothes, and is amazed. Luke continues by telling the story of the appearance on the way to Emmaus, which ends with the men going to the eleven apostles and confirming that the Lord indeed is risen and has appeared to Peter (24:34). This gives the impression that the ten disciples (that is, the twelve minus Judas and Peter), had neither believed the women, nor Peter (although the text does not clearly state that Jesus had actually appeared to Peter). Hereby Luke emphasises the reliability of the testimony of both the women and of Peter. As we have seen above, the reliability of Peter's testimony about Jesus is a central theme for Luke in Acts.

3.4.2 Conclusion: Peter in the Gospel of Luke

In many ways, Luke is the evangelist who is most careful in shaping his Peter-image, in order to set the scene for the role he assigns to Peter in Acts. Luke reworks Mark's initial chronology in order to make Peter the disciple who knew Jesus even before he was called. By having Jesus visit Peter's house before Peter is even presented, he gives the impression that Peter and Jesus had known each other since before the start of Jesus' ministry. Already at the calling of Peter (who is the only one called where the other Synoptics also include Andrew, James, and John), he makes a confession (5:8), followed by a response from Jesus (5:10), which in a way

resembles the famous account of Peter's confession in Matthew 16. When the actual parallel to Matt 16||Mark 8 takes place in Luke 9, the *Satanswort* is not included. Luke emphasises that Peter left everything to follow Jesus by placing the healing of his mother-in-law before his calling, since Jesus seems to imply that Peter has even left his wife behind (18:29).

Luke attributes the parable of the faithful manager (12:41–46) specifically to Peter, and prays specifically that his faith will not fail, that he might strengthen the disciples and take leadership of the group after Jesus is gone (22:31–34). Luke continues expounding how Peter was the chief witness of all the important events of the life of Christ. He alone followed him to the house of the high priest (22:54–71), and he was the only disciple who believed the women and ran to the empty tomb (24:1–12), and Peter seems to have been the first to claim to have met the risen Jesus (24:34).

It is plausible that Luke uses Peter to legitimise his branch of Christianity by letting Peter be the link between his sphere of influence and the earthly Jesus himself. Luke-Acts portrays a comprehensive picture of the *Heilsgeschichte*, where the controversies between Paul and the other apostles are absent, and Peter is portrayed as a leader who handles the problems that emerge. Peter's role is central in the narrative. He is the primary witness of Jesus, but also has the role of "strengthening the brethren" (22:32)—a role that is decisive in the development in Acts.

Luke mainly focusing on constructing Peter's *charismatic* authority in his Gospel. As the earliest and most significant of Jesus' disciples, he *embodies* a cultural capital that is necessary in order to use Peter as legitimator in Acts. The function of Peter in the narrative does not blossom in the Gospel, but mainly sets the stage for Acts.

3.5 A Note on the Significance of Synoptic Hypotheses

The two-source hypothesis is the most widely held solution to the Synoptic problem. If accurate, an analysis of the view of Peter in Q is of significant interest. As we have seen, the two Q-passages that deal with Peter are ambiguous in this respect. In Matt 18:21–22||Luke 17:3–4, Matthew mentions Peter, but not Luke. In Matt 24:45–51||Luke 12:41–48, Peter is mentioned by Luke but not by Matthew. Thus, the inclusion or exclusion of Peter in these instances cannot be established for Q. If one regards *The Critical Edition of Q* as a reliable reconstruction of Q,

one must conclude that Peter is not part of the Q-tradition but is inserted into the text by Matthew and Luke irrespectively of each other.²⁰⁷

If one would instead argue that Luke knew Matthew, the inclusion and exclusion of the references to Peter in the two relevant Q-passages could be the result of Luke's editorial activity. In the case of Matt 18:21–22||Luke 17:3–4, the Matthean reference to Peter directly follows a reference to loosing and binding (Matt 18:18–19). Since Luke does not include Jesus' pronouncement concerning Peter and his authority of loosing and binding (Matt 16:16–20), the close relation to a second reference to loosing and binding and a Peter-reference may have persuaded him to omit the Peter-reference, since it was part of a theological framework that he did not wish to argue. Instead, Luke adds a reference to Peter in 12:41, which connects Peter to a discourse on being a prepared and faithful servant (12:35–48).

If Luke knew Matthew, not only the differences in treatment of the Q-material are of interest, but also other instances where Luke omits Matthean references to Peter. There are several examples of this: Peter's walking of water is present in Matthew, but not in Luke (Matt 14:22–23), and the same is true concerning Jesus' response to Peter at his confession (Matt 16:16–20), as noted above. The *Satanswort* (Matt 16:21–23||Mark 8:31–33) is also lacking in the Lukan account, as well as the references to Peter at Gethsemane (Matt 26:36–46||Mark 14:32–42). If we would assume that Luke had access to Matthew, it would indicate that Luke significantly edits the Matthean portrait of Peter. The halakhic authority of Peter is replaced with representations of a prepared and faithful servant (Luke 12:35–48). Passages that portray Peter in negative light, such as the walking on water (Matt 14:22–23), the *Satanswort* (Matt 16:21–23||Mark 8:31–33), and the failure at Gethsemane (Matt 26:36–46||Mark 14:32–42) are omitted. Such a reconstruction would provide more answers concerning Luke's theological motivations for his redaction than the traditional two-source hypothesis. The omission of Peter (as well as Andrew and John) in Matt 24:2–8||Luke 21:7–11 compared to Mark 13:3–8 is also a minor agreement of interest. Whereas Matthew is probably a product of some kind of Jewish Christianity, Luke is more distanced from the Jewish community.²⁰⁸ If Luke knew Matthew, it would be fair to say that his Gospel was in some respect a critique of Matthew.²⁰⁹ However, the solution of the Synoptic problem is greater than the study of the redaction of the Peter-character, and thus we can

²⁰⁷ Robinson et. al. (eds.), *The Critical Edition of Q*, 366–75, 488–91.

²⁰⁸ See Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1976), 66–86.

²⁰⁹ See Franklin, *Interpreter of Paul*.

only conclude that if it could be proven that Luke knew Matthew, it would add a very interesting dimension to our study, although not changing its results in essence.

3.6 Conclusion: Peter in the Canonical Gospels

The textual studies in this chapter have two main objectives. First and foremost, they present analyses of the portraits of Peter as an authoritative figure in the respective texts. The second objective is to present something of a trajectory of how the view of Petrine authority has developed in the Gospel tradition. I have suggested the chronological sequence of Mark—Matthew—John—Luke. Matthew definitely knew Mark, and so did John. However, John probably did not know Matthew (perhaps because they are roughly contemporary). With a maximalist approach, Luke would know Mark, Matthew, and John. The following analysis will presuppose such a progression and dependence, but I believe that the conclusions to be valuable irrespectively of whether this literary trajectory is historically accurate. Regardless if there is a literary/redactional trajectory as described below, the analysis arguably describes a chronological development of the view of Peter as an authoritative figure.

Peter has obviously been viewed as a link to the earthly Jesus from the early days of Christianity. The credal formulation in 1 Cor 15:5 stating that Jesus was raised and appeared to Peter (echoed also in Luke 24:34) is a clear indication of his significance. It is therefore not strange that Peter plays such a crucial role already in Mark. The command to tell the “disciples and Peter” (Mark 16:7) very likely reflects the importance of Peter as a witness to the resurrected one that is present in 1 Cor 15:5. This is reflective of the earliest phase of the post-Easter community, in which the imminence of the Parousia was crucial, and a testimony of the resurrected Christ was at the centre of the theological outlook.

As for Matthew, the portrait of Peter as an authoritative figure reflects a new situation for the Christian movement. The portrait of Peter as an authoritative halakhic interpreter not only reflects an adaption to the theological reflection to Jewish thought. It also reflects a stage where the Parousia was not thought of as imminent. Peter is transformed from being the chief witness of the resurrection and thus a token of the imminent Parousia, into someone with relevance to a continual life whilst awaiting a more distant Parousia. Peter represents the Matthean sphere of influence and its mission. If it confesses Jesus as Lord without fear, it can do the miraculous (Matt 14:22–33). The Matthean *ἐκκλησία* has the authority to loose and bind and thus continue to live as a people of God in the present reality

(Matt 16:13–20). Peter also establishes the relationship between Matthean Christianity and Judaism (Matt 17:24–27). These three aspects of the Matthean *Sondergut* are crucial to the Matthean self-understanding. Thereby, Peter is also a significant element in the Matthean identity formation. Thus, Peter, who in Mark was connected to the reliability of the imminent Parousia, is transformed into a symbol for Matthean self-identification. Peter retains his central role, but changes in order to fit the needs of the time and place.

John's Gospel is special due to its emphasis on the beloved disciple. The portrait of Peter as authoritative is developed to differing extent in different redactional layers. In the material stemming from inclusion of Markan material, Peter's legacy in the Jesus-movement can be discerned. Although Peter is not central to John in the beginning of his Gospel, he is someone who must be referred to due to his reputation. As the beloved disciple is introduced in the final redaction of the Gospel, also the Petrine figure comes to life. Although the Fourth Gospel identifies strongly with the beloved disciple and his tradition, there is a strong awareness of the significance of Peter as link to Jesus in early Christianity. While stressing the superior theological insight of the beloved disciple, Peter's importance as link to Jesus and prominent early Christian leader is acknowledged. If we imagine that both Matthew and John have access to Mark, it is clear that they develop the view of Peter as an authoritative figure reflected in Mark in separate ways. Matthew transforms Peter to the needs of the present day and the needs of the Matthean context. So does John, but in a different way. John acknowledges Peter as a significant leader of early Christianity and link to Jesus, while still positioning the Fourth Gospel, connected to the beloved disciple, to be of superior theological insight.

The most developed Peter-image is found in Luke. As Christianity approached the 100th anniversary of the death of Jesus, Luke saw the need to make a comprehensive account of Christian origins. Supposedly drawing on Mark, Matthew, John, and other to us unknown sources, he constructs a theologically coherent narrative of Christian origins from John the Baptist to Rome. In this narrative, Peter is acquainted with Jesus already before his calling.²¹⁰ Many of the negative features of the Petrine persona are eliminated, and Peter is portrayed as the precursor and actual founder of Pauline Christianity. Thus, Luke-Acts works as historical legitimation for post-Pauline Christianity in the early second century.

²¹⁰ Perhaps this could serve as a partial legitimation of the birth accounts in Luke, which could possibly have been known to and transmitted by Peter.

Throughout the development of the canonical Gospel traditions, Peter is at the centre of theological thought when it comes to legitimacy. Peter is commonly used to legitimise “orthodox” Christianity. When Johannine Christianity defines its own identity and legitimacy, it also elaborates on its relationship to Peter, in order to associate itself with those Christians deriving their legitimacy from Peter and at the same time argue in favour of their own specificity. John 21:20–23 even has Jesus explain to Peter that the beloved disciple/Fourth Gospel type of Christianity is legitimate. Johannine Christianity thus claims its place not in opposition to Petrine Christianity, but within it. We do not find a struggle between what is necessarily clearly defined and opposing communities, but rather a matrix of early Christian varieties that struggle to define their own identity—both in relation to the earthly Jesus and to each other.

4. *In Nomine Petri*: Literature Claiming Petrine Authorship

Only two texts in the New Testament claim to be written by Peter. Although both are generally considered to be pseudonymous,¹ they are significant indications of how Peter was viewed as an authoritative figure in early Christianity. There is also a multitude of non-canonical early Christian texts that claim Petrine origin. These texts are too diverse to be the result of a Petrine school. In recent years, Jörg Frey has spoken of a “Petrine discourse” that emerges in the second century.² This does not mean that there is one unified Petrine trajectory, but rather that the figure of Peter is appropriated for various purposes. Apart from the canonical letters of Peter, we will deal with the Gospel, Preaching, Apocalypses, and Martyrdom of Peter as well as the letter of Peter to Philip and various Acts attributed to Peter.³ I will

¹ For a history of research on pseudonymity in the New Testament, see Martina Janßen, *Unter falschem Namen: Eine kritische Forschungsbilanz frühchristlicher Pseudepigraphie*, ARGU 14 (Frankfurt a.M.; Lang, 2003).

² Jörg Frey, “Hermeneutical Problems Posed by 2 Peter,” in *Der zweite Petrusbrief und das Neue Testament*, ed. W. Grünstäudl, U. Poplutz, and T. Nicklas, WUNT I/397 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 9–36 (15); idem., “Second Peter in New Perspective,” in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter: Towards a New Perspective. Radboud Prestige Lectures by Jörg Frey*, ed. J. Frey, M. den Dulk, and J. G. van der Watt, BibInt (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 7–74; idem., “Von der ‚petrinischen Schule‘ zum ‚petrinischen Diskurs‘: Der zweite Petrusbrief und seine literarischen Bezüge,” in *Petrusliteratur und Petrusarchäologie*, 87–124. See also Paul Foster, “The Relationship Between 2 Peter and Early Petrine Pseudepigraphy,” in *Der zweite Petrusbrief und das Neue Testament*, 179–201; Tobias Nicklas, “Petrus-Diskurse in Alexandria: Eine Fortführung der Gedanken von Jörg Frey,” in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, 99–127.

³ Many of these texts, especially the Acts and Martyrdoms of Peter exist in many editions and translations see Richard Adelbert Lipsius, *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte* (Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1887); S. C. Malan, *The Conflicts of the Holy Apostles: An Apocryphal Book of the Early Eastern Church* (London: Nutt, 1871); E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Contendings of the Apostles, being the Histories of the Lives and Martyrdoms and Deaths of the Twelve Apostles and Evangelists: The Ethiopic Texts now First Edited from Manuscripts in the British Museum with an English Translation*, 2 vols. (London: Frowde, 1899–1901). I will discuss

deal with the texts in roughly chronological order, and thus also study the development of the Peter-image over time. Despite the title of this chapter, some texts that do not claim Petrine authorship are also included here, such as the *Preaching, Act, and Martyrdom of Peter*. They fit thematically in this chapter through their emphasis on Peter as a main character, despite the absence of claims to Petrine authorship.

4.1 Peter in First Peter

In 1976, John H. Elliott noted that First Peter had long been a neglected subject of research in New Testament scholarship, calling it an exegetical “step-child.”⁴ Since then, there has been a tremendous increase of research on the epistle, and Elliott’s statement is no longer accurate.⁵ The letter’s claim of Petrine authorship makes the text especially interesting for our study. Since the content of the letter does not contain any explicit material on Peter, the main effort will be to analyse the function of pseudonymous authorship and the Peter-image reflected therein.

4.1.1 Introductory Matters

Peter has traditionally been viewed as the author of First Peter. However, apart from the introduction (1:1) and conclusion (5:12–14), the only instance where Peter speaks of himself is 5:1.⁶ Harnack argues that an omission of the introduction and ending does not change the message of the text, and thus these may very well be later additions.⁷ He regards 5:1 as pointing toward some kind of eyewitness to Jesus, but not necessarily one of the twelve. Richard Perdelwitz concludes that the letter was originally a baptismal homily (1:3–5:11) that has later been supplemented with an epistolary framework.⁸ Adolf Jülicher famously stated, that if it were not for the reference to Peter in 1:1, it would be more natural to assume that this letter was

the versions stemming from the studied time period or considered as best reflecting the status of the text at that time. Although the reception, translation, and editing of the texts in later centuries is interesting, it goes beyond the scope of this study.

⁴ Cf. discussion in John H. Elliott, “The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research,” *JBL* 95 (1976): 243–54.

⁵ See Eugene M. Boring, “First Peter in Recent Study,” *WW* 24 (2004): 358–67.

⁶ Lyder Brun, *Første Peters-brev* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 1949), 13.

⁷ Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1958), 2.1: 451–52.

⁸ Richard Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des I. Petrusbriefes* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1911), 26.

deutero-Pauline.⁹ William Wrede modifies Harnack's thesis, arguing that the expression Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος (I urge the presbyters among you, myself being a co-presbyter; 1 Pet 5:1) together with the formulations like Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ κτλ. (Blessed be our God and father etc; 1:3) point toward the text being a letter from the beginning, rather than a homily.¹⁰ The eulogy does not necessarily mean that there is a literary dependence upon e.g. Ephesians, but rather indicates that this phrase has become a traditional phrase featuring in Christian liturgy.¹¹ As these examples indicate, there have been several proposals concerning the origin and nature of First Peter.¹²

First Peter is presently regarded as pseudonymous by scholars of virtually all convictions.¹³ It does not show traces of the first-hand relationship to Jesus enjoyed by the historical Peter.¹⁴ The reference to being a witness of Christ's suffering (5:1) is not coherent with the presentation of Peter in the Gospels, where he denies Jesus before his crucifixion and does not encounter Jesus again until after the resurrection. It is not possible to predict how an eyewitness would express himself, but in the case of Peter this is not the kind of general remark one would expect.¹⁵

⁹ Adolf Jülicher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg and Leipzig: Mohr, 1894), 132; Supported by Norbert Brox, *Falsche Verfasserangaben: Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie*, SBS 79 (Stuttgart: KBW, 1975), 17. See also Otto Pfeleiderer, *Der Paulinismus: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der urchristlichen Theologie* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1890), 420. In relation to this, it may be noted that Bernhard Weiß, *Der erste Petrusbrief und die neuere Kritik* (Berlin: Runge, 1906), 48–65, argued in favour of an opposite relationship, i.e. Paul and his epistles are dependent on First Peter.

¹⁰ William Wrede, "Miscellen," *ZNW* 1(1900): 66–86. Cf. 2 Cor 1:3; Eph 1:3. See also Troy W. Martin, *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*, SBLDS 131 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992); Reinhard Feldmeier, *The First Letter of Peter* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 29.

¹¹ Lutz Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*, WUNT 1/298 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 450.

¹² For a more detailed account of the discussions concerning authorship of 1 Peter, see Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1996), 3–50.

¹³ Boring, "First Peter," 359. Boring notes that the only exceptions are scholars who argue that Petrine authorship is necessary for the text to be authoritative in a church setting. The problem with this view is that one approaches the text in order to find argument for a predetermined conclusion, rather than studying the text itself and draw conclusions from the evidence presented. See also discussion in Harry Y. Gamble, "Pseudonymity and the New Testament Canon," in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfälschung*, 333–62. Among those proposing Petrine authorship are Wayne A. Grudem, *1 Peter*, TNTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1988), and Norman Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, NIBC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992).

¹⁴ Brun, *Første Peters-brev*, 222.

¹⁵ Robert H. Gundry, "Verba Christi in I Peter: Their Implications Concerning the Authorship of I Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition," *NTS* 13 (1967): 336–50, argues that the author

The letter itself claims to be written from Babylon—Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή (she [the church?] who is elected together with you in Babylon greets you; 5:13). Claus-Hunno Hunzinger has shown that Babylon was used as a reference to Rome in a post-70-setting.¹⁶ Apart from this, there are numerous references to Babylon in Revelation that arguably refer to Rome.¹⁷ As Doering notes, the evidence presented by Hunzinger cannot be used for proving a Roman origin of the letter.¹⁸ Hunzinger argues that First Peter originated in the East, and the reference to Babylon/Rome is as fictional as the reference to Peter in 1:1.¹⁹ It is important not to equate the claimed location of the sender with the actual location.²⁰ Norbert Brox agrees that an origin in the East would be more natural.²¹

alludes frequently to Gospel events that Peter experienced personally, thus arguing in favour of Petrine authorship. However, claiming that the author of First Peter is frequently quoting *verba Christi* due to thematic similarities compared to the words of Jesus in the Gospels (which, if one assumes that First Peter is written by the historical Peter, are written after First Peter) is speculative at the least. Gundry argues that it is improbable that a forger would have only included *verba Christi* of a nature that Peter probably have remembered, and not only from Mark, but from all four Gospels. However, one might just as well turn the argument around—why would he limit himself to alluding to the sayings of Jesus that are recorded in the Gospels? Is it not more probable that someone who was acquainted with the widespread Jesus-traditions would allude to these in his teaching? In light of Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010), 404, it could even be argued that the Jesus traditions underlying First Peter could be derived from the Pauline letters alone.

¹⁶ Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, “Babylon als Deckname für Rom und die Datierung des 1. Petrusbriefes,” in *Gottes Volk und Gottes Land: Hans-Wilhelm Hertzberg zum 70. Geburtstag am 16. Januar 1965 dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*, ed. H. G. Reventlow (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 67–77. Jan Stolt, “Isagogiske problemer vedrørende 1. Petersbrev,” *DTT* 44 (1981): 166–73, argues that Babylon might just as well be referring to Jerusalem or Antioch, presuming Petrine authorship. I do not consider Stolt’s proposal very convincing. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, 115–17, argues that Babylon refers to the actual Babylon in Mesopotamia. In later Eastern Christian tradition, this reference to Babylon was used to claim Petrine succession for the own church, see J. F. Coakley, “The Patriarchal List of the Church of the East,” in *After Bardaisan: Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honour of Professor Han J. W. Drijvers*, ed. G. J. Reinink and A. C. Klugkist, *OLA* 89 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 65–83.

¹⁷ Cf. Rev 16:9; 17:5; 18:2, n. b. the identification of the seven hills of Rome in 17:9. See discussion in Franz Altheim and Ruth Stiehl, *Christentum am roten Meer*, 2 vols. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971–1973), 2: 297–99.

¹⁸ Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 445–46.

¹⁹ Hunzinger, “Babylon als Deckname,” 77.

²⁰ Norbert Brox, “Zur pseudepigraphischen Rahmung des ersten Petrusbriefes,” *BZ* 19 (1975): 78–96. Identifying Peter as writing from Rome may be considered as part of the pseudepigraphic enterprise, reflecting the conception of Peter in the context of this letter.

²¹ Norbert Brox, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, *EKKNT* 21 (Zürich: Benziger, 1979), 42–43.

The earliest references to First Peter are in Papias and Polycarp.²² An Eastern origin is further supported by the fact that the letter is not part of the Western *Canon Muratori*.²³ Calling the Jesus believers Χριστιανός (Christian; 1 Pet 4:16) is referred to in Acts 11:26 as originating in Antioch.²⁴ The reference to “Babylon” as such would also fit better in an Eastern setting.²⁵ Yet, Leonhard Goppelt notes that there are also several aspects of First Peter that would favour a Roman origin, thus making the issue more complicated.²⁶ He argues that the language of the epistle is closest to that of First Clement, Hebrews, and Luke-Acts, which all have some kind of Roman origin, in his opinion. Similarities to Paul’s epistle to the Romans could also point toward a Roman origin.²⁷ However, whereas the arguments supporting a Roman origin are rather general, the indications of the text as studied below rather point in the direction that it originates in the East.

The dating of First Peter is a complex issue very much dependent on the results of the subjects treated above. A *terminus post quem* can be established to 70 C.E. due to the reference to Babylon, since this way of referring to Rome was developed after the fall of the Jerusalem temple.²⁸ A *terminus ante quem* can be established with reference to Polycarp’s epistle to the Philippians, which is traditionally dated around 110 C.E. and uses First Peter.²⁹ Goppelt argues that the Presbyterian ecclesial structure mentioned in 4:10–11 and 5:1–5 indicates that the letter must be dated before 80 C.E. in order to allow time for the development of monarchical episcopate.³⁰ Brox argues that the dating cannot be more specific than suggesting the time span of 70–100 C.E.³¹ Considering that it may have taken some time for

²² Pol. *Phil.* 1.3; 8.1; 10.2; Papias according to Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.16.

²³ Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 375.

²⁴ John Knox, “Pliny and Peter: A Note on 1 Pet 4:14–16 and 3:15,” *JBL* 72 (1953): 187–89, connects the term “Christian” to the letter of Pliny to Trajan.

²⁵ Karl Heussi, *Die Römische Petrus-tradition in kritischer Sicht* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1955), 38, argues that Babylon should be interpreted as a synonym to the diaspora mentioned in 1:1.

²⁶ Leonhard Goppelt, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, KEK 12 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 65–66.

²⁷ Brox, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, 42.

²⁸ Hunzinger, “Babylon als Deckname,” 74.

²⁹ Paul Hartog, *Polycarp’s Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Oxford: University Press, 2013), 40–45; addresses the issue of dating and shows that it is a rather complex endeavour. Yet, he maintains a traditional dating of between 110–117 C.E.

³⁰ Goppelt, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, 64–65. It should be noted that he only a two years earlier allows for 1 Peter to be dated as late as 90 C.E.

³¹ Brox, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, 41.

referring to Rome as Babylon to become a general expression, I will assume a dating for Peter around 75–100 C.E.

4.1.2 The Construction of Peter in First Peter

We will now analyse how Peter emerges as the fictional author of the letter. What Peter reveals concerning his identity also reveals the conception of Peter held by the pseudonymous author, but also among his conceived audience.

As we noted in the beginning of this chapter, the only thing that really connects Peter to the letter is the mentioning of him as author in 1:1. The ending of the letter does not mention Peter but mentions Silvanus and Mark as his companions. Silvanus and Mark are commonly thought of as companions of Paul, and one may therefore ask why they are presented as Peter's co-workers. If one takes into account the many Pauline connections of the letter, it is not hard to understand that these names were associated with reliable early Christian leaders. Since we do not know of any specific companions of Peter, it is conceivable that the author refers to reliable names that are known to him, but also to the recipients. Harnack views this as a way of washing away the memories of the earlier conflicts between Pauline and Petrine Christianity, by having Peter adopt to Pauline conventions (thus following Baur).³² However, there are no hints in the text itself of trying to bridge the gap between different Christian groups.³³ At the same time, the specifically Pauline flavour of these names was probably not as prominent at the time when First Peter was composed.³⁴ The strong Pauline connection argued for Mark and Silvanus in much modern research was not necessarily self-evident in early Christianity.³⁵ Acts

³² Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 456.

³³ Cf. Norbert Brox, "Situation und Sprache der Minderheit im ersten Petrusbrief," *Kairos* 19 (1977): 1–13.

³⁴ Since Acts was written after 1 Peter, it cannot be used as a name-source for its author. Likewise, the references to Mark in 2 Tim 4:11 and Col 4:10 may very well be written after First Peter—thus leaving Phlm 24 as the only Pauline reference to Mark available at the time that First Peter was composed. Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1998), 334 dates Second Timothy to around 100 C.E. and suggests 70 C.E. for Colossians, while admitting that slightly later dates have also been proposed. If the tradition mentioned by Papias claiming Mark to be Peter's interpreter was spread at the time, the connection to Peter would probably be stronger in the contemporary mindset than an obscure note in Pilemon. As for Silvanus, he is referred to in 2 Cor 1:19. Silvanus is also used in 1 Thess 1:1 and 2 Thess 1:1. Petr Pokorný and Ulrich Heckel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament: Seine Literatur und Theologie im Überblick* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 653, date Second Thessalonians toward the end of the first century, and so does Schnelle, *History and Theology*, 318.

³⁵ A study of the different portrayals of Mark in the New Testament is available in Clifton Black, *Mark: Images of an Apostolic Interpreter* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 50–73.

connects Peter, Mark, and Silvanus to the Jerusalem Church. Mark was brought to Antioch by Paul and Barnabas (Acts 12:25), whereas Silvanus was one of the letter carriers from Jerusalem to Antioch (Acts 15:22).³⁶ The relationship between Paul and Mark was not without friction, and they eventually parted ways (Acts 15:39). These indications in Acts show that Mark and Silvanus were not necessarily unanimously connected to Paul around the turn of the first century. Although Karl Matthias Schmidt claims that the author of First Peter knew Acts, I regard this as improbable, since I date Acts to the second century.³⁷

One might ask why the trio of Peter, Mark, and Silvanus was chosen to give legitimacy to First Peter. The lack of autobiographical material makes it impossible to connect the message of the letter to some especially relevant aspect of the lives of these people. One possibility could be that the original audience viewed itself as connected to these early Christian leaders in some special way. As we have noted, Acts connects all three as originating in the Jerusalem Church and then going to Antioch. Although Acts is later than First Peter, it may still reflect some tradition connecting these three persons to Antioch, thus making it natural to put them together as a letter-writing group. Perhaps the pseudonymous author or at least his recipients viewed themselves as spiritual heirs of this group in some respect? First Peter implies something of the sort, as we will see.

Let us now turn to the only passage in the letter that might be thought of as an autobiographical section: 5:1–7. The author refers to the leaders of the recipient communities as *πρεσβύτεροι* (presbyters) and calls himself a *συμπρεσβύτερος* (co-presbyter).³⁸ This designation of church officials is also used in Acts (11:30; 14:23;

³⁶ The mentioning of Silvanus as letter carrier could be viewed as a parallel to his role as letter carrier in Acts 15. Since Acts is written later than First Peter, there cannot be a literary dependence, but may very well reflect some common tradition of Silvanus/Silas being a letter carrier. To be more specific, this tradition may entail carrying letters from Peter/the Jerusalem authorities. This cannot be proven, but the parallel is too significant to be ignored. The possible link between Mark and Peter will be discussed in a later chapter. It should also be noted that Troy W. Martin, “Peter and the Expansion of Early Christianity in the Letters of Acts (15:23–29) and First Peter,” in *Delightful Acts*, ed. H. W. Attridge, D. R. MacDonald, and C. K. Rothschild, WUNT 1/391 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 87–99, has argued for a connection between First Peter and the letter from the apostolic council in Acts 15:23–29.

³⁷ Karl Matthias Schmidt, *Mahnung und Erinnerung im Maskenspiel: Epistolographie, Rhetorik, und Narrativik der pseudepigraphen Petrusbriefe*, HBS 38 (Freiburg: Herder, 2003), 187–91.

³⁸ Although it at first glance may appear appropriate to see the dichotomy of *πρεσβύτεροι*/*νέωτεροι* as referring to age groups, the content of Peter’s exhortation here makes it clear that he is speaking of *πρεσβύτεροι* in the sense of leaders of the community, see Brun, *Første Peters-brev*, 51.

15:2, 4, 6, 22; 16:4; 20:17; 21:18).³⁹ In Acts, the apostles and presbyters appear to be two different types of officials (cf. Acts 15:2; 16:4). The presbyters are a local leadership, whereas the apostles are authoritative figures for the early Christian movement as a whole.⁴⁰ The twelve are never called presbyters.

In First Peter, the duty of the presbyters is to ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποιμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπισκοποῦντες (be shepherds of the flock of God among you, overseeing it; 5:2).⁴¹ The same description of the ministry of the presbyters is found in Acts Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μιλήτου πέμψας εἰς Ἔφεσον μετεκαλέσατο τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας [...] προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ (From Miletus he sent to Ephesus and summoned the presbyters of the church [...] keep watch over yourselves and the entire flock for which the holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of God; Acts 20:17, 28). Acts and First Peter reflect a similar view of presbyters as responsible to shepherd the flock. In both contexts, ἐπισκοπέω/ἐπίσκοπος is used to describe the ministry of the presbyters, rather than being an office in its own right.

In analysing Peter as an authoritative figure, we must ask ourselves what it means that the fictional Petrine author refers to himself as συμπρεσβύτερος.⁴² Marxsen argues that this means that the real author of the letter is in fact a presbyter who is subordinate to the presbyters he is writing to.⁴³ Goppelt rather considers this to be a reference to the apostolic origin of the ministry of the presbyters, and

³⁹ This designation resembles the prescript of Pol. *Phil.* Πολύκαρπος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι τῆ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ τῆ παροικούση Φιλιππίου (From Polycarp and those who are presbyters together with him in the church that is in Philippi). As we have noted above, Polycarp knows and uses First Peter, and thus this probably reflects the language of First Peter.

⁴⁰ In Acts 14:23, presbyters are ordained in each local community, and in 20:17 the leaders of the local community are called presbyters. A similar reference to presbyters as local ecclesial leadership can be found in Jas 5:14.

⁴¹ It should be noted that ἐπισκοποῦντες is missing in some important MSS and was placed within brackets in NA27. In NA28, these brackets have been removed.

⁴² Goppelt, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, 322, notes that Paul prefers referring to himself as *συνεργός* or *σύνδουλος*, and the *συμπρεσβύτερος* here is a *hapax legomenon*.

⁴³ Willi Marxsen, "Der Mitalteste und Zeuge der Leiden Christi," in *Theologia Crucis—Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. C. Andresen and G. Klein (Tübingen: Mohr, 1979), 377–93. Feldmeier, *The First Letter of Peter*, 232, takes a similar position and argues that the author here "falls out of the fiction of being the apostle and speaks as that which he is, as a Christian presbyter."

thus argues that the presbyters are partakers of Peter's apostolic office.⁴⁴ If *συμπρεσβύτερος* is meant to emphasise the connection between Peter and the presbyters, the reference to being *μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων* (witness to the sufferings of Christ; 5:1) at first glance appears to indicate a difference between Peter and the recipients. In Acts, *μάρτυς* is a reference to being an eyewitness of Christ.⁴⁵ As already noted above, Peter is not described as a witness of the sufferings of Christ in the Gospels. It is therefore more plausible that Peter is a witness not of the crucifixion, but rather through his sharing of the sufferings of Christ.⁴⁶ Peter is not only a co-presbyter, but also a sharer in the sufferings of Christ in a manner analogous to the receiving community. This identification between Peter, the recipients, and Christ is further underlined by *ἀλλὰ καθὼς κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε* (but rejoice insofar that you share the sufferings of Christ; 4:13). Goppelt argues that through their sufferings, the presbyters are made into co-witnesses of Christ.⁴⁷

The cooperative language is a reoccurring theme, *Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή*: she who is at Babylon is called *συνελεκτός* (co-chosen; 5:12). From this may be inferred that the presbyters of the local community and Peter conceive their relationship as collegial. Peter is in some way considered to be "one of them" and not an external authority. Just as the leaders of the community are co-presbyters with Peter, so she who is at Babylon, the Roman church to which Peter is considered to have departed, is co-chosen with the recipients of the letter. Thus, despite the geographical distance, the recipients of First Peter experience some kind of communion with other churches relating to Peter.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Leonhard Goppelt, "Kirchenleitung und Bischofsamt in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten," in *Kirchenpräsident oder Bischof? Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung und Definition des kirchenleitenden Amtes in der lutherischen Kirche*, ed. I. Asheim and V. R. Gold (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), 9–35.

⁴⁵ Goppelt, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, 322.

⁴⁶ See Hans von Campenhausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936), 63–65; Norbert Brox, *Zeuge und Märtyrer: Untersuchungen zur frühchristlichen Zeugnis-Terminologie*, SANTS 5 (München: Kösel, 1961), 36–39; idem., "Tendenz und Pseudepigraphie im ersten Petrusbrief," *Kairos* 20 (1978): 110–20; idem., *Der erste Petrusbrief*, 229; Hermann Strathmann, "μαρτυς, κτλ.," in *TDNT* 4:474–514; Goppelt, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, 322–23; Birger Olsson, *Första Petrusbrevet*, KNT 17 (Stockholm: EFS, 1982), 184; Schmidt, *Mahnung und Erinnerung*, 179; Feldmeier, *The First Letter of Peter*, 233.

⁴⁷ Goppelt, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, 324.

⁴⁸ The portrayal of Peter as a colleague of the local presbyters is an interesting rhetorical strategy that strengthens the authority of the local leaders through their connection to Peter.

4.1.3 First Peter and Paulinism

We have already noted several affinities between First Peter and the Pauline corpus, and it is commonly claimed that First Peter is affected by Pauline/deutero-Pauline theology.⁴⁹ It is appropriate to make some remarks on how this can contribute to our understanding of the letter. Schenke and Fischer go as far as to propose that First Peter was originally written as a deutero-Pauline epistle, reading Παῦλος rather than Πέτρος in 1:1.⁵⁰ Jens Herzer argues that the similarities with the Pauline/deutero-Pauline writings pertain to form rather than content.⁵¹ He suggests that some kind of “Petrine school” is behind the letter, and the form as such is to be seen as early Christian convention rather than Pauline.⁵² However, as noted by David G. Horrell, there must still be some connection to Paul, since First Peter uses distinctively Pauline traditions (which is the only early Christian convention we are aware of), and though not directly dependent on Paul, it does incorporate Pauline elements.⁵³ Also the pastoral epistles are somewhat independent from Paul, yet using Pauline style.⁵⁴ Thus, First Peter is neither deutero-Pauline nor

⁴⁹ Brun, *Første Peters-brev*, 221; Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 373. See also Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Pauline Heritage in 1 Peter: A Study of Literary Dependence in 1 Peter 2:13–25,” in *The Early Reception of Paul*, 125–47.

⁵⁰ Hans-Martin Schenke and Karl Martin Fischer, *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2 vols. (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1978–1979), 1:199–203.

⁵¹ Jens Herzer, *Petrus oder Paulus? Studien über das Verhältnis des Ersten Petrusbriefes zur paulinischen Tradition*, WUNT 1/103 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1998). Yet, it must be noted that the criteria for establishing literary dependence are not clearly defined, cf. discussion in Travis B. Williams, “Intertextuality and Methodological Bias: Prolegomena to the Evaluation of Source Materials in 1 Peter,” *JSNT* 39 (2016): 160–87.

⁵² Herzer, *Petrus oder Paulus*, 83. Cf. John L. White, “New Testament Epistolary Literature in the Framework of Ancient Epistolography,” in *ANRW. II.25.2* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 1730–56. See also M. L. Soards, “1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude as Evidence for a Petrine School,” in *ANRW II.25.5*. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988), 3827–3849. This position is questioned by Bart D. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery. The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics* (Oxford: University Press, 2013), 252–53, who argues that the incongruity is precisely the letter appear as deutero-Pauline. However, I consider this to be a matter of definition. With Ehrman’s argument, any text having a Pauline form but only partly Pauline content could be considered deutero-Pauline, and the categorisation would thus become useless.

⁵³ David G. Horrell, review of *Petrus oder Paulus? Studien über das Verhältnis des Ersten Petrusbriefes zur Paulinischen Tradition* by Jens Herzer, *JTS* 51 (2000): 287–92.

⁵⁴ The similarity between Jas 4:6–10 and 1 Pet 5:5–9 is interesting considering that both letters are sent to the “diaspora.” Examining this is beyond the scope of this study, but it should be mentioned that William Wrede, “Miscellen,” 84, suggests that there is some kind of literary relationship. Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, discusses both First Peter and James as stemming from the Jewish diaspora letter

Petrine, but a letter drawing both from Pauline as well as other early Christian traditions.⁵⁵ There is no reason to connect First Peter with some specifically Petrine school, of which we, honestly speaking, have no evidence. Goppelt writes concerning First Peter that “[d]iese Tradition ist von Paulus zwar beeinflusst, aber nicht geprägt.”⁵⁶ Thus, the Pauline connections in form and content of the letter should not be ignored, but not either overstated.⁵⁷ In many respects, the letter reflects an “Abart des Paulinismus.”⁵⁸ First Peter re-writes Pauline theology in order to fit the contemporary situation.⁵⁹ It is plausible that the original audience was well acquainted with the Pauline letter tradition and theology, and that whoever wrote First Peter wished to “update” Paul’s teachings to be relevant in the present situation.

4.1.4 How Does First Peter Work as a Pseudepigraphical Letter?

Having dealt with several aspects of the pseudonymous nature of First Peter, one might ask how it was actually conceived in its original context. It should be admitted from the very beginning that the task of discerning the *Sitz im Leben* for a pseudepigraphical letter is complex.⁶⁰ A relevant question is whether the original audience believed it to be a genuine letter from Peter or if they accepted it although they understood that it must have been pseudepigraphical. Thus, we will deal with the question of whether First Peter should be viewed as *Fiktion* or *Täuschung*, i.e. fiction or deception.

First, we must note that the original audience was probably aware that Peter had been dead for quite some time. Still, Peter appears to be speaking into a specific

tradition. He also includes the letter in Acts 15 in this tradition, thus suggesting that this letter tradition in a Christian context was stemming from Palestinian Christianity.

⁵⁵ So David G. Horrell, “The Product of a Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter,” *JSNT* 86 (2002): 29–60. See also idem., *1 Peter*; NTG (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 31–44.

⁵⁶ Goppelt, *Erster Petrusbrief*, 50.

⁵⁷ For a discussion of the relationship between First Peter and the *Corpus Paulinum*, see Goppelt, *Erster Petrusbrief*, 48–51. See also W. Seufert, “Das Abhängigkeitsverhältnis des I. Petrusbriefes vom Römerbrief,” *ZWT* 17 (1874): 360–88.

⁵⁸ Rudolf Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä völlig neu bearbeitet*, KEK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912), 8.

⁵⁹ See Kelhoffer, *Persecution, Persuasion, and Power*, 124. Kelhoffer argues that First Peter partially deals with modifying Paul’s positive view of the state as a servant of God in a new situation of persecution that was unanticipated by Paul.

⁶⁰ See Trevor Thompson, “As If Genuine: Interpreting the Pseudepigraphical Second Thessalonians” in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion*, 471–88.

situation and encouraging the recipients in the midst of their experienced persecution. Baur speaks of the *Doppelpersönlichkeit* of the pseudepigraphic author, who, being well aware of the part he was playing, would keep a healthy distance to the historical person through expressing himself in a sense general enough to fit both the situation of the fictive author as a historical person and the actual recipients at the time of the composition.⁶¹ Although this perspective of the pseudepigraphic author is appealing, it should be noted that not even Baur managed to make appropriate use of the model.⁶² Suffering and persecution are at the core of the message of First Peter. Yet, the references to suffering and persecution are always dealt with in general terms. The direct reprovals of certain individuals as found in the genuine Paulines are not present. The pseudonymous author thus balances between describing the issues he wishes to treat, such as unjust suffering (2:11–17), slaves and lords (2:18–25), and unbelieving husbands (3:1–6), and describing them in terms general enough that the letter can be thought of as being written by the historical Peter.⁶³ Since these themes, although clothed in general words, pertain to a quite specific situation, I think it is quite plausible that the letter originated from a group within or in close relation to the receiving community.⁶⁴ The letter is designed to a specific sphere of influence which is not distant, but which is thought to take heed to the words of Peter.

The very non-specific references to Peter make me inclined to view First Peter as *Täuschung* rather than *Fiktion*. If the letter was meant to be transparently fictional, it would probably have included more autobiographical material.⁶⁵ Instead, the specific Peter material is kept at a minimum, in order to be able to convincingly argue that it is a genuine Petrine letter. We have noted above that the trio of Peter, Mark, and Silvanus all have connections to Antioch. The region around Antioch is evidently a place where Peter was of central importance. I have suggested that Matthew originates from Antioch with its unique Peter-material.⁶⁶ There are also

⁶¹ Baur, *Paulus*, 2: 363–64.

⁶² As noted by Thompson, “As If Genuine,” 476–81, Baur in practice rather treats the pseudonymous author as an *Einzelpersönlichkeit*

⁶³ For a further discussion of these themes, see Kelhoffer, *Persecution*, 105–15.

⁶⁴ See Karl Matthias Schmidt, “Die Stimme des Apostels erheben: Pragmatische Leistungen der Autorenfiktion in den Petrusbriefen,” in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion*, 625–44.

⁶⁵ I am aware of the problem of stating such an argument. However, in comparison to other fictional Peter-texts studied in this chapter, this aspect is not insignificant.

⁶⁶ Rainer Metzner, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in 1. Petrusbrief: Studien zum traditionsgeschichtlichen und theologischen Einfluß des 1. Evangeliums auf den 1. Petrusbrief*, WUNT II/74

other traditions referring to Peter as an early Christian leader at Antioch.⁶⁷ It is thus not entirely improbable that First Peter was composed to speak to an audience connected to Antioch. The recipients must not necessarily have been the church at Antioch per se but could just as well be some other sphere of influence that viewed itself as derived from Antioch in some respect. In any case, the

(Tübingen: Mohr, 1995), argues that there is a literary relationship between First Peter and Matthew's Gospel. Thus, Metzner argues against Ernest Best, "1 Peter and the Gospel Tradition," *NTS* 16 (1970): 95–113. Metzner points at several similarities between Matt 5 and First Peter. While failing to prove that there is a literary dependence upon Matthew, Metzner does show that there are significant similarities in thought between the Matthean beatitudes and First Peter. However, this similarity of thought cannot be isolated to Matthew, but is rather pertinent to Q. Concerning the problem of establishing literary dependence, cf. Williams, "Intertextuality and Methodological Bias."

⁶⁷ Cullmann, *Petrus*, 46, argues that the conception of Peter as founder of the Church in Antioch is widely attested in early Christianity, mentioning the testimonies of Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and Jerome. He notes that although these traditions cannot be historically proven, the traditions connecting Peter to Antioch are stronger than those connecting him to Rome. The earliest source of this tradition is Origen, who is in turn probably the source for Eusebius (*Hist. Ecl.* 3.36.2.). It is thus plausible that the only original indication is derived from Origen, from whom Eusebius, Jerome, and Chrysostom in turn derive their information. Origen writes Δι' ὃ καλῶς ἐν μιᾷ τῶν μάρτυρός τινος ἐπιστολῶν γέγραπται – τὸν Ἰγνάτιον λέγω, τὸν μετὰ τὸν μακάριον Πέτρον τῆς Ἀντιοχείας δεύτερον ἐπίσκοπον, τὸν ἐν τῷ διωγμῷ ἐν Ῥώμῃ θηρίοις μαχησάμενον (And so I have found written elegantly in a letter of a certain martyr, Ignatius, the second bishop of Antioch after Peter, who was tortured in Rome fighting the beasts; *Hom. Luc* 6). It is important to note, contrary to Cullmann's claim, that Peter is not referred to as founder of Christianity at Antioch, but rather as its leader at some point, from whom the legitimacy of their bishops is derived. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*, 120, interprets this to mean that Ignatius was Peter's direct successor. However, Eusebius states that Ignatius was the second bishop, and Evodius the first—in the same book as he refers to Ignatius as the second bishop after Peter. Paul Parvis, "When Did Peter Become Bishop of Antioch?," in *Peter in Early Christianity*, 263–72, argues that Peter himself should not be conceived as a bishop, but rather the two bishops mentioned are seen as bishops who succeeded Peter's apostolic ministry. The discussion of how Ignatius should be placed in the bishop list at Antioch in relation to Peter has some similarities to placing Clement in the bishop list at Rome in relation to Peter. The historicity of Peter as bishop of Antioch is of course not very plausible. Harnack, *Geschichte*, 2.1:707, calls the Peter-tradition at Antioch an "orientalischen Nachschöpfung" (oriental imitation) of Roman traditions. The reconstruction of Sim, *Gospel of Matthew*, 100–106, who argues that Paul left Antioch after the controversy in Gal 2, leaving Peter as the sole leader at Antioch where he presided for many years could of course support such a notion, but I regard Sim's theory as highly speculative beyond any evidence provided from early Christian sources. Furthermore, Sim argues that Antioch under Peter's rule practised a Jewish form of Christianity, including e.g. circumcision, something that obviously contradicts the account in e.g. Acts. For a *Forschungsbericht* on the issue, see Thomas Lechner, *Ignatius Adversus Valentinianos? Chronologische und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu den Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochien*, VCSup 47 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 93–115. See also related discussion in Jaroslav Pelikan, "The Two Sees of Peter," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Volume One. The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*, ed. E. P. Sanders (London: SCM, 1980), 57–73.

recipients viewed Peter, Mark, and Silvanus as significant authoritative figures to their community, and Peter was viewed as having been part of the leadership of the group at some point (thus *συμπρεσβύτερος*).

If First Peter was conceived as genuine by its recipients, the letter must have been provided with a historical framework that explains its history after being written by Peter (prior to his death) until it arrived at the recipients. In order to accomplish this, the pseudonymous author renders the letter as a letter from Rome to the believers in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia (1:1).⁶⁸ Thus, the letter appears to be directed toward Asia Minor, probably as a circular letter.⁶⁹ The strange thing about this destination is that it is traditionally considered to be Pauline mission territory. In response, Elliott argues that the New Testament only supports a Pauline mission in Galatia and Asia, and therefore argues that the recipients are not exclusively Pauline churches—some of them could actually indirectly be a result of Peter’s sermon at Pentecost.⁷⁰ If one accepts Elliott’s proposal, Peter and Paul would likely both be important authoritative figures for the Christians at the respective locations, thus partially explaining the otherwise unexpected reference to Peter as author in 1:1. However, I regard Elliott’s proposal to be unnecessarily speculative. As argued in an earlier chapter, Acts is probably to be dated *after* First Peter, and the reliability of the historical data is thereby subject to discussion. Furthermore, a connection with a specifically Petrine “mission” is not necessary for Peter to be regarded to be a significant authoritative figure. Peter emerges as a significant authoritative figure both in Antioch (Gal 2; Acts 15) and in Corinth (1 Cor) even though these Christian communities are typically “Pauline.” Having said this, we must be aware of the possibility that the destination of the letter is fictional, and thus perhaps too much effort should not be put into making sense of the oddities of the receiving communities.⁷¹ The idea that Silvanus himself (5:12) would deliver a letter by a long-dead apostle to Christian communities in Asia

⁶⁸ It should be noted that it is uncertain whether these are to be understood as names of Roman provinces or traditional territories, see Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 368.

⁶⁹ John H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter. Its Situation and Strategy* (London: SCM, 1981), 60.

⁷⁰ Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 64. He argues that people from Pontus and Cappadocia are among the Jewish pilgrims that attend Peter’s speech at Pentecost (Acts 2:9–11). He sees the early conversion of Aquila of Pontus (Acts 18:2) as an indication of this. His conclusion is thus: 1. Bithynia-Pontus and Cappadocia were evangelised by persons other than Paul and his immediate associates. 2. Sufficient time beyond the campaigns of Paul must be allowed for Christianity to have spread throughout all the provinces named in 1:1. Thus, First Peter cannot be dated earlier than 20–30 years after Paul’s activity in the area.

⁷¹ This possibility was argued already by Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 206–207.

Minor is rather implausible. I suggest that this letter appeared to address issues in the context of its origin, invoking the authority of three people, Peter, Silvanus, and Mark, who were thought of as having formerly played a significant role in the local context.

The temporal distance between the death of Peter and the arrival of the letter is thus explained through depicting it as a letter that has already been circulated for some time in another region but has now arrived at the area and happens to have a message that fits very nicely into the present situation there. The identities of the authors and recipients are fictional and serve to present the letter as an authentic Petrine letter to its recipients. The claimed original recipients of the letter are thus fictional and serve the purpose of making possible the appearance of an authentic Petrine letter many years after his death.⁷² The reference to Babylon (5:13), i.e. Rome, as the place of composition is likewise fictional.⁷³ The actual recipients of the letter may have been aware of some tradition that Peter had gone to Rome toward the end of his life, and perhaps they also had access to something resembling the Papias tradition that also connected Mark to this vicinity, thus making the reference to Mark in First Peter very natural.⁷⁴

4.1.5 Conclusion: Peter in First Peter

What, then, can be said about Peter as an authoritative figure per se from First Peter? First, we may note his position in relation to Silvanus and Mark. Peter is depicted as a significant apostle, and Silvanus and Mark are his co-workers. Although the letter stresses the collegial aspects of presbytery, Peter refers to being a witness to the sufferings of Christ, encouraging the recipients in their own sufferings. Despite this formulation probably not referring to Peter as a witness to the crucifixion, the idea that Peter is a witness of Christ is very much present. Through Peter,

⁷² A scenario is created that makes the authenticity of the letter plausible to the readers, see Richard J. Bauckham, "Pseudo-Apostolic Letters," *JBL* 107 (1988): 469–94.

⁷³ John H. Elliott, "Peter, Silvanus and Mark in I Peter and Acts," in *Wort in der Zeit: Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorf zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. W. Haubeck and M. Bachmann (Leiden: Brill, 1980): 250–67, argues that "she who is at Babylon" is a reference to a female co-sender, and concludes that these four persons together represent some kind of Petrine group in Rome. The idea of a Petrine circle has been criticised by David G. Horrell, "The Product of a Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter," *JNTS* 86 (2002): 29–60.

⁷⁴ It cannot be proven that Peter and Paul were martyred in Rome. However, most evidence points to both of them being martyred in Rome during the reign of Nero, see Hans Georg Thümmel, *Die Memorien für Petrus und Pauls in Rom. Die archäologischen Denkmäler und die literarische Tradition*, AKG 76 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999).

the suffering of the Christian community in Antioch is connected to the sufferings of Jesus.

A significant reason for choosing Peter as pseudonym in First Peter is his relationship to the earthly Jesus. The Weberian concept of Peter as a *traditional* authority is of some importance here. Peter clearly *embodies* a great cultural capital in the eyes of First Peter, a capital which is further extended by the author by creating a fictional artefact in the form of a letter, thus creating cultural capital for Peter in the *objectified* state. This cultural capital translates into *social capital* as Peter identifies with the recipients of the text. What is more, Peter becomes the link between the sufferings of Jesus and the sufferings of the recipients, thereby creating an identification not only with Peter, but also with Jesus, which brings a sense of legitimacy to the recipients. Peter, who is a witness to the sufferings of Jesus, is also a witness of the sufferings of the recipients, thereby connecting the two.

4.2 Peter in the Preaching of Peter

The *Preaching of Peter* is a lost text, today mainly known to us through quotations by Clement of Alexandria.⁷⁵ In this study we will only treat the fragments that are relevant for understanding the view of Peter as an authoritative figure in the text. I deal here with the so-called Kerygma Petrou, which is not to be confused with the Kerygmata Petrou, which is a hypothetical source for the later Pseudo-Clementines.⁷⁶ Since only fragments of the text are available to us through quotations, it is customary to adopt the order in which the text is quoted by Clement of Alexandria. Ernst von Dobschütz has further grouped together fragments treating similar themes, thus resulting in a division into ten fragments.⁷⁷ I shall have this

⁷⁵ It is problematic that we do not know the degree of accuracy of the quotations by Clement. Annewies van den Hoek, "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria. A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods," *VC* 50 (1996): 223–43, suggests that Clement's quotations are freer when referring to authors to which he experiences kinship. Peter would probably belong to this category. A word-for-word exegesis of the quotations is therefore hazardous, but an analysis of the general themes should still give a sense of the Peter-image of the *Preaching of Peter*.

⁷⁶ However, the two terms are often used interchangeably, see F. Stanley Jones, "The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research, Part I," *SecCent* 2 (1982): 1–34.

⁷⁷ Ernst von Dobschütz, *Das Kerygma Petri kritisch untersucht*, TU II (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893), 18–27. An alternative structure, strictly following the order in Clement has been presented in Klostermann, *Apocrypha I*, 13–16. However, I choose to use the structure of Dobschütz, since its thematical approach is convenient to the purposes of this study.

structure as point of departure, and comment on and analyse the fragments relevant for understanding how Peter is portrayed as an authoritative figure.

Since we no longer possess the text in its entirety, the dating and provenance of the text is not easily settled. Dobschütz argues that the Preaching of Peter should be dated to the first quarter of the second century.⁷⁸ The text is commonly situated to Egypt, although the only support for this is that it is used by Clement of Alexandria.⁷⁹ Martin Elze has suggested that the Preaching originates from Antioch due to the many connections to the letters of Ignatius.⁸⁰ That would also imply a dating of the text to the very beginning of the second century. Michel Cambe argues that the text was composed around 100–110 C.E., although he prefers an Egyptian origin.⁸¹ Since First Peter does not include very much specifically Petrine material, this may be the earliest text available that contains allegedly Petrine content. However, evidence for the origin of the text is by no means conclusive.

The Preaching of Peter appears to have been spread as an anonymous work, not claiming Petrine authorship.⁸² From what remains, it appears to be a collection of sayings attributed to Peter rather than a sermon. Joseph Nicholas Reagan argues that the Preaching of Peter is an early Christian apology, but the remains are too fragmentary to draw such a conclusion with certainty.⁸³ In any case, the text fell out of use at some point, most likely due to its association with the Valentinian Heracleon, who quoted it frequently.⁸⁴

⁷⁸ Dobschütz, *Kerygma Petri*, 67. He argues that the possible range for dating is 80–140. Henning Paulsen, “Das Kerygma Petri und die urchristliche Apologetik,” *ZKG* 88 (1977): 1–37, narrows the spectrum to around 100–120 C.E. Since the *Preaching of Peter* is quoted in the *Apology of Aristides*, it cannot have been written later than 150, cf. Theodor m, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen and Leipzig: Deichert, 1890), 2: 823, 831. Thus also D. Gustav Krüger, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Freiburg and Leipzig: Mohr, 1895), 39.

⁷⁹ Wilhelm Schneemelcher, “Das Kerygma Petrou,” *NTAp II* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1964), 58–63.

⁸⁰ Martin Elze, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Christologie der Ignatiusbriefe*, (Habil., Tübingen, 1963), 49–51. His thesis is discussed in Paulsen, “Kerygma Petri”, 12–13.

⁸¹ Michel Cambe, *Kerygma Petri: Textus et commentarius*, CCSA 15 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 382.

⁸² Cf. Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:826. Zahn points out that Origen does not discuss whether or not it is apocryphal, but whether its content is authentic or not.

⁸³ Joseph Nicholas Reagan, “The Preaching of Peter: the Beginning of Christian Apologetic” (PhD diss., Chicago Graduate Divinity School, 1923), see also Edgar J. Goodspeed, *A History of Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), 130–34; Wilhelm Pratscher, “Scripture and Christology in the Preaching of Peter (*Kerygma Petri*), in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity. Essays in Honor of Michael W. Holmes On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. D. M. Gurtner, J. Hernández Jr, and P. Foster (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 555–77 (560).

⁸⁴ Cf. Origen *Comm. Jo.* 13.17.104.

4.2.1 Analysis of Relevant Passages

The first part of the Preaching of Peter that is relevant to this study is found in fragment six.

Διὰ τοῦτό φησιν ὁ Πέτρος εἰρηκέναι τὸν κύριον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις· ἐάν μὲν οὖν τις θελήσῃ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μετανοῆσαι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου πιστεῦειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ἀπεθήσονται αὐτῷ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. μετὰ δὲ δώδεκα ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον, μὴ τις εἴπῃ· οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν

Therefore, Peter says that the Lord said to the apostles: If anyone of Israel repents and believes in God through my name, his sins will be forgiven. After twelve years you will go out into the world, so that no one says: We did not hear.⁸⁵

At the beginning of this study we noted that Galatians describes Paul as apostle to the gentiles, whereas Peter is apostle to the Jews. This distinction is softened up by Acts, which stresses the continuity of the two missions, and that the gentile mission was in fact initiated by Peter. This quotation treats the same theme and follows a discussion on the relationship between Jews and gentiles in fragments 2–5. The mission is to begin with Israel, but after twelve years, the mission would go into the world. This roughly corresponds to the 14 years that passed between Paul’s meeting with Peter and his return to discuss the issue of gentile conversion (Gal 2:1). This is probably a kind of *vaticinium ex eventu* prophecy, constructed in order to explain the reason why the apostles did not immediately urge missions toward the gentiles as part of a plan that Jesus had given to them. For constructing this timespan, two years have simply been subtracted from the time that passed between Paul’s two visits, in order that Paul may start the gentile mission and experience some initial problems that were discussed at the council. The chronology still has problems, though, since an additional three years are accounted for before Paul met with Peter (Gal 1:18). Thus, depending on the time between Pentecost and Paul’s conversion, Galatians allows for a time span of 17 years or more between Pentecost and the Jerusalem council. However, the text serves its purpose despite these chronological contradictions. Peter and the original apostles are depicted as aware from the beginning that the gentile mission would be necessary, but that some time first must pass to preach first to Israel. Thus, their actions and hesitancy to preach to the gentiles is legitimised.

Continuing now to fragment seven:

αὐτίκα ἐν τῷ Πέτρῳ κηρύγματι ὁ κύριός φησι πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν· ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς δώδεκα μαθητάς κρίνας ἀξίους ἐμοῦ [οὗς ὁ κύριος ἠθέλησεν], καὶ ἀποστόλους πιστοὺς ἠγγελάμενος εἶναι πέμπω ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον εὐαγγελίσασθαι τοὺς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀνθρώπους

⁸⁵ *Strom.* 6.5, 53.

γινώσκειν ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν, διὰ τῆς [τοῦ Χριστοῦ] πίστεως ἐμῆς δηλοῦντας τὰ μέλλοντα, ὅπως οἱ ἀκούσαντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν, οἱ δὲ μὴ πιστεύσαντες ἀκούσαντες μαρτυρήσωσιν, οὐκ ἔχοντες ἀπολογίαν εἰπεῖν· οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν

Immediately after his resurrection, the Lord said to his disciples in the Preaching of Peter: I have chosen the twelve of you, judging you worthy of me according to the Lord's will, and considering you faithful apostles I sent you into the world to preach the gospel, so that the world's population will know that there is one God, and through faith in me (the Christ), reveal what is to come, so that those who hear and believe will be saved, but those who do not believe but testify that they have heard, they have no excuse by saying: "we have not heard."⁸⁶

This is a parallel to the great commission in Matt 28:16–20 and the longer ending of Mark 16:15–18. Some details are of special interest to us. First of all, Jesus' full confidence in his disciples is expressed as κρίνας ἀξιούς ἐμοῦ (judging you worthy of me)—thus implying that questioning the apostolic legitimacy of e.g. Peter would mean questioning the judgment of Christ himself. Furthermore, Jesus also predicts the unbelief of some. In Matthew, nothing is said concerning this. The Markan ending has a similar note on those who resist the message.⁸⁷ It is quite possible that the longer ending is here dependent on the Preaching of Peter, or at least a similar tradition.⁸⁸ Matthew probably accounts for the most primitive version of the great commission, whereas the longer ending of Mark and the Preaching of Peter are somewhat later and therefore include theologising interpretations of the results. The purpose for this is showing that it is not the disciples, including Peter, who are failing their mission, but rather those who do not receive have themselves to blame.

Next, we turn to fragment nine:

ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Πέτρον ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι περὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων λέγων φησὶν· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀναπτύξαντες τὰς βίβλους ἅς εἶχομεν τῶν προφητῶν, ἃ μὲν διὰ παραβολῶν ἃ δὲ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, ἃ δὲ αὐθεντικῶν καὶ αὐτολεξεί τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ὀνομαζόντων, εὑρομεν καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς κολάσεις πάσας ὅσας ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανὸς ἀνάληψιν πρὸ τοῦ ἱεροσόλυμα κριθῆναι, καθὼς ἐγγράπτο ταῦτα πάντα, ἃ ἔδει αὐτὸν παθεῖν καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ἃ ἔσται. ταῦτα οὖν ἐπιγρόντες ἐπιστεύσαμεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῶν γεγραμμένων εἰς αὐτόν.

⁸⁶ *Strom.* 6.6, 48.

⁸⁷ The longer ending of Mark is dated to 120–150 C.E. and is thus somewhat later than the *Preaching of Peter*, see James A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark*, WUNT II/112 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 175.

⁸⁸ See Paul Allan Mirecki, "The Antithetic Saying in Mark 16:16: Formal and Redactional Features," in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, ed. B. A. Pearson (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991), 229–41; Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 196.

Peter in his Preaching, speaking of the apostles, says: When we opened the books of the prophets which we had, we found sometimes in parables, sometimes in riddles, and sometimes plain (authentic) and self-evident references to Christ Jesus, both his coming and his death and the cross and all the other torments which the Jews put upon him, and the resurrection and assumption into the heavens the judgment of Jerusalem, all these things as they had been written, what he must suffer and what will be after him. Knowing this, we believed in God through what had been written about him.⁸⁹

Peter and the apostles are here reported to have interpreted the scriptures in such a way that they found references to Christ.⁹⁰ It is not unlikely that the purpose of this quote is to legitimise the type of interpretation of the Hebrew Bible that was practised by Christians. This quotation is used by Clement of Alexandria to defend the allegorical method of interpretation for which he is known. Peter and the apostles are here depicted as the first practitioners of such interpretation, and thus legitimise this kind of exegesis. Regardless of what kind of interpretation the Preaching has in mind, Peter emerges as some kind of authoritative interpreter.

4.2.2 Conclusion: Peter in the Preaching of Peter

The Preaching of Peter is a text that very much reflects the beliefs and history of Christianity at the time of its composition. Peter is portrayed as a link to the earthly Jesus who guarantees authentic Jesus tradition, thus corresponding to the *traditional* authority in Weber's system of classification. He is also portrayed as an authoritative interpreter of scripture and thereby functions as a *rational* authority. This text has often been classified as early apologetic literature.⁹¹ This definitely does have some degree of justification to it. The cultural capital of Peter is *objectified* in this text in order to create a social capital for those who are of the same opinion as the Peter of the text. Agreeing with the Preaching of Peter is a means of arguing one's own legitimacy as interpreter and preserver of the teachings of the earthly Jesus. It is evident that Peter is a significant authoritative figure in the sphere of influence of Clement of Alexandria. His role as interpreter is more outspoken here than in First Peter and testifies to more of a living Peter-tradition.

⁸⁹ *Strom.* 6.15, 128.

⁹⁰ This fragment brings to mind Jesus' Christological interpretation in Luke 24:13–35.

⁹¹ See Dobschütz, *Kerygma Petri*, 66; Pratscher, "Scripture and Christology."

4.3 Peter in the Apocalypse of Peter

The Apocalypse of Peter is a text that was widely read and spread both in the East and in the West during the first centuries of the Christian era.⁹² The apocalypse is listed in the Muratorian canon as an accepted book, although it is noted that some are not willing to read it in the church.⁹³ The Apocalypse of Peter should not be confused with the later Coptic Apocalypse of Peter found at Nag Hammadi. Portions of a Greek version of the apocalypse were found together with the Gospel of Peter and a Greek version of the Book of Enoch, all three written with the same scribal hand, in a monk's grave at Akhmîm.⁹⁴ The text is also preserved in two Ethiopian manuscripts, in both cases embedded within a the Pseudo-Clementine work *The Second Coming of Christ and the Resurrection of the Dead*.⁹⁵ Two other Greek fragments, the Bodleian fragment (5th cent.) and the Rainer fragment (3rd–4th cent.), have also been found, and there are some patristic references to the text.⁹⁶

Before we begin our examination of the narrative, we must discuss which version of the text that is closest to the original. For nearly a century, the Ethiopic translation of the Apocalypse has generally been preferred as the most reliable text. Montague Rhodes James argues that the Ethiopic translation appears to be a close approximation to the original Greek text that has unfortunately proven to be faulty at several points, making the original Greek rendering impossible to

⁹² See Attila Jakab, "The Reception of the *Apocalypse of Peter* in Ancient Christianity," in *The Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. J. N. Bremmer and I. Czachesz (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 174–86.

⁹³ This is remarkable, considering that none of the now canonical letters of Peter are included in the Muratorian Canon.

⁹⁴ Christian Maurer, "Offenbarung des Petrus," in *NTAp II* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1964), 468–83.

⁹⁵ The Pseudo-Clementine work was published by Sylvain Grébaud, "Littérature Éthiopienne Pseudo-Clémentine," *ROC* 12 (1907): 139–51, 285–97, 380–92; *ROC* 15 (1910): 198–214, 307–23, 425–39. Since I do not know Geez, I have consulted the translations by Bertil Gärtner, *Apokryferna till Nya Testamentet* (Stockholm: Proprius, 2001), 171–82; H. Duensing "Offenbarung des Petrus," in *NTAp II* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1964), 472–83; and Dennis D. Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened: A Study of the Greek (Ethiopic) Apocalypse of Peter*, SBLDS 97 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988). Quotations of the Ethiopic text are from Eric J. Beck, *Justice and Mercy in the Apocalypse of Peter: A New Translation and Analysis of the Purpose of the Text*, WUNT 1/427 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

⁹⁶ For a fuller treatment of the source texts available, cf. Richard Bauckham, "The Apocalypse of Peter: An Account of Research," in *ANRW* 2.25.6., ed. W. Haase (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988), 4712–50. For a list of references, see Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, *Das Petrusvangelium und die Petrusapokalypse: Die griechische Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung*, CGS 11 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 87–99.

recover.⁹⁷ Bauckham argues that the Ethiopic translation is reliable, since Ethiopic translations do not generally have many deliberate corruptions.⁹⁸ He also claims that there is no idea in the Ethiopic version that can only be paralleled at a date much later than the second century, although he does not present any specific evidence for this.⁹⁹ However, the Ethiopic translation is likely not a translation directly from Greek, but a translation of an earlier Arabic translation of the Greek, thus increasing the probability of error.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, the fact that the Ethiopic translation is incorporated in a collection of pseudo-Clementine literature could present a risk that it has been adapted to its new setting. Dennis D. Buchholz defends the integrity of the Ethiopic translation and argues that the Apocalypse of Peter is quoted in full and then commented upon in a Midrashic manner in the pseudo-Clementine writing, and is therefore essentially unaltered.¹⁰¹ However, viewed against the background of the entire text of *The Second Coming of Christ and the Resurrection of the Dead* in which the apocalypse is contained, it is more tenable to view it as one of three chapters of the book, which the compiler has likely felt free to alter in line with his own concerns.¹⁰²

⁹⁷ Montague Rhodes James, "The Rainer Fragment of the Apocalypse of Peter," *JTS* 32 (1931): 270–79. Yet, Julian V. Hills, "Parables, Pretenders, and Prophecies: Translation and Interpretation in *The Apocalypse of Peter* 2," *RB* 98 (1991): 560–73, points out that the Ethiopic text is by no means easily understood.

⁹⁸ Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, NovTSup 93 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 163. The problem with this argument is, of course, that it concerns Ethiopic translations in general, but not this text in particular. A comparison with the Bodleian and Rainer fragment makes clear that although the general story is intact, many details are different, see James, "Rainer Fragment," 272–74. It is often pointed out that the *Second Sibylline Oracle* from the late second century is probably dependent on the Apocalypse of Peter and corresponds rather well to the Ethiopic version, which could indicate that the text has not changed much, cf. Montague Rhodes James, "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter," *JTS* 12 (1910/11): 36–54. However, Beck, *Justice and Mercy*, 88, shows that the Rainer fragment is be closer to the Second Sibylline Oracle than the Ethiopic text.

⁹⁹ Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead*, 164.

¹⁰⁰ Eduard Bratke, "Handschriftliche Überlieferung und Bruchstücke der arabisch-aethiopischen Petrus-Apokalypse," *ZWT* 36:1 (1893): 454–93; Alessandro Baussi, "Towards a Re-Edition of the Ethiopic Dossier of the *Apocalypse of Peter*: A Few Remarks on the Ethiopic Manuscript Witnesses," *Apocrypha* 27 (2016): 179–96.

¹⁰¹ Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened*, 376–86.

¹⁰² See Monika Pesthy, "Thy Mercy, O Lord, Is in the Heavens; and Thy Righteousness Reacheth Unto the Clouds," in *The Apocalypse of Peter*, 40–51. It is worth noting that even Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened*, 386, admits that some aspects of the Ethiopic text are most certainly edited in order to fit into the Pseudo-Clementine work. Otto Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, 5 vols. (Freiburg: Herder, 1902–1932), 1:475, notes that this pseudo-Clementine writing contains a

The two extant minor Greek fragments correspond fairly well to the Ethiopic text. The longer Akhmîm fragment has traditionally been considered to be a revised edition of the Apocalypse, due to its differences from the prioritised Ethiopic text.¹⁰³ However, the recent study of Eric J. Beck argues convincingly that the Akhmîm text is generally closer to the original than the Ethiopic translation.¹⁰⁴ The Ethiopic texts are also significantly younger than the Greek fragments.¹⁰⁵ I will discuss the Ethiopic text when this is the only text available, but focus on the Greek fragments in the passages that they are present, and comment on the Ethiopic text in the footnotes in these cases. Although the Greek fragments are significantly older than the Ethiopic translation, we must face the possibility that the text we have differs significantly from the original. However, the quotations of the Apocalypse confirm that the text is more or less the same. Clement of Alexandria quotes the Apocalypse to argue that victims of infanticide are assigned angels (*Ecl.* 41.1–3; 48.1–49.2).¹⁰⁶ Also Methodius of Olympus appears to refer to this same passage (*Symp.* 2.6.45). A North African homily from the fourth century also refers to the Apocalypse of Peter and the flood of fire of which it speaks.¹⁰⁷ Since these features are still part of the Apocalypse, even in its Ethiopic recension, we may suspect that the main content has remained the same, despite later editorial activity.

Clement of Alexandria used the Apocalypse of Peter and it should therefore not be dated later than ca 150 C.E.¹⁰⁸ Considering that the text probably is

number of revelations to Peter that are allegedly recorded by Clement of Rome, which have probably been independent works before being incorporated into this volume.

¹⁰³ Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead*, 164.

¹⁰⁴ Beck, *Justice and Mercy*, 73–92. Also Maurice Goguel, “A propos du texte nouveau de l’Apocalypse de Pierre,” *RHR* 89 (1924): 191–209, contends that the Akhmîm text should have priority, as he views the Ethiopic text as harmonised with the canonical Gospels.

¹⁰⁵ Whereas the Ethiopic witnesses can be dated to the 15th–16th centuries C.E., cf. Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened*, 139, the Rainer fragment is dated to the third or fourth century, cf. Charles Wesley, “Les plus anciens monuments du Christianisme: Écrits sur Papyrus II,” *PO* 18 (1924): 345–511 (482); the Bodleian fragment to the fifth century, cf. Montague Rhodes James “A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter II,” *JTS* 12 (1910/11): 362–83 (369); and the Akhmîm fragment to the sixth century, cf. C. Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period A.D. 300–800* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 90. Although the dating of manuscripts is not conclusive on its own, it is a further indication that the Akhmîm version is more original than the Ethiopic text.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Apoc. Pet. 8:10.

¹⁰⁷ André Wilmart, “Un anonyme ancien *De decem virginibus*,” *Bulletin d’ancienne littérature et d’archéologie chrétienne* 1 (1911): 35–49, 88–102 (58–60, 77–78). Cf. Apoc. Pet. 5:8; 6:2; 12:4.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Maurer, “Offenbarung des Petrus,” 469.

dependent on 4 Ezra and Matthew, it was probably not written earlier than 100 C.E.¹⁰⁹ Richard Bauckham argues that the Apocalypse of Peter is a Christian response to the Bar Kokhba revolt, thus making it into a Palestinian Jewish-Christian text from around 132–135 C.E.¹¹⁰ Peter van Minnen rightly objects that such exact conclusions cannot be drawn from general observations.¹¹¹ Furthermore, Tobias Nicklas points out that there is no reason to believe that the Apocalypse is specifically Jewish-Christian in nature.¹¹² Beck also considers it plausible that the Apocalypse was written for persecuted Christians during the first half of the second century although no clear connection can be made with Bar Kokhba.¹¹³ Yet, it is not self-evident that the apocalypse was at all written in an environment of persecution.¹¹⁴ The wide spread of the text suggests that it was not as exclusive as proposed by e.g. Bauckham.¹¹⁵ Although biblical scholars typically interpret apocalypses as responses to persecution in light of the Apocalypse of John, this is in fact not the typical purpose of an apocalypse.¹¹⁶ Yet, all apocalypses address some underlying problem, and it is not uncommon that this persists from some kind of social distress.¹¹⁷ As argued by Beck, the purpose of the Apocalypse is to portray both God's justice and his mercy, and the righteous can save the unrighteous from

¹⁰⁹ See Richard Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead*, 291–303; Maurer, “Offenbarung des Petrus,” 469; Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened*, 398–408. It should be noted that Robert C. Helmer, “‘That We May Know and Understand’: Gospel Tradition in the Apocalypse of Peter (PhD diss., Marquette University, 1998), suggests that the Apocalypse of Peter uses Matthean tradition rather than Matthew's Gospel itself.

¹¹⁰ Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead*, 160–94. See also Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened*, 408–30.

