Kalina Wojciechowska / Mariusz Rosik

A Structural Commentary on the So-Called *Antilegomena*

Volume 3: The Second Letter of Peter: Proclaiming the Coming of the Lord

Part 1. Eschatological Scepticism (2 Pet 1–2)

V&R

ECEV

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Eastern and Central European Voices

Studies in Theology and Religion

Edited by
Rajmund Pietkiewicz and Krzysztof Pilarczyk (†)

In co-operation with
Piotr Burgoński (Poland), Wojciech Gajewski (Poland),
Cyril Hišem (Slovakia), Mirosław Kiwka (Poland),
Mihály Laurinyecz (Hungary), Piotr Lorek (Poland),
Dominik Opatrný (Czech Republic), Adrian Podaru (Romania),
Kristina Rutkovska (Lithuania), Oleg Salamon (Ukraine),
Sławomir Stasiak (Poland), Jose M. Vegas (Russia)

Volume 3.3.1

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Kalina Wojciechowska / Mariusz Rosik

A Structural Commentary on the So-Called *Antilegomena*

Volume 3

The Second Letter of Peter: Proclaiming the Coming of the Lord

Part 1. Eschatological Scepticism (2 Pet 1–2)

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The book was financed from the subsidy granted by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek:
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data available online: https://dnb.de.

© 2024 by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Robert-Bosch-Breite 10, 37079 Göttingen, Germany, an imprint of the Brill-Group (Koninklijke Brill BV, Leiden, The Netherlands; Brill USA Inc., Boston MA, USA; Brill Asia Pte Ltd, Singapore; Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn, Germany, Brill Österreich GmbH, Vienna, Austria)
Koninklijke Brill BV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Brill Wageningen Academic, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau and V&R unipress.

This publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial – No Derivatives 4.0 International license, at https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665. For a copy of this license go to https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/. Any use in cases other than those permitted by this license requires the prior written permission from the publisher.

Cover design: SchwabScantechnik, Göttingen
Publishing reviews: Prof. Dariusz Kotecki (Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń) and Prof. Mirosław S. Wróbel (The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin)
Translation and indexes: Monika Szela-Badzińska, Wrocław
Typesetting: le-tex publishing services, Leipzig

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage | www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com

ISSN 2749-6260 (print)
ISSN 2749-6279 (digital)

ISBN 978-3-525-50366-9 (print)
ISBN 978-3-666-50366-5 (digital)

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations 7
Bibliographic abbreviations 7
Biblical texts and translations 7
Apocrypha 7
Dead Sea Scrolls 8
Ancient non-Christian writings 9
Early Christian writings 9
Grammar abbreviations 10

Preface 11

1. Introduction 15
1.1 Textual evidence and canonicity 15
1.2 Vocabulary and style 24
1.3 Authorship 31
1.3.1 Peter's authority 32
1.3.2 Petrine circle, discourse and pseudepigraphy 38
1.3.3 Senders 43
1.3.4 Relationship to the Letter of Jude 45
1.4 Date and place of origin 50
1.5 Literary genre 54
1.6 Sources 59
1.7 Addressees 61
1.8 Structure 69
1.9 A structural reading of the Second Letter of Peter 81

2. Structural commentary 93
2.1 Prescript (2 Pet 1:1–2) 93
2.1.1 A. Faith (2 Pet 1:1c) 100
2.1.2 B. Knowledge (2 Pet 1:2b) 112
2.2 B'. Knowledge (2 Pet 1:3–4) 117
2.3 A'. Faith (2 Pet 1:5–8) 145
2.4 C. Synthesis of faith and knowledge – baptismal catechesis (2 Pet 1:9–15) 183
2.4.1 a. Negative example – forgetfulness (2 Pet 1:9) 183
2.4.2 b. Positive example: eschatological soteriology (2 Pet 1:10–11) .. 193

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

2.4.3 a'. A constant reminder (2 Pet 1:12–15) 209
2.5 D_1. Prophetic-apostolic teaching (2 Pet 1:16–21) 231
2.6 E_1. Interpretation of prophetic and apostolic teaching (2 Pet 2:1–22) .. 274
2.6.1 α. False interpretation (2 Pet 2:1–5a.c) 274
2.6.2 β. Interpretation proper – soteriology (2 Pet 2:5b) 319
2.6.3 α'. False interpretation (2 Pet 2:6) 327
2.6.4 β'. Interpretation proper – soteriology (2 Pet 2:7–9a) 336
2.6.5 α". False interpretation (2 Pet 2:9b–22) 350
2.6.5.1 Part 1. Immoral practices (2 Pet 2:9b–16) 350
2.6.5.2 Part 2. Metaphors and proverbs (2 Pet 2:17–22) 407

Bibliography 447
Biblical texts 447
Apocryphal literature 448
Qumran writings 451
Ancient Christian writers 451
Other ancient writers 454
Dictionaries and lexicons 458
Commentaries and introductions 459
Studies 462

Index of persons 471

Index of references 477
Bible 477
Apocrypha 503
Others 508

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

List of abbreviations

Bibliographic abbreviations

ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
ANF	*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1–8, ed. A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, A. Cleveland Coxe, New York–Buffalo 1885–1886, revised and edited for New Advent by K. Knight
APOT	*The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, ed. Robert Henry Charles, vol. 1–2, Oxford 1913
CBQ	"Catholic Biblical Quarterly"
JETS	"Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society"
NIDNTT	*New International Dictionary on New Testament Theology*, ed. L. Coenen, E. Beyreuther, H. Bietenhard, vol. 1–4, Grand Rapids 1986
JBL	"Journal of Biblical Literature"
JETS	"Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society"
NIDNTT	*New International Dictionary on New Testament Theology*, ed. L. Coenen, E. Beyreuther, H. Bietenhard, vol. 1–4, Grand Rapids 1986
PG	Patrologia Graeca

Biblical texts and translations

ESV	English Standard Version
LXX	Septuagint
NA	*Novum Testamentum graece*, ed. E. Nestle, B. Aland
NIV	New International Version
NKJV	New King James Version
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
USCCB	New American Bible (available at the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops website)

Apocrypha

1 En	The First Book of Enoch (Etiopian)
2 En	The Second Book of Enoch (Slavonic)

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

3 Macc	Third Book of Maccabees
4 Ezra	The Fourth Boof of Ezra
4 Macc	Fourth Book of Maccabees
ApBaSyr/2 Ba	The Apocalypse of Baruch (Syriac)
ApPet	The Apocalypse of Peter
ApPaul	The Apocalypse of Paul
ActsPet	The Acts of Peter
AscIsa	The Ascension of Isaiah
EpAp	The Epistle of Apostles
GpPet	The Gospel of Peter
Jub	The Book of Jubilees
PssSol	Psalms of Solomon
SibOr	The Sibylline Oracles
TAsh	The Testament of Asher
TBenj	The Testament of Benjamin
TDan	The Testament of Dan
TIss	The Testament of Issachar
TJos	The Testament of Joseph
TJud	The Testament of Jude
TLev	The Testament of Levi
TMos	The Testament of Moses
TNaph	The Testament of Naphtali
TRub	The Testament of Ruben
TSim	The Testament of Simeon
TZeb	The Testament of Zebulun

Dead Sea Scrolls

1QapGen	*Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20 ar)
1QH	*Hymns* (11Q5/11QPsa)
1QM	*War Scroll*
1QpHab	*Pesher on Habakkuk*
1QS	*Community Rule*
4Q265	*Miscellaneous Rules*
4Q280	*Blessings* (*Purity Rule*)
4Q287	*Blessings and curses*
4QpNah	*Pesher on Nahum* (4Q169)
4QTest	*Testimonia*
CD	*Damascus Document*

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Ancient non-Christian writings

Ant.	*Antiquitates Judaicae* by Josephus Flavius
Bell. Iud.	*De Bello Iudaico* by Josephus Flavius
Con. Ap.	*Contra Apionem* by Josephus Flavius
De migrat.	*De migratione Abrahami* by Philo of Alexandria
De mutat. nom.	*De mutatione nominum* by Philo of Alexandria
De praem.	*De praemiis et poenis* by Philo of Alexandria
De somn.	*De somniis* by Philo of Alexandria
De spec. leg.	*De specialibus legibus* by Philo of Alexandria
De virt.	*De virtutibus* by Philo of Alexandria
De vita Mois.	*De vita Moisis* by Philo of Alexandria
Ep. mor.	*Epistulae moralies* by Seneca
Epist. Hor.	*Epistulae* by Horace
Gen. Rabb.	*Genesis Rabbah* (*Midrash to The Book of Genesis*)
Inst. orat.	*Institutio oratoria* by Quintilian
LAB	*Liber antiquitates biblicae* by Pseudo-Philo
Leg. alleg.	*Legum allegoriarum* by Philo of Alexandria
Mem.	*Memorabilia* by Xenophon
Quaest. Gen.	*Quaestiones in Genesim* by Philo of Alexandria

Early Christian writings

1 Clem.	*First Epistle* by Clement of Rome
2 Clem.	*Second Epistle* by Clement of Rome
Adv. Haer.	*Adversus Haereses* by Irenaeus of Lyon
Barn.	*Epistle of Barnabas*
Comm. Io.	*Commentary on the Gospel of John* by Origen
Dial.	*Dialogue with Trypho* by Justin Martyr
Diogn.	*Epistle of Mathetes to Diognetus*
Epist. Jer.	*Epistulae* by Jerome
HE	*Historia Ecclesiastica* by Eusebius of Caesarea
Hom. Num.	*Homilae in Numeros* by Origen
HomPsClem	*Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*
IgnEph	*Epistle to the Ephesians* by Ignatius of Antioch
IgnRom	*Epistle to the Romans* by Ignatius of Antioch
MartPol	*Martyrium Policarpi*
Paedag.	*Paedagogus* by Clement of Alexandria
PE	*Praeparatio Evangelica* by Eusebius of Caesarea

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Grammar abbreviations

acc.	accusativus
ACI	accusativus cum infinitivo
act.	activum
aor.	aoristus
con.	coniunctivus
dat.	dativus
fut.	futurum
gen.	genetivus
imp.	imperativus
ind.	indicativus
inf.	infinitivus
masc.	masculinum
med.	medium
nom.	nominativus
neut.	neutru
opt.	optativus
part.	participium
pass.	passivum
perf.	perfectum
pl.	pluralis
praes.	praesens
sg.	singularis

Manuscript designations after *Novum Testamentum graece*, ed. Erwin Nestle, Barbara Aland, edn 28, Stuttgart 2012 [NA28].

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Preface

In most publications, a commentary on the Second Letter of Peter is intended to be part of various commentaries on other general (Catholic) epistles (most often on the Letter of Jude and the First Letter of Peter). *Proclaiming the Coming of the Lord* is a commentary devoted exclusively to the Second Letter of Peter in an attempt to restore autonomy to this text.

While other authors comment on the text in a linear manner, focusing primarily on the ethical aspects of the letter, and warnings against false teachers, this structural commentary aims to accentuate the main theological thought and enable the reader to draw conclusions therefrom. Due to this solution, the author of the letter can be seen as a theologian concentrated on eschatological issues, the sources of which are to be found in the prophetic texts and narratives taken from the Jewish tradition. To interpret these texts and narratives, the author proposes a particular method, named in this commentary as eschatological hermeneutics. Eschatology, rather than ethics or parenesis, is thus brought to the fore by the author, who seeks to answer the question of why God seems to delay the execution of judgements, and why the waiting for the Parousia is prolonged.

The exposition of theological and hermeneutical issues with numerous intertextual references and their analyses, has considerably expanded the volume of the commentary on the Second Letter of Peter. Therefore, the authors and publishers decided to divide the English version into two volumes. The division was dictated by the very structure of the letter, in which two parts are clearly noticeable. The first part comprises chapters 1–2, and the second is a comment on chapter 3.

Throughout the letter, the author strongly emphasises the prophetic and apostolic origin of his eschatological teaching. He sees the inauguration of the end times, and the judgement and reign of Jesus, to whom God the Father has given royal and divine glory and honour, in the transfiguration scene. At the same time, he is convinced that the eschatological judicial and kingly power of Jesus was already announced by the prophets. One only needs to look properly at the prophetic texts, in which eschatological content is conveyed not only in an explicit, but also in an implicit way. The latter includes narratives drawn from the Jewish tradition, which aim to show the inevitability of judgement and two attitudes towards the announcement of judgement and destruction: a positive attitude that leads to salvation, and a negative attitude meaning annihilation. These two attitudes can not only be found among the protagonists of these narratives, and the author of the letter perceives them among Christians, his contemporaries, and predicts that they will also appear in the future.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Part (volume) 1 of the commentary – entitled *Eschatological Scepticism* – focuses on the negative attitude towards the announcement of judgement. It results from misinterpreting the prophetic and apostolic eschatological teaching, or even ignoring it. Eschatological scepticism is represented by the mocked false teachers and their followers. Contrary to their doctrine and philosophical argumentation, the author of the letter argues that God's delay is only apparent, while judgement and punishment are inevitable, although only God knows when they will be executed.

The reader of the English version of the commentary is thus given additional clues to the structure of each of the two parts. They allow the main theological theme – the certainty of the coming of the eschatological judgement, foreshadowed from the beginning by narratives belonging to Jewish tradition – to become even more explicit:

Prescript (2 Pet 1:1–2).
A. Faith (2 Pet 1:1c).
B. Knowledge (2 Pet 1:2d).
B'. Knowledge (2 Pet 1:3–4).
A'. Faith (2 Pet 1:5–8).
C. Synthesis of faith and knowledge – baptismal catechesis (2 Pet 1:9–15).
a. negative example – forgetfulness (2 Pet 1:9);
b. positive example – soteriologically oriented eschatology (2 Pet 1:10–11);
a'. a constant reminder (2 Pet 1:12–15);
D_1. Prophetic and apostolic doctrine (2 Pet 1:16–21):
- The inauguration of the end times and the authority of Jesus (2 Pet 1:16–19);
- prophetic eschatological announcements (2 Pet 1:20–21).
E_1. Interpretation of the prophetic and apostolic teaching (2 Pet 2:1–22):
α. false interpretation (2 Pet 2:1–5a.c):
I. characterisation of the eschatological sceptics (2 Pet 2:1–3a);
II. THE CERTAINTY OF JUDGEMENT (2 Pet 2:3b–4);
I'. Negative attitude towards judgement and annihilation (2 Pet 2:5a.c);

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

β. interpretation proper (2 Pet 2:5b):
i. positive attitude towards judgement and annihilation; salvation;
α'. false interpretation (2 Pet 2:6):
I. Negative attitude towards judgement and annihilation.
β'. Interpretation proper (2 Pet 2:7–9a):
i. positive attitude towards judgement and annihilation; salvation.
α''. False interpretation (2 Pet 2:9b–22):
I. The characteristics of eschatological sceptics.

Combining and reading together the elements marked as "I" will enable the reader to obtain the picture outlined by the author of 2 Peter of eschatological scepticism and the characteristics of those who preach it. At the outset, the pattern of further description is outlined: false teaching, the resulting conduct and the inevitability of punishment (2 Pet 2:1–3). The author of the letter points out that the eschatological sceptics had precursors among the false prophets (2 Pet 2:1a). Their teaching can be reduced to a questioning of God's authority and sovereignty, especially in matters of judgement (2 Pet 2:1d), which is described as blasphemy. Questioning the authority and sovereignty of God leads to a sense of impunity and a false understanding of freedom (2 Pet 2:2). However, such conduct will certainly not go unpunished (2 Pet 2:3), and evidence of this is found in numerous narratives drawn from Jewish tradition, beginning with the description of the fate and imprisonment of the rebellious angels already waiting a very long time for the final judgement (2 Pet 2:4). The fate of those who did not believe the predictions of judgement and destruction (all mankind except Noah and his family, all the inhabitants of Sodom except Lot) is then recalled. These themes are developed in 2 Pet 2:9b–22. The author of the letter gives more details of the false, blasphemous teaching, which not only includes questioning of the certainty of judgement, but also attempts to take away God's sovereignty and influence His decisions as to when that judgement is to take place (2 Pet 2:10–11). Ironically, and using a convention called *vituperatio*, the behaviour of false teachers is described as essentially resembling animal behaviour (2 Pet 2:12.22), and has an illusory sense of freedom which is in fact enslavement (2 Pet 2:19–20, 2 Pet 2:13b–18). The invocation of the knowledge of Jesus Christ in all this (2 Pet 2:20a) only exacerbates their ultimate predicament and seals the verdict (2 Pet 2:20c–21, 2 Pet 2:9b.13a). It can thus be seen that Peter's main aim here is not only to discredit and ridicule eschatological scepticism, but above all to point out that judgement is bound to come, even though it may now seem that the eschatological predictions have lost their validity (2 Pet 2:3b).

In addition to the structural commentary on 2 Peter 1–2, volume one contains an extensive Introduction, which presents typical introductory elements such as

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

textual witnesses, canonicity, lexis, authorship, Peter's authority, and information not only on Peter's circle, but more broadly on Peter's discourse in contemporary biblical studies, which allows one to understand the similarities and differences between 1 and 2 Peter, the links with the Letter of Jude, literary genre, sources, and addressees. Moreover, much space has been devoted to structural issues. A structural interpretation of the letter has also been suggested, which connects all the elements A, B, C, D and E. Since most of elements D (characteristics and content of the prophetic and apostolic eschatological teaching) and E (proper and improper interpretation of the prophetic and apostolic teaching) are included in chapter 3 of volume 2 of this study, the authors and publishers recommend reading both volumes together.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

1. Introduction

1.1 Textual evidence and canonicity

The oldest witness to the text of the Second Letter of Peter is a papyrus in the form of a codex, designated P^{72} and named Papyrus Bodmer after its discoverer. Martin Bodmer, a Swiss collector and researcher of rare manuscripts, found it in 1959. The papyrus was made in Egypt at the turn of the fourth century. It consists of 72 pages and, in addition to the Second Letter of Peter, it also contains the Letter of Jude and the First Letter of Peter, fragments of two psalms (Ps 33:3–22, 34:1–16), the eleventh Odes of Solomon, the apocryphon entitled The Nativity of Mary, Paul's correspondence with the Corinthians (The Letter of the Corinthians to Saint Paul and The Third Letter of Saint Paul to the Corinthians), *The Homily on the Pascha* of Melito of Sardis and *The Apology* of Phileas.[1] This oldest known copy of 2 Peter was probably compiled for monks living according to the Rule of Pachomius. The Second Letter of Peter was placed in the papyrus immediately after the First Letter of Peter, which may indicate that the copyist treated them on a par. Their rank is evidenced by numerous marginal notes. It is unclear to what extent this rank contributed to the recognition of both letters as canonical, especially since P^{72} contains writings that ultimately did not enter any of the known Christian canons. Perhaps this reflects the tendency of Alexandrian Christianity to expand the catalogue of writings considered normative,[2] but it is also possible that these writings were added to one collection due to an entirely different reason, especially since, of the three criteria of canonicity most often applied by biblical scholars (apostolic origin, liturgical use, essential content consistent with the message of the Old Testament), hardly any of the writings that were included in P^{72} met the first condition: they were not handed down by any of the apostles or their direct disciples. Therefore, this compilation may have been dictated, for example, by liturgical or devotional reasons.[3]

It is worth asking, therefore, why 2 Peter was included in the group of such writings as those included in the Bodmer Papyri. Is there anything they share? Or is it rather a random collection of early works that were penned by Christian

1 T. Wassermann, *Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex*, "New Testament Studies" 51 (2005), no. 1, p. 140; J.N. Birdsall, *The Text of Jude in P72*, "Journal of Theological Studies" 14 (1963), no. 2, p. 394–399.

2 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 2013, p. 65.

3 T. Wassermann, *Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex*, p. 154.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

writers? One of the most striking features that unites all these writings is their authors' interest in eschatology and apologetics. Not only 2 Peter or Jude, but also the psalms mentioned above contain warnings of the coming judgement (Ps 32 deals with the forgiveness of guilt, Ps 33 with God being the ruler of the world). Similar motifs are found in the other writings in the papyrus, including apologetic accents, especially warnings against false teachers. This may indicate that the milieu where P^{72} was created cherished animated eschatological expectations and anticipated a defence of their own faith and religious convictions in the face of the spread of views that considerably differed from the official teaching of the Church. It should also be borne in mind that more recent research shows that P^{72} was created as part of another papyrus, from which it was later separated and incorporated into a collection presumably belonging to a monastic community.[4]

Moreover, it is worth noting that at least four scribes worked on the transcription and pagination of Papyrus P^{72}.[5] It comes as no surprise then that the copy of 2 Peter in this papyrus contains quite a few differences from other, revised later, copies of the text. The most noticeable mistakes include haplography, dittography, itacisms and omission of some words. The influence of the Coptic language is also apparent. The scribe transcribing 2 Peter was probably of Coptic origin, Greek was not his first language, which gives an explanation for his mistakes.[6] Some changes, however, may have been dictated by theological considerations. A clear example is the very beginning of the letter: "Grace to you and peace may be multiplied through/in the knowledge of God and Jesus our Lord" (2 Pet 1:2). The omission of the conjunction καί (and) in the phrase ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν may imply an intention to emphasise the divine dignity of Jesus.[7]

With the current state of research, it is certainly impossible to establish whether this was a text used by the monks only privately or whether it was used for liturgical purposes. Nevertheless, P^{72} proves that 2 Peter was known among Egyptian Christians in the late third and early fourth century.

At the beginning of the fourth century, two Coptic versions of 2 Peter also transpired, one in the Sahidic dialect and the other in the Bohairic dialect. This means that the writing must have been highly valued among Egyptian Christians, and

4 J.M. Robinson, *The Story of the Bodmer Papyri. From the First Monastery's Library in Upper Egypt to Geneva and Doublin*, Cambridge 2013, p. 15–35; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny NT 18), Częstochowa 2018, p. 31.

5 T. Wassermann, *Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex*, 138.

6 J.R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, Leiden 2008, p. 258–282; P.D. Strickland, *The Curious Case of P^{72}: What an Ancient Manuscript Can Tell Us about the Letters of Peter and Jude*, JETS 60 (2017), no. 4, p. 784–785.

7 For more on these errors or deliberate alterations to the text of the letter, see T. Callan, *Reading the Earliest Copies of 2 Peter*, "Biblica" 93 (2012), no. 3, p. 430–432.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

this may have been one of the reasons why it was included in the catalogue of canonical books. Other witnesses to the text of 2 Peter include the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus[8] (both from the fourth century), as well as the Codex Alexandrinus and the Codex Ephraemi (both from the fifth century). From that period on, with the spread of the canon, the list of manuscripts containing 2 Peter increased considerably, both in Greek and translations into other languages. The oldest manuscripts form two textual groups: the first consists of P^{72}, B, K, L, among others; the second consists of א, A and C.[9] The division, however, is not sharp, possibly due to the fact that in the early centuries the letter, apart from Egypt, did not enjoy significant authority among Christian writings, so the copyists could easily introduce changes.[10]

Since the earliest witness to the text of 2 Peter only appeared at the turn of the fourth century, it is not surprising that no earlier references to this writing can be found. John H. Elliott even argues that 2 Peter is the least attested NT writing among early Christian writers[11]. It is possible that none of those writers used it directly, or if they did, they never mentioned it.[12] Motifs and phrases common with 2 Peter can be found in *The Shepherd* of Hermas and in *1 Clem.* and *2 Clem.*,[13] in *The Epistle of Barnabas*, Polycarp and Ignatius of Antioch; no mention, however, was made of the source of the phrases or imagery.[14] It is sometimes claimed that 2 Peter was quoted by Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with Trypho* 82, when, as 2 Pet 2:1 distinguished between the former activity of false prophets and the reappearance of false teachers: "And just as there were false prophets contemporaneous with your holy prophets, so are there now many false teachers among us, of whom our Lord forewarned us to beware". Even less certain are the words "The day of the Lord is as a thousand years" (*Dial.* 81), since it is not clear whether this is a direct reference to Ps 90[89]:4 or an indirect one through 2 Pet 3:8. Similar doubts arise with *Adv. Haer.* V 23:2 and V 28:3 of Irenaeus of Lyons, where Irenaeus referred to a kind of chronometry like the author of 2 Peter: "one day is with the Lord as a thousand days". It is therefore impossible to determine precisely whether Clement or Hermas actually drew on

8 The text of 2 Pet in P^{72} is closest to the version recorded in the Vatican Code.

9 See the critical apparatus for the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart 1993, p. 608.

10 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 147.

11 J.H. Elliott, *Second Letter of Peter*, [in:] *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 5, ed. D.N. Freedman, New York 1992, p. 283.

12 G. Marconi, *Lettera di Giuda. Seconda Lettera di Pietro. Introduzione, versione, commento*, Bologna 2005, p. 103.

13 These parallels are presented in detail, e. g. by R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (Word Biblical Commentary 50), Waco 1983, p. 284.

14 J.H. Elliott, *Second Epistle of Peter*, p. 284, 287. See also C.D. Osburn, *Second Letter of Peter*, [in:] *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. D.N. Freedman, Grand Rapids 2000, p. 1039.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

2 Peter, or whether, as proponents of a very late dating of 2 Peter claim, the author of 2 Peter drew on the letters of Clement and *The Shepherd*, or – as seems most likely – the source of the common motifs and phrases is the pan-Christian tradition and the emerging sociolect.[15] It must be remembered that ancient quotations are rarely exact, they are more like paraphrases or even allusions; the source texts are also altered and adapted to the needs of the current argumentation, a good example being, for example, the use of passages from the Letter of Jude by the author of 2 Peter himself.

The Muratorian Canon (c. 135 BC) lists The Apocalypse of Peter (c. 180 BC), but no mention of 2 Peter was made. Two extant copies of ApPet have survived to this day: one in Greek and the other (slightly longer) in Ethiopic. The unknown author of this text most likely used the apocalyptic passages of 2 Peter, especially those describing the activities of false prophets and teachers and the punishment for these activities.[16] Here the similarity of motifs and vocabulary is even more striking than in the testimonies mentioned previously. It is already difficult to explain them merely by a common sociolect or even by a common – apocalyptic – literary convention. Some researchers assume, therefore, that the author of ApPet was familiar with 2 Peter, which may have been one of the more popular writings among Christian apocalyptic texts of that time.[17] This would mean that already in the first half of the second century 2 Peter was, at least in some circles, fairly highly valued. This, in turn, would also translate into hypotheses as to the dating of the writing – since the letter was known around the year 135, it must have been written sufficiently earlier, perhaps at the turn of the second century, to warrant this popularity.[18]

Eusebius of Caesarea stated that 2 Peter was known to Clement of Alexandria (died ca. 215), who in *Hypotyposes* commented on all the books of the Old and New Testaments "not omitting the disputed books, – I refer to Jude and the other Catholic epistles, and Barnabas" (*HE* VI 14:1).[19] This work of Clement is preserved in the Latin translation by Cassiodorus, which, unfortunately, does not contain a

15 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 284; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 473.

16 A different view is taken by J. Frey (*Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, Leipzig 2015), who sees a dependence of the language of 2 Peter on the Greek text underlying the Ethiopic version of the Apocalypse of Peter. See also J. Frey, *Second Peter in New Perspective*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter: Towards a New Perspective*, ed. J. Frey, M. den Dulk, J.G. van der Watt, Leiden–Boston 2019.

17 R. Bauckham, *2 Peter and Apocalypse of Peter*, [in:] *The Fate of the Dead: Studies in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, Leiden 1998, p. 290–303.

18 See below – Date and place of origin (1.4).

19 R.E. Picirilli, *Allusions to 2 Peter in the Apostolic Fathers*, "Journal of the Study of the New Testament" 33 (1988), p. 59–65; the author also provides a list of *loci communes* between 2 Peter and the writings of Ignatius, Polycarp and Hermas on pages 65–75; for a more extensive discussion of parallels

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

commentary on 2 Peter.[20] In another letter of Clement of Alexandria, *To Theodore* (insofar as it is authentic), there is a phrase that refers to Peter mentioning the slaves of corruption who promise freedom (2 Pet 2:19).[21]

In his commentary on the Gospel of John, Origen stated that Peter left one letter acknowledged by all, and whether he also left a second letter "is doubtful" (*Comm. Io.* 5:3).[22] However, he did not specify the reservations about the second letter left by the apostle. It is evident, however, that Origen has a rather positive attitude towards 2 Peter, since he alluded to it several times in different circumstances, and even called it *scriptura* (*Hom. Num.* 6:676), as is evident from Latin translations of his works by Rufinus. Further references to 2 Peter appear in a letter (*Epistola* 75:6) by Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, to Cyprian, and in the work *On the Resurrection* by Methodius of Olympus. This means that in the Egyptian Church, the text of 2 Peter had been commented on since the beginning of the third century. Since the beginning of the fourth century onwards, it had been mentioned with increasing frequency in the writings of the Church Fathers, but neither Theodore of Mopsuestia nor John Chrysostom, who were associated with the Antioch school, were familiar with it. This school – competing with the Alexandrian, that is the Egyptian school – presumably did not yet recognise the canonicity of 2 Peter. Likewise, not all Alexandrians were inclined to acknowledge the canonicity of the letter. The rector of the Alexandrian catechetical school, Didymus the Blind, wrote in the fourth century in his explanation of the Second Letter of Peter that "in any case, one cannot pass over in silence the fact that this letter is inauthentic and, although it may be circulated, is not included in the canon".[23] In addition to metatextual references in early Christian writings from the period between the second and fourth centuries, one can find phrases which may be quotations or paraphrases of 2 Peter. For example, Aristides seems to have referred to 2 Pet 1:11 in his *Apology*; Theophilus of Antioch in his letter *To Autolycus* II 9 referred to 2 Pet 1:21; Hippolytus of Rome in his treatise *On Christ and Antichrist* 2 to 2 Pet 1:21.[24]

Soon afterwards, references to 2 Peter appeared in the writings of Epiphanius of Salamis, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus. The latter even called Peter

---

between 2 Peter and early Christian literature, see M.J. Gilmour, *The Significance of Parallels between 2 Peter and other Early Christian Literature*, Leiden 2002.

20 T. Skibiński, *Listy katolickie w starożytności chrześcijańskiej*, "Vox Patrum" 28 (2008), p. 940.

21 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 477.

22 M.J. Gilmour, *Reflections on the Authorship of 2 Peter*, "The Evangelical Quarterly" 73 (2002), no. 4, p. 291.

23 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię. Nowy Testament*, vol. 9: *List św. Jakuba, I-II List św. Piotra, I-III List św. Jana, List św. Judy*, Polish transl. and ed. D. Sztuk, Ząbki 2014, p. 145.

24 For: G.H. Everett, *Study Notes on the Holy Scriptures. Using a Theme-Based Approach to Identify Literary Structures. The Letter of 2 Peter*, n.p. 2017, p. 15–16.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the head, by which he expressed his conviction of the apostle's leadership among the Twelve and in the early Church. Explaining the New Testament canon, he mentioned, in addition to the four gospels and Paul's fourteen letters, the seven universal letters, "of which one is of James the brother of God, and two are of Peter the head, and of John again the evangelist, three, and seventh is Jude the Zealot" (PG 38:845).[25] In *Carminum* 1 he added: "if there is some (other than) these seven, not (are they) among the genuine ones" (PG 37:474).[26] Doubts about the canonicity of 2 Peter was also shown by Gregory's cousin Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium. A letter attributed to him mentioned the doubts that some voiced over several universal letters: "Of the Catholic Epistles some maintain that we ought to receive seven, and others three only, one of James, and one of Peter, and one of John" (PG 37, 1597A–1598A).[27]

Eusebius of Caesarea would write that 1 Peter was acknowledged universally as genuine, while word has it that 2 Peter was only included in the New Testaments because many Christians found it valuable (*HE* III 3:1). Although at this point the Church historian had not yet expressed his own opinion, elsewhere in *The Church History* he wrote that 2 Peter belongs to the five disputed books, though acknowledged by many as authentic (*HE* III 3:4, III 25:3). He listed James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 John and 3 John, calling them *Antilegomena*: "Among the disputed writings (τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων), which are nevertheless recognized by many, are extant the so-called epistle of James and that of Jude, also the Second Letter of Peter (Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολή), and those that are called the second and third of John […]" (*HE* III 25:3; cf. *HE* VI 13:6, VI 14:1).

In 367, Athanasius the Great provided the first catalogue of inspired books. In Easter Letter 39, he presented a list of seven Catholic letters in the order in which they were later included in the Christian canon, without expressing any doubt about their inspired character. The synods of Hippo (393), Carthage (397 and 419) approved the same canon. From that time onwards, the Western Church no longer voiced doubts about the canonicity of 2 Peter. Somewhat later, in 692 at the II Council in Trullo, the Eastern Churches emulated that ruling. It is worth mentioning that it was Jerome who greatly contributed to the acknowledgement of the canonicity of 2 Peter, as he decided to add this writing to the Vulgate. He acknowledged that "the apostles James, Peter, John, and Jude, have published seven epistles" (*Epist. Jer.* 53:9). In *De Viris Illustribus* 1, he stated that Peter "wrote two epistles which are called Catholic, the second of which, on account of its difference from the first in style, is considered by many not to be by him [Peter]".[28] In his letter

25 For: G.H. Everett, *Study Notes on the Holy Scriptures*, p. 10.

26 For: Ibid., p. 10.

27 For: Ibid., p. 10–11.

28 Jerome, *Letter 53*; Jerome and Gennadius, *Lives of Illustrious Men*.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to Hedibia, the bishop of Hippo dispels these doubts: "Therefore Titus served as an interpreter, as Saint Mark used to serve Saint Peter, with whom he wrote his Gospel. Also we see that the two epistles attributed to Saint Peter have different styles and turn phrases differently, by which it is discerned that it was sometimes necessary for him to use different interpreters" (*Epist. Jer.* 120:11).[29] Jerome believed that as Paul's letters, differing in style and vocabulary, were not excluded from the canon, neither should those by Peter. The differences between 1 and 2 Peter can be explained by the differences in the translators' styles. In antiquity, it was the stylistic issues that were the source of the most serious doubts about the authenticity and therefore the canonicity of 2 Peter.

The canonicity of 2 Peter was advocated by the Council of Florence in 1441; a catalogue of normative writings for the Church was then published in the document *Decretum pro Iacobitis*.[30] Doubts about the canonicity and apostolicity of the letter revived during the Reformation, although the disputes on the subject were less heated as with the other writings from the Eusebius' *Antilegomena*. On the Catholic side, 2 Peter was considered less authoritative than other NT writings by Cardinal Cajetan (Thomas de Vio); he uttered the same opinion of James, 2–3 John and Jude.[31] To the defence of the Petrine authorship and the authority of the letter rushed Martin Luther. In his commentary on the letter of 1523–1524, explaining the *superscriptio* (1:1), where the sender introduces himself as "Simon Peter, a servant and Apostle of Jesus Christ", he wrote "Such is the subscription and the superscription of this Epistle, that we may know who writes it" (I [V.1]). Explaining the text of 2 Pet 3:15–16 containing references to Paul's letters, the Reformer recalled the doubts that had arisen about Peter as the author. He admitted that the letter "was written long after St. Paul's Epistles. And this is one of the passages [3:15–16] which might be adduced to maintain that this Epistle is not St. Peter's" (III [V.15, 16]). The second questioned passage is the sentence in 3:9 that the Lord "wills not that any one should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (III [V.8–10]). This statement is, according to Luther, "some little below the Apostolic spirit" (III [V.15, 16]), but it must nevertheless be regarded as credible and coming from the apostle, since it concerns love and not faith. Writing about love justifies, as it were, a lowering of the "Apostolic spirit", that is, the apostolicity of the writing itself, since love "humbles itself toward its neighbor" (III [V.15, 16]). It must be added that for Luther the measure of the apostolicity is the preaching and proclamation of Christ.

29 Id., *Letter 120. To Hedibia*.

30 T. Skibiński, *Listy katolickie w starożytności chrześcijańskiej*, p. 938.

31 M.H. de Lang, *The Reformation Canon and the Development of Biblical Scholars*, "The Bible Translator" 67 (2016), no. 2, p. 187.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> All the genuine sacred books agree in this, that all of them preach Christ and deal with Him. That is the true test, by which to judge all books, when we see whether they deal with Christ or not, since all the Scriptures show us Christ (Rom 3:21), and St. Paul will know nothing but Christ (1 Cor 15:2). What does not teach Christ is not apostolic, […] what preaches Christ would be apostolic […].[32]

In general, however, the Reformer did not raise doubts about the authenticity, canonicity and apostolicity of the letter. Its content confirms and gives credence to Paul's message, this Protestant "canon within the canon",[33] which for the father of the Reformation provided an additional argument for the normativity of Peter's letter, which clarified the question of faith from the practical side. In the preface to 2 Peter, Luther summarised the message of the letter and emphasised that the letter was directed "against those who think that Christian faith can be without works. Therefore he exhorts them to test themselves by good works and become sure of their faith, – as one knows trees by their fruit".[34] Surprisingly, Luther never referred to the ancient discussion on the Second Letter of Peter. It is difficult to suppose that he was not familiar with it, since he mentioned disputes about the authorship or canonicity of the Letter of James, Jude, Hebrews or Revelation.

Ancient disputes about 2 Peter are however mentioned in the introductions to Reformed translations of the New Testament, such as the Dutch translation of the Bible called *Statenvertaling* published in Leiden in 1637:

> As for the books of the New Testament which are in the Bible, there were, however, certain teachers who doubted whether the Letter to the Hebrews, the Letter of James, the Second Letter of Peter, the Second and Third Letters of John, the Letter of Jude and the Revelation of John were canonical books. But the ancient Christian Churches in general never raised doubts about it, nor did they doubt the word contained in them; these books were recognised and venerated as divine and canonical.[35]

In the introduction to 2 Peter, one can read that,

> as with the first letter of Peter, it is uncertain whether Peter himself wrote this letter, or whether someone else borrowed the apostle's authoritative name. […] It is very similar to

32 M. Luther, *Preface to the Epistles of Saint James and Saint Jude 1545* (*1522*).

33 R.W. Wall, *The Canonical Function of 2 Peter*, "Biblical Interpretation" 9 (2001), no. 1, p. 65.

34 M. Luther, *Preface to the Second Epistle of Saint Peter*.

35 M. Koktysz, *Elementy parenetyczne Listów Piotra i Judy. Studium egzegetyczno-porównawcze*, unpublished master's thesis under the supervision of Kalina Wojciechowska, Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw, 2016, p. 19.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> the letter of Judas, which is why it is thought that this letter was probably written in the second century.[36]

Earlier, John Calvin vigorously defended the apostolicity of the letter, however, being very cautious about its true authorship in his *Commentary on 2 Peter*: "it has nothing unworthy of Peter, as it shews everywhere the power and the grace of an apostolic spirit".[37]

Eventually, both the Protestant and Catholic side retained the Second Letter of Peter among the writings of the New Testament. The Council of Trent in 1546, in the document *Decretum de libris sacris et de traditionibus recipiendis*, approved its canonicity.

Finally, it should be noted that the oldest canons have a different order of Catholic letters. The Eastern Churches rely on Paul's words in the Letter to the Galatians:

> for the one who worked in Peter for an apostolate to the circumcised worked also in me for the Gentiles, and when they recognized the grace bestowed upon me, James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars, gave me and Barnabas their right hands in partnership, that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised (Gal 2:8–9).

Since Paul listed the "pillars" of the Church in this order: James, Peter, John, so were the letters: James, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 1 John, 2 John, 3 John, Jude. The Western Churches emphasised the role of Peter among the Twelve and the role of his successors in Rome, hence the adopted order was 1 Peter, 2 Peter, followed by the letters of John, James and Jude (councils of Carthage), John, Jude and James (Augustine), or James, Jude, John (Rufinus). Since Jerome favoured the Eastern tradition, once the Vulgate was adopted, the Eastern order was accepted by the entire Western Church.[38]

It is evident from the presented juxtaposition that Peter's letters have always been placed before John's letters. In contemporary studies on the canonicity, attention is paid to this order in terms of not only history, but also methodology (broadly understood "canonical approach").[39] Linguistic analyses within the canonical approach make it possible to recognise the common vocabulary of 2 Peter

36 "Net als bij de eerste brief van Petrus is het onzeker of Petrus deze brief zelf heeft geschreven, of dat iemand anders de gezaghebbende naam van de apostel heeft geleend. […] Het lijkt sterk op de brief van Judas, reden waarom gedacht wordt dat deze brief wellicht pas in de tweede eeuw geschreven werd", https://www.statenvertaling.net/bijbel/2_petrus.html [accessed: 3.07.2023].

37 J. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Second Epistle of Peter*, trans. J. Owen, [in:] *Commentaries on the Catholic Letters*, Edinburgh 1855, p. 361.

38 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 150–151.

39 See below – G.H. Everett's structure based on the canonical approach.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

and the letters of John.[40] This translates into similar themes in these letters and the way they are presented: warnings against false teachers, attention to the incompleteness of their teaching (questioning eschatology in 2 Peter, denying the incarnation in the Letters of John), and finally calling for a resumption of apostolic teaching and tradition by referring to the eyewitnesses of Jesus' earthly mission: Apostle Peter and Apostle John, who proclaim what they had seen, heard and experienced.[41]

1.2 Vocabulary and style

In most modern commentaries on particular biblical books, after discussing the textual witnesses (and possibly the canonicity), the problem of authorship comes to the fore. In the case of 2 Peter we will follow a different approach because the determination of authorship is largely dependent on the style and vocabulary of the letter[42] and the comparison with the lexis and style of 1 Peter,[43] which is attributed

40 For a detailed analysis, see D. Nienhuis, *2 Peter, the Johannine Epistles, and the Authority of "Eyewitness" Apostolic Tradition*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. J. Frey, M. den Dulk, J.G. van der Watt, Leiden–Boston 2019, p. 150–156.

41 Conclusions can also be drawn from these parallels regarding the dating of 2 Peter and the reasons for its creation. The author of 2 Peter is believed to have been familiar with John's letters, and this means that Peter's writing must/will have originated in the second century, most likely after the year 110. At that time, the collection of Paul's writings (cf. 2 Pet 3:15–16) and 1 Peter was used and considered normative by most Christian communities. In order to link the Pauline collection and the Johannine collection, which represented completely different traditions and trends, a "bridging text" was needed. Originally, 2 Peter could fulfil/would have fulfilled such a role: on the one hand, it affirmed the authority of the Pauline letters; on the other, it distanced itself from false teachers who, following Paul, called themselves apostles, although their teaching had nothing to do with the Gospel and ignored the necessity to root the Gospel in the mission and message of the earthly Jesus. In view of this, it became crucial to recall the very sources of the apostolic teaching, coming from eyewitnesses and companions of the earthly Jesus. The choice of an authority to whom such a bridging text could be attributed was not accidental. In 1 John 1:1–3 there are words similar to John and Peter's declaration from Acts 4:20: "It is impossible for us not to speak about what we have seen and heard". Since in 1 John the paraphrase of the apostolic declaration was attributed to John, the choice of the other apostle who followed this declaration in his teaching was obvious; cf. D. Nienhuis, *2 Peter, the Johannine Epistles*, p. 147–159; D. Nienhuis, *Not by Paul Alone: The Formation of the Catholic Epistle Collection and the Christian Canon*, Waco 2007; D. Farkasfalvy, *The Ecclesial Setting of Pseudepigraphy in Second Peter and its Role in the Formation of the Canon*, "Second Century" 5 (1985), p. 3–29; D. Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament*, Oxford 2000. On the role of eyewitnesses in antiquity see also R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospel as Eyewitness Testimony*, Grand Rapids 2006.

42 R.W. Wall, *The Canonical Function of 2 Peter*, p. 68.

43 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:1.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to the same author. As mentioned above – it was the stylistic issues that already in antiquity became the most serious source of doubt about the authenticity of 2 Peter.

The comparative word statistics seem extremely interesting. The First Letter of Peter uses 543 words, while the Second Letter of Peter uses 399 words, of which only 153 are common to both writings. This means that more than 60 per cent of 2 Peter contains a unique vocabulary.[44] Sometimes the same ideas are expressed in different terms. An example is the Parousia, or the second coming of Christ. In 1 Peter the term 'revelation' ἀποκάλυψις (1 Pet 1:7.13, 4:13 the term 'coming' παρουσία (2 Pet 1:16, 3:4.13). Generally speaking, the language of 2 Peter is more sophisticated and refined than that of 1 Peter. Some biblical scholars describe it as exquisite,[45] others as "pretentiously elaborate".[46] Undoubtedly, the style of 2 Peter is reminiscent of the Asiatic style,[47] and thus much more reminiscent of some Hellenistic writings with elaborate verbal ornamentation[48] than the austere, more restrained style of 1 Peter. These striking stylistic differences cannot be explained solely by the different subject matter of the two letters or by a different literary convention. One has to perceive here completely different linguistic tastes and patterns, which makes the common authorship of the two letters open to question.

The most distinctive feature of the language of 2 Peter, which sets the letter apart from other NT writings, is the use of a unique vocabulary. Even where a more common, everyday lexis could be employed, the author uses phrases that are rare and typical of literary language, which proves his erudition, especially in Greek philosophical literature.[49] There are as many as 57 *hapax legomena* or words used a few times; interestingly, only in 2 Pet 25 of them are shared with the Septuagint. Some of these *hapax legomena* very rarely appear even in Greek literature, others are not used at all in Hellenistic Jewish literature; a part of them appear in the writings of the Church Fathers, perhaps under the influence of 2 Peter. Three of the words used by the author of the letter are not familiar to any author writing in

44 M.J. Kruger, *The Authenticity of 2 Peter*, JETS 42 (1999), no. 4, p. 656.

45 P. Stancari, *A partire da Gerusalemme. Lettera di Giacomo, Lettera di Giuda e Seconda lettera di Pietro. Una lettura spirituale*, Roma 2014, p. 141.

46 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, London 1982, p. 228.

47 B. Reicke (*The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude* [The Anchor Bible 37], New York 1964, p. 146–147) judges this style very harshly as bizarre, sometimes based on absurdity, and therefore comparable to the ornate Baroque style; see also R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 137; D.F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter* (SBL Dissertation Series 104), Atlanta 1988, p. 145–146.

48 T. Callan, *The Style of the Second Letter of Peter*, "Biblica" 84 (2003), no. 2, p. 205.

49 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 136.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Greek: ἀκατάπαστος/ἀκατάπαυστος (2:14),[50] ἐμπαιγμονή (3:3) and παραφρονία (2:16).[51]

Secondly, the author of 2 Peter eagerly employs metaphors – sometimes extremely sophisticated and elaborate ones. Petrine metaphors are often based on parallel associations with Jewish literature and Greek literature. This can be seen, for example, in 2 Pet 1:19: "you will do well paying heed to it as to a lamp shining in a dark place until the day dawns and the morning star/carrying light rises in your hearts". The comparison of the prophetic word to a light or lamp illuminating the darkness is quite common in wisdom literature and intertestamental apocalyptic writings. Thus, there would be nothing special about this image were it not for the designation of darkness, or rather a gloomy, murky place as αὐχμηρὸς τόπος, which refers the viewer to Greek literature, especially Aristotle.[52] This Greek interlude is followed by an imagery typical of the Jewish apocalyptic and eschatological tradition. Even when the imagery seems conventional (e. g. the body as tent in 1:13–14) or the metaphors are borrowed and modified (e. g. 2 Pet 2:17, which is based on the nature-related metaphors of Jude 12–13), the author gives them a broader, contextual meaning.

In addition to metaphors, linguists have also identified 27 more rhetorical figures in 2 Peter, such as metonymy (1:17, 2:14, 3:16), antonomasia (1:3.19, 2:1), synecdoche (1:3.11, 2:8.21), hyperbole (2:14), onomatopoeia (3:10), periphrasis (1:9.12.13.14.15.17, 2:14.16, 3:1.7) and epithets (1:1.2.11, 2:20, 3:18).[53] One can also see the author's particular predilection for alliteration, especially where he needs to use negation. He uses *α-privativum* for this purpose (e. g. 1:8 ἀργὸς καὶ ἀκάρπος or 3:14 ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι) to achieve the intended rhetorical effect. A characteristic rhetorical device in 2 Peter is hendiadys: the representation of one concept by two words joined by a coordinate conjunction, e. g. "piety and life", "glory and perfection" in 1:3–4, which can be translated as "pious life and perfect glory". It is sometimes difficult to distinguish hendiadys from merism, which is also frequently used in the letter. However, while the hendiadys is a figure taken from classical rhetoric, merism is a device typical of Semitic style. The author employed it in an attempt to impart to his message prophetic, and apocalyptic language, e. g. in 3:3–4. Moreover, Duane F. Watson and Terrance Callan drew attention to the characteristic presentation of the teachings of false teachers in the form of the so-called enthymeme,[54] i. e. inference based on uncertain premises, which can be

50 Ibid., supposes that the form ἀκατάπαστος is a misspelling of the rare but already indispensable term ἀκατάπαυστος.

51 T. Callan, *The Style of the Second Letter of Peter*, p. 205.

52 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:19.

53 D.F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style*, p. 195–197.

54 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, Grand Rapids 2012, p. 133.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

seen above all in 3:5–7, where the narrator *expressis verbis* claims with irony that the essential ktiseological references are "hidden" from the false teachers.

Thirdly, the author of 2 Peter uses an interesting syntax with rhythm as one of the leading elements; a tendency to fall into iambic metre (1:19, 2:1.3.4.22), typical of Greek tragedies to emphasise the gloomy mood, is also noticeable. Rhythm can also be seen in the endings of particular utterances/thoughts.[55]

Fourthly, the author of the letter tends to repeat certain words. Sometimes for technical reasons, other times because he seems to have a predilection for a particular word, especially a rare one,[56] sometimes he used characteristic tropes for rhetorical reasons. When repeating a word, for example, he is in pursuit of different forms of the word or for words that sound similar, thus creating paronomasia (e. g. καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν in 2:6 or ἀκατάπαυστος – κατάρα – καταλιπόντες in 2:15). He also willingly uses different terms derived from the same stem, especially when he discusses Themes of righteousness, knowledge, glory, godliness and godlessness or eschatological doom,[57] but also when he uses a wordplay with the source texts (so, for example, in 2:13, in the dialogue with Jude 12 about the feasts attended by false teachers; Jude calls the feasts ἀγάπαι 'agape', Peter – ἀπάται – 'delights', 'delusions').

Fifthly, a considerable number of wisdom sayings have been accumulated in the relatively short writing, which partly gives it a moralising overtone. Most of these are long and elaborate sentences, embellished with metaphors. They are drawn on both Hellenistic tradition (e. g. 2:14 with the bold metaphor "having eyes full of adulteresses") and Jewish tradition (e. g. the so-called *Tob-Spruch* in 2:21: "It would have been better for them not to learn the way of righteousness than for those who have learned it to have turned away from the holy commandment handed over to them"; sometimes it is even difficult to identify their provenance unambiguously (as, for example, in 2:22 – proverbs about swines functioned in both Greek and Jewish literature).

Sixthly, it may be surprising to see in a Christian writing the accumulation of so many harsh words of condemnation against opponents, but it must be taken into account that in antiquity the invective was a peculiar literary form which fits perfectly into the convention of *vituperatio* used in the letter.[58] Ancient writers, whether Greek, Roman, Christian or Jewish, were not satisfied merely with just intellectual reasons when supporting their views. Logical argument was only part of the argumentation. The other, by no means less important, was the *ad hominem*

55 T. Callan, *The Style of the Second Letter of Peter*, p. 206–207.

56 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 137.

57 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 154.

58 *Vituperatio* usually functioned alongside *laudatio* (the laudatory element) in a form called *sincrisis* i. e. a juxtaposition and comparison of desirable and condemned behaviours and traits.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

arguments. Invectives were not avoided among them. Verbal insults were an integral part of the argument, and their absence could definitely undermine the rhetorical, especially persuasive, value of the argument.[59] The term 'invective' itself derives from the Latin verb *inveho*, meaning 'to bring in' or 'to bring in', and in its passive form taking on a meaning indicating an intrusion. Etymologically, an invective is therefore a verbal assault or insult. It may refer to a person, a group of persons or an institution. In the art of rhetoris, invectives were applied in a broad spectrum from colloquial, vulgar words, used most often (though not exclusively) by the lowest social strata, to literary works, characterised by their excellent compliance with the rules of classical rhetoric. Invective, insult, offence, humiliating epithets and demeaning terms were among the stylistic devices of ancient oratorical polemics. With this understanding of the use of invective, Peter's condemnation of the erring believers, calling them arrogant, insolent (2:10), blemishes and vices (2:13), children of the curse/condemnation (2:14), comparing them to irrational beasts (2:12) and the most abhorrent animal behaviour – returning to vomit and rolling in the mud (2:22) no longer sounds as harsh as it seems to the present-day reader of the letter. In contrast, accusations of debauchery, gluttony, drunkenness and greed are typical elements of *vituperatio*. Although attempts are sometimes made to reconstruct the actual behaviour of the false teachers on this basis, such an attempt must be doomed to failure in advance. For it must be remembered that in *vituperatio* the vices of opponents are greatly exaggerated.

Finally, the author is keen to use chiasms and related concentric compositions; he also bases the structure of the body of the letter on chiasms:

A. apostolic testimony – Peter's – 1:16–18;
  B. prophetic teaching – 1:19–21;
  B'. prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:2.5–7.10b–11a;
A'. apostolic testimony – Paul's – 3:16b–17.

Due to this approach the topics important for the hagiographer can be emphasised, namely the correct and incorrect interpretation of the inspired prophetic and apostolic teaching on the end times.[60] Similarly with the juxtaposition of 2:3bc and 3:4bc: the false teachers express their eschatological scepticism by invoking the fathers who fell asleep and the unchangeability of the world. Peter, on the other hand, argues that, despite the appearance of stagnation, God's eschatological actions are a fact:

59 C. Forbes, *Comparison, Self-praise and Irony: Paul's Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric*, "New Testament Studies" 32 (1986), p. 9–15.

60 See below – Structure (1.8).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

A. Judgement is not idle – 2:4b;
    B. Destruction is not slumbering – 2:4c;
    B'. The fathers fell asleep – 3:4b;
A'. All things have remained the same – 3:4c.

The predilection for chiasms and using them to promote theological ideas is further evidenced by the inclusion of this device at the very beginning of the letter:

A. Faith (1:1c);
    B. Knowledge (1:2b);
    B'. Knowledge (1:3–4);
A'. Faith (1:5–8).

The author of the letter also retakes the topics of faith and knowledge in the conclusion (3:18a), which allows us to identify Thematic and lexical framework of the entire letter.

Analysing the style of 2 Peter, the question of the coherence of the letter must also be raised. In the seventeenth century, Hugo Grotius (died 1645), in *Adnotationes in Actus Apostolorum et in Epistulas Catholicas* (1641), stated that the individual parts of 2 Peter differed from each other in terms of style and topic. In particular, the third chapter with its own quasi-prescript is claimed to differ from the other two chapters. The reason for these differences would be that originally chapter 3 of 2 Peter was a separate letter appended later to 2 Pet 1–2. In the early nineteenth century, L. Bertholdt formulated Thesis that the second chapter with examples taken from Jude was a later interpolation. This theory was adopted by K. Ullman in 1921, who reduced the original letter of Peter only to 2 Pet 1:1–21. In the nineteenth century there were also attempts to clarify which passages of the Second Letter of Peter could belong to the original writing of the apostle. E. Kühl regarded 2 Pet 1:1–21 and 3:3–18 as authentic with the passage 2:1–3:2 added later.[61] E.I. Robson, at the beginning of the twentieth century, identified four separate sources that would eventually make up the canonical text of 2 Peter: A. an ethical passage (1:5b–11); B. a personal testimony (1:12–18); C. a prophetic discourse (1:20b–2:19); D. an apocalyptic passage (3:3b–13).[62] These passages were originally intended to function separately, but enjoyed popularity and authority because their authorship was attributed to apostle Peter. They were eventually collected together by an editor who formulated the initial verses that imparted to the writing its epistolographic character (1:1–4) and added passages that were intended to

61 M. McNamara, *The Unity of Second Peter: A Reconsideration*, "Scripture" 12 (1960), p. 14–15.
62 Ibid., p. 15.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

give coherence and credibility to the texts as a single apostolic letter (1:19–20a; 2:20–3:3a).

In the twentieth century, the coherence of the letter was no longer so radically questioned and criticised. Admittedly, there are still claims about chapter 2 being an interpolation and especially about chapter 3 as a separate letter. The latter hypothesis proves attractive as it makes it clear that the previous letter referred to in 3:1 is not the canonical 1 Peter, which differs stylistically and thematically from 2 Peter, but precisely 2 Pet 1:1–15 (possibly 1:1–21), with which 3:1–18 already shares numerous features. In 2 Pet 1:15, the narrator announces that he will make every effort to ensure that the readers keep the apostolic teaching on the Parousia constantly in mind; in 3:1 he fulfils this announcement by sending them another letter on eschatology. In this light, 2 Pet 2 would indeed constitute a separate letter. Perhaps, as M. McNamara tried to explain,[63] 2 Pet 2 was a letter addressed to the same community, regarded by them as normative, attributed to Peter and carefully protected. Over time, even before the formation of the canon, all three writings were preserved as a single collection; later, the collection was treated as a single letter, and when copied, the redundant salutation formulas (initial and final) with which the text of 2 Pet 2 was probably accompanied were omitted.

Nowadays, the integrity of 2 Peter as a whole is no longer questioned. In all three chapters, there are formulas, terminology, intertextual strategies and, above all, theology that prove the letter's was intended as a whole. Even if 2 Pet 2 seems somewhat thematically divergent from the rest of the writing, this divergence should be treated as a digression. However, the analysis of the rhetorical and structural elements – including those presented in this commentary – make it possible to see in all parts of the letter a coherent eschatological interpretation with a consistent hermeneutic applied to the interpretation of Old Testament prophetic texts/narratives. Moreover, as can be seen, in the final part of the letter – *peroratio* – the author resumes terms used earlier and tries to synthesise their meanings (for example, in the case of ἐπάγγελμα, δικαιοσύνη or ἀπώλεια).

Obviously, recognising the compositional and stylistic coherence of the whole of 2 Peter does not resolve the question of which letter – external to 2 Peter – the author is referring to in 3:1. We have three possibilities: A. the first letter is the Letter of Jude; B. the first letter is a lost letter that has not survived to our time; perhaps it was no longer extant at the time of the formation of the NT canon, since it was not included in it; C. the first letter is the canonical 1 Peter.[64] Hypothesis C, popular – as mentioned – in antiquity and during the Reformation, seems to have gained the most supporters. The stylistic differences between the letters can be explained by

63 Ibid., p. 19.

64 All hypotheses are presented in more detail later in this commentary; see analysis 3:1.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the competence and preferences of the translators, which would imply that each of Peter's letters was handwritten and translated into Greek by a different secretary-translator. It is known that Silvanus assisted the author in writing 1 Peter (1 Pet 5:12). The translator of 2 Peter may have been the evangelist Mark who accompanied the apostle during his stay in Rome (cf. 1 Pet 5:13) and, according to tradition, is considered to have been his interpreter.[65] Mark, as the style of his gospel shows, proved to be a skilful writer, familiar with the principles of classical rhetoric and Greek literature, who also adapted his message to the expectations and competence of his audience.[66] Clement of Alexandria, on the other hand, in *The Stromata* VII 17, mentioned that one of Peter's interpreters was Glaucias, mentioned by the heresiarch Basilides as a teacher. Hypothesis B also seems attractive and plausible; it is gaining a wider and wider circle of supporters today. The disappearance of the writing referred to by the hagiographer would not be unusual, as evidenced by Col 4:16 adducing the letter to the Laodiceans, or 1 Cor 5:9 pointing to an earlier letter that Paul sent to the Corinthians.

1.3 Authorship

The authorship of the Second Letter of Peter is still hotly debated today, due to the already mentioned significant difference in style and vocabulary between 1 Peter and 2 Peter.[67] It seems that the two letters could not have been penned by the same author unless, as noted above, Peter allowed the secretaries and/or translators to write down his correspondence without restraint. It is almost universally accepted that the letter came out of "Petrine circles", most likely Roman or Alexandrian, i. e. that the letter reflects the apostle's thought, and that even if the writing is a pseudepigraph, as is generally accepted,[68] Peter's teaching must have directly influenced the actual author.[69]

In accordance with epistolary practice, the author of the letter introduces himself in the very first sentence: "Simeon Peter, a slave and an apostle of Jesus Christ" (1:1).[70] The letter also contains references to the biography of Peter the apostle.

65 See K. Wojciechowska, *Opowiadam wam jak Piotr. Elementy stylu i stylizacji w Ewangelii Marka*, Warszawa 2006, p. 27–29.

66 Ibid., p. 33–34.

67 G.K. Barr, *The Structure of Hebrews and 1st and 2nd Peter*, "Irish Biblical Studies" 19 (1997), p. 17–31.

68 R. Bauckham, *2 Peter. An Account of Research* (ANRW II.25.5), Berlin–New York 1988, p. 3719.

69 M.J. Gilmour, *Reflections on the Authorship of 2 Peter*, p. 292.

70 Only in 2 Pet 1:1 and in Acts 15:14 do the two names "Simeon Peter" appear together. For some scholars, this is irrefutable proof that the actual author of the letter is Peter the apostle, for if it were a pseudepigraph, the actual author would have used the names "Simon Peter"; P.H.R. van

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The author mentions that Jesus foresaw his imminent death (1:14),[71] recalls the transfiguration scene (1:16–18),[72] refers to the first letter he wrote to the readers, and even claims that Paul is his "brother" (3:15), i. e. most likely a close collaborator[73] or a preacher of the Gospel, equal in every respect to him as called and sent by Jesus.[74] The use of vocabulary related to fishing, i. e. the reference to attracting followers by false teachers who entice people using bait, can also be seen as an attempt to authenticate the author as a former fisherman (2:14). However, according to some scholars, such an emphasis on authenticating Peter's authorship already seems suspicious; the actual author tried at all costs to present Peter as the author of his pseudepigraph.[75] He was not the only one to do so. Indeed, at the end of the first century, the figure of Peter was very popular among authors of pseudepigraphs; one need only mention The Gospel of Peter and The Apocalypse of Peter. The name of this apostle was intended to guarantee that the text assigned to him would be received with due respect and that his commands and instructions would be considered binding. For the readers were well aware of who the apostle was and the role he played among Jesus' closest companions and in the first decades of the Church's existence.

1.3.1 Peter's authority

The author of the letter thus refers to the authority of Simon/Simeon,[76] a fisherman, called by Jesus in Galilee at Lake Gennesaret. This means that Simon was, almost from the beginning, a direct witness of Jesus' activities and teachings. The synoptic Gospels always mention him as the first among the apostles; he occupied a primary position even in scenes with three (or four) chosen, most trusted disciples (cf. Mark 3:16–18, 5:37, 9:2, 14:33 and parallel). In the synoptic gospels, Simon acted as a spokesman for the apostles. It was to him that Jesus addressed questions and it

Houwelingen, *The Authenticity of 2 Peter: Problems and Possible Solutions*, "European Journal of Theology" 19 (2010), no. 2, p. 121–122. Others, on the other hand, point out that this is an attempt to semitize and archaize too much; on the various forms and inflections of the names Peter/Simon Peter see analysis of 2 Pet 1:1.

71 John 21:18–19.

72 Matt 17:1–8, Mark 9:2–8, Luke 9:28–36.

73 E. Szymanek, *Wykład Pisma Świętego Nowego Testamentu*, Poznań 1990, p. 465.

74 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:1.

75 M.J. Gilmour, *Reflections on the Authorship of 2 Peter*, p. 295; see also P. Ostański, *Szymon Piotr, sługa Jezusa Chrystusa* (*2 P 1,1*). *Wizerunek apostoła w Listach św. Piotra*, [in:] *Wokół posługi Piotrowej*, ed. A. Klupczyński, Poznań 2009, p. 7–15.

76 For more on Peter's authority according to the Second Letter of Peter, see H. Langkammer, *Jezus Chrystus w świetle późniejszych pism Nowego Testamentu* (Bibliotheca Biblica), Wrocław 2009, p. 114–127.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

was he who most often answered on behalf of the disciples (cf. Mark 10:28–31 and parallel). It is from his mouth that we heard the messianic confession (Mark 8:29 and parallel), and he was also the one who provoked Jesus to explain, clarify and instruct.[77]

As soon as he was chosen to be one of the Twelve – according to Mark 3:16 – his name was changed. Henceforth, his name was to be Peter. The change of name was connected with his task: "that they might be with him and he might send them forth to preach and to have authority to drive out demons" (Mark 3:14–15). This choice and mission mean that he could present himself as a sent one (apostle) and as a slave of Jesus Christ (2 Pet 1:1). It is worth noting that the change of name from the Semitic – Simon/Symeon to the Greek Peter (Petros) may have been significant and meaningful for the author of 2 Peter. By introducing himself as Simeon Peter, therefore, the author of 2 Peter made it clear that he was a man who combined the Jewish and Hellenistic traditions and applied both in his teaching.[78]

When discussing the question of Simon Peter's authority and role among the Twelve and subsequently in the Christian community, it is worth turning to Matthew's explanation of the apostle's new name (Matt 16:18–20). Using the wordplay on πέτρα (rock) – Πέτρος, Matthew stated that Simon would henceforth be called Petros, and that on the rock Jesus would build his Church (συ εἶ Πέτρος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν).[79] According to the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church, this involves the inauguration of the special role Jesus assigned to Peter in the Church, known as the primacy of Peter. At the time Peter's name was changed, Jesus granted Peter the so-called power

77 K. Wojciechowska, *Opowiadam wam jak Piotr*, p. 49; A. van den Hoek, *Peter without Paul: Aspects of Primordial Role of Simon Peter in an Early Christian Context*, [in:] *The Early Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter* (*60–800 CE*), ed. R. Dijkstra, Leiden-Boston 2020, p. 208; he points out that against this background Peter's betrayal not only introduces narrative tensions, but also causes problems in later theological debates about Peter's authority and role in the Church.

78 J. Gnilka, *Piotr i Rzym. Obraz Piotra w pierwszych dwu wiekach*, Polish transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2002, p. 222.

79 Jesus' words are usually translated into English as "you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church" (NIV, KJV, NKJV, ESV, USCCB). NIV and ESV have a footnote, respectively: "The Greek word for Peter means rock" and "The Greek words for Peter and rock sound similar". In the Lutheran tradition, in Matt 16:18, the name Πέτρος Peter is either not translated (cf. e. g. Bible translations into Polish: Biblia Warszawska [1975], Biblia Ekumeniczna [2017], New Covenant Bible [2016, 2019]) or translated as Skalisty ['Rocky'], while the term πέτρα refers not to the person of Peter but to his creed (Matt 16:16), implying that the Church is built on Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. In the Polish Catholic tradition, Πέτρος is often translated as Rock (Paulist Bible [2008]: "Ty jesteś Skałą. Na tej Skale zbuduję mój Kościół [You are the Rock. On this Rock I will build my Church]") or an explanation is added ([Polish] Millennium Bible, ed. 3, 1980: "Ty jesteś Piotr [czyli Skała], i na tej Skale zbuduję Kościół mój [You are Peter [i. e. the Rock] and on this Rock I will build my Church]").

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of the keys: "I will give you the keys to the kingdom of heaven. Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt 16:19). In the Bible, the symbolism of the keys plays a significant role. In Semitic thinking, the one who is given the keys is not so much the doorkeeper, but rather the steward or manager of a house or city. Whoever is entrusted with the keys is also entrusted with power. It is worth drawing on the parallel passage from The Book of Isaiah in this case:

> On that day I will summon my servant Eliakim, son of Hilkiah; I will clothe him with your robe, gird him with your sash, confer on him your authority. He shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Jude. I will place the key of the House of David on his shoulder; what he opens, no one will shut, what he shuts, no one will open (Isa 22:20–22).

The previous administrator of the royal treasury and the entire court, Shebna, is replaced by Eliakim. The administrator was subordinate to the king, who, however, like any man, was mortal. Jesus as Ruler (and in the context of 2 Peter as the Ruler of the eternal kingdom) entrusts the power of the keys in the Church to Peter. Peter is mortal, so this power had to pass to his successor.[80] The metaphor of binding and loosening is also symbolic of the power given to Peter. The uniqueness of this power is in the decisions made by Peter on earth that will also be accepted in heaven. In the Protestant tradition, it is recalled that Peter acts as a representative of all the apostles and, in this context, the power of the keys given to him is a power that the others of the Twelve also have. This later translates into the equality of the bishops of all the local churches[81] and the power of the keys, i. e. "an office and power given by Christ to the Church for binding and loosing sin",[82] which is vested in the Church-appointed, ordained priest.[83]

---

80 The Lutheran tradition makes a distinction between succession of office (corresponding to some extent to Catholic apostolic succession) and succession of apostolic faith and doctrine, with priority given to the latter: "Today's Lutheran churches stand in unbroken succession to the ministry of the Gospel of Jesus Christ through Word and sacrament. They regard this ministry as serving the apostolic continuity of the Church. […] The Lutheran churches agree that continuity in the apostolic faith and in fidelity to it are more important than the formal succession of episcopal ordinations", after: *Luterańskie rozumienie urzędu biskupiego*, [in:] *Kościół i urząd kościelny w dokumentach i opracowaniach Światowej Federacji Luterańskiej*, Polish transl. E. Sojka, K. Karski, ed. M. Hintz, J. Sojka, Bielsko-Biała 2014, p. 172.

81 For a more extensive discussion of papacy, see M. Luther, *The Smalcald Articles*, Part 2, Article IV (*Of the Papacy*); M. Luther, *The Power and Primacy of The Pope*.

82 M. Luther, *The Smalcald Articles*, Part 3, VII (*Of the keys*).

83 In the Lutheran tradition, the equality of the Twelve and their subsequent ministry draws on Luke 22:24–27, Matt 18:1–4, John 20:21; in turn, Gal 2:7 and 1 Cor 3:4–8 were regarded by Luther as

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

It should be noted that in the synoptic gospels, the change of Simon's name to Peter is a permanent change. While other disciples were also given new names by Jesus (e. g. Boanerges), only Peter is consistently referred to by his new name in the gospels, also by Paul, who uses the Semitic version of Simon's changed name: "Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to confer with Cephas and remained with him for fifteen days" (Gal 1:18). Catholic exegetes point out that in this "conferring" Paul intended to recognise Peter's authority. Paul knew who was leading the Church and, in order to gain credibility in the eyes of this community, he took care to personally meet Peter.[84]

By referring to Peter and quoting some episodes from his life, the author of 2 Peter completely omits events that put the apostle in a less favourable light: misunderstanding the mission of Jesus (Mark 8:33 and parallel texts), impulsiveness and impetuosity (Mark 14:29.31.47–50 and parallel texts) and, above all, betrayal (Mark 14:66–72 and parallel texts). Nor does he mention the so-called Antioch incident, when Peter was counselled by Paul that it was wrong to demand the observance of all Jewish laws and customs by ethno-Christians (Gal 2:11–14, cf. Acts 15:1–31).[85] On the contrary, he portrays Peter as an advocate of inculturation, the merging of Jewish and Hellenistic traditions, and the Christianisation of both. It also emphasises the respect that Peter had for Paul and, above all, the compatibility of the apostolic teaching of Peter and Paul (cf. 2 Pet 3:16). This makes the image of Peter in 2 Peter most reminiscent of that found in the Acts (usually dated 85–95). For in the Acts, the apostle is presented explicitly as the leader of the Twelve and one of the leaders of the entire nascent Church (Acts 1:12–26, 5:1–5.29–32), an eloquent preacher (Acts 2:14–36, 3:12–26), an advocate of the integration of Hellenistic and Jewish traditions and equal treatment of Judeo-Christians and ethno-Christians

proof that Paul's apostolic mission was not dependent on Peter's approval, and that the apostles, including those outside the Twelve, were equal in their service of the Gospel; see M. Luther, *The Power and Primacy of The Pope*.

84 M. Luther argues in *The Power and Primacy of The Pope*, interpreting Gal 2:6–7 in the context of the primacy of Peter, that "Paul […] was neither ordained nor confirmed [and endorsed] by Peter, nor does he acknowledge Peter to be one from whom confirmation should be sought. And he expressly contends concerning this point that his call does not depend upon the authority of Peter". In contemporary Lutheranism, especially in the documents of the Catholic-Lutheran dialogue, there is the possibility of recognising a kind of Petrine primacy. The office exercised by the Bishop of Rome could be recognised as a visible sign of the unity of the whole Church, with the proviso that this would require its theological reinterpretation on both sides; see R. Karwacki, *Urząd Piotrowy w służbie jedności według dokumentów dialogu katolicko-luterańskiego*, [in:] *Posłannictwo Biskupa Rzymu*, ed. J. Jezierski, Olsztyn 2002, p. 181–193.

85 This very ambiguous, multidimensional and complex picture of Peter in the biblical texts is pointed out by M. Bockmuehl, *Attitudes to Jewish and Roman Power in the Gospel and Acts of Peter*, [in:] *The Early Reception*, p. 81–82.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

(Acts 10:1–11.18, 15:7–13), boldly proclaiming the Gospel (the inspired apostolic teaching) and calling for conversion; his mission was often accompanied by miracles (Acts 2:37–41, 3:1–11, 4:1–22, 5:14–16, 8:14–25, 9:32–43, 12:3–19). The Acts also prove the unity and compatibility of Peter's and Paul's teaching, portrayed in the narratives describing Peter's missionary activity parallel to Paul's missionary activity,[86] similar evangelistic successes and persecution of both apostles. A similar image of Peter as an inspired, charismatic teacher is conveyed by Eusebius of Caesarea when he describes the arrival of Peter in Rome

> that strongest and greatest of the apostles, and the one who on account of his virtue was the speaker for all the others, to Rome against this great corrupter of life. Clad in divine armor like a noble commander of God, He carried the costly merchandise of the light of the understanding from the East to those who dwelt in the West, proclaiming the light itself, and the word which brings salvation to souls, and preaching the kingdom of heaven (*HE* II 14:6).

Neither the Acts nor Paul's letters, however, mention Peter's stay in Rome. The only allusion to this fact in New Testament is found in 1 Pet 5:13, where the name Babylon most likely refers to the capital of the empire. The connection between Peter and Rome and his martyrdom in that city is more extensively described in later Christian writings.[87] The first, somewhat vague reference to Peter's fate can be read in *1 Clem.* 5:4: "Let us set before our eyes the illustrious apostles. Peter, through unrighteous envy, endured not one or two, but numerous labours; and when he had at length suffered martyrdom, departed to the place of glory due to him". Undoubtedly it is an allusion to the apostle's martyrdom; Clement, however, did not explicitly state where this would take place. Ignatius of Antioch in Rom 4:3 suggests that Peter and Paul were in Rome, since he wrote that they had given orders to the Romans: "I do not, as Peter and Paul, issue commandments unto you". In the second/third century AD, Irenaeus of Lyons drew on the enduring Church Tradition to find confirmation that the Church in Rome was established by Peter and Paul and the apostolic succession was observed:

> […] by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also [by pointing out] the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the successions of the bishops (*Adv. Haer.* III 3:2).

86 A. van den Hoek, *Peter without Paul*, p. 208.

87 M. Grant, *Święty Piotr*, Polish transl. P. Krupczyński, Warszawa 2001, p. 144.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The didactic activity of Peter and his role in the organisation of the Churches in Caesarea in Palestine, Tripoli and Antioch are confirmed by the *Pseudo-Clementines* of the third century. Eusebius of Caesarea, in describing the destiny of Peter and Paul, referred to the letter of Dionysius of Corinth (died c. 171) to the Romans:

> And that they both suffered martyrdom at the same time is stated by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, in his epistle to the Romans, in the following words: "You have thus by such an admonition bound together the planting of Peter and of Paul at Rome and Corinth. For both of them planted and likewise taught us in our Corinth. And they taught together in like manner in Italy, and suffered martyrdom at the same time" (*HE* II 25:8),

and earlier to the treatise of Caius, who "who arose under Zephyrinus" (second/third century) against the heresiarch Proclus, in which Caius affirmed that on the hill of the Vatican and on the Ostian way there were "the trophies of those who laid the foundations of this [Roman] church" (*HE* II 25:6–7). Both quotations are part of a wider characterisation of the Church during Nero's persecutions, which Eusebius summarised: "It is, therefore, recorded that Paul was beheaded in Rome itself, and that Peter likewise was crucified under Nero. This account of Peter and Paul is substantiated by the fact that their names are preserved in the cemeteries of that place even to the present day" (*HE* II 25:5). It can be seen that by the fourth century the tradition of Peter's (and Paul's) martyrdom in Rome was already widespread, well-established and unquestioned.[88]

The "recorded" account that Eusebius mentioned is obviously not the canonical Acts of the Apostles, but probably the apocryphal writings The Acts of Peter and The Acts of Paul. Both writings were possibly written in the second century, with The Acts of Peter considered older. The Acts of Peter was written in Greek, but the only extant passage from this text is the account of the apostle's martyrdom, which functioned independently in Christian circles, including in the liturgy.[89] However, larger Coptic copies and Latin paraphrases of the scripture are known. It is ActsPet that provides the accounts of the controversy with Simon Magus, the apostle's stay in Rome and his crucifixion. The picture of Peter in the ActsPet partly coincides with the portrait of the apostle in 2 Peter, for in both texts Peter is presented as a defender of apostolic doctrine and a fighter of heresy personified by Simon Magus. The final clash with him and Peter's victory takes place in Rome. In Rome, however, Peter offended the prefect Agrippa and Albinus, a friend of Caesar, by preaching

88 See also the documents listed and characterised by J.R. Curran, *From Petrus to Pontifex Maximus*, [in:] *The Early Reception*, p. 49.

89 Z. Izydorczyk, *Dzieje Piotra. Wstęp*, [in:] *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu. Apostołowie*, part 1: *Andrzej, Jan, Paweł, Piotr, Tomasz*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2007, p. 480; M. Bockmuehl, *Attitudes to Jewish and Roman Power*, p. 90–91.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the praise of chastity and abstinence. The apostle's listeners included Agrippa's concubines and Albinus' wife, who followed Peter's teachings and refused to have intercourse with their men. The refusal incited the fury of Agrippa and Albinus. They both formed a conspiracy and decided to get rid of Peter. However, Xanthippe, Albinus' wife, found out about these intentions and warned the apostle. Peter's friends advised him to leave Rome. At first the apostle resisted, but eventually, on hearing the argument that only if he saved himself could he continue to serve the Lord, he gave in. During his escape from Rome, just outside the city gates, a scene well known from *Quo vadis* by H. Sienkiewicz took place:

> And as he went forth of the city, he saw the Lord entering into Rome. And when he saw him, he said: Lord, whither goest thou thus (or here)? And the Lord said unto him: I go into Rome to be crucified. And Peter said unto him: Lord, art thou (being) crucified again? He said unto him: Yea, Peter, I am (being) crucified again. And Peter came to himself: and having beheld the Lord ascending up into heaven, he returned to Rome, rejoicing, and glorifying the Lord, for that he said: I am being crucified: the which was about to befall Peter (ActsPet 35[6]).

And indeed, Peter was arrested. His trial is reminiscent of the Gospel accounts of Jesus' trial with one difference that the people interceded on Peter's behalf to Agrippa and asked for the apostle's release. Peter, however, remembering that Jesus himself had predicted his death (cf. 2 Pet 1:14),[90] accepted the sentence. Before his death, he made a long speech in which, among other things, he asked to be crucified head down. The description of Peter's burial also closely resembles the Gospel descriptions of Jesus' burial. Marcellus, one of the apostle's most faithful companions, took his body down from the cross, washed it, anointed it with spices and buried it in his own tomb.

1.3.2 Petrine circle, discourse and pseudepigraphy

Testimonies from the first/second and third centuries, especially The Acts of Peter, confirm that the apostle gathered a large circle of followers and collaborators around him. Since, for many of the reasons mentioned above (stylistic issues, knowledge of Greek literature and the principles of rhetoric, the citation of material from the end of the first century, the convergence of the image of Peter in the letter and in the Acts, the emphasis on the unity of the doctrine and apostolic dignity preached by Peter and Paul, the recognition of Paul's letters as equal in authority to the Scriptures), Peter's authorship of the Second Letter of Peter must be and

90 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:14, where hypotheses are cited regarding the prophecy mentioned in the letter.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

is excluded, it can be assumed that the letter invoking the apostle's authority and omitting embarrassing episodes from his life was written precisely in the circle of collaborators and/or disciples holding him in high esteem. Some researchers even mention a "Peter school" or "Petrine circle", which was to include Silvanus and Mark (considered as authors or at least editors and translators of texts attributed to Peter).[91]

The existence of similar schools in antiquity was not unusual. One speaks not only of philosophical schools that nurtured the ideas of the great philosophers even after their death, but also of Christian schools, groups, communities that were concerned to preserve the ideas, the teachings of individual apostles, usually the founders and/or leaders of local churches. Thus, one can speak of Paul's school in Antioch[92] or John's school in Ephesus.[93] Such schools did not only perpetuate the memory of the founder; they also copied and disseminated his writings or produced pseudepigraphic literature – texts which, although not formally penned by the teacher's himself, faithfully conveyed the essence of his teaching, placing it in a new historical, social, cultural context. Thus the Johannine school gave rise to writings reflecting the teaching and tradition derived from the apostle John – the Gospel of John, the First, Second and Third Letter of John and the Revelation, and the Pauline school to writings reflecting the teaching and tradition of Paul, commonly known as the Deutero-Pauline letters.[94] The Johannine School and the Pauline School were both active at the end of the first century, and it is reasonable to expect that a school was also active at that time, or slightly later, which specifically cherished the memory and promoted the teaching of the Apostle Peter.

The analogies with ancient philosophical schools and with the school/circle of John lead to an attempt to formulate general conditions that a community must fulfil in order to be considered a school: 1. the existence of a group of disciples who gather around the teacher, recognise his authority, disseminate and continue his teaching; 2. the bonds of friendship linking the members of the group; 3. the activity of studying, transcribing and disseminating the writings of the master and producing texts signed with his name, promoting his teaching; 4. admission to the circle/school based on certain rules; 5. the isolation of the school from society.[95] The first three conditions seem to be met by almost any group centred around a prominent, significant figure. The last two can be put down to the general

91 J. Gnilka, *Piotr i Rzym*, p. 234.

92 P. Chatelion Counet, *Pseudoepigraphy and the Petrine School: Spirit and Tradition in 1 and 2 Peter and Jude*, "HTS Theological Studies" 62 (2006), no. 2, p. 421.

93 R.A. Culpepper, *The Johannine School*, Missoula 1975.

94 P. Chatelion Counet, *Pseudoepigraphy and the Petrine School*, "HTS Theological Studies" 62 (2006), no. 2, p. 421.

95 Cf. J. Gnilka, *Piotr i Rzym*, p. 234.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

requirements applied to Christians: admission to the community after a period of catechumenate ending with baptism and the application of the highest ethical standards. If that is the case, one can indeed speak of the Petrine School.[96]

However, certain problems arise when attempting to reconstruct the ideas of the Petrine school. While the ideas of the Johannine and Pauline schools are reconstructed by way of comparing texts belonging to a particular tradition and identifying common elements, in the case of the Petrine school one would have to consider which texts can be classified into the Petrine tradition. Due to the striking similarity of motifs, 2 Peter and Jude would have to be added here. Due to the invocation of the apostle's authority, 1 Peter would also be classified into this tradition, which, as noted above, is significantly different linguistically and theologically from 2 Peter. This means that the *loci communes* identified on the basis of these three texts will be reduced to a minimum. They include, for example, the identification of sources that Peter and his disciples referred to (could have referred to) in their teaching, the identification of the rules of interpretation of these sources and the hermeneutics that his disciples took over from Peter, and finally the similarities in the presentation of theological ideas. Such an attempt has been made by, among others, M.L. Soards[97] and P. Chatelion Counet.[98] Soards noted that the authors of 1 Peter, 2 Peter and Jude were interested in issues of eschatology-oriented ethics, elements of soteriology, questions of election, and drew most likely on the florilegia used in the community, which contained selected passages from the OT and apocrypha. In interpreting them, they followed a similar method of exegesis rooted in Jewish tradition and a Christocentric hermeneutic. Moreover, in the Petrine circle, the writings invoking the apostle's tradition were most likely used during the liturgy, hence the form of all three letters reveals a liturgical *Sitz im Leben*. Chatelion Counet came to similar conclusions. The ideas of the Petrine school would revolve around issues of ethics, which is not an intrinsic value, but must be oriented towards eschatology. It can also be seen that truth and justice are closely connected; godlessness and false teachings are not (only) external threats; rather, their origins must be sought within the community, which is why it is necessary to constantly strengthen Theological and especially the eschatological awareness of the faithful by reminding them of the most important principles of apostolic teaching. The texts on which the writers from this school rely are the florilegia with specific OT texts and Jewish apocalyptic writings, as well as texts from the wisdom tradition, interpreted by all hagiographers in a similar way. One of the distinctive features of the Petrine tradition would also be the warning and

96 From another perspective: ibid., p. 234–235.

97 M.L. Soards, *1 Peter, 2 Peter and Jude as Evidence for a Petrine School* (ANRW II.25.5), Berlin–New York 1988, p. 3828.

98 P. Chatelion Counet, *Pseudoepigraphy and the Petrine School*, p. 404–424.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

vituperative characterisation of false teachers. The disciples should only follow those who, unlike the errant believers, have the Holy Spirit and act and teach under His inspiration.[99] All these elements confirm that the time of the activity of the hagiographers from the Petrine school fell on the period before the so-called early Catholicism (*Frühkatholizismus*)[100] or the very beginnings of early Catholicism, when eschatological hopes had not yet been abandoned; on the contrary, in some circles they were developed in connection with apocalypticism.[101]

The hypothesis on the Petrine school is undoubtedly attractive and convincing. It makes it possible not only to treat 2 Peter as a pseudepigraph that perfectly fits in the Petrine tradition, but also to explain the differences between 1 Peter and 2 Peter. Although both hagiographers, belonging to the same Petrine circle, the actual authors of the texts, invoked the figure and authority of the apostle and promote his theology, each of them adopted diverse methods – emphasising different aspects, maintaining his own literary tastes and competence and individual style. If the author of Jude was also from the same circle, the similarities between his text and that of 2 Peter may be due to the use of material from the same florilegia and the application of the same method of exegesis and a similar Christocentric hermeneutic.

It is worth adding that nowadays the term "Petrine school" is gradually replaced by "Peter's discourse", a term coined by J. Frey that is much broader from the historical, cultural, ideological and literary perspective (*Petrus-Diskurs*);[102] here the figure of the apostle serves to give credibility to sometimes very different ideas and points of view in many environments – from Judeo-Christian circles (so, e. g. the *Pseudo-Clementines* and Peter's letters to James) to Gnostic circles (e. g. the texts from Nag Hammadi signed with Peter's name,[103] The Gospel of Peter or The Teaching of Peter mentioned by Origen, among others). The Petrine discourse emphasises, on the one hand, the similarities of the texts included in it, first of all 2 Peter and ApPet, with priority being given to the latter.[104] The author of 2 Peter

99 Ibid., p. 420.

100 The term "early Catholicism" is used here in a technical sense, usually defined as the transitional period between the earliest charismatic Christian communities and the beginning of the institutionalisation of the Church in the post-apostolic era.

101 See D.J. Downs, *Early Catholicism and Apocalypticism in the Pastoral Letters*, CBQ 67 (2005), no. 4, p. 641–661.

102 See J. Frey, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, Leipzig 2013, p. 151–176). At the centre of the texts that are taken as representative of the Petrine discourse are, of course, 2 Pet and the Ethiopic ApPet; Alexandria is indicated as the place where texts based on the Petrine discourse would be produced; see T. Nicklas, *Petrus-Diskurse in Alexandria: Eine Fortführung der Gedanken von Jörg Frey*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, p. 99–101.

103 J. Frey, *Second Peter in New Perspective*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, p. 22.

104 See below – Date and place of origin (1.4).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

would therefore have drawn on ApPet and – if, as proponents of this hypothesis believe, 2 Peter originated in an Alexandrian milieu,[105] also on the writing called the Preaching of Peter, which is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria in *The Stromata* (I 182:3, II 68:1–2, VI 39:1, VI 44:1–3, VI 128:1–2), among others. The depiction and teaching of Peter there largely corresponds to the depiction and teaching of the apostle in 2 Peter[106] with numerous references to Greek philosophy. While the similarities of 2 Peter to ApPet and the Preaching of Peter would be apparent at first glance, the common elements with 1 Peter would be somewhat more difficult to grasp. They appear mainly in the motivic layer (references to the disobedience of angels: 1 Pet 3:19–20 and 2 Pet 2:4, references to the flood: 1 Pet 3:2 and 2 Pet 2:5, 3:6. Christocentric interpretation of prophecies: 1 Pet 1:10–12 and 2 Pet 1:20–21), sometimes lexical (on the basis of antonyms, one can point to references to slaves of God in 1 Pet 2:16 and slaves of corruption in 2 Pet 2:19; in 1 Pet 1:19 Christ is called a lamb without spot or blemish, in 2 Pet 3:14 the faithful are described with these words, while the unfaithful are defiled and stained – 2 Pet 2:13) and formal (similarity of salutation formulas in 1 Pet 1:2 and 2 Pet 1:2).[107] Therefore, on the other hand, the variety of images of the apostle circulating simultaneously in this environment and the variety of texts associated with these images are emphasised. On the basis of one of these images – Peter as the apocalyptic writer, the advocate of inculturation and the appreciation of the Hellenistic tradition and its integration with the Jewish tradition – the Second Letter of Peter was created. With another image – Peter drawing on the LXX, staying in Rome and comforting Christians persecuted by pagans – the First Letter of Peter is associated. There was no need either to unify these images, each of which was considered genuine, let alone to unify the style, language, form, conventions and theology of the writings referring to these images. Thus, both the First and the Second Letter of Peter, signed with the apostle's name, were considered authentic, despite their apparent differences.

Usually, in the traditional introductions, the differences between 1 and 2 Peter are also explained by pointing to a different audience and different circumstances in which the texts were produced. The findings of proponents of the Petrine discourse are partly in this vein. Indeed – the emergence of writings invoking Peter's authority

105 See W. Grünstäudl, *Petrus Alexandrinus: Studien zum historischen und theologischen Ort des Zweiten Petrusbrief*, Tübingen 2013.

106 In both texts, Peter advocates an appreciation of Hellenochristianity, using an argument based on Platonic philosophy and the Greek appreciation of knowledge, and above all the motif of interpreting the Scriptures. He furthermore uses similar lexis found in Hellenochristian settings (e. g. ἐπίγνωσις, εὐσέβεια, θεοσέβεια), J. Frey, *Second Peter in New Perspective*, p. 23.

107 D. Nienhuis, *2 Peter, the Johannine Epistles, and the Authority of "Eyewitness" Apostolic Tradition*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, p. 149; cf. also J.F. Hultin, *The Literary Relationships*, p. 40–45.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

in different places, in different communities, even at different times (almost all of the second century BC), implies diverse situations, circumstances and expectations of the readers of these texts, but also various senders (cf. e. g. the anti-Pauline *Pseudo-Clementines* affirming Jewish tradition and 2 Peter, or 1 Peter and the Gospel of Peter with Gnosticising overtones).

A different approach to this issue is proposed by P. Chatelion Counet. Referring to the hypothesis of the origin of the letters in the Petrine school/circle, he argues that, firstly, their shape may have been influenced by the whole community/school, and secondly, they reflect the situation and problems of the community/school in which they were written, rather than the community of readers mentioned in the prescripts. In the group of Peter's disciples, especially after the apostle's death, in the face of growing problems and deepening divisions, the emergence of different interpretations about the inspiration and writings considered inspired, perhaps also in the face of an ambiguous attitude to Paul's writings, this question was asked: what would Peter have said/written in this situation? The answer was debated by the whole community, drawing on the apostle's teaching, while its final editing and writing was entrusted to a ghost-writer, who gave it the form we know today. Alternatively, the ghost-writer would first present his proposal, which the community would then discuss and supplement. The answer was, of course, treated as a binding teaching of the apostle and signed with his name. In this way, pseudepigraphs – texts created by the school of Peter for the internal needs of the community – were produced in the Petrine circle. Thus, from the pseudepigraphs, conclusions can be drawn concerning primarily the sending community rather than the situation of the recipients.[108] Often, however, it was decided to copy and send such texts further, with an appropriate epistolographic prescript, clearly indicating the apostolic authority. This was possible because certain problems, e. g. false teaching (Jude, 2 Peter), persecution (1 Peter), turned out to have affected most Christian communities as early as in the 50s of the first century[109] and the recommendations taken from apostolic teaching proved to have been universal. This also explains why it is so difficult to identify the specific readers of these writings.

1.3.3 Senders

The hypothesis that 2 Peter was written as a pseudepigraph in Petrine circle/school also makes it possible to identify different levels of senders and to define them in compliance with contemporary literary theories. In this commentary, the levels of

108 P. Chatelion Counet, *Pseudoepigraphy and the Petrine School*, p. 418.
109 Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

senders will be characterised on the basis of definitions and descriptors formulated by H. Markiewicz.

Firstly, the level of the author external to the text, the one to whom the writing would be attributed. This author can be perceived or reconstructed as a real person with a certain biography, with certain characteristics, regardless of the relation between these characteristics and the text that is attributed to him.[110] Such author is then called a public personality with those personal and biographical data that have become a social fact and, in the popular consciousness, have fused with his name and participate as a perceptual background to his utterances.[111] The Apostle Peter, whose public personality was reconstructed above, would thus be the external author of 2 Peter.

Secondly, the level of the internal author, the ghost-writer, who reveals himself inside the text as the subject of all text-related activities, a personality implied by the properties of the utterances. Usually the internal author is identified with the textual subject,[112] although this is not always the case. 2 Peter is an example of the individualism of the internal author and the textual speaking subject. For the internal subject presents himself precisely as Peter, a slave and apostle of Jesus Christ (1:1), and as shown above, the literary competence, linguistic predilections, stylistic preferences, knowledge of literature, especially Greek philosophical literature, knowledge of rhetorical principles[113] etc. clearly does not correspond to the public personality of a fisherman of Galilee. In other words, the qualities of the internal author revealed in the text are much better suited to the personality and literary competence of someone from the Petrine circle, who, as shown above, drew on the tradition associated with Peter and the hermeneutical and interpretive principles nurtured in the Peter school, but left his own individual stamp on them.

Thirdly, the level of the narrator. By introducing himself as Peter, the internal author assumed a role. He speaks in the text not so much on his own behalf (then he could be identified with the textual subject), but as an apostle. The narrator is thus personified or dramatized; he was, as it were, created by the internal author as a figure, a character, a separate personality.[114] One may wonder to what extent this embodiment is successful, whether the characteristics given the narrator by the internal author would correspond to the public personality of the apostle Peter. However, the internal author's aim was not to recreate traits of a personality, for

110 H. Markiewicz, *Autor i narrator*, [in:] H. Markiewicz, *Wymiary dzieła literackiego*, Kraków 1996, p. 89.

111 Ibid., p. 90.

112 Ibid., p. 90–91.

113 See above – Vocabulary and style (1.2).

114 F. Stanzel, *Theorie des Erzählens*, Göttingen 1979, p. 27–28, after H. Markiewicz, *Autor i narrator*, p. 93.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

this is not the purpose of writing pseudepigraphs. His aim was to represent what Peter would have said or written if he had encountered false teachers who denied the coming of eschatological judgement, what texts from the Jewish tradition he might refer to and what methods of interpretation he might employ. The internal author pays almost no attention to how Peter could present this all. It would mean that the essential theological content correlates well with Peter as a narrator, while the form of utterance allows the narrator to be in some fragments identified with the internal author.

As can be seen, in the case of 2 Peter a sharp distinction between different types of senders is basically impossible, especially at the level of the internal author and the narrator. The matter is also complicated by the fact that the narrator also appears here as an external author. Therefore, the terms 'the author of 2 Peter' (the internal author) and 'the narrator' are used interchangeably in this commentary. And since the narrator is presented as Peter, the three terms function interchangeably in the commentary. It must be made clear, however, that by writing 'Peter', the authors have in mind Peter, the narrator, sharing more traits with the internal author than with the external author, the actual fisherman from Galilee.

1.3.4 Relationship to the Letter of Jude

One of the leading arguments for the pseudepigrapha of 2 Peter is its similarity to the Letter of Jude. Some biblical scholars even suggest that the two letters have the same author,[115] who speaks once on behalf of Peter and another time on behalf of Jude. Given that both letters may have been written in the same circle – in the school of Peter – this does not seem impossible, although it is unlikely.[116]

It is not difficult to notice that the author of 2 Peter quotes almost all of the Letter of Jude. However, Jude's material is not incorporated into 2 Peter *in extenso*, but is subjected to transformations, reductions or extensions in line with the arguments from 2 Peter.[117] Nevertheless, it is still recognisable. On the basis of the transformations of the source from Jude, it is possible to infer certain literary strategies of the narrator of 2 Peter. Firstly, he never uses direct quotations. Secondly, despite the lack of direct quotations, the source becomes recognisable by generating the most characteristic lexical, syntactic or motivic elements from it. Thirdly, the narrator of 2 Peter often uses the source material as a pretext to employ wordplay based on phonetic similarity; in this way, he enters into a dialogue with Jude. Examples of such dialogues are given when discussing the vocabulary and style of 2 Peter.[118]

115 J.A.T Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, London 1976, p. 192–195.

116 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:1.

117 E. Szymanek, *Wykład Pisma Świętego Nowego Testamentu*, Pallotinum, Poznań 1990, p. 466.

118 See above – Vocabulary and style (1.2).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Fourthly and finally, Peter often draws conclusions from the borrowed elements, which differ from those of Jude.

It should be noted that until the nineteenth century scholars were convinced that it was Jude who quoted the Second Letter of Peter.[119] However, modern research shows that it was rather the other way around. The hypotheses on this matter can be reduced to three: the Letter of Jude is dependent on the Second Letter of Peter; the Second Letter of Peter is dependent on the Letter of Jude; both hagiographers draw on a common source independently of each other.[120] The hypothesis of joint authorship of 2 Peter and Jude is considered negligible.

The interdependence of the two writings or their origin from a common source is suggested by the striking similarities in Theological and lexical layers.[121] The most important similarities are presented in the table:[122]

Jude	Motif	2 Peter
v. 4	Ungodly false teachers	2:1
v. 6	Angels cast in the dark	2:4
v. 7	Sodom and Gomorrah	2:6
v. 8	Rejecting/despising authority and blaspheming the glories	2:10
v. 9	Refraining from condemnation/judgement	2:11
v. 10	Comprehension at the level of animals and blasphemy	2:12
v. 11	Balaam	2:15
v. 12	Nature-related metaphors	2:17
v. 16	Arrogance in words	2:18
v. 17	The words of the apostles	3:2
v. 18	The emergence of scoffers in the last days	3:3

The hypothesis that it is the Letter of Jude that is dependent on the Second Letter of Peter is based primarily on the apostolic authority and the belief in the authenticity of both letters. This theory prevailed among theologians from antiquity until the nineteenth/twentieth century. Among its proponents was M. Luther, who claimed that the Letter of St Jude "refers to the second Epistle of St. Peter, from which it has taken nearly all its words".[123] Today, defenders of the priority of 2 Peter

119 J.F. Hultin, *The Literary Relationships among 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude*, [in:] *Reading 1–2 Peter and Jude. A Resource for Students*, ed. E.F. Mason, T.W. Martin, Atlanta 2014, p. 32.

120 A. Robinson, *Jude on the Attack. A Comparative Analysis of the Letter of Jude, Jewish Judgement Oracles and Greco-Roman Invective*, London–New York 2018, p. 10–11.

121 M.J. Gilmore, *Reflections on the Authorship of 2 Peter*, p. 295.

122 After: S.J. Kistemaker, *New Testament Commentary: James, Letters of John, Peter and Jude*, Grand Rapids 1996, p. 357; K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *A Structural Commentary on the So-Called Antilegomena*, vol. 2: *The Letter of Jude: Expecting Mercy* (Eastern and Central European Voices 3.2), Göttingen 2021, p. 48 (We will continue to use the shortened title: *Expecting Mercy*).

123 M. Luther, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther*.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

include M.D. Mathews[124] and D.B. Wallace.[125] The latter gives four main arguments in support of his thesis:

(1) the style of Jude is better than that of 2 Peter, which proves that Jude was correcting errors and imperfections in the source text;

(2) 2 Peter claims that the false teachers are yet to appear, while Jude presents them as intruders who are already infiltrating the community of recipients. If both letters are addressed to the same community, then the order 2 Peter (announcement) – Jude (fulfilment) is natural;

(3) assuming that Jude 17 refers to the apostolic times that had already ended, and that the term 'apostle' is reduced to refer to the Twelve, possibly with Paul and Barnabas, it must be considered that the Letter of Jude was written after Peter's death, i. e. after the year 64 AD; the Second Letter of Peter must have been written earlier, during the apostle's lifetime;

(4) a comparative analysis of Jude 17 and 2 Pet 3:2 shows that Jude 17, asking the recipients to remember the words of the apostles about the appearance of false teachers in the last days, indirectly points to 2 Peter, since 2 Pet 3:2 predicts precisely such events.[126]

Today, however, a significant number of scholars prove that it is the Second Letter of Peter that is dependent on the Letter of Jude (e. g. R. Bauckham, J.N.D. Kelly, K.H. Schelkle, W. Grundmann, J.H. Neyrey, G.L. Green, T. Fornberg, T. Callan, F. Mickiewicz). Such a relationship seems the most natural, because since antiquity one can observe a tendency to expand rather than shorten texts. Moreover, no convincing argument were put forward why the author of Jude would only use material from 2 Pet 2:4–8.15–16?[127] G.L. Green classifies the dependence of 2 Peter on Jude as *imitatio* – μίμησις, popular in antiquity, which absolutely cannot be compared with modern plagiarism, and which allowed alterations to be made to the source material.[128]

---

124 M.D. Mathews, *The Literary Relationship of 2 Peter and Jude. Does the Synoptic Tradition Resolve this Synoptic Problem?*, "Neotestamentica" 44 (2010), no. 1, p. 47–66.

125 D.B. Wallace, *Jude: Introduction, Argument, and Outline*.

126 Ibid.: "2 Peter speaks of 'your apostles' while Jude speaks of 'the apostles'; (2) 2 Peter reminds his audience of what the prophets and apostles said while Jude merely mentions apostles. As we have argued in our discussion of 2 Peter, 'your apostles' probably refers to Paul and his associates. Peter's point was to show not only that Paul was a genuine spokesman for God, but also that his message was in line with the OT prophets. Jude, however, drops the mention of the prophets, and makes the apostles more absolute. If anything, this suggests that Jude was written later and depended on 2 Peter", most likely in the 70s of the first century; K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 48–49.

127 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 226; see also T. Callan *Use of the Letter of Jude by the Second of Peter*, "Biblica" 85 (2004), no. 1, p. 42–64.

128 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 591.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Both letters were not necessarily addressed to the same community; their authors seem to share the main theological ideas, though they may differ in details. It is usually assumed that the two letters were written in different communities. And even if they both originated in the Petrine school, they were certainly not written at the same time. This means that the situation described in them is different. This can be seen, for example, when one compares the accounts of the false teachers. In the Letter of Jude, they are more of an external threat, intruding into the community (Jude 4), which welcomes them with hospitality, so they can propagate their erroneous teachings even during the agape feasts (Jude 12). The ambition of false teachers is above all to gain recognition and supplant the existing authorities of the community (Jude 8.16.19). In the Second Letter of Peter, false teachers are an internal threat (2 Pet 2:1), who attract followers by falsely interpreting prophetic and apostolic teachings, preach eschatological scepticism, and wish to make Christianity one of the philosophical schools (2 Pet 1:16, 2:19, 3:3–7.16). Perhaps what was then considered an internal threat of false interpretations of Scripture and false teachings in 2 Peter is a consequence of the infiltration of errant believers who were gaining more and more authority and influence in the community. If this is the case, 2 Peter may have been written at least several, if not even more, years after Jude. With this assumption, it is also not surprising that the teaching of the false teachers is described more generally in Jude and more specifically, at least in some points, in 2 Peter.[129]

There is undoubtedly a different emphasis in Theology of the two letters, although they share an interest in eschatology. Jude argues that judgement is integral to soteriology; one cannot preach salvation while omitting judgement or claiming that it does not apply to the righteous. Peter has to deal with a deeper eschatological scepticism, which also presupposes God's indifference to the world. The approach to revelation is also different. Jude does not elaborate on the question of salvation, he merely says that the false teachers want to convince the community that they are the recipients of God's true revelation (Jude 8), Peter is not interested in new private revelations, he focuses on those that are recognised in his circle but falsely interpreted (2 Pet 1:16–21, 3:4–7.16). What they do have in common, however, is a Christocentric interpretation of texts belonging to the broadly understood Jewish tradition, which also includes writings that did not ultimately find their way into the canon.[130]

The author of 2 Peter made use of the possibilities offered by the convention of *imitatio* and adapted the material of the Letter of Jude to the competences and

129 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy*, p. 159.

130 On the differences in the approach of the authors of 2 Peter and Jude to the material taken from Jewish tradition, see W. M. Dunnett, *The Hermeneutics of Jude and 2 Peter: The Use of Ancient Jewish Traditions*, "Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society" 31 (1988), no. 3, p. 287–292.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

interests of the readers of his work, which seem different from those of the readers of Jude.[131] 2 Peter has reduced the Midrashic and Pesher traits clearly present in Jude.[132] Midrashic elements are rather implied than explicit, as references to reinterpretations of biblical narratives characteristic of the Second Temple period[133] are evident in the accounts of the angels (2 Pet 2:4), the description of Noah as righteous (2 Pet 2:5), the description of Lot's struggles (2 Pet 2:7–8), or the interpretation of the story of Balaam (2 Pet 2:15–16). More noticeable are the allusions and references to Greek literature. This can be seen both in the formal layer (e. g. sorites in 2 Pet 1:5–7) and in the content (Cyrenaic hedonism in 2:13–14; Epicurean freedom from fear of posthumous punishment in 2 Pet 2:19).

One of the most important arguments for 2 Peter's dependence on Jude is the elimination of direct references (and even quotations) from the Enoch literature and The Testament of Moses. Perhaps this is related to the progressive Hellenization of Christianity and its de-Judaization. Although the author of 2 Peter seeks to integrate the Jewish and Hellenistic traditions, he must consider the fact that some texts belonging to the former, which were still widely known at the time the Letter of Jude was being written and in Jude's milieu, had already been forgotten at the time of the writing and in the milieu of 2 Peter.[134] Even if one were to assume that both writings originated in the Petrine school, this would be one of the more convincing evidences of the changes that took place in the milieu/community of Peter's disciples during the years that separate the time of writing Jude from the time of writing 2 Peter.

Theory of the Petrine school in which both 2 Peter and Jude could have been written is linked to the hypothesis of a common source for both texts. As mentioned, there may have been florilegia, extracts from Jewish literature, in the milieu of Peter's disciples, which were used independently and at different times by both hagiographers.

Another version of the common source hypothesis, not referring to the Petrine circle, assumes that Jude and Peter had access to a document intended to refute the teachings of the false teachers.[135] However, it is not known exactly what such a document would have contained, in what milieu and at what time it was produced. Did it only contain examples from Judaic tradition? Or did it also contain other

131 R. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, London–New York 1990, p. 146–147.

132 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 142.

133 N.R. Werse, *Second Temple Jewish Literary Traditions in 2 Peter*, CBQ 78 (2016), no. 1, p. 111–130.

134 See below other hypotheses in the structural commentary – analysis of 2 Pet 2:12.

135 E.I. Robson, *Studies in the Second Letter of St Peter. Peter*, Cambridge 1915, p. 52–57; see also M. Green, *The Second Letter General of Peter and the General Letter of Jude*, Grand Rapids 1987, p. 58–64.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

arguments found in both writings, such as accusations of blasphemy, debauchery, gluttony and greed, or comparisons to irrational beasts and threats of destruction? However, the similar choice of invectives and accusations may result from the use of vituperative conventions in both writings.

Finally, the common source may have been some kind of oral tradition, but then it is even more difficult to determine its content and literary stability. It may have been a Jewish tradition or an early Christian tradition. It must have been literarily stabilised by now, otherwise it would have been difficult to preserve such significant lexical similarities. On the other hand, the noticeable differences in lexis between Jude and 2 Peter in the common material may indicate that the literary stability of the source was not yet achieved or that only certain parts of the message were literarily stabilised.[136]

It has already been mentioned that the hypothesis of joint authorship of the two texts is supported by the fewest number of researchers. One of its proponents is J.A.T. Robinson, who claims that the author was Jude. Jude, therefore, first wrote a short letter, sent under his own name, to order to immediately respond to the spreading heresy, and then edited a longer letter, signing with the name of Peter.[137]

For the purposes of this commentary the hypothesis of the priority of the Letter of Jude has been adopted. The author of the Second Letter of Peter relied on it for part of his arguments, but he revised the material taken from Jude and creatively transformed for his own theological and parenetic needs.

1.4 Date and place of origin

The difficulty of establishing the letter's authorship obviously translates into the question of its dating. R. Bauckham even claims that no other NT writing was dated so broadly, from the 60s of the first century to the 60s of the second century;[138] sometimes the time of the final drafting of the letter is moved even to 180 AD.[139] The few authors who argue the author of 2 Peter is the apostle himself (e. g., C. Bigg, R.H. Mounce, D.J. Moo) support the hypothesis of an early dating, i. e. before 64 (possibly 67). Since the author explicitly announces his death (1:14–15), they

136 L. Nortjé-Meyer, *Vilification in 2 Pet 2: A Comparison with the Letter of Jude*, "Scriptura" 112 (2013), no. 1, p. 3.

137 J.A.T Robinson, *Redating*, p. 192–195; See analysis of 2 Pet of 3:1.

138 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 157; Bauckham notes that actually only dating the letter to the decade 70–80 does not find supporters.

139 See an overview of the various positions about the dating of 2 Peter to the years 60–180 AD in P. Foster, *Does the Apocalypse of Peter Help to Determine the Date of 2 Peter*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, p. 217–224.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

assume that the letter was written shortly before Peter's martyrdom. Since the First Letter of Peter was written around 60 (according to the same scholars) and the author of 2 Peter mentions it (3:1), this means that the letter must have been written in the early 60s. Furthermore, there is no mention or allusion in the letter to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD or even to the Jewish War (66–70), which could mean that the text was written before these events.

The middle date hypothesis shifts the time of the letter's composition to the years 80–100, possibly to the first decades of the second century. As already mentioned, this corresponds to the period just before or the very beginning of so-called early Catholicism. It is advocated by most scholars (e. g. J.B. Mayor, R. Bauckham, B. Reicke, P. Perkins, J.D. Harrington, K.H. Schelkle, J.N.D. Kelly, W. Grundmann, E.M. Sidebottom, J.H. Neyrey, F. Mickiewicz, D.F. Watson and T. Callan). There are several arguments in favour of this dating, some of which have already appeared when discussing other issues. They can now be put in a more systematic and synthetic way:

1. The language of 2 Pet 1:4 reveals considerable Hellenistic influence, when Christianity was already developed in non-Palestinian areas.

2. 2 Pet 1:20 testifies to the fact that many differing interpretations of certain passages of Scripture had already arisen, giving rise to the need for authoritative rules and verification of proposed interpretations; it can be assumed that this process took time and was linked to the beginning of the institutionalisation of the Church.

3. The faith of the readers was based on writings that later became part of the canon of the Old and especially the New Testament (2:21, 3:2.15–17), which suggests the end of the first century. Paul's letters (at least some of them) are considered by the author of 2 Peter to be normative and on a par in authority with the Writings – 2 Pet 3:16 (this probably refers to the constituent texts of LXX regarded by Jews and early Christians as inspired). It is more difficult to describe the attitude towards the literary versions of the gospels. Certainly, references to events described in the synoptic gospels (transfiguration – 2 Pet 1:16–18) can be discerned, even the same phrases are used (cf. Matt 17:5, Mark 9:7, Luke 9:35 and Matt 3:17, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22), but their interpretation is more reminiscent of the pre-evangelical tradition. The references to the appearance of false prophets in the end times (cf. Matt 24:11), the comparison of the Parousia to the coming of a thief (Matt 24:43), or, finally, the linking of people's way of life in the end times to the situation at the time of the Flood (Matt 24:37–39)[140] may allude to Jesus' sayings, but it is impossible to confirm with certainty whether the literary version of the Gospel of Matthew, some extra-evangelical written source of the Lord's sayings, or rather

140 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 139 give places where almost verbatim quotations from Matt and Luke are used: 2 Pet 1:17b – Matt 15:5, 2 Pet 2:20b – Matt 12:45 and Luke 11:26.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the oral tradition[141] and elements typical of the apocalyptic speech were used here. On the other hand, the portrayal of Peter in 2 Peter and in the Acts is very similar. If the Acts are commonly dated to circa 85–90, then 2 Peter must come from the same or slightly later period.

4. 2 Pet 3:4 speaks of the death of the "fathers", which many exegetes fin to refer to the first generation of Christians[142] and/or the generation of the apostles.[143]

5. The author, drawing on the Letter of Jude, omits quotations from The Assumption of Moses and The First Book of Enoch, which may have been due not only to the Hellenistic milieu of the sender and the recipients, but also to the fact that these writings were already considered barely normative.[144]

6. The polemic against the false teachers and their eschatological scepticism testifies to a progressive disillusionment and eschatological crisis; in many Christian circles the expectation of the Parousia greatly weakened and sometimes even disappeared (2:20–22, 3:3–10), which is characteristic of the early Catholicism (second and third generation of Christians).

7. Similar theological ideas, especially eschatological, and a similar vocabulary can be found in early Christian writings – in *The Shepherd* of Hermas (80–100 AD), *2 Clem.* (80–100 AD), *1 Clem.* (c. 96 AD). This supports the position that all these writings, including 2 Pet, were written at around the same time.

8. The text of 2 Peter seems to be alluded to in the Apocalypse of Peter, which was written between 132 and 135 AD;[145] it means that the text of 2 Peter must have been written somewhat earlier, although, as L.R. Donelson argues, dating back to 120–150 could also be accepted,[146] especially on the assumption that ApPet was written around 150.[147]

With regard to the latter work, The Apocalypse of Peter, it is necessary to mention a third group of scholars who move the date of composition of the Second Letter of

141 For the analysis of the Gospel traditions in 2 Peter see T. Callan, *The Gospels of Matthew and John in the Second Letter of Peter*, [in:] *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Tradition*, ed. A. Batten, J. Kloppenborg, London 2014, p. 166–180 and G.L. Green, *The Testimony of Peter: 2 Peter and the Gospel Traditions*, [in:] *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Tradition*, p. 181–198; M. Barghorn, *Rezeption des Matthausevangeliums in zweiten Petrusbrief? Zum Verhaltnis zweier neutestamentlischer Schriften*, [in:] *Der zweite Petrusbrief und das Neue Testament*, ed. W. Grundstaudl, U. Poplutz, T. Nicklas, Tubingen 2017, p. 55–76.

142 For other interpretations see the analysis of 3:4.

143 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 158.

144 H. Langkammer, *Jezus Chrystus w świetle późniejszych pism Nowego Testamentu*, Wrocław 2009, p. 122.

145 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 170.

146 L.R. Donelson, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude*, Louisville 2010, p. 209.

147 J.N. Bremmer, *The Apocalypse of Peter as the First Christian Martyr Text: Its Date, Provenance and Relationship with 2 Peter*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, p. 75–98.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Peter to the middle of the second century BC or even later (R. Kopf, W. Grünstäudl, J. Frey, T. Nicklas, J.N. Bremmer). This late dating is based on Thesis that it was the author of 2 Peter who referred in his writing to The Apocalypse of Peter, not the other way round. 2 Peter will have been written to correct the eschatological expectations aroused in the second century by ApPet. The proponents of the late dating sometimes suggest that 2 Pet 1:14 supposedly refers to The Acts of Peter, written around 180, which mentions the apostle's imminent death foretold to him by Jesus during Peter's flight from Rome. As a second argument for such a late dating, the claim is made that 2 Peter is combating Gnostic movements that developed in the second half of the second century. An additional argument for the late dating would be the lack of direct references to the letter in the Apostolic Fathers. Since the letter was written around the same time as their writings, it is not surprising that they may not have known it yet.[148] This means that the letter was probably written around 180.[149]

The commentary presented here adopts the hypothesis of the middle dating, i. e. the end of the first century, or possibly the turn of the second century. This hypothesis seems to be supported by numerous arguments and is most reasonable. At the same time, it should be added that the dating of the letter does not significantly affect the interpretation of its content (though it does to some extent).

The place of composition of the letter is most likely Rome, although Egypt or Syrian Antioch or more generally Asia Minor are also taken into consideration. Obviously, exegetes who accept Peter's personal authorship mention Rome. Similarly, those who argue that authorship should be attributed to a close associate or disciple from the Petrine school support this hypothesis. It is in the imperial capital that *The First Letter of Clement* and *The Shepherd* of Hermas were composed, and the vocabulary and themes of 2 Peter, as already mentioned, overlaps in many places with the vocabulary and content of these two writings. Besides, the remark that the author sends "a second letter" to the readers (3:1) – assuming that the first letter is the canonical 1 Peter – may suggest that he is sending it from the same place from which he sent the previous one, that is Rome (1 Pet 5:13).[150]

Egypt, especially Alexandria, is usually advocated by the supporters of the late dating of 2 Peter, its dependence on ApPet and the existence of a phenomenon called the Petrine discourse. The argument here is mainly based on the popularity of the Apostle Peter, to whom various texts have been attributed, on the fact that papyrus P^{72} comes from Egypt in which 2 Peter was first known. The argument in favour of Asia Minor is based on the influence of the Hellenistic culture, evident in

148 R.E. Picirilli, *Allusions to 2 Peter in the Apostolic Fathers*, p. 74.

149 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 170–171.

150 See above – Authorship (1.3), where the oldest references to Peter's stay in Rome are also presented.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the letter, and the references to the religious and social situation of the Christian communities there, as well as the fact that the author of 2 Peter is familiar with some of Paul's letters, which were addressed mainly to Christians from Asia Minor.[151]

1.5 Literary genre

The Second Letter of Peter is a multi-genre text, integrating genres typical of Hellenistic and Jewish literature. On the one hand, from the formal point of view it undoubtedly belongs to the epistolographic literature with elements typical of ancient classical rhetoric; on the other, it combines elements of a sermon, a testament and an apocalyptic prophecy, with passages that clearly apply the conventions of vituperative, parenetic, protreptic, judicial, deliberative and epideictic rhetoric.[152]

The elements of a testament in 2 Peter received particular attention from H. Windisch,[153] followed by R. Bauckham.[154] The genre was popular in the intertestamental era (c. 200 BC – 300 AD),[155] in which numerous pseudonymous testaments signed with the names of figures known and respected in the past (The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The Testament of Abraham, The Testament of Moses, The Testament of Job and a few others) were created.[156] The testaments could function separately or as a component of a longer text (e. g. 1 En 91–104, 4 Ezra 14:27–36, Jub 21–22, 36:1–18, *LAB* 19:1–5, 24:1–5, *Ant.* IV 8:45–47).[157] They tend to idealise the protagonist who, sensing the approaching death, summons his loved ones and gives instructions on following the paths of righteousness and avoiding temptation. He warns against dangerous, false teachings and also pronounces blessings and/or curses. It is very common in testaments to find a reinterpretation of biblical texts in the form of a parenetic midrash[158] or descriptions of the future in the form of an apocalypse, since knowledge regarding the

151 See R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 158.

152 D.F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style*, p. 85–86.

153 H. Windisch, *Die katholischen Briefe* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 15), Tübingen 1951, p. 87–88.

154 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 131–135.

155 G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishna*, Philadelphia 1981, p. 231–237.

156 M. Rosik, I. Rapoport, *Wprowadzenie do literatury i egzegezy żydowskiej okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego* (Bibliotheca Biblica), Wrocław 2009, p. 70–79.

157 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 604.

158 The prototypes of this literary genre we already find in the Old Testament: the speech of Jacob (Gen 49), Moses (Deut 30–31) and Joshua (Josh 23–24). Their counterparts in the New Testament are the farewell speech of Jesus (Luke 22:14–26, John 13–17) and Paul (Acts 20:18–35).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

future was communicated to the protagonist as a dream or vision. The analysis of various texts representing testamentary literature reveals four main features of the testament as a literary genre: 1. a revelation of impending death; 2. reflection on the past; 3. instruction on the right way to live; 4. apocalyptic description of the future.[159]

Furthermore, it is important to add that testaments are always pseudepigraphs. Thus, if 2 Peter really belonged to this type of literature, one would have to assume in advance that it is also a pseudepigraph.[160] Usually, proponents of the inclusion of 2 Peter to the genre of literary testaments list four passages that would support this attribution.

The first passage is 2 Pet 1:3–11, often referred to as a miniature homily, in which the author follows the patterns from 4 Ezra:

> Hear these words, O Israel! At first our fathers dwelt as aliens in Egypt, and they were delivered from there, and received the law of life, which they did not keep, which you also have transgressed after them. Then land was given to you for a possession in the land of Zion; but you and your fathers committed iniquity and did not keep the ways which the Most High commanded you. And because he is a righteous judge, in due time he took from you what he had given. And now you are here, and your brethren are farther in the interior. If you, then, will rule over your minds and discipline your hearts, you shall be kept alive, and after death you shall obtain mercy. For after death the judgement will come, when we shall live again; and then the names of the righteous will become manifest, and the deeds of the ungodly will be disclosed (4 Ezra 14:28–35).

The Fourth Book of Ezra was originally written in a Semitic language (Hebrew rather than Aramaic) and then translated into Greek. The work is also known under two other titles: The Prophecy of Ezra and The Apocalypse of Ezra. It was probably written around the year 100 AD by a Pharisee from Palestine.[161] The apocryphon describes seven visions received by Salathiel, called Ezra, concerning the fate of the present world, the fate of Israel, the fate of those who have already departed to eternity, the end of the world and the signs preceding it, the end of the Roman empire punished by the Messiah, whose kingdom will last four hundred years, and the story of the creation of 94 books, 24 of which became part of the canon of

159 S. Mędala, *Wprowadzenie do literatury międzytestamentalnej* (Biblioteka Zwojów. Tło Nowego Testamentu 1), Kraków 1994, p. 205–206.

160 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 134, D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 132.

161 The translations known today (Latin, Syriac, Ethiopian, Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, Georgian) were based precisely on the Greek text; M. Rosik, I. Rapoport, *Wprowadzenie do literatury i egzegezy żydowskiej okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego*, p. 61.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the Hebrew Bible, while the remaining 70 remain hidden and intended only for initiates.[162]

The second passage from 2 Peter that resembles the Jewish testaments is the announcement of imminent death (1:12–15). The author hopes that readers will remember his teaching and follow it. Besides, the terminology of this fragment is typical of farewell speeches. The other two passages (2:1–3 and 3:1–4) announce the coming of the false teachers, which will take place after the death of the author of 2 Peter. Like most announcements of future events in the testaments, they are written in an apocalyptic tone.[163]

Most scholars either approve of R. Bauckham's findings on the genre or respond positively to at least part of them (e. g. J.H. Neyrey, P. Perkins, D.J. Harrington). Nevertheless, the classification of 2 Peter only as the testamentary literature seems no longer appropriate. Even a cursory comparison of the letter to known testaments reveals that 2 Peter lacks some of the typical elements of this genre: the gathering of loved ones at the protagonist's deathbed (the announcement of impending death in 1:14 is not enough for the letter to be considered a testament), the burial narrative, the description of visions[164] or dreams through which the protagonist learned about the future, there are also no typical blessings or typical curses, while the warnings against false teachers and ethical instructions are not directly related to the protagonist's impending death – their content is completely autonomous.[165]

In 2011, an insightful comparative study between 2 Peter and the Judaic and early Christian testaments was published by M.D. Mathews.[166] The author argues that although the Second Letter of Peter contains the basic elements of a farewell speech, it indeed lacks the aforementioned characteristics of the testamentary genre. He also draws attention to the complexity of the best-known Jewish testamentary texts (The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs), which contain numerous second-century

162 The author of 4 Ezra attributes pre-existence to the Messiah: "Hic est unctus, quem reservavit Altissimum in finem" (12:32) and "Ipse est, quem conservat Altissimus multis temporibus" (12:26). According to 4 Ezra 13:52 the pre-existence of the Messiah is described in terms of "hiding in God": "Sicut non potest hoc vel scrutinare vel scire quis, quid sit in profundo maris, sic non poterit quisquam super terram videre filium meum, vel eos qui cum eo sunt, nisi in tempore diei".

163 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 132.

164 It should be noted, however, that the image of Peter the visionary is clearly outlined in extra-canonical literature – including The Gospel of Peter and The Apocalypse of Peter; see R. Burnet, *Peter, the Visionary Before the Pope: Early Receptions of the Apostle in Marginal Communities*, [in:] *The Early Reception*, p. 99–113.

165 J.D. Charles, *Virtue amidst Vice: The Catalogue of Virtues in 2 Peter* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series 150), Sheffield 1997, p. 49–75; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 608.

166 M.D. Mathews, *The Genre of 2 Peter: A Comparison with Jewish and Early Christian Testaments*, "Bulletin for Biblical Research" 21 (2011), no. 1, p. 51–64.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Christian interpolations. Christian testaments, on the other hand, in accordance with testamentary convention, also refer to some figure known from Israel's history (e. g. The Testament of Isaac and The Testament of Jacob), rather than the figures of the apostles, almost contemporaries of the authors and the first, historical recipients of the text.

The absence of certain genre features does not, of course, mean that the author of 2 Peter was unfamiliar with testamentary literature. On the contrary, it seems to have been important for him as well as inspiring, although he drew on it only to a certain extent. This importance and familiarity can be evidenced not only by analyses of the text, but also by external facts. Christian testamentary literature (The Testament of Isaac and The Testament of James) was written at the beginning of the second century in an Egyptian milieu,[167] so it dates back to around the same time as 2 Peter. Probably Peter drew on it in a similar way as on the Letter of Jude – he transformed the source material and adapted it to his arguments, but he did not intend to write a typical testament.

In addition, as already mentioned, there are a number of texts from the first/second century which, although using testamentary elements, are not testaments. These include The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch and The Letter of Enoch, which M.D. Mathews compared in terms of genology with the Second Letter of Peter. The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch was originally written in Hebrew and then translated into Syriac. The Syriac version, however, is not a direct translation of the Hebrew text, but of the Greek. The work was written in the first half of the second century AD in Palestine. The author recounts the announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem made by God to the prophet Baruch. The destruction is to be carried out by four angels, after which the entire city is to be occupied by the Chaldeans. By God's command the prophet himself is to remain in the city, while Jeremiah is to go to Babylon. God also reveals to Baruch that the pagans will be punished for their wrongdoing, while the temple will be rebuilt after the coming of the Messiah.

The Letter of Enoch forms the last part of The First Book of Enoch (Ethiopic Book of Enoch 92–108). The work was most likely written entirely in Hebrew, although Aramaic fragments have also been found; however, it is known in the Ethiopic language called *Ge'ez*. As a collective work, it had many authors and took shape over several centuries. It can be assumed that the oldest parts date back as far as the sixth century BC, while the youngest parts date back to the end of the first century AD. These include The Letter of Enoch, which announces God's blessing on the righteous and punishment on sinners. Both of these documents, although they

167 See Introduction to *Testament Izaaka*, Polish transl. A. Kuśmirek, [in:] *Pisma apokaliptyczne i Testamenty* (Apokryfy Starego Testamentu 2), ed. M. Parchem, Kraków–Mogilany 2010, p. 456 and Introduction to *Testament Jakuba*, Polish transl. A. Kuśmirek, [in:] *Pisma apokaliptyczne i Testamenty*, p. 485–486.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

contain testament-like elements (e. g. a protagonist from the distant past, farewells and visions), they do not count as testaments but rather as apocalypses. Similarly, 2 Peter is considered primarily a letter.[168] This is, in fact, how the author himself defines it (2 Pet 3:1) and how the initial typical epistolary formulas allow it to be classified (2 Pet 1:1–2).

The epistolary elements include, of course, the entire prescript with the *superscriptio*, in which the sender introduces himself, the *adscriptio*, in which he introduces his recipients, and the salutation formula. The entire body of the letter is structured according to classical rhetorical principles, which is also typical of ancient epistolography. However, the conviction that the text was conceived as a letter from the beginning is overturned by the absence of an ending typical of letters. The sender does not attach greetings, nor does he refer to his own situation or that of the recipients. He ends the letter with a short doxology (2 Pet 3:18b): "To Him be the glory now and until the day of ages/eternity". Some manuscripts (e. g. P^{72}, א A C P Ψ) also add the typical liturgical acclamation "Amen".

Since the letter ends with a doxology, which has its roots in Jewish tradition, there has also been a hypothesis that the entire text of 2 Peter may have previously been a homily to which epistolary elements were added. All the more so since, as mentioned, 1:3–11 can be considered a miniature homily, a baptismal sermon). Quite often ancient homilies ended with formulas of praise to God.[169] In view of this hypothesis, the alternative option should rather be accepted, firstly because doxologies also appeared in the letters (see Paul's letters), and secondly because the letter was from the beginning intended to be read during liturgical assemblies (cf. 2 Pet 1:12.15).

The letter also contains passages that conform to the convention of *vituperatio* (e. g. 2 Pet 2:10–15.17–19.22). However, it is parenesis that dominates, and this makes it possible to treat almost the entire letter as an extended parenesis. Special instructions are those dealing with baptism (2 Pet 1:3–11), inspiration (2 Pet 1:20–21), the origin of apostolic teaching and its consistency with prophetic teaching (2 Pet 1:16–19, 3:16), the explanation of the reasons for the "delay" of the Parousia and the correct understanding of eschatological events (2 Pet 3:8–15). Part of the parenesis has protreptic features, with the sender encouraging the recipients of the letter to improve themselves morally and to know Jesus Christ. This is particularly evident in 2 Pet 1:5–8 and 2 Pet 3:14.

The multi-genre convention, the drawing on Jewish and Greek literary models, the overlapping of genres, and Peter's tendency to creative *imitatio* – drawing on only some, sometimes not at all constitutive, elements typical of the genres in

168 M.D. Mathews, *The Genre of 2 Peter*, p. 63–64.

169 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 407.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

question and additionally subjecting them to transformations – makes it so difficult to identify unambiguously the generic affiliation of the entire text.

1.6 Sources

The letter's narrator draws inspiration for his original theological reflection from three sources: the Jewish tradition (primarily apocalyptic), the Christian tradition and the Hellenistic tradition.

Undoubtedly, one of the main sources of 2 Peter is the Old Testament,[170] especially those apocalyptic passages. Jewish apocalypticism, which developed with particular intensity from the second century BC onwards, was reflected in the literary monuments of its time. These include both biblical books and apocryphal writings.[171] One of the signs of the end times, alongside the increasing spread of lawlessness, the oppression of the righteous and the emergence of false prophets and teachers, was to be, in the belief of the followers of Judaism, a universal cataclysm. The prediction of cataclysms preceding the coming of the Messiah is based on the Old Testament belief that the way to happiness leads through suffering (cf. Hos 13:13, Dan 12:1). The rabbis even coined Theory of the "pangs/sorrows of the Messiah" (cf. Hos 13:13). These are associated with signs that are to appear in the sky (OrSib 3:795–807, 4 Ezra 5:1–13, 6:18–28). There will be famine on the earth, fires and earthquakes (4 Ezra 6:24, 9:1–12, 13:29–31). The author of The Fourth Book of Ezra foretells: "At that time friends shall make war on friends like enemies, and the earth and those who inhabit it shall be terrified, and the springs of the fountains shall stand still, so that for three hours they shall not flow" (6:24).[172] Theme of universal cataclysm is present in both apocalyptic literature and oral prophecy. Only the elect, those faithful to the Law and the covenant, can expect salvation. The supporters of evil will be destroyed. Then the Messiah will appear on earth.[173]

---

170 The OT references are presented in detail, with sigla, by D.F. Watson and T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 140.

171 S. Mędala, *Wprowadzenie do literatury międzytestamentalnej*, p. 5.

172 In another place he presents a vision even more terrifying: "Blood shall drip from wood, and the stone shall utter its voice; the peoples shall be troubled, and the stars shall fall. […] the sea of Sodom shall cast up fish; and one whom the many do not know shall make his voice heard by night, and all shall hear his voice. There shall be chaos also in many places, and fire shall often break out, and the wild beasts shall roam beyond their haunts" (5:5–8).

173 According to the belief of the author of The Book of Enoch, the Messiah is a pre-existent figure in heaven, endowed with majesty and power over all creatures. It seems that only this book (9:16–38) claims that the Messiah will arrive after the final judgement day; other writings speak of his arrival before the judgement (OrSib 3:652–656, PssSol 17:24.26.27.31.38.39.41).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The source of the invectives used by the author of 2 Peter can also be found in the Old Testament passages. One of the strongest terms used by the author of the letter is to compare false teachers to dogs: "A dog having returned to its own vomit, and a swine having washed to wallow in the mud" (2:22). In the Hebrew Bible, among the animal insults, it is the cynological motif that comes to the fore as an overly insulting and deprecating term (1 Sam 17:43, 24:15, 2 Sam 16:9, Ps 22:17, Isa 56:10, Prov 26:11).

When interpreting other OT passages, the author of 2 Peter often introduces elements of haggadah or haggadic midrash. In Jewish literature two types of material can be distinguished: moral and legal recommendations and stories. The first forms the so-called *halakha*, "way" or 'walk', which is a material covering the whole body of Jewish Law and its application. For example, none of six hundred and thirteen commandments of the Torah are disputed by any of the rabbis, but for each of them different *halakhas* may arise which interpret the commandment in different ways.[174] The haggadah, on the other hand, is an interpretation of the narrative material of the Hebrew Bible, and it may contain stories contemporary to the authors or folkloric motifs. Haggadic exegesis is freer; it is inextricably linked to tradition, while it remains open to current problems and vital or contentious issues in a given community.[175] This is how Peter interprets the ktiseological narrative (2 Pet 3:4–7). It is slightly different with the diluvial or Sodom narrative (2 Pet 2:5–9), for it must be remembered that in these cases he most likely drew on distinctive Midrashic extensions of these narratives from the Second Temple period rather than on biblical sources. Undeniably, the most distinctive feature of Peter's interpretations is the use of two overlapping types of hermeneutics. Firstly, in line with Christian tradition, the author of 2 Peter reads most of the OT texts (even those primarily non-Messianic ones) in a Christocentric manner. Secondly, he subjects them to an eschatological hermeneutic. This allows him to prove Thesis that the apostolic Parousia and eschatological message is deeply rooted in the Old Testament texts.

Another source for the Second Letter of Peter is also the Letter of Jude. This has been discussed earlier, so there is no need to return to it here.

The discussion on the genre of 2 Peter revealed that the author of the letter was probably inspired by the testaments as a literary genre that contained apocalyptic visions, eschatological content and moral instructions close to his heart. Inspiration in this case does not mean the author of 2 Peter has to slavishly adhere to convention

174 "Halacha is everything that concerns the 'norm' to be followed, the pattern of conduct – practically, it is the entire rabbinic discussion aimed at establishing a legal interpretation. However, the latter, though binding, always remains subject to discussion, since history can provide new variables and *halakha* can also be modified"; A. Mello, *Judaizm*, Polish transl. K. Stopa, Kraków 2003, p. 41.

175 G. Stemberger, *Il Midrash. Uso rabbinico della Bibbia. Introduzione, testi, commenti*, Bologna 1992, p. 29.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

and transfer all the genre features of the source text to the target text; what is necessary is to transform the materials and adapt them to his own theological and parenetic argumentation. He certainly knew The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs as their original version was already available from the second century BC – Christian interpolations were added to this work almost four hundred years later. Around the year 100 AD, The Testament of Abraham was written. It may therefore have been a work almost contemporary with 2 Peter, though it is possible that the author of the letter was familiar also with this writing. In the first century BC or in the times of Christ, The Testament of Job was created. Another work, not widely known, probably dating back to the third century BC, is The Testament of Amram and The Testament of Qahat. The list could, of course, be extended. The main point, however, is to emphasise that testamentary literature was extremely popular at the time of the writing of 2 Peter, and it would be surprising if the narrator – styling himself as an apocalyptic writer – ignored it.

The source of the Second Letter of Peter is also Greek and Hellenistic philosophy, described in detail in the commentary section. While the narrator does not enter into polemics with apocalyptic literature and the Christian tradition; on the contrary, he emphasises the continuity and essential ideological coherence of his reflection with Jewish and early Christian eschatology, he adopts two attitudes towards Hellenistic literature. He attempts to Christianise themes, motifs and even formulas characteristic of Socratic, Platonic and Stoic philosophy and ethics. By contrast, Peter distances himself from motifs and themes characteristic of Cyrenaic and Epicurean philosophy and ethics, polemicises against them and regards them as a threat to the purity of Christian teaching.

1.7 Addressees

Since three levels of senders were mentioned in the section on authorship, in an attempt to identify the readers, three levels of recipients should also be referred to: the external author would correspond to the first, historical recipients of the letter, the internal author to the implied recipients intended by the internal author, and the narrator to the recipients intended by Peter, who is a speaking subject created by the internal author, an apocalypticist speaking to future generations.

The first historical readers of the Second Letter of Peter are as difficult, if not more, to identify than the author. The author does not explicitly mention who the recipients of his letter are; he only states that they are those "having faith equal in dignity to ours, obtained through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" (1:1). Such a general description, rare in NT (a similar one occurs only

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

in Jude 1),[176] could apply to any Christian community. Attempts are sometimes made to specify the readers on the basis of 2 Pet 3:15a, and to identify the letters the apostle Paul would have sent to the recipients of 2 Peter. This, too, proves difficult because it is not clear which letters are meant. Is it the entire *Corpus Paulinum*, or the Proto-Pauline letters, or perhaps only some – at least three, according to D.J. Harrington – of the Proto-Pauline collection.[177] Researchers usually narrow down "all the letters" to the Letter to Romans, the First Letter to Thessalonians and the First Letter to Corinthians, the same that are known to Clement of Rome, contemporary to the author of 2 Peter (cf. *1 Clem*. 47:1–3) and those which deal with issues similar to those in 2 Peter. However, one should not exclude the Letter to Romans from this reduced collection, even with the assumption that 2 Peter was written in Rome. For if one takes into account the hypothesis of P. Chatelion Counet that originally 2 Peter was an internal writing of the community, it is the Romans who may have been its first recipients.

The First Letter of Peter might be helpful in determining the readers of 2 Peter if we assume that the letter mentioned in 2 Pet 3:1 is precisely the canonical 1 Peter. The readers of 1 Peter include Christians in Pont, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia (1 Pet 1:1). Of the five provinces cited here, Paul was active in two – Galatia and Asia. He sent three letters to them: to the Galatians, Ephesians and Colossians. The latter contains a request to read it also to the other communes (Col 4:16). One problem, however, is that the Letter to Ephesians and Colossians are considered the Deutero-Pauline letters. However, it cannot be ruled out that in the years 90–100 there was already a collection comprising the Proto-Pauline letters and – at least some of them – the Deutero-Pauline letters, since ten letters of the Apostle of the Nations (Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1–2 Thessalonians, Ephesians [Laodiceans], Colossians, Philippians and Philemon)[178] were mentioned by Marcion about 140–150 AD;[179] earlier (c. 100 AD) the Letter to Ephesians and Romans seem to have been alluded to by Ignatius of Antioch (*IgnEph* 12:3, *IgnRom* 4:3).[180] All this taken together leads to the conclusion that 2 Peter may have been a letter intended for a number of communities who were already familiar with 1 Peter and some of Paul's letters.[181]

In summary, the readers of the letter are most likely the ecclesiastical communities of Asia Minor and, perhaps, in Rome or Alexandria. These communities may

176 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 131.

177 D.P. Senior, D.J. Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter*, Collegeville 2003, p. 295.

178 *The Marcionite Prologues to the Pauline Letters*.

179 The hypotheses concerning the formation of the collection of Paul's writings are described more extensively when analysing 3:15–16.

180 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 135.

181 E. Szymanek, *Wykład Pisma Świętego Nowego Testamentu*, p. 465.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

therefore have been at least partly identical to the communities named in 1 Peter (the northern provinces of Asia Minor). The letter was intended to be a universal letter that could be read in many Christian communities whose members were essentially from pagan backgrounds, but among the first historical recipients of the letter could be both ethno-Christians and Judeo-Christians with the latter possibly originating from a heavily Hellenised diaspora from Minor Asia, perhaps also a North Africa (Alexandrian). The content of the letter testifies that the communities of the readers had to grapple with the problem of false teachers, the correct interpretation of writings considered inspired, eschatological dilemmas, as well as ethical issues.

On the basis of the letter's content and form, one can try to identify its implied readers, intended by the author internally. It must be acknowledged that the author of 2 Peter thinks highly of their literary competence, considers them proficient in rhetoric and poetics, and therefore allows himself to use complex wordplays and sophisticated lexis. He also assumes a good knowledge of Greek literature among the readers and therefore makes allusions to Greek philosophical literature (e. g. Aristotle, Plato, Plutarch, the Stoics or Epicurus and Aristippus of Cyrene), to Greek and Roman poetry (e. g. *The Iliad*, *The Odyssey*, Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*), satire (e. g. Petronius) and to judicial language and rhetoric. He supposes that readers will be able to distinguish between different above-mentioned oratorical genres: deliberative, epideictic and demonstrative speeches.[182]

The recipients, moreover, should not only recognise the authority of the LXX, but have a very good knowledge of it, both content and form, in order to be able to recognise Peter's references to the Torah, the prophets, the psalms[183] and the wisdom literature, as well as to appreciate the stylisation of the message into apocalyptic prophetic speech in 2:1–3 and 3:3–4. The same applies to the wider Jewish tradition together with the interpretive practice prevalent in the Second Temple period. This, in turn, will enable them to appreciate Peter's reflection on internal and external inspiration in 1:20–21. Perhaps this good knowledge of OT and Jewish tradition

182 See D.F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style*, p. 85–86.

183 "Gli ebrei in generale credevano che i loro testi sacri fossero realmente Sacra Scrittura: Dio aveva dato loro la Legge tramite Mosè, e ad essa dovevano obbedire. I Profeti e gli altri libri (gli 'Scritti') erano anch'essi destinati alla guida e all'istruzione"; E.P. Sanders, *Il giudaismo. Fede e prassi* (*63 a.C.–66 d.C.*), Italian transl. P. Capelli, L. Santini, Brescia 1999, p. 64. "The sacred books grew out of the sacred Tradition of pre-exile Israel and were kept in three collections – the Torah, the Prophets and the Writings. The Torah took its final shape in the sixth or at the latest in the fifth century BC; the compilation of the collection of the Prophets was completed in the third century; the collection of the Writings was closed with the end of the second or the beginning of the first century BC. The final determination of the canon by the Jews took place at the end of the first century AD as a reaction of the rabbis to the emergence and solidification of Christianity"; W. Chrostowski, *Żydowskie tradycje interpretacyjne pomocą w zrozumieniu Biblii*, "Collectanea Theologica" 66 (1996), no. 1, p. 43.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

stems from their assumption that it should be held in higher esteem than the native Greek tradition. Josephus Flavius wrote of how important the Bible was to the Jewish world and the Jewish-Hellenists:

> we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another, [as the Greeks have,] but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times; which are justly believed to be divine; and of them five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. […] [Then] the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life (*Con. Ap.* I 8).[184]

Peter attempts to make his readers realise their errors. He never denies the value of traditions based on OT, but at the same time he appreciates the Hellenistic tradition. At the very beginning of the letter, he writes that whether the faith is transmitted by apostles of Greek or Jewish origin, it leads to the same dignity as children of God. In order to correct the erroneous hierarchy of traditions, the narrator also employs an integrative strategy and shows that both the Greek tradition and the Jewish tradition require Christianisation and interpretation inspired by the Holy Spirit.

The most important assumption is that the readers know the apostolic teaching. However, it is not clear how it was transmitted – whether as oral teaching or, as seems very likely, as teaching supported by the authority of Paul's letters and perhaps a written Gospel (perhaps Matthew, with which 2 Peter reveals most similarities). Therefore, it is not necessary to repeat it in detail, but to recall only those elements that are falsely interpreted: It eschatology and the doctrine of the second coming of Jesus as the eschatological Judge and Ruler, which is based not only on apostolic preaching but also on history and properly interpreted prophetic texts.

It is evident from the formulas and titles used for Jesus, which are not commented on in any way, that the recipients regard Jesus as Lord and Saviour (1:1.2.8.11.14.16, 2:20, 3:2.18), consider him as "the Lord who redeemed them" (2:1), the beloved Son

184 "The Scripture was not only Law, not only the warrant behind the orthopraxy which helped to keep Jewish identity alive, both in Palestine and, not least, [in:] the Diaspora. It also provided the material for defence against religious foes, for reflection on human conditions, for strengthening Jewish self-confidence, for comfort under social or existential pressure"; L. Hartman, *"Guiding the Knowing Vessel of your Heart": On Bible Usage and Jewish Identity in Alexandrian Judaism*, [in:] *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, ed. P. Borgen, S. Giversen, Peabody 1997, p. 19; cf. also: A.J. Heschel, *Mitologia Żydów*, [in:] *Judaizm*, ed. M. Dziwisz, Polish transl. K. Stark, Kraków 1990, p. 135.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of God (1:17) and God.[185] This conviction of the divinity of Jesus grew gradually in the early Church,[186] so the Christology professed by the recipients of the letter is a mature Christology. Perhaps Peter's readers had previously interpreted the transfiguration scene primarily ontologically, as a revelation of the divinity of the Son, who is equal to the Father in divinity,[187] now Peter shows that the scene can be interpreted eschatologically.

Peter seems to be clarifying somewhat the eschatological notions of the readers. Perhaps chronometric speculations about when the Parousia, the judgement and the end of the world would (finally) take place had become popular among them. This is why Peter stresses that all such speculations are unauthorised (3:8–9). Moreover, the eschatological times are not only about judgement (such a belief may have been prevalent among the recipients of the letter), but also about the renewal of creation, which is too often forgotten (3:13–14).

A reminder, rather than a systematic lecture, is also required of baptismal theology closely linked to ethics and eschatology. Peter does not need to quote Paul's entire teaching on baptism as immersion into the death and resurrection of Jesus with all its consequences (cf. Rom 6:3–11) or to describe the baptismal rituals. It seems that its recipients are perfectly familiar with these practices and their meaning. This is why the term "baptism" is not even used in 2 Peter, as if the sender was playing a game with his implied readers: "I will give you some details, and you will tell me what apostolic teaching and ecclesiastical practice I have in mind". Thus, he emphasises that it is about washing the faithful of past sins (1:9), endowing them with gifts that enable them to lead pious, holy lives and cultivate the virtues that grow out of faith (1:3–8). In other words, faith, vocation, and election, i. e. belonging to God/Christ and the ecclesial community, must be manifested in the Christian life, and the initiatory moment of this belonging is the washing away of sins. To this he adds an eschatological rationale – if the sins are washed away and the believers equipped to live a holy lifestyle (cf. 3:11), they can as undefiled, without stain and in peace (cf. 3:14) enter the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ (1:10). All this should make the readers realise that Peter has baptism in mind.

Both the presupposed and early historical recipients of 2 Peter encounter false teaching on eschatology. It is very difficult to identify clearly who the eschatological sceptics are. The author, as mentioned, applies *vituperatio* to describe them,

185 See T. Callan, *The Soteriology of the Second Letter of Peter*, "Biblica" 82 (2001), no. 4, p. 549–559.

186 M. Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, London 1976, 23–34. For more see C. Setzer, *You Invent a Christ! Christological Claims as Points of Jewish – Christian Dispute*, "Union Seminary Quarterly Review" 44 (1991), no. 3–4, p. 315–328.

187 R.W. Wall, *The Canonical Function of 2 Peter*, p. 72.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

which makes identification challenging.[188] However, excerpts from their teaching are quoted: 1. the rejection of Jesus as "the Lord who redeemed us" (2:1); 2. the path from paganism to Christianity and the return to pagan practices (2:19–20); 3. the emphasis on freedom (2:19); 4. the rejection of God's care for the world and His intervention in history (3:5); 5. the derisive questioning of eschatological predictions and the Parousia.[189] All of this suggests that an important – if not the main – component of the false teachers' doctrine was Epicureanism, which denied posthumous responsibility for deeds committed during life, the idea of posthumous punishment or reward and any judgement at all. This may have been enhanced by Cyrenaic hedonism (2:13–14) and generally understood antinomianism,[190] but, on the other hand, it must be remembered that accusations of promiscuity, greed, gluttony, drunkenness, etc. can be an element of literary convention that had be loosely related to reality. However, this does not mean that the false teachers were pagans. Rather, they were Christians struggling to integrate or even assimilate Christianity and pagan Greek philosophy. In fact, the author of 2 Peter also struggles with the same problems. While the hagiographer succeeds in integrating philosophy and Christianising it, the false teachers propose the opposite – despite being Christians, they paganise Christianity and reduce it to one of the philosophical schools.

Despite Peter's very vague descriptions, there have been attempts in the history of exegesis and interpretation of 2 Peter to identify those false teachers. Already in ancient times they were understood to be Gnostics[191] or representatives of some pregnostic movements that developed in certain Christian circles in the first/second century in Asia Minor. Bede the Venerable, in his commentary on the Second Letter of Peter, lists a great variety of groups active at this time: "Church history shows that there were many similar groups at the time of the apostles: the Simonians, the Menandrians, the Basilidians, the Nicolaitans, the Ebionites, the Marcionites, the

188 For a more extensive discussion of polemical conventions in NT, see L.T. Johnson, *The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic*, JBL 108 (1989), no. 3, p. 419–441; also note the tendency to refer to false teachers as "others", e. g., R.A. Reese, *2 Peter & Jude*, Grand Rapids 2007; P.H. Davids, *Are the Others Too Other? The Issue of "Others" in Jude and 2 Peter*, in: *Reading 1–2 Peter and Jude: A Resource for Students*, ed. by E.F. Mason, T.W. Martin, Atlanta 2014, p. 201–213.

189 Cf. T.S. Caulley, *They Promise Them Freedom. Once Again, the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι in 2 Peter*, "Zeitschrift für di neutestamentlische Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche" 99 (2008), no. 1, p. 129–130.

190 T.S. Caulley, *They Promise*, p. 131 argues that the eschatological scepticism of the false teachers, was combined with a moral libertinism that had little to do with antinomianism.

191 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 138.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Cerdonians and others".[192] At present, the Gnostics, particularly the followers of Basilides, are indicated by proponents of the late dating of the letter and its origins in the Alexandrian milieu. The writings of Clement of Alexandria (*The Stromata* VII 106:4–107:1) and Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. Haer.* I 24:1) mention that a Basilidian school was established in Alexandria during Hadrian's time, so if 2 Peter was written around 150–180 and originally addressed to Alexandrian Christians, the sender may indeed have used elements of Basilides' Gnostic teachings.[193]

The Gnostic movement (from the Greek γνῶσις – 'knowledge/discernment') spread most rapidly in the second century. Initially, its adherents were active within the Church, but there is some testimony that by the end of the second century its adherents had formed separate sects. The greatest importance in the movement was attached to the acquisition of *gnosis* – the knowledge of the origin of humanity and its destiny. This knowledge made possible the salvation of the spiritual element of man. It was acquired in two ways: either it was to come from the secret teachings of the apostles, transmitted orally, or its source was direct divine revelation, given to the founder of the group. Typically, the Gnostics distinguished between the demiurge, or creator-god, and the supreme and unknowable divinity, whose emanations in the successive aeons culminate precisely in the demiurge. The world came into being as a consequence of some disorder among the aeons; matter is fundamentally evil, but the spiritual element inherent in the divinity dwells within it. It is through *gnosis* that one can be liberated from the world of evil and return to dwell in the divine realm. According to the Gnostics, Christ came into the world as an emissary of the supreme God to bring regenerative "knowledge". Only temporarily or ostensibly did God dwell in the body of Jesus. In fact, there is nothing in 2 Peter that resembles Gnosticism understood in this way. Admittedly, the narrator refers to knowledge/fundamental knowledge (γνῶσις, ἐπίγνωσις), but this knowledge has nothing to do with the esotericism of the Gnostics,[194] it is construed in entirely Christian terms, as a process leading to conversion and a godly life. Nor is there any mention of dualism, the negative valuation of matter, or the complex Gnostic cosmology and cosmogony with its distinction between God and demiurge. Therefore, today, especially the supporters of the middle dating of 2 Peter tend to drop the so-called "Gnostic hypothesis", suggesting instead some syncretic form of false teachers' beliefs, combining elements of Greek philosophy and mythology with a belief in

192 M. Desjardins, *The Portrayal of the Dissidents in 2 Peter and Jude: Does it Tell Us More about the "Godly" than the "Ungodly"?*, "Journal of the Study of the New Testament" 30 (1987), p. 89–102; H. Langkammer, *Jezus Chrystus w świetle późniejszych pism Nowego Testamentu*, p. 116–117.

