

The Pillars and the Cornerstone
Jesus Tradition Parallels in the Catholic Epistles

Published by Eburon, Delft
Oude Delft 38
2611 CD, Delft
The Netherlands

November 2018

ISBN 978-94-6301-219-5

Cover image: Pillars from Santiago de Compostella,
https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Santiago_de_Compostela_Cathedral

Copyright © 2018 Roelof Alkema. All rights reserved. No part of these pages may be used for any purpose other than personal use. Therefore, reproduction, modification, storage in a retrieval system or retransmission, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical or otherwise, for reasons other than personal use, is strictly prohibited without prior written permission.

Unless otherwise noted, the scripture quotations in this publication are from the New International Version of the Bible. Copyright © 1984, International Bible Society.

THEOLOGISCHE UNIVERSITEIT VAN DE GEREFORMEERDE KERKEN
IN NEDERLAND TE KAMPEN

The Pillars and the Cornerstone
Jesus Tradition Parallels in the Catholic Epistles

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

TER VERKRIJGING VAN DE GRAAD VAN DOCTOR IN DE THEOLOGIE,

OP GEZAG VAN DE RECTOR DR. R. KUIPER,

ZO GOD WIL IN HET OPENBAAR TE VERDEDIGEN

OP VRIJDAG 23 NOVEMBER 2018 OM 15.00 UUR

IN DE LEMKERZAAL,

BROEDERSTRAAT 16 TE KAMPEN

door

Roelof Klaas Alkema

Eerste promotor: Prof. dr. P.H.R. van Houwelingen

Tweede promotor: Prof. dr. P.H. Davids (Houston Graduate
School of Theology)

Leden beoordelingscommissie:

Prof. dr. G. Kwakkel

Prof. dr. R. Roukema (PThU Groningen)

Prof. dr. D. Wenham (Trinity College Bristol)

Sponsored by **STICHTING AFBOUW KAMPEN**

*Dit onderzoek werd mede mogelijk gemaakt door het Greijdanus-Kruithof
Fonds*

Contents

Acknowledgments | xiv

Abbreviations | xv

Introduction – <i>The Pillars and the Cornerstone</i>	1
1. Jesus Tradition	8
1.1 What is Jesus Tradition?	8
1.1.1 Canonical Gospels	9
1.1.2 Jesus Tradition outside the canonical Gospels	12
1.1.3 The literary model	14
1.1.4 The oral model	15
1.1.4.1 Orality	16
1.1.4.2 Texts and orality	16
1.1.4.3 Fixity and flexibility	18
1.1.4.4 The setting of Jesus Tradition	22
1.1.4.5 Teachers & eyewitnesses	24
1.1.5 Interpretation and application	28
1.1.6 Wisdom and aemulatio	30
1.1.7 Concluding remarks	31
1.2 Method	32
1.2.1 Quotations, allusions, echoes: parallels	33
1.2.2 Rhetorical techniques	35
1.2.2.1 Communal remembering	35
1.2.2.2 Recitation composition	36
1.2.2.3 Progymnastic rhetoric	36
1.2.2.4 Aemulatio	38
1.2.2.5 Wisdom sayings	39
1.2.3 Methodology	40
1.3 Value	40
2. Jesus Tradition Parallels in James	42
2.1 Introduction	42
2.1.1 Introductory matters	42
2.1.1.1 Authorship	43
2.1.1.2 Date	46

2.1.1.3 Content: genre and structure	47
2.1.1.4 Purpose	48
2.1.1.5 Jesus Tradition: a brief overview of scholarship	49
2.1.1.5.1 Davies	49
2.1.1.5.2 Davids	50
2.1.1.5.3 Deppe and Hartin	50
2.1.1.5.4 Bauckham and Kloppenborg	51
2.1.2 Approach	51
2.2 Parallels	52
2.2.1 James 1	52
2.2.1.1 James 1:2	52
2.2.1.2 James 1:4	54
2.2.1.3 James 1:5-7	55
2.2.1.4 James 1:12	57
2.2.1.5 James 1:17a-b	60
2.2.1.6 James 1:19b-20	61
2.2.1.7 James 1:21	63
2.2.1.8 James 1:22-25	65
2.2.2 Acting out faith	67
2.2.2.1 James 2:1	67
2.2.2.2 James 2:5	68
2.2.2.3 James 2:8	70
2.2.2.4 James 2:11	71
2.2.2.5 James 2:13	73
2.2.2.6 James 2:15-16	74
2.2.3 Minding the tongue	76
2.2.3.1 James 3:12	77
2.2.3.2 James 3:18	78
2.2.3.3 James 4:11-12	80
2.2.3.4 James 5:12	81
2.2.4 Asking is receiving	83
2.2.4.1 James 4:3	83
2.2.4.2 James 5:17	84
2.2.5 Reversal of fate	85
2.2.5.1 James 4:4	85

2.2.5.2 James 4:9	86
2.2.5.3 James 4:10	87
2.2.5.4 James 5:7-9	88
2.2.5.5 James 5:20	90
2.3 An overview of parallels: preliminary conclusions	94
3. Jesus Tradition Parallels in 1 Peter	100
3.1 Introduction	100
3.1.1 Introductory matters	101
3.1.1.1 Authorship and date	101
3.1.1.2 Audience and reception	104
3.1.1.3 Content	106
3.1.1.4 Purpose	107
3.1.1.5 Jesus Tradition in 1 Peter: an overview of scholarship	108
3.1.1.5.1 Gundry, Best and Maier	109
3.1.1.5.2 Metzner	110
3.1.1.5.3 Horrell and Watson	111
3.1.2 Approach	112
3.2 Parallels	113
3.2.1 Eschatological perspective on suffering	113
3.2.1.1 1 Peter 1:8	114
3.2.1.2 1 Peter 1:9	116
3.2.1.3 1 Peter 3:4	117
3.2.1.4 1 Peter 3:9	119
3.2.1.5 1 Peter 3:14a	121
3.2.1.6 1 Peter 4:7	122
3.2.1.7 1 Peter 4:13-14	123
3.2.2 Living among pagans	125
3.2.2.1 1 Peter 2:12	125
3.2.2.2 1 Peter 2:17	126
3.2.2.3 1 Peter 4:10	128
3.2.3 Prophetic fulfilment	130
3.2.3.1 1 Peter 1:10	130
3.2.3.2 1 Peter 2:4-8	132

3.2.4 Idiomatic parallels	137
3.2.4.1 1 Peter 1:17	137
3.2.4.2 1 Peter 1:3.23	138
3.2.4.3 1 Peter 2:25	140
3.2.4.4 1 Peter 3:18a	143
3.2.4.5 1 Peter 4:8	144
3.2.4.6 1 Peter 5:2-3	144
3.2.4.7 1 Peter 5:7	146
3.2.4.8 1 Peter 5:8a	148
3.2.5 Passion Narrative	149
3.2.5.1 1 Peter 5:1	149
3.2.5.2 1 Peter 2:20	150
3.2.5.3 1 Peter 2:21	151
3.2.5.4 1 Peter 2:22-23	152
3.3 An overview of parallels; preliminary conclusions	155
3.3.1 Sermon on the Mount/Plain	155
3.3.2 Passion Narrative and holy week	156
3.3.3 Johannine tradition	158
3.3.4 Petrine traditions	159
3.3.5 Synoptic traditions	160
3.3.6 Luke 12	161
3.3.7 Jesus Tradition idiom	161
4. Jesus Tradition Parallels in the Johannine Epistles	164
4.1 Introduction	165
4.1.1 Introductory matters	165
4.1.1.1 Johannine community	166
4.1.1.1.1 Origins and existence	166
4.1.1.1.2 Tradition material in the Johannine churches	167
4.1.1.1.3 Authorship	169
4.1.1.2 Audience, reception and content	171
4.1.1.3 Jesus Tradition in Johannine Epistles: a brief overview of scholarship	172
4.1.2 Approach	174
4.2 Parallels	175

4.2.1 The Johannine love command	175
4.2.1.1 1 John 3:16	175
4.2.1.2 1 John 4:9	176
4.2.1.3 1 John 2:7/3:23; 2 John 1:4-6	177
4.2.1.4 1 John 3:17-18	180
4.2.1.5 1 John 4:21/Hebrew Gospel	181
4.2.1.6 1 John/Matthew	183
4.2.1.7 1 John 3:15	185
4.2.2 Eschatology	187
4.2.2.1 1 John 2:17	188
4.2.2.2 1 John 3:4	191
4.2.2.3 1 John 3:7a	192
4.2.2.4 1 John 3:1	193
4.2.3 The new people of God	195
4.2.3.1 1 John 1:5-6	195
4.2.3.2 1 John 1:10	196
4.2.3.3 3 John 1:9	198
4.2.3.4 1 John 3:9-10	199
4.2.3.5 1 John 3:22	201
4.2.3.6 1 John 5:16a-b	202
4.3 Conclusions	204
5. Jesus Tradition Parallels in 2 Peter and Jude	208
5.1 Introductory matters	208
5.1.1 Reception history	208
5.1.2 Present status	210
5.1.3 The literary relationship of 2 Peter and Jude	211
5.1.4 Purpose	215
5.1.5 Jesus Tradition in 2 Peter and Jude: a brief overview of scholarship	217
5.1.6 Approach	218
5.2 Parallels	218
5.2.1 Eschatological end-time parallels	219
5.2.1.1 2 Peter 1:19	219
5.2.1.2 2 Peter 2:1/Jude 4	222

5.2.1.3 2 Peter 3:2/Jude 17b	224
5.2.1.4 2 Peter 3:4	226
5.2.1.5 2 Peter 3:9	227
5.2.1.6 2 Peter 3:10-12	229
5.2.2 Eschatological traditions of warning and rebuke	231
5.2.2.1 2 Peter 2:3.14	231
5.2.2.2 2 Peter 2:20	233
5.2.2.3 2 Peter 2:22	234
5.2.2.4 Jude 17-18/2 Peter 3:2-3	235
5.2.3 Petrine reminiscences	237
5.2.3.1 2 Peter 1:14	237
5.2.3.2 2 Peter 1:15	238
5.2.3.3 2 Peter 1:16-18	239
5.2.4 A suspected <i>logion</i>	242
5.3 Conclusions	245
6. Conclusions	
Jesus Tradition Parallels in the Catholic Epistles	249
6.1 Sources and traditions	249
6.1.1 Possible tradition blocks	255
6.1.1.1 Double Tradition/'Q'	256
6.1.1.2 Matthean tradition/'M'	258
6.1.1.3 Sermon on the Mount/Plain	260
6.1.1.4 Johannine Sayings	263
6.1.1.5 Passion Narrative	265
6.1.1.6 Petrine/Apostolical narratives	268
6.1.1.7 Olivet Discourse	269
6.1.1.8 Miscellaneous traditions	271
6.1.1.9 Love command	273
6.1.2 Some concluding observations	275
6.1.2.1 Johannine tradition	275
6.1.2.2 Q material	275
6.1.2.3 Appropriation of source material	276
6.2 The Perception of Jesus in the Catholic Epistles	277
6.2.1 The perception of Jesus	277

6.2.2 Direct statements about Jesus' identity	280
6.2.3 The perception of Jesus through Jesus Tradition Parallels	281
6.2.3.1 Jesus, the Jewish wisdom teacher	282
6.2.3.2 Jesus, the unthought-of role model	284
6.2.3.3 Jesus, the eschatological prophet	286
6.2.3.4 Jesus, the teacher of radical love and non-retaliation	288
6.2.3.5 An integrated perspective on the perception of Jesus in the Catholic Epistles	291
6.3 Concluding Remarks	293
Synthesis – The Pillars and the Rock	295
Excursus 1 – Jesus Tradition Parallels in Paul	296
Excursus 2 – Jesus Tradition Parallels in the Apostolic Fathers	299
Bibliography	303
Abstract	322
The Pillars and the Rock – Nederlandse samenvatting	323
Curriculum Vitae	330

Acknowledgments

Writing this thesis has been a formative experience. Never before in my life have I worked so steadily and patiently on the same subject for such a long period of time. As, I suppose, everyone knows who has undertaken similar endeavors, it is immensely gratifying and challenging at the same time. And now that the work has finally been completed, the challenges are almost forgotten, while the sense of gratitude is overwhelming.

I am especially grateful to the indispensable help I have received from Rob van Houwelingen, who has always been generous in time and attention to detail. Also, Peter and Judith Davids, thank you very much for your engagement. Your involvement in the whole enterprise has been so generous. Professors Kwakkel, Roukema and Wenham: thank you for allowing me to put the last dots on all of the i's.

Liesbeth, Elke, Marin en Teije: thank you for letting me put so much time, effort and attention into this research, at times at the expense of you four. I love you all to pieces! Mom and Dad, thank you for encouraging me: I am thrilled that we can be grateful together!

Finally - *Soli Deo Gloria* – all my gratitude goes out to God, my creator and my redeemer. This book is above all about Jesus, whom I do not consider to be a limited study subject, but rather as all-encompassing as the very air I breathe.

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of ancient sources are given according to the list provided in *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

AB	Anchor Bible
AJT	<i>Asia Journal of Theology</i>
ASNU	Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	Bauer, W., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arendt and F.W. Gingrich, <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , Chicago, 3d edn, 1999
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBR	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CNT	Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament, derde serie Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown, Nicholas Perrin,
DJG	<i>Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels</i> , Downer's Grove, 2 nd edn, 2013
DPL	Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, Daniel G. Reid, <i>Dictionary of Paul and his Letters</i> , Downer's Grove, 1993
EJT	<i>European Journal of Theology</i>
ETR	<i>Etudes Theologiques et Religieuses</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ExpT</i>	<i>The Expository Times</i>
FN	<i>Filologia Neotestamentaria</i>
FR	<i>Fides Reformata</i>
HBT	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>IdS</i>	<i>In die Skriflig</i>

IVPNTC	The IVP New Testament Commentary Series
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JSHJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series
<i>JTI</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Interpretation</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>L&S</i>	<i>Letter & Spirit</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	Liddell, H.G., R. Scott, and H.S. Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9 th edn., with revised supplement, Oxford, 1996
MNTC	Moffat New Testament Commentary
NIBCNT	New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIDNTTE	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> , 2 nd edn, revised by Moisés Silva, 2014
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovTest</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NTC	The New Testament in Context
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>SF</i>	<i>Sárospataki Füzetek</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
TAnZ	Texte und Arbeit zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
<i>TB</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TR</i>	<i>Theologia Reformata</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

ZNW

Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

Introduction – the Pillars and the Cornerstone

The Pillars

A casual survey of New Testament scholarship throughout the last one hundred years or so, would suggest that the seven epistles following (in most Bible editions) Paul and Hebrews, and preceding Revelation, do not really matter all that much. In comparison to the endless shelves of books that have been devoted to the study of the Pauline letters, scholarly attention for the Catholic Epistles is negligible. Similarly, the average church-goer might raise his or her eyebrows in alarm when asked to look up 2 Peter or Jude. Luckily, they are indeed placed somewhere near the very end, which is probably the location he or she will intuitively start to scan.

However, these seven epistles are part of the New Testament canon and have been weighed and handed down by Church Fathers and generations of Christians who have cherished and valued them as Scripture. The question is whether church and academy are willing to embrace this canonical reality and interact as intently with the Catholic Epistles as they have done with the Pauline letters throughout history.

A tentative optimism is in place. The last ten to fifteen years may have marked a turning point in the relative negligence of the Catholic Epistles. In the wake of Brevard Childs' ongoing call for canonical sensitivity, it seems that the canonical unity of these seven letters is gaining increasing scholarly attention.¹ Two large essay-volumes,² several articles³ and monographs⁴ have enriched New Testament scholarship in this respect.

¹ Eusebius already acknowledges the seven epistles as a canonical unit (*HE* 2.23-25).

² Schlosser, J. (ed.), *The Catholic Epistles and Tradition*, BETL 176, Leuven: Peeters, 2004 ; K.-W. Niebuhr & R.W. Wall (eds.), *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition*, Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.

³ P.H. Davids, 'The Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Janus: A New Testament Glimpse into Old and New Testament Canon Formation', *BBR* 19 (2009), 403-16; Carey C. Newman, 'Jude 22, Apostolic Theology and the Canonical Role of the Catholic Epistles', *PRSt* 41 (2014), 367-78; Darian R. Lockett, 'Are the Catholic Epistles a Canonically Significant Collection? A *Status Quaestionis*', *CBR* 14 (1), 2015, 62-80.

⁴ Nienhaus, David R., 2007, *Not by Paul Alone: The Formation of the Catholic Epistles Collection and the Christian Canon*, Waco: Baylor University Press; Darian Lockett, *An Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*, London: T & T Clark, 2012; Darian Lockett, *Letters from the Pillar Apostles, The Formation of the Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Collection*, Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2017.

The relevance of acknowledging the canonical role of the Catholic Epistles lies, among other things, in the balance it brings to the message of the New Testament.⁵ The counterbalance these seven letters present vis á vis the Pauline letters is in fact mirrored by the book of Acts. As Childs puts it:

In terms of a canonical reading of Acts, Harnack correctly described the *three determinative corpora of the New Testament canon consisting of the Gospels, Pauline Letters and the Catholic Letters*. From this perspective the canonical function of Acts emerges with clarity. It consists primarily of *presenting the apostles as the legitimate guardians of the Jesus traditions*, strengthened by the connection with the catholic letters of Peter, James, and John, and the portrait of Paul in Acts as in agreement with that of the letters.⁶

The history of the church has proven that the witness of Scripture is needed to provide balance where there is tension. Such tension already existed in the days of the apostles, as can be seen, for instance, in Galatians 2. There Paul seems to write about a conflict between the Jewish mission of the Pillar apostles (James, Peter and John) and his own Gentile-oriented mission. The tension is resolved, when the Pillar Apostles and Paul can shake hands, and acknowledge both their contributions to God's overarching mission (Gal.2:9).

The Apostolic Decree, described in Acts 15:12-29 (cp. 21:17-26) confirms this state of resolved tension. So much so, that the notion of tension was almost forgotten in subsequent readings of Acts. *1 Clement* 5:2 indirectly testifies to this, when it mentions 'the greatest and most upright pillars', referring, not to the 'Jerusalem pillars' from Galatians 2:9, but, rather, to Peter and Paul together.

⁵ Augustine (*De fide et operibus* 21) seems to make this point, when he says that 'somewhat obscure statements of the Apostle Paul were misunderstood ... other apostolic letters of Peter, John, James and Jude are deliberately aimed against the argument I have been refuting...'. Cf. Nienhuis, *Not by Paul*, 1-2.

⁶ Brevard Childs, *The Church's Guide for Reading Paul. The Canonical Shaping of the Pauline Corpus*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008, 131 (emphasis mine).

Pillar Collection

It is, however, not self-evident to accept the Catholic Epistles as a meaningful canonical collection, nor is it common practice to accept the hermeneutical implications of such a move. This is understandable, considering the wide variety of style, origin and (possibly) dating of these epistles. Such a step, however, may be a way towards a better understanding of these letters on all levels: the canon can be taken as a necessary interpretive context where historical and theological questions can be researched alongside each other. In the words of Darian Lockett:

[S]uch collection consciousness, though not necessarily in the preview of the original authors (being perhaps unforeseen, yet not unintended), is neither anachronistic to the meaning of the letters nor antagonistic to their composition.⁷

Following this perspective, the present study embraces the canonical unity of the Catholic Epistles, and the notion of these epistles as a deliberate 'Pillar collection': The handshake that we read about in Galatians 2:9 finds its literate, canonical, counterpart in the Corpus Paulinum and the Catholic Epistles. Of course the Pauline collection speaks with one, clearly recognizable voice, whereas the Catholic Epistles form a chorus of voices (or, more aptly: a barbershop quartet).⁸ Yet there is distinct theological and topical unity throughout the Catholic Epistles that justifies a canonical approach.⁹

⁷ Lockett, *Pillar Apostles*, 231.

⁸ All introductory discussions concerning authorship, authenticity and pseudepigraphy aside: the Pauline letters are presented as a canonically unified voice regardless of whether one thinks of them in terms of 'disputed' and 'undisputed'.

⁹ Cf. Nienhaus, *Not by Paul*; Lockett, *Pillar Apostles*. Cf. also Dale C. Allison, *James* (ICC), London: T & T Clark, 2013, 108-09, who does not present a theory of canonical or theological unity, but rather simply states that 'James exhibits very strong parallels with Paul, 1 Peter and 1 John, and these cry out for explanation.'

The Cornerstone

As Brevard Childs puts it, Acts' canonical function is primarily 'presenting the apostles as the legitimate guardians of the Jesus traditions'.¹⁰

This is a very interesting way of framing the New Testament canon: Acts as a hinge between the life and words of Jesus and the writings of his earliest followers, as his message spread across the First Century-world. This framing fully appreciates the role of Jesus' teaching, Jesus' life story and the *kerygma* that derives from both. In a way, the apostles' role was to vouchsafe the integrity of this message, and to encourage its dissemination throughout the world. To look at the Pauline letters and the Catholic Epistles in this way, allows for a perspective in which Jesus and the traditions that are either ascribed to him or tell his story, are, in fact, the controlling subject matter of all these writings.

Paul shows this to be true, in a way at least, of his theology, when he writes of his gospel: 'what I received I passed on to you' (1 Cor.15:3a). He then goes on to paraphrase the gospel message, making it clear that this is not something he is making up, but something that he has received and is now passing on. Paul's gospel is not so much his own, as it is dependent on Jesus Tradition.¹¹

Similarly, the epistle of James is (as is widely accepted, cf. chapter 2 of the present study) heavily reliant on several strands of Jesus Tradition. For instance, the words of James 1:22-25 are seemingly dependent on Matthew 7:24-28 (cp. Luke 6:47-48), Jesus' parable about the house being built on either sand or rock:¹²

¹⁰ Cf. note 6 above.

¹¹ Cf. esp. David Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 1995; Gerry Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus in the Writings of Paul. A Historical Examination of Shared Core Commitments with a View to Determining the Extent of Paul's Dependence on Jesus*, Cambridge: Pickwick Publications, 2013.

¹² For a full discussion of this parallel, cf. 2.2.1 below.

Jas.1:23

Anyone who listens to the word
but does not do what it says is
like someone who ...

Matt. 7:26

But everyone who hears these
words of mine and does not put
them into practice ...¹³

Interestingly, in this simile, Jesus does not equate *himself* with a rock, as Augustine assumed,¹⁴ but he equates *his teaching* with a rock. Jesus exhorts his hearers to look upon his teaching as a foundation upon which their lives can be built. However, as Augustine's exegesis indicates, the idea of equating Jesus himself with 'the rock' was never a remote possibility. All the more since some Hebrew Bible passages (some of which are picked up in the New Testament) seem to apply the words 'stone' or 'rock' to God directly, which, of course, lent itself very well for Christological implications.¹⁵ In Matthew 21:42 we can see how Jesus relates the words of Psalm 118:22-23 to himself; both Peter and Paul conversely affirm this reading as part of a 'living stones'-theology:

Matt. 21:42

Jesus said to
them, "Have you never
read in the Scriptures:

"The stone the
builders rejected
has become the
cornerstone;
the Lord has done this,
and it is marvelous in
our eyes'

1 Pet.2:4-5a

As you come to him,
the living Stone—
rejected by humans
but chosen by
God and precious to
him— you also, like
living stones, are
being built into a
spiritual house

Eph.2:19-20

Consequently, you are
no longer foreigners
and strangers, but
fellow citizens with
God's people and also
members of his
household, built on
the foundation of the
apostles and
prophets, with Christ
Jesus himself as the
chief cornerstone.

In the book of Acts, the apostles are presented as carrying Jesus' message and the gospel narrative forward into the First Century Mediterranean

¹³ Here, and throughout the present study (unless otherwise indicated), portions of Scripture in English are taken from the NIV (2011). The Greek text is taken from the NA28 edition.

¹⁴ *De Sermone* 87.

¹⁵ Cf. Norman Hillyer, 'Rock-Stone Imagery in 1 Peter', *TB* 22 (1971) 58-81; cf. NIDNTTE, 735-40.

world. The witness of both the Pauline and the Catholic Epistles underscore their roles as tradents and proponents of Jesus Tradition. Jesus is believed to be the cornerstone of a new and living Temple and his message is presented as a firm foundation on which the apostolic gospel message is built.¹⁶

The present study will focus on the question just to what extent the seven letters that are associated with the so-called Pillar Apostles (i.e.: the Catholic Epistles) are dependent on Jesus Tradition. In other words: *how do the Pillars relate to the Cornerstone?*

Research question

The research will deal with two areas of New Testament research, one of which is easily demarcated: the seven letters of the Catholic Epistles. The other, however, is less easily demarcated and in fact needs to be defined from the start: 'Jesus Tradition' is often as broad as its researchers make it out to be.

In trying to mark off the boundaries of Jesus Tradition, the present study will be informed by contemporary ways in which Jesus Tradition and New Testament writings are conceived, mainly with sensitivity towards oral tradition studies and Ancient Greek writing techniques.

Most of this, and the basic question 'what is Jesus Tradition?', will be laid out in the first chapter. The consecutive chapters (2 through 5) will then deal with the actual research: Jesus Tradition parallels within the Catholic Epistles. The final chapter will then draw conclusions from the research and try to weigh its significance.

The actual research question, propelling this study henceforth, is:

What parallels to Jesus Tradition can be found in the Catholic Epistles, and how do these parallels inform us on the relationship of the Catholic Epistles to Jesus Tradition, both on a historical and a theological level?

¹⁶ In this sense, the words λίθος ('stone': Matt.21:42) and πέτρα ('rock': Matt.7:24-28) have related, yet distinguished metaphorical meaning.

Parallels

To enter the arena of *parallels*, is to beg the question of validity and solid methodology. Several decades ago Samuel Sandmel warned against 'parallelomania', which he defined as

[T]he extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction'.¹⁷

His plea for caution against overly simple methodology is a welcome one, as is his assurance that the New Testament authors are perfectly capable of being original, rather than being mere copycats, whose every thought must have originated in some underlying tradition.

These cautionary remarks have been taken to heart in the present study. The authors of the Catholic Epistles will indeed be presented as fully original writers, capable of formulating their own words and sentences. This, however, does not mean that they are not greatly influenced by Jesus Tradition. The following chapters will argue that not only the canonical, but also the historical realities behind the New Testament imply a continuing reliance on Jesus Tradition on the part of those who sought to follow Jesus' footsteps.

After defining Jesus Tradition, the following chapter will lay out a careful methodology for establishing parallels.

¹⁷ Samuel Sandmel, 'Parallelomania', *JBL* 81 (1) (march 1962), 1-13. T.L. Donaldson later built upon Sandmel's paper. Donaldson states that a true parallel must be genealogical, i.e.: unless it can be shown that one text has influenced the other somehow, it is useless to discuss the matter. Also, his insistence to make a distinction between stronger and weaker parallels is useful, when trying to establish the significance of a parallel; T.L. Donaldson, 'Parallels: Use, Misuse and Limitations', *EvQ* 55 (1983), 193-210.

1. Jesus Tradition

The present chapter serves as an introductory chapter in a number of ways: First of all, the concept of *Jesus Tradition* is outlined and defined in order to better understand the scope of the research question (1.1). Second, the outline and definition aim to propose a *method* by which parallels to Jesus Tradition can be traced (1.2). Third, the *value* of the research presented will be briefly assessed (1.3.).

1.1 What is Jesus Tradition?

The study of the New Testament in the twentieth century, especially from the forties up through the seventies, has seen an ongoing stream of 'new data' (i.e. Dead Sea Scrolls, Apocryphal Gospels, numerous papyri). Great care and hard work was put into the labelling and weighing of this material. However, this new data did not radically shift perspectives on Early Christianity: much of the new data was held to show that Early Christianity did indeed move 'from heterodoxy to orthodoxy', and not the other way around¹⁸ and much of it was, conversely, held to prove the obvious priority and trustworthiness of the canonical Gospels, since these differed so markedly from their apocryphal and secondary counterparts.¹⁹

Now that the Middle-Eastern sands seem to have settled (although there is no way of knowing what spectacular find may be brought to light in the near future), we must face the question of what it is exactly that has been unearthed. With regard to the question at hand: what exactly *is* this Jesus Tradition that the present research sets out to find in the Catholic Epistles? It is certainly not anything anyone has ever said about Jesus. But where are we to draw the line between 'actual Jesus Tradition' and non-valid 'secondary' material –if such a distinction can be drawn?

¹⁸ Which is still the consensus in critical scholarship since Walter Bauer's *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen: 1934.

¹⁹ Cf. i.e. D.F. Wright's review of J.D. Crossan's *Four Other Gospels*, in which he elaborately sets out Crossan's views on some apocryphal gospels, only to claim, in his concluding remarks, that these gospels on the contrary contribute 'at best nothing but additional material of the same kind as that already available in the gospels themselves': D.F. Wright: 'Four Other Gospels: Review Article', *Themelios* 12.2 (January 1987) 56-60.

James Dunn, among others, has offered a fresh perspective, in trying to make us aware of the *oral structure* of Jesus Tradition, turning away from the *literary paradigm* that has forced a tunnel vision upon New Testament study in the modern 'print-era':

To recognize that the early transmission of the Jesus tradition took place in an oral culture and as oral tradition requires us consciously to resist the involuntary predisposition to conceive that process in literary terms and consciously to re-envisage that process in oral terms. ...

The test of any theoretical model for the transmission of the Jesus tradition, of course, is how well it explains the data we have ... I believe the oral model passes that test with flying colors.²⁰

To exchange a paradigm that tries to explain data according to *literary* interdependence for one that carefully seeks to explore the possibilities that an *oral*, or even a *rhetorical* culture²¹ offers, could open our view to new horizons. Whereas the exclusive focus upon texts and their interdependence gives a very static view of Jesus Tradition, a model that acknowledges the constant interaction between oral and written tradition is more open and dynamic.²²

Below, an attempt will be made to set out the character of Jesus Tradition as it circulated among the communities of Early Christianity: what did it look like; how and where did it originate; what techniques, if any, were used to preserve traditions? What, in short, is its *Sitz im Leben*?

1.1.1 Canonical Gospels

The most obvious place to look for Jesus Tradition material is the New Testament, and especially the four canonical Gospels. Here we have four books devoted to the life and teaching of Jesus, all four, in all probability,

²⁰ James D.G. Dunn, 'Altering the Default Setting' in: Dunn, *The Oral Gospel Tradition*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013, 41-79, here: 58-59.

²¹ For 'rhetorical culture' see below, 1.1.4.2 and Cf. Vernon K. Robbins, 'Writing as a Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels', in: Duane F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991, 142-68.

²² In doing so, some restraint must be retained. We should not imagine the first century CE as though the written word had no place in it, cf. Larry Hurtado, 'Orality', 'Performance' and Reading Texts in early Christianity, *New Testament Studies* 60 (2014), 321-40.

stemming from the first century CE.²³ As Richard Bauckham has recently shown,²⁴ all four gospels employ literary strategies to emphasize that the source of the traditions, that are either transcribed or reworked within them, are known and traceable: the name of the apostle Peter, for instance, is used in Mark with an *inclusio* to show the basic trustworthiness of the traditions employed.²⁵ Bauckham's observations are sometimes met with skepticism concerning the historical trustworthiness of the Gospels, and the reliability of human memory.²⁶ This is, however, to miss the point: the Gospel authors themselves thought it necessary to emphasize that their traditions stemmed from eyewitness accounts. This means that they did care for the basic historical background of the stories they transmitted. Some of the named eyewitnesses were still alive in the second half of the first century. They were probably not readily accessible for most of the Gospel audiences, but their enduring presence, throughout the second half of the first century CE must be taken into account, especially when we bear in mind how constitutive the Gospel stories must have been for the Early Church. Therefore, we can suppose that *the canonical Gospels are consciously transmitting tradition material that is perceived as rooted in historical events that are meaningful and constitutive for the identity of the Early Christian community/communities.*

To take the four canonical Gospels as a group with a single goal is on the one hand obvious, since all four are thought to belong to the same (rather unique) genre, and all four offer the same basic story of baptism, ministry, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus (which, in fact, sets them apart from all known apocryphal Gospels). On the other hand, there is the apparent difference between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John.

Whereas the Synoptics seem to make use of the same traditions, often overlapping each other's material, the Gospel of John presents distinct

²³ Cf. the table in Heinz-Werner Neudorfer & Eckhard J. Schnabel (eds.), *Das Studium des Neuen Testaments*, Witten: Brockhaus, 2011, 232-33, where Mark is dated between 55 and 73 CE, and John from about 65 at the very earliest to 110 at the very latest.

²⁴ Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

²⁵ Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 124-149.

²⁶ i.e. Judith Redman, 2010, "How Accurate are Eyewitnesses? Bauckham and the Eyewitnesses in Light of Psychological Research." *JBL* 129: 177-97.

stories and speeches of Jesus. Jesus' speeches in John are much longer and appear to be literary compositions. Much has been written on the provenance of the Johannine tradition material, especially on how it is thought to reflect the history of the so-called Johannine community.²⁷ Still, there is enough reason to suppose that the Johannine stories are drawn from an older pool of tradition material, just as the Synoptic Gospels do.²⁸ The exact nature of its dependence upon them and on the freedom that John takes in reworking these traditions are hard to settle. Tentatively, it could be stated that the difference lies on some part on the way in which the Gospel writers handle their traditions. Whereas the authors of the Synoptic Gospels often choose to basically *transcribe* their traditions, it seems that John wants to *compose* a literary composition *based on* his traditions.²⁹ In the Synoptic Gospels, orality is still very much recognizable. John is in all likelihood aware of oral tradition, but his discourses are literate throughout.³⁰ This is in no way a solution for possible tensions between the content of the Synoptics and John on a historical level, but it reflects on the way both parties may have used and reworked Jesus Tradition material. In the present research some

²⁷ E.g. Raymond R. Brown: *The Gospel of John*, AB 29-29a, Garden City: Doubleday, 1966-70; J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, New York: Harper & Row, 1968; R. Alan Culpepper & C. Clifton Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

²⁸ Cf. esp. C.H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, New York: Cambridge University Press: 1964; James D.G. Dunn, 'John and the Oral Gospel Tradition', in: H.Wansborough, *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991, 351-79. More recently: Philipp Bartholomae, *The Johannine Discourses and the Teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics: A Contribution to the Discussion Concerning the Authenticity of Jesus' Words in the Fourth Gospel*. Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 57, Tübingen: Francke, 2012; R. Alan Culpepper, 'Jesus Sayings in the Johannine Discourses: A proposal', in: Paul N. Anderson & Tom Thatcher (eds.), *John, Jesus and History*, vol. 3: *Glimpses of Jesus through the Johannine Lens*, Atlanta: SBL, 2016, 353-82.

²⁹ If we can assume the widespread knowledge of Jesus Tradition in the Early Church, we have to reckon with the possibility that John's audience was in fact familiar with Synoptic-like tradition material. Cf. Richard Bauckham's 'John for readers of Mark', in Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for all Christians*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998, 147-171; cf. also C.S. Keener in *DJG*, 426, who does not think John 'used' Mark, or another Synoptic Gospel, but 'it can hardly follow that John (who uses the Gospel form) did not know of such works.'

³⁰ Cf. Bakker, Egbert J., 'How Oral is Oral Composition?' in: Mackay, E Anne (ed.), 1999, *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Supplements to Mnemosyne 188, Leiden: Brill, 29-47, who introduces a graph, distinguishing the conception of a discourse itself from the conception of its writing. A literate discourse can be turned into a literate composition. An oral discourse can be transcribed, and maintain its 'oral' features. But an oral discourse can also be turned into a literate composition, losing many, or all, of its distinctive oral features:

- (a) conception of a discourse: oral \leftrightarrow literate
 (b) conception of its writing: transcription \leftrightarrow composition

sensitivity with regard to this observation will be shown, when Johannine tradition material is dealt with.

1.1.2 Jesus Tradition outside the canonical Gospels

Apart from the canonical Gospels, many other traditions concerning Jesus, some of which are likely to be of first century origin, have survived. The more obvious examples are the so-called *Agrapha*. The best known of these words of Jesus not recorded in the canonical Gospels is preserved in Acts:

It is more blessed to give than to receive (Acts 20:35c).

In the *Apostolic Fathers*³¹ we also find some interesting examples. For instance, both *1 Clement* 13:2 and *Didache* 1:3-5 (and cp. *Pol.Phil.*2:3) have a catena of words of Jesus. Both are built up of strictly Sermon on the Mount/Plain material, although it is unlikely that either *Didache* or *1 Clement* cited from either Matthew or Luke. In both catenae we find otherwise unknown words of Jesus:

As you do, so it will be done to you (*1 Clem.*13:2c)

[Bless those who curse you, pray for your enemies, and]
fast for those who persecute you. (*Did.*1:3b)³²
Abstain from fleshly passions. (*Did.*1:4a)

In these instances, the phrases that are alien to the New Testament tradition seem to have belonged to the (oral) tradition that was known to both authors, in a slightly differing version from the tradition that was known to Matthew and Luke.

Ignatius, the early 2nd century bishop of Antioch, also offers an otherwise unknown Jesus-*logion*:

³¹ Quotations from the *Apostolic Fathers* are taken from the Loeb edition (LCL 24 & 25), edited and translated by Bart D. Ehrman (London: Harvard University Press, 2005).

³² The catena of *Didache* 1:3-5 has some distinctive features (including the *agrapha*) that can also be discerned in comparable catena's in the 2nd century *Didascalia Apostolorum* and the Syrian *Liber Graduum*, cf. A.F.J. Klijn, *Na het nieuwe Testament*, Baarn: Ten Have, 1973, 17.

Reach out, touch me, and see that I am not a bodiless daimon.
(*Ign.Smyrn.3:2b*)

This is a post-resurrection saying that fits well within the accounts of Mark 16:8-10, Luke 24:39 and John 20:19-29 and can hardly be explained as a later elaboration of either Gospel tradition.

Other examples are found in apocryphal Gospels, especially the *Gospel of Thomas*:

He who is near to me, is near the fire. And he who is far from me is far from the kingdom (*Gosp.Thom.82*)³³

Jesus said: If those who lead you say to you: Lo, the kingdom is in heaven, then the birds of the heaven will precede you; if they say to you: It is in the sea, then the fish will precede you. But the kingdom is within you, and outside you. When you know yourselves, then you will be known, and you will know that you are the sons of the living Father. But if you do not know yourselves, then you are in poverty, and you are poverty.
(*Gosp.Thom.3*)

Whoever among you will become a little one, will know the kingdom and will be greater than John [the Baptist].
(*Gosp.Thom.46b*).

[The kingdom] does not come when one expects (it). They will not say: Lo, here! or: Lo, there! But the kingdom of the Father is spread out upon the earth, and men do not see it. (*Gosp.Thom.113b*)³⁴

It is often assumed that *Thomas* has elaborated Synoptic sayings,³⁵ but it is just as likely that the writer has in fact either transcribed or reworked oral tradition that was known to him, oral tradition which *in turn* may

³³ Bruce Chilton, 'The Gospel according to Thomas as a Source of Jesus' Teaching', in: Wenham (ed.) *Gospel Perspectives* vol.5, 155-175, considers this to be the one authentic non-canonical Jesus-logion in *Gosp.Thom*. The three I have listed below this one he considers to be 'partially authentic' (170).

³⁴ The quotes from *Gosp.Thom* are taken from Bruce Metzger's translation, in Aland's *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 10. *durchgesehene Auflage*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1978, 517-530.

³⁵ Some even consider it to be dependent on Tatian's Diatessaron. Cf. Risto Uro, 'Thomas and Oral Gospel Tradition' in: Uro (ed.), *Thomas at the Crossroads. Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*, London: T & T Clark, 1998, 8-32, esp. 8, note 2-3.

have been influenced by written tradition ('second orality').³⁶ It should in any case be noted, that the verses mentioned above are part of a written document that also features a fair number of sayings that are known from the Synoptic Gospels.

More examples could be given; there are numerous other quotations from Apostolic and Church Fathers and apocryphal Gospels (esp. Jewish Christian Gospel traditions, *agrapha* known from Clement of Alexandria and Origen, the 'Unknown' (Egerton) Gospel, Papyri Oxhyrrhinchus 1224 & 840), which cannot all be cited here.³⁷

The examples that have been given show that *there are numerous sayings of Jesus that do not appear in the canonical Gospels* and have been written down contemporary with or shortly after the canonical Gospels. Many of these traditions are *not intrinsically alien to the traditions in i.e. the Synoptic Gospels but seem to belong to similar strands of tradition*. It should also be noted that (presumably) oral tradition continues to play its part well into the second century: the written Gospels did not immediately silence these traditions; they probably became part of them, just as they initially sprung forth from them.

1.1.3 The literary model

A literary model for explaining textual differences and interdependencies between the canonical Gospels has by far been the most popular in contemporary scholarship.

It has of course been observed that the first three Gospels share a lot of material – some pericopes showing verbal agreement even up to 90 %, which inevitably led to the assumption that there must be some form of literary interdependence.

³⁶ Uro, 'Thomas and Oral Gospel Tradition.'

³⁷ The present research is indebted to the overview that is given in the studies of James Edwards and Andrew Bernhard: James R. Edwards, *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of Synoptic Tradition*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009, and Andrew E. Bernhard, *Other Early Christian Gospels*, London: T & T Clark, 2007.

In trying to determine which Gospel is dependent on which (the 'Synoptic problem') the Two Document Hypothesis (TDH) has proved to be the most influential, up to the present day.³⁸

The Fourth Gospel can hardly produce any matching pericopes to the Synoptic parallels, apart from the account of the Baptist's ministry, the feeding miracle and some scenes in the passion narrative. And even there John's versions are markedly different from that of the Synoptics. John's sources have been thought to stem from the 'Johannine' community, or 'Johannine school', where its underlying traditions have been formed.³⁹

This strictly 'literary paradigm' thereby severs the Fourth Gospel from the first three. This is in a way problematic, especially when *Thomas* is brought into play: It is obvious that *Thomas* does share tradition material with the Synoptic Gospels (and many believe this is not through direct literary dependence on the canonical Gospels). Yet, theologically, and on the level of content, John is far closer to the Synoptics than *Thomas* is.

However precise and helpful many insights that follow from the TDH are: *to view the relationship of the Gospels merely on the level of literary dependence is to unnecessarily reduce the frame within which Gospel traditions and literary dependence can be studied.*⁴⁰

1.1.4 The Oral model

The scope with which Jesus Tradition and the Synoptic problem is studied, has to be widened. The oral model offers just that. Instead of approaching the Synoptic problem as a puzzle whose pieces fail to match, we can imagine a storeroom of Jesus Tradition from which the authors of the New Testament and early Church Fathers alike could draw. But how does that work?

³⁸ Cf. esp. B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, London: MacMillan & Co., 1930⁴ [1924], for an effective summary, cf. pp.150-152. For a contemporary overview of the Synoptic Problem, cf. Stanley E. Porter & Bryan R. Dyer (eds.), *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.

³⁹ Cf. the discussion in ch. 4.1 below.

⁴⁰ Of course Streeter and many others have recognized the possibility of the role oral transmission could have played. However, this has hardly ever led to a model in which orality and written Gospels can be studied alongside each other.

1.1.4.1 *Orality*

The immediate context of Jesus' mission, as James Dunn informs us,⁴¹ was in all likelihood one of practical illiteracy: reading and writing played a very insignificant part in everyday life. There were of course contexts where people would come in touch with literacy (e.g. the Synagogue,⁴² by signing legal contracts). Therefore, we cannot simply dub rural Palestine or, more specific, Galilee as an exclusively oral society.

However, it can safely be assumed that Jesus not only taught orally, but also that his teaching was passed around orally, from the beginning.⁴³ This would also involve stories about his ministry, specifically if it had affected a local community.

Much of Jesus' teaching, but also stories about him, as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, bear the marks of orality. In the words of Eddy:

Such phenomena include relatively simple word choice, direct speech, frequent use of the connecting "and" (Gk. *kai*), parataxis, alliteration (e.g. Mk 14:38), idea/word repetition (e.g. Mk 13:12), topical clustering (e.g., parables in Mk 4:1-34; miracles in Mk 4:35-5:43) and "acoustic echo" techniques, both large-scale (e.g. concentric/chiastic patterns throughout Mark's Gospel) and smaller-scale, such as the famous "Markan sandwich" (e.g., Mk 3:20-35; 11:12-21; 14:1-11, 53-72).⁴⁴

Therefore, we can assume the early traditioning process to be an oral one, containing both discourses of and about Jesus.

1.1.4.2 *Texts and Orality*

Much of the Greco-Roman culture of the first century (certainly including the environment which produced the texts of the New

⁴¹ James D.G. Dunn, 'Between Jesus and the Gospels', in: Dunn: *Oral Gospel Tradition*, 290-312, esp. 290.

⁴² Cf. Luke 4:16-19 where Jesus himself reads from a scroll in a Synagogue setting, as he would have done more often, since Jesus frequented Synagogues, according to the Synoptics.

⁴³ Dunn, 'Between Jesus', 291.

⁴⁴ P.R. Eddy, 'Orality and Oral Transmission' in *DJG*, 647. For a fuller treatment of oral features of Jesus' teaching cf. Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology, Part One, The Proclamation of Jesus*, London: SCM Press, 1971, 8-29.

Testament), as Vernon Robbins points out, was neither a strictly oral, nor a strictly literate culture, but rather a *rhetorical* culture:

New Testament documents were produced in a culture characterized by interaction between oral, scribal and rhetorical environments. (...) The phrase 'rhetorical culture' ... should refer to environments where oral and written speech interact closely with one another.⁴⁵

In practice this means that texts (in most of the environments prior to the printing press) were read aloud and were designed to be read aloud; usually in front of an audience. Texts, such as the Gospels, were not viewed as end products in the way we perceive modern novels to be end products. They rather ought to be compared to a Shakespearian play, which was written down only to be brought to life in front of an audience.⁴⁶ First century texts are in a way part of the oral process: they are to be voiced and will often be (partially) remembered and reproduced, if called for, by heart.

A view towards the written word as a radical breach with orality (the 'Great Divide'), then, is far too simple a picture. John Foley offers a four-part model in which the different steps between oral performance and written text are laid out:

1. **oral performance** (performance of discourse in front of audience, without textual references)
2. **voiced texts** (although written down, meant for performance)
3. **voices from the past** (written tradition of which orality is assumed, but the original oral context is now lost to us)

⁴⁵ Vernon K. Robbins, 'Writing as a Rhetorical Act', 145.

⁴⁶ Cf. Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. New York: Routledge, ³⁰2012 [1982], 129-133, but cf. Larry Hurtado, 'Oral Fixation and New Testament Studies' for a critique of those who over-emphasize this point (i.e. 'performance criticism').

4. **written oral poetry** (oral features are consciously retained in the written text, communicating more than what is being said: but there is no 'performance' anymore)⁴⁷

Jesus Tradition is ultimately rooted in oral performance by Jesus himself. Jesus' disciples, again in oral performances, then carried it further. A discourse like Q, assuming its independent existence, can be conceived of as 'voiced text': although written down (as is commonly assumed), it bore all the marks of orality and would function more as an aide-mémoire than as a literary composition.⁴⁸ The canonical Gospels, all four of which move away from transcription towards careful composition (Mark perhaps least so, and John the most), should rather be perceived as 'voices from the past'.⁴⁹ Although meant to be read aloud, heard by an audience and perhaps partly to be memorized, the Gospels do much more than simply transcribing oral tradition, even if parts of the Gospels *can* be recognized as transcribed oral tradition. All this serves to remind us that *there is no radical breach between oral and written discourse*. Both rather continue to influence one another.

1.1.4.3 Fixity and flexibility

In 1991 Vernon Robbins introduced the notion 'progymnastic composition' as a credible technical background for the way in which oral Jesus Tradition was put into writing in the Synoptic Gospels.

'[P]rogymnastic composition', in contrast to scribal reproduction, consisted of writing traditional materials, clearly and persuasively, rather than in the oral form it came to the writer. The full spectrum of progymnastic composition is outlined and discussed in documents called *Progymnasmata* (Elementary Exercises) ...⁵⁰

⁴⁷ J.M. Foley 'The Riddle of Q' in R.A. Horsley (ed.) *Oral Performance, Popular Tradition and Hidden Transcript in the Tradition of Q*, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006, 123-142, here esp. 130 and 137.

⁴⁸ Cf. Eric Eve, *Behind the Gospels*, Minneapolis: Fortress press, 2014, 14: '[T]he fact that they were written down may not have been very significant, except insofar as papyrus may have been able to fix a little more material in a more stable form than human memory'.

⁴⁹ Foley, 'Riddle', 137-8.

⁵⁰ Robbins, 'Writing in Plutarch', 145-6.

In other words, in Progymnastic composition, paraphrasing and alluding to (parts of) existing discourses would preferably be done in an author's own style and words, rather than in the words and style of the source alluded to. According to Robbins, the rhetorical culture the Early Church belonged to, would have used this technique. Not just in putting oral tradition to writing, but also in re-vocalizing and reshaping written tradition (e.g. Matt. using Mark). This would account for the differences between similar passages in the Synoptic Gospels: literary interdependence is quite conceivable, but the different choices in wording are not simply scribal revisions (editing), but they are part and parcel of the way writers, with a *progymnastic* mindset, would have 'copied' their sources.⁵¹

However, what must not be left out is the *communal* background of the traditions at hand: Jesus Tradition within an Early Church setting cannot be equated to situations in which teachings of a philosopher were put to writing. It has to be remembered that these traditions were owned by a minority group, that had spread across the Mediterranean world very quickly, and whose very existence was bound up with these traditions. Therefore, the progymnastic technique can only accord for part of the freedom with which e.g. Luke evidently used Mark. Just as important is the realization that if and when Luke made use of Mark, *he probably already knew many of the traditions Mark made use of, sometimes in slightly differing versions.*⁵²

So, two factors explain the flexibility that can be observed between many Jesus Tradition parallels:

1. The progymnastic technique that was used both in oral performances as in written discourses.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 148-9, cf. also Robbins' more recent article 'Interfaces of orality and Literature in Mark', in Horsley, Draper & Foley, *Performing the Gospel*, 125-146: 'The amount of verbatim similarity in a context of substantive variations, shows that [first-century Christian writers] composed without returning their eyes or their ears to a manuscript source as they they composed.' (126). Cf. also paragraph 1.2.2.3 of the present chapter.

⁵² Cf. Dunn, 'Altering'.

2. Familiarity of tradents with traditions in other forms than the one in front of them in writing would have influenced their 'copies' of a certain tradition.⁵³

All of this influences how we perceive the provenance of the Gospels. With regard to the double tradition James Dunn remarks:

The attempt to recover a Q document is in many ways admirable. But it has prevented us from recognizing that well into the second half of the first century the Jesus tradition was still well known in oral mode. And by assuming the fixity of written sources the attempt to recover a written Q has lost sight of the living character of the Jesus tradition.⁵⁴

All of this shows there was plenty of flexibility in the passing on of Jesus Tradition: flexibility is presumed to be inherent of orality.⁵⁵ However, this flexibility is not so much a matter of first century Mediterranean people's not being capable of memorizing verbatim,⁵⁶ as it is a matter of *performance* and *composition*: In performing oral tradition it was the speaker's responsibility to present the tradition as persuasive as possible;

⁵³ Cf. Armin D. Baum, *Der mündliche Faktor und seine Bedeutung für die synoptische Frage: Analogien aus der antiken Literatur, der Experimentalpsychologie, der Oral Poetry-Forschung und dem rabbinischen Traditionswesen Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* 49 Tübingen: Francke, 2008, for a concise defense of the view that the Gospels are in fact completely dependent on oral tradition.

⁵⁴ Cf. Dunn, 'Between Jesus', 310.

⁵⁵ Cf. Jens Schröter, 'Jesus and the Canon', in Horsley, Draper & Foley (eds.), *Performing the Gospel*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006, 104-22, who states (perhaps a bit too definitive): '[T]here was no fundamental difference in the first centuries of Christianity between oral and written tradition' (120).

⁵⁶ Which is in fact the claim of April DeConick, 'Human Memory and the Sayings of Jesus', in Tom Thatcher, *Jesus, the Voice and the Text*, Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008, 135-180. She reports on an experiment, in which she made her students learn parables and proverbs by heart, and tested their recollection, both on short term and longer term. She documented her findings on the mnemonic capabilities of her students and applied these to the situation in which the Jesus Tradition was first passed on. John Kloppenborg, 'Memory, Performance and the Sayings of Jesus', *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 10 (2012) 97-132, quotes her conclusions quite extensively, adding on the one hand that 'We should not assume, of course, that DeConick's results may be applied to all instances of remembering' (104), but on the other that 'DeConick's findings provide a strong caution against excessive claims about the infallibility of memory' (104). However, DeConick's findings can not simply be applied to the situation in which Jesus Tradition was passed on (in a rhetorical culture, and in a sociological setting in which this material mattered). For a refutation of this type of position, cf. T.M. Derico, *Oral Tradition and Synoptic Verbal Agreement*, Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2016, 173-204. For a mediating position, cf. Robert K. McIver, 'Eyewitnesses as Guarantors of the Accuracy of the Gospel Traditions in the Light of Psychological Research,' *JBL* 131, no.3 (2012): 529-46.

this would call for a certain level of creativity in wording ('recitation composition'⁵⁷). In writing down traditional material, a very similar phenomenon occurs ('progymnastic composition'), as we have seen.⁵⁸ This in turn raises the matter of *fixity* or stability in the traditioning process. There are numerous elements in Jesus Tradition that point to a great deal of stability in the handing down of traditions:

1. As mentioned above (ch. 1.1.4.1) there are many types of forms which figure in oral discourse, to safeguard the core of the message. One of the hallmarks of Jesus' teaching is the frequent repetition of ideas and words, alongside alliteration and similar stylistic features.
2. Where the Synoptic Gospels present the same stories, there is often great freedom in the choice of words, or even emphasis on different characters. However, certain key words are retained in every version of a story, and often a 'punch-line' is added (usually a word of Jesus) which shows great verbatim agreement.
3. Ancient communities probably had both the will and the proper techniques to value and safeguard their traditions. Kenneth Bailey's experience with orality within largely illiterate Middle-Eastern communities in the 20th century is insightful in this matter.⁵⁹
4. As stated above (and cf. below, 1.1.4.5) there were eyewitnesses to Jesus, who continued to play their part, possibly as active *safeguards* to the integrity of the tradition.
5. And of course, we are able to *witness* fixity and stability: we can emphasize the flexibility, but we can read *1 Clement* 13:2, *Didache* 1:3-5, Polycarp *to the Philippians* 2:3 alongside the Synoptic Sermon on the Mount/Plain traditions, and observe the basic

⁵⁷ Cf. Robbins, 'Writing in Plutarch', 146-8.

⁵⁸ Robbins' article points out the resemblances that the Gospels have in this regard to Plutarch's biographies.

⁵⁹ Kenneth E. Bailey, 'Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels,' *AJT* 5 (1991), 34-54. Cf. Eve, *Behind*, 66-85. Whereas Bailey's examples are famous and insightful, they are highly anecdotal in nature. Travis Derico (*Oral Tradition and Synoptic Verbal Agreement*, Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2016, esp. 205-66) has recently transcribed and analyzed several oral-traditional narratives from the Arabic region regarding American missionary Roy Whiteman. In a more methodical fashion than Bailey, Derico is able to show that there is in these stories indeed a verbal agreement similar to the verbal agreement between various synoptic passages.

stability of these traditions, even if there is also flexibility present.

To summarize, *we can observe that there is a certain degree of flexibility in the traditioning process, but also that there is still enough reason to assume that stability was safeguarded within the same process.*

1.1.4.4 *The setting of Jesus Tradition*

Jesus Tradition developed in a *communal* setting. This is in itself an uncontested and straightforward thesis. However, what did the communities of the early Jesus movement and the earliest Palestinian Christians look like?

First of all, Jesus' preaching seems to have been at home within *rural* (agrarian) Palestinian socio-economic groups. This setting seems to locate the earliest followers of Jesus in the lower social strata, where illiteracy and poverty were the rule.⁶⁰

However, it should also be noted that Jesus' ministry took place, to a certain degree, in a Synagogue setting. Jesus himself is portrayed as reading and preaching from an Isaiah scroll in Luke 4:16-19. The Synagogue is often the setting of controversy concerning Jesus. The Pharisees and the scribes regard Jesus as controversial, in part because what Jesus says and does affects *their* status and way of life: their presence in discourses and narratives suggests that, apart from being opponents, Pharisees and scribes were also part of Jesus' audience. Acts 15:5 accordingly witnesses the presence of Pharisees among the earliest followers of Jesus.⁶¹ At least *one* of Jesus' chosen disciples was a presumably literate tax-collector (a social group with low status, but high economic ranking, with whom Jesus apparently wined and dined on a basis regular enough for it to become notorious).

Thus, the group of followers was in all likelihood not confined to a poverty-stricken, illiterate band of peasants. Jesus' impact reached beyond that, and this allows for room to imagine his early followers in more literate settings, gathering from the beginning not just in village

⁶⁰ As Dunn emphasizes, cf. i.e. note 41 above.

⁶¹ The Pharisees were not necessarily a group of more wealth and possessions, yet their political and religious influence would assure some influence in higher circles, cf. Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003³, 515.

communities, but also in Synagogue-settings to remember and honor Jesus.

Both settings (village communities and Synagogues; admittedly there is overlap between these categories) have been proposed as settings that offer likely backgrounds for the preservation of Jesus Tradition.

Kenneth Bailey⁶² offers a model of oral transmission that is based upon his observations among rural Middle Eastern communities in the sixties and seventies of the 20th century. Bailey calls his model *informal controlled* tradition (no formal teacher-pupil setting, yet there is control from the community), opposed to respectively a Bultmannian view, which he paraphrases as *informal uncontrolled*, and the Scandinavian model⁶³ which can be presented as *formal and controlled*.

Theodore Weeden offers a critique of Bailey's view.⁶⁴ Dunn, on the other hand, embraces it wholeheartedly.⁶⁵ The recent dissertation of T.M. Derico is not a defense of Bailey, but indirectly shows that the reality Bailey has hinted at with his anecdotal evidence can be substantiated with methodical evidence.⁶⁶

Rainer Riesner, on the other hand, lays emphasis on Jesus' role as *teacher*. Jesus operated as a Rabbi, and offered teaching that was meant for memorization:

Ein grosser Teil der synoptischen Tradition besteht aus kurzen Worten, die durch Bildhaftigkeit, Hyperbolik, Kontraste uä. sehr eindringlich und damit auch einprägsam sind.⁶⁷

⁶² Cf. note 59.

⁶³ i.e. Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Trans. E.J. Sharpe, ASNU 22; Uppsala: Gleerup, 1961; cf. Rainer Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*, WUNT 2/7, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.

⁶⁴ T.J. Weeden, 'Kenneth Bailey's Theory of Oral Tradition: A Theory Contested by its Own Evidence,' *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 7 (2009) 3-43.

⁶⁵ Dunn, 'Altering', 52; 'Kenneth Bailey's Theory of Oral Tradition: Critiquing Theodore Weeden's Critique', *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 7 (2009) 44-62.

⁶⁶ Cf. note 59.

⁶⁷ Rainer Riesner, 'Jüdische Elementarbildung und Evangelienüberlieferung, in: R.T. France & David Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* vol. 1, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981, 209-223, here: 219.

Riesner supposes that Synagogues would have operated as locales for primary education: children of some Jews⁶⁸ would have had the opportunity to learn to read, or at least to become steeped in the Old Testament laws, narratives and prophecies.

This would account for Jesus' literate capacities,⁶⁹ but it also reflects on his public appearances in Synagogues: they were (among other things) places of learning, and of reflection on biblical tradition. Jesus sought out these places for his ministry, and they could very well have played a role in the handing down of Jesus Tradition in the first decades of the early Church.

These observations show that the *Sitz im Leben* of Jesus Tradition offers room for a positive view regarding stability within the traditioning process.

1.1.4.5 Teachers and eyewitnesses

Apart from the setting of Jesus Tradition some remarks can be made on its actual tradents. Luke, in the prologue to his Gospel, seems to identify them:

Many have undertaken to draw up an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed down (παρέδοσαν) to us by those who from the first were eyewitnesses and servants of the word (οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου). (Luke 1:1-2)

'Eyewitnesses' is not to be understood in the strictly forensic sense: a broader category of those with 'firsthand experience' is meant.⁷⁰ The 'servants of the word' are parallel to the eyewitnesses, and not likely a separate category. It is notable that Luke does not mention the eyewitnesses in the opening lines of Acts, but towards the end of the first chapter we do encounter a similar concept:

⁶⁸ These may have been very pious Jews, but primarily we should probably consider those with means to have their children educated.

⁶⁹ If the data of the Gospels are accepted as historical. Cf. for this question the monograph by Chris Keith: *Jesus' Literacy. Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee*. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

⁷⁰ Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 117.

Therefore it is necessary to choose one of the men who have been with us the whole time the Lord Jesus was living among us, beginning (ἀρχάμενος) from John's baptism to the time when Jesus was taken up from us. For one of these must become a witness with us of his resurrection (μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ σὺν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι ἓνα τούτων). (Acts 1:21-22)⁷¹

'Witness' in these verses clearly denotes the activity of proclaiming (μάρτυρα γενέσθαι), rather than the actual witnessing of an event. But the latter is part of the 'job-description' for the twelfth apostle that is to be selected according to this passage.⁷² The twelve apostles are thus presented as a collegium of sorts, able to speak from firsthand experience, and thus authoritatively, about Jesus.⁷³

The urgency of this matter is still felt by Papias, who at the beginning of the 2nd century writes:

I also will not hesitate to draw up for you [sg.], along with these expositions, an orderly account of all the things I carefully learned and have carefully recalled from the elders; for I have certified their truth. (...)

I would carefully inquire after their words, what Peter had said, or what Philip or what Thomas had said, or James or John or Matthew or any of the other disciples of the Lord, and what things Aristion and the elder John, disciples of the Lord, were saying. (*Papias* 3.3-4//Eusebius, *HE*, 3.39)

The first sentence quoted above, bears notable resemblance to Luke 1:1-4, in that Papias also seems to address the dedicatee of his work (of whom we do not know the name), that he also promises to give an 'orderly account' of traditions received from others, which he has personally scrutinized, and which he knows to be true. Papias then goes on to

⁷¹ Cf. also John 15:27 and 1 John 1:1-3.

⁷² The continuity between Acts 1:3-4 and 2:42, τῆ διδασκαλί τῶν ἀποστόλων, also points in this direction, cf. P.H.R. van Houwelingen, 'Vierstemmig evangelie. De traditiehypothese als oplossingsrichting in de synoptische kwestie', *TR* 55.1 (2012): 30-51.

⁷³ For the question whether or not 'the twelve' are a Lukan invention, cf. Arie W. Zwiep, *Judas and the Choice of Matthias: A Study on Context and Concern of Acts 1:15-26*. WUNT 187, Tuebingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004. The concern of the present paragraph does not hinge on this matter: clearly the *apostolic* background of Jesus Tradition was felt to matter, regardless of whether 'the twelve' in the Lukan sense are historical.

identify his witnesses, the 'elders', with the apostles, whose teaching he received from others. Note that Papias seems to claim that two of Jesus' disciples (Aristion and John the elder) were still alive when he collected all these traditions.⁷⁴

The apostle Paul writes (with less emphasis) in the fifties of the first century on the same theme:

By this gospel you are saved, if you hold firmly to the word I preached to you. Otherwise, you have believed in vain. For what I received (παρέδωκα) I passed on (παρέλαβον⁷⁵) to you as of first importance (1 Cor. 15:2-3)

After which Paul goes on to name Peter, James *and* 'the twelve' as prominent witnesses to Jesus' resurrection (cp. Acts 1:21-22), thereby placing himself in 'a chain of transmission'.⁷⁶ In Galatians 1 and 2 Paul struggles to show his independence from the Jerusalem 'Pillar Apostles', which seems to be at odds with this. However, what is at stake there is Paul's gospel in the sense that it is connected with his highly contested mission to the gentiles. If we take that into consideration, it becomes all the more noteworthy that Paul feels the need to position himself towards the Pillar Apostles in the way he does: the tension between dependence and independence runs through the whole passage. Ultimately Galatians testifies that even Paul could not preach at will, without the approval of the Jerusalem Pillars:

James, Cephas and John, those esteemed as pillars, gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, when they recognized the grace given to me. (Gal.2:9a)

So, in spite of Paul's fierce assurances that he received his Gospel from no one but Jesus, he shows himself to be dependent on traditions he has received, presumably from those very Pillars. After all, he does write

⁷⁴ Cf. Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 15-21. He emphasizes that Papias distinguishes the time at which he collected these traditions (i.e. somewhere in the last decades of the first century) from the time at which he writes them down (somewhere between 110-130), and adds: 'There is no reason at all to regard Papias's claims in this passage as apologetic exaggeration, for they are strikingly modest.' (20).

⁷⁵ Cf. the same inflections in 1 Cor.11:23; 'These Greek words were used for the formal transmission of tradition in Hellenistic schools', Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 264.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 265.

that he has spent fifteen days in Jerusalem, conversing with no one other than Peter and James (Gal.1:18-19).⁷⁷ What Paul may have been arguing in Galatians 1 and 2 (and cf. 1 Cor.11:23) is that the traditions he received and has passed on, are no more Peter's than they are his: they are Jesus' words to begin with.⁷⁸ Therefore, even the rather independent actor Paul, shows himself to be dependent on a body of Jesus Tradition, which he has received, and in turn has passed on to the churches he has founded. Not just Luke and Papias, but also Paul (perhaps in spite of himself) seem to acknowledge the apostolic origin of these traditions,⁷⁹ not in an effort to elevate the apostles, but to make sure that these traditions are indeed linked to Jesus himself.⁸⁰

Apart from apostles and eyewitnesses, Paul also mentions teachers on several occasions (cf. Rom.12:7; 1 Cor.12:28-29; Gal.6:6; Eph.4:11, cp. Heb.5:12; Jas.3:1; *Did.*15:1-2): it appears that their position was taken for granted in the earliest communities of Jesus followers. They may have played a significant part in the transmission of Jesus Tradition, although their office was probably not confined to handing down tradition.⁸¹ So, in addition to the stability that the possible *Sitz im Leben* of Jesus Tradition offered, we can observe that the earliest followers of Jesus were spearheaded by a collegium of twelve Apostles, one of whose tasks was

⁷⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, 268.

⁷⁸ Apart from the very clear example of 1 Corinthians 11:23ff, Traugott Holtz identifies a number of other examples of Pauline allusions to Jesus Tradition (leaving room for the possibility that Paul in fact alludes to Jesus on many more occasions): 'nothing in itself is unclean' (Rom14:14//Mk7:15) 'The whole law is fulfilled in the love of the neighbor' (Gal.5:14;Rom.13:8-10//Mk12:28-34), 'Give all what is due to them' (Rom.13:7//Mark 12:17) 'bless those who persecute you' (Rom.12:14;1Cor4:12-13//Mat5:43-44), Traugott Holtz, 'Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition', in Henry Wansborough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, New York: T&T Clark, 380-93. Cf. also Excursus 1 below.

⁷⁹ 'I see no difficulty, then, in merging the insights of oral tradition as community tradition and recognition of the importance of individual eyewitnesses in providing, contributing to and in at least some measure helping to control the interpretation given to that tradition. Church-founding apostles would have provided a foundational layer of tradition for the churches they founded; Paul no doubt was following an already established practice in this.' James D.G. Dunn, 'On History, Memory and Eyewitnesses: In Response to Bengt Holmberg and Samuel Byrskog', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (2004) 473-87, in Dunn, *Oral Gospel*, 209-10.

⁸⁰ Kloppenborg, 'Memory, Performance', 109, criticizes such an approach: 'Bauckham's conjecture that gospel writers 'would not be content to record the tradition as transmitted [in collective memory]' but would seek a source closer to the events (i.e. eyewitness reports), assumes more than we can expect.' According to Kloppenborg, it would have been impossible to make that very distinction, since communities immediately *shape* tradition, in such a way that individual eyewitnesses cannot possibly break into them with an 'authorized version'. However, Kloppenborg fails to address the evidence from Luke, Paul, Acts and Papias laid out in the present paragraph: surely it must be allowed to inform us on some level (cf. Dunn's careful words in the note above).

⁸¹ Cf. Bird, *The Gospel of the Lord*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014, 63-64.

to safeguard Jesus Tradition. Their role for the church at large may have been paralleled by the role 'teachers' assumed in local congregations.⁸²

1.1.5 Interpretation and Application

Richard Bauckham makes an important observation regarding the *use* of Jesus Tradition:

In the New Testament letters, the book of Revelation, the Didache, and the letters of Clement and Ignatius, there is a great deal of contemporary evidence on how the Gospel traditions were actually used in the church: in catechetical instruction, apocalyptic teaching and so on. (...)

Clearly the Gospel tradition was not understood to be the same thing as its interpretation and application. In *paerenesis*, therefore, the influence of the Gospel tradition was felt and its implications developed by teachers and prophets, but the tradition was normally not explicitly quoted. Since it was well known in its own right, it did not need to be.⁸³

This observation has some corollaries. First, we do not need to be surprised if the New Testament epistles hardly deliver any explicit quotations of Jesus Tradition.

Second, we do not need to take allusions to Jesus Tradition as possible *variants* of Jesus Tradition.

Third, when we *are* able to identify allusions to Jesus Tradition in epistles, it shows us how these traditions were understood.⁸⁴

Fourth, distinguishing between original tradition and its applications, allows us to see that the actual traditions were largely immune to the differing circumstances in which they were put to use.⁸⁵

⁸² Eve, *Behind*, 143-158, criticizes Bauckham's *Eyewitnesses* thesis, mainly because 'he has tried to push it too far'. However, Eve admits that 'it is completely fair to point out that the tradition was more likely to have been transmitted and controlled by ... authorized teachers rather than simply passed round an anonymous collective...' (158).

⁸³ Richard Bauckham, 'The Study of Gospel Traditions Outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects,' in David Wenham (ed.): *Gospel Perspectives*, vol.5. *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985, 369-403, here 376.

⁸⁴ Cf. *Ibid.*: Matt.12:43-45//Luke11:24-26 with 2 Pet.2:20 and Herm.*Sim.*9:17:5; the presentation of the saying in Luke is fairly neutral, Matt. applies it to Jesus's questioners, 2 Pet. and *Herm.* both apply it to apostasy.

The parable of James 1:22-25 (cf. the table below) is a very good example of all this. It is hard to imagine this parable *without* the example of Matthew 7:24-27, *par.* Luke 6:44-46. It needs to be read against the background of Jesus's parable, yet it is to be understood as an independent parable with its own significance in the situation James seeks to address. It is not a quote, it is not a variant, it is not intended to *replace* Jesus' parable: it is a literary *application* of the parable. The *logion* of John 13:17 could (possibly) be understood as another presentation of Jesus' words, paraphrasing the parable, but still obviously presenting them as *Jesus'* words. If this is the case, the makarism in both John 13:17 and James 1:25 may indicate that there may have been an early version of the parable in which a beatitude occurred (see ch. 2.2.1.8 for a full discussion):

Matthew 7:24-27

Therefore everyone who hears these words of mine and puts them into practice is like a wise man who built his house on the rock. The rain came down, the streams rose, and the winds blew and beat against that house; yet it did not fall, because it had its foundation on the rock. But everyone who hears these words of mine and does not put them into practice is like a foolish man who built his house on sand. The rain came down,

James 1:22-25

Do not merely listen to the word, and so deceive yourselves. Do what it says. Anyone who listens to the word but does not do what it says is like someone who looks at his face in a mirror and, after looking at himself, goes away and immediately forgets what he looks like. But whoever looks intently into the perfect law that gives freedom, and continues in it—not forgetting what they have heard, but doing it—they will be

John 13:17

Now that you know these things, you will be blessed if you do them.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 377.

the streams rose, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell with a great crash.	blessed in what they do.
---	-----------------------------

1.1.6 Wisdom and *aemulatio*

The method James applies in the above parable (and in many more instances in the epistle), has puzzled many interpreters. Why would James allude to Jesus so often, so obviously and so extensively without mentioning Jesus *as his source*? This question might be of some importance for the study of Jesus Tradition outside the canonical Gospels in general, which makes it interesting for the present research.

There are two intriguing responses, both of which seek to deal with James's technique within the Mediterranean rhetorical culture of the first century.

First, there is Bauckham's thesis,⁸⁶ which states that James views himself as a wisdom teacher, much in the tradition of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and *Ben Sira*. Bauckham quotes *Sira* 21:15, which states that the appropriate response to a wise saying is to *add to it*. He then goes on to show that this is exactly what *Ben Sira* himself did: he 'transmits and develops the tradition *without simply repeating it*'.⁸⁷ Some of this developing, but by no means all of it, deals with changing contexts. Reproducing a new and apt proverb is the sage's task, regardless of whether the context has changed. Bauckham furthermore points out that the new saying does not necessarily allude to the original wisdom: it needs to stand on its own legs. This is the reason James does not mention Jesus as his source. James is presenting his own sayings, not Jesus's, even if the informed reader will have no problem in recognizing Jesus' wisdom as James' primary inspiration.

The other possibility is offered by Kloppenborg.⁸⁸ He basically concurs with Bauckham, but he attempts to further specify the rhetorical

⁸⁶ Richard Bauckham, 'The Wisdom of James and the Wisdom of Jesus.' In J. Schlosser (ed.), *The Catholic Epistles and Tradition*. BETL 176, Leuven: Peeters, 2004, 75-92.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 81.

⁸⁸ John S. Kloppenborg, 'The Reception of the Jesus Tradition in James' in Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr & Robert Wall, *The Catholic Epistles & Apostolic Tradition*, Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009, 71-100.

technique that is used by James. Kloppenborg introduces the idea of *aemulatio*, which is basically equivalent to ‘progymnastic rhetoric’. Both theses explain how James used the parable in the table above. The catchwords ‘hear’, ‘words’, ‘do’ (opposed to merely listening) are retained. An independent parable is created, but the subject matter (the ‘words’ are in all likelihood still to be understood as Jesus’s teaching) is still the same.

Both theses have a lot to offer, and are, in principle, not mutually exclusive. Whereas Bauckham’s view on *wisdom* is an appropriate model for explaining James’s allusions (if they can be called that at all), Kloppenborg’s model of *aemulatio* has the benefit that it can be applied to other epistles and passages, where there is no wisdom teaching. In the paragraph on the *method* for investigating Jesus Tradition in the Catholic Epistles (1.2), these possibilities will be examined further. For now, it suffices to say that both these views complement the picture that has been drawn in this general paragraph (1.1) on what Jesus Tradition is, what it was, how it was perceived, how it was passed on and how it was appropriated in the Early Church.

1.1.7 Concluding remarks

Before the method of the present research is laid out, it will be helpful to look back on the first paragraph and list a number of preliminary conclusions that can be drawn from the observations that were made:

- Jesus Tradition was perceived as rooted in historical events. Some of which are remembered by the Early Church in the form of narratives. Not necessarily only the events themselves, but also teaching of Jesus (parables, proverbs, sayings) is remembered.
- What is remembered is thought to be of constitutive significance for (and by) the Early Church.
- Jesus Tradition is not confined to New Testament Gospels, but can also be located in other Early Christian literature.
- Much of the handing down of Jesus Tradition was done orally, especially in the earliest decades of the early Church.
- The earliest followers of Jesus played an active role in handing down and (to a point) safeguarding the tradition.