¹¹¹ Peter van Minnen, “The Greek *Apocalypse of Peter*,” in *The Apocalypse of Peter*, 15–39. See also L. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Tradition-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian views on Eschatological Opponents*, JSJSup 49 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 56–61; Eibert Tigchelaar, “Is the Liar Bar Kokhba? Considering the Date and Provenance of the Greek (Ethiopic) *Apocalypse of Peter*,” in *The Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. J. N. Bremmer and I. Czachesz (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 63–77.

¹¹² Tobias Nicklas, “Christliche Apokryphen als Spiegel der Vielfalt frühchristlichen Lebens: Schlaglichter, Beispiele und methodische Probleme,” *ASE* 23 (2006): 27–44.

¹¹³ See Beck, *Justice and Mercy*, 175. See also Thomas J. Kraus, “Die griechische Petrus-Apokalypse und ihre Relation zu ausgewählten überlieferungsträgern apokalyptischer Stoffe,” *Apocrypha* 14 (2003): 73–98.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Beck, *Justice and Mercy*, 174–78.

¹¹⁵ Bauckham, “Apocalypse of Peter,” 4739.

¹¹⁶ Cf. John J. Collins, “The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism. Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, 2nd ed., ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989), 531–48.

¹¹⁷ See John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 41.

their punishments through their prayers.¹¹⁸ Although there is no reason to connect the Apocalypse of Peter to any specific organised persecution, it does speak of how the righteous should relate to the often hostile unbelievers. The righteous will receive their reward, whereas the unrighteous will receive their punishment. But through all this the righteous should love and pray for their perceived antagonists.

I will divide my study of the view of Peter as an authoritative figure into two parts. In the first, I will deal with Peter's role in the apocalyptic narrative. In the second, I will examine possible reasons why Peter was chosen as the narrator when this text was composed and analyse the underlying conception of Peter in the group where it originates.

4.3.1 Peter's Function in the Narrative

The setting of the narrative is borrowed from Matt 24, where the disciples ask Jesus concerning the end times at the Mount of Olives, in order that they might be prepared.¹¹⁹ Jesus' answer summarises Matt 24:1–31, by warning for false messianic figures and speaking of his return. When Jesus starts speaking of the fig tree (Apoc. Pet. 2:1||Matt 24:32), Peter interrupts Jesus in order to ask him a question.

And I, Peter, answered him and said to him, "Explain to me about the fig tree and how we should understand it, since each of its seasons the fig tree sprouts and each of its years its fruit is gathered for its masters. What is the fig tree's lesson? We do not understand."¹²⁰

Peter willingly admits that he and the other disciples do not understand the parable of the fig tree. The narrator speaks in first person from the very beginning, but this is the first time that Peter identifies himself as the narrator. A common feature of the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter is that Peter is the first-person narrator.¹²¹ Peter appears to have the role of spokesperson of the apostles, just as in the Synoptic Gospels. However, Jesus' answer is directed to Peter directly in second person singular (2:4). It should be noted that although the vision is assigned to a group of "disciples" at the beginning and end of the apocalypse, the vision itself appears to

¹¹⁸ Beck, *Justice and Mercy*, 171. This builds on the priority of the Rainer fragment.

¹¹⁹ See Richard J. Bauckham, "The Two Fig Tree Parables in the Apocalypse of Peter," *JBL* 104 (1985): 269–87.

¹²⁰ Apoc. Pet. 2:2–3.

¹²¹ This is a significant element when studying the Akhmîm fragment, since the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter were there found in the same book. See discussion in Tobias Nicklas, "Zwei Petrinische Apokryphen im Akhmîm-Codex oder eines? Kritische Anmerkungen und Gedanken," *Apocrypha* 16 (2005): 75–96.

be a dialogue between Peter and Jesus alone. Jesus' revelations to Peter are followed by Peter asking questions to Jesus, whereupon Jesus reveals more in response.

As Jesus continues, he shows Peter the destiny of the unrighteous, and even Jesus himself weeps when seeing it (3:1–3). Peter responds to what he has seen:

And I asked him, saying to him, "O Lord, permit that I may proclaim your word about these sinners, because 'it was better for them when they had not been created.'" And the Saviour answered me, saying to me: "O Peter, why do you speak in such a way: 'Non-creation were better for them'? In fact, (it is) you who opposes God. And it is not you who shows them, his formation, mercy rather than he. For he created them and brought them forth where they did not exist. But when you saw the grief that will happen to the sinners in the last days and because of this your heart was sorrowful. But they who have transgressed against the Most High, I will show you their works."¹²²

Peter responds by quoting Jesus' words concerning Judas Iscariot in Matt 26:24. However, Peter is reproved for this utterance and accused of contending with God. Peter's response shows that he has not understood in what way they have sinned toward God. Peter is portrayed as "mere man" and does therefore not have the full perspective. This is a recurring theme also in Matthew, where Peter first attempts at taking a step of faith, but then fails.¹²³ Following this conversation, Jesus shows Peter the offenses and punishments for the respective groups.

ἰδοὺ ἐδήλωσά σοι, Πέτρε, καὶ ἐξεθέμην πάντα· καὶ πορεύου εἰς πόλιν ἄρχουσαν δύσεως, καὶ πίε τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐπηγγειλάμην σοι ἐν χειροῖν (χερσίν?) τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἄιδου, ἵνα ἀρχὴν λάβῃ αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀφάνεια καὶ σὺ δεκτὸς τῆς ἐπαγγελίας...¹²⁴

I have manifested unto you, Peter, and expounded all of this. Go into the city that rules over the West, and drink the cup that I promised you, at the hands of the son of him who is in Hades, in order that his destruction might begin. And you, worthy of the promise...¹²⁵

This text contains a clear reference to Peter's martyrdom. Peter is commissioned to the city that rules over the West, i.e. Rome. His martyrdom is presented as a prelude to the apocalypse.¹²⁶ Peter is commissioned to preach the apocalyptic message about the future of the wicked, but also the message of Jesus in peace. This

¹²² Apoc. Pet. 3:4–7.

¹²³ Cf. Matt 14:22–32; 16:13–23; although these examples are of a somewhat different character.

¹²⁴ The Greek text follows the emendations of James, "Rainer Fragment," 271.

¹²⁵ Apoc. Pet. 14.3b–5a in the Rainer fragment. The Ethiopic text of this passage: *I have told you, Peter, and informed you. Go, therefore, and depart for the city in the west to the vineyard of which I will tell you so that, because of the suffering of my son who is without sin, the work of desolation may be sanctified. But you, however, are the elect one according to the promise that I promised you. Therefore, [and] send into all the world my message in peace.*

¹²⁶ A roughly contemporary passage corresponding to this is *Ascen. Is.* 4:2–3.

message concerns hope of life, but the end will be sudden. This passage indicates something about the Peter-image of the Apocalypse. Peter is entrusted by Jesus to preach his message, but also has his martyrdom preordained by Jesus. Thus, the martyrdom of this significant apostle is not a failure, but part of the divine plan, as well as a necessary prerequisite for the apocalypse to begin. Furthermore, Peter's journey to Rome and martyrdom is linked to the journey to Jerusalem and death of Jesus himself.¹²⁷ It is significant to note that this statement concerning Peter's martyrdom follows immediately after the Rainer fragment makes clear that the prayers of the righteous can save the sinners from their eternal punishment (14:1–3). Hereby it is anticipated that Peter through his martyrdom will be put in a position where he can save sinners through his prayers.

Following this commissioning of Peter is an account that resembles that of the transfiguration in Matt 17:1–8.

Καὶ προσθεὶς ὁ κύριος ἔφη· ἄγωμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος, εὐξώμεθ[α]. ἀπερχόμενοι δὲ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μ[α]θ[η]ταὶ ἐδείχθημεν, ὅπως δείξῃ ἡμῖν ἓνα τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν <τῶν> δικαίων τῶν ἐξελεθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα ἴδωμεν ποταποὶ εἰσι τὴν μορφήν καὶ θαρσύναντες παραθαρσύνωμεν καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπους. [κ]αὶ εὐχομένων ἡμῶν ἄ[φνω] φ[αίν]ονται δύο ἄνδρες ἐστῶτες ἔμπροσθε τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς ο[ὐρανὸν] οὐκ ἐδυνήθημεν ἀντιβλέψαι· ἐξήρ[χ]ετο γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς ὄψεως αὐτῶν ἄκτιν ὡς ἡλίου.¹²⁸

And continuing, the Lord said: Let us go to the mountain and pray. And we, the twelve disciples, went with him and asked him to show us one of our righteous brothers that had departed from the world, in order that we might see what form he had, and taking courage, so that we might also encourage those who hear us. And while we were praying, two men suddenly appeared, who were before the Lord, and we were not able to look at them. From their faces came a ray like the sun.¹²⁹

καὶ προσελθῶν τῷ κυρίῳ εἶπον· τίνες εἰσὶν οὗτοι; λέγει μοι· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ δίκαιοι ὧν ἠθελήσατε [ταῖς] μορφὰς ἰδεῖν· καὶ γὰρ ἔφην αὐτῶ· καὶ ποῦ εἰσι πάντες οἱ δίκαιοι ἢ ποῖός ἐστιν ὁ αἰὼν ἐν ᾧ εἰσι ταύτην ἔχοντες τὴν δόξαν;

¹²⁷ See Tobias Nicklas, “‘Drink the Cup which I Promised You!’ (*Apocalypse of Peter* 14.4): Peter’s Death and the End of Times,” in *The Open Mind: Essays in Honour of Christopher Rowland*, ed. J. Knight and K. Sullivan, LNTS 522 (London: T & T Clark, 2015), 183–200.

¹²⁸ The Greek of the Akhmim fragment follows that of Klostermann, *Apocrypha I*.

¹²⁹ Apoc. Pet 15:1–2, Akhmim fragment of Apoc. Pet. 4–7a. Ethiopic text of this passage: *And my lord, Jesus Christ our king, said to me, “Let us proceed to the holy mountain.” And his disciples came with him while they were praying. And behold, (there were) two people. And we were powerless to look at their face, because from one of the was coming a light that was shining more than the sun.*

And I went to the Lord and said: "Who are these?" He said to me: These are your righteous brothers, whose form you desired to see." And I spoke to him: And where are all the righteous, or of what kind is this age, in which they are who have this glory?¹³⁰

In this passage, Peter and the disciples are shown righteous brothers who have departed from the world. The purpose of this is likely to inspire the readers of the rewards of perseverance during hardships.¹³¹ Following this, Jesus shows Peter the wonderful dwelling place of the righteous.¹³² In this narrative, Peter not only functions as apocalyptic seer, but also an example of the message that the author wishes to convey. Not only does the apocalypse encourage perseverance through pointing out the punishments against the evildoers and rewards of the righteous; it also brings forth a specific example in the figure of Peter himself. The rather explicit reference to his martyrdom not only connects his persecutors to their punishments and Peter to his glory, but also presents a concrete example of perseverance in suffering for the readers. Peter's martyrdom is paralleled with the death of Jesus and is portrayed as the starting point of the eschaton.¹³³ Viewed against the

¹³⁰ Akhmîm fragment of Apoc. Pet. 12–14. Ethiopic text of this passage: *And I approached near to God, Jesus Christ, and I said to him, "Lord, who is this?" And he said to me, "This is Moses and Elijah. And I said to him, "(What about) Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the other righteous fathers?"* (Apoc. Pet. 16:1)

¹³¹ The Ethiopic version of this passage is significantly shorter than its Greek counterpart. Instead of speaking of the righteous brothers, it identifies the two men as Moses and Elijah, thus connecting the narrative to the transfiguration account in Matt 17:1–13, cf. Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 510–11.

¹³² Although the Akhmîm fragment ends here, the Ethiopic text continues its assimilation to Matthews Gospel through first recounting the transfiguration account in which Peter offers to build three huts (Matt 17:1–13) and combines it with the *Satanswort* of Matt 16:21–23: *And I said to him: "My Lord, do you want me to make three tabernacles here, one for you, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah?" And he said to me in anger, "Satan is attacking you and has veiled your understanding, and the affairs of this world are overcoming you. Now your eyes are uncovered and your ears are open that (there is) one tabernacle, which was not made by people's hands, (but) which was made by my heavenly father for me and for the elect."* (Apoc. Pet. 16.7–9). Thereafter the Ethiopic version quotes the voice from the heavens in Matt 3:17, and Jesus, Moses, and Elijah are taken away. *And behold a voice came suddenly from heaven while saying: "This is my son whom I love and I have delighted in my commandment. And a cloud came over our heads great of size and very white, and it carried off our Lord, and Moses, and Elijah. And I trembled and was terrified.* (Apoc. Pet. 17:1–2) Peter and the disciples see other people greeting the three persons in second heaven. The vision is explained as a fulfilment of Ps 24, and the disciples rejoice as they leave the Mount of Olives.

¹³³ This has led some to suggest that the "son of him who is in Hades" should be identified as Nero, cf. James, "Rainer Fragment," 273; Enrico Norelli, "Situation des apocryphes Pétriniens," *Apocrypha* 2 (1991): 31–83 (37); Nicklas, "Drink the Cup." However, just as in the case with bar Kokhba, one should

statement concerning the power of the prayers of the righteous in the Rainer fragment, Peter receives power to save sinners through his prayers, and is thereby presented as rather analogous to Jesus.

4.3.2 Why Peter?

We have already noted that the Apocalypse of Peter aims at bringing encouragement to withstand hardships. The setting that is borrowed from Matt 24 is eschatological, and the future of the righteous is described in the end of the text in modern reconstructions of the text which follow the structure of the Ethiopic text. However, the Akhmîm has the reverse order so that the vision of paradise comes before the description of hell. Furthermore, the Akhmîm version uses the past tense in its tour of hell, and the future tense for its tour of paradise, whereas the Ethiopic version uses future tense throughout. Beck argues convincingly for the priority of the Akhmîm text in both in regard to both these issues.¹³⁴ The Ethiopic recension of the text has substituted the vision of the righteous with a vision of

be cautious not to draw too exact conclusions from the text. Furthermore, the historicity of the Neronian persecution has been questioned in recent years, see Brent H. Shaw, "The Myth of the Neronian Persecution," *JRS* 105 (2015): 1–28. It should be noted that Shaw is criticised by Christopher R. Jones, "The Historicity of the Neronian Persecution: A Response to Brent Shaw," *NTS* 63 (2017): 146–52; and in turn responded to by Brent H. Shaw, "Response to Christopher Jones: The Historicity of the Neronian Persecution," *NTS* 64 (2018): 231–42.

¹³⁴ Beck, *Justice and Mercy*, 57–58 responds to the arguments presented by Montague Rhodes James, "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter III," *JTS* 12 (1910/11): 573–83, and mainly focuses on the issue of the order of the narrative. In addition to this, a significant argument in favour of the tense of the Ethiopic version is the alleged quotation of the apocalypse in Clement *Ecl.* 48 which uses the future tense. However, Veronika Černušková, "References to the *Apocalypse of Peter* in Clement of Alexandria's *Eclogae Propheticae*," *STh* 19 (2017): 107–37, argues that the references to the Apocalypse in this text are not quotes of even allusions, which would therefore diminish the value of this argument. However, as acknowledged by Beck, *Justice and Mercy*, 58, the order of the Ethiopic text must still be used for reconstructing the text, since too little of the Greek text has been preserved to make a reconstruction on the basis of the Akhmîm text. The use of tenses in the Akhmîm text also fits the purpose of the text that we have described. Focus is on the future blessings of the persecuted believers, whereas the punishment of the evildoers has already begun. James' description of the difference between the character of the texts also fits our reconstruction of the history of the text rather well. He describes the Akhmîm version as a vision which puts the description into the mouth of Peter, whereas the Ethiopic version is has more of the character of a prophetic prediction by the Lord. If the Akhmîm version is, as I suppose, more original, it presents Peter as apocalyptic seer and co-sufferer in the midst of persecution, whereas the Ethiopic version is a becomes more of a theoretical exposition of life after death.

Moses and Elijah, in order to make it more relevant to its time.¹³⁵ The relevant question for the purposes of this study is now why Peter is chosen to be portrayed as the seer of the Apocalypse. Although Peter functions much as a spokesperson of the disciples in the text and is coupled with the rest of the disciples at the beginning and end of the text, the prologue makes clear that Peter alone is to be identified as the receiver and transmitter of the apocalypse. Yet, it is unlikely that the prologue is original in its current form, and it thus points more to the understanding of Peter's role in the text among its readers than the function of Peter in the original context of the apocalypse.¹³⁶

The second coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead, which he told to Peter, who die for their sin because they did not observe the commandment of God, their creator. And this he reflected upon so that he might understand the mystery of the Son of God, the merciful and lover of mercy.¹³⁷

The choice of Peter as apocalyptic seer can best be understood by the reference to his ministry and martyrdom in 14:3–6. Since the apocalypse was probably aimed at Christians enduring various hardships, the readers could identify with Peter's destiny.¹³⁸ The fact that one of the most significant initial leaders of the Jesus movement could identify with persecution and martyrdom made him especially fitting for delivering the message of the apocalypse. Peter's significant role in the

¹³⁵ On this issue, see footnotes discussing the Ethiopic text. It is worth noting that the reference to Moses, Elijah, and the Patriarchs that are taken by e.g. Bauckham to identify the Ethiopic version as a Jewish-Christian text are likely later emendations. In a time when the persecution theme was not of the same relevance, the righteous brothers were substituted with righteous men of ancient times.

¹³⁶ Beck, *Justice and Mercy*, 74–76, challenges earlier claims that the prologue is not original (Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened*, 257, 377, views it as part of the Pseudo-Clementine text) through comparing it with Rev 1:1–2. Whereas Beck manages to show that it is not improbable that a prologue was part of the original text, I consider the content of the prologue as a clear indication that it, in its current form, belongs to a later recension of the apocalypse. The prologue expresses that the focus of the apocalypse is the destiny of the dead who died for their sin, thus underlining the punishment of the evil that is a central theme in the apocalypse as it is currently known. However, as I have argued that the original purpose of the apocalypse was to encourage suffering and persecuted Christians, it is unlikely that an original prologue would have had this focus. The prologue in its current form is probably the result of the same redaction of the text that changed the focus from the destiny of the righteous to the destiny of the evildoers for which I have argued above. This is likely the same redaction that changed the order of the tours of paradise and hell.

¹³⁷ Apoc. Pet. prologue.

¹³⁸ If the Apocalypse of Peter was written specifically during the bar Kokhba rebellion, as is often proposed, the Jewish Christians would be in a very severe situation. To the Romans they were Jews, and thereby part of a rebellious people, but to their fellow Jews they were considered to be traitors since they considered Simon bar Kokhba to be a false Messiah.

Matthean account of the transfiguration is also an important background, making Peter fitting as apocalyptic seer.¹³⁹

4.3.3 Conclusion: Peter in the Apocalypse of Peter

As an apocalyptic seer and divinely ordained martyr, Peter is a central figure in the narrative. Peter emerges as a *charismatic* authoritative figure, who takes initiatives by consistently posing new questions to Jesus. However, the *traditional* authority of Peter is the most significant aspect in this text. Not only was Peter a significant follower of the earthly Jesus, but it was also well known that he himself had endured suffering. Despite his suffering, he chose to pray for the salvation of sinners, thus setting an ethical example for other believers. Peter thus *embodied* a great deal of cultural capital to Christ-believers enduring persecution. The social capital that could be derived from connecting to Peter's cultural capital was not merely theoretical. Since also Peter had suffered martyrdom for the faith, the believers could identify with him and suffer together with him. Thus, their suffering becomes an identification with the sufferings of Peter himself. A further dimension is added to what we have found in the two previous texts of this chapter. Peter is now also portrayed as an apocalyptic seer and not only a preserver of the teachings of the earthly Jesus.

4.4 Peter in Second Peter

Second Peter has received much more scholarly attention than First Peter. Although both letters claim to be written by the apostle Peter, the two letters are rather different to form, style, and content.

4.4.1 Introductory Matters

Second Peter is more or less unanimously regarded as pseudonymous.¹⁴⁰ Whereas First Peter has sometimes been considered deutero-Pauline due to its many similarities with the Pauline corpus, Second Peter mentions Paul and his letters specifically. Although the text claims to be Peter's second letter (2 Pet 3:1), it is highly

¹³⁹ Buchholz argues that *Apoc. Pet.* 16:9 which states that Peter will have his eyes uncovered and his ears unstopped is an important background for it being incorporated to the pseudo-Clementine literature, see Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened*, 382.

¹⁴⁰ Some exceptions being e.g. Michael Green, *2 Peter and Jude*, TNTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1987); and Norman Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*. A more detailed case for the authenticity of 2 Peter is made by Otto F. Myrberg, *Om apostelen Petrus och den äldsta kyrkans falska Gnosis: Äfven ett bidrag till frågan om äktheten af Petri Andra Bref* (Upsala: Edquist & Berglund, 1865).

unlikely that First and Second Peter share a common origin. The language of the two letters is very different, and thematic connections are lacking.¹⁴¹ Second Peter contains a great deal of autobiographical material, whereas First Peter is quite generally written.

Edwin A. Abbott has pointed out similarities between Second Peter and Josephus' *Antiquities*, written around 93 C.E., which would in that case set a clear *terminus post quem* in the late 90's C.E. or later.¹⁴² Considering that Second Peter is dependent on Jude, it is hard to date the letter earlier than the second century.¹⁴³ If one regards Second Peter as dependent also on the *Apocalypse of Peter*, it can hardly have been written before 140 C.E., and a dating around the middle of the second century is preferable.¹⁴⁴

The place of composition is unclear. The author makes no reference to the location of his recipients, and it is hard to link the letter to a particular area. Kieffer argues that Second Peter has in mind the same audience as First Peter, but the

¹⁴¹ The Greek style of Second Peter is generally considered to be very good. This position is contested by Anders Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy: A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude*, ConBNT 36 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001), 30–91. Gerdmar argues that the style rather shows traces of Semitic influence, but in a manner different than Jude.

¹⁴² Edwin A. Abbott, "On the Second Epistle of St. Peter. Had the Author Read Josephus?," *Exp* 3 (1882): 49–63. Although not conclusive, the evidence presented by Abbott is not easily dismissed. See also Hans Windisch, *Die Katholischen Briefe*, HNT (Tübingen: Mohr, 1911), 87–88. The issue has been picked up more recently by Terrance Callan, "The Second Letter of Peter, Josephus, and Gnosticism," in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, 128–46. An attempt at reproving the evidence can be found in George Salmon, *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament* (London: Murray, 1889), 545–59.

¹⁴³ Dependence has also been suggested on the Testament of Moses and the *Apocalypse of Peter*, cf. Richard J. Bauckham, "2 Peter: An Account of Research," in *ANRW* II:25.5, 3713–52. The clearest dependence is on Jude, which is commonly dated to around 100 CE, cf. Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 378; Henning Paulsen, *Der Zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief*, KEK 12 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 45; Anton Vöglte, *Der Judasbrief/Der 2. Petrusbrief*, EKKNT 22 (Düsseldorf: Benziger, 1994), 12.

¹⁴⁴ See discussion in Wolfgang Grünstäudl, *Petrus Alexandrinus: Studien zum historischen und theologischen Ort des zweiten Petrusbriefes*, WUNT II/353 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 105–30; and Jörg Frey, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, HKNT 15/II (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015), 173, 186. Frey suggests a dating around 140–160 C.E. Dates up until 150 C.E. are not uncommon, cf. Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 383, and Lars Hartman, "Nytestamentlig isagogik," in *En bok om Nya testamentet*, ed. B. Gerhardsson (Malmö: Liber, 1989), 15–136 (81). Yet, many scholars such as Paulsen, *Zweiter Petrus*, 94; Vöglte, *Der Judasbrief*, 128–29, have argued that Second Peter should be rather be dated to around 125 C.E. For a history of scholarship on the relationship between the *Apocalypse of Peter* and Second Peter, see Paul Foster, "Does the *Apocalypse of Peter* Help to Determine the Date of 2 Peter?," in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, 217–60.

evidence is not conclusive.¹⁴⁵ Rome has traditionally been considered the location of composition. However, the fact that the letter appears to be unknown in the West until the fourth century speaks against this assertion.¹⁴⁶ Tord Fornberg suggests Asia Minor as a plausible location, Ceslas Spicq suggests Alexandria, whereas D. G. Wohlenberg prefers locating the composition in Antioch.¹⁴⁷ Anders Gerdmar argues that the similarities between Jude and Second Peter point toward a common milieu for these two letters.¹⁴⁸ However, I rather regard Second Peter as reusing the text of Jude and making it relevant for a new setting, and the suggestion of a common location is unpersuasive.¹⁴⁹ An exact location cannot be decided, but the evidence presented below points toward it originating from the East, probably in Asia Minor.

4.4.2 Second Peter as a “Testament of Peter”

The genre of the text is significant for understanding the Peter-image of Second Peter. Second Peter 1:12–15 is often viewed as placing the letter within the ancient genre of “testament.”¹⁵⁰ Peter is presented as writing Second Peter as he approaches his death. This is a common technique for writers of pseudepigraphic literature to

¹⁴⁵ René Kieffer, *Filemonbrevet, Judasbrevet och Andra Petrusbrevet*, KNT 18 (Stockholm: EFS, 2001), 99.

¹⁴⁶ See Charles Bigg, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902), 199–215. See also David G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*, WUNT 1/39 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986), 1979.

¹⁴⁷ Tord Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*, ConBNT 9 (Lund: Gleerup, 1977), 58 n. 6. Ceslas Spicq, *Les Épîtres de Saint Pierre*, SB, (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1966), 195; D. G. Wohlenberg, *Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief*, KNT(Z) XV (Leipzig: Deichert, 1915), XXXVII.

¹⁴⁸ Gerdmar, *Rethinking*, 298–323. According to Gerdmar, this common milieu is Palestinian Christianity.

¹⁴⁹ See also Fornberg, *Early Church*.

¹⁵⁰ Contemporary parallels can be found in e.g. 2 Baruch 78–86 (Letter of Baruch) and in Josephus *Antiquities* 4.309–319. The resemblance with this text is not one of literary dependence, but rather stems from the conventions of the genre, see Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, WBC 50 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1983), 194. For an introduction to the literary form, cf. Ethelbert Stauffer, “Abschiedsreden,” *RAC* 1:29–35. For a history of research on the genre, see Martin Winter, *Das Vermächtnis Jesu und die Abschiedsworte der Väter: Gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der Vermächtnisrede im Block auf Joh. 13–17*, FRLANT 161 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 9–35. See also Klaus Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular: sein Ursprung und seine Verwendung im alten Testament*, WMANT 4 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1960), 142–67; Johannes Munck, “Discours d’adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la littérature biblique,” in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Melanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel*, BibTh (Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950), 155–70.

emphasise their message as an urgent instruction from a now dead master. Yet, Second Peter cannot in its entirety be viewed as conforming to the testament genre. Although it fits several criteria for belonging to the testament genre, this genre is mixed with the epistolary form.¹⁵¹ The fictive situation and author of the testament are part of the basic elements of the genre.¹⁵² However, the lack of an explicit reference to and description of Peter's death is at odds with the testament genre.¹⁵³ Eckhard von Nordheim deems the death account to be constitutive to the testament genre, and thus the lack of this element is of great significance to the genre designation.¹⁵⁴ Moreover, if Second Peter was to fully comply with the testament genre, it would have Peter gather his closest followers around him as his death approaches, rather than write them a letter.¹⁵⁵ At the same time, it should be noted that the so-called testament of Paul in Acts 20:17–38 also lacks an account of Paul's death.¹⁵⁶ In Acts, Paul continues to live for several years after this speech. No one would argue that Acts as a whole is a “testament of Paul” on basis of Acts 20, and likewise I do not think it to be appropriate to place Second Peter into this genre in its entirety. If the author of Second Peter wished to write a typical “testament of Peter,” he could definitely have done so. However, he chose to write a letter, but borrowed aspects of the testament genre in order to legitimise his text. Rather than having Peter collect his sons and heirs at his deathbed, he writes a letter addressed to his spiritual sons and heirs. The purpose of the testament genre is not to present a last words forecast of the future, but rather to relate to the life of the person connected to the account.¹⁵⁷ Nordheim argues that “[die anerkannte Person] soll nichts anderes, als den vorgetragenen Belehrungen und Verhaltungs-

¹⁵¹ Of the thirteen criteria for a testament in Hans-Joachim Michel, *Die Abschiedsrede des Paulus an die Kirche Apg 20, 17–38*, SANT 35 (München: Kösel, 1973), 48–54, 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8 fit Second Peter. Thus, Second Peter is clearly placed within the literary tradition of testaments but uses the genre for its own purposes rather than fulfilling it as a whole.

¹⁵² Eckhard von Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten II: Das Testament als Literaturgattung im alten Testament und im alten vorderen Orient*, ALGHJ 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 92.

¹⁵³ Eckhard von Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten I: Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der Hellenistisch-Römischen Zeit*, ALGHJ 13 (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 229, notes that the death of the fictive author is always part of the testament genre.

¹⁵⁴ Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten*, 1:237.

¹⁵⁵ This is a significant element of the testament genre, cf. Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten*, 1:236.

¹⁵⁶ Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten*, 1:238.

¹⁵⁷ Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten*, 1:238.

anweisungen besonderes Gewicht, besondere Legitimation verschaffen.”¹⁵⁸ Thus, by phrasing Second Peter in terms of a “testament”, the author brings legitimacy, and thereby authority to his text. The author alludes to the testament genre in order to strengthen the legitimacy of his content, but the dominant genre of the text is still that of a letter.¹⁵⁹ Since the text is written as a letter, it is quite natural that the death account is lacking.

The author of Second Peter uses the future tense in introducing the testament of Peter, thus enabling the now long-dead apostle to speak into the present situation of the recipients. Thus, he does not simply remind the recipients of Peter’s words in the past, but rather has the apostle remind them of the truth, through speaking to them futuristically in his testament. It is interesting that Peter here states that the Lord has revealed to him concerning his death. The thematic similarity between the testament of Peter and John 21:18–19 cannot go without comment. These two texts clearly reflect a similar tradition of predicting Peter’s death, but a textual dependence is unlikely.¹⁶⁰ It is more likely that Second Peter reflects the same tradition as Apoc. Pet 14:1–5.¹⁶¹

In any case, the presentation of Second Peter as a “Testament of Peter” gives us a clear indication of the status of Peter as an authoritative figure in the sphere of influence from which the letter originates. Testaments were normally written in connection to “great men,” and thus the author likely considered Peter to belong to that category.¹⁶² Yet, this is not unique for the testament genre, but applies to pseudepigrapha in general. Peter was considered to be a significant authoritative figure of the past. If Peter was a symbol of identity to the recipients of Second Peter, this would be the testament of the most important authoritative person to them. Walter Grundmann argues that the author belonged to a group that was promoting Peter’s authority in the Church.¹⁶³ However, the argument for Petrine

¹⁵⁸ Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten*, 1:238. English translation: The purpose of the well-respected person is nothing else than to give legitimacy to the presented teachings and instructions on behaviour that are presented.

¹⁵⁹ Martin G. Ruf, *Die heiligen Propheten, eure Apostel und ich: Metatextuelle Studien zum zweiten Petrusbrief*, WUNT II/300 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 203; see also Frey, *Der Brief des Judas*, 177.

¹⁶⁰ As noted by Frey, *Der Brief des Judas*, 167; and Ruf, *Die heiligen Propheten*, 590, there are no traces of Johannine theology or vocabulary in the letter.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Ruf, *Die heiligen Propheten*, 594.

¹⁶² Stauffer, “Abschiedsreden,” 29. Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten*, 1:237, notes that the persons who die are always significant people.

¹⁶³ Walter Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, HKNT 15 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974), 57.

supremacy should not be exaggerated, since there is no trace of emphasising the special authority of Peter over other apostles.¹⁶⁴ Yet, it is evident that the status of Peter as an authoritative figure is taken for granted.

4.4.3 Second Peter as a Creative Compilation of Sources

The author of Second Peter is not a theological innovator, but rather a redactor of various sources, combining them in order to argue his case. We will now turn our attention to the sources that the author has used and consider his redaction of the sources and what this editorial activity may indicate concerning the author's conception of Peter as an authoritative figure.

It is universally recognised that there exists some kind of literary connection between Second Peter and Jude. Although this relationship is not at the core of the subject of this study, the motives for the author of Second Peter to use material from e.g. Jude may give some kind of indication of the purpose and nature of the text. There are four suggested models to describe this relationship: Jude uses Second Peter,¹⁶⁵ Second Peter uses Jude,¹⁶⁶ Second Peter and Jude use a common source independently,¹⁶⁷ or the same pseudonymous author wrote both texts.¹⁶⁸ The two latter of these alternatives are basically unthinkable—the literary dependence is significant, and it is hard to explain why the author would use two different pseudonyms. Thus, we are left with a literary dependence between Second Peter and Jude, the question being which is the original and which is the copy. Although the priority of Second Peter is argued by e.g. Gerdmar, most scholars adhere to the priority of Jude.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁴ Bauckham, "2 Peter," 3737.

¹⁶⁵ See Bigg, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 216–24.

¹⁶⁶ See Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*; Fornberg, *Early Church*; Paulsen, *Der Zweite Petrusbrief*, 97–100; . *Der Judasbrief/Der 2. Petrusbrief*, EKKNT 22 (Düsseldorf: Benziger, 1994), 122–23.

¹⁶⁷ Bo Reicke, "Judasbrevet," in *Tolkning av Nya testamentet: De katolska breven*, ed. B. Reicke and B. Gärtner (Stockholm: Verbum, 1970), 283–309, argues that both originate from a common oral homiletic tradition

¹⁶⁸ See Robinson, *Redating*, 193–94; Smith, *Petrine Controversies*, 77–78.

¹⁶⁹ Gerdmar, *Rethinking*, 116–23; Myrberg, *Apostelen Petrus*, 68–81. Gerdmar argues that Jude is more carefully structured and clearer with regard to content than is Second Peter, whereas Second Peter uses many obscure words and expressions (which in Gerdmar's opinion are clarified in Jude). However, I would rather argue that the stringency of Jude point to it as being the "original" document, from which Second Peter has copied parts into his discourse with varied success pertaining to rhetorical structure. Gerdmar's arguments somewhat resemble those of Theodor Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament, zweiter Band* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1907), 90–112. Jörg Frey, review of *Rethinking the Judaism-*

Second Peter's redaction of Jude has three main features: It places ethical parenesis into an eschatological framework,¹⁷⁰ omits references to events of specifically Jewish interest,¹⁷¹ and omits references to Jewish literature not included in the Septuagint.¹⁷² The first of these is a way of shaping the content of Jude to fit the message of Second Peter, and the second indicates that Second Peter is probably written to a predominantly gentile community. The third could also be due to a shift from a predominantly Jewish to a predominantly gentile community. A natural assumption would be that Second Peter chose to omit pseudepigraphal material since it was excluded from the Christian canon. However, the Jewish apocalyptic literature continued to be used in the Church until the fourth century, so this does not necessarily say anything about the background of the recipients.¹⁷³ However, it is still fair to say that Second Peter does not only treat a specific situation among the recipients, but also edits Jude in order to present relevant teaching to this community, in the name of someone who was an authoritative figure to them. For some reason that is not known to us, the author of Second Peter considered the explicit extracanonical references in Jude to be a problem for his

Hellenism Dichotomy by Anders Gerdmar, *TLZ* 128 (2003): 393–95, sharply criticises Gerdmar's argumentation, claiming that his conclusions are not coherent with the arguments that he presents. As noted by Fornberg, *Early Church*, 115, the argued Semitisms in Second Peter can be derived from the LXX, and thus this is a more probable source for the Semitisms than is a direct influence from Semitic languages. Tommy Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*, ConBNT 43 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2006), 73–98, argues for the priority of Jude and examines critically Gerdmar's proposal. Thomas J. Kraus, *Sprache, Stil und historischer Ort des zweiten Petrusbriefs*, WUNT II/136 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 368–76, makes a thorough analysis of the style of Second Peter and concludes that it must be dependent upon Jude. The analysis of the discrepancy of content in Second Peter's redaction of Jude by Fornberg, *Early Church*, 33–59, makes it virtually impossible to credibly argue that Jude used Second Peter.

¹⁷⁰ Jude 7–8 → 2 Pet 2:7–10—Second Peter adds eschatological reference in v. 9; Jude 10 → 2 Pet 2:12–13 (placing their destruction in the future tense; Jude 18 → 2 Pet 3:3–4—placing this reference in the context on the current issue of the delay of the Parousia.

¹⁷¹ Jude 11 → 2 Peter 2:15—Cain and Chorah are omitted, only Balaam remains; Jude 5—reference to deliverance from Egypt is omitted.

¹⁷² Jude 6 → 2 Pet 2:4—the main story is found in Gen 6:1–4, but some specific details from First Enoch that are included in James are omitted in 2 Peter; Jude 9 → 2 Pet 2:11 The reference to the archangel Michael from the *Assumption of Moses* is changed into a more general statement about angels; Jude 14–15 quoting 1 En 1:9 is not included in Second Peter. For a more detailed study Second Peter's redaction of Jude, see Fornberg, *Early Church*, 33–59.

¹⁷³ Fornberg, *Early Church*, 57. Johannes Lindblom, *Kanon och Apokryfer: Studier till den bibliska kanons historia* (Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, 1920).

recipients, and thus edited them away.¹⁷⁴ In any case, the recipients of Second Peter probably did not know Jude.¹⁷⁵ Already Jude is something of a heresiological tract, and Second Peter reuses it to argue against the opponents in his context.¹⁷⁶ There are also some minor additions in the material that Second Peter borrows from Jude. The text is more clearly directed toward eschatology in 2:3–4 (Jude 18) and 2:6, 10 (Jude 7). Second Peter also adds descriptions of his opponents as people who “slander what they do not understand” (2:12) and that will be “deprived of the reward of their righteousness” (2:13).

Since Second Peter is longer than Jude, it of course also adds material to his source. First of all, he adds Peter’s autobiographical material in ch. 1. This material is derived from Apocalypse of Peter. The exodus narrative (Jude 5) is replaced by the examples of Noah and Lot as righteous men who are saved from an unrighteous environment. The story of Noah and the flood is important to the author of Second Peter, who mentions it again in 3:5–7 as a prototype of the eschaton.

As we have already mentioned, there is a significant literary relationship between Second Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter. Bauckham and Kraus both show clear connections between the texts, suggesting the priority of Second Peter, although it is admittedly not easy to discern which text is the source for the other.¹⁷⁷ However, Wolfgang Grünstäudl argues convincingly that the priority of the Apocalypse is to be preferred, and is followed by Frey.¹⁷⁸ Grünstäudl argues that the Matthean influence is secondary to that of the Apocalypse, since the Apocalypse and letter agree against Matthew on several points. Peter Dschulnigg points

¹⁷⁴ Peter H. Davids, “The Use of Pseudepigrapha in the Catholic Epistles,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth and C. A. Evans, JSPSup 14 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1993), 228–245 (242).

¹⁷⁵ Thus Marco Frenschowski, “Erkannte Pseudepigraphie? Ein Essay über Fiktionalität, Antike und Christentum,” in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion*, 181–32 (216).

¹⁷⁶ See Frederik Wisse, “The Epistle of Jude in the History of Heresiology,” in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böhlig*, ed. M. Krause, NHS 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 133–43.

¹⁷⁷ Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead*, 290–303; Kraus, *Sprache*, 390–96; idem., “Griechische Petrus-Apokalypse.” So also Bigg, *Epistles*, 207–9; and Friedrich Spitta, “Die Petrusapokalypse und der zweite Petrusbrief,” *ZNW* 12 (1911): 237–42. However, it is worth noting that Richard Bauckham, “2 Peter and the *Apocalypse of Peter* Revisited: A Response to Jörg Frey,” in 2 *Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, 261–81, states that he has reconsidered his position and now considers the case for literary dependence to be “very weak.”

¹⁷⁸ Grünstäudl, *Petrus*, 105–30; Frey, *Der Brief des Judas*, 170–73. See also Harnack, *Geschichte*, 2.1:470–72; James Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, ITL (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1918), 367; Eero Repo, *Der “Weg” als Selbstbezeichnung des Urchristentums: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und semasiologische Untersuchung*, AASF 132,2 (Helsinki: Soumalainen Tiedakatemia, 1964), 95–107.

out that Second Peter also shows affinities with Matthew on points that are not present in the Apocalypse.¹⁷⁹ If one imagines that Matthew was the primary source of information concerning Jesus for the author of Second Peter, it may partially explain the choice of Peter as fictive author, considering the central role of Peter in Matthew. The author arguably also knew First Peter.¹⁸⁰ The use of Matthew, the Apocalypse of Peter, and First Peter indicates a milieu where the traditions of Peter as significant authoritative figure were important, and probably present something of the background for choosing Peter as fictive author of the letter.¹⁸¹ Much of the content of Second Peter appears to be the result of a conflation of the Apocalypse of Peter and Jude, put within a Matthean framework. The author of Second Peter obviously also knows of some collection of Pauline epistles (3:15–16). The explicit reference to Paul will be dealt with in greater detail below.

4.4.4 The Construction of Peter in Second Peter

When treating Second Peter as pseudonymous, the construction of Peter in the text reveals the view of Peter by the actual author. By studying Peter's fictive self-portrayal in the text, we may thus discern something about how Peter was viewed as an authoritative figure in the sphere of influence where the letter originated.

The letter writer clearly identifies himself as Peter from the beginning of the letter (1:1). The Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Peter, apostle of Jesus Christ) of First Peter is expanded to Συμεῶν Πέτρος δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Symeon Peter, servant and apostle of Jesus Christ). Several dimensions of this greeting are of interest. The inclusion of Peter's Semitic name Συμεῶν gives the text a Semitic touch. This could be taken as an indication of the letter being written by an Aramaic/Hebrew-speaking Christian, but more likely it is a way of

¹⁷⁹ Peter Dschulnigg, "Der theologische Ort des zweiten Petrusbriefes," *BZ* 33 (1989): 161–77.

¹⁸⁰ See G. H. Boobyer, "The Indebtedness of 2 Peter to 1 Peter," in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson 1893–1958*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: University Press, 1959), 34–53.

¹⁸¹ The critical reader may note the possible incoherence that I consider the similarities with Jude to indicate that Jude was unknown to the recipients, whereas the similarities with Matthew and the Apocalypse of Peter suggest that these texts were known in some form to the original context of Second Peter. This is due to the different nature of the use of the texts. Matthew and the Apocalypse present material for Peter's biographical background in Second Peter, and thus must conform to the conception of Peter among the recipients in order to be efficient in lending authority to Second Peter. On the other hand, if Jude was known to the original recipients, they might have exposed Second Peter as a forgery. The different source texts thus play different roles for constructing the text of Second Peter.

associating the letter with the apostle Peter personally.¹⁸² The designation of Peter as a servant may very well be a result of conflating the introduction of First Peter with the introduction of Jude, which reads Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος (Jude, servant of Jesus Christ).¹⁸³ This conflation of sources points toward the author being someone combining different sources rather than reflecting some kind of “Petrine school.” I thus disagree with Elliott and Herzer on this point.¹⁸⁴

The next section where we meet the fictional author is in the autobiographical section in 1:16–2:3. In this section, Peter refers autobiographically to his relationship to Jesus. Peter does not stress his individual experience, but rather that of the disciples collectively as being ἐπόπται (eyewitnesses; 1:16).¹⁸⁵ He then describes his experience of Jesus’ transfiguration, recounted in Matt 17:1–9||Mark 9:2–10||Luke 9:28–36. As noted above, the author of Second Peter appears to know Matthew, and this is the case also here.¹⁸⁶ However, as we have noted above it is uncertain whether he here uses Matthew directly, since he clearly follows the Apocalypse of Peter where it deviates from Matthew.¹⁸⁷ We need not linger on the account of the

¹⁸² Fornberg, *Early Church*, 9–10. Robinson, *Redating*, 193–94, argues that Jude wrote Second Peter. Thus, he explains the similarities in vocabulary and theme, and argues from the fact that Jude’s brother James uses Συμμεῶν for speaking of Peter in Acts 15:14. Robinson argues that Jude is a letter written at haste in a critical situation and was soon thereafter reused to produce a more refined encyclical in the form of a testament of Peter. I agree with Robinson that it is plausible that the letters are not too far separated in time, but otherwise find his thesis rather speculative. As I will argue, the omissions of certain material from Jude in Second Peter points toward someone else wanting to portray the same message as Jude, but in a more “orthodox” way.

¹⁸³ Vöglte, *Der Judasbrief*, 132, notes that such a conflation is not necessary, since the addressees are referred to differently. After all, greetings where the sender calls himself servant of Jesus Christ also occurs in e.g. Rom 1:1 and Tit 1:1. However, considering the close resemblance between Second Peter and Jude I find it plausible that the introduction and title of Peter is at least inspired by Jude.

¹⁸⁴ See Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*; idem., *1 Peter*; Herzer, *Petrus oder Paulus*.

¹⁸⁵ This word is a NT *hapax*, but in Greek in general it is used to designate those who have been initiated to the highest grade in the mysteries (BDAG). The plural here is in contrast to the preceding section, where he has been speaking of his individual testament.

¹⁸⁶ Ruf, *Die heiligen Propheten*, 101–22. Ruf argues that there are no traces of knowledge of specific Markan wording/tradition, and a connection to Luke is unlikely. However, there are clear parallels to Matthew and points of contact with John’s Gospel.

¹⁸⁷ Grünstäudl, *Petrus*, 120, lists the following agreements between the Apocalypse of Peter and Second Peter against Matthew: 1. On the holy mountain rather than on a high mountain; 2. The voice comes from heaven rather than from the cloud; 3. Peter is together with other undefined disciples rather than Peter, James and John; 4. Jesus’ transfiguration is not directly portrayed as it is in Matthew; 5. The Apocalypse of Peter places the transfiguration after easter whereas Matthew places it before easter. Second Peter does not define the time of the event. In addition to these arguments, the failure to mention

transfiguration in detail. The purpose of recounting this event is the refutation of the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι (false teachers) in 1:20–2:3. The theme of false teachers is also central in Apoc. Pet.1:4–8, as well as Matt 24:10. But whereas Matt 24 treats the various tribulations of the end times, the Apocalypse focuses solely on the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, and thus it is plausible that the author mainly has this text in mind when writing. Second Peter argues ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται (no prophecy in the Scripture has come about through own interpretation; 1:20). Thus, he claims that the opponents in the letter have made their own, human, interpretations of the Scripture.¹⁸⁸ Peter and his fellow apostles have instead ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ (spoken what they have received from God, carried by the holy Spirit; 1:21). On the basis of being ἐπόπται, Peter and his fellow apostles do not proclaim a human interpretation of the Scriptures, but rather something that they have received from God themselves. Thus, the author here uses Peter's position as being a follower of the earthly Jesus to legitimise his teaching as authoritative. The plural indicates that this ability of authoritative interpretation of Scripture is not restricted to Peter alone, but rather concerns the whole group of apostles.¹⁸⁹

In 2:1–3, Peter compares the false teachers to the false prophets in the Hebrew Bible, concluding with pronouncing apocalyptic judgment upon them. Although the main focus of this study is not the identity of the opponents, a brief elaboration on their claims does in fact reveal something about the conception of Peter as an authoritative figure. The comparison of the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι with ψευδοπροφῆται (false prophets) indicates that the opponents were some kind of charismatic Christian prophets. Thus, the conflict centres on what are legitimate claims to authority. Whereas the opponents claim some kind of divine inspiration as source for their authority, the author of Second Peter instead appeals to apostolicity. Although evidence is too sparse to conclude with certainty that the opponents were

Moses and Elijah corresponds to the Akhmîm version of the Apocalypse of Peter, whereas the Ethiopic version refers to these figures, inspired by Matthew. This might indicate that the author of Second Peter used a version of the Apocalypse of Peter resembling the Akhmîm version.

¹⁸⁸ See John T. Curran, "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20. On the Interpretation of Prophecy," *TS* 4 (1943): 347–68. (Although much of this article is devoted to Catholic interpretation of the Vulgate, it is rather useful for understanding this verse).

¹⁸⁹ It is of course possible to limit this mandate of authoritative interpretation to the three disciples present at the transfiguration, but since they are not mentioned in Second Peter, I do not think this is the purpose. It is not even necessarily so that the author intends to limit this mandate of authoritative interpretation to the twelve. The reference to Paul in 3:15 points toward this mandate being imposed on the apostles of the early Christian movement in general.

“Christian prophets,” the claims of apostolicity by the author of Second Peter are clear. Whereas the false teachers were considered to be mere human interpreters of Scripture, Peter and his fellow apostles are described as having a certain divinely inspired ability to teach. They are referred to as ἐπόπται (1:16), which can also carry the connotations of being initiated to the highest grade.¹⁹⁰ This historical, eyewitness type initiation is combined with the carrying forth through the Holy Spirit (1:21). Thus, the chief difference between Peter and his fellow apostles, and the false teachers is the direct connection to the encounter with the transfigured Jesus and their connection to the Holy Spirit. This difference pertains to how they derive their authority. In the case of Peter and the apostles, their connection to Jesus, combined with their charismatic abilities, present for them an authority of teaching the Scripture. Thus, the author of Second Peter does not necessarily speak against the possibility of divinely inspired interpretation, but rather argues that even divine prophetic inspiration is subordinate to apostolicity.

In 3:1–2, the author echoes the testament proclamation of 1:12–15, thus reminding the readers of his apostolic claims. He refers here to his letter as δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν (the second letter I write to you; 3:1), thus implying the existence of a first letter. As we have already noted, First and Second Peter are two pseudonymous letters of different origin. It is therefore not self-evident that Second Peter is referring to First Peter. Both Robinson and Smith argue that the former letter is in fact Jude, due to the great resemblance between the letters.¹⁹¹ However, it is implausible that Second Peter would wish to refer to Jude as his first epistle. Another possibility is that the letter here refers to a letter that is unknown to us.¹⁹² Boobyer has shown that Second Peter displays knowledge of First Peter, Jude, and the Synoptics.¹⁹³ Therefore it is more likely that this reference is in fact referring to First Peter, although this letter is not written by the same person.¹⁹⁴ The differences in how Peter is presented make it inconceivable that the letters have emerged from the same context.¹⁹⁵

The writer of Second Peter apparently has a multitude of sources at his disposal, considering the literary relationships present between Second Peter and

¹⁹⁰ BDAG, s.v. ἐπόπτης, 387. This is a NT *hapax*, and perhaps it could be viewed as a parallel to αὐτόπτης in Luke 1:2, which is also a NT *hapax*.

¹⁹¹ Robinson, *Redating*, 193; Smith, *Petrine Controversies*, 77.

¹⁹² Vögtle, *Der Judasbrief*, 211. An alternative version of this theory is that of Ceslas Spicq, *Les Épîtres des Saint Pierre*, 242, who argues that 2 Pet 1–2 is a separate letter that is here referred to.

¹⁹³ Boobyer, “Indebtedness.”

¹⁹⁴ This position is argued by Vögtle, *Der Judasbrief*, 212.

¹⁹⁵ See Frey, *Der Brief des Judas*, 163.

other texts. It is uncertain whether the letter would have invoked Peter's authority if there was not already another epistle present bearing Peter's name. The reference to this being the second letter is a plea for authenticity toward the recipients. However, the recipients do not have a "personal" relationship to Peter in terms of founder or historically significant person in their church. Peter refers to the preaching of τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν (your apostles; 3:1), thus implying that he writes to an audience that traces its origins to other apostles. Apostolic collegiality is emphasised already in the autobiographical section in 1:16–2:3, where Peter argues that he and the apostles who preached to this specific community have a special authority to preach and interpret Scripture.

In Second Peter, the apostle Peter sides with and supports the apostolic preaching on which this specific Christian community was already founded. In order for this to be eligible, Peter must have been conceived as an apostle of certain prominence. First Peter must have been in circulation in the area and seen as authoritative.¹⁹⁶ The community already conceived itself as deriving from apostles who had known the earthly Jesus (cf. 1:16–21). It is unclear whether they were amongst Jesus' earthly followers, but at least they must have regarded themselves as heirs of this apostolic tradition. It is unclear how wide the definition of apostleship was in early Christianity, but the reference to apostles here does not necessarily have to refer to the twelve or Paul.¹⁹⁷ It is quite possible that the apostolic sources of the sphere of influence where the letter originated were disciples of the original disciples or something of that sort, thus deriving their apostolic authority indirectly from Jesus. In any case, Peter is some kind of more prominent and generally recognised apostolic authority than these original apostles. When Peter writes a letter supporting the preaching of the original apostles, the argument must be considered, due to Peter's important apostolate. The fact that Second Peter refers back to First Peter indicates that First Peter was circulated and viewed as authoritative. This probably helped shape the view of Peter as an authoritative figure among the recipients of Second Peter.

¹⁹⁶ Fornberg, *Early Church*, 14.

¹⁹⁷ Klein, *Zwölf Apostel*, argues that the definition of apostleship was rather wide in the beginning of the Christian movement, but is restricted in Luke-Acts to the twelve. He argues that this is a way of refuting Gnosticism and legitimising authentic faith through referring to the twelve as chief apostles. Yet, Luke-Acts arguably have a high view also of Paul.

4.4.5 Second Peter and Paul

In 2 Pet 3:15–16, Peter speaks of Paul and his letters. He calls Paul an ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφός (beloved brother) and speaks of how his letters are good but have been misused. This passage has often been used to prove the canonical status of Paul's letters, arguing that Peter here equates them with the Hebrew Bible. Such a conclusion concerning canonicity is anachronistic and does not take into consideration the purpose and message of Second Peter. However, this is an indication that several Pauline epistles were available to the recipients and held in high regard among them.¹⁹⁸ There is no reason to believe that Second Peter is some kind of *Unionsdokument* indicating an emerging *Frühkatholizismus*.¹⁹⁹ However, it does reflect a time where the apostles were dead, and texts connected to them were starting to receive some kind of authoritative status in their place. In a way the purpose of Second Peter is to discuss how theology should be made in a post-apostolic setting. Peter argued in the beginning of this letter that the eyewitness experience of the apostles gave them a special ability to correctly interpret Scripture. Paul is not an eyewitness of the earthly life of Jesus, and therefore not legitimised through the argument in 1:16ff.²⁰⁰

Spicq argues that Second Peter should be divided into two letters, the first being contained in 2 Pet 1–2 and the second in 2 Pet 3.²⁰¹ I disagree with Spicq since the continual use of Jude throughout Second Peter disproves this option.²⁰² However, I agree that 2 Pet 3 is something of a repetition, summary, and reinforcement of the message in 2 Pet 1–2. In his “second round,” Peter does not stress his connection to Jesus and thereby his interpretative abilities, but rather argues in favour of Paul. The letter's opponents had obviously interpreted the Pauline epistles in an inappropriate way. In his repetition and summary of his message, the author therefore concludes by affirming Paul's apostolic authority in terms of apostolic

¹⁹⁸ See Andreas Lindemann, *Paulus in ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1979), 94. As noted by Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 330, the author probably was acquainted with some kind of collection of Pauline epistles, but we do not know how many or which these were. Fornberg, *Early Church*, 21–27, shows that Second Peter is influenced by Pauline formulations and concepts.

¹⁹⁹ Thus Jerzy Klinger, “The Second Epistle of Peter: An Essay in Understanding,” *SVTQ* 17 (1973): 152–69.

²⁰⁰ This limitation of the argument in 1:16ff is of course dependent on how much knowledge the author of Second Peter actually had of the historical Paul.

²⁰¹ Spicq, *Les Épitres des Saint Pierre*, 242.

²⁰² Cf. Fornberg, *Early Church*, 33–34.

teaching. The misuse of the Pauline epistles is due to the undisciplined and unstable nature of the false teachers (3:16). Paul and his epistles are in a way rehabilitated to being “orthodox” teaching, when interpreted correctly. The reference to the false teachers as ἀμαθείς (unlearned/ignorant/undisciplined; 3:16) summarises the critique of the opponents. The main problem with the opponents is that they are unlearned, or ignorant, of the traditions connected to Peter and Paul. It is also possible that the orthodox teachers in the sphere of influence (that were probably responsible for the letter) were referred to as μαθητής (disciples) or something similar, indicating some claim of being disciples of the apostles and thereby heirs of orthodox apostolic teaching. By referring to the opponents as ἀμαθείς, the author emphasises their lack of apostolic legitimacy. This points to the importance of Peter, as a link to Jesus and thereby an orthodox interpretation of Scripture.²⁰³

²⁰³ A related question is how Second Peter may have been received. Much effort has been put into making the letter appear as genuine, cf. Jörg Frey, “Autorfiktion und Gegnerbild im Judasbrief und im Zweiten Petrusbrief,” in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfälschung*, 683–732. Bauckham, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 134, argues that Second Peter was written as “an entirely transparent fiction,” thus following the English tradition of P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: University Press, 1921), 12; and H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation* (London: Lutterworth, 1963), 40–41. This view is also argued in more recent scholarship, cf. Hermann Josef Riedel, *Anamnese und Apostolizität: Der Zweite Petrusbrief und das theologische Problem neutestamentlicher Pseudepigraphie*, RST 64 (Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 2005). It is true that this kind of pseudepigraphon would not necessarily have been strange to the recipients of Second Peter, see Martina Janßen, “Antike (Selbst-)Aussagen über Beweggründe zur Pseudepigraphie,” in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfälschung*, 125–79. But, as noted by Frey, “Autorfiktion und Gegnerbild,” 730, the hesitance in accepting Second Peter as genuine speaks against this idea. All available early Christian sources appear to have a negative attitude toward pseudepigrapha, see Armin Daniel Baum, *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum*, WUNT II/138 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 148. On the other hand, the criteria for determining whether a text was pseudonymous or not was mainly through examining whether the message was in line with what was known of the teachings of the claimed author or not, see Baum, *Pseudepigraphie*, 142. See also Marco Frenschowski, “Pseudepigraphie und Paulusschule: Gedanken zur Verfasserschaft der Deuteropaulinen, insbesondere der Pastoralbriefe,” in *Das Ende des Paulus. Historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte*, ed. F. W. Horn, BZNW 106 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 239–72 (249). Gerd Theißen argues that early Christians were naïve concerning pseudepigrapha due to their low social standing, see Gerd Theißen, *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments als literaturgeschichtliches Problem. Vorgetragen am 27.11.2004*, Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 40 (Heidelberg: Winter, 2007, 159. Marco Frenschowski argues that the answer to the naivety of the early Christians was not primarily due to social standing per se, but rather that they had developed a certain subculture of their own, where the texts were not analysed in such terms, see Frenschowski, “Erkannte Pseudepigraphie?,” 223. He concludes that “Christliche Subkultur hat die Fiktionalitätsdiskurse der Antike reduziert” (230). I think that both Theißen and Frenschowski have

4.4.6 Conclusion

In Second Peter, Peter emerges as an authoritative figure from outside the community itself that guides the community into remaining in the apostolic faith, rather than listening to the false teachers. The basis of Peter's authority is his connection to Jesus, which gives him the ability to correctly interpret Scripture. However, Peter is not mainly referred to in order to legitimise himself and his teaching, but rather in order to enforce the reliability of the teaching of the apostolic founders of the community and of Paul. At the time of composition, Peter has become an authoritative figure symbolising both connection to Jesus and orthodox interpretation of the Scriptures. Peter is also used to reinterpret and re-contextualise the teaching of Jude and make it relevant to a new context.

We find in Second Peter a significant example of the translation process from cultural to social capital. The author draws from the *embodied* capital of the Petrine figure, *objectifies* it through creating an artefact in form of a letter, and creates a social capital for being in line with the significant apostles Peter and Paul. In Weberian terms, we can see the process of the institutionalisation of *charismatic* authority. Peter's charismatic authority is not used simply to convey certain theological positions, but for arguing in favour of a certain leadership and theology in the community. If Second Peter was successful in convincing a larger group that this model for institutionalisation of Peter's charismatic authority, which the later canonisation of Second Peter might suggest, we have a significant example of how Petrine authority was used to shape early Christian identity. The sphere of influence responsible for Second Peter successfully incorporated the authority of a well-known apostle to strengthen the legitimacy of their message. In relation to Second

good points. It is not hard to imagine that early Christianity became a certain subculture at a quite early stage, in which the authoritative writings were not questioned in the same way as other literature (although it should be admitted that we do have evidence of discussions concerning the authenticity of not least Second Peter). Yet, when a new text appeared, the educational level of the recipients may very well have contributed to embracing pseudepigrapha. If the main criterion for accepting a text as genuine was that it was in line with the teachings that Peter was conceived to have, it is not strange that it was accepted as genuine. Second Peter affirms the teachings of the two main authorities for the recipients of Second Peter: the original founding apostles of the community, and Paul. Despite later discussions about the authenticity of Second Peter, I think it was conceived as genuine when it arrived at its original recipients. The letter affirmed their theology and condemned their opponents. It defended their traditional theological position and thus filled the criteria for being "genuine." If there were doubts concerning the authenticity, these questions were not prioritised since the letter from Peter was a good argument when confronting the false teachers. Ernst Käsemann's claim that Second Peter is an apology for "urchristlich" theology is thus quite correct, see Ernst Käsemann, "Eine Apologie der urchristlichen Eschatologie," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 272–96.

Peter, Frey's notion of a Petrine discourse appears to be legitimate, as Second Peter is connected both to First Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter. Yet, the purpose and use of Peter is significantly different and it is more accurate to speak of a trend if utilising Peter for pseudepigraphic purposes than to speak of a Petrine school.

4.5 Peter in the Gospel of Peter

The Gospel of Peter is known from bishop Serapion of Antioch, who is quoted in Eusebius as he renounces it as a Docetic forgery.²⁰⁴ This gives us a *terminus ante quem* at about 190 C.E., and the Gospel is normally dated to around 150–190 C.E.²⁰⁵ However, if the Gospel of Peter is quoted by Justin Martyr, the dating must be pushed back to at least the 150s—perhaps further in order for the text to be spread and recognised.²⁰⁶ John Dominic Crossan goes as far as to propose that the Gospel of Peter is a source to the Synoptic Gospels, thus dating it very early.²⁰⁷ His approach has been criticised by e.g. Raymond E. Brown.²⁰⁸ Gardner-Smith argues that the Gospel was probably composed around the same time as the canonical Gospels.²⁰⁹ However, there is reason to believe that the Gospel of Peter has in fact used the three Synoptics in various ways.²¹⁰ Considering the anti-Jewish content of the text, combined with it being initially unknown to Serapion, and arguing below that it is not quoted by Justin, I consider the traditional dating around 150–190 C.E. more plausible.²¹¹

²⁰⁴ *Hist. Eccl.* 6.12. Eusebius also mentions the Gospel of Peter as a forgery in *Hist. Eccl.* 3.3.2. and 3.25.6.

²⁰⁵ Paul Foster, *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary*, TENTS 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 170.

²⁰⁶ See Percival Gardner-Smith, "The Date of the Gospel of Peter," *JTS* 27 (1926): 401–407. Peter Pilhofer, "Justin und das Petrus-evangelium," *ZNW* 81 (1990): 60–78, argues that due to this quotation, the Gospel of Peter can be dated no later than 130.

²⁰⁷ John Dominic Crossan, *The Cross that Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1988); idem., *Four Other Gospels: Shadows on the Contours of Canon* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1992); idem., "The Gospel of Peter and the Canonical Gospels" in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Text, Kontexte, Intertexte*, ed. T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, TU 158 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 117–34.

²⁰⁸ Raymond E. Brown, "The Gospel of Peter and Canonical Gospel Priority," *NTS* 33 (1987): 321–43.

²⁰⁹ Gardner-Smith, "The Date of the Gospel of Peter." He suggests 90 C.E., allowing for 80–110 C.E. to be a reasonable time span.

²¹⁰ Foster, *The Gospel of Peter*, 119–46.

²¹¹ See also discussion in Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 328–32.

Eusebius states that Serapion came across the Gospel in Rhossus (*Hist. Eccl.* 6.12) but is unaware of its place of composition. Léon Vaganay suggests that it originates from Antioch, since the concept of Petrine authority appears to have been strong here.²¹² Serapion's record of acquiring the text for more detailed study indicates that it was indeed available in Antioch. Despite these speculations, the location for the composition must be regarded as unknown.²¹³ The Gospel to which Serapion referred is lost, but a fragment found in Akhmîm, Egypt, was published in 1892 only to now be lost again, contains a text that is considered to be the Gospel of Peter.²¹⁴ The fragment has no heading, but a reference to Peter in first person has made scholars believe that this is the same Gospel.²¹⁵

4.5.1 I, Simon Peter

The only mentioning of Peter in the recovered fragment is the last verse, reading: ἐγὼ δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας, ὁ ἀδελφός μου λαβόντες ἡμῶν τὰ λῖνα ἀπήλθαμεν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἦν σὺν ἡμῖν Λευεὶς ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου ὄν κύριος... (But I, Simon Peter, and my brother Andrew took our nets and went to the sea, and together with us was Levi the son of Alphaeus, whom the Lord...; Gos. Pet. 14:60).²¹⁶ Peter is identified as the narrator in the text. Peter's identity may very well have been revealed earlier in the text in a section not available today. There is no indication of certain prominence of Peter in the text other than the fact that he is portrayed as its source. The preceding story of how Mary Magdalene and some other women find Jesus' tomb empty without in some way reporting to the Peter and the apostles could be an indication that the text does not emphasise Peter in the same way as the four canonical Gospels.²¹⁷ On the other hand, the reference to Peter in the concluding verse of the fragment could be the introduction to a resurrection appearance of Jesus to Peter and the disciples. The plot of the resurrected Jesus

²¹² Léon Vaganay, *L'Évangile de Pierre*, EBib (Paris: Gabalda, 1930), 94.

²¹³ Foster, *The Gospel of Peter*, 172–74.

²¹⁴ Foster, *The Gospel of Peter*, 1. However some scholars argue that POx 2949 also contains a fragment of the Gospel of Peter, see Dieter Lührmann, "Pox 2949: EvPt 3–5 in einer Handschrift des 2./3. Jahrhunderts," *ZNW* 72 (1981): 216–26; Matti Myllykoski, "POX 2949 als Fragment des Petrus-evangeliums," *StudOr* 99 (2004): 171–89.

²¹⁵ For a history of research on the Gospel of Peter, cf. Paul Foster, "The Discovery and Initial Reaction to the So-called Gospel of Peter," in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus*, 9–30. However, the dating and indication of the text is problematic, cf. Paul Foster, "Are there any Early Fragments of the So-called Gospel of Peter?," *NTS* 52 (2006): 1–28.

²¹⁶ The Greek text follows that of Erich Klostermann, *Apocrypha I: Reste des Petrus-evangeliums, der Petrusapokalypse und des Kerygma Petri* (Bonn: Weber, 1908).

²¹⁷ Gos. Pet. 13:50–57.

appearing in connection to a fishing trip is known from e.g. John 21. The main information that can be drawn from this text is that Peter is claimed to be the narrator of the text, thus working as a transmitter of the Jesus tradition.

4.5.2 “I With My Companions was Grieved”

Apart from the self-reference to Peter as the narrator of the text, we also have one more passage where the narrator speaks of himself in first person.

τότε οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς γνόντες ὅσον κακὸν ἑαυτοῖς ἐποίησαν, ἤρξαντο κόπτεσθαι καὶ λέγειν· οὐαὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν· ἤγγισεν ἡ κρίσις καὶ τὸ τέλος Ἰερουσαλήμ. ἐγὼ δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐταίρων μου ἐλυπούμην καὶ πετρωμένοι κατὰ διάνοιαν ἐκρυβόμεθα. ἐζητούμεθα γὰρ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ὡς κακοῦργοι καὶ ὡς τὸν ναὸν θέλοντες ἐμπρῆσαι. ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις πᾶσιν ἐνηστεύομεν καὶ ἐκαθεζόμεθα πεντησύντες καὶ κλαίοντες νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἕως τοῦ σαββάτου.

Then the Jews and the elders and the priests, knowing what evil they had done to themselves began to lament and say: “Woe to our sins. The judgment and the end of Jerusalem is near. But I with my companions was grieved and being wounded in our minds we hid. For we were being sought by them as evildoers and those who wish to burn the temple. But in the midst of all these things we were fasting and sitting and mourning and weeping night and day until the Sabbath.”²¹⁸

Although the narrator is here not explicitly identified as Peter, this is a natural inference from the final verse discussed above. The pericope is something of a parallel to John 20:19. However, the Gospel of Peter not only explains the events with fear of the Jews, but also refers to some kind of mental confusion, attempting at justifying the behaviour of the disciples.²¹⁹ The disciples are referred to as ἐγὼ δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐταίρων μου (I with my companions), thus implying that Peter is some kind of leader of the group. Maurer argues that the denial-stories of Peter are suppressed in the Gospel in order to present a more favourable account of the apostles.²²⁰ However, this cannot be proven, although the attitude toward Peter appears to be positive in the text we have at our disposal.

4.5.3 Serapion’s Reaction

Serapion was bishop of Antioch 190–211 C.E. and wrote a book about the Gospel of Peter.²²¹ The book is now lost, but a portion is quoted by Eusebius.

²¹⁸ Gos. Pet. 7:25–27.

²¹⁹ Thus Vaganay, *L’Évangile de Pierre*, 272.

²²⁰ Christian Maurer, “Petruσεvangelium,” in *NTAp* I, ed. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher (Tübingen: Mohr, 1959), 118–24.

²²¹ Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, 78.

ἡμεῖς γάρ, ἀδελφοί, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀποστόλους ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς Χριστόν, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευθεπίγραφα ὡς ἔμπειροι παραιτούμεθα, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν. ἐγὼ γὰρ γενόμενος παρ' ὑμῖν, ὑπενόουν τοὺς πάντας ὀρθῆ πίστιν προσφέρεισθαι, καὶ μὴ διελθὼν τὸ ὑπ' αὐτῶν προφερόμενον ὄνοματι Πέτρου εὐαγγέλιον, εἶπον ὅτι εἰ τοῦτο ἐστὶν μόνον τὸ δοκοῦν ὑμῖν παρέχειν μικροψυχίαν, ἀναγινωσκέσθω· νῦν δὲ μαθὼν ὅτι αἰρέσει τινὶ ὁ νοῦς αὐτῶν ἐφώλευεν, ἐκ τῶν λεχθέντων μοι, σπουδάσω πάλιν γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὥστε, ἀδελφοί, προσδοκᾷτέ με ἐν τάχει. ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, καταλαβόμενοι ὅποιας ἦν αἵρέσεως ὁ Μαρκιανός, <ὅς> καὶ ἑαυτῶ ἐναντιοῦτο, μὴ νοῶν ἃ ἐλάλει, ἃ μαθήσεσθε ἐξ ὧν ὑμῖν ἐγράφη, ἐδυνήθημεν [γὰρ] παρ' ἄλλων τῶν ἀσκησάντων ναυτὸ τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν παρὰ τῶν διαδόχων τῶν καταρξαμένων αὐτοῦ, οὗς Δοκητὰς καλοῦμεν (τὰ γὰρ πλείονα φρονήματα ἐκείνων ἐστὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας), χρησάμενοι παρ' αὐτῶν διελθεῖν καὶ εὐρεῖν τὰ μὲν πλείονα τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου τοῦ σωτήρος, τινὰ δὲ προσδιεσταλμένα, ἃ καὶ ὑπετάξαμεν ὑμῖν.

But we, my brethren, receive both Peter and the other apostles as Christ himself. But the writings that falsely bear their names we reject by experience, knowing that such were not handed down to us. When I was among you, I thought that you all stuck to the right faith, and without examining the Gospel put forward by them in the name of Peter, I said that if this is all that makes you confused, it may be read. But now I have learnt from what has been told to me that their mind was hiding a heresy, I hurry to come to you, therefore, brethren, expect me quickly. But we, brethren, gathering to what kind of heresy Marcianus belonged, who contradicted himself and did not understand what he was saying, as you will know through what has been written to you. We were enabled by others who had used this same Gospel, that is from the successors of those who started it, whom we call *Docetists* (most of his thoughts belong to this teaching). We went through it and found that most of it was the right teaching of the Saviour, but some things were added, which we have noted for you.²²²

Much can be said and discussed about Serapion's view of the Gospel of Peter, but we will now focus exclusively on analysing Serapion's view of Peter as an authoritative figure. It is significant to note Serapion's aversion toward pseudepigrapha. He states that he would receive Peter and the other apostles as Christ himself, thus claiming that apostolic testimony guarantees authentic Jesus tradition.²²³ Just as Papias, Serapion evidently regards the orally transmitted apostolic traditions to be more reliable than texts of dubious authorship.²²⁴ Merely claiming apostolic origin as a means of legitimising a text is thus increasingly difficult toward the end of the second century.²²⁵ The Gospel of Peter was apparently circulated in the area, since

²²² Quotation from *On the So-Called Gospel of Peter* by Serapion of Antioch, accessed in *Hist. Eccl.* 6.12.3–6.

²²³ It would of course be interesting to know Serapion's position on the two canonical epistles bearing Peter's name in this context, but unfortunately no such material has been preserved.

²²⁴ See Papias fragment 2 in *Hist. Eccl.* 3.38.4.

²²⁵ This is not to say that the production of pseudepigraphic texts ceased—numerous examples of the opposite can be found in this dissertation alone. Furthermore, 2 Thess 2:2 suggests that pseudepigraphy was a recognised problem rather early. Yet, we here find the perhaps most elaborate statement of

Serapion could acquire a copy for study, but not widely used in the church, since he was not earlier acquainted with the text. The Gospel appears to have been mostly used in what Serapion regarded to be Docetic circles. The title of the Gospel was most likely aimed at presenting the text as a reliable eye-witness account of the events, not least considering that Peter is the first-person narrator of the text. Thus, it appears that Peter was invoked as an authoritative and reliable link to reliable Jesus tradition both by Serapion and by those using the Gospel. Whereas the Docetic party at Rhossus used the written Gospel of Peter as a means of legitimising their message, Serapion referred to the tradition connected to Peter and the apostles known to him and concluded that the discrepancy ruled out the possibility of the Gospel of Peter being authentic. Thus, the dispute over the use of the Gospel is not merely a matter of Christology, but also of establishing a correct apostolic connection to the text. If Peter had in the late first and early second centuries been used as a device for providing apostolic legitimacy, the discussion at the end of the second century rather pertained to establishing which tradition was genuinely Petrine, and thereby a guarantee for authentic Jesus tradition. We here mainly have an example of Peter as *traditional* authority, who is used to validate traditions and texts through association.

4.5.4 Justin's Possible Quotation of the Gospel of Peter

In our discussion of the Gospel of Peter, we must also note that Justin quotes something that he calls the “memoirs of Peter.”

καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακέναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον καὶ τοῦτο, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου ὄντας, ἐπωνομακέναι ὄνόματι τοῦ Βοανεργῆς, ὃ ἐστὶν υἱοὶ Βροντῆς

and when it was said that he changed the name of one of the apostles to Peter, and it was written in his memoirs that this happened, as well as that he gave the name Boanerges to two brothers, the sons of Zebedee, which means sons of thunder.²²⁶

The understanding of this formulation is debatable. Miroslav Marcovich argues that in the context of this chapter it should be understood as the memoirs of his

how such literature was viewed by church officials. We may note that Tertullian's attitude toward pseudepigraphy is rather similar, as he states that the pseudonymous author who wrote the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* (allegedly out of love for Paul) was removed from his ecclesial office (cf. *Bapt.* 17). Also Tertullian argues that the decisive point for not accepting the writing was not only that it was a forgery, but also that he considered it to be in opposition to the genuine Pauline teaching (in this case on the right of women to teach and baptise, with reference to 1 Cor 14:34–35).

²²⁶ *Dial.* 106.3.

