

‘THEY WERE FISHERMEN’: PETER AND ANDREW’S TRADE
IN THE MEMORY AND DISCOURSE OF THE FIRST CHURCHES

Mariano Agustin Splendido

Instituto de Investigación en Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales (CONICET)

Universidad Nacional de La Plata, La Plata, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Put away your sword
Don’t you know that it’s all over
It was nice but now it’s gone
Why are you obsessed with fighting?
Stick to fishing from now on¹

1. *Introduction**

The social and economic situation of Peter and Andrew before their encounter with Jesus has not left many traces in the ancient Christian literature. However, it raised various speculations and fabrications that often mixed up the historical facts with apologetic interests and theological symbolisms. The first Christian writers barely retained the information that both brothers had been working as fishermen at the time of their calling, but the conditions of their trade, their family realities and the implications of their change of life are depicted in different ways in the texts of the ancient churches.

There is a double aim in this work: on the one hand, I propose to carry out a socio-historical approach to the living conditions of fishermen in Roman

* I thank the bibliographic suggestions and critical readings made by admired colleagues such as Esteban Noce, Pablo Sarachu, Lucía Arisnavarreta, Pablo Vernola and also by my seminar students, Sofía Doktor and Mateo Bernardez. I am also indebted to the translation work of Guillermina Remiro.

1. Tim Rice and Andrew Lloyd Webber, *Jesus Christ Superstar* (1970).

Palestine in order to understand the possible relational and labour bonds in which Peter and Andrew were embedded. On the other hand, based on the previous analysis, I will observe the narrative construction that the first Christian literature created about the brothers of Bethsaida before their apostolic life. For the first objective, I will resort to written sources as well as to archaeological studies conducted in the fisher localities of Galilee and Gaulanitis. For the second one, not only will I analyze the vocabulary with which the brothers' activity is presented, but I will also consider every reference about their material condition, bearing in mind the discourse evolution about the authority of the churches and the Gentile critics of the socio-economic background of Jesus' first followers. The progressive urban insertion of Christianity and the fact that many groups of believers sought an acknowledgement from the authorities would have been a good reason to bring some order to the narrative of Peter and Andrew's lives, who, though being rough fishermen and with minimum training, became, by divine grace, eminent messengers of the kingdom.

2. *The ἀλιεῖς of Galilee*

Fishing was included among the hunting activities for the Greco-Roman societies, raising various opinions about its dignity and convenience as part of the ideal παιδεία.² Even so, the fishing industry was a big and highly productive

2. There are general analyses of fish and fishing in ancient times. See, for example, W. Radcliffe, *Fishing from the Earliest Times* (London: Murray, 1921), pp. 414-47; M.I. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941) pp. 1177-80; F.S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and Land in Bible Lands* (Leiden: Brill, 1960), pp. 68-72, 87-92); and Pasini Donati, *Pesca e Pescatori nell'antichità* (Milan: Leonardo Arte, 1997). Plato (*Soph.* 219-222) qualifies the rod fisherman as an expert (τεχνίτης) whose art entailed force; however, in *Leg.* 7.823B-824A, he scorns rod fishing and bird hunting as activities, saying they do not make up people's character. Claudius Aelianus (*Anim.* 12.43) and Oppian (*Halieutica* 3.41, 44) disagree, since they consider that the fisherman trade demands not only to learn a method and to have certain tools but also to have physical resistance, cunning, attention and temperance. See W.H. Wuellner, *The Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 11-16; T. Bekker-Nielsen, 'Fish in the Ancient Economy', in K. Ascani *et al.* (eds.), *Ancient History Matters:*

business since the Roman expansion, thanks to certain adjustments: care in activity planning and execution,³ centralization of fish extraction and processing in certain localities⁴ and emergence of big investors in fishing companies, salting houses and commercialization.⁵

Studies Presented to Jens Erik Skydsgaard on his Seventieth Birthday (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2002), pp. 29-37.

3. As a result of this, the halieutics literature would have emerged. T.H. Corcoran, 'Fish Treatises in the Early Empire', *TCJ* 59 (1964), pp. 271-74.

4. There are some cases studied in depth in the Roman world (e.g. North Africa): L. Slim *et al.*, 'An Example of Fish Salteries in Africa Proconsularis: The Officinae of Neapolis (Nabeul, Tunisia)', in A. Arévalo González *et al.* (eds.), *CETARIAE 2005: Salsas y salazones de pescado en occidente durante la Antigüedad—Actas del congreso internacional (Cádiz, 7-9 noviembre de 2005)* (Oxford: John and Erica Hedges, 2007), pp. 21-44; J.A. Espósito Álvarez, 'La industria salazonera de época romana. El contexto del Sinus Gaditanus', in J.J. Díaz, A.M. Sáez, E. Vijande and J. Lagóstena (eds.), *Estudios recientes de arqueología gaditana. Áctas de las Jornadas de Jóvenes Investigadores Prehistoria y Arqueología (Cádiz, abril 2008)* (Oxford: Archeo Press, 2011), pp. 213-33; J.M. Højte, 'The Archaeological Evidence for Fish Processing in the Black Sea Region', in T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.), *Ancient Fishing and Fish Processing in the Black Sea Region* (Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 2005), pp. 133-60; A. Trakadas, "'Exhausted by Fishermen's Nets": Roman Sea Fisheries and their Management', *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 16 (2006), pp. 259-72; R. la Rocca and C. Bazzano, 'Impianti alicutici aicilini e atelier ceramici in età imperiale', in V. Caminnci, M.C. Parello and M.S. Rizzo (eds.), *La città che produce: Archeologia della produzione negli spazi urbani—Atti delle Giornate Gregoriane X Edizione (10-11 Dicembre 2016)* (Bari, Italy: Edipuglia, 2018), pp. 297-302.

5. The fishing activity requires heavy capital investment in boats and tools, or, if necessary, in fish processing. See R.I. Curtis, 'Sources for Production and Trade of Greek and Roman Processed Fish', in T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.), *Ancient Fishing and Fish Processing in the Black Sea Region* (Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 2005), pp. 31-46; G. Boetto, 'Roman Techniques for the Transport and Conservation of Fish: The Case of the Fiumicino 5 Wreck', in L. Blue, F. Hocker and A. Englert (eds.), *Connected by the Sea: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium on Boat and Ship Archeology Roskilde 2003* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2006), pp. 123-29; A. Wilson, 'Fishy Business: Roman Exploitation of Marine Resources', *JRA* 19 (2006), pp. 525-37; T. Bekker-Nielsen, 'Fishing in the Roman World', in T. Bekker-Nielsen and D. Bernal Casasola (eds.), *Ancient Nets and Fishing Gear: Proceedings of the International Workshop on 'Nets and Fishing Gear in Classical*

Even though in some areas there were fishing companies that worked for certain monarchs under the system of requisitions, Roman Galilee seems to have known only one aspect of the fishing activity: the fiscal one. The professional fishermen got the fishing rights from the tax collectors who received a part of what was extracted.⁶ In this way, a chain of dependency began, which turned these great expert fishermen into leaders of companies integrated by μέτοχοι ('fellow-partners'), and also by other wage-earner fishermen (μισθωτοί) who were hired in certain periods of the year.⁷ It is very likely, that, in order to increase their performance, many Galilean taxpayer fisher-

Antiquity: A First Approach (Cádiz, November 15–17, 2007) (Cádiz, Spain: Universidad de Cadiz Servicios de Publicaciones, 2010), pp. 187–203 (esp. 187–95). There are several inscriptions of booming fisherman associations in the Roman world: North of Italy (CIL V 7850); Pompeii (CIL IV 826); Rome (*Corpus Piscatorum et Unrinatorum Totius Alvei Tiberis* CIL VI 1089; 1872 = ILS 7266); Ostia (CIL XIV 409).

6. Several surviving documents from Roman Egypt have the rental agreements of fishing rights and the payment conditions which must have been quite similar to the ones in Palestine (e.g. P.Mich. 5.274–275; P.Oxy. 46.3267–3269; P.Turner 25; P.Tebt. 2.359). Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, p. 43; F.D. Troche, 'Fishing in the Lake of Galilee and the Socio-Economic Context of Jesus' Movement', in A. Destro and M. Pesce (eds.), *Texts, Practices and Groups: Multidisciplinary Approaches to the History of Jesus Followers in the First Two Centuries—First Annual Meeting of Bertinoro (2-5 October 2014)* (Tournhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2017), pp. 81–107 (91); J.S. Kloppenborg, 'Jesus, Fishermen and Tax Collectors: Papyrology and the Construction of the Ancient Economy of Roman Palestine', *ETL* 94 (2018), pp. 571–99 (581–92); and R. Hakola ('The Production and Trade of Fish as Source of Economic Growth in the First Century C.E. Galilee', *NovT* 59 [2017], pp. 111–30 [122–30]), on the other hand, suggest that access to the Sea of Galilee was not controlled, and, as a consequence, it was not monetized, but what was actually controlled was the sale of fishing products.

7. H. Kreissig (*Die sozialen Zusammenhänge des jüdischen Krieges: Klassenkampf im Palästina des 1. Jahrhunderts v. u. Z* [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1970], p. 46) suggests that most of the men employed in the fishing of the Gennesaret Lake were peasants with limited resources. They would carry out their farming duties during the summer and fall so as to be part of the fish extraction during the winter-spring season to increase their meagre incomes (see T.Zeb. 6.8; Claudius Aelianus, *Anim.* 14.29). Cf. E.W.G. Masterman, 'The Fisheries of Galilee', *PEQ* 40 (1908), pp. 40–51.

men were at the same time sellers of the product, fresh or in sauce.⁸ This situation has led to discussions about the socio-economic status of fishermen in this area. Theissen considers that sea workers, due to their income instability, belonged to the popular classes, though they were not actually poor.⁹ Wuellner and Horsley prefer to place fishermen in the social group of small artisans and traders, given that they invested in their tools and formed small companies that generated incomes.¹⁰ Hanson and Oakman are less optimistic, since they point out that in the fishing companies not only the professional fishermen but also the wage-earners work diligently together, living hand to mouth, and, as Freyne adds, with an oppressive tax burden.¹¹

Due to the boom in the fishing activity, it is not surprising that the large urbanistic projects of the Herodian tetrarchs Antipas and Philip were de-

8. The fact that the fisherman was at the same time seller of the product seems to be normal in the Greco-Roman world. See Plautus, *Rud.* 974; Juvenal, *Sat.* 4.49; Dig. 2.2; A. Stöckle, 'Fischereigewerbe', in A. Pauly und G. Wissowa (eds.), *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Suppl. 4* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1924), pp. 456-62; Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 44-45. The villages and cities of Galilee and Judea, mainly Jerusalem, were the main consumers of the production obtained on the shores of the Lake of Tiberias, which was also exported to the south of Syria. There are fish remains from the Sea of Galilee in Sepphoris and in Jerusalem, in which there was even a fish door (Neh. 3.3; 12.39; 2 Chron. 33.14). Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 33-34; A. Fradkin, 'Long Distance Trade in the Lower Galilee: New Evidence from Sepphoris', in D.R. Edwards and C.T. McCollough (eds.), *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 107-16.

9. G. Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 34; G. Theissen, *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), p. 65.

10. Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 46-62; G.H.R. Horsley, 'A Fishing Cartel in the First-Century Ephesos', in G.H.R. Horsley (ed.), *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (5 vols.; repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), V, pp. 95-114 (110-12).

