

Exegetical Notes for 2 Peter 1:1-2

KEY

ACC = Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament XI (Gerald Bray, Ed.)

ATR = Word Pictures in the New Testament (A.T. Robertson).

BAG = Bauer Arndt and Gingrich: A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.

BKBC = Bible Knowledge Background Commentary: John, Hebrews - Revelation (Craig A. Evans, Gen. Ed.).

B&W = Syntax of New Testament Greek (James A. Brooks and Carlton Winbery).

Barclay = The Letters of James and Peter: Daily Study Bible Series (William Barclay).

Bullinger = Figures of Speech Used in the Bible (E.W. Bullinger).

Calvin = Calvin's Commentaries, Vol. XXII (John Calvin).

Cedar = The Preacher's Commentary: James, 1 & 2 Peter, Jude (Paul A. Cedar).

DNTT = The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (Colin Brown, Gen. Ed.).

Grudem = Systematic Theology (Wayne Grudem).

Guthrie = New Testament Introduction (Donald Guthrie).

Helm = 1 & 2 Peter and Jude (David R. Helm).

Expositors = The Expositor's Greek New Testament: Volume Five (W. Robertson Nicoll, Ed.).

Fickett = Peter's Principles: A Bible Commentary for Laymen (Harold L. Fickett, Jr.).

Keener = The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament (Craig S. Keener).

Kelly = A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude (J.N.D. Kelly).

Thomas = 1 & 2 Peter: The Crossway Classic Commentaries (Griffith Thomas).

Linguistic Key = The Linguistic Key to the Greek New Testament.

Lewis = Integrative Theology (Gordon Lewis and Bruce Demarest).

Lenski = The Interpretation of I and II Epistles of Peter, the three Epistles of John, and the Epistle of Jude (R.C. Lenski).

Luther = Commentary on Peter and Jude (Martin Luther).

MacArthur = MacArthur New Testament Commentary: 2 Peter (John MacArthur).

Maclaren = Expositions of Holy Scripture: 2 Peter (Alexander Maclaren).

Metzger = A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (Bruce M. Metzger).

NLEKGNT = New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament.

Schreiner = The New American Commentary: 1, 2 Peter, Jude (Thomas R. Schreiner).

Shedd = Dogmatic Theology (W.G.T. Shedd), 3rd edition.

Kittle = Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (G. Kittle and G. Friedrich, Eds.).

Vincent = Vincent's Word Studies of the New Testament (Marvin R. Vincent).

Wuest = First Peter in the Greek New Testament (Kenneth S. Wuest).

Basic Diagram of 1:1-2

¹ Συμεών Πέτρος

δοῦλος

καὶ

ἀπόστολος

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

τοῖς

ἰσότημον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν

ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ

τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν

καὶ

σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,

² χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη

πληθυνθείη

ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

Simon Peter,

a slave

and

an apostle /

>> of Jesus Christ,

to those

who have received a faith:

* of the same kind as ours,

in the righteousness

of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ.

Grace and peace

be multiplied

to you

in the knowledge

of God

and

of Jesus our Lord.

TRANSLATION, OUTLINE AND CENTRAL PROPOSITION

GREEK TEXT:

1 Συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθεῖη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

Simon Peter, a slave and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have received a faith of the same kind as ours, in the righteousness of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ.

PASSAGE OUTLINE:

N/A.

INITIAL SERMON OUTLINE:

I. Theme of 2 Peter (1:1a)

A. The Author - Issues of Authorship

1. Petrine Authorship

a. Ancient Objections to Petrine Authorship

b. Modern Objections to Petrine Authorship

2. Date of writing

3. Place of writing

B. The Audience - Issues of Readership (1:1b)

C. The Atmosphere - Issues of Circumstance

D. The Abstract - Issues of Content

II. Opening Greeting (v. 2)

PASSAGE SUBJECT/THEME (what is the passage talking about): N/A

PASSAGE COMPLEMENT/THRUST (what is the passage saying about what it's talking about):
N/A

PASSAGE MAIN IDEA (central proposition of the text): N/A

PURPOSE OF THE SERMON (on the basis of the CPT what does God want us to learn and do?): N/A

SERMON SUBJECT/THEME (what am I talking about): N/A

SERMON COMPLEMENT/THRUST (what am I saying about what I am talking about): N/A

INITIAL CENTRAL PROPOSITION OF THE SERMON: N/A

MEMORABLE CENTRAL PROPOSITION OF THE SERMON: N/A

SERMONIC IDEA/TITLE: Fanning the Flame of Truth: An Introduction to 2 Peter (Parts 1 & 2)

FINAL SERMON OUTLINE:

I. The Author - Issues of Authorship

A. Petrine Authorship

1. Ancient Objections to Petrine Authorship

2. Modern Objections to Petrine Authorship

B. Date of writing

C. Place of writing

II. The Audience - Issues of Readership (1:1b)

III. The Atmosphere - Issues of Circumstance

IV. The Abstract - Issues of Content

1. Overview of the Letter

2. Theme of the Letter

V. The Address - Opening Greeting (1:2)

Three Steps of Exegesis

- ❶ Do an initial translation of the entire passage.
- ❷ Do a detailed analysis of the grammar, working verse-by-verse to the end of the text.
- ❸ Do a detailed exegesis of the passage by way of a "shot-gun" approach, using all the exegetical tools.

