# 1

## INTRODUCTION

The principal aim of this study is to discern what has shaped the author of 1 Peter to regard Christian suffering as a necessary (1.6) and to-be-expected (4.12) component of faithful allegiance to Jesus Christ.[1] That 1 Peter declares suffering to be a normative reality for faithful followers of Jesus is not a novel idea in the earliest church traditions. In fact, several NT witnesses affirm this central message of 1 Peter. In the Jesus Tradition, for example, Jesus warns that those who choose to follow him will face opposition from family and compeers, and even be accused of wrongdoing (e.g. Mark 8.34; 13.9–13; John 15.18–27). In Acts 14.22, would-be followers of Jesus are reminded that tribulations are requisite for those who wish to enter the kingdom of God. Statements made by Paul seem to indicate that one of the central components of his teaching was that tribulations (for the sake of Jesus) were part and parcel with faithful Christian discipleship (e.g. 1 Thess. 3.3–4; Phil. 1.28–30; 2 Thess. 2.3–12). And the overall narrative of Revelation depicts Christian suffering as a necessary part of a wider eschatological programme (e.g. 3.10; 6–19).

These witnesses, however, offer little (if any) insight into how the early church actually arrived at such a startling conclusion regarding Christian suffering, except perhaps to suggest that the idea originated with Jesus independent of any scriptural precedent. I will argue that 1 Peter offers a unique vista into the way in which at least one early Christian witness came to conclude that Christian suffering was a necessary feature of faithful allegiance to Jesus Christ.

All abbreviations are in keeping with the Society of Biblical Literature standards.

[1] Throughout this study I have qualified 'suffering' with the adjective 'Christian' to underscore that what 1 Peter specifically has in view is suffering that comes as a result of one's allegiance to Jesus Christ. It is important to note that this study, and 1 Peter for that matter, is not offering a comprehensive theodicy but rather an explanation of suffering that is integrally related to Christian discipleship.

## 1.1 Suffering in 1 Peter: a survey of the literature

Since suffering is one of the principal themes of 1 Peter, it is no surprise that studies on the subject (whether tangentially or intentionally) are legion.[2] Most recent comprehensive investigations, however, tend to limit their scope to two particular aspects of suffering in 1 Peter: (1) its cause and nature, and (2) the strategies that the author of 1 Peter employs in order to enable his addressees to respond in faithfulness.

Prior to the ground-breaking observations of E. G. Selwyn (*The First Epistle of St. Peter* (1946)) most assumed that the addressees of 1 Peter were suffering because of Roman imperial proscription. As a result, scholars seldom questioned the nature of suffering, and instead attempted to discern whether this official programme of persecution came under Nero, Domitian or Trajan. Selwyn, however, led the way (at least in the English literature) in observing that the language used to describe the suffering in 1 Peter reflected sporadic and localized slander and social discrimination rather than physical persecution characteristic of Roman policy.[3] This astute observation opened the door for a reconsideration of the socio-historical context of the letter, and more particularly the cause and nature of suffering.

John Elliott, who was the first to apply a social-scientific perspective to 1 Peter, began a new conversation in 1 Peter studies with his monograph *A Home for the Homeless* (1981). His unique approach to 1 Peter yielded an equally unique explanation for the cause of suffering, which he argued can be explained in three words: πάροικος (2.11), παρεπίδημος (1.1; 2.11) and παροικία (1.17). According to his analysis, these key terms regularly refer to people living in a literal foreign land as actual resident aliens in a condition of social estrangement.[4] A literal reading of these three key terms served as the basis for Elliott's reconstruction of the social setting of 1 Peter. According to Elliott, the addressees of 1 Peter found themselves in a precarious situation because *some* among them were literal πάροικοι and παρεπίδημοι (1.1; 1.17; 2.11) in Asia Minor *before* becoming Christians. In other words, they were suffering because of their

[2] The words πάσχω and πάθημα occur sixteen times in 1 Peter – five in reference to Jesus (2.21,23; 3.18; 4.1; 5.1), and eleven in reference to Christian suffering (1.11; 2.19,20; 3.14,17; 4.1,13,15,19; 5.9,10).

[3] E.g. 1 Pet. 2.12; 3.9; 3.16; 4.4; 4.14. See Selwyn 1958: 47–56, esp. 55, for his full argumentation.