- In the rhetorical culture of the first century, oral and written tradition coexisted and sometimes influenced one another.
- Jesus Tradition shows a large degree of flexibility in the way it was handed down, but a large degree of fixity/stability can also be discerned.
- A strictly literate model for explaining dependence of one form of tradition upon another is unnecessarily limited in scope.
- The rhetorical notions of *progymnastic composition* and *recitation composition* are helpful and promising in constructing a model that will explain interdependencies of various occurrences of a certain piece of tradition.
- There is an important distinction between the interpretation/application of a piece of tradition, and the actual tradition.

Aided by these preliminary conclusions, the following definition for *Jesus Tradition* is proposed:

The sayings and parables of and narrative discourses about Jesus that were received and passed on by the earliest communities of Jesus' followers, both orally and in writing, perceived as historical and constitutive in Early Christianity.

1.2 Method

The present research sets out to establish parallels to Jesus Tradition that are found in the Catholic Epistles. The Catholic Epistles provide no direct quotations of Jesus Tradition and hardly anything that can pass off as an indirect quotation. Therefore whatever parallels are to be listed and weighed are probably going to be allusions.

In this paragraph the research method will be presented. First what quotations, allusions and echoes actually are will be addressed (1.2.1). Then rhetorical (oral and written) techniques and how they influence the way discourses (or events) are referred to will be discussed (1.2.2). After this discussion, the actual methodology will be proposed (1.2.3).

1.2.1 Quotations, allusions, echoes: parallels

Direct quotes to Jesus Tradition are a rarity in the New Testament. Paul quotes Jesus in 1 Corinthians 11:23ff and in Acts 20:35, according to Luke, but in the Catholic Epistles only James comes close to quoting Jesus. Once (2:8) this quote is principally a citation from Leviticus 19:18. In 5:12 he delivers an allusion which is verbally very close to Jesus' saying of Matthew 5:34-35, but not an actual quote (perhaps it could be defined as 'paraphrase').

Allusions to Jesus Tradition, on the other hand, seem to abound, especially in James and 1 Peter. Porter offers Holman's definition for allusions:

A figure of speech that makes brief, often casual, reference to a historical, or literary event or object. (...)
Strictly speaking *allusion* is always indirect. It attempts to tap the knowledge and memory of the reader, and by so doing to secure a resonant emotional effect already existing in the reader's mind. (...)
The effectiveness of *allusion* depends on there being a common body of knowledge shared by writer and reader.⁸⁹

Porter also addresses the related notion of echo. The way this concept is introduced by Hays⁹⁰ is problematic, according to Porter. It seems to be understood all too often as an allusion in disguise. Hays' criteria also point in that direction, calling for availability of the source to both author and reader, volume and recurrence, which are criteria that are often used to establish allusions. Porter questions the necessity of the concept, but ultimately believes that

the notion of echo may be used for the invocation by means of thematically related language of some more general notion or concept.⁹¹

Since 'echo' is too vague and broad a concept, and 'quotations' hardly occur, the present research is more or less confined to establishing

⁸⁹ From Holman's *Handbook of Literature* (1980), quoted in Stanley E. Porter, 'Allusions and Echoes', in Stanley E. Porter & Christopher D. Stanley, *As it is Written. Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, 29-40.

⁹⁰ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, Binghamton: Vail-Ballou Press, 1989.

⁹¹ Porter, 'Allusions', 39.

'allusions'. However, since the lines between 'paraphrase', 'allusion' and 'echo' may at times be blurry, the more neutral term 'parallel' will be used. The types of parallels to Jesus Tradition in the Catholic Epistles that will be sought, are the following:

Expressions, remarks and ideas that seem to be formulated in the way that they have been because there is a passage in Jesus Tradition containing similar expressions, remarks or ideas.

The following criteria for establishing such parallels are proposed:

1. **Verbal agreement:** are there words (or maybe even one highly distinctive word) that are also used in the parallel passage?
2. **Propositional agreement:** is the propositional value of a passage similar to that of its parallel?
3. **Conceptual analogy:** is the parallel passage of Jesus Tradition in line with the Catholic Epistle's author's argument, paraenesis or narrative?
4. **Accessibility:** is it likely that the author (and preferably also his readers) would have had access to the source?

The first two criteria seem to be the most straightforward. However, they should not be taken as absolutes. Verbal agreement is an important marker for a parallel, and to establish a parallel without it should only be done if other criteria prove to be highly persuasive. On the other hand, verbal agreement alone can never be enough to establish a plausible parallel, since the agreement may be no more than a chance occurrence. The same applies to propositional agreement: similar ideas may be expressed in different discourses without there being a generative relationship between them. However, a relationship between (parts of) Jesus Tradition (in the broadest sense) and New Testament epistles is likely beforehand. Therefore, a combination of verbal and propositional agreements between a verse from a New Testament epistle and a verse from Jesus Tradition likely indicates dependence.

This is especially true when there is also conceptual analogy. Conceptual analogy may at first sight appear to be highly similar to propositional agreement. However, this criterion seeks to look beyond the isolated allusion and to establish whether the parallel actually makes sense in the

overall argument of the author: is it likely that the author would use this piece of Jesus Tradition to strengthen his argument?

With regard to accessibility one could remark that this criterion becomes very volatile when Jesus Tradition is imagined as ever-present oral tradition. On the one hand, this is true. On the other hand, the criterion is helpful, especially as, in some cases, the likelihood of accessibility to a certain tradition increases as the number of possible allusions from a certain epistle to a certain discourse or tradition block increases. For instance: multiple possible allusions from the Matthean beatitudes within one epistle create a cumulative effect: possible allusions may thereby become probable allusions.

1.2.2 Rhetorical techniques

If we wish to understand the parallels that will be discussed in Chapters 2 through 5 from the inside out, we need to understand how and why the authors alluded to their sources in the way that they did. The following techniques need to be considered: communal remembering (1.2.2.1); recitation composition (1.2.2.2); progymnastic rhetoric (1.2.2.3); *aemulatio* (1.2.2.4) and the creation of independent wisdom sayings (1.2.2.5). All of these techniques explain to some extent the way in which authors refer to a certain passage or discourse with the apparent liberty they do.

1.2.2.1 Communal remembering

As described in 1.1.4.4, it is a fair assumption that illiterate communities had their own techniques for remembering traditions. The epistles that are the subject of this research may be some steps removed from this type of transmission. However, the Early Church setting may involve *both* communal remembering as well as techniques that are closer to scribal culture.

We saw that poetry and wisdom sayings can be expected to be remembered (almost) verbatim, whereas parables and narratives would be retold with some flexibility. The freedom the performer has, is controlled by the community: the performer cannot be the star of the material he performs; the tradition itself is.

1.2.2.2 *Recitation composition*

Recitation composition can be considered as part of the 'rhetorical culture' as described in 1.1.4.2 and 1.1.4.3. Performers within this setting have knowledge of written versions of the traditions they recite, yet they will do so with the same freedom (perhaps even a little more so) as in communal remembering. Tradition material is being recited with respect for the core of the passage: key words are retained, but the rest of the reference is sometimes closer to the original and sometimes more freely paraphrased. The message is retained, what really counts is the persuasiveness of the performance: the performer has the obligation to present the tradition as well as possible.

1.2.2.3 *Progymnastic rhetoric*

Progymnastic rhetoric entails the act of referring to earlier material (whether oral or written) in *writing*. Yet, the basic technique is the same as in recitation composition. Under this heading I will set it out briefly, in reference to Theon's and Quintillian's *Progymnasmata*.⁹²

Both works are written as instruction books that offer exercises to help the student become persuasive rhetors. Both have important steps towards learning rhetoric.⁹³

First, the student needs to train his memory. He needs to read aloud, in order to become acquainted with proper articulation and with the characteristics of narrative. Theon is very outspoken in his conviction that students need to practice writing every day.

The preliminary exercises consist of refuting or correcting narratives; composing praise or denunciation; handling 'chreiae'; 'topoi' (commonplaces) and 'prosopopeia' (personification: learning to attribute the proper idiom to different characters).

Next comes training in public debate and having a proper understanding of 'nomoi' (laws), with the eventual goal of composing and delivering speeches, especially on legal matters.

⁹² Cf. G.A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata, Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, Leiden: Brill, 2003.

⁹³ Cf. also Ian Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, Chichester: Blackwell Publishing, 2010, 311.

However, what is especially interesting for the present research is what Theon has to say about *paraphrasis*, i.e. the repetition of someone else's idea (*phantasia*) in one's own words:

Thought is not moved by any one thing in only one way (...), but it is stirred in a number of different ways, and sometimes we are making a declaration, sometimes asking a question, sometimes making an inquiry, sometimes beseeching, and sometimes expressing our thoughts in some other way. There is nothing to prevent what is imagined from being expressed equally well in all these ways.⁹⁴

The form in which a saying is delivered can be changed: it is the idea that matters and needs to be retained.

Theon then goes on to provide many instances of classical writers who pick up some predecessor's material (e.g. Homer) and repeat their statement in their own words.

After which he goes on to write:

When the students are capable of writing, one should dictate to them the order of the headings and epicheiremes and point out the opportunity for digression and amplification and all other treatments (...)

And one should show concern for the arrangement of the words, teaching all the ways students will avoid composing badly, especially (how to avoid) metrical and rhythmical style (...)

In addition, the style (*hermeneia*) must be clear (*saphes*) and vivid (*enarges*); for the need is not only to express a thought but also to make what is said dwell in the mind of the hearers, so that what is said by Homer (*Odyssey* 2.146) happens: "I shall speak a word easily and place it in mind."⁹⁵

In short: progymnastic rhetoric, when paraphrasing another author's material, seeks to present such material in the best possible way; and to

⁹⁴ Theon, 62, in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 6.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 70, Kennedy: 13-14.

make the form fit the rhetor's purpose; while avoiding boorish stylistic (oral) features and being both as memorable and persuasive as possible.

1.2.2.4 *Aemulatio*

It is this very technique that John Kloppenborg refers to, although he prefers the term *aemulatio*, drawing on Quintillian's *Progymnasmata*:

Indeed, the duty of rhetorical paraphrase, says Quintillian (...), "is rather to rival and vie [aemulatio] with the original in the expression of the same thoughts".⁹⁶

The idea of *aemulatio* is similar to 'progymnastic composition' as described above. Kloppenborg paraphrases it like this:

Rhetorical education, then, involved learning how to condense, expand and paraphrase predecessor texts, and then to use the paraphrase to create an argument, supplying a rationale, then analogies, arguments from the contrary, examples from history or mythology, and proof texts.⁹⁷

Kloppenborg lays some different emphases compared to the above description of 'progymnastic composition,' especially with regard to James' use of Jesus Tradition. Kloppenborg presents these techniques as one author's *competing* with, or even *manipulating* his source.⁹⁸

Kloppenborg is right, when he considers this approach to match James' way of handling Jesus Tradition. However, considering the unique and constitutive status that Jesus Tradition must have held in the Early Church, it is hard to believe that rivaling, competing and manipulating Jesus would have seemed the proper approach for Christian authors in the first and early second century. Therefore, the term 'progymnastic rhetoric' is preferable to *aemulatio*.

⁹⁶ John Kloppenborg, *Q, The Earliest Gospel. An Introduction to the Original Sayings of Jesus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008, 116.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 117.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 115.

1.2.2.5 *Wisdom sayings*

It is noteworthy that Richard Bauckham has offered a satisfactory answer to the problem of James' way of handling Jesus Tradition as well. Bauckham suggests that James stands in a tradition of Jewish wisdom teachers and that he has appropriated Jesus' sayings in a way very similar to how *Ben Sira* has adapted earlier wisdom from the Book of Proverbs (cf. 1.1.6 above).

In addition to, and alongside, progymnastic rhetoric, this approach is also to be considered as a possible technique that was used by the authors of the Catholic Epistles in their use of Jesus Tradition. The actual technique James uses may very well be largely in line with Theon and Quintillian, who in all likelihood represent the scribal practices of the Ancient World (and James, in turn, represents some of the finest Greek style in the New Testament). Yet it needs to be considered how James viewed himself, especially in relation to Jesus and, consequently, Jesus Tradition.

James holds a rather unique place among the New Testament letters, because his epistle is the only one that is regarded as wisdom literature. Therefore, we are likely to encounter independent wisdom sayings that are parallel to Jesus Tradition in James more than in any of the other Catholic Epistles.

In short, then, the following can be concluded:

- Oral performance techniques (probably to be seen as an amalgam of 'recitation composition' and oral community preservation techniques) influenced the way authors knew, understood and appropriated Jesus Tradition.
- Progymnastic rhetoric gives a fair representation of how New Testament authors would have appropriated Jesus Tradition in their epistles.
- Especially in the Epistle of James (but possibly in other instances as well), we should consider the creation of independent wisdom sayings as the conscious effort in which the author is engaged in appropriating Jesus Tradition.

1.2.3 Methodology

In answering the research question

What parallels to Jesus Tradition can be found in the Catholic Epistles, and how do they inform us on the relationship of the Catholic Epistles to Jesus Tradition, both on a historical and a theological level?

each of the Catholic Epistles will be discussed; possible parallels to Jesus Tradition in each of these epistles will be presented and commented upon.

Not every parallel that has ever been proposed in past research will be presented and discussed. Only those that fit the present method and meet its criteria, or come close to meeting those criteria.

Chapters 2 through 5 will walk through the epistles and present preliminary conclusions. The sixth and final chapter will provide final conclusions, including a list of parallels to Jesus Tradition, either 'probable' or 'possible'.

1.3 Value

What should be the outcome of the present research? After having undertaken all steps for each of the seven Catholic Epistles, we will know how to interpret the following data:

First of all, the present research will further inform us of the composition techniques of the authors of the Catholic Epistles, who happen to represent a peculiar blend of idiom, style and content. These letters represent a cross section of all the literary flavors available in the Early Church, as it were. It will be worthwhile to see what they have in common, especially with regard to their appropriation of Jesus Tradition. Secondly, the present research will inform us on the role Jesus Tradition played in the Early Church: how important was its role? How slow or quickly would (these) Early Christian authors use it to underline the point they were making? Could they do this in passing? Are we to assume their casual references were recognized? The answers to these questions will inform us on the presence or absence of Jesus Tradition in the earliest congregations.

Thirdly, these conclusions will consequently increase our knowledge of the theological significance of Jesus within these communities. How is the content of these epistles and how were the minds of its earliest recipients (as far as we can surmise), shaped by their knowledge of the life and teaching of Jesus?

Fourthly, and lastly from the present research, some tentative pointers could be given to researchers who are active in the ongoing Quest for the historical Jesus: some of the parallels in the Catholic Epistles (if they can be firmly established) could be counted by those who look for 'multiple attestation' of occurrences of Jesus Tradition. Apart from that: the picture of Jesus that emerges from these epistles could be used next to the portrait of the Jesus of the Gospels and that of the Pauline Epistles.

In the following chapters, parallels to Jesus Tradition in the Catholic Epistles will be established, starting with the parallels in the Epistle of James.

2. Jesus Tradition Parallels in James

In the present chapter Jesus Tradition parallels within the epistle of James will be presented and discussed. To be able to do this, the literary character of James needs to be understood, in order to place the epistle alongside the trajectory of the developing Jesus Tradition in the Early Church,

In the present chapter the most important *introductory matters* will be outlined (2.1), which will help us to properly assess the occurrence of *parallels* to Jesus Tradition that will be discussed thereafter (2.2). The chapter will conclude with a paragraph on the *preliminary conclusions* of the data for the study of the epistle (2.3).

2.1 Introduction

The study of the Epistle of James has suffered from a long history of neglect. This may in part be due to Luther's disregard of its 'Jewish' content. However, the last decades, roughly since the publication of Peter Davids' commentary,⁹⁹ have seen an increase in scholarly interest,¹⁰⁰ not infrequently focusing on James' use of Jesus Tradition. This has resulted in, among other things, a clearer view on the Epistle's Jewish-Christian outlook, and on the way it is structured.

2.1.1 Introductory matters

This is not to say, however, that a consensus has emerged regarding the more general introductory matters. Below a brief introduction to the

⁹⁹ Peter H. Davids, *Commentary on James* NIGCNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. i.e. Luke Timothy Johnson, 'The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James,' *JBL* 101 (1982), 391-401; the dissertation by Dean D. Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*, Chelsea: Bookcrafters, 1989; the study on roughly the same subject by Patrick J. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, JSNTSup 47, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991; the monographs by John Painter, *Just James*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1997 and Robert H. Eisenmann, *James, the brother of Jesus*, New York: Penguin Books, 1998; the topical introduction by Richard Bauckham, *James. Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage*, New York: Routledge, 1999; and the recent massive commentary by Dale C. Allison, *James* ICC, London: T&T Clark, 2013.

questions concerning *Authorship* (2.1.1.1), *Date* (2.1.1.2), *Content* (2.1.1.3) and *Purpose* (2.1.1.4) of the epistle will be offered, after which an overview of prior scholarship regarding Jesus Tradition in the epistle will be given (2.1.1.5). The collected data will be summarized in a preliminary conclusion that helps to establish the *Approach* (2.1.2) that the current research takes towards the epistle.

2.1.1.1 Authorship

The first verse of the epistle identifies its author as:

James, a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ (Jas. 1:1)

Kümmel had no trouble in identifying the James that is intended:

Without doubt James claims to be written by [the Lord's brother], and even if the letter is not authentic, it appeals to this famous James and the weight of his person as authority for its content.¹⁰¹

Modern scholarship is quite unanimous in its agreement with Kümmel on this subject. That James the Just (as Eusebius and *Thomas* refer to him), the brother of the Lord (as Paul tends to call him) would be the author of a canonical epistle should not surprise us: In Paul (1 Cor.5:7; Gal.2:9) as in *Thomas* (12) and the *Hebrew Gospel* (quoted by Jerome: *Vir.ill.* 211-13) he is mentioned as a prominent figure, almost of the same stature as Simon Peter. A careful reading of Acts (notably chs. 12, 15 and 21) would underline this observation.¹⁰² Jewish Christians of a more gnostic variety also held James in high esteem: several apocryphal works bear his name (i.e. *1 and 2 Apocalypse of James* and *Apocryphon of James*).

Whether the historical James is the actual author, or that we are dealing with a pseudepigraphical epistle, is another matter. Modern scholarship is still in disagreement on this subject. Allison's recent commentary features a concise discussion.¹⁰³ The most important arguments are:

¹⁰¹ Georg Werner Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed., Nashville: Abingdon, 1978.

¹⁰² Cf. i.e. P.H.R. van Houwelingen, 'Jerusalem, the Mother Church. The Development of the Apostolic Church from the Perspective of Jerusalem,' *Sárospataki Füzetek* (2012/3-4), 11-32.

¹⁰³ Allison, *James*, 3-32.

1. The Greek is quite excellent: the author of the epistle seems to be an educated man, showing rhetorical and language skills that do not seem to fit a Galilean artisan such as James would have been. However, first century Palestine was thoroughly influenced by Hellenism, and there is no telling in what way James (who of course grew out to be so much more than an average Galilean artisan) may have been assisted in composing his epistle.¹⁰⁴
2. There is an apparent lack of Christology: scarce reference to Jesus is being made (he is only mentioned in 1:1 and 2:1) and none to Jesus' crucifixion or resurrection, let alone the atoning significance of both. This seems to indicate that an early dating is in order. Some have proposed that James is originally a Jewish tract (with 1:1 and 2:1 as Christian interpolations),¹⁰⁵ but this is not defended today.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, 1:1 and 2:1 do offer firm Christological statements, which apparently did not call for elaboration or explanation.
3. There is an awkward relationship to Pauline theology: whereas Paul seems to lay repeated emphasis on the importance of 'faith without works' (Gal.2:16; Rom.3:28), James seems to stress that faith without works is an impossibility (cf. Jas.2:14-26). This can mean at least two things: either James was as yet unaware of Paul's vocabulary, and had no intention to enter into a polemic (indicating an early date and enlarging the likelihood of authenticity), or 2:14-26 was directed at Pauline theology. This could mean it was written only after the wider publication of the Pauline corpus, but it by no means needs to mean that, since James and Paul were contemporaries who are thought to have interacted (directly or indirectly) extensively.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ Cf. E. Randolph Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1991, 48, where Richards allows for the possibility that a secretary 'took an active role in the composition of a letter. This is more than the correction of grammar or phraseology, more than mere editing, for the letter would reflect, in at least some way, the thought of the secretary as well as that of the author.'

¹⁰⁵ i.e. F. Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums, Zweiter Band: Der Brief des Jakobus; Studien zum Hirten des Hermas*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1896 and L. Massebiau, 'L'Épître de Jacques; est-elle l'oeuvre d'un Chrétien?', *RHR* 32 (1895), 249-83.

¹⁰⁶ For a brief discussion on the Jewish nature of Jas., cf. Allison, *James*, 48-9.

¹⁰⁷ David R. Nienhuis in his monograph *Not by Paul Alone: The Formation of the Catholic Epistle Collection and the Christian Canon*, Baylor University Press: 2007, 115-117, seems convinced that there must be a literary connection between Romans and James, and that it could only have been Romans

The diatribic nature of the passage makes it hard to decide whether James is envisioning an actual opponent. However, if he is trying to counter Paul, he is not doing a very good job of it; and in fact, seems to be misunderstanding him.¹⁰⁸ A more fruitful exegesis reads James 2 as an elaboration of both the parable of James 1:22-25 and the saying of 1:27.

4. James' apparent lack of interest in ritual purity. This is thought to be inconsistent with what we know about the historical James (Cf. Gal.2:12; Eusebius, *HE*, 2.23), especially when the relatively important place 'the law' seems to hold in the epistle's thought-world is accounted for (cp. Jas.1:25.2:8-12.4:11-12). However, there is no reason to assume that the epistle's interest in the law is reduced to its moral assets. We can much rather assume that James and his readers were pious Jewish Christians for whom ritual observance of the Mosaic law would be self-evident. Even though ritual purity may not be a topic in James, the Mosaic law is quite important in the letter.

Allison (although conceding that authenticity may still be defended) chooses to read James as a pseudepigraphical letter. Other recent commentators, such as Bauckham, Johnson and Wall, think it is best understood as a genuine mid-first century Jewish Christian epistle, authored by James, the brother of the Lord.¹⁰⁹ The decision in either direction hinges on personal evaluation of the same data, and perhaps the wider consideration of how likely it is that an early Christian document such as this would be pseudepigraphical in nature. Davids, following the lead of Cantinat, offers a third possibility; James may be a literary reworking of homiletic performances by the historical James.¹¹⁰

that has influenced James and not vice versa. The necessity of such a one-way *literary* connection is impossible to prove, certainly given the fact that James and Paul were contemporaries. There may be a connection between Paul's and James' language, but there may equally well be an underlying Jewish tradition on works and faith that influences both authors (Cf. Davids, *James*, 21).

¹⁰⁸ For this point, cf. Klaus Haaker, 'Justification, salut et foi: Étude sur les rapports entre Paul, Jacques et Pierre.' *Etudes Théologiques & Religieuses* 73.2 (1998) 177-188 and Peter H. Davids, 'What Reading is Truly Canonical? A Brief Response.' *JTI* 9.1 (spring 2015), 137-48.

¹⁰⁹ Bauckham, *James*; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Letter of James* AB 37A, New York: Doubleday, 1995; Robert W. Wall, *The Community of the Wise; The Book of James* NTC, Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1997.

¹¹⁰ Davids, *James*, 12-3; J. Cantinat, *Les épîtres de s. Jacques et de s. Jude*, Paris: Gabalda, 1973.

2.1.1.2 Date

Of course, the choice one makes regarding authorship, greatly influences the dating of the epistle. If James is indeed the author, the letter has to be dated prior to 62 CE, which is the traditional date of James' martyrdom,¹¹¹ but later than 44, which is (according to Acts 12) the moment at which James became the principal church leader in Jerusalem.¹¹²

Another important factor regarding the date would be the relationship of James 2:14-26 to the Pauline corpus. If James were interacting with the entirety of the written Pauline corpus, a date towards the end of the first century would be necessary. Others counter that the epistle cannot have been written after the apostolic council (as described in Acts 15), since James would have chosen his words more carefully had he been aware of the possible controversy.¹¹³ Those who consider the epistle to be pseudepigraphical generally favor a date in the late first or the early second century (sometimes pointing to possible allusions in *1 Clement* and *Hermas* as a *terminus ad quem*), but recently a theory has been developed by David Nienhuis that envisions James being written as an introduction to the corpus of the Catholic Epistles. This would have been no sooner than the middle of the second century.¹¹⁴ An important issue for Nienhuis is the lack of attestation of the epistle in Church Fathers prior to Origen, which is hard to explain given the fame James appears to have had in the second century.¹¹⁵

Generally, it has to be noted that the opinions on the dating of James are remarkably versatile,¹¹⁶ with propositions equally divided over the forties, fifties, sixties, seventies up to the nineties of the first century, and sometimes crossing into the second century. All in all, a date between 44

¹¹¹ Cf. Eusebius, *HE*, 2.23.4-18 (in reference to Hegesippus). The dating can be joined to the death of Festus, which was the apparent reason James could be tried.

¹¹² The Herodian persecution (cf. Acts 12:1) is linked to the leadership transition (12:17) and is indicated to have occurred shortly prior to Herod's death (12:20-25), which can be dated 44 CE (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 19.8.2; cf. Darrell L. Bock, *Acts BECNT*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007, 431).

¹¹³ i.e. L. Floor, *Jakobus. Brief van een broeder*, Kampen: Kok, 1992; J.A.T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, London, 1976. This event is usually dated around 49 CE.

¹¹⁴ David R. Nienhuis, 'The Letter of James as a Canon-Conscious Pseudepigraph,' in K-W Niebuhr and R. Wall (eds.) *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition* (Baylor University Press, 2009) pp.183-200; *ibid.*, *Not by Paul*, 163-232.

¹¹⁵ Nienhuis, *Not by Paul*, 148.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Allison, *James*, 28-9, who offers a list of some fifty scholars' datings of the epistle.

and 62 seems to be probable, considering James as the epistle's actual author.

2.1.1.3 Content: genre and structure

'The Epistle of James is a religious and moral tract having the form, but only the form, of a letter.'¹¹⁷ This opening sentence of Ropes' commentary on James represents the way the epistle has been perceived during most of the twentieth century. Ropes thought James to be a diatribe. Dibelius, in his influential commentary,¹¹⁸ argued it was a paraenesis.

Both observations have merit, since James has diatribal sections (esp. 2:14-26), and indeed consists mainly of paraenetical literature, but both are also flawed, since neither 'diatribe', nor 'paraenesis' are proper genres.

Even if the qualifications are not precise, the observations behind them are not without value. Both commentators saw that James resembles ancient moral tractates (such as Pseudo-Phoclydes and Pseudo-Menander): it consists mainly of sayings and short pericopes on diverse matters (often concerning virtuous behavior) and seems to lack the buildup of classical letters.

Bauckham, however, points out that in antiquity it did not take much more than an address for a piece of writing to be an epistle.¹¹⁹ He has also shown that James resembles in many ways the sub-genre of *diaspora-letter*.¹²⁰

Apart from being a letter, James is also Wisdom literature. It is a Greek letter, both in language and style, and there is considerable lexical and semantical overlap with Stoic philosophy.¹²¹ However, James is first and foremost a Jewish-Christian letter, and the subtexts are primarily

¹¹⁷ James Hardy Ropes, *Epistle of St. James* ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1948 [1916], 1.

¹¹⁸ Martin Dibelius, *James*, ed. H. Greeven, Philadelphia: 1976.

¹¹⁹ Bauckham, *James*, 12.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 25-28; cf. Allison, *James*, 73, who calls it 'a paranetically oriented early-Jewish diaspora-letter.'

¹²¹ Cf. the monograph by M.A. Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law in the Letter of James*, Leiden: Brill, 2001. Alicia J. Batten, 'The Urbanization of Jesus traditions in James' (in: Alicia J. Batten & John S. Kloppenborg (eds.): *James, 1 & 2 Peter and early Jesus Traditions*, London: T&T Clark, 2014, 78-96) underscores this, and envisions James' audience and origin to be civil and educated rather than rural and poor.

biblical.¹²² Its most natural parallels are to be found in Jewish wisdom literature, such as the Book of Proverbs, *Sirach* and *Wisdom*.

Dibelius believed that separate sections and sayings of James lacked any internal coherence, beyond the catchwords that string several parts together.¹²³ Since the article by Francis,¹²⁴ however, a broad scholarly consensus has emerged that there is some overall composition after all. The first chapter, which features more separate sayings than the other chapters, is thought to serve as an introduction in which several themes, which are developed in the remainder of the epistle, are introduced.¹²⁵ Bauckham warns against over-reading compositional elements into the letter, and suggests the following overall structure:

- A Prescript (1:1)
- B Introduction (1:2-27)
- C Exposition (2-5)¹²⁶

2.1.1.4 Purpose

The epistle of James does not work out of a single consistent argument. The goal of the writing is primarily to be sought in its probable genre: diaspora-letter. The epistle of James reminds Jewish Christians that they are still part of the people of God; regardless of whatever strife they might have been enduring.¹²⁷

As in that other famous diaspora-letter, Jeremiah 29:4-23, the people of God are being advised to shift their perspective, to alter in which direction they look for counsel and authority. In James this does not occur directly, but rather implicitly, by presenting the rich as devious

¹²² Cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, 'The Use', who singles out the apparently steering role of Leviticus 19 for the epistle.

¹²³ Cf. Allison, *James*, 82, for a brief overview of these catchwords.

¹²⁴ F.O. Francis, 'The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John', *ZNW* 61 (1970) 110-26.

¹²⁵ Patient endurance/perfection (1:2-4); wisdom/divine giving/prayer of faith/divided soul (1:5-8); fate of poor/fate of rich/eschatological reversal (1:9-11); enduring trial/human desire (1:12-15); gift 'from above' (1:16-18); slow to speak (1:19-21); 'the law of freedom'/doing the word (1:22-25); bridle tongue/concern for the marginal/'the world' (1:26-27), cf. Allison, *James*, 79.

¹²⁶ Bauckham, *James*; Allison, 78, concurs.

¹²⁷ Cf. P.H.R. van Houwelingen, *Apostelen, Draggers van een spraakmakend evangelie*, Kampen: Kok, 2011, 73.

and unreliable. There is emphasis throughout on patient endurance, and a constant siding with the poor over against the rich, who extolled the people of the land in Palestine as well as in other parts of the Roman Empire. However, the rhetorical nature of James should serve as a warning against over-reading a certain historical and sociological background into these passages. The divide between rich and poor was undoubtedly a reality for many of the original readers, but it is primarily presented as an eschatological reality.

Apart from the primarily eschatological focus, there is also the invitation to James's general readership to confess Jesus not just with words, but much rather in deeds: observing Torah, as interpreted by Jesus the Messiah.

2.1.1.5 *Jesus Tradition in James: a brief overview of scholarship*

2.1.1.5.1 *Davies*

The observation that the epistle of James is influenced by Jesus Tradition is by no means new or recent. Davies notes that both Mayor (1897) and Hauck (1926) already presented lists of parallels in their respective commentaries,¹²⁸ and such observations go back at least as far as 1889.¹²⁹ Davies feels these parallels are highly meaningful: 'it is in the Epistle of James that the words of Jesus break through more often than in any other document outside the Synoptics, while at the same time they are subsumed under a single principle, the law of love'.¹³⁰ Davies provides a list of over twenty parallels, stating that especially its cumulative effect is impressive. He perceives James having drawn upon 'a tradition of the sayings of Jesus for his paraenetical purposes'.¹³¹ According to Davies,

¹²⁸ W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, Cambridge: University Press, 1966, 403.

¹²⁹ Cf. A. Resch: 'Agrapha, Ausserkanonische Evangelienfragmente,' in O. v. Gebhardt und A. Harnack,; *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, V. Band, 4. Heft, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1889.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 402.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 403.

James must have thought of the words of Jesus, and in particular the love command, as an overriding principle vis á vis the Old Testament laws.¹³²

2.1.1.5.2 Davids

Peter Davids provides a chart, containing forty-seven parallels to Jesus Tradition.¹³³ Davids believes James to be so steeped in Jesus' teaching, that even this chart is incomplete. Every 'form-critically determined unit in the epistle' seems, furthermore, to display at least one allusion to Jesus Tradition, which Davids believes to be deliberate.¹³⁴ The overlap with the double tradition, and the Sermon on the Mount/Plain in particular, leads Davids to believe that 'there existed an early paraenetic collection of the sayings of Jesus (oral or written) and that James knew a version of that block of tradition.'¹³⁵ It is telling that Paul, in his allusions to Jesus Tradition, seems to be making use of similar material.¹³⁶ Another vital point made by Davids, is that it is hard (if not impossible) to pin down literary relationship to any one strand of Jesus Tradition as we know it (i.e. 'Q', Mark, Matthew, Luke, *etc.*) since there is an impressive *number* of Matthean parallels, but they tend (in double tradition parallels) to be closer in *wording* to Luke.¹³⁷

2.1.1.5.3 Deppe and Hartin

In 1989 and 1991 respectively, Dean Deppe and Patrick Hartin published extensive studies on the subject.¹³⁸ Deppe set out to investigate the *literary* relationships between James and Jesus Tradition. He distinguishes between actual quotes, allusions, and other parallels in

¹³² *Ibid.*, 405. This indirectly testifies to Davies' perception of the Early Church's ways having parted with Judaism at an early stage.

¹³³ Davids, *James*, 47-48; reprinted in Davids, 'James and Jesus', in Wenham (ed.) *Gospel Perspectives* vol. V, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984, 66-67.

¹³⁴ Davids, 'James', 69-70.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 67.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 68.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*

¹³⁸ Dean B. Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Paraenesis of James. A PDF Revision of the Doctoral Dissertation*. Amsterdam: VU, 1990 [1989] (online at: <https://archive.org/details/TheSayingsOfJesusInTheParaenesisOfJames>); Patrick J. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

content and/or wording. He found eight full-blown allusions, which he believed relativized the claims of i.e. Davies and Davids. However, Deppe considerably downplays the value of the various meaningful parallels he lists, and the cumulative effect of these parallels. Hartin, on the other hand, is less stringent in his evaluation of allusion, employing a list resembling that of both Davies and Davids. Hartin emphasizes the wisdom element of James, and thinks that the epistle has this in common with Q. 'In both James and Q traditional wisdom has undergone a transformation through the influence of the eschatological dimension'.¹³⁹ James and Q also seem to share a common outlook on Mosaic law. Hartin therefore concludes both documents had a similar *Sitz im Leben*. Furthermore, and this seems to be Hartin's main thesis, he believes James is developing Q material in a way that is commensurate with the appropriation of Jesus Tradition in Matthew.

2.1.1.5.4 Bauckham and Kloppenborg

Bauckham notes the likeness in form and content between James and Jesus Tradition, comparing James' relation to Jesus to the way *Sirach* appropriated the wisdom tradition of Proverbs.¹⁴⁰ Bauckham refrains from listing parallels or allusions, since he does not think that 'allusion' is what James is dealing with: James is rather creating his own independent wisdom sayings, which are indebted on various levels to Jesus' wisdom teaching. Bauckham therefore extensively lists *forms* that James and Jesus have in common: types of sayings, similes and parables. As stated above, Kloppenborg mainly agrees with Bauckham, but sets out to show James' indebtedness to Greek rhetoric in the way he appropriates Jesus Tradition.¹⁴¹ Both their theses are valuable, but Bauckham's reluctance to admit that James may be dealing with allusion is somewhat problematic, when one considers such obvious examples as 1:5-7; 2:5 and 5:12.

2.1.2 Approach

Some of the above observations regarding the provenance, form and content of James are helpful in the analyses that will be offered below.

¹³⁹ Hartin, *Sayings*, 64.

¹⁴⁰ Bauckham, *James; Ibid.*, 'James'.

¹⁴¹ Kloppenborg, 'Emulation'.

Even though it remains tentative, it seems apt to consider the epistle of James as a writing that is indeed connected to the historical James. The epistle, in most respects, fits an early dating and a Palestinian background. When parallels will be established and analyzed, it will be done with the awareness that, in all likelihood, the epistle pre-dates written (or at least: literary) Gospel accounts as we know them.

Earlier research has indicated that there is probably meaningful correlation between Jesus Tradition and the epistle, particularly those traditions that we encounter in the Matthean Sermon on the Mount. Interaction with earlier research (in the present chapter, and in the following chapters) will not be very extensive, because the methodology of the present research differs extensively from earlier studies.

2.2 Parallels

Below, those parallels to Jesus Tradition that meet the criteria that have been established in chapter 1 will be presented. Some alleged parallels that come close to passing these criteria, but not quite close enough, will be brought forward. But space does not allow the presentation and refutation of every parallel that has been put forward in the past.

The parallels will be discussed in the following order: first, the parallels to Jesus Tradition that occur in *James 1*, the epistle's introduction, will be presented (2.2.1). Then the parallels will be discussed under the various topical headings that have been introduced in James 1, and are elaborated upon in the letter's main body: *Acting out faith* (2.2.2), *Minding the tongue* (2.2.3), *Asking is receiving* (2.2.4) and *Reversal of Fate* (2.2.5).

2.2.1 James 1

2.2.1.1 James 1:2

The first parallel occurs right at the start of the epistle, in James 1:2:

Jas. 1:2

Consider it pure joy, my brothers and sisters, whenever you face trials of many kind

Πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἠγήσασθε, ἀδελφοί μου, ὅταν πειρασμοὶς περιπέσῃτε ποικίλοις,

Matt. 5:11-12a//Luke 6:22-23a

Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me.

Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven

μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἴπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν [ψευδόμενοι] ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ. χαίrete καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

The **verbal agreement** in this instance may not be very impressive (χαρὰν - χαίrete), however, the propositional agreement is remarkable: Both Jesus and James express a surprising and somewhat troubling imperative, indicating that *one should rejoice when one is tried and tested*. Deppe points out the likeness of this verse to 1 Peter 1:6-7 and Romans 5:3-5, both of which may be dependent on Jesus Tradition as well. He also points to older Jewish parallels, downplaying the propositional agreement between James 1:2 and Matthew 5:11-12. However, none of the parallels he mentions combine the notions of ‘rejoicing’ and ‘being tested’, as James does, here and in 1:12.¹⁴²

There is also **conceptual analogy**: James’ introductory statement is only the first of more calls to endure suffering; the other instances looking forward to future vindication (cf. 1:12; 2:5; 5:7-11). Likewise, the parallel verses from Jesus Tradition are part of a series of beatitudes, pronouncing blessings and future vindication on those who suffer in the present age (Cf. Matt. 5:2-12). It may be of some significance that Matthew, in his presentation of Jesus’ teaching, opens with these beatitudes, and that James opens his letter with such a strongly related utterance.

¹⁴² Cf. Deppe, *Sayings*, 98-99.

Presumably, James had **access** to a source (written or oral) that contained, at least, much Sermon on the Mount/Plain material (many more parallels from that strand of tradition will follow below), which is not surprising, given the immense popularity of such traditions in paraenetical and catechetical literature in Early Christianity (cf. i.e. *Did.*1:3-5; *1 Clem.*13:2; *Pol.Phil.*2:3).

James compresses Jesus' saying considerably. First of all, by paraphrasing the 'list' of trials as 'trials of many kind'. Second, he leaves out the eschatological elements of reward: Instead, in 1:3-4 James develops a rationale, based on logic, for his statement. The eschatological vindication is reserved for a later moment in his epistle (cf. *Jas.*1:12).

Here, as in many other instances, James uses assonance ('Πᾶσαν χαρὰν' – 'πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις'), which gives the verse a distinct feel: James 1:2 is an independent, well-constructed saying. It seems likely that it has been formulated in the way it has, because it is dependent on Jesus Tradition.

2.2.1.2 James 1:4

A next possible parallel is James 1:4:

Jas.1:4

Let perseverance finish its work so that you may be mature and complete, not lacking anything.

ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω, ἵνα ᾗτε τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι.

Matt.5:48

Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν.

There is a **verbal** link between these two verses in that both have a double occurrence of *teleios* (τέλειον ... τέλειοι - τέλειοι ... τέλειός), coupled with the verb 'to be'. In both instances the plural adjective (τέλειοι) refers to the hearers and is compared to a singular noun that receives the singular adjective τέλειον/ς. But that is where the equation stops. The fact that *teleios* represents a favorite word group of James' underlines the rather thin value of this parallel. The **propositional**

agreement is not very promising: there is a mutual call to perfection, which is not uncommon in Early Christianity (cf. i.e. 1 Cor.14:20; Eph.4:13; *Did.*1:4.6:2; *1 Clem.*55:6; *Ign. Pol.*1:3), nor in first century Judaism for that matter.¹⁴³ Although the **accessibility** may be in order (once again, Sermon on the Mount/Plain tradition), there is no **conceptual analogy**, since in Matthew the saying follows Jesus' exposition on matters of the law, whereas in James 1:4 perfection is the end product of trials.¹⁴⁴

It should also be noted that the Lukan parallel to Matthew 5:48 lacks the words *τέλειοι/τέλειός* ('Be merciful, therefore, as your heavenly Father is merciful, Luke 6:36).

There is, all in all, no solid basis to regard James 1:4 to be dependent on Matthew 5:48.

2.2.1.3 James 1:5-7

Another parallel is to be found in James 1:5-7:

Jas.1:5-7

If any of you lacks wisdom, you should ask God, who gives generously to all without finding fault, and it will be given to you. But when you ask, you must believe and not doubt, because the one who doubts is like a wave of the sea, blown and tossed by the wind.

That person should not expect to receive anything from the Lord.

Εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν λείπεται σοφίας, αἰτεῖτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος,

Matt.7:7-8//Luke 11:9-10

'ask and it will be given to you'

Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν

...

'for everyone who asks, receives'

πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει

Matt.21:21-22//Mark 11:23-24)

... if you have faith and do not doubt

ἔχητε πίστιν καὶ μὴ διακριθῆτε

(Mark 11:23: μὴ διακριθῆ)

... also you can say to this

mountain, 'Go, throw yourself into the sea ...

'if you believe you will receive

¹⁴³ Cf. Allison, *James*, 155-7.

¹⁴⁴ Unless Matt.5:48 originally was linked to the beatitudes, and immediately followed 5:11-12. But this is conjecture, of course.

καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ.

αἰτείτω δὲ ἐν πίστει μηδὲν
διακρινόμενος· ὁ γὰρ
διακρινόμενος ἔοικεν κλύδωνι
θαλάσσης ἀνεμιζομένῳ καὶ
ῥιπιζομένῳ.

μη γὰρ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος
ἐκεῖνος ὅτι λήμψεται τι παρὰ τοῦ
κυρίου

what you ask for in prayer'
αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ
πιστεύοντες λήμψεσθε
(Mark 11:24 προσεύχεσθε καὶ
αἰτεῖσθε)

John 15:7 αἰτήσασθε, καὶ
γενήσεται ὑμῖν

John 15:16 ὃ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ...
δῶ ὑμῖν

John 16:24 αἰτεῖτε καὶ
λήμψεσθε

(1 John 3:22 καὶ ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν,
λαμβάνομεν)

The **verbal agreement** between Matthew 7:7 (par. Luke 11:9) and James 1:5 is very strong (αἰτείτω ... καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ - αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν), and is further strengthened by the parallel λήμψεται - λαμβάνει in James 1:7 - Matthew 7:8. It seems as though James is consciously evoking Jesus' statements ('ask and it will be given ... who asks, receives') at the opening and ending of this short section on prayer. However, in the middle section, where the idea of the necessity of faith (over against doubt) is introduced, James seems to be referring indirectly to another piece of tradition, which is similar, yet obviously distinct: Matthew 21:21-22//Mark 11:23-24. The former tradition is part of the double tradition, the second is Markan material. The former seems to be part of a sayings tradition (once again: Sermon on the Mount), the second is presented, both in Mark and Matthew, as Jesus' explanation of the withered fig tree, but might as well have had an independent life as a saying on its own. Once again, the **verbal agreement** is very strong: πίστει μηδὲν διακρινόμενος - πίστιν ... μη διακριθῆτε; θαλάσσης - θαλάσσαν.

The **propositional agreement** is quite strong as well: both Jesus and James are emphasizing God's willingness to answer prayers. James felt he could combine both traditions, in order to present his explanation of how and why prayers are and are not answered (cp. 4:3): faith is needed

for prayer to work. Jesus, in the Markan saying, focuses on the power of belief, using both the image of a steadfast mountain and the unsteady sea (the images forming something of a parallelism with the ideas of belief and doubt), whereas James zooms in on the vulnerability of doubt (possibly deliberately building on Jesus' metaphor of the unsteady sea¹⁴⁵). Also, James is limiting his scope to the prayer for wisdom, thereby evoking the narrative of Solomon's prayer (cf. 1 Kgs. 3:5-15), who was promised to receive anything he asked for, and chose to ask for a wise and discerning heart.

The analogy between James' and Jesus' sayings is so strong, that it would seem superfluous to inquire after **conceptual analogy**: obviously James used Jesus' sayings on prayer and faith to form his own saying on prayer and faith. The matter of **accessibility** is easily resolved in the case of the double tradition material, which is once again featured in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount. The Markan saying is another matter. As noted above, James may have known it as a saying independent of its narrative context.

James has shaped his own saying on the basis of two separate Jesus *logia*. James' saying is far more eloquent and literate, even if he remains fairly close to Jesus Tradition, both in words and in meaning.

2.2.1.4 James 1:12

Another parallel can be found in James 1:12:

Jas. 1:12

Blessed is the one who perseveres under trial because, having stood the test, that person will receive the crown of life that the Lord has promised to those who love him.

Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει
πειρασμόν, ὅτι δόκιμος γενόμενος
λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς
ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπώσιν

Matt. 5:11-12a//Luke 6:22-23a

Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me. Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven

μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν
ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἴπωσιν
πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν

¹⁴⁵ Cf. also Peter's 'little faith' in Matt. 14:29-31 (quite literally a rock into the sea).

αυτόν.

[ψευδόμενοι] ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ.
χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ
μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς
οὐρανοῖς

Rev.2:10

Do not be afraid of what you are about to suffer. I tell you, the devil will put some of you in prison to test you, and you will suffer persecution for ten days. Be faithful, even to the point of death, and I will give you life as your victor's crown.

μηδὲν φοβοῦ ἃ μέλλεις πάσχειν.
ἰδοὺ μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἐξ
ὑμῶν εἰς φυλακὴν ἵνα πειρασθῆτε
καὶ ἔξετε θλίψιν ἡμερῶν δέκα.
γίνου πιστὸς ἄχρι θανάτου, καὶ
δώσω σοι τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς.

The **verbal** parallel to Matthew 5:11-12 is in itself not very impressive: Μακάριοι - Μακάριος. However, since James 1:12 quite obviously picks up the thread of 1:2-4, it is not a stretch to assume the beatitude to resonate in the background once again. By shaping the verse as makarism, James seems to emphasize his indebtedness to Jesus. There is in 1:12 also an interesting verbal parallel to another verse within the epistle: ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν reappears word for word in 2:5. There it refers to God's promise of the kingdom. 'He has promised to those who love him' may be a standard formula, not necessarily of James' invention, referring to God's and Jesus' promises of an eschatological nature.¹⁴⁶ Of course such a general notion would be right at home within the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount. But in James 1:12 a different piece of tradition seems to be referred to: What is promised is τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, the crown of life. These exact

¹⁴⁶ Cf. 1 Corinthians 2:9, where the phrase occurs with a different verb: 'ἃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.'

words are on Jesus' lips in Revelation 2:10, in the message to the church of Smyrna. Both James 1:12 and Revelation 2:10 refer to the hardship that Christians have to endure by using a derivative of the verb *πειράζω* (testing). The relation between Revelation and Jesus Tradition is by no means a clear one, but some traces of Jesus Tradition might be expected, in particular in the messages from Jesus himself addressed to the seven churches in Asia (Rev.2-3).

The **propositional agreement** between James 1:12 and Matthew 5:11-12 is much the same as it was with James 1:2. One could paraphrase it as *blessed is he who faces hardship, for he will be rewarded*. Likewise, there is great propositional agreement between Revelation 2:10 and James 1:12: *the reward for those who stand the test is the crown of life*. To both Jesus and James 'hardship' is to be perceived as eschatological. The parallel in Revelation underlines this.

The **conceptual analogy** to Matthew 5:11-12 is the same as it was in James 1:2. With regard to the parallel in Revelation 2:10, it can be said that John and James share a phrase, possibly on loan from Jesus Tradition, and put it to quite similar use. It should be noted that Revelation 2:9 shares some characteristics with James as well, particularly in 2:5 (cf. ch. 2.2.2.2 below).

The **accessibility** to Matthew 5:11-12 is discussed above. With regard to Revelation 2:10 it could tentatively be proposed that John and James both had access to a source which featured, at least, the theme of testing in combination with the promise of the victor's crown. However, in Revelation 2:9, the preceding verse, it is stated that the *poor* are really *rich*, a statement that resembles that of James 2:5, which in turn closely resembles Luke 6:20 with its promise of the kingdom for the poor. Either James used two related strands of Jesus Tradition, both enforcing the point he was trying to make, or the elements of reversal of poor and rich and of the victor's crown were in fact part of the same source.

2.2.1.5 James 1:17a-b

Another parallel occurs in James 1:17a-b:

Jas.1:17a-b

Every good and perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of the heavenly lights

πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθῆ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον ἄνωθεν ἐστὶν καταβαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων

Jas.3:15 οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία ἄνωθεν ...

Jas.3:17 ἡ δὲ ἄνωθεν σοφία πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή ἐστὶν ...

Matt.7:11//Luke 11:13

If you, then, though you are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give good gifts//the Holy Spirit to those who ask him!

εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὄντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς//ἔξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει ἀγαθὰ//πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.

There is a very clear **verbal** parallel in this instance: δόσις ἀγαθῆ - δόματα ἀγαθὰ, combined with the 'Father'. In James he is called the Father 'of lights', whereas in the parallel he is called 'your Father in heaven'. However, James does indicate, indirectly, that the Father is 'above'. Both that, and the designation 'Father of lights', may indicate James' familiarity with this piece of Jesus Tradition, since it would seem proper for James to artfully improve upon the straightforward saying of Jesus.

Matthew 7:11 is close to Matthew 7:7-8 (which was alluded to by James earlier (1:5-7)), in content as well as in placement. It should be noted that James knowingly picks up the thread of 1:5-7 in this verse: no wonder that the whole of Matthew 7:7-11 (par. Luke 11:9-13) resonates. James 1:17 and Matthew 7:11 (par. Luke 11:13) can be seen to share the **proposition**: *Good gifts come from the Father [who is in the heavenly realm]*. Interestingly, Luke (whose version of the saying is almost word for word identical to that of Matthew) identifies the good gifts directly with the holy Spirit. This may appear to be Luke's personal redactional choice, but it is in full agreement with James: James' reason for introducing the

larger theme of prayer was *wisdom* (cf. Jas.1:5). Wisdom is James' topic once again in 3:13-18 and it is specifically noted as 'from above' (ἄνωθεν), and 'first of all: holy'. These verses can easily be compared to Paul's list of vices and virtues, which he in turn presents as 'the fruit of the Spirit' (Gal.5:19-23).¹⁴⁷ In the verses following 1:17, James seems to identify the 'good gifts' with God's choice to 'give us birth through the word of truth' (1:18) and 'the implanted word' (1:21); these are two images of regeneration that seem to refer to the work of the Spirit, even if James does not mention the Spirit as such. Perhaps analogous to the idea of *Wisdom* 7:27b,¹⁴⁸ James may be thought of as presenting a 'wisdom-pneumatology'. The works of the Spirit, God's gifts from above, are in his view best paraphrased as 'wisdom'. James 1:17 may therefore be considered just as close (or closer) to Luke (whose presentation of the topic of prayer in 11:9-13 is just as bound up with 'holy Spirit' as James' presentation of the theme is with 'wisdom') as to Matthew. This means there is great **conceptual analogy**, first of all, to Luke, but also to Matthew.

The **accessibility** is once again provided by James' source containing Sermon on the Mount/Plain material: double tradition.

James, in this instance, seems to paraphrase a saying from Jesus Tradition. He leaves out the element that is typical of Jesus (the comparative *πόσω μᾶλλον*), and instead introduces the notion *ἄνωθεν*, which he will pick up later in his epistle (3:15.17).

2.2.1.6 James 1:19b-20

The next parallel occurs in James 1:19:

Jas.1:19b-20

... slow to speak and slow to become angry, because human anger does not produce the righteousness that God desires.

Matt.5:22a

But I tell you that anyone who is angry with a brother or sister will be subject to judgment.

ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ

¹⁴⁷ Which may in turn allude to Matt. 12:33.

¹⁴⁸ 'Generation after generation, she [i.e.: wisdom] enters souls and shapes them into God's friends and prophets.'

βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλήσαι, βραδὺς
εἰς ὀργήν·
ὀργή γὰρ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην
θεοῦ οὐ κατεργάζεται.

ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ
ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει·

Jas.4:11-12

Do not speak evil against one another, brothers and sisters. Whoever speaks evil against another or judges another, speaks evil against the law and judges the law; but if you judge the law, you are not a doer of the law but a judge.

There is one lawgiver and judge who is able to save and to destroy. So who, then, are you to judge your neighbor?

The parallel is not very impressive at first sight: on a **verbal** level we have the parallel ὀργή - ὀργιζόμενος. On a **propositional** level both verses prohibit anger, but they do so in differing manners.

James' warning to be careful with words looks forward to 1:26 and 3:1-12 on the one hand (possibly to be linked with Jesus' warning against Christians becoming each other's teachers, Matt.23:8, cp.1 John 2:27) and 5:12 (Jesus' prohibition on oath-taking) on the other, and is at the same time linked to *anger*. In 4:11-12 James once again calls his readers to be careful with words. If the warning from James 1:19-20 is thought to resound in those verses, it can be imagined that Jesus' words of judgment in Matthew 5:22 also resound there. So, on the level of **conceptual analogy** it is the case that James' overall argument on speech would be backed up adequately by the *logion* under discussion.

Considering James' apparent **access** to Jesus' teaching, the parallel could be accepted as such: it is in any case not unlikely that James knew of Jesus' teaching on anger, and this is his way of processing such

traditions. The repeated *slow to* creates a recognizable unit, to which a rationale is added that does suit the main thought of Matthew's verse. However, Deppe rightly points out the striking resemblance of this feature to *Aboth* 5:11-12,¹⁴⁹ which in turn urges us to be slow in establishing parallels.

2.2.1.7 James 1:21

In James 1:21 the following parallel can be discerned:

Jas.1:21

Therefore, get rid of all moral filth and the evil that is so prevalent and humbly accept the word planted in you, which can save you.

διὸ ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσεῖαν κακίας ἐν πραϋτητι δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.

<p>Jas.1:18 βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπαρχὴν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων.</p>
--

Matt.13:19(//Mark 4:15//Luke 8:12)

When anyone hears the message about the kingdom and does not understand it, the evil one comes and snatches away what was sown in their heart. This is the seed sown along the path.

παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρεῖς.

There is a tentative consensus that ἔμφυτον λόγον in James 1:21 alludes to Jeremiah 31:33.¹⁵⁰ However, in his explanation of the parable of the sower (which in its basic form is triple tradition material, cf. Matt.13:18-23//Mark 4:13-20//Luke 8:11-15), Jesus speaks of the seed sown in the heart of believers, which he equates with the λόγον τῆς βασιλείας. It is very well possible that James is thinking of the parable and its

¹⁴⁹ There the righteous is described as being 'slow to anger' and 'swift to hear', cf. Deppe, *Sayings*, 127.

¹⁵⁰ "This is the covenant I will make with the people of Israel after that time," declares the LORD. "I will put my law in their minds and write it on their hearts. I will be their God, and they will be my people. Cf. Allison, *James*, 311.

explanation, especially when we take into account that James 1:18 speaks of the believers as generated through the word of truth (λόγῳ ἀληθείας), transforming them into firstfruits of the new creation. The Markan parallel is closest to the Matthean, but lacks the word ‘heart’, which does not necessarily make it a weaker parallel than the Matthean. Matthew’s rendering of the tradition (‘λόγον τῆς βασιλείας; ‘ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ’) does, in this instance, match James’ verse best, since his choice of words may also allude to the prophecy of Jeremiah.

The **verbal** parallel is restricted to the word λόγον. The **propositional agreement**, however, is more impressive. Both verses share the idea of *the word within the innermost part* of the believers’ bodies. This is a broad stroke, to be sure. Even more so when we realize that for the educated reader, as Allison puts it, ‘it is hard not to read ἔμφυτον λόγον without recalling Stoic ideas.’¹⁵¹

There is strong **conceptual** corroboration for this parallel: the verses on wisdom (3:13-18), which have some relation to the present verse (cf. the discussion of 1:17 above), end with mentioning ‘good fruits’ and the ‘fruit’ of justice following the ‘sowing’ of peace. It would, moreover, not be unlikely for James to refer indirectly to a parable from the Jesus Tradition that deals with ‘the word’: it is exactly what he goes on to do in the next verses (1:22-25, referring in all likelihood to Matt.7:24-27, par.).

When James really is alluding to this *logion*, it is noteworthy that Jesus uses the image of the *word* being *sown*, whereas James speaks of it being *implanted*, which could be a deliberate twist on the saying. Whether or not James is consciously using Stoic terminology (which, in antiquity, was used by Stoics and non-Stoics alike) is ultimately of no consequence for this matter.¹⁵²

¹⁵¹ Allison, *James*, 312.

¹⁵² But cf. Batten, ‘Urbanization’, for the view that the Stoic language at least is a sign of urban sophistication. She speaks of James as having ‘urbanized’ Jesus Tradition (96).

2.2.1.8 James 1:22-25

The next verse in the epistle offers another parallel:

Jas.1:22-25

Do not merely listen to the word,
and so deceive yourselves. Do
what it says.

Anyone who listens to the word
but does not do what it says is like
someone who looks at his face in a
mirror

and, after looking at himself, goes
away and immediately forgets
what he looks like.

But whoever looks intently into
the perfect law that gives
freedom, and continues in it—not
forgetting what they have heard,
but doing it—they will be blessed
in what they do.

Γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου καὶ μὴ
μόνον ἀκροαταὶ παραλογιζόμενοι
ἑαυτοῦς.

ὅτι εἴ τις ἀκροατῆς λόγου ἐστὶν
καὶ οὐ ποιητής, οὗτος ἔοικεν
ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον
τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ·
κατενόησεν γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ
ἀπελήλυθεν καὶ εὐθέως
ἐπελάθετο ὅποιος ἦν.

ὁ δὲ παρακύψας εἰς νόμον
τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ
παραμείνας οὐκ ἀκροατῆς
ἐπιλησμονῆς γενόμενος ἀλλὰ
ποιητῆς ἔργου, οὗτος μακάριος ἐν
τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ ἔσται.

Matt.7:24a & 26a// Luke 6:47a & 49a

Therefore everyone who hears
these words of mine and puts
them into practice

Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς
λόγους τούτους καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς

But everyone who hears these
words of mine and does not put
them into practice

Καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς
λόγους τούτους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν
αὐτούς

Matt.7:24-27//Luke 6:46-49

Like a man who built his house
upon a rock ...

Like a man who built his house
upon the sand –without a
foundation- and it fell, and great
was the fall.

John 13:17 εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά
--

The **verbal agreement** is quite obvious and meaningful: ‘doing and hearing the word(s)’ appear only in these two places grouped together so tightly. The difference between *listening* (litt.: being ‘listeners’: ἀκροαταὶ)

and *hearing* (ἀκούω) may be deliberate on the side of James, perhaps indicating a more structural setting of a Christian synagogue. The parallel of John 13:17 is also quite interesting, since it is a makarism which is in content and in two key words (μακάριοί and ποιῆτε) highly similar to the makarism of James 1:25.

There is clear **propositional agreement**: Both Jesus and James insist that *it is not sufficient to listen to the word, the word must be done [acted upon]*. This goes for James 1:25/John 13:17 as well: *you will be blessed if you act upon Jesus' teaching*.

'Now that you know' in John 13:17 is propositionally not the same as 'now that you have heard my words,' but the scene of the footwashing, which precedes this saying, fits James' understanding of what Jesus' teaching was all about. Furthermore, the presence of the beatitude may in itself be a marker for a more faithful rendering of a Jesus *logion* in John (whether or not it was originally tied to the narrative of the footwashing).¹⁵³

With regard to **accessibility** it can be assessed that the parable of the houses is part of double tradition. The Johannine saying is perhaps less likely to have been known to James. Tentatively, a mutual source can be proposed to underlie both the Johannine and Jamesian saying. John 13:17 at least witnesses to the importance of the theme 'hold fast to my words' in Jesus Tradition.

On a literary level, James, remarkably, reshapes Jesus' teaching, creating a completely different parable. Whereas the more obvious thing to do, would be to paraphrase the teaching in the fashion of John 13:17.

As an afterthought it can be noted that if James 1:18 indeed refers to the 'word of the kingdom' (or 'word' in any case related to Jesus' preaching) that would be a very fitting overture to this parallel, where we encounter a similar usage of 'word', culminating in 'the perfect law that gives

¹⁵³ Cf. R. Alan Culpepper, 'Jesus Sayings in the Johannine Discourses: A proposal', in Paul N. Anderson & Tom Thatcher (eds.): *John, Jesus and History*, vol. 3: *Glimpses of Jesus through the Johannine Lens*, Atlanta: SBL, 2016, 353-382. Culpepper presents an overview of Jesus sayings that the Johannine discourses are built up around (cf. esp. the table on 357-59). Culpepper does not consider 13:17 to be such a *logion*, he does take 13:16 as such. There is, however (even within Culpepper's own methodology), good reason to consider not only 13:16, but also 13:17 as an original *logion*, especially considering its chreiaic nature.

freedom'.¹⁵⁴ Even more so when we account for the phrase 'word of truth' in 1:21, which in Paul denotes Gospel proclamation.¹⁵⁵

2.2.2 Acting out faith

The parable of 'hearing and doing' that James presents at the end of chapter 1 serves, together with 1:27, as an introduction of sorts to the second chapter. To 'do' the word (1:22-25), mirrors 'looking after widows and orphans in their distress' (1:27). James 2 first focuses on the poor (2:1-13) and then on acting out faith ('works': 2:14-26).

2.2.2.1 James 2:1

The first parallel to Jesus Tradition can be found in 2:1. Wachob calls it a 'global allusion':¹⁵⁶

Jas.2:1

My brothers and sisters, believers
in our glorious Lord Jesus Christ
must not show favoritism.

Ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ ἐν
προσωπολημψίας ἔχετε τὴν
πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης.

John 1:14a

The Word became flesh and made
his dwelling among us. We have
seen his glory

Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ
ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ
ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ

Cf. Mark 8:38-9:8//Matt.16:27-
17:9//Luke 9:26-36

2 Pet.1:16 Οὐ γὰρ
σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις
ἐξακολουθήσαντες
ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

¹⁵⁴ Deppe, *Sayings*, 140, attempts to overrule this reasoning: 'On the other hand, the admission that Jas. 1:18,21,22 refer to the gospel does not entail that a dominical saying was in James' mind since the church constantly spoke of the gospel apart from sayings of Jesus.' Such a statement, however, seems hard to prove. The opposite may just as well be true: the Early Church would *never* speak of the Gospel without having Jesus' sayings in mind.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. 2 Cor.6:7; Eph.1:13; Col.1:5; 2 Tim.2:15.

¹⁵⁶ Wesley Hiram Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*, 122: '... it evokes the whole of what our author perceives Jesus to have believed, said and done.'

δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν ἀλλ'
ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου
μεγαλειότητος.

The unusually long cluster of genitives in 2:1 (τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης) has led many to doubt the integrity of the verse. The Greek is notably awkward for the otherwise highly able James. Spitta, Massebiaux and more recently Allison suppose that Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is an interpolation.¹⁵⁷ This is a minority standpoint. Davids notes that the ‘piling up of titles’ is not unusual in homiletic and liturgical use.¹⁵⁸

To associate Jesus with God’s glory is not uncommon in the New Testament (cf. Rom.8:17; 1 Cor.2:8 τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν; Tit.2:13 τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Certainly, Luke and John present Jesus as ‘glorified’, not only at the transfiguration or the parousia, but from his very appearance onwards.¹⁵⁹ It would be futile to try to point out one particular verse from the Jesus Tradition as a possible parallel to James 2:1, but it is clear that Jesus’ *glory* (however it is intended here) is an idea which is at home in Jesus Tradition.

The notion not to show favoritism does introduce a theme which is closely related to a theme that is prominent in the Sermon on the Mount and will be touched upon by James more directly later (cf. ch. 2.2.3.3 below).

2.2.2.2 James 2:5

In James 2:5 we find a very close parallel to a well-known saying of Jesus:

¹⁵⁷ Allison, *James*, ad loc.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Allison, *James*, 384.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. P.H.R.van Houwelingen, ‘John and the others. To whom does the “we” in the Fourth Gospel’s prologue and epilogue refer?’, *Fides Reformata* XIX, n° 2 (2014):95-115.

Jas.2:5

Listen, my dear brothers and sisters: Has not God chosen those who are poor in the eyes of the world to be rich in faith and to inherit the kingdom he promised those who love him?

ἀκούσατε, ἀδελφοί μου
ἀγαπητοί· οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο
τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ
πλουσίους ἐν πίστει καὶ
κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας ἧς
ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν
αὐτόν;

Luke 6:20b//Gos.Thom54//Pol.Phil.2:3b

Blessed are [you who are] poor, for yours is the kingdom of God.

Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα
ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Matt.5:3

Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ
πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ
βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Rev.2:9

οἶδά σου ... τὴν πτωχείαν, ἀλλὰ
πλούσιος εἶ

The **verbal agreement** is quite obvious here: τοὺς πτωχοὺς - οἱ πτωχοί; βασιλείας - βασιλεία. Matthew is the only one who has kingdom of *heaven* and poor *in spirit*. Otherwise, Polycarp seems to follow Matthew's order, as he conjoins the first and last beatitude of Matthew 5:2-12, which share the identical promise of inheriting the kingdom. As mentioned above, there is also meaningful verbal correspondence with Revelation 2:9: πτωχοὺς - πτωχείαν; πλουσίους - πλούσιος.

On the **propositional** level, both James and Jesus (in the beatitude) state that *the kingdom is for the poor*. Moreover, James seems to presuppose the knowledge of this proposition with his readers ('has God not chosen ... he promised to those who love him'), which indicates he is referring to source material. With regard to Revelation 2:9, it is noteworthy that both authors share the directly stated idea of reversal: *the poor are [or: will be] actually rich*. Considering the probable (indirect) relationship of James 1:12 to Revelation 2:10, it would seem likely that once again there is dependence on a mutual source, which is somehow related to the

beatitudes as we know them. In this case James seems to be quite overt and not very sophisticated in the combining of sources, by simply adding up the numbers, supplying the verse with slight theological rationale (between square brackets):

- a) the poor [in the eyes of the world] are chosen
- b) to be rich [in faith] (Rev.2:9)
- c) and will inherit the kingdom (Luke 6:20)¹⁶⁰

Conceptual analogy is provided by the realization that James holds Jesus' reassuring promises for those who suffer presently in high esteem, indirectly referring to them on several occasions (cf. 1:2; 1:12; 5:7-11): it seems that whenever James wants to give meaning to the trials and suffering of the present age, he does so by referring to the beatitudes. The **accessibility** is an obvious matter in this case: it is precisely the same as with James 1:12.

2.2.2.3 James 2:8

James 2:8 features an Old Testament quote, which does belong in this list, since it is also part of Jesus Tradition:

Jas.2:8

If you really keep the royal law found in Scripture, "Love your neighbor as yourself," you are doing right.

Εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε·

Considering James' overall knowledge of Jesus Tradition, it seems natural to assume that he knew of the 'chief commandment'-tradition (Mark 12:28-34//Matt.22:34-40//Luke 10:25-37), and deliberately cites this verse of Scripture to bring that out.

¹⁶⁰ Deppe, *Sayings*, 149, emphasizes the uniquely Christian value of the statement: '[T]here are no references in the OT, intertestamental literature, or the Talmud specifically saying that God gives the kingdom to the poor'.

Leviticus 19:12-18 is often alluded to in the epistle.¹⁶¹ It appears that the author believes the entire passage (which is indeed spearheaded by 19:18c) to carry forward Jesus' intentions.¹⁶²

The 'faith of Jesus' (2:1) is thus shown in God's love of the poor (2:5), and the readiness of the elect to love their neighbor as themselves.

2.2.2.4 James 2:11

A somewhat surprising parallel may be found in James 2:11, which shares some words with an *agraphon* in which Jesus is depicted as responding to a man working on the sabbath:

Jas.2:11

For he who said, "You shall not commit adultery," also said, "You shall not murder." If you do not commit adultery but do commit murder, you have become a lawbreaker.

ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν· μὴ μοιχεύσης, εἶπεν
καί· μὴ φονεύσης· εἰ δὲ οὐ
μοιχεύεις, φονεύεις δέ, γέγονας
παραβάτης νόμου.

Luke 6:4 (addition from Codex D)

Man, if you know what you do,
you are blessed.
If you do not know what you do,
you are cursed and a transgressor
of the law

ανθρωπε, ει μεν οιδας τι ποιεις,
μακαριος ει· ει δε μη οιδας,
επικαταρατος και παραβατης ει
του νομου.

The **verbal agreement** is easily established. Both verses share the term *παραβάτης νόμου*; 'transgressor of the law'. This term also features in Paul, but nowhere else in the New Testament or pagan or Jewish texts.¹⁶³ In Romans 2:25.27 Paul is making a similar case (although in a very different context) as James: it may seem as though the circumcisers are upholding the law, yet they will break it on some point, sooner or later, and thereby can be regarded as lawbreakers (*παραβάτης νόμου*, cp. Gal.2:18). As James's, Paul's treatment of this subject is steered by the stringent warning not to judge (Rom.2:1-3). Both Jesus (in the *agraphon* under discussion) and Paul argue the case that it is possible to bypass

¹⁶¹ Cf. Johnson, 'The Use'.

¹⁶² Cf. Wachob, *The Voice*, 117-128.

¹⁶³ Allison, *James*, 410.

some of Moses' commandments and *not* be a lawbreaker. But can James' **proposition** be thought to underline a statement like that? Such a thing would seem to be out of character for this Jewish-Christian epistle. However, first of all, James is not expounding the necessity to keep all the commandments: he is rather trying to prove that breaking the love command of Leviticus 19:18 is an act of transgression (2:8-9). Second, James' repeated emphasis on 'the law of freedom' or 'the royal law' is probably to be understood in relation to Jesus' teaching: James reads Moses through the lenses of Jesus. If this is the case, that would mean that for James the statement of 2:8 ('If you really keep the royal law found in Scripture 'love your neighbor as yourself', you are doing right') points to an *overriding* quality of the love command: Jesus, not Moses, is the final law-giver, though Jesus is eventually to be seen as in agreement with Moses. **Propositional agreement** may be hard to pin down, since the *agraphon* is a puzzling maxim, but at least both verses can be said to *indirectly* communicate that *being a transgressor of the law is dependent on different factors than is usually assumed*. Jesus is saying: it is not strictly *what* you do, but also *how and why* you do what you do that matters. James is saying: strict observance of several independent commandments will not keep you from being a transgressor against the overriding love commandment (which is of course commensurate with Jesus on several other instances, notably Matt.23: 23) The love command in turn introduces the notion of *motivation* into the endeavor of keeping the law.

However, if we consider **conceptual analogy**, we have to acknowledge that Jesus' application of this principle to the *Sabbath* law is very distinct, and hard to swallow for a Jewish-Christian community. The Lukan addition (by all means a scribal addition, though probably not a scribal *invention*) is right at home within the pericope of Luke 6:1-11, but the general thrust of that passage (i.e.: Jesus is lord over the Sabbath, cf. 6:5) does not resonate anywhere in the epistle of James. Moreover, the **accessibility** of such a saying would be hard to establish. It may be very old, it may even be a faithful rendering of Jesus' words, but there is no way of establishing its provenance.

In short, it does not seem very likely that James would pick up this particular saying for his argument, even if its content is in a way related to what he is saying. Yet Paul and James's agreement with the *agraphon* remains striking.

2.2.2.5 James 2:13

A next parallel is found in 2:13:

Jas.2:13

For judgment will be without mercy to anyone who has shown no mercy; mercy triumphs over judgment.

ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαν τι ἔλεος· κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως.

Matt.5:7

Blessed are the merciful, for they will receive mercy

μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται

1 Clem.13:2b

Show mercy, that you may be shown mercy

ἐλεᾶτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε

On a **verbal** level, the mere repetitious *mercy* may seem too little to go by. However, the beatitude's μακάριοι can easily be understood as eschatological (and probably should be understood as such), putting it in touch with James' κρίσις: Jesus' economy of reversal could easily provoke the question: 'well, if the poor and the merciful are the blessed ones, what then about the rich and the *unmerciful*?' These questions are answered in Luke's corresponding woes. Luke, unlike Matthew, does not present the beatitude for the merciful. It is however entirely conceivable that it was, at a certain place and time, part of the double tradition's underlying source, including a corresponding woe. Its presence in Clement's catena of Jesus teaching (*1 Clem.* 13:2) vouches for its seniority. One might be tempted to regard the simpler, shorter version of Clement more 'original' than the beatitude of Matthew, but that is not necessary: it is just as probable that the catena of *1 Clement* is intentionally comprised for mnemonic purposes.

Apart from that, the **propositional** overlap is meaningful: there is *mercy for the merciful*. James of course presents this in a negation (no mercy for the non-merciful), but then adds a concluding wisdom statement ('mercy triumphs over judgment'), which seems to vindicate the merciful after all.¹⁶⁴

The **conceptual analogy** is further strengthened by the general apparent familiarity of the epistle to the beatitudes. Of course, the **accessibility** of Matthew 5:7 is likely. It is, however, in this particular case appropriate to imagine a piece of tradition that we do not actually possess: a 'woe' in the Lukan version (cp. Luke 6:24-26) corresponding to the Matthean beatitude (Matt.5:7). Should such a saying have existed (in a 'double tradition-source'), it would have been very close verbally and propositionally to James 2:13a-b (it may even have contained the *hapax ἀνέλεος*¹⁶⁵). If this would indeed have been the case, James' reworking of the saying is modest: he then does not do much more than add the rationale *mercy triumphs over judgment*.

2.2.2.6 James 2:15-16

Another 'apocryphal' parallel may be found in James 2:15-16, which shares a number of features with a saying from the *Hebrew Gospel*, where Jesus addresses the rich young ruler:

Jas.2:15-16

Suppose a brother or a sister is without clothes and daily food. If one of you says to them, "Go in peace; keep warm and well fed," but does nothing about their physical needs, what good is it?