(i.e. Jesus') apostle (ἀπομνημονεύμασιν [τῶν ἀποστόλων] αὐτοῦ).²²⁷ It is widely agreed that Justin is referring to a text that is in some way attributed to Peter, probably either Mark or the Gospel of Peter.²²⁸ Kümmel argues that Justin is probably referring to Mark, considering the tradition found in Papias.²²⁹ This view continues to be argued by scholars such as Samuel Byrskog.²³⁰ Although it is not certain whether Justin knew Papias, some similar tradition concerning the origin of Mark may have been available to him.²³¹ The fact that Justin mentions not only the re-naming of Peter, but also that James and John were called βροανεργές, which is a uniquely Markan concept, supports this notion. Furthermore, Justin consistently uses the word ἀπομνήματα for referring to the canonical Gospels at many occasions in several of his works, not least the *Dialogue with Trypho*.²³²

Peter Pilhoffer disagrees with this hypothesis, arguing that there is no evidence that Justin knew this tradition of equating the memoirs of Peter with Mark, and thereby presupposes that his readers would immediately understand that this is the text he is referring to.²³³ He argues that it is more likely that Justin is here referring to the Gospel of Peter. However, the only mentioning of Peter we do have in the Gospel of Peter, "I, Simon Peter" (Gos. Pet. 14:60), makes this assumption less likely, since it uses the composite Simon Peter. If the name was changed in the Gospel of Peter, one would not expect such a formulation.²³⁴ Although it is probable that Justin in fact has Mark in mind, there is no reason to preclude such an assumption. Justin's expression would be easier to explain if he was referring to the existence of a Gospel of Peter. Justin claims that Peter's memoirs account for the changing of names of Peter, James, and John. Since the fragment of the Gospel

²²⁷ Miroslav Marcovich, *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*, PTS 47 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 252. He builds this assumption upon the support of lines 10 and 28 of this chapter, and I find the interpretation plausible. Bernard Orchard, "Mark and the Fusion of Traditions," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Franz Neirynck*, ed F. van Segbroeck et al, BETL 100 (Leuven: University Press, 1992), 779–800, argues that this kind of interpretation is problematic since Jesus himself left no memoirs. This is of course true, but that is not the issue here. Justin rather states that he is referring to memoirs concerning Jesus—not memoirs written by him.

²²⁸ See Philipp Haeuser, *Des heiligen Philosophen und Märtyrers Justinus Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon*, BKV, (Kempten & München: Verlag der Jos. Köselchen Buchhandlung, 1917), 173, n. 2.

²²⁹ Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 68.

²³⁰ See Samuel Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story*, WUNT 1/123 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 276.

²³¹ Richard Heard, "The ΑΠΟΜΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ in Papias, Justin, and Irenaeus," *NTS* 1 (1954): 122–29, argues that Justin probably knew Papias.

²³² See Heard, "ΑΠΟΜΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ," 124–25.

²³³ See Pilhoffer, "Justin und das Petrus-evangelium," 67–68.

²³⁴ See Claus-Jürgen Thornton, "Justin und das Markusevangelium," *ZNW* 84 (1993): 93–110.

available to us does not include this story, we cannot compare it with Justin's very brief mentioning of the event. Of our known Gospels, Mark thus best fits the criteria, but the possibility that the Gospel of Peter could have followed Mark in these instances cannot be entirely ruled out.

The significance of Justin's notion for this study is not to discern whether he was actually referring to Mark, the Gospel of Peter, or some other early Christian text, but rather in that it refers to memoirs of Peter (alternatively memoirs of Jesus' apostle Peter). With the evidence presently available, Justin is most likely referring to Mark, while calling it a memoir of Peter. Thus, he in a way connects Peter to the text, making him a link to authentic Jesus-tradition.

4.5.5 Conclusion

Working with the Gospel of Peter means working with a great deal of uncertainty. It is uncertain whether the fragment acquired at Akhmim is the same text that is referred to by Serapion, and it is uncertain how widely circulated this text was, as well as the time for its composition. The fragmentary nature of the document now available makes an analysis of the portrait of Peter as an authoritative figure hard to reconstruct in a satisfactory way. However, some general remarks can be made with an acceptable degree of certainty. First of all, the title of the Gospel indicates that Peter as an eyewitness was considered to be a reliable transmitter of the Jesus tradition.²³⁵ There are also indications that Peter is portrayed as the leading disciple in the Gospel. From Serapion's treatment of the Gospel we learn that Peter as a historical person was considered as reliable as Christ himself, whereas pseudepigraphy in his name was rejected. This reflects a situation where Peter is indeed guaranteeing authentic Jesus tradition, while showing awareness that this authoritative position of the apostle has been used by forgers. Thus, Serapion and the Docetists at Rhossus agree that Peter is someone who guarantees authentic Jesus tradition, while Serapion places greater emphasis on the traditions handed down, making him sceptical about new documents in Peter's name that do not reflect the proto-orthodox position.

Something of the complexity of discerning authentic apostolicity during the second century is reflected in Serapion's account. Considering his aversion toward pseudepigrapha, his initial non-critical attitude toward the Gospel of Peter

²³⁵ Whereas Gospel titles are seldom original, cf. Silke Petersen, "Die Evangelienüberschriften und die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons," *ZNW* 97 (2006): 250–74, Serapion makes clear that this Gospel was attributed to Peter when he was confronted with it and was apparently circulated as such.

indicates that he must have been open to the possibility that this text was indeed an authentic work of Peter. Only after understanding how the text could be used to oppose what he considered to be authentic tradition, he concluded that the text could not have been written by Peter. Thus, the authority of a text was dependent on its apostolicity, but the apostolicity could only be determined through comparing the text to orally transmitted apostolic tradition. This is in line with the conclusions we drew on the early Christian evaluation of pseudonymity when dealing with the canonical letters attributed to Peter. The main point of reference to discern the authenticity of a text was whether it was in line with the conceived teachings of the apostle, or if it taught something new.

In Weber's sociological terms, we can find traces of Peter as a *traditional* authority. The conceptions of Peter set norms against which new information is evaluated. In this respect, one might speak of Peter as imagined teacher as *embodying* a certain cultural capital, which could be translated to a certain social capital, and thereby legitimacy, if the Petrine connection was considered authentic. The story of Serapion's dealings with the Gospel is interesting, since it testifies to the appropriation of Petrine authority in two different spheres of influence. The Docetists at Rhossus claim legitimacy through literature attributed to Peter, whereas Serapion claims legitimacy through ecclesial Petrine tradition. The Gospel of Peter is an early example illustrating that Peter's authority was not only appropriated by what would later be viewed as proto-orthodox Christianity but was held in high esteem in spheres of influence of various theological outlook.

4.6 Peter in the Letter of Peter to Philip

The Letter of Peter to Philip is a text that starts as a letter but continues as a narrative.²³⁶ The title is thus somewhat misleading. The composition is normally dated to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. As for the provenance, Alexandria could be a possibility, but Peter traditions are normally linked to Syria or Rome.²³⁷ Two manuscripts containing a Coptic translation of the text are available, although the text was originally written in Greek. Since there are two different versions of the text, references will be made to the versions according to

²³⁶ For further discussion on introductory matters, cf. Johanna Brankaer and Hans-Gebhard Bethge, *Codex Tchacos: Texte und Analysen*, TU 161 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 7–10; Marvin Meyer, "The Letter of Peter to Philip," in *The Gospel of Judas Together with the Letter of Peter to Philip, James, and a Book of Allogenes from Codex Tchacos* (Washington D.C.: National Geographic, 2007), 79–89.

²³⁷ Brankaer and Bethge, *Codex Tchacos*, 9.

the system Codex Tchacos/Nag Hammadi Codex VIII. Relevant Peter-passages will be quoted.

4.6.1 Analysis of the Narrative

Peter, Apostle of Jesus Christ, writes to Philip. My brother and my fellow apostle and the other brethren, greetings! I want to let you know, my brother, that we received directions from our Lord the saviour of the whole world, that we should gather....²³⁸

The letter of Peter, that he sent to Philip. Peter, Apostle of Jesus Christ, to Philip, our beloved brother and our fellow apostle, and to the brethren who are with you, greetings! I want you to know, our brother, that we have received directions from our Lord and the saviour of the whole world, that we should come together in order to teach and preach about the salvation that was promised to us by our Lord Jesus Christ. But you have separated from us, and you did not want for us to come together and discover how we should organise ourselves in order to preach the gospel. Would you like to come according to the orders of our God Jesus?²³⁹

The greeting that introduces the text follows the conventional Greek letter form.²⁴⁰ Brankaer and Bethge suggest that the author wishes to put the text in the same category as First and Second Peter, although admitting that it is uncertain whether these letters were actually known to the author.²⁴¹ The focus on suffering could indicate knowledge of at least First Peter, but evidence is not conclusive.²⁴² In the greeting, Peter not only mentions his own apostolic status, but also refers to Philip as a fellow apostle, thus indicating a similar status of the two.

Although the whole text is called the Letter of Peter to Philip, this introductory passage contains the entire “letter.”²⁴³ According to the Nag Hammadi version, Philip has separated from the other apostles, but is now urged not only by Peter, but also by Jesus himself to join them in order to organise the preaching of the gospel. Peter presides as the leader of the apostolic collegium from which

²³⁸ CT 1:1–9.

²³⁹ NHC VIII 132:12–133:8.

²⁴⁰ See Adolf Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten: Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1908), 119–21; Hans-Josef Klauck, *Die antike Briefliteratur und das Neue Testament: Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1998), 36.

²⁴¹ Brankaer and Bethge, *Codex Tchacos*, 45.

²⁴² See G. P. Luttikhuisen, “The Letter of Peter to Philip and the New Testament,” in *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis: Papers Read at the First International Congress of Coptology* (Cairo, December 1976), ed. R. McL. Wilson, NHS 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 96–102.

²⁴³ Yet, the title summarises the message of the text quite well, cf. Judith Hartenstein, “Gedanken zur Kohärenz und Absicht des Brief des Petrus an Philippus (NHC VIII, 2),” in *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit: Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongress Münster, 20–26. juli 1996. Band 2: Schrifttum, Sprache und Gedankenwelt*, ed. S. Emmel et. al., SKCO (Weisbaden: Reichert, 1999), 475–82.

Philip has departed. Peter is also portrayed as having direct communication with God/Jesus, since he transmits an order from him.

When Philip had received and read this, he went to Peter rejoicing and glad. Then Peter gathered the others also. They went to the mountain called the Mount of Olives, where they had used to gather with the blessed Christ when he was in a body.²⁴⁴

The letter from Peter obviously made Philip change his mind.²⁴⁵ Peter is once again described as the leading figure in the apostolic collegium, gathering all its members and taking them to the Mount of Olives. After praying twice, Jesus appears in a great light, and gives a cosmic teaching about aeons and pleroma, and the struggle against the archons. After the vision, the apostles have a conversation about the necessity of suffering.

Peter answered and said: He died for our sake. It is necessary that we also die because of humanity. Then came a voice to him and said: I have often said to you: It is necessary for you to die and be brought before synagogues and governors. It is necessary for you that you are handed over.²⁴⁶

The apostles thanked the Lord with every blessing and returned to Jerusalem. As they were going up, they spoke with each other about the Light that had appeared. And there was a conversation concerning the Lord, and they said: If even our Lord had to suffer, how much must we suffer? Peter answered and said: He has suffered on our behalf, and it is necessary that we also suffer due to our smallness. Then came a voice to him and said: I have said to you often: It is necessary that you suffer. It is necessary that you are brought before synagogues and governors in order to suffer.²⁴⁷

Peter continues to play a significant leading role in the group of apostles.²⁴⁸ When the other apostles discuss the necessity of suffering following the vision of Jesus, Peter gives them an authoritative teaching. A voice speaks to Peter and confirms his answer. Just as in the actual letter at the beginning of the text, Peter is characterised as someone who has direct contact with the divine, and thus can make an

²⁴⁴ NHC VIII 133:8–17.

²⁴⁵ As noted by Marvin W. Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, SBLDS 53 (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1981), 96, there is no indication in the text that Philip's ministry is independent from the other apostles, but he is submissive to Peter. The portrait of Philip corresponds fairly well to what is found in Acts, where Philip also has separate ministry, although subordinate to the apostles.

²⁴⁶ CT 7:1–10.

²⁴⁷ NHC VIII 138:8–28.

²⁴⁸ Hartenstein, *zweite Lehre*, 164, argues that the positive and authoritative role of Peter in the Letter of Peter to Philip is unique among the "gnostic" dialogue Gospels. A similar conclusion is drawn also by Jacques É. Ménard, *La lettre de Pierre à Philippe*, BCNHT 1 (Québec: L'Université Laval, 1977), 7. However, Hartenstein also notes that whereas the main figures of other texts of this type bear forth visions, Peter in Ep. Pet. Phil. interprets Jesus' actions.

authoritative interpretation of Jesus' teaching. There is a clear difference between Peter and the rest of the apostles. They are all significant leaders of Christianity, but only Peter has the direct contact with the divine in a way that lets him authoritatively interpret the teachings of Jesus—even unto his fellow apostles.

Peter opened his mouth and said to his disciples: Surely our Lord Jesus has given us all a sign while he was still in a body. For he himself came down. My brethren, hear my voice. And he was filled with Holy Spirit and said thus: Our illuminator, Jesus, came down and was hung on wood. He bore a crown of thorns and put on a purple garment. And he was hung on wood and buried in a grave. And he rose from the dead. My brethren, Jesus is a stranger to this suffering. But we are the ones who have suffered through the transgression of the mother. And because of this, he did everything similar to us. The Lord Jesus, the Son of the glory of the immeasurable Father, he is the author of our life. My brothers, let us therefore not obey these lawless ones and [...] Then Peter gathered together the others and said: Our Lord Jesus Christ, the author of our rest, give us a spirit of understanding in order that we also may perform wonders. Then Peter and the other apostles started seeing and were filled with Holy Spirit. And each one performed healings. And they parted in order to preach the Lord Jesus.²⁴⁹

Once again Peter is characterised as an authoritative and divinely inspired interpreter of the life and sufferings of Jesus. He interprets the sufferings of the apostles in relation to the sufferings of Jesus. Having done this, he gathers his colleagues and is filled with the Holy Spirit together with them, and together with them attains the ability of performing miracles. It is quite evident that this part of the text is a parallel to Peter's preaching at Pentecost in canonical Acts.²⁵⁰

4.6.2 Conclusion

The Letter of Peter to Philip presents an alternative version of the Synoptic resurrection stories and the first couple chapters of canonical Acts. In the same manner as Acts, the Letter of Peter to Philip argues for a harmonious account of Christian origins with Peter as the leader of the apostolic circle.²⁵¹ Peter collects the dispersed apostles and takes them to the Mount of Olives, where Jesus appears to them (a parallel to the ascension?). After Jesus' departure, Peter gives his fellow disciples

²⁴⁹ NHC VIII 139:9–140:12.

²⁵⁰ See Klaus Koschorke, "Eine gnostische Pfingstpredigt: zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen gnostischem und kirchlichem Christentum am Beispiel der Epistula Petri ad Philippum (NHC VIII, 2)," *ZTK* 74 (1977): 323–43.

²⁵¹ Michael Kaler, "The Letter of Peter to Philip and its Message of Gnostic Revelation and Christian Unity," *VC* 63 (2009): 264–96. Kaler argues that the text represents some form of Pauline Gnosticism that uses Peter as most prominent apostle since he is known to have been the leading apostle in the early Church, but filling his discourses with Pauline content, and notes how Acts works similarly with Peter/Paul.

authoritative interpretations of Jesus' life and teaching, and initiates some kind of alternative version of Pentecost, where the apostles receive miraculous abilities. Although the text is often dismissed as Gnostic, it has the self-conception of belonging to mainline Christianity. G. P. Luttikhuisen argues that the author is probably a formerly orthodox Christian that has been converted to a "Gnostic" group and therefore still uses typically "orthodox" formulations.²⁵² Although the text begins with Peter encouraging Philip to rejoin the group of apostles, there is no reason to assume that this describes a certain community deriving itself from Philip. The text centres around Peter and his abilities as leader of the early Christian movement, as well as the unity of the group of apostles. Peter is described both as an interpretative authority and an initiating force. Peter is a link to Jesus, and his teachings are derived from the teachings of the earthly Jesus. The text probably aims at achieving an identification between Jesus, Peter, and the apostles and the recipients on the theme of suffering. Not only Jesus suffered, but also Peter and the apostles. It is necessary to share their suffering to be a true believer. One could speak here of the suffering of Jesus, Peter, and the apostles as carrying a certain cultural capital, which can be translated into significant social capital to those who share the experience of suffering.

A significant aspect of this text to our study is that it, just as in the case of the Gospel of Peter, shows that not only allegedly "proto-orthodox" authors would use Peter as a means for legitimisation, but this was also done by people who would with later standards have been classified as heterodox. Thus, it would be a corruptive simplification to argue that Peter was a symbol of a *Großkirche* or *Frühkatholizismus*²⁵³ from early on. This text indicates that the lines between orthodoxy and heresy were yet fluid and fragmentation into clearly defined opposing groups had not yet occurred on a larger scale. Luttikhuisen's theory of the text being written by an orthodox who had turned Gnostic is thus not warranted.²⁵⁴ The author of the text obviously viewed himself as an orthodox believer despite his deviance from what would later be considered as orthodoxy. The text would hardly have argued for the unity of all believers, if it was written by a deviant group in fierce conflict.²⁵⁵

This text utilises all possible means of ascribing authority to Peter, describing Peter as a *rational*, *traditional*, and *charismatic* leader. Peter *embodies* a significant

²⁵² Luttikhuisen, *Peter to Philip*, 102.

²⁵³ I use the term *Frühkatholisch* in a non-pejorative sense to denote an attempt at forming a proto-orthodox movement.

²⁵⁴ Luttikhuisen, *Peter to Philip*, 102.

²⁵⁵ See Kaler, "The Letter of Peter to Philip," 275–78.

cultural capital which can be translated into social capital for those who, like Peter and the apostles, share the sufferings of Christ. That Peter is a significant authoritative and unifying figure for the sphere of influence from which this text originates is beyond a shadow of a doubt.

4.7 Peter in the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles

The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles is normally dated to the second or third century.²⁵⁶ The text is known to us through a Coptic manuscript from Nag Hammadi but is clearly a translation of a Greek text. The original title of the text is damaged and therefore unknown, and the present name was added to the manuscript by a scribe at a later stage. In fact, the text itself explicitly refers to the eleven apostles (Acts Pet. 12 Apos. 9.21). Martin Krause notes that the fragments of the introduction could impossibly support the title found in the subscript, and instead suggests the reading [ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΨΑ]ΧΕ ΕΤ[ΑΥΩΑΧΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΗΙ Κ]ΕΦΑΣ [ΜΗΝ ΝΑΠΟΚΤΟΛΟ]C ΧΕ ([These are the Wor]ds that [C]ephas [and the Apostle]s spoke; 1.1–3).²⁵⁷ In any case, the title contains a reference both to Peter and a wider group of apostles. Yet, it is peculiar that Peter is called by his Aramaic name in the introduction when he is subsequently referred to as Peter. We have earlier noted the problem of shifting back and forth between Peter and Cephas in Galatians.

The geographical origin of the text is not indicated in the text, but Syrian providence fits the message of the text.²⁵⁸ Part of the text is written with Peter speaking in first person singular, part of it speaks in first person plural, and part of the text has a third person narrating voice. The narrative has several aporias and is apparently the result of an editor adding other sources to the original text. Stephen J. Patterson suggests that the original text was a travel narrative where Peter was the

²⁵⁶ See Hans-Martin Schenke, “Die Taten des Petrus und der zwölf Apostel,” in *NTAp* II (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989), 368–80. Andrea Lorenzo Molinari, *The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles (NHC 6.1): Allegory, Ascent, and Ministry in the Wake of the Decian Persecution*, SBLDS 174 (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 204, suggests a more specific dating following the Decian persecution in the mid-third century.

²⁵⁷ Martin Krause, “Die Petrusakten in Codex VI von Nag Hammadi,” in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böblig*, ed. M. Krause, NHS 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 36–58 (37). See also Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI*, ADAIK 2 (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1971), 107. However, R. McL. Wilson and Douglas M. Parrott, “The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles,” in *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2–5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*, ed. by D. M. Parrott, NHS 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 197–229 (204), considers this reconstruction to be unsatisfactory.

²⁵⁸ See Schenke, “Taten”, 370. Molinari, *Acts of Peter*, suggests an Alexandrian origin.

first-person narrator that has later been augmented with a “third person source” and a “we-source.”²⁵⁹ He argues that the original text was a myth of apostolic origins that has been supplemented with other narratives in order to argue that true apostolicity does not come from supernatural visions, but rather through serving the poor and the sick.

The original version of the writing was probably a narrative of Peter’s encounter with Lithargoel, who speaks with him concerning the earthly dwelling place in relation to the heavenly Jerusalem and gives him instructions for how to go there through asceticism.²⁶⁰ In this story, Peter is clearly the leader of the group of disciples, but he is not singled out in a way that we can analyse for our benefit.

The material derived from the third person source (3.11–5.5; 9.30–12.29) contains material of great interest to this study.²⁶¹ It consists of the insertions of the story of the pearl merchant, and the commissioning of the disciples.²⁶² The story of the pearl merchant combined with the final commissioning of the disciples makes up a warning against the rich. The people of the city address Peter:

The men²⁶³ asked Peter about the hardships. Peter answered and told those things that he had heard about the hardships of the way. Because they are interpreters of the hardships in their ministry²⁶⁴

²⁵⁹ Stephen J. Patterson, “Sources, Redaction, and Tendenz in the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles (NH VI, 1),” *VC* 45 (1991): 1–17. On the history of research of the source question, see Andrea Lorenzo Molinari, “The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles: A Reconsideration of the Source Question,” in *The Nag Hammadi Library After Fifty Years. Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration*, ed. J. D. Turner and A. McGuire, NHMS 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 461–83; Mitzi Jane Smith, “Understand Ye a Parable!: *The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles* as Parable Narrative,” *Apocrypha* 13 (2002): 29–52 (32–34).

²⁶⁰ As noted by Hans-Martin Schenke, “Die Taten des Petrus und der zwölf Apostel: Die erste Schrift aus Nag-Hammadi-Codex VI—eingeleitet und übersetzt vom Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften,” *TLZ* 98 (1973): 13–19 (14), “der Engel-Charakter des Lithargoel [ist] offenbar das ursprüngliche, die Beziehung auf Jesus mithin sekundär.”

²⁶¹ Molinari, *Acts of Peter*, 31–52, develops Patterson’s thesis into a five-source hypothesis. The most significant difference for our study is that the third person source is divided into two: one “narrator source” and a collection of “problematic sections.”

²⁶² As noted by Patterson, “Sources”, 11–12, it is possible that the story of the pearl merchant was partially present in the original text, but in that case, it was at least elaborated upon by the editor that inserted the third person source.

²⁶³ Molinari, *Acts of Peter*, 46–48, argues that the text should be reconstructed so that it reads the single “man” rather than “men.”

²⁶⁴ Acts Pet. 12 Apos. 5.1–6. I give here the translation of Wilson and Parrot, “Peter and the Twelve” and comment on linguistic peculiarities only when relevant.

There are several interesting aspects of this text that are relevant to this study. First, we may note that Peter speaks about the **ENIGICE NTEZIH** (hardships of the way; 5.4–5). This obviously does not primarily refer to Peter’s own hardships, but rather the hardships of the way of Christianity. One can hardly avoid making a connection to the designation to Christianity as ἡ ὁδός (the way) in Acts.²⁶⁵

Another interesting aspect is the reference to “them” (Peter and the apostles?) as **ZENPEQBEWA NINIGICE POW NE ZN TEGDIAKONIA** (interpreters of the hardships in their ministry; 5.5–6). Here we have a clear reference to Peter and the apostles as authoritative interpreters. Their interpretative authority does not only pertain to interpreting texts and teachings, but also interpreting historical events and experiences. Thus, Peter and the apostles are more than simply faithful transmitters of a tradition—they also have the authority to make contextually relevant interpretations of contemporary experiences. However, in 5.7–10, Peter turns to the pearl merchant and asks him concerning the sufferings of the way in his city.

As for the commissioning of the disciples (we-source), Lithargoel disguises himself as a physician, and his dialogue with Peter is of uttermost importance for this study.

He said to Peter: “Peter!” And Peter was frightened, for how did he know that his name was Peter? Peter responded to the Saviour: “How do you know me, for you called my name?” Lithargoel answered: “I want to ask you who gave the name Peter to you?” He said to him: “It was Jesus Christ, the son of the living God. He gave this name to me.” He answered and said: “It is I! Recognise me, Peter.” He loosened the garment, which clothed him—the one into which he had changed himself because of us—revealing to us in truth that it was he.²⁶⁶

This passage alludes to Matt 16.²⁶⁷ The basis for the commissioning of the disciples is a repetition of Peter’s confession and name giving. This indicates that the Petrine confession was a significant element of the myth of apostolic origins. A significant detail in the text is when the Saviour tells Peter to recognise him, using the Coptic **COYON**. This could be interpreted as a reference to γινώσις, but there is nothing in

²⁶⁵ The Coptic text is mainly in the Sahidic dialect, see Krause, *Gnostische und Hermetische Schriften*, 36–37, and it is therefore interesting to note that Sahidic New testament in the reads **TEZIH** in Acts 9:2; 18:26; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, see G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, Vol 6*, (Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1969). In 18:25, Horner’s text rather speaks of the “doctrine of the Lord,” but he notes some text critical support for **TEZIH** also in this verse. The Boharic version of the New Testament uses **PIHOUT** in all these instances, see G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, Vol 4* (Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1969).

²⁶⁶ Acts Pet. 12 Apos. 9.1–19.

²⁶⁷ See Jesse Sell, “Simon Peter’s ‘Confession’ and the Acts of the Twelve Apostles”, *NovT* 21 (1979): 344–56.

the text indicating such a theological outlook, and the result of Jesus' utterance is that Peter recognises Jesus. So, in this context it is better translated as "recognise."

When the disciples have recognised Jesus, he commissions them to go and preach the gospel, and says that he will give them a reward for enduring hardships. Peter responds by stating that they have left everything to follow Jesus (cf. Matt 19:27||Mark 10:28||Luke 18:28). However, he is worried that they do not have food for one single day. Jesus reproves Peter, since the wisdom of God surpasses all riches. Jesus gives them a pouch of medicines and commands the disciples to heal the sick. Peter is afraid of replying to Jesus once again, and therefore signals to John to ask Jesus (cf. John 13:24). John asks how they are to heal the sick when they have no medical skills. Jesus does not reprove John's question, but agrees with him, stating that the physicians of the world heal what belongs to the world, whereas the physicians of souls heal the heart. Jesus suggests that they should first heal the bodies, so that people might believe and be cured from illness of heart.

We may conclude that the author/redactor of this text is well acquainted with both Synoptic and Johannine Gospel traditions. Peter is the self-evident leader of the group of apostles, but the Johannine idea of the beloved disciple (here identified as John), portrayed as having more insight is also present, and Jesus' response to him is more positive. Jesus presents himself as **ANOK TIE**, which is the Coptic equivalent of ἐγὼ εἰμι in 9.14. This Christological feature also indicates Johannine influence. The contribution of the third person source is to add a critique against wealth and riches and emphasise the healing of the heart as more significant to that of the body.

Already the original first-person text has Peter at the centre of the myth of apostolic origins, treating Peter as a link to the earthly Jesus. Whereas the we-source increases the Petrine focus, the third person source adds a significant dimension of Peter as an authoritative interpreter. Peter not only interprets and transmits the Jesus tradition, but also interprets the developments of the community. Peter does not simply "conserve" the authentic message of Jesus but develops it and contextualises it in order to be relevant. Although there have been several suggestions to solve the problem of the sources of this text, it is fairly evident that it testifies to a milieu where a number of Petrine texts and traditions were in circulation.²⁶⁸

Also this text utilises all possible means of ascribing authority to Peter.²⁶⁹ Peter was a *traditional* authority already in the first-person text but is expanded to

²⁶⁸ See discussion of the different proposals in Molinari, "The Acts of Peter."

²⁶⁹ Also in the interpretation of Smith, "Understand," Peter plays a significant role in this composition.

become both a *charismatic* authority and a *rational* authority who interprets the course of events. It is clear that Peter *embodies* a great deal of cultural capital. However, it is not entirely clear how this could be translated into social capital by those responsible for the text. In analogy with many of the previous texts, one might link the potential for translation into social capital to suffering. Peter clearly does not care only for the sufferings of himself and Jesus, but also interprets the sufferings of the Christian movement. Thereby the recipients of the text may be connected to Peter through their suffering.

4.8 Peter in the Coptic Apocalypse of Peter

The Coptic Apocalypse of Peter was found at Nag Hammadi. Dating the composition of the text is not an easy task, and the possible dates range from 150–333 C. E.²⁷⁰ There are three passages that give concrete contributions to our understanding of Peter as an authoritative figure. The text starts by describing the Saviour sitting in the temple, and then he starts speaking to Peter about the blessedness of belonging to the Father.

You too Peter, become perfect in your name, just like me, the one who has chosen you. For with you I have made a beginning for the others whom I have called to knowledge. Therefore, be strong until the imitator of the righteousness of him who called you before—he called you so that you would know him in the worthy way²⁷¹

Peter is here described by Jesus as the **ΝΟΗΑΡΗΖ ΜΠΙΚΕΨΕΕΠΕ ΕΤΑΙΤΑ ΖΜΟΥ ΕΞΟΥΝ ΕΨΩΟΟΥΝ** (beginning for the others whom I have called to knowledge). Peter is singled out in a special way in that he is described as the first to receive special knowledge from the Saviour. An interesting feature in this passage is that Peter is to become perfect in his name (**ΠΕΤΡΕ ΨΩΠΕ ΕΚΕΨΤΕΛΙΟΣ ΝΖΡΑΙ ΖΜ ΠΕΚΡΑΝ**). A common suggestion is that this is a reference to the name Πέτρος, evoking notions of strength and perfection.²⁷² As noted by Hans-Martin Schenke, this passage indicates that the οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον (I do not know the man) in

²⁷⁰ Henriette W. Havelaar, *The Coptic Apocalypse of Peter (Nag-Hammadi-Codex VII,3)*, TU 144 (Berlin: Akademie, 1999), 16. Andrea Lorenzo Molinari, “The Apocalypse of Peter and Its Dating,” in *Coptica—Gnostica—Manichaica*, 583–605, argues that the text should be dated so late as 320–340.

²⁷¹ Copt. Apoc. Pet. 71.15–27. I follow the translation of Havelaar, *Coptic Apocalypse*.

²⁷² See Havelaar, *Coptic Apocalypse*, 81; Hans-Martin Schenke, “Bemerkungen zur Apokalypse des Petrus” in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Pabor Labib*, ed. M. Krause, NHS 6 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 277–85.

Matt 26:72, 74 was radically re-interpreted.²⁷³ Peter is also called to follow Jesus in the worthy way, which might indicate that an image of Peter as a suffering martyr lies behind this text.²⁷⁴ Following this, the priests and other people in the temple run toward the Saviour and Peter in order to stone them. As they draw near, Peter and the Saviour have a dialogue concerning the spiritual state of the people.²⁷⁵ After a long dialogue, the Saviour says

Me, they cannot touch. But you, Peter, you shall stand in their midst. Do not be afraid because of your cowardice. Their minds shall be closed for the invisible one has taken up position against them.²⁷⁶

Following this, the people crucify Jesus, but Peter discerns that it is only the fleshly part that is killed. The Living One, Jesus, is glad and laughing above. This is followed by an explanation by Jesus to Peter: **ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΔΕ ΠΕ ΠΙΝΟΕΡΟΝ ΜΠΝΑ ΠΑΙ ΕΤΕΜΕΞ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΕΠΠΡΕΨΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ** (I am the intellectual Spirit that is filled with radiant light; 83.8–10). Peter is commanded by Jesus to give what he has seen to the strangers who are of another aeon (83.15–18). This is a parallel to the great commission in Matt 28:19–20||Mark 16:15–18. Finally, Jesus turns to Peter personally and says:

So you be brave and do not fear anyway, for I will be with you, so that none of your enemies shall harm you. Peace be with you. Be strong!²⁷⁷

The Coptic Apocalypse of Peter is an interpretation of the passion of Jesus more than anything else. Peter is singled out as the sole source of the correct understanding of Jesus' passion and the truth about the living Jesus not having been crucified. Peter is portrayed as the sole link to the authentic Jesus tradition, and the interpretation of Jesus' execution that was derived from the Saviour himself. Peter is clearly singled out as the most significant disciple, and the "true gospel" of the Coptic Apocalypse is dependent on receiving this interpretation of the passion that was delivered exclusively to Peter. However, Peter is not significant as a witness of the earthly Jesus—but rather as witness of the revelation of Jesus' true identity. Thus,

²⁷³ Schenke, "Bemerkungen zur Apokalypse," 281. He draws a parallel to the reinterpretation of the role and insight of Judas among the Cainites (cf. Irenæus *Haer.* 1.31.1.).

²⁷⁴ See Pamela Mullins Reaves, "Pseudo-Peter and Persecution: (Counter-)Evaluations of Suffering in the *Coptic Apocalypse of Peter* (NHC VII,3) and the *Letter of Peter to Philip* (NHC VIII,2)," in *Fakes, Forgeries, and Fictions: Writing Ancient and Modern Christian Apocrypha: Proceedings from the 2015 York University Christian Apocrypha Symposium*, ed. T. Burke (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017), 129–51.

²⁷⁵ Of special significance is the reference to false bishops and deacons in 79.22–30.

²⁷⁶ Copt. Apoc. Pet. 80.29–81.3.

²⁷⁷ Copt. Apoc. Pet. 84.6–11.

Klaus Korschke argues that the text portrays Peter as the “first Gnostic.”²⁷⁸ The text clearly presents Peter as the sole witness of the true passion story, and the text is clearly polemical.

Peter is portrayed as a *traditional* authority of special significance—the only witness of Jesus’ true passion. As such, he is endowed also with a great deal of *charismatic* authority. Not least the significance of Peter’s name is of great importance. Although Peter is in himself a coward, he is the only witness to the true rock of faith. Thus, Peter is not a *traditional* authority in the most common sense as a link to the earthly Jesus, but rather because the true interpretation of the passion has been revealed to him alone. Peter’s *cultural capital* is greater than that of the other apostles, since he is the only eyewitness to this truth. Peter is thus used to legitimise the unembodied Christology found in this text, which indicates that his legacy was appropriated by spheres of influence of various theological outlooks.

4.9 Peter in the “Act” of Peter

A tradition of Peter healing and unhealing his daughter was apparently circulated to some extent in early Christianity. Augustine mentions a story of Peter healing his daughter, as well as a story of Peter praying for the daughter of a gardener.²⁷⁹ These two healings probably refer to the same original story which has been changed to fit the present purposes as it was handed down through tradition. We now possess three versions of the story which are quite different, but share significant elements concerning Peter as an authoritative figure. We will therefore treat the three extant versions of the narrative respectively in order to discuss what view of Peter as an authoritative figure can have been present in the original narrative.

4.9.1 The Coptic Act of Peter

Papyrus Berolinensis 8502.4 contains a text named **ΤΕΠΡΑΞΙΣ ΠΙΕΤΡΟΣ** (the Act of Peter). The title of the work indicates that it is a self-contained narrative rather

²⁷⁸ Klaus Korschke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nag-Hammadi-Traktate Apokalypse des Petrus (NHC VII,3) und Testimonium Veritatis (NHC IX,3)*, NHS 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 27.

²⁷⁹ “Therefore they show great blindness, when they read the apocrypha as if they were great works, as the one I mentioned about the apostle Thomas and the daughter of Peter who was paralysed through the prayer of her father and the gardener’s daughter who died at the prayer of Peter. They reply that it was beneficial for them, that one should be crippled and the other die, but they do not deny that it was done by the prayers of the apostle.” (*Admantum Man. Disc. XVII*).

than an excerpt from a longer work.²⁸⁰ The text is not easily dated. The dating of Carl Schmidt, who considered the text to be an excerpt from a text resembling *Actus Verzellences* and dated the whole work to around 200 C.E., has been influential, but since there is no reason for viewing this text as derived from a larger Acts of Peter, this dating cannot be taken for granted.²⁸¹ Michel Tardieu argues that the text should be viewed as a self-contained unit that may at times have been attached or detached from a narrative similar to the *Actus Verzellences*.²⁸² He suggests that it originates from Syro-Palestinian Christianity already in the first century.²⁸³ The contextual indication in the text is that it occurred on a Sunday, but the setting of the text seems to imply a setting in Jerusalem or at least Palestine.²⁸⁴

In the Coptic Act of Peter, Peter is portrayed as healing many sick people, and is an active miracle worker. However, people are perplexed that he does not help his paralysed virgin daughter who has grown up to be beautiful, and believes in the

²⁸⁰ Andrea Lorenzo Molinari 'I Never Knew the Man': *The Coptic Act of Peter (Papyrus Berolinensis 8502.4): Its Independence from the Apocryphal Acts of Peter, Genre and Legendary Origins*, NCNHE 5 (Québec: L'Université Laval, 2000), 13–25

²⁸¹ Carl Schmidt, *Die Alten Petrusakten im Zusammenhang der apokryphen Apostelliteratur nebst einem neuentdeckten Fragment*, TU 9 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903), 99–111. However, Molinari, *I Never Knew*, 26–58, shows that the affinities with *Actus Verzellences* and other early Christian texts presented by Carl Schmidt, "Studien zu den alten Petrusakten," *ZKG* 6 (1924): 321–48; idem., "Studien zu den Petrusakten II. Die Komposition," *ZKG* 8 (1926): 481–513, pertains to common conventions rather than literary dependence. Besides, there is reason to date the *Actus Verzellences* to the fourth century. Molinari, *I Never Knew*, 173–77, dates the text to the first half of the fourth century, but admits that his arguments might apply just as well to the second or third century. He argues that there seems to be no threat of persecution, but rather other believers who love lust and wealth are the threat. He also makes a connection to Constantine's jurisdiction concerning abduction marriage. However, it is uncertain whether Ptolemy was a believer prior to meeting Peter's daughter, or if he was converted by her, see Michel Tardieu, *Écrits gnostiques: Codex de Berlin* (Paris: Cerf, 1974), 408–09. However, it is quite possible that the text is earlier, since the asceticism reflected was prominent already in the second century, see James A. Francis, *Subversive Virtue: Asceticism and Authority in the Second-Century Pagan World* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995). As noted by Tardieu, *Écrits gnostiques*, 68, the emphasis on virginity is present already in the Shepherd of Hermas, and the text conforms quite well to the Jewish regulations for abduction marriage, see See James Brashler and Douglas M. Parrott, "The Act of Peter. BG 4:128,1–141,7," in *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*, ed. D. M. Parrott, NHS 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 473–93.

²⁸² Tardieu, *Écrits gnostiques*, 71.

²⁸³ Tardieu, *Écrits gnostiques*, 20–22. He argues that the story originates as an oral tradition in the first century, which was written down in Syriac in the first decades of the second century, whereas the Coptic text of the Berlin codex follows a Greek precedent.

²⁸⁴ Brashler and Parrott, "The Act of Peter," 474. Apart from the fact that Peter is surrounded with his wife and daughter (Peter normally travels to Rome alone), they argue that the Jewish regulations for abduction marriage present a logical background for the narrative.

name of God (ΕΤΒΕ ΟΥ ΝΤΟΣ ΤΕΚΩΕΕΡΕ ΜΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ Ε ΛΑΙΑΙ ΕΣΟ ΝΪΑΙΗ ΕΑΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕ ΕΠΡΑΝ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΠΕΚΡΒΟΗΕΙ). Peter heals his daughter in order to show that he sure is able to, but then un-heals her back to her invalid state. Peter explains that his daughter’s disability is for the better of both him and his daughter (ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΤΡΝΟΦΡΕ ΝΕ ΝΜΜΑΕΙ; for this sign is beneficial for us). Peter explains the background to his daughter’s disability through telling that God had told him that his daughter would hurt many souls if her body remained well.²⁸⁵ He tells how his daughter, at the age of ten, became a stumbling block for many, and that Ptolemy, a rich man, wanted her as wife after seeing her bathing with her mother.²⁸⁶ The pages describing the further affairs of Ptolemy and Peter’s daughter are lacking, and when the narrative resumes, Ptolemy delivers the daughter back to Peter, having been hindered from having intercourse with the daughter, due to Peter’s daughter becoming paralysed.²⁸⁷ Augustine’s summary of the story implies that Peter’s daughter became paralysed due to the prayers of her father, but it is not entirely certain whether this refers to the temporary miracle at the beginning of the text, or the events accounted for in the manuscript. Ptolemy, who is now a believer, laments and has a vision that he shares with Peter. Following this, Ptolemy dies, but leaves behind a piece of land for Peter’s daughter, which Peter and his daughter sell and give to the poor.²⁸⁸

4.9.2 Pseudo-Titus

This text is, as is evident from the title, a pseudepigraphon written in the name of Titus, the disciple of Paul. The text argues for chastity and should probably be

²⁸⁵ On the disability of Peter’s daughter, see Meghan Henning, “Paralysis and Sexuality in Medical Literature and the *Acts of Peter*,” *JLA* 8 (2015): 306–21; Anna Rebecca Solevåg, *Negotiating the Disabled Body: Representations of Disability in Early Christian Texts*, ECL 23 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2018), 75–94.

²⁸⁶ The bathing motif is probably be inspired by the story of David and Bahtsheba (2 Sam 11), which results in horrendous sins such as adultery and murder, but also shows similarities to the story of Susanna in the LXX version of Daniel and the first vision in the *Shepherd* of Hermas.

²⁸⁷ The idea that Peter did not marry his daughter is in continuity with Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 6.3 (also quoted in *Hist. Eccl.* 3.30), who states Πέτρος μὲν γὰρ καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαιδοποιήσαντο. Φίλιππος δὲ καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ἀνδράσιν ἐξέδωκεν, thus implying that Philip married his daughters whereas Peter did not. However, it should be noted that Clement here also argues that Paul was married.

²⁸⁸ Peter emphasises that they did not keep anything for themselves, but gave everything to the poor, perhaps a reference to Acts 5:1–11.

dated to the fifth century.²⁸⁹ Yet, the frequent use of early Christian literature in the text suggests that the relevant Peter-narrative bears witness of the reception of earlier Peter-tradition. A gardener asks Peter to pray for his only child, a daughter who is paralysed. When Peter prays, the daughter drops down dead, and Peter explains to the father that this is for the better. However, the father asks Peter to raise his daughter from the dead, and Peter does so. But a few days later, the daughter is seduced by someone pretending to be a believer and is not seen again.²⁹⁰ Thus, the gardener wishes his daughter to be healed for earthly gain, and misjudges the value of the heavenly grace, when he wants her resurrected. As a result, her virginity is defiled, and he still loses his daughter.

It is likely that the text is connected in some way to Priscillianism, and Titus is probably chosen as the sender of the letter because he was traditionally viewed to have remained a virgin all his life.²⁹¹ The similarities between this narrative and the Coptic Act of Peter are too significant to overlook. It is possible that it has reworked the narrative so that Peter would not be portrayed as sexually active and could therefore not have fathered a daughter. Another possibility is that these two narratives about Peter were circulating independently, or a combination of the two. Pseudo-Titus frequently quotes a multitude of early Christian texts of various types, and it is thus not very far-fetched to suggest that it incorporates an earlier tradition.

4.9.3 The Acts of Nereus and Achilleus

The Acts of Nereus and Achilleus retells the same story as the Coptic Act of Peter but in a slightly different version.²⁹² Here, the girl is referred to as Περωνίλλας, τῆς θυγατρὸς Πέτρου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου ἀποστόλου (Petronilla, the daughter of the

²⁸⁹ Aurelio de Santos Otero, "Der Apokryphe Titusbrief," *ZKG* 12 (1963): 1–14; idem., "Der Pseudo-Titus-Brief," in *NTAp*, 50–70 (51). Adolf von Harnack, "Der apokryphe Brief des Paulusschülers Titus >>De dispositione sanctimonii<<," *SPAW* (1925): 180–214 (210), argues that the text should be dated to 400–450, or possibly the late fourth century, since he considers it to be Priscillian, and his position has been more or less maintained since. Although the text was probably originally written in Greek, we today only have a very bad Latin translation from the eighth century, see D. Donatien de Bruyne, "Epistula Titi, discipuli Pauli, de dispositione sanctimonii," *RBén* 37 (1925): 47–72 (69).

²⁹⁰ Although the manuscript reads "homo vincetus fidelis," it should probably read *finctus* = fictus, see Harnack, "apokryphe Brief," 184, n. 2.

²⁹¹ de Santos Otero, "Der Apokryphe Titusbrief," 13–14, argues that the title is original, and that the tradition of Titus' virginity was known to Jerome.

²⁹² See discussion in Molinari, *I Never Knew*, 74–78.

blessed apostle Peter; *Acts Ner. Ach.* 15).²⁹³ Titus (!) asks Peter why Petronilla remains sick, while Peter heals other sick people. Peter answers ὅτι οὗτος ἀντὶ τῆς συμφέρεϊ (Beause it is beneficial for her). Peter heals Petronilla to prove that he is able to. Petronilla serves them, but then returns to the couch. However, in contrast to the Coptic Act, Petronilla remains healed. The imperial officer Flaccus notices her exceeding beauty and goes to fetch her as wife, attended by several soldiers. Petronilla, finding it hard to discourage Flaccus, asks for three days of sanctitude. On the third day, she receives communion and dies. Flaccus then attempts to take Petronilla’s virgin friend Felicula for his wife, but she refuses. Felicula is imprisoned but dies before she is executed.

This account has similarities with both the above narratives. Peter explains that his daughter’s disability is beneficial, since it helps her preserve her virginity. When this protection is taken away, she is immediately approached by a man due to her beauty. At this point, just as in the story of the gardener’s daughter, it is more beneficial for both the virgins to die than to be defiled.

4.9.4 Conclusion

In all three stories, Peter makes clear that disability and even death can be beneficial.²⁹⁴ He is portrayed as having an understanding of God’s logic that is inaccessible for the others. He is also portrayed as having the divine ability of performing all kinds of miracles—even when they are contrary to the will of God. In this respect, he must be regarded as some kind of *theios aner*. This is a new dimension of Peter’s authority compared to the other texts studied in this chapter, although it has a significant parallel in Acts 5:1–11. His authoritative position does not primarily have to do with his relationship to Jesus or ability to interpret his message, but in his charismatic abilities of healing and spiritual discernment. Also this is unique in relation to the previously studied texts in this chapter. Peter emerges as a *charismatic* authority, who *embodies* a significant cultural capital. For a certain segment of early Christians who emphasised the importance of sexual abstinence, Peter’s record on these issues also creates a certain *social capital* for their own position. They can claim to be of the same opinion as Peter.

²⁹³ As noted by F. Schaeffer, “Die Acten der heiligen Nereus und Achilleus: Untersuchung über den Originaltext und die Zeit seiner Entstehung,” *RQ* 8 (1894): 89–119 (114) the identification of Petronilla as Peter’s daughter is probably due to the similarity of names.

²⁹⁴ C. Erbes, “Ursprung und Umfang der Petrusakten II,” *ZKG* 32 (1911): 353–77 (360) notes that the phrase “hoc es expediebat” is a reoccurring Petrine phrase in the Clementine *Recognitions*, cf. R. 1.8; 3.1, 53, 58, 70, 79; 8.37.

4.10 Peter in the Martyrdom of Peter

The martyrdom of Peter is commonly dated to the end of the second or beginning of the third century.²⁹⁵ The martyrdom has been incorporated into the later *Actus Vercellenses* but has also been modified into other versions of the martyrdom. However, there is no reason to believe that it was not originally a work in its own right.²⁹⁶

The narrative concerns the background to and nature of Peter's martyrdom. Peter is portrayed as a mighty miracle worker in Rome, and contests with Simon Magus. Four wives of the prefect Agrippa are especially fond of Peter's teaching on chastity and agree not to have intercourse with their husband. Agrippa is filled with rage against Peter and wants to kill him. Furthermore, μία δέ τις καὶ μάλιστα εὐμορφοτάτη Ἀλβίνου φίλου τοῦ Καίσαρος γυνὴ ὀνόματι Ξανθίππη (a very beautiful woman named Xantippa, the wife of Albinus, a friend of Caesar) also withdraws from her husband. A movement starts where many women withdraw from their husbands, and husbands from their wives διὰ τὸ ἀγνώως καὶ σεμνῶς θέλειν αὐτοὺς θεοσεβεῖν (because they wished to worship God in an innocent and dignified way). Agrippa and Albinus plot a revenge on Peter, but Xantippa gives Peter notice, whereupon he leaves the city. As Peter leaves, we encounter the key event of the story for our purposes.

ὡς δὲ ἐξήει τὴν πύλην, εἶδεν τὸν κύριον εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην. καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἰδὼν εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ποῦ ᾠδε; καὶ ὁ κύριος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· εἰσερχομαι εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην σταυρωθῆναι. καὶ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριέ μου, πάλιν σταυροῦσαι; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος· ναί, Πέτρε, πάλιν σταυροῦμαι. καὶ ἔλθὼν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν κύριον εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνελθόντα, ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἀγαλλίων καὶ δοξάζων τὸν κύριον, ὅτι ἑαυτὸν εἶπεν πάλιν σταυροῦσθαι, ὃ εἰς τὸν Πέτρον προέλεγεν γίνεσθαι.

As he was going out the gate, he saw the Lord entering Rome. Peter, beholding, said to him: Lord, "Where are you going?" And the Lord said to him: "I am entering Rome in order to be crucified." Peter said to him: My Lord, are you being crucified again? The Lord said to him: "Yes, Peter, I am being crucified again." Then Peter came to himself and saw the Lord ascending into heaven. He went back to Rome rejoicing and praising the Lord, since he said that he would be crucified again. It was a prophecy of what would happen to Peter.²⁹⁷

²⁹⁵ David L. Eastman, *The Martyrdom Accounts of Peter and Paul*, WGRW 39 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2015), 2. The fact that it is used in the *Acts of Paul* suggests that it should be dated in the earlier spectrum of this time frame.

²⁹⁶ The place of composition is unknown. Bithynia, Alexandria, Asia Minor, Syria, and Rome have all been suggested.

²⁹⁷ *Mart. Pet.* 6.

The believers weep at his arrival and beg him to think of those new in the faith. But Peter comforts them by saying that God's will must be done. Peter is arrested and ordered by Agrippa to be crucified. The congregation threatens Agrippa with a riot, but Peter asks them to quit, because he has to fulfil what has been said concerning him. However, Peter asks to be crucified upside-down. Peter preaches from the cross and says *καὶ τὸ σχῆμα ἐν ᾧ ὁράτε με ἀποκρεμάμενον ἐκείνου διατύπωσις ἐστὶν τοῦ καταβεβηκότος καὶ εἰς γένεσιν ἐλθόντος ἀνθρώπου* (the form in which you see me hanging here is a perfect representation of the one who came down and became man at his own beginning; *Mart. Pet.* 9). When Peter finishes his sermon, the people answer "Amen," whereupon Peter gives up his spirit. Marcellus takes care of his body, washes and embalms it, although Peter has made clear that this is unnecessary. When Nero learns of the execution, he is furious with Agrippa, since he himself was looking forward to punishing Peter more extensively. Nero plans to persecute Peter's disciples as compensation but has a vision at night of someone whipping him and explaining that he should not persecute the servants of Christ.²⁹⁸ Hereby, the church at Rome was protected from persecution following the death of Peter.

We may conclude that the well-known accounts of Peter as a miracle worker who contested Simon Magus at Rome seems to be a widely held conception that speaks of Peter as a *charismatic* authority. His teaching on chastity is especially attractive to prominent women, but probably more for practical reasons than because he was considered to be a significant *rational* authority. The vision of Peter as he leaves Rome and his self-conception thereafter is of uttermost importance to the portrait of Peter in this text. Peter's identification with Christ is almost total. Christ was crucified again through Peter. If one, as Pseudo-Linus, takes Peter as an actor in Nero's nightly vision, the narrative also includes a Petrine post-mortem appearance. Peter suffers on behalf of the Christians in Rome, and thereby conquers Nero's power to persecute. This portrayal of Peter as a nearly divine being constructs a "high Petrology" in the text, portraying him first and foremost as a *charismatic* authority. However, the cultural capital invested in Peter readily translates into social capital—Peter is the leader who suffered on behalf of the community, and through the vision following his death, they are saved from persecution. In the Martyrdom, just as in the Act, focus is placed on the abilities and ministry of Peter himself rather than utilising him to create a bridge to Jesus. This indicates not only the high esteem of Peter in his own right, but also that he had become

²⁹⁸ In the somewhat extended and revised version of Pseudo-Linus, Peter is the one who commands Nero to be scourged and telling him not to persecute the Christians (*Lin. Mart. Pet.* 17).

part of the essence of Christian identity rather than being a preserver/legitimiser hereof.

4.11 Conclusion: Peter in Early Pseudo-Petrine Writings

In concluding our analysis of the texts claiming to be derived from Peter himself, we must acknowledge that we find no trace of seeking to legitimise e.g. Roman power through Peter. Although Petrine connections to Rome are present, e.g. in First Peter, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Martyrdom of Peter, the area where legends of Peter flourishes is in the Eastern part of the empire. Syria, and especially Antioch, appears to have been an area where Peter was held in high esteem and much literature attributed to him was produced. In First Peter, Peter is thought of as a *συμπρεσβύτερος*, indicating some kind of relationship between the community and Peter as a historically important figure in their history. Also when bishop Serapion of Antioch examines the Gospel of Peter, he claims to be heir of Peter's teaching through oral tradition, and on that basis judges that the Gospel cannot be genuinely Petrine. Obviously, the Christians at Antioch and its vicinity view themselves as heirs to Petrine tradition in some respect. It is not improbable that the Preaching of Peter and Letter of Peter to Philip also originate from this same area. However, Peter was significant also in other parts of the East. Not least the Apocalypse of Peter could indicate Peter's central role in Palestinian Christianity. As for Second Peter, perhaps originating from Asia Minor, Peter emerges as more of a distant authority, who is well respected although the recipients have no historical bonds to the apostle. Peter is invoked as an external authority in order to settle an internal conflict in a context that has a distinctively Pauline outlook.

All texts studied in this chapter are written in different contexts, and to speak of a "Petrine school" is thus unwarranted. Peter was a popular pseudonym, but there is no theologically unifying factor among the texts attributed to him.²⁹⁹ Chronologically, Peter develops from a link to Jesus via a receiver of revelation to a miracle worker, although this development is by no means straight. The driving factor is not ideological, but rather the needs at the time of the composition of the respective texts.

Peter was a significant part of the early Christian worldview and was invoked in situations that called for arguing authentic Jesus tradition. It is not strange that

²⁹⁹ As we have mentioned earlier, the texts mentioned in this chapter are by no means the only Peter-texts that were produced. Apart from the sources of the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles, a plentitude of other Petrine texts likely existed.

Petrine pseudepigrapha came into being—this is a fairly natural development. What is remarkable is that the texts claiming Petrine authorship came into existence so late—mostly during the second century.³⁰⁰ Peter appears as a fictional author later than Paul but does so rather frequently during the second century.³⁰¹ The texts are diverse when it comes to dating, style, and message. The theological systems reflected in the respective texts are also different from each other. Together, they bear witness that Peter was viewed both as an authoritative interpreter and link to Jesus in different early Christian groups during early Christian times. Authors of various theological convictions claim Petrine authority to legitimise their teachings and bring legitimacy to their spheres of influence. Although Bart Ehrman claims that pseudepigraphy mainly thrives in polemical contexts, we may note that Peter is rarely used for the purpose of polemics in the Petrine pseudepigrapha.³⁰² Peter is used as a means of arguing in favour of certain theologies, but these pseudonymous writings are not polemical as such. The objective of deceit for the purpose of persuasion and identity formation appears to be the main purpose of the Petrine pseudepigrapha.

³⁰⁰ Frey, “Autorfiktion und Gegnerbild,” 703.

³⁰¹ See Jörg Frey, “Apokryphisierung im Petrus-evangelium: Überlegungen zum Ort des Petrus-evangeliums in der Entwicklung der Evangelienüberlieferung,” in *The Apocryphal Gospels Within the Context of Early Christian Theology*, ed. J. Schröter (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 157–95 (171).

³⁰² Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 531.

5. Peter in Other Early Christian Sources

We will now turn to early Christian texts that do not claim Petrine origin, but still deal with Peter as an authoritative figure in one way or another. These texts are of different genres and from different times and places. Just as in the previous chapter, I will deal with the texts in roughly chronological order and discuss the findings at the end of the chapter. However, some texts will be kept together due to thematic considerations, although they are chronologically separated (e.g. 1–2 Clem and the Ignatian correspondence). A number of these texts use Peter as legitimator, although they do not, as in the previous chapter, use him as pseudonym. Other texts discuss Peter’s significance more specifically. This chapter is thus closely linked to the previous chapter, albeit with an even greater variation of approaches toward Peter.

5.1 Peter in First Clement

The first text that uses Peter for legitimising its own authority is First Clement. This text begins with ‘Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικίᾳ Κόρινθον (from the church of God which sojourns in Rome to the Church of God that sojourns in Corinth). No author is identified in the letter itself. The letter claims to be written communally from the church in Rome to the church in Corinth.¹ This letter has traditionally been attributed to someone called

¹ Odd Magne Bakke, *Concord and Peace: A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition*, WUNT II/143 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), notes that the many first-person plural forms throughout the letter reflect this communal authorship.

Clement.² Paul refers to a Clement in Phil 4:3, who is traditionally identified as the author.³

The dating of the letter is disputed. Proposals have been put forth ranging from the late 60s (following the deaths of Peter and Paul) until ca 150 C.E.⁴ Considering that 1 Clem 63:3 speaks of people who have lived their entire lives in the community and now reached old age, an early dating is problematic to maintain. The conventional date is between 93–97 C.E.⁵ First Clement is referred to in Ignatius' letter to the *Romans*.⁶ (ca 110 C.E.) and clearly used by Polycarp.⁷ The conventional dating in the last decade of the first century is thereby the most plausible solution.⁸ As we shall see, the identity of this Clement is a complex issue.⁹

There is a reference to a Clement in the *Shepherd* of Hermas: γράψεις ὄν δύο βιβλαρίδια καὶ πέμψεις ἕν Κλήμεντι καὶ ἕν Γραπτῇ. Πέμψει ὄν Κλήμης εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις, ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται (Write therefore two little books and send one to Clement and one to Grapte. Then Clement will send it to those outside the cities,

² Clare K. Rothschild, *New Essays on the Apostolic Fathers*, WUNT 1/375 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 61–68, argues that the letter format itself is fictional, thus making First Clement into some kind of pseudepigrapha (similar to what I argued concerning e.g. First Peter). This distinction is not relevant for the purposes of this study and will therefore not be further discussed.

³ Joachim Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief*: HTKNT 10 (Freiburg: Herder, 1968), 168. Some have further specified Clement as being Paul's guard in prison (cf. Acts 16:23ff). However, this must be regarded as mere speculation with little historical value.

⁴ There are also more extreme approaches, placing First Clement in the second or third century, cf. Horacio E. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, KAV 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 76.

⁵ The conventional dating has in recent years been challenged by Otto Zwerlein, "Kritisches zur Römischen Petrustradition und zur Datierung des Ersten Clemensbriefes," *GFA* 13 (2010): 87–157, and defended by Wolfgang Dieter Lebek, "Das Datum des ersten Clemensbriefes," in *Von Homer bis Landino. Beiträge zur Antike und Spätantike sowie zu deren Rezeptions- und Wirkungsgeschichte. Festgabe für Antonie Wlosok zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. B. R. Suchla (Berlin: Pro Business, 2011), 133–206. However, dating the text 20–25 years later does not affect our discussion in any greater degree, and the conventional dating will thus be presupposed.

⁶ Ign. *Rom.* 3.1 speaks of the church at Rome as having instructed others—a rather fitting description of First Clement.

⁷ Otto B. Knoch, "In Namen des Petrus und Paulus. Der Brief des Clemens Romanus und die Eigenart des römischen Christentums," *ANRW* II.27.1, ed. W. Haase (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 3–54. See also discussion in Kenneth Berding, *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of Their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature*, VCSup 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 202.

⁸ However, evidence for this dating is not conclusive, as pointed out by Kurt Erlemann, "Die Datierung des ersten Clemensbriefes—Anfragen an eine Communis Opinio," *NTS* 44 (1998): 591–607.

⁹ See discussion in Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers. First Part, Vol. 1. S. Clement of Rome* (London: Macmillan & Co, 1890), 63f and 201–345.

for that is his duty; Herm. *Vis.* 2.4.3). This does not identify Clement as the author of First Clement, but at least indicates that there was at some point a tradition of a letter writer bearing this name.¹⁰ Eusebius repeatedly argues that Clement is the author of the letter, and thus Clementine authorship must have been recognised by the fourth century.¹¹ Clement of Alexandria also claims the “apostle Clement” to be the author of the letter.¹² Furthermore, Dionysios of Corinth argues that a letter written by Clement was sent from Rome to Corinth. Tertullian states that Clement was ordained by Peter in Rome.¹³ Origen suggests that Clement was a disciple of the apostles.¹⁴ Due to these statements, Clement has often been used as point of departure for discussing the development of apostolic succession.¹⁵ At the same time, the bishop lists of both Irenæus and Hegesippus place Clement as the fourth bishop of Rome, preceded by Peter, Linus and (Ana)Cletus.¹⁶

If a connection could be established between Peter and Clement, and it could be argued that Clement derived his authority from Peter in some way, this could say something about Peter as an authoritative figure. The Roman church undoubtedly made such claims in subsequent years. However, the sources of this information are temporally distanced to the actual events, and not easily reconciled. If Clement succeeded Linus and Anacletus in the 90s, he cannot have been ordained by Peter, who was probably martyred in the 60s. On the other hand, it is possible that the ordination referred to by Tertullian was not that into a monarchical bishop, but into a presbyter (thus corresponding quite well with Origen’s notion of Clement being a disciple of the apostles). If this is the case, the Clement referred to in Phil 4:3 could be this same Clement. Identifying him with the letter-writing Clement of Hermas must be ruled out in any case, since this would require

¹⁰ Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 66, points out that if Hermas is dated around 140 C.E., this Clement must either have reached a considerable age or be referring to someone else than the Clement claimed to have written 1 Clement. Such a late dating is indicated by the Muratorian fragment.

¹¹ Cf. *Hist. Eccl.* 3.16.1; 3.38.1; 4.22.1; 4.23.11.

¹² *Str.* 4.27.

¹³ *Præscr.* 32.2: “Hoc enim modo ecclesie apostolicæ census suos deferunt, sicut Smyrnaeorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Iohanne conlocatum refert, sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum est.”

¹⁴ *Princ.* 2.3.6.

¹⁵ Cf. W. Moriarty, “1 Clement’s View of Ministerial Appointments in the Early Church,” *VC* 66 (2012): 115–38, shows how First Clement has been interpreted in various ways when it comes to this issue. See also Hans Katzenmeyer, “Zur Primatsfrage im 1. Klemensbrief,” *IKZ* 32 (1942): 28–37.

¹⁶ Cf. Lightfoot, *Clement of Rome*, 63. However, the interpretation of these sources is not unambiguous, as pointed out by Maurice Bévenot, “Clement of Rome in Irenæus’ Succession-List,” *JTS* 17 (1966): 98–107.

Clement reaching a considerable age. Clement is ordained as bishop of Rome in the Pseudo-Clementine *Letter of Clement to James*, but the historical value of this reference is highly debatable. However, it is an indication of the existence of such a tradition at a quite early stage.

If we presuppose that First Clement was written by a Clement, the letter shows no trace of that Clement personally exercising authority derived from Peter.¹⁷ The leaders of the church at Rome write in a collegial manner, albeit claiming authority to intervene in the affairs of another local Christian community. First Clement 44 deals with the issue of apostolic succession. Gerbert Brunner argues that the discourse on ecclesial order is the theological centre of the letter.¹⁸

Και οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἐγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εὐληφέστες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξύ ἐπινομήν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν.

Also our apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife concerning the name of bishop. Therefore they, since they had received perfect foreknowledge, appointed those who have already been mentioned and appointed that when these had fallen asleep, other approved men should succeed their ministry.¹⁹

Here, Clement is arguing in support of the bishops who had been deposed in Corinth. However, it also reflects his view of how ecclesial leadership was assumed. At the same time, First Clement clearly reflects a period before the development of the monarchical episcopate. In 44:4–5, the titles of bishop and presbyter are used interchangeably, and a plurality of bishops have been deposed in Corinth (cf. 44:6). Although it is reasonable to assume that one presbyter/bishop was leading in some way, this does not imply a different office from that of the other presbyters/bishops but is a ministry of a *primus inter pares*. If we imagine such an ecclesial structure, it is not impossible that Clement could in fact have been ordained by Peter as a presbyter/bishop and still not assumed the position of leader of the collegium until the death of some more prominent clergy. First Clement shows no

¹⁷ Donald A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), argues that First Clement quotes more or less from the entire New Testament, including First and Second Peter. First Clement indeed shows a great deal of acquaintance with the Hebrew Bible and early Christian traditions concerning the Gospels. However, he fails to establish a literary relationship between e.g. First Clement and the Petrine epistles. After all, First and Second Peter, as we have noted above, were probably unknown to Western Christianity at the time that First Clement was composed.

¹⁸ Gerbert Brunner, *Die theologische Mitte des ersten Klemensbriefs: Ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik frühchristlicher Texte*, FTS II (Frankfurt a. M.: Knecht, 1972).

¹⁹ 1 Clem 44:1–2.

trace of there being a single “bishop of Rome” as successor of Peter. However, it is clear that the collegium of presbyters/bishops derive their authority from being ordained by the apostles, among which Peter and Paul are referred to as being apostles to which the senders of First Clement had some kind of relationship (1 Clem 5:1–2). Although evidence is not conclusive, there is no reason to doubt that the letter was written by someone named Clement that held some leading position in the Church at Rome.²⁰ Laurence L. Welborn suggests that Clement was the official correspondent of the Roman church with other churches, which in that case corresponds quite nicely with the reference to this notion in Hermas.²¹

The first reference to Peter is found in a reference to the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul. This exposition has been preceded by an account of examples of persecution of the righteous from the Hebrew Bible, concluding: Ἀλλ’ ἵνα τῶν ἀρχαίων ὑποδειγμάτων παυσώμεθα, ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐγγιστα γενομένους ἀθλητάς (But let us cease from the examples of old time, let us come to those who contended in the days nearest to us; 5:1). Thus, he equates the status of the recent times with that of the heroes of the Hebrew Bible. He starts by mentioning the “righteous pillars of the Church,” which were persecuted and contended unto death, and then turns to Peter and Paul as chief examples.²²

Λάβομεν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλους. Πέτρον, ὃς διὰ ζήλον ἀδικῶν οὐχ ἓνα οὐδὲ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν πόνους καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. Δια ζήλον καὶ ἔριν Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ὑπέδειξεν κτλ.

²⁰ See discussion in Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 66–75. However, Ebenhard Nestle, “War der Verfasser des ersten Clemens-Briefes semitischer Abstammung?,” *ZNW* 1 (1900): 178–80, argues that the author of First Clement was a Hellenistic Jew, due to the many Semitisms in the text.

²¹ Laurence L. Welborn, “Clement, First Epistle of,” *ABD* 1:1055–60. This does not mean that Hermas is in fact referring to the author of First Clement—the problems with this view have been noted above. However, they show evidence of there being a tradition of a writer in Rome named Clement.

²² The reference to “pillars” here probably echoes 2:9 and speaks of the leaders of primitive Christianity in general.

Let us set before our eyes the good apostles: Peter, who due to unrighteous jealousy²³ suffered not one, not two, but many tribulations, and having thus testified he went to the glorious place that he deserved. Through jealousy and strife Paul showed the price of endurance etc.²⁴

Peter and Paul are referred to here as two equally important authoritative figures. The reference to Paul is longer and more detailed than the one to Peter. However, this should not be understood as an elevation of Paul over Peter, but as an indication that more specific information was available concerning the life and death of Paul.²⁵ Peter is also mentioned in a discussion of First Corinthians:

ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλῶ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι. ἀλλ' ἡ πρόσκλισις ἐκείνη ἤττονα ἁμαρτίαν ὑμῖν προσήνεγκεν· προσεκλήθητε γὰρ ἀποστόλοις μεμαρτυρημένοις καὶ ἀνδρὶ δεδοκιμασμένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς

In true Spirit he wrote to you about himself, Cephas, and Apollo, since you had already become sectarian. But this strife entailed only lesser sin upon you. For then you were divided over reputed apostles and a man who had been approved by them.²⁶

We have concluded above that the Cephas of First Corinthians refers to Peter. Clement shows knowledge of the situation in First Corinthians and relates to it as he writes a letter to the same community, albeit many years later. He also gives a judgment concerning Peter and Paul, calling them μεμαρτυρημένοις (reputed).²⁷ The same expression is used about Elijah, Elisha, Ezekiel, the prophets and “famous men of the old” (17:1), and the men who have been appointed by the apostles and other eminent men as successors of the apostles for the episcopal office (44:3). Thus, Clement on the one hand compares Peter to heroes of the Hebrew Bible, but at the same time argues that this high reputation should be the norm for all

²³ It should be noted that Cullmann, *Petrus*, 102, suggests that the “jealousy” here referred to reflects strife between Pauline and Petrine groups at Rome that resulted in the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, rather than imperial persecution and jealousy connected to the success of Christianity. This position is further developed by David L. Eastman, “Jealousy, Internal Strife, and the Deaths of Peter and Paul: A Reassessment of 1 Clement,” *ZAC* 18 (2014): 34–53. However, I think the evidence is not clear enough to draw such a conclusion.

²⁴ 1 Clem 5:3–5.

²⁵ 1 Clem 5:6 somewhat resembles e.g. 2 Cor 11:23–27.

²⁶ 1 Clem 47:3–4.

²⁷ He does not indicate which two of the apostles who are reputed and who is approved by them, but considering the legacy and narrative sequence, it is reasonable to assume that Peter and Paul are the reputable apostles, whereas Apollo is approved by them. First Corinthians suggests that Apollos was a Pauline associate (1 Cor 3:5; 16:12), whereas Cephas is part of the early creed (1 Cor 15:5).

true bishops—and was the case with the bishops that had now been replaced.²⁸ Clement makes a clear distinction between Peter and Paul on the one hand, and Apollo on the other, and ascribes to them the authority to appoint a new leader on the basis of being *μεμαρτυρημένοις*. In this case, however, it does not refer to the apostles as witnesses of Jesus, but rather that others have witnessed about the legitimacy of their apostolates. The position of Peter is not unique. He is on equal footing with Paul as apostolic norm for ecclesial leadership.

The view of Peter as an authoritative figure reflected in First Clement is not easily discerned. The external sources identifying Peter as the one who ordained Clement and the one from whom he gains his apostolic legitimacy are of great interest. Yet, these sources are late and do not help us to understand how Peter was understood at the composition of the letter. However, the notion of the apostles appointing successors in 44:1–2 at least does not contradict this perspective. Furthermore, in the discussion concerning the division treated in First Corinthians, First Clement emphasises the special authority of the reputed apostles Peter and Paul to appoint new Christian leaders such as Apollo. Peter is not singled out but put alongside Paul. They are both portrayed as authoritative figures that have ordained new Christian leaders to succeed them. The purpose of First Clement is to reprove the Corinthians for disposing the apostolically legitimate bishops. The connection to the apostles is important for the legitimacy of the Christian leadership, and links it to the earthly Jesus. In this context it is not the teachings of the earthly Jesus that are at the core, but rather the authenticity and legitimacy of ecclesial leadership that is connected to the earthly Jesus. The link to Jesus would become increasingly distant, but the idea of apostolic succession was derived from the idea that through being connected to the apostles would also be connected to the authentic teachings of Jesus. Here it is not the teaching per se that is in focus, but authentic (legitimate) leadership. First Clement uses continuity with Peter (and Paul) as an argument for the legitimacy of the leadership of the Roman Church, but also of the now deposed bishops at Corinth.

Peter emerges as a *traditional* authority in First Clement, an entity that is not necessarily discussed on a day-to-day basis but is an essential part of the history of

²⁸ Hermann Strathman, “*μάρτυς κτλ.*,” in *TDNT: IV*: 474–514 (505), notes that martyrdom has already been conceptualised in 1 Clem, and the references to Peter and Paul as *μάρτυροι* refers to their death rather than to their preaching. At the same time, he admits that *μαρτυρεῖν/μάρτυς* is used in its conventional sense in e.g. 38:2 and 63:3. Clement’s usage of the concept is thus fluid, and close attention must be paid to the context to discern the meaning. In this context, recounting for events before the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, the conventional use of the word is more appropriate.

the Christian movement. In First Clement we also find our first example of Peter representing an *institutionalised* cultural capital. Not only is Peter significant due to his testimony concerning the earthly Jesus, but he is crucial for legitimising the emerging hierarchy of the church. Both Peter and Paul are significant authoritative figures in the spheres of influence of the churches at Rome and Corinth, and Peter is used to argue in favour of what Clement considers to be the legitimate leadership of the church.

5.2 Peter in Second Clement

Second Clement has traditionally been ascribed to the same author as First Clement, thus the name of the text.²⁹ However, it is now widely agreed that Second Clement does not share the author of First Clement, and Second Clement is probably not even a letter. Second Clement is commonly referred to as a homily, but this notion is ambiguous and not very helpful for understanding the text.³⁰ The dating of the text is also a matter of dispute. Karl P. Donfried has suggested that Second Clement was composed in Rome around 100 C.E.,³¹ whereas Harnack has suggested that it was composed in the 160s C.E.³² Alternative locations such as Syria, Antioch, and Alexandria have also been suggested.³³ I will presuppose that Second Clement was written toward the middle of the second century.³⁴ The only mentioning of Peter in Second Clement is in chapter 5, where an ambiguous source is quoted.

Λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος Ἐσεσθε ὡς ἀρνία ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει· Ἐὰν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἀρνία; Ἔειπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ· Μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς

²⁹ Christopher Tuckett, *2 Clement*, OAF (Oxford: University Press, 2012), 14–17; Andreas Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*, HNT (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992), 190.

³⁰ Cf. James A. Kelhoffer, “If Second Clement Really Were a Sermon, How Would We Know, and Why Would We Care: Prolegomena to Analyses of the Writing’s Genre and Community,” in *Early Christian Communities Between Ideal and Reality*, ed. M. Grundeken and J. Verheyden, WUNT 1/342 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 83–108.

³¹ Karl Paul Donfried, “The Theology of Second Clement,” *HTR* 66 (1973): 487–501. He further develops his claim in *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*, NovTSup 38 (Leiden: Brill, 1974).

³² Adolf Harnack, “Zum Ursprung des sog. 2. Clemensbriefs,” *ZNW* 6 (1905): 67–71. Harnack argues that it was written as an actual letter from Soter of Rome.

³³ See discussions in Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*, 195; and Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 58–64. See also Ernst Baasland, “Der 2. Klemensbrief und frühchristliche Rhetorik: ‘Die erste christliche Predigt’ im Lichte der neueren Forschung,” in *ANRW* II.27.1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 78–157.

³⁴ Thus following e.g. Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*; Wilhelm Pratscher, *Der zweite Clemensbrief*, KAV 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 62–64; Tuckett, *2 Clement*.

λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτὰ· καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτείνοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυναμένους ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός.

