

The Quotations of Isaiah in 1 Peter: A Text-Critical Analysis

Katie Marcar
Otago University

Abstract: This article examines the quotations of Isaiah in 1 Peter in order to determine, as far as possible, the author's *Vorlage*. It first defines quotations (as opposed to allusions), evaluates the importance of introductory formula or terms, and contextualizes this study in terms of comparable analyses in Pauline studies. After this methodological ground-clearing, the textual forms of the following six Isaianic quotations are analysed in detail: 1 Pet 1:24–25 (Isa 40:6–8), 1 Pet 2:6 (Isa 28:16), 1 Pet 2:8 (Isa 8:14), 1 Pet 2:22 (Isa 53:9), 1 Pet 2:25 (Isa 53:6), and 1 Pet 3:14–15 (Isa 8:12–13). These quotations are studied in light of evidence from the proto-MT, Dead Sea Scrolls, Old Greek (OG), the hexaplaric recensions, and other relevant sources of textual information. The article concludes that quotations of Isaiah in 1 Peter generally agree with the OG, with a few exceptions where they are closer to the proto-MT, and bear no evidence of a Hebraizing revision except in quotations of Isaiah that are also quoted by Paul.

Keywords: 1 Peter, Textual Criticism, Septuagint, Isaiah, New Testament Use of the Old, Dead Sea Scrolls, Second Temple Judaism, Early Christianity

Although 1 Peter is saturated with quotations, allusions, and biblicisms from the Hebrew Scriptures, the author deploys more quotations and allusions from Isaiah than from any other text.¹ However, commentators have often described 1 Peter's quotations as septuagintal without further refinement.² Such statements fail to recognize the complex history and textual variation within individual books of the Old Greek (OG) that lies beneath this tidy label.³

¹ Schutter and Elliott number approximately forty-six quotations and allusions. William L. Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition of I Peter*, WUNT 2/30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 35–43. John H. Elliott, *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 37B (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 12–17.

² For example, Edward Gordon Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1946), 24. Leonhard Goppelt, *A Commentary on I Peter*, trans. John E. Alsup (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978); trans. of *Der erste Petrusbrief*, MeyerK 12/1, 8th (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 50, 65. Schutter seems to take the LXX text for granted since he never directly addresses the issue, though he uses the LXX consistently throughout; Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 38, 131. Elliott notes that quotations tend to follow Codex Alexandrinus over Codex Vaticanus, Elliott, *I Peter*, 16.

³ For more on the complexity of individual books, see Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, JBS 8 (Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 15–17.

This article will analyze the Petrine quotations of Isaiah in order to identify, as far as possible, the author's *Vorlage*, with particular attention to the two known text forms of Greek Isaiah, the Alexandrian text (A, Q, S, et. al.), and the Hexaplaric text (B, V, et. al.).⁴ By limiting this study to the quotations of Isaiah, this study will be able to appeal to evidence from specific studies on Isaiah's translation technique (TT) and transmission history.⁵ Due to their inherent textual fluidity, Petrine allusions and echoes to Isaiah will not be analyzed here.⁶

One of the goals of this study will be to determine how the quotations of Isaiah in 1 Peter compare to the results of similar studies on the Pauline letters. As Dietrich-Alex Koch has shown, Paul's use of Isaiah tends to agree with the Alexandrian text and to bear evidence of Hebraizing revision.

Die Zugehörigkeit des von Paulus vorausgesetzten Jes-Textes zur frühen alexandrinischen Textform ist damit eindeutig. Die zahlreichen hexaplarischen Angleichungen an den hebräischen Text, die auch innerhalb der paulinischen Textuasschnitte vorliegen, fehlen (fast) völlig, obwohl der Jes-Text des Paulus zugleich deutliche Spuren enier hebraisierenden Überarbeitung aufweist.⁷

Was the author of 1 Peter using a similar text form of Isaiah to that used by Paul?

1. Definitions, Methodology, and Citation Technique in 1 Peter

The number of quotations, allusions, and biblicisms in 1 Peter and the definitions of these terms varies from scholar to scholar (see Table 1). Disagreements occur over the importance of introductory formulas or preceding terms, the significance of grammatical and syntactical modification, and whether a text seamlessly woven into the context must be classified as an allusion.

⁴ Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*, BHT 69 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 48–51. Joseph Ziegler, *Isaias, Septuaginta 14* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939), 2153. R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 13–14.

⁵ For more on the Greek translation of Isaiah, see Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1934). I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Leiden: Brill, 1948). A. van der Kooij, "Isaiah in the Septuagint," in *Writing and Reading the Isaiah Scroll: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, vol. 2, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 513–29. Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson, "Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah," in Broyles and Evans, *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*, 531–46.

⁶ There are four clear Petrine allusions to Isaiah: 1 Pet 2:9 (Isa 43:20–21), 12 (Isa 10:3), 24 (Isa 53:4–12); 4:14 (Isa 11:2). The allusion to Isa 53:6 is strengthened since Isa 53 is quoted repeatedly in the immediate context of 1 Peter. The reference in 1 Pet 4:14 (Isa 11:2) is introduced with ὅτι, which may suggest that it ought to be classified instead as a quotation.

⁷ Koch, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 50; also see 57–69, 78–81.

Table 1: Comparison of Quotation and Allusion Statistics in 1 Peter

Author	# of Quotations	# of Allusions	# of Biblicisms
1. J. H. Elliott	18 ⁸	Clear: 13 ⁹ Possible: 11 ¹¹ Incipient: 3 ¹² Iterative: 26 ¹³	20 ¹⁰
2. T. P. Osborne ¹⁴	9 ¹⁵	21 ¹⁶	—
3. William Schutter	Explicit: 9 ¹⁷ Implicit: 13 ¹⁹	24 ¹⁸	About 20
4. Steve Moyise ²⁰	11	—	—
5. Ernest Best ²¹	11	18 ²²	—
6. Dan McCartney ²³	10	—	—
7. S. Voorwinde ²⁴	18	—	—

⁸ Elliott, *I Peter*, 12–17. Defined as having a sufficient quantity of text and degree of correspondence and/or having an introductory formula or preceding term (such as ὄτι or καί).

⁹ Reproduces sufficient quantity of text to indicate reference to a specific Old Testament segment, often in a modified form.

¹⁰ Informal idiom characteristic of Greek-speaking Israelite piety, informed by the language of the LXX.

¹¹ Insufficient quantity to indicate with certainty one of several Old Testament allusions.

¹² Old Testament reference dependent on an exegetical tradition for its recognition.

¹³ Anticipating or resuming part of an Old Testament text cited elsewhere by author; use suggested by literary context.

¹⁴ T. P. Osborne, “L’utilisation des citations de l’Ancien Testament dans la première épître de Pierre,” *RTL* 12 (1981): 64–77.

¹⁵ “Dans cette étude, je distingue les «citations» (référence à un texte de l’AT qui suit celui-ci d’assez près, sans modifications ou avec des modifications restreintes, et qui peut être accompagnée d’une formule d’introduction) des «allusions» littéraires (référence à un texte de l’AT comportant quelques ressemblances verbales avec le texte original, bien que marqué de modifications importantes—la forme des mots, leur ordre, etc.—et sans formule d’introduction),” “L’utilisation des citations,” 65 fn. 3.

¹⁶ See fn. 14 above.

¹⁷ Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 35–43. Introduced by a formula, “L’utilisation des citations,” 65 fn. 3.

¹⁸ Less formal but still demonstrable, often introduced into the context with little or no interruption.

¹⁹ Reproduces a text in extenso, such that it might have been introduced with a formula and so have been virtually indistinguishable from an explicit quotation.

²⁰ Steve Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” in *Isaiah in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 175–88 (175).

²¹ Ernest Best, “1 Peter II 4–10: A Reconsideration,” *NovT* 11 (1969): 270–93.

²² If the Old Testament was unknown, they would be indistinguishable from the text. They have no introductory formula and are seamlessly woven into the text.

²³ Jobs reproduces this information from McCartney’s unpublished dissertation. See Karen H. Jobs, “The Septuagint Textual Tradition in 1 Peter,” in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, SCS 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 311–33 (312). Dan G. McCartney, “The Use of the Old Testament in the First Epistle of Peter” (PhD Diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1989).

²⁴ Jobs reproduces this information from Voorwinde’s unpublished dissertation. See Jobs, “Septuagint Textual Tradition,” 312. Stephen Voorwinde, “Old Testament Quotations in Peter’s Epistles,” *VR* 49 (1987): 3–16.

This article defines a quotation as a passage that reproduces a portion of text with a great degree of verbal similarity and minimal contextual modification and may, though not necessarily, be introduced with an introductory formula or preceding term. In cases where an introductory formula or preceding term is used, the passage will be treated as a quotation unless there is a significant reason to do otherwise. Where introductory formulas are used, their form and function is consistent with conventions elsewhere in the New Testament and other writings from the Second Temple period.²⁵

However, introductory formulas and preceding terms are not always used in 1 Peter to introduce quotations (see Tables 2 and 3). The following tables divide the Isaianic quotations into two groups: (1) those with an introductory formula or preceding term and (2) those without a preceding formula or introductory term. The number of words has been listed as a general indication of the length of the passage.

