CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

Introduction



While Christians may believe that all Scripture is useful (cf. 2 Tim. 3:16), not all Scripture is equally used. With the major theological influences of texts like Matthew, Romans, John, or Hebrews, 2 Peter may seem an insignificant addition to the New Testament corpus. Furthermore, the epistle of 2 Peter has the most checkered past of any work in the New Testament.[1] Belonging to the "catholic epistles,"[2] which themselves are often neglected, 2 Peter was a letter heavily disputed in regard to its authenticity and canonical status. Its debated status in the early church led to it being one of the last documents agreed upon in the New Testament canon. As Kelly summarizes, "no NT document had a longer or tougher struggle to win acceptance than 2 Peter."[3] The Reformers shared misgivings as well over the nature of the letter's authorship. Calvin was aware of the stylistic differences that distinguished it from 1 Peter, though he concluded on theological grounds that its inclusion in the canon merited recognition of Peter as its author.[4]

These historical questions no doubt continue to cast a shadow upon 2 Peter today. The *Revised Common Lectionary* contains only two inclusions of 2 Peter in its readings, one as a reading for the Transfiguration (2 Peter 1:16–21) and another during Advent (2 Peter 3:8–15a).[5] At roughly

[1] As Peter Davids describes, it has become the "ugly stepchild" of the New Testament (Peter H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006], 121).
[2] This grouping includes Hebrews, James, 1–2 Peter, 1–3 John, and Jude.
[3] J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1969), 224.
[4] John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles* (Edinburgh: The Calvin Translation Society, 1855), 363.
[5] Pheme Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 2.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

1,100 words,[6] this letter offers a brief but forceful contribution to the collection of the New Testament. In all the questions of its origins and authenticity in the early church, what was never in question was its consistency with apostolic teaching. It is perhaps that reason above all others that 2 Peter was and should continue to be embraced by Christians despite the historical questions that surround it.

The letter contains two primary points of focus, both functioning as rebuttals to the influence of certain false teachers within the community. First, the letter maintains the importance of the Second Coming, or παρουσία, of Christ, and the judgment that he will bring at his return. Here, again, we stand in the tradition of the apostolic faith. The Apostles' Creed, for example, affirms that Christ will come again from heaven "to judge the living and the dead," an event described or referenced widely across the New Testament (Matt. 24:30–51; 25:1–13, 31–46; Mark 13:20–37; Luke 12:35–59; 17:20–37; 21:5–38; Acts 1:10–11; 1 Cor. 15:35–58; Phil. 3:20; Col. 3:4; 1 Thess. 1:9–10; 4:16–17; 5:2–4; 2 Thess. 1:7–10; 2:1–8; 1 Tim. 6:14–15; 2 Tim. 4:1; Titus 2:13; Heb. 9:28; Jas. 5:7–8; 1 Pet. 1:7; 5:4; 1 John 2:28; 3:2; Rev. 1:7; 3:11; 16:15; 22:7–20). Second, the letter emphasizes the theme of moral holiness, which it relates closely to the παρουσία. Followers of Jesus are to live life in transformative union with God, growing in conformity to his character until the day of Christ's return and the consummation of their salvation. Though its contents are brief, its history is checkered, and its tone may be even off-putting to a modern audience, there is indeed still great wisdom contained with this oft-neglected letter.

READING SCRIPTURE AS ANCIENT TEXTS

As late-modern readers of the New Testament, it is inescapable that our own preconceptions, presuppositions, and frameworks influence how we interpret New Testament texts. While our own interests and agendas need not completely be set aside as we interact with the scriptural texts, a first point of consideration ought to be the historical context and function of these texts in their original settings. To some extent we must speculate over what exactly these situations were, and this is certainly the case with 2 Peter, a letter whose historical situation is murky at best. To undertake a historical

[6] Only 2 Thessalonians, Titus, Philemon, 2 John, 3 John, and Jude are shorter.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

orientation to the text, we must immerse ourselves into the ancient world, and its values, beliefs, customs, and social arrangements. These features of the ancient world offer commonalities to our own situations and in other ways offer stark contrasts. Knowing the difference requires the reader to be attuned both to the settings of the ancient world, particularly as it relates to Greco-Roman and Jewish contexts, as well as to their own world. It is these "two horizons"[7] to which we as readers must attend.