For the Lord said: “You will be as lambs among wolves.” Peter answered him and said: “What if the wolves tear the lambs?” Jesus said to Peter: “The lambs should not fear the wolves after their death, and you should not fear those who kill you and can do nothing to you but fear he who after your death has the power over your soul and body to throw them into the fire of Gehenna.”³⁵

This appears to be the result of a conflation of Matt 10:16||Luke 10:3 and Matt 10:28||Luke 12:4–5. Second Clement probably uses a tradition that has combined and harmonised the sayings of Matthew and Luke.³⁶ Hans-Teo Wrege argues that this is probably not a conflation made by the author of Second Clement himself, but rather a quotation from a now-lost source, since a similar quotation can be found in Justin (*1 Apol.* 19.7).³⁷ Dieter Lührmann argues that this is in fact a quotation from the Gospel of Peter.³⁸ Despite the uncertainties surrounding the origin of this quotation, we here find an example of the popularity of dialogues between Peter and Jesus. Peter is not part of the narrative in these passages in Matthew and Luke but has been added to the narrative either by Clement when conflating texts, or (more likely) by the author of the source he is quoting. Regardless what editorial process led up to the inclusion of Peter in this saying, it indicates that Peter-traditions were significant to the author of Second Clement.

Although many dimensions of Second Clement and its content are uncertain, this text gives us a clear indication of a living tradition, which connects Peter closely to Jesus. Someone has at some point considered an inclusion of a reference to Peter appropriate to support the authenticity of the *logion*. The background can probably be traced to Peter’s role as spokesperson of the disciples in the Synoptic Gospels. This text is an indication that this function of Peter was recognised

³⁵ 2 Clem 5:2–4.

³⁶ Tuckett, 2 *Clement*, 171.

³⁷ Hans-Theo Wrege, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt*, WUNT 1/9 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1968), 162, n 3. See Also Wolf-Dietrich Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT II/24 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987), 144–46, 189–91.

³⁸ Dieter Lührmann, *Die Apokryph gewordenen Evangelien: Studien zu neuen Texten und zu neuen Fragen*, NovTSup 112 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 73–86. He shows how the recto of POxy 4009 probably reflects fragments of this quotation, only referring to Peter in first person (which is the reason he believes that it is part of *Gos. Pet.*). However, as Tuckett, 2 *Clement*, 171, notes, there are also other texts where Peter speaks in first person, so thus the connection to the Gospel of Peter is not entirely certain. However, it is likely that the fragment reflects the same tradition quoted in Second Clement in one way or another.

by the author of Second Clement. Peter initiates a dialogue with Jesus by responding to his claim and has perhaps been added to the *logion* in order to indicate the authenticity of this conflated version. It is possible that this reference to Peter—whether it was added by the author of Second Clement or already present in his source—should be viewed toward the background of the martyrdom motif often connected to Peter and Paul. 5:1–2 speaks of not fearing this world and being willing to leave it.

It must be admitted that the evidence in this case is weak and the results can thus not be treated as more than a mere suggestion that can be compared to and put into the greater context of this study as a whole. It is possible that this is just part of a typical master/disciple dialogue where the disciples give the master reason to further clarify his position. However, the reference to martyrdom in the antecedent verses indicate that the inclusion of Peter in this passage is not a coincidence. Although the evidence is sparse, Second Clement might indicate an understanding of Peter as a *traditional* authority who *embodies* a certain cultural capital.

5.3 Peter in the Ignatian Correspondence

The Ignatian correspondence is traditionally dated to around 110 C.E.,³⁹ and contains seven letters written by Ignatius of Antioch as he travels toward his martyrdom in Rome.⁴⁰ However, the authenticity of the Ignatian correspondence is a matter of much dispute. A number of significant studies during the last 50 years have questioned the authenticity of the correspondence and sought to push the dating toward the middle or second half of the second century but have been unsuccessful in shattering the support for the traditional dating.⁴¹ However, it is

³⁹ Thus following Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Perthes, 1873); and Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers II: S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp* (London: MacMillan, 1885).

⁴⁰ William R. Schoedel, "Ignatius, Epistles of," *ABD* 3:384–87.

⁴¹ Whereas Timothy D. Barnes, "The Date of Ignatius," *ExpTim* 120 (2008): 119–30 argues that the correspondence is authentic but should be dated to the 140s, Josep Rius-Camps, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, the Martyr*, *OrChrAn* 213 (Rome: Pontificium institutum orientalium studiorum, 1980), argues that the present corpus is a forgery based on four earlier, authentic letters. The authenticity of the letters is denied altogether by Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopats in der christlichen Kirche: Prüfung der neuesten von Hrn. Dr. Rothe aufgestellten Ansicht* (Tübingen: Fues, 1838), 148–85; Robert Joly, *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche* (Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université, 1979); Reinhard M. Hübner, "Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien," *ZAC* 1 (1997): 44–72; Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos?*; Otto Zwerlein, *Petrus in Rom: Die literarischen Zeugnisse*, *UaLG* 96 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 184, who prefer dating the Ignatian correspondence to 160–180 C.E.

significant to note that Ignatius' letter to the Romans differs significantly from the other Ignatian letters. It is the only letter that is dated (August 24; *Ign. Rom.* 10.3), and the office of bishop plays no significant role, in contrast to the other letters. Although Ignatius is presented as bishop of Syria (2.2), his references to himself as only now beginning to be a disciple (5.3) and his flock in Syria being overseen (ἐπισκοπήσει) by Jesus himself (9.1) are not in line with the view of bishops in the other letters. Whereas the other letters are more or less theological tracts, *Romans* is a personal letter that aims at preparing the believers in Rome for Ignatius' arrival.⁴² The discrepancy between *Romans* and the other epistles of the middle recension is further underlined by Eusebius' mentioning of *Romans* separately from the other epistles⁴³ as well as the transmission of *Romans* being separate from the other epistles.⁴⁴ With this taken in consideration, I find it likely that *Romans* is an authentic writing of Ignatius from the early second century, whereas the other epistles of the middle recension are pseudonymous works from the mid-second century.⁴⁵ This means that the two relevant Peter-passages, found in *Romans* and *Smyrnaeans*, have different origin. They will be treated together despite this for thematical reasons, just as in the case of *First and Second Clement*.

Although Ignatius is identified by Origen as the successor of Peter in Antioch, he does not make any mention to this kind of relationship to Peter.⁴⁶ However, he does comment on the difference between his own authority and that of Peter in his letter to the Romans.

οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν. ἐκεῖνοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐγὼ κατάκριτος. ἐκεῖνοι ἐλεύθεροι, ἐγὼ δὲ μέχρι νῦν δούλος. ἀλλ' ἐὰν πάθω, ἀπελεύθερος γενήσομαι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀναστήσομαι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐλεύθερος.

⁴² See discussion in Mikael Isacson, *To Each Their Own Letter: Structure, Themes, and Rhetorical Strategies in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*, *ConBNT* 42 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2004), 191–92.

⁴³ Cf. *Hist. Eccl.* 3.36.5–6.

⁴⁴ Cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers II*, 5–6. However, Caroline P. Hammond Bammel, “Ignatian Problems,” *JTS* 33 (1982): 62–97 (65), views this as an accident.

⁴⁵ On the pseudonymity of the Ignatian correspondence, see Thomas Johann Bauer, “Ignatius—alter Paulus? Die Präskripte und Postskripte der Ignatianen,” in *Die Briefe des Ignatios von Antiochia: Motive, Strategien, Kontexte*, ed. T. J. Bauer and P. von Möllendorff (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 93–129, who although not regarding *Romans* genuine still gives it a prominent place in the collection.

⁴⁶ Cf. *Comm. Luc.* 6. See also discussion in 5.13.4.

I do not, as Peter and Paul, command you. They were apostles, but I am condemned. They were free, but I am still a slave. But when I suffer, I will be a freedman of Jesus Christ, and will rise again, emancipated in him.⁴⁷

Ignatius here comments on the discrepancy in status between him and the apostles Peter and Paul. William R. Schoedel argues that Ignatius chose the examples of Peter and Paul since these were martyred in Rome, where he was heading.⁴⁸ I agree that this special relevance to his own situation may have influenced his choice of these two apostles as examples, but it is also evident in the text that Ignatius views Peter and Paul as on different footing than himself from the beginning.⁴⁹ Their status as apostles gave them the ability to command (*διατάσσω*) the believers in some way. This does not refer to just any command but pertains to detailed instructions for how something should be done.⁵⁰ Ignatius does not further elaborate on what kind of commandments were given by the apostles and not by him, but it is not far-fetched to see this as a reference to their teaching. This indicates that the teaching of Peter and Paul was viewed as authoritative in early Christianity. The apostles were in a certain position to interpret and define the Christian teachings, a position Ignatius argued that he did not have, although the self-understanding of his episcopacy is otherwise far-reaching. Peter and Paul are placed side by side, but they should not be viewed as authoritative in the sense of being links to Jesus—only Peter had in fact known the earthly Jesus.

Even though Ignatius emphasises the superiority of Peter and Paul to himself, he also skilfully manages to piggyback on their status. He does not elaborate on his own status as bishop in this context, but through elevating those holding the office of apostle, he at the same time indirectly elevates his own ecclesial office. The apostles had a certain authority to teach and interpret the message of Jesus to the Christian communities due to their apostolic offices, and Ignatius implicitly hooks on and draws from their authoritative status as a member of the contemporary ecclesial hierarchy.

The other reference to Peter in the Ignatian corpus is found in his letter to the Smyrnaeans, which is allegedly sent from Troas, in a section where he emphasises the bodily resurrection of Jesus. Arguing that Jesus was resurrected in the flesh, Ignatius writes:

⁴⁷ Ign. Rom. 4.3.

⁴⁸ William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1985), 176.

⁴⁹ See Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 176.

⁵⁰ Cf. Matt 11:1; 1 Cor 9:14; 1 Clem 20:6.

καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς· λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἤψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ ἤψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ θανάτου κατεφρόνησαν, ἠγρέθησαν δὲ ὑπὲρ θάνατον.

And when he came to them who were with Peter, he said to them: Take, touch me and see that I am not a disembodied demon. And they immediately touched him and believed when they were united with his body and spirit. Therefore, they despised death and were found to be superior to death.⁵¹

As noted above, this text is likely a pseudonymous composition that is a couple decades younger than the previous text. It is uncertain what source is quoted here. The text is clearly referring to the same saying as the one found in Luke 24:39, but in a different version.⁵² This passage is interesting to us since the group to whom Jesus appears is called “those who were with Peter.” The Lukan account follows the Emmaus story, where the two men speak of Jesus as having risen and appeared to Simon (Luke 24:34). Common to Luke and *Smyrnaeans* is thus the notion of Jesus appearing to a group headed by Peter in some way. Thus, the idea of Peter as leader of the early disciples appears to be widespread in the mid-second century, and the author of *Smyrnaeans* uses this tradition to argue for the reliability of the Jesus tradition.

Even though many texts portraying Peter as a significant figure have been connected to Antioch throughout this study, special Petrine prominence is not indicated in his see, neither in Romans, nor in the other epistles. This is probably because Peter was never identified as an exclusively Antiochene apostle, but a universally recognised apostle who had some concrete dealings with Antioch. Peter is portrayed as an authoritative interpreter—not due to his own persona, but due to his apostolic office, and thereby Peter and Paul are connected. Yet, Ignatius does not indicate that this interpretative authority is something held by all apostles, and it is possible that Peter is singled out due to his connection to the earthly Jesus whereas Paul is singled out due to the importance of his writings, thus together being transmitters of authoritative Jesus tradition. In *Smyrnaeans*, Peter is singled

⁵¹ Ign. *Smyrn.* 3.2.

⁵² With a traditional dating of Ign. *Smyrn.*, it is more or less contemporary with Luke, and thus perhaps dependent on a common tradition, but since I view Ign. *Smyrn.* as a couple decades younger, it is quite possible that the pseudepigrapher uses Luke and shapes it according to his own purposes. A similar passage can be found in *Ep. Ap.* 12, which might suggest that this type of anti-Docetic discourse emerged around the mid-second century. Markus Vinzent, “Ich bin kein körperloses Geistwesen?: Zum Verhältnis von κήρυγμα Πέτρον, ‘Doctrina Petri,’ διδασκαλία Πέτρον und IgnSm 3,” in *Der Pa-radox Eine*, 241–86, suggests that this quotation is from the long-lost Preaching of Peter.

out as the leader of the early Church, which is referred to as “those who were with Peter.”

Not only does Ignatius piggyback on Peter’s status, but the later pseudepigrapher of Smyrnaeans also uses Peter’s authority to legitimise his own theological position. He has Ignatius, the bishop, argue in favour of a bodily resurrection by referring to “those who were with Peter,” i.e. the founding apostles, in order to strengthen his case. Although the Ignatian writings do not discuss Peter as an authoritative figure in plain language, they slightly emphasise the title/office of the apostles, and thereby argues in favour of the titles/offices of the ecclesial hierarchy of which Irenaeus himself was a part. Whereas Smyrnaeans speaks of Peter in terms of a *traditional* authority, Ignatius speaks of Peter as a *rational* authority with *institutionalised* cultural capital in Romans.

5.4 Peter in the Papias Fragments

None of Papias’ works have survived to our time, and therefore we only know him through brief quotations by other authors. Papias was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia at the beginning of the second century.⁵³ The earliest existing witness of Papias is Irenaeus, who states that Papias wrote five books that he considers to be credible to believers.⁵⁴ Eusebius claims that Irenaeus considered Papias to be a hearer and friend of the apostle John and Polycarp, but argues from Papias’ own writings that he was a disciple of the disciples of the apostles.⁵⁵ The dating of the writings of Papias is very complex, since only fragments remain. The conventional dating places Papias in the first third of the second century, and we will presume that dating in this study.⁵⁶ Both texts relevant to this study are from fragment two, which is found in Eusebius. We will begin by taking a look at Papias’ list of apostles.

που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέρους ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί, λέγουσιν.

⁵³ Johannes Munck, “Presbytere og Herrens disciple hos Papias. Exegetiske bemærkninger til Euseb., h.e. III, 39,” *SEÅ* 22–23 (1957–58): 172–90.

⁵⁴ *Haer.* 5.33.4.

⁵⁵ *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.1–7.

⁵⁶ For a more detailed discussion and history of research of the issue, see Ulrich H.J. Körtner, *Papias von Hierapolis*, FRLANT 133 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 88–94.

But whenever someone came who had been a companion of the elders, I would carefully inquire their words: What Andrew or Peter had said, or what Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew or any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what things Ariston and the presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, were saying.⁵⁷

Papias names seven of the twelve disciples of Jesus. The record is confusing, since he uses the title presbyter both for the apostles as well as for Ariston and John the presbyter. He refers to Ariston and John as *μαθηταί*, a term that is used about Jesus' closest disciples in the Gospels, but about all Christians in Acts.⁵⁸ There is nothing in the list that indicates a special rank or position of Peter in relation to the other apostles. In contrast to the Synoptic Gospels, Peter is not mentioned first, but second, following his brother. Thus, the authoritative position of Peter is equal of that of the other apostles as guaranteeing orthodox teaching. For Polycarp, this not only pertains to the apostles who knew Jesus during his earthly life, but also Ariston and John the presbyter. Papias motivates his confidence in these persons by stating that οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης (for I did not suppose that what came out of books would benefit as much as a living and remaining voice; *Hist. Ecl.* 3.39.4.). He thus regards the oral tradition as more valuable than the written. His purpose is not to compare these authoritative persons with each other, but to argue the supremacy of the "living" oral tradition over the written. This is why he includes Ariston and John the presbyter on equal footing, since they transmit an oral message that pre-dates themselves.

The most famous reference to Peter in the Papias fragments is one discussing Peter's role in the composition of Mark.

καὶ τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγεν. Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσεν τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. ὕστερον δέ, ὡς ἔφη, Πέτρῳ ὅς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἤμαρτεν Μάρκος οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. ἐνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσεν παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθαι τι ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰστόρηται τῷ Πατίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου.

And thus said the presbyter: When Mark became Peter's interpreter, he wrote down accurately what he remembered about the sayings and works of the Lord, but not in order. For he had neither seen nor heard the Lord, but later, as Peter said, who taught according to the needs, but not in order to make an account of the words of the Lord. Therefore, Mark did not sin when he wrote down some as he remembered. But one thing he made sure: not to

⁵⁷ *Hist. Ecl.* 3.39.4. The list indicates that Papias is familiar with the Synoptic tradition rather than John, since Matthew and James are not mentioned in John.

⁵⁸ Munck, "Presbyterie og Herrens disciple," 180.

leave out anything that he had heard and not to lie about it. This was what is reported by Papias concerning Mark.⁵⁹

Papias is here arguing in favour of the accuracy and integrity of Mark's Gospel by claiming that the historical source behind the document is in fact Peter. This may reflect some controversy where Mark was viewed as inferior to the other Gospels.⁶⁰ A debate similar to the modern discussion of the Synoptic problem may have emerged, questioning why Mark left out much material present in other sources. The solution was to attribute the Gospel to Mark, who is described as ἐρμηνευτής Πέτρου (Peter's interpreter). There are several problems for how this notion should be understood. Papias is familiar with First Peter, and thus it is not strange that he connects Peter and Mark.⁶¹ However, it is not evident what this interpreter-role entailed, and why it would be necessary. Bockmuehl argues that Peter would have known Greek, at least orally.⁶² If one imagines Mark and Peter together in Rome, perhaps Mark could have interpreted into Latin, but that does not explain why Mark (which in that case might be considered a Roman Gospel) is still written in Greek. Ethelbert Stauffer argues that Peter as a representative of Judaizing Christianity would have taught in Hebrew or Aramaic with Mark as his "methurgeman" (interpreter).⁶³ Although it is possible that this is what Papias had in mind, there is no indication that this is something that actually took place.

Mark shows no traces of being specifically Petrine, and Papias' notion thus probably informs us of the disputes within early first century Christianity rather than of the actual origin of the Gospel.⁶⁴ The main purpose of Papias' notion is not to clarify the role of Mark, but to relate the Gospel to Peter. Thus, Peter must have been unanimously viewed as an authoritative figure in issues pertaining to the transmission of authentic Jesus tradition. Peter is portrayed as having full knowledge of the Jesus tradition, whereas the shortcomings of the Gospel are due to Mark's inferior knowledge compared to Peter. If Papias' notion that Mark did not leave out anything that he had heard is taken at face value, the shortcomings

⁵⁹ *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.15–16.

⁶⁰ Cf. Ulrich H. J. Körtner, "Markus der Mitarbeiter des Petrus," *ZNW* 71 (1980): 160–73.

⁶¹ Cf. *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.17 and 1 Pet 5:13.

⁶² See Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, 167.

⁶³ Ethelbert Stauffer, "Der Methurgeman des Petrus," in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. J. Binzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mußner (Regensburg: Pustet, 1963), 283–93.

⁶⁴ Cf. Kurt Niederwimmer, "Johannes Markus und die Frage nach dem Verfasser des zweiten Evangeliums," *ZNW* 58 (1967): 172–88. See also Josef Kürzinger, "Papias von Hierapolis: Zu Titel und Art seines Werkes," *BZ* 23 (1979): 172–86.

of the Gospel could actually be traced to Peter himself. However, the purpose is to legitimise Mark's Gospel by connecting it to Peter, rather than criticising the apostle. Papias states that Peter taught "according to the needs, but not in order to make an account of the words of the Lord." Thus, Peter is not only a link to the earthly Jesus, but also an authoritative interpreter of Jesus' teachings who can relate them to the needs of the present situation.⁶⁵ The shortcomings of the text are not due censorship, but that it is a summary of Peter's contextually determined teaching rather than a full exposé of the reminiscences of the apostle.

Eusebius notes that Clement of Alexandria argues similarly concerning Peter's connection to Mark.⁶⁶ Clement does not mention Mark as Peter's interpreter, but rather as a follower who had witnessed much of Peter's ministry in Rome. According to Clement, Mark was written during Peter's lifetime, but Peter was not involved in the composition.⁶⁷ The joint claims of Petrine origin of Mark by Clement and Papias indicate that Peter was viewed as an authoritative figure guaranteeing the authenticity of the Jesus tradition.⁶⁸ A similar tradition can also be found in Irenæus.⁶⁹ However, since both are far removed from Peter in time, the historical value of their records is dubious. It is quite possible that they both reflect a defence of Mark's authenticity stemming from an early Christian debate about the value of Mark's Gospel. Furthermore, all these references are preserved through Eusebius, and the degree of accuracy in his quotations is unknown.⁷⁰

Both mentions of Peter in the Papias fragments are ambiguous in many respects. Yet, they have in common the theme of viewing Peter as a link to the earthly Jesus and as an authoritative interpreter of the Jesus tradition. Regardless of the historical value of the records, they indicate that Peter was conceived as a guarantee for authentic teaching during the second century. Eyewitness accounts were considered reliable witnesses of the Jesus tradition, but Peter is also portrayed more

⁶⁵ This authority for contextual interpretation also occurs in the Acts if Peter and the Twelve Apostles.

⁶⁶ *Hist. Eccl.* 2.15.

⁶⁷ *Hist. Eccl.* 6.14.5–7.

⁶⁸ I will not here discuss the debate concerning the so-called "Secret Gospel of Mark" argued by Morton Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973). Morton's discovery has been accused of being a forgery by e.g. Stephen C. Carlson, *The Gospel Hoax: Morton Smith's Invention of Secret Mark* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005).

⁶⁹ *Hæc.* 3.1.

⁷⁰ On Eusebius' use of sources, see B. Gustafsson, "Eusebius' Principles in handling his Sources, as found in his Church History, Books I–VII," in *Studia Patristica, vol. 3. Papers presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1959*, ed. F. L. Cross, TU 79 (Berlin: Akademie, 1961), 429–41.

specifically as an authoritative interpreter of the Jesus tradition. Peter emerges as a *traditional* and *rational* authority, but also as one who exercises his *objectified* cultural capital through the Gospel of Mark.

5.5 Peter in the *Epistula Apostolorum*

The *Epistula Apostolorum* was probably written in Asia Minor during the first half of the second century, although Syrian and Egyptian provenience has also been suggested.⁷¹ The text was originally written in Greek, but today only survives in an Ethiopic translation as well as fragments of Coptic and Latin translations.⁷² The text is a refutation of Simon and Cerinthus in form of a story of the resurrected Jesus appearing to his disciples. Although Peter is not at the centre of this text, there are some aspects of the text that are of importance to our subject.

First of all, the list of apostles in *Ep. Ap.* 2 does not have Peter first in the list, but instead places him third, following John and Thomas. More significantly, Cephas is mentioned separately as the eleventh and last apostle in the list. It should be noted that the *Apostolic Constitutions* has the exact same list of apostles, albeit in a somewhat different order (keeping Peter third but making Cephas number ten).⁷³ Ehrman has taken this list as point of departure to argue that Cephas and Peter are two different persons in Galatians.⁷⁴ However, too much historical value should not be placed on this list of apostles. The use of both titles in e.g. the Pauline epistles presents a natural background for confusion. Other parts of this list are obviously confused, such as Judas being referred to as Judas the Zealot. The otherwise practically identical list in the *Apostolic Constitutions* substitutes Judas the Zealot for Simon, which could be viewed as a correction of the text.⁷⁵

In *Ep. Ap.* 11, Mary goes to the disciples and tells them about the resurrection, but they do not believe her. Then Jesus reveals himself as a ghost, but the disciples

⁷¹ See Charles E. Hill, "The *Epistula Apostolorum*: An Asian Tract from the Time of Polycarp," *J ECS* 7 (1999): 1–53. See also Carl Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung: Ein katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrhunderts*, TU 13 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1919); Manfred Hornschuh, *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum*, PTS 5 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965), 99–119.

⁷² For an introduction to the text, see Kirsopp Lake, "The *Epistola Apostolorum*," *HTR* 14 (1921): 15–29. The Ethiopic translation is fully preserved due to the text's canonical status in the Ethiopian orthodox church, but the Coptic translation probably preserves the Greek original more accurately.

⁷³ See discussion in Schmidt, *Gespräche*, 229–31.

⁷⁴ Ehrman, "Cephas and Peter." See also Allison, "Peter and Cephas."

⁷⁵ This would, of course presuppose a literary relationship between the texts. If we consider the *Epistula Apostolorum* to be written in Syria it is not impossible that the *Apostolic Constitutions* reflects at least a later development of the same list tradition.

still do not believe. Jesus speaks and says that he is the one whom Peter has denied three times and still denies. The disciples are still not convinced that it is really Jesus. He then asks Peter to touch the holes in his hands, Thomas to touch the wound in his side, and Andrew to watch his feet and see that he stands on the ground. This is obviously part of an anti-docetic discourse that emphasises the bodily resurrection of Jesus. From the perspective of this study it is interesting to note the emphasis on Peter as the denier who still does not believe but is eventually convinced about Jesus' bodily resurrection. This is an indication of the significance of Peter's testimony of the resurrection. If we think in terms of Peter as a link to the earthly Jesus and chief witness of the resurrection, it is natural that not only Peter's denial is mentioned, but also that Peter actually touches Jesus' wounds and experiences that he is physically resurrected.

Since Peter is not the main figure of the *Epistula Apostolorum*, no major conclusions should be drawn concerning his authoritative status. However, it is evident that this text is in line with the general tendency of presenting Peter as a link to the earthly Jesus who guarantees the authenticity a certain theological position. One might speculate whether the view of Peter is more heroic than often portrayed, since Paul's critique of Cephas could be dismissed as pertaining to someone else. However, I think it is too speculative to argue that the separate mentions of Peter and Cephas is part of some kind of early pro-Petrine apology. The text makes no point of the separation of Peter and Cephas, and therefore this should not be read into the text.⁷⁶ In this text, Peter emerges as a *traditional* authority. If he, after doubting the phenomenon, concluded as he did concerning Jesus' resurrection, this should be the "orthodox" position on the matter.

5.6 Peter in the Apocryphon of James

The Apocryphon of James has the form of a letter. Although the name of the sender in the greeting is missing in the manuscript, the rest of the text makes clear that James is the sender. PHEME PERKINS argues that the Apocryphon shows affinities with Johannine literature, and places it in Asia Minor or western Syria in the early third century.⁷⁷ W. C. van Unnik argues in favour of a composition in Egypt

⁷⁶ However, this does not mean that the form of the list is insignificant. The text is clearly influenced by John, and the placing of John first in the list may indicate some kind of connection to Johannine Christianity.

⁷⁷ PHEME PERKINS, "Johannine Traditions in *Ap. Jas.* (NHC I,2)," *JBL* 101 (1982): 403–14.

around 125–150 C.E.⁷⁸ While clinging to Egyptian providence, Jan Helderman argues that the text bears witness to Cerinthian views, thus perhaps pointing more toward Asia.⁷⁹ Evidence is too sparse to make a solid case for the origin of the text, but the central roles of James and Peter might suggest a Jewish-Christian origin, and the description of the activities of Jesus and the apostles following the resurrection indicates that it was written at a time when Acts was not yet widely circulated. Thus, I suggest placing the text in the first half of the second century.

Although James is clearly the central figure in the text, Peter is coupled with him at several instances, giving the impression that they constitute an authoritative duo. The letter is written as a response to a request to James: “Because you asked me to send you a secret writing (ὄγαποκρυφῶ/ἀπόκρυφον) that was revealed to me [and] Peter by the Lord” (1:8–12).⁸⁰ James states that he has written the Apocryphon in the Hebrew alphabet, and sent it to the recipient privately, asking him not to share it with many. James also indicates that he has delivered another apocryphon to the same recipient some ten months earlier that was received by him alone (1:28–32). However, in this second apocryphon, both James and Peter play central roles as recipients.

James describes a scenario where all twelve disciples are together and working on writing down what the Saviour has told them, both secretly and publicly, in books. 550 days after the resurrection, Jesus makes clear that he must go where he came from and says that if anyone wishes to come with him, he may come. The apostles answer: “If you command us, we will come” (2:27–28). Jesus then answers and says:

“Verily I say unto you, nobody will enter the Kingdom of Heaven if I command him; but because *you* are filled. Leave with me James and Peter in order that I may fill them.” And when he had called these two, He took them apart. He ordered the others to be concerned about their business.⁸¹

⁷⁸ W. C. van Unnik, “The Origin of the Newly Discovered Apocryphon Jacobi,” *VC* 10 (1956): 149–56.

⁷⁹ Jan Helderman, “Anapausis in the Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha,” in *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis: Papers read at the First International Congress of Coptology (Cairo, December 1976)*, ed. R. McL. Wilson, NHS 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 34–43. Helderman even suggests that the obscured addressee of the text is actually Cerinthos.

⁸⁰ The English translation follows *Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha*, ed. M. Malinine et al. (Zürich/Stuttgart: Rascher, 1968).

⁸¹ Ap. Jas. 2:29–39.

After speaking with James and Peter, Jesus departs. “But we knelt down, I and Peter, we gave thanks and sent up our hearts toward the heavens.” (15:6–9). The vision is concluded with James and Peter together again.

In the dialogue between Jesus, James, and Peter that is the core of the teaching of the apocryphon, James is clearly the central apostle, with whom Jesus primarily speaks. The discourse is driven forward through questions posed by James and Peter. The first and last questions are posed by Peter, and in between them three questions are posed by James. Peter’s two sayings question Jesus’ actions and sayings. First, he asks why Jesus tells them to become full when they are already full (**ⲙⲏⲃ**; 3:37–4:2). In his second and concluding question, he asks why Jesus sometimes draws them to faith and promises them life, only to then cast them out from the kingdom of heaven (13:26–36). James’ questions, on the other hand, concern Jesus granting that they will not be tempted (4:20–30) James asks him not to speak of the cross and death (5:36–39) and asks concerning the availability of prophecy (6:21–28). The conversation is concluded with Jesus stating that neither James nor Peter have known him since they are grieved when they are taught about the Kingdom (14:1–7). They have now received faith (**ⲡⲓⲘⲦⲒⲘ**) and knowledge (**ⲘⲁⲮⲎⲎⲎ**) that will give them life (14:8–10). The text ends with James sending out the twelve to proclaim salvation.

The identity of James who acts as the sender of the letter is unclear. He appears to be one of the twelve, among whom there are two candidates named James, but the description of him as a leader of the group of disciples in Jerusalem suggests that he is to be identified as James, the brother of the Lord, who is mentioned in e.g. Gal 2 and Acts 15. Either James has succeeded Judas Iscariot instead of Matthias as in Acts, or the identification of James as one of the twelve is a result of confusion caused to the many bearers of the name among early Christian leadership. I believe the latter explanation to be somewhat more plausible.

The Apocryphon of James portrays James and Peter in a parallel manner. James is the central figure, with which the letter correspondence takes place. However, Jesus singles out both James and Peter among the apostles. This is the result of Peter being the central apostle during the life of Jesus who is connected to many circulating Jesus traditions, whereas James has a reputation of being a central leader in the early Jerusalem church—not least for Jewish believers. Both Peter and James are both positively singled out and negatively reproved by Jesus in the Apocryphon. This is a normal function of disciples in philosophical dialogues from antiquity, and thus the importance of the praise and critique should not be overemphasised.

The main contribution to our understanding of how Peter was viewed as an authoritative figure is thus the fact that Peter is the disciple who is coupled with James when he receives his secret teaching from Jesus. The logic for this is probably Peter's legacy as a follower and prominent disciple of Jesus. The early church leader James is coupled with Peter, a follower of the earthly Jesus, in order to present an account of Jesus' teaching that is reliable and connected to the teachings of Jesus already in circulation. James is coupled with Peter in order to boost his own authority, but in a different way than e.g. Ignatius. Ignatius emphasised the superiority of Peter and Paul compared to himself, but James exalts his own authority in relation to Peter. Peter thus becomes a means for someone to promote the authority of James. Peter also here works as a link to the earthly Jesus, not in respect to teaching, but rather leadership. Peter is thus portrayed as a *traditional* authority; whose cultural capital has in some way been *institutionalised*.

5.7 Peter in the Gospel of Thomas

The Gospel of Thomas is probably the most well-known of the New Testament apocrypha. Depending on one's view of the relationship between Thomas and the canonical Gospels, dates for composition have been suggested between prior to 50 C.E. and toward the end of the second century.⁸² It is generally agreed that the Gospel dates from before 200 C.E.⁸³ Gathercole argues that Thomas should not be dated earlier than 135, since the views on the temple, Jews and circumcision are very negative and thus fit better after this date.⁸⁴ If we consider Matthew and Luke to be sources for Thomas, a dating much earlier than this is not possible in any case.⁸⁵ However, the dating is a complicated issue since it consists of logia that could well have accumulated over time. Speaking of a Thomasine theology is thus to speak

⁸² See discussion in Simon Gathercole, *The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary*, TENTS 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 112. See also Bentley Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation With Annotations and Introductions* (London: SCM, 1987).

⁸³ Gathercole, *Thomas*, 116. The basis for this is the combined evidence of papyrological data and the earliest testimony of the text by Hippolytus.

⁸⁴ Gathercole, *Thomas*, 112–27.

⁸⁵ A good case for the dependence of Thomas upon Matthew and Luke is made by Mark Goodacre, *Thomas and the Gospels: The Making of an Apocryphal Text* (London: SPCK, 2012), 66–96. See also C. M. Tuckett, *Nag Hammadi and the Gospel Tradition: Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library*, ed. J. Riches (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986); and Simon Gathercole, *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas: Original Language and Influences*, SNTSMS 151 (Cambridge: University Press, 2012).

mainly of the theology of the Gospel in its final form.⁸⁶ The respective logia may reflect other more specific theological positions from earlier stages in the textual history. Although some common features can be discerned, there are also several contradictions. The respective logia must therefore be treated individually. The dating of the individual logia is very complex, but we will at least keep in mind that they do not necessarily belong to the same period or redactional layer.

The composition of the Gospel of Thomas most frequently situated to Syria, although an Egyptian location has also been suggested.⁸⁷ Thomas contains no narrative material, but consists of 114 logia, i.e. sayings of Jesus.

The first logion where Peter is present is Gos. Thom. 13. This logion is the Thomasine version of the Petrine confession in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 16:13–23||Mark 8:27–33||Luke 9:18–22).⁸⁸

Jesus said to his disciples: “Compare me and tell me who I am like.” Simon Peter said to him: “You are like a righteous angel.” Matthew said to him: “You are like a wise Philosopher.” Thomas said to him: “Teacher, my mouth is completely unable to say whom you are like.” Jesus said: “I am not your teacher. When you drank, you became drunk with the bubbling spring that I have measured.” And he took him and withdrew and spoke three words to him. When Thomas returned to his friends, they asked him: “What did Jesus say to you?” Thomas said to them: “If I told you so much as one of the words that he spoke to me, you would pick up rocks and throw at me. But fire would come forth from the stones and consume you.”⁸⁹

In contrast to the Synoptic version, none of the disciples have full insight into Jesus’ identity. Peter calls Jesus **ΟΥΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΣ** (a righteous angel).⁹⁰ Pokorný argues that **ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ** should here probably be interpreted in the general sense of a “messenger,” since it would contradict early Christian Christology to call Jesus an angel.⁹¹ However, Charles Gieschen has shown that this kind of angelomorphic Christology would by no means have been viewed as “weak” in early

⁸⁶ The idea of a “final form” is not unproblematic since it in practice refers to the form in which the Gospel happened to be preserved to our day rather than a final redaction of the text.

⁸⁷ Gathercole, *Thomas*, 103–11.

⁸⁸ Risto Uro, “Who Will Be Our Leader? Authority and Autonomy in the Gospel of Thomas,” in *Fair Play*, 457–85 (466), argues that Gos. Thom. 13 is not dependent on the synoptic account, but the similarities of the accounts lay more in the general structure of the account. Uro concludes that the Gospel of Thomas, just as Matthew, reacts against the emerging church offices at the time of its composition and argues for an antihierarchical position.

⁸⁹ Gos. Thom. 13.

⁹⁰ A. F. Walls, “The References to Apostles in the Gospel of Thomas,” *NTS* 7 (1960): 266–70, argues that the replies of Matthew and Peter are the Thomasine counterparts to the Synoptic suggestions of Elijah and John the Baptist.

⁹¹ Pokorný, *Thomas*, 54. See also Frid and Svartvik, *Thomasevangeliet*, 155.

Christianity.⁹² Thus, the statements of Matthew and Peter should not necessarily be viewed as incorrect designations of Jesus' identity, but rather as insufficient. The importance of this logion for the text is that Jesus reveals the truth to Thomas exclusively. This might reflect a polemic against Peter as a reliable source for a true understanding of Jesus' identity.⁹³ All three disciples turn out to have inadequate understandings of Jesus, but only Thomas gets special information from Jesus himself.

There are several details in the text that could indicate that Thomas assumes the leading role among the disciples that is assigned to Peter in the Synoptic Gospels. The most evident indication is, of course, that Thomas is the one singled out by Jesus. Furthermore, Matthew and Peter are put in relation to Thomas as his friends (**ΦΙΛ**), as the disciples in the canonical Gospels are often referred to as those with Peter (cf. Mark 1:36||Luke 9:32). However, these examples are weaker than their Synoptic counterparts. There is no specifically anti-Petrine polemic in the text, other than a general disapproval of the disciples' understanding of Jesus' identity. Thomas does indeed receive special treatment from Jesus, but he is not portrayed as an authoritative figure greater than Peter per se.

Although Thomas is singled out to receive three words (**ΨΑΧΕ**), there is clearly a polarity between Jesus and Thomas.⁹⁴ Thomas' utterance concerning who Jesus

⁹² Charles A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*, AGJU 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 349.

⁹³ It is often argued that this polemic is against a view of Peter as significant leader that is derived from Matthew's Gospel, see Claudio Gianotto, "Quelques aspects de la polémique anti-juive dans l'Évangile selon Thomas," in *Colloque internationale: "L'Évangile selon Thomas et les textes de Nag Hammadi."* Québec, 29–30 mai 2003, ed. L. Painchaud & P.-H. Poirier (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 157–73 (169); Glenn W. Most, *Doubling Thomas* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), 93. Furthermore, Nicholas Perrin, *Thomas: The Other Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 109, argues that Peter represents Mark's Gospel, since he was often considered to be the source of the Second Gospel. Mark 1:2 starts with a reference to a messenger by quoting Malachi, who identifies the messenger as Elijah. Perrin in turn argues that he is identified as John the Baptist in 9:11–13 and as Jesus in 11:12–17. Perrin further argues that Matthew's identification of Jesus as "a wise philosopher" refers to the depiction of Jesus as a new Moses in Matthew's Gospel.

⁹⁴ It is often supposed that Thomas plays a significant role as the twin of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas just as in the Book of Thomas, since Thomas is referred to as **ΔΙΔΥΜΟΣ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΣ ΘΩΜΑΣ** in the prologue to the Gospel, see Martina Janßen, "Evangelium des Zwillinges? Das Thomasevangelium als Thomas-Schrift," in *Das Thomasevangelium: Entstehung—Rezeption—Theologie*, ed. J. Frey, E. E. Popkes, and J. Schröter, BZNW 157 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 222–48. However, it is significant to note that Thomas is not referred to as a twin in the Greek fragment. By interpreting **ΔΙΔΥΜΟΣ** in light of the Book of Thomas, one risks reading presuppositions into the text that cannot be substantiated by

is like is often called a confession due to the similarity with the Petrine confession in the Synoptic Gospels but is not really much of a confession. Jesus does not fully accept Thomas' statement, and makes clear that he is not Thomas' teacher (καε).⁹⁵ Jesus explains that he is the one who has measured the source of which Thomas can drink, but he is not his teacher.⁹⁶ Judith Hartenstein argues that Jesus says that he is not Thomas' teacher, since he has understood that Jesus' identity is undefinable, and is thereby equal to Jesus.⁹⁷ However, this is quite speculative and presupposes that the Gospel of Thomas stands in the same Thomasine tradition as the Book and Acts of Thomas.

The significance of this logion for this study is that Jesus makes clear that he is not the teacher of Matthew, Peter, and Thomas, but the things (ψαχε) of significance come through revelation. The disciples focus on the teachings of the earthly Jesus when trying to understand him, but thereby fail their mission. The true message of Jesus is not derived from preserving the teachings of the earthly Jesus. However, those who stand in the apostolic tradition of preserving the teachings of the earthly Jesus are not susceptible to these deeper teachings.⁹⁸

The preceding logion is often considered to portray James as the most significant leader of early Christianity, rather than Peter.

The disciples said to Jesus: "We know that you will depart from us. Who will be the great one over us?" Jesus said: "Wherever you have come from, you shall go to James the Just, for whose sake heaven and earth came into being."⁹⁹

the text itself. The Gospel of Thomas itself presents Thomas quite differently than the Book of Thomas, and Thomas is clearly not presented as equal to Jesus in the Gospel. Also John's Gospel refers to Thomas as διδυμος (John 11:16; 20:24; 21:2) without implying such connotations.

⁹⁵ Gathercole, *Thomas*, 26, sees here an echo of John 15:15|1 John 2:27.

⁹⁶ The translation of **ΝΤΑΕΙΨΙΤΕ** is a much-debated issue, see Willy Clarysse, "Gospel of Thomas Logion 13: The Bubbling Well Which I Myself Dug," in *Philobistôr: Miscellanea in honorem Caroli Laga septuagenarii*, ed. A. Schoors and P. van Deun, OLA 60 (Leuven: Peeters, 1994), 1–9; Stephan Witetschek, "Quellen lebendigen Wassers. Zur Frage einem johanneischen Motiv in EvThom 13," *ZNW* 102 (2012): 254–71. In any case, Jesus is clearly the origin of the spring to Thomas, and the exact translation does not affect the aspects of the logion discussed here.

⁹⁷ Judith Hartenstein, "Autoritätskonstellationen in apokryphen und kanonischen Evangelien," in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen: Beiträge zu außerkanonischen Jesusüberlieferungen aus verschiedenen Sprach- und Kulturtraditionen*, ed. J. Frey and J. Schröter, WUNT I/254 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 423–44 (427).

⁹⁸ The description of the Gos. Thom. as the words of the "living Jesus" (Ἰησὺς ὁ ζῶν|ἸΕ ΕΤΟΝΕ) to Thomas in the prologue might also point in this direction. Bertil Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas* (London: Collins, 1961), 98, argues that the living Jesus refers to the heavenly Jesus, the risen Christ, rather than the earthly Jesus.

⁹⁹ Gos. Thom. 12.

The background to this logion is found in Mark 9:31–36, where Jesus explains to the disciples that he who wishes to be the first among them must be the least and the servant of them all.¹⁰⁰ Here, James the Just is described by Jesus as the greatest (νοσ) of the disciples after his departure. This is often interpreted as being the leader of the early Jesus-movement and read together with Galatians and Acts which are interpreted in a similar way.¹⁰¹ We have noted in previous chapters that the nature of James' position in the Jerusalem church is not unambiguous, and therefore it cannot be taken for granted that this text discusses leadership. If one takes logion 12 at face value, Jesus portrays James not as a leader, but as the prototype of ideal discipleship due to his righteousness. Thus, this logion must not necessarily originate from some Jewish-Christian group who viewed James as their "founding father" from whom they derive their teachings, as assumed by Petr Pokorný.¹⁰² The canonical Gospels do not portray Peter as the model of integrity, and there is therefore no reason to assume anti-Petrine polemic in this logion.

The final mention of Peter in the Gospel of Thomas is in the final and much debated logion of the text.

Simon Peter said to him: "Make Mary go out from us, for women are not worthy of life."
Jesus said: Behold, I myself will draw her so that I can make her male, so that she also might
be a living spirit resembling you males. For each woman who makes herself male will enter the
kingdom of heaven."¹⁰³

This logion is highly controversial due to its view of women. Although Paul Schüngel has suggested an alternative translation where Jesus is portrayed as rebuking Peter for his chauvinistic question, his proposal has not gathered any greater following.¹⁰⁴ Antti Marjanen argues that it is hard to find similar anti-female attitudes expressed in any other second century Christian literature.¹⁰⁵ This is also the only logion where a disciple speaks to the other disciples (instead of

¹⁰⁰ Gathercole, *Thomas*, 249.

¹⁰¹ See Gathercole, *Thomas*, 249.

¹⁰² Petr Pokorný, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Thomas: From Interpretations to the Interpreted*, JCTC 5 (London: T & T Clark, 2009), 53.

¹⁰³ Gos. Thom. 114.

¹⁰⁴ Paul Schüngel, "Ein Vorschlag, EvTho 114 neu zu übersetzen," *NovT* 36 (1994): 394–401. See Antti Marjanen, "Women Disciples in the Gospel of Thomas," in *Thomas at the Crossroads: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*, ed. Risto Uro, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 89–106. There is arguably a tension between Gos. Thom. 114 and 22, and the Gospel obviously has a rich variety of expression, see Marvin W. Meyer, "Making Mary Male: The Categories 'Male' and 'Female' in the Gospel of Thomas," *NTS* 31 (1985): 554–70. On a further note, there is a significant resemblance between Gos. Thom. 22 and 2 Clem 12.

¹⁰⁵ Marjanen, "Women Disciples," 104.

Jesus). Antti Marjanen suggests that Gos. Thom. 114 was added to the text at a later date, when the female leadership was discussed.¹⁰⁶ However, it should be noted that Peter is not questioning female leadership, but the possibility for salvation on a more elementary level.¹⁰⁷ Marjanen suggests that Peter here represents an exaggerated archetype of early Christian ascetism that was used and added to the text at a time when the issue of “mixed communities” was controversial for ascetic reasons.¹⁰⁸ Another possibility is that this logion was added at a time when Mary and Peter represented opposing factions in a debate. As we will see in our treatment of the Gospel of Mary, Mary and Peter appear to have been used as antagonising forces in the early Christian theological debate. It should be noted that Jesus does not necessarily claim that he will change Mary’s biological gender, but rather bring her to the spiritual maturity of a man.¹⁰⁹ The idea of women becoming male in the sense of maturity was a rather common concept in antiquity.¹¹⁰ Yet, this should not necessarily be viewed as a preoccupation with gender per se, since for Philo it means becoming an ideal, asexual male.¹¹¹ As we will see, dispute between Peter and Mary is a reoccurring theme.

When summarising Peter as an authoritative figure in Gos. Thom. we must conclude that Peter gets to represent a conservative theological tradition that derives its teachings from the purported teachings of the earthly Jesus, as handed down from the apostles. Although rational, this means of theological inquiry lacks the ability to understand the deeper dimensions of Jesus’ message. None of the disciples can in themselves comprehend Jesus’ identity through his earthly teachings, but it is necessary to drink from the special source of revelation that is

¹⁰⁶ Marjanen, “Women Disciples,” 103.

¹⁰⁷ See Antti Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents*, NHMS 40 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 52–55. Marjanen mentions the possibility that Peter could function as a caricature of a major ecclesiastical view of subordination of women but concludes reading such a conflict into the text would be anachronistic and is not reflected in Jesus’ actual answer.

¹⁰⁸ Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 54.

¹⁰⁹ See Elizabeth Costelli, “I Will Make Mary Male: Pieties of the Body and Gender Transformation of Christian Women in Late Antiquity,” in *Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity*, ed. J. Epstein and K. Straub (New York, NY: Routledge, 1991), 29–49; Blossom Stefaniw, “Becoming Men, Staying Women: Gender Ambivalence in Christian Apocryphal Texts and Contexts,” *FT 18* (2010): 341–55.

¹¹⁰ See Kerstin Aspegren, *The Male Woman: A Feminine Ideal in the Early Church*, ed. R. Kieffer, Uppsala Women’s Studies: Women in Religion 4 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990).

¹¹¹ Richard A. Baer, Jr. *Philo’s Use of the Categories Male and Female*. ALGHJ 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 45–49, 69–71.

measured out by Jesus (Gos. Thom. 13). Likewise, Peter's negative attitude toward Mary is due to his lack of understanding of Jesus' identity and capabilities. In Weberian terms, the Gospel of Thomas presents a critique toward Peter as a *traditional* authority and argues that reliable *charismatic* authority can instead be derived from those who have gained insight into the deeper knowledge about Jesus. In Bourdieusian terms, the Gospel of Thomas undermines Peter's cultural capital and thereby discourages any use of Petrine tradition and authority to create social capital.

5.8 Peter in the Gospel of Mary

We must first begin by acknowledging that it is a matter of dispute whether the Gospel of Mary as we have it was originally one document, or several that have been put together.¹¹² However, there is good reason for considering the Gospel to be a unified document, and I will treat it as such.¹¹³ The Gospel of Mary is commonly dated to the first half of the second century, but the author and provenance of the text is uncertain.¹¹⁴ The text is today known both through a Coptic codex from the fifth century and some Greek fragments from the third century.¹¹⁵ Even the Coptic text lacks two major sections (pages 1–6 and 11–14). Most of the relevant Peter-material is preserved in the Greek fragments, which will be used as the point

¹¹² Anne Pasquier, *L'Évangile selon Marie*, BCNHT 10 (Québec: L'Université Laval, 1983), 7–10, argues that the narrative where Peter asks Mary to tell them something that they do not know as well as Mary's answer to the question, and perhaps also Andrew's reaction (6:1–9:29/10:2, King's chapter divisions) is an interpolation into the text, which she argues originally was about Peter questioning female ecclesial leadership. Walter C. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, TU 60 (Berlin: Akademie, 1955), 25–26, argues that the text consists of a first work, who has the Saviour as main character, and a second with Mary as main character. The link between the two works is Mary who comforts the weeping disciples. He suggests that the "real" Gospel of Mary starts with Peter asking Mary about what she knows that he does not. Till's position does not affect the argument in this study in any greater degree, but Pasquier's thesis has potentially significant implications.

¹¹³ See Tardieu, *Écrits gnostiques*, 22; and Judith Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre. Erscheinungen des auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge*, TU 146 (Berlin: Akademie, 2000), 135–37.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Karen L. King, "The Gospel of Mary Magdalene," in *Searching the Scriptures*, vol. 2, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (London: SCM, 1995), 601–34; Karen L. King, *The Gospel of Mary Magdalene: Jesus and the First Woman Apostle* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2003). Carl Schmidt, "Ein vorirenaisches gnostisches Originalwerk in koptischer Sprache," *SKPAW* 36 (1896): 839–47, argues that the Gospel of Mary must have been written before 180, since it was known to Irenaeus, who, according to Schmidt, had read the Greek original.

¹¹⁵ Bart D. Ehrman and Zlatko Pleše, *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations* (Oxford: University Press, 2016), 587–88.

of departure for our discussion.¹¹⁶ The Greek fragments reflect a more original reading of the text than the Coptic translation. The Coptic text starts on what was originally page seven, where Peter asks Jesus concerning the sin of the world. It is thereby quite likely that Peter played a central role also in the first six pages of the text. However, the main role of Peter in the Gospel of Mary as preserved today is found in his dialogue with and about Mary.¹¹⁷ There are several features in the Gospel of Mary that correspond to John's Gospel, and it is thus not impossible that it is influenced by the Fourth Gospel.¹¹⁸

Peter states that Jesus loved Mary more than other women and asks her to tell them the words of the Saviour that she remembers that she knows, and they do not (Gos. Mary 3:1–2; Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,1 10:1–3).

Λέγει Πέτρος πρὸς Μαρίαςμμην· ἀδελφῆ, οἶδαμεν ὅτι πολλὰ ἠγαπήθης ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ὡς οὐκ ἄλλῃ γυνή. Εἶπον οὖν ἡμῖν ὅσους σὺ γινώσκεις λόγους τοῦ σωτῆρος οὓς ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ The Greek fragments correspond fairly well to the Coptic text at the instances of interest, and discrepancies relevant to the discussion will be commented upon mostly in the footnotes, but when relevant in the text.

¹¹⁷ Although Mary is conventionally identified as Mary Magdalene in contemporary scholarship, this is a presupposition that cannot be proven, cf. Stephen J. Shoemaker, "Rethinking the 'Gnostic Mary': Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala in Early Christian Tradition," *J ECS* 9 (2001): 555–96. However, as pointed out by Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 63–64, the mother of Jesus is always called **ΜΑΡΙΑ** in Coptic literature, whereas **ΜΑΡΙ(Ω)ΛΗ(ΗΗ)** normally refers to Mary Magdalene. In the Gospel of Mary, she is referred to as **ΜΑΡΙΩΛΗ**. However, Shoemaker, "Mary in Early Christian Apocrypha: Virgin Territory," in *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early Christian and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts and Traditions*, ed. P. Piovanelli and T. Burke, WUNT 1/349 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 275–90, argues that many texts dealing with Mary of Nazareth have been generally overlooked, suggesting that Mary of Nazareth and Mary Magdalene are often conflated in the early Christian apocrypha, taking the *Pistis Sophia* as an example. Shoemaker mainly argues from the Dormition literature, see Stephen J. Shoemaker, "A Case of Mistaken Identity? Naming the Gnostic Mary," in *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition*, ed. F. S. Jones, SBLSymS 19 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 5–30. Shoemaker is dismissed by Marjanen, who argues that the Dormition literature is too late to use as key for interpreting earlier texts, see Antti Marjanen, "The Mother of Jesus or the Magdalene? The Identity of Mary in the So-Called Gnostic Christian Texts," *Which Mary?*, 31–41, and Ann Graham Brock, "Setting the Record Straight—The Politics of Identification: Mary Magdalene and Mary the Mother in Pistis Sophia," *Which Mary*, 43–52, shows that the identities of the Marys in the *Pistis Sophia* are not necessarily that ambiguous for the cautious reader.

¹¹⁸ See Esther A. DeBoer, "Followers of Mary Magdalene and Contemporary Philosophy: Belief in Jesus According to the Gospel of Mary," in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen*, 315–38.

¹¹⁹ The Greek text follows that of Ehrman and Plese, *The Apocryphal Gospels*. The chapter/verse division follows King, *The Gospel of Mary*.

Peter said to Mary: Sister, we know that you were much loved by the Saviour, as no other woman. Therefore, tell us whatever words of the Saviour that you know, which we have not heard.¹²⁰

Pages 11–14 are missing, leaving it uncertain what Mary answered. When Mary has finished telling them, the response of the disciples is not very enthusiastic.

Ἀνδρέας λέγει· ἀδελφοί, τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ περὶ τῶν λαληθήντων; ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οὐ πιστεύω ταῦτα τὸν σωτῆρα εἰρηκέναι· ἐδόκει γὰρ ἑτερογνωμονεῖν τῇ ἐκείνου διανοίᾳ. περὶ τοιοῦτων πραγμάτων ἐξεταζόμενος λέγει Πέτρος· ὁ σωτὴρ λάθρα γυναικὶ ἐλάλει καὶ οὐ φανερώς ἵνα πάντες ἀκούσωμεν; μὴ¹²¹ ἀξιολογώτεραν ἡμῶν αὐτὴν ἀποδείξει ἤθελε;

Andrew said: Brothers, what do you think of what has been said? I myself do not believe that the Saviour has said this, for they seem different from his own mind. Investigating these matters, Peter said: Was the Saviour speaking secretly to a woman and not openly, so that all might hear? Did he wish to show that she was worthier than us?¹²²

ΤΟΤΕ ΑΜΑΡΙΣΜΟΙ ΠΙΜΕ ΠΕΧΑΣ ΜΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΠΑΣΟΝ ΠΕΤΡΕ ΖΙΕ ΕΚΜΕΕΥΕ ΕΟΥ ΕΚΜΕΕΥΕ ΧΕ ΠΤΑΙΜΕΥΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΑΓΑΛΤ ΖΗ ΠΑΖΗΤ Η ΕΕΙΧΙ ΗΟΛ ΕΠΩΨ

Then Mary wept and said to Peter: “What do you think? Do you think that I have thought this up in my heart, or that I am lying about the Saviour?”¹²³

Λευεὶς λέγει Πέτρῳ· Πέτρε, αἰ σοι τὸ ὄργιον παράκειται· καὶ ἄρτι οὕτως συνζήτεῖς τῇ γυναικὶ ὡς ἀντικείμενος αὐτῇ· εἰ ὁ σωτὴρ ἀξίαν αὐτὴν ἠγάπησατο, σὺ τίς εἰ ἐξουθενῶν αὐτήν; πάντως γὰρ ἐκεῖνος εἰδὼς αὐτὴν ἀσφαλῶς ἠγάπησεν· μᾶλλον αἰσχυνθῶμεν καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν τέλειον ἄνθρωπον, ἐκεῖνο τὸ προσταχθὲν ἡμῖν ποιήσωμεν· κηρύξωμην τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μηδὲν ὀρίζοντες μηδὲ νομοθετοῦντες ὡς εἶπεν ὁ σωτὴρ· ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Λευεὶς μὴν ἀπελθὼν ἤρχεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

Levi said to Peter: Peter, your anger is always at hand, and now you are disputing with this woman as if you were her enemy. If the Saviour considered her worthy, who are you if you despise her? He knew her well and certainly loved her. Let us, rather, be ashamed and, clothed

¹²⁰ Gos. Mary 6:1–2; Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 3525, 14–17. The Coptic text translates *ἀγαπέω* as *ογωψ*, rather than using a Greek loan word. This is probably a conscious choice on part of the translator, but its significance is unclear. Either he does not consider the word to be of crucial terminological significance, or he wishes to avoid associating the connotations of the word with Mary. I regard the former possibility as more likely.

¹²¹ It is worth noting that *μὴ* indicates that he expects a negative answer.

¹²² Gos. Mary 10:1–4; Papyrus Rylands 463, recto, 5–16. Andrew appears more certain of his position in the Coptic text. Instead of asking the others of their opinion, he makes clear that the others may say whatever they want—he believes what has been spoken about the Saviour. Also, Peter is portrayed as more confident in the Coptic version. Peter does not investigate the matter, but rather argues that “He [Jesus] did not speak with women without us knowing, did he?” Instead of discussing the worthiness of Mary and the apostles, it is turned into a matter of whom Jesus preferred. Thus, the essence of the narrative is the same, but the Greek version exalts Peter and the disciples more than does the Coptic. I consider the Greek rendering to be preferred as more original here, cf. the next footnote.

¹²³ Gos. Mary 10:5–6; Papyrus Berolinensis 18:1–5, not present in Greek fragments.

in the perfect human, do what he commanded. Let us preach the gospel setting no limits nor making any laws, as the Saviour said. Saying this, Levi left and began to preach the gospel¹²⁴

The first and last of these quotations are positive toward Mary, whereas the second and third are negative. The brothers Andrew and Peter are critical about the content of what Mary has said. Andrew argues that it is not coherent with the teachings of Jesus that he knows, and Peter does not believe that Jesus would consider a woman to be worthier than them and therefore give her more insight. The matter of dispute is thus the validity of new teachings based on prophecy or private revelation.¹²⁵ Mary's "new" teaching is rejected by Andrew and Peter, who claim that it is not consistent with the teachings of Jesus known to them - neither the teaching per se nor the mode in which it is conveyed. Levi steps in and rebukes Peter. Levi then departs and preaches the gospel.

This is an example of discussion of the legitimacy of sources for transmitting authentic Jesus-teaching. Andrew and Peter represent a conservative position, where everything should be put in relation to the earthly Jesus whom they had known. The issue is first brought up by Andrew, who pleads for an apostolic examination of the teachings presented by Mary. Peter, as the leading disciple, concludes after his investigation that it is unlikely that Jesus would have revealed something to Mary that they did not know. Although the fact that Mary is a woman is pointed out several times, the argument does not apply mainly to her gender but, rather, to the likelihood that Jesus revealed something secret to someone that the

¹²⁴ Gos. Mary 10:7–14; Papyrus Rylands 463, verso. Some relevant discrepancies in the Coptic text may be noted. First of all, Levi argues that Jesus has made Mary ἀξιός (worthy), thus referring back to Peter's discussion in Gos. Mary 10:4 in the Greek. This indicates that the rendering of the Rylands Papyrus is probably original, whereas the Coptic rendering is less exact. The formulation about rules and laws is also somewhat different in Coptic, reading something like "not erect any other rule or law than what the Saviour has said." Again, this is probably the result of a less than exact translation from a Greek text similar to what is presented above. We may also note that the Coptic text indicates that Levi and Mary left together, whereas Levi appears to leave alone in the Greek. Yet, the Rylands Papyrus has a number of flaws, and we cannot presuppose that it always presents a better reading than the Coptic text, see Dieter Lührmann, "Die griechischen Fragmente des Mariaevangeliums Pox 3525 und PRyl 463," *NovT* 30 (1988): 321–38.

¹²⁵ Karen L. King, *Gospel of Mary*, argues that the discussion also pertains to the view of gender, since Mary was a woman, and argues this was a significant issue at the time. As support she refers to *Her.* 3.2.1 and 3.3.1. However, none of these speak of gender as an issue for the validity of teaching, but rather the issue of private revelation. Mary is clearly designated as a woman, but her teaching is not questioned by Andrew and Peter due to her gender. Peter was actually the one who asked her to share words of Jesus known to her, thus implying that he considered her to be a legitimate source for words of Jesus even as a woman. It is of course possible that gender was an issue, but this is not the message of the Gospel of Mary, and thus reading it into the analysis may distort our understanding of the text.

apostles did not know. This may seem a bit odd, considering that it was Peter who asked Mary to tell them some word of Jesus that they did not know, but the problem here is not that the words of Jesus are unheard of but, rather, that it is a comprehensive teaching that is considered, at least by Andrew and Peter, to contradict the teachings of Jesus that they have heard.¹²⁶

To Peter, the issue also concerns who is worthy of receiving teaching directly from Jesus. Peter asks *μη̄ αξιολογωτέραν ἡμῶν αὐτὴν ἀποδείξει ἤθελε;* (he did not wish to show that she was worthier than us, did he?). Peter argues that Jesus taught openly, and if he would have spoken something in secret, he would more likely have spoken to e.g. Peter than to Mary. This is the basis for Levi's critique of Peter in the concluding section. By saying *σὺ τίς εἶ ἐξουθενῶν αὐτήν;* (who are you if you despise her), Levi concludes that Mary is worthier than Peter, and he is therefore certainly not in a position to despise her. As for Mary, she weeps and claims that Peter accuses her of having thought up lies in her heart rather than sharing words of the Saviour. The core issue discussed in the Gospel of Mary is whether teachings such as those of Mary should be viewed as inventions and lies, or as genuine teachings of the Saviour. At the end of the text, Levi represents the view of the author of the Gospel of Mary, receiving Mary's teaching and arguing that Peter is not a reliable authority. Levi describes Peter as hot-tempered and divisive. Peter's anger would have diminished his credibility in a Hellenistic context.¹²⁷ Whereas the Greek P^Ryl 463 has only Levi depart, the Coptic translation says that "they departed"—suggesting that Levi and Mary departed together.¹²⁸ In any case, Levi (and perhaps Mary) are portrayed as preaching the gospel as Jesus commanded, whereas Peter and Andrew and the rest of the disciples stay and dispute over the validity of Mary's revelation.

¹²⁶ It is on the basis of the conceived contradiction that Peter first asks Mary to tell something new and that he is critical since she has told something new that Pasquier argues that Gos. Mary 6:1–9:29/10:2 is an interpolation. However, it need not necessarily be so. One might argue that Peter expected something in line with what he himself knew of the teachings of Jesus, whereas Mary presented teachings which were, in the opinion of Peter and Andrew, contradictory rather than complementary to the teachings of the earthly Jesus.

¹²⁷ See William V. Harris, *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

¹²⁸ Another possibility is that the translator presumed that they *all* departed. Although it is possible that they all departed, the content of the narrative makes it more plausible that the translator would have assumed that Levi and Mary departed together than that they would have departed to preach the gospel together with their opponents, see discussion in Sarah Parkhouse, *Eschatology and the Saviour: The Gospel of Mary Among Early Christian Dialogue Gospels*, SNTSMS 176 (Cambridge: University Press, 2019), 171.

The Gospel of Mary shows clear traces of a debate concerning what could be considered as a valid origin of teaching. The conservative position, which is criticised in the Gospel of Mary, argues that in order for a teaching or revelation to be genuine, it must conform to the teachings of the earthly Jesus as inherited from the apostles. The more progressive position of Mary does not accept such limitations. Rather than discussing the authenticity of the teachings, one should accept it and focus on preaching the gospel. The Gospel of Mary criticises a Peter as *traditional* authority and the cultural capital that comes with it. Peter personifies a more conservative position from which the Gospel of Mary distinguishes itself. Peter clearly *embodies* a certain cultural capital for those of conservative persuasion but is dismissed by the progressives as temperamentally unfit for such honour.

5.9 Peter in the Gospel of Judas

The Gospel of Judas is present in the Codex Tchachos together with the Letter of Peter to Philip and First Apocalypse of James, and must have come into existence before 180 C.E., since it is mentioned by Irenæus.¹²⁹ Originally written in Greek, it is today only preserved in Coptic. The author probably knew Luke-Acts in some form.¹³⁰

The Gospel of Judas makes no pretention to represent some kind of majority/mainstream early Christian theology but is rather polemic toward the Christianity derived from the twelve disciples. There has been some controversy as to how Judas' role in the Gospel should be interpreted. The first English translation and reconstruction of the text from 2007 portrays Judas as the “good guy” who has understood the truth about the Jesus whereas the other disciples have not.¹³¹ This interpretation of the text has been severely criticised by e.g. Einar Thomassen, Louis Painchaud, and April D. DeConick, who claim that the translators of this

¹²⁹ Peter Nagel, “Das Evangelium des Judas,” *ZNW* 98 (2007): 213–76.

¹³⁰ Cf. James M. Robinson, “The Sources of the Gospel of Judas,” in *The Gospel of Judas in Context: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Gospel of Judas—Paris, Sorbonne, October 27th–28th, 2006*, ed. M. Scopello, *NHMS* 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 59–67. Uwe-Karsten Plisch, “Judas-evangelium und Judasgedicht,” in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen*, 387–96, argues that the Gospel of Judas presupposes knowledge of the canonical gospels and draws from the Synoptic Gospel stories.

¹³¹ For an account of the discovery of and controversies surrounding the Gospel of Judas, see Louis Painchaud, “On the (Re)Discovery of the Gospel of Judas,” in *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early Christian and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts and Traditions*, ed. P. Piovaneli and T. Burke, *WUNT* 1/349 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 119–36.

version conform to the message as it was depicted as by Irenaeus.¹³² DeConick argues that Judas is not portrayed as a Gnostic hero or saint, but rather the Gospel of Judas is a parody that makes fun of traditional Christian doctrines and practices, whereas Judas remains as evil as ever.

Peter is not explicitly mentioned in the Gospel but is possibly alluded to in two instances. Jesus says to Judas that **ΟΥΑΤΒΟΜ ΠΕ ΕΤΧΟ ΕΧΗ ΟΥ[Π]ΕΤ[ΡΑ] Ν̄Ν̄ΣΕΧΙ Ν̄ΕΥ[ΚΑΡ]ΠΟΣ** (It is impossible to sow seed on a rock and harvest its fruit; 43.26–44.1)¹³³ This is obviously a version of the parable of the sower (Matt 13:1–9||Mark 4:1–9||Luke 8:4–8||Gos. Thom. 9). James M. Robinson argues that the Gospel of Judas resembles the Lukan version more than the others, since it speaks of “rock” rather than “rocky ground.”¹³⁴ However, in the Coptic New Testament, both Matthew, Mark, and Luke, as well as Thomas, speak of “rock” (**ΠΕΤΡΑ**) rather than “rocky ground” (**πετρῶδης**), and it is thus inconclusive which (if any) of these sources the author of the Gospel may have used.¹³⁵ The majority of modern translations view the reference to **ΠΕΤΡΑ** as denoting a natural rock. However, it is possible that an association to Πέτρος is intended—not least in the Greek original.¹³⁶ The Sahidic version of Matt 16:18 reads **ΑΝΟΚ ΔΕ ΖΩ ΨΧΩ Ψ̄ΜΟΣ ΝΑΚ ΔΕ Ν̄Ν̄ΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΑΥΩ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΗ ΤΕΠΕΤΡΑ Ψ̄ΝΑΚΩΤ Ν̄ΤΑΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ**. The wordplay between **πέτρος/πέτρα** is directly incorporated into Coptic as **ΠΕΤΡΟΣ/ΠΕΤΡΑ**. The incorporation of these terms as loan-words into Coptic indicates their conceptual connotations and makes it plausible that a reader of the text might make such a connection. Jörgen Magnusson argues that this is in fact a

¹³² Einar Thomassen, “Is Judas Really the Hero of the Gospel of Judas?,” in *The Gospel of Judas in Context*, 157–70; Louis Painchaud, “Polemical Aspects of the Gospel of Judas,” in *The Gospel of Judas in Context*, 171–86; April D. DeConick, “The Mystery of Betrayal. What Does the Gospel of Judas Really Say?,” in *The Gospel of Judas in Context*, 239–64; idem., *The Thirteenth Apostle: What the Gospel of Judas Really Says* (London: Continuum, 2007).

¹³³ Coptic text accessed in Rodolphe Kasser and Gregor Wurst (eds.), *The Gospel of Judas together with the Letter of Peter to Philip, James, and a Book of Allogenes from Codex Tchacos* (Washington D. C.: National Geographic, 2007).

¹³⁴ Robinson, “Sources,” 61.

¹³⁵ There are some possible connections to Matt, but evidence is not conclusive. Gos. Jud. 58.21–22 somewhat resembles Matt 26:50 (albeit more so in Greek than in Coptic) and the term “twelve disciples” in Gos. Jud. 33.13–14 may be derived from Matt 10:1.

¹³⁶ See Kasser and Wurst, *Gospel of Judas*; Brankaer and Bethge, *Codex Tchacos*; DeConick, *The Thirteenth Apostle*; and Peter Nagel, *Codex apocryphus gnosticus Novi Testamenti. Band 1: Evangelien und Apostelgeschichten aus den Schriften von Nag Hammadi und verwandten Kodizes, koptisch und deutsch*, WUNT I/326 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

critique of the apostle Peter.¹³⁷ Since we cannot fully access the possible connotations of the phrase, we cannot know for certain, but if Petrine connotations exist, it is evidently a critique of apostolic (Petrine) tradition. Although the immediate context of this statement is damaged beyond reconstruction, the preceding narrative contains Jesus' critique of the twelve disciples and their movement, who are described as a generation that has planted fruitless trees in Jesus' name (39.16). Thus, regardless if ΠΕΤΡΑ should be taken as a reference to Peter, it is clearly a reference to a form of Christianity that derives its authority from the twelve apostles.

The second passage of interest is an allusion to the Petrine confession, which is not explicitly related to Peter, but to all twelve disciples. The passage quoted below follows a narrative of Jesus laughing at the disciples who are celebrating the eucharist. The disciples question Jesus, and argue that they have done what is fitting (CWE).

αφοψωψῃ πεχαλῃ ναυ κε εεισωβε ἴσωτῆ ἄν ουδε εντιρε ἴπαει ἄν εἴν
 πετνοψωψ ἄλλᾳ εἴν παι εφμαχισμοῦ νοῖ πετῆνοῦτε πεχαλῃ κε πσαε ντοκ
 εψωκ πε πωηρε ἴπεννοῦτε πεχαλῃ ναυ νοῖ ιησ κε ετετνσοοῦνε ἴμοει εἴν
 οὔ ελμῆν ἴσω ἴμοε νητῆ κε ἴνλαογε ἴγενεα νασονωνῆ εἴν ἴπρωμε
 ετηρηττηγῆτῆ ἴτεροῦσωτῆ δε εἴπαι ἴνοῖ νεφμαθητῆς ἄγρχει ναγανακτει ἄψ
 εῖρωρημ ἄψ εχι οὔα πεγχιτ

He answered and said to them: "I am not laughing at you, and you do not do this by your own will, but so that your god will be worshiped." They said: "Teacher, you are the Son of our God." Jesus said to them: "How do you know me? Verily I tell you: no generation from the people who are among you." But when the disciples heard this, they began to get annoyed and angry, and cursed him in their hearts.¹³⁸

There are several connections between this text and the version of the confession found in Gos. Thom. 13. Jesus is called teacher (CAG) by the disciples, but at the same time distances himself from them. As already mentioned, Peter himself does not figure in this narrative, although the confession was certainly closely connected to Peter.¹³⁹ In this instance, the confession gets to represent a version of Christianity that claims to be derived from the apostles. The point of the text is very much the same as what we find in the Gospel of Mary, namely that Peter and

¹³⁷ Jörgen Magnusson, *Judasevangeliet: Text, budskap och historisk bakgrund* (Lund: Arcus, 2008), 121.

¹³⁸ Gos. Jud. 34.9–21.

¹³⁹ Magnusson, *Judasevangeliet*, 109, argues that the damaged text might be reconstructed to read "you are the Christ, son of our God." Nagel, *Codex apocryphus*, 276–77 rather suggests ΠCAG. In any case, the allusion to the Petrine confession is evident.

the apostles claim that the true faith consists in what is handed down from the earthly Jesus by apostolic tradition. However, this narrow-minded approach is not what Jesus is really after.

Conclusions concerning Peter per se cannot be drawn from the Gospel of Judas, but it does offer sufficient evidence to conclude that there was indeed a discussion about whether teaching should be derived solely from the teachings of the earthly Jesus as handed down by the apostles.

5.10 Peter in Marcion

Marcion of Sinope († c.160?) is one of the most well-known figures of second century Christianity.¹⁴⁰ Yet, we are not in possession of any material that originates directly from Marcion himself or his followers. Scholarly reconstructions of Marcion and his teaching are therefore dependent on what can be extracted from the works of later Christian apologists, primarily Irenæus and Tertullian.¹⁴¹ Since these works are both later than Marcion but also polemical, their degree of reliability is uncertain.¹⁴² Relevant issues of Irenæus' and Tertullian's day are likely projected onto Marcion and potentially distort our understanding of him. In addition to this source-related uncertainty, scholarly conceptions of Marcion are primarily based on the study of Marcion by Adolf von Harnack, which builds primarily on the work of Tertullian.¹⁴³ Harnack is rather fond of Marcion and uses him to present his own views of his time and his assessment is therefore not necessarily objective.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁰ I have stated an approximate year of Marcion's death, although I recognise the problems surrounding the historical data for Marcion's life, see Judith M. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge: University Press, 2015), 293–322.

¹⁴¹ Although Justin Martyr is contemporary with Marcion and comments on his teachings, the most explicit treatments of Marcionism can be found in Tertullian, which is therefore the base for most scholarly reconstructions. Justin wrote a text *πρὸς Μαρκίωνα*, but it has unfortunately been lost.

¹⁴² See David E. Willite, "Marcionites in Africa: What did Tertullian Know and When Did He Invent It?," *PRSt* 46 (2016): 437–52. See also the section on the Gospel of Judas in this dissertation, which presents an example of how Irenæus' description of a text is by no means unbiased but in fact quite misleading.

¹⁴³ Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion, das Evangelium vom fremden Gott: Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921).

¹⁴⁴ Sebastian Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, WUNT 1/250 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 1–4; Wolfram Kinzig, *Harnack, Marcion und das Judentum: Nebst einer kommentierten Edition des Briefwechsels Adolf von Harnacks mit Houston Stewart Chamberlain* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2004).