Table 2: Introductory Formulas or Terms in 1 Peter

Passages	Introductory Formula or Term	Number of Words in Quotation
1. 1 Pet 1:16 (Lev 19:2)	διότι γέγραπται ὅτι	6
2. 1 Pet 1:24–25 (Isa 40:6–8)	διότι	26
3. 1 Pet 2:6–8 (Isa 28:16)	διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ	16
4. 1 Pet 2:25 (Isa 53:6; Ezek 34:5, 16)	ἦτε γάρ	14
5. 1 Pet 3:10–12 (Ps 34:13–17)	γάρ	48
6. 1 Pet 4:8 (Prov 10:12)	ὅτι	5
7. 1 Pet 4:14 (Isa 11:2)	ὅτι	8
8. 1 Pet 4:18 (Prov 11:3)	καί	12
9. 1 Pet 5:5 (Prov 3:34)	ὅτι	6
10. 1 Pet 5:7 (Wis 12:13)	ὅτι	4

The very first quotation in 1 Pet 1:16 receives a long introductory formula even though the quoted passage is quite short. As the letter continues, the frequency of introductory formulas decreases. It is not always clear whether some terms, such as καί and ὅτι, should be interpreted as introductory terms or simple conjunctions.²⁶ Elliott and Schutter identify the citations in 1 Pet 4:8, 4:18, and 5:5 as quotations but classify 5:7 as an allusion.²⁷ Since the reference to Isa 11:2 in 1 Pet 4:14 is most likely classified as an allusion, it will not be analyzed in this study.²⁸

Table 3: Quotations Without an Introductory Formula or Preceding Term²⁹

Passages	Number of Words
1. 1 Pet 2:3 (Ps 33:8)	5
2. 1 Pet 2:7 (Ps 117/118:22)*	11
3. 1 Pet 2:8 (Isa 8:14)*	5

²⁵ See Bruce Metzger, “The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah,” *JBL* 70 (1951): 297–307. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,” *NTS* 7 (1960): 297–333.

²⁶ For more on this issue, see Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 37.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 36–38; Elliott, *I Peter*, 13–14.

²⁸ The prose in 1 Pet 4:14 is rightly classed as an allusion, because the text itself is not very long, does not have a great degree of verbal similarity, and is relatively integrated into its context.

²⁹ The asterisks (*) signal passages that do not formally have an introductory formula but should be understood as included in the introductory formula in 2:6. See below.

4.	1 Pet 2:9 (Exod 19:5–6; cf. 23:22; Isa 43:20–21)*	10 (?)
5.	1 Pet 2:10 (Hos 1:6, 9; 2:1, 3, 25)	4 (?)
6.	1 Pet 2:11 (Gen 23:4; cf. Ps 38:13)	3
7.	1 Pet 3:14–5 (Isa 8:12–13)	10 (?)

As Table 3 shows, the author is very comfortable with quoting texts, both long and short, without any introductory formula or preceding term. Most of these quotations occur in 1 Peter 2.

However, the information given by this chart should be mediated and nuanced by attention to the author's style. As Steve Moyise observes, "In addition, it is almost certain that the formula in 1 Pet. 2:6 ('For it stands in scripture') includes at least Ps.118:22, Isa. 8:14, Isa. 43:20–21 and Exod. 19:6 in the words that follow."³⁰ These texts have been marked with an asterisk in Table 3. The author has established his scriptural authority in 2:6 and therefore takes it for granted as he moves through his material, especially when he uses many texts in very quick succession in 1 Peter 2.

2. Comparative Analysis

This study will broadly follow Gert J. Steyn's approach in *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews*.³¹ Steyn followed four general steps, "(a) collecting the available evidence, (b) analysing and comparing the available evidence at hand, (c) describing the results of comparative analysis, and (d) evaluating those results with great caution in light of the question which drives this experiment."³² Comparative analysis of the quoted material of Isaiah will begin with the NA²⁸, the BHS, supplemented with textual variants from the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a) and other Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Old Greek (OG, represented by the Göttingen Septuagint).³³ Significant variants and textual evidence from other sources will be included where relevant.

This comparative analysis will investigate the quotation of Isa 40:6–8 (1 Pet 1:24–25), Isa 28:16 (1 Pet 2:6), Isa 8:14 (1 Pet 2:8), Isa 53:9 (1 Pet 2:22), Isa 53:6 (1 Pet 2:25), and Isa 8:12b–13 (1 Pet 3:14–15). In the texts below, a single line indicates complete agreement, a dotted line partial agreement.

2.1. 1 Peter 1:24–25 Quoting Isaiah 40:6–8

Table 4: Analysis of 1 Peter 1:24–25

1 Pet 1:24–25	Isa 40:6–8 (OG)	Isa 40:6–8 (MT)
<u>πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος καὶ πᾶσα</u> <u>δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου·</u> <u>ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ</u> <u>ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν· τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα</u> <u>κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.</u>	<u>Πᾶσα σὰρξ χόρτος, καὶ πᾶσα</u> <u>δόξα ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου·</u> <u>ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος</u> <u>ἐξέπεσεν, τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ</u> <u>ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.</u>	כָּל־הַבְּשָׂר הַצֵּיִר וְכָל־חַסְדּוֹ כְּצִיִן הַשָּׂדֶה יִבֶּשׂ הַצֵּיִר נִבְלָה כִּי רוּחַ יְחֹחַ וְנִשְׁבָּה בּוֹ אֶכֶן הַצֵּיִר הָעָם: יִבֶּשׂ הַצֵּיִר נִבְלָה צִיִן וְדַבַּר־אֱלֹהֵינוּ יָקוּם לְעוֹלָם

³⁰ Moyise, "Isaiah in 1 Peter," 175.

³¹ Gert J. Steyn, *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews*, FRLANT 235 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

³² Ibid., 18.

³³ Ziegler, *Isaias*; Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, *The Isaiah Scrolls*, 2 vols., DJD XXXII (Oxford: Clarendon, 2010).

Table 5:³⁴ Isaiah 40:6b, 8 in 1QIsa^a

Isa 40:6b	כי רוח _____ נשבהבוא
Isa 40:8	כול הבשר חציר וכול חסדיו כציצ השדה יבש חציר נבל ציצ ודבר אלוהינו יקום לעולם הכן חציר העם יבש חציל נבל ציצ ודבר אלוהינו (in the margins of 1QIsa ^a)

There are five differences between the Hebrew *Vorlage* and the OG: (1) חֶסֶד is translated with δόξα ἀνθρώπου;³⁵ (2) שָׁדָה is translated with χόρτος; (3) verse 7 is absent from the OG and 1QIsa^a (but was later added by a corrector); (4) נְבֵל is translated with ἐκπίπτω; (5) the definite הַבְּשָׂר in the Hebrew text is indefinite in both the OG and 1 Peter.³⁶ In nearly all of these cases, 1 Peter agrees with the OG against the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

For the first difference, “1 Peter agrees with the LXX’s δόξα but agrees with the MT in using a pronoun (αὐτῆς) rather than the LXX’s ἀνθρώπου.”³⁷ In the more than 250 places where the OG translates חֶסֶד, this is the only place in the OG where δόξα is used. This could indicate that the Greek reflects a different *Vorlage*, but this is unlikely given the agreement between 1QIsa^a and the proto-MT.³⁸ Later uncials (K L P Ψ) and most minuscules substitute ἀνθρώπου for αὐτῆς, assimilating the Petrine quotation to the OG.³⁹ However, the weight of the early manuscript evidence of Ɀ⁷² A B C 206 614 1739 etc. rests firmly with the reading αὐτῆς in 1 Peter. By contrast, the three have the more literal translation παν το ελεος αυτης.⁴¹

In the second case, χόρτος is used to translate שָׁדָה, in parallel with the first clause. This represents a departure from the Hebrew, though χόρτος is used elsewhere in Isaiah as a translational equivalent for שָׁדָה.⁴²

The third divergence is significant, because an entire Hebrew verse is absent from the OG and 1 Peter.⁴³ Interestingly, the first hand of 1QIsa^a also omitted this verse, but a second hand has added it in the interlinear and marginal spaces.⁴⁴ The scribe also supplied a series of dots

³⁴ Ibid., 1:66; 2:66–67.

³⁵ For more on the occasional, unusual translation of δόξα in Isaiah, see L. H. Brockington, “The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ,” *VT* 1 (1951): 23–32.

³⁶ Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 176. Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 141.

³⁷ Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 176. Osborne, “Utilisation des citations,” 67.

³⁸ R. Timothy McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 116.

³⁹ Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), 689.

⁴⁰ Jobes follows Robert Kraft’s proposal of a series of scribal actions to explain the change from ἀνθρώπου to αὐτῆς. Jobes takes this further with the evidence that the original hand of Sinaiticus attests αὐτοῦ in 1:24, a reading which is corrected by the second hand of Sinaiticus to αὐτῆς, “thus providing manuscript evidence of this very sequence of scribal activity”; Jobes, “Septuagint Textual Tradition,” 318. If Jobes’s reconstruction is correct, then 1 Peter agrees more completely with the LXX than previously thought. Kraft offered this suggestion in a discussion at The Septuagint in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity conference in Bangor, Maine in 2002.

⁴¹ Ziegler, *Isaias*, 267.

