

## Franciszek Mickiewicz

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw  
ORCID: 0000-0003-3945-8169

### The Missionary Activity of St. Peter Outside Palestine in the Light of the New Testament Literature<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** From the historical works of Eusebius of Caesarea we learn that St. Peter went to Rome in 42 and preached the Gospel there for 25 years. However, this information is not confirmed in the books of the New Testament. For this reason, this article attempts to answer the question of where St. Peter could have stayed and acted from the moment he left Jerusalem (Acts 12:17) until his arrival in Rome. The analysis of Gal 2:11–14 leads to the conclusion that after the Council of Jerusalem he certainly stayed in Antioch for some time. It is possible that during his long journey he reached the northern regions of Asia Minor, as a reminiscence of this can be found in 1 Peter 1:1. Then, on his way to Rome, he probably paid a visit to Christians in Corinth, as evidenced by 1 Cor 1:12; 9:5. These texts therefore allow us to suppose that after leaving Jerusalem, St. Peter became an itinerant apostle, carried out extensive missionary activities and, thanks to his personal contacts with Christian communities, gained great authority among them.

**Keywords:** St. Peter, apostolate, missionary journeys

---

In his *Church History*, Eusebius of Caesarea states that during the reign of Claudius Peter the Apostle went to Rome and brought there the priceless treasure of spiritual light.<sup>2</sup> According to St. Jerome's Latin translation of the *Chronicle* by Eusebius, St. Peter went there exactly in the second year of Claudius' reign, i.e. in 42 A.D., and preached the Gospel to the Romans for twenty-five

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is a corrected and supplemented version of the text originally published in Polish: Franciszek Mickiewicz, "Działalność misjonarska św. Piotra poza Palestyną w świetle literatury nowotestamentowej," *Collectanea Theologica* 89 (2019) no. 3, 85–109. Translated from Polish by Maciej Górnicki.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica* 12, 4, 6.

years.<sup>3</sup> St. Jerome himself, on the other hand, based on the information of Eusebius, writes in his work *De viris illustribus* [*On Notable Men*] that Simon Peter was Bishop of Rome “for twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero.”<sup>4</sup>

However, this information is unfortunately undermined by some New Testament texts. In particular, from Acts 15:1–29 and Gal 2:1–14 we learn that St. Peter participated in the so-called Council of Jerusalem, which took place around 49 and then went to Antioch for some time. In his Letter to the Romans (written at the beginning of 56), St. Paul does not mention Peter at all. Although he knows well the situation of the addressees of his letter and in its final part greets as many as 26 people (Romans 16: 3–16), he does not list Peter anywhere. If this apostle, who received the title of pillar of the Church in Gal 2:9, had been present in Rome at that time, St. Paul would certainly have known about it and would not have omitted him in the list of the people he greets. It is also known that the Jews were exiled from the capital of the empire during the reign of Emperor Claudius and could not return there until after his death, in the year 54. What is more, St. Jerome in the fragment quoted above from *De viris illustribus* places an intrinsically contradictory text, as he writes about St. Peter’s 25-year pontificate, explaining a little earlier that he came to Rome “after holding the office of the bishop in the Antioch Church and the teaching of the Jews . . . in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia.” If he left Jerusalem during the reign of Agrippa I (Acts 12:17), about the year 42, he could not have come to Rome in the same year after so many apostolic journeys.

Taking into account these and other less important arguments, many Protestant scholars believe that Peter was never in Rome.<sup>5</sup> Catholic exegetes reject such an extreme position, but taking both the New Testament data and the testimonies of the Church fathers

---

<sup>3</sup> See: *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, in: *Eusebius Werke*, vol. 7, ed. R. Helm, Berlin 1956, 261f.

<sup>4</sup> *De viris illustribus* 1. Credibility of this tradition is defended by J.W. Wenham, *Did Peter Go to Rome in AD 42?*, Tyndale Bulletin 23/1972, p. 94–102.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e.g. O. Sobrino, *Was Peter the first bishop of Rome?*, New Blackfriars, 84/2003, p. 415–421; M.D. Goulder, *Did Peter ever go to Rome?*, Scottish Journal of Theology, 57/2004, p. 377–396.

seriously, they put forward the hypothesis that he could only have come to the developing community in the capital of the empire after the year 56, and had been active there until his death, i.e. around 65.<sup>6</sup> However, this hypothesis, which has strong biblical foundations, raises the question: where did St. Peter stay and work until his arrival in Rome? Throughout the New Testament, unfortunately, there are only four short texts that can help to give a very general answer to this question: 1 Corinthians 1:12 (taken together with 3:22); 9:5; Gal 2:11–14; 1 Pet 1:1. These verses, because of their conciseness and ambiguity, have become the subject of many discussions among scholars, who are not unanimous in their interpretation. In this article we want to review their opinions and consider whether these texts are capable of helping to trace the traces of St. Peter's missionary activity, ending with his arrival in the capital of the Roman Empire.

### **1. St. Luke's Silence on the Activity of Peter the Apostle Outside Palestine**

In Acts 1–12, St. Luke devotes a lot of space to the activities of St. Peter in the first Church, while showing his great authority in the community of Jesus' disciples. He writes that it was he who took the initiative to supplement the College of the Twelve (Apostolic College), which was depleted after the death of Judas (Acts 1:15–22). He quotes 4 of his catecheses / speeches delivered after the sending of the Holy Spirit in Jerusalem (2:14–36; 3:12–26; 4:8–12; 5:29–32). He recalls the miracles he performed both in Jerusalem and in other cities of Judea (3:4–11; 5:15; 9:32–43). He underlines his courage in preaching the Gospel to the members of the Sanhedrin, who are hostile to the followers of Christ (4:13–22). Finally, he reminds his readers that it was Peter who first accepted the Gentiles into the community of believers and, by his

---

<sup>6</sup> This possibility is accepted, after careful analysis of biblical and extra-biblical data, by W. Rakocy, *Lata pobytu Apostoła Piotra w Rzymie (rys historyczny)*, in: *Opoka Kościoła Chrystusowego. Bibliści KUL w 25 rocznicę pontyfikatu Jana Pawła II*, eds. S. Szymik, H. Ordon, Lublin 2004, p. 158–159. A more radical position is represented by H.C. Snape, *Peter and Paul in Rome*, *Modern Churchman* 14/1971, p. 127–138, who thinks that St. Peter arrived in Rome only in 69 A.D. and has been martyred soon after this date.

attitude, showed that before God all people have the same dignity (10:10–48; 11:1–17).

All the descriptions of St. Peter's activities in the territory of Judea have their finale in Acts 12:1–15. This passage shows the persecution which Herod Agrippa I initiated and which was directed against Christian leaders in the first place. They resulted in the beheading of James, John's brother, and the imprisonment of Peter, which would perhaps also have ended in his death if it had not been for God's own intervention, through which Peter was miraculously freed from Herod's hands. After his release from prison, Peter went to the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark, where Christians had gathered to pray for him. After a brief mention of their encounter, St. Luke says that immediately afterwards Peter "went to another place" (Acts 12:17). With this decision Peter almost completely disappears from the pages of Acts of the Apostles. He still appears briefly in Acts 15:7–12, in the presentation of the so-called Council of Jerusalem, where he significantly influenced the content of the Apostolic Decree, concerning the religious obligations imposed on pagans who accept the faith in Christ. This passage, however, is only a minor episode in a text devoted almost exclusively to the missionary activity of St. Paul.