The New Testament is a product of the literary conventions and methods of the ancient world.[8] What we find in its pages, though in some respects unique, quite often feels "at home" with the literary styles and rhetorical forms of the Greco-Roman world and Second Temple Judaism. When we compare what we know from the New Testament itself of its composition, distribution, and strategies of persuasion, we find significant overlap with the common practices of literary production from the ancient world.[9]

Second Peter, as a "catholic epistle," fits the mold of an "ancient letter," though not all the components usually found in such documents can be found within its contents.[10] Since the author identifies its form as a letter (3:1), and its introduction and conclusion follow other epistolary conventions, such an identification is uncontroversial. Many documents in the ancient world, however, evidence a "blending" of genres. It has become customary among scholars to also categorize 2 Peter under the genre of ancient Jewish testament, an identification that, perhaps most notably, Richard Bauckham makes in his influential commentary.[11]

[7] Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).

[8] For a study of ancient Jewish letter writing, see Lutz Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

[9] See, for example, E. Randolph Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2004); Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *Paul the Ancient Letter Writer: An Introduction to Epistolary Analysis* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016).

[10] See, for example, Jerome Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, Anchor Bible Commentary (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 246.

[11] Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter,* WBC (Nashville: Word, 1983), 131. The genesis of the view appears to originate with Johannes Muck, "Discours d'Adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la Literature Biblique," in *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne Mélanges Offerts a M. Maurice Goguel a l'Occasion de Son Soixante-Dixième Anniversaire* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950), 155–70.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

The identification of 2 Peter as a testament has proved a more controversial claim.[12] The testament was an ancient literary form in Second Temple Judaism, written under the name of a long-deceased figure, in which their final words are recounted, typically along with a deathbed scene. According to Bauckham, testaments typically contained both ethical admonitions and revelations of the future.[13] He cites 2 Peter 1:12–15 as evidence that "would leave no contemporary reader in doubt that 2 Peter belonged to the genre of 'testament.'"[14] Within more recent scholarship, however, such certainty about the testamentary nature of 2 Peter has been questioned. Formal Jewish testamentary literature (e.g., *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*,[15] *Testament of Moses*, and *Testament of Job*) contains a narrative framework in which the main character offers a deathbed speech preceding the event of their death and recounting significant aspects of their life.[16] As Bauckham notes, this is usually accompanied by some form of ethical instruction or apocalyptic vision forming the content of the author's last words.[17] While 2 Peter does contain some features found in testamentary literature (particularly its ethical and apocalyptic elements, as well as its reference to Peter being near the end of his life), it does not contain the narrative framework present in other testaments, nor a description of Peter's death or a deathbed scenario. To complicate matters further for Bauckham's categorization, no other examples of a testament in epistolary form currently exist.[18]

[12] Bauckham's thesis has been quite influential in New Testament scholarship. Scholars who follow his designation include N. T. Wright and Michael Bird, *The New Testament in Its World: An Introduction to the History, Literature, and Theology of the First Christians* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019), 765; and David deSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods, and Ministry Formation* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2004), among many others. Such a designation is often taken for granted in present NT scholarship.

[13] Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter*, 131. Bauckham cites genre parallels as *T. Mos.*; *T. 12 Patr.*; *T. Job*; *1 Enoch* 91–104; Tob. 14:3–11; 4 Ezra 14:28–36; *2 Apoc. Bar.* 57–86; *Jub.* 21–22; 35–36:18; *Bib. Ant.* 19:1–5; 24:1–5; 28:3–4, 5–10; 33; *Adam and Eve* 25–29; Josephus, *Ant.* 4.309-19.