⁴² See Isa 15:16; 37:27.

⁴³ The verse does appear in Q^{mg}, see Henry Barclay Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), iii, 173.

⁴⁴ Lim notes, “The differences in script, orthography, and representation of the tetragram clearly indicate that the second was also a different hand by the scribe who, it is believed, also copied 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, and 4QTest.” Timothy H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 144.

to alert the reader of the textual issues at this point (see Table 5, above). Although it is possible that the omission of verse 7 was only a scribal error, the fact that this verse is also omitted in the OG and 1 Peter suggests that the omission, probably originally due to parablepsis, occurred at a point earlier than the translation of the OG.⁴⁵ If so, it also suggests that (at least at Qumran) scribes were aware of textual diversity and engaged in early forms of textual criticism. Referring to this text, Timothy Lim summarizes, “In any case, what was once regarded as a septuagintal quotation of 1 Peter 1:24–25 has now turned up in a Hebrew manuscript of Isaiah, which has been characterized by some to be proto-Masoretic and others as one of its late descendants.”⁴⁶ Isaiah 40:7 is found in some hexaplaric recensions.⁴⁷

The fourth difference, ἐκπίπτω for נָפַל, is not as strange as it first appears. Ἐκπίπτω is used as a translational equivalent for נָפַל twice elsewhere in Isaiah.⁴⁸ Πίπτω is also used to translate נָפַל as in Isa 34:4. As far as the tenses of the verbs in 1 Peter and Isa 40 are concerned, J. Ramsey Michaels notes the use of the relatively rare gnomic aorists here, which are used to express proverbial truths or events universal to human experience.⁴⁹ These gnomic aorists accurately translate Hebrew perfects, which frequently have the same function.⁵⁰ 1 Peter thus agrees with the OG with the exception of the pronoun αὐτῆς, which is more closely aligned with the Hebrew. Finally, the indefinite status of σάρξ in the OG and 1 Peter may be due to the use of the gnomic aorist, for which an indefinite noun was more appropriate.

However, there are two differences between 1 Peter and the OG: (1) 1 Peter adds the first ὡς, and, (2) against both the OG (τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν; om ἡμῶν Q) and the Hebrew text (אֱלֹהֵינוּ), 1 Peter reads κυρίου. The first difference is probably explained, as many commentators have observed, by an appeal to the author’s style.⁵¹ According to Elliott, the author uses ὡς comparatively twenty-seven times, which means that he most likely added ὡς himself.⁵² Consequently, the metaphor is converted into a simile.⁵³ A few scholars do not attribute ὡς to the author but to his *Vorlage*.⁵⁴

The second difference is more significant. The author here goes against both the OG and the Hebrew text. Several explanations have been proposed. First, the variation might have existed in the *Vorlage*.⁵⁵ Such a reading is preserved in a few witnesses (L¹ 46 233 456 Co Syp^a), though most manuscripts, including the best witnesses of Isaiah, do not have this reading. It is more likely that due to Petrine influence a few scribes harmonized Isaiah with 1 Peter.⁵⁶ Second, the change may have been inadvertent, since κύριος is used twice in Isa 40:5 (the titles are also used identically in Isa 40:3), or due to an incorrect memory.⁵⁷ More likely, the author deliberately changed the text for theological reasons. In 1 Peter 2:2, Christ is identified as κύριος,

⁴⁵ Ibid., 145.

⁴⁶ See sources cited in *ibid.*, 146.

⁴⁷ Ziegler, *Isaias*, 267.

⁴⁸ Isa 28:1, 4. Both verbs are used with ἄνθος.

⁴⁹ J. Ramsey Michaels, *1 Peter*, WBC 49 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1988), 78. BDF § 333.1. Gnomic aorists are also known as omnitemporal aorists.

⁵⁰ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 78.

⁵¹ Osborne, “Utilisation des citations,” 67. Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 176–77. Jobes, “Septuagint Textual Tradition,” 317.

⁵² Elliott, *1 Peter*, 390.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 390. Michaels, *1 Peter*, 76.

⁵⁴ F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter I.1–II.17: The Greek Text with Introductory Lecture, Commentary, and Additional Notes* (London: Macmillan, 1898), 94. Michaels, *1 Peter*, 76.

⁵⁵ Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 176.

⁵⁶ Jobes, “Septuagint Textual Tradition,” 318. Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 176.

⁵⁷ Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 176. Elliott, *1 Peter*, 391.

which is the regular Petrine identification for Christ (1 Peter 1:3; 2:13; 3:15).⁵⁸ Conversely, θεός is normally reserved for God the Father (1:2, 3, 5, 21, 23, etc.).⁵⁹

In conclusion, this quotation mainly follows the OG with several minor variations. In this quotation, 1 Peter does not show evidence of a revised, Hebraized Greek text. Though one of these variants (αὐτῆς) may indicate greater proximity to the Hebrew text, it is more likely that the text originally agreed with the OG but later fell victim to scribal corruption. The two other differences between 1 Peter and the OG may be due to variations in 1 Peter's *Vorlage*, though it seems more likely that they originated with the author himself.

2.2. 1 Peter 2:6 Quoting Isaiah 28:16

Table 6: Analysis of 1 Pet 2:6

1 Pet 2:6	Rom 9:33	Isa 28:16 (OG)	Isa 28:16 (MT)
<u>ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών</u>	<u>ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών</u>	<u>Ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια</u>	<u>הֲנִי יֹסֵד בְּצִיּוֹן אֶבֶן</u>
<u>λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον</u>	<u>λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ</u>	<u>Σιών λίθον πολυτελεῖ ἑκλεκτὸν</u>	<u>אֶבֶן בְּחֵן פְּנֵת יִקְרָת</u>
<u>ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον, καὶ</u>	<u>πέτραν σκανδάλου, καὶ</u>	<u>ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ</u>	<u>מוֹסָד מוֹסָד הַמְּאֲמִין</u>
<u>ὁ πιστεῦων ἐπ' αὐτῷ</u>	<u>ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ</u>	<u>θεμέλια αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων</u>	<u>לֹא יִחִישׁ</u>
<u>οὐ μὴ κατασχυνοθῆ</u>	<u>καταισχυωθήσεται</u>	<u>ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κατασχυνοθῆ</u>	

Table 7: Isa 28:16b according to 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b

1QIsa ^a	הֲנִי מוֹסֵד בְּצִיּוֹן אֶבֶן אֶבֶן בְּחֵן פְּנֵת יִקְרָת מוֹסֵד מוֹסֵד הַמְּאֲמִין לֹא יִחִישׁ
1QIsa ^b	הֲנִי יוֹסֵד

These passages are a perfect storm for textual criticism.⁶⁰ First, the OG, the MT, and the Dead Sea Scrolls witness to textual diversity at this point. Second, Isa 28:16 is quoted in a nearly identical form in Rom 9:33, which raises interesting questions about early Christian interpretive techniques and practices. In order to interact with these issues, the approach that will be taken here will be to work progressively through the text of 1 Peter.

(1) ἰδοὺ τίθημι. These words are an equivalent of the problematic Hebrew phrase הֲנִי יֹסֵד. In the MT, this phrase is a combination of a first person pronominal suffix, constituting a first person subject, seemingly paired with a 3ms piel perfect verb. Citing William Irwin, John Watts explains that this construction “must be considered a relative clause without a relative particle to account for the change of person.”⁶¹ Due to the awkwardness of this relative clause, scribes at Qumran may have emended the text. 1QIsa^a has the smoother reading מוֹסֵד, a piel participle, “(I am) laying / (I will) lay.”⁶² 1QIsa^b has הֲנִי יוֹסֵד, a qal participle.

⁵⁸ Elliott, *I Peter*, 391.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 391.

⁶⁰ See discussions of this passage in Dietrich-Alex Koch, “The Quotations of Isaiah 8,14 and 28,16 in Romans 9,33 and 1 Peter 2, 6–8 as Test Case for Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament,” *ZNW* 101 (2010): 223–40. Koch, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 58–60, 69–71, 161–62, 250. Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, SNTSMS 69 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 119–25. J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of Good News: Isaiah and Paul “In Concert” in the Letter to the Romans*, *NovTSup* 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 136–57. Jaap Dekker, *Zion’s Rock-Solid Foundations: An Exegetical Study of the Zion Text in Isaiah 28:16*, *OtSt* 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 9–34.

⁶¹ John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, WBC 24 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), 367.

⁶² Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 148–49. Koch, “Quotations,” 225. Watts, *Isaiah*, 367.

The verb **בָּנָה** means to “to found, constitute, or establish,” and nowhere else takes a “stone” as an object.⁶³ The Greek translator was aware of this problem, as Koch notes, because the normal translational equivalent of **בָּנָה**, *θεμελιώω*, “to found, make firm,” is awkward in this context.⁶⁴ Elsewhere, the object of **בָּנָה** is always something like a house, palace, or temple, never a stone. Here the text has the unusual meaning of “to found a stone.”⁶⁵ To fix this problem, *ἐμβαλῶ* and possibly *τίθημι* were used instead. However, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion chose instead to use *θεμελιώω* and followed the participial reading found at Qumran (*θεμελιῶν*).⁶⁶

The Greek versions of Isa 28:16 do not reflect the third person verb of the Hebrew but a first person singular verb. The OG has a future tense verb (*ἐμβαλῶ*), but there is evidence of the present *ἐμβάλλω* in other witnesses (B et. al.), which Koch judges to be the older form.⁶⁷ Because Hebrew participles can be used for the present and future tenses, *τίθημι* and *ἐμβαλῶ* are reasonable translations of the Hebrew.⁶⁸ 1 Peter and Romans both have a present tense verb, which makes more sense contextually of a christological understanding of the stone. 1 Peter and Romans both lack *ἐγώ*.