It is not necessary to discuss Marcion and his system in greater detail in this forum. However, there is reason to take a closer look at Marcion's rhetoric concerning Peter and Paul. According to Tertullian, Marcion uses Pauline authority to argue his teaching. Tertullian states that Marcionites argue that Marcion did not pervert the gospel, but rather restored it and delivered it from corruptions from the other apostles.¹⁴⁵ The conflict in Gal 2 is used as an example where Paul rebukes Peter and the pillar apostles for their corruption of the gospel (*Marc.* 1.20). Therefore, Marcion argues, the traditions and writings derived from Peter and the pillar apostles should not be trusted (*Marc.* 4.3; 5.3; *Præscr.* 23). If Tertullian's description of Marcion's argument of the authority of Paul in relation to that of Peter and the other apostles is derived from Marcion himself, this is a clear example of how Paul is used to legitimise Marcion's teaching at the expense of Peter.¹⁴⁶ Alexander Souter argues that Marcion places Galatians first in his *Apostolikon* due to its theological significance for him.¹⁴⁷ However, it is more likely that he based his *Apostolikon* on a previously existing collection.¹⁴⁸

Whereas we have already discussed a number of cases where Peter's relationship to the earthly Jesus is used to legitimise Paul, we find here a quite different situation. Marcion uses Paul's conflict with Peter and the pillar apostles as an analogy for his own struggle with early Christian leaders.¹⁴⁹ Just as Paul stands up for the gospel and opposes Judaising tendencies, so Marcion argues that he is defending the true (Pauline) gospel in his own day (even purging the Pauline epistles from what he regards to be apostolic interpolations). Marcion thus piggybacks on the *charismatic* authority of the historical Paul and aims at transforming him into a *traditional* authority that he can use to legitimise his teachings. Marcion seeks to draw from the *embodied* cultural capital that Paul has both for him and for his opponents and transform it into a social capital that can legitimise his theological claims.

¹⁴⁵ See more detailed discussion in Gerhard May, "Der Streit zwischen Petrus und Paulus in Antiochien bei Markion," in *Von Wittenberg nach Memphis: Festschrift für Reinhard Schwarz*, ed. W. Homolka and O. Ziegelmeier (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 204–11.

¹⁴⁶ See Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, 86.

¹⁴⁷ Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London: Duckworth, 1954), 152.

¹⁴⁸ See Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbrieffausgabe*, ANT 25 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 294–96.

¹⁴⁹ See discussion in R. Joseph Hoffmann, *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity. An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016), 101–53.

5.11 Peter in the Gospel of the Ebionites

The Gospel of the Ebionites is a Jewish-Christian Gospel from the mid-second century produced in the region East of Jordan.¹⁵⁰ The Gospel has only survived in fragments derived from quotations, and an analysis of the view of Peter as an authoritative figure in the Gospel as a whole is therefore not possible. However, one fragment contains information that is of interest.

ἐν τῷ γούν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ, οὐχ ὄλω δὲ πληρεστάτω, ἀλλὰ νουθευμένῳ καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένῳ (Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν) ἐμφέρεται ὅτι »ἐγένετό τις ἀμὴρ ὀνόματο Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὅς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναῦμ εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἶπεν· παρερχόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδης ἐξελεξάμην Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Σίμονα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμονα τὸν ζηλωτὴν καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καὶ σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα καὶ ἠκολούθησάς μοι. ὑμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύο ἀποστόλους εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.«

At least they had a Gospel called “According to Matthew,” not in full, but corrupted and mutilated (it is called the Gospel of the Hebrews), which says: It was a man named Jesus who was about thirty years old who called us. He came to Capernaum and entered the house of Simon who was called Peter and opened his mouth and said: “As I walked by the lake Tiberias, I chose John and James, the sons of Zebedee, and Simon, Andrew, Thaddaeus, Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot. But you, Matthew, I called when you sat at your customs booth, and you followed me. For my intention is that you shall be twelve apostles as a testimony for Israel.”¹⁵¹

This quotation is evidently from a polemical discourse, and it is uncertain how representative it is of the Peter-image of the Gospel of the Ebionites as a whole. However, a number of significant conclusions can be drawn even from this brief fragment. The most significant is the importance of Matthew among the apostles. Not only is the Gospel as such attributed to him, but he is especially singled out among the apostles. Furthermore, Peter loses his conventional first position in the list of apostles, and is only mentioned third, following the sons of Zebedee. The concept of “the twelve” is evidently significant for the Jewish-Christian mission of the Gospel, but among the twelve, Matthew is the most significant.

Yet, there are also indications of Peter’s special place. Peter is referred to as Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου (Simon who was called Peter), thus suggesting

¹⁵⁰ See Jörg Frey, “Die Fragmente des Ebioniterevangeliums,” in *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, ed. C. Marksches and J. Schröter (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 607–22. See also discussion in Andrew Gregory, *The Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Gospel of the Ebionites* (Oxford: University Press, 2017), 180–83.

¹⁵¹ Epiph. *Haer.* 30.13.2–3.

that this change of names was part of the social memory of this sphere of influence. The reference to the house of Simon is reminiscent of the Synoptic account of the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (Matt 8:14–15||Mark 1:29–31||Luke 4:38–39), but without the actual healing. This fragment shows a number of affinities with the Lukan account, and some weaker traces of the Matthean ditto.¹⁵² The Gospel indicates Peter's change of names but does not make a great fuss about it. Even though the Gospel of the Ebionites reflects a tradition where Matthew was the most significant disciple, the social memory of Peter, his house, and his name change imply that Peter was some kind of *traditional* authority, *embodying* a certain cultural capital. Although not the main figure in this sphere of influence, his legacy was too significant to overlook or diminish.

5.12 Peter in the So-Called Leucian Acts

For a long time, the Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul were considered to be written by a certain Leucius of Charinus.¹⁵³ This is historically very unlikely, but I here group together four of the five works that were earlier considered to belong to this corpus for pedagogical reasons. Apart from their common historical attribution, the works also are written close in time and are of a similar genre.

5.12.1 Peter in the Acts of Andrew

The *Acts of Andrew* were written in Greek during the latter half of the second century.¹⁵⁴ Dennis Ronald MacDonald suggests that the original work was an attempt at a Christianised version of Homer's *Odyssey*.¹⁵⁵ Although literary dependence is disputed, the resemblance is significant enough to at least suggest Homeric inspiration for the narrative. A significant problem for the study of the Acts of Andrew is that we possess only parts, parts which do not easily fit together.¹⁵⁶ The only

¹⁵² James R. Edwards, "The Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel of Luke," *NTS* 48 (2002): 568–86 suggests that the Gospel of the Ebionites is a source for the Gospel of Luke. His analysis of the affinities between the respective Gospels is of great value, but I tend to agree more with the conclusions of Andrew Gregory, "Prior or Posterior? The Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel of Luke," *NTS* 51 (2005): 344–60, who argues that it is rather the Gospel of the Ebionites that is dependent on Luke.

¹⁵³ See Knut Schäferdiek, "Die Leukios Charinos zugeschriebene manichäische Sammlung apokrypher Apostelgeschichten," *NTAp* 2:81–93.

¹⁵⁴ Jean-Marc Prieur, "Andrew, Acts of," *ABD* 1:244–47.

¹⁵⁵ Dennis Ronald MacDonald, *Christianizing Homer: The Odyssey, Plato, and the Acts of Andrew* (Oxford: University Press, 1994).

¹⁵⁶ For a history of research, see Jean-Marc Prieur, *Acta Andreae*, *CCSA* 5 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1989), 129–56.

version containing all parts of the narrative is a Latin summary of a Latin translation of the text by the sixth century bishop and historian Gregory of Tours. The first chapter of this summary is often considered to belong to a separate work, *The Acts of Andrew and Matthias*.¹⁵⁷ Although MacDonald¹⁵⁸ has proposed that this was originally part of a unified Acts of Andrew, his proposal has been rejected due to the significant differences in style.¹⁵⁹ However, the fact that Gregory summarised the narrative as if it were one work suggests that it early on became closely associated with the Acts of Andrew. Peter M. Peterson suggests that the original Acts of Andrew may have contained a more primitive version of what was later expanded into the Acts of Andrew and Matthias.¹⁶⁰ The legend in the Acts of Andrew and Matthias was known to Origen,¹⁶¹ and is thus likely not much younger than the Acts of Andrew.

In this disputed first part of the narrative, commonly referred to as the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, Andrew goes to rescue Matthias from the city of cannibals, where he is doing missions. At the prayer of Andrew, Matthias and the disciples are taken to a mountain where Peter is teaching (*Acts Andr. Mth. 21*).¹⁶² Whereas Andrew and Matthias perform miraculous deeds, Peter is portrayed as a teacher.

In a section of the narrative which is agreed to have belonged to the original Acts of Andrew, but is only preserved in the Latin summary, Andrew has a vision where he sees John and Peter at a mountain. John lifts Peter to the top of the mountain with his hand and urges Andrew to follow Peter to the top. John says: *Andreas, poculum Petri bibiturus es* (Andrew, you are to drink the cup of Peter; *Acts Andr. 20*). In the following sentences, John speaks to Andrew concerning his martyrdom through crucifixion. Although it is not certain whether this Latin

¹⁵⁷ J. Flamion, *Les Actes Apocryphes de l'Apôtre André: Les Actes d'André et de Matthias, de Pierre et d'André et les textes apparentés* (Paris: Picard, 1911), 301–309.

¹⁵⁸ Dennis Ronald MacDonald, *The Acts of Andrew and the Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the City of the Cannibals* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1990).

¹⁵⁹ A. Hilhorst and Pieter J. Lalleman, "The Acts of Andrew and Matthias: Is it part of the original Acts of Andrew?," in *The Apocryphal Acts of Andrew*, ed. J. N. Bremmer, SAAA 5 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 1–14.

¹⁶⁰ Peter M. Peterson, *Andrew, Brother of Simon Peter*, NovT Sup 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 32. Also Lautaro Roig Lanzilotta, *Acta Andreae Apocrypha: A New Perspective on the Nature, Intention, and Significance of the Primitive Text* (Geneve: Cramer, 2007), 268, argues that such a possibility cannot be excluded.

¹⁶¹ See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3.3.1.

¹⁶² Franz Blatt, *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1930), 9, suggests that the reference to Peter teaching at a mountain connects the narrative to the Acts of Peter (uncertain which Acts he is referring to).

summary correctly transmits the second century text in this passage, the content fits well with other second century texts (cf. Apoc. Pet. 14.3–5).¹⁶³ The martyrdom of Peter has obviously become such a significant symbol in the early Christian thought world, that one might refer to the “cup of Peter” rather than the crucifixion of Jesus for speaking of this type of events. It is possible that the imagined implications of the martyrdom of Jesus compared to Peter made it more appropriate to speak of Peter, but the fact that it had become a significant symbolic expression suggests that it was considered to be an event of great significance.

A derivative of the Acts of Andrew is *The Acts of Peter and Andrew*, which is dated to the second half of the third century.¹⁶⁴ This text is something of a sequel to the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, but also shows knowledge of the “main work” of the Acts of Andrew.¹⁶⁵ After delivering Matthias from the cannibals, also Andrew is taken away by a cloud to the mountain, where Peter, Matthias, Alexander, and Rufus are sitting. Peter is the self-evident leader of the group and asks *Τί σοι γέγονεν ἀδελφὲ Ἀνδρέα* (What has happened to you, brother Andrew?; 1.7) and wonders if the mission has been successful.¹⁶⁶ Although Andrew and Peter were biological brothers, the reference to Andrew as an ἀδελφός is more likely to mean a brother in the faith. This becomes clear when Andrew answers by saying *Ναὶ πᾶτερ Πέτρε* (yes, father Peter; *Acts Pet. Andr.* 1). The reference to Peter as a father is a significant marker of his authoritative status. When Andrew tells that he has endured a lot of hardships, Peter says *Ἀνδρίζου ἐν κυρίῳ ἀδελφὲ Ἀνδρέα, καὶ δεῦρο ἀνάπαυσαι ἐκ τοῦ κόπου σου* (You acted like a man in the Lord, brother Andrew. Come now and rest from your labour; *Acts Pet. Andr.* 1). Apart from the apparent nominal authority of Peter as a father among brothers, Peter operates within a clearly pastoral function here. He not only inquires of results, but also cares for the well-being of Andrew.

¹⁶³ Prieur, *Acta Andreae*, 400–403, points out a number of affinities with the *Actus Vercellenses*. However, this text should be dated significantly later than the Acts of Andrew and can therefore not have been used as inspiration. Much of the affinities between the works are present in the Martyrdom of Peter, which is roughly contemporary with the Acts of Andrew.

¹⁶⁴ Peterson, *Andrew*, 35.

¹⁶⁵ The *Acts of Peter and Andrew* is in turn followed by sequels such as the *Acts of Andrew and Philemon* and the *Acts of Andrew and Bartholomew*. However, these acts are beyond the temporal scope of this study. A recension of the *Acts of Andrew* that mentions Peter is the *Martyrium Prius* from the eighth century. The value of the source is dubious since it obviously edits the narrative to a high degree. Peter is described as the leader of the Jerusalem church following the ascension of Jesus (1.2–4), and Peter is identified as being called to the circumcised (2.2).

¹⁶⁶ I follow the Greek text of Maximilian Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1898).

At this point, Jesus appears in the form of a child and urges the disciples to go back to the city of cannibals. Jesus greets Peter with the phrase Χαίρε Πέτρε ἐπίσκοπε ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας μου (Hail Peter, bishop of my entire church; *Acts Pet. Andr.* 2). This is a rather explicit reference to Peter as an authoritative figure on a universal scale. As the disciples travel toward the city of cannibals, Andrew asks Πάτερ Πέτρε, ἄρα γε ἔχομεν πάλιν κόπους ὑπομεῖναι ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ ὡς καὶ ἐν γῆ χώρα τῶν ἀνθρωποφάγων (Father Peter, do hardships await us again in this city and in the land of the cannibals?; *Acts Pet. Andr.* 3). Peter admits that he does not know but suggests that if they ask a farmer for bread and receive it immediately, they are safe, but if they do not receive, trouble awaits them. The farmer that they ask willingly goes home to fetch some bread, and while awaiting his return, Peter helps him sow his field. Andrew reacts negatively and says Πάτερ Πέτρε, τί κόπους παρέχεις ἡμῖν; σὺ γὰρ εἶ πατήρ καὶ ποιμὴν πάντων· καὶ σὺ κοπιᾷς ἡμῶν ὄντων (Father Peter, what hardships are you causing us? You are the father and shepherd of all, and still you are doing the hard work!; *Acts Pet. Andr.* 4). Thereafter, the other disciples help Peter sow the field. Also here there is a clearly elevated perspective on Peter. The field miraculously grows ripe before the farmer comes back. The farmer worships them as gods, but Peter replies οὐ γὰρ ἐσμεν θεοί, ἀλλὰ ἀπόστολοι ἐσμεν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θεοῦ· ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐσμεν δώδεκα· καὶ παρέδωκεν ἡμᾶς ἀγαθὰς διδασκαλίας ἵνα ταύτας διδάξωμεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅπως ῥυθθέντες ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσουσιν (We are not gods, but apostles of the good God. He chose us, and we are twelve. He has chosen us to teach this good teaching to mankind, that they might be delivered from death and inherit eternal life; *Acts Pet. Andr.* 5).¹⁶⁷ Peter describes the commandments to the farmer in a manner much resembling Matt 19:18–19||Luke 18:20–21, but in this case the farmer himself wishes to leave all behind to follow the disciples (while referring to Peter as *πάτερ*).

As the disciples come closer to the city, Peter performs the miracle of letting a camel pass through a needle's eye in order to convince Onesiphorus of the gospel. When converted, he also wishes to try the trick, but the camel gets stuck at the neck since Onesiphorus is not yet baptised. In the end, all believe in the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, and bishops, presbyters, and deacons are ordained by the apostles (*Acts Pet. Andr.* 21).¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷ Note the obvious similarity between this passage and Acts 14:8–18.

¹⁶⁸ In the *Martyrdom of Andrew* (prius), Andrew argues that Jesus' crucifixion was the result of his own will by referring to Jesus' response to Peter's suggestion that it would not happen (Matt 16:22). *Ver. 1*: Cum frater meus Petrus diceret: Propitius esto tibi domine, non fiat istud, indignatus sic ait

The fragmentary nature and textual uncertainties of the corpus of *Andrean Acta* makes a thorough analysis of the Peter-image complicated. Conclusions can only be drawn on a fairly general level. The perspective of Peter as *traditional* authority who *embodies* a certain cultural capital can be discerned. The martyrdom of Peter has gained nearly mythological status, and the portrait of Peter as a teacher can be discerned also in e.g. the Pseudo-Clementines (see below). The association of Peter with mountains might allude to the transfiguration, which is significant in e.g. 2 Pet 1:16–22, but it is more likely that the references to Peter teaching by a mountain and miraculously ascending to its top with the help of John are allusions to Moses at Mount Sinai (cf. Exod 19).

The most significant feature of the *Andrean Acta* is the increased importance of Peter over time that can be detected. The *Acts of Peter and Andrew* has a very explicit and developed view of Peter as the supreme bishop and self-evident leader of the disciples. This text shows traces both of a clear hierarchical structure with bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and of trinitarian formulations that suggest that it has been used in a “proto-orthodox” context (although the text might have been modified on these points). As we will see in our treatment of some church fathers below, the significance of Peter for the episcopal office is increasingly discussed in the third century, and the text thus fits well into its time.

5.12.2 Peter in the Acts of John

The *Acts of John* is a collection of traditions from the second half of the second century and were known to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 3.25.6).¹⁶⁹ It speaks of the Acts of John in Ephesus and its vicinity and echoes the Johannine language of a beloved disciple. Peter appears in one concentrated section of this text. John tells how Jesus first chose Andrew and Peter, and then came to James and John and said *Χρῆζω ὑμῶν, ἔλθατε προς με* (I need you, come to me; *Acts John* 88). However, after the calling narrative, Andrew disappears from the story, and the Markan inner circle of Peter, James and John is at the forefront. Something that resembles the Synoptic account of the transfiguration occurs on a mountain together with Peter, James, and John (*Acts John* 90). The three disciples see Jesus praying at a distance, but John draws closer to Jesus and interacts with him. Peter and James get angry that

Petro: Vade retro Satanas, quia non sapis ea quae sunt dei. *Ver.* 2: “Ὅθεν τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου Πέτρῳ εἰπόντι αὐτῷ “Πλεῶς σοι κύριε, μὴ γένοιτο τοῦτο, ὀργισθεὶς βυτως εἶρηκεν αὐτῷ. “Ἦπαγε ὀπίσω μου Σατανᾶ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Ver.* 3: ᾧτινι ὁ ἕμος ἀδελφὸς Πέτρος λέλεγεν. “Πλεῶς σοι ἔσται κύριε· οὐ μὴ γένηται τοῦτο. Καὶ ἀγανακτήσας οὕτως ἔφη τῷ Πέτρῳ· “Ἦπαγε ὀπίσω μου Σατανᾶ, διότι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ

¹⁶⁹ Eric Junod and Jean-Daniel Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, CCSA 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1983), 695.

John is with the Lord, and shout to him to come back.¹⁷⁰ John also tells of an occasion when all the disciples were sleeping in Gennesaret, that he only pretended to sleep and heard Jesus converse with another being who concluded that a number of Jesus' followers did not believe in him (*Acts John* 92). It is made clear, however, that John is not among the unbelieving.

John plays a significant role in the group of apostles. He has a special calling to testify to the glory that surrounds the Lord and explain it to his brethren.¹⁷¹ John was identified as the beloved disciple of the Fourth Gospel in the context where this text originates but in contrast to the Gospel, which portrays a dynamic relationship between the beloved disciple and Peter, the Acts of John focuses solely on John and his superior insight. The Acts of John makes clear that although the disciples, and especially the inner circle of Peter, James, and John, are all witnesses to the ministry of the earthly Jesus to some extent, John alone is of superior insight. Peter's *traditional* authority and *embodied* cultural capital is diminished in order to exalt the Pseudo-Johannine understanding. Apostolic tradition could not be trivialised in the sphere of influence where this text originates, and the author therefore focuses on the limited scope of this tradition. If one wished a fuller understanding of the mysteries of Christ, one ought to adhere to the teachings of this Pseudo-Johannine figure.¹⁷²

5.12.3 Peter in the Acts of Paul

The *Acts of Paul* was written around the second half of the second century.¹⁷³ The Acts of Paul is often regarded as a continuation of canonical Acts, and from that perspective it is interesting to note whether it presupposes the same significant role

¹⁷⁰ Richard I. Pervo, "Johannine Trajectories in the Acts of John," *Apocrypha* 3 (1992): 47–68, n. 76 suggests that this might function as a counterblast to John 21.

¹⁷¹ Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, 490–91.

¹⁷² There are multiple attested endings to the narrative. In one version, the book ends with the disciples burying John's dead body, but the next day finding that only the sandals remain. They remember the words spoken by Jesus to Peter: τί γάρ σοι μέλει, ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν, ἕως ἔρχομαι; (In what manner is it your business if I wish him to remain until I come), thus echoing John 20:21–22, see Theodor Zahn, *Acta Joannis* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1880), 250.

¹⁷³ Léon Vouaux, *Les actes de Paul et ses lettres apocryphes* (Paris: Letouzey, 1913), 102–14. Richard I. Pervo, *The Acts of Paul* (Cambridge: Clarke, 2014), 41.

of Peter as in canonical Acts.¹⁷⁴ Peter is not prominent in the narrative and does not appear in person in the part of the narrative that is available today.¹⁷⁵

When the Acts of Paul tells the narrative of Paul's journey from Corinth to Italy, we learn of Ἀρτέμων ὁ [κ]υβερνήτη[ς τοῦ] πλοίου ἦν λελουμένος ὑπὸ Πέτρου (Artemon, the captain of the ship, who had been bathed by Peter).¹⁷⁶ This is obviously a reference to a significant person who has been baptised by Peter, and a direct acknowledgement of the significance of the Petrine mission. While Paul is on board the ship, the Lord comes to him on the water at night and says Πα[ῦλ]ε, ἄνωθεν μέλλω σταυρ[οῦσαι] (Paul, I am about to be crucified again). This is an obvious inference from the *Martyrdom of Peter* and is a preparation for the martyrdom account of Paul.¹⁷⁷ Paul objects to Jesus' statement, but is urged by Jesus to exhort the believers. When the ship arrives at the shore, Artemon helps Paul by presenting him to Claudius and carrying Paul's baggage. Paul begins to teach the

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Richard Bauckham, "The *Acts of Paul* as a Sequel to Acts," in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 105–52; idem., "The Acts of Paul: Replacement of Acts or Sequel to Acts," *Semeia* 80 (1997): 159–68; Peter W. Dunn, "The Acts of Paul and the Pauline Legacy in the Second Century" (PhD diss., Cambridge, 1996). It should be noted that Pervo has suggested that the Acts of Paul is a replacement rather than a sequel to Acts. This issue is not directly relevant to our study, and it is thus sufficient to note the dependence on Acts. See also Julian V. Hills, "The Acts of Paul and the Legacy of the Lukan Acts," *Semeia* 80 (1997): 145–58.

¹⁷⁵ There is a section of the text that is damaged beyond reconstruction dealing with Jerusalem in which Peter appears. The section appears to discuss Moses and the value of the Torah. Vouaux, *Actes de Paul*, 245, suggests two possible ways of interpreting the content of the passage: either it describes Paul visiting Peter in Jerusalem, or he speaks of the sufferings experienced by Peter and the other apostles, preferring the second alternative. However, he concludes that Paul for some reason goes to Jerusalem. Pervo, *Acts of Paul*, 207–12, suggests that Peter speaks in the passage and states that he and Paul agree on the issue of Torah-observance. However, the evidence is too fragmentary to draw any conclusions concerning the Peter-image from this passage.

¹⁷⁶ It is possible that the name Artemon is inferred from Acts 27:40. Furthermore, Theon in the *Actus Vercellenses* appears to be inspired by the Artemon-figure, as he is baptised by Peter and leaves the ship to prepare for Peter.

¹⁷⁷ This indicates the complex nature of the potential literary relationships. Whereas the *quo vadis* has been incorporated from the *Martyrdom of Peter* to the *Acts of Paul* (it makes more narrative sense in *Mart. Pet.*), Artemon is incorporated into the *Actus Vercellenses* as Theon. Yet, the *Actus Vercellenses* also incorporates the *Martyrdom of Peter*. For one who views the martyrdom account as an integral part of the *Actus Vercellenses* (which I do not) and dates it earlier than I do, the literary relationship is confusing. The *quo vadis* is significant for the narrative of the *Martyrdom of Peter*, but its main concept is copied into the *Acts of Paul*. Likewise, Artemon is significant for the narrative of the *Acts of Paul*, as he sets the stage for Paul's speech, but is incorporated into the *Actus Vercellenses* as one who leaves the ship and prepares for Peter, although this does not fill the same significant narrative function here.

“word of truth.” In doing so, he recounts various events from the Gospels. One passage in Paul’s speech is especially interesting for the purposes of our study:

“One of them, named Simon, was sufficiently convinced to say, ‘Lord, the deeds you accomplish are truly magnificent, for we have never heard nor have we [ever] seen someone other than you who raises the dead. [. . .]’ II. “[The Lord said] ‘[. . .], but the other works [. . .] these I perform as a temporary deliverance, while they are here, so that people may believe in the one who sent me.’ Simon said, ‘Lord, direct me to speak.’ ‘Speak, Peter.’ (For thereafter he always addressed them by name.)¹⁷⁸

This text is something of a parallel to the Synoptic account of the Petrine confession. It also contains the changing of names from Simon to Peter.

The Acts of Paul has a number of passages where Paul has typically Petrine experiences. Jesus walks on water and quotes well-known phrases from the *quoadis-section* of the Martyrdom of Peter. This points to Peter’s significance as a *traditional* authority, whose life and ministry plays a significant role in the social memory of early Christianity. Through association with Peter, Paul is legitimised.

5.12.4 Peter in the Acts of Thomas

The Acts of Thomas was written in Greek in second half of the second century.¹⁷⁹ The Acts of Thomas describes the call and ministry of Thomas as a missionary to India. In this long text, there are only two references to Peter. The first one is found in the very first sentence of the book, which contains a list of the apostles in Jerusalem, a list beginning with Peter. Peter is referred to as Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος (Simon who was called Peter).¹⁸⁰ However, this passage cannot be viewed as an underlining of Peter’s name-change, since it is basically a quotation of the list of apostles in Matt 10:2–4. The apostles divide the regions of the world among themselves, but we do not find any special mentioning of Peter.

¹⁷⁸ I follow here the reconstruction and translation of Pervo, *Acts of Paul*.

¹⁷⁹ Lautaro Roig Lanzilotta, “A Syriac Original for the Acts of Thomas? The Hypothesis of Syriac Priority Revisited,” in *Early Christian and Jewish Narrative. The Role of Religion in Shaping Narrative Forms*, ed. I. Ramelli and J. Perkins (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 105–34. Although it is often suggested that the Acts of Thomas was originally written in Syriac, most scholars agree that the Greek version that survives reflects an earlier version of the text than the Syriac, see Han J. W. Drijvers, “Thomasakten,” in *NTAp* 2:289–367.

¹⁸⁰ The Syriac version instead refers to Peter as “Simon Cephas.” The reason for this is probably that the Syriac text, just as the Greek, wishes to correspond to the reading of Matt 10:2–4 in the relevant language, see Francis Crawford Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the early Syriac Patristic evidence edited, collected and arranged*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: University press, 1904), 2:104.

The other reference to Peter is in *Acts Thom.* 86, where Peter is referred to as Πέτρῳ τῷ συναποστόλῳ ἡμῶν (Peter, our fellow apostle). However, the Syriac version instead refers to “Simon the Apostle.” Thomas is referring to Jesus’ words in Matt 26:52–53, but the identification of Peter as recipient of these words is taken from John 18:11. There is no critique of Peter here, but he is only mentioned in order to identify the example from the life of Jesus. The reference to Peter as a fellow apostle suggests that all twelve apostles are on equal authoritative standing in the Acts of Thomas.

Peter as one of the twelve apostles is part of the social memory of the Acts of Thomas, and he is some kind of *traditional* authority that *embodies* a certain cultural capital. However, this is only as one of the twelve, and he personally does not receive any especially authoritative characteristics.

5.12.5 Conclusion: Peter in the Leucian Acts

Despite their traditionally held connection, the so-called Leucian Acts are texts of different ideological outlook, which becomes quite evident when one studies the Peter-image. The significance of Peter in the Acts of Peter and Andrew is entirely incompatible with the low Peter-image of the Acts of John. However, the social memory of Peter as a significant apostle is common to all texts. It is remarkable that Paul piggybacks on typically Petrine characteristics in his Acts, thereby indicating the significant status of Peter in the context where it originated. Since the Leucian acts have shifting backgrounds and perspectives, they cannot credibly be analysed with our sociological categories as a corpus. Yet, the status of Peter as a *traditional* authority who *embodies* certain cultural can be found in the background of them all. Whereas the Acts of Andrew magnifies Peter’s significance, it is simply presupposed by the Acts of Paul and Acts of Thomas and diminished by the Acts of John.

5.13 Peter in Some Church Fathers

Apart from the early Christian texts studied above, there are also some references to Peter among the church Fathers. These references are often elaborations upon biblical texts or part of early ecclesial polemics, rather than narrative references. I will briefly comment and discuss only those passages where the ante-Nicene fathers discuss Peter’s role as an authoritative figure per se, excluding mere retellings and elaborations upon e.g. Gospel traditions where Peter occurs.

5.13.1 Peter in Irenæus

Peter plays an interesting role in Irenæus' (c. 130–202) discussion of Christian origins. Writing against the Marcionites, he rejects the notion that Paul alone would have known the truth and argues from Gal 2 that since Peter and Paul agreed to direct their missions toward Jews and gentiles respectively, they obviously must have agreed that their gospel was the same (*Hær* 3.13). He continues to argue that Peter could not have been altogether ignorant when Jesus says to him that flesh and blood have not revealed to him, but the Father himself (Matt 16:17). Irenæus continues by arguing that if Paul had some special knowledge, he certainly would have transmitted it to Luke, who would have put it in his Gospel (*Hær* 3.14). It is natural that Irenæus refers to Luke, since this is the Gospel which Marcion used in some form. However, Irenæus also uses Acts in order to refute Marcion—after all this text is written by the same author who in Irenæus' opinion also was a follower of Paul (cf. Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 5.8.3).¹⁸¹ Irenæus refers to the events described in Acts in order to argue for the legitimacy of the development of Christianity. Likewise, he argues for the legitimacy of apostolic succession and the hierarchy of the church, by referring to the church in Rome, whose legitimacy he traces to Peter and Paul.¹⁸² Peter's role as an authoritative figure is not elaborated upon in detail by Irenæus, but it is evident that he views Peter and Paul as significant *traditional* authorities that provide him and his fellow bishops with legitimacy for their *rational* authority. Thus, Peter's embodied cultural capital is institutionalised.

5.13.2 Peter in Tertullian

Tertullian (c. 155–c. 240) discusses Peter as an authoritative figure in greater detail than Irenæus.¹⁸³ The text that contains most interesting material for our purposes is *De præscriptione hæreticorum*, in which Peter is a central authoritative figure for Tertullian's refutation of heresies. This text is written when Tertullian was still "Catholic." In *Præscr.* 22, Tertullian states that the heretics sometimes claim that the apostles did not know everything. He argues that this is an absurd claim—Jesus lived inseparably with the disciples and explained everything to them. He asks:

¹⁸¹ As noted by Christopher Mount, *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*, NovTSup 104 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 35, Irenæus probably did not have any substantial information about the author of Luke-Acts and developed ideas which he found of a Luke in the Pauline epistles.

¹⁸² *Hær* 3.3.

¹⁸³ An especially interesting aspect of Tertullian is that he wrote first as a "Catholic" and later as a Montanist. Tertullian's confessional shift has arguably often been overemphasised—he is rather consistent in his views both as a Catholic and as a Montanist, cf. David Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge: University Press, 1995).

“Was anything hidden from Peter, the rock (*petram*) on which the Church was prescribed to be built, when he as a result received the keys of the kingdom of heaven and authority to loose and bind in heaven and on earth.”¹⁸⁴ Thus, he not only argues that the disciples gained all necessary knowledge from Jesus, but also emphasises the significance of Peter as an authoritative figure.¹⁸⁵ He also mentions John as an example. He continues by referring to Acts as a description of how the holy Spirit led the apostles in the early days of the church. Thus, Peter is significant as an authoritative figure not only as a link to Jesus that guarantees authentic Jesus tradition, but also as a legitimate initiating force in early Christianity.

Tertullian continues in ch. 23 by dealing with the incident at Antioch. Apparently, his opponents took Paul’s reproof of Peter as an indication that Peter indeed did not have full knowledge of Jesus’ teaching. Tertullian argues that this should not be understood as an indication that Peter and Paul preached different gospels—Paul himself admits that he had *ἱστορήσαι Κηφᾶν* in Galatians. It also appears that there is a discussion concerning the role and reliability of Acts. Tertullian argues in favour of the reliability of the text, whereas his opponents are sceptical. This is in line with my hypothesis above that Acts is at least partially an apology of the continuity between Peter and Paul. Tertullian concludes that Peter and Paul are shown to be equals in their respective martyrdoms (*Præscr.* 24).

In *Adversus Marcionem* 1.20, Tertullian deals with Marcion’s disposal of Peter and the other apostles, who were reproved by Paul in Galatians for not walking uprightly in the truth of the gospel. He now writes as a Montanist. He argues that although there was a conflict, they after resolving it joined their hands and divided themselves into a Jewish and a Gentile mission, thus, in Tertullian’s opinion, agreeing that their gospel was essentially the same. Hence, he is in continuity with his previous treatment of the events at Antioch. However, in *De Pudicitia* 21, Tertullian uses Peter for arguing against the authority of the hierarchy of the church for forgiving serious sins and propagates for more of a “spiritual” authority. His opponents view themselves as a church “akin to Peter” which thereby has the authority to bind and loose according to Matt 16. Tertullian argues that this authority is not passed down through hierarchy, but by the Spirit. Jesus’ words to Peter were to him personally, and do not automatically apply to the ecclesial hierarchy. Those

¹⁸⁴ “Latuit aliquid Petrum, aedificandae ecclesiae petram dictum, claves regni caelorum consecutum et soluendi et alligandi in caelis et in terris potestatem?”

¹⁸⁵ In *Scorp.* 10, he notes that the keys to the kingdom were given to Peter, and through him to the church. However, as he clarifies in *Pud.* 2, this does not mean that they were given to the ecclesial hierarchy per se, but to those who were of the same spirit as Peter, see below.

who have this authority are not necessarily those holding high ecclesial positions but are apostles and prophets who have the Spirit.

Tertullian bears witness to an interesting development of the view of Peter as an authoritative figure. His view of Peter as link to Jesus is paramount from the start. He also argues in favour of the historicity of Acts in order to explain the conflict between Peter and Paul in Antioch. However, his emphasis on Acts also leads him to believe that Peter's role is not merely to conserve the teachings of the Jesus tradition, but also to lead the earliest Church through his remarkable charismatic abilities. When he turns to Montanism, his basic belief in the bishops faithfully transmitting reliable apostolic teaching remains. However, when it comes to readmission of grievous sinners, he questions whether they have the power to do so, unless they have the Spirit of Christ.¹⁸⁶

5.13.3 Peter in Clement of Alexandria

Some attention must also be given to the writings of Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–c. 215). We have already noted that he quotes extensively from the *Preaching of Peter*, as well as from the epistles attributed to Peter, but there are also more independently Clementine mentions of Peter that are of interest. Apart from quoting a multitude of sources attributed to Peter in an authoritative way, Clement also mentions details of Peter's life such as his encouragement at the martyrdom of his wife (*Strom.* 7.11) and that he had children (*Strom.* 3.6). Clement also claims in his commentary on First Peter that Peter preached in Rome, and that Mark wrote his Gospel entirely from what Peter preached.¹⁸⁷

Clement makes a significant distinction between the age of the apostles, to whom he also counts Paul, and the following era (*Strom.* 7.17). All heresies were invented from the time of Hadrian and onwards. Common for the first true heretics, in Clement's opinion, was that they considered themselves to be disciples of a disciple of an apostle, i.e. claiming some form of apostolic succession. Clement writes: ὁ Βασιλείδης, κὰν Γλαυκίαν ἐπιγράφηται διδάσκαλον, ὡς ἀρχοῦσιν αὐτοί, τὸν Πέτρου ἐρμηνεία (they boast that Basilides claims Glaucias, Peter's interpreter, as his teacher; *Strom.* 7.17).¹⁸⁸ Clement uses this to argue that the truth of the Church

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Rankin, *Tertullian*, 115.

¹⁸⁷ Only fragments of the commentary have survived.

¹⁸⁸ Clement continues: ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Οὐαλεντίνον Θεοδᾶ διακηκοῖναι φέρουσιν γνώριμος δ' οὗτος γέγονε Παύλου. Μαρκίων γὰρ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αὐτοῖς ἡλικίαν γενόμενος ὡς πρεσβύτερος νεωτέρους συνεγένετο. Thus, Peter is not the only one to whom succession is claimed, but also other apostles. N.B. that in the following sentence, Simon is claimed to have listened to the preachings of Peter for a short while.

was more ancient than the heresies (Clement ignores that there is doctrinal controversy already in the New Testament texts).¹⁸⁹ For the purposes of this study, it is interesting to note that Clement's opponents claimed to be true transmitters of the teachings of e.g. Peter and Paul. Yet, Clement himself follows the same logic when arguing for his own authority.¹⁹⁰

Ἄλλ οἱ μὲν τὴν ἀληθῆ τῆς μακαρίας σώζοντες διδασκαλίας παράδοσιν εὐθὺς ἀπὸ Πέτρου τε καὶ Ἰακώβου Ἰωάννου τε καὶ Παύλου τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδεχόμενος (ὀλίγοι δὲ οἱ πατέραςιν ὅμοιοι), ἤκον δὴ σὺν θεῷ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς τὰ προγονικὰ ἐκεῖνα καὶ ἀποστολικὰ καταθησόμενοι σπέρματα.

They preserved the truth of the blessed doctrine that was delivered directly to Peter, James, John, and Paul, the holy apostles. They received it from the Father as sons (but few are like the fathers), who therefore deposited this ancestral and apostolic seed to us according to God's will.¹⁹¹

Clement argues that the true γνῶσις (knowledge) can only be derived from these apostles (*Strom.* 6.8). Jesus imparted γνῶσις to James, John, and Peter following his resurrection, which they in turn imparted to the other apostles and the seventy (*Hyp.* 7 quoted in *Hist. Eccl.* 2.1.4). He also claims that it was Peter, James, and John who chose James the Just as bishop of Jerusalem (*Hyp.* 7 quoted in *Hist. Eccl.* 2.1.3).

Having dealt with some texts that reflect Clement's high view of apostles in general, let us now turn to some texts where he elaborates more specifically on Peter. Clement claims that the only one to be baptised by Christ himself is Peter, who in turn baptised Andrew, who in turn baptised John, and then they baptised the rest together (Fragment of *Hyp.* 5 In *Pratum Spirituale* 176). However, the most well-renowned statement concerning Peter as an authoritative figure in Clement can be found in his book on the *Salvation of the Rich*:

τοιγάρτοι τούτων ἀκούσας ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος, ὁ ἐκλεκτός, ὁ ἐξαίρετος, ὁ πρῶτος τῶν μαθητῶν, ὑπὲρ οὗ μόνου καὶ ἑαυτοῦ τὸν φόρον ὁ σωτὴρ ἐκτελεῖ, ταχέως ἤρπασε καὶ συνέβαλε τὸν λόγον. καὶ τί φησιν; “Ἰδὲ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμεν σοι.”

¹⁸⁹ See discussion in Johannes Bernard, *Die apologetische Methode bei Klemens von Alexandrien*, ETS 21 (Leipzig: St. Benno, 1968), 103.

¹⁹⁰ As pointed out by Denise Kimber Buell, *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy* (Princeton, NJ: University Press, 1999), 67–68, Clement and his opponents use the same logic to argue for the authenticity of their respective teachings. This rhetoric is obviously only truly persuasive to those who already adhere to one side or another.

¹⁹¹ *Strom.* 1.1.

Therefore, on hearing this the blessed Peter, the chosen, the pre-eminent, the first of the disciples, for whom with himself alone the Saviour pays tribute, quickly grasped and understood the saying. And what does he say? Behold, we have forsaken all and followed you.¹⁹²

Although Clement most of the time places Peter on equal level as James, John, and sometimes also Paul, he here refers to him as the *πρώτος τῶν μαθητῶν* (first of the disciples; perhaps alluding to Matt 10:2) and *ἐξάίρετος* (pre-eminent). Clement's point in the narrative has nothing to do with Peter as an authoritative figure in relation to other early Christian figures. He serves as an example of how one is to follow Christ. The words of exaltation connected to Peter could indicate that Peter played a significant role in Clement's worldview, but Peter is not contrasted to the other disciples in any way, and thus we cannot infer from this text whether he thought of Peter as superior to the other apostles in some way. As we noted in Matthew, *πρώτος τῶν μαθητῶν* can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Furthermore, it is possible that Clement would make a distinction between apostles and disciples.

In conclusion, Clement evidently has a high view of Peter and views him as a significant *traditional* authority, whose *charismatic* authority has been institutionalised through the ecclesial hierarchy. However, this authoritative role is not unique to Peter but shared with a multitude of other early apostles.

5.13.4 Peter in Origen

As a prolific writer, as well as a disciple of Clement of Alexandria, it is suitable to examine whether Origen (c. 184–c. 253) shares and perhaps expands upon the view of Peter compared to Clement. What is immediately evident is that the expanded temporal distance between Peter and Origen, compared to Peter and Clement, is reflected in the absence of references to personal links to Peter in order to argue authentic teaching. However, Peter still serves as the role-model for Christian leadership. Yet, Origen has a more sceptical view concerning apostolic succession as grounds for legitimate ecclesial hierarchy and argues that the true leaders of the true church are people with special spiritual capabilities (such as himself).¹⁹³

¹⁹² *Quis. div.* 21.3–5.

¹⁹³ See discussion in Joseph W. Trigg, "The Charismatic Intellectual: Origen's Understanding of Religious Leadership," *CH* 50 (1981): 5–19. See *Homilies on Jeremiah* 12.3 οὐδενὸς φείδεται ὁ μέλλων κολάζειν. οὐκ ἐπεὶ προφήτης τις ἐχρημάτισεν, ἔχει δὲ ἁμαρτήματα, οὐ πληρωθήσεται τῶν λεγομένων ἀπειλῶν. οὐκ ἐπεὶ ἱερεὺς τις ἐχρημάτισεν καὶ ἔδοξεν ὑπεροχὴν ὀνόματος ἔχειν τιμικτέρου παρὰ τὸν λαόν, φεοῖται αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς ὥστε αὐτὸν μὴ κολασθῆναι ἁμαρτήσαντα. τα δὲ περὶ ἐκείνων ἀναγεγραμμένα, φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἐγράφη δι' ἡμᾶς εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήνησεν. εἰ τις οὖν καὶ ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἱεροῦσι

ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐχρῆν, εἰ καὶ κοινόν τι ἐπὶ τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τῶν νουθητήσαντων τρίς τοὺς ἀδελφούς λέλεκται, ἐξαιρέτόν τι ἔχειν τὸν Πέτρον παρὰ τοὺς τρίς νουθητήσαντας, ἰδίᾳ τοῦτο προτέτακται ἐπὶ τοῦ Πέτρου τὸ δῶσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ὁ ἐὰν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τοῦ καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. καίτοιγε εἰ ἐπιμελῶς προσέχομεν τοῖς εὐαγγελικοῖς γράμμασι, καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα, τὰ δοκούντα εἶναι κοινὰ πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς τρίς νουθητήσαντας τοὺς ἀδελφούς, πολλὴν διαφορὰν καὶ ὑπεροχὴν ἐκ τῶν πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον εἰληφέναι τὰς κλεῖδας οὐχ ἐνὸς οὐρανοῦ ἀλλὰ πλειόνων καὶ ἵνα, ὅσα ἐὰν δήσῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἢ δεδεμένα οὐκ ἐν ἐνὶ μόνον οὐρανῷ ἀλλ' ἐν πᾶσιν οὐρανοῖς, πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς δὲ ὄντας δέοντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὕτω λέγεσθαι, ὥστε ταῦτα δεδέσθαι καὶ λελύσθαι οὐκ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὡς ἐπὶ Πέτρου, ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐνί· οὐ γὰρ διαβαίνουσι τῇ δυνάμει, ὡς Πέτρος, ἵνα δήσωσιν ἢ λύσωσιν ἐν πᾶσιν οὐρανοῖς.

But since it was necessary, even if something common had been said concerning Peter and those who had admonished the brethren three times, that Peter would have something special compared to those who three times had admonished, for this was predetermined for Peter: "I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven that it might thereafter be loosed on earth. And if we were to study the evangelical writings carefully, we would also find there, and among the things common to Peter and those brethren who have been admonished three times, that Peter is in some way superior, since he received the keys not only of heaven, but of more, in order that whatever he might loose on earth will not only be loosed in one heaven, but in all heavens, in contrast to the many who are said to bind on earth, who do not loose and bind in the heavens, as Peter does, but only in one heaven, and do not have the power, as Peter, to loose and bind in all heavens.¹⁹⁴

From this passage isolated from its context, it might appear that Origen exalts Peter as an authoritative figure in a significant way. However, in light of his discussion of Peter in relation to Matt 16, it becomes evident that this is not necessarily the case.

Καὶ εἰ τις λέγει τοῦτο πρὸς αὐτόν, οὐ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος ἀποκαθφάντων αὐτῷ ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς πατρός, τεύξεται τῶν εἰρημένων, ὡς μὲν τὸ γράμμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου λέγει πρὸς ἐκεῖνον τὸν Πέτρον, ὡς δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ διδάσκει πρὸς πάντα τὸν γενόμενον, ὁποῖος ὁ Πέτρος ἐκεῖνος.

And if anyone says this to him, not by flesh and blood revealing it to him, but the Father in the heavens, it will come upon him what was spoken according to the letter of the Gospel

(δείκνυμι δὲ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἡμᾶς) ἢ ἐν τούτοις τοῖς περιεστηκόσι τὸν λαὸν λειταις (λέγω δὲ τοὺς διακόνους) ἀμαρτάνει, ἔξει ταύτην τὴν κόλασιν· ὡς πάλιν εὐλογία τινές εἰσιν ἱερατικάι, περὶ ὧν θεοῦ διδόντος οὐ μακράν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν ἐξέτασιν τοῦ λόγου τοῦ προφητικοῦ εἰσόμθετα ἀναγινωσκόμενων τῶν Ἀριτιμῶν· περὶ γὰρ ἱερέων ἐκεῖ τινα μέλλει λέγεσθαι; and *Homilies on Numbers* 2.1, *Nam saepe accidit, ut is, qui humilem sensum gerit et abiectum et qui terrana sapit, excelsum sacerdotii gradum vel cathedram doctoris obsideat et ille, qui spiritalis est et a terrana conversatione tam liber, ut possit examinare omnia et ipse a nemmine iudicari vel inferioris ministerii ordinem teneat vel etiam in plebia multitudine relinquatur*

¹⁹⁴ Origen *Comm. Matt.* 13.31.

concerning a certain Peter, but as the spirit of the Gospel teaches, to everyone who becomes as this Peter.¹⁹⁵

Origen thus makes clear that Peter's authority is not restricted to his own person, but to all those who have the same revelation of Christ's identity as Peter. It is not primarily the historical person Peter that is important to Origen, but Peter serves an ideal example. As pointed out by Marguerite Harl, Origen argues that Peter is not really different from the other disciples apart from having received a revelation from God.¹⁹⁶ Others with the same revelation also receive the same status.

ἐπει δὲ οἱ τὸν τόπον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐκδικούντες χρώνται τῷ σκοπῆς ἐκδικούντες χρώνται τῷ ῥήτῳ ὡς Πέτρος, καὶ τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτήρος εὐληφότες διδάσκουσί τε τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν δεδεμένα τούτεστι καταδικασμένα καὶ ἐν οὐρανοῖς δεδέσθαι καὶ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν λελυμένα τούτεστιν ἄφεσιν εὐληφόντα καὶ ἐν οὐρανοῖς λελύσθαι, λεκτέον ὅτι ὕγιως λέγουσιν, εἰ ἔχουσιν ἔργον δι' ὃ εἴρηται ἐκείνῳ τῷ Πέτρῳ· σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ εἶ τηλικούτοί εἰσον, ὡς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ οἰκοδομεῖσθαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς εὐλόγως τοῦτο ἀναφέροιτ' ἄν. πύλαι δὲ ἄδου οὐκ ὀφείλουσι κατισχύειν τοῦ θέλοντος δεσμῆν καὶ λύειν. εἰ δὲ σειραῖς τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων αὐτοῦ ἐσφιγκται, μάτην καὶ δεσμῆν καὶ λύει.

But when those holding the office of bishop in their jurisdiction use this word as Peter, and having received the keys of the kingdom of heaven from the Saviour, teach that things bound by them, that is, condemned, are also bound in the heavens, and that those who have been loosed by them, that is, received forgiveness, have also been loosed in the heavens. We can say that they truly speak, if they have deeds such as found with this certain Peter, "You are Peter," and if they are so great that Christ might build his Church upon them, that it might be blessed and exalted. Oh, that he who wishes to bind and loose will not be put to shame by the gates of Hades. But if he is chained with the wounds of his sins, he binds and looses in vain.¹⁹⁷

Origen claims that the office of bishop has the same authority as that of Peter, but that it is only valid when the bishop lives a life like Peter, i.e. a life free from sin. Origen makes clear later in his text, that one might become a "Peter" (Origen *Comm. Matt.* 12.32)

Origen continues his discussion by turning to Matt 16:22–23, and the reference to Peter as a stumbling-block (*Comm. Matt.* 12.23). Origen argues that it is not the content of what Peter says that creates a stumbling-block, but rather its origin: human thinking rather than divine revelation. This, he argues, is the difference between the doctrines of God and the church and the teachings of Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion. Thus, the embodiment of Peter in the bishop is not limited to e.g. absolution, but also pertains to the authenticity of teaching. Being a true

¹⁹⁵ Origen *Comm. Matt.* 13.11

¹⁹⁶ As noted by Marguerite Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du verbe incarné*, PS 2 (Paris: du Seuil, 1958), 249.

¹⁹⁷ Origen *Comm. Matt.* 12.14.

bishop means being a bishop with life and doctrine of Petrine standard, thereby embodying the authority given to Peter in Matt 16 in its entirety. When these prerequisites are not filled, the bishop does not possess the divine authority bestowed upon the Petrine office, and his words are empty and vain.

Origen also refers to Peter in his *Homilies on Exodus* 5.4.

Vide magno illi ecclesiae fundamento et petrae solidissimae, super quam Christus fundavit ecclesiam, quid dictatur a Domino: "modicae" inquit "fidei, quare dubitasti"

Look at this great foundation of the Church and the solid rock (petra) on which Christ founded the Church. Why does the Lord say: "You of little faith, why did you doubt?"

The preserved Latin text exposes that the problem of distinguishing between Πέτρος/πέτρα has a counterpart in *Petrus/petra*. The first part of the homily has spoken of Paul's interpretation of the rock (*petra*) in the desert at the exodus as referring to Christ. However, in this sentence, the context strongly suggests that Peter is referred to. It is debatable whether *petra* here refers to the description of Peter as πέτρα in Matt 16:18, or if the Latin translator has simply assumed that Origen is still speaking of the rock in the desert—Christ. In any case, an association to Matt 16:18 is not far-fetched. By quoting Jesus' words to Peter in Matt 14:31 (ἀλιγόπιστε, εἰς τί ἐδίστασας) Origen makes clear that he has transferred to speaking of Peter. Origen also mentions Peter as an example in his commentary on John and portrays Peter and Judas as opposites: whereas Peter confesses Christ, Judas hands him over.¹⁹⁸

Origen slightly modifies Clement's views of Peter as an authoritative figure. Being in ecclesial continuity with Peter alone is not enough for authenticity—it is necessary to live a life like Peter's in order to claim Petrine authority. Thus Origen seeks to find a balance between spiritual and institutional authority.

5.13.5 Peter in Cyprian and Stephen

Cyprian (c. 200–258) explicitly discusses the importance of Peter as an authoritative figure in the 250s. In *Ep.* 33, he introduces a quotation from Matt 16:18–19 by stating that *Dominus noster, cuius praecepta metuere et obseruare debemus, episcopi honorem et ecclesiae suae rationem disponens in euangelio loquitur et dicit Petro:* (When our Lord, whose commands we are obliged to fear and keep, accounts for the honour of the bishop and the ordering of his church, speaks in the Gospel and

¹⁹⁸ Cf. *Comm. Joh.* 32.24. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Πέτρῳ ὁμολογοῦντι τὸ «Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος» ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πατρὸς, νῦν ἦν, ἀλλὰ νῦν ἅμα αὐτῷ καὶ ἄρνησις ἦν καὶ νῦν τοίνυν ὅτε λαβῶν τὸ ψωμίον ὁ Ἰούδας καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εὐθύς, τότε ἐξεληθόντι αὐτῷ νῦν ἦν...

says to Peter). After the quotation, he states that *Inde per temporum et successionum vices Episcoporum ordination et ecclesiae ratio decurrit ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernator* (From that point on, the ordination of bishops and ordering of the church runs through times and successions, so that the affairs of the Church are settled on the bishops, and all acts of the Church are governed by the same supervisors). As noted by Arne Palmqvist, Cyprian uses Matt 16:18–19 as a *charta episcopatus* in his argumentation.¹⁹⁹ Also in *Ep.* 43, he makes clear that *Deus unus est et Christus unus et una ecclesia et cathedra una super Petrum domini voce fundata* (God is one and Christ is one and the Church is one and the chair is one, which was founded on the voice of God). It is evident that the episcopal office is closely connected to Peter in Cyprian's thought. This becomes all the more evident in *De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* (On the Unity of the Catholic Church), where Peter is described as a *primus inter pares*, from which all other bishops can trace their succession (see also *Unit. Eccl.* 4).²⁰⁰ Cyprian is probably influenced by Tertullian, but the problem addressed has been broadened from the issue of authentic teaching to the unity of the church.²⁰¹ However, this section of Cyprian's text exists in two versions, and Cyprian himself is considered to have revised his text in response to certain events.²⁰² In the original version, he speaks of the unity of the church in terms of the oneness of Peter, quoting Jesus' command to Peter in John 21:17 to "feed my sheep." This version reflects Cyprian's support of Cornelius during the Novatian Schism.²⁰³ The revised version appears as a response to the new bishop of Rome, Stephen, who argued that he had jurisdiction outside his own see. In the revised version, Cyprian omits the reference to the "single chair of Peter" and instead quotes John 20:21–23, stressing that Christ assigned like power to all the apostles after the resurrection. The first version reads

¹⁹⁹ Arne Palmqvist, "Cyprianus och primatfrågan," *NKT* 27 (1958): 152–72.

²⁰⁰ Maurice Bévenot, "Primatus Petro Datur—St. Cyprian on the Papacy," *JTS* 5 (1954): 19–35.

²⁰¹ See S. L. Greenslade, *Early Latin Theology: Selections from Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose and Jerome*, LCC 5 (London: SCM, 1956), 120. See also discussion in Hans von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, BHT 14 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953), 292–322.

²⁰² See Maurice Bévenot, *De Lapsis and De Ecclesiae Unitate*, OECT (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), x–xv. See also discussion in Russel Murray, "Assessing the Primacy: A Contemporary Contribution from the Writings of St. Cyprian of Carthage," *JES* 47 (2012): 41–63. For a thorough discussion of the text-critical issues, see Maurice Bévenot, *The Tradition of Manuscripts: A Study in the Transmission of St. Cyprian's Treatises* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 54–135.

²⁰³ See Greenslade, *Early Latin Theology*, 122–23.

Hanc Petri unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui cathedram Petri, super quem fundata ecclesia est, deserit, in ecclesia se esse condidit?

If someone does not stick to this oneness of Peter, does he believe that he sticks to the faith? He who abandons the chair of Peter, on which the Church is founded, has he placed himself so that he is in the Church?²⁰⁴

In retrospect, it is easy to see that the text could be interpreted as arguing for the superiority of the Roman see. In his revision, Cyprian instead writes:

Hoc errant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur ut ecclesia Christi una monstraretur.

It is irrefutably so that the other apostles were endowed with the same office and honour and power as Peter, but the beginning comes from unity in order that the church of Christ will be revealed as one.²⁰⁵

This is an interesting example of how the conception of Peter as an authoritative figure is used to argue the legitimacy of one's own theological position and is later modified in response to contemporary events in order to maintain one's opinion. The reference to the "chair of Peter" is omitted. In the first version, Peter emerges as a link to the earthly Jesus who maintains the unity of the church through guaranteeing authentic doctrine. The unity of the church is the objective also in the revised version, but this time Cyprian also displays an awareness of not only safeguarding the doctrine, but also interpreting it in a new situation. The issue at stake is the readmission of the lapsed, where Cyprian stresses the collegiality of the bishops and need to find a unified solution to the problem, whereas Stephen ignores the opinions of the North African bishops. Therefore, he emphasises that it is not the Roman see per se that is the foundation of the church, but the unified collegium of bishops that represents the oneness of Peter and thereby the oneness of the Church. Thus, Peter is still the foundational symbol for unity to Cyprian, but he changes his description of Peter's unifying function in response to the Roman bishop who is disturbing the unity.

Stephen of Rome apparently appreciates Cyprian's formulation in the first version of *De Unitate*. In *Ep. 74.17* of the Collection of Cyprian's epistles, it appears that Stephen has made claims to be sitting on the throne of Peter and claiming that the chair of Peter is not an expression of the episcopal office in general, but rather an exclusive feature of the see of Rome.²⁰⁶ Based on this argument, he claims

²⁰⁴ *Unit. Eccl.* 4.97–102.

²⁰⁵ *Unit. Eccl.* 4.92–98.

²⁰⁶ See also *Hist. Eccl.* 7.3.

to have jurisdiction also outside his own see and without having to consider the opinions of his fellow bishops. This is the first claim of the bishop of Rome to be the exclusive successor of Peter and is therefore of great historical significance. This is the most elaborate discussion during the studied period concerning the institutionalisation of Peter's embodied cultural capital and its practical significance.

5.13.6 Conclusion: Peter in Some Church Fathers.

The material from the church fathers testifies to a significant development in thought concerning Peter as an authoritative figure. We find the whole range from claiming Peter as a link to authentic Jesus tradition (Irenæus and Clement), via Peter as spiritual standard (Tertullian and Origen) to a discussion concerning the emergence of a Roman papacy (Cyprian and Stephen). Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement all emphasise Peter's full knowledge of the gospel. For the first two, it is also significant to emphasise Peter's continuity with Paul. They both refer to Luke-Acts to argue their case, and the need for defending the Petrine-Pauline connection could be at least partially explained with a concern for refuting Marcionism.²⁰⁷

Both Tertullian and Clement use Peter in order to strengthen their own position and establish their own authority by establishing an appropriate Petrine connection. Tertullian accepts that continuity with Peter brings legitimacy to leadership but argues that this continuity does not come through the title of the office, but through the Holy Spirit. A similar position is taken by Origen. Apparently, there are conflicts where both sides claim Petrine legitimation for their respective positions. Irenæus bestows Peter on both *traditional* and *rational* authority. Tertullian acknowledges both these aspects but argues that the *institutionalised*

²⁰⁷ Irenæus views Luke as a representative of Pauline theology and argues that it is in line with Petrine theology. Tertullian argues from Acts in favour of the continuity between the gospels of Peter and Paul. At the same time, a revised version of Luke was used by Marcion to claim the opposite. This puts Luke-Acts at the centre of the discussion of authentic Gospel tradition in the late second and early third centuries. At the time of Tertullian, the ecclesial hierarchy explicitly derived their authority from Peter. Joseph Ludwig suggests that Irenæus focuses more on the *person* of Peter, whereas Tertullian focuses on his *function*. See Joseph Ludwig, *Die Primatworte Mt 16, 18, 19 in der altkirchlichen Exegese*, NTAbh 19 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1952). He summarises (11): "Bei Irenäus ist es die Person des Petrus, in Afrika sein Amt; bei Irenäus die Ursache, in Afrika die Folge; bei Irenäus das innere Licht, in Afrika die äußere Anerkennung. Oder mit anderen Worten: bei Irenäus steht im Vordergrund der Christ. In Afrika die Kirche." Although I think there is something to this, Tertullian does not suggest a full embrace of the ecclesial hierarchy, which Ludwig's suggestion would imply. The function of Peter pertains to clergy that is filled with the Spirit, but not automatically to all clergy, according to Tertullian. Thus, Tertullian both defends the legitimacy of the ecclesial hierarchy and criticises what he views as its lack of Spirit.

cultural capital of Peter cannot be derived from succession, but only from possession of similar spiritual qualities. Clement focuses on Peter as *traditional* authority and emphasises the institutionalisation of this authority through the ecclesial hierarchy, whereas Origen claims that Petrine authority can only be invoked when one shares Peter's *charisma*. The debate between Cyprian and Stephen pertains mainly to the limitations of the institutionalised Petrine Charismatic authority—is it accessible for all bishops or reserved for the bishop of one geographical location.

5.14 Peter in the Pseudo-Clementines

Although the Pseudo-Clementines in the present form date from the fourth century, it is widely agreed that they are an elaboration and expansion upon an original work that is commonly referred to as the *Periodoi Petrou*.²⁰⁸ The original version of the work probably stems from a Jewish-Christian group in Syria around the middle of the second century C.E.²⁰⁹ Yet, the text should not be considered to be Jewish-Christian as opposed to some kind of proto-orthodoxy, but rather as a Christian context with Jewish roots, although being open to gentile conversion and participation through baptism.²¹⁰ F. Stanley Jones suggests that the *Grundschrift* stems from ca 220 C.E. (but incorporates sources that are older than that).²¹¹

²⁰⁸ See F. Stanley Jones, *The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines: An Early Version of the First Christian Novel* (Paris: Brepols, 2014), 16.

²⁰⁹ Cf. Georg Strecker, "Die Pseudoklementinen," in *NTAp II*, ed. W. Schneemelcher (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989), 439–47; Jürgen Wehnert, *Pseudoklementinische Homilien: Einführung und Übersetzung*, KAL 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 29–42. As noted by Erwin K. Broadhead, *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus: Redrawing the Religious Map of Antiquity*, WUNT I/266 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 273, especially Ps.-Clem. *Recognitions* 1.27–71 bear distinctively Jewish-Christian marks, portraying the Christian teaching as really being "true Judaism." Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:16, argues that it was published "at all events some years before the close of the second century." The question of locating the Pseudo-Clementines is of course complicated by the fact that we do not have access to the *Grundschrift*. Nicole Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines: Situating the Recognitions in Fourth Century Syria*, WUNT II/213 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 180–82, locates the *Recognitions* to Antioch.

²¹⁰ Cf. Annette Yoshiko Reed, "'Jewish Christianity' after the 'Parting of the Ways': Approaches to Historiography and Self-Definition in the Pseudo-Clementines," in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed, TSAJ 95 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 189–231.

²¹¹ F. Stanley Jones, *Pseudoclementina elchasaiticaque inter judaeochristiana: Collected Studies*, OLA 203 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 33. Wehnert, *Pseudoklementinische Homilien*, 32, argues that it can

Since the Pseudo-Clementine Romance has been edited (the Homilies and Recognitions being the editions extant to our day), it is hard to draw conclusions from the details of the narrative, since the text has undergone multiple translations and editions.²¹² However, the greater narrative might give us an indication of the view of Peter as an authoritative figure in a Jewish-Christian sphere of influence in Syria around the turn of the third century.²¹³ Considering that at least the clearly Jewish-Christian source in 1.27–71 probably claimed Matthean authorship, one might wonder whether there was a connection between Matthean Christianity and this original source, not least considering their common focus on Peter as an authoritative interpreter and preserver of authentic Jesus tradition.²¹⁴ Tomas Hägg argues that the *Grundschrift* mainly aimed at contesting paganism, only subsequently being revised in order to deal with internal Christian strife.²¹⁵ Although this possibility cannot be ruled out, I consider the text to rather suggest internal self-definition to be the core of the message and purpose of the novel. Peter is portrayed as the reliable witness from whom true Christianity is derived, as opposed to the heretic Simon Magus.

The Pseudo-Clementines have a long history of being read as a conflict over authority, the most well-known attempt being that of F. C. Baur, who found in the Pseudo-Clementines a conflict between Peter and Paul. A more at face value reading of the texts would suggest polemics against Simon Magus and the theological system he represented. However, this should not be restricted to a discussion concerning the actual teachings of the “historical Simon Magus,” but rather Simon Magus personifies the views and arguments of various forms of heterodox Christianity, in the view of the writer. Nicole Kelley argues that suggestions of anti-Paulinism, anti-Marcionism, and anti-Gnosticism are not necessarily contra-

hardly have been written earlier than the 220's, and basis his argument on Bernhard Rehm, “Bardesanes in den Pseudoclementinen,” *Philologus* 93 (1938): 218–47, which corresponds to H. J. W. Drijwers, *Bardasian of Edessa*, SSN 6 (Assen: Prakke, 1966), 9–10. However, A. Hilgenfeld, *Bardesanes, der letzte Gnostiker* (Leipzig: Weigen, 1864), 72–151, argues for the priority of the Pseudo-Clementines.

²¹² Earlier research often viewed the *Homilies* as an early second century re-writing of the *Recognitions*, thus dating the entire composition earlier than today—mostly due to its Jewish-Christian character, see Schwegler, *Nachapostolische Zeitalter*, 1:481.

²¹³ For a rather contemporary introduction to the Pseudo-Clementines, cf. Graham N. Stanton, “Jewish Christian Elements in the Pseudo-Clementine Writings,” in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 305–24.

²¹⁴ See F. Stanley Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity* Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27–71, SBLTT 37, SBLCAT 2 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995), 155.

²¹⁵ Tomas Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 162–64.

dictory, but rather symptomatic of the different redactional stages of the text.²¹⁶ Georg Strecker argues that the original *Kerygma Petrou* consisted of pure anti-Pauline polemic that was supplemented in later redactions with polemics against Marcion and Simon Magus.²¹⁷ What is clear, is that the narrative is a narrative about good and evil, personified in Peter and Simon. Hans-Josef Klauck describes it as a competition between two magicians, comparable to the more contemporary *Lord of the Rings* or *Harry Potter*.²¹⁸

It should be noted that Paul is never explicitly mentioned, and the passages that are regarded as presenting the clearest references to Paul (albeit disguised as Simon Magus) are not at all that clear.²¹⁹ H 17.13–19 is often regarded as the most explicit reference to Paul, where Peter argues that his physical knowledge of Jesus is more reliable than dreams and visions.²²⁰ If we imagine Simon Magus as representing “heterodox” groups claiming divine knowledge through revelation as opposed to Petrine Christianity that traces its roots to a physical relationship to Jesus, this argument makes sense. It is also true that Paul knew Jesus through revelation rather than from physical experience. Yet, Paul himself argues on the basis of the

²¹⁶ Kelley, *Knowledge*, 36.

²¹⁷ Georg Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Berlin: Akademie, 1981), 154, n. 1. See also, more recently, Jürgen Wehnert, “Antipaulinismus in den Pseudoklementinen,” in *Ancient Perspectives on Paul*, ed. T. Nicklas, A. Merkt, and J. Verheyden, NTOA 102 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 170–90; Frédéric Amsler, “La construction de l’homme ennemi ou l’antipaulinisme dans le corpus pseudo-Clémentin,” in *Receptions of Paul in Early Christianity: The Person of Paul and His Writings Through the Eyes of His Early Interpreters*, BZNTW 234 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 729–48.

²¹⁸ Hans-Josef Klauck, *Die apokryphe Bibel: Ein anderer Zugang zum frühen Christentum*, TrC 4 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 229.

²¹⁹ See discussion in Päivi Vähäkangas, “Christian Identity and Intra-Christian Polemics in the Pseudo-Clementines,” in *Others and the Construction of Early Christian Identities*, ed. R. Hakola, N. Nikki, and U. Tervahauta, SESJ 106 (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2013), 217–35.

²²⁰ Cf. Baur, “Christuspartei,” 133. For a more comprehensive argument for the anti-Paulinism of the Pseudo-Clementines, cf. Lüdemann, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel*, 245–57. Patricia A. Duncan, *Novel Hermeneutics in the Greek Pseudo-Clementine Romance*, WUNT 1/395 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 30, argues that this is in fact the only place where tension between Peter and Paul becomes “unmistakably palpable.” Jürgen Wehnert, “Petrus versus Paulus in den pseudoklementinischen Homilien 17,” in *Christians as a Religious Minority in a Multicultural City: Modes of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome. Studies on the Basis of a Seminar at the Second Conference of the European Association for Biblical Studies (EABS) from July 8–12, 2001, in Rome*, ed. J. Zangenberg and M. Labahn (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 175–85, argues that this passage is part of the oldest literary layer of the text, while emphasising that the suggested conflict between Peter and Paul does not necessarily reflect strife between these two as historical figures.

Petrine connection to the earthly Jesus.²²¹ Thus, reading Paul into this conflict appears to reflect the Baurian dichotomic system rather than the testimony of the actual texts available. Furthermore, at the time for the composition of the Pseudo-Clementine Romance, Paulinism was hardly the first movement one would think of in relation to revelation-based authority.

F. Stanley Jones has argued extensively that R. 1.27–71 is dependent on canonical Acts and wishes to replace it.²²² In light of this, it appears odd that Paul, who is so central to Acts, is not mentioned in the Pseudo-Clementines. At the same time, we must remember that neither the Pseudo-Clementines nor canonical Acts were written with the sole purpose of portraying history *wie es eigentlich gewesen* but use their histories in order to convey their respective messages and legitimise their respective communities. If Paul was not a significant figure in the context from which the *Grundschrift* of the Pseudo-Clementines originates, it is not strange that he is omitted. After all, Peter in Acts appears to have the function of legitimising Paul. For an author who sees no reason to legitimise Paul, it is not necessary to go to such lengths as Luke for doing so. On the other hand, Jones considers the source for R. 1.27–71 to be an anti-Pauline Counter-Acts from the late second century, arguing that it is quite likely that Paul is alluded to in 1.69.8–70.2, 6–8, 71.3–4 (cf. Acts 9:1–2; 22:4–5; 26:10–12).²²³ A certain hostile person initiates a massacre in the temple, where many wished to be baptised. This hostile person receives a letter from the high priest to persecute all who believed in Jesus and went toward Damascus, since he believes that Peter had fled there. Identifying the hostile person with the pre-Christian Paul is not very far-fetched. However, I still have a hard time seeing that this should be regarded as an anti-Pauline polemic. Paul himself emphasises the difference between his old identity as persecutor of the Church, and his new as an apostle (cf. Gal 1:13–17). A traumatic persecution may very well have been part of the living memory, and thus this description must not necessarily be a discreditation of Paulinism per se. Furthermore, it would be odd to place Paul both as a conservative Jewish opponent and a progressive anti-Jewish one without further explanation. Although Paul is alluded to, he does not appear to be central to the message of the text, and thus he is not discussed as such.

²²¹ Cf. Gal 1:18 Ἰστροῦρησαι Κηφᾶν; 1 Cor 15:5 ὄφθην Κηφᾶ

²²² Cf. Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 207–51.

²²³ F. Stanley Jones “The Pseudo-Clementines,” in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed M. Jackson-McCabe (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007), 285–304.

I agree with Kelley and Baur that a conflict of true apostleship is at the core of the Pseudo-Clementine content.²²⁴ However, there is no reason to read it as a conflict between Pauline and Petrine Christianity, but rather as a conflict between a Jewish Christian sphere of influence and the kinds of heterodoxy that are embodied by Simon Magus. The privilege of the author is of course that several contradictory heresies can be attached to the same person, although the groups clinging to these teachings do not necessarily agree neither with the description of their teachings nor with being grouped together. Peter represents what the author considers to be orthodoxy, whereas Simon Magus represents heresy. Simon argues mainly by means of his magic, whereas Peter argues through his orthodox teaching and discourse.²²⁵

Three shorter texts present the preface for the narrative of the Pseudo-Clementine Romance, thus setting the stage and narrative framework for the story.²²⁶ The first is the *Letter of Peter to James*. Peter writes to *Ἰακώβω τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας* (James, the lord and bishop of the holy Church; 1:1). The purpose of the letter is to urge James *τῶν ἐμῶν κηρυγμάτων ἅς ἐπεμψά σοι βιβλίου μηδενὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν μεταδοῦναι μήτε ὁμοφύλῳ πρὸ πείρας* (not to impart any of my preachings that I sent you to the Gentiles, and not to anyone of our own people without a trial; 1:2). Peter demands that the books only be handed over after careful examination, making a comparison to Moses, who handed over to the seventy who succeeded his *καθέδρα* (chair).²²⁷ Peter argues that since the Jews still cling to the same way of life all over the world, this has been a successful manner of preserving the faith that should be used also in the Christian community. Peter motivates his demand with that *ἐπεὶ ἂν μὴ οὗτος γένηται, εἰς πολλὰς γνώμας ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας ἡμῶν διαιρεθήσεται λόγος* (if this is not so done, our truth will be divided into many opinions; 2:1)

²²⁴ Kelley, *Knowledge*, 136.

²²⁵ See discussion in Domonique Côté, *Le thème de l'opposition entre Pierre et Simon dans les Pseudo-clémentines*, EAA 167 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2001).

²²⁶ A critical edition of these texts can be found in Bernhard Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien*, GCS 42 (Berlin: Akademie, 1953). For a discussion of their function in the narrative, cf. Patricia A. Duncan, *Novel Hermeneutics in the Greek Pseudo-Clementine Romance*, WUNT 1/395 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

²²⁷ This is an interesting aspect when discussing the nature of early Christian pseudepigrapha, since it is here claimed that the transmission of Moses' teachings was handed over to his disciples, see discussion in Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949), 148–49.

Peter's letter is followed by a text titled Διαμαρτύρια περί τῶν βιβλίου λαμβανόντων (Testimony Concerning the Receivers of the Book). James here concludes that the criteria for being entrusted with the books from Peter is that he is ἀγαθῷ τινι καὶ εὐλαβεῖ, τῷ καὶ διδάσκειν αἰρουμένῳ ἐνπεριτόμῳ τε ὄντι πιστῷ (someone who is good and devout, who desires to teach, is circumcised and faithful; 1:1), and James suggests that the trial should last for at least six years.

This introductory section containing the letter of Peter to James and its effects is interesting in many respects. Peter and James are clearly portrayed as leaders of a Jewish-Christian group where circumcision is required in order to be entrusted with the books derived from Peter.²²⁸ It is also clear that Peter is the supreme leader of the movement, although James is the leader of the local community.²²⁹ It is not implausible that the text aims at depicting the church at Jerusalem with James as its leader, whereas Peter is a significant authoritative figure that is no longer physically present. The aim of the letter is obviously to preserve the authentic teaching of the movement by only entrusting its important documents to people who are subject to special examination. The text is a plea for a centralisation of ecclesial leadership. When the texts are only possible to attain through meticulous examination by the bishop, the bishop also gains the power not only for admitting clergy, but also over the access to the scriptures at a whole. We do not know for sure what kind of documents Peter is thought of as having given to James, but the text gives the impression that these texts are the basis for the teachings of the community.

In this narrative of a letter and its response, Peter is portrayed as the most significant authoritative figure in early Christianity. Peter is of higher rank than the bishop James and is the source of the texts containing the teachings of the community. This text certainly reflects some kind of "Petrine" Christianity, where Paul has no prominent place.

Following this letter and its response is a letter from Clement to James. Clement reports about Peter's martyrdom and calls him the θεμέλιος τῆς ἐκκλησίας

²²⁸ N. B. that the requirement of circumcision is something that is introduced by James—not by Peter, thereby presenting something of a parallel to the controversy following the arrival of the "men from James" in Gal 2. Peter does not seem to agree with James' interpretation that circumcision should be required, since he obviously ordains Clement as the bishop of Rome in the following letter.