Many scholars, commenting on Acts 12:17 or referring to this mysterious sentence: "he went to another place," wondered where St. Peter could have gone to hide from Herod's wrath. Some contemporary exegetes still recognise the credibility of Eusebius' information and believe that it was then that St. Peter went to Rome, founded the Christian community there and became its first bishop.<sup>7</sup> A few hypothesize that the statement "he went to another place" is Luke's metaphor for describing St. Peter's martyr's death, which

---

<sup>7</sup> They include E. Jacquier, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1926, p. 369; J. Renié, *Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1949, p. 177–178; S. Dockx, *Essai de chronologie pétriniennne*, Recherches de Science Religieuse 62/1974, p. 221–241; C.P. Thiede, *Babylon, der andere Ort: Anmerkungen zu 1 Petr 5,13 und Apg 12,17*, *Biblica* 67/1986, p. 537; tenze, *Simon Pietro dalla Galilea a Roma*, Milano 1999, p. 228–234; G. Bray, *Romans* (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. New Testament 6), Chicago–London 1998, p. 363.

may have already happened in Jerusalem.<sup>8</sup> However, the vast majority of scholars (not only Protestant but also Catholic) do not share either of these two extreme opinions. They present many different proposals, which can be placed in five groups:

1. After the escape from Jerusalem Peter reached Alexandria, where he proclaimed the Gospel to the Jews forming a large Diaspora in Egypt.<sup>9</sup>
2. After leaving Jerusalem, Peter went to the cities on the shores of the Mediterranean where he had previously worked (see Acts 9:32–43) in order to continue his apostolic work there.<sup>10</sup> The weakness of this hypothesis lies in the fact that these territories at that time were under the jurisdiction of Herod Agrippa I, who was king of Judea from 41–44. If he remained there, Peter would still be exposed to his anger and would sooner or later be arrested again and most likely executed.
3. In order to avoid another arrest, Peter left the territories under the authority of Herod Agrippa and preached the Gospel outside Palestine, but we cannot say anything concrete about his whereabouts.<sup>11</sup> He returned to Jerusalem for the Jerusalem Council around 49 (Acts 15), because by that time the governor was already dead (he died in 44; see Acts 12:18–23).<sup>12</sup>
4. From Jerusalem, Peter went directly to Antioch, where he preached the Gospel in the fast-growing Christian

---

<sup>8</sup> See: D.F. Robinson, *Where and When Did Peter Die?*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 64/1945, p. 255–267; M. Smaltz, *Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71/1952, p. 211–216; F.F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, Grand Rapids 1988, p. 239.

<sup>9</sup> H.C. Snape, *Peter and Paul in Rome*, *Modern Churchman* 14/1971, p. 133–134.

<sup>10</sup> R.N. Longenecker, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Grand Rapids 1981, p. 207.

<sup>11</sup> J. Finegan, *The Archeology of the New Testament. The Mediterranean World of the Early Christian Apostles*, London 1981, p. 40; A. Weiser, *Die Apostelgeschichte. Kapitel 1–12* (Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament 5/1), Gütersloh–Würzburg 1981, p. 291.

<sup>12</sup> C.S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, t. 2: 3:1–14:28, Grand Rapids 2013, p. 1953.

community, as is clearly shown by St. Paul's mentions in Gal 2:11–14.<sup>13</sup>

5. From the references to Peter in 1 Cor 9:5 and Gal 2:11–14 it can be assumed that he became an itinerant apostle and carried out extensive missionary activity.<sup>14</sup> It is possible that during his long journey he even reached some parts of Asia Minor, as can be inferred from 1 Pet 1:1.<sup>15</sup>

It is certainly strange that Luke, for whom Peter was a great authority, does not give the name of the place to which he went after he was released from prison. It is possible – as some say – that he did not have any information on this.<sup>16</sup> It is also possible to agree with the suggestion of others that in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, such information is actually unnecessary.<sup>17</sup> The very general phrase “went to another place” is primarily intended to inform the reader that Peter's activities in Jerusalem and other cities of Judea and Samaria have just come to an end.<sup>18</sup> Leaving the capital, however, he does not leave it without a successor. It is significant that in Acts 12:17, Luke, through the lips of Peter, for the first time presents James, whom he already presents as the superior of the Church of Jerusalem in 15:13–21 and 21:18. He thus declares that James is Peter's successor in the leading function of the first

---

<sup>13</sup> C.F. Nesbitt, *What Did Become of Peter?*, *Journal of Bible and Religion* 27/1959, p. 10–16; G. Stählin, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 5), Göttingen 1966<sup>11</sup>, p. 170.

<sup>14</sup> J.D.G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Grand Rapids 1996, p. 164; C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, Vol. I, Edinburgh 1998, p. 587; G. Rossé, *Atti degli Apostoli. Commento esegetico e teologico*, Roma 1998, p. 473, note 88; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 31), London 2010, p. 489; J.W. Packer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, New York 2010, p. 98.

<sup>15</sup> C.S. Keener, *Acts*, p. 1952.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 1953.

<sup>17</sup> J. Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 3), Göttingen 1998, p. 335.

<sup>18</sup> B. Witherington III also thinks so, *The Acts of the Apostles. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, Grand Rapids 1998, p. 389; G. Rossé, *Atti degli Apostoli*, p. 473; C.R. Holladay, *Acts: A Commentary*, Louisville 2016, p. 254.

Christian community,<sup>19</sup> which became the mother of other Churches.

In its narrative, the verse of Acts 12:17 also has some connection with Jesus' missionary precept: "you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and to the ends of the earth" (Acts 1:8). This sentence, which concisely shows the programme of the Church's activities, makes it possible to understand that St. Luke did not intend to present the biographies of all the apostles in his work, but rather tried to acquaint the reader with the spread of the word of God from the initial phase, connected with the activity of the apostles in Jerusalem, to the transformation of Christianity into a worldwide phenomenon.<sup>20</sup> According to him, first in Jerusalem, and then all over Judea and Samaria, St. Peter was the main witness of the Risen Jesus, often accompanied by St. John, while the task of spreading the Gospel "to the ends of the earth" was fulfilled mainly thanks to the activity of St. Paul. Since Luke was personally able to accompany Paul on his missionary journeys, he dedicated the entire next part of his book, which includes Acts 13–28, to his person and his apostolic work. From this point of view, therefore, the phrase of Peter's departure from Jerusalem fulfils the function of passing from one subject of the story to another in the narrative of Acts of the Apostles.<sup>21</sup>

In the exegetical analyses of Acts 12:17 there is also a suggestion that Luke could not clearly indicate the place where Peter went after his release from prison, because he later often changed his place of residence.<sup>22</sup> In a sense, it follows the line of the last hypothesis given above that Peter, as an itinerant apostle, carried out extensive missionary activity. It may be presumed that, because of his

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. R.W. Wall, *Successors to 'the Twelve' According to Acts 12:1–17*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly 53/1991, p. 641–642.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Ph. H. Menoud, *Le plan des Actes des Apôtres*, New Testament Studies 1/1954–55, p. 50–51; G. Betori, *Lo Spirito e l'annuncio della Parola negli Atti degli Apostoli*, Rivista Biblica Italiana 35/1987, p. 420.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. B. Prete, A. Scaglioni, *I miracoli degli Apostoli nella Chiesa delle origini*, Torino 1989, p. 118.