(2) *ἐν Σιών λίθον*. The text of 1 Peter is more closely aligned with the Hebrew **בְּצִיּוֹן יִבָּנֶה** than with the OG, which has the expansive *εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον*, “into the foundations of Zion a stone.”⁶⁹ Instead of “founding a stone,” as in the Hebrew, which has the idea of beginning or establishing an edifice, the OG creates the idea that a stone is being laid into an already-existing foundation in Zion.⁷⁰ Again, 1 Peter and Romans are the only Greek witnesses to the shorter reading.

(3) *ἀκρογωνιαίον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον*. 1 Peter’s *λίθον ἀκρογωνιαίον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον* changes the order of the OG (*λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαίον ἔντιμον*) and omits *πολυτελῆ*.

A small cottage industry has sprung up around whether *ἀκρογωνιαίος* refers to an *Abschlußstein* or a *Grundstein*.⁷¹ *Ἀκρογωνιαίος* is a septuagintal *hapax legomenon* and only appears in one other place in the New Testament (Eph 2:20). Despite this modern debate over meaning, all ancient Greek witnesses used this term. 1 Peter and the OG differ in how they render the rest of the thought but not on *ἀκρογωνιαίον*. The fluidity with the other accusatives may be due to the difficulty of translating the rare word **יָבִן**. As a noun, this word occurs nowhere else in the Hebrew Scriptures, but it is probably related to the verb **יָבִן**, “to test.”⁷² Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion are again closer to the Hebrew than the OG (*λίθον δόκιμον*).⁷³

Several theories have been proposed to explain the difference between 1 Peter (and Romans) and the OG. Koch reasons that the OG translator skipped the second **יָבִן** and translated **יָבִן** twice with *πολυτελῆ* and *ἐκλεκτὸν*.⁷⁴ The text in 1 Peter and Romans is one word

⁶³ Koch, “Quotations,” 225.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 225–26. Wagner, *Heralds of Good News*, 128.

⁶⁵ Koch, “Quotations,” 225.

⁶⁶ Ziegler, *Isaias*, 218. Ulrich and Flint, *Isaiah Scrolls*, 2:147.

⁶⁷ For *ἐμβάλλω*, Ziegler lists B-0II L⁹³-90 309 393 410 449’ Syh Syl et. al. Koch, “Quotations,” 227.

⁶⁸ Koch, “Quotations,” 227.

⁶⁹ Wagner, *Heralds of Good News*, 128.

⁷⁰ Koch, “Quotations,” 226.

⁷¹ For further sources and arguments for *Abschlußstein*, see Joachim Jeremias, “ἀκρογωνιαίος,” *TDNT* 1: 792; 279. As a *Grundstein*, see R. J. McKelvey, “Christ the Cornerstone,” *NTS* 8 (1962): 352–59.

⁷² Koch, “Quotations,” 226. Watts, *Isaiah*, 367.

⁷³ Ziegler, *Isaias*, 218.

⁷⁴ Koch, “Quotations,” 226. For a discussion of doublets in LXX-Isaiah, see Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 35–36.

shorter, because πολυτελῆ is not included. Osborne has suggested that at some point a ῖ was confused for a ῑ, resulting in אבן כהר.⁷⁵ This was then translated as λίθον ἐκλεκτόν. Later, this translation was conflated with λίθον πολυτελῆ to produce the text preserved in the OG.⁷⁶ I. L. Seeligmann writes, “this would seem to suggest that ἐκλεκτόν has invaded the corresponding passage in the Septuagint from a different version, i.e. that used in 1 Petr. 2.”⁷⁷

In response, Karen Jobes argues that since there is no manuscript evidence for this theory, it is more likely that the author omitted πολυτελῆ in order to create “a deliberate paraphrase to include only the two adjectives that best suited the rhetoric of the immediate context.”⁷⁸ The situation proposed by Osborne and Seeligmann is possible, and perhaps probable, though the weight of a further argument should not be placed on this hypothetical scenario. Further, Jobes’s suggestion that the author intentionally omitted πολυτελῆ, because it did not “suit the rhetoric” of the context, is unconvincing for two reasons. First, this quotation begins with the longest introductory formula in the letter, διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ. Though the Petrine author does adapt his quotations, it seems odd that he would do so here after such a long introductory formula. Second, it makes little sense to say that πολυτελῆ would not have been consistent with the rhetoric of the letter, because the author uses this word (or forms of it) elsewhere in the letter (1 Pet 1:7, πολυτιμότερον; 3:4, πολυτελής). Thus, it seems that if πολυτελῆ had been in his exemplar, he would have used it. However, the possibility still remains that he may have omitted it.

The OG ends the clause with a repetition of εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς, which is a conflation of the beginning of the verse and מוֹסֵד מוֹסֵד.⁷⁹ A literal translation of the hendiadys does not appear in any Greek text.⁸⁰ Because the New Testament versions do not include these pluses, they are more literal translations of the Hebrew than the OG. The texts in the New Testament preserve the idea of “establishing a stone” which has been emended in the OG.

(4) καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ. At this point, 1 Peter, Romans, and the OG are identical. They agree with each other against the Hebrew text, which finishes the verse with מוֹסֵד מוֹסֵד הַמְאֲמֵן לֹא יִהְיֶה. As stated above, מוֹסֵד מוֹסֵד gets absorbed into other parts of the translation. Πιστεύω is the normal translational equivalent of אָמֵן.⁸¹ הַמְאֲמֵן is a hiphil participle, which is always translated “to trust in, confide in.”⁸² In the Hebrew, the participle does not have an object. In 1 Peter, Romans, and the OG, the object ἐπ’ αὐτῷ is supplied. This pronoun could be translated either “in him” or “in it,” since it also agrees in person, gender and number with λίθον. Koch summarizes, “By the addition of ἐπ’ αὐτῷ the translator evinces a personal understanding of the ‘stone’—which is clearly presupposed when Paul and 1 Peter quote this text.”⁸³

Debate exists over whether this prepositional phrase was original to the OG or was a later Christian interpolation. There is no basis for the phrase in Hebrew, though it does appear in

⁷⁵ Osborne, “Utilisation des citations,” 68–69.

⁷⁶ Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 36.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁷⁸ Jobes, “Septuagint Textual Tradition,” 322.

⁷⁹ Koch, “Quotations,” 226. However, Q has τεθεμελιωμενον, which evokes the terminology already used in the verse. Ziegler, *Isaias*, 218.

⁸⁰ J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*, STDJ 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 57. Theodotion has the plus τεθεμελιωμενον marked with an obelisk. See Ziegler, *Isaias*, 218.

⁸¹ Koch, “Quotations,” 227.

⁸² Cf. Job 4:8; 15:15; 39:12; Ps 78:22, 32; 199:66; Gen 15:6; Deut 28:66.

⁸³ Koch, “Quotations,” 227.

the Targum Isaiah where it has a messianic interpretation.⁸⁴ This phrase is absent from B, V, Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, but it is found in A, Q, S, and a few others.⁸⁵ However, as James Barr points out, all the sources that omit the phrase were Hexaplaric or followed the proto-MT.⁸⁶ In 88, an obelus is placed by these words marking them as variants.⁸⁷ Thus, it seems that this phrase was interpolated at some point, though whether it was done by Jewish scribes before Christianity or at some later point under Christian influence is difficult to tell, though the evidence might lean slightly in the direction of a pre-Christian origin.⁸⁸

(5) οὐ μὴ κατασχυνθῆ. This phrase is textually interesting, because it is also identical to the OG. However, unlike the previous phrase, it is different from the text in Romans, οὐ κατασχυνθήσεται. Koch offers the suggestion that since Paul only uses the emphatic negation οὐ μὴ in a few places, it is possible that he made the change himself.⁸⁹

If שׁוּחַ is derived from the root שׁוּחַ, it means “will be in haste; to flee,” though some commentators have argued on the basis of Eccl 2:25 that it can be translated “will worry.”⁹⁰ Koch suggests that “the LXX translator probably did not read שׁוּחַ in his Hebrew text but שׁוּחַ, from the verb שׁוּחַ (‘to become ashamed’).”⁹¹

In conclusion, the quotation of Isa 28:16 in 1 Pet 2:6 and Rom 9:33 differs from both the proto-MT and the OG, though it is closer to the OG than to the proto-MT. Where the Pauline and Petrine quotations differ from the OG, they are closer to the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Koch interprets these changes as evidence that the OG was in the process of being revised to bring it closer to the contemporary Hebrew text.⁹² Koch concludes that Paul was not making the changes himself but was reproducing the text of a revised version of Isaiah.