√ In no particular order:

- Work from critical commentaries to practical.
- Word studies and cross-references (analogy of the faith).
- Applicational analysis - applicational issues arising from the text.
- Theological analysis - theological issues arising from the text.

√ "Blast away" at the passage until I am content with my exegesis, main idea, and outline.

- Smooth away all of the wrinkles.
- The process is to yield an accurate "statue" as I chisel away the debris.

Parsing Verbs and Declining Nouns

Verbs: ποιμάνετε (ποιμαινω = to tend, shepherd || Verb: Second Person Plural Aorist Imperative Active).
ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι (ἀποκαλύπω = to reveal, disclose || Verb: Present Passive Infinitive).

Nouns: παθημάτων, (παθημά = suffering || Noun: Neuter Genitive Plural).

Participles: μελλούσης (μελλω = to be about to || Present Active Participle: Feminine Genitive Singular).

Adjectives: (ἐπιεικής = gentle, kind || Adjective: Masculine Dative Plural).

Pronouns: (εγώ = I || First Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Nominative Singular).
ὕμιν (σὺ = you || Second Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Dative Plural).
(αὐτοῦ = He, Him || Third Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Masculine Genitive Singular).
(τούτο = this || Near Demonstrative Pronoun: Neuter Nominative Singular).

HISTORICAL/CULTURAL/GRAMMATICAL CONTEXT

Introduction to 2 Peter: Issues of Authorship, Provenance, Date, and Content are dealt with below in the text. See also my introduction to 1 Peter.

The oldest extant mss of 2 Peter is P72 dating to the end of the third century. This papyrus also contains 1 Peter.

Second Peter (along with Jude) is viewed by some as the "dark corner" of the New Testament. As a result, it is not often preached, studied, discussed, or quoted." [MacArthur, 1]

". . . Peter wrote it [2 Peter] to help believers face a world filled with subtle spiritual deception. . . . Never has Peter's warning been more timely than it is today. The rapid advancement of mass media, coupled with the church's lack of discernment, has allowed doctrinal error to spread like wildfire. False teachers propagate their heresies via television, radio, the Internet, books, magazines, and seminars—doing whatever they can for their own self-promotion. In the process, their deceit lures multitudes to exchange the truth for utter lies (cf. 1 Tim. 1:19; 2 Tim. 2:16-18). To make matters worse, some in today's church, motivated by cowardly fear or rejection or misguided notions of love, are reluctant to expose today's apostates. Instead of countering error, they either embrace it or ignore it in the name of tolerance. [MacArthur, 1-2]

The authorship of 2 Peter has been disputed more sharply and to a greater extent than the authorship of any other New Testament book. Yet the letter itself plainly claims to have been written by "Simon Peter, a bond-servant and apostle of Jesus Christ" (1:1). The Greek text actually reads, "Simeon Peter," using the Hebrew form of Peter's name used elsewhere of him only in Acts 15:14. Such only strengthens the author's claim to be Peter, since a forger would not likely have used an obscure form of Peter's name. . . . Daniel B. Wallace remarks, "In reading the literature, one cannot help but see an element of caprice and double standard, where scholars have already made up their minds despite the evidence" ("Second Peter: Introduction, Argument, and Outline" [Biblical Studies Press: www.bible.org] [MacArthur, 4])

The first person to explicitly state that Peter wrote it [2 Peter] was Origen, early in the third century. Critics claim there is no trace of the epistle's existence until that time. Further, although Origen accepted it as a genuine writing of Peter, he noted that others had doubts about its authenticity. Writing in the fourth century, the church historian Eusebius of Caesarea also expressed doubts about 2 Peter. He did not reject it, but included it among the New Testament books whose authenticity was disputed. The silence of the church fathers before the time of Origen is taken to be a tacit denial of 2 Peter's authenticity.

While Origen was the first to attribute 2 Peter to Peter, others before him were familiar with the epistle. Origen was an astute literary critic, and he would not likely have been taken in by a recent forgery. Moreover, he repeatedly quoted the epistle as Scripture, strongly implying that 1 Peter was known and accepted as canonical long before his time. The epistle's inclusion in the third-century Bodmer papyrus P72 also indicates that it was considered part of the canon by that time. (The monumental fourth-

century manuscripts Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus and the fifth-century manuscript Codex Alexandrinus also include 2 Peter.)

Origen's teacher, Clement of Alexandria, wrote a commentary on the catholic (general) epistles, including 2 Peter (Eusebius Ecclesiastical History, 6.14.1). By writing a commentary on the book, Clement indicates that he considered 2 Peter to be Scripture (and therefore authentic). Furthermore, Clement's testimony provides strong evidence that the epistle's canonicity was generally accepted by the church in the first half of the second century.

Further evidence of the epistle's existence and acceptance at that time comes from Justin Martyr (c. a.d. 100-165). In his Dialogue with Trypho, Justin wrote, "And just as there were false prophets contemporaneous with your [the Jews] holy prophets, so are there now many false teachers amongst us, of whom our Lord forewarned us to beware" (82.1). That passage bears a striking resemblance to 2 Peter 2:1, "But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you, who will secretly introduce destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, bringing swift destruction upon themselves." That the Greek word translated "false teachers" (pseudodidaskaloi) appears before Justin's time only in 2 Peter 2:1 further suggests that Justin was borrowing from 2 Peter. [MacArthur, 6-7]

For more similarities with other non-canonical writings, see MacArthur, pages 6-8.

