BRILL

The Second Peter

Pseudepigraphy as Exemplarity in the Second Canonical Petrine Epistle

Kelsie G. Rodenbiker
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK
kelsie.rodenbiker@glasgow.ac.uk

Abstract

In early Christian literary production, Peter emerges as an early apostolic figure of prominence ripe for a prolific textual afterlife, lending his name to a wide range of literature. These works include 2 Peter, which is widely recognized as a pseudepigraphal writing. Here, the author argues that pseudepigraphy is a form of exemplarity—the constructive and strategic usage of a figure from the past as a model for the present and future. Within this model, 2 Peter is read as a pseudepigraphon styled and traditioned as a second, testamentary epistle of Peter, the leader of the apostles. Second Peter's authoritative status is doubted in the early stages of the canonical process. But the ongoing transmission of the reputation of Peter, attested for example by the manuscript tradition, aids this work's establishment as a Petrine text.

Keywords

1   Introduction[1]

Ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα τῶν ἀρχαίων ὑποδειγμάτων παυσώμεθα,
ἔλθωμεν ἐτὶ τοὺς ἔγγιστα γενομένους ἀθλητάς·
λάβωμεν τῆς γενεᾶς ἡμῶν τὰ γενναῖα ὑποδείγματα.
            1 CLEMENT 5:1[2]

In the first letter attributed to Clement of Rome, addressed to the Corinthians, the author provides a short, descriptive catalogue of scriptural figures who suffered because of jealousy, from the entry of death into the world through Cain's murder of his brother, Abel, to the role of jealousy in David's persecution by Saul, the king of Israel (1 Clem 3:4–4:13). The author continues: "to stop giving ancient examples, let us come to those who became athletic contenders in quite recent times. We should consider the noble examples of our own generation." They, too, the author argues, suffered as a result of the jealousy and envy of others, even to death. These noble examples are "the good apostles," exemplified by Peter and Paul. Peter is said to have "bore up under hardships not just once or twice, but many times; and having thus borne his witness he went to the place of glory that he deserved" (1 Clem 5:1–4), while Paul, having "taught righteousness to the whole world," serves as "the greatest example (ὑπογραμμός) of endurance (ὑπομονή)" (1 Clem 5:5–7).[3] Both exempla from the Jewish scriptural past and the Christian scriptural present are offered by the author of 1 Clement as worthy of emulation (cf. 1 Clem 7:5–12:8; 17:1–18:17).[4]

---

2   *The Apostolic Fathers, Volume 1: 1 Clement, 2 Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache* (ed. and trans. Bart Ehrman; LCL 24; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

3   The vocabulary of exemplarity includes δεῖγμα and ὑπόδειγμα (cf. 2 Macc 6:28, 31; Sir 44:16; Ezek 42:15 LXX; Jas 5:10; 2 Pet 2:6; Jud 7; 1 Clem 6:1–4, 5:1); ὑπογραμμόν (2 Macc 2:28; 1 Pet 2:21–25; 1 Clem 16:17) and on exemplarity in 1 Peter as following Jesus' example, see Katie Marcar, "Following in the Footsteps: Exemplarity, Ethnicity and Ethics in 1 Peter," *NTS* 68 (2022) 253–273.

4   The substantial use of exempla appears in a diversity of Jewish and early Christian texts (cf. Sir 44–49; 1 Macc 2:52–61; 4 Macc 16:20–22; Heb 11; 1 Pet 2:21–25, 3:6, 19–21; Jas 2:21–25, 5:7–18; 2 Pet 2:4–16; John 3:12, 4:1; Jude 5–16). In his *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus makes

It appears that the suggestion to follow the apostles was taken rather literally in Christian antiquity and beyond. Extending from their moral example of ethical living even into their practice of writing and disseminating literature associated with the apostolic figures of the early church, the reuse of exemplars from both the Jewish and Christian scriptural past(s) is manifested not only in catalogues or ethical illustrations, but also in the composition of new works. I argue here that pseudepigraphy is a form of exemplarity—the constructive and strategic usage of a figure from the past as a model for the present and future—and that 2 Peter is a pseudepigraphon styled and traditioned as the second, testamentary epistle of Peter, the leader of the apostles. I aim not to answer the question of *whether* 2 Peter is a pseudepigraphon, but more so how its perceived pseudepigraphy was accounted for in its textual and traditional afterlife by an accumulation of Petrine tradition that aids this small letter in its passage into the NT collection. I first explain the connection between exemplarity and pseudepigraphy, then I describe a variety of early traditions that contribute to the Petrine authorial image. Then, the testamentary nature of 2 Peter and the material links to Petrine tradition in the manuscript tradition are described. I conclude that 2 Peter's text and transmission history are reflective of Petrine exemplarity, the use of Peter as a significant figure from the past. Considering pseudepigraphy as a mode of exemplarity highlights the accumulation of tradition around a Petrine centre of gravity.

---

substantive use of scriptural exempla as the protagonists of his narrative historiography, chronicling the history of the Jewish people for the Greek language. Philo, too, makes extensive use of scriptural figures as allegorical or typological examples of virtue, vice, or historical events, often in service of *paideia*, the process of educating and enculturating students into a life of moral practice (cf. *De Abr.*; *Mos.*; *Ios.*; *Det.*; *Congr.* 23–33; *Virt.*) Many of these works also include information in addition or alternative to the now-canonical accounts of these scriptural figures. See also Hindy Najman, "Cain and Abel as Character Traits: A Study in the Allegorical Typology of Philo of Alexandria," in *Past Renewals: Interpretive Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity* (JSJSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 207–218; ead., "Text and Figure in Ancient Jewish Paideia," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 253–265; Annette Yoshiko Reed, "The Construction and Subversion of Patriarchal Perfection: Abraham and Exemplarity in Philo, Josephus, and the *Testament of Abraham*," *JSJ* 40 (2009) 185–212; Dorothy Sly, *Philo's Percepton of Women* (Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2020) and ead., "1 Peter 3:6b in the Light of Philo and Josephus," *JBL* 110.1 (1991) 126–129; Lester L. Grabbe, *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation: The Hebrew Names in Philo* (Brown Judaic Studies 115; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

2 Exemplarity and Pseudepigraphy

Pseudepigraphy is commonly construed as a deceptive literary practice, employed by those who would manipulate unsuspecting readers into false belief, and often considered inherently at odds with canonicity.[5] Noting that 2 Peter opposes ψευδοπροφῆται and ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι but is itself a ψευδεπίγραφον, "written by someone who deceives his readers about his own authoritative credentials," Ehrman writes that, "rarely in early Christian texts do we find irony so exquisite."[6] Recently, however, there have appeared a number of contributions to the critical movement toward viewing pseudepigraphy as a complex and creative literary practice.[7] To put it most succinctly, as Hindy Najman and Irene Peirano Garrison argue, "pseudepigraphy should not be understood primarily as forgery but rather as a reading practice which is fundamentally

---

5   For definitions of pseudepigraphy and pseudonymity and a history of scholarship, see Irene Peirano Garrison, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). David Brakke's review of Bart D. Ehrman's *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), "Early Christian Lies and the Lying Liars Who Wrote Them: Bart Ehrman's *Forgery and Counterforgery*," *The Journal of Religion* 96.3 (2016) 378–390, also provides a summary and evaluation of current research on pseudepigrahy. And on pseudepigraphy in contrast to canonicity see Kent D. Clarke, "The Problem of Pseudonymity in Biblical Literature and Its Implications for Canon Formation," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. Lee M. Mcdonald and James A. Sanders; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002) 440–468; Bruce M. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," *JBL* 91.1 (1972) 3–24; Armin D. Baum, "Literarische Echtheit als Kanonkriterium in der alten Kirche," *ZNW* 88.1–2 (2009) 97–110. Ehrman sees pseudepigraphy not only as deceptive, but also as an inherently polemical phenomenon (*Forgery and Counterforgery*, esp. 1–145, 222–229, 239–263).