193 T. Nicklas, *Petrus-Diskurse in Alexandria*, p. 112; see also T. Callan, *The Second Letter of Peter, Josephus and Gnosticism*, p. 136–142.

194 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 177.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Christian freedom taken from the apostle Paul, but warped through the elements of antinomianism.

Sometimes false teachers are also identified with the Ebionites, who questioned the divine origin of the prophecies. Some researchers quote then early Christian anti-heretical treatises in which a polemic against their doctrine appears (e. g. *Convivium* 8:10 by Methodius of Olympus, or *Panarion* 30:18 by Epiphanius). The Ebionites were a Judeo-Christian group that preserved the Torah but rejected Paul's teaching as to its interpretation. Some trace its origins to the middle of the first century,[195] but the scripture associated with them, called the Gospel of the Ebionites, was written in the first half of the second century AD. The sect's name means "the poor" and is derived from Jesus' blessing of the poor, recorded in Matt 5:3 (Luke 6:20).[196] Eusebius mocks them for calling themselves "poor" because they "they held poor and mean opinions concerning Christ" (*HE* III 27:1–2). Epiphanius claimed in his writings that the presence of sect members was recorded in Palestine and Syria. According to Epiphanius, the sect takes its origin from a certain Ebion, who was said to be a Samaritan. Today, however, almost all scholars agree that Ebion was a fictional character, invented by Epiphanius. In 2 Peter, apart from a possible allusion to the fact that the false teachers do not recognise or rather misunderstand prophetic inspiration, there are no other clues to identify them with the Ebionites.

As mentioned, the data in 2 Peter are too scarce to identify with certainty any particular group portrayed in the letter as false teachers. But the scarcity of information seems fully intentional and is related to the third level of recipients located at the narrative level. Peter – the narrator of the letter – presents himself as an apocalypticist who announces the appearance of false teachers in the future. Such prediction was a constant element of the apocalyptic message, and can be found in the aforementioned Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, in the teaching of Jesus (Matt 24:11), in the Christian apocalypses (e. g. of 3:21–31; see also *Dial.* 35:3 of Justin Martyr, *HE* IV 22:4–6, where Eusebius quotes Hegesippus' prediction). False teachers are to appear after Peter's death, but the apostle anticipates that one element of their teaching will be to undermine the doctrine of the Parousia and judgement. Since doubts in this regard probably already arose during Peter's lifetime, they are bound to increase in the future. Peter advises the readers to consider this growing eschatological scepticism in the future centuries as signs of impending judgement. The narrator further assumes that such a general strategy will allow future recipients

195 J. Misiurek, *Ebionici*, [in:] *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, vol. 4, ed. R. Łukaszyk, L. Bieńkowski, F. Gryglewicz, Lublin 1983, vol. 4, p. 636.

196 M. Starowieyski, *Ewangelia Ebionitów*, [in:] *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu. Ewangelie apokryficzne*, part 1: *Fragmenty. Narodzenie i dzieciństwo Maryi i Jezusa*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, p. 114.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

constantly updating the message of the letter to categorise contemporary opponents, heretics, ecclesiastical opponents etc. as false teachers.[197]

Peter, as narrator, encourages his letter to be read also after his death (1:15), and thus addresses it not only to his contemporaries, but also – and perhaps especially – to subsequent generations of Christians. Many of the letter's readers living in the future, like Peter himself, will not live to see the Parousia and will encounter arguments that undermine the apostolic eschatological teaching. For them, Peter has prepared a set of counter-arguments based on an eschatological hermeneutic of Old Testament narratives, prophetic texts and events in the life of Jesus. He suggests that the same hermeneutics should also be applied to all other texts considered inspired. The eschatological Prophetic and apostolic teaching should be continuously recalled after the death of Peter-narrator until the actual second coming of Jesus for judgement (1:19) and the renewal of creation (3:13). This is to assure all future readers who follow the apostle's message the status of being found "blameless and without spot, in peace" (3:14). Thus, at the narrative level, the recipients of Peter's message are future generations of Christians, reading the letter after the apostle's death until the final fulfilment of the eschatological promises.

1.8 Structure

There has never been much interest in the structure of the Second Letter of Peter. Although generic studies have been carried out, the structure of the text has generally not been widely discussed.[198] From the beginning of the twentieth century onwards, it has generally been agreed that the letter is composed according to the rules of ancient rhetoric and resembles in this respect the classical works of Hellenistic epistolography, although a detailed structure has rarely been presented. The researchers confined to opinions similar to those of J.L. White[199] regarding the function of various parts of letters that are to be divided into an epistolary introduction (2 Pet 1:1–2), an extended body (1:3–3:18a) and a final doxology (3:18b). Some biblical scholars willingly adopt this general scheme and, on the basis of it, make their own more detailed proposals to highlight theologi-

197 This is how 2 Peter is updated by, among others, M. Luther, who, especially in his commentary on 2 Pet 2, transposes the vices of the ungodly described by Peter to the sixteenth-century doctrinal and moral abuses of the clergy; see *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther* II.

198 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 61.

199 J.L. White, *The Form and Function of Greek Letter: A Study of Letter-Body in the Non-literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle*, Missoula 1972.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

cal themes. Thus, for example, G.L. Green[200] suggests the following structure of 2 Peter:

I. Epistolary introduction – 1:1–2;
    A. Author: Simeon Peter – 1:1a;
    B. Recipients: those who have obtained faith equal in dignity to our [faith] – 1:1b;
    C. Prayer with wishes for multiplication of grace and peace – 1:2;
II. Letter body: Warning against false teachers – 1:3–3:18a;
    A. Opening section: God's call to glory and the developing of virtue;
        1. Divine power and promise of gifts necessary for life and godliness – 1:3–4;
        2. A call to strive to confirm virtue – 1:5–11;
    B. Middle section: apostolic testimony and false teachers – 1:12–2:22;
        1. Reminder – 1:12–21;
            a. Occasion for the reminder: the departure of Peter – 1:12–15;
            b. Content of the reminder – 1:16–21;
                α. Transfiguration vision – 1:16–18;
                β. Prophetic Word – 1:19–21;
        2. Emergence and judgement of the false teachers – 2:1–22
            a. Emergence and actions of false teachers "among you" – 2:1–3;
            b. Former sinners and their fate – 2:4–10a;
                α. Angels – 2:4;
                β. Ancient world – 2:5;
                γ. Sodom and Gomorrah – 2:6–10a;
            c. "Those who" – vices of false teachers – 2:10b–16;
            d. "These are" – actions of false teachers – 2:17–22;
    C. Closing section – a call to holiness – 3:1–18a;
        1. Call to remember prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:1–2;
        2. Misunderstanding of this teaching: scoffers in the last days – 3:3–7;
        3. Misunderstanding of this teaching: one day as a thousand years – 3:8–10;
        4. All things shall pass away: life as preparation for the end times – 3:11–13;
        5. Waiting for the end: blamelessness – 3:14–18a;
III. Letter closing: doxology 3:18b.

200 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 620–622. This structure in a slightly less elaborate form is accepted by, among others, F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy, Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 184.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

G.L. Green's proposal makes it possible to distinguish certain levels of text and appropriateness. For example, on one level the use of arguments/examples from the apostolic and prophetic traditions can be seen (elements B.1.b.α.β – i. e. the transfiguration vision and the prophetic word, and B.2.b.α.β.γ – i. e. examples from the prophetic/OT tradition: angels, the Flood and Sodom and Gomorrah). This can be translated into Theological thesis presented in the letter about the equal authority and mutual complementarity and confirmation of the two traditions. Likewise with the juxtaposition of B.1 (reminders) and C.1 (the call to remember prophetic and apostolic teaching) or B.2 (the emergence and judgement of false teachers) and C.2 (the misunderstanding of prophetic and apostolic teaching). The reader may draw inferences on some theological similarities or correlations between these points (e. g. false teachers and judgement on teachers follows from not understanding prophetic and apostolic teaching). Unfortunately, structures of this kind are generally not annotated by scholars, so they remain a matter of conjecture.

This basic tripartite structure is modified slightly by D.J. Moo.[201] He does not distinguish the epistolary introduction as a separate part, treating it as an integral part of the entire opening (1:1–15), but he draws no conclusions from this – even including this introduction in the opening, he defines its content only as a greeting or salutation and fails to generate other content from it:

I. Opening of the letter – 1:1–15;
  A. Greeting – 1:1–2;
  B. Encouragement for striving to grow in knowledge of Christ – 1:3–11;
  C. Peter's important words in the face of impending death – 1:12–15;
II. Body (essential content) of the letter – 1:16 – 3:13;
  A. Christ's sure return according to His promise – 1:16–21;
    1. Peter as an eyewitness to the eschatological glory of Christ -1:16–18;
    2. Absolute reliability of the prophecies – 1:19–21;
  B. Resisting the views of false teachers as part of growing in Christ – 2:1–22;
    1. Peter's warning against the coming of false teachers – 2:1–3;
    2. Peter's reminder that false teachers will be doomed; those faithful to the true teaching will be saved – 2:4–10a;
    3. Peter enumerating the sins of false teachers – 2:10b–16;
    Peter's warning that false teachers will be punished for abandoning truth – 2:17–22;

201 D. J. Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, Grand Rapids 1996, p. 26.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

C. We must firmly believe in the promise of Christ's return – 3:1–13;
1. Denial of the return of Christ by false Christians – 3:1–7;
2. Christ's sure return and end of this world – 3:8–10;
3. Peter's encouragement for godly living in view of the approaching end – 3:11–13;

III. Closing of the letter: encouragement for striving to grow in knowledge of Christ – 3:14–18.

It seems that in the structure proposed by D.J. Moo it is even more difficult to indicate any correspondences between the different points than in the structure by G.L. Green. Alternatively, it is possible to see a relationship between point A. B. and C. in the body of the letter: Christ will surely return, as He Himself has promised (A), therefore the readers must held fast to this promise (C). Point B. stands in contrast to A. and C. – false teachings that deny Christ's return must be rejected. But at the next level points 1, 2, 3 and 4 no longer correspond to each other.

A better designed structure is proposed by R. Bauckham,[202] although he marks no differences in levels of argumentation and presents the issues more in the form of a table of contents:

1:1–2	–	Address and greetings;
1:3–11	–	Theme of the letter: a summary of Peter's teaching;
1:12–15	–	Occasion for the letter: the testament of Peter;
1:16–18	–	Refutation of the first objection: a. the apostles as eyewitnesses;
1:19	–	Refutation of the first objection: b. the value of Old Testament prophecies;
1:20–21	–	Refutation of the second objection: Old Testament prophecies are inspired;
2:1–3a	–	Anticipating the emergence of false teachers;
2:3b–10a	–	Refutation of the third objection: the certainty of judgement;
2:10b–22	–	Condemnation of false teachers;
3:1–4	–	Anticipating the emergence of scoffers; (with the presentation of their fourth objection to apostolic teaching in verse 4);
3:5–7	–	Refutation of the fourth objection: a. the sovereignty of the Word of God;
3:8–10	–	Refutation of the fourth objection: b. the patience of the Lord;
3:11–16	–	Encouragement (Exhortation);
3:17–18	–	Conclusion.

202 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 135.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Undoubtedly, R. Bauckham has succeeded in showing that the essential theme of the letter is not ethical instruction, but apostolic teaching. Although not explicated (Bauckham, like most commentators, refrains from commenting on the proposed structure), it is clear that it is a teaching concerning the Parousia and eschatology. On the basis of the refuted objections, one can attempt to reconstruct this teaching as 1.a. coming from eyewitnesses; 1.b. confirmed by Old Testament prophecies; 3. containing the assurance that there will be an eschatological judgement; 4.a. emphasising that judgement is God's sovereign decision and His work; 4.b. interpreting the delay of judgement as evidence of God's patience. As can be seen – the refutation of the second objection would be a digressive reflection on the inspiration of the prophecies (2:20–21), while the anticipation of the emergence of false teachers (2:1–3a) and scoffers (3:1–4) and their condemnation (2:10b–22) is, on the one hand, a typical apocalyptic element of the testament convention so strongly emphasised by Bauckham, and, on the other hand, a justification of the polemical tone of the letter.[203] The final exhortations (3:11–16) also fit in with the testament teachings about the need to follow the ways of righteousness.

The 1984 work of G.A. Kennedy,[204] followed by the 1988 analysis of D.F. Watson[205] is one of the landmark works addressing the question of the structure of the New Testament letters from a rhetorical perspective; there the principles of rhetorical criticism were applied to the Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter. Following the principles of classical rhetoric, D.F. Watson distinguishes the following sections in 2 Peter:

1. Prescript (*quasi-exordium*) – 1:1–2;
2. *Exordium* – 1:3–15;
3. *Probatio* – 1:16 – 3:13;
4. *Peroratio* – 3:14–18a.[206]

Watson then goes on to describe the content of the various sections in more detail. The *exordium* included the consequences of giving gifts to Christians (1:3–11), taking the form of a miniature homily,[207] which has little connection with the arguments in the *probatio*, and the purposes of the letter given in testamentary form (1:12–15). In the *probatio*, which is the main part of the work, largely corresponding to the earlier term "letter body", there were, according to the rules of rhetoric,

203 Cf. J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude: 2 Peter, Jude: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, New York 1983, p. 112.

204 G.A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, Chapel Hill 1984.

205 D.F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style*.

206 Ibid., p. 141–142.

207 See the critique of the homiletical form in 2 Peter by J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 112.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

five arguments proving the truth of the apostolic teaching: first proof (1:16–18) – personal testimony; second proof (1:19–21) – prophetic testimony; third proof (2:1–10a) – certainty of future judgement confirmed by past events; digression (2:10b–22) – unmasking of false teachers; transition (3:1–2); fourth proof (3:3–7) – emergence of scoffers as predicted; fifth proof (3:8–13) – the reasons for the delay of the day of the Lord and the certainty of its coming. The *peroratio* has parenetic and protreptic traits, containing exhortations and encouragement for the readers to live in holiness. The letter ends unusually with a doxology (3:18b). As can be seen, elements such as the *partitio*, which is the division that will be used to explain the topic given in the *propositio*, and the *narratio*, which is the detailed description of the subject of the speech/letter, have been omitted. These omissions may be due to the scarcity of space, but it is more likely that this is a deliberate action on the part of the author of 2 Peter. He freely applied and transformed rhetorical principles in letters, just as Demetrius of Phaleron recommended in his work *De elocutione* (228, 229, 231, 234)[208] and similarly, as could be seen, for example, in the use of source texts.

The findings of D.F. Watson show the following graphical structure of 2 Peter, based on classical rhetoric:[209]

Prescript – 1:1–2;
Exordium – 1:3–15;
    God's goodness – 1:3–11;
    Testament – 1:12–15;
Probatio – 1:16 – 3:13;
    Argument 1 – apostles/eyewitnesses – 1:16–18;
    Argument 2 – prophets – 1:19–21;
    Argument 3 – certainty of judgement – 2:1–10a;
Digression – the teaching of false teachers – 2:10b–22;
Transition – summary and introduction to the rest of the *probatio* – 3:1–2;
    Argument 4 – mocking false prophecies – 3:3–7;
    Argument 5 – reasons for delaying the Parousia – 3:8–13;
Peroratio – readers' final encouragement to be stable in the faith 3:14–18.

One can now see the precision of Peter's choice of arguments. Classical rhetorical theory recommends that the argumentation[210] and arguments should be adapted not only to the object of the rhetorical discourse, but also to the cognitive capacities

208 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 602.
209 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 343–344.
210 An alternative name for *probatio* is *argumentatio*.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

and assertive abilities of the readers, i. e. to the ability to experience the arguments. In other words, it assumes that there is an engaged interaction between the sender and the readers: not only does the sender want to convince the readers of their reasons, but the readers also want to accept the proposed argumentation.[211] The rhetorical value of arguments, especially in persuasive argumentation, which is what the author of the 2 Peter uses, is assessed by their relevance to a particular audience. This relevance stems from their hierarchy and form – each argument should be shaped in such a way as to have an effect on the audience, to convince them in the simplest way.[212] It is not surprising, therefore, that Peter first appeals to the apostolic teaching best known to the audience – which belongs mainly to the Hellenistic-Christians – which he confirms with his own authority as an eyewitness, an apostle particularly respected in the circles of the audience. He then provides arguments "from the prophets", which must, however, be accompanied by some hermeneutical commentary (1:19), a confirmation that the prophets predict the same thing as the apostle, i. e. the Parousia. Additionally, he tries to persuade the readers that, just as the prophecy itself is inspired (which they are unlikely to doubt), so the interpretation of it should be inspired (1:20–21). All of this leads to the third argument based on the previous arguments with the hierarchy reversed: the certainty of the Parousia (2:1–3) would have been confirmed by the prophetic texts (narratives coming from Moses as a prophet) appropriately interpreted (2:4–8) and the apostolic commentary (2:9–10a), which flows seamlessly into a digression on situations perfectly familiar to the readers. The fourth argument makes use of elements of the teaching of the false teachers, which are appropriately contradicted, as well as the ironic form of presenting them. The fifth argument, finally, can be called inductive, when the narrator moves from the specific to the general, from details in the previous argumentation to Thesis that the reason for the delay of the Parousia is God's patience. We can also note here, by the way, the so-called "principle of multiple explication", when the sender, guided by a certain psychological intuition, repeats or returns to some concepts or terms, presenting them in a different light and from a different angle.[213]

In these five arguments justifying and defending the apostolic doctrine on the Parousia, J.H. Neyrey also recognises the main theme of the letter.[214] He notes that the first three arguments are based on a rhetorical pattern, familiar among others to Philo of Alexandria (e. g. *De somn.* 1:172), in which a denial appears

211 M. Korolko, *Sztuka retoryki*, Warszawa 1990, p. 84.

212 Ibid., p. 86.

213 M. Korolko, *Sztuka retoryki*, p. 90.

214 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 111–113.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

first, followed by a positive assertion: not A but B, e. g. we do not follow sophisticated myths, but were eyewitnesses (2 Pet 1:16). He then discusses Theological content of each section in detail, also drawing attention to the significant key terms used by Peter. This allows him to observe the recurring lexis and draw not only theological but also structural conclusions.[215] He connects, for example, on the basis of the lexeme σπευδή, the exhortation to haste and diligence in developing virtues and affirming vocations in *exordium* section (1:5.10) with the *peroratio* section and the exhortation to make efforts so that in the last days the Lord will find the faithful blameless, without spot and in peace (3:14). He draws attention to the correlation of verses where Jesus is called Saviour in *exordium* (1:1.11) and *probatio* (2:20, 3:2) etc. He concludes his reflections by saying that the *peroratio* repeats many of the terms used earlier to describe the two different attitudes, the attitude of those who have knowledge/fundamental knowledge and those who do not; those who await the Parousia and those who deny it; those who remain pure and those who are defiled and stained; the stable and the unstable, the saved and those who face destruction. Finally, he rightly points out that the letter has a framework composition, as evidenced by the appeal to be faithful to the One who has given the elected everything they need for a godly life at the beginning of the letter (1:3–4) and a similar appeal to grow in God's benefits at the end (3:18a).[216]

In a 2012 book, D.F. Watson and T. Callan,[217] like Neyrey earlier, attempt to combine elements of rhetorical structure with Theme of the letter, with priority given to Themes:

Opening of the letter – 1:1–15;
- Greeting (1:1–2);
- Theme of the letter – 1:3–11;
  - Preamble – 1:3–4;
  - Development – 1:5–11;
- The occasion for writing the letter – 1:12–15;

Body of the letter – 1:16 – 3:13;
- Two arguments against the opponents' objections – 1:16–2:10a;
  - Refutation of first objection: argument from Jesus's transfiguration – 1:16–18;
  - Refutation of second objection: argument from prophecy – 1:19–2:10a;

215 Ibid., p. 115–118.

216 Ibid., p. 118.

217 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 145.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Appeal: heed the prophecies – 1:19–21;
Predicting the emergence of false teachers – 2:1–3;
Annihilation of false teachers and salvation of the righteous – 2:4–10a;
Criticism of opponents – 2:10b–22;
Moral defects of opponents and their punishment – 2:10b–17;
Negative consequences of false teaching – 2:18–22;
A second presentation of the occasion of the letter and resumption of the argument against the opponents – 3:1–13;
Modification of the occasion and purpose of the letter – 3:1–4;
Resumption of arguments against opponents – 3:5–13;
End of letter – 3:14–18;
Summary of exhortation – 3:14–18a;
Final doxology – 3:18b.

It is difficult to draw any binding theological conclusions from this structure. The authors focus on presenting a defence of the apostolic doctrine and thus on the polemical character of the letter. The place of the positive *argumentatio* is thus taken by the *refutatio*. Watson and Callan note some inconsistencies in the text, namely differences in the exordial presentation of the subject (1:3–11) and the circumstances/occasion of the letter (1:12–15) and in the presentation in the body of the letter (3:1–4). This is undoubtedly evidence that they are reading the letter in a linear rather than a structural manner.

A completely different approach to structure is proposed by G.H. Everett.[218] He bases his proposal on a threefold thematic scheme and assumes the canonical approach, in close connection with the rest of the universal letters and against the background of all the New Testament writings that show believers the way to sanctification.

The first level of the schema, the primary theme, thus covers the general theme of the Catholic letters, which Everett defines as perseverance in the faith. The second level, secondary theme(s), is the subject matter of the individual letters; each of the seven texts would deal with one aspect of perseverance. Only by putting them together would it be possible to have a full insight into Christian teaching on perseverance. At this level, Themes of 2 Peter are defined as the power, or rather the tools or weapons given to the believer by God to persevere in Christian conduct amidst widespread corruption and the spread of false teaching. The power to persevere is based on God's election and promises of the believer's entrance into the eternal kingdom. Finally, the third level, the imperative theme, includes a call

218 G.H. Everett, *Study Notes on the Holy Scriptures*, p. 28–40.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

and encouragement to action and specific instructions for the believer on how to behave in adverse circumstances. In 2 Peter, the imperative theme is a call to grow in knowledge and faithfulness to the Word of God. As G.H. Everett notes, this is a call that mainly engages the mind of the believer. In other universal letters, the dominant imperative theme is a call to engage the heart and the body. In this way, perseverance in faith is given an anthropological dimension, for it refers to the involvement of the whole man, his spirit (heart), mind (soul) and body. In the conclusion of his proposal, Everett further considers the purpose of the letter on three levels: the main theme – a call to persevere in adverse circumstances – reflects the parenetic purpose of the letter. The side theme – a reflection on equipping believers to persevere – reflects the doctrinal purpose of the letter. Finally, the imperative theme – a call to grow – corresponds to the pragmatic purpose of 2 Peter.

On this "canonical" structure, G.H. Everett attempts to superimpose the literary structure of 2 Peter, in which he strongly emphasises Trinitarian aspects – relating to God the Father, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. For obvious reasons, the scheme he proposed reflects the second level and is intended to indicate the secondary theme:

1. Salutation – 1:1–2;
2. God's calling and election: the role of God the Father – 1:3–15;
    a. equipping for life and godliness by knowledge of Jesus Christ – 1:3–4;
    b. a call to grow in knowledge of the Word of God – 1:5–11;
    c. Peter's departure – 1:12–15;
3. Justification: the role of Jesus in perseverance – 1:16–19;
4. Admonition: the role of the Holy Spirit – 1:20–2:22;
    a. inspiration of Scripture – 1:20–22;
    b. warning against false teachers – 2:1–3;
    c. three examples of God's judgement – 2:4–9;
        (1) fallen angels – 2:4;
        (2) Noah and the Flood – 2:5;
        (3) destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and the rescue of Lot – 2:6–8;
        (4) conclusion – 2:9;
    d. characterisation of false teachers – 2:10–16;
    e. judgement of false teachers – 2:17–22;
5. The basis of our perseverance: the certainty of Christ's return – 3:1–13;
    a. warning against the emergence of false teachers – 3:1–4;
    b. creation story – 3:5–7;
    c. certainty of the Parousia – 3:8–10;
    d. a call to perseverance – 3:11–13;

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

6. Glory: implications related to the return of Christ – 3:14–16;
7. Conclusion: summary 3:17–18.

The weakness of G.H. Everett's proposal is the need for an extensive commentary based on a canonical approach, only then does the scheme become clear. The presupposed theme of the letter – the election and equipping of believers with all they need to live godly lives and persevere in the faith and knowledge of Jesus Christ because of the hope based on God's eschatological promises – is not directly apparent from its literary structure. It would be difficult to interpret 2 Peter only on the basis of points 2, 3, 4, and 5, especially since some of them seem misplaced, unrelated to the content of the scripture and arbitrarily imposed (e. g. 2. Justification and the role of Jesus Christ based on the transfiguration scene in 2 Pet 1:16–19). One may venture to argue that Everett's structure is not a mapping of the literary and rhetorical structure of the text, but a hermeneutical proposal for its interpretation.[219]

The attempts made to present the structure of the letter show that undoubtedly the text is structured according to the general principles of classical rhetoric. However, it must be remembered that the author chose to integrate the Hellenistic tradition with the Jewish tradition. This strategy seems to have been applied not only at the level of content, but also at the level of structure. Thus, the structure characteristic of Hebrew rhetoric with chiasms and concentric compositions, as well as other kinds of parallelism and/or relevance would have had to be superimposed on the classical epistolary structure. This makes it possible to expose the main theological thought of the letter and to notice Thematic interdependencies between the different parts of the letter. Taking all this into account and adding observations of a linguistic nature (reiteration of terms and motifs), the structure of 2 Peter can be presented as follows:

1:1ab – Prescript
A. Faith – 1:1c;
    B. Knowledge – 1:2b;
    B'. Knowledge – 1:3–4;
A'. Faith – 1:5–8;
        C. Synthesis of faith and knowledge (baptismal catechesis) – 1:9–15;
            a. oblivion – 1:9;
            b. eschatologically oriented soteriology – 1:10–11;
            a'. constant reminder – 1:12–15;

219 G.H. Everett, *Study Notes on the Holy Scriptures*, p. 27.87–88, points out that his proposal has primarily homiletical (he shows how the letter can be divided into fragments as a basis for sermons) and pastoral applications.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

D_1. Prophetic and apostolic teaching – 1:16–21;
E_1. Interpretation of prophetic and apostolic teaching – 2:1–22;
α. false interpretation – 2:1–5a.c;
β. proper interpretation (soteriology) – 2:5b;
α'. false interpretation – 2:6;
β'. proper interpretation (soteriology) – 2:7–9a;
α". false interpretation – 2:9b–22;

3:1 – Transition

D_2. Prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:2;
E_2. Interpretation of prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:3–4;
α. false interpretation – 3:3–4;
D_3. Prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:5–7;
E_3. Interpretation of prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:8–10a;
β. proper interpretation (soteriology) – 3:8–10a;
D_4. Prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:10b–11a;
E_4. Interpretation of prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:11b–15a;
β. proper interpretation (soteriology) – 3:11b–15a;
D_5. Prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:15b–16b;
E_5. Interpretation of prophetic and apostolic teaching – 3:16c-17;
α. false interpretation – 3:16c-17;
C'. Synthesis of faith and knowledge – 3:18a;

3:18b – Doxology.

When the structure resulting from classical rhetoric and Thematic-motivational structure resulting from Hebrew rhetoric are superimposed, an overall picture of the integrated structure of 2 Peter will be obtained. This juxtaposition also allows a hypothesis explaining the transformations of the classical rhetorical pattern: it was adapted to the Hebrew thematic-motivational structure.

Classical rhetoric	Hebrew rhetoric – thematic and motivic structure
Prescript – 1:1ab; *Superscriptio* – 1:1a *Adscriptio* – 1:1b	Prescript – 1:1ab Sender – 1:1a Recipients – 1:1b
Exordium – 1:1c-15	Elements A. (faith) B. (knowledge) C. (synthesis of faith and knowledge)
	Elements D (presentation of the Prophetic and apostolic teaching) E (interpretation of prophetic and apostolic teaching)

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Classical rhetoric	Hebrew rhetoric – thematic and motivic structure
Probatio – 1:16–3:17d	α. false interpretation β. proper interpretation
Peroratio – 3:18a	Element C. (synthesis of faith and knowledge)
Doxology – 3:18b	Doxology – 3:18b

It is now evident that 2 Peter has a framework construction. The framework – apart from a somewhat external prescript and a similarly external doxology – is a reflection on faith and knowledge (A.B.C). Further connotations are based on the observation of the frequency and appropriateness of the generated motifs. The element of faith and knowledge is the Prophetic and apostolic teaching on the Parousia and eschatology (D). This teaching and its interpretation (E) constitute the main theme of the letter. The narrator presents the false interpretation used by errant believers (α) and the correct interpretation (β) using the appropriate hermeneutic (eschatological hermeneutic, as it is called in this commentary). The correct interpretation of the Prophetic and apostolic teaching always carries a soteriological message, the false interpretation leads to annihilation in the end times.

The proposed structure also makes it possible to see that *exordium* section is much more elaborate than the *peroratio* section. This is due to the detailed presentation of the eschatologically oriented baptismal catechesis present in *exordium*. Later in the letter, the narrator obviously refers to this catechesis, linking it to the Prophetic and apostolic teaching on the Parousia and the end times. Following this motivic structure, the content of the Second Letter of Peter is discussed in detail in this ecumenical commentary.

1.9 A structural reading of the Second Letter of Peter

Elements A and A' – faith

As the proposed structure shows, the sender begins his letter with reflections on faith (element A and A'). He considers faith as a gift that makes all the recipients have the same dignity (children of God) (1:1c). For them, faith is the starting point of the Christian life manifested in the cultivation of the virtues (1:5–7); it is also a necessary factor for knowing Jesus Christ (1:8). The juxtaposition of elements A and A' shows that the ability to lead a truly Christian life and to know Jesus Christ is not due to man's own natural efforts, but the result of the egalitarian gift of faith, which makes equal all those endowed with it.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Elements B and B'– knowledge

The process of coming to know God and Jesus leads to a multiplication of God's other gifts – grace and peace (1:2b; B). Here one can see a certain eschatological orientation of the whole letter, although it is still very subtle: the multiplication of grace and peace concerns the future (this is what the expressed wish implies). The further explanation of what the knowledge of God and Jesus is (1:3–4; B') allows this future to be interpreted also – if not primarily – in eschatological terms, for the content of the knowledge is the baptismal promises to equip and enable the faithful to live a godly life and to call them to the glory of Jesus as well as the promise of participation in his divine nature. Participation in the glory of Jesus and participation in his divine nature clearly point to the end times, when his majesty and power will be fully revealed (cf. D_1) and when his grace and peace will reach their fullness.

Elements C and C'– a synthesis of faith and knowledge

The first two units (A-A' and B-B') were based on an expanding scheme. The first element (A and B) indicated a concept, the second element (A' and B') developed it. A smooth transition from faith to knowledge was also evident. This smoothness is maintained in the third unit (C and C') synthesising reflections on faith and knowledge, but the presentation of this synthesis is reversed. Thus, first an expanded description (element C) appears, followed by a clarification of this description (element C'). The juxtaposition of C and C' demonstrates that equipping the Christian to lead a godly life and cultivate Christian virtues, cleansing from sins, calling, electing, protecting from stumbling, and finally ushering in the eternal kingdom (1:9–11; C) is nothing other than growing in grace (3:18aα; C'). The components of grace are associated with the description of faith, from which all other virtues grew (A'), and at the same time with the description of knowledge (B'). But the motif of knowledge/growing in the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (3:18aβ; C') is also developed here: its source is to be found in all that the narrator intends to recall while he is still alive (1:12–15; C).

As shown above, element C has a concentric structure:

a. oblivion (1:9);
    b. eschatologically oriented soteriology (1:10–11);
a'. constant reminder (1:12–15).

The centre of this model can be seen as a clue to the essential theme of the letter: a properly interpreted eschatological Prophetic and apostolic teaching. Faith and knowledge are inseparable, and they lead to the acceptance of this teaching. This results in eschatological vigilance, an impeccable life, a readiness to read the well-known narratives as prophecies of the end times and judgement (the eschatological

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

hermeneutic is applied); finally, the entrance to the eternal kingdom, i. e. salvation, is opened for the faithful.

Elements D_1 – D_5 – prophetic and apostolic eschatological teaching

Elements D_1 – D_5 describe what this teaching is, where it comes from, what its content is and where it can be found. The narrator begins by presenting its essential content: "we made known to you the Parousia/coming with power of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1:16b) and the assurance that this is not a teaching based on devised myths (1:16a) but on the testimony of the apostles (1:16c). The indication of the Parousia-oriented content also provides a clue as to how to interpret the transfiguration scene (1:17–18a): as the inauguration of Jesus' eschatological authority delegated to him by the Father. Further on, Peter not only reasserts that this teaching originates from the apostles, i. e. from the direct witnesses and recipients of the revelation (1:18), but adds the earlier revelation handed down by the prophets. This means that the apostolic testimony is not based on a subjective vision, but deeply rooted in prophetic literature (1:19a), not only strictly prophetic texts, but all texts from Jewish (and early Christian) tradition recognised as inspired by the Holy Spirit (1:19–21). As can be seen from D_1, the revelation and the apostolic teaching on the Parousia as well as the revelation and the prophetic and eschatological doctrine verify and complement each other: the former complements the latter, while the latter gives credence to the former. Both also point to Jesus as eschatological ruler and judge.

Element D_2 recalls and summarises what was said in D_1: the apostolic teaching to be remembered, based on the authority of Jesus, is rooted in the prophetic texts (3:2). The reverse order of presentation about the origin of the Petrine doctrine can be seen here: first the prophets are mentioned (3:2a) and then the apostles invoking the commandment of Jesus (3:2b). The content of the teaching itself is recalled and developed in D_3 and D_4.

The eschatological teaching is presented in D_3, which also shows the connections between the prophetic and apostolic elements. The narrator refers to ktiseology (prophetic tradition) and to eschatology (prophetic and apostolic tradition). He applies the general principles of his eschatological hermeneutic, which allows him to see in past events a foreshadowing of final events. In the description of the creation at God's command (3:5b–c) and the destruction of the earth by the flood also at God's command (3:6), he thus sees a foreshadowing of eschatological judgement and destruction by fire (3:7): "But now the heavens and the earth by the same word [were] and are gathered together, preserved for fire for the day of judgement and destruction of ungodly men". The existence of the heavens and the earth is indeed temporary, not eternal and unchanging; both elements still exist only because they

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

have been preserved for the day of judgement. That is when the final destruction of the ungodly will take place.

In element D_4 there are typical apocalyptic images of the destruction by fire of all that is in the heavens and on earth (3:10b–11a): "In which the heavens loudly/ at the voice [of God] shall pass away, And the heavenly bodies, burning, will be destroyed/dissolved. The earth and the works on it will not be found out/will be burnt up, Because it will all [be] destroyed/dissolved in this way". Thus, it can be seen that the narrator is developing one of Themes described in D_3 characteristic of intertestamental Jewish eschatological texts.

D_5 is a summary that clearly refers to D_1. Peter points out that eschatological teaching is also present in the letters of Paul called "our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him" (3:15b). This is undoubtedly a reference to the earlier reflections on inspiration (1:20–21). This means that eschatological apostolic teaching can be preached both by eyewitnesses of events anticipating Jesus' second coming and power (1:16–18) and by the apostles inspired by the God's Spirit "speaking of these things" (3:15b–16b). "These things" refer primarily to the eschatological content present in Paul's epistolography. Unlike the narrator of the Second Letter of Peter, however, Paul does not focus on apocalyptic images of doom and judgement. Rather, he develops themes of Jesus' final reign, his authority over all things in heaven and on earth, and the destiny of the faithful, which in turn draws heavily on the inaugural vision of Jesus' reign described in 2 Pet 1:16–18.

In the presentation of the eschatological Prophetic and apostolic teaching in the Second Letter of Peter, one can see the following chiasm:

a. content of the teaching:
- Jesus' eschatological authority and his second coming (implications of judgement) – 1:17–18 (D_1);
  - b. apostolic message – 1:16b.18 (D_1);
    - c. prophetic message – 1:19–20 (D_1);
    - c'. prophetic message – 3:2a (D_2);
  - b'. apostolic message – 3:2b (D_2);

a'. content of the teaching:
- the announcement of judgement already present in the account on creation and the origins – 3:5–7 (D_3);
- eschatology in apocalyptic imagery: annihilation and judgement – 3:10b–11a (D_4);
- "these things" communicated in Paul's letters (the implication of Jesus' eschatological authority) – 3: 15b–16b (D_5).

This chiasm affirms the complementarity of prophetic and apostolic teaching, but also shows the differences in the interpretation of prophetic and apostolic

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

elements. While the apostolic testimonies leave no doubt that they refer to the second coming of Jesus and his power, the broad prophetic testimonies sometimes require an appropriate hermeneutical key in order to be read as references to the end times.

Elements E_1 – E_5

In Peter's view, eschatological teachings are already rooted in the descriptions of creation. However, not everyone recognises them and interprets them correctly. The issues of interpretation of the eschatological teaching of the Prophetic and apostolic are presented in element E. The narrator presents both a false interpretation and its consequences (elements Eα) and a correct reading of eschatological texts and signs and the soteriological consequences of such an approach (element Eβ).

False interpretation (Eα)

This interpretation begins with negative examples ($E_1α$). As was the case when describing the prophetic and apostolic teaching (D_1; D_2), now the narrator also points to those who have preached, are preaching and will preach a false interpretation of this teaching. In the past it was false prophets (2:1a), now and in the future it will be false teachers (2:1b) who will gain many followers (2:2–3).

The essential content of their misleading interpretations can be reduced to "denying the Lord who redeemed them, drawing upon themselves violent/swift destruction" (2:1c). They reject the previously indicated main content of the apostolic teaching showing Jesus precisely as the eschatological ruler who comes in power (D_1; D_5). To question Jesus' eschatological royal and judicial prerogatives also means to cast doubt on the idea of the final judgement in general, of punishing the wicked and saving the righteous. This, of course, entails a sense of impunity. It is no coincidence that the narrator attributes to false prophets and teachers a tendency to live in debauchery, to persist in and spread blasphemies and heresies, to deceive people, and greed: "who will introduce heresies […] And many will follow their various indecent acts/ways; because of them the way of truth will be defamed. Through greed/covetousness they will exploit you with deceptive words" (2.1b.2.3a). Paradoxically, it is precisely this sense of impunity resulting from eschatological scepticism that will bring judgement and destruction upon false prophets, teachers and their followers: "drawing upon themselves violent/swift destruction. […] The judgement upon them of old has [already] not been idle/the former judgement upon them is not idle, and their destruction is not slumbering" (2:1d.4). This first, general presentation of the false interpretation of eschatological teaching contains elements that will appear in varying intensity and order in further, more specific examples:

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

1. questioning God's authority, above all the authority to judge, and a lack of confidence in God's predictions and promises,
2. a sense of impunity (false understanding of freedom), and consequently,
3. condemning oneself to judgement and annihilation.

The first of Peter's examples concerns the angels' sense of impunity and punishment (2:4a). The sin of the angels is not described; however, on the basis of the topoi present in the Second Temple literature, one can guess it is the abandonment of the spiritual domain and the relationship between angels and earthly women. This implies that the angels have questioned God's authority over the world and the laws He has established. God, however, shows His authority by ordering – as is clear from the intertestamental apocalyptic literature and Peter's description – that they be shackled and condemned to stay in Tartarus until the day of judgement when they are finally punished (2:4b).

The second example concerns the Flood. Eschatological scepticism manifests itself similarly. People reject God as the ruler of the world, who has the power to destroy the world just as he brought it into existence (cf. D_3). This naturally results in an increase in godlessness, which in turn prompts God to display his power and authority: to judge the conduct of the ungodly and punish them by sending flood on the earth – (2:5a.c).

The third example ($E_1\alpha'$) concerns Sodom and Gomorrah. The pattern is parallel to that depicted in the story of the Flood: eschatological scepticism, that is disbelief that God can bring judgement on the sinful cities, the godlessness of the inhabitants and their sense of impunity and, finally, the display of God's power: the judgement and punishment by annihilation in a fiery rain (2:6).

These three negative examples provide an insight into Peter's hermeneutical key used to interpret narratives with a motif of judgement and punishment. Every mention of judgement and every description of the infliction of punishment signifies for the narrator a foreshadowing of the judgement and doom in the end times. The criminalisation of ungodliness in narratives relating to the past provides the certainty that punishment (annihilation) will also reach the ungodly during the future eschatological judgement.

After three historical examples, the narrator moves on to the timeless fourth example ($2.10E_1\alpha''$). Much more extensively than before, he describes the manifestations of ungodliness, which seem to have been found in all eras and are thus well known to all recipients of the letter: indulging in the lusts of the flesh, impudence, blasphemy, debauchery and promiscuity, gluttony, greed, deceiving others. He interprets them as the result of contempt for divine authority (2:10b), the undermining of God's eternal, divine judgements which not even the angels dare to question (2:11), a falsely conceived freedom (2:19). He judges them very harshly and bluntly (e. g. as the conduct of irrational beasts, and disgusting animal behaviour (2:12.22) and

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

announces the final punishment of the preachers of eschatological scepticism and their followers. Already kept/destined for the day of judgement and punishment (2:9b), they will be captured and doomed like animals (2:12d), they will suffer the punishment for iniquity (2:13a), and their end will be worse than the beginning (2:20d).

Element $E_3\alpha$ indicates the sources of eschatological scepticism: one's own, rather than inspired, interpretation of eschatological prophecies (cf. 1:21), the demand for the immediate fulfilment of the promise of Jesus' second coming and the observation of the supposed immutability of the world (3:4): "where is the promise of His coming/Parousia? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things have remained the same /continued as they were since the beginning of creation". This question is a direct reference to the rejection of Jesus as ruler (cf. 2:1c; E_1 α) – for his Parousia is linked to power, majesty and royal and judicial authority (cf. 1:16–18; D_1).

In element $E_5\alpha$ the narrator exposes the reasons for the false interpretation of revealed eschatological teaching. The false interpretation comes from a misunderstanding of the prophetic and apostolic message. Peter admits that the message can sometimes be difficult to understand, especially when unlearned and unstable people take it upon themselves to explain it (3:16c): "[these difficult things] the unlearned and unstable distort as well as other scriptures to their own destruction". He refers both to element $E_1\alpha$, where the unlearned and unstable were called false prophets and teachers (2:1), to the historical examples in $E_1\alpha$ and $E_1\alpha'$, where ungodly men and angels, confident of impunity, were shown to be simply fools lacking imagination (2:4–5a.c.6), and to element $E_1\alpha''$, where they were likened to irrational beasts, and their interpretation of what they do not know described outright as blasphemy (2:12). Such a blasphemous, though arguably attractive, interpretation of texts that were not understood and/or rejection of God's announcement of judgement brings ultimate doom upon false prophets, teachers and their followers. Since this is the last passage referring to the false interpretation of the inspired texts, the narrator warns the readers of the letter more clearly than before not to be misled by these contrived and false explanations and to cling to the correct interpretation.

As can be seen, the elements $E_1\alpha$, $E_1\alpha'$, $E_1\alpha''$ and $E_5\alpha$ have much in common, which helps characterise the preachers of eschatological scepticism. Against this background, $E_3\alpha$ stands out, in which moral, evaluative and penalising motifs have been minimised. What remains are general, timeless terms to identify those who have rejected, are rejecting and will continue to reject eschatological teaching: "scoffers/mockers proceeding according to their own desires/lust" (3:3). In contrast, there are no apocalyptic motifs or predictions of punishment exposed in E_1 and E_5. Such minimisation serves to expose the less comprehensible promise of Jesus' second coming, which still remains unfulfilled. The juxtaposition of all the elements concerning the false interpretation of the inspired eschatological teaching makes it possible to see a concentric structure in Peter's reflection:

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

characteristics of eschatological sceptics – $E_1\alpha$, $E_1\alpha'$, $E_1\alpha''$;
the fundamental issue, namely the prolonged waiting for the Parousia – $E_3\alpha$;
characteristics of eschatological sceptics – $E_5\alpha$.

Interpretation proper (Eβ)

The essential purpose of the Second Letter of Peter is to indicate the correct interpretation of eschatological teaching. It is for this reason that almost every description of a false interpretation is paired with a correct interpretation. Nevertheless, an attempt can be made to group also the elements of Eβ and present them as a whole positive interpretation of the prophetic and apostolic message using Peter's eschatological hermeneutic.

Elements $E_1\beta$ and $E_1\beta'$ are parallel. Peter contrasts the negative characters in the narrative with the positive ones. The protagonists' proper attitude to the foretold judgement results in their rescue. Both Noah (2:5b) and Lot (2:7–9a) are presented as righteous living among the wicked. Noah is called the herald of righteousness; Lot is explicitly called righteous. For the reader, this is an indication that it is the righteous who are equipped with the ability to read God's will and God's designs correctly. The narrator uses terminology drawn from Jewish tradition. However, comparing the semantic range of the term righteous in Jewish tradition with the description of those endowed with faith, which launches a long catalogue of Christian virtues, those chosen, called and protected from the fall (1:3–10) the recipients of the letter can identify themselves with Noah and with Lot.

The narrator refrains from quoting the entire biblical and extra-biblical traditions concerning Noah and Lot. He assumes that the audience knows them well and will reconstruct them on their own. He only highlights those elements that fit into his argument. Noah, living among the ungodly, did not disregard God's warnings; on the contrary, in defiance of others and at the risk of mockery, he did God's will, built the ark and survived the flood with his family. Similarly, Lot, who as a righteous man was forced to live among the wicked, did not prove conformist, retained his system of values, did not reject the warning and survived being led out of Sodom with his family before the rain of sulphur and fire fell on the city. The essential element of these narratives is the implied patience of God, who not only waits for the ungodly to repent, but also gives the godly time to adequately prepare for the day of judgement (building the ark in the case of Noah and leading his family out of Sodom in the case of Lot). Also implied is the life of the survivors in the new, post-catastrophic reality. As with the negative interpretation, certain components can also be identified here, which will appear with varying intensity in further reflections:

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

1. righteousness/godliness;
2. non-conformism and resistance to mockery resulting from confidence in God's promises;
3. the patience of God (implication);
4. salvation;
5. new reality (implication).

From historical examples of the right attitude towards God's promises and predictions, Peter moves on to more universal and specific considerations, also devoting more space to motifs barely connoted in the previous narratives. He thus gives the recipients a timeless argumentation to counter the arguments of the eschatological sceptics.

The patience of God implied earlier comes to the fore, expanded, in element $E_3\beta$ (3:8–10a). On the one hand, it is a commentary on the prophetic and apostolic teaching covering a very long stretch of time since creation (3:5–7; D_3), and, on the other, a reaction to derisive questions and the suggestion that nothing has changed since the beginning of the world despite many eschatological prophecies. The narrator, unlike the false teachers, rejects his own (human) interpretation, adopts God's perspective of time perception and assumes God's inherent sovereignty in decision-making (3:8). This allows him to interpret the apparent delay in the fulfilment of the promise of the Parousia as an expression of God's patience (3:9a–c); for God gives time so that people can prepare for the day of judgement and not perish but be saved (3:9d-e). At the same time, there is a suggestion here regarding eschatological awareness and vigilance – preparation for the coming judgement, conversion, should not be postponed, for the day of the Lord will come unexpectedly, like a thief (3:10a).

In $E_4\beta$, which is a commentary on the apocalyptic doomsday imagery (3:10b–11a; D_4), the narrator encourages the continued cultivation of righteousness/holiness/godliness (3:11b) even under adverse conditions, among the ungodly, scoffers and eschatological sceptics. This is a clear reference to the righteousness and piety of Noah and Lot and their non-conformism ($E_1\beta$ and $E_1\beta'$). At the same time, Peter shows how to look at the end times in a different way – not as a time of annihilation (annihilation is the fate of the ungodly), but as a time of fulfilment of the promise regarding the new heavens and the new earth (3:14). This emphasises the soteriological aspect of eschatology present in the narratives of rescuing Noah and Lot. God's patience, in turn, allows the faithful to prepare for the day of judgement and the new reality (3:15a), i. e. to remain in peace without blemish and spotless (3:14).

As can be seen, element $E_4\beta$ is a summary of a proper interpretation of the inspired eschatology. Not surprisingly, it contains the same components (though arranged slightly differently) as the historical introductory material – $E_1\beta$ and $E_1\beta'$:

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Motif	Introduction (historical narrative) $E_1\beta$ and $E_1\beta'$	Summary (eschatological dimension) $E_4\beta$
Righteousness/impeccability	"Noah heralding righteousness"; "Righteous Lot"	"What [should you be] like? You should have/use [the opportunity to lead] holy ways of life/conduct [...] be diligent/strive earnestly that you may be found for Him as blameless and without spot, in peace"
Nonconformism	"righteous Lot, being oppressed by the way of life/the acts of the lawless [manifested] in promiscuity/licentious conduct, [...] daily tormented his righteous soul with their lawless deeds"	"waiting and toiling until the day of God comes"
God's patience (the time between announcement/promise and fulfilment)	[implication]	"And consider the patience/forbearance of our Lord as salvation/rescue"
Salvation	"Noah, heralding righteousness, He saved"; "righteous Lot, He saved"	"found for Him"
A new reality	[implication]	"And we await new heavens and a new earth according to His promise, in which righteousness dwells"

This table also allows us to reconstruct Peter's eschatological hermeneutic and apply it to narratives other than that of Noah and Lot. It is sufficient to give the elements present in the biblical narratives (column 1) an eschatological dimension (column 4).

This would mean that Peter's proposal of the interpretation of the Prophetic and apostolic eschatological teaching has a concentric structure, as does the characterisation of the false interpretation. Between the historical introduction and the timeless conclusion is a soteriological reflection on God's patience, the necessity of resignation from the human (own) view of time and adopting God's perspective (inspired by God's Spirit) (cf. 1:20–21):

historical narrative – $E_1\beta$ and $E_1\beta'$;
soteriology – $E_3\beta$;
eschatological dimension – $E_4\beta$.

The use of the same concentric model in the representation of false and correct interpretation allows the central elements to be juxtaposed: $E_3\alpha$ and $E_3\beta$. They demonstrate that the view and understanding of the announcement of the second coming of Jesus, the essential content of the eschatological prophetic and apostolic teaching announced in the first sentence of D_1, can be diametrically different: "We

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

made known to you the Parousia/coming with power of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1:16b):

"We made known to you the Parousia/coming with power of our Lord Jesus Christ" – D_1 (1:16b)	
The essence of false interpretation – $E_3\alpha$ (3:4)	The essence of proper interpretation – $E_3\beta$ (3:8–10a)
"where is the promise of His coming/Parousia? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things have remained the same /continued as they were since the beginning of creation"	"one day with the Lord [is] like a thousand years, and a thousand years like one day. The Lord is not slow [in keeping]/is not delaying the promise, as some [people] perceive a delay, but shows patience towards you, not wishing that any [of you] should perish, but that each [of you] should come to repentance/conversion. And the day of the Lord will come like a thief"

The whole structure described above provides evidence that the essential theme of the Second Letter of Peter is the "coming of the Lord". False prophets, teachers and their followers fail to properly interpret the time between the promise of Jesus' coming and its fulfilment and fall into eschatological scepticism. The correct interpretation is to see the time between the announcement of the Parousia and its fulfilment as a sign of God's saving patience and an opportunity to prepare for the end times.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

2. Structural commentary

2.1 Prescript (2 Pet 1:1–2)

> [1]Simeon Peter, a slave and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to those [having] faith equal in dignity/equally precious to our [faith], obtained through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. [2]Grace to you and peace may be multiplied through/in the knowledge of God and Jesus our Lord.

The Second Letter of Peter begins with a prescript, typical of Hellenistic letters, including a self-presentation of the sender, a characterisation of the recipients[1] and wishes or greetings. The prescript also discreetly indicates those themes that will dominate *exordium* – A. faith (1:1c) and B. knowledge (1:2b). Thus, following D.F. Watson, verses 1–2 can even be called a *quasi-exordium*, which announces the issues raised in the later, typically exordial, part of the letter.[2] Together with the classical *exordium* (1:3–15)[3] the prescript forms the following structure:

A. Faith – 1:1c;
    B. Knowledge/knowledge of God and the Lord Jesus Christ – 1:2b;
    B'. Knowledge – 1:3–4;
A'. Faith – 1:5–8;
        C. Synthesis of faith and knowledge (baptismal catechesis) – 1:9–14;
            a. Oblivion (negative aspect) – 1:9;
                b. An eschatologically oriented soteriology- 1:10–11;
            a' – Reminder (positive aspect) – 1:12–14.

This structure makes it possible, even at an introductory stage, to expose the essential soteriological content of the Second Letter of Peter: cleansing from sins (1:9d) and "entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord Jesus and Saviour Christ" (1:11b), and to show that the way to salvation leads through the inextricably linked faith and knowledge based on the correct interpretation of divine revelation. While the issues of faith and knowledge are presented in *exordium* section, the body of the letter is dominated by the issues related to the correct interpretation of revelation.

---

1 See Introduction.

2 D.F. Watson, *Intention, Arrangement and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*, Atlanta 1988, p. 46.

3 See Introduction.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The sender of the letter introduces himself by name and function and/or title as "Simeon Peter, a slave and an apostle of Jesus Christ": Συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Starting the prescript with the sender's name is the most common epistolary solution in antiquity. The self-presentation can be very laconic, limited to the name itself, e. g. "Pliny to Emperor Trajan".[4] There are also letters completely devoid of it, such as the letters of Libanius "To Olympius"[5] or "To Strategius".[6] In some Greek official letters, usually petitions,[7] and sometimes also in Aramaic letters[8] the name and titles of the recipient(s) were placed first, e. g. "My Lord and Brother Amineus from Demetrios".[9] In the Second Letter of Peter, the most conventional order is retained – a self-presentation of the sender and an indication of the addressees.

The presentation of the sender draws attention to the version of Peter's first name Συμεών, rarely used in NT. The name Συμεών is used in NT only seven times and only once (apart from 2 Pet 1:1) in relation to Peter – this is how the apostle is called by James the Just in Acts 15:14.[10] In some testimonies one can find attempts to standardise the sound of the name of the sender with the dominant NT variant Σίμων (so, for example, P^{72}, B, Ψ).[11] Both Συμεών and Σίμων refer to the Semitic name שִׁמְעוֹן (cf. Gen 29:33), though transliterated differently. From c. 100 BC to c. 200 AD, the name was widespread among the Jews living in the ecumene at that time; it may even have become the most popular, or one of the most popular, Jewish names at that time.[12] It is accepted that Σίμων is a more Hellenised variant,[13] Συμεών – a semitized variant. Both forms are known to the author of 1 Macc

4 *Przybycie Pliniusza do Bitynii i rozpoczęcie urzędowania*, Polish transl. J. Schnayder, [in:] *List antyczny. Antologia*, ed. J. Schnayder, Wrocław 2006, p. 31.

5 *Do Olimpiusza*, Polish transl. J. Schnayder, [in:] *List antyczny*, p. 161.

6 *Do Strategiusza*, Polish transl. J. Schnayder, [in:] *List antyczny*, p. 162.

7 J. Fitzmyer, *Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography*, "Journal of Biblical Literature" 93 (1974), no. 2, p. 211.

8 J.L. White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, Philadelphia 1986, p. 194–95, 199–200.

9 *W sprawie przemytników sody*, Polish transl. J. Schnayder, [in:] *List antyczny*, p. 17.

10 J.A.T. Robinson, p. 194, who argues that 2 Peter was penned by Jude, claims that the use of the Συμεών variant supports this hypothesis: since Peter was called Simeon by James, Jude's brother, Jude also used this name when writing 2 Peter.

11 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 556. NA28 no longer gives this variant even in the critical apparatus; it still appears in NA27 (P^{72}, B, Ψ, 69, 81, 614, 623, 630, 1241, 1243, 2464, in Jerome's Vulgate and in the Coptic codices). Some Church Fathers considered the form 'Simeon' to be a diminutive from 'Simon'; so, e. g., Ecumenius in his Commentary on 2 Peter: "The name Simon can also be written as Simeon, which is a diminutive, just as Metras is from Metrodorus […] and Tedas from Theodosius"; see *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 120.

12 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 376.

13 T. Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity*, part 1: *Palestine 330 BCE-200 CE*, Tübingen 2002, p. 218–235; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 208–209.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

(1 Macc 2:1.3.65), and both are also known and used interchangeably by Flavius (e. g. *Ant.* II 7:4, IV 6:10, V 1:22, V 2:1.4, VII 2:2, XII 2:5, XII 4:1.10.11, XII 5:1, XII 6:1.3, XII 8:2.6, XII 9:6, XII 11:2). A certain regularity can be observed in Flavius. The form Συμεών appears much more frequently in the context of the patriarchs and the time before the Babylonian exile, the form Σίμων predominates when the later history of Israel is described. It can therefore be thought that the variant Συμεών was considered in the first century not only more semitized, but also more archaic than the Hellenised version Σίμων. This would mean that its author, if the letter is pseudonymous and if it was written in the first/ second century, deliberately applies the archaic style,[14] imagining that this is how Peter would have presented himself 40–50 years earlier. It is worth noting that neither Σίμων nor Συμεών are the only possible transliterations of the name שמעון in Hellenistic literature. One also encounters the spelling Σύμων, Σιμωνίδης, Σιμωνάθης.[15]

The choice of the form Συμεών, as mentioned, is intended to lend even more credibility to the sender of the letter as an author of Jewish origin than the form Σίμων or even Σίμων Πέτρος. Among the proponents of authenticity, this variant provides evidence for Peter's authorship and the Palestinian provenance of the text, since the two names were used to refer to the apostle primarily in Palestinian circles. The proponents of pseudonymity point out that the letter may have been written in Rome, in the so-called Petrine school composed of Jewish associates and disciples of the apostle (e. g. Mark or Silvanus) who had known him from the Palestinian period,[16] or it belongs to an even broader Alexandrian Petrine discourse collecting various images of the apostle. Coming from these circles, the author used the Semitic sound of the apostle's name in order to give the letter, already edited after Peter's death, a greater semblance of authenticity and thus greater impact.[17]

In the process of semitizing, however, the Aramaic variant of the name Πέτρος was omitted, namely כ׳פא (Κηφᾶς), which would have better anchored the sender in the Palestinian milieu. The replacement of the Aramaic כ׳פא (Κηφᾶς) with its Greek equivalent Πέτρος (both meaning 'stone', 'stony' or 'rock', 'rocky'), may, on the one hand, weaken the impression of its Palestinian (Galilean) origin, and on the other, reveal the sender's bilingualism, which was common among Jews. The Aramaic and Greek versions of the apostle's name appear to have been used interchangeably in Jerusalem circles (Gal 1:18, 2:7–8 and 2:9.11.14).[18] In the circles of the letter's

14 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 296; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 166.

15 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 560.

16 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 167.

17 See Introduction.

18 Cf. B. Ehrman, *Cephas and Peter*, JBL 109 (1990), p. 463–474, who argues that Cephas and Peter are two different characters; this view is challenged by D.C. Allison, *Peter and Cephas: one and the Same*,

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

recipients the Greek variant used by the sender was more common, although Paul's use of the name Κηφᾶς in 1 Cor 1:12, 3:22, 9:5, 15:5 indicates that this version was also known in Hellenistic circles.

The combination of the name Σίμων with the name given to the apostle by Jesus – Πέτρος – is also not very common in NT. The cluster Σίμων Πέτρος is found mainly in the fourth gospel (John 6:68, 13:6.9.24.36, 18:10.15.25, 20:2.6, 21:2.3.7), less frequently in the synoptic gospels (Luke 5:8), which rather contain the extended formula Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος (Matt 4:18, 10:2) or its equivalent (Mark 3:16, Luke 6:14, see also John 1:42, Acts 10:5). The best-known text in which this cluster occurs is undoubtedly Matt 16:16–18. The text applies homophony to explain the meaning of the name Πέτρος, and this explanation is considered in Catholic tradition to be the basis for the establishment of Peter's primacy.[19]

The two names in the *superscriptio* of 2 Peter can be interpreted as *praenomen* and *nomen*. The former (*praenomen*) refers to Simon's Jewish origin, being his original name, while the latter (*nomen*) indicates affiliation: since it was Jesus who changed Simon's name, then Simon – as Peter – now belongs to Jesus and is his slave. In this way, the subsequent appellations of the sender as "a slave and an apostle of Jesus Christ", δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, perform a function similar to *cognomen* in the Roman practice of identifying persons by *tria nomina*, i. e. sender's position and/or office, occupation and task depending on circumstances and context.[20] In official correspondence, it was the *cognomen* that constituted the most significant identifying element of the sender[21] from the perspective of both the recipients and the sender himself. In 2 Peter the double cognomen – "slave and apostle" – draws attention. The very term 'an apostle of Jesus Christ', or its more elaborate forms, seems to be characteristic of the apostle Paul (1 Cor 1:1, 2 Cor 1:1, Gal 1:1, Eph 1:1, Col 1:1). The phrase δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ also occurs in New Testament epistolography (cf. Gal 1:10, Phil 1:1, Col 4:12, Jas 1:1, Jude 1). The combination of the two is admittedly rarer, but also unavoidable (Rom 1:1 and Titus 1:1, the closest to 2 Pet 1:1a). However, whereas in the Corpus Paulinum the terms 'slave' and 'apostle' are clearly separated, in 2 Pet 1:1a they form a synonymous whole. The inversion of the terms 'Jesus Christ' in relation to Paul's 'Christ

JBL 111 (1992), no. 3, p. 489–495; see also the earlier text: J. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Kepha' and Peter's Name in the New Testament*, [in:] J. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel*, New York 1981, p. 112–124.

19 See Introduction.

20 While the *praenomen* usually remained unchanged, the *nomen* indicating the family affiliation, also for slaves, could change; the *cognomen* was the most changeable element and dependent on the circumstances, as it indicated those functions, roles, features that became relevant in a specific communicative situation; see B. Salway, *What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700*, "Journal of Roman Studies" 84 (1994), p. 124–145.

21 J.L. White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, p. 200.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Jesus' formula may or may not indicate that 2 Peter was composed later than Paul's letters.[22]

By calling himself "a slave", the sender refers to two realities: a social reality and a religious reality. The first reference is based on the distinction between the strata of free citizens and slaves (cf. 1 Cor 12:13, Eph 6:8, Col 3:11). The second reference is rooted in the Old Testament and shifts the emphasis from a negative perception of the slave in society to a positive understanding of the status of a divine slave in a religious (Old Testament) context. Just as a slave is a "living instrument" in the hands of his master (cf. Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 1161b), so the sender of the letter considers himself a "living instrument" used by Jesus Christ. He thus likens himself to the great OT leaders "used by God". It is no coincidence that in LXX the term δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ/κυρίου (equivalent for Hebrew עבד) referred to Abraham (Ps 105[104]:42), Moses (2 Kings 18:12, 21:8, Neh 10:30), Joshua (LXX – Josh 24:30, Judg 2:8), David (2 Sam 7:5), the prophets (2 Kings 10:23, Jer 7:24, 25:4, Amos 3:7). In the aspect of social relations, the term 'slave' can be interpreted as an expression of humility – this was argued, among others, by Hilary of Arles in his *Treatise on the Seven Catholic Letters*: "In the first letter Peter did not use the title 'servant', but in the second letter he presents himself as a servant and Simon to express his humility and obedience".[23] In the religious aspect, it becomes a title of honour[24] confirming the authority of the sender and legitimising his teaching and indicating a special relationship with the Lord.

In this context, the second term – ἀπόστολος – should not be considered an addition, but an explanation of the Old Testament and religious meaning of the term δοῦλος, which emphasises the function and authority. The term ἀπόστολος reflects this well. However, it should be noted that the term 'apostle' itself has a long history; it changed its meaning to eventually become permanently embedded in Hellenistic Christian lexis. In ancient literature, ἀπόστολος is not very frequent. In the works of Lysias (*Orationes* 19:21) and Demosthenes (*Orationes* 3:5, 18:80, 50:6) it is an amplification of the term στόλος and denotes a fleet or naval expedition. Over time, it came to denote the document issued by a carrier confirming his acceptance of the cargo and his commitment to transport it and deliver it to the recipient. Not surprisingly, it was also used as a synonym for a letter of recommendation (Oxyrhynchus 1197:13).[25] In the fifth century BC, Herodotus used the noun ἀπόστολος twice in *The Histories* to denote a messenger, an envoy or a herald: "Alyattes […] promptly

22 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 241.

23 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 119.

24 J. Zmijewski, *Paulus – Knecht und Apostel Christ. Amt und Amtsträger in paulinischer Sicht*, Stuttgart 1986, p. 39; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 377.

25 D. Tomczyk, *Ὁ ἀπόστολος a τὸ χάρισμα w Corpus Paulinum*, unpublished doctoral thesis written under the supervision of K. Wojciechowska, Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw, 2020, p. 5.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

sent a herald to Miletus […] So the envoy went to Miletus" (I 21:1), "Aristagoras of Miletus […] went on an embassy […] to Lacedaemon" (V 38:2). Similarly, Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* XVII 11:1: "For an embassage of the Jews was come to Rome; Varus having permitted the nation to send it (ἀπόστολος); that they might petition for the liberty of living by their own laws". All these uses indicate a very close relationship between the noun ἀπόστολος and the verb ἀποστέλλω – 'to prepare for the journey', 'to prepare to set out', 'to send', 'to send out' (both people and objects). If the objects of the verb ἀποστέλλω were people, their availability is emphasised very strongly.[26] Some parallel can be seen here with Aristotle's consideration of the slave as "a living tool" in the hands of the master (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1161b) and the assumed full obedience and submission of the person sent to the sender.[27]

The religious context of the noun ἀπόστολος and the verb ἀποστέλλω in Greek literature appears sporadically and relatively late – only in the works of Stoics (e. g. in Epictetus in *Discourses* III 22.69).[28] The emphasis then is on being sent by a divine being and on equipping the messenger with the appropriate authority to carry out the mission. Thus the meaning of the Greek ἀπόστολος becomes closer to the idea of the Semitic שליח. Not surprisingly, in LXX the Hebrew verb שלח is most often translated as ἀποστέλλω. The noun ἀπόστολος in LXX appears only once in some ancient recensions of 1 Kings 14:6 (LXX 3 Kings 14:6).[29] Like the verb ἀποστέλλω, it emphasises the mandate given to the person sent to fulfil the mission and represent the sender. In a similar sense, ἀπόστολος and ἀποστέλλω permeate the New Testament. While the verb has a broader use that includes the secular sphere, the use of the noun is usually limited only to the religious sphere (although, for example, in the proverb in John 13:16, the "messenger" occurs in a neutral sense). For in NT, ἀπόστολος primarily means a man sent by Jesus to proclaim the Gospel, the good news of salvation that came with Jesus Christ. In the gospels recounting the earthly Jesus, the emphasis is on the proclamation of the coming of the kingdom of God; in the Acts and the apostolic letters, on the salvific work of Jesus Christ, i. e. his death and resurrection. In *Corpus Paulinum* and especially in the Proto-Pauline letters (e. g. 1 Cor 15:1–3, Gal 1:9), ἀπόστολος clearly indicates a function and/or mission which may be limited to a one-off task. This mission is mainly about the representation of the sender, so the term

26 K.H. Rengsdorf, ἀποστέλλω, [in:] *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testamennt*, vol. 1, p. 407.

27 F. Mickiewicz, *Autorytet apostołów w Kościele pierwotnym w świetle Drugiego Listu św. Piotra*, "Seminare" 39 (2018), no. 2, p. 12; K.H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefie. Der Judasbrief* (Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 13/2), Göttingen 1988, p. 184.

28 E. von Eicken, H. Lindner, *Apostle*, [in:] *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, ed. C. Brown, vol. 1, Grand Rapids 1975, p. 127.

29 In most critical editions of the LXX, chapter 14 begins with v. 21. However, some ancient recensions include the Greek version of 1 Kings 14:1–20.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

ἀπόστολος becomes an affirmation of the mandate and, over time, the authority not only of the sender but also of the person sent. As Peter Hugh Davids notes, in New Testament epistolography the term is added to the sender's name primarily when the sender wishes to authenticate himself in the eyes of recipients who might have not recognised his authority. The letter then almost automatically becomes more official. In private letters, in which the bond between the sender and recipients is strongly emphasised, the invocation of official authority is not necessary[30] (see e. g. Phil 1:1, 1 Thess 1:1, 2 Thess 1:1, Phlm 1). Towards the end of the first century, one can notice a tendency to reduce the use of the term ἀπόστολος only to the Twelve (δώδεκα), additionally to Paul, Silas and Barnabas; ἀπόστολος changes from a concept of a functional nature into a title of honour (cf. Rev 18:20, 21:14). In the case of 2 Pet 1:1, this distinction between function (mission) and title is particularly difficult; for Peter belonged to the company of the Twelve, was sent by Jesus to preach the Gospel about the kingdom (cf. Mark 6:6–12 and parallel), then about the whole salvific work of Jesus Christ (cf. Matt 28:16–20 and parallel); as an eyewitness to Jesus' earthly mission undoubtedly enjoyed respect and authority in most Christian circles. In 2 Pet 3:2, however, the term ἀπόστολος seems to have a primarily dynamic, functional character and points to the anonymous apostle-missionaries who had previously preached the Gospel to the recipients of the letter, as evidenced by the possessive pronoun ὑμῶν.[31]

Neither is the problem whether verse 1a specifies a title or a function facilitated by the genitive case Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. It is inconclusive whether it is gen. pertinens (of belonging) or gen. obiectivus, or perhaps gen. subiectivus or gen. originis? The first and second variants are semantically close and overlap. The adherence to Jesus Christ alludes to the idea of an envoy and a slave who does not represent himself, but the sending person and their authority. Existential elements can also be identified here – the fact of surrendering to Jesus in slavery. Gen. obiectivus indicates the content being preached – "an apostle [preaching] Jesus Christ" or "an apostle [preaching the message, teaching] of Jesus Christ". The third variant – gen. subiectivus – describes Peter as an apostle [called, appointed by] Jesus Christ. If the letter is considered to be pseudonymous, it can be assumed that the sender wants to evoke in the addressees the connotations carried by gen. subiectivus in the first place – the calling and mandate given to Peter personally by Jesus Christ. This aspect is indicated by the (auto)biographical passages included later in the letter, referring to words heard directly from Jesus (2 Pet 1:12–15). In this way, the sender's teaching is to be treated by the recipients as if it were the teaching of Jesus himself; the sender is therefore to command respect from the outset as the one who

30 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 377, 378.

31 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:2.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

has been chosen and called by Jesus, belonging not only to the circle of the Twelve, but even to three particularly trusted disciples (2 Pet 1:16–18, cf. Matt 17:5–7). On the other hand, taking into account the preposition ἀπο, amplifying the main word, we can also identify here gen. originis, which is very close in meaning to gen. subiectivus. In this sense, the person of the messenger, the one from whom the messenger comes, is accentuated even more strongly.

It can therefore be assumed that in 2 Pet 1:1a all four meanings of gen. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ intermingle, but a certain hierarchy of meanings can be attempted. Gen. originis and gen. subiectivus come to the fore as carrying a similar meaning, followed by gen. pertinens and finally gen. obiectivus.

The prescript shows a certain correlation of functions and/or titles with names, already noted by Hilary of Arles.[32] The Semitic name Συμεών is alluded to by the term δοῦλος, which a recipient familiar with the Old Testament and Jewish tradition should associate primarily with a function and an honourable title of a leader derived from the Old Testament. The Greek name Πέτρος is referred to by the term ἀπόστολος, which denotes the vocation and function conferred by Jesus Christ, while at the same time clarifies the Old Testament connotations of the title δοῦλος, perhaps not fully understood by some. The mutual clarification and overlapping of the Old Testament title δοῦλος and the New Testament title ἀπόστολος creates no tension. On the contrary, it points to two areas of particular importance to the sender and recipients of the letter: the roots of Peter's teaching in Jewish (Old Testament) tradition and the mandate given by Jesus. Both areas contribute to the authority and credibility of the sender,[33] and both are also referred to by the sender later in the letter (e. g. Jesus' mandate in 2 Pet 1:12–18 juxtaposed with the prophetic tradition in 2 Pet 1:19–21). This intermingling of meanings, which can also be found in other NT writings, is a characteristic feature in 2 Peter, which prefigures the integrative strategy employed by the sender of the letter. The two terms, concepts and traditions juxtaposed here melt together and form an inseparable amalgam. Sometimes, such as the phrases ζωὴ καὶ εὐσήβεια and δόξα καὶ ἀαρετή in verse 3, they form a figure called hendiadys, in which the noun standing in the second place assumes the function of an attribute to the first noun.[34]

2.1.1 A. Faith (2 Pet 1:1c)

According to ancient epistolography the sender proceeds from the self-presentation to the presentation of recipients. Unlike the majority of Paul's letters and 1 Pet 1:1, the

32 See above.

33 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter,* p. 543.

34 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

author fails to provide data allowing for a precise location and closer identification of the community (communities) to which he was writing. The letter, however, seems to have been addressed to a specific community, since the sender is well aware of its problems (cf. 2 Pet 3:15–16) and writes to it several times (cf. 2 Pet 3:1)[35]. The specification of the addressees begins with the phrase τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν "to those [having obtained] faith equal in dignity to our [faith]". The faith πίστις most likely refers to the revelation based on the Old Testament and on the preaching of the apostles and, as in the Letter of Jude (Jude 3), is on the one hand cognitive, on the other hand a personal, existential experience.[36] It is therefore not only about some already formed and formalised doctrinal system (*fides quae*), but also about those elements of revelation and experience that generate personal commitment and specific behaviour (*fides qua*). This understanding of faith makes everyone who experiences it equally chosen, privileged,[37] endowed – whether an eyewitness to the life of Jesus, an apostle, or a man who believed later. We recognise here echoes of Paul's view of faith (the existential aspect),[38] as well as of the Old Testament approach, in which faith implies doing God's will (the practical aspect).

The use of non-standard lexis when specifying faith as "having obtained" λαχοῦσιν and as "equal in dignity to our faith", "equally precious to ours" τοῖς ἰσότιμον is a procedure that slows down the process of text reception and keeps the recipients focused on "faith" for longer. In this way, the sender wants to draw the addressees' attention to faith based on properly interpreted revelation as one of the main themes of his letter.

The verb λαγχάνω, from which the participle aor. act. λαχοῦσιν is formed, primarily means 'to receive something by lot', 'to draw lots' (Acts 1:17), 'to cast lots' (John 19:24) or 'to choose by lot' (Luke 1:9).[39] Cleromancy was a widespread way of reading the will of God/gods in both Jewish (e. g. Lev 16:8, Josh 7:14, 1 Sam 14:42, Prov 16:33) and Greek traditions. In 2 Pet 1:1b the form λαγχάνω is used in the sense "to obtain/receive a share". Probably this is a reference to the casting of lots, which resulted in the division of the promised land among the tribes of Israel (Lev 26:55–56, Josh 18:6). Each of the twelve tribes received by lot a share/inheritance of specific territories. In 2 Peter the element that was given, a share which the recipients obtained is faith.

The sender does not specify by whom the faith was given to the recipients. However, one can guess that the first donor is God (although He is not mentioned as an agent, not even pass. theologicum (divinum) is used), acting through the

35 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 165; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 379.

36 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 93–94.

37 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 168.

38 Cf. J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 296.

39 The verb λαγχάνω was also used in legal language to mean 'to bring a lawsuit' or 'to challenge'.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

apostles, evangelists, missionaries, who communicated to the letter's addressees the content of revelation based on OT and apostolic preaching. Obtaining a share in something implies participation. The second "shareholder" of faith, apart from the recipients of the letter, is the group represented by the sender, as evidenced by the pronoun ἡμεῖς.

The faith obtained was further specified by the phrase ἰσότιμος ἡμῖν. The term ἰσότιμος is one of the New Testament *hapax legomena*, but it was known in Hellenistic literature. It was used, among others, by Josephus Flavius in *Bell. Iud.* I 3:1, where he mentioned that "[Aristobulus] appeared to have an affection for Antigonus, who was next to him, and made him his equal" ἰσοτίμως. Given the context (Aristobulus had proclaimed himself king), one can presume that Antigonus was to be recognised as equal in dignity, privileges and as deserving of praise and honours as Aristobulus. In *Ant.* XII 3:1 ἰσότιμος (in plural) refers to the civic privileges and powers granted to the Judeans by Seleucus Nicator, which were "equal to those of the Macedonians and Greeks" (ἰσοτίμους ἀπέφηνεν Μακεδόσιν καὶ Ἕλλησιν). This phrase appears in Philo of Alexandria in *Leg. alleg.* II XVIII in an axiological context when he described the equality of mind and senses.[40] In *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* 3:8, we read that, referring to the death of Moses, "God accounts a wise man as entitled to equal honour with the world itself" τὸν σοφὸν ἰσότιμον κόσμῳ[41] and in *De spec. leg.* I XXXV:181 in a religious context when describing the equal importance of each of the seven days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread when the same sacrifices are offered.[42] As can be seen, each time honour, honour, value is associated with something external, with social status, rank in public life. It can therefore be assumed that the same ἰσότιμος was understood by Peter – the faith of the recipients allows them to have the same status as Peter and the group he represented.

The recognition of faith as an honour and dignity presupposes that it will be manifested in public, the way the royal dignity or honour[43] and the possession of certain rights or status in the community are manifested in public by particular behaviour and conduct. The narrator draws on social associations to suggest to the audience that they too have received as exalted/precious a faith as the group he represents, so they will manifest it publicly like the apostles. The manner of this manifestation is presented primarily in verses 1:5–7. This leads to the conclusion that πίστις ἰσότιμος ἡμῖν means being both a chosen and devoted servant (as the title δοῦλος suggests) and a messenger of the gospel (as the title ἀπόστολος suggests).

40 Philo, *The Allegorical Interpretation* II.

41 Philo, *On the Birth of Abel and the Sacrifices Offered by Him and by His Brother Cain*.

42 Id., *The Special Laws* I.

43 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 380.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

There is no consensus among scholars on how to understand the "faith" of the recipients and "our faith" here. Perhaps this should be construed as a mere epistolographic *captatio benevolentiae*, a wish to appreciate the recipients. One may wonder, however, on whose behalf Peter is speaking. Is this a matter of temporal differentiation? If so, then Peter would represent the apostolic faith, whereas the recipients of the letter belonging to the next generation of Christians would represent the post-apostolic faith[44] (cf. John 20:29 and the words of blessing for those who have not seen, and the apocryphal second-century Epistle of the Apostles 6: "These things did our Lord and Saviour reveal unto us and teach us. And we do even as he, that ye may become partakers in the grace of our Lord and in our ministry and our giving of thanks (glory), and think upon life eternal".[45] Or is it a confrontation between the faith handed down by Paul and other apostles evangelizing Hellenistic circles, who did not know the earthly Jesus, and the faith of the Twelve, the circle of eyewitnesses and companions of Jesus' earthly mission?[46] Clear traces of this confrontation can be seen in the letters of Paul, who defends his dignity and apostolic mission by insisting that he too was called by Jesus Christ (1 Cor 1:1, 2 Cor 1:1, Rom 1:1, Gal 1:1, cf. 1 Cor 15:8). Obviously, 2 Pet 1:1b would not focus on Paul himself, but rather on the tension between the Helleno-Christian faith represented by the addressees and the Judeo-Christian faith represented by Peter (cf. Acts 11:17).[47]

As an argument in favour of the first possibility – the distinction between apostolic (Peter's) and post-apostolic (the addressees') faith – one usually points to 2 Pet 1:16, in which Peter, aware of his impending death, speaks on behalf of the eyewitnesses to the "majesty" of the Lord Jesus Christ. Significant here would be the plural form of the pronoun ἡμεῖς from 1:1b and the verbs ἐγνωρίσαμεν (lit. "we made known") from verse 16, ἠκούσαμεν "we heard" and the participle ὄντες "being" from verse 18 (cf. Matt 17:1–6, Mark 9:1–7, Luke 9:28–36). This would mean, however, that "our faith", that is, the faith of the group represented by Peter, is in fact limited not to the apostolic faith, not even to the faith of the Twelve, but to the faith of Peter, James and John who accompanied Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration. It is difficult to believe that such a narrowing is what the sender of 2 Peter had in mind.

44 See, inter alia, K.H. Schelkle, J.N.D. Kelly, W. Schrage, D. Harink; E.M. Sidebottom, *James, 2 Peter, Jude* (New Century Bible Commentary), Grand Rapids 1980, p. 98.

45 The Epistle of the Apostles.

46 This is the case of senior researchers M.R. James, J. Moffatt, B. Reicke, among others.

47 This is the case of senior researchers J.B. Mayor, G.H. Boobyer, among others.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The arguments deployed against both the second and the third possibility include a lack of tension between Helleno-Christians and Judeo-Christians in 2 Peter.[48] But this lack can be easily explained – the purpose of the letter is not to advocate either option, but to show that they are equal, and that "our faith" and the faith of the recipients produce the same results. This is why the narrator later invokes Paul's teaching (which can be considered representative of the Hellenic-Christian tradition) as well as examples from OT and Jewish tradition. Moreover, the double self-presentation of the sender, referring both to the Judaic tradition (Simon, the slave of Jesus Christ) and to the Hellenistic tradition (Peter, the apostle of Jesus Christ) contributes to the reduction of tension. In the same way as the elements of self-presentation in the *superscriptio*, one should treat what makes up the faith taken as a whole[49] and shows it as bringing "equally precious" effects and rights. This also explains the use of the verb λαγχάνω – both the recipients of the letter, presumably associated with the Hellenistic Pauline tradition, and those hitherto associated with the Old Testament and Petrine traditions, partake of the same faith that makes them equal in all respects.

This thought is developed in the ending of verse 1: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ "through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ". "Righteousness" here does not mean either justification, as in Paul's letters (Rom 1:16–17, 3:21–26), or the morality associated with fulfilling the law (cf. 2 Pet. 2:5.21, 3:13),[50] as in the Old Testament tradition, but "righteousness" being an attribute of God.[51] We recognise here the Old Testament image of God and the social references characteristic of Hellenism in OT, God's justice is positive; it manifests itself in his salvific, saving works; those who ask for God's justice are in fact pleading for rescue (Isa 45:21, 51:5–7, 56:1, 62:1, Ps 71[70]:2, 143[142]:11). It seems important to note here that God's "righteousness" in the Old Testament is not condemnatory.[52] In the intertestamental period, the semantic field of the term 'righteousness' in relation to God increasingly overlaps with the semantic field of 'mercy', 'kindness', 'grace' (cf. also Dan 9:18). And it is this meaning that

48 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 297; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 379.

49 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 147.

50 Such meanings may be suggested by the lesson εἰς δικαιοσύνην 'towards righteousness' in ℵ; this is also the meaning given to this phrase by, among others, P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 381, who argues that this ethical righteousness is contrasted with the lack of righteousness in false teachers. Also M. Luther in his commentary on the Second Letter of Peter understands righteousness primarily as justification by faith, he even equates faith with divine righteousness i. e. given to man by God – see *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther*.

51 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy, Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 211.

52 H. Seebas, *Righteousness*, [in:] *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 1, p. 355.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

was most likely adopted by the author of 2 Peter. This overlaps with the conviction that in his righteousness God "has no favorites" (USCCB)/ "regardeth not persons" (KJV)/ "shows no partiality" (NKJV) (Deut 10:17, cf. Acts 10:34–36, Rom 2:11), which in part turns God's righteousness into a judicial aspect. These judicial and legal connotations are more evident in LXX and in intertestamental literature (Wis 12:15, 2 Macc 9:18, PssSol 2:10.18.32.34, 5:1, 8:8, 9:2, 10:5), which is to be attributed to Greek influence.

While in the Jewish tradition, also in LXX, the attribute δίκαιος 'righteous' could only be given to God, in the Greek tradition 'righteousness' was attributed first and foremost to man, to a virtuous man. The manifestation of human excellence was to act justly towards men and towards the gods.[53] As Plato put it in *Gorgias*: "as regards men, his actions will be just, and as regards the gods, pious; and he who does what is just and pious must needs be a just and pious man" (Plato, 507b). It is no coincidence, therefore, that the adjective δίκαιος (righteous) was synonymous with εὐσεβής ('pious').[54] The term "righteousness" was readily used in judicial, legal and social language. Aristotle claimed that "To go to a judge is to go to justice, for the ideal judge is so to speak justice personified" (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1132a). A judge, a ruler who showed impartiality, graciousness and generosity, was considered to be "righteous/just". This image of a righteous judge and ruler shows clear parallels to the Old Testament image of a righteous God, to whom the prerogatives of judge and ruler also belong. In 2 Pet 1:1c, by combining elements of the Old Testament and Greek understandings of righteousness, the hagiographer seems to emphasise two things. First, the aforementioned righteousness is tantamount to impartiality, which means that in bestowing faith/revelation on people, God is not guided by their ethnicity, their religious affiliation or the time in which they live. Secondly, such an endowment is salvific, a grace shown to the beneficiary. Although at first glance this conception of righteousness seems to have originated from the Old Testament, it turns out that Aristotle's areligious considerations of righteousness directed towards human welfare and happiness can also be interpreted in salvific terms and a religious context. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1129b), the philosopher mentions that a just action is calculated not for individual benefit or individual well-being, but for the good of another: "Justice then […] is displayed towards others […] its possessor can practise his virtue towards others and not merely by himself". Earlier, he defines "the term 'just' [as] applied to anything that produces and preserves the happiness, or the component parts of the happiness, of the political community". God's righteous acts are thus acts for

53 J. Rybowska, *Zbożność i bezbożność w kulturze Greków*, Łódź 2017, p. 31.

54 Plato, *Gorgias* [in:] *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, vol. 3, English transl. W.R.M. Lamb, London 1967, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a [accessed: 25.07.2022].

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the benefit and happiness of man. But God's righteousness is also manifested in the fact that God has given to every believer a faith equal in dignity. Here, too, the influence of Stagirite and the *Nicomachean Ethics* can be traced. Indeed, one of the types of justice he describes refers to "justice in distributions must be based on desert of some sort" (1131a). The philosopher argues that if what is unequal is unjust, then what is equal is just. He juxtaposes the same concepts that Peter also uses: τὸ δίκαιον (that which is just) and τὸ ἴσον (that which is equal – cf. Peter's ἰσότιμον).

The phrase ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ in 2 Pet 1:1c should be taken as an adverbial and combined with the participle λαχοῦσιν – literally "[faith] obtained through the righteousness of God". This implies that the faith and the equal honours and rights resulting from it are the design and work of a righteous God. It is difficult to determine conclusively whether ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ expresses a cause, manner or an instrument. In the first case, it would point to righteousness primarily as an attribute of God that determines His actions. In the second case, it would be the manner of God's action, and similarly in the third, although here the emphasis would be on the instrument – righteousness – that God uses to endow everyone with equal dignity.

The term "righteousness" is made definite by the phrase τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, in which the presence of only one article in the genitive – τοῦ – draws attention. This makes the whole phrase understandable in two ways. First, as a reference to two persons: "Our God" (one person) and "Saviour Jesus Christ" (the other person), which allows some biblical scholars to recognise a binitarian formula similar to that used in verse 2b.[55]

Secondly, τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ can only refer to one person, which means that the terms 'God' and 'Saviour' are not to be treated separately (the righteousness of God and the righteousness of our Saviour Jesus Christ), but they denote the righteousness of the same person.[56] The same construction with only one definite article is used in 2 Pet 1:11, 2:20, 3:2.18, so it can be assumed that it is not only part of the idiolect of the sender, but also belongs to the literary stabilised Christian formulas.[57]

The use of only one possessive pronoun – ἡμῶν – to both the noun 'God' and the noun 'Saviour'[58] can be seen as further confirmation that the terms "God and Saviour" denote a single person – Jesus Christ. This means that Jesus Christ is, for Peter and other believers like him, both Saviour (obviously) and God, which may raise some objections. Therefore, in א Ψ 442 and in some Syriac translations one

55 So, for example, J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 148.

56 M.J. Harris, *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus*, Eugene 2008, p. 233.

57 M.J. Harris, *Jesus as God*, p. 234.

58 Ibid., p. 231.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

encounters another interpretation, easier to accept from Theological point of view, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ "[righteousness] of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" with the ambiguous title κύριος, which can refer to both God (the Father) and Jesus Christ.

Several texts can be found in NT which, like 2 Pet 1:1c, attribute divinity to Jesus Christ. Usually, John 1:1.18, 20:28, Heb 1:8–9 are cited as those that definitively point to the divinity of Christ. In others – Rom 9:5, 1 John 5:20 and perhaps Titus 2:13 – such a suggestion appears less explicitly. However, by the first/second century it was widely believed that Jesus was God, as evidenced by the letters of early Christian writers. Ignatius of Antioch in *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (1:1) wrote of the Church's destiny "by the will of the Father, and Jesus Christ, our God" ἐν θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. He expresses this poetically in the Christological hymn in the same letter (7:2):

> There is one Physician
> who is possessed both of flesh and spirit;
> both made and not made;
> God existing in flesh;
> […]
> both of Mary and of God;
> […]
> Jesus Christ our Lord.

This incarnational motif is repeated in 19:3 ("God Himself being manifested in human form"); even more explicit is the statement in 18:2: ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός "For our God, Jesus Christ, was […] conceived in the womb by Mary". This is not an isolated example. Ignatius, in *The Epistle to the Trallians* (7:1), recommends the recipients should "continue in intimate union with Jesus Christ our God" θεοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, while in *The Epistle to the Romans* (3:3) he points to pre-existence: θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, "For our God, Jesus Christ, now that He is with the Father". The Epistle of the Apostles 3, dating from the second half of the second century, contains an unequivocal confession of faith: "Our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ is God the Son of God, who was sent of God". The deification of Jesus in the first/second century is also confirmed by Pliny the Younger in his letter to the Emperor Trajan, which describes the liturgical customs of Christians in Bithynia and Pont, worshipping Christ as God: "on a stated day they had been accustomed to meet before daybreak and to recite a hymn among themselves to Christ, as though he were a god they were accustomed to meet on a fixed day before dawn and sing

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

responsively a hymn to Christ as to a god"[59] and in the Second Letter of Peter itself. In 2 Pet 1:17 the narrator mentions the transfer of honour and glory by God the Father to Jesus, and in 3:18 one can identify the transposition of traditional doxological formulas from God to Jesus.[60]

It is not possible to state unequivocally how the divinity of Jesus is understood by the sender of 2 Peter. Is it the fullness of divinity or only some divine prerogatives transferred from God (the Father) to Jesus, e. g. salvific, judicial prerogatives as in the rest of the letter. In 1:1c the sender calls Jesus σωτήρ "Saviour". Such title is not the most common practice of New Testament hagiographers. A similar attribute appears 24 times in NT.[61] This compilation shows that the majority of instances are in 2 Peter[62] or the pastoral letters. One can see this title became gradually rooted in Christianity. In the first/second century, it came to be natural to call Jesus the Saviour, as evidenced by early Christian literature. In the doxology in *2 Clem.* 20:5 one can read: "To the only God, invisible, Father of truth, who sent forth to us the Saviour and Author of immortality, […] to Him be glory for ever and ever". Jesus as Saviour also appears in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch to the Ephesians (1:1: "according to the faith and love in Jesus Christ our Saviour"), the Magnesians (in the prescript: "in the grace of God the Father, in Jesus Christ our Saviour"), the Philadelphians (9:2: "the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ"), in the prescript of Polycarp's letter to the Church at Philippi ("Mercy to you, and peace from God Almighty, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, our Saviour, be multiplied"), in *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* (19: "[Polycarp] blesses our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of our souls"), in the already quoted confession in Epistle of the Apostles 3 and in other passages of this writing (5: "They are the symbol of our faith […] in Jesus Christ our redeemer", 6: "These things did our Lord and Saviour reveal unto us and teach us"; 12: "Then said our Lord and Saviour").

The use of the title 'Saviour' when defining 'righteousness' is not accidental. As already mentioned, traditionally in Judaism the title 'Saviour' was attributed to God. The Hebrew formula אלהי ישענו "God of our salvation" is translated in LXX as ὁ θεὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν "God our Saviour" (Ps 27[26]:9, 38[37]:23, 65[64]:5, 79[78]:9, PssSol 8:33, 17:3, cf. Isa 17:10 "God your Saviour"). These Old Testament uses of the title "Saviour" refer primarily to God's liberating actions in the temporal realm, a rescue given to Israel or to a righteous person in a tragic situation, feeling

59 *Pliny the Younger's Letter to Emperor Trajan Regarding the Christians*, ed. W.S. Davis, W.M. West, *Readings in Ancient History*, Boston 1912–1913.

60 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:17, 3:18.

61 The most unambiguous are Luke 2:11, John 4:42, Acts 5:31, 13:23, Eph 5:23, Phil 3:20; four times in the pastoral letters: 2 Tim 1:10, Titus 1:4, 2:13, 3:6, five times in 2 Peter: 1:1.11, 2:20, 3:2.18.

62 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 298; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 383.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

some kind of threat. The turn to an eschatological understanding of this title only occurs in the intertestamental literature.[63] One can now see a clear correlation between Peter's understanding of 'righteousness', rooted in the Old Testament, as God's attribute generating his salvific actions and this title given to Jesus. This Old Testament understanding of the title σωτήρ is usually reinforced with its popularity in Hellenistic religious language. The term was applied to the chosen ones of the gods and to divine rulers, and became particularly established in the cult of the Caesars. Perhaps, as R. Bauckham notes, the frequent appearance of this title in 2 Peter is due to the desire to adapt Hellenistic religious lexis, close to the audience, to Christianity and give it a Christian meaning.[64] It is also possible to see here an echo of some kind of polemic with the pagan religions as to what true salvation consists in and who is the true saviour,[65] although J.N.D. Kelly, for example, rejects this suggestion, arguing that the days of polemics are over and that 2 Pet 1:1c should be regarded as a settled and even formalised Christological phrase,[66] common – as shown – in the first/second century. Given Peter's strategy of combining Jewish and Greek elements and bridging the tensions between the two, it can be assumed that this combination is most likely a certain Judaisation of the title σωτήρ, common in Hellenism, and linking it to the Old Testament understanding of righteousness and the Old Testament history of salvation, rather than a confrontation between Christianity and pagan religions.

Following the model of Hellenistic letters, the presentation of the sender and the characteristics of the recipients are followed by wishes and/or greetings. In many cases these have a very succinct form limited to the substantivised infinitive χαιρεῖν (greeting), e. g. "Teon to father Teon [sends a] greeting".[67] In 2 Pet 1:2 the greetings take the shape of a prayer: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου "Grace to you and peace may be multiplied [literally, the verb in is the singular] through/in the knowledge of God and Jesus our Lord". Such a prayerful wish, containing the phrase "grace and peace", appears frequently in the New Testament and early Christian letters, although it is rarely expressed in the optative mood (cf. Rom 1:7, 1 Cor 1:3, 2 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:3, Eph 1:2, Phil 1:2, Col 1:2, 1 Thess 1:1, 2 Thess 1:2, Titus 1:4, Phlm 3, Rev 1:4, the prescript in *1 Clem.*: "Grace unto you, and peace, from Almighty God through Jesus Christ, be multiplied", without the optative). In quoting this wish, common in Christian epistolography,

63 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 401.

64 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 169.

65 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 383, D. Harink, *1&2 Peter*, Grand Rapids 2009, p. 135 further links this to the observance of the first commandment (Exod 20:3) and the rejection of the worship of other gods.

66 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 298.

67 *Rozgrymaszony Teon pisze do ojca*, Polish transl. J. Manteuffel, [in:] *List antyczny*, p. 12.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the sender of 2 Peter nevertheless attributes a special meaning to it, continuing his references to Hellenistic and Jewish tradition.

The beginning of the formula – "grace" χάρις – can be seen as a Christianisation of the classical epistolographic tradition, which, as shown above, used the verb χαιρεῖν. In the Christian epistles, the verb is replaced by the noun χάρις that has the same stem[68] as the noun χάρα "joy". This means that originally the verb χαιρεῖν combined the element of joy and that of grace. The process of Christianisation and the preference for the noun form χάρις instead of the verb form χαιρεῖν shifted the emphasis from the joy of the recipient of "grace" to the voluntary act and the benevolence of the giver of "grace". In this, one can see the influence of the judicial Hellenistic tradition and the religious Judaic tradition. Cicero, for example, sets grace in the judicial context and defines it as "an additional favour" that was granted to the accused, the amount of which depended on the position and wealth of the one who gave and the one who received the favour.[69] It is different with God's grace, which is granted to people without limit and "partiality". In this way, the wish of verse 2a is combined with "equal in dignity" and divine "righteousness" in verse 1b and c. This in turn makes it possible to find roots of grace also in OT and to emphasise not only God's impartiality, but to pay closer attention also to "favour", "kindness", and "mercy", which correspond with the Old Testament concepts חן and חסד (cf. Gen. 39:21, Exod 3:21, 11:3, 12:36). In OT, the rare use of "grace" in Gen 6:8 is notable, where the noun חן refers to Noah's undeserved election.[70] This aspect, in turn, would correspond with participation in faith, which is a gift of God, and with the discrete reference to the story of Noah developed later in the letter (2 Pet 2:5).

The second component of the prayer wish, "peace" εἰρήνη, which is often found in Semitic epistolography (e. g. Dan 4:1, 6:26, ApBaSyr 78:2: "Mercy and peace"), is even more clearly related to Jewish tradition. The term "peace" itself has an extremely rich history and an extensive semantic field. It is here, most likely, as in the Letter of Jude, linked to salvation and eschatologically-oriented, which is already discernible in Old Testament reflection.[71] It seems worth noting that in the Old Testament texts the concept of "peace" also takes on an existential meaning – it signifies inner joy and hope resulting from a personal bond and relationship, established through faith, with God (cf. Rom 5:1, Eph 2:14).[72] As can easily be seen, "peace" understood in this way connects with Peter's understanding of faith as a

68 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 383.

69 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 551.

70 H.-H. Esser, *Grace*, [in:] *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, p. 115.

71 Sir 38:8, Zech 9:10 – LXX; Isa 26:3, 27:5, 32:17, 57:2 – LXX; Bar 3:13.14, 5:4, Ps 85[84]:9, Mal 2:5 and especially Acts 10:36, Rom 5:1, 8:6, 14:17, Eph 6:15; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 192.

72 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 88.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

revelation, the knowledge of which leads to conversion and thus reconciliation[73] as well as the establishment of a personal relationship with God. This is also how Oecumenius sees peace in 2 Pet 1:2 in his commentary on the Second Letter of Peter: "Peter speaks not of peace that is proper to the world, but of that which is born of the knowledge of God. Only that peace is true which frees us from sin and from enmity with God".[74] Peter's formula "grace and peace" was not only used as a salutation convention, but also an integration strategy. Moreover, "grace" understood as gift and mercy and "peace" understood as a restored relationship with God are undoubtedly attributes of salvation, elements of eschatological reality. Thus, wishes of "grace and peace" essentially denote a wish and hope of a soteriological nature expressed in the form of a prayer.

This is confirmed by the verb πληθυνθείη in aor. pass. optativus, which only occurs here and in Jude 2. In both cases, this indicates a good mastery of Greek by the two hagiographers rather than a direct relationship between the texts. The verb πληθύνω means "to increase, multiply, grow, fill"; the passive form is to be interpreted as pass. theologicum, indicating that the author of the multiplication, growth, abundance is God, and it is only due to His sovereign will that "grace and peace" abound and fill the recipients of the letter. Since, as has been said, "grace and peace" belong to the descriptions of the messianic and/or end times, the believers can be completely filled with them only after the second coming of Christ and the final advent of the kingdom of God. The comprehensiveness, fullness and completion of the "multiplication" process is also clearly indicated by the use of the aorist.

The Petrine thought expressed in this prayerful wish can thus be summarised as follows: it is a request and, at the same time, hope that the recipients of the letter in the end times will, by God's will and through Him, be perfectly endowed and filled with His grace and peace. In contrast to other similar wishes from the New Testament epistolography, where the emphasis is clearly put on "grace and peace", here the sender's attention is focused on the verb and its rare form, i. e. on God's saving action. This corresponds very well with Peter's understanding of God's role in giving the gift of grace and with Peter's understanding of God's justice. Furthermore, the prayerful request introduces Theological message of the letter – the characteristics of God's actions in the end times (cf. 2 Pet 2:5b–c.7–9a and especially 3:9 and 3:15a).

73 N. Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, Grand Rapids 1992, p. 419.

74 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 120.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

2.1.2 B. Knowledge (2 Pet 1:2b)

Typically, formulas containing a wish for grace and peace in New Testament letters end with an indication of the benefactor (cf. e. g. Rom 1:7 "to all the beloved of God in Rome, called to be holy. Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ"; 1 Cor 1:3 "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ"; 2 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:3, Eph 1:2, Phil 1:2, 2 Thess 1:2, Col 1:2 "grace to you and peace from God our Father"). In 2 Pet 1:2b we can see a more elaborate phrase ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου, reminiscent of 1c. Therefore, similarly to ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ in 1c, ἐν ἐπιγνώσει in 2b can be interpreted as an adverbial of cause, manner or instrument, although the interpretation of these adverbials will be the same: "through knowledge". Due to the syntactic similarity of 1c and 2b the phrases

A. faith given through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ
and
B. peace and grace multiplied through the knowledge/full knowledge of God and Jesus our Lord

become significant; they indicate the two key themes of the Second Letter of Peter, developed in *exordium*, i. e. faith and knowledge, which in Peter's view are not only complementary but even synonymous.

One can also speak of a parallelism between the two formulas:

Συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
Τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν
ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ
τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη
ἐν ἐπιγνώσει
τοῦ θεοῦ
και Ιησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Simeon Peter, a slave and an apostle of Jesus Christ
to those [having] faith equal in dignity/equally precious to our [faith], obtained
through the righteousness
of our God
and Saviour Jesus Christ.
Grace to you and peace may be multiplied
through the knowledge
of God
and Jesus our Lord.

In 2 Peter, two lexemes are used to denote 'full knowledge': the noun ἐπίγνωσις and the verb ἐπιγινώσκω (2 Pet 1:2b.3.8, 2:21) and the noun γνῶσις and the verb γινώσκω (2 Pet 1:5.6, 3:18). The preposition ἐπι has either a locative or temporal meaning; it is often used to denote extensiveness in time or space and to intensify a concept, to emphasise an accumulation of a feature. These elements – especially intensification and extension – can also be found in the term ἐπίγνωσις. In NT it is used to describe the process of coming to know the essence of someone or something, acquiring knowledge by means of insight, perception, recognition, discovering something,[75] accepting, acknowledging something or someone as something or someone (cf. Rom 1:20–21).[76] It is therefore progressive, dynamic in character, and presupposes personal commitment, especially when, as in 2 Peter, its object is Christ.[77] The second term usually implies knowledge of things and is thus more static and definitive.[78] Verse 2b would then refer to a personal commitment to coming to know the essence of God and Jesus, which leads to conversion[79] understood as a transformative change of thinking and to an ethically irreproachable life that is also a manifestation of faith (cf. 2 Pet 1:5–7, Heb 10:26, 1 Tim 2:4, 2 Tim 2:25, 3:7, Titus 1:1). Sometimes ἐπίγνωσις is defined as "the fundamental, salvific knowledge on which the whole Christian life is based",[80] while γνῶσις is

75 R.E. Picirelli, *The Meaning of "Epignosis"*, "Evangelical Quarterly" 47 (1975), p. 89–93 reviews various positions in this matter.

76 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 149.

77 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 299.

78 By means of these related and very close concepts the narrator of the letter is believed to have opposed the teaching of false prophets and teachers. Formerly, they were considered some strand of Gnosticism, but nowadays researchers depart from this thesis and identify as Peter's opponents those who, hailing from far-reaching syncretism, combined elements of Greek philosophy, Greek mythology (cf. 2 Pet 1:16) and nascent Christian doctrine; see Introduction and K.H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefie*, p. 230–234; J.D.N. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 299; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 187; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 554.

79 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 169; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 385; D. Harink, p. 136.

80 Ibid., p. 170.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

defined as knowledge that can be acquired and developed naturally.[81] This distinction does not seem to apply in 2 Peter, because later in the letter the sender does not strictly adhere to the dictionary meanings of γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις and uses these terms interchangeably.[82]

The definition given above of ἐπίγνωσις as a personal commitment to learning the nature of God and Jesus, which leads to conversion, is in fact very similar to Peter's understanding of faith.[83] Not surprisingly, later in the letter, these concepts also become synonymous, especially since both generate similar attitudes and behaviours, and both therefore have practical implications (see 2 Pet 1:3–8).

This practical feature results from the rooting of the phrase "knowledge of God" and its interpretation in the Old Testament.[84] The process of coming to know, of acquiring knowledge of God involves God's revelation in action, which is why theophanic actions are often summed up by the formula: "And you shall know that I am the Lord/God".[85] The knowledge of God and the process of coming to know God is thus disclosed in various forms of theophanies. It is not speculative knowledge concerning, for example, the existence of God, but an experience and reflection on God's action (cf. Mi 6:5). In the intertestamental period, the possibility of knowing God was also extended to include the revelation of God in creation (Wis 13:1–9, ApBarSyr 54:17–18: "But now, as for you, you wicked that now are, turn you to destruction, […] in that formerly you rejected the understanding of the Most High. For His works have not taught you, Nor has the skill of His creation which is at all times persuaded you"; cf. Rom 1:20). Whether the knowledge of God is infused in a direct act of theophany (His action) or through a theophany in creation, it requires entering into a personal relationship with God.[86] This means that the

81 Ibid. This distinction is also often developed as a polemic between true knowledge, postulated by the sender, and false knowledge, γνῶσις, represented by false teachers and deceitful prophets; cf. K.H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe*, p. 185; J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 298–299. However, in 2 Pet γνῶσις is not used in a pejorative sense, as, for example, in 1 Tim 6:20.

82 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 169.

83 This is pointed out by M. Luther in his commentary when he writes that "the true knowledge, whereby you hold and know that God is thy God and Christ is thy Christ, which the devil and the false christians could not believe. So that this knowledge is nothing else but a true christian faith; for if you thus know God and Christ, you will then confide in them with your whole heart, and trust them in good and ill, in life and death", *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*.

84 Cf. R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 170, who argues that Peter's emphasis on the practical aspects of faith and knowledge is part of a polemic against false teachers who either neglected this aspect or even preached antinomianism and libertinism (cf.: 2 Pet 2,20–21).

85 Cf. Ezek 6:7.13.14, 7:4, 11:10.11, 12:14.16, 25:5.7.11.17, 28:26, 37:6; cf. Exod 6:7, 7:5.17, 14:4.18, 6:6.12, 29:46, 1 Kings 20:13.28, 2 Kings 5:15, Isa 45:3.6–8, 49:23.26, Sir 36:4–6.

86 D.E. Schmitz, *Knowledge*, [in:] *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, p. 396.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

knowledge of God largely overlaps with the Petrine understanding of faith, which the essential elements are also revelation, its transmission and the relationship with God. The outcome of knowing God in OT is obedience to His will as expressed in the commandments, and thus the practical aspect highlighted above, which also connects faith and knowledge.

As in 1c, the knowledge in 2b is complemented with the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. A certain parallelism between the two formulas has already been mentioned above. If the sender used an exact parallelism here, on the basis of it one can also try to establish whether the formulas

τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
    καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
τοῦ θεοῦ
    καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν

are matching. If in 1c they refer to one person – Jesus – it would seem natural if in 2b they refer to one person as well. Similarly, if a binitarian formula is used in 1c, it should be repeated in 2b.

However, in contrast to verse 1c it seems that here the person of God and Jesus as Lord have been separated, as evidenced by the use of the two articles τοῦ θεοῦ and Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου (although P^{72} seems to merge these phrases, omitting the conjunction καί, but leaving the double article: τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν). Θεός refers to God the Father (cf. 1 Pet 1:2), κύριος to Jesus.[87] This would mean that in the parallelism presented above only general references to divine persons are involved: one person in the first element, two persons in the second element. The early Christian binitarian formula,[88] modified by the untypical mention of knowledge, is thus used. But in this untypical addition, Peter's integrative strategy is manifest: the Old Testament knowledge of God is extended to the Christian knowledge of Jesus. The use of the name Ἰησοῦς alone is unique here; for in other passages of the letter, Peter often mentions "the knowledge of Jesus Christ" with the addition of "Our Lord" and/or "Saviour" (2 Pet 1:8, 2:20, cf. 3:18, where the noun γνῶσις occurs).

In contrast to the idea of knowledge of God in OT, the idea of knowledge of Jesus (Christ) is not common in NT writings. The apostle Paul preached the knowledge of

87 P and Ψ 1175. 1852 omit the phrase τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ and leave only τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, in other testimonies the title Christ is prepositive to the name Jesus – Christ Jesus, or appositive – Jesus Christ; Minuscule 442 harmonises this phrase with 1:1c: τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

88 Cf. Rom 1:7, 1 Cor 1:3, 2 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:3, Eph 1:2, Phil 1:2, 2 Thess 1:2, Titus 1:4; prescript of *1 Clem.*; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 166.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Jesus – 2 Cor 5:16, Eph 4:13, Phil 3:8.10 – and treats it very existentially. Existential elements can also be found in the Johannine tradition. John, too, like Peter, links the existential knowledge of Jesus closely with the knowledge of the Father (John 10:14, 14:7, 17:3) and with the practical aspect of knowledge – the observance of the commandments (1 John 2:3). It seems that over time the existential and soteriological aspects of coming to know Jesus began to dominate over the practical aspects. This can be seen in The Epistle of the Apostles 6, where the response to knowing and understanding Jesus is his mercy and salvation, and the requirement to do God's will is the implication: "Be ye steadfast and waver not in the knowledge and confidence of our Lord Jesus Christ, and he will have mercy on you and save you everlastingly, world without end" and in *The Shepherd* of Hermas (Similitude IX 16), where the righteous dead are revived (saved) through apostolic preaching, leading to the knowledge of the name of Jesus: "By these, then, were they quickened and made to know the name of the Son of God".

Jesus is called κύριος "the Lord" in 2 Pet 1:2b. Like "the Saviour", this title in OT was given to God, and in the Greco-Roman world it was used to refer to a divinity or emperor.[89] However, this is not to be seen as some kind of a polemic with the Hellenistic cults. Rather, it is a matter of transferring titles and powers in Jewish tradition associated with God to the person of Jesus Christ[90] and, as with the title "the Saviour", of theologising the term κύριος. The Old Testament title "the Lord", transferred to Jesus, became an element of the Christian kerygma quite early (cf. Acts 2:36 and Rom 10:9–10). It is most likely that the author of 2 Peter uses the established formula and even the phraseme "our Lord Jesus Christ",[91] although the incomplete form of the formula is surprising – the title Χριστός is lacking, though present in the codices, e. g. א, A L.[92]

The genitive case τοῦ θεοῦ and Ιησοῦ can be interpreted as gen. obiectivus (the knowledge of God and Jesus), as gen. subiectivus (the knowledge offered by God and Jesus) and as gen. causae (the knowledge brought about by God and Jesus). It seems impossible to isolate the dominant element here – all three meanings overlap, and thus ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου should be understood as a personal process taking place at the initiative of God and Jesus (gen. causae and gen. subiectivus), leading to the knowledge of who God and Jesus are (gen. obiectivus) and resulting in a conversion, a change of mindset that has visible consequences – living a life according to high ethical standards, which is tantamount to keeping the commandments that express God's will.

89 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 555.

90 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 108–109.

91 Cf. e. g. Acts 11:17, 15:26, 28:31, Rom 1:4.7, 5:1.11.21, 1 Thess 1:3.5.9, 1 Pet 1:3, 2 Pet 1:8.

92 Miniscule 1881 also adds the title σωτήρ: σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, harmonising 2b with 1c.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

If one now combines verse 2a and verse 2b, Theological message is more clear: the abundance of grace and peace, which is here a synecdoche of the end times and points to the reality of the kingdom of God, takes place at the initiative of God and through God, who causes man, by engaging in a profound knowledge of Him, to convert and live irreproachably. Knowledge/full knowledge, as well as faith synonymous with it, are thus essential themes of the Second Letter of Peter. The idea of knowledge is exposed in *exordium* (2 Pet 1:3–15), explained in the *probatio* (2 Pet 1:16–3:17) and repeated – this time using the noun γνῶσις – In the *peroratio* (2 Pet 3:17–18).

As one might have noticed, 2 Pet 1:1–2 exposes "faith" and "knowledge" as essential exordial themes. The meanings of these concepts overlap and intermingle to such an extent that it becomes virtually impossible to separate them. Both contain an intellectual, existential and practical component, both presuppose personal commitment and conversion.

2.2 B'. Knowledge (2 Pet 1:3–4)

> [3]As/since all that His divine power has given [and is giving] to us for godliness/a godly/pious life through the knowledge of Him who has called us with His own glory and fame/virtue/perfection, [4]through which he has bestowed [and is bestowing] upon us precious and great promises, so that through them you might become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption in the world [caused by] lust.

Verses 3–4 clarify Peter's understanding of knowledge, bring out the existential and practical aspects of knowledge and give an even stronger eschatological focus to his considerations. As already mentioned, the prescript (1:1–2) announces two themes of particular interest to the sender of the letter – faith and knowledge. The narrator first invokes knowledge, then faith, creating thus the form of chiasm:

A. Faith (1:1c)
    B. Knowledge (1:2b)
    B'. Knowledge (1:3–4)
A'. Faith (1:5–8).

If one follows the composition defined by the rules set out in classical rhetoric, then verses 3–4 should be classified as *exordium* (verses 3–15), in which the main theses of the letter are explicated and in which the sender seeks the favour of the recipients. In this *exordium*, the researchers identified two main elements: Peter's farewell teaching (3–11) and the statement of purpose for the letter

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

(14–15).[93] As can easily be seen, verses 12–13 containing (auto)biographical references cannot be assigned to either of these elements. They may represent a kind of transition between the sermon and the purpose of the letter to attract the attention of the audience. To this end, the reminder formula (1:12) and the personal theme (1:13) are a perfect solution. Such a classical rhetorical pattern also usually presupposes the separation of the prescript from the rest of the letter,[94] which is reflected in most translations.[95] Meanwhile, the chiastic structure suggested above makes it possible to see that verses 2 and 3–4 are closely related, both syntactically and semantically.

Verse 3 begins with ὡς, which is most often translated comparatively – 'as', 'as if'.[96] However, it is not possible to clearly indicate whether verses 3–4 are linked to verse 2, or whether the participle begins a thought that ends in verses 5–7. The connection with verses 5–7 is supported primarily by the logic of the text; ὡς loses then its comparative aspect and the causal meaning comes to the fore: "As/since all that His divine power has given" (verse 3), then an effort should be made to put into practice the chain of virtues mentioned in verses 5–7. It should be, however, noted that this formula is far from being stylistically coherent and should be treated as an anacoluthon.

The connection with verse 2 can be established by comparing the stylistics, themes and tradition of early Christian epistolography, in which the prescript is often syntactically integrated into the body of the letter (for example, in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch to the churches in Ephesus, Rome, Philadelphia and Smyrna).[97] Thus, if we leave the comparative meaning of ὡς and link verse 3 with verse 2, we obtain the phrase: "May grace and peace be multiplied for you through/in the knowledge of God and Jesus, our Lord, as all that His divine power has given to us for life and godliness" (verses 3–4). In this context, the wish and hope for a multiplication of grace and peace in the end times is based on the knowledge of God and Jesus, and on the analogy with the abundant gifts of God's power that lead to godly life, and with the promises that make it possible to "become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption in the world". The emphasis

93 See Introduction.

94 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 173; some commentators also pay no attention to this participle; it is omitted in the commentary by G.L. Green (*Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 566) and F. Mickiewicz (*List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 216).

95 "His divine power has bestowed on us everything" (USCCB); "as His divine power has given to us all things" (NKJV); "His divine power has given us everything we need" (NIV); "His divine power has granted to us all things" (ESV).

96 Cf. F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 216, 225, who, quoting F.W. Danker and the genre affinity of 2 Pet 1:3–4 with Hellenistic decrees, translates ὡς as a conjunct 'because'.

97 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 173; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 388.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

falls on the multiplication by God/Jesus of His gifts to man. This confirms the suggestion, already expressed when analysing the prescript, that the emphasis in the prayerful wish was put on the verb πληθυνθείη.

The link between verses 2 and 3 also allows us to interpret the pronoun ἡμεῖς in the same way in both verses. In verse 2, the formula "God and Jesus our Lord" indicated a general Christian faith shared by the recipients of the letter and the group represented by Peter.[98] There is no reason to change the scope of this pronoun in verse 3 and limit it, as in verse 1, only to the group represented by Peter. Such a restriction of the meaning of the pronoun would imply that the gifts of God's power and promises were given to the apostles (perhaps even only to the Twelve, or only to the witnesses of the transfiguration), to be passed on. Although there is no denying that such an exclusion may be suggested by the further part of verse 3: κάλεσας ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ "who called us with His own glory and fame/virtue/perfection".[99] An inclusive understanding of the pronoun is also offered in verse 1. Since the faith of the apostles and the faith of the recipients of the letter are equally respectable and result in the same dignity, both the apostles and the recipients of the letter are equally worthy to receive the same gifts and promises. This does not, of course, exclude a different way and different means of the transmission of the gifts and promises, nevertheless their essence is the same.

It is also possible to consider verses 2 and 3 as a comparison from a rhetorical perspective. The comparative element (*comparandum*) is verse 2, the comparing elements (*comparans*) are verses 3 and 4. It is up to the competence of the recipients to reconstruct the *tertium comparationis*, but the sender of the epistle offers some tips – the quantity and quality of God's gifts/promises, which can and should be used now, but which will be fulfilled in eschatological reality.

Comparans, which is also the justification for the hope and wish expressed in verse 2, begins with the pronoun πάντα.[100] The comparative element indicates the timelessness, perfection and completeness of God's gifts, which are sufficient and necessary "for a godly/pious life". The hagiographer used the genitive absolute construction, in which the subject is expressed by the complement phrase τῆς θείας δυνάμεως, and the predicate by the part. perf. medii also in the genitive case – δεδωρημένης. Literally, it can be translated as follows: "God's power bestowed on us in the past and continues to bestow on all towards/for a godly life". In the subject, one can clearly see the integrative strategy of the sender – a combination of Judaic and Hellenistic elements. The latter, for lexical reasons, includes the phrase θεία δύναμις "divine power".

98 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 176; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 391.

99 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3.

100 Some testimonies – A Ψ 5. 33. 81. 1611. 1735. 2344 – add the article τα in this place.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Θεία δύναμις could replace the noun God,[101] since such a periphrastic practice was common in post-exilic Judaism. Here, however, it is rather a matter of using – perhaps even somewhat provocatively – strictly Hellenistic phraseology, even with pagan connotations and contexts, with the content that could also be acceptable among Judeo-Christians. For the idea of God's power is well known to both Old Testament and New Testament traditions. It is usually expressed by the phrase δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ, but, unexpectedly, the adjective θεία appears instead of the noun in the primary position. In LXX (except for 4 Macc), the adjective θεῖος occurs only ten times,[102] three times in the New Testament: in Acts 17:29 and in 2 Pet 1:3.4. In Acts 17:29, Paul's speech at the Areopagus is reconstructed; Luke's reconstruction takes into account the Hellenistic background of the speech, especially the necessity to meet the expectations and habits of the Apostle Paul's Greek listeners. The same ideas probably guided the author of 2 Peter, who uses terminology characteristic of Greek philosophy as employed by Greek-speaking Jewish writers, for instance, the author of 4 Macc (this book contains the greatest number of occurrences of θεῖος – 25 times). It should also be noted that they not only use the adjective, but the whole phrase "divine power" in different contexts.

The phrase θεία δύναμις "divine power" can be found, for example, in the decree from Stratonikeia: "The statues of the aforementioned Gods, which supply the most illustrious displays of divine power, are set up in the most hallowed council chamber".[103] In *The Letter of Aristeas* 157, "divine power" is in fact synonymous with providence: "Wherefore he exhorts us to remember that the aforesaid parts are kept together by the divine power with consummate skill". Similarly, in Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* XIX 1:10: "While Claudius was preserved from the madness of Caius by a certain Divine providence [θεία δύναμις]". Among the Jewish Hellenistic writers, Philo of Alexandria used the phrase relatively frequently. In *De Abrahamo* IV 26, he gives it an ethical meaning: "But we must not be ignorant that repentance occupies the second place only, next after perfection, just as the change from sickness to convalescence is inferior to perfect uninterrupted health. Therefore, that which is continuous and perfect in virtues is very near divine power [ἐγγυς θεῖος ἵστημι δύναμις] […]". The phrase can also be found in Philo's anthropological and theological reflections, largely based on the philosophy of Plato, who believed that man could experience a blending of human nature with "divine power" (*Laws* 691e). In the treatise *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* XXIII 83 (*That the Worse is Wont to Attack the Better*), in describing the differences between humans and animals, Philo points to the reason as the main distinguishing element; he calls this

101 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 566.

102 Exod 31:3, 35:31, Job 27:3, 33:4, Prov 2:17, Sir 6:35, 2 Macc 3:29, 4:17, 7:11, 9:11.

103 After G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 566.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

θεία δύναμις and defines it by a reference to the Genesis creation narrative as: "a certain representation and character of the divine faculty which Moses calls by its proper name an image, showing by his language that God is the archetypal pattern of rational nature, and that man is the imitation of him, and the image formed after his model". A similar thought appears in *De spec. leg.* II II, but in relation to the bringing into existence of a new human being: "And, indeed, a man's parents are the copies and imitations of divine power μίμημα θεῖος δύναμις, since they have brought people who had no existence into existence". Dio Chrysostomos, on the other hand, in *Orationes* 31:95, considers "divine power" to be some kind of perfection, including physical perfection, which makes some people seen as special: "because men such as these also share in a sort of divine power […]".

Because of its association with philosophy and, above all, with polytheistic pagan religions, the adjective θεῖος was reluctantly used by early Christian writers, especially in the time before Justin Martyr (in Justin himself it appears only once in *The First Apology* 32, when referring to "the holy and divine Spirit of prophecy [who] through Moses" foretold the appearance of Christ).[104] Occasionally it is found in the writings of Clement of Rome: *1 Clem.* 40:1 speaks of "divine knowledge" τῆς θείας γνώσεως; *2 Clem.* 20:4 of "divine judgement" contrasted with self-interest. Instead, it appears repeatedly in *The Shepherd* of Hermas (e. g. Vision III 8:7: "The deeds, then, of these are pure, and chaste, and divine" τὰ ἔργα ἁγνα καὶ σεμνὰ καὶ θεῖά ἐστιν; Commandment XI 2: "the false prophet, not having the power of a Divine Spirit in him" πνεύματος θείου…; XI 5: "such a spirit having the power of Divinity speaks all things of itself, for it proceeds from above from the power of the Divine Spirit" ἀπὸ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θείου πνεύματος; XI 7: "Try the man who has the Divine Spirit by his life" τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θεῖον; cf. also other traits of the spirit XI 8.9.12.21). It is also used by Ignatius of Antioch in *The Epistle to the Magnesian* 8:2: "For the divinest prophets [θειότατοι προφῆται] lived according to Jesus Christ. On this account also they were persecuted". Clement of Alexandria in *The Stromata* I 98 mentions being moved by "philosophy divine", and in VII 37 he speaks of "the divine power" that like light "see through the whole soul". As can be seen, in Christian documents the adjective "divine" is treated as the equivalent of the attributive noun θεός in the genitive, which – to distinguish it from the adjective "divine" – is usually capitalised as "Divine".

Most likely, the same meaning is also given to the adjective θεῖος in 2 Pet 1:3. Θεία δύναμις is in fact δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ. This equivalence makes it easier to find the referent to the pronoun αὐτοῦ. At first glance, the phrase θεία δύναμις αὐτοῦ "His divine power" may seem awkward. However, the possessive pronoun can be taken as an indication that, despite the use of terminology found in Hellenistic

104 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 393.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

philosophy, the author of 2 Peter barely shared its anthropological theses. The quotations – especially those from Philo – showed that divine power could be treated as something immanent, belonging to man; however, for the sender of 2 Peter, divine power is definitely external, transcendent. The author of the letter is thus closer to Flavius and the early Christian writers. Therefore, in order to clearly emphasise this transcendence, he adds the pronoun αὐτοῦ to the phrase θεία δύναμις, which indicates that the divine power belongs to someone other than us (ἡμεῖς).

Usually, two possibilities are mentioned with regard to the pronoun αὐτοῦ in verse 2. First, the pronoun is considered to refer to God; second, to Jesus. In support of the first option, examples from Scripture are usually given which attribute "power" precisely to God.[105] The hypothesis has two stylistic weaknesses: the closest noun to which the pronoun can refer is Jesus and the phrase θεία δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ "divine power of God" is a tautology. There are more arguments that the pronoun αὐτοῦ refers to Jesus.[106] Besides stylistic considerations, there are scriptural and Christological considerations. Numerous texts in NT attribute (divine) power to Jesus;[107] even 2 Pet 1:16 mentions the knowledge of "the power of our Lord Jesus Christ". Furthermore, the attribution of divine power understood as the power of God to Jesus is a simple consequence of the recognition of Jesus as God in verse 1c; from this verse one can also infer what specific power of God is meant. Since Jesus has been called "God and Saviour", it is most likely that his divine power is related to soteriological issues. This suggestion seems to be supported first of all by the phrase πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν "us for godliness/a godly/pious life" (towards life and godliness), which specifies the gifts of Jesus' divine power in 1:3, and eschatologically-oriented promises in verse 1:4.

Thus it is the divine power of Jesus, and not any human, inner power, even if it is a reflection, an image, a likeness of the power of God, that is the source of all that is needed for a godly life.[108] In the phrase πάντα… τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν,

105 Matt 22:29, 26:64, Mark 12:24, 14:62, Luke 1:35, 5:17, 22:69, 24:49, Rom 1:16.20, 9:17, 1 Cor 1:18.24, 6:14, 2 Cor 4:7, 13:4, Eph 3:7, 2 Tim 1:8, Rev 4:11, 7:12, 15:8, 19:1, cf. e. g. J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 300.

106 Thus W. Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, Berlin 1974, p. 69; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 177; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 393; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 567.

107 Matt 24:30, Mark 5:20, 13:26, Luke 6:19, 8:46, 9:1, 10:19, 21:27, 2 Cor 12:9, Eph 3:20, Phil 3:10, 2 Thess 1:7, Heb 1:3, Rev 5:12.

108 A different approach to this issue is taken by M. Luther. For the reformer, the divine power is a tool given by God for a man to live a godly life. In short, Luther identifies the divine power with everything that has been given: "It is such power as serves us toward life and godliness; that is, when we believe, then we attain this much, that God gives us the fullness of His power, which is so with and in us, that what we speak and work, it is not we that do it, but God Himself does it. […]

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

F.W. Danker,[109] followed by G.L. Green[110] identified parallels with the language of Hellenistic decrees containing honourable promises to make some kind of donation. As an example, the promise of Pharnaces I, king of Pontus (the second century BC), who pledged to the Athenians to give everything necessary to preserve the glory and memory[111] is cited. In 2 Peter, "all that His divine power has given [and is giving] to us for godliness/a godly/pious life" denotes everything necessary to lead such a life.

In defining the purpose of the "giving", the formula τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν draws attention. Such a construction of purpose also appears in Luke 19:42, Acts 28:10 and in the writings of Flavius, e. g. in *Ant.* I 1:6 (τὰ πρὸς εὐσεβειαν); it is usually translated as 'of necessity', 'necessary', 'needed'. In 2 Peter each of the nouns can be treated separately, and a rhetorical device called hendiadys can be seen here. If the terms ζωή and εὐσέβεια are considered separately, their semantic fields expand significantly. This is especially true of the term ζωή, which can be understood literally – in terms of earthly life – and metaphorically – in terms of eschatology. In NT, mainly in the Johannine tradition, ζωή often means eternal life.[112] If the sender of 2 Peter used the term in this sense, then the phrase τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν should be understood: "[he gave and gives all] that is necessary for eternal life".

Far more often, however, ζωή refers to earthly life as the opposite of death. It seems that this is precisely the most natural sense in which the author of 2 Peter uses the noun. The phrase should therefore be understood as τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν in Judg 17:10 in Theodotian recension – "[all] that is necessary for life". This is the solution advocated by G.L. Green, among others. Peter would argue that it is God who shapes and preserves human life at every stage. In antiquity the infant and child mortality rates were high, people rarely lived to be forty, so life was of great value and could be regarded as a gift of divine power.[113] This translation, however,

---

But this power of God which is in us, St. Peter would not have so explained, as that we might make heaven and earth, and should work such miracles as God does; for how would we be advantaged by it? But we have the power of God within us so far as it is useful and necessary to us. […] we have such power of God that by it we are eminently favored with grace to do good and to live forever. […] Such power of God, and such rich grace, come from no other source but from this knowledge of God". *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther* I (V.3).

109 F.W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*, St. Louis 1982, p. 456.

110 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 568.

111 F.W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study*, p. 456.

112 John 3:36, 5:24.26.40, 6:33.63.68, 10:10, 11:25, 20:31, cf. Acts 5:20, Rom 6:4, Eph 4:18, Phil 2:16, 2 Tim 1:1.

113 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 569.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

lacks more precise definition of 'life'. Although it is possible to understand it as 'the means needed to sustain life,'[114] yet it is unlikely in the context of the soteriological understanding of the phrase "divine power" and the eschatological context of verse 3 combined with verse 2 and 4.

It becomes natural, then, to link "life" with the second term – εὐσέβεια 'piety'. Contrary to appearances, the lexeme εὐσέβεια is not as common in either LXX or NT as one might expect. In LXX (apart from 4 Macc), it only occurs 11 times,[115] while in 4 Macc as many as 47 times; in NT, apart from 2 Pet 1:3.6–7, 2:9, 3:11, it is found in Acts 3:12 and 10:2.7 and in the pastoral letters (1 Tim 2:2, 3:16, 4:7–8, 6:3.5–6.11, Titus 1:1, 3:5). It appears much more frequently in Hellenistic literature. It is used by Philo of Alexandria and Josephus Flavius. Early Christian writers do not avoid it either. *1 Clem.* 11:1 evokes Lot's hospitality and godliness; *1 Clem.* 2:3 calls for prayer with pious confidence; additionally, in *1 Clem.* 50:3 the adjective εὐσεβεῖς appears. In *2 Clem*. 19:1 serving with zeal the cause of piety and the goodness of our God is indicated as a goal for young people; *2 Clem.* 19:4 contains the consolation of a pious man who faces many tribulations today, and *2 Clem.* 20:4 explains why the righteous one has to wait a long time for the fruit of his deeds and for his reward: "For if God tendered the reward of the righteous in a trice, straightway were it commerce that we practised, and not godliness".

The meaning of εὐσέβεια is quite broad, especially since the concept did not belong exclusively to religious language, especially in the Roman empire. It meant reverence, respectful loyalty to the gods, but also to parents, ancestors, other relatives, as well as fellow citizens and social institutions, as Cicero describes in *De Inventione* II 22.66: "Piety [Latin: *pietas*], which warns us to fulfil our duties towards our country, our parents, or others connected with us by ties of blood". Piety was thus a kind of social duty, and fulfilling it was regarded as one of the most desirable virtues.[116] This is how Peter's "piety" is viewed by G.L. Green, who emphasises that εὐσέβεια is first and foremost a duty – a duty to God and to men. That is, the divine power gave the recipients everything necessary to fulfil their duty to God and to men. In defining what this duty is, G.L. Green uses the common stem of the concepts εὐσέβεια and ἀσέβεια ('ungodliness/godlessness') and argues that it denotes a resistance to ungodly practices promoted by false teachers and prophets (2 Pet 2:2–3.7–20).[117] Thus, by using two terms – ζωή and εὐσέβεια – the narrator of 2 Peter is believed to have referred to two fundamental values for the Roman world: "life" in its most basic sense and "duty" to God and to people, to existence

114 The same opinion is held by G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 570.

115 1 Ezra 1:21, 2 Macc 3:1, 12:45, 3 Macc 2:31.32, Sir 49:3, Prov 1:7, 13:11, Wis 10:12, Isa 11:2, 33:6.

116 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 571.

117 Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

in general and to social existence. For both, "the divine power" provides all the necessary means.[118]

There is no denying that the sender of 2 Peter, as we have already seen, adopts a language that connotes the social order. This was evident in the use of such concepts as "grace" or "justice". It seems that "piety" can also be included in this group. Noticeably, the sender seeks – in accordance with his strategy and idea – to "judaise" them and thus give them a more explicit and differently oriented religious aspect. Peter's εὐσέβεια thus refers to Old Testament "righteousness" and "wisdom" that signify the fulfilment of God's will in the commandments (cf. the context in LXX and 2 Pet 2:5.7.21); it has the same practical dimension as "faith" and "knowledge", though the eschatological aspect is also discernible (cf. especially *2 Clem.* 19:4 and 20:4 with the motif of temporal persecution and the expectation of future righteousness as the crowning glory of a pious life), particularly in verse 2.

As already mentioned, the terms ζωή and εὐσέβεια can also be considered together as a figure of speech called hendiadys (one phenomenon or concept that is described by two terms connected by the conjunction καί – ἓν διὰ δυοῖν, literally "one by two").[119] This would mean that the author of 2 Peter does not mean "life and godliness", but "pious godly living", "a life in piety", "living a godly life".[120] Assuming that the notion of εὐσέβεια has been "judaised" and its meaning is closer to the Old Testament צדקה, the translation "a pious life", especially "a life of piety", better conveys the eschatological orientation of verse 3a. The "pious life" implies both a present element – pious/righteous conduct – and a future element – the expectation of righteousness after a pious/righteous life.[121] As already noted, this latter aspect of the pious life is shared by 2 Peter and to *2 Clem.* This rooting of the pious life in the present and the future (and additionally also in the past) is also confirmed by the rare verb δωρέομαι, which occurs only 8 times in LXX, only 3 in NT (including twice in 2 Peter here and in 1:4, and in Mark 15:45), and rarely in early Christian literature e. g. in *Diogn.* 11:5. It means 'to give', 'to bestow', 'to give as a gift', also 'to give freely'. The official context in which this verb most often appears is very characteristic. In Mark 15:45 it denotes the lawful transfer of Jesus' body to Joseph of Arimathea, in Esther 8:1 and 1 Ezek 1:7, 8:55 – a royal gift, in Gen 30:20 – a divine gift.[122] In *Diogn.* 11:5 the context resembles that of Peter in 1:3b. For the donor is the personified grace, which is "widely spread, increases in the saints, furnishing understanding, revealing mysteries, announcing times, rejoicing over

118 Ibid., p. 570.

119 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 391.

120 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 178; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 391; a different opinion is held by G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 571.

121 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 391.

122 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 178.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the faithful, giving to those that seek, by whom the limits of faith are not broken through, nor the boundaries set by the fathers passed over". This meaning of the verb δωρέομαι corresponds well with the verb πληθύνω of verse 2, with which verse 3 forms a simile. It can now be presented with a juxtaposition of *comparans* and *comparandum*: "Since all that His divine power has given to us for a godly life [and the expectation of eschatological righteousness after a godly life], [so] may grace and peace be multiplied to you [in the end times when this righteousness will be revealed]".

An additional element that connects and adds symmetry to both elements of the comparison is the mention of knowledge:

comparans (verse 3):
Since all that His divine power has given to us for godliness/a godly/pious life
through the knowledge of Him who called us,
comparandum (verse 2):
[so] may grace and peace be multiplied to you
through the knowledge of God and Jesus our Lord.

In both verses, "knowledge" is expressed by the same term – ἐπίγνωσις. There is no reason to look for meanings in verse 3 other than those presented when analysing verse 2b. Now the source of knowledge – the divine power of Jesus – is clarified, which means that knowledge, with all its aspects, is not the fruit of human speculation, inquiry and striving, but is initiated by "Him who called us". As in verse 2b, it is impossible to determine clearly whether the genitive τοῦ καλέσαντος is gen. obiectivus, subiectivus, or gen. causae. It seems that all these meanings overlap, since gen. obiectivus and gen. causae emphasise the external initiative for knowledge, while gen. obiectivus points to the caller as the object of knowledge.

There is some difficulty in specifying "Him who called us" and to whom the pronoun ἡμεῖς refers. Both in OT and in NT, the one who calls is primarily God (the Father).[123] Thus, if the one who calls in 2 Pet 1:3 is God (the Father), we could infer that the divine power of Jesus endowed us with everything necessary for a godly life through the knowledge of God. Although J.N.D. Kelly considers it unnatural,[124] it seems logical. One may also assume that the pronoun ἡμεῖς should be treated as inclusively as in the previous part of this verse, where it covered the recipients of the letter and the group represented by Peter.

123 E. g. Ex. 19:5, Lev 11:44, 19:2, Isa 41:1, 42:6, 48:12.15, 51:2, Rom 8:30, 9:11–12.24, Gal 1:6.15, 5:8, 1 Thess 2:12, 4:7, 5:25, 2 Thess 2:14, 2 Tim 1:9, 1 Pet 1:15, 5:10; J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 300; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 394.

124 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 300.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

However, it would be just as logical and grammatically correct to see Jesus in "Him who calls", just as the pronoun αὐτοῦ in verse 3a was previously found to refer to Jesus; especially since in 2 Peter knowledge almost always refers to Jesus (1:8, 2:20, also 3:18). Moreover, in NT, Jesus is also sometimes the subject of the calling, especially when he calls His disciples – Matt 4:21, Mark 1:20. If the participle καλέσας were indeed indicative of such an activity of Jesus, and this may be evidenced by the use of a past tense (aorist), then the meaning of the pronoun ἡμεῖς would have to be reduced to indicate only the apostles called by Jesus. In this way, the sender from 2 Peter would return to the exclusive meaning of the pronoun in verse 1b where "our faith" is specified. 2 Pet 1:16–17 with its (auto)biographical themes and mention of Jesus' transfiguration is usually given as an argument supporting this thesis. J.N.D. Kelly even gives a possible paraphrase of verse 3 with reference to verses 16–17: "God has bestowed all these blessings on us Christians, mediating them to us through our knowledge of the Christ who called us, His apostles, by that divine glory and transcendent virtue which we were privileged to observe in Him".[125] It should be remembered, however, that in NT Jesus calls not only apostles/disciples. He also calls sinners – Matt 9:13, Mark 2:17, Luke 5:32, according to his own declarations. This makes it clear that even when recognising that καλέσας refers to Jesus, the pronoun ἡμεῖς need not be narrowed down to the apostolic circle; ἡμεῖς is inclusive as in the first part of verse 3. This is also confirmed by 2 Pet 1:10, where vocation and election clearly refer to the recipients of the letter.

This inclusive use of the pronoun ἡμεῖς is characteristic of early Christian literature.[126] Jesus' words are directly quoted in *2 Clem.* 2:4. In other passages of *2 Clem.* "we" denotes all Christians, those who are called, that is snatched from sin by Jesus (1:8: "For He called us when we were not, and willed that out of nothing we should attain a real existence"; 2:5: "Christ […] saved many by coming and calling us when hastening to destruction"; 5:1: "Wherefore, brethren, leaving [willingly] our sojourn in this present world, let us do the will of Him that called us, and not fear to depart out of this world"; 9:5: "As Christ the Lord who saved us, […] and thus called us"). If, therefore, καλέσας refers to Jesus, while ἡμεῖς is extended to all Christians, then, on the basis of the analogy with *2 Clem.*, the verb καλέω can also be taken not only literally but also metaphorically as equivalent to the salvific acts of Jesus.

The alternative "God" or "Jesus" is not the only possibility for interpreting the participle καλέσας. The integrative strategy of the author of 2 Peter, as noted earlier, and the symmetry between the components of the comparison realised by verses 2 and 3 offer another interpretation. In verse 2, the knowledge concerned God and

125 Ibid.

126 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 178.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Jesus, and the one "who called". Moreover, the ambiguity here seems intentional, for it allows for both the connotations: the Old Testament stories of being called by God and the Christian stories of being called by Jesus Christ, which need not even be limited to the activity of the earthly Jesus, but also includes the acts of the risen and exalted Christ. Thus the meaning of the verb καλέω is expanded, which is understood literally in connection with OT and the calling of the apostles, but takes on a soteriological character in connection with the calling of all believers from a state of sin and death to life. This overlapping of the meanings and acts of God and Jesus corresponds to verse 1b, where Jesus is called God and Saviour.

The inclusivism and integrative understanding of the phrase καλέσας ἡμᾶς seems to be confirmed by the addition in verse 3 – ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ literally, "his own glory and fame/virtue/perfection". The phrase δόξα καὶ ἀρετή was most likely created by analogy or even taken from Hellenistic literature, where it regularly appears in various configurations and meanings.[127] Pausanias, in his *Description of Greece* (VIII 52), mentions a statue of Philopœmen at Tegea with an incription beginning with words of praise: "Spread all over Greece is the fame and glory of the Arcadian warrior Philopœmen".[128] In this inscription, the phrase ἀρετὴ καὶ δόξα is used as a hendiadys. Diodorus Siculus in *Bibliotheca Historica* (II 45:2) extols the famous valour of a certain Amazon woman (περὶ αὐτὴν ἀρετῆς τε καὶ δόξης).[129] Perhaps the whole formula ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ is a reference to the solemn language of the decrees, in which one's own perfect glory, that is reputation and honour, is a guarantor of the quality of the gifts or privileges promised by the donor.[130] The author of 2 Peter appears to have used an inversion to a phrase familiar from Greek literature (ἀρετὴ καὶ δόξα vs δόξα καὶ ἀρετή). Perhaps this is in order to avoid connotations with philosophy and to give the noun ἀρετή a slightly different interpretation than the first virtue in the ethical sense,[131] especially as the term is used to God and/or Jesus.

In addition to 'virtue', ἀρετή can also mean 'excellence', 'fame', 'praise' (cf. Phil 4:8, where τίς ἀρετή is rendered as "anything worthy of praise"). It can also mean deeds, originally mainly military, worthy of praise or fame.[132] In relation to God, the noun

127 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 573.

128 Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/68680/68680-h/68680-h.htm accessed: 31.03.2020].

129 Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*, Books I–V, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text;jsessionid=6F14D58741D49333AFFE17D1CF8B7B62?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0540%3Abook%3D2%3Achapter%3D45%3Asection%3D2 [accessed: 23.07.2023].

130 W.F. Danker, *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Chicago 2009, p. 457–458.

131 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 301 argues that the author of 2 Peter in 1:3b uses the noun ἀρετή in an ethical sense; otherwise R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 178, who finds it unlikely that ἀρετή should mean 'moral virtue'.

132 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 574.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

ἀρετή appears in Jewish Greek-language literature and even in LXX. Josephus in *Ant.* XVII 5:6 speaks of the misuse of God's fame (τῇ ἀρετῇ τοῦ θείου), or God's name. Philo in *De spec. leg.* I XXXVIII:209 – mentions God's perfections, using the plural forms. Similarly in LXX, where ἀρεταί in the plural can also be translated as excellences (so e. g. in Is. 42:8.12) or as deeds worthy of fame, praise (so e. g. in Is. 63:7). It seems that the author of 1 Pet 1:9 uses the term in the latter sense, adding to it the element of power – the mighty, praiseworthy works of God.

In 2 Pet 1:3b, however, the noun ἀρετή occurs in the singular. It forms a compound with the noun δόξα, which most likely is the equivalent of the Hebrew term כבוד. It primarily indicates God's presence, transcendence, sublimity, holiness, fear-inducing acts and reverence. It also implies that God is to be glorified, i. e. adored and worshipped[133] (cf. 2 Pet 3:18). In intertestamental literature, the term "Glory" may have been used periphrastically and meant God himself, like the divine power mentioned earlier.

"Glory" together with "fame" in 2 Pet 1:3b form a typical biblical merism, where synonymous or very closely synonymous concepts appear side by side: "glory and fame" or "praise and excellence". The use of merism would correspond well with the strategy of integration and Judaisation of Hellenistic concepts employed by the author of the letter, which at the same time weakens the philosophical-ethical connotations of the term ἀρετή. One could also find in "glory and fame" a reference to the description of the transfiguration in 2 Pet 1:16–17, where "glory" in OT referring to God is transferred to Jesus and becomes an attribute of both God and Jesus, and a reference to eschatological times, when the glory of God and his salvation is to be proclaimed (celebrated) among all nations (e. g. 1 Kings 16:24, Isa 12:2, Ps 72[71]:18, 96[95]:3, 117[116]:1). This confirms the suggestion of an inclusive meaning of the participle καλέσας that refers to God (the Father) and Jesus. It cannot, of course, be ruled out that in the phrase δόξα καὶ ἀρετή, as in verse 3b, a hendiadys was used – "perfect glory", "famous glory", "praiseworthy glory", "glory resulting from excellence" or, if one were to borrow the meaning of ἀρεταί from 1 Pet 1:9, "glory resulting from powerful, praiseworthy deeds", and it should be added that in the ancient world glory was also regarded as a manifestation of excellence.[134] However, in the light of the integrative strategy, such an interpretation of the rhetorical figure δόξα καὶ ἀρετή seems somewhat less likely than the merism typical of Semitic stylistics.

The phrase ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ is expressed in the dative case. It proves problematic to specify the pragmatic function of this dative. It can be taken as dat. finalis – specifying the purpose of the vocation: "Him who has called us with His own

133 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 410–411.

134 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 396.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

glory and fame". In this case, the eschatological aspect would be much emphasised. However, it seems that – if the hagiographer had this purpose in mind – he would rather have used εἰς in the accusative[135] (cf. 1 Pet 5:10: "The God of all grace who has called you to his eternal glory" εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον ααὐτοῦ δόξαν). It is also possible to treat this dative as dat. commodi (of benefit) – then the meaning would be: "he has called us for his own glory and fame" and the eschatological dimension would also be accentuated. A third possibility is a pragmatic interpretation of the dative as dat. causae. Then the aspect of dignity, related to reputation, which is pointed out by F. W. Danker, who compares 2 Pet 1:3b to the Hellenistic decrees: vocation "for the sake of one's own glory and fame". In other words, because glory and fame belong to God and/or Jesus, so he has called us. One can also see intentional implications in this understanding. It should be noted, however, that previously – in verses 1 and 2 – intentionality was realised with the preposition ἐν: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ and ἐν ἐπιγνώσει. Finally, the fourth variant of interpreting the dative ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, which has the most supporters, is dat. Instrumentalis:[136] "he has called us by his own glory and fame, through his own glory and fame, by means of his own glory and fame". This interpretation was recognised in antiquity, which is evidenced by the oldest text of 2 Peter text, papyrus P^{72}, where the prepositional phrase διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς is used instead of the dative. The variant with dat. instrumentalis also corresponds best with the phrase "divine power" of Jesus, it would even be its "rhetorical variation", as R. Bauckham put it;[137] for both, as mentioned, can be treated as periphrases. That is, the "divine power" of Jesus works through the "glory and fame" of Jesus and/or God. In other words: the divinity of Jesus is manifested in his glory and fame, which is unambiguously associated with the "glory and fame" of God and which was revealed to the apostles at the time of the transfiguration (2 Pet 1:16–18).

This interpretation of "glory and fame" obviously has theological implications; it reconstructs the way in which the author of 2 Peter understands the divinity of Jesus. Verse 3 could be paraphrased as follows: "as all that the divine power of Jesus [i. e. Jesus as God] has given [and is giving] to us [all Christians] towards a godly life through the knowledge of him who has called us [all Christians] with his own glory and fame [i. e. called us as God]". The use of an integrative strategy can also be seen here. It concerns the transfer to Jesus of the competence of God calling and endowing his servants. In OT, the one called by God was referred to by the dignitary title δοῦλος. The same title can now be applied to the one called by Jesus Christ (cf. 2 Pet 1:1). Moreover, if one considers verse 3 in the light of verse 1, the synonymy

135 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 178.

136 So, among others, J.N.D. Kelly, P.H. Davids, R. Bauckham.

137 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 179.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of all three terms for God and Jesus is noticeable: the God and our Saviour Jesus Christ (1c) is the one whose divine power has endowed us, i. e. Jesus endowing as God (3a), and the one who has called us with his glory and fame, i. e. Jesus calling Christians as God (3b). His endowment and vocation are salvific, as the term σωτήρ in verse 1c clearly indicates, which corresponds with the eschatological overtones of verse 2a and with the same indication in verses 4b–c.

Verse 4 begins with the prepositional phrase δι' ὧν, which has an instrumental meaning: 'through them/by means of them'. The relative pronoun in gen. pl. refers to "glory and virtue". F.W. Danker[138] once again sees here elements characteristic of ancient decrees, which emphasise that the benefactor's gifts come from his own resources. Regardless of its genological attribution, this formula could be qualified as an amplification and continuation of what has already been said in verse 3 about the source of everything needed for a pious life and the authentication of the vocation. The giver and caller in verse 3 is Jesus as God; now, in verse 4, "through the glory and fame" that are periphrases of Jesus' divinity, Jesus bestows promises on the faithful (us). It can be seen that between verse 3 and verse 4 a parallelism typical of Hebrew literature has been employed, further marked by the use of the same verb – δωρέομαι in the perfect tense in both sections. Perhaps in this way the semitization undertaken by the author of 2 Peter is also carried out at the rhetorical level:

1. Jesus, as God, has given and gives (δεδωρημένης) everything we need for a godly life and calls us;
2. Jesus, as God, has given and gives (δεδώρηται) promises so that the recipients can participate in the divine nature and guard against/escape corruption.

If one considers this parallelism as synthetic, it can be seen that the author of 2 Peter in the second part clarifies two essential elements of the first one: the pronoun πάντα and the purpose of the divine/Jesus' endowment. The pronoun "everything" corresponds to the promises, to the purpose described as a "godly life" ζωὴ καὶ εὐσέβεια – participation in the divine nature and escape from corruption θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμία φθορᾶς.

The promises are defined by the noun ἐπαγγέλματα, which is characteristic of 2 Peter (it also occurs in 2 Pet 3:13, which may indicate – as P.H. Davids suggests[139] – that the whole letter has a frame narrative). It does not appear in LXX, but it can be found in Hellenistic literature, secular as well as philosophical and religious. Attempts are sometimes made to nuance the meaning of the term ἐπάγγελμα and the more popular[140] ἐπαγγελία (cf. 2 Pet 3:4.9). The former was to emphasise the

138 W.F. Danker, *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 458.

139 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 397.

140 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 178.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

content of the promise, the latter, the very act of promising.[141] However, it seems that the terms ἐπάγγελμα and ἐπαγγελία are used interchangeably by the author of 2 Peter, just as he does not rigorously observe the differentiation of the meaning of γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις. As in Hellenistic literature, the nuancing of meanings depends on the context and the intention of the writer, who may suggest that the audience pay attention to different aspects of the promise.

When, for example, in *De Mutatione Nominum* (44:253), Philo of Alexandria describes God's promises to Abraham (cf. Gen 17:19), he characterises them not only as surpassing human prayers and petitions, but even as inherent in God's nature. This implies the certainty that the promise given by God will be fulfilled. Also in ancient decrees containing acts of commitment to give a gift of some kind, the certainty that the commitment will be fulfilled is very strongly emphasised. This is linked to the honour and reputation of the donor. On the other hand, Hellenistic inscriptions from Priene (e. g. Priene 33, 66, 100), which contained the names of the founders of public buildings and annotations that the buildings were financed in accordance with the promise (κατ᾽ ἐπαγγελίαν or equivalent phrases with the noun ἐπαγγελία),[142] make us pay attention to another aspect of the promise – namely, the congruence of promises with the possibility of their fulfilment. All these connotations converge in Peter's statement: Jesus as God gives promises. One can see here, firstly, a convergence with Philo's theology and the conviction that promises belong to the divine nature and divine power. At the same time, elements of Theologisation of concepts used in a non-religious context can be discerned. Secondly, since promises are part of God's way of acting, one can be sure of their fulfilment, since a promise is believed to be a solemn commitment. Thirdly and finally, Jesus as God has the competence and power to fulfil these promises. This reveals how the author of 2 Peter understands the divinity of Jesus and how the Jewish tradition is equated with the Hellenistic-Christian tradition. Jesus' divinity, i. e. his divine power, is manifested in the promises and the certainty of their fulfilment, just as could be observed in OT in the case of promises given and fulfilled by God (the Father). Moreover, the salvific work of Jesus – his death and resurrection – is not only the best example of the fulfilment of Old Testament promises (cf. Acts 13:32–34), but also the guarantee of the fulfilment of eschatological promises given by Jesus.[143]

The certainty of the promises and their fulfilment is emphasised by the use of the verb δωρέομαι in ind. perf. med. This form indicates the permanence and

141 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 397; otherwise G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 577, who sees no difference in meaning between the terms.

142 W.F. Danker, *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 458. 479.

143 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 301; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 179; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 578.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

finality[144] of the promises given during Jesus' earthly mission and their effects. This perfective *continuum* also manifests Peter's idea of equating the privileges arising from the faith of the addressees of the letter and the faith of the sender: all Christians, through faith and knowledge, are equal beneficiaries of God/Jesus' promises.