1:1 EXEGESIS

GREEK TEXT:

Συμεὼν Πέτρος δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,

Συμεὼν (Συμεὼν = Simon || Noun: Masculine Nominative Singular). Nominative of Appellation (with Πέτρος).

Πέτρος (Πέτρος || Noun: Masculine Nominative Singular). Nominative of Appellation (with Συμεὼν).

δούλος (δούλος || Noun: Masculine Nominative Singular).

ἀπόστολος (ἀπόστολος || Noun: Masculine Nominative Singular).

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ + Χριστοῦ || Noun: Masculine Genitive Singular). Genitive of Possession. τοῖς ἰσότιμος (ἰσότιμος =) equal in value, also simply of the same kind || Adjective: Feminine Accusative Singular).

ἡμῖν (ἐγὼ = I || First Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Dative Plural).

λαχοῦσιν (λαγχανῶ = to receive or option [by lot or by divine will || Aorist Active Participle: Masculine Dative Plural).

πίστιν (πίστις || Noun: Feminine Accusative Singular).

ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ (δικαιοσύνη || Noun: Feminine Dative Singular).

τοῦ θεοῦ (θεοῦ || Noun: Masculine Genitive Singular). Genitive of Possession.

ἡμῶν (ἐγὼ = I || First Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Genitive Plural). Possessive Genitive.

καὶ σωτῆρος (σωτήρις || Noun: Masculine Genitive Singular). Genitive of Possession.

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (Ἰησοῦ + Χριστοῦ || Noun: Masculine Genitive Singular).

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

Simon Peter, a slave and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have received a faith of the same kind as ours, in the righteousness of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ.

CONTEXTUAL, GRAMMATICAL, THEOLOGICAL, APPLICATIONAL ANALYSIS:

Simon Peter (Συμεὼν Πέτρος)

I. Author: Issues of Authorship

A. Petrine Authorship

The opening verse claims that the letter was written by "Peter" - Particularly - (Συμεὼν Πέτρος) - "Simon Peter" - further identified as δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ - "a slave and apostle of Jesus Christ."

Seems clear that we are talking about THE Apostle Peter, one of the 12, and the same author of what we refer to as 1 Peter (cf. 2 Pet. 3:1).

a. Canonicity of 2 Peter

(1) 2 Peter is considered the most poorly attested letter in the N.T.

Modern critics, almost to a man, believe it to be a pseudonymous letter (a forgery). Kummel writes: "Peter cannot have written this Epistle." (cited in D.A. Carson; Douglas Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*).

One of the criticisms in that regard is the comparable nature of 2 Peter and Jude. Norman Perrin:

"2 Peter is based on Jude 4-16. This evidence makes it impossible for the apostle Peter to have written it, and it is universally recognized as pseudonymous. . . . a date about AD 140 would be appropriate." (Norman Perrin). *The New Testament: An Introduction (Proclamation and Parenthesis, Myth and History)*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. 1974), 262.

If you were to compose a spurious letter in the 1st or 2nd c. there is no better name to use as a forgery than Peter's, and many did just that (Gospel of Peter; Apocalypse of Peter, etc.). However, there is no doubt that this letter has come to from the hand of The Apostle Peter. This was a universally accepted fact by the earliest Xns.

Because of this, any letter proposed as coming from him went through much greater scrutiny. There was a healthy sense of skepticism, the idea that, "Let's be absolutely sure."

(2) Process of canonicity for the N.T. (review)

b. Main criticisms

"(1) the idea that the relation of this letter to Jude forbids Petrine authorship, (2) the differences in literary style and vocabulary between this epistle and 1 Peter (3) the reference to Paul's letters as Scripture (3:15-16), (4) the references to the apostles as "in the past" (3:2) and to "our fathers" as having died (3:4), references that are said to point to a time later than the apostle." [Carson and Moo, N.T. Intro]

"The message that we get in the letter is said to be the product of an emerging tradition from a later period, rather than personal recollections of the apostle. Some point out that there were several books attributed to Peter, such as the Gospel of Peter, the Acts of Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter." [Carson and Moo, N.T. Intro]

"Generally speaking, conservative scholars have held to the Petrine authorship."

As far as those who believe that it was acceptable back then for Xns to forge a document in the name of an Apostle, Carson and Moo point out that "this view does not give enough attention to the fact that in the early church the debates on whether it should be accepted or not raged over whether it was written by an apostle or not." [Carson and Moo, N.T. Intro]

External Attestation.

"E. M. B. Green takes from Westcott the point that while no book of the New Testament is as poorly attested in the early church as 2 Peter, this epistle "has incomparably better support for its inclusion than the best attested of the rejected books." This is perhaps as far as we can go along this line. Those who reject Petrine authorship will point to the weakness of the attestation; those who accept it point out that no noncanonical book has as much acceptance."

Due to the relatively short length and the content, 2 Peter was less likely to be quoted or even referred to as often as other New Testament writings.