<sup>22</sup> O. Bauernfeind says so, *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 22), Tübingen 1980, p. 162.

humility, he did not take care to ensure that Mark, who recorded in writing his testimony of Jesus Christ, Son of God (cf. Mk 1:1), or some other of his disciples, wrote down his own memories of the work and missionary journeys made before he reached Rome. However, this does not mean that we know absolutely nothing about this period of his life. As has already been said in the introduction to this article, we find some scattered traces of his apostolic activity, which he carried out in various parts of the Roman Empire, in the letters of Saint Paul (1 Cor 1:12; 3:22; 9:5; Gal 2:11–14) and in the mysterious list of addressees of the First Letter of Saint Peter (1 Pet 1:1). In our analysis we will first deal with the text of Gal 2:11–14.

## 2. The Stay of St. Peter in Syrian Antioch

In Gal 2:11 St. Paul writes: “But when Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned” (ASV). In the whole New Testament, this is the only text from which the reader can learn that after leaving Judea, Peter was certainly staying for some time in Syrian Antioch. Due to its brevity, however, it raises many questions, among which the question of when and why Peter went to this very city comes first.

It should first of all be stated that it is difficult to determine clearly when St. Peter came to Antioch. In his commentary, Th. Zahn attempts to prove that this took place before the Council of Jerusalem.<sup>23</sup> U. Borse specifies that after his escape from Jerusalem, mentioned in Acts 12:17, Peter went directly to Antioch, where a conflict between Paul and Peter soon occurred.<sup>24</sup> A similar view is held by H.-M. Féret, who suggests reading the text of Gal 2:11 in the context of Acts 14:28, where Luke writes that Barnabas and Paul, having returned from their first missionary journey, “they remained no little time with the disciples” (RSV).

---

<sup>23</sup> Th. Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 9), Leipzig 1922<sup>3</sup>, p. 110–112.

<sup>24</sup> U. Borse, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Regensburger Neuen Testament 9), Regensburg 1984, p. 107–111. F.J. Matera is of similar opinion, *Galatians* (Sacra Pagina Series 9), Collegeville 2007, p. 85.



It was then that they met with Peter.<sup>25</sup> And F.F. Bruce believes that Acts 15:6–29 and Gal 2:1–10, which differ greatly in their content, actually describe two different meetings of the Apostles and that the meeting described by Paul took place before the Jerusalem Council described by Luke. According to him, the conflict between Paul and Peter took place between the two meetings, after Barnabas and Paul returned from their first missionary journey.<sup>26</sup>

Situating this incident before the Council of Jerusalem probably makes it possible to recreate a more logical sequence of events,<sup>27</sup> according to which the conflict between Peter and Paul in Antioch was the direct cause of the apostles going to Jerusalem in order to obtain a clear position with regard to Gentiles converting to Christianity.<sup>28</sup> Nevertheless, most scholars believe that Peter arrived in Antioch shortly after the Council of Jerusalem, when Paul and Barnabas, before going on their next missionary journey, were teaching there and, together with others, were preaching the word of the Lord (Acts 15:35),<sup>29</sup> that is, around the year 50. This order of events is supported above all by the text of Gal 1–2 itself, in which St. Paul chronologically presents the most important moments of his life after his conversion and places the dispute with Peter after the

---

<sup>25</sup> H.-M. Féret, *Pierre et Paul a Antioche et a Jérusalem. Le «conflit» des deux Apôtres*, Paris 1955, p. 77–83.

<sup>26</sup> F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Exeter 1982, p. 128. A. Schlatter takes an isolated position on this issue (*Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit*, Gütersloh 1926, p. 190–191), placing the Antiochene conflict between St. Paul's second and third missionary trip.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. A. Méhat, «*Quand Képhas vint à Antioche...*» *Que s'est-il passé entre Pierre et Paul?*, *Lumière & Vie* 192/1989, p. 29–43; A. Vanhoye, *Lettera ai Galati. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento*, Milano 2000, p. 64.

<sup>28</sup> This is the opinion of G. Lüdemann, *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles. Studies in Chronology*, London 1984, p. 75–77.

<sup>29</sup> See: H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament), Göttingen 1962, p. 82; J. Eckert, *Die urchristliche Verkündigung im Streit zwischen Paulus und seinen Gegnern nach dem Galaterbrief*, Regensburg 1971, p. 193; T. Holtz, *Der antiochenische Zwischenfall (Galater 2.11–14)*, *New Testament Studies* 32/1986, p. 347; J. Rohde, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 9), Berlin 1989, p. 104; M.C. de Boer, *Galatians. A Commentary*, Louisville 2011, p. 130.

meeting of the apostles concerning the treatment of the Gentiles receiving the Gospel of Christ.

It is impossible to establish with full certainty the reason for Peter's arrival in Antioch, because Paul, in his Letter to the Galatians, does not keep a detailed chronicle, but concentrates only on what happened in that community when Peter was present there,<sup>30</sup> so many exegetes in their comments completely ignore this issue. Some, however, try to give the most reasonable reason in their opinion, and their hypotheses can be combined into four groups:

1. Peter's arrival in Antioch had the character of some kind of an inspection. He intended to check the nature of the Christian movement in the cities of the nearby Jewish diaspora,<sup>31</sup> or how the provisions of the Council of Jerusalem were implemented.<sup>32</sup>
2. This was a kind of a return visit by Peter, made to those who had previously come to Jerusalem for the gathering of the Apostles and officially represented the Antiochene community there.<sup>33</sup>
3. In accordance with the decision referred to in Gal 2:8, Peter came to Antioch, where there was a large diaspora, to carry out missionary activities among the Jews.<sup>34</sup> However, since the Christian community that was growing there was made up of both Jews and Gentiles, Peter consequently included both groups in his apostolic work.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. F. Mußner, *Der Galaterbrief* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 9), Leipzig 1974, p. 137, note 14.

<sup>31</sup> N. Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationship and Authority in Earliest Christianity* (Journal for the Study of NT. Supplement Series 66), Sheffield 1989, p. 123; D.J. Moo, *Galatians* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 2013, p. 145.

<sup>32</sup> K. Romaniuk, *Św. Piotr. Życie i dzieło*, Katowice 1995, p. 100.

<sup>33</sup> J. Becker, *Der Brief an die Galater*, in: *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 8/1), Göttingen 1998, p. 39.

<sup>34</sup> B. Witherington, *Grace in Galatia. A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians*, Grand Rapids 1998, p. 150.

<sup>35</sup> C.P. Thiede, *Simon Pietro*, p. 243–244.

4. It was an ordinary visit to the superiors of the Antiochene community during a journey to the next cities where Peter intended to preach the Gospel.<sup>36</sup>

This diversity of proposals shows that it is not possible to clearly define with what intention Peter came to Antioch and what role he played during his stay in the city. Eusebius of Caesarea suggests in his *Ecclesiastical history* that Peter was the first superior of the Antiochene Church and that his second successor was Ignatius,<sup>37</sup> but unfortunately in another place he presents different information, where, not mentioning Peter at all, he writes that in Antioch the first bishop was Evodios (Evodius) and the second Ignatius.<sup>38</sup> What is more, this detail contradicts another piece of information by this historian, mentioned at the beginning of this article, namely that Peter was the bishop of Rome for 25 years. From these contradictions it can be concluded that Eusebius' information in this respect is based on divergent traditions. Perhaps Peter stayed there for almost seven years, perhaps even until 56, but to attribute to him the post of first bishop of Antioch is rather an anachronism, because the apostles did not hold offices reminiscent of the later residential bishoprics, but all were itinerant missionaries.<sup>39</sup>

In Galatians 2:8, Paul writes that the Lord “who worked through Peter for the mission to the circumcised worked through me also for the Gentiles.” By making such a comparison, Paul, who carried out extensive missionary activity in the Gentile community, allows us to think that Peter, in turn, was one of the leading missionaries among the Jews.<sup>40</sup> This sentence embraces all the activities of both apostles until then. In the case of Peter, this is not only about the events described in Acts 9:32–43, but about his work among the Jews of the Diaspora, undertaken for several years from leaving Jerusalem after his miraculous release from prison (see Acts 12:17) until his return to the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15).

