1

1 Peter and the Modern Discourse on the Use of Scripture

Introduction

THE GROWING LITERATURE ON the use of scripture in the New Testament points to an ongoing struggle to come to grips with how the early church drew upon the Hebrew scriptures.[1] This volume contributes to this literature by considering the role of Isaiah in 1 Peter. This brief epistle contains numerous uses of scripture both explicit and subtle in their deployment. Isaiah stands out as the most prominent source in terms of proportion (well over half the quotations in 1 Peter are from Isaiah) and distribution (each chapter in 1 Peter draws upon Isaiah). First Peter is not alone in its appropriation of Isaiah. A brief perusal of the index "*Loci citati vel allegati*" in NA27 provides evidence that, apart from the Psalter, Isaiah has been drawn upon more than any other source by the authors of the NT. This strongly suggests that Isaiah was formative in the thought of the early church. The extent to which this was true in general, we may expect the same to be true for 1 Peter in particular. For all its brevity, 1 Peter gives voice to some of the issues theologians have raised throughout the ages regarding the relationship of the two testaments in the Christian canon.

Many have focused on the way scripture has influenced the christology of 1 Peter, and rightfully so.[2] One need only look at the way Isaiah 53

1. The work of Childs (*Struggle to Understand Isaiah*, 5–21) immediately comes to mind. After a brief review of the Septuagint, he locates the impetus of the Christian struggle with Isaiah in the NT.

2. Achtemeier ("Christology of 1 Peter," 147) makes the point that Isaiah "plays a key role in this important passage for understanding the Christology of 1 Peter." He sees more of a general "appropriation of the language of Israel for the Christian communities" in 1 Peter ("Suffering Servant," 187; "Christology of 1 Peter," 142–43) rather

is put to use in 1 Pet 2:21–25 to identify the important dynamic between scripture and christology. However, 1 Peter issues bold statements regarding the relationship between the church and the scriptures emanating from Israel's history. For instance, the claim is made that the church is the intended audience of the prophets of old (1 Pet 1:10–12). Throughout 1 Peter, issues concerning the nature and purpose of the church (2:6–10) or concerning the conduct of believers (2:12—3:16) draw directly upon Isaiah, insisting that scripture speaks to the concerns of the church. In many instances, christological claims built on scripture—such as the use of Isaiah 53 in 1 Pet 2:21–25—reveal themselves to be ecclesiological appropriations of scripture on closer inspection. In this particular case, 1 Pet 2:21 establishes that the christology built on Isaiah 53 serves as an example (ὑπογραμμός) for the church to follow. There has not yet been a study devoted to the correlation of Isaianic texts and the ecclesiology 1 Peter.

I propose that the ecclesiology of 1 Peter draws upon the narrative of the restoration of divine presence among his people presently experiencing suffering, which is informed largely by the themes and images of the Isaianic corpus, so that the church is identified as participants in this scriptural narrative through its participation in Christ, who is understood to be the messiah of the scriptures. The narrative of Isaiah, and most prominently Isaiah 40–66, depicts a suffering people who receive the good news of God's restored presence. First Peter takes up this narrative in order to address the churches of Asia Minor with a story that meaningfully situates their suffering within an unfolding drama. The gospel message of the Christ event provides the means by which the scriptures of Israel are able to address the Anatolian churches and by which the churches are enabled to participate in the scriptural story.

In order to fully attend to this Petrine construction of ecclesiology with Isaianic texts, several factors must be addressed.[3] The hermeneutics employed in 1 Peter, to the extent that they are made explicit, must be considered in connection with observations about what texts are used, how they are used, interrelationships between texts and their ultimate deployment in specific rhetorical settings. The cumulative picture from such observations

---

than a more direct connection between Isaiah and ecclesiology. Affirmations of the connection between Isaiah and Petrine christology have most often occurred within the confines of hymnic theories (e.g., Schlosser, "Ancien Testament et christologie," 65–96; Osborne, "Guide Lines," 381–408; Richard, "Functional Christology," 121–40; Pearson, *Christological and Rhetorical Properties*).

3. Important works on the ecclesiology of 1 Peter generally approach the question from the vantage point of socio-rhetorical methods without connecting Peter's theology of the church to scripture. Representative works are Elliott, *Home for the Homeless*; Feldmeier, *Die Christen*; Schlosser, "'Aimez la fraternité.'"

reveals for us some of the interpretive techniques by which scripture was brought to bear upon questions centering on the church. Of course, to consider *how* a text was read requires a knowledge of *what* the text said. A recent flowering of scholarship on the Septuagint has brought to our attention key questions about the state of the text in the first century. Comparisons must be made between the text as quoted in 1 Peter and the evidence available for the text of scripture. Differences between Petrine quotations and their *Vorlagen* may reveal interpretive strategies. Yet, not every use of scripture provides enough material for text-critical evaluations. Cases such as these complicate the attempt to analyze thoroughly all the uses of scripture. But the overall effect of the uses of scripture in the letter allows us to arrive at positive conclusions about Petrine hermeneutics.[4]

The present thesis considers how Isaiah is drawn upon to address the concerns of the various churches in Asia Minor. Inasmuch as 1 Peter is a pastoral address to the far-flung communities of ancient Anatolia, it is necessary to consider the situation of the audience and the strategies employed to minister to that audience. Thus, another factor to be addressed in this thesis is a consideration of how Peter *applied* scripture to his audience. It is the pastoral role taken up by Peter that reveals much about what texts are selected and how they are employed within the context of the letter. In short, the individual uses of scripture point to a larger scriptural narrative in which the addressees are depicted as participants. Through this narrative, Peter is able to account for present suffering by showing that suffering is integral to the scriptural narrative, but so too is future glory, which is presented as the hope of believers.

A thorough study of Petrine hermeneutics is overdue in light of advances in research on 1 Peter as well as continuing conversations about the interpretive practices in the first century. Well over thirty years have elapsed

---

4. The term "scripture" is preferred to "Old Testament." "Scripture" is used when discussing texts that would have been authoritative at the time 1 Peter was written. To use the phrase "Old Testament" in this instance would be anachronistic on two levels. "Old Testament" implies a set of canonical texts, which are now considered to be unstable at the time of 1 Peter. The idea of an "old" testament implies a "new" testament, a distinction that does not pertain in 1 Peter. In chapter 2 the term "prophets" will be argued as Old Testament prophets who are contrasted with contemporary gospel preachers. This is done largely because the scholarly discussion has maintained use of this terminology. The phrase "Old Testament" will be used in rare cases to signify the 39 books contained in the Old Testament. The phrase "Hebrew Bible/Scriptures" is not helpful here because it is most likely that Greek was the language of the scriptures read and cited by Peter as well as what was available in Asia Minor. The phrase "scriptural discourse" is used throughout to denote the presence of formative scriptural subtexts revealed in Petrine contexts through quotation, allusion or echo. See Greene, *Light in Troy*, 50–51.

since Elliott's famously titled review of research on 1 Peter, "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-child."[5] Most studies on 1 Peter since then reflect a certain obligation to interact with the image of 1 Peter as in need of rehabilitation because it often receives less attention than other family members such as the Gospels or the writings of Paul. Indeed, since 1976, when Elliott wrote his review of research, a considerable amount of attention has been given to 1 Peter. It is not the place of the present study to assess the state of well-being of this brief but important epistle. There may still be a certain amount of neglect and ill-usage even to this day. Perhaps the present work will go some way toward a greater sense of the critical role 1 Peter ought to play within NT studies.

In this chapter, the backdrop of this study will be erected. It begins by surveying the field of scholarly discussion centered on the use of scripture in 1 Peter. The present study adds to this discussion by pointing to the distinctive contribution scripture makes to the ecclesiology of 1 Peter. Pauline hermeneutics has seen a wellspring of focused attention in ways that have not been present in the Petrine discussion. By listening in on the Pauline discussion concerning the use of scripture, strategies are opened that will better enable us to explore the role scripture plays in the ecclesiology of 1 Peter, and to explain how the scriptural narrative informs the identity of the church. Following on this, sections will be devoted to studying the audience and the author. Understanding the original audience allows us to picture more clearly the first people addressed by 1 Peter. At the same time, there exists a tension between the general nature of the address—highlighted by the circulatory nature of the epistle—and the ever-growing knowledge of ancient Anatolia. So, inasmuch as it is possible to do so, a sketch of the recipients in Asia Minor is offered to clarify who is being pictured as participants in the narrative of scripture. If the ecclesiology of 1 Peter is informed by a scriptural narrative, it is therefore necessary to consider how the author has interacted with the texts of scripture. Here, recent discussions surrounding Paul may be leveraged to provide insights for how Peter has accessed scriptural texts.