The promises were referred to as τίμια καὶ μέγιστα. Perhaps the whole phrase alludes to the language of Hellenistic decrees with honourable obligations, in order once again to emphasise the certainty of their fulfilment.[145] The first adjective confirms that the narrator is indeed referring to the equal privileges of the beneficiaries; indeed, it can be regarded as a synonym of the adjective ἰσότιμος from verse 1. The common stem here denotes value, respect, dignity, honour (cf. the noun τιμή – 'payment', 'value', 'price', 'dignity', 'esteem', and the verb τιμάω – 'to judge', 'esteem', 'honour', 'reverence', 'respect'). The lexem τίμιος appears frequently in NT, primarily in descriptions of what is valuable, precious, and respectable.[146]

The second adjective is morphologically the superlative form of μέγας 'great'; *superlativus*, although rare in NT, is found in Greek literature, e. g. in *The Iliad*, *The Odyssey*, often in acclamatory formulas and in conjunction with the name of a deity or hero.[147] This would imply that the author of 2 Peter thus emphasises the divine origin of Jesus' promises. The suggestion, therefore, of equating the value and certainty of Jesus' promises with Old Testament promises is confirmed.[148] The combination of the two adjectives can be seen as a hendiadys: "most valuable promises",[149] "valuable (because) divine promises". But they can be regarded as two independent terms, characteristic of the emerging Christian sociolects, especially the formulas referring to the promises of Christ. In *1 Clem.* 34:7 the promises are described as τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἐνδόξα ἐπαγγελία "great and glorious"; in *2 Clem.* 5:5 it is the promise μεγάλη καὶ θαυμαστή "great and wonderful". If indeed a certain convention has been followed in 2 Pet 1:4a, as in the texts attributed to Clement of Rome, it is already possible to infer the content, or at least the nature, of these promises by analogy. In *1 Clem.* 26:1, 34:7, and especially in *2 Clem.* 5:5–6, these are eschatological promises, but their fulfilment already begins in the present and concerns the means needed for "a holy and righteous life":

> the promise of Christ is great and wonderful, even the rest of the kingdom to come, and of life everlasting. By what course of conduct, then, shall we attain these things, but by

144 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 301.

145 W.F. Danker, *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 458; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 578.

146 Acts 5:34, 20:24, 1 Cor 3:12, Rev 17:4, 18:4.12a.16, 21:11.19, 1 Pet 1:7.19, Jas 5:7, Heb 13:4.

147 F. Thiele, *Large*, [in:] *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, p. 424–425.

148 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 179.

149 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 397.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> leading a holy and righteous life, and by deeming these worldly things as not belonging to us, and not fixing our desires upon them.

A similar pattern can be seen in the parallelism employed by the author of 2 Peter. It is true that instead of the content of the promises, their purpose is emphasised, but this purpose too, as in the epistles of Clement, is doubly described as an eschatology rooted in the present first as "a godly life" in verse 3a and then, in 4b, as "participation in the divine nature" and, in 4c, "escape from the corruption in the world [caused by] lust". It can now be seen that the purpose of the promises is expressed through a concentric structure, with the present as the framework and the future as the centre:

a. Pious life – an element of the eschatological present
    b. Participation in the divine nature – an element of the eschatological future
a'. Escape from the corruption caused by lust – an element of the eschatological present.

The future-oriented purpose of the promise is described as ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως "so that through them you might become partakers of the divine nature". Like 4a, verse 4b also begins with the instrumentally understood phrase διὰ τούτων; the difference lies solely in the change of the relative pronoun in 4a to the indicative pronoun in 4b. There is no doubt that the phrase refers to promises.

Later in verse 4b the change from the first-person plural to the second-person plural draws attention. In verses 3 and 4a the narrator used the inclusive personal pronoun ἡμεῖς 'we' and replaced it with the verb in the second-person plural γένησθε (con. aor. med.). The aorist emphasises that "the becoming" will be considered as complete and utter, and thus includes the perspective of future eschatology (4b) as well as present eschatology (4c), the positive aspects ("participation in the divine nature") and the negative aspects ("escape from the corruption in the world caused by lust").[150] The transition to the second person also has its rhetorical justification. The narrator is already slowly preparing the audience for the call to perfect the Christian life (cf. verses 5–7),[151] showing how this exercise in perfection is related to God's promises and gifts and to the practical aspects of faith and knowledge.

The eschatological future is described in philosophical language as "participation in the divine nature". The philosophical provenance of the language is emphasised by the adjective θεῖος, used for a second time, which serves to accentuate

150 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 302.
151 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 179.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the parallelism between verse 3 and verse 4. In the former, Jesus' "divine power" was mentioned, in the latter the "participation in the divine nature". This juxtaposition should direct the audience towards a theological rather than philosophical interpretation of the whole phrase (as in verse 3a). A second interpretive clue is the use of the atypical phrase γίνομαι κοινωνός to become a participant, to become an accomplice instead of the more common verb μετέχω 'to belong, to take/have a part', to convey the idea of participation.[152] The nouns κοινωνία and κοινωνός accentuate not just the possession of some common feature, thing, but rather a community, a bond, a unity, a shared experience (cf. 1 Cor 10:18, 2 Cor 1:7). In an eschatological sense, the noun κοινωνός is also used by the author of 1 Peter (1 Pet 5:1), who presents himself as "a partaker of the glory to be revealed".

The phrase θεία φύσις "divine nature" has a rich history and an equally extensive semantic field in the philosophical literature. The earlier analysis of the "divine power" showed that the sharing of an attribute with God/divinity is that element which distinguishes man from animal.[153] Dio Chrysostom argues that it is intelligence and the ability to reason and recognise the traces of the divinity in the world:

> they had received from him intelligence and the capacity for reason, illumined as they were on every side by the divine and magnificent glories of heaven and the stars (θείσιος καὶ μεγάλοις φάσμασιν οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ ἄστρων) of sun and moon, by night and day encountering varied and dissimilar experiences, seeing wondrous sights and hearing manifold voices of winds and forest and rivers and sea, of animals tame and wild (*Orationes* 12:28).

This allows them to be aware of the existence of a deity who makes nature flourish and who takes care of people: "on every side they were filled with the divine nature (θείας φύσεως) through both sight and hearing" (*Orationes* 12:29). This understanding of the participation in the divine nature are also echoed by Philo of Alexandria, who in *Leg. alleg.* I XXVIII:89 argues that it is the human mind – pure, immaterial and not sharing in any perishable matter – that is to protect and cultivate the virtues: "the disposition to cultivate the virtues, and the resolution never to desert them, but always to minister to and guard every one of them", are in fact a divine endowment of the human mind. In *De Decalogo* XXI 104–105, Philo's reflection is more general and concerns the divine nature of the universe manifested in immutability and constancy. The number of the universe is the perfect seven, and the heavenly bodies, though they seem to move, do not

152 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 301.

153 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

in fact wander, "inasmuch as they all enjoy a divine, and happy, and blessed nature (θείας καὶ μακαρίας καὶ εὐδαίμονος φύσεως μετεσχηκότων), to all of which characteristics a freedom from wandering […] it is by its means that the Creator and Father of the universe is most especially made manifest; for the mind beholds God in this as in a mirror, acting, and creating the world, and managing the whole universe".

Josephus Flavius seems much more explicit in specifying the participation in the divine nature. In *Con. Ap.* I 26, quoting after Manetho the characterisation of Amenophis, son of Papis, Flavius indicates that the divine nature is wisdom and knowledge of the future. Manetho "introduces his fictitious King Amenophis, and says thus: "This King was desirous to become a spectator of the gods […]. He also communicated that his desire to his namesake Amenophis; who was the son of Papis; and one that seemed to partake of a divine nature θείας δὲ δοκοῦντι μετεσχηκέναι φύσεως, both as to wisdom, and the knowledge of futurities". In doing so, he uses language very reminiscent of Peter's formula: θείας δὲ δοκοῦντι μετεσχηκέναι φύσεως with the difference already pointed out – he uses the verb μετέχω instead of Peter's γίνομαι κοινωνός.

The belief of the Hellenistic writers in the existence of some divine particle in man, which would indicate the kinship between gods and humans, the possibility of participation in the divine nature, most probably takes its origin from Plato[154] and his reflections on the immortal soul, inherent in gods and humans, whose "pilot" is reason. The philosopher presents these reflections most fully in *Phaedrus* (245c–248a):

> The soul through all her being is immortal, for that which is ever in motion is immortal; […] But if this be true, must not the soul be the self-moving, and therefore of necessity unbegotten and immortal? […] The soul in her totality has the care of inanimate being everywhere, and traverses the whole heaven in divers forms appearing – when perfect and fully winged she soars upward, and orders the whole world; whereas the imperfect soul, losing her wings and drooping in her flight at last settles on the solid ground – there, finding a home, she receives an earthly frame which appears to be self-moved, but is really moved by her power; and this composition of soul and body is called a living and mortal creature. For immortal no such union can be reasonably believed to be; although fancy, not having seen nor surely known the nature of God, may imagine an immortal creature having both a body and also a soul which are united throughout all time.

Unlike the divine soul, the human soul can lose its wings.

154 Although the concept of knowledge, which is a synthesis of logical thinking and dream theory in which the gods appear, was probably known to Leukippos or Democritus of Abdera.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> The wing is the corporeal element which is most akin to the divine, and which by nature tends to soar aloft and carry that which gravitates downwards into the upper region, which is the habitation of the gods. The divine is beauty, wisdom, goodness, and the like; and by these the wing of the soul is nourished, and grows apace; but when fed upon evil and foulness and the opposite of good, wastes and falls away.

As can be seen, Plato argues that being guided by reason, beauty and goodness makes the human soul similar to the divine soul not only in its immortality, but also in perfection and virtue. Such a soul has the chance to live a life similar to the life of the gods. Plato concludes his description of the divine sphere with "Such is the life of the gods; but of other souls, that which follows God best and is likest to him". The very life of the gods and the place where the divine souls reside are, of course, very difficult to describe. The essence of this divine existence seems to be the pure knowledge of what is the essential being:

> There abides the very being with which true knowledge is concerned; the colourless, formless, intangible essence, visible only to mind, the pilot of the soul. The divine intelligence, being nurtured upon mind and pure knowledge, and the intelligence of every soul which is capable of receiving the food proper to it, rejoices at beholding reality, and once more gazing upon truth, is replenished and made glad, until the revolution of the worlds brings her round again to the same place. In the revolution she beholds justice, and temperance, and knowledge absolute, not in the form of generation or of relation, which men call existence, but knowledge absolute in existence absolute.

Plato seems to have drawn on the Orphic beliefs, above all, the belief in the pre-existence of souls and in metempsychosis and the return to the divine nature through intellectual (hence the emphasis on the role of reason) and moral purification combined, of course, with liberation from the body.

Whereas Plato and the Hellenistic writers who depended on him, including Flavius, see participation in the divine nature as an element that, rooted in the divine world or the divinity itself, accompanies man in mortality (reason, wisdom, knowledge of the future, the soul "imprisoned" in the body), the author of 4 Macc points out that the divine participation/divine inheritance of θεία μέρις is linked to post-mortem existence: "Therefore those who gave over their bodies in suffering for the sake of piety were not only admired by mortals but also were deemed worthy to share in a divine inheritance" (4 Macc 18:3). The Book of Wisdom 2:23 explicitly points to immortality as the goal of creating man, and this immortality is the image (εἰκών) of God's eternity: "For God formed us to be imperishable; the image of his own nature he made us. At the same time, eternal life is seen as the consequence of a pious, or righteous life: the righteous live forever, their reward with the Lord;

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the Most High takes care of them. Therefore they will receive a royal house and a beautiful diadem from the hand of the Lord (Wis 5:15–16a); "Faithful is the Lord to them that love Him in truth […], that walk in the righteousness of His commandments, In the law which He commanded us that we might live. The pious of the Lord shall live by it for ever […] the pious of the Lord shall inherit life in gladness" (PssSol 14:1–3.10, cf. also PssSol 15).

The Jewish intertestamental literature includes descriptions suggesting that the righteous dwell after their death in a divine zone,[155] near God and in communion with Him: "All the holy ones who are in heaven shall bless Him, And all the elect who dwell in the garden of life: And every spirit of light who is able to bless, and glorify, and extol, and hallow Thy blessed name, And all flesh shall beyond measure glorify and bless Thy name for ever and ever" (1 En 61:12, cf. 1 En 39:12, 40:1). The Ascension of Isaiah, a Christian text, also contains similar images. The first image presents the time before the birth of Christ:

> And he raised me up into the seventh heaven, and I saw there a wonderful light and angels innumerable. And there I saw the holy Abel and all the righteous. And there I saw Enoch and all who were with him, stript of the garments of the flesh, and I saw them in their garments of the upper world, and they were like angels, standing there in great glory. But they sat not on their thrones, nor were their crowns of glory on them (AscIsa 9:6–10).

The second image depicts the deceased Christians who, together with the risen and exalted Christ, will ascend to the same seventh heaven and receive their garments, thrones and crowns:

> And when [Christ] hath plundered the angel of death, He will ascend on the third day, [and he will remain in that world five hundred and forty-five days]. And then many of the righteous will ascend with Him, whose spirits do not receive their garments till the Lord Christ ascend and they ascend with Him. Then indeed they will receive their [garments and] thrones and crowns, when He has ascended into the seventh heaven (AscIsa 9:16–18).

It seems that it is precisely this perspective of the author of 2 Peter. Thus, Peter's concept of participation in the divine nature is not, as in Greek literature, about possessing or attaining some divine attribute, about perfection, about deification, some kind of pantheism or panentheism; there is no question of blurring the

155 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 301 mentions abiding "in divine glory".

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

distinction between God and participants in the divine nature.[156] It is first and foremost about finding oneself close to God, which is very much emphasised by the relational formula γένησθε κοινωνοί and experiencing the fullness of grace and peace, as indicated already in the prescript (1:2a). This is also confirmed by the end of 2 Peter, where reference is made to a new earth and a new heaven, in which the faithful will be found by God as impeccable, without spot and in peace (cf. 2 Pet 3:14).[157]

It is somewhat problematic to determine whether this refers to being in relationship and communion with God immediately after death, or only in the end times and during the Parousia.[158] The author of 2 Peter fails to give a clear answer. A comparison with Hellenistic and early Christian literature brings no clear results either. The examples quoted above from Hellenistic literature, LXX, 1 En, *2 Clem.* and AscIsa are either ambiguous or seem to suggest that it is about communion with God just after death. This suggestion is also confirmed by Flavius' description of Essene beliefs in *Bell. Iud.* II 8:11:

> And this is like the opinions of the Greeks, that good souls have their habitations beyond the ocean, […] this place is such as is refreshed by the gentle breathing of a west wind, that is perpetually blowing from the ocean; while they allot to bad souls a dark and tempestuous den, full of never-ceasing punishments. And indeed the Greeks seem to me to have followed the same notion, […] whereby good men are bettered in the conduct of their life by the hope they have of reward after their death, and whereby the vehement inclinations of bad men to vice are restrained, by the fear and expectation they are in, that although they should lie concealed in this life, they should suffer immortal punishment after their death (see also *Ant.* XVII 1:5 and the beliefs of the Pharisees about the immortality of the soul and the possibility of the righteous souls returning to life).[159]

The issue is somewhat different in *The Sentences* of Pseudo-Phocylides (103–106), where there is a merging of Jewish eschatology and the idea of resurrection in the

156 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 181; see also T.M. Dąbek, *Wezwani do uczestnictwa w Bożej naturze* (*2 Pet 1:4*), "Vita Consecrata" 11 (2008), no. 1, p. 40–43, and the extensive argument on this topic by S. Hafemann, *"Divine Nature" in 2 Pet 1:1 Within Its Eschatological Context*, "Biblica" 94 (2013), no. 1, p. 80–99.

157 M. Luther adopts the same perspective. First, he explains what the divine nature is: "It is eternal truth, righteousness, wisdom; eternal life, peace, joy, happiness, and whatever good one can name". And then he specifies what it means to partake of the divine nature: "Whoever then becomes partaker of the divine nature, attains all this, – that he is to live forever, and have eternal peace, delight and joy, and is to be perfectly pure, just, and triumphant over the devil, sin and death", *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther*.

158 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 181.

159 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 285.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

body inherent in it with the Greek concept of an immortal soul: "And we hope, too, that quickly from the earth into the light will come the remains of the departed; and then they become gods. For souls remain unscathed in the deceased. For the spirit is a loan from God to mortals, and is God's image".[160] The attainment of the divine nature would then be tantamount to a kind of deification, which in the case of 2 Peter, however, must be rejected. But what is important here is to indicate the moment of fulfilment of the philosopher's hopes – it is the moment of the resurrection, which is clearly associated with the end times. A similar thought is expressed in *1 Clem.* 26:1: "Do we then deem it any great and wonderful thing for the Maker of all things to raise up again those that have piously served Him in the assurance of a good faith, when even by a bird He shows us the mightiness of His power to fulfil His promise?".

It seems that in 1:4b the author of 2 Peter does not yet fully reveal his perspective. He allows the audience to speculate according to their competence and preferences. This may also be part of his integrative strategy to equate Hellenistic concepts associated with being in the presence of God immediately after death and concepts that accentuate resurrection in the end times. From a rhetorical point of view, such a device is also fully justified – the sender wants to arouse the interest and focus the attention of his audience on these eschatological concepts present and developed in the subsequent parts of the letter (cf. 2 Pet 1:11 and chapter 3); this is also the basis of his polemic against false teachers who display a far-reaching eschatological scepticism. Now his aim is to point the eschatological communion with God, the attainment of which is made possible by God's salvific promises and gifts and not by human initiative.[161]

In verse 4c, as previous rhetorical analyses have shown, the author returns to the perception of eschatological promises in terms of the present times, so it seems appropriate to link this passage with verse 3a in a parallelism: "a pious life" would mean an "escape from the corruption in the world caused by lust". Some exegetes combine verse 4c with 4b and consider it from the perspective of a future-oriented eschatology: participation in "the divine nature", and thus in immortality and impermanence, would mean "escape from corruption", while corruption would be associated with corporeality, materiality, transience, as in dualistic Greek philosophy. In

160 W.T. Wilson, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature), Berlin–New York 2005, p. 141.

161 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 180–181. Some commentators, in order to avoid discussing when exactly people can be granted a share in the divine nature, suggest that the divine nature should be seen in ethical rather than eschatological terms. G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 582, for example, considers that the divine nature is the aforementioned divine ἀρετή understood as perfection. The human ἀρετή – described in verses 5–7 – is said to resemble ἀρετή of God.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

other words, to escape from corruption is to escape from/to the body.[162] A temporal clue may be provided here by the use of the aorist ἀποφυγόντες, which suggests that the escape took place before participation in the divine nature. R. Bauckham interprets this as death.[163] Meanwhile, this aorist can indeed be interpreted as a state prior to the attainment of full participation in "the divine nature" but parallel with the temporal "pious life". Then the earthly and present roots of future-oriented eschatology would be considered from two perspectives – the positive one as "a godly life" and the negative one as "an escape from corruption".

An important clue will be to decide whether the noun φθορά 'corruption' is to be understood literally or metaphorically. The term φθορά is well known to Septuagint translators (e. g. Ps 103[102]:4, Isa 24:3, Mic 2:10, Jonah 2:7, Dan 3:92, PssSol 4:6) and to New Testament writers (Rom 8:21, 1 Cor 15:42.50, Gal 6:8, Col 2:22). It can be used in a literal sense as destruction, corruption, decay, decomposition, also the decay of the body after death. But corruption can also be understood metonymically – as moral corruption, i. e. sin (cf. Wis 14:12, where corruption φθορά is synonymous with idolatry, or Wis 14:25, where it is mentioned together with blood and murder, theft and guile, faithlessness, turmoil, perjury). There is a metaphorical meaning to the noun φθορά in 2 Pet 2:19, where reference is made to "the slaves of corruption" δοῦλοι τῆς φθορᾶς. The next verse – 2:20 – can be seen as a refinement of both 2:19 and 1:4c, since it contains a formula almost identical with ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, namely ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου, where corruption is replaced by the term μίασμα 'corruption', 'defilement', 'tarnish'. This term does not denote corporeality and matter subject to decay, which is evidenced by the addition in 2:20: "escape from defilements" (the text uses the plural form) is accomplished not through death, but through knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Moreover, it is possible to become entangled in this corruption again. It is difficult to suppose that the author of 2 Peter has the Orphic metempsychosis in mind here, so it must be assumed that both 2:19–20 and 1:4c refer to corruption in the ethical sense. Escaping corruption would therefore mean escaping from sin, and this must be considered synonymous with a pious life.

As already mentioned, the narrator of 2 Peter avoids dualism in which matter is the source of corruption. He recognises the cause of corruption in the world in "lust/desire" ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ, which is "the origin of sin" (cf. Jas 1:14–15). In Old Testament literature, the noun ἐπιθυμία appears relatively frequently and is used in various contexts. It can have a completely neutral meaning (e. g. Deut 12:15,

162 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 182; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 401.

163 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 182; J.N.D. Kelly in *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (p. 302) points out that the aorist signifies a finite and final act and sees here an allusion to baptism and the renunciation of "former lusts" (1 Pet 1:2.14).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

14:26, Ps 21[20]:3, 78[77]:29), or it can have a positive meaning, especially in wisdom literature when referring to "the desire for wisdom" or "the desires of the righteous" (Prov 10:24, 11:23, Wis 6:17.20, Sir 3:29, 14:14). However, it is most often accompanied by negative connotations (Ps 10[9]:24, 106[105]:14, 140[139]:9, Prov 12:12, Wis 4:12, Sir 5:2, 18:30, 23:5). This negative view of "desire" can also be seen in New Testament.[164] The author of 2 Peter adopts this negative view of "desire", which he interprets broadly, though he adds the ethical connotations typical of Stoicism.

Ἐπιθυμία thus most likely means here all uncontrolled desires in Greek literature, identified with low instincts and instability, leading to demoralisation and harm to fellow human beings. Such desires are contrasted with reason, and this, as shown above, is very often identified with the most essential and divine element in the human soul. This is strongly emphasised, for example, in Plutarch's *Morals*, who, referring to the views of Plato and Aristotle, describes different parts of the soul, which has

> one part intelligent and reasoning, which is intended by nature to rule and dominate in man, and another part unreasoning, and subject to passion and caprice, and disorderly, and in need of direction. And this last again is divided into two parts, one of which, being most closely connected with the body, is called desire, and the other, sometimes taking part with the body, sometimes with reason, lending its influence against the body, is called anger (*On Moral Virtue* 442A).

This unintelligent part, unless it is subordinated to the rational part, is sometimes "entirely corrupted by brute pleasure and a life of indulgence" (*On moral virtue* 442C). In Stoic philosophy, lust belongs to the four main passions (πάθος) alongside grief, fear and pleasure,[165] the overcoming of which (ἀπάθεια) leads to perfection and brings one closer to the gods. Diogenes Laertius, in *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (VII 110), characterising the views of Zeno of Citium, defines lust/desire as follows:

> Desire or craving is irrational appetency, and under it are ranged the following states: want, hatred, contentiousness, anger, love, wrath, resentment. Want, then, is a craving when it is baulked and, as it were, cut off from its object, but kept at full stretch and

164 E. g. Mark 4:19, Rom 7:7–8, Gal 5:16–17, 1 Tim 6:9, Titus 3:3, 1 Pet 1:14, 2:11, 1 John 2:16–17; K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 310–311; see also the meaning of the noun ἐπιθυμία in the Johannine texts in: M.S. Sparrow, *Who are the father and his children in John 8:44? The literary, historical and theological analysis of John 8:44 and its context*, Paris 2005.

165 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 156–157; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 587.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> attracted towards it in vain. Hatred is a growing and lasting desire or craving that it should go ill with somebody. Contentiousness is a craving or desire connected with partisanship; anger a craving or desire to punish one who is thought to have done you an undeserved injury. The passion of love is a craving from which good men are free; for it is an effort to win affection due to the visible presence of beauty. Wrath is anger which has long rankled and has become malicious […]. Resentment is anger in an early stage.

As can be seen, relying on associations with Greek philosophy, the author of 2 Peter wants to convince his audience that being driven by lusts cannot lead to participation in the divine nature, since it is against a godly life, especially love of neighbour, brotherly love, which stands at the end of a series of virtues indicating the attainment of knowledge (cf. 2 Pet 1:7).

Thus, the only way to be able to live a pious life is the escape from the corruption in the world caused by lust. In Greek philosophy, escape was often understood metaphorically. In this metaphorical interpretation, two main tendencies can be distinguished: the radical, which considers death escape from the corruption inherent in matter and the body in death, and the ethical, which saw escape from corruption in perfecting oneself in virtue. The author of 2 Peter is definitely closer to the latter trend, which is represented by Plato's *Theaetetus*, among others. In this dialogue, escape means imitating the gods in their perfection: "Having no place among the gods in heaven, of necessity [evils] hover around the mortal nature, and this earthly sphere. Wherefore we ought to fly away from earth to heaven as quickly as we can; and to fly away is to become like God, as far as this is possible; and to become like him, is to become holy, just, and wise". Further, Plato, through the mouth of Socrates, argues that even the most righteous of men will not be able to become fully like a god. Nevertheless, the pursuit of justice is an escape not so much from the world as towards the gods. "Herein is seen the true cleverness of a man, and also his nothingness and want of manhood. For to know this is true wisdom and virtue, and ignorance of this is manifest folly and vice". Philo in *De migratione Abrahami* (II 7–10) seems more radical when he allegorically explains that Abraham's leaving his country and relatives should be construed as his leaving his body and senses; however, it does not result in death,[166] but in gaining control over the body and senses through reason and escaping from indulging in the senses, pleasures and lusts:

> they are your subjects, use them not as your rulers; since you are a king, learn to govern and not to be governed; know yourself all your life, as Moses teaches us […] "Take heed to Thyself." For thus you will perceive what you ought to be obedient to, and what you

166 Thus, among others. R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 183.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> ought to be the master of. Depart therefore from the earthly parts which envelop you, O my friend, fleeing from that base and polluted prison house of the body ἐκφυγὼν δεσμωτήριον, τὸ σῶμα, and from the keepers as it were of the prison, its pleasures and appetites, putting forth all your strength and all your power so as to suffer none of thy good things to come to harm, but improving all your good faculties together and unitedly. Depart also from thy kindred, outward senses; for now indeed you have given yourself up to each of them to be made use of as it will, and you have become a good, the property of others.

The escape from "the polluted prison house of the body" in Philo is thus in essence a call to regain freedom from submission to the senses and lusts and to gain control over the body.

These two examples fit perfectly into Peter's parallelism of pious living and escape from the corruption caused by lust. The positive aspects of the moral life and the pursuit of righteousness in Plato correspond to the first part of the parallelism. The negative aspects – the escape from the dominion of the senses and lusts in Philo – are summarised in the second part. It is worth noting here that there is no escape from the world, but only from the corruption in the world. In this precise phrase one can see the implications of the positive, or at least neutral, evaluation of the world characteristic of the Jewish tradition. Once again, the narrator uses the strategy of integration, but here he also re-evaluates the negative view of the world inherent in Greek dualism and makes use of the belief, rooted in Jewish theology, that the world as God's creation is good.

This theological precision is also evident in the use of the perfective forms δεδωρημένη and δεδώρεται. The author of 2 Peter stresses the fact that man alone is unable to lead a perfect life or escape corruption/sin in order to achieve full communion with God, but from God he received πάντα "all" that is necessary for this. The perfective forms mean that "all that", or – as was shown at the beginning of this analysis – the promises are still and uninterruptedly given to man, they do not lose their validity, they are constantly being fulfilled. Thus, both the godly pious life and the escape from corruption should be seen as an ongoing process that ultimately leads to communion with God.

Since the pious life and escape from corruption have both an intellectual and a practical aspect, it is not surprising that they were juxtaposed with knowledge. Although the phrase διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως is formally in verse 3a, it can be taken as a complement for 4c as well. Then the eschatological elements of this passage will be even more noticeable. At the beginning of the analysis of verses 3–4, it was mentioned that verse 3 should be read as *comparans* of the comparison begun in verse 2. At the end of this analysis, in order to get the full picture of the comparison, verse 4 must also be added to *comparans*. 4. It can now be seen that in both parts

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of the comparison the explicitly and implicitly recurring component, and thus the most prominent one, is precisely knowledge, which becomes the axis of the passage:

comparans
(verse 3): As/Since all that His divine power has given [and is giving] to us for godliness/a godly/pious life
through the knowledge of Him who has called us with His own glory and fame/virtue/perfection,
(verse 4): through which he has bestowed [and is bestowing] upon us precious and great promises,
so that through them you might become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption in the world [caused by] lust
[by knowing Him who has given us the salvific promises].

comparandum
(verse 2): [so that] grace to you and peace may be multiplied
through the knowledge of God and Jesus our Lord.

It was mentioned in the analysis of verse 2 that Peter's ἐπίγνωσις is defined as a personal commitment to knowing the essence of God and Jesus, which leads to conversion. Now the narrator emphasises the practical (ethical) effects of this knowledge – pious/godly life and escape from corruption/sin. Moreover, the pious/godly life and escaping from corruption are an ongoing process, likewise is knowledge interpreted by Peter progressively. Ultimately, through knowledge, the object and giver of which is God and/or Jesus calling the faithful, and through the resulting pious life and escape from corruption, which are already taking place in the present, it will be possible in the future to achieve full communion with God/Jesus, i. e. to become a partaker of His divine nature.

2.3 A'. Faith (2 Pet 1:5–8)

[5]And for this same reason have diligence/strive eagerly that through/to your faith you may add virtue, through/to virtue knowledge, [6]through/to knowledge the self-control, through/to the self-control the endurance, through/to the endurance the godliness, [7]through/to the godliness the brotherly affection, and through/to the brotherly affection the love. [8]And because you have this at your disposal/in you and multiplying/abounding in them, [therefore] [they] do not make/render [you] idle and unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

In verses 5–8, the author of 2 Peter returns to the issues of faith initiated in verse 1 and elaborates on them on the basis of verses 3–4. Faith is then interpreted as a gift of Jesus (as God) and a means to live "a godly life" and "to escape corruption". The practical aspects of faith, implied in verse 1, come to the fore. At the same time, as noted earlier, it is this practical dimension that makes Peter's understanding of "faith" overlap in many places with his understanding of "knowledge". This is clarified in verse 8, where the term ἐπίγνωσις appears once again, and in the following verses (9–14) "faith" and "knowledge" are captured synthetically as two closely related elements.

Verses 5–7 are regarded as one of the most Hellenistic passages in the Second Letter of Peter. They are often quoted in the attempts to indicate the community or at least the milieu to which the letter is addressed.[167] Recipients would thus be expected to be familiar enough with Greek philosophical ethics, especially Stoic ethics, to read all the nuances of form and meaning introduced by Peter into conventional parenetic catalogues of virtues.[168] As before, the narrator employs a strategy of integration. He theologises philosophical forms and concepts; this theologisation takes the shape of Christianisation rather than Judaisation. This does not mean, however, that he omits elements specific to Jewish tradition and literature. On the contrary, Peter's Christianisation is very often based on a Hellenistic Jewish reinterpretation of Greek philosophical and ethical terms.

Verse 5 begins with the phrase καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ. The pronouns between the conjunct καί and the participle δέ can be interpreted as adverbials[169] and rendered as "in such a way, so, just because". They can refer to everything from verses 3–4 about the gifts and promises concerning "a godly life", "escape from corruption in the world", and finally "participation in the divine nature". This is also confirmed in the new catalogue of virtues, which starts with faith as a basic gift from which all the other qualities that make up "a pious life" spring. G.L. Green between verses 3–4 and verses 5–7 sees not only a grammatical formal cohesion, but also a connection based on the similarity of the Petrine text to ancient decrees in which the receipt of gifts obliged the recipient to lead an exemplary moral life.[170]

As already mentioned, from verse 4 onwards, the sender of the letter prepares his recipients for the call to lead "a pious life", so there is a change from first person plural to second person plural. Now this call is made explicit by the verb in the imperative ἐπιχορηγήσατε. The imperative is preceded by the phrase σπουδὴν

167 See Introduction.

168 J.D. Charles, *The Language and Logic of Virtue in 2 Pet 1:5–7*, "Bulletin for Biblical Research" 8 (1998), p. 56.

169 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 306; cf. F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 225.

170 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 591.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες. The phrase σπουδὴν πᾶσαν emphasises the intensity of action, suggesting zeal and effort put into the action. This would mean that the accusative σπουδὴν πᾶσαν in 2 Pet 1:5 should be taken as acc. modi (of manner) and of course the adverbial of manner "with all zeal, making every effort". The phrase σπουδὴν πᾶσαν had a similar function in other Hellenistic writings. It is used, among others, by Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* XI 8:4, describing the involvement of Sanball in the building of the temple (πάσαν εἰσενεγκάμενος σπουδήν) and in *Ant.* XX 9:2, describing the strenuous efforts of Albinus to preserve peace on earth: "as soon as Albinus was come to the city of Jerusalem, he used all his endeavours and care that the country might be kept in peace". It can be found in Diodorus Siculus (*Bibliotheca Historica* I 83:8 and XVIII 34:4) and Polybius (*The Histories* I 18:11 and XXI 29:12); everywhere it denotes commitment, effort, endeavour, sometimes enthusiasm for the action taken.[171] The verb παρεισφέρω used by Peter in part. aor. belongs to the New Testament *hapax legomena*; it also occurs very rarely in extra-biblical texts. It means 'to intensify', 'to make an effort'. The aorist further indicates that these efforts are complete and finished. The whole phrase σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες can thus be regarded as an introductory formula for the catalogue of virtues, which would encourage and even oblige one to practice them zealously.[172]

Catalogues of virtues (and vices) were common in Greek literature. The form itself dates back to the Homeric era and was not originally associated with moral philosophy.[173] It appears, for example, in satire – e. g. in *Frogs* by Aristophanes (V 145), where it serves to stereotype certain behaviours. Charon forces Dionysus to get into a boat and row; Dionysus refuses using a list of qualities that prevent him from rowing: "Why, how am I to pull? I'm not an oarsman, seaman, Salaminian. I can't" Over time, catalogues of virtues, qualities and vices increasingly appeared in philosophical literature. One of these is presented by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* (1366a–1366b): "Virtue, it would seem, is a faculty of providing and preserving good things, a faculty productive of many and great benefits, in fact, of all things in all cases. The components of virtue are justice, courage, self-control, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, practical and speculative wisdom". Each virtue is then discussed in more detail, sometimes in an elaborate and complicated way. By Hellenistic times, such catalogues – largely accompanying Stoic philosophical and ethical reflection – seem to have been very widespread in many circles. As J.D. Charles notes, this was influenced by the turn from purely theoretical considerations to the practical dimension. In use, then, were the lists themselves, without intricate

171 F.W. Danker, *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 459; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 592.

172 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 184.

173 J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 57.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

philosophical commentaries. Speakers were keen on making use of these lists, especially as they had an epideictic function in speeches – they were intended to arouse either appreciation or dislike and shame in their recipients.[174] From there, it was only a step away from using them in parenetic literature.

Catalogues of virtues also became popular among the Jews. Philo in *De Sacrificiis Abeli et Caini* V 26–27.32 gives lists of dozens of virtues and vices. The first is a long list of feminine virtues, beginning with outward appearance, manner of movement and dress:

> a firm step, a very gentle look, the native colour of modesty and nature without any alloy or disguise, an honest disposition, a genuine and sincere way of life, a plain, honest opinion, an language removed from all insincerity, […] a sound and honest heart, a disposition averse to pretence, a quiet unobtrusive gait, a moderate style of dress, and the ornaments of prudence and virtue, more precious than any gold. And she was attended by piety, and holiness, and truth, and right, and purity, and an honest regard for an oath, and justice, and equality, and adherence to one's engagements […], and temperance, and orderliness, and meekness, and abstemiousness, and contentment, and good-temper, and modesty, […] a noble disposition and wisdom in counsel, and prudence, and forethought, and attention, and correctness, and cheerfulness, […] gentleness, and courtesy, […] magnanimity, and happiness, and goodness". The second list contains the vices of a man who, before indulging in pleasures, will be "cunning, audacious, unsociable, uncourteous, […] savage, illtempered, unrestrainable, […] deaf to advice, foolish, full of evil acts, […] unjust, unfair, […] covetous, […] unfriendly, homeless, […] faithless, […] impious, […] unstable, […] profane, […] indecent, […] murderous, […] brutal, slavish, cowardly, intemperate, irregular, disgraceful, shameful, doing and suffering all infamy, colourless, immoderate, unsatiable, insolent, conceited, self-willed, mean, envious, calumnious, quarrelsome, slanderous, greedy, […] stupid, […] dishonest, disobedient, obstinate, tricky, […] [spreading] gossip, a vain babbler, a flatterer, a fool, full of heavy sorrow, weak in bearing grief, trembling at every sound, […] inconsiderate, […] impudent, neglectful of good, unprepared, ignorant of virtue, […] erring, stumbling, […] a glutton, a captive, a spendthrift, easily yielding, most crafty, double-minded, […] perfidious, treacherous, unscrupulous, […] always in want, infirm of purpose, fickle, a wanderer, a follower of others, yielding to impulses, […] fond of vain glory, passionate, ill-tempered, lazy, […] suspected, […] full of evil jealousies, despairing, […] rejoicing in evil, […] eager for disgraceful gain, selfish, […] effeminate, […] vain.

Even the Essenes at Qumran do not resign from such lists. *The Community Rule* lists the qualities of the Angel/Prince of Light, who exercises authority over the

174 Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Sons of Righteousness, and the Angel of Darkness, who exercises authority over the Sons of Lawlessness. It is the task of the former to ensure

> enlightenment of the heart of man, and that all the paths of true righteousness may be made straight before him, and that the fear of the laws of God may be instilled in his heart: a spirit of humility, patience, abundant charity, unending goodness, understanding, and intelligence; (a spirit of) mighty wisdom which trusts in all the deeds of God and leans on His great loving kindness; […] But the ways of the spirit of falsehood are these: greed, and slackness in the search for righteousness, wickedness and lies, haughtiness and pride, falseness and deceit, cruelty and abundant evil, ill-temper and much folly and brazen insolence, abominable deeds (committed) in a spirit of lust, and ways of lewdness in the service of uncleanness, a blaspheming tongue, blindness of eye and dullness of ear, stiffness of neck and heaviness of heart, so that man walks in all the ways of darkness and guile (1QS 4:2–4.9–11).

A long list of virtues, which overlaps in many places with Peter's catalogue, is also presented in a fourth-century Latin paraphrase of The Acts of Peter, purged of heterodox elements, called *Actus Vercellensis* (*The Vercelli Acts*). It is located after an equally long list of vices and sins:

> if […] keep yourselves from all guile and wrath and fierceness and adultery and defilement, and from pride and envy and contempt and enmity, Jesus the living God will forgive you that ye did in ignorance. Wherefore, ye servants of God, arm yourselves every one in your inner man with peace, patience, gentleness, faith, charity, knowledge, wisdom, love of the brethren, hospitality, mercy, abstinence, chastity, kindness, justice.

The longer the list, the more difficult it is to put the elements in order. This is why both lists compiled by Greek philosophers and lists compiled by Jewish writers and teachers give the impression of being disordered, and the order of the elements listed in them seems rather random.[175] However, there were also catalogues compiled according to a rhetorical principle called "sorites" (chain). A sorites is a type of polysyllogism with more than two premises. These premises form the individual links of a chain, which ends with a conclusion.[176]

> With regard to the virtues, the classical sorites is applied by Seneca in *Ep. mor.* (85:2): He that possesses prudence is also self-restrained; he that possesses self-restraint is also unwavering; he that is unwavering is unperturbed; he that is unperturbed is free from

175 J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 58.

176 Definition after: M. Korolko, *Sztuka retoryki*, p. 88; cf. G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 598.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> sadness; he that is free from sadness is happy. Therefore, the prudent man is happy, and prudence is sufficient to constitute the happy life.

In *On the Laws* (I 7:23), Cicero elaborates further on the links:

> There exists, therefore, since nothing is better than reason, and since this is the common property of God and man, a certain aboriginal rational intercourse between divine and human natures. But where reason is common, there right reason must also be common to the same parties; and since this right reason is what we call law, God and men must be considered as associated by law. Again, there must also be a communion of right where there is a communion of law. And those who have law and right thus in common, must be considered members of the same commonwealth. And if they are obedient to the same rule and the same authority, they are even much more so to this one celestial regency, this divine mind and omnipotent divinity. So that the entire universe may be looked upon as forming one vast commonwealth of gods and men.[177]

A sorites is also found in LXX. In Wis 6:17–20, wisdom is described by means of logically consecutive and consequent links: "For the first step toward Wisdom is an earnest desire for discipline; then, care for discipline is love of her; love means the keeping of her laws; To observe her laws is the basis for incorruptibility; and incorruptibility makes one close to God; thus the desire for Wisdom leads to a kingdom". As can be seen, the lists in all these examples are progressive, the successive links in the chain leading to a statement containing a conclusion and/or culmination, i. e. the element standing highest in the hierarchy of values presented (the so-called *summum bonum*).

The author of 2 Peter drew on these classical models. He presents a catalogue of virtues arranged in a specific order from faith to love, which can be regarded as Peter's and even the all-Christian *summum bonum*.[178] Moreover, the sender of the letter does not end his sorites on this, but completes it with an interesting conclusion linking faith and knowledge, as in verse 1.

Peter's list is not random, which is evidenced by the verb ἐπιχορηγήσατε. Its primary meaning is 'to provide', 'to give', 'to take care of', 'to equip'. This meaning derives from antiquity and alludes to the Athenian custom of having a choir perform at various ceremonies. It implies a double aspect related to these performances: firstly, 'to provide', 'to supply the choir itself for the festivities'; secondly, 'to take care

177 Marcus Tullius Cicero, *The Treatises of M. T. CICERO on the Nature of the Gods; On Divination; On Fate; On the Republic; On the Laws; and On Standing for the Consulship*, English transl. C.D. Yonge, London 1853, p. 408.

178 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:7.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of', 'to provide' the choir with the means of subsistence during the festivities.[179] Over time, ἐπιχηορηγέω began to be used in texts referring to acts of charity, generosity, providing something at one's own expense. Among others, it is used in such a context by Diogenes Laertius in *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (V 67), when he speaks of Lyco being "esteemed beyond all other philosophers by Eumenes and Attalus, who also did him very great service" (οἳ καὶ πλεῖστα ἐπεχορήγουν αὐτῷ). In LXX, the verb occurs in the form of χορηγέω and also means 'to supply', 'to give', 'to deliver' (1 Kings 4:7, 5:1, Jdt 12:2, 1 Macc 14:10, 2 Macc 3:3, 4:49, 9:16, 3 Macc 6:30.40, 7:18). New Testament writers are also familiar with this meaning, but in New Testament ἐπιχορηγέω appears primarily in texts referring to God's generous, abundant gifts – 2 Cor 9:10, the giving of the Spirit – Gal 3:5, or the holding of all the members of the body (the church) by the head (Christ) – Col 2:19, rather than in reference to human actions.

There may be some problem in translating the entire formula that introduces Peter's list of virtues and then the subsequent links of the sorites where the prepositional phrase ἐν is used with the dative. If καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε is rendered as "And therefore having made every effort, provide virtue X with virtue Y" or the most common translated variant "And therefore having made every effort, add Y to X",[180] then the progressive nature of the chain of virtues and the rooting of each successive virtue in the preceding virtue[181] will not be made clear enough. There may also be a mistaken impression that faith – as God's gift – is insufficient and something needs to be complemented. Perhaps the best translation would be: "And precisely for this reason, with all your strength/zealously strive to make Y develop through/thanks to X". This would also convey the causal or instrumental meaning of the prepositional phrase ἐν with the dative.

Such chains emphasising the relationship between the various links were well known to New Testament and early Christian writings. They are successfully employed by the apostle Paul in Rom 5:3–5, where each preceding virtue produces (κατεργάζομαι) the next: ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμήν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα, ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει "affliction produces endurance, and

179 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 306.

180 Cf. "make every effort to add to your faith goodness; and to goodness, knowledge" (NIV); "add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge" (NKJV); "supplement your faith with virtue, and virtue with knowledge" (ESV); "in your faith supply moral excellence, and in your moral excellence, knowledge" (New American Standard Bible).

181 J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 58. Differently, R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 185, who argues that the order of virtues in 2 Peter and *The Shepherd* is quite random, and that the whole list is based on a philosophical ethic popular in antiquity, probably Stoic. It seems significant, however, that "faith" is at the beginning of this list and "love" at the end.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

endurance, proven character, and proven character, hope, and hope does not disappoint". The interdependence of the virtues is even better explained by the allegory in *The Shepherd* of Hermas, in Vision III (8:7), in which each virtue listed is a daughter of the preceding virtue:[182] "Their powers are regulated by each other, and follow each other in the order of their birth. For from Faith arises Self-restraint; from Self-restraint, Simplicity; from Simplicity, Guilelessness; from Guilelessness, Chastity; from Chastity, Intelligence; and from Intelligence, Love".

Compared to the Hellenistic catalogues, Peter's list of virtues is not very extensive, consisting of eight elements. Some exegetes see a certain symbolism in this,[183] since in ancient times, eight was regarded as a number indicating the divine realm. In circles associated with the Jewish and later Christian allegorical Alexandrian philosophy, the eighth heavenly sphere was the seat of God. The eight, therefore, became a symbol of eternal abode with God in heaven.[184] It was associated with the first day after the Sabbath, with the day of Jesus' resurrection and with the resurrection in eschatological times (Luke 9:28, John 20:20).[185] In the context of the Second Letter of Peter, it could be a reference to "participation in the divine nature" (verse 4b).

---

182 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 184; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 408.

183 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 305.

184 See, for example Clement of Alexandria's consideration of the superiority of the eight over the seven, and the symbolic interpretation of the seventh day, on which one rests, and the eighth, on which, after resting, the propitiatory sacrifice is offered: "Whether, then, the time be that which through the seven periods […] or the seven heavens, which some reckon one above the other; or whether also the fixed sphere which borders on the intellectual world be called the eighth" (*Stromata* IV 25). When discussing the mystical symbolism of the ark of the covenant (*Stromata* V 36:3), Clement writes that the word *kibotos*, derived from *thebotha*, should be interpreted: "one instead of one in all places. Whether, then, it is the eighth region and the world of thought, or God, all-embracing, and without shape, and invisible". Even more explicitly, Irenaeus of Lyons speaks of the eight heavens in *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*: "Now this world is encompassed by seven heavens, in which dwell powers and angels and and angels and archangels, doing service to God, the Almighty and Maker of all things", https://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/0130-0202,_Iraeneus,_Demonstration_Of_The_Apostolic_Preaching,_EN.pdf [accessed: 25.10.2022]. Given that in the Judeo-Christian tradition God dwells above the realm of angels and archangels, there must be an eighth heaven.

185 M. Szram, *Duchowy sens liczb w alegorycznej egzegezie aleksandryjskiej* (*II–V w.*), Lublin 2001, p. 160–162. Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* (41:4), interprets the symbolism of the figure eight as follows: "The command of circumcision, again, bidding [them] always circumcise the children on the eighth day, was a type of the true circumcision, by which we are circumcised from deceit and iniquity through Him who rose from the dead on the first day after the Sabbath, [namely through] our Lord Jesus Christ. For the first day after the Sabbath, remaining the first of all the days, is called, however, the eighth, according to the number of all the days of the cycle, and [yet] remains the first".

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Peter's eight-element list also stands out from the New Testament catalogues of virtues. In New Testament there are sometimes more extensive lists with up to a dozen elements each (1 Tim 3:2–3, Titus 1:7–8, 2 Cor 6:5–7), but usually there are fewer than 10 – e. g. nine elements (Gal 5:22–23, Jas 3:17–18); six (Col 3:12–14, 1 Tim 6:11), or seven (Eph 6:14–17, Titus 3:1–2). The most popular, it seems, are catalogues consisting of four (Rom 5:3–5, 1 Thess 5:8, Heb 10:22–24, Rev 2:19) or three virtues (1 Cor 13:13, Gal 5:5–6, Col 1:4–5, 1 Thess 1:3, 1 Pet 1:21–22,). Only a few of the New Testament catalogues form sorites similar to Peter's (Rom 5:1–2.3–5, Gal 5:5–6, 1 Pet 1:21–22); in others, even those with a small number of elements, the virtues appear in a rather random order. The short New Testament epistles, in which the so-called theological virtues faith, hope, love are most often repeated, are reminiscent of the Greek and Hellenistic epistles with the so-called cardinal virtues – fortitude/courage, justice, temperance/moderation and wisdom/prudence, which stand for specific actions. They are first encountered in Aeschylus when characterising Amphiaraus: "moderate, just, noble, reverent" (*Seven against Thebes* 610). Menander suggests that actions of those who will be praised should be divided into four virtues: courage, justice, temperance and wisdom.[186] Plato, in Book IV (419a–445e) of *The Republic*, attributed the virtues to the parts of the soul. Wisdom is the attribute of the intellectual part of the soul, which consists in the fact that reason rules over the whole soul (*The Republic* 442c); fortitude is the attribute of the so-called wrathful part of the soul (*The Republic* 442b–c); temperance is the attribute of the lustful part of the soul (*The Republic* 442c–d); justice finally brings harmony between all parts of the soul:

> [the righteous man] harmonized these three principles, the notes or intervals of three terms quite literally the lowest, the highest, and the mean […], self-controlled and in unison, he should then and then only turn to practice if he find aught to do either in the getting of wealth or the tendance of the body or it may be in political action or private business, in all such doings believing and naming the just and honorable action to be that which preserves and helps to produce this condition of soul, and wisdom the science that presides over such conduct; and believing and naming the unjust action to be that which ever tends to overthrow this spiritual constitution, and brutish ignorance, to be the opinion that in turn presides over this (*The Republic* 443c–444a).

Quintilian, too, links the cardinal virtues with actions (*Inst. orat.* III 7:15): "on the other hand it is well to divide our praises, dealing separately with the various virtues, fortitude, justice, self-control and the rest of them and to assign to each virtue the deeds performed under its influence". Slightly different virtues are mentioned in

186 After: J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 30.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

one inscription from the first century. from Asia Minor, which praises Herostratos, son of Dorkalion, and attributes to him the following virtues, which overlap in part with those given by the author of 2 Peter: faith [πίστει,], virtue [ἀρετῇ], righteousness [δ (ικ) αιοσύνῃ], duty/piousness [εὐσεβείᾳ], great effort [τὴν πλείστ (η) ν εἰσενηνεγμένον σπουδήν].[187]

It appears that in the ancient world the ideal of morality, which is represented in particular by the short lists of virtues, was not at all widespread. It was thought to be accessible only to the mighty and educated.[188] This is because the virtues and the ethical conduct resulting from them are the fruit of a well-established (habitual, as it were) exercise of right choices, with which reason (λόγος) and knowledge (γνῶσις) stand, and not everyone was able and acquired the right knowledge to recognise the virtues, and not everyone had the capacity, especially the security of property, to practise them.[189] With these assumptions, the author of 2 Peter seems to disagree. This is why he places faith at the beginning of his catalogue, about which he had already spoken in an egalitarian and inclusive way – in verse 1. Later, he showed that it is not acquired through any human effort, but is a divine gift. This element clearly distinguishes Peter's understanding of virtue from the perception of it in the Greek philosophical systems (especially the Stoic), where, it was said, it is the result of human thought. In Peter's axiological system, faith, having the same dignified effects for all, being a divine gift irrespective of the ethnicity or social status of the recipient, and irrespective of how and by whom it was given, entails further virtues that illustrate its practical dimension.

Faith. The beginning of the sorites with faith is not accidental. It becomes part of the Christianisation of Hellenistic ethics and follows the New Testament and early Christian convention of listing virtues. Paul begins his list with faith in Rom 5:1–2, 1 Cor 13:13, Gal 5:5–6, Col 1:4–6, 1 Thess 1:3.5.8. Similarly, the author of 1 Pet 1:21–22. The first place is given to faith in *1 Clem.* 1:2: "For who ever dwelt even for a short time among you, and did not find your faith to be as fruitful of virtue as it was firmly established?" βεβαίαν ὑμῶν πίστιν; *1 Clem.* 62:2: "For concerning faith περὶ γὰρ πίστεως and repentance and true love and continence and soberness and patience"; *1 Clem.* 64:1: "May God, […] grant to every soul that calls upon His glorious and holy name, faith δῴη […] πίστιν, fear, peace, patience, long-suffering, self-control, purity, and sobriety", in the catalogues found in *The Shepherd* of Hermas: "For from Faith arises Self-restraint; from Self-restraint, Simplicity; from Simplicity, Guilelessness; from Guilelessness, Chastity; from Chastity, Intelligence; and from Intelligence, Love" (Vision III 8:7); "I gave you […] directions

187 W.F. Danker, *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 460; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 593; on the similarities between this inscription and 2 Pet 1:5–7 see J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 65–66.

188 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 594.

189 J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 59.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

[…] to attend to faith, and fear, and self-restraint (Similitude VI 1:1); "First of all there is faith, then fear of the Lord, love, concord, words of righteousness, truth, patience" (Commandment VIII 9); "The first is Faith, the second Continence, the third Power, the fourth Patience. And the others standing in the midst of these have the following names: Simplicity, Innocence, Purity, Cheerfulness, Truth, Understanding, Harmony, Love" (Similitude IX 15:2), and in *The Epistle of Barnabas* 2:2: "Fear and patience, then, are helpers of our faith; and long-suffering and continence are things which fight on our side". The primacy of faith is also recognised by the author of The Acts of Paul and Thecla: "who alone has had compassion upon a world led astray, that they may be no longer under judgement, […] but may have faith, and the fear of God, and the knowledge of holiness, and the love of truth". Even the author of the partly gnostic The Acts of John 29 mentions faith at the beginning of the list of metaphorical colours with which John's portrait would be painted: "Thou hast colours which he giveth thee through me, who painteth all of us for himself […]: faith in God, knowledge, godly fear, friendship, communion, meekness, kindness, brotherly love, purity, simplicity, tranquillity, fearlessness, griefiessness, sobriety".

An important element of the Christianisation strategy is Peter's understanding of faith that departs from Hellenistic definitions of this virtue, especially in the lists of virtues and virtues. In the Greco-Roman world, faith – Greek πίστις, Latin *fides* – meant primarily loyalty and trustworthiness. G.L. Green[190] gives examples of this understanding of faith especially in the social relationship between the patron, who is also the beneficiary, and the client, who is the beneficiary of the patron's actions. In this relationship, loyalty relates primarily to the client, while credibility relates to the patron. On the one hand, the client was *in fide*, i. e. under the faithful, reliable care of the patron; on the other hand, the patron expected the client to repay for this care with *fide*, i. e. loyalty and fidelity. This ideal did not always work. Plautus, for example, in his comedy *The Twin Brothers* (*Menaechmi* 4:2), stigmatises a pathological understanding of patronage duties and client claims, based on deception and corruption:

> How we do practise a custom here that is very foolish and extremely troublesome, and how even those who are the most worthy and great do follow this habit: all wish their dependants to be many in number; whether they are deserving or undeserving, about that they don't enquire. Their property is more enquired about, than what the reputation of their clients is for honor. If any person is poor and not dishonest, he is considered worthless; but if a rich man is dishonest, he is considered a good client. Those who neither regard laws nor any good or justice at all, the same have zealous patrons. What has been

190 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 601.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> entrusted to them, they deny to have been so entrusted; men full of litigation, rapacious, and fraudulent; who have acquired their property either by usury or by perjury; their whole pleasure is in litigation. When the day for trial is appointed, at the same time it is mentioned to their patrons, in order that they may plead for them, about what they have done amiss.

Lists of virtues are supposed to suggest desirable behaviour. Thus, as G.L. Green[191] and P.H. Davids[192] argue, the placement of faith/faithfulness in the primary position in Peter's catalogue of virtues by the ancient recipients of the letter was understood to emphasise loyalty to the donor God (1:3–4.11), and a breach of loyalty/faithfulness to the patron was seen as a moral failing.

Obviously, such implications of faith cannot be ruled out, but loyalty seems not to be of primary importance, since faith is to be understood here as in verse 1 – as the soteriological content present in the Gospel, its existential impact and its practical dimension.[193] In the context of the sorites, the latter element is important here. This is because Peter's faith generates the appropriate conduct described in the following links, previously defined as all that is necessary for a godly life (verse 3a), for "escape from corruption" (verse 4c) and for participation in the divine nature" (verse 4b). This was the practical way in which faith in 2 Pet 1:5 was interpreted in antiquity. For example, Theophylact in *The Explanation of 2 Peter* explained the steps to be taken in order to reach maturity with faith being the first, since it is the foundation and source of all good works.[194] Bede the Venerable, in his commentary on 2 Peter, also emphasises this aspect of faith, referring in addition to the Letter of James: "Peter does not regard as a virtue here the strength or power to perform miracles, but the ability to lead a good life, which consists in putting faith into action in the right way, because faith without works is dead".[195] This trend is joined by both Thomas Aquinas, who affirms the unity of Theological virtues (including hope), and also by M. Luther, who emphasises that faith must be manifested in works: "St. Peter would admonish believers that they should prove their faith by good works".[196]

It is only with this understanding of faith as it emerges from verses 1 and 3 that the images familiar from the social relations between patron and client of the time

191 Ibid.

192 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 410.

193 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:1 and R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 185.

194 Theophylact of Ochrid, *The Explanation of 2 Peter*, English transl. N. Christina, A. Skoubourdis, s.l. 2002.

195 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 123.

196 M. Luther, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther* I (V.2).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

can be complemented. Faith is undoubtedly an egalitarian gift,[197] very much linked to promises as commitments of God/Jesus to people. The person of the giver makes the promises credible and their fulfilment certain. Man's response to this gift, in turn, is to live the kind of life to which he has been called and equipped to ultimately share in the divine nature. In other words – it is on faith that the whole pious life of the faithful is based. This is further emphasised by the construction ἐν τῇ πίστει, which is to be understood instrumentally or causally. On the foundation of faith and with its help, virtue can develop.

Virtue. Immediately after faith, virtue ἀρετή is mentioned. The noun ἀρετή already appeared in verse 3, but in a completely different context – along with glory, virtue was an attribute belonging to God[198] and was part of a process of Judaising Greek philosophical concepts. Now the author of 2 Peter goes a step further in his strategy of integration and performs a Christianisation of virtue. In verse 3 only the implications of perfection remain from the Hellenistic, philosophical meaning of virtue. In verse 5 this philosophical-ethical provenance, which recognises virtue as the source of actions deserving public recognition and praise (cf. Quintilian's *Inst. orat.* III 7:15), is retained.

As already mentioned, the late OT books take over this general meaning of ἀρετή. In Wis 8:7, the list of virtues derived from the love of justice is very reminiscent of the list of Hellenistic cardinal virtues: "Or if one loves righteousness, whose works are virtues, She teaches moderation and prudence, righteousness and fortitude, and nothing in life is more useful than these". In 2 Macc 15:12, the moral aspect of the virtues is emphasised; in 3 Macc 6:1, virtue can mean moral dispositions as well as deeds: "Now a certain Eleazar […] throughout his life he had displayed every virtue"; similarly in 4 Macc 1:30, where reference is made to the praise of the virtues of these men, i. e. the seven brother martyrs who suffered death during the Maccabean uprising (167–160 BC), and in 4 Macc 13:24 extolling the seven brothers who were "trained in the same virtues and brought up together in right living". In 4 Macc 1:2, the greatest virtue is identified with prudence. This is accompanied by a philosophical introduction: "For the subject is essential to everyone who is seeking knowledge, and in addition it includes the praise of the highest virtue – I mean, of course, rational judgement"; in a philosophical way, virtue and reason are also linked in 4 Macc 1:30: "rational judgement is sovereign over the passions by virtue of the restraining power of self-control". It is different in 4 Macc 10:10, where virtue is a divine gift: "[we] are suffering because of our godly training and virtue". In New Testament, virtue – apart from the Second Letter of Peter – is only mentioned in

197 J.D. Charles, *Language*, p. 66 points out that the faith in 2 Peter was not given (παραδίδωμι) but donated (δωρέομαι).

198 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Phil 4:8 and uses the term in the sense of something praiseworthy, whereby it is not clear whether it refers to moral dispositions or actions.

This seems to be the same very general meaning of virtue in 2 Pet 1:5. What distinguishes it from the philosophical account, however, is its origin. In philosophy, as already pointed out, virtue, is the result of human reflection, the fruit of reason and knowledge, which lead to habitual actions, and moral excellence can be achieved by one's own efforts. Peter, however, derives virtue from faith, which is a divine gift.[199] It is through faith – ἐν πίστῃ – that virtue can develop, whereby its development is not limited to reflection and the cultivation of moral dispositions, but is oriented towards action. Indirectly, therefore, virtue too is a divine gift, like everything necessary for a godly life.

This understanding of virtue is characteristic of early Christian literature. In *2 Clem.* 10:1 virtue becomes synonymous with acting according to the will of God and the antonym of wickedness leading to sin: "Wherefore, my brethren, let us do the will of the Father who called us, that we may live; and let us earnestly follow after virtue, but forsake every wicked tendency which would lead us into transgression; and flee from ungodliness, lest evils overtake us. For if we are diligent in doing good, peace will follow us". In connection with doing God's will, it appears in *The Shepherd* of Hermas, e. g. in Commandment I 1:2: "Have faith therefore in Him, and fear Him; and fearing Him, exercise self-control. Keep these commands, and you will cast away from you all wickedness, and put on the strength of righteousness ἐνδύςῃ πᾶσαν ἐρετὴν δικαιοσύνης and live to God"; in Commandment XII 3:1: "You will practice righteousness and virtue literally. in the desire of virtue) τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῇ ἀρετήν, truth and the fear of the Lord, faith and meekness, and whatsoever excellences are like to these. Practising these, you will be a well-pleasing servant of God, and you will live to Him"; in Similitude VI 1:4: "and by putting on all the virtues of a holy life πᾶσιν ἀρετὴν δικαιοσύνης, you will be able to keep these commandments, and will no longer add to the number of your sins". Virtue as an action resulting from faith is also supported by Theophylact who claimed that it is the next step to maturity after faith, since faith is dead without works according to James.[200]

As can be seen, Peter's Christianisation of the philosophical concept of virtue proceeds in two directions. The first points to the origin of virtue – it is the result of faith and is based on God's will. The second emphasises its practical action – for virtue cannot be limited to ethical dispositions and to theoretical reflection, but must manifest itself in action. In this way, it becomes the practical aspect of faith.

199 Of course, it must be remembered that also in Greece, before virtue became a philosophical-ethical concept, it first functioned in the religious space and signified the favour of the gods (so, for example, [in:] *Iliad* 9:498 or *Odyssey* 13:45).

200 Theophylact of Ochrid, *The Explanation of 2 Peter*, English transl. N. Christina, A. Skoubourdis, s.l. 2002.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Knowledge. The next link in the sorites is knowledge. In contrast to verse 2, here instead of the term ἐπίγνωσις the author of 2 Peter uses the term γνῶσις. As said, they are closely synonymous, but it is possible to point out some nuances between them, especially as the two occur very close together here. The use of the term γνῶσις makes the audience connect it intuitively with familiar ethical systems, where γνῶσις understood speculatively represented either an end in itself or, as said, was considered the origin and source of the virtues. It could also be the counterpart of the mystical union and knowledge of the divinity,[201] as in the Orphic or Hermetic systems, and later also in the Gnostic systems (see *Corpus Hermeticum* XIII, 7–9, where gnosis is understood as a rebirth in God achieved by withdrawing into oneself, putting the senses to sleep, purifying oneself from the twelve mindless torments of the material world; the chain of these torments begins with ignorance).[202] The author of 2 Peter seems to polemicise against such meanings. Like the Stoics, he juxtaposes knowledge and virtue, showing that he believes in an organic, inseparable relationship between the two,[203] but presents them in reverse order – as virtue and knowledge. The surprising inversion forces the audience to revise their belief that virtue is a corollary of knowledge; they must accept that it is knowledge that develops through virtue.

If virtue means the practical aspect of faith, i. e. praiseworthy acts resulting from obedience to God's will, knowledge in this context must mean knowing, understanding and discerning what acts and actions are right (Phil 1:9, cf. Eph 5:17) and are part of leading a godly life and avoiding corruption. The correlation between practice and knowledge/discernment is emphasised by the author of Heb 5:14, who also places practice before discernment. Thus, knowledge can also be seen as a reflection on the meaning of actions, which are not meant to be an end in themselves or a reason for glory and recognition among people, as was the case in the Greco-Roman world,[204] but a testimony of faith. In this way, the connection is also shown between faith and knowledge, and practically oriented knowledge ceases to be mere intellectual speculation. Just as faith is a divine gift (cf. Prov 1:7, Jas 1:5)[205] and an equipment of the believer.

Interpreted in this way, knowledge becomes characteristic of Christian virtue catalogues. Moreover, usually in these lists it does not occupy the first place, but

201 In the New Testament literature, examples can be found of the description – especially with the verb γινώσκω – of the relationship between the Father and the Son, which translates into the believer's participation in this relationship (e. g. John 10:14–15).

202 W. Myszor, *Corpus Hermeticum XIII: wstęp, przekład z greckiego, komentarz*, "Studia Theologica Varsaviensia" 17 (1979), p. 251–252.

203 J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 67.

204 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 306.

205 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 411.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

appears in the middle[206] (cf. e. g. 2 Cor 6:6), often precisely between faith and love, as in 2 Peter (cf. 2 Cor 8:7) or The Acts of John 29: "faith in God, knowledge, godly fear". Sometimes it appears at the end, as in *1 Clem.* 1:2, where, however, it is not considered a goal but one of the Corinthians' equal virtues after faith, prudence, piety and hospitality, or in *Barn.* 2:3, where it is mentioned as a consequence rather than a source of virtues such as faith, fear, perseverance assisted by righteousness and temperance: "While these remain pure in what respects the Lord, Wisdom, Understanding, Science, and Knowledge rejoice along with them".

Temperance/continence/self-control. Through knowledge, ἐγκράτεια temperance can develop. This term is usually understood as mastery over the senses (temperance in relation to eating, drinking, sexual intercourse), but can be taken more broadly and generally as self-control and self-discipline or self-control. Ἐγκράτεια was one of the leading virtues in the ethical system of Socrates, who – as Xenophon wrote in *Mem.* I 2:1 – "in control of his own passions and appetites he was the strictest of men". Temperance plays a significant role in the writings of Plato and Aristotle. The latter, in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1145b), juxtaposing the behaviour of the intemperate man ἀκρατής with that of the controllable man ἐγκρατής, also explains what the relationship is between temperance/self-control and reasoning, which can be considered synonymous with knowledge:

> It is thought, I. That Self-Control and Endurance belong to the class of things good and praiseworthy, while Imperfect Self-Control and Softness belong to that of things low and blameworthy. II. That the man of Self-Control is identical with the man who is apt to abide by his resolution, and the man of Imperfect Self-Control with him who is apt to depart from his resolution That the man of Imperfect Self-Control does things at the instigation of his passions, knowing them to be wrong, while the man of Self-Control, knowing his lusts to be wrong, refuses, by the influence of reason, to follow their suggestions. […] Again, men are said to be of Imperfect Self-Control, not simply but with the addition of the thing wherein, as in respect of anger, of honour, and gain.

This idea is not foreign to Greek-speaking Jews. Sir 18:30–32, although it does not formally mention the concept of ἐγκράτεια, in fact defines temperance when it warns not to follow lust, to abstain from passions and not to indulge in a lavish life. Wis 8:21 adds that one cannot be temperate/restrained (ἐγκρατής) unless God grants it. In 4 Macc 5:34, ἐγκράτεια – here understood contextually as abstaining from eating meat contrary to the Law – is one of Eleazar's qualities. *The Letter of Aristeas* (277–278) interprets temperance in a more philosophical way:

206 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 186.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> Why is it that the majority of men never become virtuous? Because […] all men are by nature intemperate and inclined to pleasure. Hence, injustice springs up and a flood of avarice. The habit of virtue is a hindrance to those who are devoted to a life of pleasure because it enjoins upon them the preference of temperance and righteousness. For it is God who is the master of these things.

Much of the reflection on temperance/continence is devoted to Philo of Alexandria. In the already quoted *De migratione Abrahami* (II 7–10), he calls for freedom from the dominion of the senses and lusts (ἡδονὰς καὶ ἐπιθυμίας).[207] In *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* 27:101–103, he notes that temperance should apply to each of the human senses and organs of the body: the eyes, therefore, should see only things worthy of light, the ears should avoid hearing shameful things, the faculty of taste was not given to man to eat insatiably, but to choose nourishing things, and procreation must not mean fornication and other impure relationships, but relations that serve procreation; the mouth must not encourage talkativeness, for "those who have learnt to speak have also learnt to be silent […] we labour to bind each of the mouthpieces of the senses beforementioned with the imperishable bonds of temperance [τοῖς ἀρρήκτοις εγκρατείας δεσμοῖς]. For whatever is not bound with a bond (Num 19:15) […] is Impure". In *De spec. leg.* II XXII 195 he briefly and bluntly indicates what areas the restraint prescribed by the Law should concern: "the lawgiver is continually exhorting men to display at all times, both in their language and in their appetites, both in and below the belly". Josephus Flavius in *Bell. Iud.* II 8:2 views the continence practised by the Essenes primarily from the perspective of sexuality: "These Essens reject pleasures as an evil, but esteem continence, and the conquest over our passions to be virtue". This perspective is shared by TNaph 2:29–30: "For the commandments of the law are twofold, and through prudence must they be fulfilled. For there is a season for a man to embrace his wife, and a season to abstain therefrom for his prayer".

In the New Testament, the term ἐγκράτεια appears very rarely – apart from 2 Pet only four more times. In 1 Cor 7:9 (here in the verb form) it refers to sexual restraint, but in Gal 5:23 restraint/control closes the list of the fruits of the Spirit; one can presume that its understanding is not limited to the sexual, sensual, but also the emotional sphere. Similarly in Titus 1:8, where self-control is listed among the qualities desirable in a bishop. In Acts 24:25 it appears in the context of Paul's teaching, which, in addition to Christological issues (faith in Jesus verse 24), also included ethical issues – righteousness and temperance – and eschatological issues – judgement. Here, too, temperance seems to have been treated quite broadly.

207 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:4.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Early Christian literature can shed more light on Peter's understanding of temperance. Of course, in some texts, especially in the catalogues of the virtues, ἐγκράτεια is treated very generally, without defining what it refers to – so, for example. in the letters already quoted in *1 Clem.* 62:2 (between true love and soberness); 64:1 (between patience and purity, which may suggest that it refers to spheres of life other than sexuality), in *Barn.* 2:2 (after long-suffering), in *The Shepherd* of Hermas in Commandment VI 1:1 (after fear of God) and in Similitude IX 15:2 (between faith and power). Other texts illuminate in more detail various aspects of temperance – e. g. its origin, effects, purpose, practical dimension. In *1 Clem.* 35:2 self-control, placed between assurance in faith and holiness, along with the other virtues, is available to our understanding, reminiscent of Peter's reflection on temperance as a corollary to knowledge. A very active understanding of the virtues is emphasised in *1 Clem.* 30:3; self-control is treated here as one of the components of righteousness: "Let us clothe ourselves with concord and humility, ever exercising self-control, standing far off from all whispering and evil-speaking, being justified by our works, and not our words". On the other hand, *1 Clem.* 38:2 makes it clear that temperance, by which one can remain pure, is one of the charisms; therefore, it must not be regarded as a personal merit, but as a divine gift: "Let him that is pure in the flesh not grow proud of it, and boast, knowing that it was another who bestowed on him the gift of continence".

Similar to 2 Pet 1:5–7 and to the active approach to virtues is *2 Clem.* 4:2, which encourages us to confess the Lord with our deeds: "Wherefore, brethren, let us confess Him by our works, by loving one another, by not committing adultery, or speaking evil of one another, or cherishing envy; but by being continent, compassionate, and good. We ought also to sympathize with one another, and not be avaricious". Since here shying away from debauchery and negative emotions are mentioned separately, self-control/restraint may refer mainly to eating and drinking.[208] Peter, however, does not make such a distinction, suggesting that the temperance encompasses a broad spectrum of sensuality and emotion, just as in *The Shepherd* of Hermas, in Vision III 8:4: "Another, […] is called Self-restraint ἡ δὲ […] ἐγκράτεια καλεῖται. She is the daughter of Faith. Whoever then follows her will become happy in his life, because he will restrain himself from all evil works, believing that, if he restrain himself from all evil desire, he will inherit eternal life. She is the daughter of Faith. He who follows her will find happiness in his life, for he will abstain from every evil act, trusting that if he restrains every evil desire, he will receive eternal life as an inheritance", and especially in Commandment VIII

208 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 413 points out that the Second Letter of Peter is written to a community living in a Hellenistic culture in which indulgence in table pleasures passing into gluttony was common.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

1:1–7. Here temperance is approached from two perspectives – the negative, i. e. what one should abstain from, and the positive, i. e. what one should not abstain from. In general, one must abstain from evil things, while one cannot abstain from doing good. Among the evil things listed are

> adultery and fornication, from unlawful revelling, from wicked luxury, from indulgence in many kinds of food and the extravagance of riches, and from boastfulness, and haughtiness, and insolence, and lies, and backbiting, and hypocrisy, from the remembrance of wrong, and from all slander. […] theft, lying, robbery, false witness, overreaching, wicked lust, deceit, vainglory, boastfulness, and all other vices like to these.

Using the example of fasting, Hermas shows in Similitude V 3:5–8 what these two aspects of abstinence specifically consist of:

> Thus, then, shall you observe the fasting which you intend to keep. First of all, be on your guard against every evil word, and every evil desire, and purify your heart from all the vanities of this world. If you guard against these things, your fasting will be perfect. And you will do also as follows. […] in the day on which you fast you will taste nothing but bread and water; and having reckoned up the price of the dishes of that day which you intended to have eaten, you will give it to a widow, or an orphan, or to some person in want, and thus you will exhibit humility of mind, so that he who has received benefit from your humility may fill his own soul, and pray for you to the Lord.

With the above overview, it is now possible to attempt to reconstruct Peter's understanding of temperance and his strategy for Christianising it. Undoubtedly, the close association of temperance/continence with knowledge, reason/intelligence was taken from Aristotle. This is why temperance was placed in the list of virtues immediately after knowledge. What Peter has in common with Greek philosophy and Philo is a broad understanding of temperance, which is not limited to the sexual sphere but includes all the senses and feelings. In this context, it is better to equate it with ascetically uninspired self-control. J.H. Neyrey[209] even points out that the affinity with Philo's sensual view of temperance is noticeable in the content of the entire letter, for Peter speaks out against the lack of control over sight (2 Pet 2:14), speech (2 Pet 2:12–13.18a.22) and sexuality (2 Pet 2:2.14.18b). Part of Theologisation of temperance is the recognition of it, following the sapiential literature in LXX, as a divine gift (Wis 8:21); like other virtues beginning with faith, it was given to man as a means to lead a godly life and escaping the corruption caused by lust. This escape aspect in particular is emphasised here, for temperance is related to

209 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 160; see also G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 606.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

not giving in to every lust (ἐπιθυμία) that causes corruption (φθορά). This, in turn, signifies the Christian freedom that Peter mentions in 2:19 (cf. Gal 5:13).[210]

The placement of temperance in the sorites of virtues describing the practical dimensions of faith suggests an active, works-based understanding of it. This makes the most common elements in Peter's account to be found in early Christian literature, especially in *The Shepherd* of Hermas. One might even venture to say that for Peter, as for Hermas, temperance has two dimensions – a negative one, consisting of escaping and avoiding the works behind lust, and a positive one, more implied than explicated, consisting of directing activity and freedom towards doing good.

Perseverance. The result of temperance is ὑπομονή "perseverance", sometimes translated as "patience". However, it is worth distinguishing between ὑπομονή and the term μακροθυμία (2 Pet 3:15), meaning God's patience with people. Etymologically, the noun ὑπομονή is a derivative of the verb ὑπομένω, and this consists of μένω – to remain, to stay, and the preposition ὑπό, thus indicating 'to endure', 'to remain', 'to wait', and literally 'to endure under (burden, hardship)'. It was originally used in military contexts, and not surprisingly it was also later combined with courage/fortitude (ἀνδρεία). This can be clearly seen in the writings of Plato and Aristotle.[211]

Already in the early dialogue *Laches*, Plato links perseverance to valour (192d; 194a) and to wisdom (194d). In *The Republic* (440cd), it is to measure oneself against injustice and harm until victory or death: "when a man believes himself to be wronged, does not his spirit in that case seethe and grow fierce (and also because of his suffering hunger, cold and the like) and make itself the ally of what he judges just, and in noble souls it endures and wins the victory and will not let go until either it achieves its purpose, or death ends all" (καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα πάσχειν, ὑπομένων και νικᾷ).

In *Nicomachean Ethics* (1115a–1117b), Aristotle repeatedly evokes situations in which valour implies not only courage but also perseverance and the necessity of exposing oneself and enduring unpleasant things in order to achieve a noble, ethically good goal:

> The courageous man, therefore, in the proper sense of the term, will be he who fearlessly confronts a noble death, or some sudden1 peril that threatens death; and the perils of war answer this description most fully. […] But the courageous man is proof against fear so far as man may be. Hence although he will sometimes fear even terrors not beyond man's endurance, he will do so in the right way, and he will endure them as principle dictates, for the sake of what is noble […]. The courageous man then is he that endures or

210 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 186; J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 67.

211 U. Falkenroth, C. Brown, *Patience*, [in:] *The Dictionary of the New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, p. 722.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> fears the right things and for the right purpose and in the right manner and at the right time, and who shows confidence in a similar way. For the courageous man feels and acts as the circumstances merit, and as principle may dictate. […] a thing is defined by its end; therefore the courageous man endures the terrors and dares the deeds that manifest courage, for the sake of that which is noble.

The Stagirite distinguishes between noble, morally beautiful valour and mere, sometimes incompatible with reason, lack of fear. Everything depends on the goal. The same can be said of perseverance/patience. A truly persevering/patient person endures difficulties and dangers without thinking of any reward and without taking credit for it. However, this cannot mean passive resignation, surrender and acquiescence to enslavement combined with fear or laziness.[212]

One of the most essential components of fortitude, and therefore of perseverance, is hope:

> He is also deficient in confidence; but his excessive fear in face of pain is more apparent. The coward is therefore a despondent person, being afraid of everything; but the courageous man is just the opposite, for confidence. […] for it is weakness to fly from troubles, and the suicide does not endure death because it is noble to do so, but to escape evil.

The second important element is the aforementioned enduring of annoyances, which brings Aristotelian fortitude very close to patience and perseverance: "men are sometimes called courageous for enduring pain. Hence Courage itself is painful; and it is justly praised, because it is harder to endure pain than to abstain from pleasure". Of course, for a man of valour, for whom life is of great value, the highest form of suffering will be death: "the death or wounds that it may bring will be painful to the courageous man, and he will suffer them unwillingly; but he will endure them because it is noble to do so, or because it is base not to do so". This means that bravery also manifests itself in the willingness to die for values and/or beliefs. This martyrdom perspective in the perception of valour and perseverance was taken over by the LXX.

In 4 Macc 1:11 and 1:17.12.23, fortitude and perseverance – ἀνδρεία καὶ ὑπομονή – are juxtaposed together as virtues by which the martyrs amazed even their oppressors, and the despot, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, called on his soldiers to have the same perseverance. Both virtues are to be proof that "reason rules the passions" (4 Macc 1:5.7.9.13–14), and both are rewarded: "The prize was immortality in endless life" (4 Macc 17:12). 4 Macc 9:30–31 perseverance is illustrated by the attitude of the second of the seven brother martyrs, who, when skinned, claims that virtue

212 Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

gives him joy, and that joy allows him to experience relief from torment. At the same time, perseverance is linked here to piety, as in 2 Pet 1:6b. In 4 Macc 17:4, the mother is said to place her persevering hope (literally, the hope of perseverance – ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς ὑπομονῆς) in God. This connection between courage, perseverance and hope was already emphasised by Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics* quoted above.

Philo of Alexandria is more restrained; in *De mutatione nominum* XXXVI 197 he lists fortitude among other virtues and recommends its cultivation:

> wisdom is a necessary good; folly is pernicious; temperance is desirable αἱρετὸν ἡ σωφροσύνη; intemperance is hateful; courage is a thing proper to be cultivated ὑπομονῆς ἄξιον ἡ ἀνδρεία; cowardice must be avoided; justice is advantageous; injustice is disadvantageous; holiness is honourable; unholiness is shameful; piety […] is praiseworthy; impiety is blameable.

It must be stressed that for Aristotle, and later for the Stoics and Jews, suffering in itself and the deliberate pursuit of it has little to do with valour, perseverance or any other virtue. Very bluntly, using irony, this is expressed by Seneca in *Ep. mor.* 67:

> If it is a good to be brave under torture, to go to the stake with a stout heart, to endure illness with resignation, it follows that these things are desirable. But I do not see that any of them is worth praying for. At any rate I have as yet known of no man who has paid a vow by reason of having been cut to pieces by the rod, or twisted out of shape by the gout, or made taller by the rack. […] I should prefer to be free from torture; but if the time comes when it must be endured, I shall desire that I may conduct myself therein with bravery, honour, and courage. […] not that hardships are desirable, but that virtue is desirable, which enables us patiently to endure hardships. […] For it is not mere endurance of torture, but brave endurance, that is desirable. I therefore desire that "brave" endurance; and this is virtue. […] When one endures torture bravely, one is using all the virtues. Endurance may perhaps be the only virtue that is on view and most manifest; but bravery is there too, and endurance and resignation and long-suffering are its branches. There, too, is foresight; for without foresight no plan can be undertaken; it is foresight that advises one to bear as bravely as possible the things one cannot avoid. There also is steadfastness, which cannot be dislodged from its position, which the wrench of no force can cause to abandon its purpose. There is the whole inseparable company of virtues.

The references associated with martyrdom and perseverance are alluded to in the New Testament texts. As in Aristotle and in LXX, perseverance is sometimes associated with hope and the attainment of some goal (so, e. g. Luke 21:19, Rom 5:3–5, Heb 12:1), although this is not explicit in all passages. In addition to an explicit con-

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

nection with suffering, tribulation, persecution (so e. g. 2 Cor 1:6, 6:4, 2 Thess 1:4, Rev 2:2–3), perseverance is also mentioned in New Testament catalogues of virtues and virtues, both those of a sorites nature – such as Rom 5:3–5, Jas 1:3–4 – and those where the relationships between virtues are not marked – such as 1 Tim 6:11, Titus 2:2. Some of the closest contexts do not clarify what the trials/tests refer to – they can be interpreted in terms of martyrdom, but they can also be understood in moral terms, as courage and perseverance in resisting temptation.

In these two aspects – related to martyrdom and ethics – perseverance also appears in early Christian literature. Since it is most often mentioned among the other virtues and is not accompanied by any additional descriptions or definitions, it is not possible to conclusively decide which aspect is dominant. In *1 Clem.* 62:2, already cited, temperance/self-control occupies the final position in the list, similarly in *The Shepherd* of Hermas in Commandment VIII 9, in *1 Clem.* 64:1 it appears between peace and patience, and in *Barn.* 2:2 it supports faith together with fear.

Peter's understanding of perseverance is undoubtedly firmly rooted in Greek and Roman ethics. From Aristotle, perhaps through the LXX and Paul's letters, the link between perseverance and hope is drawn. In the context of verses 3–4, it is primarily an eschatologically oriented hope, referring to the fulfilment of God's promises, which gives such an orientation to perseverance in verse 6b (cf. 2 Pet 3:3–5 and the lack of perseverance/patience in waiting for the Parousia).[213] Placing perseverance among the other virtues highlights its moral significance much more than its martyrdom significance. The association with temperance may point to the influence of Aristotle, who argues that it is more difficult to endure annoyances than to renounce pleasures. This would indicate a certain gradation of virtues in Peter's sorites. It is only after one has passed the stage associated with "escaping the corruption caused by lust" that one can seek to endure all temptations patiently and perseveringly, no longer only sensual and emotional temptations, but also those associated with the expectation of the fulfilment of God's promises and the second coming of Jesus. Active perseverance here means total trust in God, submission to His will[214] and the conviction that He only subjects the believer to such tests (concerning the moral, existential or even physical sphere) that the believer is able to bear. This, in turn, leads to the primary thesis of the author of 2 Peter that perseverance, too, is rooted in faith and, as a means to live "a godly life", must be regarded as God's gift and not as a merit or a reason for glory (cf. Rom 2:7).

Piety. Through perseverance, ἐυσέβεια 'piety' can develop. This term already appeared in verse 3, where, together with the noun ζωή 'life', it formed the hendiadys "a pious life"; thus, it had the function of a qualitative specifier. This time it

213 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 307.

214 J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 68–69.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

occurs independently, so that it becomes semantically autonomous and concrete. As mentioned, in the Greco-Roman world ἐυσέβεια meant above all respect, loyalty and duties to gods, parents, ancestors, relatives, fellow citizens and social institutions.[215] The fulfilment of these duties was regarded as one of the more significant virtues. The Hellenised Jewish tradition, on which the author of 2 Peter seems to have drawn in this case, has a slightly different view of piety. One can see a close affinity between Peter's depiction of piety and the description of piety in *The Letter of Aristeas* (18, 229, 255):

> For when men from pure motives [piety] plan some action in the interest of righteousness and the performance of noble deeds, Almighty God brings their efforts and purposes to a successful issue […] What is it that resembles beauty in value? […] Piety, for it is the pre-eminent form of beauty, and its power lies in love, which is the gift of God. […] And most important of all, by the power of God every plan of yours will find fulfilment because you practice piety.

Both texts emphasise the active aspects of piety and treat it as God's gift and/or God's help in fulfilling good intentions.

It is no coincidence that *The Letter of Aristeas* repeatedly connects piety with justice (24, 131, 215), in order to show that this active piety, understood as conduct towards people, is in fact nothing other than the justice shown to them:

> Wherefore since it is acknowledged that we are accustomed to render justice to all men and especially to those who are unfairly in a condition of servitude, and since we strive to deal fairly with all men according to the demands of justice and piety […] Lawgiver first of all laid down the principles of piety and righteousness […] you must in every possible way, […] govern your words and actions by the rule of piety that you may have the consciousness that you are maintaining virtue and that you never choose to gratify yourself at the expense of reason and never by abusing your power do despite to righteousness.

On the other hand, piety means an attitude towards God – getting to know Him, showing respect to Him, fulfilling duties towards Him and imitating Him:

> I have received your letter and am greatly. I summoned together the whole people and read it to them that they might know of your devotion to our God […]. What constitutes piety? […] To perceive that God constantly works in the Universe and knows all things, and no man who acts unjustly and works wickedness can escape His notice. As God is

215 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3; J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 69.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> the benefactor of the whole world, so you, too, must imitate Him and be void of offence (*The Letter of Aristeas* 42, 210).

The same two aspects of piety – towards God and towards people – are distinguished by Philo, although he formally calls piety only conduct towards God, conduct towards people he describes as benevolence and justice. In *De spec. leg.* II LXIII he writes of two main principles shaping the various doctrines and teachings: "the regulating of one's conduct towards God by the rules of piety and holiness, and of one's conduct towards men by the rules of humanity (φιλανθρωπία) and justice (δικαιοσύνη); each of which is subdivided into a great number of subordinate ideas, all praiseworthy". Most likely, the practical understanding of godliness in 2 Pet 1:6c is also based on these two principles (cf. 2 Pet 3:11). Peter seems even more intent here on emphasising justice towards people as an essential component of godliness. This is evident from the gradation of the virtues in his sorite: the first, beginning with faith and virtue, followed by knowledge, temperance and perseverance, although they have a practical dimension, are internally oriented, serving personal self-improvement. Piety is a "transitive" virtue, making it possible to move from an internal orientation (piety as a personal relationship with God) to an external orientation, towards people, which will be realised in justice towards people, and then in fraternal charity and love for people in general.[216]

This understanding of piety fits well with the all-Christian view of this virtue. As already mentioned, the New Testament mentions it infrequently[217] – in Acts 3:12, several times in 1 Tim (2:2, 3:16, 4:7.8, 6:3.5.6.11) and in Titus 1:1. The closest to the context of 2 Pet 1:6c is Titus 1:1, where faith and the knowledge of the truth lead to piety. The early Christian *1 Clem.* 1:2 also emphasises the practical dimension of piety, which is one of the virtues listed in the catalogue: "Who did not admire the sobriety and moderation of your godliness in Christ? Who did not proclaim the magnificence of your habitual hospitality? And who did not rejoice over your perfect and well-grounded knowledge?". On the one hand, the context indicates an understanding of it as benevolence towards people; on the other hand, the mention of Christ's goodness implies an element of imitation of God (here Christ) familiar from *The Letter of Aristeas*.

Fraternal love. The penultimate virtue is φιλαδελφία 'fraternal love', which develops through piety. As already mentioned, in 2 Pet 1:6c and 7a one can see a shift from the predominant self-improvement in virtue towards actions calculated solely

216 Cf. P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 414–415, who speaks of the vertical virtues mentioned in verses 5–6 and the horizontal virtues mentioned in verse 7.

217 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 187, supposes that such a low frequency is due to the very general, imprecise meaning of the term ἐυσέβεια.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

for the benefit of others. Here, too, one can see a gradation, from actions for the benefit of family members to actions for the benefit of fellow human beings in general (verse 7b). In the first case, the author of 2 Peter uses the term φιλαδελφία etymologically limiting the circle of recipients of love to brothers (cf. φιλέω 'to love' and ἀδελφός 'brother'). This is the meaning of φιλαδελφία described extensively by Plutarch in his diatribe *On Brotherly Love* (*Moralia* 478D–479A).[218]

Plutarch derives fraternal love from observation of the human body, and therefore considers it to be something as natural as possible:

> And yet the illustration of such common use by brothers Nature has placed at no great distance from us; on the contrary, in the body itself she has contrived to make most of the necessary parts double and brothers and twins: hands, feet, eyes, ears, nostrils; and she has thus taught us that she has divided them in this fashion for mutual preservation and assistance, not for variance and strife. […] through the concord of brothers both family and household are sound and flourish, and friends and intimates, like a harmonious choir, neither do say, nor think, anything discordant.

He argues that love and friendliness among brothers and the unity of brothers in action are the greatest joy of parents and proof of the love, gratitude and affection shown to them: "they have made their brotherly love a sweet and blessed sustainer of old age for their parents". Later in the diatribe, using examples from mythology, literature and history, Plutarch presents both desirable and condemned relationships between brothers. Desirable ones include gentleness, patience, forbearance, readiness to apologise for one's own transgressions on the one hand and readiness to forgive transgressions on the other. However, no manifestation of hostility can be tolerated,

> every enmity between man and man which steals into the heart in company with the most painful emotions — contentiousness, anger, envy, remembrance of wrongs — causes pain and perturbation of mind; but when that enmity is toward a brother […]. Anxiety, anger and all negative feelings should be suppressed as quickly as possible. In this regard, Plutarch gives the example of the Pythagorean community, who, though related not at all by birth, yet sharing a common discipline, if ever they were led by anger into recrimination, never let the sun go down before they joined right hands, embraced each other, and were reconciled […]. It is therefore of no slight importance to resist the spirit of contentiousness

218 Plutarch's notion of brotherly love can also be understood as love between siblings in general. However, it seems that the philosopher is keen on showing equality between brothers, and when describing the brother-sister relationship due to the social relations of the time, it would have been difficult to achieve this.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> and jealousy among brothers when it first creeps in over trivial matters, practising the art of making mutual concessions, of learning to take defeat, and of taking pleasure in indulging brothers rather than in winning victories over them". An element of fraternal love, however, is also admonition, even sharply, openly "pointing out with all frankness his errors of commission and of omission. For one should neither give free rein to brothers, nor, again, should one trample on them when they are at fault (for the latter is the act of one who gloats over the sinner, the former that of one who aids and abets him), but should apply his admonition as one who cares for his brother and grieves with him.

There is a very strong emphasis on empathy and equality by removing the divisions between "mine" and "yours" and condoning the sharing and equal use of all goods, including intangible ones. This feature is particularly important in the context of Peter's strategy of integration and equating elements belonging to different traditions:

> in the matter of a family estate after the manner of Plato's advice to the citizens of his state, to abolish, if possible, the notion of "mine" and "not mine", but if he cannot do this, to cherish equality and cling to it […] all manner of inequality is dangerous as likely to foster brothers' quarrels […] One would therefore advise a brother, in the first place, to make his brothers partners in those respects in which he is considered to be superior, […] if he is a cleverer speaker than they, to make his eloquence available for their use as though it were no less theirs than his; in the next place, to make manifest to them neither haughtiness nor disdain, but rather, by deferring to them and conforming his character to theirs, to make his superiority secure from envy and to equalize, so far as this is attainable, the disparity of his fortune by his moderation of spirit (*On Brotherly Love* 4).

Perhaps the author of 2 Peter drew on Plutarch that the relationship between brotherly love and love for people in general:

> For it is first necessary to show love to those closest to one another in order to be able later to call others brothers: Or what sort of man is he who addresses his comrade as "brother" in salutations and letters, but does not care even to walk with his own brother when they are going the same way? For as it is the act of a madman to adorn the effigy of a brother and at the same time to beat and mutilate the brother's body, even so to reverence and honour the name "brother" in others, but to hate and shun the person himself, is the act of one who is not sane and has never yet got it into his head that Nature is the most holy and great of sacred things.

With all these analogies, however, it is worth noting a very significant difference between Plutarch's and Peter's depiction of brotherly love. Plutarch repeatedly insists

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

that it is natural, and that it is unnatural to hate siblings. Peter, on the other hand, seems to argue that, like the other virtues, it is given by God so that man can lead a godly life. It is also derived from faith, which is at the root of all the virtues, and is directly dependent on piety, or rather on that aspect of it which can be described as justice. For justice means treating the brethren with reverence, respect and equality.

The concept of φιλαδελφία is also not alien to the Jews. In LXX it appears in the books of Maccabees in two senses. The first is similar to that of Plutarch and describes family relationships (so, e. g., in 4 Macc 13:23.26, 14:1, when referring to the love that the martyr brothers had for and showed for each other). The second oscillates towards friendship (so, for example, in 2 Macc 14:15, where the prophet Jeremiah is referred to as φιλάδελφος – "friend of the brothers"). Josephus Flavius uses it when describing relations in Herod's family (*Bello Iud.* I 14:1, I 24:4):

> Herod did the more zealously pursue his journey into Arabia […] to get money of the king, while his brother was yet alive. […] Now he was ready to give three hundred talents for his brother, and intended to desire the intercession of the Tyrians, to get them accepted; however, fate had been too quick for his diligence; and since Phasaelus was dead, Herod's brotherly love was now in vain [εἰς κενὸν Ἡρώδης φιλάδελφος ἦν]. [Herod summoned his sons], he admonished them as a father, and exhorted them to love their brethren.

In *Ant.* II 6:9 the term φιλαδελφία appears when reporting the trial to which the brothers were subjected by Joseph in Egypt (cf. Gen 45:1–3): "I find you better men than I could have expected from what you contrived about me. Indeed I did all this to try your love to your brother e ἐπὶ πείρᾳ τῆς ὑμετέρας φιλαδελφίας". In the same context, this notion is used by Philo in *De Josepho* XXXVII: "Then when they were brought before the governor of the country they displayed their real affection and brotherly love προσαχθέντες φιλάδελφον with genuine feeling […] falling all together at his knees as if they were all liable to be punished for Theft […], and gave themselves up to him, and offered to submit to voluntary slavery". The treatise *De legatione ad Caium* XII 87 defines the relationship between the twin sons of Jupiter as follows: "Have you imitated the twin sons of Jupiter in their brotherly affection?" The term is thus used in its basic sense to describe the natural relationship between siblings/brothers. A distinct new focus is given to it by Christianity.

Rather, in NT, φιλαδελφία means respect, loyalty, solidarity and is not limited to relationships between biological siblings, but applies to members of the community (Rom 12:10, 1 Thess 4:9, Heb 13:1, 1 Pet 1:22, cf. Matt 23:8, Mark 3:32–35). The author of 2 Peter makes only half-hearted use of this understanding of fraternal love. In Peter's catalogue of virtues, φιλαδελφία refers to the relationship between brothers in the most literal sense possible. For the author, like Plutarch, believes that there can be no love in the more general sense – as φιλανθρωπία and/or ἀγάπη

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– if it is not practised within the circle of loved ones. It should also be noted that it is likely that in the concept of φιλαδελφία in 2 Peter the greatest role is played by the same elements that characterised brotherly love in Plutarch, i. e. concord, harmony, gentleness, patience, forbearance, but also seeing weaknesses, negativities in the conduct of the brothers and admonishing them without exaltation, triumphalism or malice. In the context of the integration strategy of the author of the letter, it will be particularly important here to emphasise the idea of equality between brothers who have been equally equipped by the Father, endowed with the same gifts, the same dignity, without favouritism or favouritism. For these gifts, children should show their gratitude to the Father, and, as the moralist from Chaeronea states, one of the ways of showing love and gratitude to parents is precisely fraternal love.

Obviously, on this literally understood brotherly love the formation of the egalitarian structure of the Christian community is based. It was also perceptible externally – not only in deeds but also in gestures, such as the exchange of kisses (Rom 16:16, 1 Cor 16:20, 2 Cor 12:12, 1 Thess 5:26, 1 Pet 5:14) practised among close family members, friends and Christians.[219]

Although brotherly love within the family was regarded as a model of behaviour, as Peter Hugh Davids notes,[220] when transferred to relationships between members of the Christian community it was ridiculed and discredited by opponents of Christianity. Perhaps this is why it appears so rarely in the catalogues of the virtues of the first/ second and second centuries. In fact, it is only mentioned in The Acts of John 29 after such virtues as fellowship, gentleness and kindness, The Acts of Peter (*Actus Vercellensis*) 2 between knowledge, wisdom and hospitality, and in *The Shepherd* (Commandment VIII 10) recommends "watching the brotherhood". Earlier, he mentions these behaviours, which are in turn ridiculed by Lucian of Samosata in *The Passing of Peregrinus*. Namely, the Christians took great care of the imprisoned impostor Proteus (Peregrinus), and this was due to the doctrines they had adopted and, according to Lucian, far-reaching naivety and credulity:

> every other form of attention was shown him, not in any casual way but with assiduity, and from the very break of day aged widows and orphan children could be seen waiting near the prison, while their officials even slept inside with him after bribing the guards. Then elaborate meals were brought in, and sacred books of theirs were read aloud […] Indeed, people came even from the cities in Asia […], to succour and defend and encourage the hero. They show incredible speed whenever any such public action is taken; for in no time they lavish their all. […] The poor wretches have convinced themselves, first and foremost, that they are going to be immortal and live for all time […], their first lawgiver persuaded

219 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 417.

220 Ibid., p. 418.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> them that they are all brothers of one another […] they despise all things indiscriminately and consider them common property […]. So if any charlatan and trickster, able to profit by occasions, comes among them, he quickly acquires sudden wealth by imposing upon simple folk.

This attitude is defended by Tertullian, who in *Apology* 39 seems to use arguments taken almost verbatim from Plutarch's and Peter's understanding of brotherly love. Christians, therefore, admonish each other, share goods, support orphans, the poor, bury the dead, and finally

> call each other brethren; for no other reason, as I think, than because among themselves names of consanguinity are assumed in mere pretence of affection […]. At the same time, how much more fittingly they are called and counted brothers who have been led to the knowledge of God as their common Father […] we do not hesitate to share our earthly goods with one another. All things are common among us but our wives.

As already pointed out, although Peter explicitly refers in his catalogue to Plutarch's understanding of brotherly love, the essential equation between the two accounts is the origin of love for the brothers. For Plutarch, this love is natural; for Peter, like the other virtues, it is a gift and equipment necessary for a pious life, and its origin is faith. This implication in turn provides a very good transition to love crowning Peter's catalogue of virtues.

Love/charity. Peter's catalogue of virtues concludes with "love" ἀγάπη. It is no coincidence that "love" in such a general sense follows "brotherly love". As has already been said, this is for two reasons. Firstly, it is difficult to require someone who does not maintain correct relations with his biological siblings to cultivate fraternal love towards unrelated persons, even towards friends. Secondly, because fraternal relationships are transferred not only to friends and members of the Christian community, but to all people, including those who are not friendly towards Christians. One can see here a certain inversion from what Plutarch, among others, preached. For the moralist from Chaeronea, it is fraternal love that is the ideal to be pursued, and universal love and friendship only its shadow: "For most friendships are in reality shadows and imitations of that first friendship which Nature implanted in children toward parents and in brothers toward brothers" (*On Brotherly Love* 479D). For Peter, the ultimate, culminating link of the sorites, and therefore the virtue standing highest in the hierarchy, *summum bonum*, is love,[221] the source of which is not natural but divine (cf. 1 John 4:8), and therefore includes not only brothers and friends but also enemies. Thus, instead of the evocative term

221 J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 71.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

φιλανθρωπία, the author of 2 Peter uses the term ἀγάπη, which does not appear very often in extra-biblical literature. It can be found, for example, in Aesop's fable *The Eagle and the Fox*, where he describes the friendship of the fox and the eagle, in *De libertate dicendi* 13a:3 by Philodemus of Gadara, where he describes the feeling of love that binds people together, in *Quod Deus sit immutabilis* XIV 69 by Philo of Alexandria, where he speaks of one of the attitudes – besides fear – towards God, or, finally, a hymn in honour of Isis (Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1380:109) from the first/second century.[222] In Greek literature, the verb ἀγαπάω is more often found, usually as a synonym of φιλέω, less often as an equivalent of ἐράω; it means to like, to show friendship, to respect, to love.[223] By contrast, there is no evidence that the Greeks considered ἀγαπάω (and by extension ἀγάπη) to be some unique or supreme, spiritualised form of love. On the contrary. Plato in *Symposium* (180b) and *Phaedrus* (253) uses the verb ἀγαπάω with clear sexual connotations, and similarly Anaxilas Comicus (fourth century BC; *Fragmenta* 22:1).

The notion of ἀγάπη was thus taken by the author of 2 Peter most likely from the Christian sociolect, which was probably influenced by the use of the term in LXX. In this way he Christianises his list of virtues. For love, as has already been said, is one of the most important elements of Christian catalogues. It appears, among others, in Rom 5:3–5, 2 Cor 8:7, Gal 5:5–6:22, Eph 4:2–4, Col 1:4–5, 1 Thess 1:3, 5:8, 1 Tim 4:12, 6:11, 2 Tim 2:22, 3:10, Titus 2:2, Heb 10:22–24, 1 Pet 1:21–22) often occupies a final position (Rom 5:3–5, 2 Cor 8:7, Gal 5:5–6, Heb 10:22–24 together with the practical aspect – good works; 1 Pet 1:21–22), as explained by the apostle Paul in 1 Cor 13:13. Peter seems to embrace this Pauline hierarchy and, at the same time, the very egalitarian and inclusive understanding of ἀγάπη most prevalent in the New Testament, which puts neighbour first (Heb 6:10, 10:24), includes enemies (cf. Matt 5:43–48); the model and source of such love is Jesus (John 3:16, Rom 5:6–8, 1 John 4:8).[224]

Like the other virtues, love/charity is also understood actively, as actuals deeds, and not merely declaratively. It manifests itself primarily in acts of charity, as Tertullian, quoted above, wrote extensively about in *Apologia* 39. At the same time, placing charity after fraternal love presupposes that a certain egalitarianism is also transferred to it. Ἀγάπη, like φιλαδελφία, does not presuppose a hierarchical relationship of the donor (usually standing above) – beneficiary (standing below) type, but the equality of those who love.[225] The same applies to good deeds towards one's enemies – they must not stem from a sense of any superiority, whether related

222 W. Günther, H.-G. Link, *Love, ἀγαπάω, ἀγάπη*, [in:] *New International Dictionary of the New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, p. 539.

223 Ibid.

224 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 613.

225 Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to material goods or moral superiority. In general, therefore, it can be said that such love is not based on any passion – πάθος, on the contrary, is not subject to lusts and passions. Like the other virtues, love/charity is a gift of God and equips the believer for a godly life and flows from faith standing at the beginning of Peter's catalogue of virtues.

A similar understanding of love was adopted by early Christian writers. It appears twice in the list of virtues in *1 Clem.* 62:1–2, and the context and placement here seem to allude, on the one hand, to the New Testament epistles and, on the other hand, to Plutarch's account of relations in the Pythagorean community:

> Concerning the things pertaining to our religious observance which are most profitable for a life of goodness to those who would pursue a godly and righteous course, we have written to you, men and brethren, at sufficient length. For concerning faith and repentance and true love (περὶ γνησίας ἀγάπης) and continence and soberness and patience, […] putting you in mind that you ought in righteousness and truth and long-suffering to be well-pleasing to Almighty God with holiness, being of one mind — not remembering evil— in love (ἐν ἀγάπῃ) and peace with instant gentleness.

Particularly noteworthy is the use of the term ἀγάπη in *The Shepherd* of Hermas. In Vision III 8:5.7–9, already cited several times, the catalogue of virtues begins and ends similarly to 2 Pet 1:5–7, with Faith (Πίστις), the mother of all virtues, personified first, and Love (Ἀγάπη) born of Knowledge (Ἐπιστήμη) last. The practical, active aspect of the virtues and their eschatological orientation is emphasised: "Whoever devotes himself to these, and is able to hold fast by their works, shall have his dwelling in the tower with the saints of God". The final position of love is also occupied in Similitude IX 15:2 after the personified Faith, Continence, Power, Patience, Simplicity, Innocence, Purity, Cheerfulness, Truth, Understanding and Harmony, which can be considered the equivalent of brotherly Love. At the end of this list is the promise: "He who bears these names and that of the Son of God will be able to enter into the kingdom of God". Love is also mentioned in the Gnostic writings of the second century. – in The Acts of John 29 and purged of Gnostic elements in The Acts of Peter (*Actus Vercellensis*) 2 of the fourth century, where, as mentioned above, it is distinguished from brotherly love in the same way as in the Second Letter of Peter: "Wherefore, ye servants of God, arm yourselves every one in your inner man with peace, patience, gentleness, faith, charity, knowledge, wisdom, love of the brethren, hospitality, mercy, abstinence, chastity, kindness, justice".

Usually commentators claim that it is love ἀγάπη crowning Peter's sorites that distinguishes the catalogue of virtues characteristic of Greek philosophical ethics from the list of Christian virtues, because Christian ethics is first and foremost

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

an ethics of love.[226] This would also be justified from a rhetorical point of view – love is the virtue standing highest in the hierarchy presented, although the formal finishing of the sorites with a conclusion connecting the first link to the last one is missing here. It would be easy to reconstruct – love of neighbour stems from faith as a divine gift. R. Bauckham sees here a double hierarchy:[227] on the one hand all the virtues are derived from faith, and on the other hand the chain culminates in love. All the virtues are rooted in faith, all are regarded as divine gifts and equipment necessary to lead "a godly life" and "escape corruption" in order to share in "the divine nature", and all represent and concretise the practical dimension of faith marked in verse 1c. But Peter's thought does not end there. For it must be remembered that this practical dimension was also discernible in knowledge in verse 2b, and, as noted, the semantic fields of Peter's understanding of faith (πίστις) and knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) largely overlap. This can be seen even more clearly when verses 5–7 are joined by verse 8, which concludes the catalogue of virtues, in keeping with the art of rhetoric. It is in verse 8 that the typical sorites conclusion appears, which links the first link – faith – with the last link – knowledge.

Thus, the framework of the chain of virtues is formed by faith on the one hand and, unexpectedly, not by love but by knowledge on the other. In this way, Peter creates a link between faith and knowledge. This link would be the practical dimension of both faith and knowledge, already implied and, as it were, announced in the prescript, now developed by the chain of virtues. Only now it is possible to mention a double hierarchy – all the virtues are rooted in faith (the first link), and all – as stated in verse 3 – are given "through the knowledge" διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως (through the last link). In verse 8 this interdependence of faith and knowledge and their common practical dimension are developed and given as a rhetorically sound summary conclusion. Moreover, the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ here functions even more explicitly than faith to Christianise the catalogue of virtues well known to the Greek moralists.

The pronoun ταῦτα, which begins verse 8, refers to the virtues just mentioned (verses 5–7),[228] but formally – as neut. pl. also refers to "all that is needed for a pious life" in verse 3, where the pronoun πάντα is used in the same form. The verb ὑπάρχω in part. neut. pl. (ὑπάρχοντα) – 'to have in one's possession, to have at one's disposal' – and the verb – πλεονάζω in the same form (πλεονάζοντα), which means 'to become more and more', 'to increase', 'to multiply', 'to grow', 'to abound'. Both participles – ὑπάρχοντα and πλεονάζοντα – occur here in praes. activi. And although part. praes. can refer to both the present and the future, it is clear from

226 J.D. Charles, *The Language*, p. 71; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 187.

227 Ibid.

228 So, for example, G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 614.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the pragmatics and syntax of the sentence that both participles are to be associated with the present. This in turn confirms that "the pious life" and all that is necessary to live it concerns the present, not the future, and implies a continuous process of using and multiplying the gifts given.[229]

It is worth noting the similarities in meaning between the verb πλεονάζω in verse 8a and the verb πληθύνω in verse 2, which referred to multiplying, magnifying of grace and peace. Grace and peace are multiplied until they reach their fullness in the end times.[230] The same thought is repeated now – the gifts and equipment for godly living – the virtues mentioned in verses 5–7 – are to be multiplied until they reach their fullness and lead to full communion with God, participation in the divine nature, also in the end times. However, it is important to note the difference in the form of the close verbs in verse 2a and verse 8a. In verse 2 πληθύνω is used in aor. pass., and this passive voice has been interpreted as pass. theologicum. This means that the author of the multiplication of grace and peace is God Himself. In verse 8a, πλεονάζοντα is part. praes. act., suggesting that the recipients of the letter themselves, having these virtues at their disposal, should see to the growth of each virtue (cf. 1 Thess 3:12, where πλεονάσαι occurs in opt. aor. act. and points to God as the agent, and 2 Thess 1:3, where the subject of πλεονάζει in ind. praes. act. is love itself).

This activation of the recipients in verse 8a corresponds well with the call for their earnest efforts in verse 5 and confirms the earlier intuition about the expansion of the sorites and framework composition of verses 5–8. Given this activation and the parallels with verse 5 (and verse 10), where the imperative mode is used, L.G. Green suggests that the participles in verse 8a should be interpreted as the imperative: "have at your disposal and multiply".[231] However, one should note a certain difficulty in translating the whole of verse 8 and in properly qualifying the sentences that constitute it. This is due to the lack of formal exponents of cohesion apart from the particle γάρ in 8a. There are proposals to treat verse 8 as a conditional sentence with *protasis* in 8a ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα "[if you] have these at your disposal and multiply in them" and apodosis in 8b:[232] οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν "[they] do not make/render [you] idle and unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ". There is also the possibility of a consequential and at the same time emphatic interpretation of verse 8, especially 8a, in relation to all that was said earlier, in verses 3–7, about God's gifts, their purpose and their interdependence: "[and for this very reason; therefore] you have these at your disposal and multiply them; [they] do

229 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 231.

230 Cf. analysis of 2 Pet 1:2.

231 L.G. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 615.

232 Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

not make [you] idle and unfruitful". Here, however, there is some doubt about the injunction in verse 5 – what place to assign to it in the whole of this consequential construction. Therefore, the most likely reading of verse 8a as a causal sentence directly referring to the sorites of the virtues of verses 5–7: "Because you have these at your disposal and multiply them, [therefore] they do not make [you] idle and unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ". Such an interpretation, moreover, is best suited to the rhetorical treatment of verse 8 as a sorites conclusion.

Verse 8b further highlights the previously noted active character of all the virtues that make up the practical dimension of both faith and knowledge. To make this more readily apparent, the author of 2 Peter uses the practice, popular in parenetic literature, of affirming an idea by introducing the negation of its opposite.[233] The most natural conclusion would naturally be that the virtues make believers productive and fruitful; meanwhile, the narrator has opted for a less natural but attention-grabbing negation: the virtues do not make believers unproductive/idle and unfruitful. In doing so, alliteration was employed – through *α-privativum* in the adjectives ἀργοί and ἀκάρποι – which in turn contributed to paronomasia. Additionally, the synonymy of the two terms would indicate the use of merism. Faced with these accumulated figures and rhetorical strategies, the recipients of the letter could not have passed by indifferently.

The adjective ἀργός essentially means a lazy person. Laziness and idleness were viewed very negatively in Greek culture and literature as well as in Jewish and later Christian culture and literature. Plutarch, whose views are close to those of the author of 2 Peter, in *That Epicurus Actually Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible*, argues that there is "nothing more inglorious than want of friends, absence of activity, irreligion, sensuality and indifference".[234] Dio Chrysostom, in his discourse *On Covetousness* (*Orationes* 17:4.7), sees laziness and idleness as vices that hurt the one who is characterised by them: "idleness everybody must certainly know is not only unable to provide the necessaries of life, but, in addition, is destructive to what one already has. […]. Idleness ἀργία, intemperance and, to express it in general terms, all the other vices without exception are injurious to the very men who practice them". Philo, on the other hand, in *De spec. leg.* II XX:101 considers laziness/ idleness to be a downright unnatural state, since nature itself "excites our bodies, and rouses them up to all the necessities and duties belonging to life, compelling those to work who would gladly be accustomed to cultivate the leisure of idleness, and an effeminate and luxurious life" ἀργῷ καὶ ἀβροδιαίτῳ βίῳ. In defending the Sabbath and the lack of activities on that day, he makes it clear that the Law "hates those

233 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 188.

234 Plutarch, *That Epicurus Actually Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible*, [in:] *Plutarch's Moralia in sixteen volumes*, vol.14, London 1967, p. 107.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

who desire to be indolent and idle" ἀργεῖν καὶ σχολάζειν (*De spec. leg.* II XV:60). In LXX, the term ἀργοί also means primarily those who do not work (Sir 37:11), but it can also indicate uselessness (Wis 14:5). Both meanings are taken over by the New Testament. Matt 20:3.6 speaks of those who stand idle; 1 Tim 5:13 links idleness with the talkativeness, nosiness and gossip attributed to young widows; Titus 1:12 lists them among the vices of the Cretans; while Matt 12:36 and Jas 2:20 emphasise uselessness close to fruitlessness.

The author of 2 Peter seems to have combined the two meanings in a sophisticated way. Firstly, the practice of the virtues compels action – the faithful are therefore certainly not idle. Secondly – practising the virtues cannot be useless if it leads to eschatological participation in the divine nature. These two distinctive Christian meanings can also be seen in *1 Clem.* 34:4: "[the Lord] exhorts us, therefore, with our whole heart to attend to this, that we be not lazy or slothful (μὴ ἀργοὺς μηδὲ παρειμένους – literally, that we should not be lazy or careless) in any good work". Here, moreover, the context is very reminiscent of that of Peter[235] – for it speaks of a zeal flowing from faith to do good, for all that is necessary for this, believers have received from the Lord (verse 3), and furthermore of an imminent eschatological retribution (verse 4).

"Uselessness" is emphasised even more strongly by the second adjective – ἀκάρπος used in a metaphorical sense. The metaphor of fruit as the result of actions was popular, especially in Jewish and early Christian circles. It appears in such a context in LXX, e. g. in Job 22:21, Wis 3:15, 4:5, Prov 10:16, 19:22, Sir 37:22.23, Ps 58[57]:12. The metaphor of fruit-bearing trees was known and used in relation to each other by the Essenes at Qumran (e. g. 1 QH 16:4–8.11–13.20),[236] although it should be noted that the image in Qumran literature has a somewhat different meaning, much more eschatological than ethical and much more pertaining to election.

The figurative meaning of fruit is frequently encountered in NT (Matt 3:8, 21:43, Mark 4:20, Luke 13:6–9, John 15:2–8, John 3:18. The closest to Peter's seems to be Gal 5:22 and Col 1:10 (cf. the inverted text in Eph 5:9), where the fruit of virtues and actions is spoken of in a positive sense. Fruitlessness, on the other hand, is literalised in Matt 13:22, Mark 4:19, Eph 5:11, Titus 3:14, Jude 12, where it is the opposite of a life full of good deeds. In early Christian literature, the fruitful life was given considerable space in *The Shepherd* of Hermas, in Similitude IV 3–5. First, a comparison is used: "For as in summer the fruits of each individual tree appear,

235 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 188 considers that such pairs of closely related adjectives may have been in early Christian literature to highlight the ethical implications of faith.

236 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 244. It should be noted, however, that the metaphor of fruit-bearing trees in Qumran literature has a slightly different meaning, much more eschatological.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

and it is ascertained of what sort they are, so also the fruits of the righteous shall be manifest, and all who have been fruitful in that world shall be made known". Hermas then referred to pagans and sinners as withered trees whose destiny is fire. Finally, he called for bearing fruit, but at the same time warned that action should not become an end in itself and eliminate service to the Lord: "You should therefore bear fruit, that in that summer your fruit may be known. And refrain from much business, […] for they who are occupied with much business […] being distracted about their affairs, and not at all serving their Lord".

In Peter's juxtaposition of ἀργοὶ καὶ ἀκάρποι, a strategy of integration can be seen alongside the rhetorical treatment. As shown above, the notion of "inactivity" was frequently encountered in Greek literature and can be seen as a representation of the Hellenistic tradition. The notion of "fruitlessness", on the other hand, can be considered a representation of the Judaic tradition. Placing them side by side in the context of the effects of ethical actions flowing from God's gifts on the one hand, and aiming at eschatological communion with God on the other, fits very well with the development of Thesis of the equal dignity of Christians resulting from the faith transmitted through various channels.

The predicate in verse 8b is the verb καθίστημι, usually translated as 'to do', 'to make'. However, it also means 'to lead', 'to conduct', which better conveys the progressive nature of both the chain of virtues and the two framework, key concepts – faith and knowledge. Thus, the virtues growing out of faith lead/conduct the faithful as "non-unproductive" and "non-unfruitful" to the ultimate goal of sharing in the divine nature. Here, the verb form καθίστησιν (ind. praes. act.) also points to development and ethical action in the present, in which future eschatology is anchored.

Knowledge ἐπίγνωσις was already mentioned in verse 2b and 3b. In both verses, knowledge was defined as a personal commitment to know the essence of God/Jesus, which leads to conversion understood as a change of thinking and to an ethically impeccable, i. e. pious life, which is also a manifestation of faith.[237] Similarly in verse 8b, which emphasises even more strongly this practical, ethical aspect of knowledge, which brings Peter's understanding of knowledge even closer to Peter's understanding of faith.

There is a great temptation to translate the phrase εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν intentionally – as acc. *finalis*: a sequence of virtues would lead to the knowledge of Jesus Christ. Such a translation, however, does not stand up to confrontation with verses 2b and 3b, where the phrases with the term ἐπίγνωσις were instrumental or causal. Since "through/due to/because of knowledge" one receives gifts and promises (verse 3b) and "through/due to/because of knowledge" grace and peace

237 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:2.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

are multiplied (verse 2), a similar meaning of εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν (acc. causae) is to be expected in verse 8b as well. There may be some doubt, however, about the preposition εἰς, which indeed in Classical Greek points primarily to the objective; instrumental and causative constructions are realised with the preposition ἐν (as in verse 2b). In Koine Greek, however, such a strict distinction is blured. The preposition εἰς begins to take over the functions of the preposition ἐν. Commentators generally agree, therefore, that εἰς in koine Greek forms both intentional constructions and causative and instrumental constructions, even if the latter two are rarer at the time of the New Testament writings than the former.[238] For this reason, there is a suggestion in the commentaries that εἰς in verse 8b should be translated safely as "with regard to/in relation to":[239] "And because you have this at your disposal/in you and multiplying/abounding in them, [therefore] [they] do not make/render [you] idle and unfruitful with regard to the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ". However, a translation analogous to verse 2b seems better: "thanks to/by knowledge/coming to know", which means that it is thanks to knowledge of Jesus Christ that the virtues of faith that gradually develop will not make the addressees of the letter unproductive/idle and unfruitful. On the contrary, it is through knowing Jesus Christ that the virtues growing out of faith will lead the faithful through life as active and fruitful/effective.

The above analysis reveals a certain ellipticity in. 8 – the causal (or instrumental) translation of the phrase εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν has no clearly formulated purpose. It is, however, possible to reconstruct it from verse 4 as an eschatological participation in the divine nature. Thus, Theological idea announced in verses 3–4 is reiterated: the eschatological, close relationship with God, being in his presence in the end times and in the post-eschatological era is rooted and begun in the present. The focus on theology rather than ethics means that the whole of 1:5–8 should be seen primarily as an outline of Peter's programme and a presentation of Theological themes addressed later in the letter (cf. 2 Pet 1:11).[240] Prominent among these is eschatology which is also the main axis of the conflict and polemic with the false teachers.

238 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 422.

239 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 308; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 188.

240 Ibid.; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 599.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

2.4 C. Synthesis of faith and knowledge – baptismal catechesis (2 Pet 1:9–15)

2.4.1 a. Negative example – forgetfulness (2 Pet 1:9)

[9]For in whom they are not present is blind [or rather] short-sighted, ignoring/forgetful of the cleansing of his old [committed] sins.

Having presented arguments that faith and knowledge, which are divine gifts, manifest themselves in the same – active – way, the author of 2 Peter continues his theological reflection without any clear separation of these concepts. On the contrary, he seems to integrate and synthesise them in order to indicate their common soteriological goal provided expressis verbis in verses 10–11 – "the entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ". In order to ensure that this purpose, and the main theological message, is not only noticed but also highlighted, it is reinforced by two contrasting statements. The first (verse 9) is essentially a warning against any attempt to ignore (λήθην λαβών) the requirements without which the entrance into the kingdom is impossible. The second statement (verses 12–15) is a reminder, intensified by repetition (ὑπομιμνήσκω, μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι), based on Peter's personal authority and a reaffirmation of the accepted truth, which can be considered here as synonymous and/or quintessential to faith and knowledge. Accordingly, the structure of verses 9–15 is as follows:

a. 1:9 – failure to use baptismal gifts and ignorance/forgetfulness of purification from sins (negative aspect);
  b. 1:10–11 – an encouragement to use baptismal gifts as a reinforcement of vocation and election and a theological thesis setting out the purpose of vocation and election – entry into the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ;
a'. 1:12–15 – reminiscent of the content presented in verses 3–11 (positive aspect); autobiographical themes with a transitive function.

So far, the author of 2 Peter has provided no details about the circumstances under which man receives everything he needs to live a godly life, to escape corruption and to become a partaker in the divine nature. He only presents details in verse 9, whose content and formal aspects has been deliberately contrasted with verses 3–8 and 10–15. The formal difference lies firstly in the fact that here there is a shift from the plural to the singular; and secondly in the use of negative imagery – a metaphor describing the condition of one (ᾧ – singular) who ignores his status as a Christian. Previously, such an explicit and rather conventional metaphor appeared only once, and in a similar – negative – context. In verse 4 the narrator declared that

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

corruption in the world that is caused by lust. Now, when he mentions blindness, he seems to be alluding to this metaphor, implying that ignoring God's gifts of faith and knowledge and the virtues that result from them makes one a blind man incapable of noticing the corruption in the world and escaping it.

In contrast to the sorites, which used primarily references to Greek tradition, the narrator now draws primarily on associations with Jewish tradition, both Old and Intertestamental. In doing so, he pursues his strategy of integration and equality between the two traditions.

Line 9, as noted, begins with the relative pronoun ᾧ, which indicates a shift from a communal to an individual perspective. This transition is dictated by rhetorical considerations – the narrator aims to move (*movere*) each reader separately. He also does not want to generalise, especially since he describes a negative phenomenon. The dative case here should be interpreted as dat. possessoris, as is evident from the closer and further context. The closer context is marked by the phrase μὴ πάρεστιν. The verb πάρειμι means 'to be present', 'to be at something', 'to be with someone'; it can also be translated as 'to have ownership', especially since part. neut. pl. παρόντα is often used in the sense of 'ownership, that which one possesses, that which one has'. This possessive meaning of the verb πάρειμι occurs frequently in Xenophon. In *Symposium* 4:42, Xenophon expresses the belief that "those who are most contented with what they have (παρόντα) are least likely to covet what belongs to others". Similarly, in *Cyropaedia* (*The Education of Cyrus*) VIII 4:6 he claims that it is: "not at all surprising that there was a great abundance of everything upon the table of a man who ruled over wide domains". Also in LXX πάρειμι can indicate the possession or disposal of something, not only material. In Wis 11:22 and 12:18, for example, it refers to power belonging to God/which God disposes of.

In this light, it is not surprising to treat the pronoun ᾧ as dat. possesoris, and consequently to translate the whole phase of verse 9a as: "one who does not dispose of these things", or "one who does not own these things", or "one who does not use these things". One can note here the semantic similarity of the phrase (μὴ) πάρεστιν ταῦτα to the participle ὑπάρχοντά in verse 8 – "that which is possessed", "that which is at one's disposal". Obviously the similarity is not coincidental, since both verses are about the same thing – God's gifts and the resulting dispositions to live a godly life, as indicated by the pronoun ταῦτα, which marks the subsequent context. This pronoun most often refers to the virtues mentioned in verses 5–7.[241] However, it could be taken more broadly, analogous to its previous uses in verses 3 and 8. Then it would clearly indicate all that is necessary for a pious life and escape from corruption, and needed to participate in the divine nature. Obviously, listed in a gradational, successive, dependent manner, the virtues are a particularisation

241 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 618.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of the general pronoun ταῦτα and πάντα and draw attention to the active aspect of the gifts given by God, which should not only be accepted but also practised by the beneficiaries. By linking the pronoun ταῦτα to God's gifts, one can better understand the whole argument of the author of 2 Peter's Epistle on the subject of the gifts, their reception and treatment by the faithful, as carried out in verses 3–8. The gifts, i. e. everything needed for a godly life, escape from corruption and participation in the divine nature (verses 3–5), should be cherished and strenuously sought so that through them further Christian virtues are developed. In other words – although faith, knowledge and the activities they generate do not belong to man's natural dispositions, but are gifts given by God, the believer should accept them as his property, treat them as his own possessions and use them as he would his own property, which also implies the constant multiplication of these possessions (cf. Matt 25:14–30, Luke 19:11–28).

One who does not treat the gift of God as his property and does not cherish it is called blind and visually impaired/short-sighted (literally short-sighted) τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων. While the noun τυφλός 'blind man' in biblical literature often appears in both literal and metaphorical senses, the participle μυωπάζων 'somebody squinting eyes' (more often translated as 'short-sighted') is a New Testament *hapax legomenon*.[242] At first glance, the juxtaposition of τυφλός and μυωπάζων might be considered a rhetorical device, a kind of binarism or merism, but what is surprising is the order of the terms used by the hagiographer – from the stronger ('blind') to the weaker ('short-sighted', 'visually impaired', 'squinting', suggesting incomplete loss of sight). This surprising sequence is explained by M. Green;[243] he claims that the author of 2 Peter quotes some decontextualised paroemia, a thought taken from Greek poetry, as indicated by the trochaic tetrameter used in this phrase τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων. However, explanations based on logical and rhetorical criteria are much more common. Sometimes, therefore, translations reverse this order and translate the whole sequence as a causal collocation: "he is so short-sighted that he cannot see".[244] G.L. Green argues that, in addition to indicating short-sightedness, the verb μυωπάζω could also refer to a condition called ophthalmia,[245] first described most likely already by Hippocrates. It manifests itself by blurred vision, loss of accommodation, sometimes swelling of the eyelids and photophobia, which of course causes squinting; untreated leads to blindness. The whole of Peter's phrase would thus be understood as a kind of warning – "he becomes a blind person who previously [only] squinted". J.N.D. Kelly also sees a collocational rather than

242 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 308.

243 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 160–161.

244 So, for example, Good News Bible/Good News Translation (GNB/GNT), see P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 424.

245 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 619.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

synonymous meaning here, and proposes that the participle μυωπάζων should be translated as "deliberately closing the eyes"[246] ("he is a blind man deliberately closing his eyes"). Such a translation would indeed correspond with another participial phrase, λήθην λαβών, which means to intentionally omit, to erase from memory.[247] Perhaps the phrase τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων should be translated as a kind of hendiadys, in which the participle μυωπάζων is a complement to the substantive adjective τυφλός, as it was in verse 3 with "life and piety". With this assumption, τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων can be translated as "a squinting blind man" or "a blind man closing eyes". Finally, one can try to separate this cluster and attribute the term "blind man" to verse 9a – a blind man is thus one who does not make use of God's gifts, while the term "a short-sighted man" would belong to verse 9c – a short-sighted man is one who deliberately forgets purification: "For in whom they are not present is blind [or rather] short-sighted, ignoring/forgetful of the cleansing of his old [committed] sins".

The above attempts to rationalise Peter's phrase, with the exception of the one separating the phrase τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων, are primarily based on treating the phrase in isolation from the rest of verse 9. Meanwhile, it is precisely verse 9c that helps to justify this order.[248]

There is no doubt that both terms – τυφλός and μυωπάζων – were treated metaphorically, and that the image of a man blind to various values, especially spiritual ones, belongs to the typical parenetic repertoire. In the Greek world, blindness primarily meant the inability to think rationally, to exercise sober judgement. This is the sense in which the metaphor is used, for example, by Josephus Flavius in *Con. Ap.* II 14: "Apion was therefore quite blinded in his mind τυφλὸς ἦν τὸν νοῦν, when, for the sake of the Egyptians, he contrived to reproach us". Similarly, Lucian of Samosata in *Vitarum auctio* 18, when Socrates rules that he who does not perceive the world of ideas is "spiritually blind".[249]

The image of a blind man as a sinner incapable of fulfilling God's commandments appears in OT, e. g. in Ps 146[145]:8, Isa 10:6, 43:8, 59:9–10. The metaphor is encountered in intertestamental literature – in TSim 1:8: "the prince of deceit sent forth the spirit of jealousy and blinded my mind, so that I regarded him not as a brother, nor did I spare even Jacob my father"; TDan 1:11: "For anger is blindness, and does not suffer one to see the face of any man with truth"; TJud 3:38, 3:41.45:

246 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 308.

247 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:9.

248 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:9.

249 Lucian of Samosata, *Sale of Creeds* (*Vitarum auctio*).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> For these things [promiscuity and greed] withdraw from the law of God, and blind the inclination of the soul, and teach arrogance, and suffer not a man to have compassion upon his neighbour. […] For he is a slave to two contrary passions, and cannot obey God, because they have blinded his soul, and he walketh in the day as in the night. […] And the prince of deceit blinded me, and I sinned as a man and as flesh, being corrupted through sins; and I learnt my own weakness while thinking myself invincible.

The metaphor of blindness, of not seeing is sometimes used by New Testament authors (e. g. Matt 15:14, 23:16, Luke 6:39, John 9:39–41, 12:40, Rom 2:19, 2 Cor 4:4, 1 John 2:11, Rev 3:17) and early Christian authors (e. g. *1 Clem.* 3:4: "For this reason righteousness and peace are now far departed from you, inasmuch as every one […] has become blind in His faith, […] walks after his own wicked lusts"). If one were to consider only the first part of verse 9, one would think that the narrator, like the other authors, is warning that focusing on one's own immediate, present desires, earthly and temporal needs, involves a failure to see divine matters, revelation, the future and especially future judgement.[250]

The author of 2 Peter in verse 9c, however, gives his metaphor an additional meaning related to baptism seen as "enlightenment", "the receiving of light" enabling one to see,[251] as is the case in Heb 6:4, 10:32 (cf. 2 Cor 4:4) and in early Christian literature, especially in *2 Clem.* 1:6: "Involved in blindness, and with such darkness before our eyes, we have received sight, and through His will have laid aside that cloud by which we were enveloped". In doing so, he proceeds in a rather unconventional manner. For the blind man he mentions is not one who will only receive enlightenment in baptism, but one who has already received this enlightenment in the act of baptism. This also explains, as mentioned, the use of the clarifying addition μυωπάζων 'short-sighted' after the term τυφλός. This is because the idea here is to indicate someone who was enlightened, even saw for a while, but did not make use of it. The whole phrase τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων can then be understood explicatively: a blind man is, in fact, short-sighted. 'Short-sightedness' then means receiving dispositions at baptism which, unused and unattended, do not lead to entry into the kingdom of God (cf. verses 10–11).

The blind man or rather the short-sighted one is additionally referred to in verse 9c as λήθην λαβών τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν – literally "taking the forgetfulness of purification from his former [committed] sins", confirming the suggestion of the participle μυωπάζων's specifying function in the

250 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 308; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 424; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 160.

251 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 189; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 423; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 159–160.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

baptismal context. The phrase λήθην λαβών is unique in the Bible, and the noun λήθη 'forgetfulness' belongs to the New Testament *hapax legomena*.[252]

In Hellenistic literature, the phrase λήθην λαβών quite often refers to the loss of memory – it appears in this sense, for example, in Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* II 9:1 ("And having in length of time λήθην λαβόντες forgotten the benefits they had received from Joseph"); IV 8:44 ("they should not forget the injuries of the Amalekites"). But λήθην λαβών can also mean deliberately ignoring something, relegating something to oblivion – as in *Ant.* II 6:8 ("I would have you also rather to forget the same" ὑμᾶς τε βούλομαι καὶ αὐτοὺς λήθην ἐκείνων λαβόντας). This is made even more explicit by *The Shepherd* of Hermas in Vision II 3:1, where the hero's call appears, albeit expressed in a different formula: "But as for you, Hermas, remember not the wrongs done to you by your children μηκέτι μνησικακήςῃς τοῖς τέκνοις, […] that they may be cleansed from their former sins". What also follows is an explanation of why guilt should be let go: "For the remembrance of wrongs works death μνησικακία θάνατον κατεργάζεται". And it is most likely in this sense – as a volitional act of forgetting what happened before – that the phrase is used in verse 9c (cf. 2 Pet 3:5.8).[253] The crucial difference is that Peter's forgetting is negatively characterised and treated as ingratitude and disloyalty. For in the ancient world, as P.H. Davids points out, an essential element of loyalty, especially in the relationship between benefactor and beneficiary, was the remembrance of the benefits that the beneficiary (client) had received from the benefactor (patron).[254]

The object of forgetfulness is expressed periphrastically as καθαρισμὸς τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν "purification from formerly [committed] sins". The rite, sometimes ceremony, of purification from uncleanness and/or from sins is often mentioned in OT both when the description concerns the enlistment of ritual uncleanness and when it concerns the purification from sins.[255] A synthetic description of ritual cleansing from leprosy based on Lev 13:45–14:32 is found in *Con. Ap.* I 31 Flavius:

> [Moses] forbad those that had the leprosy either to continue in a city, or to inhabit in a village; but commanded that they should go about by themselves with their clothes rent: and declares that such as either touch them, or live under the same roof with them should be esteemed unclean. Nay more, if any one of their disease be healed, and he recover his natural constitution again, he appointed them certain purifications, and washings, with spring water; and the shaving of all their hair; and enjoins that they shall offer many

252 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 232.

253 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 621.

254 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 424.

255 Lev 12, 13–14, 15, 16:19.30, Job 7:21, Ps 51[50]:4, Sir 23:10, 38:10, Ezek 36:33, Zech 3:3–4.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> sacrifices; and those of several kinds: and then, at length, to be admitted into the holy city.

In Qumran literature, purification is described with an emphasis on its initiatory character. *The Community Rule* (1QS 2:24–3:10) includes motifs familiar to that of Peter's. The rules of the Essene community are reminiscent of the norms of the Christian community mentioned in 2 Pet 1:5–8 in the form of sorites. Attention is also drawn to the reference to darkness as a counterpart to Peter's blindness, as well as to knowledge, the indication of obtaining dispositions to fulfil the commandments, and finally the descriptions of Baptist rituals:

> they shall all of them be in a Community of truth and virtuous humility, of loving kindness and good intent one towards the other, and (they shall all of them be) sons of the everlasting Company. No man [shall be in the] Community of His truth who refuses to enter the Covenant of] God so that he may walk in the stubbornness of his heart, for his soul detests the wise teaching of just laws. […] He shall not be reckoned among the perfect; he shall neither be purified by atonement, nor cleansed by purifying waters, nor sanctified by seas and rivers, nor washed clean with any ablution. Unclean, unclean shall he be. For as long as he despises the precepts of God he shall receive no instruction in the Community of His counsel. For it is through the spirit of true counsel concerning the ways of man that all his sins shall be expiated that he may contemplate the light of life. He shall be cleansed from all his sins by the spirit of holiness uniting him to His truth, and his iniquity shall be expiated by the spirit of uprightness and humility. And when his flesh is sprinkled with purifying water and sanctified by cleansing water, it shall be made clean by the humble submission of his soul to all the precepts of God.

This initiatory nature of Baptist purifications is confirmed by Josephus Flavius, describing both the customs of the Essenes and the practice of John the Baptist. In *Bell. Iud.* II 8:7 he indicates that a candidate for membership in the community "is made a partaker of the waters of purification; yet is he not even now admitted to live with them; for after this demonstration of his fortitude, his temper is tried two more years, and if he appear to be worthy, they then admit him into their society". On the other hand, describing the baptism of John in *Ant.* XVIII 5:2, he interprets it not as "the remission] of some sins [only,] but for the purification of the body".

In contexts similar to those known from the OT and Qumran, purification appears in New Testament literature. The Gospel narratives mention both cathartic rituals (Mark 7:2–4, Luke 2:22, John 2:6) and the significance of cleansing from leprosy (as absolution), for example (Mark 1:44, Luke 5:14). In epistles, statements referring to the salvific work of Christ are more common in cathartic contexts (Rom 3:25, Eph 2:1–5, Titus 2:14, Heb 1:3, 9:14, 1 John 1:7). Equally frequent are

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

texts referring to the practice of baptism, a form of Christian initiation involving cleansing from sins and enabling one to live a godly life and serve God, closely linked, of course, to the soteriological content.[256]

The author of 2 Peter, like most early Christian writers, here primarily combines the absolution and initiation of baptism. The former is emphasised with the phrase καθαρισμὸς τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν "the cleansing from old/formerly committed sins". A similar phrase "old/formerly committed sins", accentuating the temporal dimension, is found, among others, in Rom 3:25 and in *The Shepherd* of Hermas, in Commandment IV 3:1: "I heard, sir, some teachers maintain that there is no other repentance than that which takes place, when we descended into the water and received remission of our former sins ἐλάβομεν ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν τῶν προτέρων". This dimension of baptism is later developed by Justin Martyr in *The First Apology* 61. He refers to Isa 1:16–20:

> And how those who have sinned and repent shall escape their sins, is declared by Esaias the prophet […]; he thus speaks: Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from your souls […]. And though your sins be as scarlet, I will make them white like wool; and though they be as crimson, I will make them white as snow.

He goes on, citing this time the teaching of the Apostles, to explain the origin of the sins from which Baptism cleanses:

> Since at our birth we were born without our own knowledge or choice, by our parents coming together, and were brought up in bad habits and wicked training; in order that we may not remain the children of necessity and of ignorance, but may become the children of choice and knowledge, and may obtain in the water the remission of sins formerly committed, there is pronounced over him who chooses to be born again, and has repented of his sins, the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe.

Peter's hamartiology is not yet so advanced as to refer – as Justin does – to human nature corrupted by original sin. Most likely, when writing about sins committed in the past, the author of 2 Peter has in mind first and foremost indulging in the corruption of this world, which is caused by lust (2 Pet 1:4, cf. Eph 2:2–3) resulting perhaps from ignorance (cf. 1 Pet 1:14) and/or living according to pagan appetites/likes (cf. 1 Pet 4:3, where debauchery, lusts, drunkenness, revelry, drunkenness, idolatry, and 1 Cor 6:9–11 are mentioned among these pagan tastes).[257]

256 Acts 2:38, 22:16, 1 Cor 6:9–11, Eph 5:26, Col 2:11–14, Titus 3:5, Heb 9:14, 10:22, 1 John 1:9.
257 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 424.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The cleansing from these sins implies at the same time the beginning of a new, virtuous life[258] – here the initiatory character of baptism is revealed. From the beginning of the letter, the narrator has strongly emphasised the practical aspects of faith and knowledge, and has also listed the virtues that Christians should have, so pointing them out once again seems superfluous. Now, as already mentioned, he specifies, although more implicitly than explicitly, that everything needed to live a godly life, to escape corruption in the world and to attain participation in the divine nature, a person receives at baptism together with purification from past sins. In other words – at baptism the believer is equipped with the gifts to begin a new Christian life.

With this integral approach to baptism of absolution and initiation, Peter fits perfectly into the early Christian tradition. It should be noted, however, that he treated it in an unconventional, one might say inverted, manner. He first described the gifts and the way the baptism equips the believer (verses 3–8), and only now mentions the forgiveness of sins. Other authors usually follow the standard order: the forgiveness of sins and the equipment needed to live the Christian life. "Reckon not (μὴ λογίσῃ) every sin of Your servants and handmaids, but You will purify us with the purification of Your truth; and direct our steps that we may walk in holiness of heart and do what is good and well-pleasing in Your sight and in the sight of our rulers" – can be read in *1 Clem.* 60:2. Hermas writes similarly in *The Shepherd* in Similitude V 6:2–3:

> God planted the vineyard, that is to say, He created the people, and gave them to His Son; and the Son appointed His angels over them to keep them; and He Himself purged away their sins, having suffered many trials and undergone many labours, for no one is able to dig without labour and toil. He Himself, then, having purged away the sins of the people, showed them the paths of life by giving them the law which He received from His Father[259]

and the author of *The Epistle of Barnabas*, who first (6:11) speaks in general terms of baptism as a renewal, or rather a new creation: "having renewed us by the remission of our sins, He has made us after another pattern, [it is His purpose] that we should possess the soul of children, inasmuch as He has created us anew", and then (11:10–11) he already explicitly refers to ritual immersion, through which one

258 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 189.

259 Many authors showing the common motifs of 2 Pet 1:9c and early Christian writings additionally quote Vision III 2:2, 8:11 and Vision IV 3:4, where purification from sins is also mentioned. However, these texts are clearly eschatological in nature and do not correspond to Peter's context, which explicitly speaks of the forgiveness of sins committed earlier and the forgetting of the act of purification and the resulting dispositions and obligations.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

receives the remission of sins and the dispositions/goods to attain eternal life: "we indeed descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up, bearing fruit in our heart, having the fear [of God] and trust in Jesus in our spirit. 'And whosoever shall eat of these shall live for ever, This means: Whosoever, He declares, shall hear you speaking, and believe, shall live forever'". Justin Martyr, as said, in *The First Apology* 61 quotes Isa 1:16–20, which, after the call to wash, commands: "learn to do well; judge the fatherless, and plead for the widow".

In the context of the gifts received at baptism and the competences necessary to lead a godly life, which become the property of the Christian, it is worth noting the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ used here as a possessive pronoun. This usage corresponds with the concept of property, property (πάρεστιν ταῦτα) implied in verse 9a, which consists of God's gifts and competence to lead a godly life, and which must be guarded and multiplied. He who ignores and does not care for the dispositions received at baptism shows himself to be not only short-sighted but also attached to his former "property", i. e. sins; he ignores the fact that they have been forgiven and multiplies his former "property".

Although the example given by the author of 2 Peter has an individual, primarily existential dimension, as evidenced by the use of singular forms, one can also see communal aspects here (cf. verse 10 with plural forms). For baptism signified incorporation into the community and a declaration of adherence to its rules, which is closely linked to Peter's understanding of faith and knowledge, which includes, as noted, the reception of the Gospel content, conversion and its practical, outwardly visible aspects. This is very clearly stated by Justin Martyr: "As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and say is true, and undertake to be able to live accordingly" (*The First Apology* 61).

One usually sees in 2 Pet 1:9 an allusion to the conduct of the false teachers,[260] who were once incorporated into the Church, but who reverted to habits from before conversion and baptism, and even went further, denying the content of the faith professed at baptism (cf. 2 Pet 2:1.19–20). It must be strongly emphasised, however, that here the narrator's attention is not focused on the opponents. From the immediate context and Theology of the entire passage 2 Pet 1:1–15, it is clear that the author of 2 Peter wishes to focus rather on soteriological and eschatological content. This interpretation can be found in patristic commentaries. Hilary of Arles in his *Treatise on the Seven Catholic Epistles* wrote that when the virtues are present, people can see God; but if they are lacking, they will not see Him[261] and Oecumenus in his commentary on the Second Letter of Peter adds another Baptist element; namely that the short-sighted should be aware that they have been washed by

260 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 424; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 160.

261 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 124.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

holy baptism. After baptism, they are required to walk in the way of sanctification, without which no one will see the Lord[262] This is thus an encouragement to the recipients of the letter, expressed for rhetorical reasons through negative imagery, to make full use of the baptismal gifts because, as 2 Pet 1:4,11 argues, they ensure "participation in the divine nature" and "entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ". The encouragement is reinforced by a warning based on associations with the Judaic tradition prevalent here, in which all the unclean were excluded from the community and the crippled – including the blind and visually impaired – from being chosen and called to special service to God (cf. Lev 21:18–20, 1QM 7:4).

2.4.2 b. Positive example: eschatological soteriology (2 Pet 1:10–11)

> [10]Therefore rather, brethren, be diligent/strive earnestly/eagerly that your calling/invitation and election may be made certain/be confirmed: for by doing these [things] you will never stumble. [11]Thus/in this way the entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ will be abundantly provided for you.

In verses 10–11, which are Theological summary of the reflections so far, the author of 2 Peter uses a lexis similar to the one he had already used earlier, in verse 5: σπουδή – σπουδάζω; ἐπιχορηγέω. In this way, he accentuates the connection between the exhortations of verse 5 and those of verse 10. The injunction of verse 5 had a practical development: verses 5–8 list the virtues flowing from God's gifts – faith and knowledge – which enable one to lead a godly life, avoid corruption and lead to participation in God's nature (verses 3–4). Now the hagiographer once again calls for zeal in the use and development of the baptismal gifts and dispositions, giving a threefold justification: firstly, the need to give Christian witness; secondly, protection from stumbling and falling on the way to the eternal kingdom; thirdly and finally, entry into the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ. It is impossible not to notice the correspondence between the purposes listed in verses 3–4 and those described in verses 10–11; in each of these triplets, two elements relate to temporal life, one to future eschatology. The eschatological element is always prominent in some way. In verses 3–4 it occupies a central position between the indications relating to temporality; in verses 10–11 it occupies a final position.

262 Ibid., p. 124–125.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

verses 3–4	verses 10–11
A pious life Ζωὴ καὶ εὐσέβεια	Doing these things Ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες
Participation in the divine nature Γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως	Avoiding stumbling Μὴ πταίσητε
Escape from the corruption in the world [caused by] lust ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς	Abundantly providing [all that is necessary for] the entrance to the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμων καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

Line 10 begins with the phrase διὸ μᾶλλον, where the resultative conjunct – διό 'therefore' and the comparative adverb – μᾶλλον 'more/even more',[263] are juxtaposed side by side, suggesting that the further part of the sentence will denote the higher degree of the action described earlier. The problem is that verse 9 was describing a situation extremely different from the one presented in verse 10. A blind man, or rather a short-sighted man, is one who ignored the fact of baptismal cleansing from sins and did not treat the baptismal gifts as his property, an asset to be used and multiplied. Thus, it is difficult to regard the exhortation in verse 10 as a higher degree of the behaviours and omissions of verse 9. But it is possible to relate this intensification to verse 5, with which, as mentioned, verse 10 shares a similar lexis. Then both exhortations should be read as follows: "strive earnestly so that virtue may develop through your faith" (verses 5–7), and "strive even more that your calling and election be confirmed, for by/in doing these things you will never stumble" (verse 10).[264] It should be noted, however, that due to the distance between verses 5 and 10 such a connection is not obvious and easily discernible. Other researchers suggest, G.L. Green,[265] among others, that the sentence is constructed in such a way to show a result with the conjunction διό as the exponent, rather than a gradation with the adverb μᾶλλον, which in this case is best translated as an alternative to the attitude described in verse 9: "rather", or even as an interjection: "on the contrary". Therefore, the first clause in verse 10 reads: "Therefore rather, brethren, be diligent/strive earnestly/eagerly". Sometimes, in order to emphasise that it is a result clause, the adverb μᾶλλον[266] is omitted from the translation altogether.

In line 10 the plural forms are used again. The sender addresses the audience, using second person plural forms. By using two plural forms in his argumentation, he marks the contrast between the unaccepted, individual and non-dominant

263 Cf, e. g. "be even more diligent" (NKJV); "be all the more diligent" (ESV); "be all the more eager" (USCCB).

264 D. J. Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 48 links verse 10 with verses 3–9.

265 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 624–626; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 162.

266 E. g. "make every effort" (NIV).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

attitude in Christian communities (first singular in verse 9) and the desired, affirmed attitude adopted by a majority (first plural). The second person plural were used by the hagiographer to convey a positive content, presenting the equal effects of "our faith" and "your faith" (verse 1), wishing for increasing grace and peace (verse 2), encouraging the development of baptismal gifts (verse 5), and finally in the promise associated with the outward, active manifestation of these gifts (verse 8). He also does not deviate from this principle in verses 10–11. From a rhetorical perspective, this can be seen as an element of winning the favour of the audience, belonging to a typical *exordium* together with the presentation of the purpose and main message – the conditions for entering the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ, i. e. the eschatological content.

The sender refers to his recipients as ἀδελφοί brothers for the first time. This addressative form has a double function. Firstly, it is a rhetorical preparation for the transition – the idea is to focus attention on the content about to be given. Secondly, by means of this phrase the narrator equates the Christianity represented by the addressees with the Christianity represented by Peter, which is emphasised from the beginning of the letter (cf. verse 1). The naming of the addressees as "brothers" implies not only membership in the Christian family and fraternal relations between the members of this family (cf. φιλαδελφία in verse 7), but also the same gifts for all from God (and Jesus), equal privileges and responsibilities, and the possibility of using these gifts as property (cf. verses 5.9). The latter, together with the change in the tone of the narrative in verse 9, may lead to the observation that one who does not use and multiply this property can hardly be called a brother.

Although only the masculine gender – "brothers" – is used here, it can be assumed that the message is addressed to members of the community of both sexes,[267] This was typical of Jewish communities (Exod 2:11, 2 Macc 1:1, 1QS 6:10.22[268]), in NT texts and early Christian writings,[269] though in some communities sometimes both "brothers and sisters" were mentioned, as evidenced, for example, by the following. *2 Clem.* 19:1: "So then, brothers and sisters, ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἀδελφαί, after the God of truth I address to you an appeal that you may give heed to the words written".

---

267 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 190; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 625; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 426.

268 "No man shall interrupt a companion before his speech has ended […] if it be his destiny, according to the judgement of the Congregation, to enter the Community, then he shall be inscribed among his brethren in the order of his rank for the Law, and for justice, and for the pure Meal; his property shall be merged".

269 Rom 1:13, 7:1.4, 8:12, 10:1, 11:25, 12:1, 1 Cor 1:10.11.26, 2:1, 3:1, 4:6, 7:24, 10:1, 12:1, 2 Cor 1:8, 8:1, Gal 1:11, 3:15, 4:12.28.31, 5:11.13, Phil 1:12, 3:1.13.17, 1 Thess 2:1, 2:9.14.17, 4:1, 2 Thess 2:1.13.15, Heb 3:1.12, 10:19, Jas 2:1.5.14, 5:9.10, 1 John 3:13, *1 Clem.* 4:7, 13:1, 16:17, 37:1, 46:1, *2 Clem.* 1:1, 5:1, 7:1, 10:1, 13:1, 14:1.3.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

It is noteworthy that in the whole of the New Testament epistolography attributed to Peter, the phrase ἀδελφοί only occurs in 2 Pet 1:10. This means that the message introduced by this transition must be crucial for the sender.[270] Indeed, the structure of the text shows that it is this fragment that contains the synthesis of what has been said so far about faith and knowledge as baptismal gifts which, when developed, lead to the eternal kingdom occurs. The message itself consists of two elements: the exhortation in verse 10a and the promise in verses 10b–11.