11. K.C. Hanson, 'The Galilean Fishing Economy', *BTB* 27 (1997), pp. 99-111 (105-7); D.E. Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), p. 109; S. Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian., 323 B. C. E. to 135 C. E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1980), p. 174.

ployed in coastal areas of Gennesaret Lake.¹² In the case of Antipas, the foundation of Tiberias around 20 CE revitalized the adjacent localities, especially Magdala, known for its production of salted fish.¹³ Phillip, on the other hand, transformed the village of Bethsaida, near the river Jordan mouth, to the north of the lake, in a city called Julias around 30 CE.¹⁴ Both cities,

12. Cf. Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 28-30; J. Gnlika (*Pedro y Roma: La figura de Pedro en los dos primeros siglos de la Iglesia* (Barcelona: Herder, 2003), p. 22; M.H. Jensen, 'Herod Antipas in Galilee: Friend or Foe of the Historical Jesus?', *JSHJ* 5 (2007), pp. 7-32 (18-26); S. Guijarro, 'Magdala: Un enclave galileo del comercio entre Roma y Oriente', *Estudio Agustiniano* 54 (2019), pp. 519-46 (534-35). A.H.M. Jones (*The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940], pp. 259-61) points out that ancient cities were founded with the strategic aim of facilitating the move of the imperial messengers. A. Alt (*Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* [3 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1953 (1925)], II, pp. 449-51) argues that the foundation of Bethsaida-Julias and Tiberias was merely conducted for economic purposes: the industrial exploitation of fishing resources.

13. The archaeological site of Magdala shows not only an evident practise of Judaism but also notorious commercial movement from the discovery of five thousand coins (from different places) and the presence of ἀγορανόμοι, that is to say, commerce supervisor authorities (Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, p. 31; S. De Luca and A. Lena, 'The Harbor of the City of Magdala/Taricheae on the Shores of the Sea of Galilee, from the Hellenistic to the Byzantine Times: New Discoveries and Preliminary Results', *Byzas* 19 [2014], pp. 113-63; R. Bauckham and S. De Luca, 'Magdala as We Now Know It', *Early Christianity* 6 [2015], pp. 91-118 [111, 113]; S. Guijarro, 'La Galilea del tiempo de Jesús: Las excavaciones de Magdala y el Documento Q', *RevBib* 79 [2017], pp. 89-125 [97-105]; Guijarro, 'Magdala', pp. 540-46).

14. Josephus narrates the transformation of Bethsaida into Julias by initiative of the tetrarch Philip (*Ant.* 18.2.1); after his passing in 34 CE, the governor of Syria abandoned the projects of the city development (*Ant.* 18.4.6) (see M.D. Smith, 'A Tale of Two Julias: Julia, Julias and Josephus', in R. Arav and R.A. Freund [eds.], *Bethsaida: A City by the North Shore of the Sea of Galilee* [4 vols.; Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 1999], II, pp. 333-46; M. Bockmuehl, 'Simon Peter and Bethsaida', in B. Chilton and C.A. Evans [eds.], *The Missions of James, Peter and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity* [Leiden: Brill, 2005], pp. 53-90 [62, 71-72]; F. Strickert, *Philip's City: From Bethsaida to Julias* [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011], pp. 125-88). At an archaeological level, there is debate about two possible locations for the Bethsaida of the New Testament: et-Tell or Tel-Araj (see M. Nun, 'Has Bethsaida Finally Been Found?', *Jerusalem Perspective* 54 [1998], pp.

Tiberias and Bethsaida-Julias, became cosmopolitan centers and reference points in the commercial routes. Although the tetrarchs made efforts to foster the presence of Jewish populations in these cities, the truth is that they did not seem to be very successful. In Bethsaida, there are no traces of a synagogue, nor of ritual pools or other tools that denote the practices of Judaism; it seems that the very few Jews who lived there were bilingual and deeply integrated into the Hellenistic culture.¹⁵ Regarding industrial fishing in Bethsaida, there is not enough evidence to consider this activity as essential for its inhabitants, but rather circumstantial or recreational;¹⁶ it appears that the fishing post par excellence was in Capernaum, located on the border of the Galilee of Antipas.¹⁷

12-31; R. Arav, 'New Testament Archaeology and the Case of Bethsaida', in M. Becker and W. Fenske [eds.], *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des Heils: Begegnungen mit dem Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt—Festschrift für Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn zum 65* [Leiden: Brill, 1999], pp. 75-99; J. Zangenberg, 'Bethsaida: Reassessing the Bethsaida Identification', *BAR* 26 [2000], pp. 10-12; M. Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012], pp. 171-74).

15. Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, p. 30; Strickert, *Philip's City*, pp. 113-24.

16. Even though the archaeological evidence is decisive for Nun ('Has Bethsaida Finally Been Found?', p. 31) and Bockmuehl ('Simon Peter and Bethsaida', pp. 72-73; *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 173), other scholars such as S. Fortner ('The Fishing Implements and Maritime Activities of Bethsaida Julias [et-Tell]', in R. Arav and R.A. Freund [eds.], *Bethsaida: A City by the North Shore of the Sea of Galilee* [4 vols.; Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 1999], II, pp. 269-80 [269]), Gnilka (*Pedro y Roma*, p. 22) and Strickert (*Philip's City*, pp. 79-98) continue reclaiming the image of Bethsaida as an enclave for industrial fishing.

17. The Capernaum site does not show signs of public buildings, honorific writings or walls in the first century CE. This leads us to think that well-off people did not live there, but mostly farmers and rural artisans did. The village was mainly connected to the commercial circle of Tyre (see V. Corbo, 'Aspetti urbanistici di Cafarnao', *Studi Biblici Franciscani liber annus* 21 [1971], pp. 263-85; J.L. Reed, *El Jesús de Galilea: Aportaciones desde la arqueología* [Salamanca, Spain: Sígueme, 2006 (2000)], pp. 179-207; S.L. Mattila, 'Revisiting Jesus' Capernaum: A Village of Only Subsistence-Level Fishers and Farmers?', in D.A. Fiensy and R.K.

The Fishermen of the Shore

The Gospel of Mark is very brief in its introduction of the fisherman brothers, who are approached by Jesus on the shore of the lake (Mk 1.16-18), along the edges of the village of Capernaum (Mk 1.21, 29).¹⁸ Interestingly, the Evangelist preserves the Greek names of both men, Simon (Σίμων) and Andrew (Ἀνδρέας) (1.16) and does not use the nickname ‘Peter’ until later.¹⁹ At the

Hawkins [eds.], *The Galilean Economy in the Time of Jesus* [Atlanta: SBL, 2013], pp. 75-138 [esp. 90-95]).

18. V. Taylor (*The Gospel according to St. Mark* [London: Macmillan, 1966 (1955)], p. 167) and S.O. Abogunrin (‘The Three Variants Accounts of Peter’s Call: A Critical and Theological Examination’, *NTS* 31 [1985], pp. 587-602 [588]) wonder whether Peter’s calling tradition was not spread initially without precise information about the place. Their questioning arises from the analysis of Mk 1.16, where they recognize that *παράγων παρά* ... is an unusual structure (cf. Mk 2.14; 15.21) and that *παράγω* is an intransitive verb that was not part of the original account of the episode. It does not seem to be an absurd thesis if we consider that, as we will see later on, the Gospel of John places the first encounter of Jesus with Andrew and Peter in Judea, not in Galilee (Jn 1.35-43).

19. In Paul’s letters, he calls the fishermen apostle ‘Cephas’ (Κηφᾶς), an Aramaic nickname that means gem/stone (Gal. 1.18; 2.9, 11, 14; 1 Cor. 1.12; 3.22; 9.5; 15.5). He uses the Greek translation of this nickname ‘Peter’ (Πέτρος) only once (Gal. 2.7-8). It is Mark’s text, belonging to a second generation of believers, that recovers the original Greek name of the character Simon (Σίμων) and explains that Jesus named him Πέτρος (Mk 3.16), probably with a symbolic sense (see O. Cullmann, *Peter: Apostle, Disciple, Martyr—A Historical and Theological Study* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953], pp. 18-19, 21; J.A. Fitzmyer, “‘Aramaic Kepha’ and Peter’s Name in the New Testament”, in J.A. Fitzmyer [ed.], *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* [New York: Crossroad, 1981], pp. 112-24; A. Rodríguez Carmona, ‘La figura de Pedro en el Evangelio de Marcos’, in R. Aguirre Monasterio [ed.], *Pedro en la Iglesia primitiva* [Valencia, Spain: Verbo Divino, 1991], pp. 29-42 [esp. 29-31]; M. Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter in Ancient Reception and Modern Debate* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], pp. 137-40, 148-52). Some authors such as E. Dinkler (‘Petrus, Apostel’, *RGG* 5 [1961], pp. 247-49) and H. Conzelmann (‘Zur Analyse der Bekenntnisformel 1 Kor 15,3-5’, *EvT* 25 [1965], pp. 1-11), based on the future passive indicative (κληθήσῃ) used in Jn 1.42 at the moment of giving the new name to the apostle, propose that the nickname Peter/Cephas came up in a post Paschal time. For an analysis of the nicknames of other apostles such as James and John (Mk 3.17 [Βοανηργές/Υἱοὶ Βροντῆς]), see J.T. Rook,

same time, it is intriguing that Andrew is introduced as 'Simon's brother' (τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος [1.16]); this might be evidence that he was a lesser known character in the communities or that Peter was older than him. Apart from this, the author of Mark holds Andrew in high esteem, not only for his vocation but also as one of the twelve apostles (3.18) and even as one of the members of Jesus' intimate circle (13.3).²⁰

When Mark's text introduces Andrew and his brother, both are working, throwing (ἀμφιβάλλοντας [1.16]) the nets (τὰ δίχτυα [1.18]) into the lake.²¹ This would indicate that the fishermen worked near the shore and that they probably used individual nets, which were possibly circular in shape. Unlike James and John, the other two brothers summoned by Jesus, Peter and Andrew, did not have either a boat or μισθωτοί (Mk 1.19-20). Is this an indication that the brothers were simply wage-earner fishermen? Most exegetes and historians believe that, despite this short and unfavorable description, Peter and Andrew were independent fishermen who would be a part of a local fish-

“Boanerges, Sons of Thunder” (Mark 3:17), *JBL* 100 (1981), pp. 94-95; R.A. Culpepper, *John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), pp. 38-41; H.B. Keshet, ‘Rethinking Mark 3:17—Did Jesus Give Both Boanerges and Huiōi Brontes as Apostolic Names?’, *EvQ* 89 (2018), pp. 162-80.

20. In Gethsemane, Andrew does not form part of Jesus' intimate group anymore (Mk 14.32-33).

21. J.G. Duncan ('The Sea of Tiberias and its Environs', *PEQ* 58 [1926], pp. 15-22 [20]) point out that Peter and Andrew could be standing up in the water working, since along the coast of Capernaum water descent is not abrupt. Others (e.g. E.F.F. Bishop ['Jesus and the Lake', *CBQ* 13 (1951), pp. 398-414 (401)]) consider that the brothers could have only fished in the summer when waters descended. About τὰ δίχτυα in ancient times, see Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 17, 38-39; T. Bekker-Nielsen, 'Nets, Boats and Fishing in the Roman World', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 53 (2002), pp. 215-24; C. Alfaro Giner, 'Fishing Nets in the Ancient World: The Historical and Archeological Evidence', in T. Bekker-Nielsen and D. Bernal Casasola (eds.), *Ancient Nets and Fishing Gear: Proceedings of the International Workshop on 'Nets and Fishing Gear in Classical Antiquity: A First Approach' (Cádiz, November 15-17, 2007)* (Cádiz, Spain: Universidad de Cadiz Servicios de Publicaciones, 2010), pp. 55-82; F.D. Troche, 'Ancient Fishing Methods and Fishing Grounds in the Lake of Galilee', *PEQ* 148 (2016), pp. 281-93 (esp. 282-89).

ing company.²² Mark's text gives us insufficient evidence to reconstruct the economic status of these brothers. Yet this could be understood by taking into account two aspects: the comparison with Zebedee's sons and the information about Andrew and his brother having a house in Capernaum (Mk 1.29). As regards the first aspect, the Evangelist contrasts Peter and Andrew's activity, in the middle of the morning work (though fishing time is at night), with the relaxed attitude of James and John, who are in their boat (ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ [1.19]), along with their father and day laborers (1.20) repairing (καταρτίζω [1.19]) the nets.²³ Clearly, Zebedee's sons would not be heads of a household, since his father is introduced as the boss of the fishing company and hence guarantor of the family's subsistence.²⁴ As opposed to Simon and Andrew, not only

22. Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, p. 62; S. Freyne, *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), pp. 155-67; J. Gnilka, *El Evangelio según san Marcos. Mc 1,1-8,26* (Salamanca, Spain: Sígueme, 1992 [1978]), pp. 87-88; Gnilka, *Pedro y Roma*, p. 23; A. Chester, 'The Jews of Judaea and Galilee', in J. Barclay and J. Sweet (eds.), *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9-26 (esp. 12-16). Only Bockmuehl ('Simon Peter and Bethsaida', p. 60) allows himself to doubt about the labour condition of the brothers when comparing the different data offered by the Synoptic Tradition.