Origin, whose life spanned the 2d and 3d centuries, referred to Peter "sounding aloud with the two trumpets of his epistles." Very early recognition. He also mentions doubts about it, but uses it at least six times w/o hesitation. [*citations occur in Rufinus' Latin translation which is sometimes not completely accurate] –Guthrie

Eusebius, who lived early in the 4th c., said that Peter left "one acknowledged letter and perhaps also a second, for this is disputed." [Guthrie]

There's some evidence for the canonicity of 2 Peter from as early as Clement of Alexandria and Polycarp. [Guthrie]

Some point out that 2 Peter is not found in the Muratorian Canon (the earliest list of the NT books which dates to t/end of 2d c.). However, the copy we have of the MT is corrupt (not complete). Copies we do have don't mention James or Hebrews, or 1 Peter for that matter. Interestingly, the M.C. does refer to spurious books where it lists such letters as "The Epistles to the Alexandrians and Laodiceans" as not part of the N.T., but having been "forged in Paul's name." Neither of Peter's letters are mentioned.

Jerome (d. AD 420) accepted it but also noted that doubts existed over its authenticity based on differences in style to 1 Peter. He believed that the differences were a result of 2 different amanuenses

"It would seem a fair conclusion to this survey of external evidence to submit that there is no evidence from any part of the early church that this epistle was ever rejected as spurious, in spite of the hesitancy which existed over its reception." [Guthrie, 811]

Interesting that Erasmus (15th/16th c.) regarded it as spurious or written by Silas. Calvin regarded it as having been written by a disciple under Peter's direction (he was too old and infirm to write it himself).

What would be the motive for a forgery? Generally this was done to promote false doctrines by using the name of an apostolic source. There is no such aim in 2 Peter which doctrinally fits into the rubric

of the rest of the N.T. In fact, the quality of 2 Peter is discernibly higher than that of acknowledged forgeries done in Peter's name, such as *the Apocalypse of, the Gospel of, the Preaching of, or the Acts of*. Cf. Guthrie, 838.

During the past two centuries, many scholars have proposed that six of Paul's letters, the two letters of Peter, James, and Jude are pseudonymous, that is, written in the name of a recognized leader in the church by some n other, unknown author. The case for the pseudonymity of some of these, such as 2 Thessalonians, James, and Jude, is weak indeed. The case for 2 Peter as a pseudonymous letter, however, deserves close consideration. First, although framed as a letter, which was the typical form of apostolic communication by the 50s and 60s, 2 Peter has much in common with the genre of the "testament." The "testament" was a deathbed speech placed on the lips of an important figure from antiquity, thus, pseudonymity was a constant feature of this genre. The prototype for this is found in Genesis 49, where Jacob blesses each of his twelve sons on his deathbed, predicting their various fortunes. During the intertestamental period, the form became very popular as a means of passing on ethical instruction as well as predictions of the course of history from the time of the alleged speaker to the time of God's decisive intervention on behalf of God's people.

In each of these texts, the speaker is aware of his approaching death (he usually speaks from his deathbed to his gathered children), Its his reminiscences at length, provides instructions to his family, and, in many cases, predicts the fortunes that will befall his descendants and the future interventions of God. These traits are all evident in 2 Peter, with the modification of the setting from deathbed "speech" to "letter." Peter is aware of his impending death (2 Peter 1:13-15) and expresses his desire to provide moral instruction (1:12-13) that will serve as ongoing guidance and influence after his "departure" (1:15). He gives ethical instructions to his spiritual "children" (see 2 Peter 1:3-11; 3:14-15, 17-18) and predicts future events pertinent both to the challenges that his "children" will face (2:1-3) and to the ultimate intervention of God (3:8-13). Indeed, the letter's close resemblance to the genre of "testament" might have been expected by the real author to signal to the readers that the work was pseudonymous." [BKBC, 314-15]

Could it have been a friendly forgery? Transparent forgery? See Schreiner for a rebuttal.

Style Differences to 1 Peter.

He may have used an amanuensis, Silas/Silvanus (5:12). Dictation was a common practice (cf. Rom. 16:22). Secretaries would often aid with style and grammar. In some cases the scribe would be given a bare outline to work with and the author would check over the work when it was completed. Note that Silas was a prophet and a Roman citizen (Acts 15:32, 16:37). He was well acquainted w/Apostle Paul being Paul's chosen associate on his Second Missionary Journey in Acts. He is associated with Paul in both of the Thess. epistles. While it is possible, it is not certain that Silas actually scribed the letter. He may have simply "carried it." - The phrase use3d in 5:12 (γραφω δια τινος) is no where else used of an amanuensis, however it is used of a carrier. Possible, but we don't know. It's also possible that Peter used an unnamed amanuensis.

R.C.H. Lenski writes:

"First Peter has 361 words that are not found in Second Peter, and Second Peter has 231 words that are not found in First Peter. First Peter also has sixty-three that are not found in the rest of the New Testament; Second Peter has fifty-seven (five of them doubtful), and only one (ἀποθεσις) of these 120 occurs in both First and Second Peter. Yes, this seems "remarkable." The subject matter of the two epistles is totally different."