Scholarly Background to the Present Study

This is not the first study to consider the role of scripture in 1 Peter. The scholarly discussion has generally treated the subject of scripture in 1 Peter in an atomistic fashion. The present thesis seeks to articulate a more comprehensive and holistic study of scripture than heretofore achieved. To

5. Elliott, "Rehabilitation," 243–54.

situate better the current study in this discussion, I begin with an overview of this scholarly background. Numerous topics are tied up in any scholarly discussion regarding the use of scripture in the NT. The following are the most important issues in the conversation specifically surrounding 1 Peter. Not all of the studies of scripture in 1 Peter have dealt with each of these issues, but they resurface consistently in the literature.

The Text of Scripture

A foundational question centers on the textual version(s) used in 1 Peter. It is insufficient simply to adduce a scriptural passage employed at a particular point in an author's argument. The fact that multiple versions of scripture existed imposes the burden of determining the Petrine *Vorlage*.

Few now argue for a Hebrew text directly underlying the quotations and allusions in 1 Peter. Voorwinde articulates a strong opinion regarding a Petrine preference for the Hebrew based largely on the faulty assumption that Paul went to the Gentiles and Peter shared the gospel with the circumcised exclusively (Gal 2:7).[6] More common is the view that 1 Peter exhibits an underlying Greek text. Glenny considers Petrine citations to be "closer to the LXX than the Masoretic Text with the exception of the quotation of Proverbs 10:12 in 1 Peter 4:8 and Isaiah 8:14 in 1 Peter 2:8."[7] The majority of scholars are confident that the Septuagint is the source used in 1 Peter.[8]

Determining whether there is a Greek or Hebrew *Vorlage* only scratches the surface of textual issues. Recensional activity in the textual history of the "Septuagint" has ramifications for the study of scripture in 1 Peter.[9] This has been greatly overlooked in studies on the role of scripture in 1 Peter. For instance, Schutter seeks to identify text-types as a significant component of his methodological procedure.[10] However, he never clarifies what text-types

6. Voorwinde, "Old Testament Quotations," 6.

7. Glenny, "Hermeneutics," 292.

8. Osborne, "Guide Lines," 73; McCartney, "Use of the Old Testament," 56; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 12.

9. For an overview of recensions of the Greek text, see Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 46–56. The term "Septuagint" is itself a scholarly construct. Use of the term often adds confusion to an already complex textual history. The translation of the Greek version of the Bible occurred over a length of time, with individual books having distinct textual histories. On the definition of the Septuagint, see ibid., 30–33. In this thesis OG (Old Greek) will be used to refer to the critical editions of each book. The abbreviation of Septuagint, LXX, will be used only to differentiate from the Hebrew version, for instance with the Psalter. More will be said later about the complexities of the textual transmission.

10. Schutter, *Hermeneutic*, 170.

were available to Peter. It is quite common among scholarship to identify ways in which scripture has been adapted by the author.[11] But without considering recensional activity prior to and within the first century, the ability to speak confidently of the adaptation of scriptures has no firm basis. Beaton's overview of Jewish exegetical practices and the textual environment of the Second Temple period is instructive. His location of Matthew during a period of textual fluidity with texts incorporating exegetical alterations would hold true for 1 Peter as well.[12]

These issues demonstrate that care must be taken to consider the textual history of the Greek text and draw upon other versions where the text of 1 Peter differs from any of the extant Greek versions.[13] It is generally acknowledged that revision of the Greek text was already underway in the pre-Christian era.[14] Thus, we cannot assume that the text of scripture in the NT has as its *Vorlage* the OG. Furthermore, allowances must be made for differences in the transmission history of the individual books of the Septuagint.[15] If the transmission history of a Septuagint book is unclear, it becomes problematic placing an occurrence of scripture in 1 Peter within that transmission history. These new advances in Septuagint studies make it necessary to bring the study of scripture in 1 Peter up to date.[16]

11. E.g., Glenny, "Hermeneutics," 292.

12. Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ* , 60–61.

13. The "steps for determining the textual basis for a citation in the NT" provided by McLay, *Use of the Septuagint*, 133–34 are helpful in this regard.

14. See, for instance, Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches*, 19–42.

15. Also, our access to the transmission history differs from book to book.

16. See Tov, *Text-critical Use of the Septuagint*, 10–15 for a history of research on the Septuagint. One of the recent discussions that confounds the study of scripture in the NT centers on a more serious consideration of the Septuagint as "translation literature." Krause ("Contemporary Translations," 64–67) expresses how the LXX was intended to exist alongside the Hebrew in a relationship of dependence upon it, but it also carved out its own autonomous existence. Thus to posit either a Hebrew or Greek *Vorlage* for NT quotations and allusions requires greater sensitivity to the interrelationship of these two versions, on which see also Pietersma, "New Paradigm." Adding to this interrelationship is a growing interest in the relationship of LXX to DSS (Tov, *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 285–300; Ziegler, "Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta"). There is a growing interest in evaluating the use of Greek scriptures in the NT as textual evidence in the study of LXX (e.g., Jobes, "Septuagint Textual Tradition," 311–33). Hengel (*Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, 26) finds the onset of fervor for the Septuagint as the authoritative text about the time of Justin with subsequent debate being engaged by Origen, Jerome and Augustine (ibid., 47–56). See Childs, *Struggle to Understand Isaiah*, 19–20. It seems that debate surrounding the Septuagint and Hebrew text existed during the apostolic era. While the Septuagint served as the basis for missionary proclamation and teaching in the Greek speaking world, there was significant recourse to the Hebrew as evidenced by consistent divergence from the Septuagint text in the NT.

Defining Scriptural Occurrences

Different kinds of uses of scripture have not been uniformly defined by scholars.[17] Many questions bear upon this matter of definition. Are introductory formulae a defining characteristic? How many words must correspond with the source text? Does authorial modification or alteration bear upon how these textual occurrences are defined?[18] One of Schutter's contributions was a move toward classification that distinguishes between quotations, allusions and biblicisms.[19]

Observed in aggregate, a continuum from lengthy, explicit citations to discrete, implicit echoes. The terms "citation" and "quotation" are often used synonymously. In this study, I define *citation* as any use of scripture which is cited as such—e.g., "David says . . ." (Rom 11:9), "As written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet" (Luke 3:4), or the more general, "For it is contained in scripture" (1 Pet 2:6). A *quotation* is a more explicit use of scripture and an *allusion* is a less explicit use of scripture.[20] The overlap between the two is intentionally left opaque, reflecting the fact that the NT authors appear to have no clear distinction in their various uses of scripture. The use of introductory formulae is an unnecessary characteristic of a quotation, since explicit uses of scripture often occur without any introductory formula. Instead, introductory formulae sometimes mark out a use of scripture as more explicit. Furthermore, establishing a number of words to distinguish between quotation and allusion cannot be anything but arbitrary.

The term "echo" has been successfully employed in biblical studies by Hays. In his study of Pauline hermeneutics, he drew upon the work of Hollander's intertextual readings of Milton.[21] On the continuum between more and less explicit uses of scripture, there is a "vanishing point" at which "intertextual relations become less determinate."[22] Thus, *echo* will refer here

---

17. See the ongoing criticism Porter levels on the discipline (e.g., "Use of the Old Testament," "Further Comments," and "Allusions and Echoes").

18. Gréaux, "Elect Exiles," 30–32; Voorwinde, "Old Testament Quotations," 4; McCartney, "Use of the Old Testament," 46; Osborne, "Guide Lines," 65; Aitken, *Jesus' Death*, 18.

19. Schutter, *Hermeneutic*, 35–36.

20. See Hays, *Echoes*, 23; but see his elaboration in Hays, *Conversion of the Imagination*, 34–37. Porter's insistence on carefully defined categories—formulaic quotation, direct quotation, paraphrase, allusion and echo—is too precise and introduces concepts foreign to ancient authors ("Allusions and Echoes," 29).

21. Hays, *Echoes*, 18–21.

22. Ibid., 23. Along these lines, Ciampa ("Scriptural Language and Ideas," 42–43) correctly points out that every text is part of "an ongoing discourse" pertaining to an infinite number of issues. This discourse influences the author, often times without the

to the most subtle of intertextual resonances.[23] We will return to Hays's work on echoes in due course.

Emphasis on Quotations

A propensity to emphasize the most explicit uses of scripture has dominated studies of 1 Peter. Several studies intentionally exclude allusions.[24] Other studies account for allusions, but neglect to factor them into their work in meaningful ways.[25] This is one of the shortcomings of Schutter's project. Having provided a taxonomy of uses of scripture in 1 Peter, the body of his analysis is limited to five passages featuring the most explicit quotations in 1 Peter.[26] Two studies making greater use of allusions are the dissertations by McCartney and Gréaux. McCartney's approach accounts for allusive material by way of themes and motifs.[27] Gréaux produces several lists of passages that are echoed throughout 1 Peter. However, the structure of his

---

author consciously knowing it. What is helpful about working with an ancient set of texts within a cultic sub-culture is that the parameters of this discourse are "more narrowly defined" (ibid., 45). Thus, it is not impossible to describe a set of prominent issues pertaining to the first century *milieu*. For this thesis, it is less important to demonstrate the influence Isaiah has on the early church; this is already a given. Instead, it is to spell out with some specificity how Isaiah has made its presence known in 1 Peter.