ἐὰν ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοὶ ὑπάρχωσιν καὶ λειπόμενοι ὧσιν

Hebrew Gospel

How can you say, 'I have done the law and the prophets,' since it is written in the law: Love your neighbor as yourself; and behold, your many brothers, who are sons of Abraham, are covered in dung, dying from hunger, while your house is filled with many good things, and not one of the good

¹⁶⁴ Deppe, *Sayings*, 164, points to the parallel of Hos.6:5.7 LXX, where judgment is the result of Israel's lack of mercy. This is meaningful, to be sure, but in no way does it exclude the likelihood of an allusion to Jesus Tradition.

¹⁶⁵ Assuming the source would also have been in Greek.

τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς,
εἵπη δέ τις αὐτοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν·
ὕπάγετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, θερμαίνεσθε
καὶ χορτάζεσθε, μὴ δῶτε δὲ
αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος,
τί τὸ ὄφελος;

things goes out to them.

“Quomodo dicis ‘legem feci et prophetas’? quoniam scriptum est in lege: diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum, et ecce multi fratres tui filii Abahae amicti sunt stercore, morientes prae fame, et domus tua plena est multis bonis, et non egreditur omnino aliquid ex ad eos. (in Origen, Comm.Matt. 15.14)¹⁶⁶

1 John 3:17-18: If anyone has material possessions and sees a brother or sister in need but has no pity on them, how can the love of God be in that person?
Dear children, let us not love with words or speech but with actions and in truth.

The **verbal agreement** is of course difficult to establish, since we have James in Greek and Origen only in a Latin translation. Both passages have the noun ‘brother’, yet this is hardly impressive in itself. It is even less impressive since James has (rather exceptionally): ‘brother *and* sister’. And in the parallel the noun is in the plural.

The **propositional agreement** is all the more interesting, especially when we consider the parallel passage from 1 John. All three passages consist of a rhetorical question whose main point is: *if you do not meet the material needs of a wanting brother, you are acting unjustly*. It is also quite striking that 1 John 3:18 summarizes the proper course of action by opposing the keywords λόγος and γλῶσσᾶ with ἔργα, which are key terms with the same basic meaning for James in his entire letter. The likeness of the

¹⁶⁶ Text and translation taken from Edwards, *Hebrew Gospel*, 269.

passages in James and 1 John has often been noted,¹⁶⁷ but the likeness they have to the passage from the *Hebrew Gospel* seems to have been overlooked.

The **conceptual analogy** is very strong as well: all three passages are dealing with the love command (cf. ch. 4.2.1). In the passage from the *Hebrew Gospel* this is clear and outspoken. James 2:15-16 stands at the head of a new pericope (2:14-26), but is still to be read as connected to the argument of 2:1-13, of which the command not to show favoritism, and the love command of Leviticus 19:18 were central. It is precisely *this* rendering of the story of the rich young ruler that suits James' argument.

With regard to the **accessibility** of the passage it should be noted that many of the Jewish-Christian ('Hebrew') Gospel fragments appear to be akin to much Synoptic material, especially when compared to *Thomas*. The above passage may belong to an early first century version of the story of the rich young ruler. Therefore, we should accept the possibility that the first-century author of the Epistle of James (and 1 John) could know this tradition. Just as the traditions of Jesus' attitude concerning the Sabbath automatically inspired a copyist to add the *agraphon* we find in Luke 6:5 in Codex D, the present saying may have been known widely to belong to the story of the rich young ruler.

The fragment from the *Hebrew Gospel* thus forms a plausible background to the passages from both James and 1 John. James retained the general feel of the *logion*: he still presents a rhetorical question confronting his audience with the same dilemma that the rich young ruler faced. However, James takes the general principle out of the story and forms an independent simile, with a prophetic wisdom outlook.

2.2.3 Minding the tongue

After having treated the idea of 'acting out faith' in chapter 2, James moves on to his second major subject, 'minding the tongue', in chapter 3, and, later on, in 4:11-12. The basic notion is summarized in 1:26, but introduced concisely in 1:19-21, where the author warns his readers to be quick to hear, slow to speak and humbly *accept* the word.

¹⁶⁷ Allison, *James*, 467, cf. also Nienhuis, *Not by Paul*, 214-15.

2.2.3.1 James 3:12

A first parallel occurs in James 3:12:

Jas. 3:12

My brothers and sisters, can a fig tree bear olives, or a grapevine bear figs? Neither can a salt spring produce fresh water.

μη δύναται, ἀδελφοί μου, συκῆ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι ἢ ἄμπελος σῦκα; οὔτε ἀλυκὸν γλυκὺ ποιῆσαι ὕδωρ.

Jas. 3:10-11

Out of the same mouth come praise and cursing...
Can both fresh water and salt water flow from the same spring?

Luke 6:44//Matt.7:16//Gos.Thom. 45a

Each tree is recognized by its own fruit. People do not pick figs from thornbushes, or grapes from briars.

ἕκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν σῦκα οὐδὲ ἐκ βᾶτου σταφυλὴν τρυγῶσιν.

Luke 6:43-45//Matt. 7:16-20 &12:33-35//Gos.Thom. 45//Ign.Eph. 14:2b

- Each tree is recognized by its own
- No figs from thornbushes
- No good tree bears bad fruit
- Good man good, evil man evil treasure
- Out of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaks

The parallel on the exact **verbal** level is not very strong here. However, the basic **propositional** notion is retained: *it is impossible to harvest a certain type of fruit from another type of plant*. James presents a reversal (olives from fig tree and figs from grapevines), whereas Jesus speaks of the impossibility of harvesting good fruit from worthless shrubs. The element of impossibility (taking the good from the worthless) is present in James' example of the fresh water from the salt spring, which immediately precedes the remark under discussion.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁸ According to Deppe, *Sayings*, 169, the fact that James presents a reversal, instead of the Jesus Tradition motif of harvesting the good from the bad, proves that James cannot be alluding to the Jesus *logion*. However, Deppe pays virtually no attention (throughout) to the rhetorical appropriation that is to be expected from an author such as James.

Gospel of Thomas 45 follows the order of Luke 6:43-45, although it is closer to Matthew on a verbal level. The tradition in the way Luke presents it is probably the senior and seems to be split in two in Matthew's case (Matt. 7:16-20 & 12:33-35), so that in Matthew 7 the notion of 'fruit' is less exclusively tied to 'speech', as in *Thomas* and Luke, and even in Ignatius *to the Ephesians* (however: cp. Matt.7:21 and Ign.*Eph.* 4:2c). The basic **conceptual** notion of 'speech' is exactly what makes this allusion fit in James 3.

Both verses immediately prior to James 3:12 hold aphorisms that seem to be building on Jesus' words in the same way as 3:12. It is probably a safe assumption that James utilizes his saying on olives and grapes as the centerpiece, so that his readers/audience would be reminded of Jesus' catena of similes as we know it from Luke 6:43-45, where three out of five sayings mention tree and fruit, and the final saying connects it to proper speech. It is true that sayings such as James's and Jesus's are far from unique in antiquity. Yet James' constant interaction with Jesus Tradition makes the present parallel.

2.2.3.2 James 3:18

More fruit-related prose is found in James 3:18:

Jas.3:18

And a [fruit] of righteousness is sown in peace for those who make peace.

καρπὸς δὲ δικαιοσύνης ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιῶσιν εἰρήνην.

Matt.5:9

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God
μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται.

A remarkable verbal parallel seems to exist here in the notion of 'peacemaking'. However, ποιέω + εἰρήνη is in fact a common combination in classical Greek and in the Septuagint; this combination in itself should not automatically signal an allusion to the above *logion*. εἰρηνοποιοί in Matthew is an uncommon word.

If James is alluding to the *logion* it would seem appropriate for him to improve on the odd Greek.

Allison¹⁶⁹ believes 3:13-18 to allude to Isaiah 32:15-20:

Until a spirit from on high is poured out on us, and the wilderness becomes a fruitful field, and the fruitful field is deemed a forest. Then justice will dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness abide in the fruitful field. **The effect of righteousness will be peace, and the result of righteousness, quietness and trust forever.** My people will abide in a peaceful habitation, in secure dwellings, and in quiet resting places. The forest will disappear completely, and the city will be utterly laid low. **Happy will you be who sow** beside every stream, who let the ox and the donkey range freely.

This is probably correct, but there is no reason to believe it may not allude to the Jesus saying as well.

The word-pair *sowing* + *fruit* forms a somewhat odd couple in this verse: both words regularly resound in Jesus' teaching (as in other Jewish wisdom teaching). In fact, the parable of the *sower* in Matthew speaks of 'children of the kingdom' (Matt.13:38), in parallel to Matthew 5:9's 'children of God'. Perhaps James consciously combined both sayings, in order to bring out his version of a 'righteous fruit'-saying.

The basic **proposition** *peace for peacemakers* does have a distinct Jesus Tradition ring to it (cp. *mercy for the merciful*), although it does not fully describe what either Jesus, or James is saying. The **conceptual analogy** is strengthened on the one hand because of the link with 'good fruit' in the preceding verse, which seems to refer back to the 'fig' in 3:12, a verse that has a parallel (as was established above) in Luke 6:44 (& parallels). On the other hand, there is the link with the 'implanted word' in James 1:21, which has conceptual overlap with the pericope of 3:13-18 and the notion of the parable of the sower.

All in all, it is quite likely that James has formulated his saying with the Jesus *logion* in his mind. When we consider it plausible that James would have had **access** to this *logion* (a beatitude from the Sermon on the Mount, be it strictly Matthean), it seems equally implausible that James

¹⁶⁹ Allison, *James*, 587.

would mention ‘peace-making’ without considering what Jesus had said about it.

2.2.3.3 James 4:11-12

Another parallel connected to the subject matter of ‘minding the tongue’ is James 4:11-12:

Jas.4:11-12

Do not speak evil against one another, brothers and sisters. Whoever speaks evil against another or judges another, speaks evil against the law and judges the law; but if you judge the law, you are not a doer of the law but a judge.

There is one lawgiver and judge who is able to save and to destroy. So who, then, are you to judge your neighbor?

Μὴ καταλαεῖτε ἀλλήλων, ἀδελφοί. ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἢ κρίνων τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καταλαεῖ νόμου καὶ κρίνει νόμον· εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις, οὐκ εἶ ποιητῆς νόμου ἀλλὰ κριτῆς. εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ νομοθέτης καὶ κριτῆς ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι· σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων τὸν πλησίον;

Matt. 7:1-2a // Luke 6:37

Do not judge, so that you may not be judged.

For with the judgment you make you will be judged

Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε

Here the **verbal agreement** (around the verb κρίνειν) is not very impressive, since κρίνειν comes in to play fairly regularly in an eschatological discourse.

Propositionally, however, there is highly meaningful overlap. Both seem to be saying *if you act like a judge, you place yourself under [God’s] judgment*. It may seem strange that James in this instance equates the ‘brother’ and the ‘law’. This can be explained when we read these verses in connection

to 2:8-13, where we also read of law and judgment. The overriding quality of the love command steers the meaning of ‘law’ there, and the love command of Leviticus 19:8c is itself called the ‘royal’ law in that instance.¹⁷⁰ If the love of the neighbor (or ‘the brother’) is the principle requirement of the law, James’ equation starts to make sense. The present occurrence of ποιητής νόμου points back to 1:22-25, which strengthens the impression that James is consciously working out the theme of ‘law’ in three steps: 1:22-25; 2:8-13 and 4:11-12. Thus, James has appropriated Jesus’ saying into his letter in a rather sophisticated way. He uses it to tie different motifs together (law; judgment; proper speech) and does so by combining sources skillfully, since the verses seem to allude to Leviticus 19:15 (another prohibition of slander) as well. Further **conceptual analogy** is found in James 2:2-7, which may indirectly presuppose Jesus’ prohibition on judging others (those verses certainly also allude to Leviticus 19:15). The **accessibility** is once again settled: The *logion* is part of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain.

Romans 2:1¹⁷¹ and 14:4¹⁷² form interesting parallels: Paul appears to be doing the same as James. It is likely that both of them are thinking of Jesus’ prohibition against judging one another.

2.2.3.4 James 5:12

In a final instance of emphasizing proper speech, James presents a saying of Jesus, not alluding but paraphrasing (and perhaps even quoting) it:

Jas. 5:12

Above all, my brothers and sisters, do not swear—not by heaven or by earth or by anything else. All you need to say is a simple “Yes” or “No.” Otherwise you will be condemned.

Πρὸ πάντων δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ

Matt. 5:34-37

But I tell you, do not swear an oath at all: either by heaven, for it is God’s throne; or by the earth, for it is his footstool; or by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King. And do not swear by your head, for you cannot make even one hair white or black. All you

¹⁷⁰ This can mean either ‘principle law’ or ‘kingdom law’, or (likely) both of these combined in word-play.

¹⁷¹ Therefore you have no excuse, whoever you are, when you judge others; for in passing judgment on another you condemn yourself, because you, the judge, are doing the very same things.

¹⁷² Who are you to pass judgment on servants of another? It is before their own lord that they stand or fall. And they will be upheld, for the Lord is able to make them stand

ὁμνύετε μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε
τὴν γῆν μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὄρκον·
ἦτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὐ
οὐ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ κρίσιν πέσητε.

need to say is simply 'Yes' or
'No'; anything beyond this comes
from the evil one.
ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὁμόσαι
ὄλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὅτι
θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ θεοῦ,
μήτε ἐν τῇ γῆ, ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν ἐστιν
τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, μήτε εἰς
Ἱεροσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ
μεγάλου βασιλέως,
μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὁμόσης,
ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν
ποιῆσαι ἢ μέλαιναν.
ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναὶ ναί, οὐ
οὐ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ
πονηροῦ ἐστίν.

In this instance the **verbal agreement** is so overwhelming, that dependence seems to be impossible to deny. The variation between both sayings is reminiscent of the way Synoptic parallels of the triple tradition can vary among each other.

The question, then, is whether Matthew has embellished the saying, or that James has simplified it. Of course, we have so far dealt extensively with James' tendency to present Jesus *logia* in heavily reworked forms, often taking verses from Matthew as the supposed originals. However, in this case it might as well be Matthew who (with much less liberty, to be sure) felt free to present the saying a little better than the original known to him.

If the expression 'πρὸ πάντων δέ' could be taken as some sort of introduction formula, then we can assume James to directly *quote* Jesus. The parallel expression in 1 Peter 4:8 introduces the phrase 'love covers over a multitude of sins' (cf. Jas.5:20; 1 Cor. 13:7; 1 Clem.49:5; 2 Clem.16:4), which, in turn, may indeed go back to Jesus (cf. ch. 2.2.5.5). However, it may as well just mean 'most importantly', referring to either the string of

imperatives that follows it (5:12-20) or to 5:12 as the spearhead of teaching on proper speech.¹⁷³

James does add a rationale ('otherwise you will be condemned'), which seems to belong exclusively to his letter.

2.2.4 Asking is receiving

The notion of prayer is important to James. He has mentioned it twice already in his opening chapter. In both instances (1:5-7.17) he emphasizes the notion that prayer will be answered, as Jesus has before him.

2.2.4.1 James 4:3

In 4:3 James once again addresses the notion of prayer, referring back to 1:5-7, *and* to the Jesus Tradition parallels:

Jas.4:3

When you ask, you do not receive, because you ask with wrong motives, that you may spend what you get on your pleasures.

αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε.

Matt.7:7-8//Luke 11:9-10

'ask and it will be given to you'

Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν

...

'for everyone who asks, receives'

πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει

It seems that James elaborates not so much on the saying, as on his own introduction on the subject, which is obviously building on the *logion*.

It is noteworthy that James takes great liberty in construing his own saying here, construing his own logic, even. This shows on the one hand his independence of Jesus in shaping his sayings, on the other hand, its logic is connected to the reality his readers probably had to deal with:

¹⁷³ Cf. Allsion, *James*, 730-31.

when they prayed, they would not always receive, in spite of Jesus' promises.

2.2.4.2 James 5:17

Another piece of Jesus Tradition seems to be alluded to with regard to this theme:

Jas.5:17

Elijah was a human being, even as we are. He prayed earnestly that it would not rain, and it did not rain on the land for three and a half years.

Ἡλίας ἄνθρωπος ἦν ὁμοιοπαθῆς ἡμῖν καὶ προσευχῆ προσηύξατο τοῦ μὴ βρέξει, καὶ οὐκ ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἑνιαυτοῦς τρεῖς καὶ μῆνας ἕξ.

Luke 4:25

I assure you that there were many widows in Israel in Elijah's time, when the sky was shut for three and a half years and there was a severe famine throughout the land.

ἐπ' ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, πολλὰ χῆραι ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡλίου ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτε ἐκλείσθη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, ὡς ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν

The **verbal agreement** is quite obvious in these verses. Both refer to the story of 'Elijah' who had prayed for rain. Both exclusively inform us that the period of drought that followed lasted 'three and a half years'. Since we know of no other source regarding this exact duration, we might conclude that both Luke and James must have learned this information via Jesus Tradition.

However, **positionally** and **conceptually**, both verses have little or no overlap. James is emphasizing the power of prayer, pointing to the effect of Elijah's prayer. Jesus is not interested in Elijah's prayer, and only mildly in the duration of its effect. He is rather informing his listeners on the gentile characters in 1 and 2 Kings, who share in the divine blessings, over against the Israelites.

In effect, it is just as likely that the tradition about the duration of the period of drought belonged to a piece of Jewish tradition,¹⁷⁴ to which both Jesus (or Luke) and James had **access**.

2.2.5 Reversal of fate

The theme 'reversal of fate' is very meaningful for James. On the one hand it is connected to the attention he pays to the poor throughout the epistle. Yet it is most evidently connected to his eschatological focus on testing and suffering (1:2-4; 1:12-15). The theme is connected to the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain but might just as well be influenced by the corresponding woes (Luke 6:24-27).

2.2.5.1 James 4:4

In 4:4 James speaks of *adulterers*, a notion which may be on loan from Jesus Tradition:

Jas.4:4

Adulterers! Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God? Therefore whoever wishes to be a friend of the world becomes an enemy of God.

μοιχαλίδες, οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου ἔχθρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν; ὃς ἂν οὖν βουλευθῆ φίλος εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσταται.

Matt.12:39 (cf. Matt.16:4; Mark 8:38)

But he answered them, "An evil and adulterous generation asks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah.

ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου.

Other than the **verbal** parallel μοιχαλίδες /μοιχαλὶς, there is not much to connect these verses. A mere word could be enough to establish an allusion, but hardly in this case. It is more likely that James is thinking (as of course Jesus is) of i.e. Hosea (1:2; 3:1), and other prophetic oracles:

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Allison, *James*, 778, for a brief discussion of the options.

he may or may not have been aware of Jesus' using this tradition in this way.

2.2.5.2 James 4:9

In James 4:9 the theme is picked up, in analogy to a Lukan beatitude and woe:

Jas.4:9

Grieve, mourn and wail. Change your laughter to mourning and your joy to gloom.

ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ πενθήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε. ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μετατραπήτω καὶ ἡ χαρὰ εἰς κατήφειαν.

Luke 6:21b,25b

Blessed are you who weep now, for you will laugh. ...
Woe to you who laugh now, for you will mourn and weep.

μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν, ὅτι γελάσετε. ...
οὐαὶ, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.

John 16:20

Very truly I tell you, you will weep and mourn while the world rejoices. You will grieve, but your grief will turn to joy.

ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι κλαύσετε καὶ θρηνήσετε ὑμεῖς, ὁ δὲ κόσμος χαρήσεται· ὑμεῖς λυπηθήσεσθε, ἀλλ' ἡ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται.

Matt. 5:4 μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες

With regard to verbal agreement, Allison indicates that the verbs *πενθέω* and *κλαίω* often appear paired with each other.¹⁷⁵ The combination with *ταλαιπωρήσατε* is odd but may be explained as a nod toward *ταλαιπωρία* in 5:1. Allison also lists a number of Old

¹⁷⁵ Allison, *James*, 629-30.

Testament parallels on ‘feasting’ (etc.) turned into mourning, yet none of them have γελάω, as Luke and James share with one another. The parallel of the nearby 5:1 to Luke 6:25 makes it all the more likely that James is here referring to a tradition close to Luke. **Propositionally**, both share the idea (be it in differing manners) that *laughter* on the one and *weeping and mourning* on the other hand, *need to trade places*.

Instead of simply repeating or rephrasing the Jesus saying, James seems to pick up a strand of OT wisdom, first of all Ecclesiastes 3:4: ‘a time to weep and a time to laugh, a time to mourn and a time to dance,’ but probably also 7:2, ‘It is better to go to a house of mourning than to go to a house of feasting,’ since James emphasizes the weeping and mourning, and leaves out the future laughter and feasting (which does not fit his purposes here). James is apparently familiar with the Jesus saying, but he wants to make sure his readers understand that the time of laughter is not just now, since now repentance is called for. In this, he has John’s version of the saying on his side: If grief is to turn into joy, *now is the time for mourning and weeping*. John, in turn, seems to have reworked the Lukan twin-saying into one, even more comprehensively than James.¹⁷⁶ On the level of **conceptual analogy**, James is close enough to the Lukan saying(s). The element of reversal is one-sided here (James does not express that grief in turn will be replaced by joy), but elsewhere (1:2; 1:12) James shows knowledge of this element of Jesus Tradition. His preference for the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain forms enough of a cumulative argument to think of the present verse as an allusion to the Lukan *logia*.

2.2.5.3 James 4:10

The next verse seems to depend on a piece of Jesus Tradition that also emphasizes the reversal of fate for the faithful Christian:

¹⁷⁶ Culpepper (‘Jesus Sayings in the Johannine Discourses’) does not count John 16:20 among the original *logia* that were presented by the fourth evangelist. However, again, a good case can be made for it, especially considering the ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, with which the verse opens.

Jas.4:10

Humble yourselves before the Lord, and he will lift you up.

ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου
καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς.

Matt.23:12//Luke 14:11;18:14b

For those who exalt themselves will be humbled, and those who humble themselves will be exalted.

ὅστις δὲ ὑψώσει ἑαυτὸν
ταπεινωθήσεται καὶ ὅστις
ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.

The main **proposition** *humble yourselves, and you will be exalted [by God]* is perfectly retained by James, as are the main **verbs** *ταπεινώ* and *ὑψώ*. James adds the idea that the faithful should humble themselves *before the Lord*. This, in combination with the fact that James is still working out the quotation of Proverbs 3:34 (Jas.4:6), forms something of a rationale for the saying: The faithful should humble themselves *before God*, for ‘He resists the proud, but shows favor to the humble’.

With regard to **conceptual analogy** the context in Matthew 23 seems to be fitting for James. Matthew 23:8-10 can be read as a warning from Jesus against presuming a teaching position. This is precisely the sort of thing James keeps telling his readers. The contexts of either Luke 14 or 18 are less fitting. In both cases the saying follows a parable with a more eschatological outlook. However, a literal relation need not be established, since the saying may have, in all likelihood, been quoted by heart and was probably known well enough to be recalled apart from any context. One can also imagine the saying to be transmitted in the same context as the beatitudes and woes, since it corresponds quite closely to them.

All in all, it seems likely that James would have had **access** to the saying and very likely that he has shaped his saying on its basis.

2.2.5.4 James 5:7-9

A possible parallel to Jesus’ apocalyptic teaching is found in 5:7-9:

Jas.5:7-9

Be patient, then, brothers and

Mark 13:28-29.35-36//Matt.24:32-33.45-51//Luke

sisters, until the Lord's coming. See how the farmer waits for the land to yield its valuable crop, patiently waiting for the autumn and spring rains. You too, be patient and stand firm, because the Lord's coming is near. Don't grumble against one another, brothers and sisters, or you will be judged. The Judge is standing at the door!

Μακροθυμήσατε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου. ἰδοὺ ὁ γεωργὸς ἐκδέχεται τὸν τίμιον καρπὸν τῆς γῆς μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, ἕως λάβῃ πρόϊμον καὶ ὄψιμον.

μακροθυμήσατε καὶ ὑμεῖς, στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου ἤγγικεν.

μὴ στενάζετε, ἀδελφοί, κατ' ἀλλήλων, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· ἰδοὺ ὁ κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἔστηκεν.

12:42-46

“Now learn this lesson from the fig tree: As soon as its twigs get tender and its leaves come out, you know that summer is near. Even so, when you see these things happening, you know that it is near, right at the door. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ἤδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς ἀπαλὸς γένηται καὶ ἐκφύη τὰ φύλλα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν· οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδητε ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις.

...

“Therefore keep watch because you do not know when the owner of the house will come back—whether in the evening, or at midnight, or when the rooster crows, or at dawn. If he comes suddenly, do not let him find you sleeping.

γρηγορεῖτε οὖν· οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται, ἢ ὄψε ἢ μεσονύκτιον ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ἢ πρωτῆ, μὴ ἐλθῶν ἐξαίφνης εὖρη ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας.

Rev.3:20a

Ἴδοὺ ἔστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν καὶ κρούω ...

This parallel is not very certain. There is little **verbal** overlap (‘at the door’: πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἔστηκεν - ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις) and there is only

tentative resemblance to the Olivet Discourse parallel. Yet the overlap is meaningful.

Both texts consider the notion of patiently awaiting the arrival of the Lord;¹⁷⁷ both stress that the arrival will come suddenly; both use an agricultural metaphor for the passing of the time that separates the hearers from the return of the Lord; both texts warn for the imminent judgment that is part of the *parousia*. The notion of the judge at the doorstep is also found in Revelation 3:20 (ἔστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν). The **verbal agreement** to that verse is noteworthy: the infliction of the verb in Revelation is closer to James (I stand/he stands, whereas Mark simply has ἔστυ), the preposition is the same as in Mark.

Conceptual analogy is of course very clear: the *parousia* of the Lord is the subject in all three cases. **Propositional agreement** can be stated as such: *Natural phenomena teach us that we must patiently await things that nevertheless will come undoubtedly and swiftly, such as the Lord's return, which is at the door.*¹⁷⁸

The **access** James might have had to the Olivet Discourse can be debated: it is a different strand of tradition from the ones James usually seems to refer to. However, the remarkable mix in wording of the parallels to Revelation 3:20 and Mark 13:29 reveal that the source of James may have been older than and different from Mark 13 (cf. 6.1.1.7 below).

2.2.5.5 James 5:20

A final verse that attracts attention is 5:20:

Jas.5:20

remember this: Whoever turns a sinner from the error of their way will save them from death and cover over a multitude of sins.

1 Pet.4:8//1 Clem.49:5//2

Clem.16:4//Didascalia 2.3

love covers over a multitude of sins.

ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν

¹⁷⁷ Davids, *James*, 131-32 and Painter, *James*, 161, both consider τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου to relate to Jesus' coming in judgment as Lord. However, Allison, *James*, 699, debates this.

¹⁷⁸Allison, *James*, 708, refers to a tradition handed down by Hegesippus (in Eusebius, *H.E.* 2.23.12) in which scribes and Pharisees asked James what he meant by 'the door of Jesus'. In response James referred to Jesus' return and enthronement, upon which James was executed.

γινωσκέτω ὅτι ὁ ἐπιστρέψας
ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ
σώσει ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐκ θανάτου
καὶ καλύψει πληθὸς ἁμαρτιῶν.

Clement of Alexandria, *The*

Instructor 3.12; *Miscellanies* 4.8:

Yes, indeed, concerning love also
he says: Love covers a multitude of
sins.

Ναι, μην και περι αγαπης· Αγαπη,
φησι, καλυπτει πληθος αμαρτιων.

(Cp. 1 Cor.13:4)

In this instance there is no direct parallel to a saying we know to be of Jesus, but to a saying that led a life of its own in the Early Church: ‘love covers a multitude of sins.’ Love, in this instance, is to be taken strictly as ‘charity’ or even ‘alms’. The question is: where did this saying come from; could it possibly belong to an unknown strand of Jesus Tradition?

It appears that Clement of Alexandria believed it to be. Clement might be called the champion of *agrapha*. One could discard this as a personal hobby. On the other hand, one could also conclude that Clement had both a personal interest in *and* a broader knowledge of and access to Jesus Tradition than we have today.

Clement, in the third book of *The Instructor*, is usually quite exact in quoting. As a rule he quotes directly. Sometimes saying ‘the word says’, but usually more specific: ‘Moses’, ‘the apostle’ or ‘the Lord’ ‘says’. In the direct context of the alleged dominical saying he is presenting a catena of Jesus *logia*, apparently from all types of sources. The perceived *logion* he presents directly prior to ‘love covers over a multitude of sins’, however, is a verse taken from the Book of Proverbs (13:11). Likewise, the saying under discussion is often perceived as a variation of a verse from Proverbs (10:12: it is very similar to MT, but LXX, which is usually followed by James, is markedly different in this instance¹⁷⁹), which is completely understandable, but does not resolve the issue of how and why the saying appears so often in Early Christian literature in exactly

¹⁷⁹ MT: לְעַלְיוֹתָיִם כָּל־הַכֹּסֶף הַכֹּסֶף; LXX: πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φίλια, cf. Allison, *James*, 788.

the same form. The *Didascalia*, which is broadly contemporary to Clement's writing, shows a similar pattern: the saying is presented as something 'the Lord said' (*Didasc.*2.3), but alongside a saying taken from Proverbs (15:1). It is noteworthy that the *Didascalia* offers some strings of quotations from the Book of Proverbs on other occasions.¹⁸⁰

What we have, then, is a saying that seems to be *treated as* a dominical saying in the Early Church, a saying that is similar to a saying known from Proverbs and is presented by the *Didascalia* and Clement of Alexandria *as a dominical saying*, but *alongside an actual quote from Proverbs which is also presented as a Jesus logion*.

Four possibilities present themselves:

1. Both the *Didascalia* and Clement misquoted: they mistakenly believed these sayings to be Jesus's, while in fact one was from Proverbs and the other an ecclesial variation of a saying from Proverbs.
2. They did not misquote: they had access to a source in which all of these sayings were presented as dominical.
3. Both the *Didascalia* and Clement knew the saying was not dominical, nor did they claim it was. Sometimes Jesus Tradition and sayings from Proverbs were given alongside each other, both perceived as divine wisdom. The 'Lord says' is to be interpreted in this way.
4. They misquoted regarding the one account, but were correct on the other.

It is hard to decide which of these options is the more likely. A lot of quoting must have been done by heart, so a mistake is easily perceived, especially a swap between the proverbial wisdom collections 'Proverbs' and 'Jesus Tradition' (option 1). However, it is conceivable that options 2 and 3 offer a way out: a passage in *1 Clement* testifies to a similar procedure in quoting a large portion of Proverbs as divine wisdom, in such a way, that it is almost as though Jesus' words are quoted (*1 Clem.*

¹⁸⁰ Esp. 5-7; 40-48; 54-58. According to the edition of Margaret Dunlop Gibson (*The Didascalia Apostolorum in English*, Cambridge: University Press: 2011 [1903], xiv) *Didascalia* quotes Proverbs 29 times, which exceeds its number of Psalms quotations, although the number of references to Isaiah are even greater.

57:3-7). If Proverbs played a role in 'catechetical' instructions for Early Christian congregations, a mix-up is conceivable. The *Didache* is another early example where this plays a role.¹⁸¹

There remains the possibility that the saying under discussion was known as a dominical saying. This would make sense, when we regard how the saying is appropriated by New Testament authors and Apostolic Fathers alike. It should also be borne in mind that 1 Corinthians, 1 Peter, 1 & 2 *Clement* all hold many quotes of and allusions to Jesus Tradition, probably more than other Early Christian epistles, apart from James.

James once again presents the saying in a distinct manner: The most important word ('love') is missing from his presentation, and the saying is transferred to the future tense. James combines the saying with another wisdom saying, so that in his presentation it is whoever turns another person away from sin, and so rescues him from death, 'covers over a multitude of sin'. For James, however, sin and judgment are connected throughout to the attitude towards the poor, which is exactly the kind of *agape* that is meant in the saying. So whatever the origin of the saying; James appropriates it in the way we have come to know of him.

¹⁸¹ The *Didache* is a very early writing (either late first or early second century) whose contents somehow seem to relate to what in later developments became (in a technical sense) 'catechism'. Its emphasis on the 'two ways' (a Christian 'version' of Jewish moral instruction) in combination with teaching on Baptism, Fasting, Eucharist and the parousia, correlates largely with catechism in later centuries (cf. M.E. Nelson, 'Catechesis and Baptism in the Early Christian Church', In *die Skriftig* 30 (4) 1996: 443-456 and Everett Ferguson, *The Early Church at Work and Worship*, vol. 2, Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2014, 2). It is telling that the first chapter of the *Didache* bases itself largely on Jesus Tradition, the second and third briefly on Mosaic commandments, but mostly on Proverbs.

2.3 An overview of parallels; preliminary conclusions

Below, the findings will be presented in tables that will provide some overview: The sayings derived from the Sermon on the Mount/Plain first; then sayings featured uniquely in non-Synoptic sources will follow and below that other Synoptic sayings (and their parallels in i.e. *Thomas* and Apostolic Fathers) will be listed.

Traditions from the Sermon on the Mount/Plain		
Text in Jas.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
1:2	One should rejoice when one is tried and tested	Matt.5:11-12a//Luke 6:22-23a
1:5-7	Ask and it will be given to you if you have faith and do not doubt	Matt.7:7-8//Luke 11:9-10 Matt.21:21-22// Mark 11:23-24
1:12	blessed who faces hardship, for he will be rewarded.	Matt.5:11-12a//Luke 6:22-23a
1:17a-b	Good gifts come from the Father [who is in the heavenly realm]	Matt.7:11//Luke 11:13
1:19b-20	Prohibition of anger	Matt.5:22a
1:22-25	it is not sufficient to listen to the word, the word must be done [acted upon].	Matt.7:24-27//Luke 6:47-49
2:5	The kingdom is for the poor	Luke 6:20// <i>Gos.Thom</i> 54// <i>Pol.Phil.</i> 2:3b (Matt.5:3)
2:13	There is mercy for the merciful	Matt.5:7//1 <i>Clem.</i> 13:2b
3:12	It is impossible to harvest a certain type of fruit from another type of plant	Luke 6:44//Matt. 7:16// <i>GThom.</i> 45a
3:18	Eschatological reward for peacemakers	Matt.5:9
4:3	Asking and receiving	Matt.7:7-8//Luke 11:9-10

4:9	Laughter, and weeping and mourning, need to trade places	Luke 6:21b,25b
4:11-12	If you act like a judge, you place yourself under God's judgment	Matt.7:1-2a //Luk.6:37
5:12	do not swear—not by heaven or by earth or [by anything else]. All you need to say is a simple "Yes" or "No."	Matt.5:34-37

Sayings from non-Synoptic sources

1:12	the reward for those who stand the test is the crown of life	Rev.2:10
1:22-25	it is not sufficient to listen to the word, the word must be done [acted upon]. you will be blessed if you act upon Jesus' teaching.	Matt.7:24-27//Luke 6:47-49 John 13:17
2:1	Jesus as glorified Lord	John 1:14a
2:5	the poor are [or: will be] actually rich.	Rev.2:9
2:15-16	If you do not meet the material needs of a wanting brother, you are acting unjustly	<i>Agraphon</i> from the <i>Hebrew Gospel</i> , Origen, <i>Comm.Matt.</i> 15.14
4:9	Now is the time for mourning and weeping	John 16:20
5:20	[love] covers over a multitude of sins	1 Pet.4:8//1 Cor.13:7// 1 Clem.49:5// 2 Clem.16:4// <i>Didascalia</i> 2.3 Clement of Alexandria: <i>The Instructor</i> 3.12; <i>Miscellanies</i> 4.8

Other Synoptic sayings		
1:21	The word within the innermost part [of the believer's body]	Matt.13:19 (//Mark 4:15//Luke 8:12)
2:1	Jesus as glorified Lord	Mark 8:38-9:8// Matt.16:27-17:9//Luke 9:26-36
2:8	Quotation of Leviticus 19:18c: <i>Love your neighbor as yourself</i>	Mark 12:28-34//Matt. 22:34-40//Luke 10:25-37
4:10	Humble yourself, and you will be exalted [by God]	Matt. 23:12//Luke 14:11; 18:14b
5:7-9	Natural phenomena teach us that we must patiently await things that nevertheless will come undoubtedly and swiftly, such as the Lord's return, which is at the door.	Mark 13:28-29.35-36//Matt.24:32-33.45-51//Luke 12:42-46//Rev.3:20

Some things become clear from this overview. First of all, with regard to sources:

1. James knew a tradition containing large portions of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain. At eleven distinct moments James appears to be alluding to a saying from this strand of tradition. Given that it is impossible to decide whether he is closer to Luke or Matthew, it -seems reasonable to tentatively conclude that he had access to a source that predates (or otherwise existed independently of) the composition of either Gospel. There is only one parallel to double tradition that is not Sermon on the Mount/Plain material (Matt.23:12//Luke 14:11; 18:14b). This basic observation seems to rule out the necessity of 'Q' as a source for James, rather the possibility of the sermon as an independent source presents itself.
2. At seven instances James seems to know non-Synoptic Jesus Tradition material. Twice, these are so-called *agrapha* (one of which is very well attested, the other is originally coupled to a well-known narrative). Twice we encounter traditions from Revelation 2, and three times there is meaningful overlap with a saying from John. It has to be noted that, however meaningful

(esp. in the cases of John 13:17 and 16:20), the parallels from John seem to be variants of known Synoptic traditions.

3. Four instances have been found of non-Sermon-Synoptic traditions, one of which is double, and the other are triple tradition. Two of these are rather indirect (i.e.: Jesus, as James, quotes Leviticus 19:18c; Jesus is presented as glorified), one is a *logion* with a prophetic-eschatological outlook that closely matches the traditions from the Sermon on the Mount/Plain, and the last one is often considered to be a Markan invention: Jesus' explanation of the parable of the sower. If it is indeed alluded to by James, it may very well predate Mark.
4. In six instances James, in construing his 'independent' sayings, combines and paraphrases different sources. Sometimes both stemming from Jesus Tradition (i.e. 1:5-7; 1:12; 2:5; 4:11-12), sometimes referring to Old Testament passages alongside Jesus Tradition (i.e. 3:18; 4:9).

Second, with regard to the content of the propositional agreement:

1. A superficial reading of James may not leave the reader with the impression that he is dealing with an eschatological discourse. When the parallels to Jesus Tradition that have been found are singled out, a different picture emerges: of the twenty-three parallels, eight presuppose a future blessing (i.e.: rewards for the tested, the poor, the merciful, the humble), seven more presuppose rewards in the present, or the future (sometimes it is unclear which is meant, i.e.: prayer will be answered, blessing upon righteous behavior, the kingdom is for the poor, gifts [holy Spirit?] from above), and in five instances, God's judgment seems to be presupposed. Of the three remaining parallels, the love command of James 2:8 is highly significant for James' eschatological outlook. This marks out twenty-one of the twenty-three parallels as eschatological.
2. Eschatological *reversal* seems to be of primary concern in this regard: The humble will be raised, the poor will be counted as rich, the suffering rejoice. On the other hand: those who now laugh, will mourn, those who judge unjustly will be judged. In

this way, the element of reversal works out in both directions, as it does in the Lukan Sermon, where the beatitudes are accompanied by corresponding woes. James' probable familiarity with the Lukan woes, in correspondence with the beatitudes, implicitly critiques a minimalist approach to Jesus Tradition, which tends to see the woes as a Lukan invention.¹⁸²

3. The idea is reinforced that James' theology of acting out faith, and his siding with the poor and harsh words towards the rich, are all directly influenced by Jesus Tradition. James' diaspora letter, then, is a conscious effort to spread the ethical and eschatological implications of Jesus' redemptive acts: even if the epistle does not seem to treat Christ's atoning sacrifice in any way, its heavy emphasis on eschatology and its obvious dependence on Jesus seem to presuppose awareness on James' part that a new age has been inaugurated through Christ's ministry.
4. James' eschatological outlook sets the epistle apart from conventional Jewish wisdom literature, such as Proverbs and *Sirach*,¹⁸³ but also from Hellenistic Jewish wisdom, such as *Pseudo-Phocylides* and *Pseudo-Menander*.

Jesus Tradition was obviously of great importance to James. If the above listing of parallels is shorter than some others', it is not because James is considered to be less influenced by Jesus, but rather so influenced by him that, more often than not, it is impossible to pinpoint exactly where and how the influence took place.

With regard to literary technique, it should be noted that James often *paraphrases* Jesus' short and crude statements. Sometimes he simply combines sources in a straightforward way. Once, he creates an elaborate

¹⁸² Cf., however, Q.6 in Robert J. Miller (ed.): *The Complete Gospels* (Salem: Polebridge, 2010), 264-65. The editors of this version of Q have chosen to incorporate Luke 6:24-26 into the text, apparently tentatively considering the internal logic of the overall passage.

¹⁸³ Although Gary A. Adamson, 'Redeem your Soul by the Giving of Alms: Sin, Debt and the "Treasury of Merit" in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition', *Letter & Spirit* 3 (2007), 39-69, points out that Jewish wisdom texts at times did emphasize the connection between righteous dealing with the poor and one's stand in God's judgment: 'what one does toward the poor registers directly with God. It is as though the poor person was some sort of ancient automatic teller machine through which one could make a deposit directly to one's heavenly account.' (49) There remains, however, a clear distinction with James' (and Jesus') strong and direct eschatological emphases.

parable over against an equally elaborate parable by Jesus. James' technique can be compared, on the one hand, to what Theon said¹⁸⁴ about appropriating *chreiae*: '[They] are practiced by restatement, grammatical inflection, comment, and contradiction, and we expand and compress the chreia ...' On the other, to *Sirach's* proposition that the appropriate response to a wise saying, is to add to it (*Sir.21:15*).

¹⁸⁴ Cf. 1.2.2.3 above.

3. Jesus Tradition Parallels in 1 Peter

1 Peter is a very different piece of writing than James, both in form and in subject matter. However, there are still some agreements between these two letters that are of interest to the present research. For example, in the research of 1 Peter, several allusions to Jesus tradition have been noted, although these are fewer than in James.¹⁸⁵

The present chapter will largely follow the same lines as the chapter on James. The first section will deal with *introductory matters* (3:1) and the second section will note the *parallels* (3:2) to Jesus Tradition that seem to fit the criteria that were laid out in Chapter 1 and the third section will draw *preliminary conclusions* (3:3) in the closing paragraph.

3.1 Introduction

As the Epistle of James, 1 Peter has not been in the academic spotlights in the past centuries. While studies in the Gospels and Paul (and, to a lesser extent, the Johannine writings) abounded, 1 Peter was back behind the scenes. The last few decades have nevertheless given rise to a handful of scholarly commentaries on 1 Peter.¹⁸⁶ Also, the renewed interest in the Catholic Epistles as a canonical unit,¹⁸⁷ plus the existence of the Society of

¹⁸⁵ Cf. especially Robert H. Gundry, "Verba Christi" in 1 Peter: Their Implications Concerning the authorship of 1 Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition', *NTS* 13 (1967), 336-50; Ernest Best, '1 Peter and the Gospel Tradition', *NTS* 16 (1970), 95-113; Gundry, 'Further Verba on Verba Christi in First Peter', *Bib* 55 (1974), 211-32; Gerhard Maier, 'Jesu-tradition im 1. Petrusbrief?', in David Wenham (ed.), *Gospel Perspectives*, vol. 5, *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985, 85-128; Rainer Metzner, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums im 1. Petrusbrief: Studien zum traditions-geschichtlichen und theologischen Einfluss des 1. Evangeliums auf den 1. Petrusbrief*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1995; Alicia Batten & John Kloppenborg, *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*, T & T Clark: London, 2014.

¹⁸⁶ i.e.: J. Ramsey Michaels, *1 Peter*, WBC 49, Waco: Word, 1988; Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*, Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996; John H. Elliott, *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 37B, New York: Doubleday, 2000; Ben Witherington III, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*, vol. II, *A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1-2 Peter*, Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2007; Reinhard Feldmeier, *The First Letter of Peter: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (transl. Peter H. Davids), Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008.

¹⁸⁷ i.e.: Schlosser, *Catholic Epistles*; Niebuhr & Wall, *Catholic Epistles*; Nienhaus, David R., 2007, *Not by Paul Alone: The Formation of the Catholic Epistles Collection and the Christian Canon*, Waco: Baylor University Press; Darian Lockett, *An Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*, London: T & T Clark, 2012;

Biblical Literature study group on the Petrine Epistles and Jude¹⁸⁸ are indicative of more and a keener interest in the study of 1 Peter (and, of course, 2 Peter and Jude).

3.1.1 Introductory matters

Still, various introductory matters are open for debate. Many, but certainly not all commentators believe 1 Peter to be pseudepigraphical. Likewise, most, except some, consider it to be written to a Gentile audience. Both these matters will be discussed below, since they do have an impact on the present research. Date, authorship and audience are of direct influence when it comes to weighing the how and why of any verse in 1 Peter alluding to Jesus Tradition.

Below, I will go into the most important introductory matters; *Date and authorship* (3.1.1.1); *Audience and reception* (3.1.1.2); *Content* (3.1.1.3) and *Purpose* (3.1.1.4).

3.1.1.1 Authorship and Date

In the heading of the epistle the author seems to introduce himself clearly enough:

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ... (1 Pet. 1:1a)

Nevertheless, most commentators argue that this introduction is of the hand of an impersonator of some kind:

- Either the epistle is the product of a Petrine 'school', laying out the admired apostle's spiritual heritage in epistolary form (in this case reminiscent of that of the Pauline letters).
- Or the prophetic inspiration that has led a later Christian to the writing of the epistle is felt to stand at odds with claiming

Darian Lockett, *Letters from the Pillar Apostles, The Formation of the Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Collection*, Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2017.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. i.e.: Eric F. Mason & Troy W. Martin (eds.), *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude. A Resource for Students*, Atlanta: SBL, 2014.

personal authorship. The letter is therefore, in all sincerity, presented as the work of a great apostle.¹⁸⁹

In either case, no 'fraudulent' agenda is usually believed to be implied, which, however, can be debated.¹⁹⁰ There are several reasons why it is thought to be improbable that 'the historical Peter' is this epistle's actual author. The epistle is usually considered to address a largely Gentile readership, whereas Peter's 'mission-field' is thought to be limited to Jewish Christians (cp. Gal.2:9). The style and language of the epistle, furthermore, is believed to be too good for an uneducated Galilean fisherman. And there is 1 Peter's perceived general mismatch with the person of Simon Peter. Donelson gives a brief sketch of this historical persona:

The portrait of Peter in both the Gospels and Paul portrays a Palestinian Jew whose native language is Aramaic, who was imbedded in the controversy about Jewish and Gentile Christians and the status of the law, who focused his ministry on Jews and Jewish Christians, and who, as one of the so-called Twelve, knew Jesus firsthand.¹⁹¹

These characteristics are generally thought to be unfitting of the author of 1 Peter, since the letter is written in quite good Greek and seems, at first sight, to be addressed to non-Jewish Christians. In addition, the letter does not show firsthand knowledge of the historical Jesus, or even suppose the author to belong to the Jewish Christian side of the 'controversy,' Donelson mentions. What is more, the epistle's form seems to be shaped after the Pauline letters: its address, closing greetings and general buildup (and, some would argue, its theology) appear to copy Paul's way of constructing letters.

These observations have some merit. They are, however, not conclusive. Several points speak in favor of authenticity:

¹⁸⁹ Cf. for both views Lewis R. Donelson, 'Gathering Apostolic Voices: Who Wrote 1 and 2 Peter and Jude?', in: Mason & Martin, *Reading*, 11-26, esp.12-13.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. however Bart D. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Ehrman (cf. esp. 149-54) believes deception was the motivation for writing pseudepigraphically in Early Christian letters. Aune, 387-388, states that pseudepigraphy was generally frowned upon in antiquity and the Early Church alike.

¹⁹¹ Donelson, 'Gathering', 16.

The attestation of 1 Peter in the Early Church is quite strong. 2 Peter 3:1 is often believed to refer to 1 Peter¹⁹²; Eusebius counts 1 Peter among the accepted books (ὁμολογουμένα)¹⁹³; and then there is the testimony of Papias (in Eusebius, *HE* 2.15.2):

... Papias, the bishop of Hierapolis, corroborates [Clement's] account, pointing out in addition that Peter makes mention of Mark in his first epistle, which also they maintain was written in Rome itself.¹⁹⁴

If 1 Peter was composed by a pseudonymous author, he would have been a direct contemporary of Papias, who is believed to have lived from ca. 60 – ca. 130 AD.¹⁹⁵ Papias implicitly vouches for the epistle's authenticity, which should caution 21st century readers to dismiss this possibility.

Furthermore, the historical Peter may not be as ill-equipped for letter-writing as is often assumed. He was after all a leading figure in a growing religious movement, and as such was likely to travel, but also to maintain communication with the places he had visited (or others had visited on his behalf). Undoubtedly his Greek was not sufficiently polished to write a skilled letter such as 1 Peter,¹⁹⁶ but he most likely would have had assistance from an amanuensis or secretary, as Paul usually had.

It has often been suggested that Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ... ἔγραψα (5:12) points to Silvanus in the role of secretary. However, it is now generally argued that the words διὰ ... ἔγραψα only apply to the carrier of a letter.¹⁹⁷

Jongyoon Moon put forward the hypothesis that not Silvanus, but rather

¹⁹² Aune, 350; Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 366.

¹⁹³ *HE* 3.25.2

¹⁹⁴ LCL 25, trans. Ehrman.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid*, 86. Most commentators now follow Eusebius' chronological presentation, at the cost of that of Philip of Side, believing that Papias probably wrote towards the end of the first decade of the second century AD. Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 13-14, rightfully points out that the research Papias has done for his book on Jesus *logia* must have been done in the 80's of the first century, the point in this case being that Papias was already eager for and critical of apostolic tradition, in Asia Minor, during that period.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. however Karen Jobes, 'The Syntax of 1 Peter: Just how Good is the Greek?' *BBR* 13.2 (2003) 159-73, who points to numerous Semitisms, toning down the 'excellence' of the Greek. ; cf. Charles Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902, 2-7, who recognizes some stylistic refinement, but also that 'the writer was not a Greek' (5).

¹⁹⁷ Cf. E. Randolph Richards, 'Silvanus Was not Peter's Secretary. Theological Bias in Interpreting διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ... ἔγραψα in 1 Peter 5:12.' *JETS* 43/3 (September 2000), 417-432.

Mark (5:13) wrote the letter on behalf of Peter. Not as actual composer, but as an editor, halfway between transcribing and composing.¹⁹⁸ The presence of two former companions of Paul also may help to explain the 'Pauline' shape of the epistle.¹⁹⁹

In any case, there is no reason to suppose that Simon Peter could not have written letters in agreeable koine-Greek.²⁰⁰ On the contrary: it is quite inconceivable that a man in his position would *not* continue communication with the places he had visited.²⁰¹ The secretary hypothesis therefore does reflect historical probability.

Simon Peter, therefore, may after all be the actual author of the first epistle of Peter, which is usually believed to have been sent from Rome to a host of congregations in Asia Minor in the early sixties AD.²⁰²

3.1.1.2 Audience and reception

The social setting of 1 Peter's recipients has been the object of extensive study.²⁰³ In the past, the epistle's references to hardship were taken as

¹⁹⁸ Jongyoon Moon, *Mark as Contributive Amanuensis of 1 Peter?*, Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2009, esp. 50-53. One may object to this hypothesis that it is arbitrary and impossible to prove. However, Moon deals in historical probability, and as such his book at least eliminates the objection that Peter could not have written this epistle, because it is too fancy for a Galilean fisherman. Witherington, *Hellenized Christians*, 246-47, on the other hand, argues that Silvanus must in fact have been the secretary, since the letter is said to have been written 'briefly' through Silvanus. 'Briefly' can hardly refer to the delivery in this case (Cf. Richards, 429, however).

¹⁹⁹ Cf. E. Randolph Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing*, Downers Grove: IVP Academic (esp. 32-46), who points out that composing letters of the scope that Paul wrote would in all likelihood have been a team-effort. This would apply to 1 Peter as well.

²⁰⁰ Or even in agreeable Asian style.

²⁰¹ Cf. Gal.2:9 (which shows Peter's role to be a missionary one); 1 Cor.9:5 (which underscores this role, this and other parts of the letter possibly testifying to Peter's presence in Corinth). Furthermore, it is highly likely that Peter was martyred in Rome, during the Neronian persecution, cf. Richard Bauckham's article 'The Martyrdom of Peter in Early Christian Literature' in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Part II, vol.26/1, ed. W.Haase (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1992), 539-95.

²⁰² Armin D. Baum ('„Babylon“ als Ortsnamenmetapher in 1 Petr 5,13 auf dem Hintergrund der antiken Literatur', in: *Petrus und Paulus in Rom. Eine interdisziplinäre Debatte*. Hg. Stefan Heid. Freiburg: Herder, 2011, 180-220) argues that 'Babylon' need not necessarily depict 'Rome' in the sense of 'tempelzerstörende Stadt' (as some have argued), but can also refer to it in the sense of a 'Stadt des Exils'. Peter's presence in Rome (ultimately following his forced departure from Jerusalem; Acts 12:17) thus makes him a 'fellow exile' of his addressees. For the view that Babylon is not a nickname but denotes the Diaspora region in Mesopotamia, so that 1 Peter should be dated earlier, see: Van Houwelingen, 'The Authenticity of 2 Peter: Problems and Possible Solutions', *EJT* 19:2 (2010), 119-29.

²⁰³ i.e. J.H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, its Situation and Strategy*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press:1981 [1979]; D. Balch, *Let Wives be Submissive: The domestic Code in 1 Peter*, SBLMS 26, Chico: Scholars' Press: 1981; Reinhard Feldmeier, *Die Christen als Fremde: Die*

indicative of persecution, either under Nero (in the early sixties AD) or Domitian (thirty years later). Nowadays these references are usually explained as indications of social estrangement, rather than governmental persecution.²⁰⁴ Elliott thinks of the addressees as a group that was estranged (or 'homeless') to begin with, and found a 'home' in the Christian church. This would explain the apparent lack of social status. However, there is also the possibility that their newly found faith was in fact the cause of their low social status.²⁰⁵ The anxiety that troubles the communities 1 Peter addresses, is also found between the lines of James, Hebrews, 1 & 2 Thessalonians and Revelation and should (in line with Acts) probably be considered indicative of first century Christian communities, instead of viewed as exceptional.²⁰⁶

Peter's address is meaningful in this regard:

To God's elect, exiles scattered (ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις
διασπορᾶς) throughout the provinces of Pontus, Galatia,
Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia ... (1 Pet. 1:1b)

Peter addresses his readers as 'residents in a strange land' (παρεπιδήμοι), 'resident aliens' (παροῖκοι, 1:17; 2:11). Much has been made of the use of these terms. It seems that they primarily serve to underline the underprivileged sociological status of the recipients, and may strictly be metaphorical in that sense. However, when taken more literally, their usage could fit a group of Jewish believers, scattered in the diaspora of Asia Minor.²⁰⁷ The believers are called ἐκλεκτοί, 'elect' (1:1), and are firmly associated with Israel as the chosen people of God (1:10.15-16; 2:9). The 'Gentiles', on the other hand, are presented as a class of hostile outsiders (2:12), even if the addressees have beforehand

Metapher der Fremde in der antiken Welt, im Urchristentum und im 1. Petrusbrief. WUNT 64 Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992; Paul A. Holloway, *Coping with Prejudice: 1 Peter in Social-Psychological Perspective.* WUNT 244 Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

²⁰⁴ David G. Horrell ('Ethnicity, Empire and Early Christian Identity: Social-Scientific Perspectives on 1 Peter. In Mason & Martin: *Reading*, 135-50, esp.146-47) warns against posing that as a false dichotomy: There may not have been a policy for persecuting Christians in the first century, yet 'if a governor were so minded, the charge of being a Christian, if upheld, was sufficient in itself to warrant the death penalty.'

²⁰⁵ Cf. P.H.R. van Houwelingen, *1 Petrus*, Kampen: Kok, 30.

²⁰⁶ Cf. J. Ramsey Michaels in *DPL*, 917: 'The readers' life situation is not a local or specific one but rests on the author's generalization about the situation of Christians in Roman society at the time the letter was written.'

²⁰⁷ Witherington, *Hellenized Christians*, 24-25.

wasted time participating in 'doing what pagans choose to do' (4:3).²⁰⁸ The assurance of 2:10 'Once you were not a people, but now you are the people of God' is to be read as a reference to their former ignorance, in line with the scripture that is being quoted (Hos.1:9-10), which was, of course, originally directed at Jews.

However, most commentators feel that the language used in 1:14.18; 2:9-10.25; 3:6 and 4:3-4 is too crass for it to refer to Jews in exile.²⁰⁹ Rather, a mixture of Jewish and (predominantly) Gentile Christians may be addressed 'as God's true Israel in dispersion'.²¹⁰ In that case, there might remain some tension with Galatians 2:9, which, at first sight, seems to indicate that Peter's potential addressees would primarily consist of Jewish Christians. However, Peter Davids considers it likely that changing circumstances would have broadened Peter's original target audience.²¹¹

3.1.1.3 Content

First Peter is an epistle concerned with various issues that troubled early Christians in their everyday lives.

In the early 20th century, however, commentators tended to emphasize the theological and form-critical concerns. The central issue of the letter was then considered to be baptism (cf. 1:3.23; 2:2; 3:21). The epistle was therefore regarded as a (reworked) baptismal liturgy, or, alternatively, as a way of explaining the bulk of paenetic material, as a reworked catechetical document.²¹²

²⁰⁸ James G. Dunn, *Christianity in the Making* vol. 2, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009, 1158-60; Witherington, *Hellenized Christians*, 29-30 points out that 4:3-4 may very well refer to Hellenized Jews partaking in temple feasts, guild gatherings and the like: '...they participated in various existing signs of civic virtue and cooperation ... If they needed to go home and wash in a ritual bath thereafter ... they would see this as no big deal.'

²⁰⁹ Davids, *Theology*, 103, i.e.: Christoph Stenschke, "...Das auserwählte Geschlecht, die königliche Priesterschaft, das heilige Volk" (1 Petr 2.9): Funktion und Bedeutung der Ehrenbezeichnungen Israels im 1.Petrusbrief' (*Neotestamentica* 42.1 (2008) 119-146): 'Es ist unwahrscheinlich, dass Juden vor ihrer Hinwendung zu Jesus Christus mit Heiden "mitgelaufen" wären bei "Schwelgereien, Lüsten, Weingelagen, Schmausereien und Trinkereien"' (124).

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, 104, esp. note 51.

²¹² Davids, *First Epistle*, 11.

Today 1 Peter is regarded as a proper letter. Obviously, it is not a personal, but a circular letter, framed as a diaspora-letter (which is appropriate since 1 Peter considers its addressees to be 'exiled' in the regions of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia). An important difference with other diaspora letters (i.e.: James) is its being sent from 'Babylon' rather than Jerusalem. Its large exhortative parts point to the likelihood of it being composed as a paerenetic letter;²¹³ a letter in which persuasion towards certain and dissuasion of other behavior is the objective.²¹⁴ This can be seen in 1 Peter's sizeable Household Code (2:18-3:7), but also in his repeated assertions not to fold under the pressure of pagan society (1:17-2:10; 3:13-4:19). Witherington, focusing on its rhetorical buildup, proposes the following outline:

- Epistolary Prescript (1:1-2)
- Exordium (1:3-12)
- Propositio (1:13-16)
- Argument 1 (1:17-2:10)
- Argument 2 (2:11-3:12)
- Argument 3 (3:13-4:11)
- Argument 4 (4:12-19)
- Argument 5 (5:1-5)
- Peroratio (5:6-9)
- Closing Doxology (5:10-11)
- Epistolary Prescript (5:12-14)²¹⁵

3.1.1.4 Purpose

Peter's primary and unifying goal is to instruct his readers what their demeanor should be towards contemporary Greco-Roman society, especially from the vantage point of alienation and discrimination.

1 Peter apparently addresses a large group of congregations throughout (almost) all of Asia Minor. It may be that the attitude of Asian society towards (Jewish) Christians was alarming in the mid-first century, but it may just as well be the case that suffering and persecution (primarily in

²¹³ Cf. Aune, 351.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 334.

²¹⁵ Witherington, *Hellenized Christians*, 49.

the form of societal marginalization) were concerns the universal church was dealing with at that time.

Peter exhorts his readers to follow the example of Jesus, the ultimate 'suffering servant'. In a passage that is heavily dependent on Isaiah 53, Peter informs his readers of how Jesus responded to suffering and persecution:

When they hurled their insults at him, he did not retaliate; when he suffered, he made no threats. Instead, he entrusted himself to him who judges justly. (1 Pet.2:23)

Christian lives are lived differently, and the Christian Lord is another than the emperor. Yet Christians are called to live among their pagan neighbors, to suffer their indignation, mockery and abuse. In all of this, Christ's exemplary life and his role as redeemer of a new people are the key to understanding how to play out this difficult role.

3.1.1.5 Jesus Tradition in 1 Peter: an overview of scholarship

In a recent article Duane Watson paraphrased the present consensus on Jesus Tradition in 1 Peter concisely:

1 Peter incorporates early Christian tradition as it seeks to present the gospel in a way that instructs and comforts its beleaguered recipients. ... More specifically, the letter draws on the gospel tradition of Jesus.²¹⁶

Watson notes this matter-of-factly: the recognition that Jesus Tradition plays its part in 1 Peter is not a recent one. However, there still remains more to be said on this subject. Below a brief overview of scholarship on this subject in the last five decades is presented.

²¹⁶ Duane F. Watson, 'Early Jesus Tradition in 1 Peter 3:18-22', in Batten & Kloppenborg, *James, 1 & 2 Peter*, 151-165, here: 151.

3.1.1.5.1 Gundry, Best and Maier

In the late 1960s and early 1970s Robert Gundry and Ernest Best were engaged in a debate over the presence of allusions to dominical sayings in 1 Peter.²¹⁷ Gundry set off the topic by arguing that 1 Peter offers a string of allusions to dominical sayings, and also allusions to dominical actions. Gundry used his findings as a means to prove the authenticity of 1 Peter: its author apparently spoke of firsthand experience. This thread of logic was an easy target for Best, who stated that if, for instance, allusions to the love command prove firsthand experience, the apostle Paul might just as well have been present, which he obviously was not. Best is of course, in a sense, right. If Jesus Tradition was all-present and rather free-flowing in the Early Church, anyone and everyone could be acquainted with *logia* of Jesus, Synoptic or otherwise.

Gundry, however, believes that 1 Peter shows acquaintance with Jesus Tradition *as depicted in the Gospels*,²¹⁸ whereas Best only imagines acquaintance with independent *logia*.²¹⁹ Gundry also sees meaningful and repeated acquaintance with Johannine traditions,²²⁰ whereas Best sees none of those.²²¹

All in all, Gundry presents some twenty parallels to Jesus Tradition, mainly from Luke and John. Best allows for no more than seven allusions. Both agree on acquaintance with (the traditions presented in) Matthew 5:10-16; Mark 10:45; Luke 6 and Luke 12. Interestingly, much of their disagreement has to do with how each imagines Jesus Tradition to play its role in the Early Church. Gundry defends his choices with regard to Johannine parallels:

Best suggests that in Jn I assume a stenographic report of Jesus' teaching ... I simply do not hold that in Jn the words of Jesus are always recorded verbatim. But is it advisable to hold that the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus never sound through?²²²

²¹⁷ Cf. note 185 above. David G. Horrell, 'Jesus Remembered in 1 Peter? Early Jesus Traditions, Isaiah 53 and 1 Peter 2:21-25.' In Batten & Kloppenborg, *James, 1 & 2 Peter*, 123-150, mentions earlier studies by J. Pairman Brown and Ceslas Spicq, cf. p. 127, note 14.

²¹⁸ Gundry, 'Verba', 345.

²¹⁹ Best, '1 Peter', 111.

²²⁰ Gundry, 'Verba', 350.

²²¹ Best, '1 Peter', 99.

²²² Gundry, 'Further Verba', 215.

In 1985 Gerhard Maier joins the controversy. He accepts many of Gundry's observations, though not all. The list of allusions he presents is longer than that of Gundry. He allows for six Johannine passages that are alluded to by 1 Peter, and twenty more allusions to Synoptic material.²²³ He divides these allusions into three categories: (1) Sermon on the Mount/Plain; (2) eschatological discourse (including the Johannine farewell discourse); (3) passion and resurrection narratives.²²⁴ Interestingly, Maier does not divide these source-groups into (for instance) 'Synoptic and Johannine', but rather allows for source material that informs both gospel traditions *and* the first Petrine epistle.

3.1.1.5.2 Metzner

In a 1995 Ph.D.-thesis,²²⁵ Metzner defends the position of single literary dependence of 1 Peter on the first Gospel.

The Matthean *logia* that he finds represented in 1 Peter are found in 5:10-16; 5:38-48; 6:25-34 (Sermon on the Mount) and 4:1-11 (Jesus tested in the wilderness). Next to examining Petrine dependence on these passages, he also examines theological dependence (ecclesiology, Christology, eschatology) and the 'Petrusbild' that Gospel and epistle have in common (in both, Peter is presented as guarantor of Jesus Tradition). Furthermore, Metzner assumes the Matthean traditions to be especially significant for the Petrine readership.

There are some problems with Metzner's thesis.²²⁶ Metzner assumes, but hardly defends, 1 Peter's posteriority to Matthew. He also assumes the author to refer to the written Gospel strictly from memory. Yet how can the necessity of literary dependence be shown, when only relatively few literal connections are made (almost all from Sermon material)?

However, Metzner's acknowledgment of conscious reminiscences not only of Jesus' teaching but also of the *persona* Simon Peter in the epistle is noteworthy.

²²³ Maier, '1. Petrusbrief', 127-28.

²²⁴ Cf. also the brief but interesting comments of Peter Davids on these data: Davids, *First Epistle*, 26-27.

²²⁵ Cf. note 185 above.

²²⁶ Cf. the review by John H. Elliott in *JBL* 116/2 (Summer 1997) 379-82, whose main points of criticism are repeated in the text.

3.1.1.5.3 Horrell and Watson

David Horrell and Duane Watson have recently contributed to a collection of essays probing beneath the surfaces of James and the Petrine epistles, in search of Jesus Tradition.²²⁷

In a detailed study of 1 Peter 2:21-25, Horrell sheds light on 1 Peter's multi-levelled intertextuality, involving Old Testament prophecy and Jesus Tradition synchronically.

Horrell acknowledges the passage to be dependent on Isaiah 53, but refutes the notion that the prophetic passage has helped to shape the historical fiction of the passion narrative (as i.e. Crossan would have it). 1 Peter rather understands Isaiah 53 through the events of the passion narrative. The epistle's use of the word *πάσχω* is influenced by the meaning it has in the passion narrative. Jesus' sinlessness as presented by 1 Peter is a reflection of Jesus' life, notably in reference to the passion. Also, the non-retaliatory behavior described in 2:23 may resemble Jesus' teaching on the subject, but in this case even more so his behavior during the whole passion narrative.

Horrell finds it likely (agreeing with Maier) that early, pre-Synoptic traditions informed the author of 1 Peter:

In short, in 1 Pet. 2.21-25, we encounter something of the historical Jesus, as remembered in early Jesus traditions, depicted in the language of scripture, and in a way that constitutes a central statement of the Christology of 1 Peter which in turn underpins the ethics of the letter.²²⁸

Horrell's observations are highly valuable for the present research, especially since 1 Peter may contain more passages like 2:21-25 where Jesus Tradition and Old Testament citation/allusion blend.

In Watson's article, 1 Peter 3:18-22 is examined in like fashion. Watson shows that the pericope is built up in reference to 'interconnected sources': The examples of Christ and Noah are played out alongside one another. The story of the Flood is being read through the tradition of *1 Enoch* 6-36 (the imprisonment of the disobedient angels), encapsulating

²²⁷ Batten & Kloppenborg, *James, 1 & 2 Peter*.

²²⁸ Horrell, 'Jesus Remembered', 150.

the whole of Genesis 6-8. The story serves as a background for the salvific events concerning the believer's baptism.

Simultaneously, Christ's suffering and victory are connected to the salvation of the believers *and* to the fate of the imprisoned angels. However, Christ's actions are described, very briefly, with the use of terminology that belongs to Jesus Tradition. For instance, the use of both *περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν* and *ὑπὲρ* in 3:18 recurs in the New Testament in various places, referring respectively to the sacrificial and substitutionary character of Jesus' death (cp. i.e.: Rom.8:3; Heb.5:3; 10:26, and respectively Mark 10:45; John 11:50-52; Rom.14:15 and various other Pauline examples).

Watson's observations, like those of Horrell, serve to remind the reader of the subtle way in which various traditions are played out simultaneously by the author of 1 Peter. What is more, Watson shows that Jesus Tradition consists of more than *Gospel* parallels.

3.1.2 Approach

In the listing of parallels that is offered below, some of the following considerations, building upon the observations of 3.1.1, are taken into account.

First of all, even if we cannot be certain, it does not seem unlikely to consider 1 Peter a genuinely Petrine epistle, written to a number of congregations in Asia Minor that the historical Peter somehow was affiliated with. But at the same time, it has to be acknowledged that the letter is a skilled literary product. One that, like James, probably pre-dates literary Gospel accounts.

In James, the form and genre of the epistle were helpful in establishing parallels: James' wisdom statements often overlap in form and content with Jesus Tradition. In approaching 1 Peter, it has to be conceded that the ways in which allusion and echo take place are more subtly intertwined with the various arguments Peter is presenting. These subtle intertextual allusions touch upon Jesus Tradition on multiple levels: *logia*, narrative, idiom and prophecy-fulfillment. The studies of Horrell and Watson have sufficiently proven this point.

At the same time, the subject matter of 1 Peter (the proper attitude towards hostile neighbors) is right at home in Jesus Tradition. Various studies point to, for instance, a close verbal and thematic link with Matthew 5 and Luke 6; Sermon on the Mount/Plain material. This can be seen as a starting point: As was the case with James, it can be assumed that the author of 1 Peter was acquainted with at least that strand of tradition.

3.2 Parallels

In this paragraph a listing of parallels to Jesus Tradition in 1 Peter will be presented, and commented upon. As in the previous chapter, not all proposals that have been made in the past are discussed and either accepted or refuted.²²⁹ Rather, the criteria as laid out in chapter 1 are decisive in which the alleged parallel is discussed and which is not.

The parallels will be presented according to the following thematic headings: *Eschatological perspective on suffering* (3.2.1); *living among pagans* (3.2.2); *prophetic fulfillment* (3.2.3); *idiomatic parallels* (3.2.4); and, finally, *passion narrative* (3.2.5). These headings mainly serve to present the parables in a reader-friendly fashion, not too much weight should be given to what parallel is placed in which category. The substantive presentation of the meaning of the parallels' contents is given in the *preliminary conclusion* (3.3).

3.2.1 Eschatological Perspective on Suffering

Suffering is a major theme in 1 Peter. Within the scope of this theme, Jesus Tradition parallels are appropriated by the author, to point to future reward and reversal of fate as a reality that is part and parcel of present suffering.

²²⁹ Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 10, note 97, offers an overview of all parallels that have been identified in the past.

3.2.1.1 1 Peter 1:8

The first parallel to Jesus Tradition that deals with suffering, is found in 1:8:

1 Pet.1:8

ὄν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι
μὴ ὄρωντες, πιστεύοντες δὲ
ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ
δεδοξασμένη

Though you have not seen him, you love him; and even though you do not see him now, you believe in him and are filled with an inexpressible and glorious joy,

John 20:29

λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ὅτι ἐώρακάς με
πεπίστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες
καὶ πιστεύσαντες.

Then Jesus told him, "Because you have seen me, you have believed; blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed."

Matt.5:12a//Luke 6:23a

Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven

χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ
μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

1:8 belongs to the unit 1:6-9, which appears to be a chain-saying, largely commensurate with Romans 5:2-5 and James 1:2-4. Peter Davids expresses not only their respective similarity, but also their probable mutual dependence on the saying of Jesus in Matthew 5:11-12.²³⁰

First, however, the parallel to the Fourth Gospel appears to be quite clear. On the **verbal** level we have ἰδόντες... πιστεύοντες - ἰδόντες... πιστεύσαντες (ἰδόντες in both cases set in a negation). However, ἰδόντες is not a very secure reading in 1 Peter: some manuscripts have εἰδότες here.²³¹ Ἰδόντες is clearly the easier reading and, as i.e. Van Houwelingen argues, is easily explained precisely by the parallel in John 20:29.²³² However, sometimes the easier reading is the better one.²³³ Michaels shows the parallel of ὀλίγον ἄρτι (1:6) to ἄρτι ὄρωντες to

²³⁰ Cf. Davids, *First Epistle*, 55.

²³¹ A, K, P, Ψ, 33, 81 and 614.

²³² P.H.R. van Houwelingen, *1 Petrus*, 56.

²³³ Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the New Testament*, New York: UBS, ²2002, 616.

presuppose emphasis on seeing,²³⁴ in this case distinguished between eschatological and present-day viewpoints. The **propositional agreement** lies in the basic statement that *it is commendable to believe [in Jesus] in spite of what you see*.

The parallel to Matthew 5:12 (& *par.*) is, **verbally**: ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾶ - χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, and is strengthened by the **propositional agreement** that this joy is meant especially for those who suffer in the present. Peter states that the visual evidence may lead one to believe otherwise, but the believers' point of view creates joy, because of the *goal* of their faith (1:9). This is an eschatological perspective, which brings it even more to the same level as the Matthean parallel. The shared proposition would then read: *the perspective of faith leads one to experience joy and gladness in the face of suffering*. In 4:13-14 it appears that Peter alludes to the same *logion*.

In both cases, there is **conceptual analogy** as well. 1 Peter as a whole is obviously highly engaged with the theme of suffering: one would almost be surprised if Peter would *not* use the beatitudes to prove his point. On the other hand, the present verse emphasizes the difficulty of faith in the absence of the experience of heavenly blessing. 1:6-9, as a somewhat larger unit within the pericope, deals with the idea of suffering and testing, precisely as 'faith under pressure'. The Johannine *logion* seems to be a very fitting exhortation in this situation.²³⁵

Peter's **access** to the beatitudes need not surprise us, certainly given the weight they appeared to have as a source for James. It remains to be seen if Peter shows more knowledge of the beatitudes and/or other Sermon on the Mount/Plain traditions, but the verbal and propositional agreement in the present parallel are quite strong, and the apparent repetition of the allusion (in 4:13-14) seems to increase the likelihood of Peter's familiarity with at least part of the Sermon. It is harder to evaluate the **access** to the Johannine saying. Yet it is striking that, even though it is not Sermon-tradition, this saying is a beatitude as well. As was remarked with regard to James 1:25//John 13:17, the fact that the saying is in the form of a makarism may indicate that its wording predates the Gospel of John.

²³⁴ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 33.

²³⁵ John 20:19 can be understood to be a *logion* in its own right, cf. Culpepper, 'Jesus Sayings', 357-59.

