



TRANSACTIONS OF THE  
CONNECTICUT ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

INCORPORATED A. D. 1799

---

---

VOLUME 17, PAGES 363-538

JANUARY, 1913

---

---

The Literary Relations of  
"The First Epistle of Peter"

with

Their Bearing on Date and Place  
of Authorship

BY

ORA DELMER FOSTER, PH.D.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, D.D., Litt.D., LL.D



YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

1913

BS2795  
A.F75



LIBRARY OF PR  
OCT 14 1  
THEOLOGICAL SE

TRANSACTIONS OF THE  
CONNECTICUT ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

INCORPORATED A. D. 1799

VOLUME 17, PAGES 363-538

JANUARY, 1913

The Literary Relations of  
"The First Epistle of Peter"

with

Their Bearing on Date and Place  
of Authorship

BY

ORA DELMER FOSTER, PH.D.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, D.D., LITT.D., LL.D.



YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

1013

WEIMAR: PRINTED BY R. WAGNER SOHN.



## CONTENTS

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| INTRODUCTION . . . . .                                    | 370  |
| PART I. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS                             |      |
| Tertullian . . . . .                                      | 381  |
| Clement of Alexandria . . . . .                           | 381  |
| Irenaeus . . . . .  | 381  |
| Papias . . . . .  | 381  |
| II Clement . . . . .                                      | 381  |
| Justin Martyr . . . . .                                   | 382  |
| Barnabas . . . . .  | 384  |
| Hermas . . . . .  | 388  |
| Didache . . . . .   | 392  |
| Polycarp . . . . .  | 393  |
| Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs . . . . .              | 396  |
| Ignatius . . . . .  | 397  |
| Clement of Rome . . . . .                                 | 398  |
| PART II. THE CANONICAL BOOKS                              |      |
| Galatians . . . . .                                       | 411  |
| I Thessalonians . . . . .                                 | 414  |
| II Thessalonians . . . . .                                | 416  |
| I Corinthians . . . . .                                   | 417  |
| II Corinthians . . . . .                                  | 421  |
| Romans . . . . .  | 424  |
| Ephesians . . . . .                                       | 442  |
| Colossians . . . . .                                      | 455  |
| Philemon . . . . .  | 459  |
| Philippians . . . . .                                     | 459  |
| I Timothy . . . . .                                       | 460  |
| II Timothy . . . . .                                      | 462  |
| Titus . . . . .   | 463  |
| Marked Text Showing Possible Sources . . . . .            | 466  |
| Dependence of I Peter upon the Pauline Epistles . . . . . | 472  |
| Hebrews . . . . .   | 480  |
| "Q" Source . . . . .                                      | 492  |
| Markan Source . . . . .                                   | 495  |
| Peculiar to Matthew . . . . .                             | 499  |
| Peculiar to Luke . . . . .                                | 500  |
| Acts . . . . .  | 502  |

|                             |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| James . . . . .             | 508     |
| Jude . . . . .              | 518     |
| Revelation . . . . .        | 519     |
| I John . . . . .            | 522     |
| II John . . . . .           | 525     |
| III John . . . . .          | 525     |
| John . . . . .              | 525     |
| Tables of Results . . . . . | 533     |
| <br>BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .  | <br>536 |

## INTRODUCTION

by

Professor BENJAMIN W. BACON.

There are few writings, if any, besides First Peter, the accurate determination of whose date is a matter of greater moment to the student of Christian origins. Datings vary from before *A.D.* 50 to 115, or later ; and with the question of date that of authenticity is inextricably bound up. Early tradition is unanimous in placing the death of Peter under Nero. Yet Ramsay, stalwart defender as he is of the Petrine authorship, feels compelled to date it under Domitian, compelled by the implications of the Epistle itself regarding official treatment of Christianity. For First Peter speaks of "sufferings accomplished among the brethren throughout the world, penalties appropriate to murderers and thieves visited upon them "for the name of Christ." In fact this "fiery trial" which has come upon the church through the work of Satan, who prowls about it like a roaring lion "seeking whom he may devour" seems to be the one chief occasion of the writing. It stands practically alone among the epistles in its complete silence as to doctrinal differences. Ramsay sees no alternative but to add a score of years more or less to the traditional life-time of Peter, recognizing the extreme difficulty of identifying these general persecutions "for the name" with the local onslaught of Nero in Rome, of which the distinctive feature was prosecution for *flagitia cohaerentia nomini*.

Even were it found for any reason impossible to maintain the Petrine authorship, accurate determination of the date of First Peter would be of immense advantage for the settlement of a great number of disputed points of criticism ; for scarcely any writing of the canon has so many points of literary connection with others. Itself widely used from an extremely early date it employs to an extraordinary extent the thought and phraseology of others. It stands in the very midst of the stream of literary development. Almost every writing of the New Testament has lines of dependence leading either to it, or from it. And the period within which

nearly all authorities agree that it must be placed, is just that where light is most needed, the dark subapostolic age from Nero to Trajan. Again the field addressed is just that whose history we most need to trace, the mission field of Paul in Asia Minor. The type of teaching (so far as it is not simply Paul's) comes under the name of Peter, tempting us to correlate it with other sources claiming relationship to this Apostle, in the attempt to define a "Petrinische Lehrbegriff" or "Petrinische Strömung."

These literary relations are undeniably present, and in a degree of abundance which few, we think, will have realized who have not been brought face to face with the facts by some such statistical survey as the following pages afford. The data then are before us. The solution of the problem depends simply on the degree of critical acumen with which we can pronounce upon extremely delicate questions of literary employment, more especially of priority in employment. Fortunately evidence of relationship becomes rapidly cumulative, and even the question of priority is not hopeless when real impartiality holds the scales.

We bespeak the careful attention of students of New Testament origins to the data presented by Dr. Foster; first, because of the importance of the subject, whose ramifications extend even beyond what we have already so briefly indicated; second, because of the peculiar hopefulness of the effort in view of the superabundance of material; third, because of the scholarly reserve, caution, and objectivity of Dr. Foster's method; which allows the reader full liberty to form his own judgment, and aims only to let the facts speak for themselves.

The present writer gladly acknowledges his own indebtedness to the careful comparisons and statistics of Dr. Foster. The outcome, a date not far from 90 *AD.*, with dependence of First Peter on Ephesians, Romans and Hebrews, and conversely of James, Clement of Rome, and other writers on First Peter, tallies indeed very closely with results previously attained by an important group of scholars. But the evidence, much of which, though available, has hitherto been scattered, acquires far more convincing power when exhibited in due order and classification. The inferences appeal, even to one who has traversed the field before, with new freshness and urgency. To not a few, we believe, the conviction will be brought home that now, at last, we have a definite, fixed point in the sub-apostolic age, a datable literary product of the Pauline mission-field twenty years after Paul's death; instead of a floating, indeterminate possibility. To others the problem will

seem to call for further light. To all, as we believe, who give to Dr. Foster's data the attention their careful compilation deserves, the time will prove well spent. One cannot review the evidence, no matter what the verdict, without new insight into the history of primitive Christian thought and literature.

Yale University.

BENJ. W. BACON.

## INTRODUCTION

by  
The AUTHOR.

In this age of Biblical reconstruction, there is probably no one thing more important to be determined, as a prerequisite for arriving at the truth concerning the History of Christian Origins, than the authorship and date of early documents. Criticism constantly forces us to revise and rewrite our Histories. Unfortunately or otherwise, criticism has robbed us of our "certainty," as concerns the authorship of many of the Canonical books. On discovering that dependence cannot be placed either upon the tradition concerning the authorship or date of certain documents or upon the claims these documents make for themselves, the modern historian is compelled to travel a more difficult path than his predecessors. Though this new path be difficult, and but vaguely defined at places, it is of the greatest importance for an understanding of the early period of Church History that the critical historian follow it to its very end, however wearisome the journey. Unless the dates of the early sources can be accurately determined the historian will ever grope about in uncertainty.

As great and important results were effected in the study of the Old Testament when the Book of Deuteronomy was properly located, so also the correct dating of certain New Testament books will prove to have most significant results for the History of Christian Origins. It is as reasonable to write a history of the Hebrews during the latter half of the second Millenium before our Era on the basis of Deuteronomy as it is to construct a history of the early Church on the basis of the dates sometimes assigned to early documents. Critical History, therefore, necessarily depends upon the most careful judgment of the sources. That which has been done in analysing the sources of the Hexateuch has, in a limited degree, been done also in the New Testament. Valuable service has already been done in bringing to light the sources both of the Gospels and of the Acts, but there is much important work yet to be done.

Much valuable information concerning the Apostolic Age is supplied by the certain dating of the Pauline Epistles, but unfortunately we are left in doubt concerning the Sub-Apostolic Age, because of the dubious dates assigned to the documents of the period. For

example, there is little agreement among scholars concerning the date of Hebrews, James and I Peter, though they are of the utmost importance for an understanding of this age. After a prolonged battle over the origin of the Gospels, scholars enjoyed a brief period of truce, but they have again been summoned to action by Harnack's recent challenge. That this great scholar should move the dates of the Synoptic Gospels so far back, in the face of all but universal agreement, furnishes a good illustration of the need of more critical study of the literature of this most difficult period.

Probably no one book, if properly located, will throw more light on this puzzling period than the First Epistle of Peter. Though small, it contains, in proportion to its size, perhaps more points of contact with other New Testament literature than any other book of the New Testament. It is exceedingly important that the problems in connection with its authorship be solved. If, as many contend, the Epistle is genuine, it is probably the only written legacy we possess from any of the original "Twelve." Since, as is agreed by scholars of all schools, the Epistle is thoroughly Pauline, we should have, in the case of its genuineness, a key to the solution of the problem of how the Pauline and the Petrine mission fields were ultimately united. But the very difficult problem of how Peter became so thoroughly Paulinized is presented. If the great Apostle to the Circumcision is the author, then important information is here supplied not only regarding the early influence of Paul upon Peter, but also regarding the early development of Christian thought as well as the extent of the Neronian persecutions, which in that case would be alluded to in I Peter.

But if, as others contend, I Peter was not written by the one whose name it bears, it modifies our views of all this period. In this case its evidence amounts to very little in reconstructing the history of the period until it is definitely located in time and place.

Since the date of this Epistle must be determined before certainty can be obtained regarding its authorship, the present inquiry is concerned about its location in time. The Literary Relations have a very small bearing upon the problem of authorship, but much on the question of date.

Of all the disputed books of the New Testament no one is more important to locate. Some make it antedate the Pauline Epistles, others put it as late as the fourth decade of the Second Century. Each decade between these extremes has its claimants for its date. Scholars have differed just as widely as to its place of origin. Some claim that it was written at Babylon on the Euphrates, others that

it came from Babylon in Egypt or Old Cairo, while still others hold that it was penned in Babylon on the Tiber, or Rome. Obviously therefore the location of the time and place of authorship of the First Epistle of Peter would be of the greatest value to the History of Christian Origins.

Two means of dating are open to us, *i. e.*, (1) the internal evidence, so far as concerned with the happenings of the time, and (2) the literary relations. These must necessarily be kept apart, for any suspicion of one affecting the other tends to invalidate the proof.

Much has been written concerning the date required by the stratum of theological thought found in the Epistle. Many have discussed at great length the date implied by the allusions to the persecutions which were being waged against the Christians at the time of writing. Some also have elaborated lengthy arguments concerning the date implied from the incidental references to ecclesiastical institutions and government. Many New Testament Introductions and Commentaries on I Peter point out some of the more probable points of contact with other literature, but nowhere have these relations been exhaustively or systematically treated. This thesis is limited to the last line of approach, *i. e.*, the Literary Relations.

Nevertheless we may mention briefly some of the problems connected with the external conditions of the Church in the Sub-Apostolic Age. Obviously the Epistle was written during a fiery ordeal, to encourage and to exhort the Christians to endure to the end and to order their conduct in such a way as to avoid as far as possible both social and civil odium. The ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (5 ; 9) seems to indicate that the Imperial Government had adopted a definite policy toward the Christians throughout the world. This inference seems to be borne out by the general tenor of the Epistle. They were persecuted "for the name." Arnold and others are right who claim that the persecutions of Nero did not extend beyond the Capital and its immediate vicinity. The conflict here referred to cannot have been that inaugurated by Nero, nor was it earlier than Domitian. Ramsay has no real evidence for saying that "the Neronian policy was resumed under Vespasian. (C. R. E. p. 282.) Nor need we suppose that the persecutions alluded to are later than Domitian, as many contend. The conditions here are practically the same as those reflected in Hebrews, Revelation and Clement of Rome. These four writings have a common background. They look back to the Neronian outbreak as something that occurred in former times, whereas the present one is a "strange thing." Apparently then this is the beginning of Governmental punishment of the Christians as



such, throughout the world. A study of the five theories which have been proposed concerning the persecutions alluded to in I Peter, in the light of the data at hand, has led the present writer to the conclusion that those scholars are correct who claim that the "fiery trial," which the Christians were undergoing when the Epistle was written, was caused by Domitian. Assuming the correctness of this conclusion we should be required to date I Peter somewhere between 81 and 95.

The internal conditions of the Church are quite clearly reflected in I Peter. There is a distinct advance over the doctrine as presented by Paul. Though Pauline to the core, I Peter seems to be Post-Pauline in its stage of doctrinal development. "The Christian's freedom from the Law is assumed in a genuine Pauline fashion in 2 ; 16. The tendency is present to give to the ethical side of the Christian life an independent value which it lacks in Paul, who always lays chief stress upon its religious basis. There is a tendency also to emphasize the future and to treat faith as almost synonymous with hope which looks forward to the glory of Christ and his saints, and thus furnishes an incentive to Christian living, instead of making it as clearly and distinctly as it is in Paul the mystical oneness of the believer with Christ. And so baptism in the same way takes on the aspect rather of a pledge of right conduct than a bond between the Christian and his Lord. Similarly the sufferings of Christ are looked upon not simply in their redemptive value, as effecting the death of the flesh, and thus the believer's release from its bondage, but also in their moral value as an example for the Christian. This Epistle bears testimony to the survival after Paul's death of his conception of Christianity in a somewhat modified, but still comparatively pure form." (McGiffert's *Apostolic Age* p. 486 f.) "Christ, grace, faith—these are the foundations of Christianity. The threefold formula even appears : chosen by God, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, reconciled by Christ. The struggle against Jewish legalism is altogether past and yet Paul's main dogma remains, that redemption is through God's grace alone. It is not difficult to discover many points in which the author of the First Epistle of St. Peter diverges from St. Paul and betrays a tendency to interpret his epistles in a catholic sense." (Wernle's *Beg. of Christianity*, Eng. tr. Vol. I.) The sinless Christ who died for our redemption is here thought of as the "Suffering Servant" of II Isaiah. This thought is foreign to Paul, but common in later literature. The Pauline doctrine of the preexistence of Christ may be implied if not expressed in 1 ; 11, 20. Though many scholars think that this doctrine is not implied here,

others assert that it is, e. g. Bevon, Bigg, Gloag, Holtzmann, Lechler, Pfeleiderer, Stevens, etc. The Christology of I Peter occupies a position mid-way between Paul and the Johannine Literature. It also suggests Paul on the one side and the Synoptic Gospels on the other. (For other examples see McGiffert's *Apostolic Age* p. 486 ; note also the later discussion of John.)

The book reveals no traces of enemies within the Church, as Ephesians, Colossians and the Pastoral Epistles, but the enemies are without. Heresies were no doubt in existence at this time, but they were for the time overlooked, in the more pressing need of saving the Church from being stamped out entirely by Imperial action. The silence as to heresies seems to be as easily accounted for on the assumption that the Epistle was written during this time of external hostility as if it were written before the heresies alluded to in the Pauline Epistles had arisen.

These preliminary conclusions drawn from the external conditions are very important for an understanding of the Epistle, but they will be kept separate from the discussion of the Literary Relations.

In returning to the problem of Literary Relations, it may be said it is a long and difficult one to solve, but that the effort is fully recompensed by the definite results that attend its solution. Knowing as we do, with no little degree of certainty, the date and place of authorship of the greater part of the literature related to the First Epistle of Peter, the determination of the order of dependence would, if accurately done, also determine the approximate date and place of this Epistle. It is hoped therefore that the following study may show, with some degree of accuracy, what literature I Peter presupposes as well as what presupposes it.

The aim has not been to give every possible point of contact between I Peter and all the literature considered, but an effort has been made to record what seemed to the author to be the more important ones. Many more resemblances might have been recorded, but the time and space required to collate them would not be justified by the results obtained. By arranging in parallel columns, in the original language, the more probable points of contact, it is thought that a basis is afforded for some valuable conclusions, both as regards date and place of authorship.

By the very nature of the subject little new material can be advanced. A great percent of the parallels tabulated have already been pointed out by others, yet there are many additional ones discussed, which were discovered independently.

The method adopted in this thesis is, in the main, that followed by the Oxford Committee, in their excellent little book entitled "The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers" (1905.) The parallels are arranged in textual order. The order of probable dependence is shown by arranging them into classes A, A\*, B, C, C—D, and D. Class A includes those books which mention our Epistle by name. Class A\* comprehends those which do not mention the Epistle by name but concerning which there is no real doubt in the author's mind. In class B are found those which reach a very high degree of probability. In class C have been placed those which are of lower degree of probability. Class C—D represents those which give reason to suspect literary acquaintance, but are not sufficiently suggestive to belong in class C. Class D includes all those for which the evidence affords no ground for judgment. Doubtless there are books placed in the last class which are related to I Peter, but since the evidence is not sufficient to prove it they may be classed as doubtful. For example, Colossians shows many points of very probable connection, but since these points, with many others, are also found in Ephesians, it cannot be claimed with any degree of certainty that our author knew Colossians. Under the respective classes named above, the parallels have been arranged in textual order according to the letters a\*, b, c, c—d, and d, to which an explanation will apply similar to that given in connection with the capital letters. The present writer has ventured to assign to some books a higher degree of probable dependence than the Oxford Committee has done. It would seem that they have not given due consideration to the value of cumulative evidence. A book containing a number of probable points of connection deserves a higher rating than any single passage in it. Again more evidence should be attached to probable points of contact which show close contextual connection. Peculiar words of themselves mean but little, but when they occur in suggestive connections they become significant.

Many of the parallels were assigned to their respective classes with much hesitancy, and it is not expected that their classification will meet the approval of those who may read them reflectively, but it is hoped that they may represent, on the whole, the real order of connection. The notes represent in part the author's reasons for the various classifications.

The books of the Apostolic Fathers are arranged with the chronological order reversed, beginning at the point of positive reference to I Peter and extending backward to Clement of Rome. Harnack's "Chronologie" has been followed in the main. In the New Testa-

ment, the order proposed by Professor Bacon (Intr. p. 280) has been adopted with few exceptions.

The New Testament books are treated as wholes. This method, however, is not followed in discussing the Synoptic Gospels. Their sources are first considered, after which the peculiarities of each are reviewed in order. Though Acts is presented as a whole, attention has been called to the comparative degree of probable dependence with the "Petrine" and the "Pauline" divisions of the book. II Peter does not receive separate treatment because it is taken as direct testimony to I Peter.

The application of the method described above has secured some significant results, which are presented in tabular form at the conclusion of the thesis.

It has been made obvious that our author was not an original writer. This fact has proven very greatly to our advantage in locating the Epistle by its literary relations. On the other hand the freedom with which he used his sources makes it often difficult to determine whether he was influenced by a certain document or whether the agreement is due to current teaching. He was an extensive reader but no slavish copyist. He was acquainted with the early Christian writings as well as with the LXX. Scharfe, in his "Petrinische Strömung", shows probably as clearly as anyone how well at home our author was with the LXX, though it must be noted that he has frequently overlooked the more obvious connection with the Pauline Epistles, in his zeal to make a strong case.

The discussion of the Pauline Epistles in the following pages, it is believed, shows conclusively that our Epistle rests directly upon Paul, more especially upon Romans and Ephesians. In addition to the information afforded by the tables at the conclusion of the thesis, it may be stated that no less than fifty percent of the text of I Peter shows a possible connection with the Pauline Epistles, and a great many references find parallels in as many as three of Paul's letters. This fact which is represented by the 218 parallels tabulated, is alone sufficient to show that I Peter depends upon the Pauline literature, notwithstanding the recent claim that no reference is made to this Literature for a century or more.<sup>1</sup> It can be said with a reasonable degree of certainty that the author of I Peter both knew and used Romans and Ephesians. There is much in the points involved, to say nothing of historical considerations, to make it

<sup>1</sup> W. B. Smith in "Der vorchristliche Jesus" (1906). Ch. V. "Saeculi Silentium".

certain that I Peter depends upon Paul and not vice versa as B. Weiss and Kühl have contended. From the literary relations alone then Ephesians fixes the terminus a quo for I Peter at about 60 *A. D.* Granting with Moffatt that "a copy of Ephesians came back to Rome some years after its circulation in Asia," it would not be safe to fix the earliest possible date for I Peter later than the year 65.

Irenaeus (cir. 186) is the first concerning whose acquaintance with I Peter there is absolute certainty. We are quite certain also that Papias (cir. 150) knew the Epistle. Doubt cannot well be entertained in the case of Polycarp (cir. 115). It appears highly probable that the Johannine Literature (95—100) presupposes I Peter. Clement of Rome quite certainly used it as early as the year 95. From the literary relations alone, therefore, we may fix the termini a quo and ad quem for I Peter with perfect confidence at the years 60 and 95. Granting Moffatt's view to be correct, three decades would still be open for the date of this Epistle.

It is a positive gain to be able to pin this Epistle down to three decades, but it would be of still greater service to know in just which one it should be located. But to do this from the standpoint of literary relations alone requires that we employ the testimony of witnesses that are themselves difficult to locate. Yet if these doubtful writings show literary connections, they have mutual service to render in establishing their respective dates. Fortunately for us this is just the case.

This study has led to the conclusion that the Epistle of James depends upon I Peter. If then, as many scholars contend, Clement of Rome knew and used James, I Peter must have been written not later than 90. At all events it would seem fair, even granting that the Oxford Committee was correct in finding no proof of connection between James and Clement, to fix the terminus ad quem for I Peter at the year 90. On the other hand it appears from our study that the Epistle to the Hebrews is presupposed by I Peter. Practically all scholars admit that Hebrews depends upon Paul. This then would require that we fix the terminus a quo for I Peter much later than the year 60. But how much later? To determine this the internal as well as external evidence of Hebrews will be involved. Yet this is not going beyond the limits of our discussion inasmuch as the question of literary relations was settled independently.

Since both Hebrews and I Peter were written by thorough students of Paul and with similar motives, and under similar circumstances their evidence may fairly be considered as supplementary. Scholars

are very generally agreed that Hebrews is removed several years from the Neronian Persecution. Granting that Heb. 11; 32 refers to this persecution, 12; 3 f. certainly points to another outbreak against the Christians, which was then in progress but which had not reached its full height. This cannot allude to the Jewish War of 66-70. It was apparently long enough after the destruction of Jerusalem for them to have become reconciled to the catastrophe. We are to conclude therefore, so it seems, with Bacon, Holtzmann, Jülicher, McGiffert, Moffatt, Weizsacker, Von Soden and others, that the persecutions alluded to in Hebrews are those of Domitian. If these conclusions are correct I Peter could not have been written earlier than 85.

Incidentally the foregoing study has afforded an earlier limit for the Epistle of James, as well as a later limit for Hebrews. If, as is here maintained, James depends upon I Peter it must have been written some time after 85, and not early as many contend. But if, as we believe, this study shows, I Peter presupposes Hebrews and the latter comes from the reign of Domitian, we should be required to date James somewhere between 90 and 95. Hebrews would in that case be dated between 84 and 85 and I Peter between 85 and 90.

It may be noted in passing that Pliny, in his correspondence with Trajan in 112, states that in Bithynia, one of the provinces to which I Peter is addressed, "some of the accused assert that they forsook Christianity twenty-five years ago." (Ad Traj. 96, 6.) This apostasy of cir. 87 may very probably have been due to the persecutions that are alluded to in I Peter, whose author aims to prevent this very thing.

We may next consider the place of authorship of our Epistle. It is clear from Table III, p. 535, that the literature which shows the closest relation to I Peter was either written in Rome or Asia Minor, or circulated in those regions very early. Nowhere in the whole realm of early Christian literature does there seem to be any writing, not having to do with the regions just mentioned, that shows any connection with I Peter earlier than Pseudo-Barnabas cir. 135. On the other hand there are many in these localities which show a very probable literary connection. Galatians, written from Corinth and circulating in Asia Minor, was very probably known by our author. I Corinthians, written at Ephesus, seems to have been known by him. There are reasons also to suspect that he knew II Corinthians, which would be apt to circulate in this region. Apparently he knew Hebrews, the evidence of whose existence comes to us first from Rome. It appears highly probably that the author or authors

of the Johannine literature, who wrote from Ephesus, knew I Peter. So also Ignatius, writing from the same region. We are confident that Polycarp, of Smyrna, was acquainted with our Epistle. It will be noticed in the Table that there are none of those marked "A\*" earlier than Polycarp which do not show a direct connection with Rome, e. g. Romans, Ephesians, and Clement of Rome. James may also be added to this list, inasmuch as the first echoes which we have of it are in Rome. All the literature marked "B" or "C" earlier than 160 also shows direct connection with Rome or Asia Minor or both, unless it be Titus, which will hardly be counted an exception.

The silence of the literature of other places, as well as that of these localities in the period assigned to I Peter is quite as significant as the direct references; for manifestly some time must be allowed for acquaintance with the Epistle to extend, and more as the remoteness increases. Both lines of evidence converge, therefore upon the conclusion that I Peter was written in Rome cir. 87-90.

In addition to the conclusion just reached regarding the date and place of authorship of I Peter, this study has other important results. The bearing that it has on the problem of dating the Synoptic Gospels should not be overlooked. If, as Harnack claims, the Gospels are so early one is surprised not to find them reflected more in I Peter. It may be claimed that the author was acquainted with the Synoptic tradition in some form, but there is very little, if indeed anything, to indicate that he knew our Gospels. There is no real evidence that he knew the "Q" source. The real evidence for literary connection between I Peter and the Markan source is reduced to I Peter 2; 7 = Mark 12; 10. (See discussion on Mk. Ex. 5.) Were we to grant that these passages show a direct literary connection, there is nothing to prove the priority of Mark. There seems to be nothing peculiar to Matthew or Luke which would justify the claim of literary connection. It seems strange that our author, susceptible as he was to literary influences, did not make more use of the Synoptic Gospels, if they were written as early as Harnack contends. This silence is against Harnack's position. It would seem therefore, if for example, Mk. 12; 10 is directly connected with I Peter, that the priority must be given to the latter and not to the former.

The Johannine Literature is also involved in the dating of I Peter. If the conclusions reached here are correct, namely that the Johannine Literature presupposes I Peter as a necessary connecting link between it and Paul, they have a very important bearing, not only on the development of doctrine in Asia Minor, but also on the vexed problem of the Johannine authorship. Many ideas merely suggested by

Paul, which were more fully expressed in I Peter, are found in the Johannine Literature in fully developed form ; in speeches, narratives, prayers, etc. That is to say these anecdotes seem to presuppose the " Petrine " development. Apparently, then, the Pauline thought travelled in part by way of I Peter.

This study also has a significant bearing on other problems of Church History. It shows the influence that Rome wielded over the Pauline Churches in Proconsular-Asia at this very early period. The relations of Roman Christianity to that of Asia Minor were indeed of the most delicate kind (cf. Rom. 1 ; 11 f. and 15 ; 15-29). The process of annexation of the great Pauline mission field after Paul's death was of the utmost concern and required the greatest possible skill. This could only be effected from Rome, not from Jerusalem, and necessarily from the " Petrine " wing, which we have reason to believe became dominant in Rome between 70 and 95. This our Epistle helped to accomplish by endorsing Paul's doctrine and fellow workers (cf. I Peter 5 ; 12 with the contemporary Acts 15 ; 13-17).



PART I.—APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

TERTULLIAN

A

Scorpiace XII (written cir. 220) "Addressing the Christians of Pontus, Peter, at all events, says" . . . quoting I Pt. 2 ; 20.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

A

(Cir. 200)

INSTRUCTOR I, 6. "Peter says" . . . quoting I Pt. 2 ; 1-3.

IRENÆUS

A

(Cir. 186)

IV, ix, 2 "Peter says in his Epistle" . . . quoting I Pt. 1 ; 8.

IV, xvi, 5 "And for this reason Peter says" . . . quoting I Pt. 2 ; 16.

V, vii, 2 "And this it is which has been said also by Peter" . . . quoting I Pt. 1 ; 8.

PAPIAS

A

(145-160)

Eusebius (H. E. III, xxxix, 17) quotes Papias as follows ; *κέγγρηται δ' ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως.*

II CLEMENT

(Cir. 170)

C

c

II Clem. XIV, 2

I Pt. 1 ; 20

*ἐφανερῶν διδασκαλῶν δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν φανερωθέντων δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἵνα ἡμεῖς σώσῃ, γρόνων δι' ἡμᾶς.*

This striking resemblance receives additional significance when we note with Benecke (N. T. in Apost. Fath.) that *ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς τῆς ζωνῆς* (XVI, 1) occurs in the same contextual connection. Cf. *λίθου ζωντες* of I Pt. 2 ; 4. Bishop Lightfoot thinks the context of II Clement at this point refers to Eph. 1 ; 23.

- (2) II Clem. XVI, 4 I Pt. 4; 8  
 ἀγάπη δὲ καλύπτει πλῆθος ἀμαρτιῶν ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἀμαρτιῶν

Although this is an exact parallel we cannot be certain that it is quoted from our Epistle. It occurs also in I Clem. XLIX, 5, in which place it is discussed.

The above parallels are close even in details, yet the probabilities of dependence are of a low degree.

JUSTIN  
 (Cir. 153—155)

B

b

- (1) Trypho 116 I Pt. 2; 9  
 ἀρχιερατικῶν τὸ ἀληθινὸν γένος ἡμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτῶν βασιλείων  
 ἔσμεν ἡμεῖς ἱεράτευμα, εἰνός ἅγιον

No other book in the Bible furnishes a passage so nearly resembling this as I Pet. 2; 9.

- (2) Trypho 138 I Pt. 3; 18-21  
 Mr. Bigg thinks there is a reference here to I Pt. 3; 18—21. Inasmuch as the story of Noah is commented upon in the same manner, it seems to imply a knowledge of this passage. Noah is a type of Baptism, the eight persons are dwelt upon, and we find close together ἀνάγενναν. διεσώθη. δι' ὕδατος. Further similarity is noted in reference to Jesus' resurrection and exaltation, following in the same order as in our Epistle.

c

- (3) Apol. 1; 61 uses ἀναγεννάω, which is peculiar to I Peter. The thought however, in this connection is nearer that of John 3; 5, than that of our Epistle. In I Pt. 1; 3 the word refers to the new birth of a "lively hope," accomplished by the resurrection of Jesus. In the other reference (I Pt. 1; 23) the Christian is born again not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the word of God, and not by baptism as in Justin.

- (4) Trypho 116 I Pt. 4; 12  
 τῆς πυρωσέως, ἣν πυροῦσιν ἡμεῖς. μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῆ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει  
 ὃ τε διάβολος καὶ οἱ ἀποστοῖ ὑπηρέ- πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν γινομένη.  
 ται πάντες.

Bigg thinks Justin quite clearly alludes to I Peter here. He rightly points out that *πύρωσις* in this sense is peculiar to I Peter.

We should not overlook the fact however, that although the word has a different application in Rev. 18 ; 9, 18, the thought is quite like this section.

- (5) Trypho 119 I Pt. 2 ; 10  
 ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ μόνον, λαὸς ἀλλὰ καὶ Οἱ ποτε οὐ λαὸς, ὧν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ.  
 λαὸς ἁγίος ἔσμεν

It is obvious that Bigg is right in saying " Justin is here referring to Isa. 52 ; 12." The suggestion might come either from Rom. 9 ; 25 ff, or I Peter.

d

- 6) Trypho 35 I Pt. 1 ; 19

Here Justin exhorts not to blaspheme " Him who . . . is the ἁμώμος, and in all things irreproachable Christ Jesus." Well does Bigg cite Heb. 9 ; 14 as a possible reference, for it seems more probable that Justin had it in mind, rather than I Pt. 1 ; 19, inasmuch as he would have given in all probability a better connection to both the thought and words, ὅς ἀμωῶ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ. Cf. also Eph. 1 ; 4, 5 ; 27, Col. 1 ; 22, Jude 24, Rev. 14 ; 5.

- (7) Trypho 110 I Pt. 1 ; 19

We have here a parallel to the one just mentioned in 35. In the later chapter of the " Dialogue," the word " ἁσπίλος," with others, is used to point out the perfection of Jesus as " the most righteous and only spotless and sinless one." Our Epistle compares Jesus' blood to that of a lamb without spot or blemish. I Pt. 1 ; 19 . . . ἅματι ὡς ἁμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ. The word here refers directly to ἀμωῶς rather than to Χριστοῦ as Bigg would make it. Similar usage may be seen in I Tim. 6 ; 14 i. e., τῆς ἁγίας καὶ σε τῆς ἐν τολῆς ἁσπίλου. Cf. also Jas. I ; 27 and II Pt. 3 ; 14.

- (8) Trypho 114 I Pt. 2 ; 6

τοῦ ἀκαρτονομίας ἕθους is very suggestive of I Pt. 2 ; 6, but on close examination it becomes evident that Justin's mind was imbued with the O. T. references, more especially Isa. 28 ; 16. Yet it may have been suggested by I Peter.

Mr. Bigg rightly concludes that it is probable but not certain that Justin knew I Peter. Chapters 114, 119, and 138 of the " Dialogue with Trypho," taken together, intensify the probabilities of literary dependence.

BARNABAS  
(131—160 Harnack)

A\*

b

(1) Bar. IV, 11 f.

I Pt. 1; 17

μελετωμεν τον φόβον του Θεου . . .  
(12) ο Κυριος απροσωπολημπτως  
κρινει τον κοσμον . εκαστος  
καθως εποίησεν κομειται . εαν η  
αγαθος, η δικαιοσυνη αυτου προ-  
ηγησεται αυτου, εαν η πονηρος, ο  
μισθος της πονηριας εμπροσθεν  
αυτου.

και ει πατερα επικληθεισε, τον  
απροσωπολημπτως κρινοντα κατα  
το εκαστου εργον, εν φόβω τον  
της παροικιας υμων χρονον ανα-  
στραφητε.

Cf. also II Cor. 5; 10.

Dr. Bartlet (N. T. in Apost. Fathers) thinks this affords no argument for literary dependence, either on II Corinthians or I Peter, "though the likenesses are striking in both cases." It is significant however that *απροσωπολημπτως*, which is peculiar to our Epistle, is used just in the same connection as in I Peter. The "εαν clauses" on the other hand appear to be developed from "εϊτε αγαθόν, εϊτε κακόν" of II Cor. 5; 10. Since I Pt. 1; 17 implies all that is included in the clauses, just alluded to, the probabilities are yet in favor of our Epistle. It is also important to note the employment in verse 11 of *ναός τελειος του Θεου* which corresponds to *οίκος πνευματικός* of I Pt. 2; 5. Reference to "the last days" in verse 9 is also suggestive of I Pt. 1; 5, 20.

(2) Bar. V, 5, 6, 7

I Pt. 1; 10

πως ουν υπεμεινεν υπο χειρος αν-  
θρωπων παθειν; μαθετε. 6. οι  
προφηται, απ αυτου εχοντες την  
χαριν, εις αυτον επροφητευσαν.  
αυτος δε ενα κατα ρησιν, τον υα-  
νακτον και την εκ νεκρων αναστα-  
σιν δεϊξει, οτι εν σαρκι εδει αυτον  
φανερωθηναι, υπεμεινεν. 7. ενα  
και τως πατρασιν την επαγγελιν  
αποδο.

περι της σωτηριας εξεζητησαν και  
εξηρευνησαν προφηται οι περι της  
εις υμας χαριτος προφητευσαντες.  
(11) ερευνηοντες εις τινα η ποσον  
καιρον εδδγλου το εν αυτοις Ηνευ-  
μα Χριστου, προμαρτυρομενον τα  
εις Χριστον παθηματα, και τασ-  
μετα ταυτα δοξας.

Dr. Bartlet rightly sees a twofold parallelism here with our Epistle; "(1) prophecy foreshadows Christ's passion and its sequel, and (2) this is due to grace proceeding from himself." Attention should have been called also to the close parallel in the clause im-

mediately following Mr. Bartlet's reference. See just below. Bigg contends that Barnabas used I Peter here. See Com. p. 108.

- (3) Bar. V, 7 I Pt. 2; 9  
 ἀυτοῦς ἕαυτοῦ τὸν λαὸν τὸν καινὸν ἑτοιμάζων ἐπιδειξίη. ἑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν. βασιλείου ἱεράτευμα. ἔθνος ἅγιον. λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν.

Following the preceding parallel this striking similarity is very significant.

- (4) Bar. V, 13 I Pt. 2; 24  
 ἀυτοῦς δὴ ἐβέλησεν οὖτω παθεῖν. ὅς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀυτοῦς ἀνή-  
 ξδει γὰρ ἵνα ἐπὶ ζῴων πάθῃ. νεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι ἀυτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ζῴον.

This reference shows closer kinship to our Epistle than to any other passage of scripture. Gal. 3; 13 is the next closest parallel in the N. T., but clearly "Barnabas" is not following it at this point.

C

- (5) Bar. I, 6 I Pt. 1; 9  
 ζῶης ἐλπιδος, ἀρχῆ καὶ τέλους πίστεως ἡμῶν κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν

This similarity is probably due to common currency. Cf. the parallel usage immediately following i. e. δικαιοσύνη, κρίσεως ἀρχῆ καὶ τέλος. It is to be noted however that reference is made to the prophets in the contexts following the citations. Cf. I. 7 with I Pt. 1; 10.

- Bar. V, 1 I Pt. 1; 2  
 ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἀγ- ἐν ἀφιασμῷ Ἡνεύματος, εἰς ὑπα-  
 νισθῶμεν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι κολῆν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ  
 τοῦ ῥαντισματός ἀυτοῦ Νριστοῦ.

Cf. 1; 19, Heb. 12; 24, 13; 12.

Were we to follow C and the Lat. of Barnabas (i. e. ἐν τῷ ῥαντισματι ἀυτοῦ τοῦ αἵματος, Lat. sparsione sanguinis illius); we should have here a closer parallel with I Peter than with Hebrews, but as Professor Bartlet says "all depends on the reading adopted; and as N is as likely to be right as C and a version, we must leave the phrase out of account." The similar use however made of the "suffering servant" of Isaiah is in favor of dependence on I Peter. Cf. V, 2 with I Pt. 1; 19, 2; 21f., 3; 18, 4; 1.

- (7) Bar. V, 5 I Pt. 2; 21  
 ὁ Κύριος ὑπέμεινεν παθεῖν περὶ τῆς Χριστοῦ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. 4; 1  
 ψυχῆς ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί.

Barnabas is quite suggestive of I Peter at this point.

- (8) Ibid. I Pt. 1; 20  
 ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου
- The context (ὡν παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου Κύριος, ὃ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός) connecting this parallel with the one just cited is in favor of considering this verbatim agreement to be merely accidental, yet it occurs in significant connections in both books.
- (9) Bar. VI, 2 (Isa. 28; 16 b) I Pt. 2; 6  
 Ἰδοὺ ἐμβάλῃ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών ἰδοὺ, τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἀγρο-  
 λίθον πουςτελί, ἐκλεκτόν, ἀχρο- γωνιάον, ἐκλεκτόν. ἔντιμον.  
 γωνιάον, ἔντιμον

Quoted from the LXX, but probably suggested by I Peter as will be seen by the following parallels.

- (10) Bar. VI, 3 Isa. 28; 16 b I Pt. 2; 6  
 ὅς ἐλπίζει ἐπ' αὐτόν ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ κατα- ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ  
 ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα αἰσγυνοῦσθαι οὐ μὴ κατασγυνοῦσθαι.

Since "Barnabas" purports to be quoting from "the prophet," the passage is a good commentary on his method of quoting. That he is not following the original is obvious from the text itself. (צִיּוֹן אֶבֶן יְסוּדָה). Ἐλπίζω is here used in the sense of πιστεύω as in I Pt. 3; 5, ἐλπίζουσαι ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν. This usage is rare in the N. T. Paul may parallel it in Rom. 15; 12 and Phil. 2; 19, yet in the latter case it refers to desire mingled with trust. Other probable examples are I Tim. 4; 10, 5; 5. It seems on the whole altogether likely that our "Epistle of Hope" may have influenced "Barnabas" to employ unconsciously ἐλπίζω for πιστεύω.

- (11) Bar. VI, 4 I Pt. 2; 7 b  
 λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδο- λίθος ὃν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος  
 μοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κερ- ἐγενήθη εἰς κεραιλὴν γωνίας.  
 αλὴν γωνίας.

There is nothing here but the context by which to determine whether "Barnabas is quoting" Ps. 118; 22 independently or at the suggestion of our Epistle. If he is following Rom. 8; 33 it

is probably by way of I Peter, since the wording, order and context of the latter is more in accord with this Epistle at this point.

When taken alone the quotations taken from Chap. VI mean but little, but since they occur in the same context in the same order and are connected with a variation suggestive of Petrine influence, dependence is highly probable. Among the infinite number of possible combinations the above could be a mere coincidence, but exceedingly improbable.

It may also be said in this connection that Chap. VI lays stress upon some Petrine ideas which are worthy of note, e. g. "hope" v. 3, *λπίδος* for Christ, 1-4, "recreation" 11, 14, corresponding to I Pt. 1 ; 3, 23, and the suffering of Christ.

d

- |      |                                   |                                      |
|------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (12) | Bar. I, 6                         | I Pt. 5 ; 1                          |
|      | <i>ὄς εἰς ἔξ ὑμῶν δεῖξω ὀλίγα</i> | <i>συνπρεσβύτερος 12, δι' ὀλίγων</i> |

This parallel of Monnier's need not detain us.

- |      |                         |                         |
|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| (13) | Bar. XVI, 10            | I Pt. 2 ; 5             |
|      | <i>πνευματικῶς νεῶς</i> | <i>ὄκος πνευματικῶς</i> |

We have here no clear evidence either for or against acquaintance with our Epistle. Yet the reference to "temple building" and "new creation in v. 8 may have a direct bearing on the question.

#### Conclusion.

It has been seen that Chapter V seems to be thoroughly imbued with Petrine thought and expressions. The same use made of Isa. 53 in regard to Christ, and the close and quite continuous sequence of Petrine ideas make it highly probable that "Barnabas" here depends upon I Pt. 1 and 2. The sequence and the variations of the references in Chap. VI also add weight to the above observation.

Hesitation and consideration should characterise any statement which is adverse to the opinion of great scholars, yet on the basis of the combined evidence of Chapters IV-VI, it seems necessary to conclude that "Barnabas" knew and used our Epistle.

## SHEPHERD OF HERMAS

(Written cir. 140)

## B

## b

- |     |  |   |  |
|-----|--|---|--|
| (1) | Vision III, xi, 3<br>οὐκ ἐπερίψατε εἰδυτῶν<br>τὰς μέριμνας ἐπὶ τὸν<br>Κύριον   | I Pt. 5; 7a<br>πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν<br>ὑμῶν ἐπερίψαντες ἐπ'<br>αὐτόν [τὸν Θεόν] | Ps. 54; 23a<br>ἐπιρίψον ἐπὶ Κύριον τὴν<br>μέριμνάν σου |
| (2) | Vis. IV, ii, 4<br>ἐξέφυγες . . . ὅτι τὴν<br>μέριμνάν σου ἐπὶ τὸν<br>Θεὸν ἐπερίψαξ . . .<br>(5) ἐπερίψατε τὰς μερ-<br>ίμνας ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸν<br>Κύριον. καὶ αὐτὸς κατ-<br>ερθώσῃ αὐτάς. | I Pt. 5; 7b<br>ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ<br>ὑμῶν                                    | Ps. 54; 23b<br>καὶ αὐτός σε διαθρή-<br>ψει             |

Principal Drummond has pointed out these parallels. (N. T. in Apost. Fathers.) He thinks this quotation is taken independently from Ps. 54. Bishop Lightfoot is undecided between the Psalm and our Epistle. Perhaps Drummond disposes of the comparison too readily. The fact that the huge beast, used as a type of direful tribulation, is given in connection with the echo of I Pt. 5; 7, makes it very probable that Hermas had in mind also I Pt. 5; 8b.

- |     |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
| (3) | Sim. IX, xiv, 6<br>οὐκ ἐπαισχύνονται τὸ<br>ὄνομα αὐτοῦ φορεῖν.<br>xxi, 3.<br>ὅταν θλιψὴν ἀκούσωσι<br>. . . τὸ ὄνομα ἐπαισχ-<br>γύνονται τοῦ Κυρίου<br>αὐτῶν. xxviii, 5, 6.<br><br>οἱ πάσχοντες ἕνεκεν<br>τοῦ ὀνόματος δοξάζειν<br>ὑπερέχετε τὸν Θεόν, ὅτι<br>ἀξίους ὑμᾶς ἡγήσατο<br>ὁ Θεὸς ἵνα τοῦτο τὸ<br>ὄνομα βρασταζήτε . . .<br>πεπόνθητε ἕνεκεν τοῦ<br>ὀνόματος Κυρίου | I Pt. 4; 14-16<br>εἰ ὄνειδίξεσθε ἐν ὀνό-<br>ματι Χριστοῦ . . . πασ-<br>χέτω . . . εἰ ὡς Χρισ-<br>τιανός μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω,<br>δοξάζετω δὲ τὸν Θεὸν<br>ἐν τῷ ὀνοματι τούτῳ. | Poly. VIII, 2<br>εἴαν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ<br>ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζω-<br>μεν αὐτόν. τοῦτον γὰρ<br>ἡμῖν τὸν ὑπογραμμὸν<br>ἔθρηξε δι' ἑαυτοῦ.<br>Mk. 8; 38, Lk. 9; 26.<br><br>ὁς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυν-<br>θῆ με.<br>Cf. Acts 5; 41. |
|-----|--|--|--|



Sim. VIII, vi, 4

ἐπαυσχύνουσιν τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου  
τὸ ἐπαληθῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῦς

Again we are indebted to Mr. Drummond for this careful analysis, as well as for his comment upon the same. He thinks there is here a probable reminiscence of I Peter, which inference is confirmed from the parallel from Polycarp, for the latter has just quoted I Peter, and that he still has the Epistle in mind is indicated by the last clause. Cf. I Pt. 2 ; 2f. Bigg only calls attention to the parallel between Sim. IX, xxviii, 5 and I Pt. 4 ; 15. Lightfoot and Crombie fail to record any of these parallels just given. Though a few accidental catch words as *πάσχω*, *ἐπαυσχύνονται*, *ἔνεχεν τοῦ ὀνόματος*, etc. may but suggest our Epistle, the general tenor of the passage, especially ch. 28, in connection with the verbal likeness, and the reference in Polycarp, all combine to make a strong case for literary dependence.

c

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| (4) | Vis. III, iii, 5                             | I Pt. 2 ; 5   |
|     | ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν διὰ ὕδατος ἐσώθη<br>καὶ σωθήσεται | ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε, κατασκευαζομένης<br>κιβωτοῦ, εἰς ἣν εἰσῆλθον . . . διεσώθη-<br>σαν δι' ὕδατος . . . σώσει βάπτισμα. |

Drummond thinks the idea of salvation through water springs too readily from the practice of baptism to justify one in claiming literary dependence. The verbal similarity however is worthy of note.

- |     |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
| (5) | Sim. IX, xxix, 1, 3  | I Pt. 2 ; 1, 2   | Mt. 18 ; 3   |
|     | ὡς νήπια βρέφη εἰσι.<br>οἷς οὐδεμία κακία ἀνα-<br>βάινει ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν<br>. . . ἕσαι οὖν . . . | ἀποσβέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν<br>κακίαν . . . ὡς ἄπι-<br>γέννητα βρέφη | γέννηθε ὡς τὰ παιδία.<br>Cf. I Cor. 3 ; 1, and<br>14 ; 20. |

In I Pt. 2 ; 1 and I Cor. 14 ; 20 it is the blamelessness of the babe which is considered, where-as in I Cor. 3 ; 1 and I Pt. 2 ; 2 its diet. Sim. IX, xxix is more likely to have been suggested by I Pt. than by I Cor.

- (6) Mand. VIII, 10

Bigg calls attention to a list of " Petrine words close together" here i. e. *φιλόθεος*, *ἡσύχος*, *ἀδελφότης* and *ἀγαποποιήσις* = (*ἀγαπο-*

ποίη). The first is found not only in I Pt. 4 ; 9 but also in I Tim. 3 ; 2 and Tit. 1 ; 8. The second occurs in I Pt. 3 ; 4, and in I Tim. 2 ; 2, while ἡσυχία is found in Acts 22 ; 2, II Thes. 3 ; 12 and I Tim. 2 ; 11, 12. The third is peculiar to I Peter, being found only in 2 ; 17 and 5 ; 9. The exact form of the last is not found in the N. T., but the allied form ἀγαθοποιός is only in I Pt. 2 ; 14. The verbal form ἀγαθοποιέω is common in the N. T. Cf. Mk. 3 ; 4, Lk. 6 ; 9, 33, 35, Acts 14 ; 17, and III Jn. 11. It is indeed a favorite word of our author. Cf. I Pt. 2 ; 15, 20, 3 ; 6, 17.

## d

- (7) Vis. III, v, 1 I Pt. 2 ; 5  
 τῶν λίθων τῶν ὑπαγόντων εἰς τὴν λίθου ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος  
 οἰκοδομηγῶν πνευματικῶς . . .

This is indeed suggestive of our Epistle, especially as a development of the figure. The figure however, is too common to guarantee any degree of certainty for dependence.

- (8) Vis. IV, iii, 4 I Pt. 1 ; 7  
 ὡσπερ γὰρ τὸ χρυσίον δοκιμάζεται τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πο-  
 διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς . . . οὕτως καὶ λυπηρότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυ-  
 ῦμεν δοκιμάζεσθε μένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμάζομένου.

Drummond can see no connection here with our Epistle. Bishop Lightfoot is not sure. When taken alone we cannot lay any weight on this parallel, though it is suggestive.

- (9) Sim. IX. xii, 2, 3 I Pt. 1 ; 20 Heb. 1 ; 2  
 ὁ μὲν οὖν τῶν Θεῶν χριστοῦ προεγνωσμέ- ἐπὶ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμε-  
 πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐ- νου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς ρῶν. I Jn. 3 ; 5.  
 τοῦ προγενέστερος ἐσ- κόσμου ψανερωθέντος ἐκεῖνος ἐψανερωθή  
 τίν . . . ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων δὲ ἐπὶ ἐσχάτου τῶν Col. 1 ; 15.  
 τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συν- χρόνου. πρωτότοκος πάσης κτί-  
 τελείας ψανερός ἐγένε- σεως.  
 νετο

These parallels, borrowed from Drummond, show close similarity in thought and phraseology. Yet stress cannot be placed on the likenesses, inasmuch as the same thought and forms of expression

are to be found elsewhere, also that the context does not refer to our Epistle. Mr. Crombie (*Antenicene Fathers* II, 47) sees here a reference to I Peter, but Bishop Lightfoot fails to record it.

(10)

Sim. IX, xvi, 5

I Pt. 4; 6

οὕτοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι οἱ κηρύξαντες τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κοιμηθέντες ἐν δυνάμει καὶ πιστεῖ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκήρυξαν καὶ τοῖς προκεικοιμημένοις, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ κηρύγματος

οἱ ἀποδώσαντες λόγον τῷ ἔτοιμῳ κρίνοντι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς ἐκήρυξις ἵνα κηρῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι.

Bigg thinks Hermas here is explaining I Pt. 4; 6, and bases his argument largely on the occurrence of the "Petrine word ζῶσποισιν" just before the reference cited. This is indeed suggestive, yet a dubious argument since the "Petrine word" is really a Pauline word. It occurs but once in our Epistle (3; 18), but Paul uses it seven or eight times. Cf. Rom. 4; 17, 8; 11, I Cor. 15; 22, 36, 45, II Cor. 3; 6, Gal. 3; 21. See also I Tim. 6; 13, Jn. 5; 21a, and b, 6; 63. The thought of the passage is close to that of I Peter, yet our Epistle no where speaks of the ἀπόστολοι καὶ διδάσκαλοι preaching to the dead. Just above in I Pt. 3; 19 our author has told of Christ preaching to the spirits in prison. Possibly this may refer to I Peter, but the "harrowing of hell" is a mythological loan of early Christianity not confined to our Epistle. Drummond, Crombie and Lightfoot fail to record this as a parallel.

On the cumulative evidence of all the foregoing parallels it would seem that we are justified in claiming a higher degree of probable dependence of Hermas on our Epistle than Drummond, or even Monnier, who says, after pointing out that Westcott, Gebhardt and Harnack see striking resemblances, that: "On ne peut en dire autant de l'écrit de Pierre; mais il est fort possible pourtant qu' Hermas le connaisse."

## DIDACHE

(120 or later)

D

d

- (1) Did. I, 3 I Pt. 2; 19  
 ποιὰ γὰρ χάρις ἔσθ' . . . τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις εἶ . . .

Though the phrase is similar the passage does not deserve serious attention.