23. This least explicit or less determinate use of scripture does not imply less significant. Hays (*The Conversion of the Imagination*, 36–37) argues that depending on "the distinctiveness, prominence, or popular familiarity of the precursor text" in concert with the rhetorical prominence the author gives the echoed text, one may talk about the "relative weightiness of the material cited." The concept of "intertextuality" is used throughout this thesis to denote the incorporation of one text or source into a new composition. Challenges to this use have been raised by Porter ("The Use of the Old Testament," 79–96), and rightfully so since the term originally had more to do with the plurality of meanings brought to a text by readers (see also Kristeva, "Word, Dialogue and Novel," 34–61). Moyise ("Intertextuality" 17–18) has helpfully spelled out how the term has been employed in particular ways in biblical studies . This thesis usually uses the term in the sense of "intertextual echo," but at points "dialogical intertextuality" comes into play, particularly as scripture is shown to impact the thought of the author.

24. E.g., Moyise, "Isaiah in 1 Peter," 175; Köstenberger "The Use of Scripture," 230; Voorwinde, "Old Testament Quotations," 4. The reasons for limitation are rarely expressed.

25. E.g., Glenny ("The Hermeneutics," 71) lists allusions to the OT, but none of these are addressed in the remainder of his study. The same holds true for Osborne, "L'utilisation des citations," 64–77.

26. These are 1:22–23 (Schutter, *Hermeneutic*, 124–30), 2:4–10 (ibid., 130–38), 2:21–25 (ibid., 138–44), 3:7–17 (ibid., 144–53) and 4:14–19/5:1–10 (ibid., 153–66).

27. McCartney, "Use of the Old Testament," 104. The three motifs he lists are election, the cult and judgement.

argument is such that allusions and echoes are only considered after explicit quotations are addressed. This bifurcation interrupts the flow of the argument of 1 Peter and tacitly indicates that the more explicit material is more important than the less explicit material.[28]

This study will follow a sequential format placing quotations and allusions within the flow of the Petrine argument. This has the advantage of assessing the role of a quotation or allusion based not on its explicitness but on the basis of its role within the author's argument. Furthermore, each use of scripture, whether it functions at an explicit or implicit level, will be examined to the fullest possible extent in order to arrive at a more comprehensive picture of the use of scripture in 1 Peter than has previously been given.

Conceptual Frameworks

To this point, the scholarly discussion has been considered as it relates to the data of scriptural texts occurring in 1 Peter: what texts are used and how do we define these occurrences? Here we turn to another discussion pertaining to how this data coheres. What are the organizing principles scholars have provided for understanding the role of scripture in 1 Peter?

There have been two major views on how the variety of scriptural texts come together in a conceptual framework. The first centers on the theme of suffering. Osborne deduces that scripture was used "in order to understand what happens in the life of the community and to console it."[29] References to scripture are drawn from contexts that develop the theme of suffering, which is then applied to a particular "Christian attitude towards suffering."[30] Schutter finds this focus on suffering resident in the suffering/glory motif, expressed in the first instance at 1 Pet 1:11. He sees 1:10–12—and this motif in particular—as the hermeneutical key of 1 Peter.[31] This idea is taken further by Pearson who infers that the suffering/glory motif is "derived from the humiliation/vindication theme of the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah, especially Isaiah 53."[32] So, the suffering/glory motif is not only a means of

---

28. The work of Bacq (*De l'ancienne*, 19) on Irenaeus calls for a more even-handed approach. He finds that the distinction between explicit citations and simple allusions and subsequent emphasis on explicit citations are made for heuristic reasons. He counters, however, that "simples allusions scripturaires peuvent très bien jouer le rôle de citations clés."

29. Osborne, "L'utilisation des citations," 70: "Il se réfère à l'AT pour comprendre ce qui se passe dans la vie de sa communauté et pour la consoler."

30. Ibid., 75.

31. McCartney, "Use of the Old Testament," 123.

32. Pearson, *Christological and Rhetorical Properties*, 43.

organizing the scriptural texts in 1 Peter, but is also derived from scripture. Pearson's study, however, is hampered by an atomistic approach stemming from her form-critical methodology. She begins by identifying several hymns in 1 Peter in order to develop the christological underpinning to the letter.[33] These hymns—located at 1:3–12, 1:18–21, 2:21–25, 3:18–22[34]—provide a christological pattern of death and resurrection drawn together by the suffering/glory motif.[35] Despite the valuable insights she provides in her study, the isolation of hymnic elements needlessly hinders a fuller exploration of how christology relates to ecclesiology and the broader development of a scriptural narrative within 1 Peter.[36] The motif of suffering and glory to which these studies point and the critical role of 1 Pet 1:10–12 will be considered in chapter 2 in order to assess the special issues that have surrounded this passage in previous scholarship.

The second major conceptual framework centers on the idea of exile or diaspora.[37] The imagery of diaspora or exile frames the letter in 1 Pet 1:1; 2:11 and 5:13. Martin expounds this in a study unrelated to the role of scripture in 1 Peter. He contends that "the controlling metaphor of 1 Peter is the Diaspora."[38] The concept of the diaspora is a metaphor borrowed from early Judaism and applied to the Christian community.[39] He recognizes that Isaiah is important among the literary sources that inform this metaphor.[40] This means that many of the metaphors he analyzes have their background in the scriptures.[41] Dubis, reading 1 Peter alongside early Jewish apocalyptic

33. The criteria used to identify these hymns may be found in Stauffer *New Testament Theology*, 338–39; see also Pearson, *Christological and Rhetorical Properties*, 8.

34. Pearson, *Christological and Rhetorical Properties*, 5.

35. Ibid., 8–9.

36. For a recent critique of form-criticism, focused particularly on the criteria for identifying hymnic material in the NT, see Peppard, "'Poetry,'" 322–29.

37. The most influential voice on the concept of continuing exile and the hope of restoration is Wright, *The New Testament*, 268–72.

38. Martin, *Metaphor and Composition*, 144.

39. Ibid., 148.

40. Ibid., 149. He also lists Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther, *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, *1 Enoch*, *Sibylline Oracles*, *1–4 Maccabees*, Josephus, *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* and Philo as literary sources for the concept of diaspora (ibid., 149–50).

41. Martin is less concerned with the source of the metaphors than the role these metaphors play in the structure of 1 Peter. Thus, one of the benefits of the present study is to bolster some of Martin's claims by making more explicit the connections between some of these metaphors and their scriptural sources. The same can be said with regard to the work of Bechtler (*Following in His Steps*, 208) where he analyzes the role of metaphors which are used to depict the liminality of the community. He emphasizes that these metaphors are "mostly drawn from the LXX."

literature,[42] asserts that 1 Peter is "shaped by the apocalyptic notion of messianic woes."[43] He substantiates this by looking at general apocalyptic features of 1 Peter and then particularly for 1 Pet 4:12–19. An important conclusion he reaches is that "the messianic woes pattern of 1 Peter fits well into 1 Peter's overarching motif of exile and restoration (1:1, 17; 2:11–12; 5:9–10, 13)." As was the case for Martin's overarching diaspora motif, Dubis finds that Isaiah 40–55 informs the motif of exile and restoration and significantly overlaps the suffering/glory motif.[44] This is an important and suggestive synthesis of two conceptual frameworks.

Gréaux, drawing upon the method developed by Hays, further extends this line of thought by seeing the use of scripture as contributing to "a continuing diaspora metaphor."[45] Similar to previous studies, he finds that Isaiah plays a key role in developing this metaphor by way of second exodus language.[46] The result is that "references to the Old Testament in 1 Peter are drawn from sections of the Old Testament that contain exodus, second-exodus or diaspora themes in their context."[47] He has taken as his starting point a particular metaphor (diaspora) and used this to "listen" for echoes of scripture. This metaphor, though, does not always fit individual passages employed in 1 Peter. Mbuvi likewise sees "lingering exile" as the background to 1 Peter.[48] He, however, pursues the temple as the framework for 1 Peter, incorporating "the concepts of exile, judgment and restoration providing the cultic language by which 1 Peter addresses the concerns of identity and alienation with which his audience was struggling."[49]

The application of categories drawn from Second Temple literature for NT epistles is not altogether straight-forward if the work of Christ inaugurated the end of exile and the restoration of the people of God. For 1 Peter, there is no explicit reflection on the inclusion of Gentiles or the persistent rejection of Christ by the majority of Jews in the first century, as is the case in Romans or Galatians.[50] Instead, the ideas of Israel and Gentile

---

42. Dubis (*Messianic Woes*, 6) includes rabbinic literature along with texts from Qumran, *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, Apocalypse of Abraham, Jubilees, Testament of Moses* and Revelation. He is aware of the fact that 1 Peter is not an apocalypse but argues that it "shares in the worldview of the apocalypses" (ibid., 39).