Apparently, 1 Peter has combined sources in much the same way as James sometimes did. Achtemeier notes the grammatical awkwardness of the verse, as it combines the aorist (ιδόντες) and present (ὄρωντες) tense in one sentence.²³⁶

The participle κομιζόμενοι in the next verse seems to fit the idea that 1:8 may presuppose the beatitudes, since the verb is often used in the New Testament for receiving a prize (2 Cor.5:10; Eph.6:8; Heb.11:13). In these cases, the 'prize' is salvation of the soul, but in the present chain-saying its occurrence is reminiscent of the 'future reward' that is so characteristic of the beatitudes in the Sermon. 'The salvation of your souls', however, is reminiscent of another *logion*:

3.2.1.2 1 Peter 1:9

1 Pet.1:9

for you are receiving the end result of your faith, the salvation of your souls

κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν.

Mark 8:35//Matt.16:25//Luke 9:25

For whoever wants to save their life will lose it, but whoever loses their life for me and for the gospel will save it

ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

John 12:25

ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολλύει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ μισῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτήν.

The **verbal** correspondence lies in the strong emphasis on σωτηρία and ψυχή. As Davids notes, Peter's understanding of ψυχή is that of the

²³⁶ Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 103.

'total self', as in the Gospels.²³⁷ The **propositional agreement** may seem slight at first sight, but becomes more tenable when we take into account that the salvation of the soul in 1 Peter 1:9 is the 'prize' for those who have 'been tested by fire' (1:7). This is a strong metaphor (possibly well-known to Peter's readers), and is used to emphasize that the present suffering and testing should be willfully accepted. This approach is largely commensurate with that of the *logion* under discussion, whose strict division (either losing or gaining) should be appreciated as typical of a wisdom saying. So, the agreement can be summarized as: *the salvation of the soul is for those who value their future conditions over their present conditions*. Granted, this agreement is already supposed in the parallel to Matthew 5:11-12 in 1:8. But there is undeniably meaningful overlap, both verbally as propositionally, which may indicate that Peter has this saying in mind.

In the Gospels, the saying belongs to Jesus' disclosure of his future suffering. In all four accounts Jesus presents this suffering as a model to be followed, and in all four accounts this behavior will be honored with a reward at Jesus' coming. In this regard the context of the saying shows great **conceptual analogy** to 1 Peter 1:6-9, which does not go into Jesus' suffering as a model, but does involve reward at Jesus' coming for exactly that type of behavior.

With regard to the **access** Peter could have had to the saying, it needs to be stressed that it is remarkable that the Synoptic and Johannine accounts, not only of the verse, but also of the larger contexts, are so much in agreement. John can in this instance be seen as dependent on the same tradition as the Synoptics. His version of Jesus' speech is reworked in a slightly more literate way. This observation indicates that the saying probably was widespread and highly valued throughout the Early Church.

3.2.1.3 1 Peter 3:4

A next possible parallel within the same thematic domain is found in 3:4:

²³⁷ Davids, *First Epistle*, 60, cf. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 104. Contra Reinhard Feldmeier ('Salvation and Anthropology in First Peter' in Niebuhr/Wall, 203-213).

1 Pet.3:4

Rather, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God's sight.

ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας
ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ
πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος ὃ
ἐστὶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελής.

Matt.5:5

Blessed are the meek,
for they will inherit the earth.

μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς,
ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν.

The **verbal** parallel is in this case merely *πραέως* - *πραεῖς*. The word in itself is very rare in the New Testament, apart from these occurrences it is only found in Matthew on two more occasions (11:29; 21:5). The scarceness of the word does add some weight to this otherwise not very impressive parallel.

Propositional agreement is slight, but meaningful. Both verses seem to agree that meekness is a proper attitude, and that it is appreciated as such by God.

The **conceptual analogy** is remarkable: earlier on 1 Peter has appropriated a verse from the beatitudes (Matt.5:11-12). There it served to evoke the proper response to suffering and oppression. The theme of oppression is present here, but not as strong as in the first chapter. The Household Code, to which the present verse belongs, rather deals with an apt attitude of submissiveness. This may include facing some 'indoor oppression', but this is of a different kind than the social oppression that was referred to in 1:6-9. That the author would return to the beatitudes, but now to pick out the *meek*, rather than the suffering, poor or oppressed, seems very fitting. The **accessibility** seems to be self-explanatory: from the Sermon on the Mount. Still, it is non-Lukan material.

That Peter would appropriate a saying of Jesus in this manner is conceivable. The use of the word *πραέως* may be incidental, but when we assume the author's familiarity with the Sermon on the Mount,

especially the beatitudes, the likelihood of this verse's dependence on the *logion* seems high.²³⁸

3.2.1.4 1 Peter 3:9

In 3:9 there seems to be another parallel to Sermon on the Mount/Plain tradition:

1 Pet.3:9

Do not repay evil with evil or insult with insult. On the contrary, [repay evil with] blessing, because to this you were called so that you may inherit a blessing.

μη ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας, τοῦναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες, ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε, ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε.

1 Pet.2:20

But how is it to your credit if you receive a beating for doing wrong and endure it? But if you suffer for doing good and you endure it, this is commendable before God.

Luke 6:28//Matt.5:44

bless those who curse you, pray for those who mistreat you.

εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς

But I tell you, love your enemies and *pray for those who persecute you*, (Matt.5:44)

...

If you love those who love you, what reward will you get? Are not even the tax collectors doing that? And if you greet only your own people, what are you doing more than others? Do not even pagans do that? (Matt.5:46-47)

The **verbal agreement** is limited to εὐλογοῦντες - εὐλογεῖτε, which is lacking altogether in the Matthean version of this saying. This verbal parallel to Luke 6:24 is meaningful when the **propositional agreement** is taken into account. 1 Peter's advice to repay evil with blessing displays an attitude far surpassing the general idea (present in both Old Testament and Stoic thought) of withholding vengeance. Davids

²³⁸ And cf. the parallel 1 Pet.3:14/Matt.5:10 below.

emphasizes how unique this feature is to Jesus Tradition and Paul (who is obviously dependent on Jesus as well, cf. Rom.12:14; 1 Cor.4:12; 1 Thess.5:15).²³⁹ The shared proposition is: *bad or oppressive behavior by others should be repaid with blessing (instead of vengeance)*. It is conspicuous, however, that 1 Peter is closest in wording to Romans 12, where Paul seems to present the Petrine verse as two separate sayings: μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες (12:17, cp. 1 Thess.5:15); εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας [ὑμᾶς] (12:14). And in 1 Corinthians 4:12 we find the same theme, and here with a parallel to Peter's 'insults': λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν, διωκόμενοι ἀνεχόμεθα.

In Luke the *logion* is accompanied by the exhortations to love your enemies and to turn the other cheek. Matthew likewise offers the imperative to love your enemies, but goes on to offer a pair of rhetorical questions in 5:46-47, stating that it is hardly impressive to love back who love you first; this will not set you apart from toll-collectors and heathens. It seems that in Matthew 5 the saying is offered at the end of the chapter to return the hearers' attention to what was dealt with in the beatitudes at the start of the chapter. In Luke these sayings immediately follow the beatitudes. This general interest in the attitude towards those who persecute and suppress the community of believers secures **conceptual analogy** to 1 Peter. Interestingly, Peter also seems to echo the rhetorical questions of Matthew 5:46-47 in 1 Peter 2:20: 'But how is it to your credit if you receive a beating for doing wrong and endure it? But if you suffer for doing good and you endure it, this is commendable before God.' Of course, Peter reverses the question, reasoning from punishment, instead of reward. Whether or not this is a valid parallel in its own right, it does underline that the author of 1 Peter is working out the same themes in like manner as the evangelists, especially Matthew (and cp. 1 Pet.3:17).

With regard to **accessibility** it is striking that Peter usually tends to follow Matthean Sermon tradition, but in this instance favors Lukan wording, which is found more often in James.

It seems quite possible that Peter is dependent on Jesus Tradition, even that he would presume the *logion* to be somehow connected to the

²³⁹ Davids, *1 Peter*, 126.

beatitudes. The verbal correspondence between 1 Peter and Romans 12:14.17 (and Thess.5:15, and even 1 Cor.4:12) is remarkable. Both in Romans and Thessalonians Paul offers his version of the saying as part of a string of sayings that may resemble an older tradition, not necessarily Jesus Tradition proper. The differences and resemblances of Romans 12:9-21 and 1 Thessalonians 5:12-22 make clear that Paul, anyway, felt free to present this tradition in his own words.

3.2.1.5 1 Peter 3:14a

In 3:14 Peter presents a very direct allusion of one of the beatitudes:

1 Pet.3:14a

ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ
δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι.

But even if you should suffer for
what is right, you are blessed.

Matt.5:10//Pol.Phil.2:3

μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν
δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἔστιν ἡ
βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Blessed are those who are
persecuted because of
righteousness,
for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

The **verbal agreement** is obvious and highly meaningful: μακάριοι in both verses and the correspondence δικαιοσύνην - δικαιοσύνης. **Propositionally**, it needs to be understood that the verse in 1 Peter is a rhetorical response (almost diatribically) to the preceding verse, 3:13. There the author asks, rhetorically, 'who will be able to harm you, if you do what is right?' There is semantical 'spill' into 3:14 that leads us to understand the 'suffering' in 3:14 as 'suffering by the hand of others', which in turn is very close to Matthew's 'persecution'. This leads to the shared statement *those who suffer by the hand of others because of righteousness are blessed*. The author seems to consciously introduce his allusion with ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ (cf. 1 Cor.7:21b), as if saying: 'Still, you *may* suffer (in spite of the fact that no one can really hurt you, 3:13), *but* you know very well that those who suffer because of righteousness' sake are

blessed.²⁴⁰

Of course, this once again fits very well into the general **concept** of suffering in 1 Peter, and the way he constantly seems to back up his theology on suffering and persecution with the beatitudes and closely related traditions to which he had **access**.

3.2.1.6 1 Peter 4:7

A next parallel is found in 4:7:

1 Pet.4:7

The end of all things is near. Therefore be alert and of sober mind so that you may pray.

Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν.
σωφρονήσατε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς
προσευχᾶς

Mark 13//Matt.24//Luke 21

Mark 1:15

πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ
βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ

As Maier has rightly observed,²⁴¹ this verse is probably dependent on Jesus Tradition, but no allusion to one particular verse is intended. Possibly, the whole of Jesus' discourse on the Mount of Olives is in view. This discourse is highly eschatological, speaking first of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, and then increasingly applying apocalyptic language to end-time prophecy. 'The end of all things is near' would be an appropriate way to summarize this discourse. The second part of the verse ('be alert and of sober mind so that you may pray') aptly paraphrases Jesus' conclusion of his eschatological teaching (cp. Mark 13:33-37).

It may be meaningful that Mark 1:15 (*par.* Matt.4:27) speaks of the time

²⁴⁰ Cf. Travis B. Williams, 'Reading Social Conflict through Greek Grammar: Reconciling the Difficulties of the Fourth-Class Condition in 1 Pet 3,14.' *Filologia Neotestamentaria* – Vol.XXVI – 2013, 117-34, esp. 118: '...it seems not to imply the *reality* of suffering, but merely the remote *possibility*.' This may seem to stand at odds with some statements found later on in the epistle (i.e. 4:12-19; 5:9), but this may be explained when we realize Peter is not so much actualizing as he is paraphrasing the beatitude.

²⁴¹ Gerhard Maier, 'Jesustradition', 92-93.

being fulfilled and the kingdom being near (πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία). The similar use of ἐγγίζω may be due to their belonging to the specific idiom of Jesus Tradition eschatology.²⁴² This does not mean that Peter is thinking of either verse. It rather indicates that his choice of words is right at home within the tradition.

3.2.1.7 1 Peter 4:13-14

In 4:13-14 1 Peter once again seems to build upon Jesus' saying as recorded in Matthew 5:11-12:

1 Pet.4:13

But rejoice inasmuch as you participate in the sufferings of Christ, so that you may be overjoyed when his glory is revealed.

ἀλλὰ καθὼ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν, χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι.

1 Pet. 4:14

If you are insulted because of the name of Christ, you are blessed, for the Spirit of glory and of God rests on you.

εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται .

Matt.25:31

"When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, he will sit on his glorious throne.

Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, τότε καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ·

Matt.5:11-12

"Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me. Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven, for in the same way they persecuted the prophets who were before you.

μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἰπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν

²⁴² Cf. similar expressions: ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν (1 John 2:18); ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν (Heb.2:2).

[ψευδόμενοι] ἔνεκεν ἑμοῦ.

χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ
μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς
οὐρανοῖς· οὕτως γὰρ ἔδιδωξαν
τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πρὸ
ὑμῶν.

The **verbal** link between 4:13-14 and Matthew 5:11-12 is quite strong: χαίρετε ... ἀγαλλιώμενοι - χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε and ὀνειδίξεσθε ... μακάριοι - μακάριοί ... ὀνειδίσωσιν. This is further supported by the **propositional agreement**. Both passages admonish that suffering for the sake of Christ should lead to joy and is a blessed state in itself. The **conceptual analogy** and **accessibility** are the same as with 1:8.

The link with Matthew 25:31 is, on the other hand, hard to prove. Sure enough, to speak of 'his glory' is a certain aspect of referring to the larger narrative of Jesus. On the other hand, τῆς δόξης(ς) αὐτοῦ is not really a *terminus technicus* for this glory in the New Testament. 'Glory' for Jesus in this sense is not a very often recurring theme (cf. 1Tim.3:16; Hebr.2:7-9). The **verbal** parallel, τῆς δόξης(ς) αὐτοῦ, is therefore a unique link between these verses, but not necessarily a very impressive one.

Propositionally both verses agree that *there will be a moment at which Christ will reappear in his glory*. **Conceptually** the passages do match very well: in 4:13, as in many other instances, the author of the epistle contrasts present hardships with future blessings. Eschatological vindication (as in the beatitudes) is ever-present in the epistle's argument, and is precisely the subject of Matthew 25:31-46. In fact, that pericope (which is uniquely Matthean) accords very well with the general view of the beatitudes, since end-time judgment is so closely connected to the theme of suffering and poverty. Those who consider it to be a Matthean invention may doubt the accessibility to the pericope. However, it may have been present in Jesus Tradition long before the first Gospel was composed.

Another possibility is to assume τῆ(ς) δόξη(ς) αὐτοῦ was a way of referring to the return of Christ in the Early Church, one that is appropriated by 1 Peter and the Gospel of Matthew alike.

3.2.2 Living Among Pagans

Apart from the eschatological perspective towards the readers' present circumstances, 1 Peter also lays emphasis on the proper attitude for Christians in Roman society. On two separate occasions Jesus Tradition seems to play a part in the argument.

3.2.2.1 1 Peter 2:12

1 Peter 2:12

Live such good lives among the pagans that, though they accuse you of doing wrong, they may see your good deeds and glorify God on the day he visits us.

τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλὴν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς.

Matt.5:16

In the same way, let your light shine before others, that they may see your good deeds and glorify *your Father in heaven*.

οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

This parallel seems to be very straightforward. The **verbal agreement** is high: τῶν καλῶν ἔργων - τὰ καλὰ ἔργα ... δοξάσωσιν - δοξάσωσιν. Peter makes Jesus' general remark on good deeds in front of 'others' particular. The **propositional agreement** is paraphrased as: *when those around you see your good deeds they will glorify God*. The fact that 1 Peter, unlike Jesus in the *logion*, contrasts this with a hostile social setting, and situates the glorifying in an eschatological scene, increases the probability that Peter knew the saying as belonging to the same general tradition as the beatitudes, as presented by Matthew. This indicates that the saying is to be seen as a proper Sermon on the Mount/Plain-saying

and as such would be **accessible** to Peter.

The **conceptual analogy** is there as well; Matthew's 'town on a hill', 'salt' and 'light' (Matt.5:13-16) are stripped of their metaphorical language and translated matter-of-factly into the living of exemplary lives among pagans.

3.2.2.2 1 Peter 2:17

In 2:17 an even stronger emphasis is being laid on proper conduct:

1 Pet.2:17

Show proper respect to everyone, love the family of believers, fear God, honor the emperor.

πάντας τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε, τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε.

1 Pet.1:22

Τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς

Matt.22:21//Mark 12:17//Luke 20:25

Then he said to them, "So give back to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's."

τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.

John 13:34

Ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.

1 John 4:21

καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔχομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.

1 Peter 2:17 is a verse that can be regarded as a proper saying, almost an Early Christian wisdom saying, comparable to the kind of sayings that can be found in James. The present saying is constructed as a spearhead for the whole of 2:13-18, which is part of a Household Code (2:13-3:7),

and is occupied with proper respect for masters of various kinds.

The saying is built up of four parts, in a chiastic ABBA pattern, both A's dealing with those outside ('all' and 'the emperor'), and both B's dealing with those inside ('the brotherhood' and 'God') the Christian fellowship. Both A's use a derivate of τιμάω (to value, honor) whereas both B's have stronger imperatives: ἀγαπᾶτε and φοβεῖσθε. To show the proper honor towards those above you (and first of all the emperor) was commonplace in antiquity. However, Peter downplays this classical *topos* by starting out his saying with the imperative to honor *all* (cp. Rom.12:10). The value of the honor that the emperor is due is downplayed even further when we realize Peter is (in all likelihood) alluding to Proverbs 24:21 (LXX), where God *and* king (βασιλέα, as in 1 Peter 2:17) are to be feared equally. Here, in contrast, *God* is to be feared (or: revered, worshipped), but the emperor is merely to be honored or respected (as *all* are to be respected).

The word the NIV translates as 'family of believers' (ἀδελφότητα), is almost a New Testament *hapax*.²⁴³ The idea of 'brotherhood' as a general notion, however, is not foreign to the New Testament. Its combination with ἀγαπᾶτε is reminiscent of 1 Peter 1:22, where Peter commands that his readers ought to love one another (ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε). That particular form of love command-language can be found in the Johannine writings (i.e. John 13:34). It has often been stated that the love command with a scope limited to the Christian community is a typical Johannine feature. This is neither completely apt, nor is it typically Johannine, as both these Petrine parallels show. 1 John 4:21 shows, furthermore (cf. the chapter on 1 John), a variation on ἀγαπήσατε ἀλλήλους: there the 'brother' is loved as God. This twofold emphasis on proper love is in turn reminiscent of the Synoptic love command (Matt.22:37-39 & *pars.*). Together with 1:22, 1 Peter 2:17 seems to fit right into this picture: it appears to be quite meaningful that the love of the brotherhood is combined so tightly with the fear of God. On a **verbal** level, then, there is no one specific love command which can serve as a proper parallel, but it should be noted that both 1:22 and 2:17 fit neatly in the broader trend in the Early Church to command (following Jesus'

²⁴³ It occurs here, and also in 1 Pet.5:9. And cf. 1 Mac.12:10, where NRSV translates it as 'family ties'.

command, no doubt) *love for each other and/or the brother, alongside the love for God*. The **propositional agreement** and **conceptual analogy** are contained within this observation. It can be assumed that as far as **accessibility** is involved, this part of Jesus' teaching was almost inescapable.

The **verbal** agreement to Matt.22:21, then, is slight: both have θεῶ, which is hardly impressive, and Peter has βασιλέα instead of Καίσαρος. The latter choice of words may be due to the allusion to Proverbs 24:21, and the point Peter is making by that allusion. If we keep the rhetorical weight of the latter in mind, the **propositional agreement** may be stated thus: *Give the emperor what he is due, and give God what He is due*, in other words: make a distinction in how to honor each! Peter makes it quite clear that the emperor is not worthy of fearful reverence, as is God. With regard to both **conceptual analogy** and **accessibility** it should be noted that this *logion* belongs to the Temple discourse of Mark 12//Matthew 22, part of which is also alluded to in 1 Peter 2:4-8. This discourse ultimately provides the Synoptic love command in Matthew 22:37-39.

If the above reasoning is correct, the present verse cleverly combines two sayings of Jesus (one of which (the love command) is so well-known that the general notion of loving one another and/as God is just as valid as a parallel as any one scriptural passage) with one Old Testament proverb. By doing so, the author of 1 Peter succeeds in delivering a paraenetical passage (2:13-18) -which would otherwise not be very distinct from Stoic paraenesis - with sharp Christian distinction.

3.2.2.3 1 Peter 4:10

In 4:10 Peter exhorts his readers to use their 'χάρισμα' to the benefit of others. That which has been offered as a gift, should not be used for one's own personal gain. This general observation serves as the condition under which the use of the word οἰκονόμος is used:

1 Pet.4:10

Each of you should use whatever gift you have received to serve others, as faithful stewards of God's grace in its

Luke 12:42

The Lord answered, "Who then is the faithful and wise manager, whom the master puts in charge of his servants

various forms.

ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ.

to give them their food allowance at the proper time?

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος· τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ διδόναι ἐν καιρῷ [τὸ] σιτομέτριον;

Luke 16:2

So he called him in and asked him, 'What is this I hear about you? Give an account of your management, because you cannot be manager any longer.'

καὶ φωνήσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ; ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας σου, οὐ γὰρ δύνῃ ἔτι οἰκονομεῖν.

In Luke 16:1-13 Jesus tells the parable of the unjust οἰκονόμος. This parable is notoriously difficult to interpret, but the main point at least seems to be that one has to look ahead and invest in the future (kingdom). In Luke 12:42 Jesus asks the disciples who among them is a faithful οἰκονόμος. Jesus does so to make the point that the disciples have a greater responsibility than other hearers: they have to consider themselves as stewards of God's household.

In spite of the occurrence of language similar to Luke 16:2 in 1 Peter 3:15 and 4:5, the parable of the unjust steward does not seem to offer credible **conceptual analogy**. The parallel of Luke 12, however, does. We should then take χάρισμα in 4:10 to mean not just 'spiritual gifts' in a charismatic sense, but rather as endowed responsibility given to apostles and, in implicit analogy, church office holders, which is exactly what χάρις seems to mean in Ephesians 4:7 (cp. Eph.4:11-12). Ephesians 4:7-12 also discusses Jesus' ministry 'to the lower regions', which is another analogy of sorts to 1 Peter 4:6-11 (cp. also 1 Pet.4:11. with Eph. 4:7.11-

12²⁴⁴). **Propositional agreement** lays in the shared metaphor: The distribution of what is given to the Christian community, by God, is the task of the good and faithful steward. The **accessibility** is not a straightforward question: the tradition is strictly Lukan. The possible parallel allusion in Ephesians may be meaningful.

3.2.3 Prophetic Fulfillment

In the canonical Gospels the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy is a very distinct feature in presenting Jesus' ministry. 1 Peter has an interest in this theme of prophecy fulfillment, and his way of dealing with it closely resembles the approach of the evangelists. On two occasions, the letter seems to be dependent on the same tradition as the Gospel writers.

3.2.3.1 1 Peter 1:10

First of all there is 1:10, which involves a saying of Jesus on this subject:

1 Pet.1:10

Concerning this salvation, the prophets, who spoke of the grace that was to come to you, searched intently and with the greatest care,

περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν προφηταὶ οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες

Matt.13:17//Luke 10:24

For truly I tell you, many prophets and righteous people longed to see what you see but did not see it, and to hear what you hear but did not hear it.

ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφηταὶ καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

The **verbal** correspondence in this instance is solely the word 'prophets'.

²⁴⁴ The larger unit of Eph.4:1-13 has a lot in common with 1 Peter 4:6-10. Especially when Eph.4:1.7.11-12 is singled out as the passages' main thought, one may start to wonder whether the author of Ephesians is not thinking of Luke 12:41-48 as well. The *logion* the author of Eph. may be thinking of could be: παντὶ δὲ ὧ ἐδόθη πολὺ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ (Luke 12:48b, cf. Eph.4:7: 'Ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ; the author seems to equate χάρις and δωρεᾶς).

It should be noted that Matthew 5:12c (following the beatitudes from the Sermon on the Mount) also mentions prophets. It was the first part of that saying (5:12a) that is already on the author's mind (cf. 1:8). In Matthew 5:12 (= Luke 6:23) the prophets are mentioned as models of righteousness in the face of persecution. However, the present verse may connect to the previous ones by going into the theme of *salvation* (cf. 1:9), the link with suffering is apparently abandoned for now. Rather, the exact details of prophecy are discussed in 1:10-12: secrets that were hidden from the prophets, who uttered them, are becoming reality in the presence of Jesus and the Church. This is what marks the **propositional agreement** with Matthew 13:17: *the prophets longed to comprehend (but did not) what is becoming (and is now) reality.*

Conceptual analogy is harder to establish. Luke and Matthew present the saying in radically differing contexts. Matthew has the saying following an extended quotation of Isaiah on the heart-heartedness of the deaf and blind people of Israel, and ultimately as an answer to why Jesus speaks in parables. Luke offers it as a conclusion to his exalted prayer in response to the successful mission of the seventy(-two). When these two approaches are compared, Matthew's offering appears to be a little strained, since Isaiah's prophecy spoke of the limited vision of the unrighteous people, whereas Jesus' saying speaks of the limited vision of prophets and righteous men ('prophets and kings' in Luke), which is a bit awkward. However, both sayings are placed at a point in their respective narratives where it becomes obvious that they refer to the *kingdom* (Matt.13:11.24.31.33; Luke 10:9-11). Either the observable reality of the kingdom (in Luke) or the revealing of the secret of the kingdom (Matthew) is what Jesus is referring to. The latter seems to be closer to Peter's meaning (cf. also 1:12: even angels desire to get a glimpse of this hidden reality), since Matthew stresses that there remains something to be uncovered.

It is not likely that Peter would have had **access** to either Luke's or Matthew's Gospel. The saying obviously belonged to an older source and is double tradition, often associated with a written Q. However, the verbal agreement between Luke and Matthew is such that an oral source may just as well be considered.

If Peter did have this saying in mind, he is alluding to it in a very clever way. He transfers the 'longing to see, but did not see' into 'searched intently and with the greatest care', which he will elaborate on in 1:12. Doing so, he creates a backdrop to which he can elaborate on the theme of 'salvation'. There is some continuity with 1:6-9, but mainly there is secession. Through the allusion, Jesus' teaching remains in focus, and, with it, the notion of a view of better things than the present circumstances.

3.2.3.2 1 Peter 2:4-8

In 2:4-8, 1 Peter is not dealing directly with a *logion* of Jesus, but rather with the way Jesus' ministry in the Temple, during the last week in Jerusalem, is presented by the gospels, and (presumably) also older oral tradition:

1Pet.2:4-8

As you come to him, the living Stone—rejected by humans but chosen by God and precious to him—you also, like living stones, are being built into a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.

For in Scripture it says:

“See, I lay a stone in Zion,
a chosen and precious
cornerstone,
and the one who trusts in him
will never be put to shame.”

Now to you who believe, this stone is precious. But to those who do not believe,

“The stone the builders rejected
has become the cornerstone,”
and,

Matt.21:42//Mark 12:10//Luke 20:17

Jesus said to them, “Have you never read in the Scriptures:

“The stone *the builders* rejected
has become the cornerstone;
the Lord has done this,
and it is marvelous in our eyes

Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οὐδέποτε
ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς· λίθον ὄν
ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες,
οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας·
παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη
καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστή ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς
ἡμῶν

Luke 20:18

Everyone who falls on that stone will be broken to pieces; anyone on whom it falls will be crushed.

πᾶς ὁ πεσὼν ἐπ’ ἐκεῖνον τὸν λίθον
συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ’ ὃν δ’ ἂν πέσῃ,

“A stone that causes people to stumble
and a rock that makes them fall.”
They stumble because they disobey
the message—which is also what
they were destined for.

πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι λίθον ζῶντα
ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν
ἀποδοκιμασμένον, παρὰ δὲ θεῶ
ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον,
καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες
οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς
ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνεύγκαι
πνευματικᾶς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους
θεῶ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ·
ἴδοῦ τίθημι ἐν Σιών
λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον
ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον,
καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ
καταισχυθῆι.
ὕμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν,
ἀπιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος ὃν
ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες,
οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας

καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα
σκανδάλου· οἱ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ
λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες εἰς ὃ καὶ
ἐτέθησαν.

λικμήσει αὐτόν.

Matt.16:18.23

And I tell you that you are *Peter*, and
on this *rock* I will build *my church*,
and the gates of Hades will not
overcome it.

κἀγὼ δὲ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος,
καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω
μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ᾄδου
οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.

Jesus turned and said to Peter, “Get
behind me, Satan! You are a
stumbling block to me; you do not
have in mind the concerns of God,
but merely human concerns.

ὁ δὲ στραφεὶς εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ·
ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ·
σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς
τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν
ἀνθρώπων.

Gosp. Thom. 66

Show me the stone which the
builders rejected. It is the
cornerstone

In 1 Peter 2:4-10 we find a cluster of clauses, building upon the closing
statement of 2:3. The main thought is presented in three parts:

1. You approach the Lord, who is good (2:3-4)
2. You are (thereby) being formed into a spiritual temple (2:5)
3. Therefore, you are now God’s chosen people, but the unbelievers

stumble (2:7-10)

The first two clauses are connected furthermore by the use of the same metaphor: both 'the Lord' as 'you yourselves' are called 'living stone(s)'. This metaphor is the leading idea of these verses, and Peter calls upon a series of proof texts to underline his message: Isaiah 8:14 and 28:16 and Psalm 118:22 (LXX). Norman Hillyer²⁴⁵ has argued that the Old Testament uses the notions of 'rock' and 'stone' as highly meaningful metaphors, sometimes even as designations for God. Likewise, as have Rabbinical and Qumran sources, the Early Church has appropriated these prophetic 'stone'-texts as messianic and eschatological.²⁴⁶ There is some conspicuous overlap with 1 Peter 2:4-8 and Romans 9:33, which has led some scholars to believe that there is an underlying source (a *testimonia* gathering together messianic stone-texts) used by both.²⁴⁷

For the present purposes the Old Testament texts that are quoted by Peter are interesting, since Jesus refers to them in the Gospel narratives. In the Synoptic account of Jesus' final week in Jerusalem Psalm 118:22 figures alongside the cursing of the fig tree and the parable of the wicked tenants, displaying the relationship between the Jerusalem notables and Jesus. Jesus' clash with the scribes, Sadducees and Pharisees in these chapters is connected to the temple in more than one way. Wright believes Jesus' quotation to be a deliberate 'riddle' whose answer has to be sought in the well-known theme of messianic rock/stone imagery, such as Isaiah 8:14 (which is subsequently quoted by Jesus in the Lukan account, Luke 20:18) and 28:16 and Daniel 2.²⁴⁸

Peter is associated with this rock, when Jesus calls him the rock on which the *ecclesia* will be built, which the gates of hades will not overcome (Matt.16:18). As in 1 Peter, Jesus' quotation of Psalm 118:22 is certainly as much about the Temple as it is about himself. In Mark's account Jesus' discourses in the Temple in 11:27-12:44 are preceded by the cleansing of the Temple (11:15-18) and directly followed by a prophecy of its imminent destruction (13:1-2), and of course followed later by the 'false'

²⁴⁵ 'Rock-Stone Imagery in 1 Peter', *Tyndale Bulletin* 22 (1971), 58-81.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 58-59.

²⁴⁷ Cf. Witherington *Letters and Homilies*, 118; Davids, *First Epistle*, 89.

²⁴⁸ N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996, 498-500.

report of Jesus' claim that he was going to destroy and rebuild it (14:58).

In the Matthean account of Peter's confession and subsequent rebuke in Caesarea Philippi, we find that the significance of these same rock/stone-texts is utilized in Jesus' respective praise and rebuttal of Peter (Matt.16:18.23). As in 1 Peter 2:4-8, this account moves from Peter (cp. 'believers' in 1 Pet.) being a stone/rock in the positive sense to being a 'stumbling block'. In fact, the parallel is so neat that it is quite conceivable that 1 Peter uses this story as foundational: the fellow-believers are invited to share in Peter's role as 'rock', as unbelievers are implicitly warned that they will be regarded stumbling blocks. The meaningfulness of this metaphor is underlined by the combination with the quote from Psalm 118 and Jesus' role as cornerstone, which brings the idea of the eschatological Temple sharper into focus, especially against the backdrop of the Synoptic account of holy week and the passion narrative.

The **verbal** and **propositional** agreement to the Psalm-quotation is of course primarily to the LXX. But the **conceptual analogy** to Mark 12:10 (& *pars.*) is significant: Jesus' role as cornerstone in the eschatological Temple is presupposed in both texts. The **verbal** parallels to the Matthean account of the confession at Caesarea Philippi are not very impressive at first sight: οἰκοδομεῖσθε - οἰκοδομήσω ... σκανδάλου - σκάνδαλον. Yet both Matthew 16 and 1 Peter 2 are in these instances referring to the Isaiah texts. Three times they refer to the Isaiah texts indirectly, but 1 Peter 2:8 is a combined paraphrase of Isaiah 8:14 and 28:16. Matthew 16 and 1 Peter 2 are involved in similar word play with regard to especially Isaiah 28:16. **Propositionally** there is no real parallel, because the reference is deliberately indirect and playful. The parallel is present primarily at the **conceptual** level: Jesus' words directed at Peter, words that indirectly refer to at least Isaiah 28:16 and possibly 8:14 as well, are now applied to 1 Peter's audience. The character of Peter is carefully removed from the allusion, as the author places his audience immediately next to Jesus, since the readers are given the same title as Jesus in this pericope: living stones. By themselves, these parallels would not be very impressive. Yet the fact that both passages make the same basic conceptual move, using the same Old Testament references, the first time directed *at* Peter, the second time related *by* Peter, gives weight

to the idea that 1 Peter consciously picks up this piece of Jesus Tradition.

With regard to **access** it is an interesting question whether the author of 1 Peter would know the tradition of Jesus quoting Psalm 118:22, since it seems to be part of the very core of the Synoptic narrative leading up to the passion. Its (slightly differing) presence in *Gospel of Thomas* 66 (lacking the deliberate interplay with Scripture²⁴⁹) shows that the tradition has had a place in Jesus Tradition in its own right. Matthew's account of Jesus' praise and rebuke of Peter in Matthew 16 is strictly (in fact, typically) Matthean, so it is hard to picture 1 Peter's relation to that tradition. It cannot be proven that 1 Peter makes use of that particular piece of tradition, but it is very well possible. One would have to assume broad familiarity with the tradition of the events leading up to Jesus' arrest in an (oral) form in the basic narrative flow of Mark's Gospel.²⁵⁰

The whole of 1 Peter 1:13-2:10 should be read under one heading: it is the holiness of God's chosen people with which Peter is concerned in this passage. He marks off this passage first by the quotation of Leviticus 19:2 (LXX), 'be holy as I am holy', and ends it with the clear allusion to Hosea 1:9-10 ('once you were called 'not my people', but you will be known as 'children of the living God'), both passages are covenantal in nature. In working out his theme of holiness Peter seems to have used Old Testament texts that also played a part in Jesus Tradition. In this particular pericope it is striking that he first uses the theme of 'seed' and 'new birth', and follows it up with the theme of 'stones' and 'building'. It brings to mind another covenantal Old Testament passage which combines the themes of 'planting' and 'rebuilding' in a way that seems very appropriate for Early Christian use: Jeremiah 24:6b-7a: 'I will build them up and not tear them down; I will plant them and not uproot them. I will give them a heart to know me, that I am the LORD.' Although not very clearly, it can be assumed that Jeremiah 24 also resonates in the background of Mark 11:12-21 - the cursing of the fig tree and the cleansing of the Temple. In those verses (and Mark 11:12-13:2 as a whole) Jesus is occupied with 'uprooting' and 'tearing down'. It may be

²⁴⁹ Cf. Vernon K. Robbins, 'Interfaces of Orality and Literature in the Gospel of Mark', in Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper & John Miles Foley (eds.), *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory and Mark*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 125-46.

²⁵⁰ Cf. the way Richard Bauckham lays out and develops this possibility in 'John for Readers of Mark', in Bauckham (ed.) *The Gospels for all Christians*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998, 147-72.

that Peter is alluding to Jesus' confrontation with the Jerusalem notables, in order to bring out the contrast with his addressees who indeed are and have been 'planted' and 'built up'.

3.2.4 Idiomatic Parallels

On several occasions 1 Peter is using words or phrases that are not direct allusions to specific sayings of Jesus, but are still dependent on Jesus Tradition: the choice of words has only been made in this way, because Jesus has used similar words in a similar manner first.

3.2.4.1 1 Peter 1:17

The use of 'Father' in 1:17 is such an example:

1 Pet.1:17

Since you *call on* a Father who judges each person's work impartially, live out your time as foreigners here in reverent fear

καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε

Matt.6:9a//Luke 11:2

This, then, is how you should pray:
"Our Father in heaven,

Οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς·
Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς·

The present parallel is not to be seen as an allusion in any way. Its dependence on Jesus Tradition lies in the notion of calling God 'Father'.

The basic notion of God's fatherhood to Israel is to be found sparingly, but throughout the Old Testament.²⁵¹ Jesus seems to have developed this notion more poignantly, calling upon God as Father in a direct and personal sense. The consequences of this argument have sometimes been exaggerated, but the basic observation is justified. Thus, Paul's use of

²⁵¹ Of its more than 1300 occurrences in LXX, Πάτερ is only used 15 times in reference to God, 13 times of which as an epithet, twice in prayer (cf. *NIDNTTE*, 678-79).

'Abba, Father', in Romans 8:15 and Galatians 4:6 is reminiscent of Jesus' vocabulary in a deliberate way²⁵² (one could offer Mark 14:36's 'Abba, Father' as a parallel, but it seems more logical to take that verse as a similar attempt to convey Jesus' liberty, and that of the Christian congregation, in addressing God as Father).

The Christian use of 'Father' over against the Jewish or Old Testament notion is apparent here: 'Father' is not used as a metaphor that suits the context, but rather as a title, which in this case forms a contrast (probably deliberate) with God's role as *judge* that comes to the fore in the present sentence.

3.2.4.2 1 Peter 1:3.23

Another example is 1 Peter's use of 'born again'-language:

1 Pet.1:3

... In his great mercy he has given us new birth into a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead

...ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζωσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν

1 Pet.1:23

For you have been born again, not of perishable seed, but of imperishable, through the living and enduring word of God

ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλ' ἀφθάρτου διὰ λόγου ζωῆς θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος.

John 3:3

Jesus replied, "Very truly I tell you, no one can see the kingdom of God unless they are born again.

ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Matt.13:19(//Mark 4:15//Luke 8:12)

When anyone hears the message about the kingdom and does not understand it, the evil one comes and snatches away what was sown in their heart. This is the seed sown along the path.

παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ,

²⁵² Cf. Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007, 499-500.

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν
σπαρείς.

In 1:3.23 Peter uses regeneration language that is reminiscent of John 3:3-7. John does not, as Peter, use a compound verb (ἀναγεννάω, which is unique to Peter), but combines γεννάω with ἄνωθεν, which can be translated either as ‘born again’ or ‘born from above’.²⁵³ This presents the **verbal** parallel ἀναγεννήσας/ ἀναγεγεννημένοι - γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν. In 1:23 Peter works out the notion of regeneration with the image of ‘seed’, which he indirectly equates with the ‘word’ of God. This combination of words evokes the Synoptic parallel of the explanation of the parable of the sower and the verbal parallel: σποράς ... λόγου - λόγον ... σπαρείς.

Being ‘born again’ may be, as Michaels puts it, ‘a heightened form of Jesus’ use elsewhere of children as a metaphor of discipleship,’²⁵⁴ but it can just as well be understood to be connected to the idea of the word sown in the believers’ hearts. It seems as though 1 Peter 1:23 understands it in that way: The citation of Isaiah 40:6-8 (LXX) in the following verses (1:24-25) underscores this; generations who are beget in the natural sense wither away, but (those who are beget by) the word of the Lord, endure forever. The **propositional agreement** to the Johannine parallel, then, is the basic notion of *being born anew* which *is effected by*, respectively, the word or the Spirit. The agreement with the Synoptic parallel is difficult to describe, since Peter uses the metaphor in an absolute sense. But when we acknowledge that he uses the metaphor of sowing the word, related to the idea of regeneration as a salvific occurrence for Christian believers, we can state that ‘*the seed of the word is sown from heaven* (in the believer’s hearts)’ is the propositional agreement.

This may not seem much to go by, but the case of this double parallel is strengthened when we consider how James made use of much the same ideas in reference to Jesus Tradition. We have seen how James combines the notions of the ‘implanted word’ (Jas.1:21, in reference to the same

²⁵³ Cf. *NIDNTE*, 339: the ambiguity in the Johannine wording is deliberate.

²⁵⁴ J. Ramsey Michaels, *1 Peter* (WBC), Waco: Word Books, 1988.

Synoptic parallel as 1 Pet.1:23), the ‘good gifts from above’ (Jas.1:17) and ‘birth ... through the word of truth’ (1:18). ‘From above’ in James 1:17 is ἄνωθεν, which reoccurs in James 3. It was proposed above that James’ use of that word, and the notion of ‘wisdom from above’, is closely related to the idea of the holy Spirit, as we encounter it in other New Testament authors. So, it seems that both authors witness an Early Church idiom in addressing the notion of regeneration. To speak of regeneration would mean to consider the word sown in the believers’ heart. This does not just evoke the parable, it is also covenantal language (which may explain the baptismal undertones of John 3:5 and also Tit.3:5) which points to a new people of God, purified through the holy Spirit. This is both parallel’s **conceptual analogy** to Jesus Tradition.

The **access** to the Synoptic parallel seems to be quite imaginable. The explanation of the parable of the sower is triple tradition, but the fact that neither Luke nor Matthew seems to follow Mark very closely, points to the probability that all three evangelists knew of this tradition apart from each other.²⁵⁵ This would enhance the likelihood that the author of 1 Peter also had access to this tradition. The Johannine parallel is more problematic. John 3:4-7 presents itself as a typical Johannine elaboration, possibly composed long after 1 Peter was written.²⁵⁶ Yet 1 Peter may testify to the existence of the basic notion of ‘rebirth’ as an early Christian idiom with the saying of John 3:3 as original source. Moreover, 1 Peter 1:22 (the preceding verse) offers an allusion to the love commandment in passing, which is Johannine in phrasing (ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε, cp. John 13:34: ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους), which allows for more room to suppose Johannine parallels, regardless of the exact provenance of these traditions.

3.2.4.3 1 Peter 2:25

A next parallel is a more clear allusion, but still one within a larger idiomatic domain, namely that of Jesus as ‘shepherd’:

²⁵⁵ Cf. James G. Dunn, ‘Between Jesus and the Gospels’, in: Dunn (ed.) *The Oral Gospel Tradition*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013, 290-312.

²⁵⁶ John 3:3, however, is thought to be an underlying original *logion* by Culpepper (‘Jesus Sayings’, 357-59).

1 Pet.2:25

For “you were like sheep going astray,” but now you have returned to the Shepherd and Overseer of your souls.

ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλ’ ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.

Matt.18:12//Luke15:4//Gos.Thom.107

... If a man owns a hundred sheep, and one of them wanders away...

ἐὰν γένηται τινὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ πλανηθῇ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν

Matt.9:36//Mark 6:34

...like sheep *without a shepherd*

...ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα

John 10:11

Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων·

I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.

The idea of God or the messianic king as a shepherd to Israel is found in several places in the Old Testament (Gn.48:15; Ps.23; Is.40:11; Jer.23:1-4; 31:10; Ez.37:24; Zech.11:4-17)²⁵⁷ and is picked up by Jesus and the New Testament authors on numerous occasions (i.e.: the passages in the table above; Mark 14:27; Matt.10:6; 15:24; 25:32; Luke 19:10; Hb.13:20; Rev.7:17). But in the present verse we once again encounter a specific allusion to Isaiah (53:6 LXX: ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν), which is also part of Jesus Tradition.²⁵⁸ Peter was already dealing with Isaiah 53 in the preceding verses, using it to somehow join together the fate of the suffering slaves among his addressees with that of the suffering servant Christ. Yet in the present verse Jesus Tradition proper seems to come to the fore. The idea of Jesus as a shepherd vis-à-vis his (lost) sheep was sufficiently widespread to be able to assume this position. The idea of Jesus as a shepherd is implicit in the parable and Matthew 9//Mark 6 and

²⁵⁷ Cf. Davids, 113.

²⁵⁸ Cf. Steve Moyise ('Jesus and Isaiah', *Neotestamentica* 43.2 (2009), 249-70) who shows the prominence of Isaiah in Jesus' interpretation of Scripture. He, however, does not highlight Isaiah 53:6.

explicit in John 10. The idea of 'lost sheep' is explicit in the parable and in Matthew 9//Mark 6. Furthermore, in John 10:11 Jesus lays down τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ for his sheep, whereas Peter reminds his readers that Jesus is the 'shepherd and overseer' of τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.

The closest parallel to the Petrine verse seems to be that of Matthew 9:36//Mark 6:34. Both present Jesus as the ultimate shepherd for a lost people, both do so with a passing allusion to Isaiah 53:6. Yet that it does, and that this verse is not part of the teaching of Jesus, but rather part of narrative tradition, is reminiscent of the types of parallels that were found in 2:4-8, where the Markan narrative played a role in the background and the allusions to Isaiah and Psalm 118 combined with that to Jesus Tradition. The **verbal agreement** consists of ὡσ(εἰ) πρόβατα and ποιμένα. The notion of the sheep being 'lost' is implicit in Matthew.

Propositional agreement is found in the shared metaphor: a people that is not properly guided is *like sheep without a shepherd*. The implicit proposition in Mark (explicit in 1 Peter) is that *Jesus is the right shepherd for those sheep*. **Conceptually**, Peter is stressing the right kind of submissiveness towards the shepherd/overseer. This notion is not present in the Synoptic Gospel account, nor in the parable. But it is present in the Johannine parallel: Jesus laid down his life, and implicitly calls on his followers to surrender in like manner. Assuming that the author of 1 Peter had the Markan narrative parallel in mind when writing the present verse, combined with the earlier appropriation of Jesus' Temple discourse, this leads to the possibility that there existed a pre-Markan narrative tradition which already incorporated some of the Old Testament passages that are used in the canonical Gospels. 1 Peter's author may very well have had **access** to such a tradition, presumably in oral form. Apart from that, tradition material concerning Jesus' role as a shepherd to his people (with or without prophetic allusions) can be assumed to have been widespread in the Early Church.

3.2.4.4 1 Peter 3:18a

As Watson has shown in his essay²⁵⁹ (cf. 3.1.1.5.3 above), 3:18 has some interesting idiomatic familiarity with Jesus Tradition:

1 Pet.3:18a

For Christ also suffered once for sins, the righteous for the unrighteous

ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν,
δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων

Heb.10:26:

οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία

ὑπὲρ with genitive: Mark 14:24
Luke 22:19, 20; John 6:51; 10:11, 15; 11:50ff.; 15:13; 17:19; 18:14
Rom. 5:6, 8; 8:32; 14:15; 1 Cor. 1:13; 5:7 var.; 11:24; 15:3 2 Cor. 5:14, 15 (twice), 21; Gal. 1:4; 2:20; 3:13; Eph. 5:2, 25; 1 Thes. 5:10 var.; 1 Tim. 2:6; Tit. 2:14; Heb. 2:9; 7:27; 10:12; 1 Pet. 2:21; 3:18; 4:1 var.; 1 John 3:16²⁶⁰

The examples in Mark 14, Luke 22, John 6 (implicitly) and 1 Corinthians 11 all belong to the eucharist tradition. 1 Corinthians 15:3 also is thought to belong to tradition material that predates Paul. The other examples in John are all variations on the same principle of Christ's substitutionary death. 1 John 3:16 is in turn a variation on these instances. The Pauline language in Romans, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, 1 Thessalonians and the Pastoral Epistles betray variation on the same tradition; Hebrews probably offers a link between Jesus and Jewish tradition. 1 Peter's use of ὑπὲρ (here and in 2:21) is the same as in Mark, Luke and John (Matt.26:28 has περὶ) and Paul. The text-critical variations Davies lists are probably not preferable in 1 Peter 4:1 and 1 Corinthians 5:7, but they probably are in the case of 1 Thessalonians 5:10.²⁶¹ The variations in themselves prove how strong this language was imbedded

²⁵⁹ Watson, 'Early Jesus Tradition', in Batten & Kloppenborg, *James, 1 & 2 Peter*.

²⁶⁰ This list is taken from R.E. Davies, 'Christ in Our Place – The Contribution of the Prepositions', *TB* 21 (1970), 71-91 (here: 72).

²⁶¹ In 1 Cor.5:7 ὑπὲρ seems to have been prefixed to ἡμῶν in some codices (κ², C³, Ψ) and manuscripts (1881, 28, sy, sa, bo^{ms}), against all other major codices and manuscripts that lack ὑπὲρ. In 1 Pet.4:1 either ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν or ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is inserted into the text in some witnesses, a majority of important manuscripts lacks either grouping of words (P⁷², B, C, Ψ). 1 Thess.5:10 has ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν in an overwhelming majority of witnesses, against κ and B.

in the Early Church: the substitutionary idiom was probably dependent on Isaiah 53:4-6 to begin with, which 1 Peter seems to understand.

3.2.4.5 1 Peter 4:8

In 4:8 we find an Early Christian saying which may very well belong to Jesus Tradition:

1 Pet.4:8

Above all, love each other
deeply, because love covers over a
multitude of sins.

πρὸ πάντων τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην
ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες, ὅτι ἀγάπη καλύπτει
πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν

Cf. James 5:20 (above 2.2.5)

In 4:7 Peter exhorts his readers to be 'alert and sober of mind'. In 4:8-11 he seems to make this advice more specific by rolling out a number of ethical imperatives: love one another; be hospitable; use the spiritual gifts properly; speak in a fitting way and help others. By starting this list with *πρὸ πάντων* and ending it with a doxology and a firm 'amen', the author is setting it somewhat apart from the other arguments.

In the chapter on James (cf. 2.2.5) the position has been defended that *ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν* (1 Pet.4:8, cp. Jas.5:20) was likely understood to be a Jesus *logion*. Its prominent place in this list of imperatives, all of which are aimed at seeing to the need of others, suggests that Peter uses it (in combination with *εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες*) as a variant of the love command.

3.2.4.6 1 Peter 5:2-3

Another example of Jesus Tradition idiom is found in 5:2-3, where the notion of Jesus' shepherding is extrapolated to the role the elders need to assume.

1 Pet.5:2-3

Be shepherds of God's flock that is under your care, watching over them

not lording it over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock.

ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλ' ἐκουσίως κατὰ θεόν, μὴ δὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως,

μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου·

John 21:16c

Jesus said, "Take care of my sheep."

λέγει αὐτῷ· ποιμαίνε τὰ πρόβατά μου.

Mark 10:42b-43//Matt.20:25

οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν.

οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος

You know that those who are regarded as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them.

Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant

On a **verbal** level, there are great similarities between 1 Peter 5:2-3 and John 21:16: ποιμάνατε ... ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ - ποιμαίνε τὰ πρόβατά μου. There is the shared imperative to shepherd over others. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus speaks of 'my sheep', 1 Peter calls these 'God's flock'; different vocabulary, but propositionally so close that the one can be understood as a mere variation on the other. Yet, it is in itself insufficient to establish a relation between both verses, since the metaphoric images of shepherding and sheep are quite general in Early Christianity. The verbal link with the Markan parallel is equally unsure, for exactly the opposite reasons: it rests solely on the shared occurrence of the verb κατακυριεύω, which occurs, apart from Mark 10:42 (& *par.*) and 1 Peter 5:3, only once more in the New Testament (Acts 19:16; it has the meaning of 'overpowering' there).

The shared **proposition** with John 21 is a shared metaphor. Both phrases communicate, imperatively, the assignment that *the community of Jesus' followers needs to be looked after*. Interestingly, Jesus, in John 21, is himself known to be the principal shepherd of his flock (cp. John 10:1-18; 1 Pet.5:4), but now seems to lay this responsibility on Simon Peter's shoulders. Peter, who, within the narrative that encapsulates the epistle, is also known to be the foremost shepherd of God's flock, now passes a part of this responsibility along to (what he has just called in 5:1) his 'fellow elders'. The shared proposition with the Markan parallel is the warning *not to 'lord over' the community of Jesus' followers*, but rather serve it with apt humility. Christian leadership is being contrasted, in both instances, with worldly power-play.

The **conceptual** analogy is obvious in the case of the Johanne parallel: both sayings use the same metaphor for almost the same purpose. One could add that both assignments stress the shepherd's humility. This also goes for the Markan parallel: Jesus is addressing Christian leadership issues, and 1 Peter may be picking up on this basic thought. The **accessibility** of the Markan parallel is conceivable, since in Mark and Matthew the narrative is the prelude to holy week and the passion narrative. Peter betrays knowledge of this larger narrative in its basic Synoptic form in other instances. It is likely that 1 Peter would use the verb κατακυριεύω specifically with an eye to the Gospel account. The other parallel is only known in its Johannine form, but may have been accessible as oral tradition. In any case, Peter appears to take a keen interest in traditions regarding Simon Peter (cf. 1 Pet.2:4-8).

A final couple of possible parallels in this category is found in 5:7 and 5:8:

3.2.4.7 1 Peter 5:7

1 Pet.5:7

Cast all your anxiety on him because he cares for you.

πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν
ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ
μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν.

Matt.6:25-26; cp.Luke 12:11.22-32

"Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or drink; or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothes?"

Look at the birds of the air; they do not sow or reap or store away in barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not much more valuable than they?

Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε [ἢ τί πίητε], μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε. οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖόν ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος;

ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὅτι οὐ σπεύρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τρέφει αὐτά· οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν;

Pap.Oxy.655 36//Gos.Thom.36

Do not be concerned from morning until evening and from evening until morning ...

The **verbal agreement** lies in the parallel use of μεριμνάω: Jesus' uses it as a negative imperative; 1 Peter's derivate is a noun.

Propositionally both passages have a great deal in common. 1 Peter's exhortation may be seen as a paraphrase of the saying. The epistle uses a more fancy way of simply saying 'do not worry', and a compressed way of stating God's care. The shared proposition is *do not worry; God takes care of you*. The **conceptual analogy** to the Matthean parallel (Sermon on the Mount) lies in that in both cases those who are in need of God's care are reassured. The background of Luke 12 is somewhat more promising. Luke 12:11 also has a derivate of μεριμνάω and indirectly influences the meaning of the discourse of 12:22-32 (which is parallel to Matt.6:25 ff). The 'worries' of Luke 12 are both persecution and riches and poverty. The **accessibility** of the tradition is likely; it is well attested. Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 655 (a Greek version of *GThom.* 24 and 36-39) shows

knowledge of the saying, probably independent from the Synoptic version. Its version focuses on care for the poor. The coptic *Thomas 36* apparently shortened this to 'do not worry what you will wear'.

It is quite possible that Peter's choice of words is influenced by Jesus Tradition. This is, however, ultimately hard to establish, since Peter is alluding to Psalm 55:22a (LXX) principally. There it reads ἐπίρριψον ἐπὶ κύριον τὴν μέριμνά σου: cast your anxieties on the Lord.

3.2.4.8 1 Peter 5:8a

1 Pet.5:8a

Be alert and of sober mind.

νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε

1 Pet.1:13

Therefore, with minds that are alert and fully sober, set your hope on the grace to be brought to you when Jesus Christ is revealed at his coming.

Διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν νήφοντες τελείως ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Mark 13:37 (cp.1 Tess.5:6)

Ὁ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω πᾶσιν λέγω, γρηγορεῖτε.

What I say to you, I say to everyone: 'Watch!'

1 Tess.5:6

So then, let us not be like others, who are asleep, but let us be awake and sober.

ἄρα οὖν μὴ καθεύδωμεν ὡς οἱ λοιποὶ ἀλλὰ γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν.

Most of the 23 occurrences of γρηγορέω ('to stay awake') that are found in the New Testament are metaphorical in the same sense as here in 1 Peter 5:8 (with the one exception of Mark 14:35-38 & *pars.*, but that story serves, in part, to drive the metaphorical point of Mark 13:33-37 & *pars.* home). Paul (1 Cor. 16:13; Col.4:2; 1 Thess.5:6, cp. Acts 20:31) and Revelation (3:2-3; 16:15) share Jesus' and 1 Peter's use of γρηγορέω: the New Testament is quite unanimous in its expectation of Jesus' return (and cp. *Did.*16:1), and the exhortation to remain vigilant in expectancy of the Parousia was apparently a common topic. 1 Peter 5:8 is, however, not a very straightforward example of this emphasis: Jesus' imminent

return is not directly addressed. In fact, 1 Peter does not directly address the Parousia at all. But the verses 5:8-10, paralleling 1:4-6.13 in this regard, emphasize that the present suffering is short-lived and seek to avert the readers' attention to the promises of the world to come, more so than elsewhere in the letter. This establishes adequate **conceptual analogy** to place 1 Peter 5:8 in line with the other instances of metaphorical use of *γρηγορέω* in the context of Jesus' return. It seems likely that all of these uses are in some way dependent on the tradition that lies behind Mark 13. So, even if the parallel seems to rest on the usage of merely one word, this does establish **verbal** and **propositional agreement** with an idiom that appears to be widespread and therefore easily **accessible**.

1 Peter 1:13 underlines this basic observation: there is no verbal parallel to Jesus Tradition there, but its meaning is tied up with the tradition even closer as 5:8. The verbal link *νήψατε* - *νήφοντες* ('sober', cp. also 4:7; 1 Thess.5:6) shows that the author is thinking of the same issue in both instances.

3.2.5 Passion Narrative

Throughout the epistle Jesus' suffering is an important theme, but especially in the short catechetical pericope of 2:21-25.

3.2.5.1 1 Peter 5:1

It seems, however, that 5:1 is especially important in the epistle's presentation of this theme:

1 Pet.5:1

To the elders among you, I appeal as a fellow elder and a witness of Christ's sufferings who also will share in the glory to be revealed

Πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν
παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ
μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ
παθημάτων, ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης

Global allusion to the passion narrative

Cp. 1 Pet. 1:11; 1:19; 2:19-24; 3:18; 4:1.12-14

ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός·

The idea here is that Peter is alluding to the Passion narrative in its entirety: It may be called a 'global allusion' as i.e. James 2:1. Throughout the epistle, the author shows awareness of Christ's suffering, as a meaningful event for his addressees, but here, as the author is emphasizing his own person as never before, he is very outspoken.

The reference to the Passion narrative is consciously presented as eyewitness testimony, as in e.g. 1 John 1:1-6, which makes the allusion and its general relevance for the entire epistle all the more emphatic.

3.2.5.2 1 Peter 2:20

In 2:20 the theme of Christ's suffering may be present:

1 Pet.2:20

But how is it to your credit if you receive a beating for doing wrong and endure it? But if you suffer for doing good and you endure it, this is commendable before God.

ποῖον γὰρ κλέος, εἰ ἀμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ.

Matt.26:67 (cf.Mark 14:65)

Then they spit in his face and struck him with their fists. Others slapped him

Τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ ἐράπισαν

The **verbal** parallel (κολαφιζόμενοι - ἐκολάφισαν) is not very strong, but the verb is quite rare in the New Testament: apart from the occurrences here and in the passion narrative it only occurs in the Corinthian correspondence (1 Cor.4:11; 2 Cor.12:7, both referring to the hardship Paul himself endures, which in Paul is always, either implicitly or explicitly, considered alongside Christ's suffering). The rareness of the verb in combination with the string of allusions to both the suffering

servant of Isaiah 53 and the passion narrative in the verses immediately following the present verse (2:21-25) may indicate a meaningful relation between 2:20 and the use of the word ἐκολάφισαν in the passion narrative.

Propositional agreement is at first sight slight. Both verses deal with the suffering of the just, 2:20 clearly functions as an introduction to the following pericope. The verse itself still belongs to the instruction to household slaves, and half of it serves as a warning to behave justly, the second half makes clear that suffering of those who are just, as opposed to those who are unjust, is a good thing. 2:21-25 makes clear that this is the case because of the example of Christ. Propositional agreement between both verses may then be paraphrased as: *to endure a beating [i.e.: without fighting back] is proper conduct for one who is innocent.* **Conceptual** analogy is obvious in this case: Christ's suffering is the example 1 Peter lays out for its readers. Consequently, **access** to the passion narrative is obvious as well. It is a matter of likelihood that 2:20's phrasing is dependent on that of the passion narrative in the way the author knew it, which may very well be closely related to the way the Synoptics relate it. The following parallels will increase this likelihood, as the author's dependence on the Temple discourse of Mark 12//Matthew 22 in 2:4-10 does as well.

3.2.5.3 1 Peter 2:21

Starting with 2:21, 1 Peter offers something of a meditation on Isaiah 53:4-12:²⁶²

1 Pet. 2:21

To this you were called, because Christ suffered for you, leaving you an example, that you should follow in his steps.

εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε,
ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν
ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμόν,

Matt. 16:24//Mark 8:34//Luke

9:23// John 12:26

Then Jesus said to his disciples, "Whoever wants to be my disciple must deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me.

Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς
αὐτοῦ· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου

²⁶² Witherington, *Hellenized Christians*, 154.

ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς ἴχνεσιν
αὐτοῦ,

ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ
ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ
ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι

The **verbal** parallel is not very impressive: ἐπακολουθήσητε - ἀκολουθεῖτω. It is especially weak when we consider (1) how frequent the verb ἀκολουθέω occurs in the New Testament (90 times) and (2) that ἀκολουθέω and ἐπακολουθέω are distinct in meaning (the latter meaning ‘to follow in close correspondence with’).²⁶³

However, there are good grounds to assume 1 Peter is in fact phrasing this verse in close correspondence with the *logion* of Matthew 16:24 (& *pars.*). First of all, this particular saying is well attested: all three Synoptic Gospels have it, as well as John (without the cross-bearing, cp. *GThom.55*²⁶⁴). All four canonical Gospels offer this saying in combination with the saying ‘whoever wants to save their life will lose it’, and with Jesus’ first clear prediction of his impending suffering. Since 1 Peter 1:9 in all likelihood refers to the *logion* of Matthew 16:25 (& *pars.*), the **accessibility** to the tradition is guaranteed, and the likelihood of the author referring to the present saying is increased.

This is especially the case when the **propositional agreement** is taken into account. Both verses state that *followers of Jesus Christ should follow his model in suffering*. Jesus is phrasing this cryptically before the passion; 1 Peter states it matter-of-factly referring back to the event. Naturally there is **conceptual analogy**, placing Jesus’ call to discipleship alongside 1 Peter’s in the shared context of suffering.

3.2.5.4 1 Peter 2:22-23

In the next verse Isaiah 53:9b LXX is quoted directly²⁶⁵:

²⁶³ On the other hand ἀκολουθέω is common for ‘following Jesus’ in the Gospels, whereas in the apostolic setting the call to follow Jesus’ footsteps is usually the invitation to become a μιμητής of Jesus.

²⁶⁴ *GThom. 55* has the cross-bearing, but lacks the ‘following’. This is, however, quite an obvious example of a conflated saying: the saying of Matt. 10:37 is mixed with that of 16:26.

²⁶⁵ Although LXX has ἀνομίαν where 1 Peter has ἀμαρτίαν.

1 Pet.2:22-23

“He committed no sin,
and no deceit was found in his
mouth.”

When they hurled their insults at
him, he did not retaliate; when he
suffered, he made no
threats. Instead, he entrusted
himself to him who judges justly.

ὅς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν
οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι
αὐτοῦ,

ὅς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ
άντελοιδόρει,
πάσχων οὐκ ἠπέλει,
παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως

Matt.5:39.44//Luke 6:28-29

But I tell you, do not resist an evil
person. If anyone slaps you on the
right cheek, turn to them the other
cheek also. ...

But I tell you, love your enemies and
pray for those who persecute you

ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ
πονηρῷ· ἀλλ’ ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς
τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [σου], στρέψον
αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· ...

ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ
προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων
ὑμᾶς

Matt.26:67 (cf. Mark 14:65)

Then they spit in his face and struck
him with their fists. Others slapped
him

Τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον
αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ
ἐράπισαν

1 Cor. 4:12b-13a

..., λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν,
διωκόμενοι ἀνεχόμεθα,
δυσφημούμενοι παρακαλοῦμεν

As Horrell indicates,²⁶⁶ the sinlessness of Jesus (which is the object of the quotation of 2:22) is not mentioned in the passion narrative (although it is probably presupposed), but it is part of Early Christian tradition regarding Jesus (i.e.: 2 Cor.5:21; Heb.4:15; 7:27-28; 9:14; 1 John 3:5, cp. John 8:46), as is the inclination to allude to and quote Isaiah 53 (Cf. esp.

²⁶⁶ Horrell, ‘Jesus Remembered’, 134.

Acts 8:34-35; Matt. 8:17 as direct and early witnesses to the view that Jesus' suffering, and its atoning qualities are prophesied by Isaiah). 1 Peter 2:21-25 joins the ranks of Early Christianity in this respect.

In 2:23 Peter moves into a description of Jesus' suffering that, on the one hand, shows substantive overlap with one single event as narrated by the Synoptic gospels: the torture Jesus had to endure from the hand of the Roman soldiers. Both the tradition as 1 Peter agree that *Jesus was mistreated physically and verbally*. It is quite obvious that 1 Peter 2:23 is referring to an incident belonging to the passion narrative, and in all likelihood it is this event.

While 2:23 probably refers to the abuse Jesus suffered during his arrest and trial, the verse seems to be referring to Jesus' teaching on non-retaliation as well. **Verbally** (as with the passion narrative) there is not a direct link. There is, however, Paul's use of λοιδορούμενοι in 1 Corinthians 4:12, which is highly similar to 1 Peter's λοιδορούμενος. Paul, in 4:12b-13a, seems to be crafting a saying based on Jesus' teaching as well, notably Jesus' imperative to pray for your persecutors, although this can hardly be severed from the whole of Luke 6:27-29 or Matthew 5:39-44. Paul and Peter's very conspicuous similar use of λοιδορέω should not be explained by literary dependence in either way, and probably not by chance either. It may point to an underlying (oral) version of Jesus' teaching on non-retaliation in which the verb occurred. **Propositionally** both passages agree that *it is virtuous not to retaliate*. **Conceptual analogy** with the passage lies in the obvious shared preposition of hostile outsiders. The tradition belongs to the Sermon on the Mount/Plain traditions, which secures its **accessibility** for 1 Peter.

3.3 An overview of parallels; preliminary conclusions

In the present chapter, many parallels to Jesus Tradition in 1 Peter have been listed. Some of which are convincing allusions, others may be more disputable, but may increasingly be regarded as valid parallels in the context of similar parallels and allusions to similar strands of tradition.

Below the parallels will be presented in an overview in which an attempt is made to distinguish and arrange them according to possible primitive early Christian sources, whether oral or written. The increasing complexity of the form in which 1 Peter alludes to his source material calls for a distinct manner in presenting this overview, in order to give insight into 1 Peter's relationship to Jesus Tradition.

3.3.1 Sermon on the Mount/Plain

Some of the strongest parallels are to the Sermon on the Mount/Plain traditions. There is almost universal agreement of 1 Peter's use of the sayings recorded in Matthew 5:5.10.12.16; Jesus' teaching on non-retaliation belongs to the same strand of tradition:

Parallels to Sermon on the Mount/Plain tradition

Text in 1 Pet.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
1:8	<i>The perspective of faith leads one to experience joy and gladness in the face of suffering</i>	Matt.5:12//Luke 6:23
4:13-14	<i>Suffering for the sake of Christ should lead to joy and is a blessed state in itself</i>	
3:4	<i>Meekness as a proper attitude</i>	Matt.5:5
3:9	<i>Bad or oppressive behavior of others should be repaid with blessing (instead of vengeance)</i>	Matt.5:39-44//Luke 6:28-29
2:22-23	<i>It is virtuous not to retaliate</i>	
3:14	<i>Those who suffer by the hand of others because of righteousness</i>	Matt.5:10

	<i>are blessed</i>	
2:12	<i>When those around you see your good deeds they will glorify God</i>	Matt.5:16
5:7	<i>Do not worry; God takes care of you</i>	Matt.6:25-26//Luke 12:11.22-32

A number of observations and questions rise from this short overview:

1. The author of 1 Peter apparently knew some form of Sermon on the Mount/Plain-tradition.
2. It is impossible to tell what exactly was the extent of this source, but the parallels to Matthew 5 stand out. The entire spectrum of the chapter is utilized, and two of the sayings alluded to (Matt. 5:5.16) are strictly Matthean. This is not to say the author must have known Matthew, but he may have been acquainted with a source (written or oral) already resembling Matthew 5 and its structure.
3. It is questionable whether the parallel to Matthew 6:25-26//Luke 12:22-32 belongs in the present table: 1 Peter 5:7 may refer to a different strand of tradition, which was appropriated in the Matthean Sermon by the author of the first Gospel, whereas Luke has chosen a different context for the same teaching.

3.3.2 Passion Narrative and holy week

Another layer of tradition, which in some form must have been known to the author of 1 Peter as a larger unit, is the Passion narrative. And not just the Passion as a singled out event, but including Jesus' prediction of his impending death and the discourses in the Temple. All three Synoptic Gospels incorporate the Olivet Discourse into this larger narrative, which may already have been conventional in the oral mode of the Gospel story.

Parallels to holy week and the Passion Narrative

Text in 1 Pet.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
1:9	<i>The salvation of the soul is for those who value their future conditions over their present conditions</i>	Matt.16:25//Mark 8:35// Luke 9:25//John 12:25
2:21	<i>Followers of Jesus Christ should follow his model in suffering</i>	Matt.16:24//Mark 8:34// Luke 9:23//John 12:26
2:4-8	Quotation of Ps.118:22	Matt 21:42//Mark 12:10// Luke 20:17
2:17	<i>Give the emperor what he is due and give God what He is due</i>	Matt.22:21//Mark 12:17// Luke 20:25
4:7 (1:13)	<i>The end is near, be alert</i>	Olivet Discourse
5:8	<i>Be vigilant</i>	Mark 13:37
5:1	<i>Christ's sufferings</i>	Passion Narrative
5:3	<i>Do not 'lord over' the community of Jesus' followers</i>	Mark 10:42b-43// Matt. 20:25
2:20.22-23	<i>To passively endure a beating is proper conduct for who is innocent; Jesus was mistreated physically and verbally</i>	Matt.26:67//Mark 14:65

In the above table there is less unity in source material than in the one on the Sermon-parallels. Nevertheless, there is the possibility that the above traditions were part of an underlying source, perhaps a unified narrative, transcribed and redacted by the author of the second Gospel, further elaborated upon by Matthew and Luke, but appropriated differently by John. The above framing of 'passion and holy week' makes sense as a possible (oral or written) source, yet as such it does not have the same credentials as the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain.²⁶⁷

Therefore one could think of the above parallels of sustaining one

²⁶⁷ Cf. Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium: Teil 2, Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27-16,20* HTKNT, Freiburg: Herder, 1977, 15-16, where he presents a chart proposing such an underlying source. However likely such a reconstruction may be, it would probably benefit more from comparative analysis to other Early Christian literature than extensive source-critical studies within the Gospel texts.

another in a cumulative sense, but not with great confidence. However, in their own right these parallels still make a convincing case.

3.3.3 Johannine tradition

Some parallels in 1 Peter seem to betray knowledge of what is generally considered to be Johannine source material:

Parallels to the Fourth Gospel

Text in 1 Pet.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
1:3.23	<i>Rebirth of believers</i>	John 3:3
1:8	<i>It is commendable to believe in Jesus in spite of what you see</i>	John 20:29
1:22; 2:17; 4:8	<i>Love one another</i>	John 13:34-35
5:2-3	<i>Shepherd metaphor: the community of Jesus' followers needs to be looked after</i>	John 21:16c

The parallels from 1 Peter 1 are very strong in their own right; still, it may be of some significance that they can be found in such close vicinity to one another. Furthermore:

1. It cannot be determined how the author of 1 Peter knew of such distinctively Johannine traditions, but it seems likely that he did in some way.
2. The author seems to have particular knowledge of the Johannine love command, combining the command to love one another with the command to love the 'brotherhood', an emphasis (love among 'brothers') which is also reflected in 1 John.
3. The shepherding metaphor is not as strong a parallel as the others in this table; it is more persuasive as a 'Petrine' tradition, than as a strictly Johannine parallel (see table below).

In the Epistle of James some parallels to Johannine tradition were found, but those Johannine verses had parallels in Synoptic tradition in turn.

This is not the case with the above parallels, in which the distinct Johannine idiom is paralleled.

3.3.4 Petrine traditions

Two passages in 1 Peter seem to allude to traditions concerning the apostle Peter himself:²⁶⁸

Parallels to Petrine traditions

Text in 1 Pet.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
2:4-8	<i>The possibility of relating to Jesus as a rock and/or a stumbling block</i>	Matt.16:18.23
5:2-3	<i>Shepherd metaphor: the community of Jesus' followers needs to be looked after</i>	John 21:16c

Taken on their own, these allusions are not certain, but still quite probable. Both refer to a narrative that share the characteristic that Peter is on the one hand confirmed by Jesus in a certain position and on the other his apparent failure is addressed.

It cannot be proven that both stories belong to the same source, but it is not unlikely: The interaction between Jesus and Peter in Matthew 16 belongs to a string of Peter-stories in Matthew 16 and 17 that are uniquely Matthean. The encounter in John 21 is presented as an afterthought in the Fourth Gospel, in part meant to reflect the ongoing role of the disciple 'whom Jesus loved'. It does not seem unlikely, however, that the story of the encounter of Jesus and Peter belonged to

²⁶⁸ The existence of a 'Petrine' source has some merit. The first Gospel seems to offer a cycle of narratives on the apostle Peter in chs. 16-17, narratives which are not featured in the other Synoptic Gospels. The post-resurrection encounter with Jesus in John 21 may be the event 1 Cor.15:5 is referring to and may have been part of such a Petrine cycle. John 6:68-71 may betray some knowledge of the same tradition Matt.16:16-23 is dependent on, since Peter's confession is followed by a rebuke of Jesus ('Satan/Devil'), even if it is directed at Judas in John's narrative. This could mean John knew of similar traditions concerning Peter as did Matthew.

older source material (possibly the same strand of tradition as the Petrine narratives from Matt.16-17), while the question of the beloved disciple and Jesus' subsequent answer was a Johannine addition.²⁶⁹

3.3.5 Synoptic traditions

The following table is made up of parallels to miscellaneous Synoptic traditions:

Parallels to Synoptic traditions

Text in 1 Pet.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
1:10	<i>The prophets longed to comprehend (but did not) what is becoming (and is now) reality</i>	Matt.13:17//Luke 10:24
2:25	<i>Sheep without a shepherd / Jesus is the right shepherd for those sheep</i>	Mark 6:34//Matt.9:36
4:10	<i>The distribution of goods is the task of the good and faithful steward</i>	Luke 12:42
4:13	<i>There will be a moment at which Christ will reappear 'in his glory'</i>	Matt.25:31
5:3	<i>Do not 'lord over' the community of Jesus' followers</i>	Mark 10:42b-43// Matt.20:25

The two upper parallels can be thought of as allusions and need hardly be given second thought. The three beneath those are less certain. But their distinctive use of vocabulary that parallels that of Jesus Tradition is not likely coincidental in all three cases, especially when the cumulative effect of other parallels is taken into account.