- (2) Did. I, 4 I Pt. 2; 11  
 ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν καὶ σωμα- ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν  
 τικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν

Professor Lake (N.T. in A.F.) thinks the connection, if any, comes through a later gloss of *σαρκικῶν* from our Epistle, and as evidence that the tautologous form *σαρκικῶν καὶ σωματικῶν* was not original, cites IV Macc. 1; 32, τῶν δὲ ἐπιθυμιῶν αἱ μὲν εἰσι ψυχικαὶ αἱ δὲ σωματικαί. This argument however is based on an assumption that has less in its favor than the conjecture that it is an actual quotation. The context has nothing to suggest I Peter but this was to be expected inasmuch as the whole document is a mosaic of scriptural references taken almost at random. The evidence either way is too slight to warrant one recognizing more than a possible connection.

- (3) Did. II, 6 I Pt. 5; 5  
 ὑπερήφανος ὑπερηφάνοις

This parallel, pointed out by Monnier, need not detain us, since the word is not peculiar to I Peter, nor is the context as suggestive of it as of "James."

- (4) Did. IV, 11 I Pt. 2; 18  
 ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ δούλοι ὑποταγήσεσθε οἱ οἰκέται, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντί  
 τοῖς κυρίοις ὑμῶν . . . ἐν φόβῳ φόβῳ

In addition to this very similar phrasing, the context also has ideas which suggest our Epistle. Compare ἀπὸ νεότητος διδάξεις τὸν φόβον τοῦ Θεοῦ, (v. 9,) with such passages as I Pt. 5; 5, 2; 17. Compare also οὐ γὰρ ἔργεται κατὰ πρόσωπον καλέσαι (v. 10) with ἀπροσωπολήπτως of I Pt. 1; 17 and the Petrine doctrine of election. The combination of these inferences makes dependence somewhat

probable, yet there is very little here which cannot be paralleled in the Pauline Literature. Cf. Eph. 6; 5.

- (5) Did. XVI, 4 I Pt. 4; 3  
 ἀθέμιτα ἀθέμιτοις  
 Merely accidental.
- (6) Did. XVI, 5 I Pt. 4; 12  
 εἰς τὴν πύρωσεν τῆς δοκιμασίας πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν  
 I Pt. 1; 7  
 διὰ πύρος δὲ δοκιμαζόμενον

This figure is too common to betray dependence.

The foregoing study justifies us in claiming for the Didache no more than a very doubtful connection with I Peter.

Harnack, with Lightfoot and others, sees no connection here with our Epistle, but notes certain resemblances to Jude and II Peter. (See Art. in Schaff. Herzog Relig. Enc.) The Oxford committee notes but one parallel.

POLYCARP

Cir. 115

A\*

a\*

- (1) Poly. I, 3 I Pt. 1: 8  
 εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες πιστεύετε χαρᾷ ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπήσατε, εἰς ὃν  
 ἀνεκκαλίπτω καὶ δεδούξασμένη ἄρτι μὴ ἔρῳντες πιστεύοντες δὲ  
 ἀγαλλιάσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκκαλίπτω καὶ  
 δεδούξασμένη

This reference clearly depends upon I Peter.

- (2) Pol. II, 1 I Pt. 1; 21  
 πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν τοῦ δὲ αὐτοῦ πιστοῦς εἰς Θεὸν  
 Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν  
 νεκρῶν καὶ δόντα αὐτῷ δόξαν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα

The dependence here is too obvious to require any comment.

- (3) Pol. VIII, 1 I Pt. 2; 24  
 ὅς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὅς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς  
 τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ  
 ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον.

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (4) | Ibid.   | I Pt. 2; 22  |
|     | ὁς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ | ὁς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ              |
| (5) | Ibid.   | I Pt. 2; 21  |
|     | ἀλλὰ δι' ἡμᾶς   | ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν   |
| (6) | Ibid.   | I Pt. 2; 24  |
|     | ἵνα ζήσωμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, πάντα ὑπέμειν                              | ἵνα τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀπογενόμενοι τῆ δικαιοσύνης ζήσωμεν.                        |
| (7) | Pol. VIII, 2  | I Pt. 4; 16  |
|     | ἐὰν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ δοξάζωμεν αὐτόν                 | εἰ δὲ ὡς χριστιανός, μὴ ἀισχυνοσθε. δοξάζετε δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦτω |
| (8) | Ibid.   | I Pt. 2; 21  |
|     | τοῦτον γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπογραμμὸν ἔθηκε ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν    |  |

These parallels in Pol. VIII have been pointed out by all scholars. That Polycarp drew in VIII, 1 from I Pt. 2; 21—24, seems to be beyond all doubt. Though he has not followed the order of our Epistle he has not only reproduced its thought but its phraseology verbatim.

The first reference under VIII, 2 is drawn from another context but clearly echoes I Peter. The second reference returns to the context drawn from in VIII, 1. Since *ὑπογραμμὸν* occurs nowhere else in the N. T., there can be but little doubt but that the last parallel presupposes our Epistle. Mr. Benecke notices that in the place where I Peter is dependent on Isaiah, Polycarp seems clearly to be dependent on I Peter. Cf. I Pt. 2; 22 with Isa. 53; 9. Isaiah employs *ἀνομίαν* where I Peter uses *ἁμαρτίαν*. Other differences occur, but Polycarp gives verbatim the form found in our Epistle.

- |     |   |   |             |
|-----|---|---|-------------|
| (9) | Pol. X, 2   | I Pt. 2; 12 (Vulg.)   | I Pt. 2; 12 |
|     | Omnes vobis invicem subjecti estote, conversationem vestram inter Gentes habentes bonam; ut ines, quod detrectant de vobis tamquam demalefactoribus vos considerantes, glo- | τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ὅν τῶς εἴνεστιν ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐπισπεύοντες δοξάσωσιν τῷ |             |

accipiatis et Dominus in vobis non blasphemetur.

rificent Deum in die visitationis. 5; 5 Omnes autem invicem, (subditi estote. 5; 4).

Θεῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς. ὑποτάσσεται πάσαι ἀνθρώπων κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον. 5; 5 πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις (ὑποτάσσεται 5; 4).

Benecke, after quoting the above, states : " the second clause in the passage seems to be a certain quotation from I Pt." Bishop Lightfoot thinks there may be a reference in the first part of the quotation to Eph. 5 ; 21. It is significant that in X. 1 the word " exemplar " occurs, corresponding to the ὑπογραμμὸν of Jesus in I Pt. 2; 24, in close conjunction with " fraternitatis," which likewise corresponds to another word peculiar to our Epistle. i. e. ἀδελφότητι of I Pt. 2 ; 17. These two words, it is noticed, occur in I Peter in rather close contextual connexion. These observations make Benecke's conclusion all the more certain, that Polycarp here shows dependence upon I Peter.

b

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| (10) | Pol. II, 1   | I Pt. 1; 13                                      |
|      | διὸ ἀναξωσάμενοι τὰς ὑσφύαξ δούλευσατε τῷ Θεῷ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀληθείαι | διὸ ἀναξωσάμενοι τὰς ὑσφύαξ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν |

Although this citation has a certain affinity with Eph. 6 ; 14 the probabilities are that the Pauline thought reached Polycarp via our Epistle. The context seems to demand such a conclusion.

- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| (11) | Pol. II, 2  | I Pt. 3; 9  |
|      | μηὲ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας | μηὲ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας |

Benecke thinks this verbatim agreement may be accounted for, as a common proverb which both are quoting. This however is rendered highly improbable, inasmuch as Polycarp had just quoted from I Peter. If it is a common proverb, in all probability it was suggested by our Epistle.

c

- |      |                                    |  |
|------|------------------------------------|--|
| (12) | Pol. I, 3                          | I Pt. 1; 12                            |
|      | εἰς ἣν πολλὰ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν εἰσελθεῖν | εἰς ἣ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύβηται. |

Though Lightfoot, Bigg and others fail to find any reference here to our Epistle, Benecke is correct in claiming a possible connection on the basis of the certain quotation just preceding it.

(13)

Pol. V, 3

I Pt. 2; 11

καλὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀνακόπεσθαι ἀπὸ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυ-  
 τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅτι μιῶν αἰτίνας στρατεύονται κατὰ  
 πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ψυχῆς  
 στρατεύεται.

This is probably a free quotation from I Peter, yet its close relationship with such passages of Paul as Gal. 5 ; 16, 17, and Rom. 13 ; 14, render it somewhat doubtful.

The foregoing study in the Epistle of Polycarp seems to justify us, without further comment, though numerous other minor likenesses might be pointed out, in adopting Monnier's conclusion, "L'épître de Polycarpe aux Philippiens contient les citations les plus expresses et les plus détaillées de l'épître de Pierre, mais sans le nommer comme l'auteur." ("La Première Épître De L'Apôtre Pierre" p. 307). Eusebius is also responsible for the statement that "Polycarp in his Epistle to the Philippians, still extant, has made use of certain testimonies taken from the First Epistle of Peter." Though Polycarp never mentions the name of Peter in connection with the quotations there can be no doubt but that he used the "First Epistle" that bears the Apostle's name.

## TESTAMENTA XII PATRIARCHARUM

## D

Bigg, in basing the date of this document on the authority of Sinker, who puts it in the latter part of the First Century or the early part of the Second, gives it a voice in deciding our problem. But if Professor Charles is right in dating the original in the closing years of the Second Century B. C.<sup>1</sup> there can be but little value in its testimony, since the date of the Christian interpolations is much more indefinite than the date of I Peter itself. (Cf. also the articles by F. C. Conybeare and K. Kohler in the Jewish Encyclopedia.) The Parallels between the two books may be due either to dependence by the writer of I Peter on the earlier Jewish document or to later Christian interpolations from I Peter. At all events this book complicates rather than helps to solve our problem.

<sup>1</sup> Greek Version of the "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs", p. ix.



## IGNATIUS

(Writing Cir. 110—117)

B

b

(1) Mag. VIII, 2

I Pt. 1; 10 f.

ἐμπνεόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος (αὐτοῦ) προσφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς  
(X) χάριτος προφητεῶντες . . . ἐδή-  
λωσάντες τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ

Inspiration of the prophets by the preexistent spirit of Christ is not a common idea in the N. T., though it occurs in Heb. 2; 11—13. 10; 5—9. Since there are "several ideas in common" in the immediate contexts of the above passages, (cf. Lightfoot's *Apos. Fathers*, II, 125,) dependence on our Epistle is far more probable than on the Epistle to the Hebrews, the thought of whose context is quite foreign to the thought of Ignatius in this section.

(2) Eph. V, 3

c

I Pt. 5; 5 c

ὑπερηφάνους ὁ Θεὸς ἀντιτάσσει τὸ Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσει

It seems impossible to determine definitely whether the author was quoting Prov. 3; 34 directly, or whether he was influenced either by I Peter or James 4; 6 or Clement of Rome (30; 2). The order is neither that of the original in the LXX, nor that of any of the later writers. The change of *Κύριος* for *ὁ Θεός* shows later influence. The context in which the quotation occurs both in Clement and James is not in accord with the context in Ignatius. On the other hand the context of our Epistle is quite in accord with that of Ignatius, who gives immediately after the quotation *σπουδάζομεν οὖν μὴ ἀντιτάσσεσθαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ*, corresponding exactly to *ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέρους* of I Pt. 5; 5a. The context preceding the quotation is an exhortation to humility, quite in harmony with I Pt. 5; 5b. If there be literary dependence, therefore, it is probably on our Epistle, but we are dealing with a mere "winged word," a memoriter quotation. The value of the datum will be largely determined by the number of other instances in Ignatius.

(3) Eph. IX, 1

I Pt. 2; 5

ὡς ὄντες λίθου ναοῦ προσημασ- ὡς λίθου ζῶντος ἀκαθομεῖσθε οἶκος  
μένου εἰς ἀκαθομίην Θεοῦ πατρὸς πνευματικῶς

Both the thought and phraseology are very suggestive of our Epistle. Ignatius shows however some points of likeness to I Cor. 3; 16. The probabilities seem to be in favor of I Peter.

- (4) Mag. IX, 3 I Pt. 3 ; 19  
 οὗ καὶ διὰ προφῆται μαρτυροῦνται ὄντας ἐν τῷ (πνεύματι) καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ  
 τῷ πνεύματι ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν πνεύμασιν παρευθεις ἐκήρυξεν, 4 ; 6  
 προσεδόκων. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὅν νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη  
 δικαίως ἀνέμενον, παρὼν ἡγείρεν  
 αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν

The idea that Jesus descended into Hades, (drawn probably from Eph. 4 ; 9, which is developed in I Pt. 3 ; 19, and 4 ; 6, into the doctrine that Christ preached there to release the spirits from prison) receives even fuller development here. This idea was too prevalent in the Second Century to enable us to be certain that Ignatius was depending directly upon our Epistle, though the general context seems to make it probable. See also Mt. 27 ; 51-53, Justin, Dial. 72 ; Hermas, Sim. IX, 16 and Clem. of Alex. Strom. II, 9.

- (5) Mag. VIII, 2 d I Pt. 1 ; 11  
 οἱ γὰρ Θεότατοι προφῆται κατὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς (προφήταις) πνεῦμα  
 Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐξήσαν. Cf. Phili- Χριστοῦ  
 lad. V.

All depends on the interpretation of "κατὰ" as to whether this is a parallel or not.

This study of the Ignation Epistles has not discovered sufficient ground for asserting literary dependence on our Epistle. It merely shows the prevalence of certain ideas which are more likely to have been suggested by it than by any other writing to which we can definitely point.

#### CLEMENT OF ROME

(95)

A\*

b

- (1) Clem. Int. I Pt. 1 ; 1  
 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη (ἀπὸ παν- χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη  
 τοκράτορος Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χρισ-  
 τοῦ) πληθυνθείη

Bishop Lightfoot observes that "χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη" is the common salutation of Paul, excepting the Pastoral Epistles. With the addition πληθυνθείη, however, it occurs only in the two Epist-

les of Peter, from whom probably Clement derived the form, as the First Epistle is frequently quoted by him." (Clem. of Rome I, p. 647.) Cf. also his "Notes on the Epistles of Paul", p. 8. Against this it may be urged that Clement is here borrowing from Daniel instead of from I Peter. Dan. (LXX) 3; 31 has εὐργὴ ὑμῶν πληθύνθει. See also Dan. 4; 34. Dan. 11; 39 employs the phrase πληθύνει δόξαν. Πληθύνω is a very common word in the LXX. It is rarely employed as in I Peter and Clement, but is frequently used to express the growth of evil. Cf. Ps. 118 (119); 69, Si. 47; 24, Am. 4; 4, Jl. 3 (4); 13, Is. 57; 9, Jer. 5; 6, 37 (30); 14, 15, etc. It is also to be observed that the word παντοκράτωρ does not appear in Daniel. The word, however, is common in the LXX, especially in Amos, where it is used no less than ten times. But it is never used in the O. T. in a connection similar to the above usage in Clement and I Peter. Nor is χάρις employed in this way in the O. T. It does not seem necessary therefore to think Clement selected words from different O. T. books to compose this clause when he could have taken the major portion of the expression directly from I Peter, from which he apparently drew in other connections. "Jude" has a very similar clause; ἔλεος ὑμῶν καὶ εὐργίῃ καὶ ἀγάπῃ πληθυνθείη, but it need not detain us here as a rival of 1. Pt. 1; 1. On the whole it seems Lightfoot's conclusion is well grounded.

There is a further likeness in the salutation of Clement in the word παροικουῶσα. Though ἐπιδημιῶς is used in I Peter instead, the idea is the same, as may be seen, both by I Pt. 2; 11 (where παροίκους and παρεπιδημοῦς are coordinated) and by Clement himself. Cf. salutation for παροικουῶσα and 1, 2 for παρεπιδημήσας. In the salutation of no other N. T. book does either word, or a word expressing a similar idea occur. The nearest approach is in Jas. 1; 1 (ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ), But I Pt. 1; 1 also employs διασπορᾶς.

Clement uses κλητοὶς while I Peter has ἐκλεκτοὶς. The former occurs in the N. T. salutations only in Romans, I Corinthians and Jude, while the latter appears only in Titus and our Epistle. Though I Peter nowhere uses the form κλητοὶς, the idea is the same. Thayer contrasts these words (Lex. in loco), but evidently there is no contrast to be understood here, since it is improbable that Clement would, in the salutation, upbraid his readers as "those who have shown themselves unfitted to obtain salvation". Paul does not contrast these forms, nor indeed is there a contrast here. (Th. Lex. κλητοὶς.) Then if Clement shaped his salutation after

the model of I Peter, as Lightfoot thinks, the change of form would not militate against it, since "ἐκλεκτός is indeed a rare word with Greek writers", (cf. Th. Lex. on ἐκλεκτός) and he would, in quoting from memory, naturally employ the more familiar word expressing the same idea. He, however, uses ἐκλεκτός elsewhere, which will be considered later. Cf. 1; 1.

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| (2) | Clem. Int.   | I Pt. 1; 2   |
|     | ἡγιασμένοις ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ | ἐν ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ |

This seems to express the thought of I Peter in contracted form. The likeness will be made clearer by the following analysis.

|     |                                   |  |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|
| (1) | ἡγιασμένοις                       | ἁγιασμῷ  |
| (2) | ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ                  | κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ                              |
| (3) | διὰ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ | εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. |

The forms of the verb ἁγιάζω are found in the salutations of but two N. T. writings, i. e., I Corinthians and Jude. The former has

ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ

while the latter has,

ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγιασμένοις.

Attention has been called to the close parallel between the salutations of Jude and I Clement. It seems there is more probability of connection between I Clement and Jude than between I Clement and I Corinthians at this point. But it is to be noted that many of the best manuscripts of Jude have ἡγιασμένοις instead of ἡγιασμένους, as in I Corinthians. In favor of the former Tregelles cites A. B. 8. Vulg., Syr., Hcl. Memph. Theb. Arm. (AETH.) Orig. III, 607c, etc. It appears therefore that I Clement was very probably influenced here by I Peter.

(2) Ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ is a very different form from that used in I Peter, but the thought of κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ . . . πνεύματος is far from alien to that of ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ. Indeed the latter may be a reminiscence of the former in contracted form.

(3) Διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ may be a general form drawn from ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, in which case διὰ takes the place of ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος.

In the beginning of no other N. T. book is the same emphasis laid on "election," with the single exception of Ephesians, and there the dependence is on the side of I Peter. Cf. *κληρονομία* of I Clem. Int. and *ἐκλεκτοὶ* of I Clem. 1; I with *ἐκλεκτοὶ* of I Pt. 1; I and *πρόγνωσιν* of I Pt. 1; 2. Cf. also 1; 3 ff.

Though some of the above "likenesses" may be imaginary, there seems to be, on the whole, a good basis for maintaining, notwithstanding Professor Carlyle's adverse conclusion (N. T. in Apos. Fathers p. 57), that the salutation of I Clement is in some way dependent upon I Peter.

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| (3) | I Clem. 22; 2-6  | I Pt. 3; 10-12   |
|     | <p>τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἕλωσιν ζώην, ἀγαπῶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθά; (3) παύσον τὴν γλῶσσαν σου ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χεῖλη τῶ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον (4) ἐκκλινον ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιήσον ἀγαθόν (5) ζήτησον εἰρήνην καὶ διώξιν ἀπὸ τῆς. (6) ὑψαλμὸς Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους, καὶ ὅσα ἀποδοῖ πρὸς δέξιν ἀποτῶν πρόσσωπον δὲ Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιῶντας κακά . . . Cf. Ps. 34; 13-17a.</p> | <p>ὁ γὰρ ἕλωσιν ζώην ἀγαπῶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς. παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀποτῶ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χεῖλη ἀποτῶ τῶ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον, (11) ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιήσάτω ἀγαθόν. ζήτησάτω εἰρήνην καὶ διώξάτω ἀπὸ τῆς. (12) ὅτι ὑψαλμὸς Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ὅσα ἀποδοῖ εἰς δέξιν ἀποτῶν, πρόσσωπον δὲ Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιῶντας κακά</p> |

We are certain that Clement is quoting here from the LXX, not only because of the verbatim agreement but also because he quotes at greater length. But that the scripture was suggested by I Peter (3; 10-12) is made most probable, since it is used as the scriptural authority for the lengthy Petrine exhortations just given in Chap. 21, precisely as it is employed in I Pt. 3; 10-12 after 3; 1-9. It is especially significant that the quotation is followed in both instances with a buoyant expression of God's providential care for His followers. Cf. Clem. 22; 1 with I Pt. 3; 13. This sequence can hardly be accidental.

- |     |   |                                       |   |
|-----|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| (4) | I Clem. 49: 5   | I Pt. 4: 8                            | Jas. 5: 20  |
|     | <p>ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν</p>                   | <p>ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν</p> | <p>ὁ επιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ἴδου αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ βανάτου καὶ καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν</p> |
|     | Prov. 10; 12  |                                       |   |
|     | <p>πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεκιοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία.</p> |                                       |   |

Lightfoot, Monnier and others think we have here a certain quotation from our Epistle. Professor Carlyle, however, views it as a

mere possibility. Nor can he justify A. Resch (Agrapha p. 248) in his conclusion that both I Peter and I Clement are quoting a traditional saying of our Lord. (N. T. in A. F. p. 56—57. Clement's mind was certainly and deeply imbued with I Cor. 13. There is, however, no record that Paul ever alluded to this passage in Proverbs. The fact that this exact form of the quotation is to be found nowhere earlier than I Peter is indeed significant. Though Jas. 5 ; 20 and Prov. 10 ; 12 are similar, it seems evident that if there is dependence anywhere it is on our Epistle. It is also to be noted that Clem. 49 ; 6 is quite suggestive of I Peter. This parallel affords no conclusive proof that Clement used I Peter, but in view of the other parallels and quotations common to both Epistles, we are justified in regarding this verbatim agreement as very important.

- (5) I Clem. 59 ; 2 I Pt. 2 ; 9  
 δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκότους τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ἡμᾶς καλέσαντος  
 εἰς φῶς, 36 ; 2 εἰς τὸ θουμαστὸν εἰς τὸ θουμαστὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ φῶς  
 ἀπὸ τοῦ φῶς. Cf. Eph. 1 ; 18, 5 ;  
 8—14.

This is a closer parallel to the above passage in I Clement than is to be found elsewhere in the N. T. In fact the two references in I Clement reproduce both the thought and phraseology of I Peter. Similar thought appears in Ephesians but the form is much different. The use of the word ἐπίσκοπον v. 3, finds its closest N. T. parallel in I Pt. 2 ; 25. Clement speaks of God as the bishop of πνευμάτων while our author makes Christ the bishop of ψυχῶν. In the same context both writers employ the same metaphorical expression for the believers, i. e., πρεβρατα. The doctrine of election διὰ Χριστοῦ (cf. 64 ; 1) is particularly Petrine. Cf. I Pt. 1 ; 2, 21, 2 ; 9, 3 ; 18, 5 ; 10. It is important to note that "election through Christ" is thought of in both instances as a "calling from darkness to light." The similarities of thought and expression in chap. 59, make dependence here very probable.

- (6) I Clem. 1 ; 3 b—c I Pt. 1 ; 17  
 ἀπροσωπολήμπτως ἀπροσωπολήμπτως

Dependence here is made very probable since this word, which is not found elsewhere in the N. T., appears in a context suggestive of our text, which context also contains another word peculiar

to I Peter, and others common with it but rare in the N. T. Cf. parallels No. 15—19, 27—30.

- (7) I Clem. 1; 3 I Pt. 3; 7  
 τιμήν . . . ἀπονέμοντες ἀπονέμοντες τιμήν

Ἀπονέμω occurs but this one time in the N. T. That Clement uses τιμήν as its object in a context suggestive of I Peter can hardly be accidental.

- (8) I Clem. 2; 2, 7 I Pt. 4; 19  
 ἀγαθoσούα ἀγαθoσούα

Professor Carlyle not only notes that this word occurs nowhere else in the N. T., but also that it is found neither in the LXX nor other Greek versions of the O. T. and Apocrypha; and that apparently it does not occur in classical literature. The word is very significant in this connection.

- (9) I Clem. 2; 4 I Pt. 2; 17 5; 7  
 ἀδελφότητες ἀδελφότητα

This word, which occurs in no other book of the N. T., Carlyle says, "appears in the LXX only in I Mac. 12; 10, 17, but in the sense of brotherly affection." He is also unable to find the word in classical literature. (N. T. in A. F. p. 57.) It is also significant that it is found in direct connection with . . . συνειδήσεως (τὸν ἀρετήν) τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀποστό. Cf. I Pt. 2; 19, 3; 16, 21 and 1; 2, 2; 4, 6, 9.

- (10) I Clem. 2; 1 I Pt. 5; 1  
 τὰ παθήματα ἀποστό ἦν πρὸ ὅσ- ὁ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ \ ριστοῦ παθήμα-  
 θαλμῶν ἑμῶν τῶν

Although this is a favorite Petrine expression it affords, in itself, but little evidence for or against dependence, since it is also common in the letters of Paul. Yet taken in conjunction with parallels 8 and 9, and the general tone of the passage with its appeal to their witnessing, the probabilities are greatly increased.

Professor Carlyle is justified in not taking into account the last three citations, when viewed separately, but when so many likenesses, both in diction and thought, occur in such close contextual connection, one is justified in taking into account less striking resemblances and in giving to all a higher rating.

- (11) I Clem. 16; 5, 6 I Pt. 2; 24, 25  
 τῷ μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἤμεῖς ἰάθημεν. οὗ τῷ μῶλωπι ἰάθητε. ἦτε γὰρ  
 6 πάντες ὡς πρόβρατα ἐπλανήθη- ὡς πρόβρατα πλανώμενοι,  
 μεν. Isa. 53; 5, 6.
- (12) I Clem. 16; 10 I Pt. 2; 22  
 ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ ὅς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ  
 εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐ- εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν στόματι αὐτοῦ  
 τοῦ. Isa. 53; 9.
- (13) I Clem. 16; 14 I Pt. 2; 24  
 καὶ αὐτὸς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀν- ὅς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν [ὑμῶν] αὐ-  
 ἴνεγκεν. Isa. 53; 12. τὸς ἀνίνεγκεν

Quotations 12-13 show they were not copied directly from I Peter but from the LXX. That these quotations from Isa. 53 follow the LXX rather than our Epistle is no proof that the latter did not suggest their use, especially since Clement did not consider the N. T. writings to be on the same level with the O. T. books. If he were following the thought of I Peter, he would, in that case, still be inclined to refer to the original and in so doing quote at greater length, just as he has done. 16; 10 follows I Pt. 2; 22 in using εὐρέθη δόλος instead of δόλος. Though the form used by Clement and our author is found in *s. c. a.*, Swete rejects it and adopts δόλος instead. The latter reading agrees with the original. (יָרַבְרַב הַבְּרַבִּי אֵלֶּי.) While this is no proof that Clement was influenced by I Peter it is suggestive. Dependence here is indeed made very probable by the use of the word ὑπογραμμός in the immediate context with these quotations. See note on the following parallel.

- (14) I Clem. 16; 17 I Pt. 2; 11  
 ὁ υπογραμμός ὁ δεδωμένος ἡμῖν ὑμῖν ὑπολημπάνων υπογραμμῶν

Professor Bacon has rightly noted that very probably Clement dipped his pen into our author's ink-well when he wrote "υπογραμμός of the suffering of Christ". Cf. also 33; 8. (Bacon's Introduction p. 151.) This word is not found anywhere else in the N. T., and it is indeed significant that St. Peter is mentioned by name in a context where the word is used. Cf. 5; 4 and 5; 7. This parallel is also strengthened by the occurrence of the word ταπεινοφρονέω. See Paral. 22.



c

- (15) I Clem. 1; 3 I Pt. 2; 13, 17  
 ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν ὑποτάγητε . . . εἴτε βασιλεῖ . . . εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν (17) τὸν βασιλεῖα τίματε

Though Clement does not refer to secular rulers as does our author yet the phraseology is very suggestive in this context. Note that this passage stands between parallels 6 and 7.

- (16) I Clem. 1; 3 I Pt. 5; 5  
 τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις νέοις . . . ἐπετρέπετε νεωτέροι ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις

- (17) I Clem. 1; 3 I Pt. 3; 1  
 γυναιξίν τε ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ σεμνῇ διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστρέψεως καὶ ἀγνῆ συνειδήσει πάντα ἐπιτελεῖν παρηγγέλλεσθε, ἄνευ λόγου κερδιθήσονται

ἄμωμος is a rare word in the N. T. Cf. I Pt. 1; 19. ἀγνῆ συνειδήσει also finds a similar phrase in συνειδήσιν ἀγαθῶν of I Pt. 3; 16, 21.

- (18) I Clem. 1; 3 I Pt. 3; 1, 6  
 σπεργύσας καθ' ἑκόντως τοῖς ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἄνδρας ἑαυτῶν

- (19) I Clem. 1; 3 I Pt. 3; 6  
 ἐν τε τῷ κανόνι τῆς ὑποταγῆς ὡς Σάρρα ὑπέκουσε τῷ Ἀβραάμ. ὑπαρχούσας . . . κέρειον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα

When taken separately these references have little value, but in view of the Petrine phrasing and vocabulary, which includes two words not found elsewhere in the N. T. and others which appear but rarely, and the Petrine sequence of thought (cf. parallels 6, 15, 7, 16–19) in Chap. I, the passage suggests that Clement was acquainted with our Epistle.

- (20) I Clem. 7; 2, 4 I Pt. 1; 18, 19  
 διὸ ἀπολίπωμεν τὰς κενὰς καὶ ματαιὰς φροντίδας, καὶ ἔλυθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐκλεῆ καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς παραδόσεως ἡμῶν κανόνα, . . . ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γινώμεν ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθάροτες ἀργυρίου ἢ χρυσίου, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαιῆς ὑμῶν ἀναστρέψεως πατροπαραδότου. ἀλλὰ τιμῶ αἵματι ὡς ἄμωσὶ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ . . .

θεοῦ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τῆν  
 ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ  
 τῷ κόσμῳ μετανόιας χάριν ἐπί-  
 νεγκεν

“ These passages present many points of correspondence of phrase and thought, but the conception of redemption through the blood of Christ is not peculiar to St. Peter’s Epistles in the N. T., and may well be supposed to have been current among all Christians.” Among the “ many points of correspondence ” Professor Carlyle should have noted that *ἀίματι τιμίον* is peculiar to our Epistle. It is also important to note that Clement alludes, in the immediate context, to the preaching of Noah. Cf. I Clem. 7 ; 6 with I Pt. 3 ; 20. It seems probable, therefore, that this Pauline thought traveled by the way of I Peter.

(21) I Clem. 13 ; 1

I Pt. 2 ; 1

. . οὖν, ἀποδέμενοι πᾶσαν . . . ἀποδέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν . . .

Monnier thinks there is a reference here to I Peter. This may be a mere coincidence, and indeed we should so conclude, were it not for the fact that this compound word (*ἀποτίμιμι*) is not common in the N. T., and that it is used here in a connection resembling that of I Peter. The probabilities are increased in geometrical ratio to the number of times it is used in this way. Cf. I Clem. 30 ; 1 and 57 ; 2.

(22) I Clem. 16 ; 1

I Pt. 5 ; 2, 3

ταπεινοφροσύνην γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ  
 Χριστός, οὐκ ἐπαιρομένων ἐπὶ τὸ  
 ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ. τὸ σαῖπτρον  
 . . . οὐκ ἤλθεν ἐν κόμπῳ ἀλαζο-  
 νείας οὐδὲ ὑπερηφανίας, καίπερ  
 δυνάμενος, ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρονῶν

ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ  
 θεοῦ. μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ἐκου-  
 σίως, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ  
 προσύμωως, μηδὲ ὡς κατακυριεύοντες  
 τῶν κληρῶν ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι  
 τοῦ ποιμνίου.

This parallel is significant in this context. *Ποίμνιον* is a rare word in the N. T. It is used in all five times, two of which are here. Neither Lk. 12 ; 32 nor Acts 20 ; 28, 29 shows as many points of likeness to I Clement. Acts 20 ; 28, 29 and I Pt. 5 ; 2, 3 have much in common and seem to be related, yet the context with its appeal to the “ Suffering Servant ” of II Isaiah is more in accord with our author’s interpretation of Jesus. Clement uses *ταπεινοφρονέω* (16 ; 1, 17) in harmony with *ταπεινοφροσύνη* of I Pt. 5 ; 5 and *ταπεινώω* of 5 ; 6. As in I Peter those in authority are exhorted not to exalt

themselves over the flock, but to be in a spirit of humility. Significantly enough, he follows our author's characteristic way of appealing to the example of Christ. Ὑπερηΰφανος of I Pt. 5 : 5 is also a rare word in the N. T. It appears, therefore, that there is much here to suggest dependence. Cf. also parallels 6, 7, 15-19.

- |      |   |   |  |
|------|---|---|--|
| (23) | I Clem. 30 : 2  | Prov. 3 ; 34  | I Pt. 5 ; 5  |
|      | ἑσθὲς γὰρ, φησὶν, ὑπερηΰφανοῖς ἀντιτάσσεται. ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν | Κύριος ὑπερηΰφανοῖς ἀντιτάσσεται. ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν. | ὁ ἑσθὲς ὑπερηΰφανοῖς ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν. Cf. Jas. 4 ; 6. |

Clement is not following the Hebrew original here, which words the first clause very differently, but the LXX, I Peter or James. He follows the LXX in omitting the article "ὁ" with the subject, but agrees with the N. T. writers in changing κύριος to ἑσθὲς. Reference to lusts, adultery and justification by works suggest dependence upon James, while the Petrine tone of the exhortation, before and after the quotation, plus the probable reference to I Peter in v. 1, make it more probable that he was influenced here by our Epistle.

- |      |  |                                      |
|------|--|--------------------------------------|
| (24) | I Clem. 61 ; 3                         | I Pt. 2 ; 25                         |
|      | ἀρχιερέως καὶ προστάτου τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν | πομπέα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν. |

This parallel is close both in thought and form of expression. The balancing of ἀρχιερέως with προστάτου, corresponds exactly with πομπέα and ἐπίσκοπον, while both are followed by the possessive genitive ψυχῶν.

- |      |                                    |                           |
|------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| (25) | I Clem. 64 ; 1                     | I Pt. 5 ; 10              |
|      | ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος . . . ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ | ὁ καλέσας . . . ἐν ἑριστῷ |

The membrans of the parallel are introduced by "ὁ" with an aorist participle of antecedent action. This identical construction of synonymous participles being followed by a phrase expressing Christ as means or agent is indeed suggestive.

- |      |                                     |   |
|------|-------------------------------------|---|
| (26) | I Clem. 64 ; 2                      | I Pt. 2 : 10                                  |
|      | εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον . . . ἀρχιερέως | βασιλείαν ἱεράτευμα . . . λαὸς εἰς περιούσιον |

The "royal priesthood" of believers would very naturally suggest that Christ himself was the great "high priest."

d

- (27) I Clem. 1; 1 I Pt. 1; 2, 2; 4, 6, 9  
 ἐκλεκτοῖς ἐκλεκτός

This word appears four times in I Peter and but six times in all the Pauline literature.

- (28) I Clem. 1; 2 I Pt. 1; 1, 2; 11  
 παρεπιδημήσας παρεπιδήμοις

This word is found in the N. T. only in Heb. 11; 13 and the two places noted above.

- (29) I Clem. 1; 2 I Pt. 2; 18  
 ἐπεικῆ ἐπεικέσιν

A rare word in the N. T.

- (30) I Clem. 1; 2 I Pt. 4; 9  
 φιλοξενία φιλόξενος

The form of the word used by Clement occurs in the N. T. only in Rom. 12; 13 and Heb. 13; 2. Though the form of the word which our author employed is slightly different the context is much more suggestive of his Epistle. Cf. parallels 6, 15, 7, 16-19, 27-30.

- (31) I Clem. 7; 6 I Pt. 3; 20  
 Νῶς ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν, καὶ οἱ ὑπακούσαντες ἐσώθησαν . . . Νῶς κατασκευαζομένης κιβω-  
 τοῦ εἰς ἦν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἁ-  
 τω ψυχῆ, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος

This parallel should be considered in the light of No. 20.

- (32) I Clem. 21; 6 I Pt. 1; 19  
 οὗ (Χριστοῦ) τὸ αἷμα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐλυτρώθητε . . . τιμῶ ἀμαρτιᾷ . . .  
 ἐδούλη Χριστοῦ

This thought is common in the N. T.

- (33) I Clem. 21; 6 I Pt. 2; 13  
 τοὺς προηγουμένους ἡμῶν αἰδεσ- ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει  
 θῶμεν . . . εἴτε βασιλεῖ . . . εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν

The general tone is Petrine, but the rulers to which Clement alludes are Ecclesiastical and not Political as in I Peter.

- (34) I Clem. 21 ; 6 1 Pt. 5 ; 5  
 τούς προσβυτέρους ἡμῶν τιμησῶμεν, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε προσβυτέροις  
 τούς νέους παιδεύσωμεν τὴν παι-  
 δείαν τοῦ ῥόβου τοῦ θεοῦ

This is quite suggestive of our Epistle.

- (35) I Clem. 21 ; 6 1 Pt. 3 ; 1 f.  
 τὰς γυναικας ἡμῶν ἐπι τὸ ἀγαθὸν γυναικες, ὑποτασσόμεναι . . . .  
 δευθωσόμεθα

The thought is in accord but the phrasing is different.

- (36) I Clem. 21 ; 7 1 Pt. 3 ; 2  
 τὸ ἀξιαγάπητον τῆς ἀγνείας ἦψος ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν ῥόβῳ ἀγνήν  
 ἐνδείξασθωσαν ἀναστρουθῆν ἡμῶν

The terms employed do not indicate acquaintance, yet the sequence (No. 35 and 36) is very suggestive.

- (37) I Clem. 21 ; 7 1 Pt. 3 ; 1 b  
 τὸ ἐπεικὲς τῆς γλώσσης . . . διὰ διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστρουθῆς  
 τῆς συγῆς . . . ἄνευ λόγου . . .

This citation finds a closer parallel in Paul's letters, and can have no value here further than to show that Clement thought in a sphere akin to that of our Epistle.

- (38) I Clem. 21 ; 8 1 Pt. 5 ; 5  
 τὰ τέκνα . . . μαυέτωσαν, τί ταπει- νεώτεροι . . . τὴν ταπεινωθροσύνην  
 νοθροσύνη παρὰ θεῷ ἰσχύει ἐγαυμβώσασθε

There is here a close parallel, though in itself not sufficient to make dependence probable.

None of the citations of chapter 21 considered separately justify any claim for dependence, but when the combined evidence is presented, the probabilities are increased in geometrical ratio of the number of the possible points of contact. See No. 32-38.

- (39) I Clem. 30; 1 I Pt. 1; 15, 2; 9  
 Ἁγίου μερὶς ὑπάρχοντες Ἄγιοι γένεσθε γένος ἐκλεκτὸν . . .  
 λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν.

Monnier sees a likeness here between 30; 1 and I Pt. 1; 15. Though not as close in wording, his reference is related in thought more closely to I Pt. 2; 9.

- (40) I Clem. 30; 1 I Pt. 2; 1  
 φεύγοντες καταλαλίαις ἀποθήμενοι καταλαλίαις

The thought in the contexts of these references is also much the same.

- (41) I Clem. 36; 2 I Pt. 2; 9  
 εἰς τὸ θυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς εἰς τὸ θυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς

This verbatim agreement is indeed suggestive, but the context is thoroughly Pauline.

#### Order of Parallels.

| I Clement | I Peter                 | I Clement | I Peter       |
|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Int.      | = 1; 1                  | 16; 14    | = 2; 24       |
| „         | = 1; 2                  | 16; 17    | = 2; 41       |
| 1; 1      | = 1; 2, 2; 4, 6, 9      | 21; 6     | = 1; 19       |
| 1; 2      | = 1; 1, 2; 11           | 21; 6     | = 2; 13       |
| 1; 2      | = 2; 18                 | 21; 6     | = 5; 5        |
| 1; 3      | = 1; 17                 | 21; 6     | = 5; 5        |
| 1; 3      | = 2; 13, 17             | 21; 6     | = 3; 1 f.     |
| 1; 3      | = 3; 7                  | 21; 7     | = 3; 2        |
| 1; 3      | = 5; 5                  | 21; 7     | = 3; 1 b      |
| 1; 3      | = 3; 1                  | 21; 8     | = 5; 5        |
| 1; 3      | = 3; 1, 6               | 22; 2     | = 3; 10       |
| 1; 3      | = 3; 6                  | 30; 1     | = 1; 15, 2; 9 |
| 2; 1      | = 1; 11, 4; 13, 5; 1, 9 | 30; 1     | = 2; 1        |
| 2; 2, 7   | = 4; 19                 | 30; 2     | = 5; 5        |
| 2; 4      | = 2; 17, 5; 7           | 36; 2     | = 2; 9        |
| 7; 2, 4   | = 1; 18, 19             | 49; 5     | = 4; 8        |
| 7; 6      | = 3; 20                 | 59; 2     | = 2; 9        |
| 13; 1     | = 2; 1                  | 61; 3     | = 2; 25       |
| 16; 1     | = 5; 2, 3               | 64; 1     | = 5; 10       |
| 16; 5, 6  | = 2; 24, 25             | 64; 2     | = 2; 9        |
| 16; 10    | = 2; 22                 |           |               |

Conclusion.

The foregoing study has shown that Clement has used words which are peculiar to our Epistle in most significant connections, as well as O. T. quotations common with our Epistle in unmistakably Petrine contexts. Of course no one can, at the conclusion of a discussion of this nature, place his Q. E. D., but if Professor Sanday is correct in saying "the occurrence of the same ideas in the same order must be accepted as conclusive evidence" (I. C. C. on Rom. p. lxxvi), we have shown that I Clement is dependent on I Peter. Monnier contends that "Clement connaît l'épître. Il ne la cite pas expressement : il l'utilise." (Com. p. 307.) Knopf reaches a similar conclusion : "In Rom. wird noch vor der Jahrhundertwende I. Petri wahrscheinlich von I. Clem. benutzt." . . . (Das nachapostolische Zeitalter p. 34.)

PART II.—CANONICAL BOOKS

GALATIANS

B

b—c

- (1) I Pt. 1 ; 23—25 Gal. 4 ; 4—7, 28—31

Professor Bacon (Com. on Gal. p. 8, 75, 93) notes a close parallel, in the doctrine of the new birth from "spiritual seed," in the above references. In his letter to the Romans (4 ; 19—21, 9 ; 7—9), Paul "reckons the children of the promise for a seed," 9 ; 9. They become sons through adoption, Gal. 4 ; 5, (Rom. 8 ; 15, 23, 9 ; 4, Eph. 4 ; 5). While the idea is the same in our Epistle, our author, in accord with later writers (Jn. 1 ; 13, 3 ; 5, Jas. 1 ; 18, I Jn. 3 ; 9) used the figure as a "new birth" instead of an "adoption." There seems to be evidence here not only of borrowing but also of a later stratum of thought.

- (2) I Pt. 2 ; 16 Gal. 5 ; 13

ὡς ἐλευθεροί, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικατά- ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπὶ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε  
λυμμα ἔγοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλ- ἀδελφοί μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν  
ευθερίαν ἀλλ' ὡς Θεοῦ δούλοι εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῆς σαρκί, ἀλλὰ διὰ  
τῆς ἀγάπης δούλουτε ἀλλήλοις

The likeness here is striking. In both cases a reference to the defeat of persecutors precedes. The freedmen are exhorted alike

not to use their liberty as license but (notice the antithesis ἀλλά) to use it as becometh true servants. I Cor. 7 ; 22 is a close parallel. The *δοῦλος Χριστοῦ* or *δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ* is a common Paulinism, but on the whole certainly no reference can outdo Gal. 5 ; 13, as the probable source of I Pt. 2 ; 16. Cf. Hort's "First Epistle of St. Peter." p. 146.

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| (3) | I Pt. 2 ; 24   | Gal. 3 ; 13  |
|     | ὅς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτοῦ ἀν-<br>ήνεργεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ<br>τὸ ζῆλον | Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγήρασεν ἐκ τῆς<br>κατάρax τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ<br>ἡμῶν κατάρax . . . ἐπικατάρaxτος πᾶς<br>ὁ κρεμᾶμενος ἐπὶ ζῆλου |

I Pt. 2 ; 24 from Isa. 53 ; 4, 5, 6, 11, probably was suggested by Galatians. Rom. 8 ; 3, II Cor. 5 ; 21, etc., contain the idea of vicarious suffering, as does I Pt. 2 ; 24a, but they do not specifically allude to the ζῆλον as does Gal. 3 ; 13. Thus on both counts Gal. 3 ; 13 is more closely related to our Epistle.

- |     |   |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|
|     |   | c  |  |
| (4) | I Pt. 1 ; 4   | Gal. 4 ; 7, 3 ; 18   |  |
|     | εἰς κληρονομίαν ἀφύρατον καὶ ἀμί-<br>αντον καὶ ἀμάραντον, τετηρημένην<br>ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ἡμᾶς | εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος Θεοῦ<br>διὰ Χριστοῦ 3 ; 18 κληρονομία |  |

In Gal. 3 ; 18, Rom. 4 ; 13 f., (Heb. 6 ; 12,) the promise of the "inheritance" is already fulfilled. In Gal. 4 ; 7 (Rom. 8 ; 16 f.), as in I Peter, the "inheritance" is present, "being inseparable from sonship." (Hort "Ep. of St. Peter," p. 35). The idea is too common in the N. T., and the context too dubious to be sure of dependence, yet the parallel I Pt. 3 ; 6 = Gal. 4 ; 26 makes it quite probable.

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (5) | I Pt. 1 ; 5   | Gal. 3 ; 23  |
|     | τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ ὑπορουμέ-<br>νοὺς διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν<br>ἐτοιμῆν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ<br>ἔσχατῷ | πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, ὑπὸ<br>νόμον ὑπορουμέμεθα, συγκεκλισμέ-<br>νοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀπο-<br>καλυφθῆναι |

This parallel is very important. Paul said, "before faith they were kept under the law," I Peter then notes "they were kept through faith," whereas both have in view the "future revelation." This



doctrine of the believer's security is common in the Fourth Gospel (Jn. 10 ; 28, 29, 17 ; 11, 12, 15), as well as in the Pauline Literature, but nowhere is the likeness so close in both members, i. e., the ideas of " the believer's security " and of " the future revelation."

(6) I Pt. 1 ; 18  
 οὐ φθαρτοῦς . . . ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ  
 τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πα-  
 τροπαρὰδότης

Gal. 3 ; 13  
 Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξιγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς  
 κατάρκας τοῦ νόμου

As has been noted elsewhere this is a weakened form of Paulinism.

(7) I Pt. 2 ; 11  
 ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυ-  
 μιῶν, αἵτινες σφραττεύονται κατὰ  
 τῆς ψυχῆς

Gal. 5 ; 17  
 ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ  
 πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς  
 σαρκὸς· ταῦτα δὲ ἀντίκειται ἀλλή-  
 λως

The internal warfare, of which St. Paul so frequently speaks, is here alluded to. Jas. 4 ; 1 likewise refers to it, but this later writer, of course, cannot have suggested it to either of these earlier authors. It is difficult to determine whether our author is following Rom. 7 ; 23 or Gal. 5 ; 13. The parallels I Pt. 2 ; 16 = Gal. 5 ; 13 and I Pt. 4 ; 3 = Gal. 5 ; 21, however, seem to make it more probable that he is influenced by Galatians at this point.

(8) I Pt. 3 ; 6  
 ὡς Σάρρα . . . ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκ-  
 να . . .

d  
 Gal. 4 ; 26  
 ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐλευθέρα  
 ἐστίν. ἡτις ἐστὶ μίτηρ πάντων  
 ἡμῶν

Holtzmann calls attention to this similarity of thought. (Einl. p. 314.) Though there is nothing striking in the phrases, the likeness is worthy of consideration in view of the parallel to which Professor Bacon alludes, i. e., I Pt. 1 : 23-25 = Gal. 4 ; 4-7, 28-31.

(9) I Pt. 4, 3  
 τὸ ὕψισμα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατεργάσ-  
 κσθαι, πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελείαις,

Gal. 5 ; 20, 21  
 . . τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς . . ἀσελ-  
 γεια, εἰδωλολατρεία, φαρμακεία,

ἐπιθυμίαις, οἰνοφλυγίαις, κόμοις, ἔχθραι ἔρεις, ζῆλοι, θυμοί, ἐριθείαι,  
 πότοις, καὶ ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλόλατ- διγροσπασίαι, αἰρέσεις, φθόνοι, φόνοι.  
 ρείαις μείαι, κῶμοι . . .

Holtzmann thinks the similarity may show dependence, (Einl. p. 314,) yet there seems to be nothing to commend it over and above Eph. 2 ; 2, 3, 4 ; 17, I Thes. 4 ; 5, Tit. 3 ; 3, Rom. 13 ; 13, I Cor. 6 ; 9, Eph. 5 ; 5, etc.

Although the parallels are not numerous, and there are no words found only in these two Epistles, the combined evidence of those examples classed as " b—c " and " c " make it quite probable that there is here a literary dependence. Scholars are almost unanimous, of course, in giving to " Galatians " the priority. Bigg, however, thinks " if a writer calling himself Peter had read Galatians he would have made distinct allusion to the second chapter." The fact that no such allusion is to be found in I Peter may be regarded as a strong indirect argument in favor of its authenticity." Now our interest here is not whether the Epistle is authentic or not, but we are interested in the relative positions of these two Writings. Does it not seem, though, that the silence would be quite as natural for one " calling himself Peter " as for Peter himself? Certainly Peter would have chafed at such scathing allusions, while a later writer would not feel the sting of the thrust at Peter. Furthermore the letter comes, more probably, from a later period of mediation, though not so late as the Tübingen School would contend. To say " the author's silence, if writing before Galatians, is natural " is almost naive. The circumstances under which the letter was written and the conditions revealed in it make it impossible to suppose it to have been written at such an early period.

#### I THESSALONIANS

D

d

- (1) I Pt. 1; 13 I Thes. 5; 6  
 νήφροντες, τελείως ἐπίσχετε . . . γρηγοροῦμεν καὶ νήφουμεν. Cf. 5; 8.

A closer parallel is to be found in Rom. 13 ; 11—13.

- (2) I Pt. 1; 14 I Thes. 4; 5  
 ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίαις . . . μὴ εἰ-  
 δότα τὸν Θεόν

Cf. I Cor. 15 ; 34, Gal. 4 ; 8, Eph. 2 ; 12, 4 ; 18, 22, II Thes. 1 ; 8. See also Romans Ex. 9 (i. e., I Pt. 1 ; 14 = Rom. 12 ; 2), which more probably sustains some relation to this verse.

- (3) I Pt. 1 ; 15 I Thes. 4 ; 7  
 ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἐπὶ  
 ἁγίων καὶ ἀποτῶν ἁγίων ἐν πάσῃ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἀλλ' ἐν ἁγιασμῷ  
 ἀναστρουφῆ γενήθητε

The thought and wording are close, yet not such as to make dependence here more probable than in Rom. 11 ; 2. See Rom. Ex. 10.

- (4) I Pt. 1 ; 22 I Thes. 4 ; 9  
 ἀλλήλους ἀγαπίσατε ἐκτενωθῆς ὑμεῖς θεοδιδάκτοι ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγα-  
 πῆν ἀλλήλους

Cf. Rom. 12 ; 9, 10, or Ex. 13.

- (5) I Pt. 2 ; 17 I Thes. 4 ; 9  
 τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπήτε περὶ τῆς φιλημελιότητος . . . ὑμεῖς θεο-  
 διδάκτοι ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγαπῆν ἀλλή-  
 λους

Cf. Rom. 12 ; 10 a, or Ex. 44.

- (6) I Pt. 3 ; 9 I Thes. 5 ; 15  
 μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ μὴ τις κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ τινὶ ἀποδοῖ

See Rom. 12 ; 17 for an exact parallel, which is also in a better context.

- (7) I Pt. 4 ; 7 I Thes. 5 ; 6  
 σωφρονίσατε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς γρηγοροῦμεν καὶ νήρωμεν  
 προσευχάς

In I Pt. 4 ; 7 b the exhortation is given in view of the imminent judgment (4 ; 7 a) likewise in I Thes. 5 ; 6, they are exhorted to watchfulness that they may be ready for the sudden coming of the Lord (5 ; 1—4). I Thes. 5 ; 5 seems to interrupt this thought and make the exhortation an appeal for consistent action on the part of the "children of light." Cf. Col. 4 ; 2, Mt. 26 ; 41, Lk. 21 ; 34.

- (8) I Pt. 4 ; 15 I Thes. 4 ; 11  
 [μὴ τις ὑμῶν πασγέτω] ὡς . . . πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια  
 ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος

The background here is very different.

- (9) I Pt. 5 ; 8 I Thes. 5 ; 6  
 νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε γρηγοροῦμεν καὶ νήψομεν

This parallel is very suggestive, yet is probably accidental. Cf. Examples 1 and 7.

- (10) I Pt. 5 ; 9 I Thes. 3 ; 2, 3  
 ὃ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῆ πίστει παρακαλέσαι ἑμᾶς περὶ τῆς πί-  
 εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθνημάτων τωσ ἑμῶν, τῷ μηδένα σκίνεσθαι  
 τῆ τῷ κόσμῳ ἑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι ταύταις  
 ἐπιτελεῖσθαι

Dependence may easily be inferred from this parallel, yet the context does not warrant us to consider it more than a mere possibility.

We are not to conclude from the above study that either Epistle presupposes the other.

