TROY W. MARTIN

Theology and Practice in Early Christianity

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
440

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

442

Troy W. Martin

Theology and Practice in Early Christianity

Essays New and Old with Updated Reception Histories

Mohr Siebeck

Troy W. Martin, born 1953; 1990 PhD, University of Chicago; 1997-1998 sabbatical Eberhard-Karls Universität, Tübingen; 2005 sabbatical Ruprecht-Karls Universität, Heidelberg; 2018 Visiting Fellow Macquarie University; 2020 recipient of Festschrift *With Gentleness and Respect: Pauline and Petrine Studies in Honor of Troy W. Martin*; currently Professor of Biblical Studies at Saint Xavier University.
orcid.org/0000-0002-5257-671X

ISBN 978-3-16-154811-6 / eISBN 978-3-16-159488-5
DOI 10.1628/ 978-3-16-159488-5

ISSN 0512-1604 / eISSN 2568-7476 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at http://dnb.dnb.de.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen, printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

For my parents

Troy Sibbley Martin

and

LaValta Ruth Martin

with my deepest gratitude and highest respect

Table of Contents

A. Early Christian Salvation

B. Early Christian Virtues

C. Early Christian Sacraments

D. Early Christian Pneumatology

E. Early Christian Life and Practice

F. Early Christian Eschatology

Preface to the Collection: On the Study of Early Christianity

1. Introduction

I have grown up and grown old with the Bible and in Christian communities. Some of my earliest memories are of my mother's reading Bible stories to me and of both my mother and my father's modeling biblical principles in their lives and practices. Hence, this volume of essays is appropriately dedicated to them. My early education in Bible continued with Essie Gary, who took a group of unruly children on Sunday evenings and told them Bible stories with the aid of a flannelgraph board. She had the extraordinary gift of making those still and motionless figures on that board come alive as she explained and described the real-life situations of those biblical characters. I still remember her vivid descriptions of the intrigues of Joseph's brothers and of the seaweed wrapping around Jonah's head in the belly of the big fish. In my faith community, she was not alone in her great love of the Bible, and many other women made great sacrifices to hold an annual Bible School and to teach Sunday school every week. In my teenage years, my Aunt Sue Currie and Lavern Connelly continued to fuel my curiosity about the Bible and its importance for Christian life and practice. Considering my up-bringing, I had, not surprisingly, read the Bible through cover-to-cover almost three times before I left my home and earliest Christian community to attend college.

Naturally, I found my Bible classes at college the most interesting and stimulating. Studying the Bible in its original languages and cultures raised my curiosity to new heights, and I proceeded from college to seminary and then to The University of Chicago. In each stage of my education, I found some answers to my questions but ended each stage with far more questions than I had at the beginning. I was privileged to study with many excellent teachers and especially with Rabbi Charles D. Isbell, who first introduced me to the rhetorical dimension of scripture. At The University of Chicago, I was also extremely privileged to study with outstanding scholars including Dr. David Wilmot (Classical and Koine Greek), Prof. John D. Levenson (Hebrew Bible), and Prof. Hans Dieter Betz (New Testament and Early Christian Origins). My time in Chicago especially set the direction for my continued study of the Bible once my formal education came to an end, and I have spent the past thirty years following my curiosity and

publishing on many different aspects of the Bible and its representation of early Christian theology and practice. The Bible and my study of it and my interest in Christian communities have indeed been the focus of my entire life from childhood to the present.

2. Approach and Method in this Collection

The twenty-two essays in this volume represent some of my investigations into New Testament texts and their entextualization of early Christian theology and practice. The earliest one (21) was published in 1991, but the most recent two (8 and 9) are published here for the very first time. All of them have been revised and formatted for the present volume, and each is updated with a final section of reception history. In this section, I assess the influence and impact of my essays on the field of New Testament studies and the degrees to which the interpretations proposed and the conclusions reached have been accepted or rejected in subsequent scholarship. Of course, New Testament scholarship is not static, and thousands of articles, books, commentaries, and dissertations have appeared on the topics of my essays since their initial publication. Tracing every reference to my work in the content and notes of these other publications is not at all feasible, and although the sections on reception history are extensive and hopefully representative, they are not exhaustive.