²⁶⁹ I do not envisage a distinct collection of Peter-stories that could have been written down in the same way as 'Q' is often thought of. Rather, I consider it probable that the Passion narrative would originally have been told without detailed sub-narratives concerning the apostles. There were contexts in which these narratives were proper, in which they did gain tradition status. Mark and the other evangelists subsequently appropriated these traditions in their Gospels.

3.3.6 Luke 12

Some scholars have pointed out the possibility of 1 Peter's acquaintance with a source resembling Luke 12.²⁷⁰

Parallels to Luke 12

Text in 1 Pet.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
4:10	<i>Steward metaphor for distribution of goods in the Christian community</i>	Luke 12:42
5:7	<i>Do not worry; God takes care of you</i>	Luke 12:11.22-32

Among the Gospel writers, only Luke offers the steward-parables. One may argue that these have arisen as elaborations on the steward-metaphor that was already in use (cf. 1 Cor.4:1-2; Tit.1:7) in the Early Church. This is unlikely, however, considering how obscure and hard to explain these parables are. The use of the steward-metaphor probably did originate in Jesus' parables of Luke 12 and 16. However, the steward-parallel in this table (as indicated above) is not very firm: the use of the term may already have been common, and there is no need to explain the parallel with a literary connection. The double connection to Luke 12 is therefore in all likelihood nothing more than mere chance: Luke 12:22-32 is double tradition and belongs to a common source of Matthew and Luke.

3.3.7 Jesus Tradition idiom

Apart from the parallels in the above tables some instances were pointed out in which an idiom was appropriated that belongs to Jesus Tradition:

²⁷⁰ Cf. Davids, *1 Peter*, 26-27.

Jesus Tradition idiom

Text in 1 Pet.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
1:17	<i>'Father' in addressing God</i>	i.e.: Matt.6:9//Mark 14:36// Rom.8:15//Gal.4:6
2:25	<i>Shepherd metaphor</i>	i.e.: Matt.18:12// Luke 15:4//Matt.9:36// Mark 6:34//John 21:16
3:18	<i>περὶ and ὑπὲρ relating to Christ's substitutionary death</i>	i.e.: Heb.10:26; Mark 14:24 Luke 22:19, 20; John 6:51; 10:11, 15; 11:50ff.; 15:13; 17:19; 18:14 Rom. 5:6, 8; 8:32; 14:15; 1 Cor. 1:13; 5:7 var.; 11:24; 15:3 2 Cor. 5:14, 15 (twice), 21; Gal. 1:4; 2:20; 3:13; Eph. 5:2, 25; I Thes. 5:10 var.; 1 Tim. 2:6; Tit. 2:14; Heb. 2:9; 7:27; 10:12; 1 Pet. 2:21; 3:18; 4:1 var.; 1 John 3:16

These are not allusions in a strict sense, yet they deserve some attention: Jesus Tradition obviously influenced Early Christian language and theology in a profound way.

Arguably, the parallels that have been mentioned earlier to the Lukan 'steward' and the Johannine regeneration-language could be added to this table. However, neither of those are as common and widespread as the examples in the present table.

All in all, a significant amount of Jesus Tradition parallels can be recognized in 1 Peter. The author of the epistle was quite obviously well versed in Jesus' teachings and the narratives concerning Jesus' ministry and suffering. Whereas James mainly appropriated Jesus' teaching in

forms resembling the original texts, 1 Peter's approach is more like that of Paul:²⁷¹ the author seems to assume Jesus Tradition as a given with which not only he, but also his readers were familiar, and to which he can loosely refer. Whereas Paul does so in a context in which traditions can be argued over,²⁷² Peter seems to assume a uniform understanding of the tradition, which gives him the liberty of weaving the allusions into his arguments, trusting his readers to understand the significance of what is meant in both the text and the sub-text.

In the following chapter, the Johannine epistles and their dependence on Jesus Tradition will be discussed. After having discussed James and 1 Peter as independent epistles, the Johannine epistles will be discussed as a group, after which 2 Peter and Jude will be discussed as a pair. The topical unity and the shared introductory matters within these groups (but also the relative brevity of 2-3 John and Jude) call for this buildup, even if the canonical sequence will be momentarily impaired.

²⁷¹ Cf. David Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, esp. 392-395.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, 395.

4. Jesus Tradition Parallels in the Johannine Epistles

The Johannine epistles form a distinct subgroup within the collection of the Catholic Epistles. They stand out in more than one regard.

First of all, 1, 2 and 3 John seem to relate to the Fourth Gospel on a literary level, placing these letters not only in a strand of tradition seemingly different from that of other New Testament epistles, but probably also situating them no farther than a hand-span in time and space from an actual written Gospel.

Second, the epistles lay no direct claim to apostolic authorship. It seems likely that all three epistles were written by the same author, who designates himself simply as 'the elder'.

Third, while the other Catholic Epistles appear to be circular letters with a broad target audience, the Johannine epistles are much more particular in nature. Even though the first may appear to be quite general and homiletic, it does address some particular community-issues. 2 and 3 John contain particular addressees.

The shared idiom and literary overlap between the epistles and the Gospel of John are sometimes explained through common authorship, traditionally ascribed to the apostle John, the son of Zebedee. More recently, the idea of a Johannine school and particularly a 'Johannine community' has been prevalent, following the magisterial labor of Raymond Brown, J. Louis Martyn and R. Alan Culpepper. Sometimes this Johannine community is presented as a sectarian strand of first century Christianity.

The way in which the epistles deal with Jesus Tradition is directly related to how the individuals and communities that were involved in these correspondences were linked with the Early Church at large. The Fourth Gospel's relationship to Mark, or Synoptic tradition material in general, is an important issue in this matter. The epistles will prove to be important secondary witnesses.

Therefore, the pressing and heavily contested *introductory matters* (4.1) are at some points intertwined with the outcome of the search for

parallels (4.2) to Jesus Tradition. The matters that have been hinted at above, will be dealt with comprehensively in the following paragraph. In this way, the parallels that will be discussed will be framed appropriately, so that fitting *conclusions* (4.3) may be drawn.

4.1 Introduction

The interest in the Johannine epistles has, in the past, been overshadowed by the attention that has been given to the Fourth Gospel. The question of authorship of the epistles, for instance, has often been treated as a byproduct of the all-important matter of the authorship of the Gospel of John. Ever since Brown's commentary²⁷³ the introductory matters of the Johannine epistles have been treated with renewed care, although always in alignment with the questions surrounding the Gospel.

4.1.1 Introductory matters

Of course, the similarities between epistles and Gospel press us to treat them together. Both make use of similar vocabulary and similar ways of presenting Jesus. Does this distinctive voice within the New Testament corpus belong to one prolific author, or is it the voice of one particular 'community'? Parallel to that question: Can the voice of Jesus be heard in the Johannine writings, or do we merely hear a faint and undeterminable echo of Jesus' *ipsissima vox*, his original message distorted by the Early Church's version of the telephone game?

Below, the most important introductory matters will be dealt with. First of all, the character of the so-called *Johannine community* will be discussed (4.1.1.1). To start with, the origins and existence of such a community (4.1.1.1.1), to continue with the position of its tradition material (4.1.1.1.2), and, finally, the matter of authorship (4.1.1.1.3)) will be laid out. Furthermore, *Audience, Reception and Content* (4.1.1.2) will be dealt

²⁷³ Raymond R. Brown, *The Epistles of John; Translated with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* AB 30, Garden City: Doubleday, 1982.

with, after which *Jesus Tradition in the Johannine Epistles* in the history of scholarship (4.1.1.3) will be looked into.

4.1.1.1 Johannine community

4.1.1.1.1 *Origins and Existence*

In 1968 the face of Johannine studies changed overnight through the publication of one single monograph: J. Louis Martyn's *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*.²⁷⁴ Martyn took John 9 as the basis for his thesis that the Fourth Gospel needed to be read twofold. First of all as a witness to Jesus's earthly career (focusing esp. on John 9:1-7; the healing of a blind man), secondly as a witness to Jesus' continuing presence in the community in which the Gospel was written (reading John 9:8-41, the blind man's expulsion from the synagogue, as a witness to later events, contemporary to the evangelist's time and place of writing).

Martyn's work focused quite heavily on the Rabbinical Synagogue Ban (*Birkat Ha-Minim*) on Christians. This element of his work has been criticized and downplayed in later years, but the main focus of his study has been massively influential: the Gospel of John (which was already largely perceived as historically less trustworthy compared to its Synoptic counterparts) has since been the object of mirror-reading approaches, focusing on what lies behind the text. The so-called Johannine Community has been the object of meticulous research ever since.²⁷⁵

Raymond Brown's *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* is the next milestone in this approach, specifying all that was tentative in Martyn's work.²⁷⁶ In it, Brown not only tries to present the various Gospel's and epistles' target audiences (followers of John the Baptist, Samaritans, Unbelieving Gentiles, Unbelieving Jews, Gentile Christians, Jewish Christians, Crypto-Christians and, finally, Docetic secessionists), but also the different phases the Johannine community underwent. He suggests

²⁷⁴ J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1968.

²⁷⁵ Cf. Jan van der Watt's *An Introduction to the Johannine Gospel and Letters*, London: T&T Clark, 2007.

²⁷⁶ Raymond R. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*, New York: Paulist, 1979.

that it started out as a Palestinian and Samaritan group around the Beloved Disciple in the 50's of the first century; the group had to move into a diaspora setting, following the Jewish war. Opposition from the Synagogues would have opened the community's doors to Gentile converts, preparing their move into Gentile territory (which, according to church tradition, must have been Ephesus). The community, in this reconstruction, valued the traditions handed over by the Beloved Disciple, but disputed over its meaning. Secessionists were placing themselves over against the Elder (who, according to Brown, succeeded the beloved Disciple as the community's leader), toward the end of the first century, denying that Jesus was the Son of God who came 'in the flesh'. The Elder in turn decries the secessionists as antichrists and evildoers. In a final phase, Brown envisions the secessionists to have developed into Christian Gnostics, pointing out the relative popularity John's Gospel enjoyed among 2nd century Gnostics.²⁷⁷

Brown has thus sketched a vivid background to the Gospel's and epistles' provenance,²⁷⁸ which, however, remains highly debatable.

Additionally, the way the idea of a Johannine Community has developed over the years has often led scholars to think of such a community as a sect, largely parallel to the Qumran community's isolated setting,²⁷⁹ which is a contestable viewpoint.²⁸⁰

4.1.1.1.2 Tradition material in the Johannine churches

The perception of this Johannine Community as a sectarian group, or group of churches, has had a major impact on how Johannine tradition

²⁷⁷ For a synthesis of Brown's work, see Paul N. Anderson: 'The Community that Brown Left Behind', in: R. Alan Culpepper & Paul N. Anderson (eds.), *Communities in Dispute. Current Scholarship on the Johannine Epistles*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014, 47-93.

²⁷⁸ Cf. Anderson, 'The Community', 63-93, for a 21st century reworking of and a way forward for Brown's overall thesis.

²⁷⁹ E.g. Barnabas Lindars, 'The Readers of the Gospel', in: *The Johannine Literature*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000, 62-79, esp.73; Judith M. Lieu, 'The Audience of the Johannine Epistles', in *Communities in Dispute*, 123-40, where she criticizes this perceived fact as if 'a great deal more is known about the audience of the Johannine Epistles than, for example, about the church at Corinth' (123). And: '[T]hat community is a construct, a production of scholarly imagination upon the texts...' (140).

²⁸⁰ For a very different viewpoint cf. B.W.J. de Ruyter, *De gemeente van de evangelist Johannes: haar polemiek en geschiedenis*, Delft: Eburon, 1998.

has been viewed. Sectarian Johannine churches would not have had lively communications with other Christian churches. This perception can be aligned neatly with the rather unique literary character of the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine epistles over against their New Testament counterparts: the Johannine sect apparently had its own language and traditions.

Of course, one can also argue that the Johannine writings (Gospel, letters and Revelation) reflect a 'linguistic coherence' and 'consistent worldview' that point towards shared authorship.²⁸¹

There are great similarities between Synoptic traditions and the Gospel of John. Yet both C.H. Dodd and Raymond Brown have taken the view that these similarities can be traced back to the earliest strands of oral traditions, preceding written Gospel accounts.²⁸² No *literary* connection between John and, for instance, Mark needs to be envisioned in their view.

The whole notion of an isolated group of churches, as well as an isolated and independent growth and construction of traditions on Jesus, have come under new criticism following the publication of the essay collection *The Gospels for All Christians*.²⁸³ In an essay on the Fourth Gospel, Bauckham observes that the consensus has been that John was written long after Mark had been distributed, but its author still chose not to use Mark. This, in the eyes of many, underlines the idiosyncratic and isolated character of John.²⁸⁴ However, Bauckham considers the socially dynamic and interdependent character of early Christianity and its texts and traditions to be a given, which leads him to conclude that it was far more likely that the author of John *assumed* that his readers were familiar with Mark: 'He would not write in a way that would be unintelligible for those who did not know Mark, but he might

²⁸¹So Andreas Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009, 134-35.

²⁸² C.H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964, '[B]ehind the Fourth Gospel lies an ancient tradition independent of the other Gospels, and meriting serious consideration as a contribution to our knowledge of the historical facts concerning Jesus Christ' (423); Raymond R. Brown (posthumously edited by Francis J. Maloney), *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003, 90-104.

²⁸³ Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for all Christians*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

²⁸⁴ Richard Bauckham, 'John for Readers of Mark', in *Gospels for all*, 147-171.

nevertheless find ways of enabling the majority of his readers to relate their knowledge of Mark to his own narrative.'²⁸⁵

Another angle is taken by James Dunn. In an article on oral transmission and John's tradition material²⁸⁶ Dunn examines Dodd's earlier position and concludes that John's presentation of the tradition is, in a way, indeed independent. However, this is not to be viewed as proof of sectarian isolation, but rather as an example of how oral transmission (with both free and with fixed elements) would function within early Christianity at large.²⁸⁷

A recent article by R. Alan Culpepper examines the possibility that John's discourses are built up around older sayings, which would limit the distinctly Johannine idiom of these discourses to the elaborate explanations of more original sayings.²⁸⁸ In this article, Culpepper has proposed in detail which verses are likely to be thought of as 'traditional logion'.²⁸⁹

Therefore, the view of the Johannine writings as specimens of an isolated or sectarian strand of Christianity faces many difficulties. It would be preferable to read the Johannine writings as belonging to the wider corpus of early Christian writings on the same level as the Synoptic Gospels and the Pauline letters. The (Jesus) tradition material that will be encountered in the Johannine epistles will be evaluated accordingly.

4.1.1.1.3 Authorship

All three Johannine epistles share the same idiom and vocabulary, indicating that, in all likelihood, all three were written by the same

²⁸⁵ Bauckham, 'John', 148.

²⁸⁶ James G. Dunn, 'John and the Oral Gospel Tradition.' in Henry Wansborough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, JSNTSup 64, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991, 351-379.

²⁸⁷ Dunn, 'John', 379.

²⁸⁸ R. Alan Culpepper, 'Jesus Sayings in the Johannine Discourses: A Proposal', in: Paul N. Anderson & Tom Thatcher (eds.), *John, Jesus and History*, vol. 3: *Glimpses of Jesus through the Johannine Lens*, Atlanta: SBL, 2016, 353-82.

²⁸⁹ These verses are: 2:19; 3:3; 3:13; 4:24; 4:25; 4:37; 4:44b; 5:19; 6:27; 6:31; 6:41; 7:34; 7:388:21; 8:31; 8:51; 10:1-5; 10:34; 11:25; 12:24; 13:16; 13:21; 13:33; 13:34; 14:2-3; 15:1-2; 15:13; 16:16; 20:33; 20:29, cf. *ibid.*, 357-59.

author(s).²⁹⁰ 1 John as it stands lacks an address and a sender, but 2 and 3 John claim to be written by ‘the elder’.²⁹¹ Christian tradition has taken the view that this anonymous elder is the same as the beloved disciple from the Fourth Gospel, who is to be identified as John of Zebedee, one of the Twelve. This is still defended today.²⁹² There are also scholars who take Eusebius’ reference (*HE* 3.39.4-6) to the graves of *two* Johns in Ephesus at face value.²⁹³ This results in various hypotheses concerning the activities and identities of John of Zebedee, the beloved disciple and the elder,²⁹⁴ although few are convinced by these hypotheses. The main scholarly consensus, following Culpepper’s dissertation, may be that the Johannine writings have been written by a group rather than by an individual.²⁹⁵

Culpepper’s claim that, in terms of authorship, the Johannine writings share all the necessary characteristics of ancient schools is dependent on the perception of the Johannine churches as an isolated group. The enigmatic first person plural in John 1:14; 21:24 and 1 John 1:4 (and cp. 3 John 1:12) does seem to point in the direction of either shared authorship or redactional activity.²⁹⁶ The scope of the present research is too limited to either refute or defend any or all of the above hypotheses, none of which can claim the corner on truth.²⁹⁷

²⁹⁰ Cf. Brown, *The Johannine Epistles*, 14-35; Köstenberger, *Theology of John’s*, 134-35. However, cf. Lieu, ‘The Audience’, who defends the possibility of some form of pseudepigraphical imitation for all or some of the letters.

²⁹¹ However, the margins of NA²⁸ show that many early manuscripts provide John’s name in a superscript.

²⁹² E.g., D.A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991; A.J. Köstenberger, *Encountering John*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999; C.S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*, vol.1, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003.

²⁹³ It seems to be Eusebius’ hesitation towards the book of Revelation which makes him embrace this possibility. He himself constructs this hypothesis by combining the observation that Papias lists John twice in one sentence and the tale of the two graves.

²⁹⁴ Cf. Martin Hengel, *Die johanneische Frage*, (WUNT 67), Tübingen: Mohr, 1993; Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006, 412-471.

²⁹⁵ R. Alan Culpepper, *The Johannine School. An Evaluation of the Johannine School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of Ancient Schools*. SBLDS 26. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.

²⁹⁶ Cf. however P.H.R. van Houwelingen, ‘John and the Others. To Whom Does the “we” in the Fourth Gospel’s Prologue and Epilogue Refer?’, *Fides Reformata* XIX, n° 2 (2014), 95-115, who takes this ‘we’ as an ‘apostolic plural’.

²⁹⁷ One general observation is made by Wally V. Cirafesi, ‘The Johannine Community Hypothesis (1968–Present): Past and Present Approaches and a New Way Forward’, *CBR* 2014, Vol. 12(2) 173–193: the study of Johannine literature, following Martyn’s monograph, has been *model-driven, rather than data-driven*, which has clouded some of the data in front of us. A very worthwhile exception to this rule is Köstenberger’s *Theology of John’s Gospel and Letters*, which is data-driven, thorough and broad.

It can be stated, however, with a fair amount of certainty, that the Fourth Gospel and the first Epistle both make strong claims on eyewitness testimony.²⁹⁸ Also, a face-value reading of the relationship of the author of the epistles to his recipients shows an individual (and not a group) addressing either communities or other individuals. This author presents himself as a tradent of Jesus Tradition and a firsthand witness (1 John 1:1-6), aligning himself with the authority of other such witnesses and addressing a crisis in the churches he is somehow associated with. This author is apparently known as 'the elder', and could be the 'elder John' that is mentioned by Papias (*HE* 3.39.4),²⁹⁹ which in turn could very well be the John of Zebedee we know from the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 10:35).³⁰⁰ However, since the author of the Johannine epistles does not introduce himself by name, he will be called 'the author' henceforth.

4.1.1.2 Audience, Reception and Content

Brown rightly notes that the target audience of the epistles seems to be radically different from that of the Gospel.³⁰¹ The epistles bear witness to a schism within the Johannine community (1 John 2:19). The author advocates the view that Jesus has come 'in the flesh', presumably opposing some form of Docetic heresy. 2 and 3 John witness problems within the community on a more practical level: for whom should the doors be opened or closed?

1 John can be read as a long tract (although it is unmistakably intended as a letter), attacking certain heresies that were held by the author's opponents.³⁰² 2 and 3 John are typical examples of classical letters in form and in length (in accordance with one sheet of papyrus). 2 John is directed at 'the elect lady and her children'; this is probably a metaphorical designation for a sister-church, although this cannot be

²⁹⁸ '[E]ven though the term 'witness' is not used here –what the "we-group" refers to is all about perceiving with their eyes and ears' ... 'It is precisely their seeing with their own eyes that does not apply to the readers...' , Van Houwelingen, *John and the Others*, 99. Cf. also Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 358-381.

²⁹⁹ For this line of reasoning cf. W.G. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 451. Eusebius' sharp distinction between this elder and John of Zebedee seems to be strained and serves his own interest (cf. 4.1.1.1.3 above).

³⁰⁰ Cf. Köstenberger, *A Theology of John*, 72 and Paul Rainbow, *Johannine Theology. The Gospel, the Epistles and the Apocalypse*, Grand Rapids: IVP, 2014.

³⁰¹ Cf. esp. Brown, *Johannine Epistles*, 47-68.

³⁰² For an overview of texts refuting opponents in the epistles, cf. Brown *Johannine Epistles*, 762-63.

said with any certainty. The elect lady is pressed to keep her doors shut for teachers who do not remain in the teaching of Christ. 3 John is directed at one Gaius, who is instructed to take sides with a certain Demetrius, but against an otherwise unknown Diotrephes, who is accused of shutting his doors to those who are advocates of the truth and of ruling his congregation with inappropriate rigor.

The developments of heresy towards Docetism within the Johannine churches has led scholars to date the letters quite late, toward the end of the first century. This is also in accordance with the view that the elder and the beloved disciple are one and the same, since John 21 focusses on the disciple's high age. The letters of John have not always been published and read as a group of three. Sometimes 1 John is known,³⁰³ sometimes 1 and 2 John. Sometimes 2 John is thought to have been an appendix to 1 John. Sometimes 2 and 3 John have been paired. However, according to Eusebius (*HE* 6.14.1), Clement of Alexandria has written syntheses of all Catholic Epistles, which may indicate knowledge of the whole corpus as early as the late second century.

4.1.1.3 *Jesus Tradition in Johannine Epistles*

Previous scholarship has paid little attention to the presence of Jesus Tradition in the Johannine Epistles. This is largely due to the perception of the Johannine churches as an isolated group.

One notable exception is C.H. Dodd's 1946 commentary on the epistles.³⁰⁴ Dodd is known for his division of Early Church traditions into proclamation and teaching. Dodd's special interest in early traditions, especially instructive sayings of Jesus, led him to locate a number of interesting parallels in the first epistle of John:³⁰⁵

Mark xii. 29-31

| *I John iv. 21*

³⁰³ Particularly notable is Polycarp's paraphrase of 1 John 4:2-3 in *Pol.Phil.7:1-2*.

³⁰⁴ C.H. Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946. This work, of course, precedes the theses of Martyn and Brown that were discussed in 4.1.1.1.1 above.

³⁰⁵ Taken from Dodd, *Epistles*, xxxviii-xli.

<i>Matt. vii. 21</i>	<i>I John ii. 17</i>
<i>Matt. v. 8-9</i>	<i>I John iii. 1-3</i>
<i>Matt. xxiv. 24</i>	<i>I John iv. 1</i>
<i>Matt. vii. 15, 20</i>	<i>Id.</i>
<i>Matt. xxiv. 24</i>	<i>I John ii. 18</i>
<i>Mark xiii. 5</i>	<i>I John iii. 7</i>
<i>Matt. v. 48</i>	<i>Id.</i>
<i>Luke vi. 36</i>	<i>Id.</i>
<i>Luke vi. 22</i>	<i>I John iii. 13</i>
<i>Matt. vii. 8 = Luke xi. 10</i>	<i>I John iii. 22</i>
<i>Mark xi. 24</i>	<i>I John v. 15</i>
<i>Matt. x. 25 (cf. Luke vi. 40)</i>	<i>I John iv. 17</i>
<i>Matt. xi. 30</i>	<i>I John v. 3</i>

Dodd specifies that the author of 1 John shows awareness of the Synoptic version of the love command and that he must have known the beatitudes in some form. The many echoes of Synoptic parallels that he traces led him to believe that the author of 1 John must have had extensive knowledge of tradition material such as we encounter in the Synoptic Gospels.

Of course, ample attention has been given in the past to parallels in the Epistles to passages from the Fourth Gospel. Brown has added a chart as an appendix to his commentary showing a long list of such parallels.³⁰⁶ A lot (if not most) of these parallels are caused by the use of a similar idiom (i.e. John's preference for μένειν ἐν), as is the case with the examples in the table below:

John.5:38	1 John 2:14
καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα, ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος, τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε.	καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένει καὶ νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν.
John 6:56	1 John 3:24

³⁰⁶ Brown, *Epistles*, 755-763.

<p>ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ.</p>	<p>καὶ ὁ τηρῶν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν αὐτῷ.</p>
<p>John 8:47</p> <p>ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούει· διὰ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστέ.</p>	<p>1 John 3:10</p> <p>πᾶς ὁ μὴ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.</p>
<p>John 15:11</p> <p>Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἢ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ἢ καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ.</p>	<p>1 John 1:4</p> <p>καὶ ταῦτα γράφομεν ἡμεῖς, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ἢ πεπληρωμένη.</p>

Such idiomatic parallels will not be discussed below. Only those parallels to Jesus Tradition, which can be reasonably expected to have been known and taught throughout the Early Church will be discussed. In practice, this will mean the type of verses that Culpepper calls ‘traditional logion’, in his article.³⁰⁷

4.1.2 Approach

In listing possible parallels to Jesus Tradition in the Johannine Epistles, the present research will approach these epistles as documents written against the backdrop of first century Christianity in its wider sense, rather than as products of one isolated community. The above probing into Johannine introduction matters has given sufficient reason to do so.

4.2 Parallels

³⁰⁷ Cf. 4.1.1.1.2, esp. note 288.

In the following paragraph those parallels will be discussed that, first of all, have to do with John's treatment of the *love command* (4.2.1), secondly, parallels that have to do with *eschatology* (4.2.2) and lastly those parallels that are concerned with *the new people of God* (4.2.3).

4.2.1 The Johannine love command

Before touching upon the love command, which is of considerable interest to the author of the epistle, we should briefly look into the author's more general interest in love as a theological theme in accordance with Jesus Tradition.

4.2.1.1 1 John 3:16

First of all there is 1 John 3:16, at the heart of a pericope that deals with the love command (3:1-24). Here, in developing the idea of brotherly love for the community, the author appears to consciously evoke Jesus' words as we read them in John 15:13:³⁰⁸

1 John 3:16

This is how we know what love is: Jesus Christ laid down his life for us. And we ought to lay down our lives for our brothers and sisters.

ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν, καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀφείλομεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὰς ψυχὰς θεΐναι.

John 15:13

Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends.

μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῆ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ.

Dial. Sav. 4:9

I will lay down my life for you. You also lay down your lives for your friends so that you might be pleasing to my Father.

On a **verbal** level there are a number of meaningful parallels. First of all there is *ἀγάπη* as the verse's main subject, in both cases in the

³⁰⁸ John 15:13 is among the sayings that is considered to be traditional by Culpepper (cf. 'Jesus Sayings', 357-59).

accusative. Second, there is the 'laying down one's life' (τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν - τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῆ) *for* (ὑπὲρ) either one's friends or one's brothers.³⁰⁹

On a **propositional** level we can state that the verses run parallel in stating that *love is exemplified by [Jesus'] giving of his life for others.*

Conceptually the parallels are very close to one another: both verses serve to expound the love command and both passages serve to explain the love command by linking the lives of followers of Jesus to Jesus' example.

Of course the **accessibility** of this tradition for the author of 1 John is not easily settled: it is clear that the Gospel of John and 1 John share knowledge of tradition material, so much so that a literary link seems obvious.³¹⁰ It is still unclear, however, whether 1 John was informed by the Gospel or vice versa.

The late second century *Dialogue of the Savior* is not especially helpful in this matter, except in underlining that John 15:13 was somehow known as a *logion* in its own right. It is remarkable that the words of 1 John are closer to *Dialogue of the Savior* 4:9 than to those of John 15:13.

4.2.1.2 1 John 4:9

Whereas for the author of 1 John the core of *brotherly* love is found in the giving of one's life, and so, by extension, in Jesus' sacrifice, the summit of *God's* love is shown in the sending of his Son:

³⁰⁹ Brown, *Epistles*, 448, points to Mark 10:45 as another parallel. He is of course right regarding the theological content of both verses, but on a textual level Mark 10:45 is remote from 1 John 3:16. His remark on the author's use of ὑπὲρ is of greater interest: 'If we think of John 10:15, "For these sheep I lay down my life"; Rom 5:8, "Christ died for us"; Mark 14:24, "This is my blood of the covenant which is poured for many," all of which employ *hyper*, we realize that this preposition had become standard in Christian descriptions of Christ's death on behalf of others.'

³¹⁰ Although some (Lieu, Strecker and others) defend their mutual independence, cf. the table in *Communities in Dispute*, 117-119.

1 John 4:9

This is how God showed his love among us: He sent his one and only Son into the world that we might live through him.

ἐν τούτῳ ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ.

John 3:16³¹¹

For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life.

οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

The **verbal** agreement is easily established: ἀγάπη is the controlling subject of God's actions, in this case concerning τὸν υἱὸν [αὐτοῦ] τὸν μονογενῆ on the one hand, and τὸν κόσμον on the other. The goal in both cases is life-giving: ζήσωμεν - ζωὴν. The shared **proposition** is that *God showed his love by sending his only Son into the world in order to give life to [believers]*. The **conceptual** analogy lies in Jesus' role as intermediary. A role that is stressed in both contexts: 1 John 4:10 calls Jesus' death an 'atoning sacrifice', John 3:16-18 points out that the sending of the Son has had the role of taking away God's condemnation. Both passages also equally echo Genesis 22:2 where Abraham is called to sacrifice his son. Incidentally, in retelling this tale, the author of Hebrews uses the word μονογενῆς (only begotten) for Isaac (Heb.11:17).

4.2.1.3 1 John 2:7/3:23; 2 John 1:4-6

When it comes to the actual love command, it is often stated that the Johannine writings have their own version over against the Synoptic love command of Matthew 22:37-39 (& *pars.*). John's emphasis is thought to lay on the love within the community, loving *one another*:

1 John 2:7/3:23

Dear friends, I am not writing you a

John 13:34

A new command I give you: Love

³¹¹ Culpepper, 'Jesus Sayings', takes John 3:13 to be the *logion* that the larger pericope is built up around. 3:16, however, seems to be at least as apt for that role. 3:14-15 seems to act as a hinge connecting the preceding pericope to the following one; the γὰρ of 3:16 focusses the attention to the saying that immediately follows and is further expounded in 3:17-21.

new command but an old one, which you have had since the beginning. This old command is the message you have heard.

Ἀγαπητοί, οὐκ ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν ἀλλ' ἐντολὴν παλαιὰν ἣν εἶχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς·

2 Jn 1:4-6

It has given me great joy to find some of your children walking in the truth, just as the Father commanded us.

And now, dear lady, I am not writing you a new command but one we have had from the beginning. I ask that we love one another.

And this is love: that we walk in obedience to his commands. As you have heard from the beginning, his command is that you walk in love.

Ἐχάρην λίαν ὅτι εὕρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου περιπατοῦντας ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καθὼς ἐντολὴν ἐλάβομεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός·

καὶ νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε, κυρία, οὐχ ὡς ἐντολὴν γράφων σοι καινὴν ἀλλ' ἣν εἶχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους·

καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ· αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή ἐστίν, καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ

one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another.

Ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους·

περιπατήτε.

The **verbal** agreement is obvious in these verses: ἐντολήν καινὴν and ἀγαπᾶτε/ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους.

A strange feature of these parallels is that in the Gospel Jesus calls his love command a 'new command', whereas in the epistles the author stresses that the command is not new. However, what was a new command on Jesus' lips is in fact constitutive for the author and the community he addresses, and so it is not new at all. By using the words 'new command' anyway (be it in a negating sense) the author seems to refer to the moment Jesus spoke these words: he employs word-play in order to make the link to Jesus' well-known 'so-called new command'.³¹²

In 2 John the author expressly states that the *Father* issued this command, whereas in the Fourth Gospel it is Jesus himself who utters it. This is, in the Johannine corpus, not strictly contradictory, since Jesus is presented throughout as intermediary of the Father: whatever Jesus commands, the Father commands.

The shared **proposition** would be: *the [well known] new command is: you should love one another.*

Both in John 13:34 and in the indicated verses from the epistles, it seems that the command is constitutive. In John 13 it is the foundation stone of the rest of the farewell discourse. In 2 John it is the mutual ground upon which the writer and his addressees stand. He repeats the command in order to create the impression that the wandering preachers are outside of this most basic of agreements. Likewise in 1 John, love is a repeated subject. The 'new command' seems to be the starting point of all that can be said of love.

One thing should be noted about 1 John 2:7, compared to 2 John 1:5 and John 13:34-35: there is no explicit call to *love one another*. In fact, it is hard to distill an actual commandment at all from the pericope 2:7-11, except ó

³¹² Cf. e.g. Brown, *Epistles*, 285-86; Thompson, *1-3 John*, 58.

ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ (2:10, cf.3:10; 4:21). The love of the *brother* seems to be the heart of the matter.

It may seem as though, in neither referring to πλησίον or ἀλλήλους, the author has taken the freedom instead to make use of the category of 'brother', as a form of artistic or theological license. There is, however, the possibility that this association is also at home in Jesus Tradition.

4.2.1.4 1 John 3:17-18

In his commentary on Matthew, Origen refers to the love command (in the context of the story of the Rich Young Ruler), by quoting a verse which he claims to have found in the Gospel of the Hebrews:

1 John 3:17-18

If anyone has material possessions and sees a brother or sister in need but has no pity on them, how can the love of God be in that person?

Dear children, let us not love with words or speech but with actions and in truth.

ὃς δ' ἂν ἔχη τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου καὶ θεωρῇ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχοντα καὶ κλείσῃ τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, πῶς ἢ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐν αὐτῷ;
Τεκνία, μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ μηδὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργῳ

Jas.2:15-16

Suppose a brother or a sister is without clothes and daily food.

If one of you says to them, "Go in peace; keep warm and well fed," but does nothing about their physical needs, what good is it?

ἐὰν ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοὶ ὑπάρχωσιν καὶ λειπόμενοι ὧσιν τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς, εἴπῃ δὲ τις αὐτοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν· ὑπάγετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, θερμαίνεσθε καὶ χορτάζεσθε, μὴ δῶτε δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος, τί τὸ

Hebrew Gospel

How can you say, 'I have done the law and the prophets,' since it is written in the law: Love your neighbor as yourself; and behold, your many brothers, who are sons of Abraham, are covered in dung, dying from hunger, while your house is filled with many good things, and not one of the good things goes out to them.

"Quomodo dicis 'legem feci et prophetas'? quoniam scriptum est in lege: diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum, et ecce multi fratres tui filii Abahae amicti sunt stercore, morientes

καὶ ἀληθεία,

ὄφελος;

prae fame, et domus tua
plena est multibus bonis,
et non egreditur omnio
aliquid ex ad eos. (in
Origen, *Comm.Matt.*
15.14)³¹³

The agreement on various levels of these three passages is commented upon in the chapter on James (2.2.2). The **propositional** agreement between the three is *if you do not meet the material needs of a brother in need, you are acting unjustly*. It has to be noted in the present chapter that the propositional agreement between the quote from the Hebrew Gospel and the Johannine verses is even stronger: *withholding material possessions from a brother in need is acting in opposition to God's call for love*.

In the present chapter, however, the interest in this parallel is all the more poignant because of John's repeated use of ἀδελφός instead of ἀλλήλους or πλησίον.

4.2.1.5 1 John 4:21/Hebrew Gospel

This becomes even more clear when we zoom in on another quote from the Hebrew Gospel:

1 John 4:21

And he has given us this command: Anyone who loves God must also love their brother and sister.

καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔχομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν θεὸν

Hebrew Gospel

Never be joyous unless you observe charity with your brother.
(Comm.Eph. 5.4)³¹⁴

laeti sitis nisi cum fratres vestrum
videritis in caritates³¹⁵

³¹³ Text and translation taken from Edwards, *Hebrew Gospel*, 269.

³¹⁴ Quoted from (and translated by) J.R. Edwards, *Hebrew Gospel, and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009, 79.

³¹⁵ Unlike most translators, Edwards chooses 'charity' over 'love' for his translation. He agrees with Klijn that 'observe charity' seems to be a semitism, which makes sense, since it derives from the *Hebrew Gospel*. However, within the concept of 'brotherly love' within the community, even in connection to the love commandment, ἀγάπη seems to be equally connected to 'love' as to 'charity', as is clear

ἀγαπᾶ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. |

In 3.2.2 above, on 1 Peter 2:17 and 1:22, it became apparent that the command ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους was neither strictly Johannine, nor strictly limited to a small circle of believers. The author of 1 Peter could use this type of love command language using both ἀλλήλους and ἀδελφότητες. It is not surprising to find love command-language in the Early Church with such a broad spectrum of verbal variation ('love' is usually ἀγάπη in Greek, but can translate to either *diligere* or *caritas* in Latin; on the other hand the πλησίον in Matthew 22:37-39 can become ἀδελφός, or even φίλος (3 John 1:15) in different contexts), since Jesus Tradition did not originate in Greek. The nouns πλησίον, ἀδελφός and even φίλος are semantically related, the first meaning 'one standing near', but also 'friend', as the second means not just 'brother', but also 'relative' or 'friend' in a metaphorical sense, just as the third may be understood to mean not just 'friend', but also (especially in the Johannine context³¹⁶) 'beloved'.³¹⁷

The parallel in the above table may not be a probable parallel in the strict sense of the present research; it does however shed light on the use of the love command in the Johannine literature, and especially the repeated use of ἀδελφός in the love command.

One distinct feature of the above quote from the Hebrew Gospel needs to be pointed out, however: it reads *fratres vestrum videritis*. Observing your brothers is a Semitism, which speaks somewhat in favor of Jerome's claim that he translated the verse from the Hebrew original. It may be meaningful that 1 John 3:17 reads θεωρῆ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, 'see your brother' (the only occurrence of θεωρέω in the epistle). This may indicate that the Johannine choice of words regarding the love command went through an independent translation process. It may also indicate that the quotes from the Hebrew Gospel do in fact stem from first century Jesus Tradition, perhaps even preceding Mark's Gospel.

from the way ἀγάπη in 1 John 3, Vg., is alternately translated with the noun *caritas* and forms of the verb *diligere*.

³¹⁶ Cf. Raymond Brown, *The Gospel of John* AB 29, New York: Doubleday, 1966, 497-99.

³¹⁷ Cf. NIDNTTE, 149-52; 605-606; 793-94.

Taking both quotes from the Hebrew Gospel into account, it can be concluded that there is **verbal** overlap in the use of ‘brother’, rather than ‘neighbor’ in the context of the love command and in the phrase ‘seeing a brother’. **Propositional** agreement is strong in the first parallel, less so in the second; **conceptual** analogy lies in the subject of the love command. Both quotes from the Hebrew Gospel stress the love for the poor,³¹⁸ as 1 John 3:17-18 does as well, rather unexpectedly.³¹⁹ Of course, **accessibility** is hard to determine. The view that the Johannine churches originated in Palestine certainly accords with the possibility of familiarity with a certain type of Jesus Tradition: namely, the sort of traditions that can be conceived of as having originated in Palestine, independent from Synoptic tradition material.

4.2.1.6 1 John 4:21/Matthew

1 John 4:21 displays another feature which is of interest to the present research, namely that is its relation to the love command in its most familiar version:

1 John 4:21

And he has given us this command: Anyone who loves God must also love their *brother* and sister.

καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔχομεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.

1 John 3:23

Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ

Matt.22:37.39

‘Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.’ This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: ‘Love your neighbor as yourself.’

ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου· ... ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

³¹⁸ Much in a Lukan fashion, cf. Luke 6:20; 18:22; Acts 2:45.

³¹⁹ The context in 1 John 3 is ‘love’ in a situation of apparent animosity, in vss. 17-18 ‘love’ takes on the meaning of ‘charity’ in a situation of an encounter with poverty. The only possible link where charity may have been involved earlier in the pericope, is in 3:12, where Cain’s and Abel’s *actions* are contrasted.

ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, καθὼς
ἔδωκεν ἐντολὴν ἡμῖν

In both 3:23 and 4:21 we can see that the author of 1 John delivers variations on the love command, following progymnastic techniques. He is carefully choosing his words and repeating the message, without repeating himself. What stands out in these two verses is the twofold instruction. In 3:23, on the one hand, faith in the name of Jesus Christ is mentioned, and, on the other hand, love for each other. In 4:21 it is on the one hand the love for God, and on the other the love for the brother.

On a **verbal** level it is quite obvious that the author of 1 John has taken the liberty to choose his own words; apart from ‘God’ and ‘love’, there is no meaningful overlap. Rather, the difference between ‘neighbor’ and ‘brother’ stand out.

The shared **proposition**, however, is more promising: *God is to be loved [implicitly in 1 John] and those near to you are to be loved.* It may seem as though ‘neighbor’ in the Synoptics means more than ‘those near to you’, but it has to be stressed that this is only so inasmuch as Jesus himself explains just how radically this command is to be understood. It would be a mistake to suppose that the command to ‘love your enemy’ is already semantically present in the statement ‘love your neighbor’. What is more, the term ‘brother’ is not to be understood quite as narrowly as is often supposed.³²⁰ The way ‘love for the brother’ is explained in 3:17-18 calls to mind Jesus’ compassion (note the use of *σπλάγχνα*) and his exposition of who the neighbor actually is (Luke 10:25-37, esp. 33). Simultaneously, it is not necessarily so that 1 John 4:20 (the negative counterpart of 4:21) would be directed *only* to brothers within the community: ‘For whoever does not love their brother and sister, whom they have seen, cannot love God, whom they have not seen.’

Many statements in 1 John have a universal ring to them, even if the goal of the letter is to address community issues. It seems to be more likely that John and his readers are quite aware of the broader scope of Jesus’ love command, but that the author uses it mainly to deal with tensions within the community. That way it even has an implicit *a fortiori*

³²⁰ Cf. e.g. Brown, *Epistles*, 534.

function: ‘if you understand the scope of Jesus’ love command, how on earth is it possible that there is disagreement within your community?’

Conceptual analogy is once again found in the love command itself, but in this case also in the Christian actualization of Scripture: the commands to love God (Deut.6:5) and to love your neighbour (Lev.19:18c) are understood through Jesus’ words and actions. This goes all the more for the Johannine author who understands this love to be self-giving love. The **access** to the Synoptic tradition should not surprise us: its presence here is equivalent to the Fourth Gospel’s many parallels to Synoptic traditions. It would in fact be hard to imagine Christians, even in the first century, who were unacquainted with the double love command.³²¹

1.2.1.7 1 John 3:15

One last parallel can be offered under the heading of the Johannine love command, although its object is ‘hate’ rather than ‘love’. Its fierce tone calls to mind a saying of Jesus:

1 John 3:15

Anyone who hates a brother or sister is a murderer, and you know that no murderer has eternal life residing in him.

πᾶς ὁ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστίν, καὶ οἶδατε ὅτι πᾶς ἀνθρωποκτόνος οὐκ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἐν αὐτῷ μένουσαν.

Matt.5:21-22

You have heard that it was said to the people long ago, ‘You shall not murder, and anyone who murders will be subject to judgment.’ But I tell you that anyone who is angry with a brother or sister will be subject to judgment. Again, anyone who says to a brother or sister, ‘Raca,’ is answerable to the court. And anyone who says, ‘You fool!’ will be in danger of the fire of hell.

Ἦκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις· οὐ φονεύσεις· ὃς δ’ ἂν φονεύσῃ, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ

³²¹ Dodd, *Epistles*, 123, states that ‘[t]he reference is clearly to the teaching of Jesus, as we have it in Mark xii. 28-31 and parallels. Hence the overt proof of love to God ... lies in the practical exercise of charity towards his fellow men.’

ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ
 ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει· ὃς δ' ἂν
 εἴπη τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ· ῥακά,
 ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ· ὃς δ' ἂν
 εἴπη· μωρέ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν
 γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.

In 3:11-12 the author has laid out the example of Cain, implicitly comparing the secessionists within the community to Cain in his anger and hate (3:13), contrasting this with the love within the community of true believers (3:14).

The **verbal agreement** in the above verse is not too impressive. The text in 1 John uses the noun ἀνθρωποκτόνος³²² for 'murderer', whereas Jesus recites the commandment 'you shall not kill' (φονεύσεις), using a verb from a different root. The meaning of both, however, is not so very different. The introducing sentences πᾶς ὁ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ - πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ are quite close. But here, again, a difference occurs in the key noun that is used. Hate (μισῶν) is indeed different from anger (ὀργιζόμενος).

On a **propositional** level both verses follow a similar pattern. There is the generalizing 'anyone who', coupled to a negative quality (anger/hate: not the same, but closely related) which is somehow declared as an equal violation of the law as murder. This reasoning is completed (or illustrated) by the assurance that the punishment for anger or hate, is either forfeiting eternal life, or the danger of burning in the fires of Gehenna. The agreement between both verses reads: *[hate or anger] toward a brother, will be judged [implicitly: by God] as an act of murder*. There is some **conceptual analogy** as well. Matthew 5:21-48 deals not only in the repeated exercise of overruling Scriptural commands by enlarging their focus (so that hate is equated with murder, looking at a woman with adultery, and so on), as 1 John 3:15 does, but it also deals with the love command, enlarging its focus in like manner, obligating Jesus'

³²² A rare noun in classical Greek and LXX. It is on Jesus' lips in John 8:44, where he calls the devil 'a murderer from the beginning', also pointing to the Cain event. However, 1 John 3:15 is about the attitude of individuals, not about Satan, which makes the link with Matthew 5:21-22 more interesting and probable.

followers to act out divine love in ways never before imagined (Cf. esp. Matt.5:43-48). The **accessibility** of such traditions is hard to establish; it would depend on the author's use of other such passages.

The author of 1 John has skillfully reworked Jesus' saying in his own words, placing it very naturally in his own argument. It is hard to tell whether the author had access to the saying in a more 'original' form (a form in which it had not been molded into Johannine vocabulary), or that he already had access to a 'reworked' Johannine version that he could have reproduced.

The outlook towards judgment, at the end of the verse, offers a smooth transition to the next topic of Jesus Tradition that has been utilized by 1 John: eschatology.

4.2.2 Eschatology

One of the things that can be said with some certainty about 1 John, is that it is written in reaction to a schism within the community (cf. especially 2:19). In line with Johannine stylistic features, the schism is described in dualistic terms: it is a division between children of God and children of the devil (3:10).

However, not only the dualistic language attracts attention. It is notable that the events that have led to the schism are interpreted eschatologically. The 'false prophets' of the heretical party that 'went out from us' (2:19) are identified as 'antichrists' (2:18). The 'last hour' has arrived, and Jesus' swift return is anticipated (2:28), with the promise of 'eternal life' (2:25).

These phrases are familiar eschatological catchwords, right at home within Jesus Tradition, although curiously absent from the Fourth Gospel. It would be instructive to investigate the traditions that underlie the statements made by the author.

4.2.2.1 1 John 2:17

A first verse which is of interest in this regard is 1 John 2:17. This verse is rightly regarded as the last of the first large pericope. However, its strong eschatological flavor seems to connect it to the next pericope. Perhaps the verse should be considered a hinge, constructing a smooth transition from one pericope (1:5-2:17) to the next (2:18-3:10).³²³

1 John 2:17

The world and its desires pass away, but whoever does the will of God lives forever.

καὶ ὁ κόσμος παράγεται καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ, ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

1 John 2:18

Dear children, this is the last hour; and as you have heard that the antichrist is coming, even now many antichrists have come. This is how we know it is the last hour.

Παιδιά, ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν, καὶ καθὼς ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν, ὅθεν γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν.

1 John 4:1b

because many false prophets have gone out into the world.

ὅτι πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐξεληλύθασιν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

2 John 1:7

because many deceivers, who do

Matt.7:21

Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven.

Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι· κύριε κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Matt.24:24

For false messiahs and false prophets will appear and perform great signs and wonders to deceive, if possible, even the elect.

ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα ὥστε πλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

³²³ So also L.J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist*, Leiden: Brill, 1996, 100.

not acknowledge Jesus Christ as coming in the flesh, have gone out into the world. Any such person is the deceiver and the antichrist.

Ὅτι πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πλάνος καὶ ὁ ἀντίχριστος.

1 John 2:17 can be connected to a specific logion from Jesus Tradition, because of the clause 'whoever does the will of God' (ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ), which has striking **verbal agreement** with Matthew 7:21b, 'the one who does the will of my Father' (ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου).

It is not just the isolated clauses that connect both verses; the contexts of both clauses are also quite similar. 1 John 2:17 reads:

The world and its desires pass away, but whoever does the will of God lives forever. (1 John 2:17)

If we assume that 'the world and its desires' are connected to the subject matter of the 'antichrists' and the false prophets of the following pericope, the allusion to Matthew 7:21 makes perfect sense:

Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven. (Matt.7:21)

Both verses propose that 'doing the will of God/the Father' is the decisive factor for gaining eternal life. Moreover, the 'false prophets' of the next verse, 1 John 2:18, are explicitly under discussion in Matthew 7, and so labelled in 7:15 (ψευδοπροφητῶν).³²⁴ This calls to memory another verse

³²⁴ Another possible parallel is to be found in Mark 3:35: 'Whoever does God's will (ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ) is my brother and sister and mother.' This, along with a closely related *agraphon* found in Clement's *Eclogue Propheticae* 20.3 'For my brothers and fellow heirs are those who do the will

in Matthew, which is equally eschatologically laden: Matthew 24:24, from the Olivet Discourse, where Jesus warns against ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφήται; false messiahs ('christs') and false prophets. 1 John 2:18, seems to presuppose Matthew 24:24 or a very similar tradition, as do 1 John 4:1b and 2 John 1:7. Of course, in these instances the author of the epistles chooses to dub his opponents ἀντίχριστοι, rather than ψευδόχριστοι, and he might not even imagine the one to be the same as the other. However, in 1 John 4:1 the link to Matthew 24:24 is stronger, because there the author acknowledges that many ψευδοπροφήται have gone out into the world, verbally identical to Jesus' prediction. The repeated 'many' (πολλοὶ: 1 John 2:18 and 4:1), in both cases combined with the perfect tense, gives the impression that the author takes the *antichrists* and the *false prophets* together and that he consciously refers to ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφήται in both verses, 2:18 and 4:1. In 4:3-5 we again find the false prophets connected to the antichrist.

Matthew 7:21 and 24:24 are all the more appealing for the Johannine author to refer to, because of the distinct warning that possibly 'even the elect' and 'those who say "Lord, Lord"' are in fact false prophets, wolves dressing up as sheep. This is precisely what in his view is happening within the Johannine community, and accounts for the **conceptual analogy**.

Verbal links have been discussed above; **propositional agreement** can be paraphrased in the first case as: *Those who do the will of [God/the Father] will gain eternal life* (2:17/Matt.7:21). The second is less easily paraphrased, since the prophecy Jesus gives is perceived to be fulfilled in the present by the Johannine author:

Jesus: *False messiahs and false prophets will go out in order to try to deceive believers* (Matt.24:24 – as a sign of the end of the ages, cp. Matt.24:3)

of my Father', would make a fitting connection with the 'brother'-texts mentioned above. However, the strong judgment eschatology makes it far more likely that the author is here thinking of the words we know from Matthew 7:21. It does remind us of how much 'doing God's will', and 'keeping the commandments' function as a prominent feature of Jesus Tradition, cf. below on 1 John 3:9-10.

John: *Anti-messiahs and false prophets have gone out to deceive believers* (1 John 2:18; 4:1; 2 John 1:7); *this is proof of the arrival of the last hour* (1 John 2:18).

The cumulative force of the parallels in the above table is very strong. It is hard to tell in what manner the author had **access** to these traditions, but it is almost impossible to escape the conclusion that he knew of these end-time prophecies, and that he might have known them to be sayings of Jesus.

4.2.2.2 1 John 3:4

In 1 John 3:4 it reads: 'Everyone who sins breaks the law (ὁ ποιῶν ... τὴν ἀνομίαν); in fact, sin is lawlessness (ἀνομία),' which we can compare to Matthew 7:23:

1 John 3:4

Everyone who sins breaks the law;
in fact, sin is lawlessness.

Πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν
ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν
ἡ ἀνομία

Matt.7:23//Luke 13:27

Then I will tell them plainly, 'I
never knew you. Away from me,
you evildoers!'

καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι
οὐδέποτε ἔγνω
ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ
ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.

Ps.6:8a LXX

ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, πάντες οἱ
ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν,

The **verbal** agreement in the present parallel is not too impressive, and amounts to ἀνομία; 'lawlessness'. It can be stretched to 'doers of lawlessness', but both verses use different words (Πᾶς ὁ ... τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ - οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν). The term lawlessness is relatively rare in the New Testament. It is on Jesus' lips in the same Matthean pericope where he denounces some of those who have called him 'Lord'

(7:21, see above). In 2 Thessalonians 2:3.7 the term is used in a similar eschatological context.

The author of 1 John is, in these verses, in the process of making a division between children of God and children of the devil, which connects it **conceptually** to the Matthean verse. The nearness of 7:23 to 7:21 makes it a likely candidate for allusion. The **propositional agreement**, however, is very slight: *those who practice lawlessness stand under judgment [implicitly]*; moreover, this is not a very surprising statement. However, 1 John's involvement with the type of tradition available to him, and the way the word ἀνομία uniquely corresponds to the same tradition material as is alluded to in 2:17-18, makes it a possible parallel.³²⁵

4.2.2.3 1 John 3:7a

A similar example can be found in 1 John 3:7, where the author warns his children not to be led astray. In doing so, he may very well refer to the *logion* that we can find in Matthew 24:4, where Jesus is reported to say: 'watch out that no one deceives you'. On both occasions the verb πλανάω is used for the warning:³²⁶

1 John 3:7a

Dear children, do not let anyone lead you astray.

Παιδιά, μηδεις πλανάτω ὑμᾶς

Matt.24:4b

Watch out that no one deceives you

βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ

Once again the **verbal agreement** is limited to the one word: πλανάτω - πλανήσῃ. However, if the above assumptions concerning eschatological

³²⁵ Interestingly, 1 John 3:4 parallels only the Matthean verse. However, as Koester (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, 131) points out: Luke 13:27 and Matt.7:23 combined form a full quotation of Ps.6:8a LXX.

³²⁶ Cf. Lietaert Peerbolte, *Antecedents of Antichrist*, 109, who points out that πλάνος and ἀντίχριστος are closely related, and share a common referent in 1 and 2 John (cf. 2 John 1:7).

Jesus Tradition in the Johannine epistles have been correct, it is likely that John is consciously alluding to these words of Jesus. This is even more likely since the **propositions** of both verses are pretty much identical: *do not be deceived [by anyone]*. With regard to **conceptual analogy** and **accessibility**, the same goes for the present parallel, as for the parallels listed above, under 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.2.2.

Apart from this type of judgment eschatology, there is also a positive future expectation, which seems to reach a climax in the following verses in which the *parousia* is not to be seen as a fearful event for those who belong to the faithful community. Rather, those whom the author addresses throughout as his 'children', appear to be just as much 'God's children'.

4.2.2.4 1 John 3:1

In reassuring his readers that they are God's children, the author borrows two phrases from the Matthean beatitudes:

1 John 3:1

See what great love the Father has lavished on us, that we should be called children of God! And that is what we are! The reason the world does not know us is that it did not know him.

ἴδετε ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ πατήρ, ἵνα τέκνα θεοῦ κληθῶμεν, καὶ ἔσμεν. διὰ τοῦτο ὁ κόσμος οὐ γινώσκει ἡμᾶς, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτόν.

1 Joh.3:2c-3

for we shall see him as he is. All who have this hope in him purify themselves, just as he is pure.

Matt.5:9

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.

μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται.

Matt.5:8

Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God.

μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται.

ὅτι ὀψόμεθα αὐτόν, καθώς ἐστίν.
καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἔχων τὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην
ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἀγνίζει ἑαυτόν, καθώς
ἐκεῖνος ἀγνός ἐστίν.

The first verse of chapter 3 reminds the readers that they may be called children of God. This is done in a more 'realized' form compared to the future tense in the beatitude, which is in line with the author's general sense of end-time urgency.

On a **verbal** level, both texts state that the believers will be called children of God: τέκνα θεοῦ κληθῶμεν - υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται. The Johannine author favors τέκνα over υἱοὶ, which is not surprising, since he addresses his readers as τέκνα throughout. The verbal agreement to the other beatitude lies in the assurance that the believers will see God: ὀψόμεθα αὐτόν - τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται. There is a variation in inflection, and in 1 John it is unclear if it is God or Jesus who is to be beheld, an ambiguity that runs throughout the epistle's use of αὐτός. Brown favors 'God' as a referent in this case:³²⁷ it makes the most sense grammatically ('God' is mentioned prominently in 2a) and semantically (the believers are to prepare themselves for this encounter, as Jesus (ἐκεῖνος in 3:3) has).³²⁸ This preparation is a matter of purity: the believers are to sanctify themselves, just as the promise in the beatitude was for the ritually clean 'in heart'. Once again there is a difference in vocabulary, but the concepts are similar. The **propositional agreement** between these statements is: *true believers will be called children of God and if they are spiritually purified, they will see God*. **Conceptual analogy** is quite clear, since 1 John 3:1-3 is all about God's rich promises, as are the beatitudes.

Once again the author of 1 John seems to relay a Matthean tradition, fueling the impression that he must have had **access** to a source containing such traditions.

³²⁷ Brown, *Epistles*, 394-95, as does Marianne Meye Thompson, *1-3 John*, 89.

³²⁸ If Jesus is in fact the intended referent, it would make little difference, 'for in Johannine thought to see the Son is to see the Father' (Dodd, *Epistles*, 70).

4.2.3 The New People of God

Another topic which is touched upon regularly by the author of the Johannine epistles, is the way the members of the community should behave, both in ethical conduct as in reaction to secessionist activities. In discussing this, the author leans on Jesus' words on more than one occasion.

4.2.3.1 1 John 1:5-6

Already in the opening statement of the first epistle we can recognize such an allusion:

1 John 1:5-6

This is the message (ἀγγελία)³²⁹ we have heard from him and declare to you: God is light; in him there is no darkness at all.

If we claim to have fellowship with him and yet walk in the darkness, we lie and do not live out the truth.

Καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶν καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία.

ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ σκότει περιπατῶμεν, ψευδόμεθα καὶ οὐ ποιοῦμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

John 8:12³³⁰

When Jesus spoke again to the people, he said, "I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness, but will have the light of life."

Πάλιν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοὶ οὐ μὴ περιπατήσει ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς.

³²⁹ Brown, *Epistles*, 191-3, translates ἀγγελία as 'gospel'. Ἀγγελία only appears here and in 3:11 in the NT (cf. also P.H.R. van Houwelingen, *Apostelen*, Kampen: Kok, 2011, 91-92), and it may very well be a technical term, the Johannine equivalent of εὐαγγέλιον and its cognates, which never appears in the Johannine writings.

³³⁰ Again, although Culpepper ('Jesus Sayings', 357-59) does not list it as such, John 8:12 bears all the characteristics of a traditional saying. It is certainly the opening statement of the pericope 8:12-20 and it is introduced in a similar manner as 8:21 ('Πάλιν οὖν αὐτοῖς').

The **verbal agreement** is very high, unsurprisingly, since we seem to be dealing with a Johannine allusion to a Johannine text: first of all there is the claim of God/Jesus 'being [the] light'. In 1 John the author makes sure to state that *God* is light, whereas Jesus claims of himself that he is the light. However, this tension is partly resolved when we accept that Jesus in fact makes a claim to divinity by stating *ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς*. The other element is the statement that it is impossible for followers of Jesus to 'walk in darkness': *ἐν τῷ σκότει περιπατῶμεν - περιπατήση ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ*.

Implicitly in both texts is the reassurance that to have fellowship with God (to 'remain in' Him, in Johannine idiom), is to be in the light. The **propositional agreement** is that [*God/Jesus*] is light. *To be close to Him means one cannot walk in darkness*. The difference is that on Jesus' lips the text is a reassurance, whereas in the epistle the text is used to make a division between true and false believers.

However, even if the author of the epistle takes the liberty to alter the **concept** of the statement (in part), it is clear that both verses cannot be read apart from each other. The epistle, in this case, is very likely dependent on the Gospel tradition; we cannot be sure whether it is the *written* Gospel account the epistle draws upon.

4.2.3.2 2 John 1:10

Another example of division within the community is found in 2 John 1:10:

2 John 1:10

If anyone comes to you and does not bring this teaching, do not take them into your house or welcome them.

εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδασχὴν οὐ φέρει, μὴ λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν καὶ χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε

Matt.10:13//Luke 10:6

If the home is deserving, let your peace rest on it; if it is not, let your peace return to you.

καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ᾗ ἡ οἰκία ἀξία, ἐλθάτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ' αὐτήν, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ᾗ ἀξία, ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω.

There may be a connection between these verses.

On a **verbal** level, all there is, is 'house', which is not much to go by. However, εἰρήνη in Matthew is meant as a Jewish greeting, which, in a sense, corresponds to the Greek χαίρειν.³³¹ The latter, in turn, as a greeting, is a blessing of happiness.

The **propositional** agreement is not very straightforward: in Matthew the apostolic messengers that are being sent out by Jesus are instructed, whereas in 2 John a receiving party is instructed. In Matthew the messengers are perceived as the 'right side', in 2 John the wandering teachers are on the wrong side. However, it may just be that the wandering teachers are, according to the author, *posing as* messengers sent by Jesus. So there is some overlap, given the fact that the message is turned around completely: *do not welcome them into your house and do not speak a greeting/blessing versus if you are not welcomed properly into the house, it is not worthy of your greeting/blessing*. The implicit propositional agreement might be: *Christian messengers ought to be blessed and welcomed into your house*.

There is **conceptual analogy** as well: If the author is saying: these people are deliberately *posing as* apostles, 'sent ones' (cf. 2 Cor.11:12-15), it would make sense to allude to Jesus' teaching in which he sent out his disciples (cf. 2 Cor.12:12). The *rhetorical* bonus of this allusion is this: The believers may have felt as the lesser party towards these teachers, since 'sent ones' apparently had a divine mandate: John takes this logic and turns it on its head, assuring his readers that the divine mandate to welcome and bless is instead *theirs* to give or withhold.

The mission speech of Matthew 10 and Luke 10 was widely known in the Early Church. Paul displays familiarity with it (1 Cor.9:14; 2 Cor.12:12; 1 Tim. 5:18), as do various extracanonical writings (*Dial.Sav.*53b; *Did.*13:1-2; *Gos.Thom.*14:2.39:2; *2 Clem.*5:2; *Ign.Pol.*2:2; *Gos.Naz.*7, usually single sayings are quoted here). It cannot surprise that the Johannine author had **access** to this tradition and made use of it here.

³³¹ Cf. Mounce, *Matthew* (NIBC), 93; within the first Gospel the word εἰρήνη only occurs in ch. 10, and there four times. In epistolary greetings in the NT it is often combined with χάρις rather than interchanged, cf. also *NIDNTTE*, 114.

4.2.3.3 3 John 1:9

In the third epistle, we encounter a different situation, where one Diotrophes unjustly shut his doors for John's fellow-workers:

3 John 1:9

I wrote to the church, but Diotrophes, who loves to be first, will not welcome us.

Ἐγραψά τι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἀλλ' ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν Διοτρέφης οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς.

Mark 10:44//Matt. 20:27

and whoever wants to be first must be slave of all

καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος

Before the author has put Diotrophes' name on paper, he has already characterized him negatively, by introducing him as 'the loving-to-be-first of them Diotrophes'. **Verbally**, there is a possible play on the above saying. Jesus warns his disciples, who strive for leadership positions, that the desire to be first will not work out for them in the way they envision. The disciples strove for number one, and now Diotrophes strives for that position. The author shows, using a unique word in New Testament and Classical Greek, that Diotrophes' way of gaining a leadership position is contrary to what Jesus had in mind for his church.³³² It is especially the addition of αὐτῶν that is noteworthy (φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν), since it runs parallel to what Jesus said just prior to the present saying: gentiles 'lord over them' (κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, Mark 10:42//Matt.20:25), which is precisely the model that Diotrophes is following.

The shared **proposition** is an implicit one: *striving to be first is wrong*. Of course both situations address a concrete individual (or individuals) who in fact strives for a position in the wrong way. This adds meaning to the shared proposition, and it forms **conceptual analogy** as well. This may be the only example of the author of the Johannine epistles using a

³³² Thompson, *1-3 John* IVPNTC, 161-62, supposes that this is in fact the heart of the epistle's accusation towards Diotrophes. Not that he is spreading doctrinal heresy, but that he has accumulated power in a wrongful manner.

Markan tradition. It is, however, telling that Mark 10:42-45 is paralleled almost verbatim by Matthew in 20:25-28.

4.2.3.4 1 John 3:9-10

In 1 John 3 the author goes so far as to call the secessionists 'children of the devil', placing them over against the true followers of Jesus, who are 'children of God', this time the two ways to measure this status are given side by side: 'love' on the one hand, 'ethics' on the other:

1 John 3:9-10

No one who is born of God will continue to sin, because God's seed remains in them; they cannot go on sinning, because they have been born of God.

This is how we know who the children of God are and who the children of the devil are: Anyone who does not do what is right is not God's child, nor is anyone who does not love their brother and sister.

Πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται.

ἐν τούτῳ φανερά ἐστιν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου· πᾶς ὁ μὴ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.

Matt.13:38-39a

The field is the world, and the good seed stands for the people of the kingdom. The weeds are the people of the evil one, and the enemy who sows them is the devil.

ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος, τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας· τὰ δὲ ζιζάνιά εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ὁ σπεύρας αὐτὰ ἐστιν ὁ διάβολος

Augustine, in his homilies on 1 John, states that the 'seed' in these verses is to be understood as the Gospel.³³³ That Augustine would make such a connection is hardly surprising, since σπέρμα plays a role in one of Jesus' best known parables: the parable of the sower in Matthew 13 (*par.* Mark 4), and Jesus' explanation of the parable is linked to the proclamation of the Gospel.

In Matthew 13:38 we can isolate a *logion* that is in a number of ways closely related to 1 John 3:9. The most striking **verbal** resemblance (apart from σπέρμα) lies of course in the opposition of children of God/the kingdom versus the children of the devil/evil one: τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου - οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ... οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ. As in 1 John 3:1 (referring to another Matthean tradition) the difference lies in the use of τέκνα over against υἱοὶ, but also τοῦ θεοῦ instead of τῆς βασιλείας. Whereas the former can be understood as Johannine idiomatic preference, the latter may in fact be due to the Matthean idiom, since Matthew shies away from using the word 'God' lightly (e.g. 'kingdom of heaven', instead of Mark's 'kingdom of God').³³⁴ Matthew's πονηροῦ instead of 1 John's διαβόλου is also easily resolved, since Matthew identifies the evil one as the devil in his next sentence.

In 1 John the theme of the seed is developed in typically Johannine regeneration language: the 'seed' remains (μένει) in whoever is 'born' of God. The actual parable (Matt. 13:3-9) mentions the scattered seed of which only a fragment bears fruit. The parallel is all the more interesting because the parable, as well as Jesus' explanation (13:36-42), focuses on the two kinds of seed that develop into plants. The one being proper crops, the other weeds. These weeds are then identified as the children of the 'evil one'. For the author of 1 John this is a useful parallel, because it once again gives him the possibility to shed light from Jesus Tradition on the recent events concerning the false prophets within the community: they have grown up alongside the elect, but turned out to be weeds and

³³³ 'The seed of God, *i.e.* the word of God: whence the Apostle saith: "I have begotten you through the Gospel..." Homily V.7, Schaff, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series I, Volume 7, *St. Augustine: Homilies on the Gospel of John; Homilies on the First Epistle of John; Soliloquies* New York: Cosimo Classics, 490.

³³⁴ Cf. e.g. Mounce, Matthew, 33. However, Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009, thinks that Matthew does not so much shy away from the word 'God', but rather prefers to emphasize the present dichotomy of the earthly and heavenly realms.

thorns trying to smother the children of God (cf. above on 1 Joh.2:17-19, and the considered allusions to Matt. 7:21 and 24:24). The **conceptual analogy** is therefore very clear.

The **propositional agreement** between both passages reads: *the long-term outworking of God's seed marks the difference between children of God and children of the devil*. This is stretching the concept of 'the seed', since Jesus directly identifies the seed with the believers themselves in the above verse. It is fair to say, however, that the idea of the seed and the act of sowing also point to God's activity in the believers.

Interestingly, the author uses the term 'born of God' in the epistle, whereas the Gospel speaks of 'born from above' (ἄνωθεν, John 3:3). In the previous chapters, on James and 1 Peter, it was noted how similar Early Christian regeneration concepts were used with different idiom, yet sometimes also very similar words. In 1 Peter 1:23 we encounter Johannine-like regeneration language, when Peter speaks of 'being born again', mentioning 'seed' in the same verse, and implicitly equating the seed with the word. In James 3:18 James mentions the seed in one sentence with the phrase 'children of God', just as in 1 John 3:9-10. James 1:17 and 3:17 speak of 'good gifts' and 'wisdom' from above (ἄνωθεν), going on to mention 'fruits'. Taken together, it appears that all three authors may be addressing a similar concept, in their own words, yet drawing upon similar tradition material.

4.2.3.5 1 John 3:22

Those who do have fellowship with Jesus, who walk in the light and are in fact God's children, are also in a loving relationship with their Lord, as the next parallel shows:

1 John 3:22

[we] receive from him anything we ask, because we keep his commands and do what pleases him.

καὶ ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν, λαμβάνομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ

Matt.7:8a//Luke 11:10

For everyone who asks receives;

πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει

τηροῦμεν καὶ τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιον
αὐτοῦ ποιοῦμεν

1 John 3:22 is in all likelihood a reflection on Jesus' strong promise that prayers of his disciples will be answered. In the Johannine Farewell Discourse a similar utterance is thrice repeated, in John 14:13; 15:7 and 16:26-27.³³⁵ However, only in the double tradition do we find the same **verbal agreement**: αἰτέω and λαμβάνω.

The **propositional agreement** is also very straightforward: *ask [God or Jesus] and you will receive*. The **conceptual analogy** is that of an unreserved prayer-relationship with God. According to 1 John 3:21 believers have *παρρησίαν* to approach God in prayer, which is in fact a fine way of summing up the chain-saying that 7:8a belongs to ('ask-see-knock'). The pericope of Matthew 7:7-11 (unlike the highly comparable Luke 11:5-13) is concluded by the so-called 'golden rule', encompassing the law and the prophets. That in turn aligns with 1 John 3:22's assurance that 'we keep his commands and do what pleases him'.

It is striking that the author should pick the first saying out of this chain-saying ('ask and receive'), since 'seek' and 'knock' are the preferred idiom throughout the Early Church (cf. *Gos.Thom.2*; 92; 94; *Dial.Sav.20c*; *Gos.Heb* in *Strom.5.14.96.3*), the only exception being the epistle of James (*Jas.1:5-7*, cf. 2.2.1 above). It strengthens the impression that the Johannine author had access to a source resembling double tradition, and in this case the Matthean version is again closest to 1 John.

4.2.3.6 1 John 5:16a-b

A final verse that deserves our attention may be found in 5:16:

1 John 5:16a-b

If you see any brother or sister
commit a sin that does not lead to

Mark 3:29//Matt.12:32//Luke
12:10//
Gos.Thom.44//Did.11:7b

³³⁵ Cf. Brown, *Epistles*, 460-61.

death, you should pray and God will give them life.

I refer to those whose sin does not lead to death. There is a sin that leads to death.

Ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, αἰτήσῃ καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ ζωὴν, τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον. ἔστιν ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον·

but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will never be forgiven; they are guilty of an eternal sin.”

ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλ' ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος.

The reference to sins that do and do not 'lead to death' (ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον) has often evoked the question whether or not the author of the epistle means the same thing as Jesus when he speaks of the 'unpardonable sin' (Mark 3:29; Matt. 12:31-32; Luke 12:10; *Gosp. Thom.* 44; cf. *Did.* XI.7). Lalleman³³⁶ connects the 'sin unto death' to the lawlessness of 3:4. This is the type of sin which is impossible to conduct for those who remain in a loving relationship with Jesus and the Father (3:6-10). The word 'sin' would be the only **verbal agreement** between both verses.

The original context of the Synoptic saying, which is by and large retained in *Gospel of Thomas* 44 and *Didache* XI.7, is that of the sin against the holy Spirit. This connection is not found in 1 John 5:16. The Markan context of 'a household divided against itself' (3:25) fits the purpose of the author neatly, and would form interesting **conceptual analogy**. But there is little reason to suppose that the author of 1 John is pointing towards the Synoptic *logion*, since there is in fact hardly any **propositional agreement**, apart from the notion that some sins are more severely punished than others.

³³⁶ P. Lalleman, *1,2,en 3 Johannes*, Kampen: Kok, 2001, 321.

4.3 Conclusions

Several compelling parallels to Jesus Tradition have been found in the Johannine epistles. Below, the nature of familiarity and access to certain strands of tradition will be considered.

The probability of literary relations between the Fourth Gospel and the epistles (in either direction) makes it hard to evaluate these parallels. The shared vocabulary (and possible shared authorship) between both bodies of texts makes this even harder.

Parallels to the Fourth Gospel		
Text in John Ep.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
1 John 3:16	<i>Love is exemplified by [Jesus'] giving his life for others</i>	John 15:13
1 John 4:9	<i>God showed his love by sending his only son into the world in order to give life to [believers]</i>	John 3:16
1 John 2:7; 3:23; 2 John 1:4-6	<i>The [well-known] 'new command' is: you should love one another</i>	John 13:34
1 John 1:5-6	<i>[God/Jesus] is light. To be close to him means one cannot walk in darkness</i>	John 8:12

The above table shows parallels that seem to point to a joint understanding of both Gospel and epistles of the concept of God's love. This understanding is exemplified by the constitutive nature of the love command. Both underline that this command was given by Jesus. The nature of this love is exemplified by Jesus' giving of his life, and God's giving of his Son. The Fourth Gospel is very clear that both statements belong to Jesus' teaching. This goes as well for the statement that God/Jesus is light. 1 John's allusion to this verse immediately follows his assurance that the author is an ear- and eyewitness to Jesus' ministry.

More striking than the (anticipated) parallels to the Fourth Gospel, are those to the Gospel of Matthew. Some of these parallels (four out of eleven) have parallels to Markan or Lukan verses as well. Surprisingly, there is not one example of a Markan or Lukan parallel without a

Matthean parallel. What is more, when more than one Synoptic parallel is offered, the Matthean parallel has to be favored on verbal, propositional or conceptual grounds.

Those Matthean verses that have Synoptic (either Markan or Lukan) counterparts have been rendered in bold in the table below.