6   Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 225, and cf. Jörg Frey, "Autorfiktion und Gegnerbild im Judasbrief und im Zweiten Petrusbrief," in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen* (ed. Jörg Frey et al.; WUNT 246; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009) 707.

7   See especially Hindy Najman and Irene Peirano Garrison, "Pseudepigraphy as an Interpretive Construct," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Fifty Years of the Pseudepigrapha Section at the SBL* (ed. M. Henze and L.I. Lied; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019) 331–355; Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2010) esp. 1–16; ead., "Traditionary Processes and Textual Unity in *4Ezra*," in *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, Proceedings from the Sixth Enoch Seminar* (ed. G. Boccaccini and M. Henze; Leiden: Brill, 2013) 99–117; Irene Peirano Garrison, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake*, 1–35; Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen* (ed. Jörg Frey et al., WUNT 246; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), esp. Harry Y. Gamble, "Pseudonymity and the New Testament Canon," 333–362 and David E. Aune, "Reconceptualizing the Phenomenon of Ancient Pseudepigraphy: An Epilogue," 789–824; Patricia Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

interpretive," that is, pseudepigraphy is an intentional extension and genera-
tion of tradition, and it is related to exemplarity in the use of key figures from
the past.[8] The varied use to which exemplary figures can be put is necessar-
ily both stable and flexible: key characteristics of a figure's teaching, ethos,
or even a particularly gruesome martyrdom provide a centre around which
flexible characterization—e.g. constructed discourse, interaction with previ-
ous texts and scriptures, the specifics of interpersonal relationships and com-
munication—can orbit. In addition to an exemplary legacy of ethical living,
figures from the past also present exemplary models for literary production,
notably through the practice of pseudepigraphy.

The notion and analysis of exemplarity is relatively widespread in the
studies of ancient Judaism and Greek and Roman history and rhetoric, but
exemplarity discourses are not isolated streams of the traditional use of
exempla. Plutarch was among the ancient Greek writers making substan-
tial use of *exempla*,[9] while Latin use includes works by Livy, Seneca, Cicero,
Tacitus, Valerius, and Pliny the Younger.[10] The use of exemplarity by Philo
and Josephus has received particular attention as indicative of the overlap
between Judaism and Hellenism.[11] Hindy Najman notes that Philo considers
his method of allegorical interpretation, which often involved the use of scrip-
tural figures, to be a function of Jewish heritage, though it also exhibits similar-
ities to contemporary Greek and Roman interpreters.[12] Annette Yoshiko Reed
adds that "the discourse of exemplarity itself exemplifies the complex cultural
dynamics of Hellenization—a shared discourse in the eastern Mediterranean
world, wherein elements of Greek culture were creatively appropriated for

---

8   Najman and Peirano, "Pseudepigraphy as an Interpretive Construct," 331.
9   Rebecca Langlands, "Plutarch and Roman Exemplary Ethics: Cultural Interactions," in
     Literature and Culture in the Roman Empire, 96–235: Cross-Cultural Interactions (ed. Alice
     König, Rebecca Langlands, and James Uden; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
     2020) 75–94.
10   See Jane D. Chaplin, *Livy's Exemplary History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000);
     Alex Dressler, "'You Must Change Your Life': Theory and Practice, Metaphor and Exem-
     plum, in Seneca's Prose," *Helios* 39.2 (2012) 145–192; William Turpin, "Tacitus, Stoic *Exem-
     pla*, and the *praecipum munus annalium*," *Classical Antiquities* 27.2 (2008) 359–404;
     Teresa Morgan, *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge Uni-
     versity Press, 2007) 122–159; Rebecca Langlands, "Roman *Exempla* and Situation Ethics:
     Valerius Maximus and Cicero *de Officiis*," *JRS* 101 (2011) 100–22.
11   Hindy Najman, "Text and Figure in Ancient Jewish Paideia," in *Authoritative Scriptures
     in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Mladen Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 253–265, esp. 257;
     Reed, "The Construction and Subversion of Patriarchal Perfection," 185–212.
12   Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 134.

the articulation of new expressions of local pride, ethnic specificity, and cultural resistance."[13] The direction of influence that led to the widespread use of *exempla* in Jewish, Greek, and Roman literature is not straightforwardly genealogical or singular; there is rather an interplay between these literary traditions that attests to the diverse creativity of the ancient Mediterranean world.

Exemplarity is a mode of cumulative and generative tradition—it draws on the past for the sake of the future—and the malleability of tradition is key to exemplarity as a rhetorical strategy. While this is demonstrably the case for the use of *exempla* from the scriptural past as ethical models for emulation, it can also be true of *exempla* serving as "authors." Some figures, including Peter, are exemplary in both modes: an ethical figure characterized *by* a text (as in 1 Clement) and a narrative or authorial sage, "who embodies the particular text's values and outlook" and who can "help the reader become an embodiment of such understanding," as we find in 2 Peter, where "Peter" is keen to provide a last teaching prior to his martyrdom.[14] In addition to the tension between stability and malleability, pseudepigraphy as exemplarity involves time-bending and composite construction in the development and perpetuation of tradition. As Najman and Peirano Garrison additionally show, the idealized pseudonym is a strategic construct who adds to the composite tradition that already orbits that figure, and

> the claim to having been written by a prior figure, who is then extended and transformed through the application and extension of that past, is about recovering the past, but also and at the same time it is about re-invigorating a new present. This is then catapulted into a new figure which is a revised and transformed interpretive extension of that past.[15]

Najman also argues, regarding the production of "discourse tied to a founder" that, taking the Ezra figure of Esdras as an example,

---

13   Reed, "The Construction and Subversion of Patriarchal Perfection," 185–212, 195.

14   Hindy Najman and Tobias Reinhardt, "Exemplarity and Its Discontents: Hellenistic Jewish Wisdom Texts and Greco-Roman Didactic Poetry," *JSJ* 50.4–5 (2019) 460–496, 472. And see Hindy Najman, "The Vitality of Scripture Within and Beyond the Canon," *JSJ* 43 (2012) 497–518; ead., "Traditionary Processes," 99–117; ead. (with I. Manoff and E. Mroczek), "How to Make Sense of Pseudonymous Attribution: The Cases of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*," in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012) 308–336.