The strong similarity of the text in 1 Peter to that in Romans is striking. In Romans, Paul splices a short quotation of Isa 8:14 into the middle of his quotation from Isa 28:16. The author of 1 Peter, on the other hand, first quotes Isa 28:16, adds his own quotation of Ps 118:22, and concludes with a quotation of Isa 8:14. Koch offers two possibilities to account for the similarity.⁹³ One, the OG scroll used by the author of 1 Peter was at this point identical to the scroll used by Paul. Or, two, the Petrine author used an unrevised OG scroll and also knew of Paul’s reshaped quotations of Isa 28:16 and conflated both versions. However, Koch avoids the conclusion that the author of 1 Peter worked directly with Paul’s letter to the Romans, a position he has softened since his earlier work.⁹⁴

⁸⁴ De Waard, *Comparative Study*, 56. Klyne R. Snodgrass, “1 Peter II.1–10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities,” *NTS* 24 (1997): 97–106 (99). Jobes, “Septuagint Textual Tradition,” 320. See also, Dekker, *Zion’s Rock-Solid Foundations*, 28–30.

⁸⁵ Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, 124.

⁸⁶ James Barr, “Paul and the LXX: A Note on Some Recent Work,” *JTS* 45 (1994): 593–601.

⁸⁷ De Waard, *Comparative Study*, 56. Barr, “Paul and LXX,” 599–600.

⁸⁸ Snodgrass, “1 Peter II.1–10,” 99–100. Michaels, *1 Peter*, 104.

⁸⁹ Koch, “Quotations,” 229. Compare, Wagner, *Heralds of Good News*, 129.

⁹⁰ See comments and sources cited in Watts, *Isaiah*, 367.

⁹¹ Koch, “Quotations,” 227.

⁹² Koch explains that this movement back towards the MT is consistent with Paul’s use of Isaiah elsewhere. “At least four other quotations differ from the LXX and are at the same time closer to the Hebrew text.” See Isa 8:14 (Rom 9:33), 25:8 (1 Cor 15:54), 28:11 (1 Cor 14:21), and 52:7 (Rom 10:15). Koch, “Quotations,” 230.

⁹³ Koch, “Quotations,” 231–32.

⁹⁴ Koch writes in his later article, “I put forth a different explanation in Koch, *Schrift* (see n.18), 69–71, which I now withdraw. In that work, I started with the presupposition that 1 Peter 2,6 was independent of Rom 9,33 and I concluded that the common elements of both versions must be of pre-Pauline, but early Christian, origin. This assumption is questionable. The text form of Isa

2.3. 1 Peter 2:8 quoting Isaiah 8:14

Table 8: Analysis of 1 Peter 2:8

1 Pet 2:8	Isa 8:14 (OG)	Rom 9:33	Isa 8:14 (MT)
λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου	καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι	λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου	וְלִאֲבֹן נִגְרָה וְלִצֹּר מִכְשׁוֹל

This passage is interesting for several reasons. First, the MT and the OG are very different.⁹⁵ Second, this passage is quoted in a nearly identical form in Rom 9:33. Third, the hexaplaric recensions show that there was some textual fluidity here (see Table 9 below).

This Petrine use of Isa 8:14 could be either a quotation or an allusion.⁹⁶ The OG is quite different from both the MT and 1 Peter. At a glance, 1 Peter resembles the Hebrew text more than the OG. If the author's *Vorlage* was the OG, then the shortened form of the text found in 1 Peter would more accurately be categorized as an allusion. If the *Vorlage* was a different text form, in either Hebrew or Greek, which followed the Hebrew text more closely than the OG, then this passage should be classified as a quotation. As Jobes notes, "it is difficult to say whether the syntax of 1 Peter actually agrees with the Hebrew text against the OG or whether the author is simply excerpting two short phrases from his Greek text and changing their inflection for the new grammatical context."⁹⁷

As stated above, the OG and the Hebrew text are very different here. Koch admits that "the existing Hebrew text is very complicated," to the extent that most modern commentators correct the text before commenting on it.⁹⁸ The OG translators, on the other hand, had to work with what they had. According to Joseph Ziegler, the OG translator of Isa 8:14 was dependent on Isa 28:16.⁹⁹ Ziegler concludes that the protasis καὶ ἔὰν ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ἦς in Isa 8 is dependent upon καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ in Isa 28:16. It is interesting that Ziegler connects Isa 8 and Isa 28 since the passages are quoted together in both 1 Peter and Romans.

The Dead Sea Scrolls also provide evidence that these two texts were read together. In 1QS VIII, a quotation of Isa 28:16 comes before a possible allusion to Isa 8:16.¹⁰⁰ Thus Klyne Snodgrass concludes, "the connection of the two verses in Christian literature then is not an innovation based on theological necessity, but follows Jewish tradition."¹⁰¹

The Hebrew text of Isa 8 is difficult, because it holds in tandem very positive and very neg-

28,16 present in Rom 9,33 is not due to a Christian interpretation. On the other hand it is undisputed that the author of 1 Peter combines in his letter Pauline, post-Pauline and non-Pauline traditions, and precisely these dynamics are at play in the combination of Pauline and non-Pauline 'stone'-quotations in 1 Peter 2,6–8." He concludes, "The author of 1 Peter 2,6 had access to a Greek version of Isaiah independently from Rom 9,33. He knew lines 2 and 3 of Isa 28,16 in the LXX version and shaped the wording according to his own aims." Koch, "Quotations," 231.

⁹⁵ For a thorough analysis of LXX Isa 8:11–16, see A. van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation," in *The Book of Isaiah*, BETL 81 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 127–33. Van der Kooij, "Isaiah in the Septuagint," 519–28.

⁹⁶ As an allusion, see Osborne, "Utilisation des citations," 69. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 161. As a quotation, see Michaels, *1 Peter*, 106.

⁹⁷ Jobes, "Septuagint Textual Tradition," 324.

⁹⁸ Koch, "Quotations," 233.

⁹⁹ Quoted in Snodgrass, "1 Peter II, 1–10." See Ziegler, *Isaias*, 95.

¹⁰⁰ See discussion and sources cited in Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 132.

¹⁰¹ Snodgrass, "1 Peter II.1–10," 99.

ative relationships with God.¹⁰² The OG translator took some liberty here to smooth over these differences by restructuring the passage.¹⁰³ The translator completely omitted Isa 8:14b (אִתּוֹ מִעֲרֹצָקָה) and added two phrases in verse 14 with no equivalent in Hebrew (καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ἦς and συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ). Further, he added two negative particles (οὐχ ... οὐδέ) and the particle (ὡς). Koch summarizes,

The result is a dramatic change. The message put forward by the Greek text is directly opposed to that of the Hebrew text: “You will not encounter him (i.e. God) as a stumbling caused by stone ...” ... Accordingly, the negative metaphors of the “stone of stumbling” and the “rock of fall” are suspended. The Hebrew text clearly says: “God will be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense for both the houses of Israel,” whereas the LXX text says: “If you trust in him, you will not (!) encounter him as a stumbling caused by (!) a stone nor (!) as a fall caused by (!) a rock.”¹⁰⁴

In 1 Peter and Romans, the referent of the stone imagery is clearly Jesus Christ. The sense of 1 Peter is much closer to the Hebrew text than to the OG. Further, neither 1 Peter nor Romans have any of the OG's pluses.

When Paul quotes this passage in Rom 9:33, “λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου,” it is nearly identical to 1 Peter's text (the only difference is the shift from λίθος to λίθον and πέτρα and πέτραν for grammatical continuity). As in 1 Peter, Paul's text bears none of the OG's pluses. Again, the sense of these New Testament passages is much more closely aligned with the sense of the Hebrew text than the OG. In fact, in Romans, “the quoted text gives the clear expression to the negative consequences of Christ's mission for those who tried to fulfill the law, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων (9,32)—and this would have been impossible on the basis of the LXX text.”¹⁰⁵ Koch concludes that Paul used a scroll of Isaiah that had been revised to bring the translation into greater accordance with Hebrew text.¹⁰⁶

Based on the similarity of the text in Romans and 1 Peter, again, three options are possible. One, Paul and the author of 1 Peter may have been using the same version of Isaiah, which translated the Hebrew text more literally than the OG (or, had been revised to follow the Hebrew text more closely), but is not represented by any extant form of the text. Or, two, these texts had become part of an early Christian tradition which may have included the use of testimony books, collection of proof-texts, or early Christian hymns.¹⁰⁷ Or, finally, the author of 1 Peter used Romans (or the text form in Romans, mediated through another source) but supplemented it with further text from Isaiah and the Psalms.

The Hexaplaric recensions contain relevant variants at this point.¹⁰⁸

Table 9: Comparison of Variants (Isa 8:14)

1 Peter	λίθος προσκόμματος ... πέτρα σκανδάλου
Göttingen	λίθου προσκόμματι ... πέτρας πτώματι (B)
Aquila	λιθον προσκομματος ... στερεον σκανδαλου
Symmachus	λιθον προσκομματος ... πετραν πτωματος (σκανδαλου Eus. fragment)
Theodotion	λιθον προσκομματος ... πετραν πτωματος (Q)

¹⁰² Koch, “Quotations,” 233–34.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 234.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 234.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 238.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 238.

¹⁰⁷ See Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 179; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 162; De Waard, *Comparative Study*, 161.