[4] His lexical analysis includes biblical as well as extra-biblical usages such as inscriptions and Graeco-Roman literature. See Chapters 1 and 2 of Elliott 1981, and especially his summary *ibid.*: 48. For a detailed and updated summary of his position see also 2000: 101–3, 312–16, 457–62, 476–83.

social status as resident aliens prior to joining the fellowship of Christ followers. In response to this social alienation, Elliott argued that the author of 1 Peter employs the metaphor 'household of God' (οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ; 4.17; 2.5) in order to 'reinforce the group consciousness, cohesion and commitment' – in other words, to offer a home for the homeless.[5]

Elliott's work generated a number of responses, many of which questioned his lexical analysis and his reconstruction of the letter's occasion, and which sought to examine further the strategy of the letter. Perhaps the most significant response to *A Home for the Homeless* was Reinhard Feldmeier's *Die Christen als Fremde* (1992).[6] Feldmeier offered an extensive analysis of the terms πάροικος and παρεπίδημος in both the context of 1 Peter as well as within the wider Graeco-Roman world (including philosophical works and Second Temple Jewish texts),[7] and concluded that their usage in 1 Peter is based primarily upon OT references to the dispersed people of God, and therefore ought to be understood as metaphors which point to the addressees' (new) favourable status with God, a status which also generates misunderstandings and conflict with their compeers.[8] In essence, Feldmeier turned Elliott's work on its head: οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ, rather than being the chief metaphor of the letter and the author's strategy for reducing alienation, is instead the basis for the addressees' estrangement within society.[9] What is more, Feldmeier contended that the *Fremde* motif, understood in relation to the dispersed people of God in the OT, rather than being the cause of alienation is in fact 1 Peter's strategy both for consoling as well as for instructing the addressees with respect to their new obligations and lifestyle.[10]

Troy Martin and Steven Bechtler also offered challenges to Elliott's proposal, while additionally contributing new insights into the strategy of 1 Peter.[11] Martin argued not only that 'diaspora' (1.1) is the controlling metaphor of the letter, but also that it is the organizing principle for its compositional structure.[12] What is more, Martin maintained that the author of 1 Peter has taken over the metaphor of 'diaspora' in order to orient his addressees with respect to their new eschatological journey,

[5] Elliott 1981: 107; for full argumentation see *ibid.*: 101–266. In the same year that Elliott's work appeared, in a monograph entitled *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*, David Balch (1981) argued that 1 Peter's strategy was targeted more towards assimilation rather than (sectarian) group cohesion. The two engaged in a number of responses, which later became known as the Balch–Elliott debate. For a summary of the debate and a nuanced response see Horrell 2007.

[6] Others of note are Chin 1991; Bechtler 1998; and Seland 2005.

[7] Feldmeier 1992: 8–104. [8] *Ibid.*: 169–74. [9] *Ibid.*: 203–10.

[10] *Ibid.*: 133–74, 175–91. [11] Martin 1992; Bechtler (1998).

[12] Martin 1992: 144–267. For a more detailed discussion of Martin's proposal see §6.2.

which is a result of their new birth.[13] Bechtler similarly recognized that 1 Peter speaks of the Christian life as a kind of transition period, which he described as 'temporal liminality': 'Christian life is . . . an existence "betwixt and between" history and the eschaton.'[14] Bechtler maintained that this concept of temporal liminality 'contains within it one very important element of the letter's total answer to the problem of the suffering of the addressees'.[15]

Elena Bosetti's monograph *Il Pastore* (1990), astonishingly, is the only comprehensive study to date of the pastoral motif in 1 Peter. In her analysis she noted that 1 Peter's appropriation of shepherd imagery has been relatively ignored, and in turn demonstrated that it serves a key role in the overall strategy of the letter and is integrally connected to the expectations of Jewish restoration eschatology.[16] However, as I will argue in more detail in Chapter 3, because she neglected to analyze comprehensively the eschatological shepherd tradition of Zechariah 9–14 and note its unique contribution, she was unable to make a connection between the shepherd imagery and the theology of Christian suffering in 1 Peter. In other words, for Bosetti, the shepherd imagery gives comfort to suffering Christians, tells us something about the identity of Jesus, and helps give scriptural warrant for his suffering and death – but it does not offer any help in determining how our author arrived at the conclusion that he makes in the letter regarding Christian suffering.