## II THESSALONIANS

D

d

- (1) I Pt. 1 ; 2 II Thes. 2 ; 13  
 ἐν ἀγιασμῷ Πνεύματος ἐν ἀγιασμῷ Πνεύματος

" Election " through sanctification of the Spirit is set forth here in a way not found elsewhere in the N. T. The thought is Pauline and the verbal agreement closer than elsewhere. The context, however, is not suggestive of I Peter.

- (2) I Pt. 1 ; 13 II Thes. 1 ; 7  
 ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ

Again there is verbal agreement. It is significant that " angels " are spoken of in the immediate contexts, yet they play very different roles.

- (3) I Pt. 5 ; 3 II Thes. 3 ; 9  
 τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου ἵνα ἐκαστοὺς τύπον δῶμεν ἑμῶν

- (4) I Pt. 5 ; 10 II Thes. 2 ; 17  
 στήριξαι στήριξαι

- (5) I Pt. 5 ; 10 II Thes. 3 ; 3  
 στήριξάται, σθιενώσασιν στήριξέται ἡμᾶς καὶ φυλάξεται ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ

These last three parallels need not detain us.

As in I Thessalonians, there is no word common to these Epistles only, and clearly the evidence will not warrant any claim for dependence.

I CORINTHIANS

C

c—d

- (1) I Pt. 1 ; 13 I Cor. 1 ; 4, 7  
 ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ἡμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐλπίζομεν ἐν μετῴσῃ χάρισματι ἀπειδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

The hope of a great blessing at the " Parousia " is Pauline, though not peculiar to him. (Cf. II Thes. 1 ; 7.) " Ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is the Pauline term for the Parousia." (Cone, Com. on I Pt. p. 306). This is the closest parallel to I Pt. 1 ; 13 in the N. T., yet it is not conclusive.

- (2) I Pt. 2 ; 2 I Cor. 3 ; 2  
 ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιπονήσατε ὡς νηπίαι ἐν Χριστῷ γάλα ἡμᾶς ἐπότισα. οὐ βρωμα. οὐτω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε . . .

Heb. 5 ; 12, 13 has a similar figure. Heb. 6 ; 5 also corresponds closely with I Pt. 2 ; 3. The passages in the above Parallel refer to those who are "tull of hearing." I Cor. 3 ; 1, 2 is followed in v. 3 by thought much like I Pt. 2 ; 1. Both textually and contextually then this is the nearest N. T. parallel, and may indicate a real point of contact. (Cf. Holtzmann's Einleitung p. 314.)

- (3) I Pt. 2 ; 16 I Cor. 7 ; 22  
 ὡς ἐλεύθεροι . . . ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῦ ὁ ἐλεύθερος κληθείς. δοῦλός ἐστι Χριστοῦ

No other N. T. passage reproduces this thought so closely, except Gal. 5 ; 13. The probabilities of dependence here are increased by the possible echo of I Cor. 7 ; 23 in I Pt. 1 ; 18.

- (4) I Pt. 5; 3 I Cor. 3; 9a  
 μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν ἔσμεν συνεργοί· Θεοῦ γεώργιον.  
 κλήρων

This parallel becomes more significant when taken in connection with Θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε of I Cor. 3; 9b. Cf. also I Pt. 2; 5 = I Cor. 3; 16.

- (5) I Pt. 5; 4 I Cor. 9; 25  
 κομιεῖσθε τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς ἵνα φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβωσιν,  
 δόξης στέφανον ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀφθαρτον

This figure may have been borrowed from I Cor. 9; 25. In neither of the other parallels (II Tim. 4; 8 and Jas. 1; 12) is the imperishable nature of the crown mentioned. Since I Peter cannot depend upon James, and the connection with II Timothy is very dubious the dependence of our Epistle upon I Corinthians is all the more probable at this point.

- d
- (6) I Pt. 1; 7 I Cor. 3; 13  
 δοκίμιον ὑμῶν πίστεως . . . διὰ πυ- ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον . . . ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ  
 ρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου . . . ἀποκαλύπτεται· καὶ ἑκάστου τὸ  
 ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστι τὸ πῦρ δοκιμάσει

A closer duplicate is found in Jas. 1; 2, 3, though the figure here is much the same. Although the background is very different in these Epistles, I Cor. 3; 13 may have suggested the figure to our author.

- (7) I Pt. 1; 18 I Cor. 6; 20, 7; 23  
 οὐ φθαρτοῖς . . . ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ 6; 20 ἡγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς 7; 23  
 τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς . . . τιμῆς ἡγοράσθητε  
 ἀλλὰ τιμῶ ἀίματι . . .

The idea is Pauline, though the deliverance from a vain manner of life is a mild statement as compared with Gal. 3; 13. Τιμῆς and αἷματι seem to refer to the same thing.

- (8) I Pt. 1; 21 I Cor. 15; 14  
 τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν . . . εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, [κε-  
 ῶστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα νὸν ἄρα τὸ κήρυγμα ἡμῶν] κενή  
 εἶναι εἰς Θεόν δὲ καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν. Cf. 13; 13.

The parallel is suggestive, but not so close as in Romans. Cf. I Pt. 1; 21 = Rom. 4; 24.

- (9) I Pt. 2 ; 5 I Cor. 3 ; 16  
 λίθου ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος κατὰ Θεοῦ ἐστε, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα  
 πνευματικῶς τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν

The figure of a spiritual temple is common with Paul. Eph. 2 ; 20—22 very probably suggested this figure to our author. See the discussion loco citato.

- (10) I Pt. 2 ; 15 I Cor. 15 ; 34  
 ἀγνοσίχθων ἀγνοσίχθων

Although this word appears only in these two places in the N. T., it is a mere coincidence here. It seems to be the only word which is found in these two Epistles only.

- (11) I Pt. 3 ; 1 I Cor. 14 ; 34  
 γυναικες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἄνδράσιν γυναικες ὑμῶν . . . ἀλλὰ ὑποτάσσεσθαι

A closer parallel is found in Eph. 5 ; 22. Cf. also 5 ; 33.

- (12) I Pt. 3 ; 1b I Cor. 7 ; 14  
 ἵνα εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἡγάσται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν  
 διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστrophῆς τῆς γυναικί  
 ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται

This similarity of thought is probably due to accident.

- (13) I Pt. 3 ; 9 I Cor. 4 ; 12  
 μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ λοιδορούμενοι ἐβλογοῦμεν· διωκό-  
 ῃ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας τούτων-  
 αντίων δὲ ἐβλογοῦντες μένοι ἀνεχόμεθα βλασφημοῦμενοι  
 παρκαλοῦμεν

Though the thought is the same, a closer parallel is to be found in Rom. 12 ; 17, 14 ; the first clause of which is in verbal agreement. See the discussion on this passage in Romans.

- (14) I Pt. 3 ; 18 I Cor. 15 ; 3  
 Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέ- Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρ-  
 θανεν [ἐπαθεν] τιῶν ἡμῶν

The thought and phrasing are close, but too common to base any argument upon them. Cf. Rom. 5 ; 6, 8, 10, 11, Heb. 9 ; 28, etc.

- (15) I Pt. 3; 22 I Cor. 15; 25  
 ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν  
 ἐξουσίαν καὶ δυνάμειον ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν
- The agreement is obvious, but the frequency with which this thought occurs in the Pauline Literature makes it almost impossible to determine which Epistle may have suggested it to our author. The probabilities, however, are in favor of Romans (8; 38) and Ephesians (1; 21, 22). Cf. also Col. 2; 10, 1; 16.
- (16) I Pt. 4; 10a I Cor. 12; 5  
 ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα διακρίσεις διακονῶν εἰσι
- See Rom. 12; 6 for closer parallel.
- I Pt. 4; 10 b I Cor. 4; 1  
 διακοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ὡς ὑπηρέταις Ἰησοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους . .
- Thoroughly Pauline but not conclusive.
- (17) I Pt. 4; 12 I Cor. 3; 13  
 τῆ ἐν ὑμῶν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ἕκαστου τὸ ἔργον ὑπόσθιν ἐστὶ τὸ  
 ὑμῶν γινομένη πῦρ δοκιμάσει
- Paul here refers to the testing of the Judgment, of which our author thought the present persecutions were the immediate precursors. Cf. I Pt. 4; 7. Though the conditions under which they wrote were very different, the figure used by Paul would be picked up most appropriately during the trying ordeal.
- (18) I Pt. 5; 10 I Cor. 1; 9  
 ὁ δὲ Θεὸς πάσης Χάριτος, ὁ καλὸς πιστὸς ὁ Θεὸς, δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε  
 ἕσας ἑμᾶς εἰς τὴν κλήσιν αὐτοῦ εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ  
 δόξαν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
- This close parallel finds similar thought in I Tim. 6; 12, but is quite suggestive of dependence here.
- (19) I Pt. 5; 12 I Cor. 4; 17  
 διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῶν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἔπεμψα ὑμῶν Τιμόθεον . . . πιστὸν  
 ἀδελφοῦ . . . ἔγραψα ἐν Κυρίῳ
- (20) I Pt. 5; 12 I Cor. 15; 1  
 χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στήτε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . ὃ ἐστήκατε



- (21) I Pt. 5; 13 I Cor. 16; 19  
 Ἀσπάζεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἡ . . . ἀσπάζεσθαι ὑμᾶς αἰ ἐκκλησίαι . . .
- (22) I Pt. 5; 14 I Cor. 16; 20  
 Ἀσπάζασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης ἀγίῳ ἀσπάζασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ

The last four parallels may be duplicated in most any of the Pauline Epistles.

The foregoing study shows the difficulty in ascertaining the exact relationship between these two Epistles. The combined evidence of a score or more of possible points of contact, and especially of those classed "c—d", make dependence somewhat probable. No one instance requires this conclusion, nor do they all necessarily prove it since much of the thought is to be duplicated in Romans and Ephesians, with which dependence is far more probable. Hence we can do no more than assign to I Corinthians a low degree of probability.

## II CORINTHIANS

C—D

c—d

- (1) I Pt. 2; 22 II Cor. 5; 21  
 ὁς ἄμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν τὸν μὴ γινόντα ἄμαρτίαν

The doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ is common. See Jn. 8; 34, 46, Heb. 4; 15, I Jn. 3; 4, 8. Since II Corinthians antedates them all, none can surpass its claim to originality, yet all may draw from Isa. 53.

- (2) I Pt. 4; 5 II Cor. 5; 10  
 τοῦ ἐπαιμῶς κρίνοντι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς . . . τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ὑμᾶς παραρροῦναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ

This parallel is made more significant by the possible relation of 4; 1 to II Cor. 5; 15. Yet the doctrine is common. Cf. Acts 17; 31, Rom. 4; 10, 12; 1, I Cor. 15; 51, 52, Jas. 5; 9, Acts 10; 42 and II Tim. 4; 1, the last two of which are closer to I Pt. 4; 5 than to II Cor. 5; 10.

- (3) I Pt. 5; 3 II Cor. 1; 24  
 μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλη- οὐχ ὅτι κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίσ-  
 ρων τρωας

II Cor. 1; 24 is a closer parallel to 5; 3 than is to be found elsewhere in the N. T. Dependence is somewhat probable, though not certain since the context is neutral.

- d  
 (4) I Pt. 1; 3 II Cor. 1; 3  
 Εὐλογητός ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Εὐλογητός ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ  
 Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

Holtzmann calls attention to this parallel (Einl. p. 314), but as we have seen the dependence is much more likely upon Eph. 1; 3. See discussion on I Pt. 1; 3 = Eph. 1; 3.

- (5) I Pt. 1; 3 II Cor. 1; 3  
 ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν
- Again the thought is not as close as in Ephesians.

- (6) I Pt. 1; 8 II Cor. 5; 7  
 εἰς ἃν ἄρτι μὴ ὀρῶντες πιστεύοντες διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν οὐ  
 διὰ εἰδους

This thought is too common and the context too different to claim dependence. Cf. Jn. 20; 29, Rom. 8; 24, 25, I Cor. 13; 12, Heb. 1; 1, 27, I Jn. 4; 20.

- (7) I Pt. 1; 21 II Cor. 6; 6  
 φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον ἀγάπην ἀνυπόκριτον

Although there is a parallel in I Pt. 2; 4 and II Cor. 6; 16, there is nothing to indicate dependence at this point. Cf. discussions on I Pt. 1; 2 = Eph. 1; 20 and I Pt. 2; 5 = I Cor. 3; 16.

- (8) I Pt. 2; 1 II Cor. 12; 20  
 καταλαλίαι καταλαλίαι

This word occurs only in these two places in all the N. T., yet the context is not such as to lead one to infer dependence at this point.

- (9) I Pt. 4; 10 II Cor. 10; 13  
 ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος οὗ  
 ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεός

Our Epistle finds a closer parallel at this point in Rom. 12; 6, I Cor. 12; 4, 5 and Eph. 4; 7.

- (10) I Pt. 4; 11 II Cor. 9; 10

χορηγῆϊ

χορηγίσει

The usage of this word, which occurs only here in the N. T., seems to be independent.

- (11) I Pt. 4; 13 II Cor. 1; 7

καὶ ὁ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅσπερ κοινωνοί ἐστε τῶν παθιμάτων  
 παθιμάτων χάριστε . . . χαρήτε τῶν, οὕτω καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως  
 ἀγαλλιώμενοι

The thought is the same, yet Rom. 8; 17, 48 more probably suggested this to our author.

- (12) I Pt. 4; 14 II Cor. 12; 10

εἰ ὄνειδιζέσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ. εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις . . . ὑπὲρ  
 μακάριοι Χριστοῦ

The phrase ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ occurs now here else in the N. T. Persecution caused by confessing the name of Christ is specific. The passage in I Corinthians shows Paul's willingness to pay the price, that he might be "strong in Christ." The evidence for dependence here is slight.

- (13) I Pt. 5; 10 II Cor. 4; 17

ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ ὀλίγον ἡμῶν καὶ ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερ-  
 παθόντας αὐτὸς καταρτίσει . . . βολὴν αἰώνιον βάρους δόξης καταρ-  
 γᾷσεται ἡμῖν

The joyful optimism during suffering is noticeable in both cases. Paul was an "apostle of hope" quite as much as our author, and no doubt was a great inspiration to him. Dependence however can not be asserted here.

The concluding greeting (I Pt. 5; 13 = II Cor. 13; 13 and I Pt. 5; 14 = II Cor. 13; 12) has no more to commend it here than in the other Pauline Epistles.

The possible points of contact between these two Epistles are not such as to warrant any confidence in the probability of dependence. What may be termed real evidence is limited to the parallels classed "c—d". Even these do not show more than a low degree of probability.

## ROMANS

A\*

a\*—b

(1) I Pt. I; 20

Rom. 16; 25

προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς  
κόσμου. φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπὶ ἐσχά-  
του πῶν χρόνων

κατὰ ἀπροκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρό-  
νοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερω-  
θέντος δὲ νῦν

The significance of this parallel has been noted by many scholars. Professor Sanday (Com. on Rom. p. 434) makes the following comment on the passage in Romans; "This is the thought which underlies much of the argument of chapters 9—11, and is directly implied in the first eight chapters. It represents in fact the conclusion which the Apostle had arrived at in musing over the difficulties which the problems of human history, as he knew them, had suggested. God . . . is working out a purpose in the world. For ages it was a mystery, now in these last days it has been revealed; and this revelation explains the meaning of God's working in the past." That I Peter here alludes to the Pauline idea of the *μυστήριον* is very probable. It is wholly in accord with the non-speculative nature of the author, as well as in harmony with his characteristic trait of expressing in a simple phrase or clause the equivalent of the more elaborate reasoning of Paul. This brevity has led B. Weiss to advocate the dependence of Paul. Yet Professor Sanday follows the general consensus of scholastic opinion in contending for the originality of Paul. That the above reference occurs in connection with the Pauline doctrine of the preexistence of Christ is very important to note.

(2) I Pt. 2; 6

Rom. 9; 33

Ἴδού τίθημι ἐν Σιών . . .

Ἴδού τίθημι ἐν Σιών

(3) I Pt. 2; 6 b

Rom. 9; 33 b

ὁ πιστεύων ἐπὶ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κα-  
ταισχυνηθῆ

ὁ πιστεύων ἐπὶ αὐτῷ οὐ κατα-  
ισχυνηθήσεται

(4) I Pt. 2; 8

Rom. 9; 33 a

λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα  
σκανδάλου

λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν  
σκανδάλου

The very important place these three parallels have in the problem of literary relation, necessitates quite extensive comment. Bigg says "It is unnecessary to suppose that St. Peter's version of Isaiah is derived from St. Paul." (I. C. C. p. 132.) B. Weiss after arguing

that there is here a literary dependence says "Es ist nun aber auch in dieser Stelle völlig unmöglich, daß die Abhängigkeit auf Seiten des Petrus sein kann." (Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff. p. 422) Against this almost isolated example is to be given the general consensus of scholastic opinion. Furthermore Weiss does not seem to have met Brückner's argument. Monnier says: "la dépendance de I Pt. 2 ; 6 et 8 par rapport à Rom. 9 ; 33 est évidente." (Com. p. 38.) H. M. Holtzmann, (Einl. p. 314.) gives the following line of reasoning ; "Am wenigsten aber ist nur Zufall dabei im Spiele, wenn Jes. 28 ; 16 und 8 ; 14, letztere Stelle verschmolzen mit Ps. 118 ; 22, I. Pt. 2 ; 6-8, ganz ähnlich wie Röm. 9 ; 33 (Jes. 28 ; 16 mit Jes. 8 ; 14 verbunden, vgl. auch I. Pt. 2 ; 8 *προσκόπτειν* wie Röm. 9 ; 32 und paulinischer Determinismus wie Röm. 9 ; 14 f. und unmittelbar darauf 10. Hos. 2 ; 25 ganz in demselben Sinne, um den Unterschied des ehemaligen heidnischen und des gegenwärtigen christlichen Zustandes hervorzuheben, angeführt wird, wie Röm. 9 ; 25 eine solche Benutzung Bestätigung findet.) Gerade wie Pls., Rom. 9 ; 33, 10 ; 11 thut, ist der Spruch Jes. 28 ; 16 mit einem zu *πιστεύων* hinzutretenden *ἐπ' αὐτῷ* aus Jes. 8 ; 14 ausgestattet ; auch der beiderseitige Eingang des Spruches stimmt gegen LXX überein."

Zahn (Introduction II p. 188) gives the following against Weiss : "That Rom. 9 ; 32 f. and I Pt. 2 ; 6, still more 2 ; 4-8 were not written independently of each other is proved (1) by the fact that both apostles in quoting Isa. 28 ; 16 are practically agreed against the strongly variant reading of the LXX ; even the addition *ἐπ' αὐτῷ* (Rom. 9 ; 33, 10 ; 11, I Pt. 2 ; 6) is certainly spurious in the LXX ; (2) from the fact that after the quotation of Isa. 28 ; 16, following a quotation from Ps. 118 ; 22, in I Pt. 2 ; 7 f. are added the words *λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρας σκηνδαλίω*, which are taken from Isa. 8 ; 14, but vary greatly from the text of the LXX, and which Paul inserts in the quotation of Isa. 28 ; 16. Here also Peter does not copy Rom. ; he is familiar with the prophetic text from his own reading, since in 2 ; 6 he gives the characteristics of the stone,—as also earlier in 2 ; 3,—passed over by Paul. But there remains in his memory also the form in which Paul had quoted the words of the prophet, and, following the cue suggested by Paul's combination of Isa. 28 ; 16 and Isa. 8 ; 14 he also adds Ps. 118 ; 22."

To Professor Sanday we are indebted for the following important observations on the variations ; (1) The LXX reads *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμψάλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών*. In both the passages in the N. T. the words are *ἰδοὺ τῷ ἔθνει ἐν Σιών*. (2) For the LXX *ἰδοὺ πάλωτελῃ*

ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον, St. Peter reads ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον; while St. Paul substitutes λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου taken from Isa. 8 ; 14 καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθον προσκόμματα συναντήσεσθε οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι. Here St. Peter 2 ; 8 agrees with St. Paul in writing πέτρα σκανδάλου for πέτρας πτώματι. (3) The LXX proceeds εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς, which both St. Peter and St. Paul omit. (4) The LXX proceeds καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ κατασχηθῆ. Both St. Peter and St. Paul bring out the personal reference by inserting ἐπ' αὐτῷ while St. Paul reads κατασχηθήσεται and in 10 ; 11 adds πᾶς." (I. C. C. p 280 f.) Cf. also Hilgenfeld's Einleitung p. 633 f.

We may note in this connection that in the " Petrine " speech of Acts 4 ; 11, reference is made to Ps. 118 ; 22 and not to Isa. 28 ; 16. I Pt. 2 ; 6b = Isa. 28 ; 16, 2 ; 7b = Ps. 118 ; 22 and 2 ; 8a = Isa. 8 ; 14. Rom. 9 ; 33 combines I Pt. 2 ; 6a, 8a, and 6b into one short sentence, i. e., Isa. 28 ; 16b, 8 ; 14 and 28 ; 16c, omitting I Pt. 2 ; 7b, the quotation from Ps. 118 ; 22 which is given in " Peter's speech " in Acts 4 ; 11.

That there is literary dependence here scholars agree, and that the dependence is on the part of our author they are nearly all quite as ready to admit. Only B. Weiss and his pupil Kühl resist this conclusion. It seems fair therefore to say the arguments presented above by representative scholars prove the originality of Paul, who had thoroughly worked over these ideas and put them in compact form, while our author apparently was contented in his " practical treatise " to sort out and string together the scriptural pearls discovered by Paul. (For counter arguments see " Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff " by B. Weiss, p. 421 f.)

(5) I Pt. 4 ; 10

Rom. 12 ; 6

ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα, ἔχοντες δὲ χάρισμα κατὰ τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες . . . χάριν τὴν διδούσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα . .

Jülicher (Int. p. 209) agrees with Cone (Com. p. 319) " that the dependence of the writer on the Pauline passage is evident " in this and the following parallels. The Pauline thought is expressed in Pauline terms. Cf. also I Cor. 12 ; 4, 28.

(6) I Pt. 4 ; 11

Rom. 12 ; 7

ἔι τις διακονῆ, ὡς εἰς ἰσχύος ἦς εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ χορηγῆ ὁ Θεός

This citation in I Peter continues the thought of Paul in the same order, noted in the preceding parallel.

(7) I Pt. 4 ; 13 Rom. 8 ; 17, 18  
 καθὼς κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρήτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι. Cf. 5 ; 1.  
 εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν. 8 : 18 οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς

(8) I Pt. 5 ; 1 Rom. 8 ; 17, 19  
 μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθῶν, ὁ καὶ τῆς μαρτυρίας ἀποκαλύπτει δόξης κοινωνός  
 εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν . . . (19) τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς

These last two parallels belong together. Weiss (Lehrbegriff p. 423) thinks there is here a clear case of Paul's dependence upon I Peter. Chase (H. B. D., III. p. 788) on the other hand thinks the dependence of I Peter is obvious. Practically all scholars are agreed that there is here a clear case of dependence. The priority must be given to Paul, as will appear later.

b

(9) I Pt. 1 ; 14 Rom. 12 ; 2  
 μὴ συνασχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις  
 μὴ συνασχηματιζέσθε τῷ αἵωνι τούτῳ

*Συνασχηματιζομαι* is found only in these two passages in all the N. T. Nor is the word used by the LXX. Our Epistle has an amplification of the simpler form found in Romans. This parallel receives added significance when placed alongside of I Pt. 2 ; 5 = Rom. 12 ; 1. Cf. H. J. Holtzmann's *Einleitung* p. 314.

(10) I Pt. 1 ; 15 Rom. 12 ; 2  
 ἀλλὰ . . . αὐτοὶ ἄριστοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστρέφῃ γενήθητε  
 ἀλλὰ μετὰ φόβου κυρίου ἀνακτανώσθε τοῦ νοῦ

The antithesis here is an important parallel construction, while the thought is equally striking. This and the foregoing example make a strong case for dependence.

(11) I Pt. 1 ; 17 Rom. 2 ; 11, 6  
 τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον  
 οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ προσωπολήπιος κατὰ τῷ θεῷ 2 : 6 ὅς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ

This is a common N. T. parallel, but it is closer here than in James 2 ; 1 or Acts 10 ; 34. Our Epistle clearly refers to God's

impartiality in the judgment in harmony with Rom. 2 ; 11. Cf. also 2 ; 6. A similar sentiment is expressed in Eph. 6 ; 9, and Col. 3 ; 25. That this is a closer parallel than in the "speech of Peter" is very significant.—We have seen another probable point of contact in this context of Romans, (i. e., I Pt. 1 ; 7 = Rom. 2 ; 10,) thereby justifying us in putting this parallel in class "b".

(12) I Pt. 1 ; 21

Rom. 4 ; 24

δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοῦς εἰς Θεὸν τὸν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα  
ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν

That God raised up Jesus from the dead, was a common belief, but that He did it to beget belief in Himself, hence be efficacious for salvation, is peculiar to these authors. Monnier says "La résurrection de J. C. est constamment rapportée à un acte de Dieu, à qui revient, en dernière analyse, la première initiative et la puissance supreme dans l'œuvre de salut . . ." Both the thought and phrasing are very close.

(13) I Pt. 1 ; 22

Rom. 12 ; 9, 10

τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ἡ ἀγάπῃ ἀνυπόκριτος. ἀποστου-  
βηκασθὲ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδέλ- γουῦντες τὸ πονηρὸν, κολιθώμενοι  
φίαν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐκ καρδίας ἀλ- τῷ ἀγαθῷ, τῇ φιλαδέλφειᾳ εἰς ἀλ-  
λήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενωθῆς. λήλους φιλόστοργοι

This parallel is too close to require comment. Jas. 4 ; 8 approximates it but is not nearly so close. Furthermore the evidence seems to indicate that "James" is later than either of the above passages.

(14) I Pt. 2 ; 11

Rom. 7 ; 23

ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν βλέπω ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλ-  
αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς εσι μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ  
ψυχῆς τοῦ νόθου μου

An obvious parallel to the Pauline doctrine of the *σάρξ* which "wars" against the *πνεῦμα*. Monnier (Com. p. 110) says: "Eph. 2 ; 3 est imité ici", but in reality there is here a combination of Rom. 7 ; 23 and Eph. 2 ; 3 in one sentence. The passage in Ephesians fails to emphasise the "internal warfare" as do these passages.



- (15) I Pt. 2; 12 Rom. 12; 20, 21
- ἐν ᾧ κατακλιθεὶς ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν, ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσι τὸν Θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς
- ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν· ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν ἀνδρακκας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. μὴ νικῶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, ἀλλὰ νίκᾳ ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν

Holtzmann calls attention to this parallel. Though the background is different the thought is similar and the gap is filled which would have been left open by v. 12. The importance of the position of this parallel, it is thought, justifies this classification.

- (16) I Pt. 2; 13 Rom. 13; 1
- ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν Κυρίον· εἴτε βασιλεῖ . . . εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν
- πάσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις, ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω . . . αἰοῦσαι ἐξουσίαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν

Concerning the extended parallel between I Pt. 2; 13—17 and Rom. 13; 1—7, Zahn says: "The sense is not only the same, but several expressions are alike, e.g., the aim for which civil authorities exist is described." (Int. II, p. 187.) Cf. I Pt. 2; 14 and Rom. 13; 3 f. Many commentators have discussed these parallels and are agreed in the main. Bigg rightly calls attention to the different backgrounds of the authors (I.C.C. p. 139). "Paul speaks of Caesar as holding his authority from god, not from the people. Rom. 13; 1. A doctrine of divine right could be built upon the words of Paul, but not upon those of Peter." To this most will agree, but many will not accept his conclusion, that "Peter's" attitude is due to his priority to Paul; i. e., that he viewed the government as a Republic, while Paul viewed it as a Monarchy. The reason is made obvious by the body of the letter, which indicates a shifting attitude of the State towards the Church. This shifted attitude quite clearly implies priority of Paul.

- (17) I Pt. 2; 14 Rom. 13; 4
- ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπόμενοις εἰς ἐκδικήσιν κακοποιῶν
- ἐκδικεῖ εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακόν πράσσοντι

The parallel is obvious, but the situations are different. Paul refers to social disturbances caused by evil doing, actual crime, but I Peter alludes to the accusation of "evil doing," brought on by their insubordination to the state religion being taken in "a

false light." Cf. Holtzmann's Com. p. 137, also Gunkel, Abschnitt 3, p. 43. Regarding this and its relation to Romans the latter says it is "Ein Zusatz, begründet ganz in paulinischer Weise."

- (18) I Pt. 2; 14 Rom. 13; 3  
 ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ, καὶ ἕξεις ἔπαινον

Dependence may quite easily be inferred here. Ἐπαινος is only used by these two authors in all the N. T. Our author combines in his characteristic fashion the adjective and the verb. Out of the sixty-one words peculiar to I Peter forty-one are compounds. With this tendency of his in mind we can see a perfect parallel here. The closeness of the last three parallels, both in thought and textual sequence make a strong case for dependence.

- (19) I Pt. 2; 24 Rom. 6; 2, 11.  
 ἵνα ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ,  
 τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσομεν πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ. 11  
 τοῦς νεκροῦς μὲν εἶναι τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ,  
 ζῶντας δὲ τῷ Θεῷ. Cf. 6; 18.

"This passage implies the writer's dependence upon the Pauline thought and phraseology." Cone Com. p. 312. Cf. Monnier Com. p. 136. The figure is too thoroughly Pauline for us to say with Bigg that "the Pauline images of death or burial with Christ do not cross the author's mind." (I.C.C. p. 148.)

- (20) I Pt. 3; 4 Rom. 2; 16  
 ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος,  
 καὶ περιτομῇ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι.  
 Cf. Rom. 7; 22 and II Cor. 4; 16.

An exact parallel to Paul's "inward man." Cf. Rom. 7; 22. Combining this parallel with I Pt. 2; 11 = Rom. 7; 23, they both receive added significance.

- (21) I Pt. 3; 8 Rom. 12; 16  
 τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ἡμῶρονες τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονούντες  
 15; 5, δόφῃ ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν  
 ἐν ἀλλήλοις

- (22) I. Pt. 3; 8 Rom. 12; 5  
 συμπάθεις χάριεν μετὰ χαίρόντων, κλαίεν  
 μετὰ κλαιόντων

- (23) I Pt. 3; 8 Rom. 12; 10  
 ψιλάδελεγοί τῆ ψιλάδελεγοί εἰς ἀλλήλους ψιλόσ-  
 τороί
- (24) I Pt. 3; 8 Rom. 12; 16  
 ταπεινώσομεν μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονούντες ἀλλὰ  
 ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι
- (25) I Pt. 3; 8 Rom. 12; 13  
 εὐσπλαγγνοί ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἀγίων κοινωνο-  
 ῦντες

Following the canon of brevity we should be required to cast our vote in favor of the originality of I Peter at this point in accord with the contention of Weiss, but other considerations lead us to believe our author summed up the exhortation of Rom. 12 ; 5—16 into one sentence, i. e. 3 ; 8. The last five parallels afford a conspicuous example of expressing the content of Pauline phrases by single compound words. This is especially obvious in the next to the last parallel, where two words already used by St. Paul are combined. Separately these parallels do not merit such a high rating, yet when taken together they may well be placed in class " b ".

- (26) I Pt. 3; 9 Rom. 12; 17  
 μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ μηδὲν κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδι-  
 δόντες

Prov. 20 ; 22 (μὴ εἰπῆς τίσομαι τὸν ἐχθρόν) can hardly be the original for these two passages as some contend. Nor is it probable they were quoting independently a logion of Jesus. Cf. Mt. 5 ; 39, and Lk. 6 ; 29, which have very different forms. The probabilities are therefore that one is quoting the phrase from the other. Paul uses it also in another connection. 1 Thes. 5 ; 15. See Zahn's Introduction II, p. 187.

- (27) I Pt. 3; 9 b Rom. 12; 14  
 ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας του- εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντάς ὑμᾶς  
 ναντίον δὲ εὐλογούντες εὐλογεῖτε, καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε

This parallel is strengthened also by I Pt. 2 ; 15. The context as well as the wording makes dependence very probable.

- (28) I Pt. 3; 11 Rom. 12; 18, 14; 19  
 ζητησάτω εὐρηνην καὶ διωξάτω μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εὐρηνεύον-  
 αὐτήν τες. 14; 19 τὰ τῆς εὐρήνης διώ-  
 κωμεν

The thought, phrasing and context are very suggestive of literary dependence.

- (29) I Pt. 3; 18 Rom. 5; 6, 8  
 Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀ- Χριστὸς . . . ὑπὲρ ἁσεβῶν ἀπέθανε.  
 πέθανεν. [ἔπαθεν] W. H. 5; 8 Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανε

W. H. prefer ἀπέθανεν to ἔπαθεν, on the authority of SAC and all the versions. This rendering makes a very close parallel with Romans, yet the thought would not be materially altered by ἀπέθανε, which has in its favor BKLP.

- (30) I Pt. 3; 18 Rom. 5; 7  
 δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθαν-  
 εῖται

An important parallel as Rom. 5; 7 connects vs. 6 and 8 given in the example I Pt. 3; 18 = Rom. 5; 6, 8. Rom. 5; 9 is also in accord with the Petrine doctrine.

- (31) I Pt. 3; 18 Rom. 5; 10  
 ἵνα ὑμεῖς προσαγάγη τῷ Θεῷ καταηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ  
 θανάτου τοῦ ἡμοῦ αὐτοῦ. Cf. 5; 2.

This parallel is obvious. Jülicher thinks the agreement is closer with Rom. 5; 2. (δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχηκαμεν) "Introduction" p. 209. This appears to be another example of condensing. What was done elsewhere in words is here done in phrases and clauses, as 3; 18 seems to be an abstract of Rom. 5; 2—10. The combined evidence of the last three parallels in direct contextual sequence makes dependence here very probable.

- (32) I Pt. 3; 22 Rom. 8; 34  
 ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ πορευθεὶς ἐγερευθεὶς, ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ  
 Θεοῦ

This parallel is too close to require comment.

(33)

I Pt. 3; 22 b

Rom. 8; 38

ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων ἄγγελοι οὗτε ἀρχαὶ οὗτε δυνάμεις

Christ's leadership over angels, authorities and powers is distinctly a Pauline teaching. Bigg thinks the reference to Noah in I Pt. 3; 20 is a proof that our author was not borrowing from Paul but from Enoch 61; 10, "since the passage comes just before one of the Noachic fragments." (Com. p. 166.) Enoch 61; 10 reads as follows; "And He will call on all the host of the heavens and all the holy ones above, and all the host of God, the Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim, and all the angels of power, and all the angels of principalities, and the Elect one, and the other powers on the earth, over the water, on that day." Charles says "the other persons on the earth, over the water, etc., refer to the lower angel-powers over nature." The "Noachic fragment" therefore seems too fragmentary to merit attention. On the other hand Charles says these (referring to Enoch 61; 10) are exactly St. Paul's principalities and powers. Cf. Rom. 8; 38, Eph. 1; 21, Col. 1; 16." (Book of Enoch p. 162.) Professor Sanday refers to the same passage in Enoch as a probable source of Paul's terminology. Cf. Com. on Rom. p. 222. The commonness of the idea with Paul, along with the variety of expression argue for his independence of I Peter. In addition to the passages cited by Charles cf. I Cor. 15; 24, Eph. 3; 10, 6; 12, Col. 2; 10, 15. This and the preceding parallel taken together makes the dependence of our author upon Paul highly probable, and very likely on Romans.

(34)

I Pt. 4; 1

Rom. 6; 7, 2

ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας ὁ ἀποθάνων δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 6:2 οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ

This seems to be a very probable case of dependence "for the thought that death annuls man's relationship to sin, which is only differently expressed in the two instances is very boldly applied in both cases, first to the death of Christ and then as the ground of moral obligation on the part of those who have been redeemed through His death. Similar relations do not exist between I Peter and any other of Paul's letters." (Zahn's Intro. II, p. 188.) Gal. 3; 23 and I Pt. 1; 5, quoted by Hilgenfeld, (Einkl. p. 633), agree only in the use of the word *ἁμαρτία*. B. Weiss, whose judgment

here regarding the connection is better than concerning the order of dependence, thinks the "Pauline mysticism, regarding the efficacy of Christ's sufferings, is borrowed from this passage in I Peter." ("Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff" p. 289.)

- |      |                         |   |
|------|-------------------------|---|
| (35) | I Pt. 4; 7              | Rom. 13; 11, 12   |
|      | πάντων τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν | νῦν ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία . .<br>ἢ νῦν προσέκοψεν, ἢ δὲ ἡμέρα<br>ἤγγικεν |

That these scriptures are followed by similar exhortations based upon them and that they occur in such close contextual connection with I Pt. 4; 3 = Rom. 13; 13, is a strong argument for literary dependence. Cf. Weiss' Lehrbegriff p. 420.

- |      |                     |   |
|------|---------------------|---|
| (36) | I Pt. 1; 2          | c<br>Rom. 8; 29, 11; 2, 1; 7  |
|      | κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ | οὕς προσέγνω 11; 2, τὸν λαὸν . .<br>ὃν προσέγνω 1; 7 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ<br>εἰρήνη |

Πρόγνωσις and προγνωστικὸν are strictly Pauline and Petrine terms. The former is found only in I Pt. 1; 2 and Acts 2; 23. The latter in Acts 26; 5, Rom. 8; 29, 11; 2, I Pt. 1; 20, II Pt. 3; 17. Though I Peter shows a more extended likeness in the fore part to "Ephesians" than to "Romans", it is quite probable that our author was influenced just at this point by the latter, for the former uses προορίσας. On the whole it is to be noted that "The salutation of I Peter is formed in an independent manner after the model which had been created by St. Paul, especially as it appears in his Epistles to the Galatians and Romans". Hort's "First Epistle of St. Peter," p. 13. We should also add the Epistle to the Ephesians.

- |      |  |   |
|------|--|---|
| (37) | I Pt. 1; 9   | Rom. 6; 22  |
|      | κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως<br>σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν | ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασ-<br>μὸν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον |

Nowhere is this thought more closely duplicated.

- (38) I Pt. 2 ; 4 Rom. 9 ; 33  
 λίθον ζῶντα, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν λίθον προσκύματος καὶ πέτρην  
 ἀποδεδοκιμάσμενον σκανδάλου

When considered along with I Pt. 2 ; 6-8 = Rom. 9 ; 33, this parallel deserves a higher rating.

- (39) I Pt. 2 ; 5 Rom. 12 ; 1  
 ἀνεύγκαι πνευματικᾶς βυσίας εὐ- παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν βυ-  
 προσδέκτους Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χρισ- σίαν ζῶσαν. ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ  
 τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν

The thought is very similar. The sacrifice in both cases is to be pleasing to God.

- (40) I Pt. 2 ; 8 Rom. 9 ; 22, 18  
 εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν σαλεύει ὀργίῃς κατηρέσειεν εἰς ἀπό-  
 λειαν. 18 ὅν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει

Our author here echoes the Pauline doctrine that the disobedient were foreordained to spiritual hardness. Cf. I Tim. 2 ; 7, II Tim. I ; 4. That the thought occurs in these contexts is significant. See Rendel Harris' emendation of ἐτέθησαν to ἐτέθη. (Expos. 1909, p. 155 f.) The suggested change is indeed clever, but it in no way affects the doctrine at issue, since it is found elsewhere.

- (41) I Pt. 2 ; 9 Rom. 13 ; 12  
 ἐκ σκότους . . . εἰς τὸ φαναστὸν ἀποδόμενα ὧν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκό-  
 αὐτοῦ φῶς τους, καὶ ἐνδυσόμενα τὰ ὄπλα  
 τοῦ φωτός

The figure is Pauline and the antithesis suggestive. The contextual connection should not be overlooked.

- (42) I Pt. 2 ; 10 Rom. 9 ; 25  
 οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαοὶ νῦν δὲ λαοὶ Θεοῦ καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου, καὶ τῆν  
 οἱ οὐκ ἠλεγμένοι νῦν δὲ ἐληθύντες οὐκ ἠγαπημένην

"Dasselbe Zitat und in demselben Sinne Röm. 9 ; 25, eine Stelle, die dem Verfasser vorzuschweben scheint." (H. Gunkel, Dritter Abschnitt, p. 40, "Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments.") Cf. Holtzmann's comment on parallels between I Pt. 2 ; 6, 8 and Rom. 9 ; 33. This reference to Hosea is preceded in both cases by the statement that God had so "called" them. Cf. Rom. 9 ; 24 = I Pt. 2 ; 9.

- (43) I Pt. 2; 17 Rom. 12; 10b  
 πάντες τιμήσατε τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι
- (44) I Pt. 2; 17 Rom. 12; 10 a  
 τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι

Close parallels both in form and meaning, yet our author reverses the order.

- (45) I Pt. 2; 17 Rom. 13; 7  
 τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα ἀπόδοτε τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον· τιμάτε τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν
- (46) I Pt. 2; 18, 19 Rom. 13; 5  
 ὑποτασσόμενοι . . . 19 διὰ συνείδη- διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι οὐ μόνον  
 σιν Θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσ- διὰ τὴν ἔργην. ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν  
 χῶν ἀδίκως συνείδησιν

The last two parallels should be considered together. The form is similar, but the background is different. Dependence may readily be inferred from these passages.

- (47) I Pt. 3; 18 Rom. 8; 11  
 ζῶσπουθεῖς δὲ πνεύματι τὸ Ἅγιον τοῦ ἐνεργήσαντος ἐν ὑμῖν ἐκ νεκρῶν

This entire verse is thoroughly akin to the Pauline teaching on the subject. The suffering of Christ for sins accords with "gave himself for our sins" (Gal. 1; 4) and "died for our sins" (I Cor. 15; 3). It is significant also that the well known Pauline antithesis of the *σὰρξ* and *πνεῦμα* appears here. (Cone Com. p. 214.)

- (48) I Pt. 3; 21 Rom. 4; 25, 10; 9  
 δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἡμῶν. πιστεύσας ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ

It was noted in the parallel I Pt. 1; 21 = Rom. 4; 24 that these authors saw in the resurrection of Jesus, a special power or proof which would beget faith, which in turn would lead to justification, hence "salvation." Our author parallels Paul's whole train of reasoning with the simple phrase *δι' ἀναστάσεως*, apparently implying what Paul explicitly states.



- (49) I Pt. 4; 5 Rom. 14; 10  
 τῶ ἐπιζήμιως κρινόντι ζῶντας καὶ πάντες παραστησίμενοι τῶ βίματι  
 νεκρούς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Θεοῦ)

“ So far as the dead are concerned, believers only are included in the writer’s thought, just as the Pauline doctrine of the last things takes account of them alone. The believers were conceived of as being subject to judgment.” Cf. II Cor. 5; 10. (Cone Com. p. 317.)

- (50) I Pt. 4; 8 Rom. 12; 9, 10  
 εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες ἢ ἀγάπῃ ἀνυπόκριτος 10 τῆ φιλα-  
 δελφία εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι

The context adds to the significance of this parallel. See “ Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff ” p. 420.

- (51) I Pt. 4; 9 Rom. 12; 13  
 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες

Φιλόξενοι is only found in Rom. 12; 13 and Heb. 13; 2. Φιλόξενος occurs only in I Tim. 3; 2, Tit. 1; 8, and I Pt. 4; 9. The use of this rare word, although in a slightly different form, in this context may indicate a real point of contact. This parallel occurs between two drawn from the same contexts, i. e., I Pt. 4; 8 = Rom. 12; 9, 10 and I Pt. 4; 10 = Rom. 12; 6.

d

- (52) I Pt. 1; 2 Rom. 1; 7  
 χάρις ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη χάρις ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη

This verbatim agreement is very suggestive, yet this form is common with Paul. The “ Pastoral Epistles ” employ εἰρεως also. The expression also occurs in Rev. 1; 4, which is probably borrowed from I Peter. Πληθυνθῆν suggests that II Peter copied the phrase from I Peter. The same word, as well as contextual reasons make it much more probable that our author is following Ephesians here rather than Romans.

- (53) I Pt. 1; 3 Rom. 15; 6  
 Ἐβλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ δοξαζήσε τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ  
 κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Ἰησοῦ κυριοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Cf. 1; 7.

Dependence may easily be inferred from this very close agreement. I Pt. 1; 2b and 1; 3a = Rom. 1; 7 and 15; 6, modelled

on the plan of 1; 7. With the single exception of I Pt. 1; 3, this exact phrase is peculiar to Paul and at the same time very common with him. Though the close agreement is striking in the context, Eph. 1; 3 shows a much more probable connection.

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| (54) | I Pt. 1; 7                               | Rom. 2; 10   |
|      | εὐρεθεῖς εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν | δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εὐρίνη πάν-<br>τι τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν.<br>Cf. 2; 7. |

This may be a real echo, though the evidence is inadequate for any degree of certainty.

- |      |                         |   |
|------|-------------------------|---|
| (55) | I Pt. 2; 9              | Rom. 8; 28, 30  |
|      | ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν | τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν . .<br>οὓς πρόωρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε |

Although the γένος ἐκλεκτόν may be borrowed from Isa. 43; 20 it is in thorough accord with Paul's doctrine of election.

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| (56) | I Pt. 3; 13  | Rom. 8; 28, 31   |
|      | τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγα-<br>θοῦ ζήλωται γένησθε | τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα<br>συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. 31 εἰ ὁ Θεὸς<br>ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν |

The parallel is closer in thought than in form.

- |      |                                   |   |
|------|-----------------------------------|---|
| (57) | I Pt. 4; 2                        | Rom. 6; 12  |
|      | εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις | μηδ' οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν<br>τῷ ὕμνῳ ὑμῶν σώματι . . . ἐν<br>ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις . . . ἁμαρτία |

This parallel is strengthened both by the context and I Pt. 2; 24 = Rom. 4; 11 and I Pt. 4; 1 = Rom. 6; 2, 7.

- |      |                    |                                       |
|------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (58) | I Pt. 4; 2         | Rom. 6; 12                            |
|      | ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ | ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε εἰς αὐτοὺς τῷ<br>Θεῷ |

This antithesis may indicate Pauline influence, since it follows immediately after a possible point of contact.

- (59) I Pt. 4; 3 Rom. 13; 13  
 πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπι- περιπατήσωμεν μὴ κόμοις καὶ μέ-  
 θυμίαις, οἴνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις, πό- θαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις .  
 ταις, καὶ ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρίαις

Though the thought is similar, the context is hardly in favor of dependence.

- (60) I Pt. 4; 11 Rom. 3; 3  
 λόγια Θεοῦ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ

In all probability this parallel is due to accident.

- (61) I Pt. 5; 5 Rom. 12; 10  
 πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις ὑποτασσόμενοι, τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους ὡς φιλό-  
 τῆν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκοιμβώσασθε στοργῆν τῇ τιμῇ, ἀλλήλους προτι-  
 γόμενοι γόμενοι

The thought is similar but the form is different.

- (62) I Pt. 5; 13 Rom. 16; 16  
 ἀσπάζεσθε ἑμᾶς ἡ (ἐν Βαβυλῶνι) ἀσπάζονται ἑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ  
 \ Χριστοῦ

- (63) I Pt. 5; 14 Rom. 16; 16  
 ἀπάσασθε, ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι  
 ἀγάπης ἀγάπης

These salutations are clearly built on the same specifications. The form is common with Paul, hence its occurrence in I Peter can be no proof of dependence upon Romans.

The following table of parallel references will serve to make more apparent the relationship between Romans and I Peter.

|            |                     |             |                        |
|------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| I Pt. 1; 2 | = Rom. 8; 29, 11; 2 | I. Pt. 3; 4 | = Rom. 2; 16, 7; 22    |
| " 1; 2b    | = " 1; 7            | " 3; 8      | = " 12; 16, 15; 5      |
| " 1; 3     | = " 15; 16          | " 3; 8      | = " 12; 5              |
| " 1; 7     | = " 2; 10           | " 3; 8      | = " 12; 10             |
| " 1; 9     | = " 6; 22           | " 3; 8      | = " 12; 16             |
| " 1; 14    | = " 12; 2           | " 3; 8      | = " 12; 13             |
| " 1; 15    | = " 12; 2           | " 3; 9      | = " 12; 16, 17         |
| " 1; 17    | = " 2; 11, 6        | " 3; 9      | = " 12; 14             |
| " 1; 20    | = " 16; 25          | " 3; 11     | = " 12; 18, 14; 19     |
| " 1; 21    | = " 4; 24           | " 3; 13     | = " 8; 28, 31          |
| " 1; 22    | = " 12; 9, 10       | " 3; 18     | = " 5; 6, 8            |
| " 2; 4     | = " 9; 33           | " 3; 18     | = " 5; 10              |
| " 2; 5     | = " 12; 1           | " 3; 18     | = " 8; 11              |
| " 2; 6     | = " 9; 33           | " 3; 21     | = " 4; 25, 6; 4, 10; 9 |
| " 2; 6b    | = " 9; 33b          | " 3; 22     | = " 8; 34              |
| " 2; 8     | = " 9; 33a          | " 3; 22     | = " 8; 38              |
| " 2; 8b    | = " 9; 18, 22       | " 4; 1      | = " 6; 2, 7            |
| " 2; 9     | = " 8; 28, 30       | " 4; 2      | = " 6; 12              |
| " 2; 9b    | = " 13; 12          | " 4; 3      | = " 13; 13             |
| " 2; 10    | = " 9; 25           | " 4; 5      | = " 14; 10             |
| " 2; 11    | = " 7; 23           | " 4; 7      | = " 13; 11, 12         |
| " 2; 13    | = " 13; 1           | " 4; 8      | = " 12; 9, 10          |
| " 2; 14b   | = " 13; 4           | " 4; 9      | = " 12; 13             |
| " 2; 14c   | = " 13; 3           | " 4; 11     | = " 3; 3               |
| " 2; 15    | = " 12; 14, 20, 21  | " 4; 11     | = " 12; 7              |
| " 2; 17    | = " 12; 10b         | " 4; 13     | = " 8; 17, 18          |
| " 2; 17b   | = " 12; 10a         | " 5; 1      | = " 8; 17-19           |
| " 2; 17c   | = " 13; 7           | " 5; 5      | = " 12; 10             |
| " 2; 18    | = " 13; 5           | " 5; 13     | = " 16; 16             |
| " 2; 24    | = " 6; 2, 11, 18    | " 5; 14     | = " 16; 16             |

From the above table we may sum up the possible points of contact with Rom. 12, as follows; 2, 2, 9, 10, 1, 14, 20, 21, 10b, 10a, 16, 5, 10, 16, 13, 16, 17, 14, 18, 9, 10, 13, 7, 10. Rom. 8 also contains a number of parallels, i. e., 12, 1, 4, 3, 7, 5, 13, 11, 12. Many of these it will be noted occur in groups in close contextual connection.

Bennet has an excellent analysis of the parallels in Rom. 12; 1-13; 14 in the "New Century Bible" on the Gen. Eps. p. 33 f.

#### SUMMARY

The foregoing parallels and notes it is believed show quite conclusively that "I Peter" is indebted to "Romans." The parallels have been too close, employing too similar phraseology, and too

often of the same order to be independent. Nor have instances been lacking to show the priority of the Pauline Epistle.

Few indeed are the advocates of the priority of "I Peter." B. Weiss has made the most heroic effort of all to defend this position in his "Petrinische Lehrbegriff." His pupil Kühn follows a similar line of thought. The anonymous article on "Peter" in the "International Encyclopaedia" 1910, says "The opinion of Weiss and Kühn, has much in its favor, and appears on the whole, the most probable." Bigg is inclined to favor the independence of our author. Cf. also E. Scharfe's "Die petrinische Strömung der neutestamentlichen Literatur." (1893.)

With these exceptions the scholars of all schools are agreed that our author was the borrower. Strange to say not all the most enthusiastic defenders of this position are to be found in the "radical school." "Conservatives" claim, on the one hand, that this dependence upon Romans is a proof of its genuineness, while "radicals" maintain, on the other hand, that it proves the very opposite. At this point it may be well to review a few of the opinions and arguments of some of the leading conservative scholars.

Chase in his excellent article in H.B.D. says "there is no doubt that the author of I Peter was acquainted with this Epistle," i. e., Romans. Zahn, the worthy prince of German conservatives, says: "It is especially the hortatory portion of Romans to which I Peter shows numerous points of resemblance; Rom. 12; 2 = I Pt. 1; 14,  $\mu\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$ , with substantially the same object in the dative; Rom. 12; 17 = I Pt. 3; 9,  $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\ \nu\grave{\alpha}\ (\mu\eta\iota)\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\delta\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\grave{\iota}\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$ , in both instances standing between an exhortation to humility and the advice to preserve peace with non-Christians, while in the immediate context in both passages stands the command that they bless their persecutors instead of reviling them (Romans 12; 14). Taken in connection with such clear resemblances, a certain weight is to be given also to similarities in the same chapter, which cannot be used as positive proof, such as the similar use of  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ,—not to be found elsewhere in the N. T. or LXX,—Rom. 12; 1, I Pt. 2; 2, and the conception of offerings, in a figurative sense, made by Christians, Rom. 12; 1, I Pt. 2; 5. In relatively close proximity to these parallels, Rom. 13; 1-7 and I Pt. 2; 13-17, occurs an exhortation with regard to civil authorities. The sense is not only the same but several expressions are alike, e. g. the aim for which civil authorities exist is described thus" (N. T. Intro. II, p. 187): Cf. parallels I Pt. 2; 13, 14 = Rom. 13; 1, I Pt. 2; 14b = Rom. 13; 4, I Pt. 2; 14c = Rom. 13; 3. For the continuation of Zahn's argument see note on I Pt. 2; 6, 8 = Rom. 9; 33.