---

<sup>36</sup> H.D. Betz, *Galatians*, Philadelphia 1979, p. 105; A. Pitta, *Lettera ai Galati. Introduzione, versione e commento*, Bologna 2009<sup>2</sup>, p. 132.

<sup>37</sup> See: Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica* III, 36, 2.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 22.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. K. Romaniuk, *Św. Piotr*, p. 127.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. J. Eckert, *Die urchristliche Verkündigung*, p. 194.

It may seem surprising that St. Luke, who, in Acts 12:17, did not mention the place where Peter went after leaving Jerusalem, does not even mention in one sentence the Apostle's stay in Antioch.<sup>41</sup> After all, according to the ancient tradition, he himself came from Antioch, he personally knew the apostles preaching the Gospel in his environment and, on the basis of his own testimony, he described with clear enthusiasm, in Acts 11:19–28, the development of Christianity in his city. The lack of mention in the Acts of the Apostles of Peter's stay in Syrian Antioch (Antioch on the Orontes) certainly cannot serve as an argument for the fact that this event never took place. After all, it is known that St. Luke omitted many details also from the life of St. Paul, about which we learn e.g. from 1 Cor 15:6–7; 2 Cor 11:24–28; Gal 1:17–24; 2:9–10. In Acts 13:1 there is no Peter on the list of prophets and teachers active there either because he had not yet reached this place or that he came to the capital of Syria only for a short time. He did not intend to enlarge the numerous groups of evangelizers, but he treated it as a stop on the way to the Jews from the diaspora, to take up the momentarily interrupted evangelization work after a short rest there.<sup>42</sup>

It was a natural thing that after coming to this community Peter joined its religious life, closely connected with participation in the Eucharist, which was combined with a common meal of people gathered for prayer (such a Lord's Supper with a common agape is described in 1 Cor 11:17–34). Although he was considered an Apostle of the Circumcised, based on his own experience, which he brought about from his meeting with the centurion Cornelius (cf. Acts 10:28–35) and which greatly influenced the final decision of the Apostles and Elders gathered for the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:7–11), he was open to the Gentiles and ate with them, thus exposing himself to the consumption of food considered unclean by the Mosaic Law. A change in his conduct took place after the appearance in Antioch of people who shared the views of James, the Lord's brother, who believed that Judaic Christians should

---

<sup>41</sup> This problem is noticed, among others, by B. Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 288, note 103.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. S. Cipriani, *Św. Piotr Apostoł*, Kraków 2008, p. 156.

remain completely faithful to the Mosaic Law.<sup>43</sup> Perhaps they were scandalized with Peter's violation of these laws, which is why the Apostle began to increasingly avoid Gentile Christians, while at the same time acting against his beliefs.

The text of Gal 2:11–14 shows how great authority Peter already had not only in Judea, but also beyond its borders. Since other Christians of Jewish origin, including Barnabas himself, also adopted his conduct, this means that they looked at his behaviour and treated it as a symbol, a model and an example to follow, or as a point of reference in solving problems arising in the Church.<sup>44</sup> It is therefore understandable that Paul decided to publicly rebuke the great apostle to return to the truth of the Gospel (v. 14). His fraternal admonition was not, however, a result of an intention to weaken Peter's authority, but of the concern for the rights and dignity of Christians of Gentile origin. Focusing on the fact that Gentiles should not be forced to adopt Jewish customs, Paul omits Peter's reaction in his Letter to the Galatians. If, however, this Antiochene incident could have served him as an argument for the validity of his position, then one can guess that it was positive and, as a result, edifying for the whole community of believers.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Cf. C.P. Thiede, *Simon Pietro*, p. 245. The situation which led to Peter's conflict with Paul in Antioch is presented more extensively in many studies directly devoted to this issue. See: J.D.G. Dunn, *The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2: 11–18)*, Journal for the Study of New Testament 18/1983, p. 3–57; P.C. Böttger, *Paulus und Petrus in Antiochien: Zum Verständnis von Galater 2.11–21*, New Testament Studies 37/1991, p. 78–81; Ch. Böttrich, *Petrus und Paulus in Antiochien (Gal 2,11–21)*, Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift 19/2002, p. 231–236; J.J. Gibson, *Peter Between Jerusalem & Antioch: Peter, James & the Gentiles* (WUNT 2/345), Tübingen 2013.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. H. Ordon, *Autorytet św. Piotra w świetle tzw. konfliktu antiocheńskiego (Ga 2, 11–14)*, in: *Opoka Kościoła Chrystusowego. Bibliści KUL w 25 rocznicę pontyfikatu Jana Pawła II*, eds. S. Szymik, H. Ordon, Lublin 2004, 138–141; P. Melczewski, *Niewłaściwe postępowanie Piotra w Antiochii (Ga 2, 14)*, RBL 58/2005, p. 276.

<sup>45</sup> A similar conclusion is also reached in the study of D. Matak, *Another Look at the Antioch Incident (Gal 2:11–14)*, Kairos: Evangelical Journal of Theology 6/2012, p. 57.

### 3. The Apostolic Activity of St. Peter in Asia Minor

In 1 Pet 1:1 “Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ,” declares that he writes “to the chosen, the exiles of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.” Referring to this text, Eusebius of Caesarea writes after mentioning Paul’s missionary work from Jerusalem to Ilyria: “It is also evident from Peter’s words in which provinces he preached the Gospel of Christ to those who came from circumcision, teaching them the doctrine of the New Testament, and this can be seen above all from the Letter, which, as I said, is widely accepted as authentic. In it he writes to the faithful of Jewish origin, living in the diaspora of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia.”<sup>46</sup>

While some contemporary exegetes question the authenticity of the First Epistle of St. Peter and others consider that the Apostle’s closest associates (the so-called “Peter’s group”)<sup>47</sup> are responsible for its creation, many still maintain that there are not enough arguments to question the authorship of Peter’s letter.<sup>48</sup> However, no matter if we accept Peter’s own dictation of the letter or the participation of his disciples in its the final drafting, the question arises as to why its addressees are Christians from those very provinces of Asia Minor and not from Jerusalem or Antioch, where the Apostle was well known and had great authority. Paul addressed his letters to his closest associates (Timothy, Titus and Philemon), to the communities he himself founded (the Philippians, Thessalonians, Corinthians, Ephesians and Galatians), or to the churches that were founded on the initiative of his closest associates and in which his apostolic authority was recognised (Colossae).

---

<sup>46</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3, 4, 2 (similar information is also in 3, 1, 2).

<sup>47</sup> For example, J.H. Elliott, *1 Peter. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 37B), New York 2000, p. 127–130; D.G. Horrell, *The Product of Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1. Peter*, *Journal for the Study of New Testament* 86/2002, p. 45–47.