43. Ibid., 45.

44. Ibid., 187.

45. Gréaux, "'To the Elect Exiles,'" 25.

46. Ibid., 76.

47. Ibid., 88.

48. Mbuvi, *Temple*, 8, 31.

49. Ibid., 125.

50. On which, see Hafemann, "Paul and the Exile of Israel."

are metaphors for insiders and outsiders without any apparent reference to the ethnic problems such metaphors raise. Continuing exile is not the best framework for 1 Peter, since redemption is already assumed for the audience (esp. 1:14–19). Elliott has argued for the prominence of the terms πάριοχος and παρεπίδημος in 1 Peter, even though few have accepted his argument that these depict the audience's literal status in Asia Minor.[51] Taken as metaphors depicting the audience, the passages that frame the letter (1:1, 17; 2:11; 5:13) show no evidence of any connection with the scriptural texts of the letter. This does not mean there is no relationship between these metaphors and scripture, but the use of exile/diaspora as a unifying theme for the scriptural discourse of 1 Peter is dubious.

Thus, it is necessary to reconsider how scripture in 1 Peter coheres. Like previous studies, I find the motif of suffering and glory as integral to understanding the relationship between the letter and the scripture it uses. But I see it as constituting a scriptural narrative of God's redemptive work among his people, which presupposes at the outset the work of Christ and the proclamation of the gospel (1:12, 25; 4:17). The restoration of divine presence—God's glory—among his people presently experiencing suffering is the story Peter finds in scripture concerning the people of God, which he then portrays as a narrative in which the church now participates through Christ. To be sure, this story as drawn from Isaiah recaptures much of the Exodus narrative in the context of an exilic experience. However, Peter's use of the narrative does not depict the church as in exile, but as the locus of the restoration of God's glorious presence among his people.

Mbuvi, I believe, comes closest to articulating this when he identifies the spiritual house in 1 Peter "as the anticipated Jewish eschatological temple, now fulfilled in the community of believers, based on their relations with Jesus Christ the Messiah."[52] However, his reading of the temple as a unifying concept drawing upon images of exile, judgment and restoration needs to be reversed. Instead, the temple ought to be viewed as one of the images that populates the scriptural narrative of divine restoration. The narrative is not expressed through the symbol of the temple, but the temple is one of many images that are used to retell the story of Israel anew. More promising is the direction taken by Joseph who draws upon a narratological analysis of 1 Peter using a methodology developed by Mieke Bal.[53] He proposes a four-part *fabula* patterned after the scriptures of Israel, namely election, suffering, faithful response and vindication. This fabula "gives

---

51. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 48–49. See also Horrell, *1 Peter*, 50–52.

52. Mbuvi, *Temple*, 109.

53. Joseph, *A Narratological Reading*, 40–44.

theological significance to the suffering of his audience and sketches for them the nature of faithful response."[54] These four elements create a framework for the message of 1 Peter, and the bulk of Joseph's work is devoted to tracing the themes of election, suffering, faithful response and vindication throughout 1 Peter. Joseph's use of narrative and his sensitivity to theological hermeneutics provides a promising avenue for studying 1 Peter, an avenue that will be further developed at the end of the next chapter. However, the four elements are perhaps too abstract. It might be possible to construe all biblical and extra-biblical texts in this way. The works of Mbuvi and Joseph present two ends of a spectrum, one which presents a conceptual framework (the temple) which is too narrowly focused and one which presents a conceptual framework which is too broad. By considering an Isaianic narrative structure, a passage through these two extremes might be forged. God's redemption as put forward in 1 Peter presents a story in language consistent with Isaiah's understanding of the restoration of the divine presence among God's people.

Listening in on the Pauline Discussion

The epistolary genre shared between the Pauline and Petrine letters affords an opportunity to listen in on the issues discussed by scholars working in this area. It is hoped that listening to the Pauline conversation will inform study of the Petrine text. Petrine studies have lagged behind Pauline studies, and the application of methodological advances will bring the study of Peter's use of scripture up to date.[55] In other words, we may borrow from Paul with payoff for Peter. At the same time, broadening this discussion beyond the Pauline corpus should go some way toward deepening our understanding of early Christian hermeneutics as it occurs within the epistolary literature of the NT.[56]

54. Ibid., 30.

55. This discussion begins with the work of Hays's 1989 monograph, *Echoes in the Letters of Paul*. For a survey of literature and issues arising in the generation of scholarship from the discovery of the Dead Sea Scroll to the late 1980s, see Marshall, "An Assessment of Recent Developments." For a literature survey of pre-Qumran scholarship on the use of scripture in NT, see Tasker, *The Old Testament in the New Testament*. Hays's evaluation of the work of Ellis and Hanson and his response to previous work on Pauline hermeneutics occurs in *Echoes*, 11–14.

56. Indeed, such a conversation ought also to deepen our understanding of the entire NT. However, it does seem that there are differences between the appropriation of scripture in the gospels and what we find in the epistles. To support this broad assertion, I appeal to the differences in genre as well as the focus on the life of Jesus in contrast to the more didactic nature of the epistles occasioned by the needs of the church.

Allusive Echo

A landmark study in Pauline use of scripture is *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (1989) by Hays. The title of the book alludes to Hollander's *The Figure of Echo*[57] and draws upon it, among other literary studies, to develop a method of hearing the "rhetorical and semantic effects" that reverberate when a text alludes to another text.[58] This method pushes the discussion of the use of scripture in Paul away from the most explicit quotations. opening up vistas in which less explicit scriptural resonances may be heard. Hays writes, "Allusive echo functions to suggest to the reader that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed."[59] This interplay, termed "metalepsis" by Hollander, allows scholars "(a) to call attention to them so that others might be enabled to hear; and (b) to give an account of the distortions and new figuration that they generate."[60]

Is a modern literary approach an imposition on the text, though? Would the application of a literary theory developed in the past fifty years not bear marks of anachronism? A subtle answer to this question comes in a brief citation of what Fishbane calls "inner-biblical exegesis."[61] Subtle forms of interpretive resonances are already apparent throughout the Hebrew Bible.[62] Thus, what modern literary criticism has provided is the language with which to speak about textual phenomena that occur not only in the use of scripture by NT authors, but within that scripture itself.

Hays developed seven tests by which intertextual echoes may be identified.[63] He cautions that these cannot be used as a scientific method "because exegesis is a modest imaginative craft."[64] The first test is *availability* which refers to whether an author has access to a source.[65] *Volume* refers to

---

57. Hollander, *The Figure of Echo*.

58. Hays, *Echoes*, 19.

59. Ibid., 20.

60. Ibid., 19.

61. Ibid., 21. See also 27, where Hays discloses his intent "to produce late twentieth-century readings of Paul informed by intelligent historical understanding."

62. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 5–10; "Inner-Biblical Exegesis," 34–35.

63. Wagner (*Heralds of The Good News*, 11–12) narrows the seven criteria to five "particularly important" for his purposes: *volume, recurrence, historical plausibility, thematic coherence* and *satisfaction*. Compare this with the discussion of allusions (*Anspielungen*) in Paul in relation specifically to Isaiah in Wilk, *Die Bedeutung*, 266–68.