15   Najman and Peirano, "Pseudepigraphy as an Interpretive Construct," 351.

> It should be clear that it does not make sense to speak of a discourse tied
> to a stable and unchanging figure of Ezra. Rather, we should speak of
> a complex of voices, traditions, and protagonists which make up a new
> "Ezra," who is at once *all of these figures and none of them in particular*,
> including the Ezra of the past.[16]

The transformation of the past into a future informed by tradition is essential
to the power of exemplarity and this also plays into the composite nature of
tradition. Eva Mroczek writes regarding the practice of pseudonymous attri-
bution that, "rather than texts in search of authors, we sometimes have some-
thing like the opposite—characters in search of stories. That is, linking texts
and figures was sometimes less about filling a bibliographic gap than about
expanding lore about a popular cultural figure."[17] In the Jewish literary imag-
ination, she explains, authorship is not necessarily a literal, singular under-
taking, but more of an indefinite, intentionally flexible means of attribution
and traditional association. Literary practices that link anonymous texts
with traditional figures such as David, or paratextual elements that uniquely
develop authorship beyond the content of the main text can be understood
as "effusions of historical, ethical, and aesthetic interest in a compelling
character—as biography, not bibliography."[18] Many Jewish Pseudepigrapha
are well known, variously attributed to Adam, Enoch, Moses, David, Solomon,
Baruch, Elijah, and others from across the span of scriptural genres, while
other works develop particular narratives, such as how Jubilees or the Genesis
Apocryphon provide expansions of creation, the Fall, and its aftermath, espe-
cially focusing on the characters and commonly including pseudepigraphal
elements through first-person speech. The Genesis Apocryphon, for example,
is presented as first-person narrative from the perspectives of Lamech, Noah,
and Abram, whose speech is emphasized through the repetition of their self-
identification: "I, Lamech," "I, Noah," and "I, Abram."[19]

---

16   Najman, "Traditionary Processes," 115.

17   Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 16.

18   Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 51, and the second chapter, "The Sweetest Voice: The
      Poetics of Attribution," 51–85.

19   For the text, see Daniel Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and
      Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17* (Leiden: Brill,
      2009) 31–84. And see Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the
      Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (LSTS 63; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2007);
      Molly M. Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and
      Transmission* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

Just as the more distant past can be utilized for these purposes, a more recent past and even present might also be transformed and extended into the future. Gamble thus notes that,

> [b]ecause the early church regarded the apostolic past as both the source and the norm of authoritative teaching, pseudonymous apostolic authorship was a ready means for the extension of apostolic authority into the post-apostolic period, and for the interpretive contemporization and application (*Vergegenwärtigung*) of teachings that had, or were believed to have, apostolic sanction.[20]

Pseudepigraphy directly enables the strategic extension of scriptural and apostolic tradition. In the wake of the deaths of many of the disciples and original apostles, a similar and intertwined phenomenon is expressed in the textual expansion of apostolic lore, as the end of the apostolic age is creatively extended through imaginative and rhetorically strategic literary practices like pseudepigraphy, hagiography, *onomastica*, *chreia*, and *ethopoeia*.[21] These are related literary phenomena that find their roots in the imitation and extension of an exemplary figure. The inclusion of pseudepigraphy among this list contextualizes it as a complex, deliberate, and interpretive literary practice—rather than as inherently deceptive forgery. Pseudepigraphy is a rhetorically-significant way of attaching an authorial voice to the past.

3   Peter(s) in Early Christian Literature

The topic of exemplarity is much less explored in the context of the New Testament and early Christianity, particularly in the sense that this literary-rhetorical phenomenon is an inheritance from both Judaism and the

---

20   Gamble, "Pseudonymity," 360. And see Tobias Nicklas on the development not only of texts and stories surrounding the apostles, but also relics, spaces, and rituals: "Retelling Origins: Stories of the Apostolic Past in Late Antiquity," in *The Apostles Peter, Paul, John, Thomas and Philip with Their Companions in Late Antiquity* (ed. Tobias Nicklas, Janet E. Spittler, and Jan N. Bremmer; Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha 17; Leuven: Peeters, 2021) 1–20.

21   On a variety of practices extending and imitating earlier important figures, see Morgan, *Popular Morality*; Michael Motia, "Three Ways to Imitate Paul in Late Antiquity: Ekstasis, Ekphrasis, Epektasis," *HTR* 114.1 (2021) 96–117; Ellen Muelhberger, "Affecting Rhetoric: The Adoption of *Ethopoeia* in Evagrius of Pontus' Ascetic Program," in *Monastic Education in Late Antiquity* (ed. Lillian I. Larsen and Samuel Rubenson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018) 182–194; Kelsie G. Rodenbiker, "Marking Scriptural Figures as Sacred Names," *Religions* 13.7: 577 (2022) 1–12.

Greco and Roman literary milieux.[22] To the interplay between Judaism and Hellenism as a site of literary overlap can be added a further appropriative layer: *exempla* from the Jewish scriptural past, many of whom were reimagined in second temple Jewish literature as examples of Hellenistic virtue or vice, are again reimagined for a Christian present and future. Likewise, the second temple enthusiasm for nostalgia is manifested in the contemporary and later literary practice of pseudepigraphy, in which early exemplary figures serve as mouthpieces for the perpetuation of Christian teaching. Key to the "Petrine discourse" of the early centuries of Christianity is the adaptability of the Petrine image(s).[23]

The New Testament characterizations of Peter are varied. The apostle Peter is a central character in the now-canonical gospels and Acts, present alongside James in Acts 15 for the council at Jerusalem, where he is the first to address the council of apostles and elders (Acts 15:6–11). His role there leads Paul to mention their conflict—how Paul opposed Peter (here Cephas) "to his face" (cf. Gal 2:1–21). Peter is also a figure both positively associated with Jesus and in need of rehabilitation. In Matthew's gospel, Jesus calls Peter "the rock" upon whom the church will be built and gives him "the keys to the kingdom of heaven" after Peter's declaration of Jesus' identity as the Messiah (Matt 16:13–20), and he is positively depicted elsewhere, too (cf. Matt 16:18–19;

---

22   But see Katie Marcar, "Following in the Footsteps," 73, where she focuses on the ethnic expression of exemplarity; and Kelsie G. Rodenbiker, "Pseudonymity, Exemplarity, and the Dating of James," in *Die Datierung neutestamentlicher Pseudepigraphen: Herausforderungen und neuere Lösungsansätze* (ed. Wolfgang Grünstäudl and Matthias Schmidt; WUNT 470; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021) 219–243. Here, I argue that exemplarity is not necessarily explicitly ethnic, at least in its deployment in the letter of James. On NT apocrypha and their history of reception, see Annette Yoshiko Reed, "The Afterlives of New Testament Apocrypha," *JBL* 134.2 (2015) 401–425.