<sup>48</sup> See: S. McKnight, *1 Peter* (The NIV Application Commentary), Grand Rapids 1996, p. 28; Th.R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude* (The New American Commentary 37), Nashville 2003, p. 35–36; K.H. Jobes, *1 Peter* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 2005, p. 19; D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, Grand Rapids 2012, p. 5.

In this regard, not even the Letter to the Romans is an exception, since among these addressees were many of his collaborators or acquaintances (see Rom 16:3–15), to whom he intended to go soon, treating Rome as a stopover on his way to Spain (15:24). By analogy, can we say that Peter also wrote his letter to those who knew him and treated him as his apostle?

All the provinces listed in 1 Pet 1:1 are located in northern Asia Minor. In Acts 2:9, Luke writes that the feast of Pentecost was attended by Jews from Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, among others. This information, as well as extra-biblical and archaeological data, indicate that there was a developed Jewish diaspora in this area, which attracted to the synagogue the Gentile community of God-fearing people and proselytes and became the cradle of the first Christian communities.<sup>49</sup> From Acts 14:1; 17:1–2.10.17; 18:4.19; 19:8 we learn that St. Paul went first and foremost to those cities where there was a large Jewish diaspora, and where synagogues became a privileged place to preach the Gospel. However, when on his second missionary journey he intended to go to Asia and then to Bithynia, the Holy Spirit forbade them to preach the Gospel in these lands (Acts 16:6–7). Nor did he ever reach Pontus and Cappadocia, and in Acts 16:6 we read that he and his companions, urged by the Holy Spirit, rushed through the “land of Galatia.” It is only from Gal 4:13 that we learn that he stopped for a short time among the Galatians because of his illness and used this time to preach the Gospel to them, but following the route of his journey one can suppose that he only wandered through the southern part of Galatia. Finally, during his third missionary journey, he lived for three years in Ephesus, the capital of the Roman province called Asia, but we know nothing about whether he ever left it to preach the Gospel in the surrounding cities as well.

As can be seen, St. Paul, in his missionary journeys at the command of the Holy Spirit, completely or almost completely omitted the lands mentioned in 1 Peter 1:1. Moreover, when writing his Letter to the Romans at the end of his third missionary journey,

---

<sup>49</sup> Cf. J.H. Elliott, *1 Peter*, p. 84–93; M.W. Wilson, *Cities of God in Northern Asia Minor: Using Stark’s Social Theories to Reconstruct Peter’s Communities*, *Verbum et Ecclesia* 32/2011, p. 7–8.

he confessed: “Thus I make it my ambition to preach the gospel, not where Christ has already been named, lest I build on someone else’s foundation” (Rom 15:20). In the context of these words, can the hypothesis be put forward that St. Paul did not go to Bithynia and other lands in the northern and eastern parts of Asia Minor because there were already Christian communities there, founded by St. Peter or by another apostle? This question is posed by some scholars, although on the basis of biblical data alone they are unable to give a clear answer to it.<sup>50</sup> It seems, however, that the relationship between Acts 16:6–7 together with Rom 15:20 and 1 Pet 1:1 can be observed and this question can be answered in the positive. Since the Holy Spirit is the Wisdom of God, he must have had some important reason to ban the preaching of the Gospel in Asia, Bithynia and other northern territories of Asia Minor. This legitimate reason could have been precisely the activities of Peter and his disciples in those lands.<sup>51</sup>

If neither Peter nor his pupils had ever appeared in these lands, it would be difficult to justify the importance of his name which can be observed in his first epistle. Even more puzzling is his indisputable significance in the Letter to Galatians. Here as many as five times St. Paul refers to the person of Peter to justify his own apostolic authority or the truthfulness of the Gospel he proclaims (Gal 1:18; 2:7.8.9.14). Also when he writes in 2:11 that he opposed Peter in Antioch, he adds, “because he stood condemned,” thus justifying himself before the Galatians, why he dared to admonish such a person as Peter. When Paul wrote this letter, there were still no Gospels showing Peter’s role in the Twelve, no Acts of the Apostles describing Peter’s lively activity in the community of Jerusalem, nor any official letter testifying to his high rank in the whole Church of Christ. For the Galatians, therefore, he could only become a point of reference because he came to them, preached the Gospel among them and became known as an authority. Of course,

---

<sup>50</sup> See: M.-L. Lamau, *Des chrétiens dans le monde. Communautés pétriniennes au I<sup>er</sup> siècle* (Lectio Divina 134), Paris 1988, p. 40.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. E.G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays*, London 1981<sup>2</sup>, p. 131; Ch. Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, Edinburgh 1987, p. 73.



when preaching the Gospel of Christ to the Galatians on his second missionary journey, Paul also had to mention the Apostle Peter, but such “theoretical” knowledge of his person could hardly have made the Galatians treat him as one of the pillars of the Church too (cf. Gal 2:9).

It is then possible that, while St. Paul preached the Gospel in southern and western Asia Minor, Peter was wandering through its northern areas and founding Christian communities there,<sup>52</sup> but because of the great distances they could not contact each other. In this regard, Eusebius of Caesarea, whose testimony is also taken up by St. Jerome,<sup>53</sup> may be right that Peter himself, in the introduction to his letter, reveals in which provinces he preached the Gospel to the Jews before he reached Rome.<sup>54</sup> N. Brox is obviously right that the circle of addressees outlined in 1 Pet 1:1 is of almost Utopian proportions.<sup>55</sup> However, it must be remembered that this letter has clearly the character of a general (circular) letter, which perhaps was delivered to Christians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia by Sylvan mentioned in 1 Pet 5:12. Even the order of the lands mentioned here corresponds to the path a courier had to take from one city to another to deliver the letter to the individual communities<sup>56</sup> that knew Peter and for which Peter felt spiritually responsible. It does not appear from the names of these five lands that Peter’s activities covered the entire population of North Asia

---

<sup>52</sup> Such a possibility, or at least one of several possibilities, is accepted by e.g. R.E. Brown, J.P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*, New York 1983, p. 131; P.H. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 1990, p. 8; Th. Klein, *Bewährung in Anfechtung: der Jakobusbrief und der Erste Petrusbrief als christliche Diaspora-Briefe*, Tübingen 2011, p. 235; H.A. Kent, D.R. Dilling, *The First Epistle of Peter. A Translation and Exegetical Study*, Lafayette 2014, p. 37, note 2.

<sup>53</sup> St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 1.

<sup>54</sup> Mr. Ketter doubts the truth of this information, *Hebräerbrief, Jakobusbrief, Petrusbriefe, Judasbrief* (Herders Bibelkommentar. Die Heilige Schrift für das Leben erklärt 16/1), Freiburg 1950, p. 203, but does not give any arguments to support its position.

<sup>55</sup> N. Brox, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, Leipzig 1987<sup>2</sup>, p. 56.

<sup>56</sup> This fact is highlighted by many scholars. See more on this topic: D.E. Hiebert, *Designation of the Readers in 1 Peter 1:1–2*, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 137/1980, p. 64–75; J.H. Elliott, *1 Peter*, p. 91–93; Th.R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, p. 37.

Minor. It can be assumed that he preached the Gospel only in some of the cities he managed to reach, and Christianity (as was the case in St. Paul's evangelising mission) was spreading rapidly, as it were, by its own power, thanks to the work of the eager Christians he converted, who, as his disciples and invoking his authority, continued to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Saviour.<sup>57</sup> However, on the basis of the scarce traces and circumstantial evidence that we know of, it is impossible to establish how long or exactly when Peter was present in that territory.