As a leader of English Conservatives we may quote Sanday (Com. on Rom. lxxv f.) : "The resemblance" between these parallels "is too great and too constant to be merely accidental. In I Pt. 2 ; 6 we have a quotation from the LXX that we find in Rom. 9 ; 32. Not only do we find the same thoughts, such as the metaphorical use of the idea of sacrifice (Rom. 12 ; 1 = I Pt. 2 ; 5), and the same rare words, such as *συστηναι τὴν ἐσθλάνην*, *ἀνομιόκριτος*, but in one passage (Rom. 13 ; 1-7 = I Pt. 2 ; 13-17) we have what must be accepted as conclusive evidence, the same ideas occurring in the same order. Nor can there be any doubt that of the two, the Epistle to the Romans is the earlier. St. Paul works out a thesis clearly and logically ; St. Peter gives a series of maxims for which he is largely indebted to St. Paul. For example in Rom. 13 ; 7 we have a broad general principle laid down, St. Peter, clearly influenced by the phraseology of that passage, merely gives three rules of conduct. In St. Paul the language and ideas come out of the sequence of thought ; in St. Peter they are adopted because they had already been used for the same purpose." For Sanday and Headlam's further argument see note on I Pt. 2 ; 6 = Rom. 9 ; 33.

Numerous quotations from the "liberal school" might be given in defence of the position here maintained by "conservatives," but let one suffice. Knopf rests the case, "vor allem an den starken Anleihen, die I Peter bei den Paulusbriefen macht, Anleihen, die das theologische Gedankengut im allgemeinen, aber auch besondere einzelne Gedanken in ihrer speziellen Formulierung betreffen. (Vgl. I Pt. 2 ; 13-17 mit Rom. 13 ; 1-7, I Pt. 3 ; 8 f. mit Rom. 12 ; 16 f.)" See "Das nachapostolische Zeitalter" p. 33 f.

## EPHESIANS

A\*

a—b

(1) I Pt. 1 ; 2

Eph. 1 ; 2

*χαρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη**χαρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*

When considered alone, this parallel means little, but when placed alongside the following parallel which is also in exact verbal agreement, it is seen to be very important. It is indeed significant that this precise form occurs when so many others might have been employed.

(2)

I Pt. 1 ; 3

Eph. 1 ; 3

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>ἐβλῳγιτῶς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ<br/>         κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ὁ<br/>         . . . ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς</p> | <p>ἐβλῳγιτῶς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ<br/>         κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ὁ<br/>         ἐβλῳγίσας ἡμᾶς</p> |
|---|---|

Only in II Cor. 1 ; 3 is there to be found a duplicate of this perfect parallel. Though the "evidence for dependence here is weakened by II Cor. 1 ; 3" (Salmon's Int. p. 553), the "weakening" is more than counterbalanced by the occurrence, in the immediate context of Ephesians, of the "Petrine" emphasis on the predestination of believers, which is wholly wanting in II Cor. 1 ; 1 ff. Eph. 1 ; 3b also leads off with "ὁ" and an aorist active participle used substantively (Burton's Moods and Tenses p. 165), governing ἡμᾶς just as in I Pt. 1 ; 3b. II Cor. 1 ; 4 has a similar construction but the participle is a present of simultaneous action, and is separated from its antecedent by an interpreting phrase. Though ἐκτιμῶν of II Cor. 1 ; 3b is synonymous with ἔλεος of I Pt. 1 ; 3b, the thought is closer in the Petrine parallel. The evidence is in favor of the dependence of I Peter upon Ephesians at this point.

Zahn says : "In favor of the conscious dependence of I Peter upon Ephesians is the fact that they begin with exactly the same word, "ἐβλῳγιτῶς . . . Χριστοῦ, ὁ" followed by a participle,—a construction which does not occur in this or similar form in any other N. T. Epistle. . . . The reference to the future κληρονομία. (cf. ex. I Pt. 1 ; 4, is found also in Eph., only farther from the beginning, 1 ; 14 ; while the thought which immediately follows Eph. 1 ; 4 f. (cf. 1 ; 9, 11), namely, that of election through the divine foresight and predestination, has been utilized already in I Pt. 1 ; 1 f. (Int. II, p. 186.) Alluding to 1 ; 5-13 and Eph. 1 ; 5-15, T. K. Abbot says : "the alternation of participles and relative pronouns is the same until the transition to the succeeding period is made, in the one case by δὲ, in the other by διὰ τοῦτο". (I C. C. on Eph. p. xxivf.) The substance of the passage in I Pt. 1 ; 3-5 corresponds to that of the following passage in Eph. 1 ; 18-20, ἔλπίζε (Ex. 34) being emphasised in both, and its object being designated the κληρονομία (Ex. 23), the connection with the resurrection (Ex. 35) of Christ as its ground being the same, and in both the δύνამε Θεῶ being put in relation to the πίστις. (Ex. 24.) After making a careful analysis of the foregoing parallels Von Soden says : "the priority cannot be determined with certainty by the text itself." ("Hand commentar zum Neuen Testament," III, p. 122.) He also considers the text of our Epistle to be more compact

than that of Ephesians. These conclusions are affected, no doubt, by his doubts concerning the authenticity of Ephesians. Against the position of Von Soden may be urged the following line of argument presented by Monnier: "En réalité, c'est l'épître de Pierre qui tantôt résume et tantôt développe. C'est elle dont les idées se suivent d'une façon large, coulante, sans rien de rigoureux. Si le style des Ephésiens a des détours (1 ; 11-14) où la pensée semble se resaisir, il est plein, nerveux, original ; les idées forment un ensemble solide, bien lié, avec une indiscutable puissance." (Com. p. 261.) It would seem, therefore, that the general consensus of scholastic opinion is that "This form of benediction is copied from Eph. 1 ; 3." (Hort's Ep. of Pt. p. 27.)

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| (3) | I Pt. 1 ; 21                                       | Eph. 1 ; 20  |
|     | τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα | ἐγείραξ αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ . . . |

This is a striking parallel and in this context is very significant. "This connection of the resurrection of Christ with Christian faith and hope is distinctly Pauline." (Cone Com. p. 308.) Romans Ex. 12 affords a close parallel, but this one combines the exaltation of Jesus with the resurrection, and in this respect is the closest N. T. parallel.

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (4) | I Pt. 2 ; 4-6   | Eph. 2 ; 18-22   |
|     | πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι λίθων ζῶντα . . .                   | δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσερχομένην 19) . . . οἰκοδομοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ.             |
|     | 5) καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε, ὡς πνευματικὸς | 20) ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ . . . ὄντες ἀκρογωνιαίον αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ 22) |
|     | 6) . . . λίθων ἀκρογωνιαίου                               | συναποδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ                                    |

This arrangement, borrowed from Abbot (Com. p. xxv), shows the extended parallel in detailed form. In I Pt. 2 ; 4 and Eph. 2 ; 18 access to God is through Christ. Cf. also I Pt. 3 ; 18 and Eph. 3 ; 12. Holtzmann's theory, that the reference to Isa 28 ; 16 was suggested to our author by the ἀκρογωνιαίου of Eph. 2 ; 20, is quite plausible. The word is found in the N. T. only in these two passages. The reference in Acts 4 ; 11 may seem to indicate the originality of I Peter, yet stress cannot be placed upon this point, since Acts may depend upon I Peter. See also the discussion on Rom. Ex. 2-4. The believers are frequently thought of as a spiritual temple by Paul. (Cf. I Cor. 3 ; 16.) Cone thinks the



application of the epithet "living" is not only obscure here but also has the appearance of a mixing of metaphors, and that the transition is abrupt from "new born" babes longing for the reasonable milk to "living stones" in a "spiritual house." These considerations are important in determining the order of priority. In favor of Paul's independence, Zahn offers the following: "Paul develops the figure briefly at the end of the discussion; Peter makes a varied and detailed use of the same, in connection with various O. T. expressions, and also sayings of Jesus. The building suggests the Lord of the building, who has chosen this particular stone for a cornerstone, and Himself has put it in place, after it had been rejected as worthless by the foolish master builders. From the thought of the living character of the person of Christ, who is represented as the corner-stone, is argued the living character of the stones built upon this foundation, as well as the freedom of their attachment to Him. The comparison of the building with the temple suggests the thought of the priesthood and the offerings. The corner-stone is also the curb-stone, over which passers-by stumble. It would seem almost as if in I Pt. 2; 4-8 one were hearing the voice of a preacher making various applications of the figure suggested by his text, Eph. 2; 20-22" (Int. II, p. 187.) Alluding to I Pt. 2; 4-6 Monnier says: "La même image se retrouve dans Eph. 2; 20, 21, dont ce passage dépend." (Com. p. 90-91.) Cf. Ignatius and Hermas for further development.

There seems to be a clear case of the independence of Paul at this point, but whether I Peter depends upon Ephesians, or Romans, or both is not so clear. Our study of Romans (Ex. 2-4) led us to believe it to be the original starting point for our author. The above discussion, it is believed, shows that he was also acquainted with Ephesians. "Il ne copie pas, il s'inspire. Son attitude est celle d'un disciple." (Monnier's Com. p. 264.)

(5) I Pt. 3; 19

Eph. 4; 9

τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν παρευ-  
θεῖς ἀκήρυξεν

κατέβη, πρῶτον εἰς τὰ κατώτερα  
μέρη τῆς γῆς

Apparently Paul thought only of the descent of Christ from heaven to the present world; the abode of the power of death. Yet some think there is here an allusion to the idea as developed in I Peter. The doctrine of the "Harrowing of Hell" in its pre-Christian form probably goes back to Isa. 26; 12-19, which Cheyne dates cir. 104 B. C. (cf. also Ezek. 37.) It is based on the mythological conception of Yahweh smiting the dragon of darkness and delivering his people

from the prison-house of the underworld. The Christians took over the doctrine with but few changes. They thought of God effecting the deliverance in the person of Christ. This passage in Ephesians marks the transition point, and from it our author apparently drew the doctrine of the mission of Christ to the underworld. The more developed form found in I Peter indicates the priority of Paul. The thought occurs in the fully developed form but this one time in the N. T., but is common in later writings. Sandwiched as it is here between thoroughly Pauline ideas and phrases, the probabilities are highly in favor of Abbot's theory of dependence. See Monnier's discussion Com. p. 172-178.

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (6) | I Pt. 3; 21-22  | Eph. 1; 20-21  |
|     | ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν. 22) ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων | ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. 21) ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος. . . . |

The exact sequence of thought and similar phrasing in this extended parallel thoroughly justify Zahn in saying: "these" parallels "go to confirm the correctness of the observation that Peter and Silvanus had Ephesians before them." (Int. II, p. 187.) Robinson also thinks there is here a clear case of dependence upon the Pauline Epistle. (Ep. to Eph. p. 151).

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| (7) | I Pt. 5; 8   | Eph. 6; 11  |
|     | ὁ . . . διάβολος . . . περιπατεῖ ζήτων τίνα καταπίη· ὃ ἀνίστητε σπερὸς τῆ πίστει . . . | ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς στῆναι πρὸς τὰς μεμυδαίας τοῦ διαβόλου . . . |

"Dependence on the part of I Peter is evident from the fact that at the conclusion of both letters it is suggested that back of the men, through whose hostilities the readers are compelled to suffer, stands the devil, whom they are steadfastly to resist." (Zahn's Int. II, p. 187.)

- |     |                            |                                    |
|-----|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (8) | I Pt. 1; 3                 | Eph. 1; 7                          |
|     | κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος αὐτοῦ ἔλεος | κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ |

This parallel is very significant, since it follows one which is in complete verbal agreement. This usage can hardly be accidental. See Ex. 2.

- (9) I Pt. 1; 10—12 Eph. 3; 5
- περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνώ-  
 ἐξήρουντο προφητῶν οἱ περὶ τῆς ρίσθη, τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,  
 εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητευσάντες ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύθη τοῖς ἁγίοις  
 . . . οἱ ἀπεκαλύθη, ὅτι οὐχ ἔα- ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις  
 τῶν ὑμῶν δὲ διηρόνουν αὐτά, ἀ ἐν Ηνεύματι 3; 10 ἕνα γνωρισθῆ  
 νῦν ἀνηγγέλη, ὑμῶν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγ-  
 γελισαμένων νῦν

I Pt. 1; 10—12 finds a related thought in Heb. 11; 13, 39, 40, but Eph. 3; 5, 10 is the only other place in the N. T. where the meaning of the prophecies was not clearly known to the prophets themselves but has first become so to us. That I Peter goes beyond Ephesians in saying the prophets themselves were made acquainted by revelation with their own ignorance (Eph. 3; 5), indicates the priority of the latter. (Cf. Abbot's Com. on Eph. p. xxv). Hort thinks we have here a clear "clue to St. Peter's trend of thought." (Ep. of St. Pt. p. 64.)

- (10) I Pt. 1; 13 Eph. 6; 14
- ἀκλινοσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς δια- περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν ἐν  
 νοίας ὑμῶν ἀληθείᾳ

No other passage in the N. T. affords as close a parallel to our Epistle here as Eph. 6; 14. Dependence is made more probable by ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1; 13), which is "a Pauline term for the Parousia." Cf. I Cor. 1; 7, II Thes. 1; 7. (Cone Com. p. 306.)

- (11) I Pt. 1; 20 Eph. 3; 11, 1; 4
- προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου κατὰ πρόβλεψιν τῶν αἰώνων ἦν ἐ-  
 κόσμου πόισεν ἐν Χριστῷ . . . Cf. 3; 9, 10  
 ἐξελέξατο ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ κα-  
 ταβολῆς κόσμου

The "preexistence of Christ" is a common Pauline conception. Monnier thinks with Hort (Ep. of Pt. p. 80), that πρὸ καταβολῆς is "probablement empruntée à Eph. 4; 4." (Com. p. 76.) "I Pt. 1; 20 and Eph. 3; 9 correspond in the same reference to the mystery ordained πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and hitherto hidden, but now revealed. And as in Eph. 3; 10 the wise purpose of God is now made known to angelic powers, so in I Pt. 1; 12 they desire to search into these things." (Abbot Com. p. xxvi).

- (12) I Pt. 2; 18 Eph. 6; 5  
 οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντί οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κυρίοις  
 φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις . . . μετὰ φόβου
- On ὑποτάξατε f. of 2; 13, Dr. Hort comments as follows: "In Ephesians (5; 21-24, 6; 1-3, 5-8) subjection (ὑποτάσσεσθαι) is set forth only in so far as it concerns family and household relations, the subject of 2; 18-3; 7 here, but apparently as founded on a general principle of subjection (ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ), laid down at the outset in 5; 21, which likewise corresponds in drift to I Pt. 5; 5 as well as to this verse. (Ep. of Pt. p. 139).
- (13) I Pt. 3; 1 Eph. 5; 22  
 γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντί αἱ γυναῖκες, τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν  
 φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις ὑποτάσσεσθε
- (14) I Pt. 3; 6 Eph. 5; 22b, 33  
 ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουσε τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ (ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφα-  
 λὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας . . .) 33 ἡ γυνὴ  
 ὡς ὑποτάσσεται τῷ ἀνδρὶ
- (15) I Pt. 3; 7 Eph. 5; 25  
 οἱ ἄνδρες . . . τῷ γυναικείῳ ἄπο- οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπήτε τὰς γυναῖκας  
 νέμοντες τιμὴν ἑαυτῶν
- Robinson, in commenting on Eph. 5; 33 b, claims "there is here a double reference to this passage in I Pt. 3; 1-6, which clearly is not independent of Ephesians: 'Ὁμοίως γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν . . . τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν: and then as if to guard against a false conception of fear, μετὰ φόβου μένουσιν.' (Com. on Eph. p. 209). The general trend of the thought as well as the sequence in the last four parallels make dependence very probable. When taken separately these citations do not merit this classification.
- (16) I Pt. 3; 8 Eph. 4; 32  
 τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ἡμῶντες. γίνεσθε δὲ εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοὶ  
 συμπαιθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι. εὐσπλαγγ- εὐσπλαγγχοι, χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς . . .  
 γνοι . . .

This form of exhortation is common in the Pauline literature. Cf. Rom. 12; 13-17, I Cor. 4; 12, I Thes. 5; 15. But since the passage, which contains a word (εὐσπλαγγχοι) not found elsewhere in the N. T., follows immediately after a context suggestive of Ephesians, dependence is made very probable.

(17) I Pt. 3; 18 Eph. 2; 18  
 ἔνα ἕμῃς προσκαγαγγί, τῶ Θεῶ δὲ ἀποτῶ ἔχομεν τὴν προσκαγαγγίαν

“ I Pt. 3 ; 18 reminds us of Eph. 2 ; 18, while the verses immediately following exhibit the ancient explanation of Eph. 4 ; 8-10.” (Abbot Com. p. xxv.)

(18) I Pt. 4; 2, 3 Eph. 2; 3  
 ἀνδροπῶων ἐπιθυμίαις (4 ; 2) τὸ ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν. ποιοῦν-  
 βούληται τῶν ἐνῶν κατεργασθῆαι τες τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι τῆς σαρκὸς  
 (4 ; 3).

Monnier has pointed out this close parallel. (Com. p. 263.) R. Knopf also thinks there is here a clear case of dependence upon Ephesians. (Das nachapostolische Zeitalter p. 34).

(19) I Pt. 1; 1 Eph. 1; 1  
 Ἡέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἡαῦλος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

This Pauline form of address is worthy of attention in a context so suggestive of Ephesians. Though “epistolary forms are not made by any one man,” it is indeed significant that our author used the Ephesian form both at the beginning and at the end of his Epistle.

(20) I Pt. 1; 1 Eph. 1; 4  
 ἐκλεκτοίς ἐξελεκτοίς

(21) I Pt. 1; 2 Eph. 1; 5  
 κατὰ πρόγνωσιν προρρήσιας

Election is a common Pauline doctrine, but it is alluded to in the opening verses of but three of his Epistles, i. e., Eph. 1 ; 4, I Thes. 1 ; 4 and Tit. 1 ; 1, granting the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. Predestination is also a Pauline doctrine. Cf. Rom. 8 ; 29, 30, I Cor. 2 ; 7, and Eph. 1 ; 5, 11. But in the beginning of no other Epistle is it alluded to. Paul never uses the noun πρόγνωσις, yet he employs the verb προγνωσσω in the same way. Cf. Rom. 8 ; 29. See also Acts 26 ; 5. The occurrence of these ideas in the beginning of these two Epistles only, and in the same order is too significant to be passed over lightly.

- (22) I Pt. 1; 2 Eph. 1; 3  
 ἐν ἀγασμοῦ πνεύματος ἐν χάσῃ εὐλογία πνευματικῆ 1; 4.  
 εἶναι ἡμῶς ἀγίους

These phrases are quite different, but they afford a close parallel in thought, and are suggestive in this connection.

- (23) I Pt. 1; 2 Eph. 1; 5  
 εἰς ὑπακοῆν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος εἰς υἱοθεσίαν (7) ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ  
 τοῦ αἵματος

In the beginning of no other N. T. books is redemption through Christ's blood so mentioned, except in Col. 1; 4, I Jn. 1; 7 and Rev. 1; 5. It is clear, however, that our Epistle cannot depend upon either of the last two. Nor have we found sufficient evidence to suppose that it was influenced by the companion Epistle of Ephesians. There is, therefore, a closer parallel here than can be found in the beginning of any N. T. book earlier than I Peter. True, Paul never uses the term ῥαντισμός, yet the theology is the same. This exact usage is found only in later writers (e. g. Heb. 12; 24), which indicates the priority of Ephesians.

- (24) I Pt. 1; 4 Eph. 1; 18  
 κληρονομία κληρονομία

The "inheritance reserved in heaven," is equivalent to the "hope reserved in heaven" (Col. 1; 5). Ephesians contains the doctrine of "the hope of his calling, and the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints." Dependence, therefore, seems somewhat probable in this connection.

- (25) I Pt. 1; 5 Eph. 1; 13  
 διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ  
 Πνεύματι

The Pauline doctrine of justification by faith is obvious in both references.

- (26) I Pt. 1; 7 Eph. 1; 14  
 εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης

That this close parallel follows the preceding one in direct contextual connection in both instances is significant.

- (27) I Pt. 1; 14 Eph. 4; 22, 18  
 τᾶς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ἡμῶν 22 τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν. 18  
 ἐπιθυμίαις διὰ τὴν ἀγνοίαν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν  
 αὐτοῖς

The thought is thoroughly Pauline. Cf. Rom. 12; 2, I Thes. 4; 5, and Acts 17; 30. Ἀγνοία appears in the N. T. only in these passages and in Acts 3; 17 and 17; 30. The parallel suggests dependence.

- (28) I Pt. 2; 9 Eph. 1; 11, 12  
 ἡμεῖς γένος ἐκλεκτῶν . . . ὅπως τὰς προσορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν . . .  
 ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγέλιητε . . . εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμῶς εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς  
 δόξης

The sequence of thought is worthy of note. Cf. Ex. 25.

- (29) I Pt. 2; 9 b Eph. 5; 8  
 τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ἡμεῖς καλέσασθαι ἥτε γὰρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς  
 εἰς τὸ θυμαστῶν αὐτοῦ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ

“The transition from darkness to light is much emphasised in Eph. 5; 8—14, yet the phrase probably was suggested by Eph. 1; 17—19.” (Hort’s Ep. of St. Pt. p. 130.) The preceding parallel makes this one more significant.

- (30) I Pt. 2; 11 Eph. 2; 19  
 παροίκους καὶ παρεπίδημους ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι

Πάροικος is found only here and in Acts 7; 6, 29. Παρεπίδημος occurs only in I Pt. 1; 1, 2; 11 and Heb. 11; 13. Ξένος, a comparatively rare word in the N. T., is used by our author in 4; 12. It is employed by no N. T. writer in the above sense earlier than I Peter, except in Eph. 2; 12, 19. This combination, following Exs. 27 and 28, is very suggestive.

- (31) I Pt. 3; 20 Eph. 5; 26  
 διεσώθησαν δι’ ὕδατος (21) ὁ καὶ ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγάσῃ, καθαρίας τῷ  
 ἡμῶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώξει βάν- λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος  
 τισμα

Though the thought is more crassly expressed in our Epistle it is important to note that this reference is found between two very suggestive parallels, i. e., 5 and 6.

- (32) I Pt. 5; 5 Eph. 5; 21  
 ἀλλήλοισ ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἐγ- ἡποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοισ  
 κομψώσασθε

See note on Ex. 12.

- (33) I Pt. 5; 12 Eph. 6; 21  
 διὰ Σιλουανῶν ὑμῶν τοῦ πιστοῦ Τυμῶδες ὁ ἀγαπητὸς καὶ πιστὸς  
 ἀδελφῶν . . . ἔγραψα . . . ὃν ἔπεμψα

Attention is to be directed to the use of the word πιστός as well as to the general similarity. The proper names play similar parts in connection with the verb in the first person, Aor. Ind.

- (34) I Pt. 5; 14 Eph. 6; 23  
 εὐρένην ὑμῶν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ εὐρένην τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς

Though this parallel is not very close it is significant that our Epistle closes with ἐν Χριστῷ, a Pauline phrase "par excellence." For further justification of this classification see note on Ex. 18.

- (35) I Pt. 1; 3 Eph. 1; 18  
 εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλησεως ἀποδοῦ

The wording is different but the thought is much the same. Considered alongside Ex. 23, this parallel deserves a higher classification.

- (36) I Pt. 1; 3 Eph. 1; 20  
 δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν

Suggestive here, though a closer parallel appears in Ex. 22.

- (37) I Pt. 1; 17 Eph. 6; 9  
 τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρινόντα προσωπολήψια οὐκ ἔσται παρ' αὐτοῦ  
 κατὰ τὸ ἐκείνου ἔργον

This thought is suggestive in this connection, yet it is reproduced Rom. 2; 6, 11, Col. 3; 25, Jas. 2; 1 and Acts 10; 34. See discussion on Romans Ex. 11.

- (38) I Pt. 1; 18 Eph. 4; 17  
 ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀνατροπῆς ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν

- (39) I Pt. 1; 7 Eph. 1; 7  
 ἐλυτρώθητε . . . (19) τιμίῳ ἀμνατι ἐν ᾧ ἔργουμεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ  
 . . . Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀμνατος αὐτοῦ

Examples 37 and 38 show Pauline influence, though the term "redeem" is considerably weakened. The thought is too common with Paul to be sure of dependence here. See Gal. Ex. 6 and I Cor. Ex. 7.



- (40) I Pt. 1; 20 Eph. 1; 10  
 ψανερωθέντες δὲ ἐπὶ ἐσχάτου τῶν . . . τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν  
 χρόνων

A common view.

- (41) I Pt. 2; 1 Eph. 4; 25  
 ἀποθήμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ διὸ ἀποθήμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος 31,  
 πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑπόκρισιν καὶ πᾶσα πικρίαν καὶ θυμὸν καὶ ὀργήν  
 ὑβρίσους καὶ πάσας κατακλίσεις καὶ κραυγὴν καὶ βλασφημίαν ἀρβύρων  
 ἀφ' ἑμῶν . . .

This is a very suggestive parallel, yet the thought is common in the Pauline Epistles. Cf. Rom. 13; 12 and Col. 3; 8. See also Heb. 12; 1, and Jas. 1; 21.

- (42) I Pt. 2; 9 Eph. 2; 14  
 ἡμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτῶν βασιλείων ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφοτέρω ἐν καὶ τὸ  
 ἱεράτευμα ἔθνος, ἄγιον, λαὸς εἰς μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας . . .  
 περιποιήσιν

See Ex. 27 and Rom. Ex. 55.

- (43) I Pt. 3; 15 Eph. 3; 17  
 κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγάσατε κατοῦνσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς  
 ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἐν  
 ἀγάπῃ

It does not seem probable that this Isaianic passage was suggested to our author by Eph. 3; 17.

- (44) I Pt. 4; 10 Eph. 4; 7  
 ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα ἕκαστῶ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ  
 τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ

The idea of the distribution of spiritual gifts according to the ability to receive is common in the letters of Paul.

- (45) I Pt. 4; 11 Eph. 3; 21  
 δοξάζετε τὸ Θεὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ ἡ δόξα ἐν Χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ

The glorification of God through Christ is common in the later literature.

The following table will show the sequence of the foregoing parallels.

| I Peter | Ephesians        | I Peter   | Ephesians    |
|---------|------------------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 ; 1   | = 1 ; 1          | 2 ; 4-6   | = 2 ; 18-22  |
| 1 ; 1   | = 1 ; 4          | 2 ; 9     | = 4 ; 11, 12 |
| 1 ; 2   | = 1 ; 5          | 2 ; 9     | = 2 ; 14     |
| 1 ; 2   | = 1 ; 3          | 2 ; 9b    | = 5 ; 8      |
| 1 ; 2   | = 1 ; 5          | 2 ; 11    | = 2 ; 19     |
| 1 ; 2   | = 1 ; 2          | 2 ; 18    | = 6 ; 5      |
| 1 ; 3   | = 1 ; 3          | 3 ; 1     | = 5 ; 22     |
| 1 ; 3   | = 1 ; 7          | 3 ; 6     | = 5 ; 22, 33 |
| 1 ; 3   | = 1 ; 18         | 3 ; 7     | = 5 ; 25     |
| 1 ; 3   | = 1 ; 20         | 3 ; 8     | = 4 ; 32     |
| 1 ; 4   | = 1 ; 18         | 3 ; 15    | = 3 ; 17     |
| 1 ; 5   | = 1 ; 13         | 3 ; 18    | = 2 ; 18     |
| 1 ; 7   | = 1 ; 14         | 3 ; 19    | = 4 ; 9      |
| 1 ; 10  | = 3 ; 5          | 3 ; 20    | = 5 ; 26     |
| 1 ; 13  | = 6 ; 14         | 3 ; 21-22 | = 1 ; 20-22  |
| 1 ; 16  | = 4 ; 18, 22     | 4 ; 2, 3  | = 2 ; 2-3    |
| 1 ; 17  | = 6 ; 9          | 4 ; 10    | = 4 ; 7      |
| 1 ; 18  | = 4 ; 17         | 4 ; 11    | = 3 ; 21     |
| 1 ; 18  | = 1 ; 7          | 5 ; 5     | = 5 ; 21     |
| 1 ; 20  | = 3 ; 11, 4 ; 4  | 5 ; 8, 9  | = 6 ; 11     |
| 1 ; 20  | = 1 ; 10         | 5 ; 12    | = 6 ; 21     |
| 1 ; 21  | = 1 ; 20         | 5 ; 14    | = 6 ; 23     |
| 2 ; 1   | = 4 ; 22, 25, 31 |           |              |

#### SUMMARY

Other points of likeness and similar combinations have been noted by such men as Chase, Holtzmann, Scharfe, Weiss, Monnier, Abbott, Hort, Westcott, Cone, etc., but these will be sufficient to show the real or apparent dependence of one author upon the other. Though no one reference may prove dependence conclusively the cumulative evidence of a succession of forty-five parallels, at lowest count, is indeed formidable. The thought and many of the expressions are the same in I Pt. 1 ; 1-7 and Eph. 1, even to verbal agreement. The fact that the parallels in I Pt. 1 ; 1-7 are all in the first chapter of Ephesians, and that, on the whole, they show progress in the Ephesian order almost precludes doubt at the very outset, as to the relationship between the Epistles. (For order see the above table.) The close similarity in the salutation and final greetings, the sequence of thought, which is obscured by analysis, and the general structure, to say nothing of similar Christology, go to show not

only that the writers were of the same school of thought but also that one was actually depending upon the other. Instances were noted in which the thought of our Epistle shows a development of the thought of Ephesians, while the latter, at many points, appeared to be the more original and logical. There are other considerations, not coming under the scope of this paper, which confirm the results of the foregoing study.

Practically all scholars agree that there is here a clear case of dependence. Von Soden is undecided on which side it should be reckoned. Hilgenfeld, B. Weiss and Kühl contend for the priority of I Peter, but the overwhelming weight of scholarship supports its dependence upon Ephesians.

Abbot concludes that "the parallels are so numerous that the Epistles may almost be compared throughout." (I. I. C. on Eph. xxiv.) In harmony with this observation Monnier remarks: *L'épître a été rédigée en toute liberté d'esprit par un écrivain qui connaissait parfaitement les Ephésiens, et en reproduisait instinctivement les expressions essentielles.* (Com. p. 261.) Dr. Hort thinks that "the connection, though close, does not lie on the surface, and that the question must be settled by identities of thought and similarities of structure rather than by identities of phrase." (Epis. of I Pt. p. 5.) Professor Ropes sees such a close similarity that he is ready to say "there is here a closer parallel to Paul's thought than some of the Epistles which bear Paul's own name." (Apos. Age, p. 213 f.) Seufert stands almost alone in ascribing to the two Epistles the same author, of course neither Paul nor Peter.

Numerous other authorities might be cited, but the general consensus of opinion is that "the acquaintance of our author with the Epistle to the Ephesians is especially evident." (Purves' "Christianity in the Apos. Age," p. 280.)

COLOSSIANS

D

d

(1) I Pt. 1; 4

Col. 1; 5

κληρονομίαν . . . περιτηρημένην ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι τῇ ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν  
 οὐρανῶς εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανῶς

"The thought of the 'hope', i. e., the blessing hoped for, being already prepared is not expressed in this form by St. Paul elsewhere, except perhaps in I Tim. 6; 19, but is clearly put in I Pt. 1; 4. In

substance it is involved in Phil. 3 ; 20, and, indeed, in Mat. 6 ; 20." (Abbot I. C. C. on Col. p. 197). Cf. discussion on Galatians Parallel 4. This is a close parallel, yet it is more probable that our author was influenced by Gal. 4 ; 7 or Eph. 1 ; 18 ; more likely the latter.

- (2) I Pt. 1 ; 17 Col. 3 ; 25  
 τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν κομιεῖται ὁ ἠδίκησε  
 κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον καὶ οὐκ ἔστι προσωποληψία

In both instances an impartial judgment is pronounced and the penalty is to be inflicted in accordance with the evil done. Cf. Rom. 2 ; 11, 12, 6, Eph. 6 ; 9b, Jas. 2 ; 1, Acts 10 ; 34–35. See discussion on Eph. 6 ; 9 = 1 Pt. 1 ; 17. The probabilities are that our author was following the lead of Ephesians here rather than Colossians.

- (3) I Pt. 1 ; 20 Col. 1 ; 26  
 προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον  
 κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσ- ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων . . . νῦν δὲ ἐφαν-  
 χάτου τῶν χρόνων ερωδή . . .

See Eph. 3 ; 11, 1 ; 4 for closer parallel.

- (4) I Pt. 2 ; 1 Col. 3 ; 8  
 Ἀποθήμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ ἀπόθεθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα,  
 ὑπόκρισιν καὶ φθόνους καὶ πᾶσας ὀργήν, θυμὸν κακίαν βλασφημίαν,  
 καταλαλιάς, ἀσχηλογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος  
 ὑμῶν

See Eph. 4 ; 22, 25, 21, etc. for equally close parallels.

- (5) I Pt. 2 ; 18 Col. 3 ; 22  
 οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντὶ οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε κατὰ πάντα  
 φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις τοῖς . . . κυρίοις

Cf. Eph. 6 ; 5.

- (6) I Pt. 3 ; 1 Col. 3 ; 18  
 γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις γυναῖκες ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἰδίοις  
 ἀνδράσιν ἀνδράσιν

See Eph. 5 ; 22, which also agrees verbally.

- (7) I Pt. 3 ; 7 Col. 3 ; 19  
 οἱ ἄνδρες συνουκούντες . . . ὡς ἄσ- οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπήσατε τὰς γυναῖκας  
 βενεστέρω σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ καὶ μὴ πιεραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς  
 ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν

Cf. Eph. 5 ; 25.

- (8) I Pt. 3 ; 8 Col. 3 ; 12  
 Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὑμῶν οὖν ἐνδύσασθε . . . σπλάγγνα οὐκτιμῶν  
 συμπαιθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλάγγνοι, χριστετότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραύ-  
 ταπεινώφρονες . . . τητα μακροθυμίαν . . .

Cf. Eph. 4 ; 32.

- (9) I Pt. 3 ; 18 Col. 1 ; 22  
 Ὑπανατωθεῖς μὲν σαρκί . . . νῦν ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι  
 τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ ὑανάτου

This thought is common in the Pauline Epistles.

- (10) I Pt. 3 ; 22 Col. 3 ; 1  
 ἥς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ πορευθεῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ  
 εἰς οὐρανὸν Θεοῦ καθήμενος

- (11) I Pt. 3 : 22 b Col. 2 ; 10, 1 ; 16  
 ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξου-  
 ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων σίας. ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα,  
 εἴτε οὐρανοὶς . . . εἴτε ὑρόνοι, εἴτε κυριότητες, εἴτε ἀρχαί, εἴτε  
 ἐξουσίαι

With the last two parallels cf. Rom. 8 ; 34, 6 ; 2, 7, and Eph. 1 ; 20—22, for better contexts.

- (12) I Pt. 4 ; 7 Col. 4 ; 2  
 σωφρονήσατε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς τῆ, προσευχῆ, προσκατερεῖτε. γρη-  
 προσευχάς γοροῦντες

Cf. Rom. 12 ; 12, Mt. 26 ; 41, Lk. 21 ; 34, I Thes. 5 ; 6, 17, etc. On the whole this reference shows no more similarities to I Peter than do some of the others mentioned.

- (13) I Pt. 4; 8 Col. 3; 14  
 πρὸ πάντων τῆν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγά- ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τοῦτοις τὴν ἀγάπην  
 πην ἐκτενῆ ἔργοντες

This parallel is made more important by the possible reference to Col. 4; 2 in I Pt. 4; 7. Yet we have reasons to think I Peter is borrowing, through this section, quite freely from Rom. 12.

- (14) I Pt. 5; 12 Col. 4; 7  
 διὰ Σιλουανῶ ὑμῶν τοῦ πιστοῦ Τυγκῶς, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ  
 ἀδελφῶν . . . ἔργαζα πιστὸς . . . ὃν ἔπεμψα

This may be an accidental parallel, yet it is suggestive.

The following table will show that I Peter is following Ephesians rather than Colossians.

| I Peter | Ephesians     | Colossians | I Peter  | Ephesians | Colossians  |
|---------|---------------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| 1; 1    | 1; 1          | 1; 1       | 2; 4-6   | 2; 18-22  |             |
| 1; 1    | 1; 4          |            | 2; 9     | 1; 11, 12 |             |
| 1; 2    | 1; 5          |            | 2; 9     | 2; 14     |             |
| 1; 2    | 1; 3          |            | 2; 9b    | 5; 8      |             |
| 1; 2    | 1; 5          |            | 2; 11    | 2; 19     |             |
| 1; 2    | 1; 2          |            | 2; 18    | 6; 5      | 3; 22       |
| 1; 3    | 1; 3          |            | 3; 1     | 5; 22     | 3; 18       |
| 1; 3    | 1; 7          |            | 3; 6     | 5; 22, 33 |             |
| 1; 3    | 1; 18         |            | 3; 7     | 5; 25     | 3; 19       |
| 1; 3    | 1; 20         |            | 3; 8     | 4; 32     | 3; 12       |
| 1; 4    | 1; 18         | 1; 5       | 3; 15    | 3; 17     |             |
| 1; 5    | 1; 13         |            | 3; 18    | 2; 18     | 1; 22       |
| 1; 7    | 1; 14         |            | 3; 19    | 4; 9      |             |
| 1; 10   | 3; 5          |            | 3; 20    | 5; 26     |             |
| 1; 13   | 6; 14         |            | 3; 21-22 | 1; 20-22  | 3; 1, 2; 10 |
| 1; 16   | 4; 18, 22     |            | 4; 2-3   | 2; 2-3    | [1; 16      |
| 1; 17   | 6; 9          | 3; 25      | 4; 10    | 4; 7      |             |
| 1; 18   | 4; 17         |            | 4; 11    | 3; 21     |             |
| 1; 18   | 1; 7          |            | 5; 5     | 5; 21     |             |
| 1; 20   | 3; 11, 1; 4   | 1; 26      | 5; 8, 9  | 6; 11     |             |
| 1; 20   | 1; 10         |            | 5; 12    | 6; 21     | 4; 7        |
| 1; 21   | 1; 20         |            | 5; 14    | 6; 23     |             |
| 2; 1    | 4; 22, 25, 31 | 3; 8       |          |           |             |

It appears from this table that all the thought, which we find in Colossians, that is paralleled in I Peter, is to be found also in Ephesians. On the other hand, there are many parallels in Ephesians that are not to be duplicated in Colossians. We have, therefore, on evidence that our author knew Colossians.

PHILEMON

D

No one can determine with certainty from the Epistles themselves whether our author did or did not know Philemon, but that he made no use of it is obvious.

PHILIPPIANS

D

d

- (1) I Pt. 2; 5 Phil. 4; 18  
 πνευματικὰς ἑνωσίας ἐμπροσθενέκτους ἑνωσίαν δεκτέην. ἐν ἀρεστῶν τῶ Θεῷ  
 τῶ Θεῷ . .

Though the thought is much the same, there is a closer parallel in Rom. 12; 4.

- (2) I Pt. 3; 8 Phil. 3; 16  
 τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ἑμύψρονες τὸ αὐτὸ ψρονεῖν  
 See Rom. 12; 16, 15; 5.

- (3) I Pt. 4; 7 Phil. 4; 5  
 πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἡγήγηκεν ὁ Κύριος θείῳς  
 See Rom. 13; 11, 12, which is in a more favorable context.

- (4) I Pt. 4; 9 Phil. 2; 14  
 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους ἕνευ ἡσυχίας πάντα ποιᾶτε χωρὶς γογγυσμῶν  
 γογγυσῶ  
 Cf. Rom. 12; 13, Heb. 13; 2, II Cor. 9; 7, Philem. 14.

- (5) I Pt. 4; 13 Phil. 3; 10  
 κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθή- κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ  
 μασι

Verbally, no other passage is such an exact parallel. But the idea of sharing and participating in the sufferings of Christ is very common with Paul. Cf. Rom. 8; 17, 18, II Cor. 1; 7, 14; 10, Col. 1; 24. This similarity suggests dependence but the context is not in its favor.

- (6) I Pt. 5; 3 Phil. 3; 17  
 τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ πομπίου καθὼς ἔχετε τύπον ἡμῶς  
 Cf. II Thes. 3; 9, I Tim. 4; 12, Tit. 2; 7.
- (7) I Pt. 5; 5 Phil. 2; 3  
 ἀλλήλοισι τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγ- μηδὲν κατὰ ἐριθίειαν ἢ κενοδοξίαν,  
 κομβώσασθε ἀλλὰ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν.
- See Rom. 12; 10 for better context and equally close wording.  
 Cf. also Eph. 5; 21.
- (8) I Pt. 5; 13 Phil. 4; 22  
 Ἀσπάξεται ὑμᾶς ἡ . . . ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι . . .
- (9) I Pt. 5; 14 Phil. 4; 21  
 ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀσπάσασθε πάντα ἅγιον . . .  
 ἀγάπης

The last two parallels are common in the Pauline Epistles.

The foregoing study makes it clear that we have no real evidence that I Peter in any way rests upon Philippians.

#### I TIMOTHY

D

d

- (1) I Pt. 3; 3 I Tim 2; 9  
 ὃν ἔστω οὗχ ὁ ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τὰς γυναῖκας ἐν καταστολῇ κοσ-  
 τρυγῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ μίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης,  
 ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν,  
 ἢ χρυσῷ, ἢ μαργαρίταις, ἢ ἱματι-  
 σμῷ πολυτελεῖ
- Although this is suggestive it need not presuppose dependence, for exhortations to plainness seem to have been common in the early church.
- (2) I Pt. 3; 4 I Tim. 2; 10  
 ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄν- ἀλλ' (ὁ πρέπει γυναῖξιν ἐπαγγελ-  
 ὄρωπος λωμέναις ἕσοσβίαν) δι' ἔργων ἀ-  
 γαθῶν

The wording is not close enough to show dependence, yet the antithesis leads one to suspect it.



(3) I Pt. 3; 4

I Tim. 2; 2

ἡσυχίᾳ

ἡσυχίᾳ

This word appears only in these references in all the N. T. and suggests dependence, yet the context does not seem favorable.

(4) I Pt. 3; 9

I Tim. 5; 14

λοιδορίας

λοιδορίας

Although this word also appears only in these two places in the N. T., it seems to have been accidentally so employed.

(5) I Pt. 4; 11

I Tim. 6; 16

ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς  
τοῦς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν

ᾧ τιμὴ καὶ κράτος αἰώνιον· ἀμήν

This thought is too common in the Pauline literature to afford an argument for dependence.

(6) I Pt. 4; 15

I Tim. 5; 13

(μὴ . . . πασχέτω) ὡς . . . ἄλλοτριω-  
επίσκοπος

περιεργόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας, οὐ μόνον  
δὲ ἀργαί, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψεύχου καὶ  
περιεργου

I Timothy refers to "tattling and meddling women," whereas I Peter alludes to fanatical zealots inspired either by religious or civil motives. "Erst unter K. Trajanus finden wir den ἄλλοτριω-επίσκοπος oder *delator*, den Denuncianten als Criminalverbrecher." (Hilgenfeld's Einl. p. 360.) It seems clear that I Timothy alludes to an individual weakness while our author had in mind a more serious offense.

(7) I Pt. 5; 2

I Tim. 3; 3, 8

μηδὲ ἀσχηροκερδέως ἀλλὰ προσηύμως

(ἐπίσκοπον) . . . ἀσχηροκερδέως, 3; 8,  
μηδὲ ἀσχηροκερδέως

This qualification seems to have been a general requirement of church officials, especially of bishops.

(8) I Pt. 5; 3

I Tim. 4; 12

τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου

τύπος γίνου τῶν πιστῶν

The thought is similar, yet compare Phil. 3; 17 and II Thes. 3; 9.

- (9) I Pt. 5; 10 I Tim. 6; 12  
 ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς εἰς ἣν  
 αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐκλήθητε

Both clauses were written in view of trials to be endured. Timothy is to fight manfully in the moral conflict "whereunto he is called," whereas the Christians of Asia Minor are "to receive the glory of their calling" after enduring "fiery trials." There is, therefore, no necessary connection here.

Other minor points of similarity might be given, e. g. I Pt. 1; 2 = I Tim. 1; 2, 1; 16 = 3; 16, 1; 20 = 4; 2, 2; 18 = 6; 1, 3; 18 = 3; 16, 4; 9 = 5; 10, etc., but they do not make dependence probable.

From the foregoing data we have no reason to believe that one author knew the work of the other.

## II TIMOTHY

## D

## d

- (1) I Pt. 4; 5 II Tim. 4; 1  
 οἱ ἀποδώσουσι λόγον τοῦ ἑτοίμου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μέλλοντος  
 κρίνοντι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς
- (2) I Pt. 4; 7 II Tim. 4; 5  
 νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς νήψτε ἐν πᾶσι
- (3) I Pt. 4; 11 II Tim. 4; 18  
 ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. ἀμήν ὃ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. ἀμήν
- (4) I Pt. 4; 19 II Tim. 1; 12  
 οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ πιστῶ κτίστη παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς δι' ἣν αἰτίαν καὶ ταῦτα πάσχω, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι . . . πέπεισμαι ὅτι δυνατός ἐστι τὴν παράκλησιν μου φυλάξαι
- (5) I Pt. 5; 4 II Tim. 4; 8  
 κοιμῆσθε τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς ἀπόκειται μοι ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξης στέφανον στέφανος

The points of contact between these Epistles are not of such a character, nor are they of sufficient number, to make dependence

probable. Obviously neither author was influenced by the other to any appreciable extent. (Cf. Holtzmann's *Commentar zum N. T.* III, p. 110.)

## TITUS

## C—D

## d

- (1) I Pt. 1; 3 Tit. 3; 5  
 ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλθεος ἀνα- κατὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ ἔλθειν ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς  
 γεννήσας ἡμᾶς

Titus refers to "salvation" per *sū*, whereas I Peter alludes to a "new birth," a new creation.

- (2) I Pt. 1; 7 Tit. 2; 13  
 ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Ἐριστοῦ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης . . . Ἰησοῦ  
 Ἐριστοῦ

This thought is too common to afford any evidence for dependence. Cf. Col. 3; 4, II Tim. 4; 18, Heb. 9; 2, I Jn. 3; 2, etc.

- (3) I Pt. 1; 20 Tit. 1; 2, 3  
 προσεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς ἡν ἐπιγγείλατο ὁ ἀβελιθῆς (θεός)  
 κόσμου. φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσ- πρὸ γένων αἰωνίων. ἐφάνερωσε δὲ  
 χάτων τῶν γένων καιροῖς ἰδίαις τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ

The phrasing is closer than the thought of the passage.

- (4) I Pt. 2; 9 Tit. 2; 14  
 λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν λαὸν περιούσιν . . .

Our author probably borrowed *περιποίησιν* from the LXX. Cf. Exod. 19; 5.

- (5) I Pt. 2; 12 Tit. 2; 8  
 τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθ- λόγον ὑμῶν, ἀκατάγνωστον. ἵνα ὁ  
 νουσις ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ εἰς ἐναντίας ἐντραπῆ, μηδὲν ἔχων  
 κατακλιθεῖσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν περὶ ὑμῶν λέγειν ψαύλον 2; 7  
 ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων, ἐποπτεύοντες δόξασωσι τὸν (θεόν). 17 κρεῖττον ἔργων . . .  
 γὰρ ἀγαθοποιούντας Cf. 3; 16

This suggests dependence, yet our author more probably used Rom. 12; 14, 17 here. Cf. also II Cor. 8; 21, Phil. 2; 15, etc.

- (6) I Pt. 2; 13 Tit. 3; 1  
 ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον εἴτε βασιλεῖ . . . εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν . . . ὑπομίμησθε αὐτοῦς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι πειθαρχεῖν, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐτοιμοὺς εἶναι

See Rom. 13; 1 for equally close thought and better context

- (7) I Pt. 2; 13 Tit. 2; 9  
 οἱ τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι δοῦλους ἰδίαις δεσπόταις ὑποτάσσεσθαι

See Eph. 6; 5. It is important, however, to note here the possible reference to I Pt. 2; 12 in Tit. 2; 8.

- (8) I Pt. 3; 1 Tit. 2; 5  
 γυναικες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίαις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτασσόμενάς τοῖς ἰδίαις ἀνδράσιν

An equally close parallel is seen in Eph. 5; 22, yet the sequence here is suggestive.

- (9) I Pt. 3; 3-4 Tit. 2; 3  
 ὃν ἔστω σὺν ὁ ἕξωθεν . . . ἀλλ' ὁ καρπὸς τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπου . . . πρεσβυτιδίας ὡσαύτως ἐν καταστάματι ἱεροπρεπειῶν . . .

Cf. I Tim. 2; 9 and Rom. 2; 29.

- (10) I Pt. 3; 21 Tit. 3; 5  
 διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώξει βάντισμα, σὺ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς, διὰ λουτροῦ πλυνγηνεσίας καὶ ἀνακαίνωσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου

The thought is much the same though the wording is very different. Eph. 5; 26 is also a close parallel. The context is more in harmony with Romans and Ephesians, yet parallels 1, 6, and 12 suggest dependence.

- (11) I Pt. 4; 2 Tit. 2; 12  
 εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμί- παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς. ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι  
 αις, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ τὸν ἐπι- τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς  
 λοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον ἐπιθυμίαις. σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως  
 καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ ὄντι  
 κλέωνι

This thought may be paralleled in other Pauline Epistles, yet the sequence here is suggestive. Cf. Exs. 2, 4, 6, and 12.

- (12) I Pt. 4; 3 Tit. 3; 3  
 ἀρετῆς γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ παρεληλυθὼς ἦμεν γὰρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνόητοι.  
 . . . εἰδωλολατρίαις ἀπειθεῖς . . . ἀλλήλοισι  
 Cf. Gal. 5; 21, Rom. 13; 13, Eph. 2; 2, 3.

- (13) I Pt. 5; 2 Tit. 1; 7, 11  
 μηδὲ ἀίσχροκερδῶς ἐπίσκοπον . . . μὴ ἀίσχροκερδίῃ . . .  
 ἀίσχρῶς κέρδους χάριν

This parallel is of very little consequence.

- (14) I Pt. 5; 3 Tit. 2; 7  
 τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου σεαυτὸν παρεγόμενος τύπον καλῶν  
 ἔργων

Though similar exhortations occur elsewhere, καλῶν ἔργων reminds one of our author's emphasis on "good works."

Holtzmann sees a parallel between I Pt. 1; 3-5 and Tit. 3; 4-7. (Handcommentar III, p. 110). Many other minor likenesses exist, but they are, in the main, such as are common in the Pauline literature.

Obviously, these parallels afford but little evidence for literary dependence, since many of those given above, however close, are not peculiar to these Epistles. The general structure of Titus, as Holtzmann notes, is more suggestive than the separate passages. But this cannot be conclusive, for it too has much in common with other Epistles upon which we have more reason to suppose our Epistle depends.

The underscored text of I PETER on the following pages will show at a glance the probable influence of the Pauline Epistles upon our Epistle.

The dotted line (.....) shows the points of contact with Romans ; the black line (—) calls attention to the parallels with Ephesians ; the broken line (-----) represents all the other points of contact between I Peter and the Pauline Epistles (not found in Romans or Ephesians).

The lines in italic show the possible influence of Hebrews upon I Peter.