The exhortation begins with the phrase σπουδάσατε, which contains the lexeme σπουδή already used in verse 5, where it referred to making earnest efforts. In the verb σπουδάζω the emphasis seems to be primarily on the effort, conscientiousness and perseverance accompanying the endeavour, as in 1:15 and 3:14 (cf. Gal 2:10, Eph 4:3, 2 Tim 4:21, Heb 4:11, *2 Clem.* 10:2, 18:2).[271] This is confirmed by the form of the aorist (imp. aor. act.), which suggests that these efforts should be complete and multifaceted,[272] followed by the first part of the promise: μὴ πταίσητε "not to stumble", which presupposes work and effort to maintain balance. The presupposition of effort to nurture and develop the baptismal gifts contrasts with the attitude of the blind, or rather short-sighted, person who only accepts the cleansing of past sins but does not work on the other gifts. This means that baptism must be treated initiatively, not finically; Baptist initiation, on the other hand, involves the assumption of Christian duties, the fulfilment of which does not always prove easy, but must instead become a priority of the Christian's life.[273]

The purpose of the Christian life effort[274] is expressed by the ACI construction – βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, literally: "that your calling and election be made certain/guaranteed". The adjective βεβαίος comes from juridical language – it means something that has been solemnly approved, ratified and thus made reliable and certain.[275] In the New Testament it also means something certain and reliable, as well as permanent, steadfast, firm, unshakeable, gaining power[276] (Rom 4:16, 2 Cor 1:7, Heb 2:2, 3:6, cf. also *comparativus* in 2 Pet 1:19). In Wis 6:17–22[277] the phrase βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας "the basis for incorruptibility" appears in a context similar to Peter's involving on the one hand the practice of virtues, on the other the desire to be close to God. This is summed up by the statement

270 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 426.

271 On the basis of the frequency of uses of σπουδάζω in 2 Peter, R. Bauckham (*Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 190) argues that this verb is one of the favourite concepts of the author of the letter.

272 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 162.

273 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 427.

274 D. Keating, *First, Second Peter, Jude*, Grand Rapids 2011, p. 214.

275 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 190.

276 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 427.

277 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 190; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 428.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

that "the desire for Wisdom leads to a kingdom" (Wis 6:20). Perhaps in keeping with the strategy adopted to integrate and Christianise both Hellenistic and Judaic traditions, the narrator here uses motivic and lexical associations with the sapiential text to show the continuity, the constancy of the inviolability of God's promises, which were once linked to the desire for wisdom, are now fulfilled in baptism and its gifts. In the baptismal context in 2 Pet 1:10, βεβαίος thus signifies the certainty and constancy of the baptismal promises (verses 3–4.10c-11), although their ultimate fulfilment seems to be stretched out in time and transferred to eschatological reality (cf. Heb 9:17). In this way, the narrator already in *exordium* prepares the audience for the need to arm themselves with patience and perseverance, which corresponds very well with the toil and effort of the introductory phrase in verse 10 (cf. 2 Pet 3:8–9.12).

The guarantee of the fulfilment of the promises, however, is not based on human efforts, but on God's actions, as is very clearly indicated by the verb ποιέω used here as inf. praes. pass., which should be interpreted as pass. theologicum.[278] This verb is rather unusual in a legal context; the verb ἔχω 'to have'[279] is more common in Greek juridical texts. The phrases "to have a guarantee" and "to guarantee", "to make a guarantee" differently indicate the agent and the beneficiary. In "to have a guarantee" the person of the beneficiary of the guarantee come to the fore. Peter's phrase – "to make a guarantee" – emphasises God's actions giving certainty to the fulfilment of promises. One can guess that this refers to the salvific actions of God observed throughout salvation history, but reaching their peak in the death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus Christ and in the proclamation of his second coming in judgement, and this kerygma was not only the content of faith (cf. verse 1), but also an essential component of Baptist catechesis. This means that the confirmation of "calling and election" is not a human competence, but a prerogative of God.[280] It is noteworthy that in the next segment of this verse the verb ποιέω appears, and people are the subject of the phrase ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες. The use of the polyptotone ποιεῖσθαι – ποιοῦντες with various agens attests to the conformity of human actions to the primary will of God. It should be noted, however, that some manuscripts use the personal forms of the verb ποιέω instead of the infinitive ποιεῖσθαι in verse 10b (perhaps on the basis of an analogy with verse 10c, due to

278 Differently M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 163, and J. McArthur, *2 Peter and Jude*, Chicago 2005, p. 77, who emphasise the reciprocal side here, and interpret the whole phrase in ACI as: "that you may confirm one another in your calling and election".

279 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 629.

280 Z.C. Hodges, *Making Your Calling and Election Sure: An Exposition of 2 Pet 1:5–11*, "Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society" 11 (1998), no. 1, p. 29–30; cf. G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 629; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 428, who argue that it is for the recipients of the letter to affirm their calling and election by practising the virtues listed in verses 5–8.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

an attempt to harmonise the subjects): ποιεῖσθε (so 1243. 2344), ποιῆσθε (so, inter alia, א A Ψ 5. 81. 307. 1735. 1852), ποιήσησθε (so 1175), which allow us to interpret the whole purpose sentence as a human activity aimed at affirming God's calling and election.

The terms κλῆσις and ἐκλογή "calling and election" are listed side by side, which clearly alludes to the Old Testament tradition on at least two levels: stylistic and semantic, while also confirming that the agent in this purpose sentence is God alone. At the stylistic level, the phrase κλῆσις καὶ ἐκλογή should be considered a merism. R. Bauckham, pointing to other such juxtapositions (e. g. Rev 17:14, cf. the somewhat distant concepts in 1 Cor 1:26–27), argues that the two terms have a very similar meaning.[281] And although this is indeed the case,[282] it is by revealing the Old Testament, Judaic background of both terms that it is possible to see how differently the two terms distribute their emphasis and how other aspects both emphasise.

In the Old Testament, as already mentioned when analysing verse 3, where the vocation is mentioned for the first time,[283] the one who calls is God. The Hebrew verb קרא occurs 730 times in OT; it means 'to make contact', 'to call by name', 'to give a name', 'to call to action and service' (1 Sam 3:4.6.10, Isa 43:1), and – what seems relevant in the context of Peter's *exordium* – 'to invite to oneself' and 'to form the people of God' (Isa 41:9, 42:6, 43:1–2, 48:12.15, 51:2).[284] Two aspects of vocation can be seen here – the individual aspect and the communal aspect. The first seems more existential, internal, the second more external and certifying. This translates into the New Testament meanings of "vocation" (Rom 9:11, 1 Thess 2:12, 4:24, 1 Pet 1:15, 2:9, 5:10). The called are, on the one hand, those whom Jesus calls to action and service (Matt 4:21); those who were/are sinners (Mark 2:17); and, on the other hand, those who make up the holy assembly, the Church (cf. Gr. ἐκκλεσία and ἐκ-καλέω).[285] The cleansing from sins and the bestowal of baptismal gifts in 2 Pet 1:3–9 can be linked to the individual aspect of vocation, the communal and attestation aspects are in turn linked to the references to the initiatory character of baptism in 2 Pet 1:9 (cf. Rom 1:1.6–7, 8:28, 1 Cor. 1:1–2.24).

In the New Testament tradition, there is also the image of "a call" to conduct oneself in a manner worthy of "vocation" (Eph 4:1, 1 Thess 2:12, 4:7, 5:23, 1 Pet 1:15, 2:21, 3:9) as in 2 Peter. Firstly, it is linked to the tradition – dating back to

281 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 190.

282 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 427; T.R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, Nashville 2003, p. 304; D.J. Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 48.

283 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3.

284 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 82.

285 Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the roots of the OT and Greek culture – of a vocation as an invitation to the religious community of the elect. Such a vocation does not only mean an invitation to participate in a congregation, but also active participation itself, which is an expression of the personal religious commitment of the person invited (Exod 12:21, Deut 5:1, 2 Sam 11:13, 1 Kings 1:9.19.25, 12:20).[286] Secondly – active participation, which can be understood as conduct worthy of participation in the community, is a consequence of the calling and a sign of belonging to the community rather than a cause of the calling. Peter conveys this through the sequence – the bestowal and unfolding of gifts in 1:3–8. This is further accentuated by the idea of an eschatological vocation (Heb 3:1, Eph 1:18, 4:4, Phil 3:14), represented in the Old Testament-based Gospel narratives as an invitation to a feast or an invitation to the kingdom (Matt 22:1–14, Luke 14:15–24). It seems that Peter's message is twofold: the honour of belonging to the community of the called is combined with and the eschatological calling to participate in the divine nature and enter the eternal kingdom.

The second term used, ἐκλογή, is inextricably linked to vocation, for it is usually the basis of God's calling. In Old and New Testament literature, election is the result of God's sovereign will, His love and grace, and does not depend on the merits of the elect. This is how the election of God's first people, Israel, took place and how the election of God's new people, the Church, took place.[287] Characteristically, in LXX, the abstract noun ἐκλογή does not occur, while verb forms (from the verb ἐκλέγομαι) appear, which make us pay attention not so much to the act of election itself as to the person of the elect.[288] In NT, the choice in Theological sense is made only by God or Jesus. In the case of 2 Pet 1:10b, this is significant because it points to God as the agent of all the actions described in the purpose clause. Choice was understood differently in the Greek tradition, where the noun ἐκλογή referred primarily to the political and military spheres, and signified a choice based on an evaluation of past actions or intellectual dispositions to hold some office. The selection was thus in the nature of a distinction and reward. A meaning similar to the Old Testament one, where selection is based on the will of the chooser, only appears in Stoic literature.[289]

In the NT narrative texts, election is eschatological. This is particularly evident in the same parables, where vocation is also mentioned. In this context, Z. C. Hodges[290] draws attention to Peter's order of use of the terms κλῆσις καὶ ἐκλογή. It seems as

286 Ibid., p. 83.

287 Deut 4:37, 7:7, 14:2, Ps 47[46]:4, 78[77]:68, Isa 42:1, Matt 12:18, Rom 9:11, 11:5.28, Eph 1:4–5, Col 3:12, 2 Tim 1:9.

288 L. Coenen, *Election*, NIDNTT 1, p. 537.

289 Ibid., p. 536.

290 Z.C. Hodges, *Making Your Calling and Election Sure*, p. 30–31.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

surprising and illogical as that of τυφλός the blind and μυωπάζων the short-sighted man in verse 9. It would have been more logical to point first to election, then to calling (cf. Rom 8:30), but Peter's order corresponds to the order in which these terms appear in the sentence summarising the parabola about the royal feast in Matt 22:14: "Many are invited, but few are chosen" (cf. Rev 17:14).[291] Perhaps such an inversion was a characteristic feature of Jesus' teaching, which the author of 2 Peter cites without narration but in a similar eschatological context? M. Green, although he does not quote Jesus' parables, also sees a kind of exclusivism here, since not all who hear the voice of God's call act in life in such a way as to confirm God's choice.[292] A similar thought can already be found in a commentary on 2 Peter by Bede the Venerable:

> Many are called, few are chosen. The vocation of all who have embarked on the path of faith is certain, but whoever constantly adds good works to the sacraments received makes his vocation and election credible to those who discover it. Also, on the contrary: those who have been called but revert to their former transgressions will become totally unfit.[293]

It is also possible to consider the inversion as a rhetorically conditioned element of Peter's style, intended to sensitise the audience to a theological message that escapes the laws of Hellenistic logic and ethics.

The relationship between human actions and the calling and election of God is also linked to this last hypothesis. As already mentioned, in the Greek world it was competence and its active manifestation that determined election. In the emerging Christian theology, the Judaic perspective – election without merit – dominated in this respect. Similarly with vocation, although here the idea of vocation as invitation turns out to be common to the Jewish and Greek traditions. Divine election and vocation generate behaviours that allow the called and chosen to be identified with some congregation, a religious group (cf. John 13:35). This corresponds with the earlier theology of baptism in 2 Peter: it is only the baptismal gifts and developed

291 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 273.

292 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 163.

293 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 125. M. Luther's reflection is also similar. On the one hand, the Reformer emphasises that God's election and vocation are certain and that man does not need to affirm them; on the other hand, he acknowledges that this affirmation manifested in action is needed as a proof for the believer and others: "although the calling and election are effectual enough in themselves, yet with you it is not yet effectual and assured, since you are not yet certain that it includes you. Therefore St. Peter would have us make such calling and election sure, by good works", *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther* I (V.10).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

dispositions that make it possible to lead a godly life, avoid corruption and ultimately share in the divine nature. In turn, leading a godly life and avoiding corruption are the manifestation of belonging to the group of the called and chosen, and thus a necessary element for the attainment of final salvation. In this light, the whole formula of ACI βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι becomes clear: the confirmation made by God concerning His binding, immutable election and calling and thus the fulfilment of the eternal salvific promises – this immutability, eternity or timelessness is also marked by the verb ποιέω in inf. praes. – is the baptismal endowment of man with that which makes it possible to externalise, to actively attest before the world, one's membership in the company of the elect and called. Some manuscripts, especially those in which the personal forms of the verb ποιέω enter instead of the inf. ποιεῖσθαι – e. g. the codices ℵ Ψ – emphasise this active aspect of attestation even more strongly by adding before the objective sentence the phrase: ινα δια των καλων εργων ("so that by good works") or its more or less elaborate variants.[294]

The narrator then moves on to reveal the promise associated with the call. The first part of the promise begins with the pronoun ταῦτα, which can be related directly to the preceding sentence – the effort to have the call and election of the addressees confirmed by God – but also to verses 5–8 describing the developing and multiplying of the baptismal gifts (cf. the use of ταῦτα and its referentiality in verses 8 and 9). Clearly, verses 5–8 and 10 ab are complementary to each other and can even be seen as mutually explicative: developing baptismal gifts is an element that affirms vocation and election, and vocation and election are manifested in developing baptismal gifts. The verb ποιέω, here in the form of part. praes. act. ποιοῦντες, confirms earlier assumptions about the active understanding of the virtues, which seems characteristic of the Christian worldview and is also expressed in the New Testament phraseology as "lives the truth/act in truth" (John 3:21, 1 John 1:6), "not one who does good" (Rom 3:12), "one who has not shown mercy" (Jas 2:13), "do good" (1 Pet 3:11); "acts in righteousness" (1 John 2:29, 3:7, Rev 22:11).[295] The whole participial phrase ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες "for by doing these things" can be taken as a summary of Peter's reflection on the use and development of the baptismal gifts (verses 3–10c), and as a condition for the fulfilment of the promise: the active use of the baptismal gifts will enable the recipients "not to stumble" and "to enter the eternal kingdom".

294 ℵ Ψ 5. 81.307.436. 1175. 1611. 1852 give ινα δια των καλων εργων; A has a variant extended by a personal pronoun: ινα δια των καλων υμων εργων; similarly 1735 ινα δια των καλων εργων υμων; 442, however, includes an abbreviated version without the conjunction: δια των καλων εργων.

295 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 630.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The negated part of the promise is very arbitrary; for it contains the double negation οὐ μή, to which the adverb ποτε is added.[296] The whole phrase can thus be translated as: "you will certainly never stumble/ fall". This arbitrariness fits well with Peter's theology of promise.[297] In verse 4, God's promises were described as τίμια καὶ μέγιστα "precious and great", and were concerned with both temporal life and eschatology. Now the narrator returns to this thought and in verses 10d-11, but in an inverted way – he swaps the positive element with the negative one in places. By juxtaposing verse 4 and verses 10d-11 one can even see a chiasm that facilitates the explication of "escape from corruption" and "participation in the divine nature":

A. That you may become partakers of the divine nature
  B. Having escaped from the corruption in the world [caused by] lust
  B'. You will certainly never stumble/fall
A'. Abundantly provided [by God] will be for you the entrance to the eternal kingdom.

The verb πταίω 'to stumble', 'to fall', 'to smash [against something]' is used here not by mistake. On a literal level, it alludes to the image of a blind man, or rather a short-sighted man, who, due to his limited field of vision, often stumbles, strikes, falls and fails to reach his destination. The promise therefore – despite its contradictory form – has an affirmative meaning, for it announces the attainment of the goal by the one who does not stumble,[298] is not blind, but remains enlightened by baptism. At the rhetorical and mnemonic level, the promise is expressed alliteratively: ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε.[299] On a metaphorical level, the verb πταίω means 'to make a mistake', 'to transgress', 'to fail', i. e. 'to commit a sin'. The whole image refers to the Jewish tradition rooted in the psalms, where stumbling is associated with accusations of the ungodly to set traps for the righteous. The righteous cannot follow the path of righteousness and ask God to protect them from stumbling, falling, or being trapped, or expresse gratitude for protection (e. g. Ps 121[120]:3–8, 140[139]:5, 141[140]:9). Philo, in *De agricultura* XL 177–180, observes that on the path leading to the attainment of piety, people encounter numerous obstacles, find it difficult to stay the course without stumbling and without becoming breathless ἀπταίστχς καὶ ἀπνεθστί, and it is "a very rare thing when God gives to any one to keep his life in a steady course from the beginning to the end, without either stumbling or

296 In some manuscripts – e. g. A Ψ 436 – this addition is missing.

297 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:4 and the following verses when the narrator of 2 Peter refers in detail to the eschatological promises.

298 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 190.

299 Z.C. Hodges, *Making Your Calling and Election Sure*, p. 30.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

falling" μήτ᾽ ὀκλάσαντι μήτ᾽ ὀλισθόντι. The New Testament literature continues this metaphorical view of stumbling and falling as obstacles to godliness in the attainment of righteousness and emphasises that even a minor and/or involuntary error resulting in the transgression of God's Law renders a person completely ungodly (Rom 11:11, Jas 2:10, 3:2).[300]

A similar holistic hamartiology based on the Old Testament understanding of sin and law is represented by 2 Pet 1:10d. This is also implied by the form of the metaphorically understood verb πταίω – con. aor. act., for the use of the aorist emphasises the all-encompassing effect of sin on the one hand, and God's comprehensive support in avoiding it on the other. This means that the promise in verse 10cd should be understood as follows: "by doing these things", i. e. by developing the baptismal gifts, "you will never stumble/ fall", i. e. you can be sure that God will guard and guide you on your way to the eternal kingdom.[301] This helps avoids the tautology pointed out by R. Bauckham when 10c refers only to a virtuous life and 10d only to avoiding error/sin (he who pursues virtue does not commit sin).[302]

As mentioned, 10d can also be taken as an explanation of 4c: "escaping the corruption in the world caused by lust" would mean "avoiding stumbles/falls". On the one hand, this requires human effort, as suggested in verse 10a and the lexeme σπουδή; on the other hand, this effort would be fruitless were it not for God's help.

The further part of the promise – already expressed in verse 11 in an affirmative way – continues the picture of the way to the goal from verse 10cd and also explains the statement from verse 4b about the participation in the divine nature. Three planes of reference can thus be seen here: formal reference – to verse 10b; pictorial reference – to verse 9b and 10cd; explanatory reference – to verse 4b and the divine nature.

Formally, verse 11 begins with the adverb οὕτως, which does not directly refer to the image of a journey and walking towards a goal, but to God's confirmation of the calling and election of those who multiply the baptismal gifts (10b). It is thus an anaphoric phrase that can be understood in three ways as: a result – since God's call and election is confirmed, therefore the entrance to the eternal kingdom will be abundantly provided; a goal – confirmation of vocation and election is essential so that the entrance to the eternal kingdom will be abundantly provided; a condition – if vocation and election are confirmed, then the entrance to the eternal kingdom will be abundantly provided.[303]

300 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 393.

301 D. J. Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 49.

302 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 190.

303 So, for example, P. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 430.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Regardless of the choice of dominant option, all options indicate that entry into the kingdom depends first on baptism and then on the use of baptismal gifts in the Christian life.

When describing the journey, or rather its final stage – the entrance into the kingdom, the author of 2 Peter uses the verb ἐπιχορηγέω 'to provide', 'to take care of', 'to equip', which already appeared in verse 5. When analysing verse 5, attention has been drawn to its Hellenistic roots and connotations with Greek ceremonies.[304] These connotations do not disappear, they are even used,[305] but now the narrator highlights the meanings operating in the Christian sociolect. In the New Testament, apart from 2 Pet 1:5.11, the verb appears three times – in Gal 3:5, 2 Cor 9:10 and Col 2:19, and each time it describes God's actions of bestowing (providing gifts), multiplying gifts both material (so in 2 Cor 9:10) and spiritual (so in Gal 3:5), and sustaining church members (so in Col 2:19). All these meanings are synthesised and reflected in Peter's text. Passivum theologicum ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται in verse 11 clearly alludes to the whole Baptist reflection in *exordium*, implying that it is God who at baptism equipped man with the enabling faith to practise the virtues, He is the one who causes these virtues to be multiplied and developed, He is the one who sustains/sustains the members of the community of the called and chosen, i. e. it is God – and this can be seen as the synthesising contribution of the author of 2 Peter to the New Testament semantics of the verb ἐπιχορηγέω – He provides all that is necessary to enter the kingdom.

The verb ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται is accompanied by the adverb πλουσίως denoting the nature of God's actions. Usually this adverb and the adjective from which it derives are translated 'rich', 'abundant' (cf. Rom 10:12, Eph 1:7, 1 Tim 6:17, Titus 3:6, also *The Epistle of Barnabas* 1:3: "because I truly perceive in you the Spirit poured forth from the rich Lord of love"). Here πλουσίως also suggests the generosity of God, but also the comprehensiveness of His salvific acts (all He gives).

The noun εἴσοδος can also be understood in three ways. First, as the place of entry into the kingdom (cf. Judg 1:24–25, 2 Kings 11:16, 23:11);[306] however, it would be difficult to interpret the phrase πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται. A literal treatment of the entrance abundantly provided by God would bring to mind a particularly prepared, decorated (?), widened (?) place (gate?) leading to the kingdom. Such an image appears in Similitude IX 12:3 of *The Shepherd* of Hermas: "for this reason the gate was made newδιὰ τοῦτο καινὴ ἐγένετο ἡ πύλη, that they who are to be saved by it might enter into the kingdom of God ι᾽αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέλθωσι τοῦ θεοῦ". The imagery of Hermas, however, is not about literalism, but an allegory

304 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:5.

305 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:11.

306 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 633.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

based on John 10:1–10 (Jesus as the gate of the sheep). In the narrative that follows, there is an explanation: "In like manner, he continued, no one shall enter into the kingdom of God unless he receive His holy name. For if you desire to enter into a city, and that city is surrounded by a wall, and has but one gate, can you enter into that city save through the gate which it has? […] If, then, you cannot enter into the city except through its gate, so, in like manner, a man cannot otherwise enter into the kingdom of God than by the name of His beloved Son. If we take the description of the entrance in 2 Pet 1:11 in a similar metaphorical way, it would mean that the abundantly provided entrance to the kingdom points first to the saving work of Jesus Christ,[307] an expression of God's grace rich in mercy.

Secondly, εἴσοδος could be understood as a one-time ceremonial act of entry associated with a special welcome,[308] similar to the boisterous welcome of a friend, brother or faithful servant, or possibly the triumphal arrival of a victor.[309] In this case, an entrance richly, lavishly furnished could mean everything that goes into expressing the joy of a believer's arrival, and the whole picture would resemble a parable narrative (cf. Luke 15:7.10.22–24) and most closely relate to the Hellenistic understanding of the verb ἐπιχωρηγέω.[310]

Thirdly, and finally, εἴσοδος can be interpreted as an durative entry/entrance process begun in the present, associated with specific behaviours and actions; here, too, references to Jesus' teaching on the conditions for entry into the kingdom can be seen,[311] but not only, for, in line with the narrator's strategy of drawing on Jewish tradition, the predominant reference would be to the extended multi-stage Jewish *exodus*. Perhaps even the wordplay ἔξοδος εἴσοδος was used. This interpretation seems closest to Peter, who further reinterprets it in the context of his baptism theology. Entrance thus denotes a process begun at baptism, lasting a lifetime, involving the use and multiplication of baptismal gifts, culminating in eschatological participation in the divine nature. Such an interpretation correlates with the comprehensive understanding of the phrase πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται given above, and the use of the verb ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται in the form of ind. fut. indicates a focus on the final stage of entrance. This also confirms the suggestion of an explicative relationship between "participation in the divine nature" in verse 4b and "the entrance into the kingdom" in verse 11. Both participation in the divine nature and entry into the kingdom signify eschatological communion with God.[312]

307 N. Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, p. 306.

308 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 164.

309 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 431.

310 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:5.

311 Cf. Matt 5:20, 7:21, 18:3, 19:23–24, 23:13, Mark 9:47, 10:15.23–25, Luke 18:17.25, John 3:5, G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 634.

312 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:4.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Moreover, such a comprehensive and progressive account confirms the synthetic account of faith and knowledge presented in the concluding *exordium* in verses 9–12. Previously, it was generally stated that both faith and knowledge, understood synonymously, are eschatologically oriented processes; now this process has been inscribed in the Christian life from baptism to the end times.

The author of 2 Peter is not the only early Christian writer who explicitly pointed out the relationship between entry into the kingdom and baptism and the holiness/sinlessness of the Christian life involving the development of baptismal gifts. This motif appears in *The Shepherd* of Hermas: "For he who has received remission of his sins ought not to sin any more, but to live in purity" (Commandment IV 3:2);

> they were obliged […] to ascend through water in order that they might be made alive; for, unless they laid aside the deadness of their life, they could not in any other way enter into the kingdom of God. Accordingly, those also who fell asleep received the seal of the Son of God. For, he continued, before a man bears the name of the Son of God he is dead; but when he receives the seal he lays aside his deadness, and obtains life. The seal, then, is the water: they descend into the water dead, and they arise alive. And to them, accordingly, was this seal preached, and they made use of it that they might enter into the kingdom of God (Similitude IX 16:2–4).

It is also alluded to in *2 Clem.*:

> And consider, brethren, that the sojourning in the flesh in this world is but brief and transient, but the promise of Christ is great and wonderful, even the rest of the kingdom to come, and of life everlasting. By what course of conduct, then, shall we attain these things, but by leading a holy and righteous life, and by deeming these worldly things as not belonging to us, and not fixing our desires upon them? For if we desire to possess them, we fall away from the path of righteousness (5:5–6); […] if men so eminently righteous [Noah, Job, Daniel], are not able by their righteousness to deliver their children, how can we hope to enter into the royal residence of God unless we keep our baptism holy and undefiled? (6:9); If, therefore, we shall do righteousness in the sight of God, we shall enter into His kingdom, and shall receive the promises" (11:7).

The distinctive feature of Peter's reflection, however, is a stronger emphasis than in the case of other authors on God's participation and activity[313] at each stage of "the entrance" understood as a process.

The entrance into the kingdom ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν – as noted – alludes to the teaching of Jesus. Outside the Gospel accounts of Jesus' speeches (including

313 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 192; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 165.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

in non-canonical gospels such as Gospel of Thomas 22:29), references to entering the kingdom are relatively rare in early Christian literature.[314] They appear in the passages quoted above from *2 Clem.* (6:9, 11:7) and in the Parables from *The Shepherd* of Hermas (Similitude IX 12:3–8, IX 16:2–4). It is most likely that the use of phrases characteristic of Jesus and of the parable convention in 2 Peter that are familiar to the recipient is intended to lend credibility to the sender of the letter as a witness and hearer of Jesus' speeches. This form is much more subtle than the literal invocation of Jesus' words (1:14) or the facts of his life in which the chosen disciples participated (1:16–18).

The kingdom itself is defined as ἡ αἰώνιος βασιλεία τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰεσοῦ Χριστοῦ "the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ". The Gospels more often mention the kingdom of God[315] or the kingdom of heaven,[316] references to the kingdom of Jesus Christ (Son of Man, messiah) appear sporadically and are due to context rather than to the formula used (Matt 16:28, 20:21, Luke 1:33, 22:29–30, 23:42, John 18:36–37). Similarly, in the New Testament epistles, where the formula is not yet as established and elaborate as in 2 Pet 1:11, but more often than in the gospels authority in the kingdom is attributed to Christ, the Lord, the Son of God (1 Cor 15:24–25, Eph 5:5, Col 1:13, 2 Tim 4:1.18, Heb 1:8). Early Christian literature also based the mentions of the kingdom on the contexts rather than formulas. The formula "kingdom of Christ" is used, for example, in *1 Clem.* 50:3, when it speaks of "the revelation of the kingdom of Christ". *2 Clem.* 12:1–2 juxtaposes the terms kingdom of God and kingdom of the Lord (Christ) in a similar context:

> Let us expect, therefore, hour by hour, the kingdom of God in love and righteousness, since we know not the day of the appearing of God. For the Lord Himself, being asked by one when His kingdom would come, replied, When two shall be one, that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female, neither male nor female.

In The Epistle of the Apostles 39 during the final judgement, the Lord (Jesus Christ) asks: "Wherefore hast thou departed from me?" It is evident from this brief list that in New Testament and early Christian literature the kingdom of Christ is a concept referring primarily to the end times, when authority, including the authority to judge, is transferred by God the Father to the exalted Son (cf. 1 Cor 15:24–26). This understanding of "the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" is also shared by the author of 2 Peter, as the remainder of the letter makes clear.

314 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 192.

315 Matt 19:24, 21:31.43, Mark 1:15, 4:26.30, 9:1, 10:23, Luke 8:10, 9:62, 10:9.11, 14:15, 17:20.21.

316 E. g., Matt 3:2, 4:17, 10:7, 13:24.31.33.44.45.47, 19:23, 20:1, 22:2, 23:13, 25:1.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

As already mentioned, the postpositional attributes of the kingdom are quite elaborate in 2 Pet 1:11. Genetivus is used here, each of which can be interpreted as gen. possessoris ("the kingdom belonging to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ"), or alternatively as gen. subiectivus ("the kingdom in which our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ reigns"). This is not the first time the author of 2 Peter has referred to Jesus as Lord and Saviour. Previously, however, he had separated these titles – in 1:1 the righteousness of "the Saviour" Jesus Christ was referred to; in 1:2 the knowledge of Jesus "our Lord".[317] The collective formula of 1:11 becomes characteristic of 2 Peter, and is repeated still in 2:20 and in 3:18, and in 3:2 in a somewhat abbreviated version (without proper names). Of course, most often the narrator refers to Jesus only as Lord (2:9.11, 3.8.9.10.15), but he is also keen to use the fuller, typically Christian formula "our Lord Jesus Christ" (1:2.8.14.16). While the use of the title "Lord" itself can be interpreted as part of the sender's authentication as one of the Twelve who thus called the earthly Jesus,[318] the established formulas clearly indicate the recognition of Jesus as God (cf. 2 Pet 1:3–4).[319] In the context of "the kingdom", calling Jesus Lord and Saviour is particularly significant, for these titles were held by the Roman Caesars. There is thus an element of juxtaposition between the transient, temporal kingdom, where the lord and saviour is the Caesar,[320] and the kingdom of Jesus Christ, not coincidentally also called eternal in an eschatological sense (cf. Roman inscriptions describing the empire as eternal).[321]

The prepositional designation of Christ's kingdom as αἰώνιος "eternal" is also relatively rare in New Testament and early Christian literature. The imagery and wording refer to Daniel's prophecy, where in Dan 7:14[322] "dominion, splendor, and kingship" given to the Son of Man is referred to, and in Dan 7:27[323] this kingdom is called eternal (βασιλεία αἰώνιος), which should be seen as part of Peter's strategy of drawing on Jewish tradition. In New Testament, equivalent terms actually appear only in Luke 1:33: καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακὼβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν τέλος "he will rule over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there will be no end" (cf. Rev 11:15). They only become more popular in early Christian literature at the end of the second century. The "everlasting kingdom", referring to The Book of Daniel, is mentioned by Justin Martyr in *Dialogue with Trypho* (32:1): These and such like Scriptures, sir, compel

317 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:1–2.

318 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:20, 3:18.

319 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 636.

320 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 433; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 636.

321 W.F. Danker, *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 465; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 636; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 165.

322 G.L. Green, Jude and 2 Peter, p. 636.

323 R. Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 192.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

us to wait for Him who, as Son of man, receives from the Ancient of days the everlasting kingdom". In a more general soteriological sense, this formula is used by Melito of Sardis in *The Homily on the Pascha* 68: "It is He that delivered us from slavery to liberty, from darkness to light, from death to life, from tyranny to eternal royalty, and made us a new priesthood and an eternal people personal to him".[324]

As can be seen, verses 10–11 not only summarise and synthesise the previous reflection of the author of 2 Peter regarding faith and knowledge as eschatologically oriented processes. They also clarify the imagery used earlier and place it unambiguously within Baptist theology. In accordance with the rules of rhetoric, the most prominent point of *exordium* foreshadows the main message of the letter – the eschatological reflection, which explains how God's promise regarding the believers' entrance into the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ is to be understood.

2.4.3 a'. A constant reminder (2 Pet 1:12–15)

> [12]Therefore, I will always remind/never neglect to remind you of these [things], even though you know [it]/learnt about [them] and are grounded/stable/firmly established in the present truth. [13]And I consider it right that for the [time] that I am [still] in this tent, I may stir you up/arousing by reminding you,[14]knowing that soon is the putting off/getting rid of my tent/shortly I will put off my tent, as our Lord Jesus Christ has revealed to me. [15]I will be diligent/strive earnestly that you may always and after my departure remind one another of these [things]/have remembrance of these to keep.

The last part of Theological synthesis in 2 Pet 1:9–15 draws our attention because of its function and form. Together with verse 9, it forms the framework for Peter's soteriological thesis (verses 10–11). However, while verse 9 referred to being deliberately "forgetful/ignoring" the baptismal gifts with the forgiveness of sins, verses 12–15 contain a positive message – a reminder of the entire eschatologically oriented baptismal theology laid out in verses 1–11: from faith giving all believers the same dignity to "the entrance into the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ". Rhetorically, verses 12–15 can be categorised as a transition – readers should at least pay attention to the concluding thesis (verses 10–11). However, by mentioning the "reminding" three times (verses 12.13.15), the sender extends his persuasion and argues that the entire baptismal theology presented grounds the recipients in the truth and should therefore be continually repeated and practised.[325]

---

324 Melito of Sardis, *On Pascha and Fragments*, English transl. S.G. Hall, Oxford 1979.

325 A different approach is adopted by F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy, Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 238, who does not structurally link this passage with the previous one and sees two parts in 2 Pet 1:12–15 1. Fixation on the memory of God's gifts (12–13) and 2. Awareness of imminent death (14–15).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

There is disagreement among commentators as to what literary genre verses 12–15 represent; are they more in keeping with Jewish tradition or with Hellenistic tradition? Many, following R. Bauckham,[326] argue that the reminder formulas, together with the mentions of impending death, indicate the use of a convention known as the testament.[327] As mentioned in the Introduction, Peter's form would allude both to biblical texts (Gen 49:1–28, Deut 33:1–29, Josh 24:1–28, 1 Kings 2:1–9) and to the messages and moral instructions popular in intertestamental times in Jewish literature, including Greek-language literature,[328] attributed to well-known and revered figures of the past (Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Testament of Abraham). A particular similarity, not only generic but also motivic and phraseological, would link 2 Peter with ApBaSyr 78–86, where one can read, among other things, the reasons why Baruch writes the letter before his death:

> I bear in mind, my brethren, the love of Him who created us […] who loved us from of old, and never hated us, but above all educated us. And truly I know that behold all we the twelve tribes are bound by one bond, inasmuch as we are born from one father. Wherefore I have been the more careful to leave you the words of this epistle before I die, that you may be comforted regarding the evils which have come upon you, and that you may be grieved also regarding the evil that has befallen your brethren (ApBaSyr 78:2–4).

Also in the rest of the text there are elements typical of a testament – a mention of impending death, a reminder of doctrine and a call to apply it:

> Behold! I have therefore made known unto you (these things) whilst I live: for I have said (it) that you should learn the things that are excellent; for the Mighty One hath commanded me to instruct you: and I will set before you some of the commandments of His judgement before I die. […] let this epistle be for a testimony between me and you, that you may remember the commandments of the Mighty One […]. And remember you the law and Zion, and the holy land and your brethren, and the covenant of your fathers, and forget not the festivals and the Sabbaths. And deliver this epistle and the traditions of the law to your sons after you, as also your fathers delivered (them) to you (ApBaSyr 84:1.7–9).

326 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 202–203; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 434–436; D.A. Keating, *First, Second Peter, Jude*, p. 336; J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 311; R.B. Vinson, R.F. Wilson, W.E. Mills, *1&2 Peter, Jude*, Macon 2010, p. 309–311.

327 See Introduction.

328 R.B. Vinson, R.F. Wilson, W.E. Mills, *1&2 Peter, Jude*, p. 309.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

These distinctive features of the testament also include Abraham's speeches in Jub 22:7–24 (7:16): "behold, I am one hundred three score and fifteen years, an old man and full of days, and all my days have been unto me peace […]. And do thou, my son Jacob, remember my words, And observe the commandments of Abraham, thy father". Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* IV 8:46 summarising Moses' testament, points out that the patriarch "had recapitulated whatsoever he had done for the preservation of the people, both in their wars, and in peace; and had composed them a body of laws, and procured them an excellent form of government". In contrast, the farewell speech, reconstructed further on, contains clear allusions to his impending death, euphemistically called his "departure":[329] "Since I am going to my forefathers, and God has determined that this should be the day of my departure to them, I return him thanks while I am still alive and present with you, for that providence he hath exercised over you […] On which accounts I think it proper to bless that divine power" (*Ant.* IV 8:47). The use of the convention of the testament familiar to the audience is at the same time playing a certain game with them: both parties are well aware that, although the author presents himself by the name of a generally respected figure, the text is a pseudo-epigraph.[330] It does, however, faithfully convey the teaching of the figure whose name it bears – hence the emphasis on the immutability of the teaching preached earlier, recalled now, just before his death, and repeated in the future.

Some commentators, however, do not accept R. Bauckham's proposal, arguing that it has too tenuous a basis.[331] G.L. Green[332] notes that 'testamentary' elements may have been contained in other literary genres, e. g. letters or "biography" narratives (cf. e. g. Jesus' farewell speech in John 13–17, Paul's farewell speech Acts 20:17–38);[333] the presence of these elements cannot, however, prejudge the classification of a text as a testament alone. For it is the generic dominant that is important. In the case of 2 Peter, it is not the testamentary but the epistolary convention that would be this dominant. This is confirmed by the rhetorical structure of the entire passage 1:1–15, in which the typical prescript is followed by *an exordium* with the prominence of the main theological (eschatological) thought of the entire letter. The testamentary elements, acting as transition – as said – perfectly emphasise both Theological thesis (verses 10–11) and the purpose of the letter – to

329 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:15.

330 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 203.

331 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 171–172; M.D. Mathews, *The Genre of 2 Peter: A Comparison with Jewish and Early Christian Testaments*, "Bulletin for Biblical Research" 21 (2011), no. 1, p. 51–64.

332 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 643.

333 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 435 also includes Luke 22:15–36 among such speeches.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

constantly remind this Peter's eschatological teaching and to reinforce it among the recipients of the text (verses 12 and 15).

The hypomnemic formula itself from verse 12 μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων καίπερ εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηριγμέους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ "Therefore, I will always remind/never neglect to remind you of these [things], even though you know [it]/learnt about [them] and are grounded/stable/firmly established in the present truth" can therefore be taken not as part of a testament, but as a renewed reference to Hellenistic tradition, Greek epistolography[334] and literature of an ethical-parenetic nature. A similar formula is used by Dio Chrysostom, among others, who considers it appropriate to remind people of what they know perfectly well but do not adhere to:[335]

> The majority of men think that they should speak […] regarding what is well known and patent to all alike they think it superfluous to instruct. […] if I saw that we were holding to what we believe to be right and were doing nothing out of harmony with the view we already have. I should not myself hold it necessary to insist on matters that are perfectly clear. However, since I observe that it is not our ignorance of the difference between good and evil that hurts us, so much as it is our failure to heed the dictates of reason […] and to be true to our personal opinions, I consider it most salutary to remind men of this without ceasing, and to appeal to their reason to give heed and in their acts to observe what is right and proper (*Orationes* 17:1–11).[336]

Less elaborate reminder formulas are found in the New Testament letters[337] and early Christian letters: "You understand, beloved, you understand well the sacred Scriptures, and you have looked very earnestly into the oracles of God. Call then these things to your remembrance" (*1 Clem.* 53:1), also based on Hellenistic epistolography. The interweaving of elements characteristic of Greek and Jewish literature here is part of Peter's strategy of integrating and equating the two traditions. In fact, as will be seen, in verses 12–15 the two overlap more clearly than in earlier passages, so it is more difficult to identify an overarching tradition.

The four poems summarising *exordium* are arranged in a chiasm:

334 J.L. White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, p. 207.

335 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 114.

336 See also G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 231.

337 Rom 1:13, 11:25, 1 Cor 8:1, 10:1, 12:1, 2 Cor 1:8, Gal 1:11, Phil 1:12, 1 Thess 4:13, Jude 5.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

A. the purpose of the letter – to continually remind the recipients of knowledge and to ground them in the truth (verse 12);

B. justification – staying alive and a sense of duty (verse 13);

B'. justification – impending death (verse 14);

A'. the purpose of the letter – to continually remind us of Peter's message even after his death (verse 15).

It seems that more important from the point of view of epistolary rhetoric are elements A and A' – the purpose of the letter. Elements B and B' have side functions, referring to the present situation of the sender-narrator – imminent death, which is supposed to justify the necessity of writing down the message and passing it on to contemporary and future recipients. In addition, these most personal confessions written in 1 pers. sg. provide a bridge between *exordium* and the rest of the letter, where the sender wants to establish himself as Peter and suggests how his message is to be interpreted (1:16–21).

Line 12 begins with the phrase διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων καίπερ εἰδότας containing a reminder formula. However, the introduction of this formula is unusual and poses some difficulties. The conjunction διό logically refers to the reason for the reminder, which is contained in the soteriological thesis in verse 11 – "entry into the eternal kingdom". So, in order for the recipients of the letter to "enter the kingdom", the sender will be reminding them of all the stages of this "entry", starting with catechesis (faith), conversion (knowledge) and baptism. This is also confirmed by the use of the pronoun ταῦτα later in the sentence.

Unusual and difficult to translate is the form of the verb μέλλω – 'to intend', 'to intend', which is combined with the infinitive ὑπομιμνήσκειν 'recollect'. Instead of the more natural and more commonly used present tense (cf. e. g. 2 Macc 8:11, Acts 11:28, 24:15, 27:10), the narrator has here used ind. fut. act. μελλήσω, which should be literally translated: 'and I will intend [to remind you]'. Translational difficulties led copyists and biblical scholars to search for an explanation of this Petrine construction. The tenth-century minuscule Codex 1175 of Mount Athos contains the variant μέλλω: I intend [to remind you]. Some manuscripts give μελλήσω with a negative participle: δι οὐ μελλέσω (so P^{72} Ψ) διὸ οὐ μελλέσω (so 1611): literally. I will not intend [to remind you], or conversely διὸ οὐκ ἀμελήσω (so 5. 81. 307. 436. 442. 1448. 1735. 1852. 2492): I will not neglect [to remind you]. J. B. Mayor[338] proposes to use a conjunct and instead of μελλήσω read this verb as μελήσω: 'I will endeavour [to remind you]', synonymous with σπουδάσω of verse 15. G.L. Green[339] sees here a distorted classical construction of μέλλω with an infinitive, which was

338 J.B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, London 1907, p. 99.

339 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 646.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

no longer in common use at the time of the composition of 2 Peter's Epistle. Perhaps the future construction with the infinitive should be read as a weakening of the modal overtones of the verb μέλλω and a strengthening of the certainty of the performance of the action expressed with the infinitive: "I intend certainly to remind you", or as a simple indication of the future: "I will remind you", although expressed in a periphrastic way:[340] In view of the durative adverb ἀεί ('always', 'constantly'), it is most convincing to accept Thesis that μελλήσω ὑπομιμνῄσκειν is a periphrastic variant of the extended futurum, and that the whole phrase μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνῄσκειν should be understood as: "I will continually/always remind you", whereby this "always" – as is evident from verses 13–15 also refers to the time after the death of the sender presenting himself as Peter.[341] This is confirmed by the use of inf. praes., where praes. emphasises a multiple, ongoing, unfinished action. As R. Bauckham argues,[342] this unusual situation, where the sender anticipates that his message will be read and current for many future generations, required the use of an equally unusual futuristic construction that would draw due attention to the timelessness of this message.[343] Aorist or praes. would have limited the communicative situation to the writing and reading of the letter in historically defined circumstances. It is no coincidence, then, that details facilitating the reconstruction of the circumstances of the letter's writing and its reading in a historical context are so scarce in Peter's text.

At first glance, the timelessness and universality of Peter's message is hampered by the use of the personal pronoun ὑμεῖς. Usually in epistolography, it denotes the specific, original addressees of a letter, which is due, among other things, to the ancient understanding of correspondence as the equivalent of direct conversation.[344] Seneca in one of his letters to Lucilius (*Ep. mor.* 67:2) explicitly refers to the exchange of letters as conversation: "Whenever your letters arrive, I imagine that I am with you, and I have the feeling that I am about to speak my answer, instead of writing it. Therefore let us together investigate the nature of this problem of yours, just as if we were conversing with one another". This was most likely how the pronoun ὑμεῖς was treated in the salutation formula (1:2). But even then, universalising tendencies could be discerned – the sender, as has been repeatedly noted, employed inclusive strategies, equating both the channels of faith transmission and the dominant traditions in that transmission. Thus, regardless of how and by whom the faith was transmitted, it has the same effects on every believer. The same applies to knowledge. In the following verses, the emphasis fell on the horizontal element:

340 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 195; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 646.

341 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:13–15.

342 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 195–196.

343 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 436.

344 *List antyczny*, p. VII.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

parallel traditions of equal value – Hellenistic and Jewish – were not only aligned with each other, but integrated through Christian reinterpretation (verses 3–11). Now comes the temporal, vertical element – everything that was communicated to the original recipients of the letter regarding soteriology and eschatology is also to be communicated to subsequent generations of Christians, whom the sender addresses using the same pronoun – you. This means that the pronoun ὑμεῖς includes in verse 12 both the first, direct concrete addressees of the letter and all the virtual recipients (assumed – implied readers) – contemporaries of the sender and the future recipients. He assumes, it seems, that his letter will be treated as Paul's letters and other writings were treated in the late first century. In 2 Pet 3:15–16, he speaks of Paul's letters – addressed to specific communities in specific circumstances – as if they were also written to all – present and future – addressees, regardless of where they lived, including the addressees of Peter's letter: καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπετὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν "as our beloved brother Paul […], wrote to you".[345] Polycarp of Smyrna, among others, follows a similar approach. In a letter to the church in Philippi written around 107, he refers to Paul's presence in the city decades earlier and to the apostle's letter to the Philippians from the fifties or early sixties of the first century. Each time he uses the pronoun "you", thus emphasising that Paul's letter had not lost its topicality and can be read after around fifty years as a message to the next generation of Philippians:

> I write to you concerning righteousness, not because I take anything upon myself, but because you have invited me to do so. For neither I, nor any other such one, can come up to the wisdom of the blessed and glorified Paul. He, when among you, accurately and steadfastly taught the word of truth in the presence of those who were then alive. And when absent from you, he wrote you a letter, which, if you carefully study, you will find to be the means of building you up in that faith which has been given you.

The content to be constantly recalled is referred to by the phrase περὶ τούτων. The hagiographer had already used the indicative pronoun to refer to what he was talking about previously. He seems to be doing the same thing this time too. Thus, "to recall these things" is to recall what is contained in verses 1–10 and summarised in the soteriological thesis in verse 11. There is no reason to limit the reminder only to the eschatologically oriented Baptist theology (verses 3–11), although it is undoubtedly leading here. But the narrator in the rest of the letter will also refer to what he intimated in verses 1–2 regarding faith and knowledge.

The further part of the hypomnemic formula clearly indicates its rhetorical function – to win the favour of all potential audiences, both contemporary to the

345 See an analysis of 3:15b.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

sender and future ones. Indeed, the narrator appreciates the knowledge of the audience, stating that he reminds them of these things, although (καίπερ) he firmly believes that they are perfectly familiar. The lack of indication of the source of knowledge seems significant. This corresponds to a strategy of integrating and equating different sources, means and now and time of transmission of faith and knowledge. Peter's summary and reminder, then, is not so much to further instruct or give a detailed lecture, but to reassure all audiences of the well-known truth present in the knowledge already imparted. The knowledge itself, as is evident from the context and from the rest of the letter, comprises the basic all-Christian content based on properly interpreted revelation[346] concerning salvation and especially "the entrance to the eternal kingdom", which is to be regarded as the apostolic message.

In stating the purpose of the reminder, the author of 2 Peter uses the verb στηρίζω – 'to establish', 'to set', 'firmly set', 'to strengthen' in the form of part. perf. pass. – ἐστηριγμένους. Part. perf. pass. indicates that the agens here is God and it is He who strengthens/fixes in the truth; perf. suggests that the affirmation has already taken place and its effects are ongoing. For Peter, the strengthening, the affirming in the truth by God occurred at his baptism and God has continued to strengthen his believers ever since. Verse 12a would thus correspond to what has already been said in verses 9 and 10.[347] It is also no coincidence that the stability described by the participle would allude, on the one hand, antonymically to the image of the blind man or rather the short-sighted one walking uncertainly and stumbling, and on the other hand, synonymously to the assurance that the one who, with God's help, develops the baptismal gifts is protected by God from stumbling and/or falling. This means that Peter's strengthening/affirmation is also – paradoxically – to be understood actively and dynamically as the development of the baptismal gifts needed to live "a godly life" and "to escape the corruption in the world caused by lust" (cf. Luke 22:32, Rom 16:25, 1 Thess 3:2, 1 Pet 5:10, *2 Clem.* 2:6: "For it is indeed a great and admirable thing to establish not the things which are standing, but those that are falling", where this active aspect is not always as strongly emphasised as in Peter), and as striving towards a clearly defined goal – entry into the eternal kingdom. This intentional meaning of empowerment is found, for example, in Philo of Alexandria (*De somn.* II 2:11), who, in describing a man (Josephus) following different goals in life and being pulled in different directions by different things, describes him as one who is literally "without being able to stand firm" μὴ δυνάμενος στηριχθῆναι, i. e. unstable. R. Bauckham[348] notes that the play on words, as well as imagery, between ἀστήρικτος 'unstable/unfortified' (2 Pet 2:14, 3:16) and the derivatives of

346 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 196; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 438.

347 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 437.

348 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 196.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the verb στηρίζω (2 Pet 1:12, 3:17) is one of the favourite rhetorical devices of the author of 2 Peter. This game is definitely easier to see when considering the active understanding of the lexeme στηρίγ-: the strengthened are those who live godly and flee from corruption, develop baptismal gifts, while the unstable/unstrengthened are those who live ungodly, cling to the corruption of the world caused by lust and do not use baptismal gifts. It would seem, then, that strengthening/affirmation is not just about doctrinal issues (although these, as the rest of the letter shows, are very important), but also about the practical manifestation of faith.

Narrator of 2 Peter tries to reconstruct the Christian consciousness of Peter's time in a more realistic and successful way than is done, for example, by the author of The Epistle of the Apostles, who also refers to fortification and unwavering, abiding apostolic teaching, but gives these concepts a doctrinal meaning and contrasts them with the teaching of Simon Magus and Cerinthus:

> The book which Jesus Christ revealed unto his disciples: […] Simon and Cerinthus, the false apostles, concerning whom it is written that no man shall cleave unto them […]. (The book hath been written) that ye may be not flinch nor be troubled, and depart not from the word of the Gospel which ye have heard.

This surprising active and intentional understanding of empowerment is not weakened by the addition ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ "in present truth/in truth you have". The participle παροῦσα emphasises the fact that the truth is contained (present) in the knowledge that has already been given to all the recipients of the letter. It does not need to be given once again, possibly only reminded. This clearly refers to the baptismal gifts that have been given to the faithful, are present in the life of the faithful and must be used. In the Baptist context of the whole exordium, part. ὑπάρχοντα in verse 8, ind. πάρεστιν in verse 9 and part. παροῦσα in verse 12 would thus be synonymous terms. Verse 9 also sheds light on Peter's understanding of truth. Truth here would mean the essence of what Christians believe, content even more fundamental than knowledge. In the New Testament, 'truth' is often synonymous with the 'gospel'[349] and there is no reason to try to find any advanced doctrinal findings here.[350] In 2 Pet 1:12, therefore, truth directly alludes to what the short-sighted have forgotten and therefore need to be continually reminded of,[351] i. e. the gospel message of cleansing from sins as a condition for entry into the eschatological, eternal kingdom (cf. John 14:6, 2 Cor 11:10, Eph 4:21.24; and the active understanding of truth in 2 John 4, 3 John 3–4). This presupposes that an

349 Gal 2:5.14, 5:7, Eph 1:13, Col 1:5, 2 Thess 2:12–13, 2 Tim 2:15, Jas 1:18, 2 John 4.

350 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 197.

351 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 439.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

integral element of truth is eschatology. This truth is encapsulated by the apostolic message (basic knowledge) that cleansing from sins is accomplished in the act of baptism and involves receiving ownership of gifts to be used and developed, and great and wonderful eschatological promises. To be strengthened in the truth one possesses, therefore, means to actively manifest faith, i. e. to develop the baptismal gifts and dispositions (cf. the active departure from the truth in Jas 5:19, Rom 1:18, 2:8, 1 Cor 13:6)[352] taking into account their eschatological conditionality.

After setting out the essential purpose of the letter – a constant reminder of apostolic knowledge and grounding in the truth understood as an encouragement of distinctive Christian activity – the narrator proceeds to announce his impending death three times (verses 13.14 and 15). This is primarily to justify the writing of the letter, but also to justify the use of the adverb 'always' ἀεί and the extended periphrastic form of the future tense. For always refers both to the present described in verses 13–14 and to the future described in verse 15. The hagiographer thought it appropriate δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι right now, while he is still alive (the present), to stimulate the addressees with a reminder of the basic Christian soteriological message. The phrase δίκαιον ἡγέομαι or δίκαιόν ἐστιν possibly its elliptical form with the adjective δίκαιον alone is not unique, appearing both in Greek literature (e. g. in Diodorus Siculus in *Bibliotheca Historica* XII 45:1: "for they considered it only fair that the benefactors of their ancestors should in turn receive from their descendants the corresponding benefactions") as well as in NT (Matt 20:4, Luke 12:57, Eph 6:1, Phil 1:7). The verb ἡγέομαι itself – 'to consider as something', 'to regard as something' is one of the author's favourites in 2 Peter; it occurs three more times in the letter (2 Pet 2:13, 3:9.15). It refers to a certain reflection, thought and evaluation of the phenomenon being reflected upon. The sender thus states that his desire to influence his audience is not spontaneous, but preceded by deep reflection. One can even detect here a certain inner compulsion and understand the whole phrase as equivalent to a sense of duty (cf. Jude 3),[353] which Peter should complete before his death – ἐφ᾽ ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι "as long as I am in this tent".

In speaking of death, the narrator uses a metaphor whose origins can be traced back to both Jewish and Greek traditions. In the LXX, the noun σκήνωμα primarily means a tent,[354] a temporary dwelling place during a wandering,[355] in a military camp, the opposite of a permanent, stable residence.[356] Dwelling in tents in Jewish

352 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 652.

353 Ibid., p. 653.

354 Deut 33:18, 1 Sam 4:10, 2 Kings 13:5, Ps 69[68]:26, 77[78]:55, Prov 1:8.

355 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 440; N. Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, p. 172.

356 D.A. Keating, *First, Second Peter, Jude*, p. 342. Of course, in the OT this term is also used to refer to the Tent/Temple of God, but this meaning does not affect Peter's imagery.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

tradition was primarily associated with the exodus. Perhaps Peter, as in verse 11 and later in verse 15 alludes to this. In the wisdom tradition, most likely influenced by Greek thought,[357] the tent – more commonly referred to as σκῆνος[358] – pictured the human mortal body (Wis 9:15), and in the prophetic tradition, the taking down of the tent signified readiness for death (Isa 38:12).

The New Testament (2 Cor 5:1.4) and early Christian literature refer primarily to sapiential thought. In *Diogn.* 6 there is a reference to an immortal soul inhabiting a mortal tent: "The immortal soul dwells in a mortal tabernacle ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν θνητῷ σκηνώματι κατοικεῖ; and Christians dwell as sojourners in corruptible [bodies], looking for an incorruptible dwelling in the heavens". The Apocalypse of Paul 15 describes the process of leaving the body-tent by the soul of the wicked, and announces the necessity of returning to it at the resurrection: "O wretched soul, pay heed to thy flesh; take note of that whence thou art coming forth, for thou must return into thy flesh in the day of the resurrection, that thou mayst receive the recompense of thy sins". However, in contrast to the Hellenistic dualistic anthropology, Wis 9:15 and *Diogn.* 6:7 Peter does not value the body-tentacle negatively, nor does he mention that it is a burden or a prison for the soul. In fact, he does not mention the soul at all *expressis verbis*; he speaks only of "putting away the tent/house" (verse 14), which suggests the necessity of leaving it and – by implication – moving to another place. Anthropological considerations about the relationship between soul and body are thus outside the sphere of interest of the narrator,[359] who focuses rather on ontological-existential issues – the transition from a corporeal, mortal form of existence to a form, as one might guess, immortal and incorporeal, which he also not only does not describe, but does not mention at all.

The noun σκήνωμα is preceded by the indicative pronoun τοῦτο. It is difficult to determine clearly the function of this pronoun. Perhaps it replaces the possessive pronoun occurring in verse 14 (μου) and then remaining in this tent should be understood as remaining in my tent, thus referring to one's own body and then to one's own death. It is also possible that the pronoun τοῦτο was used to emphasise the connectivity of this tent with this world (cf. John 12:31, 14:30, 1 Cor 3:18–19). To remain in this tent would then mean to be present, to live in this world, which is seen as a place where corruption caused by lust is rampant (2 Pet 1:4). As already mentioned, the world itself is not valued negatively, what is valued negatively is the corruption present in it. Leaving this world would therefore involve moving to a

357 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 198; D.A. Keating, *First, Second Peter, Jude*, p. 342.

358 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 198 considers that of these two terms for tent – σκήνωμα and σκῆνος – the former was more popular in the first centuries after Christ.

359 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 655; otherwise R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 198, who sees here references to Hellenistic anthropological body-soul dualism.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

qualitatively different form of existence,[360] where neither corruption nor its cause – lust – is any longer a threat.

The narrator feels obliged to διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει "awake/stir up/you with a reminder". The verb διεγείρω/ἐγείρω in both the active and past tense is most often used in the context of waking from sleep (to rouse someone – cf. Mark 4:38, Luke 8:24, to be roused – Matt 1:24, Mark 4:39). In a metaphorical sense it means to evoke (arouse) emotions, e. g. anger and malice, as in TDan 1:22: "by deeds it strengtheneth him who is angry, and with sharp losses disturbeth his mind, and so stirreth up with great wrath his soul", attitudes, e. g. courage, as in 2 Macc 7:21; zeal as in 2 Macc 15:10, or jealousy and lust, as *Bell. Iud.* II 9:6: "when Agrippa had arrived at that degree of dignity, he enflamed διήγειρεν the ambitious desires of Herod the tetrarch".

The whole poem ends rather unexpectedly by stating how the sender intends to stimulate the addressees. The prepositional phrase ἐν ὑπομνήσει, favoured, it seems, by the author, is used here instead of the usual dat. instrumentalis (cf. ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ in 1:1, ἐν ἐπιγνώσει in 1:2). However, it is not specified what the recipients are to be stimulated to by the reminder. The reconstruction of the purpose is somewhat helped by 2 Pet 3:1, where there is an almost identical phrase supplemented by the complement διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικριωῆ διάνοιαν literally "by means of the reminder I awaken your pure/sincere thought".[361] The addendum refers to the preservation in an unadulterated form of the apostolic teaching, i. e. what is referred to in 1:12 as "the truth that you have". This means that Peter intends, by means of a reminder even before his death, to stimulate the recipients to preserve his message and to actively – by developing the baptismal gifts and the resulting virtues – manifest their faith and their belonging to the community of the called and chosen.

Such a reconstruction of the purpose of stimulation by reminder corresponds to the Hellenistic, and later Christian, convention, concept and function of formulas reminding the recipients of what they already know, which are intended to encourage specific actions and which have become an integral component of moral instruction (cf. 1 Thess 2:9, 3:4, 4:1, 5:1–2). Peter's emphasis from the beginning of the letter on practice is not accidental, for through conduct one is recognised as belonging to a community of believers. Of course, practice must be integrated with Christian doctrine – faith and knowledge. This is why the practical dimension was emphasised in the very first verses. A disconnection between doctrine and practice does not allow one to walk confidently, leading a pious life, towards the final goal to

360 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 655; Green additionally sees the irony here and understands the phrase "this tent" as "this (so-called) tent".

361 See an analysis of 2 Pet 3:1.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

enter the eternal kingdom. Through practical instruction and its reminder, misunderstood aspects of doctrine can also be clarified and straightened out. Thus, Peter's encouragement through recollection, although at first sight it primarily encourages the practice of the Christian virtues that are the aftermath of the baptismal gifts, is also intended to perpetuate the known and correctly understood, unblemished and correctly interpreted apostolic teaching.

Such an integrated approach and a positive appreciation of frequent reminders of instruction are close to the Stoics. Seneca in *Ep. mor.* (94:1.5.21.25) observes that

> [t]hat department of philosophy which supplies precepts appropriate to the individual case, instead of framing them for mankind at large – which, for instance, advises how a husband should conduct himself towards his wife, or how a father should bring up his children, or how a master should rule his slaves – this department of philosophy, I say, is accepted by some as the only significant part, while the other departments are rejected on the ground that they stray beyond the sphere of practical needs – as if any man could give advice concerning a portion of life without having first gained a knowledge of the sum of life as a whole! "For precepts will be of no avail while the mind is clouded with error; only when the cloud is dispersed will it be clear what one's duty is in each case […]. precepts alone are not effective in overthrowing the mind's mistaken beliefs; but they do not on that account fail to be of service […]. In the first place, they refresh the memory; in the second place, when sorted into their proper classes, the matters which showed themselves in a jumbled mass when considered as a whole, can be considered in this with greater care […]. Advice is not teaching; it merely engages the attention and rouses us, and concentrates the memory, and keeps it from losing grip […] The mind often tries not to notice even that which lies before our eyes; we must therefore force upon it the knowledge of things that are perfectly well known. […] whatever is wholesome should be often discussed and often brought before the mind, so that it may be not only familiar to us, but also ready to hand.

In verse 14, the narrator returns to the tent metaphor and specifies that he will soon "take down (literally put away) this tent", as Jesus revealed to him. The participle εἰδώς knowing ties in with the declaration in verse 13: δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι 'I deem it right', 'I feel obliged'. Peter chooses to stimulate his audience because he knows that he is about to die.[362] He describes this death as ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου, literally "quick is the putting away of my tent". The adjective ταχινός in Old Testament literature most often refers to speed (Isa 59:7, Wis 13:2, Sir 18:26). Here, however, it does not refer to a rapid process of dying, but to death, dying that is about to (quickly) occur, so the adjective should rather be assigned

362 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 657.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

an adverbial meaning. This is the sense in which ταχινός is used, among others, in Similitude in *The Shepherd* of Hermas: "If, therefore, any one intends to repent, let him do so quickly ταχινὸς γενέσθω" (IX 26:6). However, it is impossible to know what is implied by the term "quickly". Should it be regarded as an element of prophetic language with very vague temporal categories (cf. 2 Pet 3:8–9), or should it be taken more literally as a foreshadowing of events that will occur within a few years, a few months, or a few weeks? Much depends on the temporal location of Jesus' prophecy in verse 14b – before the crucifixion, before the ascension or after the ascension.[363] In order to circumvent these difficulties, some exegetes[364] see here rather a foreshadowing of a violent, sudden death during the persecution of Christians in the first or first/second century, for which Peter is ready, but neither on the basis of the reconstruction of Jesus' prophecy nor on the basis of the analogy with 2 Pet 2:1, where this adjective also occurs, can such conclusions be drawn.[365]

When describing death, alongside the image of a tent, the noun ἀπόθεσις, which means 'to put away', 'to get rid of' (it essentially depicts the getting rid of, putting away of clothes) (cf. 2 Macc 8:35, Acts 7:58). While the verb ἀποτίθημι is encountered in the New Testament quite frequently and in various contexts, including in metaphors referring to conversion – to put away evil deeds, to put away evil, sin (Matt 14:3, Rom 13:12, Eph 4:22.25, Heb 12:1, Jas 1:21, 1 Pet 1:1), while the noun ἀπόθεσις occurs only in the letters of Peter – here and in 1 Pet 1:21 – and only in a metaphorical sense referring to a change in ontological status.[366] Ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος literally: "getting rid of the tent" should therefore be considered a mixed hybrid metaphor[367] in which the Jewish and Greek tradition's common image of death as leaving the tent is laid over the Jewish-Christian image of a change of ontological status as taking off, getting rid of clothes (cf. Zech 3:3–5, 1 Cor 15:53–54, Col 3:9–10, 2 En 22:8–10: "And the Lord said to Michael: 'Go and take Enoch from out (of) his earthly garments, and anoint him with my sweet ointment, and put him into the garments of My glory'. And Michael did thus, as the Lord told him. He anointed me, and dressed me […] and I looked at myself, and (I) was like (transfigured) one of his glorious ones"; AscIsa 9:7–8: "And there I saw the holy Abel and all the righteous […] stript of the garments of the flesh, and I saw them in their garments of the upper world"). A similar imagery is also used by Paul in 2 Cor 5:3–4, where he speaks of the changing of the tent into new clothes, which may indicate the rather early rooting of such imagery based on mixed metaphor in the Christian milieu and sociolect.

363 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:14.

364 See, for example, M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 174.

365 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 199.

366 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 661; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 242.

367 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 199; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 442–443.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Verse 14 ends with an explanation of where Peter's knowledge of death comes from. It seems that the narrator is pointing to two sources: the explanation of Jesus, which in fact confirms some unknown prophecy.[368] This is evidenced by the construction καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσέν μοι "as well as our Lord Jesus Christ explained/revealed to me", which can also be translated as: "what our Lord Jesus Christ also explained/revealed to me" (cf. similar constructions in Luke 11:1, Acts 15:8, Rom 1:13, 15:7). R. Bauckham[369] notes that the invocation of prophecy of impending death is a generic feature of wills. However, it seems that this motif may also occur in other literary genres (e. g. Deut 31:2, 14:16, 2 Tim 4:6) and it becomes common in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic and hagiographic narratives. Baruch, through divine revelation, learns that he will receive the rapture:

> understand those things which have been shown to you; For there are many eternal consolations for you. For you shall depart from this place, And you shall pass from the regions which are now seen by you, And you shall forget whatever is corruptible, And shall not again recall those things which happen among mortals (ApBaSyr 43:1–2).

Rebekah receives the vision of her death in a dream: "my son: I shall die this year, and I shall not survive this year in my life; for I have seen in a dream the day of my death, that I should not live beyond a hundred and fifty-five years: and behold I have completed all the days of my life which I am to live" (Jub 35:6). Polycarp of Smyrna has a vision while praying: "And while he was praying, a vision presented itself to him three days before he was taken; and, behold, the pillow under his head seemed to him on fire. Upon this, turning to those that were with him, he said to them prophetically, I must be burnt alive" (*MartPol* 5:2).

It is not known how Peter learned of his impending death. It is only known that he also received this knowledge from Jesus Christ. Four hypotheses and four traditions are usually identified[370], which may stand behind this statement.

Firstly, this may be an allusion to the tradition reflected in John 13:36: Peter, though very willing, is "now" νῦν unable to accompany Jesus and die with him. Jesus promises, however, that this will be possible "later" ὕστερον.[371] It is widely

368 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 199; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 443.

369 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 199.

370 Ibid., p. 201 adds a further tradition known from the *Epistle of Clement to James* preceding the *Homilies* in *Pseudo-Clementines* (third century). The mention of the prophecy concerning Peter's death is as vestigial there as in 2 Pet 1:14 and most likely dependent on this text altogether: "as I have been taught by the Lord and Teacher Jesus Christ, whose apostle I am, the day of my death is approaching".

371 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 200; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 443.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

believed that John's account is a reinterpretation of the apostle's declaration in Matt 26:35, Mark 14:31, Luke 23:33 made after Peter's martyrdom.[372]

The most popular is the second hypothesis, also based on the record in the fourth gospel – John 21:18, when Jesus, in an enigmatic way typical of prophecy[373] announces that when Peter grows old, he will be girded and led against his will. The only clear clue here concerns old age. If the recipients are familiar with this tradition, they should become convinced that the letter was written by an old man who expects death not only because it is natural, but also because Jesus predicted it. The weakness of this hypothesis, however, is the lack of evidence for any relationship between the Gospel of John and the Second Letter of Peter. Perhaps the author of the fourth Gospel, referring *post eventum* to the martyrdom of Peter, to the words of Jesus, which were well known in the early Church, and which originally not only did not have the character of a prophecy of martyrdom, but did not even necessarily refer to the death of the apostle,[374] added this mortuary addition in John 21:19: "He said this signifying by what kind of death he would glorify God".

The third hypothesis is based on a tradition inspired by and elaborating on John 13:36 recorded in The Acts of Peter 35. It contains the famous scene of Peter leaving Rome and Jesus going to the city to allow himself to be crucified a second time.

> And the Lord said unto him: I go into Rome to be crucified. And Peter said unto him: Lord, art thou (being) crucified again? He said unto him: Yea, Peter, I am (being) crucified again. And Peter came to himself: and having beheld the Lord ascending up into heaven, he returned to Rome, rejoicing, and glorifying the Lord, for that he said: I am being crucified: the which was about to befall Peter.

This would mean that the explicit announcement of Peter's martyrdom took place after the ascension and involved a vision. If the recipients of 2 Peter were familiar with this tradition, they should also easily reconstruct the circumstances of the letter's composition: the sender writes to them from Rome, after meeting Jesus in a realistic vision, in preparation for the crucifixion. However, there is no certainty that the tradition of a prophecy received or specified in a vision existed before 180, when ActsPet was written. As a derivative of the hypothesis of prophecy received after the ascension, one can consider the proposal of G.L. Green,[375] who refers to the charism of prophecy being alive in the early Church (Acts 16:6–7, 21:10–11, 1 Thess 5:19–22, 2 Thess 2:2, 1 John 4:1–3). Peter could therefore have received

372 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 200; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 443.

373 Ibid., p. 444.

374 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 200.

375 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 659.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the announcement of death directly through "the Spirit of Jesus" πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ or through a prophet speaking through "the Spirit of Jesus". This could indeed have occurred during the apostle's stay in Rome. Then the term ταχινός takes on a more literal meaning than in the case of a prophecy delivered before the ascension.[376]

The fourth concept also refers to the extra-canonical sources. In The Apocalypse of Peter 17, we find the words spoken by Jesus to Peter after his resurrection from the dead and before his ascension: "Go forth therefore and go unto the land (or city) of the west. […] and enter into the vineyard which I shall tell thee of, in order that by the sickness (sufferings) of the Son who is without sin the deeds of corruption may be sanctified". The mention of the promised/promised cup is undoubtedly an allusion to martyrdom. Perhaps ApPet also alludes to John 13:36 (the promise given by Jesus before his death) or to John 21:18–19 (the prophecy delivered after the resurrection). However, the arrangement of the narrative in ApPet most closely resembles the text of 2 Pet 1:14–18: the eschatological prophecy, which also includes an allusion to Peter's martyrdom (cf. 2 Pet 1:14), is followed by Jesus' transfiguration (cf. 2 Pet 1:16–18) and ascension. The Apocalypse of Peter was most likely written at the time of the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135), so it is a contemporary or not much younger work than 2 Peter. Nothing binding can be said about the interdependence of the two texts, especially whether it is the author of 2 Pet who reinterprets and transforms motifs from ApPet, or vice versa – the author of ApPet is based, among other things, on 2 Pet – or perhaps both independently exploit the well-established tradition in the Church after Peter's martyrdom that such a death was announced to the apostle by Jesus.

Prophecy is described with the help of the verb δηλόω in ind. aor. act. (ἐδήλωσεν). This verb is used to describe simply the transmission of information (so, for example, in 1 Cor 1:11), but it is more often used in the sense of 'to show', 'to display', 'to expound', 'to explain', 'to make plain', 'to reveal' in order to emphasise the importance of the message being communicated, the hierarchy of the participants in the communication (the superiority of the sender over the receiver) and to accentuate the process of transition from ignorance to knowledge in the receiver of the information. Not surprisingly, δηλόω appears in texts dealing with various forms of divine revelation and can be considered synonymous with the verb ἀποκαλύπτω (Exod 6:3, 33:12, 1 Kings 8:36, 2 Kings 6:27, Dan 2:23–26.28–30).[377] The form of the aorist indicates that the explanation of the putting away of the tent is complete and needs no further elaboration. It seems that the narrator deliberately withholds details, for he states, as he makes clear with pronouns, that the object of the revelation is his death (σκηνῶμα μου "my tent", cf. "this tent" in

376 D.A. Keating, *First, Second Peter, Jude*, p. 343.

377 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 659–661.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

verse 13) and that he is the addressee of the explanation (ἐδήλωσέν μοι "revealed to me").

Verse 15 is the final summary of what the narrator has conveyed so far. As noted earlier, there is a chiasmic component which, like verse 12 refers to the purpose of the letter. The two poems even use similar wording to indicate this purpose – "to recall these things":

Verse 12	Verse 15
ὑπομιμνῄσκειν περὶ τούτων	τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι
To remind of these [things]	To make each other reminders of these [things]

Both use the ACI construction, and both are dominated by the future tense. However, unlike verse 12 with its periphrastic construction, here the hagiographer used the usual ind. fut. σπουδάσω.[378] The summary character of the whole *exordium* in verse 15 was also marked by the use of lexis that had appeared earlier, or terms clearly synonymous or antonymic to those occurring previously:

Verse 15	Significance	Reference
σπουδάσω	strive earnestly/effortlessly	v. 5. σπουδή v. 10. σπουδάσατε
ἑκάστοτε	always	v. 12. ἀεί
ἔχειν	have, possess	v. 8. ὑπάρχοντα v. 9. πάρεστιν
μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον	after I left	v. 11. εἴσοδος
		v. 14. ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος
μννήμην	reminder/reminder	v. 9. λήθη v. 12. ὑπομιμνήσκειν v. 13. ὑπομνήσει
τὴν τούτων	these things	v. 3. πάντα v. 8.9.10.12 ταῦτα
ποιεῖσθαι	make	v. 10. ποιεῖσθαι

The verb σπουδάσω, as stated earlier, means endeavour, endeavour in which determination and effort must be put. In verse 5, zeal was emphasised; in verse 10, effort. Such efforts were what the narrator was calling his audience to. Effort concerned the practice and development of the baptismal gifts and the dispositions and virtues resulting from them. In verse 15, the subject of the efforts is the sender and their object is to leave a message for all addressees, contemporary to the author and later, that they could always recall, even after the writer's departure. The context means that an element of haste can now be added to the meanings previously

378 In some testimonies – P^{72} ℵ 1735 – fut. σπουδάσω is replaced by ind. praes.: σπουδάζω.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

ascribed to the lexeme σπουδή – for, as verse 14 shows, this departure (the taking down of the tent) is imminent.

In contrast to the previous uses, here the use of the lexeme σπουδή is most likely part of the typical convention and epistolary style,[379] especially epistolography of a parenetic nature. It is not only a matter of stating the purpose of the letter, but also of describing the circumstances and reasons for it, as in Jude 3 and in *Barn.* 1:5, 4:9, 21:9:

> Considering this, therefore, that if I should take the trouble ἐσπούδασα to communicate to you some portion of what I have myself received, it will prove to me a sufficient reward that I minister to such spirits, I have hastened briefly to write unto you, in order that, along with your faith, you might have perfect knowledge; […] Now, being desirous to write many things to you, not as your teacher, but as becomes one who loves you, I have taken care not to fail to write γράφειν ἐσπούδασα to you from what I myself possess, with a view to your purification; […] Wherefore I have been the more earnest ἐσπούδασα to write to you, as my ability served, that I might cheer you.

As in verse 12, the use of the future tense is surprising. However, whereas previously the periphrastic form was surprising, now the future tense itself seems to be obtuse. The present tense would have been much more natural and understandable and would have referred to the process of the letter. However, the narrator is returning to what he intimated in verse 12 – he wants his message not to be read once in the community of the immediate, first, historical recipients, but to be continually repeated also in other communities (cf. Col 4:16, 1 Thess 5:27) and by future generations of Christians. One may wonder whether this is the message contained in 2 Peter – this idea is advocated by most commentators – or whether, in addition to this letter, Peter intends just as soon to communicate (in writing or orally) something else,[380] in which case futurum would be a better solution. Among the works to which 2 Pet 1:15 could point is the text of 2 Pet 3:1–7, which in this context would rank as a separate letter later incorporated into 2 Peter.[381]

The second reference text would be the Gospel of Mark, which according to tradition was based on the teaching of Peter.[382] In the early Christian accounts of the circumstances of the composition of the Mk, a lexis reminiscent of 2 Pet 1:15 is surprising. Papias states that this gospel is a record of what Mark retained from

379 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 201.

380 Thus, e. g. T. Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. 2, ed. M.W. Jacobus and others, Edinburgh 1909, p. 200–202; after: R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 201; see also. P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 446.

381 See Introduction.

382 See K. Wojciechowska, *Opowiadam wam jak Piotr*, p. 27–29.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Peter's teaching: γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνεισεν (*HE* III 39). Irenaeus of Lyon in *Adv. Haer.* III 1:1 indicates that the Markan account was written after the departure of Peter and Paul: μετὰ δὲ τούτων ἔξοδον. This is different from Clement of Alexandria, who suggests that the gospel was written while Peter was still alive, at the request of the apostle's hearers, who, moved by his teaching, asked Mark "that he would leave them a written monument [ὑπόμνημα] of the doctrine which had been orally communicated to them" (*HE* II 15:1). Peter would have learned of the origin of the Gospel of Mark "through a revelation of the Spirit, of that which had been done — was pleased with the zeal of the men, and that the work obtained the sanction of his authority for the purpose of being used in the churches" (HE II 15:2). This, in turn, would agree with the intention in 2 Pet 1:12.15. The problem, however, is that the Gospel of Mark does not focus on the transmission of those ταῦτα "things" that the author of 2 Peter speaks of in both *exordium* and the body of his letter,[383] and 2 Peter also lacks explicit evangelical references.[384] It is therefore necessary to stay with the most likely hypothesis that, despite the unusual use of futurum, the narrator is referring to his letter and it would be the one always recalled message.

The phrase δὲ καί translated as "but also" can be seen as an exponent of the coherence between verse 14 and verse 15: despite his impending death, the narrator tries not to focus on this and to formulate a universal timeless teaching, recalled also "after his passing". This timelessness of recalling Peter's message is very much emphasised by the adverb ἑκάστοτε belonging to the New Testament *hapax legomena* and taken, it seems, from classical texts, since it does not occur in LXX either and is rare in Hellenistic literature.[385] It is usually translated always, but depending on the context it can also have an iterative meaning "every time" or "at every moment", or a durative meaning "at all times".

It seems that in the summary of *exordium* the sender's main concern is that the recollection of his teaching laid out also later in the letter should lead to its practice. This is evident in the lexis used in the construction of the ACI: ἔχειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι "so that you may (literally so that you may) recall/remember these things", which on the one hand alludes to the "possession of" baptismal gifts and the use of them as if they were one's property/property, and on the other hand empowers the recipients to also make use of Peter's teaching.[386] The continuous use of what one possesses is emphasised by the use of the verb ἔχω in inf. praes. act. "These things" ταῦτα refer, as before, to "everything needed to live a pious life, avoid corruption and to become a partaker in the divine nature" (verses 3–4). In the sorites in verses 5–8 and then in verses 9–10 "all" this is concretised and

383 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 446.

384 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 202.

385 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 664.

386 Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

directed practically.[387] At the same time, ταῦτα also points to what Peter will write later in the letter.

In the conclusion, the narrator uses the noun μνήμη instead of ὑπομνήσις to denote "recollection" and "memory". This is another *hapax legomenon* which, although popular in LXX,[388] does not appear elsewhere in the New Testament, especially in combination with the verb ποιέω.[389] Such constructions are instead found in Greek literature. They usually denote the mention of something or someone – as in Herodotus in *Histories* I 15:1 "[I] shall speak instead of Ardys" or in Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* XIII 3:1: "But then the son of Onias the High Priest, […] who fled to King Ptolemy, […] out of a desire to purchase to himself a memorial and eternal fame" βουλόμενος αὐτῷ δόξαν καὶ μνήμην αἰωνιον. But they can also be used with more solemn texts, especially eulogies, in which case they would have to be translated according to the requirements of the high, lofty style as to keep something in memory or to keep something in mind.[390] The phrase μνήμην ποιέω appears in this sense and register, for example, in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (III 12:4 [1414a]): "Homer has increased the reputation of Nireus […]; he has perpetuated his memory" or in Diogenes Laertius in *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (II 2): "Let us who were his pupils cherish his memory, and let it be cherished by our children and pupils; and let us not cease to entertain one another with his words". Such a solemn character is also assumed by the last sentence of Peter's *exordium*.

It is noteworthy that the verb ποιέω is used in inf. praes. pass., which suggests a durative understanding of it – continually making memory/constantly remaining in memory/constantly recalling. Moreover – it is about reminding each other, as indicated by the reflexive side. The final position of ποιέω also seems significant, allowing the activism that characterises the whole beginning of Peter's letter to be exposed. A similar combination of practising the virtues and keeping them in mind can be found among others in Philo of Alexandria, who in *De migrat.* III 16 writes that "But if anything well affected towards virtue has shot up by the side of it, that is preserved in the recollection".

Peter specifies and emphasises that the reminding each time, or the constant reminding, should continue not only as long as he lives, but also after his departure. He uses the noun ἔξοδος in a metaphorical way, of course, characteristic above all

387 E. Waltner and J.D. Charles, *1–2 Peter, Jude*, Scottdale 1999, p. 210 consider that the recollection, which refers to a Christianised catalogue of virtues, is part of a polemic with the pagan world. This is because pagans would accuse Christians of the attitude presented in v. 9 – emphasising strictly theological elements in the faith (cleansing from sins) without translating them into the practice of a virtuous, ethical life.

388 Ps 30[29]:5, 97[96]:12, 145[144]:7, Prov 10:7, Wis 4:1.19, 8:13, 2 Macc 2:25, 7:20.

389 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 665.

390 Ibid., p. 666.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of the Jewish-Christian tradition, where "departure/passing away" means death. Although such a term for death did not actually become widespread until the second century (cf. the text quoted above from *Adv. Haer.* III 1:1 speaking of the departure of Peter and Paul), it can also be found in earlier texts, e. g. in Wis 3:2–3, 7:6, or in TNaph 1:1–3, when the hero announces to his sons that he is dying. Philo in *De virt.* XII 77 equates "departure" and "termination of existence": Then, having prepared all things for his departure πρὸς ἔξοδον, [Moses] did not approach the actual termination of his existence until he had shown respect to all the tribes of his nation". Flavius, describing the same episode, quoted the words of Moses: "I should depart out of this life; […] I thought it reasonable not to leave off my endeavours even now for your happiness; but to do my utmost to procure for you the eternal enjoyment of good things, and a memorial for my self" (ἐπ᾽ἐξόδου) (*Ant.* IV 8:2; see also *Ant.* IV 8:45–47). To a different category of texts, however, belongs the Luke 9:31 usually cited in this context, where, after Jesus' transfiguration, Moses and Elijah discuss his departure in Jerusalem. It seems that they are actually talking, without metaphorizing, about Jesus' departure to heaven, i. e. his ascension, not his death.

In some Jewish and Christian texts there is a Hellenistic suggestion that "departure/exodus" actually means the moment when the soul leaves the body – so, for example, in Sir 38:23 or ApPaul 14:1.3: "I wish to see the souls of the righteous and of the sinners, how they go out of the world. […] And I looked […] the good took possession of the soul of the righteous man, and said to it: Take note of the body whence thou art coming out; for it is necessary for thee again to return to it in the day of the resurrection" (cf. also ApPaul 15 quoted above). However, as already stated when analysing verses 13–14, there is no indication that Peter's imagery is based on such a dualistic anthropology. Of course, behind it is the conviction of a change in ontological status and a transition from one form of existence to another, which is further emphasised by the antonymy of verses 11 and 15: ἔξοδδος εἴσοδος ("exodus/exit" – "entrance"),[391] but no details about the anthropological and thanatological conception in 2 Peter can be provided.

In this final summary in verse 15, the narrator makes it clearer even than in verse 12 that the personal pronoun ὑμεῖς is to be understood collectively. It encompasses the first recipients and all virtual recipients, the later perhaps wondering whether Peter's message is in fact universal or conditioned by historical context. Peter anticipates these concerns. In the rest of the letter, moreover, he will return to this, citing arguments for the timelessness of his teaching. In doing so, he refers to episodes from his life to confirm his authority (2 Pet 1:16–18), but above all to the universality and timelessness of the prophetic message (2 Pet 1:19–21) and of Paul's

391 D.A. Keating, *First, Second Peter, Jude*, p. 343.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

teaching (2 Pet 3:15–16). While describing the criteria for interpreting both kinds of texts (not according to one's own discretion and wisdom), he will at the same time suggest that his teachings should be interpreted in a similar way by future generations.

2.5 D_1. Prophetic-apostolic teaching (2 Pet 1:16–21)

> [16]For we have not succumbed to/followed cleverly devised myths, we made known to you the Parousia/coming with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, but have been eyewitnesses to His majesty. [17]For he received (lit. having received) honour and glory from God the Father when the voice from the Magnificent Glory was brought to him: This one is my Son, my Beloved, to him I found favour/in whom I am well pleased. [18]And this voice brought from heaven we heard/we heard from heaven was brought, being with him on the holy mountain. [19]And we have [also for this] a sure/confirming prophetic word; you will do well paying heed to it as to a lamp shining in a dark place until the day dawns and the morning star/carrying light rises in your hearts, [20]knowing first of all that no/every prophecy of Scripture happens/comes into being by its own interpretation/becomes [a subject of] its own interpretation, [21]for prophecy was never/at any time brought by the will of man, but by the Holy Spirit inspired (lit. carried) men spoke from God.

Lines 16–21, on the one hand, justify why Peter's message is to be read not only by contemporaries but also by later recipients of the letter; on the other hand, they also constitute a general reflection on apostolic and prophetic authority and their credibility and equality. This reflection, together with the hermeneutics employed by the narrator, will be developed later in the letter. One can note a certain regularity in Peter's argument. He starts from a general, broad understanding of the apostolic teaching as the message given by all the apostles and missionaries (verse 16a), to gradually narrow it down (16b) to the message on the Parousia (verse 16b) until he identifies the apostles as eyewitnesses to the transfiguration scene (verses 16c–18). From verse 19, where the certainty of the apostolic and prophetic message is mentioned, the process of expansion begins again, which now concerns the prophetic message. In verse 19a "the word prophetic" is primarily concerned with the Parousia, in 19b it also extends to the ethical teaching of the prophets, and in verses 20–21 "the prophecies of Scripture" and "prophecy" are given the general quantifier "none" (literally "every" – πᾶσα), and thus constitute a reflection on the essence of prophecy in general. This means that at the centre of 2 Pet 1:16–21 stands verse 19, which on the one hand represents the pinnacle of the particularising gradation and on the other a turn towards the generalising gradation:

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

A. Apostolic teaching is not based on myths (16a)
  B. Apostolic teaching on the Parousia is not based on myths (16b)
    C. Apostolic teaching about the Parousia is based on eyewitness accounts (16c–18)
      D. Apostolic teaching and prophetic teaching confirm each other (19a)
    C'. Prophetic teaching concerning the Parousia (19a)
  B'. Prophetic teaching on the Parousia and proceedings (19b–c)
A'. No prophecy arises from human will; every prophecy is inspired (20–21).

The juxtaposition shows that the equation of apostolic and prophetic authority is central to Peter's argument. Both have the same credibility and both confirm each other: apostolic teaching is essentially a reinterpretation of past prophecies and a testimony to their fulfilment, while prophetic teaching is the basis of apostolic teaching (cf. Eph 2:20, Luke 11:49, Rev 18:20). Such an introduction will allow the narrator to refer later in the letter (from 2:1 onwards) both to examples based on the broad prophetic tradition and to eschatological apostolic teaching.

Beginning in verse 16, in order to justify why the message of verses 1–11 should be repeated over and over again, the narrator reaches for the οὐ […] ἀλλά construction, which is often used in polemical and apologetic texts.[392] Many commentators want to see here a polemic against the teachings of the false teachers[393] and a rebuttal to accusations that the apostles were following some myths.[394] Peter would thus somewhat ironically adopt the terminology of his opponents, while making it clear that it is rather their teaching that is based on myths, deceptive fables (cf. 1 Tim 1:4, 4:7, Titus 1:14, Ignatius of Antioch's *Letter to the Magnesians* 8:1: "Be not deceived with strange doctrines, nor with old fables [μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν] which are unprofitable"). He also proceeds in a similar way in 3:4, where the polemic is more explicit, for it is preceded by a detailed characterisation of the false teachers. Here it can only be guessed at.

Perhaps verse 16 to be considered more universal rather than directed only against specific opponents. An argument in favour of such a universal treatment of

392 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 204–205.

393 J.H. Neyrey, *The Apologetic Use of Transfiguration in 2 Pet 1:16–21*, CBQ 42 (1980), p. 506–508; J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 316; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy, Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 246.

394 Thus, for example, J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 316; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 672; cf. also K.H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefie*, p. 195; W. Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, p. 71, who believe that Peter here not only wants to reject the charge, but ironically uses the concept of myths in relation to his own teaching, having in fact in mind mythology – the untrue stories of his opponents.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the mention of myths might be the strongly emphasised universalism and timelessness of Peter's message recalled "always" before. With such an assumption, then, it would be a matter of generally pre-empting the accusations that can be made against Peter and his teaching now and later, without specifying from whom they come. All the more so since the semantic field of the noun μῦθοι (sg. μῦθος) was already very extensive in the first century after Christ.[395] It is also worth noting the conjunct γάρ, which can be regarded as an exponent not only of coherence, but even of cohesion. For it indicates that the argumentation cited next is in fact an explanation[396] of why Peter's eschatological and soteriological message summarised in verses 9–11 can and should be continually recalled.

The term μῦθος (cf. Latin *fabula*), as said, has many meanings. In the first instance, it is associated with pagan stories about the gods, which would explain the rules of the world, religious rites and customs, and finally philosophy and ethics.[397] Initially the term was neutral,[398] it was used regardless of the assessment of the sources of the stories. It was also used as a *terminus technicus* to designate the plot of a tragedy or comedy, which originally had a religious function. From the time of Pindar, however, μῦθοι and λόγοι began to be contrasted. The former were based on fiction, the latter on fact.[399] Thucydides in the *Histories* (I 21–23) judges that many of the historiographers who preceded him (e. g. Herodotus) were rather mythographers who were more concerned with pleasing their readers than presenting the truth.[400] Also Plato in *Timaeus* distinguishes between an invented fable (πλασθέντα μῦθον) and true history (ἀληθινὸν λόγον) when he contrasts mythological explanations of natural disasters and their real causes: "Now this has the form of a myth, but really signifies a declination of the bodies moving in the heavens around the earth, and a great conflagration of things upon the earth".

This opposition is particularly evident in later historiographical literature, including Strabo (*Geographica hypomnemata* V 1:9: "the historical accounts […], which I shall relate insofar as they may be historically useful; but I must disregard most of the mythical or false stories"), Diodorus Siculus (*Bibliotheca Historica* I 25:4: "In proof of this, as they say, they never spread legends, as the Greeks do, but manifest facts; for practically the entire inhabited world is their witness, in that it eagerly contributes to the honours of Isis because she manifests herself in healings"; cf. also IV 8:4, V 23:1–2) and in *The Life of Theseus* 1:1, which begins Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, contrasts myth and fact-based history (ἀληθεῖ λόγῳ): "I have traversed those

395 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 213; see below – analysis of the term μῦθος.

396 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 672.

397 Ibid., p. 674.

398 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 246.

399 F.F. Bruce, *Myth*, NIDNTT 2, p. 643.

400 For: ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

periods of time […] which afford basis for a history dealing with facts, I might well say of the earlier periods: 'What lies beyond is full of marvels and unreality, a land of poets and fabulists, of doubt and obscurity'".

This also led in philosophical and ethical writings to discredit mythology as a basis for the workings of the world and moral principles that are based on reason and logical inference rather than invented stories. Epicureans spoke particularly contemptuously of myths, especially those concerning the posthumous punishment of the wicked.[401]

In the LXX, the term "myth" appears very rarely. It is absent in the books that were translated from Hebrew.[402] In the Greek books, it can be found in a negative sense – as the opposite of truth. In Sir 20:19, ungrateful and unlearned people use "an untimely story"; in Bar 3:23, "the storytellers" who "have not known the way to wisdom, nor have they kept her paths in mind".

Jewish Hellenistic writers antagonised biblical stories concerning the creation of the world and pagan cosmogony. Philo makes a clear distinction between biblical ktiseology and cosmological myths, using, incidentally, the same oppositional polemical formula οὐ…ἀλλά as the narrator of 2 Peter[403] (cf. *De fuga et inventione* XXII 121: "[the biblical author was] not here inventing a fable οὐ μυθοπλαστῶν, but pointing out the proper nature of the event"; *De mundi opificio* 1:2: "But Moses […], made the beginning of his laws entirely beautiful, and in all respects admirable, neither at once […] inventing fables μύθους πλασάμενος himself or adopting those which had been invented by others"; cf. also *De mutat. nom.* XXVIII 152; *De somn.* I 27:172, where these statements refer to later biblical history).

Philo's differentiation is also reflected in early Christian literature, e. g. in *2 Clem.* 13:3, when reference is made, on the one hand, to the pagans' admiration for the word of God regarding the conditions of expectation of the Parousia in end times[404] (cf. *2 Clem.* 12:1–6), and, on the other hand, to the equating of the word of God with mythology if the eschatological Christian proclamation is not followed by deeds: "For the nations, hearing from our mouth the oracles of God, marvel at their excellence and worth; thereafter learning that our deeds are not worthy of the words which we speak — receiving this occasion they turn to blasphemy, saying that they are a fable (μῦθόν τινα) and a delusion" (*2 Clem.* 13). It is most likely that the author of 2 Peter gives to the term "myths" as used in 2 Pet 1:16 a content that consists in part of all the meanings outlined above: a lack of grounding in real, actual testimony, a lack of grounding in reason, and finally a lack of coherence between Christian teaching and conduct. In the remainder of

401 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 213; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 453–454.

402 F.F. Bruce, *Myth*, NIDNTT 2, p. 644.

403 J.H. Neyrey, *The Apologetic Use of Transfiguration*, p. 507–508.

404 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 214.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the letter, these accusations will be successively refuted, and Peter's eschatological message of "the entrance into the eternal kingdom" and the Parousia of Jesus Christ (cf. 2 Pet 1:17–21, 3:4.12)[405] presented as based on the credible testimony of a disciple of Jesus, the prophetic and apostolic message, consistent with reason, and requiring appropriate activity.

The myths in 2 Pet 1:16 are defined by part. perf. σεσοφισμένοι 'sophisticated',[406] which can be seen as a formula synonymous with πλαστοὶ λόγοι in 2 Pet 2:3. Perfectum indicates that what is meant is the lasting impact of what has been invented in the past, but the essential emphasis is on the pejoratively perceived sophistry – as a kind of cleverness, sometimes complex operations of thought, which are intended to give the 'myths' – the eschatological and soteriological teaching of Peter – the appearance of probability and more easily deceive or even seduce the hearers.[407] Such a conception is close to what the Epicureans claimed about myths concerning posthumous punishment. They considered them particularly dangerous, not only because they are unsupported by reality and reason, but above all because they are designed to frighten people and gain control over their behaviour.[408] This means that the narrator introducing himself as Peter anticipates that later accusations about his message may be based on the same accusations that appear in his contemporaries with the Epicureans and, in addition to all the meanings contained in the notion of "myth", will also include slander for the fanciful and, in fact, bogus communication of the truth and a desire to control the faithful.

G.L. Green[409] sees here elements of *vituperatio* used against Peter by his opponents. One of the characteristic elements of this convention was the weighty accusation of opponents of using arguments based on deception and sophistry. Calling someone a sophist was regarded as an invective, an phrase of contempt. It is used, among others, by Plutarch in *Morals* 1124C (*Adversus Colotem*) against Epicureans, whom he describes as sophists and charlatans/deceivers (σοφισταὶ δ'εἰσὶ καὶ ἀλαζόνες), and Dio Chrysostom in *Orationes* 54:1 contrasts the dubious value of the teachings of the sophists, who have gained temporary acclaim and fortunes, with those of Socrates, which are still valid. Philo condemns sophistry as a kind of magic, for he juxtaposes side by side the sophists and the magicians who, like Moses, threw staffs that turned into serpents (*De vita Mois.* I XVI:92–94). Perhaps, indeed, the narrator has encountered or expects in the future to refer

405 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 673.

406 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 316 considers that the term 'sophisticated/inventive' is used here in an ironic sense.

407 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 674.

408 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 214; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 455.

409 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 673.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to Christian teaching in general and the eschatological message in particular as deceptive sophistry.

These fanciful, elaborate myths would be preached because Peter and other Christian teachers had succumbed to them. The phrase used here is μύυοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες 'to follow myths', 'to succumb to myths', which appears among others in Flavius in *Ant.* I 1:4 in relation to the legislation of the neighbouring peoples, which, unlike the law of Moses, was based on myths (οἱ μὲν γὰρ νομοθέται τοῖς μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες). As we can see, it is about conforming to some way of thinking or acting The verb ἐξακολουθέω belongs to Peter's unique lexis. It appears nowhere else in NT, only in 2 Pet 1:16, 2:2 and 2:15, where it describes reactions to the actions of false teachers. It can, however, be found in intertestamental literature, e. g. in TIss 2:3: "they will follow after their own wicked devices".

In stark contrast to these ironically presented predictable accusations, the phrase ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν literally: "we have made known to you", "we have declared to you". The verb γνωρίζω comes to be regarded in NT almost as a terminus technicus used when describing the transmission of revelation[410] (cf. e. g. John 15:15, 17:26, Rom 9:22.23, 16:26, Eph 1:9, 3:10, 6:19, Col 1:27), and it is also used in this sense by the narrator of 2P, suggesting even now, before he has given all the arguments, that the message that not only he but also the other apostles proclaim is based on revelation. Therefore, the form 1 sg. in verses 12–15 is replaced with the form 1 pl. to indicate that, although it is a teaching given by different apostles in different forms, it is not only consistent but also identical with revelation. In this way, he alludes to 1:1 where he mentioned "our faith" and equated it with the faith of the recipients of the letter, the content of which was transmitted by "your apostles" who were not part of the Twelve (cf. also 2 Pet 3:1–2). Now this collective form of the verb also does not just point to the Twelve (possibly the three disciples) as communicators of the revelation,[411] but rather to the revelation itself as the source of the general apostolic message.

One may, of course, wonder how this collective meaning relates to the description of the transfiguration in verse 17 and the mention of the voice that was heard in verse 18. It seems that the phrase in the 1st person pl. of verse 18 ἠκούσαμεν "we heard" cannot be taken only literally, for then indeed the circle of disciples who were eyewitnesses of the transfiguration and thus predestined to convey this revelation would have to be limited to Peter, James and John. [412] R. Bauckham[413] explains this apparent inconsistency by the fact that, although not all the disciples – even from the group of the Twelve – witnessed all the episodes of Jesus' life, this did

410 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 317.

411 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 214.

412 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:18.

413 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 214–215; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 457.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

not prevent all of them from talking about them after they had learned about them from the mouths of eyewitnesses and/or participants. The same applies to later missionaries and evangelists referred to as apostles, who did not even know the earthly Jesus. An excellent example of this is Paul, whose apostolic teaching the author of 2 Peter greatly appreciates (2 Pet 3:15–16). The desire to indicate that the whole eschatological message of Peter is based on the revelation given by eyewitnesses who are guarantors of the veracity of the revelation dominates here over grammar, R. Bauckham argues, and the necessity of referring 1 pl. in verse 16 and in verse 18 to the same subjects. For the subjects are different: in verse 16 all the apostles (missionaries, evangelists), in verse 18 the eyewitnesses of the transfiguration.

The plural form in 2 Pet 1:16 is explained differently by G.L. Green.[414] For he argues that ἐγνωρίσαμεν may refer to a 2 Pet text written in collaboration with Silvanus, as was the case with 1 Pet (1 Pet 5:12). This hypothesis, however, in the light of the letter as a whole, seems less likely than R. Bauckham's proposal. G.L. Green himself admits that the author of 2 Peter may have in mind the proclamation of the gospel by the holy prophets and your apostles;[415] he thus extends, among other things, on the basis of verses 19–21, the apostolic message to include the prophetic message. The opponents contesting Peter's teaching would thus be acting not only against the apostle, but against all the apostles and prophets. Thus, already here the narrator would be suggesting the unity and coherence of apostolic and prophetic teaching, which he will develop later by referring to the category of inspiration.[416]

As already mentioned, R. Bauckham's conception seems more convincing. Especially when juxtaposed with the gradual narrowing of the concept of apostolic testimony in verses 16–19, described in the introduction to this passage. Then, indeed, ἐγνωρίσαμεν would have to be understood as referring to the preaching of all the apostles, missionaries and evangelists, and ἠκούσαμεν in verse 18 as eyewitness testimony concerning the transfiguration which is an anticipation of the Parousia. At the same time, this detailed description of the transfiguration is taken as an example, so that the recipients gain confidence in the truth and basis of the apostolic message from it.

The pronoun ὑμεῖς here refers to all addressees, but especially to those future ones. So does the exhortation in verse 19b. The two messages with direct addresses to future addressees complement and condition each other. The word of the prophets, whom the addressees have not had the opportunity to know and hear, is reliable because it is based on revelation and inspiration, and with it one must abide until

414 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 678.

415 Ibid.

416 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:19–20.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the Parousia (19). Likewise, the word of the apostles – based on the same revelation – should be credible to the recipients, even if they did not have the opportunity to encounter the apostles – direct witnesses of the life of Jesus – but with the later apostles and through them learn about this revelation. Neither the past message of the prophets nor the past and future message of all the apostles, missionaries and evangelists can, according to the narrator, be called myths, as not only Peter's opponents, but in general the opponents of the eschatological prophetic and apostolic teaching in the future, would like to do.

The content of the apostolic eschatological message is contained in the words ἡ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶνν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμις καὶ παρουσία literally: "the power and Parousia/coming of our Lord Jesus Christ". The two terms "power and Parousia/coming" are noteworthy here. It would most likely be appropriate to treat them as hendiadys, which is one of the narrator's more favoured rhetorical devices (cf. piety and life in verse 3),[417] and to regard the noun power as a derivation of the noun Parousia, and to translate the whole as "Parousia/coming in power".

The term παρουσία "Parousia" itself has many meanings; it appears in both secular and religious literature. To commemorate Nero's arrival in Corinth, commemorative coins were issued in the city with the Latin inscription "Adventus Aug[usti] Cor[inthi]",[418] where "adventus" is the Latin equivalent of the Greek "Parousia". 3 Macc 3:17 speaks of the Parousia, or arrival of King Ptolemy: "Our arrival was welcomed with kind words, but by deeds they revealed its insincerity". Parousia also referred to the coming of a deity, e. g. the Parousia of Asclepius, the god of the art of medicine, signifies his coming to the sick sleeping in the abaton and awaiting healing. Josephus Flavius, on the other hand, repeatedly speaks of God's coming to his people (*Ant.* III 5:2, III 8:5, IX 3:3) and even of coming to show power (XVIII 8:6) as a manifestation of God's power, but without any eschatological context. This context begins to be evident in TJud 4:12–13, when the coming of salvation for Israel is mentioned: "among men of another race shall my kingdom be brought to an end, until the salvation of Israel shall come. Until the appearing of the God of righteousness, that Jacob, and all the Gentiles may rest in peace". In 2 Pet 1:16, in keeping with his strategy of Christianising concepts drawn from Greek and Jewish tradition, this coming and revelation of God's power is given new content by the epistle sender.

The vision of "the coming" of Jesus belongs to typical Christian eschatological imagery (Matt 24:3.27.37.39, 1 Cor 15:23, 1 Thess 3:13, 4:15, Jas 5:7–8, 1 John 2:28, cf. 1 Pet 1:7.13, 4:13, where, instead of the Parousia, the revelation of Christ in the

417 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 215; J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 176; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 679; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 163; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 247.

418 For: G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 681.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

end times is spoken of). Later in the letter, the narrator uses the noun Parousia when he mentions the promise of Jesus' coming (2 Pet 3:4) and "the coming of the Day of God" (2 Pet 3:12). There is no reason to think that he departs from this in 1:16[419] and has in mind, for example, those contents he associated with the similar-sounding participle παροῦσα in verse 12, where he emphasised primarily the present state, i. e. the possession of knowledge. It is equally unlikely to refer the Parousia to the first coming of Christ in the flesh.[420] Indeed, such a view did not become widespread until the second century[421] on the basis of the early Christian apocalypses with their prominent theme of pre-existence and Christ's "coming" into the world as Jesus. On the basis of the New Testament texts, it would be difficult to draw such a conclusion unequivocally.

As mentioned, by means of the hendiadys, the narrator specifies that the second coming of Jesus is a coming with power. The "power" δύναμις alongside "the glory" δόξα are the definitions typical of this eschatological imagery (Matt 24:30, Mark 9:1, 13:26, Luke 21:27, Rev 4:11, 5:12, 17:13, *2 Clem.* 17:5: "And the unbelievers will see His glory and might καὶ ὄψονται τὴνδόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ κράτος, and, when they see the empire of the world in Jesus, they will be surprised". However, as the further context shows, it would be appropriate here to look not only to the Gospel tradition of a strictly eschatological,[422] but also to that underlying the Gospel account of the transfiguration, especially Matt 16:28 and Mark 9:1.[423]

In the letter, the mention of "power" had already appeared in 1:3, where it referred to the divine power of the resurrected exalted Christ[424] (cf. Rom 1:4); now the narrator expands the concept. It can therefore be considered that verse 16 continues the thought and imagery from verse 3: the divine power of the exalted Christ, through which believers have received their baptismal gifts, will be the same divine power with which Jesus will appear at his second coming.[425]

The end of verse 16 refers to the notion of eyewitnesses.[426] It thus provides an introduction to the transfiguration narrative in verses 17–18. The term ἐπόπται, which is a New Testament *hapax legomenon* (cf. the verb ἐποπτεύω in 1 Pet 1:12,

419 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 316; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 215.

420 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 318; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 215.

421 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 680.

422 T. Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralitic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*, Lund 1977, p. 80.

423 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:17.

424 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3.

425 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 680.

426 R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospel as Eyewitness Testimony*, Grand Rapids 2006, p. 8.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

3:2),[427] appears in Greek and Hellenistic literature, including religious literature. In Aeschylus in *Prometheus Bound* 298–299.301 it denotes an observer, a spectator: "Ha! What have we here? So then you too have come to stare upon my sufferings?". In Flavius in *Con. Ap.* II 22 he indicates the overseers (priests performing this function): "These men had the main care of the law, and of the other parts of the people's conduct committed to them. For they were the priests who were ordained to be the inspectors of all καὶ γὰρ ἐπόπται πάντων; and the judges in doubtful cases". And indeed, hence hath arisen that accusation which some make against us; that we have not produced men that have been the inventers of new operations, or of new ways of speaking. For others think it a fine thing to persevere in nothing that has been delivered down from their forefathers: and these testify it to be an instance of the sharpest wisdom, when these men venture to transgress those traditions. Whereas we, on the contrary, suppose it to be our only wisdom and virtue to admit no actions, nor supposals that are contrary to our original laws. Which procedure of ours is a just and sure sign that our law is admirably constituted. For such laws as are not thus well made, are convicted upon trial to want amendment". In LXX it refers to God as a witness and is – depending on the context – synonymous with guardian – Est 5:1a; the watcher who guards the temple – 2 Macc 3:39, the one who watches – 2 Macc 7:35, the one who looks after everything – 3 Macc 2:21, is "the ruler and lord of the Universe" (*The Letter of Aristeas* 16) and "Guardian of every spirit" – *1 Clem.* 59:3. It seems, however, that the author of 2 Peter also draws rather provocatively on the tradition associated with the Eleusinian mysteries.[428] Indeed, in the descriptions of the mysteries, this term is used to refer to initiates who have learned the divine mysteries by means of visions. Plutarch in *Alcibiades* 22:3 mentions the accusation of Alcibiades imitating priests who reveal secrets to initiates (ἐπόπταις):

> Thessalus […] impeaches Alcibiades, son of […] for committing crime against the goddesses of Eleusis […] by mimicking the mysteries and showing them forth to his companions in his own house, wearing a robe such as the High Priest wears when he shows forth the sacred secrets to the initiates, and calling himself High Priest.

In keeping with his strategy, the narrator Christianises and at the same time neutralises this familiar notion in the Hellenistic world: to know in mystical vision the divine mysteries means in 2 Pet to recognise in the transfiguration vision the

427 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 248 draws attention to the aspect of attentiveness in the concept of ἐπόπται, which distinguishes it from the almost twin concept of αὐτόπται (cf. Luke 1:2).

428 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 215.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

mysteries of Christ's second coming. In contrast to the mystical tradition, no special mystical experience is needed for this, mere observation suffices, and furthermore, these mysteries are revealed to all (γνωρίζω), accessed by all, not just to the elect/initiates.

R. Bauckham[429] observes that the author of 2 Peter reaches for the typical apologetic argumentation used especially when it is necessary to demonstrate the historical basis of Christianity (John 19:35, 1 John 1:1–3, 4:14, also in GpPet 26–27: "But I [Peter] with the companions was sorrowful; and having been wounded in spirit, we were in hiding, for we were sought after by them as wrongdoers and as wishing to set fire to the sanctuary. In addition to all these things we were fasting; and we were sitting mourning and weeping night and day until the Sabbath" and GpPet 59–60: "But we twelve disciples of the Lord were weeping and sorrowful; and each one, sorrowful because of what had come to pass, departed to his home. But I, Simon Peter, and my brother Andrew, having taken our nets, went off to the sea. And there was with us Levi of Alphaeus"). This reference to eyewitnesses in verse 16b thus fits perfectly with the message already marked in verse 16a, when the opposition between "myths" and events was implied, underpinned not only by true words, true revealed teaching, but also by real events. A gradation of argumentation can be seen from denying that Peter's eschatological and soteriological message is based on myth – μῦθος, to denying that it is based on sophisticated intellectual speculation – σεσοφισμένος, then by claiming that it is backed by an all-apostolic teaching – ἐγνωρίσαμεν to the statement that it is based on a revelation that has eyewitnesses – ἐπόπται, and is therefore fully reliable.

Before describing the vision in more detail, the narrator refers to its general meaning – it is a vision that testifies to μεγαλειότης the majesty of Jesus.[430] The noun μεγαλειότης was most often used to refer to royal majesty (LXX in Jer 40:9, Dan 7:27, 1 Ezra 1:4: "according to the magnificence of Solomon"; 4:40: "[truth] is the strength, kingdom, power, and majesty, of all ages"). And since divine majesty was seen as a superlative version of royal majesty,[431] it is not surprising that the term was also used when describing the greatness, magnificence and power of God, often as a synonym or complement to glory (Deut 11:2, Ps 71[70]:19, 2 Macc 3:34, 3 Macc 7:22, Odes of Solomon 9:49, Sir 17:8.10.13, 18:4, 36:7, 42:21, 45:24) described the greatness and power of God and His acts. Similar descriptions of God's greatness are encountered in *Ant.* I 4:24 (πρὸς τὴν μεγαλειότητα τοῦ θεοῦ); VIII 4:3 ("It is not possible by what men can do to return sufficient thanks to God for his benefits bestowed upon them. For the Deity stands in need of nothing: and is above any such requital" τὴν

429 Ibid., p. 216.

430 The transfiguration scene is commented on in its broader evangelical and consequent Christological context by R.A. Reese, *2 Peter and Jude*, Grand Rapids 2007, p. 193.

431 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 458.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

σὴν εὐλογεῖν μεγαλειότητα) and *Con. Ap.* II 17 by Josephus Flavius ("they testify, with great assurance, that these notions are just, and agreeable to the nature of God" τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσει καὶ μεγαλειότητι); in Luke 9:43 (cf. Acts 19:27, where the hagiographer refers to the greatness of Artemis); in *1 Clem.* 49:3: "the excellence of its beauty τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς καλλονῆς αὐτοῦ, as it ought to be told?"; and in *Diogn.* 10:5 the author speaks of the majesty of God, presenting false ideas about him: "For it is not by ruling over his neighbours, or by seeking to hold the supremacy over those that are weaker, or by being rich […], nor can any one by these things become an imitator of God. But these things do not at all constitute His majesty". In 2 Pet 1:16b, majesty is also meant to be a complement to "the divine power" of verses 3a and 16a and "the glory" of verse 17,[432] an element that foreshadows the coherence between the vision and the content of the revelation: the appearance of the majesty, greatness, magnificence of Jesus is compatible with what this majestic Jesus says regarding his "second coming with power". It is at the same time, as said, a historical addition concerning the divine power of verse 3: the divine power of the risen Jesus was already revealed during his earthly mission (transfiguration – 2 Pet 1:17–18) and will ultimately be revealed at the Parousia (2 Pet 1:16b). In this context, most commentators regard the transfiguration described in verses 17–18 – apart from its function of proving the truth (and not the mythicism) of Peter's Parousia message[433] – as an anticipation of the second coming in power and glory.[434]

The next two verses illustrate this divine majesty of Jesus by means of a reference to the transfiguration scene witnessed by Peter, among others. While earlier motific and especially lexical and semantic references to both Greek and Jewish traditions could be discerned, there is now a clear turn towards imagery based on the latter and a polemical even attitude towards the former. This turn begun with the transfiguration scene is undoubtedly a preparation of the audience for the argumentation in chapters 2 and 3.

Verse 17 begins with the mention that Jesus received τιμὴ καὶ δόξα "honour and glory" from God the Father. The participle λαβών is usually translated as verbum finitum – "received", and the whole sentence is treated as an anacoluthon.

As already noted when analysing verse 3, the term δόξα 'glory' on the one hand points to Jesus' divinity, on the other hand it is eschatological and foreshadows the time when God's glory and his salvation will be proclaimed among all nations.[435]

---

432 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 317.

433 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 216–217; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 686.

434 Thus, for example, J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 317–318; J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 173; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 370; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 452,456; C.L. Blomberg, *A New Testament Theology*, Waco 2018, p. 263–265.

435 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Then, the hagiographer juxtaposed "glory" and "virtue" (δόξα καὶ ἀρετή) side by side, and now he also uses a similar juxtaposition, replacing the noun ἀρετή with the closely related term τιμή in this context. As before, he has used merism, which, on the one hand, seems to be a rhetorical figure he likes, but on the other hand, is also a sign of reaching for the Old Testament tradition. One can try to distinguish between these meristic terms and nuance their meaning; then δόξα indicates primarily reputation and fame, while τιμή indicates honour and reverence given to a person enjoying honour and glory. Other meanings are given by J.D.N. Kelly,[436] who argues that "honour" here refers to the proclamation of Jesus' divine sonship, while "glory" would indicate the radiance that surrounded the transfigured Jesus (cf. Mark 9:2–4 and par.). In addition, this radiance would confirm Jesus' participation in the divinity of the Father. However, most biblical examples of the use of the pair τιμὴ καὶ δόξα (or equivalent) suggest that the terms should not be separated.[437] Such a juxtaposition is therefore not unusual either in LXX,[438] or in Greek-speaking Jewish literature. Philo, in *De ebrietate* XVIII 75, regards "the office of serving and paying honour to Him who is in truth the only being worthy of honour and service" τῆς τιμῆς ἀξιώματα μόνον as more valuable than all honours ("riches, not glory, not honour" μὴ πλοῦτον, μὴ δόξαν, μὴ τιμήν) received for great deeds. Josephus Flavius attributes "glory and honour" not only to God but also to people. In *Ant.* II 12:1 he attributes them to Moses: "he foretold to him, that he should have glory and honour δόξαν καὶ τιμήν] among men"; in *Ant.* X 11:7 – to Daniel: "while he was alive, he had the esteem and applause τιμή τε καὶ δόξα both of the Kings and of the multitude; and now he is dead he retains a remembrance that will never fail", and in *Ant.* XII 2:15 to the interpreters, who were invited by King Ptolemy, and the king lent them his wealth: "And this was what came to the Jews, and was much to their glory and honour καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰς δόξαν καὶ τιμήν Ἰουδαίοις from Ptolemy Philadelphus". It should be noted that such a juxtaposition as a certain glorifying phrasey also appears in Greek literature of the intertestamental period.[439] Dio Chrysostom in *Orationes* 4:116 writes of the honour and fame that can come to an ambitious man, and in *Orationes* 44:10 he encourages prayer for honour, glory and prosperity: "And I ask of you […] that […] you cherish the hope of their realization and pray that some measure of honour or fame or affluence may accrue". Plutarch, in *Moralia*, mentions Plato's conduct that earned him honour and glory.

The narrator of 2 Peter emphasises that τιμὴ καὶ δόξα Jesus received from God the Father, meaning that they are now shared by the Father and the Son. However, the main focus of the description here is not the revelation of Jesus' divinity (this

436 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 319.

437 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 460.

438 2 Kings 32:33, Job 37:22, 40:10, Ps 8:6, 29[28]:1, 96[95]:7, Dan 2:37, 4:30, 1 Macc 14:21, Wis 8:10.

439 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 687.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

element was clearer in 1:3), but the fact that this dual status (τιμὴ καὶ δόξα) was given to Jesus by God himself[440] and will be fully revealed at the Parousia (cf. verse 16). This would imply that "honour and glory" can be taken as synonyms or doxologies for "the divine power" with which Jesus will come again. This would be confirmed by the use of the noun δόξα in an eschatological and Parousia context in the synoptic gospels,[441] in the New Testament epistles[442] and in early Christian literature – e. g. *2 Clem*. 17:5 quoted above. However, unlike 2 Peter in other NT writings it does not appear in the context of the transfiguration of Jesus.[443] This combination of Parousia and transfiguration contexts is a distinctive feature of the Peter narrative, for, as already mentioned, the transfiguration is treated here primarily as an anticipation of the Parousia rather than as a theophany. Jesus received honour and glory because he was called to carry out the eschatological judgement and reign forever (cf. Dan 7:14 in LXX and "the eternal kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ" in 2 Pet 1:11). It should be noted here, however, that "the glory and honour" of Jesus is not something partial or unequal to the glory and honour surrounding God the Father. This is evidenced by the use of the aorist λαβών, which indicates that they are equally complete, total and perfect.

What is significant about Peter's argument, and the transfiguration scene is an essential element of it, is first and foremost that the apostolic message is based not on theological speculation about the relationship between God the Father and Jesus Christ as Lord[444] – the title Father is used here to highlight the title Son in 17c[445] – but on witness accounts and prophetic teaching. The witnesses were given the opportunity to hear directly the voice of God the Father proclaiming the fame and glory of the Son. Thus, as G.L. Green argues,[446] the way in which Jesus was honoured and glorified was through the audible witness of God. This is described by the phrase φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης literally, "when the voice was brought", in which a construction with the genitive absolute is used. It seems that the verb φέρω, occurring here in the form of part. aor., is one of the favourite terms used in 2 Peter when describing revelation. It appears in a similar context still in verse 18.21 and then in 2.11. It actually denotes the path of transmission of the revelation, especially since both here and in verse 18 it appears in tandem with the noun φονή "voice". The hagiographer's exposition of God's activity as donor is marked threefold – for the first time *expressis verbis* with παρὰ θεοῦ πατρός, for the second time with

440 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 459.

441 Matt 16:27, 19:28, 24:30, 25:31, Mark 8:38, 10:37, 13:26, Luke 9:26, 21:27.

442 Phil 3:21, Col 3:4, 2 Thess 1:9, Titus 2:13, 1 Pet 4:13, 5:1.

443 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 217.

444 Cf. J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 319–320.

445 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 217.

446 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 688.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the passive form (pass. theologicum) of the participle ἐνεχθείσα, for the third time with the metaphorical phrase ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης.

At first glance, it may be surprising that a voice was brought to Jesus. However, as with the "Magnificent Glory" in 17b this periphrastic phrase is an attempt to protect the transcendence of God,[447] to circumvent the anthropomorphic "God said". One may wonder how justifiable, since earlier the hagiographer had spoken explicitly of God the Father. However, this phrase and the imagery behind it (a voice from heaven, a voice coming from God's throne) allude to Jewish tradition and Jewish apocalypticism (Acts 12:22, and e. g. Gen 3:8, Exod 15:26, Deut 4:33, 5:25–26, 8:20, [D 4:7 LXX]; Dan 9:10, Hag 1:12, Zech 6:15, Bar 1:18.21, 1 En 65:4: "And thereupon there was a great commotion, on the earth, and a voice was heard from heaven, and I fell on my face"; ApBaSyr 22:1: "the heavens were opened, and I saw, and power was given to me, and a voice was beard from on high, and it said unto me"; Rev 11:12, 16:1, cf. John 12:28, Acts 10:13–15, 11:7.9, *MartPol* 9:1: "as Polycarp was entering into the stadium, there came to him a voice from heaven, saying, Be strong […], O Polycarp! No one saw who it was that spoke to him; but those of our brethren who were present heard the voice"). Furthermore, God's voice addressed to man was often associated with election, vocation and task, and this supposition corresponds with Jesus' equipping Himself with the divine honour and glory with which Jesus, as God's anointed one, is to appear in the end times to, as already pointed out, carry out judgement and inaugurate the eternal kingdom. It must be remembered here that Peter's description does not refer to the voice as sound, but rather to the voice as word and action, and thus to an act of a performative nature – by means of a solemn declaration, "honour and glory", and with them the corresponding messianic prerogatives, were transferred to Jesus. Behind this is the Jewish tradition about the "visible voice of God" – then the juxtaposition of "eyewitnesses" and "the voice brought" would be easier to explain. Such a visible voice as confirmation of the veracity of the testimony is written about, among others, by Philo in *De decalogo* 11:47:

> And the law testifies to the accuracy of my statement, where it is written, 'And all the people beheld the voice most evidently' [ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα τὴν φωνήν]. For the truth is that the voice of men is calculated to be heard; but that of God to be really and truly seen [ὀπατὴς δὲ ὡς ἀληθῶς τὴν θεοῦ]. Why is this? Because all that God says are not words, but actions which the eyes determine on before the ears.

In the narrative preceding the independent speech, the pronoun τοιᾶσδε is inserted to emphasise the unique, inimitable nature of this declaration. The pronoun itself

447 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 218; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 461.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

can be found in 2 Macc 11:27, 15:12, where it is translated as an indicative pronoun or as an introductory formula: "the following". At the end of the introductory narrative for the third time, as mentioned, it is pointed out that the agent of the whole scene and the giver of glory and honour together with the performative declaration is God called here μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα "magnificent Glory". Glory in this context is, of course, a periphrastic indication of God that is found relatively frequently in Old Testament literature and Jewish tradition. It is based on a synecdoche in which the glory surrounding God, which is a manifestation of his presence, becomes synonymous with God himself (Exod 40:34–35, 1 Kings 8:10–11, Ps 26[25]:8, cf. also John 12:41, Acts 7:2.55, 22:11, Eph 1:17, Rev 15:8, 21:11.23).

Glory is specified with the adjective μεγαλοπρεπής – "magnificent" – which in NT occurs only here, but the stem μεγαλο- or μεγαλειο- as an attribute of God – God's greatness and magnificence[448] – is quite common in LXX (Deut 33:26, Ps 8:2, 21[20]:6, 29[28]:4, 68[67]:35, 71[70]:8, 96[95]:6, 111[110]:3, 145[144]:5).[449] Similar terms for God (ἡ μεγάλη δόξα) are also encountered in Jewish intertestamental literature. 1 En 14:20 describes God seated on the throne thus: "And the Great Glory sat thereon"; 1 En 104:1 speaks of the names of the righteous, recorded before God and mentioned by angels: "I swear unto you, that in heaven the angels remember you for good before the glory of the Great One"; TLev 3:4 approximates this place in heaven where God dwells: "And in the highest of all dwelleth the Great Glory, far above all holiness". This title and the concept of the dwelling of God are also taken up by the early Christian apocalypses. Isaiah, when he was raised to the seventh heaven, saw "the great glory" (AscIsa 9:37), and Jesus, after his ascension, entered "into the seventh heaven, and all the righteous and all the angels praised Him. And then I saw Him sit down on the right hand of that Great Glory" (AscIsa 11:32). The term "excellent glory" appears in *1 Clem.* 9:2: "Let us steadfastly contemplate those who have perfectly ministered to his excellent glory" (τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ). It also occurs in later Greek liturgical language, although it is quite likely that this liturgical use of the phrase "magnificent/great glory" was already made at the time of the composition of 2 Peter and *1 Clem.*[450] The entire Petrine phrase μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα can thus be translated literally as "majestic glory" or, by analogy with other texts, as "great glory" or "magnificent glory". The twofold use of the term δόξα in verse 17 is not accidental. It serves to link the glory given to Jesus to the source of the glory, i. e. God, and adds a solemn, divine and royal atmosphere to the whole scene.[451]

448 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 691.

449 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 460.

450 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 219.

451 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 461.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The emphasis put on the endowment of Jesus with glory and honour by God has not only a theological function, but also an apologetical one, for it accentuates that the apostolic teaching in general and that of an eschatological nature comes from God and from Jesus endowed with honour and glory; Therefore, it is the same revelation as that given by God and the Spirit to the Old Testament prophets (cf. verses 19–21). In other words, the prophetic and apostolic messages are equal in origin and essence.

Further on, the author of 2 Peter *in extenso* quotes God's declaration, which is addressed on the one hand to the witnesses – as evidenced by the use of the third-person singular: οὗτός ἐστιν 'this is', εἰς ὃν 'towards him', on the other hand to Jesus – as evidenced by the pronoun αὐτῷ 'to him', in the narrative preceding *oratio recta*. The declaration itself is essentially based on two texts – Ps 2:7 and Isa 42:1 reinterpreted in a messianic and apocalyptic spirit. However, the narrator himself is not the author of this reinterpretation. It is known to have already been in use in Jewish tradition, but Christianity gave it an additional ontological feature, as Ps 2:7 has often been cited as proof of Jesus' divine sonship, not only of a symbolic nature. The content of God's spoken words must therefore have been taken by the narrator from the newly established Christian tradition.

In the performative declaration of God, Jesus is called the Son: ὁ υἱός μου. This, it has been said, is an allusion to Ps 2:7 interpreted Christologically already at a very early stage in the development of Christian theology.[452] Initially, Ps 2 was mainly used in the context of resurrection (Acts 13:33, Rom 1:4), but later it was also incorporated into the transfiguration narrative (Matt 17:5, Mark 9:7, Luke 9:35), where the emphasis falls on theophanic and ontological aspects (cf. also Heb 1:5), and baptismal (Matt 3:17, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22), where, as in psalm 2 and 2 Pet 1:17, the inauguration of Jesus' messianic mission is emphasised (cf. also Heb 5:5). Such a psalmic and messianic background, which is also supported by the mention of the mountain in verse 18 corresponding to Zion in Ps 2:6, would confirm the suggestion that the narrator of 2P is primarily concerned with the appointment of Jesus as the eschatological King and Judge,[453] who will realise the eternal kingdom (cf. Acts 10:42, 17:31). Peter no longer needs to affirm or prove the divinity of Jesus, for he had dealt with this issue earlier, in the prescript when he explicitly spoke of the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ[454] and in exordium when he spoke of the gifts bestowed by the divine power of Jesus through his glory and fame.[455] This distribution of emphasis suggests that the narrator here is not reaching directly into the transformational gospel tradition, for in it, as has been said,

452 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 219.

453 Ibid.

454 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:1.

455 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:3.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

theophanic elements are exposed, but into some pre-synoptic tradition in which the transfiguration scene was understood, like the baptism scene, as an inauguration. It is not, however, the inauguration of Jesus' earthly mission, but the inauguration of his eschatological power of judgement and ultimate dominion over all nations (Ps 2:8), which were proleptically revealed to the disciples in the transfiguration vision. To this end, God equipped Jesus with His royal and divine "honour and glory", gave Him a share in divine majesty. The transfiguration, therefore, is a foreshadowing of the Parousia, when Jesus will fully fulfil his mission of the king and judge.[456] This is why Peter so strongly emphasises the performative act – the voice establishing Jesus as the messianic King and Judge, the titles and functions behind the term Son taken from Ps 2:7 and understood in the same inaugural way.

To the title "Son" the appositive honorary "Beloved" ὁ ἀγαπητός μου is added.[457] However, depending on the identification of the Old Testament text to which it refers, it can be interpreted differently. Firstly, it could be the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew יחידי (literally "my only one" – as in Gen 22:2.12.16). Then ὁ ἀγαπητός would be closely related to the noun υἱός and would indicate the singularity, the uniqueness of the nature of Jesus' sonship; it would thus have an ontological rather than a functional meaning. Of course, such implications are possible, but the dominant one here seems to be the reference to the term בחירי "my chosen one" from Isa 42:1, which, as already stated, is the second of the sources of the transfigurative declaration.[458] Election fits better with the image of the establishment of Jesus as eschatological King and Judge evoked by the title Son. The titular understanding of the term Beloved and its association with election is not unusual in Christian literature. It appears, among others, in Eph 1:6; in *Barn.*: "He is long-suffering, foreseeing how the people whom He has prepared shall with guilelessness believe in His Beloved" (3:6); or in a similar apocalyptic context to 2 Peter in AscIsa, which mentions "the faith of the Beloved"(AscIsa 1:4), "transformation and the persecution and ascension of the Beloved" (AscIsa 1:5); the visionary saw

> the Beloved [coming] from the seventh heaven […] and His transformation and His descent and the likeness into which He should be transformed (that is) the likeness of man, and the persecution wherewith he should be persecuted, and the torturers […] the coming of His twelve disciples, and the teaching […], the descent of the angel of the Christian Church […], and the angel of the Holy Spirit, and Michael […] on the third

456 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 220.

457 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 168.

458 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 220; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 462.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> day will open the sepulchre: And the Beloved sitting on their shoulders will come forth and send out His twelve disciples (AscIsa 3:13–17);

there appears, moreover, the greeting "As the Lord liveth" (AscIsa 1:7) and the unmasking of Hezekiah's intention: "The Beloved hath made of none effect thy design, and the purpose of thy heart will not be accomplished, for with this calling have I been called and I shall inherit the heritage of the Beloved" (AscIsa 1:13). The prescript of the *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans* by Ignatius of Antioch, on the other hand, contains a formula in which the term "Beloved" can be taken titularly or attributively: "Ignatius […] to the Church of God the Father, and of the beloved Jesus Christ". All this testifies to the very widespread use in early Christian circles of the term/title *Beloved* in relation to Jesus.[459]

Also from Isa 42:1 comes the phrase εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησα "with whom I am pleased", which further specifies choosing. The verb εὐδοκέω means 'to regard as good', 'to please someone', 'to take a liking to someone or something' and 'to decide', 'to want to do something'. Here it occurs in the form of ind. aor., behind which is the conviction of a one-time, immutable liking and choosing/determining. In a Christological context, it may be related to pre-existence and apocalyptic traditions, in which the messiah was chosen by God before the foundation of the world to carry out eschatological judgement "on that day". It is also no coincidence that the messiah is referred to as the chosen one in apocalyptic literature:

> On that day Mine Elect One shall sit on the throne of glory And shall try their works, […] his face was full of graciousness […]. And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, (and) why he went with the Head of Days? […] This is the son of Man who hath righteousness, With whom dwelleth righteousness, And who revealeth all the treasures of that which is hidden, Because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him, And whose lot hath the pre-eminence before the Lord of Spirits in uprightness for ever (1 En 45:3, 46:1–3, cf. 1 En 61:8, 62:2, 69:27.29).
>
> And for this reason hath he been chosen and hidden before Him, Before the creation of the world and for evermore […] And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits hath revealed him to the holy and righteous; […] Because the Elect One standeth before the Lord of Spirits, And his glory is for ever and ever, And his might unto all generations […] And he shall judge the secret things, And none shall be able to utter a lying word before him; For he is the Elect One before the Lord of Spirits according to His good pleasure […] All these

459 A. Malina, *Chrzest Jezusa w czterech ewangeliach. Studium narracji i teologii*, Katowice 2007, p. 270 adds that ἀγαπητός can be understood as the One or the Only-begotten, especially when considered in the context of the Father-Son relationship.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

things which thou hast seen shall serve the dominion of His Anointed" (1 En 48:6–7, 49:2.4, 52:4, cf. 1 En 62:7, 69:26).

What is unusual for this is the addition of εἰς ὅν, for usually the dative appears here (ἐν ᾧ as in Matt 3:15 and 17:5). The intention may have been to indicate more clearly that the grace that is associated with election and predilection was also given to Jesus in the act of declaration and/or to emphasise the dynamics of this grace. Also of note in the declaration is the emphatic use of the pronoun ἐγώ. This pronoun does not occur in the text of Isaiah; nor does it occur in other New Testament passages dependent on Isa 42:1 (Matt 3:15, 17:5, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22). It most likely has two functions here. One relates to the immediate context, the other to the apologetic character of the entire passus 1:16–21. Thus, first – it emphasises that the royal and judicial eschatological messianic prerogatives were entrusted to Jesus by God himself. Secondly, it indicates that the eschatological apostolic message based on this event are not "fanciful myths", but are rooted in God's will and His revelation.[460]

In the messianic interpretation of Ps 2:7 and the first of Isaiah's songs about the servant of the Lord – Isa 42:1, G.L. Green sees a more advanced dialectical, as it were, Christology.[461] The performative declaration in 2 Pet 1:17 would in fact concern the establishment of Jesus as a ruler who will rule over the nations, as well as a servant, a redeemer who suffers and dies for human sins (Isa 53:6–12). This dialectical Christology is explicitly formulated in 2 Pet 2:1 and has been the subject of rejection by opponents challenging Peter's teaching. However, it is difficult to say firmly that it was also included here, for there is no indication that Isa 53:6–12 was an additional source of imagery in 2 Pet 1:17.

In verse 18 Peter goes on to describe the circumstances that make his message true and credible. He once again refers to the divine origin of the vision and broadcast that the apostles witnessed. After stating that Jesus received honour and glory from God the Father, that the voice proclaiming Jesus as eschatological King and Judge was brought by God (pass. theologicum) and from the Great Glory, he now describes the event from the perspective of the direct observers. As already mentioned when analysing verse 16, the 1st person plural ἠκούσαμεν "we have heard" refers to the apostles who witnessed the transfiguration of Jesus – Peter, James and John, and is part of a strategy of increasingly narrowing the sources of apostolic teaching. It was the named three disciples on the mountain who heard "a voice from heaven" φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (cf. Matt 3:17, 17:5, Mark 1:11, 9:7, Luke 3:22, 9:35). The "voice from heaven" is one of the more characteristic elements of apocalyptic visions. It

460 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 220.

461 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 691.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

appears, among others, in Dan 4:31 (LXX); Rev 10:4.8, 11:12, 14:13 and, already quoted, 1 En 65:4 or ApBaSyr 13:1, 22:1. It is therefore not surprising that the author of 2 Peter used it in his apocalyptic and eschatological interpretation of the transfiguration scene.

Common to 2 Peter and the synoptics is the location of the transfiguration on the mountain. Peter adds that it is ἁγίος ὄρος "the holy mountain". A similar phrase occurs when describing the transfiguration in ApPet 15 (Ethiopic): "my Lord Jesus Christ our King said unto me: Let us go unto the holy mountain" and in ActsPet 20: "Our Lord, willing that I should behold his majesty in the holy mount", which are most likely based on the account of 2 Peter. Undoubtedly "the holy mountain" is an allusion to Zion and refers to Ps 2:6. In doing so, it is not a matter of actually identifying the site of Jesus' transfiguration, as in the case of the synoptic tradition, but rather a messianic (messianic-eschatological) orientation of the interpretation of the whole scene and a closer connection with Ps 2. By reminding us that the scene of Jesus' proclamation as eschatological Ruler and Judge has eyewitnesses, the narrator once again speaks out against accusations of using myths.

As already stated, the transfiguration scene in 2 Pet 1:17–18 is based on a different tradition, most likely earlier than the tradition behind the transfiguration scenes in the synoptic gospels. This is evidenced not only by the different focus of the interpretation of the whole scene, but also by the noticeable differences in the narrative:

Transfiguration			
2 Pet 1:17	Matt 17:5	Mark 9:7	Luke 9:35
ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα	οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ	οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ	οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ
My son My beloved This is to him I found favour/ in whom I am well pleased	This is My son Beloved With whom I am pleased Listen to him	This is My son Beloved Listen to him	This is My son Chosen Listen to him

As can be seen, Peter's declarative formula is closest to Matthew's account, but Peter's version also diverges from it. What is conspicuous first of all is the absence of the exhortation to listen to Jesus, which is most likely taken from Deuteronomy 18:15. In addition, the phrase οὗτός ἐστιν is placed elsewhere, and instead of the intentional construction ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, the passive construction εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησα appears. Of course, such a variant is permissible; nevertheless, it seems

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to be behind the presynoptic tradition, which, apart from the author of 2 Peter, is known and used by the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (3:53) and Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 29:1).[462] There, too, the formula εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησα is used, and the voice of God comes from heaven and not, as in the Synoptics, from the cloud:[463] "But also a witnessing voice was heard from heaven, saying, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear Him'" (*HomPsClem* 3:53). Likewise in ApPet 17 (Ethiopic), where it is part of the ascension narrative: "And behold, suddenly there came a voice from heaven, saying: This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased: my commandments". Perhaps Justin, the Homilies and certainly ApPet depend on 2 Pet 1:17–18. However, it cannot be ruled out that they are based on this tradition, which is also the source for the synoptic Baptist narratives. Indeed, it appears that 2 Pet 1:17–18 shows quite a few parallels with the baptismal descriptions, especially in Matt 3:17.

Baptism			
2 Pet 1:17–18	Matt 3:17	Mark 1:11	Luke 3:22
	Καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα	Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν	Καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ ουρανοῦ γενέσθαι
	οὗτός ἐστιν	σὺ εἶ	σὺ εἶ
ὁ υἱός μου	ὁ υἱός μου	ὁ υἱός μου	ὁ υἱός μου
ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν	ὁ ἀγαπητός	ὁ ἀγαπητός	ὁ ἀγαπητός
εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα.	ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα	ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα	ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα
Καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ			
	And here is a voice from the heavens saying:	And there became a voice from the heavens:	And a voice from heaven arose:
	This is	You are	You are
My son	My son	My son	My son
My beloved	Beloved	Beloved	Beloved
This is			
in whom I am well pleased	in whom I am pleased	In you I am pleased	In you I am well pleased
And a voice we heard from heaven			

Of course, fundamental differences can also be seen in these four narratives. In the synoptics, the voice from heaven is the introductory narrative, in 2 Peter it is the concluding one. In the declarative formula itself, the third person is changed to the second person in Mark and Luke. The most similarities are in the formula given

462 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 209.

463 Ibid, p. 206; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 690.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

by Peter with the formula used by Matthew. There are also similarities: the voice in all accounts comes from heaven and there is no encouragement to listen to Jesus.

This similarity between Peter's transfiguration scene and the synoptic accounts of baptism does not seem coincidental. What is common, as has been said, is the inaugural nature of these narratives. At his baptism, Jesus was equipped with the Spirit of God, at the transfiguration with glory and honour, in order to carry out the mission entrusted by God. Being equipped in turn with everything necessary to fulfil God's will also recalls Peter's *exordium* baptismal theology and gives it an even more pronounced eschatological character: just as Jesus was endowed with divine honour and glory, which will be fully revealed at his eschatological coming to exercise judgement and authority over the nations, so the gifts received at baptism ultimately lead to that eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ which will be fully realised with the second coming of Jesus as Judge and King.

In verses 19–21, the narrator continues to justify the reliability of the apostolic witness, this time basing his argument on the parallels between apostolic and prophetic teaching. He also increasingly develops the eschatological themes outlined in verses 16–18.

He begins his reflection by stating καὶ ἐχόμεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον literally "and we have a more confident prophetic word". Commentators and translators usually give the term βεβαιότερονς a comparative meaning.[464] Indeed, formally it is the comparativus of the adjective βέβαιος, but it can be variously understood, referred to and translated. The whole introductory phrase can be understood to mean that this prophetic word regarding the Parousia is more certain, more reliable than the apostolic account of the transfiguration as an anticipation of the eschatological coming of Jesus in power/power.[465] Two types of testimony would be juxtaposed: one based on the eyewitness account of hearing a voice from heaven, and one based on the prophetic word, considered more reliable. Behind such a gradation would be the conviction, known also in rabbinic tradition, that the so-called בת קול literal "daughter of a voice", i. e. "a voice from heaven" being a kind of individual, private revelation, could not equal in authority and reliability the already recognised written prophecies; nor could it effectively undermine and invalidate the Scriptures.[466] Perhaps, as the narrator would have predicted, for future audiences coming from a Judaic background, a testimony based on "a voice from heaven" would not have been entirely convincing and would have needed to be reinforced with a prophetic word.

464 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 321; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 466.

465 So, among others, G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 700.

466 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 467.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

However, such an interpretation would undermine the argument for the reliability of the apostolic message based on eyewitness accounts and the possibility of contrasting such testimony "with fanciful myths". In all likelihood, the narrator has here once again reached for his strategy of integrating Greek and Jewish traditions. While for the Greeks (ethno-Christians) the eyewitness account is indeed convincing, for the Jews (Judeo-Christians) it is the prophetic message that matters most. The narrator combined the two expectations and equated the two types of preaching in credibility. For the transfiguration scene was not simply a voice from heaven, but something more – a performative declaration equipping Jesus with the divine honour, glory and power to be fully revealed at his second coming,[467] but a declaration fully based on earlier prophecies, as evidenced by the references to Ps 2 and to Isa 42. Thus, the transfiguration scene as an anticipation of the Parousia was also a fulfilment of earlier prophecies.

As noted when analysing the term βέβαιος in verse 10,[468] the term, taken from legal language, meant a guarantee of something, a confirmation, a ratification. Here, the narrator does not abandon this meaning, although he introduces a comparativus – βεβαιότερος – controversial in this juridical context, which in koine Greek can have the meaning of a superlativus.[469] Following the example of Greek writers, he combined it with the verb ἔχω.[470] The whole phrase would thus make sense: "we have the most certain prophetic word", which does not require a comparison. However, the most questionable aspect of both the comparative and the superlative sense of the comparative is the gradation of certainty, reliability or confirmation regarding the word of God transmitted by the prophets, which is not likely to be found. Philo (*De vita Mois.* II III:14; "But the enactments of this lawgiver are firm, not shaken by commotions, not liable to alteration, but stamped as it were with the seal of nature herself, and they remain firm and lasting") and Flavius (*Con. Ap.* II 17: "And by this means he thought he […] might procure the most lasting security to those who had made him their governour. […] But our legislator, […] so firmly imprinted this faith in God upon all their posterity") spoke of the firmness, certainty – βέβαια – and unshakeability of God's law, which provides security and perpetuates, strengthens faith. Rather, the narrator seems to want to indicate the unshakeable certainty of the prophetic word, so the most appropriate understanding of the whole phrase καὶ ἐχόμεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον would be here: "we have [for this also] a certain/confirming prophetic word". In this way – according to the strategy of the author of 2 Peter – the apostolic teaching and the prophetic teaching

467 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 223.

468 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:10.

469 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 700; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 223 argues that in 1:19 the adjective βέβαιος lacks the legal context it had in 1:10.

470 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 700.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

are equal, for both are based directly on revelation given from God and not on myths. The coherence and mutual confirmation of the apostolic message and the prophetic message can also be seen here: what the apostles heard and transmitted is deeply rooted and confirmed in the prophetic message (Ps 2:7, Isa 42:1), and the prophetic message finds fulfilment and confirmation in what the apostles heard and transmit.

There is disagreement among commentators as to how broadly to treat the phrase προφητικὸς λόγος "the prophetic word". Is it an indication of Old Testament messianic prophecies,[471] or does it refer to the entire Old Testament read in a Christological key,[472] or perhaps to some one specific prophecy behind the transfiguration scene (Ps 2 and Isa 42)[473] or to Old and New Testament prophecies taken collectively?[474] More particularistic hypotheses also arise. The word prophetic would, for example, be a reference to what the author of 2 Peter describes later in the letter (1:20–2:19) when he gives examples taken from the OT; it could also be a reference to the transfiguration as an anticipation (prophecy) of the Parousia.[475]

Some light on the meaning of the phrase "prophetic word" may be shed by the very adjective προφητικός still found only in Rom 16:26, where it means writings revealing God's mysteries.[476] Peter does not stop at the adjectival term, but extends it with a noun, in order to make a clear – formal and semantic – reference to Jewish tradition. For in Jewish tradition, "the prophetic word" could refer to all Scriptures considered inspired, regardless of their nature or literary genre,[477] which is why the two terms were often used interchangeably. The LXX often mentions the word as a prophetic message,[478] with – especially in the books of the Deuteronomistic tradition – not only the spoken word but also the written word (1 Kings 29:29, 2 Kings 9:29, 12:15).[479] Among the Jewish writers, the equivalence of "the prophetic word" – "Scripture" is used, for example, by Philo of Alexandria, who uses a phrase identical to Peter's when referring to Scripture: "Moses says the prophetic word" Μωυςῆς δὲ ὁ προφητικὸσ λόγος φησίν (*Legum alleg.* III 14:43). The apostle Paul follows a similar practice (cf. Rom 1:2, 16:26, 2 Tim 3:16, where the prophetic

471 Such as C. Bigg, J.B. Mayor, J. Moffatt, J. Chaine, G.L. Green.

472 So, among others, K.H. Schelkle, J.D.N. Kelly, W. Grundmann, G.L. Green.

473 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 467.

474 So, for example, E.M. Sidebottom.

475 So, for example, J.H. Neyrey, *The Apologetic Use*, p. 514–516.

476 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 254.

477 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 224.

478 Deut 13:4, 1 Kings 22:13, Jer 20:1, 23:16, 32:30, Sir 48:1, Bar 1:21.

479 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 702.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Scriptures actually mean the prophetic word). Such a practice seems to be characteristic also of the narrative books of the NT.[480] This leads to the conclusion that "Scripture" is very often a technical term for all divinely inspired writings, including the prophetic writings.

The author of 2 Peter in 3:16 himself also uses the term "Scripture" in a rather broad sense, encompassing both the Old Testament texts and (at least) the New Testament letters of Paul. It is uncertain, however, whether he treats "the prophetic word" and "Scripture" equivalently, or whether he gives the prophetic word a more particularistic meaning. The second option seems more likely, since in 1:20 he describes the rules for interpreting "the prophecies of Scripture", which may suggest that Scripture is hyperonymous with prophecy.[481]

On the basis of the early Christian writings, it is also impossible to make this clear. There, the phrase προφητικὸς λόγος usually refers generally to Old Testament prophecies[482] or texts that were treated in this way before the OT canon was constituted (e. g. 1 En – cf. Jude 14–15). As a synonym of "Scripture" προφητικὸς λόγος is treated e. g. in *Barn.* 2:4: "For He has revealed to us by all the prophets that He needs neither sacrifices, nor burnt-offerings, nor oblations, saying thus"; 4:3: "The final stumbling-block (or source of danger) approaches, concerning which it is written, as Enoch says"; 11:2–6: "Concerning the water, indeed, it is written, in reference to the Israelites, that they should not receive that baptism which leads to the remission of sins […]. The prophet therefore declares […] And again says the prophet, […] And again He says in another prophet" and in Justin Martyr in *Dial.* 129: "And now I shall again recite the words which I have spoken in proof of this point. When Scripture says, 'The Lord rained fire from the Lord out of heaven,' the prophetic word indicates that there were two in number: One upon the earth, […] Another in heaven". Sometimes, however, Justin refers it to specific passages of Scripture, as for example in *Dial.* 56: "And when I had made an end of quoting these words, I asked them if they had understood them. And they said they had understood them […], I shall attempt to persuade you, since you have understood the Scriptures, [of the truth] of what I say", or *Dial.* 72: "From the statements, then, which Esdras made in reference to the law of the passover, they have taken away the following: […], from the sayings of Jeremiah they have cut out the following: […]. And since this passage from the sayings of Jeremiah is still written in some copies [of the Scriptures] in the synagogues of the Jews".

The most probable assumption seems to be the one that fits most firmly into the context of 2 Pet 1:16–21, especially verses 17–18. The "prophetic word" would

480 Matt 26:56, Luke 4:21, 24:27, John 2:22, 7:42, 13:18, 19:24.28.36.37, 20:9, Acts 1:16, 8:32.35.

481 It is noteworthy that in P^{72} there is a suggestion of equating scripture and prophecy: προφητεία καὶ γραφή, and in the minuscule codex 1611 the opposite relationship: γραφὴ προφητείας.

482 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 467.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

refer primarily to the texts underlying the declaration from the transfiguration scene understood as a foreshadowing of the Parousia. In addition to Ps 2 and Isa 42, one could also point to Dan 7:13–14. But further on in verse 19, which is no longer so strongly dependent on the preceding context, references to the "prophetic word" suggest that a general prophetic teaching is involved. What occurs, then, is the gradual expansion of the concept of the prophetic word indicated in the introduction to verses 16–21. This ambiguity and expansion are not accidental here. In this way, the narrator seems to suggest that virtually every prophecy can be interpreted in a Parousia-eschatological context, which he gives phrase to in 2:5–8.[483] He then gives examples of narratives (prophetic word) seemingly devoid of an eschatological context. At the same time, he shows that when the appropriate interpretation – a kind of eschatological hermeneutic – is applied, this eschatological element can be extracted from them. He expounds this hermeneutic even more clearly in 3:5–7.[484]

The divergence among commentators also concerns the interpretation of the 1st person plural in ἔχομεν "we have" – does it refer to all Christians, or to all apostles, or perhaps only to the apostles – the witnesses of the transfiguration? Since verse 19 was considered a direct continuation of the argument begun earlier, a third possibility seems more likely. The narrator, it has been said, defends the veracity of his eschatological message on the basis of the eyewitness account, which finds confirmation and fulfilment in specific Christologically reinterpreted prophetic texts. However, this does not close off the possibility of extending the verb ἔχομεν to (at least) all the apostles. This ambiguity seems intentional because, as noted, in verse 19a there is a shift here from understanding the apostolic testimony to the Parousia as the message of the three eyewitnesses of the transfiguration to extending it again to an all-apostolic message confirmed by prophetic teaching.

The second part of verse 19, appears apparently independent of the first. This is suggested by the change in verb forms. The narrator departs from the 1 pers. pl. and now directly addresses all his addressees, contemporary and later, in 2 pers. pl.: καλῶς ποιεῖτε. The phrase can be literally translated as: "you will do well", but it can be seen as equivalent to an exhortation, a request or even an injunction,[485] as indicated by the homonymy of ind. and imp. praes. act. ποιεῖτε (cf. Mark 7:37, Acts 10:33, 1 Cor 7:37–38, Phil 4:14, Jas 2:8.19, 3 John 6). Functionally and rhetorically, one can also see here a transition, a call to focus on what the narrator will say not only regarding the prophetic word, but rather regarding the conduct of the audience, who should abide by the word (cf. the meaning of the verb προσέχω).[486]

---

483 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:5b and 2:7–9a.

484 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:5–7.

485 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 225; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 468.

486 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 255.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

As G.L. Green notes,[487] such attentiveness to instruction or just the word was quite common both in LXX (Deut 32:46, Prov 4:20, 5:1, Sir 16:24, Jer 6:19) and in intertestamental literature (TZeb 1:2: "Hearken to me, ye sons of Zebulun attend to the words of your father") and in Jewish writers (Flavius *Ant.* VIII 9:1: "Which things came to pass, as I suppose, according to the will of God: that so Jeroboam might not give heed to the words of Jadon").

The injunction concerning the validity of the prophetic message is formulated by the author of 2 Peter by means of a comparison of the prophetic word to a lamp shining in a dark place: ᾧ προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ. The imagery behind this comparison is taken from Jewish tradition. A comparison of the word of God/prophetic word/Law to a light or lamp can be found in LXX Ps 119[118]:105, Sir 48:1, Wis 18:4 and in the intertestamental apocalyptic – ApBaSyr 17:4: "[Moses] brought the law to the seed of Jacob, and lighted a lamp for the nation of Israel". Sometimes those who preach the word of God are compared to a lamp shining in the darkness – John 5:35, ApBaSyr 77:13: "For the shepherds of Israel have perished, And the lamps which gave light are extinguished"; 4 Ezra 12:42: "For of all the prophets you alone are left to us […] like a lamp in a dark place, and like a haven for a ship saved from a storm".