I am grateful to those scholars who have found at least some of my work persuasive, and I appreciate as well those who have taken time to pose counter arguments and who have forced me to think more carefully and to argue in more detail for the interpretations I propose. I remain convinced, however, of the relevance of the data I have collected in these essays and of the soundness of the arguments I have presented, and of the validity of the conclusions I have reached. Hence, I have decided to leave the content of each essay largely as it was in the original publication except for a few minor changes where I have changed my mind or now think differently about something and to reserve my further reflections and responses for the final section of reception history at the end of each essay.[1]

All these articles attempt to interpret biblical texts, and the goal of biblical interpretation is meaning, but not all meaning is the same. The discipline of biblical studies works with two basic types of meaning, namely, the *creative* meaning and *created* meanings. Humans speak or write to communicate meaning to other humans, and a speaker or writer usually has a specific meaning in mind that prompts the speaking and the writing. This meaning may be called the creative meaning since it is responsible for the creation of speech and text. Once cre-

[1] These changes are pointed out in the footnotes where the change occurs.

ated, however, an utterance or a text is heard or read by another human or other humans who create meaning from what they are hearing or reading. These meanings are what may be called created meanings, and they differ in some significant ways from creative meaning.

Creative meaning is stable, synchronic, and uniform in that a speaker or writer is usually a single person who has a definite meaning or thought in mind that this person wishes to communicate in a finite act of speaking or writing. In contrast, created meanings may be quite diverse and differ from hearer to hearer or reader to reader. Especially in the case of texts, created meanings are diachronic and often somewhat infinite as they can sometimes span thousands of years. Even though creative meaning is stable and uniform, its investigation often results in a diversity of opinions. Even though created meanings differ from person to person, investigations of them usually reach more consensus.

Even though these two types of meaning differ in these significant ways, the measure of a speaker or writer's success in communicating is the degree to which created meanings correspond to a creative meaning. Of course, an utterance or speech is more likely to succeed with the initial hearer(s) or reader(s), but not always. In 1 Cor 5:9–11, for example, Paul mentions an earlier letter he has sent to the Corinthians warning them not to get mixed up with those (πόρνοι) who practice sexual immorality. He now writes again to the Corinthians and explains that he did not mean the immoral of this world but the immoral who call themselves a brother or sister in the community. Even with an initial audience, therefore, Paul is not sure they understood what he previously wrote, and he offers further clarification. Many other examples occur in the gospels when Jesus or the evangelists point to some misunderstanding of Jesus' speech (Mark 4:12; 8:17, 21; Matt 13:13–15; 15:17; 16:9, 11; Luke 8:10; John 8:43; 12:40). These examples demonstrate the precarious nature of communication even with an initial audience, but this precariousness increases exponentially the greater the distance in time and space between a creative meaning and created meanings.

These two types of meaning as well as the precarious nature of communication shape the field of biblical studies. For many centuries, biblical scholars devoted themselves to an investigation of the creative meaning of biblical texts. What these scholars sought to understand was the meaning that created or generated the text, and they used philological, historical, and contextual methods that eventually came to be known as the historical-critical method, at least among English-speaking scholars.[2] James A. Kelhoffer cautions that this expression is misleading because the so-called historical-critical method "*is not just one method*" but "the expression is an umbrella term for a number of historically oriented, compara-

[2] James A. Kelhoffer, *Conceptions of "Gospel" and Legitimacy in Early Christianity*, WUNT 324 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 13. Kelhoffer notes, "With rare exception, 'historisch-kritische Exegese' has been the standard terminology of German-language scholarship."

tive, and (most often) tradition-critical methods."[3] What enables these methods to be grouped together is their goal of investigating the creative meaning of biblical texts, and the adjective "historical-critical" applies not only to the older methods usually so-designated such as source, form, and redaction criticism but also to the newer narratological, sociological, and anthropological methods. In fact, almost any method that investigates the creative meaning of a biblical text qualifies as historical-critical.

Recently, many biblical scholars influenced by Post-modernism turn their attention to the other type of meaning and investigate the created meanings of biblical texts. Biblical studies almost always showed some interest in a history-of-research that described the meanings of biblical texts through the centuries, but this interest has intensified in recent scholarship with the emergence of Reception Theory in the 1960s that has led to the publication since then of numerous volumes devoted specifically to reception history. This new focus on created meanings is the essence of reader-response criticism and has generated a whole host of methods attentive to the social and cultural location of readers as well as their gendered experiences, sexual preferences, and ideological perspectives. Annual meetings of the SBL now include program units devoted to African, African American, Asian, Asian American, Latino, Latino American, Feminist, Ecological, Postcolonial, and LGBTI/Queer Hermeneutics among others. The desire to know what a specific reader finds significant and meaningful in a biblical text provides coherence to all these diverse methods.