"As far as grammatical differences are concerned, what Jerome called difference in style, this has for a long time been recognized as an exaggeration and as altogether insufficient for assuming that different writers composed the two epistles. They present not only differences but also marked similarities. In both epistles there is a fondness for repeating a word that has just been used, a feature that is found also in James. Again, in both epistles there is a fondness for plural abstract nouns. In both epistles the main thought is not stated at once and then elaborated; the main thought is approached gradually, after due preparation. Thus Bigg writes: "So far we may agree with Weiss that no document in the New Testament so like First Peter as Second Peter." [Lanski, 245]

Doctrinal issues.

These have been overblown, particularly by Käsemann who viewed it as reflecting early catholicity with its emphasis on works and church tradition/authority.

Allusions to Peter.

The author's use of "Simeon" (lit. as in the earliest MSS) in connection with his name has caused some to doubt that the Apostle Peter was the author. Only other use is in Acts 15:14. However, why would an imitator use this form and not simply parrot what Peter used in 1 Peter? This argument is more of a factor in favor of Petrine authorship.

The writer knows that his death was near (1:14) - not unusual given Peter's advancing age and the persecutions that would have been acute by that time. Cf. Jesus' prediction of Peter's death.

He refers to the Transfiguration Account, which is no surprise. And his account of it is not a mirror image of that found in the Gospels (which you would expect if you were copying the account).

He calls Paul "our dear brother" (3:15).

Peter refers to Paul's writings as "Scripture" and critics have contended that the first c. was too early for any recognition of, or collection of, Paul's letters as part of the canon. It's possible that Peter is simply referring to Paul's 'writings' (γραφας). But this is surely referring to "Scripture" and there's no affirmation that all of Paul's writings were collected, only some of them. Paul thought his letters were inspired (1 Cor. 7:40; 14:37) and authoritative (1 Cor. 2:16; 7:17; 14:34-37; 2 Thess. 3:14). Paul's writings follow in the vein of the prophetic voice of the OT. Since we believe in inspiration, it would be no surprise that the HS would move Peter to affirm this as being true.

The fact that he refers to Paul's writings as 'difficult to understand' (3:16) would seem like a strange insertion by a writer pretending to be Peter.

He refers to "The Fathers" (3:4)

Critics say this was too early to refer to their early leaders in this way. However, that's assuming this refers to Christians of the first c. and not to the Jewish Patriarchs of old. That's the common understanding of the term and there's no reason not to understand it in that way in 3:4.

The Use of Jude.

"It is argued that an apostle would not have made use of a writing by a nonapostolic person, and this writer's use of Jude thus rules out the possibility of Peter's being the author. But there are two assumptions here. The first is that Jude's the source of the of the corresponding passages in 2 Peter. This is not impossible, but not certain, and some have felt that the dependence was the other way (see discussion below in "Relation of 2 Peter to Jude"). The second assumption is that an apostle would not use a nonapostolic writing. But we are in no position to say what writings an apostle would or would not use. There is no reason for holding that Peter would not incorporate any useful words, no matter where he found them." [Carson and Moo]

Some scholars have proposed that Jude wrote both letters, the letter of Jude under his own direction and 2 Peter under Peter's direction.

The False Teaching.

Critics say it was full-blown Gnosticism, which wasn't around until the mid-2nd c. But there's no evidence that this is what Peter was addressing. The false teachings may have had some incipient correlations to Gnosticism, but this would not be a surprise since the Gnostics drew heavily from false doctrines that were around in the first c.

As far as Jude is concerned, Carson and Moo write:

"Most of Jude is included in 2 Peter, no less than nineteen of his twenty-five being represented in the longer writing. It is difficult to hold accordingly that there is no relationship, although exactly what is the relationship is not easy to determine. While the subject matter of Jude is almost all to be found in Peter the wording is rarely identical. Guthrie has done some word counts and observes that the passages containing matter common to the two letters run into 297 words in 2 Peter and into 256 words in Jude but that only 78 were common to the two accounts. Thus if 2 Peter was the borrower, he has changed 70 percent of Jude's words and added some of his own, while if Jude took over a section of 2 Peter, he has changed a somewhat higher percentage and has reduced the length of the excerpt. Guthrie says that of twelve parallel sections, Jude is longer than Peter on five occasions, which means that neither writer is consistently more concise than the other. Whichever writer borrowed from the other, there was no slavish copying; the borrower shaped what he borrowed to make it fit his purpose.

Most writers hold that 2 Peter used Jude, largely on the grounds that it is difficult to imagine that a writer who on this hypothesis had so little to say as Jude would take an extract from the longer writing and do no more than simply add a few words. But such a procedure cannot be

ruled out as impossible. Jude tells us that he wrote in a hurry (v. 3), and it may have suited him to make use of whatever material he happened to have by him." [437-38]

"Second Peter has been called a second-century forgery. Second Peter would be a senseless forgery. It would also be a forgery that was so well done that only Peter himself could have executed it." [Lenski]

Origin of writing.

"There is not much to go by if we are looking for the place of origin of 2 Peter. If it was written by the apostle, it is lively that it came from Rome, or that is where tradition places Peter toward the end of his days. Such a place is favored by the strong stand against false teaching, for Rome early became a bastion of orthodoxy. Defenders of this view also point to the picture given of the writer's relations with Paul (for both men were in Rome under Nero's rule), and they find a hint at the Gospel of Mark in 1:15. We can certainly say that there is nothing in the letter that contradicts such an origin, but Rome is far from having been proven." [Carson and Moo, 438]

Date.