¹⁰⁸ Ziegler, *Isaias*, 152; Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, 123–24.

These variants suggest that the text of Isaiah was fluid here.¹⁰⁹ 1 Peter's πέτρα σκανδάλου, not found among the Hexaplaric recensions, could point towards an earlier Greek text. Thus, Jobes argues, "According to HRCS this Hebrew word [מכשול] is rendered only here in the OG Isa 8:14 by πτώμα but elsewhere three times by σκάνδαλον (Lev 19:14; 1 Kgs 25:31; Ps 68[69]:22). Because the reading in 1 Peter is the more common translational equivalent for מכשול, its source is possibly a Greek text different from the OG." This is possible and would be consistent with the theory that the author was working with a revised Greek text.

Aside from the grammatical adjustment for context and the switch of πέτρα with στερεόν, J. De Waard finds the agreement between the New Testament and Aquila striking.¹¹⁰ "This might point to a direct dependence upon the latter, but it might also mean that in the New Testament textual form an adaptation to the Hebrew text has taken place in a manner similar to that in the A-text."¹¹¹ Given the fluidity of the text, it is difficult to align the text of 1 Peter with one particular hexaplaric recension. More likely, the Greek text of Isaiah was in a state of fluidity and revision as some editors worked to align it more closely to the Hebrew. J. Ross Wagner's conclusions for Isa 28:16 and Isa 8:14 in Romans are equally relevant to 1 Peter: "The overall impression one derives from this mass of data is that Paul's citation depends on an OG text that has been reworked at points to bring it closer to a Hebrew exemplar."¹¹²

The text of 1 Peter bears witness to this textual fluidity. While its content bears more similarity to the Hebrew text, its form does not align exactly with any of the known Greek versions, except for the quotation in Romans.

2.4. 1 Peter 2:22 quoting Isaiah 53:9

Table 10: Analysis of 1 Pet 1:22

1 Pet 2:22	Isa 53:9 (OG)	Isa 53:9 (MT)
ὁς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ	ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ	עַל לֹא־תָקַם עֲשָׂה וְלֹא מָרַקָה בְּפִיו

Before addressing this text specifically, it will be helpful to first consider some of the particular issues involved with the quotations and allusions of Isa 53 in 1 Peter. David A. Sapp has argued compellingly that major theological differences undergird the many linguistic differences between the Greek and Hebrew forms of Isa 53.¹¹³ The Greek text of Isaiah offered Christian exegetes significantly less support for the doctrine of atonement than the Hebrew text.¹¹⁴ In fact, the most important verses on atonement, verses 10–11, are never quoted in the New Testament, probably for this reason. Sapp concludes, "The Christian doctrine of atonement rests upon an understanding of Isaiah 53 that is fully preserved only in the Hebrew versions."¹¹⁵

It will be important to bear these insights in mind as the following passages from Isaiah are evaluated textually. Is the Petrine author familiar with the theology of the Hebrew form of Isa 53 (though perhaps in a revised Greek translation), or does he remain firmly within the

¹⁰⁹ Elliott, *I Peter*, 430; Jobes, "Septuagint Textual Tradition," 323.

¹¹⁰ De Waard, *Comparative Study*, 61.

¹¹¹ De Waard, *Comparative Study*, 61.

¹¹² Wagner, *Heralds of Good News*, 130.

¹¹³ David A. Sapp, "The LXX, 1QIsa, and the MT Versions of Isaiah 53 and the Christian Doctrine of Atonement," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*, ed. William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer (Harrisburg: Trinity International Press, 1998), 170–92.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 186.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 187.

bounds set by the OG? 1 Peter is an ideal candidate for this type of investigation because, as Schutter notes, 1 Peter “represents the most elaborate reorganizing or rewriting of Is. 53, as it were, that survives from the early church.”¹¹⁶

The Petrine quotation of Isa 53:9 is nearly identical to its counterpart in the OG. One of two differences between these two texts is ἀμαρτίαν in 1 Peter compared to ἀνομίαν in the OG. These words are translations of the Hebrew אָמָרָה. In Isaiah, אָמָרָה appears three times (Isa 53:9; 59:6; 60:18). Twice it is translated as ἀνομία (53:9; 59:6), once as ἀδικία (60:18).¹¹⁷ The Petrine ἀμαρτίαν is not found in other OG texts.¹¹⁸ Further, the OG never translates ἀμαρτία for אָמָרָה.¹¹⁹ However, ἀμαρτία is used repeatedly in Isa 53 (vv. 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, and 12). It seems likely that either the author (or his exemplar) mistakenly copied ἀμαρτία instead of ἀνομία, or he made the change because ἀμαρτία was contextually more appropriate than ἀνομία.¹²⁰ Both words are used many times throughout the passage (ἀνομία, 4; ἀμαρτία, 7), making such an error understandable. On the other hand, Michaels argues that the author made the substitution since he uses the same word in verses 20 and 24.¹²¹ Either option is possible, especially since this is a relatively minor change.

The second difference between these texts is the conjunction. The OG “uses the causal conjunction ὅτι, ‘because,’ instead of the Hebrew’s concessive conjunction לָעֵ, ‘although.’”¹²² Sapp uses this difference to emphasize the differences between these two versions. However, Sapp is perhaps overstating his case since לָעֵ can mean both “although” as well as “because.”¹²³

Finally, in one respect, 1 Peter and the OG agree more with each other than with the proto-MT: both supply εὐρέθη, for which there is no equivalent in Hebrew.¹²⁴ As Michaels notes, “The best manuscripts of Isaiah (B & L) also lack εὐρέθη, which is found in 1 Peter, Polycarp, and 1 Clement, but there is little reason to suppose that Peter originated this change.”¹²⁵

In conclusion, 1 Peter contains a text almost identical to the OG at this point. Though there are two minor variants, both can be explained contextually.

2.5. 1 Peter 2:25 quoting Isaiah 53:6

Table 11: Analysis of 1 Pet 2:25

1 Pet 2:25	Isa 53:6 (OG)	Isa 53:6 (MT)
ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι	ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν	כְּצֹאֵן הָרְעִינִי

The reference to Isa 53:6 in 1 Pet 2:25 may be classified as an allusion. However, given the extensive use of Isa 53 in this section of 1 Peter, it will be worthwhile for the sake of completeness to look briefly at this text. Among New Testament manuscripts, variants occur over whether “straying” goes with “sheep” (πλανώμενα, “you were like straying sheep,” Ψ^{72} C P 33 Ψ) or with

¹¹⁶ Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 143.

¹¹⁷ Also, Theodotion has και εργον αδικιας εν κερσιν αυτων has with an asterisk. See Ziegler, *Isaias*, 340.

¹¹⁸ ἀμαρτίαν is found elsewhere only in Eus.dem and Cyr.^{lem} Ziegler, *Isaias*, 322.

¹¹⁹ See Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 140. H.-R., I, 62.

¹²⁰ Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 200; Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 140.

¹²¹ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 144–45.

¹²² Sapp, “Versions of Isaiah 53,” 179.

¹²³ J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993), 436.

¹²⁴ Osborne, “Utilisation des citations,” 71.

¹²⁵ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 144.

the recipients of the epistle (“you were straying like sheep,” ⚡ A B).¹²⁶ Though less widely attested, Paul J. Achtemeier argues that the second reading “is preferable on grammatical grounds as completing the periphrastic imperfect ἦτε . . . πλανῶμενοι, and as the more difficult reading.”¹²⁷ Michaels also supports the latter, because it is a stronger use of the metaphor.¹²⁸

First Peter, the OG, and the Hebrew text are very close. However, the OG’s ἐπλανήθημεν (2 aor. pass. ind. 1 pl. of πλανάω) in 1 Peter becomes πλανώμενοι (pres. mid. ptc. nom. pl. of πλανάω). This change moves the text away from the Hebrew text, whose perfect verbs are best translated with the aorist, as in the OG.

With ἦτε, the main verb in 1 Pet 2:25 has been switched from the first person plural to second person plural. It is characteristic of the author’s style to use the second person pronoun rather than the first.¹²⁹ This is especially true of his use of Isa 53, which in other respects he seems to follow.¹³⁰

In 1 Pet 2:21–23, the author uses imperatives and second person pronouns (e.g., 2:21, Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, etc.). A switch temporarily occurs in verse 24a when he uses first person plurals (ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, etc.) and then switches back to the second person in 24b–25 (ιδίητε, etc.). Achtemeier argues that the switch in 24a–24b was “prompted by our author’s dependence in v. 24a on the wording of Isa 53.”¹³¹ This is possible, though it does not explain why he uses the second person in other places, such as the text at hand, when he is also dependent on the OG. More likely is the option proposed by Schutter, who suggests that the change occurs because the sections in the second person have special relevance to slaves, who received exhortation and encouragement in the immediately preceding section.¹³² In any event, the change is small and can be explained contextually due to the author’s stylistic habits. As for its *Vorlage*, this text is consistent with the OG and the Hebrew text.