The task of the lamp is to illuminate a dark, gloomy place – αὐχμηρὸς τόπος. The term αὐχμηρός belongs to the New Testament *hapax legomena*.[488] In using it, the narrator applied his integrative strategy and wove a bit of Greek tradition into the typically Jewish imagery, for the adjective αὐχμηρός occurs, though also not very often, in Greek literature, e. g. e. g. in Aristotle's *De coloribus* 3:793A: "It also makes a difference whether the colour mixed is bright and shining, or on the contrary dark and dull" αὐχμηρὸν καὶ ἀλαμπές".[489] Usually the whole phrase αὐχμηρὸς τόπος is valued negatively. In ApPt 21 (Greek), for example, it is used to describe hell: "And I saw also another place over against that one, very squalid; and it was a place of punishment, and they that were punished and the angels that punished them had their raiment dark". Although ApPet is dependent on 2 Peter, among others, the author of the letter does not give such a radical meaning to this adjective. Perhaps the "dark place" here means a "world" where corruption caused by lust prevails (cf. 2 Pet 1:4 and John 1:5, Eph 6:12, 1 Thess 5:4, 1 John 2:8)[490] or a human life dominated by sin in which there is no room for adherence to the Law and prophetic teaching (cf. John 3:19, Rom 2:19, 13:12, 2 Cor 6:14, Eph 5:11). If so, the meaning of the metaphor αὐχμηρὸς τόπος would be: "stand by the prophetic teaching as by

487 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 703.

488 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 468.

489 For G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 705; see also R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 225.

490 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 321; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 256.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

a lamp that illuminates life/mind/conduct". Such an image is also deeply rooted in Jewish tradition. The image of life without God and His law as darkness appears in LXX (Ps 82[81]:5, Prov 4:19) and especially frequently in Qumran literature (1QM 13:5.9–12: "For they [the sons of Belial – KW, MR] are the lot of darkness, but the lot of God is light [eternal]. […] And you, [O God], created us for Yourself as an eternal people, and into the lot of light. You cast us in accordance with your truth. You appointed the Prince of Light from of old to assist us […]. his [Belial's – KW, MR] [dominio]n is in darkne[ss] and his counsel is to condemn and convict. All the spirits of his lot […] walk in accord with the rule of darkness"; 1QM 15:9: "For they are a wicked congregation, all their deeds are in darkness"; 1QS 1:9–10: "they may love all the sons of light, each according to his lot in God's design, and hate all the sons of darkness each according to his guilt"; 1QS 3:19–21: "Those born of truth spring from a fountain of light, but those born of falsehood spring from a source of darkness. All the children of righteousness are ruled by the Prince of Light and walk in the ways of light, but all the children of falsehood are ruled by the Angel of Darkness and walk in the way of darkness"). He is encountered in the intertestamental apocalyptic (TLev 5:30: "And now, my children, ye have heard all; choose, therefore, for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar"; TNaph 1:21–22: "So then, my children, let all your works be done in order with good intent in the fear of God, and do nothing disorderly in scorn or out of its due season. For if thou bid the eye to hear, it cannot; so neither while ye are in darkness can ye do the works of light"; TBenj 1:30: "For where there is reverence for good works and light in the mind, even darkness fleeth away from him"), where he does not refer to specific times, as in the Qumran writings, but describes a timeless phenomenon, occurring during the lifetime of the prophets of old, contemporaneously and in the future. It seems that it is precisely this direction that is particularly close to Peter, who has primarily in mind the present and future times, but in his argumentation and descriptions of ungodliness he also draws on examples from the past in chapter 2. At the same time, as has been said, he does not treat these examples neutrally, but as a foreshadowing of the future.

If a life of sin is portrayed as plunging into darkness, it is not surprising that conversion is described as coming out of darkness into light (Acts 26:18, Eph 5:8, Col 1:13, 1 Pet 2:9) or enlightenment (Heb 6:4, 10:32).[491] This is reminiscent of the categories that were also present in Peter's baptismal catechesis in *exordium*. Once again – after the transfiguration scene and the equipping of Jesus – the narrator here draws on associations with baptism and baptismal gifts. The prophetic teaching, understood in this part of verse 19 more broadly than in verse 19a, for it

491 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 706.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

contains guidelines that, like the baptismal gifts, enable one to live a godly life, avoid corruption and enter the eternal kingdom where Jesus is the Ruler and Judge. The darkness would allude this to the situation presented in verse 9 – one who forgets the baptismal gifts, just as one who forgets the prophetic teaching, is a short-sighted person moving in darkness, whose stumbling and falling is more than likely. If so, then, like παρίστημι earlier (verse 9), here προσέχω would also have an active meaning. And since the reflection on the use or non-use of baptismal gifts was about temporality, here too the term αὐχμηρὸς τόπος can be seen to refer broadly to temporality, the time before the Parousia.[492] This association of darkness with the world and the present age appears in the commentary on the Second Letter of Peter by Bede the Venerable who claimed that without the light of the prophetic word during the night of this age, which is filled with dark temptations, it is difficult to find anyone who has not succumbed to them.[493]

This suggestion of darkness as broadly present time is confirmed by the next phrase commanding abiding by the lamp ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ until the dawn (literally "until [the time] when the day will shine through"). The day ἡμέρα belongs to the typical eschatological-apocalyptic lexis and, although not specified here, points to the day of the Lord (cf. 2 Pet 3:10), which will be the day of salvation.[494] The day that dawns therefore signifies the beginning of salvation and judgement associated with the very coming of Jesus. Any doubt that the dawn here is symbolic of the Parousia and the end times (cf. Rom 13:12) is dispelled by the phrase καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ "and the morning star will rise". Although from the point of view of astronomy the whole image is somewhat confusing,[495] it should be recognised that both the dawn and the morning star that rises, i. e. Venus, refer to the same phenomenon and the same event. It is most likely that the narrator applied here the merism he likes and made use of the already used incorporation of typically Greek lexemes into Jewish metaphorical expressions.

There is no doubt that in OT and later in NT the verb ἀνατέλλω belonged to eschatological and messianic imagery – e. g. Isa 60:1 cf. Mal 3:20, Luke 1:78. Of particular importance here is the text of Lev 24:17: ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακωβ,

492 Ibid., p. 705.

493 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 130.

494 2 Pet 3:12, cf. Joel 2:21–23, Obad 15–21, Zech 14:1–21), but also the day of judgement (2 Pet 2:9, 3:7 cf. Isa 13:6.9, Ezek 30:3, Joel 1:15, 2:1.11, Amos 5:20, Zeph 1:7.14, Acts 2:20, 1 Cor 5:5, 2 Thess 2:2; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 707.

495 From an astronomical point of view, the whole picture is somewhat ambiguous. The morning star, Venus, rises before dawn, and therefore to another star, perhaps the sun, the words may refer. This issue is described by J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 322 and R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 226, among others; Bauckham also notes the connection between the two images, star rise and sunrise in TLev 5:13–17, TJud 4:20–23.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

which was interpreted messianically not only in Christian but also in Jewish circles. This interpretation was influenced primarily by the identification of the symbol of the messiah in the noun ἄστρον 'star' very much alive in the intertestamental period.[496] This is particularly strongly emphasised, for example, in 4QTest 9–13, where the leadership powers of the messiah are exposed:

> Oracle of Balaam, son of Beor, and oracle of the man of penetrating eye, oracle of him who listens to the words of God and knows the knowledge of the Most High, of one who sees the vision of Shaddai, who falls and opens the eye. I see him, but not now. I espy him, but not close up. A star has departed from Jacob, /and/ a sceptre /has arisen/ from Israel. He shall crush the temples of Moab, and cut to pieces all the sons of Sheth.[497]

Similarly, CD (4Q265) 7:17–21, where, in addition to leadership competence, teaching competence is mentioned:

> [the basis] of the images are the books of the Prophets whose words Israel has despised, and the Star is he who explained the Law who came to Damascus, as it is written, "There came forth a Star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel." The Sceptre is the prince of all the congregation, and when he will rise 'he will destroy all the children of Seth.

In TLev 5:13–17 the priestly functions are added:

> Then shall the Lord raise up a new priest. And to him all the words of the Lord shall be revealed […]. And his star shall arise in heaven as of a king. Lighting up the light of knowledge as the sun the day […]. He shall shine forth as the sun on the earth, and shall remove all darkness from under heaven, and there shall be peace in all the earth;

and TJud 4:20–23 speaks of the bringing of peace and justice through a sinless messiah: "And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace, And a man shall arise from my seed, like the sun of righteousness, Walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness; And no sin shall be found in him". However, the term φωσφόρος does not appear in these texts. It was taken from the Greek tradition, where it often referred to deities and rulers. In this way, the narrator wove a typically Greek phrase into the Jewish apocalyptic imagery, introducing important

496 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 470.

497 F.G. Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English*, English transl. W.G.E. Watson, Leiden 1994, p. 137.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

for him divine and royal connotations related to the Parousia – the coming of Jesus as eschatological Judge and Ruler.

One may wonder whether this *Parousia*, eschatological picture is not weakened by the addition of ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν "in your hearts". Perhaps it should be referred to an individualised, spiritualised treatment of the Parousia, as argued by K.H. Schelkle[498] and J.N.D Kelly,[499] associated with the psychologization of Christianity?[500] R. Bauckham[501] sees here an application of an argumentation similar to that used by Paul in 1 Cor 13:8–12: the prophecy about the Parousia is a partial knowledge, a vision "as in a mirror" available to people in their hearts at the present time (the dark place). In the end times, with the second coming of Christ, when the prophecies cease, there will be full, "face-to-face" knowledge. The temporal individualism and subjectivism in the reception of eschatological prophecies suggested here does not exclude or replace the expectation of the Parousia as a cosmic, global event (cf. 2 Pet 3:7–13), but is compatible with it. In other words – the hopeful expectation of a cosmic Parousia is accompanied by an incomplete, subjective interpretation of eschatological prophecies "in the heart".

A similar proposal in essence, based on the distinction between the cosmic external event of Christ's coming and its existential meaning, i. e. the internal experience in the "hearts", is suggested by G.L. Green.[502] The phrase "in your hearts" would allude to 2 Cor 4:6 and to an understanding of God's salvific intentions, which through the (external) work of Christ has shone in our hearts so that the knowledge of glory shines forth. In practical terms, this means first and foremost obedience to God and observance of God's law, as is confirmed by Philo of Alexandria's use of the comparison of the law to "stars giving light to the soul" (*De decalogo* 11:49): "those who think fit to show themselves obedient to the sacred commands shall live for ever and ever as in a light which is never darkened, having his laws themselves as stars giving light in their soul ἀστέρας ἔχοντες ἐν ψυχῇ φωσφοροῦντας".

Bauckham's suggestion fits well with the suggestion that the 2 Pet narrator is now thinking primarily of the later recipients of his letter. He anticipates, as it were, that with the passage of time the eschatological prophecies will be reinterpreted (such reinterpretations were already emerging at the time of the letter's composition and the gradual fading of the hope of a quick Parousia), but this does not mean that their central message of the second coming of Jesus Christ in power as Ruler and Judge will become obsolete, as he makes very clear in verse 20. Green's proposal

498 K.H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefie*, p. 199.

499 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 323.

500 Ibid., p. 323; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 709.

501 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 226; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 471; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy, Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 257.

502 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 710.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

completes this picture with regard to the baptismal catechesis of *exordium* and the active staying/remaining with the prophetic teaching of verse 19b. Adherence to this teaching, which overlaps to a large extent with the development of the gifts and dispositions each believer has received at baptism, allows one to actively prepare for Christ's coming and entry into his eternal kingdom. This dual view of eschatology – on the one hand, as entry into the kingdom, and on the other hand, as an expectation of the Parousia – stems from Peter's assumption and demand that his letter be read by future generations of Christians. As mentioned, not all recipients will live to see the Parousia – for them, eschatology will be associated primarily with entry into the kingdom and the posthumous anticipation of Jesus' coming in judgement. But among the future recipients there will be some, Peter supposes, who will live to see Christ return in power, glory and honour.

From the timeliness of the prophetic message, which makes it possible not to stumble and fall even in the darkness of mortality, the narrator in verses 20–21 turns to the problem of its origin. In doing so, he also addresses the accusations hinted at in verse 16a that the prophecies confirming the apostolic doctrine are also based on fanciful myths, or are even fanciful myths themselves.[503]

Verse 20 begins with a conventionalized formula also repeated in 2 Pet 3:3: τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες literally "knowing first of all", which here functions as a transition (cf. Luke 12:39, Rom 6:6, Gal 3:7, Eph 5:5, 2 Tim 3:1, Heb 10:34, 13:23, Jas 1:3).[504] The narrator wants to focus the audience's attention on how to treat the prophecies. Formally, this is a continuation of the reflection begun in 19b, when he addressed the (future) readers of the letter directly.[505] Therefore, he does not use imperative statements, but part. praes. γινώσκοντες. As said, he allows for various reinterpretations of the prophecy of the Parousia in the future, but in making these, it is important to remember/know the general principle that any prophecy must be regarded as inspired, which is not a novelty for the recipients, but "a well-known" element of faith (cf. 2 Pet 1:12 and Rom 6:6, Eph 5:5, 2 Tim 3:1).[506]

The elliptical phrase πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γύνεται "no prophecy of Scripture becomes [a subject of] its own interpretation" is not ex-

503 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 228.

504 T. Callan, *A Note on 2 Pet 1:19–20*, JBL 125 (2006), p. 148 suggests that the phrase τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες should be read together with the concluding verse 19 with the phrase ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν as indicating that the reminder/knowledge is an internal reality, whereas the Parousia described in verse 19 should be understood as an external, physical reality.

505 On the formula τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες, its components, construction and occurrence in NT, among others, see S.E. Porter, A.W. Pitts, *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι in 2 Pet 1:2 and Hellenistic Epistolary Convention*, JBL 127 (2008), no. 1, p. 165–171.

506 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 712.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

plicit.[507] As already mentioned, in the pair προφητεία γραφῆς it is the writing that is the hyperonym and the prophecy that is the hyponym. This means that the narrator now most likely has in mind those utterances of the inspired authors that were written down (2 Kings 32:32, Ezra 5:1, 6:14, Tob 2:6, Matt 13:14).[508] He thus expands the concept of prophecy from what it meant in verse 19a.[509]

The ambiguity concerns the subject making "its own interpretation". The pronoun ἰδίος 'own', 'private', also 'self-willed', as the context of verse 21, is to be understood primarily in opposition to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The basic question, then, is whether this refers to the exegetes/interpreters' own/subjective explanation of an existing and written prophecy,[510] or to the prophet's own subjective explanation already contained in the content of his message.

The first solution is advocated by, among others, J.N.D. Kelly.[511] The second according to him would be stylistically awkward. Patristic exegesis shows, however, that in antiquity and the early Middle Ages (Ecumenius, Theophylact, Bede the Venerable) the latter understanding was popular.[512] "The prophets received prophecies from God and proclaimed what He Himself had a home to say, not what they wanted. They were therefore fully aware of the entrustment. to them the words of prophecy and did not even try to put forth their own interpretation", wrote Ecumenius in his commentary on the Second Letter of Peter.[513] Similarly, Andrew of Crete in *Catenas*: "The prophets did not interpret the word themselves, they did not speak of themselves, but did so with the help of the Holy Spirit".[514]

Furthermore, as early as the third century. Pseudo-Callisthenes in his *Romance on Alexander* (II 1.5) recorded Stasagoras's complaint about the misinterpretation

507 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 229.

508 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 714.

509 For a general discussion of the understanding of prophecy in NT (mainly in Paul's writings, but also in Jude) see E.E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*, Tübingen 1978.

510 This is what most translations suggest: "no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation" (NKJV); "no prophecy of Scripture came about by the prophet's own interpretation of things" (NIV); "no prophecy of Scripture comes from someone's own interpretation" (ESV). This is also how M. Luther understands this text: "no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation; by this be directed, and do not think that ye shall explain the Scripture by your own reason and wisdom […] The Holy Spirit will explain it Himself, or it shall remain unexplained". He then invokes the principle that Scripture interprets itself: "If now any one of the holy fathers can prove that he has his explanation from the Scriptures, which give assurance that it should be so explained, then it is right; where this is not the case, I for one shall not believe him", *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther* I (V.20, 21).

511 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 324.

512 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 229.

513 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 130.

514 Ibid., p. 130.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of a sign: "you gave the omen your own interpretation".[515] This means that prophecy was treated as a phenomenon composed of a sign, a vision, an audition, etc., to which the prophet could give his own meanings incompatible with the will of the divinity. It is noteworthy here that he uses forms of the verb ἐπιλύω, derived from the same stem as Peter's ἐπίλυσις ('interpretation', 'explanation'), in his work.

Without even consulting the ancient literature, but only on the basis of verse 21a, which begins with the explanatory γάρ and explicitly speaks of prophecy arising not by the will of man, it is possible to assume that verse 20, too, is about prophecy itself and not its subsequent explanation. This would agree with the objections refuted in verse 16a – the apostolic (and prophetic) message is not a myth invented by men. Moreover, this line of understanding ἰδία ἐπίλυσις' "own explanation" is confirmed by Judeo-Hellenistic (especially Philo) and early Christian uses of the pronoun ἰδίος as a kind of *terminus technicus* in texts denying the human origin of prophecies. Already the LXX distinguishes between false prophets, who tell the delusions of their own fancy, and true prophets, who speak what comes from the mouth of the Lord – Jer 23:16, cf. Ezek 13:3. The phenomenon of prophecy is addressed more extensively by Philo, who repeatedly addresses its origin and components. In *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* LII 259. Philo writes:

> for a prophet says nothing of his own προφήτης γὰρ ἴδιον οὐδεν ἀποφθέγγεται, but everything which he says is strange and prompted by some one else; and it is not lawful for a wicked man to be an interpreter of God, as also no wicked man can be properly said to be inspired; but this statement is only appropriate to the wise man alone, since he alone is a sounding instrument of God's voice, being struck and moved to sound in an invisible manner by him.

He emphasises even more strongly the process of man's submission of his will to the will of God when prophesying in *De vita Mois.* I LI:281 and I LII:286:

> But Balaam, his moment of inspiration being now past, replied: "I am exposed in this to a most unjust charge, and am undeservedly accused; for I am saying nothing of my own, but whatever the Deity prompts me to say". But the prophet, […] although he had always replied to the accusations which were brought against him with one true excuse, namely, that he was saying nothing out of his own head, but was only interpreting the words of another, being himself carried away and inspired.

As can be seen, even the awareness of exposing oneself to unpleasantness cannot stop an inspired prophet from speaking words from God. Philo is echoed by

515 For: G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 715.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Josephus Flavius, who makes a very similar statement about Balaam's prophecy in *Ant.* IV 6:5: [Balaam says]:

> if thou rightly considerest this whole matter, canst thou suppose that 'tis in our power to be silent, or to say any thing, when the spirit of God seizes upon us? for he puts such words as he pleases in our mouths; and such discourses as we are not our selves conscious of. […] For those that take upon them to foretel the affairs of mankind, as from their own abilities, are intirely unable to do it; or to forbear to utter what God suggests to them; or to offer violence to his will. For when he prevents us, and enters into us, nothing that we say is our own.

The very meaning of the noun ἐπίλυσις also confirms this direction, especially as it suggests the complexity of prophetic phenomena in many extra-biblical texts. The term ἐπίλυσις belongs to the New Testament *hapax legomena*. Philo in *De vita contemplativa* X 75 uses a similar verb when describing the explanation of some difficulty or interpretation of obscure passages of Scripture:[516] "some one looks out some passage in the sacred scriptures, or explains some difficulty" καὶ ὑπ᾽ἄλλου προταθὲν ἐπιλύται. Aquila's translation of the OT uses this concept in the narrative of Joseph's interpretation of dreams (Gen 40:8, 41:8.12), and it is known that this explanation came from God.[517] In the Greek version of 4 Ezra 10:43, ἐπίλυσις refers to the angelic interpretation of the vision. This direction of divine/angelic interpretation of the vision is represented by *The Shepherd* of Hermas (Similitude V 3:1–2: "I said to him, 'Sir, I do not see the meaning of these similitudes, nor am I able to comprehend them, unless you explain them to me πάντα σοι ἐπιλύσω'. 'I will explain them all to you ἐὰν μη μοι ἐπιλύσῃς αὐτάς and whatever I shall mention in the course of our conversations I will show you'"; Similitude V 4:2–3: "You ought not […] to ask any questions at all; for if it is needful to explain anything, it will be made known to you καὶ πᾶσαν παραβολὴν ἐπιλύσει"; Similitude V 5:1: "you were cunning and obstinate in asking explanations of the parables ἐπερωτῶν τὰς ἐπιλύσεις τῶν παραβολῶν; but since you are so persistent, I shall unfold to you the meaning of the similitudes of the field, and of all the others that follow, that you may make them known to every one"; Similitude VIII 11:1: "And after he had finished the explanations of all the branches, he said to me, Go and tell them to every one, that they may repent, and they shall live unto God"; Similitude IX 10:5: "but I laid hold of him […] and began to adjure him […] that he would explain ἐπιλύσῃ what he had showed me"; Similitude IX 11:9: "I beg of you, sir, that as I

516 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 323; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 231.

517 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 231; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 474.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

shall ask you, so also you will give me the explanation ἐπιλύσω. […] will I explain to you, and will conceal nothing at all from you" see also Similitude V 6:8, V 7:1, Similitude IX 13:9, 16:7). The examples by Hermas make it clear to readers that there are at least two components behind the words conveyed by the prophet-visionary: firstly, multi-element, complex visions or parables, all the components of which are explained by the God/angel, and secondly, the vision descriptions or parabolic narratives themselves. The Old Testament messages too, despite the absence of the term ἐπίλυσις, indicate such complexity, which translates not only into two stages of interpretation, but also into two stages of inspiration:[518] the first stage of inspiration involves God sending a vision/audition (Dan 8:1), a sign (Amos 7:1, Jer 1:11.13), a dream (Zech 1:8, Dan 7:2), and the second involves a divinely inspired rather than one's own interpretation of all the elements of a vision, audition, sign or dream. It is probably these two stages comprising a full prophecy that the author of 2 Peter has in mind. This suggestion seems to be confirmed by the accusations popular also in the pagan world against visionary-interpreters who, although they received a sign from the deity, subjected it to their own interpretation.[519] Biblical prophecy also faced such accusations. Such accusations are finally reckoned with by the author of 2 Peter, especially with regard to eschatological prophecies, especially the prophecy of the Parousia based on the apostolic vision, behind which are also the visions of the Old Testament prophets – David, Isaiah or Daniel.

This processual, complex understanding of prophecy in verse 20 is confirmed by the verb γίνεται. It can, of course, be understood statically as a synonym of the verb "is", but a dynamic understanding as "becoming, arising" is more appropriate here. Depending on whether οὐ γίνεται is regarded as a linking verb in the predicate nominative or as a simple predicate, we get different translations. When considering οὐ γίνεται as part of the predicate nominative, a translation of πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται could be as follows: "no prophecy of Scripture becomes [subject to] its own interpretation/explanation". The narrator of the epistle would have committed an anacoluthon here – he did not introduce the predicate, which he nevertheless chose to specify with the adjective ἐπιλύσεως. On the other hand, when considering οὐ γίνεται as a simple predicate and ἐπιλύσεως as an adverbial, the translation would read: "no prophecy of Scripture becomes/comes into existence for its own interpretation/explanation or no prophecy of Scripture becomes/comes into existence through its own interpretation/explanation". The problem is that the circumstantial should rather be expressed with a prepositional phrase, e. g. with the preposition ἐκ (cf. 1 Tim 6:4). The absence of a preposition

518 Therefore M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 201 suggests that it is not interpretation, but precisely inspiration, and he understands the whole phrase similarly to verse 21a that no prophecy arises by its own inspiration; it is not by the will of man that it is brought.

519 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 231; P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 475.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

would indicate a semitic syntax, which may be a procedure intended by the narrator to draw attention to the Jewish origin of the prophecies of Scripture.

As already mentioned, however, the context of the whole of 1:16–21 is most helpful in understanding "its own interpretation/explanation". Verse 21 suggests that prophecy is involved, and similarly, though less directly, verse 16a, where there are allegations of mythological provenance of apostolic and prophetic teaching. Verses 17–18 would focus on a defence of the apostolic message, verse 19 would link the apostolic and prophetic message, and verses 20–21 would focus on a defence of the divine provenance of the prophetic message. The climax of the argument, the ultimate proof of the inspiration of the prophetic message, would be the assertion in verse 21 that the prophets did not act of their own free will but were, as it were, 'compelled' by the Holy Spirit, and this in turn gave rise to a special relationship between the prophet and God.[520]

Perhaps, however, the ambiguity of the elliptical πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γύνεται is intentional, just as the ambiguity of the verb ἔχομεν in verse 19a indicating both the three chosen apostles and all the preachers of the gospel appeared to be intentional earlier. Although the dominant feature in verse 20 is unquestionably the reference of one's own interpretation to the explanation of the various elements of prophecy, and the consideration of false and correct interpretation formally begins in 2 Pet 2:1, it cannot be entirely ruled out that the narrator already wants to suggest that one's own interpretation also concerns the explanation of an already existing, fixed written prophecy. Especially if such an interpretation is considered to be an integral part/stage of a dynamic prophetic process. An example of this approach is precisely the apostolic message, which makes a Christological reinterpretation of prophetic teaching. Such an approach also has much in common with the Qumran pesher,[521] which presupposes a literal-historical interpretation of prophecies in the past and an apocalyptic-eschatological one carried out by the predestined Teacher of Justice in the end times (cf. e. g. 1QpHab, 4QpNah; etc.). Thus, once again, as in verse 19, the prophecies and apostolic messages would be combined and equated. Such a combination of internal (by the prophet) and external (by later teachers) interpretation of prophecy in 2 Pet 1:20 was already admitted by Bede the Venerable in his commentary on the Second Letter of Peter:

> On the one hand, he emphasised that none of the holy prophets preached to the people their own interpretation of the doctrine of faith, but what they had heard from God […] What, therefore, in secret, as the mysteries of God, they had been given to know, this

520 R. Rumianek, *Idea powołania indywidualnego w księgach prorockich*, "Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne" 13 (2000), p. 51.

521 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 476.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> they communicated by preaching or writing down to the people of God. They did not, however, write down made-up words like the pagan. Diviners. The prophets wrote down not their own words, but words spoken by God.[522]

On the other hand, he warned that he "who reads these words [prophecy] must not interpret them according to himself, but according to God's design. If he does not do so, he will distance himself from the truth".[523]

As has been repeatedly pointed out, "own interpretation/explanation" as an expression of the internal interpretation of the components of a prophecy is confirmed in verse 21. First, the narrator emphatically states that "prophecy never οὐ […] ποτέ comes/happens/is brought by the human will θελήματι ἀνθρώπου".[524] The dative used in the phrase θελήματι ἀνθρώπου can be interpreted as dat. causae – "not by a cause/not by will", or as dativis instrumentalis[525] – "not by means of/not by will". Then, from this categorical negation (he used a similar one in verse 10), the author of 2 Pet moves on to present an affirmative argument. In doing so, he uses the classic opposition human element – divine element (cf. Matt 16:23, Mark 8:33, 12:14, Acts 12:22, Rom 2:29, 1 Cor 1:25, 2:5.11, Gal 1:1, 1 Pet 4:2), also used in the context of contrasting tradition, word, human testimony with the commandment, word or testimony of God (Mark 7:8, 1 Thess 2:13, 1 John 5:9).[526] In the affirmative he returns, as it were, to the transfigurative vision, for he repeats the verb φέρω in ind. aor. pass. He thus once again suggests to the audience that the apostolic (verse 17) and prophetic messages come directly from God.[527] As before, he also multiplies formally the message of divine inspiration – implicatively he does so with pass. theologicum ἠνέθη προφητεία in 21a, explicatively with the phrases ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι "carried by the Holy Spirit" and ἀπὸ θεοῦ "from God" in verse 21b. Of particular note here is the phrase

522 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 130.

523 Ibid.

524 Based on an understanding of verse 20b as a reference to the interpretation of an already existing prophecy, J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 324 argues that the whole of verse 21 also describes the conditions for the proper explanation of prophecy. Like prophecy, the interpretation of prophecy should also come from the Holy Spirit. Such an inspired interpretation is provided by the apostolic authority, which is represented by the charismatic teachers of the local churches. Under the influence of the Holy Spirit, they explain the prophecies because that is what the Spirit tells them to do. This leads to the conundrum that it is the Church (as composed of local communities) that is the depository of apostolic authority, and the guardian and custodian (custodian) of Scripture and its proper interpretation. At the same time, Kelly points out that all this content is merely implied rather than explicitly stated.

525 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 719.

526 Ibid.

527 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 478.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι with its simultaneous implication (φερόμενοι in part. praes. passivi) and expilication (ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου) of the divinity of inspiration. The passive voice of aorist ἠνέχθη of verse 21a can also be applied to the content of verse 20: the prophecy coming (brought) from God is complete, utter, and therefore does not require any additional human explanation or elaboration.

It is worth noting that the phrase ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι "carried by the Holy Spirit" is reminiscent of the phraseology used by Greek and Hellenistic writers to describe divine inspiration.[528] Particularly frequent – in Philo and Josephus Flavius, among others – is the verb θεοφορέω. In addition to it, the term πνευματοφορος also appears, which can have different meanings depending on the placement of the accent: πνευματοφόρος means "carrying/bringing the spirit"; πνευματόφορος – "carried/brought by the spirit". The latter is used in LXX when describing the activity of the prophets – Hos 9:7, Zeph 3:4,[529] but in a decidedly negative sense,[530] so it does not refer to the Holy Spirit. Basically, however, the LXX uses terminology that was also taken over by the author of 2 Pet.

In the pagan world, inspiration was most often associated with a trance, an ecstasy in which the rational element was marginalised, and the prophet/bearer himself became a mere passive instrument for the transmission of the divinity's will, sometimes not even realising the meaning of the words he spoke. Therefore, inspiration, complete encompassment by the divinity could also be seen as possession. Similar pagan meanings and descriptions of inspiration/possession can also be found in Jewish Hellenistic writers.[531] Philo in *De vita Mois.* I LI:283 describes Balaam's inspiration as follows:

> And he, as soon as he was by himself, was again suddenly filled by divine inspiration, and, without at all understanding the words which he uttered, spoke everything that was put into his mouth, prophesying in the following manner: Rise up and listen, O king! prick up thy ears and hear. God is not able to speak falsely as if he were a man, nor does he change his purpose like the son of man. […] For he will say nothing at all which shall not be completely brought to pass, since his word is also his deed.

Similarly in *De spec. leg.* I XI:65, where he includes a more general reflection on inspiration and possession:

528 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 233.

529 Ibid.

530 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 722.

531 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 481–482.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> some other Prophet […] will appear to them on a sudden, inspired like himself, who will preach and prophesy among them, saying nothing of his own (for he who is truly possessed and inspired, even when he speaks, is unable to comprehend what he is himself saying), but that all the words that he should utter would proceed from him as if another was prompting him; for the prophets are interpreters of God, who is only using their voices as instruments (cf. also *De somn.* I 1:2).

A similar understanding of inspiration is represented by Flavius:

> Thus did Balaam speak by inspiration; as not being in his own power; but moved to say what he did by the divine spirit. […] canst thou suppose that 'tis in our power to be silent, or to say any thing, when the spirit of God seizes upon us? for he puts such words as he pleases in our mouths; and such discourses as we are not our selves conscious of. […] For those that take upon them to foretell the affairs of mankind, as from their own abilities, are entirely unable to do it; or to forbear to utter what God suggests to them; or to offer violence to his will. For when he prevents us, and enters into us, nothing that we say is our own (*Ant.* IV 6:5).

For Philo, Flavius and the author of 2 Peter, the common belief is that a prophet does not speak from himself or on his own initiative. This is rooted in the Old Testament, where it is one of the main criteria for distinguishing between false prophets guided by their own will (Jer 14:13, 23:16–18.21–22.26, Ezek 13:3) and true prophets carrying out God's command, even against their own will (Amos 3:8, Jer 20:9). But in OT – and this is also taken up by the narrator of 2 Peter – the transmission of God's word does not necessarily involve ecstasy, trance and prophetic passivity; on the contrary, the prophet never renounces his own competence and background and is perfectly aware of the significance of his words[532] (cf. 1 Cor 14:32). It seems, moreover, that it was precisely this activity and the use of individual competences,

532 This passive and instrumental understanding of prophecy was opposed, among others, by Bede the Venerable. He ridiculed the popular comparison of the prophet to a flute: "According to this interpretation", he wrote in the Commentary on the Second Letter of Peter, "the Spirit was to inspire the prophets in such a way that they became like an instrument in the hands of God: they spoke the words of the Spirit without necessarily understanding them or believing them. This seems to be a case of blatant confusion. For how could they give such useful advice to others if they did not know the meaning of what they were saying? […] Could Isaiah or any other prophet have proclaimed to the great assembly what he had been given to see in mysterious visions. Heavenly, if he had not fully grasped what he had seen?" Otherwise, Ecumenius, who in a commentary on The Second Letter of Peter allowed for the lack of full understanding of the meaning of God's words in the prophet who communicates them: "The prophets discerned that they were inspired by the Holy Spirit, although they did not always grasp the full meaning of what was communicated to them", see *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 131.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

which resulted in the variety of external forms of the prophetic message, that became the object of criticism, the basis for undermining the veracity of the prophecies and, above all, their divine origin.[533] This understanding is explained by the author's earlier use of the phrase ἰδία ἐπίλυσις in 2 Peter, in which, it seems, the external, individualised form of the prophetic message would be supposed to be evidence of the prophet's own interpretation of the word given by God. This is why the narrator speaks with such emphasis in defence of the veracity of the prophecies and, as mentioned, multiplies phrases indicating divine inspiration (cf. Acts 3:21).[534] On the other hand, probably for the same reason, he abandons the use of the compound term πνευματόφορος and separates its elements so as to denote "people carried by the Holy Spirit". In this way, he refers to the Old Testament rather than the Hellenistic tradition, since the emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in the origin of prophecies is common both in the Old,[535] and later in the New Testament.[536]

In opposition to prophecies made under the influence of the Holy Spirit are prophecies made under the influence of an "earthly" spirit. These are described in detail in *The Shepherd* of Hermas (Commandment XI 5:8). A false prophet is recognised above all by the fact that he answers the questions of those concerned, whereas a prophet inspired by the Holy Spirit speaks of himself:

> For no spirit given by God requires to be asked; but such a spirit having the power of Divinity speaks all things of itself, for it proceeds from above from the power of the Divine Spirit. But the spirit which is asked and speaks according to the desires of men is earthly […] nor when man wishes the spirit to speak does the Holy Spirit speak, but it speaks only when God wishes it to speak.

G.L. Green[537] points out that at the time of the formation of 2 Peter, truth was widely regarded as the domain of divinity, which means that the divine origin of a prophecy is also evidence of its truthfulness. The notion of ἀληθεία used in verse 12[538] can also be viewed from this perspective. The truth in which the recipients of the letter are strengthened would therefore indicate the divine origin of the message given to them by the various apostles, evangelists and missionaries.

533 R. Rumianek, *Idea powołania indywidualnego w księgach prorockich*, p. 50–51.

534 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 234.

535 Num 11:25–26.29, 1 Sam 10:6.10, 19:20.23, 2 Sam 23:2, Neh 9:20.30, Isa 61:1, Zech 4:6, 7:12.

536 Matt 22:43, Mark 12:36, Luke 1:67, 2:26, Acts 1:16, 2:17–18, 28:25, Eph 3:5, Heb 2:4, 3:7, 10:15–16, 1 Pet 1:11.

537 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 720–721.

538 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:12.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Since the divine origin of the prophecies was questioned by Peter's historical opponents, attempts are sometimes made to identify them as Ebionites or proto-Ebionites. To this end, quotations from early Christian anti-heretical treatises are provided. The texts of Methodius of Olympus and Epiphanius would be helpful in this identification. Methodius in *The Banquet of the Ten Virgins or Concerning Chastity*, in Dialogue 8 entitled *Thekla* (Conv. 8:10) claims that some of his heretical contemporaries "contend, like the Ebionites, that the prophets spoke of the Person of the Spirit, of their own motion". Epiphanius seems more precise in characterising the views of the Ebionites in *Panarion* (30:18,4–5):

> They acknowledge Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses and Aaron – and Joshua, the son of Nun, simply as Moses' successor, though he is of no importance. But after these they acknowledge no more of the prophets, but even anathematize David and Solomon and make fun of them. Similarly, they disregard Isaiah and Jeremiah, Daniel and Ezekiel, Elijah and Elisha; for they pay them no heed and blaspheme their prophecies, but accept only the Gospel.

The data cited by the author of 2 Peter are too vague to make any confident identification. This vagueness, however, seems intentional – for the narrator is addressing future audiences and anticipates that, in the future, accusations will be raised against the prophetic and apostolic teaching similar to those of his time. He therefore tries to synthesise them, to indicate their essence, which he succeeds in doing. Perhaps he has made use here of the all-Christian, apocalyptic topos, in which he includes among the signs of the approach of the end times the appearance of false teachers and prophets who deny, among other things, the divine inspiration of the universally recognised prophetic message. For it must be remembered that the letter is ultimately addressed to those who will live to see the Parousia. The argumentation in AscIsa 3:21–31 proceeds in a similar way: the apocalyptic vision indicates that in the end times there will be many speaking in the Spirit, but also many heresies that will undermine the inspired teaching of the prophets:

> And afterwards, on the eve of His approach, His disciples will forsake the teachings of the Twelve Apostles, and their faith, and their love and their purity. And there will be much contention on the eve of [His advent and] His approach. […] And there will be much slander and vainglory […] and the Holy Spirit will withdraw from many. And there will not be in those days many prophets, nor those who speak trustworthy words, save one here and there in divers places. […] And they will make of none effect the prophecy of the prophets which were before me [Isaiah], and these my visions also will they make of none effect, in order to speak after the impulse of their own hearts.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The narrator of 2 Peter also anticipates the same. However, he does not use, at least for the time being (cf. 2 Pet 3:3–13), a typically apocalyptic vision, but uses a polemic and argumentation that he considers timeless and useful not only for his contemporaries, but above all for future recipients of the letter.

2.6 E_1. Interpretation of prophetic and apostolic teaching (2 Pet 2:1–22)

2.6.1 α. False interpretation (2 Pet 2:1–5a.c)

[1]There were also false prophets among the people as there will be false teachers among you, who will introduce heresies of destruction/ruin and deny the Lord who redeemed them, bringing upon themselves violent/swift destruction. [2]And many will follow their various indecent acts/ways of destruction; because of them (lit. because of whom) the way of truth will be defamed/blasphemed. [3]Through greed/covetousness they will exploit you with deceptive words. The judgement/sentence upon them of old has [already] not been idle/the former judgement upon them is not idle, and their destruction is not slumbering. [4]For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but/what is more, having cast them into Tartarus [bound] by the bonds/chains of darkness, delivered – the preserved ones – to judgement/to the execution of sentence, [5a][if] the ancient world was also not spared […], [5c]having brought flood upon the world of the ungodly

Having proved that the apostolic and prophetic teachings on eschatology are not myths, that they are based on divine revelation, inspired and mutually contingent, the narrator moves on to their interpretation, devoting much more space to the false interpretation. He suggests that the perception of the apostolic and prophetic message as myths is in fact based on their distorted explanation – internally by false prophets who interpret the components of a prophecy contrary to God's will, and externally by false teachers who misinterpret already existing prophecies. In doing so, he refers to the past (in the case of false prophets) and the future (in the case of false teachers), which he marks with the use of appropriate tenses. Since he has adopted an apocalyptic approach, it is not surprising that he focuses primarily on the depiction of the future, which is nevertheless clearly anticipated by past events, provided that they are correctly interpreted as prophecies relating to the end of time, the Parousia and the judgement. He thus applies his characteristic eschatological

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

hermeneutics to them. This can already be seen in the chiastic structure[539] employed by the hagiographer:

A. There were false prophets – 2.1a
    B. There will be false teachers – 2.1b
    B'. Characteristics of false teachers – 2.1c-3
A'. Examples of prophecies from the past 2:4–5a (exactly 2:8.15–16).

Treating past events as prophecies relating to the future also explains why so much space has been devoted to them.

"There were" ἐγένοντο false prophets ψευδοπροφῆται in the past. The verb γίνομαι in ind. aor. emphasises this past historical perspective. Based on the Old Testament tradition and on 2 Pet 1:20, it can be assumed that, for the narrator, false prophets are those who, already at the stage of the creation of the message, make some kind of their own interpretation of words or signs from God, speaking from themselves rather than on His behalf.[540] In doing so, it is worth noting the conjunction καί, which has a similar function to that in 2 Pet 1:19: it suggests that, in addition to the true prophets mentioned in 1:19–20, there have also been false prophets in the past.

With their seemingly parsimonious presentation, the author of 2 Peter draws on the terminology and the characterisation behind it of false prophets present in OT. From Zech 13:2, where the term ψσευδοπροφήτης appears, he perhaps draws the suggestion that such prophets are not essentially different from pagan diviners. However, he largely bases his argument on the descriptions of Jeremiah, in whom the term ψσευδοπροφήτης occurs much more frequently (Jer 6:13, 33:7–8.11.16, 34:9, 35:1, 36:1.8).[541] It appears, moreover, that in OT the characterisation of false prophets and descriptions of their actions occur much more frequently than the term ψευδοπροφῆται itself.[542] These descriptions show that false prophets are often prophets inspired by a lying spirit (1 Kings 22:22–23, 2 Kings 18:21–22), so it is not surprising that their prophecies are lies (Jer 14:14–15, 23:25–26, 34:15), based on false dreams (Jer 23:25.32) or false visions (Ezek 13:9, 22:28)

539 This structure is seen differently by R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 236:
    A. apostles (1:16–18)
    B. OT prophets (1:19–21)
    B'. OT false prophets (2:1a)
    A'. false teachers (2:1b–3).

540 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 729.

541 It is noteworthy that the term ψευδοπροφήτης is not known to Greek writers, and rather the closely related term ψευδόμαντις is used in Hellenistic literature.

542 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 487.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

and false, arbitrary interpretations or their own understanding of signs (Jer 23:26, Ezek 13:3).

Usually, three essential characteristics of false prophets are mentioned on the basis of Old Testament texts. First – unlike the true prophets, they did not speak by divine inspiration (Deut 18:20, Jer 14:14, 23:21.32, Ezek 13:2–3.6–7). Secondly – often their prophecies were the proclamations the recipients wanted to hear. Not surprisingly, they did not contain warnings or calls to repentance, but dulling messages of peace, security and prosperity (Jer 4:10, 6:14, 14:13.15, 23:17, Ezek 13:10, Mic 3:5.11). Thirdly and finally – and this is closely related to the second point – the false prophecies, unlike the true ones, did not concern divine judgement and punishment (Jer 14:15, 23:15).[543] Meanwhile, for the author of 2 Peter, one of the criteria for the truthfulness of a prophecy, is that it can be interpreted in an eschatological key, and therefore anticipates the Parousia and eschatological judgement (cf. 2 Pet 1:19a).

This historical treatment of the issue of false prophets is actually unique in NT and apocalyptic tradition. It is true that Luke 6:26 mentions former false prophets – ψευδοπροφῆται – who were praised by their contemporaries, but generally hagiographers focus on the present teaching of false prophets or on their appearance in the future (Matt 7:15, 24:11.24, Mark 13:22, Acts 13:6, 1 John 4:1). Their action is, moreover, considered one of the eschatological signs (Rev 16:13, 19:20, 20:10).[544] The vision of false prophets spreading their teachings in the end times is also known to Jewish apocalypticism. It occurs, for example, in TJud 4:10: "false prophets like tempest, and they shall persecute all righteous men". Later, similar phrases and images appear in early Christian literature, but already without such clear links to the end times, instead often in relation to heterodox sects.

The closest to the OT-based image of the false prophet in 2 Peter seems to be the description of Hermas in Commandment XI 1–4, although Hermas refers to a contemporary rather than historical phenomenon:

> These […] says he, are the faithful, and he who sits on the chair is a false prophet ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστίν, ruining the minds of the servants of God. It is the doubters, not the faithful, that he ruins. These doubters then go to him as to a soothsayer, and inquire of him what will happen to them; and he, the false prophet, not having the power of a Divine Spirit in him, answers them according to their inquiries, and according to their wicked desires, and fills their souls with expectations, according to their own wishes. For being himself empty, he gives empty answers to empty inquirers; […] Some true words he does occasionally utter; for the devil fills him with his own spirit, in the hope that he may be able to overcome some of the righteous.

543 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 238.

544 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 730.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Justin Martyr in *Dial.* 35:3 recalls Jesus' words about the appearance of false teachers, false apostles and false messiahs, but treats all three terms as synonyms and interprets them without eschatological references as events that will take place in connection with Jesus' name after His departure:

> For what things He predicted would take place in His name, these we do see being actually accomplished in our sight. For he said, "Many shall come in My name, clothed outwardly in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." And, "There shall be schisms and heresies." And, "Beware of false prophets, who shall come to you clothed outwardly in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." And, "Many false Christs and false apostles shall arise, and shall deceive many of the faithful." There are, therefore, and there were many, […] who, coming forward in the name of Jesus, taught both to speak and act impious and blasphemous things; and these are called by us after the name of the men from whom each doctrine and opinion had its origin.

Further on (51:2), Justin explains that prophecies concerning events taking place between the first and second coming of Christ are thus fulfilled, but he also does not elaborate that the appearance of false prophets is a sign of the end times: "He […] foretold that in the interval between His [first and second] advent, as I previously said, priests and false prophets would arise in His name, which things do actually appear". Similarly, Hegesippus quoted by Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* IV 22:6): "From them [seven sects] came false Christs, false prophets, false apostles, who divided the unity of the Church by corrupt doctrines uttered against God and against his Christ".

The author of 2 Peter also ostensibly departs from this apocalyptic direction by listing the false prophets and turning to history. But he does so in order to indicate even at the lexical level that the false prophets in fact foreshadow the future appearance of false teachers. Such a clear distinction is presumably due to an awareness of the associations that the term ψευδοπροφήτης might evoke in the Christian recipients of the letter, and it usually evoked precisely eschatological associations, the Old Testament ones being a side element. Perhaps we should even consider the narrator of 2 Peter as a precursor of such a distinction and typology, which is partly taken up later by Justin Martyr. In *Dial.* 82:1–2 Justin uses a similar typology and also distinguishes between historical false prophets and contemporary false teachers, pointing out that the latter are called prophets by Jesus in his prophecy:

> For the prophetical gifts remain with us, even to the present time. And hence you ought to understand that [the gifts] formerly among your nation have been transferred to us. And just as there were false prophets contemporaneous with your holy prophets, so are

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> there now many false teachers among us, of whom our Lord forewarned us to beware; so that in no respect are we deficient, since we know that He foreknew all that would happen to us after His resurrection from the dead and ascension to heaven. For He said we would be put to death, and hated for His name's sake; and that many false prophets and false Christs would appear in His name, and deceive many: and so has it come about. For many have taught godless, blasphemous, and unholy doctrines, forging them in His name; have taught, too, and even yet are teaching, those things which proceed from the unclean spirit of the devil.

The false prophets were active among the people – ἐν τῷ λαῷ. By marking the scope of the activities of the former false prophets in this way, the narrator further marks and confirms his historical account. For the term λαός "the people" meant "the chosen people", Israel,[545] in relation to pagan peoples/nations the term ἔθνος[546] is used. It should be noted, however, that in NT the term λαός is also used in relation to God's new people – Acts 15:14, 18:10, Rom 9:25, Heb 4:9, 1 Pet 2:9–10. Such implications can be seen as an exponent of the shift from a historical to an eschatological perspective and a suggestion that false prophets operating in Israel will have successors operating in Christian environments.[547] In this way, the narrator would be using not only typology, but also the now fairly established Christian sociolect and associations associated with both the people and the false prophets,[548] which make up his eschatological hermeneutic, to present his argument.

These eschatological implications are developed further in the phrase referring to the false teachers who "will be among you ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται". In general, commentators here point to the typological message:[549] the former people of God are a foreshadowing of the new people of God; the former false prophets are a foreshadowing of the false teachers.[550] But what draws attention here is the differentiated terminology: instead of the false prophets ψευδοπροφῆται will appear the false teachers ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι. This demonstrates, as has already been said, the sociolectic awareness of the narrator and the fact that he does not want to apply the 1:1

545 Matt 2:6, 15:8, 26:47, Mark 7:6, Luke 1:17, 2:32, John 11:50, Acts 3:23, 4:10, 7:17, 26:17.23, 28:17, Rom 11:1–2, Heb 8:10.

546 Matt 6:32, 12:21, 25:32, 28:19, Mark 13:10, Luke 2:32, 12:30, 21:24, 24:47, Acts 4:25, 10:45, 11:1, 13:19.46.48, 15:7, 21:21, 26:17.23, Rom 11:14, 9:30, 15:9–12.16.27, 1 Cor 12:2, Gal 2:8–9.14, 3:8.14, Eph 2:11, Rev 12:5, 14:8, 15:4, 17:15, 18:3.23, 19:15, 20:3.8.

547 D.E. Hiebert, *Selected Studies from 2 Peter. Part 3: A Portrayal of False Teachers: An Exposition of 2 Pet 2:1–3*, "Bibliotheca Sacra" 141 (1984), no. 563, p. 256.

548 Ibid., p. 258 argues that the author of 2 Peter may also have had in mind here Jewish prophets who did not recognise Jesus as the Messiah and still proclaimed that the Messiah was yet to appear.

549 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 732.

550 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 178.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

parallel between the past activity of the false prophets and the future activity of the false teachers in his argument. The essential difference between the two has already been pointed out: to the former the narrator attributes the formula of false prophecies, to the latter the use of misinterpretation of past prophecies.

The term ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι is another New Testament *hapax legomenon*,[551] perhaps even coined by the author of 2 Peter,[552] in order to employ paronomasia and thus further emphasise the similarity, but not the equivalence, of pseudo-prophets and pseudo-teachers. He undoubtedly modelled the expressions on already existing phrases formed with the prefix ψευδ- (ψευδάδελφος "false brother" 2 Cor 11:26, Gal 2:4, ψευδαπόστολος "false apostle" 2 Cor 11:13, ψευδόμαρτυς Matt 15:19, 26:59–60, 1 Cor 15:15, ψευδόχριστος Matt 24:24, Mark 13:22).[553] In many cases, these collocates appear in an apocalyptic context, which undoubtedly influenced the vocabulary of the writer (so, for example, Matt 24:24, 2 Thess 3:1–7.12–13, 1 Tim 4:1, 2 Tim 4:3). All the more so since, as has been said, the narrator was perfectly aware of the connotations evoked by the term ψευδδοπροφῆται. The connection between the phrase ἐγένοντο δὲ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ "there were false prophets among the people" and ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι "there will be false teachers among you" is also evidenced by the use of chiasm:

A. ἐγένοντο δὲ ψευδοπροφῆται
    B. ἐν τῷ λαῷ
    B'. ἐν ὑμῖν
A'. ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι

This chiasm also draws attention to differences that do not allow the two phrases to be regarded as a mere parallelism, but a kind of analogy and development of the suggestion in 2 Pet 1:20 that, when speaking of the proper explanation of prophecies, the hagiographer has in mind their internal interpretation as well as their external interpretation.

The most striking difference between 2 Pet 2:1a and 1b is the change of tense from the past (aor. – ἐγένετο) to the future (fut. – ἔσονται) and the fairly consistent continuation of the narrative with regard to the false teachers' activities in futurum, in keeping with the apocalyptic convention adopted by the narrator. This reference to the future is disrupted by the introduction of the present tense in 2:10b–22 and

551 It is possible that this neologism was created quite accidentally, through a typo – the omission of ι in the term ψεῦδοι in the commonly known two-element phrase ψεύδοι διδάσκαλοι. The majuscule text devoid of clear spaces between words (see P^{72}) was later read as ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, written together according to the rules of Greek orthography and interpreted as a neologism.

552 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 179.

553 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 733.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

3:5–7.15–16, which suggests that the activities of the false teachers are already taking place.[554] Nevertheless, the audience understands the whole message as a description of a future reality in relation to the narrator's point. Thus, it is in the broad future covering the times from the sending of the letter to the second coming of Jesus that false teachers will appear.

The term ψευδοδιδάσκαλος is usually understood by commentators in two ways. Firstly, they can be those who teach Christian doctrine but do not act with the authority of the Church; secondly, they can be those whose teaching contains false, perverse content.[555] Alternatively, the two meanings can be combined, in which case the term ψευδοδιδάσκαλος would refer to those self-appointed teachers who speak on behalf of the Church and, in addition, preach doctrines contrary to divine revelation.[556] G.L. Green[557] even argues that this is a reference to the crisis of the early Church caused by the emergence of teachers who claim recognition of their authority equal to that of the prophets. Their teaching, however, does not withstand confrontation with either the prophetic message or the apostolic message.

However, it seems that in 2 Pet 2:1b the narrator is not particularly interested in the ecclesiastical legitimacy of the teaching. Nor does he attribute to the false teachers a prophetic charisma,[558] such as the Old Testament prophets had. On the contrary, since he avoids saying that false prophets will also appear in the future, he wants to draw attention to some other aspect of future activities. One can possibly agree with G.L. Green about the confrontation of false teaching with the apostolic message, but without narrowing this confrontation to the narrator's contemporaries and the crisis in the Church at the time. Indeed, the narrator's intention is to outline the future situation in general terms in a form that can be defined as *vaticinium ex eventu*.[559] Such general mentions of successively emerging errors in Christian teaching, not infrequently limited to the mere mention of false prophets, teachers, apostles or messiahs, or to some metaphor, dominate the New Testament writings, especially when they concern the end times (Matt 7:15–23, 1 Thess 5:20–22, 2 Thess 2:2, 1 John 4:1–3). It is to these that the narrator refers in verse 2b. The later more elaborate criteria for distinguishing between false and true teachings are referred to later – in verse 2c-4.[560]

On the basis of the juxtaposition of the false prophets of the past and the false teachers, it is possible to try to identify those common features of one group and

554 Ibid., p. 734; see analysis of 2 Pet 2:10.

555 D.E. Hiebert, *Selected Studies*, p. 257; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 238.

556 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 207.

557 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 734.

558 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 208.

559 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 267.

560 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:2.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the other that the narrator wants to emphasise. As has already been said, the false prophets not only preached a false message, but were full of the spirit of falsehood, did not experience inspiration by the Holy Spirit, and even if God sent them dreams or visions, they did not accept God's explanation of these signs, but preferred their own interpretations. The false teachers, on the other hand, although themselves lacking the prophetic charism, make a false interpretation of the prophetic message. With this juxtaposition and a certain reduction of parallels, the suggestion that verse 20 is about an internal interpretation of prophecy by the prophet as well as an external explanation by the teachers is also resolved. In other words – in the case of false teachers, the narrator is primarily drawing attention to the fact that they will preach on the basis of misinterpreted prophecies as well as the apostolic message, which has the same value and the same basis as prophecies (cf. 2 Pet 1:19a).

From verse 1c the narrator moves on to a more detailed description of false teaching resulting from a false interpretation of the message of the prophets and apostles. The primary charge against the false teachers is that they "introduce heresies of destruction" παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας (verse 1c) and "deny the Lord who redeemed them, bringing upon themselves violent/swift destruction" τὸν ἀγοράσατα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμεοι ἐπάφοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν (verse 1df) This whole two-part formula can be taken explicatively and/or consequentially: "introducing heresy" means "denying the Lord" (explication) and/or "introducing heresy" leads to "denying the Lord" (consequence).

The verb παρεισάγω belongs to the New Testament *hapax legomena* (cf. παρεισάκτους in Gal 2:4). Its basic meaning is 'to bring/fetch/introduce' without any clear negative connotation. It is used in this sense by the Greek writers Polybius (*Histories* II 7:7: "[they intended] to pillage the city of Agrigentum of which they formed the garrison"; III 63:2: "he had brought the prisoners before them designedly in order that clearly seeing in the person of the others what they might themselves have to suffer, they should thence take better counsel at the present crisis") and *The Letter of Aristeas* (20: "it was God who had brought our purpose to fulfilment […] to redeem […] any who had been subsequently brought into the kingdom"). Context can sometimes indicate the introduction of some new religious beliefs and/or customs: "For this reason […] the ancients acted rashly and at haphazard in introducing among the people notions concerning the gods and beliefs in the terrors of hell", wrote Polybius in *Histories* VI 56:12), Similarly, Diodorus Siculus (*Bibliotheca Historica* I 96:5) commented on the origin of Greek funerals: "all these were introduced by Orpheus in imitation of the Egyptian funeral customs", and Plutarch (*Moralia* 328D) spoke of Socrates "tried on the charge of introducing [the worship of] foreign deities".

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

It is most likely in this sense that the verb παρεισάγω also appears in 2 Pet 2:1c. It is not a case of some slipping in, creeping in,[561] as the comparison with Jude 4, where the similar-sounding verb παρεισδύω, which is also *hapax legomenon*,[562] occurs, might suggest, but rather of officially introducing and spreading false teachings. This could, of course, have met with opposition – as is evident from the accusations against Socrates in Plutarch's *Moralia* quoted above; but there is no indication that false teachers would be tricked into introducing their teachings.[563] In a similar context to Peter's, the verb παρεισάγω is used, for example, by Hegesippus (*HE* IV 22:5), who also refers it to the actions of heretics: "Each [heretic] introduced – παρεισηγάγοσαν – privately and separately his own peculiar opinion". And here, too, there is no basis for finding latent activity. The narrator of 2 Pet thus suggests that false teachers in the future will act quite overtly and introduce heresies into Christian doctrine that undermine the veracity of eschatological-parochial prophecies and lead to the rejection of Jesus as eschatological Ruler, to whom also belongs the power of planting. Such overt activity is also a connecting element between the action and preaching of false prophets in the past and false teachers in the future.

Peter predicts that false teachers will introduce heresies. Originally, the noun αἵρεσις meant making a choice or leaning towards something, as it was formed from the verb αἱρέομαι 'to choose'. In Greek and Hellenistic writings it did not have a pejorative meaning, but rather a neutral one, indicating a philosophical school, a group, a party adhering to certain views and principles that differed from others. This is how Josephus Flavius, among others, uses it when he refers to the Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees as heresy (*Bell. Iud.* II 8:2: "For there are three philosophical sects among the Jews. The followers of the first of which are the Pharisees, καὶ τοῦ μὲν αἱρετισταὶ Φαρισαῖοι, of the second, the Sadducees, and the third sect, which pretends to a severer discipline, are called Essens"; *Ant.* XIII 5:9: "At this time there were three sects τρεῖς αἱρέσεις τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἦσαν among the Jews, who had different opinions concerning human actions. The one was called the sect of the Pharisees; another the sect of the Sadducees; and the other the sect of the Essens"; XIII 10:6: "Jonathan, […] but of the sect of the Sadducees ἐκ τῶν Σαγγουκαίων τῆς αἱρέσεως; whose notions are quite contrary to those of the Pharisees"). The same nomenclature is applied to the Pharisees and Sadducees by the author of the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 5:17, 15:5, 26:5), who at the same time points out that Christians were also called "heresy" by their opponents (Acts 24:5, 28:22).[564] By heresy, the

561 So e. g. R.Ch.H. Lenski, *Interpretation of 1 and 2 Epistle of Peter, the three Epistles of John and the Epistle of Jude*, Minneapolis 2008, p. 309.

562 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 99.

563 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 737.

564 D.E. Hiebert, *Selected Studies*, p. 258.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Apostle Paul understands mainly factions, schisms, divisions (1 Cor 11:18–19), which belong to the negatively perceived works of the flesh (Gal 5:20).[565] This negativity, however, is associated not so much with some separate erroneous doctrine, but with generally understood actions that destroy the unity of the Church. By the turn of the first/ second century, a decisive change turn can already be observed – heresy became a pejorative term, which is also linked to a synecdochic shift in the understanding of the term itself. Heresy began to denote not only some distinct group, party or school, but above all the views propounded by these groups, judged negative from the point of view of maintaining the unity of Christianity. In such a doctrinal-pejorative sense, the noun αἵρεσις appears, for example. in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch[566] to the Ephesians 6:2 "you all live according to the truth, and that no sect has any dwelling-place among you" ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεμία αἵρεσις καοικεῖ) and to Trallians 6:1 ("I therefore, yet not I, but the love of Jesus Christ, entreat you that […] abstain from herbage of a different kind; I mean heresy" ἥτις ἐστὶν αἵρεσις). If heresy is similarly understood by the author of 2 Peter, then a denial of the prophetic and apostolic teaching in the Church (cf. Eph 2:20) can be inferred. Moreover, most likely false teachers treat Christianity as one of many philosophical schools. The narrator develops this thought in 2:19 by introducing one of the most important philosophical concepts of freedom.[567] In other words – as G.L. Green argues, citing H. Schlier[568] – the church (ἐκκλησία) and heresy are opposites – the church as inclusion, the gathering of believers to the teaching of the prophets and apostles, and heresy (αἵρεσις) as exclusion arising from the denial of this teaching.

It may be surprising to find the plural noun αἵρεσις – αἱρέσεις. Since in 2 Pet 2:1c heresy (singular l.) denotes a doctrine denying prophetic and apostolic teaching, heresies (plural) may indicate the emergence of different variants and modes of this denial. This would be in line with tendencies noted in early Christian writing, e. g. in *Letter to Autolycus* II 14 by Theophilus of Antioch: "so there are doctrines of error – I mean heresies – which destroy those who approach them" and in *HE* IV 22:4: "The same author [Hegesippus] also describes the beginnings of the heresies τῶν αἱρέσεων τὰς ἀρχάς which arose in his time", and goes on to list the seven heresies of his contemporaries ἑπτὰ αἱρέσεως (*HE* V 22:5). By using the plural, the 2 Pet narrator undoubtedly wants to indicate that in the future the false teachers will not represent a single school and suggests that their teaching may be syncretic, composed of doctrines that both together and separately lead to destruction. Unlike Theophilus or Hegesippus, however, he does not specify or name

565 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 270.

566 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 239 argues that the pejorative meaning of the term αἱρέσις takes on only in Ignatius' letters.

567 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:19.

568 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 738.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

individual heresies,[569] but uses generalisations characteristic of apocalypticism. A similar formula, also without specification, can be found in AscIsa 3:22: "there will be much contention on the eve of [His advent and] His approach" and in *Dial.* 35:5 of Justin Martyr precisely in the context of the general prophecy of Jesus: "There shall be schisms and heresies", the fulfilment of which is very extended in time and includes sects that arose in the past and were in operation in Justin's time.

Heresies are defined in 2 Pet 2:1c as αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας "heresies of destruction", and the genitive used here should be interpreted as gen. obiectivus – "heresies that result in destruction" or gen. subiectivus – "heresies that bring destruction, lead to destruction",[570] and not just as gen. qualitatis, which can be translated adjectivally ("destructive heresies"). Usually the phrase is understood in social and eschatological terms. With the social and communal meaning, the rupture of unity, of social bonds is emphasised,[571] which is why some translations render the phrase αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας as "destructive divisions".[572] However, the dominant meaning here seems to be eschatological, repeated still in 2:1f crowning the explanatory segment of the parallelism (cf. also 2:3, 3:7.16, and 3:6.9, where the verb ἀπόλλυμι occurs). All the more so since in NT the term ἀπώλεια usually refers to the final destruction[573] of those who oppose God and His will (Matt 7:13, Rom 9:22, 1 Tim 6:9, Phil 1:28, 3:19, Heb 10:39, Rev 17:8.11). It is the opposite of salvation (Phil 1:28, Heb 10:39) and the result of God's wrath (Rom 9:22), and those who are doomed to destruction are called children of annihilation (John 17:12, 2 Thess 2:3). For the narrator of 2 Peter, "destruction" thus stands in opposition to "the entrance into the eternal kingdom" (1:11) and "participation in the divine nature" (1:4).

As already said, verse 1c is explained by 1df. First, the author clarified the main contents in the context of future heresies; then Thesis that the heresies lead to destruction is reiterated:

1c: heresies → 1de: denying the Lord who redeemed them;
1c: destruction → 1f: bring violent destruction upon themselves.

G.L. Green[574] argues that in describing the content of heresy, the author of 2 Peter modifies Jude 4, which describes "intruders, who long ago were designated for this

569 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 240.
570 So, among others, W. Grundmann, K.H. Schelkle; R. Bauckham, G.L. Green.
571 D.E. Hiebert, *Selected Studies*, p. 259.
572 Thus, for example, *The Message*, English transl. E.H. Peterson, 2018.
573 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 240; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 740.
574 Ibid..

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

condemnation, godless persons, who pervert the grace of our God into licentiousness". Here the author of Jude uses the typical *vituperatio*;[575] however, the author of 2 Peter is much more restrained. He states that the false teachers "deny/reject the Lord who redeemed them". He mentions nothing about turning grace into debauchery.[576] Denying Christ is the opposite of confessing Him as Ruler/Lord, and therefore denies the basic Christian kerygma (John 1:20, 2 Tim 2:12, Titus 1:16, 1 John 2:22–23). In some contexts, the verb ἀρνέομαι can simply be a negation of a statement, a denial of something (so, e. g., Luke 8:45, and Philo in *De Abrahamo* XX 112 describes how Sarah denied that she laughed at the promise of parenthood: "therefore the scriptures record that Abraham's wife, when she first heard what they were saying, laughed; and when they said afterwards, 'Is anything impossible to God?' they were so ashamed that they denied ἠρνῆσθαι that they had laughed"). Sometimes, however, he points to a more radical or emphatic rejection (so, e. g., Acts 7:35, Josephus Flavius in *Bell. Iud.* II 9:2: "upon Pilate's denial of their request Πιλάτου δὲ ἀρνουμένου, they fell down prostrate upon the ground, and continued immoveable in that posture for five days, and as many nights"). Hence the relatively frequent use of the verb ἀρνέομαι in a religious (Wis 16:16) and even eschatological sense (Wis 12:27, Matt 10:33, Philo, *De spec. leg.* II XLVI:255: "And if even he who swears in an unbecoming manner is guilty and blameable, of what punishment is that man worthy who denies the one only true and living God and now honours the creature"). However, it is important to note that the religious context can also involve a positive valuing of rejection/ renunciation. This is the case when the renunciation concerns ungodliness, sin and is an element of conversion (Titus 2:12).

This religious negative denotation, which was taken from the Hellenistic reinterpretation of the verb ἀρνέομαι, was used by Peter in his letter. In doing so, he is not concerned with the act of rejection itself, although the verb accentuates this declarative dimension, but with the conduct which indicates this[577] – for he had already strongly emphasised the practical aspects of faith, knowledge, the need to develop baptismal gifts and prophetic teaching. Now he also suggests that there is a practical dimension to rejection,[578] and he expresses this clearly in verses 2–3. Some exegetes see in this emphasis on the act of denial, denial, echoes of Peter's own experience of denying Jesus,[579] although in Theological-eschatological context of 2:1–3 this seems unlikely, even if the letter had actually come out of the hand of the apostle Peter. Moreover, the participle ἀρνούμενοι in praes. is indicative of a still

575 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 110.

576 Ibid., p. 110–112.

577 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 741.

578 So, inter alia, W. Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, p. 76; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 241.

579 D.E. Hiebert, *Selected Studies*, p. 259.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

ongoing process of rejection, which also fits well with the apocalyptic convention of the text and with the author's assumption that this denial may take different forms in the future and originate in developing and diverse theological reflections, as expressed, as noted, by the rare plural of the noun αἱρέσεις.

The rejection concerns Jesus as Ruler – δεσπότης. In the NT, the title δεσπότης is applied to God the Father, as can be seen especially in texts derived from the liturgy or containing already established formulas (Luke 2:29, Acts 4:24, Rev 6:10).[580] In the LXX, it occurs most often in invocatory formulas or phrases to God expressing special respect and submission to Him and speaking of His power and authority over the world (Gen 15:2.8, Josh 5:14, Isa 3:1, 10:33, Jer 4:10, 2 Macc 5:17.20, 15:22, Wis 8:3); similarly in early Christian literature.[581] *1 Clem.* by this term often emphasises God's dominion over the world he has created; in 8:2 and 52:1 he calls God "the Lord of all" (ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων), 20:11 and 33:2 "the Creator and Lord of all" (ὁ μέγας δημιουργὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων), and 20:8 contains a description of the ocean obeying the commands of the Lord τοῦ δεσπότου. In *1 Clem.* 9:4 this title appears in the narrative of Noah's rescue, and in 11:1 in the narrative of the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah and the rescue of Lot, to emphasise that the authority God exercises over the world also includes the authority to judge, punish and reward (cf. *1 Clem.* 36:4). In this light, the use of the term δεσπότης in 2 Pet 2:1 seems unusual. Although the narrator does not explicate it, he clearly relates this title to Jesus, as evidenced by the complement of the noun δεσπότης with part. aor. ἀγόρασας "who redeemed". In transposing the title δεσπότης to Jesus, the author of 2 Peter is most likely dependent on Jude 4, where the "denying of the only Ruler and Lord our Jesus Christ" is mentioned. But the addition of ἀγόρασας allows him to emphasise more the aspect of Jesus' authority that is related to the salvific redemption of sinners to become His own (cf. 1 Tim 6:1–2). Thus, he also uses associations with the social relations of the time.

The act of buying out slaves as a commercial transaction is described in many ancient manuscripts and inscriptions. One inscription from Delphi conveys information about the sale of slaves to the temple of Apollo the Pythian: "The slave, now freed from former obligations, was consecrated to the deity" (cf. 1 Cor 7:22).[582] The liberation inscriptions stipulate that the redeemed/liberated person should not once again be sold into slavery should this happen – punishments for this injustice are envisaged (cf. Gal 2:4).[583] This language has been used in Christianity as a metaphor for salvation (1 Cor 6:20, 7:23, Rev 5:9, 14:3–4, cf. Acts 20:28, Rom 6:17–18, 1 Pet 1:18).

580 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 107–109.

581 Ibid., p. 107.

582 For: G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 742.

583 For: ibid., p. 743.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The verb ἀγοράζω is thus intended not only to build associations with the social situation, but also to draw attention to the salvific work of Christ. R. Bauckham[584] argues that this is the only allusion to the death of Jesus on the cross in 2 Peter. It is difficult to agree with this if one also considers *exordium* and the mention of the cleansing from sins (2 Pet 1:9) in baptism, which is. immersion into the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Rom 6:3–4.11). Thus, one can see a theological connection between 1:9c and 2:1d: to ignore the baptismal cleansing of sins is in fact to reject Jesus as the one who redeemed people through his death. Both acts are manifested in very similar ways – the first by not developing and not using the baptismal gifts, the second by debauchery (2:2) and indulging in corruption (2:20). The un/redeemed by Christ now belong to Him alone (1 Cor 6:19–20, 7:23, 15:23, Gal 5:24) and should obey Him alone. Heretics/false teachers, however, reject Jesus as Lord (ruler, owner) who has all authority over the redeemed, including the authority to judge. This, of course, involves the negation of Old Testament Parousia prophecies[585] and their apostolic interpretation. They manifest this by disobeying Jesus, i. e. leading an immoral lifestyle[586] (2 Pet 2:2–3.10.12–14.18–20, cf. *2 Clem.* 3:4, 4:3: "But in what way shall we confess Him? By doing what He says, and not transgressing His commandments, and by honouring […] with all our heart and all our mind. […] Wherefore, brethren, let us confess Him by our works, by loving one another, by not committing adultery, or speaking evil of one another, or cherishing envy; but by being continent, compassionate, and good. We ought also to sympathize with one another, and not be avaricious"). All this brings destruction ἀπώλεια, which is, as said, the opposite of "the entrance to the eternal kingdom" after "living a pious life" and "escaping the corruption in the world [caused by] lust".

The last part of verse 1 develops theme of destruction. The narrator uses the verb ἐπάγω (here in the form part. praes. act. ἐπάγοντες), which means 'to bring something' upon others (Acts 5:28) or, more often, upon oneself (LXX Exod 28:43, Lev 22:16). It usually means 'to bring misfortune, evil, curse and judgement and/or punishment' (2 Pet 2:5, Gen 6:17, Hos 13:15, Amos 5:9, Ezek 28:7). The phrase ἐπάγοντες ἀπώλειαν no longer leaves any doubt that what is meant is "destruction as a result of eschatological judgement and verdict" (2:1.3, 3:7.16). It is worth noting the agendas – it is the false teachers themselves who bring the punishment upon themselves, as clearly emphasised by the pronoun ἑαυτούς (cf. 2 Pet 2:3c). Thus, the undermining of the basic Christian kerygma of redemption in Christ, and consequently of all Christian teaching including the Parousia-eschatological

584 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 240.

585 T. Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralitic Society*, p. 37–38; D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 179.

586 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 240.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

prophecies, and the manifestation of this rejection in the conduct of denying that the Ruler/Owner of the redeemed is Christ (verse 2), brings ultimate destruction upon the false teachers.

The narrator also asserts that this is the destruction referred to as ταχινός. However, he gives the term ταχινός slightly different meanings than in 1:14 when he spoke of his death, even though he uses the same adjectival construction ταχινὴ ἀπώλεια. In 1:14 he had primarily temporal aspects in mind; now he is most likely thinking of the violence, suddenness and inevitability of the destruction which, like the day of the Lord, will come like a thief (cf.2 Pet 3:9–10). What is meant, therefore, is a vision of "violent, sudden destruction", which fits well with the apocalyptic convention of this passage. It is difficult to agree with G.L. Green,[587] who argues that here, too, temporal aspects are involved and the destruction will come soon (cf. Jas 1:19, Matt. 5:25, 28:7, Luke 15:22, John 11:29, Rev 2:16, 3:11, 11:14, 22:7.12.20). This prediction of a soon-to-be Parousia is for Green also evidence that the letter must have been written earlier than the time of so-called "early Catholicism", when eschatological hopes had waned, and the narrator himself links the idea of a soon Parousia with its delay explicitly stated in chapter 3. Such a connection is for Green an example of paratactic thinking, which, especially in the Jewish tradition, made it possible to combine two apparently different or even mutually exclusive views.[588] However, it seems unnecessary to reach for a parataxis conceived in this way. Rather, it is a polemic against the views that have emerged from Peter's life and – as the narrator-apocalypticist predicts – will intensify, that "the Lord is delaying the fulfilment of the promise" concerning the Parousia and the judgement (2 Pet 3:9). Meanwhile, the judgement – despite the delay caused by the Lord's patience and His desire for all to repent (2 Pet 3:8–9) – is sure to come and will surprise especially those who deny it. Then there will be violent, sudden, inevitable destruction.

In verses 2 and 3, the author continues the characterisation of false teachers, considering their actions. It is hard not to notice that this description is reminiscent of early Christian lists of behaviours to help distinguish true teachers from false teachers and prophets. Such a list is given in Didache 11 and *The Shepherd* of Hermas (Commandment XI 11–15), among others. Peter's list is further supplemented by evaluative elements foreshadowing punishment at the eschatological judgement:

587 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 744.

588 Ibid., p. 745; G.B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of Bible*, London 1980, p. 117–121.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Didache 11	*The Shepherd* (Commandment XI 11–15)	2 Pet 2:2–3	Evaluative elements and the announcement of the court
Demand for money (11:6.12) Requesting other remuneration (11:12)	Exaltation (XI 12) Willingness to occupy prominent positions (XI 12) A life of excess (XI 12) Collecting remuneration for prophecies (XI 12)	Greed (2:3a)	Verdict/judgement is not idle (2 Pet 2:3b) [eschatological] destruction does not slumber (2 Pet 2:3c)
Incompatibility of the doctrine with the way of life (11:8.10).	Acting under the influence of the spirit of vanity (XI 11.14) and foolishness (XI 11) Audacity (XI 12) Insolence (XI 12) Talkativeness (XI 12) Avoiding the company of the just (XI 13) Prophesying on request (XI 13) Preaching in line with the expectations of the audience (XI 13)	Acts of promiscuity (2:2a); Desecration of the way of truth (2:2b) Deceptive words (2:3a)	Verdict/judgement is not idle (2 Pet 2:3b) [eschatological] destruction does not slumber (2 Pet 2:3c)

The perceived generality of the Petrine letter especially in comparison to the elaborate text of Hermas is due to the adoption of an apocalyptic convention; the author of 2 Peter refers to the future rather than describes the present. This suggestion is confirmed by the addition of elements concerning eschatological judgement. Because of this apocalyptic-eschatological focus, the description in 2 Pet 2:2–3 is reminiscent of Jude 4.15.18–19.[589] It should also be noted that Peter's list is, as it were, an "introductory list". Its individual elements will be developed in 2:13b–20.

Peter predicts that false teachers will succeed in gaining many followers (2.2a). Here he uses his favourite verb ἐξακολουθέω – 'to follow someone', 'to imitate someone', which he had already applied in 1:16 (cf. also 2:2.15). In the Jewish tradition, following someone or something often meant abandoning one's previous value system, submitting to a new authority and adopting his way of thinking and forms of action (TNaph 1:25: "The Gentiles went astray, and forsook the Lord, and charged their order, and obeyed stocks and stones, spirits of deceit"; TIss 2:1–2: "in

589 The similarities and relationships to Jude will be discussed successively when the following poems are analysed in detail.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the last times your sons […] leaving guilelessness, will draw near to malice; and forsaking the commandments of the Lord, they will cleave unto Beliar"). Here, too, there is a suggestion that false teachers will become authorities and role models for many, although, as he already points out in verse 2b, "following them", "imitating them" stands in opposition to "following the path of truth".

As mentioned, the verb ἐξακολουθέω outside 2 Peter does not occur in NT texts. In the gospels, the closely related verb ἀκολουθέω, formed from the same stem, usually means to accompany Jesus, to follow him and to imitate him, i. e. everything that makes up discipleship.[590] This may explain why the author of 2 Peter preferred to use a slightly different verb ἐξακολουθέω and to place it here in the context of "anti-discipleship" (cf. also 2 Pet 2:15).[591] Moreover, this act of imitation is not about the personal authority of the false teachers or their charisma, but rather about imitating their conduct, which is explained and justified by eschatological scepticism. This element of discrediting heresy is expressed by the suggestion that "many" will follow not the teachers, not the teachings, but the acts of promiscuity that accompany these teachings – ταῖς ἀσελγείαις αὐτῶν.

The noun ἀσέλγεια usually means 'indulgence of the senses', 'promiscuity', 'licentiousness', 'lack of moral restraint', 'outrageous and/or indecent behaviour'. The term can be found in such meanings in Greek and Jewish literature. Polybius in *Histories* V 28:5 uses the term ἀσέλγεια in a very general context: "On reading them and being convinced that all the mischief was originally due to Apelles". Similarly, Flavius in *Ant.* VIII 10:2:

> the greatness of a Kingdom, and its change into prosperity, often becomes the occasion of mischief and of transgression to men. […] Rehoboam […] went out of the right way unto unrighteous and irreligious practices: and he despised the worship of God: till the people themselves imitated his wicked actions. For so it usually happens, that the manners of subjects are corrupted at the same time with those ἀσελγείας of their governors: which subjects then lay aside their own sober way of living, as a reproof of their governors intemperate courses: and follow their wickedness, as if it were virtue (cf. also XX 5:40).

The sexual nature of these outrageous, indecent behaviours is sometimes emphasised – Wis 14:26, Mark 7:22, 2 Cor 12:21, Gal 5:19, Eph 4:19, so also Philo in *De vita Mois.* I LVI:305:

> Balak [who executed his plan] to destroy the power of the Hebrews, and who had executed his purpose by the agency of the licentiousness ἀσελγείας and incontinence of the women,

590 Matt 8:22, 9:9, 10:38, 19:21, Mark 2:14, 10:21, Luke 18:22, John 1:37.42, 10:4, 21:19.22.
591 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 748.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

who destroyed the bodies of those who associated with them by debauchery, and their souls by impiety.

In Jewish apocalyptic literature, behaviour described as ἀσέλγεια is attributed to pagans, as in TJud 4:15–16: "Now I have much grief, my children, because of your lewdness and witchcrafts, and idolatries which ye shall practise against the kingdom, following them that have familiar spirits, diviners, and demons of error. Ye shall make your daughters singing girls and harlots, and ye shall mingle in the abominations of the Gentiles" (cf. 1 Peter 4:3). G.L. Green[592] links this mention of the following of many by ἀσελγείαι directly to the story of Lot (2 Pet 2:7), where ἀσέλγειαι is also mentioned, and sees in this term above all sexual promiscuity, which was to be one of the "hallmarks of heresy" (2:10.14, 3:3), indicating its links with pagan sexual freedom (cf. 1 Cor 6:15–20). However, this seems to be a suggestion too far, especially in the context of the letter's apocalyptic convention and general reference to the future. Moreover, the use of the plural – ἀσέλγειαι – rather indicates the great number and variety of[593] outrageous, indecent, unrestrained acts, as in 3 Macc 2:26: "his innumerable indecent acts" (cf. Rom 13:13) or in *The Shepherd* of Hermas, in Vision II 2:2: "Your seed, O Hermas, […] have added to their sins lusts and iniquitous pollutions τὰς ἀσελγείας, and thus their iniquities have been filled up". Furthermore, there seems to be confirmation of the broad and general understanding of the term ἀσέλγειαι in the second part of verse 2, which speaks just as broadly and generically of "defaming the way of truth".[594]

Perhaps the very term ἀσέλγεια/ἀσέλγειαι in the context of the actions of the false teachers was taken by the narrator of 2 Peter from Jude 4 (the singular is used in Jude 4). However, he did not annotate it with Jude's comment that this promiscuity is the result of the "perverting God's grace". According to R. Bauckham, this omission is due to the fact that Peter does not associate the promiscuity of the false teachers with antinomianism and an antinomian interpretation of grace, but rather with the denial of the Parousia and future judgement.[595] This is confirmed in verses 3b–c, where the judgement/judgement seems idle and dormant. And since the false teachers do not believe in the coming of Jesus as the eschatological Judge, it is not surprising that, in their sense of impunity, they manifest this with a very wide-ranging promiscuity, in which they gain a multitude of followers. Ostentatious promiscuity would thus be tantamount to mocking the prophetic and apostolic

592 Ibid., p. 749–751.

593 D.E. Hiebert, *Selected Studies*, p. 261.

594 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:2b.

595 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 241; Bauckham sees in this negation the influence of pagan scepticism or a return to pagan practices.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

doctrine of the Parousia on the one hand, and an anti-Christian witness to the world on the other (verse 2b).

Verse 2b is introduced by the phrase δι᾽ οὕς – literally, 'by whom'. It is not clear whether the relative pronoun refers to "many" from verse 2a or "the false teachers" from verse 1b. The cohesion associated with the immediate context would point to the first possibility – the "many" who have succumbed to the teachings of the false teachers will cause the way of truth to be defiled.[596] However, as the analysis of *exordium* has shown, one of the characteristic elements of Peter's style is to relate pronouns not only to the immediate context, but also to what has been said before. This, in turn, would lend credence to possibility two – it is the false teachers who will cause the way of truth to be defamed. In all likelihood, this ambiguity was intended by the narrator and is intended to emphasise that both the one and the other – the false teachers and those who imitate their conduct – will equally contribute to bringing Christianity into disrepute. The indictment of both groups stems from the assumption that Peter's letter will be read by many future generations, both those who will come into direct contact with the teaching coming from the authors of the false teachings themselves (ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι) and those who will come into contact with the propagators of these teachings (πολλοί).

Expressions with the noun ὁδός the way can be qualified as some of the narrator's favourites 2 Peter. In addition to ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας "the way of truth" also appears ὁδὸς εὐθεῖα "the way of righteousness" (2:15) and ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης "the way of justice" (2:21). All these phrases have a similar metaphorical meaning – they indicate a way of life, a course of action and its moral evaluation. They thus accentuate the practical dimension of Christianity, which seems particularly important for the author of 2 Peter, who from the beginning has paid attention to the practical dimensions of faith and knowledge. Now he seems to be returning to this concept – conduct is to be an expression of belonging to a Christian community and an element of witness to the world.

This understanding of "the way" as a way of life and an expression of obedience or disobedience to God is rooted in OT.[597] The concept of two ways – two ways of doing things in opposition to each other – is well known at Qumran (CD 1:9–13: "they were like the blind groping in the way […] and He raised for them a teacher of righteousness to make them walk in the way of His heart. And He made known to later generations").[598] It is taken over by the New Testament writers (Matt 7:13–14, Luke 3:5, Acts 2:28, 9:2, 13:10, 19:9.23, 24:22, 1 Cor 4:17, Heb 3:10, Jas 5:20 and by the early Christian writers – e. g. *Didache* 1:1–2:

596 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 318.

597 1 Kings 15:26.34, 16:2.19.26, 2 Kings 8:18.27, 16:3, Ps 32[31]:8, 81[80]:14, 101[100]:6, 119[118]:30, 139[138]:24, Prov 1:15, 2:13, 28:18, Isa 2:3, 40:3, Jer 18:15, Ezek 23:31.

598 Cf. CD 2:6, 1QS 8:13–14, 9:17–20, 10:20–21, 1QH 7:22.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> There are two ways, one of life and one of death; but a great difference between the two ways. The way of life, then, is this: First, you shall love God who made you; second, your neighbour as yourself; and all things whatsoever you would should not occur to you, do not also do to another.

The phrase ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας "the way of truth" also appears in LXX – Gen 24:48, Ps 119[118]:30, Wis 5:6. In the NT, it occurs only here[599] (cf. Jas 5:19, where an ellipsis is most likely employed and only the noun ἀληθεία is used in the sense of "the way of truth").[600] In early Christian writing, the phrase is used e. g. in *1 Clem.* 35:5 ("if we do the things which are in harmony with His blameless will; and if we follow the way of truth τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀληθείας, casting away from us all unrighteousness and iniquity, along with all covetousness, strife, evil practices, deceit, whispering, and evil-speaking, all hatred of God, pride and haughtiness, vain glory and ambition" in *The Shepherd* of Hermas [Vision III 7:1]: "those who have indeed believed, but through doubt have abandoned the true road τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀληθινήν", in ActsPet 12: "Cursed therefore shalt thou be, thou enemy and corrupter of the way of the truth of Christ" [cf. also ApPet 7: "Then shall men and women come unto the place prepared for them. By their tongues wherewith they have blasphemed the way of righteousness"]. Everywhere it refers to a way of living in accordance with the will and commandments of God.[601] It is noteworthy that sometimes "the ways of truth" are referred to – in the plural, which may suggest a certain individualisation and contextualisation of conduct, as e. g. in Tob 1:3, CD 5:15 ["the testimony of His righteousness and the ways of His truth"]; 1QS 4:2 ["These are their ways in the world for the enlightenment of the heart of man, and that all the paths of true righteousness may be made straight before him"], and especially in 1 En 104:13 ["all the righteous who have learnt therefrom all the paths of uprightness be recompensed"]).

M. Green points out that in NT Jesus himself describes himself as the Way, the Truth and the Life (John 14:6).[602] The blasphemy against the way of truth referred to by Peter in 2:2b could in this context mean blaspheming Jesus, which in turn would be a commentary on 2:1de – the rejection of Jesus as a redeeming Ruler. Furthermore, the opposition between Christianity as "following Jesus" and heresy as "following promiscuity and blaspheming Jesus" could be marked in this way. Close to this conception seems the formula in ActsPet 6 containing and mention of "the way of truth" and of Jesus Christ: "[thou] showest the right way which is in

599 D.E. Hiebert, *Selected Studies*, p. 261.

600 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 752.

601 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 242.

602 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 212.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the Lord Jesus Christ our God". While these associations may seem theologically attractive and tempting, it should be noted that there is no explicit idea of following Christ in 2 Peter (the ἀγάπη in 1:7 can be seen as the only allusion).[603] Rather, one would have to connect this "way of truth" with "the pious life" and "escape from corruption" of 2 Pet 1:3–4 and the sorority of 2 Pet 1:5–8, i. e. with Peter's baptismal theology. The way of truth as a conduct resulting from the development of baptismal gifts would lead the faithful without stumbling into the eternal kingdom (2 Pet 1:9). To desecrate this path would in turn be tantamount to condemning oneself to destruction.

The verb βλασφημέω in Greek, Jewish Hellenistic and early Christian literature meant 'to defame', 'to insult', 'to say offensive things', 'to embarrass', 'to mock'. It usually referred to 'defamation' or 'insulting a deity/God' (2 Kings 19:4.6.22, Isa 52:5, Matt 9:3, 26:65, Acts 19:37, Rom 2:24), but it could also be applied to accusations of defamation or saying offensive, slanderous things against humans or supernatural beings other than God (1 Pet 4:4, Rom 3:8, Titus 3:2). Public defamation, whether directed against a deity or against human beings, was seen as a crime and often led to the blasphemers/slanderers being brought to trial.[604] It was considered that any blasphemy, understood as slander or libel, whether in a secular or religious context, brings shame and dishonours the blasphemer. It also causes outrage and a desire to defend the person who was slandered. This can be observed, for example, in the writings of Josephus Flavius, who attacks pagan historians and accuses them of defaming the Jews (*Con. Ap.* I 11: "[they] have attempted to calumniate my history: and took it to be a kind of scholastick performance"), and he accuses his antagonist Apion of slanderous claims concerning Jewish ritual murders of the Greeks (II 8: "He adds another Grecian fable, in order to reproach us"; cf. also Ant. VIII 13:8: "Upon this the King was grieved, as if he had received an injury, when he could not get another man's possession; […] he had been affronted").

The entire phrase from verse 2b δι᾽ οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται "because of whom the way of truth will be defamed/blasphemed" undoubtedly refers to Isa 52:5 (LXX: δι᾽ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν "by you all My Name is desecrated among the Gentiles"). Quotations, paraphrases and allusions to this text were usually used in early Christian literature either against the Jews or serving to urge Christians not to live in such an immoral way as the pagans. Justin Martyr in *Dial.* 17:2 accuses the Jews of spreading false news about Christians:

603 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:7.

604 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 169.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> you selected and sent out from Jerusalem chosen men through all the land to tell that the godless heresy of the Christians had sprung up, and to publish those things which all they who knew us not speak against us. So that you are the cause not only of your own unrighteousness, but in fact of that of all other men. And Isaiah cries justly: "By reason of you, My name is blasphemed among the Gentiles" (cf. Rom 2:24, where the Jews are accused of blaspheming God by transgressing the Law).

Admonitions addressed to Christians, on the other hand, can be found in *1 Clem.* 47:7: "through your infatuation, the name of the Lord is blasphemed, while danger is also brought upon yourselves"; in *2 Clem.* 13:1–2, where the accusatory paraphrase from Isa 52:5 appears, he points out that the conduct of Christians should find respect among the Gentiles: "[let us please] also the men without, for righteousness sake, that the name may not be, because of us, blasphemed. For the Lord says, 'Continually my name is blasphemed among all nations'". In *The Epistle to Philippians* 10:2–3, Polycarp of Smyrna warns us not to give the pagans any pretext for accusing and thus blaspheming God: "Be all of you subject one to another having your conduct blameless among the Gentiles, that you may both receive praise for your good works, and the Lord may not be blasphemed through you"; likewise in the letter of Ignatius of Antioch to Trallians 8:2: "Let no one of you cherish any grudge against his neighbour. Give no occasion to the Gentiles, lest by means of a few foolish men the whole multitude [of those that believe] in God be evil spoken of. For, Woe to him by whose vanity my name is blasphemed among any" (cf. Rom 14:16, 1 Tim 6:1, Titus 2:5). An allusion to Isa is also found in Similitude VI 2:3 of *The Shepherd* of Hermas in a context reminiscent of 2 Pet 2:2b: "those which have torn themselves away from God for ever, and have delivered themselves over to luxuries and deceits [of this world. Among them there is no return to life through repentance, because they have added to their other sins, and blasphemed the name of the Lord".

For the author of 2 Peter, this aspect of external witness to the world[605] seems particularly important. Already in *exordium* he drew attention to it, emphasising firstly the equipping of Christians to lead a pious life (1:3–4), secondly confronting the sorites of the Christian virtues with the Greek virtues (1:5–8), and thirdly, finally, pointing out that the ability to develop the baptismal gifts and to lead a pious life is a confirmation of God's election and of belonging to the Christian community (1:10). False teachers and their followers, by living in a promiscuous manner, give anti-testimony not only to themselves but to all Christians, who, precisely by their irreproachable lives, should be distinguished from the surrounding primarily pagan world. In turn, this anti-testimony can become a pretext for accusing the whole

605 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 242.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

movement of various abominations,[606] and the odium of promiscuity and immorality was also attributed to Christ, to whom – as Lord – Christians acknowledge and belong. That these were not unfounded fears is evidenced by the anti-Christian statements of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Celsus. Tacitus, in *The Annals* XV 44, calls Christianity a superstition: "Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace. Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilatus, and a most mischievous superstition, thus checked for the moment, again broke out not only in Judæa, the first source of the evil, but even in Rome, where all things hideous and shameful from every part of the world find their centre and become popular. […] an immense multitude was convicted, not so much of the crime of firing the city, as of hatred against mankind". Suetonius in the *Lives of the Caesars* (Nero 16:2) adds that it is "impious superstition": "He likewise inflicted punishments on the Christians, a sort of people who held a new and impious superstition". On the basis of his observation of the actions of the false teachers, accusations are made against Christians by Celsus, who argues, among other things, that the Christian community has no solid foundation, but "rebellion is a substantial reason, as well as the advantages which accrue from it, and the fear of external enemies" (*Contra Celsum* III 14). This criticism, says Origen defending Christians, is due to the fact that "Celsus has become acquainted with certain heresies which do not possess even the name of Jesus in common with us. Perhaps he had heard of the sects called Ophites and Cainites, or some others of a similar nature, which had departed in all points from the teaching of Jesus. And yet surely this furnishes no ground for a charge against the Christian doctrine" (*Contra Celsum* III 13). It is no coincidence, therefore, that Bede the Venerable, in his commentary on The Second Epistle of Peter, interprets 2:2 thus:

> The way of truth will be defamed with blasphemies because of heretics. This will be done not only by people who, seduced by their heresy, have joined them, but also by those who, looking at their promiscuity, the sacrifices and the rites performed by them, burn with hatred against the name of Christians. For they will be convinced that all Christians indulge in such shameful practices.[607]

These quite real concerns (cf. 1 Thess 3:1–5)[608] are further overlaid by the apocalyptic convention of 2 Peter. The motif of deviation, i. e. departing from the truth (or

606 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 753; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 212.

607 *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 134.

608 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 746.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the way of truth, righteousness), committing terrible, perverse deeds and reigning in general promiscuity and immorality, appears frequently in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic. ApBaSyr 41:3 speaks of departure from the law and obedience to God: "For lo! I see many of Your people who have withdrawn from Your covenant, and cast from them the yoke of Your law" and in 42:4: "those who were before subject, and afterwards withdrew and mingled themselves with the seed of mingled peoples". 1 En 93:9 foretells: "And after that […] an apostate generation arise, And many shall be its deeds, And all its deeds shall be apostate". A more detailed description is found in 4 Ezra 5:1–2.9–10: "the way of truth shall be hidden, and the land shall be barren of faith. And unrighteousness shall be increased […] all friends shall conquer one another; then shall reason hide itself, and wisdom shall withdraw into its chamber, and it shall be sought by many but shall not be found, and unrighteousness and unrestraint shall increase on earth". In the NT, wide-ranging deviations, iniquity and immorality preceding the end times or even being a sign of them are mentioned e. g. Matt 24:12, 2 Thess 2:3, 1 Tim 4:1.

In verse 3, the narrator continues the apocalyptic description of the conduct of the false teachers. He devotes the first part of the poem to the motivation of the heretics, making extensive use of the vituperative convention,[609] in the second part he returns to the motif of judgement. Πλεονεξία 'greed' is indicated as the main motive for all the actions of the false teachers. This noun is used in the author's favoured 2 Pet purposeful construction with the preposition ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ (cf. 1.1.4.5–7).

The phrase about greed and exploitation/exploitation brings to mind mainly the financial or property gains that false teachers derive from their teachings and from their listeners. But the concept of πλεονεξία is more general and its semantic field broader, for it encompasses the insatiable desire to acquire more and more riches (Sir 14:9) and the pursuit of all non-material needs. Plutarch, in his diatribe *On the Love of Wealth*, compares such greed to a disease which is only intensified by its medicine, satisfaction, not eradicated: "neither silver nor gold allays the craving for money, nor does the greed of gain ever cease from acquiring new gains. No; one can say to wealth as to a pretentious physician: Your physic but increases the disease". One of his talks was devoted entirely to greed by Dio Chrysostom. He recognises greed as the greatest evil that man can do to himself and to others:

> greed is not only the greatest evil to a man himself, but it injures his neighbours as well. And so no one pities, forsooth, the covetous man or cares to instruct him, but all shun him and regard him as their enemy. […] it is of advantage neither to the individual nor to the state; but that, on the contrary, it overthrows and destroys the prosperity of families

609 Ibid. p. 753.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> and of states as well; […] quarrels, internal strife, and foreign wars are due to nothing else than the desire for more (*Orationes* 17:7.10).

In the NT, greed often appears in lists of transgressions or vices, often together with promiscuity – ἀσέλγεια (or the closely related term πορνεία) – Mark 7:22, Rom 11:29, Eph 4:19, 5:3, Col 3:5.[610] But in Luke 12:15, in the introduction to the parable of the rich man hoarding grain, Jesus already warns only against greed, which leads to trusting and placing one's hope in possessions rather than in God.

It is no coincidence that in 2 Pet 2:2a "greed/covetousness" is linked to πλαστοὶ λόγοι "deceptive words" and to the verb ἐμπορεύομαι, meaning both to exploit and to make money from something.[611] This is undoubtedly a reference to the widespread practice in antiquity of creating and delivering opinionated speeches purely for profit. This practice was condemned by Greek, Hellenistic and Christian writers alike. In 1 Thess 2:5–6, the apostle Paul stipulates that he was never motivated by greed when preaching the gospel, with greed understood here rather as an insatiable desire for recognition and the experience of human glory (cf. Acts 20:33, where he confesses that he coveted neither silver nor gold nor another's garment).[612] Dio Chrysostom finds the buying of the art of the word shocking and outrageous (*Orationes* 32:10):

> Those, however, who do come before you as men of culture either declaim speeches intended for display, […] or else chant verses of their own composition […] if they themselves are really poets or orators, perhaps there is nothing so shocking in that, […] they do these things with a view to their own profit and reputation, and not to improve you.

The profit motive has often been attributed to the sophists.[613] Critics of their practices include Philo, who in *De vita Mois.* II XXXIX:212 accuses the sophists of selling their doctrines: "sophists, seek to reduce [philosophy] to a system, selling doctrines and reasonings as they would any other vendible thing in the market". Peter predicts that such a practice will grow in the future, and that preaching doctrines or prophecies for profit will become one of the most characteristic features of false teachers (see the table presented above comparing 2 Pet 2:2–3 with the *Didache* and *The Shepherd* of Hermas). The form of ind. fut. ἐμπορεύσαντοι and the pronoun ὑμεῖς in the accusative clearly indicate that the narrator is primarily addressing an

610 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 754.

611 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 214.

612 D.E. Hiebert, *Selected Studies*, p. 262.

613 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 755.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

audience living in the future, whom he wants to sensitise and prepare to distinguish between true and false teachings.

A certain problem here may be the lack of a clear subject. It is not possible to decide clearly whether the predicate ἐμπορεύσονται refers only to the false teachers, or only to the many who were deceived by them, or perhaps to both. The closest neighbourhood would suggest seeing the subject in the pronoun πολλοί, but Peter's practice allows one to look for the subject further afield as well. Thus, it seems that, as with δι᾽ οὓς in verse 2, the subject includes both the false teachers and their followers, as the assumption that the letter is to be read in the future, when the false teachers are acting, and in the even further future, when their followers are acting, convinces us. The pronoun οἷς beginning 2:3b should be treated in the same birefringent way.

The phrase πλαστοὶ λόγοι, used in Peter's characterisation of false teachers and their followers, was probably taken from classical Greek, from where it passed into Hellenistic literature. The adjective πλαστός itself indicates something contrived, pretended, untrue, falsified and deceptive. Pentheus, in *Bacchantes* 218 by Euripides, tells of the feigned follies of women dancing in honour of Dionysus (πλασταῖσι βακχείαισιν): "the women have left our homes in contrived Bacchic rites, and rush about in the shadowy mountains, honoring with dances". Philo in *De somn.* II 20:140 uses this lexeme to express how deceptive and seductive pride can be: "And what could be a greater evil than for pride, that deceiver and beguiler τὸν πλαστὸν καὶ φένακα, to be praised and admired, instead of sincere and honest simplicity?". In Flavius this lexeme appears when describing forgery: "the Galileans had cut off his brother's hands, […] upon an accusation laid against him, as if he […] had forged some letters" πλαστῶν αὐτῷ γραμμάτων (*The Life of Flavius Josephus* 35:177); "These men do like those who compose forged deeds and conveyances: πλαστὰ γράμματα […] therefore […] he falsifyed in what he related about me: and could not speak truth" (*The Life of Flavius Josephus* 65:337). It is also used by the authors of the Jewish apocalypses (e. g. TRub 3:5: "there is an eighth spirit of sleep […] is joined which is that of error and fantasy"). As can be seen, the term πλαστός most often appears in a negative context. It was also used in polemical texts to indicate, for example, a false presentation of some commodity.[614] The same is true in 2 Pet 2:2a, where the phrase πλαστοὶ λόγοι, used as dat. instrumentalis, is used to discredit the teaching of false teachers. When analysing 2 Pet 1:16[615] it was mentioned that this phrase can be taken as a synonym for σεσοφισμένοι μύθοι "fanciful myths", since it is the myths judged negatively as an antonym of truth that were often rendered πλαστοί. The polemical correlation between 1:16 and 2:3a now

614 Ibid.

615 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:16.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

becomes more apparent – it is not the apostolic teaching that is based on a fanciful myth, nor is it itself such a myth, but its interpretation by false teachers is false and deceptive,[616] supported by false and deceptive arguments.[617] Added to this are the false teachers' accusations of material motives – their false interpretation is not just due to poor understanding, but is more cynical and down-to-earth – the desire for gain is behind it.

Verse 3b is closely related to 2:1–3a, as it summarises the presentation of the actions of the false teachers and their followers so far. What is notable here, however, is the shift from a future tense narrative to a present tense narrative – κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ, ἀπώλεια οὐ νυστάζει "judgement/verdict is not idle, destruction does not slumber". According to R. Bauckham,[618] this involves a change in argumentation and even literary convention – the narrator would be expected to abandon the stylistics of prophecy and proceed to attack his contemporary heretics (cf. similar changes in 3:3 and 3:5). There may be a suggestion behind this and a desire to convince the audience that it does not take long for the prophecy of verses 1b–3a to be fulfilled, for it is being fulfilled before the eyes of Peter's contemporary addressees of the letter (cf. 2 Tim 3:1–9). However, it is difficult to agree with this thesis in its entirety, especially if one considers three elements related to this text: firstly, its concluding nature; secondly, the parallelism of the members; thirdly, and finally, the possible partial dependence on Jude 4.

The change of tense to the present tense may therefore be due to the transitional nature of the summary in verse 3b. Not only the content, but also the form is intended to draw the attention of the recipients to the fact that the eschatological-parochial prophecies and their apostolic interpretation are valid for all time – hence the use of the present tense. Behind this is a call to all the letter's addressees, especially those of future generations, to be vigilant (see 3:8–10) and to live as if the Parousia and judgement were about to take place any moment.

Many exegetes see here echoes of the teaching of the narrator's contemporaries, the false teachers, who mocked the Parousia and the judgement, claiming derisively that this judgement is idle and asleep (cf. 3:9a).[619] It may indeed be that the author of 2 Peter used familiar accusations – after all, he did so also in 1:16 – but referred them to the future. In the future, therefore, there are (also) to be false teacher-interpreters (and still later their followers) who will argue for the dormancy of God's judgement, i. e. its delay (cf. 2 Pet 3:4), or for the inaction, i. e. the uselessness, of this eschatological teaching. In order to demonstrate the falsity of such an interpretation, the narrator has employed the present tense, which is intended to convince the

616 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 243.

617 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 192.

618 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 245.

619 Ibid., p. 247.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

audience of the continuing relevance of God's judgements, even if they have long since come to pass (ἔκπαλαι) and even if they seem to be no longer in force. In doing so, he did not abandon the apocalyptic convention of the letter. Instead, he used a parallelism often found in prophetic texts, which can be interpreted as a climactic or synonymous parallelism depending on one's understanding of the concept of κρίμα: κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ → ἀπώλεια οὐ νυστάζει.

The noun κρίμα most often means judgement and it is a judgement condemning or at least unfavourable to the defendant.[620] This is the meaning used by Polybius, among others, in *Histories* 23:1.12: "maintaining in some cases that they could not get justice in the authorized tribunals, as Philip quashed the proceedings, and in others finding fault with the decisions on the ground that the rulings were unfair, Philip having bribed the judges" (cf. Rom 5:16). This is overlaid by the equivocation, common in Christian sociolects, of the verdict and the judgement itself – that is, the act of announcing the judgement and the entire process of judging (Mark 12:40, Luke 20:47, 24:20, Rom 2:2–3, 3:8, 13:2, 1 Cor 11:25.34, Gal 5:10, 1 Tim 3:6, 5:12, Jas 3:1, 1 Pet 4:17, Rev 17:1, 20:4). In Peter's parallelism, κρίμα is made more specific with the noun ἀπώλεια 'destruction', which may suggest that the dominant meaning of κρίμα is 'judgement'. If so, the parallelism used would be a synonymous parallelism. However, if κρίμα is understood as a court (trial), then the term ἀπώλεια would point to the last act of that trial – the passing of a sentence of destruction or even the execution of an adjudged punishment. Then the whole parallelism would have to be regarded as a climax. However, it seems that this ambiguity is intended by the narrator. For it fits in very well with the vagueness, lack of clarity and precision characteristic of apocalypticism.

Moreover, in this symbolic apocalyptic utterance, the author of 2 Peter allowed himself to personify the concepts κρίμα and ἀπώλεια, as evidenced by the verbs usually referred to living beings – ἀργεῖ 'to be idle', 'not to act', and especially νυστάζει 'to sleep', 'to slumber'. Of course, both judgement and destruction are God's responsibility, so the passive voice interpreted as pass. theologicum could be used here, but it seems that intentionally – precisely in order to expose the apocalyptic convention – the narrator has used personification here,[621] using associations that refer to both Jewish and Hellenistic traditions.

The verb ἀργέω resembles the adjective ἀργός already used in 2 Pet 1:8. Both refer to idleness and laziness viewed negatively in Greek and Jewish tradition.[622] In the LXX, the verb ἀργέω is also sometimes used to indicate the completion or cessation of some activity, the cessation of action (cf. Ezra 4:24, 2 Macc 5:25, Koh 12:3,

620 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 758.

621 Ibid., p. 762.

622 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:8.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Sir 33:28). In some contexts it can also indicate a delay (LXX – 1 Ezra 2:26).[623] This delay leading gradually to doubt in the veracity of the eschatological and prophetic prophecies makes the narrator of 2 Peter the axis of false teaching resulting from a false interpretation of the words of the prophets.[624] The mocking tone used by heretics in their teaching and elements of blasphemy can be detected here. For if the personification "judgement/verdict is idle, does not act, is lazy" is to be taken as a metonymy in which judgement/verdict (and in the second part, destruction) points to God/Jesus, who exercises judgement and passes the verdict, then accusing God/Jesus of laziness (and in the second part – of falling asleep or slumbering) is undoubtedly slander and slander.

The second part of the parallelism clarifies, as mentioned, what the judgement or how the trial ends – it is about ἀπώλεια 'destruction'. The narrator from 2:1 onwards prepares the audience to think of destruction as something certain and inevitable, the opposite of "the entrance into the eternal kingdom" (cf. 2 Pet 3:7.16), which will ultimately be met by false teachers mocking and disregarding eschatological prophecies. In the imagery used, personification is even more pronounced than in the first segment of the parallelism – "destruction does not sleep/does not slumber". The verb νυστάζω means either sleeping or slumbering (cf. e. g. 2 Sam 4:6, Prov 6:10, 24:33, Nah 3:18, Jer 23:31, Sir 22:10, PssSol 16:1: "When my soul slumbered being afar from the Lord"). The denied here indicates that the punishment – destruction – is watching to appear unexpectedly. The most likely sources for this metaphor are the blasphemous mockery of a deity who sleeps – cf. 1 Kings 18:27 (here in LXX the verb καθεύδω is used) and the echoes of the dramatic cry for rescue: "Awake! Why do you sleep, O Lord?" from Ps 44[43]:24 (here in LXX the verb ὑπνόω is used). In addition, the lexis and imagery of the narrator may have been influenced by the LXX texts – Ps 121[120]:4: "Behold, the guardian of Israel never slumbers nor sleeps", and Isa 5:27: "None among them is weary, none stumbles, none will slumber, none will sleep".[625]

This was also compounded by polemics against the views that dormant gods were uninterested in the world and humans. Cicero ridicules such views, asking ironically: "why did these deities suddenly awake into activity as world-builders after countless ages of slumber? […] why did your Providence remain idle all through that extent of time of which you speak? Was it in order to avoid fatigue?" (*De natura deorum* I 9:21–22). Eusebius in *PE* V 19:2 cites pagan accusations against the gods: "I pass over the fact that you gods are indignant at the death of Androgeus at Athens, but sleep on while so many die in all places and at all times". Similarly, Origen in

623 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 758.

624 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 329.

625 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 247.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Contra Celsum VI 78, where he quotes a mocking question that Celsus addresses to Christians: "Celsus next makes certain observations of the following nature: Again, if God, like Jupiter in the comedy, should, on awaking from a lengthened slumber, desire to rescue the human race from evil, why did He send this Spirit of which you speak into one corner (of the earth)?".

The parallelism in verse 3b draws attention to the adverb ἔκπαλαι 'long ago'. Although grammatically and stylistically its placement between the subject κρίμα and the predicate οὐ ἀργεῖ is not very skilful, it seems to play a theologically significant role in Peter's reflection. It all depends on whether ἔκπαλαι is considered in the function of an attribute to the subject κρίμα, or as an adverbial to the predicate οὐ ἀργεῖ.

In the function of an adverb, this adverb is used, among others, by Josephus Flavius in *Ant*. XVI 8:4: "Now it was Antipater who was the cause of all this. Who when he knew what a mad and licentious way of acting his father was in, and had been a great while ἔκπαλαι one of his counsellors". Similarly in Jude 4, to which 2 Pet 2:3b is most likely dependent. In Jude 4, πάλαι pointed to ancient prophecies, both Old Testament (cf. Heb 1:1) and apocalyptic, intertestamental,[626] which described the fate of the wicked. Thus, the same meaning can be given to ἔκπαλαι also in 2 Pet 2:3b. Here, the narrator would be making use of that principle mentioned in 1:16–19a: the confirmation of the apostolic teaching on the Parousia is appropriately reinterpreted from earlier (former) prophetic teaching. Now similarly – God's judgement foretold by the prophets and executed is the proof and guarantee of Jesus' eschatological coming to judge and destroy the false teachers and their followers. This framing also explains the use of the present tense as a bridge between past prophecy and its future ultimate fulfilment. Judgement on the false teachers has been passed long ago, in the past (as spoken of by the prophets), will be carried out in the future, and is still in effect now – neither languishing nor sleeping. This framing is meant to prevent false interpretations of the past prophetic message, i. e. questioning or even denying the Parousia, the judgement and the reign of Jesus. The reference to the past teaching of the prophets furthermore functions as an introduction to examples illustrating on the one hand the irrevocability and on the other the suddenness of God's judgements for those who question them.

It is also possible to translate ἔκπαλαι as an adverbial, emphasising not so much a long-ago judgement, but rather a judgement (this is also the meaning of the noun κρίμα) which "has not been idle for a long time", i. e. it began a long time ago and is now taking place.[627] Such a translation would firstly explain why, in contrast

626 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 102.

627 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 759. The explanation of Bede the Venerable in a commentary on The Second Letter of Peter already goes in this direction: "If the condemnation started so long ago, we can be sure that it will not end soon"; *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 134.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to Jude 4, the author of 2 Peter used the compound form of the adverb (wishing to change its adverbial function to an appenditive one), secondly it requires the use of the present tense "is not idle, is not asleep", and thirdly it would correspond well with Old Testament examples of a judgement that has been taking place "for a long time" (2 Pet 2:4–10). The present tense, on the other hand, would harmonise with 2 Pet 3:8–9 and emphasise the Lord's patience: the Lord has been judging people for a long time, but each time he awaits repentance before passing final judgement, which may give the impression of inactivity and slumber. Perhaps also this contextual and functional ambiguity of the adverb ἔκπαλαι is enigmatic as a characteristic element of apocalypticism.

Unlike other apocalyptic writers, however, neither in verse 1 nor here does the narrator elaborate on what "the destruction" consists of or develop images of punishment. He reveals a little more detail, but also without the suggestive and pictorial narrative characteristic of apocalypses, only in chapter 3 (3:5–7.10–13), where he addresses the destruction of the old and the creation of the new creation. In doing so, he uses the examples of the punishment of the fallen angels (2:4), the corrupted ancient world (2:5a) and Sodom and Gomorrah (2:6), which for him have an eschatological rather than merely historical dimension. The concluding reflections in 3:5–7 also allow us to fully understand why it seems that the world remains unchanged and God's judgements suspended or obsolete.[628]

What the eschatological reinterpretation of events and prophecies described in OT consists of is shown by the examples beginning in verse 4. In the choice of examples, 2 Peter shows great similarity to Jud. In verse 4 it is a reference to the story of the fall of the angels (cf. Jude 6), followed by the story of Sodom and Gomorrah – 2 Pet 2:6 (cf. Jude 7)[629] and Balaam – 2 Pet 2:15 (cf. Jude 11).[630] Despite the noticeable lexical similarities, it is impossible to conclude unequivocally and categorically that the author of 2 Pet drew motifs directly from Jude.[631] All the more so since the arrangement of the examples is more chronologically structured in Peter's text,[632] with some episodes completed. It is possible that Peter drew on toposes commonly used in not only parenetic literature,[633] but also apocalyptic, Jewish and early Christian literature.[634] In doing so, he did not need to draw directly

628 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:7.

629 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:6.

630 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:15.

631 See Introduction.

632 Cf. Jude 5–7, where the motif of the Exodus from Egypt appears first, followed only by the mention of angels and Sodom and Gomorrah.

633 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 246.

634 B.S. Billings, *The Angels, who Sinned… He Cast into Tartarus* (*2 Pet 2,4*)*: Its Ancient Meaning and Present Relevance*, "Expository Times" 119 (2008), no. 11, p. 532.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

from the source texts; he could have used the circulating Jewish tradition of the Second Temple period,[635] in which the revolt of the angels and the story of the giants ending in the Flood (Sir 16:7, TNaph 1:27, 3 Macc 2:4, Jub 22:5) and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Sir 16:8, TNaph 1:28, 3 Macc 2:5, Jub 20:5–6)[636] are cited as leading examples of punishment. These topoi Peter interprets differently than the author of Jude. For he treats them primarily as an unfolding of prophecies that foreshadow eschatological judgement. He also has a second purpose, related to the baptismal theology presented in exordium – to indicate attitudes that illustrate "the pious life" and "escape from corruption" leading to "the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ". Hence the presence of not only negative examples, but also positive ones. All are interpreted in a similar way on two levels. The first concerns the correct/incorrect interpretation of revelation in a historical (literal) context, the second concerns the correct/incorrect interpretation of these stories in an eschatological context. In other words, in Peter's method one can clearly see the already mentioned references to internal interpretation (intra-narrative, intra- or homodiegetic – literal context) and external interpretation (extra- or heterodiegetic – eschatological context).

The eschatological reinterpretation of the prophetic narratives begins with the conjunction εἰ introducing the protasis (antecedent) of the conditional sentence: εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο "if God did not spare the angels who sinned". Contrary to expectations, apodosis (the consequent) does not appear after the presentation of the punishment for the angels. Instead of apodosis in verse 5, another protasis is introduced, this time elliptical, without a conjunct: (εἰ) καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο "(if) he did not spare the ancient world either". Again, this predecessor has no successor. In verse 6 a third protasis appears, also elliptical: (εἰ) καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν "(if) and the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah having burnt to ashes", and in verse 7 a fourth: (εἰ) καὶ δίκαιον Λωτ […] ἐρρύσατο and "(if) righteous Lot […] he saved". An apodosis covering all these four examples[637] supplemented by the story of Noah's rescue (verse 5b) does not appear until verse 9: οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς […] ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν "(than) the Lord knows how the save the godly/the pious […] and preserve the unrighteous for the day of judgement". This means that the grammatical structure of the examples in verses 4–9 is as follows:

635 T.R. Schreiner, *1,2 Peter, Jude*, p. 442.

636 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 111.

637 D.W. Jones, *The Apostate Angels of 2 Pet 2:4 and Jude 6*, "Faith and Mission" 23 (2006), no. 2, p. 19–20 argues that this extended conditional phrase has three preceding clauses, overlapping with the negative examples. He does not regard verses 7–8 as *protasis*.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Protasis		Apodosis	
Negative example	Positive example		
v. 4: if the angels were not spared			
v. 5a: (if) the ancient world was not spared			
	v. 5b: but Noah was saved		
v. 6: (if) the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were condemned to destruction			
	v. 7–8: and (if) the righteous Lot was saved		
		Positive example	Negative example
		v. 9a: (that) the Lord is able to save the pious	
			v. 9b: the unjust shall be preserved for the day of judgement

Throughout this extended conditional sentence, modus realis is used, as indicated by the use of ind. aor. in both the antecedents and the main (consequent) sentence.

In the first example (verse 4), the author of 2 Peter draws not only on the biblical text (Gen 6:17) in LXX, but also on the Jewish Midrashic tradition – here the haggadic (similarly in verses 5.7 and 8).[638] This is particularly evident in the second section, which describes the punishment of the angels. The motif of angelic sin is treated much more generally than in Jude 6.[639]

2 Pet 2:4		Jude 6	
The sin of angels	Punishment	The sin of angels	Punishment
ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο	ἀλλα σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδοκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους	ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν	ἀλλα ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀιδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν

638 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 247.

639 See K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 138–140.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

2 Pet 2:4		Jude 6	
The sin of angels	Punishment	The sin of angels	Punishment
God did not spare the angels who sinned,	But/what more cast them into Tartarus with chains of darkness, he has delivered the preserved ones to judgement	Angels who have not keep to their kingdom/authority/	But/what is more – they deserted their own abode, for the judgement of the great day with eternal chains in darkness preserved.

By dispensing with a description of what the sin of the angels consisted of, the narrator presumably assumes that all his audience – contemporary and future – is well aware of the story described in Gen 6:1–4 and its extensions (cf. 1 En 6–12) about the sons of God who were attracted to human daughters, and from the union between them giants were born. Unlike the author of Jude, however, he is not interested in the nature of the sin(s) of the angels,[640] so he only says that they sinned ἁμαρτήσαντοι (cf. Gen 6:1–2). The interpretation of Gen 6:1–4 itself is based on the intertestamental apocalyptic tradition (1 En 6:2, 10:7, 14:4, cf. also 1 En 10:9.15, 12:4, 13:10, 14:1.3, 16:2, Jub 10:5, TNaph 1:27, where the spiritual beings who communed with the daughters of men are called "Watchers") and the early Judeo-Christian tradition, which in Hebrew is rendered as בני האלהים (literally "sons of God") after LXX (Codex A) sees angels (cf. Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7, where בני האלהים is translated as ἄγγελοι in most LXX testimonies).[641] From the middle of the second century after Christ, the belief begins to prevail in Judaism that בני האלהים (υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ) in Gen 6:2 refers to people living long and without suffering.[642] Perhaps – as R. Bauckham argues[643] – the narrator of 2 Peter has already encountered this interpretation, known among others to Philo (cf. *Quaest. Gen.* I 92), considers it erroneous, which is why he emphasises with such insistence that it is about angels and God's power over them, including judgement and punishment.

It is the inevitability of judgement and punishment that is the element of greatest interest to the narrator. He expresses this with the phrase οὐκ ἐφείσατο "not spared", which is one of the typical parenetic and apocalyptic formulas, for as G.L. notes. Green,[644] is the opposite of showing mercy and in most cases refers to the execution of punishment (Deut 7:16, 13:9, 19:13.21, 25:12, Ps 78[77]:50, Jer 13:14, Ezek 5:11, 7:6.8, 8:18, 9:10, Jdt 2:11, Prov 6:34, Sir 16:8, Rom 11:21, 2 Pet 2:5). In

640 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 767.

641 B.S. Billings, *The Angels, who Sinned*, p. 533.

642 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 138.

643 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 248.

644 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 769.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Peter's reflection, this means that nothing can stop God from passing judgement and punishing sinners. The use of the aorist suggests that a complete and utter punishment is meant, although only part of it is described in verse 4b. Seemingly, then, it may appear that the angels, bound in chains and left in darkness, have been forgotten and the final judgement and ultimate punishment deferred, as it were. It is worth noting here the recursion – the verb φείδομαι requires the use of the complement, so the phrase ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων appears in the genitive rather than in the expected accusative.[645]

Verse 4b begins with the oppositional or introductory amplification ἀλλά, followed by a description of the punishment of the angels: σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδοκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους. This description seems to depend on Jude 6b,[646] but the narrator of 2 Peter has given it his own very distinctive touch – he introduces the typically Greek phrase ταρταρώσας – "having imprisoned in/cast into Tartarus"[647] into an image firmly rooted in Jewish apocalyptic tradition. The verb ταρταρόω occurs in NT only here.[648] It means 'to imprison in Tartarus', 'to cast into Tartarus'. It was commonly used in Greek theogonic myths, recounting how the Titans were imprisoned in Tartarus – the most remote and darkest part of Hades, destined for those doomed to eternal suffering:

> There by the counsel of Zeus who drives the clouds the Titan gods are hidden under misty gloom, in a dank place where are the ends of the huge earth. And they may not go out; for Poseidon fixed gates of bronze upon it, and a wall runs all round it on every side. It is a great gulf, and if once a man were within the gates, he would not reach the floor until a whole year had reached its end, but cruel blast upon blast would carry him this way and that. And this marvel is awful even to the deathless gods. There stands the awful home of murky Night wrapped in dark clouds (Hesiod, *Theogony* 729–733.740.744–745).

In *Iliad* 8:13–15, Tartarus is described as a dark place located in Hades beneath the earth at the same distance that separates earth and heaven: "I shall take and hurl him into murky Tartarus, far, far away, where is the deepest gulf beneath the earth, the gates whereof are of iron and the threshold of bronze, as far beneath Hades as heaven is above earth".

In the LXX, the noun Tartarus occurs three times – in Job 40:20, 41:24, Prov 30:16. In Job 40:20, it is difficult to see any correlation between the Hebrew text and its Greek translation that would justify a reference to Tartarus. The

645 D.W. Jones, *The Apostate Angels of 2 Pet 2:4 and Jude 6*, p. 20.

646 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 770.

647 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 202; B.S. Billings, *The Angels, who Sinned*, p. 535.

648 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 771.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

passage describing the hippopotamus (בהמות) in the Hebrew text reads as follows: כי־בול הרים ישׂאו־לו וכל־חית השׂדה ישׂחקו־שׁם "because the mountains bring him food and all the wild animals play there". In LXX the description is very vague, and it is not even clear whether it also refers to a hippopotamus or some mythical animal (θηρία): ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπ᾽ὄρος ἀκρότομον ἐποίησεν χαρμονὴν τετράποσιν ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ "having reached the cliff, he gave joy to the quadrupeds in Tartarus". In Job 41:24 the whole phrase τάρταρος τῆς ἀβύσσου is most likely the equivalent of the Hebrew תהום "deep abyss". In Deut 30:16, ᾅδης is translated as Hebrew שאול *Sheol*; τάρταρος, on the other hand, which has no equivalent in the Hebrew text, can be considered an amplification of the term Hades. This would mean that Tartarus was not part of the vocabulary of the religious language of the Hellenised Jews as late as the third/second century BC.[649] It is only in the first century that the texts of Jewish Hellenistic writers show a progressive process of inculturation and the use of the term Tartarus in a meaning similar to that ascribed to it in Greek literature. Josephus in *Con. Ap.* II 34 explicitly refers to Greek mythology "some [gods] to be under the earth; as some to be in the sea; and the ancientest of them all to be bound in hell" τοὺς μέντοι πρεσβυτάτους αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ. On the other hand, Philo, in *De legatione ad Gaium* VII 49, speaks of "the depths of Tartarus" as the place where all evil and shameful deeds should be hidden: "For your house has discovered and brought to light everything that is good, even in the midst of evils, and has banished all evils to the extremities of the earth, and beyond its borders to the very depths of Tartarus" Ταρτάρου μυχούς; XIV 103: "shameful actions […] are suited to the extreme depths of Tartarus ἐσχατᾶς Ταρτάρου, into which they ought to be thrust".

This would mean that in intertestamental times, also for the Jews, Tartarus becomes a place where evil and those who committed this evil during their lifetime are gathered, a place of eternal punishment resembling *Gehenna*, later identified with hell,[650] rather than *Sheol* which is the land of the dead, identified with Hades, as is clearly stated in SibOr 1:95–105: "Hades it was called where first Adam arrived when he had tasted death. And earth had covered him on all sides round. Therefore all earthborn men are said to go Into the halls of Hades".

As D.W. Jones supposes,[651] the author of 2 Pet did not accidentally name the place where the angels were imprisoned as Tartarus. There were two main reasons for this. The first is the similarity of the classical Greek descriptions of Tartarus to the Jewish apocalyptic descriptions of the place where fallen angels bound in chains reside. The second was the desire to point out that, unlike Sheol, Hades or

649 B.S. Billings, *The Angels, who Sinned*, p. 534.

650 Ibid., p. 532.

651 D.W. Jones, *The Apostate Angels of 2 Pet 2:4 and Jude 6*, p. 21.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

even Gehenna, where humans reside after death, Tartarus is a place of punishment intended only for angels.

Indeed, parallels can easily be drawn between the above-quoted descriptions of Tartarus in Hesiod's *Theogony* or Homer's *Iliad* and the narrative in, for example, 1 En 18:11–19:2:

> And I saw a deep abyss, […] I saw columns of fire fall […]. And beyond that abyss I saw a place which had no firmament of the heaven above, and no firmly founded earth beneath it […] it was a waste and horrible place. […] Here shall stand the angels who have connected themselves with women, […] here shall they stand,) till the day of the great judgement in which they shall be judged till they are made an end of,

or Jub 5:6–10:

> And against the angels whom He had sent upon the earth, He was exceedingly wroth, and He gave commandment to root them out of all their dominion, and He bade us to bind them in the depths of the earth, and behold they are bound in the midst of them, and are (kept) separate. And against their sons went forth a command from before His face that they should be smitten with the sword, and be removed from under heaven. […] And He sent His sword into their midst that each should slay his neighbour, and they began to slay each other till they all fell by the sword and were destroyed from the earth. And their fathers were witnesses (of their destruction), and after this they were bound in the depths of the earth for ever, until the day of the great condemnation.

The exclusive conception of Tartarus as a place of punishment for angels in the first/second century with the development of Christianity begins to give way to a more inclusive vision. Tartarus identified with hell becomes a place of punishment for humans as well. This is already well seen, for example, in ApPaul (second/third century), where the rebellious angels are depicted as servants of Hades, subject to the angel Tartaruch, who sends the souls of sinners "into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth" (ApPaul 16:6); "Let this soul be delivered to the angel Tartaruch, and guarded till the great day of judgement" (ApPaul 18:2): "And I […] saw an old man dragged along by two, […] And the angel Temeluch coming, laid hold of an iron with his hand, and with it drew up the entrails of that old man through his mouth" (ApPaul 34); "Their infants […] were given to an angel to be carried away into a spacious place" (ApPaul 40:3).

The similarities between the description of Tartarus in the Greek myths of the Titans and the place of punishment for angels in apocalypticism carried the danger of mythologising the Jewish tradition along the lines of the Greek tradition. This is particularly evident in the identification of the *Nephilim* – giants born from the

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

union of celestial beings – angels – with earthly women, and the Titans born from the union of Uranos (Heaven) and Gaia (Earth) or the Giants formed, according to Hesiod, from the blood flowing from the genitals of Uranos castrated by Kronos and seeping into Gaia – Earth.[652] Flavius is aware of this, who in *Ant.* I 3:1 writes plainly: "For many Angels of God accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good; on account of the confidence they had in their own strength. For the tradition is, that these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians call Giants" (cf. Gen 6:4, where נפלים is translated as γίγαντες, and Sir 16:7, which clearly refers to the narrative of Gen 6:4 and its intertestamental extensions: "[God] did not forgive the princes of old who rebelled long ago in their might"). Among the Hellenistic writers, Philo, who, as mentioned earlier, strongly emphasises the reliability of the biblical narratives and contrasts them with Greek myths, rejects such comparisons. In *De gigantibus* 13:58, he responds to both the mythological stories about giants and the biblical accounts of the *nephilim*:

> And there were giants on the earth in those Days. Perhaps some one may here think, that the lawgiver is speaking enigmatically and alluding to the fables handed down by the poets about giants παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς μεμυθευμένα περὶ τῶν γιγάντων, though he is a man as far removed as possible from any invention of fables μυθοπλαστεῖν, and one who thinks fit only to walk in the paths of truth itself.

This view seems particularly close to the author of 2 Peter, who also places the prophetic and apostolic message in opposition to myths (1:16) and treats the examples cited in 2:4–8 as true stories, as evidenced, among other things, by the use of modus realis in the conditional phrase. The introduction into the narrative of an example with such clear parallels in mythology, moreover, the provocative use of the verb ταρταρόω, which evokes mythological associations, thus serves to continue the polemic. Of course, elements of 2 P's characteristic strategy of integrating Jewish and Greek traditions and Christianising both can also be seen here.[653]

As noted, the detailed description of the angels' punishment in 2 Pet 2:4b may be somehow dependent on Jude 6b, as evidenced by lexical similarities or the use of equivalent wording. Somewhat problematic in this context may be the appearance in Peter's description of the noun σειρά 'rope', 'chain', 'ties', 'bonds' in dat. pl. σειραῖς, which should be interpreted as dat. instrumentalis. This New Testament *hapax legomenon* undoubtedly alludes to Jude's δεσμοί, which has the same meaning.

652 W. Kosior, *Upadli* (*czy*) *Giganci? Kilka uwag o Nefilim i Gigantes w Biblii Hebrajskiej i Septuagincie*, "Przekładaniec" 29 (2014), p. 45.

653 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter*, *Jude*, p. 202.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Moreover, it fits well with the imagery of Tartarus, where the imprisoned are bound with chains.[654] The motif of binding fallen angels is also well known to Jewish tradition: "Bind Azazel hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness" – God commands Raphael in 1 En 10:4 (cf. 1 En 13:1, 14:5, 88:1).

In some codices, however – ℵ A B C 81 – instead of the noun σειραί, there also appears the noun σιροί (in dat. pl. – σιροῖς), *hapax legomenon*, which means 'dungeons', 'pits', 'cavities'. It, too, would contextually fit the descriptions of Tartarus quoted above as a place hidden deep not only underground, but also beneath the subterranean Hades. Furthermore, the reference to a pit, an abyss, a hole brings to mind apocalyptic, Enochite, descriptions of the place of exile of the rebellious angels. 1 En 10:12 speaks of a place "in the valleys of the earth"; in 1 En 18:11 of "a deep abyss"; in 1 En 21:7 "the place was cleft as far as the abyss"; in 1 En 54:5 "the abyss of complete condemnation, and they shall cover their jaws with rough stones", and in 1 En 88:1–2 "that abyss was narrow and deep, and horrible and dark". Similarly, Jub 5:6, which reports that God "bade us to bind them in the depths of the earth". As R. Bauckham argues,[655] such a reference to Jewish tradition is not at all impossible. Indeed, allusions to similar extensions from extra-biblical tradition can also be seen in 2 Pet 2:5.7.16.

It seems that the narrator of 2 Peter, in keeping with his practice, is here attempting to reconcile elements of Greek and Jewish tradition. He does so by means of a play on words – for it is worth adding that the noun he uses, σειραί 'chains', 'fetters', phonetically resembles very much the noun σιροί 'dungeons', 'cavities', 'pits'. In this way, by means of paranomic associations, the viewer can evoke both images of deep abysses and of angels tied up in bonds.

The noun σειραί is rendered with the noun ζόφος – 'darkness' in the genitive. Thus a rather bold metaphor emerges – the synecdoche σειραὶ ζόφου 'ties of darkness'. Darkness is associated primarily with Tartarus. The "misty gloom" of Tartarus is mentioned by Hesiod in *Theogony* 729, "murky Tartarus" is mentioned by Homer in *Iliad* 8:13 and he adds in 8:480 that "have joy neither in the rays of Helios Hyperion nor in any breeze, but deep Tartarus is round about them". In *Odyssey* 11:55 the shadow of Heracles "went down to the house of Hades". Even Philo, in the treatise *De praemiis et poenis* XXVI 152, speaks of the depths of Tartarus as "profound darkness". In Jewish tradition, the abode of the fallen angels is also sometimes described as "darkness", "dark abyss" (1 En 10:4–5, 88:1), but there are relatively frequent references to fire burning there (1 En 18:17, 21:7, 54:6).

The punishment of the fallen angels does not end with their being cast bound into the dark Tartarus. In Tartarus they are to await the eschatological judgement for

654 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 773.

655 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 249.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

which they are preserved: παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους. Of importance here is the verb τηρέω – 'keep' used in the form of part. praes. passivi τηρούμενοι. The passive voice can be interpreted as pass. theologicum – this would be an additional emphasis that the one who preserves the angels is God. The present tense describes the present state in which the angels find themselves. As in verse 3, it acts as a bridge between the past and the future. On the one hand, the angels have already been judged and punished by being cast into Tartarus (the past); on the other hand, they await future judgement in Tartarus, even though it might seem that it is no longer necessary (cf. verse 3b and the uselessness of judgement – κρίμα [οὐκ] ἀργεῖ).[656] Verse 4b should therefore be seen as a perfect illustration and explanation of Thesis of verse 3b:

	Past	Present	Future
2 Pet 2:3b	ἔκπαλαι	Τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ; ἡ ἀπώλεια οὐ νυστάζει	(εἰς κρίσιν)
2 Pet 2:4b	Οὐκ ἐφείσατο; Ταρταρώσας; Παρέδωκεν.	τηρουμένους	Εἰς κρίσιν
2 Pet 2:3b	of old	The judgement is not idle Destruction does not slumber	(for the final judgement)
2 Pet 2:4b	He did not spare He cast into Tartarus delivered	saved	for final judgement/ verdict/ punishment

The phrase παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν can be translated as "handed over to be judged" or as "handed over to be condemned/for the final punishment".[657] This is because the verb παραδίδομι often occurs in such a dual role – handed over to judge and handed over to execute an ordered punishment, e. g. imprisonment, and the noun κρίσις like κρίμα can mean judgement, sentence or punishment. (cf. Matt 10:17, Mark 13:9.11, Luke 21:12, Acts 8:3, 22:4, see also 1 En 97:10: "ye shall be given over to a great curse" and Similitude IX 28:7 in *The Shepherd* by Hermas: "acknowledge that you have the Lord, lest, denying Him, you be delivered up to prison παραδοθήσησθε εἰς δεσμωτήριον"). In 2 Pet 2:4b this cannot be clearly resolved, especially when trying to read verse 4b in the light of 3b. For κρίσις synthesises the two previous concepts

656 In an interesting way, Bede the Venerable explains this duality of judgement in his commentary on The Second Letter of Peter: "Rebellious angels are not what God created them to be, but they have become wicked because of their sins. For this reason they will have to appear at the final judgement, although they have already been cast into hell, into a deep prison breathing brimstone"; *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 135.

657 D.W. Jones, *The Apostate Angels of 2 Pet 2:4 and Jude 6*, p. 22.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

κρίμα and ἀπώλεια. Such ambiguity also seems intentional here and corresponds to the apocalyptic style. At the same time, Peter's conception of judgement, which encompasses past, present and future, is also clarified.

The image of the imprisonment/arrest of fallen angels in shackles/chains and darkness became, in intertestamental times and in early Christian literature, a device for a typology concerning the punishment of sinners during the final judgement.[658] This typology was also used by the author of 2 Peter: the angels who sinned are a type of all sinners (hence the lack of precision in specifying what the angels' sin consisted of). The stretched-out judgement, including the angels' punishment in the past, their behaviour in the present and the judgement they will hear in the future, is a type of the judgement to which sinners are subjected: the judgement has already been passed, there is now an expectation of its execution in the future.

It is now easier to see Peter's interpretative method, which can be called eschatological hermeneutics. Peter considers the story of the angels summarised in the example as a prophecy. At the level of his internal interpretation, all the essential elements are clear. The point is to show the simple relationship between guilt and punishment and the consequences in God's action. The sin of the angels (disobeying God, indulging in lust), was judged and punished by being cast into Tartarus. It did not matter that spiritual beings, the sons of God, succumbed to sin. At the level of external interpretation, it is important to read this narrative not only from a typological perspective – the angels are a type of all sinners – but above all from an eschatological perspective: the extended judgement and punishment to which the angels are subjected is a foreshadowing (prophecy) of an extended eschatological judgement spanning past, present and future. To further emphasise the necessity of an eschatological reading of the biblical narratives, the author of 2 Peter gives his introductory reflections an apocalyptic style.

After these introductory considerations (2 Pet 2:1–3a) and the presentation of a general outline of the methodology (hermeneutics) on the example of the angel narrative (2 Pet 2:3b–4b), Peter moves on to its application to the interpretation of stories concerning humans. Since, in the biblical narrative (Gen 6:5–8:22), the story of the angels and the story of the Flood immediately follow each other, it is not surprising that the Flood appears as Peter's second example. Moreover, as noted, in his choice of examples the hagiographer is not original. He is guided by standardised catalogues of episodes illustrating God's punishment rooted in intertestamental Jewish tradition, although it cannot be ruled out that the motif of the Flood, as one of the most typogenic in the eschatological context, is one of his favourites (cf. 2 Pet 3:6).[659] In contrast to the previous example, there are no

658 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 773.

659 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 219.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

such explicit references to Greek tradition here, although the story of the Flood is well known to Greek mythographers and Roman writers; it is extensively described by Apollodros in *Library* (I 7:2) and by Ovid in *Metamorphoses* (1:253–261), and Philo of Alexandria even identifies Noah and Deucalion (*De praem.* IV 23).

The biblical narrative and Jewish tradition in giving the causes of the Flood are not as unanimous as they seem at first sight.[660] However, it is widely believed that the main cause of the corruption of the world, which triggered God's wrath and the punishment of the Flood, was precisely the fall of the angels and the appearance of giants in the world.[661] This is borne out by apocalyptic literature, primarily Enochite, which not only uses but also expands upon the diluvial motifs.

Peter's account seems most reminiscent of that in 1 En 106:13–15, where the flood is almost a direct consequence of the sin of the angels:

> in the generation of my father Jared some of the angels of heaven transgressed the word of the Lord. And behold they commit sin and transgress the law, and have united themselves with women and commit sin with them, and have married some of them, and have begot children by them. […] there shall be a deluge and a great destruction for one year.

Also in TNaph 1:27 the fallen angels are blamed for the punishment of the whole earth: "In like manner the Watchers also changed the order of their nature, whom the Lord cursed at the flood, on whose account He made the earth without inhabitants and fruitless". 3 Macc 2:4 does not mention *expressis verbis* the sin of the angels, but mentions the giants, who were the descendants of the sons of God – the angels and the human daughters: "You destroyed those who did evil in the past, even giants. The giants trusted in their bodily strength and boldness, but you destroyed them in a great flood". *The Damascus Document* from Qumran (CD 2:18–21) warns us not to walk in the ways of wickedness, and the beginning of the list of wickedness includes the angels and their sons the giants, suggesting that they "kindled His wrath". The guilt of the angels and giants was that "they walked in the stubbornness of their heart […] they kept not the commandment of God". Josephus Flavius claims that God "not only condemned those other men for their wickedness [the descendants of angels and women – KW, MR], but determined to destroy the whole race of mankind; and to make another race that should be pure from wickedness" (*Ant.* I 3:2). For earlier he had mentioned the progress of wickedness and ungodliness among men (*Ant.* I 3:1). Much more extensively the interrelationship between the fall of the angels,

660 See E. Zając, *Potop w tradycji biblijnej oraz w literaturze judaizmu okresu Drugiej Świątyni*, Lublin 2007, p. 81–105; e. g. in Wis 10:4 the cause of the Flood is the crime of Cain.

661 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 769.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

their punishment, the activities of the giants, which led to the spread of evil and corruption on earth and consequently to the Flood is described in 1 En 6–16.

The author of 2 Peter, however, makes no attempt to indicate any connection between the sin of the angels and the sending of the Flood. Moreover – he separates these episodes, making each of them a separate protasis in an extended conditional sentence.[662] One could even say that all of Peter's negative examples are articulated staccato.

The first reference to the Flood in 2 Pet 2:5a is periphrastic. The narrator says that God "did not spare the ancient world". Similar lexis makes it possible to juxtapose verse 4a and 5a: ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάωτων οὐκ ἐφείσατο "the angels who sinned did not spare" and ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο "the ancient world did not spare". In verse 5a the hagiographer also adhered to the verb rection and used the genitive rather than the accusative. Since a description of punishment appears in verse 4b, the viewer expects a similar structure in verse 5 as well. Indeed, in verse 5c there is the complement κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας "having brought flood upon the world of the ungodly", which alludes to Gen 6:17 in LXX (cf. Gen 7:4, 3 Macc 2:4b) and not only *expressis verbis* points to the Flood, but also gives its cause – ungodliness.

In the first part of Peter's diluvial narrative, the phrase ἀρχαίος κόσμος "ancient world" draws attention. The adjective ἀρχαίος itself can refer to the distant or nearer past, sometimes to antiquity (Ps 44[43]:1[2], 77[76]:6, 143[142]:5, Isa 25:1, 37:26, Lam 2:17, Wis 8:8, 13:10, Sir 2:10, 16:7, Matt 5:21.33, Luke 9:8.19, Acts 15:7.21).[663] On the other hand, the noun κόσμος in this context primarily denotes humanity, the generation that was punished by the Flood in the time of Noah (cf. cosmos as humanity in Matt 18:7, John 4:42, 8:12, 9:5, Rom 3:19, 5:13). However, a more global, universal meaning cannot be ruled out – the world as the earth and all that inhabits it – which would emphasise the universal scope of the cataclysm. The evocation of the "world" here is not accidental and fits perfectly with Peter's conception of an eschatological typology based on the Jewish view of the Flood as the 'first end'.[664] This idea can be found, among others, in prophetic literature, intertestamental apocalyptic (1 En 1–16) and in NT (Matt 24:37–39). Perhaps even some kind of Petrine historiosophy and division of world history into three periods should be found here.[665] An element of this would be to interpret the dark place in 2 Pet 1:19b as the present and present world.[666] This would mean that the first period – the ancient world – ended with the coming of the Flood. The second period

662 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:4.

663 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 778.

664 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 250.

665 Ibid.

666 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:19.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

is the present world, which is plunged into darkness full of corruption, but which is illuminated by prophetic teaching, enabling people to move in the darkness. This period will end with the Parousia of Jesus as Ruler and Judge. The third period is the new, post-eschatological, purified and just world, initiated by the second coming of Jesus and emerging after the final judgement (2 Pet 3:13). This periodisation of history favours both a typology and a view of the Flood in terms of eschatological prophecy.

The first destruction is described in 5c as "a catastrophe brought upon the world of the ungodly". The verb ἐπάγω 'to bring', 'to bring upon oneself or others' usually some calamity, catastrophe, punishment, judgement or destruction (cf. Gen 6:17, 7:4, Exod 10:4, 1 Kings 20:21, 2 Kings 22:16.20, 2 Kings 34:24.28, Jer 4:6, 6:19, 11:11, 19:3, Ezek 6:3, 14:17, 29:8, 33:2) was already used in 2 Pet 2:1f. At that time, however, the hagiographer was saying that it was the heretics who would bring destruction upon themselves (cf. Josephus Flavius in *The Life of Flavius Josephus* 4:18: "and desired them not rashly, and after the most foolish manner, to bring on the dangers of the most terrible mischiefs upon their country, upon their families, and upon themselves" περὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων κακῶν κίνδυνον ἐπάγειν). Now the subject is God, who brings punishment upon the whole world. The juxtaposition of 2:1 and 2:5c makes it possible to see the difference in the dimension of the punishment described. It is due to the change of perspective from the particular-individual to the global. In 2:1f, the narrator marks – somewhat ironically – the surprise of the false teachers when it turns out that the judgement they deny will nevertheless come and bring them unexpected destruction. In 2:5c, already without irony, Peter emphasises the universality and globality of God's action at the Flood (hence the use of the aorist – ἐπάξας), which is meant to illustrate the universality, globality and totality of the eschatological judgement.

The judgement that God pronounced on the world during the 'first end' is identified in 2:2c by the noun κατακλυσμός – 'flood', 'deluge', 'inundation' (Gen 6:17, 7:6.7.10.17.22, 9:11.15.28, 10:1.32, 11:10, Sir 4:10, 44:17.18, Matt 24:39, Luke 17:27).[667] The verb κατακλύζω, from which the noun is derived, also means 'to wash', 'to wash away', 'to cleanse'. The implication developed in 2 Pet 3:13 thus appears here, that out of the annihilation will emerge a new – cleansed – world in which righteousness will dwell. This cathartic aspect of the Flood will be emphasised in *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitiones* XXIX: "the righteous providence of God brought a flood upon the world".

The Flood as punishment and purification is the consequence of wickedness, corruption and godlessness, which is why the world – here also in the sense of humanity – was called the world of the godless. Godlessness is, of course, a very

667 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 783.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

broad and general term, used in religious language to express a lack of respect and gratitude towards a deity, and consequently the disappearance of any relationship with the deity. Both in Hellenistic general language and in LXX, the most commonly used equivalent for "ungodliness" is "unrighteousness" – ἀδικία[668] (Gen 18:23.25, Exod 9:27, Deut 25:1, Ps 1:1.5.6, 51[50]:15, 58[57]:11, Prov 1:7, 10:6.7.11.16.20.30, 11:3.5.9.11.19.23, 12:12, 15:8.9, 28:4.12, Wis 3:10, 14:9, 16:16.18, Sir 9:12, Rom 5:6). This reference to righteousness is significant here,[669] for it allows the world of the ungodly/unrighteous to be vividly contrasted with the figure of Noah heralding righteousness. It should also be added that the author of 2 Peter, following the example of other apocalyptic and early Christian writers, links "ungodliness" with God's wrath and judgement[670] (cf. "But upon the ungodly shall the Lord bring eternal fire, and destroy them throughout all generations" in TZeb 2:38; "inquiry will be death to the ungodly" in *1 Clem.* 57:7).

Seemingly, as in the example about the sin of the angels, the narrator deliberately avoids the specification of "ungodliness" in order to make it easier for the audience to apply the typology and eschatological interpretation of the story. Meanwhile, it turns out that Peter's understanding of ungodliness is illuminated quite clearly by *exordium* of the letter. In this context, "ungodliness" should be defined as the opposite of "the a pious life" and "escape from the corruption of the world" (cf. 2 Pet 1:3–4), "stumbling and falling" (2 Pet 1:10), as well as "in a dark place" (2 Pet 1:19), "licentiousness" and "blaspheming the way of truth" (2 Pet 2:2). This particularisation does not compromise the reading of the story according to the principles of Peter's interpretation. The intra-narrative interpretation does not present any major difficulties. The godlessness of the world had to be punished. As it spread throughout the world, the magnitude of the punishment also had to be global. God, as Creator and Ruler of the world, brought destruction upon it – the Flood, as a result of which the world was destroyed. According to the assumption as a result of the external interpretation, the story should be read as an eschatological prophecy: it announces that the present world, where corruption and godlessness are on the rise, will be judged and destroyed. And since the first end – the Flood – was a world-encompassing element, so too the second end – the Parousia and eschatological judgement – will be cosmic in scope (cf. 2 Pet 3:6–7). In Peter's interpretation, there is also a very eschatologically relevant motif of the new creation and the purposefulness of the punishment of destruction: just as the Flood destroyed the old world so that a new world could emerge again from the

668 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 103–104.

669 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 250.

670 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 105.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

waters, so the present old world will be destroyed so that a new world – purified and righteous – can then appear (2 Pet 3:7.13).

2.6.2 β. Interpretation proper – soteriology (2 Pet 2:5b)

[5b]But the eighth Noah, preaching/heralding righteousness, he saved

An integral module of both the apocalyptic convention adopted by the author of 2 Peter and the eschatological hermeneutic he applies to texts considered inspired is the citation not only of negative examples as warnings, but also of positive examples as consolation, hope and encouragement to follow. In 2 Peter these positive examples are complemented by the encouragement expressed explicitly in *exordium* (2 Pet 1:5.8.10). The combination of the eschatological message with this particular – hortative – form of parenesis means that Peter's positive examples can be considered, like the sorites of 1:5–8, as protreptic elements (incentives for moral improvement).

Positive examples (Noah, Lot) appear in narratives that draw primarily on the biblical tradition. This cannot be said of the first example, concerning angels, which is based largely on the intertestamental apocalyptic tradition and lacks a positive element.[671] This confirms the earlier suggestion of a certain differentiation of examples. While they all serve to illustrate Thesis of the certainty of the Parousia and judgement, since they are preached from the very beginning by the prophets – writers considered inspired in the author's 2 Peter milieu – the first one concerning the punishment of the angels is also a direct reference to 2:3b and an explanation of why it may seem that judgement is useless and destruction slumbering.[672] Neither has a positive element.

The first positive example is the mention of Noah, which is essentially based on the narrative of Gen 6:5–9:17, but also draws on extra-biblical tradition in detail. The narrative is introduced with the phrase "eighth Noah" ὄγδοον Νῶε. A similar phrase is found in 1 Pet 1:20, but there is no convincing evidence to establish a direct relationship between the two texts.[673] Both are most likely based on the same

671 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 180.

672 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:3b and 2:4.

673 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 250; otherwise G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 777–778, who argues that the author of 2 Peter uses the text of 1 Pet 3:20 in a similar way to the Epistle of Jude – selecting those elements which serve to build his argument. He points thus to several additional elements that would demonstrate 2 Peter's dependence on 1 Peter: the linking of the sin of the angels to the Flood, the mentions of the corruption of the world, the rescue of Noah, the sending of the Flood/water. However, almost all of these elements also appear in other narratives of the Flood, and the author of 2 Peter uses a completely different lexis to depict the rescue of Noah than the author of 1 Peter, without such allusions as he did in 2:4, referring to Jude 6.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

tradition, in which the symbolic treatment of the number eight plays a key role (cf. also the eight-element sorites in 2 Pet 1:5–7).

The Greek idiom ὄγδος Νῶε itself means "Noah with seven other [people]" (cf. 2 Macc 5:27 with the phrase, lit.: "the tenth Jude", meaning Jude Maccabeus with nine companions). This is a reference to the fact that Noah, his wife, three sons and three daughters-in-law were saved from the flood, a motif that is repeated frequently especially in the Christian reception of the diluvial story (Gen 8:18, cf. SibOr 1:340–341: "Into one place. And then went Noah forth As eighth, most just of men, when on the waters", Theophilus in *To Autolycus* III 19: "eight human beings were preserved in the ark"). The number eight may have a threefold meaning here. Firstly, on a literal level, to indicate the actual number of those rescued from the Flood. Secondly, to make the audience aware of how small the number of saved was against the background of the global cataclysm.[674] This is emphasised, inter alia, in Sir 44:17, speaking of the fact that, thanks to Noah, only a remnant was saved, and in Pseudo-Clementine *Homily* 8:17: "having warned a certain righteous man, with his three sons, together with their wives and their children, to save themselves in an ark, He sent a deluge of water, that all being destroyed, the purified world might be handed over to him who was saved in the ark, in order to a second beginning of life".

Thirdly and finally, the number eight carries the symbolic meaning characteristic of eschatology and apocalyptic.[675] In the Hebrew tradition, this number signified order, law, adherence to rules and commandments,[676] so here it may further emphasise Noah's righteousness. Furthermore, the eighth day in the law of Moses was reserved for the offering of purification sacrifices (Lev 9:1, 14:10, 15:14.29, Numbers 6:10). After the Maccabees cleansed the temple, eight days were celebrated (1 Macc 4:56.59).[677] This cathartic meaning translates into an eschatological meaning – after seven days symbolising the old creation, the eighth day signified the new, purified creation. For Peter's eschatological hermeneutics, his typology and typological periodisation of history, this is obviously of fundamental importance.[678]

This is overlaid by Christian symbolism identifying the eighth day with the day of Jesus' resurrection: "Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead. And when He had manifested Himself, He ascended into the heavens" – wrote the author of *The Epistle of Barnabas* (15:9), and Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with Trypho* links the Old Testament command to

674 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*.

675 Differently, F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy, Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 276, who argues that "nothing authorises such a [symbolic-eschatological] interpretation".