Probably AD 65-69.

The Greek Text.

Not in good shape, according to Moo and Carson. The book did not enjoy as wide of circulation as other N.T. books. It is often a neglected work. The letter has the highest proportion of hapax legomena of any N.T. book. A few of the words are not found anywhere in all of Greek literature.

Adoption into the Canon.

New Testament commentator JND Kelly wrote that, "No N.T. document had a longer or tougher struggle to win acceptance than 2 Peter." [Kelly, commentary on the epistles of Peter and Jude, 224]

Place of Writing.

1 Peter was written from Rome ("Babylon," 5:13). There is no reference within 2 Peter as to where it was written. We can assume Rome, but we don't know for sure.

It has traditionally been held that Peter set up residence in Rome and also died there.

AD 203 - Tertullian wrote: "Since, moreover, you are close upon Italy, you have Rome from which there comes even into our own hands the very authority of the apostles themselves. How happy is its church, on which apostles poured forth all their doctrine along with their blood! Where Peter endures a passion like his Lord's! Where Paul is his crown in a death like John's! [cited in Grudem, 34]

Eusebuis, writing in AD 325

"Peter seems to have preached to the Jews of the Dispersion in Pontus and Galatia and Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia, and at the end he came to Rome and was crucified head downwards, for so he had demanded to suffer." [cited in Grudem, 35]

The Audience (to whom was 1 Peter written?).

They were largely Gentiles. This is assuming that 3:1 refers to 1 Peter, thus the same audience. Cf. my intro. notes to 1 Peter establishing a largely Gentile readership.

The Atmosphere (what were the circumstances of the letter?).

Much like Jude, the emphasis is on contending for the truth, the faith once for all delivered to the saints. It has been about 4 years since Peter wrote his first letter which was to a persecuted and suffering church. While there's no reason to believe their persecution had abated (probably intensified under Nero) there was an addition of false teachers who were infiltrating their ranks attempting to lead them astray.

These false teachers denied the second coming of Christ (3:3-4). They denied the atoning work of Christ; They twisted the Scriptures to their own destruction; they were licentious and immoral; their heresies were destructive. Cf. Jude where the same false teachers are in mind.

A reoccurring theme is living and persevering through the maze of false teaching. Cf. 1:12-13 as the theme.

The Abstract (a survey of what's in 1 Peter).

a slave and an apostle of Jesus Christ (δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)

δούλος (δούλος || Noun: Masculine Nominative Singular).

ἀπόστολος (ἀπόστολος || Noun: Masculine Nominative Singular).

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ || Noun: Masculine Genitive Singular). Genitive of Possession.

to those who have received a faith of the same kind as ours (τοῖς ἰσότημον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν)

λαγχανω 1. *receive, obtain* (by lot, or by divine will; τὶ ἔλαχεν τὸν κληῖρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης Ac 1:17. πίστιν 2 Pt 1:1. 2. *be appointed or chosen by lot* (Hom.+; Pol. 290E ὁ λαχῶν βασιλεύς; 3 486, 9; 762, 12 λαχῶν ἱερεὺς. used in inscra.; Bell. 3, 390) ἔλαχεν τοῦ θυμιαῖσαι *he was chosen by lot to burn incense* Lk 1:9 (on the Bl- §400, 3;

1060; 1 Km 14:47 Σαοὺλ ἔλαχεν τοῦ βασιλεύειν). 3. *cast lots* (7, 23; 4, 63, 3b) περίτινος *for someth.* (Ps.- 21 Hyp. 2 §3.—Bl-D. §229, 2; Rob. 509) J 19:24. [BAG]

"have received" ==> salvation is a gift. The verb means "to gain by divine will" or "to be given by lot." God allotted to them faith. Cf. Acts 11:15-17; Gal. 3:14; Phil. 1:29; Eph. 1:13, 2:8-10.

Faith is not the subjective element of believing, but the objective faith, the body of Christian truth (cf. Jude 3). Evident in "the same kind as ours".

ισότιμος, ον (15, 3, 20; 24[41], 2; 234, 25 [200]; 544, 33 []; 253; 13, 10; Ant. 12, 119) *equal in value*, also simply *of the same kind* (N.A. 10, 1; Herodian 2, 3, 6; 12, 12) ισότιμον ἡμῶν πίστιν *a faith of the same kind as ours* 2 Pt 1:1. [BAG]

May be that Peter has in mind the Jew/Gentile conflict in the church. Cf. Acts 11:4-17; 10:1-48; 15:5-11. God makes no distinction (Eph. 2:11-18, 4:5; Rev. 4-5; Gal. 3:28; cf. 1 Tim. 4:10; 1 John 2:2).

in the righteousness of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ. (ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,)

"John Murray one of the foremost Reformed theologians of the twentieth century, wrote the following about the profound and superlative significance of the atonement:

The Father did not spare his own Son. He spared nothing that the dictates of unrelenting rectitude demanded. And it is the undercurrent of the Son's acquiescence that we hear when he says, "Nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done" (Luke 22:42). But why? It was in order that eternal and invincible love might find the full realization of its urge and purpose in redemption by price and by power. Of Calvary the spirit is eternal love and the basis eternal justice. It is the same love manifested in the mystery of Gethsemane's agony and of Calvary's accursed tree that wraps eternal security around the people of God. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" (Rom. 8:32). "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" (Rom. 8:35). "For I am persuaded that neither death nor life nor angels nor principalities nor things present nor things to come nor powers nor height nor depth nor any other creature will be able to separate us from the love which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:38,39). That is the security which a perfect atonement secures and it is the perfection of the atonement that secures it. {Redemption—Accomplished and Applied [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955], 78)

Without question, God's redemption of sinners unto eternal life through the atoning work of His Son Jesus Christ is, for all those who believe, God's most precious gift." [MacArthur, 17-18]

The problem of ecumenism.