[14] Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter*, 132.

[15] This text is included though its origin is debated as to whether its composition was from Jewish or Christian circles.

[16] Robert A. Kugler, "Testaments," in *The Eerdman's Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 1295; David A. deSilva, "Testament of Moses," in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 1195.

[17] deSilva, "Testament of Moses," 1195.

[18] For a recent analysis of these issues, see Mark D. Mathews, "The Genre of 2 Peter: A Comparison with Jewish and Early Christian Testaments," *BBR* 21.1 (2011): 51–64.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

Bauckham suggests that 2 Peter, as a testament, would have been a sort of "transparent fiction," meaning it would be widely known that as a testament, Peter was not the actual author of the document, similar to other pseudonymous ancient Jewish works.[19] In their essay, Richards and Boyle argue that the testamentary genre was actually not understood in the ancient world as "obviously pseudonymous" as Bauckham has suggested. In examining the reception of testaments by other ancient authors, Richards and Boyle conclude, "In these texts, there is no hint that their authors or audiences knew the testaments were pseudepigraphic. Rather, the ancient authors appeared to cite the testamentary material as authentic, reliable, even authoritative tradition."[20] If this is the case, accepting testaments as a "transparent fiction" seems a difficult possibility as it relates to 2 Peter's authorship and genre. Since it is likewise known that ancient authors were at times suspicious of texts known to be pseudonymous, substantial evidence to the contrary would need to be offered to establish Bauckham's claim in light of Richards' and Boyle's challenge.

In interacting with the genesis of the testamentary thesis from Munck, Mark Mathews argues that whereas testaments and "farewell speeches" are sometimes conflated, Munck's work maintained a distinction between the two and identified 2 Peter as a form of farewell speech.[21] Mathews notes

Bauckham cites *2 Apoc. Bar.* 78–86 as an example of an epistolary testament (Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter*, 133). The parallels, however, are not exact. The *Epistle of Baruch* is a letter embedded within a narrative, though the Syriac form of the letter appears to have circulated apart from the narrative. While the letter does contain testamentary features (Lutz Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012], 252), it lacks the characteristics of a formal testament mentioned above. Further, concerning 2 Peter, as Mathews states, the text being written so close to the death of the individual in question would be an anomaly for the genre as well (Mathews, "The Genre of 2 Peter," 63).

19 For a critique of pseudepigraphic testaments being transparent fictions, see E. Randolph Richards and Kevin J. Boyle, "Did the Ancients Know the Testaments Were Pseudepigraphic? Implications for 2 Peter," *BBR* 30.3 (2020): 403–23. On the broader question, see Terry L. Wilder, "Revisiting Pseudonymity, the New Testament, and the Noble Lie," *JBTM* 19.2 (2022): 367–80. Meier suggests that the author of 2 Peter did not even try to emulate Peter in his authoring of this text (John P. Meier, "Forming the Canon on the Edge of the Canon: 2 Peter 3:8–18," *Mid-Stream* 38 (1999): 65–70). Wright and Bird largely follow Bauckham's assessment, Wright and Bird, *The New Testament in Its World*, 765. See also I. Howard Marshall, *New Testament Theology: Many Witnesses, One Gospel* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2004), 670.

20 Richards and Boyle, "Did the Ancients Know the Testaments Were Pseudepigraphic?," 422.

21 Mathews, "The Genre of 2 Peter," 54.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

Bo Reicke developed the argument further to suggest that, since testaments grew out of the farewell speech, 2 Peter could be associated with the genre of testament, though Reicke also downplayed its epistolary features.[22]