Tensions often arise between scholars interested in the creative meaning and those focused on created meanings. The former sometimes disdain the latter as being neither historical nor critical. Indeed, methods investigating created meanings may be more or less historical depending on whether the reader under scrutiny is from the past or the present, but the assumption that a valid interpretive method must always be historical ignores the sound methodological principle that the object of investigation determines the method and not the other way around. History is indispensable for investigating the creative meaning of ancient texts but may not be as necessary in a study of created meaning. Furthermore, the very meaning of the term *critical* undermines the assumption that methods devoted to created meanings are uncritical. The Greek verb κρίνειν means *to separate* or *distinguish* based on some criterion or criteria, and every method describes in some detail or at least utilizes some criteria to obtain created meanings. In the end, historicity is not essential for every method to be effective, and all methods for interpreting the Bible, at least as far as I am aware, are critical

[3] Ibid., 11. On p. 13, Kelhoffer recommends, "I find it more helpful – and more accurate – to speak not of one particular method as 'historical-critical' (i.e. 'eine [sogenannte] historisch-kritische Methode') but to speak of the goal of doing 'historical-critical exegesis' ('historisch-kritische Exegese')."

even if they employ different criteria. In my opinion, the disdain of some biblical scholars for others does not serve our interpretive enterprise very well.[4]

Unhelpful also, in my opinion, is the charge of committing the intentional or authorial fallacy that is frequently leveled at scholars interested in creative meanings. The origin of this charge goes back at least to the argument of W. K. Wimsatt and M. C. Beardsley "that the design or intention of the author is neither available nor desirable as a standard for judging the success of a work of literary art."[5] Anyone who has ever worked to interpret an ancient text knows very well the philological, cultural, and historical obstacles to investigating the meaning that created that text, and indeed an author's intention may be unavailable but no more unavailable than any other phenomenon in history. The fact remains that humans speak or write to communicate meaning, and this meaning is an appropriate object for investigation. Recognizing the difficulty and perhaps even the impossibility of knowing with absolute certainty what an ancient author intended does not preclude attempts to understand, and the more an interpreter knows about a text's language, culture, and situation, the better informed and able that interpreter will be to investigate the creative meaning of that text.[6] In spite of the unhelpful charge of committing the intentional or authorial fallacy, many scholars continue to explore the creative meaning of biblical texts.

---

[4] Unfortunately, scholarly works sometimes contain disdainful and discriminatory language. For example, see Jennifer G. Bird, *Abuse, Power and Fearful Obedience: Reconsidering 1 Peter's Commands to Wives*, LNTS 442 (New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 11–12. She labels my work along with that of other male scholars as *malestream*. She then comments, "Since malestream scholars indirectly imply that their interpretations are value-neutral by not naming their socio-political location, their contributions have a tone of universal authoritativeness" (p. 12). In her discussion of method, she criticizes malestream interpretations for not being liberative but rather reinforcing patterns of patriarchal submission (pp. 27, 33). I disagree with her characterization of my own work under her labeling of me as a *malestream scholar* and hope she will read essay 18 (pp. 383–393) in the present volume as well as my co-authored book entitled *I Promise to Hate, Despise, and Abuse You: Marriage in a Narcissistic Age* (Bourbonnais, IL: Bookend Publishers, 2010), passim. I consider my work more liberative with less of a tone of "universal authoritativeness" than her label indicates. Discrimination requires that a label be placed on a group targeted for discrimination, and Bird admits, "I think that labels are more harmful or detrimental than helpful because they are based upon a system of knowledge and power that needs to contain and circumscribe discourses" (p. 37). She continues, "Until the day comes that we can throw off the yoke of containment, however, I will participate in the discourses of power and choose my own labels." Along with her, I welcome the day when all scholars discard the labels of discrimination that encourage and enable disdain for a scholar's work based upon a discriminatory label that obscures and masks that scholar's individual contribution to our common task of finding creative and created meanings in biblical texts.

[5] W. K. Wimsatt and M. C. Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," *The Sewanee Review* 54 (1946): 468–488, here 468.

[6] Peter Lampe, "Rhetorical Analysis of Pauline Texts – Quo Vadit?" in *Paul and Rhetoric*, ed. J. Paul Sampley and Peter Lampe (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 3–21, here 7. Lampe states, "It still makes sense to confront the then-speaking and then-writing people with the then-current theories of text and language – no matter how adequate or inadequate from today's philosophical perspective these ancient theories might have been."