²²⁹ Kelley, *Knowledge*, 174, argues that Peter is subordinate to James in the Pseudo-Clementines, since James commissions Peter to debate with Simon Magus (R 1.72.5, 6, 7). However, the introductory letter speaks to the contrary. I see here a parallel to the apostolic council in Acts 15, where James assumes leadership, while Peter still is somehow the most significant authoritative figure. James represents practical leadership whereas Peter represents theological leadership.

(foundation of the church; 1:2).²³⁰ Clement ends by promising James to send him his experiences with Peter in every city, calling it the *Κλήμεντος τῶν Πέτρου ἐπιδημίων κηρυγμάτων ἐπιτομή* (Clementine Epitome of Peter's Travel Sermons; 20:4). The rest of the Pseudo-Clementine Romance consists of this story of how Clement visits Peter and then travels with him back to Rome.

When Clement arrives at Peter, Peter first explains the significance of the Jewish divine history and exposes what must be considered as distinctively Jewish-Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. Thereafter there is a weeklong (according to R) theological debate between Peter and Simon Magus. Both Peter and Simon argue from the Hebrew Bible for their case, and both appear to view Jesus as an authority for interpreting the Scriptures. Simon argues that the Hebrew Bible reveals the existence of many gods that are all connected to this world, whereas Jesus preached about a secret, supreme God.²³¹ In rejecting the creator-god as a lower standing being than the supreme God, Simon appears to be representing some kind of demiurgical tradition. Simon reproves Peter for not reciting exactly the words of Jesus but rather teach a general message of peace, to which Peter answers that Jesus sent the disciples out to teach rather than to recite words of Jesus.²³² After Peter has won the debate with Simon, he travels with Clement toward Rome and preaches and performs miracles along the way.

Although the original form of the Clementine Romance is uncertain, the main plot of the work gives us indications of the view of Peter among Jewish Christians in Syria. First, we may note that the two leading figures are Peter and James, of whom Peter is more of a universal authoritative figure and James more of a local leader. The teachings of the group are derived from Peter. Since the teachings are distorted by many, Peter admonishes James and the leaders not to entrust the important texts to anyone without thorough examination. The continuity between Judaism and Christianity is emphasised, as well as the necessity of ecclesial hierarchy. As noted earlier, the result of the story (as stated in the letter of Clement to James) is that Peter ordains Clement as the bishop of Rome. We have already noted the historical problems with Clement being the first bishop of Rome in our discussion on First Clement. The hierarchy of the West does not appear to have held Ignatian standard. Considering that the text is written at a significantly later

²³⁰ This designation of course brings to mind Jesus' response to Peter's confession in Matt 16, but also raises the question whether 1 Cor 3:11 should be viewed as part of a polemic related to this issue.

²³¹ Cf. R 2.47

²³² Cf. R 2.33. This could be viewed as an authorisation of some kind of hermeneutic principles, rather than recital of fixed formulæ.

Excursus E: The *Actus Vercellenses*

As we noted in an earlier chapter, the *Act of Peter* has often been considered to be an excerpt of a Greek *Vorlage* to the *Actus Vercellenses*, thus creating a larger *Acts of Peter* that could have been known by e.g. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 3.3.2). However, it is more likely the Latin text of the *Actus Vercellenses* stems from North Africa in the fourth century.²³⁵ Matthew C. Baldwin argues quite convincingly that the *Actus Vercellenses* should be treated as a complete composition in its own right rather than a translation of a second or third century text.²³⁶ It has long been noted that certain adaptations have been made in the text in order to fit a late fourth-century setting.²³⁷ However, Baldwin argues that the *Actus Vercellenses* is in fact a translation and abbreviation of the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*.²³⁸

The narrative begins with a Paul leaving Rome. Shortly after, Simon Magus arrives in the city and causes commotion with his signs and teachings.²³⁹ Meanwhile, God speaks to Peter at Jerusalem that he should go to Rome. When Peter arrives at Rome, he speaks to the people and contends Simon Magus.²⁴⁰ The story is rather fanciful and includes a speaking dog and a resurrected herring, and ends with Peter disrupting Simon while flying, whereupon Simon becomes disabled and leaves the city. The story is ended with an account of Peter's martyrdom in Rome. Through Peter's brief ministry in Rome, the church is strengthened until Paul's return to the city. From chapter 30 and onwards, the *Martyrdom of Peter* is incorporated into the work.²⁴¹ It appears that the Pseudo-Clementine narrative has been combined with other texts, such as the *Martyrdom of Peter*, in order to

²³⁵ Cf. Baldwin, *Whose Acts*, 303; C.H. Turner, "The Latin Acts of Peter," *JTS* 32 (1931): 119–33; Gérard H. Poupon, "L'Origine africaine des *Actus Vercellenses*," in *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism*, ed. J.N. Bremmer, SAAA 3 (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 192–99.

²³⁶ See Matthew C. Baldwin, *Whose Acts of Peter?*, WUNT II/196 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005). For an evaluation of Baldwin's thesis, cf. Marietheres Döhler, *Acta Petri: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den Actus Vercellenses*, TU 171 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 37–40. Baldwin argues, contra Schneemelcher, *NTAp*, II:297, that *Actus Vercellenses* is in fact not a literal translation of an earlier Greek text.

²³⁷ See Bremmer, "Aspects," 19.

²³⁸ Baldwin, *Whose Acts*, 193; Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 20, argues for an opposite dependence. Considering the thematic similarities pertaining to Peter contesting Simon Magus, it is likely that there is some kind of relationship. I am inclined at viewing Baldwin's proposal as slightly more plausible.

²³⁹ For a discussion of Simon Magus in early Christian literature, see Hans Waitz, "Simon Magus in der altchristlichen Literatur," *ZNW* 5 (1904): 121–43.

²⁴⁰ The tradition that Peter fought Simon Magus in Rome appears to be rather early and is found in e.g. Hippolytus *Ref.* 6.15.

²⁴¹ See Critical edition in Zwerlein, *Petrus in Rom.*

create a narrative of the acts of Peter in Rome. This narrative resituates the conflict between Simon Magus and Peter from Palestine to Rome.

What is interesting for the purposes of this study is that it describes how an early Christian community that is distinctively and outspokenly Pauline in outlook receives deliverance through Peter. Paul, Timothy and Barnabas are claimed to have been the leading figures at Rome but are all “out of town” doing missions. Thus, the conception of Paul and his co-workers appears to be that they are people who start new communities and then move along, whereas Peter has stayed in Jerusalem until now.²⁴² The notion of Peter staying 12 years in Jerusalem before going into the rest of the world corresponds to fragment 6 of the *Preaching of Peter*. Peter is depicted as preaching the “Pauline” gospel, and there is no indication of any tension between the two apostles.

Furthermore, Peter is portrayed as the guarantee for preserving the authentic apostolic preaching. He is the one who refutes Simon Magus first in Palestine, and then in Rome, thus making him into a universal “apologist.” Peter’s charismatic abilities make him appear as a *theios aner*, who is directly connected to the power of God. Through Peter, Christianity is connected to the earthly Jesus of Galilee. Peter, the leader of the church at Jerusalem goes to Rome and defends there the teachings that he has himself heard.

Through the incorporation of the *Martyrdom of Peter*, Jesus’ crucifixion is not only connected to Jerusalem, but also to Rome. Through the crucifixion of Peter in Rome, also Christ has been crucified in Rome. Thus, Peter is used as a link to the earthly Jesus in order to legitimise the authoritative status of Roman Christianity, and thereby a *traditional* authority who *embodies* certain cultural capital.

5.15 Peter in the Fayum Fragment

The so-called Fayum fragment dates from the beginning of the third century and resembles Mark 14:26–30||Matt 26:30–34.²⁴³ Although it is sometimes argued that the fragment is a variant reading of Mark,²⁴⁴ the differences between the fragment and the known Synoptic versions rather suggest that it is part of an otherwise

²⁴² This is of course hard to conform both to actual historical reality (since he is said to have been there for 12 years), but also a very different version than that found in canonical Acts.

²⁴³ First published by Gustav Bickell, “Ein Papyrusfragment eines nichtkanonischen Evangeliums,” *ZKT* 9 (1885): 498–504; on dating of the manuscript, see K. Wessely, “Über das Zeitalter des Wiener Evangelienpapyrus,” *ZKT* 11 (1887): 507–15.

²⁴⁴ Adolf Hilgenfeld, “Kein neuentdecktes Evangelium,” *ZWT* 29 (1886): 50–58.

unknown text.²⁴⁵ Two aspects of the fragment are of special interest. The most obvious is that it contains Peter's statement that he will not leave Jesus, whereupon Jesus replies that Peter will deny him three times before the cock crows. However, what is more significant is that Peter is abbreviated as ΠΙΕΤ,²⁴⁶ thus suggesting that Peter's name had status as a *nomen sacrum*.²⁴⁷ The name is written with red ink and with dots over the first and last letters to indicate that it is an abbreviation. This indicates that Peter must have had a significant theological importance in the context where this fragment originated.²⁴⁸ However, it is uncertain whether the scribe originally intended to abbreviate Peter's name or if the space he left in order to write it with red ink was simply too small.²⁴⁹ Yet, the fact that he took the pains to write Peter's name with red ink clearly indicates his significance. Although the rest of the document from which the fragment originates is lost, it is plausible that Peter plays a significant role throughout the narrative. Even if this would not be the case, the treatment of the name of Peter suggests that Peter played a significant role in the context where this fragment originated. Due to the brevity of the fragment, we cannot draw any certain conclusions concerning the fragment, other than that Peter appears to have been a significant figure in the sphere of influence where it originated.

²⁴⁵ Thomas J. Kraus, "Das sogenannte Faijumfragment (P.-Vindob. G. 2325)," in *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, ed. C. Marksches and J. Schröter (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 1:375-76.

²⁴⁶ It is worth noting that pre-Constantinian graffiti invoking Peter's prayers on wall G in the Vatican (constructed in the first half of the third century and thus contemporary with the Fayum fragment) uses the abbreviation PE and PET, see Peter Lampe, "Traces of Peter Veneration in Roman Archaeology," in *Peter in Early Christianity*, 273-317 (277), and more detailed in Margherita Guarducci, *I Graffiti sotto la confessione di san Pietro in Vaticano*, 3 vols. (Vatican: Libreria editrice Vaticana, 1958), 411-78.

²⁴⁷ *Nomina sacra* were not only used for referring to God, but also to other significant concepts, see Ludwig Traube, *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung* (München: Beck, 1907); Larry W. Hurtado, "The Origin of the Nomina Sacra: A Proposal," *JBL* 117 (1998): 655-73.

²⁴⁸ See discussion in Thomas J. Kraus, "P.Vindob.G 2325: Das sogenannte Fayûm-Evangelium—Neuedition und kritische Rückschlüsse," *ZAC* 5 (2001): 197-212.

²⁴⁹ See discussion in Thomas J. Kraus, "The Fayum Gospel," in *The Non-Canonical Gospels*, ed. P. Foster (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2008), 150-56; idem., "Other Gospel Fragments," in *Gospel Fragments*, ed. T. Nicklas, M. J. Kruger, and Thomas J. Kraus (Oxford: University Press, 2009), 219-80 (224-25). Since other words also have spaces, it is possible that there was no intention of writing the entire name.

5.16 Peter in the Pistis Sophia

The Pistis Sophia was probably written in Egypt during the second half of the third century.²⁵⁰ It is likely that it was originally written in Greek but is preserved in a Coptic manuscript from the fourth century.²⁵¹ The author shows knowledge of the canonical Gospels and the Pauline epistles, but differs significantly from what would later become orthodoxy. Although the language of the Pistis Sophia has been much debated, Hans-Martin Schenke argues that it does not differ significantly from classic Sahidic.²⁵² Despite the fact that the text has often been overlooked and overshadowed by the Nag Hammadi material, it is a significant window into the world of a Jesus-believing sphere in the third century.

The *Pistis Sophia* describes Jesus as instructing and discussing with his disciples for eleven years following his resurrection (*1PS* 1). The text brings to mind the Gospel of Mary in the regard that it is Mary who is Jesus' most active dialogue partner who is frequently complimented by Jesus. Although she is the most frequent, she is not the only dialogue partner. A number of other women and disciples also partake in dialogue with Jesus (Peter is dialogue partner in *1PS* 36, 37, 53; *2PS* 65, 122; *4PS* 146), but no one nearly as frequently as Mary. Although Peter is not directly criticised in the text, the portrait of him is still less than sympathetic. The first time he appears in the text is when Jesus asks whether the disciples have understood his teaching (*1PS* 36). Peter's main contribution is to complain that Mary talks too much, stating "we are not able to suffer this woman who takes the opportunity from us, and does not allow anyone of us to speak, but she speaks many times."²⁵³ Peter appears as a spokesperson of the disciples, speaking in the first-person plural.

Later on, Jesus puts Peter to the test to see if he is compassionate (*3PS* 122). Peter passes the test, but it is Mary who interprets the event and is called "spiritual one" (ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΗ/πνευματικῆ) by Jesus. Peter once again complains that Mary and the other women speak with Jesus at what he considers to be the expense of the male disciples (*4PS* 146). It should be noted that this reference occurs in a

²⁵⁰ Schenke and Schmidt, *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften*, XXIV. Schmidt argues that the fourth book of the Pistis Sophia is dependent on the Books of Jeu, and is written earlier in the third century, whereas books 1–3 were written in the second half of the third century. Furthermore, chs. 144–48 are probably part of a different work.

²⁵¹ Carl Schmidt, "Die Urschrift der Pistis Sophia," *ZNW* 24 (1925): 218–40.

²⁵² Hans-Martin Schenke and Carl Schmidt, *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften 1: Die Pistis Sophia, Die beiden Bücher Jeu, Unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk*, GCS (Berlin: Akademie, 1981), XIX.

²⁵³ Unless otherwise stated, I follow the translation of Carl Schmidt, *Pistis Sophia*, Transl. V. MacDermot (Leiden: Brill, 1978). Schmidt suggests that the word translated as suffering is derived from the Greek ἀνέχεσθαι.

section of the Pistis Sophia that may be part of a different work. Nonetheless, it has the same content as *1PS* 36.

The main impression of Peter is thus that Jesus sees a need to put him to the test, and that he criticises Mary and the other women speaking extensively with Jesus at the expense of him and the other male disciples. Mary is obviously troubled by Peter's behaviour and says to Jesus "I am afraid of Peter, for he threatens me and hates our race" (*2PS* 72).²⁵⁴ Mary is afraid to set forth the solution of the words uttered by Pistis Sophia because of Peter. We can here see a clear thematic parallel to the Gospel of Mary, which also portrays Peter as a hothead who makes Mary cry (*Gos. Mary* 10:5).

²⁵⁴ The interpretation of **ΓΕΝΟC**/γένος here is a matter of dispute. One possibility is that it refers to the "gnostic race," see Douglas M. Parrott, "Gnostic and Orthodox Disciples in the Second and Third Centuries," in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, & Early Christianity*, ed. C. W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986), 193-219 (205). Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved*, 181, argues that it should be understood as relating to the female race or sex. Adolf Harnack, *Das Gnostische Buch Pistis-Sophia*, TU 7 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891), 17, suggests that the conflict in fact deals with female ecclesial leadership, and compares to more explicit discussions of this kind in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. However, the *Apostolic Constitutions* is written in the fourth century, and there is otherwise no indication of gender-conflicts in the text. An interesting parallel can be found in Acts, where Paul quotes Aratus: τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμὲν (for we are his descendants; Acts 17:28). He uses this as basis for his further argumentation: γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ θεοῦ (since we are descendants of God; Acts 17:29). A related expression is found in Revelation, where Jesus refers to himself as τὸ γένος Δαυὶδ (the descendant of David; Rev 22:16). First Peter speaks of the recipients as a γένος ἐκλεκτόν (a chosen people; 1 Pet 2:9). These examples indicate that it is quite possible to interpret **ΓΕΝΟC** as referring to a theological identity. There are also other NT-references to γένος, but mainly as designations of the Jewish people, cf. Gal 1:15; Phil 3:5; 2 Cor 11:26; Acts 7:19. It also has a particular use in 1 Cor 12:10, 28. The fact that γένος is etymologically derived from γίνομαι/γίγνομαι might suggest that it pertains to a socially constructed identity rather than to a biological condition. Lexical definitions of the word do not include gender, cf. BDAG, s. v. "γένος." See also Lone Fatum, "Den kollektive Kristus: Kristus-identitet som eskatologisk etnicitet," in *Etnicitet i Bibelen*, eds. N. P. Lemche and H. Tronier, FBE 9 (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 1998), 124-43. The constituting factor for this identity would be the myth of common descent through faith, see Jonathan M. Hall, *Ethnic identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: University Press, 1997); idem, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 9. It should also be noted that **ΓΕΝΑ** appears 40 times in the Gospel of Judas and is etymologically close to **ΓΕΝΟC**. In *Gos. Jud.* 36.15-21, Jesus tells the disciples that he has visited "another great and holy race." This is a further example of how a theological identity could be described in ethnic terms, see Philippa Townsend, "Sacrifice and Race in the Gospel of Judas," in *Judasevangelium und Codex Tchacos. Studien zur religionsgeschichtlichen Verortung einer gnostischen Schriften-sammlung*, ed. E. E. Popkes and G. Wurst, WUNT 1/297 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 149-72; Denise Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2005). Although Peter explicitly criticises the women, it is not certain that the base for his criticism is solely their gender. The gender likely plays a significant role, but not for its own sake.

The absence of several common Petrine themes is significant. Although Peter is commonly referred to as a faithful transmitter of authentic Jesus tradition, this role is ascribed solely to Philip, Matthew and Thomas. However, this does not refer to traditions concerning the earthly Jesus, but rather interpretations of various mysteries (1PS 42–43). Furthermore, Peter is not named among the apostles surrounding the altar at the end of the book, which is also the beginning of the fourth book, which is probably written at a different occasion than books 1–3 (4PS 136).²⁵⁵ At the same time, it is the understanding of Mary that is proposed as the norm for orthodoxy, which is confirmed through the witnesses of Philip, Thomas, and Matthew (3PS 134). Those whose teachings harmonise to those of Mary, are those who belong to Jesus.²⁵⁶ Jesus makes clear already from the beginning of the work that Mary has a very special role: [Mary], thou blessed one, whom I will complete in all the mysteries of the height, speak openly, thou art she whose heart is more directed to the Kingdom of Heaven than all thy brothers” (1PS 17); and “Excellent, [Mary]. Thou art blessed beyond all women upon earth, because thou shalt be the pleroma of all pleromas and the completion of all completions” (1PS 19). Although Jesus admits the significant place of the twelve disciples, he singles out Mary Magdalene and John the Virgin as the leaders of all disciples and believers, stating that they will be on his right and left hand (2 PS 96).²⁵⁷

The portrait of Peter in the Pistis Sophia is not very authoritative and all but flattering. Peter interrupts and wants to talk, although those he opposes are those who have actual insight. Peter’s significance as traditional authority is normally built on his eyewitness testimony of the life of the earthly Jesus. However, in the Pistis Sophia, the important teachings of Jesus are delivered after his death and resurrection. Due to this construction, Peter’s eyewitness account is no longer necessary for theological legitimation of the teachings of Jesus. The similarities to the state in the Gospel of Mary are striking, not only due to the power-play between

²⁵⁵ The named disciples are Thomas, Andrew, James, Simon the Cananite, Philip, and Bartholomew. Peter is probably in the category of “the rest of the disciples” (ΠΚΕΩΦΧΠ ΠΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) which is mentioned as well as the “women disciples” (ΠΜΑΘΗΤΡΙΑ ΝΣΩΙΝΕ).

²⁵⁶ “Those who come to you, and whose words fit and are in accord with the whole knowledge which I have said to you, I will accept as belonging to us.”

²⁵⁷ “In the place where I will be, there will also be with me my twelve servers (διάκονος). But Mary Magdalene and John the Virgin will be superior to all my disciples (μαθητής).” John the Virgin probably refers to the beloved disciple in John’s Gospel, since 1PS 40–41 he is described as “adoring the breast of Jesus” (cf. John 13:23). Also the significance of Philip might be derived from the Fourth Gospel. The disciples Mary, Philip, Thomas and Matthew are also significant for the dialogue in the *Sophia of Jesus Christ* (NHC 3), together with Bartholomew.

Peter and Mary, but also in the narrative of what is valuable knowledge. Whereas the Gospel of Mary has a rather polemic discourse between what I have called a more conservative and a more progressive position, the Pistis Sophia presupposes the progressive position, i.e. that it is the revelation and special understanding of the teachings of Jesus which he transmitted after his resurrection that is significant, rather than correct transmissions of the teachings of the earthly Jesus. Sayings of the earthly Jesus are quoted but are not fully understood when interpreted in their literal sense, but only through mystic understanding. In the sphere of influence which produced the Pistis Sophia, Peter was a well-known historical figure belonging to the group of disciples, but not the main authoritative figure. His most well-known characteristic was allegedly his hot-headedness and scepticism toward ideas and revelations originating from others than himself.

5.17 Conclusion: Peter in Other Early Christian Sources

Several interesting aspects of Peter as an authoritative figure have been discovered in the texts studied in this chapter. It is hardly surprising that Peter emerges as a *traditional* authority in all the studied texts in one way or another. In some texts, such as Papias and Tertullian, Peter also emerges as a *rational* authority. However, the most significant development in the texts studied in this chapter is the emergence of a discussion concerning Peter's cultural capital in the *institutionalised* state. First Clement, Ignatius, the Apocryphon of James, and Irenæus all acknowledge that Peter is of some significance for the institutional legitimacy of the ecclesial hierarchy. Both Cyprian and the Pseudo-Clementines argue more explicitly for the importance of Peter for institutional legitimacy, not least in reference to the church at Rome. However, as the tendencies of legitimising the ecclesial hierarchy through Peter emerge during the second century, we also see a counter-reaction. The critique of Peter as touchstone for authentic teaching is questioned in the Gospel of Mary. Tertullian, who maintains that Peter is an appropriate standard for legitimacy argues that the significance of Peter has more to do with possessing the same spiritual qualities as Peter rather than standing in Petrine ecclesial succession. The most extreme position is taken by Stephen, who sees Cyprian's reference to a "single chair of Peter" as a reference to himself. Cyprian shows in his revised edition of the text that he rather views Peter as a *primus inter pares* and symbol of the unity of the church.

The second and third centuries witness the slow development toward what would later be referred to as the papacy. Initially a means of self-legitimation, pertaining to both leadership and teaching, continuity with Peter increasingly was

viewed as the mark of legitimate hierarchy. However, we cannot speak of a Roman papacy until Stephen (more known as pope Stephen I) uses Cyprian's interpretation to claim exclusive Petrine authority for himself.

6. Summary and Conclusions

6.1 Summary of the Results

Before analysing the conclusions and possible implications of this study, I will briefly summarise the results presented. The introductory chapter accounts for previous research on Peter as an authoritative figure and introduced the methodological and terminological definitions necessary for the undertaking of this project. The terminology of *traditional*, *rational*, and *charismatic* authority derived from Weber plays a significant role in the analysis of the studied texts, as well as Bourdieu's terminology of *cultural capital* that can be transferred to *social capital*.

Chapter two deals with Peter in the Pauline epistles and Acts. Although these texts partially aim at covering the same events, the perspectives differ significantly. Paul recognises the Petrine legacy as a follower of the earthly Jesus, while at the same time criticising his cowardice. The Pauline epistles, especially Galatians, indicate some degree of tension between the Pauline mission and the Jerusalem establishment. Acts, on the other hand, seeks to smoothen out the controversies of the early Christian era and present Paul and his mission as in continuity with Peter and the Jerusalem establishment. Peter's *traditional* authority is unquestioned in the Pauline epistles, whereas *charismatic* authority belongs to Paul. However, in First Corinthians, Peter is also described as a *rational* authority. In Acts, Peter's *traditional* and *rational* authority are combined with narratives describing his *charismatic* authority in order to provide a credible narrative of Christian origins. By portraying Paul as legitimate heir of apostolic Christianity, Paul's heritage can be defended in a time when his *charisma* is no longer sufficient.

The third chapter deals with Peter as an authoritative figure in the canonical Gospels. Despite the ambivalent portrait of Peter, he is put forth as a significant *traditional* authority already in Mark's Gospel. However, the Markan Peter is further developed by Matthew, who makes Peter into an authoritative halakhic interpreter, thus making Peter into a *rational* authority. Peter's *traditional* authority is also a significant feature in the Fourth Gospel, where the beloved disciple is associated with, but also surpasses, Peter in order to boost the cultural capital of this

disciple. Luke goes further than the other evangelists in ascribing authority to Peter and presents him as a *charismatic* authority already in the Gospel and continues to develop Peter as an authoritative figure in Acts.

The fourth chapter deals with literature that claims to be derived from Peter in one way or another. The texts have no common denominator apart from their use of Peter, and there is no reason to speak of a “Petrine school.” Perhaps one could speak of a “Petrine discourse” in the sense that Peter’s popularity as pseudonym increased in the second century, but the common denominator is still only the Petrine attribution, thus indicating the significance of the Petrine legacy. Most significant is Peter’s function as a *traditional* authority, but also a *rational* authority, which can be invoked in order to argue in favour of certain theological positions.

The fifth chapter deals with other literature that discusses Peter and his authority in some way. This is, for natural reasons, the most diverse category of texts to be treated. Still, Peter’s function as *traditional* and *rational* authority appears to have been a widely recognised dimension of Peter’s legacy. This legacy had apparently become a significant feature of the self-definition of those claiming Petrine authority, which is apparent from those texts seeking to undermine the credibility of their opponents through undermining Peter’s credibility. Yet, it was not Peter’s *traditional* authority as such that was attacked, but rather its sufficiency was put into question.

6.2 Conclusions

Following this extensive study of Peter as an authoritative figure in various texts from a long period of time, it is obviously challenging to draw general conclusions. The texts differ in genre, message, theology, geographical location, and time of composition. It is not possible to conclude that there is one, two, or even three ways of viewing Peter as an authoritative figure in early Christian literature. It is more accurate to speak of a patchwork of conceptions of Peter as an authoritative figure that develops depending on the needs at the time. However, some main points of reference are common to virtually all texts, and some trajectories of thought can be discerned, although they are neither unanimous nor all-encompassing. In this final chapter, I will summarise the results of the preceding analyses and discuss what conclusions can be drawn concerning Peter as an authoritative figure in early Christian literature. I will discuss how Peter is used in order to create legitimacy, but also how the use of Peter as an authoritative figure changes in relation to chronology and geography.

6.2.1 Assessment of Sociological Categories

The most basic foundation for Peter as an authoritative figure is his relationship to the earthly Jesus, making him into a *traditional* authority that guarantees authentic Jesus tradition, which is present in virtually all the studied texts.¹ Although most texts approve of Peter as an authoritative figure in this respect, some texts argue against the sufficiency of Peter's historical record as basis for authority, the most evident example being the Gospel of Mary. We can know for certain that Peter was viewed as a significant traditional authority from the earliest days of Christianity (the earliest example being found in 1 Cor 15), and whoever was of differing opinion had to address the issue of this widely held conception. This idea pertains both to the reliability of artefacts connected to Peter in some way, by authorship or association, but also oral traditions associated with Peter.

Peter is also presented as an authoritative interpreter (*rational* authority) in a great portion of the studied texts, of which Matthew is the most significant example.² Not only the interpretative authority of Peter himself is emphasised, but also the *institutionalisation* of this type of authority, which is argued by e.g. Clement of Alexandria in relation to the Preaching of Peter.

Furthermore, the examples of Peter as a *charismatic* authority show traces of a living tradition that develops over the years. Peter was a widely acknowledged charismatic authority already among his contemporaries (cf. First Corinthians), and following his death his charisma is developed in a multitude of texts, where canonical Acts has been the most influential for creating an image of Peter as the initiating force in early Christianity, the founder of both the Jewish and Gentile missions, and the de facto founder of the Christian church. As such, his charisma successively grows into the exceptional narratives reflected in e.g. the Pseudo-Clementines and is eventually canonised as a saint inseparable from Christ himself.

Turning from Weber to Bourdieu, we have found that Peter is nearly always bearer of an *embodied* cultural capital. This cultural capital is of various expressions, as it alternately corresponds to all three Weberian types. Peter embodies a certain cultural capital, whether it pertains to his traditional, rational, or charismatic authority. We also find examples of Peter's cultural capital in the *objectified* state, most prominently in First and Second Peter and the Preaching of Peter, but

¹ The exceptions being the two Apocalypses of Peter, the Preaching of Peter, and the Act of Peter. However, although Peter's relationship to the earthly Jesus is not explicitly referred to as basis for Peter as an authoritative figure in these texts, it is plausible that it presented the background for Peter as an authoritative figure in the symbolic universes reflected in these texts.

² Cf. Matt; John; Gal; 1 Cor; 2 Pet; Pseudo-Clementines; *Acts Pet. 12 Ap.*; *Pet. Phil.*; *Copt. Act. Pet.*

also in the traditions of Peter as source for Mark derived from Papias. However, the purpose of highlighting Peter's cultural capital is always to bring legitimacy to a text or phenomenon. I have therefore suggested that the cultural capital embedded in the texts was translated to social capital, i.e. a text, teaching, or order was regarded as legitimate in relation to its relationship to the significant authoritative figure Peter.

The discussion of sociological models could be boiled down into three aspects of how Peter is portrayed as an authoritative figure. The most significant is Peter as a link to the earthly Jesus. This aspect centres mainly around the concepts of *traditional* authority (Weber) and *embodied* cultural capital (Bourdieu), and is always in the background of the discussion in some way. The second aspect is that of Peter as an authoritative interpreter. This aspect has similarities with Weber's category of *rational* authority and argues that Peter's rulings concerning doctrinal issues are normative. The third aspect deals with Peter's role as initiator, thereby legitimising certain aspects of the formation of early Christianity. These three aspects are somewhat overlapping, but still distinguishable, and are necessary to understand the function of Peter as an authoritative figure in the early Christian texts.

6.2.2 Peter's Authoritative Function in Early Christian Discourse

The earliest portrait we have of Peter as an authoritative figure in the Pauline epistles portrays Peter as a link to Jesus, thus connecting the historical and theological legitimacy of early Christianity to Peter. Although Paul severely criticises Peter, he also makes clear that Peter is his most reliable source of information concerning the Jesus tradition. In a later generation, this aspect is further emphasised as Luke formulates answers to questions of how Pauline Christianity is related to the earthly Jesus, and formulates an answer where Peter is portrayed as the actual founder of Pauline Christianity. Luke thus does not only (as Paul) claim Petrine origin in order to argue for historical accuracy, but also in order to portray Peter as an initiator, who is responsible for transforming the early Jesus movement into early Christianity. Thereby the legitimacy of early Christianity is not only derived from being tradents of Petrine, and thereby authentic, Jesus tradition, but also claiming Petrine leadership in its initial phase.

Although Peter appears to play a marginal role in Paul's letters at first sight, it should be noted that he is more significant than any other original disciple of Jesus to Paul. Furthermore, the prominence of Peter in the creedal formulation in 1 Cor 15 should not be neglected. In the earliest Gospel at our disposal, Mark, Peter is a significant disciple, forming the inner circle around Jesus together with James and

John. Matthew further underlines Peter's significance in his three major Petrine *Sondergut* insertions, and portrays Peter as an authoritative interpreter. In this respect, Matthew and Luke share the dimension of transforming Peter from someone merely guaranteeing historical accuracy, into someone who has a significant role in the shaping of early Christian practice. It is possible that Matthew's portrayal of Peter as an authoritative interpreter has been transformed by Luke-Acts into a more generally applicable initiative-leadership type of authority. This Matthean/Lukan focus on Peter can hardly be viewed as mere invention, since John's Gospel, while portraying the beloved disciple as the most significant figure, ascribes a more universal recognition to Peter. This suggests that Peter was widely held to have a certain prominence in early Christian imagination.

The rich flora of pseudo-Petrine writings bears witness to the conception of Peter being connected to theological legitimacy. Petrine authorship was claimed to an extent comparable only to the deutero-Pauline literature. However, the pseudo-Petrine literature appears to have little or no connection to the historical Peter, whereas the deutero-Paulines at least are some kind of development of Pauline theology. This indicates that the perception of Peter as an authoritative figure must have been fairly strong in early Christianity, and probably also verbalised, considering its consistency. The value of Peter's authoritative status as a link to Jesus and his teachings was apparently also at the core of early Christian debate concerning orthodoxy. Heterodox spheres of influence would ridicule Peter and argue that his testimony was insufficient, whereas orthodox spheres of influence would view him as the guarantee that the preaching of the Church was coherent with the teachings of Jesus. The designations of heterodox and orthodox are used anachronistically, and I have pointed out that Peter was also appropriated by spheres of influence that would later be considered heterodox. However, this division is significant enough to be noted. This view of Peter is also found in Irenaeus and Tertullian. As the genre of the Christian novel develops, Peter is the self-evident hero who defeats the heretics both through his teaching and his miraculous deeds.

6.2.3 Chronological Development

The ways in which Peter is used as an authoritative figure develops over time. To Paul, Peter is simply a significant person in early Christianity, to whom one must relate. If we take Papias to refer to an older tradition of attributing Mark to Peter, this further points out his importance as someone who knew the earthly Jesus. The authority connected to Peter at this point does not elaborate further upon the

characteristics of the Petrine person but makes clear that Petrine origin is a mark of authenticity, connecting the Christian teachings to those of the earthly Jesus.

However, following Peter's death, which roughly coincided with the fall of the Jerusalem temple, the conditions under which apostolic Christianity had developed were radically changed. The expected Parousia had not arrived, and the leading apostles were no longer present. These events necessitated a development of Christian thought, but leading figures with authority were lacking. Matthew, Luke, John, and the Pastorals are all examples of attempts at defining a post-apostolic Christian identity. Although Pauline authority is used in e.g. the Pastorals, since Paul was the most prolific writer of the first Christian generation, the awareness arose that if one wished to derive one's faith from the earthly Jesus, Paul was not the most reliable source.³ Therefore, we begin witnessing a development where Peter, the most well-known of the original disciples, receives a role that was unanticipated during apostolic times, although Peter for sure was significant already from the beginning. The social memory of Peter is used and appropriated in a new context. Peter is used to define halakhic interpretation in Matthew, whereas Luke goes as far as to make him into the founder of the Gentile mission and spiritual ancestor of Paul—a narrative to which the historical Paul most certainly would have objected. Epistles were also produced in Peter's name, although they must theologially (at least First Peter) be regarded as deutero-Pauline.

During the last decades of the first century, Peter became the most significant link between the Church and the earthly Jesus, and as the second century emerges, Peter is invoked to defend Paul (cf. Acts and Second Peter). We begin to see an idealisation of the apostolic generation, in particular Peter and Paul, who are exalted by e.g. First Clement and Ignatius of Antioch.

However, this development is not without resistance. Christianity is too diverse to speak of a *Frühkatholizismus*, and there appears to be an emerging conflict concerning the basis for Christian doctrine. On the one hand, there is a conservative position which argues that Christian doctrine should primarily be derived from the earthly Jesus, arguing that Peter is a link that guarantees the authenticity of such tradition. On the other hand, there is a more progressive approach, emphasising the importance of contemporary spiritual manifestations. Although this has traditionally been described as a conflict between orthodoxy and "Gnosticism," this is a grave simplification. Both sides in the conflict display a great

³ That Paul early on loses authority to "the twelve" due to their connection to the earthly Jesus has long been recognised, see Julius Wagenmann, *Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten*, BZNW 3 (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1926).

doctrinal variety, and it is not impossible that this kind of discussion occurred within local Christian communities, rather than between clearly defined opposing groups. It is therefore more appropriate to speak, as we have done, of spheres of influence. Since history has given the conservative position the victory, we have more texts reflecting this orientation preserved, but the existence of texts such as the Gospel of Mary clearly indicate that a more progressive approach was not necessarily a minority view. It must also be underlined that the difference of these approaches is not the theology per se, but their approaches to legitimising theology. Stating that the conservative position prevailed thus does not imply that a certain Christian group or theological system prevailed, for there is great variation within the conservative approach, but that this way of legitimising theology was eventually considered more persuasive.

This discussion concerning the correct origin of doctrine goes hand in hand with a discussion of legitimate ecclesial hierarchy. All studied church fathers connect legitimate hierarchy to Peter. For Clement of Alexandria, continuity with Peter is the constituting element of a legitimate bishop. Tertullian and Origen agree that continuity with Peter is significant for a bishop, but claim this does not occur through ecclesial lineage, but through sharing Peter's spiritual qualities. Thus, we can see clearly that the discussion is not one of orthodoxy contra Gnosticism, but rather between a conservative and progressive orientation, between formal (*rational*) authority and dynamic (*charismatic*) authority. Although the term "progressive" may seem inappropriate, I find it fitting in its literal sense. The issue is not necessarily certain doctrinal definitions, but the approach to theology and hierarchy itself. Should it be *conservative* in the respect that it claims to preserve what it considers to be authentic Christianity, or should it be *progressive* in the respect that it is part of a charismatic, spirit-led development. The questions of doctrine and of hierarchy are two sides of the same coin and are part of a discussion of the essence of the Christian movement. Peter, as we have seen, is often associated with the conservative approach and serves as a significant authoritative figure for its purposes.

6.2.4 Geographical Dimensions

Although this study has not focused primarily on the geographical dimensions of the development in early Christian thought, the results clearly indicate some geographical dimensions that must be considered. For the earliest centuries of Christian history there is a general lack of Western sources, which makes reconstructions of Western Christianity difficult. Although the modern reader will naturally

associate Petrine authority with Rome and the West, the development of Peter as an authoritative figure appears to have taken place more explicitly in the East, not least in Syria. Matthew is often placed in Antioch, and John in Asia Minor. Mark is also often considered to originate from the East. As for Luke and Acts, it is more difficult to determine whether the work should be connected to the East or the West. Since Acts ends in Rome, it would be natural to assume that the text reaches its climax there if it is written for a Roman congregation. However, it is a matter of dispute why Acts ends so abruptly—was the text originally intended to continue, or did the author intend to write a third volume? On the other hand, there are traditions connecting Luke to the East, more specifically to Antioch.⁴ Marcion reportedly used Luke's Gospel when he established his teachings in Asia Minor, and then continued toward Rome.

Although the original locations of the pseudo-Petrine writings are in many cases impossible to determine, the signals in the texts that indicate their origins present a picture where Syria is a major centre of production for pseudo-Petrine writings, which in some cases extends to Asia Minor in the North and Palestine in the South. Syria was also the birthplace of the Pseudo-Clementine Romance. Papias, who claimed Peter to be the authority behind Mark, was located in Phrygia, thus confirming the importance of Peter as link to Jesus in the Eastern parts of early Christianity.

The earliest texts of Roman prominence, e.g. First and Second Clement, do not at all emphasise Peter's role as a link to Jesus in the same way, although it is arguably part also of their conception of Christian origins. Yet, it should be noted that not even Ignatius of Antioch, who had an arguably high view of ecclesial hierarchy, connected his vocation explicitly to Peter, but rather emphasised Peter as link to Jesus. Other western witnesses, such as Tertullian, also confirm that the view of Peter as a link to Jesus was present also in the West, although it was not as heavily emphasised as in the East. The difference in emphasis might reflect the differing needs of the respective geographical areas. For example, the Pseudo-Clementines are partially a way of defying the relationship between Rome and the Eastern Christianity of the Romance, through claiming that the reliability of Roman Christianity rests on an Eastern foundation (Peter). The difference between East and West thus does not necessarily reflect a theological difference of the view of Peter, but rather Peter is exploited more extensively in the East due to the perceived needs of the congregations there. However, the lack of Western sources makes it

⁴ Cf. Richard Glover, "Luke the Antiochene and Acts," *NTS* 11 (1964/65): 97–106.

difficult to draw any certain conclusions regarding differences between East and West.

The idea that Peter was not only martyred in Rome, but also ministered there, appears to be widespread. Regardless of the historical accuracy of this belief, it indicates something of the ideological convictions concerning Peter and Christianity. Acts is not unique in putting forth a narrative of the development of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome, but Peter himself, as the significant authoritative figure he is, takes the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome. Christianity from about 100 C.E. and onwards made universal claims that it was not merely an obscure Jewish sect, but a world religion which had reached all the way to Rome. Eastern Christians would make claims of a universal (and thereby legitimate religion) that had spread throughout the empire—even to Rome (cf. the Pseudo-Clementines). At the time of Cyprian and Stephen, the discourse on Peter as an authoritative figure was a significant aspect also of the Western self-understanding.

6.2.5 Implications for Our Understanding of Early Christianity

Several aspects of this study contribute to establishing the self-conception(s) of the early Christians. Continuity with the teachings of Jesus was a general trait, but it took a multitude of different expressions. The main divide was between the *conservative* approach, which sought continuity both with what they believed to be the exact words and teachings of the earthly Jesus and with the apostolic succession based on human relations, and a more *progressive* approach, which focused on the spiritual dimensions of the faith. Whereas conservatives would emphasise the significance of historically reliable testimonies to the teachings of the earthly Jesus, progressives would emphasise the significance of the present-day revelations and manifestations of the Spirit. However, it would be incorrect to say that conservative theology was static whereas progressive theology was dynamic. Both approaches would entail theological innovation and variation. Moreover, conservatives could also value the spiritual dimensions of the faith, and likewise the progressives could value historical accuracy. The difference lies in the means by which one legitimises one's theology. Conservatives would focus on the continuity of apostolic succession through human relations, whereas progressives would focus on the continuity in *Spirit* between apostolic and present times. Both these approaches contained a great variety of theological positions. It is therefore not legitimate to speak of theological schools, or even rivalling groups, but rather two different approaches to legitimising theology. To put it in Weberian terms: rational

and charismatic authoritative systems existed side by side.⁵ The controversies were not between isolated sectarian communities, but rather theologically distinctive influencers sought to argue for their positions within their spheres of influence.

⁵ Karl Holl, *Entbusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum: Eine Studie zu Symeon dem neuen Theologen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898), describes this as a conflict between Geist and Amt.

Appendix: Related Archaeological Evidence

This dissertation has focused exclusively on literary evidence in its assessment of early Christian conceptions of Peter as an authoritative figure. However, there is also some archaeological evidence from the period, which I wish to treat briefly in this appendix.¹

The first archaeological evidence I wish to discuss is found in the house-Church in Dura-Europos, which is the earliest example of a distinctively Christian church that has been recovered. The Church is situated in Dura, Syria, and has a baptistery from the first half of the third century which portrays Peter walking on water.² Whereas later art often highlights Peter sinking and Jesus rescuing him, there is no hint in this fresco that Peter would sink. Jesus is to the left, and Peter to the right.³ Unfortunately, Peter's facial expression is not preserved, but the disciples that are in the boat (which looks more like a large ship) are amazed, staring with big, open eyes.⁴ Clark Hopkins argues that the focus of the fresco is not on the miracle itself, but on the astonishment of the disciples, since they carry colourful robes whereas Peter and Jesus are only simply sketched.⁵ Michael Peppard argues that the fresco reflects the common Syrian image of Peter as an example full of faith.⁶ The suggestions of Hopkins and Peppard combined suggest that both

¹ On early depictions of Peter in general, see Erich Dinkler, "Die ersten Petrusdarstellungen: Ein archäologischer Beitrag zur Geschichte des Petrusprimates," *MJK* 11–12 (1938–39): 1–80.

² Robert Milburn, *Early Christian Art and Architecture* (Aldershot: Scolar, 1988), 8–13.

³ Although the question of who is who is somewhat disputed, a good case for Jesus being to the left and Peter to the right is made by Dieter Korol and Jannicke Rieckesmann, "Neues zu den alt- und neutestamentlichen Darstellungen im Baptisterium von Dura-Europos," in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. D. Hellholm, et al. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 1612–72.

⁴ As noted by Ann Perkins, *The Art of Dura-Europos* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), 54, Jesus and his disciples are short-haired and beardless, which is not the most common way of depicting them.

⁵ Clark Hopkins, *The Discovery of Dura-Europos* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1979), 114.

⁶ Michael Peppard, *The World's Oldest Church: Bible, Art, and Ritual at Dura-Europos, Syria* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016), 86–93.

Jesus and Peter were viewed as significant examples for the believers at this venue. Although it is uncertain how representative this fresco is for its time, it is a clear indication that the Peter narratives especially of the Gospel of Matthew were very much alive and vivid to the Christian population in this area.

Apart from Dura-Europos, the Petrine artefacts in Rome must be taken into consideration. The most obvious artefact is Peter's tomb.⁷ This site has been a significant place of veneration of the apostle for nearly two millennia.⁸ Since the site has been renovated and rebuilt on several occasions, much of the earliest remains of the site have been destroyed or lost. Twentieth century excavations discovered a necropolis underneath St. Peter's Cathedral with an Aedicula to commemorate Peter that is dated to the mid-second century, thus predating also the Constantinian basilica.⁹ It is sometimes also suggested that there was a monument even prior to the oldest remains that are present today.¹⁰ *Liber pontificalis* suggests that a *memoria* of Peter was constructed by Anacletus.¹¹ *Liber pontificalis* is a bit confused at this point, as it both mentions Cletus (3rd bishop) and Anacletus (5th bishop), whereas they in fact were different names of the same person, as we have presupposed in our discussion of First Clement. As pointed out by Engelbert Kirschbaum, it is probable that the author has here not only separated Cletus and Anacletus, but also confused him with the later bishop Anicetus, who was bishop of

⁷ Some graffiti on the Red Wall of the necropolis reads ΠΙΕΤΡ ΕΝ Ι, see figure 3 in A. Ferrua, "La Storia del Sepolcro di San Pietro," *La Civiltà Cattolica* 103 (1952): 15–29. This is normally interpreted to stand for Πέτρος(ς) ἐν (ἐ)ι(ρήνῃ). However, Margherita Guarducci, *Hier ist Petrus: Die Gebeine des Apostelfürsten in der Confessio von St. Peter* (Regensburg: Josef Habel, 1967), argues that it should rather be interpreted as Πέτρος ἐνι and suggests that some bones recovered inside the Red Wall at the same place are the actual bones of Peter that have been moved there at a later date. However, Guarducci's thesis is rejected by most scholars.

⁸ On Petrine artefacts in Rome, see Peter Gemeinhardt, "Liegt Petrus in Rom, und wenn ja, seit wann?: Zur Herausbildung der römischen Petrus-tradition im 2. Jahrhundert," in *Petrusliteratur und Petrusarchäologie*, 219–54.

⁹ Theodor Klauser, *Die römische Petrus-tradition im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen unter der Peterskirche*, AFLN WG 24 (Köln: Westdeutscher, 1956), 69; Jocelyn Toynbee and John Ward Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Peter and the Vatican Excavations* (London: Longmans, 1956), 144; Guarducci, *Hier ist Petrus*, 56.

¹⁰ Toynbee and Perkins, *Shrine of St. Peter*, 157.

¹¹ "hic memoriam beati Petri construxit et composuit, dum presbiter factus fuisset a beato Petro, seu alia loca ubi episcopi reconderentur sepulturae: ubi tamen et ipse sepultus est III Id. Iulias"

Rome around the time when the now recovered Aedicula was constructed.¹² The Aedicula is probably also referred to by Gaius, here quoted by Eusebius.¹³

ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖξαι. ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσῃς ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν Βατικανὸν ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Ὡστίαν, εὐρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν αὐτῆν ἰδρυσαμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

But I can show you the trophies of the apostles. If you were to go to the Vatican or to the Ostian way, you would find the trophies of those who laid the foundations of the church.¹⁴

Eusebius identifies the *τρόπαια* (trophies) of the apostles to refer to the graves of the apostles (*Hist. Eccl.* 2.25.5). Eusebius claims that Gaius wrote when Zephyrinus was bishop of Rome, which is traditionally around 199–217 CE. This indicates that it marks a place where Peter was venerated from at least the second half of the second century.¹⁵

This site, which has obviously been connected to Peter at least since the mid-second century is an indication that Peter was viewed as a significant figure to Roman Christianity. The monument gives no further clue as to how Peter was conceived as historical figure more precisely, but it is evident that he is considered to have a significant legacy. Hans Georg Thümmel argues that the construction of the monument around 160 C.E. coincides with the visit of Hegesippus to Rome which is preserved in *Hist. Eccl.* 4.22 and speaks of the orthodoxy and apostolic succession of the Roman church.¹⁶ Although it is quite possible that the monument was constructed in order to demonstrate the apostolic faith of the Roman church, evidence is too sparse to substantiate such an interpretation.

Apart from the monument under St. Peter's, a cult for venerating Peter and Paul started at San Sebastino in 258.¹⁷ The founding tradition of the church suggests that the relics of Peter and Paul were moved to the site during the persecution of Valerian, and later moved back to their original sites.¹⁸ Graftiti at the site

¹² Engelbert Kirschbaum, "Das Petrusgrab," *Stimmen der Zeit* 77 (1952): 321–32, 401–10. José Ruysschaert, *Réflexions sur les fouilles vaticanes, le rapport officiel et la critique* (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1954) has argued in favour of the historicity of the account of Liber pontificalis, that this became a papal cemetery, but this is not very plausible, see critique in Toynbee and Perkins, *Shrine of St. Peter*, 262–66.

¹³ See Thümmel, *Memorien*, 7.

¹⁴ *Hist. Eccl.* 2.25.7.

¹⁵ Toynbee and Perkins, *Shrine of St. Peter*, 127. Thümmel, *Memorien*, 14, suggests that it is possible that a tradition connecting Peter's martyrdom to the site could have been handed down for a century before the monument was built.

¹⁶ Hans Georg Thümmel, "Die Archäologie der Petrusmemorie in Rom," *Boreas* 16 (1993): 97–113.

¹⁷ Hippolyte Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, SH 20 (Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1933), 267; Thümmel, *Memorien*, 10.

¹⁸ See Milburn, *Early Christian Art*, 42.

suggests that pilgrimages came from afar already in the late third century.¹⁹ It is uncertain how exclusively this devotion was paid to Peter and Paul.²⁰ It is plausible that the celebrations of Peter and Paul emerged in the aftermath of the schism between Stephen and Cyprian, which has been discussed above.²¹ From the late third century and onwards Peter emerges as a significant figure in Christian iconography, not least in the catacombs.²² He is more frequent than Paul, and two examples of depictions of Peter's denial in tombs suggests that he became an apostle of special relevance in times of persecution.²³ In a chamber of the catacombs of Domitilla, there is a fresco from the second half of the third century that depicts Peter as he reads a scroll.²⁴ Another fresco from the same catacomb from the second half of the fourth century also has Peter holding a scroll.²⁵ From as early as the second half of the second century, we have an image that presents Peter as a new Moses, who strikes the rock so that water comes forth.²⁶ We also have two frescoes of Peter sitting on the right hand side of Christ among the disciples from the second half of the third century²⁷ and from the middle of the fourth century,²⁸ and in the latter Peter is also holding a scroll.²⁹

These examples of archaeological remains of early Peter-images essentially confirm the results of the study above. Through our study of the relevant literature, we might also gain a greater understanding of the Petrine artefacts that have been uncovered from this crucial time period.

¹⁹ James Stevenson, *The Catacombs: Rediscovered Monuments of Early Christianity* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1978), 32.

²⁰ Pasquale Testini, *Die christlichen Katakomben in Rom* (Rome: Ente provinciale per il turismo, 1970), 48.

²¹ Alfons Maria Schneider, *Die Memoria Apostolorum an der Via Appia*, NAWG (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951).

²² See Lampe, "Traces of Peter Veneration."

²³ Lampe, "Traces of Peter Veneration," 290–94. See also Joseph Wilpert, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms* (Freiburg: Herder, 1903), 329–31.

²⁴ Wilpert, *Malereien*, Tafel 94.

²⁵ Wilpert, *Malereien*, Tafel 153.

²⁶ Wilpert, *Malereien*, Tafel 182, 248.

²⁷ Wilpert, *Malereien*, 112–13, tafel 96. Peter is the only identifiable disciple of the totally six disciples surrounding Jesus

²⁸ Wilpert, Tafel 155, 179.

²⁹ For a discussion of the further development of Peter in early Christian art, see Jutta Dresken-Weiland, "Petrusdarstellungen und ihre Bedeutung in der frühchristlichen Kunst," in *Petrus und Paulus im Rom: Eine interdisziplinäre Debatte*, ed. S. Heid (Freiburg: Herder, 2011), 126–52.

Bibliography

- Abbott, Edwin A. "On the Second Epistle of St. Peter. Had the Author Read Josephus?" *Exp* 3 (1882): 49–63.
- . "On the Second Epistle of St. Peter. Had the Author Read St. Jude?" *Exp* 3 (1882): 139–53.
- . "On the Second Epistle of St. Peter. Was the Author St. Peter?" *Exp* 3 (1882): 204–19.
- Abogunrin, S. O. "The Three Variant Accounts of Peter's Call: A Critical and Theological Evaluation of the Texts." *NTS* 31 (1985): 587–602.
- Achelis, Hans. *Acta SS. Nerei et Achillei. Text und Untersuchung*. TU II. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. *1 Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1996.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Pauline Heritage in 1 Peter: A Study of Literary Dependence in 1 Peter 2:13–25." Pages 125–47 in *The Early Reception of Paul*. Edited by Kenneth Liljeström. SESJ 99. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2011.
- Aejmelaeus, Lars. "The Pauline Letters as Source Material in Luke-Acts." Pages 54–75 in *The Early Reception of Paul*. Edited by Kenneth Liljeström. SESJ 99. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2011.
- . *Die Rezeption der Paulusbriefe in der Miletrede (Apg 20:18-35)*. AASF 232. Helsinki: Soumalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.
- Aland, Kurt. "Der Schluß des Markusevangeliums." Pages 435–70 in *L'évangélie selon Marc. Tradition et redaction. Nouvelle édition augmentée*. Edited by M. Sabbe. Leuven: University Press, 1988.
- Aland, Kurt. (ed). *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 2009.
- Allison, Dale C. *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- . "Peter and Cephas: One and the Same." *JBL* 111 (1992): 489–95.
- Altheim, Franz, and Ruth Stiehl. *Christentum am roten Meer*. 2 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971–1973.
- Amadi-Azuogu, Chinedu Adolphus. *Paul and the Law in the Arguments of Galatians: A Rhetorical and Exegetical Analysis of Galatians 2,14–6,2*. Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1996.
- Amsler, Frédéric. "La construction de l'homme ennemi ou l'anti-paulinisme dans le corpus pseudo-Clémentin." Pages 799–822 in *Receptions of Paul in Early Christianity: The Person of Paul and His Writings Through the Eyes of His Early Interpreters*. BZNV 234. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.
- Annand, Rupert. "He was Seen of Cephas: A Suggestion about the First Resurrection Appearance to Peter." *SJT* 11 (1958): 180–87.
- Appold, Mark L. *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. WUNT II/1. Tübingen: Mohr, 1976.
- Arnesen, J. *Udvalgte Skrifter af Tertullian*. Christiania: Mallings, 1887.
- Aronsson, Peter. *Historiebruk—att använda det förflutna*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2004.
- Aspegren, Kerstin. *The Male Women: A Feminine Ideal in the Early Church*. Uppsala Women's Studies: Women in Religion 4. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.
- Aus, Roger D. "Three Pillars and Three Patriarchs: A Proposal Concerning Gal 2:9." *ZNW* 70 (1979): 252–61.

- Baasland, Ernst. "2. Peters brev og urkristelig profeti: Eksegese av 2. Pet. 1,12–21." *TTKi* 53 (1982): 19–35.
- . "Der 2. Klemensbrief und frühchristliche Rhetorik: 'Die erste christliche Predigt' im Lichte der neueren Forschung." Pages 78–157 in *ANRW* II.27.1. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993.
- Backhaus, Knut. "Zur Datierung der Apostelgeschichte: Ein Ordnungsversuch im Chronologischen Chaos." *ZNW* 108 (2017): 212–58.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* HTS 7. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- . *The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1925.
- Baer, Richard A., Jr. *Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female*. ALGHJ 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Bailey, Jon Amedee. *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*. NovTSup 7. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Bakke, Odd Magne. *Concord and Peace: A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition*. WUNT II/143. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Baldwin, Matthew C. *Whose Acts of Peter?* WUNT II/196. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Baltzer, Klaus. *Das Bundesformular: Sein Ursprung und seine Verwendung im Alten Testament*. WMANT 4. Neukirchen: Neukirchner, 1960.
- Bammel, Caroline P. Hammond. "Ignatian Problems." *JTS* 33 (1982): 62–97.
- Barclay, John M. G. "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case." *JSNT* 31 (1987): 73–93.
- Bardenhewer, Otto. *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*. 5 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 1902–1932.
- Barnes, Timothy D. "The Date of Ignatius." *ExpTim* 120 (2008): 119–30.
- Barnikol, Ernst. *Der nichtpaulinische Ursprung des Parallelismus der Apostel Paulus und Petrus (Galater 2:7–8)*. FENTK 5. Kiel: Mühlau, 1931.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. "Cephas and Corinth." Pages 1–12 in *Abraham unser Vater, Festschrift für Otto Michel*. Edited by Otto Betz, Martin Hengel and Peter Schmidt. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- . *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Black, 1968.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- . *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- . "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles." Pages 1–20 in *Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii*. Edited by Jan Nicolaas Sevenster and Willem Cornelis van Unnik. Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- Bauckham, Richard J. "The Acts of Paul as a Sequel to Acts." Pages 105–52 in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- . "The Acts of Paul: Replacement of Acts or Sequel to Acts." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 159–68.
- . "The Apocalypse of Peter: An Account of Research." Pages 4712–50 in *ANRW* 2.25.6. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988.
- . "The Apocalypse of Peter. A Jewish Christian Apocalypse from the Time of Bar Kokhba." *Apocrypha* 5 (1994): 7–111.
- . "The Beloved Disciple as Ideal Author." *JSNT* 49 (1993): 21–44.
- . *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. NovTSup 93. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

- .“The Eyewitnesses in the Gospel of Mark.” *SEA* 74 (2009): 19–39.
- .“For Whom Were the Gospels Written?” Pages 9–48 in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.
- .*Jude, 2 Peter*. WBC 50. Dallas, TX: Word, 1983.
- .“2 Peter: An Account of Research.” Pages 3791–3826 in *ANRW II.25.5*, edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988.
- .“2 Peter and the *Apocalypse of Peter* Revisited: A Response to Jörg Frey.” Pages 261–81 in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter: Towards a New Perspective. Radboud Prestige Lectures by Jörg Frey*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, and Jan G. van der Watt. BibInt. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- .“The Two Fig Tree Parallels in the Apocalypse of Peter.” *JBL* 104 (1985): 269–87.
- .“Pseudo-Apostolic Letters.” *JBL* 107 (1988): 469–94.
- Bauer, Thomas Johann. “Ignatius—alter Paulus? Die Präskripte und Postskripte der Ignatianen.” Pages 93–129 in *Die Briefe des Ignatios von Antiochia: Motive, Strategie, Kontexte*. Edited by Thomas Johann Bauer and Peter von Möllendorff. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.
- Bauer, Walter. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Second edition. BHT 10. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.
- Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Bauernfeind, Otto. “Der Schluß der Antiochenischen Paulusrede. Pages 64–78 in *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis: Festschrift für Karl Heim*. Hamburg, 1954.
- Baum, Armin Daniel. *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum: Mit ausgewählten Quellentexten samt deutscher Übersetzung*. WUNT II/138. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Baumeister, Theofried. “Die Rolle des Petrus in Gnostischen Texten.” Pages 3–12 in *Acts of the Second International Congress of Coptic Study. Roma, 22–26 September 1980*. Edited by Tito Orlandi and Frederik Wisse. Rome: C. I. M., 1985.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Paulus: der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Werke, seine Briefe und seine Lehre: Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristentums*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Fues, 1866–67.
- .“Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des paulinischen und petrinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom.” *TZTh* 4 (1831): 61–206.
- .*Die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr verhältniß zu einander, ihren Character und Ursprung*. Tübingen: Fues, 1847.
- .*Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopats in der Christlichen Kirche: Prüfung der neuesten von Hrn. Dr. Rothe aufgestellten Ansicht*. Tübingen: Fues, 1838.
- Baussi, Alessandro. “Towards a Re-Edition of the Ethiopic Dossier of the *Apocalypse of Peter*: A Few Remarks on the Ethiopic Manuscript Witnesses.” *Apocrypha* 27 (2016): 179–96.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. WBC 36. Dallas, TX: Word, 1999.
- Beck, Eric J. *Justice and Mercy in the Apocalypse of Peter: A New Translation and Analysis of the Purpose of the Text*. WUNT I/427. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- Becker, Eve-Marie. *Der früheste Evangelist: Studien zum Markusevangelium*. WUNT I/380. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

- Becker, Jürgen. "Der Brief an die Galater." Pages 9–106 in *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser*. Edited by Jürgen Becker and Ulrich Luz. NTD 8/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- . *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. ÖTK 4. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981.
- . *Johanneisches Christentum: Seine Geschichte und Theologie im Überblick*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- . *Simon Petrus im Urchristentum*. BibThSt 105. Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 2011.
- Bendix, Reinhard. *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1960.
- Benedetti, Michael, and Burkhardt Orth. "Petrus und das Papstamt." Pages 108–24 in *Semiotica Biblica: Eine Freundesgabe für Erhardt Güttgemanns*. Hamburg: Kovac, 1999.
- Berding, Kenneth. *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of Their Literary & Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical & Extra-Biblical Literature*. VCSup 62. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Bergmann, Klaus, Annette Kuhn, Jörn Rüsen, and Gerhard Schneider. *Handbuch der Geschichtsdidaktik*. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1985.
- Bernard, Johannes. *Die apologetische Methode bei Klemens von Alexandrien: Apologetik als Entfaltung der Theologie*. ETS 21. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1968.
- Bernier, Jonathan. *Aposynagogs and the Historical Jesus in John: Rethinking the Historicity of the Johannine Expulsion Passages*. BUS 122. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Besler, J. E. "Lukas und Josephus." *TQ* 77 (1895): 634–62.
- Best, Ernest. "1 Peter and the Gospel Tradition." *NTS* 16 (1970): 95–113.
- . "Peter in the Gospel According to Mark." *CBQ* 40 (1978): 547–58.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1979.
- Beutler, Johannes. "Peter on the Way to His Universal Mission in the Gospel of John." Pages 85–97 in *The Church and Its Mission in the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Memory of Hans Kvalbein*. Edited by David E. Aune and Reidar Hvalvik. WUNT 1/404. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- Bévenot, Maurice. "Clement of Rome in Irenæus' Succession-List." *JTS* 17 (1966): 98–107.
- . *De Lapsis and De Ecclesie Unitate*. OECT. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.
- . *The Tradition of Manuscripts: A Study in the Transmission of St. Cyprian's Treatises*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- . "Primatus Petro Datur—St. Cyprian on the Papacy." *JTS* 5 (1954): 19–35.
- Bickell, Gustav. "Ein Papyrusfragment eines nichtkanonischen Evangeliums." *ZKT* 9 (1885): 498–504.
- Bieler, Ludwig. *ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ: Das Bild des "göttlichen Menschen" in Spätantike und Frühchristentum*. Wien: Höfel, 1935.
- Bierstedt, Robert. "The Problem of Authority." Pages 67–81 in *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*. Edited by Morroe Berger, Theodore Abel, and Charles H. Page. New York, NY: van Nostrand, 1954.
- Bigg, Charles. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902.
- Binzler, Josef. *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Ein Forschungsbericht*. SBS 5. Stuttgart: Katolisches Bibelwerk, 1965.

- Bird, Michael F. "Sectarian Gospels for Sectarian Christians? The Non-Canonical Gospels and Bauckham's *The Gospels for All Christians*." Pages 27–48 in *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*. Edited by Edward W. Klink III. LNTS 353. London: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Black, C. Clifton. *Mark: Images of an Apostolic Interpreter*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- Blaine, Bradford B., Jr. *Peter in the Gospel of John: The Making of an Authentic Disciple*. SBLAcBib 27. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- Blatt, Franz. *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos*. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1930.
- Boismard, Marie-Émile. "Le chapitre XXI de Saint Jean: Essai de critique littéraire." *RB* 54 (1947): 473–500.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. *Ancient Apocryphal Gospels*. Interpretation: Resources for the Use of Scripture in the Church. Edited by Samuel E. Balentine. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2017.
- . *The Remembered Peter*. WUNT I/262. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- . *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Boer, Esther A. de. "Followers of Mary Magdalene and Contemporary Philosophy: Belief in Jesus According to the Gospel of Mary." Pages 315–38 in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelien-überlieferungen: Beiträge zu außerkanonischen Jesusüberlieferungen aus verschiedenen Sprach- und Kulturtraditionen*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter. WUNT I/254. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Bond, Helen K. "Was Peter behind Mark's Gospel?" Pages 46–61 in *Peter in Early Christianity*. Edited by Helen K. Bond and Larry W. Hurtado. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Bond, Helen K., and Larry W. Hurtado (eds). *Peter in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Boobyer, G. H. "The Indebtedness of 2 Peter to 1 Peter." Pages 34–53 in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson 1893–1958*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University Press, 1961.
- Boring, M. Eugene. "First Peter in Recent Study." *WW* 24 (2004): 358–67.
- Bornemann, Wilhelm. "Der erste Petrusbrief—eine Taufrede des Silvanus?" *ZNW* 19 (1919/1920): 143–65.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in Matthew's Gospel: The Problem of Sources in Matthew's Gospel." *Perspective* 11 (1970): 37–50.
- . "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew." Pages 15–57 in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Edited by Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held. Translated by Percy Scott. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- . *Hard Sayings of Jesus*. Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1983.
- . *Paul*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Bötttrich, Christfried. *Petrus. Fischer, Fels und Funktionär*. Biblische Gestalten 2. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2001.
- Bovon, François. *Luke*. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002–2013.
- Brakke, David. "Early Christian Lies and the Lying Liars Who Wrote Them: Bart Ehrman's *Forgery and Counterforgery*." *JR* 96 (2016): 378–90.
- . *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

- Brandenburg, Albert, and Hans Jörg Urban (editors). *Petrus und Papst*. 2 vols. Münster: Aschendorff, 1977–1978.
- Brandon, Samuel George Frederick. *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*. London: SPCK, 1951.
- . *Jesus and the Zealots. A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity*. Manchester: University Press, 1967.
- Brankaer, Johanna, and Hans-Gebhard Bethge. *Codex Tchacos: Texte und Analysen*. TU 161. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Brashlar, James, and Douglas M. Parrott. “The Act of Peter BG, 4:128–1,141,7.” Pages 473–93 in *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berlionensis 8502, 1 and 4*. Edited by Douglas M. Parrott. NHS II. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Bratke, Eduard. “Handschriftliche Überlieferung und Bruchstücke der arabisch-aethiopischen Petrus-Apokalypse.” *ZWT* 36:1 (1893): 454–93.
- Braumann, Georg. “Der sinkende Petrus. Matth. 14, 28–31.” *TZ* 22 (1966): 403–14.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. SBLMS 33. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Bremmer, Jan N. “Aspects of the Acts of Peter: Women, Magic, Place and Date.” Pages 1–20 in *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer. SAAA 3. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- Broadhead, Edwin K. *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus: Redrawing the Religious Map of Antiquity*. WUNT I/266. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Brock, Ann Graham. “Setting the Record Straight—The Politics of Identification: Mary Magdalene and Mary the Mother in Pistis Sophia.” Pages 43–52 in *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition*. Edited by F. Stanley Jones. SBLSymS 19. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Quest for the Origin of John’s Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach*. Oxford: University Press, 1993.
- Brooks, E. C. “The ‘Epistola Clementis’—a Petrine infusion at Rome c. A. D. 385.” Pages 212–16 in *Studia Patristica 15. Papers presented to the Secenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1975*. Edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone. Berlin: Akademie, 1984.
- Brown, Raymond E., S. S. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple. The Life, Loves, and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times*. New York, NY: Paulist, 1979.
- . *The Gospel According to John*. AB 29. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966–1970.
- . “The Gospel of Peter and Canonical Gospel Priority.” *NTS* 33 (1987): 321–43.
- . “The Gospel of Thomas and St. John’s Gospel.” *NTS* 9 (1963): 155–77.
- Brown, Raymond E. Karl P. Donfried, and John Reuman. *Peter in the New Testament*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1974.
- Brox, Norbert. *Der erste Petrusbrief*. EKKNT 21. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1979.
- . *Falsche Verfasserangaben: Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie*. SBS 79. Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1975.
- . “Situation und Sprache der Minderheit im ersten Petrusbrief.” *Kairos* 19 (1977): 1–13.
- . “Tendenz und Pseudepigraphie im ersten Petrusbrief.” *Kairos* 20 (1978): 110–20.
- . *Zeuge und Märtyrer: Untersuchungen zur frühchristlichen Zeugnis-Terminologie*. SANT 5. München: Kösel, 1961.
- . “Zur pseudepigraphischen Rahmung des ersten Petrusbriefs.” *BZ* 19 (1975): 78–96.
- Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. *The Book of the Acts*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.
- . “The Church of Jerusalem in the Acts of the Apostles.” *BJRL* 67 (1985): 641–61.

- . *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1982.
- Brun, Lyder, *Første Peters-Brev*. Oslo: Aschehoug & Co., 1949.
- Brunner, Gerbert. *Die theologische Mitte des ersten Klemensbriefs: Ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik frühchristlicher Texte*. FTS II. Frankfurt a. M.: Knecht, 1972.
- Bruyne, D. Donatien de. "Epistula Titi, discipuli Pauli, de dispositione sanctomonii." *RBén* 37 (1925): 47–72.
- Bubar, Wallace W. "Killing Two Birds with One Stone: The Utter De(con)struction of Matthew and his Church." *BibInt* (1995): 144–57.
- Buchholz, Dennis D. *Your Eyes Will Be Opened: A Study of the Greek (Ethiopic) Apocalypse of Peter*. SBLDS 97. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis. *The Contendings of the Apostles, being the Histories of the Lives and Martyrdoms and Deaths of the Twelve Apostles and Evangelists: The Ethiopic Texts now First Edited from Manuscripts in the British Museum*. 2 vols. London: Frowde, 1899–1901.
- Buell, Denise Kimber. *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy*. Princeton, NJ: University Press, 1999.
- . *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. KEK 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950.
- . *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Fifth edition. NThG 1. Tübingen: Mohr, 1953.
- Burkett, Delbert. *The Case for Proto-Mark: A Study in the Synoptic Problem*. WUNT I/399. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- . *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: From Proto-Mark to Mark*. New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2004.
- . *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: The Unity and Plurality of Q*. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2009.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford. *The Gospel History and its Transmission*. Second edition. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907.
- Burnet, Regis. *Les douze apôtres : Histoire de la reception des figures apostoliques dans le christianisme ancien*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2014.
- Busse, Ulrich. *Das Johannesevangelium: Bildlichkeit, Diskurs und Ritual*. BETL 162. Leuven: University Press, 2002.
- Butler, B.C. *The Originality of St. Matthew*. Cambridge: University Press, 1951.
- Byers, Andrew J. "Johannine Bishops? The Fourth Evangelist, John the Elder, and the Episcopal Ecclesiology of Ignatius of Antioch." *NovT* 60 (2018): 121–39.
- Byrskog, Samuel. *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*. ConBNT 24. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1994.
- . "A New Quest for the Sitz im Leben: Social Memory, the Jesus Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew." *NTS* 52 (2006): 319–36.
- . *Story as History—History as Story*. WUNT I/123. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke: The Diction of Luke and Acts*. HTS 6. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

- Callan, Terrance. "The Second Letter of Peter, Josephus and Gnosticism." Pages 128–46 in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter: Towards a New Perspective. Radboud Prestige Lectures by Jörg Frey*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, and Jan G van der Watt. BibInt. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Cambe, Michel. *Kerygma Petri: textus et commentarius*. CCSA 15. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.
- Campenhausen, Hans von. *Der erste Petrusbrief*. EKKNT 21. Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1979.
- . *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.
- . *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. BHT 14. Tübingen: Mohr, 1953.
- . "Die Nachfolge des Jakobus: Zur Frage eines urchristlichen 'Kalifats.'" *ZKG* 63 (1950/51): 133–44.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. *Peter and the Rock*. BZNW 58. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990.
- Carlson, Stephen C. *The Gospel Hoax: Morton Smith's Invention of Secret Mark*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005.
- . *The Text of Galatians and Its History*. WUNT II/385. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Carlston, Charles E., and Craig A. Evans. *From Synagogue to Ecclesia*. WUNT I/334. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Cassidy, Richard J. *Four Times Peter: Portrayals of Peter in the Four Gospels and at Philippi*. Interfaces. Collegeville, PA: Liturgical, 2007.
- Cavallin, Caesarius. "The False Teachers of 2 Peter as Pseudo-Prophets." *NTS* 21 (1979): 263–70.
- Cavallo, G., and H. Maehler. *Greek Bookbands of the Early Byzantine Period A.D. 300–800*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987.
- Černušková, Monika. "References to the *Apocalypse of Peter* in Clement of Alexandria's *Eclogae Propheticae*." *STh* 19 (2017): 107–37.
- Chilton, Bruce. *Rabbi Jesus: An Intimate Biography*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 2000.
- Clark, Albert C. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Clarke, Andrew D. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6*. AGJU 18. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Clarysse, Willy. "Gospel of Thomas Logion 13: The Bubbling Well Which I Myself Dug." Pages 19 in *Philohistor. Miscellanea in honorem Caroli Laga septuagenarii*. Edited by A. Schoors and P. van Deun. OLA 60. Leuven: Peeters, 1994.
- Coakley, J. F. "The Patriarchal List of the Church of the East." Pages 65–83 in *After Bardaisan. Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honour of Professor Han J. W. Drijvers*. Edited by G. J. Reinink and A. C. Kluglist. OLA 89. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism." Pages 531–48 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism. Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*. Second edition. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- Collins, Raymond F. "The Representative Figures of the Fourth Gospel—II." *DRev* 94 (1976): 118–132.
- Connerton, Paul. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: University Press, 1989.

- Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles*. Hermeneia, MN. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987.
- . *Der erste Brief and die Korinther*. Second edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- . *Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. München: Kaiser, 1968.
- . "Literaturbericht zu den synoptischen Evangelien." *TRu* 43 (1978): 321–27.
- . *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. BHT 17. Tübingen: Mohr, 1954.
- Costelli, Elizabeth. "I Will Make Mary Male: Pieties of the Body and Gender Transformation of Christian Women in Late Antiquity." Pages 29–49 in *Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity*. Edited by Julia Epstein and Kristina Straub. New York, NY: Routledge, 1991.
- Côte, Dominique. *Le thème de l'opposition entre Pierre et Simon dans les Pseudo-Clémentines*. EAA 167. Paris: Institut d'études Augustiniennes, 2001.
- Crawford, Matthew R. "Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος and Scripture according to the Letter of Peter to James." *ZAC* 20 (2016): 260–75.
- Cribbs, F. Lamar. "St. Luke and the Johannine Tradition." *JBL* 90 (1981): 422–50.
- Crossley, James G. *The Date of Mark's Gospel*. JSNTS 266. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Cross that Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1988.
- . "The Gospel of Peter and the Canonical Gospels." Pages 117–34 in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Text, Kontexte, Intertexte*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. TU 158. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Johannine Circle*. London: SCM, 1976.
- . *Petrus. Jünger—Apostel—Märtyrer. Das historische und theologische Petrusproblem*. Second edition. Zürich: Zwingli, 1960. (First edition 1952).
- . *Problème littéraire et historique du roman Pseudo-Clémentin: Étude sur le rapport entre le gnosticisme et le judéo-christianisme*. Paris: Jouve, 1930.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983.
- . *John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend*. SPNT. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.
- Curran, John T. "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20. On the Interpretation of Prophecy." *TS* 4 (1943): 347–68.
- Dahl, Nils A. *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976.
- . "Paul and the Church at Corinth According to 1 Corinthians 1–4". Pages 313–336 in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*. Edited by W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- Damgaard, Finn. *Rewriting Peter as an Intertextual Character in the Canonical Gospels*. CopIS. London: Routledge, 2016.
- . Review of *Das Petrusbild im Johannesevangelium* by Tanja Schultheiß. *SEÅ* 78 (2013): 263–65.
- Danker, Ferederick W. "2 Peter 1: A Solemn Decree." *CBQ* 40 (1978): 64–82.
- Dassmann, Ernst. *Der Stachel im Fleisch: Paulus in der Frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1979.
- Dauer, Anton. *Johannes und Lukas. Untersuchungen zu den johanneisch-lukanischen Parallelperikopen Job 4, 46–54/Lk 7, 1–10—Job 12, 1–8/Lk 7, 36–50; 10:38–42—Job 20, 19–29/Lk 24, 36–49*. FB 50. Würzburg: Echter, 1984.