23. G.R. Wynne ('Mending their Nets', *Expositor* 8 [1909], pp. 282-85) distinguishes between Zebedee's sons who are ready to throw the nets to the first shoal from Peter and his brother who are dragging what was captured; Gnilka (*El Evangelio según san Marcos*, p. 84) assumes that the story of James's and John's calling would have overlapped with that of Andrew's and his brother's, given that they carry out a night activity, fishing, while the first ones conducted daily duties, such as net repair (cf. Culpepper, *John, the Son of Zebedee*, pp. 17-18; Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 133). Jerome (*Comm. Mark* 2) interprets that the action of darning the nets might entail that the group of Zebedee was not able to fish much.

24. S. Guijarro (*Fidelidades en conflicto: La ruptura con la familia por causa del discipulado y de la misión en la tradición sinóptica* [Salamanca, Spain: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia, 1998], pp. 303-6) and A. Destro and M. Pesce (*From Jesus to his First Followers: Continuity and Discontinuity—Anthropological and Historical Perspectives* [Leiden: Brill, 2017], pp. 11-33) agree that the Jesus movement many times meant fragmentation of the homes since the group of men and women that adhered to the itinerant life were adults of middle age who did not hold the complete responsibility of the domestic economy, due to the fact that the previous generation, from which they separated, were still the household administrators.

do James and John leave their nets, but also their father, boat and day laborers. Does this mean that their decision is conceived of as being more radical? It could be thought that the author of Mark wants to encourage that idea, given that he later shows Peter in touch with his family in a domestic sphere (Mk 1.29-30; 2.2; 3.20; 7.17; 9.27). However, nothing is mentioned about the bonds of Zebedee's sons (an aspect that Matthew will question in his account, as we will see below). As for the house of Simon and Andrew, it is a symbol of certain community status, given that Jesus himself uses it afterwards as a reference point for the group (Mk 1.29, 32; 2.1; 3.20; 9.33).²⁵ We are not told whether Andrew was married or not. If he had been, both families would have lived in the same place, which was a typical situation in the Near Eastern world. Another option is that Andrew was still single and that, for labor reasons or an unstable economic situation, he would have been part of the οἶκος of his brother (at least temporarily) and was one of the providing figures of the family group.²⁶

25. Peter's house is mentioned also in *The Gospel of the Ebionites* frag. 2 (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.13,2-3). Cullmann, *Peter*, p. 23; Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, pp. 73-77; Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, pp. 24, 53. D.M. May ('Mark 2.15: The Home of Jesus or Levi?', *NTS* 39 [1993], pp. 147-49) and A. Doole ('Jesus "at Home": Did Jesus Have a House in Capernaum?', *Protokolle zur Bibel* 26 [2017], pp. 36-64 [esp. 42-54]) have wondered about the possibility that many of the references to the οἶκος of Capernaum in Mark could allude to Jesus' own house, as E. Struthers-Malbon maintains ('TH OIKIA AYTOY: Mark 2.15 in Context', *NTS* 31 [1985], pp. 282-92 [282-83]). But this seems to be implausible; the house mentioned is described as Peter's a few times and others as Levi's (Mt. 9.10). About the archaeological analysis of the hypothetical house of Peter in Capernaum, see J.P. Strange and H. Shanks, 'Has the House Where Jesus Stayed in Capernaum Been Found?', *BAR* 8 (1982), pp. 26-37.

26. The Old Testament acknowledges obligations between brothers, as the liberation of the one that is in captivity (Lev. 25.48), the recovery of the property that one of them was obliged to sell (Lev. 25:25) and, moreover, the levirate (Deut. 25.5-10). In rabbinic Judaism, the Mishnah and the Tosefta elaborate on the legal aspects of the fraternal relation. In these rules, it is considered that adult brothers lived together for shared property issues after inheritance or because they were partners in the same activity (*m. Pe'ah* 3.5; *m. Beṣah* 5.3; *m. 'Erub.* 6.7; *m. Sanh.* 3.4; *m. Ketub.* 2:10) (see F.E. Greenspahn, *When Brothers Dwell Together: The Preeminence of Younger Siblings in the Hebrew Bible* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994], pp. 111-40; D.E.

The metaphor that Mark's Jesus uses to refer to the new life of Peter and Andrew is ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων ('fishers of men' [Mk 1.17]). This would seem to allude to the prophetic vision of Jeremiah of the divine fishermen/hunters that would reunite Israel in the last days (Jer. 16.15-16).²⁷

The tradition that Mark upholds seems to have generated certain disapproval since the author of Mark, though following it closely, introduces minor corrections (Mt. 4.18-22). To begin with and before showing Jesus walking towards the shore of the lake, he explains that his mission began in Capernaum (Mt. 4.13, 17), which gives a prophetic reason based on Isa. 9.1-2 (Mt. 4.15-16).²⁸ Afterwards, when speaking about the fishermen brothers, he introduces them as Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ (Mt. 4.18); Simon is Peter from the very beginning, and it could be interpreted by τὸν λεγόμενον that the author wants to point out that Jesus did not give him that nickname, but that he had it before that (Mt. 10.2) and the Master used it (Mt. 16.17-18) and the community of believers adopted it to refer to the apostle.²⁹ Andrew, on the other hand, appears to be blurred, given that there is no reference about him living with his brother (whose house still occupies a prominent place in the ministry of Jesus in Galilee [Mt. 8.14; 13.1, 36; 17.24]) and neither is he part of the Master's intimate circle. The author of Matthew shows a clear preference towards Peter and barely mentions his

Weisberg, *Levirate Marriage and Family in Ancient Judaism* [Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2009], pp. 97-102).

27. Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 23.

28. W. Carter ('Evoking Isaiah: Matthean Soteriology and an Intertextual Reading of Isaiah 7-9 and Matthew 1:23 and 4:15-16', *JBL* 119 [2000], pp. 503-20 [esp. 513-20]) proposes that Isaiah's quote evokes the reality of the imperial power since Rome dominated Galilee by means of the tetrarch Antipas, as well as the promise of God's salvation initiated in the public ministry of Jesus. Cf. R. Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 102-10.

29. R. Aguirre ('La figura de Pedro en el Evangelio de Mateo', in R. Aguirre Monasterio [ed.], *Pedro en la Iglesia primitiva* [Valencia, Spain: Verbo Divino, 1991], pp. 43-59 [44, 49]) and Bockmuehl (*The Remembered Peter*, pp. 135-57; *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 71) consider that the author of Matthew leads us to believe that Peter was an epithet he had since his youth (Mt. 4.18) and gains great significance with the confession of Caesarea (Mt. 16.16-19), in which the prominent role of the fisherman is foreshadowed among the disciples. Cullmann (*Peter*, p. 20) is inclined to think that it is Jesus who gives him the nickname.

brother, which would indicate that there are some other traditions spread about Andrew being the first to meet Jesus.

Regarding the work tools of Peter and his brother, in Matthew the ἀμφίβληστρον is mentioned first, a net for trawling or a fence, but then the plural τὰ δίκτυα is used,³⁰ a more general term to speak about the nets that are abandoned. Is this an indication that when following Jesus, they left other fellows/partners of the company? In this Gospel, we have already observed that, even though they have their own nets, the brothers did not own a boat. Simultaneously, the evangelist highlights three interesting aspects when introducing James and John. In the first place, James is placed in a clear hierarchy as he is called τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου (Mt. 4.21), indicating probably that he is the first-born and the right hand of his father, as it is with Peter, whose father Jonah is mentioned in Mt. 16.17.³¹ Secondly, the author of the Gospel of Matthew erases the μισθωτοί of Zebedee, who is now preparing the nets only with his sons. Lastly, the renunciation of John and his brother is nuanced with the relevant presence of his mother in the group of Jesus' female disciples (Mt. 20.20-23; 27.56).³²

The author of Matthew does not change at all the missionary invitation addressed by Jesus to Peter and Andrew, to whom he promised to be ἀλιεῖς

30. Oppian, *Haliutica* 3.83-84. This kind of net could be used in a standing position, which seems to be suggested by the evangelist, or from a boat. Cf. Giner, 'Fishing Nets', p. 60; C. Beltrame, 'Fishing from Ships: Fishing Techniques in the Light of Nautical Archaeology', in T. Bekker-Nielsen and D. Bernal Casasola (eds.), *Ancient Nets and Fishing Gear: Proceedings of the International Workshop on 'Nets and Fishing Gear in Classical Antiquity: A First Approach' (Cádiz, November 15–17, 2007)* (Cádiz, Spain: Universidad de Cadiz Servicios de Publicaciones, 2010), pp. 229-42 (229-36).

31. About Peter and Andrew's father, called 'Jonah' in Mt. 16.17 and 'John' in Jn 21.15-17, there have been heated discussions, as it has been suggested that in Aramaic *bar-yônâ* means 'terrorist', which would place the origin of these apostles within the nationalist circles. Cf. R. Eisler, *Jesous basileus ou basileusa* (Heidelberg: Carl Winters, 1929), p. 67; Cullmann, *Peter*, p. 21; Bockmuehl, 'Simon Peter and Bethsaida', p. 56.

32. The absence of Zebedee's wife in the other Synoptics has aroused doubts regarding figure in Matthew's plot. Cf. R.E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1994), I, p. 1155; E. Cheney, 'The Mother of the Sons of Zebedee (Matthew 27:56)', *JSNT* 68 (1997), pp. 13-21; F. Manns, 'La mère des dils de Zébédée', *Liber Annuus* 67 (2017), pp. 99-106.

ἀνθρώπων (Mt. 4.19), showing a clear influence of the story of the calling of Elijah to Elisha (1 Kgs 19.19-24).³³

Peter, Boss of a Fishing Company

The subtle retouches Matthew's introduction of Andrew and Peter suggest tension in the received traditions, tension that seemed to have been aggravated towards the end of the first century, when the Gospel of Luke was written. In this text a clear and conscious reworking of Peter's figure can be observed, whose pre-apostolic past is depicted in much more positive terms.

This could be an answer to the controversies with certain segments of Judaism and Gentile intellectuals, who would spot in the poor social background of the apostles an essential argument to characterize faith in Jesus as superstition. On the other hand, Luke's version of Peter's calling could also be understood as evidence of disagreements between the churches in connection with the Petrine Primacy in the apostolic vocation, defended in this Gospel.