676 B. Szczepanowicz, *Tajemnice liczb biblijnych*, Kraków 2018, p. 147.

677 Ibid.

678 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:2 and 3:5–7.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

circumcise boys on the eighth day as a sign of the covenant with the new covenant sealed by the blood and resurrection of Christ:

> Now, […] it is possible for us to show how the eighth day possessed a certain mysterious import, […] there is now another covenant, and another law has gone forth from Zion. Jesus Christ circumcises all who will — as was declared above— with knives of stone; that they may be a righteous nation, a people keeping faith, holding to the truth, and maintaining peace (24);
> The command of circumcision, again, bidding [them] always circumcise the children on the eighth day, was a type of the true circumcision, by which we are circumcised from deceit and iniquity through Him who rose from the dead on the first day after the Sabbath, [namely through] our Lord Jesus Christ. For the first day after the Sabbath, remaining the first of all the days, is called, however, the eighth, according to the number of all the days of the cycle, and [yet] remains the first (41).

Peter – as it appears at first glance – does not explicitly call Noah righteous. However, hidden in the phrase δικαισύνης κῆρυξ is an allusion to the common belief in Noah's righteousness based on Gen 6:9 (Νωε ἄντρωπος δίκαιος).[679] This is evident both in the Old Testament texts (Ezek 14:14.20, Wis 10:4, Sir 44:17) and in the extra-biblical tradition, which greatly develops the motif of the patriarch's righteousness.

1 En 106, Jub 5 and 10 and 1QapGen 6 depict him as perfect and spotless from the moment of his birth, symbolised by his white hair, skin, luminous eyes and ability to speak immediately after his birth.[680] This raised suspicions about his angelic origin and thus his affinity with the giants (1 En 106:12). Noah also turned out to be a giant, but a giant of the spirit, the opposite of the giants of the flesh born from the unions of angels with earthly women (1 En 106:17). According to Jub 10:17, righteousness accompanied Noah throughout his life: "And in his life on earth he excelled the children of men save Enoch because of the righteousness, wherein he was perfect", and Jub 5:19 argues that he and his family were saved from the flood precisely because Noah's "heart was righteous in all his ways, according as it was commanded regarding him". Also in 1QapGen 6:1–6, Noah says of himself that he practised righteousness throughout his life, from the first moments after his birth

> from corruption, and in my mother's womb I swelled for (the sake of) righteousness. When I emerged from the womb of my mother, I was planted for righteousness, and during all my days I conducted (myself) righteously and walked in the paths of eternal

679 R.B. Vinson, R.F. Wilson, W.E. Mills, *1&2 Peter, Jude*, p. 334.
680 E. Zając, *Potop w tradycji biblijnej*, p. 161.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> truth, […] I bound my loins with the vision of righteousness and wisdom […] all the paths of violence. […] Then I, Noah, became an adult. I held firmly to righteousness.

Noah's righteousness is mentioned by SibOr (1:154–156: "Single among all men, most just and true, Was the most faithful Noah, full of care For noblest works") and the Jewish Hellenistic writers. Josephus claims that "God loved this man for his righteousness" (*Ant.* I 3:2). Philo, on the other hand, aptly notes that the Bible does not give a single example of this righteousness: "For if any one were to ask why Moses says that 'Noah found grace before the Lord God,' without having previously done any good thing, as far at least as we know" (*Leg. alleg.* III XXIV:77). He himself describes Noah as a wise man, and justifies his righteousness by drawing on the meaning of the patriarch's name:

> the lover of God and the lover of virtue […] this man is in the language of the Hebrews called Noah, but in that of the Greeks, 'rest', ἀνάπαυσις or 'the just man,' δίκαιος both being appellations very well suited to the wise man. That of 'the just man' most evidently so, for nothing is better than justice, which is the chief among virtues, and which receives the highest honours […]; and the appellation 'rest' is likewise appropriate, since the opposite quality to rest is unnatural agitation, the cause of confusion, and tumults, and seditions, and wars, which the wicked pursue (*De Abr.* V 27);
> for the name Noah, being interpreted, means rest, or just: and it follows of necessity that one who is resting from acts of injustice and from sins, and who, so resting, lives with virtue and justice, must find grace before God (*Leg. alleg.* III XXIV:77).

In another place – in *Quaest. Gen.* I 96 – he indicates, however, that Noah found favour in God's sight because he was grateful to God for everything:

> he had found favour with God, not because he alone was deserving of favour, when the whole universal body of the human race had had benefits and mercies heaped on them, but because he alone had seemed to be mindful of the kindnesses which he had received.

This tradition about Noah "full of care For noblest works" is also known from SibOr 1:155–156, quoted above.

In calling Noah δικαισύνης κῆρυξ "the herald of righteousness", however, the narrator of 2 Peter draws not only on the common belief in the patriarch's righteousness, but also on the extra-biblical and/or Midrashic tradition that saw in Noah a prophet proclaiming God's righteousness and calling people to repentance and/or a lawgiver handing down commandments and laws to ensure mankind "walks in the ways of righteousness". This is related, on the one hand, to Noah's activity before

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

(the call to repentance) or after (the transmission of laws and commandments) the Flood and to the understanding of the term "justice".

The noun δικαισύνη, used here as gen. obiectivus, already appeared in 2 Pet 1:1, where it denoted an attribute of God.[681] It has been pointed out that this divine righteousness, which is not condemnatory, also has no regard for the person (cf. Deut 10:17), which in LXX gives it in part a juridical aspect.[682] If, therefore, in 2 Pet 2:5b the hagiographer gives the term "justice" the same meaning that he used in 1:1, then Noah as δικαισύνης κῆρυξ would proclaim, above all, that sadistic justice of God which, on the one hand, is based on the guilt-punishment relationship and, on the other, has in view the rescue, benefit and happiness of man. This is clearly linked to the conviction that Noah was calling people to repentance and repentance before – as sinners – they would be punished by the flood.[683]

This motif is well known to Jewish and Christian tradition. Josephus, in *Ant.* I 3:1 mentions that "But Noah was very uneasy at what they did: and being displeased at their [the giants'] conduct, persuaded them to change their dispositions, and their actions for the better".[684] Similarly, *1 Clem.* 7:6: "Noah preached repentance, and as many as listened to him were saved" (cf. *1 Clem.* 9:4) and Theophilus in *To Autolycus* III 19: "Noah, when he announced to the men then alive that there was a flood coming, prophesied to them, saying, Come thither, God calls you to repentance". SibOr 1:157–159 say that it was God Himself who commanded Noah to proclaim the necessity of repentance and repentance: "Noah, be of good cheer In thyself and to all the people preach Repentance, so that they may all be save", and then cite a statement by Noah resembling in style the exhortations of the Old Testament prophets. In ApPaul 50:2–3 Noah complains to Paul: "And I ceased not to proclaim to men, Repent, for, behold, a deluge is coming. And no one paid heed; but all derided me".

Such an understanding of the proclamation of justice would correspond with the underlying message of the examples used by the author of 2 Peter and the relationship between "guilt" and "punishment". In this context, δικαισύνης would obviously have to be interpreted as gen. obiectivus. However, Noah's proclamation

681 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:11.

682 Wis 12:15, 2 Macc 9:18, PssSol 2:10.18.32.34, 5:1, 8:8, 9:2, 10:5.

683 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 251; S. Hafemann, *Noah, the Preacher of* (*God's*) *Righteousness: the Argument from Scripture in Peter 2:5 and 9*, CBQ 76 (2014), no. 2, p. 318.

684 Philo of Alexandria in *Quest. Gen.* II 13 omits the motif of Noah's exhortation to the people to repent. He argues that by sending the Flood only seven days after the door to the ark closed behind Noah (Gen. 7:10), God gave the people time to repent so that "they may in a suppliant spirit return to the Creator of all things, and so may entreat him again that his works may be everlasting; and that they may offer their entreaty, not with mouth and tongue, but rather with the heart of amendment and penitence".

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of justice may also point to his actions after the Flood, when God enters into a covenant with the patriarch and communicates the commandments to be binding on a new, purified, righteous humanity (cf. Gen 9:1–17). This would mean that "righteousness" is to be understood here primarily as obedience to God's will and the fulfilment of His commandments. It is then possible to regard the genitive δικαισύνης as gen. qualitatis (gen. Hebraicus) and translate the phrase δικαισύνης κῆρυξ as "a righteous herald". Such a syntax would, of course, be a semitic syntax, which, when referring to the biblical characterisation of Noah, would be perfectly understandable.

The motif of Noah's righteousness is also present in extra-biblical Jewish tradition, especially apocalyptic. Jub 7:20 mentions how Noah instructs "his sons' sons the ordinances and commandments, and all the judgements that he knew, and he exhorted his sons to observe righteousness". Noah's exhortation to do justice is even quoted *in extenso*: "And now, my children, harken: work judgement and righteousness that ye maybe planted in righteousness over the face of the whole earth, and your glory lifted up before my God, who saved me from the waters of the flood" (Jub 7:34). Furthermore, in the Enochite literature, Noah is portrayed as the one who will initiate a new just humanity: "And [God] has destined thy [Noah's] name to be among the holy, And will preserve thee amongst those who dwell on the earth, And has destined thy righteous seed both for kingship and for great honours, And from thy seed shall proceed a fountain of the righteous and holy without number for ever" (1 En 65:12). This is a clear reference to Wis 14:6–7 and the poetic periphrastic characterisation of Noah as "the hope of the universe, who took refuge on a raft, left to the world a future for the human family, under the guidance of your hand. For blest is the wood through which righteousness comes about".

It is no coincidence that in the apocalyptic tradition, in the context of the Flood, the entire family of Noah is also referred to as the righteous.[685] This is not just an indication of the behaviour before the Flood, but above all of the righteous who are to populate the earth cleansed by the waters. It is for the sake of the sons of Noah, who are to usher in a new humanity, that God rescues the entire family of the patriarch: "And as for all those who corrupted their ways and their thoughts before the flood, no man's person was accepted save that of Noah alone; for his person was accepted in behalf of his sons […] for his heart was righteous in all his ways, according as it was commanded regarding him, and he had not departed from aught that was ordained for him" (Jub 5:19). This is even more clearly stated in 4 Ezra 3:11: "But thou didst leave one of them, Noah with his household, and all the righteous who have descended from him". Also Philo mentions that the whole

685 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 507.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

family of Noah was preserved from evil, and that Noah himself was to become the beginning of a new generation:

> But in the great deluge […] the house of Noah alone was preserved free from all evil, inasmuch as the father and governor of the house was a man who had never committed any intentional or voluntary wickedness. […] For he, being considered […] a second generation of men, in obedience to the divine commands which were conveyed to him by the word of God (*De vita Mois.* II XI:59–60).

It seems that the perception of Noah's proclamation of justice as a proclamation of post-diluvian justice is closer to the author of 2 Peter. He refers to it in 3:6.13, when he returns to the Flood and especially to its interpretation as a foreshadowing of the final judgement, after which a new earth and a new heaven will emerge, and there justice will reign.[686] This would imply that by already preaching justice, Noah was foreshadowing the end times. This in turn fits well with the method of internal and external interpretation used in 2 Peter and corresponds with the baptismal catechesis of *exordium* and its protreptic message.

In the internal interpretation, at the intradiegetic level, one can also see elements alluding to justice understood juridically and to the tradition of Noah's call to repentance and repentance before the Flood, but they do not dominate here. The protagonist of the story, Noah, who is presented as a prophet (here one can possibly see parallels between Noah's message and the prophetic call to repentance), correctly reads the signs from God and God's words. He obeys them and builds the ark on which he and his immediate family are saved. However, he does not do this on his own initiative. This is a clear reference to 2 Pet 1:20–21: Noah does not carry out his own interpretation of the announcement of the cataclysm. He believes that since God has revealed to him that he intends to destroy the earth, the destruction is bound to happen (Gen 6:12.17); he therefore obeys God's command (Gen 6:22). The words about destruction are accompanied by the promise of a new covenant (Gen 6:18), an integral part of the source narrative, which the author of 2 Peter seems to pay particular attention to when interpreting externally.

The external interpretation is based on a typological and eschatological reading of the elements of the Flood tradition. First, the narrator of 2 Pet probably draws on the Noe-Christ typology popular in early Christianity. It is used, among others, by Justin Martyr in *Dial.* 138:

> You know, […] that God has said in Isaiah to Jerusalem: "I saved you in the deluge of Noah." By this which God said was meant that the mystery of saved men appeared in the

686 S. Hafemann, *Noah*, p. 307.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> deluge. For righteous Noah, along with the other mortals at the deluge, i. e., with his own wife, his three sons and their wives, being eight in number, were a symbol of the eighth day, wherein Christ appeared when He rose from the dead, for ever the first in power. For Christ, being the first-born of every creature, became again the chief of another race regenerated by Himself through water, and faith, and wood, containing the mystery of the cross; even as Noah was saved by wood when he rode over the waters with his household. Accordingly, when the prophet says, "I saved you in the times of Noah," as I have already remarked, he addresses the people who are equally faithful to God, and possess the same signs. […] But the whole earth, as the Scripture says, was inundated, […] so that it is evident this was not spoken to the land, but to the people who obeyed Him: for whom also He had before prepared a resting-place in Jerusalem, as was previously demonstrated by all the symbols of the deluge; I mean, that by water, faith, and wood, those who are afore-prepared, and who repent of the sins which they have committed, shall escape from the impending judgement of God.

It seems that also for Peter, Noah is a type of Christ who gives rise to a new – just – humanity. Unlike Justin, however, Peter here does not refer directly to soteriology, but firstly to his Baptist theology, and secondly to eschatology.

In 1:9 Peter mentioned purification from past sins, which has been interpreted as a reference to baptismal practice. The manifestation of this cleansing is the use and development of baptismal gifts that allow one to live a godly life and avoid corruption in the world. A pious life and the avoidance of corruption can be seen as synonymous with righteousness, that is, obedience to God's will as communicated to people in the commandments. Thus, the new – righteous – humanity emerging from the waters of the flood that cleansed the earth is a foreshadowing of the new – righteous – humanity emerging from the cleansing waters at baptism, that is, a Christian community distinguished in the world by love and ethical conduct.

More important and more striking to the viewer, however, is the eschatological interpretation of the Flood narrative. Undoubtedly, the Flood is a foreshadowing of the final judgement and eschatological salvation. Indeed, as already mentioned, it has such a function in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic and eschatology (Isa 54:9, 1 En 1–16, Matt 24:37–39). Just as in the time of Noah the Flood was foretold by God, so in later times judgement was and is foretold by successive prophets communicating God's word, and finally, finally, by Jesus himself, who will come in power (cf. 1 Pet 1:16), as the apostles affirm. Judgement will result in the annihilation of the earth, which means first and foremost the destruction of the ungodly, as happened at the Flood. In Peter's typology, the ungodly of Noah's time are a type of the false teachers who will appear in the future, not only leading and promoting the same sinful life, but above all questioning the coming of judgement and annihilation. Noah, on the other hand, is, on the one hand, the type of righteous people who,

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

like the patriarch, do not question the coming of judgement and destruction; on the contrary, they prepare for them according to God's will and His guidance. They are to be guarded in the end times, as Noah and his family were guarded in the ark at the time of the Flood. It is no coincidence that the hagiographer used the verb φυλάσσω here, which primarily means 'to keep watch/guard/vigil', and fits well with the image and the idea of guarding, protecting some small element in a situation of danger from something global, lurking on all sides (cf. Wis 10:1.5.12).[687]

Noah, on the other hand, obviously represents Christ, which, as mentioned, is quite popular in early Christian typology. *1 Clem.* 9:4 characterises Noah as one who "being found faithful, preached regeneration to the world through his ministry; and the Lord saved by him the animals which, with one accord, entered into the ark". In the same way, Christ proved himself faithful and obedient to God to the point of death on the cross (cf. Phil 2:8) and through him salvation was accomplished. Moreover – and this is particularly emphasised in 2 Peter – as once to Noah, so in eschatological times to Christ the world will be handed over (cf. 2 Pet 1:16–17, *Pseudo-Clementine Hom.* 8:19). And from Christ, as before from Noah, will come a new post-eschatological humanity, purified through judgement, which is characterised – like Christ himself – by righteousness (2 Pet 3:13).

2.6.3 α′. False interpretation (2 Pet 2:6)

> [6][if] the cities – Sodom and Gomorrah – having burnt to ashes, he executed the sentence/condemned with a catastrophe/annihilation/having begun reducing to ashes, he executed the sentence with a catastrophe/doing the reduction to ashes he executed the sentence with a catastrophe/reducing to ashes with a catastrophe, he executed the sentence/doing the reduction to ashes with a catastrophe, he executed the sentence, setting an example to those intending to [continue] to live ungodly.

Line 6 is the next *protasis* after that in verse 5a, although the narrator no longer adds the typical conditional sentence conjunct εἰ. One can, however, easily guess at its presence. The first part of the poem speaks of the incineration of Sodom and Gomorrah as a result of God's judgement on the cities; the second part is didactic, interpreting the story of the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah as a universal example warning of the ultimate consequences of persisting in ungodly behaviour.

The choice of narrative for the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is very conventional. Indeed, these cities were themselves archetypes and symbols of ungodliness and a paradigm of the punishment for this ungodliness. Moreover, Jewish

687 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 779 points out that it is a matter of preservation, of guarding against something that for others (the unguarded, the unguarded) constitutes annihilation.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

tradition often links the story of the fall of the angels, the giants and the Flood with the story of Sodom and Gomorrah: "And he told them of the judgement of the giants, and the judgement of the Sodomites, how they had been judged on account of their wickedness" (Jub 20:5). In TNaph 1:26–27 the order is reversed: "the Lord who made all things, that ye become not as Sodom, which changed the order of nature. In like manner the Watchers also changed the order of their nature, whom the Lord cursed at the flood, on whose account He made the earth without inhabitants and fruitless". Josephus, on the other hand, judges that the ungodliness of the Jews who desecrated and robbed the temple surpasses even that of the inhabitants of Sodom. If the Romans had not punished them, "the city would either have been swallowed up by the ground opening upon them, or been overflowed by water; or else been destroyed by such thunder, as the country of Sodom perished by. For it had brought forth a generation of men much more atheistical than were those that suffered such punishments" (*Bell. Iud.* V 13:6). Philo, on the other hand, in *De vita Mois.* II X:53 points out that divine justice for especially hardened sinners envisages not ordinary punishments, but "the most powerful elements of the universe, water and fire ὕδατος καὶ πυρός, so that at appointed times some are destroyed by deluges κατακλυσμοῖς, others are burnt with fire καταφλεχθέντας". This connection between water and fire is also used by the author of 2 Peter in 3:5–7, but in a different way. The annihilation by water is meant to be a foreshadowing of the annihilation that fire will bring during the final judgement.[688]

The primary source for Peter's third example is Gen 18:20–33, 19:24–25.28–29. However, it seems that the narrator does not go directly to the biblical text and summarise it.[689] Rather, he uses, like other Jewish and early Christian writers, typical sodomite and Gomorrah motifs. It is not possible to determine clearly which text was the direct inspiration for the author of 2 Peter. Perhaps it was Wis 10, where one finds not only similar wording, but also similar motifs and characters,[690] although they are not mentioned by name. Thus there appears, on the one hand, an account of the conduct of Cain (Wis 10:3), through whom the earth was overwhelmed by a flood (Wis 10:4a), the annihilation of the wicked and the fire that fell on the five cities (Wis 10:6.7a), and, on the other hand, examples of positive heroes, the righteous, whom God/Wisdom protected (φυλάσσω and his submission in verses Wis 10:1.5.12) or saved (ῥύομαι in verses Wis 10:6.9.13.16) – including Noah and Lot (Wis 10.4b and 6b).

It is widely believed that the author of 2 Pet drew his inspiration from Jude 7. However, there are not as clear lexical references and allusions here as in 2 Pet 2:4

688 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 252.

689 R.B. Vinson, R.F. Wilson, W.E. Mills, *1&2 Peter, Jude*, p. 335.

690 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 247.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

and Jude 6. In fact, only the names of cities preceded by the noun πόλεις and the concept of δεῖγμα in Jude and ὑπόδειγμα in 2 Pet 2:6b[691] can be identified as parallels. But one can see a similar elaboration of Jude's material and the addition of positive examples drawn from a parenetic tradition independent of the Letter of Jude, perhaps the same one behind Wis 10.[692]

In 2:4a Peter treated the guilt of angels very generally, now in 2:6a he omits the question of the guilt of Sodom and Gomorrah altogether,[693] assuming that his audience can reconstruct it (allusions to guilt defined as "the way of life of lawbreakers through promiscuity" ἀναστροφὴ τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ do not appear until verse 7b).[694] Perhaps he does not want to focus like Jude on one aspect of guilt – the transgression and willingness of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah to have sexual intercourse with the angels[695] – especially since Jewish tradition defines this guilt very differently – as pride, arrogance, conceit, haughtiness (Sir 16:8, 3 Macc 2:5, similarly Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* I 11:1), carelessness, insensitivity to the needs of others and the general perpetration of wickedness (Ezek 16:49–50) and abominations, adulteries, lies (Jer 23:14), abandonment of the way of wisdom, foolishness and ignorance of good (Wis 10:6–9) and inhospitality (Wis 19:14).[696] Also Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* I 11:1 emphasises the lack of hospitality and the ingratitude of the Sodomites towards God: "they became unjust towards men, and impious towards God: insomuch that they did not call to mind the advantages they received from him: they hated strangers". The sins of sexuality and promiscuity (Jub 16:6, TBenj 2:4), the abandonment of the laws of nature (TNaph 1:25) come to the fore in the intertestamental literature, which Philo described as:

> men lusted after one another, doing unseemly things, and not regarding or respecting their common nature […], the men became accustomed to be treated like women, and in this way engendered among themselves the disease of females, and intolerable evil; for they not only, as to effeminacy and delicacy, became like women in their persons, but they made also their souls most ignoble, corrupting in this way the whole race of man (*De Abrahamo* XXVI 135–136).

In other writings, Philo's explained in a more general way and argues that the destruction by deluge or fire was deserved by those "who have rejected virtue, and have chosen crafty wickedness, and all others kinds of vice, not through compulsion,

691 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:6b.

692 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 247.

693 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 332.

694 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:7.

695 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 153–155.

696 Ibid., p. 152.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

but of their own spontaneous free will, looking upon that which is the greatest of all evils as the greatest possible advantage" (*De vita Mois.* II X:53).

Peter begins his elliptical – no blame given – narrative by stating that "God incinerated the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah", thus extending the biblical narrative, which makes no mention of what remains of the destroyed cities.[697] Formally, the subject – θεός – is moved from the predicate. It appears in verse 4a and does not repeat or change until verse 9a. The object of the punishment is the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. Unlike Jude, who spoke of Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις (cf. Gen 19:25.28.29, Deut 29:22), Peter limits himself to giving only two archetypal names. He also reduces Jude's description of the punishment of eternal fire, focusing on the effect of the punishment – the incineration of the cities – rather than on its course. This is undoubtedly a deliberate procedure. He reserves the fire itself for his description of the final punishment and cosmic annihilation (3.7.10.13), the extent of which will more closely resemble the global flood (3.6) than the local destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

When describing the effect of the punishment of sinful cities, the author of 2 Peter uses the verb τεφρόω belonging to the New Testament *hapax legomena*. The form of part. aor. indicates the complete, utter destruction that only fire sent by God can bring. A similar thought expressed by the same verb appears in Philo in *De Ebrietate* 53:223, where the writer compares joy to a plant grafted into the human soul. "There is no plant of true joy naturally implanted in the soul of the bad man; inasmuch as it has no healthy roots, but only such as are burnt and reduced to ashes, since, instead of water, Heaven has poured upon it the fire of lightning which cannot be quenched, God having adjudged that as fitting punishment for the impious".

By introducing this image of destruction, Peter refers to the belief, common in antiquity, that ashes can still be found in the place where Sodom and Gomorrah once existed as a trace of their burning (cf. Wis 10:7, where "a smoking wasteland" is mentioned). This seems significant, especially in the light of the polemic of 2 Pet 1:16. The narrator thus indirectly points to evidence of the veracity of the biblical story to which he refers and which he cites as a credible prophetic foreshadowing of eschatological judgement and punishment. Josephus Flavius in *Bell. Iud.* IV 8:4 spoke directly of the remains of Sodom and Gomorrah as evidence of the reality of their tragic fate:

> The country of Sodom […] was of old a most happy land, both for the fruits it bore and the riches of its cities: although it be now all burnt up. It is related how, for the impiety of its inhabitants, it was burnt by lightning. In consequence of which there are still the

697 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 333.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> remainders of that divine fire, and the traces [or shadows] of the five cities are still to be seen: as well as the ashes growing in their fruits. Which fruits have a colour, as if they were fit to be eaten; but if you pluck them with your hands, they dissolve into smoke, and ashes. And thus what is related of this land of Sodom hath these marks of credibility, which our very sight affords us.

Similarly, Philo claimed in *De vita Mois.* II X:56:

> Therefore on this occasion, as the holy scriptures tell us, thunderbolts fell from heaven, and burnt up those wicked men and their cities; and even to this day there are seen in Syria monuments of the unprecedented destruction that fell upon them, in the ruins, and ashes, and sulphur, and smoke, and dusky flame which still is sent up from the ground as of a fire smouldering beneath.

The traces of fire and scorched earth in the vicinity of Masada are also mentioned by Strabo, although he does not take them as authentication of the biblical narrative: "Many other proofs are produced to show that this country is full of fire. Near Moasada1 are to be seen rugged rocks, bearing the marks of fire; fissures in many places; a soil like ashes; pitch falling in drops from the rocks; rivers boiling up, and emitting a fetid odour to a great distance" (*Geographica hypomnemata* XVI 2:44).

The incineration of the cities is the result of the judgement pronounced upon them by God. This is expressed with the verb κατακρινόω in ind. aor. act., where the aorist primarily indicates the completeness of God's action as Judge, which appears to include both the trial and the pronouncement of judgement, as well as the infliction of punishment itself on the guilty (PssSol 4:2, Matt 20:18, 27:3, Mark 10:33, 14:64). The term often appears in the context of a judgement of condemnation (Matt 12:41–42, Luke 11:31–32, Rom 2:1, 8:34, 1 Cor 11:32, Heb 11:7). The recipient may be somewhat puzzled by the sequence of verbs τεφρώσας κατέκρινεν "having incinerated, judged/passed judgement", for the participle τεφρώσας indicates an action prior to that expressed by the verbum finitum which is the main predicate. The explanation of this apparent inconsistency is somewhat facilitated by the addition in most testimonies of the noun καταστροφῇ "total annihilation" (missing from P^{72*} B^{*} C^{*}, among others) in the dative, which is most naturally interpreted as dat. instrumentalis. It can be a complement of both the verb κατέκρινεν and the participle τεφρώσας.

In the first case, as an adverbial of manner, καταστροῃῇ makes it possible to accentuate, in the broad semantic spectrum of the verb κατακρινόω given above, primarily the execution of the judgement: "having incinerated, he executed the verdict" by means of extermination, and to treat καταστροῃῇ κατέκρινεν as an explanation of the participle τεφρώσας, i. e. "incineration" would be tantamount to

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

executing "the verdict by means of extermination". In such a case, the participle aor., which, as it were, defines the action expressed by the verbum finitum, can be taken as indicating a concurrent action: "by incinerating, he executed judgement by means of annihilation". An inchoative interpretation of this participle is also possible. Then it would only indicate the beginning of the action, or rather the process; the end of the process would be marked by the phrase καταστροηῇ κατέκρινεν: "having begun the incineration, he executed the sentence by means of annihilation".

However, it seems more natural to refer dat. instrumentalis καταστροηῇ to the participle τεφρώσας. The noun would also act as an adverbial of manner and specify how the incineration took place: "having been incinerated by means of annihilation". After the burning of Sodom and Gomorrah, it could be pronounced that God had carried out his judgement.

The term καταστροφή in the context of the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah is most likely taken from Gen 19:29 (LXX), where the term is used to describe Lot's rescue from annihilation[698] (cf. Prov 1:27, Hos 8:7, 3 Macc 5:47). In 2 Pet 2:6a καταστροφή has three functions. First, by means of lexis referring to Gen 19:29, it anons the narrative of verses 7–8 (the rescue of Lot). Secondly, it is a reference to verse 5c, where alliteration is used in the phrase κατακλυσμὸς κόσμου "the flood of the world". This is intended, as J.H. Neyrey notes,[699] to reinforce the parallelism between verse 5 and verse 6 through the phonetic and semantic similarity between κατακλυσμός and καταστροφή. Thirdly, through phonetic similarity – this time the paronomasia καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν – it draws attention to judgement, sentence and especially the execution of punishment through annihilation.

The second part of verse 6 explains how to understand the story of Sodom and Gomorrah. As mentioned, the 2 Pet narrator here uses the term ὑπόδειγμα similar phonetically and in meaning to Jude's δεῖγμα. Both δεῖγμα and ὑπόδειγμα indicate the use of a certain convention used in parenetic and protreptic literature, well attested by biblical and extra-biblical texts. It served primarily to instruct and warn.[700] Already 3 Macc 2:5 mentions the paradigmatic (παράδειγμα) use of the narrative of the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah: "The people of Sodom acted arrogantly and were notorious for their wicked deeds. You destroyed them with fire and sulfur, making them an example to others for all time". The story of the Flood is treated in the same way in *Pseudo-Clementine Homily* 9:2: "If, therefore, while I expound and show you that this is the greatest sin, which is able to destroy you all, it occur to your mind that you are not destroyed, being great multitudes, you are deceived. For you have the example of the old world deluged". The main point is

698 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 789.

699 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 132–133.

700 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 158; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 252.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

that descriptions or mentions of negative behaviour and its consequences should induce the audience to avoid such behaviour and stimulate the opposite behaviour, considered positive and desirable.[701] Such a function of paradigmatic narratives is mentioned, among others, by Plutarch: "So, I think, we also shall be more eager to observe and imitate the better lives if we are not left without narratives of the blameworthy and the bad" (*Demetrius* 1:6).[702]

G.L. Green[703] points out that in 2 Pet 2:6b ὑπόδειγμα may also have a meaning similar to that given by Flavius in *Ant.* XVII 11:2: "he let the nation understand his meaning; and this before his dominion was well established: […] That he had given a specimen παράδειγμα of his future virtue to his subjects". The point here, then, is to consider the description of the annihilation of Sodom and Gomorrah only as a sample, a substitute for what will happen in the end times. This may be indicated by the juxtaposition of the local scope of the punishment that befell Sodom and Gomorrah and the global scope of the final judgement, in the face of which the destruction of the sinful cities indeed seems a mere minor detail.

The noun ὑπόδειγμα is rendered indefinite by the phrase μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν, which leaves no doubt that it refers to a warning example for those intending to remain in or commit ungodliness. The manuscripts of P^{72} B P 1175. 1243. 1852 contain the lesson ἀσεβέσιν with dat. pl. suggesting even more strongly that this is a warning to the ungodly. The whole phrase ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν would then have to be understood as "a (warning) example about abiding (in ungodliness) or intending (to commit ungodliness) for (them or others) the ungodly". Adopting the variant ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν shifts the emphasis from those to whom the example would be directed to its essential content, as emphasised by the genitive obiectivus μελλόντων – it is thus an example about those keeping/remaining or intending (these are the primary meanings of the verb μέλλω) to commit ungodliness. Although at first glance the second variant seems more difficult, combining the verb μέλλω with the inf. ἀσεβεῖν is much more natural than combining it with the dative ἀσεβέσιν.[704]

Moreover – it is an example once given by God himself and still relevant today, as indicated by part. perf. act. τεθεικώς. This constant warning topicality is confirmed by the Old Testament texts, where Sodom and Gomorrah are treated, on the one hand, archetypically as habitats of sin and corruption, and, on the other hand, paradigmatically as a foreshadowing of punishment, its illustration or a warning against it (e. g. Amos 4:11, Zeph 2:9, Isa 1:9, 13:19, Jer 23:14, Ezek 16:46–48). This is explicitly stated in Jub 16:6: "God will execute judgement on the places where they

701 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 159.

702 For: G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 258.

703 Ibid., p. 791.

704 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 333.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

have done according to the uncleanness of the Sodomites, like unto the judgement of Sodom". The OT also used isolated elements to describe the annihilation of sinful cities – usually fire/rain of fire, tar, brimstone as a foreshadowing of punishment or references to the scorched, desolate space that remained after the annihilation as an illustration of the state prevailing after the execution of the punishment (Deut 29:22–24, Isa 34:9–10, Ezek 38:22, Amos 1:4.7.10.12.14, 2:2.5). In the NT, Sodom and Gomorrah are treated even proverbially. Their destruction becomes a reference point for the portrayal of the final judgement as something "even worse" (Matt 10:15, 11:24, Luke 10:12, 17:29–30).[705] Presumably, this evangelical tradition, probably originating from Source Q, was known to the narrator of 2 Peter and used it in his argument.

The differences in the typological use of the Flood narrative and the warning-paradigmatic use of the story of Sodom and Gomorrah are apparent at first glance. The typology emphasises the global scope of the Flood and judgement, their irreversibility, the cathartic aspect of both events and the ushering in of a new, just world. This is different in the Sodom, Gomorrah – final judgement paradigm, where there is a gradation, intensification and multiplication of the elements present in the Sodom and Gomorrah doomsday descriptions in relation to the future judgement. With the Sodomite-Gomorrah paradigm, moreover, the possibility of a postponement or reduction in the magnitude of the destruction is implied – hence the reference in 2 Pet 3:9 to the patience of God, who does not want the perdition of sinners but desires their conversion (cf. Gen 18:23–34 and Abraham's bargain with God). At the same time, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah does not lead to the creation of a new world; on the contrary, the destruction is complete. It seems that by attaching the image of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah to that of the Flood, the narrator wants to make the audience aware of the fate that awaits the ungodly – represented by the false teachers and their followers.[706] The image of the flood is a general image, an illustration of the statement that κόσμος ἀσεβῶν "the world of the godless" awaits destruction (verse 5c). The picture of Sodom and Gomorrah is a detailed one: yes, the world of the ungodly is doomed, but the number of those exterminated can be changed if the ungodly begin to repent and take the predictions of punishment seriously. At the same time – and this is an essential element of the paradigmatic warning – if the destruction of the ungodly already occurs during the final judgement, their destruction will be complete.

One can see here a polemic with the belief, which had been at work since Old Testament times, that the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, although a paradigm of every divine judgement, was an event that could and would be averted if only a

705 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 510.

706 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 252.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

sufficient number of righteous people were found and people repented. The same would apply to the final judgement. In the context of 2 Pet 1:20–21, however, this conviction would arise from a false external and internal interpretation.

As an internal interpretation, key to the narrative of the annihilation of Sodom and Gomorrah are: firstly, the general ungodliness and the suggestion that the ungodly far outnumber the righteous. Thus, a situation has arisen in which guilt must be punished. Secondly – there is no deviation from the guilt-punishment principle. God is consistent, but He is also just, and therefore saves those who obey Him (this is where Theme of Lot described in verses 7–8 comes in).[707] Third, God is patient, which is why He first listens to Abraham's pleas and then waits to punish Sodom until there is no longer any chance of converting even part of Lot's family. Finally, the punishment meted out to the sinners inhabiting Sodom and Gomorrah is absolute and complete. The sinful cities are annihilated.

When interpreted externally, this story must be read as a proleptic example of what will happen to the ungodly (6b) represented by the false teachers and their followers.[708] Such a proleptic and paradigmatic treatment of this narrative was, as mentioned, long present in Jewish tradition, but it emphasised the didactic and cautionary aspect. The pronouncement was thus primarily conditional: if you do not repent, you will meet the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah. Failure to fulfil the condition resulted in temporary and local punishments in the history of God's people. The external eschatological interpretation, however, goes further. It gives all the essential elements of the narrative generated above a global and final character. Firstly, therefore, the evil and ungodliness spreading in the world reaches such proportions as to require the punishment of the entire lust-ridden world (cf. 2 Pet 1:4). Secondly, there will be no deviation from the principle of guilt-punishment in the end times. For the number of the righteous will be less than the number of the ungodly. The prophetic teaching to which the righteous adhere only illuminates this dark place that is the broken world (cf. 2 Pet 2:19b). For the ungodly, who deny the coming of the final judgement and its cosmic dimension, the punishment will come as a great surprise. However, in keeping with the warning-parenetic nature of the literary convention called δεῖγμα, ὑπόδειγμα or παράδειγμα, there is the possibility of repentance before the judgement This will not stop God from judging the world, but will allow the converted to save themselves from annihilation (cf. 2 Pet 3:9). This is why Peter emphasises so strongly the patience of God and the fact that the final punishment, the final doom will befall those who "persist, remain, intend to continue (part. praes. act. μελλόντων) to act ungodly" (inf. praes. act. ἀσεβεῖν).

707 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:7–8.

708 R.B. Vinson, R.F. Wilson, W.E. Mills, p. 335; D.A. Keating, *First, Second Peter, Jude*, p. 372.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

2.6.4 β′. Interpretation proper – soteriology (2 Pet 2:7–9a)

> [7](if) and righteous Lot, being oppressed by the way of life/the acts of the lawless [manifested] in promiscuity/licentious conduct, he saved, [8]because the righteous, dwelling among them/when he dwelt among them, by sight/seeing and by reports/hearing/by means of sights and reports/considering what he saw and heard, daily tormented his righteous soul with their lawless deeds, [9a]then the Lord knows how to save the godly from temptation/trial.

The final *protasis* in the extended conditional phrase covering 2 Pet 2:4–9 contains a second positive example – Lot being rescued from doomed Sodom. In contrast to the example of Noah in 2:5b, this time the narrative is more elaborate and more autonomous. It is not merely an interjection, but contains an interesting psychologising extension, most likely the invention of the letter's narrator. It builds on the sapiential tradition of seeing Lot as righteous, which is also used by Philo of Alexandria, although he does so in a much more critical way than the author of 2 Peter and then to some extent the rabbinic literature.[709]

While the juxtaposition of the Flood and Sodom and Gomorrah is relatively common, especially in texts that invoke the topos of guilt and punishment, the typological link between the figures of Noah and Lot is rare. In the New Testament literature, it appears only in Luke 17:22–37 in an eschatological context similar to Peter's.[710] For both hagiographers, the Flood and the rain of sulphur and fire that fell on Sodom are illustrative of the end times. Both emphasise the waywardness of the people who are surprised by the catastrophe. Finally, both mention the survivors – Noah and Lot. In Luke, however, there is no such decisive juxtaposition of the figure of the righteous saved and the unrighteous, the ungodly exterminated, as there is in Peter's letter.

The source text for the narrative of Lot's rescue is Gen 19. However, as with the references to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, it is not this text that directly inspires the narrator of 2 Peter, although in verse 8 Peter seems to refer to it more than in verse 7. The crucial difference is the explicated assessment of Lot as righteous in 2 Pet 2:7–8 and the absence of such an unequivocal positive assessment of the patriarch in both Gen 19 and other passages of this book.[711] On the contrary, many episodes in Lot's life raised and still raise ethical questions, even

709 Rabbinic tradition largely treats Lot as a weak and essentially sinful man; see J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 333; T.D. Alexander, *Lot's Hospitality: A Clue to His Righteousness. Critical Notes*, JBL 104 (1985), no. 2, p. 289–300.

710 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 792.

711 J. Makujina, *The "Trouble" with Lot in 2 Peter: Locating Peter's Source for Lot's Torment*, "Westminster Theological Journal" 60 (1998), no. 2, p. 255.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

when one takes into account the socio-behavioural and cultural conditions of the time. It is no coincidence, therefore, that the figure of Lot is mentioned infrequently in OT (apart from Genesis, the name of the patriarch is mentioned as late as Deut 2:9.19, Ps 83[82]:9 and Sir 16:8, and most of these references are periphrastic indications of Moab and Amon or Moabites and Ammonites as descendants of Lot). The conviction of Lot's righteousness came relatively late. It is only mentioned in the Book of Wisdom (Wis 10:6), which may have been one of the immediate sources of inspiration for the author of 2 Pet: αὕτη δίκαιον ἐξαπολλυμένων ἀσεβῶν ἐρρύσατο φυγόντα καταβάσιον πῦρ Πενταπόλεως. But the author of the Book of Wisdom, although he leaves no doubt that he is referring to Lot, omits the name of the patriarch and confines himself to referring to the hero as δίκαιος, which is largely due to the anonymisation of well-known figures he has adopted. The phrase δίκαιος Λωτ in the Bible thus appears only in 2 Peter.

The tradition of the righteous Lot is familiar to Philo of Alexandria, who, while somewhat discrediting Lot's personal righteousness and wisdom, seeks to reconcile sapiential tendencies with the ambiguous characterisation of Lot in the Torah:[712]

> But when the whole of that district was thus burnt, inhabitants and all, by the impetuous rush of the heavenly fire, one single man in the country, a sojourner, was preserved by the providence of God because he had never shared in the transgressions of the natives, though sojourners in general were in the habit of adopting the customs of the foreign nations, among which they might be settled, for the sake of their own safety, […] And yet this man had not attained to any perfection of wisdom, so as to be thought worthy of such an honour by reason of the perfect excellence of his nature; but he was spared only because he did not join the multitude who were inclined to luxury and effeminacy, and who pursued every kind of pleasure and indulged every kind of appetite (*De vita Mois.* II X:58).

Less harsh on Lot is Clement of Rome, who, like the author of 2 Peter, was probably influenced by this parenetic tradition;[713] Clement of Rome wrote of Lot's rescue because of his hospitality and piety: "On account of his hospitality and godliness, Lot was saved out of Sodom when all the country round was punished by means of

712 B.D. Lerner, *Lot's Failed Trial*, "Jewish Bible Quarterly" 37 (2009), no. 3, p. 153.

713 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 252; J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 334 supposes that this positive perception of Lot in the sapiential, early Christian and partly rabbinic traditions is linked to the development of the messianic idea. The Messiah was to be a descendant of David. David, on the other hand, was a descendant of Ruth the Moabite, a representative of the nation which originated with Moab, the son of Lot and one of his daughters. This means that Lot was one of the ancestors of the messiah, which is why – despite the incestuous incident – efforts were made to portray him as righteous.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

fire and brimstone, the Lord thus making it manifest that He does not forsake those that hope in Him" (*1 Clem.* 11:1). In the intertestamental and later rabbinic tradition (e. g. *Gen. Rabb.* 49:13),[714] Lot is presented as righteous on the basis of Gen 18:23–32. Abraham asks God to save Sodom if there would be ten righteous people in it. These righteous, in Abraham's mind, would be Lot, his wife, his four daughters, and his two sons-in-law and two fiancées of his daughters.[715] However, it turned out that although not all of Lot's household could be considered righteous (there were not 10 righteous people in Sodom), Lot himself must have been righteous, since he was saved. Moreover, Lot is credited with praying all night for mercy for the inhabitants of Sodom, which would prove his nobility and loyalty (*Gen. Rabb.* 26:5).[716] It should also not be forgotten that it was at Lot's request that God did not destroy Soar so that the patriarch could find refuge there (Gen 19:18–23). Although here one may have doubts about Lot's selflessness. The Book of Jubilees, like Philo, denies personal justice to Lot and states that God saved Lot "for God remembered Abraham, and sent him out from the midst of the overthrow" (Jub 16:7). Immediately afterwards, the sin that Lot and his daughters committed is mentioned "such as had not been on the earth since the days of Adam till his time; for the man lay with his daughters" (Jub 16:8).

As can be seen, even in antiquity, opinions were divided as to the grounds for declaring Lot righteous. The same is the case in the contemporary discussion. The problem of Lot's righteousness has been attempted by, among others, T.D. Alexander,[717] R.I. Letellier,[718] W.W. Fields[719] or W.J. Lyons.[720] Arguments similar to the ancient ones were made with reference to Gen 18:23–32. In addition, the hospitality of Lot was emphasised, which contrasted with the inhospitality of the inhabitants of Sodom (cf. Wis 19:14 and *Ant.* I 11:1 by Flavius, where the sin of Sodom is defined as a lack of hospitality, and *1 Clem.* 11:1)[721] and which, as T.D. Alexander points out, can even be compared to the hospitality shown to the three wanderers by Abraham under the oak tree of Mamre.[722] He is echoed by W.W. Fields,[723] who argues that ancient hospitality included not only the provision of meals and lodging, but also

714 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 252.

715 *Midrash Rabbah. Genesis I*, English transl. H. Freedman, London 1961, p. 432.

716 Ibid., p. 214.

717 T.D. Alexander, *Lot's Hospitality*, p. 289–291.

718 R.I. Letellier, *Day in Mamre, Night in Sodom: Abraham and Lot in Genesis 18 and 19*, Leiden 1995.

719 W.W. Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah: History and Motif in Biblical Narrative* (Journal for Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 231), Sheffield 1997.

720 W.J. Lyons, *Canon and Exegesis: Canonical Praxis and the Sodom Narrative*, (Journal for Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 352), Sheffield 2002.

721 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:6.

722 T.D. Alexander, *Lot's Hospitality*, p. 290.

723 W.W. Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah*, p. 61.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

protection. Guaranteeing protection could be particularly difficult and require great personal commitment. Such was the case with Lot, who, while protecting the angels who came to him, had to face the inhabitants of Sodom demanding that the guests be handed over to them. Rape was to be committed on the guests, as evidenced by the use in the Hebrew text of the verb ידע meaning sexual intercourse, and in the Greek text of the verb συγγίνομαι being its equivalent.[724] The difficult situation forced Lot to make the controversial decision to give his own virgin daughters to the sodomites instead of the newcomers (Gen 19:5.8). W.J. Lyons,[725] citing S.P. Jeansonne, portrays this controversial decision as wicked and believes that Lot himself should be called wicked rather than righteous, at least in this regard. If Lot was ever righteous, it was only when he accompanied Abraham. Since he parted from his uncle (Gen 13:11–12), having selfishly chosen a better land and settled in Sodom, his righteousness begins to degrade. Nevertheless, he cannot be judged in black and white terms. He remains an ambiguous and complex figure,[726] which makes it difficult to consider him as archetypal as Abraham or even Noah, mentioned earlier by Peter.

Peter chooses Lot, relying – as mentioned – primarily on the sapiential tradition. He is not concerned with a full characterisation of the character, but rather with illustrating Thesis expressed in the apodosis (verse 9a) – it is God's responsibility to rescue the righteous who, along with the unrighteous, find themselves in the grip of God's punishment. The narrator does not need to reach for Lot's entire biography; on the contrary, he treats his story point by point, refers only to the sodomite episode and interprets it in the spirit of the haggadic midrash.[727] At the same time, presumably aware of Lot's ambiguity, he justifies why he calls him righteous (verses 7b–8). This is contextualised – against the backdrop of the unrighteous inhabitants of Sodom who immerse themselves in debauchery, Abraham's nephew may indeed appear righteous. From a rhetorical point of view, then, the idea is to contrast the righteous (δίκαιος) Lot and the unrighteous (ἄθεσμοι) sodomites plunging into debauchery (ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ). Moreover, references to righteousness appear throughout 2 Peter in various places and contexts,[728] even forming the framework of the letter and its skeleton. God's justice is first mentioned in 1:1, where, as the analysis has shown, it has a primarily soteriological significance.[729] It corresponds to its mention in 3:13, where righteousness, understood both in terms

724 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 153.

725 W.J. Lyons, *Canon and Exegesis*, p. 221–222.

726 R.I. Letellier, *Day in Mamre, Night in Sodom*, p. 184–186; K.A. Matthews, *Genesis 11:27–50:26* (The New American Commentary 1b), Nashville 2005, p. 232.

727 J. Makujina, *The "Trouble" with Lot in 2 Peter*, p. 258.

728 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 791.

729 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:1.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of soteriology and devotion, is a feature of the new, post-eschatological world.[730] Such a world is foreshadowed by Noah, who is "the herald of righteousness" (2:5b), if one interprets his prophecy appropriately in an eschatological key. The righteous Lot, rescued from the destruction of Sodom (2:7), is representative of those righteous people who remain faithful to God and His commandments and, even living among the ungodly (2:8), lead a pious life, in contrast to those who have abandoned the path of righteousness (2:21).[731] For them there is no place where righteousness dwells (3:13). This means that Lot's righteousness must be considered primarily from the perspective of Peter's eschatological hermeneutic, in the context of the final judgement argument, rather than in absolute terms and from the point of view of ethics.

Lot's righteousness is presented against the background of the iniquity of the inhabitants of Sodom. Moreover – the narrator mentions that Lot was tormented or himself tormented by the conduct of the sodomites. Part. praes. καταπονούμενος can be translated passively ('to be tormented") or reflexively ('to torment oneself'). The verb καταπονέω itself is used in Hellenistic Greek to describe oppression, mistreatment, torment. In 3 Macc 2:2.13 it appears in a similar form and context to that in 2 Pet 2:7b – it refers to torments caused by the behaviour of the ungodly. TLev 3:7 describes the oppression of Abraham as a sojourner by the inhabitants of Canaan. Josephus Flavius uses this verb when he mentions the actions of the Ammonites against Joab's army (*Ant.* VII 6:2), but also when he speaks of penitential practices involving, among other things, "torment" (*Bell. Iud.* II 15:1). In Acts 7:24 the participle καταπονούμενος describes a Hebrew wronged by an Egyptian. As can be seen, most often καταπονέω refers to real, physical torment. Thus, if the participle καταπονούμενος accentuates the passive side, one could see here an allusion to some real repression suffered by Lot as a newcomer from the inhabitants of Sodom. Perhaps it is even specifically about the episode in Gen 19:9 when the sodomites lashed out at Lot appealing to him not to harm the guests staying in his house. As G.L. Green notes,[732] verse 7b would refer to mistreatment in the physical sense, and verse 8 to the mental anguish that Lot suffered as a result of the conduct of the inhabitants of Sodom. It would also be drawing the audience's attention to the physical and psychological violence that can be used against the righteous by the ungodly. Such harassment would be, alongside the knowledge that the wicked would be cruelly punished, a source of spiritual suffering for the righteous.

However, if the participle καταπονούμενος is stressed on the reflexive side, this would mean that verse 7b is an introduction to verse 8 and both concern spiritual

730 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:13.

731 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:21.

732 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 798.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

suffering. This is the direction taken by, among others, R. Bauckham.[733] Verse 8 would then explain the rather laconic[734] and, considered by the narrator himself as not very clear, abstract statement concerning the torments inflicted on the righteous not so much by the unrighteous themselves (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀθέσμων,) what by their conduct (ὑπὸ τῆς ἀναστροφῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων), which manifests itself in promiscuity (ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ).

The source of Lot's anguish, whichever side is emphasised more strongly in the participle καταπονούμενος, is the lifestyle led by the inhabitants of Sodom. This is expressed by the noun ἀναστροφή meaning 'way of life', 'conduct'. In general language, the term ἀναστροφή is neutral, it has no negative connotation, and its meaning is modified by additional attributes and/or context. In 2 Pet 3:11, ἀναστροφή indicates a life of holiness; here, on the contrary, it indicates a way of life and conduct characteristic of those who do not respect and obey the law, practising lawlessness instead – ἄθεσμοι. Derived from Hellenistic Greek, the adjective ἄθεσμος belonging to the New Testament *hapax legomena*, used by Peter in 3:17, can mean something forbidden by the law (so e. g. in *Bell. Iud.* VII 8:1 by Flavius, where reference is made to "unlawful food" τράπεζάν τε γὰρ ἄθεσμον that appeared on John Hyrcanus's table), but more often it denotes those who break the law. This is how Philo in *De praem.* XX 126 contrasts those who fulfil the law with those who break it; the former deserve grace and reward from God, the latter curses: "good men who fulfil the laws by their actions which it is said will be accomplished by the grace of […] God, who honours and rewards all that is good […] We must now consider the curses appointed against those who transgress the commandments and the Laws" ἐκνόμων καὶ ἀθεσμων. In *De vita Mois.* II XXXVII:198, Philo emphasises the transition from words to deeds that is characteristic of lawlessness: "when intemperate language and an unbridled tongue are subservient to lawless folly, then inevitably and invariably some iniquitous conduct must follow" πάντως τι καινουργεῖται τῶν ἀθέσμων.

For Peter, lawlessness, or more precisely the way of life/proceedings of lawbreakers, manifests itself in promiscuity in the broadest sense – ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ. The phrase ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ in conjunction with ἀναστροφή and ἄθεσμοι is to be understood instrumentally: the conduct of lawbreakers through promiscuity. Attention is drawn here to the use of alliteration: ἀναστροφή τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ, which further emphasises that lawlessness, which is a general concept, a hyperonym, manifests itself primarily in promiscuity, which is a narrower, more specific concept, a hyponym. This means, however, that promiscuity does not exhaust the entire meaning

733 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 253.

734 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 182.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of lawlessness. As already mentioned when analysing 2:6,[735] the biblical literature gives a wide variety of manifestations of the corruption of Sodom and Gomorrah. With debauchery, promiscuity and even the desire for sexual intercourse with angels (cf. Jude 7)[736] the sin of Sodom commonly becomes associated in the intertestamental period. On the one hand, Peter makes use of this association (see 2:18–19).[737] On the other hand, however, there is no indication that Lot's righteousness is limited to sexual abstinence; on the contrary, it seems to be a general concept. Thus, the opposition between the righteous (Lot) and the lawbreakers (the inhabitants of Sodom) cannot be reduced to sexual aspects. This supports the suggestion that promiscuity understood in carnal-erotic terms is only one manifestation of the lawlessness of the sodomites.

In describing God's actions towards Lot, the narrator uses ῥύομαι – 'to rescue', 'to save', 'to deliver'. This lexeme in NT usually appears in the context of rescue from distress, danger, rescue from death or in a soteriological context (Rom 15:31, 2 Cor 1:10, Col 1:13, 1 Thess 1:10, 2 Thess 3:2, 2 Tim 3:11, 4:17–18). But the presence of this verb in 2 Pet 2:7 (and 2:9a) is to be associated with the Book of Wisdom rather than the pan-Christian sociolect. For in LXX, ῥύομαι occurs only four times (Wis 10:6.9.13.15), once of which it weighs heavily in reference to the righteous man who escaped the fire sent to Pentapolis (Wis 10:6), and once in a general summary referring to both Noah and Lot, how Wisdom delivers/saves those who cherish it (Wis 10:9).[738]

Verse 8 is, as noted, closely related to verse 7b. It can be understood as an explanation of what Lot's anguish consisted of and a clarification that spiritual suffering was involved. It could also be seen as an addendum – a reference to mental anguish would be added to the physical torment described in 7b. The first option seems more likely, at least from a syntactic perspective. The introduction of an explanation is indicated by the conjunct γάρ – 'because/since'. Peter's statement would thus look as follows: Lot was tormented by the conduct of the law-breakers, [consisting, among other things,] of promiscuity, because, living among them, by sight and report he daily tormented the righteous soul with their unrighteous acts. It is clear from the letter that Lot did not take part in the actions of the inhabitants of Sodom, he merely saw them or heard about them. It is not clear exactly where the narrator of the letter drew this explanation from. R. Bauckham[739] argues that it may come from some local haggadic tradition that was well known in the milieu and/or time of the

735 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:6.

736 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 153–158.

737 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 801.

738 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 253; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 792; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 278.

739 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 253.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

creation of 2 Peter, while it was later forgotten. In a similar vein, J. Makujina,[740] who seeks to demonstrate the motivic and partly lexical dependence of 2 Pet 2:7–8 on the narrative of Gen 19:15–16 in LXX and to reconstruct the process of Petrine exegesis described as haggadic midrash. Lot's distancing himself from the conduct of the inhabitants of Sodom is mentioned very explicitly by Philo of Alexandria in *De vita Mois.* II X:58: "[Lot] did not join the multitude who were inclined to luxury and effeminacy, and who pursued every kind of pleasure and indulged every kind of appetite". Although it must be acknowledged that the treatise does indeed make no mention of Lot's vulnerability and inner suffering.

Peter's explanation begins with the phrase βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ, in which both nouns – βλέμμα "that which is seen, that which has been seen, seeing" (this is another hapax legomenon in 2 Peter)[741] and ἀκοή "that which is heard, that which has been heard, reporting" – are used in the dative case interpreted pragmatically as dat. Instrumentalis.[742] Often this combination of terms meaning seeing and hearing indicates inner perception, understanding, pondering, reflecting (Isa 6:9, Jer 5:21, Ezek 12:2, Matt 13:13, Mark 4:12, 8:18, Luke 8:10, Acts 28:26, Rom 11:8)[743] and most likely such implications can also be found in 2 Pet 2:8a – "pondering what he saw and heard". Alongside this, of course, there is a literal meaning at work, which suggests that Lot observed the behaviour of the inhabitants of Sodom with anxiety and inner dilemma and listened to reports of their ungodly deeds.

Lot's observer status and distancing himself from the Sodomites is confirmed by the phrase ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς "dwelling/living among them", which can be understood and translated in three ways: as an adverbial sentence of time: "when he lived among them"; as an adverbial sentence of cause: "because he lived among them"; and as an adverbial of assimilation: "living like them". The verb ἐγκατοικέω is used, among others, by Josephus Flavius in *Con. Ap.* I 33, when he cites Manetho's account of how "polluted persons […] the city Avaris was given them for their habitation" τὴν Αὔαριν δοὺς ἐγκατοικεῖν. This means that those who are assigned a place of residence do not have a status equal to the indigenous inhabitants, but rather that of newcomers. It should be noted, however, that in Gen 19:29 the verb κατοικέω appears in relation to the cities in which Lot lived, suggesting Lot's closer integration with his neighbours.[744] A certain degree of assimilation may also be evidenced by the fact that Lot's sons-in-law most likely originated from among the inhabitants of

740 J. Makujina, *The "Trouble" with Lot in 2 Peter*, p. 259–161.

741 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy, Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 280 points out that, although there is indeed often a combination of terms in the Bible denoting 'seeing' and 'hearing', 'seeing' is expressed in terms other than βλέμμα.

742 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 334.

743 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 802.

744 Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Sodom (cf. Gen 19:14) and, like the other Sodomites, did not believe the warnings of the city's punishment and destruction. Moreover, the aforementioned rabbinic tradition recorded in *Gen. Rabb.* does not ultimately include them among the ten righteous ones through whom Sodom was able to escape punishment. Perhaps even the sodomite was Lot's wife, who, according to Philo, who "was turned into stone because she loved Sodom, and who reverted to the disposition and habits which had been condemned by God" (*Leg. alleg.* III LXXV:213). It is apparent, then, that Peter is not reaching directly into the biblical narrative here. He seems to depend more on the justifying tradition of Lot represented by Philo, based on the wisdom account. For this reason, the interpretation of ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς as a adverbial of assimilation seems least likely. The other two can be regarded as equivalent, with the most neutral remaining to regard the phrase as a temporal sentence.

The phrase ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας essentially has a temporal meaning – "daily, day by day, day by day". Here it serves to intensify reports of the iniquities of the sodomites. It is most likely to be referred to the verb ἐβασάνιζεν as an adverbial of time: "daily/constantly tormented [the soul]", although there is also the possibility of a syntactic connection with ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς as "living daily/every day among them". The whole description so far is firstly to make the audience aware that the punishment that fell on Sodom and Gomorrah was just and righteous. For it applied to those who persisted in sin. This is reminiscent of the statement in verse 6 containing a warning to those who intend to commit ungodliness and/or persist in committing ungodliness. It can be considered that the narrative of verse 8 is an illustration of the warning of verse 6, and that the sodomites, daily committing unrighteousness and thus continually harassing Lot, are a type of the future ungodly persisting in their sins. Both groups of sinners are also united by their disbelief in the coming punishment.

2 Pet 2:6	2 Pet 2:8
ὑπόδειγμα	(βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ)
μελλόντων	ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας […].
	(ψυχὴν ἐβασάνιζεν)
ἀσεβεῖν	ἀνόμοις ἔργοις
A cautionary example	(due to views and reports)
Intending to [continue]	Daily/continuously […].
	(tormented the soul)
To live ungodly	Due to unlawful acts

This relationship makes it possible to see that the narrator of 2 Pet in both poems is primarily concerned with emphasising persistence in broadly understood ungodliness and iniquity, which are treated equivalently. The counterpart of remaining/persisting/intention expressed by the verb μέλλω in verse 6 is the adverbial ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας in verse 8 understood not only temporally but also qualitatively.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The condemnation and observation of the unrighteous acts of the sodomites are a torment to Lot. The verb καταπονέω of verse 7b is replaced in verse 8 by the verb βασανίζω. In LXX and in NT, it primarily means physical harassment, physical oppression and the infliction of suffering (2 Macc 1:28, 7:13.17, 9:6, 4 Macc 6:10–11, 8:27, Wis 11:9, 16:4, Matt 8:6.29, Mark 5:7, Luke 8:28, Rev 9:5, 11:10, 14:10, 20:10). It thus has a very similar meaning to the verb καταπονέω. However, the addition of ψυχὴν δικαίαν "righteous soul" as a direct complement in 2 Pet 2:8 redirects the viewer's attention from physical suffering to internal, spiritual suffering.

G.L. Green, defending Thesis that verse 7b refers to Lot's physical harassment, he also tries to read the explanation in verse 8 similarly. In this light, "a righteous soul" would be a synecdoche meaning simply a human being, a person, a human being. Such a figurative meaning of the noun "soul" would not be unusual; indeed, it is encountered in biblical (Gen 2:7, Heb 10:39, 1 Pet 3:20) and extra-biblical literature[745] (TAsh 1:35 "for when the soul departs troubled, it is tormented by the evil spirit which also it served in lusts and evil works. But if he is peaceful with joy he meeteth the angel of peace, and he leadeth him into eternal life"). However, this use of the phrase ψυχὴ δίκαια in 2 Pet 2:8 seems unlikely, primarily because the subject of "righteousness" appears here. It is "the righteous one who torments the righteous soul". The repetition of the adjective δίκαιος is intended to indicate that the same designator is involved in both cases, so that the phrase δίκαιος ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν the righteous one tormented the righteous soul is to be understood "the righteous one tormented his soul". In addition, similar thoughts expressed in a similar way are found, among others, in *The Shepherd* of Hermas (Similitude IX 9:3): "why do you torment yourself τί σεαυτὸν βασανίζεις"; and (Commandment IV 2:2): "For he who has sinned […] does good munificently, and humbles and torments βασανίζει his soul because he has sinned". Ultimately, even G. L. Green admits that verse 8 refers to Lot's spiritual and/or emotional response, but justifies this by the presence of the nouns βλέμμα and ἀκουή, which he relates mainly to the act of inner perception, reflection and understanding.[746]

The formal direct complement of the predicate ἐβασάνιζεν is the phrase ἀνόμοις ἔργοις "with unrighteous acts". The dative used here should be interpreted as dat. causae – "he tormented the soul because of unrighteous acts". This is the second phrase in dat. causae after βλέμματι καὶ ἀκουῇ, which is specified the verb ἐβασάνιζεν. This may not be stylistically very successful, but syntactically acceptable.[747] The adjective ἄνομος has the same meaning as ἄθεσμος in verse 7 – "prohibited, forbidden by law, against the law, law-breaking"; it applies to both people and deeds,

745 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 804.

746 Ibid.

747 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 334.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

so it quickly became a synonym for sin (Rom 4:7, 2 Cor 6:14, Titus 2:14, Heb 1:9, 10:17) and an antonym of righteous deeds and people (Prov 21:18). This antonym of "righteous man/righteous soul – unrighteous acts" was also used by Peter to reinforce his message.

Unlike in verse 7, where, among the conduct of the unrighteous, the example of a life of promiscuity is mentioned as a conspicuous one, this time the narrator stops at the general term unrighteous acts. In doing so, he makes it clear once again that the sins of the inhabitants of Sodom were not limited to sexuality. This generality also serves to universalise the image, and especially its transposition to the end times: God's punishment is threatened by all unrighteous acts, all lawlessness, and before that, all ungodly conduct (verse 6), and not just promiscuity in even the broadest sense.

Commenting on this Peter's explanation of "the torments of the soul of the righteous man", R. Bauckham[748] has been tempted to provide a psychological explanation. He has put forward the assumption that verse 8 reflects the feelings of the recipients of the letter, and perhaps of the narrator himself. On the one hand, there may be indignation at the all-pervading sin and evil (cf. Ezek 9:4), on the other, suffering and sorrow, perhaps compassion caused by an awareness of the punishment that will inevitably befall sinners. Particularly when the ungodly and those who do not believe in the coming of judgement include and/or are joined by relatives, family members, as was the case with Lot's sons-in-law and married daughters-in-law (Gen 19:14). Josephus Flavius paraphrases the biblical text in *Ant.* I 11:4: "But Lot, upon God's informing him of the future destruction of the Sodomites, went away; taking with him his wife, and daughters; who were two, and still virgins: for those that were betrothed to them were above the thoughts of going; and deemed that Lot's words were trifling".

The narrator's explanation in verse 8 can be seen as an element of intra-narrative interpretation in Peter's characteristic two-level method of referring to 1:20–21. The narrator of the epistle assumes that his audience is well acquainted with the story of Sodom and of Lot, so firstly he refers to it point by point to present Lot as a righteous man and a prophet in Sodom; secondly he draws on the various motifs present in this one episode in Lot's life. Lot is undoubtedly presented here as a prophet who sorrows over the iniquity of the inhabitants of Sodom. Moreover, as a prophet, he showed openness and readiness to receive God's word communicated by God's angels/messengers. He took seriously God's intention to punish Sodom with destruction and the command to leave the city (Gen 19:12–14). He shared the message he had received with the Sodomites – represented by his sons-in-law. These, however, did not take Lot's prophetic words seriously; not only did they

748 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 253.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

not want to leave the city, they most likely did not change their sinful lifestyle. This is another, more personal, reason for Lot's inner suffering. At the same time, his reluctance to leave the city (Gen 19:16) may have reassured the inhabitants of Sodom that God would not carry out his intention. However, God does not deviate from inflicting punishment on the city and rescues Lot in a very decisive way so that he can destroy the city – the angels grab the patriarch by the hands and lead him out of the city (Gen 19:16–17). The vehemence and radicality of the rescue of Lot corresponds to the vehemence and radicality of the punishment of the unrighteous sodomites.

An external interpretation makes us read the story in an eschatological key. In the end times, sin will be as prevalent as it was in Sodom. Many righteous people will be pained by it, especially when their loved ones act in this way. Added to this is the widespread denial of the coming of judgement and punishment. For it may seem that God has waived or delayed punishment (cf. 2 Pet 2:3b). This time, however, the emphasis is not on the situation of the wicked at the time of judgement – this is presented in verse 6 – but on the situation of the righteous represented by Lot. During the Parousia and the judgement, they will be separated from the sinners who persist in lawlessness. This separation, perhaps even a very violent one, serves to save them from the final destruction/punishment.

This eschatological explanation is alluded to in verse 9a. Formally, it is an apodosis of a long conditional sentence, with four antecedents beginning in verse 4. It is directly related to the story of Lot's rescue, which is emphasised not only by the cohesion (formal coherence) but also by the lexical reference – the use of the verb ῥύομαι this time in inf. praes. (ῥύεσθαι). But by treating *apodosis* as a summary of the five examples in 2:4–8, it can also be applied to the story of Noah (despite the lack of formal exponents). Compositionally and lexically, 2:9a would thus refer to the generalising summary of the examples in Wis 10:9:

Wis 10:9	2 Pet 2:9a
σοφία τοὺς θεραπεύοντας αὐτὴν ἐκ πόνων ἐρρύσατο	οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι
Wisdom caring for it/those who serve it from suffering/tribulations saved	The Lord knows (how) the pious from temptation/tests save

Although the narrator of 2 Peter started with a negative example illustrating the falsity of the claims about "idle judgement" and "slumbering destruction" (2:3b) and exempla negativa are more numerous in the preceding verses than the positive examples, the apodosis began with a positive example. Most likely because the

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

narrator wants to address the negative examples in detail after the subsequent verse (from 2:10).[749]

The *apodosis* begins with the statement οἶδεν κύριος "knows the Lord", common to both positive and negative examples. The narrator has chosen to repeat the subject of the conditional sentence. This time, however, he did not use the term θεός (as in verse 4a), but the title κύριος "Lord". In the OT this title refers to God, so at first glance it would seem that Peter also used it in this sense here. This is all the more so since the illustrative narratives refer to episodes familiar from Jewish tradition. It should be noted, however, that so far in the epistle the title Lord has referred to Jesus Christ, and there is no indication that it should be read differently in verse 9a. On the contrary, the introduction of the person of Jesus Christ corresponds to Peter's strategy and Peter's interpretative method – an eschatological hermeneutic. In transposing the titles in OT belonging to God to the person of Jesus Christ, the narrator of the letter resembles Jude. Perhaps, as in Jude 5, a conviction of the pre-existence of Christ, through whom God acted in the past, should be seen here.[750] All the more so since in the parallel text in The Book of Wisdom the counterpart of "the Lord" is "Wisdom", in early Christianity identified with Christ.[751] Here, however, the reference to eschatology is crucial. All the examples have been interpreted as prophetic predictions of future judgement, which confirm the truth of the apostolic message of the Parousia (2 Pet 1:17–19a). This implies a Christocentric reading of the Old and Intertestamental narratives within their eschatological interpretation. It is no coincidence that the author of 2 Peter in 1:16–17 emphasised the delegation of divine honour and glory by God the Father to Jesus, and with them all the competences associated with the final judgement and the establishment of Jesus as Ruler of the future eternal kingdom.[752] Jesus' competence as eschatological Judge and Ruler also includes knowing how to save the pious and punish the unrighteous on the day of judgement. The verb οἶδεν "knows" is thus to be understood not as knowledge (γιγνώσκω, ἐπιγιγνώσκω), but as the capacity belonging to the Judge,[753] and even power, which is a component of divine justice (2 Pet 1:1).

749 Ibid.

750 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 121–124.

751 Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* VII 7:4–5: [The Son] before the foundation of the world, was the counsellor of the Father. For He was the Wisdom in which the Sovereign God delighted. For the Son is the power of God, as being the Father's most ancient Word before the production of all things, and His Wisdom. He is then properly called the Teacher of the beings formed by Him"; see also R.E. Murphy, *Wprowadzenie do literatury mądrościowej*, [in:] *Katolicki komentarz biblijny*, ed. R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer, R.E. Murphy, W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2001, p. 436–444.

752 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:16–17.

753 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 807.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Those whom the Lord saves are now referred to as εὐσεβεῖς "the godly". This is an obvious reference to 1:3.6–7 (cf. also 3:11). What emerges is a very clear indication, based on Peter's method, that the juridical and soteriological action of God/Jesus is not limited to the righteous known from the OT and Jewish tradition, but will also include Christians, endowed at baptism with the competence and ability to live a godly life and avoid corruption in the world, who without falling strive to enter into the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ. God's rescue is expressed once again with the verb ῥύομαι, which on the one hand alludes to God's actions towards Lot, and on the other – thanks to the typology of[754] and the generalising Christocentric-eschatological interpretation – takes on a soteriological meaning here (2 Cor 1:10, Col 1:13, 1 Thess 1:10).

What seems most problematic in verse 9a is the phrase ἐκ πειρασμοῦ mainly because of the ambiguity of the noun πειρασμός – 'trial', 'test', 'experience', 'temptation'. One can consider this concept on two levels: in close connection with the tradition concerning Lot and Noah, and immediately on a general, eschatological and anthropological or only anthropological level. With the first option, an understanding of the concept of πειρασμός as a temptation must be excluded.[755] For in the narratives about Noah and Lot, the motif of temptation and joining the unrighteous leading a sinful, promiscuous life does not appear.[756] It would therefore be about experiencing, testing, proving, a trial that reveals and shapes character (cf. Sir 2:1, 6:7, 27:5.7, Gal 4:14). In these particular cases, about "the testing of" the righteous living among sinners, like Noah and Lot, who suffer as they watch their surroundings plunge into iniquity and most likely experience some sort of harassment on their part. If, according to Peter's hermeneutic, the experiences of Noah and Lot are to be a foreshadowing of end-times experiences, this would mean that the future recipients of the letter, especially those who will come to live in the times just before the Parousia, must reckon with increasing lawlessness in the world and various kinds of testing of their faith by the ungodly (cf. Luke 8:13, Acts 20:19, Jas 1:2, 1 Pet 1:6, Rev 3:10). They will be rescued from these experiences by the coming judgement of Jesus.[757] This corresponds with Peter's exhortations to abide in faithfulness (2 Pet 1:10 and 3:17) and is in fact a promise of God's help so that the faithful – distinguished by holiness and piety (2 Pet 3:11) – will be preserved in peace, without blemish and blameless (2 Pet 3:14) and, strengthened in their calling and election without falling away, will reach the eternal kingdom (2 Pet 1:10–11).

The second option, the anthropological one, is based on an apocalyptic tradition close to Peter, according to which, in the world and in the human heart, the forces

754 Ibid., p. 808.

755 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 253; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 808.

756 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 808.

757 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 253; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 809.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of good and evil are constantly confronting each other and therefore man (the righteous) is constantly exposed to the attacks of the latter. The conviction of this type of experience is reflected particularly clearly in the Qumran texts: "Every one of their chastisements, and every one of the seasons of their distress, shall be brought about by the rule of his persecution; for all his allotted spirits seek the overthrow of the sons of light. But the God of Israel and His Angel of Truth will succor all the sons of light" (1QS 3:23–25); "Until now the spirit of truth and falsehood struggle in the hearts of men" (1QS 4:23); "The sons of light and the forces of Darkness shall fight together to show the strength of God with the roar of a great multitude and the shout of gods and menl a day of disaster. It is a time of distress fo[r al]l the people who are redeemed by God" (1QM 1:11–12).[758] In this context, rescue from the experience will mean the rescue of man from the influence of the forces of darkness, the release from inner dilemmas. Nor does this preclude understanding the term πειρασμός as a temptation.

The experience/trial/temptation and rescue evokes, in the opinion of numerous commentators, the last two requests of the Lord's Prayer – Matt 6:13: καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονεροῦ. The author of 2 Peter could summarise them here in a single promise of deliverance from trial. This is not impossible, especially since Peter had already referred several times to the Gospel tradition,[759] most clearly in 1:17–18, where he took from it the description of the transfiguration, although he interpreted it differently from the Synoptics. Here, similarly, he considers the requests of the Lord's Prayer from an apocalyptic-eschatological and Parousia perspective. For the fulfilment of the promise in 2 Pet 2:9a would take place in the end times, when Jesus would come a second time as Judge and Ruler.[760]

2.6.5 α''. False interpretation (2 Pet 2:9b–22)

2.6.5.1 Part 1. Immoral practices (2 Pet 2:9b–16)

[9b] [The Lord knows] how to keep the unrighteous being punished for the day of judgement, [10] most of all those following the flesh [led] with impure lust and despising lordship/authority. The insolent and arrogant are not afraid to blaspheme the glories, [11] while angels, being of greater strength and power, do not bring a blasphemous judgement against them before the Lord.

758 *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A New Translation*, p. 152.

759 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 253; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 808–809.

760 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 508–509.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

[12]And those blaspheming [things] which they do not comprehend/of which they are ignorant, like irrational beasts by nature born for capture and destruction, shall be utterly destroyed [as now] they are destroyed, [13]receiving punishment [as] a reward for unrighteousness, considering it a pleasure [indulging in] desire by day, revelling in blemishes and vices in their delusive luxuries, gorging with you, [14]having eyes full of adulteress and not abstaining from sin, enticing uncertain/unstable souls, having hearts trained in greed/covetousness, children of the curse!
[15]Having forsaken the straight path/leaving the straight path/starting to forsake the straight path, they went astray // let themselves be misled/when [only] they left/when [only] they started to leave the straight path, they went astray/were misled, [i. e.] they imitated the way of Balaam, [son of] Bosor, who loved the reward for unrighteousness. [16]And he was accused of his own transgression: the dumb beast of burden, having spoken/by speaking with a human voice, stopped the madness of the prophet.

This relatively long passage 2:9b–22 is devoted to the unrighteous who, in the conviction of the narrator, are not only "slaves" to an erroneous interpretation of prophetic and apostolic teaching concerning the Parousia (verse 19), but also, knowing the correct interpretation, cynically reject it and convince others to do so (verses 14c-15a,18b,20–21). They manifest this primarily by their promiscuous lifestyle (verses 10a,13bc,14ab,18b), arrogance and haughtiness and blasphemy (10b–d); they are also accused of greed (14c-15). It seems that the text from verse 9b onwards develops the characteristics of the false teachers of 2:1b–3, especially since the descriptions of their actions are interspersed with announcements of judgement (cf. 2:3). It is therefore not difficult to see some correspondences between 2:1b–3 and 2:9b–21:

2 Pet 2:1b–3	2 Pet 2:9b–21
False teachers (1b)	Unrighteous (9b)
Deny the Lord who redeemed them (1d)	Despise divine authority (10b) Blasphemy the glories (10c) Through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ they once escaped from the corruption in the world, and then submit to it (20ab)
They bring destruction upon themselves (1e)	Suffer severe punishment for unrighteousness (13a) Their end is worse than their beginning (20c)
Many will follow their indecent acts (2a)	Follow the flesh with impure lust (10a) Promiscuity practised in broad daylight is considered a delight (13b) Have eyes full of promiscuous women and cannot abstain from sinning (14b)

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

2 Pet 2:1b–3	2 Pet 2:9b–21
	Speak pompous words of vanity, they entice into carnal pleasures and debauchery those who do not escape from those living in error. Promise freedom, although they themselves remain slaves to corruption (18–19b)
The way of truth will be defamed (2b)	Having left the straight path, they went astray (15a) It would be better for them not to know the way of righteousness at all than to first know and then reject the holy commandment (21)
Through greed they will exploit with deceptive words (3a)	Experienced greed seduces weak beings (14c)
The verdict on them is not useless, Destruction does not slumber (3b–c)	[The Lord knows] how to keep the unrighteous being punished for the day of judgement (9b)

The description of the actions of the false teachers is supplemented by metaphors and comparisons taken from Jude 8–13 to discredit the heretics maintained, as in Jud, in a vituperative convention. The dependence on Jude is evidenced by lexical and motif similarities, but both Jud's lexis and motifs have been appropriately reworked by Peter,[761] and the *vituperatio* takes on a more biting form by, among other things, the addition at the end of this characterisation of two proverbs, probably well known to the sender and his contemporary audience. Attention is also drawn to the invectives in vocal form against false teachers appearing quite regularly in this passus: τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις "arrogant defilers" (10b/c), σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι "blemishes and vices" (13c), κατάρας τέκνα "sons/children of curse" (14d). They usually function as emotional exclamations summarising or initiating an accusation of some kind.

In addition to the dependence on Jude and the references to 2 Pet 2:1b–3, references to *exordium* can also be seen here. This is primarily in the form of an elaborate catalogue of negative characteristics of false teachers, which appear to be the opposite of the sorites of Christian virtues resulting from baptismal gifts (2 Pet 1:5–7). Furthermore, the rejection of the knowledge/knowledge of Christ and His saving work and Christian conduct (2:20–21) undoubtedly alludes to the situations described as "blindness" or rather "short-sightedness" and "ignoring the cleansing of formerly committed sins" (1:9). In other words – the actions of the false teachers described in 2:9b–22 are at odds with the knowledge of God and Jesus (1:2.8b), the use of baptismal gifts (1:3–8a), and especially with the way and entry into the eternal kingdom (1:11).

The table additionally shows the transition from the future tense in verses 1b–3a to the present tense in the passage detailing the conduct of the false teachers resulting

761 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 260.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

from their misinterpretation of the prophetic and apostolic message. The caesura here is verse 9, which begins with the verb οἶδεν, translated as "knows", which has a universal, timeless meaning. This timelessness is justified here by the subject and theological presuppositions. For the subject is "the Lord", while Theological presuppositions refer to His plans and knowledge of ultimate things (eschatological element) existing before the creation of the world (protological element). More controversial is the use of the present tense in the following verses, especially when the verbs mostly in the form of part. praes. refer to the description of "unrighteous/unjust" actions ἀδίκοι (from verse 9b onwards). This could suggest that the false teachers referred to by the narrator in 2:1b in the future tense had already appeared in the Church during Peter's lifetime. Their presence in the Church would mean that the end-times announced by Peter had already come (cf. 2 Tim 2:16–18, 3:1–9, 4:3–4).[762] Such a solution would bring the message of 2 Peter closer to that of the Letter of Jude, in which the actions and behaviour of false teachers in the community of the letter's recipients are indeed considered one of the signs of the Parousia and eschatological judgement. However, it would not take into account the assumption that 2 Pet is addressed to future generations of Christians. It can be considered that Peter's way of writing in the present tense about the false teachers was taken directly from Jude, as can be seen especially in the combination of motivic and lexical borrowings, but he placed his whole argument in a typical apocalyptic convention in which the present tense often functions as the future tense and therefore they are used interchangeably.[763]

Furthermore, as noted, verse 9 (here 9b) introduces a certain universality into Peter's argument that can be extended to predicates concerning "the unrighteous" living both in the past and those who will appear in the end times. Out of this whole group, the narrator singles out specifically "those" who […] μάλιστα δὲ τούς […]. The present tense serves to emphasise that certain behaviours have always characterised the unjust and ungodly (verses 10–19), and that knowing Jesus Christ, turning away from him and going against Christian ethics not only does not change the situation of the false teachers, who are a special group of unjust and ungodly, during the judgement, but actually makes it worse.

Formally, verse 9b is the second part of the apodosis begun in 9a with the phrase οἶδεν κύριος. This time it concerns "the behaviour of the unrighteous punished on the day of judgement" ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν. The narrator is trying to convince us that the Lord's knowledge is not only about the past, but extends to the present and the future. Lexically, he makes a clear

762 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 736.

763 S.E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood. Studies in Biblical Greek*, New York 1989, p. 403–405.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

reference to the Letter of Jude – he repeats Jude's key verb τηρέω, which on the one hand describes the present position of the unrighteous, like the angels in Tartarus preserved for judgement (cf. 2 Pet 2:4) as if in temporary custody (cf. the use of τηρέω in Matt 27:36.54, Acts 12:5, 16:23), and on the other hand points to what is to be fulfilled on the day of judgement.

The phrase "for the judgement of the great day"[764] εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας, marked with Christological connotations, in 2 Peter is replaced by the simpler phrase "for the day of judgement" εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως (as in 3:7). It occurs in LXX (Prov 6:34, PssSol 15:12), in intertestamental literature (1 En 22:11 with additional phrases) and in the New Testament (Matt 10:15, 11:22.24, 12:36, 1 John 4:17) as equivalent to the day of the Lord (2 Pet 3:10), the day of the Lord's judgement (Isa 34:8) and the day of God (2 Pet 3:12).

"Those preserved for the day of judgement", Peter calls this time ἀδίκοι "the unrighteous". Hitherto he has referred to them as "the ungodly" ἀσεβεῖς (2:5) or "the unrighteous" ἀθέσμοι (2:7), everywhere using the characteristic negation with *α-privativum* Here he contrasts "the unrighteous" with "the pious" εὐσεβεῖς (2:9a). Since, as said, "the pious" are both righteous Old Testament heroes and Christians equipped with everything "necessary for a pious life", "the unrighteous" can be defined here as those who did not keep God's commandments in the past and those who do not keep them at the time of the letter's composition (in the present) and will not do so until the end times. This confirms the suggestion expressed above of a certain universalism in Peter's argument further emphasised by the use of the present tense. The term ἀδίκοι is primarily associated with Jewish tradition. However, through the participle κολαζόμενοι, it is overlaid with associations related to Greek literature, especially Plato, who in the dialogue *Protagoras* (323d–234a) states that "injustice" ἀδικία and "impiety" ἀσέβεια provoke anger, punishment κολάσεις and rebuke:

> But as to all the good things that people are supposed to get by application and practice and teaching, where these are lacking in anyone and only their opposite evils are found, here surely are the occasions for wrath and punishment and reproof. One of them is injustice, and impiety, and in short all that is opposed to civic virtue.

Although there is no doubt as to the basic meaning of the verb κολάζω – 'to punish', 'to inflict punishment' – the contexts in which it occurs in texts of Hellenistic provenance may pose difficulties of interpretation. In the LXX, κολάζω can mean temporal punishment inflicted by humans (1 Macc 7:7, 3 Macc 3:26, 7:3.14, 4 Macc 2:12, 8:6, Wis 11:5.8) and divine punishment (2 Macc 6:14, Wis 3:4, 12:12.14–15), which

764 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 147–148.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

befalls man not only during life but also after death (4 Macc 18:5), with the possibility of it being implemented before and after the final judgement (Matt 25:46). The form of part. praes. passivi used by the narrator of 2 Pet – κολαζόμενοι – indicates that in this case it is undoubtedly a case of punishment inflicted by God, for the passive voice is to be interpreted here as pass. theologicum.

More difficult to interpret seems to be the present tense of the participle.[765] As noted above, its use is conditioned, on the one hand, by the universality of the hagiographer's theses, on the other hand, by the use of apocalyptic conventions, and it should then be regarded as the equivalent of the future tense[766] (cf. also Matt 26:25, Luke 1:35, John 17:20, Acts 21:2–3, where part. praes. has a future meaning). From a grammatical point of view, however, part. praes. describes an action/state contemporaneous with the action/state expressed by the main verb – τηρέω in inf. praes. act. It is therefore impossible to decide clearly whether the narrator of 2 Pet has in mind a punishment that is already being carried out (grammar indicates this) or a punishment that will be carried out in the future (literary convention indicates this). And if it would be a future punishment, does it refer to the time and state between death and the final judgement,[767] or to the time and state that will already occur after the final judgement.[768] The least likely option seems to be that it refers to divine punishment implemented in temporality, although, according to G.L. Green,[769] citing J. Schneider, there were catalogues of temporal punishments for sins in antiquity. These can be reconstructed on the basis of surviving inscriptions. For example, violations of sacredness and cultic laws are most often punished by the deity with illness. However, the punishment can be more severe – death, which affects not only the offender himself, but also his entire family. Probably this kind of temporal punishment was widely expected, and since it did not take place, there was a growing conviction either of the indifference of the divinity/God (cf. Plutarch's treatise *On the Delay of Punishment by the Gods*),[770] or of the abandonment of the Parousia and judgement (2 Pet 3:4), or of the ineffectiveness – inaction – of judgement and the dormancy of punishment (2 Pet 2:3b).

The narrator of 2 Peter tries to polemicise with this belief in various ways. This polemic is also undertaken now: although it seems that the punishment of the unjust is on hold and will be realised (possibly) in some indefinite future, it is in fact already happening. Thus, verse 9b can be taken, like 2:4 and the angel

765 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 282.

766 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 254 points out that the participium futuri form in the New Testament occurs only in Heb 3:5.

767 So, for example, J.D.N. Kelly, T. Fronberg, R. Bauckham; S.J. Kraftchick.

768 So, for example, W. Grundmann, M. Green, K.H. Schelkle.

769 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 814.

770 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:3.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

narrative, as a commentary on 2:3b: τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει "the judgement upon them of old has [already] not been idle, and their destruction is not slumbering". This means that the unrighteous are already "preliminarily" punished by God – κολαζόμενοι. This does not absolutely rule out a final judgement at an eschatological judgement and a final, eschatological punishment in the future, especially since, as pointed out when analysing 2 Pet 2:3b, judgement and sentence are durational and processual: from protological resolution to eschatological fulfilment (cf. also 2 Pet 2:20c).

The conviction that a "preliminary" punishment will be carried out on the ungodly even before the final judgement alludes very clearly to the Jewish apocalyptic tradition.[771] This motif also links the fate and status of the fallen angels with that of the dead unrighteous, a point made clear by the narrator of 2 Peter, treating 2:4 and 2:9b as commentaries on 2:3b, introducing the same lexis (τηρέω, κρίσις) and suggesting that both the state in which the fallen angels are now and the state – punishment – in which the dead unrighteous are in applies until (the day of) judgement: εἰς κρίσιν (verse 4), εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως (verse 9b). In 1 En 22:1–11 there is a description of the place where human souls reside after death:

> These hollow places have been created for this very purpose, that the spirits of the souls of the dead should assemble therein […] till the day of their judgement and till their appointed period […], till the great judgement (comes) upon them. […] These three have been made that the spirits of the dead might be separated. […] And such has been made for sinners when they die and are buried in the earth and judgement has not been executed on them in their lifetime. Here their spirits shall be set apart in this great pain till the great day of judgement and punishment and torment of those who curse for ever and retribution for their spirits.

The posthumous torment of the unrighteous is captured in more detail in 4 Ezra 7:78:

> When the decisive decree has gone forth from the Most High that a man shall die, as the spirit leaves the body to return again to him who gave it […]. And if it is one of those who have shown scorn and have not kept the way of the Most High, and who have despised his law, and who have hated those who fear God – such spirits shall not enter into habitations, but shall immediately wander about in torments, ever grieving and sad, in seven ways. The first way, because they have scorned the law of the Most High. The second way, because they cannot now make a good repentance that they may live. The third way, they shall see the reward laid up for those who have trusted the covenants of the Most High. The fourth

771 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 254; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 814.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> way, they shall consider the torment laid up for themselves in the last days. The fifth way, they shall see how the habitations of the others are guarded by angels in profound quiet. The sixth way, they shall see how some of them will pass over into torments. The seventh way, which is worse than all the ways that have been mentioned, because they shall utterly waste away in confusion and be consumed with shame, and shall wither with fear at seeing the glory of the Most High before whom they sinned while they were alive, and before whom they are to be judged in the last time.

This tradition was taken up by early Christianity. In the NT, Luke's parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31) is the most recognisable text representing it. Hermas, in Similitude IX 18:2, speaks of a double condemnation: "they who have not known God and do evil are condemned to death; but they who have known God, and have seen His mighty works, and still continue in evil, shall be chastised doubly, and shall die forever". More details regarding the posthumous existence of the unrighteous are given in ApPet 20–25. Since the torments of the ungodly are watched by the souls of the murdered, it can be assumed that the description refers to the time before the final judgement, before the resurrection:

> it was the place of punishment; and those who were punished there and the punishing angels […] under them lay fire, burning and punishing them. And there was a great lake, full of flaming mire, in which were certain men that pervert righteousness, and tormenting angels afflicted them. And there were also others, women, hanged by their hair […] and the men who mingled with them in the defilement of adultery, were hanging by the feet and their heads in that mire. […] I saw the murderers and those who conspired with them, cast into a certain strait place, full of evil snakes, and smitten by those beasts, and thus turning to and fro in that punishment; and worms, […] And the souls of the murdered stood and looked upon the punishment of those murderers and said: O God, your judgement is just.

Verse 10 shows a clearer turn towards the future and the eschatological unfolding and resolution of the punishment of the unjust. In order to mark this turn more strongly, the narrator, by means of the adverb μάλιστα, introduces a specification of the behaviour that will be observed in the end times and punished. Henceforth, he no longer speaks generally of "the unjust", including "the unjust" dead, but characterises and evaluates the actions of the false teachers who are active in his day and will appear in the future, just before the Parousia and the judgement. In doing so, as noted above, he elaborates on Themes announced in 2 Pet 2:1b–3a. While the announcements are formulated in the future tense, their development takes place in the present tense, which this time must be attributed mainly to the apocalyptic convention of the text. For it must be remembered that Peter draws

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the material largely from the Letter of Jude, and that this epistle describes the signs of the coming Parousia and judgement using the present tense. This assumption and mode of descriptive writing is also taken up by the narrator of 2 Peter, but, unlike the narrator of Jud, he does not relate them only to the present tense, but also to future times. The punishment is a process from "long ago" until "the great judgement", which is also expressed in the present tense. This means that even on those who will be found alive by the Parousia, God's judgement is still weighing down all the time.

Verse 10 begins with the narrator's description based on Jude 7–9.16. However, he does not use Jude slavishly, but transforms the borrowed elements and adapts them to his vision and to his argument.[772]

2 Pet 2:10	Jude 7.8.9.16	
ὀπίσω σαρκὸς	ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας	Jude 7
ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ	κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτῶν	Jude 16
μιασμοῦ		
πορευομένους	πορευόμενοι	Jude 8
	σάρκα μιαίνουσιν	Jude 8
καὶ κυριότητος	κυρίοτητα	
καταφροντοῦντας	ἀθετοῦσιν	Jude 9
τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις	οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν	Jude 8
δόξας	δόξας	
οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες	βλασφημοῦσιν	
following the flesh	following strange flesh	Jude 7
because of lust	in lust	Jude 16
impure	indulge,	
going,	defile the flesh,	Jude 8
authorities	authorities	Jude 8
despise	are unfaithful	
arrogant	dared not	Jude 9
not afraid to blaspheme the glories	blaspheme the glories	Jude 8

In Jude 7, the characterisation of those who "followed strange flesh" ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας concerns the inhabitants of Sodom who wanted to have sexual intercourse with angels, thus violating God's established order.[773] In 2 Pet 2:10a those who follow "the flesh [led] with impure lust" ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους are false teachers. Perhaps the phrase πορεύομαι ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ was constructed from Jude 16, where it also refers to behaviour attributed to false teachers. One can see here the same technique that was used in combining Jewish and Hellenistic imagery, when in a phrase of Judaic provenance the narrator

772 T. Callan, *Use of the Letter of Jude by the Second Letter by Peter*, "Biblica" 85 (2004), no. 1, p. 52–54.
773 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 152–158.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

inserted a concept from Greek tradition (cf. 1:19b; 2:4b). Now the narrator incorporates elements from Jude 16 and 9 into an image that refers generally to Jude 7 and Jude 8.

The phrase πορεύομαι ὀπίσω occurs relatively frequently in LXX, especially in the context of following foreign gods[774] and pagan customs (1 Macc 1:13–14), i. e. apostasy – abandoning the service of the One God and worshipping other gods (cf. Deut 13:5). It is no coincidence that apostasy in OT is often compared to adultery and/or fornication. This makes it possible for Peter's narrative to be understood on two levels – on the literal level as leading a promiscuous lifestyle (cf. 2:18) and on the metaphorical level as departing from Jesus Christ, which the author of 2 Peter has already mentioned *expressis verbis* (1:9, 2:1) and to which he will return (2:20.21).

The reference to lust is also primarily associated with sexuality.[775] This association the narrator seems to maintain here, linking lust to the "following of the flesh" and giving the phrase ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ[776] a causal meaning. However, such an explicit, unambiguous sexualisation of desire, further emphasised by the noun μιασμός 'impurity', 'defilement', is something unique in 2 Peter. The other contexts in which the term ἐπιθυμία is placed allow its semantic field to be extended to include non-sexual aspects (cf. 1:4, 2:19, 3:3). This extension brings the Petrine text closer to the sapiential literature, where "lust" could refer, among other things, to all passion in general, to indulge in which is tantamount to folly and ridicule (Sir 18:30), and to Jude 16c, where it signifies a lack of self-control, being guided by one's own will, seeking to satisfy needs not only of a physical nature but also of a psychological and emotional nature, all combined with contesting the will of God.[777]

The genitive case μιασμοῦ can be interpreted as gen. obiectivus or subiectivus. The first variant would mean that the false teachers wish to defile, pollute (the body); the second variant – more likely – that it is lust that causes the body to be defiled, polluted,[778] hence the frequent translation of the phrase ἐπιθυμία μιασμοῦ as "impure lust". The imagery undoubtedly refers to Jude 8, where the verb μιαίνω referred to the body and was clearly sexual in nature.[779] Here – although the noun μιασμός formally collocates with lust – it affects a sexualised perception of both lust and, to a somewhat lesser extent, the body. Generally, the term μιασμός

774 Deut 4:3, 6:14, 8:19, 28:14, Judg 2:12.17.19, 1 Kings 11:10, 18:18.21, 2 Kings 17:15, 1 Kings 5:25, Hos 5:11, Jer 2:5.23.25, 7:9, 8:2, 13:10, 25:6.

775 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 255.

776 In some testimonies (including C and P) the plural appears here presumably as a result of harmonisation with Jude 16c.

777 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 302.

778 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 336.

779 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 166.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

refers to colourful stains on clothing, fabric. However, it is usually given a pejorative meaning and the stain is interpreted as dirt, uncleanness in the moral and/or religious sense.[780] In Jewish tradition, polluting, defiling is associated both with indecency and promiscuity in general (see e. g., Josephus Flavius *Bell. Iud.* IV 5:2) and strictly with sexuality, adultery, fornication and debauchery (e. g., Wis 14:26, TBenj 2:2, Jub 7:20–21). Peter chooses the latter meaning (cf. 2:20, with a general meaning of τὰ μιάσματα), which allows him to strike a balance between the literalism and vituperative accusations of the false teachers of sexual promiscuity, and the metaphoricism and portrayal of the pseudo-teachers as apostates abandoning Jesus and the Christian community with its maximalist morality.

In this literal – sexual – and metaphorical – apostatic – context, "the body" σάρξ seems to be valued negatively. Most likely, the narrator uses the term similarly to the apostle Paul – as a synonym for man's sinful and weak nature (cf. Rom 7:18.25, 8:4–7, Gal 5:13.24, Col 2:23)[781] and as an antonym for spiritual values. He draws on both Greek philosophy and the late Jewish tradition in this assessment. In a similar vein, Plutarch in *That Epicurus Actually Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* (*Moralia* 1087B; 1096C) claims that "every agreeable stirring of the flesh that is transmitted upward to give some pleasure and delight to the mind […] [which is] depriving these men of life"; "Instead they lay the contemplative part of the soul flat in the body and use the appetites of the flesh as leaden weights to hold it down […]. Do they not in similar fashion play swineherd to the soul, feeding it only on this swill of the bodily pleasures, permitting it to delight only in the hope or experience or recollection of some carnal thing".[782] In the intertestamental literature, mastery over the flesh is linked with piety and rationality, submission to the flesh with sinfulness and lack of reason (4 Macc 7:18: "But as many as attend to piety with a whole heart, these alone are able to control the passions of the flesh"; TJud 3:45: "I sinned as a man and as flesh, being corrupted through sins"; TZeb 2:31: "because they are flesh, and are deceived through their own wicked deeds"). Philo in *Quod Deus sit immutabilis* XXX 143 even argues that the love of wisdom and knowledge cannot be reconciled with the folly of the flesh:

> And know that this way is wisdom. For the mind being guided by wisdom, while the road is straight and level and easy, proceeds along it to the end; and the end of this road is the knowledge and understanding of God. […] for there is no one thing so much at variance with another, as knowledge is at variance with the pleasure of the flesh. Accordingly,

780 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 195.

781 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 820.

782 Plutarch, *That Epicurus Actually Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible*, [in:] *Plutarch's Moralia in sixteen volumes*, vol.14, London 1967, p. 21, 81.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the earthly Edom is always fighting with those who wish to proceed by this road οὐδεν ἀντίπαλον ὡς ἐπιστήμη σαρκὸς ἡδονῇ.

In verse 10b, the unrighteous deserving of judgement are described as those who despise dominion. The term κυριότης can be variously translated. In Col 1:16, Eph 1:21, 1 En 61:10, 2 En 20:1 and in early Christian literature – AscIsa 2:22 and in *The Stromata* V 11:77 by Clement of Alexandria it refers to angels, but in all these texts the plural forms are used.[783] In the singular it indicates – as in Jude 8c – the reign of Jesus Christ.[784] It is no coincidence that so many times the author of 2 Peter refers to Jesus as Lord (1:2.8.11.14.16, 2:9.11.20, 3:2.8–10.15.18), although R. Bauckham, for example, argues that κυριότης should refer to the authority of God rather than the authority of Christ.[785] It seems, however, that Peter deliberately does not make a clear distinction and an unambiguous, disjunctive reference to God or Jesus. For the mention of contempt for authority is directly linked to the rejection of the prophetic and apostolic doctrine of the Parousia, which is, after all, based on the conviction that all authority, and especially (post)eschatological dominion over all nations, has been delegated by God to Jesus. This was confirmed by the transfiguration vision (1:16–18), which inaugurated Jesus' eschatological authority and anticipated his Parousia as Judge and Ruler. Already in 2:1 the narrator had accused the false teachers of rejecting the Ruler; now he adds to this an accusation of contempt for the authority. In 2:1 it was about the person of Jesus and his redemptive work; now, it seems, it is about the whole teaching of his presence, coming and eschatological reign. This suggestion is confirmed by early Christian literature.[786] According to Didache 4:1, "for in the place whence lordly rule is uttered, there is the Lord", and Hermas in Similitude V 6:3 interprets, like Peter, the Jewish tradition about the transfer of authority to the messiah in a Christological spirit and emphasises that Jesus "is the Lord of the people, having received all authority from His Father".

Contempt for Jesus and his lordship is described by the verb καταφρονέω in part. praes. act. – καταφρονοῦντας. In Greek and Hellenistic literature it is the antonym of showing respect, honouring.[787] Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* VI 5:3 conveys contempt

783 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 167. M. Luther sees secular authority in lordship: kings, princes, lords, municipal authorities, civil courts: "Wherefore this is St. Peter's meaning: that [people] should be subject and obedient to civil magistracy; as the sword is introduced by God's ordinance, stand thou in fear!", *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther* II (V.10, 11).

784 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 336.

785 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 255.

786 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 167.

787 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 824.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

for Saul with this verb: "For although there were some of them that contemned him before οἳ πρότερον αὐτοῦ κατεφρόνουν, they now changed their minds, and honoured him, and esteemed him as the best of men". In relation to the deity it signifies contempt, lack of humility, impudence and impiety: "Jehoash, Jehoahaz, […] guilty of as wicked practices as those that first had God in contempt" οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονήσαντες (*Ant.* IX 8:5); "contemning καταφρονοῦντας God, and his commands, when by those commands they left the land of Egypt" (*Ant.* III 1:4). This attitude is also manifested in disobedience: "that he himself should be so grossly despised and disobeyed by them καταφρονεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ παρακούεσθαι as that a meer man that was a King would not bear […]. He then looks upon himself as affronted καταφρονεῖσθαι not when any one does not sacrifice; but when any one appears to be disobedient" (*Ant.* VI 7:4). In the NT, it primarily means discrediting, belittling someone's importance, significance, value[788] (Matt 18:10, Rom 2:4, 1 Cor 11:22, 1 Tim 4:12). This often involves resentment or abandonment of service to a despised and disrespected ruler (Matt 6:24, Luke 16:13, 1 Tim 6:2). This aspect also seems to be emphasised by the narrator of 2 Peter, for whom contempt for the lordship of Jesus (and the rejection of him as Ruler) is not merely declarative and theoretical, but has a very concrete practical dimension, for it involves the manifestation of disobedience through the rejection of God's commandments and Christian morality.

In verse 10c, the narrator calls "the unrighteous/unjust" ἀδίκοι "arrogant/insolent" τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις. On the one hand, these epithets can be taken as a vocativus and a summary of the characterisation of the false teachers so far, especially with regard to the active contempt shown for Jesus as Ruler/Owner and Lord. On the other hand, formally, it should rather be combined as a nominative subject with the last segment of verse 10: δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες "are not afraid to blaspheme the glories". The two terms appear to be closely synonymous and negatively valued and appear together in early Christian literature (cf. *1 Clem.* 30:8: "Boldness, and arrogance, and audacity θράσος καὶ αὐθάδεια καὶ τόλμα belong to those that are accursed of God"), but in fact it is the adjective αὐθάδεις that gives the noun τολμηταί its pejorative meaning. This is further compounded by the context and the vituperative convention of the text borrowed from Jude. For the term τολμητής itself can be used in a quite neutral or even positive sense when it describes a courageous and bold man.[789] This is how it is referred to, for example, in Mark 15:43 by Joseph of Arimathea, who τολμήσας – having been bold, having shown courage went to Pilate to ask for the body of Jesus to be released (cf. also Rom 5:7, Phil 1:14). Philo uses it when he characterises

788 Ibid., p. 823.

789 Ibid., p. 829.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Jude, the fourth son of Jacob and Leia: "he was one of a daring πολμητής character, combined with modesty, and full of true courage" (*De Josepho* XXXVIII 222).

The verb τολμάω or its noun derivatives can also have a negative meaning, as in *Ant.* XX 9:1, where Flavius characterises "Ananus, who, […] took the High Priesthood, was a bold man θρασύς in his temper, and very insolent πολμητής" or in *Bell. Iud.* III 10 where the Jews are characterised by Titus with a slight derision as

> very bold, and great despisers of death καὶ σφόδρα τολμηταὶ καὶ θανάτου καταφρονοῦντες, […] but a disorderly body, and unskilful in war, and may rather be called a rout than an army […]. It is boldness and rashness τόλμα καὶ θράσος, the effects of madness, that conduct the Jews. Those passions indeed make a great figure when they succeed, but are quite extinguished upon the least ill success.

In a similar sense as hardiness, audacity, excessive boldness, the lex τολμα- also appears in biblical literature – Esther 7:5, Jdt 14:13, 2 Macc 4:2, Rom 15:18, 1 Cor 6:1, 2 Cor 11:21. The author of 2 Peter was most likely guided by the context in which this verb was used by Jude when describing the behaviour of the archangel Michael towards the devil accusing Moses: οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας "dared not bring the judgement of blasphemy/over blasphemy" (Jude 9).[790] He will allude to Jude 9 even more explicitly in verse 11, but here he points out how the false teachers will be bold before God, men and angels, seeking to take away God's judicial prerogatives – hence the use of the phrase τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις.

In contrast to the noun τολμηταί, the adjective αὐθάδεις (sometimes used as a noun) is valued negatively regardless of the context. It denotes an arrogant, self-centred, self-willed person, sometimes boastful and proud (as in Prov 21:24), disrespectful of others, conceited (as in Titus 1:7). Philo and Flavius combine arrogance with quarrelsomeness. The former, in *De vita Mois.* I XXIV:139 cites the opinion of the Egyptians about Pharaoh delivered after the death of the first-born: "For if […] immediately when Moses […] first came to him he had allowed his nation to depart, we should never have experienced any one of the miseries that have befallen us at all. But he yielded to his natural obstinacy and haughtiness αὐθαδείᾳ, and so we have reaped the ready reward of his unreasonable contentiousness". Flavius, on the other hand, in *Bell. Iud.* VI 2:10 referred to arrogance, self-righteousness and insolence, and painted a portrait of Jonathan, who

> uttered many other insolent things to the Romans; […] Some of them also reasoned thus, and that justly enough, that it was not fit to fight with a man that desired to die: […] a violence in attacking men that could not be opposed: and had no regard to God himself.

790 T. Callan, *Use of Letter of Jude*, p. 53.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> And that to hazard ones self with a person, whom if you overcome you do no great matter; and by whom it is hazardous that you may be taken prisoner; would be an instance not of manly courage, but of unmanly rashness. […] the Jew cutting them with a great number of reproaches, as cowards: […] one whose name was Pudens, […] out of his abomination of the other's words βδελυξάμενος αὐτοῦ ῥήματα καὶ τὸ αὔθαδες […] ran out to him.

Also in early Christian literature, the adjective αὐθάδης describes arrogance, self-will and overconfidence. It is very often juxtaposed with other negative traits, as in *1 Clem.* 1:1 – "we feel that we have been somewhat tardy in turning our attention to the points respecting which you consulted us; and especially to that shameful and detestable sedition, utterly abhorrent to the elect of God, which a few rash and self-confident persons have kindled to such a pitch of frenzy" ὀλίγα πρόσωπα προπετῆ καὶ αὐθάδῃ; or in Similitude IX 22:1 in *The Shepherd*: "slow to learn, and obstinate, and pleasing themselves, wishing to know everything, and knowing nothing at all", or in *Didache* 3: "neither self-willed nor evil-minded, for out of all these blasphemies are engendered".

Peter uses as an illustration of the behaviour of "the arrogant" the phrase "they are not afraid to blaspheme the glories" referring to Jude 8: δόξας βλασφημοῦσιν "blaspheme the glories". It is difficult to make clear how the author of the letter understands glories, whether he shares Jude's understanding or gives the concept a different meaning. Three basic interpretations of the noun δόξαι are usually indicated. First, "the glories" may point to God himself or Jesus, who received "honour and glory" from God the Father (2 Pet 1:16).[791] Secondly, on the principle of synecdoche referring to angels as reflectors and carriers of God's glory, angels themselves may be so designated (cf. Exod 15:11 in LXX and the phrases "the angels of the glory" in TLev 5:20; "the powers of glory" in TJud 4:29).[792] Thirdly and finally, it is about people who are held in special esteem and regarded as authorities, who in Jewish tradition are often referred to נכבד.[793] The nounנכבד obviously has the same root as כבוד יהוה "praise the Lord", both being derivations of the verb כבד "to be momentous, honoured".[794] Given the enigmatic, ambiguous and symbolic language typical of apocalyptic, all three variants are possible, especially since the noun δόξα occurs here in the plural.

The first option, theological and/or Christological, would imply that the rejection of the Parousia and the eschatological authority of Jesus for the author of 2 Peter is a blasphemy that demands judgement and punishment. This would be a reference

791 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 190.

792 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 194.

793 Gen 34:19, Num 22:15, Ps 149:8, Isa 3:5, 23:8, 34:4, 49:5, Nah 3:10, 1 QM 14:11, 1QpHab 4:2, 4QpNah 2:9, 3:9, 4:4.

794 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 194.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to the transfiguration scene and the commentary in 2 Pet 1:17 about the honour and glory τιμὴ καὶ δόξα that Jesus received from God the Father and the voice that rang out from the sublime glory μεγαλοπορεπὴς δόξα. The direct reference to 1:17 would explain well the use of the plural noun δόξαι – it would be about the glory given to Jesus and the periphrastic identification of God the Father as the "sublime Glory".[795]

The angelological variant has the most supporters.[796] It is supposed to be indicated by verse 11, where it is mentioned that the angels did not judge before the Lord concerning blasphemers. A certain reciprocity is assumed here in advance, which, however, has no plausible support: false teachers commit blasphemy against angels, angels do not respond "with a blasphemous judgement" βλάσφημος κρίσις against false teachers.[797] An interesting version of angelological interpretation is presented by R. Bauckham,[798] followed by Peter Hugh Davids.[799] It is based on the distinction between" the glories" in verse 10c and "the angels" in verse 11. Δόξαι would mean evil, fallen angels, ἄγγελοι angels serving God. Associated with the adoption of this version is the reference of the phrase κατ᾽ αὐτῶν "against them" in verse 11 not to false teachers, but to δόξαι. The false teachers would thus have defamed the evil, fallen angels, although even the good angels, who have greater strength and power, did not bring a blasphemous lawsuit against them – the evil angels – (or pass a blasphemous judgement against them). However, it is difficult to specify what this defamation of the fallen angels would consist of, whether in judging their conduct that led to the fall, or in cursing them,[800] or in denying their existence, or perhaps in mocking their present situation – being bound and placed in Tartarus awaiting judgement (2:4).

Option three would have to be considered in conjunction with option one. The mocked glories would then be the apostles and prophets teaching about the Parousia and the reign of Jesus, inaugurated when God the Father gave glory to Jesus. False teachers would dismiss their teaching as σεσοφισμένοι μύθοι "sophisticated myths" (1:16) and πλαστοὶ λόγοι "deceptive words" (2:3). This would agree with the anthropological understanding of "glories" in Jude 8, where the term also points

795 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:17.

796 So, among others, G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 832; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 283.

797 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:11.

798 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 261.

799 P.H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter*, p. 522.

800 Being the opposite of blessings, curses against rebellious angels appear, among others, in Qumran literature – 4Q280 2–5, 4Q287 11–12; see K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, Expecting Mercy, p. 184.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to communitarian authorities that false teachers discredit in order to take their place.[801]

The false teachers spread their blasphemies against the glories without fear, in fact without trembling. For the verb τρέμω means 'to tremble', 'to shake'. In LXX it is used, among other things, to describe a trembling of the earth (Ps 104[103]:32, Jer 4:24) or a shaking from the cold (1 Ezra 9:6), a trembling, shaky step (1 Sam 15:32). More often, however, it is used in a religious context, when it characterises a person's attitude before God as an expression of *tremendum* (Isa 66:2.5, Dan 10:11, cf. Mark 5:33, Luke 8:47). It is most likely that the narrator of 2 Peter has the latter meaning in mind. The use of this verb fits well with both the apocalyptic and ambiguous style of the entire passage, for it does not resolve the doubts surrounding Peter's understanding of the glories. On the one hand, it seems to confirm the first option – since man trembles in the face of God, it is the arrogant audacity of the false teachers to take the opposite attitude towards God/Jesus. On the other hand, one must bear in mind the development of angelology in intertestamental times and the increasingly noticeable, strengthening status of angels as autonomous and powerful entities to be respected. This is why even New Testament literature emphasises the natural fear of people of angels (Matt 28:5, Luke 1:13.30, 2:9–10).[802] When describing the attitude of the false teachers as a lack of fear of angels, the narrator of 2 Pet would have in mind primarily the role these spiritual beings will play during the Parousia and final judgement.[803] Images are provided by Jewish apocalypticism, which depicts angels as participants in God's judgement and executors of the punishment that has been ordeed. In 1 En 9:1–10:20, in the description of the situation preceding the destruction of the earth by the Flood, which is an anticipation of the final judgement (cf. 2 Pet 3:6–7), it is the angels who present to God the complaints of the people against the ungodly/ungodliness and carry out God's orders related to the punishment of all those responsible for ungodliness on earth. Azazel is bound by Raphael and cast into darkness, into the wilderness, and "on the day of the great judgement he shall be cast into the fire". Gabriel is to destroy the giants and the ungodly, while Michael is to bind the companions of the rebellious Semjaza, placing them "in the valleys of the earth, till the day of their judgement and of their consummation, till the judgement that is for ever and ever is consummated". Michael, moreover, is to "destroy all the spirits of the reprobate and the children of the Watchers, because they have wronged mankind. Destroy all wrong from the face of the earth". In other words, the angels, at the command of God – the Judge, are to "cleanse […] the earth from all oppression,

801 Ibid., p. 174.

802 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 833.

803 J.H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 213.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

and from all unrighteousness, and from all sin, and from all godlessness: and all the uncleanness that is wrought upon the earth". This tradition is known and used by other New Testament writers, especially the authors of Matthew and Revelation (Matt 13:39.41.49, 16:27, 24:31, 25:31, Rev 7:2, 8:2.6–9:15, cf. 2 Thess 1:7). The role of angels as executors of God's judgements and destroyers of evil and lawlessness was also revealed during the destruction of Sodom (Gen 19:12–13.24), to which – like the Flood – the narrator of 2 Peter refers in an anticipatory and warning manner in 2:6.

But the third option – the false teachers' lack of fear of blasphemy against the prophets and apostles – is also defensible. The position of the prophets, understood here very broadly as all those who, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, communicate God's word to the people (cf. 2 Pet 1:19–21), was very strong. In intertestamental times, some of them were regarded as righteous, i. e. uncompromisingly fulfilling God's will, and as righteous even before the final judgement they were given the honour of being close to God (Abraham, Moses, Enoch), usually after having been angelized beforehand. 2 En 22:6–10 describes Enoch's transformation, symbolised by the change of garments from earthly to glorious: "And Michael […] anointed me, and dressed me […] and I looked at myself, and (I) was like (transfigured) one of his glorious ones" (ApAbr 13). Abraham undergoes a similar transformation in Rev 13. Like the angels, the prophets know God's plans and intentions for the world. Some of these intentions, moreover, they conveyed in their messages. Since their status is similar to that of the angels as messengers proclaiming God's will, calling for repentance and repentance, and especially announcing the coming of God's judgement, fear of themselves and fear of what they proclaim seems natural. By blaspheming them, i. e. by questioning the credibility of the message concerning the Parousia, the judgement and the reign of Jesus, the false teachers manifest a lack of fear of the announced judgement.

The options presented are not mutually exclusive; moreover, read in an eschatological-juridical key, they are complementary to each other. The false teachers do not feel fear of the Parousia and the judgement proclaimed by the prophets, they do not fear the angels as participants in judgement and executors of God's judgements, and finally they do not tremble either before God or before Jesus, to whom God has delegated the power of judgement and dominion. This complementary view translates into an understanding of the essence of blasphemy, which was defined when analysing 2 Pet 2:2 as 'defamation', 'insulting', 'saying offensive things' about both divinity/God and people.[804] Such public defamation was considered a crime and resulted in a lawsuit. Peter's mention of blaspheming the glories therefore implies almost automatically a court and punishment.

804 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:2.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

In verse 11, the audacity of the false teachers described previously is contrasted with the attitude of the angels. The whole poem depends on Jude 9, but significant changes have been made to the source text.

2 Pet 2:11	Jude 9
ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύι καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ᾽ αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν	ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ἀρχάγγελος ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν ἐπενεγκεῖν κρίσιν βλασφημίας ἀλλ᾽ εἶπεν ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κυρίος
while angels being of greater strength and power do not bring against them in front of/before the Lord a blasphemous judgement/verdict	And Michael the archangel When he contending with the devil About the body of Moses Dared not bring The judgement of blasphemy But said: May the Lord rebuke/punish you

First of all, the author of 2 Peter omits the narrative concerning the dispute between the archangel Michael and the devil over the body of Moses, based on the text The Assumption of Moses, popular in Jewish circles.[805] He also changed the *dramatis personae*: angels appear instead of the archangel Michael; the role of the devil is taken over by false teachers. All that remains of the source material is the mention that the angels (formerly the archangel Michael) do not bring the blasphemous judgement.

The omission of the entire narrative setting is sometimes explained in various ways. T. Fornberg[806] argues that this is due to the unfamiliarity of 2 Peter's audience with the Jewish tradition concerning the death and post-mortem fate of Moses, and thus the history of the dispute between the archangel Michael and the devil over the patriarch's body. Therefore, instead of pointing to the archangel Michael, Peter only mentions angels in general terms, who do not bring an accusation or pass judgement

805 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 177–180.

806 T. Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralitic Society*, p. 54.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

against blasphemers. R. Bauckham[807] sees the reason as Peter's ignorance of the history of the dispute over the body of Moses, which entailed a misunderstanding of the message of Jude's narrative. An unlikely thesis is that J.D.N. Kelly[808] also echoed by T.R. Schreiner,[809] that the narrator of 2 Peter omitted Jude's references to the apocryphal Assumption of Moses, the text most likely to be the source for Jude 9, not wanting it to be treated on a par with the canonical writings. However, it must be taken into account that at the time of the composition of both the Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter, canons of OT and NT writings did not yet exist, the question of the normativity and authority of specific writings and the discussion of the criteria for their canonicity was only just emerging in Christian and Jewish circles. Moreover, elsewhere, the narrator of 2 Peter is not reluctant to draw on texts that ultimately did not enter either canon. P. Perkins[810] rightly points out that Peter leaves out from the story cited in Jude 9 only those elements that serve and fit his argument. The narrative concerning the dispute over Moses' body does not add anything substantial to the story and is therefore omitted, in contrast to the mention of the angels' withdrawal from passing judgement/judgement on the blasphemers, which serves to contrast the audacity of the slanderers and the humility of the angels. G.L. Green[811] agrees with P. Perkins' assertions and adds that such a far-reaching transformation of the source material, including modification of the message and intention, is not far from the ancient adaptation practice known as *imitatio*. As evidence, he cites the opinion of Horace, who considered such reworking to be creative in contrast to slavish adherence to the original text, which he compared to staying in a tight well. According to T. Callan,[812] the reason for the omission of Jude's narrative may have been that the contrast between Michael's refraining from judging the devil and the behaviour of the false teachers described in 2:10b–c was too small or not clear.

Connectivity between verse 10c and verse 11 is based on the contrast between the audacity of the false teachers who blaspheme "the glories" and the humility of the angels who do not bring judgement against the blasphemers.[813] Advocates of the angelic interpretation of the glories of verse 10c, see in the attitude of the angels a direct response to human slander against them: defamed by false teachers, the mighty heavenly entities do not take revenge and take no action against the

807 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 261.

808 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 338.

809 T.R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, Nashville 2003, p. 348.

810 P. Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James and Jude*, Louisville 1995, p. 184.

811 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 837–839.

812 T. Callan, *Use of Letter of Jude*, p. 54.

813 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 191; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 835.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

blasphemers.[814] One can partially agree with this – verse 11 does indeed describe the angels' reaction to blasphemies, but there is no indication that these are blasphemies only against the angels. An interpretation using a complementary understanding of "praise" seems more reasonable: angels do not take action against those who insult God, Jesus, the prophets and themselves. It can be inferred that – as in Jude 9 – they leave the conduct of judgement to the Lord.

Such a complementary approach is also confirmed by a more detailed analysis of the narrator's transformations of the Jude material 2 Peter. As already mentioned, the narrator has made significant changes to the *dramatis personae* and has heavily reduced the narrative element. Although he does not mention the dispute over Moses' body itself, he does make use of its components: the parties to the dispute and its substance.[815] The parties are the archangel Michael (here the angels) and the devil (here the false teachers). The object of the dispute is the body of Moses (this element the author of 2 Peter omits). Archangel Michael suggests that it should be buried with the honours due to the patriarch, leader and guide of God's people, or even taken to heaven, just as another righteous (and) prophet, Enoch (later also Elijah), was taken to heaven. This is opposed by the devil. What is relevant here is the reason for the devil's objection, who commits blasphemy in defence of his reasons. It is to question the righteousness of Moses, who committed the murder of an Egyptian in his youth. By recalling and exaggerating this episode, the devil not only slanders Moses (blasphemes Moses) and denies him justice, but also undermines the will of God (blasphemes God), on whose behalf the archangel Michael acts. This development is omitted formally by both hagiographers, although in Jude 9 it is implied by the very mention that Michael was in dispute with the devil. It is clear, however, that the devil's blasphemy does not affect the other party to the dispute – Michael – but Moses and God himself. This perspective also seems to be taken up by the narrator of 2 Peter: it is not the angels who are the objects of blasphemy (or at least they are not the main and only objects), but primarily the prophets (like Moses), who are denied credibility when they announce the Parousia and the coming of God's judgement. The discrediting of a prophetic message based on the word of God automatically entails questioning the credibility of that word, so it also strikes at God. A tabular presentation will make it easier to see these parallels:

814 Ibid.

815 See the reconstruction of *The Testament of Moses*, [in:] R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 67–76, for an early Christian reception of *The Testament of* Moses, [in:] R. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives*, p. 243.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

	Jude 9	2 Pet 2:11
Party to the dispute	Archangel Michael	angels
Party to the dispute	devil	false teachers
Subject of the dispute	the body of Moses	prophets
Essence of the dispute	The righteousness of Moses	The credibility of the prophetic message on judgement and the Parousia; The reliability of God's word on the orchard and the Parousia; (the role of angels during the final judgement).

The contrast between the attitude of the false teachers and the reaction of the angels is conveyed in a manner typical of *vituperatio* – by discrediting and belittling their opponents. This is done by emphasising the superior status in every respect of the angels referred to as ἰσχύι και δυνάμει μείζονες ὄνες literally "being of greater strength and power". The juxtaposition of the closely synonymous nouns ἰσχὺς καὶ δύναμις "strength and power" can be taken as hendiadys and translated as "strong strength", i. e. strength superior not only to the essentially weak false teachers, but also to all human strength. However, it is more likely that merism has been applied here.

In biblical literature, the juxtapositions of "strength and power" – with the same terms as in 2 Pet 2:11 or their synonyms – are used when describing great human power (Deut 8:17, 1 Kings 12:22, Jdt 5:3, Zech 4:6) and divine might (Deut 3:24, 1 Kings 29:11, Wis 12:17, Eph 1:19, Rev 5:12, 7:12). The noun "power" or "might" often appears in a military context as equivalent to an army (2 Kings 26:11, 1 Macc 3:19.27.42, 6:29.33.56, 7:2.4, 10:2.6.21.36.48, 11:1.3.38–40, 12:45–46, 15:10.12), also an angelic army (Ps 148:2, Dan 3:61). These military connotations seem justified here, especially when one considers the apocalyptic-eschatological orientation of Peter's argument. In the last days, according to the Apocalypse of John (Rev 12:7), among others, there will be a clash in heaven between Michael and his angels and the dragon (Satan) and his angels, and Jesus' Parousia will take place assisted by armies/angelic hosts (Matt 24:29–31, Rev 19:4). *The War Scroll* describes an eschatological war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness (the sons of Belial), in which hosts of angels will be involved on the side of the former:

> For you have a multitude of holy ones in the heavens and hosts of angels in Your exalted dwelling […]. The b]ook) of the names of all their host is with You in Your holy dwelling, and […] in the abode of Your glory. […] The covenant of peace You engraved for them with a stylus of life in order to reign […] commissioning the hos[ts of] Your [e]lect […] together with Your holy ones [and] Your angels, and directing them in battle […]. With

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> the elect of heaven [they] shall prev[ail]. […] a host of angels are with our commissioned forces (1QM 12:1–8).

1 En 1:4 foretells that in the end times "the eternal God will tread upon the earth, (even) on Mount Sinai, […] And appear in the strength of His might from the heaven of heaven". This means that God's power and might is realised, among other things, through the actions of his hosts – the angels, who, incidentally, in OT are called οἱ ἄγγελοι δυνατοὶ ἰσχύι "mighty in strength" (Ps 103[102]:20, and in NT metonymically even "powers" (Rom 8:38).

Angels do not bring judgement against false teachers ἄγγελοι […] οὐ φέρουσιν κατ᾽ αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν. As already noted, lawsuits were brought for blasphemy – both against a deity and against people – in ancient societies. For the insult should be avenged. Meanwhile, the angels waive vengeance, i. e. judgement and passing judgement. The noun κρίσις here has a double meaning, although the additions κατ᾽ αὐτῶν "against them" and especially παρὰ κυρίῳ "before/in front of the Lord" indicate a trial rather than a judgement. Examples of angels bringing a trial can be found in Jewish literature, where one of the primary angelic functions was intercessory and accusatory.[816] 1 En 9:1–11 describes how Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Uriel brought a complaint to God against Azazel, Semjaza and other rebellious angels and giants who had contributed to great wickedness and immorality on earth. The angels were not acting on their own behalf, but as spokesmen for the people who had experienced this wickedness: "the souls of those who have died are crying and making their suit to the gates of heaven, and their lamentations have ascended: and cannot cease because of the lawless deeds which are wrought on the earth. And Thou knowest all things before they come to pass, and Thou seest these things" (1 En 9:10–11). Perhaps a similar intercessory and accusatory role for the angels was what the author of 2 Peter had in mind. It would seem, then, that the narrator's thought is clear here: although the angels would have the power to bring the blasphemers to trial, they do not initiate legal proceedings. This issue, however, is complicated by the prefixing of the noun κρίσις with the adjective βλάσφημος "blasphemous", meaning that a trial brought by the angels would be a blasphemous trial.[817]

The phrase κρίσις βλάσφημος "blasphemous trial/judgement" is undoubtedly taken from Jude 9, where the variant κρίσις βλασφημίας "judgement of blasphemy"

816 D. Iwański, *Wstawiennicy i Oskarżyciele, czyli aniołowie w akcji* (*1 Hen 90,13–19*), [in:] *Apokaliptyka judaizmu i wczesnego chrześcijaństwa*, ed. M.S. Wróbel, Lublin 2010, p. 69. 76.

817 In translations βλάσφημον κρίσιν is rendered as "blasphemous judgement" (ESV); "to condemn" (NIV); "a reviling accusation" (NKJV); "an abusive judgement" (New American Standard Bible); "a slanderous judgement" (NET).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

appears.[818] The context and the wishful utterance of the archangel Michael "May the Lord punish you" allow Michael to refrain from "judgement of blasphemy" to be interpreted as leaving the judgement on the devil to God. It would be blasphemy for the archangel to exceed his own competence and to assume God's function of judge.[819] It is not possible, however, to carry these connotations over to 2 Pet 2:11. For it is clearly stated in the text that "the blasphemous process" would be brought before the Lord, which means that the Lord would not be deprived of the function of judge. Various attempts are therefore made to explain this problematic formula. According to P. Perkins[820] οὐ φέρουσιν κατ᾽ αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν means that angels do not bring before the Lord (παρὰ κυρίῳ) the blasphemies uttered by false teachers as evidence against them. G.L. Green[821] in his explanation draws on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (II 2:5–6), which argues that "retaliation is not insult, but punishment".[822] This would imply that the narrator of 2 Peter uses the phrase "blasphemous trial" ironically and yet elliptically. If the angels were to bring the false teachers to trial, it would not be the same insult committed by the slanderers, but a just retaliation (revenge) for the blasphemies. The angels, however, deviate from this and do not engage in condemnatory legal proceedings. R. Bauckham[823] argues that this phrase should be read in the light of verse 10c: false teachers are not afraid to use slander, angels, on the other hand, when they pass judgement from the Lord (παρὰ κυρίου),[824] do not pay back, i. e. do not insult those under trial.

It seems that the key to understanding the "blasphemous trial/judgement" should be sought somewhat further than in the immediate vicinity of this phrase. Peter's argumentation constantly oscillates around the statement in 2 Pet 2:3b: "judgement on them is not ide, and their destruction does not slumber". Seemingly, this seems to be the case, which emboldens false teachers to question the reliability of the prophecies concerning the Parousia and eschatological judgement. Why it seems that "judgement is idle and destruction slumbers", the narrator has already explained in 2:4 and 2:9b: the angels who have sinned and the unrighteous are not ultimately punished immediately, but are "preserved for the judgement" that will come with Jesus' Parousia. Now to these explanations he adds another: it seems that "the judgement is idle" and "the destruction slumbers" because the angels "do not bring

818 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 183–186.

819 Ibid., p. 185–186.

820 P. Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James and Jude*, p. 184.

821 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 841,843.

822 Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, p. 107.

823 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 261; F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 185.

824 R. Bauckham uses the variant παρὰ κυρίου "from the Lord", which appears, among others, in P^{72}; see also B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commetary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart–New York 1994, p. 633.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

a trial" against the blasphemers. If they did, they would themselves be committing blasphemy by challenging the judgement that had long since been passed on the unjust (cf. ἔκπαλαι – 2:3b) and initiating the final judgement. Only God knows when the judgement will come and the sentence will be executed – this element will be particularly emphasised in 3:9–10 (cf. Matt 24:36, Mark 13:32). "The blasphemous trial/judgement" thus signifies – as in Jude 9 – the entrance of angels into the competence of God. In Jude this referred to the power of judgement itself, in 2 Peter it refers to the decision when the final judgement and annihilation of the unrighteous will take place.

This interpretation also explains why the narrator abandoned the narrative of the dispute over Moses' body. The story of the dispute cited in Jude 9 is singular and strongly connected to the history of Israel. Peter needed more universal material, oriented towards the present and eschatological future rather than the past, explaining the apparent suspension (inaction) of judgement and the dormant doom that should befall the blasphemers. Therefore, he also changed Jude's past tense, characteristic of historical narratives, to a present tense, which corresponds to the apocalyptic convention and covers the future.

The annihilation of the unrighteous is sure to follow, as the author of the letter argues ironically in verse 12, evoking the imagery from Jude on the one hand, and reinforcing Jude's vituperative devices on the other.

2 Pet 2:12	Jude 10
Οὗτοι δὲ	Οὗτοι δὲ
ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα	ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν
γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ	ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς
εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν	ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα
ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες	ἐπίστανται
ἔν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται	ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται
Those	These
Like irrational beasts	[which they do not know,] they blaspheme
By nature born	[that] which they instinctively,
to be captured and destroyed/destroyed,	Like irrational animals/beasts
blaspheming [things] they do not comprehend,	Perceive
shall be utterly destroyed [as now] they are destroyed	Because of them, they are destroyed/ corrupt themselves

Verse 12 is linked to verse 10c by a motif of blasphemy (as was the case with 10c and 11), which most fully illustrates the arrogance and audacity of the false teachers. There is a mocking accusation that heretics insult the thing(s) they do not understand. It is interwoven into the comparison of the arrogant to irrational beasts, just as in Jude 10. However, in Peter's comparison the emphasis is distributed differently than in Jude 10. The author of Jude sought to ridicule the teaching of the

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

false teachers and to discredit them as unintelligent creatures guided by instinct;[825] the author of 2 Peter emphasises above all the similarity of the fate of heretics and irrational beasts from birth condemned to capture and destruction.

Verse 12 begins with the demonstrative pronoun οὗτοι referring formally to "the arrogant"[826] of verse 10c. The entire highly elaborate sentence begun in this way does not end until verse 14. The narrator continues the characterisation he undertook in verse 10c and interrupts with a reference to the angels in verse 11. At first glance there would appear to be no direct connection between verses 11 and 12, but the exponent of their cohesion is the participle δέ, which serves to further contrast the behaviour of the angels and the false teachers. The angels humbly accept the fact that it is God, not they, who appoints the time of judgement for the arrogant. They, however (δέ), brazenly undermine this fact and mock it (cf. 2 Pet 3:3–4).

By questioning the coming of judgement on the one hand, and derisively demanding that it has already taken place on the other, they are in fact acting like "irrational beasts" ἄλογα ζῷα. The narrator of 2 Pet here uses a phrase taken from Jude 10. It refers to the belief that animals cannot think rationally. This view has no basis in the Hebrew books of the Bible, but can be found in the Greek books and in Hellenistic literature.[827] Wis 11:15 speaks of the foolishness that led people to worship "dumb serpents and creatures", for which God repaid them by sending a host of "dump creatures" as punishment. Plutarch in *On Love to One's Offspring* I (*Morals* 493D) describes animals as creatures devoid of reason and argues that "in brutes the gentleness of mood inspired by reason, the subtlety, the love of freedom, are not qualities found in excess, but they have unreasonable appetites and desires, and act in a roundabout way within certain limits, riding, as it were, at the anchor of nature".

It appears that the very phrase "irrational beasts", even without reference to the ideology behind it, was very popular in the Hellenistic world. It is familiar to Philo and Flavius. The Alexandrian uses it when he speaks of the human mind, which "has invented arts and pursuits, and laws and customs, and all the principles of […] common justice, with reference both to men and to irrational animals" πρὸς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα (*Leg. alleg.* III IX:30). Josephus Flavius in *Con. Ap.* II 29 emphasises the leniency and gentleness of God's law towards "brute beasts": "Indeed he hath taught us gentleness, and humanity so effectually, that he hath not despised the care of brute beasts ὡς μηδὲ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων ὀλιγωρεῖν, by permitting no other

825 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 194.

826 Another connection is suggested by D.F. Watson and T.D. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 191, who see verses 12, 13 and 14 as referring to the common comparison of false teachers to "unintelligent animals".

827 T. Callan, *Comparison of Humans to Animals in 2 Pet 10b-22*, "Biblica" 90 (2009), no. 1, p. 102.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

than a regular use of them, and forbidding any other". On the other hand, in *Ant.* X 11:6 Flavius described Daniel's rescue in the lions' den and the punishment of the prophet's opponents. In doing so, he emphasised that "wild beasts" are moved by wickedness: "I suppose therefore it was not their hunger, which had been a little before satisfied with abundance of flesh, but the wickedness of these men that provoked them" τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζῴοις.

In developing the comparison, Peter departs from Jude's material. He adds the opinion that animals are "by nature born for capture and destruction". He thus reiterates the belief,[828] that animals created for man are basically born to be pursued, and that when they are captured, they must be exploited, i. e. generally put to death. Aristotle, in the *Politics* (1256b), expresses this thought more circumspectly. For he argues that animals exist for the sake of humans, so that humans can eat them, use them in work, use them for clothing, tools and sacrifices in worship: "plants exist for the sake of animals and the other animals for the good of man, the domestic species both for his service and for his food, and if not all at all events most of the wild ones for the sake of his food and of his supplies of other kinds, in order that they may furnish him both with clothing and with other appliances". Similarly, Epictetus writes in one of his discourses *Of Providence*: "God constitutes every animal, one to be eaten, another to serve for agriculture, another to supply cheese, and another for some like use". The Stoics argued, for example, that a pig by nature (φύσει) exists to be killed and eaten.[829] Pliny the Elder goes even further, who believes that animals can be eaten even at the prenatal stage. In his *Natural History*, he describes various types of hares, including the white hare:

> Those in the Alps are white, and it is believed that, during the winter, they live upon snow for food. […] in Spain, which is called the rabbit; […] The young ones, either when cut from out of the body of the mother, or taken from the breast, […] are considered a most delicate food. […] The hare, which is preyed upon by all other animals, is the only one, except the dasypus, which is capable of superfœtation; while the mother is suckling one of her young, she has another in the womb covered with hair, another without any covering at all, and another which is just beginning to be formed (*Historia naturalis* VIII 81).

The belief that animals were destined for – often cruel – death was also used in texts designed to discredit opponents. Plutarch, in *Alexander* 22:4, cites the command "to punish [soldiers] and put them to death as wild beasts born for the destruction of mankind". The source of the focus of Peter's comparison is to be sought in such

828 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 263 even argues that this was a widespread view, citing Juvenal's *Satire* 11:141 alongside Pliny.

829 T. Callan, *Comparison*, p. 103.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

opinions, not on the way of life of the false teachers, as Jude does, but on what end awaits them. When describing the fate of the animals, Peter reaches for the lexeme φθορά. He has used it before when he mentions "corruption in the world" (1:4) and will repeat it when he refers to pseudo teachers and their followers as "slaves of corruption" (2:19). However, in 1:4 and 2:19 he gives the term a metonymic meaning, and in 2:12 he uses it twice in a literal sense – 'corruption', 'decay', 'decomposition', and in relation to animals also 'slaughter', 'butchery'. In 2:12a he makes it clear in this suggestive and figurative way that he means "the corruption of an animal", i. e. its death, followed by the decomposition of the body. In 2:12c, he transfers this imagery to false teachers, and the noun φθορά becomes the equivalent of the ἀπώλεια "destruction" already mentioned in 2:1e and 3b.

It can be seen that also in verse 12 the narrator comments on 2:3b. Each of the key elements in 3b has a development in the animal comparison. The suggestion that the fate of the false teachers is a foregone conclusion ἔκπαλαι finds counterpart in the statement that the fate of animals is assigned to them from birth and according to nature. It is noteworthy that the participle perfecti passivi γεγεννημένος is used here, which indicates a past action (or state) whose effects last. With the proposed appropriateness, the meaning of this form can be transposed to the adverb ἔκπαλαι and can also be understood as a continuum: the effects of a judgement that was made long ago are still ongoing. The conviction that the "judgement is not idle" κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ is matched by the image of the pursuit and capture of the animals ἅλωσις. Finally, the counterpart to the statement that "destruction does not slumber" ἀπώλεια οὐ νυστάζει is the indication of the destruction of φθορά. If the pseudo-scientists and their followers are not/will not be punished immediately, it is not because annihilation does not await them, but because the grasping stage is underway.

The image of the capture of animals brings to mind the binding of sinful angels and their imprisonment in Tartarus (2:4). In Peter's argument to justify the truth of Theses in 2:3b, the image of the imprisonment of angels "for judgement" can be regarded as the leading one; that is why it appears first. References to it have already made it possible to clarify the situation of "the unrighteous dead" preserved "until the day of judgement". It is now also clear that the (s)grasping stage corresponds to the state in which the sinful angels find themselves. The stage of corruption – the final punishment – is yet to come.

The fate of the arrogant is as foredoomed as that of the captured animals primarily because they question the message of the Parousia and the final judgement, i. e. – "they blaspheme those they do not know/comprehend" ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες. This idea was taken by the narrator of 2 Pet from Jude 10. What is notable here is the phrase ἐν οἷς which deviates from the classical rationalization according to which the verb βλασφημέω is combined with the preposition εἰς, περί or κατά, possibly with the accusative alone, as in 2 Pet 2:10. However, it is possible

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

that the rationalization was adapted to the verb ἀγνοέω. The obvious element – the proximal complement of the verb βλασφημέω – would then have been omitted, and the narrator would have moved directly to specifying the verb ἀγνοέω: "blaspheming [to it – element omitted], in which they have no discernment".

Whether the pronoun οἷς is dat. neut. pl. or for dat. masc. pl. cannot be clearly determined. If the pronoun οἷς is considered to be dat. neut. pl., then Peter's thought would be general in nature, yet rooted in the text of Jude 10, where the pronoun in neut. pl. – ὅσα – is also used. The whole phrase can then be understood as "blaspheming [those things] in which they have no discernment". At the same time, "these things" include the "glories" mentioned in verse 10 as an object of blasphemy. It is also possible to treat the pronoun οἷς as masc. pl. While this distances Peter's text from Jude's, it makes Peter's thought more precise and coherent. The masculine gender of the pronoun allows the "glories" to be understood more personally, which would confirm the suggestion expressed earlier that the term refers first to God and Jesus, then to the prophets, and only finally to the angels, more difficult to identify individually. False teachers therefore insult God and Jesus because they do not understand the word of God regarding the Parousia and the end times directed and transmitted by the prophets, or they interpret it in the wrong way (cf. 1:20–21).[830]

The lack of understanding was expressed by the verb ἀγνοοῦσιν – 'to know', 'to comprehend with the mind', 'to have discernment'. He substituted the Judaean phrase οὐκ οἴδασιν for rhetorical reasons in order to emphasise, through the alliteration ἄλογα – ἀγνοοῦσιν, the connection between lack of understanding and lack of comprehension. Thus, in a remarkably blatant manner, the narrator of 2 Peter accuses the false teachers of ignorance and inability to grasp with reason the issues surrounding the Parousia, the judgement and the reign of Jesus. Flavius spoke in a similar way against Apion, reproaching him for his "gross ignorance" (*Con. Ap.* II 2) or blindness of mind (*Con. Ap.* II 13). This means that in their ignorance, indeed their stupidity and ignorance, false teachers also resemble mindless animals.

The misunderstanding by the arrogant of the issues involved in eschatology contrasts with the necessity of continual knowledge so strongly emphasised by the narrator of 2 Peter in *exordium* (1:2.3–4.8). Faith and knowledge, understood as a process, and their practical development in "a pious life" lead to "the eternal kingdom", while ignorance, misunderstanding of the word of God in the prophetic message and the resulting blasphemy and immoral conduct lead to "annihilation" ἀπώλεια and the "destruction" φθορά.

830 Cf. G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 851, who interprets the glories in 10c as angels. Misunderstanding "the glories" means, according to him, the false teachers' lack of insight into the supernatural world and order and the denigration of heavenly beings.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The last part of verse 12 justifies the use of the whole comparison and once again strongly emphasises the commonality of fate between the false teachers and the captured animals. In the phrase ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται one can see a subtle hint as to when the destruction will occur. A literal reading of this statement makes little sense; why would pseudo-scientists and their followers be destroyed in the destruction of animals? Alternatively, one could regard the phrase ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ φθαρήσονται as an intensifying Semitism that denotes complete and terrible destruction filled with suffering, as in Isa 24:3 or Mic 2:10.[831] However, the problem with the pronoun αὐτῶν then remains. Whether to actually refer it to animals, or perhaps, as R. Bauckham wants, also, as οἷς, to "the glories" of verse 10c understood as "fallen angels";[832] this would suggest that The arrogant will be destroyed together with the fallen angels whom they had previously reviled. Bauckham's suggestion seems attractive, but is not borne out by the content of the first part of verse 12, where reference is made to the destiny of animals for destruction. The viewer therefore naturally connects the pronoun αὐτῶν with the noun ζῷα.

The whole phrase acquires a clearer meaning as a reference to eschatology, which is made possible both by treating the comparison as a commentary on 2.3b and by juxtaposing it with 2.4. Also the form of the verb φθαρήσονται – ind. fut. pass. distinguished from verbs in the present tense justifies this eschatological focus. It implies that in the future, in the end times, the arrogant defilers will be destroyed (fut.) just as now, according to their natural destiny, captured animals are destroyed[833] (perf.). It seems less reasonable to see in the phrase ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται an allusion to the eschatological destruction of the whole of the old creation – animals and godless, audacious humans – just as the whole of creation – animals and humans – was destroyed at the time of the Flood.[834] It is also worth noting the passive voice of the verb φθαρήσονται, which is to be interpreted as pass. theologicum: in the end times the destruction of the blasphemers will be accomplished by Jesus as the Judge who was the object of their blasphemies.

The consequences of ignorance are supplemented in verse 13a: [ἀδίκοι] ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, literally "[the unjust] suffering harm/evil [will receive] the reward for unrighteousness". This saying has a dual function. It can be seen as a summary of the reflection begun in verse 9b on the unjust and the fate that awaits them. The framework composition of passus 9b–13a would indicate this:

831 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 849.

832 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 264.

833 Thus J.D.N. Kelly, K.H. Schelkle, W. Grundmann, T. Fornberg.

834 Thus W. Schrage.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

9b – general reflection [Lord knows] how to "preserve the unjust for judgement";
10–12 – details the conduct of false teachers as an example of the unjust;
13a – general reflection: "suffering evil [will receive] the reward for unrighteousness".

It is also possible to consider this saying as an introductory sentence, introducing the listing of unjust acts that are the aftermath of ignorance (13b–19b),[835] for which, of course, the arrogant ignoramuses will face appropriate retribution.

From the beginning in verse 13 a lexical dependence on Jude 11 and Jude 12 is evident, but with Peter's distinctively characteristic reworking of Jude's motifs and thoughts,[836] including the introduction of a dialogue with the source text involving the use of word games. From the mention of Balaam in Jude 11c is taken the question of the payment of μισθός, which in Peter's elaboration has taken on a broader, universal meaning, not directly related to the figure of Balaam, which the narrator of 2 Peter does not recall until 2:15. Like Jude, Peter is convinced that the bold will participate in communal meals with the faithful, but unlike Jude, who draws attention to the erroneous teaching of the deviants, the author of 2 Peter emphasises above all the promiscuous and debauched behaviour of the feast-goers. The wordplay he applies to the source material is based on sound associations. Where Jude warningly referred to opponents as "sea-rocks" – σπιλάδες, Peter introduces the noun σπίλοι – "blemish". The cautious source text is changed into a vituperative invective, with an additional term μῶμοι. Similarly, Jude's ἀγάπαι "agape" is replaced with the term ἀπάται – "luxuries" and at the same time "delusions".[837]

The beginning of verse 13a the verb ἀδικέω means 'to do injustice/evil' (Matt 20:13, Acts 7:26, 1 Cor 6:8, Col 3:25, Phlm 18, Rev 22:11). In the passive voice it is usually translated as "to suffer evil, harm or to be harmed" (Acts 7:24, 2 Cor 7:12, Rev 2:11).[838] Regardless of whether verse 13a is taken as a summary of 9a–12 or as a prelude to the description of the further behaviour of "the arrogant", it is difficult to speak of harming them, and so the participle ἀδικούμενοι should rather be understood as "suffering loss", i. e. "suffering punishment"[839] (cf. Acts 25:11, where ἀδικέω is supplemented by the parallel suffix "I have done something deserving of death"). Although the whole phrase ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν

835 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 340.

836 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 853.

837 Some testimonies harmonise the two texts and also introduce the phrase ἀγάπαις αὐτῶν in 2 Pet 2:13 (so A B Ψ 5. 1611 and Syriac translations, among others) or ἀγάπαις ὑμῶνν (so 1243).

838 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 853.

839 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 339 attempts to translate this verb as to "be wronged", ignoring any implication or connotation of "wrong" as some sort of injustice (cf. Wis 14:29, 3 Macc 3:8, Rev 2:11).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

ἀδικίας is sometimes difficult to translate,[840] it was introduced by the hagiographer not only for its meaning but also for its paronomasia: ἀδικούμενοι – ἀδικίας.

The noun μισθός usually has a meaning of some material reward. It means 'payment', 'charge', 'remuneration', 'profit', 'pay'. Sometimes, however, in LXX and NT it is used in the sense of bearing the consequences for past conduct (cf. 2 Macc 8:33, Wis 2:22, 5:15, 10:17, Sir 51:30, Isa 40:10, 62:11, Zech 11:12, Matt 5:12, 6:2.5.16, 10:41–42, Luke 6:23.35, Acts 1:18, Rev 11:18, 22:12). This is also how the narrator of 2 Pet understands it and therefore specifies it with the noun ἀδικία in gen., which can be interpreted as gen. originis or gen. obiectivus – in either case the whole phrase, which takes on a semitic character,[841] should be translated as "payment/reward for iniquity/injustice". But it is also possible to regard ἀδικίας as gen. subiectivus and to understand μισθὸς ἀδικίας as a payment/reward granted by the injustice/unrighteousness committed by the arrogates. The whole thing takes on an ironic character because the notion of μισθός, understood especially as a reward, is valued positively and is associated with recognition. Meanwhile, the narrator of 2 Pet seems to scoff at the ungodly and their reward. This is all the more so since, in the argumentation that follows (2:13b–14), he uses images of a lazy and promiscuous life of superfluities and pleasures, which deprives the arrogant not only of Christian eschatological vigilance, but also leads to a negation of the message of Parousia and judgement in general. "The reward" for such a life and conduct, the narrator suggests, will therefore come as a great surprise.

In early Christian writings, "reward", especially "the reward for ungodliness", is linked directly to the Parousia and the judgement. Behold, the Lord [comes], and His reward μισθός is before His face, to render to every man according to his work" – can be read in *1 Clem.* 34:3. The author of *The Epistle of Barnabas* announces: "The Lord is near, and His reward" μισθὸς αὐτοῦ (21:3); earlier he spoke of the reward for wickedness μισθὸς τῆς πονηρίας, which will be given at the judgement: "The Lord will judge the world […]. Each will receive as he has done: […] if he is wicked, the reward of wickedness is before him" (4:12). In *Diogn.* 9:2 the payment is further specified as punishment κόλασις and death θάνατος: "But when our wickedness had reached its height, and it had been clearly shown that its reward, punishment and death, was impending over us". Such views also seem to be held by the narrator of 2 Peter. For him, it is obvious that The arrogant he characterises, who appear in the narrator's contemporaries and will appear in the end times, will receive their payment/reward at Jesus' coming in judgement.

840 Due to the difficulty in understanding the whole phrase ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας in many testimonies (e. g. ℵ^2 A C 5. 33. 81. 307. 436. 442. 642. 1448. 1611. 1735. 1739. 2344. 2492), another interpretation appears with the participium κομιούμενοι "receiving [payment]".

841 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 287.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Verse 13b begins with a description of the ungodly behaviour of the arrogant maintained in a mocking tone. This can be seen as a narratively developed catalogue ending in 2:21, contrasting with the virtues listed in the sorites in *exordium* (1:5–8). Both lists lead to knowledge, which is, however, treated quite differently. In 1:8, knowledge bears fruit in (good) deeds and ultimately leads to "the entrance into the eternal kingdom". In 2:20–21, knowing the Lord Jesus Christ and the way of righteousness and then rejecting the holy commandments heralds "an end worse than the beginning" and justifies "the reward for iniquity".

As faith was the source of the subsequent virtues in 1:5–7, so 2:13bnn suggests that the conduct of the arrogant is subordinated to the pursuit of pleasure – ἡδονή. The appearance of the term ἡδονή may be a rhetorical effect.[842] The narrator juxtaposes the similar-sounding terms ἡδονή and ἡγέομαι (alliteratively still ἡμέρα), and furthermore, as already noted, the suffering-filled wages of wickedness (13a) with pleasure, based on debauchery and lust (cf. 2:10a). He thus anticipates the conclusion of verse 20: "their end is worse (suffering) than their beginning" (pleasure). This is most probably due to the influence of Greek philosophy, especially the Cyrenaics (disciples of Aristippus of Cyrene),[843] whose views are explained in detail by Diogenes Laertius in his *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*:

> They laid down that there are two states, pleasure and pain, […] and that pleasure does not differ from pleasure nor is one pleasure more pleasant than another. The one state is agreeable and the other repellent to all living things. However, the bodily pleasure which is the end is […] not the settled pleasure following the removal of pains, or the sort of freedom from discomfort which Epicurus accepts and maintains to be the end. […] Our

842 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 855.

843 Ibid., p. 856–858. G.L. Green sees here a polemic with the Epicureans, who, however, conceived of pleasure differently. Diogenes Laertius cites Epicurus' letter to Menoeceus (X 123), where the philosopher's views on happiness and pleasure are laid out: "When we say, then, that pleasure is the end and aim, we do not mean the pleasures of the prodigal or the pleasures of sensuality as we are understood to do by some through ignorance, prejudice, or wilful misrepresentation. […] Pleasure is our first and kindred good. It is the starting-point of every choice and of every aversion, and to it we come back, inasmuch as we make feeling the rule by which to judge of every good thing. And since pleasure is our first and native good, for that reason we do not choose every pleasure whatsoever, but ofttimes pass over many pleasures when a greater annoyance ensues from them. And ofttimes we consider pains superior to pleasures when submission to the pains for a long time brings us as a consequence a greater pleasure. […] Of all this the beginning and the greatest good is prudence […] Plain fare gives as much pleasure as a costly diet, when once the pain of want has been removed, while bread and water confer the highest possible pleasure when they are brought to hungry lips. […] By pleasure we mean the absence of pain in the body and of trouble in the soul. […] It is not an unbroken succession of drinking-bouts and of revelry, not sexual love, not the enjoyment of the fish and other delicacies of a luxurious table, which produce a pleasant life; it is sober reasoning" (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> end is particular pleasure, whereas happiness is the sum total of all particular pleasures. […] Pleasure is good even if it proceed from the most unseemly conduct, […]. For even if the action be irregular, still, at any rate, the resultant pleasure is desirable for its own sake and is good. […] bodily pleasures are far better than mental pleasures (II 86–88).