As a biblical scholar, the creative meaning rather than created meanings is what I find interesting, and my investigation of the creative meaning of the biblical text energies me and propels my scholarship. As the twenty-two essays in this volume demonstrate, I most want to know the meaning that generated the formulation and expression of each text I investigate. The numerous critiques of my articles make me acutely aware that many others do not consider any one of my interpretations to be the creative meaning I am seeking but merely my own opinion and a meaning I myself have created. Perhaps, but the understanding I have of the texts investigated in these essays is certainly not the same naïve opinion I held before investigating but an opinion shaped by the philological, cultural, and historical evidence that I present. Several scholars have already agreed with me on various points of interpretation, and hopefully the republication of these essays will enable and encourage many more to reach similar conclusions as well or at least to understand better why I reach such conclusions.

Even though the essays in this volume are primarily about the creative meaning of biblical texts, I hope that those who focus on created meanings will nevertheless find these essays interesting and useful. Although my training and life-long interest in the Bible has been largely focused on historical-critical exegesis, I still value other interpretive approaches and take a similar attitude as Paul did with others who were preaching Christ (Phil 1:18). He queries what it matters since regardless of the motives, Christ is being preached. For whatever reason and with whatever methods we are studying the Bible, the Bible is still being studied and engaged, and for one who has grown up and grown old with the Bible, this interest in the Bible is quite enough.

James A. Kelhoffer articulates a standard by which I hope my life's work will be evaluated. He states, "In all scholarship, regardless of the discipline, the important question is not which method(s) are used. What scholars want to know is whether a colleague has something new, interesting and instructive to present from his or her research."[7] I hope and trust that my own work has indeed presented something "new, interesting and instructive" for other biblical scholars to consider and that when my work is evaluated according to this standard, it will not have been in vain.

March 2020 *Troy W. Martin*

[7] Kelhoffer, "Conceptions," 14.

A. Early Christian Salvation

I. Christians as Babies: Metaphorical Reality in First Peter*

1. Introduction

Metaphors permeate First Peter from the very beginning, where the Christian recipients are described as "chosen sojourners of the Diaspora," to the end, where the sender and his community are identified as the "co-chosen [Diaspora] of Babylon."[1] The author of First Peter is quite fond of metaphor, and an informed interpreter of this document as well as of the New Testament as a whole needs some understanding of metaphors and how they function both in thought and communication. R. Melvin McMillen notes, "Petrine scholars are well-advised to think deeply and read widely in the field of metaphor, not only because of its importance, but also because of its often-unnoticed complexities."[2]

In explaining the nature of metaphor, Aristotle provides an explanation for the abundance of metaphors in First Peter. He states, "Metaphors must not be far-fetched, but we must give names to things that have none by deriving the metaphor from what is akin and of the same kind, so that as soon as it is uttered, it is clearly seen to be akin" (*Rhet.* 3.2.12 [1405a] [Freese, LCL]). First Peter addresses those "who formerly were *no people* but now are the people of God" (1 Pet 2:10). These recipients are non-Jews who have left their former life and now believe in the Jewish God (1 Pet 2:9).[3] They are neither Greek nor Jew but a new

---

* Earlier versions of this essay were read at the John Cardinal Cody Chair of Theology Faculty and Graduate Seminar at Loyola University Chicago on March 28, 2012; at the Department of Religious Studies Spring Research Colloquium at Saint Xavier University on April 12, 2012; and at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Chicago on November 17, 2012. I wish to thank Edmondo Lupieri, Eric Mason, and others in attendance at these meetings for their helpful comments and suggestions that improved the published version of this essay. Any faults or errors that remain are of course my own. All translations of ancient texts are also mine unless otherwise noted.

[1] The term *diaspora* is lacking from 1 Pet 5:13 but should probably be supplied because of the connection between "chosen" in 1:1 and "co-chosen" in 5:13. The term *brotherhood* may also be supplied from 5:9. See Troy W. Martin, *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*, SBLDS 131 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 145–146.

[2] R. Melvin McMillen, "Metaphor and First Peter: The Essential Role of the Minds of Father-God's Children in Spiritual Conflict with a Special Focus on 1:13," (PhD diss., University of South Africa, 2011), 3.