2.6. 1 Peter 3:14–15 quoting Isaiah 8:12b–13

Table 12: Analysis of 1 Pet 3:14–15

1 Pet 3:14–15	Isa 8:12b–13 (OG)	Isa 8:12b–13 (MT)
τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ παραχθῆτε, κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν	τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆτε οὐδὲ μὴ παραχθῆτε, κύριον αὐτὸν ἀγιάσατε, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου φόβος	וְאֶת־מוֹרְאָו לֹא־תִירָאוּ וְלֹא תַעֲרִיצוּ אֶת־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱתוֹ תַקְדִּישׁוּ וְהוּא מוֹרְאֵכֶם וְהוּא מַעֲרָצְכֶם

There are three differences between 1 Peter and the OG. First, the genitive singular pronoun in the OG appears as a genitive plural in 1 Peter. Second, the double negative is handled differently. Third, 1 Peter has κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν where the OG has κύριον αὐτὸν.

Φόβος can take either a subjective genitive (fear felt *by* someone) or an objective genitive (fear felt *of* someone).¹³³ Namely, it can be translated with a pronoun as “their fear” (subjective)

¹²⁶ Ibid., 134.

¹²⁷ Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 190; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 537.

¹²⁸ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 134.

¹²⁹ Jobs notes that the author of 1 Peter uses the second person plural pronoun eighty-three times, compared to the first person plural, which is used only four times. Karen H. Jobs, *1 Peter*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 198. Cf. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 203.

¹³⁰ Jobs, *1 Peter*, 198.

¹³¹ Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 203.

¹³² Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 142.

¹³³ Selwyn, *First Epistle of St. Peter*, 192.

or “fear of them” (objective). The form of this genitive engages a translational and interpretive question. The Hebrew has **לֹא־תִירָאוּ לְאֵת־מִזְרָאוֹ**, “do not fear his fear.” Commentators have interpreted this as a subjective genitive, though it need not be.¹³⁴ The Hebrew could also be taken as an objective genitive; the phrase is ambiguous. However, New Testament commentators have interpreted the perceived switch from a subjective genitive in the Hebrew to an objective genitive in the OG as either an intentional interpretive act or a misreading of the Hebrew.¹³⁵ Further, Michaels argues that, because 1 Peter has an objective genitive, 1 Peter here agrees with the Hebrew text against the OG.¹³⁶ This debate is misguided since the genitives in both the Greek and Hebrew could be either subjective or objective. There is no reason to say that the OG has changed the Hebrew, either intentionally or unintentionally, or to say that 1 Peter agrees with the Hebrew text against the OG. Both 1 Peter and the OG have preserved the ambiguity of the Hebrew text.

The debate over the plurality of the pronoun is also misguided. Even though the pronominal suffixes are singular in Hebrew, they refer to the collective singular noun, **אֶלֶף**, in Isa 8:12a, which leaves two options for why the translation of **αὐτοῦ** in the OG was made.¹³⁷ First, the translators of the OG may have misunderstood or reinterpreted the Hebrew.¹³⁸ Or, second, as Mark Dubis writes, more likely, “the LXX reflects a literal translation of the Hebrew and the antecedent of the LXX’s **αὐτοῦ** is simply **λαός** (Isa 8:12a), a collective singular that translated the collective singular **אֶלֶף** in the Hebrew text.”¹³⁹ This singular pronoun could refer to a collective singular noun.¹⁴⁰ Further, **αὐτοῦ** is often used without formal agreement, that is, without a noun present in the same gender and number to which it would refer.¹⁴¹

Thus, the OG is a faithful, literal translation of the Hebrew. This results in the interesting situation in which both the singular and plural translations of the pronoun can be defended as literal translations of the Hebrew, because both reflect valid translations of a collective singular noun. The Petrine author may have used a different Greek translation, but he need not have done so. As Dubis explains, “As for the pluralization of the LXX’s **αὐτοῦ** to **αὐτῶν** in 1 Peter, this is required by the omission of the LXX’s collective singular antecedent **λαός**.”¹⁴² Dubis does not provide a reason why this must be the case, but it seems reasonable to suppose that whereas the context of the OG is sufficient to provide the background of the collective noun, this context is absent in 1 Peter and must be more directly stated since no antecedent is provided in the letter.¹⁴³

Two conclusions can be reached. First, no information on 1 Peter’s *Vorlage* can be based on the status of the genitives in the Hebrew text, OG, or New Testament as subjective or objective.

¹³⁴ So, J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, BNTC (London: Black, 1969), 141–42. Michaels, *1 Peter*, 186–87. Mark Dubis, *1 Peter: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, BHGNT (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010), 108.

¹³⁵ Francis Wright Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970), 163–64. Kelly, *Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 141–42. Michaels, *1 Peter*, 186–87. Or, “La 1 P change le pronom **αὐτοῦ** de la LXX en **αὐτῶν**, et ce faisant transforme le génitif subjectif en génitif objectif.” Osborne, “Utilisation des citations,” 72.

¹³⁶ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 186–87.

¹³⁷ Dubis, *1 Peter*, 108.

¹³⁸ So Michaels, who argues that the singular pronoun was translated to refer to the king of Assyria, Michaels, *1 Peter*, 186.

¹³⁹ Dubis, *1 Peter*, 108; Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 185.

¹⁴⁰ BDF §282 (3). Cf. 2 Cor 5:19, Luke 23:50–51.

¹⁴¹ BDF §282.

¹⁴² Dubis, *1 Peter*, 108–9.

¹⁴³ Jobes, *1 Peter*, 329.

In both the Greek and the Hebrew, these genitives are ambiguous. Second, no information on 1 Peter's *Vorlage* can be obtained on the switch from the singular to the plural pronoun. Both are valid ways of translating a collective singular Hebrew noun. Both 1 Peter and the OG accurately reflect the Hebrew text.

For the negatives, the OG uses οὐ μὴ ... οὐδὲ μὴ with subjunctive verbs, since Greek does not allow a negative command in the aorist.¹⁴⁴ 1 Peter shortens this to μὴ ... μηδὲ. First Peter may have emended this negative for stylistic reasons. It is also possible that it was altered, because οὐ μὴ with the aorist subjunctive is a classical form.¹⁴⁵ Overall, this change does not mark a significant departure from the OG. Both the forms in the OG and 1 Peter are similar to the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The final difference is the replacement of κύριον αὐτόν in the OG for κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστόν in 1 Peter. By making this change, the author interpreted κύριον christologically. There are some manuscripts which have κυριον δε τον θεον (K L P and most minuscules). However, τὸν Χριστόν is very strongly supported by early and diverse witnesses (P⁷² S A B C Ψ 33 614 etc.). Bruce Metzger notes that transcriptionally, it is more probable that this unusual phrase was emended to the more common one. It is also possible that the scribes harmonized the text of 1 Peter to match Isaiah.¹⁴⁷

The Petrine text has τὸν Χριστόν where the OG has only αὐτόν. The author probably changed this pronoun to τὸν Χριστόν for theological reasons.¹⁴⁸

The divine names in the OG and 1 Peter point to one of the interesting differences between the Greek texts and the MT. The Hebrew text has the divine name אֱת־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. In both the OG and 1 Peter, צְבָאוֹת is not translated.¹⁴⁹

1QIsa^a does not explain the minus of צְבָאוֹת, but it does provide an interesting variant.

Table 13: Comparison of Isaiah 8:12–13 in the MT and 1QIsa^a

Isa 8:12–13 (MT)	לֹא־תִאמְרוּן קִשְׁר לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־ יֹאמַר הָעַם הַזֶּה קִשְׁר וְאֵת־ מוֹרְאֵי לֹא־תִירְאוּ וְלֹא תַעֲרִיצוּ אֶת־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱתוֹ תִקְדְּשׁוּ וְהוּא מוֹרְאֵכֶם וְהוּא מַעֲרָצְכֶם	¹² Do not call conspiracy all that this people calls conspiracy, and do not fear what they dread, nor be in dread. ¹³ But the LORD of hosts, him you shall honor as holy. Let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. (ESV)
------------------	--	---

¹⁴⁴ Other translation options were available to the translators. For example, they could have used a negative command in the present tense.

¹⁴⁵ Jobes, "Septuagint Textual Tradition," 330. BDF §365.

¹⁴⁶ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 691.

¹⁴⁷ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 183.

¹⁴⁸ Commentators have noted that when this title is read as one unit, τὸν Χριστόν can be read as either a predicate (sanctify Christ as Lord) or in apposition (sanctify the Lord, namely, Christ). Achtemeier argues for a predicative reading on the basis of a single article in the construction, which is "natural if it is predicative, but awkward if it is appositional, which would normally have both words ("Lord" and "Christ") either with or without the article." A predicative reading may be preferable, but, as Achtemeier notes, these differences in classification make very little difference to the meaning of the phrase. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 232. For the predicative sense, see Selwyn, *First Epistle of St. Peter*, 192. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 232. For the appositional sense, see Kelly, *Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 142. Michaels, *1 Peter*, 187; Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition*, 149; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 625.

¹⁴⁹ Jobes, "Septuagint Textual Tradition," 329.