#### 4. The Visit of St. Peter in Corinth

Eusebius of Caesarea in his *Church History* quotes Dionysus, the Bishop of Corinth, who in his *Letter to the Romans* writes that Peter and Paul planted a graft of the Church of Christ in Corinth and proclaimed the doctrine to its inhabitants.<sup>58</sup> This planting of the graft is, of course, a metaphor for founding the Church. Such a formulation, however, raises a problem, because in Acts 18:1–11 and 1 Cor 3:6.10; 4:15 we learn that St. Paul was the founder of the Christian community in Corinth, while the activities of St. Peter in that city are completely out of the question. Would this mean that this very early testimony of Dionysius of Corinth dating back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, was completely untrue?

It is noteworthy in this context that in the First Letter to the Corinthians, the name of Peter, in its original Aramaic wording (that is, Cephas), appears four times. For the first time, and in our context, St. Paul writes about Peter in the most meaningful way, when he sharply rebukes the divisions which, after his departure from Corinth, appeared in the community there, expressed by its members using the words: "I belong to Paul and I belong to Apollos; I belong to Cephas and I belong Christ" (1 Cor 1:12, RSV). Some exegetes believe that there is a genetic relationship in these statements that expresses relationships between spouses ("I am the

---

<sup>57</sup> Cf. K.H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 13/2), Freiburg–Basel–Wien 1965, p. 2.

<sup>58</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 25, 8.

wife of someone”) or between children and their parents.<sup>59</sup> Others believe that it indicates a person’s membership of a particular political party or group focused around a leader enjoying high authority in Corinth<sup>60</sup> (“I am for Paul and I am for Apollos” or “I follow Paul and I follow Apollos”<sup>61</sup>). Still others say that there is a *genetivus possessionis* (Genitive of Possession) that can be translated: “I belong to . . .”<sup>62</sup>

All these translations may indicate the specific attitude of each group being in favour of one of the apostles, but they are not the subject of the analyse in this article. However, it should be noted here that the persons indicated by the Corinthians were not responsible for the divisions existing in their community.<sup>63</sup> Nor were they caused by the difference of views of Paul, Apollos and Cephas (since Paul himself in 1 Corinthians 3:1–4:2 explains that all the apostles are faithful servants of Christ), but probably a different way of teaching and conveying the same truths. St. Paul himself wrote that his preaching to the Corinthians had “nothing of the plausible words of wisdom,” but was “the demonstration of the Spirit and power” (1 Cor 2:4). It is known about Apollos in Acts 18:24–28 that, as “an eloquent man, competent in the Scriptures,” he proved on their basis “that Jesus is the Messiah.” He therefore acted as an apologist defending the faith and Christian teaching.<sup>64</sup> St. Peter, on the other hand, represented the Palestinian roots of the original

---

<sup>59</sup> Cf. M.M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, Louisville 1992, p. 85.

<sup>60</sup> L.L. Welborn, *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles*, Macon 1997, p. 7–16.

<sup>61</sup> The latter translation of 1 Cor 1:12 (*I follow Paul*) is present, among other places, in New International Version.

<sup>62</sup> Such translation can be found, for example in The New Jerusalem Bible and in the New Revised Standard Version.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. N.A. Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, Minneapolis 1977, p. 40–61.

<sup>64</sup> The scholars’ discussion on the nature of the Apollos Group is presented by A.C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Grand Rapids 2000, p. 123–125.

Church and the group of its pillars (cf. Gal 2:9), so perhaps Jews converted to Christianity identified with him.<sup>65</sup>

Since neither in the Acts, nor in both of the Letters to the Corinthians is there any direct mention of St. Peter's stay in that community, exegetes explain 1 Cor 1:12 in several different ways. Some of them even state that St. Paul probably exaggerates the scandalizing divisions in Corinth in this text and personalises them to show their absurdity.<sup>66</sup> Some of them suggest that the name Cephas (Peter) is a sign "for this group of Corinthian Christians who privileged the Judean tradition (as opposed to the pagan Christian tradition)."<sup>67</sup> Yet other scholars merely state in their comments that it is not possible to prove that St. Peter was in the city and they do not deal with this issue any further.<sup>68</sup> However, there are many exegetes who take up this problem and give many convincing arguments for the possibility of his stay in Corinth.<sup>69</sup>

Several references to the person of Peter in the 1<sup>st</sup> Letter to the Corinthians may prove that Corinthians knew him and recognized his authority.<sup>70</sup> First, it should be stated that in 1 Cor 1:10–16 St. Paul mentions by name only those persons who were personally known to the recipients of the letter: Chloe, Apollos, Crispus, Gaius and Stephanas. The parties of Paul and Apollos were in favour of the apostles who were actually in Corinth and were active there. A combination of these parties with those who spoke: "I belong to

<sup>65</sup> Cf. G.T. Montague, *First Corinthians* (Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture), Grand Rapids 2011, p. 38; F. Manzi, *Prima Lettera ai Corinzi. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Cinisello Balsamo 2013, p. 48.

<sup>66</sup> W.F. Orr, J.A. Walther, *I Corinthians. A New Translation, Introduction with a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 32), New York 1976, p. 148.

<sup>67</sup> M. Rosik, *Pierwszy List do Koryntian. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (NKB.NT 7), Częstochowa 2009, p. 120.

<sup>68</sup> See: A. Robertson, A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, Edinburgh 1999, p. 12; D.E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, Grand Rapids 2003, p. 45; R.B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching), Louisville 2011, p. 22.

<sup>69</sup> These arguments are briefly presented by W.M. Ramsay (among others), *Historical Commentary on First Corinthians*, Grand Rapids 1996, p. 151–155; A.C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 128–129.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. G.T. Montague, *First Corinthians*, p. 38.

Cephas,” and placing this name in the context of the permanent residents of Corinth makes us think that Cephas (Peter) was also known to the Corinthians due to his direct contact with them.<sup>71</sup> This conclusion is confirmed by 1 Cor 3:21–22, where Paul writes: “So let no one boast in men. For all things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas.” By reproving the divisions that exist between those who said they belonged to Paul, Apollos or Cephas, Paul reverses the order of things and declares that in reality these apostles belong to the followers of Christ, that is, they are servants and helpers of God in building and strengthening the Church of Christ (see 1 Cor 3:5–9; 4:1). This way of writing also implies personal ties between Peter and the Corinthians.

In 1 Cor 9:5 Paul shows as an apostolic model the methods of the other apostles and brothers of the Lord, distinguishing Cephas from among this group of authorities of Jerusalem Judaic Christianity, mentioning only his name. St. Paul, who was celibate, points out that these apostles are taking sister-women with them. The *adelfē-gynē* term used here by Paul is not entirely clear. Many believe that this simply means a wife, because in both Jewish and Greek circles it was not customary for a man’s material affairs to be taken care of by a woman who was not his wife.<sup>72</sup> However, it is not so much the understanding of this term that is important in St. Paul’s argument as is the fact that Christian communities have given hospitality not only to the apostles but also to their companions (cf. 1 Cor 9:4). His way of writing presupposes that the Corinthians knew from their own experience Peter’s lifestyle and missionary methods. They could see for themselves that they were a little different from the Paul’s ones, and since in the eyes of the Corinthians Peter was considered a great authority, Paul declares that he too would have the right to act as Peter did and to demand support for himself,

---

<sup>71</sup> Cf. W.M. Ramsay, *Historical Commentary*, p. 152; J.A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Yale Bible 32), New haven–London 2008, p. 144. Some scholars believe that Peter baptised several people in Corinth. See, for example: W.A. Beardslee, *First Corinthians: A Commentary for Today*, St. Louis 1994, p. 24.