In LXX ἡδονή is also understood more in the manner of the Cyrenaics than in the manner of the Epicureans. Perhaps he based his rhetorical comparison of "suffering and pleasure" from the narrator of 2 Pet from 4 Macc, where pleasure/pleasure also appears alongside pain as its opposite: "The two most comprehensive types of the passions are pleasure and pain, and each of these is by nature concerned with both body and soul. There are many sequences of passions with both pleasure and pain […]. Just as pleasure and pain are two plants growing from the body and the soul, so there are many offshoots of these plants" (4 Macc 1:20–21.28). According to 4 Macc, delight is the fruit of lust ἐπιθυμία and the source of sinful sensations: "Thus desire precedes pleasure, and delight χαρά follows it […]. In pleasure there exists even a malevolent tendency, which is the most complex of all the passions" (4 Macc 1:22.25). Delight thus conceived, however, can be mastered and controlled by reason: "reason has mastered agonies but also that it masters pleasures and in no respect yields to them" (4 Macc 6:35, cf. also 5:22–23). Especially this last suggestion is important in the context of 2 Peter, where the arrogant are accused of "lacking reason/want of reason" and not being in control.

In his pejorative approach ἡδονή, the narrator of 2 Peter does not differ from other New Testament writers who see the pursuit of pleasure/delight as a source of spiritual destruction (Luke 8:14, Titus 3:3, Jas 4:1.3). In early Christian literature, the glorification of ἡδονή, which leads to unpunished godlessness, is attributed, sometimes tendentiously, mainly to Epicurus. Epicurus' philosophy is negatively evaluated by, among others, Lactantius in *Divinae Institutiones* III 17. He condemns not only its assumptions, but above all its pathogenic effect on people who cease to pay attention to morality, no longer seek to control and combat their vices, become extremely selfish, and above all cease to fear posthumous punishment:

> The system of Epicurus was much more generally followed than those of the others; not because it brings forward any truth, but because the attractive name of pleasure invites many. For every one is naturally inclined to vices. […] But perhaps he promised himself impunity in the indulgence of his vices; for he was an advocate of most disgraceful pleasure, and said that man was born for its enjoyment. Who, when he hears this affirmed, would abstain from the practice of vice and wickedness? […] Therefore let us live in the indulgence of pleasures in every possible way […]. If any chieftain of pirates or leader of robbers were exhorting his men to acts of violence, what other language could he employ than to say the same things which Epicurus says: that the gods take no notice; that they

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> are not affected with anger nor kind feeling; that the punishment of a future state is not to be dreaded, because souls die after death, and that there is no future state of punishment at all; that pleasure is the greatest good; that there is no society among men; that every one consults for his own interest; that there is no one who loves another.[844]

This Cyrenaic philosophical background of ἡδονή as a supreme value can be seen in the further reflections of the author of 2 Peter, when describing the elements that comprise it. The first of these, not coincidentally, is the ambiguous, multifaceted τρυφή, considered by the audacious to be ἡδονή. The term τρυφή in many contexts has a neutral or only slightly negative meaning. It can mean prosperity – e. g. Sir 11:27, wealth – Mic 2:9, sumptuous living – e. g. Sir 18:32, even sumptuous feasting/dining – e. g. Sir 37:29, Wis 19:11; entertainment, pleasure – e. g. Sir 14:16, *2 Clem.* 10:4, luxury, superfluity – Luke 7:25, TJos 3:4. There is a positive meaning in Similitude VI 5:7 of *The Shepherd* of Hermas, where pleasure or even delight found, e. g. in doing good things, is so described. But in many texts τρυφή is used in a pejorative sense. Philo in *De spec. leg.* II XLIII:240 refers the term to pleasure and superfluity and links it to effeminacy understood primarily as laziness: "being full of luxury τρυφήν and arrogance; and coveting a luxurious life, and becoming effeminate both in body and soul". Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* X 10:2 argues that Daniel and his companions, although they had given up eating meat, "looked as if they had lived in plenty, and in all sorts of luxury ἐν ἀφθονίᾳ καὶ τρυφῇ […] their bodies in better tune for hard labour. For they neither had the former oppressed and heavy with variety of meats". He therefore judges negatively excessive splendour, which causes drowsiness and is not conducive to the exercise of endurance of hardship.

Hermas uses the term τρυφή particularly frequently. Although he generally values it according to the context, he overwhelmingly inscribes it in negative contexts. Similitude VI 5:5 ("Every act of a man which he performs with pleasure, he replied, is an act of luxury τρυφή; for the sharp-tempered man, when gratifying his tendency, indulges in luxury; and the adulterer, and the drunkard, and the back-biter, and the liar, and the covetous man, and the thief") shows that it was understood as indulging oneself and was associated with various forms of indulgence of the senses.

---

844 Lactantius, *Divine Institutes. Book III* (*Of the False Wisdom of Philosophers*); chapter 17: "He Passes from Philosophy to the Philosophers, Beginning with Epicurus; And How He Regarded Leucippus and Democritus as Authors of Error". In the letter to Menoeceus, Epicurus states that "death is nothing to us, for good and evil imply sentience, and death is the privation of all sentience; therefore a right understanding that death is nothing to us makes the mortality of life enjoyable, […] by taking away the yearning after immortality. […] Death, therefore, the most awful of evils, is nothing to us, seeing that, when we are, death is not come, and, when death is come, we are not. It is nothing, then, either to the living or to the dead, for with the living it is not and the dead exist no longer" (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* X 123).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

This is confirmed by Commandment XII 2:1, where τρυφαί are listed among the elements "which slay the servants of God", such as "the desire after another's wife or husband, and after extravagance, and many useless dainties and drinks, and many other foolish luxuries τρυφαί; […] But as many as are mastered by them, and do not resist them, will perish at last, for these desires are fatal".

A similar negative meaning is also given to the term τρυφή by the author of 2 Peter. What is more – he claims that false teachers will indulge in such lifestyle ἐν ἡμέρᾳ – full of wide-ranging delight, superfluity, splendour, lavishness – "during the day". This phrase – in addition to the aforementioned rhetorical aspects (alliteration) – can be considered equivalent not only to openness, but also to arrogance, pride, shamelessness. Indeed, the ancients believed that the time conducive to gluttony, drunkenness, debauchery and other unworthy "pleasures" was night (Job 34:15–17, Rom 13:12–13, 1 Thess 5:5.7),[845] and that darkness was naturally associated with evil, which should be at least somewhat hidden.[846] "His days he passed in sleep, his nights in the business and pleasures of life", Tacitus wrote of Petronius (*The Annals* XVI 18), "Indolence had raised him to fame, as energy raises others, and he was reckoned not a debauchee and spendthrift". By contrast, it was considered scandalous to indulge in a "life of pleasure" during the day (Isa 5:11, Eccl 10:16, Acts 2:15). Even the Cyrenaics, famous for an unconcealed pursuit of the pleasurable life, believed that, according to Plutarch (*Moralia* 1089A), it is "wrong to indulge in sexual commerce when there is a light, and instead provide for a cover of darkness, so that the mind may not, by receiving the images of the act in full clarity through the sense of sight, repeatedly rekindle the desire".

Not surprisingly, the narrator of 2 Pet for the sake of immoral, scandalous delights denying Christian morality, emotionally describes the arrogant as "blemishes and vices" σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι. It has already been said that through the use of the term σπίλοι a dialogue is established with the source text, Jude 12, where the false teachers are metaphorically referred to as σπιλάδες – "reefs, sea rocks".[847] The author of 2 Peter uses a wordplay based on the paronomasia σπιλάδες – σπίλοι (it is better seen in the singular: σπιλάς – σπίλος). Rare in biblical literature, the noun σπίλος (apart from 2 Pet 2:13 it occurs only in Eph 5:27) means a blemish, a stain (cf. Jas 3:6, where the verb σπιλόω appears). The second term, μῶμοι, is more frequent. In LXX it appears primarily in wisdom literature (Sir 11:31.33, 18:15, 20:24, 33:23, 47:20), where it indicates defects, moral blemishes, and in cultic texts (Lev 1:3, 22:20, 21:21), which speak of blemishes preventing the use of animals for sacrifice and physical defects preventing the performance of priestly functions. While the moral meaning

845 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 859.

846 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 340.

847 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 220–224.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of the noun μῶμος rooted in sapiential literature seems obvious, more significant and sophisticated is its connection to worship. Perhaps the whole phrase σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι is a reversal of the well-known liturgical phrase ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι, used by Peter in 3:14, and this is the context in which the phrase was to be read by the recipients of 2 Peter: false teachers are absolutely useless to the Church, as animals with blemishes and priests with bodily defects are useless in sacrificial worship;[848] they cannot not only serve God but also, according to Jewish tradition, stand before God, i. e. enter "the eternal kingdom". The recipients of the letter, on the other hand, are called to stand before the Lord as ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι "undefiled and without defect".

Later in verse 13 the narrator clarifies the general meaning of τρυφή. First, he uses paronomasia. He uses part. praes. act. – ἐντρυφῶντες, which is the inflectional form of the verb ἐντρυφάω, which has a common stem with the noun τρυφή.[849] The idea, then, is to emphasise indulging oneself, leading a lavish lifestyle on the one hand and a lazy one on the other, wallowing in luxury and indulging in all sensual pleasures/delights. It is worth noting that the use of two paronomasias in line 13 is not accidental. The first paronomasia: ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας clearly warns of the consequences of the behaviour described by the second paronomasia: τὴν τροφὴν […] ἐντρυφῶντες.

To illustrate the sensual pleasures, communal feasts are invoked. The narrator of 2 Peter, by calling them ἀπάται, undertakes, as mentioned, a word game with the source text (Jude 12) where the term ἀγάπαι falls. The term ἀπάτη can have many meanings. Usually, following Aelius Moeris (Atticista), two leading ones are indicated: deception, delusion corresponding to the term πλάνη (cf. Mark 4:19) and delight corresponding to the term τέρψις.[850]

Some light is shed on the meaning of ἀπάται in 2 Pet 2:13c by *The Shepherd* of Hermas, where, as in Peter, the terms τρυφή and ἀπάτη repeatedly occur side by side. Commandment XI 1:12 contains a description of a false prophet who exalts himself, wants to occupy the first places, is "bold, and impudent, and talkative, and lives in the midst of many luxuries ἐν τρυφαῖς πολλαῖς and many other delusions ἐν ἑτέραις πολλαῖς ἀπάταις". Similitude VI describes the action of "the angel of luxury and deceit" ἄγγελος τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπάτης: "he wears out the souls of the servants of God, and perverts them from the truth, deceiving them with wicked desires,

848 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 266.

849 This is why, for example, W. Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, p. 97 directly links 13b ἡδονή and τρυφαί during the day with indulgence during agape feasts, which would suggest, however, that agape feasts and their caricatures in the form of ἀπάται also took place during the day rather than very early in the morning or evening.

850 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 341; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 861.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

through which they will perish; for they forget the commandments of the living God, and walk in deceits ἀπάταις and empty luxuries τρυφαῖς; and they are ruined" (VI 2:1–2). Then the delusions and pleasures themselves are assessed as short-lived and foolish: "the time of luxury τρυφή and deceit ἀπάτη is very short" (VI 4:4); "He who indulges in luxury, and is deceived for one day, and who does what he wishes, is clothed with much foolishness, and does not understand the act which he does until the morrow; for he forgets what he did the day before. For luxury and deceit have no memories, on account of the folly with which they are clothed" (VI 5:3). Yielding to them leads to anguish and punishment: "Every man, therefore, who is luxurious and deceived is thus tormented, because, although having life, they have given themselves over to death […] All these acts of luxury are hurtful to the servants of God" (VI 5:4,6).

The last sentence seems particularly relevant in establishing the semantic fields of the two terms. Hermas used synonymous parallelism here, which indicates that the meaning of τρυφή largely overlaps with that of ἀπάτη. Previously, however, especially where τρυφή and ἀπάτη occurred directly next to each other, merism was used to confirm the close synonymy of the two terms. In all probability, this is also the synonymous sense in which the author of 2 Peter. Thus, one can venture to say that Peter's ἀπάτη is an event, a gathering where all sensual pleasures are enjoyed. At the same time, the very term implies that such pleasures bring only a brief and fleeting sense of happiness.

One of the sensual pleasures available during ἀπάται is to eat together. This is expressed by a verb borrowed from Jude 12 – συνευωχέωμαι, usually translated as "eating together, feasting together". It suggests, however, above all, eating to your heart's content together, or even – as a euphemism – gorging together.[851]

In ancient times, feasts had important social functions.[852] Participation in them built the community. However, in contrast to Jude 12, the narrator of 2 Peter does not have this aspect of the feast in mind. There are no clues to see in ἀπάται any allusion to the Lord's Supper meetings.[853] The pronoun αὐτῶν defining ἀπάται even suggests that the gatherings are "their", i. e. "the arrogant", held to partake in the pleasures of the table, as συνευωχέωμαι suggests. In this context, the use of the pronoun ὑμῖν in the phrase "eating/gorging with you" is puzzling. Most

851 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 231–232.

852 M. Węcowski, *Sympozjon, czyli wspólne picie. Początki greckiej biesiady arystokratycznej* (*IX–VII wiek p.n.e.*), Warsaw 2011, p. 77–79.

853 See the discussion on this topic in Jude 12, in K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 224–229. Profanation of the Lord's Supper is found in 2 Pet 2:14 by, among others, W. Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, p. 97; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 862; general feasts without liturgical character are rightly found here by, among others, F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 289.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

commentators regard it as a complement to consider the events mentioned in 13c as Christian gatherings.[854] But it could be interpreted as a confirmation that Christians were invited as guests to sumptuous feasts or symposia in order to convince them of a hedonistic lifestyle.

Such sumptuous feasting was well described by, among others, Petronius in *Satyricon*. Elaborate, surprising dishes were served at feast organised by Trimalchio: "a fat becafico rolled up in spiced yolk of egg" (33), dishes corresponding to the signs of the zodiac (35), and underneath them "fat fowls and sow's bellies, and in the middle a hare got up with wings to look like Pegasus" (36), "a wild boar of the largest size upon it, wearing a cap of freedom, with two little baskets woven of palm-twigs hanging from his tusks, one full of dry dates and the other of fresh. Round it lay sucking pigs made of simnel cake with their mouths to the teats […]. A number of thrushes flew out at the blow […] they fluttered round the dining-room" (40), "a Priapus made by the confectioner standing in the middle, holding up every kind of fruit and grapes […]. All the cakes and all the fruits, however lightly they were touched, began to spurt out saffron" (60), "thrushes made of fine meal and stuffed with raisins and nuts. There followed also quinces, stuck all over with thorns to look like sea-urchins" (69), "my cook made the whole thing out of a pig. There could not be a more valuable fellow. If you want it, he will make you a fish out of a sow's belly, a woodpigeon out of bacon, a turtledove out of a ham, and a chicken out of a knuckle of pork" (70). The gluttony was, of course, accompanied by drunkenness and loud music. The participants were repeatedly anointed with fragrant oils and could also take a bath.

Puns similar to the one used by Peter for Jude were also an important part of the entertainment: ἀγάπαι – ἀπάται, σπιλάδες – σπίλοι. It is difficult not to notice that the descriptions of Peter (verses 13b–19) and Petronius are composed of similar elements: not only gluttony and drunkenness are mentioned, but also the insolence of the revellers, greed, vainglory, showing off wealth, boastful speeches with sophisticated wordplays. Of course, these similarities not necessarily mean that the author of 2 Peter was familiar with Petronius' work, although *Satyricon* was most likely written in the time of Nero, and thus in a period close to or slightly earlier than the Second Letter of Peter. Rather, they testify that both writers had a good observational sense and knowledge of the course of the feasts, which often became caricatured. It is also worth noting that Petronius refers to Trimalchio's feast as "liberae cenae" – "an abundant feast", an expression taken from the milieu of the gladiators, who were treated to such a feast before their performances.[855] Afterwards, the gladiators would go out into the arena, and thus "their end was

854 So R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 266.

855 Petronius, *Satyryki*, Polish transl. M. Bożek, Wrocław 2005, p. 31, note 53.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

worse than their beginning" (2 Pet 2:20). Moreover, Trimalchio himself was a freedman who inherited his master's wealth, which he multiplied considerably. Holding sumptuous feasts and boasting about his wealth can therefore be seen as one of the manifestations of his freedom. Similarly, false teachers who are still subject to corruption (2 Pet 2:19) manifest their supposed freedom.

Gluttony and drunkenness at feasts met with widespread criticism. Plutarch, in *That Epicurus Actually Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* (*Moralia* 1098), comments on the conduct of those who adhere to the slogan 'The ground is the belly':

> Indeed these people, you might say, describing a circle with the belly as centre and radius, circumscribe within it the whole area of pleasure […]. For the soul is nothing paltry and inconsiderable, or yet petty, nor does it put forth its desires […] only as far as there are edibles to be got; no such appetite flourishes for the briefest fraction of an hour, and then is cut short by a most swift satiety.[856]

Early Christian writers also condemned excessive indulgence in gluttony and drunkenness. *The Shepherd* of Hermas, in Commandment VI 2:5 enumerates, as the narrator of 2 Peter, similar works of the angel of evil in the human heart, although in a different order: "anger […] harshness […], a longing after many transactions, and the richest delicacies, and drunken revels, and various luxuries, and things improper, and by a hankering after women, and by overreaching, and pride, and blustering, and by whatever is like to these". In Commandment VIII 1:3 he repeats that one should abstain "from adultery and fornication, from unlawful revelling, from wicked luxury, from indulgence in many kinds of food and the extravagance of riches, and from boastfulness, and haughtiness, and insolence, and lies, and backbiting, and hypocrisy, from the remembrance of wrong, and from all slander". In the second and third centuries, moderation and modesty in all respects distinguished Christian feasts from pagan ones.[857] Tertullian, in *Apology* (39:16–19), convinces opponents that, although Christian feasts sometimes require no small amount of money and preparation, it is not

> as it is with you, do parasites aspire to the glory of satisfying their licentious propensities, selling themselves for a belly-feast to all disgraceful treatment […]. The participants, before reclining, taste first of prayer to God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger; as much is drunk as befits the chaste.

856 Plutarch, *That Epicurus Actually Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible*, p. 95–97.

857 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 230.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Clement of Alexandria as the narrator of 2 Peter and Jude mocks the attitude of some people who "live that they may eat, as the irrational creatures, whose life is their belly, and nothing else" (*Paedag.* II 1). He also asserts that, for Christians, pleasure derived from food is not a life goal. However, he is well aware that human gluttony is "insatiable" […]. For it is the mark of a silly mind to […] make one's eyes the slaves of the delicacies. […] But we who seek the heavenly bread must rule the belly, which is beneath heaven" (*Paedag.* II 1).

Gluttony and drunkenness at feasts and/or symposiums were combined with sexual liberty. This was noted by Hermas, who mentioned, in the passages quoted above, "adultery" μοιχεία and "fornication" πορνεία, alongside drunkenness and binge eating. Peter also noted it and devoted more attention to this phenomenon in verse 14.

The phrase ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος, which begins verse 14, "has eyes full of an adulteress", should be understood in this context literally[858] – as indulging in erotic games with the women present at the feasts,[859] and not infrequently with men or boys. The fact that one of the best places to win and ensnare a woman is at feasts was argued by, among others, Ovid in *Ars amatoria* (I):

> In feasts, as at our shows, new means abound;
> More pleasure there, than that of wine, is found […].
> Wine warms the blood, and makes the spirits flow;
> Care flies, and wrinkles from the forehead go;
> Exalts the poor, invigorates the weak,
> Gives mirth and laughter, and a rosy cheek.
> Bold truth it speaks; and spoken, dare maintain;
> And brings our old simplicity again.
> Love sparkles in the cup and fills it higher;
> Wine feeds the flames, and fuel adds to fire.
> But choose no mistress in thy drunken fit;
> Wine gilds too much their beauties and their wit.

In the connection between the sense of sight (eyes) and adulteress (adultery), commentators often find echoes of Jesus' teaching: "everyone who looks at a woman with lust has already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Matt 5:28).[860]

858 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 266; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 867.

859 Ibid., p. 864. G.L. Green quotes an inscription carved on the wall of the *triclinum* (dining room) of one house in Pompeii, which would attest to the fact that some participants in ancient feasts attempted to have intercourse with the host's wife: "Keep your lascivious looks and bedroom eyes away from another man's wife".

860 So, for example, F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 289.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

But the notion that adultery or, more broadly, sexual lust, followed by debauchery, fornication, begins with looking at a woman, seems natural and common (cf. 1 John 2:16 and ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν "desire of the eyes"), does not necessarily come directly from Jesus' sermon on the mount.

Most questionable is Peter's use of the term μοιχαλίς 'adulteress'. It can be regarded as a kind of metonymy or even synecdoche with the replacement of the general term μοιχεία, μοιχαλεία 'adultery' with the term of the person who commits it. Some manuscripts, moreover, replace the genitive μοιχαλίδος with the genitive μοιχαλείας (so א A 33. 436. 442) or μοιχείας (so Ψ 2344).[861] The adoption of these variants actually facilitates the understanding of the whole phrase ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλείας "having eyes full of adultery" in a manner similar to Jesus'. Furthermore, in the amendment about adultery, one could see an allusion to the failure to be faithful to God, which in the prophetic tradition is depicted by this very term.[862]

The variant with the adulteress μοιχαλίς, however, fits better with the 2 Peter's style and the narrator's penchant for using word games. A proverb based on paronomasia (even homonymy) concerning insolence, shamelessness and arrogance in general became popular in the first century. It is quoted, among others, by Plutarch in *Morals* (*On Shyness* 528E) in precisely this general sense: "And so the orator said the shameless person had not pupils in his eyes but harlots". The play on words is related to the noun κόρα, which means not only a pupil but also a girl, which is why the saying was often quoted as "the shameless person has harlots in his eyes rather than virgins". This version is known to an author contemporary to 2 Peter, Pseudo-Longinus, who in his treatise *On the Sublime* IV 5–6 explains that "virgins in the eyes" is a synonym for modesty, and that both modesty and shamelessness are expressed in the gaze: "modesty is always without exception expressed in the eye […], there is nothing by which an impudent fellow betrays his character so much as by the expression of his eyes". It is very possible that this proverb was also referred to by the author of 2 Peter in order, as suggested by Pseudo-Longinus, to emphasise not only the indulgence in erotic pleasures at the feast, but also the arrogance and audacity of the false teachers, which he mentions *expressis verbis* in 2:10c.

A further description of the behaviour of the arrogant would confirm the use of a popular proverb based on wordplay, as the narrator reaches for another figure using a similarity of sound – alliteration: ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας 'unable to abstain

861 This is also how M. Luther translates and explains: "Wherefore does St. Peter say, – not, they are adulterers, – but, they have eyes full of adultery? It is as much as though he should say, They think ever on nothing but fornication, and can never restrain their roguery, nor be satisfied and quiet", *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther* II (V.14).

862 D.F. Watson, T.D. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 192.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

from sin'. Whether this lack of abstinence from sin refers to sexuality, or whether the concept of ἁμαρτία 'sin' is to be taken more generally here, cannot be clearly resolved. The context of the feast as a place for indulging in all kinds of pleasures suggests the latter possibility. Moreover, the mention of the sin of the arrogant recalls the earlier general reference to the sin of the angels (2:4),[863] which included both the implications of sexual sin and the rebellion of the angels against God en bloc (cf. Jude 6). By the end of the first century, Jewish angelology and demonology were already developed and several strands. Among other things, there were suggestions that the angels' rebellion was caused by their pride and jealousy of Adam. Vita Adae et Evae 12–17 (a text also known as The Apocalypse of Moses or The Atonement of Adam), written between the second/first century BC and the first/second century A.D., explains the origin of Satan's hatred of man:

> And with a heavy sigh, the devil spake: "O Adam! all my hostility, envy, and sorrow is for thee, since it is for thee that I have been expelled from my glory, which I possessed in the heavens in the midst of the angels and for thee was I cast out in the earth." […] It is for thy sake that I have been hurled from that place. When thou wast formed. I was hurled out of the presence of God and banished from the company of the angels. When God blew into thee the breath of life and thy face and likeness was made in the image of God, Michael also brought thee and made (us) worship thee in the sight of God; […] "Worship the image of God as the Lord God hath commanded." […] I said to him, "Why dost thou urge me? I will not worship an inferior and younger being (than I). I am his senior in the Creation, before he was made was I already made. It is his duty to worship me." When the angels, who were under me, heard this, they refused to worship him. […] And God the Lord was wrath with me and banished me and my angels from our glory; and on thy account were we expelled from our abodes into this world and hurled on the earth.

If the meaning of the participle ἁμαρτήσαντες in 2 Pet 2:4 and the noun ἁμαρτία in 2 Pet 2:14 are similar and have the same connotations, then the sin of the false teachers and the sin of the angels is rooted in their pride and arrogance. This confirms the previous suggestion that eyes full of adulteresses is a term also referring to the pride, arrogance and insolence of the false teachers, evident even in the gaze. Pride and arrogance manifest themselves in a total lack of restraint, including a lack of sexual restraint.

The arrogant unwillingness to refrain from sin is described by the narrator with the relatively rare adjective ἀκατάπαυστος.[864] It appears, among others, in *Histories* IV 17:4 of Polybius ("The people of Cynaetha, who are Arcadians, had

863 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:4.

864 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 867.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

been for many years vexed by the never-ending and embittered strife of factions") and in *Bell. Iud.* VII 10:2 by Flavius: ("[Caesar] having in suspicion the restless temper of the Jews for innovation" ἀκατάπαυστον) in the context of social and interpersonal conflicts. One can then translate the adjective ἀκατάπαυστος literally as 'incessant', which reinforces Thesis that the arrogance evident even in the gaze of false teachers is a constant source of sin understood here collectively, not partisan as having sex with other people's wives. It is also difficult to imagine a "constant" readiness for this particular sin.[865]

In line 14b, the narrator continues the wordplay, speaking of "luring wavering souls with" δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους. The verb δελεάζω belongs to the lexis of fishing, meaning to fish for bait (δέλεαρ). The participle δελεάζοντες is thus to be understood as 'baiting' or 'casting bait' (cf. Jas 1:14, 2 Pet 2:18) in order to obtain an abundant catch. By using lexis related to fishing, the narrator makes himself credible in the eyes of the audience as Peter, a fisherman from Galilee, himself called by Jesus to become a fisher of men (Mark 1:17–18). This discreet reference to Peter's apostolic mission means that the activities of the false teachers should be perceived by the audience as anti-missionary in content, morals and methods of winning believers. A similar phrase is used by Josephus Flavius in *Bell. Iud.* V 3:4, when he describes the deceitful actions of the Jews against the Romans:

> [Jews] jested upon the Romans for being deluded τοὺς Ῥωμαίους δελεασθέντας by the trick they bad put upon them: and making a noise with beating their shields, leaped for gladness, and made joyful exclamations. […] These Jews, which are only conducted by their madness, do every thing with care, and circumspection: they contrive stratagems, and lay ambushes, and fortune gives success to their stratagems, because they are obedient, and preserve their good will and fidelity to one another;

and Philo in *De praem.* IV 24–25 when describing deceptive, false, but also sophisticated means to keep especially young people attached to pagan deities. The elaborate metaphors associated with fishing are also used somewhat mockingly by Ovid in *Ars Amatoria* (I). He mentions feasts, among other things, as places where women are most easily won:

> Thus far the sportful muse, with myrtle bound,
> Has sung where lovely lasses may be found,

865 D.F. Watson and T.D. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 192 propose that the metaphor ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος "to have eyes filled with an adulteress" and the phrase ἀκατάπαυστοι ἁμαρτίας "not to cease to sin" be taken purely rhetorically and considered as an example of hyperbole or emphases.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Now let me sing, how she who wounds your mind,
With art, may be to cure your wounds inclined.
The wary angler, in the winding brook,
Knows what the fish, and where to bait his hook.
The fowler and the huntsman know by name
The certain haunts and harbour of their game.
So must the lover beat the likeliest grounds;
Th' Assemblies where his quarries most abound.

Also, the narrator of 2 Pet places this activity of false teachers aimed at gaining followers at the feasts. In doing so, he is most likely alluding to the source text, Jude 12, with which he once again enters into dialogue. Jude described the teaching of the deviants using the shepherd metaphor, rooted in Jewish tradition;[866] Peter uses the more popular osprey metaphor in the Greco-Roman world. However, he does not specify what bait is being used to lure followers. Some light is shed on this issue in verse 18, where the verb δελεάζω is rendered with the phrase ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις literally: "in the lusts of the flesh, promiscuity".[867] Although the hagiographer uses the same rather general statements as before, it can be inferred that the lure is primarily the condoning of immoral behaviour based on the gratification of various sensual lusts at any cost and in an uncontrollable manner, from food and the condoning of gluttony, to sexual intercourse and the condoning of promiscuity. This amounts to the promotion of Cyrenaic hedonism, antinomianism and the denial of Christian values and virtues, among which temperance is listed (2 Pet 1:6).

False teachers will try to find followers and followers among ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους – literally, unstable souls. The noun ψυχή is used here in the sense of "a person", "a human being" (cf. Gen 2:7, 1 Pet 1:9.22, 2:11, 3:20, 4:19, Jude 15). The adjective, occurring in NT only here and in 2 Pet 3:16[868] – ἀστήρικτος comes from the same stem as στηριγμός ('immovable', 'fixed') in 3:17,[869] indicates something unstable, unstable. As can be seen, the vocabulary practice of using *α-privativum* is very characteristic of the narrator (see ἄλογος, ἀδικούμενοι, ἀδίκια, ἀκατάπαυστος, ἄφωνος in vv. 12–16). There is a kind of irony inherent in the claim that false teachers lure unstable individuals into *vituperatio*: the 'catch' pursued by heretics includes only weak and sickly individuals – "blind" or rather "short-sighted" individuals who "ignore the cleansing of past sins" (2 Pet 1:9). It is therefore not worth much. People

866 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 232–235.

867 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:18.

868 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 342.

869 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:17d.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

who are strong, established in the faith, the kind of people described by the narrator in *exordium* as nurturing baptismal gifts, living a godly life, escaping the corruption of the world, manifesting their faith and membership of the Christian community in deeds, and therefore walking without stumbling/falling into the eternal kingdom, are beyond the reach of the catchers. At the same time, a warning and pastoral concern for these weak ones can be discerned here: unless they are convinced and strengthened by stronger arguments based on the correct interpretation of the inspired Scriptures on the one hand (2 Pet 1:16–21), and on Christian practice with fraternal love and love of neighbour at the forefront on the other (2 Pet 1:5–7), they will fall prey to false teachers and their deceptively (cf. ἀπάτη) attractive views.

Verse 14 ends with a sarcastic accusation of arrogant men having "having hearts trained in greed/covetousness" καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες. The narrator, through the use of part. perf. γεγυμνασμένη, clearly evokes the image of gymnasion and the physical training of young boys.[870] This is not unique in New Testament literature. A similar image with a similar transfer from the physical to the moral sphere is used by the authors of 1 Tim 4:7–8 and Heb 5:14, 12:11. Typically, the verb γυμνάζω and its derivatives in the metaphorical sense were contrasted with terms indicating vacillation, instability.[871] This is intended to suggest to the audience that internal instability and vacillation can be overcome by systematic moral training. This is explicitly stated by the Jewish Hellenistic writers. Philo, in *De Josepho* V 26, cites the words of Jacob after the supposed death of Josephus: "I am compelled to endure distresses which I never had imagined, I am without any cause practised in enduring many miseries" γεγύμνασμαι πολλαῖς κακοπαθείαις. Flavius (*Ant.* III 14) argues that "God tries their virtue, and exercises their patience by these adversities; that it may appear what fortitude they have" γυμνάζειν αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἄρτι χαλεποῖς.

Peter's sarcasm also lies in the juxtaposition of the image of exercise, which suggests effort, perseverance, overcoming weakness, self-control and temperance, with the image of the feast, which best illustrates the love of comforts and excesses associated with Cyrenaic hedonism, the lack of temperance and the general laziness of the false teachers.

In addition – in line with the narrator's integrative strategy – the reference to a typically Greek mode of education in physical and moral terms is accompanied by a reference to Semitic anthropology, according to which the heart is the seat of will, decision, understanding, memory and feeling. Aware of these associations, the author of 2 Pet ironically adds that, in the case of the false teachers, all these elements were not only subordinated to greed, but also "trained by greed". As already

870 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 870.

871 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 342.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

mentioned, the actions of false teachers are seen as anti-mission and anti-testimony. This reversal can be seen particularly clearly when one compares the encouragement to develop the baptismal gifts contained in the sorites in 2 Pet 1:5–7, i. e. exercising faith, virtue and godliness, and the suggestion that false teachers exercise greed/greed instead of virtue. The genitive πλεονεξίας here can be interpreted as gen. obiectivus – in greed – and gen. subiectivus or originis – with the indication that greed is the driving force and source of all actions (exercises). The narrator seems to combine all these functions. This is all the more so because the greed of the false teachers was already mentioned in 2:3a, where the dative in the phrase ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ was interpreted as dat. causae describing "greed" as the motive for their actions. The mention of greed in v.14 is furthermore an introduction to the juxtaposition of the actions of the false teachers with those of Balaam driven by the desire for profit derived from iniquity (verses 15–16).

This juxtaposition, however, was interrupted by the emotional exclamation κατάρας τέκνα literally "children/sons of the curse". This time, the narrator has used the semitic phraseology of "children/sons" with the noun in the genitive (cf. e. g. Isa 57:4 – children of destruction; Hos 1:2, 2:6 – children of harlotry; Hos 10:9 – children of iniquity). Such phrases usually indicate belonging (Eph 5:8), origin (Eph 2:3), destiny or a particular distinctive element (cf. 1 Pet 1:14). They were used frequently in early Christian epistolography as addressative phrases, a prime example being *The Epistle of Barnabas*, where the author calls the recipients "children of gladness" (7:1); "my children" (9:7); "children of love and peace" (21:10). Here the exclamation is not addressative, rather it is an invective similar to that used in 2:13 σπιλοὶ καὶ μῶμοι; this is evidenced, among other things, by its final position in the sentence. Thus, the emotional invectives in 2:13 and 14 form a functional and structural epiphora. In the phrase κατάρας τέκνα, the emphasis seems at first sight to have been primarily on destiny – false teachers face a κατάρα "curse". But after citing 2 Pet 2:3b, it becomes apparent that this destiny has not only been decided long ago but is already being realised, and this in turn stigmatises the pseudo teachers and their followers in a certain way and makes the "curse" an identifying feature of them. In other words – false teachers already as "cursed ones" will stand before God/Jesus on the day of judgement and hear the judgement confirming this "curse", which can be identified with destruction/destruction (cf. 2 Pet 2:1.3). They are thus from the beginning (origin) to the end (destiny) under the curse (cf. Sir 41:9–10),[872] which confirms their conduct (belonging).

The greed of verse 14, but also (at least in part) the curse, is evoked in the example of Balaam, probably taken from Jude 11 and expanded by Peter to include elements that are not present in Jude. This makes the narrative of Balaam serve slightly

872 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 267.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

different functions in Peter's argument and in Jud's argument. In 2 Peter it is an extension of Thesis in 2:3 that false teachers will preach their teachings primarily out of a desire for profit. This view is repeated in 2:14c and now illustrated by an example familiar from Jewish tradition.

As mentioned, preaching views and principles for profit was widely criticised and condemned in the Greco-Roman world.[873] Dio Chrysostom states that it is not at all easy "to find a man who in plain terms and without guile speaks his mind with frankness, and neither for the sake of reputation nor for gain makes false pretensions, but out of good will and concern for his fellow-men stands ready" (*Orationes* 32:11) and adds: "I have come before you not to display my talents as a speaker nor because I want money from you, or expect your praise" (*Orationes* 35:1). The prevalence of this phenomenon by the narrator of 2 Peter is interpreted in an apocalyptic way: in the future, in the end times, there will be many false teachers who, for profit, will preach acquiescence to immoral, sinful behaviour. This, of course, involves a denial of the prophetic and apostolic message of the Parousia and judgement (cf. 2 Pet 3:3). Initially, the narrator exposes the first two elements: the desire for profit and the persuasion of immorality, leaving the denial of judgement in the background. But he does not abandon it completely; on the contrary, he allows the judgement motif to resound at the end of the whole story.

The desire for profit and the encouragement of immorality are unequivocally associated with the figure of the soothsayer Balaam (Lev 22–24),[874] who was asked by Balak, king of Moab, to curse Israel. At first Balaam refused, citing the prohibition of God himself, but when the king promised a hefty reward for the curse placed on Israel, the prophet decided against God's wishes to set out and personally speak to Balak. God sent his angel with a sword to stop Balaam because the path he was treading led to perdition (Lev 22:32). The angel was initially seen only by a donkey. This incident is alluded to by the narrator of 2 Peter in 2:16. Eventually, God allowed Balaam to go to Balak, but stipulated that the bard would only say what the Lord would command him. Therefore, having arrived at the king, the bard blessed Israel three times. Balak became angry and sent Balaam away without payment. This old rather neutral narrative is supplemented by later tradition, more clearly suggesting that for a fee Balaam was prepared to curse Israel against the will of God (Deut 23:5–6, Neh 13:2, cf. Josh 24:9–10). The motif of the bard's greed was developed later by the Jewish Hellenistic writers Josephus Flavius (*Ant.* IV 6:2–9) and Philo (*De vita Mois.* I XLVIII-LV:264–304).[875]

873 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:3.

874 See the summary of the biblical narrative in: K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 205.

875 Ibid., p. 207.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Balaam thus became an archetypal figure not only for the greedy men, but also – and in the context of Peter's reflection perhaps especially – for the prophets who misappropriated their vocation,[876] and although they could not prophesy against inspiration, they subjected prophecy to their own interpretation (cf. 2 Pet 1:20–21). Nevertheless, it is the ruthless desire for gain as a vituperative element that in 2 Pet 2:15–16 is the glue that binds together the three essentials of Peter's argument: the false internal interpretation of the word of God, the false teaching based on it (the false external interpretation), the practical aspect of which is immorality.

Providing the example of Balaam in the Letter of Jude, Peter omits the other two Jude's examples – Cain, whose name became synonymous with all evildoers,[877] and Korach, who epitomised rebellion against the religious leaders.[878] However, he leaves out some of the wording used by Jude to portray Cain and adapts it to his portrayal of Balaam. The characterisation of Korah, however, is not used in any way, probably because the narrator of 2 Pet is not interested in the issue of rebellion in political-religious terms and the possible assumption of leadership in the community by false teachers, but only in the problem of false teaching based on a deceitful, opportunistic interpretation and the resulting behaviour. Moreover, the example of Korah and especially the punishment meted out to the rebels – annihilation – is the concluding element of the illustrations in Jude 11. Meanwhile, the author of 2 Peter does not yet aim for a summary and even extends the story of Balaam with a clearly vituperative narrative in verse 16b.

2 Pet 2:15	Jude 11
καταλιπόντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλααμ τοῦ Βοσορ ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν	ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάιν ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν
They left the straight path, went astray, They imitated the way of Balaam, [son of] Bosor, who loved reward for unrighteousness	They followed/walked in the way of Cain For reward, they made Balaam's error

The most controversial element is the attributive genitive τοῦ Βοσόρ added to Balaam, which suggests Balaam, son of Bosor. Meanwhile, according to Num 22:5, 24:3.15, 31:8, Deut 23:5, Josh 13:22, Mic 6:5, Balaam's father's name was Beor

876 T. Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralitic Society*, p. 39–41; W. Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, p. 99.

877 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 201–205.

878 Ibid., p. 211–215.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

(Βεωρ).[879] Perhaps this is a mistake by the author of the Second Letter of Peter.[880] However, if the name Bosor was introduced intentionally, one would have to wonder what this might indicate? The most popular explanation takes into account the 2 Pet author's predilection for word games. Here, he would have used a transliteration referring to the sound of the Hebrew noun בשר – "flesh" and suggest that Balaam was "a son of the flesh",[881] "a man of flesh" (cf. σαρκινός in Rom 7:14).[882] However, it is difficult to say why the transliteration replaced the vowel a with the vowel o, perhaps it was not so much (or not only) about the transliteration, but also about the paronomasia *basar – Bosor*, a figure often used by the author of 2 Peter.

According to another hypothesis, Bosor would mean not the name of the father, but the name of the town from which Balaam came.[883] The city of Bosor was in Syria, while Balaam, according to Num 23:7, came from Aram, so indeed from the territory of Syria. This is confirmed by Num 22:5, which links Balaam to the city of Pethor located in Aram, at the confluence of the Sajur and Euphrates rivers (cf. Deut 23:5). Another toponymic hypothesis is also based on Lev 23:7 and the Aramaic origin of the bard. He would be thought to have come from Bezer, a city about 70 km east of Lake Gennesaret, which in 1 Macc 5:26.36 is named Bosor.[884] In the ninth century BCE this city was indeed under the control of Aram, so it may have passed for Aramaic, but earlier, in Balaam's time (probably the fourteenth century BCE) it was an independent Canaanite city).[885] Perhaps Bosor refers to the Edomite capital, which has two variant names בצר or בצרה transliterated in LXX as Βοσόρ (Isa 34:6, 63:1) and Βοσόρρα (Gen 36:33, 1 Kings 1:44, 1 Macc 5:26.28).[886] Most likely, therefore, there was an involuntary substitution of the patronym Beor for the toponym Bosor.

Peter's false teachers and their followers thus followed the path of Balaam who, like them, "loved the reward of injustice/unrighteousness". Hence this strong emphasis on imitation, following in someone's footsteps, taking credit for authority

879 Such a revised variant is found in B vg^{mss} sy^{ph} sa; it is also given by Augustine.

880 This is suggested by J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 343.

881 See, for example, R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 267; D.J. Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 128; T.R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, p. 354.

882 This was pointed out by M. Luther, who, commenting on 2 Pet 2:15–16, first states that the name Balaam means one who is "a swallower or swiller, like one who gapes his throat open, and swallows and devours all". Patronym filius Bosor, "the son of Bosor, – that is to say, flesh, – or, as Moses says, son of Beor, that is, of a fool"; *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther* II (V.15, 16).

883 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 889–890.

884 So C.M. Hays, *A Fresh Look at Βοσορ: Textual Criticism in 2 Pet 2,15*, "Filologia Neotestamentaria" 17 (2004), p. 105–106.

885 Ibid., p 106.

886 Ibid., p 107.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

rendered by the verb ἐξακολουθέω, which is used as early as 2 Pet 2:2.[887] Why the pseudo-teachers and their followers imitate the way of Balaam is explained by the narrator in 15a: καταλιπόντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν "having left the straight path, they were deceived". Once again, the narrator's penchant for using phrases that create paronomasia and alliteration is revealed. This time it is the verb λείπω, which, by adding the prefix κατά, forms part of a meaningful sequence: ἀκατάπαυστος – κατάρα – καταλιπόντες "continual/unstopping (from sin) – cursing – leaving (the straight path)", suggesting on a rhetorical and purely phonetic level that not stopping from sin and leaving the straight path are linked to cursing.

The verb πλανάω has the same root as the "error" πλάνη in Jude 11. It is sometimes used in a literal or metaphorical sense (so, e. g., in 1 Pet 1:25, Isa 53:6, 64:4, Ps 119[118]:110.176, Job 19:4, Wis 5:6). Although it is generally indicated that the passive voice of the verb πλανάω is translated in the same way as the active side (cf. Prov 14:22, Job 38:41, Matt 18:12–13, Mark 12:24.27, 2 Tim 3:13, Titus 3:3, Heb 3:10, 11:38, Jas 5:19, 1 Pet 2:25),[888] here it may suggest that the false teachers themselves were misled. However, it would be difficult to identify a logical subject – by whom they were misled, so it is most likely that despite the use of the passive voice, the narrator has in mind the false teachers themselves wandering and misleading others. The use of the passive voice can be explained by rhetorical considerations and the narrator's fondness for word games based on the phonetic similarity of words. This is because the form ἐπλανήθησαν resembles the next verb, ἐξακολουθήσαντες.

The question of the sequence of tenses between καταλιπόντες and ἐπλανήθησαν in verse 15a can be fairly problematic. The participle καταλιπόντες occurs here in the aorist, by which it is distinguished from part. praes. referring to false teachers, arrogants in verses 10–14. Some manuscripts try to harmonise these participles and therefore give instead of καταλιπόντες the interpretation καταλείποντες – part. praes. act. (א A B* 33. 442): leaving the straight path, they went astray. However, this differentiation of participle forms can be seen as the introduction of a new thought and a new image referring no longer to Hellenistic customs but to Jewish tradition – hence the use of forms referring to the past. The aorist also contains the verb ἐπλανήθησαν. According to the classical rules, the participle and indicative should be translated as: "having left the straight path, they went astray/fell into error", which may suggest that the false teachers and their followers first left the straight path and only later went astray. However, there seems to be a similar situation here as in 2:6 and part. aor. can be taken as equivalent to the present tense: "having left the straight path, they went astray/fell into error", or inchoatively: "having begun to

887 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:2.

888 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 875.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

leave the straight path, they went astray/fell into error". The same can be expressed in translation with the sentences: "as soon as [they] left the straight road", they went astray/as soon as they started to leave the straight road, they went astray". The sequence ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες would also have to be treated as simultaneous actions: "they went astray/they were misled into following the way of Balaam". Furthermore, the terms for the actions of the false teachers and their followers: καταλιπόντες, ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες can be understood as a sequence of explicatives: "they left the straight path", i. e. "they went astray", "they imitated the way of Balaam".

In lexical terms, 2 Pet 2:15ab resembles 2 Pet 2:2:

2 Pet 2:2	2 Pet 2:15ab
Πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις δι᾽ οὕς ἡ ὁδος τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται	Καταλιπόντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλααμ
Many will follow them in promiscuity, by them the path of truth has been defiled/defamed	Leaving (have left) the straight path, [i. e.] went astray, imitating (they imitated) the way of Balaam

From the comparison presented between 2:2 and 2:15ab, it is clear that "leaving the straight path" is the equivalent of "defiling the way of truth". In 2:2, "the way of truth" is combined with "the godly life", "the escape from corruption" and the sorites of 1:5–8, and defined as the conduct resulting from the development of baptismal gifts. Such a path leads the faithful without stumbling into the eternal kingdom.[889] In the same terms, then, the term "straight path" – εὐθεῖα ὁδός – should be understood. In LXX this phrase appears relatively frequently (1 Sam 12:23, Ps 27[26]:11, LXX Prov 2:16, Hos 14:10, Isa 33:15, Dan 3:27), in NT less frequently, of which in three Gospel texts it is a paraphrase of prophetic statements (Matt 3:3, Mark 1:3, Luke 3:4, Acts 13:10). It means, first and foremost, to act in accordance with God's will. It appears in the same sense in *The Shepherd* of Hermas, in Commandment VI 1:2: "For the path of righteousness is straight τὸ γὰρ διίκαιον ὀρθὴν ὁδὸν ἔχει, but that of unrighteousness is crooked".

In Jewish tradition, "to depart from the straight path, to abandon it", signifies a complete, conscious, consistent turning away from God's commandments, a disregard for God's will (Deut 4:19, 13:1–18, 30:17, Wis 12:24, Jas 5:19, cf. also phrases with the verb καταλείπω in Jer 2:17, Bar 4:1, 1 Macc 2:21). In Qumran literature,

889 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:2.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

"the departure from God's straight, righteous path(s)" gains an eschatological context. CD 1:13, like 2 Peter, claims that traitors leaving God's way will appear in the end times, in the last generation: "And He made known to later generations what He has wrought in a former generation in an assembly of treacherous men. They are those who turned out of the way". Their fate at the time of judgement is a foregone conclusion. If they do not repent, "power and might and great wrath in flames of fire. Therein are all the angels of destruction for them who turned out of the way and despised the statute, so that there should be no remnant nor escaping for them" (CD 2:5–7). A similar prediction is found in 1QS 10:21: "I will offer no comfort to the smitten until their way becomes perfect". This eschatological radicalism can also be seen in the statements of early Christian writers, where "going off the straight path" is equated with disregarding God's commandments or denying Jesus: "nothing shall deliver us from eternal punishment, if we disobey His commandments" (*2 Clem.* 6:7); "those who have swerved and denied Jesus by words or deeds are punished with grievous torments in fire unquenchable" (*2 Clem.* 17:7).

The abandonment of the straight path in 2 Pet 2:15a must also be read in an eschatological context. Since the way of truth/straight path leads to the eternal kingdom, leaving it leads to the destruction that will befall both false teachers and their followers. Already in 2 Pet 2:1 and 2:2a Theoretical and practical manifestations of the desecration of the way of truth are marked: denial of the Ruler and debauchery. These are repeated in 2 Pet 2:10a in reverse order: "following the flesh [caused by] impure lust and contempt for the Lordship". From verse 10b began to describe them in more detail, which is now summarised once more as "leaving the way of truth".[890]

Whereas in 2 Pet 2:2 it was the false teachers who became the role model for "many", in 2 Pet 2:15b the role model and authority for the false teachers became

890 An interesting suggestion for interpreting the conduct of Balaam and later the false teachers and their followers is offered by T.S. Caulley, p. 135–138. He argues that the narrator of 2 Pet is strongly against the assimilation of Christianity and Greek philosophy. He quotes Flavius (*Ant.* IV 6:10–11) and his narrative based on the story of Zimri who, through his marriage to the Midianite woman Cozbi, daughter of a Midianite prince, assimilated with the Midianite population and departed from the laws of Moses, accusing Moses himself of autocratism. Zimri's story follows Balaam's advice to Balak that the Midianite women should seduce the Israelites and thus Israel was defeated. In 2 Pet 2:15, then, it is not just a matter of breaking Jewish law, but of assimilation involving the adoption of local customs and mixing them with Jewish tradition (later also Christian tradition – cf. Rev 2:14). Dissimilation and distance in the approach to the worldview of the local population was in turn to ensure salvation, a point strongly emphasised in the story of Lot (2 Pet 2:7–8). Significantly, Zimri calls his desire for assimilation – freedom. The false teachers later make a similar argument. When they speak of the freedom to assimilate, they have in mind such – their own arbitrary – interpretation of the prophecies as would justify this assimilation, resulting in an erroneous eschatology and Christology; cf. also F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 297.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Balaam, who, as mentioned, unable to change the word of God and reject the inspiration, misinterpreted it in order to secure fame and profit. Balaam's way is thus to manipulate the inspired word of God for profit.

One can see a fundamental difference in the presentation of the two elements that make up Balaam's journey. The manipulation of the word of God is implied here and follows from the narrator's argument so far. In contrast, the desire for profit is explicated, presumably because it is a side theme for Peter, but one that is important because of the vituperative convention of the text, in which opponents are presented as foolish, debauched and greedy. Moreover, greed (and complacency) is also highlighted in texts of extra-biblical Jewish tradition dedicated to Balaam.

> Balak […] gave [Balaam] some presents at once, and he promised to give him others […]. And immediately other messengers of the highest rank in the whole land were sent on the same business, bringing with them more abundant presents of money, and promising still more ample rewards […]. And Balaam, being allured by the gifts which were already proffered to him, and also by the hopes for the future which they held out to him, and being influenced also by the rank of those who invited him, began to yield

– Philo describes Balaam's actions in *De vita Mois.* I XLVIII:266–268. Flavius adds that Balaam was ultimately disappointed that the king "without thinking him worthy of any honour" (*Ant.* IV 6:6). Pseudo-Philon, on the other hand, cites Balak's sarcastic comment to Balaam: "Thy God hath defrauded thee of many gifts from me" (LAB 18:12).

There is another variant understanding of the whole phrase Καταλιπόντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαμ "left the straight path, went astray, followed the way of Balaam" in relation to the story of the soothsayer. This time, however, it is not a matter of imitating the prophet's conduct, but of following the path outlined by Balaam's advice. With this understanding, the phrase Balaam's way should be taken elliptically as a reference to the advice given by Balaam to Balak on how to bring about Israel's destruction (cf. Lev 25:1–5). The false teachers acted like the Israelites seduced by the Midianites: they indulged in fornication (promiscuity), rejected God's commandments (antinomianism defined here as "leaving the straight/proper path" and "as wandering"), and finally committed apostasy (cf. 2 Pet 2:1, where reference is made to their rejection of "the Lord who redeemed them"). The Israelites were severely punished for such behaviour, so the implication is that heretics too will face an equally severe retribution for deviation.

In Peter's rendering of the Balaam story, attention is drawn to the genitive ἀδικίας for the noun μισθός, as in verse 13a. The meaning of μισθός ἀδικίας in both verses is similar, but not the same. In verse 13a it was a foreshadowing that the unrighteous

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

will receive payment/punishment for their injustice at the final judgement, which will come as a great surprise to them. Now, the dominant story is summed up by Balaam, who, for cursing Israel and for his advice on how to defeat the Israelites through immorality, expected to receive a reward – wages from Balak. This is overlaid by an irony ingrained in Jewish tradition – the payment, the reward for Balaam was death:[891]

> but what advantage did he reap from such hearing, and what good accrued to him from such knowledge? In his intention he endeavored to injure the most excellent eye of the soul, which alone has received such instruction as to be able to behold God, but he was unable to do so by reason of the invincible power of the Saviour; therefore, being overthrown by his own insane wickedness, and having received many wounds, he perished amid the heaps of wounded, because he had stamped beforehand the divinely inspired prophecies with the sophistry of the soothsayers

– comments Philo in *De mutat. nom.* XXXVII 203 (cf. Lev 31:8). At the same time – through the same lexis and sarcasm as in verse 13a – the narrator of 2 Peter makes it clear that for the Balaam-like manipulation of the word of God and the acquiescence and encouragement of promiscuity, those who followed the path of the soothsayer would also receive a corresponding payment during the judgement. Thus left temporarily in the background, the motif of judgement resounds with even greater force, reinforced by the legally derived wording used in verse 16a.

Juridical phrases in verse 16a undoubtedly include ἔλεγξις 'to accuse', 'to rebuke', and παρανομία 'an act', 'an unlawful action', literally 'beside the law'. The rather rare noun form ἔλεγξις, derived from the verb ἐλέγχω ('to command', 'to accuse', 'to rebuke', 'to chastise') refers to admonishing or accusing in legal cases.[892] The implication here is that the accusation is based on irrefutable evidence (cf. ἔλεγχος – 'proof'). The reason for Balaam's accusation (and consequently that of his followers) is an unlawful act, alongside the law, an unlawful action – παρανομία. The noun παρανομία is another New Testament hapax legomenon in 2 Peter, but it occurs in LXX (Prov 5:22, 10:26, 4 Macc 2:1, 4:19, 5:13, 9:3, Ps 37[36]:7, PssSol 4:11.12, 8:9, 17:20), where it clearly indicates a violation of the law. In Peter's argument, therefore, the concept of παρανομία is close to that of ἀδίκια; both concern conduct contrary to God's will as expressed in the law.

Verse 16b is a surprising summary of the whole story fitting perfectly into the convention of *vituperatio*: for it turns out that the accuser is a mute pack animal speaking with a human voice. This periphrastic formula concerns a donkey and is

891 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 268.

892 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 880.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

a reference to the biblical narrative of Numbers 22:21–35, when an angel with a sword stood in the way of Balaam going to King Balak to curse Israel. The prophet himself did not see the angel, but a donkey saw him and tried to get out of his way. Each time she stepped out of the way, she met her punishment – Balaam severely beat the animal with a stick. Finally, God allowed the donkey to speak with a human voice. The donkey asked reproachfully why it was being punished when it had so far performed without complaint. Balaam treated these questions as derision, until he saw the angel himself.

Peter assigns the donkey a role somewhat different from the one it played in the biblical text.[893] The animal is not complaining about unjust mistreatment, but accusing Balaam of unlawful conduct (according to Num 22:21–35, the accusation falls from the mouth of an angel). It is an accusation that summarises all the prophet's actions and motivations, especially his greed and treacherous advice on how to lead Israel to turn away from God by condoning and even promoting promiscuity. This accusation is at the same time intended to stop Balaam from going mad.

The differences that appear at various levels in the biblical narrative and in Peter's study indicate that the author of 2 Peter may have taken the motif of the donkey accusing and restraining Balaam from acting irrationally directly from a source other than Numbers 22:21–35. The affinity with the Palestinian tradition, which is familiar to Josephus Flavius, Philo and Targums, among others, is usually indicated here.[894] Flavius in *Ant.* IV 6:3 emphasises, like Peter, Balaam's misunderstanding of God's will:

> But when the ass, upon the Angels continuance to distress her, and upon the stripes which were given her, fell down: by the will of God she made use of the voice of a man (φωνὴ ἀνθρωπίνη), and complained of Balaam, as acting unjustly to her; that whereas he had no fault find with her in her former service to him, he now inflicted stripes upon her; as not understanding that she was hindred from serving him in what he was now going about, by the providence of God.

Likewise the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan (22:30), which speaks plainly of Balaam's impiety, lack of reason and wisdom: the donkey said to Balaam: "Woe to thee, Bileam the wicked, wanting in understanding and wisdom!".[895] In Philo, it is Balaam who calls Balaam the most foolish of men and accuses him of madness, although for a very different reason from the haggard donkey:

893 Ibid., p. 882.

894 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 268; T. Callan, *Comparison*, p. 105.

895 *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, Section XL, English transl. J.W. Etheridge.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> Of what a vast amount of money, O most foolish of men ἀνοητότατε, of how many presents, and of how much renown, and celebrity, and glory, hast thou deprived thyself in thy madness! Now you will return to thy home […], bearing with thee no good thing, but only reproaches […] great disgrace, being ridiculed and despised for that knowledge on which you formerly so greatly prided yourself (*De vita Mois.* I LIII:293).

Balaam's behaviour is described by the noun παραφρονία, which in biblical literature in noun form occurs only here. A similar noun formed from the same stem – παραφρόνησις – occurs in Zech 12:4 and means madness; the verb παραφρονέω also indicates insanity, losing one's mind and/or losing one's sanity.[896] It can therefore be assumed that the author of 2 Peter uses the term παραφρονία to express the same content – a lack of sanity verging on insanity. A wordplay based on the phonetic similarity of the nouns παρανομία and παραφρονία is not without significance here. It contains the suggestion that acting contrary to God's law is in fact madness and indicates a lack of reason.

An ironic, vituperative opposition is created between the voice of reason coming from the mute animal and the incomprehension, stupidity, madness of the complacent Balaam acting against God's law representing false teachers.[897] The attribute "mute" ἄφωνος can be taken as the equivalent of lack of reason (cf. 2 Pet 2:12a). In antiquity, the inability to express thoughts in words was generally regarded as an inability to think at all, as evidenced by the double meaning of the phrase ἄλογος – 'unintelligent/irrational/unreasonable' and 'without speech'[898] from verse 12. Aristotle in *Politics* argues "man alone of the animals possesses speech. The mere voice, it is true, can indicate pain and pleasure, and therefore is possessed by the other animals as well […] but speech is designed to indicate the advantageous and the harmful, and therefore also the right and the wrong" (*Politics* 1253a). He repeats this in *The History of Animals*, where he judges that those who cannot speak and talk are mostly also stupid: "Viviparous quadrupeds utter vocal sounds of different kinds, but they have no power of converse. In fact, this power, or language, is peculiar to man. […] Men that are born deaf are in all cases also dumb; that is, they can make vocal sounds, but they cannot speak" (*Hist. Anim.* IV 3). the narrator of 2 Peter, however, does not repeat the term ἄλογος, but calls the measure ἄφωνος, presumably in order to be able to apply another paronomasia: ἄφωνος and (ἀνθρώπου) φωνή, which emphasises on the one hand the unusualness of the

896 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 887.

897 This is already noted by Hilary of Arles in his *Treatise on the Seven Catholic Epistles*: "The donkey warned him against foolishness, for whoever shows disobedience to God is foolish. Dumb animals are wiser than such a man, because they follow the law of nature", *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 139; see also F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 292.

898 T. Callan, *Comparison*, p. 102.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

situation described, but on the other hand even more strongly discredits Balaam (and with him the false teachers) as a person standing even lower than the animals, not only irrational but even insane.

Peter's irony is completed by calling Balaam a prophet contrary to biblical and Hellenistic literature. In Num 22–23 the title prophet is not used in relation to him; Philo calls him μαντικῆς or μάντις – "soothsayer", "magician" (*De vita Mois.* I XLVIII:264 and I L:276), and likewise Josephus Flavius μάντις (*Ant.* IV 6:2). Philo, however, admits that Balaam possessed the prophetic spirit προφητικοῦ πνεύματος, which "drove all his artificial system of divination and cunning out of his soul; for it was not possible that holy inspiration should dwell in the same abode with magic" (*De vita Mois.* I L:277). This Philonic distinction seems close to the author of 2 Peter who, on the one hand, has to admit that Balaam, in blessing Israel, acts not of his own will but under the influence of the Spirit (cf. 2 Pet 1:21), but on the other hand, by manipulating the word of God and giving advice contrary to God's will, he missed his prophetic vocation and becomes a model for insane, arrogant, false prophets (cf. 2 Pet 2:1a) who make their own internal and external interpretations.

2.6.5.2 Part 2. Metaphors and proverbs (2 Pet 2:17–22)

> [17]These are waterless springs/wells, mists driven by a storm. For them, the gloom of darkness is preserved.
> [18]Speaking loudly pompous things/words of lies/falsehood, by the desires of the flesh, promiscuity, they entice those who truly escape from those living in error.
> [19]They promise freedom to them – they, being slaves to corruption: a man [lit. someone] becomes a slave to what he submits to/what overcomes him. [20]If, therefore, having escaped from the defilements of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they again, having entangled themselves, submit to them, the end becomes worse for them than the beginning. [21]It would have been better for them not to learn the way of righteousness than for those who have learned it to have turned away from the holy commandment handed over to them. [22]The [content/word] of the true proverb is confirmed with regard to them/has happened to them: a dog having returned to its own vomit, and a swine that was washed/having washed to roll/wallow in the mud.

Formally, verses 17–19b resemble the structure of verses 12–14 that begins with the pronoun οὗτοι. In terms of the content, the emphasis is shifted from the behaviour of the false teachers to a description of their teaching. The composition of the passage 2:17–22 reveals a framework formed by two metaphors in verse 17 and two metaphors in verse 22. In between the metaphorical imagery is translated into exemplary actions of the false teachers, and their effects:

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

17a – these are waterless springs
17b – mists driven by a storm.
17c – destiny/fate of false teachers
18–19a – gaining supporters and followers
19b – exposing falsehoods in the teachings of heretics
19c – destiny/fate of false teachers
20 – exposing falsehoods in the teachings of heretics
21 – destiny/fate of false teachers
22b – a dog that returned to its own vomit
22c – a swine that was washed and returned to roll/wallow in mud.

As can be seen, the arguments aim at demonstrating that the teaching offered by the heretics is not only illusory and false, but also abhorrent and disastrous. To make this clear to the audience, the narrator uses not only metaphors, but also a series of proverbs: 19c, 20c, (21), 22. Almost all of them were widely known and commonly used. The narrator added his own contextual interpretation and combined them with theological content. Verse 21 is a separate case, because here, the other way round, Theological content was given a distinctive sapiential formula.[899] This is noticeable even when comparing the brevity of the well-known proverbs and the elaborate form of the sentences created by Peter. On this distinctiveness of verse 21 from the rest of the proverbs the main message is based, concerning not only the fate of false teachers, but also Christians unstable in the faith who might be attracted by false teachings:

19c. A man becomes a slave to what he has surrendered and submits to (a well-known proverb).
20c. The end worse than the beginning (a well-known proverb).
21. It would have been better for them not to learn the way of righteousness than for those who have learned it to have turned away from the holy commandment handed over to them (sentence of the author of 2 Peter).
22b. A dog having returned to its own vomit (a well-known proverb).
22c. A swine was washed, to roll in the mud (a well-known proverb).

As before, the narrator of 2 Peter uses the wording and/or thoughts from the Letter of Jude but transforms them creatively. This can be illustrated by the first series of metaphors based on Jude 12–13:

899 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:21.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

2 Pet 2:17	Jude 12–13
Οὗτοί εἰσιν	Οὗτοί εἰσιν [...].
πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι	νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι
Καὶ ὁμίχλαι	
ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι	ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι,
	δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα
	δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα,
	κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἀποφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας,
	ἀστέρες πλανῆται
οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται	οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται
These are waterless springs/wells, mists driven by a storm.	Waterless clouds
	carried away/along/swept along by winds, late-autumn fruitless trees,
	twice dead, uprooted,
	wild sea waves spitting out their shame,
	wandering stars,
For them, the gloom of darkness is preserved	[for] whom the blackness of darkness is reserved forever

Among the transformations, the most striking is the separation of Jude's metaphor νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι into two independent ones. The attribute "waterless" (ἄνυδροι) was applied to springs/wells (πηγαί), not to the clouds; the clouds were changed to ὁμίχλαι "mists driven by a strom". The usual explanation for this change is hydrological issues – every cloud, even if it does not bring rain, is composed of water,[900] so the addition of mist – evidently composed of water – could be considered a correction of Jude's text. However, one must take into account the poetic dimension of Jude's metaphors and the deliberate use of the oxymoron "waterless clouds". The narrator of 2 Peter shows great sensitivity, both rhetorical and poetical, so it is unlikely that he wanted to correct Jude's imagery and enter into a polemic on the basis of his knowledge of nature. Rather, he seems to have wanted to introduce additional imagery based on associations with the lack of water. In the argumentation that follows, he is already trying to shorten rather than expand the source material. Thus, he omits a series of natural metaphors related to climate and Palestinian tradition,[901] perhaps because it is the climate of Italy or Greece that is closer to him and his audience.[902] J.N.D. Kelly argues, however, that this omission is due to Jude's metaphors being too tightly related to and visibly embedded in the apocryphal tradition, which Peter would avoid.[903] This is debatable, given that

900 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 344.

901 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 238.

902 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 274.

903 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 344.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

earlier (especially 2 Pet 2:4–9a) Peter had already drawn on extra-biblical tradition and on literature that was ultimately not included among the Jewish inspired books. Furthermore, the narrator of 2 Peter concludes his metaphorical identification of false teachers with a summary, borrowed from Jude almost without any change (omitting only the phrase εἰς αἰῶνα), which refers primarily to the intertestamental apocalyptic and its use in 2 Pet 2:4.

It is therefore difficult to establish unambiguously why Peter omitted Jude's botanical, nautical and astronomical metaphors. The reason behind this omission may be the limited competence of the audience compounded by the purpose and composition of Peter's arguments. It has already been pointed out that the metaphors of verse 17 are supplemented by the proverbs of verse 22. The proliferation of figurative phrases could obscure the message, which on the one hand – like the *vituperatio* in Jude – exposes the wretchedness, falsity and repulsive nature of the teaching of the heretics, and on the other – much more strongly than Jude – emphasises the eschatological implications of this teaching both for the teachers and for those among Christians who would accept it.

Verse 17 begins, like Jude 12 and 2 Pet 2:12, with the pronoun οὗτοι (literally 'these/those'). Its primary function is similar in all these verses. In apocalyptic texts, the use of the pronoun was intended to express a dismissive and condemnatory attitude towards the unrighteous, in this case the heretics.[904] Furthermore, the pronoun marks the return to the characterisation of false teachers after the narrative of Balaam in verse 16.[905]

The first of Peter's metaphors, which can be called hydrological – πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι "waterless springs/wells" refers to the climate of Palestine, but also to that of Egypt or Greece. It indicates above all the promise and the impossibility to fulfil it, the disappointment of the thirsty wanderer or farmer.[906] The noun πηγή has several meanings, two of them must be considered in the reconstruction of the image to which Peter refers: in classical Greek πηγή means 'spring'; in LXX it can mean both 'spring' (more often) and a 'well' (in Gen 16:7, 24:13.16.29.30.42.43.45, Lev 33:9, Deut 8:15, Josh 15:9, 17:7, 18:15, 1 Kings 18:5, 2 Kings 3:19.25, Isa 35:7, 41:18, Job 38:16). Similarly, in the New Testament (John 4:6, Jas 3:11, Rev 7:17, 8:10, 14:7, 16:4, 21:6). It seems that the narrator of 2 Peter also wants to preserve this ambiguity in order to broaden the spectrum of connotations.[907] He refers thus primarily to The Book of Jeremiah. In Jer 14:3, there is a narrative of servants

904 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 191.

905 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 894.

906 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 345; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 274.

907 In an interesting way, the two meanings of the noun πηγαί are combined by Hilary of Arles in his *Treatise on the Seven Catholic Epistles*: "[The dissolutes] are like springs without water, that is,

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

sent to a well (LXX uses here the noun φρέαρ, meaning a cistern in the ground that collects rainwater and serves as a well). The well, however, turns out to be empty, waterless. So the servants return disappointed and bitter. Similar disappointment is brought about by the doctrines of false teachers. The heretics seem to have something substantial and invigorating to offer (e. g. freedom – cf. 2:19), but it turns out that these are only empty promises. This picture is linked with Jer 2:13,[908] where the phrase πηγὴ ὕδατος ζωῆς "the source of living waters" points to God. The people abandoned this source and dug cisterns and reservoirs (LXX uses a very rare term λάκκος), which, however, are unable to hold water. This, in turn, illustrates the conduct of false teachers who have turned away from God, abandoned His commandments (cf. 2:20), try to create their own ideology and follow it. The human teaching that is not based on the revelation handed down by the prophets and apostles unchanged (cf. 1:16–21) proves to be not only imperfect, but also pernicious, because it does not provide life-giving water.

The second metaphor calls the false teachers ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι "mists driven by a storm", and alludes to Jude's meteorological metaphor: "clouds carried away by winds". The narrator of 2 Peter is perhaps drawing on Aristotle's systematics, according to which 'mist/fog' is a special kind of 'cloud',[909] 'a leftover', as the philosopher writes in *Meteorology*, "Mist is what is left over when a cloud condenses into water, and is therefore rather a sign of fine weather than of rain; for mist might be called a barren cloud".[910] As can be seen, the notion of ὁμίχλαι encompasses Jude's metaphor: "waterless clouds". This supports the suggestion that the intention of the narrator of 2 Peter was not to correct Jude's knowledge of nature, but rather to appeal to two images: the first illustrating the falsity of heretical teaching and the second illustrating the horrific consequences of that teaching. It seems that the term ὁμίχλαι is understood by the author of 2 Peter in a different way than Aristotle did. The mists are not morning refreshing mists heralding good weather and dispersed during the day by the sun (as in Wis 2:4, Sir 24:3, 43:22), but rather dense, ominous fogs bringing darkness and obstructing visibility (as in Job 38:9, Joel 2:2, Isa 29:18, Zeph 1:15). Such clouds/fogs never bring invigorating rain, but herald drought. One can now see the affinity between Jude's metaphor referring to the cloud and Peter's metaphor referring to the fog. The common element is the absence of life-giving water in a hot climate.[911] Peter additionally identified the mist, common in biblical imagery, with transience and

old wells into which the sheep fall and in which, finding no drink, they perish"; *Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię*, p. 139.

908 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 193.

909 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 895.

910 Aristotle, *Meteorology*, I 9.

911 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 274.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

nothingness (Wis 2:4),[912] the end of life, death and judgement (Joel 2:2, Zeph 1:15). This suggests that the false teachings are, on the one hand, transitory and illusory, but on the other hand, pernicious above all to those who preach them. Probably, an idea similar to *2 Clem.* 1:6 is also implied here, where the dense clouds signify the pagan practices from which the faithful are led to the knowledge of Jesus Christ (cf. 2:20a), and to which the false teachers of 2 Peter would return (cf. 2:20b) and draw others (cf. 2:18c): "Involved in blindness, and with such darkness before our eyes, we have received sight, and through His will have laid aside that cloud by which we were enveloped".

The mists are driven by a storm, a gale. This part of Peter's metaphor is much more dynamic than that of Jude. Instead of Jude's noun ἄνεμοι, which means 'winds',[913] the noun λαῖλαψ is used, which means 'a violent squall', 'a gale', 'a storm', 'a whirlwind', even 'a tempest' (Wis 5:14.23, Sir 48:9.12, Job 21:18, 38:1, Jer 25:32 [LXX 32:32]; Mark 4:37, Luke 8:23). The image can denote the effects of false teaching, preventing people from seeing and judging correctly, from walking confidently in the ways of righteousness by obscuring and distorting the revelation (thick fog). False doctrines amplify chaos, disruption, inner conflicts and a sense of enslavement in those who hesitate (whirlwind, storm).[914] This metaphor is interpreted differently by Duane F. Watson and T.D. Callan.[915] They perceive a suggestion that the actions of the false teachers are controlled by powerful (storm-like) external forces. However, nowhere else did the narrator of 2 Peter address the issue of either external inspiration or external control of heretical teaching.

The image of darkness brought by the metaphor of mist and storm is continued in a warning in 17c. The pleonastic term ζόφος τοῦ σκότους, literally 'gloom/blackness of darkness', which is taken from Jude, appears here to heighten the impression of darkness. The first noun – ζόφος – also refers to 2 Pet 2:4 and the description of the fate of the fallen angels. The second noun – σκότος – appears relatively frequently in biblical literature, where it can mean, among other things, 'darkness' as a place of punishment after death (cf. Job 10:22, 15:22, Wis 17:2, 16:20, Tob 4:10, 14:10). Similarly, in the intertestamental tradition: "I […] came to […] the great darkness, and went to the place where no flesh walks" (1 En 17:6); "And light has vanished from before us, And darkness is our dwelling-place for ever and ever" (1 En 63:6). In the New Testament the noun σκότος has an eschatological meaning to describe

912 Cf. also the positive valuation of mist cited by F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 293.

913 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 241.

914 A different interpretation of these metaphors is given by G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 897, who argues that they refer to the spiritual condition of false teachers and imply that the arrogant are now dead.

915 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 194.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the place for those who have not entered the kingdom of God (Matt 8:12, 22:13, 25:30).

The connotations are transferred to false teachers to convince the audience that the fate of heretics is essentially the same as that of fallen angels. This conclusion can be seen as another commentary on 2 Pet 2:3b and 2:4. Peter is convinced that judgement is not useless, the destruction is not slumbering, and false teachers will not escape the ultimate punishment, just like the fallen angels. This is emphasised expressively by the use of the verb τηρέω in ind. perf. pass. This form should be regarded as pass. theologicum indicating that the fate of heretics has already been decided by God. Moreover, the perfective form hides the suggestion that "the gloom of darkness" was preserved for them long ago (cf. ἔκπαλαι), that this decision is still in effect and will be realised in the future, at the final judgement, when it will be revealed that they will not enter the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ (cf. 1:11), but will remain outside (Matt 8:12, 22:13, 25:30).

The metaphors of false teachers are followed by a literal characterisation of their conduct. Verse 18 continues the previous thoughts, as evidenced by the presence of the causal conjunction γάρ. It means that the narrator will now offer an explanation as to why the false teachers have been called "waterless wells/springs" and "mists driven by a storm", and why their destiny, like that of the fallen angels, is "the gloom of darkness". Three fundamental reasons are mentioned: deceitful arrogant/pompous things/words of lies (18a); enticing those who truly want to escape from their previous environment and those living in error (18b); the promise of false freedom (19a).

The first reason was based on Jude 16:

2 Pet 2:18a	Jude 16c
ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι	Τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα
speaking pompous [things/words] of lies/falsehood	their mouths saying [things/words] haughty/arrogant/pompous

Comparing the material in Jude 16, one can see an intensification of the behaviour of false teachers in 2 Pet 2:18a. The manner of speech of the heretics is rendered by the narrator of 2 Pet with three terms. The participle φθεγγόμενοι (cf. 2:16, Ps 94[93]:4, Job 13:7, Wis 1:8) means to speak in an offensive, deceitful, wicked way; the term ὑπέρογκα, literally "haughty/arrogant things" is taken from Jude. It refers both to Dan 7:8.20 (LXX – λαλεῖν μεγάλα – 'to speak great/haughty/arrogant things') and to the apocalyptic intertestamental tradition (possibly derived from the Aramaic version of 1 En 1:17 in 4Q 204 1:17: "proud and hard words").[916] The context of 2 Peter indicates that verse 18a primarily describes arrogant and deceitful

916 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 313.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

proclamation of one's own impunity by denying the coming of judgement and the Parousia. This, in turn, is related with the previously described displays of arrogance towards God, Jesus and the prophets (2:10).[917] This suggestion is confirmed by the use of the phrase ὑπέρογκα in intertestamental apocalyptic literature, where it denotes not only words full of pride but also blasphemy. In 1 En 5:4 the wicked who will suffer punishment at the final judgement are characterised as "[…] With your impure mouths against His greatness". Similarly, in TMos 7:9: "And though their hands and their minds touch unclean things, yet their mouth shall speak great things". Unlike in Jude 16, in 2 Pet 2:18a there is no indication that the phrase ὑπέρογκα refers to arrogance towards people. One could possibly, as M. Green argues,[918] see here an allusion to the verbosity, a talkative nature of false teachers. This would correspond with Jude 12ab and the description of the behaviour of the intruders at the community agape feasts, when they appropriated the time and attention of the participants.[919] Finally, the "arrogant/great [words/things]" can be understood as a sophistic(ated) and manipulative way of speaking.[920] In this manner, the narrator of 2 Peter suggests that it is the false teachers, in contrast to the apostles, who preach teachings based on σεσοφισμένοι μύθοι (1:16) and use πλαστοὶ λόγοι (2:3) to do so. This is confirmed by the genitive ματαιότητος added to ὑπέρογκα as an attribute, as in the phrase ἐπιθυμία μιασμοῦ in 2:10 translated most often as 'impure/vile lust'.

The third of the terms that refers to the teaching, ματαιότης, means 'void', 'vacuum', but also 'falsehood', as in LXX[921] and in Philo of Alexandria. In *De confusione linguarum* 27:141 falsehood is compared to folly: "And Moses indeed says […] 'Thou shalt not receive vain Hearing [οὐ παραδέξῃ ἀκοὴν ματαίαν]'. Meaning not only this, that one ought not to receive false or silly reports by hearsay". In NT, in 1 Tim 1:6, a synonymous noun ματαιολογία is used, derived from the same root, meaning 'idle', 'empty', 'deceitful talk', and in Titus 1:10 the term ματαιολόγος indicating one who indulges in this idle talk. As can be seen, this lexeme, rare in biblical literature, was gaining popularity by the end of the first century. Among the early Christian writers, it is used, for example, by Ignatius of Antioch in his letter to the Church in Philadelphia 1:1: "[the bishop] who by his silence is able to accomplish more than those who vainly talk" τῶν μάταια λαλούντων.

The picture of evaluating the doctrine of false teachers is completed by the verb φθέγγομαι – 'to speak/address somebody loudly', which the narrator of 2 Peter has

917 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 274 argues that in contrast to Jude 16 in 2 Pet 2:18 ὑπέρογκα refers less to God and more to people.

918 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 254.

919 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 235.

920 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 194.

921 Ps 4:3, 31[30]:1, 38[37]:13, 40[39]:5, 139[138]:20, 144[143]:8.11.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

already used in 2:16 when describing the "speech" of Balaam's donkey. This is most likely a vituperative subtle attempt to equate the noisy speeches of heretics and animal roaring, while at the same time suggesting that the donkey's speech is more substantive than the false teaching. The whole phrase ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι should thus be understood as follows: although the words of the false teachers may sound beautiful and sublime,[922] they are in fact only arrogant blasphemy uttered with sophisticated phrases, so they remain empty, deceitful and worthless[923] and must be treated like the roars of irrational beasts. This corresponds fully to the thought contained in the "waterless springs/wells" metaphor of verse 17a. One can therefore consider verse 18a as an explanation of verse 17a.

In verse 18b, the narrator of 2 Peter returns to the motif of enticing/luring followers with a bait. The imagery of 2:14 has expanded slightly.[924] As already mentioned, the extension concerns the mode of enticing – ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις "by the desires of the flesh, promiscuity". The mention of "desires/lusts" was undoubtedly also taken from Jude 16:

2 Pet 2:18b	Jude 16b
δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις	οὗτοί εἰσιν [...] κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτῶν πορευόμενοι
They entice by the desires of the flesh, promiscuity	[these] are [...] following their desires/ indulging in their lusts

Jude describes the false teachers as those who "are following their desires", i. e. they are guided by their own will and desire to satisfy their ambitions, gain power and recognition, while contesting the will of God; moreover, they want to pretend to be God's chosen ones who have received special revelation from God.[925] Peter shifts the emphasis on a different aspect from satisfying all desires and ambitions to gaining followers by means of the consent to follow "the desires of the flesh, promiscuity". Here, the narrator employs his favourite construction with the dative and ἐν (cf. 1:1.2, 2:7.10) of an instrumental meaning: "they entice by the desires of the flesh, promiscuity". Although these phrases are primarily associated with sexuality, they are not limited to it, and should be treated similarly to the descriptions of hedonistic behaviour in verses 12–14. It means that "the desires of the flesh" involve all the senses, while "promiscuity" – understood, as in 2:2, as various actions, acts, deeds – means an unlimited indulgence of these desires and their satisfaction. One may wonder how to interpret the whole asyndetic construction of ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς

922 It is difficult to verify the suggestion of G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 900–901, that the words of false teachers are also aggressive.

923 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 274.

924 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:14.

925 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 311–312.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

ἀσελγείαις? Should we treat ἀσελγείαι as an apposition[926] to ἐπιθυμίαι, or perhaps as an adverbial of manner made up of two terms usually linked by the conjunction καί? The first variant seems more likely – an epegegetical apposition in which the noun ἀσελγείαι 'promiscuity', 'licentiousness' specifies the meaning of ἐπιθυμίαι σαρκός 'desire of the flesh'. The whole phrase should thus be understood: "by means of the desires of the flesh, i. e. [consenting to acts of] promiscuity".

In addition to the clarification of the mode of enticing/luring, verse 18 defines the object of the hunt. In 2 Pet 2:14, these were persons unstable in the faith – ψυχαὶ ἀστηρίκτοι "uncertain/unstable souls", who are easier to tempt than those having a firm foothold (στήριγμα) in the faith. Now the object of the hunt is referred to as τοὺς ὄντως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους – "truly escaping from those living in error". Most questionable is the adverb ὄντως[927] – 'really', 'truly', 'indeed'. In NA27, instead of ὄντως, the adverb ὀλίγως[928] (with a temporal meaning 'lately', 'just recently' or qualitative 'barely', 'only') appeared in the text. In NA28, the adverb ὄντως, which has a valuative meaning: "they entice those who truly escape", seems to fit in with the accusatory tone of the narrator and shows that the target of the false teachers is not only the hesitant and uncertain ones, but also believers who are not stable enough in the faith, though they try to "truly escape" from their former life and "truly" want to gain Christian freedom. Such action seems particularly perfidious.

In Peter's sociolect, the escape is usually from that which is valued negatively. In 2 Pet 1:4 it was "the corruption in the world [caused by] lust" τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς. In 2:18c this escape is expressed with part. praes. ἀποφεύγοντες[929] (cf. also 2 Pet 2:20), which indicates an ongoing, unfinished (durative, iterative) action. This would imply that false teachers lure those who truly, sincerely, genuinely want to abandon/escape their previous life and/or environment, but for various reasons have not yet radically cut themselves off from it. This also indirectly explains their instability and possible hesitations mentioned in 2:14.

The milieu from which the victims of false teachers attempt to cut off is defined as those "living in error". The participle ἀναστρεφόμενοι appears here, formed from the verb ἀναστρέφω, with the same stem as the noun ἀναστροφή in 2:7.[930] Ἀναστροφή, as said, means 'a way/mode of life'. The participle ἀναστρεφόμενοι has a similar meaning here. Thus, the narrator of 2 Pet refers to those who live a life

926 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 345; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 254.

927 Thus NA28 per *א C P 048. 5. 811. 307. 442. 642. 1175. 1243. 1448. 1611. 1735. 1739. 1852. 2492. *Byz*.

928 Thus, *inter alia*, P^{72} $א^2$ A B Ψ 33. 436.

929 Some testimonies in 2:18 use participium aoristi ἀποφύγοντες, as in 1:4 and 2:20.

930 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:7.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

that may be described as persisting "in error" ἐν πλάνῃ. The point of reference here is most likely Peter's perspective, rather than the constatation of those who wish to escape error.

The term πλάνη 'error', 'a departure from the truth' in the form of a noun appeared in 2 Peter for the first time. Earlier, the narrator used the cognate verb πλανάω (2:15). It is most likely that the noun πλάνη, which often appears in biblical literature,[931] is taken directly from Jude 11, where the false teachers are accused of having committed "the error of Balaam" (cf. also Jude 13, where they are called wandering/errant stars). If so, then verse 18c can be seen as a further allusion and some parallels to the story of Balaam. Balaam took advantage of pagan women's propensity for fornication to lead the Israelites into apostasy (Lev 31:16). False teachers act in a similar way – they exploit the promiscuity (hedonism) associated with pagan milieus to find followers and lead them, instead of the eternal kingdom, towards destruction. It is significant that the term πλάνη in the intertestamental and early Christian times often referred to idolatry and pagan customs that opposed the path of righteousness, i. e. God's will and God's commandments (Wis 12:24, Rom 1:27, Titus 3:3).[932] This would mean that the term "living in error" applies to Peter's, and more broadly to the Christian assessment of pagan milieu[933] and pagan customs.

When analysing verse 12 it was mentioned that some references to the Cyrenaics and/or Epicureans can be found in Peter's narrative. Verse 18c seems to confirm this. Some of the pagans want and seek to escape from the Cyrenaics who lived an attractive, hedonistic lifestyle (cf. Eph 2:3, 4:19.22, Col 3:5, 1 Thess 4:5, 1 Pet 1:14, 4:3). Not surprisingly, such people quickly fell into the snares of false teachers who led similar, equally attractive lives, but had a different justification for them, based on their own interpretation of the Christian message but stripped of the doctrine of Parousia and judgement. This suggestion is confirmed by the asyndetic phrase ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις "in the desires of the flesh, promiscuity", which points to the most appealing and attractive element in both the Cyrenaic philosophy and the acts of false teachers.

The narrator of 2 Pet reveals here his characteristic sarcasm: there are people who wish to escape and flee from a pagan hedonistic lifestyle, but they fall into the snares of hedonism set by false teachers. They thus reassert themselves in the belief that it is not a promiscuous life and indulgence to the senses that is the error πλάνη pointed out to them by Christians and false teachers, but the justification of such

931 Prov 14:8, Wis 1:12, 12:24, Jer 23:17, Matt 27:64, Eph 4:14, 1 Thess 2:3, 2 Thess 2:11, Jas 5:20, 2 Pet 3:17, 1 John 4:6.

932 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 345.

933 R. Bauckham, *Jude 2 Peter*, p. 274; M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 256; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 905.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

a lifestyle. It would therefore be an error to consider pleasure as happiness and to pursue it, but it is not an error to live such a lifestyle if it is justified by Christian freedom in a heretical interpretation.

At the same time, this sarcasm is intended to make the audience realise that the consent and acceptance of a lifestyle subordinate to the flesh and its desires (2 Pet 2:12–14) equates the false teachers with the pagans (Eph 2:3, 4:19.22, Col 3:5, 1 Thess 4:5, 1 Pet 1:14, 4:3). The whole teaching of the heretics is in fact a Christianised version of an eclectic pagan philosophy, in which elements of Cyrenaicism and Epicureanism predominate. Obviously, in the opinion of the author of 2 Peter the Christianisation of selected ideas of Greek philosophy is by no means wrong, and he did so himself. It has already been noted in *exordium* that in 2 Peter the Greek philosophical terminology is translated into Christian practice. Additionally, the author of 2 Peter intertwined elements of Jewish tradition and thus built his integrative strategy. Yet he proves that false teachers do the same, but instead of christianising the Greek thought, they actually paganise Christianity. He makes this particularly clear in verse 19a, when he refers to "freedom" – one of the most important ideas in both pagan and Christian thought.

The pursuit of sensual pleasures and unbridled indulgence in them to gain followers became one of the key elements in the identification of false teachers. It has already been said that Cyrenaicism is particularly close to them. For the Cyrenaics sometimes emphasised, in a manner bordering on vulgarity, only the value of worldly life and selfish pleasure, since nothing beyond the pleasure is certain, especially in the future. One should not, therefore, care at all about the future, either the earthly future or, if there is one at all, the post-mortem one.[934]

This hedonistic, Cyrenaic trait is linked by M. Green[935] with the belief that the false teachers considered themselves to be deeply spiritual people who express their religiosity and spirituality through sexuality. This would correspond, according to him, to the description of the Valentinians in *Adv. Haer.* I 31:3 by Irenaeus of Lyons. The Valentinians, too, in gaining followers apply "their wicked, although plausible, persuasions, imagining that they will obtain from them the knowledge of some greater and more sublime mysteries. […] still cleaving to these miserable and baseless fables, have reached such a pitch of arrogance as to reckon themselves superior to all others on account of such knowledge, or, as it should rather be called, ignorance".

In contrast, G.L. Green[936] compares the activity of the false teachers described by Peter to the actions of arrogant Carpocratians, preaching all freedom from the

934 T. Biesaga, *Spór o dobro moralne: hedonizm – eudajmonizm – personalizm*, [in:] *Spór o dobro*, ed. A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień, P. Gondek, Lublin 2012, p. 292.

935 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 254–256.

936 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 906.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

law, freedom of customs, and slandering, blaspheming the Church. Like M. Green, he cites Irenaeus' characterisation of this heresy:

> The soul, therefore, which is like that of Christ can despise those rulers who were the creators of the world, and, in like manner, receives power for accomplishing the same results. This idea has raised them to such a pitch of pride, that some of them declare themselves similar to Jesus; while others, still more mighty, maintain that they are superior to his disciples, such as Peter and Paul, and the rest of the apostles, whom they consider to be in no respect inferior to Jesus. […] They practise also magical arts and incantations; philters, also, and love-potions; and have recourse to familiar spirits, dream-sending demons, and other abominations, declaring that they possess power to rule over, even now, the princes and formers of this world; and not only them, but also all things that are in it. […] [we] have in fact no fellowship with them, either in doctrine or in morals, or in our daily conduct. But they lead a licentious life, and, to conceal their impious doctrines, they abuse the name [of Christ], as a means of hiding their wickedness; so that their condemnation is just, when they receive from God a recompense suited to their works. So unbridled is their madness, that they declare they have in their power all things which are irreligious and impious, and are at liberty to practise them; for they maintain that things are evil or good, simply in virtue of human opinion (*Adv. Haer.* I 25:2–4).

The weakness of both hypotheses is their anachronism. Both the Valentinians and the Carpocratians appeared in the Christian milieu later than 2 Peter. Even G.L. Green, while pointing out that the Carpocratians may have preached relatively early (perhaps as early as the beginning of the second century),[937] admits that other elements characteristic of Gnostic thought, such as dualism, the creation of the world by a demiurge, the role of the archons, or the negative attitude to body and matter, are absent from Peter's message.[938] Indeed, while some particular features of the heretics' teaching can be identified in 2 Peter, it is impossible to reconstruct their overall doctrine. This is not only because Peter does not deal with it, but above all because he probably does not want to point out any of the heresies of his contemporaries. For it must be remembered that his text is apocalyptic, and the narrator intension is to refer to the future. In keeping with this convention, it must be generic. Peter selects from contemporary heterodox currents the elements he finds most attractive, which at the same time will be universal enough to be able to relate them to the future and not to one, but to many heretical groups. For this reason, he focuses less on the doctrine itself (he emphasises only generally the denial of the Lord as the Redeemer – 2.1.10 and the blasphemous denial of

937 J. Daniélou, *Teologia judeochrześcijańska*, Polish transl. S. Basista, Kraków 2002, p. 82–84.
938 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 275.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the Parousia and judgement – 2.10, 3.3–4) and more on the mores and moral indifferentism.[939]

Line 19 explains the metaphor in 17a in more detail. The narrator of 2 Peter clarifies what the false promises of pseudo-teachers and the promoters of their teachings consist in. The explanation was already initiated in the sarcastic verses 18bc, now follows an ironical explanation and summary of the promises that are empty and false as waterless wells/springs: ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς "They promise freedom to them – they, being slaves to corruption". The very juxtaposition of "freedom" and "slavery" may allude to the slavery characteristic of all ancient societies. In LXX, the lexeme ἐλευθερία actually appears only in a social context: in connection with slavery (Exod 21:2.5.26.27, Lev 19:20, Deut 15:12.13, Jdt 16:23, Sir 7:21, 33:26, Jer 41:9.16), with war (Deut 21:14, 1 Macc 10:33, 14:26).[940] In the political and existential context, rather than the term "freedom", the terms "deliverance, redemption, salvation" appear. This means that "freedom" in this dimension is not the work of man, but the gift of God, and as such cannot be the object of human promises. It seems, therefore, that Peter's notion of freedom in verse 19 rather refers to Greek philosophy, since the narrator here continues to expose the teaching of the heretics as a way to paganise Christianity and treating Christendom as one of eclectic philosophical schools. Thus, he also refers to his first mention of false teachers as those who will introduce heresies (2:1).[941]

In the Greek tradition, freedom as a value had been known since the time of Homer. In Homeric literature, the term ἑκούσιος 'voluntary', 'acting voluntarily', described a man who never succumbs to any inner force and acts according to his nature.[942] As from the sixth/fifth century BC, the idea of freedom became increasingly linked to the democratic model of socio-political life, a broad interpretation of Homeric voluntary acting, acting according to one's own will and nature, could lead to anarchy. Not surprisingly, the redefinition of freedom in the classical era was based on the organisation and functioning of the state. Its essence was equality before the law on the one hand, and on the other, a clear ethical orientation and an emphasis on responsibility towards the state and its citizens. This can already be seen in the writings of Aeschylus and Sophocles. For Aeschylus, a free man is not only one who acts on the basis of his own nature and his own laws, but also, and perhaps above all, one who recognises the laws established by the gods and/or the cosmic world order reflected in state law as his own. Sophocles believed similarly

939 See Introduction.

940 J. Blunck, *Freedom*, NIDNTT 1, p. 716.

941 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:1.

942 S. Kowalczyk, *Idea wolności w filozofii grecko-rzymskiej*, "Rocznik Nauk Społecznych" 27 (1999), no. 1, p. 18.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

that freedom means to accept divine law and to act on the basis of that law.[943] Over time, freedom in its individual aspect, understood no longer as acting according to one's own laws and nature, but as personal independence from external forces and from internal, sensual inclinations, began to play an increasingly important role. The concept of Socrates, who saw the essence of personal freedom (autonomy of the spirit) in the control of oneself, one's desires, passions and needs, i. e. in the subordination of the bodily sphere to reason, became a model.[944] Plato also claimed that a free man is one who does not succumb to his drives, senses or fears. Such freedom can be achieved by acquiring and nurturing moral virtues, by rational, responsible actions and by respecting state and divine law.[945]

Responsibility for one's actions, mastery of passions and desires, recognition and respect for existing laws – laws of nature, laws of the state and divine laws – is required for rational freedom in Stoic terms, especially in Epictetus' reinterpretation of Stoicism. Inner freedom is also the ability to come to terms with one's fate and to rid oneself of the fear of an unknown future, to maintain peace of mind in any situation. This is fostered by the cultivation of virtues, whereby one develops internally, learns external and internal restraint and gets rid of vices. According to Epictetus, gaining such freedom and at the same time strength of spirit requires trust and reliance on the god.[946]

It seems that these Socratic-Platonic and, in part, Stoic-Epictetian ideas are particularly close to the author of 2 Peter. He had already admitted this, as it were, in *exordium* when christianising elements characteristic of Greek ethics (especially in the catalogue of virtues in 1:5–8). He now focuses on the problem of freedom, which was of interest from different aspects and perspectives for early Christian circles (cf. Rom 6:5–23, 1 Cor 7:20–24, Gal 5:13, John 8:31–36, 1 Pet 2:16).[947] Aware of the centuries-long development of eleutheric reflection in Greek philosophy and observing the emergence of libertine interpretations of Christian freedom in his own time, he recognised that this issue would also be of interest to future generations of Christians, both in its ethical and soteriological-eschatological aspects.

In all probability, it can be assumed that the freedom promised by false teachers is individually understood and connected with the transposition of Greek ethics and philosophy into Christianity. This rooting of heterodox eleutheric thought in

943 Ibid., p. 17.

944 J.W. Gałkowski, *Wolność moralna w ujęciu Sokratesa i Arystotelesa*, "Roczniki Filozoficzne" 22 (1973), no. 2, p. 16.

945 S. Kowalczyk, *Idea wolności*, p. 22.

946 Ibid., p. 27–28.

947 More information about a possible link between 2 Pet 2:19 and Rom 8 in: M.G. Ruf, *Die heiligen Propheten, eure Apostel und ich: Metatextuelle Studium zum zweiten Petrusbrief*, Tübingen 2011, p. 457–460.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Greek philosophy and ethics makes it attractive to those who, on the one hand, want to liberate themselves from their pagan milieu and, on the other, still apply its philosophical categories.

Unfortunately, the narrator of 2 Peter does not specify how the false teachers understood Christian freedom. We can only assume that, on the one hand, their understanding is based on a philosophy other than the one Peter appreciated, on the other hand, on the Christian concept of freedom from sin. One of the few clues is the manifestation of freedom in morals. Due to the fact that Peter's teaching in this matter is too general, various proposals for interpreting freedom in 2:19a were formulated. The most important were collected and presented by R. Bauckham[948] (and later by D.J. Moo,[949] S.J. Kraftchick,[950] G.L. Green,[951] F. Mickiewicz[952]). All of them actually refer to libertinism and antinomianism, differently interpreted and justified, caused by a misconception of Christian freedom (cf. 2 Pet 3:15–16);[953] to a lesser extent taking into account the philosophical considerations mentioned above.

Firstly, freedom in 2 Pet 2:19a generally means freedom from observance of the Law.[954] On this basis, false teachers were identified with the libertines described in 1 Cor 8:9, 10:23, or with the antinomians condemned by the author of the Letter of Jude, or possibly with "extreme Paulists" who abused Paul's doctrine of justification by faith and freedom from the Law.[955]

Secondly, this freedom can be construed as the concept later developed by the Gnostics: as liberation from the rule of the archons and/or demiurge and the rules imposed by them. The Gnostics considered themselves liberated through knowledge from the power of the creators of the temporal, material world (cf. *Adv. Haer*. I 23:4, where the priests of the Simonians descended from Simon the Magus "lead profligate lives and practise magical arts, each one to the extent of his ability. […] from them knowledge, falsely so called, received its beginning"; and *Adv. Haer.* I 24:4–5: "Those angels […] formed all the things which are in the world, and made allotments among themselves of the earth […] The chief of them is he who is thought to be the God of the Jews […]. Salvation belongs to the soul alone, for the body is by nature subject to corruption. […] the prophecies were derived from those powers who were the makers of the world, but the law was specially given by

948 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 275.
949 D. J. Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 143–145.
950 S.J. Kraftchick, *Jude & 2 Peter*, p. 143–145.
951 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 909.
952 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 295–296.
953 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 909.
954 This opinion is held by J.D.N. Kelly, M. Green, T. Fornberg.
955 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 275.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

their chief, who led the people out of the land of Egypt. He attaches no importance to [the question regarding] meats offered in sacrifice to idols, thinks them of no consequence, and makes use of them without any hesitation; he holds also the use of other things, and the practice of every kind of lust, a matter of perfect indifference"). As mentioned, however, this would be the only such "(pre)Gnostic" feature of the doctrine of the false teachers in 2 Peter; it is difficult to advance a theory of the Gnostic rooting of the heresy described on its basis.

Freedom from corruption φθορά understood primarily metaphorically as a synonym for sin is indicated as another hypothesis. Christians, and this is what the false teachers consider themselves to be, are supposed to be free from sin regardless of what they do. Consequently, the principle "guilt/sin vs punishment" does not apply to them. The same applies to the afterlife: since they remain free from corruption/sin, they are not subject to corruption understood as punishment, i. e. death and destruction. Such an attitude is often called a realised eschatology. But, as in the "Gnostic hypothesis", apart from this scant circumstantial evidence, there is no other evidence to attribute to the false teachers a belief in a realised eschatology. On the contrary, it seems that by denying a future eschatology, they deny all Christian eschatological teaching.[956]

Eschatological scepticism translates into the next eleutheric hypothesis, namely freedom from the fear of Parousia, judgement and punishment, which makes the views of the false teachers closer to Epicureanism, especially in the Christian interpretation of it.[957] In the *Letter to Herodotus*, which Diogenes Laertius cites in *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* X 133, Epicurus argues that all ideas about posthumous punishment are based on myths. Here he evaluates myths negatively – as does Peter in 1:16a – as stories about the future that cannot be verified: "the greatest anxiety of the human mind arises through the belief that the heavenly bodies are blessed and indestructible, and that at the same time they have volitions and actions and causality inconsistent with this belief ; and through expecting or apprehending some everlasting evil, either because of the myths, or because we are in dread of the mere insensibility of death, as if it had to do with us; and through being reduced to this state not by conviction but by a certain irrational perversity, so that, if men do not set bounds to their terror, they endure as much or even more intense anxiety than the man whose views on these matters are quite vague. But mental tranquillity means being released from all these troubles". He repeats this in the *Letter to Menoeceus* already quoted: "Accustom thyself to believe that death is nothing to us, for good and evil imply sentience, and death is the privation of all sentience".

956 Ibid.

957 J.H. Neyrey, *The Form and Background of the Polemic in 2 Peter*, JBL 99 (1980), no. 3, p. 419–420; see also above for an analysis of 2:13 and the Christian view of Epicurus cited by Lactantius in *Divinae Institutiones*.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Plutarch, in *Moralia* 1092A–B, comments sarcastically on this Epicurean lack of fear of death and punishment:

> if pain or fear of the ordinances of the gods or fear of Hades is a bad thing, then to escape from it is a bliss worthy of envy. It is a scanty and small range of joy that they delineate, in which she goes round and round and round – only that she is rid of the fear of torments in Hades […] they make the height of wisdom the very thing that would seem to be due to creatures without understanding. […] They do not, after all, harbour any mistaken fears about the gods, they are not tormented by vain anxieties about the fate of the afterlife, nor do they have any idea at all that this is something terrible.

It seems that this attitude is also close to the author of 2 Peter.

Freedom from fear of eschatological punishment would justify freedom of morals and liberation from any moral norms and constraints. In this way, moral hedonism and libertinism (antinomianism) would combine with the denial of eschatology.[958] The teaching of the false teachers, however, appears to be somewhat more sophisticated. It has already been mentioned that it combines elements of misunderstood Christian liberty and Epicurean eschatological scepticism. Paul himself notes that his ideas can be misinterpreted, since he warns that the freedom to which Christians are called should not be seen as an encouragement to indulge and succumb to every whim of the flesh (Gal 5:13). In The Letter to the Romans, he asks rhetorically whether liberation from the Law means consent to break it (Rom 6:15). And he answers emphatically that certainly Christian freedom is liberation from the dominion of sin, but also submission to the bondage of righteousness (Rom 6:16–23).[959] In doing so, he uses a phrase reminiscent of 2 Pet 2:19c: δοῦλοι ἐστε ᾧ ὑπηκούσατε "you are slaves of the one you obey" (Rom 6:16). False teachers reduce this teaching to liberation from sin, and treat liberation from the Law in a radical and complete way. Meanwhile, in accordance with Paul's thought, it is a matter of liberation from the Law constantly accusing man before God, which, being impossible to fulfil, does not bring justice to man. Man must abandon the conviction that he is capable of attaining a state of righteousness before God on his own, and recognise that righteousness before God is brought to him only by accepting Christ's righteousness upon himself. This, in turn, means that observance of the Law is no longer regarded as a path to righteousness, but as an acceptance of Christ's righteousness (submission to the bondage of righteousness). To this reductionist

958 Political freedom also appears among the less likely propositions; see R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 275; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 909, 910.

959 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 346; T. Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralitic Society*, p. 106–107; S.J. Kraftchick, *Jude & 2 Peter*, p. 144; T.S. Caulley, *They Promise*, p. 131–132.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

interpretation of Christian freedom, false teachers add freedom from fear of eschatological judgement and punishment. This freedom, as has been shown, they take over from Epicurus along with the belief that God/Jesus, having endowed people with freedom from the Law, is no longer interested in their conduct and therefore waives judgement on them at the end of time.[960] In this way, although they combine selected Christian ideas with elements of Greek philosophy, they do not christianise the latter, as the narrator of 2 Peter does, but make a narrow and sophistic pagan reinterpretation of Christendom[961] in the spirit of Cyrenaic hedonism.[962]

Peter expresses his disapproval of this kind of practice through an irony based on the "freedom – slave" opposition: freedom is promised by the slaves of corruption. It is worth noting, however, that what is discredited here is not so much the term δοῦλος, but the whole phrase δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς "being slaves of corruption". For the noun δοῦλος was used by the author of 2 Peter in the prescript of the letter, introducing himself as a slave and apostle of Jesus Christ and treating the term as an honourable title. Now, on the contrary, δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς should be read as an invective and dishonour. It is also no coincidence that the promises are made using the participle ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, which alludes to the noun ἐπαγγέλματα in 1:4 and emphasises the qualitative difference between God's/Christ's promises to escape corruption in the world, which are fulfilled and will certainly be fulfilled also in the future (cf. ἐπαγγελία in 2 Pet 3:4.9) and unrealistic promises used by false teachers – "slaves of corruption".[963]

It seems that the "corruption" φθορά is understood metaphorically from the perspective of the morals – as in 2 Pet 1:4.[964] There is no reason to limit its meaning to the sexual sphere, although, for example, G.L. Green[965] citing, among others, *Con. Ap.* II 25 by Flavius[966] and on *Quod deterius* 27, 102 by Philo,[967] he tries to prove such a limitation. On the contrary, one sees rather a tendency to expand

960 J.H. Neyrey, *The Form and Background*, p. 123; D.J. Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, p. 148–150; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 275–276.

961 S. Kowalczyk, *Idea wolności*, p. 27.

962 Cf. T.S. Caulley, *They Promise*, p. 132–138, who calls this process an assimilation based on an erroneous, uninspired, non-apostolic interpretation of the prophecies.

963 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 277.

964 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:4.

965 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 916.

966 Josephus Flavius, *Against Apion*: "If any one therefore proceeds to such fornication, or murder, he cannot be clean. Moreover, the law enjoins, that after the man and wife have lain together, in a regular way, they shall baThemselves. For there is a defilement contracted thereby, both in soul and body".

967 Philo, *That the Worse is Wont to Attack the Better*: "Nor does it follow that, because for the sake of the perpetuation of your race you have been endowed with the powers of generation, you ought to pursue pollutions and adulteries and other impure connections".

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

the meaning of φθορά in relation to the context of 1:4, for the word "corruption" may be interpreted as synonymous with eschatological destruction, annihilation – ἀπώλεια (cf. 2 Pet 2:1e,3b).[968] This in turn leads to imagery based on a literal perception of destruction as death, decay. It seems likely, therefore, that all three meanings:[969] moral (dominant), eschatological and literal, are applied. This would mean that the false teachers are "slaves of corruption" because they are completely subject to it, both during the earthly life and in the eschatological future.

The whole phrase δοῦλοι τῆς φθορᾶς "slaves of corruption" undoubtedly belongs to the Christian sociolect. A similar phrase appears, among others, in Rom 8:21 – δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς "slavery of corruption" (cf. also Rom 6:16),[970] in John 8:34 – πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δοῦλος ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας and in Clement of Alexandria's letter to Theodore in *Secret Mark* 1:6–7 – καυχώμενοι ἐλευθέρος εἶναι δοῦλοι γεγόνασιν ἀνδραποδώδων ἐπιθυμιῶν "they do not know that they are casting themselves away into 'the nether world of the darkness' of falsity, and boasting that they are free, they have become slaves of servile (lit. binding, tethering) desires". It is used by Hippolytus of Rome (*Comm. Dan.* III 22:4) and Origen (*Hom. Exod.* XII 4), the fourth century anti-Marcion treatise *The Dialogues of Adamantius* (58:1–2) and *Recognitiones* by Pseudo-Clement (V 12:4).[971] Hippolytus used it when commenting on the conduct of Daniel, who prayed to God at night while showing disobedience to King Darius: "By his disobedience, Daniel shows that he is not the king's but God's slave, because a man becomes the slave of him who overpowers him".[972] Origen, in his twelfth homily on Exod 34:30–34, linked the Old Testament text to the New Testament and explained that

> "[…] he will come from fleshly to spiritual things and will pass over from slavery to freedom." Later on he asks: "But how can we attain freedom, we who serve the world, who serve money, who serve the desires of the flesh?" And switching to the first person singular, he states: "I am a slave of that affair and care to which I am bound. For I know that it is written that 'by what each one is conquered, to this also he is delivered as a slave'".[973]

968 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 276.

969 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 346.

970 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 276 admits here the influence of the apostle Paul's theology and indicates that the author of 2 Peter may have been familiar with Paul's letter to the Romans, especially if it is assumed that 2 Peter was sent from Rome.

971 W. Gründstäudl, *"On Slavery": A Possibile Herrenwort in 2 Pet 2:19*, "Novum Testamentum" 57 (2015), no. 1, p. 57–71.

972 For: W. Gründstäudl, *"On Slavery"*, p. 60.

973 For: Ibid.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Recognitiones connects these words to Jesus and at the same time to Peter, who explains to the Gentile audience that the status of God's servant and God's slave means the acquisition of the inheritance in the kingdom of heaven. The apostle is here to evoke the words of "the true prophet", i. e. Jesus, "unusquisque illius sit servus cui se ipse subiecerit (everyone will be the servant of the one to whom he himself submits)".[974] In *The Dialogues of Adamantius*, this phrase appears between quotations from Matt 6:24, Luke 16:13 and John 8:34 and serves to demonstrate that one should only submit to the one God, serving another Lord has nothing to do with freedom. It is accompanied by an enigmatic commentary: ὁ ἔξωθεν λόγος "external word".[975] As W. Gründstäudl notes, it is unlikely that these are quotations from 2 Pet 2:19; in fact, completely different contexts rule this possibility out. Gründstäudl, however, makes a valiant attempt to trace the origins of this saying.[976] He argues that the saying may come from Jesus himself. In fact, it appears in such a context in *Recognitiones*, which include quite a few *agrapha* – words attributed to Christ that are not included in the canonical versions of the Jesus narrative. In the same vein, the ὁ ἔξωθεν λόγος "external word" in *The Dialogues of Adamantius* can also be translated: these would be the words of Jesus coming from outside (ἔξωθεν "from outside") the canonical gospels. Perhaps the tradition familiar to the authors of *Recognitiones* and *The Dialogues of Adamantius* was also used by the narrator of 2 Pet in his typical way: without explicitly mentioning the source and with some transformations. On the other hand, it would have been more natural for the narrator's identity as Peter to indicate that the words came from Jesus, and that he had heard them and can now refer to them, as in 2 Pet 1:16–18.

Although W. Gründstäudel's hypothesis does not seem impossible, it is more likely that the quotations quoted above are examples of adaptations and Christian concretisations of the popular, well-known aphorism:[977] ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται. The saying presumably originates from the time of military conquests, which resulted in the taking of captives into slavery and the slave trade.[978] There may even be allusions to the Jewish War (66–70 AD), which contributed to the increase in Jewish slaves from Judea forced by Nero to build the Corinth Canal. It is therefore no coincidence that military lexis is used here. The verb ἡττάομαι in LXX most often appears in the context of losing a battle/war and means 'to surrender',

974 For: Ibid., p. 61.

975 For: Ibid.

976 W. Ibid., p. 67–69.

977 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 277; see also D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 195.

978 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 277; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 917; similarly A. Vögte, *Der Judasbrief. Der Zweite Petrusbrief* (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 22), Neukirchen–Vluyn 1994, p. 206, who calls this phrase a saying derived from the laws of war (*dem Kriegrecht entstammende Maxime*).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

'to be defeated' (Isa 8:9, 13:15, 30:31, 31:9, 33:1, 51:7, 54:17, Jer 48:1 [LXX – 31:1]; 2 Macc 10:24). This meaning is also applied by the author of 2 Peter. The context in which the sentence is placed indicates that the false teachers were overcome by lusts and corruption, they surrendered to them, becoming their slaves. This is further emphasised by the paronomasia:[979] in 19b the false teachers are referred to explicitly as δοῦλοι τῆς φθορᾶς "slaves of corruption", in 19c there is reference to falling into the slavery – δουλόω. The lack of mastery over lusts, i. e. submission to moral corruption, alludes to the philosophical beginning of verse 19 associated with freedom. As mentioned, in the Socratic-Platonic and Stoic philosophies that Peter valued, personal freedom meant the dominion of reason over bodily desires. Now Peter seems to be unmasking the real reasons for the heretics' preaching of hedonism – they have failed to overcome lust and corruption, and so – being subject to them – they praise them. This element fits well with the vituperative convention of the text and corresponds especially with 2:10 and 2:12.

Verse 20ab develops the saying from verse 19c and more openly exposes the roots of false teaching. The false teachers, described from verse 17 onwards, remain the subject of these considerations. This is emphasised by the conjunct γάρ acting as a marker of cohesion – formal coherence between verses 19 and 20 – and the motif of submission expressed by the verb ἡττάομαι. Formally, line 20 is a conditional sentence with a double *protasis*: "If, therefore, having escaped from the defilements of the world" and "having entangled themselves, submit to them [the defilements of the world]". The *apodosis* contains a concluding and warning sentence expressing a general truth concerning the fate of false teachers: "the end becomes worse for them than the beginning".

In *protasis*, the narrator draws on the motif already used in *exordium* of escaping defilements/impurity in the world (cf. 2 Pet 1:4). The formula τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου "the defilements of the world" is of course understood in moral terms, as, for example, in TBenj 2:3: "the pure mind, though encompassed by the defilements of earth, rather cleanseth (them) and is not itself defiled". In describing the escape of the false teachers, Peter uses part. aor. ἀποφυγόντες, which suggests they completely cut off from the defilements as in 1:4. Most likely, however, the use of the aorist in 2:20 is part of a continuing ironic characterisation of the arrogant. On the one hand, they present themselves as those who have successfully escaped "the defilments of the world", i. e. those who have overcome it (hence the resultative understanding of the aorist ἀποφυγόντες in contrast to verse 18, where part. praes. ἀποφεύγοντες is iterative or durative). On the other hand, however, the author of 2 Peter sarcastically exposes the transience and lack of effect of this escape, since he points out a return to the defilements.

979 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 194.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The noun μιάσματα already appeared in 2 Pet 2:10 in the singular as the equivalent of an adjective. Then the arrogant were described as those "following the flesh ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ with impure lust", the whole phrase being interpreted as referring primarily to fornication and debauchery.[980] In this verse, the immediate context shoes that the understanding of μιάσματα was expanded. The false teachers were thus to escape from a life based on satisfying all carnal lusts, which make a person unclean in the moral sense and in need of purification (cf. 1:9). In other words, the defilement is treated here not so much as a reference only to sexuality, but as a general indulgence of the flesh,[981] which makes people have "blemishes" μῶμοι (2:13) and cannot stand before God without purification (cf. also the motif of baptismal purification in 2 Pet 1:9; this purification considered in the light of 2:20 could mean that baptism sanctions the escape from pagan, sinful customs). In this general, often even broader sense, the lexeme μιάσματα is used by LXX (Lev 7:18, Ezek 33:31, 1 Macc 13:50, Jdt 9:2.4, 13:16); intertestamental literature (1 En 10:22: "And the earth shall be cleansed from all defilement, and from all sin, and from all punishment, and from all torment") and e. g. Josephus Flavius (*Bell. Iud.* II 17:10: "the city was all over polluted with such abominations, from which it was but reasonable to expect some vengeance").

Defilement/impurity is, according to the narrator of 2 Peter, characteristic of this world. The genitive case κόσμου should be interpreted here as gen. subiectivus (impurity is committed by the world), alternatively as gen. possessivus (impurity belongs to the world). However, one cannot infer from it that the whole world (cosmos) is corrupt or impure.[982] For the world is understood not as a cosmos created by God, but as the cultural and moral conditions among which the Christian community functions. From "corruption" (1:4) and from "impurity (2:20), which are elements of this reality surrounding Christians, both the recipients of the letter and the false teachers have escaped. The point here, therefore, is to mark a quality gap in religious and moral terms between the hedonistic customs of pagans and the ethical standards of Christianity. Such a contrast in quality between the community of the chosen and the rest of mankind is one of the most common motifs in apocalyptic literature (e. g. 1QS 5:1–2.10.14.18–19: "And this is the rule for the men of the community who have freely pledged themselves to be converted from all evil and to cling to all his commandments according to his will. They shall separate from the congregation of the men of falsehood […] shall undertake by the Covenant to separate from all the men of falsehood who walk in the way of wickedness. […] for

980 See analysis of 2 Pet 2:10a.

981 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 922 argues that μιάσματα are "acts that cross the moral line", to which he also includes criminal offences.

982 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 348 sees elements of dualism in the formula τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου (cf. also 1:4).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

all who transgress His word are unclean. […] None of the saints shall lean upon works of vanity: for they are all vanity who know not His Covenant […]. All their deeds are defilement"). It also appears in NT, where the reality outside the chosen Christian community with its axiology is also called the world (Matt 18:7, John 7:7, 8:23, 15:18–19, 17:9.14–16, 1 Cor 1:21.27–28, 2:12, 3:19, 4:13, 5:19, 7:31, 11:32, Gal 4:3, Eph 2:2, Jas 1:27, 4:4, 1 John 2:15–17, 4:5, 5:19) and in early Christian literature. *1 Clem.* 30:1:3.8 lists what Christians as "the inheritance of the saints" should avoid:

> Seeing, therefore, that we are the portion of the Holy One, let us do all those things which pertain to holiness, avoiding all evil-speaking, all abominable and impure embraces, together with all drunkenness, seeking after change, all abominable lusts, detestable adultery, and execrable pride. […] Let us cleave, then, to those to whom grace has been given by God. […] standing far off from all whispering and evil-speaking, being justified by our works, and not our words. […] Boldness, and arrogance, and audacity belong to those that are accursed of God; but moderation, humility, and meekness to such as are blessed by Him.

And he warns: "You see, brethren, that the greater the knowledge that has been vouchsafed to us, the greater also is the danger to which we are exposed" (*1 Clem.* 41:4). According to *2 Clem.* 6:4 the (temporal) world "urges to adultery and corruption, avarice and deceit", therefore one should not allow oneself to be "allured back by worldly lusts" (*2 Clem.* 17:3).

However, the human strength is not sufficient to escape from the defilements of the world. It is crucial to acquire "the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Once again in 2:20 the narrator draws on the motif from *exordium* (1:2.3.8). He uses the same noun ἐπίγνωσις, which was defined there as a dynamic, progressive action, presupposing personal commitment and above all conversion, in addition to elements of theoretical knowledge. Such "knowledge" manifests itself in turning away from the previous way of life and adopting the highest moral standards.[983] The same meaning of the noun ἐπίγνωσις also applies in this verse, with a strongly accentuated practical dimension (as in 1:8) and a developed intellectual and theoretical aspect. The object of process is Jesus Christ (1:2.3.8, 3:18). As before, the genitive case τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is used specify the term ἐπίγνωσις and to highlight the overlapping function and meaning of gen. obiectivus (the resulting knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ), gen. subiectivus (knowledge brought about by the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ), gen. causae (knowledge brought about by the

983 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:2.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ) and gen. originis (knowledge coming from the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ).

On the basis of Peter's considerations, one can recognise that the exordial interpretation of the formula "knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ". Alongside the existential and practical elements, more explicit intellectual, rational components appear, which allow full knowledge of Jesus Christ based on the revelation handed down by the prophets and apostles. Full knowledge must not be limited to the death and resurrection of Jesus, but must also include the announcement of his second coming for the judgement (cf. 1:16–19, 2:1).

It seems that Peter's thesis of escaping the impurities of the world by knowing Jesus Christ should also be analysed in connection with 2:18.[984] This is made possible by the motivic, lexical and rhetorical similarities between verse 18b ἀποφυγόντας and 20a ἀποφυγόντες. The essence of actual and effective escape is not the promise of freedom given by false teachers, but the knowledge of the whole saving work of Jesus Christ. This presupposes, firstly, conversion from the way of life promoted and prevalent in the pagan world, and secondly, baptism understood as purification (1:9) and equipping one with everything needed to live a godly life, to attain a share in the divine nature and – precisely – to escape from the corruption in the world (1:3–4). Thus, through the verb polyptoton in verses 18b and 20a, the narrator refers back to the ἀποφυγόντες from *exordium* (1:4) and his baptismal catechesis.

2 Pet 1:3–4	2 Pet 1:9	2 Pet 2:20
πάντα τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδωρημένης ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς		ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματοῦ κόσμου
	λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν	Τούτοις πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες
They were given everything they needed to escape the corruption in the world		Having escaped from the defilements of the world
	Forgetful of the cleansing of old committed sins	Having again entangled in them [defilements]

The false teachers, like all Christians, received at baptism everything necessary to lead a godly life and to escape the corruption in the world. They therefore succeeded in escaping the defilements of the world. Since they again became entangled in the defilements of this world, it means that they acted like those who forgot the

984 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 347–348; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 277.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

gifts and obligations of baptism, became blind, or rather short-sighted,[985] and this prevents them from traversing the path to the eternal kingdom without stumbling and without deviating from it.

The second segment of *protasis* (20b) is developed as an opposition to the first segment. This makes it possible to read the vituperative irony in the first segment, namely that the false teachers had not successfully escaped the impurities of the world, had not truly come to know Jesus Christ, having again been overcome by the impurities of the world. The demonstrative pronoun in the dative τούτοις is an equivalent of the phrase μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου. On the other hand, the verb ἡττῶνται in ind. praes. act. lexically refers to verse 19b and the same verb in ind. perf. passivi – ἥττηται. The narrator thus leaves no doubt that μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου means what the false teachers indulge in and what they serve, i. e. the hedonistic satisfaction of all bodily needs. G.L. Green[986] suggests that the point here is to indicate how powerful the impurities of the world are, since they can overcome and enslave people. One can agree with this, but only partially, because this text clearly has two levels: the first related to literary convention, the second subordinated to a theological idea. The vituperative convention allows 20b to be understood as ridiculing false teachers who prove too weak to overcome "the corruption/defilements of the world" and free themselves from them; just as they have proved incapable of true, full knowledge of Jesus Christ, effective conversion and escape. On a theological level, this can indeed be read as an indication that human powers are too limited to effectively deliver a person from the defilements of the world. This would therefore be a complement to 20a, which already points out that the essence of effective escape is to truly know Jesus Christ.

Abandoning the multi-faceted knowledge of Jesus and neglecting or distorting any of the components of knowledge leads to a renewed entanglement with the defilements of the world. It seems that this distorted component of knowledge in the case of the false teachers was the rejection of the prophetic and apostolic teaching on the Parousia and judgement. This, in turn, entailed a re-qualification and re-evaluation of the practical aspects of knowledge: both freedom of custom and godly living ceased to matter. The abandonment of the demanding Christian pious life and the return to pagan, hedonistic customs thus have, according to the false teachers, no eschatological consequences.

Taking up the polemic, in verse 20b the narrator of 2 Peter uses, as in the metaphors, a highly figurative language. He describes the consequences of distorting "the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" with the phrase πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες "again entangled". The adverb πάλιν signifies withdrawal and a return

985 See analysis of 2 Pet 1:9.

986 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 924.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to a previous state, to previous habits and actions (Rom 8:15, 11:23, 1 Cor 7:5, 2 Cor 1:16, Gal 1:17, 2:18, 4:9.19, 5:1, Phil 2:28, Heb 6:6, Jas 5:18). In relation to the situation of the false teachers, it should be understood primarily as a suggestion of a return to "the defilements of the world" and Cyrenaic hedonism. The verb ἐμπλέκω, was used to describe the entanglement of animals (e. g. sheep, hares) in thorny thickets. Unable to free itself from this natural trap, the animal would die. Such a picture is painted in one allegory by Hermas in *The Shepherd* (Similitude VI 2:6–7):

> This shepherd, accordingly, was receiving the sheep from the young shepherd, those, viz., that were rioting and luxuriating, but not leaping; and he cast them into a precipitous place, full of thistles and thorns, so that it was impossible to extricate the sheep from the thorns and thistles; but they were completely entangled among them. These, accordingly, thus entangled, pastured among the thorns and thistles, and were exceedingly miserable, being beaten by him; and he drove them hither and there, and gave them no rest; and, altogether, these sheep were in a wretched plight.

Biblical writers use the verb ἐμπλέκω infrequently, usually in a metaphorical sense – as an illustration of being entangled in troubles or sins (Prov 28:18, 2 Tim 2:4). Similarly, early Christian writers. In *Barn.* 4:1 there is this warning: "Let us then utterly flee from all the works of iniquity, lest these should take hold of us" μήποτε καταλάβῃ ἡμᾶς τὰ ἔργα τῆς ἀνομίας; equivalent wording appears in *2 Clem.* 10:1: "let us […] flee from ungodliness, lest evils overtake us" καὶ φύγωμεν τὴν ἀσέβειαν, μὴ ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ κακά.

The verb ἐμπλέκω seems to be given the closest meaning to that of Peter's in *The Shepherd* of Hermas, who in Commandment XII 2:3 not only warns against this "entanglement", but also *expressis verbis* against its fatal consequences: "But as many as are mastered by them κατακυριευθῶσιν […] will perish at last, for these desires are fatal". The author of 2 Peter also has primarily in mind the eschatological consequences of entanglement. On the one hand, ἐμπλέκω – through associations with the fate of animals – refers the viewer back to 2 Pet 2:12, where the false teachers, the arrogant ones, are likened to "irrational beasts" which, once captured, await destruction. On the other hand, the destiny of false teachers entangled in "the defilements of the world" is expressed in the apodosis in verse 20c with the second of Peter's list of five sentences: γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων "the end becomes worse for them than the beginning".

Most likely, the saying quoted in the apodosis was a well-known and widely used gnome on various occasions. It may have entered the Christian sociolect permanently, since it is also used by the evangelists as a summary of the narrative of the renewed – more severe – possession of the man freed from the unclean

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

spirit (Matt 12:43–45, Luke 11:24–26, cf. Matt 27:64).[987] Closer or further references to it are found in early Christian literature. Two trends can be discerned here: firstly, the saying is used in the context of human, deteriorating behaviour; secondly, it concerns the eschatological destiny of deviants. The first trend is represented, for example, by *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*, where the protagonist, urged to change his views, replies: "for we are not accustomed to repent of what is good in order to adopt that which is evil; and it is well for me to be changed from what is evil to what is righteous" (*MartPol* 11:1). In Commandment XII 5:4, Hermas clearly refers to Matt 12:43–45: "As many, then, as are full in the faith, resist him strongly, and he withdraws from them, having no way by which he might enter them. He goes, then, to the empty, and finding a way of entrance, into them, he produces in them whatever he wishes, and they become his servants"; and in Similitude IX 17:5 he says of those excluded from the community that they have become worse than they were: "But after they had entered into the same place, and became one body, certain of these defiled themselves, and were expelled from the race of the righteous, and became again what they were before, or rather worse".

The second – eschatological – strand includes Similitude IX 17:5–18:2:

> But after they had entered into the same place, and became one body, certain of these defiled themselves, and were expelled from the race of the righteous, and became again what they were before, or rather worse. How, sir, I said, did they become worse, after having known God? He that does not know God, he answered, and practices evil, receives a certain chastisement for his wickedness; but he that has known God, ought not any longer to do evil, but to do good. If, accordingly, when he ought to do good, he do evil, does not he appear to do greater evil than he who does not know God? For this reason, they who have not known God and do evil are condemned to death; but they who have known God, and have seen His mighty works, and still continue in evil, shall be chastised doubly, and shall die forever.

The Acts of John (107) contains a similar warning: "if, then, ye sin no more, he forgiveth you that ye did in ignorance: but if after that ye have known him and he hath had mercy on you, ye walk again in the like deeds, both the former will be laid to your charge, and also ye will not have a part nor mercy before him". The gradation of punishments for pagans indulging in sensual pleasures and Christians who departed from the faith and adopted a pagan hedonistic lifestyle is mentioned by Irenaeus of Lyons:

987 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 277; G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 926.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

> For if these men of old time, who preceded us in the gifts [bestowed upon them], and for whom the Son of God had not yet suffered, when they committed any sin and served fleshly lusts, were rendered objects of such disgrace, what shall the men of the present day suffer, who have despised the Lord's coming, and become the slaves of their own lusts? (*Adv. Haer.* IV 27:2).

In 2 Peter the saying γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων can also be interpreted in two ways. In the context of Peter's argument so far, it seems most natural to give the phrase τὰ ἔχατα, literally "last things", also "the end", an eschatological meaning. Τὰ πρῶτα literally "first things", "beginning" could then indicate their hedonistic, promiscuous, pleasure-oriented lifestyle. The whole saying should therefore be understood as follows: the judgement and judgement on the false teachers, which will take place in the end times, is their destruction (τὰ ἔσχατα); their fate and destiny to perdition stand in contrast to the sumptuous, superlative, lifestyle, love of luxury, satisfaction of all sensual cravings, to which they indulged in the belief that there would be no judgement (τὰ πρῶτα). This interpretation corresponds well with Peter's earlier statements that those who indulge in debauchery have been preserved for judgement (2 Pet 2:10b), their destiny is annihilation (2 Pet 2:1), destruction/destruction (2 Pet 2:12), they will receive payment/reward for their iniquity (2 Pet 2:13a). As "defiled and stained" with σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι (2 Pet 2:13), they will not be able to stand before the Lord (2 Pet 3:14) and enter the eternal kingdom (2 Pet 1:11); on the contrary, theirs is and will be the curse; not coincidentally, therefore, they are called "children of the curse" κατάρας τέκνα (2 Pet 2:14). This would also be another concluding commentary on the central claim of 2 Pet 2:3b: judgement is not idle, destruction does not sleep, for although the actions and lifestyle of the false teachers appear to go unpunished, in fact a terrible fate awaits them. This interpretation is grammatically supported also by the use of the personal pronoun in the dative – αὐτοῖς, which should be interpreted as incommodi ("end becomes worse for them to end than the beginning").

According to the second interpretation, it would be a matter of assessing the conduct of the false teachers, who, having again become entangled in the impurities of the world, became even worse in their wickedness than before their failure to escape from them.[988] Such an explanation would be based on verse 21. However, it is then more difficult to interpret the function of the dative αὐτοῖς. The dat. auctoris ("the end becomes worse for them than the beginning") would fit best.

Verse 21 seems an ethical development and explanation of the saying in verse 20c on the basis of the statements in 20ab. The relationship between verse 20 and 21

988 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 927–928.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

is marked by the conjunction γάρ. One can easily see the explicative references between these texts:

Statement (2:20ab)	Explanation (20:21)
Εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	ἐπιγνοῦσιν [τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης].
They escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of Jesus	They learned [the way of righteousness].
Τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶται,	ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς.
They became entangled in defilements again, submit to them	They abandoned the holy commandment given to them

A chiastic opposition was applied to 20c:

A. end becomes worse
    B. than the beginning
    B'. it was better not to learn the way of righteousness (beginning)
A'. Than to have turned away from the holy commandment given to them (end).

However, the temporal interpretation (the false teachers, having rejected the Parousia and the judgement, have become even worse than before their conversion) and the eschatological interpretation (their destiny and ultimate fate are worse than that of those who have not come to know Christ and Christianity) should not be treated as opposites. It seems that the two claims are complementary to each other. It would not be the first time that the narrator of 2 Peter would employ such complementary and overlapping implications, which fit well with the apocalyptic language of the letter and provide a further commentary on 2:3b. Thus, by distorting the Christian message of Parousia and judgement and reverting to a pre-conversion lifestyle, the false teachers have ethically become worse than they were. However, the judgement on them is not idle, and doom does not slumber, for their final end will be far worse not only than a glamorous and luxurious mortal life, but worse also than the judgement and punishment intended for the Gentiles who do not know Christ.

In formal terms, verse 21 is the third in a series of five sentences. It is reminiscent of the so-called *Tob-Spruch*, popular in Jewish literature after W. Zimmerli, a gnomic declaration comparing two elements, one of which is better than the other (Ps 37[36]:16, 84[83]:11, Prov 3:14, 8:11, 12:9, 15:16–17, 16:8 [15:29].19.32, 17:1, 19:1, 21:9.19, 25:7.24, 27:5.10, 28:6, Sir 10:27, 16:3, 20:31, 29:22, 30:14.17, 33:22,

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

40:28, 41:15, 1 Cor 7:9, 1 Pet 3:17).[989] Of course, Greek literature is also familiar with such proverbs. For example, Prometheus, the protagonist of Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound (623), when the nymph Io asks about her fate, answers her with a phrase similar to Peter's: τὸ μὴ μαθεῖν σοι κρεῖσσον ἢ μαθεῖν τάδε "It would be better not to know than to know, in your case".

G.L. Green[990] argues that the narrator of 2 Pet this time is not quoting any proverb, but is giving such a sapiential form to his claims about knowing Christianity, abandoning it and returning to his previous, non-Christian life. In doing so, he also wants to give them a universal meaning. This corresponds both to the apocalyptic convention of the text and to the conviction that the letter will be read by future generations of Christians. At the same time, it fits perfectly with the strong cadential coda constructed from five sentences referring to false teachers operating in the future (2:19c.20c.21.22ab). As already noted, the saying in verse 21 stands out from the other proverbs for its volume and concreteness. It is the only one to refer to false teachers in an explicative rather than merely contextual manner. This would mean that it is central to Peter's reflection – it is both a description of the temporal conduct of heretics, a foreshadowing of their fate in the eschatological future, and a warning to those who would follow them.

In describing what he thinks is better, the narrator again refers to knowledge. This time, instead of the noun ἐπίγνωσις, he uses the verb ἐπιγινώσκω. Its semantic field, however, overlaps with the noun concept and the previous formula ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ "knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ", and thus includes the content of faith as well as ethical obligations and practice. The latter are referred to by the complement ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης "the way of righteousness".[991] It is synonymous with ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας "the way of truth" (2:2) and εὐθεῖα ὁδός "the straight path" (2:15) and antonymic with ὁδὸς τοῦ Βαλαάμ "the way of Balaam" (2:15). The whole phrase "to learn the way of righteousness" is taken from wisdom literature. It appears in Job 24:13: "While they were on earth, they did not even notice them, and they did not know the way of righteousness, nor did they travel its pathways" (LXX NETS), where it refers to the conduct of the ungodly. The context in Job is reminiscent of Peter's. The hagiographer, on the one hand, explains how it is possible for the ungodly to act among the righteous (Job 24:1) and, on the other hand, announces severe punishments for them (Job 24:14,19–20.22b–24).

The very phrase "path(s)/way(s) of righteousness" meaning the observance of God's commandments is encountered much more frequently in LXX, but also

989 Ibid., p. 929–930.

990 Ibid., p. 930.

991 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 195 argue that "knowing Jesus Christ" is fully equivalent to "knowing the way of righteousness".

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

primarily in the sapiential tradition (Prov 8:20, 12:28, 16:17.31, 17:23, 21:16.21, Wis 5:6). It became popular in intertestamental literature (Jub 23:26: "And in those days the children shall begin to study the laws, And to seek the commandments, And to return to the path of righteousness"; 1 En 82:4: "blessed are all those who walk In the way of righteousness and sin not"; 1 En 91:18–19 ("And now I […] show you The paths of righteousness and the paths of violence. […] walk in the paths of righteousness, And walk not in the paths of violence"; see also 1 En 94:1, 99:10, 1QS 4:2: "These are their ways in the world for the enlightenment of the heart of man, and that all the paths of true righteousness may be made straight before him, and that the fear of the laws of God may be instilled in his heart"). Among the New Testament writers, it is applied by the author of the Gospel of Matthew to John the Baptist (Matt 21:32). In early Christian literature, it appears most frequently in *Barn.*: "he Lord has accompanied me in the way of righteousness" συνώδεθσεν ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσυνης (1:4); "This means that the man perishes justly, who, having a knowledge of the way of righteousness ἔχων ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης, rushes off into the way of darkness turns to the way of darkness" (5:4); 12:4 contains a paraphrase of the words of Isa 65:2: "And in another prophet He declares, All day long I have stretched forth My hands to an unbelieving people, and one that gainsays My righteous way" ὁδῷ δικαίᾳ. The author of *2 Clem.* 5:7 contrasts "the path of righteousness" with "the desire" for the things of this world: "For if we desire to possess them [the things of this world], we fall away from the path of righteousness τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς δικαίας". The Apocalypse of Peter, probably dependent on 2 Peter, uses wording most resembling that of the letter and describes the punishments for those who blasphemed the way of justice (cf. 2 Pet 2:2): "And some there were there hanging by their tongues; and these were they that blasphemed the way of righteousness" (ApPet 22 [Greek]; cf. ApPet 7 [Ethiopic]); "having iron heated in the fire set against their eyes. And these were they that did blaspheme and speak evil of the way of righteousness" (ApPet 28 [Greek]).

Thus, it can be seen that Peter's understanding of "the way of righteousness" is based, on the one hand, on the Judaic tradition, where the "way(s) of righteousness" means fulfilling the commandments of the Mosaic law, and on the other hand, on the Christian tradition (cf. 2:20 and knowing Jesus), where the phrase most likely refers both to the teaching of Jesus and to the moral standards of the Christian community.[992]

The second part of the sentence: ἢ ἐπιγωοῦσιν ὑοιστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς "than for those who have learned it to have turned away from the holy commandment handed over to them" confirms this suggestion of a complementary – Judaic-Christian meaning of "the way of righteousness". For its

992 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 278.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

equivalent here is ἁγία ἐντολή "the holy commandment". Attention is drawn to the singular number used in the collective sense. The Law was often referred to in this way (cf. Rom 7:8–13). The narrator's intention here, however, is to refer not only to Old Testament commandments handed down by the prophets (Matt 5:19, 15:3, 19:17, Mark 7:8–9, 10:19, Luke 18:20, Rom 13:9, Eph 6:2, Heb 7:18, 9:19, 1 John 5:2–3.6, 2 John 1:5), by which one must abide as by a lamp (cf. 2 Pet 1:19b), but also to the teaching of Jesus transmitted by the apostles (John 13:34, 14:15.21, 15:10.12, 1 Cor 14:37, 2 Pet 3:2, 1 John 2:3–4.7–8, 3:22–24, 4:21) and the ethical requirements of Christianity (cf. 1 Tim 6:14). He also does likewise in 3:2, where he uses the noun ἐντολή in the singular to refer to the teachings of Jesus handed down by the apostles and juxtaposes them with the words of the holy prophets.[993] From this it follows that "the holy commandment" in relation to Jewish tradition should not be restricted to the Torah alone, but extended to the ethical teaching of the prophets. It is more difficult to clarify what is meant by a holy commandment in relation to the teaching of Jesus and the apostles. One points here to Jesus' commandment of love (John 13:34–35), to Jesus' reinterpretation of the law in the sermon on the mount (Matt 5–7)[994] with maximalist ethical requirements for the disciples. It may also be about Christian ethical commitments as reflected in Peter's sorites (2 Pet 1:5–8), which clearly distinguishes a restrained, moderate way of life for Christians from an all-encompassing hedonism. The latter interpretation also takes into account "all that given for a godly life" (2 Pet 1:3–4), i. e. to follow the path of righteousness.[995]

All of the above theories regarding the Jewish and Christian components of Peter's understanding of the holy commandment are linked by part. aor. pass. παραδοθείσα "given/transmitted". Perhaps this is a reference to Jude 3 and παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστις of "the faith given to the saints".[996] In both cases, the aorist is used to suggest that both the holy commandment and the faith were transmitted in a perfect and complete manner.[997] The past participle, interpreted as pass. theologicum, indicates that it is a commandment given by God. The first association would therefore be to identify the holy commandment with the Law present in the prophetic message. 2 Pet 1:1 seems to identify "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ", and 1:2 speaks of grace and peace growing through the knowledge of "God and Jesus our Lord". Similarly here – pass. theologicum can simultaneously refer to God the Father and Jesus Christ. This would mean that it is not only about the Old Testament law, but also about Jesus' reinterpretation of it transmitted by the apostles. On top of all this is the baptismal equipment for leading a godly life, which

993 See analysis of 2 Pet 3:1.

994 M. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 263.

995 D.F. Watson, T. Callan, *First and Second Peter*, p. 196.

996 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 350.

997 K. Wojciechowska, M. Rosik, *Expecting Mercy*, p. 95–96.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

"the divine power has given us" (δεδωρημένη) through knowledge and calling (2 Pet 1:3). Moreover – the use of the gifts to lead a godly life is a condition for participating in the divine nature and escaping corruption in the world (2 Pet 1:4), and thus entering the eternal kingdom. Turning away from prophetic and apostolic teaching, rejecting baptismal gifts and forgetting purification closes the way to the kingdom, leads to destruction.

It seems that an eschatological aspect must additionally be superimposed on these meanings. According to Peter's eschatological hermeneutic, prophetic teaching must be interpreted not only in ethical terms, but above all in eschatological terms. Similarly with the teaching of Jesus. In the latter case, the command to be eschatologically vigilant is associated with the holy commandment (cf. Matt 24:42–44).

The verb ὑποστρέφω means to turn away from something or to turn back combined with a return.[998] The narrator of 2 Peter has the latter meaning in mind. This is evidenced both in verse 20, where the idea of return is marked by the adverb πάλιν 'again', and verse 22 with proverbs evoking the motif of return with the related verb ἐπιστρέφω.[999] This literal meaning of ὑποστρέφω is overlaid with a metaphorical meaning derived from the context – to turn away from a commandment means to transgress it in the first place. It seems, however, that Peter's reflection is more complex, as indicated by the use of the aorist form (ὑποστρέψαι). It is thus about completely and definitively abandoning the commandment/road of righteousness and finding a justification for this step. The justification is the distortion of the prophetic and apostolic message and the rejection of the message concerning the Parousia and eschatological judgement. This, in turn, translates into a return to the life before baptism and entails certain eschatological consequences.

Line 22 is a typical *vituperatio* containing two metaphors, contained in proverbs, offensive to false teachers. This continues the cadential coda, consisting of sapiential universal statements, though adapted to Peter's argument and narrative on heretics. The proverbs are preceded by an introduction συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας "The [content/word] of the true proverb is confirmed with regard to them". The verb συμβαίνω 'to fulfil', 'to confirm' often appears in contexts that emphasise that what has been said before is true and reflected in reality.[1000] This is how Euripides uses it, for example, in *Helena* (622): συμβεβᾶσιν οἱ λόγοι οἱ τῆς δ᾽ἀληθεῖς "her words have turned out to be true" or Sophocles in Ajax (Ajax 664–665): ἀλλ᾽ ἔστ᾽ ἀληθὴς ἡ βροτῶν παροιμία "Yes, men's proverb is true". In both examples, it is worth noticing the double meaning of the truthfulness of the thought contained in the prediction or proverb; for the adjective ἀληθής 'true' is added

998 Luke 1:56, 2:45, 4:1, 17:15, 24:33.52, Acts 1:12, 8:25, 13:13, 21:6, Gal 1:17.

999 Some manuscripts harmonise verses 21 and 22; verse 21 includes ἐπιστρέφω (436. 642. 1243. 1448. 1611. 2492).

1000 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 937.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

to the verb συμβαίνω. Such a pleonastic practice was common, deeply rooted in Greek phraseology; so it is also adopted by the narrator of 2 Peter. By using the pronoun in the dative αὐτοῖς, he makes it clear that he is not so much or not only concerned with conveying some universal truth as with referring the proverbs to false teachers. Such references, moreover, he has used before, but incorporated them into gnomic formula (verse 20c "the end becomes worse for them (αὐτοῖς) than the beginning"; verse 21a "It would have been better for them not to learn the way of righteousness").

The proverbs cited in 22b and 22c are identified as παροιμία. The term appears in LXX both with single maxims or sentences (Sir 8:8, 47:17) and with whole collections of them, such as in the title of The Book of Proverbs – παροιμίαι (Prov 1:1). It has been known in Greek literature since the time of Aeschylus, who uses it in *Agamemnon* (264: "As herald of gladness, with the proverb"). According to Diogenes Laertius, the collection of proverbs/parables (*Proverbs*) and the more theoretical work *On Proverbs* were left by Aristotle. Of the New Testament writers, the noun παροιμία is used, apart from the author of 2 Peter, only by the author of the Gospel of John, most likely as a synonym for parable (John 10:6, 16:25.29). This means that as a genre name the term παροιμία was very vague and capacious in antiquity. Nevertheless, it can be argued that the unified connotation that such proverbs conveyed was based on the observation of the natural world and everyday life and the use of allegory. These two elements are also present in Peter's paroemias.

Although the narrator of 2 Peter cites two proverbs, he uses the singular number in the introductory formula. This may be because initially he really intended to quote one proverb,[1001] presumably the former. Eventually he added to it a second elliptical saying. The two paroemias are derived from separate sources. The first is taken from Prov 26:11; the original source of the second remains unknown. It is most likely, however, that the narrator of 2 Peter did not draw on primary sources, but on some Hellenistic collection of proverbs, perhaps even Jewish proverbs, in which they already functioned together. There would be nothing surprising in this. In both Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions, dogs and pigs were often juxtaposed,[1002] especially in negative contexts, to express contempt and disgust (Matt 7:6). For the Jews, the swine and the dog were culturally unclean animals (cf. Lev 11:7, Deut 14:8, Luke 16:21); any contact with them required purification. The Greeks and Romans viewed the uncleanness of the swine and the dog more literally, as did Horace in the *Epistles*: "he had lived a filthy dog, or a hog delighting in mire" (*Epist. Hor.* I 2:26); "here runs a mad dog, there rushes a sow begrimed with mire" (*Epist. Hor.* II 2:75).

1001 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 278.

1002 Ibid., p. 279.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

As already mentioned, the first paroemia (verse 22b) is based on Prov 26:11a: ὥσπερ κύων ὅταν ἐπελθῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἔμετον καὶ μισητὸς γένεται. The narrator of the letter does not quote the biblical text verbatim, but undoubtedly retains both its sense and imagery intended to inspire revulsion. Nor does he cite the second part of the paroemic comparison – the *comparandum*, which is the fool returning to his evil deeds and to his sins. This omission can be explained in three different ways. Firstly, only the first part of the comparison (*comparans*) was recorded in the collection from which Peter directly took the proverb. Secondly, the narrator may have assumed that the recipients of the letter were well acquainted with the whole proverb, could reconstruct the latter part and relate it to the false teachers. Thirdly, since the reflections from 2:9b onwards refer to heretics, he considered it superfluous to refer to them once again in *comparandum*. Furthermore, the addition of the biblical comparative element would have disrupted the refined composition of verses 17–22, in which, as already noted, the natural (hydrological and meteorological) opening metaphors are also matched by natural (zoological) final metaphors.

The narrator in verse 22b refers to the negative perception of dogs based primarily on the observation of stray animals wandering the streets of cities.[1003] In the Old and Intertestamental texts, the term 'dog' was pejorative; it was an epithet applied to enemies, a phrase of disgust and contempt (e. g. 1 Sam 17:43, 2 Sam 16:9, Ps 22:17, 59:6–8, Isa 56:10).[1004] Animal characteristics such as aggression, acrimony, danger of being bitten, voraciousness and insatiability, and uncleanness, which was caused primarily by feeding on carrion, were emphasised (Jer 50:39).[1005] Since the dog played no small part in Mesopotamian magical practices, cults, also in sacral prostitution (cf. Deut 23:14, where a dog's pay for male temple prostitution is mentioned), it is not surprising that it was commonly associated with paganism and negative pagan practices.[1006] Josephus Flavius in *Con. Ap.* II 85 attributes "a dog's impudence". The Greeks too referred to the aggression, audacity and constant readiness of dogs to copulate when they used the term 'dog/bitch' as an invective. Semonides of Amorgos, in his satirical poem *Types of Women* preserved in the *Anthology* of Stobaeus, juxtaposes with a bitch a woman who "would fain hear all, know all, and

1003 Ibid.; J. Lemański, *Negatywny obraz psa w Biblii. Przyczyny i konsekwencje*, "Colloquia Theologica Ottoniana" 1 (2011), p. 53–58.

1004 M. Rosik, *Plemię żmijowe i psie wymiociny, czyli o funkcji antycznej inwektywy*, "Scriptura Sacra" 18 (2014), p. 55.

1005 K. Wojciechowska, *Wbrew zwyczajom i tradycji. Interpretacja metafory "nie jest dobrze zabierać chleb dzieci i rzucać pieskom" (Mk 7:27b) z perspektywy Syrofenicjanki*, "Collectanea Theologica" 85 (2015), no. 3, p. 37–38.

1006 K. Wojciechowska, *Czy psy nie zasługują na zbawienie? Religijno-kulturowe uwarunkowania Ap 22,15*, [in:] *Ekologia wyzwaniem dla teologii*, ed. J.M. Lipniak, Wrocław 2016, p. 382, 394.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

peering and prying everywhere barketh e'en though she see nothing; a man cannot check her with threats".

In the New Testament, the epithet 'dog' refers to pagans (Matt 15:26–27, Mark 7:27, cf. Rev 22:15) and to false teachers (Phil 3:2). All these correlations are also taken up by the author of 2 Peter, but in his imagery he draws attention to the particularly repulsive habit of stray, feral dogs which, having disposed of their stomach contents, return to vomit and sniff them.[1007] In the context of the characterisation of the heretics in verses 19–21, it can be assumed that vomit is the pagan lifestyle from which the false teachers first freed themselves and to which they later returned. This makes them particularly distasteful and should discourage the audience from any contact with them.

Although the original source of the second, elliptical saying ὗς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου "a washed pig/having washed the pig wallows in the mud" is unknown, it was undoubtedly, in its basic version, widely known in the ancient world. Like the first, it is based on a negative perception of the animal bearing the metaphor and on the observation of its peculiar behaviour and then on relating it to human conduct. The pig in antiquity did not enjoy a good reputation. Because it rolled around in mud and/or excrement to cool itself and maintain its body temperature, it was abhorred and regarded as a symbol of impurity, unworthiness and stupidity. Semonides of Amorgos derives from the swine a woman, "all that is in her house lies disorderly, defiled with dirt, and rolling upon the floor, and she growth fat a-sitting among the middens in garments as unwashed as herself".

For the Jews, the swine was also, like the dog, a symbol of the pagans and a reference to their cultic practices (Isa 65:4, 66:17), and abstaining from eating pork was intended as an phrase of Israel's dissociation from everything associated with the pagan lifestyle.[1008] These associations with pagans and uncleanness were used by the author of 2 Peter. He added to them the popular associations in Jewish Hellenistic literature of the swine with lack of self-control especially in yielding to the senses. Philo in *De spec. leg.* I XXIX:148 juxtaposes the swine wallowing in the mud with gluttony, an unbridled appetite and the devouring of great quantities of all food: "the belly is a kind of stable of that irrational animal – the appetite, which, being irrigated by much wine-bibbing and gluttony, is continually washed with incessant provision of meat and drink, and like a swine is delighted while wallowing in the mire". In *De agricultura* 32, 144 he compares sophists to pigs subject to the lowest instincts: "For which reason the lawgiver very admirably compares those

1007 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 351 advises that the pronoun ἴδιος should be omitted in translations. In this way, the proverb acquires a slightly different dimension: the dog returns not only to its vomit, but to vomit in general.

1008 B. Szczepanowicz, A. Mrozek, *Atlas zwierząt biblijnych. Miejsce w Biblii i symbolika*, Kraków 2007, p. 83.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

of the sophists who live in this manner to the race of swine, who live a life in no respect pure or brilliant, but confused and disorderly, and who are devoted to the basest habits". In the author of 2 Peter, the use of these associations leads to the construction of an image of false teachers who revert to a hedonistic, pagan, animalistic in his view, because mindless lifestyle.

The reconstruction of the verb in the elliptical statement about the sow/swine may pose some problems: ὗς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου. The verb ἐπιστρέφω comes to mind here is as in verse 22b, or ὑποστρέφω as in verse 21c, or possibly another compound verb with the root στρέφω. The second paroemia would then read as follows: "The washed swine [turns around and] goes back to wallow in the mud".[1009] As an argument in support of this reconstruction, a proverb preserved in the Syriac version of The Story of Ahiqar 8:18 is usually cited, which may be the original source of Peter's saying:[1010] "O my son! thou hast been to me like the swine who went into the hot bath with people of quality, and when it came out of the hot bath, it saw a filthy hole and it went down and, wallowed in it".