Additionally, I draw attention to J. de Waal Dryden's *Theology and Ethics in 1 Peter* (2006). Dryden argues that 1 Peter is a paraenetic letter concerned with forming Christians seeking faithfulness to God in the midst of suffering and temptation.[17] Of the five paraenetic strategies that Dryden identifies in the letter, his most significant and original contribution was to demonstrate that story (or narrative) is a strategic and integral part of the letter, working at the substructure level:[18] '[b]efore giving [the addressees of 1 Peter] moral instructions, [the author of 1 Peter] gives them a moral vision that places them in a moral universe. He does this by depicting not simply ontological statements about how the world is, but weaving together a *story* of how the world is'.[19]

[13] *Ibid.*: 153. [14] Bechtler 1998: 134; for full argumentation see *ibid.*: 109–78.
[15] *Ibid.*: 134. [16] Bosetti 1990: 10, 259–80, 117–58.
[17] Since the work of Lohse (1954), many Primopetrine scholars have abandoned the once popular composite theory and concluded that 1 Peter is paraenetic in nature.
[18] Dryden 2006: 66. I highlight this first element because, arguably, all the other elements (remembrance, construction of a corporate identity, moral instruction and Jesus as moral exemplar) can all be subsumed under the 'narrative' strategy. Saying that 1 Peter has narrative elements is not the same as saying that 1 Peter narrates a story.
[19] *Ibid.*: 64.

These investigations into the source and nature of Christian suffering in 1 Peter and into the strategy employed by the author have enhanced our understanding of 1 Peter. And as any good investigation should, they also generate further questions. For example, with respect to the various strategies that have been proposed, is there a relationship that can be discerned between the *Fremde* motif (Feldmeier), the notion that the 1 Peter addressees are on an eschatological journey (Martin), the concept of temporal liminality (Bechtler), shepherd imagery (Bosetti) and story (Dryden)? In other words, is there some way that these elements of 1 Peter's strategy can be synthesized? The most glaring lacuna in all of the works mentioned above, however, is that they have not sought to discern where the author of 1 Peter might have derived his strategy. If, for example, 'diaspora' (as understood by Martin) is in fact the controlling metaphor, how did the author of 1 Peter arrive at such a conclusion? If liminality is a key response to the addressees' situation, does our author give us any indication regarding where this notion of the Christian life came from? Are we able to discern what has led the author of 1 Peter to the particular narrative he develops in the letter? These questions are particularly important because the OT prophetic material, which is said to have shaped the author's understanding of τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα (1.11), seems to suggest that when God's redemptive agent emerges he will immediately usher in peace and justice.[20] What has led the author of 1 Peter to conclude otherwise?

Surprisingly there are only two studies that comprehensively have sought to discern the source behind 1 Peter's theology of Christian suffering – Helmut Millauer's (1976) *Leiden als Gnade*, and Mark Dubis' (2002) *Messianic Woes in First Peter*.

Millauer's work was, in part, a challenge to the consensus within German scholarship which regarded the theology of 1 Peter as dependent upon Pauline theology.[21] Focusing on the particular theme of suffering,

[20] As I will explain in §6.1, I translate τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα as 'the suffering until [the second coming] of Christ'.

[21] The following comment by W. G. Kümmel (1975: 424) is representative of the consensus:

> 1 Pet presupposes . . . Pauline theology. This is true not only in the general sense that the Jewish-Christian readers, the 'people of God' (2:10), are no longer concerned about the problem of the fulfilment of the Law, but also in the special sense that, as in Paul, the death of Jesus has atoned for the sins of Christians and has accomplished justification (1:18f; 2:24). Christians are to suffer with Christ (4:13; 5:1), obedience to the civil authorities is demanded (2:14f), and the Pauline formula ἐν Χριστῷ is encountered (3:16; 5:10, 14). The frequently advanced proposal that 1 Pet is literarily dependent on Rom (and