64. Hays, *Echoes*, 29.

65. Ibid., 29–30; *The Conversion of the Imagination*, 34. This later essay updates several of the tests significantly.

"how insistently the echo presses itself upon the reader."[66] This has three interconnected factors. The first factor pertains to "the degree of verbatim repetition of words and syntactical patterns."[67] Beyond simply identifying what text is in use, this factor raises questions about the author's *Vorlage*—whether the text was Greek, Hebrew or Aramaic, whether there are changes to the text, and whether these occur as a variant in the manuscript tradition or are intentionally altered by the author. The second factor has to do with "the distinctiveness, prominence, or popular familiarity of the precursor text," which differs from the availability of a text.[68] It is one thing to say that Isaiah was available for the author and readers, but it is another to discern the prominence of the suffering servant as compared to, say, a woe oracle against Cush. The third factor relates to the rhetorical emphasis placed on the text in the flow of the epistolary discourse.[69]

Recurrence takes into consideration the use of a particular passage elsewhere by the same author. He writes, "When we find repeated Pauline quotations of a particular OT passage, additional possible allusions to the same passage become more compelling."[70] Hays allows for a range of meaning with regard to the term "passage" which may include larger units of scripture (e.g., Isa 40–55). *Thematic coherence* coordinates two sources of meaning. The source text must be understood to contribute meaning to the discourse in which it is quoted. Does this meaning match the context of the discourse and how does the use of the source text inform that discourse? This does not simply occur on an instance-by-instance basis, but accounts for the overall argument. So, if Isaiah (or portions thereof) may be shown to be instrumental to the development of the overall argument, then "we may assume that other possible echoes of that same text elsewhere in the same letter are likely to be theologically significant rather than merely the product of our own interpretive fantasy."[71]

Historical Plausibility considers both the interpretive *milieu* of the Second Temple period as well as the ability of the original audience to understand the meaning of what is being interpreted. One of the difficulties with this test is the fact that early Christian interpretation—although indebted to a Jewish interpretive tradition—significantly breaks with the Jewish

---

66. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination*, 35.
67. Ibid., 35. Original emphasis removed.
68. Ibid., 36. Original emphasis removed.
69. Ibid., 37.
70. Ibid. Original emphasis removed.
71. Ibid., 40.

interpretation of its time.[72] Things are further complicated when we attempt to account for the audience. Would a predominantly Gentile audience pick up on intra-Jewish interpretive debates? Hays suggests, "If, however, it can be shown that Paul's allusions to Scripture do have analogies and parallels in other contemporary writings, then we are on firmer ground in placing interpretive weight upon them."[73] *History of Interpretation* considers whether others throughout the centuries have likewise discerned an allusion or echo. Finally, *satisfaction* attempts to answer the questions, "Does the proposed intertextual reading illuminate the surrounding discourse and make some larger sense of Paul's argument as a whole?"[74]

These tests provide a road map for confirming the use of intertextual echoes. However, they are not a scientific manual that may be used to identify and classify various species of textual phenomena. Therefore, these tests inform the present study, enabling us to be sensitive to the presence of themes and images populating 1 Peter which contribute to the scriptural narrative.

Ecclessiocentricity

One of the surprising results of Hays's work is his insistence that Paul's reading of scripture is not governed by christological interpretations, but produces readings that are ecclesiocentric.[75] Thus, Paul expresses a "conviction that Scripture is rightly read as a word addressed to the eschatological community."[76] The church is founded upon the scriptures of Israel, and Paul proves this more by demonstration rather than by treatise.[77] Paul grapples explicitly with issues surrounding the inclusion of Gentiles and how the Law is to be read in light of Christ. Hays produces a reading that, perhaps, overly differentiates christological and ecclesiological interpretation; but even if he has overreached, he has brought to our attention the profound importance ecclesiology holds in understanding Paul's hermeneutics.

Wagner's study of Romans 9–11 augments this to some extent by focusing on how Paul reads his own ministry in the scriptures. He contends

---

72. The Christ event has significant ramifications for differentiating the interpretive activity of the early church from that of early Judaism. This will be explored further in the next chapter.

73. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination*, 41.

74. Ibid., 44.

75. Hays, *Echoes*, 86.

76. Ibid., 123. He cites Rom 15:4 and 1 Cor 10:11.

77. Ibid., 160.

that Paul finds himself at a momentous stage in history in which God's work among the Gentiles requires a reconsideration of the covenant with Israel.[78] Paul argues, based on his reading of Isaiah, for a "two-stage process" in which "Paul finds himself playing a pivotal role in this drama of cosmic redemption: he is not only a herald bearing the message of redemption to the Gentiles, but also a chosen instrument through whom God will provoke his own people to jealousy and so effect their salvation."[79]

The present study finds many correlations between the ecclesiological readings of scripture by Paul and Peter. These will be spelled out in the chapters to follow. Unlike Paul, though, Peter seems less preoccupied with justifying his mission.[80] Only in 1 Pet 5:1 does he mention his own ministry. But when he does, he draws upon the language of scripture developed over the course of his letter and casts himself in the role of witness to suffering and partaker in glory. Also unlike Paul, Peter does little to deal with issues centering on the Gentile inclusion.[81] The reasons for this are unclear. Ever present is the temptation to read 1 Peter in light of tensions within the community, and perhaps the letter served to address some of these tensions. But these are never made explicit. What is made clear, though, is that the scriptures of Israel address ecclesiological concerns, particularly as the church in Asia Minor has experienced suffering.

Narrative Substructure

A suggestive line of argument put forward by Hays contends against the accusation that Paul's use of scripture is highly eclectic and self-referential.[82] Instead, Paul's hermeneutic shows a commitment to an underlying narrative based on "fundamental themes of the biblical story."[83] Therefore, the seemingly scattered scriptural quotations "derive coherence from their common relation to the scriptural story of God's righteousness."[84] On the

78. Wagner, *Heralds of The Good News*, 41.

79. Ibid., 359.

80. E.g., ibid., 32–33.

81. Goppelt, *A Commentary on I Peter*, 6–7.

82. And to this point Marks ("Pauline Typology," 80) comes under fire, since he finds Paul "affirming the priority of his own conceptions by imposing them on the earlier tradition." Hays (*Echoes*, 159) contends that such a perspective is beholden to generations of "misreadings" of Paul "that ignore his roots in Scripture or highlight antithetical aspects of his relation to it."

83. Hays, *Echoes*, 157.

84. Ibid., 157. For Paul, then, the phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is key to understanding his hermeneutic. Such phraseology is not entirely absent in 1 Peter (see 2:23), but it

basis of this narrative, Paul can envision the gospel as a continuation of the narrative.[85] Furthermore, scripture can be read as addressing the needs of the community primarily because the community participates within the narrative.[86] These ideas are important for the present thesis, particularly for demonstrating the key role scripture plays in the ecclesiological hermeneutic of 1 Peter. The link between scripture and the churches of Asia Minor lies not in a patchwork of passages deemed suitable by Peter, but in a narrative that unifies all of scripture and enables Peter to locate the church within an overarching drama.

Wagner, a student of Hays, further focuses these ideas in his work on the use of Isaiah in Romans. Building upon the recognition of linking terms (*gĕzērâ šāwâ*) between scriptural quotations in Paul, he finds that texts have been selected by Paul "for reasons beyond simple catchword associations." Paul shows an "awareness of significant thematic as well as verbal connections between the texts."[87] Such connections are not unique to Paul, but are apparent in the interpretive tradition inherited by Paul.[88] These connected texts become "in some sense mutually interpreting for Paul," whether the connection occurs between Isaianic texts or with texts drawn from outside Isaiah.[89] The net effect is that "Isaiah does make significant and distinctive contributions to Paul's particular retelling of the story of God, Israel, and the Gentiles in Romans," even if it is not the only voice within Paul's scriptural discourse.[90] Wagner identifies a narrative constituent of Isaiah. He writes:

> In terms of Isaiah's larger three-act 'plot line' of rebellion, punishment, and restoration, Paul locates himself and his fellow believers (Jew and Gentile) in the final act of the story, where heralds go forth with the good news that God has redeemed his people.[91]

This is in many ways similar to the overarching narrative articulated by Hays, but confines such a narrative within a single book. The difference between an overarching narrative uniting all of scripture and a particularly

---

would be a stretch to claim it as Peter's understanding of "the ground of the narrative unity between Law and gospel."

85. Ibid., 160.

86. Ibid., 160–64.

87. Wagner, *Heralds of The Good News*, 347.

88. Ibid., 148. He cites in particular the inter-Isaianic linkages apparent in the Greek translation (n. 19).

89. Ibid., 351.

90. Ibid., 352.

91. Ibid., 354.

Isaianic narrative is subtle. The overarching narrative provides bridges between different individual narratives contained within the disparate books of scripture. Isaiah appears to have provided for the early church a self-contained articulation of the more-or-less complete narrative (albeit with other passages orbiting around it and even competing with it) as evidenced by its high frequency of quotation in the NT and its prominence in the manuscript tradition.

Both Hays and Wagner have recognized that Paul has not played fast and loose with the text of scripture, but rather has pursued interpretive strategies consistent with the narrative that extends from scripture to the gospel and ultimately to God's work in and through the church as the eschatological community. Inasmuch as Paul has "used" scripture to argue his case, it remains true that scripture itself exerts pressure upon Paul as an interpreter. Hays's turn of phrase—"Gospel interprets scripture; Scripture interprets gospel"[92]—expresses this idea. In the consideration of the hermeneutics involved in 1 Peter, it is reasonable to expect the same kind of dual pressure to be apparent. The text of scripture supplies metaphors, structures and phrases that are determinative for the shape of Peter's argument just as much as Peter's concerns for the church shape his reading of scripture.