The author of Luke clearly knew the Gospel of Mark and agrees with him that Jesus' mission began in Capernaum (Lk. 4.31). However, the author disagrees with Mark's account regarding the first encounter between the Master and the fisherman. Luke progressively displays the relation between Jesus and Simon Peter departing from the entrance of the former into the house of the latter,³⁴ where Jesus heals his mother-in-law, who is feverish (Lk. 4.38-

33. P. Perkins, *Peter: Apostle of the Whole Church* (Edinburgh: Bloomsbury, 2000 [1994]), p. 28; T. Wiarda, *Peter in the Gospels: Pattern, Personality and Relationship* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), pp. 183-88; Gnilka, *Pedro y Roma*, p. 31; R. Burnet, *Les douze apôtres: Histoire de la réception des figures apostoliques dans le christianisme ancien* (Tournhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2014), p. 148. Wuellner (*Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, p. 167) and L. Brun ('Die Berufung der ersten jünger Jesu in der evangelischen Tradition', *Symbolae Osloenses: Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies* 11 [2008], pp. 35-54 [35]) conclude that these accounts of the calling as apothegm simply symbolize the radical obedience that the Lord demands from a person.

34. G. Klein ('Die Berufung des Petrus', *ZNW* 58 [1967], pp. 1-44 [2]) and Bockmuehl (*Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, pp. 24-25, 115) consider that the author of Luke makes up this approach. Cf. P. Perkins, 'Peter: How a Flawed Disciple Became Jesus' Successor on Earth', *BRev* 20 (2004), pp. 12-23 (23); H.D. Bond, 'When Supporting Characters Move to Centre Stage: Peter in Mark and Luke—Acts',

39).³⁵ It is interesting to note that it is precisely on a Saturday that the healing is performed and that it is other people (other relatives? an unnamed Andrew? Peter's wife?) who intercede on her behalf. Simon does not appear in the episode, presumably because he is working.³⁶ Luke makes out of the miracle the antecedent of Peter's calling, thus winning the loyalty of the οἶκος before asking for the radical renunciation of the one whom, we might assume, was their main economic support. This reorganization in Luke's episodes might lead us to think that either there was a divergent tradition concerning the topic, crystalized in John's text having Andrew as the main character, or that the memory of this family-labor rupture of the apostles clashed with the suggestion of a Christian οἶκος organized and centered in the work and far from any

in J.M. Lieu (ed.), *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader* (Leuven: Peeters, 2021), pp. 47-62 (56).

35. The episode of the healing of Peter's mother-in-law has played different roles in each of the Synoptics. In the Gospel of Mark, it could be understood as part of the exorcist activity of the Master (J.G. Cook, 'In Defence of Ambiguity: Is there a Hidden Demon in Mark 1.29-32?', *NTS* 43 [1997], pp. 184-208; G. O'Collins, 'Peter's Mother-in-Law [Mark 1:29-31]: More to Be Said', *ABR* 63 [2020], pp. 67-75). In the Gospel of Matthew, it seemed to be destined to favour the introduction of Jesus as a healing prophet (i.e. Elijah) (W.T. Wilson, 'The Uninvited Healer: Houses, Healings and Prophets in Matthew 8.1-22', *JSNT* 36 [2013], pp. 53-72).

36. J. Rius-Camps ('La figura de Pedro en la doble obra lucana', in R. Aguirre Monasterio [ed.], *Pedro en la Iglesia primitiva* [Valencia, Spain: Verbo Divino, 1991], pp. 61-99 [61-63]) interprets that in Luke's account, this miracle does not only prepare for the encounter with Peter but also could be leading us to believe that certain in-laws of Simon showed strong nationalistic inclinations, allegorized in *πυρετῶ μεγάλῳ* (Lk. 4.38) the woman suffered from. Moreover, since the ones that ask Jesus to heal the mother-in-law do it on a Saturday, it could be assumed that the family would not be close to the synagogue. Bockmuehl (*Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, pp. 24-25, 175-76) agrees that Peter's in-laws could have been inclined to factions of the national renewal but assumes that the reorganization of Peter's account in Luke stems from the interest the author has in highlighting, much more than Mark does, that Peter truly left everything. Cf. A.M. Klummer, 'Rock and Roles: Masculinity, Transformation, and Future in the Narrative Construction of Simon Peter in Luke—Acts', in J.M. Lieu (ed.), *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader* (Leuven: Peeters, 2021), pp. 611-26 (esp. 614-16).

possibility of rebellion.³⁷ Peter's abandonment of his home and responsibilities is undeniable, yet it is described as a gradual and pacific process, shared with the members of the οἶκος and with the κοινῶνοι of the fishing company, all of which are clear beneficiaries of the miracles.

Luke's version of the vocation of the leader of the apostles is the outcome of the fusion of three micro accounts: a sermon (5.1-3), a miracle (5.4-7) and Peter's calling (5.8-11).³⁸ Although the conclusion arrived at is the same as the one in the texts of Mark and Matthew, that is to say, that Peter goes with Jesus, the author of Luke softens the renunciation with a speech and a miracle that preannounce the missionary call of the fisherman. First of all, he points out that Jesus sees two boats (Lk. 5.2),³⁹ which, we must infer, are property

37. Eph. 5.27–6.9; Col. 3.18–4.1; 2 Thess. 3.10-12; 1 Pet. 2.13–3.7; Acts 20.33-35; Did. 11–13; Ignatius, *Pol.* 4–5. The praise for work entails strengthening the self-management of the Christian οἶκοι and, hence, of the extended family structure as opposed to those alleged itinerant leaders who live from hospitality. See G.S. Holland, *The Tradition That You Received from Us: 2 Thessalonians in the Pauline Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), pp. 50-57; S.J. Patterson, 'Didache 11–13: The Legacy of Radical Itinerancy in Early Christianity', in C.N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), pp. 313-29; B. Chilton and J. Neusner, *Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 38-69, 100-122; A. Stewart-Sykes, 'Prophecy and Patronage: The Relationship between Charismatic Functionaries and Household Officers in Early Christianity', in A. Gregory and C. Tuckett (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 165-89.

38. Brun, 'Die Berufung der ersten jünger Jesu', p. 36; Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 115; R. Burnet, 'Se débarrasser de l'apôtre fragile: Comment Luc fait le reboot du Pierre de Marc', in J.M. Lieu (ed.), *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader* (Leuven: Peeters, 2021), pp. 63-83 (74-75). Klein ('Die Berufung des Petrus', p. 6) observes that Lk. 5.1-3 would have been written based on three different parts of Mark's text.

39. The only exemplar of ships of the Sea of Galilee of the first century that we have is the popular 'Boat of Jesus', found in 1985 and currently in the museum *Yigal Allon* in Kibbutz Ginosar. This ship is built with seven types of wood and measures 8.2 meters in length, 2.3 meters in width and 1.3 meters in depth, with a capacity for fifteen people (see S. Wachsmann, *The Sea of Galilee Boat: An Extraordinary 2000-Year-Old Discovery* [New York: Plenum Press, 1995], pp. 5-168; C.A. Evans, 'A Fishing Boat, a House, and an Ossuary: What can We Learn from the Artifacts?', in

of the fishing company;⁴⁰ the Master gets specifically into the one belonging to Peter and asks him to use it as stage for his sermon for the people crowded on the shore (Lk. 5.3).⁴¹ Peter, who, according to what Luke's sequence suggests, already knows Jesus from the episode with his mother-in-law, does not offer resistance. It seems that his *κοινωνοί* James and John have remained on the shore, washing the nets (Lk. 5.2), and that he has stayed on the boat with some day laborers. The great number of people crowded on the shore (Lk. 5.1) preannounces the great number of fish of the miracle. Peter, who has so far remained silent, reacts only after Jesus orders him to put out the boat into deep water and let down the nets for a catch (Lk. 5.4). Even though this is not the Peter in Mark's text, who is in the sea working for his sustenance during the morning, Luke's Peter shows the failure of his company when saying *ὄλης νυκτὸς κοπιᾶσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν* (Lk. 5.5). The verb *κοπιᾶω* is much more than *ἐργάζομαι*, since it means 'to work hard, with exhaustion';⁴² fishing was

B. Chilton and C. Evans [eds.], *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity* [Leiden: Brill, 2005], pp. 211-31 [esp. 222-23]). About fishing boats in the Roman world in general, see A. Von Brandt, *Fish Catching Methods of the World* (Farnham: Fishing News Books, 1984), p. 91; D. Carlson, 'Roman Fishing Boats: Form and Function', in R.F. Docter and E.M. Moorman (eds.), *Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Classical Archeology, Amsterdam, July 12-17, 1998* (Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Museum, 1999), pp. 107-9.

40. In this case, we should understand that this group of fishermen that Peter led would be a more informal business *societas*, not a *collegia*. This *societas* assumed that two or more fishermen got together to face the expenses of the acquired fishing right and also to divide the benefits. It is very likely that, in a *societas*, the families of the fishermen would participate in the fishing, cleaning, salting and sale as well as in the repair of nets and other tools (see P.Oxy. 12; P.Oxy. 46.3270; P.Turner 25; D. Sperber, 'Some Observations of Fish and Fisheries on Roman Palestine', *ZDMG* 118 [1968], pp. 265-69; Horsley, 'A Fishing Cartel', pp. 101-4; C. Ravara Montebelli, *Halieutica: Pescatori nel Mondo Antico* (Pesaro: Museo della Marineria Washington Patrignani, 2009), p. 63.

41. Some church fathers saw in these two boats a reference to the church of the circumcision and the church of the uncircumcision (see Maximus of Turin, *Hom.* 49.1-3; 110.1; Ephrem the Syrian, *Comm. Diat.* 5.18).

42. In the Gospel literature, this verb is ambiguous, as it may allude to excessive concern (Mt. 6.28; 11.28; Lk. 12.27), or especially in Paul's literature, to the level of expected commitment from those who announce the gospel (Rom. 16.6, 12; 1 Cor.

a lucrative business, yet the compliance with the requirements were what guaranteed the preservation of the extraction rights. The frustration in Simon Peter leads him to trust in the authority of Jesus, whom he calls ἐπιστάτης ('Master')⁴³ and believes in his ῥῆμα (Lk. 5.5).⁴⁴ When witnessing the miracle, which, due to its magnitude, almost breaks the nets and sinks the boats (Lk. 5.6)—the tools of these men's livelihood—astonishment (θάμβος) fills the fishermen (Lk. 5.9).⁴⁵ Unlike the other versions of the encounter between Jesus and Peter, in Luke's text, the fisherman adopts the praying posture, falling on his knees (προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν)⁴⁶ and begins a dialogue calling Jesus κύριος (Lk. 5.8).⁴⁷ Peter asks him to go away from him because he con-

4.12; 15.10; 16.16; Gal. 4.11; 1 Thess. 5.12; Col. 1.29; Eph. 4.28; 1 Tim. 4.10; 5.17; 2 Tim. 2.6; Acts 20.35).

43. This way of referring to Jesus—kept only by Luke (Lk. 8.24, 45; 9.33, 49; 17.13)—embodies him as someone who is in a leadership position due to his education and knowledge (ἐπιστήμη). Abogunrin ('Three Variants Accounts', p. 591) supposes that the author in the Lukan Gospel uses ἐπιστάτης (instead of terms such as ῥαββί or ῥαββουλί) because he is addressing the Gentile audience. Cf. O. Glombitza, 'Die Titel διδάσκαλος und ἐπιστάτης für Jesus bei Lukas', *ZNW* 49 (1958), pp. 275-78; A. Oepke, 'Epistates', *TDNT*, II, pp. 622-23. In the LXX, this term is found in Exod. 1.11; 5.14; 1 Kgs 5.16; 2 Kgs 25.19; Jer. 36.26; 2 Chron. 2.2; 31.12.