[3] Scholars still debate whether the recipients are Jews, non-Jews, or a mixture of both. See

race of humans, a καινὸν γένος according to *Diognetus* 1. Consistent with Aristotle's explanation, metaphors are therefore necessary to "give names" to these recipients and to describe their new unique status. Indeed, one metaphor, Χριστιανός ("Christian;" 1 Pet 4:16), which this text uses perhaps for the very first time, will become the common designation not only for these recipients but also for all who belong to this new human race.[4]

Considering the importance of metaphors in First Peter, this essay will first survey various definitions of metaphor. Next, it will describe some of the recent theories about metaphor that interpreters have applied to First Peter. It will then investigate the salvific metaphor of newborn babies in 1 Pet 2:1–3 to illustrate the metaphorical reality of the recipients' new life in Christ.

2. Defining Metaphor

All speech is symbolic, but not all speech is metaphorical, and distinguishing metaphor from other symbolic speech requires definition. Metonymies are often confused with metaphor but can be distinguished because they only name a constituent part in reference to the whole. Numerous metonymies occur in First Peter and include "house" for the household (4:17) and "tongue" and "lips" for speech (3:10).[5] Allegories and parables do not play a significant role in First Peter, but they are nonetheless figurative speech and are sometimes understood as extended metaphors. A simile is an expression that uses "like" or "as" to make a comparison, and simile is often contrasted with metaphor, which uses copulative verbs to join the two comparative entities. However, Aristotle states, "The simile also is a metaphor; for there is very little difference. … Similes must be used like metaphors, which only differ in the manner stated" (*Rhet.* 3.3.4 [1406b] [Freese, LCL]). The close connection of simile and metaphor is illustrated in First Peter, which uses both a metaphor ("exiles," 1:1) and a simile ("as exiles," 2:11) to compare its recipients to exiles. It is thus customary in Petrine studies to include similes such as the recipients as children (1:14) and newborn babies (2:2) when discussing the epistle's use of metaphors. These and other types of symbolic speech necessitate defining metaphor.

James D. G. Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, vol. 2 of *Christianity in the Making* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 1158–1160. Dunn makes the case for Jewish recipients. Several passages such as 1 Pet 1:14, 18; 2:10; and 4:3–4, however, persuade the majority of interpreters that the letter is addressed to non-Jews.

[4] David G. Horrell, "The Label Χριστιανός: 1 Peter 4:16 and the Formation of Christian Identity," *JBL* 126 (2007): 361–381.

[5] Bonnie Howe, *Because You Bear this Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter*, SBLBibInt 81 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 368–369.

The Greek word μεταφορά means "transference," and transference is essential to the definition of metaphor. Aristotle writes, "A metaphor is the application of a word that belongs to another thing: either from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy" (*Poet.* 21.7 [1457b] [Halliwell, LCL]; cf. *Rhet.* 3.10.7 [1411a–b]). Until recently, his definition determined the definition of "metaphor as 'the transfer of a name,' with emphasis on metaphor as an isolable word or phrase."[6] Modern theorists, however, deem Aristotle's definition of metaphor and indeed the entire previous approach to metaphor as inadequate and operating on the faulty assumption that metaphor is primarily a phenomenon of language.

Instead of defining metaphor as the transfer of a word, modern theorists define metaphor as a phenomenon of thought. George Lakoff explains that "the word 'metaphor' has come to mean a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system."[7] This shift in understanding leads to this working definition: "The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another."[8] Michael Kimmel gives a more detailed and functional definition:

> Metaphor is a mapping of certain salient and fitting characteristics of one domain to another domain, so as to give rise to a set of systematic correspondences. In order to characterize the directional nature of this mapping, we speak of a topical Target domain and a Source domain from which new structures are adduced.[9]

The notions of source and target domains as well as mapping have become essential to the modern treatment and definition of metaphor.

Current definitions of metaphor are numerous, and no single one has gained consensus. McMillen notes, "The difficulty of defining metaphor is complicated by the fact that not all metaphors have identical features: some, for example, are based on shared attributes, while others depend on common relationships."[10] These diverse definitions and understandings of metaphor give rise to numerous modern theories about metaphor, but some notion of transference remains a common aspect of all of them.

---

[6] David E. Aune, *The Westminister Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 301.

[7] George Lakoff, "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor," in *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 202–251, here 203. Quoted by Howe, *Because You Bear this Name*, 68.

[8] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 5. Quoted by Howe, *Because You Bear this Name*, 60.