MARKED TEXT SHOWING POSSIBLE SOURCES

- 1 ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῦς παρεπιδήμιος δια-  
πορεῖς Ἰόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας, κατὰ  
2 πρόβρωσον Θεοῦ πατρὸς, ἐν ἀγαπῶν πνεύματι εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ  
ἀντιστοιχίαν ἀγαπῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ χάρις ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη,  
3 Ἐὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,  
ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζωῆν  
4 δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἁγθαριον  
5 καὶ ἀμίαιτον καὶ ἀμόραντον, τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανῶς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοῦς  
ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοίμην  
6 ἀποκαλύψουσαν ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχατῷ, ἐν ᾧ ἀγγελλιάσθε, ἄλλοι ἄρτι εἰ  
δόν λεπιδέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς  
7 πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δε δοκιμα-  
8 ζομένου εὐπέθει εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ  
Χριστοῦ, ἐν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπήτε, εἰς ἧν ἄρτι μὴ δοκῶντες πιστεύοντες  
9 δὲ ἀγαλλιάτε χαρᾷ ἀνεκκλητήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῳ, κοιμῶμενοι τὸ  
10 ἐλκος τῆς πίστεως σωτηρίῳ ψυχῶν. Περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν  
11 καὶ ἐξήρανήσαν προσφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προσφεύσαντες,  
ἐρκανθῶντες εἰς τῖνα ἢ ποῶν καιρὸν ἐδάχλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα  
12 Χριστοῦ προμηνυόμενοι ἵα εἰς Χριστὸν παιθήματα καὶ τὰς μειὰ  
ταῦτα δόξας οἷς ἀπεκαλύθη ὅτι οὐκ ἐντοῖς ἑμῶν δὲ διζήνον  
αὐτά, ἀ νῦν ἀνγγέλι ὑμῶν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν ὑμᾶς πνεύματι  
ἀγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, εἰς ἧ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἀγγελοι παρακύψαι.  
13 Διὸ ἀνάζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, νήφοντες τελείως,  
ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῶν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.  
14 Ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς, μὴ συνηματιζόμενοι τὰς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοία

15 ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἄριστον καὶ αὐτοὶ  
 16 ἄριστοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀνυσίρωσιν ἢ γεννήθαιτε, διότι γέγραπται [ὅτι] Ἄριστοι  
 17 ἐσσεύσε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἄριστος, καὶ εἰ πατέρες ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπο-  
 18 λήμπτος κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, ἐν θρόνῳ τῶν ἡγῶν λειτουργίας  
 19 ἡμῶν χρόνον ἀνυσίρωμαίτε· εἰδότες ὅτι ὑποτασσάμεθα ἀγαπῶν ἢ  
 20 χροσῶν, ἐλπιούθητε ἐκ τῆς μακαρίας ὑμῶν ἀναστρωσῆς πατρικαρὰδότην.  
 21 ἀλλὰ τιμῶν ἰσχυροὶ ὡς ἡμῶν ἀμῶρον καὶ ἀσπίλον Λοιστοῦ.  
 22 προσηγορευμένοι μὲν πρὸ καιροβολῆς κόσμον, φανερωθέντες δὲ ἐπ'  
 23 ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων δι' ἡμᾶς τοῖς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοῖς εἰς Θεὸν τὸν  
 24 ἐργάσαντα αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δοῦναι, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν  
 ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπιδὰ εἶναι εἰς Θεόν. Ὡς οὖν ὑμεῖς ὑμῶν ἡμεκότες ἐν τῇ  
 ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐκ καρδίας ἀλλήλους  
 ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς, ἀναγενημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σποράς ὑποκατῆς ἀλλὰ  
 ἀποθέτου, διὰ λόγον ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος· διότι

πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς γόρτος.

καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος γόρτου·

ἐξήρανθη ὁ γόρτος.

καὶ τὸ ἄνθρωπος ἐξέπεσεν.

II. τὸ δὲ βῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ βῆμα  
 τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς. ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ  
 2 πᾶντα δόλον καὶ ὑπόκρισιν καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας κατακλιμαίξας, ὡς  
 3 αἰτιγέννηται βροσφῆ τὸ λογικὸν ἄδοξον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν  
 4 αὐτῷ ἀνέξηθητε εἰς σωτηρίαν, εἰ ἐργάσασθε ὑποχρηστικῶς ὁ κύριος.  
 5 πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι, λῖθον ζῶντα, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασ-  
 6 μένον· παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν ἑν-τιμον καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες  
 7 οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικῶς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἄριστον, ἀντιτάξι  
 8 πνευματικῶς θησῶς ἐπιπροσδέχωντος Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· διότι  
 περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ

Ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἐκλεκτὸν ἀποδοκιμασθὲν ἑν-τιμον.

καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κατακλιμαίξῃ.

7 ὑμῶν οὖν ἢ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀπιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος ὃν ἀποδοκιμασθῶν  
 8 οἱ οἰκοδομησῶντες οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλήν γωνίας καὶ λίθος προκίον·

- ματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου· οἱ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες·  
 9 εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν. ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλείαν ἱεράτευμα,  
ἔθνος ἁγίον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε  
 10 τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς κατέσχαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς· οἱ  
ποτε οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλευθέρους.  
 11 Ἀγαπητοί, παρκαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμιους ἀπέμνησθαι  
τῶν σαρκικῶν, ἐπιθυμιῶν, ἀτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν  
 12 ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλῆν, ἵνα, ἐν ᾧ καταλα  
λοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν, ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δόξασωσι  
τὸν Θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς.  
 ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον· εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς  
 13 ὑπερέχοντι, εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπόμενοις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν  
 14 κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν (ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ  
 15 Θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιῶντας ἑμῶν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν) ὡς  
ἐλευθέρου, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν,  
 16 ἀλλ' ὡς Θεοῦ δούλοι. πάντας τιμᾶτε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε.  
 17 τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε. Οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν  
 18 παντὶ φόβῳ ταῖς δεσπόταις, οὐ μόνον ταῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπεικῆσιν  
ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς σκληραῖς. τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις εἰ διὰ συνειδήσιν Θεοῦ  
 19 ὑποῦρει τις λύπᾳ πάσχων ἀδίκως· ποῦν γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἀμαρτάνοντες  
 20 καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε· ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιῶντες καὶ πάσχοντες  
ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ Θεοῦ. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ  
 21 Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἡμῶν ὀλομπιάνων ἰσογραμῶν ἵνα  
ἐπακολουθήσητε ταῖς ἔχουσιν αὐτοῦ· ὡς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ  
 22 εὗρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· ὡς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀνιέλοι-  
 23 δόρει, νόσθον οὐκ ἠπέλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως· ὡς  
 24 εἰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήγαγεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ  
ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῆ δικαιοσύνη ζήσωμεν· οὐ  
 25 τῷ μῶλωπι λάβητε. ἴτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλὰ ἐπιστρά-  
 φητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν. Ὁμοίως  
 III γυναικες ὑποτασσόμεναι ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα εἰ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ  
 2 λόγῳ διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται



- 3 ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν. ὧν ἔστω οὕχ ὁ  
 4 ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριγῶν καὶ περιβέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων  
 5 κόσμου, ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφύαρθῳ τοῦ  
 ἴσχυίου καὶ πραέως πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ πολυτελής.  
 6 οὕτως γὰρ ποτε καὶ αἱ ἄγιοι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμου  
 ἐαυτάς, ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίαις ἀνδράσιν, ὡς Ἄρρα ὑπέκρουεν τῷ  
 Ἀβραάμ, κύριον αὐτὸν γελῶσα· ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαποποιούσαι  
 7 καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόχην. Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως συναικαύντες  
 κατὰ γνώσιν, ὡς ἀσθενεστέρω σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ ἀποστέλλοντες τιμὴν,  
 8 ὡς καὶ σινκληρονόμοι χιόριος ζωῆς, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τας  
 9 προσευχὰς ὑμῶν. Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες, συμπαιθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι,  
 εὐσπλαγχνοὶ, ταπεινόφρονες, μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ  
 λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας πουναντίον δὲ εὐλογούντες, ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο  
 ἐκλήθητε ἵνα εὐλογίαι κληρονομήσητε.  
 10 ὁ γὰρ θελῶν ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν  
 καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθάς  
 πυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ  
 καὶ γέλιε τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον.  
 11 ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν,  
 ἤγησάτω εὐφρόνη καὶ διωξάτω αὐτήν.  
 12 ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους  
 καὶ ὄψα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέξιν αὐτῶν,  
 πρόσωπον δὲ Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιούντας κακά.  
 13 Καὶ τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γενήσθε; ἀλλ' εἰ  
 14 καὶ πάσχετε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι. τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ  
 φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταρχυθῆτε. κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγάπατε ἐν ταῖς  
 15 καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἔτοιμοι αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογία πᾶσι τῷ αἰτῶντι ὑμᾶς  
 λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραύτητος καὶ φόβου,  
 16 συνείδησιν ἔνοιες ἀγαθῆν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καιαλαῖεσθε καιαωσενθῶσιν  
 17 οἱ ἐπιηραῖζοντες ἑμῶν ἢ ἀγαθῆν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφῆν. κραίτητον  
 γὰρ ἀγαποποιούντας εἰ θελοὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακω-  
 18 ποιούντας. ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸς περὶ ἁμασιῶν ἀλάθαιεν,  
 δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαιγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ. ὑπανατωθεῖς μὲν

- 19 σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν  
 20 πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, ἀπειθήσασιν ποτε ὅτε ἀπέξεδέχετο ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ  
μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῦν κατασφραγισμένης κιβωτοῦ εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι,  
 21 τοῦτ' εἶναι ὁκτιῶ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος. ὃ καὶ ἡμᾶς  
ἀντίστοιχον ἔνν σώζει βεβαπτισμα σὺ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ἦντων ἀλλὰ  
 22 συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερωτήματα εἰς Θεοῦ, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ  
Χριστοῦ. ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν ὑποιγέτω
- IV αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων. Χριστοῦ οὖν παθόντος  
 2 σαρκὶ καὶ ὑμῶς τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ὀπλάσασθε, ὅτι ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ  
πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας, εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίας ἀλλὰ θελήματι  
 3 Θεοῦ τὸν ἐπιλοιοπὸν ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον. ἄκατος γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς  
χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἔθνων κατειργάσθαι, πεπορευμένους ἐν  
ἀσελείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις, ὀνομασίαις, κόραις, πότοις, καὶ ἀθεμίτοις  
 4 εἰδωλοκαρτίαις. ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται μὴ συντρέχόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν  
 5 τῆς ἀσωτίας ἀνάγκην, βλασφημοῦντες· οἱ ἀποδώσαντες λόγον τῷ  
 6 ἐτόιμῳ κρίνοντι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς  
εὐηγγελίσθη ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ  
Θεὸν πνεύματι.
- 7 Ἠάντιον δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν. σωφρονίσατε οὖν καὶ νύψατε εἰς  
 8 προσευχάς· πρὸ πάντων τὴν εἰς ἐπιτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενή· ἐχοντες, ὅτι  
 9 ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν· φιλοῦσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους ἄνευ  
 10 γογγυσμοῦ· ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα, εἰς ἑαυτοῦς αὐτὸ διακο-  
 11 νοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος Θεοῦ· εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς  
λόγια Θεοῦ· εἴ τις διακονεῖ, ὡς εἰς ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεός· ἵνα  
 12 ἐν πᾶσιν δοξάζηται ὁ Θεός διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ  
τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. ἀμήν.
- 13 Ἀγαπήτοι, μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν  
 14 γινομένη ὡς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαινόντος, ἀλλὰ καθὼς κοινονεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ  
Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε. ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης  
 15 αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι. εἰ ὀνειδίξεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ,  
μικαίριον, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀνα-  
πάσεται. μὴ γὰρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιός

16 ἢ ὡς ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος. εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός, μὴ ἀσχημένω, δοξάζετο  
 17 δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦτου. ὅτι [ὁ] καιρὸς τοῦ ἤρξασθαι τὸ  
 κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ· εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν. τί τὸ  
 τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ; καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος  
 μόλις σώζεται, ὁ [δὲ] ἀσεβής καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανῆται; ὥστε καὶ  
οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θελημα τοῦ Θεοῦ πιστῶ κτίστη, παρατιθέσθωνται  
τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν ἀγαθήσῃ.

V Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συνπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς  
 τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήματων. ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτέσθαι  
 2 δόξης κοινωνός, ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς  
 3 ἀλλὰ ἐκούσιως, μὴδὲ ἀσχηροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως, μὴδ' ὡς κατακυ-  
 4 ριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου· καὶ φανερω-  
 5 θέντες τοῖ ἀρχιποιμένοις κομιθεῖν τὸν ἁμαρτανῶν εἰς δόξης  
 6 σιέματι. Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις. Πάντες δὲ  
ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοσυρόνην ἐγκοινοῦσασθε. ὅτι [ὁ] Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνους  
 ἀντιτάσσει ταπεινῶς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.

6 Ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κρατιᾶν χεῖρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμεῖς  
 7 ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ, πάσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιβύχοντες ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὅτι  
 8 αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν. Νύψατε, κατηγόρησατε. ὁ ἀντιδικὸς ὑμῶν  
 9 διὰ βολῆς ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος περιπατεῖ ἕρπῶν καταπιεῖν· ὃ ἀντίστητε  
 10 ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελειῖσθαι. Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς κρίσις κρίσις, ὁ  
 11 καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰῶναν αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὀλίγον παύοντας  
 12 αὐτὸς καταποιήσει, στηρίξει, στενωώσει. αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς  
 αἰῶνας ἁμήν.

12 Διὰ Σίλουανου ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογίζομαι, δι' ὀλίγων  
 ἔγραψα, παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ  
 13 Θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στήτε. Ἀσπάζεμαι ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνελευκτῆ καὶ  
 14 Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου. Ἀσπασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης.  
 Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πάντων τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.

## DEPENDENCE OF I PETER UPON THE PAULINE EPISTLES

## (A)

## Supporting Considerations

Zahn maintains, with others, that the churches addressed in I Pt. 1 ; 1 were not in existence long enough before Paul penned his letter to the Romans to permit of its dependence upon our Epistle. "According to the testimony of his own letters and of Acts, Paul was the missionary who, in the sense of Rom. 15; 20, I Cor. 3 ; 10, II Cor. 10 ; 15, laid the foundations of Christianity in all this region" (Zahn Int. II, p. 135). "The supposition that Paul found in Ephesus or Iconium Christian Churches already organised or even individual Christians, is contrary to the evidence of all existing sources of information." (ibid.) "Regarding the founding of the churches in Cappadocia, Pontus, and Bithynia, regions which Paul did not visit personally, we have no information. But it is probable that in these provinces . . . the gospel was preached somewhat later, but practically under the same conditions" (ibid. p. 136). "Nor were the provinces evangelized by persons from these districts, who heard the preaching at Pentecost. It must be remembered that these hearers were not pilgrims to the feast, who, after the feast, returned to the lands of their birth, but Jews from abroad residing in Jerusalem" (ibid. p. 138).

Jülicher also contends that "Paul would not have begun his missionary work in Galatia and Asia if flourishing Christian communities had already been founded there under the influence of Peter, as we should be obliged to assume from I Pt. 1 ; 2 ff." (Int. p. 211). The same author argues that : "(a) the independence asserted by Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians becomes a grievous delusion, since he would have owed not only the kernel of his Gospel but even his epistolary style to Peter ; (b) he must, contrary to his principles, have worked upon a field over which Peter had prior rights ; (c) the history of the Apostolic times becomes an absolute riddle, for we should find Peter, who had just been publicly rebuked by Paul at Antioch (Gal. 2 ; 11 f.) for exercising a moral pressure towards Judaism upon Gentile Christians, writing immediately afterwards to Christian communities in a manner by which it might be supposed that such a thing as a written norm for the social conduct of mankind—the Law—did not exist : that he knew only of Christians, not of Jewish or Gentile Christians ; and (d) we should be forced to admit that Peter already possessed everything in Paul's teaching which helped to form the common Christian consciousness."

McGiffert, as against Weiss, claims : " There is no other early Christian document, by another hand than Paul's, whose Paulinism can begin to compare with that of I Peter. There can be no mistaking the fact that the author was a Paulinist, that his Gospel was the Gospel of Paul, and that his mind was saturated with Paul's ideas " (Apos. Age, p. 485).

Salmon says : " The Paulinism of Peter's Epistle proceeds beyond identity of doctrine, and is such as to show that Peter had read some of Paul's letters. In particular the proofs of his acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans are so numerous and striking as to leave no doubt in my mind. There are isolated coincidences with other Pauline Epistles, but it is with the Epistle to the Ephesians that the affinity is closest. There are several passages in Peter's Epistle which so strongly remind us of passages in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that the simplest explanation of their origin is that they were suggested to the writer by his knowledge of Paul's Epistles. But the resemblance is often merely in the thoughts, or in the general plan, without any exact reproduction of the words. We might conjecturally explain this difference by supposing the Epistle to the Romans to have been so long known to St. Peter that he had had time to become familiar with its language, while his acquaintance with the Ephesian Epistle was more recent. ' For his argument see Introduction p. 553 f.

Bennett and Addeney maintain that " Peter here appears as having learned more from Paul than from Christ. There are many allusions to some of Paul's Epistles, certainly Romans and probably Ephesians " (Bib. Int., p. 442).

" This similarity "—between I Peter and the Pauline epistles— " certainly is traceable and is of a kind to lead us to suppose an acquaintance on the writer's part with several of our Pauline epistles." Among the Pauline epistles which the Apostle Peter seems to have had in mind in writing his, were those to the Colossians and Ephesians." Bleek's Int. II, p. 168 f.

" One seeks in vain in this supposed work of Peter, that head of Jewish Christianity, for a definite distinctness such as is seen in the writings of Paul and John. There are not only to be found in it reminiscences of the Pauline Epistles, which the author without doubt read, but also the doctrine and phraseology are essentially Pauline." (De Wette's Einl. in das N. T. p. 381.)

Reuss, after giving a list of parallels between I Peter and the Pauline Epistles notes that : " The circumstance that two epistles

only furnish these parallels shows that the coincidence is not accidental." (Hist. of the N. T. p. 145.)

Examples like the above might be multiplied indefinitely, but let these suffice. Almost any N. T. Introduction, or Commentary on I Peter, to which we may turn will contain some such view as these cited above. That is to say the overwhelming weight of scholarship supports the claim that I Peter depends upon the Pauline Epistles. In addition to the authorities cited above, we may also add the names of Bleek, Credner, Ewald, Harnack, Hug, Hofmann, Lechler, Mangold, Pfleiderer, Reuss, Schmiedel, Schmidt, Schott, Sieffert, Wellhausen, etc., in Germany ; Alford, Bennett, Davidson, Cook, Farrar, Plumptre, Ramsay, etc., in England ; Loisey, Monnier, etc., in France and Bacon, McGiffert, etc., in America.

### (B)

#### Opposing Considerations.

As has been noted at various points in the notes on the parallels, B. Weiss, in his "Petrinische Lehrbegriff," has said about all that can be said in favor of the dependence of Paul upon I Peter. He has gained so small a following that we need not discuss his position in detail. Practically all scholars to-day admit that I Peter contains a later stratum of thought than that found in the Pauline Epistles. This, of course, is accounted for by a very small minority, by the theory of a later redaction. (See P. Schmidt's article on "Zwei Fragen zum ersten Petrusbrief," in the "Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie," 1908, p. 24-52.) The above discussion assumes, on the authority of the greater number of scholars, the integrity of the Epistle. This may not be giving due consideration, either to the "partition theory," proposed by Schmidt, or to the claim of Pauline dependence, advocated by Weiss, yet, not only the evidence afforded by the 223 parallels given above, but also the consensus of scholastic opinion, seem to justify an apparently hasty disposition.

Some, very naturally, question "Petrine dependence," who do not advocate the reverse relation, e. g., Brückner, Davidson, Eadie, Huther, Mayerhoff, Rauch, Ritschl, Steiger, etc. A few of the arguments, which are advanced against the view of Petrine dependence, may now be reviewed.

It is urged that "I Peter has too large a vocabulary of words peculiar to itself to depend upon Paul." This becomes of little consequence, when the possibility of the reverse relationship is sug-

gested. It would be much more difficult to account for the absence of all the 61 words, which are peculiar to I Peter, in all the Pauline Literature, on the supposition that Paul depends upon I Peter, than to suppose the dependence is on the side of our author.

The objection is raised that "many of the Pauline expressions do not appear in the Epistle." This, all will concede, but it is also important to note that the book does contain many of the fundamental expressions of Paul. The following list of N. T. words, which occur in I Peter and the Pauline Epistles only, will show that this objection merits but little consideration. ἀγνωσία, ἀκροβυστιάζει, ἀσωτία, ἀψύχαι, εἰδωλοπλατρεία, εἴπερ, εἴτε, ἐκκλήνω, ἑκάνω, ἐκπερὶσθεκτός, εὐσπλαγγιστός, ἴσχυρός. ἔργος, κἀνός, κατακλίβω, κῶμος, λογικός, λιδοθήκη, νιψέω, πνευματικός, πρόσκομμα, συσχηματίζομαι, τριαντών. ὑπερέγω, ὑποθέρω, ψύχαι, ψιλότης, ὑποπέτω, χέρισμα, χρομήτω. Twenty-two appear only in I Peter and the generally accepted Epistles of Paul; nine more are found in the Pastoral Epistles, making a total of thirty. Several more appear also in Hebrews, which, with I Peter depends upon Paul. Some of Paul's favorite terms may be found in this list, e. g. κρείσσων, μυστήρις, περιπέσις, σαρκικός, συγκαταρόνομος, ὑπακοή, ψιλαδέλφεια, etc.

Bigg argues that "there are none of those words which belong especially to the circle of Paul's ideas to be found in I Peter," hence the inference is that it cannot depend upon Paul. The force of his argument is seen to be nil, by a glance at the following arrangement of the words which he cites.

|                 | Rom. | I C. | II C. | Gal. | Eph. | Phil. | Col. | I Th. | II Th. | Philem. | I Tim. | II Tim. | Titus |
|-----------------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|---------|--------|---------|-------|
| ἀκροβυστία      | 11   | 2    |       | 3    | 2    |       | 2    |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| δικαιοσύνη      | 14   | 2    |       | 8    |      |       |      |       |        |         | 1      |         | 1     |
| περιτομή        | 14   | 1    |       | 7    | 1    | 2     | 4    |       |        |         |        |         | 1     |
| ἐλλογέω         | 1    |      |       |      |      |       |      |       |        | 1       |        |         |       |
| ἀνακεφαλαιοῦμαι | 1    |      |       |      | 1    |       |      |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| νίψομαι         | 3    |      |       | 1    | 1    |       |      |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| πλήρωμα         | 4    | 2    |       | 1    | 4    |       | 2    |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| μυστήριον       | 2    | 5    |       |      | 6    |       | 4    |       | 1      |         |        | 2       |       |
| ἀρετῶν          |      |      | 2     |      | 1    |       |      |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| παράπτωμα       | 9    |      | 1     | 1    | 3    | 2     |      |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| παράβασις       | 3    |      |       | 1    |      |       |      |       |        |         | 1      |         |       |
| παράβησις       | 2    |      |       | 1    |      |       |      |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| πρόβησις        | 2    |      |       |      | 2    |       |      |       |        |         |        | 2       |       |

|            | Rom. | I C. | II C. | Gal. | Eph. | Phil. | Col. | I Th. | II Th. | Philim. | I Tim. | II Tim. | Titus |
|------------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|---------|--------|---------|-------|
| προσβίβειν | 2    | 1    |       |      | 2    |       |      |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| καυχᾶσθαι  | 5    | 4    | 17    | 2    | 1    | 1     |      |       | 2      |         |        |         |       |
| καταργεῖν  | 6    | 9    | 4     | 3    | 1    |       |      |       | 1      |         |        | 1       |       |
| σπαυρός    |      | 2    |       | 3    | 1    | 2     | 2    |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| σπαυροῦν   |      | 4    | 1     | 3    |      |       |      |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| μορφῇ      |      |      |       |      |      | 1     |      |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| ζύμη       |      | 4    |       | 1    |      |       |      |       |        |         |        |         |       |
| γράμμα     | 3    |      | 2     | 1    |      |       |      |       |        |         |        | 1       |       |

No one denies that I Thessalonians came from the "circle of Pauline ideas," yet of all the words Bigg cites, not one is found in that generally accepted Epistle. They also appear in other Epistles so rarely that the argument is absolutely worthless.

One is puzzled to know how the same author can advance, as an argument against the Pauline influence upon our Epistle, the statement that "we do not find, in I Peter, *δικαιοῦν* or its family." True, the verbal form is not to be found in I Peter, neither is it to be found in eight of the Pauline Epistles. Hence from his premise these are not Pauline. On the other hand, if we may consider the kindship of *δικαίως*, *δικαιοσύνη*, and *δίκαιος* not too distant to belong to the household of *δικαιοῦν*, we shall be required to conclude Professor Bigg had incidentally overlooked many of the references, since our author employs *δικαίως* once (2; 23), *δικαιοσύνη* twice (2; 24, 3; 14), and *δίκαιος* three times (3; 12, 18, 4; 18).

Bigg notes (Com. p. 4-5) that "very few connecting particles occur" in the Epistle. He then gives the following examples :

|                | ὅν | ἄρα | γε | ἐπειδή | ἐπεὶ | τε  | δὲ | ποῦ | πῶς |
|----------------|----|-----|----|--------|------|-----|----|-----|-----|
| Matthew        | 41 | 7   |    | 1      | 2    | 4   | 1  |     |     |
| Mark           | 21 | 2   |    |        | 1    | 1   |    |     |     |
| Luke           | 29 | 6   | 4  | 1      | 2    | 7   | 1  |     |     |
| John           | 27 |     |    |        | 2    | 3   |    |     |     |
| Acts           | 20 | 6   | 3  | 3      |      | 136 | 2  |     | 2   |
| Romans         | 7  | 11  | 1  |        | 4    | 16  |    | 1   | 3   |
| I Corinthians  | 12 | 5   | 3  | 4      | 5    | 4   | 1  |     | 2   |
| II Corinthians | 3  | 3   |    | 1      | 2    | 1   | 1  |     | 5   |
| Galatians      | 5  | 6   |    |        |      |     |    |     | 2   |
| Ephesians      |    | 1   |    |        |      | 2   |    |     |     |



|                  | ὅν | ἀρα | γε | ἐπειδή | ἐπεὶ | τε | δή | ποῶ | πῶς |
|------------------|----|-----|----|--------|------|----|----|-----|-----|
| Philippians      | 1  |     |    | 1      |      | 1  |    |     | 1   |
| Colossians       | 1  |     |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| I Thessalonians  | 1  | 1   |    |        |      |    |    |     | 1   |
| II Thessalonians |    | 1   |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| I Timothy        |    |     |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| II Timothy       |    |     |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| Titus            |    |     |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| Philemon         |    |     |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| Hebrews          | 6  | 2   |    |        | 9    | 20 |    | 1   |     |
| James            | 3  |     |    |        |      | 1  |    |     |     |
| II Peter         |    |     |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| I John           | 5  |     |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| II John          |    |     |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| III John         |    |     |    |        |      |    |    |     |     |
| Jude             |    |     |    |        |      | 1  |    |     |     |
| Revelation       | 3  |     |    |        |      | 2  |    |     |     |

“ That ὅν is not to be found in the Epistle ” he says “ is alone sufficient to show that the writer was not a Greek.” (Com. p. 5.) The weakness of this argument is made obvious by the above arrangement of the words which he cites. It is seen that this particle does not appear in a number of Paul’s Epistles. True, Paul was not a Greek by birth, yet his native city was a center of Greek culture of no little consequence. He had abundant opportunity in Tarsus to learn the Greek language thoroughly. At any rate we are assured by his writings that he was a master of the Greek language. It is to be noted that in all his Epistles, which compose cir. 25% of the N. T., ὅν appears but thirty times, whereas in Matthew, which certainly goes back to a Semitic original, the word occurs forty-one times. The above table shows that Paul, or his amanuensis, employed the particle very freely at times and at other times not at all. That the word appears in Matthew about as often as in Luke and Acts combined, which, on the whole, are written in as good Greek as is to be found in the N. T., shows that Bigg’s argument has practically nothing to support it. Furthermore it involves an inconsistency, in that, he admits that our author possessed “ a remarkable correctness of usage.” He also states that “ the article is employed in more classical style than by any other writer in the N. T., and still more striking is the refined accuracy of his use of ὅς.” (Cf. Com. p. 4.) These concessions certainly do not support his claim that our author “ could not have been a Greek.”

On Bigg's premise, we should expect the particle to be of rare occurrence in the "Petrine portion" of Acts, whereas out of its twenty appearances in the entire book, thirteen are in the first ten chapters. Many of them are also in the "speeches of Peter." It would seem, therefore, that the absence of  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ , instead of being an argument against the dependence of our Epistle upon Paul, rather indicates the opposite, since the "Pauline portion" of Acts uses the word but rarely.

The study of  $\tilde{\alpha}\rho\alpha$  yields a similar result to that obtained through  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ . It appears four times in the Petrine portion of Acts, and but twice in the Pauline section. It also shows a great variation of usage in the Pauline Epistles.  $\Gamma\epsilon$  is found in Acts only in the first eleven chapters, which again would seem to show a closer relation between our Epistle and the Pauline section than with the Petrine portion, as might be expected. "Luke", who also "uses the language with freedom and not with an inconsiderable degree of correctness", does not use  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota$  in the Acts at all, and but twice in the Gospel. If in fifty-two chapters he uses the word but twice, and in the acts not at all, we should not be surprised at its absence in a short Epistle of but five chapters.  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\delta\eta$  is used but six times by Paul and but five times by all the rest of the N. T. authors, so we should not think it strange that it does not appear in this little Epistle.  $\Gamma\epsilon$  affords a good example of how an author may vary in the use of a particular word in different writings. It appears sixteen times in Romans, and not at all in Galatians, Colossians, I and II Thessalonians, and the Pastoral Epistles. "Luke" also employs it but seven times in his Gospel, whereas it appears one hundred and thirty-six times in Acts, fifty-four of which are in the "Petrine division."  $\Delta\eta$  is a very rare word in the N. T. The absence of the particle from I Peter is just what would be expected by those who assert its dependence, since Paul only uses it twice.  $\Pi\omega$  is only used once in all the letters of Paul.  $\Pi\omega\zeta$  is strictly a Pauline term, yet he does not use it in seven of his Epistles.  $\Pi\tilde{\omega}\zeta$  is not used by our author, yet it occurs nine times in Acts, seven of which are in the Petrine section.

On the whole, therefore, the list of "missing particles," cited by Bigg, does not argue against, but for Petrine dependence upon the Pauline Epistles.

As a further test of the verbal argument, a careful classification and count has been made of all the words used in I Peter, which are also employed by no more than six other N. T. writers.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Total occurrences in the generally accepted Epistles of Paul    | 344 |
| Total occurrences in the Pastoral Epistles                      | 40  |
| Total in the Pauline Epistles                                   | 384 |
| Number in Petrine section of Acts                               | 23  |
| Number in Pauline section of Acts                               | 41  |
| Total in Acts   | 64  |
| Total in all the other N. T. books                              | 333 |
| Grand total   | 781 |
| Of the N. T. the Pauline Epistles (excluding Pastorals) =       | 22% |
| Of the N. T. the Pastoral Epistles =                            | 3%  |
| Of the N. T. the Pauline Epistles compose cir.                  | 25% |
| Normal proportion of occurrences in the Petrine section of Acts | 29  |
| Normal proportion of occurrences in the Pauline section of Acts | 35  |

It is obvious, therefore, that the words of this list are below the normal in the Petrine section, contrary to the "one source" theory.

The Pauline Epistles which constitute but 25% of the N. T. contain almost 50% of these words.

It seems therefore, as against Professor Bigg, that there must be some relationship between I Peter and the Pauline Epistles.

#### Conclusion

We have seen that the opposing arguments, reviewed above, have proven to be of very little moment. Their testimony, what little they have to offer, seems to be in favor of the dependence of I Peter upon the Pauline Epistles rather than against it.

We have also noted that the great majority of scholars of all schools agree that our Epistle depends upon Paul. Even those, as Klöpper, who deny the genuineness of either I Peter or Ephesians, contend that Ephesians was used by our author. Moffat voices the opinion of the majority of scholars when he says: "The literary connection of I Peter with the later Pauline epistles is indubitable" (*Hist. N. T.* p. 246). A glance at the underscored text of the Epistle (cf. pgs. 101-106) would seem not only to justify this conclusion, but also to warrant McGiffert and Bennet and Adeney in saying that: "there is no other book in the N. T. not written by Paul himself that so closely resembles his writings (*Apos. Age* p. 485, and *Bib. Int.* p. 442).

As a result of the foregoing study we are led to say with Professor Bacon that: "It is one of the most solid results of criticism, that

our Epistle stands in direct literary dependence on the great epistles of Paul, particularly Ephesians," (and Romans). Int. N. T. p. 153).

## HEBREWS

## B

## b—c

(1) I Pt. 1; 18—20

ἐλυτρώθητε . . . τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἄμωυ ἁμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ, προσεινωμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς

Heb. 9; 12, 14, 24—25

τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἁμώμον τῷ Θεῷ . . . Χριστός . . . οὐδ' ἵνα πολλὰκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτὸν ὡσπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὸ ἅγιον κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν αἵματι . . . ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, νυνὶ δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται

St. Paul frequently alludes to the redemption through Christ but not just as these authors do. The former never uses the word ἁμωμοῦς just as the latter use it. "The physical perfection of the victim is regarded as typical of the sinlessness of Christ, which makes his blood τίμιον" (Bigg), all of which is in thorough harmony with Hebrews. Christ's blood as the means of redemption is emphasised by both authors. Both contrast the efficacy of the appointed means with other agencies. Both allude to the former conduct much in the same fashion. Cf. I Pt. 1; 18b with Heb. 9; 14 b. Compare also πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου with ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου; φανερωθέντος with πεφανέρωται; ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων with ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, and ἅπαξ . . . Heb. 9; 25 with ἅπαξ . . . I Pt. 3; 18. Both Epistles have thought in common with Paul, yet the parallels noted above can hardly be due to common dependence. The thought runs through the whole chapter of Hebrews, whereas in I Peter it is more fragmentary, indicating the priority of the former. Dependence is made more probable by the close parallel between I Pt. 1; 17 and Heb. 12; 28.

(2) I Pt. 2; 24

ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ

Heb. 9; 28

οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ προσενηύθει εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας

"The turn which St. Peter has given to the words represents Christ as not only the sin-offering who bore the consequences of

the sins of his people on the cross of shame (ἵνεκεν ἐπὶ τῷ ῥύλλῳ), but as the priest who took the sins, or sin-offering and laid the sacrifice on the altar of the cross. Thus Alford appears to be right in giving ἀναφέρων here a double meaning; but the two meanings 'bear' and 'carry' both belong to the one Greek word, and St. Peter has done his best to cure the ambiguity by expanding Isaiah's κρῖνος into the highly emphatic κρῖνος ἐν τῷ σώματι κρῖνος, which, reinforced as they are by the following μὴλωπι, clearly mean, He Himself, by His own personal suffering, carried the sins up; in other words, the Priest was also the Victim." Bigg. That Christ was both priest and victim is dwelt upon at length in Hebrews, e. g. 9; 11, 12, 14, 24-28. This un-Pauline chapter of Hebrews seems to form the basis of our author's allusion to the "Suffering Servant." Not only the peculiar thought but also the phraseology is very suggestive of literary dependence. The phrase ἀναφέρων ἁμαρτίας appears only in these two places in all the N. T. Note also the other possible points of contact in these contexts, e. g. I Pt. 2; 23 = Heb. 12; 3, and I Pt. 2; 25 = Heb. 13; 20.

(3) I Pt. 2; 25

Heb. 13; 20

ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἡμῶν

Professor E. J. Goodspeed (Epis. to the Heb. p. 122) calls attention to this striking parallel. It is indeed suggestive since the only reference to the favorite Petrine "doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus," in the whole Epistle, appears in this connection. "The great shepherd of the sheep is a Messianic designation. Cf. also I Pt. 5; 4 (the arch-shepherd). Not simply the shepherd of the sheep, of Isa. 63; 11 LXX, but the *great* shepherd." Goodspeed. Cf. also Jn. 10; 11, 14, 21; 16, which were probably influenced by the above passages. Paul never uses the metaphor ποιμήν except of the Christian minister. Cf. Eph. 4; 11 (Acts 20; 28). Though it is easy to draw the figure used here either from Paul or the O. T., it seems more probable in this connection that I Peter was influenced by Hebrews. Note I Pt. 2; 22 = Heb. 4; 15, 2; 23 = 12; 3, 2; 24 = 9; 28, 2; 25 = 13; 20.

(4) I Pt. 3; 18

Heb. 9; 28

Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν (ἐπαθεῖν)

Χριστὸς ἅπαξ προσενηύθει εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενηκαῖν ἁμαρτίας . . .

Only in these two places is *ἕπαξι* so employed. Cf. Heb. 9; 26. The same doctrine of the atonement is here set forth in a similar fashion. This shows that both authors moved in the same sphere of thought, if indeed, it does not prove dependence. Salmon thinks that *ἕπαξι* is accounted for by the *ἐπαπαξι* of Rom. 6; 10. (Int. p. 556.) But against this view it is to be urged that the phrase *ἀναγέρειν ἀμαρτίας* only appears in I Peter and Hebrews. See Ex. 2 above. The conjunction of these two peculiar usages in a suggestive context makes dependence highly probable.

- |     |                                    |  |
|-----|------------------------------------|--|
| (5) | I Pt. 3; 18 b                      | Heb. 12; 22  |
|     | <i>ἵνα ὑμεῖς προσκαγάγη τῷ Θεῷ</i> | <i>προσεληλύθητε Σιών ὄρει καὶ πόλει Θεοῦ ζῶντος. Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ</i> |

I Peter and Hebrews both represent the Christians as mere strangers and sojourners in the world and that Christ leads them through this wilderness of life to God, the heavenly home, the New Jerusalem. This non-Pauline thought shows a real point of connection. The above parallel is made more significant by the ones immediately preceding and immediately following.

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| (6) | I Pt. 3; 20  | Heb. 11; 7   |
|     | <i>ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ . . . ὡς τὸ ψυχαὶ διασώσονται</i> | <i>Νῶε . . . κατασκεύασε κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ σώου αὐτοῦ</i> |

"Salvation" is mentioned by both authors as the purpose of preparing the ark. No other N. T. writers so allude to it. Heb. 11 is an excursus on "faith," calling up the Patriarchs in order as examples. Hence the passage was not suggested by our Epistle to the author of Hebrews, but the reverse relation seems highly probable in this context. Cf. Exs. 5 and 7.

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| (7) | I Pt. 3; 21  | Heb. 9; 24, 10; 22   |
|     | <i>ὁ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόψεις ἴψου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν</i> | <i>ἀντίτυπα . . . βεβαπτισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ</i> |

*Ἀντίτυπον* occurs only in these two places in the N. T. The ethical and symbolical signification of baptism is here set forth in similar ways. Both see great efficacy in the baptismal ordinance.

not as a cleansing of the body but as a cleansing of the conscience. No other N. T. writers so allude to it. Both refer to the physical ablation in suggestive phraseology. It is also to be noted that *βαντισμένοι* is similarly used by I Peter in other connections.

- (8) I Pt. 4; 11 Heb. 13; 21  
 ὅτι ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ὅτι ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰ-  
 εῖς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων ἁμήν. ῶνων, ἁμήν  
 See also 5; 11

That no earlier writer addresses doxologies to Christ is most significant. II Tim. 4; 18 is hardly an exception. The similar phrasing in this peculiar usage is most easily accounted for on the basis of some real connection.

- (9) I Pt. 5; 4 Heb. 13; 20  
 τοῦ ἀρχιπούμενος τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν  
 μέγαν

Monnier, Goodspeed and many others think that there is here some connection. See comments on Ex. 3.

c

- (10) I Pt. 1; 2 Heb. 12; 24  
 βαντισμὸν ἄμαρτος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διαθήκης νέας μεσίτη Ἰησοῦ, καὶ  
 ἄμαρτι βαντισμοῦ. 10; 22

The parallel is striking since it is used by no other N. T. writers. "The idea is foreign to Paul but recurs in Barnabas." (Bigg.) The possible reference in I Pt. 4; 6 to Heb. 12; 23 b is significant in this connection. Note also I Pt. 1; 3 may refer to Heb. 6; 18.

- (11) I Pt. 1; 11 Heb. 12; 2  
 πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρούμενον ὑπέμενον σταυρὸν ἀσχηγνῆς κατα-  
 τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς ὑποστάσεις ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου  
 μετὰ τούτων δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ καυχόμενον

Though Paul frequently alludes to the *σταυρὸς* he does not think of Jesus "enduring" it that glory should follow. Nor does he think of Jesus as the suffering Servant of Isa. 53, as is here presented. *ὑπέμενον σταυρὸν* and *παθήματα* are quite different in form yet the meaning is the same and probably shows some connection. No doubt both authors are influenced here by Paul yet it is to be noted that

I Peter may also be influenced by Hebrews, for the latter, in accordance with the former, lays, greater stress upon Christ's sufferings than does Paul. Christ's glorification is a common teaching of this period.

- (12) I Pt. 1 ; 12 Heb. 11 ; 13  
 οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν ἀποτάξ ἰδόντες καὶ ὑμῶν δὲ διηκόνουν ἀποτά . . ἀσπασάμενοι

Both authors may draw independently from such O. T. passages as Num. 24 ; 17 or Deut. 18 ; 15, but because of the close resemblance between Heb. 11 ; 13b and I Pt. 1 ; 17 (2 ; 11), I Pt. 1 ; 11 and Heb. 12 ; 2 dependence is rendered quite probable.

- (13) I Pt. 1 ; 17 Heb. 12 ; 28  
 ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παρρησίας ὑμῶν λατρεύομεν εὐχρέστως τῷ Θεῷ  
 χρόνον ἀναστράφητε μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους

These authors emphasise the "fear of God" whereas Paul lays the stress on the "love of God." The contextual connection makes it more probable that I Peter was influenced by Hebrews. Heb. 12 ; 5, 6 is echoed in I Pt. 1 ; 17a and Heb. 11 ; 13 in I Pt. 1 ; 17b. Cf. also I Pt. 2 ; 11.

- (14) I Pt. 2 ; 2 Heb. 5 ; 12  
 ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν γεγονάτε χρεῖαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος  
 ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε . . πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος  
 ἄπειρος λόγου, δικαιοσύνης, νήπιος  
 γὰρ ἐστίν

Both authors may be influenced by Paul at this point. Paul employs with Hebrews the word *νήπιος*, whereas I Peter uses *βρέφος*. "This passage (I Pt. 2 ; 2) marks better than any other the difference between St. Peter, Hebrews, and St. Paul. In St. Peter's eyes the Christian is always a babe, always in need of mother's milk, growing not to perfection but to deliverance. In Heb. 5 ; 12, 6 ; 2, milk is the catechism, the rudiments of faith . . . contrasted with the "solid meat." St. Paul is vexed with the babe, who is the weaker brother the formalist. Hebrews represents (here) a *via media* between St. Paul and St. Peter" (Bigg). It would seem therefore that the Pauline figure was modified in our author's mind by the use made of it in Hebrews.



- (15) I Pt. 2; 3 Heb. 6; 5  
 εἰ ἐγέσασθε ὅτι χριστός ὁ κύριος καὶ ἄλλόν γενοσμένους θεοῦ ἕψμα  
 I Peter refers here to Ps. 34; 9 (γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι χριστός ὁ κύριος), but probably at the suggestion of Hebrews since the similar usage follows the preceding parallel so closely in both books.

- (16) I Pt. 2; 5 Heb. 3; 6  
 οἰκοδομεῖσθε ἑαυτοὺς πνευματικῶς τὸν ὁῶν ἀποστόλου ὡς ὁῶν ἐσμεν ἕψμα  
 "These authors alone insist on the believers' privileges as members of the house of God." Possibly I Peter drew independently from Paul, yet the following parallel makes dependence here seem probable.

- (17) I Pt. 2; 5 Heb. 13; 15  
 ἀνεύρηται πνευματικῶς ἡσυχία ἐν- δεῖ ἀποστόλου ἀναψέξωμεν ἡσυχίαν ἀ-  
 προσδέκτους θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χρισ- νεσεως διὰ πάσης τῆς (θεῷ)  
 τῆς

Though these passages suggest Rom. 12; 1 f., these are the only N. T. authors who use the phrase ἀναψέξωμεν ἡσυχίαν. They may have drawn the phrase from the LXX, where it is frequently employed, but in view of the other possible points of contact with Hebrews in this context it seems very probable that our author was also influenced by the more copious treatment of the sacrificial figure in that book.

- (18) I Pt. 2; 11 Heb. 11; 13  
 παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ξένοι καὶ παρεπιδήμοι

The exact form used in Hebrews is peculiar to that book. Ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι appears only in Eph. 2; 19. Παρεπιδήμοις is found in the N. T. only in the above passages. By eliminating the term ξένοι, common to the earlier authors, it would appear that our author combined the remaining terms. It is also to be noted that no other N. T. books lay so much stress upon the thought that Christians are but sojourners in the world.

- (19) I Pt. 2; 21, 23 Heb. 12; 3  
 ὅτι Χριστός ἐπαθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ τὸν ποιῶντα  
 ἡμῶν ὑπομνήσεων ὑπομνήσεων ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ὑπομνήσεων ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ὑπομνήσεων ἡμῶν  
 λοιδορούμενος ὡς ἀντιλοιδόρει εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀντιλοιδόρει

The appeal to the sufferings of Christ as a reason for the Christians endurance under persecution is not made by Paul. Though the

phraseology is different the thought is very suggestive. The probabilities of dependence are heightened by the following parallels. I Pt. 2 ; 22 = Heb. 4 ; 15, Heb. 12 ; 2 = I Pt. 3 ; 22, I Pt. 2 ; 24a = Heb. 9 ; 28a, Heb. 9 ; 26 = I Pt. 3 ; 18.

- (20) I Pt. 3 ; 16 Heb. 13 ; 18  
 συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν, ἵνα ἐν καλῆν συνείδησιν ἔχομεν, ἐν πᾶσιν  
 ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε κατασκευασθῶσιν καλῶς θιέλοντες ἀναστρέφεσθαι  
 οἱ ἐπιπράζοντες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν  
 ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστρέφην

“ These are the only N. T. authors who connect ‘ the good conscience ’ with good habits of life.” The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ suggests that our author is influenced here by Paul, yet the above usage seems to indicate that he also knew Hebrews. Note the parallel usage of ἀνατρέφειν and its derivative.

- (21) I Pt. 3 ; 22 Heb. 1 ; 3, 4, 6  
 ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ πορευθεὶς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης  
 εἰς οὐρανὸν ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, τοσοῦτον κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων  
 ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων  
 Cf. 2 ; 9, 12 ; 2.

Though I Peter may depend upon Paul at this point, the sequence of thought, which is so suggestive of Hebrews, should not be overlooked. Cf. I Pt. 3 ; 20 with Heb. 11 ; 7 and I Pt. 3 ; 21 with Heb. 9 ; 24, 10 ; 22.

- (22) I Pt. 4 ; 14 Heb. 11 ; 26, 13 ; 13  
 εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, ἠγγισάμενος . . . τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ  
 μακάριοι Χριστοῦ, 13 ; 13 τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν  
 αὐτοῦ φέροντες

“ These writers only refer to the blessing pronounced by the ninth beatitude on those who suffer reproach for Christ’s sake.” Our author may draw independently from a logion of the Lord, but it seems quite natural in this context to suppose that he was influenced by Hebrews.

- (23) I Pt. 4 ; 17 Heb. 10 ; 21  
 ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ

I Peter may be influenced directly by Ez. 9 ; 6, yet the phrase is different. No other N. T. writers use the phrase with the meaning

“household of God.” The phrase appears in I Tim. 3 ; 15, but not in the above sense. Cf. Heb. 3 ; 6.

- (24) I Pt. 5 ; 4 Heb. 2 ; 7, 9  
 τῆς δόξης στέφανον δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐσπεύσαντες κλητῶν

The “crown of glory” would very naturally be attributed to Christ first, then to his followers. If there is dependence shown here it would seem to indicate the priority of Hebrews. The thought “crown of glory” or “crowned with glory” occurs only here in the N. T. The contextual sequence is hardly accidental. Cf. I Pt. 2 ; 25, 5 ; 4 with Heb. 13 ; 20, also I Pt. 3 ; 22 with Heb. 2 ; 9, 12 ; 2.

- (25) I Pt. 5 ; 10 Heb. 13 ; 20  
 ὁ Θεὸς πάσης χάριτος . . . καταρτίσει ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εὐχαρίστησης . . . καταρτίσει ὑμᾶς

It is very significant that in the immediate contexts, Jesus Christ is appealed to as the one through whom God works. Hebrews very probably depends here upon II Thes. 2 ; 17.

- (26) I Pt. 5 ; 12 Heb. 13 ; 22  
 δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα διὰ βραχείων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν

Though the thought is couched in different words, it is indeed suggestive.

c—d

- (27) I Pt. 1 ; 4 Heb. 9 ; 15  
 κληρονομίαν ἁφραστον καὶ ἀμραν- τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας  
 τον καὶ ἀμρανστον

These are the first N. T. writers to use the word ἀμραντος. Cf. Heb. 7 ; 26, 13 ; 4. The imperishable nature of the inheritance is emphasised by both authors. Yet they may draw independently from Paul. Cf. Gal. 3 ; 18, Eph. 1 ; 14, 18, 5 ; 5, Col. 3 ; 24, I Cor. 6 ; 9, 10, 15 ; 15, Gal. 4 ; 30, 5 ; 21.

- (28) I Pt. 1 ; 6 Heb. 12 ; 11  
 ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιάσθε, ὀλίγων ἔρπι εἰ πᾶσα μὲν παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ  
 δέον λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πει- παρὸν οὐ δοκεῖ χαρῆς εἶναι ἀλλὰ  
 ρασμοῖς λύπης, ὕπερον δὲ καρπὸν εὐχρητικόν

The phraseology is not so suggestive as the thought. The parallel receives additional significance by the possible reference to Heb. 12 ; 10b in I Pt. 1 ; 15, 16.

- (29) I Pt. 1; 8 Heb. 11; 27  
 εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες πίστει . . . τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν  
 Faith in both instances consists in laying hold of the unseen. Cf. Heb. 11; 1, also 11; 13, which may be connected with I Pt. 1; 17, 2; 11.

- (30) I Pt. 1; 9 Heb. 10; 36, 39  
 κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως κομιζήσθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν . . . ἀλλὰ  
 σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς

Though this thought is Pauline, both the phraseology and the context are suggestive.

- (31) I Pt. 1; 21 Heb. 2; 9  
 τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξαν  
 δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα καὶ τιμῆ ἐστεφανωμένον

Again the thought is Pauline, but suggestive in its context. Cf. I Pt. 1; 18–20 with Heb. 9; 12, 14, 24–25, and I Pt. 1; 22 with Heb. 13; 1.

- (32) I Pt. 2; 1 Heb. 12; 1  
 ἀποθέμενοι ὅν πᾶσαν κακίαν . . . ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα

This parallel is made more suggestive by the possible reference to Heb. 5; 12, 13 in I Pt. 2; 2.

- (33) I Pt. 3; 7 Heb. 11; 9, 1; 14  
 συνκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς συνκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελείας  
 κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν

This may be a mere coincidence, yet I Pt. 3; 7 ff. is very suggestive of Hebrews. Cf. I Pt. 3; 8 with Heb. 13; 1, 3; 9 with 12; 17, 3; 11 with 12; 14, etc.

- (34) I Pt. 3; 9 Heb. 12; 17  
 εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσατε κληρονομήσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν

This phrase appears only in these two places in all the N. T.

- (35) I Pt. 4; 1 Heb. 4; 12  
 ἔννοιαν ἔννοιῶν

Though this word appears only in these two places in the N. T., it may be wholly accidental. It is to be noted, however, that

Pt. 4; 1 lays much stress upon the sufferings of Christ, in harmony with Hebrews.

- (36) I Pt. 4; 2 Heb. 9; 14  
 . . . θελήματι Θεοῦ . . . βιώσαι εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι

Cf. I Pt. 4; 1a with Heb. 9; 26, 4; 1b with 4; 12, also 3; 15 with 9; 15.

- (37) I Pt. 4; 5 Heb. 13; 17  
 οἱ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον λόγον ἀποδώσοντες

This exact usage is peculiar to these authors.

- (38) I Pt. 4; 7 Heb. 10; 25  
 πάντων τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν

This idea, when considered alone, is too common in the N. T. to merit attention, but it must be viewed in the light of its context.

- (39) I Pt. 4; 8 Heb. 13; 1  
 εἰς ἐκκενῶς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω

The context makes this very common exhortation worthy of mention.

- (40) I Pt. 4; 9 Heb. 13; 2  
 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους τῆς φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε

Cf. Rom. 12; 13, I Tim. 3; 2, Tit. 1; 18. The probabilities of dependence are increased by the sequence of the last three parallels.

- (41) I Pt. 5; 9 Heb. 12; 8  
 εἰδότες τὰ ἀδύατα τῶν πνευμάτων εἰ χωρὶς ἐσθε παιδείας, ἦτε μέτρον τῆ . . . ἀδελοφρόντη ἐπιτελεῖσθαι γεγόνασιν πάντες

This close resemblance in thought may be due to the common background, yet the context is to be considered.

- (42) I Pt. 1; 3 Heb. 6; 18  
 ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος

The phraseology is very different and probably shows no connection.

- (43) I Pt. 1; 15 Heb. 10; 14  
 ἄγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε . . . διώκετε . . . τὸν ἁγιασμὸν  
 Accidental.
- (44) I Pt. 2; 9 Heb. 12; 28  
 ὑμεῖς, βασιλείων ἐσθλάτευμα ἔθνος ἄγιον, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ . . . διὸ βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες ἔχωμεν χάριν, δι' ἧς λατρεύομεν εὐαρέστως τῷ Θεῷ μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους
- I Peter more probably shows acquaintance here with Eph. 1; 11, 12. Cf. Deut. 10; 15 or Ex. 19; 5, 6.
- (45) I Pt. 2; 22 Heb. 4; 15  
 ὅς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν . . . χωρὶς ἀμαρτίας
- The doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ is too common to constitute an argument for literary dependence.
- (46) I Pt. 3; 11 Heb. 12; 14  
 ζήτησάτω εἰρήνην καὶ διωξάτω εἰρήνην διώκετε αὐτήν
- Our author is quoting directly from Ps. 34, very probably at the suggestion of Paul.
- (47) I Pt. 5; 7 Heb. 13; 5  
 ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ σε ἀνοῶ οὐδὲ οὐ ἐγκαταλίπω
- Our author is probably borrowing here from Ps. 55; 22.
- (48) I Pt. 5; 13 Heb. 13; 24  
 Ἀσπάξεται ὑμεῖς ἡ . . . ἀσπάξονται ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας
- (49) I Pt. 5; 14 Heb. 13; 24  
 Ἀσπασασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀσπασασθε . . . πάντες τοὺς ἁγίους ἀγάπῃς

These greetings are common in the Pauline literature. Cf. Rom. 16; 16, Phil. 4; 21–22, II Cor. 13; 12–13, etc.