<sup>72</sup> As for this, see: M. Rosik, *Pierwszy List do Koryntian*, p. 297.

but despite this he does not do so.<sup>73</sup> Also because of this authority, at the end of his letter, in an argument about the truthfulness of the resurrection of the dead, he reminds his addressees of the truth that Cephas is one of the privileged witnesses of the risen Christ (1 Cor 15:5).

All these arguments indicate that, before the First Letter to the Corinthians was written, St. Peter had paid a visit to Christians in the capital of Achaia at the time when Paul was in Ephesus for three years.<sup>74</sup> It is very likely that Peter stopped over in Corinth, travelling from Asia Minor to Rome. In that case, the most convenient journey was from the port of Ephesus, because at that time ships were often sailing between Ephesus and Corinth.<sup>75</sup> But also when it sailed from Syria, it was important that Corinth was halfway between Palestine and Rome and for many people was a good place to rest.<sup>76</sup> It is certain that he was not the founder of the Corinthian community, but it is impossible to say anything concrete about the nature of his visit to that community and the formation of the grouping that invoked his name there.

---

<sup>73</sup> Cf. G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 1987, p. 57; W.M. Ramsay, *Historical Commentary*, p. 151.

<sup>74</sup> Many authors allow this possibility: M. Goguel, *L'Apôtre Pierre a-t-il joué un rôle personnel dans les crises de Grèce et de Galatie?* Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 14/1934, p. 469–470; C.K. Barrett, *Cephas and Corinth*, in: *Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel: Festschrift für Otto Michel*, ed. O. Betz, Leiden 1963, p. 1–12; P. Vielhauer, *Paulus und die Kephaspartei in Korinth*, New Testament Studies 21/1975, p. 344; J. Kremer, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther übersetzt und erklärt*, Regensburg 1997, p. 32; A. Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9/1) Tübingen 2000, p. 39–40; J.A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, p. 144; M. Hengel, *Saint Peter: The Underestimated Apostle*, Grand Rapids 2010, p. 67.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. W.M. Ramsay, *Historical Commentary*, p. 152–153.

<sup>76</sup> S. Dockx (*Essai de chronologie pétrinienne*) believes that Peter paid a visit to Corinth, sailing to Rome, as early as 42–43, which, as already indicated in that article, is unlikely to have happened.

## Conclusion

Historians and Catholic theologians agree that at the end of his life, St. Peter spent several years in Rome and died a martyr's death during the reign of Nero, but in the light of the analyses contained in this article, it can be concluded that the itinerary he took before he got there from Jerusalem was a long one. Although biblical data on the subject is scarce, it can be assumed that after leaving Judea in 42 AD under the reign of Herod Agrippa I, he became an itinerant apostle and carried out missionary work in the various Jewish diasporas of the then Roman Empire. Four short texts in the New Testament indicate this. Gal 2:11–14 is an unequivocal testimony to the fact that after the Jerusalem Council St. Peter went to Syrian Antioch, where he evangelised both Jews and Gentiles for some time. 1 Pet 1:1 may be a reminiscence of his activities in the northern regions of Asia Minor. And 1 Cor 1:12; 9:5 suggests that he paid a visit to Christians in Corinth during his journey to Rome. These texts should obviously be seen not so much as a proof, but as circumstantial evidence leading to the general conclusion that St. Peter, too, fulfilled in his own way the missionary injunction of Jesus, that His apostles should go out into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature (cf. Mk 16:15). This, in turn, would mean that Peter's authority was not only based on being handed over the power of the keys (cf. Matt 16:19) and his stay in Rome, but was also born out of zealous apostolic work which made it possible for Christians from the many important local Churches of the time in Palestine, Asia Minor and Greece to meet, know and appreciate him personally.

## Bibliography

### 1. Commentaries

- Barrett C.K., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, vol. I, Edinburgh 1998.
- Bauernfeind O., *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 22), Tübingen 1980.

- Beardslee W.A., *First Corinthians: A Commentary for Today*, St. Louis 1994.
- Becker J., *Der Brief an die Galater*, in: *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 8/1), Göttingen 1998.
- Betz H.D., *Galatians*, Philadelphia 1979.
- Bigg Ch., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, Edinburgh 1987.
- Boer M.C. de, *Galatians. A Commentary*, Louisville 2011.
- Borse U., *Der Brief an die Galater* (Regensburger Neuen Testament 9), Regensburg 1984.
- Bray G., *Romans* (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. New Testament 6), Chicago–London 1998.
- Brox N., *Der erste Petrusbrief*, Leipzig 1987<sup>2</sup>.
- Bruce F.F., *The Book of the Acts*, Grand Rapids 1988.
- Bruce F.F., *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Exeter 1982.
- Davids P.H., *The First Epistle of Peter* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 1990.
- Dunn J.D.G., *The Acts of the Apostles*, Grand Rapids 1996.
- Elliott J.H., *1 Peter. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 37B), New York 2000.
- Fee G.D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 1987.
- Fitzmyer J.A., *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 31), London 2010.
- Fitzmyer J.A., *First Corinthians. a New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Yale Bible 32), New Haven–London 2008.
- Garland D.E., *1 Corinthians*, Grand Rapids 2003.
- Hays R.B., *First Corinthians* (A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching), Louisville 2011.
- Holladay C.R., *Acts: A Commentary*, Louisville 2016.
- Jacquier E., *Les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1926.
- Jervell J., *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 3), Göttingen 1998.
- Jobes K.H., *1 Peter* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 2005.
- Keener C.S., *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 2: 3:1–14:28, Grand Rapids 2013.
- Kent H.A., Dilling D.R., *The First Epistle of Peter. A Translation and Exegetical Study*, Lafayette 2014.



- Ketter P., *Hebräerbrief, Jakobusbrief, Petrusbriefe, Judasbrief* (Herders Bibelkommentar. Die Heilige Schrift für das Leben erklärt 16/1), Freiburg 1950.
- Klein Th., *Bewährung in Anfechtung: der Jakobusbrief und der Erste Petrusbrief als christliche Diaspora-Briefe*, Tübingen 2011.
- Kremer J., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther übersetzt und erklärt*, Regensburg 1997.
- Lamau M.-L., *Des chrétiens dans le monde. Communautés pétriniennes au I<sup>er</sup> siècle* (Lectio Divina 134), Paris 1988.
- Lindemann A., *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9/1), Tübingen 2000.
- Longenecker R.N., *The Acts of the Apostles*, Grand Rapids 1981.
- Manzi F., *Prima Lettera ai Corinzi. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Cinisello Balsamo 2013.
- Matera F.J., *Galatians* (Sacra Pagina Series 9), Collegeville 2007.
- McKnight S., *1 Peter* (The NIV Application Commentary), Grand Rapids 1996.
- Montague G.T., *First Corinthians* (Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture), Grand Rapids 2011.
- Moo D.J., *Galatians* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 2013.
- Mußner F., *Der Galaterbrief* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 9), Leipzig 1974.
- Orr W.F., Walther J.A., *1 Corinthians. A New Translation, Introduction with a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 32), New York 1976.
- Packer J.W., *The Acts of the Apostles*, New York 2010.
- Pitta A., *Lettera ai Galati. Introduzione, versione e commento*, Bologna 2009<sup>2</sup>.
- Ramsay W.M., *Historical Commentary on First Corinthians*, Grand Rapids 1996.
- Renié J., *Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1949.
- Robertson A., Plummer A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, Edinburgh 1999.
- Rohde J., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 9), Berlin 1989.
- Rosik M., *Pierwszy List do Koryntian. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (NKB.NT 7), Częstochowa 2009.
- Rossé G., *Atti degli Apostoli. Commento esegetico e teologico*, Roma 1998.
- Schelkle K.H., *Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 13/2), Freiburg–Basel–Wien 1965.