23   On "Petrine discourse" borrowing the term from Najman, see Jörg Frey, "Second Peter in New Perspective," in *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter: Toward a New Perspective* (ed. Jörg Frey, Matthijs den Dulk, and Jan van der Watt; BIS 174; Leiden: Brill, 2019) 22–23. Schmidt's identification of the Petrine epistles as *prosopopoiia* is also relevant, Matthias Schmidt, "Die Stimme des Apostels erheben: Pragmatische Leistungen der Autorfiktion in den Petrusbriefen," with David E. Aune's summary, "Reconceptualizing the Phenomenon of Ancient Pseudepigraphy," in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen* (ed. Jörg Frey et al.; WUNT 246; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009) 625–644 and 816–817 respectively. Schmidt argues that the Petrine epistles are narrative fictions from distinct authors similar to other rhetorical collections. For other explorations of the Peter image, see John-Christian Eurell, *Peter's Legacy in Early Christianity* (WUNT 2/561; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012) esp. 262–263; *Peter in Early Christianity* (ed. Helen K. Bond and Larry W. Hurtado; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015); and Fred Lapham, *Peter: The Man, the Myth, the Writings: A Study of Early Petrine Text and Tradition* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2004).

Luke 22:32; John 21:15–17; Gal 2:9).[24] Yet, three of the canonical gospels highlight Peter's denial and reinstatement by Jesus after the resurrection (cf. Matt 26:31–35, 69–75; Luke 22:31–34, 54–62; John 18:15–18, 25–27; 21:15–19).

Also participating in the stream of tradition associated with Peter are ecclesiastical writings that transmit varied images of the apostle. Part of Peter's association with Jesus tradition, for example, stems from the tradition that Mark's gospel is written according to Peter's teaching. Eusebius details it as follows:

> But a great light of religion shone on the minds of the hearers of Peter, so that they were not satisfied with a single hearing or with the unwritten teaching of the divine proclamation, but with every kind of exhortation besought Mark, whose Gospel is extant, seeing that he was Peter's follower, to leave them a written statement of the teaching given them verbally …[25]

Eusebius further refers to Clement's *Hypotyposes* regarding Mark's authorship of a gospel written based on Peter's teaching. Clement is said to be in agreement with Papias in affirming the relationship between Peter and Mark, and Peter's "revelation of the Spirit" that Mark's gospel had been written (quoting 1 Pet 5:13, in which Peter refers to Mark as "my son"; *Hist. eccl.* 2.15.2; 3.39.15 [Papias]; 6.25.5 [Origen]). An alternative Clementine version is also told, in which Peter's attitude to Mark's writing is neutral (*Hist. eccl.* 6.14.6–7).[26] Jerome, too, refers to the Gospel of Mark as a Petrine composition: since Mark "was his disciple and interpreter," and Jerome reinforces that it is "this Mark" who Peter mentions in his first epistle, who was Peter's disciple and interpreter (*De vir.* 1, 8). In this way, Mark's gospel is ascribed to Peter.

Jerome also mentions Peter's conflict with Simon Magus during the reign of Claudius and his martyrdom through upside-down crucifixion during the reign of Nero (*De vir.* 1). In Eusebius's telling, Simon Magus is cast as the proto-heretic, and Peter's victory is a seminal win for orthodoxy. Where Eusebius describes Simon as "the first author of all heresy" and a "great

---

24 And see Markus Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter in Ancient Reception and Modern Debate* (WUNT 262; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010) 6–7. Bockmuehl's focus is on memory and the historical Peter, while acknowledging the probable lack of "authentic" Petrine literature (see 3–29).

25 Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.15.1 (trans. Lake, LCL 153).

26 Beside this reference to Mark, Ehrman finds nothing other than the prescript and the veiled reference to Rome ("Babylon") at the end of 1 Peter to tie it directly to the apostle, versus 2 Peter, "which goes out of its way to claim Petrine origins," Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 249–250.

antagonist for the great and inspired apostles of our Saviour," Peter stands in as an archetype for the defense of righteousness (*Hist. eccl.* 2.13.5–14.1). Eusebius details how the "Providence of the universe"

> guided to Rome, as against a gigantic pest on life, the great and mighty Peter, who for his virtues was the leader of all the other Apostles. Like a noble captain of God, clad in divine armor, he brought the costly merchandise of the spiritual light from the east to the dwellers in the west, preaching the Gospel of the light itself and the word which saves souls, the proclamation of the Kingdom of Heaven.[27]

Despite his high view of Peter, Eusebius recognizes among the plethora of texts claiming Petrine authorship "only one as genuine (γνήσιος) and admitted by the presbyters of old": 1 Peter—though he is aware of a second considered "useful to many" (*Hist. eccl.* 3.3.1–4). Origen likewise writes that "Peter, on whom the Church of Christ is built, against whom the gates of Hades shall not prevail, has left one acknowledged epistle, and, it may be, a second also, for it is doubted" (*Hist. eccl.* 6.25.8). And, according to Jerome, 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" (*De vir.* 1). Still, a prolific tradition of Petrine textual production and reception persists.

As for what Bockmuehl has called "a bewildering range of apocryphal sources" related to Peter, these span a remarkable range of genre and form.[28] Such texts include the Gospel of Peter (CANT 13), the Acts of Peter (CANT 190), the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles (CANT 207), two apocalypses: one in Greek (better preserved in Ethiopic; CANT 317) and one in Coptic (CANT 324), the Preaching of Peter (CANT 208), the Letter of Peter to James (part of the Clementina; CANT 209.1–7), and the Letter of Peter to Philip (CANT 26). Some of these texts were discussed by ecclesiastical writers in the context of their possible or likely pseudepigraphy. It is the Gospel of Peter that Bishop Serapion, in the late second century, recalls from a community in Rhossus after he reads the text and realizes the heretical nature of its supposed pseudepigraphal

---

27   Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.14.6 (trans. Lake, LCL 153; cf. Acts 8:9–25). Irenaeus, referring to Peter's confrontation with Simon the Sorcerer in Acts 8, names Simon Magus as the origin of numerous heresies (*Adv. haer.* 1.23.1–2). The 4th-century *Apostolic Constitutions* lists Simon's heretical successors and provides an account of the Peter-Simon conflict in Peter's own words (*Apost. const.* 6.7–10); cf. Alberto Ferreiro, *Simon Magus in Patristic, Medieval, and Early Modern Traditions* (Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 125; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 43–45.

28   Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, 4.

interpolations.[29] Neither the Gospel of Peter nor the Akhmim fragment of the Apocalypse of Peter offer much in the way of a characterization of Peter, who is hardly named (cf. Gosp. Pet. 60).[30] The Ethiopic version of the Apocalypse, though, preserves a declaration to Peter to "go into a city ruling over west, and drink the cup which I have promised you," likely in reference to Peter's martyrdom in Rome (Eth. Apoc. Pet. 14:4).[31] The Acts of Peter, a possible late-second-century writing detailing Peter's ministry and martyrdom, also emphasizes Peter's ties to Rome, and the conflict between Peter and Simon Magus runs throughout the majority of the narrative (Acts Pet. 4–32). In the final defeat, when Simon attempts to fly in order to prove his divine power, Peter prays that Simon would fall and break his legs but not be killed; a chastened and miserable Simon later kills himself (Acts Pet. 32).[32] The Acts also narrates Peter's later martyrdom: crucifixion upside down (Acts Pet. 37–39).[33] The Preaching of Peter, a portion of a collection of broadly Petrine material association with Clement of Rome commonly called the Pseudo-Clementines or Clementina, narrates Peter's conflict with Simon Magus, who is also said to stand in as a Pauline figure, adding a layer of Peter-Paul conflict.[34] Many of these features found variously throughout Petrine literature—the conflict with Simon Magus, his early church leadership, his upside-down crucifixion, authorship of at least one Petrine catholic epistle, and even a number of

29   Eusebius cuts off the account before Serapion's list of these interpolations, see *Hist. eccl.* 6.12.3–6. See also Watson, *Gospel Writing*, 447.