Parallels to the first Gospel		
Text in John Ep.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
1 John 4:21	<i>God is to be loved and those near to you are to be loved</i>	Matt.22:37-39
1 John 3:15	<i>[hate or anger] toward a brother, will be judged [implicitly: by God] as an act of murder</i>	Matt.5:21-22
1 John 2:17	<i>Those who do the will of [God/the Father] will gain eternal life</i>	Matt.7:21
1 John 2:18; 1 John 4:1; 2 John 1:7	<i>[False/Anti-]messiahs will go out/have gone out to [try to] deceive believers. This is a sign/proof of the end of the ages/the last hour</i>	Matt.24:24
1 John 3:4	<i>Those who work out lawlessness stand under judgment</i>	Matt.7:23
1 John 3:7a	<i>Do not be deceived</i>	Matt.24:4b
1 John 3:1-3	<i>true believers will be called children of God and if they are spiritually purified they will see God</i>	Matt.5:8-9
2 John 1:10	<i>Christian messengers ought to be welcomed into your house</i>	Matt.10:13
3 John 1:9	<i>Striving to be first is wrong</i>	Matt.20:27
1 John 3:9-10	<i>The long-term outworking of God's seed marks the difference between children of God and children of the devil</i>	Matt.13:38-39
1 John 3:22	<i>Ask [God or Jesus] and you will receive</i>	Matt.7:8a

A number of conclusions can be drawn from this overview:

1. Whereas the propositional overlap in most of these parallels is significant, the verbal overlap is less compelling.

2. From the cumulative evidence of these parallels follows that the author of the Johannine epistles must have had knowledge of Synoptic tradition material.
3. Without opting for the possibility that the actual Gospel of Matthew was known to the author of the epistles, the apparent familiarity with strictly Matthean material is striking.
4. Most of the parallels can be found in the large blocks of teaching that Matthew presents (nine out of eleven, i.e.: Matt.5-7; 10; 13; 18; 24-25).
5. The Matthean division of this teaching is not mirrored: the author of the epistles seems to connect Matthew 7:15-23 to the prophecies of the Olivet Discourse.

Further, a few tentative observations can be made regarding the parallels to the *Hebrew Gospel*.

Parallels to the *Hebrew Gospel*

Text in John Ep.	Propositional agreement	Parallel(s) from JT
1 John 3:17-18	<i>Withholding material possessions from a brother in need is acting in opposition to God's call for love</i>	Origen, <i>Comm.Matt.15.14</i>
	<i>Seeing a brother</i>	Jerome, <i>Comm.Eph.5.4</i>
1 John 4:21	<i>Love for the brother</i>	

1. The Johannine love command may seem to deviate slightly from the Synoptic love command; the indicative 'love your brother(s)' coincides with love command passages that are known from the *Hebrew Gospel*.
2. Further propositional, verbal and conceptual overlap points to the possibility that the author of the Johannine epistles was acquainted with a similar strand of tradition.
3. The verbal and semantic overlap only tentatively points to a relation with the *Hebrew Gospel*, but it highlights a semantic field within the First epistle of John that seems to be more Jewish in its outlook.

Finally, it should be noted that the author of the epistles takes great liberty in reworking tradition material. Especially in 1 John 2:18 and 2 John 1:10 he does not shy away from significantly altering the form of the underlying (supposed) tradition, presenting a prophecy as a realized fact, or turning a mission statement around to bring out surprising nuances. All of this concords with protogymnastic rhetoric, which praises variation of style and form over mere repetition.

When these conclusions are brought into play, it is hard to still envision the Johannine epistles as a sectarian, inner-circle, esoteric sort of literature. Rather, the Johannine epistles show the same type of familiarity with Jesus Tradition that can also be found in Paul, James and 1 Peter. The typical idiom that the epistles share with the Fourth Gospel should not distract from the basic agreement the Johannine literature has with other early Christian writings.

5. Jesus Tradition Parallels in 2 Peter and Jude

Questions regarding source dependence, intertextuality and the literary appropriation of source material have been of ongoing interest to this study. To the academic research of 2 Peter and Jude, however, they are congenital from the outset. Both epistles' introductory matters revolve around the relationship that the one epistle has to the other.

5.1 Introductory matters

The remarkable overlap between the middle section of 2 Peter and the epistle of Jude conjoins both writings almost as a Siamese twin, presenting those who wish to read either letter in its own right with a puzzle that requires surgical precision. The difficulty of this task has not always been met with great enthusiasm, since both epistles (but especially 2 Peter) are considered by many to be chronologically late and (relatively) canonically irrelevant. Therefore, the outlining of relevant introductory matters of these epistles will commence with the questions regarding canonicity and significance (5.1.1).

5.1.1 Reception History

In their study of the reception history of 2 Peter and Jude, Grünstäudl and Nicklas surmise that '[e]ven if, however, both texts belong together in a certain sense, their paths to canonical status were remarkably different'.³³⁷ They go on to show that the epistle of Jude seems to be known, used, and accepted as an authoritative writing from the apostolic era, from a relatively early date, and in large parts of the Roman empire. It is mentioned in the 'Roman' *Canon Muratori* (usually dated ca. 200 AD); by the North African bishop Tertullian (again, ca. 200. Tertullian makes explicit mention of the Apostolic authority of the epistle) and by the Egyptian Clement of Alexandria (also ca. 200). More than one hundred years later, Eusebius grants that it may still be disputed by

³³⁷ Wolfgang Gründstäudl and Tobias Nicklas, 'Searching for Evidence: The History of Reception of the Epistles of Jude and 2 Peter', in Mason & Martin, *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude*, 215-228, this quote 216.

some, but that it is accepted by most. Jerome paints a similar picture, adding the reason for the dispute: some reject it 'because in it he [Jude] quotes from the apocryphal book of Henoch' (*Vir. Ill.*IV). This is an interesting detail. Apparently the (implicit) notion of 'canonical purity', sits uneasy with the content of Jude, to some Christians in the fourth century, at least.

2 Peter's itinerary through early readership is harder to establish. The fourth century councils agree on its apostolic and canonical status. However, as late as the sixth century, Cassiodorus still translates and distributes a document stating that 2 Peter is in fact non-canonical (even if published in the churches; 'non tamen in canone est').³³⁸ Both Eusebius and Jerome knew the epistle to be disputed. However, both also understand it to be part of the 'Catholic Epistles' collection. Eusebius *does* inform us that Clement of Alexandria wrote commentaries on the whole Catholic Epistles collection, which likely includes 2 Peter, even if this writing is now lost.³³⁹ Clement's pupil Origen shows firm trust in a new Testament canon of sorts consisting of 24 or 25 books (only lacking Acts and Revelation, and possibly 2 or 3 John).³⁴⁰

Centuries later, Luther's tentative reevaluation of the New Testament canon cast a negative judgment on Jude as 'non-apostolical'.³⁴¹ Certainly, its relation to apocryphal Jewish writings has been an ongoing problem or even embarrassment to some.³⁴² Critical evaluation of Petrine authorship of 2 Peter, especially in the second half of the twentieth century, sidelined the epistle in turn, as 'early catholic apologia'.³⁴³ the

³³⁸ Grünstäudl & Nicklas, 220.

³³⁹ Eusebius, *HE*, VI, 14,1. Cf. also P.H.R. van Houwelingen, *De tweede trompet. De authenticiteit van de tweede brief van Petrus* (Diss.). Kampen: Kok, 1988, 21-24, who lists some further indirect evidence of 2 Peter being known and used in the second century, esp. by Irenaeus and Justin Martyr. The latter's knowledge of 2 Peter has recently been defended by Martin Ruf, *Die heiligen Profeten, euerer Apostel, und ich: Metatextuelle studien zum zweiten Petrusbrief*. WUNT 2/300. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011, 361.

³⁴⁰ In his *Homilia in Librum Jesu Nave VII*, 1. Cf. his statement in *HE* VI, 25,8, where he seems to take the position that he himself accepts 2 Peter, even though some others dispute it, cf. Van Houwelingen, *Tweede trompet*, 24-27.

³⁴¹ Cf. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 429.

³⁴² Cf. e.g. Peter Davids, 'The Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Janus. A New Testament Glimpse into Old and New Testament Canon Formation', *BBR* 19.3 (2009), 403-416, in which he argues that both Petrine epistles, as well as James and Jude, can be seen to be influenced by non-Biblical Second Temple literature.

³⁴³ Cf. Ernst Käsemann, 'An Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology,' in *Essays on New Testament Themes* (trns. W.J. Montague; SBT 41; London: SCM, 1964), 169-95, cf. also the review of Käsemann's

exemplary early catholic writing, the latest writing in the canon, which ‘raises in especially sharp form the problem of “the inner limits of the canon” and demands reflection on the normative character of this theology’.³⁴⁴

5.1.2 Present status

The Jude of Jude 1:1, is universally understood to be the brother of Jesus (cf. Matt.10:2-4; Mark 3:16-19), and ‘Jude’s eventual inclusion in the canon depended on the assumption in the early church that Jude the brother of James (and Jesus) really was the author’.³⁴⁵ Many scholars today reject Jude’s authenticity in this regard, deeming the letter too spurious and too literate to have come from the historical Jude. There are however strong proponents of its authenticity, Bauckham being the first among them.³⁴⁶ The letter is usually dated in the last quarter of the first century, although those who defend its authenticity often date it earlier: Bauckham thinks it likely that it is written prior to James’ martyrdom in 62.³⁴⁷

The opinions regarding authenticity of 2 Peter are less nuanced; there is near unanimity regarding its pseudepigraphical character. The testamentary genre that the letter self-consciously seems to adopt, makes it hard, according to the majority of scholarship, to imagine that Peter himself would have been the author.³⁴⁸ Bauckham and Witherington

position in Robert L. Webb, ‘The Rhetoric of 2 Peter: An Apologia for Early Christian Ethics (and not “Primitive Christian Eschatology”)’ in Burns & Rogerson: *In Search of Philip R. Davies; Whose Festschrift is it Anyway?*, London: T&T Clark, 2007, online at <http://tandtclark.typepad.com/ttc/2007/12/an-online-lhbot.html>, this article at http://tandtclark.typepad.com/Davies_FS_Files/Davies_FS_Webb.pdf, visited at 2-20-2017.

³⁴⁴ Kümmel, 434, cf. Grünstäudl & Nicklas, 228: ‘[t]he insights gleaned along the way encourage us to ask questions about 2 Peter’s and Jude’s ongoing “usefulness” today.’

³⁴⁵ Donelson, ‘Gathering Apostolic Voices. Who Wrote 1 and 2 Peter and Jude?’, in Mason & Martin: *Reading*, 11-26, this quote, 24.

³⁴⁶ Esp. Richard Bauckham, *Jude-2 Peter* (WBC), Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015 [1983], 14-16. Cf. the commentaries by Gene L. Green (BECNT), Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008, Peter H. Davids (PNTC), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006 and David A. deSilva [Painter] (Paideia), Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

³⁴⁷ Bauckham, *ibid.*, 14.

³⁴⁸ Cf., however, P.H.R. van Houwelingen’s criticism in his dissertation *De tweede trompet*, 130-31: if the testamentary genre seeks to address timeless realities, how are we to understand 2 Peter as a proper fictitious testament, considering its contents are so particular and polemic? (paraphrase mine); and Mark D. Matthews, ‘The Genre of 2 Peter: A Comparison with Jewish and Early Christian Testaments’, *BBR* 21.1 (2011), 51-64, adds to this the observation that (1) 2 Peter lacks a number of convincing

propose a nuanced form of pseudepigraphy, in which the Roman church faithfully sought to write on the deceased Peter's behalf, not long after Peter's martyrdom.³⁴⁹ Most authors, however, still think of 2 Peter as a late document, written in the first half of the second century.³⁵⁰

Michael J. Gilmour offers a welcome 'plea for caution': he compares the debates surrounding the authenticity of New Testament documents (2 Peter especially) to the ongoing debate surrounding the authorship of the literature attributed to William Shakespeare.³⁵¹ None of the many arguments that are brought forward from either the proponents of pseudonymity or defendants of authenticity are in fact conclusive³⁵² and '[w]e need to be careful not to create evidence (...) that is simply not there'.³⁵³ Such care will be adopted in this study. The authorial claim that is made in 2 Peter 1:1 will be denied nor defended (that would call for more space than these pages allow). 'Peter' will be designated as the implied and assumed author.³⁵⁴

5.1.3 The literary relationship of 2 Peter and Jude

Readers have noticed the remarkable overlap between 2 Peter and Jude for a long time. Certain words, phrases, and even pericopes have almost as much in common as some parallel passages in the synoptic Gospels. The table below shows the extent of this overlap:³⁵⁵

elements (such as a deathbed scene) that were part and parcel of the testamentary genre; and (2) 2 Peter would, therefore, either have been received as a genuine letter or dismissed as a forgery.

³⁴⁹ Bauckham, 151-54; Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians, vol. II*, 277-85, cf. the view of J. Ramsey Michaels in Barker, Lane & Michaels, *The New Testament Speaks*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969, 352.

³⁵⁰ Of course, scholars have various arguments which they weigh differently in addressing this issue; not every one of these arguments can be addressed in this study.

³⁵¹ Michael J. Gilmour, 'Reflections on the Authorship of 2 Peter', *EQ* 73:4 (2001), 291-309.

³⁵² However, for a recent and thorough defense of the position that 2 Peter might very well have been written by the apostle Peter, cf. P.H.R. van Houwelingen, 'The Authenticity of 2 Peter: Problems and Possible Solutions', *ETJ* (2010) 19:2, 119-29.

³⁵³ Gilmour, 'Reflections', 309.

³⁵⁴ Paucity on this subject seems all the more apt, since the view that literary property was in fact known and understood as a concept in the first century seems to gain recognition, cf. e.g. Armin D. Baum, *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühesten Christentum*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004; Terry L. Wilder, *Pseudonymity, the New Testament and Deception*, Lanham: University Press of America, 2004; Bart D. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

³⁵⁵ This table has been adapted from Jeremy F. Hultin, 'The Literary Relationships Among 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude', in Mason & Martin, *Reading*, 27-46.

Jude	2 Peter
2 peace ... be yours in abundance	1:2 peace be yours in abundance
3 every effort ...	1:5 every effort ...
That was ... passed on to ... holy	2:21 holy ... that was passed on to ...
4 ...have snuck in among you Deny ... master	2:1 among you ... will sneak in ... deny ... Master
5 to remind you, though you are fully informed...	1:12 to remind you ... though you know them already
6 angels ... kept ... chains ... deepest darkness for the judgment	2:4 angels ... chains ... deepest darkness ... kept ... judgment
7 Sodom and Gomorrah ... cities ... example	2:6 cities ... Sodom and Gomorrah ... example
8 defile ... flesh ... lordship ... slander glories	2:10 flesh ... defiled ... lordship ... slander glories (daring)
9 angel ...not (dare) to bring against ... a judgment of slander	2:11 angels ... not bring against ... a slanderous judgment
10 But these people slander whatever they do not understand ... instinct, like irrational animals ... they are destroyed	2:12 But these people ... like irrational animals ... instinct ... slander what they do not understand ... they .. will be destroyed
11 way ... Balaam's error ... wages	2:15-16 erred ... way ... Balaam ... wages
12-13 [These are] waterless ... For whom the deepest darkness has been reserved	2:17 These are waterless... For whom the deepest darkness has been reserved
16 lusts ... bombastic	2:18 bombastic ... lusts

17-18 beloved, remember the words spoken beforehand by the apostles of ... Lord

In the last time there will be scoffers, indulging their own ... lusts

3:1-3 beloved ... remember the words spoken beforehand by the ... apostles ... Lord

In the last days scoffers will come ... indulging their own lusts

Hultin rightly points out that there is meaningful overlap on three levels: content; vocabulary and sequence.³⁵⁶ There is, however, a vast difference in style. 2 Peter is written in the most baroque Greek in the New Testament; a (far from flawless) example of the Grand or Asiatic style, that was also frequently used by e.g. Cicero.³⁵⁷ Jude, on the other hand, is written in quite excellent, relatively straightforward Greek.³⁵⁸

It is clear to most scholars that there must be some form of literary dependency. This dependence can move in one of the following three directions:

1. Jude used 2 Peter

One can see how Jude has simplified and improved the Greek in many of the parallels to 2 Peter; it is harder to imagine it the other way around.³⁵⁹ Also, the most straightforward reading of both epistles would suggest that Jude twice points to a *prediction* (Jude 4.17-18) that is made in 2 Peter (2:1-3; 3:3). However, if 2 Peter is to be thought of as pseudepigraphical and dependent on Jude, it is quite conceivable that its author would have chosen to make it seem that way.

³⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 30.

³⁵⁷ Cf. Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*, vol. II, 272-277.

³⁵⁸ Cf. Mark D. Mathews, "The Literary Relationship of 2 Peter and Jude: Does the Synoptic Tradition Solve this Synoptic Problem?" *Neotestamentica* 44.1 (2010): 47-66.

³⁵⁹ Cf. esp. *Ibid.* Mathews points out that the activities of Matthew and Luke in using and editing Mark are a useful parallel: both evangelists tend to shorten the Markan pericopes and improve on their rather flawed style.

2. 2 Peter used Jude

It may not seem as the most straightforward possibility to us, that 2 Peter would parallel Jude by making the text more complex, but it is quite conceivable when the notion of progymnastic composition is brought into play. The most important argument to opt for this viewpoint (as an overwhelming majority of scholars does) is that of dating: 2 Peter is widely believed to be decades later than Jude, so the dependence must simply be sought in this direction and not vice versa. This, however, comes close to circular reasoning, since all the tentative arguments that point to the possibility of a late date for 2 Peter, would be nullified if it could be shown that Jude is dependent on it, and not the other way around. Hultin lists a number of arguments in favor of this position.³⁶⁰ Most of these arguments are far from conclusive.³⁶¹

3. 2 Peter and Jude made use of the same source

Since the matter of which epistle is dependent on which cannot be resolved with great certainty, the option of mutual dependence on a third source (either a written document or an oral tradition) can be appealing. Some scholars have pointed to similarities with certain Dead Sea Scrolls, others have thought of oral (catechetical) instruction.³⁶² Furthermore, as Hultin points out, a one-way dependence in either direction confronts us with the question why the source has not been named; after all, elsewhere in the epistles, Jude points to Enoch as a source and 2 Peter approvingly mentions Paul.³⁶³ This latter point might speak in favor of mutual dependence on oral tradition.

The question remains open and unanswered. However, since this research is concerned with matters of intertextuality from a different (but possibly, at times, overlapping) perspective, it may be worthwhile to see

³⁶⁰ Hultin, 36: 2 Pet. presents Jude's biblical examples in chronological order; 2 Pet. filters out the apocryphal elements of Jude; in a few cases it is easier to conceive of 2 Pet. improving on Jude than the other way around; 2 Pet. shifts between predictions and descriptions of what is already reality; why would Jude have been treasured and copied if 2 Peter was already around?

³⁶¹ Cf. Charles Bigg, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (ICC), Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1956 [1901], 216-224, who quite satisfactorily refuted most of these arguments.

³⁶² Cf. Hultin, 39.

³⁶³ *Ibid.*, 40.

if any data will surface that could help to strengthen one or some of the above arguments.

5.1.4 Purpose

As much as 2 Peter and Jude have in common; one should avoid the pitfall of identifying their subject matters too closely with one another. It is clear that both epistles have been written to instruct communities in how to deal with certain individuals that have overstepped critical boundaries in observance of either doctrine or ethics. Both epistles name them 'scoffers' (ἐμπαῖκται), which is a word otherwise unknown to the New Testament. Webb³⁶⁴ has pointed out that (at least in 2 Peter) the voices of the scoffers have more to do with ethics than with doctrine. There is, however, a real difference to be discerned between the groups either epistle is dealing with.

Peter Davids has written a notable article on this distinction,³⁶⁵ building on some insights from (group) psychology. On the one hand, the originating Jesus movement was called to adapt, in any case, to its incorporation of Gentile believers (both ethically and theologically). On the other hand, it had to search for where boundaries were indeed called for, since '[a] community without boundaries ceases to exist.'³⁶⁶ These boundaries are arrived at when 'dissonant behavior becomes intolerable':³⁶⁷ the 'others' have become 'too other'.³⁶⁸

³⁶⁴ Webb, 'The Rhetoric'.

³⁶⁵ Peter H. Davids, 'Are the Others too Other? The Issue of "Others" in Jude and 2 Peter', in Mason & Martin, *Reading*, 201-228.

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 206.

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁶⁸ Such an approach to diversity within early Christianity fits our knowledge of how groups and movements originate and develop much better than either Walter Bauer's schema (in *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934) or that of James Robinson and Helmut Koester (*Trajectories Through Early Christianity*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971). Cf. Larry Hurtado, 'Interactive Diversity: A Proposed Model of Christian Origins,' *JTS* (2013) 64 (2): 445-62, who states that 'early Christian diversity was often (even typically?) of a highly interactive nature.' With which he implies that any groups and factions that no doubt arose, would have been likely to maintain interaction. The NT canon itself more or less testifies to this, since it is so multifaceted, esp. when compared to 2nd century exclusivist (Marcion, *GThom*) or harmonizing (Tatian) tendencies.

The 'others' in Jude and 2 Peter appear quite alike, perhaps, because of the similar ideas and images that both authors use to judge them.

However, there are some marked differences between both groups:³⁶⁹

- Whereas in Jude the others have snuck in (they are outsiders from the outset); in 2 Peter they do not themselves sneak in, but rather, they sneak in *ideas*.
- In Jude, these 'outsiders' are never presented as 'false teachers' or 'prophets': they therefore do not seem to be *leading* or *authoritative* figures from within the community. In 2 Peter the issue *is* with false teachers.
- The 'others' in Jude rather seem to be a group (possibly of newcomers) within the community who are 'transforming God's grace into self-abandonment' (probably referring to sexual behavior that transgresses that which is acceptable to the community).
- These 'dissenters' are, to Jude, not beyond redemption (v.23: 'show mercy mixed with fear'): 2 Peter does not (explicitly) make room for such a forgiving approach.

In 2 Peter, furthermore, the false teachers themselves behave immorally, but they also propagate this behavior, promising 'freedom': this may be reminiscent of the situation in the community addressed by Paul in 1 Corinthians. It also evokes the notion of Epicurean freedom.

That would coincide with their wholesale rejection of divine providence and coming judgment. Webb has taken the position that *parousia* in 2 Peter does not refer exclusively to 'the second coming' of Christ, but in some instances to further divine interference.³⁷⁰ The 'others' in 2 Peter seem to have waived the notion of God's intervening in human business. This has theological corollaries, naturally, but the text primarily deals with the ethical ones.

It is noteworthy that 2 Peter deals with these dissenting voices, who may be appealing to the writings of Paul, and yet the epistle itself chooses not to distance itself from Pauline writings, but to affirm their apostolic credentials. Larry Hurtado states that '[2 Peter 3:15-16] appears to reflect

³⁶⁹ Following Davids, 'Others', 208-213.

³⁷⁰ Webb, 'The Rhetoric'.

a view of Paul's letters as scripture held by Christian circles that otherwise differed sharply from each other.³⁷¹ Hurtado may overstate this 'sharp difference', but his point is interesting: 2 Peter is not somehow closing ranks towards all and any Christians that do not belong to its specific community, rather it is affirming the unity of the church. This understanding places 2 Peter (and, by association, Jude) right at the heart of our New Testament canon.

It will be worthwhile to see if and how 2 Peter and Jude make use of Jesus Tradition to address the issues their respective communities were faced with. Strong association with traditions that are appropriated in other New Testament writings would surely underline the canonical relevance of 2 Peter and Jude even further.

5.1.5 Jesus Tradition in 2 Peter and Jude: a brief overview of scholarship

Not too much has been written on the study of Gospel and Jesus Tradition parallels in Jude. Jude is rich in intertextual references, appealing to Old Testament and Pseudepigrapha alike. Eric Mason points out, in his recent article on the use of tradition material in 2 Peter and Jude,³⁷² that it is noteworthy that someone who introduces himself as a member of the family of Jesus (Jude 1),³⁷³ does not include any explicit appeal to the words and deeds of Jesus. Only Jude 17-18 can be thought of as remotely touching upon Jesus Tradition.

The situation is quite different with 2 Peter. 2 Peter 1:16-18 has long been recognized as a retelling of the transfiguration. Bauckham has argued persuasively that these verses are independent from the Synoptic accounts of the transfiguration, but flow from an underlying tradition.³⁷⁴ He similarly argues that 2 Peter 1:14 refers to the words of Jesus recorded

³⁷¹ Hurtado, 'Interactive', 461.

³⁷² Eric F. Mason, 'Biblical and Nonbiblical Traditions in Jude and 2 Peter: Sources, Usage, and the Question of Canon,' in Mason & Martin, *Reading*, 181-200.

³⁷³ 'Of the different bearers of the name Jude who are known from the NT there is no doubt which is intended: he is clearly designated as "the brother of James." This could only be the one great well-known James, the brother of the Lord.' (Kümmel, *Introduction*, 427).

³⁷⁴ Bauckham, *Jude – 2 Peter*, 204-212.

in John 21:18, which must have been known as a saying independent from the Fourth Gospel.³⁷⁵

Recently Terrance Callan has written an article, arguing that, on the contrary, 2 Peter is dependent on the *written* Gospel accounts of Matthew and John.³⁷⁶ Matthew 17:1-8 is, according to Callan, appropriated in 2 Peter 1:16-18; Matthew 12:45 in 2 Peter 2:20b and John 21:18 in 2 Peter 1:14. Furthermore, Callan sees an echo to John 15:1-17 in 2 Peter 1:3-11.

In the same volume, Gene Green writes on the *testimony* of 2 Peter, as a Greco-Roman textual feature. 'Testimony [in this sense] combines memory of events past and the unique perspective of the one who bears witness.'³⁷⁷ Green (dismissing the notion of 2 Peter as a testament) sees the author of 2 Peter presenting himself as a reliable eye- and ear-witness to those events that are part of Jesus Tradition.

5.1.6 Approach

All in all, there is no agreement, either on the nature of Jesus Tradition in the epistles of 2 Peter and Jude, or on any of the other introductory matters. Below, possible parallels to Jesus Tradition in these epistles will be listed and commented upon. Operating from a hermeneutic of trust (without making any definite claims on the matter of authorship) I will be calling the authors of the epistles 'Peter' and 'Jude' respectively.

5.2 Parallels

Again, the parallels are listed according to topical headings that will make it easier for the reader: these headings do not anticipate certain conclusions that will be drawn later on in the chapter (5.3). The headings are: Eschatological end-time parallels (5.2.1); Eschatological traditions of warning and rebuke (5.2.2); Petrine reminiscences (5.2.3); A suspected *logion* (5.2.4).

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 200.

³⁷⁶ Terrance Callan, 'The Gospels of Matthew and John in the Second Letter of Peter,' in Alicia J. Batten & John S. Kloppenborg, *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*, London: T&T Clark, 2014, 166-180.

³⁷⁷ Gene L. Green, 'The Testimony of Peter: 2 Peter and the Gospel Traditions,' in *Ibid.*, 181-98.

5.2.1 Eschatological end-time parallels

Eschatology is one of both epistles' main themes.

On several occasions Peter seems to appropriate traditions from Jesus Tradition when dealing with eschatological subject material.

5.2.1.1 2 Peter 1:19

The first parallel to be discussed in this chapter is concerned with 'the day of the Lord'.

2 Pet.1:19

We also have the prophetic message as something completely reliable, and you will do well to pay attention to it, as to a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts. καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν ἀύχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν

Rev.2:28b

I will also give that one the morning star καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ τὸν ἀστέρα τὸν πρωϊνόν

Rev.22:16

I, Jesus, have sent my angel to give you this testimony for the churches. I am the Root and the Offspring of David, and the bright Morning Star.

Ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς ἔπεμψα τὸν ἄγγελόν μου μαρτυρῆσαι ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ρίζα καὶ τὸ γένος Δαυίδ, ὁ ἀστήρ ὁ λαμπρὸς ὁ πρωϊνός.

Luke 12:35-36 (Matt.25:1-13)

Be dressed ready for service and keep your lamps burning, like servants waiting for their master to return from a wedding banquet, so that when he comes and knocks they can immediately open the door for him

Ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι καὶ οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι· καὶ ὑμεῖς ὅμοιοι

ἄνθρωποι προσδεχομένοι τὸν
κύριον ἑαυτῶν πότε ἀναλύση ἐκ
τῶν γάμων, ἵνα ἐλθόντος καὶ
κρούσαντος εὐθέως ἀνοιξωσιν
αὐτῷ.

Did.16:1-2a

Be watchful for your life. Do not let your lamps be extinguished or your robes be loosed; but be prepared. For you do not know the hour when our Lord is coming. Gather together frequently, seeking what is appropriate for your souls.

Γρηγορεῖτε ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν·
οἱ λύχνοι ὑμῶν μὴ σβεσθήτωσαν,
καὶ αἱ ὀσφύες ὑμῶν μὴ
ἐκλυέσθωσαν, ἀλλὰ γίνεσθε
ἔτοιμοι· οὐ γὰρ οἶδατε τὴν ὥραν,
ἐν ᾗ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἔρχεται.
πυκνῶς δὲ συναχθήσεσθε
ζητοῦντες τὰ ἀνήκοντα ταῖς
ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν

Peter discusses the value of the prophetic message and the apostolic teaching, against the backdrop of the day of the Lord. The prophetic message, he wants to say, serves as a provisionary source of light, until our understanding (hence: 'in your hearts') has no need for artificial light anymore. This is why the arrival of the day of the Lord is presented in terms of the arrival of light: the morning star as a signal of daybreak. In 1:13 Peter already may have deliberately used the word διεγείρω (wake up/keep awake) as a catchword signaling the subject-matter of the Olivet Discourse; in 1:16 he makes absolutely clear that the *parousia* is in fact what he is talking about.

The **verbal** parallel appears only in the English translation. Both $\varphi\omega\sigma\phi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ in 2 Peter and $\acute{o}\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\eta\rho$ (...) $\acute{o}\ \pi\rho\omega\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Revelation are translated best by 'morning star'. The parallel is thus primarily **conceptual**. For Peter the arrival of daybreak signifies the arrival of the eschatological age. The first sign of this is the appearance of the morning star. Most commentators agree that Peter alludes to Numbers 24:17 LXX here ('a star shall rise out of Jacob'), which was understood messianically in early Judaism.³⁷⁸ Jesus' self-designation as Morning Star in Revelation may independently relate to that verse from Numbers. However, both New Testament texts may also be part of a tradition known wider; a metaphor that was known to refer to Jesus' *parousia*. We cannot know for sure, but it is possible that a designation of 'morning star' for Jesus was known and used among Early Christians, in the context of the *parousia*.

Didache 16:1-2 offers an interesting parallel (**verbally**, both have the notion lights/lamps; $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\chi\nu\omega/\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\chi\nu\omicron\iota$) to this Petrine verse that may shed further light on the matter. Obviously, *Didache* 16 is related to the Olivet Discourse, or a similar tradition (esp. Mark 13:33 & *pars.*). The warning 'do not let your lamps be extinguished', appears to be a paraphrase of the parable of Matthew 25:1-13, which in turn may be something of an elaboration of an originally similar but simpler story,³⁷⁹ perhaps like the one we encounter in Luke 12:35-36. The metaphor as it stands in Luke 12 and *Didache* 16,³⁸⁰ however, supposes nighttime in anticipation of the arrival of the Lord,³⁸¹ as does 2 Peter 1:19 and Mark 13:33-35 (& *pars.*). What is more, as 2 Peter, *Didache* advises the faithful to use the time that is left until the *parousia* not just for vigilance, but also for reflection. 2 Peter works this out concretely as the study of apostolic and prophetic testimony,³⁸² whereas *Didache* merely advises contemplation in a general sense.³⁸³ **Propositionally**, both seem to imply that the faithful should

³⁷⁸ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 226.

³⁷⁹ So e.g. W.D. Davies & Dale C. Allison, *Commentary on Matthew* (ICC), vol. III, London: T&T Clark, 1997, 393.

³⁸⁰ For the nature of this parallel cf. Murray J. Smith, 'The Lord Jesus and His Coming in the *Didache*', in: Jonathan A. Draper & Clayton N. Jefford, *The Didache. A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015, 363-408, esp. 387-88. He claims that the relationship between Luke and *Did.* is strong here, troubling to those who claim a strong Matthean dependence on the part of *Did.*

³⁸¹ *Did.* 16 generally gives off the impression that various traditions relating to Mark 13 and 2 Thess. 2 were known to the author(s), but not at all in a very coherent way.

³⁸² Cf. Gene L. Green, 'The Testimony of Peter: 2 Peter and the Gospel Traditions', in: Kloppenborg & Batten, *James, 1 & 2 Peter*, 181-198.

³⁸³ *Did.* also exhorts to 'gather together frequently', which puts it on a par with Heb. 10:24-25.

attend to their *λύχνοι* in anticipation of the *parousia*, the *parousia* also being the general **concept** both verses refer to.

If both inferences are correct (which is hardly certain: both parallels remain tentative), we can observe how the author of 2 Peter appropriates early Christian traditions. Awaiting the day of the Lord as a period of nighttime was a well-known tradition (Mark 13:33-37 & *pars.*); Jesus as the morning star of eschatological daybreak was perhaps a lesser known tradition, as was the notion of ‘attending to your lamps’. 2 Peter weaves these three traditions together in a unifying metaphor in which the nighttime calls for lamps, but only until the morning star emerges. The preference for *λύχνοι* stands out in this instance, since Matthew has *λαμπάδας*.

5.2.1.2 2 Peter 2:1/Jude 4

A second parallel is to be found in 2 Peter 2:1, where Peter clings to the subject of reliance on prophecy to introduce the notion of false prophets.

2 Pet.2:1

But there were also false prophets among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you. They will secretly introduce destructive heresies, even denying the sovereign Lord who bought them—bringing swift destruction on themselves. Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινήν ἀπώλειαν.

Jude 4

They are ungodly people, who pervert the grace of our God into

Luke 12:9a//

Matt.10:33a//2Tim.2:12b

But whoever disowns me before others will be disowned
ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνηθήσεται

John 13:38b (cp. John 18:25,27)

truly I tell you, before the rooster crows, you will disown me three times!
ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς.

Matt.24:24//Mark 13:22

(Matt.7:15)

For false messiahs and false prophets will appear and perform great signs and wonders to deceive, if possible, even the

a license for immorality and deny
Jesus Christ our only Sovereign
and Lord.

ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς
ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον
δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν
Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.

elect.

γερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι
καὶ ψευδοπροφήται καὶ
δώσουσιν σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ
τέρατα ὥστε πλανῆσαι, εἰ
δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

2 Peter 2:1 here shares the notion of ‘denying the Lord’ with Jude. Jude emphasizes the offense by identifying this Lord as ‘Jesus Christ our only Sovereign and Lord.’

Apart from this feature, 2 Peter 2:1 offers a seemingly straightforward parallel to the Olivet tradition in Matthew 24:24 (which was alluded to by the author(s) of 1 and 2 John as well). The **verbal** component is clear (ψευδοπροφήται in both cases), the **propositional** parallel is less straightforward: whereas Jesus foretells the coming of false prophets, Peter prophesies of false teachers, pointing out that there have been false prophets in the past. **Conceptually**, however, the analogy is strong. Both Peter and Jesus are discussing the same issue. Peter is merely paraphrasing in the elaborate way that fits the style of the epistle. Moreover: he has a reason for doing so, since he has to bridge the gap with the preceding topic. The propositional agreement may be sketched as follows:

Jesus: [discussing the end-time] *there will be false prophets*

Peter [discussing prophecy and the end-time] *as there have been false prophets in the past, there will be false teachers in the future*

It is quite probable that Peter uses the word ψευδοπροφήται here because it was known to him through Jesus Tradition.³⁸⁴ It makes perfect sense to allude in the way he does. It is striking, however, that Matthew 7:15, the other verse in the Gospels that uses the word ψευδοπροφήται, is part of a pericope that goes on to say, ‘not everyone who says to me ‘Lord, Lord’, will enter the kingdom of heaven’ (Matt.7:21). This is far

³⁸⁴ However, the word does have an OT background: it is featured ten times in the LXX, nine of which are to be found in Jer., the other in Zach.

from an analogy to what Peter goes on to say in 2:1; ‘...even denying the sovereign Lord...’ This slightly tips the balance against those who believe that 2 Peter has to be literally dependent on the First Gospel.³⁸⁵

The notion of ‘denying the Lord’ is the other possible parallel to Jesus Tradition. Callan (179-180) thinks Peter’s choice of words to be dependent on the story of Peter’s denial of Jesus. This could make sense, since we can find a Petrine reminiscence of the same kind in 1 Peter 2:4-8; 5:1-2 and in 2 Peter 1:16-18. It hardly does, however, on the supposition that Peter is dependent on Jude, since he uses pretty much the same words.

It is more likely, therefore, to consider that both the Gospel stories of Peter’s denial of Jesus, and Peter and Jude’s use of the word ἀρνούμενοι depend on the *logion* we find in Matthew 10:33 (& *pars.*), which reads, in its simplest form: ‘whoever disowns me/will be disowned’.

The **verbal** parallel is: ἀρνούμενοι ; ἀρνησάμενός. This corresponds with the **propositional** agreement between Jesus and Peter: *to deny [Jesus] is to face judgment*. Jude is less clear on this matter, but **conceptually** all are agreed that judgment awaits those who deny Jesus (in Jude the rest of the epistle is clear about this).

5.2.1.3 2 Peter 3:2/Jude 17b

In 2 Peter 3 the same subject matter (end-time, against the backdrop of prophecy) is addressed:

2 Pet.3:2

I want you to recall the words spoken in the past by the holy prophets and the command given by our Lord and Savior through your apostles.

μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων
 ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων
 προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν

Matt.24:25//Mark 13:23

See, I have told you ahead of time.

ἰδοὺ προεἶρηκα ὑμῖν.

³⁸⁵ Contra Callan, ‘Matthew and John’.

ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ
κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος.

Jude 17b

But, dear friends, remember
what the apostles of our Lord
Jesus Christ foretold.

Ἕμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε
τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων
ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

These words form, in both 2 Peter and Jude, an introduction to the arrival of the scoffers in the last days. In their parallel in the Olivet Discourse, they refer back to the preceding verse: the prophecy regarding false prophets. Witherington³⁸⁶ finds it likely that Jude and Peter refer back to this particular element of Jesus Tradition.

This may indeed be the case: the compound verb is not very common in the New Testament. Paul uses it a number of times, only when he does this, 'προ-' usually is understood to convey emphasis, rather than foreknowledge.³⁸⁷ The apparent allusion to Matthew 24:24 in 2 Peter 2:1 at least makes the case of **accessibility** a very convincing one. The **verbal** agreement is limited to προείρηκα ; προειρημένων. **Conceptual analogy** is clear: Jesus and Jude and Peter are still discussing the same thing.

Propositional agreement differs slightly in the three verses:

Jesus: *I have foretold the coming [of false prophets and false messiahs].*

Peter: *Prophets foretold us the coming [of scoffers], likewise Jesus gave us a command about them (through his apostles).*

Jude: *The apostles (of Jesus) foretold us the coming [of scoffers].*

Jude's choice of words compared to Jesus Tradition in this instance would be hard to explain. Why would he borrow the notion of προλέγω, and ascribe the prophetic action not to Jesus, but to his apostles? A free choice of words by Peter would be easier to explain. He is concerned

³⁸⁶ *Letters and Homilies II*, 365-66.

³⁸⁷ So LSJ, *ad loc.*

with the unity of prophetic and apostolic testimony throughout, so he can be imagined having taken the liberty to borrow the verb from Jesus Tradition, and apply it freely in the sentence he chooses to compose (much as in the above parallel 2 Pet.2:1/Matt.24:24). Most important is that in Peter's sentence, Jesus remains the active agent of prophecy, by handing down a command intended for the future.

5.2.1.4 2 Peter 3:4

A possible parallel to another verse from the Matthean Olivet Discourse is found in 2 Peter 3:4.

2 Pet.3:4

They will say, "Where is this 'coming' he promised? Ever since our ancestors died, everything goes on as it has since the beginning of creation."

καὶ λέγοντες· ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.

1Clem.23:3b//2Clem.11:2

How miserable are those who are of two minds, who doubt in their soul, who say, 'we have heard these things from the time of our parents, and look! We have grown old, and none of these things has happened to us.' Ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τῇ ψυχῇ, οἱ λέγοντες· Ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἰδοῦ, γεγηράκαμεν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβέβηκεν.

Matt.24:48

But suppose that servant is wicked and says to himself, 'My master is staying away a long time,'

ἐὰν δὲ εἴπῃ ὁ κακὸς δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ· χρονίζει μου ὁ κύριος

2 Peter 3:4 has significant overlap with a tradition that is apparently quoted by 1 and 2 *Clement*. Bauckham makes the case that both the Clementine epistles and 2 Peter depend on a common source, likely a

Jewish apocalypse (perhaps even the elusive *Book of Eldad and Modad*).³⁸⁸ Supposing a Roman, late first century origin for both 2 Peter and 1 Clement, such a line of thinking is conceivable. The strength of the alleged parallel is, however, questionable. It hinges on the conceptual analogy and the verbal occurrence of the word 'father'. However, the 'fathers' of the Clementine epistles are to be understood as biological parents, or perhaps an earlier generation of Christians, whereas the 'fathers' in 2 Peter are best understood as the fathers of ancient Israel.³⁸⁹

There is more reason to assume a dependence on the parable of Matthew 24:45-51 (which may be an elaboration of Mark 13:35. On the other hand, the Markan verse may be a paraphrase of an originally longer story). Considering the virtual certainty of 2 Peter's familiarity with the Olivet Discourse in some form and the possibility that the author also knew the tradition of *Didache* 16:1//Matthew 25:1-13 ('do not let your lamps be extinguished', cf. the comments on 2 Pet.1:19 above), the possibility that he would also have had **access** to this parable in some form is very real. There is, however, no **verbal** overlap to substantiate this claim. The **conceptual analogy** on the other hand, is very meaningful: the parable speaks of a servant eating and drinking 'with drunkards', which puts him on the same level with 2 Peter's false teachers and 'scoffers' in 2:13. And of course, both the parable and 2 Peter 3:4 ascribe their misconduct to the fact that they refuse to believe that the Master will return. The **propositional agreement** may be paraphrased as: *misconduct [of the Lord's servant(s)] can be explained by their refusal to believe in his return.*

The possibility of this parallel, however, remains tentative. The relation between the parable and 2 Peter 3:4 is not conclusive. It is, however, telling, to say the least, that a letter so obviously familiar with the Olivet Discourse, would also agree with the parable in the Matthean version of it.

5.2.1.5 2 Peter 3:9

Another verse in 2 Peter 3 also evokes a parallel passage from the Olivet Discourse in the reader's mind.

³⁸⁸ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 284-5.

³⁸⁹ So Van Houwelingen, *2 Petrus Judas*, 80-81; Ruf, *Die heiligen Propheten*, 494-96.

2 Pet.3:9

The Lord is not slow in keeping his promise, as some understand slowness. Instead he is patient with you, not wanting anyone to perish, but everyone to come to repentance.

οὐ βραδύνει κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι

Mark 13:10 (Rom.11:25c)

And the gospel must first be preached to all nations.

καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

Matt.24:14

And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come.

καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τότε ἔξει τὸ τέλος.

In this verse, Peter refers back to the ‘promise’ that was mentioned in 3:4. Still, the supposed delay of God’s intervention is the subject. The first half of the verse could almost be paraphrased as ‘The Lord is not too late to fulfill the promise’.³⁹⁰ The scoffers apparently advocated the view that he was. Peter explains this perceived lateness in a number of ways: God does things at his own time, v.8; God is ‘slow to anger’,³⁹¹ v.9b and God wants everyone to repent, v.9c. The latter idea is also found in the Olivet Discourse (and in Rom.11, concerning Israel and the gentiles). The more natural way to read 9c would be to understand ‘everyone’ in the broadest sense possible.³⁹² This is quite important; 9c is not to be read as an afterthought, nor as an addition to God’s apparent patience specifically with the ‘scoffers’. No, the idea here is that the scoffers are fortunately given the opportunity to repent, because God is still involved in the larger plan of offering the possibility to repent to all nations worldwide. This would open up the possibility to a meaningful parallel with Jesus’ words in Mark 13:10 (& *pars.*).

³⁹⁰ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 311.

³⁹¹ Bauckham (312) and Witherington (378) see an allusion to Ex.34:6 here.

³⁹² Cf. Van Houwelingen, *2 Petrus Judas*, 88, contra Bauckham.

There is no **verbal** connection here (the word ἐπαγγελίας has very little to do with εὐαγγέλιον in this instance), but the **conceptual analogy** is still quite meaningful. Even more in the Matthean placement of the *logion* within the discourse than in the Markan. Mark has his verse follow the prediction of the coming of wartime, whereas Matthew 24:14 immediately follows the foretold rise of false prophets within the oppressed and divided church of the end-time. The verse itself makes clear that when the gospel is in fact preached throughout the whole world, the end will come. So, Matthew and 2 Peter seem to **propositionally** agree in this instance that *'the end'/'the parousia' will only arrive when everyone is given the opportunity to heed to the apostolic preaching.*

It is conceivable that Peter would add this reason for the perceived delay of the fulfillment of God's promises to the other reasons he mentions. Given his likely familiarity with the Olivet Discourse, it would have been surprising when he had not. Therefore, we can assume that Peter would not have written down 3:9c in this way, had it not been for Jesus' words.

5.2.1.6 2 Peter 3:10-12

Even though God may be patient yet, the day of the Lord will arrive, and when it does the scoffers will be taken by surprise:

2 Pet.3:10-12

But the day of the Lord will come like a thief. The heavens will disappear with a roar; the elements will be destroyed by fire, and the earth and everything done in it will be laid bare.

Since everything will be destroyed in this way, what kind of people ought you to be? You ought to live holy and godly lives as you look forward to the day of God and speed its coming. That day will bring about the destruction of the heavens by fire, and the elements will melt in the heat.

Matt.24:29.35a.43 (&pars.)

24:29:

Immediately after the distress of those days

“the sun will be darkened,
and the moon will not give its
light;

the stars will fall from the sky,
and the heavenly bodies will be
shaken.’

Εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν
ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων

ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται,
καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος
αὐτῆς,

καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,

Ἦξει δὲ ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν ἧ οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα οὐχ³⁹³ εὐρεθήσεται.

Τούτων οὕτως πάντων λυομένων ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρας δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται.

καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται.

24:35a:

Heaven and earth will pass away...

Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται

24:43:

But understand this: If the owner of the house had known at what time of night the thief was coming, he would have kept watch and would not have let his house be broken into

Ἐκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἤδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποῖα φυλακῆ ὁ κλέπτῃς ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἶασεν διορυχθῆναι τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ.

1 Thess.5:2

...the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night...

Rev.16:15 (3:3)

Look, I come like a thief!

2 Peter's statement that this day will come 'like a thief' is almost certainly derived from the parable in Matthew 24, as are its counterparts in 2 Thessalonians and Revelation.³⁹⁴ The **verbal** and **propositional** agreement is obvious (*[when the day of the Lord comes, it will be unexpected], like a thief* (κλέπτῃς)), the **conceptual analogy** still in place. Of course, within the parable the metaphor is more elaborate, whereas in 2

³⁹³ I have presented the Greek text from NA²⁸, which has chosen to add οὐχ to εὐρεθήσεται. The translation in NIV assumes NA²⁷. The added negation delivers a smooth sentence. It is however only attested 'in the Sahidic version and one manuscript of the Harclean Syriac version' and therefore almost certainly to be considered an emendation' (Bruce M. Metzger. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, New York: USB, 2002, 636).

³⁹⁴ So Bauckham *Jude, 2 Peter*, 314-15; Witherington, *Letters and Homilies II*, 379.

Thessalonians, Revelation and 2 Peter, the metaphor has come to signify all that the parable meant to say within a single phrase. It is quite likely that not only the parable, but also the shorter saying was known, and thus both could have been known to Peter.

The parallel to Matthew 24:35a is also striking. **Verbally**, there is much overlap. In Matthew Jesus states that Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται, whereas Peter has οἱ οὐρανοὶ ... παρελεύσονται, ... καὶ γῆ ... Peter's plural 'heavens' may be different from Matthew's singular, but even that has a parallel in Matthew 24:29, where Isaiah is quoted. **Propositionally** both state that *heaven [and earth] will undergo cosmic, shocking events*. Peter may seem to foresee a slightly different fate for the earth than for the heavens, but this is beside the point: in any event he elaborates on Jesus' words. He may be dependent on other Jewish apocalyptic sources for his choice of words (as the Olivet Discourse is dependent on Isaiah 13:10; 34:4 and Daniel 7:13-14), but the main authority here is Jesus, and the point is that the *parousia* is considered a cosmic event, affecting heaven and earth, for which only the strongest apocalyptic language imaginable is fitting.

5.2.2 Eschatological traditions of warning and rebuke

Traditions foretelling the *parousia*, are often coupled with prophecy about misbehavior, even of the faithful. It appears that 2 Peter and Jude were familiar with these traditions.

5.2.2.1 2 Peter 2:3.14

2 Pet 2:3

In their greed these teachers will exploit you with fabricated stories. Their condemnation has long been hanging over them, and their destruction has not been sleeping.

καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἄργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.

Mark 7:22//Matt.15:19

adultery, greed, malice, deceit, lewdness, envy, slander, arrogance and folly.

μοιχεῖται, πλεονεξία, πονηρία, δόλος, ἀσέλγεια, ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, βλασφημία, ὑπερηφανία, ἀφροσύνη.

Luke 12:15

Then he said to them, "Watch

2:14

With eyes full of adultery, they never stop sinning; they seduce the unstable; they are experts in greed—an accursed brood!

ὄφθαλμούς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα.

out! Be on your guard against all kinds of greed; life does not consist in an abundance of possessions.”

Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε ἀπὸ πάσης πλεονεξίας, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶ.

πλεονεξία is a rare word in the New Testament. Apart from the occurrences in the verses quoted here, it occurs only six times, all in the Pauline letters. Four out of those six instances are from vice lists comparable to 2 Peter 2:14 and Mark 7:22 (cp. Rom.1:29; 2 Cor.9:5; Eph.4:19; 5:3; Col.3:5; 1 Thess.2:5).

The parallel between the latter verses is especially conspicuous, because of the relatively large **verbal agreement**. The Markan version has μοιχεῖαι, πλεονεξία, ὀφθαλμός ..., and the Petrine version ὀφθαλμοὺς ... μοιχαλίδος ... πλεονεξίας. Mark speaks of ‘evil eye’ and Peter of ‘eyes full of an adulteress’, which may weaken the ὀφθαλμός parallel a bit, but Peter is free to elaborate on the Markan verse. In fact, given his vocabulary extravagancies, it is surprising to come upon a parallel such as this at all. The **propositional agreement** is quite obvious, both verses can be labelled as *a vice list, condemning the notions ‘[evil/adulterous] eye(s); ‘adultery’ and ‘greed’*. Mark 7 reports a debate of Jesus with the Pharisees, which seems apt as far as **conceptual analogy** is concerned. The Markan vice list in particular describes ‘what defiles someone’s heart’, making it a very desirable authoritative text for one who seeks to describe and condemn sinners, in the way Peter does.

The **accessibility** of the verse is hard to determine in itself. The parallel is strong enough, however, to state that Peter’s choice of words is best explained by dependence on this piece of tradition. It is telling that in this instance Peter is closer to the Markan version than to the Matthean, which lacks the word πλεονεξία.

5.2.2.2 2 Peter 2:20

Another parallel which has meaningful verbal agreement is found in 2 Peter 2:20.

2 Pet.2:20

If they have escaped the corruption of the world by knowing our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and are again entangled in it and are overcome, they are worse off at the end than they were at the beginning.
 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττώνται, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.

Matt.12:45//Luke 11:26

Then it goes and takes with it seven other spirits more wicked than itself, and they go in and live there. And the final condition of that person is worse than the first. That is how it will be with this wicked generation.
 τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἑπτὰ ἕτερα πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ· καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χείρονα τῶν πρώτων. οὕτως ἔσται καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ πονηρᾷ

The **verbal agreement** is τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων, although the sentence structure in Matthew and Luke is slightly different (the wording and meaning in Matt. and Luke is highly similar, in this instance). **Propositional agreement** is [someone who has been set free by Jesus, but does not act as such, is once again brought under dominion/slavery] and is worse off than he was at first. Both verses discuss nearly the same concept. Peter speaks of dominion of the worldly powers, whereas Jesus speaks of demonic forces. Further **conceptual analogy** lies in Jesus' reference to a 'wicked generation', which seems especially apt for Peter's use.

5.2.2.3 2 Peter 2:22

In the last verse of the second chapter, Peter offers a double proverb, which has all the characteristics of folk-wisdom:³⁹⁵

2 Pet.2:22

Of them the proverbs are true: "A dog returns to its vomit," and, "A sow that is washed returns to her wallowing in the mud."

συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας· κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα, καὶ ὄψις λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.

Matt.7:6//Gos.Thom.93

(Did.9:5b)

Do not give dogs what is sacred; do not throw your pearls to pigs. If you do, they may trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you to pieces

Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶν μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς

Although Peter's proverbs signify another reality than the Jesus *logion*, there may be a connection in the echoed use of dog and pig/sow as negative examples. The fact that Peter uses dog and pig alongside each other in this way is striking, given the possibility that he may have had access to this particular tradition.

The **verbal** overlap is κύων - κυσὶν, but of course ὄψις and χοίρων also signify an almost identical reality. Peter's preference for ὄψις may be explained by a desire to present male and female (dog & sow) alongside each other, thus applying the proverb to a universal referent in a more sophisticated way than a simple use of the plural (as in the Jesus *logion*) would achieve.

Conceptually, the parallel fits into Peter's argumentative purposes. The proverb is offered parallel to the statement of the preceding verse, in which Peter states that the scoffers would have been better off not knowing the Gospel at all. Jesus warned beforehand that the Gospel truths should be spread with discernment, since those who are unworthy

³⁹⁵ Van Houwelingen, *2 Petrus Judas*, 75. Peter presents the *parοimία* as one proverb, which is generally thought to be a compound of Prov.26:11 and *Story of Ahikar* 8:18 (Syriac version) or 8:15 (Arabic version), cf. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 279.

of it are like dogs who devour sacred meat without second thought, or like pigs who trample valuable goods underfoot because they do not appreciate the value. Peter seems to pick up on this warning, and adds commonplaces to the animal behavior of dogs and pigs that fit the present circumstances: not only have the scoffers been inherently unappreciative of the value of the Gospel message, they are now likely to turn their backs on it and return to the vomit and dirt of their past behavior.

There is, then, **propositional agreement** on a certain level. Both Jesus' and Peter's statements suggest that *some are unworthy of the Gospel message and their behavior is comparable to that of dogs and swine.*

Peter's allusion to a Jesus saying by means of two completely different sayings is especially noteworthy and clever. Even though commentators have generally not considered the parallel passage from Jesus Tradition, it would seem that the odds are slight that a parallel such as this would rest on mere chance.

5.2.2.4 Jude 17-18/2 Peter 3:2-3

A final parallel in this section may be found in Jude 17-18 and 2 Peter 3:2-3. A single parallel to a verse from Jesus Tradition is not considered in this instance, but the 'command given by our Lord and Savior' makes it an interesting passage for the present research:

Jude 17-18

But, dear friends, remember what the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ foretold.

They said to you, "In the last times there will be scoffers who will follow their own ungodly desires."

Ἕμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.

2 Pet.3:2-3a

I want you to recall the words spoken in the past by the holy prophets and the command given by our Lord and Savior through your apostles.

Above all, you must understand that in the last days scoffers will come
 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγίων προφητῶν καὶ
 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος,
 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν
 ἐν ἐμπαιμονῇ ἐμπαίκεται

The parallel of Jude and 2 Peter is obviously striking. And it is this parallel which is most problematic of all; the natural way of reading it would allow for Petrine primacy, since Peter directly foretells the coming of ‘scoffers’³⁹⁶, whereas Jude points to an apostolic prophecy with the same substance: one of the ‘apostles’ he mentions may very well be Peter. Bauckham (283), however, supposes that the author of 2 Peter deliberately ‘puts the prediction directly into Peter’s mouth’. That may be the case. Another possibility is that Jude slightly misread Peter’s intention, or somehow comprised Peter’s argument. 2 Peter 3:2 refers to the entirety of chapter 3; Peter is introducing his final topic and finishes with identifying its authority in 3:2. 2 Peter 3:3, then, is just the start of what is to follow. Jude can be conceived of as having understood 2 Peter 3:2 to refer to 3:3.

Be that as it may; both epistles offer the same difficulty: what dominical and/or apostolical words/prophecy/command are they referring to?

The easiest answer to this question accepts 2 Peter’s priority: 2 Peter 3:2 is an introductory formula for the apocalyptic teaching that is to follow. Peter states that he has not invented this teaching, but that it has come down to him through the prophets of old, and through Jesus himself.³⁹⁷ This is the natural way to understand Peter’s words, and it makes perfect sense, given what follows in chapter three. Jude’s words, on the other hand, can best be explained as dependent on 2 Peter’s. If so understood, he borrows half the phrase of 2 Peter 3:2, pointing to both ‘apostles’ and ‘Jesus Christ’ as authorities. But he does so *only* to introduce the phrase which was merely introductory for 2 Peter 3: ‘in the last times/days there will be ‘others’.’ It is possible that, in doing so, Jude means to evoke the reality of the entire chapter. Either way, he

³⁹⁶ This word is unique to these two verses within the New Testament, see above 5.1.4.

³⁹⁷ Cf. Green, ‘Testimony’.

introduces that very line itself as apostolic teaching, which makes sense when he believes it to be Petrine in origin.

What remains elusive, however, is Peter's use of the words ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου (command of the Lord). Peter used the word 'command' in much the same sense just above the present verse (2:21), and he is probably picking up on it. Both Witherington (361) and Van Houwelingen (74) think it likely that 'command' there refers to the Christian lifestyle, molded after Jesus' teaching.³⁹⁸ Another possibility would be to take 'the command' to be a global allusion specifically introducing the subject matter of chapter 3 through the lens of the Olivet Discourse. The 'command' itself may then be understood to be Jesus' final and all-encompassing exhortation to be watchful (Mark 13:37).

5.2.3 Petrine reminiscences

As in 1 Peter, in 2 Peter there are some instances in which the author seems to use traditions concerning the apostle Peter that were probably known to his readers and that can also be found in the canonical Gospels.

5.2.3.1 2 Peter 1:14

2 Pet.1:14

because I know that I will soon put it aside, as our Lord Jesus Christ has made clear to me.

εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχινή ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπόθεις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσέν μοι.

John 21:18

Very truly I tell you, when you were younger you dressed yourself and went where you wanted; but when you are old you will stretch out your hands, and someone else will dress you and lead you where you do not want to go.

Ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω σοι, ὅτε ἦς νεώτερος, ἐζώννυες σεαυτὸν καὶ περιεπάτεις ὅπου ἤθελες· ὅταν δὲ γηράσης, ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς

³⁹⁸ Van Houwelingen, *2 Petrus, Judas*, 74 points to Matt.28:20 as a similar use of the root-word 'command': *and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded* (ἐνετειλάμην) you.

σου, καὶ ἄλλος σε ζώσει καὶ οἴσει
ὅπου οὐ θέλεις.

There is no **verbal agreement** here. There is, on the other hand, the indirect appeal to a form of tradition. Peter clearly evokes the image of Jesus communicating to the apostle Peter that his life is going to end.

John 21:18-20 presents a tradition (or: combination of traditions) that has Jesus musing on the deaths of two disciples, one of whom is Peter. The whole context of the verses makes it clear that these verses display tradition material that was widely known. The introductory Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι brings 21:18 to the fore.

Richard Bauckham points out that Peter is not saying, 'I know I am going to die soon *because* Christ has told me', but rather 'I know that I am going to die soon-and this corresponds to Christ's prophecy'. He also makes clear that ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός forms a mixed metaphor (the laying off of clothes, applied to the image of a tent).³⁹⁹ This puts some extra emphasis on ἀπόθεσις, and also to its apparently deliberate opposition to ἐζώννυες σεαυτὸν (you dressed yourself) in John 21. Most commentators have agreed that Peter here refers in some way or another to that particular prophecy.⁴⁰⁰

The **propositional agreement** may be paraphrased as follows: *Jesus has foretold Peter his death employing 'undressing' language.* The **conceptual analogy** lies primarily in both texts addressing the same historical event, but also in both texts' immediate context of the ongoing responsibility of the apostle Peter to tend to what Jesus ordered him to do.

5.2.3.2 2 Peter 1:15

Immediately following this reminiscence, is a verse bridging this one to the next verse and parallel (1:16-18), using a word that features conspicuously in the tradition that is evoked in 1:16-18, but applying it to the subject matter of 1:14:

³⁹⁹ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 199, cf. also 200-201.

⁴⁰⁰ Callan even treats it as corroborative evidence for his thesis that 2 Peter shows literary dependency on the Gospels of Matthew and John: 'The Gospels', 173-74.

2 Pet.1:15

And I will make every effort to see that after my departure you will always be able to remember these things.

σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι.

Luke 9:31

They spoke about his departure, which he was about to bring to fulfillment at Jerusalem.

οἱ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ.

The **verbal agreement** here is merely ἔξοδος. Its metaphorical use for ‘impending death’ is not very straightforward and certainly unique to these verses, within the New Testament. As far as **conceptual analogy** and **accessibility** go; it is telling that the verse is featured in Jesus Tradition in the Lukan account of the Transfiguration, the Transfiguration being the event that the following verses in 2 Peter so obviously allude to. Normally Luke 9:31 is (justifiably) assumed to be part of Lukan redaction. However, it may also belong to an underlying strand of Jesus Tradition. The occurrence of the word in 2 Peter 1:15 certainly gives us some reason to suspect as much. That Peter bridges the tradition concerning his own death to the tradition concerning the Transfiguration, using a word he applies on the former subject, borrowing it from the latter, may be surprising, but is not likely coincidental.

The **propositional agreement** is that both use *the exodus as a metaphor for announcing their own impending death*.

5.2.3.3 2 Peter 1:16-18

Peter then moves on to the tradition of the Transfiguration:

2 Pet.1:16-18

For we did not follow cleverly devised stories when we told you about the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ in power, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty.

He received honor and glory from

Mark 9:2-8//Matt.17:14-21//Luke 9:28-36Luke 9:32

they saw his glory
εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ

John 1:14

We have seen his glory, the

God the Father when the voice came to him from the Majestic Glory, saying, "This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased."

We ourselves heard this voice that came from heaven when we were with him on the sacred mountain.

Οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. λαβῶν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιαῦδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης· ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ ὄρει.

glory of the one and only Son, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.

καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

John 12:28a-b

Father, glorify your name!"

Then a voice came from heaven...

πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα. ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ...

Matt.17:5

While he was still speaking, a bright cloud covered them, and a voice from the cloud said, "This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased. Listen to him!"

ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

That 2 Peter is here dependent on Jesus Tradition needs no argument. The question is: how?

Callan supposes Peter is directly dependent on the Gospel of Matthew, mainly because of the **verbal agreement** which is indeed striking.⁴⁰¹ First of all there is · ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν - οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός (Matt. & Mark ; Luke has ἐκλελεγμένος), but then also: εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα - , ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα (the latter being

⁴⁰¹ Callan, "The Gospels", 166-71. Contra Bauckham, *Jude 2 Peter*, 205-210, who argues that Peter's version is independent from the Gospel accounts.

confined to Matthew). The strong verbal overlap to Matthew does not, however, necessarily signify literary dependence on the first Gospel. Three arguments can be levelled against Callan's optimism:

First of all, it need not surprise us that, in these words (key words of the tradition, cf. 1.1.4.3), we find a greater verbal agreement than in most other instances. Whether Peter had **access** to written or oral accounts, words such as these would have been passed on (also by the author of 2 Peter who is so fond of embellished language) pretty much verbatim.

Second, if 2 Peter 1:15 indeed alludes to Luke 9:31 (or, as is more likely, an underlying tradition), it is unnecessary to think of single literary dependence on the Matthean account.

Third, Luke 9:32 narrates the event by stating that 'they saw his glory' (εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ), a traditional phrase which is echoed in turn by John 1:14. 2 Peter's ἐπόπτται ... τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος is a free (naturally first-person) rendering of the same notion. Here, the variation in vocabulary makes sense: no divine speech or point of the story is breached.

Both Johannine verses that are quoted in the table also call for attention. The event depicted in John 12:28-30 is often thought to be a Johannine variant of the Synoptic Transfiguration narrative. Here, as in other instances, the Fourth Gospel applies some liberty vis á vis the historical 'order' of the Synoptic accounts.⁴⁰² It certainly seems to be the case that John, of all four canonical Gospels, is the least bound by his tradition material and the freest in applying it in his narrative. John did not feel the need to spell out the words that sounded at the Transfiguration (assuming that he would have known them); rather he makes the theological point that he has emphasized throughout: the Son and the Father are bound up together more closely than can be imagined. The point that Jesus is the Father's ἀγαπητός has been sufficiently made by John, for example in 1:14. ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, the evangelist states in the prologue. As has been shown by C.H. Turner, ἀγαπητός should, in many instances in LXX and New Testament (especially so in the Transfiguration accounts)

⁴⁰² The exact opposite could also be argued; the point is that both Gospels in fact derive from underlying sources.

be read as ‘only son’.⁴⁰³ So John’s μονογενοῦς is in that sense equivalent to ἀγαπητός. Perhaps both John and Luke (in Luke 9:35) sidestep the use of ἀγαπητός, because of its strong Christian flavor of ‘beloved’, whereas both evangelists understood the tradition to mean more than that. The fact that John 1:17, following 1:14 quite closely, points to Jesus’ superiority over against Moses, may also be of interest here: the Father states in the Synoptic Transfiguration accounts, that Jesus is his *only* Son, in response to Peter’s suggestion that he may build tents for Moses, Elijah and Jesus.⁴⁰⁴

In sum, 2 Peter 1:16-18 is either to be thought of as dependent on Matthew, Luke and John simultaneously, or - as is far more likely - reflecting an oral tradition underlying the canonical gospels. Considering the role the apostle Peter plays in the Synoptic narrative, this is in itself a very plausible way of reasoning.

5.2.4 A suspected *logion*

One final parallel needs to be taken into account. In 2 Peter 2:19 Peter quotes a saying that was apparently known in the early Church:⁴⁰⁵

2 Pet.2:19

They promise them freedom, while they themselves are slaves of depravity—for “people are slaves to whatever has mastered them.”

ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς
ἐπαγγελλόμενοι αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι
ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς ᾧ γάρ
τις ἤττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται.

Hipp. Rom. Comm. Dan. III, 22.4

ᾧ γὰρ ἂν τις ὑποταγῆ,
τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται

Adamant. 58.1-2

πέσει δέ σε καὶ
ὁ ἕξωθεν λόγος ὅτι
ἕκαστος ᾧ ἤττηται,
τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται

Origen, Hom. Ex. 12.4

Illius, quo constringor, negotii et
sollicitudinis servus sum; scio
enim scriptum esse quia

⁴⁰³ C.H. Turner, ‘Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ’, *JTS* 27, January 1926, 113-129.

⁴⁰⁴ So Turner, 122, cf. for a similar reasoning P.H.R. van Houwelingen, ‘John and the Others’, *Fides Reformata* XIX, n° 2 (2014): 95-115, esp.101-103.

⁴⁰⁵ Cf. Wolfgang Grünstäudl, “On Slavery” A Possible Herrenwort in 2 Pet 2:19’, *NovTest* 57 (2015) 57-71, for an elaborate defense of the position that this phrase is quite possibly a *logion* taken from Jesus Tradition.

unusquisque,
a quo vincitur, huic et
servus addicitur.

Ps.-Clem. Rec. V, 12.4

secundum quod ipse dixit, quia
unusquisque illius sit servus cui
se ipse subiecerit

The saying Peter introduces is only known within Early Christianity - which is something of a red flag in itself. Even more striking are the introductions to the saying offered by the third and fourth century texts quoted above; the anti-Marcionite *Dialogue of Adamantius*, the *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* and (to a lesser degree) Origen's *Homilies on Exodus*,⁴⁰⁶ the latter of which is directly quoting Peter. In the *Pseudo-Clementines* the apostle Peter introduces the saying as something the great prophet (=Jesus) said. The author of the *Dialogue of Adamantius* speaks of ὁ ἕξωθεν λόγος, which indicates that he did not borrow the phrase from 2 Peter, or any other written source. Bauckham (277) takes this expression to mean that the author considers the saying to be non-Christian. This, however, is at odds with the author's apparent familiarity with 2 Peter (cf. *Adamant.*80.23-25).⁴⁰⁷

Apparently the saying was neither considered to be known as strictly belonging to 2 Peter, nor can we assume it to be a proverb known outside of Early Christianity.

The key seems to be the introduction of the saying in *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* V,12.4. The pseudo-Clementine literature may seem far removed from the period in which oral tradition (including Jesus Tradition) flowed freely in the early Church, the fact is that it does hold a considerable amount of Gospel - and Jesus Traditions, including many

⁴⁰⁶ Origen's Latin translator, Rufinus, is believed to have added quotations of 2 Peter, which are missing from the Greek original, cf. *ibid.*, 60. Interestingly, Rufinus also translated *Adamant.* There he translates the words ὁ ἕξωθεν λόγος as *sicut et vulgor dicitur quia* ('as is commonly said'), indicating that he did not exclusively link the saying to 2 Peter (Grünstäudl, 63).

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 64-65. Grünstäudl also discusses the possibility that ὁ ἕξωθεν λόγος may mean 'not belonging to your [Marcionite] canon'. This, again, would be at odds with other instances in which *Adamant.* unapologetically quotes scripture from i.e. the Fourth Gospel.

agrapha, which do seem to stem from oral transmission.⁴⁰⁸ It may be significant that in this writing the apostle Peter is presented as the one who puts this saying on the lips of Jesus. According to this writing, the proverb was a *Jesus-logion*.

ὁ ἔξωθεν λόγος of *Adamantius* might then be taken to mean something like ‘*agrapha*’, or: non-canonical.⁴⁰⁹ As well as in *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* V,12.4, in *Adamantius* 58.1-2 the direct context of the saying fits the idea that the author believes it to be a *Jesus-logion*. Moreover, both texts discuss Matthew 6:24//Luke 16:13 in the direct context of the saying.⁴¹⁰

Given the fact that the saying is not known in sources prior to 2 Peter, and was considered as Jesus Tradition in sources after 2 Peter, it seems likely that the proverb from 2 Peter 2:19 was known to the author of 2 Peter as a saying of Jesus. The direct context within the epistle supports this assumption: the verses 2:19-22 seem to apply multiple sayings of Jesus (cf. above) as proof texts for the apparent maliciousness of the scoffers. And it is precisely in these verses (cf. table below in 5.3) that Peter apparently picks and chooses without depending on one fixed source.

⁴⁰⁸ Leslie L. Kline, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (SBL Dissertation series 14), Missoula: SBL, 1975, argues that a Gospel harmony must underlie the text. However, J. Neville Birdsall (‘Problems of the Clementine Literature’ in: James G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways AD 70-135*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999, 347-361) states that the ‘bewildering variety’ of Gospel material that is found in the Pseuso-Clementines can and should not be explained through the use of (only) the literary model (esp. 350-51).

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. Grünstaudl, 67.

⁴¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 68.

5.3 Conclusions

In an overview, the parallels to Jesus Tradition that were found in the second epistle of Peter and that of Jude are gathered in the tables below.

2 Peter /Jude	Propositional agreement	Text in Jesus Tradition
Traditions from Luke 12 and the Olivet Discourse		
2Pet.1:19	<i>Jesus as the Morning Star Attend to your lights</i>	Luke 12:35-36; <i>Did.</i> 16:1-2a; Rev.3:22; 22:16
2Pet.2:1 (Jude 4)	<i>To deny Jesus is to face judgment False prophets</i>	Luke 12:9a// Matt.10:33a Mark 13:22// Matt.24:24
2Pet.3:2-3 (Jude 17-18)	<i>Foretelling of opponents Global allusion to JT from Olivet Discourse</i>	Matt.24:48 Olivet Discourse
2Pet.3:9	<i>The [end/parousia] will only arrive when everyone has been given the opportunity to heed to the apostolical preaching</i>	Mark 13:10// Matt.24:14
2Pet.3:10-12	<i>When the day comes it will be unexpected like a thief Heaven [and earth] will undergo cosmic, shocking events</i>	Matt.24:29.35.43 (& <i>pars.</i>); 1Thess.5:2; Rev.3:3; 16:15

Petrine reminiscences

2 Pet.1:14	<i>Jesus foretold Peter his death employing 'undressing' language</i>	John 21:18
2 Pet.1:15	<i>Discussing impending death in terms of 'exodus'</i>	Luke 9:21
2Pet.1:16-18	<i>Transfiguration traditions</i>	Mark 9:2-8 (& <i>pars.</i>)//John 1:14; 12:28

Other traditions

2Pet.2:3	<i>Vice list condemning</i>	Mark 7:22
----------	-----------------------------	-----------

	<i>evil/adulterous eye; adultery and greed</i>	
2Pet.2:19	<i>People are slaves to whatever that masters them</i>	Hipp.Rom.Comm. Dan.III,22.4; Adamant.58.1-2; Origen, Hom.Ex.12,4; Ps-Clem.Rec.V,12.4
2Pet.2:20	<i>[someone who has been set free by Jesus, but does not act as such, is once again brought under dominion and is] worse off than he was at first</i>	Matt.12:45//Luke 11:26
2Pet.2:22	<i>Some are unworthy of the Gospel message and their behavior is comparable to that of dogs and swine.</i>	Matt.7:6//Gos.Thom.93

A number of preliminary conclusions can be drawn from this:

1. At 12 separate occasions 2 Peter draws on Jesus Tradition. Some strands of tradition are favored (esp. the Olivet Discourse and Petrine traditions), although Peter also uses individual sayings which do not give the impression of belonging to a certain discourse when Peter alludes to them.
2. As was the case with 1 Peter, 2 Peter can be seen to cherish, in particular, certain traditions concerning the apostle Peter. These do not stem from one single written Gospel, but quite likely from oral tradition or, less likely, a written source containing traditions about Jesus' disciples.
3. Jude shares Peter's vocabulary in parallels to Jesus Tradition on two occasions. However, both times Jude fails to show awareness of the proposed parallel. Both times the parallel does make sense in the Petrine verses. This could be explained in four different ways:
 - a. Peter borrowed his vocabulary from Jude, and recognized in these words a potential (namely: allusion to JT) that was not present in Jude. This seems highly unlikely.
 - b. Peter and Jude both borrowed from a source in which this vocabulary was present without the allusions. Peter was the

only one to weave the allusions into his version. This is no less unlikely than option a.

- c. Peter and Jude both borrowed from a source in which the allusions *were* present. Jude did not recognize them or was not interested in following them through in his own account. This seems like a real possibility.
- d. Jude borrowed from Peter, without recognizing or being particularly interested in the allusions.