Cf. my sermon notes on the sovereign joy of our salvation from 1 Peter 1:2ff.

The doctrine of imputation as the heart of the Gospel of grace. Cf. modern attacks against.

"In time, tradition was placed on a par with the Bible as the source of theology. Medieval theology also reflected a shift from the spirituality of the fathers to an external sacramentalism. The theology of the Eucharist, for example, developed into the dogma of transubstantiation and the Mass. Medieval Catholic theology also became increasingly Pelagian, thus provoking the protest of the sixteenth-century Reformers." [Gordan Lewis and Bruce Demarest, *Integrative Theology*, 1:49]

Romans 4:4-8; 5:1.

Faith is "Christ's wedding ring; to whomsoever he gives it, he gives himself with it. . . . The act of faith is to apply Christ to the soul; and this the weakest faith can so well as the strongest, if it be true. A child can hold a staff as well, though not so strongly, as a man. The prisoner through a hole sees the sun, though not as perfectly as they in the open air. They that saw the brazen serpent, though a great way off, yet were healed. The poor man's "I believe" saved him; though he was fain to add, " Lord, help my unbelief." [Adams, 10-11]

"Thus we have considered this precious jewel of faith, and how we have obtained it: by no worthiness of our own, but by lot; that is, the free gift and disposition of God, who gives it, or denies it, according to his own good pleasure. If he have given thee this lot of believing, the thanks be to him: if thou draw a blank and dost not obtain it, yet he hath done thee no wrong: who shall command that independent Proprietary to give away his own? . . . Faith is God's gift; no man can obtain it, if he detain it. " [Thomas Adams, 13-14]

"The message is, that there is only one way whereby man can be right, or righteous, in the sight of God; and that is by the righteousness that is given to us in Christ. The problem confronting man is how to be just with God. It is certainly very right to come back to God and to believe in God, but the first question is. How can I do this? God is Holy, God is Absolute, God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.' I am sinful. What can I do? The Old Testament contains a law, and the law said. If you do these things you will be right with God. And the tragedy is that so many people still try to do that. Yes, they say, we must be right with Gd. But how do I become right with God? How can I live that new life? I read the Commandments, I do my best to keep them — I try to get right with God. But by my own efforts and exertions I will never put myself right with God. To believe that I can is an utter antithesis to and a contradiction of the Christian Gospel. What is the Gospel? It is this - 'Like precious s faith with us through le righteousness of God and our Savior Jesus Christ.' The message which the apostles preached round their world was simply this, that Jesus Christ of Nazareth was none other than the only begotten Son of God, and that He had come on earth for one thing only, and that vas that He might bear the sins of man Himself. In Christ God has dealt with the sin of mankind; He has punished sin there. He has done away with it. How can man be right with God? Believe that, submit yourself to it, and say: I have no righteousness of my own; I accept the righteousness that Good gives me in Christ. I am unworthy and sinful, but I can be clothed with the righteousness of Christ; and, clothed with that, I can stand and face God and the righteousness of God. That is the essence of the Christian faith. The Christian church, therefore, has in this modern world to tell men that they cannot save themselves, that all their efforts and exertions will end in utter utility, but that God has done something in Christ; He has made a new way of righteousness — 'the righteousness

of God ... by faith' God tells me that here is the way to get rid of sin and its guilt and power: here is a new nature and a new life and positive righteousness. God is offering a way back to Himself in and through Jesus Christ and Him crucified - that is the nature of the faith." [D.M. Lloyd Jones, 8-9]

"And moreover in that he added, "in the righteousness, which God gives," he excludes all human righteousness. For through faith alone we are justified before God; and therefore faith is called the God-righteousness, for it avails nothing before the world, yea, it is even condemned by the world." [Luther, 232-33]

1:2 EXEGESIS

GREEK TEXT:

χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

χάρις (Χαρις || Noun: Feminine Nominative Singular).

ὑμῖν ὑμῖν (συ = you || Second Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Dative Plural).

καὶ εἰρήνη (εἰρήνη || Noun: Feminine Nominative Singular).

πληθυνθείη (πληθυνω = to increase, be increased || Verb: Third Person Singular Aorist Passive Optative).

ἐν ἐπιγνώσει (ἐπιγνώσις = knowledge || Noun: Feminine Dative Singular).

τοῦ θεοῦ (θεος || Noun: Masculine Genitive Singular).

καὶ Ἰησοῦ (Ἰησοῦ || Noun: Masculine Genitive Singular).

τοῦ κυρίου (κυριος || Noun: Masculine Genitive Singular).

ἡμῶν. (συ = you || Second Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Genitive Plural).

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

Grace and peace be multiplied to you in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord.