30   See J.K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 151–152.

31   From the Rainer Fragment of Eth. Apoc. Pet. in D.D. Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened: A Study of the Greek (Ethiopic) Apocalypse of Peter* (SBL Dissertation Series 197; Atlanta: SBL, 1988) 228. The Ethiopic and Greek fragments are typically considered together. See also *The Apocryphal New Testament* (ed. J.K. Elliott; Oxford: Oxford University Press 2005) 595–597, 609, n. 40. The plurality of Petrine literature already available to the writer of 2 Peter in the second century could also explain the lack of effort to adopt the Peter image from 1 Peter, see Jörg Frey, *The Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter* (trans. Kathleen Ess; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018) 206.

32   Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 400–426.

33   Wilhelm Schneemelcher, "The Acts of Peter," in *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2: *Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects* (ed. id.; trans. R.M. Wilson; Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 1992) 271–321.

34   Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Retelling Biblical Retellings: Epiphanius, the Pseudo-Clementines, and the Reception History of the Book of Jubilees," in *Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation, from Second Temple Literature through Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity* (ed. Menahem Kister, Hillel Newman, Michael Segal, and Ruth Clements; STDJ 113; Leiden: Brill, 2015) 304–321; Nicole Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines: Situating the 'Recognitions' in Fourth Century Syria* (WUNT 2/213; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

apocryphal writings attributed to him—were also compiled by Jerome in his description of Peter (*De vir.* 1). Ecclesiastical writings and a plethora of Petrine literature narrate Peter's reputation as a central teacher, preacher, and apostle *par excellence.*

For the post-apostolic era, the NT world becomes the scriptural past, just as the prophets, Enoch, Moses, Abraham, and many other figures from the Jewish scriptural past were put to use as authorial voices for texts that re-used and extended narrative-historical realms and teachings.[35] So, too, NT figures such as Peter made ideal figures to accomplish a similar goal for the apostolic age and the perpetuation of its teaching, particularly as chronological distance from the historical past expanded and their characterizations became increasingly distilled. Christian rewritings and new compositions in the names of, for example, Job, Abraham, or other patriarchs, as well as Paul, Peter, James, and John inhabit a shared space within the ancient (and continuing) literary phenomenon of pseudepigraphy, which included not only new works written in the names of exemplars from the Jewish scriptural past, but also works associated with figures from the more recent Christian scriptural past.[36] Chief among these figures is Peter, who becomes a prolific authorial icon. Peter's subtle, behind-the-scenes role in the gospels and even the NT more broadly provides an early apostolic figure of prominence ripe for a prolific textual afterlife.[37]

4   The Petrine Author and the "Testament of Peter"

The proliferation of Petrine tradition in the NT and beyond presents substantial material reimagining and extending the Petrine authorial image. Just as Jewish Pseudepigrapha are not necessarily derivative or secondary to the texts of the Hebrew Bible, so also the NT is not the *origin* but rather another link in

---

35 For nods toward the time-bending nature of pseudepigraphy, see especially Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Pseudepigraphy, Authorship, and the Reception of the Bible in Late Antiquity," in *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11–13 October 2006* (ed. Lorenzo DiTomaso and Lucian Turcescu; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 467–490, esp. 485–90; Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 1–69 and ead., "Traditionary Processes" esp. 107–112.

36 Reed, "Pseudepigraphy," 486 and 488.

37 See Markus Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, 3, 6, and see 3–29. Reed refers to the pseudepigraphal author as "tradent and guarantor" earlier, writing on the reception of "the Bible" in Late Antiquity in "Pseudepigraphy," 477. And Frey suggests that Peter may have been "particularly useful for negotiating various ideas because the historical Peter had not left any written texts," "Second Peter in New Perspective," 22.

the chain of Petrine material. In the prolific tradition of Petrine discourse,[38] there are a few cornerstones of the Petrine image that commonly feature as elements of Peter's characterization. These include his status as a leader among the apostles, his role as a teacher and an opponent of heresy (principally Simon Magus, the proto-heretic), his martyrdom through upside-down crucifixion in Rome, and his link to early Christian texts. Like earlier Jewish and Christian testamentary literature, 2 Peter makes use of an exemplary figure as a mouthpiece for continued teaching in their name. Furthermore, this teaching is to be understood as definitive of Peter's legacy—his last opportunity for teaching prior to his death.[39]

A self-conscious sequel, 2 Peter is presented as "the second letter I have sent you" (2 Pet 3:1). First and Second Peter are both presented as letters containing the learned teachings of a trusted elder to communities among whom he had some influence, 1 Peter from "Peter" and 2 Peter from "Simon Peter" (cf. Matt 4:18; Acts 15:14). Though the author of 2 Peter refers to an earlier letter, presumably 1 Peter (2 Pet 3:1), the author portraits of 1 and 2 Peter differ significantly. Frey contrasts them this way: "Whereas the Peter of 1 Pet is primarily a witness to the suffering of Christ and a participant in the suffering of the community (1 Pet 5:1), the Peter of 2 Pet is decidedly a witness to the glory or revelation of Christ (2 Pet 1:16–18)."[40] Doering is also interested in the constructed character of Peter in 1 Peter, arguing that a Gentile-friendly portrait of Peter emerges, who is an apostle and head elder in solidarity with those who are suffering.[41] While the first "Peter" claims to have been witness to Jesus' suffering (1 Pet 5:1), the second "Peter" claims in contrast to have been among the "eyewitnesses of [Jesus'] majesty" at the transfiguration, "when we were with him on the holy mountain" (2 Pet 1:16–18). This difference is substantial: the first Peter is a suffering elder apostle in solidarity with his readership; the

---

38   See Najman, *Seconding Sinai*; Frey, *Jude and Second Peter*, 206–208.

39   It is not uncommon to identify 2 Peter as testamentary literature, e.g. Sandra Hübenthal, *Gedächtnistheorie und Neues Testament: Eine methodisch-hermeneutische Einführung* (Tübingen: UTB, 2022) 235–242, 246–247; Frey, *Jude and Second Peter*, 210. Hübenthal likens 2 Peter to a "historical family photograph" that simultaneously exhibits its falsified age and establishes ties to previous tradition.