Millauer sought to demonstrate that 1 Peter's theology of suffering was derived not from Paul (or deutero-Pauline theology) but rather from two *Vorstellungskomplexe*: (1) the election tradition of the Old Testament and Judaism (e.g. Qumran and Second Temple Literature), and (2) the Synoptic tradition. In particular, Millauer identified three themes in 1 Peter which were derived from the election tradition: (1) suffering as πειρασμός, (2) the juxtaposition of suffering in the present with rejoicing in the future and (3) suffering as judgment and purgation of the elect.[22] From the Synoptic tradition, Millauer argued, 1 Peter develops the notions of (1) suffering as a Christian vocation, (2) suffering as 'blessing', and (3) joyfully responding to suffering in the present.[23] In Millauer's view, this complex of ideas which are found in these two traditions was the raw material which the author of 1 Peter ingeniously fused together to form his distinct theology of Christian suffering: 'Aufgrund dieser verschiedenen Traditionen kommt der 1 Peter zu einer eigenen Leidensdeutung: das Leiden des Erwaehlten in der Gemeinschaft mit Christus ist als Berufung in die Nachfolge Gnade.'[24] According to Millauer, the nexus which brings the complex of ideas together is the *Nachfolgetradition* (*imitatio christi*) of the Synoptics: Christ, the elect one, faithfully embodies the election tradition and becomes the example of how to live loyally to God.[25]

Although Millauer was successful in demonstrating differences between Pauline and Primopetrine theologies of suffering,[26] and in showing parallels between the Synoptic tradition and 1 Peter,[27] his overall thesis is problematic for at least three reasons. First, as is often characteristic of the history of traditions approach, Millauer traces the development of words and ideas from their earliest usage to their appearance in NT traditions, assuming that the Synoptic tradition and the author of 1 Peter have the same access to and notions of these texts, words and ideas, but without demonstrating this to be the case. Second, he is unable to explain in a satisfactory manner what has compelled or governed the author of 1 Peter to interact with this particular complex of ideas among the many he could have chosen in the two traditions and why the author presents

> Eph) is improbable because the linguistic contacts can be explained on the basis of a common catechetical tradition. But there can be no doubt that the author of 1 Pet stands in the line of succession of Pauline theology, and that is scarcely conceivable for Peter, who at the time of Gal 2:11 was able in only a very unsure way to follow the Pauline basic principal of freedom from the Law for Gentile Christians.

[22] Millauer 1976: 15–59, 105–33, 135–44, 165–79.
[23] *Ibid.*: 61–104, 145–64,179–85. [24] *Ibid.*: 187. [25] *Ibid.*
[26] See, e.g. *ibid.*: 38–44, 85–7. [27] *Ibid.*: 69–76, 146–59.

his theology of suffering in the fashion that he has. In other words, what is it that brought these six particular themes together? Finally, and most significantly, it is unclear how the election tradition and the Synoptic tradition are relevant to the situation that the author of 1 Peter is addressing. How does the complex of ideas in these two traditions, which explain the suffering of God's people prior to or concomitant with the appearance of God's chosen redemptive agent, adequately explain Christian suffering *after* the coming, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and prior to his second coming?

Although Mark Dubis does not interact with Millauer, this is precisely the point that he addresses in his *Messianic Woes in First Peter*. For Dubis, the best way to explain Christian suffering after the coming, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ is to read 1 Peter against the backdrop of the messianic woes tradition of 'early Judaism'.[28] In his analysis of 1 Pet. 4.12–19, the primary focus of his study, Dubis identifies seven themes which are paralleled in the messianic woes tradition of Judaism: (1) the necessity of 'fiery trials' for God's people prior to restoration (1 Pet. 1.6; 4.12);[29] (2) suffering which is directly related to one's allegiance to the Christ and part of God's eschatological programme (4.13; 5.1; 1.11);[30] (3) the spirit of glory as a sign of the restoration of God's people (4.14);[31] (4) lawlessness and apostasy during the messianic woes (4.15–16);[32] (5) judgment that begins with 'the house of God' (4.17);[33] (6) God's sovereign protection of those who undergo the messianic woes (4.17);[34] and (7) the exhortation to trust God for eschatological deliverance (4.19).[35] According to Dubis, these parallels suggest that the theology of suffering found in 1 Peter was dependent on the messianic woes tradition.[36]