In line with this scholarly trajectory, Gignilliat suggests that the narrative substructure of Paul's use of the OT is more theologically oriented than accounted for in previous scholarship.[93] He argues that Paul's reading of scripture is "a genuine extension of the text in light of its true subject matter in Jesus Christ."[94] The scriptures provide "warrant for Paul's role in this redemptive drama" depicted most prominently in Isaiah 40–66.[95] Gignilliat proposes that Paul's thought is influenced by "Isaiah's canonical message of redemption and its attendant key figures (the Servant and the servants of the Servant)."[96] In expounding the key role this Isaianic figuration plays in Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, he writes:

> These servant followers of the Servant, the offspring promised in
> Isa 52.10, carry on the task of the Servant as light to the nations,
> and restorers of Zion. They, like the Servant, suffer in righteous-
> ness (Isa 57.1); however, they do not take on the unique role

---

92. Hays, *Echoes*, 160.

93. Gignilliat, *Paul and Isaiah's Servants*, 16.

94. Ibid., 22.

95. Ibid., 38.

96. Ibid., 2.

of the Servant, who is the incarnation of Israel and vicarious sin-bearer.[97]

Like Paul, Peter appears to be sensitive to the unique role of the singular servant (1 Pet 2:22–25), yet develops the imitative potential of the servant's righteous suffering (2:21). In the next chapter, it will be demonstrated how the plural servants are key to understanding how Isaiah depicts the narrative of divine restoration. Unlike Paul, Peter does not go to lengths to identify his own mission in the categories raised in Isaiah 40–66 (although he does show himself to be a participant in them in 1 Pet 5:1). Instead, he pictures how the church participates in the drama of restoration in the role of the plural servants.

Comparison with the Interpretive Practices of the Second Temple Period

There is a significant line of scholarship devoted to the study of Paul's reading of scripture in comparison with other contemporaneous literature.[98] Since the discovery of manuscripts at Qumran in 1947, there has been a wealth of materials with which to compare Paul's use of scripture.[99] Lim compares textual modification in the commentaries of Qumran and the letters of Paul.[100] In the post-Qumran scholarly discussion, the stability of the Greek or Hebrew texts in the first century can no longer be assumed. He writes, "The Qumran pesharim and Pauline letters are dated to a period when the textual situation is fluid and more than the three textual traditions of the MT, LXX, and SP should be posited."[101] From this he argues that work on the Pauline text form "should be carried out not only with extant witnesses written in Greek, but also with Hebrew sources."[102] Most prominently among these Hebrew sources are the biblical scrolls and the pesharim of Qumran. Lim's study challenges previous work on the use of scripture in 1 Peter. For one, Lim dismantles the phrase "Midrash pesher." He suggests that the hybridization of genres "should, in our opinion, be left

---

97. Ibid., 53.

98. An important example is Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*.

99. See Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," 289–300 for a history of research on biblical interpretation in the scrolls.

100. Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 95.

101. Ibid., 22. See also Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," 317.

102. Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 142.

out of a discussion of pesherite or Pauline exegeses."[103] This matches in many ways Hays's critique of Midrash.[104] He correctly points out how the rabbinic writings of later centuries represent different historical backgrounds than was true for Paul in the first century.[105]

Yet, the discontinuity between the exegetical practices before and after the fall of Jerusalem is not as stark as might be supposed. Brooke suggests that many of the exegetical practices codified in the rabbinic writings were in fact used by Philo and in the Targums as well as in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[106] An example is the use of key term links, or *gĕzērâ šāwâ*. The use of this interpretive technique is important in the present study. What the current debate demonstrates is that this technique is less a characteristic of Midrashic interpretation than it is a common practice throughout the history of interpretation of scripture.[107] Another important technique for the present study is *ʾal tiqrēʾ*, or intentional "misreadings" of the text. With regard to the interpretive tradition surrounding the Hebrew version, the use of *ʾal tiqrēʾ* involves the interpreter taking advantage of textual peculiarities, variants or exchanging similar letters.[108] What is unclear is whether this interpretive technique is drawn into the interpretive tradition surrounding the Greek version. If so, some of the differences between quotation and *Vorlage* may stem from this technique.[109]

These insights drawn from comparisons with Qumran point to text critical issues overlooked in most studies of scripture in 1 Peter. The instability of the text in the first century complicates our understanding of Peter's *Vorlage*. A simple comparison of critical editions of the Greek text can no longer be the basis of a serious study of the NT appropriation of scripture. Lim pushes further by broadening the problem to Hebrew texts, and Brooke draws considerations of Jewish interpretive techniques into the study of NT interpretive techniques. Wagner's study exemplifies an approach that is sensitive to these issues by comparing the wording of Pauline quotations with OG Isaiah while consulting variant manuscripts before proceeding to "the

---

103. Ibid., 139.

104. Hays, *Echoes*, 10–14.

105. Ibid., 11. Contra Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic*, 151–99 and Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique*, 209–24. For a succinct introduction into the use of Midrash and pesher in NT interpretation, see Snodgrass, "The Use of the Old Testament," 420–22.

106. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 16–17, 355.

107. Brooke ("Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," 299) suggests that for midrash "in its strict sense the term is both inappropriate and anachronistic."

108. Brooke (*Exegesis at Qumran*, 284) shows how this was practiced at Qumran.

109. See Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Church," 456–57 for an application of this technique at the Jerusalem council.

later Greek versions, the church fathers, and quotations in other NT writings" and to "Hebrew forms of the text, including MT, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Isaiah Targum, and the Peshitta."[110]

Such work is necessary to identify the *Vorlage(n)* behind the quotations and allusions found in the NT. However, it must also be recognized that problems associated with the textual situation in the first century are manifold. McLay presents a number of difficulties including the fact that there was no canon for the early church along with the pluriformity of scripture in the Second Temple period.[111] By this he means that scripture existed in different languages, sometimes in multiple literary editions (i.e., Daniel), each with variant readings and undergoing a process of interpretation incorporated into the textual transmission. Alongside this situation also exists the possibility that revision has occurred.[112] This diversity of texts complicates an assessment of Peter's *Vorlage*, so that statements about authorial change or variants in the manuscript tradition must be made tentatively at best. This is true even where the extant manuscript tradition shows no evidence for differences occurring in 1 Peter.[113]

The discussion in Pauline circles allows us to briefly assess difficulties that have arisen in the Petrine discussion, particularly as it relates to the hermeneutics of 1 Peter and its relationship with midrash. The work of Schutter is the seminal study of Petrine hermeneutics. He finds that a pesher-like hermeneutic, similar to that found in Qumran, was employed in 1 Peter.[114] He begins by investigating 1 Pet 1:13—2:10 to determine its genre and considers homiletic midrash the most likely candidate in terms of "form, hermeneutical presuppositions, methods, and practices."[115] He then looks at 1:10–12 "where explicit information exists concerning the author's hermeneutic,"[116] and corroborates the correspondence between 1 Peter and Jewish hermeneutical conventions.[117] Several texts from Qumran are placed

110. Wagner, *Heralds of The Good News*, 16–17.

111. On matters bearing on canon, see McLay, "Biblical Texts," 38–42; Ulrich "The Canonical Process," 267–91; McDonald and Sanders, *The Canon Debate*.

112. McLay, "Biblical Texts," 55–58.

113. Moyise, "Quotations," 16–17.

114. However, see Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," 299–300. He correctly points out that the pesharim have dominated the discussion of biblical interpretation at Qumran, but that scholarship must "allow for several kinds [of texts] than that of the pesharim alone."

115. McCartney, "Use of the Old Testament," 99. More recently on genre, see Dryden, *Theology and Ethics*, 37–53.

116. McCartney, "Use of the Old Testament," 100.

117. Ibid., 109.

next to 1:10–12 to demonstrate the pesher-like hermeneutic employed.[118] The suffering/glory motif first expressed in 1:11 is then explored as the basis for identifying Petrine hermeneutics. He concludes, "Each passage was seen also to have correlations with the S/G of 1.11, establishing its antithesis as an important organizing principle in the author's understanding of Christian doctrine."[119]

Glenny's thesis comes to contradictory conclusions regarding midrash. He finds that "the evidence in 1 Peter supports the theory that midrash is a genre of literature rather than a hermeneutical methology [sic]."[120] This stems partly from the fact that Glenny finds the hermeneutical centerpiece not to be 1 Pet 1:10–12 but rather 2:6–10 which establishes "a pattern which Peter demonstrates between Israel, the Old Testament People of God and the church, the New Testament People of God."[121] So, despite techniques that exhibit pesher-like qualities (e.g., 1:24–25; 2:6–10), the use of different hermeneutical methodologies in 1 Peter "argues against classifying the hermeneutics as midrash."[122]

McCartney stands between these studies regarding Petrine hermeneutics. Whereas Glenny saw 1 Pet 2:6–10 as centrally important, McCartney finds in 1:10–12 a means by which the OT is applied to the church. He writes, "In accordance with the principle of 1:10–12, the Scripture is about Christ, but through Christ the Scripture also describes believers."[123] Instead of a direct appropriation of scripture between the OT people of God and the church, McCartney identifies how Christ is an indispensable step between the OT and the church.