Peter's syntax, however, also allows the use of other verbs, such as those related to washing.[1011] A version of the proverb is already known to Heraclitus, which is based on the belief that a pig likes to wash in mud rather than in clean water.[1012] This proverbial belief is still repeated in the second/third century. Sextus Empiricus in the *Pyrrhonic Sketches* I 14:56: "Swine also prefer to wash in vile filth rather than in pure clean water". Clement of Alexandria, when in the *Exhortation to the Heathen* X 92:4 he described the intemperance of the pagans, also referred to it and to the opinion of Democritus: "Some there are, who, like worms wallowing in marshes and mud in the streams of pleasure, feed on foolish and useless delights – swinish men. For swine, it is said, like mud better than pure water; and, according to Democritus, doat upon dirt". He reiterated this opinion in *The Stromata*. First, he quoted a proverb: "And if knowledge belong not to all, yet written compositions are for the many. Swine, for instance, delight in dirt more than in clean water" (I 1), and then he went on to illustrate the errors/sins committed in thoughts:

> The legislator seems to teach differently the interpretation of the three forms of sin – understanding by the mute fishes sins of word, for there are times in which silence is better than speech, for silence has a safe recompense; sins of deed, by the rapacious and carnivorous birds. The sow delights in dirt and dung; and we ought not to have a conscience that is defiled (II 15).

1009 F. Mickiewicz, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra*, p. 301.

1010 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 350; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 279.

1011 G.L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, p. 940.

1012 R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 279.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The reconstruction of the verb related to washing would also be justified by the image of the false teachers in verses 20 and 21 and the references to *exordium*. Since, as said, the false teachers received baptism,[1013] this means that they were washed/cleansed of their formerly committed sins (1:9). However, they ignored this, i. e. they returned to mud, uncleanness (2:20) and thus to their previous immoral, unchristian life. It is impossible to decide conclusively whether the association of the proverb with a swine with the image of washing at baptism is a coincidence,[1014] or an intentional intervention. The former would be supported by the non-Christian roots of the proverb. In favour of the second would be the thoughtful composition of the letter and the intricate linking of motifs from 2 Pet 2:19c-22 with exordial motifs and images, which also appear in the conclusion of the letter. As those who have returned to a corrupt and unchristian life, false teachers have the status of unclean and stained (2 Pet 2:13). And as unclean and stained, they obviously cannot enter the eternal kingdom (cf. 2 Pet 3:14). It also means that their end – their destiny – is worse than their beginning – a sinful life, a short-lived conversion (washing) and a return to their previous habits of rolling in the mud.

In 2 Pet 2:19–22 one can see an increasing number of lexical and motific references to *exordium*. This gives the impression that the baptismal and ethical motifs are a framework characteristic of epistolary literature, in which the end of the letter refers to the issues raised in the introduction. This may be one of the arguments in favour of the compilation hypothesis[1015] according to which 2 Peter comprises two independent pieces of writing – the first covering passages 1:1–2:22 and the second beginning in 3:1 with a suggestion that a letter has already been sent to the recipients. On the other hand, it should be noted that the baptismal issue is explored throughout the text, and the motifs linking *exordium* and 2:19–22 also appear in the final part of the letter, whose framework is set by verses 1:2 and 3:18a.

1013 W. Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, p. 101; R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, p. 280.

1014 J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, p. 351.

1015 See Introduction.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Bibliography

Biblical texts

Bibbia TOB. Edizione Integrale, Torino 1992.

Die Bibel nach der Uebersetzung Martin Luthers, Stuttgart 1984.

Die Bibel. Lutheruebersetzung, Stuttgart 2016.

La Bible. Traduction Oecuménique de la Bible comprenant l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament traduits sur les textes originaux hébreu et grec avec introductions, notes essentielles, glossaire, Paris 1992.

Biblia de Jerusalén. Nueva edición totalmente revisada y aumentada, Bilbao 1975.

Biblia Ekumeniczna to jest Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu z księgami deuterokanonicznymi. Przekład ekumeniczny z języków oryginalnych, Warszawa 2017.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, ed. Karl Elliger, Wilhelm Rudolph, Stuttgart 1975.

Biblia Jerozolimska, Poznań 2006.

Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem, ed. Robert Weber, Stuttgart 1983.

Biblia to jest Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Przymierza (*przekład dosłowny*), Poznań 2019.

Biblia to jest Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu z apokryfami. Nowy przekład, Warszawa 1990.

Grecko-polski Nowy Testament. Wydanie interlinearne z kodami gramatycznymi, Warszawa 1994.

Die Heilige Schrift. Altes und Neues Testament, Bonn 1966.

Holy Bible. New International Version, Grand Rapids 2011.

Holy Bible. New Revised Standard Version, New York 1990.

The Message, English transl. Eugene H. Peterson, 2018, https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/Message-MSG-Bible/#vinfo [accessed: 21.12.2023].

New Jerusalem Bible, New York 1985.

Novum Testamentum graece et latine, ed. August Merk, Romae 1964.

Novum Testamentum graece, ed. Erwin Nestle, Barbara Aland, Stuttgart 2012.

Nowy Testament. Ekumeniczny Przekład Przyjaciół, Warszawa 2017.

Pismo Święte Nowego Testamentu i Psalmy. Najnowszy przekład z języków oryginalnych z komentarzem, Częstochowa 2005.

Pismo Święte Nowego Testamentu i Psalmy. Przekład ekumeniczny na trzecie tysiąclecie, Warszawa 2001.

Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych, Poznań–Warszawa 1990.

Septuaginta, Polish transl. Remigiusz Popowski, Warszawa 2017.

Septuaginta, ed. Alfred Ralphs, Stuttgart 1984.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Apocryphal literature

The Acts of John, English transl. Montague Rhodes James, [in:] Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford 1924, http://gnosis.org/library/actjohn.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Acts of Paul and Thecla, English transl. Alexander Walker, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0816.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Acts of Peter, English transl. Montague Rhodes James, [in:] Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford 1924, https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/actspeter.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Apocalypse of Baruch (*Syriac*), English transl. Robert Henry Charles, [in:] APOT 2, p. 70–526, http://www.pseudepigrapha.com/pseudepigrapha/2Baruch.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Apocalypse of Paul, https://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf08.vii.xl.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Apocalypse of Peter, English transl. Montague Rhodes James, [in:] Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford 1924, http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/apocalypsepeter-mrjames.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Apocalypse of Peter (*Coptic*), https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/apocalypsepeter.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Apocalypse of Peter (*Gnostic*), English transl. James Brashler, Roger A. Bullard, http://gnosis.org/naghamm/apopet.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Apocalypse of Peter (*Greek*), https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/apocalypsepeter-mrjames.html, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1003.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu, ed. Marek Starowieyski, vol. 1–5, Kraków 2003–2007.

Apokryfy Starego Testamentu (Prymasowska Seria Biblijna), ed. Ryszard Rubinkiewicz, Warszawa 2000.

Apokryfy syryjskie, ed. Marek Starowieyski, Kraków 2011.

The Ascension of Isaiah, http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/ascension.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Ascension of Isaiah. Translated from the Ethiopic Version, Which, Together with the New Greek Fragment, the Latin Version and the Latin Translation of the Slavonic, ed. Robert Henry Charles, London 1900, https://archive.org/details/cu31924014590529 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Book of Enoch, https://www.ccel.org/c/charles/otpseudepig/enoch/ENOCH_1.HTM [23.12.2023].

The Book of Enoch (*Second*), English transl. Robert Henry Charles, Nevill Forbes, [in:] APOT 2, p. 425–469, https://archive.org/details/apocryphapseudep02char/page/n7/mode/2up [accessed: 23.12.2023].

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The Book of Jubilees, English transl. Robert Henry Charles, [in:] APOT 2, p. 1–82, http://www.pseudepigrapha.com/jubilees/index.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Epistle of the Apostles, https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/apostolorum.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Fourth Book of Ezra, [in:] APOT 2, p. 542–624 https://archive.org/details/apocryphapseudep02char/page/590/mode/2up; http://www.pseudepigrapha.com/apocrypha_ot/2esdr.htm [accessed: 6.01.2024].

The Fourth Book of Maccabees, https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/r/rsv/rsv-idx?type=DIV1&byte=4496061, https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=4%20Maccabees%201&version=NRSVUE [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Gospel of Peter, https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/gospelpeter-brown.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Old Testament Greek Pseudoepigrapha with Morphology, ed. Ken M. Penner, Michael S. Heiser, Bellingham 2008.

Parchem, Marek, *Testament Mojżesza: wprowadzenie oraz przekład z objaśnieniami*, "Collectanea Theologica" 76 (2006), no. 2, p. 79–103.

Pisma apokaliptyczne i Testamenty (Apokryfy Starego Testamentu 2), ed. Marek Parchem, Kraków–Mogilany 2010.

Psalms of Solomon, English transl. G. Buchanan Gray, [in:] APOT 2, p. 625–652, https://archive.org/details/apocryphapseudep02char/page/n7/mode/2up [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Psalmy Salomona, Polish transl. Antoni Paciorek, [in:] *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ed. Ryszard Rubinkiewicz, Warsaw 2000.

Secret Mark, English transl. M. Smith, https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/secretmark.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Sibylline Oracles, English transl. Milton S. Terry, New York–Cincinnati [1899], https://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/sib/sib05.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Story of Ahiqar, http://www.pseudepigrapha.com/pseudepigrapha/ahikar.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Tajemna Ewangelia Marka, Polish transl. Michał Wojciechowski, https://opoka.org.pl/biblioteka/T/TB/ew_marka_taj.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Testament Izaaka, Polish transl. Anna Kuśmirek, [in:] *Pisma apokaliptyczne i Testamenty* (Apokryfy Starego Testamentu 2), ed. Marek Parchem, Kraków–Mogilany 2010, p. 453–481.

Testament Jakuba, Polish transl. Anna Kuśmirek, [in:] *Pisma apokaliptyczne i Testamenty* (Apokryfy Starego Testamentu 2), ed. Marek Parchem, Kraków–Mogilany 2010, p. 483–502.

The Testament of Asher, https://sacred-texts.com/bib/fbe/fbe291.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Asher concerning Two Faces of Vice and Virtue, https://www.biblestudytools.com/history/early-church-fathers/ante-nicene/vol-8-third-fourth-centuries/twelve-patriarchs/x-testament-of-asher-concerning-two-faces-of-vice-and-virtue.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

The Testament of Benjamin, https://sacred-texts.com/bib/fbe/fbe294.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Benjamin Concerning a Pure Mind, https://www.biblestudytools.com/history/early-church-fathers/ante-nicene/vol-8-third-fourth-centuries/twelve-patriarchs/xii-testament-of-benjamin-concerning-a-pure-mind.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Dan, https://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/fbe/fbe285.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Dan Concerning Anger and Lying, https://www.biblestudytools.com/history/early-church-fathers/ante-nicene/vol-8-third-fourth-centuries/twelve-patriarchs/vii-testament-of-dan-concerning-anger-and-lying.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Issachar, https://sacred-texts.com/bib/fbe/fbe281.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Issachar Concerning Simplicity, https://www.biblestudytools.com/history/early-church-fathers/ante-nicene/vol-8-third-fourth-centuries/twelve-patriarchs/v-testament-of-issachar-concerning-simplicity.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Judah, https://sacred-texts.com/bib/fbe/fbe277.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Judah Concerning Fortitude, and Love of Money, and Fornication, https://www.biblestudytools.com/history/early-church-fathers/ante-nicene/vol-8-third-fourth-centuries/twelve-patriarchs/iv-testament-of-judah-concerning-fortitude-and-love-of-money-and-fornication.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Levi, https://sacred-texts.com/bib/fbe/fbe272.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Levi Concerning the Priesthood and Arrogance, https://www.biblestudytools.com/history/early-church-fathers/ante-nicene/vol-8-third-fourth-centuries/twelve-patriarchs/iii-testament-of-levi-concerning-priesthood-and-arrogance.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Moses, http://wesley.nnu.edu/index.php?id=2124 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Naphtali, https://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/fbe/fbe288.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Naphtali concerning Natural Goodness, https://www.biblestudytools.com/history/early-church-fathers/ante-nicene/vol-8-third-fourth-centuries/twelve-patriarchs/viii-testament-of-naphtali-concerning-natural-goodness.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Simeon, https://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/fbe/fbe269.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Simeon Concerning Envy, https://www.biblestudytools.com/history/early-church-fathers/ante-nicene/vol-8-third-fourth-centuries/twelve-patriarchs/ii-testament-of-simeon-concerning-envy.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Zebulun, https://sacred-texts.com/bib/fbe/fbe283.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Testament of Zebulun Concerning Compassion and Mercy, https://www.biblestudytools.com/history/early-church-fathers/ante-nicene/vol-8-third-fourth-centuries/twelve-pa

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

triarchs/vi-testament-of-zebulun-concerning-compassion-and-mercy.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Third Book of Maccabees, https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/r/rsv/rsv-idx?type=DIV1&byte=4451716 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Vita Adae et Evae, https://www.ccel.org/c/charles/otpseudepig/adamnev.htm; https://www.sacred-texts.com/chr/apo/adamnev.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Qumran writings

The Community Rule, English transl. G. Vermes, http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/gopher/other/courses/rels/225/Texts/1QS [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Dead Sea Scrolls. A New Translation, English transl. Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Edward Cook, HarperCollins, New York 1996.

Muchowski, Piotr, *Rękopisy znad Morza Martwego. Qumran – Wadi Murabbaat – Masada*, Kraków 1996.

Reeves J.C., *Translation of 1Q Genesis Apocryphon II–XXII*, https://pages.uncc.edu/john-reeves/course-materials/rels-2104-hebrew-scripturesold-testament/translation-of-1q-genesis-apocryphon/ [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Ancient Christian writers

Apology of Aristides the Philosopher, English transl. D.M. Kay, http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/aristides-kay.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Augustine of Hippo, *The Works of Saint Augustin*, vol. 12: *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions*, English transl. Boniface Ramsey, New York 2008.

Bede the Venerable, *Commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles*, English transl. David D. Hurst, Kalamazoo 1985.

The Clementine Homilies, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0808.htm [accessed: 28.12.2023].

Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Heathen*, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0208.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Clement of Alexandria, *The Stromata*, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0210.htm, http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/clement.html [accessed: 12.08.2023].

Clement of Alexandria, *The Instructor* (*Paedagogus*), English transl. William Wilson, [in:] ANF 2, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/02092.htm [accessed: 30.04.2023].

Clement of Rome, *Letter to the Corinthians*, English transl. John Keith, [in:] ANF 9, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1010.htm [accessed: 25.07.2023].

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Clement of Rome, *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*, English transl. Joseph Barber Lightfoot, http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/1clement-lightfoot.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Clement of Rome, *The Second Epistle of Clement*, English transl. John Keith, [in:] ANF 9, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1011.htm [accessed: 11.01.2024].

The Didache, English transl. M.B. Riddle, [in:] ANF 7, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0714.htm [accessed: 09.04.2023].

The Epistle of Barnabas, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0124.htm; https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/barnabas-lightfoot.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Epistle of Mathetes to Diognetus, English transl. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, [in:] ANF 1, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0101.htm [accessed: 11.01.2024].

Eusebius of Caesarea, *Church History* [*Historia Ecclesiastica*], English transl. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, [in:] *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 1, ed. Philip Schaff, Henry Wace, Buffalo 1890, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2501.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, English transl. E.H. Gifford (1903), Ipswich 2003.

Hermas, *The Shepherd*, English transl. Frederick Crombie, [in:] ANF 2, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0201.htm [accessed: 9.01.2024].

Hermas, *The Shepherd*, English transl. Joseph Barber Lightfoot, http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/shepherd-lightfoot.html [accessed: 9.01.2024].

Ignatius of Antioch, *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians*, English transl. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, [in:] ANF 1, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0104.htm [accessed: 11.01.2024].

Ignatius of Antioch, *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians*, English transl. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, [in:] ANF 1, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0105.htm [accessed: 11.01.2024].

Ignatius of Antioch, *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians*, English transl. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, [in:] ANF 1, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0108.htm [accessed: 11.01.2024].

Ignatius of Antioch, *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans*, English transl. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, [in:] ANF 1, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0107.htm [accessed: 9.01.2024].

Ignatius of Antioch, *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrnaeans*, English transl. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, [in:] ANF 1, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0109.htm [accessed: 11.01.2024].

Ignatius of Antioch, *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians*, English transl. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, [in:] ANF 1, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0106.htm [accessed: 11.01.2024].

Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adversus Haereses*, http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/irenaeus.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Irenaeus of Lyons, *Against Heresies*, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Irenaeus of Lyons, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Doctrine*, http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/demonstrationapostolic.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Jerome and Gennadius, *Lives of Illustrious Men: Simon Peter*, https://ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf203/npnf203.v.iii.iii.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Jerome, *Letter 53. To Paulinus*, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3001053.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Jerome, *Letter 120. To Hedibia*, https://www.tertullian.org/fathers/jerome_hedibia_2_trans.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, English transl. Marcus Dods, George Reith, [in:] ANF 1, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0128.htm, https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/justinmartyr-dialoguetrypho.html [accessed: 4.01.2024].

Justin Martyr, *The First Apology*, http://earlychristianwritings.com/text/justinmartyr-firstapology.html; http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0126.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Lactantius, *Divine Institutes. Book III* (*Of the False Wisdom of Philosophers*), chapter 17: *He Passes from Philosophy to the Philosophers, Begining with Epicurus; And How He Regarded Leucippus and Democritus as Authors of Error*, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/07013.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Marcionite Prologues to the Pauline Letters, https://www.ccel.org/ccel/harnack/origin_nt.v.i.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Martyrdom of Polycarp, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0102.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The Martyrdom of Polycarp, English transl. Kirsopp Lake, [in:] *Apostolic Fathers* (Loeb Classical Library), Kirsopp Lake 1912, http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/martyrdompolycarp-lake.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Melito of Sardis, *On Pascha and Fragments*, English transl. S.G. Hall, Clarendon, Oxford 1979, https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/melito.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Methodius of Olympus, *The Banquet of the Ten Virgins or Concerning Chastity* https://ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf06/anf06.xi.iii.ix.x.html, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/062308.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Ojcowie Kościoła komentują Biblię. Nowy Testament, vol. 9: *List św. Jakuba, I–II List św. Piotra, I–III List św. Jana, List św. Judy*, Polish transl. and ed. Dariusz Sztuk, Ząbki 2014.

Origen, *Contra Celsum*, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/04163.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Polycarp of Smyrna, *Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians*, English transl. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, [in:] ANF 1, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0136.htm [accessed: 8.01.2024].

Pseudo-Clementine Literature, https://ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf08/anf08.vi.iv.vi.liii.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Recognitiones, https://ccel.org/ccel/clement_rome/pseudo_literature/anf08.vi.iii.iii.xxix.html, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0804.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Tertullian, *Apology* (*Apologeticus*), English transl. S. Thelwall, [in:] ANF 3, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0301.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Theophilus of Antioch, *To Autolycus*, English transl. Marcus Dods, http://www.logoslibrary.org/theophilus/autolycus/214.html [accessed: 5.01.2024].

Theophilus of Antioch, *To Autolycus*, English transl. Ph. Schaff, https://documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/0165-0183,_Theophilus_Antiochenus,_Ad_Autolycum_[Schaff],_EN.pdf [accessed: 5.01.2024].

Theophylact of Ochrid, *The Explanation of 2 Peter* (Blessed Theophylact's Explanations), English transl. N. Christina, A. Skoubourdis, 2002.

Other ancient writers

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0004%3Acard%3D258 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0009%3Acard%3D609 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Apollodros, *Library*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0022%3Atext%3DLibrary [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Aristophanes, *Frogs*, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/7998/7998-h/7998-h.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Aristotle, *The History of Animals*, English transl. D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/history_anim.4.iv.html, https://penelope.uchicago.edu/aristotle/histanimals4.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, [in:] *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*, vol. 19, English transl. H. Rackham, London 1934, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0054%3Abekker+page%3D1132a [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, English transl. W.D. Ross, http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Aristotle, *Meteorology*, http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/meteorology.1.i.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Aristotle, *Politics*, English transl. Benjamin Jowett, http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/politics.4.four.html, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0058%3Abook%3D1%3Asection%3D1252a [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, [in:] *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*, vol. 22, English transl. J.H. Freese, Cambridge 1926, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0060%3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D1%3Asection%3D1 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, English transl. William Rhys Roberts, http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *On Invention* (*De Inventione*), https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/On_Invention/Book_2#22 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *De natura deorum*, https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cicero/de_Natura_Deorum/1A*.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *The Treatises of M. T. Cicero on the Nature of the Gods; On Divination; On Fate; On the Republic; On the Laws; and On Standing for the Consulship*, English transl. C.D. Yonge, London 1853.

Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses*, https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/home.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica. Books I–V*, ed. Immanuel Bekker, Ludwig Dindorf, Friedrich Vogel, Immanel Bekker, Leipzig 1888–1890, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0540 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* (*Bibliotheca Historica*), English transl. C.H. Oldfather http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0084%3Abook%3D15%3Achapter%3D58%3Asection%3D1; https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Diodorus_Siculus/1A*.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, English transl. Robert Drew Hicks, Cambridge 1972, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0258%3Abook%3D2%3Achapter%3D17 [accessed: 4.01.2024].

Epictetus, *Discourses*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0236%3Atext%3Ddisc%3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D6 [accessed: 32.12.2023].

Euripides, *Bacchantes*, https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0092%3Acard%3D215 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Euripides, *Helen*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0099%3Acard%3D597 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Flavius, Josephus, *Against Apion* (*Contra Apionem*), http://public-library.uk/ebooks/10/45.pdf [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Flavius, Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*, [in:] *Flavii Iosephi opera*, ed. Benedikt Niese, Berlin 1892, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0145%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+chapter%3D6%3Awhiston+section%3D7 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Flavius, Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews* (*Antiquitates Iudaicae*), English transl. William Whiston, London 1737, http://penelope.uchicago.edu/josephus/index.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Flavius, Josephus, *The Jewish War* (*De Bello Iudaico*), English transl. William Whiston, London 1737, http://penelope.uchicago.edu/josephus/war-pref.html; http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D1%3Awhiston+chapter%3D3%3Awhiston+section%3D1 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Herodotus, *Histories*, English transl. George Rawlinson, https://files.romanroadsstatic.com/materials/herodotus.pdf, https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0126 [accessed: 4.01.2024].

Hesiod, *Theogony*, [in:] *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns, and Homerica*, English transl. Hugh G. Evelyn-White, Cambridge–London 1914, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0130%3Acard%3D1 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Homer, *The Iliad*, English transl. Samuel Butler, http://classics.mit.edu/Homer/iliad.6.vi.html https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0134%3Abook%3D8%3Acard%3D1 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Homer, *The Odyssey*, English transl. A.T. Murray, vol. 1–2, Cambridge–London 1919, https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0136%3Abook%3D11%3Acard%3D51 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Josephus in Greek: Niese Critical Editrion with Apparatus, ed. B. Niese, D. Noe, L. Marshall, Bellingham, Faithlife 1887–2008 (Logos).

The Letter of Aristeas, ed. Robert Henry Charles, Oxford 1913, https://www.ccel.org/c/charles/otpseudepig/aristeas.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

List antyczny. Antologia, ed. J. Schnayder, Wrocław 2006.

Lucian of Samosata, *The Passing of Peregrinus*, https://www.tertullian.org/rpearse/lucian/peregrinus.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Lucian of Samosata, *Sale of Creeds* (*Vitarum auctio*), http://lucianofsamosata.info/wiki/doku.php?id=home:texts_and_library:dialogues:sale-of-creeds#section18 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Midrash Rabbah. Genesis I, English transl. H. Freedman, London 1961.

Myszor W., *Corpus Hermeticum XIII: wstęp, przekład z greckiego, komentarz*, "Studia Theologica Varsaviensia" 17 (1979), no. 1, p. 245–256.

Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0069%3Atext%3DArs [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, https://www.theoi.com/Text/OvidMetamorphoses1.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, English transl. W.H.S. Jones, H.A. Ormerod, vol. 1–4, Cambridge–London 1918, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Paus.+10.32.13&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0160 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Petronius, *Satyricon*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2007.01.0027%3Atext%3DSatyricon%3Asection%3D1 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Philo of Alexandria, *The Works of Philo*, English transl. Charles Duke Yonge, London 1854–1890, https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/yonge/index.html; http://www.earlyjewishwritings.com/philo.html [accessed: 4.01.2024].

Plato, *Phaedrus*, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1636/1636-h/1636-h.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Plato, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, English transl. W.R.M. Lamb, London 1967.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Plato, *Protagoras*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0178%3Atext%3DProt.%3Asection%3D323e [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Plato, *The Republic*, https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0168%3Abook%3D4%3Apage%3D442 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Plato, *Theaetetus*, English transl. Benjamin Jowett, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1726/1726-h/1726-h.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Plato, *Timaeus*, English transl. Benjamin Jowett, https://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/ancient-greece/plato/plato-timaeus.asp, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1572/1572-h/1572-h.htm [accessed: 4.01.2024].

Pliny the Elder, *The Natural History*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0137%3Abook%3D8%3Achapter%3D81 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Plutarch, *Adversus Colotem*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0396%3Astephpage%3D1124c [accessed 23.12.2023].

Plutarch, *Moralia*, https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Moralia/ [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Plutarch, *Morals. Ethical Essays*, English transl. Arthur Richard Shilleto, London 1989, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/23639/23639-h/23639-h.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Plutarch, *The Parallel Lives*, English transl. Bernadotte Perrin (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge–London 1923, https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Pseudo-Longinus, *On the Sublime*, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/17957/17957-h/17957-h.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, English transl. Harold Edgeworth Butler (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge 1920–1922, https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Quintilian/Institutio_Oratoria/3C*.html#7 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Semonides, *Elegy and Iambus*, vol. 2, ed. J.M. Edmonds http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0480%3Avolume%3D2%3Atext%3D22 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Seneca, Lucius Annelius, *Moral Letters to Lucilius* (*Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium*), English transl. Richard M. Gummere, vol. 1–3, London–New York 1917–1925, https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Moral_letters_to_Lucilius [accessed: 8.01.2024].

Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhonic Sketches*, [in:] M. Mills Patrick, *Sextus Empiricus and Greek Scepticism*, Cambridge 1899, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/17556/17556-h/17556-h.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Sophocles, *Ajax*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0183%3Acard%3D646 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Stemberger, Günter, *Il Midrash. Uso rabbinico della Bibbia. Introduzione, testi, commenti*, Bologna 1992.

Strabo, *Geography* (*Geographica hypomnemata*), English transl. Horace Leonard Jones, vol. 1–8, Cambridge 1917–1932, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0239%3Abook%3D16%3Achapter%3D2%3Asection%3D44;

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Strabo/5A*.html [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Suetonius Tranquillus, *Nero*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:abo:phi,1348,016:16 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Tacitus Cornelius, *The Annals*, https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0078%3Abook%3D15%3Achapter%3D44 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Section XL, English transl. J.W. Etheridge, http://targum.info/pj/pjnum22-25.htm [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Titus Maccius Plautus, *Menaechmi, or The Twin Brothers*, English transl. Henry Thomas Riley, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0101%3Aact%3D4%3Ascene%3D2 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

The works of Epictetus, consisting of his discourses, in four books, the Enchiridion, and fragments, English transl. Thomas Wentforth Higginson, vol. 2, Boston 1891.

Wilson, Walter T., *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature), Berlin–New York 2005.

Works of Philo: Greek Text with Morphology, ed. Peder Borgen, Kåre Fuglseth, Roald Skarsten, Faithlife 2005 (Logos).

Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, ed. Walter Miller, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0204%3Abook%3D8%3Achapter%3D4%3Asection%3D6 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0208 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Xenophon, *Symposium*, https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0212%3Atext%3DSym.%3Achapter%3D4%3Asection%3D42 [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Dictionaries and lexicons

The Anchor Bible Dictionary, ed. David Noel Freedman, New York 1992.

Głowiński, Michał, Kostkiewiczowa, Teresa, Okopień-Sławińska, Aleksandra et al., *Podręczny słownik terminów literackich*, Warszawa 1994.

Ilan, Tal, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity*, part 1: *Palestine 330 BCE-200 CE* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 91) Tübingen 2002.

Jaworski, Stanisław, *Podręczny słownik terminów literackich*, Kraków 2001.

Louw, Johannes P., Nida, Eugene A., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domain*, New York 1988.

New International Dictionary of the New Testament Theology, ed. Colin Brown, Grand Rapids 1975.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, ed. Colin Brown, vol. 1–4, Grand Rapids 1975–1978.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Szczepanowicz, Barbara, Mrozek, Andrzej, *Atlas zwierząt biblijnych. Miejsce w Biblii i symbolika*, Kraków 2007.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, Gerhard Friedrich, English transl. Geoffrey William Bromiley, Grand Rapids 1985.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, Gerhard Friedrich, vol. 1–10, Stuttgart 1933–1979.

Westminster Dictionary of the New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric, ed. David Edward Aune, Louiseville–London 2003.

Commentaries and introductions

Barnett, Albert E., Homrighausen, Elmer George, *The Second Epistle of Peter and the Letter of Jude*, London 1957.

Bartnicki, Roman, *W trosce o czystość wiary* (*Drugi List św. Piotra*), [in:] *Ewangelia św. Jana, Listy powszechne, Apokalipsa*, ed. Janusz Frankowski (Wprowadzenie w myśl i wezwanie ksiąg biblijnych 10), Warszawa 1992, p. 142–155.

Bauckham, Richard, *2 Peter: A Supplementary Bibliography*, JETS 25 (1982), no. 1, p. 91–93.

Bauckham, Richard, *2 Peter: An Account of Research* (ANRW II.25.5), Berlin–New York 1988, p. 3713–3752.

Bauckham, Richard, *Jude, 2 Peter* (Word Biblical Commentary 50), Waco 1983.

Bigg, Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments 41), Edinburgh 1901.

Calvin, John, *Commentaries on the Second Epistle of Peter*, English transl. John Owen, [in:] *Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles*, Edinburgh 1855, p. 363–426.

Chaine, Joseph, *Les Epitres catholiques*, Paris 1939.

Chester, Andrew, Martin, Ralph Philip, *Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude*, Cambridge 1994.

Craddock, Fred B., *First and Second Peter and Jude*, Louisville 1995.

Davids, Peter H., *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude* (The Pilar New Testament Commentary), Grand Rapids 2006.

Donelson, Lewis R., *I and II Peter and Jude* (New Testament Library), Louisville 2010.

Elliott, John H., *Second Epistle of Peter*, [in:] *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 5, ed. David Noel Freedmann, New York 1990, p. 282–287.

Farkasfalvy, Denis, *Drugi List św. Piotra Apostoła*, [in:] *Międzynarodowy komentarz do Pisma świętego. Komentarz katolicki i ekumeniczny na XXI wiek*, ed. William R. Farmer, Waldemar Chrostowski, Polish transl. M. Kulikowska, Warszawa 2001, p. 1651–1659.

Frey, Jörg, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, Leipzig 2015.

Fruchtenbaum, Arnold G., *The Messianic Jewish Epistles. Hebrew, James, I Peter, II Peter, Jude* (Ariel's Bible Commentary), San Antonio 2005.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Green, Gene L., *Jude and 2 Peter* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 2013.

Green, Michael, *2 Peter, Jude. An Introduction and Commentary* (Tyndale New Testament Commentaries), Grand Rapids 1987.

Grundmann, Walter, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 15), Berlin 1974.

Gryglewicz, Feliks, *Listy katolickie. Wstęp. Przekład. Komentarz*, Poznań 1959.

Harink, Douglas, *1&2 Peter*, Grand Rapids 2009.

Harrington, Daniel J., *Jude and 2 Peter*, Collegeville 2003.

Hiebert, D. Edmond, *Second Peter and Jude. An Expositional Commentary*, Greenville 1989.

Hillyer, Norman, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, Grand Rapids 1992.

James, Montague Rhodes, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and of Jude*, Cambridge 1912.

Keating, Daniel A., *First, Second Peter, Jude*, Grand Rapids 2011.

Kelly, John Norman Davidson, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (Black's New Testament Commentaries), London 1982.

Kistemaker, Simon J., *New Testament Commentary: James, Epistles of John, Peter and Jude*, Grand Rapids 1996.

Knoch, Otto, *Der erste und zweite Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief*, Regensburg 1990.

Lenski, Richard Charles Henry, *Interpretation of I and II Epistles of Peter, the three Epistles of John and the Letter of Jude*, Minneapolis 2008.

Lucas, Dick, *The Message of 2 Peter and Jude. The Promise of His Coming*, Leicester 1995.

Luther, Martin, *Die ander Epistel Sanct Petri und eine S. Judas gepredigt und ausgelegt*, [in:] *D. Martin Luthers Werke*, vol. 14, Weimar 1895, p. 14–91, https://archive.org/details/dmartinlutherswe114luth/page/20/mode/1up [accessed: 5.01.2024].

Luther, Martin, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude Preached and Explained by Martin Luther*, English transl. E.H. Gillet, New York 1859, https://ccel.org/ccel/luther/stpeter_stjude/stpeter_stjude.i.html [27.12.2023].

Luther, Martin, *Preface to the Epistles of Saint James and Saint Jude 1545* (*1522*), http://www.godrules.net/library/luther/NEW1luther_f8.htm [accessed: 27.12.2023].

Luther, Martin, *Preface to the Second Epistle of Saint Peter*, https://godrules.net/library/luther/NEW1luther_f8.htm [accessed: 5.01.2024].

Marconi, Gilberto, *Lettera di Giuda. Seconda Lettera di Pietro. Introduzione, versione, commento*, Bologna 2005.

Mayor, Joseph Bickersteth, *The Epistle of. St. Jude and the Second Epistle of. St. Peter*, London 1907.

McArthur, John, *2 Peter and Jude* (New Testament Commentary 30), Chicago 2005.

Mickiewicz, Franciszek, *List św. Judy. Drugi List św. Piotra* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny NT 18), Częstochowa 2018.

Moffatt, James, *The General Epistles: James, Peter and Judas* (The Moffat New Testament Commentary), London 1928.

Moo, Douglas J., *2 Peter, Jude* (The NIV Aplication Commentary), Grand Rapids 1996.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Müller, Peter, *Der 2. Petrusbrief*, "Theologische Rundschau" 66 (2001), p. 310–337.
Neyrey, Jerome H., *2 Peter, Jude: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 37c), New York 1993.
Osburn, Carroll D., *Second Letter of Peter*, [in:] *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. David Noel Freedman, Grand Rapids 2000, p. 1039–1041.
Ostmeyer, Karl-Heinrich, *Die Briefe des Petrus und das Judas* (Die Botschaft des Neuen Testament), Göttingen 2021.
Paulsen, Henning, *Der Zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief* (Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 12/2), Göttingen 1992.
Perkins, Pheme, *First and Second Peter, James and Jude, Interpretation* (A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching), Louisville 1995.
Reading 1–2 Peter and Jude, ed. Eric F. Mason, Troy W. Martin, Atlanta 2014.
Reading Second Peter with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of Second Peter, ed. Robert L. Webb, Chris Keith, Duane F. Watson, London 2010.
Reese, Ruth Anne, *2 Peter and Jude*, Grand Rapids 2007.
Reicke, Bo, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude* (The Anchor Bible 37), New York 1964.
Richard, Earl J., *Reading 1 Peter, Jude, and 2 Peter: a literary and theological commentary*, Macon 2000.
Robson, Edgar Iliff, *Studies in the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, Cambridge 1915.
Rosik, Mariusz, *List św. Judy*, [in:] Hugolin Langkammer, Mariusz Rosik, Mirosław S. Wróbel, *Komentarz do Listu św. Jakuba Apostoła, 1–2 Listu św. Piotra Apostoła, 1–3 Listu św. Jana Apostoła, Listu św. Judy i Apokalipsy* (Komentarz teologiczno-pastoralny do Biblii Tysiąclecia. Nowy Testament 5), Poznań 2015, p. 129–140.
Rosik, Mariusz, *Pierwszy List do Koryntian* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny NT 7), Częstochowa 2009.
Schelkle, Karl Hermann, *Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 13/2), Freiburg–Basel–Wien 1988.
Schrage, Wolfgang, *Der Zweite Petrusbrief*, [in:] Horst Balz, Wolfgang Schrage, *Die katholischen Briefe. Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Johannes and Judas* (Neue Testament Deutsch 10), Göttingen 1973, p. 122–155.
Schreiner, Thomas R., *1, 2 Peter, Jude* (New American Commentary 37), Nashville 2003.
Senior, Donald P., Harrington Daniel J., *Jude and 2 Peter* (Sacra Pagina 15), Collegeville 2003.
Seremet, Bogusław, *Dzieje Apostolskie i listy katolickie* (Academica 54), Tarnów 2001.
Sidebottom, Ernest Malcolm, *James, 2 Peter, Jude* (New Century Bible Commentary), Grand Rapids 1980.
Skaggs, Rebecca, *1–2 Peter and Jude Through the Centuries* (Wiley Blackwell Bible Commentary), Chichester 2020.
Skaggs, Rebecca, *The Pentecostal Commentary on 1 Peter, 2 Peter, Jude* (Pentecostal Commentary Series), London 2004.
Snyder, John, *A 2 Peter Bibliography*, JETS 22 (1979), no. 3, p. 265–267.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Stachowiak, Lech, *Drugi List św. Piotra*, [in:] *Komentarz praktyczny do Nowego Testamentu*, part 2, ed. Augustyn Jankowski, Kazimierz Romaniuk, Lech Stachowiak, Poznań–Kraków 1999, p. 1091–1104.

Stancari, Pino, *A partire da Gerusalemme. Lettera di Giacomo, Lettera di Giuda e Seconda lettera di Pietro. Una lettura spirituale*, Roma 2014.

Vinson, Richard Bolling, Wilson, Richard Francis, Mills, Watson E., *1 & 2 Peter, Jude* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary), Macon 2010.

Vögtle, Anton, *Der Judasbrief. Der zweite Petrusbrief* (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 22), Düsseldorf–Neukirchen–Vluyn 1994.

Wallace, Daniel B., *Jude: Introduction, Argument, and Outline* (New Testament: Introductions and Outlines), https://bible.org/seriespage/26-jude-introduction-argument-and-outline [accessed: 23.12.2023].

Waltner, Erland, Charles, J. Daryl, *1–2 Peter, Jude* (Believers Church Bible Commentary), Scottdale 1999.

Watson, Duane F., Callan Terrance, *First and Second Peter* (Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament), Grand Rapids 2012.

Windisch, Hans, *Die katholischen Briefe* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 15), Tübingen 1951.

Wojciechowska, Kalina, Rosik, Mariusz, *Mądrość zstępująca z góry. Komentarz strukturalny do Listu św. Jakuba*, Warszawa 2018.

Wojciechowska, Kalina, Rosik, Mariusz, *Oczekując miłosierdzia. Komentarz strukturalny do Listu św. Judy*, Warszawa 2020.

Wojciechowska, Kalina, Rosik, Mariusz, *A Structural Commentary on the So-Called Antilegomena*, vol. 2: *The Letter of Jude: Expecting Mercy* (Eastern and Central European Voices 3.2), Göttingen 2021.

Zahn, Theodor, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. 2, ed. Melancthon Williams Jacobus, Edinburgh 1909.

Studies

Alexander, T. Desmond, *Lot's Hospitality: A Clue to His Righteousness*, JBL 104 (1985), no. 2, p. 289–300.

Allison, Dale C., *Peter and Cephas: One and the Same*, JBL 111 (1992), no. 3, p. 489–495.

Barr, George K., *The Structure of Hebrews and 1st and 2nd Peter*, "Irish Biblical Studies" 19 (1997), p. 17–31.

Bauckham, Richard, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, Leiden 1998.

Bauckham, Richard, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospel as Eyewitness Testimony*, Grand Rapids 2006.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Bauckham, Richard, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, London–New York 1990.

Biesaga, Tadeusz, *Spór o dobro moralne: hedonizm – eudajmonizm – personalizm*, [in:] *Spór o dobro*, ed. Andrzej Maryniarczyk, Katarzyna Stępień, Paweł Gondek, Lublin 2012, p. 291–308.

Billings, Bradly S., *The Angels who Sinned… He Cast into Tartarus* (*2 Pet 2:4*)*: Its Ancient Meaning and Present Relevance*, "Expository Times" 119 (2015), no. 11, p. 532–537.

Birdsall, J. Neville, *The Text of Jude in P72*, "Journal of Theological Studies" 14 (1963), no. 2, p. 394–399.

Blomberg, Craig L., *A New Testament Theology*, Waco 2018.

Bockmuehl, Marcus, *Attitudes to Jewish and Roman Power in the Gospel and Acts of Peter*, [in:] *The Early Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter* (*60–800 CE*), ed. Roald Dijkstra, Leiden–Boston 2020, p. 81–98.

Boobyer, George H., *The Indebtedness of 2 Peter to 1 Peter*, [in:] *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson*, ed. Angus Higgins, Manchester 1959, p. 34–53.

Bremmer, Jan N., *The Apocalypse of Peter as the First Christian Martyr Text: Its Date, Provenance and Relationship with 2 Peter*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, Jan G. van der Watt, Leiden–Boston 2019, p. 75–98.

Burnet, Régis, *Peter, the Visionary Before the Pope: Early Receptions of the Apostle in Marginal Communities*, [in:] *The Early Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter* (*60–800 CE*), ed. Roald Dijkstra, Leiden–Boston 2020, p. 99–113.

Caird, George Bradford, *The Language and Imagery of Bible*, London 1980.

Callan, Terrance, *Comparison of Humans to Animals in 2 Pet 10b-22*, "Biblica" 90 (2009), no. 1, p. 101–113.

Callan, Terrance, *The Gospels of Matthew and John in the Second Letter of Peter*, [in:] *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Tradition*, ed. Alicia J. Batten, John S. Kloppenborg (Library of New Testament Studies 478), London 2014, p. 166–180.

Callan, Terrance, *A Note on 2 Pet 1:19–20*, JBL 125 (2006), no. 1, p. 143–150.

Callan, Terrance, *Reading the Earliest Copies of 2 Peter*, "Biblica" 93 (2012), no. 3, p. 430–432.

Callan, Terrance, *Rhetography Rhetology of Apocalyptic Discourse in Second Peter*, [in:] *Reading Second Peter with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of Second Peter*, ed. Robert L. Webb, Duane F. Watson, London 2010, p. 59–90.

Callan, Terrance, *The Second Letter of Peter, Josephus and Gnosticism*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, Jan G. van der Watt, Leiden–Boston 2019, p. 136–142.

Callan, Terrance, *The Soteriology of the Second Letter of Peter*, "Biblica" 82 (2001), no. 4, p. 549–559.

Callan, Terrance, *The Style of the Second Letter of Peter*, "Biblica" 84 (2003), no. 2, p. 202–224.

Caulley, Thomas Scott, *They Promise Them Freedom. Once again, the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι in 2 Peter*, "Zeitschrift für di neutestamentlische Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche" 99 (2008), no. 1, p. 129–138.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Callan, Terrance, *Use of the Letter of Jude by the Second Letter by Peter*, "Biblica" 85 (2004), no. 1, p. 42–64.

Charles, J. Daryl, *The Language and Logic of Virtue in 2 Pet 1,5–7*, "Bulletin for Biblical Research" 8 (1998), p. 55–73.

Charles, J. Daryl, *Polemic and Persuasion: Typological and Rhetorical Perspectives on the Letter of Jude*, [in:] *Reading Jude with New Eyes. Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of Jude*, ed. Robert L. Webb, Peter Hugh Davids, New York 2008, p. 81–108.

Charles, J. Daryl, *Virtue amidst Vice: The Catalogue of Virtues in 2 Peter* (Journal of the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series 150), Sheffield 1997.

Chatelion Counet, Patrick, *Pseudoepigraphy and the Petrine School: Spirit and Tradition in 1 and 2 Peter and Jude*, "HTS Theological Studies" 62 (2006), no. 2, p. 404–424.

Chrostowski, Waldemar, *Żydowskie tradycje interpretacyjne pomocą w zrozumieniu Biblii*, "Collectanea Theologica" 66 (1996), no. 1, p. 39–54.

Culpepper, R. Alan, *The Johannine School*, Missoula 1975.

Curran, John R., *From Petrus to Pontifex Maximus*, [in:] *The Early Reception, and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter* (*60–800 CE*), ed. Roald Dijkstra, Leiden–Boston, p. 43–57.

Daniélou, Jean, *Teologia judeochrześcijańska*, Polish transl. S. Basista. Kraków 2002.

Danker, Frederick William, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*, St. Louis 1982.

Davids, Peter H., *Are the Others Too Other? The Issue of "Others" in Jude and 2 Peter*, [in:] *Reading 1–2 Peter and Jude: A Resource for Students*, ed. Eric F. Mason, Troy W. Martin, Atlanta 2014, p. 201–213.

Dąbek, Tomasz M., *Wezwani do uczestnictwa w Bożej naturze* (*2 Pet 1,4*), "Vita Consecrata" 11 (2008), no. 1, p. 40–43.

Desjardins, Michel, *The portrayal of the dissidents in 2 Peter and Jude: Does it tell us more about the "Godly" than the "Ungodly"?*, "Journal of the Study of the New Testament" 30 (1987), p. 89–102.

Downs, David J., *Early Catholicism and Apocalypticism in the Pastoral Epistles*, CBQ 67 (2005), no. 4, p. 641–661.

Dunnett, Walter M., *The Hermeneutics of Jude and 2 Peter: The Use of Ancient Jewish Traditions*, JETS 31 (1988), no. 3, p. 287–292.

Ehrman, Bart, *Cefas and Peter*, JBL 109 (1990), no. 3, p. 463–474.

Ellis, E. Earle, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*, Tübingen 1978.

Everett, Gary H., *Study Notes on the Holy Scriptures. Using a Theme-Based Approach to Identify Literary Structures. The Epistle of 2 Peter*, s.l. 2017.

Farkasfalvy, Denis, *The Ecclesial Setting of Pseudepigraphy in Second Peter and its Role in the Formation of the Canon*, "Second Century" 5 (1985), p. 3–29.

Fields, Weston W., *Sodom and Gomorrah: History and Motif in Biblical Narrative* (Journal for the Old Testament, Supplement Series), Sheffield 1997.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *Aramaic Kepha' and Peter's Name in the New Testament*, [in:] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel. New Testament Studies* (The Biblical Resource Series 13), New York 1981, p. 112–124.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography*, JBL 93 (1974), no. 2, p. 201–225.

Forbes, Christopher, *Comparison, Self-praise and Irony: Paul's Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric*, "New Testament Studies" 32 (1986), no. 1, p. 1–30.

Fornberg, Torn, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter* (Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series 9), Lund 1977.

Foster, Paul, *Does the Apocalypse of Peter Help to Determine the Date of 2 Peter*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, Jan G. van der Watt, Leiden–Boston 2019, p. 217–260.

Frey, Jörg, *Second Peter in New Perspective*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter: Towards a New Perspective*, ed. Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, Jan G. van der Watt, Leiden–Boston 2019, p. 7–74.

Gałkowski, Jerzy W., *Wolność moralna w ujęciu Sokratesa i Arystotelesa*, "Roczniki Filozoficzne" 22 (1973), no. 2, p. 13–30.

Gilmour, Michael J., *Reflections on the Authorship of 2 Peter*, "The Evangelical Quarterly" 73 (2001), no. 4, p. 291–309.

Gilmour, Michael J., *The Significance of Parallels between 2 Peter and other Early Christian Literature*, Leiden 2002.

Gnilka, Joachim, *Piotr i Rzym. Obraz Piotra w pierwszych dwu wiekach*, Polish transl. Wiesław Szymona, Kraków 2002.

Grant, Michael, *Święty Piotr*, Polish transl. Piotr Krupczyński, Warszawa 2001.

Green, Gene L., *The Testimony of Peter: 2 Peter and the Gospel Traditions*, [in:] *James, 1 & 2 Peter and Early Jesus Tradition*, ed. Alicia J. Batten, John S. Kloppenborg (Library of New Testament Studies 478), London 2014, p. 181–198.

Gründstäudl, Wolfgang, *"On Slavery": A Possibile Herrenwort in 2 Pet 2:19*, "Novum Testamentum" 57 (2015), no. 1, p. 57–71.

Grünstäudl, Wolfgang, *Petrus Alexandrinus: Studien zum historischen und theologischen Ort des Zweiten Petrusbrief* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/353), Tübingen 2013.

Hafemann, Scott, *"Divine Nature" in 2 Pet 1:1 Within Its Eschatological Context*, "Biblica" 94 (2013), no.1, p. 80–99.

Hafemann, Scott, *Noah, the Preacher of* (*God's*) *Righteousness: The Argument from Scripture in Peter 2:5 and 9*, CBQ 76 (2014), no. 2, p. 306–320.

Harris, Murray J., *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus*, Eugene 2008.

Hays, Christopher, *A Fresh Look at Βοσορ: Textual Criticism in 2 Pet 2,15*, "Filologia Neotestamentaria" 17 (2004), p. 105–109.

Hengel, Martin, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, London 1976.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Heschel, Abraham Joshua, *Mitologia Żydów*, [in:] *Judaizm*, ed. M. Dziwisz, Polish transl. K. Stark, Kraków 1990.

Hiebert, D. Edmond, *Selected Studies from 2 Peter. Part 3: A Portrayal of False Teachers: An Exposition of 2 Pet 2,1–3*, "Bibliotheca Sacra" 141 (1984), no. 563, p. 255–264.

Hodges, Zane C., *Making Your Calling and Election Sure: An Exposition of 2 Pet 1:5–11*, "Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society" 11 (1998), no. 1, p. 21–33.

Hoek, Annewies van den, *Peter without Paul: Aspects of Primordial Role of Simon Peter in an Early Christian Context*, [in:] *The Early Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter* (*60–800 CE*), ed. Roald Dijkstra, Leiden–Boston, p. 203–230.

Houwelingen, P.H.R. van, *The Authenticity of 2 Peter: Problems and Possible Solutions*, "European Journal of Theology" 19 (2010), no. 2, p. 119–129.

Hultin, Jeremy F., *The Literary Relationships among 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude*, [in:] *Reading 1–2 Peter and Jude. A Resource for Students*, ed. Eric F. Mason, Troy W. Martin, Atlanta 2014.

Iwański, Dariusz, *Wstawiennicy i oskarżyciele, czyli aniołowie w akcji* (*1 Hen 90,13–19*), [in:] *Apokaliptyka judaizmu i wczesnego chrześcijaństwa*, ed. Mirosław S. Wróbel, Lublin 2010, p. 69–78.

Johnson, Luke Timothy, *The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic*, JBL 108 (1989), no. 3, p. 419–441.

Jones, David W., *The Apostate Angels of 2 Pet 2:4 and Jude 6*, "Faith and Mission" 23 (2006), no. 2, p. 19–26.

Karta Ekumeniczna. Wytyczne dla wzrastającej współpracy między Kościołami w Europie, https://ekumenia.pl/czytelnia/dokumenty-ekumeniczne/karta-ekumeniczna/ [accessed: 27.12.2023].

Karwacki, Roman, *Urząd Piotrowy w służbie jedności według dokumentów dialogu katolicko-luterańskiego*, [in:] *Posłannictwo Biskupa Rzymu*, ed. Jacek Jezierski, Olsztyn 2002, p. 181–193.

Kennedy, George A., *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, Chapel Hill 1984.

Koktysz, M., *Elementy parenetyczne Listów Piotra i Judy. Studium egzegetyczno-porównawcze*, unpublished master's thesis under the supervision of Kalina Wojciechowska, Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw, 2016.

Korolko, Mirosław, *Sztuka retoryki*, Warszawa 1990.

Kosior, Wojciech, *Upadli* (*czy*) *Giganci? Kilka uwag o* Nefilim *i* Gigantes *w Biblii Hebrajskiej i Septuagincie*, "Przekładaniec" 29 (2014), p. 41–64.

Kowalczyk, Stanisław, *Idea wolności w filozofii grecko-rzymskiej*, "Roczniki Nauk Społecznych" 27 (1999), no. 1, p. 17–31.

Kruger, Michael J., *The Authenticity of 2 Peter*, JETS 42 (1999), no. 4, p. 645–671.

Lang, Marijke H. de, *The Reformation Canon and the Development of Biblical Scholars*, "The Bible Translator" 67 (2016), no. 2, p. 184–201.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Langkammer, Hugolin, *Jezus Chrystus w świetle późniejszych pism Nowego Testamentu* (Bibliotheca Biblica), Wrocław 2009.

Langkammer, Hugolin, *Wiara i wyznanie. Teksty biblijne i ich orędzie* (Bibliotheca Biblica), Wrocław 2013.

Lemański, Janusz, *Negatywny obraz psa w Biblii. Przyczyny i konsekwencje*, "Colloquia Theologica Ottoniana" 1 (2011), p. 51–95.

Lerner, Berel Dov, *Lot's Failed Trial*, "Jewish Bible Quarterly" 37 (2009), no. 3, p. 153–156.

Letellier, Robert Ignatius, *Day in Mamre, Night in Sodom: Abraham and Lot in Genesis 18 and 19*, Leiden 1995.

Luterańskie rozumienie urzędu biskupiego, [in:] *Kościół i urząd kościelny w dokumentach i opracowaniach Światowej Federacji Luterańskiej*, Polish transl. Ewa Sojka, Karol Karski, ed. Marcin Hintz, Jerzy Sojka, Bielsko-Biała 2014, p. 170–176.

Luther, Martin, *The Power and Primacy of The Pope*, https://bookofconcord.org/power-and-primacy/ [accessed: 27.12.2023].

Luther, Martin, *The Smalcald Articles*, [in:] *Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church*, St. Louis 1921, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/273/273-h/273-h.htm [accessed: 27.12.2023].

Lyons, William John, *Canon and Exegesis: Canonical Praxis and the Sodom Narrative* (Journal for Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 352), Sheffield 2002.

Makujina, John, *The "Trouble" with Lot in 2 Peter: Locating Peter's Source for Lot's Torment*, "Westminster Theological Journal" 60 (1998), no. 2, p. 255–270.

Malina, Artur, *Chrzest Jezusa w czterech ewangeliach. Studium narracji i teologii*, Katowice 2007.

Markiewicz, Henryk, *Autor i narrator*, [in:] Henryk Markiewicz, *Wymiary dzieła literackiego*, Kraków 1996, p. 89–111.

Matthews, Kenneth A., *Genesis 11:27–50:26. An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (The New American Commentary 1b), Nashville 2005.

Mathews, Mark D., *The Genre of 2 Peter: A Comparison with Jewish and Early Christian Testaments*, "Bulletin for Biblical Research" 21 (2011), no. 1, p. 51–64.

Mathews, Mark D., *The Literary Relationship of 2 Peter and Jude. Does the Synoptic Tradition Resolve this Synoptic Problem?*, "Neotestamentica" 44 (2010), no. 1, p. 47–66.

Mello, Alberto, *Judaizm*, Polish transl. K. Stopa, Kraków 2003.

Mędala, Stanisław, *Wprowadzenie do literatury międzytestamentalnej* (Biblioteka Zwojów. Tło Nowego Testamentu 1), Kraków 1994.

Metzger, Bruce M., *A Textual Commetary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart–New York 1994.

McNamara, Martin, *The Unity of Second Peter: A Reconsideration*, "Scripture" 12 (1960), no. 17, p. 13–19.

Mickiewicz, Franciszek, *Autorytet apostołów w Kościele pierwotnym w świetle Drugiego Listu św. Piotra*, "Seminare" 39 (2018), no. 2, p. 11–21.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Mickiewicz, Franciszek, *Główne tematy teologiczne Drugiego Listu św. Piotra*, "Collectanea Theologica" 88 (2018), no. 1, p. 23–42.

Misiurek, Jerzy, *Ebionici*, [in:] *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, vol. 4, ed. R. Łukaszyk, L. Bieńkowski, F. Gryglewicz, Lublin 1983.

Murphy, Roland E., *Wprowadzenie do literatury mądrościowej*, [in:] *Katolicki komentarz biblijny*, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fritzmyer, Roland E. Murphy, Waldemar Chrostowski, Warszawa 2001, p. 436–444.

Neyrey, Jerome H., *The Apologetic Use of the Transfiguration in 2 Pet 1:16–21*, CBQ 42 (1980), no. 4, p. 504–519.

Neyrey, Jerome H., *The Form and Background of the Polemic in 2 Peter*, JBL 99 (1980), no. 3, p. 407–431.

Nickelsburg, George W.E., *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishna*, Philadelphia 1981.

Nicklas, Tobias, *Petrus-Diskurse in Alexandria: Eine Fortführung der Gedanken von Jörg Frey*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, Jan G. van der Watt, Leiden–Boston 2019, p. 99–127.

Nienhuis, David R., *2 Peter, the Johannine Epistles, and the Authority of "Eyewitness" Apostolic Tradition*, [in:] *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, Jan G. van der Watt, Leiden–Boston 2019, p. 147–159.

Nienhuis, David R., *Not by Paul Alone: The Formation of the Catholic Epistle Collection and the Christian Canon*, Waco 2007.

Nortjé-Meyer, Lilly, *Vilification in 2 Pet 2: A Comparison with the Letter of Jude*, "Scriptura" 112 (2013) 1, p. 1–10.

Ostański, Piotr, *Szymon Piotr, sługa Jezusa Chrystusa* (*2 Pet 1,1*). *Wizerunek apostoła w Listach św. Piotra*, [in:] *Wokół posługi Piotrowej*, ed. A. Klupczyński, Poznań 2009, p. 7–15.

Picirilli, Robert E., *Allusions to 2 Peter in the Apostolic Fathers*, "Journal of the Study of the New Testament" 33 (1988), p. 59–65.

Picirelli, Robert E., *The Meaning of "Epignosis"*, "Evangelical Quarterly" 47 (1975), p. 85–93.

Porter, Stanley E., Pitts, Andrew W., *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι in 2 Pet 1:2 and Hellenistic Epistolary Convention*, JBL 127 (2008), no. 1, p. 165–171.

Porter, Stanley E., *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood. Studies in Biblical Greek*, New York 1989.

Reese, Ruth Anne, *Narrative Method and the Letter of Second Peter*, [in:] *Reading Second Peter with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of Second Peter*, ed. Robert L. Webb, Duane F. Watson, London 2010, p. 119–146.

Robinson, Alexandra, *Jude on the Attack. A Comparative Analysis of the Letter of Jude, Jewish Judgement Oracles and Greco-Roman Invective*, London–New York 2018.

Robinson, James M., *The Story of the Bodmer Papyri. From the First Monastery's Library in Upper Egypt, to Geneva and Doublin*, Cambridge 2013.

Robinson, John A.T., *Redating the New Testament*, London 1976.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Rosik, Mariusz, *Plemię żmijowe i psie wymiociny, czyli o funkcji antycznej inwektywy*, "Scriptura Sacra" 18 (2014), p. 51–59.

Rosik, Mariusz, Rapoport, Icchak, *Wprowadzenie do literatury i egzegezy żydowskiej okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego* (Bibliotheca Biblica), Wrocław 2009.

Royse, James Ronald, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, Leiden 2008.

Ruf, Martin G., *Die heiligen Propheten, eure Apostel und ich: Metatextuelle Studien zum zweiten Petrusbrief* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II.300), Tübingen 2011.

Rumianek, Ryszard, *Idea powołania indywidualnego w księgach prorockich*, "Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne" 13 (2000), p. 49–59.

Rybowska, Joanna, *Zbożność i bezbożność w kulturze Greków*, Łódź 2017.

Salway, Benet, *What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700*, "Journal of Roman Studies" 84 (1994), p. 124–145.

Sanders, Ed Parish, *Il giudaismo. Fede e prassi* (*63 a.C.–66 d.C.*), Italian transl. P. Capelli, L. Santini, Brescia 1999.

Setzer, Claudia, *You Invent a Christ! Christological Claims as Points of Jewish-Christian Dispute*, "Union Seminary Quarterly Review" 44 (1991), no. 3–4, p. 315–328.

Skibiński, Tomasz, *Listy katolickie w starożytności chrześcijańskiej*, "Vox Patrum" 28 (2008), p. 937–950.

Soards, Marion L., *1 Peter, 2 Peter and Jude as Evidence for a Petrine School* (ANRW II.25.5), Berlin–New York 1988, p. 3827–3849.

Stanzel, Franz, *Theorie des Erzählens*, Göttingen 1979.

Starowieyski, Marek, *Ewangelia Ebionitów*, [in:] *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu. Ewangelie apokryficzne*, part 1: *Fragmenty. Narodzenie i dzieciństwo Maryi i Jezusa*, ed. Marek Starowieyski, Kraków 2003.

Strickland, Phillip David, *The Curious Case of P^{72}: What an Ancient Manuscript Can Tell Us about tle Epistles of Peter and Jude*, JETS 60 (2017), no. 4, p. 781–791.

Szczepanowicz, Barbara, *Tajemnice liczb biblijnych*, Kraków 2018.

Szram, Mariusz, *Duchowy sens liczb w alegorycznej egzegezie aleksandryjskiej* (*II–V w.*), Lublin 2001.

Szymanek, Edward, *Wykład Pisma Świętego Nowego Testamentu*, Poznań 1990.

Tomczyk, Dominik, *Ὁ ἀπόστολος a τὸ χάρισμα w Corpus Paulinum*, unpublished doctoral thesis written under the supervision of Kalina Wojciechowska, Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw, 2020.

Trobisch, David, *The First Edition of the New Testament*, Oxford 2000.

Wall, Robert W., *The Canonical Function of 2 Peter*, "Biblical Interpretation" 9 (2001), no. 1, p. 64–81.

Wassermann, Tommy, *Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex*, "New Testament Studies" 51 (2005), no. 1, p. 137–154.

Watson, Duane F., *Comparing Two Related Methods: Rhetorical Criticism and Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation Applied to Second Peter*, [in:] *Reading Second Peter with New Eyes: Method-*

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

ological Reassessments of the Letter of Second Peter, ed. Robert L. Webb, Duane F. Watson, London 2010, p. 27–57.

Watson, Duane F., *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter* (SBL Dissertation Series 104), Atlanta 1988.

Werse, Nicholas R., *Second Temple Jewish Literary Traditions in 2 Peter*, CBQ 78 (2016), no. 1, p. 111–130.

Węcowski, Marek, *Sympozjon, czyli wspólne picie. Początki greckiej biesiady arystokratycznej* (*IX-VII wiek p.n.e.*), Warszawa 2011.

White, John Lee, *The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter: A Study of the Letter-Body in the Non-literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle*, Missoula 1972.

White, John Lee, *Light from Ancient Letters*, Philadelphia 1986.

Wojciechowska, Kalina, *Czy psy nie zasługują na zbawienie? Religijno-kulturowe uwarunkowania Ap 22,15*, [in:] *Ekologia wyzwaniem dla teologii*, ed. Jarosław M. Lipniak, Wrocław 2016, p. 379–401.

Wojciechowska, Kalina, *Opowiadam wam jak Piotr. Elementy stylu i stylizacji w Ewangelii Marka*, Warszawa 2006.

Wojciechowska, Kalina, *Wbrew zwyczajom i tradycji. Interpretacja metafory „nie jest dobrze zabierać chleb dzieci i rzucać pieskom"* (*Mark 7,27b*) *z perspektywy Syrofenicjanki*, "Collectanea Theologica" 85 (2015), no. 3, p. 33–48.

Zając, Ewa, *Potop w tradycji biblijnej oraz w literaturze judaizmu okresu Drugiej Świątyni*, Lublin 2007.

Zmijewski, Josef, *Paulus – Knecht und Apostel Christ. Amt und Amtsträger in paulinischer Sicht*, Stuttgart 1986.

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Index of persons

A

Aaron 273
Abraham 97, 132, 143, 211, 273, 285, 334, 335, 338–340, 367
Aeschylus 153, 420, 437, 441
Alexander, T. Desmond 336, 338
Allison, Dale C. 95
Amenophis 136
Anaxilas Comicus 175
Antigonus 102
Aristippus of Cyrene 63, 382
Aristobulus 102
Aristotle 26, 63, 106, 142, 160, 163, 166, 167
Augustine of Hippo 23, 399

B

Barnabas the Apostle 23, 47, 99
Barr, George K. 31
Bauckham, Richard 17, 18, 24–27, 31, 47, 49–52, 54–56, 72, 73, 95, 101, 109, 113–115, 118, 119, 122, 125, 127, 128, 130–134, 139–141, 143, 147, 151, 152, 156, 160, 164, 169, 177, 179, 180, 182, 187, 191, 195, 196, 198, 202, 203, 206–208, 210, 211, 214, 216, 217, 219, 222–224, 227, 228, 232–242, 244–248, 250, 252, 254, 255, 257, 258, 260, 262–264, 266, 267, 270, 272, 275, 276, 280, 283–285, 287, 291, 293, 295, 300, 302, 304, 306, 307, 312, 316, 318, 319, 323, 328, 329, 332, 334, 337, 338, 341, 342, 346, 349, 350, 352, 355, 356, 359, 361, 365, 369, 370, 373, 376, 379, 386, 388, 390, 396, 399, 404, 405, 409–411, 414, 415, 417, 419, 422, 424–427, 431, 434, 438, 441, 444, 445
Bede the Venerable 66, 156, 200, 260, 264, 268, 271, 296, 303, 313
Bertholdt, L. 29
Biesaga, Tadeusz 418
Bigg, Charles 50, 255
Billings, Bradly S. 304, 307–309
Birdsall, J. Neville 15
Blomberg, Craig L. 242
Bockmuehl, Marcus 35, 37
Boobyer, George H. 103
Bremmer, Jan N. 52, 53
Burnet, Régis 56

C

Caird, George Bradford 288
Callan, Terrance 16, 25–27, 47, 51, 52, 55, 59, 62, 65, 67, 76, 77, 200, 263, 278, 279, 287, 319, 341, 358, 360, 363, 364, 369, 375, 376, 391, 393, 405, 406, 411, 412, 414, 427, 428, 437, 439
Calvin, John 23
Cassiodorus 18
Caulley, Thomas Scott 66, 402, 424, 425
Celsus 296, 303
Chaine, Joseph 255
Charles, J. Daryl 56, 146, 147, 149, 151, 154, 157, 159, 164, 167, 168, 174, 177, 229
Chatelion Counet, Patrick 39, 40, 43, 62
Chrostowski, Waldemar 63
Cicero 110
Clement of Alexandria 18, 19, 42, 67, 152, 228, 348, 390, 426, 444
Clement of Rome 62, 121, 133, 337
Culpepper, R. Alan 39

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Curran, John R. 37
Cyprian of Carthage 19

D

Dąbek, Tomasz M. 139
Daniel 206, 243, 267, 273, 376, 384
Daniélou, Jean 419
Danker, Frederick William 118, 123, 128, 130–133, 147, 154, 208
Darius 426
David (the King) 267
Davids, Peter H. 66, 74, 94, 97, 99, 101, 102, 104, 108–110, 113, 118, 119, 121, 122, 125, 126, 129–133, 141, 152, 156, 159, 162, 169, 173, 182, 185, 187, 188, 190, 192, 195–198, 203, 205, 208, 210, 211, 214, 216–218, 222, 223, 227, 228, 234–236, 241–246, 248, 253, 255–258, 261, 262, 266–270, 275, 324, 334, 350, 365
Democritus of Abdera 136, 444
Desjardins, Michel 67
Didymus the Blind 19
Donelson, Lewis R. 52
Downs, David J. 41
Dunnett, Walter M. 48

E

Ehrman, Bart 95
Elijah 273
Elisha 273
Elliott, John H. 17
Ellis, E. Earle 264
Epictetus 421
Epicurus 63
Eusebius of Caesarea 18, 20, 36, 37, 277
Everett, Gary H. 19, 20, 23, 77–79
Ezekiel the Prophet 273
Ezra 55

F

Farkasfalvy, Denis 24
Fields, Weston W. 338
Firmilian 19
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 94, 96, 348
Forbes, Christopher 28
Fornberg, Torn 47, 239, 287, 368, 379, 398, 422, 424
Foster, Paul 50
Frey, Jörg 18, 24, 41, 42, 53

G

Gałkowski, Jerzy W. 421
Gilmour, Michael J. 19, 31, 32
Gnilka, Joachim 33, 39
Grant, Michael 36
Green, Gene L. 15, 18, 19, 47, 52, 54, 56, 69–72, 74, 94, 95, 100, 110, 113, 116, 118, 120, 122–125, 128, 132, 133, 140, 142, 146, 147, 149, 154–156, 163, 175, 177, 178, 182, 184, 185, 188, 194, 195, 197, 201, 204, 205, 208, 211–214, 218–222, 224, 225, 228, 229, 232, 233, 235, 237–239, 242–244, 246, 250, 252–255, 258–260, 262–265, 269, 270, 272, 275, 276, 278–280, 282–286, 288, 290, 291, 293, 296, 298, 301–303, 307, 308, 312, 314–317, 319, 320, 327, 332, 333, 336, 339, 340, 342, 343, 345, 348–350, 353, 355, 356, 360, 361, 365, 366, 369, 373, 378–380, 382, 385–387, 390, 392, 395, 399, 400, 404, 406, 410–412, 414, 415, 417–419, 422, 424, 425, 427, 429, 432, 434, 435, 437, 440, 444
Green, Michael 49, 113, 185, 187, 192, 194, 196, 197, 200, 205, 206, 208, 211, 222, 238, 248, 267, 280, 293, 296, 298, 314, 355, 414, 416–419, 422, 439
Grotius, Hugo 29

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Grundmann, Walter 47, 51, 122, 232, 255, 284, 285, 355, 379, 386, 387, 398, 445
Grünstäudl, Wolfgang 42, 53

H
Hafemann, Scott 139, 323, 325
Harink, Douglas 103, 109, 113
Harrington, Daniel J. 51, 56, 62
Harris, Murray J. 106
Hays, Christopher 399
Hegesippus 68, 277, 282, 283
Hengel, Martin 65
Hermas 17, 18, 164, 387, 390
Herodotus 233
Heschel, Abraham Joshua 64
Hesiod 311
Hiebert, D. Edmond 278, 280, 282, 284, 285, 291, 293, 298
Hillyer, Norman 111, 205, 218
Hodges, Zane C. 197, 199, 202
Hoek, Annewies van den 33, 36
Houwelingen, P.H.R. van 32
Hultin, Jeremy F. 42, 46

I
Ignatius 18
Ignatius of Antioch 17, 36, 62, 118, 232, 249
Ilan, Tal 94
Isaac 273
Isaiah 267, 273
Iwański, Dariusz 372

J
Jacob patriarch 273
James the Apostle 20, 23, 103, 236, 250
James the Just 94
James, Montague Rhodes 103
Jeremiah 57, 172, 256, 273
Jerome 23
Job 206
John Chrysostom 19
John Hyrcanus 341
John the Apostle 20, 23, 24, 39, 103, 116, 224, 236, 250
John the Baptist 189
Johnson, Luke Timothy 66
Jones, David W. 305, 308, 309, 313
Joshua, son of Nun 54, 97, 273
Jude the Apostle 20

K
Karwacki, Roman 35
Keating, Daniel A. 196, 210, 218, 219, 225, 230, 335
Kelly, John Norman Davidson 25, 47, 51, 95, 97, 101, 103, 104, 108, 109, 113, 114, 122, 126–128, 130, 132–135, 138, 141, 146, 151, 152, 159, 167, 182, 185–187, 210, 232, 235, 236, 239, 242–244, 253, 255, 258, 260, 262, 264, 266, 269, 292, 302, 329, 330, 333, 336, 337, 343, 345, 355, 359, 361, 369, 379, 380, 385, 386, 394, 395, 399, 409, 410, 416, 417, 422, 424, 426, 429, 431, 439, 443–445
Kennedy, George A. 73
Kistemaker, Simon J. 46
Koktysz, M. 22
Korolko, Mirosław 75, 149
Kosior, Wojciech 311
Kowalczyk, Stanisław 420, 421, 425
Kruger, Michael J. 25
Kühl, E. 29

L
Lang, Marijke H. de 21
Langkammer, Hugolin 32, 52, 67
Lemański, Janusz 442
Lenski, Richard Charles Henry 282
Lerner, Berel Dov 337
Letellier, Robert Ignatius 338, 339
Leukippos 136

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Lot 88–90
Luke the Evangelist 120
Lyons, William John 338, 339

M
Makujina, John 336, 339, 343
Malina, Artur 249
Marconi, Gilberto 17
Mark the Evangelist 21, 31, 39, 95, 227, 228
Markiewicz, Henryk 44
Martin Bodmer 15
Mathews, Mark D. 47, 56–58, 211
Matthews, Kenneth A. 339
Mayor, Joseph Bickersteth 51, 103, 213, 255
McArthur, John 197
McNamara, Martin 29, 30
Mędala, Stanisław 55, 59
Melito of Sardis 15
Mello, Alberto 60
Methodius of Olympus 19, 273
Metzger, Bruce M. 373
Mickiewicz, Franciszek 16, 17, 23, 27, 47, 48, 51–53, 67, 70, 94, 98, 104, 118, 146, 178, 188, 209, 222, 232, 233, 238, 240, 255, 257, 258, 262, 280, 283, 320, 342, 343, 355, 365, 373, 381, 387, 390, 402, 406, 412, 422, 444
Misiurek, Jerzy 68
Moffatt, James 103, 255
Moo, Douglas J. 50, 71, 72, 194, 198, 203, 399, 422, 425
Moses 54, 64, 75, 97, 102, 121, 143, 188, 211, 230, 234–236, 243, 255, 258, 273, 320, 322, 363, 367–371, 374, 399, 402, 414
Mrozek, Andrzej 443
Murphy, Roland E. 348

N
Nero 37, 238, 388, 427
Neyrey, Jerome H. 47, 51, 56, 73, 75, 76, 104, 106, 113, 142, 153, 163, 232, 234, 238, 242, 255, 300, 308, 311, 332, 366, 423, 425
Nickelsburg, George W.E. 54
Nicklas, Tobias 41, 52, 53, 67
Nienhuis, David R. 24, 42
Noah 13, 49, 88–90, 110, 206, 286, 305, 315, 316, 318–322, 324–328, 336, 339, 340, 342, 347, 349
Nortjé-Meyer, Lilly 50

O
Oecumenus 192
Origen 19, 41, 296, 426
Osburn, Carroll D. 17
Ostański, Piotr 32

P
Pachomius 15
Papias 227
Papis 136
Perkins, Pheme 51, 56, 369, 373
Peterson, Eugene H. 284
Petronius 63
Pharnaces I 123
Phileas 15
Picirilli, Robert E. 18, 53
Pindar 233
Pitts, Andrew W. 263
Plato 63, 137, 142, 144, 160, 171, 421
Plutarch 63, 171, 172, 174
Polycarp 17, 18
Porter, Stanley E. 263, 353
Proteus (Peregrinus) 173

R
Reese, Ruth Anne 66, 241
Reicke, Bo 25, 51, 103

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Robinson, Alexandra 46
Robinson, James M. 16
Robinson, John A.T. 45, 50, 94
Robson, Edgar Iliff 29, 49
Rosik, Mariusz 46, 47, 54, 55, 58, 101, 109, 110, 116, 129, 139, 142, 180, 198, 203, 212, 282, 285, 286, 294, 303, 305–307, 318, 329, 332, 333, 339, 342, 348, 354, 358, 359, 361, 364, 368, 373, 375, 385, 387, 389, 394, 397, 409, 410, 412–415, 439, 442
Royse, James Ronald 16
Ruf, Martin G. 421
Rufinus 19, 23
Rumianek, Ryszard 268, 272
Ruth the Moabite 337
Rybowska, Joanna 105

S

Salathiel 55
Salway, Benet 96
Sanders, Ed Parish 63
Schelkle, Karl Hermann 47, 51, 98, 103, 113, 114, 232, 255, 262, 284, 355, 379
Schrage, Wolfgang 103, 379
Schreiner, Thomas R. 198, 305, 369, 399
Seleucus Nicator 102
Senior, Donald P. 62
Setzer, Claudia 65
Sidebottom, Ernest Malcolm 51, 103, 255
Silvanus 39, 95
Skibiński, Tomasz 19, 21
Soards, Marion L. 40
Socrates 143, 160, 186, 235, 281, 282, 421
Sophocles 420, 440
Stancari, Pino 25
Stanzel, Franz 44
Starowieyski, Marek 68
Stemberger, Günter 60
Strickland, Phillip David 16
Szczepanowicz, Barbara 320, 443
Szram, Mariusz 152
Szymanek, Edward 32, 45, 62

T

Theodore of Mopsuestia 19
Thomas de Vio 21
Titus (Paul's disciple) 21
Tomczyk, Dominik 97
Trobisch, David 24

U

Ullman, K. 29

V

Vinson, Richard Bolling 210, 321, 328, 335

W

Wall, Robert W. 22, 24, 65
Wallace, Daniel B. 47
Waltner, Erland 229
Wassermann, Tommy 15, 16
Watson, Duane F. 25, 26, 51, 54, 55, 59, 62, 63, 73, 74, 76, 77, 93, 200, 278, 279, 287, 319, 341, 360, 364, 369, 375, 391, 393, 411, 412, 414, 427, 428, 437, 439
Węcowski, Marek 387
Werse, Nicholas R. 49
White, John Lee 69, 94, 96, 212
Wilson, Walter T. 140
Windisch, Hans 54
Wojciechowska, Kalina 22, 31, 33, 46, 47, 58, 97, 101, 109, 110, 116, 129, 139, 142, 180, 198, 203, 212, 227, 282, 285, 286, 294, 303, 305–307, 318, 329, 332, 333, 339, 342, 348, 354, 358, 359, 361, 364, 365, 368, 373, 375, 385, 387, 389, 394, 397, 398, 409, 410, 412–415, 439, 442

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Z
Zahn, Theodor 227
Zając, Ewa 315, 321
Zeno of Citium 142
Zmijewski, Josef 97

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Index of references

Bible

Genesis 54, 323, 337, 364
- 2:7 345, 394
- 3:8 245
- 6:1–2 307
- 6:1–4 307
- 6:2 307
- 6:4 311
- 6:5–8:22 314
- 6:5–9:17 319
- 6:8 110
- 6:9 321
- 6:12.17 325
- 6:17 287, 306, 316, 317
- 6:18 325
- 6:22 325
- 7:4 316, 317
- 7:6.7.10.17.22 317
- 8:18 320
- 9:1–17 324
- 9:11.15.28 317
- 10:1.32 317
- 11:10 317
- 13:11–12 339
- 15:2.8 286
- 16:7 410
- 17:19 132
- 18:20–33 328
- 18:23.25 318
- 18:23–32 338
- 18:23–34 334
- 19 336
- 19:5.8 339
- 19:9 340
- 19:12–13.24 367
- 19:12–14 346
- 19:14 344, 346
- 19:15–16 343
- 19:16 347
- 19:16–17 347
- 19:18–23 338
- 19:24–25.28–29 328
- 19:25.28.29 330
- 19:29 332, 343
- 22:2.12.16 248
- 24:13.16.29.30.42.43.45 410
- 24:48 293
- 29:33 94
- 30:20 125
- 36:33 399
- 39:21 110
- 40:8 266
- 41:8.12 266
- 44:1–3 172
- 49:1–28 210

Exodus
- 2:11 195
- 3:21 110
- 6:3 225
- 6:7 114
- 7:5.17 114
- 9:27 318
- 10:4 317
- 11:3 110
- 12:21 199
- 12:36 110
- 14:4.18 114
- 15:11 364

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 15:26 245
– 16:6.12 114
– 20:3 109
– 21:2.5.26.27 420
– 28:43 287
– 29:46 114
– 31:3 120
– 33:12 225
– 35:31 120
– 40:34–35 246

Leviticus
– 1:3 385
– 7:18 429
– 9:1 320
– 11:7 441
– 11:44 126
– 12 188
– 13:45–14:32 188
– 13–14 188
– 14:10 320
– 15 188
– 15:14.29 320
– 16:8 101
– 16:19.30 188
– 19:2 126
– 19:15 161
– 19:20 420
– 21:18–20 193
– 21:21 385
– 22:16 287
– 22:20 385
– 22:32 397
– 22–24 397
– 23:7 399
– 24:17 261
– 25:1–5 403
– 26:55–56 101
– 31:8 404
– 31:16 417
– 33:9 410

Numeri
– 11:25–26.29 272
– 22:5 398, 399
– 22:15 364
– 22:21–35 405
– 22–23 407
– 23:7 399
– 24:3.15 398
– 31:8 398

Deuteronomium
– 2:9.19 337
– 3:24 371
– 4:3 359
– 4:19 401
– 4:33 245
– 4:37 199
– 5:1 199
– 5:25–26 245
– 6:14 359
– 7:7 199
– 7:16 307
– 8:15 410
– 8:17 371
– 8:19 359
– 8:20 245
– 10:17 105, 323
– 11:2 241
– 12:15 141
– 13:1–18 401
– 13:4 255
– 13:5 359
– 13:9 307
– 14:2 199
– 14:8 441
– 14:26 142
– 15:12.13 420
– 18:20 276
– 19:13.21 307
– 21:14 420
– 23:5 398, 399

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 23:5–6 397
– 23:14 442
– 25:1 318
– 25:12 307
– 28:14 359
– 29:22 330
– 29:22–24 334
– 30:16 309
– 30:17 401
– 30–31 54
– 31:2 223
– 32:46 258
– 33:1–29 210
– 33:18 218
– 33:26 246

Joshua
– 5:14 286
– 7:14 101
– 13:22 398
– 15:9 410
– 17:7 410
– 18:6 101
– 18:15 410
– 23–24 54
– 24:1–28 210
– 24:9–10 397
– 24:30 97

Judges
– 1:24–25 204
– 2:8 97
– 2:12.17.19 359
– 17:10 123

1 Samuel
– 3:4.6.10 198
– 4:10 218
– 10:6.10 272
– 12:23 401
– 14:42 101
– 15:32 366
– 17:43 60, 442
– 19:20.23 272

2 Samuel
– 4:6 302
– 7:5 97
– 11:13 199
– 16:9 60, 442
– 23:2 272

1 Kings
– 1:9.19.25 199
– 1:44 399
– 2:1–9 210
– 4:7 151
– 5:1 151
– 5:25 359
– 8:10–11 246
– 8:36 225
– 11:10 359
– 12:20 199
– 12:22 371
– 14:1–20 98
– 14:6 98
– 15:26.34 292
– 16:2.19.26 292
– 16:24 129
– 18:5 410
– 18:18.21 359
– 18:27 302
– 20:13.28 114
– 20:21 317
– 22:13 255
– 22:22–23 275
– 29:11 371
– 29:29 255

2 Kings
– 3:19.25 410
– 5:15 114

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 6:27 225
– 8:18.27 292
– 9:29 255
– 10:23 97
– 11:16 204
– 12:15 255
– 13:5 218
– 16:3 292
– 17:15 359
– 18:12 97
– 18:21–22 275
– 19:4.6.22 294
– 21:8 97
– 22:16.20 317
– 23:11 204
– 26:11 371
– 32:32 264
– 32:33 243
– 34:24.28 317

Ezra
– 4:24 301
– 5:1 264
– 6:14 264

Nehemiah
– 9:20.30 272
– 10:30 97
– 13:2 397

Tobit
– 1:3 293
– 2:6 264
– 4:10 412
– 14:10 412

Judith
– 2:11 307
– 5:3 371
– 9:2.4 429
– 12:2 151
– 13:16 429
– 14:13 363
– 16:23 420

Esther
– 7:5 363
– 8:1 125

1 Maccabees 94
– 1:13–14 359
– 2:1.3.65 95
– 2:21 401
– 3:19.27.42 371
– 4:56.59 320
– 5:26.28 399
– 5:26.36 399
– 6:29.33.56 371
– 7:2.4 371
– 7:7 354
– 10:2.6.21.36.48 371
– 10:33 420
– 11:1.3.38–40 371
– 12:45–46 371
– 13:50 429
– 14:10 151
– 14:21 243
– 14:26 420
– 15:10.12 371

2 Maccabees
– 1:1 195
– 1:28 345
– 2:25 229
– 3:1 124
– 3:3 151
– 3:29 120
– 3:34 241
– 3:39 240
– 4:2 363
– 4:17 120
– 4:49 151

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 5:17.20 286
– 5:25 301
– 5:27 320
– 6:14 354
– 7:11 120
– 7:13.17 345
– 7:20 229
– 7:21 220
– 7:35 240
– 8:11 213
– 8:33 381
– 8:35 222
– 9:6 345
– 9:11 120
– 9:16 151
– 9:18 105, 323
– 10:24 428
– 11:27 246
– 12:45 124
– 14:15 172
– 15:10 220
– 15:12 157, 246
– 15:22 286

Job 437
– 1:6 307
– 2:1 307
– 7:21 188
– 10:22 412
– 13:7 413
– 15:22 412
– 19:4 400
– 21:18 412
– 22:21 180
– 24:1 437
– 24:13 437
– 24:14.19–20.22b–24 437
– 27:3 120
– 33:4 120
– 34:15–17 385
– 37:22 243
– 38:1 412
– 38:7 307
– 38:9 411
– 38:16 410
– 38:41 400
– 40:10 243
– 40:20 308
– 41:24 308, 309

Psalms
– 1:1.5.6 318
– 2 247, 251, 254, 255, 257
– 2:6 247, 251
– 2:7 247, 248, 250, 255
– 2:8 248
– 4:3 414
– 8:2 246
– 8:6 243
– 10[9]:24 142
– 21[20]:3 142
– 21[20]:6 246
– 22[21]:17 60, 442
– 26[25]:8 246
– 27[26]:9 108
– 27[26]:11 401
– 29[28]:1 243
– 29[28]:4 246
– 30[29]:5 229
– 31[30]:1 414
– 32[31] 16
– 32[31]:8 292
– 33[31]:3–22 15
– 33[32] 16
– 34[33]:1–16 15
– 37[36]:7 404
– 37[36]:16 436
– 38[37]:13 414
– 38[37]:23 108
– 40[39]:5 414
– 44[43]:1[2] 316
– 44[43]:24 302

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 47[46]:4 199
– 51[50]:4 188
– 51[50]:15 318
– 58[57]:11 318
– 58[57]:12 180
– 65[64]:5 108
– 68[67]:35 246
– 69[68]:26 218
– 71[70]:2 104
– 71[70]:8 246
– 71[70]:19 241
– 72[71]:18 129
– 77[76]:6 316
– 77[78]:55 218
– 78[77]:29 142
– 78[77]:50 307
– 78[77]:68 199
– 79[78]:9 108
– 81[80]:14 292
– 82[81]:5 259
– 83[82]:9 337
– 84[83]:11 436
– 85[84]:9 110
– 90[89]:4 17
– 94[93]:4 413
– 96[95]:3 129
– 96[95]:6 246
– 96[95]:7 243
– 97[96]:12 229
– 101[100]:6 292
– 103[102]:4 141
– 103[102]:20 372
– 104[103]:32 366
– 105[104]:42 97
– 106[105]:14 142
– 111[110]:3 246
– 117[116]:1 129
– 119[118]:30 292, 293
– 119[118]:105 258
– 119[118]:110.176 400
– 121[120]:3–8 202
– 121[120]:4 302
– 139[138]:20 414
– 139[138]:24 292
– 140[139]:5 202
– 140[139]:9 142
– 141[140]:9 202
– 143[142]:5 316
– 143[142]:11 104
– 144[143]:8.11 414
– 145[144]:5 246
– 145[144]:7 229
– 146[145]:8 186
– 148:2 371
– 149:8 364

Proverbs
– 1:1 441
– 1:7 124, 159, 318
– 1:8 218
– 1:15 292
– 1:27 332
– 2:13 292
– 2:16 401
– 2:17 120
– 3:14 436
– 4:19 259
– 4:20 258
– 5:1 258
– 5:22 404
– 6:10 302
– 6:34 307, 354
– 8:11 436
– 8:20 438
– 10:6.7.11.16.20.30 318
– 10:7 229
– 10:16 180
– 10:24 142
– 10:26 404
– 11:3.5.9.11.19.23 318
– 11:23 142
– 12:9 436

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 12:12 142, 318
– 12:28 438
– 13:11 124
– 14:8 417
– 14:22 400
– 15:8.9 318
– 15:16–17 436
– 16:8 [15:29].19.32 436
– 16:17.31 438
– 16:33 101
– 17:1 436
– 17:23 438
– 19:1 436
– 19:22 180
– 21:9.19 436
– 21:16.21 438
– 21:18 346
– 21:24 363
– 24:33 302
– 25:7.24 436
– 26:11 60, 441, 442
– 27:5.10 436
– 28:4.12 318
– 28:6 436
– 28:18 292, 433
– 30:16 308

Ecclesiastes (Qohelet)
– 10:16 385

Wisdom of Solomon 342
– 1:8 413
– 1:12 417
– 2:4 411, 412
– 2:22 381
– 3:2–3 230
– 3:4 354
– 3:10 318
– 3:15 180
– 4:1.19 229
– 4:5 180
– 4:12 142
– 5:6 293, 400, 438
– 5:14.23 412
– 5:15 381
– 5:15–16a 138, 142
– 6:17–20 150
– 6:17–22 196
– 6:20 197
– 7:6 230
– 8:3 286
– 8:7 157
– 8:8 316
– 8:10 243
– 8:13 229
– 8:21 160, 163
– 9:15 219
– 10 328, 329
– 10:1.5.12 327, 328
– 10:3 328
– 10:4 315, 321, 328
– 10:4.6 328
– 10:6 337
– 10:6.7a 328
– 10:6.9.13.15 342
– 10:6.9.13.16 328
– 10:6–9 329
– 10:7 330
– 10:9 342, 347
– 10:12 124
– 10:17 381
– 11:5.8 354
– 11:9 345
– 11:15 375
– 11:22 184
– 12:12.14–15 354
– 12:15 105, 323
– 12:17 371
– 12:18 184
– 12:24 401, 417
– 12:27 285
– 13:1–9 114

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 13:2 221
– 13:10 316
– 14:5 180
– 14:6–7 324
– 14:9 318
– 14:12 141
– 14:25 141
– 14:26 290, 360
– 14:29 380
– 16:4 345
– 16:16 285
– 16:16.18 318
– 16:20 412
– 17:2 412
– 18:4 258
– 19:11 384
– 19:14 329, 338

Sirach
– 2:1 349
– 2:10 316
– 3:29 142
– 4:10 317
– 5:2 142
– 6:7 349
– 6:35 120
– 7:21 420
– 8:8 441
– 9:12 318
– 10:27 436
– 11:27 384
– 11:31.33 385
– 14:9 297
– 14:14 142
– 14:16 384
– 16:3 436
– 16:7 305, 311, 316
– 16:8 305, 307, 329, 337
– 16:24 258
– 17:8.10.13 241
– 18:4 241
– 18:15 385
– 18:26 221
– 18:30 142, 359
– 18:30–32 160
– 18:32 384
– 20:19 234
– 20:24 385
– 20:31 436
– 22:10 302
– 23:5 142
– 23:10 188
– 24:3 411
– 27:5.7 349
– 29:22 436
– 30:14.17 436
– 33:22 436
– 33:23 385
– 33:26 420
– 33:28 302
– 36:4–6 114
– 36:7 241
– 37:11 180
– 37:22.23 180
– 37:29 384
– 38:8 110
– 38:10 188
– 38:23 230
– 40:28 437
– 41:9–10 396
– 41:15 437
– 42:21 241
– 43:22 411
– 44:17 320, 321
– 44:17.18 317
– 45:24 241
– 47:17 441
– 47:20 385
– 48:1 255, 258
– 48:9.12 412
– 49:3 124
– 51:30 381

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Isaiah 295
– 1:9 333
– 1:16–20 190, 192
– 2:3 292
– 3:1 286
– 3:5 364
– 5:11 385
– 5:27 302
– 6:9 343
– 8:9 428
– 10:6 186
– 10:33 286
– 11:2 124
– 12:2 129
– 13:6.9 260
– 13:15 428
– 13:19 333
– 17:10 108
– 22:20–22 34
– 23:8 364
– 24:3 141, 379
– 25:1 316
– 26:3 110
– 27:5 110
– 29:18 411
– 30:31 428
– 31:9 428
– 32:17 110
– 33:1 428
– 33:6 124
– 33:15 401
– 34:4 364
– 34:6 399
– 34:8 354
– 34:9–10 334
– 35:7 410
– 37:26 316
– 38:12 219
– 40:3 292
– 40:10 381
– 41:1 126
– 41:9 198
– 41:18 410
– 42 254, 255, 257
– 42:1 199, 247–250, 255
– 42:6 126, 198
– 43:1 198
– 43:1–2 198
– 43:8 186
– 45:3.6–8 114
– 45:21 104
– 48:12.15 126, 198
– 49:5 364
– 49:23.26 114
– 51:2 126, 198
– 51:5–7 104
– 51:7 428
– 52:5 294, 295
– 53:6 400
– 53:6–12 250
– 54:9 326
– 54:17 428
– 56:1 104
– 56:10 60, 442
– 57:2 (LXX) 110
– 57:4 396
– 59:6–8 442
– 59:7 221
– 59:9–10 186
– 60:1 260
– 61:1 272
– 62:1 104
– 62:11 381
– 63:1 399
– 64:4 400
– 65:2 438
– 65:4 443
– 66:2.5 366
– 66:17 443

Jeremiah
– 1:11.13 267

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 2:5.23.25 359
– 2:13 411
– 2:17 401
– 4:6 317
– 4:10 276, 286
– 4:24 366
– 5:21 343
– 6:13 275
– 6:14 276
– 6:19 258, 317
– 7:9 359
– 7:24 97
– 8:2 359
– 11:11 317
– 13:10 359
– 13:14 307
– 14:3 410
– 14:4 276
– 14:13 271
– 14:13.15 276
– 14:14–15 275
– 14:15 276
– 18:15 292
– 19:3 317
– 20:1 255
– 20:9 271
– 23:14 329, 333
– 23:15 276
– 23:16 255, 265
– 23:16–18.21–22.26 271
– 23:17 276, 417
– 23:21.32 276
– 23:25.32 275
– 23:25–26 275
– 23:26 276
– 23:31 302
– 25:4 97
– 25:6 359
– 25:32 [LXX 32:32] 412
– 32:30 255
– 33:7–8.11.16 275
– 34:9 275
– 34:15 275
– 35:1 275
– 36:1.8 275
– 40:9 241
– 41:9.16 420
– 48:1 [LXX 31:1] 428
– 50:39 442

Lamentations
– 2:17 316

Baruch
– 1:18.21 245
– 1:21 255
– 3:13.14 110
– 3:23 234
– 4:1 401
– 5:4 110

Ezekiel
– 5:11 307
– 6:3 317
– 6:7.13.14 114
– 7:4 114
– 7:6.8 307
– 8:18 307
– 9:4 346
– 9:10 307
– 11:10.11 114
– 12:2 343
– 12:14.16 114
– 13:2–3.6–7 276
– 13:3 265, 271, 276
– 13:9 275
– 13:10 276
– 14:14.20 321
– 14:17 317
– 16:46–48 333
– 16:49–50 329
– 22:28 275

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 23:31 292
– 25:5.7.11.17 114
– 28:7 287
– 28:26 114
– 29:8 317
– 30:3 260
– 33:2 317
– 33:31 429
– 36:33 188
– 37:6 114
– 38:22 334

Daniel
– 2:23–26.28–30 225
– 2:37 243
– 3:27 401
– 3:61 371
– 3:92 141
– 4:1 110
– 4:30 243
– 4:31 (LXX) 251
– 6:26 110
– 7:2 267
– 7:8.20 413
– 7:13–14 257
– 7:14 208, 244
– 7:27 208, 241
– 8:1 267
– 9:10 245
– 9:18 104
– 10:11 366
– 12:1 59

Hosea
– 1:2 396
– 2:6 396
– 5:11 359
– 8:7 332
– 9:7 270
– 10:9 396
– 13:13 59
– 13:15 287
– 14:10 401

Joel
– 1:15 260
– 2:1.11 260
– 2:2 411, 412
– 2:21–23 260

Amos
– 1:4.7.10.12.14 334
– 2:2.5 334
– 3:7 97
– 3:8 271
– 4:11 333
– 5:9 287
– 5:20 260
– 7:1 267

Obadiah
– 15–21 260

Jonah
– 2:7 141

Micah
– 2:9 384
– 2:10 141, 379
– 3:5.11 276
– 6:5 398

Nahum
– 3:10 364
– 3:18 302

Zephaniah
– 1:7.14 260
– 1:15 411, 412
– 2:9 333
– 3:4 270

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Haggai
– 1:12 245

Zechariah
– 1:8 267
– 3:3–4 188
– 3:3–5 222
– 4:6 272, 371
– 6:15 245
– 7:12 272
– 9:10 (LXX) 110
– 11:12 381
– 12:4 406
– 13:2 275
– 14:1–21 260

Malachi
– 2:5 110
– 3:20 260

Matthew 34, 51, 122, 199, 205, 207, 244, 256, 272, 278, 290, 417
– 1:24 220
– 3:2 207
– 3:3 401
– 3:8 180
– 3:15 250
– 3:17 51, 247, 250, 252
– 4:17 207
– 4:18 96
– 4:21 127, 198
– 5:3 68
– 5:12 381
– 5:19 439
– 5:21.33 316
– 5:25 288
– 5:28 390
– 5:43–48 175
– 5–7 439
– 6:2.5.16 381
– 6:13 350
– 6:24 362, 427
– 7:6 441
– 7:13 284
– 7:13–14 292
– 7:15 276
– 7:15–23 280
– 8:6.29 345
– 8:12 413
– 9:3 294
– 9:13 127
– 10:2 96
– 10:7 207
– 10:15 334, 354
– 10:17 313
– 10:33 285
– 10:41–42 381
– 11:22.24 354
– 11:24 334
– 12:36 180, 354
– 12:41–42 331
– 12:43–45 434
– 13:13 343
– 13:14 264
– 13:22 180
– 13:24.31.33.44.45.47 207
– 13:39.41.49 367
– 14:3 222
– 15:3 439
– 15:14 187
– 15:19 279
– 15:26–27 443
– 16:16 33
– 16:16–18 96
– 16:18 33
– 16:18–20 33
– 16:19 34
– 16:23 269
– 16:27 367
– 16:28 207, 239
– 17:1–6 103
– 17:1–8 32

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 17:5 51, 247, 250
– 17:5–7 100
– 18:7 316, 430
– 18:10 362
– 18:12–13 400
– 19:17 439
– 19:23 207
– 20:1 207
– 20:3.6 180
– 20:4 218
– 20:13 380
– 20:18 331
– 20:21 207
– 21:32 438
– 21:43 180
– 22:1–14 199
– 22:2 207
– 22:13 413
– 22:14 200
– 23:8 172
– 23:13 207
– 23:16 187
– 24:3.27.37.39 238
– 24:11 51, 68
– 24:11.24 276
– 24:12 297
– 24:24 279
– 24:29–31 371
– 24:30 239
– 24:31 367
– 24:36 374
– 24:37–39 51, 316, 326
– 24:39 317
– 24:42–44 440
– 24:43 51
– 25:1 207
– 25:14–30 185
– 25:30 413
– 25:31 367
– 25:46 355
– 26:25 355
– 26:35 224
– 26:59–60 279
– 26:65 294
– 27:3 331
– 27:36.54 354
– 27:64 434
– 28:5 366
– 28:7 288
– 28:16–20 99

Mark 227, 228, 252
– 1:3 401
– 1:11 51, 247, 250
– 1:15 207
– 1:17–18 393
– 1:20 127
– 1:44 189
– 2:14 290
– 2:17 127, 198
– 3:14–15 33
– 3:16 33, 96
– 3:16–18 32
– 3:32–35 172
– 4:12 343
– 4:19 142, 180, 386
– 4:20 180
– 4:26.30 207
– 4:37 412
– 4:38 220
– 5:7 345
– 5:20 122
– 5:33 366
– 5:37 32
– 6:6–12 99
– 7:2–4 189
– 7:6 278
– 7:8 269
– 7:8–9 439
– 7:22 290, 298
– 7:27 443
– 7:37 257

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 8:18 343
– 8:29 33
– 8:33 35, 269
– 8:38 244
– 9:1 207, 239
– 9:1–7 103
– 9:2 32
– 9:2–4 243
– 9:2–8 32
– 9:7 51, 247, 250
– 9:47 205
– 10:15.23–25 205
– 10:19 439
– 10:21 290
– 10:23 207
– 10:28–31 33
– 10:33 331
– 10:37 244
– 12:14 269
– 12:24 122
– 12:24.27 400
– 12:36 272
– 12:40 301
– 13:9.11 313
– 13:10 278
– 13:22 276, 279
– 13:26 122, 239, 244
– 13:32 374
– 14:29.31.47–50 35
– 14:31 224
– 14:33 32
– 14:62 122
– 14:64 331
– 14:66–72 35
– 15:43 362
– 15:45 125

Luke 51, 252, 336
– 1:2 240
– 1:9 101
– 1:13.30 366
– 1:17 278
– 1:33 207, 208
– 1:35 122, 355
– 1:56 440
– 1:67 272
– 1:78 260
– 2:9–10 366
– 2:11 108
– 2:22 189
– 2:26 272
– 2:29 286
– 2:32 278
– 2:45 440
– 3:4 401
– 3:5 292
– 3:22 51, 247, 250
– 4:1 440
– 4:21 256
– 5:8 96
– 5:14 189
– 5:17 122
– 5:32 127
– 6:14 96
– 6:19 122
– 6:20 68
– 6:23.35 381
– 6:26 276
– 6:39 187
– 7:25 384
– 8:10 207, 343
– 8:13 349
– 8:14 383
– 8:23 412
– 8:24 220
– 8:28 345
– 8:45 285
– 8:46 122
– 8:47 366
– 9:1 122
– 9:8.19 316
– 9:26 244

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 9:28 152
– 9:28–36 32, 103
– 9:31 230
– 9:35 51, 247, 250
– 9:43 242
– 9:62 207
– 10:9.11 207
– 10:12 334
– 10:19 122
– 11:1 223
– 11:24–26 434
– 11:26 51
– 11:31–32 331
– 11:49 232
– 12:15 298
– 12:30 278
– 12:39 263
– 12:57 218
– 13:6–9 180
– 14:15 207
– 14:15–24 199
– 15:7.10.22–24 205
– 15:22 288
– 16:13 362, 427
– 16:19–31 357
– 16:21 441
– 17:15 440
– 17:20.21 207
– 17:22–37 336
– 17:27 317
– 17:29–30 334
– 18:17.25 205
– 18:20 439
– 18:22 290
– 19:11–28 185
– 19:42 123
– 20:47 301
– 21:12 313
– 21:19 166
– 21:24 278
– 21:27 122, 239, 244
– 22:14–26 54
– 22:15–36 211
– 22:24–27 34
– 22:29–30 207
– 22:32 216
– 22:69 122
– 23:33 224
– 23:42 207
– 24:20 301
– 24:27 256
– 24:33.52 440
– 24:47 278
– 24:49 122

John 19, 39, 96, 224, 441
– 1:1.18 107
– 1:5 258
– 1:20 285
– 1:37.42 290
– 1:42 96
– 2:6 189
– 2:22 256
– 3:5 205
– 3:16 175
– 3:18 180
– 3:19 258
– 3:21 201
– 3:36 123
– 4:6 410
– 4:42 108, 316
– 5:24.26.40 123
– 5:35 258
– 6:33.63.68 123
– 6:68 96
– 7:7 430
– 7:42 256
– 8:12 316
– 8:23 430
– 8:31–36 421
– 8:34 426, 427
– 9:5 316

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 9:39–41 187
– 10:1–10 205
– 10:4 290
– 10:6 441
– 10:10 123
– 10:14 116
– 10:14–15 159
– 11:25 123
– 11:29 288
– 11:50 278
– 12:28 245
– 12:31 219
– 12:40 187
– 12:41 246
– 13:6.9.24.36 96
– 13:16 98
– 13:18 256
– 13:34 439
– 13:34–35 439
– 13:35 200
– 13:36 223–225
– 13–17 54, 211
– 14:6 217, 293
– 14:15.21 439
– 14:30 219
– 15:2–8 180
– 15:10.12 439
– 15:15 236
– 15:18–19 430
– 16:25.29 441
– 17:9.14–16 430
– 17:12 284
– 17:20 355
– 17:26 236
– 18:10.15.25 96
– 18:36–37 207
– 19:24 101
– 19:24.28.36.37 256
– 19:35 241
– 20:2.6 96
– 20:9 256
– 20:20 152
– 20:21 34
– 20:28 107
– 20:29 103
– 20:31 123
– 21:2.3.7 96
– 21:18 224
– 21:18–19 32, 225
– 21:19 224
– 21:19.22 290

Acts 35, 37, 38, 52, 98, 278
– 1:12 440
– 1:12–26 35
– 1:16 256, 272
– 1:17 101
– 1:18 381
– 2:14–36 35
– 2:15 385
– 2:17–18 272
– 2:20 260
– 2:28 292
– 2:36 116
– 2:37–41 36
– 2:38 190
– 3:1–11 36
– 3:12 124, 169
– 3:12–26 35
– 3:21 272
– 4:1–22 36
– 4:20 24
– 4:24 286
– 4:25 278
– 5:1–5.29–32 35
– 5:14–16 36
– 5:20 123
– 5:28 287
– 5:31 108
– 5:34 133
– 7:2.55 246
– 7:24 340, 380

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 7:26 380
– 7:35 285
– 7:58 222
– 8:3 313
– 8:14–25 36
– 8:25 440
– 8:32.35 256
– 9:2 292
– 9:32–43 36
– 10:1–11.18 36
– 10:2.7 124
– 10:5 96
– 10:13–15 245
– 10:33 257
– 10:34–36 105
– 10:36 110
– 10:42 247
– 10:45 278
– 11:1 278
– 11:7.9 245
– 11:17 103, 116
– 11:28 213
– 12:3–19 36
– 12:5 354
– 12:22 245, 269
– 13:6 276
– 13:10 292, 401
– 13:13 440
– 13:19.46.48 278
– 13:23 108
– 13:32–34 132
– 13:33 247
– 15:1–31 35
– 15:5 282
– 15:7 278
– 15:7.21 316
– 15:7–13 36
– 15:8 223
– 15:14 31, 94, 278
– 15:17 282
– 15:26 116
– 16:6–7 224
– 16:23 354
– 17:29 120
– 17:31 247
– 18:10 278
– 19:9.23 292
– 19:27 242
– 19:37 294
– 20:17–38 211
– 20:18–35 54
– 20:19 349
– 20:24 133
– 20:28 286
– 20:33 298
– 21:2–3 355
– 21:6 440
– 21:10–11 224
– 21:21 278
– 22:4 313
– 22:11 246
– 22:16 190
– 24:5 282
– 24:15 213
– 24:22 292
– 24:25 161
– 25:11 380
– 26:5 282
– 26:17.23 278
– 26:18 259
– 27:10 213
– 28:10 123
– 28:22 282
– 28:25 272
– 28:26 343
– 28:31 116

Romans 62, 109
– 1:1 96, 103
– 1:1.6–7 198
– 1:2 255
– 1:4 239, 247

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 1:4.7 116
– 1:7 112, 115
– 1:13 195, 212, 223
– 1:16.20 122
– 1:16–17 104
– 1:18 218
– 1:20 114
– 1:20–21 113
– 1:27 417
– 2:1 331
– 2:2–3 301
– 2:4 362
– 2:7 167
– 2:8 218
– 2:11 105
– 2:19 187, 258
– 2:24 294, 295
– 2:29 269
– 3:8 294, 301
– 3:12 201
– 3:19 316
– 3:21 22
– 3:21–26 104
– 3:25 189, 190
– 4:3 36
– 4:7 346
– 4:16 196
– 5:1 110
– 5:1.11.21 116
– 5:1–2 154
– 5:1–2.3–5 153
– 5:3–5 151, 153, 166, 167, 175
– 5:6 318
– 5:6–8 175
– 5:7 362
– 5:13 316
– 5:16 301
– 6:3–4.11 287
– 6:3–11 65
– 6:4 123
– 6:5–23 421
– 6:6 263
– 6:15 424
– 6:16 424, 426
– 6:16–23 424
– 6:17–18 286
– 7:1.4 195
– 7:7–8 142
– 7:8–13 439
– 7:14 399
– 7:18.25 360
– 8 421
– 8:4–7 360
– 8:6 110
– 8:12 195
– 8:15 433
– 8:21 141, 426
– 8:28 198
– 8:30 126, 200
– 8:34 331
– 8:38 372
– 9:5 107
– 9:11 198, 199
– 9:11–12.24 126
– 9:17 122
– 9:22 284
– 9:22.23 236
– 9:25 278
– 9:30 278
– 10:1 195
– 10:9–10 116
– 10:12 204
– 11:1–2 278
– 11:5.28 199
– 11:8 343
– 11:11 203
– 11:14 278
– 11:21 307
– 11:23 433
– 11:25 195, 212
– 11:29 298
– 12:1 195

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 12:10 172
– 13:2 301
– 13:9 439
– 13:12 222, 258, 260
– 13:12–13 385
– 13:13 291
– 14:16 295
– 14:17 110
– 15:7 223
– 15:9–12.16.27 278
– 15:18 363
– 15:31 342
– 16:16 173
– 16:25 216
– 16:26 236, 255

1 Corinthians 34, 62
– 1:1 96, 103
– 1:1–2.24 198
– 1:3 109, 112, 115
– 1:10.11.26 195
– 1:11 225
– 1:12 96
– 1:18.24 122
– 1:21.27–28 430
– 1:25 269
– 1:26–27 198
– 2:1 195
– 2:5.11 269
– 2:12 430
– 3:1 195
– 3:12 133
– 3:18–19 219
– 3:19 430
– 3:22 96
– 4:6 195
– 4:13 430
– 4:17 292
– 5:5 260
– 5:9 31
– 5:19 430
– 6:1 363
– 6:8 380
– 6:9–11 190
– 6:14 122
– 6:15–20 291
– 6:19–20 287
– 6:20 286
– 7:5 433
– 7:9 161, 437
– 7:20–24 421
– 7:22 286
– 7:23 286, 287
– 7:24 195
– 7:31 430
– 7:37–38 257
– 8:1 212
– 8:9 422
– 9:5 96
– 10:1 195, 212
– 10:18 135
– 10:23 422
– 11:18–19 283
– 11:22 362
– 11:25.34 301
– 11:32 331, 430
– 12:1 195, 212
– 12:2 278
– 12:13 97
– 13:6 218
– 13:8–12 262
– 13:13 153, 154, 175
– 14:32 271
– 14:37 439
– 15:1–3 98
– 15:2 22
– 15:5 96
– 15:8 103
– 15:15 279
– 15:23 238, 287
– 15:24–25 207
– 15:24–26 207

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 15:42.50 141
– 15:53–34 222
– 16:20 173

2 Corinthians 62
– 1:1 96, 103
– 1:2 109, 112, 115
– 1:6 167
– 1:7 135, 196
– 1:8 195, 212
– 1:10 342, 349
– 1:16 433
– 4:4 187
– 4:6 262
– 4:7 122
– 5:1.4 219
– 5:3–4 222
– 5:16 116
– 6:4 167
– 6:5–7 153
– 6:6 160
– 6:14 258, 346
– 7:12 380
– 8:1 195
– 8:7 160, 175
– 9:10 151, 204
– 11:10 217
– 11:13 279
– 11:21 363
– 11:26 279
– 12:9 122
– 12:12 173
– 12:21 290
– 13:4 122

Galatians 23, 62, 204
– 1:1 96, 103, 269
– 1:3 109, 112, 115
– 1:6.15 126
– 1:9 98
– 1:10 96
– 1:11 195, 212
– 1:17 433, 440
– 1:18 35, 95
– 2:4 279, 281, 286
– 2:5.14 217
– 2:6–7 35
– 2:7 34
– 2:7–8 95
– 2:8–9 23
– 2:8–9.14 278
– 2:9.11.14 95
– 2:10 196
– 2:11–14 35
– 2:18 433
– 3:5 151, 204
– 3:7 263
– 3:8.14 278
– 3:15 195
– 4:3 430
– 4:9.19 433
– 4:12.28.31 195
– 4:14 349
– 5:1 433
– 5:5–6 153, 154, 175
– 5:5–6:22 175
– 5:7 217
– 5:8 126
– 5:10 301
– 5:11.13 195
– 5:13 164, 421, 424
– 5:13.24 360
– 5:16–17 142
– 5:19 290
– 5:20 283
– 5:22 180
– 5:22–23 153
– 5:23 161
– 5:24 287
– 6:8 141

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Ephesians 62
– 1:1 96
– 1:2 109, 112, 115
– 1:4–5 199
– 1:6 248
– 1:7 204
– 1:9 236
– 1:13 217
– 1:17 246
– 1:18 199
– 1:19 371
– 1:21 361
– 2:1–5 189
– 2:2 430
– 2:2–3 190
– 2:3 396, 417, 418
– 2:11 278
– 2:14 110
– 2:20 232, 283
– 3:5 272
– 3:7 122
– 3:10 236
– 3:20 122
– 4:1 198
– 4:2–4 175
– 4:3 196
– 4:4 199
– 4:13 116
– 4:14 417
– 4:18 123
– 4:19 290, 298
– 4:19.22 417, 418
– 4:21.24 217
– 4:22.25 222
– 5:3 298
– 5:5 207, 263
– 5:8 259, 396
– 5:9 180
– 5:11 180, 258
– 5:17 159
– 5:23 108
– 5:26 190
– 5:27 385
– 6:1 218
– 6:2 439
– 6:8 97
– 6:12 258
– 6:14–17 153
– 6:15 110
– 6:19 236

Philippians 62
– 1:1 96, 99
– 1:2 109, 112, 115
– 1:7 218
– 1:9 159
– 1:12 195, 212
– 1:14 362
– 1:28 284
– 2:8 327
– 2:16 123
– 2:28 433
– 3:1.13.17 195
– 3:2 443
– 3:8.10 116
– 3:10 122
– 3:14 199
– 3:19 284
– 3:20 108
– 3:21 244
– 4:8 128, 158
– 4:14 257

Colossians 62
– 1:1 96
– 1:2 109, 112
– 1:4–5 153, 175
– 1:4–6 154
– 1:5 217
– 1:10 180
– 1:13 207, 259, 342, 349
– 1:16 361

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 1:27 236
– 2:11–14 190
– 2:19 151, 204
– 2:22 141
– 2:23 360
– 3:4 244
– 3:5 298, 417, 418
– 3:9–10 222
– 3:11 97
– 3:12 199
– 3:12–14 153
– 3:25 380
– 4:12 96
– 4:16 31, 62, 227

1 Thessalonians 62
– 1:1 99, 109
– 1:3 153, 175
– 1:3.5.8 154
– 1:3.5.9 116
– 1:10 342, 349
– 2:1 195
– 2:3 417
– 2:5–6 298
– 2:9 220
– 2:9.14.17 195
– 2:12 126, 198
– 2:13 269
– 3:1–5 296
– 3:2 216
– 3:4 220
– 3:12 178
– 3:13 238
– 4:1 195, 220
– 4:5 417, 418
– 4:7 126, 198
– 4:9 172
– 4:13 212
– 4:15 238
– 4:24 198
– 5:1–2 220
– 5:4 258
– 5:5.7 385
– 5:8 153, 175
– 5:19–22 224
– 5:20–22 280
– 5:23 198
– 5:25 126
– 5:26 173
– 5:27 227

2 Thessalonians 62
– 1:1 99
– 1:2 109, 112, 115
– 1:3 178
– 1:4 167
– 1:7 122, 367
– 1:9 244
– 2:1.13.15 195
– 2:2 224, 260, 280
– 2:3 284, 297
– 2:11 417
– 2:12–13 217
– 2:14 126
– 3:1–7.12–13 279
– 3:2 342

1 Timothy 169, 204, 232, 284
– 1:6 414
– 2:2 124, 169
– 2:4 113
– 3:2–3 153
– 3:6 301
– 3:16 124, 169
– 4:1 279, 297
– 4:7 232
– 4:7.8 169
– 4:7–8 124, 395
– 4:12 175, 362
– 5:12 301
– 5:13 180
– 6:1 295

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 6:1–2 286
– 6:2 362
– 6:3.5.6.11 169
– 6:3.5–6.11 124
– 6:4 267
– 6:9 142
– 6:11 153, 167, 175
– 6:14 439
– 6:20 114

2 Timothy
– 1:1 123
– 1:8 122
– 1:9 126, 199
– 1:10 108
– 2:4 433
– 2:12 285
– 2:15 217
– 2:16–18 353
– 2:22 175
– 2:25 113
– 3:1 263
– 3:1–9 300, 353
– 3:7 113
– 3:10 175
– 3:11 342
– 3:13 400
– 3:16 255
– 4:1.18 207
– 4:3 279
– 4:3–4 353
– 4:6 223
– 4:17–18 342
– 4:21 196

Titus
– 1 124
– 1:1 96, 113, 169
– 1:4 108, 109, 115
– 1:7 363
– 1:7–8 153
– 1:8 161
– 1:10 414
– 1:12 180
– 1:14 232
– 1:16 285
– 2:2 167, 175
– 2:5 295
– 2:12 285
– 2:13 107, 108, 244
– 2:14 189, 346
– 3:1–2 153
– 3:2 294
– 3:3 142, 383, 400, 417
– 3:5 124, 190
– 3:6 108, 204
– 3:14 180

Philemon 62
– 1 99
– 3 109
– 18 380

Hebrews 22
– 1:1 303
– 1:3 122, 189
– 1:5 247
– 1:8 207
– 1:8–9 107
– 1:9 346
– 2:2 196
– 2:4 272
– 3:1 199
– 3:1.12 195
– 3:5 355
– 3:6 196
– 3:7 272
– 3:10 292, 400
– 4:9 278
– 4:11 196
– 5:5 247
– 5:14 159, 395

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 6:4 187, 259
– 6:6 433
– 6:10 175
– 7:18 439
– 8:10 278
– 9:14 189, 190
– 9:17 197
– 9:19 439
– 10:15–16 272
– 10:17 346
– 10:19 195
– 10:22 190
– 10:22–24 153, 175
– 10:24 175
– 10:26 113
– 10:32 187, 259
– 10:34 263
– 10:39 284, 345
– 11:7 331
– 11:38 400
– 12:1 166, 222
– 12:11 395
– 13:1 172
– 13:4 133
– 13:23 263

James 20–23, 156, 158
– 1:1 96
– 1:2 349
– 1:3 263
– 1:3–4 167
– 1:5 159
– 1:14 393
– 1:14–15 141
– 1:18 217
– 1:19 288
– 1:21 222
– 1:27 430
– 2:1.5.14 195
– 2:8.19 257
– 2:10 203
– 2:13 201
– 2:20 180
– 3:1 301
– 3:2 203
– 3:6 385
– 3:11 410
– 3:17–18 153
– 4:1.3 383
– 4:4 430
– 5:7 133
– 5:7–8 238
– 5:9.10 195
– 5:18 433
– 5:19 218, 293, 400, 401
– 5:20 292, 417

1 Peter 11, 15, 20, 23–25, 30, 31, 40–43, 51, 53, 62, 63, 319
– 1:1 62, 100, 222
– 1:2 42, 115
– 1:2.14 141
– 1:3 116
– 1:6 349
– 1:7.13 25, 238
– 1:7.19 133
– 1:9 129
– 1:9.22 394
– 1:10–12 42
– 1:11 272
– 1:12 239
– 1:14 142, 190, 396, 417, 418
– 1:15 126, 198
– 1:16 326
– 1:18 286
– 1:19 42
– 1:20 319
– 1:21 222
– 1:21–22 153, 154, 175
– 1:22 172
– 1:25 400
– 2:9 198, 259

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 2:9–10 278
– 2:11 142, 394
– 2:16 42, 421
– 2:21 198
– 2:25 400
– 3:2 42, 240
– 3:9 198
– 3:11 201
– 3:17 437
– 3:19–20 42
– 3:20 319, 345, 394
– 4:2 269
– 4:3 190, 291, 417, 418
– 4:4 294
– 4:13 25, 238, 244
– 4:17 301
– 4:19 394
– 5:1 135, 244
– 5:10 126, 130, 198, 216
– 5:12 31
– 5:13 31, 36, 53
– 5:14 173

1 John 23, 24, 39
– 1:1–3 24, 241
– 1:6 201
– 1:7 189
– 1:9 190
– 2:3 116
– 2:3–4.7–8 439
– 2:8 258
– 2:11 187
– 2:15–17 430
– 2:16 391
– 2:16–17 142
– 2:22–23 285
– 2:28 238
– 2:29 201
– 3:7 201
– 3:13 195
– 3:22–24 439
– 4:1 276
– 4:1–3 224, 280
– 4:5 430
– 4:6 417
– 4:8 174, 175
– 4:14 241
– 4:17 354
– 4:21 439
– 5:2–3.6 439
– 5:9 269
– 5:19 430
– 5:20 107

2 John 20, 22, 23, 39
– 1:5 439
– 4 217

3 John 20, 22, 23, 39
– 3–4 217
– 6 257

Jude 11, 14, 15, 18, 22, 30, 43, 45–50, 52, 57, 60, 73, 110, 329, 353, 354, 358, 369, 374, 398, 408, 422
– 1 62, 96
– 2 111
– 3 101, 218, 227, 439
– 4 48, 282, 284, 286, 291, 300, 303, 304
– 4.15.18–19 289
– 5 212, 348
– 5–7 304
– 6 304, 306, 308, 311, 319, 329, 392
– 7 304, 328, 342, 358, 359
– 7–9.16 358
– 8 48, 359, 361, 364, 365
– 8.16.19 48
– 8–13 352
– 9 363, 368–370, 372, 374
– 10 374, 375, 377, 378
– 11 304, 380, 396, 398, 400, 417

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 12 27, 48, 180, 380, 385–387, 394, 410, 414
– 12–13 26, 408
– 13 417
– 14–15 256
– 15 394
– 16 358, 359, 413–415
– 17 47

Revelation 22, 39, 122, 133, 251, 278, 380, 402
– 1:4 109
– 2:2–3 167
– 2:11 380
– 2:16 288
– 2:19 153
– 3:10 349
– 3:11 288
– 3:17 187
– 4:11 239
– 5:9 286
– 5:12 239, 371
– 6:10 286
– 7:2 367
– 7:12 371
– 7:17 410
– 8:2.6–9:15 367
– 8:10 410
– 9:5 345
– 11:10 345
– 11:12 245, 251
– 11:14 288
– 11:15 208
– 11:18 381
– 12:7 371
– 13 367
– 14:3–4 286
– 14:7 410
– 14:10 345
– 14:13 251
– 15:8 246
– 16:1 245
– 16:4 410
– 16:13 276
– 17:1 301
– 17:8.11 284
– 17:13 239
– 17:14 198, 200
– 18:20 99, 232
– 19:4 371
– 19:20 276
– 20:4 301
– 20:10 276, 345
– 21:6 410
– 21:11.23 246
– 21:14 99
– 22:7.12.20 288
– 22:11 201, 380
– 22:12 381
– 22:15 443

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Apocrypha

Apocalypse of Baruch 57
- 13:1 251
- 17:4 258
- 22:1 245, 251
- 41:3 297
- 42:4 297
- 43:1–2 223
- 77:13 258
- 78:2 110
- 78:2–4 210
- 78–86 210
- 84:1.7–9 210

Ascension of Isaiah 138, 139
- 1:4 248
- 1:5 248
- 1:7 249
- 1:13 249
- 2:22 361
- 3:13–17 249
- 3:21–31 273
- 3:22 284
- 9:6–10 138
- 9:7–8 222
- 9:16–18 138
- 9:37 246
- 11:32 246

Assumption of Moses 52, 368, 369

Book of Jubilees 338
- 5 321
- 5:6 312
- 5:6–10 310
- 5:19 321, 324
- 7:16 211
- 7:20 324
- 7:20–21 360
- 7:34 324
- 10 321
- 10:5 307
- 10:17 321
- 16:6 329, 333
- 16:7 338
- 16:8 338
- 20:5 328
- 20:5–6 305
- 21–22 54
- 22:5 305
- 22:7–24 211
- 23:26 438
- 35:6 223
- 36:1–18 54

1 Ezra
- 1:4 241
- 1:21 124
- 2:26 302
- 9:6 366

4 Ezra 55, 59
- 3:11 324
- 5:1–2.9–10 297
- 5:1–13 59
- 6:18–28 59
- 6:24 59
- 7:78 356
- 9:1–12 59
- 10:43 266
- 12:42 258
- 13:29–31 59
- 13:52 56
- 14:27–36 54
- 14:28–35 55

1 Enoch 52, 57, 59, 139, 256
- 1:4 372
- 1:17 413

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 1–16 316, 326
– 5:4 414
– 6:2 307
– 6–12 307
– 6–16 316
– 9:1–10:20 366
– 9:1–11 372
– 9:10–11 372
– 10:4 312
– 10:4–5 312
– 10:7 307
– 10:9.15 307
– 10:12 312
– 10:22 429
– 12:4 307
– 13:1 312
– 13:10 307
– 14:1.3 307
– 14:4 307
– 14:5 312
– 14:20 246
– 16:2 307
– 17:6 412
– 18:11 312
– 18:11–19:2 310
– 18:17 312
– 21:7 312
– 22:1–11 356
– 22:11 354
– 39:12 138
– 40:1 138
– 45:3 249
– 46:1–3 249
– 48:6–7 250
– 49:2.4 250
– 52:4 250
– 54:5 312
– 54:6 312
– 61:8 249
– 61:10 361
– 61:12 138
– 62:2 249
– 62:7 250
– 63:6 412
– 65:4 245, 251
– 65:12 324
– 69:26 250
– 69:27.29 249
– 82:4 438
– 88:1 312
– 88:1–2 312
– 91:18–19 438
– 91–104 54
– 93:9 297
– 94:1 438
– 97:10 313
– 99:10 438
– 104:1 246
– 104:13 293
– 106 321
– 106:12 321
– 106:13–15 315
– 106:17 321

2 Enoch
– 20:1 361
– 22:6–10 367
– 22:8–10 222

3 Maccabees
– 2:2.13 340
– 2:4 305, 315, 316
– 2:5 305, 329, 332
– 2:21 240
– 2:26 291
– 2:31.32 124
– 3:8 380
– 3:17 238
– 3:26 354
– 5:47 332
– 6:1 157
– 6:30.40 151

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 7:3.14 354
– 7:18 151
– 7:22 241

4 Maccabees 120, 124, 137, 383
– 1:2 157
– 1:5.7.9.13–14 165
– 1:11 165
– 1:17.12.23 165
– 1:20–21.28 383
– 1:22.25 383
– 1:30 157
– 2:1 404
– 2:12 354
– 4:19 404
– 5:13 404
– 5:22–23 383
– 5:34 160
– 6:10–11 345
– 6:35 383
– 7:18 360
– 8:6 354
– 8:27 345
– 9:3 404
– 9:30–31 165
– 10:10 157
– 13:23.26 172
– 13:24 157
– 14:1 172
– 17:4 166
– 17:12 165
– 18:3 137
– 18:5 355

Odes of Solomon 15
– 9:49 241

Psalms of Solomon
– 2:10.18.32.34 105, 323
– 4:2 331
– 4:6 141
– 4:11.12 404
– 5:1 105, 323
– 8:8 105, 323
– 8:9 404
– 8:33 108
– 9:2 105, 323
– 10:5 105, 323
– 14:1–3.10 138
– 15 138
– 15:12 354
– 16:1 302
– 17:3 108
– 17:20 404
– 17:24.26.27.31.38.39.41 59

Sibylline Oracles
– 3:795–807 59

Story of Ahiqar
– 8:18 444

Testament of Moses
– 7:9 414

Testament of Simeon
– 1:8 186

Testament of Levi
– 3:4 246
– 3:7 340
– 5:13–17 260, 261
– 5:20 364
– 5:30 259

Testament of Judah
– 3:38 186
– 3:41.45 186
– 3:45 360
– 4:10 276
– 4:12–13 238
– 4:15–16 291

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 4:20–23 260, 261
– 4:29 364

Testament of Issachar
– 2:1–2 289
– 2:3 236

Testament of Zebulun
– 1:2 258
– 2:31 360
– 2:38 318

Testament of Dan
– 1:11 186
– 1:22 220

Testament of Naphtali
– 1:1–3 230
– 1:21–22 259
– 1:25 289, 329
– 1:26–27 328
– 1:27 305, 307, 315
– 1:28 305
– 2:29–30 161

Testament of Asher
– 1:35 345

Testament of Benjamin
– 1:30 259
– 2:2 360
– 2:3 428
– 2:4 329

Testament of Amram 61

Testament of Qahat 61

Vita Adae et Evae
– 12–17 392

Acts of John
– 29 155, 160, 173, 176
– 107 434

Acts of Paul 37

Acts of Paul and Thecla 155

Acts of Peter 37, 38, 53, 149, 224
– 2 173, 176
– 6 293
– 12 293
– 20 251
– 35 224
– 35[6] 38

Apocalypse of Paul
– 14:1.3 230
– 15 219, 230
– 16:6 310
– 18:2 310
– 34 310
– 40:3 310
– 50:2–3 323

Apocalypse of Peter 18, 32, 41, 52, 53, 56, 225, 258, 438
– 7 293, 438
– 15 251
– 17 252
– 20–25 357
– 22 438
– 28 438

Epistle of the Apostles 103
– 1 217
– 3 107, 108
– 5 108
– 6 103, 108, 116
– 12 108
– 39 207

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Gospel of Peter 32, 41, 43, 56
– 26–27 241
– 59–60 241

Gospel of the Ebionites 68

Nativity of Mary 15

Secret Mark
– 1:6–7 426

The Letter of the Corinthians to Saint Paul 15

The Third Letter of Saint Paul to the Corinthians 15

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Others

A

Aeschylus
- *Agamemnon*
  - 264 441
- *Prometheus Bound*
  - 298–299.301 240

Aesop
- *The Eagle and the Fox* 175

Anaxilas Comicus
- *Fragmenta*
  - 22:1 175

Apollodros
- *Library*
  - I 7:2 315

Aristophanes
- *Frogs*
  - V 145 147

Aristotle
- *De coloribus*
  - 3:793A 258
- *Historia Animalium*
  - IV 3 406
- *Meteorology*
  - I 9 411
- *Nicomachean Ethics* 166
  - 1115a–1117b 164
  - 1129b 105
  - 1131a 106
  - 1132a 105
  - 1145b 160
  - 1161b 97, 98
- *On Proverbs* 441
- *Politics*
  - 1253a 406
  - 1256b 376
- *Rhetoric* 147
  - II 2:5–6 373
  - III 12:4 229

B

Blessings (*Purity Rule*)
- 2–5 365

Blessings and curses
- 11–12 365

Bodmer Papyri 15

C

Calvin, John
- *Commentaries on the Second Epistle of Peter* 23

Cicero
- *De Inventione*
  - II 22:66 124
- *De natura deorum*
  - I 9:21–22 302
- *On the Laws*
  - I 7:23 150

Clement of Alexandria
- *Exhortation to the Heathen*
  - X 92:4 444
- *Paedagogus*
  - II 1 390
- *Stromata*
  - I 1 444
  - I 98 121
  - I 182:3 42
  - II 15 444
  - II 68:1–2 42
  - IV 25 152
  - V 11:77 361
  - V 36:3 152
  - VI 39:1 42
  - VI 44:1–3 42
  - VI 128:1–2 42
  - VII 7:4–5 348
  - VII 17 31
  - VII 106:4–107:1 67

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Clement of Rome
– *First Epistle* 17, 52, 53, 109, 115, 162, 246
– 1:1 364
– 1:2 154, 160, 169
– 2:3 124
– 3:4 187
– 4:7 195
– 5:4 36
– 7:6 323
– 8:2 286
– 9:2 246
– 9:4 286, 323, 327
– 11:1 124, 286, 338
– 13:1 195
– 16:17 195
– 20:8 286
– 20:11 286
– 26:1 133, 140
– 30:1.3.8 430
– 30:3 162
– 30:8 362
– 33:2 286
– 34:3 381
– 34:4 180
– 34:7 133
– 35:5 293
– 36:4 286
– 37:1 195
– 38:2 162
– 40:1 121
– 41:4 430
– 46:1 195
– 47:1–3 62
– 47:7 295
– 49:3 242
– 50:3 124, 207
– 52:1 286
– 53:1 212
– 57:7 318
– 59:3 240
– 60:2 191
– 62:1–2 176
– 62:2 154, 162, 167
– 64:1 154, 162, 167
– *Second Epistle* 17, 52, 125, 127, 139
– 1:1 195
– 1:6 187, 412
– 1:8 127
– 2:4 127
– 2:5 127
– 2:6 216
– 3:4 287
– 4:2 162
– 4:3 287
– 5:1 127, 195
– 5:5 133
– 5:5–6 133, 206
– 5:7 438
– 6:4 430
– 6:7 402
– 6:9 206, 207
– 7:1 195
– 9:5 127
– 10:1 158, 195, 433
– 10:2 196
– 10:4 384
– 11:7 206, 207
– 12:1–2 207
– 12:1–6 234
– 13 234
– 13:1 195
– 13:1–2 295
– 13:3 234
– 14:1.3 195
– 17:3 430
– 17:5 239, 244
– 17:7 402
– 18:2 196
– 19:1 124, 195
– 19:4 124, 125

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 20:4 121, 124, 125
– 20:5 108
Community Rule (1QS) 148
– 1:9–10 259
– 2:24–3:10 189
– 3:19–21 259
– 3:23–25 350
– 4:2 293, 438
– 4:2–4.9–11 149
– 4:23 350
– 5:1–2.10.14.18–19 429
– 6:10.22 195
– 8:13–14 292
– 9:17–20 292
– 10:20–21 292
– 10:21 402

D

Damascus Document
– 1:9–13 292
– 1:13 402
– 2:5–7 402
– 2:6 292
– 2:18–21 315
– 5:15 293
– 7:17–21 261
Demosthenes
– *Orationes*
– 3:5 97
– 18:80 97
– 50:6 97
Didache 298
– 1:1–2 292
– 3 364
– 4:1 361
– 11 288
Dio Chrysostom
– *Orationes*
– 4:116 243
– 12:28 135
– 12:29 135
– 17:1–11 212
– 17:4.7 179
– 17:7.10 298
– 31:95 121
– 32:10 298
– 32:11 397
– 35:1 397
– 44:10 243
– 54:1 235
Diodorus Siculus
– *Bibliotheca Historica* 147
– I 25:4 233
– I 96:5 281
– II 45:2 128
– I–V 128
– IV 8:4 233
– V 23:1–2 233
– XII 45:1 218
– XVIII 34:4 147
Diogenes Laertius
– *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 382
– II 2 229
– II 86–88 382
– V 67 151
– VII 110 142
– X 123 384
– X 133 423

E

Epictetus
– *Discourses*
– III 22.69 98
– *Of Providence* 376
Epicurus
– *Letter to Menoeceus* 423
Epiphanius
– *Panarion*
– 30:18 68
Epistle of Barnabas 17, 248
– 1:3 204
– 1:4 438

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 1:5 227
– 2:2 155, 162, 167
– 2:3 160
– 2:4 256
– 3:6 248
– 4:1 433
– 4:3 256
– 4:9 227
– 4:12 381
– 5:4 438
– 6:11 191
– 7:1 396
– 9:7 396
– 11:2–6 256
– 11:10–11 191
– 12:4 438
– 15:9 320
– 21:3 381
– 21:9 227
– 21:10 396

Epistle of Mathetes to Diognetus 125
– 6 219
– 6:7 219
– 9:2 381
– 10:5 242
– 11:5 125

Euripides
– *Bacchantes*
  – 218 299
– *Helena*
  – 622 440

Eusebius of Caesarea
– *Historia Ecclesiastica*
  – II 14:6 36
  – II 15:1 228
  – II 15:2 228
  – II 25:5 37
  – II 25:6–7 37
  – II 25:8 37
  – III 3:1 20
  – III 3:4 20
  – III 25:3 20
  – III 27:1–2 68
  – III 39 228
  – IV 22:4 283
  – IV 22:4–6 68
  – IV 22:5 282
  – IV 22:6 277
  – V 22:5 283
  – VI 13:6 20
  – VI 14:1 18, 20
– *Praeparatio Evangelica*
  – V 19:2 302

F

Firmilian
– *Epistola*
  – 75:6 19

G

Genesis Apocryphon
– 6 321
– 6:1–6 321

Genesis Rabbah 338, 344
– 26:5 338
– 49:13 338

H

Hermas
– *The Shepherd* 17, 18, 52, 53, 116, 151, 152, 154, 158, 162, 164, 167, 173, 180, 188, 190, 191, 204, 206, 207, 222, 266, 272, 288, 289, 291, 293, 295, 298, 313, 345, 364, 384, 386, 389, 401, 433
  – Commandment I 1:2 158
  – Commandment IV 2:2 345
  – Commandment IV 3:1 190
  – Commandment IV 3:2 206
  – Commandment VI 1:1 162
  – Commandment VI 1:2 401
  – Commandment VI 2:5 389
  – Commandment VIII 1:1–7 162

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– Commandment VIII 1:3 389
– Commandment VIII 9 155, 167
– Commandment VIII 10 173
– Commandment XI 1:12 386
– Commandment XI 1–4 276
– Commandment XI 2 121
– Commandment XI 5 121
– Commandment XI 5:8 272
– Commandment XI 7 121
– Commandment XI 8.9.12.21 121
– Commandment XI 11–15 288
– Commandment XII 2:1 385
– Commandment XII 2:3 433
– Commandment XII 3:1 158
– Commandment XII 5:4 434
– SimilitudeV 6:8 267
– Similitude IV 3–5 180
– Similitude IX 9:3 345
– Similitude IX 10:5 266
– Similitude IX 11:9 266
– Similitude IX 12:3 204
– Similitude IX 12:3–8 207
– Similitude IX 13:9 267
– Similitude IX 15:2 155, 162, 176
– Similitude IX 16 116
– Similitude IX 16:2–4 206, 207
– Similitude IX 16:7 267
– Similitude IX 17:5 434
– Similitude IX 17:5–18:2 434
– Similitude IX 18:2 357
– Similitude IX 22:1 364
– Similitude IX 26:6 222
– Similitude IX 28:7 313
– Similitude V 3:1–2 266
– Similitude V 3:5–8 163
– Similitude V 4:2–3 266
– Similitude V 5:1 266
– Similitude V 6:2–3 191
– Similitude V 6:3 361
– Similitude V 7:1 267
– Similitude VI 386
– Similitude VI 1:1 155
– Similitude VI 1:4 158
– Similitude VI 2:3 295
– Similitude VI 2:6–7 433
– Similitude VI 5:5 384
– Similitude VI 5:7 384
– Similitude VIII 11:1 266
– Vision III 8:5.7–9 176
– Vision III 8:7 121

Herodotus
– *Histories*
– I 15:1 229
– I 21:1 98
– V 38:2 98

Hesiod
– *Theogony* 310
– 729 312
– 729–733.740.744–745 308

Hilary of Arles
– *Treatise on the Seven Catholic Epistles* 192, 410

Hippolytus of Rome
– *Commentary on Daniel*
– III 22:4 426
– *On Christ and Antichrist*
– 2 19

Homer
– *Iliad* 63, 133, 310
– 8:13 312
– 8:13–15 308
– 8:480 312
– 9:498 158
– *Odyssey* 63, 133
– 11:55 312
– 13:45 158

Horace
– *Epistulae*
– I 2:26 441
– II 2:75 441

Hymns (1QH)
– 7:22 292

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

I
Ignatius of Antioch
– *The Epistle to the Ephesians*
– 1:1 107, 108
– 6:2 283
– 12:3 62
– *The Epistle to the Magnesians* 108
– 8:2 121
– *The Epistle to the Philadelphians*
– 1:1 414
– 9:2 108
– *The Epistle to the Romans*
– 3:3 107
– 4:3 62
– *The Epistle to the Trallians*
– 7:1 107
– 8:2 295
Irenaeus of Lyon
– *Adversus Haereses*
– I 23:4 422
– I 24:1 67
– I 24:4–5 422
– I 25:2–4 419
– I 31:3 418
– III 1:1 228, 230
– III 3:2 36
– IV 27:2 435
– V 23:2 17
– V 28:3 17

J
Jerome
– *Epistulae*
– 53:9 20
– 120:11 21
Jerome and Gennadius
– *Lives of Illustrious Men* 20
Josephus Flavius
– *Antiquitates Judaicae*
– I 1:4 236
– I 1:6 123
– I 3:1 311, 315, 323
– I 3:2 315, 322
– I 4:24 241
– I 11:1 329, 338
– I 11:4 346
– II 6:8 188
– II 6:9 172
– II 7:4 95
– II 9:1 188
– II 12:1 243
– III 1:4 362
– III 5:2 238
– III 8:5 238
– III 14 395
– IV 6:2 407
– IV 6:2–9 397
– IV 6:3 405
– IV 6:5 266, 271
– IV 6:6 403
– IV 6:10 95
– IV 6:10–11 402
– IV 8:2 230
– IV 8:44 188
– IV 8:45–47 54, 230
– IV 8:46 211
– IV 8:47 211
– IX 3:3 238
– IX 8:5 362
– V 1:22 95
– V 2:1.4 95
– VI 5:3 361
– VI 7:4 362
– VII 2:2 95
– VII 6:2 340
– VIII 4:3 241
– VIII 9:1 258
– VIII 10:2 290
– VIII 13:8 294
– X 10:2 384
– X 11:6 376
– X 11:7 243

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– XI 8:4 147
– XII 2:5 95
– XII 2:15 243
– XII 3:1 102
– XII 4:1.10.11 95
– XII 5:1 95
– XII 6:1.3 95
– XII 8:2.6 95
– XII 9:6 95
– XII 11:2 95
– XIII 3:1 229
– XIII 5:9 282
– XIII 10:6 282
– XIX 1:10 120
– XVI 8:4 303
– XVII 1:5 139
– XVII 5:6 129
– XVII 11:1 98
– XVII 11:2 333
– XVIII 5:2 189
– XX 5:40 290
– XX 9:1 363
– XX 9:2 147
– *Contra Apionem*
  – I 8 64
  – I 11 294
  – I 26 136
  – I 31 188
  – I 33 343
  – II 2 378
  – II 13 378
  – II 14 186
  – II 17 242, 254
  – II 22 240
  – II 25 425
  – II 29 375
  – II 34 309
  – II 85 442
– *De Bello Iudaico*
  – I 3:1 102
  – I 14:1 172
  – I 24:4 172
  – II 8:2 161, 282
  – II 8:7 189
  – II 8:11 139
  – II 9:2 285
  – II 9:6 220
  – II 15:1 340
  – II 17:10 429
  – III 10 363
  – IV 5:2 360
  – IV 8:4 330
  – V 3:4 393
  – V 13:6 328
  – VI 2:10 363
  – VII 8:1 341
  – VII 10:2 393

Justin Martyr
– *Dialogue with Trypho*
  – 17:2 294
  – 24 321
  – 29:1 252
  – 32:1 208
  – 35:3 68, 277
  – 35:5 284
  – 56 256
  – 72 256
  – 81 17
  – 82 17, 277
  – 129 256
  – 138 325
– *First Apology*
  – 32 121
  – 61 190, 192

L

Lactantius
– *Divinae Institutiones*
  – III 17 383

Letter of Aristeas 169
– 16 240
– 18 168

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– 20 281
– 24 168
– 42 169
– 131 168
– 157 120
– 210 169
– 215 168
– 229 168
– 255 168
– 277–278 160

Lucian of Samosata
– *The Passing of Peregrinus* 173
– *Vitarum auctio*
  – 18 186

Luther, Martin
– *Epistles of Saint Peter and Saint Jude* 46, 104
  – I (V.1) 21
  – I (V.2) 114, 156
  – I (V.3) 123
  – I (V.4) 139
  – I (V.10) 200
  – II 69
  – II (V.10, 11) 361
  – II (V.14) 391
  – II (V.15, 16) 399
  – III (V.8–10) 21
  – III (V.15, 16) 21
– *Preface to the Epistles of Saint James and Saint Jude 1545* (*1522*) 22
– *Preface to the Second Epistle of Saint Peter* 22
– *The Power and Primacy of The Pope* 34, 35
– *The Smalcald Articles*
  – Part 2:Article IV (*Of the Papacy*) 34
  – Part 3:Article VII (*Of the keys*) 34

Lysias
– *Orationes*
  – 19:21 97

M

Martyrium Policarpi
– 5:2 223
– 9:1 245
– 11:1 434
– 19 108

Melito of Sardis
– *The Homily on the Pascha* 15
  – 68 209

Methodius of Olympus
– *Convivium*
  – 8:10 68, 273
– *On the Resurrection* 19
– *The Banquet of the Ten Virgins or Concerning Chastity* 273

Miscellaneous Rules (4Q265) 261

O

Origen
– *Commentary on the Gospel of John*
  – 5:3 19
– *Contra Celsum*
  – III 13 296
  – III 14 296
  – VI 78 303
– *Homilae in Numeros*
  – 6:676 19
– *Homily on Exodus*
  – XII 4 426

Ovid
– *Ars Amatoria* 63
  – I 390, 393
– *Metamorphoses*
  – 1:253–261 315

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus
– 1197:13 97
– 1380:109 175

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

P

Pausanias
- *Description of Greece*
  - VIII 52 128

Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab) 268

Pesher on Nahum (4QpNah) 268

Petronius
- *Satyricon* 388
  - 33 388
  - 35 388
  - 36 388
  - 40 388
  - 60 388
  - 69 388
  - 70 388

Philo of Alexandria
- *De Abrahamo*
  - IV 26 120
  - V 27 322
  - XX 112 285
  - XXVI 135–136 329
- *De agricultura*
  - XL 177–180 202
- *De decalogo*
  - XXI 104–105 135
- *De Ebrietate*
  - XL 223 330
- *De Josepho*
  - V 26 395
  - XXXVII 172
  - XXXVIII 222 363
- *De migratione Abrahami*
  - II 7–10 143, 161
  - III 16 229
- *De mutatione nominum*
  - XXVIII 152 234
  - XXXVI 197 166
  - XXXVII 203 404
- *De praemiis et poenis*
  - IV 23 315
  - IV 24–25 393
  - XX 126 341
  - XXVI 152 312
- *De somniis*
  - I 1:2 271
  - I 27:172 234
  - II 2:11 216
  - II 20:140 299
- *De specialibus legibus*
  - I XI:65 270
  - I XXIX:148 443
  - I XXXV:181 102
  - I XXXVIII:209 129
  - II II 121
  - II LXIII 169
  - II XLIII:240 384
  - II XLVI:255 285
  - II XV:60 180
  - II XX:101 179
- *De virtutibus*
  - XII 77 230
- *De vita contemplativa*
  - X 75 266
- *De vita Moisis*
  - I L:276 407
  - I L:277 407
  - I LI:281 265
  - I LII:286 265
  - I LIII:293 406
  - I LVI:305 290
  - I XLVIII:264 407
  - I XLVIII:266–268 403
  - I XLVIII-LV:264–304 397
  - I XVI:92–94 235
  - I XXIV:139 363
  - II III:14 254
  - II X:53 328, 330
  - II X:56 331
  - II X:58 337, 343
  - II XI:59–60 325
  - II XXXIX:212 298
  - II XXXVII:198 341

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

- *De vita Moisis*
  - I LI:283 270
- *Legum allegoriarum*
  - I XXVIII:89 135
  - II XVIII 102
  - III IX:30 375
  - III LXXV:213 344
  - III XXIV:77 322
- *Quaestiones in Genesim*
  - I 92 307
  - I 96 322
- *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*
  - LII 259 265
- *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*
  - XXIII 83 120
  - XXVII 101–103 161
- *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*
  - XIV 69 175
  - XXX 143 360

Philodemus of Gadara
- *De libertate dicendi*
  - 13a:3 175

Plato
- *Gorgias*
  - 507b 105
- *Laches*
  - 192d 164
  - 194a 164
  - 194d 164
- *Laws*
  - 691e 120
- *Phaedrus*
  - 245c–246d 136
  - 253 175
- *Protagoras*
  - 323d–234a 354
- *Republic*
  - 419a–445e (Book IV) 153
  - 440cd 164
  - 442b–c 153
  - 442c 153
  - 442c–d 153
  - 443c–444a 153
- *Symposium*
  - 180b 175
- *Theaetetus* 143
- *Timaeus* 233

Plautus
- *Menaechmi*
  - 4:2 155

Pliny the Elder
- *Natural History* 376

Plutarch
- *Adversus Colotem*
  - 1124C 235
- *Moralia* 243, 282
  - 328D 281
  - 493D 375
  - 1087B 360
  - 1089A 385
  - 1092A–B 424
  - 1096C 360
  - 1098 389
- *On Brotherly Love*
  - 478D–479A 170
  - 479D 174
  - 484B–D 171
- *On Moral Virtue*
  - 442A 142
  - 442C 142
- *On Shyness*
  - 528E 391
- *On the Delay of Punishment by the Gods* 355
- *On the Love of Wealth* 297
- *Parallel Lives*
  - *Alcibiades* 22:3 240
  - *Alexander* 22:4 376
  - *Demetrius* 1:6 333
  - *Theseus* 1:1 233
- *That Epicurus Actually Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* 179

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab)
– 4:2 364
Pesher on Nahum (4QpNah)
– 2:9 364
– 3:9 364
– 4:4 364
Polybius
– *Histories*
– I 18:11 147
– XXI 29:12 147
Polycarp of Smyrna
– *The Epistle to Philippians*
– 10:2–3 295
Pseudo-Clement
– *Homilies*
– 3:53 252
– 8:17 320
– 8:19 327
– 9:2 332
– *Pseudo-Clementines* 37, 41, 43, 223
– *Recognitiones*
– V 12:4 426
– XXIX 317
Pseudo-Longinus
– *On the Sublime*
– IV 5–6 391
Pseudo-Philo
– *Liber antiquitates biblicae*
– 18:12 403
– 19:1–5 54
– 24:1–5 54
Pseudo-Phocylides
– *Sentences*
– 103–106 139

Q
Quintilian
– *Institutio oratoria*
– III 7:15 153, 157

S
Semonides of Amorgos
– *Types of Women* 442, 443
Seneca
– *Epistulae moralies*
– 67 166
– 67:2 214
– 85:2 149
– 94:1.5.21.25 221
Sextus Empiricus
– *Pyrrhonic Sketches*
– I 14:56 444
Sophocles
– *Ajax*
– 664–665 440
Strabo
– *Geographica hypomnemat*a
– V 1:9 233
– XVI 2:44 331
Suetonius Tranquillus
– *Nero*
– 16:2 296

T
Tacitus
– *The Annals*
– XV 44 296
– XVI 18 385
Targum Pseudo-Jonathan 405
Tertullian
– *Apologia*
– 39 175
Testimonia (4QTest)
– 9–13 261
The Apology of Phileas 15
The Dialogues of Adamantius
– 58:1–2 426
Theophilus of Antioch
– *To Autolycus*
– II 9 19

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

– II 14 283
– III 19 320, 323
Theophylact of Ochrid
– *The Explanation of 2 Peter* 156, 158
Thucydides
– *Histories* 281, 290, 301, 392
– I 21–23 233

W

War Scroll (1QM)
– 1:11–12 350
– 7:4 193
– 12:1–8 372
– 13:5.9–12 259
– 15:9 259

X

Xenophon
– *Cyropaedia*
– VIII 4:6 184
– *Memorabilia*
– I 2:1 160
– *Symposium*
– 4:42 184

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Eastern and Central European Voices

Studies in Theology and Religion

Vol. 1: Andrzej Siemieniewski / Mirosław Kiwka, *Christian Charismatic Movements. Threat or Promise?* (2021) Open Access.
Vol. 2: Sławomir Stasiak, *Exaltation in the Epistles of St Paul against the Background of Greek Classical Literature* (2021) Open Access.
Vol. 3: Kalina Wojciechowska / Mariusz Rosik, *A Structural Commentary on the So-Called Antilegomena:*
- Vol. 3.1: *The Letter of James: Wisdom that Comes from Above* (2021) Open Access;
- Vol. 3.2: *The Letter of Jude: Expecting Mercy* (2021) Open Access;
- Vol. 3.3.1: *The Second Letter of Peter: Proclaiming the Coming of the Lord.* Part 1. *Eschatological Scepticism (2 Pet 1–2)* (2024);
- Vol. 3.3.2: *The Second Letter of Peter: Proclaiming the Coming of the Lord.* Part 2. *Eschatological Hermeneutics (2 Pet 3)* (2024).

Vol. 4: Kazimiera Jaworska (ed.), *Catholic Church in Lower Silesia against Communism (1945–1974)* (2021) Open Access.
Vol. 5: Krzysztof Pilarczyk, *Bibliological and Religious Studies on the Hebrew Book. Collected Essays* (2021) Open Access.
Vol. 6: Marcin Kołodziej, *„Liturgia semper reformanda". Adaptations and accommodations in the liturgy in light of canon 838 of the Code of Canon Law* (in preparation).

© 2024 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht | Brill Deutschland GmbH
https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666503665 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0