Formal Jewish testaments, of which scholars of Judaism typically identify only three texts (*Testament of Moses*, *Testament of Job*, and *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*) contain the following literary features: (1) a narrative framework with an introduction to the testator and a conclusion that narrates their death and (2) the presence of parenesis, eschatological or apocalyptic material, or both.[23] Based on these criteria, only the three aforementioned texts may be classified as Jewish testaments. While 2 Peter alludes to its author being near the end of their life and contains both parenesis and eschatological/apocalyptic material, it lacks the features of the narrative framework found in our other testaments. Davids, in comparison, notes five common features of Jewish testaments, with some obvious overlap: (1) they are embedded in narrative or historical frameworks; (2) they provide a final charge from the hero to their children or followers; (3) they contain prophecies about the futures of the individuals addressed; (4) there is a deathbed scene and final blessing; (5) they are typically written centuries or millennia after the death of their figure of focus.[24] By his criteria, 2 Peter matches almost none of the required criteria of a Jewish testament. Davids also summarizes the characteristics of farewell speeches, which he states contain five major features: (1) prediction of death, (2) prediction of future crises, (3) exhortation to virtue, (4) blessing or commission, and (5) reference to the legacy of the dying person.[25] Here again, while 2 Peter shares certain features of this form (particularly 1–4, though number 4 is common of epistles in general), it does not fit the mold entirely. Mathews concludes his study in stating:

> While 2 Peter does include some basic elements of the tradition of the farewell speech, it lacks significant features that are evident in most testaments, that is, deathbed scene, ancient figure from Israel's past, death, burial, response. More importantly, it lacks the most consistent element, the third-person narrative framework.[26]

[22] Mathews, "The Genre of 2 Peter," 55.
[23] Kugler, "Testaments," 1295. For further discussion, see Mathews, "The Genre of 2 Peter," 51–64.
[24] Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 146.
[25] Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 191–92.
[26] Mathews, "The Genre of 2 Peter," 63–64.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

On the basis of this evidence, we ought to say that some elements of the literary genres/forms of the testament or farewell speech have been integrated into 2 Peter, but 2 Peter, quite simply, should be classified as an ancient letter rather than both a letter and testament.[27]

While discussion of authorship will follow below, the lack of conformity to the genre of a testament undercuts part of Bauckham's argument of 2 Peter's origins. He states: "The evidence which really rules out composition *during Peter's lifetime* is that of literary genre and that of date. Either of these might be fatal for any degree of Petrine authorship. Together they must be regarded as entirely conclusive against Petrine authorship."[28] If we remove the label of "testament" from 2 Peter, which the above evidence indicates we should, Bauckham's argument of reading 2 Peter as a "transparent fiction" misunderstands the nature of the letter. The date of the letter, however, is another matter entirely, which will be addressed shortly below.

Second Peter adopts the general framework and expectation that ancient letters carried, though the application of the standard features of letters could be broad. Ancient letters in the Greco-Roman world could take the form of personal correspondence, business discussions and transactions, official legal or governmental correspondence, or religious treaties, prayers, and curses.[29] Letters were often viewed as personal correspondences, representing the presence of a person in their physical absence. Demetrius understood them to imitate a conversation (*On Style*, 223–27).

[27] According to Bauckham, Most ancient pseudepigraphal letters can be classified as either imaginative literature . . . or historiography (Richard Bauckham, "Pseudo-Apostolic Letters," *JBL* 107.3 [1988]: 475). In these cases, Bauckham argues, the author "does not want his fictional letter to perform for him and his readers the function which an authentic real letter would perform" (Bauckham, "Pseudo-Apostolic Letters," 477). Should the author want to address a contemporary audience in a way that would impact their behavior and beliefs, Bauckham suggests their apparent options were to address the ancient ancestors of the audience, to depict the historical situation in a way analogous to the contemporary one, or to author their letter as a testament or farewell speech (Bauckham, "Pseudo-Apostolic Letters," 477. As noted previously, the examples of Jewish pseudepigraphal letters that Bauckham suggests as parallels to his classification of 2 Peter as a testamentary-letter are both insufficient parallels (they typically occur as a part of larger texts) and are not of the same epistolary nature as 2 Peter. See, again, the critique in Mathews, "The Genre of 2 Peter," 51–64. The evidence for an established genre of "testamentary letter" appears much thinner than Bauckham concludes.