40   Frey, *Jude and Second Peter*, 193–194.

41   Lutz Doering, "Apostle, Co-Elder, and Witness of Suffering: Author Construction and Peter Image in First Peter," in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in früchristlichen Briefen* (ed. Jörg Frey et al.; WUNT 246; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009) 645–681, here 681; and id., "First Peter as Early Christian Diaspora Letter," in *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition: A New Perspective on James to Jude* (ed. Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr and Robert W. Wall; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009) 215–236.

second Peter is constructed, in more grandiose terms, as presenting authoritative testamentary teaching.[42] By virtue of claiming to be "the second Peter," 2 Peter draws on the first Peter, extending the Petrine past into a Petrine future. Works attributed to Peter, ecclesiastical tradition, and paratextual features added to Petrine literature throughout its transmission all provide various perspectives on these aspects of Peter's reputation. Given 2 Peter's alterations of Jude and awareness that at least some Pauline works were considered among the "scriptures" by the time of 2 Peter's writing, the "second" Peter also demonstrates an awareness not only of textual tradition but also of reception issues in the development of a collection of Christian scriptural writings.[43]

Second Peter is accompanied by reception issues of its own. Even if pseudepigraphy can be re-contextualized as an interpretive and imaginative ancient literary practice, there remains an ancient and modern concern over authenticity which is demonstrated with particular verve regarding 2 Peter, which has commonly been considered the most obviously pseudepigraphal text in the NT.[44] Its differing style from 1 Peter and superior linguistic quality, lack of attestation in early Christian writings, rejection by later Christian writers, and likely late (mid-second-century or later) date based on possible sources including the Apocalypse of Peter, arguably preclude 2 Peter from

---

42 Against the notion of a "Petrine school" that produced 2 Peter as an "authentic" Petrine work, see Frey, "Second Peter in New Perspective," 14–15; Matthew Novenson, "Why Are There Some Petrine Epistles Rather Than None?," in *Peter in Early Christianity* (ed. Helen K. Bond and Larry W. Hurtado; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015) 146–157, here 153; David G. Horrell, "The Product of a Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter," *JSNT* 86 (2002) 29–60.

43 For example with regard to the Petrine Apocalypse: Frey, *Jude and Second Peter*, 206; on the ApocPet see Wolfgang Grünstäudl, *Petrus Alexandrinus: Studien zum historischen und theologischen Ort des Zweiten Petrusbriefes* (WUNT 2/353; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013) 97–144: Grünstäudl counters Bauckham's argument that ApocPet relies on 2 Peter, arguing instead that 2 Pet 1:16–18 represents a synthesis of Matt and the Ethiopic ApocPet, particularly the references to the "holy mountain" and "glory and honor" received from God, which are found in the Ascension narrative in ApocPet (pp. 121–123); Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter* (2nd ed.; WBC 50; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2010) 205–212; Frey, *Jude and Second Peter*, 196–199, 203–206; and see the contributions in Frey et al., eds., *2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter*.

44 "No document included in the NT gives such thorough evidence of its pseudonymity as does 2 Peter," David G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition* (WUNT 39; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986) 179. And see Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter*, 158–162; Frey, *Jude and the Second Peter*, 217–220.

consideration as an "authentic" Petrine letter.[45] In part these claims rely on the idea that 1 Peter *might* be, but is likely not, authentic; at the least, it seems that 1 Peter and 2 Peter were composed by different hands.[46]

A principal feature of 2 Peter's presentation as a Petrine work is that it shares elements with the testamentary genre, the most central aspect of which is a text presented as the final teaching of an important figure in light of their imminent death."[47] The main passage from 2 Peter relevant to this claim comes in the first chapter, when "Peter" writes (2 Pet 1:12–15),

> Therefore I intend to keep on reminding you of these things, though you know them already and are established in the truth that has come to you. I think it right, as long as I am in this body [tent/dwelling], to refresh your memory, since I know that my death [the putting off of this dwelling] will come soon, as indeed our Lord Jesus Christ has made clear to me. And I will make every effort so that after my departure you may be able at any time to recall these things.

The emphasis on memory and a reminder of Peter's teaching goes hand in hand with Peter's reinstatement after the resurrection in John 21. After asking Peter three times, "Do you love me?," Jesus says (John 21:18–19):[48]

---

45   See Grünstäudl, *Petrus Alexandrinus*, 9–14, 20–23; Frey, *Jude and Second Peter*, 213–220. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 222–229 and id., "The New Testament Canon of Didymus the Blind," *VC* 37.1 (1983) 9–11; Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter*, 158–162; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.3.1–4; 3.25.3; 6.25.8 (cf. Origen, *Comm. Joh.* 5.3); Jerome, *De vir.* 1; (Pseudo-)Didymus, *Enarratio in epistolas canonicas* (cf. Frey, *Jude and Second Peter*, 173).

46   It is often suggested that 1 Peter involves the participation of a scribe or secretary, supposedly Silvanus (cf. 1 Pet 5:12, διὰ Σιλουανοῦ), or even Mark, but more likely the reference to Silvanus indicates that he was the letter carrier, not the scribe. Subscriptions commonly refer to where a letter is written from (ἀπό) and through whom it has been sent (διά), cf. subscriptions to 1 Peter in GA 915.378.1845. On the linkages between 1 and 2 Peter see Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 239–263, esp. 248–249; G.H. Boobyer, "The Indebtedness of 2 Peter to 1 Peter," in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson* (ed. A.J.B. Higgins; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959) 34–53; Theo Heckel, *Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Johannes und Judas* (NTD 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019) 133–135.

47   For an explanation and history of research on testamentary literature, see Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Textuality Between Death and Memory: The Prehistory and Formation of the Parabiblical Testament," *JQR* 104.3 (2014) 381–412, here 383. And see Frey, "Autorfiktion und Gegnerbild im Judasbrief und im Zweiten Petrusbrief," and id., *Jude and Second Peter*, 210, 215; Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter*, 131–134.

48   Cf. Reed, "Textuality between Death and Memory," 392, 400, 403.

> Very truly, I tell you, when you were younger, you used to fasten your own belt and go wherever you wished. But when you grow old, you will stretch out your hands and someone else will fasten a belt around you and take you where you do not wish to go. (He said this to indicate the kind of death by which he would glorify God.)[49]

Testamentary texts not only "reimagine the teaching and transmission of knowledge in the biblical past but they form part of the intensive Jewish literary creativity of the Second Temple period, when an array of new forms and genres was innovated at the interface between older biblical models of literary production and new models from Greek *paideia* and Roman law"—that is, the testamentary genre, and exemplarity more broadly, are rhetorical strategies that borrow from and combine existing tradition.[50] Peter's suffering and his connection to Rome are vague in 1 Peter (cf. 5:13), but Petrine writings, the manuscript tradition, and ecclesiastical references variously attest to Peter's martyrdom as a pillar of his exemplary status and apostolic identity (cf. Eth. ApocPet 14; ActsPet 30–40; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.1.2, citing Origen's *Comm. Gen.* 3).[51] In addition to the emphasis on Peter's death in 2 Peter, another crucial aspect of the testamentary mode of 2 Peter is Peter's claim to being one of the "eyewitnesses of his majesty," that is, an eyewitness to the transfiguration "when we were with him on the holy mountain" (2 Pet 1:16–18; and cf. Eth. ApocPet 15; Matt 17:1–8; Mark 9:2–8; Luke 9:28–36). That Peter was an eyewitness to Jesus' ministry, transfiguration, and resurrection remains a central pillar of his high apostolic status in early Christian teaching. There is also a strong emphasis on teaching, especially *against* false teachers, the ψευδο-διδάσκαλοι of 2 Pet 2 who mirror those ψευδοπροφῆται who arose in the past (2 Pet 2:1–3; cf. Jude 3–4; Akh. ApocPet 1). Readers are explicitly exhorted to guard against such teaching because they know better—presumably because they have been instructed by "Peter" himself (2 Pet 3:17).