All other things being equal, c and d are the likeliest options.⁴¹¹

- 4. The Olivet Discourse and the tradition underlying Luke 12 are both used by the author of 2 Peter to apply Jesus' authority to Peter's eschatological end-time teaching. On the one hand, the parallels to either strands of tradition are neatly divided over chapters 2 and 3 respectively. On the other hand, the similar purpose of both (plus the combined use in 3:2) gives the impression that for Peter there was no fundamental distinction between the Olivet Discourse and Luke 12. The words of Luke 12:35-40 certainly open up the possibility of it being handed down together with the Olivet Discourse.
- 5. There is no demonstrable preference in 2 Peter for any one of the written Gospels. In the Olivet Discourse parallels, there is a preference for Matthew over Mark, almost against Luke. But at other occasions there is a distinct Markan preference over against a Matthean version, and the parallels to Luke 12 speak for themselves. Especially in 1:16-18 the parallels cannot possibly be said to favor one Gospel over another.
- 6. Jude, as was already surmised in 5.1.5 above, does not actively allude to Jesus Tradition. Considering its brevity this may not account for much. Considering its rich intertextuality otherwise, however, it should perhaps be noted as a curious feature, when compared to other New Testament literature.⁴¹²

⁴¹¹ This is obviously not meant as a claim to settle the matter of priority : the contention is merely that it should count as a valid argument in an open case.

⁴¹² A 'Lutheran' dismissal of its overly Jewish character would not account for this feature: James is very Jewish as well, and it is steeped in Jesus Tradition. Neither can dating the epistle very early solve the

2 Peter, all in all, seems to be steeped in Jesus Tradition. There is no literary relationship to any written Gospels, no preference for 'Q'/double tradition either. Rather, there seems to be a strong dependence on presumably oral Jesus Tradition.

2 Peter's acquaintance with Jesus Tradition is comparable to that of 1 Peter and James. The absence of allusions to Sermon-traditions is, however, notable.⁴¹³ In 1 John the traditions tended to lie closer to Matthew on most accounts. James, 1 and 2 Peter overall lack this kind of preference, and their knowledge of Jesus Tradition seems to have been quite sophisticated.

With regard to dating (i.e. 'how close in time is this type of knowledge to Matthean/Lukan/Markan redaction?'), it is not likely that anything can be said with certainty. One of the oldest parallels to Jesus Tradition is highly sophisticated and bears all the marks of literal dependence on Lukan redaction (1 Cor.11:23-26//Luke 22:17-20), yet it is generally believed to predate the third Gospel by decades. The same principle applies here: sophistication (for instance in betraying knowledge of a parable that is thought to have originated as a simile) is no guarantee for witnessing a later development. In fact, Apostolic and Church Fathers alike tend to be brief in their allusions and quotations, often shortening and paraphrasing the traditions we know from the canon.

In sum: in its dependence on Jesus Tradition, 2 Peter bears great resemblance to some other New Testament epistles, especially 1 Peter and, to a lesser extent, James and 1 John. Jude, however, does not. All other things being equal, in drawing on Jesus Tradition, the second epistle of Peter bears the marks we have come to recognize from other New Testament epistles and is not in any way to be considered as an exception.

issue: some Pauline letters (and possibly James as well) are very early, yet they do allude to Jesus Tradition. Jude's Christian character, yet negligence of Jesus Tradition, remains somewhat of a mystery.

⁴¹³ However, 2 Peter's relative brevity should guard against drawing conclusions from such an argument from silence.

6. Conclusions

Jesus Tradition Parallels in the Catholic Epistles

In this final Chapter, the focus will be on the ‘what’, ‘how’ and ‘why’ of the parallels to Jesus Tradition that have been found within the corpus of the Catholic Epistles.

The first paragraph (6.1) will zoom in on the ‘what’: some observations will be made with regard to possible sources and tradition blocks. In passing, some additional observations will be made on the ‘how’, the means by which this has been done (the first chapter has already answered most questions regarding this subject).

The second paragraph (6.2) will deal with the ‘why’: the views and perceptions of the authors of the Catholic Epistles regarding Jesus will be laid out, informed to a large extent by the parallels that have been found in the present study.

6.1 Sources and traditions

All parallels that were established in the preceding chapters have been compiled in the table below. This time the actual segment of Jesus Tradition has been placed in the left column. In the right column, the likelihood of the parallel is marked as either ‘probable’ or ‘possible’.

Jesus Tradition	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>Blessed are the poor</u> Luke 6:20//Matt.5:3// <i>Gos.Thom.54//Pol.Phil.2:3b</i>	Jas.2:5	Probable
<u>Blessed who weep, woe who laugh</u> Luke 6:21b.25b	Jas.4:9	Probable
<u>Blessed are the meek</u> Matt.5:5	1 Pet.3:4	Probable
<u>Mercy for the merciful</u>	Jas.2:13	Probable

Matt.5:7//1 Clem.13:2b <u>The pure in heart will see God</u> Matt.5:8	1 John 3:3	Probable
<u>The peacemakers called children of God</u> Matt.5:9	Jas.3:18 1 John 3:1-2	Possible Probable
<u>Blessed those persecuted for righteousness</u> Matt.5:10	1 Pet.3:14	Probable
<u>Blessed the persecuted</u> <u>Rejoice when persecuted</u> Matt.5:11-12//Luke 6:22-23	Jas.1:2,12; 1Pet.1:8; 4:13-14	Probable Probable Probable
<u>Let them see your good deeds</u> Matt.5:16	1 Pet.2:12	Probable
<u>Anger to be judged as murder</u> Matt.5:21-22	Jas.1:19b-20 1 John 3:15	Possible Possible
<u>Prohibition of oaths</u> Matt.5:34-37	Jas.5:12	Probable
<u>Non-retaliation</u> Matt.5:39-44//Luke 6:28-29	1Pet.2:22-23; 3:9	Possible Possible
<u>Do not worry</u> Matt.6:25-26//Luke 12:11,22-32	1 Pet.5:7	Probable
<u>As you judge, you will be judged</u> Matt.7:1-2//Luke 6:37	Jas.4:11-12	Probable
<u>Holy for dogs, pearls for swine</u> Matt.7:6//Gos.Thom.93	2 Pet.2:22	Probable
<u>Ask and it will be given</u> Matt.7:7-8//Luke 11:9-10	Jas.1:5-7; 4:3 1 John 3:22	Probable Probable
<u>Good gifts from the Father in heaven</u> Matt.7:11//Luke 11:13	Jas.1:17	Probable
<u>Grapes from thorns, figs from thistles</u> Matt.7:16//Luke 6:44	Jas.3:12	Possible
<u>Not everyone who says 'Lord, Lord', but those who do the will of my Father</u> Matt.7:21	1 John 2:17	Possible
<u>Away from me, evildoers</u>	1 John 3:4	Possible

Matt.7:23		
<u>Parable of the houses</u> Matt.7:24-27//Luke 6:47-49	Jas.1:22-25	Probable
<u>Love God and your neighbor</u> Mark 12:28-34//Matt.22:34-40//Luke 10:25-37	Jas.2:8 1 John 4:21	Probable Possible
<u>The material needs of a wanting brother</u> <i>Hebrew Gospel</i>	Jas.2:15-16 1 John 3:17-18	Probable Probable
<u>Seeing a brother</u> <i>Hebrew Gospel</i>	1 John 3:17-18	Possible
<u>Love one another</u> John 13:34-35	1 Pet.1:22; 2:17; 4:8 1 John 2:7; 3:23 2 John 4-6	Possible Possible Probable Probable
<u>The end is near, be alert</u> Mark 13//Matt.24-25//Luke 21	1 Pet.1:13; 4:7 2 Pet.3:2-3 [Jd.17-18]	Probable Probable
<u>Do not be deceived</u> Matt.24:4//	1 John 3:7a	Probable
<u>The end will come</u> Mark 13:10//Matt.24:14	2 Pet.3:9	Probable
<u>False messiahs</u> Mark 13:22//Matt.24:24	2 Pet.2:1 1 John 2:18; 4:1 2 John 7 [Jd.4]	Probable Probable Probable
<u>Heaven and earth will pass away; a cosmic event</u> Matt.24:29.35	2 Pet.3:10-12	Probable
<u>Like a thief</u> Matt.24:43	2 Pet.3:10-12	Probable
<u>Returning Lord at the door</u> Mark 13:29//Rev.3:20	Jas.5:7-9	Probable
<u>Natural phenomena as indication of <i>parousia</i></u> Mark 13:28-29	Jas.5:7-9	Possible
<u>Be vigilant</u> Mark 13:37	1 Pet.5:8	Probable
<u>The wicked servant</u> Matt.24:48	2 Pet.3:2-3 [Jd.17-18]	Possible
<u>Christ reappears in his glory</u>	1 Pet.4:13	Possible

<u>Matt.25:31</u>		
<u>Follow Jesus in suffering</u> Matt.16:24//Mark 8:34// Luke 9:25//John 12:25	1 Pet.2:21	Possible
<u>Salvation of the soul</u> Matt.16:25//Mark 8:35// Luke 9:26//John 12:24	1 Pet.1:9	Possible
<u>Quotation of Ps.118</u> Matt.21:42//Mark 12:10// Luke 20:17	1 Pet.2:4-8	Possible
<u>Give God and the emperor what they are due</u> Matt.22:21//Mark 12:17// Luke 20:25	1 Pet.2:17	Possible
<u>Do not lord over one another</u> Matt.20:25//Mark 10:42b-43	1 Pet.5:3	Probable
<u>Striving to be first</u> Matt.20:27//Mark 10:44	3 John 9	Possible
<u>Christ's sufferings</u> <i>Globally</i>	1 Pet.5:1	Probable
<u>Jesus beaten and scolded</u> Matt.26:67//Mark 14:65	1 Pet.2:20.22-23	Probable
<u>Word sown in the heart</u> Matt.13:19//Mark 4:15// Luke 8:12	Jas.1:21 1 Pet.1:23	Possible Possible
<u>Jesus as glorified Lord</u> Matt.16:27-17:9//Mark 8:38- 9:8//Luke 9:26-36(//Jn1:14)	Jas.2:1 2 Pet.1:16-18	Possible Probable
<u>The humble exalted</u> Matt.23:12//Luke 14:11;18:14b	Jas.4:10	Probable
<u>Prophets longed to see what you are seeing</u> Matt.13:17//Luke 10:24	1 Pet.1:10	Possible
<u>Worse off than at first</u> Matt.12:45//Luke 11:26	2 Pet.2:20	Probable
<u>Have faith and do not doubt</u> Matt.21:21-22//Mark 11:23- 24	Jas.1:5-7	Probable
<u>'Father' in addressing God</u> Matt.6:9; Mark 14:36	1 Pet.1:17	Possible

<u>Sheep without a shepherd</u> Matt.9:36//Mark 6:34	1 Pet.2:25	Possible
<u>Children of God or children of the devil</u> Matt.13:38-39	1 John 3:9-10	Probable
<u>Impending death as 'exodus'</u> Luke 9:21	2 Pet.1:15	Possible
<u>Vice list</u> Mark 7:22	2 Pet.2:3	Possible
<u>If your home is deserving, let peace be on it</u> Matt.10:13	2 John 10	Possible
<u>Who disowns will be disowned</u> Matt.10:33//Luke 12:9a	2 Pet.2:1	Probable
<u>Faithful steward</u> Luke 12:42	1 Pet.4:10	Possible
<u>Do not worry</u> Luke 12:11.22-32	1 Pet.5:7	Possible
<u>Keep your lamps burning</u> Luke 12:35-36	2 Pet.1:19	Possible
<u>Who disowns will be disowned</u> Luke 12:9a	2 Pet.2:1	Probable
<u>Be a shepherd for the flock</u> John 21:16	1 Pet.5:2-3	Probable
<u>Rock and stumble stone</u> Matt.16:18.23	1 Pet.2:4-8	Possible
<u>Peter will die violently/undressing language</u> John 21:18	2 Pet.1:14	Probable
<u>Now is the time for mourning and weeping</u> John 16:20	Jas.4:9	Probable
<u>Blessed those who act upon Jesus' words</u> John 13:17	Jas.1:22-25	Probable
<u>Rebirth of believers</u> John 3:3	1 Pet.1:3.23	Probable
<u>Believing over seeing</u> John 20:29	1 Pet.1:8	Probable

<u>Love is giving your life for others</u> John 15:13//Gos.Sav.4:9	1 John 3:16	Probable
<u>God showed love by giving his Son</u> John 3:16	1 John 4:9	Probable
<u>God is light, do not walk in darkness</u> John 8:12	1 John 1:5-6	Probable
<u>Crown of life</u> Rev.2:10	Jas.1:12	Probable
<u>The poor will be rich</u> Rev.2:9	Jas.2:5	Probable
<u>Jesus is the Moring star</u> Rev.3:22; 22:16	2 Pet.1:19	Possible
<u>Love covers over a multitude of sins</u>	Jas.5:20 1 Pet.4:8	Possible Possible
<u>Slaves to whatever masters them</u>	2 Pet.2:19	Probable

The above table is impressive in itself. It shows the extent of familiarity that the authors of the Catholic Epistles must have had with Jesus Tradition: seventy-six separate sayings or other instances from Jesus Tradition have been found to have parallels in the Catholic Epistles at one-hundred separate instances in these Epistles. Sixty-three of these instances can be labelled 'probable' parallels (meaning the author is believed to have chosen his words in such an instance in all likelihood because he was influenced by Jesus Tradition). Thirty-seven can be labelled 'possible' (meaning that the author may have chosen his words in the way that he did, because of the influence of Jesus Tradition).

The designations 'probable' and 'possible' respectively do help in distinguishing between the stronger and weaker parallels that have been established, but they should not be taken as absolutes: both categories represent numerous subtle variances in weighing and deciding to what

extent it is likely that a verse or a saying is dependent on Jesus Tradition.⁴¹⁴

6.1.1 Possible tradition blocks

Another distinction that can be made is the distinction according to possible source material. By far most of the Jesus Tradition parallels above are parallels to verses from the canonical Gospels. Yet we can assume (as we have, throughout the study) that these written Gospels were not the sources used by the authors of the Catholic Epistles.⁴¹⁵

Rather, we should assume that the Gospel writers had access to much the same traditions as the authors of the Catholic Epistles had.⁴¹⁶ Traditionally, one would think of 'Q' (double tradition), special Lukan traditions ('L') and special Matthean traditions ('M'). In Streeter's view,⁴¹⁷ these, together with Mark, formed the sources that were appropriated by Luke and Matthew. Streeter's view is by and large retained by a majority of New Testament scholarship today, yet it is also clear that historical reality is more complicated than a simple four-document-chart would reveal.

Below, the parallels that have been found above will be grouped according to tradition blocks. The sources of the four document hypothesis will be addressed, but also other possibilities, that are raised by questions that Streeter's hypothesis can not answer: What is the origin of Johannine traditions? Could John and others have been familiar with the Markan narrative(s)? Could Q, L and M have been oral, rather than written sources? Then there is the possibility that neither Q, nor L and M can be identified and named as separate sources. In sum: we may surmise that there was a plethora of source-material available, but we cannot be sure about the exact nature of these sources.

⁴¹⁴ The distinction in itself does not entirely do justice to this subtlety, but neither would a classification of e.g. 1 through 5 'stars' (or from, let us say, 'certain' to 'unlikely, but possible') have done that: for a full assessment the reader should check the discussion of each individual parallel in this book.

⁴¹⁵ With the possible exception of the Fourth Gospel, which may have been a source for the Johannine epistles.

⁴¹⁶ And Paul, presumably, as well, cf. Excursus 1 on Jesus Tradition parallels in the Pauline writings.

⁴¹⁷ Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*.

Below, an attempt will be made to distinguish possible (rather than probable) tradition blocks in which they could have been known, such as *Double Tradition/'Q'* (6.1.1.1); specifically *Matthean tradition/M* (6.1.1.2); *Sermon on the Mount/Plain* (6.1.1.3); *Johannine sayings* (6.1.1.4); *Passion Narrative* (6.1.1.5); *Petrine/Apostolical narratives*(6.1.1.6); *Olivet Discourse* (6.1.1.7); *Miscellaneous traditions* (6.1.1.8) and, finally, (more topically) *Love command* (6.1.1.9). Each possible source will be briefly evaluated.

6.1.1.1 Traditions linked to Double Tradition/'Q'

Jesus Tradition	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>Blessed are the poor</u> Luke 6:20//Matt.5:3// <i>Gos.Thom.54//Pol.Phil.2:3b</i>	Jas.2:5	Probable
<u>Blessed who weep, woe who laugh</u> Luke 6:21b.25b ⁴¹⁸	Jas.4:9	Probable
<u>Blessed the persecuted</u> <u>Rejoice when persecuted</u> Matt.5:11-12//Luke 6:22-23	Jas.1:2.12; 1Pet.1:8; 4:13-14	Probable Probable Probable
<u>Non-retaliation</u> Matt.5:39-44//Luke 6:28-29	1Pet.2:22-23; 3:9	Possible Probable
<u>Do not worry</u> Matt.6:25-26//Luke 12:11.22-32	1 Pet.5:7	Probable
<u>As you judge, you will be judged</u> Matt.7:1-2//Luke 6:37	Jas.4:11-12	Probable
<u>Ask and it will be given</u> Matt.7:7-8//Luke 11:9-10	Jas.1:5-7; 4:3 1 John 3:22	Probable Probable
<u>Good gifts from the Father in heaven</u> Matt.7:11//Luke 11:13	Jas.1:17	Probable
<u>Grapes from thorns, figs from thistles</u>	Jas.3:12	Possible

⁴¹⁸ Luke 6:25 is strictly speaking not part of Double Tradition. However, the *Scholars Version* of "Q", does adopt Luke 6:24-26 (Cf. Robert J. Miller (ed.) *The Complete Gospels*, Salem: Polebridge Press, 2010, 264).

Matt.7:16//Luke 6:44		
<u>Away from me, evildoers</u> Matt.7:23//Luke 13:27	1 John 3:4	Possible
<u>The humble exalted</u> Matt.23:12//Luke 14:11;18:14b	Jas.4:10	Probable
<u>Parable of the houses</u> Matt.7:24-27//Luke 6:47-49	Jas.1:22-25	Probable
<u>Prophets longed to see what you are seeing</u> Matt.13:17//Luke 10:24	1 Pet.1:10	Possible
<u>Worse off than at first</u> Matt.12:45//Luke 11:26	2 Pet.2:20	Probable
<u>Who disowns will be disowned</u> Matt.10:33//Luke 12:9a	2 Pet.2:1	Probable

Q has been studied, reconstructed and hypothesized in detail.⁴¹⁹ We can suffice by stating that the double tradition material, or Q, may have been an early sayings source, containing (at least some) narrative elements. It is uncertain whether this was really one written document, or, for instance, a (partly) oral source.

It seems clear, in any case, that, if there was a common source for the non-Markan agreements of Matthew and Luke, the authors of the Catholic Epistles were acquainted with a fair number of the traditions that have been derived from it. Especially James and 1 Peter show a large degree of familiarity with sayings from this strand of tradition.

What stands out in these parallels is the recurring (be it often tentative) preference for the Matthean version of the sayings. No conclusions can be drawn from this single observation; this is all the more true because there are also some instances in which the Lukan wording or Lukan themes (esp. poverty/riches; blessings and woes in James) are preferred.

⁴¹⁹ For a number of recent discussions (and viewpoints), cf. i.e. John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999; Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q. Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002; James G. Dunn, *Christianity in the Making, vol. I. Jesus Remembered*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003, 147-159.

6.1.1.2 Traditions linked to Matthean tradition/'M'

A majority of scholars today still adopts the view, developed by Streeter, that Matthew and Luke both made use of specific sources that lay behind much of the material unique to their gospels.⁴²⁰ In the earlier decades of the twentieth century it was often thought that Matthew and Luke respectively made use of their own versions of Q: Q^{MT} and Q^{LUKE}.⁴²¹

Streeter's observations and his Four Document Hypothesis have been useful and clarifying in a number of ways. Yet a note of caution is in order: even though Streeter himself was aware that much of the Matthean *Sondergut* might have been oral rather than written tradition, M has often been designated and envisioned as a written source of some kind. In fact, we do not know the origin of the Matthean tradition material.⁴²²

The present study, however, did find a considerable amount of parallels to Jesus Tradition that are part of the material that is unique to Matthew:

Jesus Tradition	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>Blessed are the meek</u> Matt.5:5	1 Pet.3:4	Probable
<u>Mercy for the merciful</u> Matt.5:7//1 Clem. 13:2b	Jas.2:13	Probable
<u>The pure in heart will see God</u> Matt.5:8	1 John 3:3	Probable
<u>The peacemakers called children of God</u> Matt.5:9	Jas.3:18 1 John 3:1-2	Possible Probable
<u>Blessed those persecuted for righteousness</u> Matt.5:10	1 Pet.3:14	Probable

⁴²⁰ Cf. Brice C. Jones, *Matthean and Lukan Special Material. A Brief Introduction with texts in Greek and English*, Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011, for an overview of the *status quaestionis* and a synopsis of the texts, cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 198.

⁴²¹ But cf. H.D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995, who holds to the different versions of Q.

⁴²² Cf. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 161. Talbert, *Matthew*, 5, simply refers to the Matthean sources as 'Mark and Q plus oral tradition, M'.

<u>Let them see your good deeds</u> Matt.5:16	1 Pet.2:12	Probable
<u>Anger to be judged as murder</u> Matt.5:21-22	Jas.1:19b-20 1 John 3:15	Possible Possible
<u>Prohibition of oaths</u> Matt.5:34-37	Jas.5:12	Probable
<u>Holy for dogs, pearls for swine</u> Matt.7:6//GThom.93	2 Pet.2:22	Probable
<u>Not everyone who says 'Lord, Lord', but those who do the will of my Father</u> Matt.7:21	1 John 2:17	Possible
<u>Children of God or children of the devil</u> Matt.13:38-39	1 John 3:9-10	Probable
<u>If your home is deserving, let peace be on it</u> Matt.10:13	2 John 10	Possible
<u>Rock and stumble stone</u> Matt.16:18.23	1 Pet.2:4-8	Possible

The M-traditions consist largely of three major elements:

1. A number of birth and childhood narratives (Matthew 1 and 2).
2. Sayings and parables appropriated as additions to discourses also present in either Mark or Luke (or both).
3. A number of traditions concerning the apostle Peter (scattered across chs. 14, 16 and 17).

The table above consists mostly of traditions from the Matthean 'discourses',⁴²³ whereas the scope of specifically Matthean traditions is wider than that.

For example, birth narratives, especially, seem to be entirely absent from the collective memory presented by the Catholic Epistles. David Wenham does consider it likely that Paul was familiar with (proto-

⁴²³ Matt. 5-7 (Sermon on the Mount); Matt. 10 (Mission discourse); Matt. 13 (Kingdom parables discourse); Matt. 18 (Discourse on the church) and Matt. 23-25 (Olivet Discourse), cf. R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007, 9. The exception is the Petrine 'Rock and stumble-stone' tradition from Matt. 16.

Matthean/Lukan) birth narratives.⁴²⁴ His position is not a majority viewpoint, but it is well argued. It would follow that we can not draw rash conclusions from the absence of any allusions to birth narratives in the Catholic Epistles.

Therefore, no firm conclusions can be drawn from the above table, since ten out of twelve of these sayings are derived from the Sermon on the Mount, which may have been known as tradition material in its own right.

6.1.1.3 Traditions linked to Sermon on the Mount/Plain

The Sermon on the Mount is the traditional name for the longest pericope of Jesus' teaching in the New Testament (Matt.5:1-7:27),⁴²⁵ which has a counterpart in Luke's Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6:20-49). Both pericopes start out with the Beatitudes and end with the parable of the houses. There is a lot of double tradition ('Q') material to be found in the sermons, and a few Markan parallels. It is also clear that both Matthew and Luke (but especially Matthew) present quite a few traditions that are not found elsewhere.

Some of the traditions in the table below have also been presented in the tables on double tradition or M. Yet the traditions of the sermon may have been especially well known in the Early Church, and deserve to be considered as a trajectory of tradition material in its own right:

Jesus Tradition	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>Blessed are the poor</u> Luke 6:20//Matt.5:3// <i>GThom.54//Pol.Phil.2:3b</i>	Jas.2:5	Probable

⁴²⁴ David Wenham, *Paul*, 338-43, cf. Excursus 1. But cf. James G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996 [1980], 42-44, who discusses Gal.4:4, 'born of a woman' (as most scholars do and have) with regard to the question whether or not Paul refers to 'incarnation' or not and concludes that Paul simply stresses Jesus' humanity.

⁴²⁵ The name originates from a commentary on the text by Augustine, *De sermone Domini in monte*, DJG, 845.

<u>Blessed who weep, woe who laugh</u> Luke 6:21b.25b	Jas.4:9	Probable
<u>Blessed are the meek</u> Matt.5:5	1 Pet.3:4	Probable
<u>Mercy for the merciful</u> Matt.5:7//1 Clem.13:2b	Jas.2:13	Probable
<u>The pure in heart will see God</u> Matt.5:8	1 John 3:3	Probable
<u>The peacemakers called children of God</u> Matt.5:9	Jas.3:18 1 John 3:1-2	Possible Probable
<u>Blessed those persecuted for righteousness</u> Matt.5:10	1 Pet.3:14	Probable
<u>Blessed the persecuted</u> <u>Rejoice when persecuted</u> Matt.5:11-12//Luke 6:22-23	Jas.1:2.12; 1Pet.1:8; 4:13-14	Probable Probable Probable
<u>Let them see your good deeds</u> Matt.5:16	1 Pet.2:12	Probable
<u>Anger to be judged as murder</u> Matt.5:21-22	Jas.1:19b-20 1 John 3:15	Possible Possible
<u>Prohibition of oaths</u> Matt.5:34-37	Jas.5:12	Probable
<u>Non-retaliation</u> Matt.5:39-44//Luke 6:28-29	1Pet.2:22-23; 3:9	Possible Probable
<u>Do not worry</u> Matt.6:25-26//Luke 12:11.22-32	1 Pet.5:7	Probable
<u>As you judge, you will be judged</u> Matt.7:1-2//Luke 6:37	Jas.4:11-12	Probable
<u>Holy for dogs, pearls for swine</u> Matt.7:6//GThom.93	2 Pet.2:22	Probable
<u>Ask and it will be given</u> Matt.7:7-8//Luke 11:9-10	Jas.1:5-7; 4:3 1 John 3:22	Probable Probable
<u>Good gifts from the Father in heaven</u> Matt.7:11//Luke 11:13	Jas.1:17	Probable
<u>Grapes from thorns, figs from thistles</u> Matt.7:16//Luke 6:44	Jas.3:12	Possible

<u>Not everyone who says 'Lord, Lord', but those who do the will of my Father</u> Matt.7:21	1 John 2:17	Possible
<u>Away from me, evildoers</u> Matt.7:23//Luke 13:27	1 John 3:4	Possible
<u>Parable of the houses</u> Matt.7:24-27//Luke 6:47-49	Jas.1:22-25	Probable

A number of elements stand out when these traditions are reviewed:

1. The beatitudes seem to be well known: James, 1 Peter and 1 John all seem to know and appropriate some of these sayings.⁴²⁶
2. Not just the beatitudes from the double tradition, but also Matthean beatitudes (Matt.5:5.7-10) are appropriated by the authors of these epistles.
3. Other strictly Matthean portions from the sermon (esp. from Matt.5:16-37) are also referred to.
4. The 'do not worry' tradition of Matthew 6:25-26 (paralleled in 1 Pet.5:7) is part of double tradition, yet it is not presented in the Lukan Sermon, but in Luke 12. In paragraph 6.1.1.7 Luke 12 again is considered, as the same chapter presents traditions that bear close resemblance to the Olivet Discourse.
5. That makes it all the more striking that there are so many parallels to Matthew 5 and 7, and only one to Matthew 6, one that can be coupled to a different strand of tradition at that. However, Luke 11:1-13 couples the tradition found in Matthew 6:9-13 to the tradition found in Matthew 7:7-11, showing at least that underlying tradition did couple elements we know from Matthew 6 to elements we know from Matthew 7.
6. James appears to be familiar with the Lukan woes, which are absent from Matthew (Luke 6:24-26).

It is hard to draw conclusions from this overview. That the parallels have been grouped together in a table for our convenience, does not mean the

⁴²⁶ Early references from i.e. 1 *Clement* and *Poycarp to the Phillipians* show that the beatitudes were still well-known as oral catenae well into the second century.

authors of the Catholic Epistles knew these sayings as belonging together somehow.

However, the presence of these allusions, a majority of which have been labelled 'probable', rather than 'possible', should caution against making the sort of claims made by Kloppenborg in his seminal *The Formation of Q*,⁴²⁷ where he writes that Matthew is the one who has altered the original Q-text, whereas Luke follows it through, except for his 'woes' (Luke 6:24-26), which, to his mind, do not fit Q's theology.⁴²⁸

Apart from opting for Matthean redaction or invention, or both authors' dependence on different textual *Vorlagen* of the Q-sermon, the possibility of a somewhat longer sermon that circulated perhaps both orally and in writing, which has been differently appropriated by Matthew and Luke respectively (and perhaps by tradents who preceded them), should not be discarded. The relative freedom that performers and authors had in reproducing discourses, makes the latter assumption quite viable.⁴²⁹ The role that Luke 12 plays in this should also be considered. That particular chapter seems to harbor some traditions that may have originally belonged to differing strands of tradition (Sermon on the Mount/Plain and Olivet Discourse, respectively). This would belie the assumption that Luke is automatically to be followed as the one who most effectively guards the integrity of the 'original' traditions.

6.1.1.4 Traditions linked to Johannine sayings

Several Johannine Jesus Tradition sayings have been found in the Catholic Epistles:

Jesus Tradition	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>Now is the time for mourning and weeping</u> John 16:20	Jas.4:9	Probable
<u>Blessed those who act upon</u>	Jas.1:22-25	Probable

⁴²⁷ Kloppenborg, *The Formation*.

⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*, 170-71.

⁴²⁹ Cf. also James G. Dunn, 'Q¹ as Oral Tradition', in Dunn (ed.), *Oral Gospel*, 80-108, esp. 83.

<u>Jesus' words</u> John 13:17		
<u>Rebirth of believers</u> John 3:3	1 Pet.1:3.23	Probable
<u>Believing over seeing</u> John 20:29	1 Pet.1:8	Probable
<u>Love is giving your life for others</u> John 15:13//Gos.Sav.4:9	1 John 3:16	Probable
<u>God showed love by giving his Son</u> John 3:16	1 John 4:9	Probable
<u>God is light, do not walk in darkness</u> John 8:12	1 John 1:5-6	Probable
<u>Love one another</u> John 13:34-35	1 Pet.1:22; 2:17; 4:8 1 John 2:7; 3:23 2 John 4-6	Possible Possible Probable Probable
<u>Peter will die violently/undressing language</u> John 21:18	2 Pet.1:14	Probable

A number of things should be noted about the parallels to Johannine traditions.

1. These traditions are not confined to the Johannine letters. Of the 'probable' parallels, six are from the Johannine epistles, and six more are from the other Catholic Epistles (the Johannine epistles make up about 40% of the Catholic Epistles). When we add the 'possible' parallels to this equation, the number remains six in the Johannine, and becomes nine in the other Catholic Epistles, which would mean that the Johannine epistles themselves do not (relatively) have a larger preference for alluding to Johannine traditions than do the other Catholic Epistles.⁴³⁰

⁴³⁰ The Johannine epistles do, however, relatively, favor Johannine traditions more than the other epistles do.

2. The sayings that are paralleled in the Catholic Epistles are just that: *sayings*. This is noteworthy, since the Fourth Gospel is usually not noted for its affinity with sayings.
3. The sayings above often coincide with the sayings that have been identified by Culpepper as sayings that preceded the Fourth Gospel and have been used by John to construct discourses.⁴³¹ Where they do not coincide, they might still be proposed as 'sayings' according to the same method used by Culpepper (e.g.: they are preceded by introductory formulae and followed by an exposition).⁴³²

Culpepper has already proposed that some of these sayings belong to strands of Jesus Tradition that precede Johannine tradition.⁴³³ The parallels that have been discerned above strengthen this position and provide some room to speculate on the possibility of strands of Jesus sayings that are appropriated in the Johannine writings that 'were drawn from the same general reservoir as those in the Synoptic gospels', as C.H. Dodd writes. To which he adds that in some cases 'the tradition followed by [the fourth] evangelist appears to reach back to a stage distinctly more primitive than that represented in the other gospels.'⁴³⁴ The present study at least seems to reinforce the possibility of such a view.

6.1.1.5 Traditions linked to the Passion Narrative

There is a tentative consensus that a narrative of Jesus' passion is one of the oldest Gospel sources in Jesus Tradition, with a large amount of narrative structural integrity throughout the canonical gospels and the second-century *Gospel of Peter*.⁴³⁵ Especially the agreements between Mark and John may point to an underlying tradition, starting with the anointing of Jesus at Bethany (Mark 14:3-9 & *pars.*) and ending with the empty tomb (Mark 16:1-8 & *pars.*). However, the events leading up to the

⁴³¹ Cf. Culpepper, 'Jesus Sayings'.

⁴³² Cf. the individual treatment of the proposed parallels in the above chapters, especially in the footnotes, and cf. the remarks in 4.1.1.1.2.

⁴³³ Culpepper, 380.

⁴³⁴ Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 430.

⁴³⁵ The latter of which may or may not be dependent on the canonical Gospels, cf. *DJG*, 663-66; Koester, *Ancient Christian*, 216-30; 253-56.

Passion may also have been part of the larger narrative framework.⁴³⁶ This would account for the Johannine sayings of John 12:24-25 in the table below, which are paralleled by Mark 8:34-35 (& *pars.*). These are placed, in the Johannine narrative, after the anointing in Bethany and the entrance into Jerusalem and Jesus' prediction of his impending death, whereas the Synoptic narrative couples these sayings to Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi.

Jesus Tradition	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>Follow Jesus in suffering</u> Matt.16:24//Mark 8:34// Luke 9:25//John 12:25	1 Pet.2:21	Possible
<u>Salvation of the soul</u> Matt.16:25//Mark 8:35// Luke 9:26//John 12:24	1 Pet.1:9	Possible
<u>Quotation of Ps.118</u> Matt.21:42//Mark 12:10// Luke 20:17	1 Pet.2:4-8	Possible
<u>Give God and the emperor what they are due</u> Matt.22:21//Mark 12:17// Luke 20:25	1 Pet.2:17	Possible
<u>Do not lord over one another</u> Matt.20:25//Mark 10:42b-43	1 Pet.5:3	Probable
<u>Striving to be first</u> Matt.20:27//Mark 10:44	3 John 9	Possible
<u>Christ's sufferings</u> <i>Globally</i>	1 Pet.5:1	Probable
<u>Jesus beaten and scolded</u> Matt.26:67//Mark 14:65	1 Pet.2:20.22-23	Probable

A number of conclusions derive from this table.

⁴³⁶ Cf. Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium: Teil 2, Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27-16,20* HTKNT, Freiburg: Herder, 1977, 15-16. According to Pesch, this narrative runs from Mark 8:27-16:8.

1. It appears that only 1 Peter among the Catholic Epistles appropriated the Passion Narrative tradition (apart from the uncertain parallel in 3 John 9, which in any case has no conceptual links with the passion itself).⁴³⁷
2. We should not assume that the Passion narrative was unknown to the authors of the other Catholic Epistles, since that would be an argument from silence and the assumption that the Passion Narrative was indeed a senior and widespread tradition among early Christians seems a logical and viable one. We should rather assume that this particular piece of tradition was less likely to be utilized for general edification.⁴³⁸
3. The content of 1 Peter (much like *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, for instance) did make the Passion Narrative a likely discourse to allude to, since 1 Peter explicitly deals with suffering.

The second point, if considered viable, is an important one. It reveals a methodological base of how the Early Church may have dealt with Jesus Tradition that is normally hidden from sight: Jesus' wisdom sayings from e.g. the Sermon-traditions were likelier candidates to use for edification than complex narratives that are about Jesus' life and death. That does not mean that Jesus' wisdom teaching and the narrative of his life and passion did not belong together or somehow originated in very different settings.

In other words: when Luke and Matthew are perceived as adding their double tradition-material (which is indeed for a good part sapiential in nature) to the basic Markan narrative, we should not necessarily assume this to be a move in which a foreign element is added to Mark's traditions. The authors of the first and third Gospels may just as well

⁴³⁷ The Passion Narrative does not feature in Paul's allusions to Jesus Tradition either. Apart from the Last supper tradition in 1 Cor.11:23-25, that is. But that may have been known to him independent from the Passion Narrative framework (cf. Excursus 1). Likewise, parallels to Jesus Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers are remarkably restrained in relation to the Passion Narrative (cf. Excursus 2), apart from the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*.

⁴³⁸ This brings to mind Richard Bauckham's observation that there must have been an early distinction between the actual Gospel tradition on the one hand, and its interpretation and application on the other (cf. Bauckham, 'The Study of Gospel Traditions', 376).

have been restoring separated elements to reshape a more original whole.⁴³⁹

6.1.1.6 Traditions linked to Petrine/Apostolical narratives

In discussions on Gospel sources there is often much room for theorizing about oral or written sources for the Synoptic Gospels, or John's Gospel. But usually these discussions are limited to a) sayings sources; b) miracle stories collections; c) infancy narratives and d) the Passion Narrative.⁴⁴⁰

This, however, does not explain the presence of numerous stories featuring the disciples, and, especially, the apostle Peter. Regarding the Gospel of Mark, Richard Bauckham has stated that 'the evidence is at the very least consistent with, at most highly supportive of, the hypothesis that Mark's main source was the body of traditions first formulated in Jerusalem by the Twelve, *but that he knew this body of traditions in the form in which Peter related them*'.⁴⁴¹ This would indeed be a viable explanation for the otherwise almost inexplicable interwovenness of apostle-narratives with Mark's story about Jesus.

Interestingly, both Matthew and John add to this tendency by zooming in even further on narrative episodes in which apostles play key roles. Especially the unique narratives in Matthew 14:28-31⁴⁴²; 16:17-19,23; 17:24-27; 18:21-22 and John 21:2-23 focus on Peter, and suggest the possibility that there may have been an underlying source consisting of stories of Jesus and Peter. Some of these traditions are paralleled in the Catholic Epistles:

⁴³⁹ If Mark indeed chose not to incorporate these traditions, one can only speculate as to why he has done so. In composing his Gospel he may have considered the actual narrative to be his main goal.

⁴⁴⁰ Cf. i.e. Koester, *Ancient Christian*, 286-88; 303-13.

⁴⁴¹ Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 172 (italics mine). Cf. also Martin Hengel, *Saint Peter, The Underestimated Apostle*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010 [transl. of *Der unterschätzte Petrus. Zwei Studien*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck], 28-36.

⁴⁴² Interestingly, this particular Peter-narrative includes an 'I am'-saying, otherwise typically Johannine.

Jesus Tradition from <u>Petrine/apostolical narratives</u>	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>Be a shepherd for the flock</u> John 21:16	1 Pet.5:2-3	Probable
<u>Rock and stumble stone</u> Matt.16:18.23	1 Pet.2:4-8	Possible
<u>Peter will die violently/ undressing language</u> John 21:18	2 Pet.1:14	Probable
<u>Do not lord over one another</u> Matt.20:25//Mark 10:42b-43	1 Pet.5:3	Probable
<u>Striving to be first</u> Matt.20:27//Mark 10:44	3 John 9	Possible

Two observations need to be made with regard to these parallels.

1. Once again, 1 Peter seems to favor a strand of tradition (if it may be called that) that the other authors of the Catholic Epistles largely ignore.
2. The presence of these Petrine reminiscences in Petrine literature may not be very surprising. If they are acknowledged, however, it is noteworthy that their presence in 1 Peter is quite subtle and not very obvious. The two stories of Peter's commissioning by Jesus are presented with surprising restraint.

It is noteworthy that Paul also may show familiarity with the tradition of Peter's commission.⁴⁴³ The M-traditions concerning Peter may indeed be very old and conceivably widespread in the Early Church.

6.1.1.7 Traditions linked to the Olivet Discourse

Another strand of Jesus Tradition that has surfaced in the Catholic Epistles is that of Jesus' apocalyptic teaching, which is spearheaded by the Olivet Discourse (Mark 13 & *pars.*) and, to a lesser extent, Luke 12:35-59.

⁴⁴³ Wenham, *Paul*, 200-205, explores the possibility that Gal.1:15-16 ('flesh and blood') alludes to the tradition known from Matt. 16:16-20. Cf. also Excursus 1.

The authenticity of Jesus' apocalyptic teaching has often been questioned, presupposing that these sayings represent a later development within Jesus Tradition. Wright and Pitre, however, have shown the Olivet Discourse to be right at home within Jesus' world and his teachings.⁴⁴⁴ Wenham has argued convincingly that Paul, in all likelihood, was acquainted with these teachings.⁴⁴⁵ The same reasoning seems to apply to the authors of the Catholic Epistles:

Jesus Tradition	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>The end is near, be alert</u> Mark 13://Matt.24-25//Luke 21	1 Pet.1:13; 4:7 2 Pet.3:2-3 [Jd.17-18]	Probable Probable
<u>Do not be deceived</u> Matt.24:4//	1 John 3:7a	Probable
<u>The end will come</u> Mark 13:10//Matt.24:14	2 Pet.3:9	Probable
<u>False messiahs</u> Mark 13:22//Matt.24:24	2 Pet.2:1 1 John 2:18; 4:1 2 John 7 [Jd.4]	Probable Probable Probable
<u>Heaven and earth will pass away; a cosmic event</u> Matt.24:29.35	2 Pet.3:10-12	Probable
<u>Like a thief</u> Matt.24:43	2 Pet.3:10-12	Probable
<u>Be vigilant</u> Mark 13:37	1 Pet.5:8	Probable
<u>The wicked servant</u> Matt.24:48	2 Pet.3:2-3 [Jd.17-18]	Possible
<u>Christ reappears in his glory</u> Matt.25:31	1 Pet.4:13	Possible

⁴⁴⁴ Wright, *Jesus*, 377-79; Brant Pitre, *Jesus, The Tribulation and the End of the Exile*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005, 219-380.

⁴⁴⁵ David Wenham, *Paul, Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, 327-28, cf. Excursus 1.

<u>Returning Lord at the door</u> Mark 13:29//Rev.3:20	Jas.5:7-9	Probable
<u>Natural phenomena as indication of <i>parousia</i></u> Mark 13:28-29	Jas.5:7-9	Possible
<u>Faithful steward</u> Luke 12:42	1 Pet.4:10	Possible
<u>Keep your lamps burning</u> Luke 12:35-36// <i>Did.</i> 16:1-2a	2 Pet.1:19	Possible

With regard to these parallels a number of observations can be made:

1. The traditions from the Olivet Discourse appear to have been known and appropriated by all the authors of the Catholic Epistles.
2. This is especially noteworthy, when we realize that Mark 13 represents a tradition that was known and appropriated (in all likelihood) by Paul,⁴⁴⁶ but is virtually ignored (apart from *Didache* 16) by the Apostolic Fathers.⁴⁴⁷
3. As we have seen in 5.2.2.1, *Didache* 16 offers an interesting parallel to both the Olivet Discourse and Luke 12:35-36.
4. 2 Peter 1:19 further has some semantic overlap (Jesus as 'morning star') with a verse from Revelation (cf. below 3.1.1.8), just as James 5:7-9 shows verbal overlap to Mark 13:29 and Revelation 3:20 simultaneously: there is a possibility that the traditions from Luke 12, *Didache* 16 (cp. Matthew 25) belonged to a single strand of tradition that preceded and informed Mark 13, which even may have incorporated the designation 'Morning Star' for Jesus and informed the author of Revelation in further ways.

6.1.1.8 Miscellaneous traditions

The heading of this paragraph obviously does not purport to propose a source or a strand of tradition. Rather it serves as an overview of the

⁴⁴⁶ Cf. Excursus 1.

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. Excursus 2.

sayings that could not be fit into any of the categories that have been discussed above:

Jesus Tradition	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>Love God and your neighbor</u> Mark 12:28-34//Matt.22:34-40//Luke 10:25-37	Jas.2:8 1 John 4:21	Probable Possible
<u>The material needs of a wanting brother</u> <i>Hebrew Gospel</i>	Jas.2:15-16 1 John 3:17-18	Probable Probable
<u>Seeing a brother</u> <i>Hebrew Gospel</i>	1 John 3:17-18	possible
<u>Word sown in the heart</u> Matt.13:19//Mark 4:15//Luke 8:12	Jas.1:21 1 Pet.1:23	Possible Possible
<u>Jesus as glorified Lord</u> Matt.16:27-17:9//Mark 8:38-9:8//Luke 9:26-36(//Jn1:14)	Jas.2:1 2 Pet.1:16-18	Possible Probable
<u>Have faith and do not doubt</u> Matt.21:21-22//Mark 11:23-24	Jas.1:5-7	Probable
<u>'Father' in addressing God</u> Matt.6:9; Mark 14:36	1 Pet.1:17	Possible
<u>Sheep without a shepherd</u> Matt.9:36//Mark 6:34	1 Pet.2:25	Possible
<u>Impending death as 'exodus'</u> Luke 9:21	2 Pet.1:15	Possible
<u>Vice list</u> Mark 7:22	2 Pet.2:3	Possible
<u>Crown of life</u> Rev.2:10	Jas.1:12	Probable
<u>The poor will be rich</u> Rev.2:9	Jas.2:5	Probable
<u>Jesus is the Morning star</u> Rev.3:22; 22:16	2 Pet.1:19	Possible
<u>Love covers over a multitude of sins</u>	Jas.5:20 1 Pet.4:8	Possible Possible
<u>Slaves to whatever masters them</u>	2 Pet.2:19	Probable

The table holds several Markan verses, some of which have also been appropriated by Matthew and/or Luke and one Lukan verse (9:21), which is a Lukan variation or addition to a triple tradition-pericope. Furthermore, a number of supposed *agrapha*, two of which stem from the *Hebrew Gospel*, and a number of sayings from Revelation are presented.

In and of itself, a table consisting of miscellaneous traditions can hardly inform on the nature of several individual strands of tradition. Its presence is, however, useful as a reminder that theorizing about such strands is an effort of limited scholarly certainty: apart from or next to any and all of the proposed strands of traditions or tradition sources, there are still numerous sayings that cannot be pinpointed into neat trajectories. These sayings therefore testify to a greater reality: Jesus Tradition is a corpus that has coherence beyond theorized sources and strand of tradition, however useful the efforts in charting those may be.

6.1.1.9 Traditions linked to the Love command

In the final table in this section the parallels that are thematically linked to Jesus’ love command have been grouped together. The love command is of course not a particular strand of traditions. However, the thematic grouping of these traditions has some merit, because the love command is central to Jesus’ ethic.⁴⁴⁸ Its appropriation in the Catholic Epistles informs us on how Jesus was perceived.

Jesus Tradition	Text in Catholic Epistles	Probability of parallel
<u>Love God and your neighbor</u> Mark 12:28-34//Matt.22:34-40//Luke 10:25-37	Jas.2:8 1 John 4:21	Probable Possible
<u>The material needs of a wanting brother</u> <i>Hebrew Gospel</i>	Jas.2:15-16 1 John 3:17-18	Probable Probable
<u>Seeing a brother</u>	1 John 3:17-	Possible

⁴⁴⁸ *DJG*, 535-36.

<i>Hebrew Gospel</i>	18	
<u>Love one another</u>	1 Pet.1:22;	Possible
John 13:34-35	2:17; 4:8	Possible
	1 John 2:7;	Probable
	3:23	Probable
	2 John 4-6	

A number of observations can be made on the basis of this list:

1. The three longer Catholic Epistles (James, 1 Peter and 1 John) all seem to appropriate Jesus' teaching on love. There are three types of tradition that have been drawn from: the synoptic love command (based on Lev.19:19); the Johannine Love command (from John 13:34); the *Hebrew Gospel*, which emphasizes love of the brother in close connection to Lev.19:19.
 - a. These different types of tradition all somehow originate in Jesus' own teaching, which was in all likelihood diversified, consisting of more than one single saying on this subject, probably delivered on more than one occasion.
 - b. These different types also downplay the differences between closely related semantic categories, such as 'neighbor', 'brother', 'one another', 'brotherhood', all of which are used within these traditions.
 - c. These different types therefore call into question just how distinctly Johannine the phrase 'love one another' really is.⁴⁴⁹
2. As was the case with the parallels to the Olivet Discourse, Paul seems to be aware of Jesus' love command (which he paraphrases in Rom.13:8), but it hardly ever occurs in the Apostolic Fathers (save from *Didache* 1:2).⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁹ Which even Paul may have known, cf. Excursus 1.

⁴⁵⁰ Cf. Excursus 1 and 2.

6.1.2 Some concluding observations

In his study on *Ancient Christian Gospels*, Helmut Koester sets out by criticizing the prejudice that has long existed in New Testament scholarship towards apocryphal Gospels and gospel traditions.⁴⁵¹

Koester is right, in a sense: the scholarly consensus has long favored the witness of the Synoptic Gospels as the more trustworthy presentation of the life and teachings of Jesus.

6.1.2.1 Johannine tradition

There is, however, also another strong prejudice at play, and that is the one that favors Synoptic tradition (often with special affection for the double tradition, or Q) over against Johannine tradition. The present study, however, has found elements of Johannine tradition outside of the realm of the Johannine community (cf. 6.1.1.4 above).

What is more: there are links to Synoptic sources within the Fourth Gospel, not only when it comes to e.g. the Passion Narrative, the Love command, and some healing stories, but also when it comes to the role and the commission of the Apostle Peter (cf. 6.1.1.6 above).

6.1.2.3 Q Material

Furthermore, there is a tendency to view a certain type of (written) Q (which is reconstructed with something of a minimalist approach) as the most senior and historically informative strand of Jesus Tradition. This is not necessarily in tune with the historical reality that is reflected by the pages of the Catholic Epistles. The underlying Jesus Tradition is usually to be conceived as richly detailed, variegated and hard to pin down to a single source.⁴⁵² Q may be a logical inference from within the confinements of the Synoptic problem, but its edges start to blur as soon

⁴⁵¹ Koester, *Ancient Christian*, xxx.

⁴⁵² A very interesting proposal of viewing the Synoptic problem is given by Rainer Riesner in Porter & Dyer, *The Synoptic Problem*, 107. There he displays a chart showing a 'simplified' version of how different strands of tradition may have influenced a 'proto-Mark' and ultimately the three Synoptic Gospels.

as other early Christian writings are brought into play. When considering strands of traditions appropriated by not only the Catholic Epistles, but also Paul and the Apostolic Fathers, one does not necessarily have to consider editions of Q as underlying sources. Spoken or written versions of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain may equally well have been sources, however expanded or abbreviated.

6.1.2.3 Appropriation of source material

Most Catholic Epistles are dated, by many, quite late. Therefore their parallels to Jesus Tradition could simply be held to convey later developments within Jesus Tradition. It is, however, noteworthy that the strands of tradition that are encountered in the Catholic Epistles are remarkably comparable to those that are appropriated by Paul and *Didache*. Paul is the earliest, uncontested witness to Jesus Tradition. *Didache's* first stages may reach as far back as the sixties of the first century. Paul and *Didache*, for instance, share the Catholic Epistle's interest in both the Love command and the Olivet Discourse, whereas the other Apostolic Fathers do not parallel these traditions.⁴⁵³

In general, we can conclude that the authors of the Catholic Epistles have *chosen freely to use some* sayings and episodes from Jesus Tradition. This implies that they appropriated a limited amount of their source material. That may seem a rather obvious point. However, above we have established the likelihood that these authors knew and used much the same sources as the Gospel writers. The evangelists of course felt the need to convey a more complete image of Jesus, and therefore made much more extensive use of the same traditions. Yet, they also had to make choices, as to what traditions they were to incorporate. Assuming Markan priority, this is most clearly shown by Luke's lesser use of Mark over against Matthew's. Whether or not Q is conceived of as an actual source for both Gospels, Luke may as well have been the one to abbreviate the traditions he shares with Matthew that are not found in Mark. After all, that is exactly what he does with Mark.

⁴⁵³ Cf. Excursus 1 & 2.

This leads to the observation that in the process of writing down Jesus Tradition, choices had to be made: *the writing process was likely one of abbreviation of source material, rather than one of addition and invention.*⁴⁵⁴ The rich tapestry of source material that is appropriated by the authors of the Catholic Epistles speak in favor of such a view.

6.2 The Perception of Jesus in the Catholic Epistles

The above observations relate to the ‘what’ of Jesus Tradition in the Catholic Epistles: a tentative attempt has been made to discuss the nature of the source material available to the authors. Incidentally, some observations were made on the ‘how’, which has been discussed more broadly in Chapter 1: traditions were appropriated with relative freedom, often according to (progymnastic) composition techniques that were common in the first century.

The present paragraph will deal with the ‘why’ of Jesus Tradition in the Catholic Epistles: why was Jesus Tradition appropriated? *What did the authors of the Catholic Epistles communicate about who Jesus was?*

6.2.1 Perceptions of Jesus

The question of Jesus’ identity has intrigued New Testament scholars since the days of Reimarus to those of Wrede,⁴⁵⁵ throughout the 20th century⁴⁵⁶ and up to the present day.⁴⁵⁷ This is a question sparked by curiosity that has resulted in an academic pursuit of the identity of Jesus. More often than not, this ‘Quest’ has been one for the ‘Jesus of history’

⁴⁵⁴ This still holds true when we consider the relative freedom with which traditions were handed down: the present observation is not about the wording of individual traditions, but rather about the choices that were made with regard to what sayings were and were not incorporated in a writing.

⁴⁵⁵ Cf. Albert Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1906.

⁴⁵⁶ Culminating esp. in N.T. Wright’s influential study *Jesus and the Victory of God*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

⁴⁵⁷ Recent contributions are e.g. John Dominic Crossan, *God and Empire: Jesus against Rome, Then and Now*, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco: 2007; Beverly Roberts Gaventa & Richard B. Hays (eds.), *Seeking the Identity of Jesus, A Pilgrimage*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008. And since 2002 there has been the peer-reviewed *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, published by Brill.

over against 'the Christ of faith.'⁴⁵⁸ This is a distinction that may come across as clear and logical, but has often proved to be problematic.⁴⁵⁹

The question of who Jesus really was, is, of course, bound up with his personhood, his identity. *Jesus was a Jewish man*, one who lived, travelled and taught in first century Palestine. For the historian this may be satisfactory; this may be a good start to build upon, in order to construct a plausible biography. The obvious questions to follow up on this observation would be: 'what did he say?'; 'what did he do?', and 'what would he have thought?'. The answers to these questions may provide a concise picture of the person Jesus. However, Jesus' humanity is not as self-evident as is sometimes assumed. It is not only dogmatics that finds it hard to accept Jesus' humanity as a given.⁴⁶⁰

Furthermore, although considerable insight has come to the fore through the study of 'the historical Jesus', we should realize that almost all (if not: all) of the source material that we have for this field of research, comes from the pen of those who have come to know Jesus as 'the Christ of faith'. This is no less so in the case of Markan traditions than it is in the Fourth Gospel.⁴⁶¹ Marianne Meyers Thompson, writing about John's perception of Jesus, makes a helpful observation with regard to this distinction:

The various meanings of "seeing" in the Gospel point to the importance and character of eyewitness testimony ... On the one hand, "seeing" refers to the simple act of physical sight; on the other it refers to perception, or spiritual insight...

What [Jesus' death on the cross] means in its historical context and what it means in the testimony of the beloved disciple and others contrast quite considerably. Sight sees the shameful death of a would-be king; the insight granted by the Spirit perceives

⁴⁵⁸ A distinction coined by Martin Kähler in the title of his book: *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus* (1892).

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. Sarah Coakley, 'The identity of the Risen Jesus: Finding Jesus Christ in the Poor', in Gaventa & Hays, 301-325.

⁴⁶⁰ Academic philosophy, for instance, still debates what 'to be human' really means, cf. Eric T. Olson, 'Who Are We?', *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 14, No.5-6, 2007, 27-35.

⁴⁶¹ But cf. for a defense of the basic historicity of John: Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel*, Downer's Grove: IVP, 2001; cf. Richard Bauckham, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

God's glorification of the rightful King of Israel or, perhaps better, together. Which of these shall we label "historical"?⁴⁶²

The theological perception of the authors of the New Testament is not a matter of a-historical myopia. On the contrary, their perception makes clear that they invested their observations, memories and traditions with meaning, like we all do.⁴⁶³ The bottom line is: who Jesus was and how he was perceived are indeed two separate matters that are, however, inextricably bound up with each other.⁴⁶⁴ In this light, the pursuit of a purely historical Jesus, unfettered by the restraints of idea and meaning that his followers imposed upon him, seems to be a quest for a Platonic ideal.⁴⁶⁵

To read the New Testament is indeed to read and learn about the Jesus of history. A human being who was regarded with awe and whose particular life has raised questions and issues that the lives of others have not raised in like manner.⁴⁶⁶ Therefore, he can, in the end, not be studied separately from the Christ of faith.⁴⁶⁷ One could even argue that the endeavor to *extract* those questions, issues and *meaning* from the witness of the New Testament would be the a-historical move.

The authors of the Catholic Epistles generally take a firm stand on their perception of Jesus: 1 John opens by assuring his readers of the physical reality behind the witness of tradition: 'That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked at and our hands have touched...' (1 John 1:1-2). Likewise, 2 Peter assures the readers: 'For we did not follow cleverly devised stories when we told you about the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ in power, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty' (2 Pet.1:16). Tradition, eyewitness testimony, history and high Christology

⁴⁶² Marianne Meye Thompson, 'Word of God, Messiah of Israel, Savior of the World: Learning the Identity of Jesus from the Gospel of John', in: Gaventa & Hays, 166-179, here esp. 175-76.

⁴⁶³ Cf. Robert K. McIver, 'Eyewitnesses as Guarantors of the Accuracy of the Gospel Traditions in Light of Psychological Research,' *JBL* 131 no.3 (2012), 529-46.

⁴⁶⁴ Which was, in fact, the basic idea of Martin Kähler's book (cf. note 458 above). Kähler, however, takes this as evidence that we cannot know the Jesus of history.

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. also Jens Schröter, *From Jesus to the New Testament: Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the new Testament Canon*, Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013, 23-35, who delivers a helpful and thorough defense of the perspectival nature of historiography in general.

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. for a similar perspective: J.D.G. Dunn, *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005, esp. 15-34.

⁴⁶⁷ As, conversely, the Christ of faith should not be believed in separately from the Jesus of history.

come together in such statements in a way that appears to be murky, muddled or simply inappropriate to many modern minds.⁴⁶⁸ It is, however, precisely the sort of *perception* that we should expect from those who wish to bear witness to Jesus, in all his capacities.

6.2.2 Direct statements about Jesus' identity

The parallels to Jesus Traditions that have been established above, do inform us on the perception its authors had of Jesus. More to the point, however, we are informed by what the authors tell us about Jesus directly, as the following summary shows:

What the Catholic Epistles say directly about Jesus

Jesus came into the world as a man, to redeem our sins (1 John 4:3.9-10; 2 John 1:7); he himself was without sin (1 Pet.2:22).

Although he was rejected by men, he received approval from God (1 Pet.2:4), who identified Jesus as *my beloved son in whom I am well pleased* (2 Pet.1:17-18). Jesus is also known as 'the messiah' (1 John 2:22; 5:1); 'Son of God' (1 John 4:15; 2 John 1:3) and 'glorious Lord' (Jas.2:1, cf. 1 Pet.3:15; 2 Pet.: 'Lord and Savior').

Jesus suffered according to prophecy (1 Pet.1:11); he suffered physical and verbal abuse (1 Pet.2:23). Jesus was willing to suffer (1 Pet.2:21; 4:1). Jesus ultimately died upon a cross (1 Pet.2:24), atoning for the sins of man (1 Pet.2:24; 3:18; 1 John 2:2); this was a sacrificial death (1 Pet.1:19-20; 1 John 1:7).

Jesus rose from the dead (1 Pet.1:3).

Jesus foretold Peter's death (2 Pet.1:14) and he foretold the arrival of false teachers (2 Pet.3:2).

Jesus now rules in heaven, on God's right hand (1 Pet.3:22), performing a priestly role (1 Pet.2:5), pleading for his followers with the Father (1 John 2:1).

He will return in glory (1 Pet.1:7.13; 5:4; 2 Pet.1:16).

⁴⁶⁸ Such statements do not prove that the 'historical' Peter and John actually were the authors of these epistles. It is remarkable, however, that the authors of 2 Peter and 1 John would feel free to use such statements, whereas one could hardly imagine that Paul would put it quite like that.

These statements are almost all very theological in nature. This aligns well with a tentative consensus on the general lateness of all or most of the Catholic Epistles: a strong correlation is supposed to exist between chronological development and development in theology, especially 'high Christology'.

But does that correlation really exist? Are the Petrine and Johannine epistles theologically or Christologically 'more developed' than e.g. the Pauline epistles? This does not necessarily seem to be the case. The Jesus of Paul is a historical persona, to be sure. But Paul's perception of Jesus is also a highly theological one. In the words of Richard Hays:

Jesus Christ, according to Paul, is the preexistent Son of God through whom all things exist; he freely took human form and surrendered himself to suffering and death for the sake of reconciling the world to God; by virtue of his resurrection he is exalted as Lord over the world, which he transforms and sustains with his life-giving power; and he will come again to judge the world and to bring about the final redemption of all things.⁴⁶⁹

Of course, Paul also knows Jesus as Son of God, *Christos* and *kyrios*.⁴⁷⁰ The portraits that Paul and the Catholic Epistles respectively paint are really quite similar.

6.2.3 The Perception of Jesus through Jesus Tradition Parallels

When we let the parallels to Jesus Tradition inform us on how the authors of the Catholic Epistles perceived Jesus, a different perspective emerges. The Jesus that these authors confess to be *Christos*, *kyrios* and pre-existent Son of God, is depicted, unwittingly, more along the lines that historical Jesus-research traditionally has taught.

Below, four ways of depicting Jesus will be presented, in which the perspective of the Catholic Epistles coincides remarkably well with that of historical Jesus-research: *Jesus, the Jewish Wisdom Teacher* (6.2.3.1); *Jesus,*

⁴⁶⁹ Richard B. Hays, 'The story of God's Son: The Identity of Jesus in the Letters of Paul', in: Gaventa & Hays, 180-199, here esp.182. Hays seeks to follow 'the plotline' of Phil.2:5-11, and underscores this depiction of Jesus with several scriptural (Pauline) references.

⁴⁷⁰ Cf. Wenham, *Paul.*, 116-124; Hays, *ibid.*, 184-86.

the unthought-of role model (6.2.3.2); *Jesus, the Eschatological Prophet* (6.2.3.3) and *Jesus, the Teacher of Radical Love and Non-Retaliatio*n (6.2.3.4).

6.2.3.1 *Jesus, the Jewish Wisdom Teacher*

The most striking aspect of parallels to Jesus Tradition in James is that James never mentions Jesus as a source in his letter, in spite of the numerous allusions. Kloppenborg has shown this to be quite normal for authors who followed the guidelines of progymnastic composition.⁴⁷¹

Bauckham, however, has shown that James does more than simply reference in a progymnastic way. He deliberately acts as a wisdom teacher: it was the task of a sage to develop and add to the tradition he sought to represent, as *Sira* 21:15 indicates.⁴⁷²

James' own role as wisdom teacher, and especially how he relates to Jesus' teachings in this role, informs us on his perception of Jesus. Apart from acknowledging Jesus as *Christos* and 'glorious Lord' (2:1), James saw Jesus as a Jewish wisdom teacher, in the tradition of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and *Sira*.

Jesus was seen and understood to be a teacher, a *Rabbi*, by most of his contemporaries.⁴⁷³ His teachings themselves resemble Jewish wisdom writings.⁴⁷⁴ Howes has recently made the case that a reconstructed 'Q' is best understood as belonging to the sapiential genre.⁴⁷⁵ Within the double tradition, one might focus on the Sermon on the Mount/Plain-traditions and acknowledge that those, too, are largely sapiential in nature: beatitudes, parables, parallelisms and aphorisms are the core-

⁴⁷¹ John S. Kloppenborg, 'The Reception of the Jesus Tradition in James' in Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr & Robert Wall, *The Catholic Epistles & Apostolic Tradition*, Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009, 71-100 (cf. 2.1.1.5.4 above).

⁴⁷² Richard Bauckham, 'The Wisdom of James and the Wisdom of Jesus.' In J. Schlosser (ed.), *The Catholic Epistles and Tradition*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 176, Leuven: Peeters, 2004, 75-92, esp. 81 (cf. 2.1.1.5.4 above).

⁴⁷³ The Gospels of Matthew and John even seem to consciously present Jesus as Wisdom incarnate. Cf. M.E. Willett, *Wisdom Christology in the Fourth Gospel*, San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992; Ben Witherington III, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994; C.M. Deutsch, *Lady Wisdom, Jesus and the Sages: Metaphor and Social Context in Matthew's Gospel*, Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996.

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. Witherington, *ibid.* and Bauckham, *James*.

⁴⁷⁵ L. Howes, *Judging Q and Saving Jesus – Q's Contribution to the Wisdom-Apocalypticism Debate in Historical Jesus Studies*, Durbanville: Aosis, 2015, esp. 285-86.

ingredients of Jewish wisdom writings, starting with beatitudes, and ending with a parable that states: 'someone who ... is like a wise man who...', which are precisely the sort of things a Jewish wisdom teacher would say.

It is exactly the tradition material that belongs to this sapiential Jesus that is being appropriated by James. One distinctive feature, however, of the wisdom of Jesus in James is its eschatological outlook. As was concluded in 2.3 above:

1. Twenty-one out of twenty-three parallels can be described as eschatological.
2. Eschatological *reversal* seems to be of primary concern in this regard: The humble will be raised, the poor will be counted as rich, the suffering rejoice. On the other hand: those who now laugh, will mourn, those who judge unjustly will be judged. James' probable familiarity with the Lukan woes, in correspondence with the beatitudes, implicitly critiques a minimalist approach to Jesus Tradition, which tends to see the woes as a Lukan invention.⁴⁷⁶

To read James like this, offers an interesting window into the nature of Jesus the sage. Jesus' role as a Jewish wisdom teacher is often contrasted sharply with the possibility of Jesus as an eschatological (or even: apocalyptic) prophet.⁴⁷⁷ This is not warranted. James' appropriation of Jesus' wisdom sayings indirectly portrays a Jesus for whom wisdom and eschatology go hand in hand.⁴⁷⁸

⁴⁷⁶ Cf., however, Q 6 in Robert J. Miller (ed.): *The Complete Gospels* (Salem: Polebridge, 2010), 264-65. The editors of this version of Q have chosen to incorporate Luke 6:24-26 into the text, apparently tentatively considering the internal logic of the overall passage.

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. e.g. Stephen J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1993, 231: '[W]e have already seen that Thomas and Q1 agree in opting for a non-apocalyptic interpretation of Jesus preaching, so also now it is to be noticed that neither Thomas nor Q1 seem to be much interested in Jesus' death. ... The convergence of Thomas and Q1 on these points is very important, for it helps us clearly to locate reflection upon the death of Jesus and the use of apocalyptic scenarios in the sayings tradition to the synoptic trajectory alone, and to its later stages at that. It is becoming ever more difficult to imagine a Jesus who reflected upon his own death, and preached an imminent apocalyptic judgment to be visited upon the world.'

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. also Gerd Lüdemann, *Jesus nach 2000 Jahren. Was er wirklich sagte und tat*. Springe: Klampen Verlag, 2014 [2000].

The image of Jesus as wisdom teacher is confirmed in some of the other Catholic Epistles:

1. Both 1 Peter (1:8; 3:4.14) and 1 John (3:1-3) also seem to be aware of (some of) the beatitudes from the Sermon on the Mount/Plain.
2. 1 and 2 Peter and 1 John are likewise also aware of other traditions that are featured in the Matthean sermon (1 Pet.2:12//Matt. 5:16; 1 Pet.2:22-23; 3:9//Matt. 5:39-44; 1 John 2:17//Matt.7:21; 1 John 3:4//Matt.7:23; 1 John 3:15//Matt.5:21-22; 2 Pet.2:22//Matt.7:6), and often appropriate these traditions in ways very much like James does.
3. Not only the Synoptic traditions, but also Johannine wisdom sayings appear to be known to the three major Catholic Epistles (Jas.1:22-25//John 13:17; Jas.4:9//John 16:20; 1 Pet.1:8//John 20:29; 1 John 3:16//John 15:13).
4. In two instances, an *agraphon* from the Jesus Tradition (both with sapiential outlook) seems to be paralleled in the Catholic Epistles (Jas.5:20 & 1 Pet.4:8, *Love covers over a multitude of sins*, and 2 Pet.2:19, *Slaves to whatever that masters them*).

All in all, Jesus as a Rabbi, rooted in the tradition of Jewish wisdom writings, is anchored in Jesus Tradition and perceived as such by the authors of the CE.

6.2.3.2 Jesus, the Unthought-of Role Model

What stands out in 1 Peter, with respect to its parallels to Jesus Tradition, is its relation to the Passion Narrative. The cumulative force of the various parallels suggest that the author of 1 Peter knew a narrative tradition describing the passion. Other parallels within 1 Peter further suggest that the author may have known this Passion tradition alongside (and perhaps taken together with) traditions that the Synoptic Gospels present as taking place in the days and weeks leading up to the passion (cf. 6.1.1.5 above).

The addressees of 1 Peter were a marginalized minority. They suffered in various ways because of their status as Christians. 1 Peter shows with great effect how Jesus' shameful death on a cross was meant to be

imitated by his followers, not just ceremonially, but by viewing their own lives with an almost sacrificial mindset. As such, the experience of discrimination becomes not only meaningful, but commendable. This is worked out especially forcefully in 2:21-25, where the picture of Jesus merges with that of the 'suffering servant' of Isaiah 53,⁴⁷⁹ creating a Passion Narrative *in nuce*, as Maier has put it.⁴⁸⁰ Jesus' attitude in suffering is brought to the front in these verses as an admirable example: followers of Jesus are called to undergo any suffering for the sake of their Master in silent obedience. They may appear to lose their pride, fortune or very lives in the process. In reality, the author of 1 Peter assures his readers, they are gaining their lives.

It is, furthermore, not only in suffering that Jesus is presented as a role model, but also in leadership. In 5:2-4 the readers are encouraged to that effect. Peter tells his readers to be obedient like Jesus, whether as a silent lamb, or as a good shepherd, but not as 'lords', wielding power and authority.

The image of Jesus as an example to follow is not worked out as effectively in the other CE, but the idea is certainly present:

1. James generally lacks any narrative reference to Jesus. Therefore the notion of Jesus as an example is not to be expected within the epistle. However, in his recent commentary, John Painter makes the point that James 5:6 paints a similar picture as 1 Peter 2:21-25 does (the 'innocent one' is murdered and condemned and he 'does not resist'), also evoking Isaiah 53. The murder of the innocent one may refer to the death of Jesus or James, or both.⁴⁸¹ Indirectly, within this line of reasoning, Jesus' unresisting suffering sets an example for the community James addresses.
2. In 2 Peter 1:14-15 Peter speaks of his impending death, referring to Jesus' prophecy (John 21:18) and referring to Jesus' words concerning his own impending death (as an 'exodus', cf. Luke

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. esp. David G. Horrell, 'Jesus Remembered in 1 Peter? Early Jesus Traditions, Isaiah 53 and 1 Peter 2:21-25', in Alicia J. Batten & John S. Kloppenborg (eds.), *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*, London: Bloomsbury: 2014, 123-150.

⁴⁸⁰ Gerhard Maier, 'Jesusstradition im 1. Petrusbrief?', in David Wenham (ed.), *Gospel Perspectives*, vol. 5, *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985, 85-128, esp.119.

⁴⁸¹ In John Painter & David A. deSilva, *James and Jude*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012, 157-58. Cf. Davids, *Theology*, 73-75.

9:21). There is an underlying element of ‘following Jesus’ present in these verses.

3. In 1 John 2:6 the notion of following Jesus is even stronger, almost akin to 1 Peter 2:21. John calls his readers ‘to walk as Jesus did’. 1 John 3:16 makes clear what ‘to walk as Jesus did’ really means: to be prepared to lay down your life for others, as Jesus has done.

The picture of Jesus as a model to follow, in obedient willingness to sacrifice one’s very life, is already present in the canonical Gospels.⁴⁸² However, it is also painted with vigour throughout the Catholic Epistles, and especially in 1 Peter.

6.2.3.3 Jesus, the Eschatological Prophet

2 Peter 2:1-3:3 and Jude have considerable overlap in content and vocabulary, so much so, that either a literary or a source-relationship is almost the only conceivable explanation. Two of the parallels to Jesus Tradition that can be discerned in 2 Peter, are found in verses that have, in turn, a parallel in Jude. In both instances 2 Peter seems aware of the parallel (so much so, that a conscious allusion is probable), but Jude does not. Jude, in fact, does not seem to consciously relate to what we understand to be Jesus Tradition at all, even if the epistle does understand Jesus to be Christ and Lord.

2 Peter, on the other hand, is very aware of Jesus Tradition and relates to both Synoptic and Johannine elements of it, probably to underlying oral traditions. What really stands out in 2 Peter are parallels to Jesus’ apocalyptic teachings, which can mainly be found in the Olivet Discourse (i.e.: Matt.24-25//Mark 13//Luke 21), Luke 12:35-59 and Matthew 7:15-23.

As has been stated above, Jesus’ eschatological outlook is present in most of his teaching. It is, however, more pressing in his apocalyptic teaching. Jesus’ apocalyptic eschatology was by no means new or unexpected to his hearers. What stands out in Jesus’ apocalyptic eschatology (as compared to that of contemporary prophets like John the Baptist and

⁴⁸² Cf. Wright, *Jesus*, 297-301.

Theudas the Egyptian and Old Testament prophets like Daniel and Isaiah) is (in the words of Paula Frederikson) his ‘timetable’⁴⁸³: for Jesus, the coming kingdom has now drawn near in his own person.

This element is embraced by 2 Peter. In 1:16-19 the assuredness of the future coming of Jesus is connected to the transfiguration and heavenly confirmation of Jesus, as personally witnessed by his disciples. Heaven and earth; past, present and future in effect come together in the person of Jesus. The Jesus of 2 Peter is himself an agent of eschatology, as is the Jesus of the canonical Gospels, especially in his self-designation of ‘Son of Man’ who will come ‘in clouds with great power and glory’ (Mark 13:26).⁴⁸⁴

Jesus is not only the agent of the end-times, but also its herald: 2 Peter indirectly testifies to Jesus’ role as a prophet. Jesus foretold Peter’s death (1:14-15); is known as an apocalyptic prophet (1:19; 3:2-3.9-12) and predicts false teachers (2:1; 3:2-3). All of this concords very well with the emphasis on prophecy-fulfilment that characterizes Petrine writings and speeches generally.⁴⁸⁵

The other Catholic Epistles underscore 2 Peter’s depiction of Jesus as apocalyptic eschatological prophet:

1. James 5:7-9 possibly parallels some of the traditions that can be found in the Olivet Discourse; the notions of patiently awaiting the arrival of the Lord, who will come soon and the judge on the doorstep evoke Mark 13:28-36 where similar metaphors are worked out.⁴⁸⁶
2. James 5:1-11 is, as a pericope, very prophetic in outlook. Its scope aligns with Jesus’ prophetic ministry to the poor and marginalized (cf. Luke 4:16-27). Furthermore, Jesus promised

⁴⁸³ Cf. Paula Frederiksen, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews*, New York: Vintage Books, 1999, 266-67.