CONTEXTUAL, GRAMMATICAL, THEOLOGICAL, APPLICATIONAL ANALYSIS:

Grace and peace be multiplied to you (χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη)

This is present grace that comes from the righteousness of Christ (verse 1). Cf. the flow of Romans 5:1ff.

πληθυνθείη (πληθυνω = to increase, be increased || Verb: Third Person Singular Aorist Passive Optative).

Saving grace isn't increased. Sanctifying grace is.

How is it multiplied? Through knowledge.

in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord. (ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.)

J.A. Robinson contends that this is knowledge directed toward a particular object. That object is Christ. The more you know about Christ the more grace and peace is multiplied to you!

Cf. 3:18.

Barclay writes that this word was used by Plutarch to distinguish a scientific knowledge of music from that of a rank amateur.

(ἐπιγνώσις = knowledge || Noun: Feminine Dative Singular). Theology is important. Full knowledge. Cf. Romans 1:8, 2:20, 3:20, 10:2; Eph. 1:17 John 8:32; 14:6; 17:17; 2 John 2; Col. 1:9-10, 2:2, 3:10; Titus 1:1; Phil. 3:10.

Also note Philippians 3 (sermon notes follow)

I consider all things to be "loss" on account of the surpassing greatness of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord

1 thing to refer to knowledge of X; another to speak of greatness of KOX; Here: Paul uses superlative "ὑπερέχων" => "surpassing greatness" of KOX.

Surpassing what? Everything! Tru knowledge of JC surpasses everything (nothing excluded)! Surpasses all your worldly possessions; all your supposed human rights; all your personal & religious achievements; everything!

Matthew 13:44 "The kingdom of heaven is like a treasure hidden in the field, which a man found and hid; and from joy over it he goes and sells all that he has, and buys that field."

That's a tru knowledge of JC. Like a man who finds something of such a great value that he is willing to give up everything he is and has to gain it.

What's this knowledge? (γινωσις). Is it knowing about X? Is it knowing facts? Intellectualism? Knowledge (γινωσις) = "to know experientially; to know with experience; to know personally; to have a relationship with." So imp. that t/o Script. idea of "knowing X" is used as a syn. for salvation. IOW - those that are regen. children of God are those who "know X."

John 10 (good Shepherd): 14 "I am the good shepherd; and I know My own, and My own know Me, 15 even as the Father knows Me and I know the Father; and I lay down My life for the sheep.

ISW that t/Father knows me and I know Him (personally) my sheep know me and I know them. That's intimacy. That's tru knowledge.

John 17:3 (Jesus' HP prayer) "And this is eternal life, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.

1 John 5:20 - And we know that the Son of God has come, and has given us understanding, in order that we might know Him who is true, and we are in Him who is true, in His Son Jesus Christ. This is t/ true God & eternal life.

We're not here to simply accrue intellectual knowledge about JC. We're to gain an ever-increasing intimate knowledge of JC.

1 thing to know about some1. It's another to know them.

I know about a lot of people I don't know personally. T true believer in JC "knows X" w/an ever-increasing intimate, personal, living knowledge that's willing to sacrifice all for Him. That's why everything else is loss for true bel. in JC. Because He has t/knowledge of X.

Cf. Colossians and gnosis.

How do you increase this sort of knowledge? It isn't merely academic. I have no doubt hell will be populated by scholars whose theology was orthodox.

Note the connection to vv. 3-11 in that regard. Peter's words here introduce his readers to the content of that section. Verses 3-11 answer t/question, "How might grace and peace be multiplied to me in the knowledge of Christ?"

Knowledge includes guarding your heart ==>

"Learn to preserve what thou hast gotten. 'That which ye have already hold fast till I come,' Rev. ii. 25. This was St. Paul's happiness, that having finished his course, yet he had still 'kept the faith,')- 2 Tim. iv.7. The loss of faith is a dangerous shipwreck, 1 Tim. i. 19: if it be possible, save your vessels, save your goods, save your wares, save your bodies; but though you lose all, save your faith, save your souls. Imagine thyself a vessel; the sea this world, thy freight faith. There is a man of war against thee: the bark is diffidence; the soldiers, atheism, heresy, schism, profaneness; the charged cannons and ordnance are pride, lust, hypocrisy, to which drunkenness is the master gunner and gives fire. The arch-pirate is the devil, who so violently assaults us, and boards us with his temptations, that often we are fain to blow up our decks, lose some of our necessary appurtenances; glad, though we leave our case behind us. There be also rocks of persecutions, and gulfs of errors; horrible gulfs in the sea of Rome, dangerous swallows about Amsterdam. When opinion goes before us, it is a great question whether truth will follow us. Look to thy faith. Shipwreck thy faith, and drown thy soul. Cast Judas out of the ship, and take Jesus in. That ship is troubled that harbors a traitor: the ship is safe that hath in it the Savior; now he hath Christ that hath faith." [Adams, 14-15]

Note that last statement. We must be wary of always talking about our faith as if it has life of its own. Sometimes I hear people say things like, "Well, so and so doesn't have faith." "I don't know what I'd do without faith." It's true that without faith it is impossible to please God (Hebrews xx.xx) but faith is the golden chain that leads us to Christ. It is Christ we have! Faith did not die for your sins. Faith did not suffer the wrath of God on your behalf.