Along with the testamentary shape of 2 Peter and its contribution to wider Petrine tradition, another aspect worth highlighting in considering the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy as a mode of exemplarity is that, in addition to textual content and immediate historical milieu, a work's later reception

---

49   On 2 Peter's ties to Jesus tradition, especially the transfiguration, see Frey, *Jude and Second Peter*, 196–199; Bauckham, *Jude–2 Peter*, 205–212.

50   Reed, "Textuality between Death and Memory," 383.

51   On "Babylon" as Rome and further evidence for the pseudepigraphy of 1 Peter, see Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 241–247. On living memory and the historical Peter, see Bockmuehl's sixth chapter, "Peter's Death in Rome? Back to Front and Upside Down," in *The Remembered Peter,* 114–132.

might be said to play a larger role in "validating" the "Petrine-ness" of a letter like 2 Peter. The paratextual features of 2 Peter's textual afterlife contribute significantly to its perception as a letter from the same apostle Peter to whom 1 Peter is attributed.

5　Material Pseudonymity: Peter, Chief of the Apostles Who Was Martyred in Rome

The figure of Peter is not only constructed within the works attributed to him, but also and especially within the paratextual traditions associated with their material transmission. These include not only major finds including newly discovered texts related to the figure of Peter, like the Nag Hammadi codices, but also the vast manuscript tradition containing NT texts. These traditions provide examples of the later reception of the letters of Peter, particularly the high status that the figure of Peter and the canonical letters attributed to him held as part of the NT collection.[52] The earliest preserved copy of 1 Peter is preserved in Coptic in the Crosby-Schøyen Codex, with the inscription, "The Epistle of Peter," which suggests that a second letter was either not known to or not accepted by the scribe(s) and community that produced this manuscript.[53] Also preserved in Coptic, a ninth- or tenth-century Egyptian codex containing the Catholic Epistles begins with an ornamented hybrid inscription for the Catholic Epistles generally and the letters of Peter particularly, which come first: ⲛⲕⲁⲑⲟⲗⲏⲕⲏ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲉⲓ[ⲟⲧⲉ] ⲛⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ,

---

52　Titles were often affixed in the course of a text's transmission, not its production. As Heckel argues, for example, the titles of the Gospels are the result of collective editing, not initial production: Theo K. Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium* (WUNT 120; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) 207–217 (against Hengel).

53　For the text, see W.H. Willis, "The Letter of Peter (1 Peter): Coptic Text, Translation, Notes and Variant Readings," in *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex MS 193 in the Schøyen Collection* (ed. J.E. Goehring; Leuven: Peeters, 1990) 135–215. The Crosby-Schøyen Codex MS 193 was found among the Dishna Papers not far from the Nag Hammadi find site along with the Bodmer Composite Codex, which contains some of the same texts, including 1 Peter. See Hugo Lundhaug, "The Dishna Papers and the Nag Hammadi Codices: The Remains of a Single Monastic Library?," in *The Nag Hammadi Codices and Late Ancient Antique Egypt* (ed. Hugo Lundhaug and Lance Jennot; STAC 97; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 78–84; Brice Jones, "The Bodmer 'Miscellaneous' Codex and the Crosby-Schøyen Codex MS 193: A New Proposal," *JGRChJ* 8 (2011–12) 9–20; David G. Horrell, "The Themes of 1 Peter: Insights from the Earliest Manuscripts (the Crosby-Schøyen Codex ms 193 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex Containing P[72])," *NTS* 55 (2009) 502–522.

"Catholic [Epistles] of our fathers the Apostle Peter" (M.572 f. 1r).[54] Syriac tradition likewise attests the primacy of Peter among the Catholic Epistles. Prior to the Philoxenian and Harklean versions from the sixth and seventh centuries, respectively, the Peshitta included only 1 Peter and 1 John, with James added later.[55] Here, the major Catholic Epistles were also received even more explicitly as a part of the Praxapostolos, with the Acts of the Apostles. A tenth-century Peshitta containing the Gospels, Acts, James, 1 Peter, 1 John, and the epistles of Paul includes this subscription after 1 John: "End of the Acts of the 12 Apostles" (DCA 00144f. 201r).[56] In Coptic and Syriac tradition, as one of the "minor" Catholic Epistles 2 Peter finds less favor than its canonical Petrine counterpart. Yet, that Peter served as a figurehead of the Catholic Epistles is also suggestive of his high status both as an apostolic leader and as a textual figure to whom significant literature is attributed. Of particular interest is the way in which 2 Peter is brought into the fold through its apostolic association to 1 Peter and binding with Acts and the Catholic Epistles, contributing over time to its reception as an apostolic letter.

While there are examples of Coptic and Syriac manuscripts that place the Petrine letters in a position of prominence among the Catholic Epistles, Greek manuscripts reflect an even more explicit tradition that accumulated around the figure of Peter as a leader of the apostles. A variety of inscriptions and subscriptions from a broad span of time preserve two key details associated with Peter: an honorific title of "chief of the apostles," and his association with Rome, where he is said to have been martyred.

---

54   The folio can be viewed at http://ica.themorgan.org/manuscript/page/1/77274. James is placed after the Johannine epistles, while a Cairene fragment from the same codex preserves Jude and its initial title; Paola Buzi, "New Testament Titles in the Coptic Manuscript Tradition: An Overview," *Religions* 13.6: 476 (2022) 1–13, esp. 8. As Buzi notes, a similar codex containing the fourteen Pauline letters presents a similar inscription both for the whole corpus and for Romans in particular (M.570 f. 1r).

55   John Gwynn, "The Older Syriac Version of the Four Minor Catholic Epistles," *Hermathena* 7.16 (1890) 281–314; Julius August Bewer, "The History of the New Testament Canon in the Syrian Church II: The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles," *AJT* 4.2 (1900) 345–363; J.S. Siker, "The Canonical Status of the Catholic Epistles in the Syriac New Testament," *JTS* 38.2 (1987) 311–340. Brock suggests that Syriac translations of the "minor" Catholic Epsitles, including 2 Peter, may not have existed until the sixth century: Sebastian P. Brock, *The Bible in Syriac Tradition* (2nd ed.; Gorgias Handbooks 7; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006) 18–19, 106–107.

56   The manuscript can be viewed at https://www.vhmml.org/readingRoom/view/607206. Thanks are due to Dr. James Walters who pointed this out and provided a translation.