The strength of Dubis' study is the manner in which he relates suffering to Jewish eschatological restoration expectations. Dubis rightly notes that the themes of suffering and glory are integrally linked to notions of exile and restoration. But, as I will detail in Chapter 4, his overall approach is ultimately unsatisfying. First, he has unduly dismissed the OT as a viable source for the kind of theology of suffering that 1 Peter offers. Second, in the place of the OT, Dubis has constructed a particular strand of messianic woes from a variety of texts within the Second Temple period and then noted the parallels that this construction shares with

[28] Dubis 2002: 186. [29] *Ibid*.: 62–95.
[30] I.e. he interprets τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα to be references to the messianic woes tradition. *Ibid*.: 96–117.
[31] *Ibid*.: 118–29. [32] *Ibid*.: 130–41. [33] *Ibid*.: 142–62.
[34] *Ibid*.: 163–71. [35] *Ibid*.: 172–85. [36] *Ibid*.: 186–91.

1 Peter. In the process, he has failed to address adequately the variety of perspectives regarding the 'messianic woes' that these Second Temple texts offer, especially with respect to when suffering is to occur and who is to undergo the suffering. Additionally, he has not demonstrated the availability of these texts or their notions regarding suffering. And finally, he does not adequately demonstrate how his findings in 1 Pet. 4.12–19 relate to the overall strategy of 1 Peter.

In my view, there remains a compelling and comprehensive explanation for the source that has generated 1 Peter's theology of Christian suffering. In other words, if Jesus truly is the Christ, God's chosen redemptive agent who has come to restore God's people, then how can it be that Christian suffering is a necessary part of discipleship *after* his coming, death and resurrection? What led the author of 1 Peter to such a startling conclusion, which seems to runs against the grain of the eschatological hopes and expectations of Jewish restoration theology?

## 1.2 Thesis stated in brief

I will argue that as we trace the argumentation of 1 Peter, and the appropriation of imagery and OT texts, we can discern dependence upon Zechariah 9–14 for our author's understanding of Christian suffering. Said in another way, I will argue that the eschatological programme of Zechariah 9–14, read through the lens of the Gospel, functions as the substructure for 1 Peter's eschatology and thus his theology of Christian suffering.

## 1.3 Methodological issues

### 1.3.1 What is a 'substructure' and how do we find it?

In order to advance my thesis, it will be essential that I explain what I mean by the term 'substructure'. In this regard it will be necessary to survey the work of two scholars who have been influential in using the term, yet in distinct fashions, and who also have contributed to several assumptions that I maintain regarding the way in which the OT shapes NT theology and discourse.

In his seminal work *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (1952), C. H. Dodd sought to demonstrate that NT authors were dependent upon the OT in order to elucidate their understanding of the kerygma:[37] 'the Church was committed . . . to a

[37] I do not agree with Dodd (1952: 12) when he states that the kerygma is 'pre-theological' and 'does not bring us very far on the road to that reflective and reasoned presentation of the truth of the Gospel which is Christian theology'.

formidable task of biblical research, primarily for the purpose of clarifying its own understanding of the momentous events out of which it had emerged, and also for the purpose of making its Gospel intelligible to the outside public'.[38] One of Dodd's unique contributions in *According to the Scriptures* was to draw attention to a body of OT passages, which he called *testimonia*,[39] that were called upon in the process of explaining the significance of the Christ event.[40] In his investigation Dodd points to 'fifteen instances where there are grounds . . . for believing that New Testament writers were working upon a tradition in which certain passages of the Old Testament were treated as "testimonies" to the Gospel facts, or in other words as disclosing that "determinate counsel of God" which was fulfilled in those facts'.[41] In the course of analyzing the fifteen *testimonia*, Dodd observed that while the NT authors may have agreed upon the exegetical value of a particular passage in the OT, they nevertheless did not agree in the precise material that they included in their discourse. In other words, Dodd argued, the NT authors do not appear to have been working from anthologies (at least not in the way that Rendel Harris imagined) or with mere proof-texts. Instead, Dodd suggests, 'there were some parts of scripture which were early recognized as appropriate sources from which *testimonia* might be drawn'.[42] This hypothesis led to Dodd's second significant contribution, an analysis of the wider context of the *testimonia*, upon which he concluded that the selected OT passages were understood as *wholes*, and that particular verses or sentences were quoted from them rather as pointers to the whole context than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves.[43] For Dodd then, in light of these judgments, it follows that 'the attempt to discover just how the

[38] *Ibid*.: 14.