Pearson contends that Isaiah 53 not only stands behind the suffering/glory motif in 1 Peter,[124] but plays an important role in drawing together the various sources in 1 Peter.[125] Although she discerns a pesher-like exegesis, she thinks Isaiah 53 is at the center of the various texts on display in 1 Peter. For her, christology is the fundamental category standing behind the Petrine use of scripture.

---

118. Ibid., "Use of the Old Testament," 109–23; see also Bauckham, "James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude."

119. McCartney, "Use of the Old Testament," 168.

120. Glenny, "The Hermeneutics," 292.

121. Ibid., 289.

122. Ibid., 292

123. McCartney, "Use of the Old Testament," 102.

124. Pearson, *Christological and Rhetorical Properties*, 9.

125. Ibid., 43.

Clearly confusion has arisen in the Petrine discussion concerning midrash and pesher. This is not surprising in light of the difficulty associated with these terms.[126] For one, the two terms do not appear to be synonymous.[127] Midrash has been defined by Porton as "a type of literature, oral or written, which has its starting point in a fixed canonical text, considered the revealed word of God by the midrashist and his audience, and in which this original verse is explicitly cited or clearly alluded to."[128] Porton, though, is careful to differentiate midrash as activity from later rabbinic midrash. Teugels, along these lines, discourages "use of the term 'midrash' outside the rabbinic corpus," but does admit that there is something comparable to the literature of early Judaism and early Christianity.[129] The essential element for rabbinic midrash, according to Teugels, is the "Oral Torah" which transmits a "chain of tradition" from which authority is derived.[130] To be sure, such oral traditions existed in the Second Temple era, but were not self-consciously collected in literature aimed at preserving authoritative interpretations.[131] Such being the case, scholars still tend to speak of midrash as an interpretive activity in distinction from the genre and aims associated with later rabbinical literature.[132] Even so, the association of the term with later rabbinic practices cautions us against using the term even to describe the underlying interpretive practices shared between Second Temple Judaism, the early Church and Tannaitic Judaism.

Pesher, on the other hand, more often refers to a particular exegetical method or to the genre of literature that employs this kind of method.[133] Schutter's identification of a pesher-like technique in 1 Peter is sound, but this does not entail that the genre is midrashic. Lim, for instance, demonstrates how the evidence from Qumran does not support the designation of a Midrash genre.[134] Carmignac clarified our understanding of pesher as a genre by distinguishing "un *péshèr* «continu»" and "un *péshèr* «discontinu» ou «thématique»."[135] The characteristics of the former exhibit

---

126. Alexander, "Midrash and the Gospels," 1.

127. See Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 48–51; Brooke, *EDSS* 1:298.

128. Porton, "Midrash," *ABD* 4:819.

129. Teugels, *Bible and Midrash*, 169. See also Campbell, *The Exegetical Texts*, 37.

130. Teugels, *Bible and Midrash*, 167.

131. Here Teugels (*Bible and Midrash*, 166–69) draws upon the work of Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, esp. 67–68.

132. Porton, "Midrash," *ABD* 4:819. See also Neusner, *What is Midrash?*, 31–33; Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 69.

133. See Dimant, "Pesharim, Qumran," *ABD* 5:244.

134. Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 50–51.

135. Carmignac, "Le document de Qumrân," 361.

continuous quotations of biblical text, with the technical use of the term 'pesher,' followed by an interpretation.[136] Lim is careful to define the continuous pesharim as a genre, but the exegetical practices displayed in the thematic pesharim do not, per se, constitute a genre.[137] Dunn, comparing the exegetical practices of the Qumran pesharim with NT use of quotations, notes that NT quotations differ from the continuous pesharim inasmuch as they does not provide a quotation and then produce an interpretation; "the actual quotation of the text embodies its interpretation within the quotation itself."[138] This distinction is important because it moves our understanding of the interpretive practices of the early church away from the generic features of the pesharim and enables us to focus on the principles in use.[139] In the course of this study, it will be assumed that such pesher-like interpretive techniques contribute to the creative, narratival reading of scripture found in 1 Peter. As was the case in Qumran, where texts were creatively brought together, Peter also brings texts together to draw out themes and images that are integral to the narrative of God's restoration. However, the decisive work of Christ and the proclamation of the gospel press us to look beyond the issues raised by the diverse and thorny issues contained within recent debates on the interpretive techniques of ancient Judaism. At many points, these issues inform the present study, but only insofar as they illuminate the way in which the Isaianic narrative is drawn into 1 Peter.

Unambiguous Quotations

The study of Pauline hermeneutics has generated studies focused on determining Paul's *Vorlagen*. Koch developed a set of criteria to identify explicit uses of scripture which helps establish Paul's citation technique.[140] He distinguishes a quotation—a formulation that is from an external source and is recognizable as such[141]—from allusion and paraphrase which are more fully integrated into the context of the letter.[142] This distinction considers whether the reader is able to recognize (*erkennen*) that the author is using an external source. In contemplating how an author indicates to an audience

---

136. Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 40.

137. Ibid., 52–53.

138. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 91.

139. See ibid., 93–102.

140. Koch, *Die Schrift*, 11–23.

141. Ibid., 11.

142. Ibid., 17.

that he is quoting an external source, Koch provides seven categories based on textual indicators. These are:[143]

1. Quotations with unambiguous (*eindeutig*) introductory formula

2. Quotations already specifically cited in the context

3. Quotations emphasized by subsequent interpretation (*nachträgliche Interpretation*)

4. Quotations incongruous with the context

5. Quotations that differ stylistically in their context

6. Quotations that are indirectly marked with simple conjunctions

7. Totally unlabeled quotations (*ungekennzeichnete Zitate*)[144]

It is only when these unambiguous quotations are identified that scholars may proceed to reckon with Paul's use of scripture from the standpoint of a stable set of data.[145]

Stanley builds upon the work of Koch by both refining the distinguishing characteristics of citations but also expanding considerably upon the characteristics of the first-century readers of Paul. The definition of quotation or citation is limited to "places where the author's appeal to an outside source is so blatant that any attentive reader would recognize the secondary character of the materials in question."[146] Stanley streamlines the criteria by limiting blatant citations to three: "(1) those introduced by an explicit quotation formula . . . (2) those accompanied by a clear interpretive gloss . . . and (3) those that stand in demonstrable syntactical tension with their present Pauline surroundings."[147] This tightened set of criteria provides for him a set of "assured citations" that allows him to identify, isolate and catalogue the "author's normal citation technique."[148] This supports the aim of his study of finding places where Paul has adapted the text of scripture.

---

143. Koch (*Die Schrift*, 21–23), with his list of verses, provided for each category from the undisputed Pauline corpus.

144. This last category is more fully explained earlier as something belonging to a tradition or common knowledge shared between the author and reader: "wenn es sich um einen Satz, Ausspruch o. dgl. handelt, der zum gemeinsamen Bildungs- und Überlieferungsgut von Verfasser und Lesern gehörte" (Koch, *Die Schrift*, 15).

145. Ibid., 12–13.

146. Stanley, *Paul*, 4.

147. Ibid., 37.

148. Ibid., 32.

One of the strengths of both studies is that they work from more recent advances made in Septuagint research.[149] The present state of research in 1 Peter has lagged in this respect. The main weakness of the approach, though, is the insistence upon a criteria of explicitness. By isolating the most explicit citations, one is not able to assess the overall picture of normal usage. Instead, the result is a picture of normal usage in explicit cases. However, if an author "normally" works at a less explicit level, the criteria established by Koch and Stanley have already weeded out what amounts to the author's "normal" practice. The reasons for insisting on a criteria of explicitness are understandable. For one, the data are easier to process in this case and allow one to work from more certain cases to less certain cases. But another reason for insisting on this criteria has to do with the ability of the audience to perceive the use of scripture. To this concept we now turn.

Audience Competence

Stanley questions "whether Paul's Gentile readers would have understood even some of his more explicit quotations."[150] His full investigation of Paul's readers is carried out in a study entitled *Arguing with Scripture*. Assuming a literacy rate of 10–20 percent, the problem of illiteracy among Paul's original audience is significant.[151] This situation is further compounded by the limited availability of scrolls.[152] If Paul's congregations were mostly composed of illiterate Gentiles, what hope did they have of following his skilled use of scripture when employed subtly?[153] There is a discrepancy, then, between Paul's use of scripture and the ability of his audience to perceive his use of scripture.[154] Stanley suggests four possible explanations for this discrepancy. It is possible that (1) there was an established program whereby Gentile audiences were taught to study and memorize the Jewish scriptures. Or (2), Paul assumes a shared scriptural background between him and his audience where there, in fact, was none. Or perhaps (3), Paul addressed his letters to the literate elite and expected these to explain to illiterate members of the audience the scriptural nuances in his letters. Or

---

149. See n. 16 above.

150. Ibid., 35.

151. Ibid., 44, 55. He bases this on Harris, *Ancient Literacy*.

152. Ibid., 42, 44, 55.

153. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 45–46.