⁴⁸⁴ Cf. Simon Gathercole, ‘The Son of Man in Mark’s Gospel’, *ExpT* 115 (2004), 366-72; J.R. Daniel Kirk, ‘Mark’s Son of Man and Paul’s Second of Adam,’ *Horizons in BT* 37 (2015), 170-95. The latter claims that Daniel 7’s ‘like a son of man’ is close to Mark’s Jesus in every turn: not only as one coming with the clouds of heaven, but also as one who claims ἐξουσία on earth and proclaims the coming of God’s dominion (esp.181).

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. Paul A. Himes, ‘Peter and the Prophetic Word: The Theology of Prophecy Traced through Peter’s Sermons and Epistles’, *BBR* 21.2 (2011), 227-44.

⁴⁸⁶ The ‘coming’ (παρουσία) of the Lord is ‘almost certainly a reference to Jesus’ coming in judgment as the exalted Lord’ (Painter, 161). However, this is debated by e.g. Allison, *James* (ICC), 699, who states that it is a line that ‘Christians could have read one way, Jews another’.

eschatological reward to the poor (Jas.2:5), the merciful (Jas.2:13), the humble (Jas.4:10), the peacemaker (Jas.3:18) and the meek (1 Pet.3:4)) and eschatological punishment to the rich (Jas.5:1) and to those who judge (Jas.4:11-12).

3. 1 Peter is also familiar with apocalyptic sayings of Jesus (1:13; 4:7; 5:8).
4. The same holds true for 1 and 2 John (1 John 3:7a; 2:18; 4:1; 2 John 1:7), who share 2 Peter's emphasis on warning against false teachers.

All in all, the Catholic Epistles paint a coherent picture of Jesus as a prophet of apocalyptic eschatology. The traditions that are reflected in the Olivet Discourse, Matthew 7:15-23 and Luke 12:35-59 (cf. 1 Thess.4:15-16; 2 Thess.2 and *Didache* 16) can be assumed to have been known widely in the Early Church, most certainly by the authors of the Catholic Epistles (with some uncertainty regarding Jude).

6.2.3.4 *Jesus, the Teacher of Radical Love and Non-Retaliatio*

Next to parallels to the Fourth Gospel, which do not come as a surprise, the Johannine epistles have some parallels to Synoptic traditions, especially from the Matthean 'sermons'.⁴⁸⁷ In addition to which there are some parallels from the so called *Hebrew Gospel*.

An important element in 1 John, especially in relation to Jesus Tradition, is the 'Johannine "love ethic"',⁴⁸⁸ which 'presents Jesus' sacrificial love as the grounds for believers' love for other believers'.⁴⁸⁹ John's emphasis on love within the community has led scholars to describe this ethic as a very narrow, almost sectarian philosophy.⁴⁹⁰ Parallels to Jesus Tradition,

⁴⁸⁷ This does not mean that John knew the Gospel of Matthew, he may also have known traditions in a trajectory leading up to the Matthean sermons. Cf. C.H. Dodd, *Epistles*, xxxviii-xli, for a similar perspective on Synoptic Jesus Tradition in 1 John.

⁴⁸⁸ Cf. Andreas J. Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*, Grand rapids: Zondervan, 2009, 268.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. esp. R. Alan Culpepper, *The Johannine School. An Evaluation of the Johannine School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of Ancient Schools*. SBLDS 26. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974; Raymond R. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*, New York: Paulist, 1979; Wayne A. Meeks, 'The Ethics of the Fourth Evangelist', in R. Alan Culpepper & C. Clifton Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996, 317-26.

however, show that the Johannine epistles are open to tradition material other than strictly Johannine traditions.⁴⁹¹

That Jesus taught his disciples to love, is clear. The canonical Gospels offer different narrative framings for Jesus' conveying of his love command. Matthew (22:36) and Mark (12:28) present the love command as the most important command in the law (combining Lev.19:18 and Deut.6:5). Luke (10:25) offers it as the definitive condition for obtaining eternal life, whereas John (13:34-35) seems to offer it as the most important pathway for discipleship.⁴⁹²

When we read carefully, in and behind the text, the author of the Johannine epistles testifies to Jesus as a teacher of radical love, no less so than the Synoptic Gospels do. Interestingly, the *Hebrew Gospel* fragments passed on by Origen and Jerome, offer two sayings of Jesus that seem to incorporate and combine the Synoptic outlook (that seeks to aim the disciples' love primarily towards the poor and marginalized) and the Johannine outlook (that appears to address behaviour within the community). In fact, one of these sayings, may very well represent a core tradition regarding the love command, to which both James and 1 John relate directly (Jas. 2:15-16; 1 John 3:17-18).

Victor Paul Furnish has pointed out that Jesus' summary of the law (in Matt.22:37-39//Mark 12:30-31) is on the one hand typical for a Jewish Rabbi,⁴⁹³ but, on the other hand, his coupling of both Mosaic texts (Lev.19:18 & Deut.6:5) is quite unique, as is his persistence on love for the enemy and radical non-retaliation (Matt.5:38-48//Luke 6:27-36).⁴⁹⁴ Furnish sees elements of this throughout Jesus' teaching, especially in the parable of the Good Samaritan.⁴⁹⁵

⁴⁹¹ The Johannine epistles (especially 1 and 2 John) are very concerned with community boundaries. This topical particularity gives off the impression that the community's love ethic is also restrained by these boundaries. This way of reasoning may be too quick; cf. Köstenberger, *Theology*, 511: 'John's "love ethic" ... is the product of John's deliberate focalization of all of Jesus' ethical demands in the command to love.'

⁴⁹² Cf. E.E. Popkes, 'Love, Love Command', in *DJG*, 536.

⁴⁹³ Cf. *Test. XII Patr.*, lss.5:1-2; 7:2-7; Zeb.5:1; Dan 5:1-3; Ben. 3:1-5; *Sifre on Deut.* 32:39; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* II, 63.

⁴⁹⁴ V.P. Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* NTL, London: SCM Press, 1973, esp. 59-69.

⁴⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 64.

Jesus' teaching of radical love can also be said to be fully eschatological in outlook.⁴⁹⁶ Jesus preached the kingdom, whose rule is a rule of Love, rather than Law. In the teaching of radical love and non-retaliation, Jesus the sage, the eschatological prophet and the role-model come together.

At the same time, Jesus' emphasis on love, and his principle of non-retaliation are fully political in outlook. It is not just eschatology, but also first century reality that is involved here: to announce God's kingdom, but to oppose armed resistance, would have been an unpopular viewpoint, to say the least.⁴⁹⁷ This political tension can be felt by reading Jesus Tradition in tune with its first-century Palestinian context. It is however no longer present in its appropriation in the epistles of the New Testament,⁴⁹⁸ perhaps because Jesus' followers realised that the impact of Jesus' teaching reached beyond particular social and political circumstances.

The perceived tension between viewing the love command as either a community ethic or a command to care for the poor and marginalized within broader society, is lifted when we understand it to belong to Jesus' larger program of restoration of the people of God.⁴⁹⁹ Jesus can on the one hand be perceived as ministering solely to Israel (Matt.15:24), and on the other hand as bringing light to the entire *kosmos* (John 3:16; 1 John 3:16). Exclusive claims and stark dualism are to impact the entire world order, without reservation.

Jesus as a teacher of radical love and non-retaliation is present in the Catholic Epistles, even apart from 1 John:

1. In James the repeated phrase 'law of freedom' (1:25; 2:12, cf. 'royal law' in 2:8) probably refers to Jesus' kingdom teaching, especially his love command.⁵⁰⁰
2. 1 Peter seems to adhere to love command-teaching that sounds more Johannine than Synoptic, which opens up the possibility of a wider trajectory of these traditions (1 Pet.1:22; 2:17; 4:8).

⁴⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹⁷ Cf. Wright, *Jesus*, 296.

⁴⁹⁸ Save for, perhaps, the saying to give Caesar what is Caesar's, and God what is God's (Matt.22:21//Mark 12:17//Luke 20:25), which is echoed in 1 Pet.2:17 and Rom.13:1-7.

⁴⁹⁹ Cf. Wright, *Jesus*, 465-66.

⁵⁰⁰ Davids, *Theology*, 81-82; Painter, 95-96.

3. James 2:15-16 (in combination with 2:8) closely resembles the *Hebrew Gospel* traditions quoted above, as does 1 John 3:17-18.
4. 1 Peter seems to allude quite directly to Jesus' teaching on non-retaliation (1 Pet.2:22-23; 3:9).
5. James 5:20 and 1 Peter 4:8 testify to what is quite possibly a Jesus *logion*: 'love covers over a multitude of sin'. A saying that may also have been appropriated by Paul (cf. 1 Cor.13:4-7) and is viewed by Clement of Alexandria as Jesus Tradition.⁵⁰¹

In sum, the corpus of the Catholic Epistles displays an awareness of Jesus' role as a teacher of radical love. Their witness is not to a single strand of tradition saying either 'love God and your neighbour', or 'love your neighbour as yourself', or 'love your brother' or 'love the brotherhood', instead there is a broad awareness through James, 1 Peter and 1 John of all these idioms. 1 Peter's particular concerns point strongly towards Jesus' emphasis on non-retaliation. James combines love command-language with care for the poor, and 1 John (remarkably) has the broadest outlook, and a surprising awareness of Jesus' love command pertaining to not only discipleship, but also love for the poor and marginalized.

6.2.3.5 An Integrated Perspective on the Perception of Jesus in the Catholic Epistles

The table that was presented above (6.2.2), containing *direct* statements from the Catholic Epistles about Jesus, can now be complemented with an overview of what the same authors say *by implication* about Jesus:

<i>What the Catholic Epistles say directly about Jesus</i>	<i>What the Catholic Epistles say by implication about Jesus</i>
<p>Jesus came into the world as a man, to redeem our sins (1 John 4:3.9-10; 2 John 1:7); He himself was without sin (1 Pet.2:22).</p>	<p>Jesus was perceived as a wisdom teacher, who taught in parables, aphorisms and beatitudes. In this way, he ministered to Israel and interacted with Jewish wisdom</p>

⁵⁰¹ Clement Al., *The Instructor* 3,12; *Miscellanies* 4,8; 'Yes, concerning love also he says: 'Love covers over a multitude of sins.'

Although he was rejected by men, he received approval from God (1 Pet.2:4), who identified Jesus as *my beloved son in whom I am well pleased* (2 Pet.1:17-18). Jesus is also known as 'the messiah' (1 John 2:22; 5:1); 'Son of God' (1 John 4:15; 2 John 1:3) and 'glorious Lord' (Jas.2:1, cf. 1 Pet.3:15; 2 Pet.: 'Lord and Savior').

Jesus suffered according to prophecy (1 Pet.1:11); physical and verbal abuse (1 Pet.2:23). Jesus was willing to suffer (1 Pet.2:21; 4:1). Jesus ultimately died upon a cross (1 Pet.2:24), atoning for the sins of man (1 Pet.2:24; 3:18; 1 John 2:2); a sacrificial death (1 Pet.1:19-20; 1 John 1:7).

Jesus rose from the dead (1 Pet.1:3).

Jesus foretold Peter's death (2 Pet.1:14) and he foretold the arrival of false teachers (2 Pet.3:2).

Jesus now rules in heaven, on God's right hand (1 Pet.3:22), performing a priestly role (1 Pet.2:5), pleading for his followers with the Father (1 John 2:1).

writings.

The striking feature of this Jewish wisdom teacher, is that he combines sapiential teachings with strong eschatological elements.

Jesus was also perceived as an unthought-of role model, whose sinless, sacrificial and passively enduring lifestyle (especially in his passion) was seen as fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah 53 (the suffering servant). Jesus' meekness and passive endurance were not only seen as fit examples for suffering Christians, but also for leaders within the Early Christian communities. Jesus was also perceived as an eschatological prophet. He offered apocalyptical visions of future events as well as eschatological hope through the announcement of punishment and reward.

Lastly, Jesus was believed to have taught radical love and non-retaliation. Not only as a community ethic, but also as a command to care for the poor and marginalized.

This integrated perspective may be called an *Apostolical perspective*. It combines theological statements on Jesus' unique identity (a sinless man, our redeemer, God's Son, whose death was of a special sacrificial nature, whose resurrection has vindicated him as divine ruler) with observations that may have derived from eyewitness testimony.

There is ample reason to suppose that the authors of the Catholic Epistles⁵⁰² viewed their historical perception of Jesus as completely bound up with their theological opinions on Jesus, and vice versa. While the corpus of the Catholic Epistles may not be perceived as a unified whole in the way the *corpus Paulinum* is, its authors do on occasion speak with a single voice, especially in their witness of Jesus.

Furthermore, many scholars think of the Catholic Epistles as a randomly collected group of writings, usually very late when compared to Paul's letters. However, the authors of these epistles show remarkable coherence in their dealing with Jesus Tradition and their perception of Jesus. And, as a corpus, the Catholic Epistles show significant overlap with the Pauline epistles and the way they deal with the same tradition material. The parallels to Jesus Tradition do not only show a certain Apostolical perspective on Jesus, but also an *Apostolical integrity* with regard to the unified voice with which they often speak.

6.3 Concluding Remarks

If all of the above observations are largely correct, that would have some corollaries:

1. The recent trend towards viewing the Catholic Epistles as a (canonical) corpus in its own right is justified: there is sufficient unity and integrity to further pursue the study of this group of epistles as a distinct group.
2. New Testament scholars should tread cautiously when trying to separate matters of faith and history, especially in the study of the historical Jesus.
3. In further study, Jesus Tradition parallels in Early Christian writings, other than the canonical Gospels, should be more actively employed in the effort to reconstruct the trajectories along which tradition material was handed down.
4. These efforts should be pursued with some restraint: often, the Synoptic problem has lured New Testament scholarship in over-

⁵⁰² With some reservations regarding Jude, whose stance towards Jesus Tradition has not become entirely clear.

theorizing on (written) Gospel sources for which no physical and little theoretical evidence is present.

Synthesis – The Pillars and the Rock

In this study it was argued that the Catholic Epistles are indeed dependent on Jesus Tradition. Not in a trivial and extrinsic way, but truly fundamentally.

The question has been asked: *What parallels to Jesus Tradition can be found in the Catholic Epistles, and how do these parallels inform us on the relationship of the Catholic Epistles to Jesus Tradition, both on a historical and a theological level?* Many such parallels have been found, and these parallels have been informative in a number of ways.

First of all, there is a fundamental unity in the witness of the Catholic Epistles regarding its reliance upon Jesus Tradition and its appropriation of Jesus Tradition. The same Jesus can be recognized throughout all Catholic Epistles (with the possible exception of Jude, whose brevity does not supply enough clarity about its relation to Jesus Tradition), and this Jesus is not merely a theological construct, but a historical person, very much in line with the Jesus from historical Jesus-research.

Second, a fundamental unity between the canonical Gospels, Corpus Paulinum and the Catholic Epistles can be acknowledged. All three corpora are consciously witnessing to Jesus. Each corpus has its own distinct way of doing this, and the Catholic Epistles can be seen as witnessing Jesus from a distinct apostolic perspective.

Jesus, from this perspective, is after all the cornerstone and the rock on which the Pillar Apostles have built in their writings. Jesus Tradition, no matter how elusive and variegated it has proven to be, supplied a firm foundation on which the apostolic witness could build.

Excursus 1

Jesus Tradition Parallels in Paul

The table below is a schematic representation of the findings of Heinz Arnold Hiestermann, as documented in his recent PhD thesis on the dependence of Paul on Jesus Tradition.⁵⁰³ Hiestermann has limited his research to the undisputed letters Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians and Philemon. This may be a regrettable show of academic restraint, but its results are highly informative nonetheless:

Text in Paul	Propositional agreement	Text in Jesus Tradition
Rom.12:14	<i>Love your enemy</i>	Luke 6:27-28// Matt.5:43-44
Rom.13:8-10	<i>Love command/fulfilling the law</i>	Matt.19:18-19
Rom.14:14	<i>Nothing is unclean</i>	Matt.15:11// Mark 7:15
Rom.14:20	<i>Everything clean</i>	Mark 7:19
Gal.1:16	<i>Flesh and blood</i>	Matt.16:16-17
1 Cor.7:10	<i>Prohibition against divorce</i>	Mark 10:9// Matt.19:6
1 Cor.7:11	<i>Prohibition against divorce</i>	Mark 10:11// Matt.19:9
1 Cor.9:14	<i>Fair wages</i>	Matt.10:10b// Luke10:7b
1 Cor.11:23b-25	<i>Last supper tradition</i>	Luke 22:19-20 (<i>& pars.</i>)
1 Thess.4:14-16	<i>Word of the Lord</i>	Matt.24:30-31
1 Thess.5:2	<i>Thief in the night</i>	Matt.24:42-43// Luke12:39
1 Thess.5:3	<i>Pregnancy metaphor</i>	Luke 21:23 (<i>& pars.</i>)

⁵⁰³ Hiestermann, *Paul's Use of the Synoptic Jesus Tradition*, University of Pretoria, March 2016. Visited online at http://www.repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/56971/Hiestermann_Paul_2016.pdf?sequence=1, 10-19-2016.

In addition to these findings, Hiestermann offers a table showing meaningful overlap between Paul and the Matthean Sermon on the Mount.⁵⁰⁴

Paul	Matthew	Topic
Gal.5:14; Rom.13:8,9,10	5:17	Fulfilling the law
1 Cor.7:10-11	5:30-32	Divorce
Gal.5:14; Rom.13:8-10	5:43	Love the neighbor
Rom.12:14	5:44	Love the enemy

Moreover, Hiestermann points out how *every* parallel to the Synoptic tradition in Paul has a parallel to a verse in the Gospel of Matthew, except Rom.14:20. On occasion there is closer verbal agreement with Luke, but never with Mark.⁵⁰⁵

Additionally, the findings of David Wenham may be taken into consideration.⁵⁰⁶ His conclusions focus more directly on the type of tradition material Paul could have been familiar with:⁵⁰⁷

Highly probable	Probable	Plausible
Last Supper	Baptism of Jesus / baptism-metaphor for suffering	Birth stories
Resurrection stories	Petrine traditions	Temptation story
Teaching on divorce	Kingdom teaching	Beatitude to the poor
Wages for preachers	Jesus as revealer of the secrets of the kingdom	Other Sermon traditions
Olivet discourse	Woe against Jewish leaders	Son of Man-idiom
Nonretaliation	Stories of Jesus'	Righteousness of the

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid., 319.

⁵⁰⁵ Ibid., 323.

⁵⁰⁶ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995. Wenham does consider the disputed letters.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid., 381, ff.

(combined with Johannine love command)	involvement with sinners, women and poor	kingdom
Nothing is unclean	Renouncing family	Various parables
<i>Abba</i> as a prayer address	No marriage in the resurrection life	Church discipline

Furthermore, Gerry Schoberg has published a study in which some of Paul's more theological stances are shown to be dependent on Jesus' ministry:⁵⁰⁸

- Paul's fellowship with Gentile converts should be understood in light of Jesus' table fellowship with sinners.
- Paul's theology of finding life in death and suffering by somehow participating in Jesus' death is dependent on Jesus' words, especially those in which Jesus foretells his own death and suffering.
- Paul's eschatological (already/not yet) perspective is dependent on Jesus' eschatological inauguration of a new era, especially as seen in his healings on the sabbath day.

Taken together, these three studies show that Paul interacted with Jesus Tradition in much the same way as the authors of the Catholic Epistles did. Jesus Tradition was foundational to Paul's theology; he made use of it without spelling out the traditions.

Furthermore, the slight preference for Matthean traditions, and the familiarity with Sermon traditions, Olivet Discourse, Passion Narrative and Love Command (Synoptic and Johannine) show that Paul favored the same nuclear core of Jesus Tradition that seems to emerge from the present study.

⁵⁰⁸ *Perspectives of Jesus in the Writings of Paul. A Historical Examination of Shared Core Commitments with a View to Determining the Extent of Paul's Dependence on Jesus*, Cambridge: Pickwick Publications, 2013.

Excursus 2

Jesus Tradition Parallels in the Apostolic Fathers

In the table below, those parallels of the Apostolic Fathers to Jesus Tradition that have been identified in the footnotes of Ehrmann's *Apostolic Fathers*⁵⁰⁹ are listed in a table, in the same way as has been done in the concluding chapters and paragraphs of the present study throughout.

In a recent study,⁵¹⁰ Stephen Young has shown it to be likely that these parallels, as a rule, are recalled from memory and alluded to independently from written Gospel texts. In other words: the authors of the Apostolic Fathers (prior to 2 *Clem.*, that is), some fifty to one hundred years later, applied the same methods and used a similar body of Jesus Tradition as the New Testament letter-writers did in their day.⁵¹¹

Apostolic Fathers	Propositional agreement	Text in Jesus Tradition
<i>Ep.Diogn.</i> 9:6	<i>Anxiety on food and clothing</i>	Matt.6:25-31
<i>Ep.Diogn.</i> 11:7	<i>Johannine idiom: 'logos'</i>	John 1:1.14; 1 John 1:1
<i>Barn.</i> 4:14	<i>Many called, few chosen</i>	Matt.22:14
<i>Barn.</i> 5:9	<i>Not to call the righteous, but the sinners</i>	Matt. 9:13//Mark 2:17//Luke 5:32
<i>Barn.</i> 7:11	<i>Those who desire to see me and to gain my kingdom must receive me through affliction and suffering</i>	<i>Agraphon</i>

⁵⁰⁹ Bart D. Ehrman (translated and introduced by), *Apostolic Fathers* LCL 24 & 25, London: Harvard University Press, 2005.

⁵¹⁰ Stephen E. Young, *Jesus Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers*, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2011. Cf. Helmut Koester, 'Gospels and Gospel Traditions in the Second Century', in Andrew Gregory & Christopher Tuckett (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford: University Press, 2005, 27-44, who agrees on the prominence of oral tradition, but still emphasizes the role of second orality, and thereby, indirectly, the influence of written Gospels.

⁵¹¹ Similar in the sense that Jesus Tradition was known and understood as an oral corpus of sayings and narratives.

2 Clem.2:4	<i>Not to call the righteous, but the sinners</i>	Matt. 9:13//Mark 2:17//Luke 5:32
2 Clem.3:2	<i>Who acknowledges me ... I will acknowledge</i>	Matt. 10:32//Luke 12:8
2 Clem.4:2	<i>Not everyone who says 'Lord, Lord..'</i>	Matt.7:21// Luke 6:46
2 Clem.4:5	<i>I never knew you, depart from me</i>	Matt.7:23// Luke 13:25-27
2 Clem.5:4	<i>Sheep among wolves/snake and pigeon/ body and soul</i>	Matt.10:16- 28//Luke 10:3;12:4-5
2 Clem.6:1	<i>Two masters</i>	Matt.6:24// Luke 16:13
2 Clem.6:2	<i>Acquiring the world, forfeiting your life</i>	Matt.16:26// Mark 8:36// Luke 9:25
2 Clem.7:6	<i>Worm will not die, fire not be extinguished</i>	Mark 9:44-48
2 Clem.8:5	<i>Faithful in little, faithful in much</i>	Luke 16:10-12
2 Clem.9:11	<i>The will of my Father</i>	Matt.12:50// Mark 3:35// Luke 8:21
2 Clem.12:2	<i>The two become one</i>	<i>Gos.Thom.22</i>
2 Clem.13:4	<i>Love your enemies</i>	Luke 6:32.35
2 Clem.14:1	<i>My house a cave of thieves</i>	Matt.21:13// Mark 11:17// Luke 19:46
Mart.Pol.8:1	<i>Riding in on a donkey – great Sabbath</i>	Passion narrative
Mart.Pol.9:2-3	<i>Interrogation by Herod</i>	Id.
Mart.Pol.12:2-13:1	<i>The Jews call for Polycarp's death</i>	Id.
Mart.Pol.13:1-3	<i>Crucifixion of Polycarp</i>	Id.
Mart.Pol.18:2-3	<i>Followers collect bones</i>	Id.
Did.1:2	<i>Love command</i>	Matt.22:39-41

		(&pars.)
<i>Did.1:2</i>	<i>Golden rule</i>	Matt.7:12// Luke 6:31
<i>Did.1:3</i>	<i>Love your enemies</i>	Matt.5:44-47// Luke 6:28-35
<i>Did.1:4</i>	<i>Turn the other cheek</i>	Matt.5:39
<i>Did.1:4</i>	<i>Be perfect</i>	Matt.5:46
<i>Did.1:4</i>	<i>Go extra mile; cloak and shirt</i>	Matt.5:48
<i>Did.1:4</i>	<i>If someone seizes, don't ask back</i>	Matt.4:40-41// Luke 6:29-30
<i>Did.1:5</i>	<i>He will not get out until he has repaid all</i>	Matt.5:26// Luke 12:59
<i>Did.1:6</i>	<i>Charity sweats in hands</i>	<i>Agraphon</i>
<i>Did.3:7</i>	<i>The meek will inherit</i>	Matt.5:5
<i>Did.7:1</i>	<i>Baptism in name of Father, Son and Holy spirit</i>	Matt.28:19
<i>Did.8:1</i>	<i>Do not fast with hypocrites</i>	Matt.6:16
<i>Did.8:2</i>	<i>Do not pray with hypocrites</i>	Matt.6:5
<i>Did.8:2</i>	<i>Lord's prayer</i>	Matt.6:9-13
<i>Did.9:5</i>	<i>Do not give the holy to the dogs</i>	Matt.7:6
<i>Did.11:7</i>	<i>Sin against the Holy Spirit</i>	Matt.12:31
<i>Did.13:3</i>	<i>Teacher deserves his reward</i>	Matt.10:10
<i>Did.14:2</i>	<i>Reconcile before offering sacrifice</i>	Matt.5:23-24
<i>Did.16:1</i>	<i>Lamps and robes</i>	Luke 12:35-36
<i>Did.16:1</i>	<i>Not knowing the hour</i>	Matt.24:42// Luke 12:40// Mark 13:35-37
<i>Did.16:4</i>	<i>Increase of hate and persecution</i>	Matt.24:10-12
<i>Did.16:4</i>	<i>Deceiver performs signs and wonders</i>	Mark 13:22
<i>Did.16:5</i>	<i>The faithful will be saved</i>	Matt.24:10.13
<i>Did.16:5</i>	<i>Signs of truth</i>	Matt.24:30
<i>Did.16:5</i>	<i>Sign in the sky, sound of a trumpet</i>	Matt.24:31
<i>Did.16:5</i>	<i>The Lord on the clouds</i>	Matt.24:31
<i>1 Clem.2:1</i>	<i>Better to give than to receive</i>	<i>Agraphon</i>
<i>1 Clem.13:2</i>	<i>String of sayings</i>	Matt.5:7;6:14-15;7:1-2.12; Luke 6:31.36-

		38
1 Clem.15:2	<i>Honor me with lips</i>	Matt.15:8// Mark 7:6
1 Clem.24:5	<i>Sower parable</i>	Mark 4:3
1 Clem.46:8	<i>Better if he were not born / millstone</i>	Matt.26:24// Luke 17:2
Pol.Phil.2:3	<i>String of sayings</i>	Matt.7:1-2// Luke 6:36-38
Pol.Phil.7:2	<i>Not in temptation</i>	Matt.6:13
Pol.Phil.7:2	<i>Spirit willing, flesh weak</i>	Matt.26:41
Pol.Phil.12:3	<i>Pray for persecutors</i>	Matt.5:44// Luke 6:27
Ign.Eph.14:2	<i>Tree is known by its fruits</i>	Matt.12:33
Ign.Eph.17:1	<i>Jesus anointed</i>	Matt.26:7
Ign.Rom.	<i>Living water</i>	John 4:10.14
Ign.Phil.7:1	<i>Spirit exposes hidden things</i>	John 3:8
Ign.Phil.9:1	<i>Jesus is the door to the Father</i>	John 10:7.9
Ign.Sm.3:2	<i>Resurrection saying</i>	<i>Agraphon</i>
Ign.Pol.2:2	<i>Dove / snake</i>	Matt.10:16

Even if, generally speaking, the *Apostolic Fathers* write some decades later than most of the New Testament authors, the same rough preferences for certain strands of Jesus Tradition appear in the above table:

- The Sermon on the Mount/Plain remains very popular.
- Again there is a strong preference for the Matthean rendering of tradition.
- Many traditions are paralleled in the Matthean discourses.
- Both the Olivet Discourse (and Luke 12) and the Passion Narrative are favored.

However, with regard to the Olivet Discourse and the Passion Narrative, it has to be said that the Passion Narrative traditions appear almost singularly in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. Similarly, the Olivet Discourse is echoed extensively in *Didache*, but almost ignored in the rest of the *Apostolic Fathers*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achtemeier, Paul J., 1996, *1 Peter, A commentary on First Peter Hermeneia*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Adamson, Gary A., 'Redeem Your Soul by the Giving of Alms: Sin, Debt and the "Treasury of Merit" in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition', *L&S* 3 (2007), 39-69.
- Aland, Kurt (ed.), 1978, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 10. *Durchgesehene Auflage*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung.
- Allison, Dale C., 2013, *James ICC*, London: T&T Clark.
- Anderson, Paul N., 2014, 'The Community that Brown Left Behind', in R. Alan Culpepper & Paul N. Anderson (eds.), *Communities in Dispute. Current Scholarship on the Johannine Epistles*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 47-93.
- Anderson, Paul N. & Thatcher, Tom (eds.), 2016, *John, Jesus and History*, vol. 3: *Glimpses of Jesus through the Johannine Lens*, Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Aune, David E., 2003, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament & Early Christian Literature & Rhetoric*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Bailey, Kenneth E., 'Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels,' *AJT* 5 (1991), 34-54.
- Bakker, Egbert J., 'How Oral is Oral Composition?' in Mackay, E. Anne (ed.), 1999, *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Supplements to Mnemosyne 188, Leiden: Brill, 29-47.
- Balch, D., 1981, *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* SBLMS 26, Chico: Scholars' Press.
- Barker, Glenn W., Lane, William L. & Michaels, J. Ramsey, 1969, *The New Testament Speaks*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

- Bartolomae, Philipp, 2012, *The Johannine Discourses and the Teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics: A Contribution to the Discussion Concerning the Authenticity of Jesus' Words in the Fourth Gospel*, TAnZ 57, Tübingen: Francke.
- Batten, Alicia H. & Kloppenborg, John S., 2014, *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*, London: T&T Clark.
- Bauckham, Richard, 1983, *Jude – 2 Peter* WBC, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Bauckham, Richard, 1992, 'The Martyrdom of Peter in Early Christian Literature' in W. Haase (ed.): *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Part II, vol.26/1, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 539-95.
- Bauckham, Richard (ed.), 1998, *The Gospels for all Christians*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bauckham, Richard, 1998, 'For Whom Were the Gospels Written?', in Richard Bauckham (ed.): *The Gospels for all Christians*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 9-48.
- Bauckham, Richard, 1998, 'John for Readers of Mark', in Richard Bauckham (ed.): *The Gospels for all Christians*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 147-72.
- Bauckham, Richard, 1999, *James. Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage*, New York: Routledge.
- Bauckham, Richard, 2004, 'The Wisdom of James and the Wisdom of Jesus.' in J. Schlosser (ed.), *The Catholic Epistles and Tradition*. BETL 176, Leuven: Peeters, 75-92.
- Bauckham, Richard, 2006, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bauckham, Richard, 2007, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Bauer, Walter, 1934, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Baum, Armin D., 2004, *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühesten Christentum*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Baum, Armin D., 2008, *Der mündliche Faktor und seine Bedeutung für die synoptische Frage: Analogien aus der antiken Literatur, der Experimentalpsychologie, der Oral Poetry-Forschung und dem rabbinischen Traditionswesen*, TANZ 49, Tübingen: Francke.

Baum, Armin D., 2011, '„Babylon“ als Ortsnamenmetapher in 1 Petr 5,13 auf dem Hintergrund der antiken Literatur', in Stefan Heid (ed.), *Petrus und Paulus in Rom. Eine interdisziplinäre Debatte*, Freiburg: Herder, 180-220.

Bernhard, Andrew E., 2007, *Other Early Christian Gospels*, London: T&T Clark.

Best, Ernest, 1970, '1 Peter and the Gospel Tradition', *NTS* 16, 95-113.

Betz, H.D., 1995, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain Hermeneia*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Bigg, Charles, 1902, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Bird, Michael F., 2014, *The Gospel of the Lord: How the early Church Wrote the Story of Jesus*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Birdsall, J. Neville, 1999, 'Problems of the Clementine Literature' in James G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways AD 70-135*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 347-361.

Blomberg, Craig L., 2001, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel*, Downer's Grove: IVP.

Bock, Darrell L., 2007, *Acts* BECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Brooke, Alan England, 1912, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Brown, J. Pairman, 1963, 'Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form-History', *NTS* 10, 27-48.

Brown, Raymond R., 1966-70, *The Gospel of John*, AB 29-29a, Garden City: Doubleday.

Brown, Raymond R., 1979, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*, New York: Paulist.

Brown, Raymond R., 1982, *The Epistles of John; Translated with Introduction, Notes and Commentary AB 30*, Garden City: Doubleday.

Brown, Raymond R. (posthumously edited by Francis J. Maloney), 2003, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Callan, Terence, 2014, 'The Gospels of Matthew and John in the Second Letter of Peter,' in Alicia J. Batten & John S. Kloppenborg, *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*, London: T&T Clark, 166-180.

Carson, D.A., 1991, *The Gospel According to John*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Childs, Brevard, 2008, *The Church's Guide for Reading Paul. The Canonical Shaping of the Pauline Corpus*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Chilton, Bruce, 1986, 'The Gospel according to Thomas as a Source of Jesus' Teaching', in David Wenham (ed.), *Gospel Perspectives vol.5, The Jesus Tradition Outside the Canonical Gospels*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 155-175

Cirafesi, Wally V., 2014, 'The Johannine Community Hypothesis (168-Present): Past and Present Approaches and a New Way Forward', *CBR* 12(2), 173-93.

Coakley, Sarah, 2008, 'The identity of the Risen Jesus: Finding Jesus Christ in the Poor', in Beverly Roberts Gaventa & Richard B. Hays, *Seeking the Identity of Jesus, A Pilgrimage*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 301-325.

Crossan, John Dominic, 1986, *Sayings Parallels. A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Crossan, John Dominic, 2007, *God and Empire: Jesus against Rome, Then and Now*, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

- Culpepper, R. Alan, 1974, *The Johannine School. An Evaluation of the Johannine School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of Ancient Schools*. SBLDS 26, Missoula: Scholars Press.
- Culpepper, R. Alan & Black, C. Clifton (eds.), 1996, *Exploring the Gospel of John*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Culpepper, R. Alan & Anderson, Paul N. (eds.), 2014, *Communities in Dispute. Current Scholarship on the Johannine Epistles*, Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, 2016, 'Jesus Sayings in the Johannine Discourses: A Proposal', in Paul N. Anderson & Tom Thatcher (eds.), *John, Jesus and History*, vol. 3: *Glimpses of Jesus through the Johannine Lens*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 353-82.
- Dauids, Peter, 1982, *Commentary on James* NIGTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Dauids, Peter H., 1990, *The First Epistle of Peter* NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Dauids, Peter H., 2009, 'The Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Janus. A New Testament Glimpse into Old and New Testament Canon Formation', *BBR* 19.3, 403-416.
- Dauids, Peter H., 2015, 'What Reading is Truly Canonical? A Brief Response.' *JTI* 9.1, 137-48.
- Dauids, Peter H., 2014, 'Are the Others too Other? The Issue of "Others" in Jude and 2 Peter', in Eric F. Mason & Troy W. Martin (eds.), *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude*, 201-28.
- Dauids, Peter H., 2014, *A Theology of James, Peter and Jude*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Davies, R.E., 1970, 'Christ in our Place – The Contribution of the Prepositions', *TB* 21, 71-91.
- Davies, W.D., 1966, *The Setting of the sermon on the Mount*, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, W.D. & Allison, Dale C., 1997, *Commentary on Matthew* vol.III ICC, London: T&T Clark.

DeConick, April, 2008, 'Human Memory and the Sayings of Jesus', in Thatcher, Tom (ed.), *Jesus, the Voice and the Text*, Waco: Baylor University Press, 135-80.

Deppe, Dean B., 1989, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*, Chelsea: Bookcrafters.

Deppe, Dean B., 1990 [1989], *The Sayings of Jesus in the Paraenesis of James. A PDF Revision of the Doctoral Dissertation*, available online at: <https://archive.org/details/TheSayingsOfJesusInTheParaenesisOfJames>.

Derico, T.M., 2016, *Oral Tradition and Synoptic Verbal Agreement. Evaluating the Empirical Evidence for Literary Dependence*, Eugene: Pickwick Publications.

Deutsch, C.M., 1996, *Lady Wisdom, Jesus and the Sages: Metaphor and Social Context in Matthew's Gospel*, Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.

Dibelius, Martin, 1976, *James* (ed. H. Greeven), Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Dodd, C.H., 1946, *The Johannine Epistles* MNTC, London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Dodd, C.H., 1964, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Donaldson, T.L., 1983, 'Parallels, Use, Misuse and Limitations', *EvQ* 55, 193-210.

Donelson, Lewis R., 2014, 'Gathering Apostolic Voices: Who Wrote 1 and 2 Peter and Jude?', in Eric F. Mason & Troy W. Martin (eds.), *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude*, 11-26.

Dunn, James G., 1991, 'John and the Oral Gospel Tradition, in Henry Wansborough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* JSNTSup 64, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Dunn, James G., 2009, 'Kenneth Bailey's Theory of Oral Tradition: Critiquing Theodore Weeden's Critique', *JSHJ* 7, 44-62.

Dunn, James G., 2003, *Christianity in the Making*, vol. 1, *Jesus Remembered*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Dunn, James G., 2005, *A new Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Dunn, James G., 2009, *Christianity in the Making*, vol.2, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Dunn, James G., 2013, *The Oral Gospel Tradition*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Edwards, James R., 2009, *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of Synoptic Tradition*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ehrman, Bart D. (translated and introduced by), 2005, *Apostolic Fathers* LCL 24 & 25, London: Harvard University Press.

Ehrman, Bart D., 2013, *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eisenmann, Robert H., 1998, *James, the brother of Jesus*, New York: Penguin Books.

Elliott, John H., 1981 [1979], *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological exegesis of 1 Peter, its Situation and Strategy*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Elliott, John H., 'Review of Rainer Metzner, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangelium im 1. Petrusbrief*,' *JBL* 116/2 (summer 1997), 379-82.

Elliott, John H., 2000, *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* AB 37b, New York: Doubleday.

Eve, Eric, 2014, *Behind the Gospels. Understanding the Oral Tradition*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Feldmeier, Reinhard, 1992, *Die Christen als Fremde: Die Metapher der Fremde in der antiken Welt, im Urchristentum und im 1. Petrusbrief* WUNT 64, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Feldmeier, Reinhard, 2004, 'Salvation and Anthropology in 1 Peter', in Karl Wilhelm Niebuhr & Robert Wall: *The Catholic Epistles & Apostolic Tradition*, Waco: Baylor University Press, 203-13.

Feldmeier, Reinhard, 2008, *The First Letter of Peter: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (transl. Peter H. Davids), Waco: Baylor University Press.

Ferguson, Everett, ³2003, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ferguson, Everett, 2014, *The Early Church at Work and Worship*, Eugene: Wipf and Stock.

Floor, L., 1992, *Jakobus. Brief van een broeder CNT*, Kampen: Kok.

Foley, J.M., 2006, 'The Riddle of Q', in Horsley R.A. (ed.), *Oral Performance, Popular Tradition and Hidden Transcript in the Tradition of Q*, Atlanta: SBL Press.

France, R.T., 2007, *The Gospel of Matthew* NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Francis, F.O., 1970, 'The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John', *ZNW* 61, 110-26.

Frederiksen, Paula, 1999, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews*, New York: Vintage Books.

Furnish, V.P., 1973, *The Love Command in the New Testament* NTL, London: SCM Press.

Gathercole, Simon, 2004, 'The Son of Man in Mark's Gospel', *ExpT* 115, 366-72.

Gerhardsson, Birger, 1961, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, (trans. E.J. Sharpe), ASNU 22: Uppsala: Gleerup.

Gibson, Margaret Dunlop, 2011 [1903], *The Didascalia Apostolorum in English*, Cambridge: University Press.

Gilmour, Michael J., 2001, 'Reflections on the Authorship of 2 Peter', *EvQ* 73:4, 291-309.

Goodacre, Mark, 2002, *The Case Against Q. Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.

Green, Gene L., 2008, *Jude & 2 Peter* BECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Green, Gene L., 2014, , 'The Testimony of Peter: 2 Peter and the Gospel Traditions,' in Alicia J. Batten & John S. Kloppenborg, *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*, London: T&T Clark, 181-98.

Gründstäudl, Wolfgang & Nicklas, Tobias, 2014, 'Searching for Evidence: The History of Reception of the Epistles of Jude and 2 Peter', in Eric F. Mason & Troy W. Martin (eds.), *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude*, 215-228.

Grünstaudl, Wolfgang, 2015, "'On Slavery". A Possible Herrenwort in 2 Pet 2:19', *NovTest* 57, 57-71.

Gundry, Robert H., 1967, "'Verba Christi" in 1 Peter: Their Implications Concerning the Authorship of 1 Peter and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition', *NTS* 13, 336-50.

Gundry, Robert H., 1974, 'Further Verba on Verba Christi in First Peter', *Bib* 55, 211-32.

Haaker, Klaus, 1998, 'Justification, salut et foi: Étude sur les rapports entre Paul, Jacques et Pierre.' *ETR* 73.2, 177-88.

Hartin, Patrick J., 1991, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* JSNTSup 47, Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Hays, Richard B., 1989, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, Binghamton: Vaill-Ballou Press.

Hays, Richard B., 2008, 'The story of God's Son: The Identity of Jesus in the Letters of Paul', in Beverly Roberts Gaventa & Richard B. Hays, 2008, *Seeking the Identity of Jesus, A Pilgrimage*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 180-199.

Hengel, Martin, 1993, *Die johanneische Frage* WUNT 67, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Hengel, Martin, 2006, *Der unterschätzte Petrus. Zwei Studien*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck [transl. Thomas H. Trapp: *Saint Peter. The Underestimated Apostle*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010].

Hiestermann, Heinz Arnold, 2016, *Paul's Use of the Synoptic Tradition*, Pretoria: University of Pretoria, online at

https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/56971/Hiestermann_Paul_2016.pdf?sequence=1

Hillyer, Norman, 1971, 'Rock-Stone Imagery in 1 Peter', *TB* 22, 58-81.

Himes, Paul A., 2011, 'Peter and the Prophetic Word: The Theology of Prophecy Traced through Peter's Sermons and Epistles', *BBR* 21.2, 227-44.

Holloway, Paul A., 2009, *Coping with Prejudice: 1 Peter in Social-Psychological Perspective* WUNT 244, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Horrell, David G., 2014, 'Ethnicity, Empire and early Christian Identity: Social-Scientific Perspectives on 1 Peter', in Eric F. Mason & Troy W. Martin, *Reading 1 & 2 Peter and Jude*, Atlanta: SBL, 135-50.

Horrell, David G., 2014, 'Jesus Remembered in 1 Peter? Early Jesus Traditions, Isaiah 53, and 1 Peter 2.21-25', in Alicia H. Batten & John S. Kloppenborg: *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*, London: T&T Clark, 123-50.

Houwelingen, P.H.R. van, 1988, *De tweede trompet. De authenticiteit van de tweede brief van Petrus*, Kampen: Kok.

Houwelingen, P.H.R. van, 2005, *1 Petrus. Rondzendbrief uit Babylon* CNT, Kampen: Kok.

Houwelingen, P.H.R. van, 2007, *2 Petrus en Judas. Testament in tweevoud* CNT, Kampen: Kok.

Houwelingen, P.H.R. van, 2010, 'The Authenticity of 2 Peter: Problems and Possible Solutions', *EJT* 19:2, 119-29.

Houwelingen, P.H.R. van, 2011, *Apostelen. Draggers van een spraakmakend evangelie* CNT, Kampen: Kok.

Houwelingen, P.H.R., 2012, 'Vierstemmig evangelie. De traditiehypothese als oplossingsrichting in de synoptische kwestie', *TR* 55.1, 30-51.

Houwelingen, P.H.R. van, 2012, 'Jerusalem, the Mother Church. The Development of the Apostolic Church from the Perspective of Jerusalem,' *SF*, 11-32.

Houwelingen, P.H.R. van, 2014, 'John and the Others. To Whom Does the "We" in the Fourth Gospel's Prologue and Epilogue Refer?' *FR*, 95-115.

Howes, L., 2015, *Judging Q and Saving Jesus – Q's Contribution to the Wisdom-Apocalypticism Debate in Historical Jesus Studies*, Durbanville: Aosis.

Hultin, Jeremy F., 2014, 'The Literary Relationships Among 1 Peter, 2 Peter and Jude', in Eric F. Mason & Troy W. Martin, *Reading 1 & 2 Peter and Jude*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 27-46.

Hurtado, Larry, 2013, 'Interactive Diversity: A Proposed Model of Christian Origins,' *JTS* 64 (2): 445-62.

Hurtado, Larry, 2014, 'Oral Fixation and new Testament Studies? 'Orality', 'Performance' and Reading Texts in Early Christianity', *NTS* 60, 321-40.

Jackson-McCabe, M.A., 2001, *Logos and Law in the Letter of James*, Leiden: Brill.

Jeremias, Joachim, 1971, *New Testament Theology, Part One: The Proclamation of Jesus*, London: SCM Press.

Jewett, Robert, 2007, *Romans* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Jobs, Karen, 2003, 'The Syntax of 1 Peter: Just How Good is the Greek?', *BBR* 13.2, 159-73.

Johnson, Luke Timothy, 1982, 'The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James,' *JBL* 101, 391-401.

Johnson, Luke Timothy, 1995, *James* AB 37a, New York: Doubleday.

Johnson, Matthew, 2010, *Archaeological Theory. An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Jones, Brice C., 2011, *Matthean and Lukan Special Material. A Brief Introduction with texts in Greek and English*, Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Kähler, Martin, 1892, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus*, Leipzig: A. Deichert.

Käsemann, Ernst, 1964, 'An Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology,' in *Essays on New Testament Themes* (trans. W.J. Montague) SBT 41, London: SCM Press, 169-95.

Keith, Chris, 2011, *Jesus' Literacy. Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee*, London: T&T Clark.

Kennedy, George A., 2008, *Progymnasmata. Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, Leiden: Brill.

Kirk, J.R. Daniel, 2015, 'Mark's Son of Man and Paul's Second of Adam,' *HBT* 37, 170-95.

Klijn, A.F.J., 1973, *Na het Nieuwe Testament*, Baarn: Ten Have.

Kline, Leslie L., 1975, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* SBLDS 14, Missoula: SBL Press.

Kloppenborg, J.S., 1979, 'Didache 16:6-8 and special Matthean Tradition', *ZNW* 70, 54-67.

Kloppenborg, John S, 1999, Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.

Kloppenborg, John, 2008, *Q, The Earliest Gospel. An Introduction to the Original Sayings of Jesus*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Kloppenborg, John S., 2009, 'The Reception of the Jesus Tradition in James' in Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr & Robert Wall, *The Catholic Epistles & Apostolic Tradition*, Waco: Baylor University Press, 71-100.

Kloppenborg, John S., 2012, 'Memory, Performance and the Sayings of Jesus', *JSHJ* 10, 97-132.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., 1999, *Encountering John*, Grand Rapids: Baker.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., 2009, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Koester, Helmut, 1990, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, London: SCM Press.

Kümmel, Georg Werner, 1978, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed., Nashville: Abingdon.

Lalleman, Pieter J., 2005, *1,2, en 3 Johannes. Brieven van een kroongetuige* CNT, Kampen: Kok.

Lietaert Peerbolte, L.J., 1996, *The Antecedents of Antichrist*, Leiden: Brill.

Lieu, Judith M., 2014, 'The Audience of the Johannine Epistles', in R. Alan Culpepper & Paul N. Anderson (eds.), *Communities in Dispute. Current Scholarship on the Johannine Epistles*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 213-40.

Lindars, Barnabas, 2000, 'The Readers of the Gospel', in Barnabas Lindars, Ruth B. Edwards, John M. Court (eds.), *The Johannine Literature*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 62-79.

Lockett, Darian, 2012, *An Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*, London: T&T Clark.

Lockett, Darian R., 2015, 'Are the Catholic epistles a Canonically Significant Collection? A *Status Quaestionis*', *CBR* 14 (1), 62-80.

Lockett, Darian, 2017, *Letters from the Pillar Apostles, The Formation of the Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Collection*, Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Lüdemann, Gerd, 2014 [2000], *Jesus nach 2000 Jahren. Was er wirklich sagte und tat*. Springe: Klampen Verlag.

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

Martyn, J. Louis, 1968, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Mason, Eric F. & Martin, Troy W., 2014, *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude. A Resource for Students*, Atlanta: SBL Press.

Mason, Eric F., 2014, 'Biblical and Nonbiblical Traditions in Jude and 2 Peter: Sources, Usage, and the Question of Canon,' in Eric F. Mason & Troy W. Martin, *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 181-200.

Massebieau, L., 1895, 'L'Épître de Jacques; est-elle l'oeuvre d'un Chrétien?', *RHR* 32, 249-83.

- Matthews, Mark D., 2010, 'The Literary Relationship of 2 Peter and Jude: Does the Synoptic Tradition Solve this Synoptic Problem?' *Neotestamentica* 44.1, 47-66.
- Matthews, Mark D., 2011, 'The Genre of 2 Peter: A Comparison with Jewish and Early Christian Testaments', *BBR* 21.1, 51-64.
- McIver, Robert K., 2012, 'Eyewitnesses as Guarantors of the Accuracy of the Gospel Traditions in Light of Psychological Research,' *JBL* 131^{no3}, 529-46.
- Meeks, Wayne A., 1996, 'The Ethics of the Fourth Evangelist', in R. Alan Culpepper & C. Clifton Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Metzger, Bruce, 2002, *A Textual Commentary on the New Testament*, New York: UBS.
- Metzner, Rainer, 1995, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums im 1. Petrusbrief: Studien zum traditionsgeschichtlichen und theologischen Einfluss des 1. Evangeliums auf den 1. Petrusbrief*, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey, 1988, *1 Peter WBC*, Waco: Word Books.
- Miller, Robert J., 2010, *The Complete Gospels*, Salem: Polebridge.
- Moon, Jongyoon, 2009, *Mark as Contributive Amanuensis of 1 Peter?* Berlin: Lit Verlag.
- Mounce, Robert H., 1991, *Matthew NIBC*, Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Moyise, Steve, 2009, 'Jesus and Isaiah', *Neotestamentica* 43.2, 249-270.
- Neudorfer, Heinz-Werner & Schnabel, Eckhard J. (eds.), 2011, *Das Studium des Neuen Testaments*, Witten: Brockhaus.
- Nelson, M.E., 1996, 'Catechesis and Baptism in the Early Christian Church', *IdS* 30 (4), 443-56.
- Niebuhr, Karl Wilhelm & Wall, Robert, 2009, *The Catholic Epistles & Apostolic Tradition*, Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Nienhaus, David R., 2007, *Not by Paul Alone: The Formation of the Catholic Epistles Collection and the Christian Canon*, Waco: Baylor University Press.

Olson, Eric T., 2007, 'Who Are We?', *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 14, No.5 (6), 27-35.

Ong, Walter J., 2012, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*, New York: Routledge.

Painter, John, 1997, *Just James*, Columbia: University of South Caroline Press.

Painter John & deSilva, David A., 2012, *James and Jude Paideia*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Patterson, Stephen J., 1993, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, Sonoma: Polebridge Press.

Pennington, Jonathan T., 2009, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Pesch, Rudolph, 1977, *Das Markusevangeliums: Teil 2, Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27-16,20* HTKNT, Freiburg: Herder.

Pitre, Brant, 2005, *Jesus, The Tribulation and the End of the Exile*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Porter, Stanley E., 2008, 'Allusions and Echoes', in Porter, Stanley E. & Stanley, Christopher D. (eds.), *As it is Written. Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, Atlanta: SBL Press.

Porter, Stanley E. & Dyer, Bryan R. (eds.), 2016, *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Rainbow, Paul, 2014, *Johannine Theology. The Gospel, the Epistles and the Apocalypse*, Grand Rapids: IVP.

Redman, Judith, 2010, 'How Accurate are Eyewitnesses? Bauckham and the Eyewitnesses in Light of Psychological Research,' *JBL* 129, 177-97.

Resch, A., 1889, 'Agrapha, Ausserkanonische Evangelienfragmente,' in Gebhardt O. v. & Harnack A., *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, V. Band, 4. Heft, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

Richards, E. Randolph, 1991, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, Tübingen: Mohr.

Richards, E. Randolph, 2000, 'Silvanus Was not Peter's Secretary. Theological Bias in Interpreting διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ... ἔγραψα in 1 Peter 5:12,' *JETS* 43/3, 417-432.

Riesner, Rainer, 1981, *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*, WUNT 2/7, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.

Riesner, Rainer, 1981, 'Jüdische Elementarbildung und Evangelienüberlieferung,' in France, R.T. & Wenham, David (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, vol.1, Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Robbins, Vernon K., 2006, 'Interfaces of Orality and Literature in the Gospel of Mark', in Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper & John Miles Foley (eds.), *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory and Mark*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 125-46.

Roberts Gaventa, Beverly & Hays, Richard B. (eds.), 2008, *Seeking the Identity of Jesus, A Pilgrimage*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Robinson, James R. & Koester, Helmut, 1971, *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Robinson, J.A.T., 1976, *Redating the New Testament*, London: SCM Press.

Ropes, James Hardy, 1948 [1916], *Epistle of St. James* ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Ruf, Martin, 2011, *Die heiligen Profeten, euere Apostel, und ich: Metatextuelle studien zum zweiten Petrusbrief*. WUNT 2/300. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Ruyter, B.W.J. de, 1998, *De gemeente van de evangelist Johannes: haar polemieken en geschiedenis*, Delft: Eburon.

Sandmel, Samuel, 1962, 'Parallelomania', *JBL* 81 (1), 1-13.

Schaff, Philip (ed.), 2007 [1888], *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series I, Volume 7: St. Augustine: *Homilies on the Gospel of John; Homilies on the First Epistle of John; Soliloquies*, New York: Cosimo Classics.

- Schlösser, J. (ed.), 2004, *The Catholic Epistles and Tradition*, BETL 176, Leuven: Peeters.
- Schoberg, Gerry, 2013, *Perspectives of Jesus in the Writings of Paul. A Historical Examination of Shared Core Commitments with a View to Determining the Extent of Paul's Dependence on Jesus*, Cambridge: Pickwick Publications.
- Schröter, Jens, 2006, 'Jesus and the Canon: The Early Jesus Traditions in the Context of the Origins of the New Testament Canon', in Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper & John Miles Foley (eds.), *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory and Mark*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 104-122.
- Schröter, Jens, 2013, *From Jesus to the New Testament: Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the New Testament Canon*, Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Schweitzer, Albert, 1906, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Smith, Murray J., 2015, 'The Lord Jesus and His Coming in the Didache', in Jonathan A. Draper & Clayton N. Jefford, *The Didache. A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 363-408.
- Spicq, Ceslas, 1966, 'La I^a Petri et le témoignage évangélique de Saint Pierre', *ST* 20, 37-61.
- Spitta, F., 1896, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums, Zweiter Band: Der Brief des Jakobus; Studien zum Hirten Hermas*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Stenschke, Christoph, 2008, "'...Das auserwählte Geschlecht, die königliche Priesterschaft, das heilige Volk" (1 Petr 2.9): Funktion und Bedeutung der Ehrenbezeichnungen Israels im 1. Petrusbrief', *Neotestamentica* 42.1, 119-146.
- Streeter, B.H., 1930, *The Four Gospels*, London: MacMillan & Co.
- Talbert, Charles H., 2010, *Matthew Paideia*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye, 1992, *1-3 John IVPNTC*, Downer's Grove: IVP Academic.

Thompson, Marianne Meye, 2008, 'Word of God, Messiah of Israel, Savior of the World: Learning the Identity of Jesus from the Gospel of John', in Beverly Roberts Gaventa & Richard B. Hays, *Seeking the Identity of Jesus, A Pilgrimage*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 166-79.

Turner, C.H., 1926, 'O YIOC MOY O ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟC', *JTS* 27, 113-129.

Uro, Risto (ed.), 1998, *Thomas at the Crossroads. Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*, London: T&T Clark.

Wachob, Wesley Hiram, 2000, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James* SNTSMS 106, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wansborough, Henry (ed.), 1991, *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Wall, Robert W., 1997, *The Community of the Wise; The Book of James* NTC, Harrisburg: Trinity Press.

Watson, Duane F., 1991, *Persuasive Artistry*, Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Watson, Duane F., 2014, 'Early Jesus Tradition in 1 Peter 3:18-22', in Alicia H. Batten & John S. Kloppenborg (eds.), *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*, London: T&T Clark, 151-65.

Watt, Jan van der, 2007, *An Introduction to the Johannine Gospel and Letters*, London: T&T Clark.

Webb, Robert L., 2007, 'The Rhetoric of 2 Peter: An Apologia for Early Christian Ethics (and not "Primitive Christian Eschatology")' in Duncan Burns & John W. Rogerson: *In Search of Philip R. Davies; Whose Festschrift is it Anyway?*, London: T&T Clark.

Weeden, Theodore, 2009, 'Kenneth Bailey's Theory of Oral Tradition: A Theory Contested by its Own Evidence,' *JSHJ* 7, 3-43.

Wenham, David (ed.), 1986, *Gospel Perspectives* vol.5. *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Wenham, David, 1995, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wilder, Terry L., 2004, *Pseudonymity, the New Testament and Deception*, Lanham: University Press of America.

Willett, M.E., 1992, *Wisdom Christology in the Fourth Gospel*, San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press.

Williams, Travis B., 2013, 'Reading Social Conflict through Greek Grammar: Reconciling the Difficulties of the Fourth-Class Condition in 1 Pet 3,14', *FN* - vol. XXVI, 117-34.

Witherington III, Ben, 1994, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Witherington III, Ben, 2007, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*, vol. II. *A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1-2 Peter*, Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Worthington, Ian (ed.), 2010, *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, Chichester: Blackwell Publishing.

Wright, D.F., 1987 'Four Other Gospels: Review Article', *Themelios* 12, 56-60.

Wright, N.T., 1996, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Young, Stephen E., 2011, *Jesus Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers. Their Explicit Appeals to the Words of Jesus in Light of Orality Studies* WUNT 311, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Zwiep, Arie W., 2004, *Judas and the Choice of Mathias: A Study of Context and Concern of Acts 1:15-26*, WUNT 187, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.

Abstract

Jesus Tradition – early Christian traditions from and about Jesus - plays an important role in New Testament letters, not only in the Gospels and Corpus Paulinum, but also in the seven Catholic Epistles. This dissertation revolves around the relationship between the Catholic Epistles and the traditions about Jesus that have informed the Gospels. Based on the research, two important observations can be made.

First of all, there is a fundamental unity in the witness of the Catholic Epistles regarding their reliance upon and appropriation of Jesus Tradition. The same Jesus can be recognized throughout all Catholic Epistles (with the possible exception of Jude, since its brevity does not supply enough information for clarity about its relation to Jesus Tradition), and this Jesus is not merely a theological construct, but a historical person, very much in line with the Jesus from historical Jesus-research.

Second, a fundamental unity is observable between the canonical Gospels, Corpus Paulinum and the Catholic Epistles. All three corpora are consciously witnessing to Jesus. Each corpus has its own distinct way of doing this, and the Catholic Epistles can be seen as witnessing Jesus from an apostolic perspective.

The Pillars and the Cornerstone – Nederlandse samenvatting

Inleiding en onderzoeksvraag

In deze studie, *The Pillars and the Cornerstone – Jesus Tradition in the Catholic Epistles*, wordt de relatie tussen traditiemateriaal van en over Jezus en de zeven ‘Katholieke’ Brieven (Jakobus, 1 en 2 Petrus, 1, 2 en 3 Johannes en Judas) onderzocht.

Eenzijds vloeit dit onderzoek voort uit de toegenomen aandacht voor en erkenning van de Katholieke Brieven als canonieke groep binnen het Nieuwe Testament. Verwijzend naar de apostelen ‘die als steunpilaren golden’ (Galaten 2:9) wordt deze groep tegenwoordig ook wel de ‘Pillar collection’ genoemd.

Anderzijds staat dit onderzoek in het kader van de huidige discussie rondom de aard en herkomst van de tradities die ten grondslag liggen aan de evangeliën (‘Jesus Tradition’). In de afgelopen decennia is er toenemende aandacht gekomen voor de mondelinge factor in de overdracht van dit traditiemateriaal.

De centrale vraagstelling van dit onderzoek is:

Welke parallellen met Jesus Tradition kunnen gevonden worden in de Katholieke Brieven? En hoe informeren deze parallellen ons over de relatie tussen Jesus Tradition en de Katholieke Brieven, zowel op historisch als op theologisch niveau?

Om deze vragen te kunnen beantwoorden, zijn een aantal stappen doorlopen:

Ten eerste is een verkennend onderzoek gedaan naar *Jesus Tradition*: wat is het precies, en hoe werd dit traditiemateriaal doorgegeven en gewaardeerd onder de eerste christenen?

Ten tweede is een bruikbare methodiek ontwikkeld om aan de hand van vier criteria parallellen tussen passages uit de Katholieke Brieven en *Jesus Tradition* vast te kunnen stellen.

Ten derde is die methodiek toegepast, door individuele parallellen tussen passages uit de Katholieke Brieven en *Jesus Tradition* te identificeren, te beschrijven en te becommentariëren.

Hoofdstuk 1: Jesus Tradition en methodiek

Over het traditiemateriaal dat ten grondslag ligt aan de evangeliën worden in het eerste hoofdstuk allereerst twee observaties gedaan:

De canonieke evangeliën hebben bewust traditiemateriaal weergegeven en verwerkt. *Jesus Tradition* werd gezien als geworteld in historische gebeurtenissen en juist dit materiaal was van fundamenteel belang voor de gemeenschap(pen) van de eerste christenen, die het doorgaven in een wereldwijde beweging van volgelingen van Jezus.

Daarnaast zijn er vele tradities in niet-canonieke vroegchristelijke geschriften te vinden (de zogeheten *Agrapha*) die uit dezelfde of een vergelijkbare bron putten: het fenomeen *Jesus Tradition* is breder dan wat in het Nieuwe Testament over Jezus verteld wordt.

Vervolgens is een verkennende studie uitgevoerd naar de manier waarop het traditiemateriaal in de eerste eeuw van onze jaartelling werd doorgegeven. Hoe konden evangelie- en briefschrijvers van het Nieuwe Testament met dit materiaal in aanraking komen en hoe zouden zij het verwerken? Enkele conclusies:

- Mondelinge overdracht van het traditiemateriaal is van grote invloed geweest op hoe de nieuwtestamentische auteurs *Jesus Tradition* kenden, begrepen en verwerkten.
- Deze overdracht leunt soms op de technieken van antieke ongeletterde gemeenschappen, soms op meer ontwikkelde en retorische technieken, maar over het algemeen gaat het om een mengeling van technieken. Dit type overdracht staat garant voor de nodige stabiliteit, maar verklaart tegelijk een zekere mate van flexibiliteit, zoals die ook te vinden is in parallele passages uit de evangeliën.
- De basale technieken die worden aangeboden in eerste- en tweede-eeuwse retorische onderwijsboeken (*Progymnasmata*) geven een goede indruk van de manier waarop de

nieuwtestamentische auteurs dit traditiemateriaal op hun beurt verwerkt hebben: met grote vrijheid, maar wel herkenbaar. Naast deze 'progymnastische' schrijftechniek is ook een meer Joodse manier van werken herkenbaar, met name in de brief van Jakobus, wanneer de wijsheidsspreuken van Jezus worden omgevormd tot zelfstandige wijsheidsspreuken.

In de hoofdstukken 2-5 zijn de parallellen met *Jesus Tradition* uit de Katholieke Brieven onderzocht. Met name die parallellen waarin uitdrukkingen en ideeën zodanig worden weergegeven, dat aannemelijk is dat ze er alleen maar zó staan, omdat ze ergens in *Jesus Tradition* op vergelijkbare wijze worden toegepast. Daarbij is gebruikgemaakt van vier criteria:

1. Woordelijke overeenstemming: zijn er woorden (of misschien één opvallend woord) die ook gebruikt worden in de parallelle passage?
2. Inhoudelijke overeenstemming: is de betekenis-inhoudelijke waarde van een passage vergelijkbaar met die van de parallel?
3. Conceptuele analogie: is de parallelle passage vanuit *Jesus Tradition* in lijn met wat de auteur wil zeggen?
4. Toegankelijkheid: is het waarschijnlijk dat de auteur toegang had tot een bron waarin hij deze parallel kon vinden?

Hoofdstuk 2-5: Parallellen onderzocht en beschreven

In de brief van Jakobus zijn drieëntwintig parallellen met passages uit *Jesus Tradition* gevonden.

Uit de individuele parallellen kan het volgende worden geconcludeerd:

1. Jakobus kende een traditie die veel overeenkomst vertoonde met de Bergrede (Matteüs 5-7, dan wel Lucas 6). Elf keer zijn er parallellen tussen Jakobus en deze traditie.
2. Zeven maal heeft Jakobus een parallel met niet-synoptisch *Jesus Tradition*-materiaal, zowel uit het Johannesevangelie en het boek Openbaring als uit buitenbijbelse bronnen.
3. Hiernaast zijn er nog enkele parallellen met synoptische passages, anders dan de Bergrede.

4. De parallellen met *Jesus Tradition* zijn opvallend eschatologisch van aard, zeker wanneer bedacht wordt dat Jakobus tot het domein van wijsheidsliteratuur gerekend kan worden. Met name eschatologische omkering (bijvoorbeeld: de nederige wordt verhoogd; de arme wordt rijk) is een terugkerend motief in deze parallellen.
5. Het voorgaande versterkt de gedachte dat Jakobus' theologie sterk door Jezus' onderwijs is beïnvloed en gekleurd.

In de eerste brief van Petrus zijn eenentwintig parallellen gevonden. Deze kunnen onderverdeeld worden naar mogelijke bronnen:

1. Er zijn acht parallellen met de Bergrede.
 - a. Hierin springt vooral de terugkerende parallel met Matteüs 5 in het oog.
 - b. Dit wil niet zeggen dat de auteur het evangelie van Matteüs kende.
2. Negen maal zijn er parallellen met het passieverhaal en/of de gebeurtenissen die naar het lijden en sterven van Jezus toewerken. Het is goed mogelijk dat Petrus een bron gebruikt heeft waarin het passieverhaal (gecombineerd met eraan voorafgaande gebeurtenissen, zoals lijdensaankondigingen) op zichzelf stond.
3. Zeven keer is er een parallel met passages uit het Johannesevangelie.
 - a. Kennelijk kende de auteur enkele Johanneïsche tradities.
 - b. De passages uit Johannes hebben (anders dan bij die uit Jakobus) geen parallellen in de synoptische evangeliën.
 - c. Opvallend zijn de verwijzingen naar het liefdegebod, zoals we dat kennen uit het Johannesevangelie (Johannes 13:34-35).
4. Tweemaal is er een opmerkelijke verwijzing naar tradities die specifiek over de apostel Petrus gaan.
5. Er zijn twee parallellen met Lucas 12: dit hoofdstuk heeft enkele in het oog springende kenmerken (op sommige momenten parallel lopend met de eschatologische rede van Jezus), maar het is niet kenmerkend genoeg om aan een aparte bron te denken.

6. Verder zijn er nog enkele parallellen met synoptische tradities en op sommige momenten een woordgebruik dat overeenkomsten heeft met *Jesus Tradition*.

In de brieven van Johannes zijn verschillende parallellen gevonden.

1. Zes parallellen met het evangelie van Johannes. Dit is niet verwonderlijk, aangezien de Johanneïsche geschriften dikwijls als een gesloten literair systeem beschouwd worden (zie echter bij 2b).
2. Dertien parallellen met het evangelie van Matteüs.
 - a. De inhoudelijke overeenstemming is doorgaans sterker dan de woordelijke overeenstemming: dit kan deels verklaard worden door het eigen idioom van de Johanneïsche geschriften.
 - b. Het cumulatieve effect van deze parallellen is vrij sterk: hoogstwaarschijnlijk heeft de auteur kennis gehad van synoptisch traditiemateriaal. Dit weersprekt de voorstelling van de Johanneïsche geschriften als gesloten systeem (zie bij 1).
 - c. Sterker dan bij Jakobus en 1 Petrus valt de voorkeur van de auteur voor het Matteüsevangelie op: met name de 'onderwijsblokken' uit dit evangelie worden aangehaald. Dit hoeft niet te wijzen op literaire afhankelijkheid, maar een 'familieband' op bronnenniveau lijkt waarschijnlijk.
 - d. De ordening van de 'onderwijsblokken' uit Matteüs blijft niet gehandhaafd: enkele parallellen met Matteüs 7:15-23 lijken thematisch gelinkt te worden aan Jezus' eschatologische rede.
3. Op enkele plaatsen lijkt de eerste brief ook parallellen te hebben met enkele passages uit het *Evangelie van de Hebreëen*.
 - a. In de weergave van het liefdegebod stemmen 1 Johannes en het *Evangelie van de Hebreëen* overeen wat accentuering betreft.
 - b. Hierin stemt 1 Johannes ook opvallend overeen met Jakobus 2:15-16.
 - c. Deze parallellen zijn niet zeker, maar de mogelijkheid dient zich nadrukkelijk aan.

Ook in 2 Petrus en Judas zijn parallellen gevonden. De tweede brief van Petrus (dertien parallellen) laat een vergelijkbaar beeld zien als Jakobus, 1 Petrus en 1 Johannes. De brief van Judas geeft minder duidelijkheid. Er zijn wel twee mogelijke parallellen, maar die vinden we ook terug in corresponderende verzen uit 2 Petrus. Laatstgenoemde brief geeft in die gevallen sterker de indruk zich bewust te zijn van de parallel. Hieruit kunnen echter geen vergaande conclusies worden getrokken, aangezien Judas te kort is om een representatief beeld te geven.

1. Op vijf verschillende plekken vinden we in 2 Petrus parallellen met de eschatologische rede.
 - a. Er is een voorkeur voor Matteüs 24-25 en eventueel Marcus 13 boven Lucas 21.
 - b. Opvallend is dat tradities uit *Didache* 16 en Lucas 12 meespelen.
 - c. Er zijn opmerkelijke parallellen met 1 Tessalonicenzen en het boek Openbaring.
2. Ook in de tweede brief van Petrus vinden we (drie maal) verwijzingen naar tradities die specifiek over de apostel Petrus gaan.
3. Daarnaast zijn er nog vier tradities uit diverse (Bijbelse en buitenbijbelse) bronnen.

Hoofdstuk 6: Conclusies; traditieblokken en de perceptie van Jezus

Alles overziende, blijkt dat zevenenzestig passages uit *Jesus Tradition* op honderd afzonderlijke momenten een parallel vinden in de Katholieke Brieven. Drieënzestig van deze honderd parallellen kunnen 'waarschijnlijk' genoemd worden; zevenendertig kunnen 'mogelijk' genoemd worden.

Deze parallellen brengen ons een stap dichterbij het fenomeen *Jesus Tradition*. Dikwijls is er al onderscheid gemaakt tussen verschillende stromingen en bronnen die ten grondslag zouden liggen aan de vier canonieke evangeliën, vooral in Streeters vierbronnenhypothese (met name een oer-Marcus, 'Q', 'L' en 'M'). Dit onderzoek laat zien dat inderdaad in termen van stromingen en bronnen gedacht kan worden, echter: de 'traditieblokken' die mogelijkerwijs onderscheiden kunnen

worden zijn anders dan de bronnen die men meestal noemt. Met name moet gedacht worden aan:

1. De Bergrede
2. De eschatologische rede
3. Johanneïsche tradities
4. Het passieverhaal
5. Verhalen over apostelen (met name Petrus)

Het gebruik van *Jesus Tradition* in de Katholieke Brieven zegt ook iets over de visie van de auteurs op Jezus. Behalve dat in deze brieven op een theologische manier over Hem gesproken wordt, hebben de auteurs Hem als een historische persoon gezien:

1. De parallellen in Jakobus schetsen Jezus als Joodse wijsheidsleraar.
2. De parallellen in 1 Petrus schetsen Jezus als een uniek voorbeeld om na te volgen, in lijden en sterven.
3. De parallellen in de brieven van Johannes schetsen Jezus als leraar van liefde en radicale verdraagzaamheid.
4. De parallellen in 2 Petrus (en Judas) schetsen Jezus als een eschatologisch/apocalyptische profeet.

Samen vormen deze schetsen een portret van Jezus dat veel lijkt op degene die we kennen uit het zogeheten 'onderzoek naar de historische Jezus'. Ook blijkt hoe dicht de historische persoon Jezus door het onderzoeken van *Jesus Tradition* benaderd kan worden.

Tot slot kan vastgesteld worden dat de Katholieke Brieven het onderling, maar ook samen met de rest van het Nieuwe Testament, fundamenteel eens zijn over welke Jezustradities van blijvend belang zijn. De vier langere brieven (Jakobus, 1 en 2 Petrus en 1 Johannes) geven op dit punt een vergelijkbaar beeld, dat ook grotendeels overeenstemt met de relatie van Paulus' brieven tot *Jesus Tradition*. Jezus blijkt inderdaad de hoeksteen en de rots te zijn waarop de 'steunpilaren' verder hebben willen bouwen. Het getuigenis over Jezus Christus dat de Katholieke Brieven geven is daarmee voluit apostolisch te noemen.

Curriculum Vitae

Roelof Alkema
Meidoornlaan 12
9736 CG, Sauwerd
The Netherlands

Roelof is currently serving as a pastor at *DE STADSKERK* in Groningen.

Education

- 2013-2018 External PhD-student at TU Kampen
2010-2012 MA New Testament Theology, TU Kampen
2007-2010 Evangelische Theologische Academie, Zwijndrecht

Teaching

- 2012-present New Testament Course ETS for evangelisch college,
Zwijndrecht

Publications

- 2018 *The Pillars and the Cornerstone: Jesus Tradition in the Catholic Epistles*, Delft: Eburon.
2013 'Jacobus en de wet: de daad bij het woord', *Soteria* 30.2, 15-22.
2010 'Een messiaanse lezing van de liederen van de Opgangen', *Soteria* 27.2, 30-39.