[39] Throughout his work Dodd distances himself from Rendel Harris' work on *testimonia*, emphasizing that the quotation of passages from the OT is not to be accounted by the testimony books. Instead, he argues that the composition of testimony books was the result of the work of early biblical scholars.

[40] For Dodd (*ibid*.: 29–30; 61–110), any two passages that are cited by two or more NT authors independently are considered *testimonia*.

[41] *Ibid*.: 57; for full analysis see *ibid*.: 28–60. The fifteen passages are: Ps. 2.7; Ps. 8.4–6; Ps. 110.1; Ps. 118.22–3; Isa. 6.9–10; Isa. 53.1; Isa. 40.3–5; Isa. 28.16; Gen. 12.3; Jer. 31.31–4; Joel 2.28–32; Hab. 2.3–4; Isa. 61.1–2; and Deut. 18.15,19.

[42] *Ibid*.: 60.

[43] *Ibid*.: 126. See *ibid*.: 61–110 for full argumentation. In Chapter 2 I will show how Zechariah 9–14 functioned in this manner. In the course of his investigation Dodd (*ibid*.: 72) highlights a particular cluster of *testimonia* (Joel 2–3, Zechariah 9–14 and parts of Daniel), which he labels 'apocalyptic-eschatological', that he argues were employed in order to indicate 'that the crisis out of which the Christian movement arose is regarded as the realization of the prophetic vision of judgment and redemption'. In Chapter 2 I will analyze the 'prophetic vision of judgment and redemption' in Zechariah 9–14 and trace its reception in Second Temple Judaism and in the NT.

Old Testament was employed to elucidate the *kerygma* in the earliest period accessible to us and in circles which exerted permanent influence on Christian thought, is one which we are bound to make in seeking the *substructure* of New Testament theology'.[44]

Richard Hays (*The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*) has advanced significantly the discussion regarding the way in which the OT shapes NT theology, arguing in particular that Paul's letters are 'best understood as the product of an underlying narrative bedrock'.[45] Hays' key observation is that a number of interpreters, including Dodd, have offered readings of Paul that stress various aspects of what he calls 'the narrative substructure' of Paul's theology, but have failed to develop an interpretation of Paul that roots his theology in story.[46] Drawing on the work of Nothrop Frye, Paul Ricoeur and Robert Funk, Hays argues that

(1) There is an organic relationship between stories and reflective discourse [i.e. letters] . . . which not only permits but also demands restatement and interpretation in non-narrative language.

(2) The reflective statement does not simply repeat the plot (*mythos*) of the story; nevertheless, the story shapes and constrains the reflective process because the *dianoia* [the meaning of the *mythos* or sequence of the story when seen as a whole] can never be entirely abstracted from the story in which it is manifested and apprehended.

(3) When we encounter this type of reflective discourse, it is legitimate and possible to inquire about the story in which it is rooted.[47]

[44] *Ibid*.: 27. Italics mine. Lindars (1961) and Juel (1988) have advanced Dodd's work in significant ways, the former highlighting the exegetical techniques and practices which paralleled the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) while also tracing the development of particular doctrines in the early church, the latter arguing that Jesus' messiahship was the starting point for OT exegesis. For a critique of Dodd 1952 see Albl 1999: 27–32. It is notable that in the midst of his critique of Dodd, Albl (*ibid*.: 32) grants that Dodd offered two especially valuable contributions with his study: (1) the suggestion that NT writers had an entire 'plot' in mind when they cited a passage, and (2) the notion of a substructure which undergirded NT theology. I wish to point out that Dodd is certainly not the last word regarding OT appropriation in the NT; neither does he offer an exhaustive account of the subject. However, I find his foundational observations (i.e. *testimonia* read as wholes and viewed as sources for elucidation of the gospel and its implications) to be helpful in understanding at least one way in which the OT is appropriated in the NT.

[45] This description is taken from Longenecker (2002: 3). For an appraisal of the narrative approach to Pauline theology by several leading Pauline scholars see *ibid*.

[46] Hays 1983: 9. For a full discussion see *ibid*.: 9–14.

[47] *Ibid*.: 28. Brackets not original to Hays.