## Order of Parallels.

| I Pet.                 | Heb. | I Pet.               | Heb. | I Pet.              | Heb. |
|------------------------|------|----------------------|------|---------------------|------|
| 1 1 ; 2 = 12 ; 24      |      | 18 2 ; 9 = 12 ; 28   |      | 34 4 ; 2 = 9 ; 14   |      |
| 2 1 ; 3 = 6 ; 18       |      | 19 2 ; 11 = 11 ; 13  |      | 35 4 ; 5 = 13 ; 17  |      |
| 3 1 ; 4 = 9 ; 15       |      | 20 2 ; 22 = 12 ; 3   |      | 36 4 ; 7 = 10 ; 25  |      |
| 4 1 ; 6 = 12 ; 11      |      | 21 2 ; 22 = 4 ; 15   |      | 37 4 ; 8 = 13 ; 1   |      |
| 5 1 ; 8 = 11 ; 27      |      | 22 2 ; 24 = 9 ; 28   |      | 38 4 ; 9 = 13 ; 2   |      |
| 6 1 ; 9 = 10 ; 36      |      | 23 2 ; 25 = 13 ; 20  |      | 39 4 ; 11 = 13 ; 21 |      |
| 7 1 ; 11 = 12 ; 2      |      | 24 3 ; 7 = 11 ; 9    |      | 40 4 ; 14 = 13 ; 13 |      |
| 8 1 ; 12 = 11 ; 13     |      | 25 3 ; 9 = 12 ; 17   |      | 41 4 ; 17 = 10 ; 21 |      |
| 9 1 ; 15 = 12 ; 14     |      | 26 3 ; 11 = 12 ; 14  |      | 42 5 ; 4 = 13 ; 20  |      |
| 10 1 ; 17 = 12 ; 28    |      | 27 3 ; 16 = 13 ; 18  |      | 43 5 ; 4 = 2 ; 7, 9 |      |
| 11 1 ; 18f. = 9 ; 12f. |      | 28 3 ; 18 = 9 ; 28   |      | 44 5 ; 7 = 13 ; 5   |      |
| 12 1 ; 21 = 2 ; 9      |      | 29 3 ; 18b = 12 ; 22 |      | 45 5 ; 9 = 12 ; 8   |      |
| 13 2 ; 1 = 12 ; 1      |      | 30 3 ; 20 = 11 ; 7   |      | 46 5 ; 10 = 13 ; 20 |      |
| 14 2 ; 2 = 5 ; 12      |      | 31 3 ; 21 = 10 ; 22  |      | 47 5 ; 12 = 13 ; 22 |      |
| 15 2 ; 3 = 6 ; 5       |      | 32 3 ; 22 = 1 ; 2f.  |      | 48 5 ; 13 = 13 ; 24 |      |
| 16 2 ; 5 = 3 ; 6       |      | 33 4 ; 1 = 4 ; 12    |      | 49 5 ; 14 = 13 ; 24 |      |
| 17 2 ; 5 = 13 ; 15     |      |                      |      |                     |      |

## CONCLUSION

The many suggestive parallels between these two Epistles would form a conclusive argument for literary dependence, were we not certain that they both rest upon the Epistles of Paul. It is difficult to determine whether one author is drawing from Paul independently or at the suggestion of the other. Nor is it easy to tell whether one is drawing directly from the other or whether they are expressing thought due to a common background. Through this labyrinth of possibilities we can only hope to discover a somewhat circuitous trail. From the marked text on page 101 f. it would appear that these authors sometimes follow paths over which Paul had never traveled. Since these paths are quite clearly defined in some instances of resemblance here one may readily infer that there is some literary connection between I Peter and Hebrews.

Furthermore there are places where we were led to believe that one author pointed out the Pauline path to the other. In view of the many striking parallels one is tempted to assert that these Epistles show a direct literary connection. Though the case seems very certain, the complication of possibilities lessens the degree of certainty until it would seem advisable to claim no more than that one author very probably knew the work of the other.

The next question to be determined is the order of probable dependence. We have noted several points in the discussion where Hebrews more probably blazed the way for our author. Cf. Exs. 2, 4, 5, 8, 18, 22, etc. Hebrews is a carefully thought out homily, logical and rethorical, whereas I Peter is halting in its logic and disconnected at many points. In contrast to the former the latter is a mere literary mosaic. Instances are not wanting in which the contexts of the members of the parallels considered show Hebrews to be the more original. For instance, in Ex. 6 it will be noted that Noah is referred to in Hebrews as but one of a long list of ancient worthies, whereas I Peter alludes to him as if at the suggestion of another. Cf. Exs. 1, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 20, etc.

It can hardly be accidental that Hebrews 12-13 contain 26 of the 49 possible points of contact with I Peter. The first 8 chapters contain but 9 points of contact, whereas the last 4 chapters have 40. Apparently then our author used that part of Hebrews most which is in closest harmony with the purpose for which he was writing, i. e. to strengthen and encourage the Christians during a fiery persecution.

Although much of the thought and phraseology of these books may be due to common dependence upon Paul or to a common background, it would seem that we are justified in claiming that our author was very probably acquainted with Hebrews.

#### "Q" SOURCE

D

d

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| (1) | I Pt. 1; 6, 8  | Mt. 5; 11, 12 = Lk. 6; 22, 23   |
|     | ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε. ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ<br>δέον λυπηθέντες ἐν ποιμίῳις πει-<br>ρασμοῖς . . . 8 ἀγαλλιᾶτε γὰρ<br>ἀνεκκλητήῳ | μακάριοί ἐστε. ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν<br>ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἰπωσιν<br>πάν πονηρὸν καὶ ὑμῶν ψευδόματι.<br>γαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε |

<sup>3</sup>Αγαλλιᾶσθε serves as a catch word. Though a rare word in the N. T. it does not show dependence. Cf. Lk. 1; 47, 10; 21, Acts 2; 26, 16; 34, Rev. 19; 7, Jn. 5; 35, 8; 56. The word does not occur in the parallel account in Luke. There is no more reason to suppose that our author was influenced by "Q" at this point than by Paul Cf. Rom. 12; 12, Phil. 3; 1, 4; 4, I Thes. 5; 17, etc.



- (2) I Pt. 1: 10 Mt. 13: 17 = Lk. 10; 24  
 περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξέζήτησαν καὶ πολλοὶ προσήγγισαν | καὶ βραχυεῖς |  
 ἐξήρακύνθησαν προσήγγισαν . . . ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε καὶ  
 οὐκ εἶδαν

This is indeed a suggestive parallel. If there is any literary dependence it must be on the side of our author, as " Q " surely antedates our Epistle some decades. But the thought is not close enough to make this probable. Cf. Eph. 3; 3 f. Col. 1; 25, Rom. 16; 25, Eph. 1; 9, etc.

- (3) I Pt 1: 17 Mt. 6; 9 = Lk. 11; 2  
 καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε [Οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε] ὑμεῖς·  
 πατερ . . .

Harnack, in his " Sayings of Jesus " p. 134, does not place the bracketed phrase in the " Q " source, as A. Huck seems to do in his " Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien " s. 28. At all events, this parallel has no evidential value in the solution of our problem, though Bigg, Chase and Holtzmann point it out.

- (4) I Pt. 3; 9 Mt. 5; 39 = Lk. 6; 29  
 μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ Ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν [δεξιάν],  
 ἢ λαιδορῆαν ἀντὶ λαιδορίας σου, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ  
 τὴν ἄλλην. Cf. Mt. 5; 44 = Lk. 6; 28.

The doctrine of " nonresistance " is clearly set forth in both instances, but the words in which it is couched are very different and not at all suggestive either of dependence or of a common source. A close parallel appears in the Markan source, i. e. 15; 29. The doctrine here taught is not wholly new in the N. T., e. g. Prov. 17; 13, 20; 22, 24; 29, etc. As we have seen elsewhere I Peter most certainly depends upon Rom. 12, so we need not go back of Paul for the doctrine taught in I Pt. 3; 9. See Rom. 12; 17, 19, I Thes. 5; 15, I Cor. 6; 7, etc. Though Chase, Bigg, Holtzmann, Monnier and others have pointed out the above parallel it does not so much as prove a common source.

- (5) I Pt. 3; 20 Mt. 24; 37, 38 = Lk. 17; 26  
 τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις ὡσπερ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Νῶε  
 Νῶε

Though the reference to ταῖς ἡμέραις Νῶε suggests some literary connection, it will be observed that the phrase occurs in contexts

which have nothing else in common. Our author thinks of the ark as a symbol of salvation by water baptism, whereas Q alludes to the unconcern of Noah's contemporaries in view of the approaching destruction as analogous to the conditions at the imminent parousia. There is, therefore, no necessary connection between these passages.

(6) I Pt. 4; 10

Mt. 24; 45 = Lk. 12; 42

διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι . . . ὁ πιστὸς δούλος καὶ φρόνιμος, ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκραιῆς αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφὴν ἐν καιρῷ

Clearly this parallel, cited by Dean Plumtre, does not show the dependence of our Epistle upon "Q" to be any more probable than upon Paul. Cf. I Cor. 4; 1, 2, Tit. 1; 7.

(7) I Pt. 5; 6

Mt. 23; 12 = Lk. 14; 11

ταπεινώθητε ὡς ὑπὸ τῆν κροταίαν γέφυρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ

"Ὅστις ὑψώσει ἑαυτὸν ταπεινώσεται, καὶ ὅστις ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν ὑψώσεται

Chase, Holtzmann, Monnier and others have recorded this very suggestive parallel. The citation in "Q" resembles the thought of our Epistle at this point more than any other N. T. passage. But that the Christian should be humble is a very common teaching in the Pauline Epistles. Cf. Rom. 12; 16, II Cor. 7; 6, 10; 1, 11; 7, 12; 21, Eph. 4; 2, Phil. 2; 3, 8, 4; 12, Col. 2; 18, 23, 3; 12, etc. II Cor. 11; 7 is a very close parallel to I Pt. 5; 6. This logion pertains to social distinctions whereas, I Peter alludes to the Christians' resignation during the fiery ordeal of persecution, which is viewed as a providential means of exaltation. Consequently there is not such a close resemblance here as at first appears. Hence it cannot be asserted from this parallel that our author was acquainted with "Q," nor that he remembered a saying that he had heard from the lips of Jesus.

(8) I Pt. 5; 8

Mt. 5; 25 = Lk. 12; 58

ὁ ἀντιδίκος

τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ

Dean Plumtre gives this among other resemblances to show that "one of the most dominant influences upon St. Peter was the personal teaching of our Lord." But it would seem that a single word like this, occurring as it does in contexts differing so widely, could no real evidential value.

(9) I Pt. 5; 10 Mt. 7; 25 = Lk. 6; 48

θρημελιώσει

τεθρημελιώσῃ

Granting that this word belonged originally in I Peter, we should still have to question the propriety of considering it as a datum to prove that "Peter was influenced by the personal teaching of our Lord." Especially is it hazardous to depend upon this "datum," since many of the best Manuscripts do not contain the word. See W. H. in loco.

It seems quite clear from the above study that we cannot claim either that there is any literary connection between "Q" and I Peter or that they both go back to a common source.

#### MARKAN SOURCE

D

d

(1) I Pt. 1; 18 Mk. 10; 45 (Mt. 20; 28)

ἐλυτρώθητε . . . τιμίῳ αἵματι . . . δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον  
 Χριστοῦ ἀντὶ πολλῶν. Cf. Mk. 14; 24.

The Markan source represents "the life of the Son of Man" to be the "ransom," whereas our author alludes to the redemption price in symbolic terms, i. e. "the precious blood of Christ." I Tim 2; 6, Tit. 2; 14, Gal. 1; 4, 2; 20, Rom. 4; 45, etc. resemble the thought of Mark more closely, but Eph. 1; 7, 5; 2, Col. 1; 14, Rom. 3; 24, 25, Acts 5; 2, etc. are closer to I Peter. Cf. also Heb. 9; 12. It is obvious that the Pauline doctrine of the atonement is here heard from the lips of Jesus. No one can be certain as to the genuineness of Mk. 10; 45, yet it is conceded by the majority of modern scholars to be more in accord with the theology of Paul than with what we know of the teaching of Jesus concerning himself. That Mark was a disciple of Paul we are assured. Cf. Acts 12; 25. All things considered there is no reason to claim that there is here any literary connection. There is, however, an obvious Pauline influence back of the members of this parallel.

(2) I Pt. 1; 18 b Mk. 7; 3 (Mt. 15; 26)

πατροπαράδότηον

τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πατέρων

This parallel of Dean Plumtre's need not detain us.

- (3) I Pt. 1; 23 Mk. 4; 14 (Mt. 13; 18 f. = Lk. 8; 12f.)  
 ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σποράς ὁ σπείρων λόγον σπείρει ff.  
 ψευδαρχῆς . . . διὰ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ

Bigg thinks that there is some connection here. But cf. I Cor. 4; 15, Gal. 3; 16, 26, 29, 4; 19, etc. There is no reason to think that our author depends upon Mark at this point nor that both draw from a common source.

- (4) I Pt. 2; 2 Mk. 10; 15 (Mt. 18; 2 = Lk. 18; 17)  
 ὡς ἀρτυρήνηται βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἐς ἃν μὴ δέξεται τὴν βασιλείαν  
 ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον. οὐ μὴ εἰς-  
 αὐτῷ ἀξήνητε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐλθῆναι εἰς αὐτήν

Chase notices this parallel but he does not advance it as an argument for literary dependence. Closer resemblances both in thought and phraseology are to be found in the Pauline Epistles. Cf. I Cor. 3; 1 f., 14; 20, Eph. 4; 14, etc.

- (5) I Pt. 2; 7 Mk. 12; 10 (Mt. 21; 42 = Lk. 20; 12)  
 λίθους ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκο- λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκο-  
 δομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κερ- δομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κε-  
 λῆν γωνίας ψαλῆν γωνίας

Verbal agreement, in this quotation from Ps. 118; 22, leads us to suspect that some literary connection exists in this parallel. Yet there is nothing in the contexts which suggests it. Mark also quotes Ps. 118; 23, showing that he is probably following the original independently. Our Epistle, as we have seen elsewhere, surely depends upon Rom. 9.; 33 and Eph. 2; 20-22 at this point. Assuming that this is a genuine saying of Jesus, as it purports to be, we still have no special reason to conclude that Peter is the common source back of these quotations.

- (6) I Pt. 2; 13, 17 Mk. 12; 17 (Mt. 22; 21 = Lk. 20; 26)  
 ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτί- τῷ Καίσαρος ἀπόδοτε Καίσαρι καὶ  
 σει διὰ τὸν κύριον εἶτε βασιλεῖ τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ  
 ὡς ὑπερέχοντι εἶτε ἡγεμόσιν 17  
 τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε. τὸν βασιλέα  
 τιμᾶτε

This parallel is very suggestive, yet it is to be noted that Rom. 13; 1 is even more suggestive of our Epistle. There is practically nothing in the immediate context in Mark to suggest I Peter, whereas Rom. 12-13 has numerous points of probable connection. Cf.

especially Rom. 13 ; I, 6, 7, 8 with I Pt. 2 ; 13, 17. Certainly there are more obvious reasons for believing that our author was influenced at this point by Paul than by Mark or the Petrine source back of Mark. Mark in like manner may equally be dependent upon Romans.

- (7) I Pt. 2 ; 21 Mk. 8 ; 34 (Mt. 10 ; 38 = Lk. 9 ; 23)  
 Χριστός ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἡμῶν ἢ τις βέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλάβεν, ὑπολαμβάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἕνα ἐκακωλοῦνθήσῃτε τοῖς ἔγγιστον ἀποῶ εἰ τις βέλει ὀπίσω ἐκιντὸν καὶ ἀρχάτω τὸν σταυρὸν ἀποῶ καὶ ἀκολούθειω μου

Dean Plumtre thinks that this is one of "Peter's reminiscences of the Lord's teaching." But the thought and phraseology of I Pt. 2 ; 21 a is too common in the Pauline Epistles to render such a view tenable. Furthermore the ἔγγιστος of I Pt. 2 ; 21 b occurs only here and in Rom. 4 ; 12 and II Cor. 12 ; 18, in which places, significantly enough, it is employed in the same sense in which our author uses it. Hence it is not necessary for us to suppose that these scriptures come from a common Petrine source.

- (8) I Pt. 2 ; 23 Mk. 14 ; 61, 15 ; 5 (Mt. 27 ; 14)  
 ὃς λυθισυμένους οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει, πάσχων οὐκ ἠπεύθει ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπη καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη

Our author is drawing from Isa. 53 all through this section. Cf. I Pt. 2 ; 23 with Isa. 53 ; 7. The word λυθισυμένω is not found in the Synoptic Gospels, but it is used in I Cor. 4 ; 12 and in the Pauline portion of Acts (23 ; 4). Λυθισυμένω is used only by Paul and our author, while λυθισυμένω is only to be found in I Cor. 5 ; 11, 6 ; 10. Ἰησοῦς is peculiar to above citation. Hence this would be a slender thread on which to suspend an argument either for literary dependence or a common source.

- (9) I Pt. 2 ; 24 Mk. 15 ; 15 (Mt. 27 ; 26)  
 οἷ τῷ μῶλωπι ἔβαψτε. παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὑραχελιώσας Cf. Isa. 53 ; 5.

Again we cannot follow Plumtre in his "reminiscences of St. Peter." The language of Mk. 15 ; 15 is much more in accord with a real reminiscence than I Pt. 2 ; 24. The quotation from Isaiah seems to indicate that our author was musing on the picture of the "Suffering Servant" of II Isaiah rather than upon the concrete instance depicted in Mark.

- (10) I Pt. 2; 25 Mk. 6; 34 (Mt. 9; 36 = Lk. 15; 4)  
 ἦτε ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλ- ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποι-  
 λὰ ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποι- μένα  
 μένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν

Chase records this striking parallel, yet he is unable to find any evidence in it for literary dependence. The quotation in Mark does not claim to have come from the lips of Jesus, consequently it is a later interpretation in accord with the O. T. symbolism. Cf. Num. 27; 17, I Ki. 22; 17, Ezek. 34; 6, 37; 24, Zech. 10; 2, etc. See Isa. 53; 6 for the probable original of I Pt. 2; 25.

- (11) I Pt. 4; 7 Mk. 13; 33 (Mt. 24; 42 = Lk. 12; 37)  
 πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν. βλέπετε ἀγρυπνεῖτε ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ  
 σωτηρονήσατε ὅν καὶ νήψατε εἰς πότε ὁ καιρὸς [ἔσται]. Cf. Mt. 25;  
 πρὸςευχάξ 13, 26; 41 and Lk. 21; 34.

Though the thought here is much the same the phraseology is very different. Exhortations to watchfulness in view of the approaching parousia were too common during the early period for this parallel to be of any evidential value either for dependence or for a common source. Cf. Rom. 13; 11, I Thes. 5; 6 f., etc.

- (12) I Pt. 5; 3 Mk. 10; 42 (Mt. 20; 25 = Lk. 22; 24)  
 μηδ' ὡς κατακρυβεύοντες τῶν κλη- Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκῶντες ἄρχων  
 ρῶν . . . τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακρυβεύουσιν αὐτῶν  
 καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν

Κατακρυβεύω is a rare word in the N. T., yet it is not sufficient in these contexts to make literary acquaintance probable. The reference in I Peter could have been suggested, quite as naturally, by II Cor. 1; 24 or Ezek. 34; 4.

A study of the above points of contact (which, it is believed, exhaust the more important ones) shows that the Pauline Literature, upon which we are quite sure our author depends, furnishes, in nearly every instance, equally close thought and phraseology: and in not a few cases is the resemblance even more striking. It has also been seen that Mark has been influenced by Paul. Whether or not Mark and I Peter alike go back to Peter, we are quite sure that they are deeply indebted to Paul. At all events literary dependence cannot be claimed between I Peter and the Markan Source.

PECULIAR TO MATTHEW

D

d

- (1) I Pt. 1; 4 Mt. 25; 34

εἰς κληρονομίαν . . . περιηρημένην κληρονομίᾳσθε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην  
 ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ἑμᾶς. Cf. 3; 9 b. ἑμῶν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς  
 κόσμου

Κληρονομεῖν with its family is a very common word in the N. T., especially in the Pauline Epistles. "Inheriting the Kingdom" is mentioned in I Cor. 6; 10, 15; 50, Gal. 5; 21, Eph. 5; 5. That the "inheritance is laid up in heaven" is also alluded to in Col. 1; 5 and inferred in Eph. 1; 14. Ἐτοιμαζέω is a common word in the Gospels, but rare elsewhere, occurring in the Pauline Epistles only three times and in I Peter not at all. Therefore literary dependence cannot be argued from this parallel.

- (2) I Pt. 2; 5 Mt. 16; 18

ὡς λίθου ζῶντος θεοδομηθεὶς ὄκτος σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῆι  
 πνευματικῷς . . . πέτρᾳ θεοδομησώ μετ' τὴν ἐκκλη-  
 σίαν . . .

The change of Simon's name to ΠΕΤΡΟΣ or Πέτρος, and the allusion to ἐκκλησίαι lead many to think that there is here an anachronism. Unfortunately the Siniatic Syriac (Ss) fails us at this point. Both the Curetonian (Sc) and the Peshito (P) follow the Greek text in using ܩܦܝܘܢܝܘܬܝܢ . We have concluded elsewhere that our Epistle depends upon Rom. 9; 33 and Eph. 2; 20-21 at this point, so if either of these authors influenced the other, Matthew is the borrower. Knowing what we do about the rapidly developing tradition of the early church we should conclude, apart from literary considerations, that the thought of Mt. 16; 18 antedates our Epistle. Therefore we cannot so much as argue a common source for these scriptures.

- (3) I Pt. 2; 12 Mt. 5; 16

τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ἑμῶν ἐν ἔθνεσιν οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ἑμῶν  
 ἔργοντες καλῶς ἕνα . . . ἐκ τῶν κα- ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς  
 λῶν ἐργῶν ἐπιποτεύοντες δοξάσωσι ἴδωσιν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν  
 τὸν Θεὸν τὸν πατέρα ἑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς  
 οὐρανοῖς

Mt. 5; 16 resembles our Epistle at this point more closely than any other N. T. passage. It is quite natural to suppose that Matthew

preserves a genuine logion of our Lord, which was current in the church, but which was not used by the other Synoptic writers. Yet the form in which the thought is expressed suggests that there is here no literary connection.

- (4) I Pt. 3; 14 a Mt. 5; 10  
 εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν  
 μακάριοι δικαιοσύνης

This parallel may be accounted for in the same way as No. 3. Certainly no one will affirm that these must go back to a common origin.

- (5) I Pt. 3; 14 b Mt. 10; 26  
 τὸν δὲ φόβον ἀποῶν μὴ φοβηθήτε μὴ οὖν φοβηθήτε ἀποῶς  
 μηδὲ ταραχθήτε

Chase calls our attention to this parallel, yet he is unable to find in it any evidence for literary acquaintance. The resemblance can hardly be more than a mere coincidence.

We may conclude from the above possible points of contact that there is nothing peculiar to Matthew which warrants any claim for literary acquaintance.

#### PECULIAR TO LUKE

D

d

- (1) I Pt. 1; 11 Lk. 24; 26  
 πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρούμενον οὐ γὰρ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χρισ-  
 τὸν εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς τὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν  
 μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας. Cf. v. 21. ἀποῶ. Cf. vv. 44, 46.

This close parallel suggests literary dependence. Acts 26; 22, 23, which is in a "speech of Paul," also resembles our Epistle very much at this point. That the sufferings of Christ were foretold was a common doctrine: belief in his subsequent glorification also grew up very early. Consequently there need be no literary connection here, though the thought is very suggestive. Both passages bear evidence of Pauline influence.



- (2) I Pt. 1; 13 Lk. 12; 35  
 Δὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς Ἐστρωσάν ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσ-  
 διανόιας ὑμῶν μέλαι

Certainly this parallel, cited by Holtzmann and Plumtre, need not detain us. The phrase is not of the sort that suggests dependence. Furthermore, a closer resemblance to our Epistle here is to be found in Paul. Cf. Eph. 6; 14, which uses the common phrase in a tropical sense more in accord with I Pt. 1; 13 than with Lk. 12; 35.

- (3) I Pt. 1; 13 b Lk. 17; 30  
 ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτεται

The ἀποκαλύψει of Christ is too common in the Pauline Epistles to make it necessary for us to suppose that there is any literary connection here. Cf. II Thes. 1; 7, I Cor. 1; 7, I Thes. 4; 16, etc.

- (4) I Pt. 2; 12 Lk. 10; 44  
 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς τὸν κριτὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς

That the word ἐπισκοπή is used in this sense only in these two places in all the N. T. seems quite significant. It would not be wise, however, to place too much stress upon this usage, which is probably accidental.

- (5) I Pt. 2; 23, 4; 19 Lk. 23; 46  
 παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρινοντι δικαίως Ἠάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθε-  
 4; 19 πιστῶ κτίστη παρεπιθέσθω- μιαι τὸ πνεῦμα μου  
 σαν τὰς ψυχάς . . .

Though παρατίθεμι is a common word in the N. T., it is employed just in this way but rarely. I Peter uses παρεδίδομι and παρατίθεμι interchangeably, consequently this resemblance has but little value as a datum for literary dependence. For similar usage of παρατίθεμι see Acts 14; 23, 20; 32. Cf. also Acts 7; 59 for similar idea.

- (6) I Pt. 4; 5 Lk. 16; 2  
 αἱ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ . . . κρίνοντι ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας  
 οντι . . . σου

Cf. Mt. 12; 36, 22; 21, Mk. 4; 20, Acts 19; 40, etc.

- (7) I Pt. 4; 8 Lk. 7; 47  
 ἀγάπη καλύπτει πληθύνος ἁμαρτιῶν ἀφείωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς αἱ  
 πολλάί, ἕτι ἠγάπησεν πολὺ

Occurring, as it does, in a context so thoroughly Pauline, this quotation from Prov. 10; 12 very probably has no connection with the citation in Luke.

- (8) I Pt. 5; 1 Lk. 24; 48  
 μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθῆμα- ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων  
 των

Connection here is very dubious.

Sir John Hawkins shows in his *Horae Synopticae* (p. 190 f.) that Luke is linguistically more closely related to Paul than either of the other Synoptic Gospels. In view of the close dependence of our Epistle upon Paul we should be surprised not to find close parallels between Luke and I Peter. Indeed, these likenesses have been such as lead Bigg to say that "I Peter shows upon the whole the nearest resemblance to Luke" (i. e. of the Gospels). In favor of this it may also be said that the literary style of Luke and I Peter is much the same. Both have large vocabularies. They very frequently employ compound words. They have an abnormally large number of words peculiar to each, as well as common to each. Yet with all these likenesses we cannot claim that either author knew the work of the other.

#### ACTS

D

d

- 1 I Pt. 1; 4 Acts 20; 32  
 εἰς κληρονομίαν . . . τετηρημένην ἐν δοῦναι τὴν κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς  
 οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς ἡγασμένοις παῖσιν

Very clearly these scriptures come from the same circle of ideas. Acts 20; 32 purports to give Paul's own words, whereas I Peter, as we have seen elsewhere, very probably depends directly upon Paul. Cf. Eph. 1; 14, Col. 1; 5, II Tim. 4; 8.

- (2) I Pt. 1; 11 Acts 26; 22-23  
 προσῆται . . . πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προ- ὦν τε οἱ προσῆται ἐλάλησαν μελ-  
 μαρτυρούμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν πα- λόντων γίνεσθαι ἀλλὰ Μωυσῆς, εἰ

θήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δό- πάλι τὸς ὁ χριστός. εἰ προῦτος εἶ-  
ξίας ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν

This close parallel suggests literary dependence. Obviously the passage in Acts is closely related to I Cor. 15 ; 20 f. Acts 3 ; 18 is also a close parallel to I Pt. 1 ; 11 a, but it makes no reference to Christ's glorification through suffering. Apparently, therefore, the citation in the Pauline portion of Acts affords the closer parallel, although we cannot assert that it shows literary dependence.

(3) I Pt. 1 ; 12 Acts 2 ; 4  
 πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπὸ καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματός  
 ὑβρανοῦ ἁγίου

The doctrine of the gift of the Spirit is too common in the Pauline Literature to make it necessary for us to suppose that there is here any literary connection.

(4) I Pt. 1 ; 14 Acts 17 ; 30  
 ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν τοῖς οὖν χρόνοις τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑ-  
 ἐπιθυμίας περιδὸν ὁ Θεός . .

It seems significant that ἀγνοία occurs in " Paul's speech." Thought resembling this is also to be found in another one of Paul's speeches, i. e. Acts 14 ; 16. These passages suggest acquaintance, yet our Epistle more probably depends upon Rom. 3 ; 25, while Acts 17 ; 30 comes from the " ἱμεῖς document," which is obviously older than I Peter. Literary dependence, therefore, cannot be claimed for these passages.

(5) I Pt. 1 ; 17 Acts 10 ; 34  
 πατέρη . . . τὸν ἀπροσωπολήϊμπ- οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήϊπις ὁ θεός  
 τως . . .

That God is no respecter of persons is a common doctrine, both in the N. T. and contemporary literature. Neither of the above words expressing this idea is to be found elsewhere in the N. T. Paul uses *προσωπολήϊπις* in Rom. 2 ; 11, Eph. 6 ; 9 and Col. 3 ; 25. Rom. 2 ; 11 alludes, as in I Peter, to the impartial judgment of God ; an idea which is not on the surface in Acts 10 ; 34. The story of Peter's visit with Cornelius in Acts 10 makes Peter the Apostle to the Gentiles very early in his ministerial career, whereas we are told in Gal. 2 that this vision of a world wide mission came later : through the mediation of Paul. Consequently we are certain that Pauline influence is not wanting here in Acts 10 ; 34. There is, therefore, no literary relation between the members of this parallel.

- (6) I Pt. 1 ; 18, 19 Acts 20 ; 28  
 ἔλυτρώθητε . . . τιμίῳ ἀίματι . . . τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἣν περιποιήσατο  
 Χριστοῦ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου

Since, as we have seen elsewhere, I Pt. 1 ; 18, 19 quite certainly depends upon Paul (cf. Eph. 1 ; 7, Col. 1 ; 14, I Cor. 6 ; 20, 7 ; 23, Gal. 3 ; 13), and since the account in Acts comes from a document which antedates I Peter, we cannot suppose that there is any literary connection here.

- (7) I Pt. 1 ; 21 Acts 2 ; 32  
 Θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός, . . . τῇ δεξιᾷ οὗν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψωθείς . . .

There is here a close resemblance. The doctrine of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ is too common, however, to permit us to use this parallel as an argument for dependence. Cf. Acts 2 ; 32, 3 ; 15, 4 ; 10, 40 ; 40, 13 ; 30, 34, 17 ; 31, Rom. 4 ; 24, 8 ; 11, I Cor. 6 ; 14, 15 ; 15, II Cor. 4 ; 14, Gal. 1 ; 1, Eph. 1 ; 20, Col. 2 ; 12, I Thes. 1 ; 10, etc.

- (8) I Pt. 1 ; 22 b Acts 15 ; 9  
 τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἠγωνίσσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει καθαρίσαι τὰς καρδίας ὑπακούει τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπὸ τῶν

The reference in Acts is a clear allusion to the doctrine of "Justification by Faith," so common with Paul, whereas the citation in I Peter shows progress in the Johannine direction ; cf. Jn. 14 ; 15, 21, 23, 15 ; 7, 10, I Jn. 2 ; 5, 5 ; 3, etc.

- (9) I Pt. 2 ; 7 Acts 4 ; 11  
 λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες αὐτὸς ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας ὁ λίθος ὃς ἐξουθενήθη εἰς ὑψῆος ὑμῶν τῶν οἰκοδόμων, ὃ γενόμενος εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας

Ps. 118 ; 22 was, during the early history of the church, a favorite proof text for the Messiahship of Jesus. Mark 12 ; 10, followed by Matthew and Luke, records it as having been quoted by Jesus with reference to himself. It is significant that the text in Mark is exactly the same as that used by our author, whereas the text used in the "speech in Acts," which purports to be Peter's, has important variations. Assuming the historicity of Acts 4 ; 11, tradition, which tells us that Mark drew from Peter, would in that case lead us to

expect closer resemblance between Mark and Acts than between Mark and I Peter, since we are quite certain that the latter depends upon Rom. 9 ; 33 and Eph. 2 ; 20—22. Granting that Jesus did allude to this Psalm, there would be no reason for us to suppose that there is any literary relation between Acts and I Peter, nor need we think that they are derived from a common source, unless Paul, upon whom I Peter surely depends, gained his information from Peter, which he would seem in Gal. 1 ; 11 f. to repudiate.

- (10) I Pt. 2 ; 9 Acts 20 ; 28  
 λαλῶς εἰς περιποίησιν ἐκκλησίαν . . . περιποιησάτο  
 Connection here is very doubtful.

- (11) I Pt. 2 ; 9 b Acts 26 ; 18  
 τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ἡμῶν καλέσαντος, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς  
 εἰς τὸ ἕκρυπτον ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτός· φῶς  
 The Pauline source is too obvious here to require comment. Cf. Eph. 5 ; 8, Col. 1 ; 13, I Thes. 5 ; 4, etc.

- (12) I Pt. 2 ; 12 Acts 24 ; 5  
 τὴν ἀναστρέψην ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς λοιμὸν καὶ κινῶντα στάσεις πᾶσι  
 ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν, ἕνα. ἐν ᾧ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν  
 κατακλιθεῖσιν ἡμῶν ὡς κωκυτοῖν. οὐκουμένην  
 Cf. 3 ; 16.

Apparently there is here no direct connection.

- (13) I Pt. 3 ; 8 Acts 4 ; 32  
 τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ἡμῶρονες ἦν καρδίᾳ καὶ ψυχῇ μία  
 Though the thought is similar the phraseology is different. Pauline influence is obvious here. Cf. Rom. 12 ; 16, 15 ; 5, 6, II Cor. 13 ; 11, Phil. 1 ; 27, 2 ; 2, 3 ; 16.

- (14) I Pt. 3 ; 22 Acts 10 ; 36  
 πορευθεὶς εἰς θύραν ὑποταγέντων οὗτος (I. N.) ἔστων πάντων Κύριος  
 ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ ἔθνεσιν καὶ  
 δυνάμεων

For closer parallels see Eph. 1 ; 20—22, Col. 1 ; 16 f., 2 ; 15, I Cor. 15 ; 24 f.

- (15) I Pt. 4 ; 1 Acts 17 ; 3  
 Χριστοῦ οὗν παύοντος σαρκί . . . ὅτι τὸν χριστὸν ἔδει ταυθεῖν  
 This thought is too common to show dependence.

- (16) I Pt. 4; 3 Acts 14; 16  
 ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρό- τις ἐν ταῖς παρωχημέναις γενεαῖς  
 νος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατερι- εἶασεν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πορεύεσθαι  
 γάσθαι, πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελ- ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν. Cf. 15; 20,  
 γείαις . . . 17; 30.

Again the Pauline influence is obvious. Cf. Rom. 3; 25, Eph. 2; 2, 4; 17, Col. 1; 21, 3; 7, I Thes. 4; 5. See also Ex. 3 above.

- (17) I Pt. 4; 4 Acts 13; 45  
 βλασφημοῦντες λαλοῦμένοις βλασφημοῦντες
- (18) I Pt. 4; 5 Acts 10; 42  
 τοῦ ἐτοιμίως κρίνοντι ζῶντας καὶ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ  
 νεκρούς Θεοῦ κριτῆς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν

This parallel affords no real evidence either for literary dependence or for a common Petrine source. A common Pauline source seems more apparent. Cf. Acts 17; 31, Rom. 2; 16, 14; 10, 12, II Cor. 5; 10, II Tim. 4; 1. It is important to note that Acts 17; 31 comes from a much better source than Acts 10; 42.

- (19) I Pt. 4; 14 Acts 5; 41  
 εἰ θνειδίξεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες  
 μακάριοι (16) εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός, ἀπὸ . . . ὅτι κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ  
 μὴ ἀισχυνέσθω, δοξάζέτω δὲ τὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀτιμασθήναι  
 Θεόν ἐν τοῦ ὀνόματι τούτῳ

"Suffering for the name" in Acts 5; 41 is obviously an anachronism. It is more natural to suppose that this phrase comes from a time at least as late as I Peter. The resemblance in the above parallel seems to be accounted for sufficiently well by the assumption that these passages have a common background. Though the conditions are different, Paul has much to suggest these citations. Cf. Rom. 5; 3, Eph. 3; 13, II Cor. 12; 10, Phil. 2; 17. See also Jas. 1; 2, 12, which was probably written soon after I Peter. Dependence upon the apostle Peter is very improbable at this point.

- (20) I Pt. 5; 2 Acts 20; 28  
 ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποιμνιον τοῦ προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τοῦ  
 Θεοῦ. (ἐπισκοποῦντες) μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς . . . ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ  
 ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν  
 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν

This parallel is very close. Though this "charge" may not come directly from Paul, his influence upon this section of Acts

is obvious and in all probability he prepared the way for the suggestion in our Epistle, which the author of the Appendix to the Fourth Gospel wove into an anecdote. Mk. 14 ; 27 may bear some relation to these passages. Cf. also I Pt. 2 ; 25.

(21) I Pt. 5; 9

Acts 14; 22

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>ὃ ἀντίστητε στρεψάλοι τῆς πίστεως, εἰδότες τὰ ἀνὰ τῶν παθρημάτων τῆς ἐν τῷ κρίσῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητος ἐπιτελεῖσθαι</p> | <p>παρκακλῶντες ἐμμένειν τῆς πίστεως καὶ ὅτι διὰ πολλῶν θλίψεων δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ</p> |
|---|---|

In both members of this very suggestive parallel, to which Holtzmann calls our attention, reference is made both to continuing in the faith, and to the afflictions that are rife. Though the backgrounds are different, both passages show Pauline influence. Cf. Rom. 8 ; 17, Eph. 6 ; 11, I Thes. 3 ; 3, II Tim. 2 ; 11, 12, 3 ; 12, etc. It appears that there is no direct literary connection here.

(22) I Pt. 5; 12

Acts 20; 24 b

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>ἐπιμαρτυρῶν τὰύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ διὰ μαρτυρίας τοῦ Θεοῦ</p> | <p>διὰ μαρτυρίας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ</p> |
|--|--|

The Pauline influence is too obvious here to require comment. I Cor. 15 ; 1 b not only has close resemblance in thought to the above parallel but also contains the phrase "wherein ye stand," which appears in I Pt. 5 ; 12b.

Acts 3 ; 13, 26, 4 ; 27, 30 and I Pt. 2 ; 21 f. allude to the *עַבְדֵי יְהוָה* of II Isaiah. The title *παῖς* is rarely applied to Christ. It is important to note that the death of the "suffering servant" in the early chapters of Acts has no atoning significance as in our Epistle. Though our author never uses the title *παῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ* he employs the doctrine of the "suffering servant" in its most developed form. I Peter does not rest upon Paul here, as the latter rarely alludes to this Isaianic teaching. Nor do these passages in Acts depend upon I Peter, for the theology of the former is quite primitive. Neither can we be certain that there is a common source back of the scriptures in question, inasmuch as the "servant" is alluded to so differently.

### Conclusion.

Of the twenty-two parallels just cited, but eight are in the Petrine portion of Acts, and in almost every instance equally close thought is to be found in the Pauline Epistles. Of course, the fourteen

parallels in the non-Petrine portion of Acts all show strong Pauline influence. Our study has revealed many suggestive points of contact between Acts and I Peter, yet they are not such as to justify the conclusion that one author knew the work of the other. If there is any dependence it would seem that "Luke" is the borrower. It is generally agreed that Luke, the author of the "we document," was a disciple of Paul. Our author also appears to have been a student of Paul. Consequently these authors would naturally have similar thoughts and forms of expression and still be independent of each other. The resemblances between I Peter and Acts 1-12 are due, it would seem, not to a common Petrine source, but (1) to the dependence of our author upon the Pauline Epistles and (2) to the influence of Paul upon the author of Acts. That is to say, the common source is Pauline rather than Petrine.

## JAMES

A\*

b

(1) I Pt. 1; 6, 7

Jas. 1; 2, 3

ἐν ᾧ ἀγλάλιᾶσθε, ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ  
δέον λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πει-  
ρασμαῖς (7) ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν  
τῆς πίστεως

πάσαν χαρὰν ἠγάσασθε . . . ὅταν  
πειρασμαῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις (3)  
γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν  
τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεταιται

Nearly all commentators have recognized a dependence between these two passages. Mayor says: "it is proven beyond all doubt by the recurrence in both phrases *ποικίλοις πειρασμαῖς* and *τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως* with its usual order of words. Assuming then, as we must, that one copied from the other, we find the trial of faith illustrated in I Peter (as in Ps. 66; 10, Prov. 17; 3, Job 23; 10, Zech. 13; 9, Mal. 3; 3) by the trying of the precious metals in the fire; we find also the addition, *ὀλίγον ἄρτι, εἰ δέον, λυπηθέντες*, which looks as if it were intended to soften down the uncompromising Stoicism of St. James' *πάσαν χαρὰν ἠγάσασθε*". (Com. on Jas. p. xcvi.) That there is here a case of dependence, practically all agree, yet the order of dependence many question. *Πειρασμαῖς ποικίλοις* seems somewhat weak prior to the Neronian persecution, which is assumed in the argument, inasmuch as it refers in I Peter to "trials and persecutions of the Christians". (For *πειρασμαῖς* see any Gk. Lex. Cf. also Cone's com. p. 273; Schmidt and Holzendorf Com. III, p. 158; etc.)



Against the argument that the longer form in I Peter is a proof of its priority may be advanced the general consensus of even conservative opinion regarding the alleged dependence of Romans and Ephesians on I Peter. Cf. Sanday's Com. on Rom. p. lxxvf. Many of the "illustrations of I Peter," no doubt, were originally from the O. T., but they do not appear to have been dragged in unnaturally. They have been called out by a concrete situation, whereas the passage in James is lacking not only in local coloring but also in clearness of purpose. The phrase alluded to above may be "a softening down of James' harder expression," but as a matter of fact the tendency was towards an increase in the fanaticism for suffering as we approach the second Century. Cf. Acts 5 ; 41 and the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans.

Again, in I Peter, the successful endurance of the present trial has an important bearing on the condition of the Christians at the imminent "parousia," a most vital and burning issue, whereas in James it is advanced merely as a motive for "patience." Jas. I ; 2 has nothing to recommend its priority in this context. On the other hand I Pt. 1 ; 6 is the continuation of a line of thought begun in the preceding verses, i. e., (3) God has begotten the believers to a lively hope (4) of an inheritance reserved for those (5) who are kept through faith unto salvation, (6) in which thought they may find comfort in the present persecutions (7) which will turn out to their good in the approaching parousia.

In view of the foregoing considerations the position of Mayor and Monnier seems untenable. The probabilities are in favor of the dependence of James on I Peter, at this point.

(2)

I Pt. 1 ; 23

Jas. 1 ; 18

ἀναγεγεννημένοι . . . διὰ λόγου

βουληθεῖς ἀπεκνήσεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ  
ἀληθείας

The "birth" here is accomplished "by the word of God," or "of truth." Mayor thinks that ; "I Peter expanded the simpler thought of James" (p. xcvi), to which Monnier adds : "d'une façon oratoire" (p. 269). Yet the ἀναγεγεννημένοι of 1 ; 23 refers back to the ἀναγεννίσαις of 1 ; 3 which shows close sequence of thought. Some have felt a difficulty here in finding a logical connection of Jas. 1 ; 18 to its context. (See note on Ex. 11.) Ἀπικνέω is peculiar to James, being found only in 1 ; 15, 18, while ἀναγεννάω occurs only in I Pt. 1 ; 3, 23. The closeness of thought and phraseology make dependence probable. The priority seems also to belong to I Peter.

- (3) I Pt. 1; 23, 24 Jas. 1; 10, 11
- δι' ὅτι πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς γόρτος καὶ ὡς ἄνθος γόρτου παρελεύσεται  
 πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς, ὡς ἄνθος γόρ- ἀνέτειλεν γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος . . . καὶ  
 του· ἐξήρανθη ὁ γόρτος καὶ τὸ ἐξήρανε τὸν γόρτον καὶ τὸ ἄνθος  
 ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν, τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα κυρίου αὐτοῦ ἐξέπεσεν  
 μένει

Professor Bacon thinks that ; “the thought here is reproduced from I Peter.” He also maintains that James is the borrower in Ex. 2. (Com. on Gal. p. 8 n.) The language of James shows a close relation to Ps. 90 ; 6, 103 ; 15, Job 14 ; 2 and Isa. 40 ; 6-8, but it is more closely related to the last. Dependence here is made very probable by the next parallel.

- (4) I Pt. 2; 1 Jas. 1; 21
- ἀποσόμενοι σὺν πᾶσιν κακίαις καὶ διὸ ἀποσόμενοι πᾶσιν ρυπαρίαις  
 πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑπόκρισιν καὶ καὶ περισσεύειν κακίας ἐν πρᾶότητι  
 ὑβρόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλιὰς. δέξασθε τὸν ἔμπροσθεν λόγον τὸν  
 ὡς ἀρτιγέννητη βρέφη τὸ λογί- δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχάς. Cf. 3;  
 κὸν . . . γάλα ἐπιποθύσατε ἵνα ἐν 14, 17 and 4 ; 11.  
 αὐτῷ ἀξήνητε εἰς σωτηρίαν (re-  
 sumes 1 ; 13). Cf. 3 ; 21 σαρκεῶς  
 ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου

The identical use of the introductory participles is striking. The wording and general plan are also very similar. That I Pt. 2 ; 1 is preceded by a possible reference to James is significant, as well as the fact that 2 ; 2 finds a parallel in the “new born babes” to the “new birth” of Jas. 1 ; 18, which is in a close context. Monnier compares the “Word of Truth” which saves our souls (Jas. 1 ; 21) to “le lait λογικόν par lequel on grandit en vue du salut.” I Pt. 2 ; 2 (Com. p. 269). I Pt. 2 ; 1 is an exhortation based upon 1 ; 23a. If Jas. 1 ; 21 is in any way connected with the preceding context, it too must go back a few verses, i. e. to 1 ; 18. Obviously the connection is better in I Peter. That this similar exhortation follows three verses below the common reference to the “new birth,” makes a strong case for dependence. I Peter also employs the “Word” in 2 ; 2, which James used in the foregoing connection.

- (5) I Pt. 4; 8 Prov. 10; 12 Jas. 5; 12, 20
- πρὸ πάντων τῆν εἰς LXX πάντας τοὺς μὴ ψίλο- πρὸ πάντων μὴ ἁμνώ-  
 εἶαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτε- νεικουσὺντας καλύπτει. Heb. εἶτε (20) γινώσκατε ὅτι

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>νή ἔχοντες, ὅτι ἀγάπη<br/>καλύπτει πληθύνος ἀμαρ-<br/>τιῶν</p> | <p>הַאֲהָבָה הַרְבֵּיבָה<br/>מְכַסֶּת עֲוֹנוֹת רַבִּים</p> | <p>ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἀμαρτω-<br/>λὸν . . . καλύψει πληθύν-<br/>τος ἀμαρτιῶν</p> |
|---|--|--|

Monnier thinks that the thought of James is the more primitive, and that the citation in I Peter is of a homiletical character (Com. p. 270—271). Others take it to be a “ proverbial expression not appropriately employed by James.” (Cf. Cone’s Com. p. 295.) Mayor says : “ James makes use of a familiar phrase without regard to the bearing of the context, applying it to the conversion of the erring, while St. Peter keeps the original application ” (Com. p. xcix). With this we agree, but on this basis, we are inclined, with Bigg (Com. p. 173), to turn Mayor’s argument against himself and infer the priority of I Peter. If our author “ keeps the original application,” James cannot have influenced him to any appreciable extent. Bigg gives the following summary of the argument : “ If there is any connection here between St. James and St. Peter, it is clear that the former is the borrower, for the connection of his phrase with verse of Proverbs can only be made clear by taking the phrase of the latter as a help. If St. Peter had not first written ἀγάπη καλύπτει πληθύνος ἀμαρτιῶν, St. James never could have said that he who converteth a sinner καλύψει πληθύνος ἀμαρτιῶν.” (For more complete discussion see Mayor p. 170 f., and Bigg p. 173.) From the above parallels it is obvious that these N. T. authors do not follow either the LXX or the original Hebrew as we now know them. The verbal agreement, therefore, is best explained on the basis of literary dependence, and reasons have not been wanting to give to I Peter the priority.

- |   |                   |  |
|---|-------------------|--|
| <p>(6) I Pt. 5; 4<br/>κοιμισθε τον ἀμαρταντων τῆς<br/>δύξις στέφανον</p>                                    | <p>Jas. 1; 12</p> | <p>λήθεται τον στέφανον τῆς<br/>ζωῆς</p>                               |
| <p>(7) I Pt. 5; 5<br/>ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσειται.<br/>ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσι χάριν</p>                   | <p>Jas. 4; 6</p>  | <p>ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσειται,<br/>ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσι χάριν</p> |
| <p>(8) I Pt. 5; 6<br/>ταπεινώθητε ὡν ὑπὸ τῆς κριτικῆς<br/>χρῆρα τοῦ Θεοῦ. ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψώσῃ<br/>ἐν κληροῖ</p> | <p>Jas. 4; 10</p> | <p>ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου,<br/>καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμεῖς</p>            |

- (9) I Pt. 5; 8 Jas. 4; 7 b  
 ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβηλος . . . ἀντίσταντε τῷ διαβήλῳ καὶ φεου-  
 9) ὃ ἀντίσταντε στερροὶ τῆ πίστει ζεταὶ ἀφ' ὑμῶν

Dependence is indisputable in parallels 6—9. The phrasing and general structure are remarkably alike. The sequence cannot well be considered accidental. Following the quotation in both cases is the exhortation to submission to God with the view of exaltation, which will follow after resisting the devil. Ex. 9. The evidence of Ex. 20 should also be considered here. These quotations are too constant and too close to permit a doubt of dependence.

The importance of these parallels justifies us in quoting somewhat at length from Bigg (p. 191) where the priority of our Epistle is defended in a convincing way. "Reasons why we should assign the priority to I Peter: (1) in James the mention of humility is sudden and unexpected; (2) though he gives the quotation from Prov. 3; 34 in the same shape as I Peter, he writes, in ver. 10, *καπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου*, as if he were aware that ὁ Θεός was not quite correct: we may infer perhaps that he had somewhere seen the quotation in its altered shape; (3) the mention of the devil in I Peter is not only more natural but more original; (4) in ver. 8, St. James has *ἀγνώσκατε τὰς κερδίνας*, which may be suggested by *τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες* of I Pt. 1; 22: if this is so, St. James is combining different parts of the Petrine Epistle."

- (10) I Pt. 1; 1 Jas. 1; 1  
 ἐκλεκτοὶς παρεπιδήμοις διασποράς ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῆ  
 διασπορά

This leads one to infer literary dependence. Our Epistle addresses people of a definite location while James refers to the Diaspora in general. Mayor argues that the definiteness of I Peter is an unconscious enlargement of the general address of Jas. 1; 1, but others see in it an evidence of originality. Ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς cannot be very early if it refers to the children of Abraham by faith, rather than by birth, which the body of the Epistle requires. Many scholars believe that James bears a literary relation to Romans. If this were not so the *διασπορά* might be understood to refer to the Jews as such—assuming an early date—but if James depends upon Romans the *διασπορά* must refer to the faithful regardless of race. That the author had the latter class in mind is evident from the con-

text. Cf. ver. 18. The distorting effect that a theory of date may have an interpretation is illustrated by Mayor, not only when he makes "James" address "the Jews of the Eastern Dispersion," but also when he says; "St. Peter addresses the Jews of Asia Minor". (Com. on Jas. p. xcvi.)

- (11) I Pt. 1; 3 Jas. 1; 18

ὁ κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτοῦ εἰσεῖς ἀνα- βουλήθειε ἀπεκύρυσεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ  
γεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζωῶν ἀληθείας

The reference to the "new birth" comes in more naturally in I Peter than in James. It is difficult to see any connection with the context in the latter, unless it be preparatory to the following exhortation. (Cf. Cone p. 277.) Since there is nothing in the preceding context to suggest it, the probabilities are that the borrowing is on the part of James.

- (12) I Pt. 1; 3 Jas. 1; 27, 2; 5

εἰς κληρονομίαν ἁφθαρτον καὶ θρησκεία καθαρά καὶ ἀμίαντος . .  
ἀμίαντον κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας

Ἀμίαντος occurs in the N.T. only here and in Heb. 7; 26; and 13; 4. Dependence here is made probable by the possible points of contact in the immediate context of James. Cf. parallels 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 24 and 30.