- Schlatter A., *Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit*, Gütersloh 1926.
- Schlier H., *Der Brief an die Galater* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament), Göttingen 1962.
- Schreiner Th.R., *1, 2 Peter, Jude* (The New American Commentary 37), Nashville 2003.
- Selwyn E.G., *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays*, London 1981<sup>2</sup>.
- Stählin G., *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 5), Göttingen 1966<sup>11</sup>.
- Thiselton A.C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Grand Rapids 2000.
- Vanhoye A., *Lettera ai Galati. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento*, Milano 2000.
- Watson D.F., Callan T., *First and Second Peter*, Grand Rapids 2012.
- Weiser A., *Die Apostelgeschichte. Kapitel 1–12* (Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament 5/1), Gütersloh-Würzburg 1981.
- Witherington B. III, *The Acts of the Apostles. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, Grand Rapids 1998.
- Witherington B., *Grace in Galatia. A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians*, Grand Rapids 1998.
- Zahn Th., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 9), Leipzig 1922<sup>3</sup>.

## 2. Monographs and studies

- Barrett C.K., *Cephas and Corinth*, in: *Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel: Festschrift für Otto Michel*, ed. O. Betz, Leiden 1963, 1–12.
- Betori G., *Lo Spirito e l'annuncio della Parola negli Atti degli Apostoli*, *Rivista Biblica Italiana* 35/1987, 399–441.
- Böttger P.C., *Paulus und Petrus in Antiochien: Zum Verständnis von Galater 2.11–21*, *New Testament Studies* 37/1991, 77–100.
- Böttrich Ch., *Petrus und Paulus in Antiochien (Gal 2,11–21)*, *Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift* 19/2002, 224–239.
- Brown R.E., Meier J.P., *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*, New York 1983.
- Cipriani S., *Św. Piotr Apostoł*, Kraków 2008.
- Dahl N.A., *Studies in Paul*, Minneapolis 1977.
- Dockx S., *Essai de chronologie pétrinienne*, *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 62/1974, 221–241.

- Dunn J.D.G., *'The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2: 11–18)'*, Journal for the Study of New Testament 18/1983, 3–57.
- Eckert J., *Die urchristliche Verkündigung im Streit zwischen Paulus und seinen Gegnern nach dem Galaterbrief*, Regensburg 1971.
- Féret H.-M., *Pierre et Paul a Antioche et a Jérusalem. Le «conflit» des deux Apôtres*, Paris 1955.
- Finegan J., *The Archeology of the New Testament. The Mediterranean World of the Early Christian Apostles*, London 1981.
- Gibson J.J., *Peter Between Jerusalem & Antioch: Peter, James & the Gentiles* (WUNT 2/345), Tübingen 2013.
- Goguel M., *L'Apôtre Pierre a-t-il joué un rôle personnel dans les crises de Grèce et de Galatie?* Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 14/1934, 461–500.
- Goulder M.D., *Did Peter ever go to Rome?*, Scottish Journal of Theology, 57/2004, 377–396.
- Hengel M., *Saint Peter: The Underestimated Apostle*, Grand Rapids 2010.
- Hiebert D.E., *Designation of the Readers in 1 Peter 1:1–2*, Bibliotheca Sacra 137/1980, 64–75.
- Holtz T., *Der antiochenische Zwischenfall (Galater 2.11–14)*, New Testament Studies 32/1986, 344–361.
- Horrell D.G., *The Product of Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1. Peter*, Journal for the Study of New Testament 86/2002, 29–60.
- Lüdemann G., *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles. Studies in Chronology*, London 1984.
- Matak D., *Another Look at the Antioch Incident (Gal 2:11–14)*, Kairos: Evangelical Journal of Theology 6/2012, 49–59.
- Méhat A., *«Quand Képhas vint à Antioche...» Que s'est-il passé entre Pierre et Paul?*, Lumière & Vie 192/1989, 29–43.
- Melczewski P., *Niewłaściwe postępowanie Piotra w Antiochii (Ga 2,14)*, RBL 58/2005, 263–277.
- Menoud Ph.H., *Le plan des Actes des Apôtres*, New Testament Studies 1/1954–55, 44–51.
- Mitchell M.M., *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, Louisville 1992.
- Nesbitt C.F., *What Did Become of Peter?*, Journal of Bible and Religion 27/1959, 10–16.
- Ordon H., *Autorytet św. Piotra w świetle tzw. konfliktu antiocheńskiego (Ga 2, 11–14)*, in: *Opoka Kościoła Chrystusowego. Bibliści KUL w 25 rocznicę pontyfikatu Jana Pawła II*, eds. S. Szymik, H. Ordon, Lublin 2004, 129–141.

- Prete B., Scaglioni A., *I miracoli degli Apostoli nella Chiesa delle origini*, Torino 1989.
- Rafiński G., *Problem przeciwników św. Pawła w 1 Kor*, *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 23 (1985) no. 2, 151–168.
- Rakocy W., *Lata pobytu Apostoła Piotra w Rzymie (rys historyczny)*, in: *Opoka Kościoła Chrystusowego. Bibliści KUL w 25 rocznicę pontyfikatu Jana Pawła II*, eds. S. Szymik, H. Ordon, Lublin 2004, 143–159.
- Robinson D.F., *Where and When Did Peter Die?*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 64/1945, 255–267;
- Romaniuk K., *Św. Piotr. Życie i dzieło*, Katowice 1995.
- Smaltz M., *Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71/1952, 211–216.
- Snape H.C., *Peter and Paul in Rome*, *Modern Churchman* 14/1971, 127–138.
- Sobrino O., *Was Peter the first bishop of Rome?*, *New Blackfriars*, 84/2003, 415–421.
- Taylor N., *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationship and Authority in Earliest Christianity* (*Journal for the Study of NT. Supplement Series* 66), Sheffield 1989.
- Thiede C.P., *Babylon, der andere Ort: Anmerkungen zu 1 Petr 5,13 und Apg 12,17*, *Biblica* 67/1986, 532–538.
- Thiede C.P., *Simon Pietro dalla Galilea a Roma*, Milano 1999.
- Vielhauer P., *Paulus und die Kephaspartei in Korinth*, *New Testament Studies* 21/1975, 341–352.
- Wall R.W., *Successors to 'the Twelve' According to Acts 12:1–17*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53/1991, 628–643.
- Welborn L.L., *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles*, Macon 1997.
- Wenham J.W., *Did Peter Go to Rome in AD 42?*, *Tyndale Bulletin* 23/1972, 94–102.
- Wilson M.W., *Cities of God in Northern Asia Minor: Using Stark's Social Theories to Reconstruct Peter's Communities*, *Verbum et Ecclesia* 32/2011, 1–9.