44. The author of the double Lukan work prefers the term ῥῆμα/ῥήματα to λόγος to refer to Jesus' saying and the divine word in general (see Lk 1.37-38, 65; 2.15, 17, 19, 29, 50-51; 3.2; 4.4; 5.5; 7.1; 9.45; 18.34; 20.26; 22.61; 24.8; Acts 2.14, 17; 5.20, 32; 6.11, 13; 9.45; 10.22, 44; 11.14, 16; 13.42; 16.38; 26.25). C. Burchard, 'A Note on 'RHMA in JosAs 17:1 F.; Luke 2:15; Acts 10:37'', *NovT* 27 (1985), pp. 281-95 (esp. 286-95); S. Shauf, 'The "Word of God" and Retribution Theology in Luke-Acts', in P. Gray and G.R. O'Day (eds.), *Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 173-92.

45. Although there are other expressions to refer to the astonishment (ἐκλήσσω, ἔκστασις, ἐξίστημι, θαυμάζω), θάμβος is used by Luke exclusively to express the wonders of the extraordinary, which could cause positive or negative reactions (Lk. 4.36; 5.9; Acts 3.10-11). W. Grimm, 'θαμβέω, θάμβος', *EDNT*, II, pp. 128-29; T.D. Espinoza, *The Motif of Amazement in Luke-Acts* (Ann Arbor: UMI. Dissertation Publishing, 2014), pp. 139-146; 163-166.

46. For the double Lukan work, kneeling is a gesture that means to acknowledge the authority and to pray (Lk. 8.28, 47; Acts 16.29).

47. For Abogunrin ('Three Variants Accounts', p. 592), the use of κύριος indicates the path from simple obedience to acknowledgment of the supernatural power.

siders himself an ἀνήρ ἁμαρτωλός (Lk. 5.8), which could be understood as someone sinful, having broken the Law.⁴⁸ This self-naming of Simon is at odds with his own statement upon the vision in Joppa, when he claims to have been a respectful Jew and has never eaten anything impure (οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον [Acts 10.14]). Was Peter a pious Jew or someone uninterested in the issue of compliance? If we consider the episode of the mother-in-law, healed on a Saturday on which the people of Capernaum were in the synagogue, we are told that he was not there, showing that he did not respect the day of rest. In Acts 4.13, the priests of the Sanhedrin regarded Peter as ἀγράμματος ('inexperienced as regards the Law') and ἰδιώτης ('a tough and simple person').⁴⁹ This would add to the theory about certain instability in Peter's Jewish practice, though this does not mean that he did not

Cf. W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1970), pp. 121-29; L.W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), pp. 108-18.

48. Cf. S. Szkredka, *Sinners and Sinfulness in Luke: A Study of Direct and Indirect References in the Initial Episodes of Jesus' Activity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), pp. 59-61; Klummer, 'Rock and Roles', pp. 616-18. Rius-Camps ('La figura de Pedro en la doble obra lucana', p. 64) observes that the author of the Lukan texts places Peter parallel to the demons when asking Jesus to go away from him (cf. Lk. 4.35-36, 41; 8.2, 29, 33, 35, 38; 11.14, 24; Acts 16.18). Cf. S. Bevan, 'Proskynesis in the Synoptics: A Textual Analysis of προσκυνέω and Jesus', *Studia Antiqua* 14 (2015), pp. 30-43 (37-40); R. Lozano, *The Proskynesis of Jesus in the New Testament: A Study on the Significance of Jesus as an Object of προσκυνέω in the New Testament Writings* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2020), pp. 83-99.

49. Cullmann, *Peter*, p. 22; Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 55-59; T.J. Kraus, *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and their Significance for Studying Early Christianity—Selected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 149-70; R.I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2009), pp. 117-18; Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 168. F.J. Foakes-Jackson (*Peter: Prince of the Apostles—A Study in the History and Tradition of Christianity* [New York: George H. Doran, 1927], p. 55) assumes that these names are related to the Galilean accent; Gnllka (*Pedro y Roma*, p. 23) believes that they have, apart from a historical sense, a concrete literary meaning, contrasting them with the image of Peter full of the Holy Spirit.

comply with some obligations and that he, or at least his relatives, showed a possible nationalist inclination.⁵⁰

The vocational account of Luke has three remarkable aspects: (1) the improvement in Peter's socio-economic position; (2) the complete absence of Andrew; and (3) the change in the missionary summons of Jesus, who invites the fisherman to be an *ἄνθρωπος ζωγρῶν*. The first one of these aspects has a clear apologetic sense, since Peter is shown as the boss of a fishing company with at least one boat as his property. James and John appear to be his secondary partners (or are they the owners of another boat?), Zebedee is only mentioned as their father and there is no trace of their mother among Jesus' female disciples. The author of Luke–Acts is aware of the fact that James and his brother were models for Jerusalemite Christianity and he cannot erase them.⁵¹ But he subdues them to Peter, who now has day laborers, and is responsible for coordinating the team actions, thus making his final renunciation more dramatic, given that he has abandoned many responsibilities for the mission.

Who is deliberately eliminated in Luke is Andrew, becoming the second peculiarity of this vocational account. One reason to remove Andrew from this episode could be to give exclusive prominence to Peter, who would not have shared the leadership of the company with anyone, enhancing his directive profile. But if we consider that Matthew already corrected Mark when saying that the house in Capernaum was Peter's and not Andrew's, we could venture that some Christian groups demonstrated preference for one brother over the other. In Mark's apostolic list, we find, curiously enough, that Andrew is placed fourth, after Peter, James and John (Mk 3.17-18). But then, Matthew and Luke draw up the top of their list with Peter and his brother, though diminishing the importance of the latter (Mt. 10.2; Lk. 6.14); in Acts, Andrew returns to the fourth place (Acts 1.13). There are here two non-exclusive possible interpretations: (1) either the author of Luke had reliable information that Andrew and Peter had divergences in opinion regarding their

50. Rius-Camps, 'La figura de Pedro en la doble obra lucana', pp. 62-63; Bockmuehl, 'Simon Peter and Bethsaida', pp. 83; Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, pp. 175-76.

51. In Acts, the author of Luke witnesses the close bond between Peter and John (Acts 1.13; 3-4; 8.14-17), which was already stated by Paul (Gal. 2.9) as well as the prominent role of James, son of Zebedee, among the community of Jerusalem (Acts 1.13; 12.1-2).

work that led them to separate before meeting Jesus; or (2) Andrew's scorn is caused by post-Paschal issues, strictly connected to the fact that Peter's brother would have aligned with Hellenized groups.⁵²

Finally, Peter's vocation in Luke ends with Jesus' invitation to the fisherman to be *ἀνθρώπους ζωγρῶν*, and not *ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων* as mentioned by Mark and Matthew. The verb *ζωγρέω* belongs to war vocabulary, and means to capture men alive, to hold men captive without killing them.

Andrew and Peter in Judea: The Gospel of John

The author of John disrupts everything mentioned in connection with the stories of the apostolic vocation, putting them in a different place. He stresses the relevance of other characters and, mainly, changes the calling mechanics: Jesus does not summon his followers, instead they go to him for diverse reasons.⁵³

52. P.M. Peterson (*Andrew, Brother of Simon Peter: His History and his Legends* [Leiden: Brill, 1963], p. 2) considers that this elimination is connected to the limited relevance that Andrew had during the earliest period. Cf. Abogunrin, 'Three Variants Accounts', p. 590.

53. Gnllka (*Pedro y Roma*, p. 32) believes that these stories of search are influenced by the Jewish sapiential literature (e.g. Prov. 8.17; Wis. 6.12-13). The only exception is the summon of Philip in Jn 1.43, who copies the stories of the calling in the Synoptics. Cf. C.R. Matthews, *Philip: Apostle and Evangelist—Configurations of a Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 106-10; J. Beutler, 'Die Berufung des Andreas und des Philippus nach dem Johannesevangelium (Joh 1.35-46)', *NTS* 65 (2019), pp. 461-76 (esp. 467-69); F. Bianchini, 'Trova Filippo e Gesù gli dice: «Seguimi»: Il personaggio Filippo nel Quarto Vangelo', *RB* 130 (2023), pp. 41-53. There are some authors such as R. Schnackenburg (*Das Johannesevangelium I* [Freiburg: Herder, 1965], pp. 312-13); R.E. Brown (*The Gospel according to John I [I-XII]* [New York: Doubleday, 1966], pp. 81-85); R. Bultmann (*The Gospel of John: A Commentary* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971], p. 98); J.L. Martyn (*The Gospel of John in Christian History: Essays for Interpreters* [New York: Paulist Press, 1979], pp. 9-54); and M. Theobald (*Das Evangelium nach Johannes: Kapitel 1-12* [Regensburg: Pustet, 2009], pp. 187-90) who believe that the text is altered and that it was originally Andrew who found Phillip since Jn 1.41 indicates that Peter's brother, after meeting the Master, did something first (*πρῶτον*) but does not state what he did afterwards. Chrysostom (*Hom. Jo. 20.1*) assumes that Jesus already knew Philip. Cf. Brown, *Gospel according to John I*, pp. 75-76.

In this Gospel, it is Andrew who first approaches Jesus⁵⁴ and he does this at the request of John the Baptist, of whom he was a disciple at that moment (Jn 1.35-43). It is interesting to note that, as in Mk 1.16, Andrew is introduced as ‘Simon Peter’s brother’ (ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου [Jn 1.40; 6.8]), thus indicating his bond with one of the great leading apostolic figures. However, Andrew’s path in John’s text is independent of that of Peter’s, showing the former as a comprehensive and predisposed disciple.⁵⁵ Could this be an indication that Andrew’s positioning in the primitive church would have been different from that of his brother? Probably it was, as we have observed that, for some reason, Luke–Acts barely mentions him, reclaiming Peter’s character. In John’s account, Andrew forms a team with Philip, the other apostle with a Hellenistic name, and both are part of the multiplication of bread (Jn 6.5-9) and act as mediators when some Greek sympathizers of Jewish faith want to see Jesus (Jn 12.20-22).⁵⁶ Certainly, for the purpose of the author, who postpones Peter, the traditions about Andrew are useful to him; this would also explain why he pronounces the first Christological confession: ‘We found the Messiah’ (εὐρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν [Jn 1.41]).⁵⁷

54. P. Dschulnigg (‘Die Berufung der Jünger Joh 1,35-51 im Rahmen des vierten Evangeliums’, *FZPhTh* 36 [1989], pp. 427-47 [429]) and Gnlika (*Pedro y Roma*, p. 32) seem to understand that the author of John would have provoked certain controversy when relating the encounter of Jesus with the first disciples and keeping Andrew but replacing Peter with an anonymous disciple.

55. E. Haenchen, *John 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 1–6* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 271; Dschulnigg, ‘Die Berufung der Jünger’, p. 435; Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 58; C. Bennema, *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014 [2009]), p. 52.

56. According to C.S. Keener (*The Gospel of John: A Commentary* [2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003], II, pp. 665-66), Jesus tests Philip and Andrew, the disciples that have proclaimed their faith in him, in the episode of the multiplication of bread and fish. Cf. M.C. de Boer, ‘Andrew: The First Link in the Chain’, in S.A. Hunt, D.F. Tolmie and R. Zimmermann (eds.), *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Approaches to Seventy Figures in John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), pp. 137-50 (147-48); Bennema, *Encountering Jesus*, pp. 47-51.