- (13) I Pt. 1; 12 Jas. 1; 25

εἰς ἃ ἐπιβουλεύουσιν ἄγγελοι παρα- ὁ δὲ παρακλύψας εἰς νόμον τέλειον  
κλύψαι τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας

Παρακλύπτω is a rare word in the N. T., being found elsewhere only in Lk. 24; 12 and Jn. 20; 5, 11. It is used in the perceptual sense in the latter references, whereas it is employed in the conceptual sense in the above parallel. The context in James is suggestive of I Peter. Dependence here seems quite probable.

- (14) I Pt. 1; 17 Jas. 2; 1

τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα μὴ ἐν προσωποληψίαις . . .

Προσωποληψία is found also in Rom. 2; 11, 3; 25, 6; 9, and may suggest dependence of James upon Paul. The verbal form appears only in Jas. 2; 9. Προσωπολήπτως occurs in "Peter's speech" in Acts 10; 34. "A" privative is employed with this word only by our author. It appears then that Paul is the source for I Peter. The usage in I Peter is more in favor of its priority than in James.

I Peter employs it in a chain of thought whereas James uses it, as if suggested by another, to introduce an exhortation quite foreign to the previous context. This parallel is made more significant by Exs. 12, 24 and 30.

- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| (15) | I Pt. 2; 11   | Jas. 4; 1   |
|      | <p>παρκαλῶ . . . ἀπέγεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες σφρατίζονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς</p> | <p>πέθειν πόλεμον . . . οὐκ ἐντεθῆεν ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν τῶν σφρατίζμένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν</p> |

Obviously these passages are closely related. I Peter depends very probably upon Paul (cf. Rom. 5; 17, Gal. 5; 17, etc.), rather than upon James, inasmuch as the influence of Romans is apparent all through this section. The verse contains nothing that cannot be duplicated in the Pauline Literature. Jas. 4; 1b agrees with I Pt. 2; 11 in making the warfare internal in accordance with Paul's doctrine of the "σάρξ against the πνεῦμα." But the preceding and succeeding contexts lead one to think "James" alludes to social disturbances. If so μέλεσιν should refer to "persons", but this is wresting the word out of its most obvious meaning. The phrase 4; 1b, therefore, seems to be borrowed.

- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| (16) | I Pt. 2; 12   | Jas. 3; 13  |
|      | <p>τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν . . . ἔργοντες καλῶς ἕνα . . . ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάζουσι τὸν Θεόν. Cf. 3; 2 τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνήν ἀναστροφὴν, 16. τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ</p> | <p>δειξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν πραύτητι σοφίας</p> |

The sequence of thought is better in I Peter. A difficulty is felt in the attempt to bring the verse in James into connection with the idea implied in the analogies of the foundation, etc. (Cf. Cone's Com. p. 286.) This author says: "the connection, if any, is strained." The writer begins here a new theme of the "Meekness of Wisdom," whereas in I Peter the verse is a continuation of the thought begun in the foregoing context. If I Peter shows dependence at this point it is upon Paul. Cf. ver. 11.

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| (17) | I Pt. 2; 15                                      | Jas. 1; 25, 2; 12                        |
|      | <p>ὡς ἐλευθεροῦσαι . . . ἀλλ' ὡς Θεοῦ δοῦλοι</p> | <p>νόμος ἐλευθερίας 1; 1 Θεοῦ δοῦλος</p> |

This is a close parallel on the Pauline basis. Cf. Gal. 2; 4, 5; 1, 13, etc. We have seen in another connection that this section of

I Peter depends upon Romans, hence, if there is dependence here between James and I Peter it must be on the part of the former. This parallel is made more significant by Exs. 4, 6 and 20.

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| (18) | I Pt. 2; 20, 21  | Jas. 5; 10, 11   |
|      | εἰ ἀγαθόποισοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομεινέτε. τοῦτο γάρτι πάρα Θεῷ εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε. ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἑπαύεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. ἡμῶν ὑπομιμνήσκων ὑπογραμμῶν | ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε τῆς κακοπαθείας καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας τοῦ προσήταξ . . . ἰδοὺ μακαρίζομεν τοὺς ὑπομιμνήσκων. Cf. I; 12. |

Patient endurance in suffering is at a premium in both cases, though they appeal to different examples. The appeal of James to the O. T. worthies does not show the Christian trait as distinctly as I Peter in its appeal to Christ, nor is it in accord with Jas. 1; 1. Ἀγαθόποισοῦντες of Peter is in accord with "James' polemic" against the misunderstanding either of Paul's doctrine of "Justification by Faith," or of Hebrews II.

- |      |   |            |
|------|---|------------|
| (19) | I Pt 3; 10  | Jas. 1; 26 |
|      | πανσάτω τῶν γλωσσῶν ἀπὸ κακοῦ μὴ χαλινωθῶντων γλωσσῶν ἀποστοῦ |            |

Here is a close parallel in thought. I Peter probably quoted 3; 9 a from Prov. 17; 13 at Paul's suggestion. Cf. Rom. 12; 14, 17, I Thes. 5; 15. On the basis of Mayor's criterion, the brevity of James here indicates its priority, but against this is Jas. 3, which is more explicable as a discourse preached on the text of I Peter against the growing zeal to become teachers. Cf. I Cor. 14; 16—22.

- |      |                      |                               |
|------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| (20) | I Pt. 4; 5           | Jas. 5; 9                     |
|      | τῷ ἐπιμῶσι κρίνονται | ὁ κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν ὑμῶν ἔστηκεν |

The thought is too common during the early period to be decisive, yet the general trend of the contexts is quite alike in both cases.

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| (21) | I Pt. 4; 7                               | Jas. 5; 8  |
|      | πάντων τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν σωζομένησατε οὖν | στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὅτι ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Κυρίου ἤγγικεν. v. 3 ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις |

This parallel is made more significant by Exs. 20 and 22.

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| (22) | I Pt. 5; 10  | Jas. 5; 8                                      |
|      | ὁ Θεὸς . . . δόξῃσον παύσονταις ἀποστοῦ . . . στηρίξει | μακροθυμήσατε καὶ ἡμεῖς, στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας |

Note the sequence in parallels 20—22.

## d

- (23) I Pt. 1; 1 Jas. 1; 1  
 Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰάκωβος, Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ  
 Χριστοῦ δοῦλος

On the supposition that the author of "James" was an apostle it is significant to note that *δοῦλος* is used instead of *ἀπόστολος*. *Δοῦλος* Paul uses, in Phil. 1; 1, for an apostles associate. In the salutations of five of Paul's epistles he alludes to himself as an *ἀπόστολος*, also in two of the Pastoral epistles. Only Titus and Romans employ *δοῦλος* in this connection, which may be used as a datum for the dependence of James upon Romans. Or on the supposition that the author is the Lord's brother one would expect to find *ἀδελφός*. Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου are important additions.

- (24) I Pt. 1; 19 Jas. 1; 27. 5; 7  
 τῆμῳ αἵματι ὡς ἄμῳ ἁμώμου ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ  
 καὶ ἄσπιλου κόσμου. 5; 7 τῆμῳ κακῶν
- (25) I Pt. 1; 22 Jas. 4; 8  
 τὰς ψυχὰς ἡγνικότες ἡγνίσατε καρδίαις
- (26) I Pt. 1; 22 Jas. 1; 18  
 ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας λόγῳ ἀληθείας

When taken separately these three parallels need not detain us.

- (27) I Pt. 2; 18, 3; 1 Jas. 4; 7  
 ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς δεσπόταις. ὑπο- ὑποτάγητε τῷ Θεῷ  
 τασσόμενοι τοῖς ἀνδράσιν. τὸν Θεὸν ὑποβείθε. 2; 17.

See Ex. 8 for a closer parallel.

- (28) I Pt. 2; 25 Jas. 5; 19  
 πλανώμενοι ἐπεστράφητε ἔάν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ . . . καὶ  
 ἐπιστρέφῃ τις αὐτὸν

Suggestive but not conclusive.

- (29) I Pt. 3; 15 Jas. 1; 21  
 μετὰ παύτητος. Cf. v. 4. ἐν παύτητι

Probably accidental.



(30) I Pt. 4; 14 Jas. 2; 1  
 τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ  
 πνεύματι Κυρίου ἡμῶν. τῆς δόξης

This furnishes no argument either for or against dependence.

(31) I Pt. 4; 16 Jas. 2; 7  
 εἰ ὡς γριστιανός (πάσχει) . . . τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθῆν ἐξ  
 δόξης ἐστὼ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι ἡμῶν  
 τούτῳ

While this is suggestive the background is different.

### Conclusion

J. P. Mayor says : " I think no unprejudiced reader can doubt the resemblances between the Epistle of St. James and the Epistle of St. Peter. The recurrence in them of the same words and phrases and their common quotations from the O. T. are such as to prove conclusively that the one borrowed from the other. Nor can there be much doubt as to which of the two was the borrower if we observe how in almost every case, the common thought finds fuller expression in St. Peter." (Epis. of St. Jas. p. xcvi.) So Zahn says : " it is plain that the author of I Peter was well acquainted with James and had read the letter reflectively." (Int. I, p. 134.) Salmon thinks that " the proofs of the use by Peter of the Epistle of James are decisive." (Int. p. 556.) Falconer maintains that " there is a close relation between the Epistles, but the order of priority can be determined only on the basis of the date of James." (H. B. D. p. 716.)

That these Epistles are in some way directly related, critics of all schools are agreed, but as to the order of priority they differ widely. Luther long ago contended for the priority of I Peter. He has been followed by an illustrious line of scholars, e. g. W. Brückner (S. 35), Hausrath (IV, S. 253), Hilgenfeld (S. 638), Holtzmann (Einl. S. 315, 336), von Soden (H.C., III 2; 2, S. 2 f., 110), Pfeiderer (S. 417, 424, 427), Knopf (N. Z. S. 34), Bacon (Int. p. 160), Bigg (p. 23), Cone (E. B., Com. p. 269).

Jülicher contends that : " James has considerable literature behind it not only O. T. Apocrypha, but Christian writings also : Paul, Hebrews, I Peter and the Gospels. The points of resemblance, too, between it and the First Epistle of Clement are so many and so striking that it is impossible to explain them satisfactorily

except by supposing our author to have been acquainted with that Epistle. James shares its fundamental ideas with those of the Shepherd of Hermas, and even in expression it often approaches the latter remarkably closely." (Int. p. 224.)

Were we to grant the truth of Mayor's assertion—which is not supported by the facts—that "the common thought finds fuller expression in I Peter," it would still afford no conclusive argument for the priority of James. Cf. the relation of I Peter to Ephesians and Romans. What is much more conclusive is the naturalness with which the citations in question occur in their respective contexts. It has been noted at various points in the above study that the contextual connection is much better in I Peter and not unfrequently does it appear that the thought of James has been introduced at the suggestion of another. The priority of our Epistle seems evident in no less than half of the parallels, e. g. 1-9, 11, 14-17, 19. Apparently therefore those are correct who claim James depends directly upon the First Epistle of Peter.

## JUDE

D

d

|     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| (1) | I Pt. 1; 1, 5  | Jude 1  |
|     | ἐκλεκτοῖς . . . ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύ-<br>ματος ὃ (τετηρημένοι) ὑποσπου-<br>μένους διὰ πίστεως . . . | τοῖς ἐν (θεῷ) πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις . . .<br>τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς |

The occurrence of the doctrines of the believers' election, sanctification and security in such close contextual connection makes dependence seem probable at the very outset.

|     |                                    |   |
|-----|------------------------------------|---|
| (2) | I Pt. 1; 2                         | Jude 2  |
|     | χαρίζε ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνην πληθυνθεῖν | ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη<br>πληθυνθεῖν |

Jude reproduces the phraseology of our Epistle more perfectly at this point than any other N. T. writing, excepting II Pt. 1; 2, which was borrowed either from Jude or from I Peter. II Peter has the exact form found in I Peter, but it is a recasting of Jude by a student of I Peter, hence the priority must be given to our Epistle. The direct sequence of this close parallel with the one preceding it leads

us to infer dependence. Yet the superscriptions Jas. 1 ; 1 and Jude 1—2 are peculiarly open to the suspicion of adjustment and assimilation in the process of formation of the canon.

- (3) I Pt. 2 ; 8 Jude 4  
 . . . ἀπειθουσίν τε εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐπέ- οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο  
 θήσαν τὸ κρίμα

This parallel affords no argument for dependence. Cf. Rom. 9 ; 21, 22, I Thes. 5 ; 9, Prov. 16 ; 4, Jer. 18 ; 6 etc.

- (4) I Pt. 3 ; 19 Jude 6  
 τοῖς ἐν ψυλακῇ πνεύμασιν δεσμοῖς αἰδίους ὑπὸ ζόρον τετήρημεν

There is here no obvious connection.

The evidence afforded by the above possible points of contact is not such as to warrant the claim that one author knew the work of the other.

## REVELATION

C

c

- (1) I Pt. 1 ; 19 Rev. 1 ; 5  
 ἐλυτρώθητε . . . τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς λύσαντι ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν  
 ἁμῶν ἁμῶν καὶ ἀπίλου Χρισ- ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ὄν. 5 ; 6  
 τοῦ. 1 ; 2 βαντισμῶν αἵματος ἁγίου ἐσπηλάς ὡς ἐσπαγγμένον  
 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 5 ; 9 ἡγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵ-  
 ματί σου

The purchase was made with the blood of the lamb. (Cf. Acts 20 ; 28, I Cor. 6 ; 20, Heb. 9 ; 14.) The words used for "lamb" and for "purchase" are different, yet the ideas are the same. It can hardly be accidental that this reference to "redemption" or "washing from sin" is contextually connected with parallels 2 and 3.

- (2) I Pt. 2 ; 9 Rev. 1 ; 6  
 ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βρασ- ἐποίησεν ἡμεῖς βρασιλεῖν. ἱερεῖς τῷ  
 ἰλαίου ἱσραήτευμα, ἕθνος ἅγιον. λαός Θεῷ. 5 ; 10 τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν βρασι-  
 εἰς περιποίησιν λαῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς

Both authors may be following the original independently (i. e. Exod. 19 ; 6), yet the context in Revelation makes this very improbable.

(3) I Pt. 4; 11

Rev. 1; 6

ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς αὐτὸν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν. τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.  
Cf. 5; 11. Cf. 5; 13.

"The collocation of words is rightly considered by Hoffmann, von Soden (and Swete) to show that the doxology is addressed to Christ, as are those in II Tim. 4; 18, II Pt. 3; 18, Apoc. 1; 6." (Bigg p. 176.) But in no other instance is there verbal agreement throughout. The textual sequence and very similar phraseology in these three parallels make a strong argument for dependence.

c—d

(4) I Pt. 1; 20

Rev. 13; 8

προεγνωμένους μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς τοῦ ἁρνίου ἐσφαγμένους ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου βολῆς κόσμου

If ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου limits ἐσφαγμένους, as one would naturally understand it, we have here a closer parallel than is to be found elsewhere in the N. T. On the other hand, if, as in 17; 8, it connects with γέγραπται, the thought is not the same. Cf. Swete's "Apoc. of St. John," p. 164. As the text of Rev. 13; 8 stands it really demands a direct connection between ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου and ἐσφαγμένους. Bigg so interprets it. (Com. p. 120.) "Qui occisus est ab origine mundi," of the Textum Vaticanum, and  $\text{ܐܘܠܝܢܐ ܨܘܦܪܘܩܐ ܨܘܦܪܘܩܐ ܨܘܦܪܘܩܐ ܨܘܦܪܘܩܐ}$  of the Peshito, can only be taken as our revisers of 1881 rendered the Greek text. This parallel, therefore, is very significant, especially when taken in connection with Ex. 1.

(5) I Pt. 2; 25

Rev. 7; 17

ἤτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι τὸ ἁρνίον τὸ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ θρόνου ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμανεῖ αὐτοῦς . . . ποιμένα . . .

It is interesting to note that our author uses the word referring to Christ, which is common with later authors. Cf. Jn. 10; 2, 11, 12, 14, 16, Heb. 13; 20, etc. See John Exs. 11—12.

(6) I Pt. 4; 8

Rev. 12; 12

ὅτι ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος, ὡς ὅτι κατέβη ὁ διάβολος πρὸς ὑμᾶς λέων ὠρυόμενος, περιπατεῖ ζυγῶν ἔχων θυμὸν μέγαν, εἰδὼς ὅτι θλίγον τίνα καταπίη καιρὸν ἔχει

These passages show a common belief in the devil's activity during the fiery persecution then waging. Rome appears to be the base of his operations in the world and apart from there he is thought of as "a roaring lion going about seeking whom he may devour." I Pt. 1 ; 8. These references therefore, show similar conditions to have existed when the books were written, if, indeed, they do not show dependence.

d

(7) I Pt. 1 ; 7 Rev. 3 ; 18

χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, διὰ πυρός· χρυσίον πεπυρωμένον  
δὲ δεικνυζόμενον

Though this parallel is suggestive it is not conclusive. It only shows that the two books have a common background.

(8) I Pt 2 ; 16 Rev. 1 ; 1

δούλοι Θεοῦ δούλοις αὐτοῦ

A very common thought in the N. T.

(9) I Pt. 3 ; 10 Rev. 14 ; 5

καὶ χεῖλη τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον καὶ ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν οὐχ  
εὐρέθη δόλος. (ψεῦδος)

These passages suggest dependence, yet they may be drawn from the original directly. Cf. Ps. 34 ; 13 and 32 ; 2.

(10) I Pt. 4 ; 7 Rev. 1 ; 3

πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικε ἡ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς

This idea is very common in the N. T.

(11) I Pt. 5 ; 1 Rev. 1 ; 9

παρακαλῶ ἡ συμπεσβύτερος καὶ ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης, ἡ καὶ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν  
μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθη- καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει . . .  
μάτων διὰ . . . τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ

This similarity is probably due to the similar conditions out of which these writings were produced.

(12) I Pt. 5 ; 4 Rev. 2 ; 10

τῆς δόξης στέφανου στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς

Though suggestive, dependence here is very doubtful.

13) I Pt. 5; 13

βαβυλῶνι

Rev. 14; 8

βαβυλῶν. Cf. 16; 19, 17; 5,  
18; 2, 10; 21.

In view both of tradition and history, we need not consider any interpretation which does not identify βαβυλῶν with Rome. On this basis, which is the only tenable view, we must recognize a relation between I Peter and the Apocalypse. We cannot claim any literary relation, but that the circumstances and time of writing were closely related seems obvious. Rome was already drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. Rev. 17; 6. C. A. Scott expresses the opinion of many scholars when he makes this passage, just quoted, presuppose the Neronian persecution. (New Cent. Bib. on Rev. p. 262.) On this basis the mystical name has meaning, but to place it before the Neronian persecution, or even at the beginning, as the "traditional view" would claim for I Peter, would be to involve us in an insoluble mystery. It is clear from our Epistle that the persecutions had not made as much progress in Asia Minor as they had in Rome. Cf. Rev. 17; 6 f. The persecutions alluded to in I Peter, were a "new thing," whereas in Rome they were of some duration. It would thus appear that the Apocalypse was written soon after I Peter.

The more obvious points of contact between these writings (e. g. Exs. 1-3) can hardly be satisfactorily accounted for on the basis of a common background, yet the evidence is not such as to make dependence very probable.

## I JOHN

## B

## b—c

(1) I Pt. 1; 8

I Jn. 4; 20

ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπήσατε, εἰς ὃν ὃν ἐώρακαεν, τὸν Θεὸν ὃν οὐχ  
ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες . . . ἐώρακαεν οὐ δύναται ἀγαπήν

Dependence here is made very probable by the additional evidence of John Ex. 2.

(2) I Pt. 1; 19

I Jn. 1; 7

ἐλυτρῶσθητε (φθαρτοῦς) τιμῷ αἵματι τοῦ αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . κα-  
τι ὡς ἄνοσθ' ἀνόμους καὶ ἀπίστους θαρξίσει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀμαρτίας  
Χριστοῦ

The thought is very similar as well as the phrasing. Here Jesus' blood is thought of as "cleansing from sin," whereas in Jn. 1; 29

it is the "Lamb of God who bears the sin of the world." Our author has used these two ideas together, if indeed they may be said to be two ideas. "Redemption is through the spotless blood of the Lamb." Dependence here seems probable. Cf. also John Ex. 3.

|     |                          |  |
|-----|--------------------------|--|
| (3) | I Pt. 1; 22 a            | I Jn. 3; 3   |
|     | τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἵγινοῦσθε | καὶ παρὰ . . . ἀγνοῦσαι ἕκαστον καθὼς<br>ἐκείνος ἀγνοῖ ἕστην |

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| (4) | I Pt. 1; 22 b   | I Jn. 5; 2  |
|     | ἐν τῇ ὑποκοπῇ τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ<br>Ἡνεύματος εἰς φιλαδέλφειαν ἀνω-<br>πύκρυστον, ἐκ καθάρσεως καρδίας<br>ἀλλήλων ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενωθῆς | ἐν τοῦτου γνώσκουμεν ὅτι ἀγαπῶ-<br>μεν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ. ὅταν τὸν<br>Θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν, καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς<br>αὐτοῦ ποιῶμεν |

Parallels 3 and 4 should be considered together. Our Epistle teaches that purification is effected by obedience to truth and that it issues in brotherly love. I John sets forth obedience to the commandments as the final test of love (I Jn. 3-5). The mere suggestion "ἐν τῇ ὑποκοπῇ τῆς ἀληθείας" of I Peter is treated more extensively in I John. The author of the Fourth Gospel puts the teaching into the mouth of Jesus himself. Cf. Jn. 14; 15. 21, 23, 15; 10, 12, 14, etc. The reference to "brotherly love" of I Pt. 1; 22b (2; 17, 3; 8, 4; 8) is extensively elaborated in I John. (Cf. 2; 9, 10, 3; 10-20, 4; 7-21, 5; 1-3.) Jesus himself teaches it in John 13; 34, 35. All this seems to indicate that the Johannine literature presupposes our Epistle.

|     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| (5) | I Pt. 1; 23  | I Jn. 3; 9  |
|     | ἀναγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς<br>φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου | ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁμαρ-<br>τίαν οὐ ποιεῖ ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ<br>ἐν αὐτῷ μένει |

Σπορᾶς and σπέρμα are very significant parallels just in this connection. Obviously the expression "born of God" means the same as "born again", or from above (ἄνωθεν). Apparently I John elaborates the idea found in I Peter. (Cf. I Jn. 3; 9, 4; 7, 5; 1, 18.) This doctrine is definitely taught by Jesus himself in John 3. Note the sequence of thought in Exs. 3-5. It is also significant that there are other probable points of contact with I Peter in this context. Cf. Exs. 7 and 8. (For relationship of Jas. 1; 18 see note on John Ex. 6.)

- (6) I Pt. 2; 21 I Jn. 2; 6  
 ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσῃτε τοῖς ἔχουσιν καθὼς ἐκείνος περιεπάτησε, καὶ  
 αὐτοῦ αὐτὸς περιπατεῖν

See John Ex. 15 for a closer parallel in the fore part. Yet the περιπατεῖν of I John is more in accord with I Pt. 2; 21b than is John 13; 15. I Peter is probably the basis for Jn. 13; 15 and I Jn. 2; 6.

- (7) I Pt. 2; 22 I Jn. 3; 5 b  
 ὅς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἀμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστι

Cf. John 8; 46, Ex. 7. It is to be noted again that this doctrine is taught by Jesus himself in the Fourth Gospel.

- (8) I Pt. 2; 24 I Jn. 3; 5 a  
 ὅς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄρας. Cf. 2; 2, 4; 10.  
 τὸ ξύλον

I Jn. 4; 10 has ἰλασμός corresponding to ἰλαστήριον of Rom. 3; 25. Rom. 5; 8, 10 expresses in abstract form what is given in I Pt. 3; 18 and I Jn. 3; 16. I Pt. 2; 24 thinks of Jesus "bearing our sins in his own body," while I Jn. 3; 5 says; "he bears them away," in accordance with the testimony of John the Baptist. Cf. John Exs. 2 and 3.

- (9) I Pt. 1; 24 d I Jn. 2; 17  
 διότι πάντα σὰρξ ὡς γόρτος, καὶ καὶ ὁ κόσμος παράγεται, καὶ ἡ  
 πάντα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἀνθός γόρτου . . . δὲ ἔρχεται Κυρίου μένει εἰς ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ· δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Cf. 1; 1, 3.

There is probably no connection here.

- (10) I Pt. 4; 7 I Jn. 2; 18  
 πάντων τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἔστι

This idea is too common to trace its course down to the Johannine Literature.



II JOHN

D

I Pt. 4; 8

II Jn. 5

πρὸ πάντων τῶν εἰς ἑαυτοῦς ἀγά- ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους  
πῶν ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες

Dependence cannot be argued here, unless through the relation this parallel sustains to the other Johannine Literature. Cf. Jn. 13; 34, 15; 12, I Jn. 3; 23.

III JOHN

D

I Pt. 3; 11

III Jn. 11

ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιη- μὴ μιμοῦ τὸ κακὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθόν.  
σάτω ἀγαθόν, ζητήσάτω εἰρήνην ὃ ἀγαθοποιῶν . . .  
καὶ διωξάτω αὐτήν. ἀγαθοποιέω  
2; 15, 20, 3; 6, 17.

This parallel is quite suggestive, yet since it is the only real point of contact between these Epistles, and the reference in I Peter is a quotation from the O. T., III John can have no voice in determining the relation the Johannine Literature sustains to I Peter.

JOHN

B

b—c

(1) I Pt. 1; 3b

Jn. 3; 3

ἀναγεννήσας ἑμᾶς. Cf. 1; 23. γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν Cf. 3; 5

The idea of the "new birth" is found in the Pauline writings. Cf. I Cor. 4; 15, Gal. 4; 19, 6; 15, Tit. 3; 5. It is more clearly set forth in our Epistle. Cf. 1; 3, 23. It would seem that the author of the Fourth Gospel took up the idea as our author had developed it and incorporated it into a narrative.

(2) I Pt. 1; 8, 9

Jn. 20; 29, 31

ὅν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπήσατε, εἰς ὃν ὅτι ἐώρακάς με. [Θωμᾶ] πεπίστευ-  
ἄρτι μὴ ἑρῶντες, πιστεύοντες δὲ καὶ μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες. καὶ

ἀγαλλιᾶτε χαρᾷ ἀνεκκλήτῳ καὶ πιστεύσαντες . . . ἵνα πιστεύοντες  
 δεδουξάμεν, κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος ζωῆν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.  
 τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν Cf. 16 ; 16, 22.

The Pauline Epistles contain this thought in embryo. Cf. II Cor. 5 ; 7, I Cor. 13 ; 12, Rom. 8 ; 23, 24. This contrast of "faith and sight," to which Paul thus refers, I Peter applies to the Christians of Asia Minor in a commendatory fashion. Great joy accompanies belief in the unseen one. But in the Fourth Gospel, the blessing is because (ζῆτι) "they have not seen and yet believed." Furthermore the teaching is again found in a narrative. That there is a connection here is made very probable by the further parallel in I Pt. 1 ; 9 and Jn. 20 ; 31b. Salvation or life is here set forth as the end of faith, which refers back to the preceding parallel verse in both instances. Paul's allusions to the subject are of a general and somewhat speculative character, while the author of the Fourth Gospel weaves it into a narrative in a most concrete fashion. I Peter forms a connection which bridges the chasm. The sequence of thought and the similar phraseology make a strong argument for dependence.

(3) I Pt. 1 ; 18, 19

Jn. 1 ; 29

ἐλυτρώθητε . . . τιμῆν αἵματι ὡς ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ αἴρων τὴν  
 ἁμαρτίαν (ἁλώμενος καὶ ἀσπίλου) Ληισ- ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. Cf. 1 ; 36.  
 τοῦ. Cf. 2 ; 24.

Acts 8 ; 32 employs ἀμνός, from Isa. 53 ; 7, otherwise it does not occur in the N. T. outside this parallel. This is significant, since in all three instances it is used as an epithet of Christ. Paul nowhere speaks of the "lamb" per se, but he does speak of "Christ our passover" (I Cor. 5 ; 7), which implies what our author explicitly states in 1 ; 19. The author of the Fourth Gospel improves upon our author when he puts 1 ; 29b and 1 ; 36b into the mouth of John the Baptist. The Petrine development of Paul is again found in the form of a definite narrative. John the Baptist is made to enunciate the fully developed Pauline doctrine of the atonement, in Petrine terms. (Cf. Jn. 1 ; 29 b with I Pt. 2 ; 24.)

(4) I Pt. 1 ; 22 a

Jn. 15 ; 3

Τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνισάτε ἐν τῇ ἡδὴ ὑμεῖς καθάρσι ἐστε διὰ τὸν  
 ὑπακοῆ τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον

Purification comes in both cases through the word (truth). I Pt. 1 ; 22a probably depends upon Eph. 5 ; 26, but the parallel is much closer between I Peter and John than between Ephesians and John.

There is nothing in Jn. 13 ; 3 to suggest "cleansing by the washing of water by the word," nor is there anything in the context of Ephesians which is suggestive of Jn. 15 ; 11. It is also to be noted that Jn. 15 ; 3 seems to be somewhat unnatural in the parable ; having been suggested apparently by something already written. Since I Pt. 1 ; 22a is the closest N. T. parallel, it is reasonable to suppose John depends upon I Peter at this point. Cf. also Jn. 17 ; 17, 19 which is an essential part of the "great high-priestly prayer."

(5) I Pt. 1 ; 22 b

Jn. 13 ; 34

ἐκ καρδίας ἀλλήλων ἀγαπίσατε ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπήτε ἀλλήλους  
ἐκτενώθῃς . . . ἐὰν ἀγάπην ἔχητε ἐν ἀλλήλοις

Though this is a common exhortation, dependence is made very probable because of other probable points of contact in the immediate context of I Peter (cf. 1 ; 19, 21, 22a and 23), also because the context of John suggests I Peter (cf. 13 ; 31-32), even mentioning Peter by name, v. 36.

(6) I Pt. 1 ; 23

Jn. 1 ; 13

ἀναγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σποράς οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελή-  
σῶματός, ἀλλὰ ἀσώματος, διὰ ματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος  
λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένον- ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγγενήσασαν  
τος . . .

Attention has been called in Ex. 1 to the idea of the "new birth," but in the above parallel we are also told how it was brought about. In both instances the negative aspect precedes the positive. Our author says that "we are born not of corruptible seed," whereas "John" puts it, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man," which is clearly an expansion of the thought of I Peter. "Virtually *σπορά* and *λόγος* (of I Peter) are the same thing seen in different lights. *Λόγος* is of course not used in the sense which it ultimately reaches in St. John." (Hort's First Epistle of James," p. 93.) I Peter seems again to form a connection between the "logos" idea of Paul and the complete expression of it in John. The phrase of John, "born of God," or of the "will of God," as the case may be, is suggestive of Jas. 1 ; 18, which indeed combines the ideas of Jn. 1 ; 13 and I Pt. 1 ; 23. We have found reason elsewhere to believe that this verse in James depends upon our Epistle. I Peter understood the "new birth" to have been effected "by the word of a living and abiding God. The *λόγος* is God Himself speaking, speaking not once only but with renewed utterance, kindling life not

only by recollection but by a present power" (Hort p. 92). The tendency toward hypostatization is more marked here than in the implied *λόγος* doctrine of the Pauline Epistles. Nor does it seem to be a violation of the text to say Jas. 1 ; 18 shows a still greater tendency in this direction. That "John" was acquainted with I Peter is made very probable both by the structure and the sense of Jn. 1 ; 13a and I Pt. 1 ; 23a. The antithesis is significant, especially since it is followed by phrases similar in form and meaning. John 1 ; 14 takes up the word *λόγος* again, as if at the suggestion of another, which would come quite naturally from I Pt. 1 ; 23—25 or Jas. 1 ; 18. Hort thinks that "St. James is speaking here of the original creation of man." Granting the truth of his contention, the Epistle may still show an influence upon Jn. 1 ; 1—14. (Cf. Jn. 1 ; 3). I Pt. 1 ; 23b would have been a very suggestive text for the author who wrote Jn. 1 ; 4a, the content of which, significantly enough, is put into a discourse of Jesus (Jn. 5 ; 26). Compare I Pt. 2 ; 9b also with Jn. 1 ; 4b, which idea is also put into the mouth of Jesus (Jn. 8 ; 12. 9 ; 5, 12 ; 36, 37).

On the whole then this parallel seems to indicate that the implied "logos doctrine" of Paul was taken up in connection with the idea of the "new birth," by our author, who put it in a suggestive fashion for "James," all of which—with the possible exception of James—paved the way for the fully developed form found in the Fourth Gospel.

- |     |                          |                                      |
|-----|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (7) | I Pt. 2 ; 22             | Jn. 8 ; 46                           |
|     | ὁς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν | τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἀμαρτίας |

The doctrine of Christ's sinlessness is too common, in itself, to be certain that there is here any literary dependence. Cf. Isa. 53 ; 9, Lk. 23 ; 41, II Cor. 5 ; 21, Heb. 4 ; 15, etc. Yet the following context in both books makes dependence here very probable. Cf. Ex. 8.

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| (8) | I Pt. 2 ; 23   | Jn. 8 ; 48—50  |
|     | ὁς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδορεῖ.<br>πάσχων οὐκ ἠπεύλει | Σαμαρείτης εἶ σὺ καὶ δαυμόνιον ἔχεις (:) ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς Ἐγὼ δαυμόνιον οὐκ ἔχω, ἀλλὰ τιμῶ τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀτιμᾶτετέ με . . . |
|     | παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως                         | ἔστιν ὁ ζήτων καὶ κρίνον   |

Jn. 9 ; 48—49 gives a concrete case of what is mentioned in I Pt. 1 ; 23a. I Pt. 2 ; 23b is also parallel in 8 ; 50 by " Jesus' own " words. These close parallels in their sequence, with Ex. 7, can hardly be accidental.

- (9) I Pt. 3 ; 21 Jn. 3 ; 5, 6  
 ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίπτυσον ἄλλοι σῶξαι ἐάν μή τις γεννηθῆι ἐξ ὕδατος . . .  
 βῆπτυσμα. οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις οὐ δύνανται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βα-  
 βύπυον . . . σιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. τὸ γεννηθῆ-  
 ναι ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σὰρξ ἐστίν

This very suggestive parallel is made even more significant by the probable reference in Jn. 3 ; 7 to I Pt. 1 ; 23. Apparently I Peter depends upon Paul in this section, but it seems quite as evident that the author of the Fourth Gospel took up the Pauline thought of I Peter and developed it into a narrative. See Note on Ex. 4.

- (10) I Pt. 4 ; 11 Jn. 14 ; 13  
 ἵνα ἐν πασιν δοξάζηται ὁ Θεός ἵνα δοξασθῆι ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ ὑμῶ  
 διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

Eph. 5 ; 20 probably furnished the suggestion for our author, but clearly the parallel is closer between John and I Peter than between John and Ephesians. " The glorification of God through Christ," as alluded to in I Peter, is a common doctrine in the Fourth Gospel (13 ; 31, 17 ; 1, 4, 5, 6, etc.), and is frequently found in " speeches of Jesus." It seems probable therefore that this too is a case of natural development.

- (11) I Pt. 5 ; 2 Jn. 21 ; 15, 16 f  
 ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία μου. 16, 17 βόσκει  
 τὰ πρόβατά μου

I Peter alludes to the general oversight and succor of the church, such as an elder could have and give, quite in harmony with what is taught in Jn. 21. Ποιμάνειν is used of Christ (Mt. 2 ; 6, Rev. 2 ; 17, 7 ; 17, 12 ; 5, 19 ; 15) in the sense of " govern," and of Christian ministers (Jn. 21 ; 16, Acts 20 ; 28, I Pt. 5 ; 2, 3). Ποίμνη is used of the Christian flock, Mt. 26 ; 31, Jn. 10 ; 16 ; ποίμνιον, Lk. 12 ; 32, Acts 20 ; 28, I Pt. 5 ; 2, 3. See Bigg ad loc. Whatever view be taken of the alleged speech of Paul in Acts 20 ; 28, it shows a movement in the Johannine direction. Again the Fourth Gospel, even in its appendix, permits us to hear from the lips of Jesus himself ideas found in I Peter. This parallel is made more significant by the one following.

- (12) I Pt. 5; 4 Jn. 10; 11 f.  
 τοῦ ποιμνίου καὶ φανερωθέντος Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός  
 τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος. Cf. 2; 25.

We are certain that the Fourth Gospel depends upon Mark, hence Mk. 6; 34 may have suggested this O.T. figure (Isa. 40; 11, 53; 6, Ezek. 34; 23, 37; 24, Ps. 23, Zech. 13; 7), which "John" elaborates. What Mark only implies our author explicitly states, whereas the author of the Fourth Gospel takes up the form given in I Peter and puts it in a teaching of Jesus concerning himself. In Heb. 13; 20 Jesus is spoken of as τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν. The context, however, has nothing to suggest John. On the other hand the "Parable of the Good Shepherd" contains much to suggest I Pt. 5; 2-4 and 2; 25. It would seem, therefore, that our Epistle served again as a connecting link between the earlier tradition and the later development.

- (13) I Pt. 1; 5 Jn. 10; 28 f.  
 τοῖς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρούμε- . . . οὐχ ἀρπάσει τις αὐτὰ ἐκ τῆς  
 νοῦς . . . χειρὸς μου. Cf. 17; 11 f.

We have noted in Galatians (Ex. 5) the idea of "the believer's security," and have been led to believe that our Epistle depends there upon Paul. The Fourth Gospel has an extended discussion on the subject (e. g. 10; 28, 29, 17; 11, 12, 15) and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the development may have traveled by way of I Peter.

- (14) I Pt. 1; 25 Jn. 1; 1  
 τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος  
 αἰῶνα. τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ῥῆμα ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν  
 τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς ὁ λόγος. Cf. v. 14.

The relationship between these citations has been touched upon in the note on Ex. 6. Dependence here seems probable.

- (15) I Pt. 2; 21 Jn. 13; 15  
 ὑμῶν ὑποταγμένων ὑπογραμμὸν, ἵνα ὑπόδειγμα γὰρ ἔδωκα ὑμῶν, ἵνα  
 ἐπακολουθήσῃτε τοῖς ἔργεσιν αὐτοῦ καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐποίησα ὑμῶν, καὶ  
 ὑμεῖς ποιῆτε

This parallel is suggestive especially since the "example" occurs in a narrative in John. It is to be noted also that our Epistle has much to say about "humility."

- (16) I Pt. 4; 5 Jn. 5; 22  
 τῷ ἐπιπέμωτι κρίνοντι ζῶντας καὶ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκεν τῷ  
 νεκρούς ἰῶν

It is not clear from this passage in I Peter which is to be understood, Christ or God. Judging from the Pauline literature upon which I Peter surely depends, it would seem necessary to conclude that the author had the former in mind. It would readily be interpreted as such by anyone in the latter part of the First Century. Apparently "John" so understood it. Reference in Jn. 5; 21 to quickening the dead, is very suggestive of the quick and the dead of I Pt. 4; 5. That it is found in a speech of Jesus is again indicative of a natural development. We cannot be certain, however, for "John" may draw from Paul directly, at this point, or even from some other source.

- (17) I Pt. 4; 8a Jn. 15; 12  
 πρὸ πάντων τῆν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγά- ἀπ' αὐτῆ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολή, ἡ εἰς ἡν ἔνα  
 πην ἐκτενή ἔχροντες ἀγαπήτε ἀλλήλους καθὼς ἠγάπη-  
 σα ὑμεῖς

It is to be noted again that the thought of I Peter is found in John as the subject matter of a discourse by Jesus, in which the atonement doctrine (15; 13) is set forth in harmony with I Pt. 2; 24. It is very significant that the general statement made in the O. T. quotation in I Pt. 4; 8b is paralleled in Jn. 15; 13a by a concrete example. Note also that Jn. 15; 16 may allude to the Petrine doctrine of election, which is again incorporated in a speech of Jesus.

- (18) I Pt. 1; 1 Jn. 7; 35 b  
 παρεπιδήμιος διασποράς . . . εἰς τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων . . .

Probably accidental.

- (19) I Pt. 1; 11 Jn. 12; 41  
 ἐρευνησάντες εἰς τὴν . . . προμαρ- ταύτηα εἶπε Ἰησοῦς. ὅτε εἶδε τὴν  
 τυρόμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν πα- δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησε πρὸς  
 θήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας αὐτοῦ

Again the Pauline thought occurs in John in a narrative, but the similarity is not close enough to indicate dependence. Cf. also Lk. 24; 25, 26, 44, 46 and Acts 26; 22, 23.

- (20) I Pt. 1; 21 Jn. 12; 44  
 . . . δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοῦς εἰς Θεόν Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ πιστεύει  
 . . . ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά  
 ἐπίδρα εἶναι εἰς Θεόν με

Though John very probably depends here upon Mk. 9; 37. it is suggestive in this connection.

- (21) I Pt. 3; 12 Jn. 9; 31  
 καὶ ὅσα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέξιον αὐτῶν οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ἀμαρτωλῶν ὁ Θε-  
 πρόσωπον δὲ Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιῶντας ὅς οὐκ ἀκούει, ἀλλ' ἐάν τις θεο-  
 κακία σεβῆς ἤ καὶ τὸ βέλημα αὐτοῦ  
 ποιῆ τούτου ἀκούει

There is here no necessary connection.

- (22) I Pt. 3; 14 Jn. 14; 27  
 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, μὴ ταρασσέσθε ὑμῶν ἢ καρδίαι  
 μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε (Cf. 3; 15) καρ- μηδὲ δειλιάτω  
 δίαίς

The phraseology is suggestive, yet the similarity is probably accidental.

- (23) I Pt. 5; 1 Jn. 15; 27 a  
 μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παύσι- ἐκείνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ  
 μάτων ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε

Connection here is very doubtful.

### Conclusion on the Johannine Literature.

Professor Cone notes that "distinct foreshadowings of the ideas of the Fourth Gospel and the epistles ascribed to John are indeed not wanting. The absence of the mystical profundity of Paul and the softening of some of the harsher lines of his teaching as well as several striking accords with Hebrews, shows the writer (of our Epistle) to have been in contact with the later Paulinism which marks the transition to the Johannine theology." (Encyc. Bib. p. 3680).



We have noted at many points in the Gospels and the First Epistle of John where these "foreshadowings" have been developed into extended discourses and not unfrequently have we been permitted, in the former, to hear them from the mouth of Jesus, as a teaching of his own. Ideas of Paul have been taken up by our author and treated in a suggestive fashion for later writers. I Peter not only "marks the transition," but also plays no small part in making the later literature possible. From the parallels cited above it would seem that our Epistle formed a bridge, as it were, between the Pauline and the Johannine Literatures. Our study, therefore, seems to require us to conclude that the Johannine Literature (especially I John and the Gospel) depends directly upon the First Epistle of Peter.

TABLES OF RESULTS

TABLE I  
APOSTOLIC FATHERS

|                           | Classification | No. of References |
|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Tertullian . . . . .      | A              | 1                 |
| Clement of Alex. . . . .  | A              | 1                 |
| Irenaeus . . . . .        | A              | 3                 |
| II Clement . . . . .      | C              | 2                 |
| Papias . . . . .          | A              | 1                 |
| Justin Martyr . . . . .   | B              | 8                 |
| Test. XII Pat. . . . .    | D              | —                 |
| Barnabas . . . . .        | A*             | 13                |
| Hermas . . . . .          | B              | 10                |
| Didache . . . . .         | D              | 6                 |
| Polycarp . . . . .        | A*             | 13                |
| Ignatius . . . . .        | B              | 5                 |
| Clement of Rome . . . . . | A*             | 41                |
|                           | Total          | 104               |

TABLE II  
CANONICAL BOOKS

|                                | Classification | No. of References |                                  |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Galatians . . . .              | B              | 9                 |                                  |
| I Thessalonians . .            | D              | 10                |                                  |
| II Thessalonians . .           | D              | 5                 |                                  |
| I Corinthians . . .            | C              | 23                |                                  |
| II Corinthians . . .           | C-D            | 13                |                                  |
| Romans . . . . .               | A*             | 63                |                                  |
| Ephesians . . . . .            | A*             | 45                |                                  |
| Colossians . . . . .           | D              | 14                |                                  |
| Philemon . . . . .             | D              | —                 |                                  |
| Philippians . . . .            | D              | 9                 |                                  |
| I Timothy ? . . . .            | D              | 9                 |                                  |
| II Timothy ? . . . .           | D              | 5                 |                                  |
| Titus ? . . . . .              | C-D            | 14                | 219 Total in Pauline<br>Epistles |
| Hebrews . . . . .              | B              | 49                |                                  |
| "Q" Source . . . . .           | D              | 9                 |                                  |
| Markan Source . . .            | D              | 12                |                                  |
| Matthew . . . . .              | D              | 5                 |                                  |
| Luke . . . . .                 | D              | 8                 |                                  |
| Acts . . . . .                 | D              | 22                |                                  |
| James . . . . .                | A*             | 31                |                                  |
| Jude . . . . .                 | D              | 4                 | 140                              |
| Revelation . . . . .           | C              | 13                |                                  |
| I John . . . . .               | B              | 10                |                                  |
| II John . . . . .              | D              | 1                 |                                  |
| III John . . . . .             | D              | 1                 |                                  |
| John . . . . .                 | B              | 23                | 48 Total in Joh. Lit.            |
| II Peter . . . . .             | A              | 1                 | 1                                |
| Total in Canonical Literature  |                | 408               |                                  |
| Total in Apostolic Fathers . . |                | 104               |                                  |
| Grand total . . . . .          |                | 512               |                                  |

TABLE III

The Literature Showing a Probable Connection with I Peter

|                      | Classification |    |   |       | Place of    |              | Date    |
|----------------------|----------------|----|---|-------|-------------|--------------|---------|
|                      | A              | A* | B | C C-D | Circulation | Writing      |         |
| Galatians . . . . .  |                |    | B |       | Asia        | Corinth      | 50      |
| I Corinthians . . .  |                |    |   | C     | Rome        | Ephesus      | 54      |
| II Corinthians . . . |                |    |   | C-D   | Corinth     | Ephesus      | 54      |
| Romans . . . . .     |                | A* |   |       | Rome        | Corinth      | 55      |
| Ephesians . . . . .  |                | A* |   |       | Asia, Rome  | Rome         | 59      |
| Titus . . . . .      |                |    |   | C     | ?           | ?            | ?       |
| Hebrews . . . . .    |                |    | B |       | Rome        | Rome ? ?     | 85-90   |
| FIRST PETER          |                |    |   |       |             |              |         |
| James . . . . .      |                | A* |   |       |             | Rome ? ?     | 90-95   |
| Revelation . . . . . |                |    |   | C     |             | Ephesus      | 95      |
| Clement of Rome      |                | A* |   |       |             | Rome         | 95      |
| I John . . . . .     |                |    | B |       |             | Ephesus      | 95-100  |
| John . . . . .       |                |    | B |       |             | Ephesus      | 100     |
| Ignatius . . . . .   |                |    | B |       |             | Smyrna       | 115     |
| Polycarp . . . . .   |                | A* |   |       |             | Smyrna       | 115     |
| Hermas . . . . .     |                |    | B |       |             | Rome         | 140     |
| Barnabas . . . . .   |                | A* |   |       |             | Alexandria ? | 130-160 |
| Justin . . . . .     |                |    | B |       |             | Rome         | 155     |
| Papias . . . . .     |                | A  |   |       |             | Hierapolis   | 145-160 |
| II Clement           |                | A  |   |       |             | Alexandria   | 170     |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY<sup>1</sup>

### HISTORIES

- Mc GIFFERT. History of the Apostolic Age. 1897.  
WEIZSÄCKER. Apostolic Age. Eng. tr. 1895  
DOBSCHÜTZ. Christian Life in the Primitive Church. Eng. tr. 1904.  
— The Apostolic Age. Eng. tr. 1909.  
HAUSRATH. History of the New Testament Times.  
ROPES. The Apostolic Age. 1907.  
PURVES. Christianity in the Apostolic Age. 1901.  
HARNACK. Expansion of Christianity.  
WERNLE. Beginnings of Christianity. Eng. tr. 1904.  
KNOPF. Das nachapostolische Zeitalter. 1905.  
PFLEIDERER. Primitive Christianity. Eng. tr. 1906.  
BARTLET. The Apostolic Age. 1899.  
VON SODEN. Early Christian Literature. Eng. tr.  
RAMSAY. The Church in the Roman Empire. 1893.  
— St. Paul the Traveller.  
NEANDER. Planting of the Christian Church. 1899.  
SCHAFF. History of the Christian Church. Vol. I. 1882.  
MOELLER. History of the Christian Church. A. D. 1—600. Eng. tr. 1892.  
FISHER. History of the Christian Church. 1896.  
VON SCHUBERT. Outlines of Church History.  
BACON. The Story of St. Paul. 1904.  
FARRAR. The Early Days of Christianity. Vol. I. 1882.  
MOMMSEN. The Provinces of the Roman Empire. Eng. tr. 1887.  
HARDY. Christianity and the Roman Government. 1894.  
BUSS. Roman Law and History in the New Testament. 1901.  
RAMSAY, G. G. The Annals of Tacitus, Vol. II. 1909.  
ARNOLD. Die Neronische Christenverfolgung.  
Histories of Suetonius, Dion Cassius, and Eusebius.  
  
REUSS. History of the New Testament. Eng. tr. 1884.  
MOFFATT. The Historical New Testament. 1901.

### INTRODUCTIONS.

- BACON. An Introduction to the New Testament. 1905.  
ZAHN. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Eng. tr. 1909.  
HOLTZMANN. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 1892.

---

<sup>1</sup> Only the most important of those works which have been consulted in the preparation of this monograph are included in this list.

- JÜLICHER. An Introduction to the New Testament. Eng. tr. 1904.  
HILGENFELD. Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 1875.  
PEAKE. A Critical Introduction to the New Testament. 1910.  
DAVIDSON. Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. III. 1851.  
SALMON. Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament.  
GLOAG. Introduction to the Catholic Epistles. 1887.  
B. WEISS. A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament. Eng. tr. 1888.  
BLEEK. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Eng. tr. 1870.  
DODS. An Introduction to the New Testament.

## COMMENTARIES.

- BIGG. On I Peter, International Critical Commentary. 1905.  
MONNIER. La prem. Ep. de l'apôtre Pierre. 1900.  
GUNKEL. On Der erste Brief des Petrus, in Die Schriften des N. T. 1907.  
HOLTZMANN. On Der erste Brief des Petrus, in Commentar zum N. T. III.  
BENNETT. On General Epistles, in the Century Bible. 1901.  
PLUMPTRE. On I Peter, in Cambridge Bible for Schools. 1880.  
CONE. On I Peter and other Epistles, in the International Handbook to the New Testament Series. 1901.  
HART. On I Peter in Expositor's Greek Testament. 1910.  
MEYER. Commentary on I Peter. Eng. tr. 1891.  
GODET. Commentary on I Peter. Eng. tr. 1886.  
HILGENFELD. On I Peter in Schmidt and Holzendorff's Short Commentary on the New Testament. Eng. tr. 1884.
- BACON. On Galatians in The Bible for Home and School. 1909.  
LIGHTFOOT. St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. 1869.  
— Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul. 1895.  
DRUMMOND. On Gal. and other Epistles, in International Handbook to the New Testament Series.  
SANDAY and HEADLAM. On Romans, in the Int. Crit. Com. 1902.  
HORT. The Romans and the Ephesians, Prolegomena. 1895.  
GARVIE. On Romans, in the Century Bible. 1901.  
WESTCOTT. The Epistle to the Ephesians. 1906.  
ROBINSON. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. 1903.  
BEET. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. 1888.  
ABBOTT. On Ephesians and Colossians, in Int. Crit. Com. 1897.  
MARTIN. On Ephesians and Colossians, in The Century Bible.  
LIGHTFOOT. The Epistles of St. Paul, Colossians and Philemon. 1892.  
VINCENT. The Epistle to the Philippians and to Philemon, I. C. C. 1897.  
MILLIGAN. St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians. 1908.  
GOODSPEED. On Hebrews, in The Bible for Home and School.  
PEAKE. On Hebrews, in The Century Bible.  
MAYOR. The Epistle of St. James. 1892.  
HORT. The Epistle of St. James.

- SWETE. Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark. 1898.  
 ALLEN. On Matthew, in the Int. Crit. Com. 1907.  
 PLUMMER. On Luke, in Int. Crit. Com. 1896.  
 HEITMÜLLER. Das Johannes-Evangelium, in Weiss' Die Schriften des N. T.  
 ZELLER. The Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles. Eng. tr.  
 GILBERT. On Acts, in The Bible for Home and School. 1908.  
 BARTLET. On Acts, in The Century Bible. 1901.

DICTIONARIES AND ENCYCLOPAEDIAS.

- Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible. Article on I Peter, by Chase.  
 Hasting's One Volume Bible Dictionary. Article on I Peter, by Falconer.  
 Encyclopædia Biblica, Article on I Peter, by Cone.  
 Standard Bible Dictionary. Article on I Peter by, Dods.  
 Encyclopaedia Britannica. Article on I Peter, by Harnack.  
 The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia. Article on Peter the Apostle, by Seiffert.

GENERAL.