[9] Michael Kimmel, "Metaphor, Imagery and Culture: Spatialized Ontologies, Mental Tools and Multimedia in the Making," (Ph.D. diss. University of Vienna, 2002), 26. Quoted by McMillen, "Metaphor and First Peter," 32.

[10] Ibid.

3. Theories of Metaphor

The complexity of metaphor is demonstrated by the explosion of studies and investigations since 1970.[11] The myriad of studies reveals that no single approach to metaphor has gained consensus and makes it difficult to integrate the diverse and competing theories. Nevertheless, some general observations can be made, and evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of specific theories used in the study of First Peter is possible.

When I began to work on First Peter for my dissertation in the 1980s, modern theories about metaphor were only in their infancy.[12] I relied on the theory of Harald Weinrich, who distinguished between an image-contributor and an image-receptor.[13] The subsequent studies of First Peter by Bonnie Howe and R. Melvin McMillen intentionally apply modern metaphorical theory to First Peter and adopt the language of source domain and target domain instead of the terms I took from Weinrich.[14] These studies criticize my dissertation for relying on an older conception of metaphor and for not giving more attention to the theory of metaphor.[15] In the 1980s, however, the metaphor theory applied by each of these scholars to First Peter was not fully available to me, and both of these scholars have made important theoretical advances to the study of metaphors in First Peter.

The thesis of Howe's work "is that conceptual metaphor, grounded in basic embodied human experience, makes possible a shared moral language and discourse between the New Testament writers and readers of the New Testament today."[16] Her goal is to minimize the old hermeneutical gap between what First Peter meant then and what it means now so that the epistle can function as an exemplar and speak more directly to modern readers.[17] She adopts Conceptual or Cognitive Metaphor Theory (CMT) and attempts to map the source domains to the target domains of the metaphors in First Peter. She describes the source domain as the "sensorimotor domain" and the target domain as the "non-

[11] See Robert R. Hoffman, ed., *Metaphor: A Bibliography of Post-1970 Publications* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1985), passim. See also Jean-Pierre van Noppen and Edith Hols, eds., *Metaphor II: A Classified Bibliography from 1985–1990* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1990), passim. Both surveys of the literature are cited by McMillen, "Metaphor and First Peter," 2 n. 4.

[12] My dissertation was published as *Metaphor and Composition in First Peter* in the SBL Dissertation Series.

[13] Harald Weinrich, *Sprache in Texten* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1976), 276–341. See my discussion of his theory in *Metaphor and Composition*, 147.

[14] Other terms for the image-receptor or target domain are "target," "topic," "tenor," "subject," and "focus." The image-contributor or source domain is variously called "base," "source," "vehicle," and "frame." See McMillen, "Metaphor and First Peter," 17.

[15] See Howe, *Because You Bear this Name*, 271–272 nn. 10–11; and McMillen, "Metaphor and First Peter," 7–8.

[16] Howe, *Because You Bear this Name*, 5.

[17] Ibid., 2.

sensori-motor" domain. Thus, metaphor is experientially based in "basic bodily experience" and social interaction.[18] Since human bodies do not differ much from the ancient to modern times and several social interactions are similar, she thinks that the distance between the metaphors in First Peter and today is not as great as the traditional hermeneutical gap has supposed.[19] Obviously, Howe is correct that human bodies have not changed much. However, the perception and understanding of the human body has changed a great deal from when First Peter was written to now, and Howe's study needs to be more sensitive to this change.

Howe's method is far too complex to summarize completely here, but it can be illustrated by her treatment of the newborn baby metaphor in 1 Pet 2:1–3, where the recipients are exhorted to desire the "logical, undiluted milk" as newborn babies so that they can grow into salvation. She describes this metaphor as blended from two source domain frames. Howe defines "frames" as "structured understandings of the way aspects of the world function."[20] The two frames on which this metaphor relies are the household frame and the body frame.[21]

Regarding the household frame, she comments, "When Christian believers as a group constitute the target domain, they are fitted into selected slots in the Household Frame." She states that Christians "are fitted into the Child slot: they are 'little children, infants' whose desire to grow 'into salvation' is expressed as a 'longing for the pure, spiritual milk.'" She then concludes, "Infantile longing for milk is mapped onto adult desire to 'grow' into salvation."[22] Regarding the body frame, she explains that an infant's longing for milk is a clear example of good desire, for "we know what it is for newborns to want milk … not only for growth, but for life itself."[23] Thus, Howe's Conceptual Metaphor Theory allows her to map the source and target domains of the metaphor of newborn babies in 1 Pet 2:1–3 and to observe some salient features of this metaphor.