- Davids, Peter H. *The First Epistle of Peter*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- . “The Use of Pseudepigrapha in the Catholic Epistles.” Pages 228–45 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. JSPSup 14. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1993.
- Davies, Margret. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTS 69. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988–1997.
- DeConick, April D. “The Mystery of Betrayal. What Does the Gospel of Judas Really Say?” Pages 239–64 in *The Gospel of Judas in Context: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Gospel of Judas—Paris, Sorbonne, October 27th-28th, 2006*. Edited by Madeleine Scopello. NHMS 62. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . *The Thirteenth Apostle: What the Gospel of Judas Really Says*. London: Continuum, 2007.
- . *Voices of the Mystics. Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature*. JSNTS 157. Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1908.
- Delehaye, Hippolyte. *Les origines du culte des martyrs*. SH 20. Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1933.
- Denker, Jürgen. *Die theologiegeschichtliche Stellung des Petrusvangeliums: Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte des Doketismus*. EHS 36. Bern: Lang, 1975.
- Derrett, Duncan M. “Thou art the Stone, and Upon This Stone...” *DRev* 106 (1988): 276–85.
- Dietrich, Wolfgang. *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften*. BWANT 14. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1972.
- Dijkstra, Roald (ed.). *The Early Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter (60–800 CE): The Anchors of the Fisherman*. Euhormos 1. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Dinkler, Erich. “Der Brief an die Galater—Zum Kommentar von Heinrich Schlier.” Pages 270–82 in: *Signum Crucis: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament und zur Christlichen Archäologie*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1967.
- . “Die ersten Petrusdarstellungen: Ein archäologischer Beitrag zur Geschichte des Petrusprimates.” *MJK* 11–12 (1938–39): 1–80.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. *Das Kerygma Petri kritisch untersucht*. TU 11. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894.
- Dodd, Charles Harold. *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments: Three Lectures with and Appendix on Eschatology and History*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936.
- . *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- Doering, Lutz. *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*. WUNT I/298. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- . “Apostle, Co-Elder, and Witness of Suffering. The Construction and Peter Image in First Peter.” Pages 645–81 in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jens Herzer, Martina Janßen, and Clare K. Rothschild. WUNT I/246. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Döhler, Marietheres. *Acta Petri: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den Actus Versellences*. TU 171. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.
- Donfried, Karl Paul. *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*. NovTSup 38. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- . “The Theology of Second Clement.” *HTR* 66 (1973): 487–501.
- Doty, William G. *Letters in Primitive Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1973.

- Dresken-Weiland, Jutta. "Petrusdarstellungen und ihre Bedeutung in der frühchristlichen Kunst." Pages 126–52 in *Petrus und Paulus im Rom: Eine interdisziplinäre Debatte*. Edited by Stefan Heid. Freiburg: Herder, 2011.
- Drews, Arthur. *Die Christusmythe*. 2 vols. Jena: Diederichs, 1910–1911.
- . *Die Entstehung des Christentums aus dem Gnostizismus*. Jena: Diederichs, 1924.
- . *Die Petruslegende: Ein Beitrag zur Mythologie des Christentums*. Frankfurt a.M.: Neuer Frankfurter, 1910.
- Drijwers, Han J. W. *Bardasian of Edessa*. SSN 6. Assen: Prakke, 1966.
- . "Thomasakten." Pages 289–367 in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung II: Apostolisches Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*. 5th ed. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1976.
- Dschulnigg, Peter. "Der theologische Ort des Zweiten Petrusbriefes." *BZ* 33 (1989): 161–77.
- Duncan, Patricia A. *Novel Hermeneutics in the Greek Pseudo-Clementine Romance*. WUNT I/395. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Dunderberg, Ismo. *The Beloved Disciple in Conflict? Revisiting the Gospels of John and Thomas*. Oxford: University Press, 2006.
- . *Gnostic Morality Revisited*. WUNT I/347. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- . *Johannes und die Synoptiker. Studien zu Joh 1–9*. AASFDHL 69. Helsinki: Soumalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1994.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. BNTC. London: Black, 1993.
- . "The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11–18)." Pages 199–234 in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Edited by Mark Nanos. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.
- . "Once More Gal 1:18: ἰστορήσαι Κηφᾶν." In Reply to Otfried Hofius." *ZNW* 76 (1985): 138.
- . "The Relationship Between Paul and Jerusalem According to Gal 1 and 2." *NTS* 28 (1982): 461–78.
- . *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*. London: SCM, 1977.
- Dunn, Peter W. "The Acts of Paul and the Pauline Legacy in the Second Century." PhD diss., Cambridge, 1996.
- Eastman, David L. *The Ancient Martyrdom Accounts of Peter and Paul*. WGRW 39. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2015.
- . "Jealousy, Internal Strife, and the Deaths of Peter and Paul: A Reassessment of 1 Clement." *ZAC* 18 (2014): 34–53.
- . *The Many Deaths of Peter and Paul*. Oxford: University Press, 2019.
- Easton, Burton Scott. *Early Christianity. The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers*. Edited by Frederick C. Grant. London: SPCK, 1955.
- Edwards, James R. "The Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel of Luke." *NTS* 48 (2002): 568–86.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "Cephas and Peter." *JBL* 109/3 (1990): 463–74.
- . *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*. Oxford: University Press, 2013.
- . *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: University Press, 1993.

- Ehrman, Bart D., and Zlatko Pleše. *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations*. Oxford: University Press, 2011.
- Ekstrand, Thomas. *Max Weber in a Theological Perspective*. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Eller, Vernard. *The Beloved Disciple: His Name, His Story, His Thought. Two Studies from the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Elliott, John H. *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. London: SCM, 1981.
- . “Peter, Silvanus and Mark in I Peter and Acts. Sociological-Exegetical Perspectives in a Petrine Group in Rome.” Pages 250–67 in *Wort in der Zeit, neutestamentliche Studien: Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorff zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by Wilfrid Haubeck and Michael Bachmann. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- . “The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research.” *JBL* 95 (1976): 243–54.
- . *1 Peter*. AB 37 B. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Elliott, J. K. “Κηφᾶς: Σίμων Πέτρος: ὁ Πίετρος: An Examination of New Testament Usage” *NovT* 14 (1972): 241–56.
- Elze, Martin. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Christologie der Ignatiusbriefe*. Habilitationsschrift, Tübingen, 1963.
- Erbes, C. “Ursprung und Umfang der Petrusakten II.” *ZKG* 32 (1911): 353–77.
- Erlemann, Kurt. “Die Datierung des ersten Klemensbriefes—Anfragen an eine Communis Opinio.” *NTS* 44 (1998): 591–607.
- Ernst, Johann. *Cyprian und das Papsttum*. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1912.
- Esler, Philip Francis. “Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham’s Gospels for All Christians.” *SJT* 51 (1998): 235–48.
- . *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts. The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. SNTSMS 57. Cambridge: University Press, 1987.
- . *Galatians*. NTR. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . “Review of *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence. Interests and Ideology from I Corinthians to I Clement* by David G. Horrell.” *JTS* 49 (1998): 253–60.
- . “Models in New Testament Interpretation: A Reply to David Horrell.” *JSNT* 78 (2000): 107–11.
- Eurell, John-Christian. “Becoming Christian: On the Identification of Christ-Believers as Χριστιανοί.” *JECH* 10 (2020): 1–19.
- . Review of *Peter—False Disciple and Apostate according to Saint Matthew* by Robert H. Gundry. *SEÁ* 83 (2018): 231–33.
- Farmer, William R. “Peter and Paul: A Constitutive Relationship for Catholic Christianity.” Pages 219–36 in *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers*. Edited by W. Eugene March. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1980.
- . “The Stoldt-Conzelmann Controversy: A Re-view.” *PRSt* 7 (1980): 152–62.
- . *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1964.
- Farrer, Austin Marsden. “On Dispensing with Q.” Pages 55–88 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955.
- Fatum, Lone. “Den kollektive Kristus: Kristus-identitet som eskatologisk etnicitet.” Pages 124–43 in *Etnicitet i Bibelen*. Edited by Niels Peter Lemche and Henrik Trønier. FBE 9. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 1998.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

- Feldmeier, Reinhard. "Die Darstellung des Petrus in den synoptischen Evangelien." Pages 267–71 in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*. Edited by Peter Stuhlmacher. WUNT 1/28. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- . *The First Letter of Peter: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Translated by Peter H. Davids. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- Fenton, J.C. *Saint Matthew*. London: SCM, 1977.
- Ferrua, A. "La Storia del Sepolcro di San Pietro." *La Civiltà Cattolica* 103 (1952): 15–29.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles*. AB 31. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1998.
- . "Aramaic Kepha' and Peter's Name in the New Testament." Pages 121–32 in: *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Edited by Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: University Press, 1979.
- Fjärstedt, Biörn. "Synoptic Tradition in 1 Corinthians: Themes and Clusters of Theme Words in 1 Corinthians 1–4 and 9." ThD diss. Uppsala, 1974.
- Flamion, J. *Les Actes Apocryphes de l'Apôtre André: Les Actes d'André et de Mathias, de Pierre et d'André et les textes apparentés*. Paris: Picard, 1911.
- Fornberg, Tord. *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*. ConBNT 9. Translated by Jean Gray. Lund: Gleerup, 1977.
- . "Matteus och hans läsare. Några exempel från tolkningshistorien." Pages 25–39 in *Matteus och hans läsare—förr och nu: Matteussymposiet i Lund den 27–28 sept 1996*. Edited by Birger Olsson, Samuel Byrskog, and Walter Übelacker. Religio 48. Lund: Teologiska institutionen, 1997.
- . *Matteusevangeliet*. 2 vols. KNT 1. Stockholm: EFS, 1989–1999.
- . "Peter—the High Priest of the New Covenant?" *EJAT* 4 (1986): 113–21.
- Forster, Edward Morgan. *Aspects of the Novel and Related Writings*. London: Arnold, 1974.
- Fortna, Robert T. "Diachronic/Synchronic Reading John 21 and Luke 5." Pages 387–99 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by Adelbert Denaux. BETL 101. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
- Foster, Paul. "Are there any Early Fragments of the So-Called Gospel of Peter?" *NTS* 52 (2006): 1–28.
- . "The Discovery and Initial Reaction to the So-called Gospel of Peter." Pages 9–30 in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Text, Kontexte, Intertexte*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. TU 158. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- . "Does the *Apocalypse of Peter* Help to Determine the Date of 2 Peter?" Pages 217–60 in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter: Towards a New Perspective. Radboud Prestige Lectures by Jörg Frey*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, and Jan G. van der Watt. BibInt. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- . *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Commentary*. TENTS 4, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Wendy J. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . "Memory, Orality and the Fourth Gospel: Three Dead-Ends in Historical Jesus Research." *JSHJ* 10 (2012): 191–227.
- . "The Relationship Between 2 Peter and Early Petrine Pseudepigrapha." Pages 179–201 in *Der zweite Petrusbrief und das Neue Testament*. Edited by Wolfgang Grünstäudl, Uta Poplutz, and Tobias Nicklas. WUNT 1/397. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Francis, James A. *Subversive Virtue: Asceticism and Authority in the Second-Century Pagan World*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.

- Franklin, Eric. *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew*. JSNTS 92. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.
- Frenschowski, Marco. "Erkannte Pseudepigraphie? Ein Essay über Fiktionalität, Antike und Christentum." Pages 181–232 in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jens Herzer, Martina Janssen, and Clare K. Rothschild. WUNT I/246. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- "Pseudepigraphie und Paulusschule: Gedanken zur Verfasserschaft der Deuteropaulinen, insbesondere der Pastoralbriefe." Pages 239–72 in *Das Ende des Paulus: Historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte*. Edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Horn. BZNW 106. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001.
- Frey, Jörg. "Apokryphisierung im Petrus-evangelium. Überlegungen zum Ort des Petrus-evangeliums in der Entwicklung der Evangelienüberlieferung." Pages 157–95 in *The Apocryphal Gospels Within the Context of Early Christian Theology*. Edited by Jens Schröter. BETL 260. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- "Autorfiktion und Gegnerbild im Judasbrief und im Zweiten Petrusbrief." Pages 683–732 in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jens Herzer, Martina Janssen, and Clare K. Rothschild. WUNT I/246. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*. HKNT 15/II. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015.
- "Docetic-like Christologies and the Polymorphy of Christ: A Plea for Further Consideration of Diversity in the Discussion of Docetism." Pages 27–49 in *Docetism in the Early Church: The Quest for an Elusive Phenomenon*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden, Reimund Bieringer, Jens Schröter, and Ines Jäger. WUNT I/402. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- "Die Fragmente des Ebioniterevangeliums." Pages 607–22 in *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by Christoph Marksches and Jens Schröter. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- "Hermeneutical Problems Posed by 2 Peter." Pages 9–36 in *Der zweite Petrusbrief und das Neue Testament*. Edited by Wolfgang Grünstäudl, Uta Poplutz, and Tobias Nicklas. WUNT I/397. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Review of *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy. A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude* by Anders Gerdmar. *TLZ* 128 (2003): 393–95.
- "Second Peter in New Perspective." Pages 7–74 in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter: Towards a New Perspective. Radboud Prestige Lectures by Jörg Frey*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, and Jan G. van der Watt. *BibInt*. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- "Von der ‚petrinischen Schule‘ zum ‚petrinischen Diskurs‘: Der zweite Petrusbrief und seine literarischen Bezüge." Pages 87–124 in *Petrusliteratur und Petrusarchäologie: Römische Begegnungen*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Martin Wallraff. Rom und Protestantismus 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Frey, Jörg, and Martin Wallraff (editors). *Petrusliteratur und Petrusarchäologie: Römische Begegnungen*. Rom und Protestantismus 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Frid, Bo, and Jesper Svartvik. *Thomasevangeliet*. Lund: Arcus, 2004.
- Fridrichsen, Anton. *Markusevangeliet*. Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelsens bokförlag, 1952.
- Fuchs, Albert. "Entwicklungsgeschichtliche Studie zu Mk 1,29–31 par Mt 8,14–15 par Lk 4,38–39." *SNTU* 6/7 (1982): 21–76.

- Funk, Robert W., Roy W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar. *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1993.
- Gaechter, Paul. *Petrus und seine Zeit: Neutestamentliche Studien*. Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1958.
- Gale, Aaron M. *Redefining Ancient Borders: The Jewish Scribal Framework of Matthew's Gospel*. New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Gamble, Harry Y. "Pseudonymity and the New Testament Canon." Pages 333–62 in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jens Herzer, Martina Janssen, and Clare K. Rothschild. WUNT I/246. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Gardner-Smith, Percival. "The Date of the Gospel of Peter." *JTS* 27 (1926): 401–7.
- . *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: University Press, 1938.
- Gärtner, Bertil. *Apokryferna till Nya Testamentet*. Stockholm: Proprius, 2001.
- . *Simon Petrus*. Göteborg: Församlingsförlaget, 2003.
- . *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas*. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. London: Collins, 1961.
- Gathercole, Simon. *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas: Original Language and Influences*. SNTSMS 151. Cambridge: University Press, 2012.
- . *The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary*. TENTS 11. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Gebhardt, Oscar von. *Das Evangelium und die Apokalypse des Petrus: Die neuentdeckten Bruchstücke nach einer Photographie der Handschrift zu Gizeh in Lichtdruck herausgeben*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893.
- Gebhardt, Winfried. *Charisma als Lebensform: Zur Soziologie des alternativen Lebens*. SK 14. Berlin: Reimer, 1994.
- Gee, D. H. "Why Did Peter Spring Into The Sea? (John 21:7)." *JTS* 40 (1989): 481–89.
- Gemeinhardt, Peter. "Liegt Petrus in Rom, und wenn ja, seit wann?: Zur Herausbildung der römischen Petrus-tradition im 2. Jahrhundert." Pages 219–54 in *Petrusliteratur und Petrusarchäologie: Römische Begegnungen*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Martin Wallraff. Rom und Protestantismus 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Gerdmar, Anders. "Baur and the Creation of the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy." Pages 107–28 in *Ferdinand Christian Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums*. Edited by Martin Bauspeiss, Christof Landmesser, and David Lincicum. WUNT I/333. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- . *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy: A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude*. ConBNT 36. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. "Confession and Denial Before Men: Observations on Matt 26:57–27:2." *JSNT* 13 (1981): 46–66.
- . *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Lund: Gleerup, 1961.
- . "Nycklamakten enligt Skriften." Pages 41–74 in *Himmelrikets nycklar: Predikningar och föredrag hållna vid Kyrklig förnyelses kyrkodagar kring bikten och själavården i Uppsala 1902*. Edited by Eric Segelberg. Saltsjöbaden: Kyrkligt forum, 1963.
- Gerkan, Armin von. "Zu den Problemen des Petrusgrabes." *JAC* 1 (1958): 79–93.
- Gianotto, Claudio. "Quelques aspects de la polémique anti-juive dans l'Évangile selon Thomas." Pages 157–75 in *Colloque international: "L'Évangile selon Thomas et les textes de Nag Hammadi"*. Québec 29–31 mai 2003. Edited by Louis Painchaud and Paul-Hubert Poirier. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

- Gibson, Jack J. *Peter Between Jerusalem and Antioch*. WUNT II/345. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. AGJU 42. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Gilmour, Michael J. *The Significance of Parallels between 2 Peter and Other Early Christian Literature*. SBLAB 10. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Glover, Richard. "Luke the Antiochene and Acts." *NTS* 11 (1964/65): 97–106.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. 2 vols. HTKNT 1. Freiburg: Herder, 1986–1988.
- . *Petrus und Rom: Das Petrusbild in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten*. Freiburg: Herder, 2002.
- . *Der Philipperbrief*. HTKNT 10. Freiburg: Herder, 1968.
- Goetz, Karl Gerold. *Petrus als Gründer und Oberhaupt der Kirche und Schauer von Geschichten nach den altchristlichen Berichten und Legenden: Eine exegetisch-geschichtliche Untersuchung*. UNT 13. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1927.
- Goguel, Maurice. *Introduction au Nouveau Testament, tome II: Le quatrième Évangile*. BHR. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1924.
- . "A propos du texte nouveau de l'Apocalypse de Pierre." *RHR* 89 (1924): 191–209.
- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2002.
- . *Gouldner and the Gospel: An Examination of a New Paradigm*. JSNTS 133. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1996.
- . *Thomas and the Gospels: The Making of an Apocryphal Text*. London: SPCK, 2012.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. *A History of Early Christian Literature*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Der erste Petrusbrief*. KEK 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- . "Kirchenleitung und Bischofsamt in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten." Pages 9–35 in *Kirchenpräsident oder Bischof? Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung und Definition des kirchenleitenden Amtes in der lutherischen Kirche*. Edited by Ivar Asheim and Victor R. Gold. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
- . *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by Jürgen Roloff. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
- Gouldner, Michael. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. JSNTS 20. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.
- . *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001.
- . *St. Paul versus St. Peter: A Tale of Two Missions*. Louisville, KY: Knox, 1994.
- Grappe, Christian. *D'un Temple à l'autre: Pierre et l'Église primitive de Jérusalem*. EHPH 71. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1992.
- . *Images de Pierre aux deux premiers siècles*. EHPH 75. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1995.
- . Review of *Peter Between Jerusalem and Antioch*, by Jack J. Gibson. *RHPH* 94 (2014): 365–66.
- Grébaut, Sylvain. "Littérature Éthiopienne Pseudo-Clémentine." *ROC* 12 (1907): 139–51, 285–97, 380–92; *ROC* 15 (1910): 198–214, 307–23, 425–39.
- Green, Gene L. *Vox Petri: A Theology of Peter*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019.
- Green, H. Benedict. "Matthew, Clement and Luke: Their Sequence and Relationship." *JTS* 40 (1989): 1–25.
- Green, Joel B. "Preparation for Passover (Luke 22:7–13): A Question of Redactional Technique." *NovT* 29 (1987): 305–19.
- Green, Michael. *2 Peter and Jude*. TNTC. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1987.

- Greenslade, S. L. *Early Latin Theology: Selections from Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose and Jerome*. LCC 5. London: SCM, 1956.
- Gregory, Andrew. *The Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Gospel of the Ebionites*. Oxford: University Press, 2017.
- . “Prior or Posterior? The Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel of Luke.” *NTS* 51 (2005): 344–60.
- . *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*. WUNT II/169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Gregory, Andrew F., and C. Kavin Rowe (eds). *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.
- Grudem, Wayne A. *1 Peter*. TNTC. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1988.
- Grundmann, Walter. *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*. HKNT 15. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974.
- Grünstäudl, Wolfgang. *Petrus Alexandrinus: Studien zum historischen und theologischen Ort des zweiten Petrusbriefes*. WUNT II/353. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- . “Petrus, das Feuer und die Interpretation der Schrift: Beobachtungen zum Motiv des Weltenbrandes im zweiten Petrusbrief.” Pages 183–208 in *Der eine Gott und die Völker in eschatologischer Perspektive: Studien zur Inklusion und Exklusion im biblischen Monotheismus*. Edited by Luke Neubert and Michael Tilly. BTS 137. Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 2013.
- Guarducci, Margherita. *Hier ist Petrus: Die Gebeine des Apostelfürsten in der Confessio von St. Peter*. Regensburg: Habbel, 1967.
- . *I graffiti sotto la confessione di san Pietro in Vaticano*. 3 vols. Vatican: Libreria editrice Vaticana, 1957.
- Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1–8:26*. WBC 34A. Dallas, TX: Word, 1989.
- Gundry, Robert H. “Verba Christi in I Peter: Their Implications Concerning the Authorship of I Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition.” *NTS* 13 (1967): 336–50.
- . *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . *Peter: False Disciple and Apostate according to Saint Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Gustafsson, B. “Eusebius Principles in handling his Sources, as found in his Church History, Books I–VII.” Pages 429–41 in *Studia Patristica, vol. 3. Papers presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1959*. Edited by F. L. Cross. TU 79. Berlin: Akademie, 1961.
- Guthrie, Donald. *Galatians*. CBib. London: Oliphants, 1974.
- . *New Testament Theology*. Leicester: InterVarsity, 1981.
- Haacker, Klaus. “Das Bekenntnis Paulus zur Hoffnung Israels nach der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas.” *NTS* 31 (1985): 437–51.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968.
- Haeuser, Philipp. *Des heiligen Philosophen und Märtyrers Justinus Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon*. BKV. Kempten & München: Kösel, 1917.
- Hägg, Tomas. *The Novel in Antiquity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew*. 2 vols. WBC 33. Dallas, TX: Word, 1993–1995.
- . *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. NovTSup. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

- Hahn, Ferdinand. *Exegetische Beiträge zum ökumenischen Gespräch. Gesammelte Aufsätze I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Hainz, Josef. "Gemeinschaft (κοινωνία) zwischen Paulus und Jerusalem (Gal 2,9f)." Pages 30–42 in *Kontinuität und Einheit: Festschrift für Franz Mußner*. Freiburg: Herder, 1981.
- . *Koinonia. "Kirche" als Gemeinschaft bei Paulus*. BU 16. Regensburg: Pustet, 1982.
- Hakola, Raimo. *Reconsidering Johannine Christianity: A Social Identity Approach*. BibW. New York, NY: Routledge, 2015.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950.
- . *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte: Étude de mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1941.
- . *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. Presses Universitaires de France, 1952.
- . *On Collective Memory*. Edited by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Hall, Jonathan M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: University Press, 1997.
- . *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Harl, Marguerite. *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du verbe incarné*. PS 2. Paris: du Seuil, 1958.
- Harland, Philip A. *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities*. New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Harnack, Adolf von. "Der apokryphe brief des Paulusschülers Titus <<De dispositione sanctimonii>>." *SPAW* (1925): 180–213.
- . *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament III: Die Apostelgeschichte*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908.
- . *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament IV: Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte und zur Abfassungszeit der synoptischen Evangelien*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911.
- . *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910.
- . *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893–.
- . *Das Gnostische Buch Pistis-Sophia*. TU 7. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891.
- . *Lukas der Arzt: Der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte*. BENT. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906.
- . *Marcion, das Evangelium vom fremden Gott: Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921.
- . *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der Alten Kirche*. AKG 19. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931.
- . "Die Verklärungsgeschichte Jesu, der Bericht des Paulus (I. Kor. 15, 3ff.) und die beiden Christusvisionen des Paulus." *SPAW.PH* (1922): 62–80.
- . "Zum Ursprung des sog. 2. Clemensbriefs." *ZNW* 6 (1905): 67–71.
- Harris, Horton. *The Tübingen School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.
- Harris, William V. *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Harrison, P. N. *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*. Oxford: University Press, 1921.
- Hartenstein, Judith. "Autoritätskonstellationen in apokryphen und kanonischen Evangelien." Pages 423–44 in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen: Beiträge zu außerkanonischen Jesusüberlieferungen aus verschiedenen Sprach- und Kulturtraditionen*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter. WUNT I/254. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

- . *Charakterisierung im Dialog: Maria Magdalena, Petrus, Thomas und die Mutter Jesu im Johannesevangelium im Kontext anderer frühchristlicher Darstellungen*. NTOA 64. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- . “Gedanken zur Kohärenz und Absicht des Brief des Petrus an Philippus (NHC VIII, 2).” Pages 475–82 in *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit: Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongress Münster, 20-26. Juli 1996. Band 2. Schrifttum, Sprache und Gedankenwelt*. Edited by Stephen Emmel, Martin Krause, Siegfried G. Richter, and Sofia Schaten. SKCO. Weisbaden: Reichert, 1999.
- . *Die zweite Lehre: Erscheinungen des auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge*. TU 146. Berlin: Akademie, 2000.
- Hartog, Paul. *Polycarp’s Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp. Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford: University Press, 2013.
- Hartman, Lars. *Mark for the Nations: A Text- and Reader-Oriented Commentary*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010.
- . “Nyttestamentlig isagogik.” Pages 15–136 in *En bok om Nya testamentet*. Edited by Birger Gerhardsson. Malmö: Liber, 1989.
- Hartmann, Gert. “Die Vorlage der Osterberichten in Joh 20.” *ZNW* 55 (1964): 197–220.
- Havelaar, Henriette W. *The Coptic Apocalypse of Peter (Nag-Hammadi-Codex VII,3)*. TU 144. Berlin: Akademie, 1999.
- Heard, Richard. “The ΑΠΟΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ in Papias, Justin, and Irenaeus.” *NTS* 1 (1954): 122–29.
- Heckel, Theo K. *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium*. WUNT I/120. Tübingen: Mohr, 1999.
- Heintze, Werner. *Der Clemensroman und seine griechischen Quellen*. TU 40. Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1914.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm. “Zur Johannes-Tradition.” *ZNW* 15 (1914): 189–209.
- Helderman, Jan. “Anapausis in the Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha.” Pages 34–43 in *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis: Papers Read at the First International Congress of Coptology (Cairo, December 1976)*. Edited by R. McL. Wilson. NHC 14. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Helmer, Robert C. “That We May Know and Understand’: Gospel Tradition in the Apocalypse of Peter.” PhD diss., Marquette University, 1998.
- Hemer, Colin J. *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*. WUNT I/49. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- Hengel, Martin. “Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und “literarische Fälschung” in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur.” Pages 231–329 in *Pseudepigrapha I*. Edited by Kurt von Fritz. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1972.
- . “Entstehungszeit und Situation des Markusevangeliums.” Pages 1–46 in *Markus-Philologie: Historische, literaturgeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Evangelium*. Edited by Hubert Cancik. WUNT 1/33. Tübingen: Mohr, 1984.
- . *Die Evangelienüberschriften. Vorgetragen am 18. Oktober 1981*. SHAWPH. Heidelberg: Winter, 1984.
- . *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000.
- . *The Johannine Question*. Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press, 1989.
- . *Kleine Schriften: Judaistica et Hellenistica*. WUNT I/90. Tübingen: Mohr, 1997.
- . *Saint Peter: the Underestimated Apostle*. Translated by Thomas Trapp. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010. (German Original 2006).

- . *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. London: SCM, 1985.
- Henning, Meghan. *Educating Early Christians through the Rhetoric of Hell: "Weeping and Gnashing of Teeth" as Paideia in Matthew and the Early Church*. WUNT II/382. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- . "Paralysis and Sexuality in Medical Literature and the *Acts of Peter*." *JLA* 8 (2015): 306–21.
- Herron, Robert W., Jr. *Mark's Account of Peter's Denial of Jesus: A History of Its Interpretation*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991.
- Herzer, Jens. *Petrus oder Paulus? Studien über das Verhältnis des Ersten Petrusbriefes zur paulinischen Tradition*. WUNT I/103. Tübingen: Mohr, 1998.
- Heussi, Karl. *Die Römische Petrus-tradition in kritischer Sicht*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1955.
- Hiers, Richard H. "Binding and Loosing: The Matthean Authorisations." *JBL* 104/2 (1985): 233–50.
- Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Bardesanes, der letzte Gnostiker*. Leipzig: Weigel, 1864.
- . "Kein neuentdecktes Evangelium." *ZWT* 29 (1886): 50–58.
- Hilhorst, A., and Pieter J. Lalleman. "The Acts of Andrew and Matthias: Is it part of the original Acts of Andrew?" Pages 1–14 in *The Acts of Andrew*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer. SAAA 5. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Hill, Charles E. "The Epistula Apostolorum: An Asian Tract from the Time of Polycarp." *J ECS* 7 (1999): 1–53.
- Hillerdal, Gunnar. *Simon Petrus*. Stockholm: EFS, 1983.
- Hills, Julian V. "The Acts of Paul and the Legacy of Lukan Acts." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 145–58.
- . "Parables, Pretenders, and Prophecies: Translation and Interpretation in *The Apocalypse of Peter 2*." *RB* 98 (1991): 560–73.
- Hillyer, Norman. *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*. NIBC. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.
- Hirsch, Emanuel. *Studien zum vierten Evangelium*. BHT II. Tübingen: Mohr, 1936.
- Hoare, Frederick Russell. *The Original Order and Chapters of St. John's Gospel*. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1944.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: University Press, 1983.
- Hoek, Annewies van den. "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria. A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods." *VC* 50 (1996): 223–43.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph. *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity. An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016.
- Hofius, Otfried. "Gal 1:18 ἰστορήσω Κηφᾶν" *ZNW* 74 (1984): 73–85.
- Hofstetter, Karl. "Das Petrusamt in der Kirche des 1.–2. Jahrhunderts: Jerusalem-Rom." Pages 373–90 in *Begegnung der Christen: Studien evangelischer und katholischer Theologen*. Edited by Maximilian Roesle and Oscar Cullmann. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, and Frankfurt a.M.: Knecht, 1960.
- Holl, Karl. *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum: Eine Studie zu Symeon dem neuen Theologen*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898.
- . *Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde*. Berlin: Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1921.
- Holmberg, Bengt. *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*. ConBNT II. Lund: Gleerup, 1978.
- . "Sociologiska perspektiv på Gal 2:11-14(21)." *SEÅ* 55 (1990): 71–92.

- Holmstrand, Jonas. *Markers and Meaning in Paul: An Analysis of 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Galatians*. ConBNT 28. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1997.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius. *Die Synoptischen Evangelien: Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Character*. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1863.
- Hooker, Morna D. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. BNTC. London: Black, 1991.
- Hopkins, Clark. *The Discovery of Dura-Europos*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Horner, G. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, Vol 4*. Osnabrück: Zeller, 1969.
- . *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, Vol 6*. Osnabrück: Zeller, 1969.
- Hornschuh, Manfred. *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum*. PTS 5. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965.
- Horrell, David G. *Becoming Christian: Essays on 1 Peter and the Making of Christian Identity*. LNTS 394. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- . "Models and Methods in Social-Scientific Interpretation: A Response to Philip Esler." *JSNT* 78 (2000): 83–105.
- . Review of *Petrus oder Paulus? Studien über das Verhältnis des Ersten Petrusbriefes zur Paulinischen Tradition* by Jens Herzer. *JTS* 51 (2000): 287–92.
- . "The Product of a Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter." *JSNT* 86 (2002): 29–60.
- . *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.
- . *1 Peter*. NTG. London: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Howell, Justin R. *The Pharisees and Figured Speech in Luke-Acts*. WUNT II/456. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Hübner, Reinhard M. "Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien." *ZAC* 1 (1997): 44–72.
- Hulen, Amos B. "The Call of the Four Disciples in John 1." *JBL* 67 (1948): 153–57.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Rise of Normative Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1994.
- Hummel, Reinhart. *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium*. BEvT 33. München: Kaiser, 1963.
- Hunzinger, Claus-Hunno. "Babylon als Deckname für Rom und die Datierung des 1. Petrusbriefes." Pages 67–77 in *Gottes Wort und Gottes Land: Hans-Wilhelm Hertzberg zum 70. Geburtstag am 16. Januar 1965 dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Hurtado, Larry. "The Greek Fragments of the Gospel of Thomas as Artefacts: Papyrological Observations on Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1, Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 654 and Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 655." Pages 19–32 in *Das Thomasevangelium: Entstehung—Rezeption—Theologie*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Enno Edzard Popkes, and Jens Schröter. BZNV 157. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- . *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . "The Origin of the Nomina Sacra: A Proposal." *JBL* 117 (1998): 655–73.
- Illian, Bridget. "Church Discipline and Forgiveness in Matthew 18:15–35." *CurTM* 37/6 (2010): 444–50.
- Isacson, Mikael. *To Each Their Own Letter: Structure, Themes, and Rhetorical Strategies in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. ConBNT 42. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2004.

- Jakab, Attila. "The Reception of the *Apocalypse of Peter* in Ancient Christianity." Pages 194–86 in *The Apocalypse of Peter*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Jalland, Trevor Gervase. *The Church and the Papacy: A Historical Study Being Eight Lectures Delivered Before the University of Oxford, in the Year 1942, on the Foundation of the Rev. John Bampton, Canon of Salisbury*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1944.
- James, Montague Rhodes. "The Rainer Fragment of the Apocalypse of Peter". *JTS* 32 (1931): 270–79.
- . "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter." *JTS* 12 (1910/11): 36–54.
- . "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter II." *JTS* 12 (1910/11): 362–83.
- . "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter III." *JTS* 12 (1910/11): 573–83.
- Janßen, Martina. "Antike (Selbst-)Aussagen über Beweggründe zur Pseudepigraphie." Pages 125–79 in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jens Herzer, Martina Janßen, and Clare K. Rothschild. WUNT 1/246. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- . "Evangelium des Zwillings? Das Thomasevangelium als Thomas-Schrift." Pages 222–48 in *Das Thomasevangelium: Entstehung—Rezeption—Theologie*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Enno Edzard Popkes, and Jens Schröter. BZNW 157. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- . *Unter falschem Namen: Eine kritische Forschungsbilanz frühchristlicher Pseudepigraphie*. ARGU 14. Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 2003.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. KEK 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- . *Luke and the People of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts*. (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1972).
- Jewett, Robert. "The Redaction of 1 Corinthians and the Trajectory of the Pauline School." *JAARSup* 44 (1978): 389–444.
- . *A Chronology of Paul's Life*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Joly, Robert. *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche*. Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université, 1979.
- Jones, Christopher F. "The Historicity of the Neronian Persecution: A Response to Brent Shaw." *NTS* 63 (2017): 146–52.
- Jones, F. Stanley. *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27–71*. SBLTT 37. SBLCAT 2. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995.
- . *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque Inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies*. OLA 203. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.
- . "The Pseudo-Clementines." Pages 285–304 in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Edited by Matt Jackson-McCabe. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007.
- . "The Pseudo-Clementines: A History or Research, Part I." *SecCent* 2 (1982): 1–34.
- . *The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines: An Early Version of the First Christian Novel*. Paris: Brepols, 2014.
- Jülicher, Adolf. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Freiburg und Leipzig: Mohr, 1894.
- Junod, Eric, and Jean-Daniel Kaestli. *Acta Iohannis*. CCSA 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1983.
- Kähler, Christoph. "Zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte von Matth. Xvi. 17–19." *NTS* 23 (1976): 36–58.
- Kaler, Michael. "The Letter of Peter to Philip and its Message of Gnostic Revelation and Christian Unity." *VC* 63 (2009): 264–95.

- Karakolis, Christos. "Recurring Characters in John 1:19–2:11: A Narrative-Critical and Reader-Oriented Approach." Pages 17–38 in *The Opening of John's Narrative (John 1:19–2:22): Historical, Literary, and Theological Readings from the Colloquium Ioanneum 2015 in Ephesus*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Jörg Frey. WUNT 1/385. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "Eine Apologie der urchristlichen Eschatologie." *ZTK* 49 (1952): 272–96.
- Kasser, Rodolphe, and Gregor Wurst (editors). *The Gospel of Judas Together with the Letter of Peter to Philip, James, and a Book of Allogenes from Codex Tchacos*. Washington D. C.: National Geographic, 2007.
- Katzenmeyer, Hans. "Zur Primatsfrage im 1. Klemensbrief." *IKZ* 32 (1942): 28–37.
- Kazen, Thomas. "Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts." *NTS* 51 (2005): 561–78.
- Kelhoffer, James Anthony. "If Second Clement Really Were a Sermon, How Would We Know, and Why Would We Care: Prolegomena to Analyses of the Writing's Genre and Community." Pages 83–108 in *Early Christian Communities Between Ideal and Reality*. Edited by Mark Grundeken and Joseph Verheyden. WUNT 1/342. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- . *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark*. WUNT 11/112. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- . *Persecution, Persuasion, and Power: Readiness to Withstand Hardship as a Corroboration of Legitimacy in the New Testament*. WUNT 1/270. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Kelley, Nicole. *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines: Situating the Recognitions in Fourth Century Syria*. WUNT 11/213. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- . "Problems of Knowledge and Authority in the Pseudo-Clementine Romance of Recognitions." *J ECS* 13 (2005): 315–48.
- Kellner, Karl Ad. Heinrich. *Tertullianus sämtliche Schriften aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt*. Köln: DuMont-Schauberg, 1882.
- Kieffer, René. *Filemonbrevet, Judasbrevet och Andra Petrusbrevet*. KNT 18. Stockholm: EFS, 2001.
- . *Foi et justification a Antioche: interprétation d'un conflit*. LD 111. Paris: Cerf, 1982.
- . "Jean et Marc. Convergences dans la structure et dans les details." Pages 109–25 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by Adelbert Denaux. BETL 101. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
- . *Johannesevangeliet*. 2 vols. KNT 4. Uppsala: EFS, 1988.
- Kiilunen, Jarmo. "Minor Agreements and die Hypothese von Lukas' Kenntnis des Matthäusevangeliums." Pages 165–202 in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity*. Edited by Ismo Dunderberg, Christopher Tuckett, and Kari Syreeni. NovTSup 103. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Kilpatrick, George Dunbar. "Galatians 1:18 ΙΣΤΟΡΗΣΑΙ ΚΗΦΑΝ." Pages 144–49 in *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959.
- . *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.
- King, Karen L. "The Gospel of Mary Magdalene." Pages 601–34 in *Searching the Scriptures, vol. 2: A Feminist Commentary*. Edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. London: SCM, 1995.
- . *The Gospel of Mary of Magdala: Jesus and the First Woman Apostle*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2003.

- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. "The Figure of Peter in Matthew's Gospel as a Theological Problem." *JBL* 98 (1979): 67–83.
- Kinney, Robert S. *Hellenistic Dimensions of the Gospel of Matthew*. WUNT II/414. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Kinzig, Wolfram. *Harnack, Marcion und das Judentum: Nebst einer kommentierter edition des Briefwechsels Adolf von Harnacks mit Huston Stewart Chamberlain*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2004.
- Kirschbaum, Engelbert. *Die Gräber der Apostelfürsten. St. Peter und St. Paul in Rom*. Frankfurt a.M.: Societäts-Verlag, 1974.
- . "Das Petrusgrab." *Stimmen der Zeit* 77 (1952): 321–32, 401–10.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Die apokryphe Bibel: Ein anderer Zugang zum frühen Christentum*. TrC 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Klauser, Theodor. *Die römische Petrus-tradition im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen unter der Peterskirche*. AFLNWG 24. Köln: Westdeutscher, 1956.
- Klein, Günter. *Die Zwölf Apostel: Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Klein, Hans. "Zur Frage nach dem Abfassungsort der Lukasschriften." *EvTh* 32 (1972): 467–77.
- Klijn, A. F. J. *The Acts of Thomas: Introduction, Text, Commentary*. NovTSup 5. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- Klinger, Jerzy. "The Second Epistle of Peter: An Essay in Understanding." *SVTQ* 17 (1973): 152–69.
- Klinghardt, Matthias. *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft: Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern*. TANZ 13. Tübingen: Francke, 1996.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *Synoptic Problems: Collected Essays*. WUNT I/329. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Klostermann, Erich. *Apocrypha I: Reste des Petrus-evangeliums, der Petrusapokalypse und des Kerygma Petri*. Bonn: Weber, 1908.
- Knoch Otto B. "In Namen des Petrus und Paulus. Der Brief des Clemens Romanus und die Eigenart des römischen Christentums." Pages 3–54 in *ANRW* II.27.1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993.
- . *Die "Testamente" des Petrus und Paulus: Die Sicherung der apostolischen Überlieferung in der spätneutestamentlichen Zeit*. SBS 62. Stuttgart: KBW, 1973.
- . "Das Vermächtnis des Petrus: Der 2. Petrusbrief." Pages 149–65 in *Wort Gottes in der Zeit: Festschrift Karl Hermann Schelkle zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden, Schülern*. Edited by Helmut Feld and Josef Nolte. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1973.
- Knopf, Rudolf. *Die Briefe Petri und Judä völlig neu bearbeitet*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912.
- Knox, John. "Pliny and Peter: A Note on 1 Pet 4:14–16 and 3:15." *JBL* 72 (1953): 187–89.
- Koch, Heinrich. *Die Abfassungszeit des lukanischen Geschichtswerkes: Eine historisch-kritische und exegetische Untersuchung*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1911.
- Koch, Hugo. *Cathedra Petri: Neue Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Primatslehre*. BZNW 11. Gießen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1930.
- . *Cyprian und der römische Primat: Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Studie*. TU 5. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910.

- . *Cyprianische Untersuchungen*. AKG 4. Bonn: Weber, 1926.
- Köhler, Wolf-Dietrich. *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*. WUNT II/24. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.
- Korol, Dieter, and Jannicke Rieckesmann. "Neues zu den alt- und neutestamentlichen Darstellungen im Baptisterium von Dura-Europos." Pages 1612–72 in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by David Hellholm, Tor Vegge, Lars Hartman, and Øyvind Nordervall. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- Körtner, Ulrich H. J. "Markus der Mitarbeiter des Petrus." *ZNW* 71 (1980): 160–73.
- . *Papias von Hierapolis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- Koschorke, Klaus. "Eine gnostische Pfingstpredigt: zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen gnostischem und kirchlichem Christentum am Beispiel der Epistula Petri ad Philippum (NHC VIII, 2)." *ZTK* 74 (1977): 323–43.
- . *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nag-Hammadi-Traktate Apokalypse des Petrus (NHC VII,3) und Testimonium Veritatis (NHC IX,3)*. NHS 12. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Kragerud, Alv. *Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium*. Oslo: Osloer Universitätsverlag, 1959.
- Kraus, Thomas J. "The Fayum Gospel." Pages 150–56 in *The Non-Canonical Gospels*. Edited by Paul Foster. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2008.
- . "Die griechische Petrus-Apokalypse und ihre Relation zu ausgewählten überlieferungsträgern apokalyptischer Stoffe." *Apocrypha* 14 (2003): 73–98.
- . "Other Gospel Fragments." Pages 219–80 in *Gospel Fragments*. Edited by Tobias Nicklas, Michael J. Kruger, and Thomas J. Kraus. Oxford: University Press, 2009.
- . "P. Vindob. G. 2325: Das sogenannte Fayûm-Evangelium—Neuedition und kritische Rückschlüsse." *ZAC* 5 (2001): 197–212.
- . "Das sogenannte Fajumfragment (P. Vindob. G. 2325). Pages 1:375–76 in *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by Christoph Marksches and Jens Schröter. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- . *Sprache, Stil und historischer Ort des zweiten Petrusbriefes*. WUNT II/136. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Kraus, Thomas J., and Tobias Nicklas. *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse: Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung*. GCS 11. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- Krause, Martin. "Die Petrusakten in Codex VI von Nag Hammadi." Pages 36–58 in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böhlig*. Edited by Martin Krause. NHS 3. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Krause, Martin, and Pahor Labib. *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI*. ADAIK 2. Glückstadt: Augustin, 1971.
- Krenkel, Max. *Josephus und Lucas: Der schriftstellerische Einfluss des jüdischen Geschichtschreibers auf den Christlichen*. Leipzig: Haessel, 1894.
- Krüger, D. Gustav. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Freiburg and Leipzig: Mohr, 1895.
- Kuhn, Karl Georg. "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal." Pages 65–93 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York, NY: Crossroad, 1992.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Das Neue Testament: Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme*. Freiburg: Alber, 1958.

- . *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1973.
- Kürzinger, Josef. "Papias von Hierapolis: Zu Titel und Art seines Werkes." *BZ* 23 (1979): 172–86.
- Kvalbein, Hans. "The Authorization of Peter in Matthew 16:17–19: A Reconsideration of the Power to Bind and Loose." Pages 145–74 in *The Formation of the Early Church*. Edited by Jostein Ådna. WUNT I/183. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Labahn, Michael. "Peter's Rehabilitation (John 21:15-19) and the Adoption of Sinners: Remembering Jesus and Relecturing John." Pages 335–48 in *John, Jesus and History, Volume 2. Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, S. J., and Tom Thatcher. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . "Simon Peter: An Ambiguous Character and His Narrative Career." Pages 151–167 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. François Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. WUNT I/314. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Labahn, Michael, and Manfred Lang. "Johannes und die Synoptiker. Positionen und Impulse seit 1990." Pages 443–515 in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Udo Schnelle. WUNT I/175. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Edited by Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Lake, Kirsopp. "The Epistola Apostolorum." *HTR* 14 (1921): 15–29.
- Lalleman, Pieter H. *The Acts of John: A Two-Stage Initiation into Johannine Gnosticism*. SAAA 4. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- Lampe, Peter. *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*. WUNT II/18. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.
- . "Traces of Peter Veneration in Roman Archaeology. Pages 273–317 in *Peter in Early Christianity*. Edited by Helen K. Bond and Larry W. Hurtado. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Lang, Friedrich Gustav. "Kompositionsanalyse des Markusevangeliums." *ZTK* 74 (1977): 1–24.
- Langen, Joseph. *Die Klemensromane: Ihre Entstehung und ihre Tendenzen aufs neue untersucht*. Gotha: Perthes, 1890.
- Larsson, Edvin. "Till debatten om lukasskrifternas enhet och Apostlagärningarnas genre." *SEA* 63 (1998): 189–200.
- Lapham, Fred. *An Introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha*. London: T & T Clark, 2003.
- . *Peter: The Myth, the Man and the Writings: A Study of Early Petrine Text and Tradition*. JSNTS 239. Sheffield: Academic Press, 2003.
- Layton, Bentley. *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introductions*. London: SCM, 1987.
- Lebek, Wolfgang Dieter. "Das Datum des ersten Clemensbriefes." Pages 133–206 in *Von Homer bis Landino. Beiträge zur Antike und Spätantike sowie zu deren Rezeptions- und Wirkungsgeschichte. Festgabe für Antonie Wlosok zum 80. Geburtstag*. Edited by Beate Regina Suchla. Berlin: Pro Business, 2011.
- Lechner, Thomas. *Ignatius Adversus Valentinianos? Chronologische und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu den Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochien*. VCSup 47. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Leppä, Heikki. "Luke's Selective Use of Gal 1 and 2." Pages 91–124 in *The Early Reception of Paul*. Edited by Kenneth Liljeström. SESJ 99. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2011.
- Lieu, Judith M. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: University Press, 2004.

- . *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*. Cambridge: University Press, 2015.
- Lieu, Judith M. (ed.). *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader*. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. *The Apostolic Fathers. First Part, Vol. 1. S. Clement of Rome*. London: Macmillan, 1890.
- . *The Apostolic Fathers II: S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp*. London: Macmillan, 1885.
- Lincicum, David. “Mirror-Reading a Pseudepigraphic Letter.” *NovT* 59 (2017): 171–93.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Lindblom, Johannes. *Kanon och apokryfer: Studier till den bibliska kanons historia*. Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, 1920.
- Lindemann, Andreas. *Die Clemensbriefe*. HNT. Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.
- . *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. Tübingen: Mohr, 2000.
- . *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*. BHT 58. Tübingen: Mohr, 1979.
- Lipsius, Richard Adelbert. *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte*. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1887.
- Lods, Adolphe. *Evangelii secundum Petrum et Petri apocalypses quae supersunt*. Paris: Leroux, 1982.
- Lona, Horacio. *Der erste Clemensbrief*. KAV 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. WBC 41. Dallas, TX: Word, 1990.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. *Paulus, der Heidenapostel*. Band II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- Ludwig, Joseph. *Die Primatworte Mt 18, 18. 19 in der altkirchlichen Exegese*. NTAbh 19. Münster: Aschenorff, 1952.
- Lührmann, Dieter. *Die Apokryph gewordenen Evangelien. Studien zu neuen Texten und zu neuen Fragen*. NovTSup 112. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . “Die Griechischen fragmente des Mariaevangeliums POx 3525 und Pyl463,” *NovT* 30 (1988): 321–38.
- . *Das Markusevangelium*. HNT 3. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.
- . “POx 2949: EvPt 3–5 in einer Handschrift des 2./3. Jahrhunderts.” *ZNW* 72 (1981): 216–26.
- . “Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung: Zur Geschichte der Paulinischen Tradition.” *ZTK* 67 (1970): 437–52.
- Lummis, Edward. *How Luke Was Written: Considerations affecting the Two-Document Theory with Special Reference to the Phenomena of Order in the Non-Marcian Matter common to Matthew and Luke*. Cambridge: University Press, 1915.
- Luomanen, Petri. “The ‘Sociology of Sectarianism’ in Matthew: Modelling the Genesis of Early Jewish and Christian Communities.” Pages 107–30 in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen*. Edited by Ismo Dunderberg, Christopher Tuckett, and Kari Syreeni. NovTSup 103. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Luttikhuisen, Gerard P. *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . “The Letter of Peter to Philip and the New Testament.” Pages 96–102 in *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis: Papers Read at the First International Congress of Coptology (Cairo, December 1976)*. Edited by R. McL. Wilson. NHS 14. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. 4 vols. EKKNT 1. Zürich: Benziger, 1985–2002.

- . “Das Primatwort Matthäus 16.17–19 aus Wirkungsgeschichtlicher sicht.” *NTS* 37 (1991): 415–33.
- Lyons, George. *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- MacDonald, Dennis Ronald. *The Acts of Andrew and the Acts of Andrew and Mathias in the City of the Cannibals*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1990.
- . *Christianizing Homer: The Odyssey, Plato, and the Acts of Andrew*. Oxford: University Press, 1994.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalisation in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. SNTSMS 60. Cambridge: University Press, 1988.
- Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. FRLANT 126. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Magnusson, Jörgen. *Judasevangeliet: Text, budskap och historisk bakgrund*. Lund: Arcus, 2008.
- Malan, S. C. *The Conflicts of the Holy Apostles: An Apocryphal Book of the Early Eastern Church*. London: Nutt, 1871.
- Malininie, Michel, Henri-Charles Pech, Gilles Quispel, Walter Till, and Rodolphe Kasser (eds.). *Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha*. Zürich: Rascher, 1968.
- Mann, C. S. *Mark*. AB. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1986.
- Mantley, Julius R. “The Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense in Jn 20:23, Mt 16:19, and Mt 18:18.” *JBL* 38 (1939): 243–49.
- Manson, T. W. “The Corinthian Correspondence.” Pages 190–209 in *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Manchester: University Press, 1962.
- Marcovich, Miroslav. *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*. PTS 47. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.
- Marguerat, Daniel. *Paul in Acts and Paul in His Letters*. WUNT I/310. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Marjanen, Antti. “The Mother of Jesus or the Magdalene? The Identity of Mary in the So-Called Gnostic Christian Texts.” Pages 31–42 in *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition*. Edited by F. Stanley Jones. SBLSymS 19. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . “Women Disciples in the Gospel of Thomas.” Pages 89–106 in *Thomas at the Crossroads: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*. Edited by Risto Uro. SNTW. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.
- . *The Woman Jesus Loved. Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents*. NHMS 40. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Markley, John R. *Peter—Apocalyptic Seer*. WUNT II/348. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Marshall, I. Howard. “Acts and the Former Treatise.” Pages 163–82 in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting, vol. 1*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- . *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1970.
- Martin, Ralph O. *Mark: Evangelist and Theologian*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1972.
- Martin, Troy W. *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*. SBLDS 131. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- . “Peter and the Expansion of Early Christianity in the Letters of Acts (15:23–29) and First Peter.” Pages 87–99 in *Delightful Acts: New Essays on Canonical and Non-Canonical Acts*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, Dennis R. MacDonald, and Clare K. Rothschild. WUNT I/391. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

- Marxsen, Willi. *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- . *Mark the Evangelist*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1969.
- . “Der Mitälteste und Zeuge der Leiden Christi.” Pages 377–93 in *Theologia Crucis—Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Carl Andresen and Günter Klein. Tübingen: Mohr, 1979.
- Mason, Steve. *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- . *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Matson, Mark A. In *Dialogue with Another Gospel? The Influence of the Fourth Gospel on the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Luke*. SBLDS 178. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Mattill, A. J., Jr. “The Date and Purpose of Luke-Acts: Rackham Reconsidered.” *CBQ* 40 (1978): 334–50.
- Maurer, Christian. “Petrusevangelium.” Pages 118–24 in *NTAp I*, edited by Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Tübingen: Mohr, 1959.
- May, Gerhard. “Der Streit zwischen Petrus und Paulus in Antiochien bei Markion.” Pages 204–11 in *Von Wittenberg nach Memphis: Festschrift Reinhard Schwarz*. Edited by Walter Homolka and Otto Ziegelmeier. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Maynard, Arthur H. “The Role of Peter in the Fourth Gospel.” *NTS* 30 (1984): 531–48.
- McDowell, Sean. *The Fate of the Apostles. Examining the Martyrdom Accounts of the Closest Followers of Jesus*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015.
- McEleney, Neil J. “Peter’s Denials—How Many? To Whom?” *CBQ* 52 (1990): 467–72.
- Meade, David G. *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*. WUNT I/39. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986.
- Mees, Michael. “Das Petersbild nach außerkanonischen Zeugnissen.” *ZRGG* 27 (1975): 193–205.
- Meier, John P. “The Circle of the Twelve: Did It Exist During Jesus’ Public Ministry?” *JBL* 116 (1997): 635–72.
- Ménard, Jacques É. *La lettre de Pierre à Philippe*. BCNHT 1. Quebec: L’Université Laval, 1977.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Metzner, Rainer. *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums im 1. Petrusbrief*. WUNT II/74. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.
- Meyendorff, John (ed.). *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church*. New York, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1992.
- Meyer, Marvin W. “The Letter of Peter to Philip.” Pages 79–89 in *The Gospel of Judas Together with the Letter of Peter to Philip, Hames, and a Book of Allogenes from Codex Tchacos*. Washington D.C.: National Geographic, 2007.
- . “Making Mary Male: The Categories ‘Male’ and ‘Female’ in the Gospel of Thomas.” *NTS* 31 (1985): 554–70.
- Michel, Hans-Joachim. *Die Abschiedsrede des Paulus an die Kirche Apg 20, 17–38: Motivgeschichte und theologische Bedeutung*. SANT 35. München: Kösel, 1973.
- Michelsen, Christina Solmunde. “John the Baptist’s Pulic Ministry in Lk 3.1–20: Is Luke a Writing Reader of Matthew?” PhD diss., University of Copenhagen, 2017.
- Milburn, Robert. *Early Christian Art and Architecture*. Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1988.

- Minnen, Peter van. "The Greek *Apocalypse of Peter*." Pages 15–39 in *The Apocalypse of Peter*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Minnerath, Roland. *De Jérusalem à Rome : Pierre et l'unité de l'église apostolique*. TH 101. Paris: Beauchesne, 1994.
- Mirecki, Paul Allan. "The Antithetic Saying in Mark 16:16: Formal and Redactional Features." Pages 229–41 in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991.
- Moffatt, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. ITL. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1918.
- Moffitt, David M. "Affirming the 'Creed': The Extent of Paul's Citation of an Early Christian Formulae in 1 Cor 15:3b–7." *ZNW* 99 (2008): 49–73.
- Molinari, Andrea Lorenzo. *The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles (NHC 6.1): Allegory, Ascent, and Ministry in the Wake of the Decian Persecution*. SBLDS 174. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000.
- . "The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles: A Reconsideration of the Source Question." Pages 461–83 in *The Nag Hammadi Library After Fifty Years. Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration*. Edited by John D. Turner and Anne McGuire. NHMS 44. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "The Apocalypse of Peter and Its Dating." Pages 583–605 in *Coptica—Gnostica—Manichaica: Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk*. Edited by Louis Painchaud and Paul-Hubert Poirier. BCNHE 7. Québec: Les presses de l'université Laval, 2006.
- . *'I Never Knew the Man': The Coptic Act of Peter (Papyrus Berolensis 8502.4). Its Independence from the Apocryphal Acts of Peter, Genre and Legendary Origins*. BCNHE 5. Québec: L'Université Laval, 2000.
- Moll, Sebastian. *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*. WUNT I/250. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Moriarty, W. "1 Clement's View of Ministerial Appointments in the Early Church." *VC* 66 (2012): 115–38.
- Morgan, Robert. Review of *History and Criticism of the Markan Hypothesis* by Hans-Herbert Stoldt. *JSNT* 17 (1983): 108–109.
- . "Which Was the Fourth Gospel? The Order of the Gospels and the Unity of Scripture." *JSNT* 54 (1994): 3–28.
- Most, Glenn W. *Doubting Thomas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Moule, C. F. D. "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal." *BJRL* 47 (1965): 430–52.
- Mount, Christopher. *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*. NovTSup 104. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Moxon, John R. L. *Peter's Halakhic Nightmare*. WUNT II/432. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Munck, Johannes. *The Acts of the Apostles*. AB 31. Garden City: Doubleday, 1967.
- . "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la littérature biblique." Pages 155–70 in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne. Mélanges offerts à Maurice Goguel*. BibTh. Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950.
- . *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte*. Acta Jutlandica 26. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1954.
- . "Presbytere og Herrens disciple hos Papias. Exegetiske bemærkninger til Euseb, h.e. III, 39." *SEÅ* 22–23 (1957–58): 172–90.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Tradition and Redaction in 1 Cor 15:3–7." *CBQ* 43 (1981): 582–89.
- Murray, Russel. "Assessing the Primacy: A Contemporary Contribution from the Writings of St. Cyprian of Carthage." *JES* 41 (2012): 43–63.
- Mußner, Franz. *Petrus und Paulus—Pole der Einheit*. Freiburg: Herder, 1976.

- Myllykoski, Matti. "The Material Common to Luke and John: A Sketch." Pages 115–56 in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*. Edited by Petri Loumanen. SESJ 54. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- . "POX 2949 als Fragment des Petrus-evangeliums." *StudOr* 99 (2004): 171–89.
- Myrberg, Otto F. *Om Apostelen Petrus och den äldsta kyrkans falska Gnosis: Äfven ett bidrag till frågan om äktheten af Petri Andra Bref*. Upsala: Edquist & Berglund, 1865.
- Nagel, Peter. *Codex apocryphus gnosticus Novi Testamenti. Band 1: Evangelien und Apostelgeschichten aus den Schriften von Nag Hammadi und verwandten Kodizes. Koptisch und deutsch*. WUNT I/326. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- . "Das Evangelium des Judas." *ZNW* 98 (2007): 213–76.
- Nau, Arlo J. *Peter in Matthew: Discipleship, Diplomacy, and Dispraise*. GNS 36. Collegeville, PA: Liturgical, 1992.
- Nautin, Pierre. "Les citations de la 'Prédication de Pierre' dans Clément d'Alexandrie Strom. Vi. V. 39–41." *JTS* 25 (1974): 98–105.
- . *Orinène. Sa vie et son œuvre*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.
- Neill, Stephen. *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1961*. London: Oxford University press, 1964.
- Neiryneck, Frans. "The Anonymous Disciple in John I." Pages 617–50 in *Evangelica II 1982–1991. Collected Essays by Frans Neiryneck*, edited by F. van Segbroeck, BETL 94. Leuven: University Press, 1991.
- . *Jean et les synoptiques: Examen critique de l'exégèse de M.-È. Boismard*. BETL 49. Leuven: University Press, 1979.
- . "John 21." *NTS* 36 (1990): 321–36.
- . "John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990." Pages 3–62 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by Adelbert Denaux. BETL CI. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
- . *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark with a Cumulative List*. BETL 37. Leuven: University Press, 1974.
- . "The 'Other Disciple' in Jn 18.15–16." *ETL* 51 (1975): 113–41.
- Nestle, Eberhard. "War der Verfasser des erten Clemens-Briefes semitischer Abstammung?" *ZNW* 1 (1900): 178–80.
- Neusner, Jacob. "Vow-Taking, the Nazirites, and the Law: Does James' Advice to Paul Accord with Halakhah?" Pages 59–82 in *James the Just and Christian Origins*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. NovTSup 98. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "The Apologetic Use of the Transfiguration in 2 Peter 1:16–21." *CBQ* 42 (1980): 501–19.
- . "The Form and Background of the Polemic in 2 Peter." *JBL* 99 (1980): 407–31.
- Nicholas, Barry. *An Introduction to Roman Law*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Nicklas, Tobias. "Christliche Apokryphen als Spiegel der Vielfalt frühchristlichen Lebens: Schlaglichter, Beispiele und methodische Probleme." *ASE* 23 (2006): 27–44.
- . "'Drink the Cup Which I Promised You!' (*Apocalypse of Peter* 14.4): Peter's Death and the End of Times." Pages 183–200 in *The Open Mind: Essays in Honour of Christopher Rowland*. Edited by Jonathan Knight and Kevin Sullivan. LNTS 522. London: T & T Clark, 2015.
- . "Erzähler und Charakter zugleich: Zur literarischen Funktion des 'Petrus' in dem nach ihm benannten Evangelienfragment." *VC* 55 (2001): 318–326.
- . "Gnostic Perspectives on Peter." Pages 196–221 in *Peter in Early Christianity*. Edited by Helen K. Bond and Larry W. Hurtado. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.

- , “Petrus als Gegenspieler der Maria von Magdala im *Evangelium nach Maria*? Pages 381–99 in *Gegenspieler: Zur Auseinandersetzung mit dem Gegner in frühjüdischer und urchristlicher Literatur*. Edited by Michael Tilly and Ulrich Mell. WUNT I/428. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- , “Petrus-Diskurse in Alexandria: Eine Fortführung der Gedanken von Jörg Frey.” Pages 99–127 in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter: Towards a New Perspective. Radboud Prestige Lectures by Jörg Frey*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, and Jan G van der Watt. BibInt. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- , “Petrusoffenbarung, Christusoffenbarung und ihre Funktion: Autoritätskonstruktion in der Petrusapokalypse.” Pages 347–63 in *Autorschaft und Autorisierungsstrategien in apokalyptischen Texten*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Michael R. Jost, and Franz Tóth. WUNT I/426. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- , “Zwei Petrinische Apokryphen im Akhmim-Codex oder eines? Kritische Anmerkungen und Gedanken.” *Apocrypha* 16 (2005): 75–96.
- Niederwimmer, Kurt. “Johannes Markus und die Frage nach dem Verfasser des zweiten Evangeliums.” *ZNW* 58 (1967): 172–88.
- Nock, Arthur Darby. *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*. Oxford: University Press, 1933.
- Nongbri, Brent. “The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel.” *HTR* 98 (2005): 23–48.
- Nordgren, Kenneth. “How to do Things with History: Use of History as a Link between Historical Consciousness and Historical Culture.” *Theory & Research in Social Education* 44 (2016): 479–504.
- Nordheim, Eckhard von. *Die Lehre der Alten I: Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der Hellenistisch-Römischen Zeit*. ALGHJ 13. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- , *Die Lehre der Alten II: Das Testament als Literaturgattung im alten Testament und im Alten vorderen Orient*. ALGHJ 18. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Norelli, Enrico. “Situation des apocryphes Pétriniens.” *Apocrypha* 2 (1991): 31–83.
- Obrist, Franz. *Echtheitsfragen und Deutung der Primatsstelle Mt 16, 18f. in der Deutschen Protestantischen Theologie der letzten dreissig Jahre*. NTAbh 21. Münster: Aschendorff, 1960.
- Odeberg, Hugo. “Johannesevangeliums tillkomst.” *Erevna* 4 (1947): 89–93.
- Olsson, Birger. *Första Petrusbrevet*. KNT 17. Stockholm: EFS, 1982.
- , Review of *The Gospel and Letters of John* by Urban von Wahlde. *SEÁ* 81 (2016): 277–81.
- O’Neill, J. C. *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*. London: SPCK, 1961.
- Orchard, Bernard. “Mark and the Fusion of Traditions.” Pages 779–800 in *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Franz Neirynck*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden. BETL 100. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
- , *Matthew, Luke & Mark*. Manchester: Koinonia Press, 1976.
- Orchard, Bernard, and Harold Riley. *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Orr, William F., and James Artur Walther. *1 Corinthians*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.
- O’Toole, Robert F. “You did not Lie to Us (Human Beings) but to God,” *Biblica* 76 (1995): 182–209.
- Overbeck, Franz. *Das Johannesevangelium: Studien zur Kritik seiner Erforschung*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1911.

- Overman, J. Andrew. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism. The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990.
- Pagels, Elaine. *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas*. New York, NY: Random House, 2003.
- Painchaud, Louis. "On the (Re)Discovery of the Gospel of Judas." Pages 119–36 in *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early Christian and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts and Traditions*. Edited by Pierluigi Piovanelli and Tony Burke. WUNT 1/349. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- . "Polemical Aspects of the Gospel of Judas." Pages 171–86 in *The Gospel of Judas in Context: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Gospel of Judas—Paris, Sorbonne, October 27th–28th, 2006*. Edited by Madeleine Scopello. NHMS 62. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Painter, John. "James and Peter: Models of Leadership and Mission." Pages 143–210 in *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul. Tensions in Early Christianity*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans. NovTSup 115. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999.
- Palmqvist, Arne. "Cyprianus och primatfrågan." *NKT* 27 (1958): 152–72.
- Parker, Pierson. *The Gospel Before Mark*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- . "John the Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 81 (1962): 35–43.
- . "Luke and the Fourth Evangelist." *NTS* 9 (1963): 319–36.
- Parkhouse, Sarah. *Eschatology and the Saviour: The Gospel of Mary among Early Christian Dialogue Gospels*. SNTSMS 176. Cambridge: University Press, 2019.
- Parrott, Douglas M. "Gnostic and Orthodox Disciples in the Second and Third Centuries." Pages 193–219 in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, & Early Christianity*. Edited by Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson, Jr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986.
- Parsons, Mikeal C., and Richard I. Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Parvis, Paul. "When Did Peter Become Bishop of Antioch?" Pages 273–72 in *Peter in Early Christianity*. Edited by Helen K. Bond and Larry W. Hurtado. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Pasquier, Anne. *L'évangile selon Marie*. BCNHT 10. Quebec: L'Université Laval, 1983.
- Patterson, Stephen J. "Sources, Redaction, and Tendenz in the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles (NH VI, 1)." *VC* 45 (1991): 1–17.
- Paulsen, Henning. "Das Kerygma Petri und die urchristliche Apologetik." *ZKG* 88 (1977): 1–37.
- . *Der Zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief*. KEK 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Peerbolte, L. J. Lietaert. *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents*. JSJSup 49. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. "The Two Sees of Peter." Pages 57–73 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Volume One. The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*. Edited by E. P. Sanders. London: SCM, 1980.
- Peppard, Michael. *The World's Oldest Church: Bible, Art, and Ritual at Dura-Europos, Syria*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Perdelwitz, Richard. *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des I. Petrusbriefes*. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1911.
- Perkins, Ann. *The Art of Dura-Europos*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973.
- Perkins, Pheme. *Peter: Apostle for the Whole Church*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.

- .“Johannine Traditions in *Ap. Jas.* (NHC I,2).” *JBL* 101 (1982): 403–14.
- .*Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.
- Perrin, Nicholas. *Thomas. The Other Gospel*. Louisville, KY: Knox, 2007.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Acts*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2009.
- .*The Acts of Paul*. Cambridge: Clarke, 2014.
- .“The Ancient Novel Becomes Christian.” Pages 685–711 in *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Edited by Gareth Schmeling. MBCB. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- .*Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006.
- .“Johannine Trajectories in the Acts of John.” *Apocrypha* 3 (1990): 47–68.
- .“The Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Letters: Aspects of Luke as an Interpreter of the *Corpus Paulinum*.” Pages 141–55 in *Reception of Paulinism in Acts*. Edited by Daniel Marguerat. BETL 229. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Pesch, Rudolf. *Die Apostelgeschichte, vol. 1*. EKKNT. Zürich: Benziger, 1986.
- .*Die biblischen Grundlagen des Primats*. Freiburg: Herder, 2001.
- .*Der reiche Fischfang Lk 5,1–11/Jo 21,1–14. Wundergeschichte—Berufserzählung—Erscheinungsbericht*. KBANT. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1969.
- .*Simon-Petrus*. Päpste und Papsttum 15. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1980.
- Pesthy, Monika. “Thy Mercy, O Lord, Is in the Heavens; and Thy Righteousness Reacheth unto the Clouds.” Pages 40–51 in *The Apocalypse of Peter*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Petersen, Silke. “Die Evangelienüberschriften und die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons.” *ZNW* 97 (2006): 250–74.
- Peterson, Peter M. *Andrew, Brother of Simon Peter*. NovTSup 1. Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- Pfleiderer, Otto. *Der Paulinismus: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der urchristlichen Theologie*. Leipzig: Reisland, 1890.
- Pilhoffer, Peter. “Justin und das Petrus-evangelium.” *ZNW* 81 (1990): 60–78.
- Plisch, Uwe-Karsten. “Judasevangelium und Judasgedicht.” Pages 387–96 in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen: Beiträge zu außerkanonischen Jesusüberlieferungen aus verschiedenen Sprach- und Kulturtraditionen*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter. WUNT 1/254. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Pokorný, Petr. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Thomas: From Interpretations to the Interpreted*. JCTC 5. London: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Pokorný, Petr, and Ulrich Heckel. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament: Seine Literatur und Theologie im Überblick*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Porter, Stanley E. *When Paul Met Jesus: How an Idea Got Lost in History*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Bryan R. Driver. *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Poupon, Gérard H. “L’Origine africaine des *Actus Vercellenses*.” Pages 192–99 in *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer. SAAA 3. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- Powell, Mark Allan. “Binding and Loosing: A Paradigm for Ethical Discernment from the Gospel of Matthew.” *CurTM* 30/6 (2003): 348–445.
- Pratscher, Wilhelm. *Der zweite Clemensbrief*. KAV 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.

- , “Scripture and Christology in the Preaching of Peter (Kerygma Petri).” Pages 555–77 in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity. Essays in Honor of Michael W. Holmes On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner, Juan Hernández Jr, and Paul Foster. NTTSD 50. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Prieur, Jean-Marc. *Acta Andreae*. CCSA 5. Turnhout: Brepols, 1989.
- , “Andrew, Acts of.” *ABD* 1:244–47.
- Quast, Kevin. *Peter and the Beloved Disciple: Figures for a Community in Crisis*. JSNTS 22. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Quispel, G., and R. M. Grant. “Note on the Petrine Apocrypha.” *VC* 6 (1952): 31–32.
- Rankin, David. *Tertullian and the Church*. Cambridge: University Press, 1995.
- Ratzinger, Joseph (ed). *Dienst an der Einheit: Zum Wesen und Auftrag des Petrusamts*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1978.
- Reagan, Joseph Nicholas. “The Preaching of Peter: The Beginning of Christian Apologetic.” PhD diss., Chicago Graduate Divinity School, 1923.
- Reaves, Pamela Mullins. “Pseudo-Peter and Persecution: (Counter-)Evaluations of Suffering in the *Coptic Apocalypse of Peter* (NHC VII,3) and the *Letter of Peter to Philip* (NHC VIII,2).” Pages 129–51 in *Fakes, Forgeries, and Fictions: Writing Ancient and Modern Christian Apocrypha. Proceedings from the 2015 York University Christian Apocrypha Symposium*. Edited by Tony Burke. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. “‘Jewish Christianity’ after the ‘Parting of the Ways’: Approaches to Historiography and Self-Definition in the Pseudo-Clementines.” Pages 189–231 in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed. TSAJ 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Rehm, Bernhard. “Bardesanes in den Pseudoclementinen,” *Philologus* 93 (1938): 218–47.
- , *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien*. GCS 42. Berlin: Akademie, 1953.
- Reicke, Bo. “Der Geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiochia-Episode, Gal 2, 1–14.” Pages 172–87 in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan*. Edited by J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik. Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- , *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde. Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1–7*. ATANT 32. Zürich: Zwingli, 1957.
- , “Judasbrevet.” Pages 283–307 in *Tolkning av Nya testamentet. De katolska breven*. Edited by Bo Reicke and Bertil E. Gärtner. Stockholm: Verbum, 1970.
- , “Petrusbrevet.” Pages 9–112 in *Tolkning av Nya testamentet. De katolska breven*. Edited by Bo Reicke and Bertil E. Gärtner. Stockholm: Verbum, 1970.
- , *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1986.
- Reinhartz, Adele. “Gospel Audiences: Variations on a Theme.” Pages 134–52 in *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*. Edited by Edward W. Klink III. LNTS 353. London: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. “Die Zuwahl des Matthias (Apg 1,15ff).” *ST* 15 (1961): 35–67.
- Repo, Eero. *Der “Weg” als Selbstbezeichnung des Urchristentums: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und semasiologische Untersuchung*. AASF 132,2. Helsinki: Soumalainen Tiedakatemia, 1964.
- Richter, Georg. *Die Fußwaschung im Johannesevangelium*. BU 1. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1967.
- Riedl, Hermann Josef. *Anamnese und Apostolizität: Der Zweite Petrusbrief und das theologische Problem neutestamentlicher Pseudepigraphie*. RST 64. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 2005.