- WEISS, B. Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff. 1855.  
 SCHARFE. Die Petrinische Strömung der neutestamentlichen Literatur.  
 HARNACK. Die Chronologie. 1897.  
 LIGHTFOOT. The Apostolic Fathers, Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, etc.  
 The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Published by the Christian Lit. Co. 1896.  
 Oxford Committee of Hist. Theol. The N. T. in Apostolic Fathers. 1905.  
 DITTMAR. Vetus Testamentum in Novo.  
 TOY. Quotations in the New Testament. 1884.  
 HAWKINS. Horae Synopticae. 1899.  
 VINCENT. Word Studies.  
 THAYER. Word Lists in Appendix to the Greek-English Lexicon of N. T.  
 HARNACK. Sayings of Jesus. Eng. tr. 1908. Also on Acts.  
 SMITH, W. B. Der vorchristliche Jesus. 1906.  
 SCHMIDT. Zwei Fragen zum ersten Petrusbrief, in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie. 1908. P. 24—52.  
 RAMSAY. The Flavian Persecution in the Province of Asia, Expositor Vol. X, p. 241 ff.  
 — The Church and the Empire in the First Century. Expositor 1893, pages 8 ff., 110 ff. and 283 ff.,  
 HARRIS. Expositor 1909, p. 155 ff.  
 CHARLES. Greek Version of the XII Patriarchs. 1908.  
 CONEYBEARE and KOHLER. On the XII Patriarchs, in Jewish Encyclopedia.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE  
CONNECTICUT ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

INCORPORATED A. D. 1799

VOLUME XVII

1912-13

---

Publications  
of Yale University



YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

1913

---

THE R. WAGNER SOHN PRESS





## OFFICERS FOR 1911-12.

---

### *President.*

HIS EXCELLENCY SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

### *Vice-Presidents.*

PROF. ALEXANDER W. EVANS,                      PROF. CLIVE DAY,  
    PROF. HANNS OERTEL.

### *Secretary.*

DR. GEORGE F. EATON.

### *Treasurer.*

MR. GEORGE PARMLY DAY.

### *Librarian.*

MR. JOHN CHRISTOPHER SCHWAB.

### *Committee on Publication.*

|                               |                    |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Exc. S. E. BALDWIN, Chairman, | PROF. A. W. EVANS, |
| PROF. A. S. COOK,             | PROF. CLIVE DAY,   |
| PROF. E. S. DANA,             | PROF. H. OERTEL,   |
| PROF. E. P. MORRIS,           | Mr. J. C. SCHWAB.  |



## CONTENTS.

|  | PAGE    |
|--|---------|
| ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY, JULY 1, 1911, TO . . . . .   |         |
| ART. I.—THE FINANCIAL HISTORY OF CONNECTICUT, 1789—1861.<br>BY HENRY F. WALRADT . . . . .  | 1—139   |
| ART. II.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE SECOND AND THIRD PARTS<br>OF "KING HENRY VI". BY C. F. TUCKER BROOKE . . . . .  | 141—211 |
| ART. III.—THE DATE OF THE RUTHWELL AND NEWCASTLE<br>CROSSES. BY ALBERT S. COOK . . . . .   | 213—361 |
| ART. IV.—THE LITERARY RELATIONS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE<br>OF PETER WITH THEIR BEARING ON THE DATE AND PLACE<br>OF AUTHORSHIP. BY ORA D. FOSTER . . . . . | 363—538 |



ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY  
OF THE  
CONNECTICUT ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
BY GIFT AND EXCHANGE FROM JULY 1, 1911, TO AUG. 31, 1912.

- AIX-EN-PROVENCE.—*Université*.  
Faculté des lettres. Annales. IV, 1-2. 1910.
- AMIENS.—*Académie des sciences, des lettres et des arts*.  
Mémoires. LVII. 1910.
- AMSTERDAM.—*Akademie van wetenschappen*.  
Jaarboek. 1910.  
Section of sciences. Proceedings. XIII, 1-2. Afdeling Natuur-  
kunde.  
Verhandelingen. Sectie I, X, 2, XI, 1-2; Sectie II, XVI, 4-5.  
Verslagen van de vergaderingen. Deel XIX, 1-2. 1910-11.  
*Maatschappij tot nut van t'algemeen*.  
Jaarboek. 1911-12.  
Publications. 95-99.  
*Meteorologisch instituut*.  
Annuaire. 1910, A-B.  
Mededeelingen en verhandelingen. CII, 1912.
- ANGERS.—*Société Nationale d'agriculture, sciences et arts*.  
Mémoires. Sér. V, T. XIII, 1910.
- ANTWERP.—*Académie Royale d'archéologie de Belgique*.  
Bulletin. 1911, 1-1912, 2.
- ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.—*Comisión del censo agro-pecuario*.  
1908, I-III, with maps.
- AUGSBURG.—*Naturwissenschaftlicher Verein für Schwaben und Neuburg*.  
Bericht. XXXIX-XI, 1911.
- BASEL.—*Naturforschende Gesellschaft*.  
Verhandlungen. XXII.
- BATAVIA.—*Magnetisch en meteorologisch observatorium*.  
Seismological bulletin. March-May, July, Oct. and Dec., 1911.  
Verhandelingen. No. 1-2, 1912.
- BERGEN.—*Museum*.  
Aarbog. 1910, 3-1911, 2.  
Aarsberetning. 1910.  
Skrifter. N. R., Bd. I, 1.

- BERLIN.—*Deutscher Seefischerei-Verein*.  
Mitteilungen. XXVIII, 1.  
*Universität. K. Zoologisches Museum*.  
Bericht. 1910.  
Mitteilungen. V, 3–VI, 1. 1911–12.
- BERN.—*Naturforschende Gesellschaft*.  
Verhandlungen. XCIV, 1911.
- BIRMINGHAM.—*Natural History and Philosophical Society*.  
Annual Report. 1911.  
List of Members. 1912.
- BOLOGNA.—*R. Accademia delle scienze dell' Istituto*.  
Rendiconto. Classe di scienze fisiche. N. S., V, 1–4; XIV.  
Classe di scienze morali. Ser. I, T. IV.  
Memorie. Classe di scienze morali.  
Sez. di scienze giuridiche, Ser. I. T. V, 1.  
Sez. di scienze storico-filologiche, Ser. I, T. V, 1.
- BONN.—*Naturhistorischer Verein der preussischen Rheinlande und Westfalens*.  
Sitzungsbericht. 1910, 2–1911, 1.  
Verhandlungen. LXVII, 2–LXVIII, 1, 1910–11.
- BOSTON.—*American academy of arts and sciences*.  
Proceedings. XLVI, 25; XLVII, 4–21; XLVIII, 1. 1911–12.  
*Museum of fine arts*.  
Bulletin. 52–7, 1911–12.  
*Society of natural history*.  
Memoir. VII, 1912.
- BRADFORD.—*Scientific association*.  
Journal. III, 1, 3–6, 1911.
- BREMEN.—*Meteorologisches Observatorium*.  
Deutsches meteorologisches Jahrbuch. XXI, 1910; XXII, 1911.  
*Naturwissenschaftlicher Verein*.  
Abhandlungen. XX, 2, 1911.
- BRESLAU.—*Schlesische Gesellschaft für vaterländische Kultur*.  
Jahres-Bericht. LXXXVIII, 1–2, 1910.
- BRIGHTON.—*Brighton and Hove natural history and philosophical society*.  
Annual report and abstract of papers. 1910.
- BRISBANE.—*Royal Geographical society, Queensland branch*.  
Queensland geographical journal. N. S., XXV, 1909–10.  
*Queensland museum*.  
Annals. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10.
- BRISTOL.—*Naturalists' society*.  
Proceedings. Ser. IV, II, 3–III, 1; Index to II.
- BROOKLYN.—*Institute of arts and sciences*.  
Bulletin. VII, 1, and Index to VI.  
Museum news. VII, 5–8.  
Year Book. XX–XXII, 1907–11.

BRÜNN.—*Naturforschender Verein.*

Ergebnisse der phänologischen Beobachtungen aus Mähren und  
Schlesien im Jahre 1906.

Meteorologische Kommission. Bericht. XXVI, 1908.

Verhandlungen. XLVIII, 1909.

BRUSSELS.—*Académie Royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de  
Belgique.*

Annuaire. LXXVIII, 1912.

Bulletin. Classe des sciences. 1911, 6—1912, 5.

Mémoires. Classe des sciences. Sér. II, T. III, 6—8 (8vo.);  
T. III, 5 (4o).

Notices biographiques et bibliographiques, 5e éd.

*International Congress of botany, Third.*

Actes, 1—II. 1910.

*Musée Royal d'histoire naturelle de Belgique.*

Mémoires. T. IV, Index. Traquair, Les poissons Wealdiens de  
Bernissart; Lambert, Echinides crétacés; Kidston, Les végé-  
taux houillers.

*Observatoire Royal de Belgique.*

Annales, Physique du globe. V, 1—2.

Annuaire astronomique. 1913.

*Société entomologique.*

Annales. LV.

Mémoires. XIX. 1912.

*Société R. Belge de géographie.*

Bulletin. XXXV, 1—XXXVI, 1. 1911—12.

*Société R. de botanique.*

Bulletin. XLVIII, 1—4. 1910.

*Société R. zoologique et malacologique.*

Annales. XLV—XLVI. 1910—11.

*Société scientifique.*

Annales. XXXV, 3—6; XXXVI, 2. 1910—12.

Revue des questions scientifiques. XX, 1—XXII, 1. 1911—12.

*Bryn Mawr college monographs.* VII—X.BUCHAREST.—*Societate de sciințe.*

Buletinul. XX, 2—XXI, 2.

BUDAPEST.—*Magyar Tudományos akadémia.*

Mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Berichte aus Ungarn.  
XXVI, pp. 1—272.

Rapports sur les travaux. 1910.

*Meteorológiai és Földmágnesség-i Intézet.*

Bericht. IX. 1908.

Jahrbuch. XXXVII, 1—XXXVIII, 1, 4. 1907—8.

Verzeichnis der . . . Bücher. VIII. 1909.

Offizielle Publikationen. IX. 1909.

BUDAPEST.—*Tudomány-egyetem.*

Acta. 1909-10, I-II; 1910-11, 1.

Almanach. 1910-11.

Tanrende. 1909-10, I-II; 1910-11, I-II.

BUENOS AIRES.—*Museo Nacional.*

Anales. Ser. III, T. XIV.

*Dirección general de estadística.*

Boletín mensual, 121-3. 1910.

*Sociedad científica Argentina.*

Anales. LXX, 5-LXXIII, 1. 1911-12.

BURTON-ON-TRENT.—*Natural history and archaeological society.*

Transactions. VI. 1911.

CALCUTTA.—*Asiatic society of Bengal.*

Journal and proceedings. VII, 1-3.

Memoir. III, 2-4; index to v. II.

*Indian museum.*

Natural history section. Annual report. 1909-11.

Memoirs. II, 4, and index; III, 1-2.

Records. III, index; IV, 1-9; V, 1-4; VI, 1-5.

*California academy of sciences.*

Proceedings. Ser. IV, v. I, 289-430; III, 73-186.

CAMBRAI.—*Société d'émulation.*

Mémoires. LXV. 1910.

CAMBRIDGE (England).—*Philosophical society.*

Transactions. XXI. 397-451.

*University. Observatory.*

Annual report. 1910-11.

CAMERON (La.).—*Gulf biological station.*

Biennial report. V. 1910.

Bulletin. IX-X.

CANADA.—*Archives.*

Report on Canadian archives. 1910.

*Department of mines. Mines Branch.*

Annual report on the mineral production of Canada. 1909-10.

*Forestry branch. Bulletin.* 21-30.*Geological Survey.*

Maps. 1064, 1066, 1113, 1130, 1150.

Memoir. 24 E, 27, 28.

Sheets 84, 99.

*Canadian forestry association.*

Report. 1909-10.

*Canadian forestry convention.*

Report. 1904-5, 1907-11.

*Canadian forestry journal.* VII, 1-4, 6; VIII, 1-4, 1911-12.*Canadian railway club.* Official proceedings. X, 6-9; XI, 1-5.



- CAPE TOWN.—*Royal society of South Africa.*  
Transactions. II, 3-4, 1912.
- CARACAS.—*Accademia Nacional de la historia.*  
Ramón Azpurúa, Biografías de hombres notables de Hispano-América. I-IV.  
Colección de documentos para la historia de la vida pública del Libertador. 1-XIV.
- CASSEL.—*Verein für Naturkunde.*  
Festschrift, 1911.
- CATANIA.—*Accademia Gioenia.*  
Bollettino delle sedute. N. S., 18-21. 1911-12.  
*Società degli spettroscopisti Italiana.*  
Memoria. XL, 8-12; Ser. II, T. I, 1-8.
- CEYLON.—*Administration reports.*  
Part IV, Education, science, and art. Marine biology. Report. 1910-11.
- CHALONS-SUR-SAÔNE.—*Société d'histoire et d'archéologie.*  
Mémoires. Sér. II, IV, 1. 1911.
- CHELTENHAM.—*Natural Science Society.*  
Proceedings. N S. I, 4-5, 1910-1911.
- CHEMNITZ.—*Naturwissenschaftliche Gesellschaft.*  
Bericht. XVIII. 1909-10.
- CHERBOURG.—*Société Nationale des sciences naturelles et mathématiques.*  
Mémoires. XXXVII.
- CHICAGO.—*Field Museum of natural history.*  
Publications. 151-8, 160.  
*John Crerar Library.*  
Annual report. XVII. 1911.
- CHRISTIANIA.—*Videnskabs-selskabet.*  
Forhandlinger. 1910.
- CINCINNATI.—*Lloyd library.*  
Bibliographical contributions. 3-6. 1911-12.  
Bulletin. Mycological series, 20. Pharmacy series. 18-19.  
*University.*  
Record. VII, 5-8; VIII, 1-3.  
University studies. Ser. II, Vol. VII, 1-2. 1912.
- COLOMBO.—*Museum.*  
Spolia Zeylanica, VIII, 29-30.
- Colorado College.—  
Publications. Engineering series. I, 11-12, 1911; science series. XII, 10-11. 1912.
- Colorado scientific society.  
Proceedings. XX, 39-54, 75-284.
- COLORADO.—*University of.*  
Studies. VIII, 4-IX, 3. 1911-12.

- COPENHAGEN.—*K. Danske videnskabernes selskab.*  
 Skrifter. Historisk-filosofisk afdeling. R. 7, 1-II, 2. Natur-  
 videnskabelig-matematisk afdeling. R. 7, I-V, VII, 1,  
 VIII-IX, 1. 1904-11.  
*Naturhistoriske forening.*  
 Videnskabelige meddelelser. 1910-11.
- CORUÑA.—*R. Academia Gallega.*  
 Boletín. VI, 48-63. 1912.
- CROYDON.—*Microscopical Club.*  
 Proceedings and transactions. 1910-11.
- DENISON UNIVERSITY.—  
 Bulletin of the scientific laboratories. XVII, 1-201. 1912.
- DETROIT.—*Museum of art.*  
 Annual report. 1911.  
 Bulletin. V, 3-VI, 3. 1911-12.
- DORPAT.—*Gelehrte estnische Gesellschaft.*  
 Sitzungsberichte. 1910-11.  
*Naturforscher-Gesellschaft.*  
 Bibliothek. Teile I-II.  
 Schriften. XX.  
 Sitzungsbericht. XIX, 1-XX, 4. 1910-11.
- DRESDEN.—*Naturwissenschaftliche Gesellschaft Isis.*  
 Sitzungsberichte und Abhandlungen. July, 1910-Dec., 1911.  
*Verein für Erdkunde.*  
 Mitteilungen. H. 7-9, 1908-9; II, 1-4. 1910-12.
- DUBLIN.—*Pharmaceutical society of Ireland.*  
 Calendar. XXXVI. 1912.  
*Royal Dublin society.*  
 Economic proceedings. II, 3-4.  
 Scientific proceedings. N. S. XIII, 11-23. 1911-12.  
 Scientific transactions. N. S. XII, 37; XIII, 1-10. 1911.  
*Royal Irish academy.*  
 Cunningham memoirs. Index, 1786-1906.  
 Irish MSS. Series. Index, 1786-1906.  
 Proceedings. Clare Island survey. XXXI, 2, 10-14, 23-24,  
 35-38, 51-52, 56, 60, 63, 65.  
 Proceedings. Series A. XXIX, 3, 5 and index, 1911-12;  
 Series B. XXIX, 5-XXX, 2 and index; Series C. XXIX,  
 7-9 and index.  
 Todd Lecture Series. Index, 1786-1906.  
 Transactions. Index, 1786-1906.  
*Trinity College.*  
 Hermathena. 37. 1911.
- EDINBURGH.—*Royal physical society.*  
 Proceedings. XVIII, 3.

- EDINBURGH.—*Royal society of Edinburgh.*  
 Proceedings. XXXI, 4-5; XXXII, 1-3.  
 Transactions. XLVII, 3-XLVIII, 1. 1910-12.
- ELBERFELD.—*Chemisches Untersuchungsamt.*  
 Bericht. 1909-11.  
*Naturwissenschaftlicher Verein.*  
 Jahres-Bericht. XIII, 1912.
- Elisha Mitchell scientific society.*  
 Journal. XXVII, 1-XXVIII, 2. 1911-12.
- EMDEN.—*Naturforschende Gesellschaft.*  
 Jahresbericht. XCV. 1910.
- FLORENCE.—*Società entomologica Italiana.*  
 Bollettino. XLII, 1-4. 1910.  
*Biblioteca nazionale centrale.*  
 Bollettino. 110-40. 1911-12.
- FORMOSA.—*Bureau of productive industry.*  
 Icones plantarum Formosanmarum. I. 1911.
- FRANKFURT A. M.—*Deutsche malakozologische Gesellschaft.*  
 Nachrichtenblatt. XLIII, 3-XLIV, 2. 1911-12.  
*Senckenbergische naturforschende Gesellschaft.*  
 Abhandlungen. XXIX, 4; XXXIII, 4-XXXIV, 2.  
 Bericht. 1911, 1-4.
- FREIBURG I. B.—*Naturforschende Gesellschaft.*  
 Bericht. XVIII, 2-XIX, 1. 1911.
- FRIBOURG.—*Société Fribourgeoise des sciences naturelles.*  
 Bulletin. III-IV, VII-XII, XIV-XVIII. 1883-1910.  
 Mémoires. Géologie et géographie. I, 1; II, 1-4; III, 1-IV;  
 1-3; V, 5; VI, 6; VII, 7.
- GENEVA.—*Société de physique et d'histoire naturelle.*  
 Compte rendu. XVIII. 1911.  
 Mémoires, XXXVII, 2. 1911.
- GERA.—*Gesellschaft von Freunden der Naturwissenschaften.*  
 Jahresbericht. 1910-11.
- GIESSEN.—*Universität.*  
 177 dissertations.
- GLASGOW.—*Natural History Society.*  
 Glasgow Naturalist. III, 1-IV, 2.  
*Royal philosophical society.*  
 Proceedings. XLII. 1910-11.
- GÖRLITZ.—*Naturforschende Gesellschaft.*  
 Abhandlungen. XXVII. 1911.
- GÖTTINGEN.—*K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.*  
 Philologische Klasse. Nachrichten. 1910, 1-1912, 1; and Bei-  
 heft 1-2. 1910.

- GRAZ.—*Naturwissenschaftlicher Verein für Steiermark.*  
Mitteilungen. XLVI—XLVII. 1909—10.
- GRENOBLE.—*Université.*  
Annales. XXIII, 2.
- GUELPH.—*Wellington field naturalists' club.*  
Natural science bulletin. 1—6. 1905—10.
- HAAARLEM.—*Hollandsche maaschappij der wetenschappen.*  
Ser. III. A. I, 1—4; B. I, 1—2.
- HALIFAX.—*Nova Scotian institute of science.*  
Proceedings and transactions. XII, 3—XIII, 1. 1908/9—11.
- HALLE A. S.—*Naturforschende Gesellschaft.*  
Abhandlung. N. F. I. 1912.  
Mitteilung. I. 1911.
- HAMBURG.—*Deutsche Seewarte.*  
Annalen der Hydrographie und maritimen Meteorologie. XL,  
1—8. 1912.  
Aus dem Archiv. XXXIV, 1—XXXIII, 4.  
Deutsches meteorologisches Jahrbuch. XXXIII. 1910.  
Jahresbericht. XXXIV. 1910.  
*Naturwissenschaftlicher Verein.*  
Verhandlungen. XVIII. 1910.
- Harvard University.—Museum of Comparative Zoology.*  
Annual report. 1910—11.  
Bulletin. LIII, 7—9; LIV, 6—14; LV, 1. 1911—12.  
Memoirs. XXV, 3—4; XXVII, 4; XXXVIII, 2; XXXIX, 2—3;  
XL, 4. 1911—12.
- Observatory.*  
Annals. LVI, 6—7; LIX, 9—10; LXI, 3; LXIII, 1; LXXI, 2;  
LXXII, 1—3.  
Annual report. LXVI. 1911.  
Circular. 1—30, 166—74.  
Report of Visiting Committee. 28.
- HAVANA.—*Academia de ciencias medicas, fisicas y naturales.*  
Anales. VII, 79; VIII—IX; XIV—XVI; XVII, 191—5, 198—202;  
XVIII—XIX, 203—26; XX, XXI, 248; XXII, 252; XXIII,  
264—8, 270—4; XXIV, 276; XXV—XXXVI, 287—428;  
XXXVII—LXVIII (March, 1912).
- Colegio de Belen.*  
Observaciones meteorologicas y magneticas. 1910.
- Museum d'histoire naturelle.*  
Notice, 1911.
- HAVRE.—*Société géologique de Normandie.*  
Bulletin. XXX. 1910.
- HAWAII.—*Board of agriculture and forestry.*  
Division of Forestry. Botanical bulletin. 1. 1911.

*Hawaii College.* Publication. 1. 1912.

HELGOLAND.—*K. Biologische Anstalt.*

Wissenschaftliche Meeresuntersuchungen, Abteilung Helgoland.

N. F. II, I, 1; II, 1 (2); IV, 1-2; V, 1 (2); VI, 1-X, 1.

Abteilung Kiel. I, 2; II, 2; III-X; XIII. 1896-1911.

HELSINGFORS.—*Finska vetenskaps-societeten.*

Acta. XXXVIII, 4; XL, 6-8; XLI; 4, 6-7.

Bidrag till k nnekedom af Finlands natur och folk. LXX, 1-2;

LXXI, 1-2; LXXII, 2-5, LXXIII, 1-2.

Meteorologiska Centralanstalt. Meteorologisches Jahrbuch f r  
Finnland. IV, 1904; Beilage, 1903. IX, T. 2. 1909.

Ofersigt af f rhandlingar. LIII, A-C, 1910-11.

*Societas pro Fauna et Flora Fennica.*

Acta. XXXV. 1909-11.

Meddelanden, XXXVI-XXXVII, 1909-11.

HOBART.—*Royal society of Tasmania.*

Annual report. 1911.

Papers and proceedings. 1910-11.

HONOLULU.—*Bernice Pauahi Bishop museum of Polynesian ethnology &  
natural history.*

Memoirs. III.

Occasional papers. IV, 4-5; V, I. 1909-11.

ILLINOIS.—*State laboratory of natural history.*

Bulletin. IX, 4. 1911.

Report. 1909-10.

INDIA.—*Bombay Presidency.* Rainfall in Bombay. Vol. I.

*Board of Scientific advice.*

Annual report. 1910-11.

*I. Departement of agriculture.*

Memoirs. Botanical series. IV, 2-5. 1911-12.

Chemical series. I, 10-11, 3. 1911-12.

Entomological series. II, 9-10; III, 1, IV, 1. 1911-12.

Report of progress of agriculture. 1910-11.

Agricultural Research Institute, Pusa. Report. 1910-11.

*Geological Survey.*

Records. XI, 4. 1910.

*Meteorological department.*

Rainfall in India. XX. 1910.

Annual summary. 1910.

Monthly Weather Review. March, 1911-March, 1912.

Report of administration. 1910-11.

*Indiana Academy of Science.*

Proceedings. 1910.

*Iowa Academy of Sciences.*

Proceedings. XVI-XVIII. 1909-11.

IOWA.—*State University.*

Laboratory of Natural History. Bulletin. VI, 2.

ITALY.—*R. Comitato geologico.*

Bollettino. 1910, 4—1911, 4.

JENA.—*Medizinisch-naturwissenschaftliche Gesellschaft.*

Jenaische Zeitschrift für Naturwissenschaft. XL, 3—XLI, 2.  
1911—12.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

Circular. 1911, 6—1912, 5.

KANSAS.—*Academy of science.*

Transactions. XXIII—XXIV. 1911.

*University.*

Science bulletin. V, 12—VI, 1.

KASAN.—*Observatoire météorologique.*

Bulletin. 1911.

*Société physico-mathématique.*

Bulletin. Sér. II. T. XVI, 4—XVII, 4. 1910—11.

KIEL.—*Naturwissenschaftlicher Verein für Schleswig-Holstein.*

Schriften. XV, 1.

*K. Universität.*

Chronik. 1910—11.

Dissertations (58).

KIEW.—*Société des naturalistes.*

Mémoires. XXI, 3—4.

KINGSTON.—*Institute of Jamaica.*

Annals. I, 1.

Bulletin. I, 1.

KODAIKANAL.—*Observatory.*

Annual report. 1911.

Bulletin. XXIV—XXV.

KÖNIGSBERG I. PR.—*Physikalisch-ökonomische Gesellschaft.*

Schriften. XLIX, 1908; LI, 1910; Generalregister. 1885—1909.

KRAKOW.—*K. K. Sternwarte.*

Meteorologische Beobachtungen. June, 1911—July, 1912.

Resultate der meteorologischen, seismologischen und magnetischen Beobachtungen. 1911.

*Akademija Umiejetnosci, Komisya Fizyograficzna.*

Materyaly zebrane przez Sekcye meteorologiczna. 1910.

KYOTO.—*I. University.*

College of Science and Engineering. Memoirs. III, 4—7. 1911—12.

LA PLATA.—*Museo.*

Revista. XVII—XVIII. 1910—12.

*Universidad.*

Archivos de pedagogia y ciencias afinas. VIII, 24, IX, 28.  
1911—12.

- LA<sup>R</sup> ROCHELLE.—*Académie des belles lettres, sciences et arts, Section des sciences naturelles.*  
Annales. XXXVI, 1908–10.
- LAUSANNE.—*Société vaudoise des sciences naturelles.*  
Bulletin. XLVII, 173–XLVIII, 175.
- LEIPZIG.—*Fürstl. Jablonowksi'sche Gesellschaft.*  
Jahresbericht, March, 1909.  
*Naturforschende Gesellschaft.*  
Sitzungsbericht. 1907–11.  
*K. Sächsische Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.*  
Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse. Berichte. LXII, 6–LXIII, 6.  
1910–11.  
*Verein für Erdkunde.*  
Mitteilungen. 1910.
- LEYDEN.—*Nederlandsche dierkundige Vereeniging.*  
Tijdschrift. Ser. II, D. XII, 2.  
*Anwinsten der Bibliotheek*, 1910–12.  
*Rijksuniversiteit. Sterrewacht.*  
Verslag. 1906–8.
- LIMBURG.—*Provinciaal genootschap voor geschiedkundige wetenschappen, taal en kunst.*  
Limburg's jaerboek. XVII, 1–4; XVIII, 2. Catalog, 1912.
- LINZ.—*Museum Francisco-Carolinum.*  
Jahresbericht. 70.
- LISBON.—*Sociedade de geographia.*  
Boletim. XXIX, 4–XXX, 5. 1911–12.
- LIVERPOOL.—*Biological society.*  
Proceedings. XXV. 1910–11.  
*Geographical society.*  
Transactions and annual report. XX. 1911.
- LONDON.—*Geological society.*  
Geological literature added to library. 1910.  
List. April 1912.  
*Linnean society.*  
List. 1911–12.  
Proceedings. 123d session.  
Journal (Botany). 273–277, 279. 1911–12.  
*National physical laboratory.*  
Report. 1911.  
Collected researches. VIII, 12.  
*Patent Office library.*  
Subject lists. YK–ZZ. 1911.  
*Roentgen society.*  
Journal. VII, 28–VIII, 32. 1911–12.  
*R. Geographical society.*  
Geographical journal. XXXVII, 6–XL, 2. 1911–12.

LONDON.—*Geological society.*

Quarterly journal. 267-70. 1911-12.

*Mathematical society.*

Proceedings. X, 1-6; XI, 1-3. 1911-12.

*R. Microscopical society.*

Journal. 1911, 4-1912, 4.

*Royal society.*

Philosophical transactions. Series A. 477-87. Series B. 285-94. 1911-12.

Philosophical proceedings. Series A. 580-94. Series B. LXXXIV, 569-80. 1911-12.

*R. Photographic society of Great Britain.*

Photographic journal. LI, 6-LII, 6. 1911-12.

*South London entomological and natural history society.*

Proceedings, 1911-12.

LOUISIANA.—*State museum.*

Biennial report. II. 1910.

LUND.—*K. Universitet.*

Bibliothek, Årsberättelse. 1910.

LYONS.—*Bulletin historique du diocèse de Lyon.*

69-73. 1911-12.

*Société des amis de l'Université.*

Bulletin. XXIV, 2-5; XXV, 1-3.

*Université.*

Annales. Science-médecine. XXX, 1911.

*McGill University.* Papers from the department of geology, 17-23.MADRAS.—*Fisheries bureau.*

Bulletin. II, 6.

MADRID.—*R. Academia de ciencias exactas, físicas y naturales.*

Revista. V, 9-VI, 12; IX, 9-X, 7, 10.

Memorias. XXVI. 1908.

*R. Academia de la historia.*

Boletín. LIII. 4-LXI, 2.

Cortes de los antiguos reinos de Aragon y de Valencia y Principado de Cataluña. XIII-XV. 1909-11.

Memorial historico español. XLIV-XLV. 1911-12.

*Observatorio.*

Anuario. 1912.

MAGDEBURG.—*Museum für Natur- und Heimatkunde.*

Abhandlungen und Berichte. II, 2.

MAINE.—*Agricultural experiment station.*

Bulletin. 200. 1912.

MANCHESTER (England).—*Literary and philosophical society.*

Memoirs and proceedings. LV, 2-LVI, 1.



- MANCHESTER (England).—*University*.  
 Publications. Economic series. XIII, 1910; Educational series.  
 IV–VI; English series. II; Historical series. XII–XIII;  
 Physical series. II.
- MANCHESTER, N. H.—*Institute of arts and sciences*  
 Proceedings. V, 1. 1911.
- MARBURG.—*Gesellschaft zur Beförderung der gesamten Naturwissenschaften*.  
 Sitzungsberichte. 1911.
- Mark, E. L. Anniversary volume. 1903.
- MELBOURNE.—*National Museum*.  
 Memoirs. 4.  
*Royal society of Victoria*.  
 Proceedings. N. S. VII–XXIV, 2.  
 Transactions. IV; V, 1. 1895, 1909.
- MEXICO.—*Academia Mejicana de la lengua*.  
 Memorias. I, 1–4; V–VI.  
*Instituto geologico*.  
 Boletin. 28. 1911.  
 Parergones. III, 9–10.  
*Instituto medico nacional*.  
 Anales. XII, 1–2. 1912.  
*Museo nacional de arqueologia, historia y etnologia*.  
 Anales. I, 1–13; II, 1–9; III, 1–5, 7–8.  
 Boletin. I, 1–4, 6–11. 1911–12.  
*Museo nacional de historia natural*.  
 La naturaleza. Ser. III, T. I, 2–3.  
*Observatorio astronomico nacional*.  
 Boletin. 1.  
*Observatorio meteorologico-magnetico central*.  
 Boletin. Aug., 1910–April, 1912.  
*Sociedad cientifica „Antonio Alzate“*.  
 Memoria y Revista. XXVIII, 9–XXX, 6.  
*Sociedad geológica Mexicana*.  
 Boletin. VII, 2.
- Michigan academy of sciences*.  
 Report. XIII. 1911.
- MIDDELBURG.—*Zeeuwsch genootschap der wetenschappen*.  
 Archief. 1911.
- MILAN.—*R. Istituto Lombardo di science e lettere*.  
 Rendiconto. Ser. II, T. XLIV, 1–14, 17–20.  
*Società Italiana di scienze naturali e del Museo Civico*.  
 Atti. I, 2–LI, 2.
- MILWAUKEE.—*Public museum*.  
 Annual report. XXVII. 1909.  
 Bulletin. I, 2.

- MISSOURI.—*Botanical garden.*  
Annual report. XXII. 1911.
- University.*  
Bulletin, Engineering experiment station series. I, 1-II, 2;  
Science series. I, 1-II, 2.  
Laws Observatory. Bulletin. 17-19.  
Studies. Science series. II, 2.
- MODENA.—*R. Accademia di scienze, lettere ed arti.*  
Memorie. Ser. III. T. IX.  
*Società dei naturalisti.*  
Atti. Rendiconti. Ser. IV. T. XIII. 1911.
- MONS.—*Société des sciences, des arts et des lettres du Hainaut.*  
Mémoires et publications. LXII, 1911.
- MONTANA.—*Agricultural college.*  
Experiment Station. Circular. 10-16. 1911-12.  
*Agricultural Experiment Station.*  
Annual report. XVII, 1910.  
Bulletin. 86.  
*University.*  
Bulletins. 69-70. 1911.
- MONTEVIDEO.—*Museo Nacional.*  
Anales. IV, 3.
- MONTPELLIER.—*Académie des sciences et lettres.*  
Bulletin mensuel. 1911, 9-12; 1912, 1-5.
- MOSCOW.—*Société I. des naturalistes.*  
Bulletin. 1908, 2-3; 1909, N. S., T. XXIII; 1910, 1-4.  
*K. Universität.*  
Meteorologisches Observatorium. Beobachtungen. 1908-9.
- MÜNSTER, I. W.—*Westfälischer Provinzial-Verein für Wissenschaft und Kunst.*  
Jahresbericht. XXXIX. 1910-11.
- MUNICH.—*K. Akademie der Wissenschaften.*  
Historische Klasse. Abhandlungen. XXV. Index.  
Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse. Abhandlungen. XXV, 5, 8,  
1910-12; Suppl. II, Bd. 3-7. Index to Bd. 1; Sitzungsberichte.  
1910, 10-15; 1911, 1-2.  
Philosophisch-philologisch und historische Klasse. Abhandlungen.  
XXV, 1-4, 6-7, XXVI, 1-2, 1909-12; Abhandlungen,  
Sitzungsberichte. 1910, 8-14; Sitzungsberichte. 1911, 1-12.  
*K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek.*  
Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum. T. I. Pars VI. 1912.
- NANCY.—*Académie de Stanislas.*  
Mémoires. Sér. VI, T. 8. 1910-11.
- NAPLES.—*R. Accademia di scienze morali e politiche.*  
Atti. XLI. 1912.  
Rendiconto. L. 1912.

- NAPLES.—*R. Accademia delle scienze fisiche e matematiche.*  
 Rendiconto. Ser. III. T. XVII, 1–XVIII, 2.  
*R. Istituto d'incoraggiamento.*  
 Atti. Ser. VI. T. LXII. 1910.
- Naturae Novitates.* 1911, 8–1912, 14.
- NEUBRANDENBURG.—*Verein der Freunde der Naturgeschichte.*  
 Archiv. LXV, 1–2, 1911.
- NEUCHÂTEL.—*Société neuchâteloise des sciences naturelles.*  
 Bulletin. XXXVIII, 1910–11.
- NEW BRIGHTON.—*Staten Island Association of arts and sciences.*  
 Proceedings, III, 3–4.  
 Museum bulletin. 35–49.
- NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.—*Natural history society.*  
 Bulletin. XXVIII, VI, part 3; XXIX, VI, part 3.
- NEW YORK.—*American geographical society.*  
 Bulletin. XLIII, 7–XLIV, 8. 1911–12.  
*American museum of natural history.*  
 Anthropological papers. V, 2; VII, 2; VIII; IX, 1; XII, 1.  
 Bulletin. XXVII, XXVIII, XXX. 1910–11.  
 Guide leaflet. 35.  
 Reports. XLII–XLIII. 1910–11.
- Academy of sciences.*  
 Annals. XX, 3; XXI, pp. 87–263.
- Botanical garden.*  
 Bulletin. 26–27. 1911–12.
- State museum.*  
 Annual report. LXIII, 1–4. 1909.  
 Memoirs. IX, 2. 1907.
- Public library.*  
 Bulletin. XV, 7–XVI, 6. 1911–12.
- American geographical society.*  
 Bulletin. XLIII, 7–XLIV, 6. 1911–12.
- Rockefeller institute for medical research.*  
 Studies. XIII–XV.
- Rockefeller sanitary commission for the eradication of hookworm disease.*  
 Publication. 2, 5–6.
- New Zealand Institute. Transactions and proceedings.* XLIII. 1911.
- NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.—*North of England institute of mining and mechanical engineers.*  
 Report. 1911–12.  
 Transactions. LXI, 5–9; LXII, 1–5. 1911–12.
- NORTH CAROLINA.—*University.*  
 Philological Club. Studies in philology, VIII. 1911.

- NORTH CAROLINA.—*State historical Society.*  
Collections. III. 1910.  
*University.*  
Quarterly journal. II, 1-4. 1911-12.
- NORTHAMPTON.—*Northamptonshire natural history society and field club.*  
Journal. XVI. 125-8.
- NORWICH.—*Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists society.*  
Transactions. IX, 2-3.
- NUREMBERG.—*Naturhistorische Gesellschaft.*  
Abhandlung. XIX, 1-3.  
Jahresbericht. 1882-4; 1891; 1898-9.  
Mitteilungen. 1908, 2-5; 1909, 1.
- Nyt Magazin for naturvidenskaberne.* XXXVII-L, 1.
- ONBERLIN.—*Wilson ornithological club.*  
Wilson bulletin. XXIII, 3-XXIV, 5. 1911-12.
- ODESSA.—*Société des naturalistes de la Nouvelle-Russie.*  
Mémoires. XXXIV-XXXVI; Index to I-XXX; Suppl. to XXXIV.  
*L'observatoire météorologique et magnétique de l'université Impériale.*  
Annuaire. 1910.
- OKLAHOMA.—*Geological Survey.*  
Bulletin. 3, 7-8.  
*Historical society.*  
Historia. I, 3-6; II, 7.
- OPORTO.—*Academia polytechnica.*  
Annaes scientificos. VI, 2-VII, 1.
- OSNABRÜCK.—*Naturwissenschaftlicher Verein.*  
Jahresbericht. XVI-XVII. 1903-10.
- OXFORD.—*University.*  
Observatory. Astrographic catalogue. VII. 1911.  
Radcliffe Library. Catalogue of books added during 1911.  
Radcliffe observatory. Meteorological observations. XLIX-L.
- PAISLEY.—*Philosophical institution.*  
Annual report. CII-III, 1910-11.
- PALERMO.—*Accademia di scienze, lettere e belle arti.*  
Atti. Ser. III. T. IX.  
Bolletino. 1907-10.
- PARIS.—*Ecole polytechnique.*  
Journal. II. Sér. XV.  
*Muséum d'histoire naturelle.*  
Bulletin. 1911, 1-4, 6-7.  
Laboratoire de phanérogamie. Notulæ systematicæ, par  
H. Lecomte. II, 3-8.  
Rapport annuel. II-III. 1910-11.  
*Observatoire.*  
Rapport annuel. 1911.

- PARIS.—*Société zoologique de France.*  
 Bulletin. XXXV.  
 Mémoires. XXIII. 1910.
- PASADENA.—*Throop institute.*  
 Bulletin. 51-54, 56. 1911-12.
- PASSAU.—*Naturwissenschaftlicher Verein.* I-XIX. XXI, 1857-1911.
- PERTH.—*Department of mines, Western Australia.*  
 Reports. (3).  
 Annual progress report. 1910.  
 Bulletin. 15, 20, 23, 31, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41.
- PERU.—*Ministerio de Fomento.*  
 Cuerpo de Ingenieros de Minas. Boletín. 77.
- PETERHEAD.—*Buchan Club. Museum.*  
 Transactions. I, 2.
- PHILADELPHIA.—*Academy of natural sciences.*  
 Journal. 2d ser. XIV, 3.  
*American Philosophical society.*  
 Proceedings. L, 199-LI, 205; General index to I-L.  
 Transactions. N. S., XXII, 1-2.  
*Franklin Institute.*  
 Journal. Vol. 172, 2-174, 2. 1911-12.  
*Geographical Society.*  
 Bulletin. IX, 3-4, 1911.
- PIETERMARITZBURG.—*Natal government museum.*  
 Annals. II, 3.
- PISA.—*Società Toscana di scienze naturali.*  
 Atti, Memorie. XXVI-XXVII. 1910-11; Processi verbali.  
 XX, 2-XXI, 2.
- PITTSBURG.—*Carnegie museum.*  
 Publications. 65-66, 68-70.  
*Carnegie institute.*  
 Founder's Day. XVI. 1912.  
*Western Pennsylvania engineers' society.*  
 Proceedings. XXVII, 6-XXVIII, 6.
- PLYMOUTH.—*Marine biological association of the United Kingdom.*  
 Publications. II; N.S. I, 1-4; II, 1-2; III, 1-4 and special  
 number; V-IX. 2. 1888-1911.
- PORTICI.—*R. Scuola superiore di agricoltura.*  
 Annali. Ser. II. T. IX. 1910.
- POTSDAM.—*Astrophysikalisches Observatorium.*  
 Publikationen. XXII, 64-5.
- PRAG.—*Deutscher naturwissenschaftlich-medizinischer Verein für Böhmen.*  
 Lotos. LIX. 1911.  
*K. K. Sternwarte.*  
 Magnetische und meteorologische Beobachtungen. 1910-11.

- PRAG.—*České Společnosti entomologické.*  
*Časopis.* VIII, 2-4; IX, 1. 1911-12.  
*Ceská společnost náuk.*  
 Jahresbericht. 1911.  
 Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse. Sitzungsbericht.  
 1911.  
 Philosophisch-geschichtliche und philologische Klasse. Sitzungs-  
 berichte. 1911.
- PROVIDENCE.—*Roger Williams park museum.*  
 Bulletin. II. 1; III, 1-5.
- QUEBEC.—*Société de géographie.*  
 Bulletin. VI, 1-3.
- REICHENBACH i. Vogtl.—*Verein für Natur- und Altertumskunde.*  
 Bericht. VI. 1909.  
 Mitteilungen. Heft 3-4, 1877-84.
- Renkema, E. H. *Observationes criticae et exegeticae ad C. Valerii Flacci*  
*Aragonautica.* 1906.
- RIGA.—*Naturforscher-Verein.*  
 Arbeiten. XIII. 1911.  
 Korrespondenzblatt. LIV. 1911.
- RIO DE JANEIRO.—*Instituto Oswaldo Cruz.*  
 Memoria. III, 2. 1911.  
*Instituto historico e geografico Brasileiro.*  
 Revista. XI; XXVII; XLIII, 2; XLVIII-LII, 4; LIII, 1;  
 LIV, 2; LIX-LXXIII, 2; LXXIV, 1; Special volume, 1908,  
 parts 1-2.  
*Museu nacional.*  
 Archivos. XIV, XV.
- ROCHESTER.—*Academy of Science.*  
 Proceedings. IV, 233-41; V, 1-58.
- ROME.—*R. Accademia dei lincei.*  
 Atti. Ser. V. Rendiconti. Classe de scienze fisiche, mate-  
 matiche e naturali. XX, 11-XXI, 5, 7-12.  
 Atti. Rendiconto dell' adunanza sollenne. 1911, 2; 1912, 2.  
*Accademia Pontifica dei nuovi lincei.*  
 Atti. LXIV, 1-7, 1910-11.
- ROTTERDAM.—*Bataafsch genootschap der proefondervinderlijke wijsbegeerte.*  
 Nieuwe verhandelingen. 2de Reeks, Deel V-VI, 3.
- ST. GALLEN.—*St. Gallische Naturwissenschaftliche Gesellschaft.*  
 Jahrbuch. 1910.
- ST. LOUIS.—*Academy of science.*  
 Transactions. XX, 4-6.

ST. PETERSBURG.—*Akademiia nauk.*

Classe physico-mathématique. Bulletin. Sér. VI. 1912, 1-11.  
Mémoires, Sér. VIII. T. XXV, 9-10; XXVI, 1-2; XXVII, 1-2;  
XXIX, 1-3; XXX, 1-3.

Classe historique-philologique. Mémoires. Sér. VIII. T. X, 2-3.

*I. Botanic garden.*

Hortus petropolitani. Acta. XXVIII, 4.

*Institut des mines de l'Impératrice Catherine II.*

Annales. III, 1-5.

*Observatoire physique central Nicolas.*

Annales. 1907 and 1908, I-II; II, 1-2.

*Comité géologique.*

Bulletin. XXIX, 5-XXX, 5. 1910-11.

Mémoires. N. S. LIII-LV, LX, LXI, LXVI-LXXIII.

SALEM.—*Essex Institute.*

Annual report. 1912.

SANTIAGO DE CHILE.—*Sociedad científica de Chile.*

Actes. VIII, 5; IX; XI; XIII, 3; XIII, 4-5; XIV, 5; XV, 3-4;  
XVI, 1-5. 1898-1906.

*Sociedad de fomento fabril.*

Boletín. XXIX, 1, 4-7. 1912.

SÃO PAULO.—*Museu Paulista.*

Revista. VIII. 1911.

*Sociedade científica.*

Revista. VI. 1911.

SAPPORO.—*Tôhoku I. University.*

College of agriculture. Journal. IV, 1-8.

Science report. I, 1-2.

Mathematical journal. I, 1-II, 1. 1911-12.

Sars, G. O., Account of the crustacea of Norway. V, 31-36, 1911.

Schwarzschild, K., Aktinometrie der Sterne. Teil B. 1912.

SHEWSBURY.—*Caradoc and Severn valley field club.*

Record of bare facts. 1909, 19; 1911, 21.

Transactions. V, 3.

SIENA.—*Accademia dei fisiocratici.*

Atti. Ser. V. II, 7-III, 6.

*Université.*

Annuaire. I-VI. 1904-10.

Faculté de droit. Annuaire. V-VI. 1908-10.

Faculté historico-philologique. Annuaire. V-VI. 1908-10.

Faculté physico-mathématique. Annuaire. V-VI. 1908-10.

SOFIA.—*Université.*

Annuaire. VII, 1910-11.

Faculté physico-mathématique. Annuaire. VII, 1910-11.

- SOUTH DAKOTA.—*Geological Survey.*  
Bulletin. 4. 1908.
- STETTIN.—*Entomologischer Verein.*  
Entomologische Zeitung. XLII—LXXII. 1881—1911.
- STOCKHOLM.—*K. Bibliotheket.*  
Årsberättelse. 1909, 1911.  
*Entomologisk förening.*  
Entomologisk Tidskrift. XXXII. 1911 & Register, XI—XXX.  
1890—1909.  
*K. Svenska Vetenskaps-Akademi.*  
Årsbok. 1911.  
Arkiv för botanik. X, 2—4. 1911.  
Arkiv för kemi, mineralogi och geologi. IV, 2. 1911.  
Arkiv för matematik, astronomi och fysik. VI, 4; VII, 1—2.  
1911.  
Nobelinstitut. Meddelanden. II, 1.  
Handlingar. XLVI, 4—11; XLVII, 1.  
Meteorologiska Iakttagelser i Sverige. 1910, B. 52 and appendix.  
*Sveriges offentliga bibliothek.*  
Accessions-katalog. 24—25, 1909—10.
- STONE.—*North Staffordshire field club.*  
Annual report and transactions. XLVI. 1911—12.
- STRASSBURG.—*K. Universität.*  
Sternwarte. Annalen. IV, 1, 1911.
- STUTT GART.—*Verein für vaterländische Naturkunde in Württemberg.*  
Jahreshefte. LXVII and Beilage; LXVIII. 1911—12.
- SYDNEY.—*Australian museum.*  
Memoir. IV, 13—16. 1911.  
Records. VIII, 1—3; IX, 1—2.  
Report of the trustees. LVII. 1911.  
Special catalogue. No. 1, vol. III, 2—4.  
*Linnean Society of New South Wales.*  
Proceedings. XXXV, 3—XXXVI, 2.  
*Royal society of New South Wales.*  
Journal and proceedings. XLIII, 2—XLV, 1.
- TEXAS.—*University.*  
Bulletin. 221, 228, 229, 231—2. 1912.
- TOKYO.—*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens.*  
Mitteilungen. XIII—XIV.  
*University.*  
College of science. Journal. XXVII, 15; XXVIII, 7; XXX, 1;  
XXXI; XXXII, 1, 5; XXXII, 2, 4.  
Medizinische Facultät. Mitteilungen. IX, 2—3; X, 1—2.
- TORONTO.—*Canadian Institute.*  
Transactions. Nos. 20—21.



- TOULOUSE.—*Académie des sciences, inscriptions et belles-lettres.*  
Mémoires. Sér. 10, T. X.  
*Université.*  
Bibliothèque méridionale. Sér. II, T. XIV. 1910.  
Annuaire. 1911-12.  
Conseil. Rapport annuel. 1911.  
Thèses (69).
- TRIEST.—*Osservatorio maritimo.*  
Rapporto annuale. 1907 (1911).
- TUFTS COLLEGE. Studies. Scientific series. III, 2.
- TRONDHEIM.—*Norske videnskabers selskab.*  
Skrifter. 1910.
- TURIN.—*Università.*  
Musei di zoologia ed anatomia comparata. Bolletino. XXVI,  
634-44; and Index.
- UPSALA.—*Universitet.*  
Årsskrift. 1910.  
Geologiska institution. Bulletin. XI. 1912.  
*K. Vetenskaps societaten.*  
Nova acta. Ser. IV. T. II, 2.
- UTRECHT.—*Observatoire.*  
Recherches astronomiques. IV-V.  
*Provinciaal Utrechtsch genootschap van kunsten en wetenschappen.*  
Aanteekeningen van het verhandelde. 1911.  
Verslag van het verhandelde. 1911.
- VENICE.—*R. Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti.*  
Atti. LXVII, 6-LXXX, 8. 1907-10.  
Concorsi a premio. May 28. 1911.  
*R. Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti.*  
Osservazioni meteorologiche e geodinamiche. 1907-8.
- VICENZA.—*Accademia Olimpica.*  
Atti. N. S., II. 1909-10.
- VIENNA.—*K. K. Akademie der Wissenschaften.*  
Almanach. 1910-11. Register zu Bd. I-LX.  
Erdbeben-Kommission. Mitteilungen. XXXVIII-XLIII.  
Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse. Anzeiger. XLVIII,  
1-27. Denkschriften. LXXXIV-LXXXVI, 1. LXXXVII.  
Sitzungsberichte. CXXI, Abt. 1, 1-3. II b, 1-2. II a, 1.  
*K. K. Central-Anstalt für Meteorologie.*  
Jahrbuch. N.F., XLVI, 1909.  
*K. K. Geologische Reichsanstalt.*  
Jahrbuch. LXI. 3-LXII, 1, 1911-12.  
Verhandlungen. 1911, 6-1912, 5.  
*Naturhistorisches Hof-Museum.*  
Annalen. XXIV, 3-XXV, 4.

VIENNA.—*K. K. Zoologisch-botanische Gesellschaft.*

Verhandlungen. LXI. 1911.

*Verein zur Verbreitung naturwissenschaftlicher Kenntnisse.*

Schriften. LI. 1911.

VIRGINIA.—*University.*

Philosophical society. Bulletin. Humanistic series. I, 2, pp. 51-7; Scientific series. I, 6-9, pp. 137-242; Proceedings, 1910-11.

Vliet, J., Van der, *Studia critica in Dionysii Halicarnassensis opera rhetorica.*

WARREN.—*Academy.*

Transactions. I, 3. 1909-10.

WASHINGTON.—*Bureau of American ethnology.*

Bulletin. 51.

*Department of agriculture.*

Library. Bulletin. 54-75; Monthly bulletin. II, 5-III, 6.

Librarian's report, 1911.

*Geological survey.*

Annual report. XXXII. 1911.

Bulletins. 468-9; 472-3; 475-7; 479-97; 499-500; 506; 509; 511-12.

Geologic atlas, folio. 177-82.

Professional papers. 70, 72-3, 75.

Publications. N. S. 1. 1912.

Water-supply and irrigation papers. 265-80; 282-8.

*Library of Congress.*

Report of Librarian. 1911.

WASHINGTON.—*National museum.*

Bulletin. 75-8.

National Herbarium. Contributions. XVI, 1-3.

Proceedings. XXXIX-XLI.

Report. 1911.

*Naval observatory.*

Publications. Ser. II. Vol. VI.

Report of Superintendent. 1911.

*National academy of sciences.*

Memoir. X.

*Weather bureau.* Department of agriculture.

Mount Weather observatory. Bulletin. IV, 4-6.

*Wesley College.*—Bulletin. VI, 1.

WIESBADEN.—*Nassauischer Verein für Naturkunde.*

Jahrbuch. LXIV. 1911.

WISCONSIN.—*Academy of science.*

Transactions. XVI, part II, 1-6. 1909-10; Index to XVI, part II.

WISCONSIN.—*Geological and natural history survey.*

Bulletin. 23-4.

*Natural history society.*

Bulletin. IX, 3-4. 1911.

WORKING.—*South-eastern union of scientific societies.*

South-eastern naturalist. 1911.

WORCESTER, Mass.—*American antiquarian society*

Transactions and collections. IX-X. XII. 1909-11.

Proceedings. XXI, 2. 1911.

ZÜRICH.—*Naturforschende Gesellschaft.*

Vierteljahrsschrift. LV, 3-LVI, 3. 1911.





1900

1901



BS2795 .4.F75

The literary relations of "The First

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00034 0358