[28] Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter*, 159.

[29] See John White, "The Greek Documentary Letter Tradition Third Century BCE to Third Century CE," *Semeia* 22 (1981): 89–106.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

Seneca couched a successful letter as giving the air of a conversation had sitting in the company of another (*Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium*, 75.1). White defines the form as "a written message . . . sent because the corresponding parties are separated spatially . . . [for] keeping oral conversation in motion . . . either to disclose/seek information or needing to request/command something of the recipient."[30] Letters thus had inherent rhetorical intent, depending on the goals the author wanted to achieve.

While distinct forms of letters can be categorized (personal, official, or business, for example), these could also be mixed for various purposes.[31] Writing on Paul's letters, Judd notes that these documents are personal in tone and yet contain a mixture of personal and religious/philosophical remarks. He anticipates his letters will be read publicly in various Christian communities, making them not entirely private documents, and integrates a blend of the personal and religious functions of ancient letters.[32] Second Peter likewise contains some mix of personal elements, though with limited details and combined with focused religious content, directed particularly toward the situation of its recipients. Second Peter's classification as a letter is most appropriate. As a letter, however, understanding the particular situation and social dynamics of the author-audience relationship has historically proved difficult due to the questions that surround its historical locatedness.

AUTHORSHIP AND DATE

Second Peter opens with an apparently straightforward identification of its author: "Simeon Peter, a slave and apostle of Jesus Christ" (Συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). On appearances, this seems a clear designation of the letter as originating with Simon Peter, the passionate disciple of Jesus and major apostolic leader in the early church. Simon and his brother Andrew were the first disciples Jesus called at the outset of his

[30] White, "The Greek Documentary Letter Tradition," 91.
[31] Judd has recently challenged that genres themselves are never static entities but have relatively stable structures that authors use to convey meaning but can be modified for various purposes (Andrew Judd, *Modern Genre Theory: An Introduction for Biblical Studies* [HarperCollins, 2024], 3–82).
[32] Judd, *Modern Genre Theory*, 227–28.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

public ministry (cf. Matt. 4:18–19; Mark 1:16).[33] Peter is named first in Mark's list of the twelve (cf. 3:13–18), followed by James and John, who together are portrayed as the central circle of Jesus' disciples in the Gospels. Peter and his brother were fishermen by trade before they embarked with Jesus on his itinerant ministry. Peter, perhaps most famous for his public denial of Jesus (Matt. 26:69–75; Mark 14:66–72; Luke 22:54–62; John 18:15–18, 25–27) and his forceful personality, eventually takes on a central leadership role in the early church, as evidenced throughout the book of Acts.

A majority of scholars, many evangelicals included, however, see 2 Peter as a work of pseudepigraphy.[34] Writing in the 1960s, J. N. D. Kelly surmised, "Scarcely anyone nowadays doubts that 2 Peter is pseudonymous,"[35] and the opinion has only become more entrenched since. The reasons for this are both internal to the text and external to it and will be dealt with in detail below. To summarize briefly, 2 Peter's use of Jude, flamboyant Hellenistic style and vocabulary, allusion to ideas present in "second generation Christianity," references to a collection of Paul's letters, debated canonical inclusion in the history of the church, dissimilarity to 1 Peter, and lack of discussion of issues present in early Christianity (such as the place of the law for Christian obedience) all seem to stack up against the authenticity of the letter.[36]

[33] John portrays Andrew first coming to Jesus and then bringing along his brother; cf. John 1:40–42.