Her attempt to minimize the hermeneutical gap in her analysis, however, limits her treatment of this metaphor. She assumes that modern understandings of how infants are produced in a household and how they long for milk are the same as ancient understandings. Perhaps some aspects are the same, but some may be different. Ideas about how babies are conceived and how they grow in the womb have certainly changed in the past 2000 years, and notions of nutrition are most definitely different today than they were at the time of the writing of First Peter.

[18] Ibid., 81.
[19] Ibid., 349, 352–353.
[20] Ibid., 64.
[21] Ibid., 280–286, 294–304.
[22] Ibid., 286.
[23] Ibid., 303.

Mapping metaphors requires an accurate understanding of not only the source domain but also the target domain. Howe's treatment of the metaphors in First Peter is frequently lacking in such an understanding, as John H. Elliott observes:

> The method of cognitive metaphor analysis as presented by Howe holds much promise, I believe, for ethicians and exegetes and deserves our immediate attention. It is regrettable that the method so lucidly exposed in the first half of the book is not coupled with a vigorous exegesis of 1 Peter and sound hermeneutical reflection in the study's second half.[24]

He concludes, "The combination of cognitive metaphor analysis with exegesis and ethics remains a promising idea in search of an adequate method."[25]

McMillen agrees with Howe that Conceptual Metaphor Theory makes a significant contribution to the analysis of metaphors in First Peter but he thinks her method needs supplementing with Structure Mapping Theory (SMT).[26] SMT is a type of comparative metaphor theory that "directly links Source and Target concepts."[27] Its primary objective is to identify "the system of relations in the Source that correspond to a system of relations in the Target."[28] Dedre Gentner explains, "The central idea in structure-mapping is that an analogy [or metaphor] is a mapping of knowledge from one domain (the base) into another (the target) which conveys that a system of relations which holds among the base objects also holds among the target objects."[29] McMillen prefers SMT theory because it "encourages interpreters to study all forms of similarity within a document, rather than artificially abstracting specific ones from its overall conceptual and textual context."[30]

McMillen adapts SMT as well as other theories into his own Major Metaphor Model.[31] His method is even more complicated than Howe's and cannot be summarized completely here, but, like Howe's, it can be illustrated by his treatment of the newborn baby metaphor in 1 Pet 2:1–3. Consistent with his method, McMillen describes as many structural similarities as he can between the source and target domains of this metaphor. First, he links 2:1–3 with the Father-God metaphor of 1:13–17 and sees a Father-God structure in the newborn baby

---

[24] John H. Elliott, "Review of Bonnie Howe, *Because You Bear This Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter*," URL: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/5321_5610.pdf.

[25] Ibid.

[26] McMillen, "Metaphor and First Peter," 11. McMillen relies on the numerous works of Dedre Gentner, "Structure-Mapping: A Theoretical Framework for Analogy," *Cognitive Science* 7 (1983): 155–170; idem, "The Mechanisms of Analogical Learning," in *Similarity and Analogical Reasoning*, ed. Stella Vosniadou and Andrew Ortony (London: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 199–241. For a list of her other publications, see McMillen, "Metaphor and First Peter," 291–292.

[27] Ibid., 81.

[28] Ibid., 66.

[29] Gentner, "Mechanisms," 201. Quoted by McMillen, "Metaphor and First Peter," 66.

[30] McMillen, "Metaphor and First Peter," 81.

[31] Ibid., 83–105.

metaphor in 2:1–3.[32] He identifies the "milk" as the Father-God's mercy and grace offered to his children who must desire it with humility. McMillen sees humility "implied in the Source of craving milk in terms of both its content and the desperate need."[33] This humility is "essential in relationship to Father-God and his family."[34] Second, McMillen observes a mental structure in the imperative ἐπιποθήσατε ("long for") in 2:2, and he proposes that the "logical milk" must include "God's Word, to the exclusion of all other objects of desire, leaving little doubt that filling the mind with its truth is enjoined."[35] Third, he sees a spatial structure in the "putting off" of sinful attitudes (2:1) as external clothing in contrast to the spiritual nourishment that God's children ingest, and McMillen understands the "logical milk" as spiritual nourishment.[36] Finally, he perceives a conflict structure in this metaphor by hypothesizing "a Petrine view of God's Word as a weapon in cosmic spiritual battle."[37] By earnestly desiring the "logical milk" of God's Word, the recipients of the letter nourish "hope and trust in their father" and "grow towards the salvation that is its content."[38]