57. Brown (*Gospel according to John I*, pp. 79-80) observes that Andrew’s messianic confession replaces that of Peter’s, claimed by the Synoptics. Brun (‘Die Berufung der ersten jünger Jesu’, p. 46) believes that this very early messianic con-

Having said that, John's information about Andrew being a disciple of the Baptist is added to the fact that his first encounter with Jesus was in Judea, not in Galilee (Jn 1.35-43) and that it did not happen during his duty as a fisherman.⁵⁸ This is striking: Peter and Andrew's trade is eliminated in John, who mysteriously places both brothers far away from Capernaum, and even more, makes them from Bethsaida, a town in the territory of Herod Philip, in Gaulanitis.⁵⁹ We have seen that the archaeological records do not support the existence of a fishing industry in Bethsaida; consequently, some scholars have proposed that, if Peter and Andrew were born in that place, they would have become fishermen after moving to the nearby Capernaum, the territory of Galilee.⁶⁰ It has been thought that this migration would be primarily caused by religious reasons, as both brothers, in spite of having Greek names, Σίμων and Ἀνδρέας, would have belonged to one of the few Jewish families in Bethsaida. Given that the other evangelists include the information about Peter's in-laws, it is possible that he married in Capernaum, within a more pious and observant circle.⁶¹

fession flatly contradicts the synoptic tradition. Cf. Keener, *Gospel of John*, II, p. 475; R. Bieringer, 'Peter Learning to Be a Rock: A Narrative-Critical Reading of Simon Peter in the Fourth Gospel', in J.M. Lieu (ed.), *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader* (Leuven: Peeters, 2021), pp. 27-46 (33).

58. Brown (*Gospel according to John I*, p. 77) places this encounter in the area of Bethabara/Bethany on the other side of Jordan (Jn 1.28). Cf. Brun, 'Die Berufung der ersten jünger Jesu', p. 37.

59. The author of the Gospel of John does not only call Bethsaida a πόλις (Jn 1.44; cf. Lk. 9.10 and κώμη in Mk 8.23, 26) but also places it erroneously in Galilee. Abogunrin ('Three Variants Accounts', p. 587) assumes that the Evangelist understands Galilee in a general sense, including within it all the region of the northwest of the lake of Gennesaret. Q and the synoptic tradition have not shown any interest in Bethsaida, which seems to be a place that has not received the preaching positively (Q 10.13-14; Mt. 11.21-24; Lk. 10.13-15). Only two miracles happen there: the healing of the blind man (Mk 8.22-26) and the feeding of the multitude (Lk. 9.10-17). About these last episodes, the other Evangelists, though telling them, avoid specifying the location (Mk 6.32; Mt. 14.13; Jn 6.1). Bockmuehl, 'Simon Peter and Bethsaida', pp. 53-54; Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 166.

60. Cullmann, *Peter*, pp. 22-23; Bockmuehl, 'Simon Peter and Bethsaida', pp. 72-73; Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, pp. 174-76.

61. J.M. O'Connor ('Fishers of Fish, Fishers of Men: What We Know of the First Disciples from their Profession', *BRev* 15 [1999], pp. 22-27, 48-49) and Gnilk

The fact that the author of John identifies Andrew as a disciple of the Baptist would show the firm commitment of Peter's brother to the movements of religious and social renewal of Israel.⁶² Could it be thought that Luke avoided mentioning him because of this inclination? Whatever the case may be, it is true that Luke and John agree on the fact that someone of Peter's group came to Jesus before him: for the former, some of his relatives (or in-laws) and for the latter, his own brother. The most curious aspect is that in John's account, Peter is not in Galilee, either, but in Judea, as Andrew goes there to look for him to tell him about his encounter with Jesus. It could be understood that Peter is also a supporter of the Baptist, though more reserved, or that he is in Judea for the commerce of the fishing production.⁶³ Although both options are possible, the first one does not connect the trauma of the home and work abandonment with the calling of Jesus: if Andrew and Peter followed the Baptist, they had already broken with their obligations previously. Hence, they only change the prophet. In fact, the Jesus in John, except for Philip's case (1.43-44), does not summon his followers as it happens in the Synoptics,⁶⁴ neither does he chant slogans about the family and work rupture.

Only in Jn 21, added in a final edition, can we see Peter performing a fishing activity (Jn 21.1-8). Several analysts have proposed that this narration was shaped based on the miracle fishing of Lk 5 but then placed in a post

(*Pedro y Roma*, p. 24) support the hypothesis of a moving connected to work and tax reasons. Keener (*Gospel of John*, II, p. 481) considers that, despite his moving to Capernaum, the brothers maintained a commercial link with Bethsaida, probably being providers of its market.

62. de Boer, 'Andrew', pp. 142-43. Chrysostom (*Hom. Jo.* 19.1) emphasizes the messianic expectation and the predisposition of Andrew and his brother to receive Jesus' message. The bishop even highlights Andrew's apprehension, probably due to an exclusive sense of Israel, when talking to the Greeks that want to see Jesus in Jn 12.20-22 (*Hom. Jo.* 66.2).

63. Haenchen (*John I*, p. 165) thinks that Andrew as well as Peter and Philip could have been part of the group of the Baptist. Cf. Cullmann, *Peter*, p. 23; Gnilka, *Pedro y Roma*, p. 36.

64. However, on four occasions, Jesus mentions that he has chosen (*ἐκλέγομαι*) his disciples (Jn 6.70; 13.18; 15.16, 19). Brown (*Gospel according to John I*, pp. 78-79) observes that the discipleship in the Gospel of John is born from a challenge that Jesus poses to 'come' to him (Jn 1.39; 3.21; 5.40; 6.35, 37, 44-45, 65; 7.37).

Paschal time. It would not be at all unlikely that, with a conciliatory purpose in mind, the editor of John has resorted to one episode of the Lukan tradition in which Peter was the main character.⁶⁵ The fact that Zebedee's sons appear here too—absent in the rest of the account and obvious representative figures of Judaizing Christianity—would seem to support this hypothesis. Those absent, unless we identify them in the two anonymous disciples (Jn 21.2), are Andrew and Philip.⁶⁶ Are they not mentioned in order to empathize with the groups that praise Peter? If we hold this theory, it would be very difficult to propose that, as opposed to Zebedee's sons, who acted together until the execution of James under Herod Agrippa's orders (Acts 12.2), Andrew and Peter followed different paths and that the first generations of believers knew it.

The fishing in Jn 21 does not seem to be recreational; instead, the disciples are looking for their food, that is to say, working, which clashes with the premises of the Synoptics about living off the hospitality of the believers (1 Cor. 9.3-12; Mk 6.10; Mt. 10.8-11; Lk. 9.4; 10.7-9). As in Luke's account, Peter is in charge of a small group, and we must assume that the boat belongs to him, since he is the one that takes the initiative.

The fact that the apostle is in his underclothes—this information is not present in Luke—probably points to a real facet of the work of sailors and fishermen, exposed to the burning sun, but it is also a resource drawn on by the author to show Peter's lack of preparation and his consequent hurry once the

65. E. Haenchen, *John 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 7–21* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), pp. 222-23; K. Quast, *Reading the Gospel of John: An Introduction* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), p. 141; J.P. Meier, *Rethinking the Historical Jesus: A Marginal Jew. Volume 2: Mentor, Message and Miracles* (5 vols.; AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 896-904; Keener (*Gospel of John*, II, pp. 1222-24). Bockmuehl (*Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 64) considers that the relation between Lk. 5.1-11 and Jn 21.1-8 must have been oral, a shared tradition, and not a written one. Abogunrin ('Three Variants Accounts', p. 59) and Brun ('Die Berufung der ersten jünger Jesu', p. 51) do not agree with this theory.

66. B. Lindars (*The Gospel of John* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986], pp. 624-25) does not know what to answer regarding the anonymity of the two disciples of Jn 21 but thinks that it is a strategy to point out that one of them is the beloved disciple. According to Dschulnigg ('Die Berufung der Jünger', pp. 434-36), Thomas replaces Philip in Jn 21, who would have served a negative function in Jn 14.8-11 when questioning the unity of Jesus with the Father. Cf. Brown, *Gospel according to John I*, p. 1068.

beloved disciple recognizes Jesus.⁶⁷ Peter dragging a net with one-hundred-and-fifty-three fish without breaking it (cf. Lk. 5) is the beginning of the missionary and ecclesiastic reflection, condensed in this chapter.⁶⁸

From Ignorant Fishermen to Great Apostles

The construction of the solemn apostolic profile was a process that took place throughout the second and third centuries, in which the successive generations of believers turned to Peter and Andrew to synthesize in them the ideals of mission, sanctity, martyrdom and, above all, authority. Along this path, the information about the fisherman trade carried out by these men-turned into a datum with ambiguous value. On the one hand, it highlighted the divine preference for the humble, but on the other, it converted Christian faith into the target for mockery and ironies since it was a trade deemed shameful, yet its production enjoyed good reputation.⁶⁹

67. Haenchen (*John I*, p. 223) observes, in Peter's hasty attitude, certain competence with the beloved disciple, and considers that the *διεζώσατο* in Jn 21.7 is the precedent of the *ἐζώνυες σκαυτόν* (Jn 21.18), preparing himself for what Jesus will say in 21.18. Lindars (*Gospel of John*, p. 628) sees here an example of Peter's loyalty and his vigorous body; R.E. Brown (*The Gospel according to John II [XIII–XXI]* [New York: Doubleday, 1970], p. 1072) and Keener (*Gospel of John*, II, pp. 1228–30) agree with that but believe that Peter's nakedness would simply imply wearing a tunic, not being totally naked, which is offensive to the Jewish sensitivity. For M.W.G. Stibbe (*John* [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], pp. 210–11), Peter covering his nudity would suppose a feeling of embarrassment before Jesus similar to the one of Adam and Eve before God after sinning.

68. Brown (*Gospel according to John II*, pp. 1075–76) dismisses the interpretations about the number and considers that this stems from the testimony of the beloved disciple, who would have counted the fishes; on the other hand, Bultmann (*Gospel of John*, pp. 708–9) discredits the historical foundation of the numerical datum, which he deems as purely symbolic. Cf. Haenchen, *John I*, p. 224; Abogunrin, 'Three Variants Accounts', p. 59; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, pp. 629–31; Keener, *Gospel of John*, II, pp. 1231–33; M. Rastoin, 'Encore une fois les 153 poissons (Jn 21,11)', *Bib* 90 (2009), pp. 84–92. Following some naturalists who proposed that there were one hundred and fifty-three species of fish, Jerome (*Comm. Ezech.* 14.47.1–12) sees in this detail the indication of a mission addressed to every man.

69. In the Greco-Roman literature, fishermen were introduced as poor but gifted people with a special commercial cleverness when they sold their product (see Apuleius, *Metam.* 1.18; Seneca the Younger, *Ep.* 95.42; Suetonius, *Tib.* 34; Juvenal,

The fisherman stigma seems to have been kept much more related to Peter's character than to Andrew's and, perhaps, this is associated with the traditions gathered by Luke and John, which do not present the latter working hand in hand with his brother. More precisely, it is the book of Acts that first achieves a balance between the harsh critics connected to Peter's low social background and trade, and his projection as a powerful orator and visionary. The criticism seems to have originated within the Jewish circles, because, as we have seen before, the priests of Jerusalem stigmatize Peter and John as ἀγράμματοί and ἰδιῶται as regards their limited knowledge of the Law (Acts 4.13). Furthermore, the crowd underestimates them for being Galileans (Acts 2.7), a feature specially linked to Peter (Mk 14.70; Mt. 26.73; Lk. 22.59), and they are attributed the vice of wine (Acts 2.13, 15).⁷⁰ Comparably, in the Epistle of Barnabas, in the first years of the second century, it is said that the apostles were 'unjust regarding the Law about all sin' (ὕπερ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους [Barn. 5.9]), clearly making reference to their little notion about the legal regulations of Israel due to their rustic origins. Nevertheless, the author stands out in that Jesus manifested his strength and divinity by summoning these sinners, instead of those considered just. Likewise, in Acts, the detractors are answered back when introducing Peter as a magnificent preacher well-versed in the Scriptures and expert on the prophesies about the Messiah of Israel (Acts 2.15-21, 25-28, 34-35; 3.22-25; 4.10-11).⁷¹ Even more, the ex-fisherman turns into the recipient of special spiritual grace that makes him capable of discovering frauds (Acts 5.1-11), healing the sick (Acts 3.1-10;

Sat. 4.25; Plautus, *Rud.* 283-296; Vergil, *Aen.* 12.518-520; Ovid, *Metam.* 583-591). See also T.H. Corcoran, 'Roman Fishermen', *CJ* 56 (1963), pp. 97-102 (101-2); J. Wilkins, 'Fish as a Source of Food in Antiquity', in T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.), *Ancient Fishing and Fish Processing in the Black Sea Region* (Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 2005), pp. 21-30; E. Lytle, 'Ἡ θάλασσα κοινή: Fishermen, the Sea, and the Limits of Ancient Greek Regulatory Reach', *CIAnt* 31 (2012), pp. 1-55 (36-49).

70. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), p. 235; Pervo, *Acts*, p. 69. In John (1.46; 7.15, 52), it is not Peter but Jesus who is discredited for being Galilean and illiterate. According to Brown (*Gospel according to John I*, p. 83) the aversion to Galilee could be related to the riot of Judas the Galilean (Acts 5.37; Josephus, *Ant.* 20.5.2).

71. Perkins, *Peter*, pp. 33-38.

5.15), resurrecting dead people (Acts 9.36-42) or even having ecstatic visions (Acts 10.9-16).⁷²

During the second and third centuries, Gentile critics were merciless, particularly with the trade of the first disciples. The most well-known case is that of Celsus, who, in his diatribe against Christian faith, was the first one to deploy as an argument the negative social and intellectual condition of the disciples. Origen questions that Celsus identifies the apostles as simple sailors (*ναῦται*), without stopping to specify the different trades on the sea (*Cels.* 1.62).⁷³ The philosopher and Alexandrine master only points at James and John as *ναῦται*, obviously for having a boat according to the Synoptics; on the other hand, Peter and Andrew would be *ἀλιεῖς*, simply owners of some nets, and we thus must assume they were much poorer.⁷⁴ With this, Origen develops the idea, already suggested by the Epistle of Barnabas, about the Christian disdain for the *sapientia mundi* regarded as something programmatic, that is to say, intrinsic to the manifestation and expansion of the faith. According to this apologetic premise,⁷⁵ Jesus chose men of poor education and low intelligence so as to evidence how the persuasion of divine power worked on them. This idea seems to be behind two expansions of Peter's biography designed to understand the crucial encounter with Jesus: (1) the legend that attributes to Peter a youth of orphanhood and poverty (Chrysostom, *Hom. Acts* 4; *Hom. Jo.* 2; Pseudo-Clementine, *Hom.* 12.6;

72. This introduction of Peter as a great orator and teacher will continue in *Acts Pet.* and in the Pseudo-Clementine writings. Bond, 'When Supporting Characters Move to Centre Stage', pp. 58-60; B. De Vos, 'The Literary Characterisation of Peter in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies: Life-Guide, Rhetorician, and Philosopher', in J.M. Lieu (ed.), *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader* (Leuven: Peeters, 2021), pp. 483-509 (484, 488-93, 499-509).

73. For Aelian, *ναῦται* and *ἀλιεῖς* are interchangeable terms (*Nat. an.* 14.29).

74. Regarding Peter's trade, in the Pseudo-Clementine writings, there is disparity, given that in *Rec.* 1.62,2 he is introduced as a fisherman, but in *Homilies* there is no mention of the work of the apostle.

75. It is also supported by Lactantius (*Inst.* 5.2.17), Eusebius of Caesarea (*Dem. ev.* 3.7.5-6, 8), Chromatius of Aquileia (*Comm. Matt.* 16.1) and even the Pseudo-Clementine writings (*Rec.* 1.62). R.L. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), pp. 95-101; R. Burnet, 'Peter, the Visionary before the Pope: Early Receptions of the Apostle in Marginal Communities', in R. Dijkstra (ed.), *The Early Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter (60–800 CE)* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), pp. 99-112 (109).

Gregory the Great, *Hom. Gos.* 5.2); (2) his martyrdom, the ultimate expression of the impulse of the divine virtue. The martyr Peter begins to be outlined in Jn 21 and then is developed by Clement of Rome (1 Clem. 5.4), Ignatius of Antioch (Sm. 3.2), very likely the author of *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah* (4.2-3) and, especially, the author of *Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles*. It is interesting to observe that Clement of Alexandria gathers the datum that even Peter's wife was a martyr (*Strom.* 3.52.5; 7.63-64; cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.30.2; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.27), and that, when being taken to be tortured, her husband encouraged and comforted her.⁷⁶ Peter retains his condition of married man, a historical fact that the Evangelists already knew but did not develop.⁷⁷ The apostle and his wife are called 'the blessed marriage' (ὁ τῶν μακαρίων γάμος) in Clement's fragment, though later Origen (*Comm. Matt.* 15.21) will claim that Peter in effect abandoned his wife and his trade due to Jesus' calling. This tension in the traditions clearly points out the existence of conflicts in connection with sexual topics, of particular interest to the Encratite and Gnostic Christian groups, among whom Peter avoided female presence (*Pistis Sophia* 2.72; *Gos. Thom.* 114). For Clement of Alexandria, the apostle's family life, even after following Jesus, was not incompatible with a rigid conduct of chastity, an aspect evidenced mainly in the episode of Peter's daughter, recovered in *Strom.* 3.6, 52 (cf. *Acts Pet. 12 Apos.* 17.5 [P.Berol. 8502.4]; Augustine, *Adim.* 17.5).⁷⁸ The

76. M. Hengel, *Der unterschätzte Petrus: Zwei Studien* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), pp. 209-10. Cf. S. Witetschek, 'Die Frau des Petrus: Karriere einer Randfigur in der frühchristlichen Petrus-Memoria', in J.M. Lieu (ed.), *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader* (Leuven: Peeters, 2021), pp. 693-712 (702-5).

77. Witetschek ('Die Frau des Petrus', pp. 697-99) and Hengel (*Der unterschätzte Petrus*, pp. 176-219) interpret that Paul has already mentioned Peter's wife in 1 Cor. 9.5. We consider that it is more accurate to see in this female group the missionary support of the Galilean women disciples that have accompanied Jesus and his apostles to Jerusalem (Mk 15.40-41; Mt. 27.55-56; Lk. 8.1-3; 23.49, 55; Acts 1.14; Jn 19.25). Peter's wife is mentioned in the missionary team of the apostle in the Pseudo-Clementine writings (*Hom.* 13.1.1; *Rec.* 7.25.3; 9.38.11; 36.1). Witetschek, 'Die Frau des Petrus', pp. 699-702.

78. G. Aranda, 'El apóstol Pedro en la literatura gnóstica', in R. Aguirre Monasterio (ed.), *Pedro en la Iglesia primitiva* (Valencia, Spain: Verbo Divino, 1991), pp. 185-212 (203-4); F. Lapham, *Peter: The Myth, the Man and the Writings—A Study of Early Petrine Text and Tradition* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004), pp. 36-

apostle is shown as a prominent father and guardian of the virtue of his daughter, who, being sick, is preserved out of temptation, balancing home and community benefits. Evidently, the first generations of believers knew that Peter's family had been present in the first stages of the movement, and, very likely, the recovery of Peter's domestic and family image is one of the tools to revitalize the categorical aspect of his renunciation and abandonment of his work and bonds.

Andrew, on the other hand, does not attract too much attention to the Christian writers, but it seems that his traditions spread firmly in the second century, as Papias of Hierapolis knows about his words (λόγοι [Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.4]), apparently different from Peter's, and *Epistula Apostolorum* mentions him not only as one of the writer apostles (Ep. Ap. 2), but also as a witness of the corporeality of the resurrected (Ep. Ap. 11–12). The Acts of Andrew, produced towards the end of the second century, represent the greatest expression of the devotion of the apostle. In this account, which comes to us in fragments, Andrew's occupation and his kinship with Peter are completely omitted (such as in *Acts Pet. 12 Apos.*, though some Gospel episodes are reminisced upon, Andrew is not mentioned);⁷⁹ only the journey of the apostle to Achaëa and Macedonia, followed by his martyrdom, are narrated.⁸⁰

It seems that, apart from the separate traditions that the believers shaped for Peter and Andrew, characters of immense popularity in the churches, the search for a Gospel agreement eventually imposed the stance connected to

41; Witetschek, 'Die Frau des Petrus', pp. 705-9. In the fifth-century text *Acts of Nereus and Achilleus* (15), Peter's daughter named Petronilla is mentioned and her death is narrated.

79. Only Gregory of Tours (*The Book of the Miracles of the Blessed Andrew the Apostle* [Dallas Medieval Texts and Translations, 29; trans. Randy R. Richardson; Leuven: Peeters, 2022], p. 20)—this text is based on Acts of Andrew—narrates the vision in which Andrew is invited to drink from the same cup his brother has drunk, probably suggesting that Andrew was believed to have died after Peter.

80. Even though in Acts of Andrew a scene of the distribution of the missionary camps has not been kept, Andrew was sent to Patras as apostle by the Lord (Acts Andr. Vat 808). Burnet (*Les douze apôtres*, pp. 263-65) observes that this mission and the apostle's martyrdom in Greek lands contradicts the information that Origen has (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.1.1-3), according to which Andrew has preached in Scythia.

their joined work in the fishing industry. Therefore, we see that fishing is what connects Andrew and Peter according to the Gospel of the Ebionites (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.13.2-3) and the Gospel of Peter (14.60), in whose final scene both men are grabbing their nets and approaching a small group of disciples who are getting ready to go out on the boat. Even more, in the Gospel of Mary (P.Berol. 17–18), Andrew and Peter are the only apostles who question the revelations that Mary Magdalene has declared to the disciples.⁸¹ In spite of this proclaimed harmony between the brothers, there is a marked tendency towards considering John's version of the encounter of Jesus, first with Andrew and then with Peter, as the original one in the Gospel agreements (Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 10.6; Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* 14.2; Agustine, *Conc. Ev.* 2.17.3-4).⁸²

Not Fishermen but Shepherds

The order of being ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων in Mark and Matthew's texts (Mk 1.17; Mt. 4.19) is a metaphor of the first disciples, yet it defines their future mission. In Luke, the expression becomes stronger when Jesus names Peter as ἀνθρώπους ζωγρῶν ('hunter of living men') (Lk. 5.10). However, in Jn 21, despite the miraculous fishing he performs, Jesus identifies the apostle's mission with the verbs βόσσκω ('feeding') (Jn 21.15, 17) and ποιμαίνω ('herding') (Jn 21.16).⁸³ What happens here? Why is the fishing metaphor displaced?

It could be thought that the critics of the trade of Peter and the first disciples affected the consolidation of the fisherman simile as popular reference in connection with the ecclesiastic charges, but this would not be the case. It does not seem that the negative burden of the term lies in the socioeconomic level of those that performed the trade but rather in the implications of the ac-

81. Witetschek ('Die Frau des Petrus', p. 695) distinguishes between Andrew who criticizes the content of Mary Magdalene's revelation and Peter who rejects it for coming from a woman. A similar situation, though without Andrew's participation, is found in Gos. Thom. 114 and Pistis Sophia 1.36; 2.72. Cf. Burnet, *Les douze apôtres*, pp. 236-39.

82. Curiously, in *Acts Pet. Andr.* 1 (fifth century), the hierarchy between the brothers is highlighted, since Andrew calls Peter 'father' and Peter addresses him as 'brother'.