Paratextual features are the spaces in which information can be added without necessarily affecting a main body of text.[57] While the text of 1 Peter includes a cryptic note of greeting from "she who is in Babylon," commonly said to represent Rome, the text of 2 Peter includes no such detail, ending instead with a final exhortation to readers to guard themselves against being led astray (2 Pet 3:17–18). But the manuscript tradition reflects an impulse to tie both letters together through subscriptions, where it is conventional to note where a letter has been written from.[58]

GA 43 (11th cent) inscription to 1 Peter (59r)	επιστολη του αγιου και κορυφαιου αποστολου πετρου πρωτη
GA 2243 (17th cent) inscription to 1 Peter (237r)	αρχη της πρωτης καθολικης επιστολης πετρου του κορυφαιου των αποστολων
GA 2243 subscription to 2 Peter (and the Petrine epistles, 242r)	τελος των καθολικων επιστολων πετρου εγραφη και αυτη απο ρωμης
GA 1751 (15th cent) subscription to 1 Peter (52v)	πρωτη επιστολη πετρου. εγραφη απο ρωμης
GA 1751 subscription to 2 Peter (55v)	τελος της πετρου επιστολης εγραφη απο ρωμης προς τας δωδεκα φυλας
GA 2344 (11th cent) subscription to 2 Peter (and the Petrine Epistles, 192v)	επιστολαι πετρου: α: καὶ β

These titles provide examples of the intentional ties between the canonical Petrine epistles introduced through their paratextual features. GA 2243, for example, attributes 1 Peter to Peter, "chief of the apostles," and includes a shared subscription to both epistles, noting they were "written from Rome." GA 1751 includes in its subscriptions that both Petrine epistles were "written

---

57   On Paratextuality, see Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Patrick Andrist, "Toward a Definition of Paratexts and Paratextuality: The Case of Ancient Greek Manuscripts," in *Bible as Notepad: Tracing Annotations and Annotation Practices in Late Antique and Medieval Biblical Manuscripts* (ed. Liv Ingeborg Lied and Marilena Maniaci; Manuscripta Biblica 3; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018) 130–149.

58   Many other subscriptions to 1 Peter include that the letter was written from Rome: 6.18.35.88.104.321.431.459.614.665.876.1175.1270.1297.1524.1595.1739.1832.1838.1842.1875. 2138.2374.2423. Some additionally include that 1 Peter was sent δια σιλουανου, through Silvanus: 915.378.1845. And see *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior IV: Die Katholischen Briefe* (ed. B. Aland et al.; Teil 1; 2nd rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsch Bibelgesellschaft, 2013) 101, 202, 203, 261.

from Rome," while adding that 2 Peter was written "to the twelve tribes," tying the 2 Peter subscription to 1 Peter's address "to the elect exiles of the diaspora" (1 Pet 1:1). Some of the same honorific titles from these inscriptions and subscriptions can also be found within other works associated with the Apostle Peter, for example in the Pseudo-Clementine material.[59] Given the span of time the manuscripts listed here covers, it is possible that they have been influenced by the *Clementina*. My point, though, is not a source-critical or genealogical one, but rather that there is a generative accumulation of tradition associated with prestigious scriptural-historical figures like Peter that is reflected throughout the material and interpretive transmission of scripture. Titles represent a remarkably fluid and strategic space in which to introduce material outside the main text of scriptural works like 2 Peter. Though these titles represent the transmission of the Petrine letters centuries after they were written, this is precisely the point: the cumulative amassing of tradition around the figure of Peter contributes to the "canonical" reception of 2 Peter as a Petrine text alongside 1 Peter. They also illustrate the high status of Peter as an apostolic authorial figure and a scribal effort to clarify 2 Peter's rightful place by tying its production and reception to 1 Peter and, more centrally, to the person of Peter, the martyred chief of the apostles. The reinforcement of this Petrine association contributes to the momentum of 2 Peter's reception as a canonical work.

6   Conclusion: The Second Peter

Peter enjoys an extensive afterlife in the prolific tradition of Petrine pseudepigraphy that follows in the wake of his death. It is not only the earliest textual traditions that should contribute to an understanding of the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy but also the transmission and reception of a work that reflects back on its generation and extension of tradition. Second Peter also has an afterlife, as it continues to gather and accumulate additional Petrine tradition not initially included in the text itself, including extended inscriptions and subscriptions and even iconographic representations.[60] Paratextual features remained in flux within the manuscript tradition well beyond when some

---

59   See the Clementine Homilies (or Recognitions, in Latin; PG 2:148). Jerome calls Peter "chief of the apostles" (*princeps apostolorum*) in *De vir.* (PL 23:828), as does John Chrysostom in *De Macc.* (PG 50:632) and *Oratio sec.* (PG 63; κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων).

60   On apostolic icons as paratextual features, see Isaac Soon, "Absent in Body, Present in Spirit: Apostolic Iconography in Greek Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts," *Religions* 13.7: 574 (2022) 1–16.

ecclesiastical figures acknowledged the dual reality that 2 Peter was doubted (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.25.3; Jerome, *De vir.* 1), and yet was read, at least by some, among the New Testament collection. Early hesitance surrounding 2 Peter's status eventually gives way to taking for granted that this letter does indeed represent teaching of Peter that should be included among the NT collection. This is not the result, however, of explicit attempts to defend 2 Peter's authenticity.[61]

Early Christian pseudepigraphy does not occur in a vacuum; it is representative of established Jewish literary tradition and it represents a deliberate, interpretive rhetorical strategy involving the creative expansion of the teaching of apostolic figures such as Peter. And 2 Peter is perhaps the NT work whose authoritative status was most explicitly affected by the early suspicion surrounding its authorship. But apostolic tradition neither originates with nor culminates in the NT writings. Rather, writings associated with prominent figures from the NT, Peter being a principal among them, continue to develop apostolic lore contemporaneous with and beyond the writings that came to be included in the NT collection.

As a complex, deliberate, and essentially interpretive phenomenon, pseudepigraphy is neither unique to nor remarkable within early Christianity and onward. It is a creative literary strategy enabling the generation of new tradition surrounding figures of prestige—in other words, it is also a mode of exemplarity. That said, it is not necessarily welcome or even neutral within various Christian communities, as evidenced by numerous ecclesiastical writers' hesitance over the scriptural authority of works whose authorship is suspect. Despite this, the trajectory of 2 Peter's reception tends heavily toward its Petrine, apostolic association and therefore its rightful place among the NT collection. One factor in 2 Peter's reception is represented by paratextual evidence that originates from beyond the initial centuries of Christianity, but that nevertheless provides insight into the reception of 2 Peter as apostolic, contributing to the developing understanding of textual apostolicity as transcendent of historical authenticity. Like many Jewish and early Christian pseudepigrapha, 2 Peter makes use of an exemplary figure, Peter, and creatively expands the literary and theological realm of his life, works, and teaching. The exemplary author figure of Peter embodies a constellatory range of

---

61 To the contrary, in the late fourth century, as mentioned above, Jerome acknowledges that 2 Peter is considered by many not to have been written by Peter, *De vir.* 1, and Didymus the Blind is even more explicit: "We must therefore not be ignorant of the fact that the epistle at hand is forged, which, even though published, is nevertheless not in the canon," *Enarr. in epist. cathol.* PG 39:1774; trans. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 223.

Jewish, early Christian, and specifically Petrine tradition to pass on an apostolic message. As a mode of exemplarity, pseudepigraphy contributes to the transcendence of earlier figures through their distillation into timeless models for the present and future: types become archetypes. Certain aspects of Peter's reputation provide a stabilizing centre of gravity—his status among the apostles, his well-known teaching, his martyrdom, his connection to the Jerusalem church—even as Petrine tradition expands and multiplies through the malleable and creatively adaptable practice of pseudepigraphy. Petrine tradition accumulates, aggregates, conflates, leading to new textual "Peters," including the second Peter. The generative momentum and traditionary potential of pseudepigraphy manifests in a prolific textual afterlife for the apostle Peter.