As his treatment of the newborn baby metaphor in 1 Pet 2:1–3 demonstrates, McMillen's method is far more productive of meaning than Howe's. As with Howe, however, McMillen's method assumes modern understandings of objects in the source domain of this metaphor. He does not investigate whether the ancients had a different understanding of "instinctual cravings" than moderns have.[39] Furthermore, his shifting referent for "logical milk" from "God's grace and mercy" to "God's Word" and then to "spiritual nourishment" invites the question of whether the source domain could convey these meanings to ancient readers. In the end, McMillen admits, "No claim is made that this is the final, perfect template applicable even to First Peter's metaphors, either in terms of content or structure."[40]

The studies of Howe and McMillen raise important issues in the application of modern metaphor theories to First Peter. First and most obvious is the determination of which theory of metaphor to apply. Howe's Cognitive Metaphor Theory and McMillen's Structure Mapping Theory yield very different exegetical results, and selection of any one of the dozens of possibilities thus has important exegetical consequences.[41] Second, their studies warn about obscuring the text

[32] Ibid., 174–176.
[33] Ibid., 175.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid., 176–177.
[36] Ibid., 178.
[37] Ibid., 179.
[38] Ibid., 180.
[39] Ibid., 176.
[40] Ibid., 83.
[41] Ibid., 25. He notes, "The development of theories of metaphor continues with no signs of exhaustion." On p. 16, he admits, "On the one hand, the content and structure of First Peter

of First Peter behind a plethora of analytical terms and concepts. The heuristic test of a method or theory is the clarity it provides, and modern metaphor theory is useful to the degree that it clarifies the text of First Peter. To the degree that it does not, it is not helpful. When the method becomes an obstacle to understanding a text, it loses its functionality. Third, their methodologically focused studies demonstrate that no method is a substitute for a thorough understanding of the ancient source domains in First Peter, and such an understanding is absolutely necessary for an adequate mapping of these metaphors. Finally, their studies also confirm that mapping metaphors is of crucial importance and that many of the disagreements among Petrine scholars arise from differences in mapping the individual metaphors.

4. Mapping the New-Born Baby Metaphor

Discussing all the specific metaphors in First Peter would far exceed the limitations of the present essay, and so I shall limit the remaining investigation to a single illustrative metaphor, namely Christians as babies (1 Pet 2:1–3). This expression is technically a simile, but the literature on First Peter both treats it as and calls it a metaphor.[42] This metaphor illustrates the importance of thoroughly understanding the ancient source domain for mapping the analogous characteristics First Peter transfers to its recipients. The metaphors in First Peter describe the ontological reality of these non-Jewish believers in Israel's God, and mapping each metaphor including the new-born baby metaphor is necessary for an informed understanding of First Peter's description of its recipients.

This metaphor of desiring the "logical, undiluted milk" as newborn babies in 1 Pet 2:1–3 occurs with other metaphors related to the elect household of God (1:14–2:10).[43] The themes of divine choosing and its corollary, the chosen people of God, are prevalent in the Jewish Diaspora.[44] The Jews of the Diaspora considered themselves to be the chosen people of God, and First Peter takes this prevalent Diaspora theme and applies this designation to its recipients. In their Diaspora sojourn, they are none other than the chosen people of God. This metaphor of newborn babies' desiring the "logical, undiluted milk" thus fits in and contributes to the overarching and controlling metaphor of the Diaspora.[45]

---

invites a comprehensive metaphorical analysis; on the other hand, the burgeoning field of metaphor studies today has not yet reached any clearly defensible consensus on many of the key issues critical to its application to a text such as First Peter."

[42] Howe, *Because You Bear this Name*, 286, 303.

[43] Martin, *Composition and Metaphor*, 161–188.

[44] Ibid., 163 n. 91.

[45] When I began writing my doctoral dissertation in the 1980s and investigating metaphors in First Peter, previous scholarship largely studied each metaphor in the letter individually with few attempts to understand how the metaphors related to each other or worked together

Index of References

1. Hebrew Bible/Septuagint

2. Other Ancient Jewish Literature

3. Greco-Roman Literature

4. New Testament

5. Other Early Christian and Pre-Reformation Literature

Index of Modern Authors and Persons

Index of Subjects