- Riesefeld, Harald. "The Text of Acts x.36." Pages 191–94 in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Edited by Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: University Press, 1979.
- . "Till Markusevangeliums komposition." *SEÅ* 18–19 (1953–1954): 140–60.
- Riley, Gregory J. *Resurrection Reconsidered: Thomas and John in Controversy*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995.
- Rius-Camps, Josep. *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, the Martyr*. OrChrAn 213. Rome: Pontificium institutum orientalium studiorum, 1980.
- Roberts, Keith A. *Religion in Sociological Perspective*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1990.
- Robinson, James K., Paul Hoffman, John S. Kloppenborg, and Milton C. Moreland (editors). *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000.
- Robinson, James M. "The Sources of the Gospel of Judas." Pages 59–67 in *The Gospel of Judas in Context: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Gospel of Judas—Paris, Sorbonne, October 27th–28th, 2006*. Edited by Madeleine Scopello. NHMS 62. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Robinson, James M., and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1971.
- Robinson, John A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1975.
- Robinson, Donald Fay. "Where and When Did Peter Die?" *JBL* 64 (1945): 255–67.
- Rohde, Joachim. *Die redaktionsgeschichtliche Methode: Einführung und kritische Sichtung des Forschungsstandes*. TA 22. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965.
- Roig Lanzilotta, Lautaro. *Acta Andreae Apocrypha. A New Perspective on the Nature, Intention, and Significance of the Primitive Text*. Geneva: Cremer, 2007.
- . "A Syriac Original for the Acts of Thomas? The Hypothesis of Syriac Priority Revisited." Pages 105–34 in *Early Jewish and Christian Narrative: The Role of Religion in Shaping Narrative Forms*. Edited by Ilaria Ramelli and Judith Perkins. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Roitto, Rikard. "Reintegrative Shaming and a Prayer Ritual of Reintegration in Matthew 18:15–20." *SEÅ* 79 (2014): 95–124.
- Roloff, Jürgen. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. NTD 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- Ropes, James Hardy. *The Epistle of St. James*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1916.
- Rothschild, Clare K. *New Essays on the Apostolic Fathers*. WUNT 1/375. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Rowley, H. H. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation*. London: Lutterworth, 1963.
- Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Ruysschaert, José. *Réflexions sur les feuilles vaticanes, le rapport officiel et la critique*. Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1954.
- Ruckstuhl, Eugen. "Johannine Language and Style. The Question of Their Unity." Pages 125–48 in *L'Évangile de Jean. Sources, redaction, théologie*. Edited by M. de Jonge. BETL XLIV. Leuven: University Press, 1977.
- . *Die Literarische Einbeit des Johannesevangeliums*. SF 3. Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1951.

- Ruf, Martin G. *Die heiligen Propheten, eure Apostel und ich: metatextuelle Studien zum zweiten Petrusbrief*. WUNT II/300. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Salmon, George. *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*. London: Murray, 1889.
- Sanday, William. *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1905.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Santos Otero, Aurelio de. "Der Apokryphe Titusbrief." *ZKG* 12 (1963): 1–14.
- . "Der Pseudo-Titus-Brief." Pages 50–70 in *NTAp*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- Schaeffer, F. "Die Acten der heiligen Nereus und Achilleus. Untersuchung über den originaltext, und die Zeit seiner Entstehung." *RQ* 8 (1894): 89–119.
- Schäferdiek, Knut. "Die Leukios Charinos zugeschriebene manichäische Sammlung apokrypher Apostelgeschichten." Pages 81–93 in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung II. Apostolisches Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- Schekkle, Karl Hermann. *Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief*. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1961.
- Schenk, Wolfgang. "Das 'Matthäusevangelium' als Petrus-evangelium." *BZ* 27 (1983): 58–80.
- Schenke, Gesa. "Das Erscheinen Jesu vor den Jüngern und der ungläubige Thomas: Johannes 20,19–31." Pages 893–904 in *Coptica—Gnostica—Manichaica: Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk*. Edited by Louis Painchaud and Paul-Hubert Poirier. BCNHE 7. Québec: Les presses de l'université Laval, 2006.
- Schenke, Hans-Martin. "Bemerkungen zur Apokalypse des Petrus." Pages 277–85 in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Pabor Labib*. Edited by Martin Krause. NHS 6. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . "Die Taten des Petrus und der zwölf Apostel: Die erste Schrift aus Nag-Hammadi-Codex VI—eingeleitet und übersetzt vom Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften." *TLZ* 98 (1973): 13–19.
- Schenke, Hans-Martin, and Karl Martin Fischer. *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. I. Die Briefe des Paulus und Schriften des Paulinismus*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1978.
- . *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. II. Die Evangelien und die anderen neutestamentlichen Schriften*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1979.
- Schenke, Hans-Martin, and Carl Schmidt. *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften 1. Die Pistis Sophia, Die beiden Bücher des Jeu, Unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie, 1981.
- Schille, Gottfried. *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*. HKNT. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1983.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Galater*. Fifth edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Schmid, Josef. *Matthäus und Lukas*. BibS(F) 23. Freiburg: Herder, 1930.
- . "Petrus 'der Fels' und die Petrusgestalt der Urgemeinde." Pages 347–60 in *Begegnung der Christen: Studien evangelischer und katholischer Theologen*. Edited by Maximilian Roesle and Oscar Cullmann (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk and Frankfurt a.M.: Knecht, 1960).

- Schmid, Ulrich. *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*. ANT 25. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.
- Schmidt, Carl. *Die Alten Petrusakten im Zusammenhang der apokryphen Apostellitteratur nebst einem neuentdeckten Fragment*. TU 9. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903.
- “Ein Berliner Fragment der alten ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ. SPAW (1931): 37–40.
- “Ein vorirenaeisches gnostisches Originalwerk in koptischer Sprache.” *SKPAW* 36 (1896): 839–47.
- *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung: Ein katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrhunderts*. TU 13. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1919.
- *Pistis Sophia*. Translated by Violet MacDermot. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- *ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ Acta Pauli. Nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek*. Edited by Wilhelm Schubart. Hamburg: Augustin, 1936.
- “Studien zu den alten Petrusakten.” *ZKG* 6 (1924): 321–48.
- “Studien zu den alten Petrusakten II. Die Komposition.” *ZKG* 8 (1926): 481–513.
- “Zur Datierung der alten Petrusakten.” *ZNW* 29 (1930): 150–55.
- “Die Urschrift der Pistis Sophia.” *ZNW* 24 (1925): 218–40.
- Schmidt, David Henry. “The Peter Writings: Their Redactors and Their Relationships.” PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1972.
- Schmidt, Karl Matthias. *Mahnung und Erinnerung im Maskenspiel: Epistolographie, Rhetorik und Narrativik der pseudepigraphen Petrusbriefe*. HBS 38. Freiburg: Herder, 2003.
- “Die Stimme des Apostels erheben: Pragmatische Leistungen der Autorenfiktion in den Petrusbriefen.” Pages 625–44 in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jens Herzer, Martina Janssen, and Clare K. Rothschild. WUNT 1/246. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Johannesevangelium und Johannesbriefe: Forschungsgeschichte und Analyse*. BZNW 64. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992.
- *Das kirchliche Apostelamt: Eine historische Untersuchung*. FRLANT 61. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to John, vol. 1*. Translated by Kevin Smyth. New York: Herder, 1968.
- “On the Origin of the Fourth Gospel.” *Perspective* 11 (1970): 223–46.
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. “Das Kerygma Petrou.” Pages 58–63 in *NTAp II*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.
- “Paulusakten.” Pages 193–241 in *NTAp II*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- “Petrusakten.” Pages 118–221 in *NTAp II*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.
- Schneider, Alfons Maria. *Die Memoria Apostolorum an der Via Appia*. NAWG. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951.
- Schneider, Gerhard. *Die Apostelgeschichte, 1. Teil*. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1980.
- *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk*. BBB 59. Bonn: Hanstein Verlag, 1985.
- Schnelle, Udo. *Antidoketische Christologie im Johannesevangelium: Eine Untersuchung zur Stellung des vierten Evangeliums in der johanneischen Schule*. FRLANT 144. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

- .“Der ungenannte Jünger in Johannes 1:40.” Pages 97–117 in *The Opening of John’s Narrative (John 1:19–2:22): Historical, Literary, and Theological Readings from the Colloquium Ioanneum 2015 in Ephesus*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Jörg Frey. WUNT 1/385. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- .*The History and Theology of The New Testament Writings*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998.
- .“Johannes und die Synoptiker.” Pages 1799–1814 in *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden. BETL 100. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
- .“Die Reihenfolge der johanneischen Schriften.” *NTS* 57 (2011): 97–113.
- Schoedel, William R. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1985.
- .“Ignatius, Epistles of.” *ABD* 3:184–87.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim. *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1949.
- Schröter, Jens. “Konstruktion von Geschichte und die Anfänge des Christentums: Reflexionen zur christlichen Geschichtsdeutung aus neutestamentlicher Perspektive.” Pages 201–19 in *Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit: Beiträge aus geschichtstheoretischer, philosophischer und theologischer Perspektive*. Edited by Jens Schröter and Antje Edelbüttel. TBT 127. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- .“Memory and Memories in Early Christianity: The Remembered Jesus as a Test Case.” Pages 79–96 in *Memory and Memories in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Universities of Geneva and Lausanne (June 2–3, 2016)*. Edited by Simon Buttica and Enrico Norelli. WUNT 1/398. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- Schultheiß, Tanja. *Das Petrusbild im Johannesevangelium*. WUNT II/329. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Schüngel, Paul. “Ein Vorschlag, EvTho 114 neu zu übersetzen.” *NovT* 36 (1993): 394–401.
- Schürmann, Heinz. “Der Dienst des Petrus und Johannes (Lk 22:8).” *TTZ* 60 (1951): 99–101.
- .*Das Lukasevangelium, 1. Teil*. HTKNT Freiburg: Herder, 1969.
- Schütz, John Howard. *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority*. SNTSMS 26. Cambridge: University Press, 1975.
- Schwartz, Eduard. “Aporien im vierten Evangelium I.” *NAWG* (1908): 342–72.
- .“Aporien im vierten Evangelium II.” *NAWG* (1908): 115–48.
- .“Aporien im vierten Evangelium III.” *NAWG* (1908): 149–88.
- .“Aporien im vierten Evangelium IV.” *NAWG* (1908): 497–550.
- Schwartz, M. G. *Pistis Sophia: Opus gnosticum valentino adiudicatum*. Edited by J-H. Petermann. Berlin: Duemmler, 1851.
- Schwegler, Albert. *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Fues, 1846.
- Schweizer, Albert. *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1913.
- Sell, Jesse. “Simon Peter’s ‘Confession’ and the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles.” *NovT* 21 (1979): 344–56.
- Selwyn, Edward Gordon. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. London: Macmillan, 1969.
- Seufert, W. “Das Abhängigkeitsverhältniss des I. Petrusbriefs vom Römerbrief.” *ZWT* 17 (1874): 360–88.
- Shaw, Brent H. “The Myth of the Neronian Persecution.” *JRS* 105 (2015): 1–28.

- . “Response to Christopher Jones: The Historicity of the Neronian Persecution.” *NTS* 64 (2018): 231–42.
- Shellard, Barbara. *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*. JSNTS 2015. Sheffield: Academic Press, 2002.
- . “The Relationship of Luke and John: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem.” *JTS* 46 (1995): 71–98.
- Shoemaker, Stephen J. “A Case of Mistaken Identity? Naming the Gnostic Mary.” Pages 5–30 in *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition*. Edited by F. Stanley Jones. SBLSymS 19. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . “Mary in Early Christian Apocrypha: Virgin Territory.” Pages 275–90 in *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early Christian and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts and Traditions*. Edited by Pierluigi Piovanelli and Tony Burke. WUNT 1/349. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- . “Rethinking the ‘Gnostic Mary’: Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala in Early Christian Tradition.” *J ECS* 9 (2001): 555–96.
- Shorter, Mary. “The Position of Chapter VI in the Fourth Gospel.” *ExpTim* 84 (1973): 181–83.
- Sim, David C. *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*. STNTW. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.
- . “The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham.” *JSNT* 84 (2001): 3–27.
- Smalz, Warren M. “Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?” *JBL* 71 (1952): 211–16.
- Smith, Dennis E. *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Smith, Dwight Moody, Jr. *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel. Bultmann’s Literary Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1965.
- . *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources, and Theology*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1984.
- . *John Among the Gospels*. 2nd ed. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- Smith, Mitzi Jane. “Understand Ye a Parable!: *The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles* as Parable Narrative.” *Apocrypha* 13 (2002): 29–52.
- Smith, Morton. *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- . “The Report about Peter in 1 Clement V.4” *NTS* 7 (1960/61): 86–88.
- . *Tannaïtic Parallels to the Gospels*. SBLMS 6. Philadelphia, PA: SBL, 1951.
- Smith, Terence V. *Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity: Attitudes Towards Peter in Christian Writings of the First Two Centuries*. WUNT 11/15. Tübingen: Mohr, 1985.
- Snyder, Glenn E. *Acts of Paul: The Formation of a Pauline Corpus*. WUNT 11/352. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Snyder, G. F. “John 13:16 and the Anti-Petrinism of the Johannine Tradition.” *BR* 16 (1971): 5–15.
- Soards, M. L. “1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude as Evidence for a Petrine School.” Pages 3827–3849 in *ANRW* II.25.5. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988.
- Solages, Mgr. Bruno de. *Jean et les synoptiques*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Solevåg, Anna Rebecca. *Negotiating the Disabled Body: Representations of Disability in Early Christian Texts*. ECL 23. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2018.
- Soltau, Wilhelm. “Petrusanekdoten und Petruslegenden in der Apostelgeschichte.” Pages 2:805–15 in *Orientalische Studien Theodor Noldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag (2. März 1906)*. Edited by Carl Bezold. Gieszen: Töpelman, 1906.

- Souter, Alexander. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. London: Duckworth, 1954.
- Speyer, Wolfgang. *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. HAW 1:2. München: Beck, 1971.
- Spicq, Ceslas. *Les Épitres de Saint Pierre*. SB. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1966.
- Spitta, Friedrich. "Die Petrusapokalypse und der zweite Petrusbrief." *ZNW* 12 (1911): 237–42.
- Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.
- . "Jewish Christian Elements in the Pseudo-Clementine Writings." Pages 307–24 in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*. Edited by Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007.
- . *Studies in Matthew and Early Christianity*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and David Lincicum. WUNT 1/309. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- . "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980." Pages 1889–1951 in *ANRW II.25.3*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1985.
- Starr, James M. *Sharers in Divine Nature. 2 Peter 1:4 in Its Hellenistic Context*. ConBNT 33. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2000.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. "Abschiedsreden." *RAC* 1:29–35.
- . "Der Methurgeman des Petrus." Pages 283–93 in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze. Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by J. Binzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mußner. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963.
- . "Petrus und Jakobus in Jerusalem." Pages 361–72 in *Begegnung der Christen. Studien Evangelischer und katholischer Theologen*. Edited by Maximilian Roesle and Oscar Cullmann. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, and Frankfurt a.M.: Knecht, 1960.
- . "Zum Kalifat des Jacobus. Ernst Kohlmeier zum siebzigsten Geburtstag." *ZRGG* 4 (1952): 193–214.
- Stefaniw, Blossom. "Becoming Men, Staying Women: Gender Ambivalence in Christian Apocryphal Texts and Contexts." *FT* 18 (2010): 341–55.
- Stein, Robert H. "Is the Transfiguration (Mark 9:2-8) a Misplaced Resurrection-Account?" *JBL* 95 (1976): 79–96.
- Stendahl, Krister. *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1976.
- . *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament*. ASNU 20. Lund: Gleerup, 1967.
- Sterling, Gregory E. *Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. NovTSup 64. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Stevenson, James. *The Catacombs: Rediscovered Monuments of Early Christianity*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1978.
- Stirnimann, Heinrich, and Lukas Vischer. *Papsttum und Petrusdienst. Ökumenische Perspektiven 7*. Frankfurt a.M.: Lembeck/Knecht, 1975.
- Stoldt, Hans-Herbert. *Geschichte und Kritik der Markushypothese*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
- Stolt, Jan. "Isagogiske problemer vedrørende 1. Petersbrev." *DTT* 44 (1981): 166–73.
- Storr, Gottlob Christian. *Ueber den zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und der Briefe Johannis*. Tübingen: Heerbradt, 1786.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*. München: Beck, 1922.
- Strange, W. A. *The Problem of the Text of Acts*. SNTSMS 71. Cambridge: University Press, 1992.

- Strathmann, Hermann. "Die Stellung des Petrus in der Urkirche. Zur Frühgeschichte des Wortes an Petrus Matthäus 16, 17–19." *ZST* 20 (1943): 223–82.
- Streckler, Georg. *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*. Berlin: Akademie, 1981.
- . "Die Pseudoklementinen." Pages 439–47 in *NTAp II*. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- . *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*. FRLANT 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins. Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates*. London: Macmillan, 1926.
- . *The Primitive Church. Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry*. London: MacMillan, 1929.
- Strelan, Rick. *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus*. BZNW 80. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.
- Strobel, August. "Lukas der Antiochener." *ZNW* 49 (1958): 131–34.
- . "Schreiben des Lukas? Zum sprachlichen Problem der Pastoralbriefe." *NTS* 15 (1969): 191–210.
- Sturdevant, Jason S. "The Centrality of Discipleship in the Johannine Portrayal of Peter." Pages 109–120 in *Peter in Early Christianity*. Edited by Helen K. Bond and Larry W. Hurtado. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Sumney, Jerry L. *Identifying Paul's Opponents. The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians*. JSNTS 40. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Syreeni, Kari. *Becoming John: The Making of a Passion Gospel*. LNTS 590. London: T & T Clark, 2019.
- . *The Making of the Sermon on the Mount. A Procedural Analysis of Matthew's Redactional Activity. Part I: Methodology & Compositional Analysis*. AASFDHL 44. Helsinki: Soumalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.
- . "Peter as Character and Symbol in the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 106–152 in *Characterization in the Gospels. Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. Edited by David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni. JSNTS 184. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1999.
- . "Petrus och den ende läraren i Matteusevangeliet." Pages 71–84 in *Matteus och hans läsare—förr och nu. Matteussympoiet i Lund den 27–28 sept 1996*. Edited by Birger Olsson, Samuel Byrskog and Walter Übelacker. Religio 48. Lund: Teologiska institutionen, 1997.
- Tajra, Harry W. "L'appel a César: separation d'avec le christianisme?" *ETR* 56 (1981): 593–98.
- Tang Nielsen, Jesper. "Johannes und Lukas: Szenen einer Beziehung." Pages 125–62 in *Rewriting and Reception in and of the Bible*. Edited by Jesper Høgenhaven, Jesper Tang Nielsen, and Heike Omerzu. WUNT I/396. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- Tardieu, Michel. *Écrits gnostiques: Codex de Berlin*. Paris: Cerf, 1984.
- . "Pourquoi l'Acte de Pierre a-t-il été inséré dans le Papyrus de Berlin 8502?" Pages 140–44 in *Écritures et traditions dans la littérature copte: Journée d'études coptes Strasbourg 28 mai 1982*. Leuven: Peeters, 1983.
- Taussig, Hal. *In the Beginning Was the Meal. Social Experimentation & Early Christian Identity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2009.
- Tellbe, Mikael. *Christ-Believers in Ephesus: A Textual Analysis of Early Christian Identity Formation in a Local Perspective*. WUNT I/242. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- . "The Temple Tax as a Pre-70 CE Identity Marker." Pages 19–44 in *The Formation of the Early Church*. Edited by Jostein Ådna. WUNT I/183. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Testini, Pasquale. *Die christlichen Katakomben in Rom*. Rome: Ente provinciale il turismo, 1970.

- Thatcher, Tom. "Jesus, Judas, and Peter: Character by Contrast in the Fourth Gospel." *BSac* 153 (1996): 435–48.
- Theißen, Gerd. *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments als literaturgeschichtliches Problem: Vorgetragen am 27.11.2004*. Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 40. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2007.
- . *Erleben und Verhalten der ersten Christen. Eine Psychologie des Urchristentums*. 2nd ed. Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 2017.
- . "Kritik an Paulus im Matthäusevangelium? Von der Kunst verdeckter Polemik im Urchristentum." Pages 465–90 in *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer and Lorenzo Scornaienci. BZNW 170. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- . *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics and the World of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thomas, John Christopher. *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Community*. JSNTS 61. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Thomassen, Einar. "Is Judas Really the Hero of the Gospel of Judas?" Pages 157–70 in *The Gospel of Judas in Context: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Gospel of Judas—Paris, Sorbonne, October 27th–28th, 2006*. Edited by Madeleine Scopello. NHMS 62. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Thompson, Trevor. "As If Genuine. Interpreting the Pseudepigraphic Second Thessalonians." Pages 471–88 in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jens Herzer, Martina Janßen, and Clare K. Rothschild. WUNT 1/246. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Thompson, William G. *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Mt. 17,22–18,35*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970.
- Thornton, Claus-Jürgen. "Justin und das Markusevangelium." *ZNW* 84 (1993): 93–110.
- Thümmel, Hans Georg. "Die Archäologie der Petrusmemorie in Rom." *Boreas* 16 (1993): 97–113.
- . *Die Memorien für Petrus und Paulus in Rom: Die archäologischen Denkmäler und die literarische Tradition*. AKG 76. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.
- Thyen, Hartwig. "Entwicklungen der johanneischen Theologie und Kirche im Spiegel von Joh 21 und der Lieblingsjüngertexte des Evangeliums." Pages 259–299 in *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by M. de Jonge. BETL 44. Leuven: University Press, 1977.
- . "Johannes 13 und die ‚kirchliche Redaktion‘ des vierten Evangeliums." Pages 343–56 in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt: Festgabe für Karl Georg Kubn zum 65. Geburtstag*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- . "Noch einmal: Johannes 21 und ‚der Jünger, den Jesus liebte‘." Pages 147–90 in *Texts and Contexts. Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- Tighelela, Eibert. "Is the Liar Bar Kokhba? Considering the Date and Provenance of the Greek (Ethiopic) *Apocalypse of Peter*." Pages 63–77 in *The Apocalypse of Peter*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Till, Walter C. *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*. TU 60. Berlin: Akademie, 1955.

- Torrey, Charles Cutler. *The Composition and Date of Acts*. HTS 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.
- Tovey, Derek. *Narrative Art and Act in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTS 151. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1997.
- Toynbee, Jocelyn, and John Ward Perkins. *The Shrine of St. Peter and the Vatican Excavations*. London: Longmans, 1956.
- Traube, Ludwig. *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung*. München: Beck, 1907.
- Trigg, Joseph W. "The Charismatic Intellectual: Origen's Understanding of Religious Leadership." *CH* 50 (1981): 5–19.
- Trocé, Étienne. Review of *History and Criticism of the Markan Hypothesis* by Hans-Herbert Stoldt. *RHPR* 63 (1983): 341.
- Troeltsch, Ernst. *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1912.
- Trompf, G. W. "On Why Luke Declined to Recount the Death of Paul: Acts 27–28 and Beyond." Pages 225–39 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York, NY: Crossroad, 1984.
- Townsend, John R. "The Date of Luke-Acts." Pages 47–62 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York, NY: Crossroad, 1984.
- Townsend, Philippa. "Sacrifice and Race in the Gospel of Judas." Pages 149–72 in *Judasevangelium und Codex Tchacos: Studien zur religionsgeschichtlichen Verortung einer gnostischen Schriftensammlung*. Edited by Enno Edzard Popkes and Gregor Wurst. WUNT 1/297. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *2 Clement: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. OAF. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . *The Gospel of Mary*. Oxford: University Press, 2007.
- . *Nag Hammadi and the Gospel Tradition: Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library*. Edited by John Riches. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986.
- . *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An analysis and appraisal*. SNTSMS 44. Cambridge: University Press, 1983.
- Turner, C. H. "The Latin Acts of Peter." *JTS* 32 (1931): 119–33.
- Turner, H. E. W. *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*. London: Mowbray, 1954.
- Tyson, Joseph B. *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.
- Unnik, W. C. van. "The Origin of the Newly Discovered Apocryphon Jacobi." *VC* 10 (1956): 149–56.
- Uro, Risto. "Who Will Be Our Leader? Authority and Autonomy in the Gospel of Thomas." Pages 657–85 in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen*. Edited by Ismo Dunderberg, Christopher Tuckett, and Kari Syreeni. NovTSupp 103. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Vaganay, Léon. *L'Évangile de Pierre*. EBib. Paris: Gabalda, 1930.
- Vähäkangas, Päivi. "Christian Identity and Intra-Christian Polemics in the Pseudo-Clementines." Pages 217–35 in *Others and the Construction of Early Christian Identities*. Edited by Raimo Hakola, Nina Nikki, and Ulla Tervahauta. SESJ 106. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2013.

- Verheyden, Joseph. "The Unity of Luke-Acts. What Are We Up To?" Pages 3–56 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. BETL 142. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. *Geschichte der Urchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978.
- Vinzent, Markus. "Ich bin kein körperloses Geistwesen": Zum Verhältnis von 'Doctrina Petri,' und IgnSm 3." Pages 241–86 in *Der Paradox Eine: Antignostischer Monarchianismus im zweiten Jahrhundert*. Edited by Reinhard M. Hübner. NovTSup 50. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Voaux, Léon. *Les actes de Paul : introduction, textes, traduction et commentaire*. Paris: Letouzey, 1913.
- . *Les actes de Pierre : introduction, textes, traduction et commentaire*. Paris: Letouzey, 1922.
- Vögtle, Anton. *Der Judasbrief/Der 2. Petrusbrief*. EKKNT 22. Düsseldorf: Benziger, 1994.
- . "Petrus und Paulus nach dem Zweiten Petrusbrief." Pages 223–39 in *Kontinuität und Einheit: Festschrift für Franz Mußner*. Freiburg: Herder, 1981.
- Volkmar, Gustav. *Die Religion Jesu und ihre erste Entwicklung nach dem gegenwärtigen Stande der Wissenschaft*. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1857.
- Vorster, W. S. "The Growth and Making of John 21." Pages 2207–24 in *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck* Edited by F. van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden. BETL 100. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
- Vries, Wilhelm de. "Die Ostkirche und die Cathedra Petri im IV. Jahrhundert." *OCP* 39 (1973): 114–44.
- Wagner, Fredrik. *Figuren als Handlungsmodelle*. WUNT II/408. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Wagenmann, Julius. *Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten*. BZNW 3. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1926.
- Wahlde, Urban C von. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. 3 vols. ECC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Waitz, Hans. "Simon Magus in der altchristlichen Literatur." *ZNW* 5 (1904): 121–43.
- Walker, Rolf. *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium*. FRLANT 91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Walker, William O. "Galatians 2:7b-8 as a Non-Pauline Interpolation." *CBQ* 65 (2003): 568–87.
- Walls, A. F. "The References to Apostles in the Gospel of Thomas." *NTS* 7 (1960): 266–70.
- Walters, Patricia. *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*. SNTSMS 145. Cambridge: University Press, 2009.
- Walton, Steve. *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians*. SNTSMS 108. Cambridge: University Press, 2000.
- Wasserman, Tommy. *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*. ConBNT 43. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2006.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach*. Cambridge: University Press, 1986.
- Weber, Max. "Die drei reinen Typen der legitimen Herrschaft: Eine soziologische Studie." *Preussische Jahrbücher* 187 (1922): 1–12.
- . *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1976.
- Wehnert, Jürgen. "Antipaulinismus in den Pseudoklementinen. Pages 170–90 in *Ancient Perspectives on Paul*. Edited by Tobias Nicklas, Andreas Merkt, and Joseph Verheyden. NTOA 102. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

- , “Petrus versus Paulus in den pseudoklementinischen Homilien 17.” Pages 175–85 in *Christians as a Religious Minority in a Multicultural City: Modes of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome. Studies on the Basis of a Seminar at the Second Conference of the European Association for Biblical Studies (EABS) from July 8–12, 2001, in Rome*. Edited by Jürgen Zangenberg and Michael Labahn. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- , *Pseudoklementinische Homilien: Einführung und Übersetzung*. KAL 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- Wehr, Lothar. *Petrus und Paulus—Kontrabanten und Partner: Die beiden Apostel im Spiegel des Neuen Testaments, der apostolischen Väter und früher Zeugnisse ihrer Verehrung*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1996.
- Weiser, Alfons. “Die Nachwahl des Mattias (Apg 1, 15–26). Zur Rezeption und Deutung urchristlicher Geschichte durch Lukas.” Pages 97–110 in *Zur Geschichte des Urchristentums*. Edited by Gerhard Dautzenberg, Helmut Merklein, and Karheinz Müller. Freiburg: Herder, 1979.
- Weiß, Bernhard. *Der erste Petrusbrief und die neuere Kritik*. Berlin: Runge, 1906.
- , *Der petrinische Lehrbegriff: Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie, sowie zur Kritik und Exegese des ersten Briefes Petri und der petrinischen Reden*. Berlin: Schulze, 1855.
- Weisse, Christian Hermann. *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Hartel, 1838.
- Welborn, Laurence L. “Clement, First Epistle of.” *ABD* 1:1055–60.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Erweiterungen und Änderungen im vierten Evangelium*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1907.
- , *Das Evangelium Johannis*. Berlin: Reimer, 1908.
- Wendt, Hans. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. KEK 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Wengst, Klaus. “Der Apostel und die Tradition: Zur theologischen Bedeutung urchristlicher Formeln bei Paulus.” *ZTK* 69 (1972): 145–62.
- Wennerberg, D. G. *Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief*. KNT(Z). Leipzig: Deichert, 1915.
- Wessely, Charles (Karl). “Les plus anciens monuments du Christianisme: Ecrits sur Papyrus II.” *PO* 18 (1924): 345–511.
- , “Über das Zeitalter des Wiener Evangelienpapyrus.” *ZKT* 11 (1887): 507–15.
- White, John L. “New Testament Epistolary Literature in the Framework of Ancient Epistolography.” Pages 1730–56 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. II. 25.2. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984.
- Wiarda, Timothy. *Peter in the Gospels: Pattern, Personality and Relationship*. WUNT 112/127. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred. “Die altkirchliche Überlieferung über die Abfassungszeit der Apostelgeschichte.” *BZ* 23 (1935/36): 365–71.
- Willhite, David E. “Marcionites in Africa: What did Tertullian Know and When Did He Invent It?” *PRSt* 46 (2016): 437–52.
- Wilke, Christian Gottlob. *Der Urevangelist oder exegetisch kritische Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältnis der drei ersten Evangelien*. Leipzig: Fleischer, 1838.
- Wilkins, Wilhelm. *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums*. Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1958.
- Williams, Travis B. “Intertextuality and Methodological Bias: Prolegomena to the Evaluation of Source Materials in 1 Peter.” *JSNT* 39 (2016): 169–87.

- Wilmart, André. "Un anonyme ancien *De decem virginibus*." *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne* 1 (1911): 35–49, 88–102.
- Wilpert, Joseph. *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms*. Freiburg: Herder, 1903.
- Wilson, R. McL., and Douglas M. Parrott. "The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles." Pages 197–229 in *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*. Edited by Douglas M. Parrott. NHS 11. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Wilson, Stephen G. *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- Windisch, Hans. *Die Katholischen Briefe*. HNT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1911.
- . *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Wollte der vierte Evangelist die Älteren Evangelien ergänzen oder ersetzen?* UNT 12. Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1926.
- Winter, Martin. *Das Vermächtnis Jesu und die Abschiedsworte der Väter: Gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der Vermächtnisrede im Blick auf Joh. 13–17*. FRLANT 161. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
- Wisse, Frederik. "The Epistle of Jude in the History of Heresiology." Pages 133–43 in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böhlig*. Edited by Martin Krause. NHS 3. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Witetschek, Stephan. "Peter in Corinth? A Review of the Evidence from I Corinthians." *JTS* 69 (2018): 66–82.
- . "Quellen lebendigen Wassers. Zur Frage nach einem johanneischen Motiv im EvThom 13." *ZNW* 102 (2012): 154–71.
- Wrede, William. "Miscellen." *ZNW* 1 (1900): 66–86.
- Wrege, Hans-Theo. *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt*. WUNT 1/9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1968.
- Wright, Nicholas Thomas. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Acta Ioannis*. Erlangen: Deichert, 1880.
- . *Einleitung in das Neue Testament, zweiter Band*. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche, 1907.
- . *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Zweiter Band: Urkunden und Belege zum ersten und dritten Band*. Erlangen and Leipzig: Deichert, 1890.
- . *Ignatius von Antiochien*. Gotha: Perthes, 1873.
- Zetterholm, Magnus. *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Zmijewski, Josef. "Apostolische Paradosis und Pseudepigraphie im Neuen Testament. 'Durch Erinnerung wachhalten' (2 Petr 1,13; 3,1)." *BZ* 23 (1979): 161–71.
- Zwerlein, Otto. "Kritisches zur Römischen Petrustradition und zur Datierung des Ersten Clemensbriefes." *GFA* 13 (2010): 87–157.
- . *Petrus in Rom: Die literarischen Zeugnisse*. UaLG 96. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.

Index of Ancient Literature

Hebrew Bible

Genesis

1:24	70
1:28	70
1:30	70
6:1–4	183
6:20	70

Exodus

19	263
----	-----

Deuteronomy

7:24	47
9:2	47
11:25	47

Joshua

1:5	47
23:9	47

Second Chronicles

13:7	47
------	----

Isaiah

8:14	104
22:22	102

Ancient Jewish Literature

Ascension of Isaiah

4:2–3	172
-------	-----

Second Baruch

10:18	102
78–86	179

Third Baruch

11:2	102
------	-----

Fourth Baruch

4:4	102
-----	-----

First Enoch

1:9	183
-----	-----

Josephus

Ant.

20.9.1	80
4.309–319	179

First Maccabees

6:58	43
11:50	43
11:62	43
11:66	43
13:45	43
13:50	43

Second Maccabees

4:34	43
11:26	43
12:11	43
13:22	43
14:19	43

New Testament

Matthew

3:17	174
4:18–22	97
4:18–20	98
4:18	97, 107
4:23	107

5:21-23	102	17:25	97
5:31-32	102	18:15	101
5:33-37	102	18:18	101, 103, 107, 142
5:43-48	102	18:21-22	105, 109, 142
8:14-15	97, 258	19:18-19	262
8:15	97	19:27	208
9:9	90	19:29-30	105
9:18-26	106	20:21-22	106
9:35	107	21:20-22	105, 106
10:1	254	21:20	108
10:2-4	266	22:7	90
10:2	98, 107, 114, 137, 272	23:8	103, 109
10:3	90	23:13	102
10:16	229	23:34	107
10:17	107	24:1-31	171
10:28	229	24:2-8	105, 106, 142
11:1	232	24:3	108
12:1-9	102	24:10	
12:9-14	102	24:32	171
12:9	107	24:45-51	138, 142
13:1-9	254	26:24	172
13:54	107	26:25	109
14:13-21	115	26:29	109
14:22-23	99, 106, 107, 142, 144, 172	26:30-35	106, 288
14:28-31	99, 107, 172	26:35	108
14:31	275	26:36-46	106, 142, 143
15:1-2	102	26:40	106
15:3-9	102	26:50	254
15:10-20	102	26:52-53	266
15:15	108, 109	26:57-75	106, 107
15:32-39	115	26:63	106
16:13-20	99, 105, 106, 107, 108, 142, 144, 172	26:72	210
16:13-23	243	26:74	210
16:16-18	56, 114, 142	26:75	106
16:17	101, 104, 116, 139, 267	27:55-56	123, 140
16:18-19	20, 114, 269, 275	28:7	106, 107, 108
16:18	101, 107, 254, 275	28:16-20	165
16:21-23	104, 142, 143, 174, 208, 274	28:19	210
16:22	262	Mark	
16:23	108	1:2	244
17:1-13	174	1:16-20	91
17:1-9	104, 107, 173, 186	1:16	91
17:24-27	104, 106, 109, 144	1:21-28	91
		1:29-31	91, 258
		1:31	97

1:35-38	106	15:72	94
1:36	58, 92, 244	16:1-8	95
3:13-19	92	16:7	53, 95, 106, 123, 144
3:14	92	16:9	59
3:16	56	16:15-18	165, 210
4:1-9	254		
4:14	104	Luke	
4:20	104	1:1-4	75
5:21-42	92, 106	1:2	188
5:31	93	1:3	90
6:25-52	99	4:38-39	135, 258
6:30-54	115	4:42-43	136
6:32-44	115	5:1-11	136
6:35	93	5:5	65, 136
6:45-52	115	5:8	136, 141
8:11-33	115	5:10	141
8:27	95	5:11	65
8:27-33	116, 118, 243	6:12-16	137
8:28-30	92, 94, 100	6:14	56, 69
8:31-33	93, 142, 143	8:4-8	254
8:33	93, 121	8:40-56	137
9:2-10	93, 186	9:10-17	115
9:5	138	9:18-21	137, 140
9:11-13	244	9:18-22	243
9:31-36	245	9:22	137
10:23-31	93	9:28-36	138, 186
10:28	93, 208	9:32	138, 244
11:12-17	244	10:3	229
11:20-26	93, 106	12:4-5	229
11:21	93	12:28	99
13:3-8	93	12:35-48	142
13:6	91	12:41-46	138, 141, 142
13:3-8	143	17:3-4	142
14:3-9	93, 106	18:20-21	262
14:4	93	18:20	141
14:19	118	18:24-30	138
14:22-33	115	18:28	208
14:26-31	94, 119, 288	19:43	91
14:32-42	94, 142, 143	21:7-11	139, 143
14:37	106	22:7-14	139
14:48	120	22:31-34	139, 141
14:50-52	120	22:35-38	121
14:53-72	94, 121	22:39-46	138, 140
14:61	94	22:49	121
15:40	123, 140	22:54-71	140, 141
15:40-41	132	22:54-62	122

22:67	140	13:23-24	118
22:70	140	13:23	132, 139, 292
23:49	140	13:24	208
24:1-12	140, 141	13:36-38	118, 121
24:34	53, 58, 140, 141, 144, 232	15:15	244
24:39	233	16:2	111
24:41-49	77	18:1-11	120
24:42-42	77	18:11	266
		18:12-27	121
John		18:15	133
1:35-42	113	18:31-33	111
1:36	113	18:37-38	111
1:35-42	117	19:25	132
1:37	98	19:26-27	123, 132
1:40	110, 121	20:1-13	122
1:41	114	20:2-10	132
1:42	56, 57, 113	20:4	124
1:43-51	113	20:8	122, 124
1:44	133	20:9	124
6:1-15	115	20:14	123
6:8	115, 120	20:19	195
6:16-21	115	20:21-22	263
6:52-71	130	20:23	101
6:60-71	116	20:24	244
6:66-70	138	20:25-27	140
6:70-71	116	20:30-31	125
6:60	116	21:1-14	125, 136, 195
6:65	117	21:2	244
6:67	116	21:15-19	126
6:69	116	21:17	276
9:22	111	21:18-19	127, 181
10:1-19	130	21:18	126
10:1-8	126	21:20-24	127, 145
10:15	127	21:20	132
10:16	127	21:21-22	113, 276
10:21-22	115	21:23	112, 127, 276
11:16	244	21:24	90, 111, 129
11:27	114		
12:6	104	Acts of the Apostles	
12:37-50	117	1:1	60
12:42	111	1:11-26	61-63
13:1-20	117	1:15	63
13:6-11	117	1:21-22	63, 76, 81, 135, 136
13:10	118	1:22-23	63, 76
13:21-30	118	1:22	64
13:21-24	127	2:9-11	160

2:14-41	63-64	10:19-10	70
2:24	76	10:23-33	70
2:32-33	76	10:23	70
2:32	63	10:25	70
2:37	63	10:26	70
2:42-47	64	10:28	70
2:42	64	10:34-43	71
3:15	76	10:40-48	77
4:2	64	10:44-48	71
4:8-18	262	10:45	72
4:8	64	11:1-18	71
4:10	64, 76	11:19-26	72, 82
4:13	64	11:22	71
4:18	65	11:26	151
4:20	65	11:30	153
4:36-5:11	65-66	12:1-19	72-73
5:2	65	12:2	73
5:4	65	12:17	73, 79, 79, 80
5:12-16	67	12:25	153
5:10	76	13:24-25	77
5:12	67	13:27-31	77
5:17-42	67-68	13:31	77
5:20	67	13:34	77
5:28	67	13:37	77
5:29	67, 68	14:4	75, 77
5:30-32	68	14:14	75
7:19	291	14:23	153, 154
7:54-60	76	15:1-35	73-74, 284
8:14-25	68	15:1	74
8:13	68	15:2	154
8:14	71	15:4	154, 186
8:19	68	15:6	42, 154
9:1-18	77	15:7-11	70, 81
9:1-2	282	15:12	42
9:2	207	15:13-21	74
9:19-22	77	15:13	79
9:26-28	77	15:20	70
9:26-30	82	15:22	42, 153
9:32-43	68-69	15:23-29	153
10:1-11:18	69-72, 69, 81	15:29	70
10:1-8	69	15:39	153
10:9-22	69	16:1	81
10:20-22	70	16:4	154
10:34-43	77	16:23ff	222
10:15	70	17:28	291
10:17	70	17:29	291

Ephesians		Second Peter	
1:3	149	1:1	56, 186
Philippians		1:12–15	179, 188
3:5	291	1:16–2:3	186, 189
4:3	222, 223	1:16–21	189, 190, 263
Colossians		1:16	186, 188
4:10	152	1:20–2:3	187
First Thessalonians		1:20	187
1:1	152	1:21	187, 188
Second Thessalonians		2:1–3	187
1:1	152	2:3–4	184
2:2	197	2:4	183
Second Timothy		2:6	184
4:11	152	2:7–10	183
Titus		2:10	184
1:1	186	2:11	183
James		2:12–13	183
4:6–10	156	2:12	184
5:14	154	2:13	184
First Peter		2:15	183
1:1	148, 150, 151, 152, 156, 160	3:1–2	188
1:3–5:11	148	3:1	177, 188, 189
1:3	149	3:3–4	183
2:9	291	3:5–7	184
4:10–11	151	3:15–16	185, 190
4:13	155	3:15	187
4:16	151	3:16	191
5:1–7	153	First John	
5:1–5	151	2:27	244
5:1	148, 149, 155	Jude	
5:2	154	6	183
5:5–9	156	7–8	183
5:12–14	148	7	184
5:12	150, 155, 160	9	183
5:13	161, 236	10	183
		11	183
		18	183, 184
		14–15	183
		Revelation	
		1:1–2	176
		3:7	102
		16:9	150
		17:5	150

17:9	150
18:2	150
22:6	291

Early Christian Authors

First Clement

2:9	225
5:1-2	225
5:3-5	225-26
5:4	57
5:6	226
17:1	226
20:6	232
38:2	227
44:1-2	224, 227
44:3	226
44:4-5	224
44:6	224
47:3-4	226
47:3	57
63:3	222, 227

Second Clement

5:1-2	230
5:2-4	229

Clement of Alexandria

<i>Ecl.</i>	
41.1-3	169
48.1-49.2	169, 175
<i>Hyp.</i>	
5	271
7	271
<i>Quis div.</i>	
21.3-5	271
<i>Strom.</i>	
1.1	271
3.6	270
4.27	223
6.3	213
6.5	164
6.6	165
6.8	271
6.15	165-66
7.11	270
7.17	270

Cyprian

<i>Ep.</i>	
33	275
74.17	277
<i>Unit. Eccl.</i>	
4.97-102	276
4.92-98	277

Epiphanius of Salamis

<i>Her.</i>	
30.13.2-3	250

Eusebius of Caesarea

<i>Hist. Eccl.</i>	
2.1.3	271
2.1.4	271
2.15	237
2.22.7	59
2.23.4-18	80
2.25.5	307
2.25.7	307
3.3.1	260
3.3.2	193, 286
3.16.1	223
3.25.6	193
3.30	213, 263
3.36.2	159
3.36.5-6	231
3.38.1	223
3.38.4	196
3.39.1-7	234
3.39.4	235
3.39.15-16	235
3.39.16	151
3.39.17	236
4.22	307
4.22.1	223
4.23.11	223
5.8.3	268
6.12	193
6.12.3-6	196
6.14.5-7	237
7.3	277

Hermas

21	260	17:1-2	174
Acts of John		Apocryphon of James	
88	263	1:8-12	240
89	263	1:28-32	240
92	263	2:27-28	240
		2:29-39	240
Acts of Peter and Andrew		3:37-4:2	240
1	261	4:20-30	241
2	261	5:36-39	241
3	262	6:21-28	241
4	262	13:26-36	241
5	262	14:1-7	241
21	262	14:8-10	241
		15:6-9	240
Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles		Coptic Apocalypse of Peter	
3.11-5.5	206	71.15-27	209-210
5.1-6	207	79.22-30	210
5.4-5	207	80.29-81.3	210
5.7-10	207	83.8-10	210
9.1-19	207-208	83.15-18	210
9.21	205	84.6-11	211
9.30-12.29	206		
subscription	205	Gospel of Judas	
Acts of Thomas		33.13-14	
86	266	34.9-21	255
Apocalypse of Peter		36.15-21	291
prologue	176	43.26-44.1	253-54
1:4-8		58.21-22	254
2:1	171	Gospel of Mary	
2:2-3	171	3:1-2	249
2:4	171	6:1-9:29	248, 251
3:1-3	172	6:1-2	249
3:4-7	172	10:1-4	250
5:8	169	10:2	248, 251
6:2	169	10:4	250
8:10	169	10:5-6	250
12:4	169	10:5	291
14:1-5	181	10:7-14	250
14:1-3	173	Gospel of Peter	
14:3-6	176, 260	7:25-27	195
15:1-2	173	13:50-57	194-95
16:1	173-74	14:60	194, 198
16:9	176		

Index of Modern Authors

- Abbott, Edwin A. 178
Abogunrin, S. O. 136
Achte-meier, Paul J. 149
Aejmelaes, Anneli 156
Aejmelaes, Lars 61
Aland, Kurt 95
Allison, Dale C. 55, 98, 99, 100, 102, 109, 150, 238
Altheim, Franz. 150
Amsler, Frédéric 280
Annand, Rupert 58
Appold, Mark L. 112
Aronsson, Peter 32
Aspegren, Kerstin 247
Aus, Roger D. 43
Baasland, Ernst 228
Backhaus, Knut 60, 61
Bacon, Benjamin W. 91
Baer, Richard A. 110
Bakke, Odd Magne 221
Baldwin, Matthew C. 286, 287
Baltzer, Klaus 179
Bammel, Caroline P. 231
Barclay, John M. G. 28, 40
Bardenhewer, Otto 168
Barnes, Timothy D. 230
Barnikol, Ernst 56
Barrett, Charles Kingsley 43, 49, 50, 51, 53, 62, 64, 65, 67, 71, 89, 111, 139
Bauckham, Richard J. 24, 27, 28, 90, 161, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 175, 178, 179, 181, 182, 184, 190, 191, 264
Bauer, Thomas Johann 231
Bauer, Walter. 29, 159
Bauernfeind, Otto 47
Baum, Armin Daniel 191
Baur, Ferdinand Christian 18, 19, 49, 75, 131, 152, 157–58, 230, 280, 281, 282
Baussi, Alessandro 168
Beasley-Murray, George R. 113
Beck, Eric J. 169–76
Becker, Eve-Marie 91
Becker, Jürgen 41, 132
Bendix, Reinhard 35–36
Berding, Kenneth 222
Bergmann, Klaus 32
Bernard, Johannes 270
Bernier, Jonathan 97, 111
Best, Ernest 24, 100, 158
Bethge, Hans-Gebhard 200, 201, 20
Betz, Hans Dieter 43, 44, 46, 47, 55
Beutler, Johannes 125
Bévenot, Maurice 223, 276
Bickell, Gustav 288
Bieler, Ludwig 66
Bierstedt, Robert 35
Bigg, Charles A. 179, 182, 184
Billerbeck, Paul 102, 103
Binzler, Josef 89, 236
Bird, Michael F. 28
Black, Clifton 153
Blaine, Bradford B. 24,, 114, 118–19
Blatt, Franz 260
Boismard, Marie-Émile 88–89, 137
Bockmuehl, Markus 22–23, 236
Boer, Esther A. de 249
Bond, Helen K. 21
Boobyer, G. H. 187–88
Boring, Eugene M. 148–49
Bornkamm, Gunter 23, 33, 49, 103
Böttrich, Christfried 21
Bovon, François 136
Bourdieu, Pierre 34–38

- Brakke, David 30
 Brandenburg, Albert 21
 Brandon, Samuel George Frederick, 40
 Brankaer, Johanna 200, 201, 254
 Bratke, Eduard 168
 Braumann, Georg 99
 Brawley, Robert L. 75
 Bremmer, Jan N. 167, 170, 260, 286, 287
 Broadhead, Erwin K. 279
 Brock, Ann Graham 249
 Brown, Raymon E. 21, 111, 122, 193
 Brox, Norbert 54, 149–52, 155
 Bruce, Frederick Fyvie 41–42, 47, 63, 66, 80
 Brun, Lyder 148, 149, 153, 156
 Brunner, Gerbert 224
 Bruyne, D. Donatien de 214
 Bubar, Wallace W. 107
 Buchholz, Dennis D. 167, 168, 169, 170, 176
 Budge, E. A. Wallis 147
 Buell, Denise Kimber 270, 291
 Bultmann, Rudolf 29, 112, 114, 116, 124
 Burkett, Delbert 87
 Burkitt, Francis Crawford 266
 Burnet, Regis 21
 Busse, Ulrich 125
 Butler, B. C. 85
 Byers, Andrew J. 130
 Byrskog, Samuel 31, 101, 109–10, 198
 Cadbury, Henry J. 134
 Callan, Terrance 179
 Cambe, Michel 163
 Campenhausen, Hans von 79, 155, 276
 Caragounis, Chrys C. 57, 101, 113
 Carlson, Stephen C. 56, 237
 Carlston, Charles E. 87
 Cassidy, Richard J. 25
 Cavallo, C. 169
 Černušková, Veronika 175
 Chilton, Bruce 79, 105
 Clarke, Andrew D. 37, 135, 264
 Clarysse, Willy 244
 Coakley, J. F. 150
 Collins, Adela Yarbrow 90, 91, 92, 94
 Collins, John J. 170
 Collins, Raymond F. 24
 Connerton, Paul 31
 Conzelmann, Hans 33, 49, 50–54, 60, 66, 86,
 90
 Costelli, Elizabeth 247
 Crawford, Matthew R. 285
 Cribbs, F. Lamar 89
 Crossley, James 90
 Crossan, John Dominic 193
 Cullman, Oscar 18, 20–22, 55, 129, 132, 159,
 226
 Culpepper, R. Alan 113, 123, 124, 128
 Curran, John T. 187
 Dahl, Nils Alstrup 143
 Damgaard, Finn 25
 Dauer, Anton 89
 Davids, Peter H. 184
 DeConick, April D. 253–54
 Deissmann, Adolf 160, 201
 Delehaye, Hippolyte 307
 Dietrich, Wolfgang 24
 Dinkler, Erich 56, 154, 305
 Dobschütz, Ernst von 162–63, 166
 Dodd, Charles Harold 41, 88
 Doering, Lutz 26, 149, 150, 156
 Döhler, Marietheres 286
 Donfried, Karl P. 21, 228
 Dresken-Weiland, Jutta 308
 Drews, Arthur, 19
 Drijwers, Han J. W. 279
 Drury, John 87
 Dschulnigg, Peter 21, 185
 Duncan, Patricia A. 281, 283
 Dunderberg, Ismo 114–15, 137
 Dunn, James D. G. 29, 41–42, 46
 Dunn, Peter W. 264
 Eastman, David L. 31–32, 216, 226
 Easton, Burton Scott 80–81,
 Edwards, James R. 258
 Ehrman, Bart D. 29–30, 55, 156, 194, 219,
 238, 248, 249
 Ekstrand, Thomas 35
 Eller, Vernard 111
 Elliott, John H. 148, 160–61, 186
 Elliott, J. K. 56
 Elze, Martin 163
 Erbes, C. 215
 Erlemann, Kurt 222

- Esler, Philip Francis 28, 34, 40, 43–44, 45,
46, 47, 75
- Eurell, John-Christian 24, 39
- Evans, Craig A. 97
- Farmer, William R. 85–86
- Farrer, Austin Marsden 25, 87
- Fatum, Lone 291
- Fee, Gordon D. 49, 50, 52, 53
- Feldmeier, Reinhard 85, 149, 154, 155
- Fenton, J. C. 57
- Ferrua, A. 306
- Fischer, Karl Martin 131, 156
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 58, 59, 64, 65, 67, 68,
69, 70, 73, 100
- Fjärstedt, Biörn 41
- Flamion, J. 259
- Fornberg, Tord 7, 99, 102, 107, 131, 179, 182,
183, 184, 186, 189, 190
- Forster, Edward Morgan 120
- Fortna, Robert T. 136
- Foster, Paul 147, 163, 178, 193, 194, 289
- France, R. T. 100
- Francis, James A. 212
- Franklin, Eric 87, 143
- Frenschowski, Marco 184, 191, 192
- Frey, Jörg 147–48, 184, 185, 189, 191, 193, 220,
244, 245, 257
- Frid, Bo 243
- Fridrichsen, Anton 92
- Gaechter, Paul 20
- Gale, Aaron M. 96, 97, 102
- Gamble, Harry Y. 149
- Gardner-Smith, Percival 88, 193
- Gärtner, Bertil 21, 167, 182, 245
- Gathercole, Simon 242, 244, 245
- Gebhardt, Winfried 35
- Gee, Donald H. 24
- Gemeinhardt, Peter 306
- Gerdmar, Anders 7, 19, 177, 178, 179, 182
- Gerhardsson, Birger 41, 101, 106, 140, 178
- Gianotto, Claudio 243
- Gibson, Jack J. 44, 46, 47
- Gieschen, Charles A. 243
- Glover, Richard 302
- Gnilka, Joachim 22, 97, 222
- Goetz, Karl Gerold 20
- Goguel, Maurice 131, 169, 179
- Goodacre, Mark 87, 242
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. 163
- Goppelt, Leonhard 151–57
- Goulder, Michael 20, 49–50, 87
- Grappe, Christian 22, 35
- Grébaud, Sylvain 167
- Green, Geene L. 22
- Green, H. Benedict 60
- Green, Joel B. 149
- Green, Michael 177
- Greenslade, S. L. 276
- Gregory, Andrew 257, 259
- Grudem, Wayne A. 149
- Grundmann, Walter 181
- Grünstäudl, Wolfgang 147, 178, 185, 187
- Guarducci, Margherita 288, 306
- Gundry, Robert H. 23–24, 99, 100, 105, 106,
107, 149, 150
- Haacker, Klaus 81
- Haenchen, Ernst 33
- Haeuser, Philipp 198
- Hägg, Tomas 280
- Hagner, Donald A. 100, 102, 224
- Hahn, Ferdinand 19
- Hainz, Josef 45
- Hakola, Raimo 30, 281
- Halbwachs, Maurice 31–32
- Hall, Jonathan M. 291
- Harl, Marguerite 273
- Harland, Philip A. 30
- Harnack, Adolf von 53, 60, 78, 79, 131, 135,
148–49, 152, 159, 185, 214, 228, 256, 290
- Harris, William V. 254
- Harrison, P. N. 191
- Hartenstein, Judith 24, 26, 202, 203, 244–45,
248
- Hartog, Paul 151
- Hartman, Lars 91, 93, 131, 178
- Hartmann, Gert 124
- Havelaar, Henriette W. 209, 210
- Heard, Richard 198
- Heckel, Ulrich 152
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm 131
- Helderman, 239
- Helmer, Robert C. 170

- Hemer, Colin J. 59
Hengel, Martin 21, 28, 49, 60, 90, 112
Henning, Meghan 213
Herron, Robert W. 94
Herzer, Jens 156, 186
Heussi, Karl 151
Hiers, Richard H. 103
Hilgenfeld, A. 279, 288
Hilhorst, A. 260
Hill, Charles E. 238
Hills, Julian V. 168, 264
Hillyer, Norman 149, 177
Hirsch, Emanuel 116
Hoare, Frederick Russell 111
Hobsbawm, Eric 32
Hoek, Annewies van den 162
Hoffmann, R. Joseph 257
Hofius, Otfried 41
Holl, Karl 56, 304
Holmberg, Bengt 35, 36, 41, 46
Holmstrand, Jonas 47
Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius 86
Hooker, Morna D. 100
Hopkins, Clark 305–306
Horner, G. 207
Hornschuh, Manfred 238
Horrell, David G. 34, 156, 157, 161
Howell, Justin R. 60
Hübner, Reinhard M. 230
Hulen, Amos B. 113
Hultgren, Arland J. 29
Hummel, Reinhart 23, 108–109
Hunzinger, Claus-Hunno 150–51
Hurtado, Larry W. 17, 21, 289
Illian, Bridget 103
Isacson, Mikael 231
Jakab, Attila 167
James, Montague Rhodes 167–71, 169, 172, 174, 175
Janßen, Martina 147, 191, 244
Jervell, Jacob 60, 70, 71, 73, 76, 79, 80
Jewett, Robert 39, 49
Joly, Robert 230
Jones, Christopher R. 175
Jones, F. Stanley 162, 249, 279–82, 287
Jülicher, Adolf 148–49
Junod, Eric 263, 264
Kaestli, Jean-Daniel 263, 264
Kähler, Christoph 23, 107
Kaler, Michael 204, 205
Karakolis, Christos 114
Käsemann, Ernst 192
Kasser, Rodolphe 254
Katzenmeyer, Hans 223
Kazen, Thomas 7, 28
Kelhoffer, James Anthony 7, 37, 157, 158, 165, 228
Kelley, Nicole 279, 280–82, 284, 286
Kieffer, René 47, 89, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 178, 247
Kiilunen, Jarmo 137
Kilpatrick, George Dunbar 41, 108
King, Karen L. 248, 249, 251
Kingsbury, Jack Dean. 23, 108
Kinney, Robert S. 97
Kinzig, Wolfram 256
Kirschbaum, Engelbert 306–307
Klauck, Hans-Josef 201, 280–81
Klauser, Theodor 306
Klein, Günter 54, 62, 76, 154, 189
Klein, Hans 58
Klinger, Jerzy 190
Klinghardt, Matthias 45
Kloppenborg, John S. 105
Klostermann, Erich 162, 173, 194
Knoch, Otto B. 222
Knopf, Rudolf 157
Knox, John 151
Koch, Heinrich 59
Köhler, Wolf-Dietrich 229
Korol, Dieter 305
Körtner, Ulrich H. 90, 234, 235
Koschorke, Klaus 203
Kragerud, Alv 24, 127
Kraus, Thomas J. 167, 170, 183, 184, 193, 288, 289
Krause, Martin 184, 205, 207, 210
Krenkel, Max 59
Krüger 163
Kuhn, Karl Georg 119, 125
Kuhn, Anette 32

- Kümmel, Werner Georg 19, 49, 125, 151, 156,
160, 178, 198
- Kürzinger, Josef 236
- Labahn, Michael 25, 88, 128, 281
- Labib, Pahor 205
- Ladd, George Eldon 100
- Lake, Kirsopp 238
- Lalleman, Pieter J. 260
- Lang, Manfred 88
- Lampe, Peter 288, 308
- Lang, Friedrich Gustav 92
- Larsson, Edvin 134
- Layton, Bentley 242
- Lebek, Wolfgang Dieter 222
- Lechner, Thomas 159, 230
- Leppä, Heikki 73
- Lieu, Judith M. 22, 30, 256
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber 222, 223, 230, 231,
279
- Lincicum, David 29, 96
- Lindars, Barnabas 111
- Lindblom, Johannes 184
- Lindemann, Andreas 49, 190, 228
- Lipsius, Richard Adelbert 147
- Lona, Horacio E. 222, 223, 225
- Longenecker, Richard N. 47
- Lüdemann, Gerd 51, 281
- Ludwig, Joseph 278
- Lührmann, Dieter 53, 90, 194, 229, 250
- Lummis, Edward 87
- Luttikhuisen, Gerard P. 201, 204–205
- Luz, Ulrich 41, 98, 100, 105
- Lyons, George 40
- MacDonald, Dennis R. 153, 259–60
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. 36
- Maddox, Robert 135
- Maehler, H. 169
- Magnusson, Jörgen 7, 254–255
- Malan, S. C. 147
- Mann, C. S. 100
- Mantley, Julius R. 102
- Marcovich, Miroslav 198
- Marguerat, Daniel 59, 75
- Marjanen, Antti 246–47, 248, 249, 290
- Markley, John R. 109
- Marshall, I. Howard 134
- Martin, Troy W. 149, 153
- Marxsen, Willi 32, 90, 154
- Mason, Steve 59–60, 75
- Matson, Mark A. 89
- Mattill, A. J. 59
- Maurer, Christian 167, 169, 170, 195
- May, Gerhard 256
- Maynard, Arthur H. 24
- Meade, David G. 179
- Ménard, Jacques É. 203
- Metzger, Bruce M. 92
- Metzner, Rainer, 158
- Meyendorff, John 21
- Meyer, Marvin W. 200, 202, 246
- Michel, Hans-Joachim 180
- Michelsen, Christina Solmunde 87
- Milburn, Robert 305, 308
- Minnen, Peter van 170
- Mirecki, Paul Allan 165
- Moffatt, James 186
- Moffitt, David M. 78
- Molinari, Andrea Lorenzo 205, 206, 207, 209,
212, 214
- Moll, Sebastian 256, 257
- Moriarty, W. 223
- Morgan, Robert 86, 89
- Most, Glenn W. 243
- Moule, C. F. D. 61
- Mount, Christopher 268
- Moxon, John R. L. 70, 71
- Munck, Johannes 50, 58, 65, 179, 234, 235
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome 78
- Murray, Russel 276
- Mußner, Franz 45, 236
- Myllykoski, Matti 194
- Myrberg, Otto F. 177, 183
- Nagel, Peter 253, 254, 255
- Nau, Arlo J. 23
- Neill, Stephen 49
- Neiryneck, Frans 87, 88–89, 90, 113, 122, 136,
198
- Nestle, Eberhard 225
- Neusner, Jacob 79
- Nicholas, Barry 43
- Nicklas, Tobias 132, 147, 167, 170, 171, 173,
174, 193, 280, 289

- Niederwimmer, Kurt 236
 Nongbri, Brent 111
 Nordgren, Kenneth 32
 Nordheim, Eckhard von 180–81
 Norelli, Enrico 174
 Obrist, Franz 20
 Odeberg, Hugo 112
 Olsson, Birger 101, 155
 Orchard, Bernard 85, 198
 O'Toole, Robert F. 66
 Overbeck, Franz 88
 Overman, J. Andrew 28, 109, 110
 Painchaud, Louis 253
 Painter, John 78, 79, 80
 Palmqvist, Arne 275
 Parker, Pierson 87, 89, 111
 Parkhouse, Sarah 252
 Parrott, Douglas M. 206, 212, 213, 290
 Parsons, Mikeal 135
 Parvis, Paul 159
 Pasquier, Anne 248, 251
 Patterson, Stephen J. 206, 307
 Paulsen, Henning 163, 178, 182
 Peerbolte, L. J. Lietaert 170
 Pelikan, Jaroslav 159
 Peppard, Michael 305–306
 Perdelwitz, Richard 148
 Perkins, Ann 305
 Perkins, John Ward, 306, 307
 Perkins, Pheme 21, 42, 47, 239
 Perrin, Nicholas 243–44
 Pervo, Richard I. 59–63, 69, 71, 72, 135, 263, 264, 265
 Pesch, Rudolf 21, 60
 Pesthy, Monika 168
 Petersen, Silke 199
 Peterson, Peter M. 260–62
 Pfleiderer, Otto 149
 Pilhoffer, Peter 198–99
 Plese, Zlatko 248–49
 Plisch, Uwe-Karsten 253
 Pokorný, Petr. 152, 243, 246
 Porter, Stanley E. 82, 87
 Poupon, Gérard H. 286
 Powell, Mark Allan 102
 Pratscher, Wilhelm 163, 166, 228
 Prieur, Jean-Marc 259, 260
 Quast, Kevin 24, 114, 124
 Ranger, Terence 32
 Rankin, David 268, 270
 Ratzinger, Joseph 21
 Reagan, Joseph Nicholas 163
 Reaves, Pamela Mullins 210
 Reed, Annette Yoshiko 279
 Rehm, Bernhard 279, 283
 Reicke, Bo 47, 62, 90, 182
 Reinhartz, Adele 29
 Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich 63, 161
 Repo, Eero 185
 Richter, Georg 118
 Rieckesmann, Jannicke 305
 Riedl, Hermann Josef 191
 Riesenfeld, Harald 92–93
 Riley, Gregory J. 26
 Riley, Harold 85
 Rius-Camps, Josep 230
 Roberts, Keith A. 36
 Robinson, Donald Fay 73
 Robinson, James M. 29–30, 105, 138, 142, 253, 254
 Robinson John A. T. 59, 182, 186, 188
 Rohde, Joachim 32
 Roig Lanzilotta, Lautaro 260, 266
 Roloff, Jürgen 66
 Rothschild, Clare K. 153, 222
 Rowe, C. Kavin 58
 Rowley, H. H. 191
 Royse, James R. 56
 Rösen, Jörn 32
 Ruyschaert, José 307
 Ruckstuhl, Eugen 112
 Ruf, Martin G. 181, 186
 Saldarini, Anthony J. 96, 107, 108
 Salmon, George 178
 Sanday, William 121
 Sanders, Ed Parish 159
 Santos Otero, Aurelio 214
 Schaeffer, F. 215
 Schäferdiek, Knut 259
 Schenk, Wolfgang 107
 Schenke, Gesa 125

- Schenke, Hans-Martin 131, 156, 205, 206,
210, 289
- Schille, Gottfried 66
- Schlier, Heinrich 43, 56, 64
- Schmid, Josef 87
- Schmid, Ulrich 257
- Schmidt, Carl 212, 238, 248, 289, 290
- Schmidt, Karl Matthias 153, 155, 158
- Schmithals, 54, 76, 131, 133
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf 24, 113
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm 163, 195, 279, 287
- Schneider, Gerhard 32, 60, 62, 71, 139
- Schneider, Alfons Maria 308
- Schnelle, Udo 88, 90, 113, 152
- Schoedel, William R. 230, 231–32
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim 283
- Schröter, Jens 27, 31
- Schultheiß, Tanja 24–25, 114, 116
- Schüngel, Paul 246
- Schürmann, Heinz 136, 139
- Schütz, John Howard 36
- Schwartz, Eduard 112
- Schwegler, Albert 19, 75, 279
- Schweizer, Albert 20
- Sell, Jesse 208
- Seufert, W. 157
- Shaw, Brent H. 174–75
- Shellard, Barbara 89, 135
- Shoemaker, Stephen J. 248, 249
- Shorter, Mary 115
- Sim, David C. 24, 28, 96, 97, 159
- Smith, Dennis E. 45
- Smith, Dwight Moody 89, 112
- Smith, Mitzi Jane 206, 209
- Smith, Morton 96, 237
- Smith, Terence V. 22, 96, 182, 188
- Snyder, G. F. 24
- Soards, M. L. 156
- Solages, Msgr Bruno de 88–89
- Solevåg, Anna Rebecca 213
- Soltau, Wilhelm 58
- Souter, Alexander 257
- Speyer, Wolfgang 29
- Spicq, Ceslas 179, 188, 190
- Spitta, Friedrich 184
- Stanton, Graham N. 34, 96, 97, 103, 107, 280
- Stauffer, Ethelbert 79, 179, 181, 236
- Stefaniw, Blossom 247
- Sterling, Gregory E. 75
- Stevenson, James 308
- Stiehl, Ruth 150
- Stirnimann, Heinrich 21
- Stoldt, Hans-Herbert 85, 86
- Stolt, Jan 150
- Storr, Gottlob Christian 86
- Strack, Herman L. 102, 103
- Strange, W. A. 59
- Strathmann, Hermann 155
- Strecker, Georg 23, 108–109, 279, 280
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman 86–89, 108, 150
- Strelan, Rick 132
- Strobel, August 58, 61
- Sumney, Jerry L. 50
- Svartvik, Jesper 243
- Syreeni, Kari 32, 89, 101, 108, 111, 117
- Tajra, Harry W. 81
- Tardieu, Michel 212, 214, 248
- Taussig, Hal 46
- Tellbe, Mikael 104, 132
- Testini, Pasquale 308
- Theißen, Gerd 24, 36, 96, 191, 192
- Thiselton, Anthony C. 53
- Thomas, John Christopher 117
- Thomassen, Einar 253
- Thompson, Trevor 157, 158
- Thompson, William G. 33
- Thornton, Claus-Jürgen 199
- Thümmel, Hans Georg 161, 307
- Thyen, Hartwig 125, 128, 130, 131
- Tigchelaar, Eibert 170
- Till, Walter C. 248
- Torrey, Charles Cutler 59
- Toynbee, Jocelyn, 306, 307
- Traube, Ludwig 288
- Trigg, Joseph W. 272
- Trocme, Etienne 59, 86
- Troeltsch, Ernst 19
- Trompf, G. W. 59
- Townsend, John R. 60
- Townsend, Philippa 291
- Tuckett, Christopher M. 228, 229, 242
- Turner, C. H. 286

- Turner, H. E. W. 29
 Tyson, Joseph B. 60
 Unnik, W. C. van 43, 239
 Urban, Jörg 21
 Uro, Risto 243
 Vaganay, Léon 194–95
 Vähäkangas, Päivi 281
 Verheyden, Joseph 134
 Vielhauer, Philipp 39, 174
 Vinzent, Markus 233
 Vischer, Lukas 21
 Vögtle, Anton 182, 188
 Volkmar, Gustav 19
 Vorster, W. S. 125
 Wagener, Fredrik 25
 Wagenmann, Julius 300
 Wahlde, Urban C. von 112, 126, 127
 Waitz, Hans 287
 Walker, Rolf 23
 Walker, William O. 56
 Walls, A. F. 243
 Walters, Patricia 58
 Walton, Steve 61
 Wasserman, Tommy 183
 Weber, Max 34–38
 Wehnert, Jürgen 279, 280, 281
 Weiser, Alfons 62
 Weiß, Bernhard 18, 149
 Weisse, Christian Hermann 86
 Welborn, Laurence L. 225
 Wellhausen, Julius 112
 Wendt, Hans 59
 Wengst, Klaus
 Wessely, Charles/Karl 169, 288
 White, John L. 156
 Wiarda, Timothy 25
 Wikenhauser, Alfred 58
 Wilhite, David E. 256
 Wilke, Christian Gottlob 86
 Wilkens, Wilhelm 132
 Williams, Travis B. 156, 159
 Wilmart, André 169
 Wilpert, Joseph 308
 Wilson R. McL. 100, 201, 206
 Wilson, Stephen G. 61
 Windisch, Hans 88, 178
 Winter, Martin 179
 Wisse, Frederik 184
 Witetschek, Stephan 51, 244
 Wrede, William 149, 156
 Wrege, Hans-Theo 229
 Wurst, Gregor 254
 Zahn, Theodor 163, 183, 230, 264
 Zetterholm, Magnus 46
 Zwerlein, Otto 222, 230, 287

Index of Subjects

- apostolic legitimacy 44, 62–63, 76–77, 165
apostolic succession 150, 223–24, 226–27,
231, 268, 269, 270, 273–75, 275–77, 286
Antioch 96–97, 109, 111, 151, 153, 158–59,
160, 161, 163, 179, 194, 218, 228, 230, 231,
232, 269, 300, 302
Babylon, see Rome
beloved disciple 111, 113, 114, 118, 121, 122,
123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130–34, 144,
263–64
chastity 211–16, 216–17
creed 53–54, 56, 143, 226, 289
ecumenism 20–21, 23–24, 127, 128, 129–30,
226
elder, see presbyter
empty tomb 122–24, 129, 132–33, 140–41,
194
Frühkatholizismus see proto-orthodoxy
halakha 41, 46, 48, 52, 85, 102, 105, 107,
108–109, 110, 142, 144, 298, 300
historical Peter 19, 22–23
gentile mission 44–45, 70–72, 81–82, 164,
165, 269
Gospel audiences 27–28
Großkirche, see proto-orthodoxy
Jerusalem Council 42–45, 73–74
James, the brother of the Lord 43–45, 72–
74, 78–81, 239–42, 245–46, 284
John the Baptist 77, 113, 114, 133, 145, 243–
44
John's Gospel, redaction 88–90, 111–12, 115,
120, 125, 130–34, 136
Josephus 59–60, 101, 178
literary dependence 169–70, 182–85
Mary Magdalene 122–24, 132–33, 194, 238,
246–47, 247–52, 290–92
Marcion 60, 256–57, 268, 302
papacy 18, 19, 21, 223, 225, 261, 275–77, 285
Paul, heir of Peter 40–42, 78, 82
Paulinism 53, 61, 75, 145, 148–49, 152, 155–
57, 160, 190–91, 257
persecution 157–58, 170–71, 176, 177, 217,
218, 225, 282, 307–308
Peter
– confession of 92–93, 95, 99, 100, 113–14,
116, 117, 137, 243, 154
– denial of 93–94, 106, 119, 121, 124, 140
– eyewitness 140, 148, 149, 155, 186, 188, 190,
192, 197, 199, 211 229, 232, 234–35, 237,
238–39, 250–51, 255, 271, 292
– family of 52, 91, 97, 98, 113, 135, 211, 213,
215, 250–51, 258, 259–60
– hypocrisy 47, 251–52, 256–57, 269
– leader of the early Church 61–62, 63–64,
72, 126, 139, 153–54, 201, 202, 206, 233,
250–51, 261, 269
– martyrdom 119, 127, 172–73, 176, 210, 216,
225–26, 260
– miracles of 65–66, 67, 203, 211, 213, 214,
215, 262, 287
– revelation to 69–70, 93, 104, 167–74, 176,
177, 202, 209–11, 263
– speech of 63–64, 71, 203, 217
– teacher and interpreter of scripture 63–
64, 166, 203, 210, 260, 271, 275, 284,
288, 297
Petrine discourse 147, 193, 296
Petrine school 25, 147, 156–57, 186, 193,
218–19, 296
polemics 18–19, 22, 26, 49–51, 96–97, 152
presbyter 73, 74, 79, 80, 93, 130, 127, 149, 151,
153, 153–55, 195, 234, 161, 224–25, 234–
35, 262–63

- proto-orthodoxy 18–19, 29–30, 145, 190,
 199, 200, 204, 263, 279, 286, 300
 pseudonymity 147, 148–50, 152, 157–61,
 175–76, 177–81, 185–90, 195–97, 219,
 233
 Q 86–87, 105, 138, 142–43
 redaction 20, 32–33, 97
 Rome 51, 59, 80, 90, 145, 150–52, 155, 160–61,
 169, 172, 173, 178, 200, 216–17, 212, 216–
 17, 218, 221, 222, 223–25, 226, 228–29,
 230–31, 236, 237, 268, 270, 276, 277,
 283, 284–85, 287–88, 293, 302–303,
 306–308
 Satanswort 93, 104, 116, 121, 137, 141–42, 174
 social memory 31–32, 258
 suffering 76, 93, 100, 149, 155, 158, 161–62,
 166, 174, 175, 176, 177, 201–205, 207,
 209–10, 217–18, 226, 231, 265, 290
 Synoptic problem 28, 33, 85–88, 193, 242
 Tübingen School 18–19, 22, 49

Dissertationes Theologicae Holmienses

1. Eurell, John-Christian. *Peter's Legacy in Early Christianity: The Appropriation and Use of Peter's Authority in the First Three Centuries*. DTH 1. Stockholm: Enskilda Högskolan Stockholm, 2021.