154. The ability of present scholarship to identify allusions highlights the problem of where "meaning" is to be located: in the author, reader or text. See Moyise, "Quotations," 24–25.

(4), Paul understood that his use of scripture would go largely unrecognized except for some key scriptural passages but would be appreciated and accepted all the same.[155] Elements of these four explanations lead him, then, to spell out four generalizations. First, "illiteracy did not prevent the Gentiles in Paul's congregations from knowing something about the Jewish Scriptures."[156] Stanley suggests that the Decalogue and important biblical figures such as Abraham, Moses, Elijah and David would have been well known.[157] Second, "Paul's letters leave no doubt that his patterns of thought and expression were heavily molded by the Jewish Scriptures."[158] This suggests that not all allusions to scripture are rhetorically significant.[159] Third, concerning Paul writing primarily for the literate members of his audience, Stanley writes, "Paul may have been directing his argument primarily to the literate members of his churches (or more precisely, to those who were familiar with the Jewish Scriptures) when he penned his biblical quotations."[160] Finally, "when Paul quotes from the Jewish Scriptures in his letters, he invariably has a rhetorical purpose."[161]

Wagner responds to the reader-centered approach by setting forth his understanding of the first recipients of Paul's letter in Rome. He recognizes that, with limited evidence, it is nearly impossible to arrive at an accurate reconstruction of Paul's audience regarding their ability to perceive quotations and allusions.[162] Rather than limit oneself to an historical reconstruction of the first audience, he suggests that our understanding of the historical evidence work in tandem with a consideration of the ideal reader "encoded in the letter itself."[163] He further proposes that it was likely that multiple encounters with Paul's letter would have occurred.[164] These proposals go

---

155. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 49.

156. Ibid., 50.

157. We must ask how they would know these things. Was there a textual/oral means of appropriating this knowledge? The Decalogue and the four figures he suggests cover a wide range of scriptural material from different genres. Either they had far more access to scripture than Stanley allows, or even this knowledge is inconsistent with his reconstruction.

158. Ibid., 51.

159. On the rhetorical significance of quotations, see Stanley, "The Rhetoric of Quotations," 44–58.

160. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 51.

161. Ibid., 52.

162. Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 34.

163. Ibid., 35.

164. Ibid., 36–37. See also Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 127–28.

a long way toward answering the claim that there was a low level of reader competence among the first recipients of Romans.[165]

Furthermore, Wagner considers Paul's relationship to Isaiah not simply as someone reading the written text, but also as someone committing large portions of Isaiah to memory.[166] He proposes that "we should imagine Paul interacting with scripture in a *variety* of modes, including meditation on memorized passages, hearing of spoken texts, personal reading of written texts, and collection of and reflection on excerpts from larger texts."[167] The role of memory is also important for our understanding of the audience. It cannot be suggested that the audience was composed uniformly of people as competent as Paul, but many of the traits that mark him as a competent reader of scripture would carry over to the upper end of an audience of mixed capabilities.

What has emerged in such discussion is that Paul was an exceptionally competent reader of scripture. But the gap between him and "ordinary" readers and hearers of scriptures is not always easy to discern. In the case of someone like Peter, it can be difficult to accurately rate his reader competence against that of Paul's. At the same time, there do appear to be certain presuppositions (Jewish exegetical practices, christological kerygma, gospel mission, etc.) that are shared within the early church, making the comparison between Paul and Peter valid.

Picturing the Original Audience

Stanley's contribution to the study of Paul's use of scripture challenges previous studies by questioning the assumption that one can simply study Paul in abstraction from the communicative process his letters represent.[168] The same holds true for Peter and the study of his use of scripture. In the thesis I propose for 1 Peter, then, it is necessary to remain sensitive to the rhetorical context in which scriptural texts are used in 1 Peter. However, there are some features of Stanley's work that must be refined before taking them fully on board.

---

165. See Moyise, *Evoking Scripture*, 44–48 for a competent assessment of the author-centered and reader-centered approaches. In the end, he advises readers of Paul to take both approaches into account.

166. Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 20–28.

167. Ibid., 26.

168. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 59–60.

Literacy and Orality

First, the issue of illiteracy among the majority of the original audience of early Christian epistles must be further nuanced. One fault of Stanley's portrayal of ancient illiteracy is the equating of literacy with social elites. The result of this equation is a dismissal of the significance of orality.[169] To take an example, he writes, "It seems improbable that the illiterate members of Paul's churches would have been motivated to raise questions about Paul's use of scripture, and it is even more unlikely that they would have been able to understand and critique the answers if they were offered."[170] It seems that the stigmas associated with modern illiteracy have been retrojected onto the ancient world, even though no evidence exists indicating that illiteracy was stigmatized. There is an assumption expressed here that illiteracy entails an inability to understand the written word read aloud and an inability to engage in critical thought.[171] However, in a culture where oral modes of communication dominated, this assumption is unfounded.[172]

Stanley works with the assumption that most, if not all, of Paul's audience were Gentiles (a concept that matches the current scholarly opinion regarding the Petrine audience in Asia Minor).[173] However, there was likely a higher level of Jewish presence than Stanley assumes.[174] If Paul's audience were composed of a greater number of Jewish listeners, then the competency of the audience would be raised significantly with regard to familiarity with the Jewish scriptures. Furthermore, if the leadership of the early church was composed of people who were familiar with scripture (even if illiterate), a great deal more may be expected of the audience than Stanley allows. We may expect that the leadership of the early church worked to educate those less familiar with the scriptural heritage that belonged to the early church. This is a point Wagner raises in his critique of Stanley's thesis, to which he adds the likelihood of "multiple public readings."[175] All of these areas of

---

169. Stanley addresses this more fully in "The Social Environment," 20–26.

170. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 57 n. 50.

171. Stanley, though, finds that part of this inability stems from the imposition of interpretive renderings upon the text by the literati, making it virtually impossible for the listener to differentiate written text from oral tradition ("The Social Environment," 21–22).

172. Several assumptions regarding literacy, orality and memory in the ancient world are addressed in Thomas, *Literacy and Orality*, 5–28.

173. Stanley *Paul*, 35–36, 338; *Arguing with Scripture*, x, 1–3.

174. Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 34–36.

175. Ibid., 37.

consideration contribute to a picture of the early church as more competent hearers of scripture than has been granted by Stanley.

This means that the authors of NT epistles did not have to work only at the most explicit level to indicate the use of scripture to their audience. Should we assume that everyone would have heard more subtle uses of scripture? By no means! But we can assume that there were members of the audience who caught a great deal more than the reader-centered approach has allowed. In all likelihood, the members who caught more were usually those in a position to explain what they learned to others.

Second, the scarcity of biblical scrolls intersects significantly with the first test Hays proposed: *availability*. Scholars are in agreement that Paul accessed scripture in written form. It is likely that Paul used written excerpts from previous study of scrolls as the source of (most of) his quotations.[176] We must also ask, however, the extent to which the audience was familiar with scriptural texts. How do we go about quantifying what was available? A simple perusal of Fraenkel's *Verzeichnis* of Greek manuscripts provides us a picture of our extant manuscripts for the different books of the Bible. The index of manuscripts for individual books indicates that the most popular books were the Psalter (with the most manuscripts by far), Genesis, Isaiah, the Odes of Solomon, Exodus and Proverbs.[177] At Qumran, the books of Isaiah, Genesis, Psalms, Deuteronomy, Exodus and Leviticus, along with *Jubilees*, the *Hodayot*, and *Rule of the Community* rounds out the picture of availability.[178] This profile corresponds significantly with the books most used by NT authors. This correspondence suggests that authors were aware that the availability of biblical scrolls was a significant issue.

Ultimately the proposition that 1 Peter draws upon a scriptural narrative, which is informed by the themes and images of discrete scriptural texts, makes it so that the force of Peter's argument resides less in the recognition of each individual text that is quoted or alluded to and more in the recognition of the dramatic narrative in which Peter depicts his audience as participants. In other words, stories were able to communicate effectively to widespread audiences.[179]

---

176. Lim (*Holy Scripture*, 150–52) has an extended discussion in which Hatch's *excerpta* theory is preferred to Harris's *testimonia* theory. See also Stanley, *Paul*, 79. Wagner (*Heralds of the Good News*, 24–27) wants to include memory as a significant factor behind Paul's use of scripture. He thinks it incredible "that once Paul expended the labor to find and excerpt a passage, he promptly forgot all about its original setting" (ibid., 25).

177. Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften*, 472–97.

178. Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," 301.

179. This is consistent with the findings of Barrier (*The Acts of Paul and Thecla*,