Isa 8:12–13 (1QIsa ^a)	לֹא תֹאמְרוּ קִשְׁר לְכוּל אִשְׁר יִאמַר הָעָם הוּא קִשְׁר וְאֵת מוֹרְאוֹ לֹא תִירְאוּ וְלֹא תִעֲרִיצוּ אֶת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אוֹתוֹ תְקַדִּישׁוּ וְהוּא מוֹרְאָנִם וְהוּא מֵעַרְצָכֶם	¹² You shall not say: “A conspiracy!” of all, of whom this people says: “A conspiracy! And his fear you shall not fear, and you shall not dread the Lord of Hosts.” ¹³ It is him whom you shall sanctify, and He shall be your fear, and he shall be your dread. (trans. van der Kooij)
-----------------------------------	--	--

Arie van der Kooij has observed that in Isa 8:13 of 1QIsa^a, a space has been intentionally left blank between **צְבָאוֹת** and **אוֹתוֹ**. In the proto-MT, both of these words are part of Isa 8:13, which begins **אֶת־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת**. Leaving a space indicates a division in the text, which might indicate that the text of Isa 8 at Qumran was divided differently in some places than the divisions that have been preserved in the MT.

According to van der Kooij, in 1QIsa^a the Lord of Hosts is the object of dread, as opposed to the proto-MT and OG, where it is part of the following clause.¹⁵⁰ He bases this conclusion on the vacant space, as well as on the parallelism that is created when the verse is read this way.

¹ Peter may agree with the proto-MT against 1QIsa^a here, because the postpositive **δέ** places the entire divine title in the second half of the section. If ¹ Peter was following 1QIsa^a, the expected phrase would have been **ταραχθῆτε κύριον τὸν δὲ Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε**, instead of **ταραχθῆτε κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε**.

In conclusion, the evidence yielded by this text is relatively minor. With the exception of a few minor variants, the text generally agrees with the OG. Some of these variants seem to have originated with the author, such as the expansion of a pronoun to **τὸν Χριστόν**. The most likely possibility is that the author was working with, and modifying, the OG text, though whether he was working with a text similar to the one preserved in our modern OG or one slightly different, is difficult to determine from this example.

3. Conclusion

The results of this study are listed below in Table 14. In cases where the text agrees with the OG or proto-MT, a circle (●) has been placed in the appropriate box. When the text agrees with both the OG and proto-MT, a circle has been placed in both boxes. In cases where the text agrees (perhaps partially) with both the OG and proto-MT, but follows one more closely than the other, an asterisk (*) will be placed to indicate the source with more agreement. The third column is marked when ¹ Peter does not agree with either the OG or the Hebrew text. In the fourth column, a circle has been placed when the text of ¹ Peter is preceded by either an introductory formula or a textual marker. The final column indicates whether the Greek text in ¹ Peter bears any indication that the OG text has been revised to align it more closely with the proto-MT.

¹⁵⁰ A. van der Kooij, “1QIsa^a Col. VIII, 4–11 (Isa 8, 11–18) : A Contextual Approach of its Variants,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 569–81 (577).

Table 14: Summary of Textual Analysis

	OG	MT	Agrees with neither	Intro. Form. or Text. Marker	Evidence of Greek Revision
1. 1 Pet 1:24–25 <i>Isa 40:6–8</i>	●*	●		●	No
2. 1 Pet 2:6 <i>Isa 28:16</i>	●	●*		●	Yes
3. 1 Pet 2:8 <i>Isa 8:14</i>	●(?)	●*			Yes (?)
4. 1 Pet 2:22 <i>Isa 53:9</i>	●*	●			No
5. 1 Pet 2:25 <i>Isa 53:6</i>	●*	●		●	No
6. 1 Pet 3:14–15 <i>Isa 8:12–13</i>	●	●			No

Most of the time, the text of Isaiah in 1 Peter is similar enough to both the OG and the proto-MT to make analysis of the textual form ambiguous. For this reason, it is not possible to align the quotations of Isaiah with the known Alexandrian or hexaplaric text forms of Isaiah. In three cases, the Petrine text more closely resembles the OG than the proto-MT (1 Pet 1:24–25; 2:22, 25). In two instances, the text leans more towards the proto-MT than the OG (1 Pet 2:6, 8). Significantly, the text of Isaiah only bears evidence of revision towards the Hebrew in the texts of Isaiah *that are also quoted by Paul in Romans*.

Though allowances must be made for contextual modification and other changes made by the author, this data could be interpreted in two ways. First, the evidence may suggest that the author's text of Isaiah was in the process of being revised to follow the proto-MT more closely. It is possible that the author made these revisions himself or that these changes existed in his *Vorlage*. However, though many of these quotations and allusions are similar to the proto-MT, their translation is not as literal as might be expected if the author's *Vorlage* had undergone an extensive revision, or if the author himself was revising his text to align more closely with the Hebrew text form.

The second option is that the author of 1 Peter had access to an unrevised version of Greek Isaiah *and* access to Paul's letter to the Romans. It is also possible that the author of 1 Peter had access to the Pauline forms of the text through another medium (oral tradition, testimony books, etc.). However, the fact that 1 Peter and Romans share otherwise unattested forms of the text (in some places, unique, identical readings) suggests relationship. Thus, the author of 1 Peter may have used the Pauline forms of Isa 28:16 and 8:14 but supplemented these quotations with other quotations of Isaiah from an unrevised Greek text. This conclusion is supported by the evidence that none of the other Petrine quotations of Isaiah bear witness to a Hebraizing revision. However, it must be acknowledged that the data set of Isaianic quotations in 1 Peter is small enough that these conclusions should be understood as probable rather than certain.

Bibliography

- Achtemeier, Paul J. *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Barr, James. "Paul and the LXX: A Note on Some Recent Work." *JTS* 45 (1994): 593–601.
- Beare, Francis Wright. *The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. 3 ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970.
- Best, Ernest. "1 Peter II 4–10: A Reconsideration." *NovT* 11 (1969): 270–93.
- Brockington, L. H. "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ." *VT* 1 (1951): 23–32.
- De Waard, J. *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*. STDJ 4. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Dekker, Jaap. *Zion's Rock-Solid Foundations: An Exegetical Study of the Zion Text in Isaiah 28:16*. OtSt 54. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Dubis, Mark. *1 Peter: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. BHGNT. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010.
- Elliott, John H. *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 37B. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *NTS* 7 (1960): 297–333.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *A Commentary on 1 Peter*. Translated by John E. Alsup. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978. Translation of *Der erste Petrusbrief*. 8th. MeyerK 12.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Hort, F. J. A. *The First Epistle of St. Peter I.1–II.17: The Greek Text with Introductory Lecture, Commentary, and Additional Notes*. London: Macmillan, 1898.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "ἀκρογωνιαίος." *TDNT* 1:792.
- Jobes, Karen H. "The Septuagint Textual Tradition in 1 Peter." Pages 311–33 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. SCS 53. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- _____. *1 Peter*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*. BNTC. London: Black, 1969.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. BHT 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- _____. "The Quotations of Isaiah 8,14 and 28,16 in Romans 9,33 and 1 Peter 2, 6–8 as Test Case for Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament." *ZNW* 101 (2010): 223–40.
- Kooij, A. van der. "1QIsa^a Col. VIII, 4–11 (Isa 8, 11–18): A Contextual Approach of Its Variants." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 569–81.
- _____. "Isaiah in the Septuagint." Pages 513–29 in *Writing and Reading the Isaiah Scroll: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Vol. 2. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. "The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation." Pages 127–33 in *The Book of Isaiah*. BETL 81. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Lim, Timothy H. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- McCartney, Dan G. "The Use of the Old Testament in the First Epistle of Peter." PhD Diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1989.
- McKelvey, R. J. "Christ the Cornerstone." *NTS* 8 (1962): 352–59.

- McLay, R. Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Metzger, Bruce. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah." *JBL* 70 (1951): 297–307.
- _____. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *1 Peter*. WBC 49. Waco, TX: Word, 1988.
- Motyer, J. A. *The Prophecy of Isaiah*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993.
- Moyise, Steve. "Isaiah in 1 Peter." Pages 175–88 in *Isaiah in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Osborne, T. P. "L'utilisation des citations de l'Ancien Testament dans la première épître de Pierre." *RTL* 12 (1981): 64–77.
- Ottley, R. R. *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Brook W. R. Pearson. "Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah." Pages 531–46 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Vol. 2. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Sapp, David A. "The LXX, 1QIsa, and the MT Versions of Isaiah 53 and the Christian Doctrine of Atonement." Pages 170–92 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg: Trinity International Press, 1998.
- Schutter, William L. *Hermeneutic and Composition of I Peter*. WUNT 2/30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.
- Seeligmann, I. L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- Selwyn, Edward Gordon. *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays*. London: Macmillan, 1946.
- Snodgrass, Klyne R. "1 Peter II.1–10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities." *NTS* 24 (1997): 97–106.
- Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Steyn, Gert J. *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews*. FRLANT 235. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930.
- Tov, Emanuel. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 2nd ed. rev. and enl. JBS 8. Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.
- Ulrich, Eugene, and Peter W. Flint. *The Isaiah Scrolls*. 2 vols. DJD XXXII. Oxford: Clarendon, 2010.
- Voorwinde, Stephen. "Old Testament Quotations in Peter's Epistles." *VR* 49 (1987): 3–16.
- Wagner, J. Ross. *Heralds of Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans*. NovTSup 101. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 1–33*. WBC 24. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Isaias*. Septuaginta 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.
- _____. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1934.