[34] In his recent essay, Travis Williams states the following: "The overwhelming majority of modern interpreters reject the authenticity of 2 Peter, with the style being one of many contributing factors (e.g., Schrage 1993c: 126–27; Fuchs and Reymond 1988: 30–32; Schelkle 1988: 179–81; Knoch 1990: 215–18; Frankemölle 1990: 80–82; Paulsen 1992: 89–91, 93–95; Neyrey 1993: 118–20, 134–35; Vögtle 1994: 122–27; Craddock 1995: 92; Danker 1995: 84; Knight 1995: 22–23; Perkins 1995: 160–61; Horrell 1998: 136; Richard 2000: 308–9; Kraftchick 2002: 75–76; Harrington 2003: 236; Skaggs 2004: 86–88; McKnight 2003: 1504; Hartin 2006: 48–49; Wilson 2010a: 269–70; Donelson 2010: 208–9; Aichele 2012: 4–9; Callan 2012: 137–39; Frey 2018: 213–20; Ostmeyer 2021: 107–8)" (Travis B. Williams, "The Amanuensis Hypothesis in New Testament Scholarship: Its Origin, Evidential Basis, and Application," *CBR* 22.1 [2023]: 42).

[35] Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 235.

[36] Gilmour summarizes ten key issues involved in the debate, adding to our list the wider tradition of pseudo-Petrine writings and the regard for apostolic authority, which can fall under the "second generation Christianity" category above (Michael J. Gilmour, "Reflections on the Authorship of 2 Peter," *EQ* 73.4 (2001): 291–309). See also Werner George Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), 430–34 and the detailed discussion in Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 4th ed. (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 1990), 805–42.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-28093-8 — 2 Peter
A. Chadwick Thornhill
Excerpt
More Information

The evidence presented, particularly related to the internal evidence noted, is, at times, overdetermined.[37] By "overdetermined," I refer to attributing more meaning or significance to a passage than the text itself warrants.[38] Other matters of evidence are weightier in terms of favoring post-Petrine authorship. While a majority of scholars accept the pseudonymous origins of the letter and view the evidence against authenticity as too overwhelming to make a reasonable case for Petrine authorship, some scholars argue for its authenticity. Major defenders of the authenticity of the letter include Gene Green,[39] Michael Green,[40] Kruger,[41] and Schreiner.[42]

A number of difficulties exist in assessing the data. Apart from the details in the Gospels and Acts, we know very little about the life of Peter. The New Testament does not record information on his family, upbringing, education,[43] or general biography beyond events surrounding his role as a disciple of Jesus and his role in the early church as recorded in Acts 1–12. Some traditions preserved in the early church exist, but even here, evidence is limited.[44] We also do not possess a sufficient corpus of Petrine writings with which to compare what we find in 2 Peter. We have 1 Peter, which itself is at times disputed, and Peter's brief words in the Gospels and speeches in Acts, all of which come with their own historical

[37] I first came across this term in Doug Campbell's *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

[38] One example here would be reading the language of "the fathers" in 2 Pet. 3:4 to the church fathers, which neither the context nor language used supports.

[39] Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 139–50.

[40] Green, *2 Peter and Jude*, 19–47.

[41] Michael A. Kruger, "The Authenticity of 2 Peter," *JETS* 42 (1999): 645–71.

[42] Thomas R. Schreiner, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude*, CSC (Nashville: Holman, 2020), 200–217.

[43] Though see Acts 4:13.

[44] Jerome, for example, records: "Simon Peter the son of John, from the village of Bethsaida in the province of Galilee, brother of Andrew the apostle, and himself chief of the apostles, after having been bishop of the church of Antioch and having preached to the Dispersion – the believers in circumcision, in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia – pushed on to Rome in the second year of Claudius to overthrow Simon Magus, and held the sacerdotal chair there for twenty-five years until the last, that is the fourteenth, year of Nero. At his hands he received the crown of martyrdom being nailed to the cross with his head towards the ground and his feet raised on high, asserting that he was unworthy to be crucified in the same manner as his Lord." Jerome, *De vir.*, 3.1, trans. Ernest Cushing Richardson, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 3, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. (Buffalo: Christian Literature, 1892), www.newadvent.org/fathers/2708.htm.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org