83. F.F. Felix, 'Fishing and Shepherding: A Literary-Critical Study of the Role of Peter as a Leader in John 21,1-23', in J.M. Lieu (ed.), *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader* (Leuven: Peeters, 2021), pp. 545-61 (558-59).

tivity. The book of Robert Eisler entitled *Orpheus the Fisher* observes how the fishing metaphor was used in the classic Greek tradition, which associated it with the capture of prisoners during war, and then in Hebrew culture, which interpreted it more as an educational punishment in which the divinely commissioned fishermen, as the Assyrians and Babylonians, executed God's trials towards its people.⁸⁴ Wilhelm Wuellner, on the other hand, analyzes the concept of fishing allegorically to talk about the functions of the great figures of Israel: kings, judges, prophets, priests and wisemen.⁸⁵ Where they complied with their obligations correctly, there was balance; if they failed to do so, they became corrupted and turned into men's hunters, leading the people to degeneration. In spite of this, in Second Temple Judaism, different considerations about fishing in certain Jewish groups (e.g. the Essenes) are found. For them and probably for John the Baptist too, 'fishing men' was understood in the eschatological sense.⁸⁶ In contrast, Rabbinic Judaism proposed two interpretations about the fishing metaphor, on the one hand, a soteriological interpretation, in which the rabbis were the ones in charge of keeping the believers in the waters of the Covenant and, on the other hand, a war interpretation, since the hunter Esau, the patriarch brother of Jacob, was identified as the prefiguration of the fake masters that caught men with their words.⁸⁷ Several scholars try to comprehend why the title 'fisher of men' was not included in the figurative ecclesiastic vocabulary, but instead was marginalized in comparison to others. Meinertz and Grant recognized in the concepts ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων/ ἀνθρώπους ζωγρῶν an authoritarian touch that led us to see those who held it as representatives of God's wrath.⁸⁸ Eisler points out that Jesus

84. R. Eisler, *Orpheus the Fisher: Comparative Studies in Orphic and Early Christian Cult Symbolism* (London: J.M. Watkins, 1921), pp. 1-50, 156-83.

85. Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 100-105.

86. C.W. Smith, 'Fishers of Men', *HTR* 52 (1959), pp. 187-203. Some authors of the patristic era used the fishing/hunting metaphor in this sense (e.g. Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.9; Chromatius of Aquileia, *Comm. Matt.* 16.2; Jerome, *Ep.* 71.1).

87. Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 108-26; S. Weingarten, 'Fish and Fish Products in Late Antique Palestine and Babylonia in their Social and Geographical Context: Archaeology and the Talmudic Literature', *JMA* 13 (2018), pp. 235-45 (239-43).

88. M. Meinertz, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (2 vols.; Bonn: Hanstein, 1950), II, pp. 172-73; R.M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 317.

applied to the fishing metaphor, which carried a strong negative sense in the popular Jewish tradition, a soteriological connotation.⁸⁹ Betz agrees with this hypothesis and suggests that the names 'fishers of men' and 'sons of the thunder' (Βοανεργές [Mk 3.17]), with strong war content, were given by the historical Jesus within the context of a holy war against Satan, but not with threatening intentions.⁹⁰ Based on these analyses, Wuellner notes that the idea of fishing in Jesus' proposal to the disciples is aimed at requesting their active participation in God's work. The eschatological fishing of men is about teaching the meaning of the kingdom, a task to which the twelve are devoted; they are the new symbolic Israel, the ones in charge of extending the knowledge of salvation. However, Wuellner highlights that only the apostles are called fishers of men, since they are the direct collaborators of Jesus, different from the role of the church as a separated and organized sect.⁹¹

If we take the Gospels as guidance, we can observe that the Synoptics vindicate the idea of fishing as the metaphor of the mission of the twelve, while John's text does not only avoid mentioning the twelve but also remains silent about the simile connected to the fishing activity. One of the main reasons for this could be that Peter holds a secondary place in the memory of the community that gave rise to this text, whose witness par excellence is the beloved disciple. Moreover, looking into the structure of John, we can see the strong impression of the image of Jesus as ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός ('the good shepherd' (Jn 10.11, 14), a Christological simile that seems to come from the Old Testament traditions that identify God as the shepherd of Israel.⁹² In the description of

89. Eisler, *Orpheus the Fisher*, p. 126.

90. O. Betz, 'Jesu Heiliger Krieg', *NovT* 2 (1958), pp. 116-37.

91. Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 141-46, 152.

92. Jer. 23.1-8; 23.3-4; Ezra 34.1-23; Zech. 11.16-17; Mic. 2.12. The title of shepherd applied to the monarchs of Israel seems to have been used retrospectively by the prophets to complain about those who have been bad rulers. It is God who always holds par excellence the title of shepherd (Gen. 49.24; 48.15; Hos. 4.16; Isa. 40.10-11; 49.9; Pss. 23.1-3; 28.9; 74.1; 77.20-21; 78.52; 79.3, 13; 80.1-2; 95.7; 100.1-3; 121.4). S. Mittmann, 'Aufbau und Einheit des Dankleids Psalm 23', *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 77 (1980), pp. 1-23; B. Willmes, *Die sogenannte Hirtenallegorie Ez. 34: Studien zum Bild des Hirten im Alten Testament* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang 1984); J. Beutler, 'Der alttestamentlich-jüdische Hintergrund der Hirtenrede in Johannes 10', in J. Beutler and R.T. Fortna (eds.), *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context: Studies by Members of the Johannine Writings Seminar*

the ideal shepherd, his character is contrasted with that of the *μισθωτός*, the wage earner, who takes care of the flock for a payment. This subordinate should not be seen as an enemy,⁹³ but as a criticism to the leaders that exert an institutionalized authority over the community. The only shepherd is Jesus (cf. Rev. 2.27; 7.17; 12.5; 19.15; Heb. 13.20), and the rest of them are his subordinates. Peter himself, following the dialogue in Jn 21.15-17, is introduced under the intriguing terms of being a wage earner who is commissioned by the owner of the flock.⁹⁴

In the parable of the net that drags everything and from which the fishermen choose what was caught (only included in Mt. 13.47-50), we found a violent eschatological image of the Kingdom that does not seem to fit in completely with the institutional perspective of the believers of the end of the first century and the beginning of the second.⁹⁵ The *ἀλιεῖς* are, after all, hunters whose trade causes the death of their preys. In contrast, the shepherd figure appears to be calm and intermediary already in the parable of the lost sheep (Q 16.4-5a, 7 = Mt. 18.12-14; Lk. 15.3-7; Gos. Thom. 107), incarnating in this way a stressed missionary sense.

The popularity of the term 'shepherd' can be verified in the literature of this third generation of believers, when it turns out to be a technical term referring to community leaders (Eph. 4.11; 1 Pet. 5.2-4; Acts 20.28-31; Ign.

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 18-32 (25-30); J.D. Turner, 'The History of Religions Background of John 10', in J. Beutler and R.T. Fortna (eds.), *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context: Studies by Members of the Johannine Writings Seminar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 33-52 (38).

93. The enemy would clearly be the wolf (Jn 10.12). This image is also present in Mt. 7.15; Acts 20.29; Q 10.3 (Mt. 10.16); Lk. 10.3. Turner, 'History of Religions Background of John 10', p. 48.

94. J. Painter, 'Tradition, History and Interpretation in John 10', in J. Beutler and R.T. Fortna (eds.), *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context: Studies by Members of the Johannine Writings Seminar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 53-74 (63-64).

95. This fragment specifies that the net is *σαγήνη* ("drag net") which would have between 150- to 250-meters long and would need to be moved by approximately fifteen men (cf. Qoh. 7.26; Ezek. 26.5, 14; 47.10; Hab. 1.16). Troche, 'Ancient Fishing Methods', pp. 282-85.

Rom. 9.1; *Ign. Phld.* 2.1-2; *Jude* 12; *Mart. Ascen. Isa.* 3.23-25).⁹⁶ The shift to an indefinite time of the second coming of Christ and the emergence of urban Christian intellectuals would have put the eschatology associated with segregation and violence in a secondary place. It is highlighted that the message of salvation preached is not comparable to a discriminatory judgement, but to salvation (2 *Thess.* 2.9-10; *Jas* 1.19-25; *Heb.* 4.1-3; *Jn* 12.46-47; *Ign. Eph.* 10.1–11.1), thus fostering a more peaceful cohabitation with the surrounding society.⁹⁷

3. Conclusion

The social and economic reality of the fishermen of Herodian Galilee made them prone to adhere to movements of national renovation. Embedded in a heavy chain of dependencies, and despite receiving a relatively positive return on their merchandise, the awardee of the fishing rights as well as the *μισθωτοί* who were hired temporarily in the boats would have posed a huge challenge to the system when removed from the work activity to live a nomadic life based on preaching. If we believe Mark and Matthew's accounts, Peter and Andrew did not have much to lose given that they seem to have been in a frustrating situation: submerged in Gennesaret Lake with their nets, working during the day, without a boat, and, apparently without much success.

The progressive popularity of Peter is combined with controversy about the calling traditions, evident in the disagreements expressed in the Gospels of Luke and John. Luke makes Peter out to be a boss of a fishing company, marks in stages his approach to Jesus and deliberately eliminates Andrew; in contrast, John moves the brother's encounter with the Master to Judea and gives priority to Andrew, who brings Peter and is the first one to acknowledge

96. Bockmuehl (*Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory*, p. 31) and D.G. Horrell ('Peter Remembered in 1 Peter? Representations, Images, Traditions', in J.M. Lieu [ed.], *Peter in the Early Church: Apostle—Missionary—Church Leader* [Leuven: Peeters, 2021], pp. 179-208 [192-93]) observe that 1 *Pet.* 5.2-4 goes back to the image of the wage earner shepherd of *Jn* 21.

97. In Paleo-Christian art, we found the motives of fishing and the boat but brief in comparison with that of the shepherd. Eisler, *Orpheus the Fisher*, pp. 208-10; Wuellner, *Meaning of 'Fishers of Men'*, pp. 239-42; J. Daniélou, *Les symboles chrétiens primitifs* (Paris: Seuil, 1996 [1961]), pp. 49-76.

Jesus as the Messiah. Curiously enough, the fishing trade of the brothers disappears in the Fourth Gospel, which gives us a hint to think that probably the Jewish and Gentile intellectuals are criticizing the new faith with the argument about the low socio-economic background of the first disciples. This would explain the persistence of the author of the double Lukan work in making a great orator, miracle worker and visionary of Peter. The apostle gains in spiritual and moral stature, leaving behind his humble origins thanks to—as proposed in the Epistle of Barnabas and then in Origen—divine grace. Peter is not only transformed into an accomplished preacher, but also into a martyr and a diligent father of a family. Moreover, Andrew's character achieved considerable fame, as his words were known, and he was praised as Patras's evangelist. Although both brothers had their separate traditions, the authors of the patristic writings defended their joint fishing work, but prioritized John's account with regard to the first encounter with Jesus.

Peter and Andrew's trade had, apart from its concrete social conditions, a very strong symbolic value. Nevertheless, the ecclesiastic tradition did not show sympathy for the term 'fisherman' to name the emerging community leaders. The image of the sea worker referred to the imaginary of the prophetic eschatology of Israel: the fishermen commissioned by God were the executors of his wrath. Even though Jesus understood the expression ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων/ἀνθρώπους ζωγρῶν with a soteriological logic and as a collaboration with the expansion of the kingdom, which makes sense in the historic circumstance that gave rise to its movement, the believers of the beginning of the second century were fully immersed in the shepherd simile to synthesize the ideal of community leadership. This is really evident in Jn 21, in which Peter, after accomplishing a successful fishing trip, is approached by Jesus as a wage earner shepherd under his command. The fishing metaphor, of great missionary sense, assumes after all a war factor associated with violence which is less favourable for the social insertion of Christianity.